

TERMS FOR CERAMIC VESSELS IN THE PANOAN AND TACANAN LANGUAGES: ETHNO-ARCHAEOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

ANDRZEJ KARWOWSKI

INTRODUCTION

Pottery is a traditional form of craft, but worldwide, with the development of industry, it was replaced by mass production of ceramics. On the other hand, there is a tendency to preserve traditional production in order to emphasize the tradition and identity of a given ethnic group, and for commercial purposes for tourists (another question is just how traditional such products are). In many cases, however, it disappeared irretrievably, and its traces have survived only in ethnographic reports and dictionaries. These written sources provide the grounds, on which certain attempts can be based to reconstruct the significance of pottery amongst *ancient* societies.

Pottery plays a key role for archaeologists. Remains of ceramic vessels are often the main and mass source subject to their research procedures. More precisely, the style of ceramic vessels is often the unique criterion for distinguishing, i.e. (re)construction of ancient cultures (in the Amazonian archeology the term 'traditions' is used¹). Ceramics is also a carrier of meanings defined at

ANDRZEJ KARWOWSKI – archaeologist, freelancer. E-mail: ackarwow@gmail.com

¹ Originally, taking pattern after periodization of the Andean area, the Amazonian researchers proposed the term of 'horizons' referring to stylistic and chronological units of ceramic material that occurs over a large area within a given time frames. However, when certain horizons had been found to overlap temporarily, or lack in some areas (e.g. relation between the Polychrome and Incised-Punctated ceramics), a more adequate term 'tradition' was adopted (Neves 2008).

various levels: from purely technological to magical and metamorphic, postulated by anthropologists and philosophers of culture (e.g. Kowalski 1999; 2001).


This text presents a brief analysis of terms referring to ceramic vessels encountered in the lexicon of the Panoan and Tacanan languages of the Western Amazon. The author made an attempt to find common terms in these languages used for determining particular types of vessels and their etymology, which could, in turn, shed a new light on the way how these ceramic vessels were perceived in the region under scrutiny (and probably not only there). However, this paper did not aim to reconstruct the proto-lexicon. Instead, it should be considered an impulse rather for the linguists to stimulate a substantive criticism, and perhaps for further study and research.

PANOAN AND TACANAN LANGUAGES. THE QUESTION OF ETHNOGENESIS OF PANOANS

The Panoan language family is a group of languages (in the number of ca. 30) spoken in the Upper Amazon regions of eastern Peru and adjacent areas of north-western Brazil and north-eastern Bolivia (Valenzuela and Guillaume 2017). The most numerous Pano groups are present in the Ucayali river and Cabeceras² regions. In terms of geography, they occupy discontinuous areas: southeast languages are separated from the rest of the languages by the zone where the Arawakan languages were used, extending along the Purús and Juruá rivers.

Peruvian Pano groups, although linguistically similar, are culturally differentiated. Shipibo-Conibo from the Ucayali River region is relatively numerous, engaged in intensive farming and sharing a sedentary lifestyle. They significantly developed pottery and weaving crafts. With better shipping techniques, they developed fishing rather than hunting. The other Panoans live in small semi-nomadic clusters, with the economy based on slash-and-burn agriculture. With less advanced pottery-making and weaving skills, they are excellent hunters, armed with weapons used for pursuing game, but also useful in constant conflicts. However, instead of using a canoe, they use rafts to navigate the rivers (d'Ans 1973, 366). Names of Panoan groups often include a plural ending **-bo**, or a morpheme **-nahua/-nawa**, 'people, group' such as Shipibo ('*shipi* monkeys'), Cashibo ('bats'), Conibo ('eels'), Cashinahua ('bat group'), Yaminahua ('axe group') (Aguar 2008).

² Cabeceras (Spanish) – interfluvial regions of river headwaters, in this case of the Juruá and Purús rivers.



Legend

 Panoan languages	 Rivers
 Tacanan languages	 Lakes and sea

Abbreviations

AM Amahuaca
 AR Arara
 AT Atsahuaca
 CB Cashibo
 CH Chacobo
 CO Conibo
 CP Capanahua
 KB Korubo
 KN Cashinahua
 KP Kulina Pano
 KR Karipuna

KT Katukina
 KX Kaxariri
 MB Marubo
 MG Mangeroma
 MN Marinahua
 MS Mastanahua
 MT Matis
 MY Maya
 MZ Matses
 NK Nukuini
 NW Nawa
 PC Pacaguara
 PO Poyanawa

RE Remo
 SH Shipibo
 SR Sharanahua
 YA Yamiaca
 YM Yaminawa
 YW Yawanawa

 AA Araona
 CA Cavineno
 ES Ese Ejja
 RE Reyesano
 TA Tacana

Fig. 1. Distribution of the Panoan and Tacanan languages. Drawn by A. Karwowski after: Erikson 1992, 242; Valenzuela and Guillaume 2017, Map 1, 2, modified.

The Tacanan languages, in turn, are currently spoken mainly in the Bolivian Amazon, in the north-western part of the country. The Tacanan family is divided into three branches: Takanik (Tacana proper, Reyesano, Araona), Kavinik (Cavineña) and Chamik (Ese Ejja) (Valenzuela and Guillaume 2017).

While the similarity between the Panoan and Tacanan languages has been indicated for a long time, and these languages are being jointly counted to the Pano-Tacanan family (stock), it is its nature that raises the greatest controversy nowadays. There are discrepant opinions on whether or not this resemblance is a result of a genetic relationship, and thus the existence of a common proto-language in the past, from which branches of Proto-Panoan and Proto-Tacanan languages separated, or maybe this similarity is due to contacts and borrowings that might have occurred even in the relatively recent times (Fleck 2013).

