



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

A grammar of Ashéninka (Ucayali-Pajonal)

Pedrés Caballero, T.

Citation

Pedrés Caballero, T. (2023, April 6). *A grammar of Ashéninka (Ucayali-Pajonal)*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Amsterdam. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3590495>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3590495>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

1. Introduction

The language described in this thesis belongs to a dialect continuum for which I have taken the name *Ashé-Ashá* from the Glottolog (Hammarström et al. 2022), where this name was already in use since my research began in 2015. This name is formed by the abbreviations of *Ashéninka* and *Asháninka*, which are the names traditionally given to the languages comprised in this continuum. The issues regarding the dialect continuum are discussed in Section 1.2.2 of this thesis. As explained in that section, the language described in this thesis is limited by the isogloss /s/-/h/. This language is spoken in Peru, in the Gran Pajonal plateau and on the banks of the Upper Ucayali River (see Section 1.1.1 for a more detailed geographic setting), hence the name *Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka*. Its speakers pronounce /h/ where speakers of other Ashé-Ashá languages or varieties pronounce /s/ (in identical words or cognates), i.e. the language does not have an /s/ phoneme, as the other varieties do. Some speakers by the Yuruá River, near the Brazilian border, also pronounce /h/ instead of /s/.

This thesis tries to describe all the grammatical features that I have been able to discover during my fieldwork, which is detailed in Section 1.3.1. Regarding the theoretical approach followed in the grammar, I entirely endorse the principles defended by Dixon (2010b:1-4) in what he calls “basic linguistic theory”, which consists in dealing with “linguistics conceived as a branch of natural science” (Dixon 2010b:3) whose task is “to explain the nature of human language, through active involvement in the description of languages –each viewed as an integrated system–” (Dixon 2010b:1).

Besides the grammar, this thesis includes the main conclusions of my article Pedrós 2018, which deals with the internal structure of the Ashé-Ashá dialect continuum (Section 1.2.2). This is a task that I felt urgently necessary after my first field trip, when I encountered the paradoxical situation that the Ethnologue (Eberhard, Simons & Fennig 2022) showed seven Ashé-Ashá languages –which it still does today–,³ while the Peruvian Ministry of Education officially recognised only one

³ www.ethnologue.com/country/PE/languages. Accessed in June 2022.

2 A grammar of *Ashéninka* (Ucayali-Pajonal)

language with the name *Ashéninka*, of which all the Ashé-Ashá varieties supposedly were dialects. In Pedrós (2018), I propose that two or three languages should be postulated for the whole continuum based on the principle of mutual intelligibility. During the time of my fieldwork, the Peruvian Ministry of Education recognised *Ashéninka* as a different language from *Asháninka*. This recognition is very important for producing schoolbooks for the *Ashéninka* schools, given that the formerly produced schoolbooks were in a language that the *Ashéninka* people could not understand (the standard was based on the Tambo-Ene variety, aka *Asháninka*). The Ethnologue's division in seven languages represents a totally unrealistic picture of the continuum since some dialects with minimal differences (e.g. Pajonal and Ucayali) are presented as separate languages. The same picture with seven languages is shown in the Glottolog (Hammarström et al. 2022) because its source in this respect is the Ethnologue. However, the Glottolog includes my internal classification (Pedrós 2018:26-27) of the Ashé-Ashá continuum.

This thesis also includes the article Pedrós 2019, which compares the verbal reality status marking of all Campan languages and shows the partial loss of the realis-irrealis opposition in Ucayali-Pajonal *Ashéninka*. This loss affects roughly half of the verbs and was discovered during my second field trip. I considered it crucial to make it known because it is a departure from the system of the rest of the Campan languages, and reality status is important in these languages because it is the only obligatory category on the verb.⁴

I call the language described in this grammar *Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka* because of the geographical setting of the area where it is spoken (the Gran Pajonal plateau and the Upper Ucayali River). This includes the languages named *Ashéninka Pajonal* and *South Ucayali Ashéninka*, whose codes are Ethnologue *cjo* and *cpy* and Glottolog *ashe1273* and *sout3127*, respectively (Eberhard, Simons & Fennig 2022; Hammarström et al. 2022). In the Glottolog, both are put together in the group named *Ashéninka* with the Glottocode *ashe1274*.

⁴ However, any reality status opposition is neutralized with the progressive, future and participle suffixes, so there is actually no reality status category in verbs with these suffixes.

1.1. The Ashéninka people

This section describes aspects of the people who speak the language under study and also of other Ashé-Ashá speakers, given that some aspects cannot be studied separately. The section is divided into three subsections devoted to the geographical setting and the number of people who speak the language or identify themselves as Ashéninkas (Section 1.1.1), a historical sketch of the Ashé-Ashá people with special reference to the Ucayalinos and Pajonalinos (Section 1.1.2), and the present situation of the Ashéninka in the Ucayali and the Gran Pajonal (Section 1.1.3).

1.1.1. Geography and demography

The Peruvian Ministry of Culture maintains the website *Base de Datos de Pueblos Indígenas u Originarios* (BDPI) ‘Database of Indigenous or Native Peoples’, where different data of the Peruvian indigenous peoples are shown. These data were updated with the 2017 census, carried out in October while I was in Peru doing fieldwork. According to the BDPI, 14,989 people live in indigenous communities⁵ that define themselves as Ashéninka,⁶ of whom 8,774 claim to speak the language (see Section 1.2.4 for a discussion on language vitality). The BDPI website shows a downloadable map of the communities self-defined as Ashéninka, as well as a spreadsheet with data of all the indigenous communities of Peru.⁷ Since these files are based on the 2017 census, they slightly differ from the data presented in Pedrós (2018:9). The majority of the Ashéninka communities are in the Gran Pajonal and along the Ucayali River, but some of them extend their territory from the Ucayali to the east, and there are some in the Yuruá and Masisea districts, next to Brazil. The BDPI’s map is reproduced here as Map 1. There are also the Ashéninkas of the Pichis Valley, but there is a problem with the name in this area, where most communities define themselves as Asháninka (for a discussion on this topic, see Pedrós 2018:8-10); according to the

⁵ An indigenous community in Peru is a legally recognised institution with its own authorities, namely a chief and a communal assembly.

⁶ bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/pueblos/ashéninka. Accessed in June 2022.


⁷ The map can be accessed at bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/pueblos/asheninka, and the spreadsheet, at bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/buscador-de-localidades-de-pueblos-indigenas. Both accessed in March 2021.

4 *A grammar of Ashéninka (Ucayali-Pajonal)*

BDPI's spreadsheet, there is only one community self-defined as Ashéninka in the Pichis Valley.

In any case, the language described in this thesis is the one spoken in the Gran Pajonal (GP) and on the banks of the Ucayali River, while most people in communities further east pronounce /s/ where people in the Ucayali and the GP use /h/. Actually, both areas, the Gran Pajonal and the Upper Ucayali, have always been closely connected. Hvalkof (1998:89) says that, for the GP Ashéninkas, the Ucayali is a fish paradise, and their preferred contacts outside the GP are their Ucayali relatives –my consultants hailed from the Upper Ucayali, but they had relatives in the GP. Hvalkof adds that both areas are linked by an ancient net of paths and that the *pajonalinos* love to make fishing excursions to the Ucayali, where they fish and exchange goods, so the Ucayali River is their gate to the outside world.

Map 1. Ashéninka communities according to the BDPI



1.1.2. Historical sketch

All the peoples that have been called *Campa* since the 17th century are treated together by some historical sources. This denomination encompasses the Asháninka and the Ashéninka, and, according to Hvalkof (1998:161), also the Nomatsigenga.⁸ A good account of the history of the whole Ashé-Ashá area is given in Varese (1968), and, more specifically referred to the Gran Pajonal, in Hvalkof & Veber (2005:113-58). More recent events in the Ashéninka area (1980s and 1990s) are described in more detail in Hvalkof (1998). The historical sketch provided in the present section is based mainly on these three works and is practically a summary of them. Shorter accounts about the areas traditionally called *Ashéninka* can be found in Anderson (2000) in English and its Spanish translation (Anderson 2008:31-68); and in Weiss (2005:9-12) and Vigil (2018) about the areas traditionally called *Asháninka*.

1.1.2.1. Precolonial times and the first Castilian incursion in 1595

Although archaeological findings suggest that the Campas (I will use this name when referring to the group formed by the Asháninka and the Ashéninka in historical times) maintained trade relations with peoples from the Andes (Anderson 2008:32-34), practically nothing is known of their history in precolonial times. The first Europeans known to have ventured into Campa territory are the Jesuits Joan Font and Nicolás Mastrillo in 1595, who wrote some ethnographic notes about their encounter (for details, see Varese 1968:35-41). Font travelled to Castile accompanied by two Indians and met the king in Valladolid to ask for permission to colonize the newly discovered land, which he was granted. In 1601, Font travelled back to Peru with a project to colonize the area and the royal permission to do it, but this project failed due to the opposition that he faced in Peru from the hierarchy of the Society of Jesus.

⁸ The oldest references to the word *Asháninka* that have come to my knowledge are in L.D. Kindberg (1961:505) and W. Kindberg (1961:519). Both say that “the tribe speaking this language is called Campa by the Spanish-speaking Peruvians, but the tribe refers to itself and its members as Ashaninka” (both authors use the same words).

1.1.2.2. The Franciscan missions in the 17th and early 18th century

The next attempt to colonize the area would be more successful and was carried out by another Catholic order: the Franciscans. In 1635, the Franciscan Jerónimo Jiménez arrives at the Cerro de la Sal⁹ and founds a village with a chapel: *Quimirí*, obviously an Ashé-Ashá name, in the location of the present city of La Merced. In 1637, Jiménez tries to explore the Perené River, but dies at the hands of the Indians. In the following years, there were other attempts to explore the area. In 1641, the Franciscan Illescas, accompanied by two monks from Quito, leaves Huancabamba with the intention of exploring the Perené River, but they were never heard of until 1686: they had been killed by the Shipibo by the Ucayali River. In 1645, there are rumours that there is gold to be found in the Cerro de la Sal, which brings an expedition of 46 men to the area; they are stopped by the Campas and end up sacking some mountain villages, which causes their arrest and imprisonment by the colonial authorities (Varese 1968:42-43).

In 1651, the conquistador Fernando Contreras presents an important chronicle to the king: the *Representación* of the province of the so-called *Minarvas*. Varese (1968:44-46) argues that the ethnographic description offers little doubt that these people are Campas, but most important is that the first recorded Campan words appear in this *Representación*. Contreras says that he found Indians called “Noçanganis, Canparites, Opanegis” in a place where three big rivers meet (Varese hypothesizes that this must be the area where the rivers Pangoa, Perené and Ene converge) (Varese 1968:45). Later, the Franciscan Manuel de Biedma reported the presence of the Indians called “Campas, Camparites, Pirros y Simirinchas” (Varese 1968:46), of whom Varese says that Campas and Camparites must be synonyms, as well as Pirros and Simirinchas (Pirros are usually called *Yine* today). The most transparent of Contreras’ three words is *noçangani*: *nahánkane* in Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka and *nasánkane/nasánkani* in the other Ashé-Ashá varieties means ‘my heart’ or ‘our hearts’ (exclusive) (n-ahánkane, 1-heart) (/k/ after /n/ is realized [g] in Ucayali-Pajonal

⁹ The Cerro de la Sal ‘mountain of salt’ is an important landmark in the history of the Ashé-Ashá and other peoples of the area. People from distant areas came to this place to gather salt, which made it an important commercial hub. This place is close to the present town of Villa Rica (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:117).

8 A grammar of Ashéninka (Ucayali-Pajonal)

Ashéninka, and it is most likely that the same holds for the other varieties). We cannot know how this word came to be interpreted by Contreras as the name of the people, but we can imagine a group of people calling themselves ‘our hearts’. For *opanegi*, the nearest construction that comes to my mind is *apánikì* (apani=ki, one=LOC), which would mean ‘in one’, possibly implying ‘in one place’. This would be the case if *opanegi* is interpreted as /opanegi/, but the author might have meant a Spanish reading as /opanexi/ or /opanehi/, which would be more difficult to interpret.

But the most remarkable word is *camparite*, given that it contains the element *campa*, and this is the first time that this word is attested. *-ri* and *-te* are frequent endings in Ashé-Ashá: *-ri* can be a relative and a 3rd person masculine suffix but is also common in many roots; *-te* is a possessive suffix. The meaning of *camparite* cannot be easily ascertained, but I can try to form a hypothesis. The word *ashirámpariti* in UP Ashéninka means ‘our man/men’ (inclusive) (a-shirámpari-ti, INCL-man-POSS), and, in normal speech, it would be pronounced as [aʃˈtampari,tɛ], with a great deal of variation in the height of the last vowel (the element *ashira* would be pronounced as [aʃira] instead of [aʃta] only when speaking very slowly). Initial /a/ before /ʃ/ may tend to be pronounced voiceless, a tendency that I noticed in Asháninka more strongly than in Ashéninka (on my first field trip, I also worked with some Asháninka speakers). Therefore, Contreras, who would have never heard voiceless vowels, might have overheard a voiceless sequence [aʃ] and would have heard only [ˈtampari,tɛ]. I have sometimes confounded /t/ and /k/ during my fieldwork when listening to a speaker, so it might be the case that Contreras heard something similar to [aʃˈtampari,tɛ], interpreted it as [ˈkamparite] and wrote it down as *canparite*. This is the only hypothesis that comes to my mind for interpreting this word as the self-designation of this indigenous group. As with the more transparent *noçangani*, it would be difficult to ascertain how Contreras might have taken this word to be the name of the indigenous group.

