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ABSTRACT

Knowledge of Panoan languages and linguistics has increased significantly over the last several decades. The present paper draws upon this new information to produce a current internal classification of all the extant and extinct languages in the Panoan family based on lexical, phonological, and grammatical comparisons. This classification pays special attention to distinguishing dialects from independent languages and to mismatches that exist between linguistically defined languages and socially defined ethnic groups. An evaluation of previously proposed genetic relations to other language families is followed by a discussion of lexical borrowing and possible areal diffusion of grammatical features from and into neighboring non-Panoan languages and Kechua. The history of Panoan linguistics is chronicled from the first Jesuit and Franciscan vocabularies to the most recent contributions, and priorities for future research are suggested. A typological overview of Panoan phonology, morphology, and syntax is provided along with descriptions of some of the extraordinary linguistic features found in the family. Name taboos, postmortem word taboos, in-law avoidance languages, trade languages, ceremonial languages, and other ethnolinguistic phenomena found in the Panoan family are also discussed.
Map 1. Locations of Panoan languages. The first letter of the name is positioned at the location where extant languages are spoken, where extinct languages were spoken, or where languages of captives were spoken prior to their capture. In those cases where languages are spoken over a large or disparate territory, particularly where multiple ethnic groups speak dialects of a single language, the first letter of the name indicates roughly the center of the area over which the language is spoken. See appendix 3 for the precise locations of dialects.
With approximately 32 known languages and 40,000–50,000 speakers, Panoans compose a medium-sized family, the fifth largest in South America, following the Arawakan, Cariban, Tupian, and Ge families. They are or were found in eastern Peru, western Brazil, and northern Bolivia. Panoan speakers were traditionally relatively small seminomadic ethnic groups, many of which were contacted for the first time in the 20th century. They all traditionally practiced slash-and-burn agriculture, hunting, fishing, and collection of wild foods, as most continue to do today.

Panoan languages have been known by name since the 1600s, their word lists first became publically available in the 1830s, and by the 1940s they began to be topics of academic linguistic studies. Knowledge of Panoan languages and linguistics has improved significantly over what was known 50 or even 10 years ago, but there is nevertheless a sense of urgency to describe and analyze these languages. Of the approximately 32 known Panoan languages, only about 18 are still spoken today, 6 of which are no longer spoken as everyday languages. A few large, viable Panoan speech communities still exist. Notably, Shipibo-Konibo has 30,000–40,000 speakers, and Matses, Kashinawa of the Ibuacu River, Yaminawa, Kashibo, Marubo, and Chakobo all have 1000 or more speakers. But most other extant Panoan languages are obsolescent or in danger of extinction due to low populations and language replacement by Spanish, Portuguese, or Shipibo-Konibo, and most of these are incompletely described. Among the major aims of the present paper is to qualify and put into context the linguistic information available for the family, and to pull together new and old information to provide a more accurate classification and linguistic description of the family, with the hope of facilitating future research on Panoan languages.

This paper begins with a classification of the family, which also serves as an inventory of all the extant and extinct Panoan languages and dialects. Next follow descriptions of genetic ties beyond the family level and of lexical borrowing and areal diffusion of grammatical features from, and into, neighboring non-Panoan languages and Kechua. Next is a history of Panoan linguistics, from the first Jesuit notes on affiliation and Franciscan vocabularies to the most recent contributions to the field, followed by suggested priorities for future Panoan linguistic research. Then a brief typological overview of Panoan phonology, morphology, and syntax is outlined, pointing out some of the more extraordinary grammatical features found in the family. Ethnolinguistic phenomena are discussed in the final section.

CLASSIFICATION AND INVENTORY OF PANOAN LANGUAGES AND DIALECTS

Table 1 provides a classification of all the extant and extinct languages and dialects known to be linguistically Panoan, and map 1 shows their locations. This classification is based strictly on linguistic features (lexical, phonological, and grammatical similarity), and consequently differs from most previous classifications in several ways: (1) only languages for which there exists at least a word list are included; (2) ethnic identity is
not taken into account, so that very similar varieties spoken by separate ethnic groups are not treated as distinct languages, but as dialects of the same linguistically defined language; (3) subgrouping does not take into account geographical proximity, but rather is guided by relative linguistic similarity.

It is important to keep in mind that the classification in table 1 is a classification of relative similarity, rather than one produced through the application of the comparative method, and therefore is not purported to be a genetic classification. A proper genetic classification will rely on a proto-Panoan reconstruction, which cannot be reliably carried out until more Kasharari data become available: there are no Kasharari dictionaries or long word lists available, and the two Kasharari phonological studies (Sousa, 2004; Couto, 2005) differ diametrically in many important points. I have begun a reconstruction and can say that I do not expect a Panoan genetic classification to differ much from my classification of relative similarity, but nevertheless I reiterate that readers should not take the present classification as genetic. I note that a genetic classification that takes into account new Kasharari data and considers whether similarities between Kashibo and languages of the Nawa Group are due to largely to areal contact may lead to the treatment of Kasharari and/or Kashibo as additional highest-level branches of the family. Although classifications based on a reconstruction and application of the comparative method are considered more important by linguists, a classification of relative similarity is nevertheless valuable for understanding relations within the family. For example, differences between the two types of classifications will reveal cases where linguistic contact has caused languages to become more similar. Additionally, the comparative method cannot be applied reliably to extinct languages with limited linguistic data available. See Fleck (2007a) for the methodology used for lexical comparisons and the quantitative results of a lexical comparison among 16 Panoan languages. Appendix 2 lists all the data examined while preparing the classification in table 1.

In addition to the known Panoan languages and dialects included in table 1, surely other Panoan speech varieties became extinct before they could be documented. For some extinct, possibly Panoan ethnic groups we have only ethnonyms and occasionally notes on linguistic or ethnic affiliation. The lack of linguistic information for these does not allow us to incorporate them into the classification in table 1. Even if we felt sure that any one of these ethnonyms referred to Panoan speakers, we often cannot know if it was a synonym for or the name of a dialect of a language already included in table 1. Table 2 provides a list of ethnonyms/language names that have been claimed to be Panoan, but for which no linguistic data are available.

Additionally, there are several uncontacted groups in westernmost Brazil suspected to be Panoans (Erikson, 1994). It is also believed that there are uncontacted Panoan groups in easternmost Peru, although, unlike the areal photographs of communal longhouses in Brazil, interviews with locals are the only evidence for the purported Panoan uncontacted groups in Peru (see Huertas, 2004; Krokoszyński et al., 2007). It is possible that one or more of these uncontacted groups are remnants of one of the presumably extinct groups listed in tables 1 and 2, or hitherto unknown Panoan groups.
TABLE 1. Fleck’s Classification of Panoan Languages and Dialects (that have linguistic data available)*

I. Mayoruna branch (4 extant and 4 documented extinct languages)
   A. Mayo group
      i. Matses subgroup
         a. Matses (3 dialects):  Peruvian Matses; Brazilian Matses  
            †Paud Usunkid
         b. *Kulina of the Curuçá River (3 dialects):  
            *Kapishtana; *Mawi  
            *Chema
         c. †Demushbo
      ii. Korubo (2 dialects)
         Korubo  
            *Chankueshbo
      iii. Matis subgroup (most similar to Mainline branch)
         a. Matis (most divergent from other extant Mayoruna languages)
         b. †Mayoruna of the Jandiatuba River
         c. †Mayoruna of the Amazon River (2 dialects):  
            †Settled Mayoruna of the Amazon River  
            †Wild Mayoruna of the Amazon River
   B. †Mayoruna of Tabatinga (the phonologically most divergent Mayoruna unit)

II. Mainline branch (about 14 extant and about 10 documented extinct languages)
   A. Kasharari (most divergent Mainline language)
   B. Kashibo (4 dialects; similar to Nawa group due to contact with Shipibo)
      Kashibo (Tessmann’s “Kaschinö”)  
      Rubo; Isunubo  
      Kakataibo
      nokaman (formerly thought to be extinct)
   C. Nawa group (subgroups ordered from most to least divergent)
      i. Bolivian subgroup
         a. Chakobo/Pakawara (2 dialects of 1 language)
         b. †Karipuna (may be a dialect of Chakobo/Pakawara)
         c. †Chiriha (?)
      ii. Madre de Dios subgroup
         a. †Atsawaka/†Yamiaka (2 dialects of 1 language)
         b. †Arazaire
      iii. †Remo of the Blanco River
      iv. †Kashinawa of the Tarauacá River
   v. Marubo subgroup
      a. Marubo (of the Javari Basin)
      b. Katukina
         Katukina of Olinda; Katukina of Sete Estrelas  
         †Kanamari
      c. †Kulina of São Paulo de OIivença
      “Central Panoan Assemblage”: evidently there has been areal influence among neighboring languages, such that the boundaries among subgroups vi–viii are somewhat blurred.
   vi. Poyanawa subgroup
      a. *Poyanawa
      b. *Iskonawa (very close to Poyanawa, but also resembles Shipibo-Konibo-Kapanawa and Amawaka)
      c. *Nukini
      d. *Nawa (of the Môa River) (tentatively classified due to lack of useful linguistic data)
      e. †Remo of the Jaquirana River
   vii. Chama subgroup
      a. Shipibo-Konibo (3 dialects of 1 language)
         Shipibo; Konibo (currently fused)  
         *Kapanawa of the Tapiche River
      b. *Pano  
         †Pano  
         *Shetebo; *Piskino
      c. †Sensi (see Fleck to be published)
Ethnonyms and Orthography

In addition to providing a classification of the Panoan languages, table 1 represents a complete inventory of all the Panoan languages and dialects (and of all the Panoan ethnic groups; here I consider an “ethnonym” a term that circumscribes a recognized ethnic group, and which is also the designation for their speech variety, which may be either a dialect or a language). The ethnonyms in table 1 (and table 2) were selected by me as their principal English denominations. Below I note the conventions I followed for selecting the principal ethnonyms and their spelling.

The first issue to deal with is synonymy: for many languages/ethnic groups, multiple synonymous terms exist in the literature. For example, Shipibo has also been called Calliseca and Chama in the historical literature, and Kashibo has been referred to by the pseudo-autodenomination Uni (“people”) in some recent publications (e.g., Frank, 1987, 1993, 1994). From such synonym sets the term that is most common in the current academic literature is selected as the primary ethnonym, and if two or more terms are similarly common, the older term is se-

### TABLE 1 — (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>viii. Headwaters subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Kashinawa of the Ibuáçu River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian Kashinawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian Kashinawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Kapanawa of the Juruá River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Paranawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Yaminawa (large dialect complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian Yaminawa (probably represents 2 or more dialects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian Yaminawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaninawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitonawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastanawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkenawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanenawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharanawa, *Marinawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawannawa (= Arara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yawanawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Yaminawa-arara (very similar to Shawannawa/Arara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Nehanawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Amawaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian Amawaka (intermediate between this subgroup and Chama subgroup, perhaps as a result of areal contact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Nishinawa (= Brazilian Amawaka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Yumanawa (also very similar to Kashinawa of the Ibuáçu River)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. †Remo of the Môa River (resembles Amawaka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. †Tuchiunawa (resembles Yaminawa dialects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes about 18 extant languages plus about 14 documented extinct languages = about 32 languages total (the values are approximate because †Karipuna and *Nawa may not be distinct languages, and †Chiriba is tentatively classified as Panoan). Languages in **bold**; dialects in *italics*; † = extinct; * = obsolescent (i.e., no longer spoken as an everyday language, but a few speakers remember it). Dialects with minor differences are listed on the same line. See appendix 2 for the data upon which this classification was based.

† Chiriba is an otherwise unknown language from Bolivia with a historical list of only seven words, some of which match or resemble word in Panoan languages (and none resemble other languages in the area), particularly Pakawara, as kindly pointed out to me by Harald Hammarström. It cannot be classified as Panoan with complete certainty.
I. Mayoruna branch

Chirabo – probably a Mayoruna faction (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 453)
Korugo – "Maíorumas Corugos" (Zárate, 1904 [1739]: 393)
Marubo of Maucallacta – Mayoruna subtribe (Castelnau, 1850–1859: V: 40; Raimondi, 1862: 100, etc.; see Fleck, 2007a, for more sources and discussion)
Maya (of the Quiquito River) – partially mutually intelligible with Matses (Anonymous, 1978; Erikson, 1994: 22)
Mayo – Panoan, possibly Mayoruna (Tastevin, 1924b: 424). There might be a list in Tastevin’s archive near Paris
Pisabo – Mayoruna subtribe (Grubb, 1927: 83)

II. Mainline branch

B. Aino – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Barinawa – Kashibo branch (Távara, 1905 [1868]: 425; Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Burinawa – Kashibo subtribe (Ordinaire, 1887: 302; Távara, 1905 [1868]: 425; Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Chashono – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Choromawa – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Hunino – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Inono – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Kamaigohuni – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Naibo – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Naitabohuni – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Puchanawa – Kashibo subtribe (Ordinaire, 1887: 302)
Ruino – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Shirino – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Shokeno – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Shuchanawa – Kashibo subtribe (Távara, 1905 [1868]: 425)
Tonano – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Tsargunawa – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Winano – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)
Komabo – same as Kashibo (Marqués, 1931 [1800]: 119; Steinen, 1904: 22)
Inuaka – Komabo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546)
Kūんな – Komabo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546)
Ruanawa – Komabo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546)
Zeeba – Komabo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546)

C. Nawa group

i. Bolivian subgroup

a. Kapubo – Pakawara division (Cardús, 1886: 291)
Sinabo of the Mamoré River – Pakawara division (Cardús, 1886: 291)
Chumana – related to Chiriiba (Hervás, 1800: 250)

ii. Madre de Dios subgroup

a. Tiatinawa – dialect similar to Yamiaka (Stiglich, 1908: 427)
Yaguarmayo – Yamiakas of the Yaguarmayo River (Stiglich, 1908: 427)

v. Marubo subgroup


vi. Poyanawa subgroup

b. Awabakebo – part of Iskonawa confederation (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)
Hawabakebo – part of Iskonawa confederation (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)
Inubakebo – part of Iskonawa confederation (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)
Isuhenakebo – part of Iskonawa confederation (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)
Naibakebo – part of Iskonawa confederation (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)
Runubakebo – part of Iskonawa confederation (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)
Tsinubakebo – part of Iskonawa confederation (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)
Waribakebo – same dialect as Iskonawa (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)
Yawabakebo – part of Iskonawa confederation (Whiton et al., 1964: 102)

e. Yaya – Nawa subtribe (Hassel, 1905: 52; Stiglich, 1908: 428)
Punhamunawa – could be understood with difficulty by Poyanawas (Oppenheim, 1936: 152–153)

TABLE 2. Tentative Classification of Possibly Panoan Languages/Dialects Lacking Linguistic Dataa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Mayoruna branch</th>
<th>II. Mainline branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chirabo – probably a Mayoruna faction (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 453)</td>
<td>B. Aino – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korugo – “Maíorumas Corugos” (Zárate, 1904 [1739]: 393)</td>
<td>Barinawa – Kashibo branch (Távara, 1905 [1868]: 425; Tessmann, 1930: 128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marubo of Maucallacta – Mayoruna subtribe (Castelnau, 1850–1859: V: 40; Raimondi, 1862: 100, etc.; see Fleck, 2007a, for more sources and discussion)</td>
<td>Burinawa – Kashibo subtribe (Ordinaire, 1887: 302; Távara, 1905 [1868]: 425; Tessmann, 1930: 128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo – Panoan, possibly Mayoruna (Tastevin, 1924b: 424). There might be a list in Tastevin’s archive near Paris</td>
<td>Choromawa – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisabo – Mayoruna subtribe (Grubb, 1927: 83)</td>
<td>Hunino – Kashibo subtribe (Tessmann, 1930: 128)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. By 2007, the classification was still tentative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vii. Chama subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Aw$\ddot{a}$nawa – branch of Shipibo (Velasco, 1981 [1788–1789]: 546, Markham, 1910: 81; Steward and Métraux, 1948: 567)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbudo – same as Shipibo, Shetebos, and Kapanawa (Figueroa, 1904: 115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chai – Shipibo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusabatai – Manamabobo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makonawa – Barbudo faction (Figueroa, 1904: 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawishi – Konibo horde (Bates, 1863: 379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fachikta – Manamabobo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahenbakebo – clan of Kapanawa of the Tapiche River speaking a distinct dialect (Loos and Loos, 1998: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinabo of the Ucayali Basin – Shipibo subtribe (Stiglich, 1908: 426; Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 472; Grubb, 1927: 84; also given as a synonym of Shipibo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipinawa – Shipibo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkaguane – Konibo faction (Maroni, 1988 [1889–1892]: 284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawakua – Manamabobo dialect (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniwepa – Konibo faction (Magnin in Maroni, 1988: 474)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaminawa – Konibo horde (Bates, 1863: 379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Chakaya – speak same language as Shipibos and Shetebos (Marcy, 1869: 1: 683, Shetebos facton (Marcy, 1869 [2001: II: 463–464])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iltipo – Pano dialect (Hervás, 1800: 263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manannawa – Pano faction (Richter in Maroni, 1988: 294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Inubo – Sensi faction (Carvallo, 1906 [1818]: 342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runubo – Sensi faction (Carvallo, 1906 [1818]: 342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasca – Sensi faction (Carvallo, 1906 [1818]: 342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puinawa – same language as Panos, Shipibos, etc. (Stiglich, 1908: 421–422); same as Shetebos (Tessmann, 1928: 2; Steward and Métraux, 1948: 559–560). But see Plaza’s 1813 classification where Puinawa is classified as non-Panoan (Lehnertz 1974: 451), and Carvallo, (1906 [1918]: 348) and Plaza and Cimini (1907 [1841]: 81) who explicitly say it is distinct from the other known or Panoan languages. Ordinaire (1887: 316) maintains that it is derived from Kokama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Remo – Very similar to Konibo (Richter in Maroni, 1988: 296); mutually understandable with Chama languages (Alemany, 1906: iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisibakebo – Southern Remo faction (Amich, 1988 [Pallarés and Calvo, 1870]: 418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakaya – Southern Remo subtribe (Grubb, 1927: 100; Mason, 1950: 267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Headwaters subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Tushinawa – Belong to Kashinawa &quot;clan&quot; (Tastevin, 1926: 53, though I am not sure which Kashinawa he referred to). The large geographic separation (see appendix 3) suggests that there are probably two separate groups with the same name (with no indication whether the Jutaí group is Panoan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Aninawa – possibly same as Yaminawa (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 451)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deenawa – former Yaminawa subgroup (Townley, 1994: 249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonawa – Yaminawa subgroup (Ribeiro and Wise, 1978: 194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morunawa – understood by Yaminawa (Ribeiro and Wise, 1978: 143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadinawa – extinct Yaminawa subgroup of which some survivors live among the Sharanawas (Townley, 1994: 250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shishinawa – extinct Yaminawa subgroup of which few survivors live among the Yaminawas of the Purus River and the Parkenawas (Townley, 1994: 250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Arawa – Amawaka branch (Stiglich, 1908: 402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biubakeu – Amawaka faction (Maroni, 1988 [1889–1892]: 296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espino – probably Amawaka branch (Stiglich, 1908: 416)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inubakeu – Amawaka faction (Maroni, 1988 [1889–1892]: 296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuminawa – Amawaka subtribe (Hassel, 1905: 52; Stiglich, 1908: 428)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yura – Amawaka subtribe (Hassel, 1905: 53; Stiglich, 1908: 426)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Other ethnonyms said to designate Panoan languages/dialects but with no further clues as to their classification. The citation following the ethnonym is the author(s) that associated it with the Panoan family.

Awanateo (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 452, “with doubt Panoan”)
Binabo (Steward and Métraux, 1948: 567)
Binannawa (Steinen, 1904: 21)
Chipinawa (Tastevin, 1914: 14, 1929)
Chunti (Steward and Métraux, 1948: 567)
Diabo (Steward and Métraux, 1948: 567)
Eskinawa (Tastevin, 1929: 12)
Isunawa (Steward and Métraux, 1948: 567)
Kamaringua (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 455, “very probably Panoan”)  
Kurunawa (Carvalho, 1931: 248 “verified that they speak a Panoan dialect”; Tastevin, 1929: 12)
Kustanawa (Loukotka, 1968: 169)
Mochobo (Steward and Métraux, 1948: 555)
Nianawa (Steward and Métraux, 1948: 555)
Ormiga (Steward and Métraux, 1948: 567)
Pakanawa (Reich and Stegelmann, 1903: 137; Steinen, 1904: 22)
Pitsobo (Castelnau, 1850–1859: IV: 387)
Rununawa (Tastevin, 1929: 12)
Soboibo (Steinen, 1904: 26)
Tuchunawa (Tastevin, 1929: 13)
Trompetero (Steward and Métraux, 1948: 567; possibly this is simply the Spanish translation of Nianawa, if nia is a corruption of nëa, ”trumpeter”)  
Zurina (Mason, 1950: 269)

IV: In category III, except for Kurunawa, Pakanawa, and Pitsobo, all these ethnonyms are assumed by the cited author to be Panoan, evidently based only on the ethnonyms ending in -bo or -nawa and/or geographic location (most of these authors never even visited Amazonia, and therefore they could just as well be Panoan exonyms for non-Panoans). Based on such clues, one could add the following, which lack linguistic affiliation in the literature, as possibly Panoan:

Bamunawa (Tastevin, 1926: 51)
Buinawa (Tastevin, 1926: 51)
Bitinawa (Tastevin, 1925: 415)
Chipanawa (Figueroa, 1904 [1661]: 164)
Hsunawa (Tastevin, 1925: 414, mixed with Kashinawa)
Isaknawa (Dueñas, 1792: 175)
Kayubo (Stiglich, 1908: 406)
Komanawa (Rodriguez, 2004–2005 [1780]: II: 110; Córdova, 1957: 221, 222)
Michanawa (Whiton et al., 1964: 100, Iskonawa enemies)
Panatawa (Dueñas, 1792: 181, captives of Panos)
Pimisnawa (Whiton et al., 1964: 100, Iskonawa enemies)
Suyaro (Dueñas, 1792: 175)
Takanawa (Tastevin, 1925: 415)
Tsawesbo (Erikson, 1999: 113, descendants live among the Matis)
Unabro (Taboada, 1859 [1796]: 132)
Unibo (Viegl, 1875: 106)

Ethnonyms that lack accompanying linguistic data are here placed into categories proposed in table 1 based on historical reports of mutual intelligibility or their presentation as dialects, factions, or subtribes of another language/ethnic group. Ethnonyms are followed by published sources of information on affiliation or mutual intelligibility (not necessarily the first source that mentions the name); see appendix 3 for locations. Note that this table excludes obvious errors, such as Aguano, Chamikuro, Jákaria, Pama(NA), Maparina, Urarina, Panau, and Piro, which have been erroneously classified as Panoan by early authors. Also excluded from this table (and table 1) are many denominations for moieties, marriage sections, or coresidential “clans,” which typically end with -bo, -nawa, boke, huni, or variants or combinations of these. As subcategories of ethnonyms/language names, table 1 includes only documented regional dialects, and this table includes only terms stated to be dialects, subtribes, factions or (as far as I could tell) non-coresidential “clans.”
lected. All other terms are treated as secondary synonyms, and can be found listed in appendix 1.

The second issue relevant to nomenclature conventions is homonymy within the family, which is very common in the Panoan family. As can be seen in table 3, Mayoruna, Kulina, Remo, Kapanawa, and Kashinawa are each the most widely accepted ethnonym for more than one Panoan language or dialect. Rather than invent new ethnonyms, resurrect obscure synonyms, or apply different spelling/pronunciation variants to differentiate the speech varieties, here I modify these denominations with a location (e.g., Kulina of the Curuçá River), as can be seen in tables 1, 2, and 3. Other cases of homonymy within the family exist where the term in question is the principal ethnonym for one Panoan language, and a secondary synonym for another Panoan language. Most notably, Katukina is used to designate a language on the Gregorio River, but Shanenawa is also sometimes called “Katukina (de Feijó)”; and Nawa is used for a now obsolescent language from the Môa River area in Brazil, but Parkenawa (a.k.a. Yora) is also sometimes called Nawa. In these cases the homonymous term is used, unmodified, as the principal ethnonym only for the language/ethnic group that it commonly designates.

Cases of inter-family homonymy are also pervasive in the Panoan family. In these cases, the Panoan language name is not modified, and when referring to the non-Panoan homonym in this paper, the family is specified (e.g., “Arawan Kulina”). Table 4 lists these interfamily homonyms, along with some potentially confusing look-alike language names.