In the reconstruction of the history of the Panoan groups two approaches have been adopted: lexostatistic in respect to language, and comparative with regard to material (archaeological) culture. These approaches are not devoid of defects, although they seem to be mutually verifying. The method of glottochronology presupposes a constant rate of linguistic change, based on which absolute dating can be determined, but by some archaeologists, this approach is criticized or even rejected (Renfrew 2001; 2011). In turn, major changes in the style of ceramics are considered to be a result of migration into a given area, but such an approach is rarely able to explain convincingly the reasons for these migrations.




Fig. 2. Tree of the Panoan and Tacanan languages. After Müller *et al.* 2009 (CC BY 4.0); temporal estimations after Holman *et al.* 2011.

According to the concept referring to the genetic relation of both groups under study, upon employing the glottochronological method, it was established that both groups of languages separated from the common trunk about 4.7 thousand years ago (Swadesh 1959, 18). The internal division of the Panoan languages and its estimated time of differentiation were proposed by d'Ans (1973) and recently, Holman *et al.* (2011) using the language tree model developed by Lewis (2009). These estimates, although based on a different internal division of languages, are quite consistent in terms of the starting date of its differentiation, proposed around 1900 years ago. Whereas, according to Holman *et al.* (2011) the beginning of differentiation of the Tacanan languages took place ca. 1500 years ago.

Although linguistic data allows us to formulate a precise definition of differences between languages, it does not explain how they actually differentiated. Assuming a divergent differentiation of a given language, it is not known whether it was due to the separation (migration) of some part of the original population into new territories, or for example, to the separation of the original territory as a result of the arrival of another group and isolation of these newly emerged parts. The fact is, however, that the Panoan languages currently occupy a discontinuous area, separated by the Arawakan 'corridor', which indicates a displacement of populations.

In his influential work, entitled *The Upper Amazon*, Donald Lathrap (1970, 79) suggested that the current distribution of the Panoan languages is a consequence of relatively late (within the cultural sequence of the Western Amazon) migrations. As a result of archaeological research carried out in the middle Ucayali River, he initially linked the appearance of the Panoan communities in this region with the Cumancaya complex. Finally, altogether with his collaborators (e.g. Lathrap *et al.* 1987; Myers 1976), he pointed the Pacacocha tradition, dated back to the mid-1st millennium AD, as the ancestors of the modern Panoan people. His conclusions were based on significant differences in the forms and decorations of ceramic vessels when compared with the former Hupa-iyá tradition (*Barrancoid*), and the presence of similar shapes and ornaments in the contemporary Shipibo-Conibo pottery. Moreover, the above-mentioned author indicated the external, southern origins of Panoans, due to postulated migrations to the Ucayali River from the south, through the Bolivian Amazon.

LEXICAL MATERIAL

The source database for analyzing the vocabulary related to Pano and Tacana pottery presented in this text encloses dictionaries of 11 languages: six of them are Panoan (Amahuaca, Cashinahua, Isconahua, Matsés, Sharanahua, Shipibo-Conibo), and five Tacanan (Araona, Cavineña, Ese Ejja, Maropa, Tacana

proper) (see Apendix I)³. Moreover, dictionaries of the Arawakan languages (Ignaciano of Llanos de Mojos), Quechua and Guaraní (Siriono) were used for comparisons. Most of these editions emerged as a result of the activity of Protestant missionaries/linguists from the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), and contain data in two languages, namely indigenous and Spanish. In these materials, the indigenous languages were mainly recorded using an ortography (transcription) typical of the Spanish language, while in some cases, specific ortography for a given language was preferred. All terms quoted in this paper are given directly from these dictionaries, without any modifications.

Certainly, this data is not complete because the dictionaries listed above do not comprise all of the names recorded in ethnographic sources. The authors of the dictionaries did not intend to study in detail all the nuances of traditional vocabulary; they rather aimed to document these languages (frequently for religious or pedagogical purposes) that were likely to be replaced by Spanish or Portuguese, or used by communities facing the threat of extinction.

The lexical material for referring to the Pano and Tacana pottery is quite diverse, and the terminology used for its description is often quite complex, but it can be reduced to several groups of meanings listed below, and suggesting etymology of these terms. This interpretation is based on an assumption that man-made vessels (ceramic or organic) *imitated* natural containers and hence, they were given similar names. It seems unlikely to be the other way round.

Pot as 'a ceramic basket'

There are similar terms in the Tacanan languages for the word 'pot': [tna] **juttu, jutujaja**; [ara] **jotohuaja, tohuaja**; [ara after cav3] **jutu; jóto** – 'wide place on the river'; 'lay hands in a form of a vessel'; [rey] **jubu/juwu**, 'pot'. There are also similar words in the Panoan languages: [mcd] **cutin**, [amc] **cúntii**, [shp] **quenti**, [cbs] **kenti**. It is possible that all these terms are derived from a common core that has preserved in the Tacanan [cav1] as **cuta**, 'small basket'.

Whereas, the Panoan languages have a similar term for various classes of baskets: [amc] **cácan, cácanún**; [cbs] **kaki, kuki, kakan**; [shp] **caquín, cáquiman**; [isc] **kankan**. In the Tacanan languages the morpheme **caca** refers to both, basket-works and ceramics: [ara] **cacano** – 'bag woven from palm

³ Both, in the text and the Appendix below, the three-letter abbreviations in square brackets are used as reference to specific dictionaries, e.g. [cav1] stands for (Camp and Licardi 1989), and [ara] means (Pitman 1981) (see Bibliography). Lexical data in the Appendix contains original Spanish translations quoted directly from specific dictionaries and vocabularies.

leaves'; [cav2] **sura caca** 'small jar', where **sura** means 'jar', and [cav3] **caca** 'cup'. From this viewpoint, the transfer of meaning from basket-work to pot can be seen in a word [cav1] **emaricaca** 'pot'. The core **mari** appears also in a word [cav1] **puki-mari**, 'anthill', where **puki** means 'ant', while ***mari** can be reconstructed in the proto-Tacanan as 'mud, clay' basing on e.g., [ara] **maji** (Guillaume 2017, personal communication). So, the term **emaricaca** would literally mean 'clay container' or 'clay basket-work'.