In 1671, the viceroy gave permission to explore the area around the Cerro de la Sal again (Varese 1968:47). As a result, in 1673, the Franciscan Manuel de Biedma refounded Quimirí and the village of Santa Cruz de Sonomoro (Sonomoro is a river that flows into the Pangoa River). Biedma founds new missions along the upper

Perené River, learns the native language and writes “gramáticas, vocabularios, manuales para confesiones y traduce himnos y oraciones” (Varese 1968:48).¹⁰ He explores the Mantaro, Apurímac and Tambo rivers, and the Ucayali River until the confluence with the Pachitea, and he writes about the peoples that he finds there. In 1687, he goes down the Tambo looking for a place to found a new mission and is attacked and killed by the Yine. Varese (1968:56-57) says that, since then, the Tambo River became a closed frontier for whites and mestizos, and that only from 1918 onwards could the Tambo River be navigated safely.

According to Varese’s account (1968:50-56), Biedma used Conibos as guides and also to subjugate the Campas and had spent some time living with them before venturing into Campan territory. This is adduced by Varese (1968:51-53) to posit a possible Pano origin of the word *Campa*, together with the fact that Biedma was the first who started using it frequently. However, in his long and well-built argument, Varese surprisingly disregards the *Camparites* reported by Contreras and later by Biedma, which should invalidate his whole argument about the Pano origin of the word *campa*, given that Contreras visited the area before Biedma and *camparite* was used by Contreras before Biedma. The Ashé-Ashá endings *-ri-te* simply cannot be ignored, so the word *camparite* shows a clear Ashé-Ashá origin –unless the sequence *-ri-te* is a coincidence–, which implies that *campa* should also have an Ashé-Ashá origin.

Between the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century, the Franciscans tried to found missions in the area, and they actually founded some (Varese [1968:61] mentions six in the area of the Ene and Perené rivers), but they complained because their efforts did not yield the expected results due to the lack of interest of the Campas. They also suffered attacks, such as the one near the confluence of the Ene and Perené rivers in 1724, when several Franciscans plus 14 Spaniards and 20 Christian Indians died at the hands of the Yine. Since the Franciscans had not been very successful, they thought about expanding, and the only place where they could do it was the Gran Pajonal. The first *wirákocho* (Ashéninka word for ‘non-indigenous people’) to explore the Gran Pajonal was the Franciscan Juan de la Marca in 1733

¹⁰ ‘grammars, vocabularies, manuals for confessions and translates hymns and prayers’.

(Varese 1968:61-62). In 1729, he convinced Mateo de Assia, an Asháninka chief, to lead an expedition to the Gran Pajonal (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:114). When he arrived there, he convinced 162 Pajonal Ashéninkas to settle in San Tadeo, a mission by the Upper Perené River where there was an important trade route for the Pajonal Ashéninkas, but 40 of them died of an epidemic, and the rest went back to the Gran Pajonal in 1730 (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:114). De la Marca tried again to convince some local chiefs to settle in San Tadeo, which they refused, but they said to him that they could gather people from different places of the Gran Pajonal if the missionaries themselves visited the area. Accepting this invitation, De la Marca visited the Gran Pajonal in 1733 with 15 converted Asháninkas and founded the first mission in Tampianaqui, followed by two more (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:114-15). In 1735, Mateo de Assia, accompanied by two missionaries, visited the Gran Pajonal again and founded three more missions. One of the missionaries said that they were received with much kindness, but this was due to the access to European tools and the establishment of trade routes. In 1739, the Franciscans had founded ten missions, which had fifteen priests and some cattle and crops (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:115-16) (see Map 2 for the location of the missions), but the events of 1742 would change the history of the Selva Central dramatically (the *Selva Central* ‘central jungle’ is the name given to the area of the Amazon that occupies the central part of Peru, roughly a third of the country, and is the place where the Ashé-Ashá peoples live).

1.1.2.3. The rebellion of Juan Santos Atahualpa in the 18th century

In 1742, a man called Juan Santos, an Indian from the Sierra (Varese 1968:65) (the Sierra is the name given in Peru to the Andean area), appears at the confluence of the Ene and Perené rivers (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:121). There he meets Santabangori, an Ashéninka chief who had helped the Franciscan De la Marca to found missions in the Gran Pajonal. Santabangori invites Santos to Quisopango in the Gran Pajonal, and they plan an insurrection there. In a big ceremony, Santos proclaims himself *Apu Inca* and takes the name *Atahualpa* because he claims to be a descendant of Atahualpa, the last Inca emperor (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:122). Santos sends emissaries to different places to call people to gather in the Gran Pajonal. Varese (1968:68) says that not only the Campas but also the Yanesha', the Yine, the Shipibo and the Konibo followed Santos' call and went to the Gran Pajonal to meet him.

The uprisings against the Franciscans had been occurring since they started establishing missions. The reasons were the diseases brought by the missionaries and their endeavours to impose their Catholic moral and way of life, sometimes by force or punishing the disobedient Indians. Santos is the catalyst for the discontent that had been growing for sixty years. He had been the servant of a high-ranking Jesuit and had travelled to Spain, Angola and the Congo, so he was an educated man for the standard of the epoch (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:120-21).

Santos' activity alarms the Franciscans, who send Father Santiago Vásquez de Caicedo to find out what Santos' purposes are. Santos talks to him and tells him that he is Christian and has come to found his reign, which was stolen by Pizarro and his Castilian soldiers. He wants the *wirákocha* and their black servants (the Franciscans had black servants who could carry guns and were in charge of the security) to leave the area (Varese 1968:69).

When the viceregal authorities become aware of the danger of the situation, they send two columns to the area. One arrives at Quisopango, in the Gran Pajonal, and captures the arsenal after a fierce fight, but they do not find Santos; when they return to their headquarters, most of them are annihilated by Campas through guerrilla attacks (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:124). The other column arrives at Quimiri and finds it deserted (Varese 1968:74). In the following ten years, Santos established his

headquarters in Metraró, from where he got to expel all the missions from the Selva Central and control the Campa, Yánesha and Yine territory (the Gran Pajonal and the areas of the Chanchamayo, Perené and Upper Ucayali rivers). In 1751-52, Santos conquered the territories of Pangoa, Sonomoro, Satipo, and even an area in the Eastern Andes (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:124). Varese (1968:73-85) gives a detailed account of the events in that period, which are summarized in the following lines.

In 1743, colonial troops arrive at Quimiri and build a fort, which is guarded by 80 men commanded by Captain Fabricio Bártoli with 4 cannons and 4 swivel guns. Four days later, Santos arrives with his men and they siege the fort. Santos and Bártoli agree on two fifteen-day truces, during which Santos offers Bártoli to surrender and withdraw safely, but this offer is declined. At the end of the second truce, Bártoli and his men try to escape in the night, but they are intercepted and killed. When Spanish reinforcement troops arrived, they found the fort occupied by Santos (Varese 1968:75-76). In January 1746, José de Llamas, Marquis of Mena-Hermosa, gathers a troop of 1,000 men. In March, in the middle of the rainy season, 400 of these men under Llamas' command enter the rebel territory by Huancabamba in the direction of Cerro de la Sal. In the south, Troncoso commands 500 men with the intention of joining Llamas after passing by Quimiri and Ocsabamba. The difficulty of moving forward in the rainy season made Llamas return without fighting after losing 14 men due to exhaustion. Troncoso's expedition was attacked by the rebels at the end of the Chanchamayo Valley: the soldiers got away and fled to the Sierra. These failures led the viceroy to cancel this kind of operations due to their expensive cost and null results. It was thought that Santos had a 500-man troop; actually, he did not have a regular army, but he could dispose of all the Indians of the Selva Central: they gathered when he called them in order to carry out a specific mission (Varese 1968:77-78). In 1750, Llamas attempts a new military incursion with two different columns, but both are constantly harassed by the Campas with guerrilla tactics, the bridges are cut, and deadly traps have been placed on the paths. The expedition has to go back without achieving any victory (Varese 1968:80). After conquering new territories in the areas of Pangoa and Satipo, the rebels conquer Andamarca in the Sierra, but they withdraw

after a few days in order to avoid the arriving colonial troops (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:125).

Some Franciscan chronicles say that Santos was killed in 1755-56 in Metraro by one of his followers, who wanted to check if Santos was immortal by throwing a stone at him, but other Franciscan reports say that he was still alive in 1775 (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:125). In 1756, the Franciscan Salcedo found two Campan followers of Santos in the Shipibo mission San Miguel de los Cunibos, by the Ucayali River, and they told him that Santos had disappeared in a smoke cloud (Varese 1968:83). The fact is that there was no more news from Santos' activities since 1752. In 1766, the main Pano-speaking groups in the Ucayali (Shipibos, Konibos and Xetebos) led a rebellion against missionaries and colonists, and the Campas and Yines in the Tambo joined them. The outcome of Santos' rebellion was that the Selva Central would remain closed to colonization and under the control of the indigenous people for one hundred years (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:125-26).

Between 1782 and 1790, the Franciscan missions recovered some territory only in the areas of the Upper Apurímac and the Mantaro rivers, but the regions of the Pichis, Pachitea, Perené, Tambo and Pangoa rivers and the Gran Pajonal would remain impenetrable until the foundation of La Merced by the Chanchamayo River in 1868 (Varese 1968:84). Still in 1876, a man called Wertheman, while navigating the Chanchamayo, Perené and Tambo rivers, was told that the Indians gathered every year in the Gran Pajonal for a ceremony in memory of Juan Santos Atahualpa, in which his sword was carried in a procession (Varese 1968:94-95). This story, true or false, shows Santos' long-lasting impact on the area.

1.1.2.4. The 19th century and the rubber boom (from mid-19th century until 1912)

After Santos' rebellion, the Selva Central was considered a dangerous territory, and only in the 1810s some shy attempts at recolonization were carried out. In 1815, three new Franciscan missions are founded in Sonomoro, in Pangoa and at the mouth of the Tambo into the Ucayali. Soldiers, colonists and adventurers follow the missionaries and create conflicts with the Asháninkas along the Tambo, which lead to armed

clashes. The missionaries answer with a punitive expedition on the Tambo with 362 armed men in 66 canoes, but the Asháninkas flee into the forest and remain there for the following years. However, this recolonization would be stopped by the Peruvian War of Independence: in 1820, the Franciscans had to abandon the three new missions (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:129-30).

Since 1842, there was a fort in present-day San Ramón, which was the last frontier for missionaries and colonists. The fort had the function of protecting the colonists and their fields surrounding the fort, but, at the other side of the river, the Asháninkas threw arrows from time to time, so that it was dangerous to bathe or wash in the river. Varese (1968:89-90) says that the captain of the fort told a visiting North American official that some colonists were thinking of building their houses of adobe with strong windows and doors because they were afraid of Asháninka attacks with incendiary arrows. However, this fort was going to be the place from where the recolonization of the area would take place (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:136).

In 1891, the Peruvian state gave the British company Peruvian Corporation a concession of 2 million ha along the Perené River, and the company established the Perené colony. However, only 500,000 ha were exploited with coffee plantations. Local Asháninkas were hired to work there under miserable conditions, and new epidemics (e.g. measles) appeared and spread over the whole Selva Central, which caused a decrease in the indigenous population at the turn of the century (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:136-37).

On the other side of the Campan area, by the Ucayali River, the South American rubber boom started to be noted. From the mid-19th century onward, the rubber demand in North American and European markets steadily grew, which led to the establishment of companies in Iquitos, and some trading posts and small estates began to develop along navigable rivers as the Ucayali or the Urubamba (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:131-32) –I have been told stories of some of these estates. In 1910, rubber exports made up 18% of Peruvian exports, but the boom ended abruptly in 1912 due to the competition of new rubber plantations in English and Dutch colonies (Varese 1968:108). The consequences of this business for the indigenous peoples of the area were disastrous: the rubber business needed many hands, and they were obtained

through slaves, so the slave trade grew at the same pace as the rubber trade. The rubber barons organized the so-called *correrías* (derived from Spanish *correr* ‘run’), which were raids on indigenous settlements with the goal of kidnapping people to work as slaves. These *correrías* were often carried out by indigenous people hired by rubber barons. After the fall of the rubber boom, the slave trade went on and was particularly intense along the Ucayali and Urubamba rivers. Hvalkof & Veber (2005:132-34) say that they know from their own fieldwork that local chiefs in the Ucayali were provided with Winchester rifles by rubber barons so as to conduct *correrías* in the Gran Pajonal and that the slave trade continued in the Upper Ucayali until approximately 1988 (2005:144).

