

“Our Grandparents Used to Say That We Are Certainly Ancient People, We Come From the *Chullpas*”: The Bolivian Chipayas’ Mythistory

Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz

Introduction¹

In this paper I will study the story² that the Bolivian highland Chipayas tell about their origin and past. This oral tradition is closely related to the present. Not only does it explain and justify why they live where they do and how they do, but it also explains their often tense relationship with their immediate neighbors, the Aymaras. In the story, mythical and historical discourse are fused in order to construct their ethnic identity. Before examining the narrative in detail, it is necessary to discuss briefly the two theoretical concepts that underlie my analysis: ethnic identity and mythistory.

Ethnic Identity

The concept of ethnic identity is a construct that a sociocultural group creates to signal its self-definition, both for its own members as well as for outsiders. This understanding of identity, which is not static but undergoes changes, helps the group members shape and express perceptions of their own group and relationships with other groups. These perceptions can reflect

¹ An earlier version of this article was presented at the international conference on “Reading After Empire: Local, Global, and Diaspora Audiences” (University of Stirling, 3-5 September 2008). I would like to thank my colleagues Lindsey Crickmay and María Susana Cipolletti for their careful reading of the essay and for their suggestions. The data presented and discussed here were collected during fieldwork carried out in 2002, 2005, and 2006 in a project to describe and document the Chipaya language as part of the Documentation of Endangered Languages program, funded by the Volkswagen Foundation (see <http://www.mpi.nl/DOBES>). I wish to thank our Chipaya consultants for their patient and informed cooperation, particularly our main consultant, who not only helped with the transcription and translation, but also discussed grammatical, textual, and cultural topics with us. Due to the extremely difficult and tense situation within the village, the consultants expressed the wish to remain anonymous (this difficult situation was first described by Alfred Métraux [1931:127], and little has changed since then).

² I use “story” and “narrative” interchangeably here. In Chipaya, the concept of story (*kintu*, from Spanish *cuento*) includes any kind of story, including animal stories (which normally carry a moral and are said to have happened in ancient times [pers. comm.]). However, I differentiate mythistory as a particular type of narrative limited to explanatory stories about the group’s past, in this case their origin and development as a community (see below).

the pride of belonging to a group and/or they can be a response to prejudice and discrimination, and in many cases both factors reinforce one another. The boundaries that result from this group-defining process can be physical (reflected, for example, in the competition over natural resources or access to markets) as well as conceptual (manifest, for example, in a certain interpretation of the past or a tradition, be it invented or not). Because social and ethnic groups always interact with other groups, this construct affects and changes a group's internal perceptions of identity and at the same time influences how a group shapes its image of other, especially neighboring, groups. This construct also contributes to the image that these neighboring groups form regarding the group in question.³

Mythistory

Both history⁴ and myth⁵ are normally verbal explanations of the past. They are used to construct socially and culturally relevant past events, are often related to public rituals, and are told by a narrator who tends to be a recognized representative of the group. Both history and myth claim to be authoritative and legitimate, and both highlight a continuing relevance of the past to the present and future. However, one of the most important tasks of myth is to interpret sociocultural values and give them meaning and importance in contemporary life. While history may be seen similarly, it is not typically used as a learning experience, although it may be intended as such.

The most distinctive differences, which have largely determined our basic conceptual separation of myth and history, are medium and author. Myth is usually transmitted orally (and can be supported by visual means, such as rock shapes or paintings and/or rituals that enact the myth). However, when we analyze it, it has almost always been transferred to and transformed into writing, most often by an outsider. History tends to be transmitted in writing, but it is

³ This definition has been inspired mainly by Barth 1969 and Keefe 1992.

⁴ In this article I use "history" interchangeably with "historiography," but not with "the past." History is a narrative, ordered according to certain thematic and/or theoretical criteria, that aims to explain events of the past in a meaningful and coherent way. The function of history-writing and publication is not only to provide a certain society with a meaning of its past, but to serve an ideological agenda as well. This can be the interpretation of the past as factual events or reality (reconstructionism), or it can be the intention to recognize and show that no absolute knowledge of the past is possible (relativism). In any case, history is always a narrative; it can never represent the past in a universally acceptable way. It often reflects concrete political, religious, or economic agendas of the group the historian belongs to, or it may oppose these agendas. Therefore, history is not objective or neutral. (I have found Burke 1991 and Munslow 1997 particularly useful for this discussion.)