Another explanation of this word, based on the meaning of 'cup', is also possible. Perhaps, in the past, the name was related to bowls on low pedestals or annular bases found at the archaeological sites in the lower Beni river and probably used in serving alcoholic drinks during feasts (Karwowski 2016; comp. Almeida 2015; DeBoer 2001).

Jar as 'a ceramic calabash'

In the Panoan languages a word for 'jar' ([shp] **chomo**; [amc] **shomo**, [cbs] **xumu**; amongst the Tacanan only [rey] **sumu**) probably comes from **chuma** [cbs], **choma** [mcd] - 'calabash'. The transfer of meanings was possibly due to the fact that calabashes and jars were used as containers for storing and drinking water.

In the Tacanan languages, however, there is another common name for a jar/ceramic bottle for drinking water, namely [tna] **matu**, [ara] **mato**, whose form is actually a clay copy of a calabash. It is possible that this term was borrowed from neighbouring, unrelated Arawakan languages of Llanos de Mojos, where a similar principle can be observed: [ign] **mátesi** – 'calabash, matero' and 'clay vessel used in the past'. In many other Arawakan languages, the same or similar term means 'pot', 'calabash', 'potsherd' (Créqui-Montfort and Rivet 1921–23, 178).

Vessel as a globular object

There are common terms in the Panoan languages for ceramic vessels, and spherical or globular objects: [mts] **mapi** 'head, ball, globular object'; [cbs] **mapu** 'head of axe', 'mud'; [shp] **mápo**, **mápon** 'head', **mapó**, **mápopan** 'clay'; **mapó ati** 'to make ceramics'; [amc] **mapo** 'head', **mápoo**, **mápopán** 'clay'; [mcd] **mapo**, **mapon** 'clay', 'head'; [isc] **mapo pewan** 'big jar for fermentation of *chicha*'). There is one comparable term in the Tacanan languages: [ara] **mapai** – 'big globular jar'.

These examples offer a fairly broad interpretative spectrum. They indicate that the traditional (?) Panoan pottery was based on globular vessels. Interestingly, according to the hypothesis raised by Donald Lathrap, the leading types of vessels

of the first Panoans over the Ucayali River were simple globular forms linked with the Pacacocha tradition (AD 300–600), which were also found in the Cumancaya tradition (AD 600–1700). On the other hand, these vessels survived in an almost unchanged form among the northern Panoans – Mayoruna (Matses) (fig. 3).




Fig. 3. Globular vessels: a) Mayoruna (Matses); b) Pacacocha and Cumancaya traditions. After: Lathrap *et al.* 1987, Plate 4, courtesy of the Latin American Institute of University of California, Los Angeles (a); Lathrap 1970, Fig. 24a, b, courtesy of the Thames & Hudson Ltd, London; Raymond, DeBoer, and Roe 1975, Fig. 23f, i (b). Redrawn by A. Karwowski (a–b).

There is another noteworthy hypothesis focusing on the meaning of ‘head’, which can be extended to an aesthetical and semasiological sphere. Amongst the archaeological materials from the Peruvian Amazon (Granja de Sivia/Cumancaya tradition, Apurimac River) and Bolivia (Rurenabague, Beni River), examples of vessels interpreted as urns were encountered (Portugal 1978; Raymond, DeBoer, and Roe 1975), decorated with a model of a human face (fig. 4). The above-mentioned terms could, therefore, refer to this type of depictions on the vessels.




Fig. 4. Vessels with a modelled face: a) Granja de Sivia (Peru); b) Rurenabague (Bolivia). After Raymond, DeBoer, and Roe 1975, Fig. 60 f, g (a). Redrawn by A. Karwowski (a), photo by A. Karwowski (b).

Vessel as a flat object

In the Panoan and Tacanan lexicons there is a group of words indicating a flat shape, and referring to relatively shallow vessels. In the Tacanan languages these are as follows: [ara] **sepe** – ‘potsherd, bowl’; [cav1] **seeta** – ‘clay bowl or plate’; while, in the Panoan languages they enclose: [cbs] **sapa kench** – ‘bowl’; **sapa** – ‘flat’; [shp] **sápa** – ‘flat on one side’. Amongst the Panoan words, these vessels have a different class name (**kencha**).

POSSIBLE BORROWINGS

In some of the terms related to vessel forms in the Panoan and Tacanan lexicon, it is difficult to find common cores. Names could have been created *ad hoc*, or given after other objects. However, some terms could have been borrowed from other neighbouring languages. Nevertheless, a comprehensive analysis of all possible borrowings requires detailed studies and goes beyond the scope of this text.

Yet, at this point, one of the examples of potential borrowings may be quoted. It refers to an unusual term [cav1] **sura** meaning ‘jar’, which is not present in other Tacanan or Panoan languages. Phonetic similarities, however, appear in the Guaraní languages: [sir] **iruru** – ‘jar’; [gua] **iru** ‘water jar’, but also in Quechuan [que] **yuru**, ‘jar’.

Ornamentation and art

There are common terms for ‘to draw, to paint, traditional ornaments’ in the Panoan ([isc] **kené**, [cbs] **kene**, [shp] **quené**, [amc] **cúnuu**, [mcd] **cunu**) and the Tacanan ([ara] **huene**, [cav1] **hueneya**) languages.

The artwork of Shipibo-Conibo and Cashinahua (Peruvian and Brazilian Pano groups) is characterized by a specific geometrical design placed on human bodies and textiles, as well as on ceramic vessels and other utilities, which is basically called *kené* art (Belaunde 2009; Lagrou 1991). The ceramic artwork of the Bolivian Pano- and Tacana-speaking groups is poorly documented, but in the collection of Erland Nordenskiöld gathered during his travels to the Beni River in 1913, there are several vessels from the Cavinás mission decorated with a design very strongly resembling that of Cashinahua. It can be assumed that the similarity is not limited to the word for ‘artwork’ but includes common (for some groups, at least) artistic motifs.