In 1895, the Peruvian president Nicolás de Piérola wanted to connect the Amazon to the coast in order to set up a way out for rubber exports, which were oriented towards Brazil and poorly controlled by the government, resulting in a loss of income for the state, so he put the Franciscan Gabriel Sala in charge of an exploratory expedition to the Gran Pajonal with the idea of constructing a railway through the area. Sala explored the Pichis, Pachitea and Upper Ucayali rivers and, from the Ucayali, went up to the Gran Pajonal from the Chicosa River (Varese 1968:103-04).¹¹ His expedition found most villages deserted because their inhabitants feared the frequent *correrías* and fled when they knew that strangers were approaching (Varese 1968:105). Sala made a report with a plan to colonize the Gran Pajonal, but it presupposed that the adjoining territories had a developed infrastructure, which was not the case. The logistic problems remained insurmountable, so *correrías* to gather slaves for the rubber barons could go on in the Gran Pajonal. Throughout the 20th century, there were several plans to connect the Andes with the Ucayali through the Pajonal, but none were successful (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:140-41).

With the end of the rubber trade, the exploitation of the indigenous people by rubber barons increased, which caused several rebellions. In 1912, the Swiss slave dealer Sedel Mayer was killed near Satipo by the Asháninkas. In 1913, the Asháninkas

¹¹ Most of my consultants were from the indigenous community of Chicosa (*Katsinkaari* in Ashéninka). This community is next to the Ucayali River and I was told that there is a little *quebrada* (a brook that usually dries up in the dry season) with the same name as the community. Varese probably refers to this brook when he mentions the “río Chicosa”.

and the Nomatsigengas of Pangoa rebelled against the settlers, followed by an uprising in the Upper Ucayali. In 1913, the Campas in the Pichis Valley killed 150 settlers and cut off the roads to Lima, and, also in 1914, there was an uprising in the Pichis Valley against the rubber barons in the area of Puerto Bermúdez. However, during this time, a lot of roads and paths were built (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:136, 141-42).

1.1.2.5. From the 1920s to the 1980s: attempts at recolonization

At the end of the 1920s, the Franciscans had set up missions in all the areas surrounding the Gran Pajonal, and their next step would be to do the same in the Gran Pajonal. Access to the Ucayali by land was still a goal of the mission and the Peruvian state, and the appearance of the aeroplane facilitated the colonization projects. In the mid-1920s, an air force base is established in San Ramón, and small airstrips are built in Puerto Ocopa and Atalaya. In 1933, the Franciscans fly over the Gran Pajonal to study how they could establish missions there. In 1935, Monsignor Irazola, Brother Antonio Rojas, an engineer called Béquer and twenty Asháninkas from the Puerto Ocopa mission undertake an expedition to the Gran Pajonal, in which they determine where they want to build three missions. They report that the Ashéninkas are distrustful of strangers because there are *correrías* and slave children are sold at the mouth of the Unini River into the Ucayali. Already in 1936, a road from Puerto Ocopa to Oventeni has been built, and the three missions are functioning (one of them is Oventeni, which today is the most important settlement in the Gran Pajonal). Shortly after that, an airstrip is built in Oventeni, and the colonization process starts with families from the Sierra, who sign a four-year deal to settle there. Cattle raising under the direction of Andean settlers is thought to be the way of colonization. In 1939, there are in Oventeni 11 settler families, 28 schoolchildren, 50-60 cows, 4 bulls, 17 young bulls, 25 calves, and some sheep, donkeys and horses (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:144-146).

In the 1940s, there are several clashes between Ashéninkas and settlers, with loss of lives on both sides. In 1948, 350 Ashéninkas try to reconquer Oventeni, but they are lured into a trap by the missionaries: 20 Ashéninkas and 1 settler die. At some point, the mission felt so threatened that an arsenal with army rifles was set up in

Oventeni to protect the colony. In 1946, a road from Puerto Ocopa to Atalaya along the Unini River was finished, but it was destroyed in the 1947 earthquake –Hvalkof & Veber (2005:147) say that it had not been rebuilt yet at the time of writing. Another road had been recently built when I arrived in Atalaya on my first field trip in 2015, although not along the Unini. With the earthquake, also Satipo was isolated, and the road connecting with the Sierra and Lima was not rebuilt until 1960. This isolation of the Selva Central meant a decrease in the number of settlers and a change in the type of settler: from poor Andean peasants to rich landlords who invested in big estates of up to 4,000 ha (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:147). In the Gran Pajonal, a group of investors from Lima set up a big cattle ranch in Shumahuani: the company Florestal Ganadera, S.A. A lot of qualified personnel was hired, and cattle was brought in, but the project did not turn out to be profitable because the natural pastures were of poor quality. The continual coming and going of workers caused measles epidemics that ravaged the Ashéninkas throughout the 1950s and 1960s, which led to a drastic decrease in population (Hvalkof & Veber 148-50).

The final coup de grâce for Florestal Ganadera came from an unexpected event. In November 1965, a column of the MIR (Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario ‘Left-wing Revolutionary Movement’) led by Guillermo Lobatón Milla arrived in the Gran Pajonal retreating from the Peruvian special forces from the area around Pangoa and Satipo. They seized Oventeni and stayed there for two weeks delivering speeches to the settlers. The administrator of Florestal Ganadera was not on the spot, so they took the best bulls and prepared a big barbecue with the Ashéninkas, who provided *masato*, and all together made a wild party. The next day, the Peruvian special forces arrived and caught them in the middle of the hangover. On the 9th of December 1965, the guerrillas were captured near Mapitzeviari; the Ashéninkas recount that the guerrillas were cruelly tortured and killed and that Lobatón and his second commander were killed after being forced to dig their own graves (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:151). These events deeply affected the Oventeni colony: the Franciscan nuns were evacuated, the mission and the boarding school were closed, and only one priest remained in Oventeni, where a military post was established for the following three

years. Florestal Ganadera S.A. was dissolved in 1968. The dream of a cattle development area in the Gran Pajonal had failed again (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:152).

Around 1968, a new actor appeared on the scene, who would make a big impact on the Ashéninkas: some evangelical missionaries from the Instituto Lingüístico de Verano (ILV), as the North American Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) is called in Hispanic America, settled permanently in the Gran Pajonal with the goal of registering the language and translating the Bible into Ashéninka. They also set up bilingual schools, recruited local Ashéninkas as schoolteachers and Bible translators, and sent them to study at their base in Yarinacocha (near Pucallpa). They also started vaccinating the locals and built small airstrips in some communities where they had set up their schools. (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:153-54).

In the 1970s, the Ashéninka population increased, as well as the settlers' farms. In 1978, multilateral development banks decided to invest in huge development projects to colonize the Selva Central. As a result, many settlers moved to the Gran Pajonal, pastures were sowed, and new cattle was introduced. The labour force was provided by the Ashéninkas, who worked for settlers under the system of debt bondage, by which a labourer works to pay off a debt that will never be totally paid off. The Ashéninkas that did not comply with their imposed obligations were severely punished. According to Hvalkof & Veber (2005:154), they were arrested in a hut for days without food or water and could be whipped. Some Ashéninkas were so humiliated that they committed suicide, and there is even a case of a family of fourteen who committed a collective suicide after the humiliation that two of their members suffered during a week in the Oventeni prison. Hvalkof & Veber (2005:155) say that the situation was similar in the Ucayali, which coincides with the stories that I have been told. This situation was extremely absurd because it had been caused by the financial aid of international agencies such as the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, USAID and others. In the end, the development projects failed, and the international development agencies withdrew from Peru, leaving the Selva Central in a most deplorable state (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:155).

1.1.2.6. From the 1980s on: formation of indigenous organizations, terrorism, and slavery in the Upper Ucayali

In the 1980s, the ongoing conflicts with settlers called for collective action in the Gran Pajonal, and, with the help of ILV missionaries, the OAGP (Organización Ashéninka del Gran Pajonal ‘Ashéninka Organization of the Gran Pajonal’) was created. In 1984, they successfully demarcated and entitled four indigenous communities. The settlers responded by mobilizing entrepreneurs and officials from the regional administration in order to annul the entitled communities, and, at the same time, the OAGP mobilized the human resources they had available: missionaries, teachers, anthropologists and other friends, who convinced the World Bank and its Peruvian partner, the PEPP (Proyecto Especial Pichis-Palcazu ‘Special Project Pichis-Palcazu’), that they had the responsibility to interfere in the conflict, so the people in charge of these projects demarcated and entitled all the indigenous communities of the Gran Pajonal. As the process went on, the settlers were shocked, until they realized that they could not avoid it and had to accept it. The result of the entitlement process was that the interethnic conflicts practically disappeared (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:156-57).

The preceding paragraph summarizes the last events in Ashéninka history reported in Hvalkof & Veber (2005). Although this book chapter was published in 2005, it is already cited in Hvalkof (1998:159) as of near publication, which was obviously delayed more than Hvalkof had thought. In Hvalkof (1998), more recent events than those in the preceding paragraph are reported, so it seems that Hvalkof & Veber (2005) was written before Hvalkof (1998). Therefore, the following paragraphs are not based on Varese (1968) nor Hvalkof & Veber (2005) but on Vigil (2018) for the events in the Ashéninka area and on Hvalkof (1998) in the Ashéninka area.

The appearance of the armed insurgent group Sendero Luminoso (SL) ‘Shining Path’ in the Selva Central in the late 1980s drastically marked the history of the Ashéninka people, above all in the areas around the Ene and Upper Tambo rivers. Vigil (2018:172) quotes the Comisión de la Verdad y la Reconciliación (CVR) ‘Truth and Reconciliation Commission’¹² and says that, between the second half of the 1980s

¹² This commission was created in 2001 with the goal of investigating the acts of violence perpetrated between 1980 and 2000 by the armed insurgent groups Sendero Luminoso ‘Shining

and the beginning of the 1990s, SL's activity caused the death of around 6,000 Asháninkas, 5,000 were made prisoners of SL and 10,000 were displaced. Vigil calculates that the number of deaths must have amounted to around 10% of the Asháninka population. This account coincides with the stories that I was told during my fieldwork in Atalaya about the human catastrophe that the activity of SL caused in the area around the Tambo and Ene rivers. I was told that SL kidnapped Asháninka youngsters to serve as SL soldiers under the threat of killing their families if they did not fight for SL, so around half of the people fighting for SL were forced to do it, and that the state organized a huge operation to displace people in helicopters in order to get them away from the area where SL was more active.

In the Gran Pajonal and the Upper Ucayali, the indigenous resistance achieved to bring a halt to SL, who got in touch with the indigenous leader of the Gran Pajonal, Miguel Camaiteri, in search of his support, which he categorically refused (Hvalkof 1998:150). The consequence was that a price was put on his head. At the end of 1989, an unidentified group attacked and sacked Oventeni, humiliated cattle breeders and traders and stole the radio of the OAGP. Due to this attack, the army was planning to declare the Gran Pajonal an emergency area, which would imply that the Ashéninkas would have to evacuate. This possibility brought the Ashéninkas into action. Inspired by similar events in the Pichis Valley, in January 1990, hundreds of Ashéninkas armed with rifles, bows and arrows seized Oventeni and declared it under the control of the Ashéninka army; the members and sympathizers of SL and MRTA (Movimiento Revolucionario Túpac Amaro 'Revolutionary Movement Túpac Amaru') were given twenty-four hours to leave Oventeni (Hvalkof 1998:151). In two days, the settlers left Oventeni on continuous light plane flights. The Ashéninkas declared the establishment of the Ashéninka army with Miguel Camaiteri, president of the OAGP, as its commander-in-chief, and set up a surveillance system at the entrance ways to the GP. They were able to convince the national army not to intervene and even to provide them with weapons. The commander-in-chief also helped to create a similar militia in the Upper Ucayali with people from the OIRA (Organización Indígena

Path' and Movimiento Revolucionario Túpac Amaru 'Revolutionary Movement Túpac Amaru', and by the military fighting against them.

Regional de Atalaya ‘Regional Indigenous Organization of Atalaya’). The result of these actions was that the insurgent groups SL and MRTA never got to establish a stronghold neither in the Gran Pajonal nor the Upper Ucayali (Hvalkof 1998:152). Hvalkof (1998:152-54) ends his account of the Ashéninka history by relating how the Ashéninkas’ recently acquired ability to form organizations resulted in the presentation of a list to the local election in 1995: the MIAP (Movimiento Indígena de la Amazonía Peruana ‘Indigenous Movement of the Peruvian Amazon’). This list got four mayors, many councillors and the absolute power in the provincial capital, Atalaya.

I have used Hvalkof (1998) as the reference for the last episodes of the Ashéninka history, but Hvalkof (1998) is especially interesting because of the account of the author’s own implication and work in the process of entitling the Ashéninka communities and of the system of slavery in the form of debt bondage existent in the Upper Ucayali even until the end of the 1980s. The Dane Søren Hvalkof is an anthropologist who travelled to the Gran Pajonal (GP) for the first time in 1975 so as to research the land reform in Peru. He went back to the GP in 1985 with his wife, the also anthropologist Hanne Veber, and became involved in the conflictive situation that had started with the entitlement of four indigenous communities in the GP. He got funding for the process of entitling communities from the Danish development cooperation agency DANIDA (Danish International Development Agency) through the Danish NGO IWGIA (International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs). All this is related in detail in Hvalkof (1998). The slavery system existing in the Upper Ucayali is also described in Hvalkof (1998), which is worth reading because it is hard to believe that slavery still existed in Peru in the late 1980s. Hvalkof’s account is the thread that I needed to put the stories I was told during my fieldwork in their proper context. García (1998) relates the different accusations of slavery before the Peruvian authorities by transcribing many complaints. I summarize below the main features of this system.

