Polonia

Estudios
Latinoamericanos

Sociedad Polaca de Estudios Latinoamericanos

ISSN 0137-3080

Original title / título original: The Remo Denomination.
An Inquiry into the Ethnohistory of the Ucayali Basin

Author(s)/Autor(es):

Łukasz Krokoszyński

Published originally as/ Publicado originalmente en:
Estudios Latinoamericanos, 27 (2007), pp. 61-103.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36447/Estudios2007.v27.art3>

Estudios Latinoamericanos is a journal published by the Polish Society for Latin American Studies (Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Latinoamerykanistycznych).

The Polish Society for Latin American Studies is scholarly organization established to facilitate research on Latin America and to encourage and promote scientific and cultural cooperation between Poland and Latin America.

Estudios Latinoamericanos, revista publicada por la Sociedad Polaca de Estudios Latinoamericanos (Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Latinoamerykanistycznych).

Sociedad Polaca de Estudios Latinoamericanos es una asociación científica fundada con el fin de desarrollar investigaciones científicas sobre América Latina y participar en la cooperación científica y cultural entre las sociedades de Polonia y América Latina.

The Remo Denomination. An Inquiry into the Ethnohistory of the Ucayali Basin

Łukasz Krokoszyński

Introduction

Historical mentions of the name Remo as designating groups of people in the Ucayali River basin reach the 17th century. Taking into consideration accounts written by early Occidental observers, it could have been assumed that the Remos were a large, little known group that has become extinct by the 20th century. The territory associated with them extended on the eastern bank of the Ucayali River over a vast area contained between the contemporary Amawaka Indians to the south and the Matses to the north. It was only natural for ethnographers and linguists to consider the Remo (Remu, Rhemu, Rheno, Remoauca) a single ethnic-linguistic unit or a tribe [e.g., Tessmann 1930; Steward & Métraux 1948; Whiton et al 1964; Loukotka 1968; Erikson 1994]. Entering the ethnographic literature as such, they have more recently been classified among such groups as Kapanawa, Marubo, Katukina, Poyanawa and Sensi in the “Pano medianos” category [Erikson 1992, 1993, 1994], as a “missing link” between the Juruá Purus Panoans (e.g., Amawaka) and the Mayoruna Panoans (e.g., Matses) [Erikson 1999: 50].

However, in the majority of cases the only link between all Remos was denomination itself. The only other common characteristic was their inter-

fluvial habitat with the spatial and social distance from the Peruvian riverine Indians and *mestizos*. For this reason, they were all subject to intensive slave-hunting. People thought to be Remo have been contacted by Euro-American observers only a few times at different places and only for short periods of time, so that their descriptions are vague and scarce.

Confronted with the problems of identifying similar, contemporary groups on the territory corresponding with that of the historical Remos – such as the absence of reliable information and the variety of more or less random names applied to such populations by local Peruvian population [Krokoszyński et al. 2007] – the author was led to consider a possibility that the name Remo found in the historical sources did not necessarily refer to the ethnographic or linguistic reality, but rather pertained (as it still does) to the riverine discourse on social difference in Peru. In such a case, it could be seen as a ready-made generic label for the distanced, backwoods native inhabitants of the Ucayali and Juruá Rivers divide, and later the Ucayali and Jaquirana (Yaquerana) or Javari (Yavari) Rivers divide.

To verify this hypothesis, an analysis of all the historical, ethnographic and linguistic information available on groups denominated Remo has been undertaken, and the results were presented in Krokoszyński & Fleck forthcoming. The linguistic data available for the Remos is composed by three wordlists gathered within short periods of time (early 20th century) from groups living close to each other, and the material on Iskonawa and Nukini languages. All of these proved to come from distinct Panoan languages. The Jaquirana River Remo could be classified together with Nukini, Poyanawa and Iskonawa, although it is clearly a distinct language. The Blanco River Remo is divergent from all other Panoan languages in the Nawa subgroup, and the Môa River Remo approximates Amawaka. These results are the strongest evidence of the generic character of this denomination.

The present paper focuses on the uses of the name Remo on the Ucayali, instead considering the actual identity of the different groups named Remo, as has been done in the work cited above. Its goal is to present historical data available on the groups called Remo (including contemporary groups considered their descendants – Iskonawa and Nukini) in the context where this denomination appeared. It is thus an inquiry into ethnohistory from the anthropological perspective, and discusses the phenomenon of the popularity and wide extension in the Ucayali basin of the term Remo, first documented in reference to a 17th-century group, inhabiting some 600 km from where it has been used most recently. It also presents the contemporary

context of this name and reveals new data on several uncontacted groups currently believed to be living on territories historically associated with Remos together with their various denominations. On a more general level, in showing the conception of the "Remo tribe" to result from a case of a "denomination underdifferentiation" and analyzing the uses of this label, this paper also points to a wider extension of this problem implicit in ethno-historical analysis or in the discourse on uncontacted groups. Further, after demonstrating that perceiving the Remo groups through such a generic label does not bring us closer to understanding of what social reality they lived in, we turn to information gathered in other, better known Panoan units. In comparing data from the Remo-labeled groups with the available data on the past presented by other contemporary Panoan groups and their conceptions of identity, the author hopes to indicate a possibility of another view on the history in the Ucayali-Juruá Rivers divide, taking into account the native social reality. It considers these groups apart from the overarching Remo label, and relates them with the wider Panoan context.¹

The material used in this paper is of three kinds. First, it is composed of sources mentioning the Remo name in any of its applications, and published between the 17th century and the most recent years. Secondly, it is based on oral histories recorded among groups connected with Remos. Thirdly, it refers to the works on other Panoan groups social organization.

THE REMO SOURCES

Remos of the Ucayali between the 17th and 19th centuries

Tamaya River (1682-1690)

The seventeenth century marks the appearance of the Remo name in the written sources, the fact attributable to penetration of the upper Ucayali by the Jesuits. The earliest mention of the name Remo is to be found in a general description of then little known territories of *Ucayale* in 1682. That year, the Jesuit missionary Lorenzo Lucero, who established what later became the Jesuit Maynas mission center *Santiago de Laguna* or *La Laguna de La Gran Cocama* on the lower Huallaga River, came into contact with

¹ A more detailed discussion of these issues, along with analysis of the various historical denominations associated with the Indians in the area of the Sierra del Divisor is to be found in Krokoszyński in preparation.

some *Manamabobo* Indians reported to be a “forest” section of the *Chipeo*, earlier inhabiting the Pachitea River [Maroni 1988: 291]. It was presumably from these Indians that the information on the upper Ucayali River groups came from. Those groups, living some 30 days from the Laguna were the *Cambas*, *Remos*, *Manamobobos*, *Cunivas* and *Piros* [Chantre y Herrera 1901: 282].

This name was not reported by the members of the Father Manuel Biedma’s expedition that in 1685 established the first Franciscan mission among the Konibos, denominated *San Miguel* near the confluence of the Pachitea and Ucayali Rivers. Between January and July of 1686 the mission was claimed for the Jesuit order by a young German priest named Heinrich Richter. As he went to reduce one of the *Cunivos*’ groups denominated *Turcaguanes* living downriver from *Santissima Trinidad de los Cunivos*² he found their village abandoned because of a raid on their neighbors, the Remos [Maroni 1988: 290-91].

Four years later, in 1690, Richter tried to contact and reduce presumably the same Remo group. They lived so close to the former *Turcaguanes*’ village that one could hear the sound of Remo drums from it. At this time, they numbered more than 600 warriors and spoke a language very similar to Cunivos Maroni suggests they, like the *Amenguacas*, were hostile towards Richter’s outnumbered expedition [Maroni 1988: 296]. Based on this mention, Steward & Métraux [1948: 565] calculated the number of Remos in 1690 at 3,000. According to Grohs [1974: 74], the Remos visited by Richter were located south of the Imiria River (a left affluent of the Tamaya River).

Little could be said of the actual identity of these Remo and their relations with other people called Remo between the 17th and 20th century. The language note suggests that the first Remos were closely related to the Konibo, while their territory was in later times associated with the Amawaka Indians.

The Manoa (or Cunshabatay) River missions (18th century)

The name disappeared from documents for the next century. Although the Franciscans made several attempts at establishing missions among the Sete-

² Main village of the Jesuit upper Ucayali mission. Most probably it was located at the same or near location as San Miguel, (although it was supposedly renamed San Francisco Javier by the Jesuits according to Biedma [Biedma et al. 1989: 236]). Ortiz estimates that San Miguel was located 8 to 10 leagues (24-30 miles) upriver from the mouth of Pachitea River, on the right bank of Ucayali [Ortiz 1984: 41, 50].

bos, Shipibos (or *Callisecas*) from the Cunshabatay and Aguaytía Rivers, none did succeed for long, and the efforts ceased for many years after killing of all the missionaries in 1766 or 1767 [Ortiz 1984: 88]. What is interesting in our context, the name Remo did not enter any of the accounts for this period that we are aware of. The only exemption is a peculiar reference made by Juan de Velasco who in 1770 considered them a branch of the *Campas*, without specifying any location [in: Markham 1859: 180].

Sarayacu mission (late 18th-early 19th century)

The Remos reappeared in the sources some 100 years later, in connection with the last and successful restoration of Franciscans' Manoa missions. In 1790, the Head of the Franciscan Ocopa Convent, Manuel Sobreviela initiated an expedition that was continued by Father Narciso Girbal y Barceló. Descending the Huallaga and Marañón Rivers and ascending the Ucayali, Girbal reached a Setebo Indians' village on a Sarayacu Stream. Upon his first, short visit in the area, the Setebo enumerated the different names of groups that inhabited the Ucayali River basin. Apart from the few whose members Gribal met personally (Shipibos, Panos or Setebos, Amawakas, Kokamas and Mayorunas), he was told in general terms of other "nations" living in the mountainous regions away from the river banks. He wrote down that east of the Ucayali River lived *campas*, *capanahuas*, *remus*, *diabus*, *hormigas*, *nianaguas*, *suabus*, *binabus*, *isnaguas* and *trompeteros* [Izaguirre 1922-29, 8: 161].

Upon his return to the Ucayali River in 1791, Father Girbal was accompanied by Father Buenaventura Marqués and Friar Juan Dueñas. The Sarayacu mission was then officially established. After a few months spent on the Ucayali, young Friar Dueñas presented a very similar list of names of backwoods *parcialidades* or *naciones* east of the Ucayali, offering variations of Girbal's denominations, specifying that *Nianaguas* lived 12 leagues (58 km) east from Sarayacu³ and complementing the list with *Ysacnaguas*, *Aguanaguas*, *Sinabus*, *Sentis* and *Chuntis*. Apart from those, presumably living closer to Sarayacu, he listed *Remos*, *Casibos*, *Campas*, *Amaguacas*, *Amages*, *Comabos*, *Ruanaguas*, *Pichobos* further up the Ucayali [Izaguirre 1922-29, 8: 242]. He also noted that many slaves living among the *Pano*

³ They were to be visited by fathers Girbal and Marquez in 1792 [Fuentes 1861: 162-63]. This territory corresponds with the later Remo locations.

came from *Nianagua*, *Remo*, *Mayoruna* or *Barbudo*, *Panatagua*, *Amagua*-*ca* and *Chipeo* groups [Izaguirre 1922-29, 8: 249].

Juan Dueñas also reported that the *Piro* Indians were on their way down the Ucayali to visit Sarayacu when he was leaving the Ucayali in 1792 [Izaguirre 1922-29, 8: 241], and some time later Girbal wrote that the *Piros* who came from the Tarapoto province lived in the vicinity of Sarayacu. Some Remo Indians – presumably captives – were said to live with them [Izaguirre 1922-29, 8: 225].

In 1794 Girbal specified that the group called Remo lived on the Callería and Abujao Rivers, while the Tamaya River was inhabited by the Amawakas [Izaguirre 1922-29, 8: 308-309].

In this early context, the name Remo referred to: a. captives living among the mission Indians; b. at least initially, to one of many *parcialidades* or *naciones* living east of the Ucayali River and Sarayacu mission, or to a group concentrated on the Callería and Abujao Rivers; c. generally to natives of the vast mountainous complex east of the Ucayali River (Sierra del Divisor), called *Cordillera de los Remos* by Girbal in 1794 [ibid.: 304-306].

Remos as an independent group between Canchahuaya Hills and the Tamaya River (1794-1859)

The latter, vast use seems to have been most common in subsequent mentions of the Remos. They were reported from the Canchahuaya Hills to the Abuján (Abujao) River by a Franciscan Pablo Alonso Carvallo in 1819 [in: Maw 1829: 469] and Jerónimo de Leceta in 1837 [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9]. Carvallo maintained that the Remos were very similar to Sensi⁴ and that the two spoke very closely related languages.