Fig. 5. Comparison of the Cashinahua (Panoan) (a-b) and Cavineño (Tacanan) (c) designs. After: (F) IVc 9977; Museum der Kulturen Basel in Seiler-Baldinger 1987, Abb. 15 (a); Lagrou 1991, 161 (b); Världskulturmuseet, Göteborg, no. 1915.1.1429, photo by Ferenc Schewetz (CC BY 2.5) (c). Redrawn by A. Karwowski (a-b); detail view drawn by A. Karwowski (c).

FORMAL AND FUNCTIONAL CLASSES OF VESSELS

The ceramics of some of the Peruvian Pano groups are characterized by careful execution, high artistic level, and abundance of forms. Both pottery-making and ornamentation are the domain of women (e.g. Kowalska-Lewicka 1969). In Bolivia, the tradition of pottery-making is disappearing amongst either the Pano, or the Tacana groups. Pacahuara and Chácobo's ceramic vessels gathered in ethnographic museums are simple, undecorated and of poor quality. With regard to the Tacana pottery, noteworthy is an observation made by Alfred Métraux (1942, 39) who reported that Ese Ejja did not use ceramic vessels, in contrast to Cavineños who produced beautiful resin-glazed painted pottery. Ceramics were also produced by Araonas, who developed many types of vessels, from large jars to small vessels used during journeys (*Ibid.*). Moreover, the Tacana (proper) used mainly undecorated vessels of various types (Hissink and Hahn 2000).

Names of ceramic vessels, related to their forms and function, are or rather should be considered important typological indicators for ethnologists and archaeologists. It is difficult to expect that the differences in names are not




























	Pot	Toaster	Food bowl	Drinking vessel	Jar
Cumancaya					
Shipibo-Conibo	 kenti		 kencha	 kenpo	 chomo
Cashinahua	 kenti	 tsuiti	 kencha	 kenpun	 xumu
Isconahua	 kute	 towanti		 toro joko	 mapu rhoa
Amahuaca	 kiti		 kicha	 kithpo	(shomboh)
Capanahua					
Mayoruna	 matsu	 maspan			 techu

Fig. 6. Basic classes of the Panoan vessels and their counterparts in the Cumancaya tradition. After DeBoer 1990, Fig. 9.2, courtesy of the Cambridge University Press.

culturally (or magically, in fact) significant, or vice versa, that the objects being important and distinctive from others have not been given such specific names (cf. Lévi-Strauss 2001).

Both, in the Panoan and Tacanan pottery, a set of basic classes of vessels can be distinguished, including cooking pots, toasters, food bowls, *masato/chicha* drinking vessels, and water jars. Interestingly, an analogous set of basic forms is observed in the pottery of the Cumancaya archaeological tradition (DeBoer 1989). Depending on the particular group’s lifestyle, this set could lack certain classes. Moreover, there were several variants of vessel sizes within a given

class. For example, in Shipibo-Conibo pottery, this set includes four classes: **kenti**, ‘pot’, **kencha** ‘bowl’, **kenpo**, ‘drinking vessel’ and **chomo**, ‘jar’, encountered in three variants: small (**vacu**) for transportation, medium (**anicha** or **anitama**) used in a daily life, and large (**ani**) used mainly during feasts (DeBoer 2001, 223).

On the other hand, a distinctive feature of the Tacanan (proper) pottery and, to a lesser extent, of the Araona pottery is the presence of handles, rare in the Panoan pottery. No pots were made on pedestals, although in the case of large specimens, separate clay supports were added to increase their stability.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

There are some common or near-sounding names of vessels in the Panoan and Tacanan languages that refer to their shape. The similarity between names of shallow vessels is due to using a common adjective ‘flat’, which does not necessarily imply their common root. Yet, it obviously seems to reflect their shape, created in natural, divergent linguistic processes. Globular vessels are an interesting case since in the Shipibo-Conibo tradition they seem to be synonymous with ceramic vessels and pottery in general. If this viewpoint is true, it would support a hypothesis raised by Lathrap with regard to the early pottery of the Panoans on the Ucayali River, and its association with the Pacacocha and Cumancaya traditions.

Interesting conclusions can be drawn from a comparison of the names of clay vessels with those of organic containers. The lexical similarities are quite strongly visible in a paired term of calabash-jar, less in respect to a pair of basket-pot. Assuming correctness of the glottochronological approach, the vocabulary associated with ceramic vessels should not be included within the lexicon of the Pano-Tacana proto-language, as the differentiation of these languages would be expected to have taken place before the emergence of clay vessels. In other words, the vocabulary related to pottery should have been developed independently and parallel. As far as the Peruvian Montaña had a long-lasting tradition in producing ceramics⁴ (however, it does not mean that the earliest pottery from this region can be associated with ancestors of the Panoans), in the western Bolivian Amazon ceramics dated back to such early times have not been found so far. Thus, it seems that in the Proto-Pano-Tacanan language words referring to organic containers developed in the pre-ceramic times should rather be

⁴ Tutishcainyo is the earliest ceramic complex over the Ucayali River, dated back to ca. 2000 BC (Lathrap 1970), associated with the Zone-Hachured Tradition.

present. Hence, there is a common convergence in the names of vessels referring to such containers in the Panoan and Tacanan languages.

On the other hand, the transfer of meanings from organic containers to ceramic vessels can be considered a wider tendency (indicated by the Arawakan examples), or a more general phenomenon even, typical of human culture, already at early stages of its development. The organic (woven, hollowed) prototypes of ceramic vessels are found in the reconstructed lexicon of the hypothetical Nostratic language attributed to Epipaleolithic cultures in south-western Asia (Kowalski 2000; Witczak and Kowalski 2012).