⁵ Myth is an equally complex concept that is mainly used by anthropologists who study other peoples' past and traditions, normally with respect to ethnic groups who do not use writing. Here I follow the comprehensive definition given by William Bascom (1984:9) (without any of the evaluative and frequently negative connotations historians, sociologists, and psychologists often imply): "Myths are prose narratives which, in the society in which they are told, are considered to be truthful accounts of what happened in the remote past. They are accepted on faith, they are taught to be believed, and they can be cited as authority. . . . Myths are the embodiment of dogma, they are usually sacred, and they are often associated with theology and ritual. Their main characters are not usually human beings, but they often have human attributes; they are animals, deities, or culture heroes, whose actions are set in an earlier world, when the earth was different from what it is today, or in another world such as the sky or underworld. Myths account for the origin of the world, of mankind, of death, or for characteristics of birds, animals, geographical features, and the phenomena of nature."

frequently communicated through oral or visual means (such as exhibitions or television), and this was even more the case in the past, when paintings and oral discourse were the only means of conveying “history” to an illiterate audience. It is also often enacted in public ceremonies, for example in commemoration. In this sense there is no clear boundary between a “fixed” written transmission and a “fluid” oral transmission.

The other major difference is authorship. Myth has no identifiable authors; it is conceived of as a narrative that belongs to and is produced by the community, although, of course, it is practically impossible to study how myth develops over time in its own environment, without “outside” interference; therefore, little is known as to the function and role of the narrator and the audience in the shaping and reshaping of the text.⁶ History, on the contrary, normally has an individual as author, but once we start asking about the composition and editing process of a book, including the selection of sources as well as changes due to invited critique, the seemingly clearly defined authorship becomes elusive.

As I hope to have shown, the concepts of myth and history are not as far apart from each other as one might think. Therefore, the fused concept of mythistory⁷ seems to be a legitimate and adequate combination to describe socially relevant narratives, especially in the discourse of the indigenous population in contemporary post-colonial societies. Since the colonial period, with its indoctrination and teaching of European values and interpretations of the world, both myth and history have informed and modified indigenous concepts of how to understand and interpret the past. We also have to consider that European “history” was always intertwined with religious beliefs and interpretations and therefore must have been more accessible to those peoples who did not normally separate the “secular” from the “spiritual.” Mythistory can be defined in the following way: it is (most often) a narrative construction of past events that are seen as relevant or even crucial for the creation, explanation, shaping, and maintenance of an ethnic group’s identity and social cohesion. It is considered to be true, authoritative, and legitimizing and can/must therefore be modified and adapted to new circumstances.⁸

The origin story of the Bolivian Chipayas shows how both concepts, myth and history, have shaped the contemporary construction of the Chipayas’ past, and that this mythistory is an important instrument for explaining and legitimizing their ethnic identity, in concrete as well as symbolic terms. The origin mythistory and early folk history⁹ as told by the Chipayas themselves includes the following major themes: the ancient ancestors called *chullpas* and the reasons why

⁶ Some discussion is found in the framework of formulaic theory and oral theory as well as in orality-literacy debates (see, for example, Finnegan 1992, also Foley 2002).

⁷ This term, which goes back to Francis Cornford’s 1907 *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (quoted in Mali 2003:19), has since been used by historians (for example, McNeill 1986 and Mali 2003), although with a different interpretation from mine.

⁸ Arnold (1993:49-55) emphasizes the importance of including the narrators’ and communities’ own views in the interpretation of their past. I would like to add to Arnold’s suggestion that it is not enough to “report” on the views expressed by consultants: the anthropologist’s analysis should also reflect the complex process of interaction and expectations between the community members and fieldworkers. The present study is basically limited to a textual analysis but tries to take these observations into account where possible.

⁹ As defined by Hudson (1966:54), “in a folk history we attempt to find what people in another society believe ‘really happened,’ as judged by their sense of credibility and relevance.”

the Chipayas are the most ancient people in the area, if not in the Andes; their migratory movements in the larger area where they live now, with explanation of the modern territorial limitations as well as neighborhood conflicts; and the particular surnames as a result of contacts with Aymara neighbors and Christian religion. By drawing on different kinds of constructions of the past, European as well as indigenous in form and content, the three themes are closely interrelated and situate the Chipayas in space and time. They also serve to explain their ethnic identity and legitimize territorial claims.