Similarity between the two groups was noted by several other authors at that time. It was affirmed by Smyth and Lowe who descended the Ucayali between 1834 and 1835, and by Pedro Beltrán, who accompanied them. Much of their information surely came from father Manuel Plaza, but it is likely that they also made some observations in Sarayacu. They remarked that the languages of the two groups were not very different from those of

⁴ The name Sensi/Senci/Senti referred to at least three groups living in the northern part of Sierra del Divisor, gathered in a mission on the Chunuya Stream between 1811 and 1822, when it was abandoned by the missionary [Amich 1988: 255-56]. Some Indians had left the mission previously, among them a group called Runubú that retreated to the Sierra del Divisor. This area was later associated with the Remo denomination.

the 19th century Pano group living in Sarayacu. Also their customs, material culture and adornments were almost identical, the tattoos of Sensis and Remos being analogous. Smyth and Lowe located Remos south of the Sensis (*Senci*), i.e. in the Sierra del Divisor. Reportedly, these Remos rarely came to the Ucayali banks and were hostile to strangers invading their territory, including the Franciscans [Smyth and Lowe 1836: 230-231; Beltrán 1907: 60, also in: Izaguirre 1922-29, 9].

A few years later, Sarayacu was visited by Francis de Castelnau's expedition. Laurent Saint Cricq (alias Paul Marcoy), a French graphic who accompanied Castelnau, on descending the Ucayali between 1846 and 1847 found out that the Remo were living on the Abujao River. The expedition encountered a Konibo party coming back from a "hunt" on the Remo Indians made on this river [Marcoy 2001, 2: 204]. Castelnau himself was told that the Cassibouya (Cashiboya) River was inhabited by the cannibal *Rimbos*, whom he identified as the Remos mentioned by missionaries [Castelnau 1850-59, 4: 364]. The territory pointed to Castelnau later on the route as the Remo habitat were also the Canchahuaya Hills [ibid.: 367]. It was noted by the traveler on a general note, that some 20 leagues (around 90 km) east from the Ucayali lived the *Jawabus*, *Pitsobus*, *Remus*, and *Sensis* [ibid.: 377].

In 1846, Father Juan Cimini, who traveled up the Ucayali River with Manuel Plaza, wrote a report on the condition of Manoa Missions, where he mentioned the Remos from the Callería River in his enumeration of the area groups [Ortiz 1984: 169].

Shortly afterwards, between 1852 and 1855, the Remos were also mentioned by an American painter George Catlin, although he did not specify the location of the Remos village he portrayed, other than as the general zone of *Yucayali* and *pampas*. He contrasted them with the Shipibo and *Shetebo* or "Canoe Indians", comparing the latter to North American Winnebago from the Woodlands and Remos to Sioux and Assiniboine from the Plains [Catlin 1959: 180].

Father Fernando Pallarés, upon being elected the Prefect of the Ocopa Missions, realized a series of expeditions on the Ucayali River between the years 1853-54, visiting all groups inhabiting the area between Sarayacu and the Tambo River. Based on his travels, he wrote that the Remo occupied territory from the mountains of *Caschibo-hiya* (Cashiboya) Hills to the *Ahuanchumia* creek (an affluent of the Tamaya River). They were a "pacific nation" and found themselves on the brink of extinction due to continuous fights with the Indians from the Ucayali River [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 202].

By 1859, Father Vicente Calvo had been aware of the presence of the Remos and *Amahuacas* on the upper Tamaya [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 240]. During his journey on that river in 1859 he was told that the Remo Indians lived on the right affluents of the Tamaya River, such as *Aguanchumia* and *Inunapuya* (Inamapuya) [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 241]. Shortly afterwards Father Antonio Majoral, who ascended the Tamaya in 1867, reported that the river was inhabited by the *Amuehuacas* [Amich 1988: 373], and between 1876-78 the Franciscans tried to attract different groups called the *Amuehuaques* to the upper Tamaya's mission *San Pedro de Huaitzaya* [Amich 1988: 422-27]. It seems that the two names functioned in a similar way and were possibly applied interchangeably to the same groups in the general area.

Apart from those two denominations, Pallarés and Calvo also learned of the *Sacayas* who inhabited another affluent of the Tamaya River [Amich 1988: 334]. This name later reappeared as a Remo subgroup [e.g., Grubb 1927, Rivet and Tastevin 1921; Métraux 1948], or in connection with a group "similar to the Remos", living between the Tamaya and Juruá River [Hassel 1905: 51].

Remos as captives and co-residents on the banks of the Ucayali (1792-1928)

Apart from reporting the interfluvial habitat of the independent groups known as Remos, travelers on the Ucayali in the 19th century often found people identified as Remos living on the banks of the Ucayali together with other groups. They were either slaves, liberated captives, or captives' offspring and families living among the riverine Indians, and their provenience seems to have been that of the backwoods, in all cases. Their status among the riverine Panoans was of ambiguous nature. Friar Dueñas reported that those he saw among the Indians on the Ucayali were treated with love and affection, married and absorbed into the conquerors' population [Dueñas 1792: 181]. Saint-Cricq noticed that although they were relatively free (and intermarried with their captors), they still maintained the status of the "Other" and sometimes joined with other captives, forming separate settlements on the Ucayali [Marcoy 2001, 2: 474-76]. As we will see below, the pattern of incorporating captives into captors' society was maintained until very recently among the Shipibo-Konibo.

Juan Dueñas reported Remo slaves living with Setebo already in 1791-1792, and at the same time Girbal reported there were Remos living with *Piro* in the vicinity of Sarayacu [Izaguirre 1922-29, 8: 225]. Pedro Beltrán

noted that Remos were the most numerous among the Sarayacu Pano's captives [Beltrán 1907: 60]. They were found by Manuel Plaza in 1843 at the mouth of the Pachitea, in *Sta. Rita de Masisea* together with the families of Shipibos, Konibos and Amawakas [Ortiz 1984: 163]. In 1846 Saint-Cricq found a Remo captive living with a Shetebo family. His group lived between the *Apujau* (Abujao) and *Huatpua* rivers (the Ucayali's tributaries downriver from the Tamaya River), where as a boy he was captured by the Konibos. The French traveler also reported many settlements located between Tierra Blanca and the mouth of the Ucayali populated by captives liberated from the riverine Panoans, among them Remos [Marcoy 2001, 2: 273-76, 525]. Father Juan Cimini who traveled the river at the same time, found its banks populated with the Konibos, Shipibos, Sensis and some Remos [Ortiz 1984: 169]. In 1851, an American Navy Lieutenant Lewis Herndon visited a village composed of Remos and some *Shipebos*, living on the left bank of the Ucayali, downriver from Tierra Blanca [Herndon 1853: 202]. Also F. L. Galt noted that Remos and Amawakas were mostly to be found as slaves on the Ucayali [Galt 1878: 310]. As late as in 1928, Polish research expedition's leader, Mieczysław Lepecki, documented the use of the name Remo on the banks of the lower Ucayali, as he was told that among inhabitants of Monte Caramelo village (located two days' journey by boat upriver from the mouth of the Marañón River) were remnants of *Pano* and *Remo* Indians, who according to his informants had occupied lands of the lower Ucayali in the past [Lepecki 1931: 53, 55].

San Miguel de Cayarí mission (Callería and Abujao Rivers) (1859-1870)

At the time when the banks of the Ucayali were populated by the Indians captured east of the Ucayali, the interior was still occupied by groups denominated Remo. However, the first documented, direct contact with an independent group labeled Remo took place in the 1860s. In 1859, a Franciscan Father Vincente Calvo was looking for a place for a settlement that would provide repose to travelers on the route from the Huallaga River to Sarayacu through the Pachitea River, and protect the persecuted populations identified as Remos and Amawakas on the Tamaya [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 242]. Not having found an appropriate place for establishing a mission on the Tamaya River, Calvo was on his way back to Sarayacu. When he stopped at the mouth of the Callería River he was told by a Shipibo man that the banks of the upper Callería were at that time also populated by many

Indians called Remo. Antonio Raimondi was later told (between 1859-62) by people who came to the Callería from Sarayacu, that upon ascending the river for two weeks, they found its banks populated by the Remos [ibid.: 243].⁵ Calvo arranged for the settling of a village at one day of rowing up the Callería, possibly at the same or nearby location of the current Shipibo community of the same name. It was eventually established next year, and became the *San Miguel de Cayarí* mission.

Although Pallarés reported some Remos already at the moment of establishing the *Cayarí* mission along with Shipibos, Konibos and Sarayacu Christians, information on their provenience is lacking [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 214-15]. Nevertheless, by 1862, Father Ignacio Sans had found a group of Indians on the Piyuya Stream (left affluent of the Callería) and baptized some of them. He was informed that further up the river lived a group called Isis baquebu (or Hisisbaquebo) and other groups, whom he assumed to be Remo subgroups as well. The missionary had convinced some of these Indians to descend the river to live in a village denominated *Schunumaná*, halfway between the Piyuya Stream and Callería mission [Amich 1988: 418]. However, Sans did not seem satisfied with the results, as in his 1868 letter, when he was preparing for an expedition to reduce the Hisisbaquebo, he was hoping it would go better than the one he had made to the *Remos*. By this time, five Hisisbaquebo Indians had lived with Sans for over a year [Amich 1988: 374-375]. The results of this expedition are unknown. However, between 1868-1870, in a village named *Pamaya*, there were more than 170 Remos gathered with Friar Manuel Vargas [Amich 1988: 336].

Very little is actually known of the Callería Remos. Although the general information presented by Father Pallarés seems to be based on the Carvallo-Lezeta account, and possibly his own explorations of the Ucayali, his report was written or added-to (possibly by Father Calvo or Martorell) after the establishment of Callería mission and does present some original descriptions that could only have come through Remos directly contacted on the Callería. According to this report, although themselves pacific, Remos had reached the brink of extinction because of violent encounters with the Ucayali Indians. They spoke a language related to Pano [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 202]. Like Carvallo and Smyth, Pallarés implied similarity of beliefs of

⁵ Information on Calvo's expedition on Tamaya and Callería in 1859 comes from by Antonio Raimondi, who visited Callería between 1859-1862 and had known V. Calvo personally [Raimondi 1942: 4].

Remos and Sensis, whom he had personally visited on the upper Maquía in 1854 [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 212].⁶

It was observed that they had their nostril flares, nasal septa, lips, and chins perforated. They wore silver pendants hanging from the septum piercing, and in the lower lips they inserted sticks that were replaced with silver adornments on festive occasions. Remo mothers tattooed their children's faces and arms [Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 208]. This account also suggests they practiced funeral anthropophagy and maintains that their language was closely related to that of *Cappa-nahuas* [ibid: 202]. Raimondi, who most likely based his information on the data gathered from the Franciscans, makes very similar remarks about Remos [Raimondi 1942: 92], later repeated by many other authors [e.g., Ernst 1872].

Another account that most likely also refers to the Callería mission's Remos comes from a paper first published in 1874 by Francisco Sagols, a Franciscan monk who spent some time in the Ucayali missions. While repeating Carvallo's basic data and situating Remos between the Abujao River and Canchahuaya Hills, he also provided an original observation that Remos perforated their lips in childhood, and later adorned them with macaw feathers, which according to the priest, gave them "most ridiculous appearance". He maintained they were characterized by their physical features or wide and round faces and flat noses [Sagols 1901: 364]. This seeming immediacy suggest that the observation was based on direct contact with, or a second-hand description of the Indians called Remos, and the only contact with them at that time was through the Callería mission.

This period was marked by the intensive influx of the nationals in the area and the weakening of the Franciscans' hitherto undisputed authority on the Ucayali. In 1863, they were obliged to leave Sarayacu, moving their centers of operations to the Callería and Cashiboya missions. Shipibo and Konibo were at this point engaging in trade and work relations with the newcomers. Because of the fresh demand for slaves, Shipibo habitants of the Callería were eager to take advantage of Remos presence on the river.

In a 1868 letter to the Loreto Prefect, Father Vincente Calvo complained that due to slave-hunting flourishing on the Ucayali, there were very few Remos left of those that came to the Callería mission, and there was none left on the *Poyuya* [Piyuya] and Utuquinía Rivers, and only a few on the Abujao River "where they were most numerous" before. This fate, reported

⁶ This last information is to be found in Castelnau 1850-59, 4: 387.