Moreover, there is a common (or very similar indeed) term for ornaments and ornamentation in the Panoan and Tacanan languages. If it originates from a core belonging to the proto-language and assuming the correctness of glottochronological estimations, then the art of ornamentation amongst the Pano and Tacana groups must have crystallized before the spread of ceramics and weaving (evidenced by an occurrence of spindle whorls). Most likely it manifested in human body painting, portable object decoration, and in a form of rock-art. Assuming that the semantic association between a pot and a basket is right, the custom of decorating ceramics with geometric ornaments could be derived from basketry decorations, for which geometric motifs are technologically simpler to make. Of course, the transfer of motifs from basketry to pottery containers could have been a wider trend, shared with other ethnic groups.

On the other hand, these specific geometric motifs have been widely spread in the archaeological material of the Peruvian and Bolivian Amazon. Similar patterns are also present in pottery and textiles of both, the Pano and Tacana communities, as well as neighboring peoples⁵. While it is tempting to associate this type of decoration with the Pano and Tacana ethnic groups, methodological considerations speak against this interpretation. Although there are greater or lesser correlations between the language, ethnicity and the material culture, the degree of intensity of these relationships is not constant, and in many cases, it remains unknown. Hence, in the opinion of many archaeologists, the possibility of identification of the ethnicity based on the style (form, ornamentation) is rejected. In addition, the style (art), like the language, can be borrowed or fashioned. A good example of this is the Shipibo-Conibo and Arawakan Piro

⁵ This is well exemplified by the 'serpent style' (*estilo de serpiente*), found in the 'Amazonian' ceramics from the Las Piedras fortress, and described by Finnish researchers (Pärssinen, Siiriäinen, and Korpisaari 2003). Similar motifs are found on archaeological ceramics from the regions of the Ucayali river in Peru, and the Beni river and Llanos de Mojos in Bolivia. They are also comprised within the repertoire of the traditional *kené* of Cashinahua and *huene(ya)* of Cavineño designs (see Fig. 5).

contemporary pottery, where the motifs are so visually similar that they are difficult to distinguish one from another by a non-specialist⁶. Nevertheless, it seems that the appearance of some geometric motifs on ceramics from the western Bolivian Amazon coincided with the expansion of the Guaraní people northward since ca. AD 1000 (cf. Karwowski 2016), so long time after the estimated differentiation of the Panoan and Tacanan languages took place. However, this question requires further research.

The lexical material used in the analysis presented here is obviously incomplete. It does not include, for example, the linguistic data referring to the southern Panoans (Pacahuara, Chácobo) that are geographically located within the zone of contacts with Tacanans, and would probably provide relevant information about potential borrowings. Nevertheless, it may contribute to a better understanding of the meaning of pottery both, in the ethnographic aspect and in the analysis of archaeological ceramics from the Western Amazon.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Prof. Warren DeBoer for his invaluable help in granting me the access to the related literature. I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr Antoine Guillaume for bibliographical references and valuable comments on some of the Cavineña terms. Moreover, I am grateful to several institutions and scholars who authorized me to use their images, namely the Cambridge University Press, the Latin American Institute of University of California (Los Angeles), the Museum of Cultures in Basel (Museum der Kulturen Basel), the Thames & Hudson Ltd, London, as well as Prof. Philippe Erikson, Prof. Elsje Lagrou, Prof. Scott Raymond, Prof. Pilar Valenzuela, and Dr. Søren Wichmann. My gratitude also goes to Agnieszka Klimek for stylistic corrections of this text.

⁶ . Such examples are gathered e.g., in the American Museum of Natural History ethnographic collection in New York. The similarities in geometric design are so strong that, according to the Shipibo-Conibo informant, the motifs on painted Piro vessels can be classified as 'real' *kené* art (Illius 1991–1992, 33–34). According to Peter Roe (1982, 42), the motifs of Piro derive from the Shipibo-Conibo canon. Moreover, according to France-Marie Renard-Casevitz (2002, 133) painted Shipibo-Conibo ceramics was the object of trade between the Pano and Arawak groups in historical times.

REFERENCES

Dictionaries and vocabularies

Three-letter abbreviations to the references listed below and used in the text are given in square brackets.

- Armentia, Nicolas. 1906. 'Arte y vocabulario de la lengua cavineña, con introducción, notas y appendices por Samuel A. Lafone Quevado'. *Revista del Museo de La Plata* 13: 1–120. [cav3]
- Armentia, Nicolas, and Antonio Gili. 1902. *Tacana. Vocabulario, exhortaciones, frases y un mapa por el R.P.Fr. Nicolás Armentía. Oraciones y Catecismo pro el R.P.Fr. Antonio Gili. Introducción y notas por Samuel A. Lafone Quevado*. La Plata: Museo de La Plata. [tna]
- Camp, Elizabeth, and Millicent Licardi. 1989. *Diccionario cavineña-castellano, castellano-cavineña, con bosquejo de la gramática cavineña*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. [cav1]
- Cáseres Raldes, Jesus. 2012. *Iyedu yani qui ejunrhe mimi. He aquí la lengua de mi pueblo. Idioma maropa-reyesano*. Unpublished document. [rey]
- Fleck, David W., Fernando S. Uaqui Bëso, and Daniel M. Jiménez Huanán. 2012. *Diccionario matsés-castellano. Con índice alfabético castellano-matsés e índice semántico castellano-matsés*. Iquitos: Tierra nueva. [mts]
- Gasparini, Noe, and Victor H. Dicarere Mendez. 2015. *Diccionario siriono*. Trinidad: Editorial Tiempos del Beni S.R.L. [sir]
- Hyde, Sylvia. 1980. *Diccionario amahuaca*. Serie Lingüística Peruana 7. Yarinacocha: Ministerio de Educación, Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. [amc]
- Loriot, James, Erwin Lauriault, and Dwight Day. 1993. *Diccionario shipibo-castellano*. Serie Lingüística Peruana 31. Lima: Ministerio de Educación, Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. [shp]
- Montag, Susan. 1981. *Diccionario cashinahua*. Serie Lingüística Peruana 9. Yarinacocha: Ministerio de Educación, Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. [cbs]
- Ott, Willis, and Rebecca Burke de Ott. 1983. *Diccionario ignaciano-castellano con apuntes gramaticales*. Cochabamba: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. [ign]
- Pitman, Mary. 1981. *Diccionario araona y castellano*. Riberalta: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Ministerio de Educación y Cultura. [ara]
- Rivero Pinto, Wigberto. 1985. *Vocabulario ese-ejja-español*. Riberalta. [ese]
- Rivero Pinto, Wigberto. n.d. *Vocabulario cavineño-español*. Unpublished document. [cav2]
- Román Montenegro, Felipe, and Félix Layme Payrumani. 1993. *Diccionario castellano-guaraní*. La Paz: Presencia. [gua]
- Scott, Marie. 2004. *Vocabulario sharanahua-castellano*. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. [mcd]
- Zariquiey Biondi, Roberto. 2016. *Vocabulario isconawa-castellano-inglés*. Boston: Tufts University. [isc]