The final issue is orthography. Many ethnonyms have multiple spelling variants, due to historical vs. modern spellings, Brazilian vs. Peruvian/Bolivian orthography, difficulty of transcribing sounds not found in an author’s language, etc. For example, historically Shetebo has been written as Cheteo, Gitipo, Jitipo, Schitebo, Schitipo, Setebo, Setevo, Setibo, Setetebo, Ssetebo, Xetebo or Xitipo (some of these occasionally with an accent on the first or second syllable). Two modern examples are Kashinawa and Yaminawa, spelled Cashinahua and Yaminahua in Peru, and Kaxinawá/Caxinawá and Jamináwa/Jaminaua in Brazil. Here I adopt a standardized (English) orthography for Panoan ethnonyms, which is similar to that used by Rivet and

1. In analogy to biological species nomenclature, precedent would seem a more straightforward principle for selecting official ethnonyms, but in practice it is often not possible. Unlike in biology (where published coined names are accompanied by precise descriptions and type specimens), we often cannot be sure of the precise referent of the first usages of some of these older ethnonyms. For example, the earliest use of Chama (translated as “friend” by Portillo, 1905 [1900]: 506) that I have found is by Fritz (1922: 130) for an ethnic group on the Ucayali River in 1721, but one cannot be completely certain that the reference was to Shipibos, particularly considering that, while in some instances Chama has been used to refer specifically to Shipibos (e.g., Woodroffe, 1914) or Konibos (Tizón, 1911: 5), more frequently its use is more generic, referring collectively to Shipibos, Konibos, and typically also the Shetebos (e.g., Stiglich, 1908: 414; Tessmann, 1928, 1929). (In the present paper I use the term Chama only in reference to the subgroup in my classification; see Kästner, 1980 for more discussion on the term Chama). Likewise, while some early sources equate the Shipibos with the Callisecas (e.g., Rojas [1868] and Vital [1791] in Biedma, 1989: 197, 263; Sobreviela, 1791: 99; Amich, 1854: 29; Maroni, 1988 [1889–1892]: 501; Alemany, 1906; Steward and Métraux, 1948: 561), others claim Calliseca is a synonym for Kashibo (e.g., Smyth and Lowe, 1936: 232; Herndon, 1854: 205, Marcy, 1862–1867: XI: 222; Markham, 1910: 87; Tessmann, 1930:127; Espinoza, 1955: 583) or Konibo (Rodriguez, 2004–2005 [1780]: 1: 128).
Tastevin (1921), Tessmann (1930), and Valenzuela (2003b). In addition to establishing a single form for each denomination, the orthography also aims to make pronunciation straightforward. Thus, (1) sounds absent in English are replaced with the closest English phoneme, most notably, the high central vowel [ɨ], the retroflex fricative [ʂ], and the bilabial fricative [β] are represented, respectively, by e, sh, and b (this is relevant only for those languages, such as some Mayoruna languages, that do not already have well-established denominations in the national languages or in the academic literature); (2) defects of (modern and archaic) Spanish and Portuguese orthography, such as the use of u/hu/gu for w, qu/c for k, x for sh or h, ch for sh, g for h, j for y, etc., have been eliminated; (3) letters/symbols not in the English alphabet, such as š, č, ê, and IPA characters, are excluded; and (4) all stress marks are left out, due to the inconsistency with which these are applied. After these four provisos have been applied, there may be more than one variant left (which would actually be pronunciation variants, at least in English), such as Konibo vs. Kunibo vs. Konivo, or Kulina vs. Kulino vs. Kurina, in which case I chose the form in more common usage, or the one resembling the more common unmodified forms(s) (assuming it can be established that these in fact refer to the same ethnic group/language).

Former Misconceptions about the Panoan Family

Past classifications have suffered from both overdifferentiation and underdifferentiation. By overdifferentiation I mean that the best-known speech varieties, particularly those in the Chama and Headwater subgroups, have been misinterpreted as representing more languages than there really are. Consider, for example, that Shipibo and Kapanawa of the Tapiche River share 90% of their vocabulary and have fewer phonological differences than American and British dialects of English. Conversely, there has been consistent underdifferentiation of the Mayoruna languages. Erikson (1990, 1992, 1994) revealed that Mayoruna referred to multiple extant groups, but most linguists, even in some relatively recent publications (e.g., Kaufman, 1994; Campbell, 1997; Loos, 1999b), have failed to recognize the internal diversity of the Mayoruna branch, treating “Mayoruna” instead as a single language. Consider, for example, that Matses and Matis share only 57% of their vocabulary (Fleck, 2007a), and have a long list of phonological, morphological, and syntactic differences (Fleck, in prep.).

In addition to underestimating Mayoruna diversity within the Mayoruna branch, divergence from the rest of the family has also been misjudged. Many authors have commented on the high level of divergence of the Mayoruna languages from the other Panoan

2. Variants of Shetebo and Shipibo (pronounced [ʂɨtʃɨβo] and [ʃɨpiβo] in the respective languages) missing the b (or v) were very likely of Kokama origin (see below on the Jesuits’ first contact with Shipibos/Chipeos and Shetebos/Cheteos, who were captives of the Kokamas), considering that the Kokama language lacks both a /b/ phoneme and the [β] sound, the most similar sound in the language being [p]. Note also that Kokama lacks fricatives (i.e., they would likely mispronounce the initial consonants of Shipibo and Shetebo, using instead an affricate ch [ʃʃ]), but the absence of sh ([ʃʃ] or [ʂ]) in Spanish surely also contributed the large number variant spellings. With respect to variation in vowels I point out that Kokama and all the Nawa languages lack a contrast between i and e (and between o and u; cf. Conibo vs. Cunibo) and Spanish lacks a high central vowel ([ɨ], i.e., the first two vowels in Shetebo). See Cabral (1995: 58ff.) for Kokama phonology.
languages, both in reference to the historical
Mayorunas (Sagols, 1901 [1874]: 364; Larra-
bure, 1908: XIII: 261; Izaguirre, 1922–1929: IX: 40), and to the modern Matses (d’Ans,
1982: 92; Kneeland, 1994: 23; Lanes, 2000:
162, 2002: 116; Dorigo, 2001: 9–10). How-
ever, except for Lanes,3 previous classifiers
of the Panoan family have not separated the
Mayoruna languages at the highest level as
I have done, typically instead placing the
Mayoruna languages (or “language”) on the
same level as groupings that according to my
classification are subdivisions of the Nawa
group (e.g., Bright, 1992; Valenzuela, 2003b;
Gordon, 2005: Lewis, 2009). Additionally, I
find Kasharari to be clearly the most divergent
Mainline language, at least lexically and
phonologically, yet its very divergent sta-
tus has been completely ignored by almost
all Panoan linguists (Campbell’s 1997 and
Lanes’ 2000 Panoan classifications being two
notable exceptions). This imbalance must be
rectified before sound reconstructions and
comparative studies can be carried out.

Traditionally the Panoan language fam-
ily has been characterized as extraordinarily
homogenous (e.g., Rivet and Tastevin, 1932:
232), particularly in comparison with other

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Full or more common common denomination</th>
<th>Relevant notes on classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kapanawa</td>
<td>Kapanawa of the Tapiche River</td>
<td>dialect of Shipibo-Konibo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Kapanawa of the Jurúá River</td>
<td>dialect of Kashinawa of the Ibuáçu River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashinawa</td>
<td>Kashinawa of the Ibuáçu River</td>
<td>Headwaters Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Kashinawa of the Taruacá River</td>
<td>independent member of Nawa Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulina</td>
<td>Kulina of the Curuçá River</td>
<td>Mayoruna Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença</td>
<td>Mainline Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marubo</td>
<td>Marubo of the Javari Basin</td>
<td>Mainline Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Marubo of Maucallacta</td>
<td>Mayoruna Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remo</td>
<td>†Remo of the Blanco River</td>
<td>independent member of Nawa Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Remo of the Móa River</td>
<td>Headwaters Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Remo of the Jaquirana River</td>
<td>Poyanawa Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†SOUTHERN REMO</td>
<td>Chama Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinabo</td>
<td>†Sinabo of the Mamoré River</td>
<td>Bolivian Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Sinabo of the Ucayali Basin</td>
<td>Chama Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katukina</td>
<td>Katukina</td>
<td>Marubo Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shinenawa (= Katukina of Feijó)</td>
<td>dialect of Yaminawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawa</td>
<td>Nawa</td>
<td>Poyanawa Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parkenawa</td>
<td>dialect of Yaminawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayoruna</td>
<td>†Mayoruna of the Amazon River</td>
<td>Matis Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Mayoruna of the Jandiatuba River</td>
<td>Matis Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Mayoruna of Tabatinga</td>
<td>independent member of Mayoruna Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matses</td>
<td>Matses Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BARBUDO</td>
<td>Chama Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demushbo</td>
<td>Demushbo</td>
<td>Matses Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chema</td>
<td>dialect of Kulina of the Curuçá River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denominations that lack accompanying linguistic data are in small caps and listed in table 2; the rest have lin-
guistic data and are listed in table 1. Kulina and Marubo synonymy was illustrated in Fleck (2007a); and Katukina
synonymy in Aguiar (1993). Mayoruna homonymy was treated in Fleck (2003). Kapanawa, Kashinawa, Remo, and
Nawa homonymy were detected between 2005–2006 while conducting comparisons of all available Panoan lexica
for the classification presented in Fleck (2007a).
Amazonian families, such as Arawakan (e.g., Lathrap, 1970: 79). The authors who initially made such statements did not have access to detailed information on Kasharari or the Mayoruna languages, and thus did not take into account the most divergent units of the family, but, nevertheless, the notion of homogeneity has persisted even after data became available on these languages (e.g., Erikson, 1993). In fact, it is still common for linguists to describe a feature in a Nawa language, and then erroneously assume that that feature exists and is the same in the rest of the family. In comparison with the larger Amazonian families, the Panoan family is indeed relatively less diverse, but not as homogenous as the family was once thought to be.

ON DIALECTS AND LANGUAGES

Dialects are notoriously difficult to define, but most linguists will agree that distinct speech varieties that share more than 80% of their vocabulary are dialects of the one language. This is the primary criterion that I used for making the distinction between dialects and languages in table 1. This difference between the categories dialect and language has multiple repercussions on how we think about Panoan languages. For example, one cannot say that Kapanawa (of the Tapiche River) is an endangered language, as it is a codialect of Shipibo-Konibo, whose speakers number in the tens of thousands, nor is Pano an extinct language as long as the few speakers of its codialect Shetebo remain alive. Likewise, it affects the count of Panoan languages or the world’s languages, the relative weight given to a speech variety in a linguistic reconstruction, estimates of the length of time since different Panoan groups have been separated, and so on.

In addition to those listed in table 1, we would expect there to be many unnamed dialects. For example, Hassel (1905: 34) reported that the Amawakas in Peru were divided into numerous subtribes, Déléage (personal commun.) reports that there are at least three fairly distinct extant dialects of Amawaka in Peru (in addition to two extinct ones from Brazil that I have identified; see table 1), yet in the literature they are not distinguished by different names. Meanwhile, many of the dialects in the Yaminawa dialect complex have distinct names (and have often been treated as separate languages by linguists). Thus, the linguistic situation may not be so different between Yaminawa and Amawaka with respect the their multiple dialects, but rather it appears to be a case of different autodenomination/denomination practices, perhaps based on a desire, or the lack of a desire, of closely related non-coresident societies to be distinguished from each other.

3. Lanes actually places Matses in a separate stock. This was evidently due to the inaccurate Matses data he used (from Dorigo) and a result of lexical replacement due to word taboo (see below on word taboos), but also a reflection of the high level diversion between the Mayoruna and Mainline branches.

4. Mutual intelligibility is more commonly offered as the principal criterion for defining dialects, but this is a complex, gradable, and highly subjective measure, and therefore quite imprecise (Vogelin and Harris, 1951; Chambers and Trudgill, 1980: 3–4). Nevertheless, in my classification I have also considered observations of communication attempts among speakers of different speech varieties (Matses, Matis, Marubo, and Shipibo-Konibo) and, secondarily, judgments of mutual intelligibility reported to me by speakers of all the Mayoruna groups and of Shipibo-Konibo, Kapanawa, Marubo, and Kashibo, as well as published reports of mutual intelligibility for many of the other Panoan languages.

5. In addition to these differently named dialects, all listed in table 1, there are at least three linguistically distinct dialects, spoken by geographically separated communities, all three of which are called “Yaminawa” (Townsley, 1994: 249; Déléage, personal commun.).
### Table 4. Interfamily Homonymy (the earliest references are given for lesser-known cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arara (Pará)(^a)</td>
<td>Cariban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arara (Mato Grosso)(^a)</td>
<td>Tupian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arasa (cf. Arazaire)(^b)</td>
<td>Takenan</td>
<td>Nordenskiöld (1905: 275–276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arasairi (cf. Arazaire)(^b)</td>
<td>Harakmbut</td>
<td>Aza (1933, 1935, 1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aráwá(^c)</td>
<td>Arawan</td>
<td>Stiglich (1908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atsahuaca(^b)</td>
<td>Takenan</td>
<td>Farabee (1922: 162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chama (= Ese' eja)</td>
<td>Takenan</td>
<td>Firestone (1955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanamarí(^d)</td>
<td>Katukinan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanamarí, Kanamirim(^e)</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Martius (1867); Rivet and Tastevin (1919–1924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karipuna (Rondônia)</td>
<td>Tupian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karipuna (Amapá)</td>
<td>French Creole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasharari, Cacharary</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Ehrenreich (1891: 58); Masó (1919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katukina(^f)</td>
<td>Katukinan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katukinarú(^g)</td>
<td>Tupian</td>
<td>Church (1898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulina, Curina(^h)</td>
<td>Arawan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunibo, Kuniba</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Rivet and Tastevin (1919–1924); Nimuendajú and Bentes (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayoruna(^i)</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Tessmann (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacaguara, Pakaguara(^h)</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Nusser (1890); Rivet and Tastevin (1919–1924); Castillo (1929: 123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamiaca, Yamiaco(^b)</td>
<td>Takenan</td>
<td>Cipriani (1902: 187–189); Barranca (1914: 5–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamiaca(^b)</td>
<td>mix(^i)</td>
<td>Anonymous (1901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yura/Yuracare (Bolivia)</td>
<td>isolate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grouped by family (excluding nonneighboring languages):

- **Arawakan (5):** Kanamarí, Kasharari, Kunibo, Mayoruna, Pakaguara
- **Takanan (4):** Arasa, Atsahuaca, Chama, Yamiaka
- **Katukinan (2):** Katukina, Kanamarí
- **Tupian (2):** Karipuna, Katukinarú
- **Arawan (2):** Kulina, Arawá
- **Harakmbut (1):** Arasairi

\(^a\) See Rivet and Tastevin (1921: 451–452) for Arara (= Shawannawa) homonymy.
\(^b\) See Lyon (1975) for discussion of Arazaire, Atsawaka, and Yamiaka homonymy.
\(^c\) Though no linguistic material is available for the reportedly (Peruvian) Panoan group called Arawa, it is not likely a misidentification of the Arawan Arawá, as this latter group was Brazilian and extinct by the time Stiglich (1908) made his observation that the Arawas were a branch of the Amawakas.
\(^d\) See Rivet and Tastevin (1921: 456–457) for Kanamarí homonymy.
\(^e\) See Rivet (1920) and Aguiar (1993) for discussion of Katukina homonymy; Katukinarú looks like a hoax.
\(^f\) See Fleck (2007a) for discussion of Kulina homonymy.
\(^g\) Also known as Moríke; see Fleck (2007d) for discussion of Mayoruna homonymy.
\(^h\) See Montañó (1987: 16–17) for discussion of Pakawara homonymy.
\(^i\) Contains a mix of Panoan words and words from other local non-Panoan languages; clearly a hoax.
Panoan Internal Classification and Panoan Dispersal

The conclusions from the preceding two sections have several important implications for hypotheses about the initial dispersal of the Panoan family and later movements that eventually led to the current geographic distribution of the family. The first issue is the date of the initial dispersal of the family, considering that it is generally assumed that “The [Panoan] languages show close similarities, indicating a fairly shallow time-depth and recent expansion and split” (Loos, 1999b: 227). According to Lathrap (1970: 187), “It is likely that not much more than 1000 years ago all these people shared the same language and had a common culture.” André-Marcel d’Ans (1973), in an oft-cited publication, calculated, through the controversial glottochronological method, that 17–19 centuries ago the Panoan languages began to differentiate, and 12.5–14 centuries ago dispersed geographically into distinct groups. Once the Mayoruna languages and Kasharari are taken into account, however, estimates calculated by any method will lead to much older dates for the initial dispersal of the family.

It is not only the date of initial dispersal that must be reconsidered, but also the nature of this dispersal. Based on my linguistic classification, the scenario that suggests itself is as follows: (1) first the Mayoruna ancestors split off from the Mainline Panoans; (2) later, the Kasharari ancestors split off from the other Mainline Panoans; (3) next, the Kashibo ancestors split off from the Nawa Panoans; (4) then the Bolivian Panoans split off from the rest of the Nawa group; and (5) finally a period of fission (and perhaps occasional fusion) resulted in the rest of the Nawa ancestors. I note that these first four units to break away are now found, respectively, at the northernmost, easternmost, westernmost, and southernmost reaches of Panoan territory. A proto-Panoan homeland in east-central Peru and westernmost Brazil (i.e., at the center of the family’s current territory) would allow for the simplest dispersal scenario leading to the current distribution of the family. Although other prehistorical Panoan homelands cannot be ruled out based on these findings on family-internal linguistic relations, considering that the Panoan-Takanan relation has not been adequately demonstrated (see below), one cannot accurately use “linguistics” as an argument for a Bolivian homeland.

Lathrap (1970: 186) explains the current distribution of Panoan speakers with a postulated scenario whereby the current Riverine Panoans forced the current Backwoods Panoans, from the overpopulated riparian ecosystems along the Ucayali River, into the interfluvial areas. Consider, however, that the Kapanawas of the Tapiche River are an interfluvial group, properly classified as Backwoods Panoans following Lathrap’s definition, while the Konibos are the prototypical Riverine Panoans. Yet the Kapanawas of the Tapiche River and the (Shipibo-)Konibos are so closely related linguistically that their separation must have taken place closer to 1600 A.D. Thus, it would appear that in the case of the Kapanawas of the Tapiche River (and perhaps a few others, such as the Manamanbobos and Manannawas), the current distribution of Panoan speakers can be partly accounted for by much more recent fissions from the present large riparian cultures. This also raises the question whether, at the time of this fission, the Shipibo-Konibo-Kapanawa ancestors were an inland group, with the Konibo settling on the Ucayali banks only after Loyola’s 1557 voyage. Myers (1974: 141) stated “Barring any major population shifts,
for which there is no evidence, the sixteenth century Pariache are probably Conibo.” However, the close relation between Kapanawas, Shipibos, and Konibos seem to be evidence of population shift during this period. Thus, a competing hypothesis is that after European diseases wiped out or severely reduced non-Panoan groups living along the Ucayali, such as the Pariaches, which Loyola found on the upper Ucayali.

RELATIONS TO OTHER SOUTH AMERICAN FAMILIES

Panoans are or were in geographic proximity with speakers of languages belonging to the large Arawakan and Tupian families, as well as the smaller Katukinan, Arawan (not to be confused with Arawakan), Takanan, Chapakuran, Harakmbet, Zaparoan, and Peba-Yaguan families, and the linguistic isolates Tikuna, Movima, and Cayuvava. It would be expected that Panoan languages have some relations to some of these neighboring languages, whether these relations be genetic or areal.

PANOAN-TAKANAN RELATIONS

Rudolph Schuller (1933: 480) first attempted to demonstrate the genetic relationship between the Panoan and Takanan families, highlighting shared personal pronominal forms, and considered it confirmed despite his scanty evidence. Before that, Armentia (1886; apud Navarro, 1903: 172), Navarro (1903: 172), Groeteken (1907: 733), Hestermann (1910), Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1921: 298–301), and Rivet (1924: 676) had noted similarities between the two families. Later, more extensive “Proto-Pano-Takanan” reconstructions were carried out by Key (1963/1968) and Girard (1971), after which the grouping of the Panoan and Takanan language families was generally unreservedly accepted (“proved beyond doubt” according to Suárez, 1973: 137), despite Girard’s conclusion that “Unless one can extract roots, one is left with a meager corpus of allegedly cognate material—so meager indeed that the evidence for a Pano-Takanan relationship seems only probable” (1971: 145) and his severe and apt criticism of Key’s reconstruction (1970) (see Key, 1971, for her rebuttal). Girard’s work, however, was equally sloppy and suffered from the same grave error as Key’s: both authors treated Shell’s (1965/1975) reconstruction (which included only seven languages, and did not include Kasharari and the Mayoruna languages) to be proto-Panoan, despite Shell’s (1965: 2, 1975: 11) clear warning that her reconstruction should not be taken to be proto-Panoan, but rather should be referred to provisionally as “reconstructed Panoan” until a more inclusive reconstruction could be carried out.

Presumably, like Shell (1965: 2), Key and Girard imagined that the rest of the Panoan languages would not be very different from the seven she had reconstructed, and therefore that proto-Panoan would be essentially the same as Shell’s reconstructed Pano. However, it is known now that the Mayoruna languages are considerably distinct from the Mainline languages lexically, phonologically, and grammatically, so there is good reason to expect that a proto-Panoan reconstruction including Mayoruna languages (and Kasharari) will differ significantly from Shell’s recon-

6. Wistrand (1991: 245) mentions two unpublished studies on this topic: Loos (1964) and Loriot (1965), which I have not been able to obtain.
structured Pano. Additionally, the Mayoruna languages are the most geographically distant from the Takanan family, and therefore the least likely to exhibit contact-induced similarities with the Takanan languages.

According to Swadesh’s (1959: 18) lexicostatistical calculations, Panoan and Takanan would have separated 47 centuries ago, approximating the date (5000 years) beyond which conservative linguists consider genetic relations to be impossible to demonstrate. More recently some authors have questioned this grouping (e.g., Fabre, 1998; Loos, 1999b), suggesting similarities may be due to areal rather than genetic factors. However, this new wave of skepticism is not based on any new reconstruction or comparative studies, but on recent general rejection of long-distance connections among Amazonian families. Even more recently Amaran-te Ribeiro (2003) claims to have proven the Panoan-Takanan connection, but his lexicostatistical method does not distinguish borrowing from chance occurrence of lexical matches and therefore brings us no closer to resolving the issue. Loos (2005) points out that some Panoan and Takanan languages share SOV constituent order, split-ergative pronominal systems, metrical tense systems, a similar imperative suffix, and a few body-part prefixes. However, it turns out the Takanan languages do not actually have body-part prefixes, and the rest of the shared features Loos identified still need to be looked at more closely.

In short, a genetic Panoan-Takanan relationship has not yet been convincingly demonstrated. Comparative studies have shown that there are indeed more lexical matches and phonological and grammatical similarities than could be attributed to mere chance; however, only further reconstruction work demonstrating that alleged cognates and shared grammatical features are common to both Proto-Panoan and Proto-Takanan will reveal whether the similarities can be attributed to genetic relation.

Borrowing between Takanan and Panoan languages may have been going on for thousands of years, regardless of their genetic relation. Though only sound reconstructions will allow us to identify ancient borrowings, relatively recent borrowing can be more readily detected. I end this section with some information on postcolonial borrowing between Takanan languages and the southernmost Panoan languages. Consider the following language contact situation in Bolivia in the 1880s:

The language spoken by the Indians of the Cavinás mission is a mix of Pakawara and Tacana, due undoubtedly to the mix of Araonas [speakers of a Takanan language that Armentia considered essentially the same as the Takana language] and Pakawaras who have composed or formed the population of said mission... (Armentia, 1887: 180–181).7

Moving westward along the Panoan-Takanan contact area, as is evident upon inspection of Nordenskiöld’s (1905: 275–276) 46-word comparative list, the most notable difference between Yamiaka and its co-

---

7. My translation from the Spanish original: El idioma hablado por los indios de la misión de Cavinás es una mezcla de Pacaguara y Tacana; debido sin duda a la mezcla de Araonas y Pacaguaras que han compuesto o formado la población de dicha misión.
dialect Atsawaka is that Yamiaka has of at least five borrowings from neighboring Takanan languages, while Atsawaka lacks these words (more such instances may be found in Nordenskiöld’s list published by Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913). The closely related Arazaire language shares only two of these five Takanan loans, namely the numerals *one* and *two* (Llosa, 1906b: 306). This distribution of loanwords suggests, not only that these shared lexical items are not of genetic origin, but also that there was postcolonial linguistic contact, possibly as late as the rubber boom era.8

**Other Proposed Genetic Ties beyond the Family**

Schuller (1933) placed Panoan and Takanan in a larger group he called “Carib-Aruác.” Since then, many authors have put forward higher-order affiliations of the purported Pano-Takanan unit, which I list in table 5. It is worth noting that most of the classifications include Moseten and Yuracare, both linguistic isolates in Bolivia, south of Takanan territory. These can be seen as serious possibilities worthy of further study, but the proposed connections with Patagonian languages, Yanomami, and especially Uto-Aztecan seem less plausible. More controversial has been Greenberg’s (1987) classification of Macro-Panoan into his Ge-Pano-Carib phylum; see Dixon and Aikhenvald (1999), Rodrigues (2000), and Gildea and Payne (2007) for objections. Swadesh’s proposed higher-order link between Pano-Takanan (“Tacapano” by his terminology) and Kechuan arouses skepticism, particularly in light of the obvious borrowing from Kechua into western lowland South American languages (next section), but it is of interest in that several early missionaries claimed a fundamental similarity or suggested possible affiliation between Panoan languages and Kechua (e.g., Navarro, 1903: 172; Alemany, 1906: 51). The association of Panoan with the Arawakan family (top of table 5) is by way of observed similarities between Takanan and Arawakan languages (also noted by Loukotka, 1968: 174), which nevertheless likely originate from borrowing among neighbors, in Bolivia, where Takanan and Arawakan languages are in close contact.

**Contact with Other Amazonian Groups and Kechua Speakers**

Panoan languages possess areal features found in Amazonia in general or only in western Amazonia, such as ergativity, evidentiality, and the high central vowel (i), suggesting that Panoan languages have been influenced by and/or have influenced neighboring languages. These Amazonian areal features are listed in Derbyshire (1987), David Payne (1990), Doris Payne (1990), Dixon and Aikhenvald (1999: 8–9), and Aikhenvald (2007: 193). Below, in the typological overview, I consider some of these areal characteristics found in the Panoan family. Taking of captives and coresidence at mission villages are two situations that entailed contact between Panoans and non-Panoans, but I have not yet

---

8. The level of lexical similarity between Arazaire and Atsawaka/Yamiaka (70%–75%) and the larger gap between these and the rest of the Nawa subgroups (<57%) suggests that speakers of languages in the Madre de Dios subgroup broke away from the main body of Panoans well before the Spanish conquest of Peru, though I have found no information that would help in estimating the timing of their evident southwest migration to the proximity of Takanan lands.
been able to pin down any specific linguistic repercussions of this.