Calvo, they shared with other groups such as *Puinahuas*, *Capanahuas*, *Senchis* or *Amahuacas* (and *Sacayas*). According to Calvo, the slave trade had intensified in the last decade, so that there was hardly a month when there was not any Shipibo-Konibo slave raid going up or down the Ucayali in search of backwoods groups [Ortiz 1984: 520].

Father Pallarés mentioned a frustrated attempt of a Shipibo raid on the Remos gathered upriver from the Callería mission already in 1864 [Amich 1988: 419]. Nevertheless, some time between Sans' 1868 letter and Galt's 1870 visit on the Ucayali, Shipibo from *Cayaria* mission raided Remos gathered in *Pamaya* village with Father Manuel Vargas [Amich 1988: 336, Izaguirre 1922-29, 9: 215, 244]. This attack ultimately frustrated Franciscan attempts at reducing groups associated with the Remo denomination in the area. Those Remos who managed to escape Shipibo raids were said to have retired deeper "into the Piyuya" [Ordinaire 1988: 150], or the Ucayali-Juruá Rivers divide. According to an American surgeon F. L. Galt, in 1870 their remnants were to be found around the Callería and Cashiboya, mostly as slaves [1878: 310]. His account also suggests that apart from the Shipibo violence, diseases also played some part in the failure of the mission or disappearance of the Remos, a fact that was not mentioned in the Franciscans' relations.

At this date, among the visitors to the Ucayali who had left mentions of Remo presence on the Callería were: Antonio Raimondi, who traveled in the Loreto Province between 1859-1862, and has left the most detailed notes [Raimondi 1942 [1962]]; the Loreto Prefect, Benito Arana who participated in a steamship expedition to the Pachitea river in 1867 [Matorela 2004: 19]; an unknown steamship commander of a Hydrographic Commission in 1871 [ibid.]; the above mentioned F. L. Galt [Galt 1878: 310; Steward and Métraux 1948: 565]; finally, Olivier Ordinaire who traveled through the zone around 1882 and had only found a little captive Remo girl living with a colonist [Ordinaire 1988: 150].

The 19th century Remos from the Callería River could be identified as Panoan, basing on the denominations used and of the Franciscans commentaries on their language. They have been said to be closely related linguistically and culturally to the enigmatic Sensi from the upper Maquía River, of whom even less is known. Also, a tenuous connection between these Remos and contemporary Iskonawa could be made based on the geographical location. The name Isis baquebu (or Hisisbaquebo) recorded by Father Sans in 1860's does echo a name recalled by the Iskonawa Indians as their enemies or kin (see below).

Canchahuaya Hills – the Tamaya River zone after the Calleria mission (1901-2007)

After the failure of Calleria mission, direct contacts with Remos in this area ceased and subsequent information again is merely composed of mentions of the name along with the general location or information copied from earlier sources. Nevertheless, although there are no sources on Remos in the Canchahuaya-Tamaya zone from the end of the 19th century and they are very scarce in the 20th century, the name was still locally associated with this region.

It was documented by José Antonio Sotomayor in 1901, who wrote of the Remos inhabiting the Abujao and Callaria Rivers, persecuted by other tribes. He seems to repeat Pallarés-Raimondi's information on face tattoos, face perforations and mortuary cannibalism. Original observations of unknown provenience were that they cremated their dead relative's bones, mixing the ashes with water, and that they were monogamous. Also, he added that they were expert at using different plants applied in sorcery against their enemies, which makes one believe his account is a mixture of earlier sources, the actual, direct observations or second-hand relations, and of the local riverine discourse on the backwoods' neighbors [Sotomayor 1901: 174].

In 1905, Jorge M. Von Hassel located the Remos on the Tamaya River and calculated their number at 800 to 1000. According to his account, they were remnants of a much larger group that had been reduced through wars and assimilation into such neighboring groups as *Amahuacas*, *Capanahuas*, *Yuminahuas*, *Yuras* and *Conibos*. Although these Remos themselves were little warlike, there were some fights between them and the nationals or other groups triggered by the continuous raids for women and children on both sides.

Von Hassel's information is sketchy, but his account provides some original observations that did not come from earlier sources, and again situates Remos on the Tamaya River, south from the previously mentioned locations. The Indians described lived in large houses inhabited by a couple of families, used clubs and bows, cultivated maize, manioc and bananas. Their language was similar to *Amahuaca*, being its dialect or "corrupted" by it [Hassel 1905: 50]. *Amahuacas* were, according to von Hassel, a large tribe of six or seven thousand heads, divided into various subgroups living between the headwaters of the Tamaya and Acre Rivers [ibid.: 34]. Not far from the Remos, between the Tamaya and Juruá River lived a smaller tribe similar to Remos, the *Sacuyas* [ibid.: 51].

Among the authors mentioning Remos in the early 20th century was also Augusto Martínez, who in 1912 enumerated this group among others living on the Ucayali [Martínez 1912 in: Matorela 2004: 20].

Remos were also mentioned in a similar location, neighbored by the *Campas*, at the feet of “Contamana mountains”, on the upper Paraná da Viuva or Rio do Moura and the upper Juruá Mirim River (whose headwaters approximate those of the Abujao River) by Constant Tastevin, a French priest, based on information gathered in the Juruá basin between 1908 and 1914 [Tastevin 1919: 146; 1920: 133; Rivet & Tastevin 1921: 471].⁷ Compiling the available sources mentioning Remos in different places, Rivet and Tastevin were probably the first to assume that all Remos composed a single ethnic and linguistic unit.

Between 1923-1925, a German ethnographer Günter Tessmann met a few Indians identified as Remos living in Shanaya near Contamana. Although they had not provided him with much information on their provenience or ethnography of their group, he copied their tattoos [Tessmann 1999: 319, 194] (see Fig. p. 95). All the information on the Remos in his work seems to come from Father Leuque’s Río Blanco’s Indians (see below).

In 1927, Kenneth Grubb of the World-wide Evangelization Crusade gathered all the then available written sources. In doing so, he had followed the interpretation of Rivet and Tastevin, assuming that all the mentions of the Remos referred to a single unit. In thus synthesizing, he updated Rivet and Tastevin’s information of the Remos on the right affluents of the Ucayali (to Utuquinía River) and in the Sierra del Divisor (or “Contamana hills”), with Carvalho’s account of the Remos on the upper Javari and its tributary the Batã River. Also, he reported them on the Río Blanco (an affluent of the Tapiche River – most likely based on the information published by Izaguirre, see below) and on the Galvez River. He also maintained that the *Mananagua*⁸ and the *Sakuya* were subtribes of the Remos [Grubb 1927: 84].

⁷ At the same time, it is the only source documenting the name Remo on the Brazilian side in this location (considering that Kenneth Grubb copied Tastevin’s information). It seems possible that the denomination came to the Juruá River with Peruvian rubber workers in early 20th century, and it wasn’t in much use in Brazil subsequently.

⁸ Rivet and Tastevin report the name’s placement on the right bank of Ucayali on a map elaborated by Father Samuel Fritz, a 17th century missionary working in the area [Rivet & Tastevin 1921: 465]. This denomination was also reported in the early 20th century by the Maquía River Kapanawa to Father López as referring to the isolated Indians living in the Sierra del Divisor in the Maquía River headwaters [Izaguirre 1922-29, 8: 282-83]. Tessmann identified this locally used name with the Sensi remnants [1999: 109].

Yet around 1948, César Díaz Castañeda maintained that the Tamaya River zone was inhabited by the Remos ‘from the old *Pauas* [sic! *Pano?*] race’. They did not have any relations with whites and little was known of them. The note that their word for ‘toads’ was *Maya-nahuas*, points to their Panoan linguistic affiliation. Reportedly, they maintained that these animals were the “mayas” who were annihilated by the flood and lived crying in the marshes. Provenience of this peculiar information is left unknown. Further yet in the Tamaya headwaters were reported the Amawakas [Ortiz 1984: 460].

The intriguing reference by Castañeda is the last published source we have been able to find that leaves any original information on the Indians identified as Remos in this general location in the 20th century. However, the name seems to have permeated in the area. The Shipibo-Konibo had regularly raided the area’s isolated groups at least until the 1950’s, denominating them Remos and Amawaka. In 1961 the SAM missionary Clifford Russell along with one of the recently contacted Iskonawa Indians visited an elderly woman in San Francisco de Yarinacocha, who had been captured from the Remos by the Konibos in her childhood (1900-10). The woman did not understand Iskonawa, but would recall denominations *Awannahua* and *Shawannahua* used by her people [Whiton et al.: 109]. Warren R. DeBoer in 1971 found evidence of raiding Indians called Amawaka and Remo by Konibo as recent as from the 1930’s in genealogies of San Francisco, Iparía and Sonochenea communities [DeBoer 1986: 234] on the upper Ucayali.

Apart from that, the South American Mission personnel learned there were cases of people captured on the Inamapuya River (right tributary of the Tamaya) by Shipibo in the 1920’s and 1940’s, and there were rumors that eight or nine backwoods Indians were captured on Piyuya in the 1950’s and taken to Yarinacocha [Whiton et al. 1964: 88]. This area was hitherto considered the Remo territory. In fact, the author was told that in the first years after contact with the Iskonawa Indians on the Utuquinía River (see below), local Shipibo used to call them *Rëmöbö*. This denomination was also sporadically mentioned in the Shipibo-Konibo communities downriver on the Ucayali in recollections of the grandfathers’ fights with the Remos or Remonahua [Krokoszyński et al. 2007].

Currently, the isolated groups in this area are locally denominated either (wild) Iskonawa (where the acquaintance with members of this now Callería-located group is stronger) or Kapanawa. The latter use is more common on the middle Ucayali, possibly as the effect of the raids organized by the Shipibo-Konibo on Kapanawas from the Maquíá, Buncuya and Ta-

piche Rivers as late as in the first decades of the 20th century [ibid.]. Signs of backwoods Indians thought to be Kapanawa were also found on the Ina-mapuya river (an affluent of the Tamaya River) between 1967-1972 (SIL microfiche, n.d.).

Remos of the Javari River area at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century

Although the denomination Remo continued to be connected with the Canchahuaya – Tamaya zone, from the very end of the 19th century it also started to appear at a new location, which was the Javari basin. Among the sources referring to this area, the most important, reporting direct contact with Indians called Remo, are: a. Remos living in the Río Blanco (an affluent of the Tapiche River whose headwaters approximate the upper Javari River) mission with Fathers Agustin López and Enrique Leuque; b. *Remu* from the Batã (also Batan, Bathan) River, visited by João Bralino de Carvalho; and c. *Rîmo* contacted by a few Kapanawa Indians in the Môa and Tapiche Rivers' headwaters. In these locations, wordlists were recovered and provide the most reliable evidence that these groups did not belong to a single unit.

The Javari – Curuça Rivers (1897)

Augusto da Cunha Gomes, head of the Peruvian-Brazilian boundary commission of 1897 was the first to document the use of this name (*Rhemus*) in reference to Indians living on the “middle *Javary*”, by which he meant the Jaquirana River (Javari's upper course) from Galvéz to the Batã (*Bathan* or *Paysandú*) River, and on the southern bank of the Batã River. Their villages were also reported in the Jaquirana-Curuça River divide, where they avoided contact with whites [Gomes 1898: 252].

It is not clear whether Gomes had personally met any of the *Rhemus*. His information seems to be based on their neighbors' description (including one *Capanana* [Kapanawa?]⁹ woman). These Remos tattooed their bodies, most of all women. Men perforated their lower lips, earlobes and

⁹ The *Capananas* habitat was the other bank of Jaquirana, and their identification with modern Kapanawa is uncertain.

nostrils, ornamenting them with macaw and other birds' feathers. They wore necklaces and belts made of shells and "a kind of hard and odorous wood". They did not practice anthropophagy (as their neighbors, the *Capanana* were said to) and married little girls with the approval of the *Tuchana*, or the "chief". Men went naked, and women wore breechclouts hanging from their belts only after giving birth. According to the account, they were less robust and darker than their enemies from the other bank of the Batã River, the *Capananas* [ibid.: 253-54].