Other references

- Aguiar, Maria S. 2008. 'Names of Pano groups and the endings *-bo*, *nawa* and *huaca*'. *UniverSOS* 5: 9–36.
- Almeida, Fernando. O. 2015. 'A arqueologia dos fermentados: a etílica história dos Tupi-Guarani'. *Estudos Avançados* 29 (83): 87–118.
- Belaunde, Luisa E. 2009. *Kené: arte, ciencia y tradición en diseño*. Lima: Instituto Nacional de Cultura.
- Créqui-Montfort de, Georges, and Paul Rivet. 1921–1923. 'La Famille Linguistique Takana'. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* XIII, XIII, XIV, XV. 91–102, 281–302, 141–182, 121–167.
- d'Ans, André-Marcel. 1973. 'Reclasificación de las lenguas pano y datos glotocronológicos para la etnohistoria de la Amazonia peruana'. *Revista del Museo Nacional* 34: 349–369.
- DeBoer, Warren R. 1990. 'Interaction, Imitation, and Communication as Expressed in Style: The Ucayali Experience'. In *The use of styles in archaeology*, ed. M.W. Conkey and C.A. Hastorf, 82–104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeBoer, Warren R. 2001. 'The big drink: feast and forum in the upper Amazon'. In *Feasts: archaeological and ethnographical perspectives on food, politics and power*, ed. M. Dietler, B. Hayden, 215–39. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Erikson, Philippe. 1992. 'Uma singular pluralidad: a etno-história Pano'. In *História dos Índios do Brasil*, ed. M. Carneiro da Cunha, 239–252. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Fleck, David W. 2013. *Panoan languages and linguistics*. American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers 99. New York: American Museum of Natural History.
- Hissink, Karin, and Albert Hahn. 2000. *Los Tacana. Datos sobre la historia de su civilización*. La Paz: APCOB.
- Holman Eric W., Cecil H. Brown, Søren Wichmann, André Müller, Viveka Velupillai, Harald Hammarström, Sebastian Sauppe, Hagen Jung, Dik Bakker, Pamela Brown, Oleg Belyaev, Matthias Urban, Robert Mailhammer, Johann-Mattis List, and Dmitry Egorov. 2011. 'Automated Dating of the World's Language Families Based on Lexical Similarity'. *Current Anthropology* 52(6): 841–875.
- Illius, Bruno. 1991–1992. 'La "Gran boa". Arte y cosmología de los Shipibo-Conibo'. *Schweizerische Amerikanisten-Gesellschaft Bulletin* 55–56: 23–35.
- Karwowski, Andrzej. 2016. *Ślady ekspansji ludów Guaraní w dorzeczu Río Beni, Amazonia boliwijska* (Traces of expansion of the Guaraní in the basin of the Beni river, Bolivian Amazon). Paper presented at *I Kongres Latinoamerykanistyczny im. Ignacego Domeyki "Spory o wojnę: polskie badania nad konfliktami w Ameryce Łacińskiej"*, 26–27.11.2016, Warsaw.
- Kowalska-Lewicka, Anna. 1969. *Shipibo*. Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- Kowalski, Andrzej P. 1999. *Symbol w kulturze archaicznej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Instytutu Filozofii.
- Kowalski, Andrzej P. 2000. 'Genealogia sztuk II. Naczynie w słowniku kultury „nostratyckiej”. Analiza magicznego doświadczenia rzeczy'. In *ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ. Kultura archa-*