Borrowing from, and into, Arawakan languages has been noted, particularly Ashaninka (e.g., Valenzuela, 2003b: 63). For example, the Ashaninka word for “dog,” *uchiti*, is found in Shipibo-Konibo, Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, Pano (but not Shetebo) and Poyanawa; the Ashaninka word *shima* (“fish”) is found in some Yaminawa dialects; and Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913: 56) noted that Arazaire, Atsawaka, and Yamiaka, rather than the Panoan words for “woman/wife,” used the Kampa word for “woman,” *činani* (*tšinane* in Ashaninka and Nomatsiguenga; Kinberg, 1980; Shaver, 1996). Arawakan influence is also evident in Brazil; specifically, Kanamari appears to have borrowed the word for “tapir” (*chemá*) from Manetenery (Chandless, 1866: 118). Linguistic influence has not been one-way: Campbell (1997: 12) and Wise (1976: 356) report Panoan (and Kechuan) borrowings in Amuesha (Arawakan).

Dienst (2005, 2006: 349–351) noted minor linguistic influence on Arawan Kulina and Deni from neighboring Panoan languages, and Amarante Ribeiro and Cândido (2005a) noted at least one Arawan Kulina loan in the Shanenawa and Yawanawa dialects of Yaminawa, namely *yuma(i)*, “jaguar.”

The Peruvian Amazonian Spanish words *conta* (“*Attalea tessmannii* palm”), *shebón* (“*Attalea cf. septuagenata* palm”), and *paca* (“bamboo”) appear to be borrowings from...
Chama languages, and the Panoan word for (large) river, paru/paro, appears in the historical literature as an alternate Spanish name for the Ucayali River (e.g., Marqués, 1931 [1800]: 117). Additionally many tributaries of the Ucayali have official names of Chama origin, such as the Tamaya (from tama, “peanut,” + -ya “having” = “river of [bountiful] peanuts”) and Pacaya rivers; likewise several towns along the Ucayali and its tributaries. I know of no traces of Panoan linguistic influence on western Amazonian Portuguese, and this may be due to the lesser prominence of Brazilian Panoans compared with the larger societies of speakers of the Chama languages in Peru. Borrowings from Spanish or Portuguese are now abundant in all the Panoan languages; see Fleck (2003: 200–201, 332), Valenzuela (2006), Zariquey (2011a), and Elias (in prep.) for examples of Spanish borrowings into Matses, Shipibo-Konibo, and Kashibo.

Various authors have noted that Shipibo has many words of Kechua origin (e.g., Steinen, 1904; Lathrap et al., 1985; Valenzuela 2003b). García (1990) identified 49 words and three suffixes of probable Kechua origin in Shipibo. Although in my opinion a few of these are doubtful (especially the three suffixes), it is clear that most are indeed of Kechua origin. Amarante Ribeiro and Cândido (2005c) point out the numerals kimsa “three” in Shipibo-Konibo, Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, Pano, Amawaka, and Kashibo (I add Karipuna and Pakawara; see Martius, 1867: 241; and Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913: 78) and chosko “four” and picha “five” in Shipibo-Konibo, Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, and Pano, all three words of obvious Kechua origin. The most widespread Kechua loan in Panoan languages may be tashi (“salt”) found in Shipibo-Konibo, Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, Pano, Amawaka, Kashibo, Yaminawa, Mastanawa, Nukini, and Iskonawa. The controversy surrounding Kechua loans in Panoan languages is the question of whether these words were borrowed directly from Inkas in precolonial times, or whether they were borrowed after Spanish contact, when Kechua was used as a lingua franca in the Peruvian Amazon. This question cannot be readily resolved with linguistics because there is no reason why all the loans would have to have been borrowed at once: some could have been borrowed from Inkas (directly or through pre-Andean neighbors) and others later from priests and other speakers of the lingua franca. Therefore, although it is possible to show that some Kechua loans were not borrowed directly from Inkas, for many other words there is no way to determine when they were borrowed. We can be fairly sure that Inkas had contact with more westerly groups (e.g., Arawakans like the Amueshas and Kampas), but no linguistic evidence that Kechua speakers ever had direct contact with Panoans has been uncovered.

**HISTORY OF PANOAN LINGUISTICS**

**The Jesuits (1640s–1768)**

As will be related in detail below, the first Panoan linguistic data became available outside Amazonia only in the 1800s. However, the earliest data recorded for Panoan languages were vocabularies, grammars, and catechisms prepared by Jesuit missionaries as early as the second half of the 1600s. As related by Father Francisco de Figueroa (1904 [1661]), the first Panoan society to be reduced in a mission was that of the Barudos of the Huallaga River in 1653, but before that the Jesuits were already at least vaguely...
familiar with the languages of other Panoans captured by the Kokamas (whom the Jesuits contacted in 1644; Figueroa, 1904: 100) on the Ucayali River, namely the Shipibos, Shetebos, and Kapanawas, the first two of whom were later reduced at the Jesuit mission of Santiago de la Laguna in 1670 (Luzero, 1904 [1681]: 415; Maroni, 1988 [1889–1892]: 222). The Jesuits also reduced Panos, Konibos, Mayorunas, Manamanbos, and Manannawas (Zárate et al., 1904 [1735]; Zárate, 1904 [1739]; Maroni 1988 [1889–1892]). It is be assumed that the Jesuits prepared linguistic materials for most of these, but no such documents survived the exodus of the Jesuits from the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in the late 1760s (Veigl, cited by Pallarés and Calvo, cited by Bayle in the introduction to Uriarte, 1952 [1771]: II: xiv–xv; Hervás, 1800: 271; Chantre, 1901: 91–93).9 Thus, from the Jesuit era we have only early notes on linguistic affiliation, like the following:

1654
The language [of the Barbudos] is the same as Chipeo [Shipibo], Cheteo [Shetebos], and Capanagua [Kapanawa], which are [spoken] on the Ucayali River (Figueroa, 1904: 115; original manuscript dated 1661, citing a letter by Father Raymundo de Santa Cruz written in 1654)10

1730–1750s
The Pano [language], related to others, and matrix of Chepea [Shipibo] and Mayoruna. (Chantre, 1901: 93, original manuscript written around 1770–1801)11

1768
At the mission they generically call Panos the descendents of different branches of the Chepæos (Tschepäos) [Shipibos], or, as others call them, Chipæos, Zipivos, Xitipos, including the Mananaguas [Manannawas], which means ‘people of the hills.’ All of them speak the same language with somewhat different dialectal variation. (Veigl, 1785: 63)12

The source of the second of the above three citations is from Father Martin Iriarte, who worked in the Maynas missions from the 1730s to the 1750s and was renowned for his ability to learn the local languages (Chantre, 1901: 367). These early notes of the Jesuits can be considered the first steps toward recognition and circumscription of the Panoan family, although most of this type of information

9. Hervás (1800: 271) cites a letter by Mr. Abate Velasco of Quito who mentions vocabularies and catechisms of Piro, Kampa, Konibo, and Komabo (it is not known whether the latter was Panoan or Arawakan) prepared by Father Henrich Richter, who began work in the upper Ucayali missions in 1685. But there is no indication in Hervás’ work or elsewhere that the manuscript still existed at the time or that it was ever in Quito. Tessmann (1929, 1930), in reference to Hervás’ citation, which he evidently misread, listed this document in his bibliographies as located in Quito and dated 1685.

10. My translation from the Spanish original: La lengua es la mesma que la del Chipeo, Cheteo y Capanagua, que están en el rio de Ucayali.

11. My translation from the Spanish original: La Pana, común á otras y matriz de la Chepea y Mayoruna.

was not published until the beginning of the 20th century. Veigl’s 1785 publication could be seen as the first fairly accurate, if brief, information on the Panoan family to be made available to the outside world. By contrast, one of the few other documentations of Jesuit knowledge of the western Amazon to be made widely available at an early date can be seen as a step backward for Panoan linguistics. Based on second-hand accounts from Jesuits expelled from the Spanish colonies, Juan Velasco wrote a three-volume work on all aspects of the Jesuit missions in Peru and Ecuador, which he finished in 1789, and although some copies and translations of the manuscript were circulated, it was not published until 1837 (and French and Italian translations were published in the 1840s). Along with much other implausible information, Velasco came up with some ludicrous classifications of Panoan languages; for example, Amawaka and Remo as Kampa (Arawakan) dialects (1981: 546) and Mayoruna as an Urarina (isolate) dialect (1981: 548). Unfortunately, Velasco’s misinformation was copied by Hervás into his opus on the world’s languages (1800: 262–263), which in turn was copied by Adelung (1817: 580–581), and has been repeated up until fairly recent times (e.g., Steward and Métraux, 1948: 557).

Most of the work done by the Jesuits was in the Maynas missions in Peru. Due to conflicts between Portuguese slave raiders and Maynas Jesuits in the first half of the 18th century, it was not until 1756, shortly before their expulsion, that Portuguese Jesuits were sent to missionize Indians in the upper Amazon, where they established a mission at Tabatinga (at the present Peru-Brazil border on the Amazon River) with Tikunas; before that, Carmelite priests worked the Brazilian stretch of the Amazon River (Uriarte, 1952: II: 208; Werlich, 1968). It is possible that the Portuguese Jesuits and Carmelites had contact with Panoans in the vicinity of Tabatinga, but there is no record of them having reduced Mayorunas, and Sampaio (1825: 64) explicitly stated that it had been impossible to reduce the Kulinhas of São Paulo de Olivença. D’Orbigny (1838) claims that Pakawaras were taken to Jesuit missions in Bolivia several times, though I have found no other information corroborating this or any linguistic comments or documentation on Panoan languages by Jesuits in Bolivia. No missionaries visited the remote headwaters of the Juruá and Purus rivers, where most of the Brazilian Panoan ethnic groups are found, until the early 20th century. In the end, the Jesuits considered their work in the Maynas missions a failure, and the diversity and difficulty of the local languages was identified as one of the principal contributing factors (e.g., Maroni, 1988 [1889–1892]: 167–168).

The Franciscans (1657–1930s)
When the Jesuits were expelled from the South American colonies in 1767–1768, secular priests took over the Maynas missions for a few years, but they did not leave any information on Panoan languages. In 1790 the Maynas missions were eventually handed over to the Franciscans of the missionary college of Santa Rosa de Ocopa, but it should be

13. Veigl’s suggestion that the Chamikuros were related to the Shipibos is the only major error in his treatment of Panoan languages. Consequently, Chamikuro (a nearly extinct Arawakan language of the Huallaga River valley) was considered Panoan (e.g., Brinton, 1891, Steinen, 1904), and even well into the 20th century (e.g., Steward and Métraux, 1948: 555), until Tessmann (1930) published a Chamikuro word list.
noted that almost as early as the Jesuits began working with Panoans, the Franciscans had begun working with Panoan groups on the upper Ucayali River\(^{14}\); and they did leave much valuable linguistic information.

As early as 1800, Father Buenaventura Marqués had prepared an extensive Konibo vocabulary with accompanying grammatical notes, and also a Pano vocabulary, but these were not published until a century later (Marqués, 1903, 1931). Around 1810–1812 and 1877, two unknown Franciscan monks prepared Shipibo vocabularies accompanied by grammatical notes, but these were also not published until much later (Steinen, 1904). A mission for the Pakawaras was first established in 1771 (Santiago de Pacaguaras on the Madidi River; Armentia, 1887: 22), and by the late 1800s Franciscans were publishing linguistic data on Bolivian Panoan languages. Meanwhile, linguistic contributions by Franciscans working in Peru became available only at the beginning of the 20th century (table 6). (From Brazil we have no linguistic reports from Franciscans.) It is worth noting that the Franciscans’ substantive productions were all on Chama languages.\(^{15}\)

Like the Jesuits, Franciscans also made early observations about similarities among Panoan languages, as in the following passages:

1800

This language [Konibo] is very different from the rest on the Ucayali River, and even among the Konibos themselves there are different manners of speaking, with different terms and words, as is the case with the Inga [Kechua] language, and it should be considered the general language among the Shetebo, Shipibo, Amawa-\(\kern-.25em\)ka, Sensi, and Kapanawa nations, and others, because they have many terms and words in common, and with ease these nations understand each other. (Marqués, 1931: 197).\(^{16}\)

1883–1884

The Pano language is the one that the Pano Indians speak, which extends along the Ucayali, in Peru. Although this language is not spoken in Bolivia, I include a sample of it because it is like the mother of the dialects that are spoken by the Chakobos, Sinabos, Karipunas, Pakawaras, and others. (Cardús, 1886: 308)\(^{17}\)

---

14. The first Panoans to be contacted (in 1657) and reduced by the Franciscans were the Shetebos and Callisecas (the latter probably Shipibos, in this context) along the lower course of the Pachitea River (Amich, 1988: 102).

15. According to C.A.R., in the introduction to Marqués (1931: 113), the Franciscan missionaries Frezneda and Francisco de San José in 1861 produced a Shetebo grammar and vocabulary that was not published. Hestermann (1913) also draws attention to a supposed Shetebo vocabulary cited in Ludewig (1858: 162) “Vocabulario de la Lengua Passa ó Setaba. MS. On paper, 1795, 8vo. Oblong (Catal. P. 51, No. 582)”; though Ludewig’s index (p. 254) says “Setaba, or Passa (Quichua),” suggesting this was may not have been a Panoan language after all. See appendix 2 for Shetebo sources.

16. My translation from the Spanish original: Esta lengua es muy distinta de las demás del Ucayali, y aún entre los mismos cunibos hay un distinto modo de hablar, con distintos términos y vocablos, como sucede en la lengua Inga, y se debe considerar como lengua general entre las naciones Sêteba, Xípiba, Hâume-huáca, Sênsi, y Câpanâua, y otras, pues tienen muchos términos y vocablos comunes, y con facilidad dichas naciones se entienden unas con otras.

17. My translation from the Spanish original: La lengua pana es la que hablan los indios panos, que se extienden por el río Ucayali, en el Perú. Aunque en Bolivia no se habla dicha lengua, pongo la muestra de ella por ser como la madre de los dialectos que hablan los chacobos, sinabos, caripunas, pacaguara y otros.
1887

Pakawara [is spoken by] the tribes of the Chakobos, Pakawaras, Karipunas, and even by the tribes of the Ucayali, where it is known as the Pano language, which is divided into several dialects. (Armentia, 1887: 181)

1906

By means of this [Shipibo] language, it is possible to communicate, not only with the Shipibos, but also the Konibos, Shetebos, Amawakas, Remos, and Panos.... The languages that they speak are all related: all are agglutinating, have identical structure, have the same sounds, are based on a lexicon of common origin with variations in letters and syllables, their suffixes are similar.... (Alemany, 1906: III)

To summarize all such observations made by Franciscans, we can say that by the early 1800s Franciscans had noticed that the Panoan languages/dialects of the Ucayali basin with which they were familiar (Konibo, Shipibo, Pano, Shetebo, Amawaka, Remo, Kashibo, Sensi, and often Mayoruna) were related, and by the late 1800s Bolivian languages/dialects (Pakawara, Chakobo, Karipuna, and Sinabo of the Mamoré River) were recognized as also being close to these. In the Jesuits’ and Franciscans’ understanding of linguistics, some “dialects” were derived from, or corruptions of, more pure “languages” (perhaps in analogy to how Latin and the modern Romance languages were at the time thought to be related). As can be seen in the various citations above, the principal such “pure” or “mother” varieties were sometimes called “matrix languages,” “general languages,” or simply “languages” with related varieties being but dialects of these. “Pano” was most frequently considered to be the principal/matrix Panoan language of the Ucayali, and was used as a lingua franca in missions such as Sarayacu. “Pano” has been used at several levels of inclusiveness: (1) as a codialect of Shetebo; (2) as a language that includes Shetebo as a dialect or a synonym; and (3) as a superordinate category that includes Shipibo, Konibo, and Shetebo, and even all the Panoan speech varieties of the Ucayali basin. As such, it is not surprising that Pano was chosen to name the family.

18. My translation from the Spanish original: El Pacaguara, [es hablado] por las tribus de Chacobos, Pacaguaras, Caripunas, y aún por las tribus del Ucayali, donde es conocido con el nombre de lengua Pana, que se subdivide en varios dialectos.

19. My translation from the Spanish original: Por medio de este idioma, se puede entenderse, no solo con los Shipibos, si no también con los Cunibos, Setebos, Amahuacas, Remos y Panos.... Las lenguas que hablan todas estas tribus son congéneres, todas de aglutinamiento, tienen idéntica estructura, igual fonismo, se fundan en un léxicon que presenta un origen común con variantes de letras y sílabas, sus sufijos son similares...

20. Some references suggest that Mayoruna was related to the other Panoan languages (e.g., Pallarés in Izaguirre 1922–1929: IX: 202), whereas other references (e.g., Leceta in Izaguirre, 1922–1929: II: 40) describe it as completely different. I suspect some references to Mayoruna were to the Arawakan-like Moríke or Mayú (see Fleck, 2007d), or else Franciscan were not familiar enough with Mayoruna languages to recognize shared features between the two (quite divergent) branches of the Panoan family.

21. Some modern etymologies would suggest that this ethnonym comes from the word pano ("giant armadillo"), which occurs in many Panoan languages (but not in the Pano language). Tessmann (1930: 105–106) suggests that the Chama (Shipibo/Konibo/Shetebo) denomination, and its folk etymology, pano-bo ("giant armadillo-Plural"), might be a recent innovation. Earlier etymologies identify pano as a Pano word meaning "brother" (Maroni, 1988 [1889–1892]: 222; Durand, 1915: 306) or as an interjection commonly used by the Panos when they first arrived at Santiago de la Laguna, a Jesuit mission on the Huallaga River where the Panos were first reduced (Veigl, 1785: 62).
### TABLE 6. Published Panoan Linguistic Works by Franciscans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/dialect</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Collector/publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Konibo</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Marqués (1903/1931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pano</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Marqués (1903/1931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>9(^d)</td>
<td>1810–1812</td>
<td>Anonymous in Steinen (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Anonymous in Steinen (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakobo</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cardús (1886)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakawara</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1881–1882</td>
<td>Armentia (1887)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Armentia (1898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pano</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Navarro (1903/1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Alemany (1906/1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konibo</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1896(^e)</td>
<td>Anonymous (1927)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Approximate number of entries.
\(^b\) Pages of notes.
\(^c\) Of manuscript preparation.
\(^d\) Steinen (1904) combined the two anonymous Franciscans’ Shipibo grammar notes.
\(^e\) Erikson et al. (1994) gave this date and gave the author’s name as “Delgado, Eulogio” (who wrote a Campa vocabulary).

---

### TABLE 7. Publications from the 1800s Containing Panoan Linguistic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/dialect</th>
<th>Lexicon entries</th>
<th>Publication/collector</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Collection date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Smyth and Lowe (1836)</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakawara</td>
<td>23, 52, 57</td>
<td>d’Orbigny (1838), Heath (1883), Armentia (1887)</td>
<td>French, American, Spanish</td>
<td>1830–1833, 1880–1881, 1881–1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pano</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Castelnau (1851)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1846–1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled Mayoruna</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Castelnau (1851)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Mayoruna</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Castelnau (1851) (by Melville)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konibo</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Marcy (1864)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayoruna of Tabatinga</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Martius (1867) (by Spix)</td>
<td>Bavarian</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulina of Olivença</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Martius (1867) (by Spix)</td>
<td>Bavarian</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karipuna</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Martius (1867) (by Natterer)</td>
<td>Austrian</td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanamari</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chandless (1866, 1869)</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>1864–1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakobo</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cardús (1886)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1883–1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>Armentia (1898)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>18??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Martius (1867) also published Castelnau’s Pano and Mayoruna lists.
Foreign Travelers of the 1800s

The Franciscans were not able to work continuously with Panoan groups primarily due to multiple Indian risings during which priests were killed and/or forced to retreat to the highlands for many years. As damning as these insurrections was the independence of Peru in 1821, when all the Franciscans working in Panoan territories were forced to leave the country, except for the Ecuadorian-born Father Manuel Plaza, who remained as the lone missionary in Panoan lands until the 1840s. Meanwhile, Peruvian independence opened up the country to many foreign explorers and scientists. Father Plaza remained essentially the reservoir of Franciscan knowledge of Panoan tribes, and he related this knowledge to the many foreign travelers who passed by the Sarayacu mission as they travelled the Ucayali-Amazon route to the Atlantic. While the thitherto unpublished Panoan lexica were likely in circulation among the Franciscan priests, the earliest lists to actually become available to a wider audience were collected by foreign travelers, who often did not tarry in publishing their lists. Table 7 lists, in the chronological order in which they became known to the outside world, the Panoan languages or dialects for which published lexica became available in the 1800s.

Of the authors listed in table 7, only Armentia and Cardus were missionaries, and the rest were scientists and explorers from foreign countries; see appendix 2 for details on these and other sources. In contrast to the Franciscans’ Chama lexica (table 6), these travelers’ published lists were relatively short, contain many misunderstandings (due to the travelers’ lack of familiarity with these languages, and their probable rudimentary skills in the contact languages), and were not accompanied by grammatical notes, with only a very few minor exceptions. French naturalist Francis de Castelnau published two pages of grammatical notes on Pano that he copied from the work of Ucayali missionaries (1850–1859: V: 304–305). He also published information on affiliation of Panoan languages that he learned from Father Plaza at Sarayacu:

1846
According to the information that I was able to collect, all the following peoples speak a language derived from that of the Panos: Konibos, Kashibos, Shipibos, Amawakas, Sensis, Remos, Tapanaouas [Kapanawas?], Pitsobos, and Yawabos. (Castelnau, 1850–1859: IV: 387)

1859
The Pano language, considered relative to the necessities of the Indians who speak it, has a very rich vocabu-

22. Though not published until early in the next century, a Peruvian naval officer who accompanied Castelnau during part of his trip on the Urubamba and Ucayali Rivers in 1846 collected a 167-item comparative Anti-Piro-Shipibo-Konibo vocabulary (Carrasco, 1901). See Raimondi (1880: 154ff.) for Carrasco’s report.

23. My translation from the French original: D’apres les renseignements que je pus recueillir, tous les peuples suivants parlent une langue derivee de celle des Panos: les Conibos, les Cachibos, les Sepibos, les Amouacas, les Sensis, les Remos, les Tapanaouas, les Pitsobos et les Jawabus.
lary, because it has many words that cannot be translated into another language, other than by a phrase. The pronunciation is somewhat difficult because there are many words that are very much aspirated, and others are guttural, and finally, some that are pronounced touching the tip of the tongue to base of the teeth. Also, its construction does not fall short in presenting some difficulties, with the existence of some particles [bound morphemes] that when interposed in words change entirely the sense of the sentence. (Raimondy, 1862: 123)²⁴

Although not stated explicitly, Franciscan missionaries on the Ucayali are undoubtedly the source of at least some of Raimondi’s information.

Other travelers of the 1800s who mentioned Panoan affiliations are Paul Marcoy (1862–1867: X: 185) and F. L. Galt:

**CA. 1871**
The old “Pano” lives now only as a sort of basis for some of the dialects, especially Remo, Conibo [Konibo], Sipibo [Shipibo], and Setibo [Shetebo]. (Galt, 1878: 313)

Paul Marcoy (alias Laurent St-Cricq), in addition to the short Konibo list published in 1864 (see table 7), claims to have produced, while in the Pampa de Sacramento (the area between the middle course of the Ucayali River and the eastern foothills of the Andes), a vocabulary of approximately 3000 words and grammar of Konibo (St-Cricq, 1853: 286) and/or to have produced, with the help of missionaries and a Pano Indian, an extensive vocabulary and grammar of the Pano language (Marcoy, 1869: I: 675). Most likely both references are to the same manuscript, with “Pano language” in the second reference meant to be read generically as Panoan or Chama (i.e., for Marcoy to document Konibo would be to document a dialect of the “Pano language”). In any case, the manuscript(s) is(are) apparently lost (Schuller, 1911), and one can only wonder whether Marcoy actually copied it/them from Marqués’ Konibo vocabulary (of ca. 3300 entries) and grammar (and Pano vocabulary), and later removed it when a copy of Marqués’ manuscript found its way to England.

In summary, we can make the general observation that until the beginning of the 20th century, missionaries had access to higher-quality materials and had a more precise understanding of Panoan languages and the relationships among them than did contemporary academics in Europe and North America. The travelers introduced in this section can be credited with making bits of Panoan linguistic information available to a wider audience, either through collection of short word lists, or by relaying fragments of missionaries’ knowledge about classification and grammar.

While Father Plaza and later Franciscans provided foreign travelers with much infor-

---

²⁴ My translation from the Spanish original: La lengua Pana considerada relativamente á las necesidades de los indios que la hablan, es bastante rica de voces, porque tiene muchas palabras que no se pueden traducir en otro idioma, sino por una frase. La pronunciacion es algo dificil porque hay muchas palabras muy aspiradas y otras guturales y, en fin, algunas que se pronuncian, aplicando la punta de la lengua á la raiz de los dientes. Tambien su construccion no deja de presentar algunas dificultades, existiendo algunos particulares que se interponen en las palabras que hacen cambiar enteramente el sentido de la oracion.
information on local tribes and languages, comparable information was not thus obtained on Panoans in Brazil.