The geographic data could point to a connection between Gomes' Rhemu from the Jaquirana River with the proto-Marubo groups, as some of them were (at least before 1888) gathered around a leader named Txoki on the Javari River (in Brazil, its upper course is also called Jaquirana) [Ruedas 2001: 721]. Moreover, before 1920, one of the proto-Marubo groups (Inon-áwavo, speaking a divergent language) lived on the right side of Jaquirana and in the Jaquirana-Pardo Rivers divide [ibid.: 721-22]. Also, the Marubo are said to have worn necklaces made of *Astrocaryum palm* (tucum, hui-cungo or chambira) that corresponds with odorous wood mentioned by Gomes (D. Fleck, pers. communication). Therefore, although there are no indications that Marubo ancestors practiced face perforations, one could imagine that some of the proto-Marubo groups were labeled Remo by the locals on the Javari in the early 20th century, who at that time were in majority Peruvian workers.

Santa María de los Remos mission (Blanco River) (1911-13)

In his November of 1911 letter to María Candamo, a Franciscan monk Agustín López wrote that on July 20th of 1910 he went on a journey on the Blanco River, the Tapiche River's largest, right affluent. In its upper course, approximating the upper Jaquirana, he found a village of backwoods Indians. He identified them as Remo and did not note their auto-denomination. The group numbered around one hundred people in total, divided into at least two local groups. According to López, they had originally lived on the Blanco River, but for some time moved to the Jaquirana River to escape the rubber workers' abuses, only to find more persecutions in the new location. Some of them were captured and went to work as rubber gatherers on the *Cururá* (Curuçá?) River. Managing to escape, they returned to the Blanco River decimated [López 1913: 210]. They showed Father López their scars as the evidence of maltreatment from the rubber workers [ibid.;

see also Izaguirre 1922-29, 12: 431-32]. B. Izaguirre, who most likely received information in this respect from Father López, also adds that these Indians had always lived in war with Kapanawas (whom López visited briefly on the Tapiche). After three months spent among the Remo, López went back to Requena, from where in 1911 he sent a French priest Enrique Leuque Larunda (a.k.a. Henri Philippe or Enrique Philips Leuque) to the new mission, denominated *Santa María de los Remos* [Salvador 1972].

Leuque found it after five days of ascending the Blanco River from *Ca-panagua*, a rubber-gatherers' village. By the time of his arrival, the Remos had divided into groups gathered around two *curacas*, Roque Luceiro and José Cuchirana, who had left to Jaquirana with his people, only to come back at the news of the missionary's arrival [see Izaguirre 1922-29 12: 248]. By 1913, Leuque wrote to López that the Indians were increasingly coming under the influence of local patrons and he was losing his authority among them [Salvador 1972: 78-83]. In December of 1913, the missionary was attacked by "various groups" of Indians he thought were instigated by the *patrones* and was hurt, but managed to escape at night [Salvador 1972: 83-85; see also Ortiz 1986: 249-251].

When López visited this group, he noted that men removed all facial hair and perforated their earlobes, upper lips and nostrils. On festive occasions feathers or palm pines that gave them "a cat look" were put in the lip perforations. They wore shell pendants hanging from their nose partitions (Tessmann – whose informant was Leuque – said feathers were inserted instead) and shells were used as earrings. Both sexes were tattooed on the faces and bodies, especially women. They also used necklaces, wristbands and ankle-bands made of shells, monkey teeth or weaved from cotton by women. The Indians also made headdresses of leaves and macaw feathers [Izaguirre 1922-29, 12: 244-46].

According to the information given to Tessman, men had also their penises tattooed, and while hunting or cultivating tied them in the upwards position to a belt. Women tied a gourd that covered their genitals. Their house was built on an oval plan, and all slept in hammocks. Communication between the houses was maintained by means of drums [Tessmann 1999: 319]. The dead were cremated, their ashes mixed with *chicha* (maize beverage) and consumed during a feast with all the relatives and friends present, dancing and wailing to the beat of *dundúri* or *manguare* (hallowed tree trunk drums) [Izaguirre 1922-29, 12: 245-47]. Leuque told Tessmann that part of the corpse was first consumed by the closest relatives, and the

ashes were saved during a month of mourning, after which the *chicha* or feast was prepared [Tessmann 1999: 319].

Henri Leuque has also left the first, random list of words from the Remo language, published in Izaguirre 1922-29 [13: 538-540]. Elsewhere, a detailed analysis of linguistic data available for the Remo groups was presented [Krokoszyński and Fleck forthcoming, see also Fleck forthcoming]. The Remo language documented by Father Leuque on the Blanco River was the first Remo language ever recorded. It has proven to be the most divergent among the Remo languages and while belonging to the Nawa group of the Panoan family, could be placed in a separate linguistic subgroup by itself.

We have not been able to find any subsequent mentions of this group after Leuque's leave, and its fate is unknown. However, the name itself has stayed in the discourse on isolated groups in the Tapiche-Jaquirana River area, as is testified by the Kapanawas' testimonies or the more recent use of the term by the local population (*mestizos* from the Requena area and *Matses* from the Galvez River) (see below).

The Batã River (1918-21)

Shortly after the failure of the Blanco River mission, Indians called Remo were reported at another location. According to a story told in the 1970's to J. Melatti and D. Montagner, their informant's father Raimundo de Souza Luzeiro raised a Remo child that had been captured by the Peruvians. When the boy grew up, went back to his people and after some time, before 1918-1921, brought some 80 Remos to live and work in Luzeiro's rubber estate, located on the Batã River in Brazil (a right affluent of the Jaquirana River).

According to Luzeiro's daughter, there were some 300 Remos living with her family on the Batã before the epidemic of 1918 (or 1921, according to the son). The disease had decimated them and Remos went back to Peru. She remembered that they had many perforations in their lips and at least one in their noses. Lived in a large rounded hut with two doors. Their dead were cremated and their ashes mixed with the maize beverage, while all their property, crops and animals were destroyed or killed. Among them were also a few blue-eyed and light-skinned women said to be "daughters of the Peruvians" [Melatti & Montagner 2005: 10-11]. The short list of Remo words recalled by Mrs. Maria Luzeiro was gathered by J. Melatti and D. Montagner.

Proximity of the Batã River and the documented migrations of the Blanco to the Jaquirana River leave some possibility that Remos working for

the Luzeiro family on the Batã were connected with the Indians living with Father Leuque on the Blanco River. The former have been said to come from and eventually left back to Peru. There is also the possibility that the Blanco Remos' leader, named Roque *Luceiro*, was the Remo child raised by Raimundo *Luzeiro*, who would have given him his name. The few words that Maria Luzeiro recalled from the Batã Remo language were kindly made available to us by Prof. Melatti. Unfortunately, the short list does not allow for any reliable conclusions other than this that the language also belongs to the Nawa group of the Panoan family.

The Batã River (1926)

In 1926, a few years after the Peruvian Remos had left the Luzeiros, Brazilian medic João Braulino de Carvalho visited the Batã river. Working with the joint boundary commission on Javari, he has left a report on the Indians he called *Remus*, and who referred to themselves as *Nucuiny* (which he translated as 'good people'). Carvalho was told that they had sometime in the past lived in a large village on the Batã river. However, in 1926 they were reduced or dispersed to two settlements called *Contas*, and *San Pablo* (whose exact locations are unknown), and some families lived in the Jaquirana-Ipixuna divide [Carvalho 1931: 252].

They were monogamous, used bows, and lived with their leader in large longhouses with two or three doors, divided into nuclear families' sections [ibid.: 253]. The *Nucuiny* also cremated their dead and shared the ashes between the relatives to be consumed in chicha [ibid.: 254].

They were all tattooed, and Carvalho was convinced that the name Remo was given to them on the Jaquirana because of the similarity between the designs tattooed on their faces (around the mouth, see e.g., Matses and Poyanawa on Fig. 1) and the paddles used by the caucheros. Their tattoos were composed of circles around the mouth, and some designs on the arms, neck and face. Women's tattoos were mostly applied on chests [ibid.: 252]. Carvalho has also recovered a list of Remu-Nucuini words.¹⁰

Relation between the Remos described by the Luzeiros and those visited on the Batã by Carvalho is uncertain. The former had left Batã by early 1920's and were replaced by the Indians identified as Marubo from the

¹⁰ Carvalho's information on the *Remu* – *Nucuiny* was later copied by J. Lima Figueirêdo in his 1939 publication.

Curuça River [Melatti & Montagner 2005: 11]. The Nucuiny language documented by Carvalho was different from that of the Blanco River Indians and can be classified along with Poyanawa, Nukini and Iskonawa.

Carvalho's mention of the *Remu* auto-denomination *Nucuiny* gave rise to confusion among ethnographers and linguists. Although the author himself did not connect the *Remu* he described with any other group, this was done by other authors assuming that this auto-denomination signified that Carvalho's *Remu* (and by extension other Remos as well) were the same as *Inokuinins* or *Nukuini* from Moa reported by Linhares (1913) and Tastevin [1921].

Moa, Tapiche and Buncuya; 1930's

Some time after Carvalho visited Rhemus on the Batã River, the Kapanawa from the Tapiche and Buncuya Rivers in the 1930's had contact with a group they designated as *Rïmo* in the headwaters of the Tapiche and Môa Rivers.

In 1972 a Summer Institute of Linguistics missionary Dick Montag interviewed Teobaldo Chumo Tuanama (?) living in *Contaya* on Tapiche. He was told that this 40-some year old Kapanawa man had been taken to Brazil "at about age 2 and stayed for about 10 years", living with four families of Remos on the Môa River. Although the man did not remember many words, and supposedly gave Kapanawa instead, Montag did gather some data that unfortunately were not available to us [Montag 1972].

One year later, another SIL missionary, Eugene Loos, while working on the Buncuya River, found two 60-year old men (Ernesto Baquinahua and Manuel Chumo) who maintained that they had gone from Tapiche to the Môa River in the 1930's to gather rubber along with nine other Kapanawa and their wives. There they found a group of 27 Indians they called Remos and spent almost a year living with them in "cordial relationships", gathering rubber and hunting for hides. According to Ernesto Baquinahua, those Indians did not use "canoes or paddles or clothes and did not work rubber" [Loos 1973-74, see also Loos 1976 and Ribeiro & Wise 1978: 168-169].

Apparently, the three interviews refer to the same events. This would signify, that some of the Kapanawa stayed with *Rïmo* for up to ten years. Our informant, an elderly Buncuya River Kapanawa recalled a man living with the Remos (or *Remobákëbö*) for around two years, moving between Tapiche and Maquía Rivers' headwaters.

Very little information is available on this group, however. Apart from the *Rimo* wordlists recovered from Kapanawa by E. Loos, the only data that seems to pertain to this group is to be found in the Kapanawa-Spanish dictionary published by the Looses. According to it, Remos wore tattoos from mouth to ears that made them look “like jaguars” and the Remo language sounded to Kapanawa “as if a condor was singing” [Loos y Loos 2003: 373, 312]. Their language is the third Remo language documented and in the already mentioned analysis has been identified as most similar to Amawaka.

The Kapanawa Indians also had other experiences with people they called Remo. For example, in the 1970’s there was an 80-year old woman said to be half-Remo, and a relative of Teobaldo, living on the Tapiche [Montag 1972]. The contact would thus have taken place around 1890. It is worth mentioning, that Victor Oppenheim in 1936 reported having met Panoan Indians called Rhemu living on the Tapiche. They were said to have come from Jaquirana, denominated themselves *Nucuini* and wore tattoos “identical” to those of *Nucuini* living on the Ramon (*Ramao*) stream (see below), although the Latvian geologist doubted they belonged to the same group [Oppenheim 1936a: 151]. Evidently, the relations between Indians living on the Tapiche and those denominated Remo were more common in the past.

A Buncuya informant also told us that her father had a direct contact with two friendly interior groups living in the area in the 1920’s or 1930’s. The names he used were Remo or Remoauca and Kashibo. Its members had their nostrils and earlobes pierced and were “painted”, and the Kapanawa man was able to communicate with them.

Remos and other isolated groups between the Buncuya and Yavari Mirim Rivers (20th-21st century)

From the beginning of the 20th century, the name Remo functioned in the Galvéz – Javari Rivers region on the background of many other denominations brought by outsiders from different parts of the Peruvian Montaña and the general underdifferentiation of interior groups. Avencio Villarejo who visited Javari and Jaquirana in the same year that Oppenheim crossed from the Môa to Tapiche River (1936), reported that the zone was depopulated of the white settlers for fear of the Pisahuas (or Pisabos/Pichabos) who togeth-

er with the Marubos had “dominated” Remos and Mayorunas [Villarejo 1959: 147]. Earlier, there were the denominations Sachavaca, Pisavos, Huacamayos-auca and even Hamuacas [Fuentes 1908: 149], Cahuapanas [Izagurre 1922-29, 12: 196] or *Rêmo* and Chamicuro [Melatti 1981: 18] reported between the Tapiche and Jaquirana.¹¹ There were also Mayo, Pecanoyus [López 1913: 210], and in later years Grillos or Capishto, Cumala, Shapajas and Pinshes [Villarejo 2002: 128]. Also the name Kapanawa was applied indiscriminately [e.g., Fields 1963 in reference to the Matses]. In this denominational plethora, by the second half of the 20th century, some authors still assumed Remo to be a specific group that was either extinct, or gone to Brazil.