- iczna w zwierciadle wyobrażeń, słów i rzeczy, ed. H. van den Boom, A.P. Kowalski, M. Kwapiński, 149–166. Gdańsk: Muzeum Archeologiczne w Gdańsku.
- Kowalski, Andrzej P. 2001. *Myślenie przedfilozoficzne. Studia z filozofii kultury i historii idei*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Fundacji Humaniora.
- Lagrou, Elsje M. 1991. *Uma etnografia da cultura kaxinawá. Entre a cobra e o inca*. Master's thesis. Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Lathrap, Donald. 1970. *The Upper Amazon*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Lathrap, Donald, Thomas Myers, Angelika Gebhart-Sayer, and Ann Mester. 1987. 'Further Discussion of the Roots of the Shipibo Art Style: a rejoinder to DeBoer and Raymond'. *Journal of Latin American Lore* 13(2), 225–272.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 2001. *Myśl nieoswojona (La pensée sauvage)*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo KR.
- Lewis, M. Paul. (ed). 2009. *Ethnologue*. 16th edition. Dallas: SIL International. Accessed May 27, 2017, <http://www.ethnologue.com>
- Métraux, Alfred. 1942. 'The native tribes of eastern Bolivia and western Matto Grosso'. *Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, No. 134. Washington, D.C.
- Müller, André, Viveka Velupillai, Søren Wichmann, Cecil H. Brown, Pamela Brown, Eric W. Holman, Dik Bakker, Oleg Belyaev, Dimitri Egorov, Robert Mailhammer, Anthony Grant, and Kofi Yakpo. 2009. *ASJP World Language Tree: Version 1* (April 2009). Accessed May 27, 2017, <http://asjp.clld.org>
- Myers, Thomas P. 1976. 'Isolation and Ceramic Change: A Case from the Ucayali River, Peru'. *World Archaeology* 7(3), 333–351.
- Neves, Eduardo Góes. 2008. 'Ecology, Ceramic Chronology and Distribution, Long-term History, and Political Change in the Amazonian Floodplain'. In *The Handbook of South American Archaeology*, ed. H. Silverman and W.H. Isbell, 359–379. New York: Springer.
- Pärssinen, Martti, Ari Siiriäinen, and Antti Korpisaari. 2003. 'Fortifications related to the Inca Expansion'. In *Western Amazonia – Amazônia Occidental. Multidisciplinary Studies on Ancient Expansionistic Movements, Fortifications and Sedentary Life*, ed. M. Pärssinen and A. Korpisaari, 29–72. Renvall Institute Publications 14. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Portugal Ortiz, Max. 1978. *La arqueología de la region del Rio Beni*. La Paz: Franz Tamayo.
- Raymond, J. Scott., Warren DeBoer, and Peter Roe. 1975. *Cumancaya: A Peruvian Ceramic Tradition*. Occasional Papers 2. Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary.
- Renard-Casevitz, France-Marie. 2002. 'Social Forms and Regressive History: From the Campa Cluster to the Mojos and from the Mojos to the Landscaping Terrace-Builders of the Bolivian Savanna'. In *Comparative Arawakan Histories. Rethinking Language Family and Culture Area in Amazonia*, ed. J.D. Hill and F. Santos-Ganero, 123–146. Urbana-Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Renfrew, Colin. 2001. *Archeologia i język. Łamigłówka pochodzenia Indoeuropejczyków (Archaeology and Language. The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins)*. Warsaw–Poznań: PWN.

- Renfrew, Colin. 2011. Comments to: Holman *et al.* 2011. *Current Anthropology* 52(6): 868–869.
- Roe, Peter. G. 1982. *The Cosmic Zygote. Cosmology in the Amazon Basin*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Seiler-Baldinger, Annemarie. 1987. *Indianer im Tiefland Südamerikas*. Basel: Museum für Völkerkunde.
- Swadesh, Mauricio. 1959. *Mapas de clasificación lingüística de México y las Américas. Cuadernos del Instituto de Historia*. Serie Antropológica 8. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Valenzuela, Pilar, Antoine Guillaume. 2017. ‘Estudios sincrónicos y diacrónicos sobre lenguas Pano y Takana: una introducción’. *Amerindia* 39(1): 1–49.
- Witczak, Krzysztof T., and Andrzej P. Kowalski. 2012. ‘Nostratyka. Wspólnota językowa indoeuropejska’. In *Przeszłość społeczna. Próba konceptualizacji*, ed. S. Tabaczyński, A. Marciniak, D. Cyngot, and A. Zalewska, 826–837. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

TERMS FOR CERAMIC VESSELS IN THE PANOAN AND TACANAN LANGUAGES:
ETHNO-ARCHAEOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

SUMMARY

The Panoan and Tacanan languages belong to relatively small linguistic families of the Western Amazon. This paper aimed to examine briefly the terms and meanings related to pottery and ceramic vessels comprised within the lexicon of these languages against the ethno-archaeological context. The results of studies presented in this article indicate an existence of common words referring to the shape of vessels and suggest the transfer of meanings from natural or organic containers to certain ceramic vessel types. Moreover, similar terms used for traditional ornamentation have been observed, although their relation to archaeological findings which requires further research.

Keywords: Pano, Tacana, lexicography, pottery, ornamentation

APPENDIX I. LEXICOGRAPH

Objects	Tacanan languages	Panoan languages	Other languages
Barro, greda, losa [earth/ mud, clay]	[tna] medi (mezi?) – tierra; meditudi – greda; rutu – barro; eaua, mechi – tierra; jutchujutchu – cieno, barro [ara] maji – barro, greda, losa; maji bácuá – muñeca de barro; mei – vasija, envase; meiji – caja, vasija; emei – cuerpo, vasija (linterna sin pilas, persona, animal); emi – cuerpo (persona/animal), pecho, carne [cav ₁] mei – barro para pintar loza, greda, barro colorado; [cav ₃] mechi – arcilla, tierra [rey] mechi – tierra [ese] mei – piedra; meshi – tierra, arena	[mcd] mai, main – país, terreno, tierra; mai micha – lodo, barro [amc] maí, nutú – tierra [cbs] mai – tierra [shp] maí – tierra; mapó, mápocan – greda; [mts] mannied – tierra, suelo, arcilla	[ign] máteji, apaqueje – tierra, suelo; [que] t'uru – barro
Piedra, roca [stone, rock]	[tna] tumu – piedra [cav ₁] tumu – piedra [rey] tumu , piedra, tierra	[amc] máncan, máxax – piedra, roca [shp] macán – piedra; shánca – roca [cbs] maxax, mancan – piedra, roca [mcd] toquiri – piedra, roca [mts] cuēnote – piedra	
Arena [sand]	[tna] jutujutu – arena [ara] mezizo – arena [rey] shishi – arena	[mts] masi – arena	
Calabaza [calabash]	[cav ₃] quemi – calabaza	[mcd] choma, choman – calabaza [cbs] chuma – tipo de calabaza, utilizada como vasija para sacar agua para tomar; munti, yae – calabaza [shp] masén, otó – calabaza [amc] xátan, xátanún – calabaza [isc] bacon, mano – calabaza	[ign] calavasa, erepa – calabaza