Gray (1998:175) places the origin of the slavery system in the Ucayali River at the time of the rubber boom, when rubber barons enslaved Ashéninkas, Yines, Shipibos and other peoples. This system went on when the rubber business collapsed.

According to Gray (1998:174), the most powerful exploiters of the Ucayali area are the timber companies, owned by descendants of the first European colonists who arrived in the area during the rubber boom. Other settlers are mestizos who arrived in the area between 1930 and 1960, and even poorer settlers who emigrated in the 1980s and the 1990s from the Andes. Hvalkof (1998) and García (1998) describe the slavery system and give very illustrative examples. This system existed around Atalaya and downriver by the Ucayali in estates where the indigenous people worked for their master, the estate owner. The master gave them tools very useful for them (machetes, axes, cotton, pots, etc.) at a price set by himself, usually exaggeratedly high, and, thus, the natives incurred a debt that they had to pay off with work. No matter how much they worked, they never achieved to pay off the debt. The slavery situation was reinforced because, if a native wanted to leave the estate, they could not do it until they paid off the debt. If a native got away, the master could call the police and have them arrested.

A very illustrative example is related by Hvalkof (1998:129-30). When he was staying in the Ashéninka community of Chicosa, on the banks of the Ucayali River, one morning in September 1987, two very excited men came looking for him and urged him to go down to the river. There, some people were assembled having a discussion. Among them, there were the indigenous leaders of Chicosa, two policemen armed with rifles and a landowner whom Hvalkof had met on a previous occasion. In the middle of them, there was a very thin Ashéninka. According to the land owner, he had escaped from her estate and had sought shelter in Chicosa. She said that he owed her some items (pots and other kitchen items, cotton cloth, salt and cartridges), this was the second time that he had tried to get away, and his verbal agreement said that he should work until he would have paid off these items. Hvalkof improvised a speech by saying that, according to the Constitution, everyone was free to go freely wherever they wanted, no one could be held prisoner due to debts, slavery was abolished a century ago, the Peruvian labour law forbade that kind of agreement and this man had not committed any crime, so that, if she wanted to accuse him of anything, she should do it before a judge. The most astonishing thing was that a policeman then said that they had an arrest warrant from a judge, which the policeman

showed Hvalkof, who insisted that the man should be brought before a judge in Atalaya and not to his mistress' estate. The policemen accepted this and also that the indigenous authorities of Chicosa would accompany them to Atalaya. Hvalkof knew that the lawyer of AIDSESP (Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana 'Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest') would be in Atalaya, so he could help with the case. Later Hvalkof came to know that, after a long discussion with the judge, they got to release this man.

A similar case is reported by García (1998:26). He says that, when the AIDSESP's lawyer and an indigenous leader demanded the liberation of a girl from her mistress, the judge said "esta niña ya ha sido bautizada por la señora, le pertenece a ella",¹³ and, when they presented legal arguments, the judge said "pero señores, la madre de esta niña es una india, ellos no saben de derechos".¹⁴ Finally, when they threatened to accuse the mistress as well as the judge of kidnapping, the girl was set free. García (1998:20-25) reproduces different complaints filed with AIDSESP in 1986 by Ashéninkas mistreated by their masters, with a table summarizing all the complaints on page 55 named "Violaciones de derechos de las personas".¹⁵ The list of violations includes physical aggression, holding prisoners in private jails, forced labour, disappearance of people, threat with a firearm, kidnapping, aggression by private police, theft of outboard motor, non-payment of sold timber, theft of corrugated metal roofing sheets for school, legal cover-up of death due to accident at work, rape under threat, fraud, setting fire to sowed field, and causing blindness by machete blow. García (1998) and Hvalkof (1998) provide a good insight into the ways in which the Ashéninka labourers were mistreated by their masters. Hvalkof (1998:120-22) mentions an encounter with the mistress mentioned above (he knew her from this encounter) and her nephew, when they picked him up on a boat ride to Atalaya along the Ucayali. The nephew boasted that his father and his grandfather had raped all the Ashéninka girls in the area and killed many Ashéninkas.

¹³ 'this girl has already been baptised by the lady [her mistress], she belongs to her'.

¹⁴ 'but, gentlemen, this girl's mother is an Indian, they don't know about rights'.

¹⁵ 'Violations of people's rights'.

The stories reported above show how slavery was established in the Upper Ucayali until the late 1980s, how justice and police assumed that this was the normal state of affairs, that bondage debts had to be paid, and that those who broke this rule could be arrested and punished. García's (1998:26) account of the girl set free also shows us that there was a sort of baptism right, by means of which a master who baptised a child would be their owner.

Reading García (1998) and Hvalkof (1998) has allowed me to contextualize some of the stories that I was told during my fieldwork. According to these stories, the Ashéninkas were working for masters as slaves, OIRA was awarded a prize for fighting against slavery –I was told that UNESCO awarded the prize, but it was actually awarded by Anti-Slavery International (Hvalkof 1998:154)–, when one stopped working for a while to talk to somebody or drink some *masato*, a foreman would hit them, and the women always hid from their master because he would rape them if he found them. I was also told that the gringos¹⁶ set up a school at Chicosa, and then many people fled from the estates and went to Chicosa, which implied some protection by the gringo missionaries. When relating the incident mentioned above about the man who fled to Chicosa and was pursued by his mistress and the police, Hvalkof (1998:129) also mentions that there was a mission of the North American evangelist “South American Mission (SAM)”, who, according to Hvalkof, were conservative and fundamentalist. These must be the gringos I was told about. According to the story I was told, they helped many Ashéninkas to escape from slavery, so it seems that they had some sort of authority.

Hvalkof (1998:150) says that the process in which he participated, together with the indigenous organizations OAGP, OIRA and AIDSEP, and with the money from DANIDA managed by IWGIA, got to change the power structure in the area, so that former slave workers could leave their masters and join newly formed indigenous communities that owned their own piece of land.

¹⁶ The term *gringos* (same word in Spanish and English) is the one that was always used to tell me these stories. It usually refers to North Americans, but the Dane Hvalkof (1998:129) reports being addressed as “Sr. Gringo” ‘Mr Gringo’. In my case, being a Spaniard, in one occasion, a consultant told another one by phone that I was not a gringo, so the people included in this term may not be totally clear. I use the term *gringo* in order to report what I was told as accurately as possible.

The works on Ashé-Ashá history that I have been able to find are those that I have cited in this section, which leaves the roughly twenty years of the present century unreported, yet the development of coffee plantations in the Gran Pajonal described in Fernández (2017:187-91) is worth mentioning. Coffee growing is presently the main economic activity in the GP. It began in 1998 but did not start to be successful until 2008 with the launch of a project to grow organic coffee in the GP. The coffee crops have yielded benefits that have allowed to buy equipment for schools and farming tools. This coffee can be bought in Atalaya, and I found it so good that I brought home five one-quarter bags from each of my two last field trips.

All the knowledge I got about history was obtained during casual conversations. I was told stories mainly about the catastrophe caused in the Tambo-Ene area by the activity of Sendero Luminoso and about the slavery in the Upper Ucayali, so I must assume that these historical facts have left the strongest mark on the memories of the people living in the area. The present situation in Atalaya in relation to the facts expounded in this section is described in the following section.

1.1.3. Present situation

The last historical events described in the previous section connect perfectly with the present situation as I found it during my fieldwork between 2015 and 2019.

Regarding the indigenous organizations, three of them have an office in Atalaya: the aforementioned OIRA and AIDSESP, the latter represented by CORPIAA (Coordinadora Regional de Pueblos Indígenas de AIDSESP-Atalaya ‘Regional Coordinator of Indigenous Peoples of AIDSESP-Atalaya’), plus the newer URPIA (Unión Regional de los Pueblos Indígenas de Atalaya ‘Regional Union of the Indigenous Peoples of Atalaya’). URPIA is an umbrella organization of several local indigenous organizations, such as the OAGP. Another organization integrated into URPIA is FECONAPA (Federación de Comunidades Indígenas Ashéninka de la Provincia de Atalaya ‘Federation of Ashéninka Indigenous Communities of Atalaya Province’). At first, I found the different acronyms confusing and did not fully understand the differences between the organizations. As far as I know, an indigenous community is affiliated with an indigenous organization, which represents the

community before actors such as the state, companies, NGOs, etc. AIDSEP is an organization for the whole of Peruvian Amazonia, but its regional branch CORPIAA also has affiliated communities. OIRA is integrated into CORPIAA. I have to say that I worked in the headquarters of CORPIAA, OIRA and URPIA/FECONAPA, and the members and leaders of these associations were always keen to help me, and some of them worked with me as consultants.

The important fact in connection with the previous Section 1.1.2.6 is that the start of the formation of indigenous organizations described there can be seen today as a fully developed process with well-established organizations. The start of the process of community entitlement described in Section 1.1.2.6 has also had a great development, given that most communities in the area are entitled today. A native community is a legal institution in Peru and has as governing authorities a *jefe* ‘chief’ and a communal assembly. A community is allotted a piece of land and has rights to the resources of this land, so that loggers have to pay for permission to chop down trees. Today, dealing with loggers and also with large oil and gas companies, such as Spanish Repsol or Brazilian Petrobras, is the main concern of indigenous communities and their organizations. Dealing with oil and gas companies appears to be a task of indigenous organizations due to the nature of their activities: they do not affect all communities and can affect many communities in a given area at the same time, but dealing with loggers may be a task of each individual community. I have been told by members of indigenous organizations that community members are trained in calculating prices to be charged to loggers because these tend to try to cheat them.

The Ashéninkas live mainly in native communities, although a few live in mestizo settlements such as Atalaya, Oventeni or Bolognesi. It is typical to have a *chacra* (a small plot of land for farming purposes), where the crops can be for their own consumption or some produce can be sold. As mentioned in Section 1.1.2.6, the Ashéninkas in the Gran Pajonal have specialized in growing coffee, and the Ucayali Ashéninkas sell various products: cacao, bananas, maize, rice, and even fish.

Fishing is also common, above all in the Ucayali, where there is plenty of fish. There are several fishing systems; those that I have heard of are with nets, with bow and arrow and also with a kind of poisonous root that is thrown in pools formed in

brooks: the fish die and only need to be collected. The Ashéninkas also hunt, although game is scarcer than in former times. I was told about a mother and her son from the community of Apinihua, on the east bank of the Ucayali, who went on a hunting expedition and had to travel east by boat for a whole day to arrive in an area where there are many animals to hunt. The communal reserve El Shira, located between the valleys of the Ucayali and the Pichis-Pachitea rivers, was created as a hunting ground for the communities from both valleys. For hunting, the Ashéninkas build a *maspute*, a small hut built only to hide inside and wait for game to arrive in order to shoot it. Their traditional way of hunting is with bow and arrow, but most hunters use rifles today.

The fruits that the Amazonian forest offers also make a nutritional contribution. Some Ashéninkas raise chickens. With farming, gathering fruits, fishing and hunting, an Ashéninka family may be self-sufficient, but, although I have talked with people living in this way –“the forest is our market”, an Ashéninka told me, implying that he does not need money in his community–, it seems that modern society and the use of money are penetrating the indigenous communities, so that self-sufficiency is today rather an exception –I have seen small grocery stores in some communities. The basis of the Ashéninka diet is *Manihot esculenta*, known in English as *cassava*, *manioc* and *yuca*¹⁷. Yuca is combined with many other foods and is also eaten alone, and it is used to prepare *masato*, an alcoholic drink made out of fermented yuca. *Masato* is consumed quite often, and *masato* parties play an important role in Ashéninka society, as some authors relate (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:215-17; Killick 2009:709-12, 2005:86-89).

As several authors state (Hvalkof & Veber 2005:160-63; Killick 2005, 2009), the traditional Ashéninka settlements have dispersed houses. This is a problem that the missionaries found, both the Franciscans as well as the more recent North Americans: they always tried to gather people in bigger settlements for their purpose of evangelization, and also of education in the North Americans' case (Hvalkof & Veber:153). As a result of everything that happened since the start of the

¹⁷ *Yuca* is the Spanish name, and it is also used in English, although it seems that less frequently than the other two.

recolonization and the rubber boom in the second half of the 19th century, anyone travelling to an Ashéninka community will not notice a dispersed settlement but a group of houses, not very close to each other (a minimum distance of 4-5 m of separation), while some of them can be further away. However, I was told that some members of the communities do not live in the main settlement but in the forest; actually, this is told in one of the glossed texts in Annex 2 (the conversation CTK). Killick (2005, 2009) researches this dispersed settlement and its implications for the Ashéninka way of living in detail.