In the second half of the 20th century, application of the name Remo was documented in different sources in reference to uncontacted groups living in the area between the Tapiche and Yavarí Mirim Rivers. Luis Uriarte recorded reports of the Marubo Indians on the Tamshiyacu Stream, an area formerly supposedly shared with a *Rêmo* group [1976: 46]. Ribeiro and Wise doubted existence of any Remos in Peru, and were inclined to think they had left to the Môa River, most likely referring to the SIL data mentioned above [1978: 168].

The name has endured, and native and *mestizo* local population still use it today. Most recently, it has been documented among local populations in connection with the unknown groups from the Tapiche and Blanco Rivers [Aguirre y Villasante 2003; Aquise 2007; Krogh 2006], Galvez and Yavarí Mirim Rivers [Anonymous 1988; Allen 1994; Matlock 2002, Krogh 2006]. The author has also found its use among the Buncuya River Kapanawa in reference to the uncontacted Indians on the upper Buncuya and, sporadically, among the Shipibo-Konibo on the middle Ucayali [Krokoszynski et al. 2007]. Most often, it is accompanied by other names of similar character, such as Kapanawa, Isconahua, Kashibo, Kampa, Mayoruna, Mayu, or Yaminawa from among the already existing, and Barba Negras, Boca Negra, or Pelo Largo from those elaborated locally.

It is very probable that of the large native population that has been identified as Remo, some parts were extinguished by the heavy slave-hunting in the area. Others possibly came to contribute to neighboring, known Panoan ethnic units (such as Amawaka, Marubo, Nukini, Poyanawa, Kapanawa).

¹¹ Some Peruvian-influenced proto-Marubo identified these two backwoods groups on Tamchiaco stream in early 20th century.

Still other parts remain isolated and unknown until today. Recent research done by anthropologists in the area confirms that the extensive territory of highland zone contained between the sources of the Buncuya, Tapiche, Moa, Abujao, Calleria, Cashiboya and Maquía Rivers is still occupied by the native population of unknown number and affiliation, in distinct locations denominated generically Remo (-auca), Kapanawa, Iskonnawa or Nawa [Aguirre & Villasante 2003; Aquisé 2007; Arbaiza et al. 1995; Brabec & Pérez 2006; Matorela 2004; Montagner 2002; Krogh 2006; Krokoszynski et al. 2007; Ricardo & Ricardo 2006; see also Correia 2005a and Oliveira 1987 in: Nogueira 1991]. This area possibly forms part of a larger area stretching along the Peruvian border with Brazil from the upper Juruá River [Zarzar 2000] to the south, to the Yavarí Mirim River to the north-east, where indications of uncontacted groups have also been recently gathered [Krogh 2006]. Also possible is the connection of this larger area with the Javari Valley Reserve in Brazil – where the existence of a number of uncontacted groups has been documented [e.g., Melatti 1981] – through the upper Jaquirana River. At present, the Peruvian native organization AIDSEP makes efforts to protect this area by creating national reserves (“Tapiche-Yaquerana”, “Maquía-Calleria” and “Yavarí Mirim”) and reinforcing the existing ones (“Isconahua”).

Nukini of the Môa River

One of the groups that in the ethnographical literature are sometimes connected with the historical Remos are the Nukini or Nucuini (the former being the current official Brazilian name, the latter being used in the literature) from the Môa River (an affluent of the Juruá River in Brazil). While it is possible to connect their ancestors with people described in the past, they were rarely (if ever) called Remo by Brazilians and do not identify themselves as Remo. Although we trace their connection with the other Remos to the ambiguity of historical sources, we also present indications that they could have been among the groups denominated Remo in the past, as well.

The first historical mention possibly referring to Nukini ancestors comes from 1911, when a SPI (Serviço de Proteção ao Índio) inspector Máximo Linhares [1913 in: Correia 2005b, Montagner 2002, Rivet and Tastevin 1921] found a group of 80 Indians called *Inocu-inins* living in the rubber estate called Gibraltar on the upper Môa River. Linhares learned that earlier they had for some time been forced to work in Peru, but managed to

flee to Brazil. At that time they were divided into two groups, gathered around a “Peruvian” from the *Xáxá-Baca* who recently pretended to be their leader, and a second one called Purivavô or Evaristo who had formerly been the leader of all. The inspector maintained that the term inocu-inins signified ‘poisonous and odorous jaguar’.

Father Constant Tastevin maintained that the upper Môa River was inhabited by the *Nukuinis* living in utmost misery, having been deprived of their fields subsequent to the influx of rubber workers on the river [Tastevin 1919: 146, 148-149], with their “remnants”, roaming between the *Singarú* and Môa Rivers [1920: 133]. In 1921 he identified the Nukuini with Inukuini, or the group mentioned by Linhares [Rivet & Tastevin 1921: 469]. By 1924, he managed to gather a wordlist from a Nukuini man, whose people were also called *Tsitsaya-nawa* (‘men which are tattooed’) [Tastevin 1924: 425]. It is important to note that Tastevin never connected Nukuini with Remo, whom he located to the southwest as a separate group (see above).

In 1936 Victor Oppenheim found ten to fifteen families of Indians who themselves referred to as *Nucuini*, on the border with Peru, on the the upper Ramon Stream (left tributary of the upper Môa approximating the Tapiche River headwaters) [Oppenheim 1936a, 1971]. He found out that they were survivals from the Paraná da Republica (or the Novo Recreio River) migrating from an epidemic, had had previous contacts with nationals, used manufactured tools. They lived in a large longhouse and were able to communicate with Panoan Indians accompanying Oppenheim, identified as Kashinawa from República estate¹² and especially with a Poyanawa man. Their tattoos – which the account suggests were worn mostly by women and the more aged men – were of a distinct kind, and more elaborated than those of either Poyanawa or Kashinawa. Apparently there were still other “isolated groups of the tribe” that still practiced funerary cannibalism [Oppenheim 1971: 167]. Contemporary Nukini maintain that the upper Ramon Stream was around this time inhabited by yet another group [Montagner 2002: 99-100].

When traveling further through the Tapiche River, Oppenheim met other Indians autodenominated *Nucuini* (and with “identical” tattoos¹³).

¹² During Oppenheim’s visit to this estate the Indians working for the boss were called *Cashinaua*, and their old campgrounds were located on the upper Azul River, a tributary of Môa [Oppenheim 1971: 162, 156]. This is surprising, as the estate is connected with the contemporary Nukini in their oral histories.

¹³ Tattoos of several groups met by Oppenheim were reproduced in his second 1936 paper [1936b, see also Erikson 1994, 1999]. Among them, the three Nucuini, Rhemu, Capanauá and Punhamumanauá

They had come from Jaquirana, and were called *Rhemus* by the local population. Oppenheim suspected that despite the autodenomination, they belonged to a group distinct from the Ramon Stream Nucuini, assuming these were the same *Rhemus* whom the Nucuini chief told him they fought at the headwaters of the Tapiche River.

We were not able to locate subsequent mentions of the Nucuini Indians until the 1970's, when Brazilian anthropologists and FUNAI workers reported a small group known as Nukini, living mostly in the rubber estate República, and families from the different Môa groups scattered in different estates [Montagner 1977: 2]. D. Montagner also mentioned alternative versions of the name by which Nukini were known, namely *Kuinin* and *Shin-kin-shiá* (the latter being applied to them by the Nawa) [Montagner 2002].

Recently, another group, called Nawa, has been identified among the Môa River families who trace their descent to native ancestors [Montagner 2002]. The Nukini and Nawa families present their history as one of families or groups of originally heterogeneous locations coming to live together in the *shiringales* (rubber estates) from the Môa's different tributaries (especially from the Azul River – Novo Recreio Stream divide) in the early 20th century, some willingly, others forced by rubber bosses [Aguiar 2004; Montagner 1977, 2002].

The Nukini recalled having had hostile and violent contacts with people they designated as Kapanawa, Shipibo (the rubber gatherers), Poyanawa, Mayo (from the Javari River) and Kapatxo (from the Moa Mountains) [Montagner 1977: 39].

Oppenheim's Nucuini, as well as Linhares' Inocu-inins might with much probability be identified with ancestors of the modern Nuikini. None of these authors did mention the name Remo in connection with those groups, but they have been associated with Remos by various authors. Connection between the contemporary Nukini and Remos in the literature could be traced to a mistaken interpretation of Carvalho's data or ambiguity of the situation described by Oppenheim. The first was presented by Č. Loukotka, who assumed that Carvalho's Remu-Nucuinny and Tastevin's

tattoos are of similar type, contrasting with Poyanauá and Mayu designs. It is interesting to note the striking similarity of Tessmann's Remo woman's design [Tessmann 1999: 319, 194] to Oppenheim's Rhemu tattoo (see Fig. p. 95). When Delvair Montagner visited Môa in 1977, she saw an elderly woman (originally from a Jaquirana River group) tattooed in the manner described by Oppenheim for Ramon's Nucuini [Montagner 1977].

Nukuni spoke the same language, ignoring actual differences in linguistic data [Loukotka 1968: 170]. Similarly, S. Sussekund de Mendoça assumed that Carvalho's *Remus* and Nukini from the Môa River belonged to the same group [1991: 272]. D. Montagner, on the other hand, in 1977 interpreted Oppenheim's mention of the *Rhemus* found on Tapiche as Nukini relatives who had gone to Peru [Montagner 1977: 39]. With these links, and with Ribeiro's and Wise's unsubstantiated Remo migration hypothesis it was only natural to assume that Nukini and Iskonawa were the last Remos (the former taking refuge in Brazil) [Erikson 1994: 15].

In the process, Nukini were also connected with the Iskonawa. The linguistic analysis shows that the two groups also speak separate languages.

Apart from this identification made quite recently in the literature, there is little to confirm that Nukini were called Remo in Brazil. Delvair Montagner denies having ever heard the name Remo in reference to the Nukini or Nawa on the Môa River (personal communication), and she cites only one local man who recalled the name at all [Montagner 2002: 113].

However, from the Peruvian perspective, Nukini were perfectly suited to be identified as Remo, occupying the general area where the Remos were expected. One of the strongest indications that the Môa Nukini were at times identified as Remo comes from the information gathered by Dick Montag in 1972. This author was told that around 1964, Francisco Cordeiro (Bolota), who at that time owned the República estate on the Môa, while visiting the Tapiche River, maintained that "he worked with Remos on the Moa River" in the place called Shiringa Alta [Montag 1972]. These Indians could only have been the Nukini or the Nawa. Furthermore, because the territory exploited by the Nukini ancestors in its widest extended far into Peru (their relatives were also living in Peru) [Aguiar 2004, Montagner 1977, 2002], it overlapped with the areas associated by the Peruvians with the name Remo. It is very likely that in cases of contact with the Peruvians (including the Shipibo or Kapanawa) – the Nukini were labeled Remo.

Iskonawa of the Utuquinía and Callería Rivers

Another contemporary group linked to historical Remos were the 25 or 27 Iskobákebö or Iskonawa (Isconahua) Indians who in 1959 came into contact with South American Mission members in the headwaters of the Utuquinía River (see Map). Because this area was, as has been demonstrated,

associated with the name Remo, it was only natural to assume they were descendants of the Callería-Abujao River Remos from the 19th century. The author was told that the local Shipibo had in fact initially called them Rēmōbō, which was later found insulting by the Iskonawa.

Variants of the denomination Iskonawa were sporadically noted by other authors in different locations. In 1905 Scharff had contact with Iscunahua Indians on the Rio de las Piedras (affluent of the Madre de Dios River) [Granadino 1916: 349, 356], and in 1925 the Isku-naua were documented among the Katukina on the Gregorio River by Tastevin [1925: 415]. Currently, Iskonawa are reported as one of the Gregorio River Yawanawa descent groups [e.g., Calavia 2001]. It is not possible to connect any of these sources with the small group found on the upper Utuquinía. It is not clear whether Villarejo was referring to the newly contacted group in 1959, when he spelled it *Isacnahuas*, had documented use of this name for the Sierra del Divisor group prior to that date, or simply copied Dueñas' information on the *Ysacnaguas* [Villarejo 1959]. Indians living in the area corresponding exactly with the Iskonawa habitat have been identified as Remo by Tastevin [e.g., 1919, 1924] and as *Amahuacos/Amauachos* by Oppenheim [1936a].