**European Philologists of the Late 1800s**

Based on a comparison of word lists of seven of the languages listed in table 7 (Mayoruna of the Amazon River [both dialects], Mayoruna of Tabatinga, Pakawara, Karipuna, Kulina of São Paulo de Olivência, Konibo, and Pano), Raoul de la Grasserie presented at the 1888 International Congress of Americanists held in Berlin the first formal demonstration that Panoan languages constitute a linguistic family (Grasserie, 1890). Grasserie’s lecture (and its subsequent publication) was a landmark in Panoan linguistics in that, unlike the travelers’ reports, it provided data to substantiate his claim. Prior to Grasserie’s paper, there was much confusion (outside of Amazonia) about the affiliation of Panoan languages. For example, Martius, who published several of the lists upon which Grasserie based his work, wrote that Pano was closely related to Tupi and Movima (Martius, 1867: I: 298). There was also Hervás’ (1800) misguided classification mentioned above, which repeated Velasco’s errors. Nevertheless, Grasserie’s presentation can hardly be called a discovery, since the affinities among the seven Panoan languages were already well-known among missionaries in Peru, and information on Panoan affiliation like Castelnau’s, Ramondi’s, and others’ was already in the public domain. Grasserie’s internal classification, based entirely on phonetics (or, more accurately, on transcriptions by different nonlinguists), could not have been more wrong: he divided the two Mayoruna languages into different categories, divided Pano and Konibo, grouped together Mayoruna of the Amazon River and Konibo, and grouped together Kulina of São Paulo de Olivência, Pano, and Pakawara.

The most comprehensive 19th-century work on Amazonian languages was by Daniel Brinton (1891), who added Barbudo, Cochiquinas (as a Mayoruna subtribe), Kashibo, Kanamari, Remo, Sensi, Shetebo, Shipibo, Calliseca (as a synonym for Shetebo), and, mistakenly (following Veigl, 1785: 56), Chamikuro. Brinton did not subclassify the languages, and some of the languages he added did not yet have linguistic data available, so they must have been added based on historical comments on these languages’ affiliation. His work can be seen as representing what was known about Panoan linguistics by European and American linguists at the end of the century, which was essentially limited to the awareness of the existence of a handful of closely related languages in western Amazonia.

A New Generation of List Collectors and Linguists (1900–1930s)

In the first third of the 20th century many more languages and dialects became known for the first time, thanks to a new generation of mostly foreign travelers and missionaries. These are listed in table 8, in the order in which the language/dialect became known (see appendix 2 for more details on these and other sources).

Most of the publications in tables 7 and 8 contain relatively short word lists collected following different institutions’ standard lists (e.g., Heath used the Smithsonian list), the collector’s own standard lists (e.g., Tessmann), or simply randomly; and often the same collector produced divergent lists for different languages. The consequence of this is that when a linguist wishes to
TABLE 8. Languages and Dialects That Became Known during the First Third of the 20th Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/Dialect</th>
<th>Lexicon entries</th>
<th>Publications (1900–1933)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yaminawa</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Reich and Stegelmann (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amawaka</td>
<td>84, 335, 39</td>
<td>Reich and Stegelmann (1903), Farabee (1922), Tessmann (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamiaka</td>
<td>46, 118</td>
<td>Nordenskiöld (1905), Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atsawaka</td>
<td>49, 223</td>
<td>Nordenskiöld (1905), Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arazairé</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Llosa (1906b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu R.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Abreu (1914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katukina</td>
<td>16, 317</td>
<td>Rivet (1920), Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashinawa of the Tarauacá R.</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapanawa of the Juruá R.</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remo of the Blanco R.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Leuje (1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetebo</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tessmann (1929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapanawa of the Tapiche R.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tessmann (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashibo (Kashibo dialect)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Tessmann (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakataibo (Kashibo dialect)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tessmann (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubo (Kashibo dialect)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tessmann (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nokaman (Kashibo dialect)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Tessmann (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyanawa</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>Carvalho (1931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuchiunawa</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Carvalho (1931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remo of the Jaquirana R.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Carvalho (1931)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Evidently through some type of error, this Amawaka list was labeled “Kaschinaua.”

compare a pair of lists of, say, 100–200 entries, often only a handful of lexical items are contained in both lists, making lexical comparisons imprecise and a systematic comparison of all the languages impossible. Similarly, the short-list collectors were typically unfamiliar with the sounds of the languages they documented, and so their transcriptions are too imprecise to draw more than a few speculative observations on the phonology of the languages. This problem was partially solved when better and larger vocabularies of more than 1000 words began to be published at the turn of the century, all on languages for which brief lists had already been made available. These more substantial works include the Franciscans’ contributions on Chama languages mentioned above (table 6), and, importantly, Abreu’s (1914/1941) monograph on Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River containing a vocabulary (1779 entries), a phonology/gram-
mar (22 pages) and the first Panoan text collection (488 pages with 5926 sentences). Koch-Grünberg (1941: 623) called Abreu's 1914 edition “the most substantial and best material that has ever been published on a South American Indian language.” Karl von den Steinen, in addition to publishing the two Franciscans’ Shipibo dictionaries in his 1904 book, also included a valuable ethnohistorical study of the family, some comparative grammatical material, and an inventory of all the Panoan languages known at the time.

Father Constant Tastevin collected word lists of many thitherto-unknown or little-known Panoan languages/dialects in Brazil during the first third of the 20th century (Tastevin mss.: a–f). Four of these (Nawa, Kapanawa of the Juruá River, Katukina, and Kashinawa of the Tarauacá River) were published as part of an analytical publication (Rivet and Tastevin, 1927–1929/1932), but the others were either published much later and only partially (Paranawa, Yumanawa, Nehanawa, Nishinawa, Mastanawa, and Yawanawa; Loukotka, 1963), or have never been published (Poyanawa, Yaminawa, and Nukini lists exist in Paul Rivet’s archive in Paris). This material and possibly additional Panoan linguistic data may exist in Tastevin’s archive near Paris, to which I have not yet had access.25

Paul Rivet can be considered the foremost Panoan linguist of the first third of the 20th century, when the first Panoan comparative works were produced (e.g., Rivet, 1910; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913; Rivet and Tastevin, 1927–1929/1932). Rivet’s first (1910) attempt was a failure due to confusion stemming from the homonymy between the Panoan and Takanan languages called Yamiaka and Arazaire/Arasa. Meanwhile, his subsequent publications were genuine contributions to Panoan linguistics. His 1913 paper with Créqui-Montfort contains the first comparative description of Panoan grammar, and his paper presented with Tastevin at the 1922 International Congress of Americanists held in Rio de Janeiro (published in 1927–1929 and in 1932) contains a lexical comparison incorporating data from all of the Panoan languages for which word lists were available. Rivet and Tastevin (1921) contains about 50 Panoan ethnonyms with information on geography, synonymy, affiliation, and (speculative) etymology that was more useful than any other publication available at the time for sorting out the Panoan ethnic groups/languages.

Tessmann’s work (1928, 1929, 1930), despite his questionable methodology, is also noteworthy in that he made an important contribution with new data on several thitherto undocumented Panoan languages and a detailed grammar of Shipibo-Konibo.

The newly collected Panoan material made available during this time also generated many new internal classifications of the Panoan family (e.g., Rivet, 1924; Schmidt, 1926; Rivet and Tastevin, 1927–1929/1932; Loukotka, 1935, 1939), but these classifications were all geographically based. Geographic classifications made it possible to include a large number of languages for which no data were available, but were linguistically unsound.

25. Tastevin’s original field notebooks are said to be at the Congrégation du Saint-Esprit at Chevilly-La-Rue outside Paris.
The Summer Institute of Linguistics (1940s–present)

In 1942 Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) missionaries began work on Panoan languages, mostly in Peru (table 9). In addition to Matses (Peruvian dialect) and the Sharanawa dialect of Yaminawa, which are listed in table 9 among Panoan languages and dialects studied in detail, SIL personnel documented for the first time several other Panoan languages and dialects (not listed in table 9), during the 1960s (Issonawa and the Marinawa dialect of Yaminawa), 1970s (the Paud Usunkid dialect of Matses, all three dialects of Kulina of the Curuçá River, Kasharari, and Remo of the Môa River), 1980s (the Parkenawa dialect of Yaminawa), and 1990s (the Chitonawa dialect of Yaminawa). Except for a short article on Marinawa (Pike and Scott, 1962), these were documented only with short lists that were not published (they exist as microfiche in the SIL archives in Dallas or as documents in the personal archives of Eugene Loos; see appendix 2 for references). Meanwhile, for the languages/dialects listed in table 9, the SIL produced an unprecedented flood of academic articles and pedagogical materials, partly in compliance with a contract made with the Peruvian ministry of education to produce such materials and run bilingual schools. A few linguistics articles were published in international journals (next section), but most of this work was printed as in-house publications or archived as microfiche.

Franciscan missionaries and Abreu had written traditional Latin-style grammars (i.e., mostly conjugation and declension paradigms), and additionally made some observations about the Panoan languages with respect to the qualities in which they differed from well-known European languages (of the type in the citation by Raimondi above). By the beginning of the 1900s, many academic linguists (e.g., Ferdinand de Saussure, Franz Boas, and Edward Sapir) preferred descriptions that were guided by the language’s unique structure, rather than pressed to fit into Indo-European–style grammars. Unfortunately, during this period no such descriptions were produced for Panoan languages. By the 1950s, academic linguists were interested in describing languages using complex abstract models often embedded in very intricate notation and which are considered of little use today. During the 1960s, some of the SIL missionaries working in Peru obtained M.A. and Ph.D. linguistics degrees in American universities and wrote theses on Panoan languages (table 9). Most of these theses and many publications by SIL missionaries of this period followed the then in-vogue abstract models, producing generative phonologies (e.g., Loos, 1967/1969) and tagmemic (e.g., Prost, 1965/1967a), grammemic (e.g., Shell, 1957), and transformational (e.g., Russell, 1965/1975) grammars. Exceptionally, Shell (1965/1975b) produced her reconstruction of seven Panoan languages, which remains the only Panoan lexical reconstruction study and is the hitherto soundest contribution to the genetic classification of the Panoan languages.

In the 1970s, more valuable descriptive studies of Panoan languages began to be produced by the SIL (e.g., Loos, 1978a [1973] inter alia, 1978b [1973] inter alia). Starting in the 1980s, lengthy (lexicographically naive, but useful) dictionaries with short grammar sketches of Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River (Montag, 1981), Shipibo-Konibo (Loriot et al., 1993), and Kapanawa of the Tapiche River (Loos and Loos, 1998/2003) became avail-
able, along with some shorter vocabularies (Amawaka: Hyde, 1980; Kashibo: Shell, 1987; Pano: Parker, 1992; Sharanawa: Scott, 2004).26 Pedagogical grammars (which include short vocabularies) were written for Shipibo-Konibo (Faust, 1973), Matses (Kneeland, 1979), Kashinawa of the Ibuacu River (Montag, 1979/2004), and Yaminawa (Eakin, 1991), though it should be kept in mind that in these the language’s grammar is simplified and that these were not written for use by linguists; the only SIL descriptive grammars aimed at academic audiences are for Yaminawa (Faust and Loos, 2002) and Amawaka (Sparing 2007). Olive Shell did not continue her excellent reconstructive Panoan work, and Eugene Loos became the foremost expert on the Panoan family, becoming consultant for the SIL personnel working on Panoan languages and writing several comparative works and edited volumes on Panoan linguistics (Loos, 1975b, 1976a, 1978a, 1978b, 1978c, 1978d, 1978e, 1999b, 2005).

All the Panoan languages (and many dialects) in Peru and Bolivia were studied by the SIL at some level. Meanwhile, in Brazil we have from the SIL only a Portuguese translation of Montag’s (1979) Kashinawa of the

26. Preliminary versions of some of these dictionaries were archived as microfiche; Shell’s 1959 (preliminary) Kashibo vocabulary was the only one published before the 1980s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/dialect</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Missionary</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Theses, dissertations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Lauriult, Erwin</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Loriot, James</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Eakin, Lucille</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashibo</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Shell, Olive</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Ph.D., 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amawaka</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Russell, Robert</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>M.A., 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Russell, Dolores</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Hyde, Richard</td>
<td>1960s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Hyde, Sylvia</td>
<td>1960s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Sparing, Margareth</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapanawa of the Tapiche R.</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Loos, Eugene</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Ph.D., 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Loos, Betty</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashinawa of the Ibuacu R.</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Kensinger, Kenneth</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Cromack, Gail</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>M.A., 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Cromack, Robert</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ph.D., 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Montag, Susan</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Ph.D., 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakobo</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Prost, Gilbert</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Prost, Marian</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matses</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Fields, Harriet</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Kneeland, Harriet</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharanawa</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Scott, Eugene</td>
<td>1960s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Scott, Marie</td>
<td>1960s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaminawa</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Faust, Norma</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of language study.
Ibuaçu River pedagogical grammar (Montag, 2004), an unpublished Kasharari word list (Pickering, 1973) and an unpublished Kasharari phonology (Couto, 2005). Generally speaking, the real value of the SIL’s Panoan linguistic descriptions, particularly the later ones, is that the missionaries spent enough time in the field to become intimately familiar with the languages. Thus, even if some of their analyses are fallacious, one can feel fairly confident that the data and the generalizations are valid (often imprecise, but unlikely to be completely wrong).

While the SIL were the only missionaries conducting linguistic work on Panoan languages in Peru, non-SIL missionaries working in Bolivia and Brazil produced a few linguistic descriptions. A lengthy Chakobo dictionary with a short grammar sketch was compiled by Zingg (1998) of the Swiss Mission. New Tribes Mission personnel worked with the Marubos and Katukinas (in Brazil), but they produced mostly readers, and the only linguistic descriptions available, for Marubo, were never published (Kennell, 1976, 1978).

University Academics (1970s–present)

During the 1970s, the only academic (i.e., without a missionary agenda) institution to take interest in Panoan linguistic research was the San Marcos national university in Lima (UNMSM). The academics working on Panoan languages at the UNMSM were André-Marcel d’Ans and his students. d’Ans produced several publications, including an analytical study of Navarro’s (1903) Pano vocabulary (d’Ans, 1970), a new classification based on lexicostatistics (d’Ans, 1973, 1975) and some vocabularies (Yaminawa: d’Ans, 1972a; Amawaka: d’Ans and Van den Eynde, 1972). However, none of these were based on extensive fieldwork and contain many inaccuracies and unfortunate errors.

In the 1980s many other university academics began to take interest in the description of Panoan languages. Table 10 lists the bachelor’s and master’s theses, and Ph.D. dissertations that have been completed on Panoan linguistics by nonmissionaries. As can be seen in table 10, most of these are on Brazilian languages by students enrolled in Brazilian universities, and these complemented the SIL’s contributions on Peruvian languages. Prior to the descriptive linguistic work in Brazil, personnel from the FUNAI (the Brazilian bureau of Indian affairs) and the national museum at Rio de Janeiro collected short word lists of Brazilian languages, documenting some Panoan languages and dialects for the first time, including Marubo (Boutle, 1964; Souza, 1979), Matis (Souza, 1979), the Brazilian dialect of Matses (Souza, 1979), and Nukini (FUNAI, 1981). Later, the work of Brazilian linguistics students added the Shanenawa and Shawanawa/Arara dialects of Yaminawa to the list of newly described Panoan speech varieties. Demushbo and Korubo (both the Korubo and the Chankueshbo dialects) are the most recent languages to be documented for the first time (Fleck and Voss, 2006; Oliveira,

27. From the 1950s until the 1980s, many highly inaccurate classifications have been produced mostly by academics who did not specialize in the Panoan family; these include Mason (1950), Rivet and Loukotka (1952), McQuown (1955), Tovar (1961), Loukotka (1968); Voegelin and Voegelin (1977), Tovar and Tovar (1984), and Ruhlen (1987). The accuracy of classifications improved somewhat in the 1990s: Erikson et al. (1994), Kaufmann (1994), Campbell (1997), Loos (1999), and Valenzuela (2003b).
### TABLE 10. Languages That Have Been the Subject of Linguistics Theses by Academics (theses are grouped by language and follow chronological order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/dialect</th>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>University*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo-Konibo</td>
<td>Guillén (1974)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNMSM, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>García (1994)</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>UNMSM, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valenzuela (1997)</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>U. Oregon, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elias (2000)</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>UNMSM, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valenzuela (2003b)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>U. Oregon, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapanawa of the Tapiche R.</td>
<td>Elias (2006)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Rutgers U., USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashibo</td>
<td>Cortez (1980)</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>UNMSM, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valle (2009)</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>UNMSM, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zariquey (2011a)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>La Trobe U., Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valle (in prep. a)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>U. Texas, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katukina</td>
<td>Barros (1987)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aguiar (1988)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aguiar (1994a)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marubo</td>
<td>Costa (1992)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UFRJ, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costa (2000)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UFRJ, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matses</td>
<td>Carvalho (1992)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UFRJ, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorigo (2001)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UFRJ, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleck (2003)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Rice U., USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyanawa</td>
<td>Paula (1992)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UFPE, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaminawa (Shawannawa dialect)</td>
<td>Cunha (1993)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UFPE, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Souza (2012)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaminawa (Shanenawa dialect)</td>
<td>Cândido (1998)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cândido (2004)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaminawa (Yawanawa dialect)</td>
<td>Garcia (2002)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UFG, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paula (2004)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaminawa (Yaminawa-arara dialect)</td>
<td>Souza (2004)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaminawa (Brazilian Yaminawa dialect)</td>
<td>Couto (2010)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UFPE, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panoan family</td>
<td>Cortez (1996)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNMSM, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanes (2000)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UFRJ, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zariquey (2006)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>PUCP, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbosa (2012)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanes (2005)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UFRJ, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matis</td>
<td>Spanghero (2000)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferreira (2001a)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanghero (2005)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferreira (2005)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasharari</td>
<td>Garcia (2004)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nukini</td>
<td>Oikidoi (2004)</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>UFG, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korubo</td>
<td>Oliveira (2009)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UnB, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pano</td>
<td>Gomes (2010)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>UNICAMP, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakobo-Pakawara</td>
<td>Tallman (in prep., a)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>U. Texas, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations: PUCP, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú; UFG, Universidade Federal de Goiás; UFPE, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco; UFRJ, Universidade Federal de Rio de Janeiro; UnB, Universidade de Brasília; UNICAMP, Universidade Estadual de Campinas; UNMSM, Universidad Nacional Mayor San Marcos.*
2009; Fleck, in prep.).

Since the publication of its first issue in 1917, the *International Journal of American Linguistics* has been the most prestigious academic journal for the field of Amerindian languages. As can be seen in table 11, the first Panoan works to appear in this journal were by SIL missionaries, initially on phonological topics and then on transitivity. The next topic of interest was Panoan classification, and the latest contributions are descriptive works produced by university academics.

The beginning of this century is marked by a new priority and methodology in language description: the archiving of high-quality annotated, translated, and parsed digital recordings of endangered languages. This form of language documentation not only makes it possible for future generations to study these languages, but can also be used to make contemporary linguistic articles and grammars accountable by making the data accessible to readers. The contents of these archived digital collections are often of great interest to anthropologists, and in fact ethnographers often undertake similar documentation projects, which sometimes produce materials that are of use to linguists (if at least some of the transcriptions are parsed and/or good dictionaries and grammars exist of the language in question). Additionally, speakers of these languages or their descendants may take interest in the content of these archived collections. So far, six projects for archiving recordings of five Panoan languages have been completed or are underway (in parentheses are the principal investigators followed by archive information): Kashinawa of the Ibuaçú River (B. Comrie, P. Erikson, E. Camargo, et al.; DoBeS Archive); Parkenawa dialect of Yaminawa (C. Feather; Endangered Languages Archive); Matses, Kulina of the Curuçá River, and the Chankueshbo dialect of Korubo (D. Fleck; Endangered Languages Archive); Marubo (J. Ruedas; not yet archived); and Kashibo (R. Zariquiey; Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, project in progress; and D. Valle; Endangered Languages Archive, project in progress).

**PRIORITIES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

A reconstruction or comparative work should be based on high-quality dictionaries and grammatical descriptions that follow modern academic standards of as many languages as possible. It is also important that all the major categories (branches, groups, etc.) in the family be represented. A proto-Panoan reconstruction should first include low-level reconstructions of the main Panoan groups, and then midlevel reconstructions of the two branches. In a comparative study the first priority is to include languages

---

28. A comprehensive grammar should be based on at least nine months of field research, and a complete phonology on at least three months (and a combined phonology plus grammar on at least a year). There is a tendency for the first few months of field research on a previously undescribed language to include a very large number of errors, which are discovered and corrected during the later part of the field research with growing familiarity of the language. This is especially true for linguists taking on their first field study, and particularly so for certain linguistic topics (e.g., word order, distinguishing ś from š, etc.). Thus, for the most part, information from studies based on minimal time in the field cannot be used confidently. In addition to time in the field, data-collection methodology and analysis are essential. Descriptions of suggested field linguistic methodology include Payne (1997), Dixon (2007), and Fleck (2008b). Dictionary definitions should circumscribe the precise semantic range of words, rather than simply providing a close match in English, Spanish, or Portuguese; sample sentences are helpful, but they cannot substitute for semantic circumscription (Corréard, 2006; Fleck, 2007c).
from the Mayoruna branch and the Nawa group, and also Kashibo and Kasharari. As more Nawa languages are added, Chakobo/Pakawara, the most divergent of the (extant or documented beyond word lists) Nawa languages, should not be left out. Unfortunately, it is not yet possible to conduct such ideal Panoan reconstructions and comparative studies, but the situation is rapidly improving. Full length, high-quality grammatical descriptions of Shipibo (Valenzuela, 2003b), Matses (Fleck, 2003), and Kashibo (Zariquiey, 2011a) have become available during the last 10 years, and a full-length grammar of Chakobo is underway (Tallman, in prep.), but the rest of the Panoan languages are still in need of further description. The crucial missing piece of the puzzle is Kasharari, for which only short word lists and phonological studies are available (Pickering, 1973; Cabral and Monserrat, 1987; Lanes, 2000; G. Sousa, 2004; Couto, 2005). Considering that this language is in danger of extinction, by far the highest priority for Panoan linguistics is the publication of a thorough grammatical description of this language, accompanied by a dictionary or lengthy vocabulary.

Another topic of interest is the teasing apart of areal vs. genetic factors contributing to similarities among Panoan languages, and between the Panoan and Takanan families (and other South American families). Kashibo is an interesting language to study in this respect: we can be sure there has been significant areal influence from Shipibo, but how old is it? Also, why does Amawaka in some ways seem to fit into the Headwaters subgroup and in other ways into the Chama subgroup, while having other quite unique features?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shipibo</td>
<td>Lauriault (1948)</td>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amawaka</td>
<td>Osborn (1948)</td>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashibo</td>
<td>Shell (1950)</td>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell (1957)</td>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>grammar: transitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakobo</td>
<td>Prost (1962)</td>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>grammar: transitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panoan family</td>
<td>Suárez (1973)</td>
<td>IIESE</td>
<td>classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key (1978)</td>
<td>U. of California Bennington College</td>
<td>classification literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pano</td>
<td>Parker (1994)</td>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marubo</td>
<td>Ruedas (2002)</td>
<td>Tulane U.</td>
<td>sociolinguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matses</td>
<td>Fleck (2006b)</td>
<td>La Trobe U.</td>
<td>grammar: prefixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleck (2008a)</td>
<td>La Trobe U.</td>
<td>grammar: pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapanawa</td>
<td>Elias (2009)</td>
<td>Stony Brook U.</td>
<td>phonology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations: IIESE, Instituto de Investigación e Integración Social del Estado de Oaxaca; PUCP, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú; SIL, Summer Institute of Linguistics.*
TYPOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

Below I present a brief typological overview of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the family, based on the available linguistic data. Further study of some Panoan languages, especially Kasharari, will be needed to learn how widespread some of the features mentioned here are within the family.

Phonology
Loos (1999b: 230) listed the following phoneme inventory for proto-Panoan: p, t, k, ?, ts, tʃ, s, ʃ, β, r, m, n, w, j, h, a, i, i, and o. However, this inventory is probably valid only for proto-Nawa, considering all the Mayoruna languages and Kasharari have the phoneme /tʃ/, and all the Mayoruna languages, Kasharari, and Kashibo have six vowel phonemes (/a, i, i, e, o, and u/).

Many Panoan languages have minor instances of vowel harmony, perhaps remnants of historically more general vowel harmony. A few Panoan languages have been described as having contrastive high and low tones, specifically Chakobo (Prost, 1960: 8, 1962: 111, 1967: 64), Kapanawa of the Tapiche River (Loos, 1969: 186ff.), and Amawaka (Russell, 1958; Russell and Russell 1959). Unlike tonal languages in the vicinity, like Tikuna, Bora, and Witoto, in all Panoan languages where they have been described, these contrastive tones play only a minor role. Panoan tones appear to be recent innovations specific to these Nawa languages, rather than a proto-Panoan feature (see Loos, 1999b: 230).

Within the family, Kapanawa of the Tapiche River has attracted the most attention from phonologists (e.g., Loos, 1967/1969); some of the topics of interest have been metrical syllable structure (Safir, 1979; Loos, 1986, Elias 2006, González, 2003, in prep.), nasal spreading (Safir, 1982; Piggott, 1992; Walker and Pullum, 1999), and glottal stop deletion (Elias, 2004, 2009). The last of these topics, phonemic glottal stops, is one of the few phonological features in which Kapanawa of the Tapiche differs from Shipibo and Konibo (and the other Panoan languages). Nasal spreading is common to other Nawa languages (Loos, 1975a, 1999b, 2006).