Objects	Tacanan languages	Panoan languages	Other languages
Cesto, canasta/o [basket]	[tna] ditti – canasta [cav ₁] jiti – canasta; cuta – canastilla [cav ₃] sututu – canasta, cesta [ara] cuaba, tsota, ziqui – canasta	[shp] tasá – canasta [cbs] chichan, xivati – canasta para algodón; kenpax – canasta para guardar animales; tetun – canasta de ojas de palmera [mcd] chicha, chichan – canasta; shihuati, shihuatin – canasta; tuton, tutonun – canasta para transportar carne [mts] tsitsan, chodo – canasta [isc] chichakapi – canasta pequeña tradicional	[ign] saye – canasta; cúyumáha – canasta cuadrada; catuyuhi – canasta redonda de motacú; sáyehi – cesto
	[cav ₁] emaricaca – olla [cav ₂] sura – cántaro; sura caca – cántaro pequeño [cav ₃] caca – copa; emive caca – buche [ara] cacano – una bolsa desechable tejida de hojas de majillo (palmera)	[amc] – cácan, cácanún – canasta para llevar la yuca, el maíz, la leña etc. [cbs] kaki – canasta grande usada por los antepasados; kakan – canasta con diseños pintados alrededor; kuki – canasta grande; [shp] – caquín, cáquiman – canastilla [isc] – kankan – nombre generico para diversos tipos de canasta	
Dibujo, diseño [drawing, design]	[ara] huene – dibujar con diseños [cav ₁] hueneya – escribir, hacer figuras, pintar [cav ₃] venevene – apuntar, escribir, pintar [rey] cuere – pintar	[isc] kené – diseños tradicionales [cbs] kene – dibujo, escrito, diseño tejido [shp] quené – diseño [amc] cúnuu – dibujo, letra; cunúúquin – dibujar, escribir, pintar [mcd] cunu – diseño [mts] dadaua – dibujar	
Alfarería, cerámica [pottery, ceramics]	[cav ₂] mechi jabatsu echa – objeto de alfarería en general; mechi – barro	[mcd] cutin huamisi, cutin huamisiton – alfarera [shp] mapó ati – hacer cerámica; mápocan téetai – alfarera	

Objects	Tacanan languages	Panoan languages	Other languages
Olla [pot]	[tna] juttu , jutuaia – olla; jutujutu – arena [ara] jotohuaja , tohuaja – olla; [ara según cav ₃] jutu - olla; jóto – un lugar ancho en el río; ahuecar la mano en forma de taza [rey] jubu - olla	[mcd] cutin , cutinin – olla de barro [amc] cúntii , cúzpo - olla [shp] quentí – olla de arcilla; quenti áni – olla grande [cbs] kenti – olla [mts] matsu – olla	[ign] métsutsi – olla grande de loza (barro cociso)
Cántaro, jarro [jar]	[tna] matu – cántaro [ara] mato – cántaro para agua; botella de barro para tomar agua; deze – jarro de greda de boca pequeña ocupado para chicha en las ceremonias religiosas [cav ₁] sura - cántaro	[mts] matsu – olla	[ign] métsutsi – olla grande de loza (barro cocido); mátesi – calabaza (el mate), fuente de loza que se usaba antes. [sir] iruru – cántaro/jarro; guaraní – [gua] iru – cantaro, vasija para agua; [que] yuru – cántaro
Tina, tinaja [big jar for water]	[ara] mapai – una tinaja grande con boca chica usada para guardar agua; mapasha – estar lleno, completo	[mts] mapi – cabeza, bola, objeto en forma de bola; cabeza de hacha; [cbs] mapu – barro; mapu – cabeza de un hacha [shp] mápo , mapón – cabeza; mapó , mápocan – greda; mapó ati – hacer cerámica [amc] mapo – cabeza; mápoo , mápopán – barro [mcd] mapo , mapon – greda, ceniza, polvo; cabeza [isc] mapo – ceniza; mapo pewan – tinaja grande, usada tradicionalmente para fermentar chicha	
	[cav ₂] sura - tinaja [rey] sumu - tinaja	[cbs] xumu – tinaja [amc] shomo - tinaja [shp] chómo , chomón – tinaja [mts] těchu – tinaja, tarro de barro [mcd] tutso – tinaja	

Objects	Tacanan languages	Panoan languages	Other languages
Plato, escudilla, [plate, bowl] Tiesto [toaster]	[ara] sepe – tiesto de barro, un plato [cav ₁] seeta – plato o escudilla de barro; [cav ₁] mechi peja – plato de barro; mechi – tierra; peja – plato [cav ₃] peja – plato [rey] pela – plato [tna] depe – plato	[cbs] sapa kenchá – plato; kenchá – plato, tazón, taza; sapa – plano [amc] tunxón – tiesto [shp] quenchá – plato; sápa – plano por un lado [mts] maspan – plato de barro	
Taza, tazón	[ara] tsehuai – taza; tasa, cazo; tsehua – sacar liquido	[mcd] cucho – taza; cuchan, masu – tazón [amc] hiichínyux, mánzun – tazón [cbs] kencha, xika – taza; kencha – tazón;	
Copa [drinking vessel]	[cav ₁] emaricaca – olla; emarisicui – pedazo de loza (de olla); ecuita – cuerpo, hombre, gente; [cav ₃] caca – copa; emive caca – buche	[cbs] kenpu – tazón hondo y de boca ancha, hecho de barro para tomar	[ign] mari – piedra; márijahi – piedra para afilar [ign] caja – caja (castell.), toda clase de caja, bombo, bombilla, zancuti etc.