Although the small group was initially to be taken to a SAM location in Contamana, the idea was opposed by the Shipibo and Iskonawa were transferred to the Callería River [Matorela 2004: 32-33], where they were found by the Whiton expedition, and where their remnants live today.

The Iskonawa lived in typical Panoan *malocas* (longhouses). They had their nostrils, ears and nose partitions perforated, and wore oropendola feathers, palm spine whiskers and shell pendants in them. Previous to the contact with SAM, they had also applied tattoos around the lips and on the cheeks, and the living Iskonawa remember some older members who wore them. The tattoo was applied to a young man during a feast (Krokoszyński field data, see Fig. p. 95). They cremated the dead, but did not practice anthropophagy. On festive occasions they used drums made of hollowed tree trunks, which were also used for communication, and hunted with bows and arrows [for more detailed ethnographic information, see Małkin 1962; Whiton et al. 1964; Momsen 1964; Arbaiza et al. 1995; Matorela 2004; Brabec & Pérez 2006].

Iskonawa were identified as Remo descendants on the geographic argument and on the local denomination by the first outside visitors [Kensinger 1961, Małkin 1962, Momsen 1964, Whiton et al. 1964]. All the groups that

had been enumerated by them were interpreted as composing the “Remo Tribe” [Momsen 1964: 62] or “Association” [Whiton et al. 1964]. The analysis of the sources led Whiton et al. to assume that the “Remo tribe” was divided into the southern (Iskonawa) and northern branch (in which Carvalho’s group was included according to the Tessmann’s data) [Whiton et al. 1964].

Some authors later doubted such identification. Loos did not equate Iskonawa and the *Rimo* contacted by Kapanawa linguistically [e.g., 1976], and Ribeiro and Wise maintained that the Remos were Iskonawa’s enemies [1978: 131]. In 1975, Robert Braun hesitated in identifying them with historical Remos and assumed they had migrated from the south-east and was inclined to connect them with the Sharanahua and Kashinawa Indians. Oppenheim’s [1936a] location of *Amahuacos* or *Amauachos* corresponded with the Iskonawa habitat only 20 years later. Current data show that the Iskonawa language is distinct from the three documented Remo languages, as well as from the Nukini.

As has been demonstrated, the Iskonawa or Nukini could not be identified with any other group known as Remo on which linguistic material is available, at the same time being culturally close to all other groups in the general area. Because of their geographic position, they were *denominated* Remo from the outside, whether locally or by the scientists from the distance. It is therefore reasonable to assume that their ancestors were among groups identified as Remo in the past.

The Remo denomination use

Among different applications of the name Remo throughout documented history, one can identify three major ones. Firstly, it is its generic, widest application that sets boundaries for this paper, including the earliest as well as the most recent mentions of Remo. The denomination has been applied indiscriminately by the riverine populations to all socially and spatially distanced people of the interfluvial zone between the Ucayali and Juruá or Javari Rivers. It is impossible to draw any strong conclusions about connections between all those underdifferentiated groups. Secondly, it refers to specific, localized groups, visited at a certain time or reported in a set location by a particular person. These concrete Remo groups can be identified by adding the visitor’s name or the location. Of these, some reports do not

Map. The extensions of denomination Remo

allow for any comparisons with any other groups. Others leave indications that allow to draw certain conclusions as to their connections with other groups and are thus the most significant. Finally, apart from groups that were documented as Remo, it has been used to those that are known by other names, but have been assumed to be Remo descendants.

The provenience of this denomination will have to remain obscure. Possibly it could be traced to one of the local groups denomination, to a generic description of people connected by a cultural or linguistic feature¹⁴ or to insults applied by the Panoans to their neighbors. The name Remo has however taken on different meanings as it was applied by other people at different places. The homophony of this name with a Spanish word for a paddle has in the early 20th century led nationals and some ethnographers to believe (and possibly to apply the name to new groups accordingly) that the name referred to the similarity of certain kind of a regionally popular motif of a native tattoo (of the type applied by the Matses, Marubo or Poyanawa) to the shape of a tool commonly used in the Peruvian *selva* [e.g., Carvalho 1931; Erikson 1994]. It is also possible that contemporary popularity of this denomination among the Matses in reference to uncontacted groups is due to the similarity of the name Remo to a traditional designation Dēmushbo, referring to the whiskers worn by an enemy group.¹⁵

When it was reported for the first time in the 17th century, the *Cunibo* denomination Remo referred to a rather large group (or a set of groups) living on the Tamaya River. It virtually disappeared from sources for over a century with the failure of the Jesuit missions on the upper Ucayali River. It must have been in use locally however, although gradually changing its point of reference. Reappearing at the end of the 18th century, it had already moved north towards the Sierra del Divisor. At this point, it was presented as one of many group names in the *Setebo* perspective. Gradually, mentions of the other groups disappeared from the documents and were substituted by the vast-reaching Remo denomination. Throughout the 19th century, all the groups living east of the Ucayali River, between the Canchahuaya Hills and the Abujao or Tamaya Rivers came to be called by this name by the

¹⁴ Some of the many names reported by Setebo in early 1800's might have referred to local groups denominations (they do correspond with contemporary names of descent groups among different Pano), others possibly composed generic labels.

¹⁵ Harriet Fields maintained that Demushbo was a name applied by them to Remo [Fields 1963 in: Erikson 1994: 15], and the equation of Nēmushbo and Remoaucá was also cited by Krogh [2006] [see Krokoszyński and Fleck forthcoming for further details on the Matses use of this name].

riverine Indians and the incoming nationals. One or a few of these many groups were contacted by the Franciscans and for a long time the name was to be associated with the Callería River. In this period, the little known backwoods population became an object of intensive slave-hunting. While it had been practiced at least since the first documents on the riverine Panoans from the 17th century, there are indications that it intensified with the arrival of colonists.

At the end of the 19th century, when various authors repeated secondary, classic information on the Remos in the Sierra del Divisor, and the Callería River Remos, or the only Remos actually contacted were now only a memory, the name reappeared again in the Javari basin. Although it had never before been reported in this area, it was there that it was mostly to be found throughout the 20th century.¹⁶ As has been demonstrated, in this area it was applied to linguistically differing groups. It is therefore reasonable to assume that it was not the people called Remo that migrated to the Javari basin, but the name itself. While it is not clear what caused the previous denomination extension by the end of the 18th century, it is quite evident that by the end of the 19th century it was brought to the Javari basin by the Peruvian rubber gatherers. Augusto da Cunha Gomes who visited the Javari River in 1897, reported that the majority of the Jaquirana River population was at that time composed of quechua-speaking rubber workers from Peru [Gomes 1898: 248; see also Matlock 2002: 106].

Kapanawa from the Tapiche and Buncuya Rivers used the name at least until the 1930's, but the use of its quechua variant Remo-*auca* indicates that rather than referring to their own set of denominations, Kapanawa borrowed it – along with such designations as Kashibo, Mayoruna, etc. – from the nationals or other riverine groups with whom they came into contact since the early 20th century, such as Kokama or Shipibo. Here, the denomination is still being used in reference to backwoods groups of the upper Buncuya and Tapiche Rivers.

By the end of the 20th century, the name Remo was borrowed from the *mestizos* or other groups by the Peruvian Matses contacted in the 1960's in the Galvéz River basin. There too, it is still being reused in reference to uncontacted groups of the area, also farthest north among the Remo name applications – on the Yavarí Mirim River (an affluent of the Javari River).

¹⁶ See for example the enumeration of historical and contemporary groups of the Javari or Juruá in Marcoy 1867: 99.

Comparison of the material available on Remo groups leads to a conclusion that the application of the name Remo has been highly unspecific throughout the three ages of its usage in the Ucayali basin. Even if it did refer to a specific group contacted by Father Richter at the end of the 17th century, it has become a generic label that did not refer to ethnographic or linguistic reality. It was appearing in new locations, thus moving progressively into the northeastern direction, in the 20th century following the Peruvian colonists as far from its first usage as the Javari River region. This situation resulted in the great territorial extension of the name Remo, with the extremes ranging over some 600 km which separate the Tamaya River and Yavari Mirim River. Its provenience was Peruvian, and its use in Brazil was marginal, mostly as a result of the Peruvian influence.

The Remo denomination case evokes other examples known in contemporary literature. Similar, generic usage has been noted by a number of scholars among Panoan groups, but obviously it also has a more general import. In the Panoan context, among denominations that were in use among outside observers, with the referent changing, one could note the vast, underdifferentiated usage of Mayoruna, Marubo, Amawaka, Yamina-wa, Kapanawa, Kashibo, Iskonawa, but also Katukina, or Kulina names. Apart from these, one could enumerate those generic names that did not come to be connected with any contemporary group, such as Barbudos, Pelados, Bocas Negras, Pisabos, Kapishto, Mayu, Sensi. Marcel d'Ans referred to this situation, when pointing to an almost mathematical relation between the denominations and the local knowledge: "the smaller the objective knowledge about an indigenous ethnic group, the larger the number of different names that are used to designate it" [D'Ans 1973: 42].¹⁷

Apart from the sheer ignorance about the isolated backwoods groups, such denominations seem to be a product of intersection between Euro-American and Amerindian imaginations of – and projections on – interior or marginalized or *savage* groups. As demonstrated by ethnohistorian M. H. Baqueiro Paraíso in her analysis of historical native-colonial relations in eastern Brazil [1998], such local denominations functioned in colonists' discourse as categories of native groups depending on their current relations with them. The cultural or social characteristics were in this context associated with a generic denomination, such as *Botocudos*

¹⁷ Translation by the author ("Si menor es el conocimiento objetivo que se tiene de una etnia indígena, mayor es el número de nombres diferentes que circulan para referirse a ella").

(savage, cannibalistic) or *Naknenuk* (tamed, civilizable) and projected on different groups. Such local and generic designations would later be interpreted as referring to the larger ethnic entities by ethnographers, historians or linguists. In this way, unconnected groups sharing a common territory, cultural characteristic, or just a generic label would have been assumed to compose a single unit, as in the Remo case.

On the other hand, such names could have referred to the different levels of identifying allies or foes (depending on spatial and social distance to them) by the Amerindian groups with whom colonists came into contact. According to the argument presented by Peter Gow [1993], in the imageries of the various contemporary riverine Ucayali basin groups, the isolated Indians function as a pole that helps to define their own social life on a continuum between the savage (wild Indians) and the excessively civilized (represented by the gringos). It seems likely that from the 17th century, reinforced further by the acceptance and the specific use of the term Remo by the nationals along with the accompanying preconceptions, the name has composed part of the Amerindian discourse on identities on the Ucayali. For the Shipibo-Konibo, all the Remos, as well as Amawaka or Kashibo would have stand as a sign for “the wild Indian” or the woodlands, savage pole, marked by antisociality, isolation and the lack of knowledge, as they do today. One could argue that in such a context, the actual identity of the distantiated and little known groups has been less important for the riverine population than the role they played in the imagery used to define social worlds on the river banks.

Panoan social organization characteristics and making of contemporary groups

Contrary to the generalizing tendency in application of the name Remo by the outsiders, the internal Panoan discourse on identity or the social worlds is much more complex. Assuming that majority of the Remo groups was Panoan, which at this point seems most probable, an insight into the conceptions on identity and history of other Panoan groups might give some sense of what social reality the Remo groups lived in.¹⁸

¹⁸ We must however also take into consideration other affiliations among the Remo groups. In the area associated with Remo, there were also located the non-Panoan Mayú (probably of Arawakan affiliation [Fleck 2007]), and the Sensi wordlist gathered by Tessmann might be divergent from all the Panoan languages and possibly Arawakan-influenced [Krokoszyński and Fleck forthcoming].

Fig.1. Facial tattoos and ornamentations in Panoan groups (reconstructions by the author).

Many of the contemporary Panoan ethnic groups perceive their current situation as a product of mixing of different units or kinds of people, whether by alliance (Marubo, Katukina, Yawanawa, Amawaka) or by force (Matses, Shipibo).