Morphology
Panoan languages are primarily suffixing and could be called highly synthetic due to the potentially very long words (up to about 10 morphemes), but the typical number of morphemes per word in natural speech is not large. It is the large number of morphological possibilities that is striking about Panoan languages, not the typical length of words. For example, up to about 130 different verbal suffixes express such diverse notions as causation, associated motion, direction, evidentiality, emphasis, uncertainty, aspect, tense, plurality, repetition, incompletion, etc., which in languages like English would be coded by syntax or adverb words.

Ergativity is unusually common in Amazonia (Gildea and Queixalós, 2010), and all hitherto studied Panoan languages have been found to be morphologically ergative (Costa, 1995, 1998, 2000b, 2002a; Ferreira, 2000; Valenzuela, 2000a, 2004, 2010b; Camargo, 2002b, 2005b; Camargo et al., 2002; Dorigo, 2002; Amarante Ribeiro and Cândido, 2005b; Fleck, 2005, 2006a, 2010; Zariquiey, 2006, 2011c, Camargo Tavares in prep.), always with some alignment splits, most typically in the pronominal paradigms. Whether proto-Panoan pronouns followed an ergative, nominative, or a mixed alignment is a topic of debate in Panoan linguistics (Valenzuela,
Of additional synchronic and diachronic interest is that in all the Panoan languages the ergative case marker (-n) also marks instrumental and genitive cases, and in some languages also locative and/or vocative.

Matses has one of the most intricate systems in the world for coding evidentiality (Fleck, 2007b). Valenzuela (2003a) found noncognate evidential(-like) markers in several groups of the Panoan family, an interesting finding in light of evidentiality being an areal feature of Amazonia (Aikhenvald and Dixon, 1998). Body-part prefixation was first recognized by Steinen (1904: 37) and has continued to be a topic of interest (e.g., Hall and Loos, 1978 [1973], Erikson, 1989; Fleck, 2006b; Amarante Ribeiro and Cândido, 2008; Ferreira, 2008; Zariquiey and Fleck, 2012; Barbosa 2012). Mayoruna languages, like some North American languages, have fourth-person (i.e., third-person coreferential) pronouns (Fleck, 2008a; Fleck, in prep.).

Associated motion, whereby meanings like “go and do [verb]” or “come while doing [verb]” are coded by verbal suffixes, is the most recent Panoan (and Takanan) morphological feature to be recognized as being of typological importance. See Guillaume (in prep.) for a comparative study of associated motion in the Panoan and Tacanan families.

### Syntax

Transitivity was one the first grammatical topics to attract attention in Panoan linguistics, specifically the transitive/intransitive verb pairs that are found in Panoan languages (Shell, 1957; Prost, 1962; Loos 1978e). The topic of Panoan transitivity continues to attract attention in recent times (Valenzuela, 1999, 2002a, 2003b). Related to transitivity, Panoan languages have the rare and interesting property of “transitivity agreement,” whereby various parts of the grammar (including adverbs, suffixes, and enclitics) vary depending on whether the matrix verb is transitive or intransitive (Valenzuela, 1999, 2005a, 2005b, in prep.; 2005: 93-96, 2010: 50-54; Ferreira, in prep.). Indeed, awareness of the transitivity status of verbs is essential for the Panoan speaker, as it is almost impossible to utter a grammatically correct sentence without knowing it.

Panoan discourse is characterized by “clause chaining” (or “switch-reference”): up to about 10 clauses can be linked together using suffixes that mark argument coreference (e.g., same subject, object = subject) and temporal/logical relations (e.g., “while,” “after,” “in order to”) between subordinate and matrix clauses. This intricate type of clause reference is unique to Panoan languages. For detailed descriptions of clause chaining in Amawaka, Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, Shipibo, Matses, Matis, Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River, and Kashibo, see Sparling (1998, 2005), Loos (1999a), Valenzuela (2003b: chap. 9), Fleck (2003: 1132–1159), Ferreira 2005: chap. 11), Montag (2005), and Zariquiey (2011a: chap. 18), respectively.

Panoan languages are some of the few languages in the world where both nonsubject arguments of bitransitive verbs like give are grammatically identical (Valenzuela, 1999, 2002a; Fleck, 2002, 2003b; Ferreira, 2005; Torres-Bustamante, 2011; Zariquiey, 2012b, in prep. b). Interestingly, two of the few other languages described as having this feature are Panoan neighbors, namely Yagua (Peba-Yaguan family; see Payne and Payne, 1990) and Cavineña (Takanan family; see Guillaume, 2008), suggesting that this may be another areal feature of (western) Amazonia. This characteristic of having trivalent
verbs with identical (or in some cases, nearly identical) nonsubject arguments has drawn interest in valence-increasing grammar in Panoan family, namely causative (Fleck 2001, 2002; Valenzuela 2002a; Zariquiey 2012a) and applicative (Valenzuela 2010a; Zariquiey, in prep. a) constructions.

ETHNOLINGUISTIC FEATURES

LINGUISTIC TABOOS

The Shipibos (Morin, 1998: 363) and Marubos have a type of name taboo that is common in Amazonia, where birth-given names are relatively secret and cannot be used to address people or uttered loudly when talking about a living or dead person, particularly adults; instead, relational kinship terms, teknonyms, and nicknames are commonly used. Although not adhered to so closely now, a more common phenomenon among Panoans, including the Mayorunas (s ans the Matis, who have no onomastic taboos), Kashinawas of the Ibuçu River (Kensing e r, 1995: 236), Amawakas (Dole, 1998: 211–212), and Iskonawas (Whiton et al., 1964: 100) is “postmortem name taboo,” whereby a person’s name or nicknames are avoided only after they die. Beyond the tactful notion that people not be reminded of recently deceased relatives, some tribes (the Matses, Kulinas of the Curuçá River, and Demushbos) believe that uttering a dead person’s name might invoke their spirit which can cause harm to the speaker.

The linguistically interesting aspect of these postmortem name taboos is their extension in some Panoan languages (such as Yaminawa: Eakin, 1991: 11; Townsley, 1994: 305–306) to word taboo; that is, where common words that are components of names or nicknames of the deceased are also prohibited. In Matses, Kulina, and Demushbo, the prohibition even extends to words that sound similar to postmortem-tabooed names or nicknames (as in some Polynesian languages; Simons, 1982). “Word taboo by phonological analogy to postmortem name taboo,” as I call it, was first reported for the Matses by Fields (1973), and has been described in detail for the Matses, Kulinas, and Demushbos by Fleck and Voss (2006).

A linguistic taboo reported by the Matis is one where special substitute vocabulary is used instead of certain words that cannot be uttered while preparing curare, lest the resultant poison be impotent (Erikson, 1996: 215).

IN-LAW AVOIDANCE SPEECH

In-law avoidance speech in Shipibo-Konibo has been described by Girard (1958: 245), Morin (1998: 354), Tournon (2002: 201–202), and Valenzuela (2003b: 16–18). Parents-in-law and their sons-in-law cannot speak directly to each other, but communicate through their daughter or wife. “Even in a situation when a father-in-law and his son-in-law travel far away and remain without contact with any other person for some time, they are not supposed to talk to each other directly and may behave as if the daughter or wife were present pretending they communicate through her” (Valenzuela, 2003b: 17). This avoidance speech also extends to a man’s wife’s grandfather and to his wife’s maternal aunt (Tournon, 2002: 201; Valenzuela, 2003b: 17–18). Older Kashibo speakers report that they once followed a similar practice (R. Zariquiey, personal commun.).

weeping Kinship Lexicon

When a relative dies, the Matses (and formerly the Kulinas of the Curuçá River and the Demushbos) gather around the deceased
in a house to mourn for one day and one night, by fasting, weeping, and chanting. In the chants, rather than use everyday kinship terms, a separate set of kinship terms for referring to the deceased relative is used. The weeping terms in Matses, Kulina, and Demushbo are very similar, and probably precede their historical separation. Older people know the full set of weeping chant terms, and when someone dies they inform others of the correct terminology to use when weeping (Fleck et al., 2012, contains the complete inventory for Matses). The weeping lexicon ignores some distinctions in the everyday language, such as relative age, and incorporates other distinctions including paired ego–gender-specific terms for almost all relatives (not just for cross-relatives, as in the everyday terms), and distinctions depending on the moiety membership of the deceased person (this moiety distinction does not occur in the everyday kinship terminology29). Therefore, the weeping terms are not simply synonyms, but can be seen as composing a separate kinship-classification system.

Each tribe has its peculiar dialect; but they generally communicate in the Pano language. (Herndon, 1954: 204).

One would assume that Pano was simplified when used as a lingua franca, but this was never specified in the historical literature.

Pidgins have been reported in recent times for languages in the Headwaters subgroup. “When Cashinawas converse with Sharanawas [speakers of a dialect of Yaminawa] they are known to resort to a kind of pidgin-Pano by suppressing the use of most suffixes, especially those not shared between them” (Loos, 1999b: 228). Similarly, Kensinger reports that Marinawas (speakers of a dialect of Yaminawa), Kashinawas of the Ibuaçu River, and Amawakas have a type of pidgin with which they can communicate with each other (Shell, 1975: 25). D’Ans (1972a: 1) mentions a Marinawa-based pidgin used by speakers of Yaminawa dialects. According to Déléage (personal commun.), the Sharanawas and Amawakas of the Purus River area converse in a mix of the two languages.

Ceremonial Languages

In order to carry out their religious ceremonies, the infidels of the Ucayali River congregate occasionally in the shelter of one of their chiefs, whom the recent converts call sorcerer and the infidels Muraya. ...and as they all sit in the most profound silence, the Muraya begins to speak in a language that none of the onlookers under-

29. In the Kapishtana dialect of Kulina, each moiety has a different term for “father,” but there are no other instances of moiety-specific everyday vocabulary.
stand, and answering him in the same language, a second voice is heard.

(Emich 1988 [Pallarés and Calvo, 1870]: 306)30

The above statement did not specify which Ucayali dwellers had this ceremonial language, but as mëraya is a Shipibo-Konibo and Pano word meaning “sorcerer/shaman” (translated as “brujo” and “brujo-a” by Loriot et al., 1993: 263; and Navarro, 1903: 14, respectively), we can assume the reference was to Panoans of the Chama subgroup. In any case, such ceremonial languages have been found in other Panoan cultures.

The Matses used to hold a traditional ceremony called komok (described inRomanoff et al., 2004), which involved adult men dressing as “singing spirits” in full-body hoods made from the pounded bark of komok trees (Couratari sp., Family Lecythidaceae). These spirits chanted and talked in a special “language,” that is, the Matses consider it a distinct language, but in fact it is simply the Matses language with substituted ceremony-specific vocabulary (34 words/terms have been recovered so far and are listed in Fleck et al., 2012). Some, but not all the Mayoruna groups practiced this ceremony and had a comparable ceremonial “language.” The Sharanawas have a parallel speech variety, whereby special vocabulary, obscure to the uninitiated, is substituted for certain words in shamanic chants (Déléage, 2005: 361–366).

The Marubos also have a ceremonial speech variety that, following Marubo oral history, originated from a distinct language. According to the Marubos, the current-day Marubo ethnic group is composed of several tribes who spoke mutually intelligible Panoan languages (Melatti, 1977: 93, 106, 1986: 30–37; Ruedas, 2001: 709–941, 2003: 37–39, 2004: 30–34), and the language of one of these groups (the Shainawabo people) is what the Marubos speak now, and a second language was in part retained as a ceremonial/shamanic language called Asan ikiki by the Marubos (Cesarino, 2008, 2011). However, the oral history does not match the linguistic facts, as Asan ikiki seems to actually be Marubo with substituted words, which may or may not originate from a sister language.

### Gender-specific Speech

Gender-specific language is not prominent in Panoan languages. It has only been found in interjections. Kashinawa of the Ibauacu River and Shipibo-Konibo have two words for “yes” one used by men and the other by women (Montag, 1981: 534; Valenzuela 2003b: 182). Abreu (1941 [1914]: 13) and Fleck (2003: 743) documented, in Kashinawa of the Ibaúca River and Matses, respectively, several exclamations (i.e., interjections of surprise, pain, astonishment, etc.) used exclusively by men or by women. The most complex (and first to be recorded) case of gender-specific interjections in the family is in Pano:

My attention turned to the interjection yau that he uttered in the Pano language, and which manifested his certainty that the person in sight was

---

30. My translation from the Spanish original: Para practicar sus ceremonias religiosas, los infieles del Ucayali se reúnen de vez en cuando en la choza de uno de sus jefes, al que los neófitos llaman brujo y los infieles Muraya.... y sentados todos con el más profundo silencio, el Muraya empieza a hablar en una lengua que los circunstantes no entienden, contestándole en el mismo idioma otra voz distinta que se deja oir.
a man and not a woman. Footnote to *yau*: Oh! Aah! Hey! Footnote to sentence: Such an interjection varies according to the gender of the individual who employs it and the gender of the individual being referred to. For example, man to man, *yau*! man to woman, *papau*! woman to man, *tutuy*! woman to woman, *ñañau*! (Marcoy, 1862–1867: XII: 206).31

Many Panoan kinship terms vary with respect to the gender of ego, but this does not restrict who can utter the kinship terms (other than in the vocative).

**Game Synonymy and Pet Vocative Terms**

Matses and Kulina of the Curuçá River (and perhaps other Panoan languages) have an unusually high level of synonymy distributed nonrandomly in their lexicons. Specifically, these languages have as many as five synonyms for most game animals. Fathers and grandfathers teach their sons and grandsons the synonym sets, and a good hunter is expected to know the full set of synonyms. While word taboos, mutual intelligibility, group identity, and incorporation of captives may have contributed to the genesis of these game synonyms, the elaboration of this phenomenon appears to be primarily the product of conscious manipulation of the lexicon to serve cultural purposes, primarily that of providing a means of publicly displaying hunting knowledge. See Fleck and Voss (2006) for a full discussion.

Several Panoan languages have paired terms for a subset of the local fauna: one term for typical reference to an animal species or genus, and a second (usually completely distinct) word for calling to the same species when tamed as a pet. These languages include Matis, Katukina, Marubo, Kashibo, and Shipibo (Erikson, 1988; Lima, 2002: 439; Fleck and Voss, 2006; Dienst and Fleck, 2009). These vocative terms are typically duplicated in speech, as one calls a house cat in English (*Here, kitty kitty!*). As with game synonymy, it is mostly game species that have the extra terminology. Dienst (2006: 341–342) describes a parallel pattern for the geographically proximate, but linguistically unrelated Kulinas of the Arawan family. More recently, other Arawan languages, namely Jamamadi, Paumari, and Jarawara, and also Kanamari (Katukinan family), have been found to have sets of pet vocative terminology and a few pet terms have been found in dictionaries of other non-Panoan languages in this area that have not yet been researched on this topic; thus, this appears to be an areal feature within southwestern Amazonian Brazil (Dienst and Fleck, 2009).

31. My translation from the French original: J’accourus à l’interjection *Yau* qu’il proféra dans l’idiome Pano et qui manifestait sa certitude que l’individu en vue était un homme et non pas une femme. Footnote to *Yau*: Oh! ah! eh! Footnote to end of sentence: Cette interjection varie suivant le sexe de l’individu qui l’emploie et le sexe de l’individu à qui elle est adressée. Exemple: d’homme à homme *yau*! — d’homme à femme *papau*! — de femme à homme *tutuy*! — de femme à femme *ñañau*!
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APPENDIX 1

INDEX OF COMMON DENOMINATION SYNONYMS, VARIANTS, AND HOMONYMS

Principal names of languages and dialects are in **bold** and *italic*, respectively (as in table 1). Principal ethnonyms claimed to be Panoan but for which no linguistic data exist are in **small caps** (as in table 2); names in plain, or Roman, type are synonyms for languages, dialects, or ethnonyms, according to the respective remarks. Entries for principal names are followed by their location in the classification in table 1 (T1) or table 2 (T2), followed by any spelling/pronunciation variants (“var”), synonyms (“syn”), and intrafamily homonyms (“hom”). Bibliographic references follow synonyms and some spelling variants. Accents are ignored here, as they are inconsistently applied in the literature.

Abakabu – see **Nukini**.
Aguanaco – see **Awanawa**.
Aguanaga – see **Awanawa**.
Aguanagua – see **Awanawa**.
**Aino** (T2: II.B) – var: Ainõ.
Ainõ – see **Aino**.
Amaguaca – see **Amawaka**.
Amahuaca – see **Amawaka**.
Amahuaco – see **Amawaka**.
Amajuaca – see **Amawaka**.
Amenguaca – see **Amawaka**.
Amjemhuaco – see **Amawaka**.
Amjenguaca – see **Amawaka**.
Amouaca – see **Amawaka**.
Andahuaca – see **Amawaka**.
**ANINAWA** (T2: II.C.viii.b).
Aqueti – var of Haqueti. see **Kashibo**.
Aragua – see **Arawa**.
Aranawa – see **Shawannawa**.
Arara – see **Shawannawa**.
Ararawa – see **Shawannawa**.
Aratsaira – see **Arazaire**.
Araua – see **Arawa**.
**Arawa** (T2: II.C.viii.c) – var: Araua, Aragua.
**Arazaire** (T1: II.C.ii.b) – var: Aratsaira.
Atsahuaca – see **Atsawaka**.

**Atsawaka** (T1: II.C.ii.a, codialect of Yamiaka) – var: Atsahuaca.
Auanateo – see **AWANATEO**.
Auñeiri – see **Yamiaka**.
Avantiu – see **AWANATEO**.

**AWABAKEBO** (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Awabakëbo.
Awabakëbo – see **AWABAKEBO**.

**AWANATEO** (T2: III) – var: Auanateo, Avantiu (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 452), Hahuanateo (Magnin in Maroni, 1988: 474).


**BAMUNAWA** (T2: IV) – var: Vamunawa.
**BARRUDO** (T2: II.C.vii.a) – syn: Mayoruna of the Huallaga River (Figueroa, 1904: 111); Dallus (Figueroa, 1904: 111).

Bari-nagua – see **BARINAWA**.
**BARINAWA** (T2: II.B) – var: Bari-nagua, Warinô.

Bashonahua – var of Bashonawa – see **Brazilian Yaminawa**.

Bashonawa – var: Bashonahua – see **Brazilian Yaminawa**.

Bastanaua – see **Mastanawa**.

**BINABO** (T2: III) – var: Binabu, Viabu.

Binabu – see **BINABO**.

Binanawa – see **BINANNAU**.

Binannaua – see **BINANNAU**.

**BINANNAU** (T2: III) – var: Binanawa, Binannaua.

Biti naua – see **BITINAWA**.

**BITINAWA** (T2: IV) – var: Biti naua.

**BIUBAKEU** (T2: II.C.viii.c) – var: Viuvaqueu.

**Brazilian Matses** (T1: I.A.i.a).

**Brazilian Yamianawa** (T1: II.C.viii.b). syn: Bashonawa, Dishinawa, Shaonawa (Bashonawa/Dishinawa and Shaonawa would seem to be two separate dialects according to Townsley [1994: 249–250], but I do not have the linguistic data to show it).

**BUINAWA** (T2: IV) – var: Vuinawa.

Buini-nagua – see **BUINAWA**.

Bininahua – see **BUINAWA**.

**BUINAWA** (T2: II.B) – var: Bininahua, Buini-nagua, Buninô.

Buninô – see **BUINAWA**.

**BUSKIPANI** – var: Busquipani.

Busquipani – var of **BUSKIPANI** – see **Kapanawa of the Tapiche River**.

Cacataibo – see **Kakataibo**.

Cacetero – see **Korubo**.
Cacharary – see Kasharari.
Cachibo – see Kashibo.
Cachinaua – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Cacibo – see Kashibo.
Čakaya – see Chakaya.
Caliseca – var of Calliseca. See Shipibo, Kashibo, Konibo.
Camarinigua – see Kamariniwa.
Camunahua – see Komariana.
Canabae Uni – see Kashibo.
Canamari – see Kanamari.
Canamary – see Kanamari.
Canawary – see Kanamari.
Čaninawa – see Chaninawa.
Capacho – see Kapanawa of the Tapiche River.
Capanagua – see Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, Kapanawa of the Jurua River.
Capanahua salvaje – see Matses.
Capanahua – see Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, Kapanawa of the Jurua River.
Capanaua – see Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, Kapanawa of the Jurua River.
Capanawa – see Kapanawa of the Tapiche River, Kapanawa of the Jurua River.
Capishto – see Kapishito.
Capuibo – see Kapuiro.
Carapache – see Carapacho.
Carapacho – var: Carapacho. See Kashibo.
Caripuna – see Karipuna.
Casca – see Kaska.
Caschibo – see Kashibo.
Caschivo – see Kashibo.
Cashibo – see Kashibo.
Cashiboayano – see Pano.
Cashinahua – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Cashivo – see Kashibo.
Casibo – see Kashibo.
Cataquina – see Katukina.
Catsinaua – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Catuquina – see Katukina.
Caxinaua – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Caxivo – see Kashibo.
Cayubo – see Kayubo.
Cepeo – see Shipibo.
Cepibo – see Shipibo.
Cetevo – see Shetebo.
Chacaya – see Chakaya.
Chacobo – see Chakobo.
Chai (T2: II.C.vii.a).
CHAKAYA. (T2: II.C.vii) – var: Chacaya, Čakaya.
CHAKOBO (T1: II.C.i.a, codialect of Pakawara) – var: Chacobo, Tsakobo.
Chama – superordinate term used to refer to Shipibo, Konibo, and often also Shetebo; less frequently it is a synonym for Shipibo. var: Tschama (Tessmann, 1929).
Chandenawa – see Shanenawa.
Chandinawa – see Chaninawa.
Chamenawa – see Shanenawa.
CHANINAWA (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yamianawa) – var: Čaninawa, Chandinahua, Tchaninawa, Tyaninawa (Tastevin, 1926: 34, 50).
Chankuëshbo – see Chankueshbo.
Charanahua – see Sharanawa.
CHASHONO (T2: II.B) – var: Tšažnõ.
chaunaua – var of Shaonawa. See Brazilian Yaminawa.
Chena (T1: I.A.i.b, dialect of Kulina of the Curuçá River) – syn/hom: Dëmushbo (Fleck, in prep.).
Chepaeo – see Shipibo.
Chepenagua – see Shipinawa.
Chepeo – see Shipibo.
Cheteo – see Shetebo.
Chipanagua – see Chipanawa.
CHIPANAWA (T2: IV) – var: Chipanagua.
Chipeo – see Shipibo.
Chipibo – see Shipibo.
Chipinawa – see Shipinawa.
CHIRABO (T2: I) – var: Čirabo.
Chiriba (T1: II.C.i.c) – var: Chîriva.
Chîriva – see Chiriba.
Chitodawa – see Chitonawa.
Chitonahua – see Chitonawa.
CHITONAWA (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yamianawa) – var: Chitodawa, Chitonahua.
Choromagua – see Choromawa.
CHOROMAWA (T2: II.B) – var: Choromagua.
Choshunahua – var of Choshunawa – see Peruvian Yaminawa.
Choshunawa – var: Choshunahua – see Peruvian Yaminawa.
CHUMANA (T2 II.C.i).
CHUNTI (T2: III).
Cipibo – see Shipibo.
Čirabo – see Chirabo, Schiroba (Veigl, 1785: 106).
Colino – see Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença.
Collina – see Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença.
Comabo – see Komabo.
Comanagua – see Komanawa.
Comanahua – see Komanawa.
Comavo – see Komabo.
Comobo – see Komabo.
Comunahua – see Komanawa.
Conebo – see Konibo.
Conibo – see Konibo.
Conigua – see Konibo.
Contanawa – see Kontanawa.
Coronawa – see Kurunawa.
Corubo – see Korubo.
Corugo – see Korugo.
Cuinúua – see Kuinua.
Culina – see Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença.
Culino – see Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença.
Cumabo – see Komabo.
Cumabu – see Komabo.
Cumala (Spanish translation of tonnad) – see Kapishtana, Mawi.
Cumavo – see Komabo.
Cuniba – see Konibo.
Cunibo – see Konibo.
Cunio – see Konibo.
Cunivo – see Konibo.
Curina – see Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença.
Curiveo – see Konibo.
Cusabatay – see Kusabatai.
Custanawa – see Kustanawa.
Cuyanawa – var of Kuyanawa. See Kuyanawa.
Dallus – see Barbudo.
Deenahua – var: Deenawa.
DEENAWA (T2: II.C.viii.b) – var: Deenahua.
Dëis – see Mawi.
Dëmushbo – see Demushbo.
**DIABO** (T2: III) – var: Diabu.
Diabu – see Diabo.
Dishinahua – var of Dishinawa. See Brazilian Yaminawa.
Dishinawa – var: Dishinahua. See Brazilian Yaminawa.
E’loé – see Karipuna.
Epetineri – var of Impetineri. See Amawaka.
Eskinawa (T1: 52: IV).
Espino (T2: II.C.viii.c).
Gitipo – see Shetebo.
Grillo – see Kapishiana, Mawi.
Gritones – see Sinabo of the Mamoré River.
Haguanaga – see Awanawa.
Hagueti – var of Haqueti. See Kashibo.
Hahuanateo – see Awanateo.
Hámue-huáca – see Amawaka.
Hawanbakebo (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Jawanbakêbo.
Hepetineri – var of Impetineri. See Amawaka.
Hunawa – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Hisisbaquebo – see Hisisbakebo.
Hotentot – see Puinawa.
Hsu-naua – see Hsunawa.
Hsunawa (T2: IV) – var: Hsu-naua.
Huariapano – var: Wariapano – see Pano.
Huni Kuin – var: Junikuin – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Hunino (T2: II.B) – var: Huninõ.
Huninô – see Hunino.
Ilpi (T2: II.C.vii.b).
Impetineri – var: Epetineri, Hepetineri, Ipetineri. See Amawaka, Mayoruna of the Jannditatuba River.
Inobu – see Inubo.
Inono (T2: II.B) – var: Inonô.
Inonô – see Inono.
Inuaca – see Inuaka.
Inuaka (T2: II.B) – var: Inuaca.
Inubakebo (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Inubakêbo.
Inubakêbo – see Inubakebo.
Inubakeu (T2: II.C.viii.c) – var: Inuvaqueu.
Inubo (T2: II.C.vii.c) – var: Inobu, Inubu, Ynubu.
Inubu – see Inubo.
Inukuini – see Nukini.
Inuvaqueu – see Inubakeu.
Ipetineri – var of Impetineri. See Amawaka.
Isaknawa (T2: IV) – var: Ysacnagua.
Isconabquebo – see Iskonawa.
Isconahua – see Iskonawa.
Isis baquebu – see Hisisbakebo