Regarding education, most native communities have at least a primary school, and some also offer secondary education. The Ministry of Education provides very detailed maps online that show which level of education is offered in each community.¹⁸ In indigenous communities, the Ministry of Education carries out the so-called *Educación Intercultural Bilingüe* (EIB) ‘Bilingual Intercultural Education’, which should allow that indigenous children are taught and learn to read and write in their own language and Spanish. In Ashéninka communities, the implementation of the EIB faces the problems related to the very recent recognition of Ashéninka as a different language from Asháninka (in April 2019). Once the language has been recognised, the Ministry of Education should produce schoolbooks for EIB schools. In October 2021, I was told by phone that these books had not yet been produced, but later, in July 2022, I was told that they were already in use in the schools of the Ashéninka communities. Another complaint is that non-Ashéninka teachers are often sent to EIB schools, so, if the teacher cannot speak Ashéninka, no instruction can be given in the language. To fill this gap, the indigenous university UCSS-Nopoki,¹⁹ which offers a degree in EIB teaching, has been functioning since 2008 in Atalaya. Moreover, three other degrees are offered: Administration, Accountancy and Forestry. Nopoki offered the degree in EIB teaching in Ashéninka long before the Ministry of Education recognised it as an independent language, thus tackling the problem before

¹⁸ The maps for the Ucayali Department can be downloaded at escale.minedu.gob.pe/carta-educativa/-/document_library_display/z0Kj/view/1367949. Accessed in June 2022.

¹⁹ *Nopoki* means in all Ashé-Ashá varieties ‘I come’. The glossing in UP Ashéninka is no-pok-i (1s-come-FRS). UCSS stands for Universidad Católica Sedes Sapientae, a private Catholic university with headquarters in Lima, of which Nopoki is a campus in Atalaya.

the Ministry (it was already being taught during my first field trip in 2015). Besides for Ashéninka, this degree is also offered for Asháninka, Nomatsigenga, Matsigenka, Yine, Yanesha' and Shipibo teachers. Nopoki has been most helpful during my fieldwork. They offered me any help I needed, lent me books to make copies and allowed me to attend the Ashéninka classes, where I could actively participate – actually, some of my glossed texts are from recordings of Nopoki students. This university offers the youth of the area around Atalaya the opportunity to acquire a university degree, which otherwise would be impossible for them. All the students of the EIB teacher program study with grants awarded by the university.

1.2. The language

This section is divided into five subsections that treat different aspects of Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka. Section 1.2.1 discusses the genetic affiliation of the language in relation to the other Campan languages. Section 1.2.2 deals with the Ashé-Ashá dialect continuum. Section 1.2.3 examines the previous works on the different varieties of the Ashé-Ashá dialect continuum. Section 1.2.4 deals with the sociolinguistic situation of the language, and lastly, Section 1.2.5 is a typological sketch of the language in which the most defining features are summed up.

1.2.1. Genetic affiliation


Ashéninka belongs to the Campan branch of the Arawak language family, which is also called *Maipuran*. Some scholars, namely Michael (2020) and O'Hagan (2020), have recently replaced the name *Campan* with *Nihagantsi* or *Nijagantsi* (pronounced [ni'hagantsi]), which is thought to be the Proto-Campan/Nihagantsi/Nijagantsi word for 'language' –in UP Ashéninka, this word is *ñaantsi*, which can be segmented as *ñaan-ntsi* (language-ALI). In this thesis, I will use the names *Arawak/Arawakan* and *Campan* only because I think that they are the easiest to recognise for most readers, even those unfamiliar with these languages.

As regards the internal classification of the Arawakan languages, Nikulin & De Carvalho (2019:269) highlight the absence of a classification based on shared innovations and say that most classifications are based on geographical criteria

(Aikhenvald 1999:67-71) or shared lexical retentions (D. Payne 1991). Nikulin & De Carvalho (2019:269-72) present a division of the Arawakan family into eleven groups based on lexical and grammatical similarities and explain these similarities for each group. However, they add (p. 269) that “é pouco provável que o Proto-Aruak tenha se dividido em 11 línguas/ramos descendentes simultaneamente, porém a existência de agrupamentos mais abrangentes nunca foi formalmente demonstrada, uma tarefa que deverá ser assumida em futuras pesquisas.”²⁰ D. Payne 1991 is actually based on shared lexical retentions, but it is indeed a detailed and laborious comparative work. Classifications done with computational methods are carried out by Walker & Ribeiro (2011) and Danielsen, Dunn & Muysken (2011). In any case, as Nikulin & De Carvalho (2019:269) say, a sound classification of the Arawak family based on shared innovations is yet to come.

The Campan languages form an indisputable group, given that the languages are very similar and quite different from other Arawakan languages. Regarding the internal classification of the group, Michael (2011) is the only proposal based on phonetic changes. Chen (2019) carries out a phonological reconstruction of Proto-Campa. Michael’s (2011) proposal yields the tree in Figure 1, which indicates the phonological changes that he proposed for each split.

Figure 1. Internal classification of Campan languages according to Michael (2011:3).



²⁰ ‘it is unlikely that Proto-Arawak split into 11 languages/branches simultaneously, but the existence of more extensive groups was never formally demonstrated, a task that will have to be assumed in future research.’

As can be seen in Figure 1, the Campan languages are Nanti, Matsigenka, Caquinte, Nomatsigenka and the Ashé-Ashá dialect continuum. The location of these languages is shown on Map 3, where the Ashé-Ashá dialect continuum is divided into the three languages proposed in Pedrós (2018:26-27; Section 1.2.2 of this thesis).

Map 3. Location of the Campan languages with their relative situation in the map of Peru below. Language boundaries (in grey) are based on the language map for Peru in the 21st edition of the Ethnologue (Simons & Fennig 2018). The language division of the Ashé-Ashá cluster is based on Pedrós (2018:26-27). Language names are in green.



1.2.2. The Ashé-Ashá dialect continuum

When someone wants to get information about Ashéninka in the Ethnologue (Eberhard, Simons & Fennig 2022) or the Glottolog (Hammarström et al. 2022) (the Glottolog is based on the Ethnologue in this respect), they will find that there are five reported languages with the name *Ashéninka*, plus one with the name *Ajyíninka*, which is also called *Ashéninka* in other sources, among them the Spanish version of its only grammar (Payne, Payne & Sánchez 1982). Then, one may wonder whether these are six different languages or dialects of the same language, but the Ethnologue lists languages, not dialects, and, in the Glottolog, they are registered as languages, not as dialects, so they should be considered languages despite the same name. To complicate things, there is another listed language with the almost identical name *Asháninka*. When I first travelled to Atalaya in 2015, a yet added complication was that the language named *South Ucayali* did not appear in the Ethnologue's map of the languages of Peru and was described as *spurious* in the Glottolog. My initial mission was to research the so-called *Ucayali-Yurúa Ashéninka*, although it was open to changes depending on what I might find. When I arrived in Atalaya and started speaking with members of indigenous organizations and of the university Nopoki, I was most puzzled when I discovered that the Ministry of Education of Peru recognised only one language, with the seven aforementioned (all varieties of Ashéninka plus Asháninka) allegedly being dialects of the same language. Then I heard an overall complaint that the Ashéninkas from the Ucayali and the Gran Pajonal, the Ashéninka areas closest to Atalaya, could not understand the Asháninka standard used by the government in the schoolbooks sent to Ashéninka communities to implement the EIB. Actually, the children were taught in a language that they could not understand, though very similar to the one in use in their community. However, the university Nopoki taught an Ashéninka standard (not recognised by the Ministry of Education), just following the common sense of everyone in the area with a little knowledge on the matter, who perfectly knew that Ashéninka and Asháninka clearly are two different languages. Moreover, it was evident to me that the languages spoken in the Upper Ucayali and the Gran Pajonal were identical with slight variations, and I did not have any doubt of the veracity of this since I knew that my Ucayali consultants

could trace their ancestors in the Gran Pajonal as recently as the mid-20th century – too short a time for a language to evolve so as to become a different language. With this panorama before me, I felt that the first thing I needed to set to work on a language was to get a better idea of what this language was, i.e. which might be its territorial scope and what might make it different from other close languages, for which I needed to have an overview of the whole dialectal continuum. With this goal, I set to research the matter, resulting in my article Pedrós (2018).

The languages known as *Asháninka* and *Ashéninka* form a dialect continuum, broken in some areas and with some varieties mixed in other areas. The dialectal situation is quite complicated and would require much fieldwork in many places to obtain a sound picture of the situation. In my article, I tried to present the general overview that can be drawn from the literature and my inquiries in the field, but it must be regarded as a first approximation to a complex dialectal situation. The main conclusions of the article are presented in the following paragraph.

We can say that the dialectal continuum has two languages if we apply the principle of mutual intelligibility and count the number of languages as defined by Hammarström (2008:37): “The number of languages in X is the least k such that one can partition X into k blocks such that all members within a block understand each other.”²¹ In this way, the speakers of the whole Ashé-Ashá continuum could be divided into two groups inside which everyone would understand each other. However, it would be complicated to establish an isogloss that might be the boundary between these two groups. Nevertheless, there are two important isoglosses that might divide the whole continuum into three groups: the isoglosses /ti/-/tsi/ (e.g. /a'tiri/-/a'tsiri/ ‘person’) and /h/-/s/ (e.g. /a'hankane/-/a'sankane/ ‘heart’). Therefore, I propose the division of the Ashé-Ashá group into three groups or languages with the names *Ashéninka*, *Asháninka* and *Northern Ashé-Ashá*. The article also tackles the contradictions existing in the self-denominations in the Northern Ashé-Ashá group (/a'ʃaninka/, /a'ʃeninka/, /a'ʃininka/ or /a'çininka/), which are the cause of the name *Ashé-Ashá*, thought to encompass the different self-denominations. I also propose the order of the different varieties by similarity, which is

²¹ X is a dialect continuum.

Asháninka – Alto Perené – Pichis – Apurucayali – Yuruá – Ucayali – Pajonal, so that Asháninka and Pajonal are the linguistically most distant varieties.

The grounds that lead to these conclusions are detailed throughout the article (Pedrós 2018). The Glottolog (Hammarström et al. 2022) distinguishes seven languages in the dialect continuum but reflects my division into three main groups. The isoglosses of the dialect continuum are shown in Map 4. The phonological representation of the words used in Map 4 are in Table 1, with the different varieties ordered in the three proposed main groups of the dialect continuum.

Map 4. Isoglosses of the Ashé-Ashá dialect continuum (taken from Pedrós [2018:14]; there is a mistake in the word *kameetha* in the Apurucayali area, which should be *kamiitha*).



Table 1. Phonological representation of words from Map 4 ordered in the three main groups of the Ashé-Ashá dialect continuum (adapted from Pedrós [2018:15])

Asháninka	Northern Ashé-Ashá				Ashéninka	English
Tambo-Ene	Alto Perené	Pichis	Apurucayali	Yuruá	Ucayali-Pajonal	
/a'tiri/	/a'tsiri/	/a'tsiri/	/a'tsiri/	/a'tsiri/	/a'tsiri/	'person'
/a'sankane/	/a'sankane/	/a'sankane/	/a'sankani/	/a'sankane/ /a'hankane/	/a'hankane/	'heart'
/ka'me:tsa/	/ka'me:tsa/	/ka'me:tʰa/	/ka'mi:tʰa/	/ka'me:tʰa/	/ka'me:tʰa/	'good/well'
/an'taro/	/an'taro/	/an'taro/	/an'tawo/	/an'tawo/	/an'tawo/	'big' (feminine)
/no'wori/	/no'wori/	/no'pori/	/no'pori/	/no'pori/	/no'pori/	'my leg'

I still made a field trip after the article was published. During this field trip and based on accounts about migrations in the area, I came to the idea that Asháninka (the Tambo-Ene variety) and the Gran Pajonal variety may be the sources of the rest of the dialects, i.e. that the rest of the dialects would be a mix of Asháninka and the Gran Pajonal variety in different degrees, taking into account that the Upper Ucayali is practically an extension of the Gran Pajonal, as is mentioned in Section 1.1.1, although the Ucayali speech has some Tambo influences. The Gran Pajonal variety is more innovative than the Tambo-Ene one,²² so my working hypothesis is that the people of the Gran Pajonal, located on a relatively isolated high plateau, carried out language innovations that made the language quite different from the one spoken by the rivers Tambo, Ene and Perené. The *pajonalinos* would have migrated at different stages, mainly to the Ucayali, but also to the Pichis-Pachitea Valley and further to the east until the Yuruá basin. People from the Tambo-Ene-Perené area would have also migrated mainly to the Pichis-Pachitea Valley and also to the Ucayali and the vast area to the east until the Yuruá. The result of different migrations at different moments in time would be the present dialectal situation. This is a tentative hypothesis based on the linguistic situation in accordance with oral accounts about migrations, but I think that it may approach the truth quite well. Actually, there is no doubt that the Upper Ucayali speech is that of the Gran Pajonal with a few influences from the Tambo-Ene, as some Tambo-Ene words showing up in my glossed texts show.