While such differences and divergent identities could be highlighted by the Panoan need for an Other in the discourse on identity [Erikson 1986, 1992; Keifenheim 1990; Lagrou 1998; Calavia 2002], and do not always refer to differences readily perceived by traditional ethnography, the same logic was also capable of incorporating elements differing linguistically or ethnographically. The best documented case of such an ability for incorporation is the Brazilian Marubo group, composed in the early 20th century of various local Panoan groups, some of whom spoke divergent languages. While today they are conceived of as descent groups, it is quite evident that at least some of them earlier composed differing units, or parts of different sets of marital alliances. While disruption produced by the rubber boom was an important factor in this rearrangement, the indigenous responses followed the preexisting patterns of social organization [Ruedas 2001].

Such an organization had the potential to abstract itself from the “ethnographic facts” to some degree. What appears to have played a more important role in intra-Panoan relations was the immediate social level of interactions, or the direct, mundane alliances and scissions. Indeed, the fluidity of the Panoan social organization contributed to the intermixing of groups and to constant changing of the marital alliances [Barclay & Santos 1994].

This situation would be facilitated by many similarities (and subtle differences) existing between various Panoan units, including those in the material culture (see Fig. p. 95), language and social organization [e.g., Erikson 1986]. Among them could be included the seemingly common Panoan pattern of organizing interactions in the lines of categories of “peoples” living together and intermarrying. The similarity of categories (denominations) found across diverse contemporary Panoan groups would open the potential for rearrangements and alliances even across ethnic or linguistic divisions which would further contribute to the fuzziness of borders between the units.¹⁹

However, it was the most basic, local categories that gave Panoans the priority for defining their identity [Erikson 1986: 186]. They did not perceive

¹⁹ The Matses were capable of incorporating even members of a non-Panoan group identified by them as Mayu and as Mayoruna or Morike by Tessmann [Fleck 2007].

themselves as “ethnic entities” or “tribes” which were the products of contact with the dominant societies, but as a series of named groups distinct from each other, and seen as different *peoples* [Erikson 1994: 26-27].

Although information on the level these native classifications referred to is often vague, the information gathered among different Panoans would suggest that they could designate (1) lineage or descent units, organizing marital principles; (2) current (temporary) localized residence groups, identified by their location, leader’s name, or even prevalence of one descent group; (3) generic names or labels applied to strangers (Mayu, Nawa, Mukanawa, Mananawa, also Remo, Mayoruna, Amawaka, Yaminawa, etc.) or to people identified as own (variations of the name Matses among Mayoruna groups, and Huni Kuin variations among Nawa groups).

The flexibility of this organization, based in the most immediate relations, allowed also for transforming the levels of denomination reference (so that a residence group could become descent unit or vice versa, any of the former could become a generic name, etc.) or the forms taken by the units themselves [e.g. abandoning or accepting the alternative generation descent principle in favor of an adjacent generation descent, see Ruedas 2001: 704-706].

Identifications of this kind could be indicated in the Remo sources in such mentions as the early enumerations of backwoods groups by the Setebo (and possibly also captives coming from those, identified as Remos themselves), or in the contact relations such as with the Calleria River Remos, when the different *parcialidades* have been reported. More detailed information is to be gained from the groups that most recently have been labeled Remo and whose ancestors most likely were included in the Remo category.

Among the Nukini, the contemporary situation seems to be perceived as a result of mixing various groups or families. Identity of these units and their mutual connections are in many cases unknown. Among the reported Nukini ancestors, such groups of unknown status were the Pārivakevô, of the Tapiche River origin, and the Ronobakevô from the Jaquirana River (who were persecuted by the Peruvians and made to collect rubber), among others [Montagner 1977: 37]. Contemporary Nukini recall the following names thought to be descent groups or “clans”: Inubakëvu, Panabakëvu, Itsābakëvu and Shānumbakëvu [Correia 2005b] or inuvakebo, vunavakebo, itsavakebo, among others [Lima 1994: 24].

Stories told by the Calleria River Iskonawa [Matorela 2004; Brabec & Pérez 2006; Krokoszyński field data] as well as their close linguistic affilia-

tion with Poyanawa and Nukini suggest their previous association with the Brazilian area to the east or south-east of where they met with SAM. Initially, they reported relations with groups called Runu-, Jawan-, Awa-, Wari-, Yawa-, Nai- bakēbo. In the period preceding the encounter with SAM, they maintained the closest relations with Inu, Tsinu and Isubēnē [Whiton et al. 1964: 102] and fought with Indians called Michinahua and/or Pimishnahua [ibid: 100]. Years later, they recalled mostly the friendly Ahuabaquebo [Ribeiro y Wise 1978: 131] or Awabakabu, and hostile Puátima and Isishnahua [Braun 1972, 1975]. According to Braun [1975], the Iskonawa group was earlier ideally organized in two intermarrying units, but their names are not mentioned. Today, the few elderly Iskonawa who came to Callería in their teens or twenties recount Awanawa as their allies and Puátima (or Puahönibö), Isishnahua and Variawa (Bwarinawa) as enemies. They also maintain their people fought with the Kashinawa, and recall a distinct group designated as Isökörö-hönibö. Among their own kin they recount persons identified as Awabákēbö, Inubákēbö, Tsinubákēbö, Isubēnē, Puátima and Isishnawa. Apart from this, three of the living Iskonawa from the original group identify themselves as the Yaminawa, and also include the *Brashicos* ("Brazilians") among their ancestors (as a proof of this pointing to curly hair). Indeed, the informants expressed to us that previously to the contact with SAM they lived intermixed with other people, and intermarried just as they do now with the Shipibo or *mestizos* (Krokoszyński field data).

Such insights into the social reality, predating the contemporary ethnic names applied by the outsiders and independent from the generic label given from the distance, allow to visualize the large population contained between the Tamaya and Javari Rivers in the 300 years time-span. It would have been composed of various units with more or less fuzzy borders, forming a language and cultural continuum. These would have shared many common characteristics and would have had the potential for establishing mutual alliances around certain points of attraction or influential leaders, and at the same time would have been capable of reorganizing these alliances with the changing circumstances. Furthermore, if one perceives the appearance of the national society in the zone as one of such circumstances, the gathering of possibly temporarily dispersed local groups around patrons or missionaries could be seen as guided to a large extent by their own subjectivity and by the processes recognized in the indigenous social organization, parallel to the one described for the Marubo.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AGUIAR Maria SUELÍ DE, 2004, *Pesquisar para Conhecer a Língua Nukini*, unpublished manuscript, Goiânia.
- AGUIRRE ESCALANTE Casiano, VILLASANTE SULLCA, F., 2003, *Delimitación territorial a favor de los pueblos indígenas en situación de aislamiento voluntario ubicados en los ríos Tapiche, Blanco, Yaquerana, Chobayacu y afluentes*, AIDESEP, Iquitos.
- ALLEN Benedict, 1994, *Through Jaguar Eyes: Crossing the Amazon Basin*, Harper Collins Publishers, London.
- AMICH José, 1988 [1854], *Historia de las Misiones del Convento de Santa Rosa de Ocopa*, CETA, Iquitos.
- ANONYMOUS, 1988, Mayorunas en el Ucayali: Exodo en busca de una nueva tierra, in: *Kanatari*, vol. 4, p.178.
- AQUISE LIZARBE Isrrail, 2007, *Informe Antropológico de la visita de Campo a las Cabeceras del río Blanco y Tapiche, Provincia de Requena, Loreto*, AIDESEP, Lima.
- ARBAIZA GUZMÁN Sergio, BRAVO CHELIN C., CUENTAS ROBLES M. D., 1995, *Estudio Técnico. Establecimiento y delimitación territorial para el grupo indígena no contactado "Isconahua"*, AIDESEP, Iquitos.
- BARCLAY Frederica, SANTOS Fernando, 1994, Introducción, in: SANTOS-GRANERO F., BARCLAY F. (eds.) *Guía Etnográfica de la Alta Amazonía*, vol.2, Flasco/IFEA, Quito.
- BELTRÁN Pedro, 1907 [1840], Exploración de los ríos Ucayali i Pachitea por los marinos ingleses Smith i Lowe i el sargento de ingenieros peruano don Pedro Beltrán, in: LARRABURE Y CORREA Carlos (ed.), *Colección de Leyes, Decretos, Resoluciones y Otros Documentos Oficiales Referentes al Departamento de Loreto*, vol. 11, pp. 22-71, Imprenta de "La Opinión Nacional", Lima.
- BIEDMA Manuel (OFM), et al., 1989, *La conquista franciscana del alto Ucayali*, Monumenta Amazónica 5, CETA/IIAP, Iquitos.
- BRABEC DE MORI Bernd, PÉREZ CASAPÍA Jefferson, 2006, *Los Iskobakebo: la historia del contacto de los misioneros con un pueblo de habla pano en Ucayali*, ms.
- BRAUN Robert A., 1973, *Iskobakebu Situational Ethnic Displays*, ms.
- BRAUN Robert A., 1975, *Population Dynamics and Social Organization among the Backwoods Panoans (Peru)*, ms.
- CALAVIA SÁEZ Óscar, 2001, El rastro de los pecaris. Variaciones míticas, variaciones cosmológicas e identidades étnicas en la etnología pano, in: *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, vol. 87, pp. 161-176.
- CALAVIA SÁEZ, Óscar. 2002. Nawa, Inawa, *ILHA*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 35-57.
- CARVALHO João BRAULINO DE, 1931. Breve Notícia Sobre os Indígenas que Habitam a Fronteira do Brasil com o Peru Elaborada pelo Médico da Comissão, Dr. João Brulino de Carvalho, e Calçada em Observações Pessoais, in: *Boletim do Museu Nacional (Rio de Janeiro)*, vol. 7, pp. 225-256.
- CASTELNAU Francis de, 1850-59, *Expédition dans les parties centrales de l'Amérique du Sud, de Rio de Janeiro a Lima, et de Lima au Para; exécutée par ordre du Gouvernement français pendant les années 1843 à 1847*, Paris.
- CATLIN George (ROSS M. C., ed.), 1959 [1867], *Episodes from Life among the Indians and Last Rumbles*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- CHANTRE Y HERRERA José, 1901, *Historia de las Misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el Marañón Español, 1637-1767*, Imprenta de A. Avrial, Madrid.
- CORREIA Cloude DE SOUZA, 2005a, *Nawa*, www.socioambiental.org/pib/epi/nawa.

- CORREIA Cloude DE SOUZA, 2005b, *Nukini*, www.socioambiental.org/pib/epi/nukini.
- D'ANS André-Marcel, 1973, *Estudio glotocronológico sobre nueve hablas Pano*, Documento de Trabajo vol. 17, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima.
- DEBOER Warren R., 1986, Pillage and Production in the Amazon. A View through the Conibo of the Ucayali Basin, Eastern Peru, in: *World Archaeology*, vol. 18, no. 2 (Weaponry and Warfare), pp. 231-246.
- DUEÑAS Juan, 1792, Carta y Diario de Fr. Juan Dueñas, in: *Mercurio Peruano*, vol. 6, pp. 165-186.
- ERIKSON Philippe, 1986, Altérité, tatouage, et anthropophagie chez les Pano: la belliqueuse quête du soi, in: *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, vol. 72, pp. 185-210.
- ERIKSON Philippe, 1992, Uma singular pluralidade: a etno-história Pano, in: CARNEIRO DA CUNHA M. (ed.), *História dos Índios no Brasil*, Companhia das Letras, São Paulo.
- ERIKSON Philippe, 1993, Une Nébuleuse compacte: le macro-ensemble pano, in: *L'Homme*, vol. 33, nos. 2-4, pp. 126-128.
- ERIKSON Philippe, 1994, Los Mayoruna, in: SANTOS-GRANERO F., BARCLAY F. (eds.), *Guía Etnográfica de la Alta Amazonía*, vol.2, Flacso/IFEA, Quito.
- ERIKSON Philippe, 1999, *El sello de los antepasados. Marcado del cuerpo y demarcación étnica entre los matis de la Amazonía*, Abya-Yala e IFEA, Quito.
- ERNST Adolf, 1872, Menschen und Pflanzen in der peruanischen Provinz Loreto, in: *Globus*, vol. 21, pp. 300-316.
- FIGUEIREDO José DE LIMA, 1939, *Índios do Brasil*, José Olympio, Rio de Janeiro.
- FLECK David W., 2007, ¿Quiénes eran los Mayoruna de Tessmann? in: *Amazonia Peruana*, vol. 30, pp. 305-331.
- FLECK David W., forthcoming, Panoan languages and linguistics, in: Fleck D., Ruedas J. (eds.).
- FUENTES Hildebrando, 1908, *Loreto. Apuntes geográficos, históricos, estadísticos y sociales*, Lima.
- GALT Francis L., 1878, The Indians of Peru, in: *Smithsonian Annual Report for 1877*, Washington.
- GOMES Augusto DA CUNHA, 1898, Limites Entre o Madeira e o Javary. Reexploração do Javari. Relatório do 2o Commissario Brasileiro, in: CERQUEIRA Dionisio E. DE CASTRO (ed.), *Relatório Apresentado ao Presidente da Republica dos Estados Unidos do Brazil pelo Ministro de Estado das Relações Exteriores*, Anexo no. 1, pp. 241-290, Imprensa Nacional, Rio de Janeiro.
- GOW Peter, 1993, Gringos and Wild Indians. Images of History in Western Amazonian Cultures, in: *L'Homme*, vol. 33, nos. 2-4, pp. 327-347.
- GRANADINO Estanislão, 1916, Exploraciones en el rio Piedras por C. Scharff, *Boletín de la Sociedad Geográfica de Lima*, vol. XXXII, pp. 341-357.
- GROHS Waltraud, 1974, *Los Indios del Alto Amazonas del siglo XVI al siglo XVIII*, Estudios Americanistas de Bonn vol. 2, Bonn.
- GRUBB Kenneth, G., 1927, *The Lowland Indians of Amazonia*, World Dominion Press, London.
- HASSEL Jorge M. von, 1905, Las tribus salvajes de la región amazónica del Perú, in: *Boletín de la Sociedad Geográfica de Lima*, vol. 15(17), pp. 27-73.
- HERNDON William L., 1853, *Explorations of the Valley of the Amazon, Made under Direction of the Navy Department*, Part 1, Robert Armstrong, Public Printer, Washington.
- IZAGUIRRE Bernardo, 1922-29, *Historia de las Misiones Franciscanas y Narración de los Progressos de la Geographia en el Oriente del Perú, 1619-1921*, Talleres Tipográficos de la Penitenciaría, Lima.
- KEIFENHEIM Barbara, 1990, Nawa - Un concept clef de l'altérité chez les Pano, in: *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, vol. 76, pp. 79-94.
- KENSINGER Kenneth M., 1961, Brief vocabulary of the Isconahua, *Información de Campo*, vol. 111-a (microfiche, Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Yarinacocha, Peru).
- KROGH Anders C., 2006, *Isolated Indigenous Peoples in the Tapiche and Yavari Basins*. Loreto – Peru, ms.