The Uru-Chipayas

As first documented in sixteenth-century Spanish sources, the people called Urus or Uruquillas by the colonial writers lived around the great lakes of what is today Peru and Bolivia: Lake Titicaca, Lake Poopó, and Lake Coipasa, on the rivers connecting them and on the so-called floating islands of Lake Titicaca. These people call themselves “water people.”¹⁰

In the past, this population was different from the surrounding herding and peasant Aymara- and Puquina-speaking groups because Uru subsistence was based on fishing and bird-hunting, and because they spoke their own language. With Inca and later Spanish colonial resettlements the Urus lost much of their lifestyle, intermarried with the surrounding Aymara population, and by the beginning of the twentieth century had become reduced to small groups. The best known of these are the Urus who live on the “floating islands” of Lake Titicaca; they now speak Aymara and make their living mostly through tourism. The Urus of Irohito at the southern end of Lake Titicaca and the Muratos on the shores and islands of Lake Poopó have also lost their language. However, in their oral traditions, their clothing, and certain elements of their material culture the Urus maintain common cultural features.

The mythistory studied here is that of the village of Santa Ana de Chipaya (Illustration 1, Maps 1-3). On the Altiplano at a 3,670-meter altitude, efficient agriculture and animal breeding are limited by extreme day-night temperature variations, salty soil (Illustration 2), and inundations during the wet season (November to March). Therefore, many Chipayas migrate to work in Chile or eastern Bolivia; however, there is still a tendency to return to the community. Important features of self-identification are fishing and bird-hunting (Illustration 3) in and by the river Lauca that flows through their territory; round houses; a particular type of clothes, woven by the wearers (Illustration 4); and the Chipaya language. When asked what is most typical of their culture, they always mention these features.

However, bird-hunting and fishing are mainly carried out in the wet season to supplement a diet mostly composed of *quinoa*¹¹ and potato. Sheep, pigs, and llamas are bred and kept to supply wool and meat and may in a good season provide a modest income. Nowadays no one in the village lives in a round house and traditional clothing is only worn on special occasions. The

¹⁰ See Map 1. (Maps and illustrations are located at the end of this essay.) For a state of research and bibliography, see Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 2007a.

¹¹ *Quinoa* (*Chenopodium quinoa*) is a native Andean cultivated grain that grows at high altitudes (National Research Council 1989:148-68).

only particularity the Chipayas have maintained is their language, which is spoken by almost all of the approximately 1,800 community members. The language is not related to any other language of the Andes; it is still fully functional, although increasingly endangered by radio and television, schooling in Spanish, and migration. Another feature familiar to everyone and one that seems little changed over the past century (ethnographic information began to be collected at the end of the nineteenth century) is the mythistory of their origin and remote past, which goes back to ancient times but also relates to their present-day lives.

Chipaya Mythistory

The Chipayas' mythistory consists of several episodes and has been published, among others, by Alfred Métraux in the 1930s (see Appendix, Text 1) and by Nathan Wachtel (1990).¹² A detailed version in Spanish, written by Fernando O. Martín Quispe, a youth from Chipaya, in his notebook was published in 1955. The late Porterie Gutiérrez' notebooks (and a number of sound files and transcriptions) that are available on the Internet also contain *chullpa* stories, among them several mythistories (see Porterie Collection 1982-85). Two texts collected by the DOBES team also narrate the story (Appendix, Texts 2 and 3).

During a workshop in Chipaya in 2002, all participants, mostly young men, knew this story and could narrate it themselves. Thus the interpretation of Chipaya mythistory can be said to have been relatively stable throughout a period of at least seventy years. Our consultants said that this mythistory is narrated like any other story—for example, when going out to the pastures or passing long days and nights there away from the village.

The story as a whole comprises three distinguishable episodes: the *chullpa* ancestors, the founding of the Chipaya, and the receiving of surnames.¹³ Drawing together the individual texts, Table 1 gives "the whole story" (this and the chronology were confirmed by one of our consultants and are reflected in the Porterie Collection texts).