²² Some phonetic innovations, as s>h, t>ts and the subsequent ts>tsʰ in _i position and ts>tʰ in other positions, according to the known common direction of phonetic changes, must have taken place in the direction indicated here and not the other way round.

Whether the varieties from the Perené, Pichis and Apurucayali conform to this hypothesis is yet to be seen.

1.2.3. Previous works

There is nearly nothing written about Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka. Heitzman (1973) works with word lists from different locations of the whole Campan area known at that time (Nanti was still unknown), and some of the sites are in the Gran Pajonal (Tsireentsishavo and Obenteni) and the Ucayali (Shinipo and Chicosa) (pp. 1-3). Heitzman (1991) also writes about how Pajonal Ashéninka narratives are organized and what narrative resources they use –by the way, Allene Heitzman did work with my principal consultant. A more recent work based on the speech of the Gran Pajonal is Fernández (2011), devoted to discourse connectors. To my knowledge, these are all the works based on the speech of the Gran Pajonal, and there is nothing based on the speech of the Upper Ucayali. García (1997) is a grammar sketch that, according to its title, is based on “ashéninka del Ucayali”, but the fieldwork is done in the Yuruá. García uses the name “Ucayali” to refer to the Ethnologue’s Ucayali-Yurúa (for the extent of this variety, see Pedrós 2018:13-14).

Regarding other close Ashé-Ashá varieties, there are several works from 1980 onwards by the married couple David and Judith Payne, members of the ILV, above all on the varieties of the Pichis Valley (Pichis and Apurucayali), but they also mention features of Ucayali-Yuruá and Alto Perené, often named by them just “Ucayali” and “Perené”, respectively. D. Payne (1980) is a multidialectal dictionary that includes words from Pichis, Apurucayali and Ucayali-Yuruá. The first grammar written by the Paynes is D. Payne’s (1981) grammar of Apurucayali, which he calls “Axininka Campa”. A version in Spanish followed one year later co-authored by his wife and Jorge Sánchez Santos (Payne, Payne & Sánchez 1982) and with the name “asheninca del Apurucayali” for the language. This grammar only treats phonology and morphology, but not syntax, and is specially concentrated in phonology: Payne (1981) has 48 pages for morphology and 117 for phonology; Payne, Payne & Sánchez (1982) has 47 pages for morphology and 150 for phonology. Some years later, J. Payne published a textbook (Payne 1989), which is very useful as a descriptive

grammar due to the grammar section of every lesson. Other works by the Paynes describing aspects of Ashé-Ashá varieties (mainly Pichis) are J. Payne (1982, 1983) on directionals; D. Payne & Ballena (1983), a book with six chapters, five of which are written by the Paynes, that study different aspects of Pichis; J. Payne (1990; 1991) on stress; D. Payne (2001) on causatives, and Payne & Payne (2005) on the construction with the subject marked with a suffix.

A variety more distant from Ucayali-Pajonal is Alto Perené, which has the most comprehensive grammar of a Campan language in Mihas (2015*a*), an enlargement of Mihas' (2010) doctoral dissertation. Moreover, Mihas has written several articles on Alto Perené and has given several talks about Tambo-Ene (Asháninka), whose papers (Mihas 2015*b*, 2015*c*, 2016) can be found online. Also on Tambo-Ene, there is a dictionary with a list of affixes by Lee Kindberg (1980), a member of the ILV, and two chapters in the same volume by Lee Kindberg (1961) on sentence types and by Willard Kindberg (1961) on morphology.

The textbooks published by the indigenous university UCSS-Nopoki are also worth mentioning. This thesis makes some references to the older books Casique (2012) for Ashéninka and Zumaeta (2012) for Asháninka. These textbooks have been updated in the newer textbooks Zerdin, Casique & Casique (2018) for Ashéninka and Zumaeta & Zerdin (2018) for Asháninka. There is an unpublished Ashéninka textbook, which I have put in the references list as Cacique & Zerdin (2016). I got a copy of this book during my second field trip in 2016, but it was actually a draft for the later published Zerdin, Casique & Casique (2018); thus, it contains many mistakes, so I was checking a large part of the book with speakers and corrected the mistakes. In some cases, I make references to this book, all of which were checked with speakers.

There are some older works. Sala (1905) is a dictionary, grammar and catechism of “*inga, amueixa y campa*” (Quechua, Yanesha' and Campa). As is described in Section 1.1.2.4, Sala explored the Campa area at the end of the 19th century commissioned by the Peruvian government. Adam (1890) reproduces an anonymous manuscript found by Charles Leclerc in Toledo with a grammar sketch and a dictionary, accompanied by an introduction by Adam comparing Campa with other Arawakan languages. The manuscript in Adam (1890) describes the Asháninka area,

and some words in the dictionary are obviously from this area (e.g. “maniti” vs *manitzi* in the rest of Ashé-Ashá). Sala (1905) does not mention the place where he gathered the information for his dictionary and grammar. We know that Sala explored the Gran Pajonal, but the words in the dictionary point to the main origin from Alto Perené, although some words appear to be from other varieties, and even some show different forms from different varieties.²³

There are several Bachelor’s (*licenciatura*) theses by Peruvian students, mainly at the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos and the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, both in Lima.²⁴ Most of them deal with the Alto Perené variety. I was told that the reason for this is that this is the Ashé-Ashá area closest to Lima by road.

1.2.4. Present situation

The Base de Datos de Pueblos Indígenas (BDPI) of the Peruvian Ministry of Culture allows downloading a spreadsheet with data of all the indigenous communities of Peru from the 2017 census.²⁵ According to this census, 15,789 persons live in indigenous communities that identify themselves as Ashéninka, of which 14,111 are able to speak

²³ Words as “ochichi” (*ótsitzi* ‘dog’) and “achiri” (*atziri* ‘person’) clearly are not Asháninka (the Asháninka cognates are *otsiti* and *atiri*). Words as “asangani” (*asánkani* ‘heart’) and “sani” ‘wasp’ clearly are not Ucayali-Pajonal, in which these words are *ahánkane* and *hani*. In this way, we can identify a Northern Ashé-Ashá origin of the words in the dictionary. What makes me think of Alto Perené is the word for ‘hospital’: “ihuanko-manchari” (*iwanko mantsiyari*, i-panko mantsiya-ri, 3M-house ill-M). The lenition of /p/ to /w/ after a possessive prefix only occurs in Alto Perené and Asháninka, so, discarding Asháninka due to the previously mentioned features, we have just Alto Perené. However, some words show /i/ where /e/ should be expected, as “ti” ‘no’ (*tee* in UP Ashéninka, with a clear /e/), and the dictionary shows “asheninga” (*ashéninka*) with the translation “compatriota”. I show in Pedrós (2018:10) that the Alto Perené spoken in the mountains has only three vowels, so that /i/ and /e/ merge in /i/, but “asheninga” in the dictionary has /e/, which suggests that this word and “ti” belong to different varieties, although maybe geographically very close. Moreover, Sala gives two forms for “cedro” ‘cedar’: “santari” and “jantari” (*hantari*, which in UP Ashéninka means ‘wood’), with the difference /s/-/h/, which separates UP Ashéninka from the other Ashé-Ashá varieties. My conclusion is that Sala’s dictionary has words from different varieties, but mainly from Alto Perené.

²⁴ These theses can be searched online on cybertesis.unmsm.edu.pe/ for the San Marcos University and on repositorio.pucp.edu.pe/index/handle/123456789/6 for the Pontificia. Accessed in June 2022.

²⁵ The link to download the file is bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/buscador-de-localidades-de-pueblos-indigenas. Accessed in June 2022.

(older than 3 years), of which 12,605 claim to be able to speak an indigenous language and 8,219 identify themselves as being part of an indigenous people. Moreover, there are 10 communities identified as Ashéninka/Asháninka (people from both ethnic groups are reported to live in the same community), 5 as Ashéninka/Shipibo-Konibo and 1 as Ashéninka/Chitonaua. The inhabitants of these 16 communities total 2,243 inhabitants, of which 2,025 can speak, of which 1,220 claim to be able to speak an indigenous language and 825 identify themselves as belonging to an indigenous people. If we count the people living in communities self-identified only as Ashéninka, 89% claim to be able to speak the language and 58% consider themselves ethnic Ashéninkas. The reading of these numbers suggests that 31% of the population of Ashéninka communities are mestizos who can speak Ashéninka. However, a member of the community of Apinihua told me that roughly half of the people in his community speak Ashéninka and half speak Spanish, but the BDPI spreadsheet says that 99% of the people able to speak in this community claim to be able to speak an indigenous language. The reason for this disparity is probably due to what one claims to be able to speak: one can claim to be able to speak Ashéninka, but maybe they cannot speak it fluently, or do not normally speak it, or can speak only a bit, but do not use it as a means of regular communication because they are not able to do it.

Counting half of the people of mixed communities, there should be around 13,000 Ashéninka speakers. Considering the account of the Ashéninka speaking people in Apinihua and transposing the same situation to the whole of the Ashéninka area, there should be around 7,000 active speakers, i.e. that can speak the language fluently. Another problem comes from the matter of the self-denomination in the Pichis Valley, as I explain in Pedrós (2018:8-10) and as can be observed in Map 1, where a tiny area (maybe only one community) is depicted as self-denominated Ashéninka in the Pichis Valley.

Another issue is how many speakers Ucayali-Pajonal has, which is practically impossible to know. The census indicates each community's district, so we can count only the communities in the districts Raymondi, Tahuanía and Puerto Bermúdez, where the Gran Pajonal and the Upper Ucayali are placed –also the Pichis Valley and a small part of the Gran Pajonal are in Puerto Bermúdez district, but all the Ashéninka

communities in Puerto Bermúdez in the BDPI spreadsheet are in the Gran Pajonal. So the figures for Ashéninka communities only in those three districts are 14,669 inhabitants and 13,114 older than three years, of which 11,843 claim to be able to speak an indigenous language and 7,731 consider themselves part of an indigenous people. These figures mean that 90% claim to be able to speak the language and 59% identify themselves as belonging to an indigenous people. The figures are very similar to those shown above for all the communities self-identified as Ashéninka, and the reason is that the Ashéninka communities outside these three districts have a very small population. With all this, it seems that Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka may have between 7,000 and 12,000 speakers, and the big difference between both figures may correspond to people who have some knowledge of the language but are not fluent and do not use it regularly.

Regarding my own experience, I was working with Nopoki students (from 17 to 21 years old) and can say that they speak the language fluently and use it to talk to each other, and most of them hailed from Chicosa, the biggest Ashéninka community and with a daily passenger boat service to and from Atalaya, thus quite open to mestizo influence. However, their speech shows a more significant influence from Spanish than that of older speakers phonetically (e.g. the difference between /tʰ/ and /c/ is clearly noticeable in older speakers, but, in younger speakers, both phonemes get close in a tendency towards a Spanish-like /tʃ/), morphologically and syntactically. A strange mistake showed up when transcribing a conversation between two youngsters with an older consultant. The consultant noticed that one of the speakers used the word *piyáariri* ‘your brother’ addressing a man, but this word denotes a female possessor; later, the speaker used *pirentzi*, with the same meaning, but for a male possessor; then I realized that they were using these words with the meanings ‘your brother’ and ‘your sister’, respectively, so that it seems that the Ashéninka kinship system with different words for male and female possessors is being reinterpreted in a Spanish fashion, i.e. with words that denote the kin relationship independently of the possessor’s sex. I was talking with the teacher for Secondary Education in the community of Unini Cascada, and he said that a minority of his students could speak well in Ashéninka: just those whose parents spoke in Ashéninka to them. I was also told in the nearby community

of Diamante Azul that Ashéninka is not spoken to little children. All in all, Ashéninka can be said to have a certain vitality, but the transmission to children is starting to become interrupted in some households, and the youngsters' language is being modified, radically in some respects, as the one described above, under the influence of Spanish.

1.2.5. Typological sketch

Ashéninka, like the other Campan languages, is a highly agglutinative language, which means that each morpheme contains a piece of grammatical information, so that fusion is practically non-existent since it occurs only in 3rd person subject and object affixes, where the same morpheme expresses person and gender. This agglutinative morphology is used mainly in the verb, while the morphology for nouns and adjectives is much more limited: a noun or an adjective can bear a maximum of two suffixes or enclitics. However, as attested in my text corpus, a verb can host two prefixes and up to six suffixes or enclitics (I have four words with six suffixes and one with five suffixes plus one enclitic), which does not exclude that verbs with a higher number of suffixes might be possible, although I think that it is improbable that a verb with seven or eight suffixes or enclitics shows up in a natural text. An example of a verb with six suffixes is in (1) (in bold).