**Iskonawa** (T1: II.C.vi.b) – var: Isconahua, Iscobaquebo, Iskunaua, Iskunawa.
Iskunaua – see **Iskonawa**, Yawanawa.
Iskunawa – see **Iskonawa**.
Isnagua – see Isunawa.
Isubenebakebo (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Isubēnēbakēbo.
Isubēnēbakēbo – see Isubenebakebo.
Isnagua – see Isunawa.
Isunawa (T2: III) – var: Isnagua (typo in Girbal, 1927: 161), Isunagua, Ysunagua.
Isunoobu – see Isunubo.
**Isunibo** (T1: II.B, dialect of Kashibo) – var: Isunoobu (Tessmann, 1930: 128).
Jaminawa – see **Yaminawa**.
Jaminawa – see **Yaminawa**.
Jaobo – see Yawabo.
Jawabo – see Yawabo.
Jawabu – see Yawabo.
Jawanbakēbo – see Hawanbakebo.
Jitipo – see Shetebo.
Junikuin – var of Huni Kuin. See *Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River*.
Kachinaua – see *Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River*.
*Kakataibo* (T1: II.B, dialect of Kashibo) – var: Cacataibo.
Kaliseka – var of Calliseca. See Shipibo, Kashibo, Konibo.
Kamaigohuni (T2: II.B).
Kamânawa – see **Kanamari**.
Kamariniwa (T2: III) – var: Camarinigua.
*Kanamari* (T1: II.C.v.b, dialect of Katukina) – var: Canamari, Canamary, Canawary (the latter is a frequently reproduced typo on page 188 of Chandleless, 1866), Kamânawa (autodenomination; Anonymous, 1965).
Kapanahua – see *Kapanawa of the Tapiche River*.
Kapanaua – see *Kapanawa of the Juruá River*.
Kapishto – var: Kapishto. See *Kapishtana, Mawi*.
**Kapuibo** (T2: II.C.i) – var: Capuibo.
**Karipuna** (T1: II.C.i.b) – var: Caripuna; syn: Jaun-avo (Martius, 1867: II: 240), E’loé (Barbosa, 1948).
Karunawa – see *Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença*.
**Kaschibo** (T1: II.B, dialect of Kashibo) – var: Kaschinō (Tessmann, 1930: 124, 128), Canabae Uni
Kaschibo – see Kashibo.
Kaschinaua – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Kaschinõ – see Kashibo.
Kasharari (T1: II.A) – var: Kaxarari, Kaxarirí, Cacharary.
Kashibo (T1: II.B) – var: Cachibo, Cacibo, Caschibo, Cachivo, Cashibo, Casibio, Casigua (Stiglich, 1908: 404), Caxivo, Kashibo, Kassibo. syn: Uni (Frank, 1987), Carapacho (Smyth and Lowe, 1836: 203; Steinen, 1904: 22; Stiglich, 1908: 404; Markham, 1910: 88; but see Amich, 1988 [Pallarés and Calvo, 1870]: 333, who suggests they are a distinct group), Calliseca (see fn. 1), Haqueti (Tessmann, 1930: 127; though Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 547, called this a Manannabobo dialect).
Kashinaua – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River (T1: II.C.viii.a.) – var: Cachinaua, Cashinahua, Catsinaua, Caxinaua, Kashchinaua, Kashinaua, Kasinaua, Kasinha, Katsina, Kashinaua, syn: Huni Kuin, Hounawa (Tastevin ms. g), Sheminaua (Schmidt, 1926: 228).
Kasinawa – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Kasinaua – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Kaxarari – see Kasharari.
Kaxariri – see Kasharari.
Kayubo (T2: IV) – var: Cayubo.
Kiraba (T2: II.C.v.c) – var: Quiraba, Quirabae (plural)
Komabo (T2: II.B) – var: Comabo, Comavo, Comobo, Cumabo, Cumabu, Cumavo. syn: Univitza (Richter in Maroni, 1988: 286, though on pp. 297 and 301 Univitzas are listed as a separate group).
Komanawa (T2: IV) – var: Camunagua, Comanagua, Comanahua, Comanagua.
Koniibo (T1: II.C.vii.a, codialect of Shipibo) – var: Conebo, Conibo, Conigua (Stiglich, 1905: 341), Cuniba, Cunibo, Cunio (Figueroa, 1904 [1661]: 164), Cunivo, Curiveo (Rodriguez, 1684: 388), Kunibo. syn: Chama (see fn. 1), Manoa (Smyth and Lowe, 1836: 203; Markham, 1910: 96), Calliseca (see fn. 1), Pariache (Myers, 1974: 141, speculation based on geography).
Kontanaua – see Kontanawa.
Kontanawa (T2: III) – var: Contanawa, Kontanua, Kuntanawa.
Koruna – see Kurunawa.
Korubo (T1: I.A.ii) – var: Corubo. syn: Cacetero.
Korugo (T2: I) – var: Corugo, Maioruma Corugo.
Kuinua (T2: II.B) – var: Cuinúa.
Kulina do Curuçá – see Kulina of the Curuçá River.
Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença (T1: II.C.xc) – var: Culino, Colino, Collina, Culina, Curina. hom: Kulina of the Curuçá River. n.b. Rivet and Tastevin (1921: 458) gave Karunawa as a synonym for Arawan Kulina, not for (either) Panoan Kulina, despite the obvious Panoan origin of the ethnonym.
Kulina of the Curuçá River (T1: I.A.i.b) – var: Kulina do Curuçá. syn: Kulina-Pano. hom: Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença.
Kulina-Pano – see Kulina of the Curuçá River.
Kunibo – see Konibo.
Kutanawa – see KONTANAWA.
Kununaua – var of Kununawa. See KURUNAWA.
Kununawa – var: Kununaua. See KURUNAWA.
KURUNAWA (T2: III) – var: Coronaua, Koronawa. syn KUNUNAWA (Tastevin, 1929: 12).
Kusabatai (T2: II.C.vii.a) – var: Cusabatay.
Kustanaua – see KUSTANAWA.
Kustanawa (T2: III) – var: Kustanaua, Custanawa.
Kuyanaua – var of Kuyanawa. See POYANAWA.
Kuyanawa – var: Cuyanawa, Kuyanaua. See POYANAWA.
Machonawa – see MASHONAWA.
Maconagua – see MAKONAWA.
Magirona – see Mayoruna of the Jandiatuba River.
Mai-i-naua – var of Mainawa. See Peruvian Yaminawa.
Mainagua – var of Mainawa. See Peruvian Yaminawa.
Mainahua – var of Mainawa. See Peruvian Yaminawa.
Mainaua – var of Mainawa. See Peruvian Yaminawa.
Mainawa var: Mainagua, Mainahua, Mainaua, Mai-i-naua. See Peruvian Yaminawa.
Maioruma Corugo – see KORUGO.
Maioruna – see Mayoruna of the Jandiatuba River.
Majuruna – see Mayoruna.
Makonawa (T2: II.C.vii.a) – var: Maconagua.
Manamabobo – see MANAMANBOBO.
Manamanahua – see MANANNAWA.
Mananabobo – see MANAMANBOBO.
Mananabua – see MANANNAWA.
Mananagua – see MANANNAWA.
Mananava – see MANANNAWA.
Manava – see Manannawa.
Mangeroma – see Mayoruna.
Manoa – see Konibo, Pano, Shetebo.
Manoita – see Shetebo.
Manoyta – var of Manoita. See Shetebo.
Marinhua – see Marinawa.
Marina – see Marinawa.
Marinawa (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yaminawa) – var: Marinahua, Marinaua.
Marova – see Marubo of Maucallacta.
Maruba – see Marubo of the Javari Basin, Marubo of Maucallacta.
Marubiu – see Marubo of the Javari Basin.
Marugo – see Marubo of Maucallacta.
Mashonawa (T2: II.C.viii.b) – var: Machonawa, Masrodawa, Masronahua (note: the Panoan pronunciation would have a retroflex sh, hence the representations with r).
Mashoruna – var of Maxuruna. See Mayoruna of Tabatinga.
Maspa – var of Maspo. See Amawaka.
Maspo – var: Maspa. See Amawaka.
Masrodawa – see Mashonawa.
Masronahua – see Mashonawa.
Mastanahua – see Mastanawa.
Matis (T1: I.A.iii.a) – var: Matšese (Souza, 1979).
Matses (T1: I.A.i.a.) – syn: Mayoruna (Fields, 1963), Capanahua salvaje (Fields, 1963); hom: Paud Usunkid.
Matšese – see Matis.
Mauishi – see Mawishi.
Mawi (T1: I.A.i.b, dialect of Kulina of the Curuçá River) – syn: Cumala, Dëis, Kapishto, Tonnadbo, (all five synonyms from Fleck, in prep.), Grillo (Villarejo, 1979), Marubo (Fields, 1970).
Mawishi (T2: II.C.vii.a.) – var: Mauishi.
Maxuruna – var: Mashoruna. See Mayoruna of Tabatinga.
Mayiruna – see Mayoruna.
Mayo – see Mayoruna.
Mayoruna civilisé – see *Settled Mayoruna of the Amazon River*.
Mayoruna domestica – see *Settled Mayoruna of the Amazon River*.
Mayoruna fera – see *Wild Mayoruna of the Amazon River*.

**Mayoruna of Tabatinga** (T1: I.B). Maxuruna (Martius, 1867: II: 236).

**Mayoruna of the Amazon River** (T1: I.A.iii.c).

**Mayoruna of the Jandiatuba River** (T1: I.A.iii.b) – var: Maioruna, Magirona (both from Alviano, 1957).

syn: Impetineri (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921).

Mayoruna sauvage – see *Wild Mayoruna of the Amazon River*.

Mayourna of the Huallaga River – see *Barbudo*.

Mayruna – see *Mayoruna*.

Mayuzuna – see *Mayoruna*.

Michanahua – see *Michanawa*.

**Michanawa** (T2: IV) – var: Michanahua.

**Mochobo** (T2: III) – var: Mochovo, Mochubu.

Mochovo – see *Mochobo*.

Mochubu – see *Mochobo*.

Moruba – see *Marubo of Maucallacta*.

**Morunahua** – see *Morunawa*.

**Morunawa** (T2: II.C.viii.b) – var: Morunahua.

Moyoruna – see *Mayoruna*.

Nagua – see *Nawa*.

Nahua – see *Nawa*.

Naibakebo (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Naibakêbo.

Naibakêbo – see *Naibakebo*.

Naibo (T2: II.B).

Naïtabohuni (T2: II.B).

Nastanawa – see *Mastanawa*.

Naua – see *Nawa*.

**Nawa** (T1: II.C.vi.d) – var: Nahua, Nagua, Naua. hom: *Parkenawa*, Panoan (as a general term, Nawa has been used as a synonym for the whole family, or to refer only to Panoans in the Juruá-Purus area; see Tastevin, 1924b; Carvalho and Sobrinho, 1929; Villarejo, 1959). In this paper, Nawa designates the largest group of Mainline Branch of the Panoan family, in addition to the Nawa language.


Niamaguá – see *Nianawa*.

Nianagua – see *Nianawa*.

Nianawa (T2: III) – var: Niamaguá, Nianagua, Niargua.

Niargua – see *Nianawa*.

Nishidawa – see *Nishinawa*.

Nishinahua – see *Nishinawa*.

**Nishinawa** (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of *Amawaka*) – var: Nishidawa, Nishinahua, Nišinawa. syn: Amawaka (Tastevin, 1926: 50).

Nišinawa – see *Nishinawa*. 
Nohanaua – see Nehanawa.

Nokaman (T1: II.B, dialect of Kashibo), Kamano, Camano.

Nucuini – see Nukini, Remo of the Blanco River.

Nukini (T1: II.C.vi.c) – var: Nucuini (Oppenheim, 1936a: 151), Nukuini, Inukuini (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921), syn: Abakabu (Tastevin, ms. i).

Nukuini – see Nukini.

Oni – var of Uni. See Kashibo.

Ormiga (T2: III).

Otentot – see Hotentot.

Pacabara – see Pakawara.

Pacaguara – see Pakawara.

Pacahuara – see Pakawara.

Pacanaua – see Pakanawa.

Pacavara – see Pakawara.

Pachicta – see Pachikta.

Pahenbakebo (T2: II.C.vii.a) – var: Pahenbaquebo.

Pahenbaquebo – see Pahenbakebo.

Pakaguara – see Pakawara.

Pakanawa (T2: III) – var: Pacanaua.

Pakawara (T1: II.C.i.a, codialect of Chakobo) – var: Pacabara, Pacaguara, Pacahuara, Pacavara, Pakaguara.

Pana – see Panoan, Pano.

Panatauga – see Panatawa.

Panatawa (T2: IV) – var: Panatagua.

Panavarro – see Pano.


Panoan (family) – var/hom: Pano (Pano/pano is the name of the family in Spanish, Portuguese and French, and has occasionally been used in English instead of “Panoan”), Pana. syn: Nawa (Tastevin, 1924b; Carvalho and Sobrinho, 1929; Villarejo, 1959).

Panobo – see Pano.

Pano-Purús – see Yaminawa.

Papavo – see Yumanawa (Tastevin, 1925: 415, 1926: 50, said Papavo was used by non-Indians to refer specifically to Yumanawas, while Grubb, 1927: 101, said non-Indians used Papavo to refer to several Pacific ethnic groups in the area of the upper Tarauacá and Jordão rivers).

Paranaua – see Paranawa.

Paranawa (T1: II.C.vi.b, dialect of Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River) – var: Paranaua.

Pariache – see Konibo.

Parkenawa (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yaminawa). syn: Nawa, Yora, Yura, Yoranahua. var: Parquenahua.

Parquenahua – see Parkenawa.
Paud Usunkid (T1: I.A.ia, dialect of Matses). syn: Matsés (Fields, 1970), Shëbimbo, Shapaja (both synonyms from Fleck, in prep.).
Payanso – see Shipibo.
Pelado – see Mayornua, Pano. Sometimes given as subgroup of Pano, following Hervás (1800: 263).
Peruvian Matses (T1: I.A.i.a).
Peruvian Yaminawa (T1: II.C.viii.b). syn: Mainawa, Choshunawa (both synonyms from Townsley, 1994: 250; see also Chandless, 1866: 113, and Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 465, for more on Mainawa).
Pichabo – see Pitsobo.
Pichabo – see Pitsobo.
Pichobo – see Pitsobo.
Pičobo – see Pitsobo.
Pimisnahua – see Pimisnawa.
Pimisnawa (T2: IV) – var: Pimisnahua.
Pinche – var of Pinsha. See Chankueshbo.
Pisabo (T2: I) – var: Pisabu, Pisahua, Pissabo.
Pisabu – see Pisabo.
Pisahua – see Pisabo.
Pisabu – see Pisabo.
Piskino (T1: I.C.vii.b, dialect of Pano) – var: Pisquibo, Piquino.
Pisquibo – see Piskino.
Pisquino – see Piskino.
Pissabo – see Pisabo.
Pitsobo – see Pitsobo.
Poianaua – see Poyanawa.
Poianawa – see Poyanawa.
Poyanaua – see Poyanawa.
Puchanahuia – see Puchanawawa.
Puchanawa (T2: II.B) – var: Puchanahuia.
Puinagua – see Puiuwawa.
Puyamanawa – see Punhunumunawa.
Puynagua – see Puiuwawa.
Puy-nahua – see Puiuwawa.
Puyumanawa – see Punhunumunawa.
Quiraba – see Quiraba.
Quirabae – see Quiraba.
Quixito – see Maya.
Remo – see Remo of the Blanco River, Remo of the Jaquirana River, Remo of the Môa River, Southern Remo.


Remo of the Jaquirana River (T1: II.C.vi.e) – var: Rhemu, Remu (both from Carvalho, 1931).

Remu – see Remo of the Jaquirana River.
Rhemo – see Southern Remo.

Rhemu – see Remo of the Jaquirana River, Remo of the Blanco River.

Rheo – see Southern Remo.

Rimbo – see Southern Remo.

Rïmo – see Remo of the Môa River.
Rounõ – see Rubo.

Ruanababa – see Ruanawa.
Ruanagua – see Ruanawa.

Ruanawa (T2: II.B) – var: Ruanababa (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546), Ruanagua.

Ruño (T2: II.B) – var: Ruinõ.

Runubakebo (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Runubakëbo.

Runubakëbo – see Runubakebo.

Runubu (T2: II.C.vii.c) – var: Runubu.
Runubu – see Runubu.

Rununawa (T2: IV).

Ruubu – see Rubo.

Sacaya – see Sakaya.
Sacuya – see Sakaya.
Sahnindawa – see Shanenawa.


Sakuya – see Sakaya.
Saninawa – see Shanenawa.

Sayaca – see Sakaya.

Schahnindaua – see Shanenawa.

Schipibo – see Shipibo.

Schitebo – see Shetebo.
Schitipo – see Shetebo.

Schunuman – see Shunuman.
Senci – see Sensi.
Senči – see Sensi.
Sensivo – see Sensi.
Sentci – see Sensi.
Senti – see Sensi.
Sepibo – see Shipibo.
Sepivo – see Shipibo.
Setebo – see Shetebo.
Setevo – see Shetebo.
Setibo – see Shetebo.
Settebo – see Shetebo.
**Settled Mayoruna of the Amazon River** (T1: I.A.iii.c) – var: Mayoruna civilisé (1850–1859: V: 299), Mayoruna domestica (Martius, 1867: II: 238).
Shakaya – see Sakaya.
**Shanenawa** (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yaminawa) – var: Chandenawa, Chanenawa, Saninawa, Shanhindawa, Schahnindaua. syn: Katukina (de Feijó).
Shaninahua – see Shaninawa.
Shaninawa (T1: II.C.viii.b) – var: Shaninahua.
Shaodawa – var of Shaonawa. See Brazilian Yaminawa.
Shaonahua – var of Shaonawa. See Brazilian Yaminawa.
Shapaja (Spanish translation of shëbin) – see Paud Usunkid.
Sharanahua – see Sharanawa.
**Sharanawa** (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yaminawa) – var: Sharanahua, Charanawa, Xaranaua.
Shawā – see Shawannawa.
Shawādawa – see Shawannawa.
Shawānawa – see Shawannawa.
**Shawannawa** (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yaminawa) – var: Šawánawá, Sawanaua, Shawā, Shawādawa, Shawānawa. syn: Arara (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 452 fn.), Ararawa (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 452), Aranawa (Loukotka, 1968: 172, probably a typo), Katukina (Tastevin, 1925: 415).
Shēbimbo – see Paud Usunkid.
Sheminaua – see Kashinawa of the Ibuaçu River.
Shensivo – see Sensi.
Shepegua – see Shipibo.
**Shetebo** (T1: I.C.vii.b. dialect of Pano) – var: Cetevo, Cheteo, Gitipo, Jitipo, Schitebo, Schitipo, Setebo, Setevo, Setibo, Settebo, Shetegua (Stiglich, 1905: 313), Sitibo, Sitivo, Ssetebo, Xetibo, Xitipo. syn: Chama (see fn. 1 for references), Manoa (Dueñas, 1791: 172; Steinen, 1904: 25), Manoita (Sobreviela, 1791a: 95, 97).
Shetegua – see Shetebo.
Shipebo – see Shipibo.
Shipeo – see Shipibo.

**Shipibo** (T1: II.C.vii.a, codialect of Konibo) – var: Cepeo, Cepibo, Chipao, Chepeo, Chipeo, Chipibo, Cipibo, Schipibo, Sepibo, Sepivo, Shepegua (Stiglich, 1905: 30), Shipebo, Shipeo, Sipibo, Sipivo, Ssipibo, Xipibo, Zipivo. syn: Calliseca, Chama (see fn. 1 for references to these two synonyms); Payanso (Myers, 1990: 8, speculation based on geography and dress).

**Shipinawa** (T2: II.C.vii.a) – var: Chepenagua (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546), Chipinawa (Tastevin, 1919: 146), Sipinawa (Tastevin, 1919: 149), Šipinawa.

**Shirino** (T2: II.B) – var: Širinõ.

Shirinahua – see Shirinahua.

**Shishinawa** (T2: II.C.viii.b) – var: Shishinahua.

**Shokeno** (T2: II.B) – var: Šokenõ.

**Šuchanawa** (T2: II.B) – var: Šuschanagua.

**Šunuman** (T2: II.C.vii) – var: Schunuman.

Šuschanagua – see Šuchanawa.


**Šinabo of the Ucayali basin** (T2: II.C.vii.a) – var: Sinabu. hom: Šinabo of the Mamoré River.

Sinabu – see Šinabo of the Mamoré River, Šinabo of the Ucayali basin.

**Sipibo** – see Shipibo.

Sipinawa – see Shipinawa.

Šipinawa – see Shipinawa.

**Sipivo** – see Shipibo.

Širinõ – see Shirino.

Sitibo – see Sheteto.

Sitivo – see Sheteto.

**Šoboyobo** (T2: III) – var: Soboyobo.

Šoboyobo – see Šoboyobo.

Šokenõ – see Shokeno.

**Soboyobo** – see Šoboyobo.

**Šsensi** – see Sensi.

Ssetebo – see Sheteto.

**Šsipibo** – see Shipibo.

Šsririno – see Shirino.

**Suabu** – see Suyabo.

**Suyabo** (T2: IV) – var: Suabu, Suyabo.

**Suyabu** – see Suyabo.

Taguacúa – see Tawakua.

Takanaua – see Takanawa.

Tikanawa – see Takanawa.

Tawanawa – see Takanawa.

Tawakua (T2: II.C.vii.a) – var: Taguacúa.

Tchaninawa – see Chaninawa.
Tenti – see Sensi.
Tiatinagua – see Tiatinawa.
Tiatinawa (T2: II.C.ii.a) – var: Tiatinagua
Tiuchunawa (T2: IV) – var: Tyuchunaua.
Tochinawa – see Tushinawa.
Tonano (T2: II.B) – var: Tonanô.
Tonanô – see Tonano.
Tonnadbo – see Kapishtana, Mawi.
Tošinawa – see Tushinawa.
Trompetero (T2: III).
Tsakobo – see Chakobo.
Tsalguno (T2: II.B) – var: Tsalgunô.
Tsalgunô – see Tsalguno.
Tsawesbo (T2: IV) – var: Tsawêsbo.
Tsawêsbo – see Tsawesbo.
Tšažnô – see Chashono.
Tschama – see Chama.
Tsinubakebo (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Tsinubakêbo.
Tsinubakêbo – see Tsinubakebo.
Tsōnsi – see Sensi.
Tuchinaua – see Tushinawa.
Tuchinawa – see Tushinawa.
Tuchiunawa (T1: II.C.viii.e) – var: Tutxiuanaua, Tutoriunaua (Figuêiredo, 1931: 245, probably a typo).
Turcaguane – see Turkaguane.
Turcaguano – see Turkaguane.
Turkaguane (T2: II.C.vii.a) – var: Turcaguane, Turcaguano.
Tushinawa (T2: II.C.viii.a) – var: Tuchinawa, Tuchinaua, Tochinawa, Tošinawa, Tušinawa.
Tušinawa – see Tushinawa.
Tutoriuanaua – see Tuchiunawa.
Tutxiuanaua – see Tuchiunawa.
Tyaninawa – see Chaninawa.
Tyuchunaua – see Tiuchunawa.
Unıabo (T2: IV) – var: Uniabu.
Uniabu – see Uniabo.
Unibo (T2: IV).
Unihuepa – see Uniwepa.
Univitza – see Komabo.
Uniwepa (T2: II.C.vii.a) – var: Unihuepa.
Vamunawa – see Bamunawa.
Viabu – see Binabo.
Viuvaqueu – see Biubakeu.
Vuina – see Buinawa.
Wanina – see Katukina.
Wariapano – var of Huariapano. See Pano.
Waribakebo (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Waribakëbo.
Waribakëbo – see Waribakebo.
Warinô – see Barinawa.
Wild Mayoruna of the Amazon River (T1: I.A.iii.c) – var: Mayoruna fera (Martius, 1867: II: 238), Mayoruna sauvage (Castelnau, 1850–1859: V: 300).
Winano (T2: II.B) – var: Winanô.
Winanô – see Winano.
Xetebo – see Shetebo.
Xîpibo – see Shipibo.
Xitipo – see Shetebo.
Yabinawa – see Yaminawa.
Yaguarmayo (T2: II.C.ii.a).
Yambinawa – see Yaminawa.
Yamiaca – see Yamiaka.
Yamiaka (T1: II.C.ii.a, codialect of Atsawaka) – var: Yamiaca. syn: Auñeiri (Stiglich, 1908: 402).
Yaminahua – see Yaminawa.
Yaminawa-arara (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yaminawa).
Yaobo – see Yawabo.
Yauavo – see Yawabo.
Yaubo – see Yawabo.
Yawabakebo (T2: II.C.vi.b) – var: Yawabakëbo.
Yawabakëbo – see Yawabakebo.
Yawabo (T2: C.vii.b) – var: Jaobo, Jawabo, Jawabu, Yaobo, Yauavo, Yaubo.
Yawanaua – see Yawanawa.
Yawanawa (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Yaminawa) – var: Yawanaua. syn: Iskunawa (Tastevin ms. f.; not certain whether it is meant to be synonym or a subgroup of Yawanawa).
Yaya (T2: II.C.vi.e).
Ynubu – see Inubo.
Yora – var of Yura. See Parkenawa, Yura.
Yoranahua – see Parkenawa.
Ysacnagua – see Isaknawa.
Ysunagua – see Isunawa.
Yumanawa (T1: II.C.viii.b, dialect of Amawaka) – var: Yumanawa. syn: Amawaka (Tastevin, 1926: 50), Papavo.
Yumbanawa – see Yumanawa.
Yuminagua – see Yuminawa.
Yuminahua – see Yuminawa.
Yuminawa (T2: II.C.viii.c) – var: Yuminahua, Yuminagua.
Yura (T2: II.C.viii.c) – var: Yora. hom: Parkenawa.
Zaminaua – see Zaminaua.
Zaminawa (T2: II.C.vii.a) var: Zaminaua.
Zepa (T2: II.B).
Zipivo – see Shipibo.
Zurina (T2: III).
APPENDIX 2

Available Linguistic Data for Panoan Languages and Dialects

This appendix provides a list of available first-hand data for the Panoan languages. For the extinct (†) languages (bold) and dialects (italic), all original sources are listed, along with some notable reproductions of these. For the extant languages and dialects, all original sources preceding 1950 are listed, along with a selection of the more useful (relative to the available materials for that language or dialect) post-1950 sources containing original or previously unpublished linguistic data. At the end are listed synthetic, classification, reconstructive, comparative, and bibliographic works on the family. All data in this appendix were considered for the classification in table 1, except materials tagged as “(have not been able to obtain it).” It should be mentioned that the bibliographies by Erikson et al. (1994) and Fabre (1998), both with internet updates, were instrumental in the compilation of this literature. Order of entries follows table 1.