- KROKOSZYŃSKI Łukasz, in preparation, *Los nombres y los indígenas de la Sierra del Divisor (Perú Oriental)*, M.A., UAM, Poznań.
- KROKOSZYŃSKI Łukasz, FLECK David, forthcoming, *The Historical and Linguistic Identity of the Remos*, in: Fleck, D., Ruedas J. (eds.).
- KROKOSZYŃSKI Łukasz, STOŃSKA-KAIRSKA Iwona, MARTYNIAK Alina, 2007, *Indígenas aislados en la Sierra del Divisor (Zona fronteriza Perú-Brasil). Informe sobre la presencia de los grupos indígenas en la situación de aislamiento voluntario en los afluentes derechos del bajo Ucayali, desde el río Calleria hasta el alto Maquia (Sierra del Divisor occidental), en los departamentos de Ucayali y Loreto*, UAM-AIDSESP, Iquitos-Lima-Poznań.
- LAGROU Elsie M., 1998, *Cashinahua Cosmovision a Perspectival Approach to Identity and Alterity*, Ph.D., University of St. Andrews.
- LIMA Edilene COFFACI DE, 1994, *Katukina: Historia e Organização Social de um Grupo Pano do Alto Jurua*, MA, USP, São Paulo.
- LEPECKI Mieczysław B., 1931, *Na Amazonce i we wschodnim Peru*, Biblioteka Iskier 34, Książnica-Atlas, Lwów-Warszawa.
- LOOS Eugene E., 1973-74, Listas de palabras y frases para estudios comparativos en el idioma remo. *Información de Campo*, vol. 210-a (microfiche, Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Yarinacocha, Peru).
- LOOS Eugene E., 1976, *Estudios Panos V. Verbos performativos: partículas que tienen significado performativo o significado relacionado a los performativos en idiomas panos*, Serie Lingüística Peruana 14, Ministerio de Educación, ILV, Lima.
- LOOS Eugene E., LOOS Betty H., 2003, *Diccionario Capanahua-Castellano*. Série Lingüística Peruana 45, Ministerio de Educación, ILV, Lima.
- LÓPEZ Agustín, 1913, Letter to María Candamo, Requena 6th November 1911, in: *Slavery in Peru. Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Report of the Secretary of State, with Accompanying Papers Concerning the Alleged Existence of Slavery in Peru*, House of Representatives Document No. 1366, United States Government Printing Office, Washington.
- LOUKOTKA Čestmír, 1968, *Classification of South American Indian Languages*. University of California, Los Angeles.
- MAŁKIN Borys, 1962, W dorzeczu Ucayali, *Poznaj Świat*, nr 4 (113), pp. 3-7.
- MATLOCK James G., 2002, *Registers of Resistance and Accommodation: The Structuration of a Peruvian Amazonian Society*, Ph.D., Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- MARCOY Paul, 1867, Voyage de l'Océan Pacifique à l'Océan Atlantique à travers l'Amérique du Sud. Brésil, Douzième Etape: De Tabatinga à Santa Maria de Belén do Para, in: *Le Tour du Monde*, vol. 2, pp. 97-99.
- MARCOY Paul, 2001[1862-7], *Viaje a través de América del Sur. Del Océano Pacífico al Océano Atlántico*, IFEA, BCRP, PUCP, CAAAP, Lima.
- MARKHAM Clements R., 1859, *Expeditions into the Valley of the Amazonas, 1539, 1540, 1639. Translated and Edited, with Notes*, The Hakluyt Society, London.
- MARONI Pablo, 1988, *Noticias auténticas del famoso río Marañón y misión apostólica de la Compañía de Jesús de la Provincia de Quito en los dilatados bosques de dicho río, escribiélas por los años de 1738 un misionero de la misma compañía*, IAAP-CETA, Iquitos.
- MATORELA ZÁRATE Miriam J., 2004, *Proyecto: "Conservación de la Sierra del Divisor" Pronaturaleza TNC Estudio de Actualización del Grupo Indígena en Aislamiento Voluntario Isconahua, en el Área Propuesta para el Establecimiento de la Zona Reservada Sierra del Divisor*, ms.
- MAW Henry L., 1829, *Journal of a passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic, Crossing the Andes in the Northern Provinces of Peru, and descending the River Marañón, or Amazon*, John Murray, London.

- MELATTI Julio C. (ed.), 1981, *Povos Indígenas no Brasil 5. Javari*, CEDI, São Paulo.
- MELATTI Julio C., MONTAGNER MELATTI Delvair, 2005 [1975], *Relatório sobre os índios Marubo*, Serie Antropologia 13.
- MENDOÇA Simone SUSSEKIND DE, 1991, Nukuini, in: GONÇALVES Marco A. TEIXEIRA (ed.), *Acre: História e etnologia, Núcleo de Etnologia Indígena*, LPS/IFCS/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro.
- MÉTRAUX Alfred, 1948, Tribes of the Juruá-Purus Basins, in: STEWARD Julian H. (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians, Volume 3: The Tropical Forest Tribes*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington.
- MOMSEN Richard, 1964, The Iskonahua Indians, A Study of Change and Diversity in the Peruvian Amazon, in: *Revista Geográfica*, vol. 22, pp. 59-82.
- MONTAG Dick, 1972, *Survey Report, Remos – Rio Tapiche* (microfiche, Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Yarinacocha, Peru).
- MONTAGNER Delvair, 2002, *Construção da etnia Nawa*, ms.
- MONTAGNER MELATTI Delvair, 1977, *Relatório da viagem realizada as áreas indígenas do município de Cruzeiro do Sul*, ms.
- NOGUEIRA Anna L. E. LINS, 1991, Isolados, in: GONÇALVES Marco A. TEIXEIRA (ed.), *Acre: História e etnologia, Núcleo de Etnologia Indígena*, LPS/IFCS/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro.
- PARAÍSO M. H. BAQUEIRO, 1998, *O tempo da dor e do trabalho: a conquista dos territórios indígenas nos sertões do leste*, Ph.D., USP, São Paulo.
- OPPENHEIM Victor, 1936a, Notas Ethnographicas sobre os Indígenas do Alto Juruá (Acre) e valle do Ucayali (Perú), in: *Annaes da Academia Brasileira de Ciencias*, vol. 8, pp. 145-155.
- OPPENHEIM Victor, 1936b, Sobre os restos da cultura neolítica dos índios Panos, in: *Annaes da Academia Brasileira de Ciencias*, vol. 8, pp. 311-314.
- OPPENHEIM Victor, 1971, Under the Southern Cross, *Explorers Journal*, vol. 49, no.3, pp. 150-169.
- ORDINAIRE Olivier, 1988, *Del Pacífico al Atlántico y otros escritos*, CETA-IFEA, Iquitos.
- ORTIZ Dionisio, 1984-86, *Pucallpa y el Ucayali Ayer y Hoy*, vols. 1-2, Editorial Apostolado, Lima.
- RAIMONDI Antonio, 1942 [1862] *Apuntes sobre la provincia litoral de Loreto*, Imprenta El Oriente, Iquitos.
- RIBEIRO Darcy, WISE Mary R., 1978, *Los Grupos Étnicos de la Amazonia Peruana*, Serie Comunidades y Culturas Peruanas 13, ILV, Yarinacocha.
- RICARDO Beto, RICARDO, Fany, 2006, *Povos Indígenas no Brasil 2001/2005*, Instituto Socioambiental, São Paulo.
- RIVET Paul, Constant TASTEVIN, 1921, Les Tribus Indiennes des Bassins du Purús, du Juruá et des Régions Limitrophes, in: *La Géographie*, vol. 35, pp.449-482.
- RUEDAS Javier, 2001, *The Marubo Political System*, Ph.D., Tulane University, New Orleans.
- SAGOLS Francisco, 1901, Los Habitantes de la Pampa del Sacramento, in: *Boletín de la Sociedad Geográfica de Lima*, vol. 11, pp. 357-366.
- SALVADOR ISIDRO A. (OFM), 1972, *El Misionero del Remo*, Editorial San Antonio, Lima.
- SMYTH William, LOWE Frederick, 1978 [1836], *Narrative of a Journey from Lima to Para, across the Andes and down the Amazon*, Longwood Press, Boston.
- SOTOMAYOR José A., 1901, Relación de los Infieles del Ucayali, in: *Boletín de la Sociedad Geográfica de Lima*, vol. 10, pp. 171-178.
- STEWART Julian H., MÉTRAUX, Alfred, 1948, Tribes of the Peruvian and Ecuadorian Montana, in: STEWARD Julian H. (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians, Volume 3: The Tropical Forest Tribes*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington.
- TASTEVIN Constant, 1919, Quelques Considérations sur les Indiens du Juruá, in: *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, vol. 10, pp. 144-154.

- TASTEVIN Constantin, 1920, Le fleuve Juruá, in: *La Géographie*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 1-22.
- TASTEVIN Constantin, 1924, Les études ethnographiques et linguistiques du P. Tastevin en Amazonie, in: *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, vol. 16, pp. 421-425.
- TASTEVIN Constantin, 1925, Le fleuve Muru. Ses habitants. Croyances et Moeurs Kachinaua, in: *La Géographie*, vol. 43, pp. 403-422.
- TESSMANN Günter, 1999 [1930], *Los indígenas del Perú Nororiental: Investigaciones Fundamentales para un Estudio Sistemático de la Cultura*, Ediciones Abya-Yala, Quito.
- URIARTE LÓPEZ Luis M., 1976, Poblaciones Nativas de la Amazonía Peruana, in: *Amazonia Peruana*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 9-58.
- WHITON Louis C., GREENE Bruce H., MOMSEN Richard P., 1964, The Isconahua of the Remo, in: *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, vol. 53, pp. 85-124.
- VILLAREJO Avencio, 1959, *La Selva y el hombre. Estudio antropológico del aborígen amazónico*, Ed. Ausonia, Lima.
- VILLAREJO Avencio, 2002, *Así es la Selva*, CETA, Iquitos.
- ZARZAR Alonso, 2000, *Tras las huellas de un antiguo presente. La problemática de los pueblos indígenas amazónicos en aislamiento y en contacto inicial. Recomendaciones para su supervivencia y bienestar*, Documento de trabajo vol. 3, Defensoría del Pueblo, Lima.