- (1) Nokoyi niyoti iita **pikàemakáanantakinàri**.
 no-koy-i n-iyó-t-i iita pi-kaem-aka-anant-ak-i-na-ri
 1S-want-FRS 1S-know-&-IRR WH 2S-call-CAUS-RES-PFV-FRS-1O-REL
 'I want to know why you had me called.' (CTK)

The verb *pikàemakáanantakinàri* has six suffixes: causative, resultative, perfective, reality status (fossilized), object and relative. However, the only obligatory suffix is the one that expresses reality status, which is fossilized in roughly half of the verbs (Pedrós 2019:26; Section 6.1.3 of this thesis).²⁶ The subject prefix is quasi-obligatory but can be dropped in some cases. The other possible prefix is a causative. The categories expressed by the verbal suffixes can be reality status (RS), modality, subject and object, person, gender (only in 3rd person), aspect, relativity, deixis,

²⁶ However, any reality status opposition is neutralized with the progressive, future and participle suffixes, so there is actually no reality status category in verbs with these suffixes.

directionality, number, cause-consequence, participial, impersonal, applicative, conditional, interrogative, causative, tense, reciprocity, adjectival (classifier-like), adverbial, subordinating and others poorly attested. In total, I have identified 55 verbal suffixes and 4 verbal enclitics (all listed in Annex 1).

The boundary between affixes and clitics is not always clear, even though one can find in the literature the conditions that a clitic must fulfil. We cannot forget that many suffixes derive from words that one day became clitics, which then became suffixes, and shifting from one category to the other one was not done overnight. When assigning to a morpheme the condition of enclitic (there are no proclitics in the language), I have adopted a conservative stance: my main criterion has been to consider that a morpheme is an enclitic when it acts as a quasi-word. In this way, there are very few enclitics: the demonstrative enclitics, the locative =*ki*, the conditional =*rika*, the interrogative =*ka*, the plural =*paeni*, the emphatics =*kya* and =*tya*, the dubitative =*ma* and the exclamative =*wee*. They not only can have different hosts but can change their host inside the same phrase without a change in meaning, and they usually receive a secondary stress in their position at the end of the word. An example is in (2) with the exclamative =*wee*, which is attached to a Spanish sentence.

- (2) *Allí estáwée.*
 allí está=*wee*
 there is=EXCL
 ‘There it is!’ (CCPC)

The enclitic character of =*wee* is clear because it does not matter to which host it is attached: it can be attached even to a sentence in another language and continues expressing an exclamation. Actually, this enclitic has several uses: it is used as a greeting (to say ‘good morning’, etc.), to say ‘thank you’, to announce that one is arriving and other meanings (see Section 4.1.5.6). For the rest of the enclitics, a certain number of features also cast little doubt on their being labelled as such.

Reduplication of the verb stem can be used to express iterativity but it is not frequent. Classifiers appear to have been lost, but leaving some traces. Composition and incorporation are rare, but they do occur, above all with adjectives.

Regarding phonology, a salient feature of Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka is the contrast between /ts/ and /ts^h/, which occur only before /i/. This feature also exists in

Northern Ashé-Ashá but in no other Campan language. The exclusive feature of Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka is the absence of /s/ in its inventory: /h/ occurs where other Campan languages have /s/, which clearly shows a diachronic development /s/ > /h/. Like all Campan languages, Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka uses an epenthetic /t/ to avoid vowel clusters and /a/ to avoid consonant clusters. The vowel inventory comprises four vowels: /a/, /e/, /i/, and /o/. The language has no voiced plosives, fricatives or affricates. The syllable structure is (C)V(V)(N). A word has minimally two morae and can be quite long, above all verbs (the longest verbs in my corpus have up to eleven syllables). The stress is not contrastive and follows a complex and loose pattern, i.e. it is not rigidly followed.

Nouns have an inherent gender based on sex and animacy. Men, male animals and animate beings of unknown sex are classified with a gender, which I call *masculine*; women, female animals, things and abstract concepts are classified with the other gender, which I call *feminine*. There is a nominal plural enclitic that is not obligatory with plural references. Nouns are differentiated by the category of alienability, and the difference lies in the different possessive morphology for alienable and inalienable nouns. The possessed precedes the possessor. The kin vocabulary is quite complex, given that a kin term can be expressed by four different words: a vocative with male and female ego, and a possessed form with male and female possessor. Nouns can host verbal suffixes (tense and aspect) and act as predicates. Demonstratives and quantifiers (numerals and non-numerals) precede the noun. Adjectives can precede or follow the noun, but it seems that the position before the noun is more frequent (two thirds of the occurrences in my text corpus).

Adjectives are of the type that have some grammatical properties of verbs and some of nouns. A small group that denote human properties is inflected with gender. Adjectives can host nominal and verbal suffixes and enclitics.

There is a set of full pronouns, but there are no plural pronouns except an inclusive one: plurality is inferred from the context, or the nominal plural enclitic can be used, and the same applies to pronominal verbal affixes. There is a set of demonstratives with three degrees of distance plus an absential demonstrative. There are no articles. The set of numerals is quite small, and only three are known by all

speakers, while some speakers know more numerals but not higher than ten. The interrogative words present the noteworthy feature that an interrogative can express different meanings, and the same meaning can be expressed by different interrogatives. There is a small set of adpositions, which can be used in pre- or post-position, but the pre-position is more common. There is a large set of ideophones, and some fillers, which are frequently used.

The alignment is generally nominative-accusative and is expressed with verbal subject prefixes and object suffixes, but the subject of intransitive and transitive verbs can also be marked with a suffix instead of a prefix in a special verbal construction, which yields a complex alignment system that is studied in detail in Section 6.2.2.

As in the other Campan languages, verbs belong to one of two classes called *A-class* and *I-class*, with the latter being the largest by far. The name comes from the realis RS suffix (-a and -i). I-class verbs acquire a reflexive meaning when inflected with an A-class suffix. The verb does not have a category of tense, although there are some suffixes that denote tense, but all of them are optionally used. Aspect marking is much more extended, although, as said above, the only obligatory suffix is the RS. Verbs can be marked with a series of directionals that can have spatial and also aspecto-temporal meanings. The verbal suffixes and enclitics have a fixed order, which is tackled in Section 6.8.

The language has several existentials and copulas.

The constituents' order is AVO in clauses with transitive verbs in which the two arguments are expressed with an NP, but this order is not rigid, so that a few VAO, OVA and VOA clauses are attested in natural texts. When only the subject is expressed with an NP, both orders, AV and VA, and SV and VS in clauses with intransitive verbs, are equally frequent. Regarding the position of the verb vs the object, the verb after the object is only attested in very few OVA clauses.

Verbs in imperative clauses receive no special marking, but the verb is marked irrealis, given that a command is an irrealis situation (the event is not actualized). Verbs in subordinate clauses receive no marking that differentiates them from verbs in main clauses, and irrealis marking occurs only when the situation is irrealis (e.g. in subordinate clauses in a desiderative construction).

1.3. Fieldwork carried out and the process of writing this thesis

This section explains where and when the fieldwork was carried out (Section 1.3.1), how the whole process of writing the thesis developed and who the consultants were (Section 1.3.2).

1.3.1. Time and location of fieldwork

The fieldwork was not without complications, mainly due to the lack of funding, which was only obtained for travel expenses for the last field trip in 2019 from the Leids Universiteits Fonds and the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics. The result is that the fieldwork time was much shorter than desirable, but this was partly balanced out due to three reasons: 1) I was working mainly with speakers literate in their own language; 2) some works of close Ashé-Ashá varieties have been very helpful (mainly David Payne's [1980] multidialectal dictionary and Judith Payne's [1989] textbook based on Pichis), and 3) on my first field trip in 2015, the coordinator of the bilingual teacher training programme of Nopoki University, Juan Rubén Ruiz Zevallos, gave me a copy of the textbook used for the Ashéninka class in Nopoki; this book was a kind of draft since it had several mistakes, but it was very useful for me because I checked the whole book with my consultants and, in this way, I was able to progress faster in the knowledge of the language; this book was never published because a new revised and very enlarged textbook (Zerdin, Casique & Casique, 2018) was published later.

The fieldwork was carried out over 2 weeks in 2015, 3 in 2016, 4 in 2017 and 4 in 2019, always in October, totalling 13 weeks (91 days). I was working in the town of Atalaya with two expeditions to Ashéninka communities (an unfruitful one in 2017 and a fruitful one in 2019). I was staying in small hotels –actually, all hotels in Atalaya are small. Atalaya is a small mestizo settlement with roughly 13,000 inhabitants at the place where the rivers Tambo and Urubamba join to form the Ucayali. It is the capital of the province of Atalaya, with around 44,000 inhabitants, of which roughly 3,000 live in the other mestizo settlements of Bolognesi, Sepahua and Breu, capitals of the provincial districts. The remaining 28,000 inhabitants of the province live mainly in

indigenous communities scattered throughout the province, which has an extension similar to that of the Netherlands and is almost totally covered by tropical forest (except small agricultural fields called *chacras* in local Spanish). Thus, the little riverine town of Atalaya is the political, administrative and commercial hub for a vast area of indigenous territory.

The trip to Atalaya from Lima can be made quite straightforwardly by plane, which is how I travelled during all my trips. One has to fly first from Lima to Pucallpa, with several airlines covering this one-hour route. These flights can be booked easily online. In Pucallpa, there are some companies (from only one to three during my different trips) that fly daily in light planes (around ten passengers) to Atalaya, and the trip takes one hour. These flights cannot be booked online: one has to phone the company and needs a Peruvian phone number because, when in Pucallpa, you are called the afternoon before the flight and are told at what time you have to be at the airport –but some hours later they may call you again to change the time. In Atalaya, this is yet funnier: you wait the morning of the flight until they call you and tell you that it is time for you to go to the airport because the plane has already set off from Pucallpa. The travel by road is a very long one. From Lima to Satipo, according to Google Maps, the trip takes 10 hours and 435 km by car. The last 220 km from Satipo to Atalaya take 7 hours on an unpaved road –Google Maps says that it takes 4:24 hours, but everyone in Atalaya told me that it takes 7 hours. From Lima to Satipo, there are bus services, and, from Satipo to Atalaya, the journey in public transport has to be done in a 4WD pickup truck as the one in which I travelled to the communities by the Unini River (related below). In these cars, one can travel in the cab or on the cargo, where all kinds of merchandise are transported, including living hens. On my first field trip in 2015, I was told that the road had been built only recently. The Ucayali is a busy way, with goods and people constantly travelling along by boat, including several passenger companies. I know that people travel to the Ucayali communities by boat, but one can travel until Pucallpa and even further. I do not know how much time this trip can take, but, considering the numerous meanders in the Ucayali, it must be a very long time.

1.3.2. Process of writing the thesis and consultants

At the beginning of this project, after my first field trip in 2015, I wanted to apply for a grant so that I would be able to ask for a temporary leave of two or three years from my job as a translator and devote this time entirely to doing fieldwork and writing a grammar. Unfortunately, this was not possible due to complex administrative problems. Ultimately, in February 2017, in a meeting with my supervisors, we decided that the thesis would be composed of a sketch grammar plus two or three published articles, for one of which I had already written a draft (Pedrós 2018). Initially, we thought that the shortage of time for fieldwork would allow me to write only a sketch grammar, but the articles would deal with the relation of Ashéninka with the other Campan languages, so these articles would be based on the existing literature on these languages and would need little fieldwork. However, the two following field trips in 2017 and 2019 were extremely productive, so that the gathered information resulted in a grammar that grew much larger than what is expected of a sketch grammar, even without the articles. Finally, the present thesis consists of a grammar, my published article Pedrós (2019) (on reality status; Section 6.1) with a few adaptations, and the main conclusions of my article Pedrós (2018) (on dialectology of the Ashé-Ashá cluster; Section 1.2.2).

I arrived in Atalaya in 2015 with no idea of what a Peruvian native community was, with the recommendation by Lev Michael to research the so-called *Ucayali-Yurúa Ashéninka* and with a list of some contacts that might be helpful, which I got from a contact in Pucallpa, to whom I was referred by Roberto Zariquiey, from the Pontificia University in Lima. During this exploratory trip, I got in touch with the indigenous university UCSS-Nopoki and the indigenous organizations URPIA and CORPIAA. Nopoki was most willing to cooperate with me, as well as the people I met in both indigenous organizations, so I started my fieldwork recording basic words and some basic sentences, not only with Ashéninka speakers but also with Asháninkas, since the subject of the thesis had not yet been determined. During this first fieldwork, I met the Ashéninka speakers with whom I would mostly work on the next field trips.

Instead of giving the exact age of the consultants, I will group them into three broad categories: young (18 to 21 years), middle (35 to 45 years) and older (from 60

to 90 years). These age categories fit very well the differences I found in the use of the language. The difference between the younger and the older is evident in all aspects (phonetics, syntax, morphology, vocabulary...), but there is little difference between the middle and the old age group –actually, I only found the elision of /uɥ/ in middle age speakers and a difference in the interpretation of colours (see Section 5.2). I have to add that some speakers did not seem very happy when asked about their year of birth, and this is the reason for leaving out their exact age.

This grammar clearly has a main consultant. He is Rogelio Casique Flores, aka Chóokiro (Ashéninka name that denotes a kind of ant), older age, sadly deceased in November 2020 of cancer. I met him on my first field trip and worked with him during the other three. Four of my eleven glossed texts are from him, and he is the translator of most texts. He has a long history as a linguistic consultant, given that he worked with the ILV when he was younger. He was one of the five Ashéninka translators recognised by the Ministry of Culture²⁷, so he was literate in his language. He grew up in the community of Chicosa and told me that his grandparents emigrated from the Gran Pajonal in the 1950s.