Matses

Peruvian Matses – Fields (1970) 452-entry lexicon
    Fields (1973) grammatical study
    Jakway (1975) 357-entry lexicon collected by H. Fields in 1970 and 1975
    Fields and Wise (1976) phonology
    Kneel and Fields (1976) phonology
    Kneeland (1973, 1982, 1996) grammatical topics
    Kneeland (1979) pedagogical grammar and a 750-entry vocabulary
    Fleck (2003) 1257/897-page phonology and grammar
    Fleck (2007d, in prep.) ethnohistory/linguistics
    Fleck et al. (2012) 4000-entry dictionary
    Ludwig et al. (2010), Munro et al. (2012) grammatical studies

Brazilian Matses – Souza (1979) 243-entry lexicon
    Carvalho (1992) 185-page grammar sketch
    Dorigo (2001) 247-page phonology

†Paud Usunkid – Fields (1970) 283-entry lexicon
    Fleck (in prep.) 20-word list collected from Fields’ late informant’s husband
    PARTIAL REPRODUCTION: Jakway (1975) 33 entries copied from Fields

*Kulina of the Curuçá River – Fleck (in prep.) phonology, grammar, and 400-word lexica of all three dialects
Fleck (2010) grammatical study
Fleck (2007a) historical and lexical study, 242-entry lexicon

*Kapishtana – Fields (1970) 404-entry lexicon and 85 elicited sentences
  PARTIAL REPRODUCTION: Jakway (1975) 156 entries copied from Fields

*Mawi – Fields (1970) 124-entry lexicon (called “Marubo” by Fields)
  Coutinho (1998) 60 words
  Fleck and Voss (2006) 51 animal names

*Chema – Fields (1970) 283-entry lexicon and 22 elicited sentences
  PARTIAL REPRODUCTION: Jakway (1975) 37 entries copied from Fields

†Demushbo – Fleck (in prep.) phonology, grammar and 400-word lexicon
  Fleck and Voss (2006) 25 animal names
  Fleck (2010) grammatical study

Korubo
  Fleck (in prep.) 22-word list collected from Matis speakers
  *Chankueshbo – Fleck (in prep.) phonology, grammar, and 400-word lexicon
    Fleck and Voss (2006) 25 animal names

Matis – Souza (1979) 340-entry lexicon
  Ferreira (2000, 2008, in prep.) grammatical studies
  Spanghero (2000a/2001) 143-page phonology
  Spanghero (2000b) phonology
  Ferreira (2001a/2001b) 171-page grammar sketch
  Ferreria (2005) 216-page grammar
  Spanghero (2005) 1530-entry dictionary and lexical study
  Fleck and Voss (2006) 43 animal names
  Fleck (2010) comparative grammatical study
  Fleck (in prep.) comparative phonology and grammar
  Dienst and Fleck (2009) 98 animal names

†Mayoruna of the Jandiatuba River – Alviano (1957: 44–56) 503-word lexicon
  COMPLETE REPRODUCTION: Fleck (in prep.) reproduction and phonology

†Mayoruna of the Amazon River
  †Settled Mayoruna – Castelnau (1850–1859: V: 299–300) 54-word list
  COMPLETE REPRODUCTIONS: Martius (1867: II: 238); Fleck (in prep.) reproduction and phonology
  †Wild Mayoruna – Castelnau (1850–1859: V: 300–301) 80-word list collected by M. Deville
  COMPLETE REPRODUCTIONS: Martius (1867: II: 238–239); Fleck (in prep.) reproduction and phonology
  †Mayoruna of Tabatinga (“Maxuruna”) – Martius (1867: II: 236–237) 137-word lexicon collected by Spix
  COMPLETE REPRODUCTION: Fleck (in prep.) reproduction and phonology

Kasharari – Pickering (1973) 72-word list collected in 1962
  Cabral and Monserrat (1987) 7-page phonological analysis and 141-entry lexicon
(though most are Portuguese borrowings)
Lanes (2000) 164-word list
Sousa (2004) 99-page phonology including a 378-word lexicon
Couto (2005) detailed phonology

Kashibo
Zariquiey (2011b, in press a.) dialectal studies
Kashibo – Tessmann (1930: 154–155) 220-word list plus 272 terms in the ethnographic text
Shell (1950) phonology
Shell (1957, 1973/1975) grammatical studies
Shell (1959, 1987) ca. 2100-entry vocabulary
Wistrand (1968) 81-page grammatical study
Wistrand (1971, 1978) grammatical studies
Wistrand (1969) 359-page folklore text study
Wistrand (1984) ca. 350 animal and ca. 190 plant names
Cortez (1980) phonology
Frank (1993) 13 unparsed texts
Valle (2009) 119-page grammatical study
Valle (2011, in prep. b) grammatical studies
Valle (in prep. a) full-length phonology and grammar
Zariquiey (2011a) full-length phonology and grammar
Zariquiey (2011c, 2012a, 2012b, in prep. a) grammatical studies
Zariquiey and Fleck (2012) grammatical study


Kakataibo – Tessmann (1930: 154) 30-word list
Zariquiey (2011b) 380-word list

Rubo – Tessmann (1930: 154) 30-word list
Zariquiey (2011b) 380-word list

Isunobo – Zariquiey (2011b) 380-word list

Nokaman – Tessmann (1930: 184–187) 228-word list plus 139 terms in the ethnographic text
Zariquiey (in press b) dialectal study.

Chakobo/Pakawara

Chakobo – Cardús (1886: 315) 36-word list
Nordensköld (1911: 230–240) 78-entry lexicon
Hanke (1954/1956/1957) 360-entry lexicon and phonological notes
Prost (1960/1967b) phonology plus 104/-66-entry lexica
Prost (1962) grammatical study
Prost (1965/1967a) tagmemic grammar
Zingg (1998) ca. 5000-entry dictionary with 44-page grammar sketch
Valenzuela (2005a) grammatical study
Valenzuela and Iggesen (2007) phonological-grammatical study
Córdoba et al. (2012) sociolinguistic, phonological and grammatical sketch with 3
short texts
Tallman (in prep. a) full-length phonology and grammar
Tallman (in prep. b) phonological study

**COMPLETE REPRODUCTION:** Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913) of Cardús and Nordenskiöld

**PARTIAL REPRODUCTIONS:** Pauly (1928: 138) 27 words copied from Cardús; Key (2000) 839-entry lexicon compiled from various unpublished microfiche by Prost; Montaño (1987) copied 60 words from Prost (1960) and 48 words and phrases from unpublished materials by Prost.

*Pakawara* – Palau and Saiz (1989 [1794]: 170) 7-word list
Orbigny (1838: I: 164, II: 263) 23-word list and brief phonological notes
Heath (1883) 52-word list
Armentia (1887/2006) 57-word list and 2 pages of grammatical notes
Armentia (1888) (have not been able to obtain it)
Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913) reproduction of Orbigny, Heath, and Armentia, plus an unpublished lexicon collected by Orbigny (= 414 words total from Orbigny)
East (1969–1970) word lists and phonological study (have not been able to obtain it, but see reproduction in Key)
East and East (1969) word list (have not been able to obtain it, but see reproduction in Key)


**PARTIAL REPRODUCTIONS:** Orton (1876) copied 8 words (and the Maropa mistake) from Keller; Key (2000) 93-entry lexicon copied from East, and also, coded separately, many entries copied from Orbigny, Heath, Armentia and Créqui-Montfort and Rivet

†*Karipuna* – Martius (1867: II: 240–242) 162-word list collected by Natterer ca. 1829
Pauly (1928: 142–143) 24-word list
Castillo (1929: 135–137) 181-word lexicon
Barbosa (1948) 502-word lexicon collected in 1927
Hanke (1949: 7–12) 168-word lexicon, phonological notes, and lexical comparison

**COMPLETE REPRODUCTION:** Montaño (1987) of Castillo and Pauly

**PARTIAL REPRODUCTIONS:** Keller (1874a: 132/1874b: 112) copied 50 words from Martius; Orton (1876) copied 9 words from Keller

†*Chiriba* – Palau and Saiz (1989 [Lázaro 1794]: 170) 7-word list

†*Atsawaka/Yamiaka*

Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913: 46–78) 223-word lexicon collected by Nordenskiöld that includes the 49 words of Nordenskiöld (previous entry in this list)

Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913: 46–78) 118-word lexicon collected by Nordenskiöld that includes the 46 words of the previous entry in this list

**Partial reproduction:** Rivet (1910: 225–226) copied 26 words from Nordenskiöld

†**Arazaire** – Llosa (1906b) 133-word lexicon

**Complete reproductions:** Rivet (1910: 227–236) of Llosa; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913: 46–78) of Llosa.

†**Remo of the Blanco River** – Leuque (1927: 538–540) list of 179 words and phrases

†**Kashinawa of the Tarauacá River** – Tastevin (ms. c) 144-entry lexicon

**Partial reproductions:** 125 entries in Tastevin ms. b; 128 entries in Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929, 1932)

**Marubo (of the Javari Basin)** – Boutle (1964) 162-entry lexicon

Fields (1970) 310-entry lexicon; 121-entry lexicon collected by H. Scheltamo
Souza (1979) 332-word list
Silva (1952) word list (have not been able to obtain it)
Kennell (1976, 1978) phonology and grammar
Costa (1992) 287-page phonology and grammar sketch
Costa (2000a) 261-page phonology
Costa (2002b) phonological study
Costa and Dorigo (2005) grammatical study
Dorigo and Costa (1996) grammatical study
Ruedas (2002) sociolinguistic study
Fleck and Voss (2006) list of 49 animal names
Fleck (2007a) comparative Marubo-Kulina vocabulary
Cesarino (2008, 2011) appendix with 62 words or phrases in Marubo and in their ceremonial language
Dienst and Fleck (2009) 129 animal names

**Partial reproduction:** Jakway (1975) 156-entry lexicon copied from Fields

**Katukina** – Rivet (1920) 16-word list

Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) 317 words
Tastevin ms. h. ca. 1320-entry lexicon, transcription and translation of 1 myth, collected in 1923.
Hall (1976) 59 words compiled by Hall from Katukina readers
Barros (1987) 112-page phonological study
Aguiar (1988) 78-page grammatical study
Aguiar (1994a) 430-page phonology and grammar including 983-entry lexicon
Aguiar (2001) grammatical study
Lanes (2000) 163-word list
Lima (2002) >100 animal names in tables and text

**Katukina de Olinda** – Aguiar (1993) 30-word list

**Katukina de Sete Estrelas** – Aguiar (1993) 30-word list
†Kanamari – Chandless (1866: 118) 4-word list
  Chandless (1869: 302) 1 word
  Anonymous (1965) 76-word list
  COMPLETE REPRODUCTION: Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) of Chandless (1866)
†Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença (“Culino”) – Martius (1867: II: 242–244) 243-word list collected by Spix in 1820
  COMPLETE REPRODUCTION: Fleck (2007a) reproduction and ethnohistory
*Poyanawa – Tastein ms. e. ca. 1450-entry lexicon collected in 1922
  Tastein ms. h. ca. 1040-entry lexicon
  Carvalho (1931: 239–245) 383-entry lexicon
  Paula (1992) 133-page phonology and grammar including a 267-entry lexicon
  PARTIAL REPRODUCTION: Figueirêdo (1939: 103) 31 words copied from Carvalho
*Iskonawa – Russell (1960) 602-entry lexicon
  Kensinger (1961) 689-entry lexicon
  Whiton (1964) 64-word list and an additional 25 words in the text
  Loos and Loos (1971) list of 824 words and phrases, text with 35 sentences
*Nukini – Tastein (ms. i) 15-word list from a man who worked with them 1902–1906
  FUNAI (1981) 24-word list
  Okidoi (2004) 101-page phonology including a 693-entry lexicon (most entries are phonological variants; the actual number of lexemes is ca. 210)
  Aguiar (2004) 139-entry lexicon
*Nawa – Chandless (1869: 305) 1 word
  Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) list of 39 verbs
  Montagner (2007) 38-word list
  Note: it cannot be known for certain that these three linguistic sources are for the same language.
†Remo of the Jaquirana River – Carvalho (1929/1931: 254–256) 109-word list
  PARTIAL REPRODUCTION: Figueirêdo (1939: 204–205) 20 words copied from Carvalho

Shipibo-Konibo

Shipibo – Armentia (1898: 43–91) ca. 3800-entry vocabulary
  Carrasco (1901: 205–211) 167-word list collected in 1846
  Steinen (1904: 32–128) 2513- and 3108-entry vocabularies with 9 pages of combined grammatical notes prepared by two unknown Franciscans in 1877 and 1810–1812
  Alemany (1906) 2046-word vocabulary and 14/9 pages of grammatical notes
  Tessmann (1929) 369-word vocabulary and 24 pages of grammatical notes
  COMPLETE REPRODUCTION: Izaguirre (1927) of Alemany

  Carrasco (1901: 205–211) 167-word list collected in 1846
  Marqués (1903, 1931: 117–195) ca. 3300-entry vocabulary and 15 pages of grammatical notes prepared in 1800
  Reich and Stegelmann (1903) 29-word list
  Farabbee (1922: 88–95) 464-entry lexicon and conjugation paradigms for 4 verbs
Anonymous (1927) 2400-entry vocabulary
Tessmann (1929) 395-word vocabulary and 24 pages of grammatical notes

**Shipibo-Konibo (post-1940)** – Lauriault (1948) phonology
Faust (1973) pedagogical grammar
Guillen (1974) lexical study (have not been able to obtain it)
Weisschar and Illius (1990) 25-page grammar
Loriot et al. (1993) ca. 5200-entry dictionary with 55-page grammar sketch
García (1994) 77-page phonology
García (1993) 10 unparsed texts
Valenzuela (1997) 134-page grammatical study
Valenzuela et al. (2001) phonological study
Valenzuela (2003b) 1029-page phonology and grammar
Elias (2000) 158-page phonological study
Elias (2011) 329-page phonetic and phonological study
Elias (in prep.) phonological study

**PARTIAL REPRODUCTION:** Key (2000) 917-entry lexicon compiled using Loriot et al.

**Kapanawa of the Tapiche River** – Tessmann (1930: 157) 32-word list
Anonymous (1955) 66-word list (have not been able to obtain it; cited by Aguiar 1994c: 99).
Loos (1963) discourse study
Loos (1967/1969) 233-page transformation grammar and phonological study
Loos (1976a, 1999a) grammatical studies
Loos (1986) phonological study
Hall and Loos (1978 [1973]) grammatical study
Hall (1981/1986) discourse study
Jakway (1975) 344-entry lexicon collected by E. Loos in 1971
Elias (2006) 274-page phonological study
Elias (2009) phonological study

**Pano**

†Pano – Castelnau (1850–1859: V: 292–3, 301–302) 94-word lexicon and brief grammatical notes
Cardús (1886: 324) 42-word lexicon, some appear to be copied from Castelnau, but others are original, perhaps from some unpublished manuscript
Navarro (1903) ca. 3000-entry vocabulary with 23 pages of grammatical notes
Tessmann (1930: 120–124) 261-word list plus 208 terms in the ethnographic text
Marqués (1901/1931: 198–228) ca. 1600-entry vocabulary prepared in 1800
Shell (1965/1975b) original lexical data included in cognate sets
Parker (1992) 626-word lexicon, 230 sentences, and 2 short texts
Parker (1994) phonology
Gomes (2009) 151-page morphology based on Navarro (1903) and Parker (1992)

PARTIAL REPRODUCTION: Pauly (1928: 138) 10 words copied from Cardús (and 2 from an unknown source)

*Shetebo - Tessmann (1928: 230/1929: 241–242, 246) 35-word list
  Tessmann (1930: 104–105) 7 terms in the Chama ethnographic text
  Loriot et al. (1993) 4 Shetebo forms included in Shipibo dictionary
  Marcoy (1862–1867: XII: 206) 4 interjections
  (see fn. 16 for alleged Shetebo lexica)

*Pisquino - Loriot et al. (1993) 14 Pisquino forms included in Shipibo dictionary

†Sensi - Smyth and Lowe (1836: 229) list of 12 star/constellation names
  Tessmann (1930: 188–189) 35-word list

COMPLETE REPRODUCTION: Fleck (to be published) of Smyth and Lowe and Tessmann

Kashinawa of the Ibaçu River

Brazilian Kashinawa - Abreu (1914/1941) 1779-entry vocabulary, 22-page phonology/grammar, text collection of 5926 sentences
  Tastevin ms. a. ca. 2000 entry lexicon, collected in 1924
  Tastevin ms. g. 510-entry lexicon, collected in 1924
  Carvalho and Sobrinho (1929) 540-entry vocabulary
  Camargo (1987) 88-page phonology and grammar sketch
  Camargo (1991) 448-page phonology and grammar
  Camargo (1995) ca. 2800-entry lexicon
  Erikson and Camargo (1996) text analysis
  Lanes (2000) 164-word list collected by E. Camargo

PARTIAL REPRODUCTION: Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) published 248 words from Abreu

Peruvian Kashinawa - Kensinger (1963) phonology
  Cromack (1967/1976) 158-page narrative text study
  Cromack (1968) 381-page discourse study, Swadesh 100 word list
  d’Ans and Cortez (1973) study of color terms
  Montag (1978 [1973]) grammatical study
  Montag (1979/2004) pedagogical grammar
  Montag (1981) ca. 6000-entry dictionary with 59-page grammar sketch
  Montag (1992) 171-page folklore text study

†Kapanawa of the Juruá River - Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929, 1932) 397 words

†Paranawa - Tastevin (ms. g) ca. 350-entry list collected in 1924

REPRODUCTION: Loukotka (1963: 34) 34 word-list from Tastevin

Yaminawa

Chitonawa - Lord (1996) 206-entry lexicon

Mastanawa - Tastevin (ms. g) ca. 440-entry mixed Mastanawa-Chaninawa list
Manus (1959) 270-word list
Loos (1976b) list of 966 words and phrases and 15 pages of texts
**PARTIAL REPRODUCTION:** Loukotka (1963: 35) 30-word list from Tastevin

*Chaninawa* – Tastevin (ms. g) ca. 440-entry mixed Mastanawa-Chaninawa list
Manus (1959) 152-word list
**PARTIAL REPRODUCTION:** Loukotka (1963: 35) 30-word list from Tastevin
†*Nehanawa* – Tastevin (ms. f) ca. 430-entry list collected in 1924
**PARTIAL REPRODUCTION:** Loukotka (1963: 34) 22-word list from Tastevin

*Parkenawa* – Faust (1984) 171-entry lexicon
Lord (1996) 205-entry lexicon

*Shanenawa* – Aguiar (1993) 22-word list
Cândido (1998) 139-page phonology including a 20-entry lexicon
Cândido (2004) 264-page grammar including a 361-entry lexicon
Cândido (2004b) phonological study
Cândido (2004c, 2005a, 2005b) grammatical studies
Cândido and Amarante Ribeiro (2008) grammatical study
Amarante Ribeiro and Cândido (2005b) grammatical study
Amarante Ribeiro and Cândido (2009) color terms
Lanes (2000) 162-word list

*Sharanawa* – Manus (1959) combined Sharanawa-Marinawa 391-word list
Frantz (1973) grammatical study
Scott and Frantz (1978 [1973], 1974) grammatical studies
Loos (1975a) phonological study
Jakway (1975) 365-entry lexicon collected by E. Scott in 1971
Scott (2004) ca. 3000-entry vocabulary

*Marinawa* – Manus (1959) combined Sharanawa-Marinawa 392-word list
Pike and Scott (1962) phonological study

*Shawannawa* – Cunha (1993) 174-page phonology and grammar
Lanes (2000) 158-word list
Souza (2012) 154-page grammar

*Peuvian Yaminawa* – d’Ans (1972a) ca. 700-entry lexicon
Jakway (1975) 80-entry lexicon collected by E. Scott in 1969
Key (2000) 1129-entry lexicon collected by I. Shive
Faust and Loos (2002) 174-page grammar sketch
Eakin (1991) pedagogical grammar
Loos (2006) phonological study

*Brazilian Yaminawa* – Reich and Stegelmann (1903) 71-entry list
Tastevin ms. h. ca. 600-entry lexicon
Boutle (n.d.) 39-word list
Landin (1972) 278-entry lexicon
Lanes (2000) 163-word list
Couto (2010) 221-page phonology
Couto (in prep.) phonological study
**COMPLETE REPRODUCTION:** Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) of Reich and Stegelmann

*Yaminawa-arara* – Souza (2004) 85-page phonology including 125-word list

*Yawanawa* – Tastevin (ms. f) ca. 250-entry list collected in 1924 (labeled “Yawanawa-Iskunawa”)
  - Garcia (2002) 166-page phonological and morphological study
  - Paula (2004) 302-page phonology and grammar, including a 528-entry lexicon
  - Lanes (2000) 163-word list
  - Camargo Tavares (in prep.) grammatical study
**REPRODUCTION:** Loukotka (1963: 35) 26-word list from Tastevin

**Amawaka**

*Amawaka* – Reich and Stegelmann (1903) 83-entry list (called it “Kashinawa”)
  - Farabee (1922: 110–114) list of 305 words and 30 phrases
  - Tessmann (1930: 172) 39-word list plus 135 terms in the ethnographic text
  - Osborn (1948) phonology
  - d’Ans (1972b) 766 botanical and zoological terms
  - d’Ans and Van den Eynde (1972) 1502-entry lexicon
  - Hyde (1980) ca. 2500-entry vocabulary
  - Hyde (1978 [1973]) grammatical study
  - Russell (1958) phonology
  - Russell and Russell (1959) phonology
  - Sparing (1998) grammatical study
  - Sparing (2007) 82-page grammar sketch
**COMPLETE REPRODUCTION:** Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) of Reich and Stegelmann’s “Kaschinaua” lexicon
**PARTIAL REPRODUCTION:** Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) published 78 words from Farabee

†*Nishinawa* – Tastevin (ms. f) ca. 200-entry list collected in 1924
  **REPRODUCTION:** Loukotka (1963: 34) 21-word list from Tastevin

†*Yumanawa* – Tastevin (ms. g) ca. 230-entry list collected in 1924
  **REPRODUCTION:** Loukotka (1963: 34) 26-word list from Tastevin

†*Remo of the Môa River* – Loos (1973–1974) 2 lists of 70 and 81 words and phrases

†*Tuchiunawa* – Carvalho (1931: 249–252) 127-word list collected in 1923

**Linguistic studies on the Panoan family in general** (Unlike the above entries in this appendix, the following list does not exclude studies based solely on second-hand data.)