¹² Wachtel (1990:216-22), who carried out important ethnographic and ethnohistorical research on Chipaya culture, renders the story in French, without citing consultants or any details of the context in which it was told to him or how he obtained it.

¹³ Three versions of the story are presented in the Appendix, and I will refer to some passages of the stories of F. Quispe (1955), M. Quispe (1984, 1985), E. Quispe (1985), and José Condori (1982).

Table 1: The Narrative—Chipaya Mythistory

Chronology	Chipaya mythistory (For the texts see Appendix) Text 1: <M> Métraux 1935b Text 2: <C1> Consultant 1, 2002 Text 3: <C2> Consultant 2, 2005	Chipaya interpretation Construction and justification of their ethnic identity and interethnic relationships through their mythistory (sources: field observations and Chipaya consultants).
<u>First generation:</u> <u>chullpa ancestors</u> • sensitive to the sun • agriculturalists	The ancient <i>chullpas</i> lived by the light of the moon. They built their houses with the entrance towards the east so that the sun, which used to rise from the west, wouldn't burn them. They cultivated <i>quinua</i> and <i>cañihua</i> . ¹⁴	Today they are mainly agriculturalists and herders.
<u>First key event:</u> <u>natural catastrophe</u>	One day the sun rose in the east and burned most of them <M:1; C2:3>.	
<u>Second generation:</u> <u>Chipayas</u> • herders of wild animals	One couple saved itself and started living in the water and used to come out only at night. They herded <i>vicuñas</i> ¹⁵ <M:1; C1:3>.	The Chipayas consider themselves to be the only descendants of the most ancient people of the region, the <i>chullpas</i> .
• fishers, hunters, gatherers • resettlement • contact with Aymaras of Capilla Perdida area	At that time they lived in Capilla Perdida (Lost Chapel), a different place from the modern village, and came to the lake that was close to where the village of Chipaya is now, in order to fish, hunt birds, and collect eggs <C1:1; C2:2>. Then they settled near the lake in order to make hunting and fishing easier, but thereby gave up their rights to Capilla Perdida, which the Aymaras then took over <C1:2>.	They are limited to a small village between the hills in the north and the (now reduced) lake in the south (see <C2:2> and Maps 2 and 3). ¹⁶

¹⁴ *Cañihua* (also *cañahua*, *cañahui*, *Chenopodium pallidicaule*) is a native Andean cultivated grain that grows at high altitudes (National Research Council 1989:128-37). M. Quispe (1985:1) states explicitly that the *chullpas* were not agriculturalists, whereas José Condori (1982:2, Porterie's transcription of the Chipaya text) says that there were no fields after the Judgment.

¹⁵ *Vicuñas* are wild animals, normally hunted in order to be shorn and then set free again (they are of the same family as llamas and alpacas [camelids], which are the domesticated variants). Our consultant affirmed that the *vicuñas* were the domesticated animals of the *chullpas* (and in Quechua traditions only the powerful mountain spirits "herd" *vicuñas*; see B. Condori and Gow 1976: "Los animales del Ausangate"). This and the fact that the Chipayas claim to have cultivated important Andean food plants in the distant past emphasize their self-image: in ancient times, when everything was different, they were powerful and skilled, but these capacities were lost in the process of colonization.

¹⁶ It is important to note that the landscape in the Chipaya region has never been very stable. The lakes have changed their location, and so have the rivers and sand-dunes (Wachtel 1990:288-95, 302-20, 342). The earliest mention of the village is made in a document dating from 1575/76 (*Libro de tasas* 1575-91).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contact with Aymaras of Huachacalla • herders 	They received sheep from the Aymaras of Huachacalla, which multiplied to form a herd <M:3>.	The Chipayas say that they have tense relationships with the neighboring Aymaras; for example, they have to pay too much for the traditional plant used for thatching their houses; this is why they use corrugated iron. There are quarrels and fights over land rights.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • builders 	At night they went to Sabaya, a neighboring old Aymara village, to help build the bell-tower <C1:3; C2:2>; Illustration 7.	But there are Aymaras who get married to Chipayas; Chipayas live in Aymara villages (information from an Aymara woman in Huachacalla; information from Chipayas).
<i>Second key event: Christianization, learning Aymara = "civilization"</i>	They were discovered and captured. First they could not make themselves understood because they did not speak Aymara. A Christian priest gave them their surnames that are folk-etymologically explained as Chipaya <M:2; C1:3; C2:2>.	The Chipayas consider their surnames, given to them by a Christian priest (in colonial times), as typically Chipaya. In the explanation provided, the names derive from Aymara/Andean words (but etymologically not all of them do so; see Table 3).