Another key figure for the development of this grammar was Chóokiro's daughter Luzmila Casique Coronado, aka Chochoki 'sweet fruit', middle age group –I met them in different ways, and I knew later that they were father and daughter. She is the teacher of Ashéninka at the Nopoki university. She acted as a consultant in translation and transcription sessions of recorded texts and also participated in a conversation in an unplanned way. Nevertheless, her role in this grammar has mainly been to assist me in Nopoki. I could attend the Ashéninka classes and interact with the students, all of whom were Ashéninka native speakers. Chochoki also organized some classes to let me record some conversations between students. I met her on my first field trip and worked with her during the other field trips, and we have been in touch by phone while I have been working on the thesis at home. She is another of the five recognised Ashéninka translators.

²⁷ List in

bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/sites/default/files/archivos/lenguas/bdpi-lengua_-_asheninka_.pdf. In May 2021, the list had five translators, in June 2022, six. Chóokiro was still in the list in June 2022, even though he had died eighteen months ago.

Another of Chóokiro's daughters has also been my consultant. She is Tabea Casique Coronado, aka Hani 'wasp', middle age group. She helped with translating and transcribing some texts. She is an indigenous leader and, as a representative of AIDASEP, a member of the governing board of the COICA (Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica 'Coordinating Association of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon Basin'), an international umbrella association of indigenous organizations of the Amazon basin. I met her on my 2016 field trip and also worked with her in 2017, but she was in Quito working at the COICA headquarters during my 2019 trip. She is another of the five recognised Ashéninka translators.

Chóokiro, Chochoki and Hani are the translators of all the glossed texts, so I have worked with three of the five recognised Ashéninka translators. For me, their literacy was most helpful in speeding up the transcription process and taking into account the little time I had each time I was in the field. Their knowledge of the written language means that they know how every word is written, which is roughly equivalent to doing a phonological transcription. During my two last field trips, I had already become so acquainted with the Ashéninka phonology that I was able to write words by listening to the translating consultant pronouncing them slowly, but, even at the end of my last field trip, I was not always able to recognise the difference between /tsi/ and /tsʰi/, and I could always solve my doubt by asking whether it was written <tzi> or <tsi>, respectively, which the consultants always knew without hesitation. The difference between long and short vowels is also difficult to recognise, and, in this case, even they had to think for a while before answering. In any case, I do not doubt that my work would have been delayed if I had worked with speakers illiterate in Ashéninka.

Amalia Coronado, aka Mathawo 'thin', older age, mother of Chochoki and Hani, participated in a glossed conversation and helped with elicitations in 2016. She hails from Chicosa, and her parents, from the community of Unini, a bit upriver from Chicosa.

Some Nopoki students (all of them of the young age group) participated in conversations: they are Lindis Candy Cachique Vásquez, aka Thaampi 'butterfly'; Jándér (unknown surnames), aka Kamato 'dragonfly'; Ronaldo Cachique, aka

Mathari ‘thin’; Karen Román Torres, aka Hamani ‘paca’, and Gladys (unknown surnames) aka Otéyaki ‘flower’. Kamato hails from the community of Chanchamayo in the Tahuanía district (near the mestizo settlement of Bolognesi), and the other three hail from Chicosa. The parents of each of them hail from the same community as their children. Thaampi also helped with some questions about the language.

Two Nopoki students from the Yuruá area, Luz Clarita Gómez Pacaya and Remigio Mañaningo Ramos, also of the young age group, helped with some short questions that were very important to know some key features of the speech of the Yuruá (see Pedrós 2018:13-14).

Chochoki and Hani’s uncle and aunt, Florencio Pacaya Ríos, aka Píichotzi, and Amelia Andrés Gutiérrez, aka Cheroki (both Ashéninka names denote kinds of birds),²⁸ both of older age, participated in a recorded and glossed conversation and story in the community Unini Cascada, where Chochoki accompanied me. Both were born in the Gran Pajonal and moved to Unini when they were 10 and 8 years old, respectively. Their parents hailed from the Gran Pajonal except for Cheroki’s mother, who hailed from the Tambo River, which is reflected in some words that she uses.

Carlos Vásquez, of the middle age group, helped in 2016 in two elicitation sessions. He hails from the community of Boca Cocani, but grew up in Bellavista, a community very close to Boca Cocani. His parents also hailed from Bellavista.

The consultants were paid between 6 and 9 soles per hour, more in the last years and according to their experience. This amount was calculated based on the recommendation to pay the equivalent to a schoolteacher’s salary (I was told that a schoolteacher earns between 1,200 and 1,500 soles a month, and I calculated the corresponding amount per hour in a 40-hour working week).

During my 2015 field trip, I also worked with several people, some of them Asháninkas, whose names are not mentioned here because I worked with them in short sessions, and the results helped me to start to get familiar with the basics of the language but did not yield valuable results. Summing up, they were the teachers of two Asháninka communities, Nopoki’s Asháninka teacher, an Ashéninka living in

²⁸ These were the only Ashéninkas that introduced themselves with their Ashéninka names, and they only said their Spanish names when I asked them.

front of the FECONAPA building and two indigenous leaders who had participated in a meeting of URPIA (an Ashéninka and an Asháninka). In 2015, I also interviewed Kamato (mentioned above) and another Nopoki student (a girl) and started working with Chóokiro.

During my 2016 field trip, it was already clear that I was going to concentrate on Ashéninka, so I did not work with Asháninka speakers anymore. I continued working mainly with Chóokiro and in Nopoki and started recording some stories and a conversation, and transcribed and translated them with the help of consultants.

In my 2017 field trip, with a better knowledge of the language and the topic of the thesis already clearly defined, I made significant progress. I was able to solve many doubts through elicitation and continued recording, transcribing and translating. I returned home with three conversations and four stories translated and transcribed to gloss. With all the gathered information, I spent the next two years glossing the texts and writing the two published articles and a sketch grammar, which was completed except for the syntax part. Obviously, many doubts and questions arose while writing the grammar, all of which I noted down with the hope of untangling them in my next field trip.

In 2019, I was very successful in getting satisfactory solutions for the list of 82 questions that I brought to the field. Moreover, I recorded, translated and transcribed a conversation and three more stories, hence the total of eleven parsed texts in my corpus. When I returned home, I set to update my sketch grammar with all the solved questions and new grammatical features that had appeared while discussing these questions and translating the recordings.

I used a Tascam DR-05 as the main recorder. I also used a secondary recorder, whose only use was to let the consultants listen to recorded texts for translation. In this way, I recorded the whole translation and transcription session with the main recorder while letting the consultant listen to the recorded text from the secondary recorder, a Samsung mobile phone. On every field trip, I bought a Peruvian SIM card on the first day I was in Lima to ease communication with everyone in the field. I brought a 10 inches Asus laptop with a touch screen to the field, which could be separated from the keyboard to be used as a tablet.

I have to mention my attempts to visit indigenous communities. When I first arrived in Lima in 2015, I met the linguist Roberto Zariquiey at the Pontificia University. He advised me not to travel to an indigenous community without being accompanied by someone known in the community, and my later experience told me that this was good advice. On my first exploratory trip in 2015, Julio César Gonzales, who was then in charge of the local office of the Spanish NGO CESAL, took me on his motorcycle to the Asháninka communities of Impamequiari and Sapani during two of his routine trips. There I interviewed the Asháninka teachers, who were native speakers. In 2016, I asked some people whether they could accompany me to a community, but I was unsuccessful. In 2017, I travelled by a public transport 4WD pickup truck to the community of Diamante Azul, at the mouth of the Unini River; I went alone but with a recommendation by Julio César Gonzales, by then director of Nopoki, to ask for a trustworthy acquaintance of his, who should help me to find some speakers to work with them during the day. Unfortunately, the men of the community were at a *masato* party, which was not the best moment to work there, so I travelled back to Atalaya in the first public car that arrived. In 2019, Chochoki accompanied me also in a public transport 4WD pickup truck to the community of Unini Cascada, and there I was able to make some recordings from some relatives of her and visit the community and the *chacras*. We travelled back to Atalaya by boat. As I said before, it is usually thought that the best linguistic fieldwork is done in an environment where the language is spoken on a daily basis. In my case, I arrived in Atalaya, found speakers and set to work as quickly as possible. Trying to establish myself in a community would have taken a lot of precious time that was much better leveraged working with speakers in Atalaya. Moreover, as I have explained above, working with speakers who are literate in their language was an advantage.

1.4. Organization of the thesis and conventions

This thesis is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter that presents a general picture of the Ashéninka people and the main features of their language, plus an explanation of the details of the process of writing the thesis, the fieldwork carried out, and the conventions used in the thesis. Chapter 2 studies the

phonology of the language. Chapter 3 describes different word classes (pronouns, demonstratives, quantifiers, indefinites, interrogatives, adverbs, affirmative and negative particles, adpositions, conjunctions, ideophones and fillers). Nouns, adjectives and verbs require a much larger space, which is why a whole chapter is devoted to each of them (chapters 4, 5 and 6, respectively, with the noun phrase included in the chapter on nouns). Finally, Chapter 7 describes the syntax of the language. Moreover, the thesis has three annexes: Annex 1 is a list of the grammatical morphemes; Annex 2 compiles all the glossed texts from which most examples of the thesis are taken, and Annex 3 is a list of vocabulary with all the words that have appeared during my fieldwork.

The glossed examples are presented in four lines. When the second and third lines do not fit in the page width, they are separated into two groups of two lines, as in (3).

- (3) Tee iñagaeri iwírintòti. Ótsitzi rahánkahànkawitakàri.
 tee i-ñag-a-e-ri i-pirinto-ti
 NEG.REA 3M.S-see-REG-FRS-3M.O 3M-frog-POSS
 ótsitzi r-ahank~ahank-a-wi-t-ak-a-ri
 dog 3M.S-sniff~ITE-&-FRU-&-PFV-REA-3M.O
 ‘Again, he hasn’t seen his frog. The dog repeatedly sniffs in vain.’ (FS)

In the first line, the uttering is reproduced following the Ashéninka official orthography, but with two departures: one is using <h> instead of <j> (see Section 2.4 for justification); the other one is that primary and secondary stresses are marked with an acute and a gravis, respectively. While the stress can be quite clearly heard, the difference between primary and secondary stresses cannot be identified so straightforwardly, so this indicated difference must be taken cautiously, except in the section devoted to stress (Section 2.5), where the recordings of the words used as examples have been examined more carefully than in the rest of the corpus. When there is a morphophonological change, as in *iwírintòti* ‘his frog’, where the root meaning ‘frog’ is *pirinto*, the actual pronunciation of the word is shown in the first line, and the underlying form of the modified morpheme is given in the second line. However, /i/-elisions after /tʰ/ and /ʃ/ are not shown in the first line because they are regular in non-slow pronunciation, and the /i/ is not elided in slow pronunciation (e.g. *ótsitzi* ‘dog’ in (3) is regularly pronounced [ˈotʰtʰsi] in non-slow pronunciation).

The second line of the example shows the Ashéninka word segmented in morphemes, and the third line reflects the English translation of lexemes and the glosses of grammatical morphemes. I have tried to follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules²⁹ except when the specificities of the language made it more convenient to use different conventions (e.g. S and O instead of SBJ and OBJ, given that subject prefixes occur in almost every verb and the use of three letters would make the glosses too long and more confusing, while the continuous repetition of S or O in verbs makes its meaning clearer).

The fourth and last line shows the English translation, which is my translation from the Spanish translation given by the Ashéninka consultant. At the end of the translation, the acronym between parentheses identifies the text from which the example is taken. The meaning of the acronyms can be found in Annex 2 (e.g. FS stands for *Frog Story*). In examples taken from other authors, the reference is given between parentheses. When there are no parentheses, the examples are from elicitations. Annex 2 compiles all the glossed texts. In this way, the more interested reader can inspect every example in its context.

Spanish loans are written in italics in the first line of the glosses when they are not adapted to the Ashéninka orthography, but in roman if they are adapted. In this way, I write “aroosa” ‘rice’, from Spanish *arroz*, but “*bicicleta*” ‘bicycle’, from Spanish *bicicleta*. There are dubious cases, e.g. Spanish *tía* ‘aunt’, which might be written *tiya* with the Ashéninka orthography and practically with the same pronunciation as in Spanish, i.e. it does not need adaptation because the Spanish pronunciation does not break the Ashéninka phonotactics. In these cases, if the loan appears too evident, I write it in italics, as in *tía*.

In the examples, the word containing the described morpheme is in bold, as in (4), taken from Section 4.1.5.5, which deals with the infinitive suffix *-aantsi*.

- (4) Páerani piyótziro éeroka apaani **mampaantsi**?
 páerani p-iyo-t-zi-ro éeroka apaani mamp-aantsi
 long.ago 2-know-&-REA-3F.O 2 one sing-INF
 ‘Long ago, did you know a song?’ (CMH)

²⁹ Available online at www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf. Accessed in February 2023.

Some examples are repeated throughout the thesis, but each instance is used to illustrate a different grammatical feature.