- *linguistic synopses and internal classifications* – Grasserie 1890 classification
  - Brinton (1891) Panoan language inventory
  - Steinen (1904) Panoan language inventory
  - Rivet (1924) classification
Schmidt (1926) classification
Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) classification
Loukotka (1935, 1939, 1968) classifications
Mason (1950) classification
Rivet and Loukotka (1952) classification
McQuown (1955) classification (following Mason)
Tovar (1961), Tovar and Tovar (1984) classifications
Shell (1965/1975) classification based on reconstruction
Voegelin and Voegelin (1977) classification
Ruhlen (1987) classification
Migliazza and Campbell (1988) synopsis (following Shell and d’Ans)
Bright (1992) classification (following Ruhlen), language inventory
Kaufman (1994) classification
Campbell (1997) classification (same as Kaufman 1994)
Loos (1999) synopsis, classification
Valenzuela (2003b) synopsis, classification
Solís (2003: 168–174) synopsis
Adelaar (2004: 418–22) synopsis
Amarante Ribeiro (2006) classification
Fleck (2006d) synopsis
Fleck (2007a) classification

comparisons and reconstructions – Grasserie (1890) phonological comparison
Rivet (1910) lexical comparison
Créqui-Montfort and Rivet (1913) lexical, phonological and grammatical comparisons
Hestermann (1919) orthographic comparison
Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) lexical comparison
Shell (1965/1975) reconstruction of 7 Peruvian Panoan languages
Loos (1975b, 1976a, 1978c, d, e; 1999b; 2005) grammatical comparisons
Ibarra (1982) lexical comparison of languages of the Bolivian subgroup
Aguiar (1994b) grammatical comparison
Soares (2000) phonological comparison
Valenzuela (2000, 2003a, in prep.) grammatical comparisons
Lanes (2000) phonological and lexical comparison of Brazilian Panoan languages
Lanes (2002) acoustic analysis of Panoan vowels
Lanes (2005) phonological comparison (have not been able to obtain it)
Amarante Ribeiro and Cândido (2005c, 2008) lexical/grammatical comparisons
Zariquiey (2006) reconstruction of Panoan pronouns
Soares (2006) grammatical comparison
Soares et al. (1993) phonological comparison
Ferreira (2008) grammatical comparison
Torres-Bustamante (2011) grammatical comparison
Barbosa (2012) grammatical comparison
Guillaume (in prep.) grammatical comparison
Valenzuela (in prep.) grammatical comparison
Zariquiey (in prep. b) grammatical comparison

bibliographies – Steinen (1904: 21–26) list of sources of linguistic data available for each Panoan language
Abreu (1941 [1914]) discussion of thitherto available Panoan linguistic sources
Hestermann (1910, 1913) bibliographical notes on Panoan linguistics
Rivet and Tastevin (1927–1929/1932) bibliography of (almost) all sources of Panoan linguistic data available at the time
Kensinger (1983/1985) annotated Panoan ethnographic and linguistic bibliography
Chavarría (1983) annotated Panoan and Takanan bibliography
Frank (1987) annotated Kashibo bibliography
Aguiar (1994c) annotated bibliography for all Panoan topics
Erikson et al. (1994) nearly exhaustive annotated bibliography for all Panoan topics (with internet updates)
Fabre (1998) bibliography for all Panoan and Takanan topics (with internet updates)
Erikson (2000) annotated bibliography for all topics on the Mayoruna branch
APPENDIX 3

Geographic Locations of Panoan Languages and Dialects

Part 1 gives location information for all the Panoan languages/dialects for which linguistic information is available and part 2 for all ethnonyms purported to designate Panoan speakers. The order of entries in part 1 follows that of table 1, and those in part 2 follow that of table 2. For extant languages/varieties, current locations are given, followed by historical locations, if different from current locations. For extinct languages and dialects the earliest location I have found is given. For languages spoken by captives of the Matses, the location where they were captured is given. Abbreviations: \textit{af(s)} = affluent(s) of (i.e., tributary of); \textit{l} = lower (course of river \(x\)); \textit{lb} = left bank (i.e., while facing downstream); \textit{m} = middle (course of river \(x\)); \textit{R(s)} = river(s); \textit{rb} = right bank; \textit{u} = upper (course of river \(x\)).

PART 1

- **Matses** – Javari (Yavari) and Jaquirana (Yaqurana or Upper Javari) Rs and their afs, Peru and Brazil.
  - \textit{Peruvian Matses} – \textit{lb} of \(u\) Javari, \textit{lb} of \(m\) Jaquirana R, Gálvez R (\textit{lb} af Javari R), Chobayacu Creek (\textit{lb} af Jaquirana R), Peru.
  - \textit{Brazilian Matses} – \textit{rb} of Javari R, both banks of Jaquirana R, Curuçá R (\textit{rb} af Javari R), Lobo Creek (\textit{rb} af Jaquirana R), Brazil and one village in Peru.
  - \textit{Paud Usunkid} – \textit{rb} of \(l\) Curuçá R (\textit{rb} af Javari R), Brazil.
  - \textit{Kulina of the Curuçá River} – \textit{m} Curuçá R (\textit{rb} af Javari R), Brazil.
  - \textit{Kulishtana} – \textit{rb} of \(m\) Curuçá R.
  - \textit{Mawi} – \textit{rb} of \(m\) Curuçá R.
  - \textit{Chema} – \textit{rb} of Pardo R. (\textit{lb} af Curuçá R).
  - \textit{Demushbo} – in or near Curuçá R basin (\textit{rb} af Javari R), Brazil.
  - \textit{Korubo} – \textit{l} Ituí R (\textit{lb} af \(l\) Itacoai R), Brazil.
  - \textit{Matis} – \textit{m} Ituí R (\textit{lb} af \(l\) Itacoai R), Brazil.
  - \textit{Mayoruna of the Jandiatuba River} – Jandiatuba R (\textit{rb} af Amazon R), Brazil, to where they purportedly migrated from Ucayali R (Peru) via the Javari basin (Alviano, 1957: 43).
  - \textit{Mayoruna of the Amazon River} – Amazon and \(l\) Javari Rs, Peru and Brazil.
    - \textit{Wild Mayoruna} – mouth of Itacoai R (\textit{lb} af Javari R, near its confluence with Amazon R), Brazil (Castelnau, 1850–1859: V: 53, 300).
  - \textit{Mayoruna of Tabatinga} – near town of Tabatinga (\textit{lb} of Amazon R), Brazil (Martius, 1867: II: 236, Spix and Martius, 1823–1831: III: 1188).
  - \textit{Kasharari} – Abunã R (\textit{lb} af \(u\) Madeira R), Marmelo R (\textit{lb} af Abunã R), and Curuquetê R (\textit{rb} af Ituxi R, \textit{rb} af Purus R), Brazil.
Kashibo – Pachitea and Aguaytía Rs (lb afs Ucayali R) and their afs, and Inuya R (rb af l Urubamba R), Peru.

Kashibo – l Aguaytía R (lb af m Ucayali R), Peru (Wistrand, 1969: 15).


Chakobo/Pakawara – Beni and Mamoré Rs (which join to form the Madeira R) and their afs, Bolivia.

Chakobo – Ivon R (rb af Beni R) and Yata R (lb af Mamoré R), Bolivia.

Pakawara – confluence of Beni and Mamoré R (d’Orbigny, 1839); Beni R (Heath, 1883); Beni R, Mamoré R, l Madre de Dios R, u Madeira R and Abunã R (lb af u Madeira R) (Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913: 21), Bolivia.

†Karipuna – u Madeira R (Martius, 1867: I: 416; Keller, 1874a; Pauly, 1926: 142, Castillo, 1929: 136; Barbosa, 1948: 163), Bolivia and Brazil.

†Chiriba – Reyes de los Moxos, Bolivia (Palau and Saiz, 1989 [Lázaro, 1794]: 170).

†Atsawaka/Yamiaka – area of Inambari and Tambopata Rs (both rb afs Madre de Dios R), Peru.

†Atsawaka – Carama/Atsahuaca R (lb af Tambopata R) and u Chaspa R (rb af Inambari R), Peru (Nordenskiöld, 1906: 519).


†Arazaire – Marcapata/Arasa R (lb af Inambari R), Peru (Llosa, 1906a).

†Remo of the Blanco River – Blanco R (rb af Tapiche R), Peru (López, 1913; Salvador, 1972); possibly extended to Brazilian side of Javari R.


Marubo – u Curuçá R (rb af Javari R), u Ituí R (lb af l Itacoai R, lb af l Javari R), Brazil.

Katukina – u Juruá R area, Brazil.

Katukina de Olinda – Gregório R (af u Juruá R), Brazil (Aguiar, 1993).


†Kanamari – south of u Purus R above Rixala R (Chandless, 1866); vicinity of town of Feijó (on Juruá R) (Anonymous, 1965), Brazil.

†Kulina of São Paulo de Olivença – Jandiatuba, Acuruí, and Cumatiá Rs (all rb afs Amazon R in the vicinity of the town of São Paulo de Olivença), Brazil (Fleck, 2007a).

*Poyanawa – u Môa R (lb af Juruá R), Brazil.

*Iskonawa – u Utuquinía R; in 1962 relocated to the l Callarí R (both rb af Ucayali R), Peru (Whiton et al., 1964).

*Nukini – u Môa R (lb af Juruá R), Brazil.

*Nawa – Mu or Liberdade R (Chandless, 1966: 305), u Juruá and Môa Rs (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: map), Môa R (Montagner, 2007).

†Remo of the Jaquirana River – Batã R (rb af Jaquirana R), Brazil (Carvalho, 1931).
Shipibo/Konibo

Shipibo – originally (1600) reported on m Aguaitía R, and later (1700s) also on the m Pisqui R (both lb af m Ucayali R); by 1800s they were along m Ucayali R and l and m afs both banks of m Ucayali, especially the Aguaitía, Pisqui, Cushibatay, Tamaya, and Callería Rs, Peru.

Konibo – Pachitea and u Ucayali Rs above mouth of Pachita R, Peru.

Shipibo-Konibo (post-1940) – m and u Ucayali R and its tributaries, between the towns of Orelhana and Bolognesi, Peru.

Kapanawa of the Tapiche River – Maquía R (Aristio, 1794), Guanache R (Castelnau, 1850–1859: IV: 377); u Tapiche and Buncuya R (the latter is rb af Guanache R, the other three are rb afs l Ucayali R), Peru.

*Pano

†Pano – Lakes Cashioboya and Cruz Muyuna (both on rb of Ucayali R) and Manoa/Cushibatay R area.

*Shetebo – m Manoa or Cushibatay R (lb af Ucayali R); later also along the m Ucayali R at and near Sarayacu; currently living among Shipibo-Konibos.

*Piskeno – Pisqui R (lb af Ucayali R); currently living among Shipibo-Konibos.

†Sensi – Chunuya Creek (rb af Ucayali R; Carvallo, 1906 [1818]: 342), Lake Cruz Muyuna (rb of Ucayali R; Tessmann, 1930: 188), Peru.

Kashinawa of the Ibaçaú River

†Kashinawa of the Ibaçaú River – Basins of u Juruá and u Purus Rs, Peru and Brazil.

†Kapanawa of the Juruá River – several rb afs u Juruá R (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 457–458), Brazil.

†Paranawa – Muru R (rb af Tarauacá R, in turn lb af Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R) (Loukotka, 1963: 33); Teixeira Stream (rb af u Muru R) (Tastevin, 1925: 414), Brazil.


†Yumanawa – Serrano R (rb af u Juruá R, Tastevin, 1925: 415), u Ibuya R (lb af u Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R); (Tastevin, 1926: 34, 49); Muruzinho R (lb af u Muru R, in turn rb af Tarauacá R, in turn lb af Envira R) (Loukotka, 1963: 33), Brazil.

Yaminawa

Brazilian Yaminawa – u Juruá R and its afs, and Iaco R (= Yaco R, rb af m Purus R), Brazil.

Peruvian Yaminawa – mostly on u Purus R and its afs and a few in headwaters of Juruá R, Peru and Brazil.

Chaninawa – u Xinani R (lb af u Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R; Tastevin, 1926: 34, 49); Valparaíso, Libertade and Humaitá Rs (Loukotka, 1963: 33); among Sharanawas (Ribeiro and Wise, 1978: 176), Brazil.

Chitonawa – headwaters of Envira R (rb af u Juruá R), Peru.

Marinawa – headwaters of Furnaya R (af u Envira R, rb af u Juruá R) and divide between Envira and Purus Rs (Linhares, 1913 apud Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 466; Tastevin, 1925: 415; Carvalho, 1931: 249), Brazil; u Purus R at mouth of Curanja R (Pike and Scott, 1962), Peru.

Mastanawa – Tarauacá R (Tastevin, 1926: 50); u Jordão R (lb af u Tarauacá R, in turn lb af Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R) (“Nastanawa”; Loukotka, 1968: 170), Brazil; u Purus
near international border (Loos, 1976; Ribeiro and Wise, 1978: 176), Peru.

†Nehanawa – Matapá/Bernardo Creek (af Jordão, in turn lb af u Tarauacá R, in turn lb af Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R) and Laurita or Papavos Creek, near headwaters of Tarahuacá R, originally from lb af Envira R (Tastevin, 1925: 415, 1926: 34, 49); I Jordão R (Loukotka, 1963: 33), Brazil.

Shanenawa – Riozinho R (af u Envira, rb af u Juruá R; Reich and Stegelmann, 1903: 133), Brazil.

†Sharanawa – Purus R, Peru and Brazil, also in Bolivia (Scott, 2004: 9).

Shawannawa – u Juruá and Humayta Rs (af u Juruá R) (Linhares, 1913; Sombra, 1913, apud Rivet and Tastevin 1921), u Gregório R (Tastevin, 1925: 415), Brazil.


Yawanawa – Muru R (rb af Tarauacá R, in turn lb af Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R) area (Tastevin, 1925: 415), Valparaiso, Libertade and Humaitá Rs (Loukotka, 1963: 33), Brazil.

Parkenawa – u Manu R (in Manu national park) and headwaters of nearby rivers, Peru (purported 20th-century migration from Purus-Juruá headwaters).

Amawaka – currently, Sepahua, Purús, Curuwa, Curanja, Yuruá, u Ucayali and Río de las Piedras Rs, Peru and supposedly uncontacted Amawakas on the u Purus in Brazil (Sparing, 2007); Liberdade R (rb af Juruá R), Brazil (Rodrigues, 1986); historically at similar locations in Peru and af u Purus and Juruá Rs, Brazil (Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 450).


†Tuchiuinawa – mouth of Progresso Creek (af u Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R), Brazil (Carvalho, 1931: 249).

PART 2

Chirabo – between Tahuayo R (rb af Amazon R) and Yavari Mirim R (lb af Javari R), Peru (Vacas, 1906 apud Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 453), between Tapiche (rb af u Ucayali R) and Yavari or upland areas of Cochiquinas R (rb af Amazon R) and Ylinué R, Peru.

Korugo – Tabayay R (rb af Amazon R), Peru (Zárate, 1904 [1739]: 393).

Marubo of Maucallacta – town of Maucallacta (rb af Amazon R), Cochiquinas R (rb af Amazon R), and area south thereof, Peru (Ijrra, 1905 [1849–1850]: 365; Castelnu, 1850–1859: V: 40).


Mayo – lb of u Itacoai R (rb af Javari R), Brazil (Tastevin, 1924b: 424).


Barinawa – between Pachitea and Aguaíta Rs, Peru (Távara, 1905 [1868]: 425).

Buninawa – from banks of Pachitea R (lb af u Ucayali R) fled to the valleys of the Aguaíta and Pisqui Rs (lb af m Ucayali R), Peru (Ordinaire, 1892: 198).

Choromawa – between Pachitea and Aguaíta Rs, Peru (Távara, 1905 [1868]: 425).

Komabo – east of u Ucayali R (Maroni, 1889 [1889–1892]: 112), Taraba/Apurimac R, above the Ene R
(Amich, 1988 [1854]: 119), Peru.
Puchanawa – from banks of Pachitea R (lb af u Ucayali R) fled to the valleys of the Aguaitía and Pisqui R (lb af m Ucayali R), Peru (Ordinaire, 1892: 198).
Ruana – west of u Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175).
Shirino – Kashibo territory (see Kashibo entry in this appendix for locations), Peru (Tessmann, 1930: 624).
Shuchanawa – between Pachitea and Aguaitía Rs, Peru (Távara, 1905 [1868]: 425).
Kapuibo – Biata R (lb af Bení R, af u Madeira R), Bolivia (Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913: 21).
Sinabo of the Mamoré River – u Mamoré R (af u Madeira R), Bolivia (Cardús, 1886: 291; Créqui-Montfort and Rivet, 1913: 21).
Chuman – Reyes de los Mojos, Bolivia (Hervás, 1800: 250).
Tatianawa – Bení R, Bolivia (Stiglich, 1908: 427).
Yaguarmayo – Yaguarmayo R (rb af Inambari R) (Stiglich, 1908: 427), Peru.
Shipinawa – u Liberdade and u Valparaíso R (rb afs of Juruá R), Brazil (Linhares, 1913, apud Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 472), between the u Liberdade and u Juruá Rs (Tastevin, 1919: 146), Brazil.
Kiraba – north of u Amazon R (Coleti, 1975 [1771]: II: 321), Peru.
Awabakebo – u Uruquini R-u Môa R area; 1 went to live with the Iskonawas (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Hawanabakebo – Capua and Amua Creeks (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Inubakebo – u Uruquini R-u Môa R area (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Isubenebakebo – u Uruquini R-u Môa R area (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Naibakebo – u Uruquini R-u Môa R area (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Runubakebo – u Uruquini R-u Môa R area (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Tsinebakebo – u Uruquini R-u Môa R area; 5 went to live among the Iskonawas (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Waribakebo – u Uruquini R-u Môa R area (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Yawabakebo – Yumaiya R (Whiton et al., 1964: 102), Peru-Brazil border.
Yaya – lb of Juruá R, Brazil (Hassel, 1905: 52).
Awanawa – Ucayali R (Figueroa, 1904 [1661]: 164), east of m Ucayali R (Dueñas, 1792: 175), Peru.
Chai – Ucayali R., upriver from the Kokamas (Rodriguez, 1684: 163).
Kusabatai – Maynas missions, Peru (Velasco, 1988 [1788–1789]: 546), possibly along the Cushibatay R (lb af Ucayali R).
Makonawa – area of Huallaga R (rb Marañón R), Peru (Figueroa, 1904: 122).
Manamano – originally near the Pachitea R (lb af u Ucayali R) and later moved south, Peru (Richter in Maroni, 1988: 291).
Mawishi – headwaters of the Juruá R, Brazil? (Bates, 1863: 379; possibly refers to Arawakan Kuniba).
Sinabo of the Ucayali basin – inland east of Ucayali R, (Dueñas, 1792: 175), Pisqui R. (Stiglich, 1908: 426), Peru.
Turkaguane – north of Konibos along the Ucayali R (Richter in Maroni, 1988: 290), Peru-Brazil border.
Chakaya – between the Ucayali and Tapiche Rs (Marcoy, 1869: II: 234), Peru-Brazil border.
Iltipo – Peru (Hervás, 1800: 263).
Manannawa – inland from Ucayali R, later reduced at mission on Taguacoa Creek (between Huallaga and Ucayali Rs), Peru (Richter in Maroni, 1988: 295).
Yawabo – 20 leagues east of Ucayali R (Castelnau, 1850–1859: IV: 377), Peru, Acuria/Aturia stream (right bank af of the u Juruá R) (Linhares, 1913, apud Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 475), Brazil.
Inubo – east of Ucayali R (Carvallo, 1906 [1818]: 342), Peru.
Runubo – east of Ucayali R (Carvallo, 1906 [1818]: 342), Peru.
Kasca – east of Ucayali R (Carvallo, 1906 [1818]: 342) Peru.
Puinawa – Deseada Island (separated from lb Ucayali R by the Puinahua Canal), Peru (Carvallo, 1906 [1818]: 348).
Hisisbakebo – Callaría R (rb af Ucayali R), Peru (Amich, 1988 [1854]: 334).
Tushinawa – Humayta R (af of u Muru R, in turn rb af Tarauacá R, in turn lb af Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R) and Furnaya (af of u Envira R) (Linhares, 1913, apud Rivet and Tastevin, 1921: 473), between Muru and Envira Rs (Tastevin, 1926: 50); Jutaí R (rb af m Amazon R; Castelnau, 1851: V: 85), Brazil.
Aninawa – u Envira R (rb af u Juruá R), Brazil (Linhares, 1913).
Deenawa – originally from the Envira R (rb af u Juruá R), a few among the Yaminawas of the Juruá R and the Sharanawas (Townsley, 1994: 249), Peru.
Mashonawa – Envira R (rb af u Juruá R), Brazil (Tastevin, 1926: 49).
Shaninawa – originally from the Envira R (rb af u Juruá R), some among Sharanawas, Peru and Brazil (Townsley, 1994: 250).
Shishinawa – a few among the Yaminawas of the Purus R and the Parkenawas, Peru and Brazil? (Townsley, 1994: 250).
Arawa – Chivé Creek in Madre de Dios, Peru (Stiglich, 1908: 402).
Espino – Inland west of u Curumahá R (lb af u Purus R), Brazil (Chandless, 1866: 106).
Yura – Pique-Yacu, Torolluc and neighboring afs u Juruá R (Villanueva, 1902: 426), Peru.

Awanateo – right bank of Javari R, Brazil (Fritz, 1922 [1707]: map), between headwaters of Tapiche R (rb af l Ucayali R) and Javari R, Peru (Veigl’s map in Chantre, 1901).

Binabo – east of m/l Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175; Girbal, 1791: 70/1927: 161).

Binannawa – Envira R (rb af u Juruá R), Brazil (Tastevin, 1926: 50).

Chunti – east of m/l Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175).

Diabo – east of m/l Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175; Girbal, 1791: 70/1927: 161).

Isunawa – east of m/l Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175, Girbal, 1791: 70/1927: 161).

Kamarinigua – Camarinigua or Cumaria R (rb af u Ucayali R), Peru (Sobreviela, 1791b).


Kurunawa – Envira R (rb af u Juruá R), Brazil (Tastevin, 1926: 50); headwaters of Curanja and Curanjinha R (lb af u Purus R), Peru, and between the headwaters of the Envira and Purus R, Brazil (Carvalho, 1931: 248).


Mochobo – west of u Ucayali R (Sobreviela, 1791b), near Unini, Inua and other af of u Ucayali u river from the Konibos (Richter in Maroni, 1988: 286), Mazarobeni R (af Ene R) (Amich, 1854 [1854]: 120), Peru.

Nianawa – east of m Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175, 181).

Ormiga – east of m Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175).

Pakanawa – headwaters of Envira R (rb af u Juruá R), Brazil (Reich and Stegelmann, 1903: 137).

Pitsobo – rb of Ucayali R (Castelnau, 1850–1859: IV: 387); on small af of Ucayali between the Coingua/Coenhua and Camarinigua/Cumaria Rs (rb afs u Ucayali R) (Sobreviela, 1791b), Peru.

Soboibo – on small af of Ucayali between the Coingua/Coenhua and Camarinawa/Cumaría Rs (rb afs u Ucayali R), Peru (Sobreviela, 1791b)

Trompetero – east of m Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175).

Zurina – south of Amazon R below Cuchiguara R (Markham, 1859: 107 identified this as the Purus R), Peru (Acuña, 1641: 30).

Bamunawa – u Juruá area, Brazil (Tastevin, 1926: 51).

Buiunawa – u Juruá area, Brazil (Tastevin, 1926: 51).


Chipanawa – Ucayali R, Peru (Figueroa, 1904 [1661]: 164).

Eskinawa – u Juruá area, Brazil (Tastevin, 1926: 51).


Isaknawa – east of m Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175).

Kununawa – between Muru (rb af Tarauacá R, in turn lb af Envira R, in turn rb af u Juruá R) and Envira R, Brazil (Tastevin, 1925: 415, 1926: 50).

Kayubo – Yacaré and Yacaré-Mirim, Brazil (Stiglich, 1908: 406).

Komanawa – Province of Panataguas (i.e., western Pampas de Sacramentno), Peru (Córdova, 1957: 221, 222; Izaguirre, I: 123–126).
Michanawa – u Uruquinia R-u Môa R area (Whiton et al., 1964: 100), Peru-Brazil border.
Panatawa – captives of Panos, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 181).
Pimisnawa – area of u Uruquinia and Môa Rs (Whiton et al., 1964: 100), Peru-Brazil border.
Rununawa – u Juruá area, Brazil (Tastevin, 1926: 51).
Suyabo – east of m Ucayali R, Peru (Dueñas, 1792: 175).
Tiuchunawa – headwaters of Jurupari or Yuraya R (rb af l Taraucá R), Brazil (Tastevin, 1925: 415).
Tsawesbo – probably near current Matis territory, Brazil (Erikson, 1999: 113).
Uniabo – Amazonian Peru (Taboada, 1859 [1796]: 132).
Unibo – between Tapiche (rb af u Ucayali R) and Yavari Rs or upland areas of Cochiquinas R (rb af Amazon R) and Ylinué R, Peru.
On the cover: Engraving of drawing by Laurent Saint-Cricq of Mayoruna Indians whom he met briefly at the town of Maucallacta on the right bank of the Peruvian Amazon River in 1847, taken from Marcoy (1869: 307). Laurent Saint-Cricq, under the pen name Paul Marcoy, published a detailed illustrated account of his travels across South America over the Andes and down the Amazon. He travelled through the heart of Panoan territory and provided useful ethnographic notes, a few word lists, and illustrations of several Panoan tribes. His sketches and watercolors were reproduced as engravings by E. Riou for publication.
When Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries descended the Andes into the valley of the Amazon in the 17th century, they encountered a multitude of tribes speaking languages of bewildering diversity. Although early missionary priests, European philologists, 20th-century evangelical missionaries, and modern academic linguists have all contributed to describing and sorting out the identities and relationships among these languages, early errors have been perpetuated and new misconceptions have emerged. The chief accomplishment of the present work has been to resolve much of the confusion that has persisted up to the present, thereby providing a more accurate view of one of the most important linguistic families in western Amazonia.

This monographic study of the Panoan family will serve as an invaluable handbook for both Panoanists seeking a broader perspective and scholars who require an introduction to the family. A new classification encompassing all the extant and extinct Panoan languages and dialects, an evaluation of proposed relations to other language families, a detailed history of Panoan linguistics, a typological overview of the phonology and grammar, and a description of ethnolinguistic features in the family combine to provide a complete picture of Panoan languages and linguistics. An index with the synonyms and spelling variants of all the language names and ethnonyms that are or have been claimed to be Panoan will allow for obscure references in the literature to be quickly resolved.
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