Analyzing Chipaya Mythistory: *Chullpas*, Access to Land, and Names

The Chullpa Ancestors

With respect to the past, the Andean peoples¹⁷ do not believe in a fixed point of origin of the world; rather, there has always been something in existence, but key events, mostly in the form of catastrophes, have produced generations of human beings who have come and gone (this belief can be found in early chronicles and still today, partly infused by Christian concepts).¹⁸ A common view of the past in the Andes is that of successive generations of ancestors, the *ñawpa*,

¹⁷ The highland people(s) of the Andes have many cultural features in common (this is often called *lo andino*), based on the particular ecological conditions they live in and their long history of mutual contact and interaction. The largest groups are those that speak Quechua (mainly in Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia, c. 9 million speakers) and Aymara (mainly in Bolivia and Peru, c. 2 million speakers), whereas there are only c. 1,800 Chipaya speakers left. In terms of many cultural practices Quechua, Aymara, and Chipaya people(s) are not easy to delimit from each other. The clearest differentiation is through language because Quechua, Aymara, and Chipaya can be defined as distinct languages. Quechua and Aymara are typologically similar and have many words in common, but because the oldest records reach back only to the sixteenth century, it is impossible to trace the route loanwords may have taken or whether there was an ancient common Andean stock (cf. Torero 2002). Chipaya is typologically different from the other two and its vocabulary differs as well, although it has taken over a substantial number of Aymara words and a few, but frequently used Quechua words. Obviously all three languages have been subjected to considerable influence by Spanish, and so have the people(s) by Spanish/European culture. It is therefore not always possible to assign a certain element to any particular one of these languages/cultures, as is the case, for example, with the surnames (see Table 3 below). Therefore I use the word "Andean" when I refer to more than one of the mentioned groups, their languages, or practices.

¹⁸ For example, the chronicler Juan de Betanzos (informed by Inca consultants) starts his account about the beginnings of the world by stating that it is said that in ancient times that the land and provinces of Peru were dark and that there was no light (Betanzos 1987 [c. 1551], primera parte, cap. I, p. 11). Creation is not conceived of as making the world and humankind from nothing, but rather as bringing order into the world (cf. Marzal 1996:85).

machu (Quechua “ancestor”), or *gentiles* (Spanish “ancestor,” implying “pagan”) (Urbano 1980:117-19). Narratives tell us that there were ancestors who lived only by the light of the moon, and with the arrival of the sun (often equated with the Incas) they perished. In other versions of the narrative some people escaped and went to live underwater or in springs and have become malignant spirits.¹⁹ Yet another Quechua story tells that some persons escaped from being burned by the sun and went to the *yungas* (warm valleys of the eastern Andean slopes). Similarly, the Aymaras who are the Chipayas’ direct neighbors talk of ancestors called *chullpas*, who were an ancient generation that perished when the sun rose first. The Aymaras themselves are a different people. This is reflected in the story of “Jesus Christ-Tatala and the Supay-Chullpas,” told by the Aymaras from K’ulta (Bolivia). After fights between Tatala and the *chullpas* (Dillon and Abercrombie 1988:56),

Tatala rises into the sky as the sun from the east, and the Chullpas die in their houses, burned and dried up by the heat. To this day, one can see their remains, and the sun, Tata Awatiri, continues to travel across the sky. Some of the Chullpas, however, managed to escape, by diving under the water of Lake Poopo [*sic*]. These became the present day Chullpa people [in this case the Urus of Lake Poopó, also called Muratos, SD].²⁰

While the origin stories vary among Quechuas and Aymaras, the *chullpas* still have a certain influence on them since they are related to the architectural remains of ancient graves called *chullpas*; coming into contact with them may have a negative impact: they can cause illness and death.²¹ The present generation of the Quechuas and Aymaras is a new post-*machu/chullpa* generation that came into existence with the appearance of the sun²² and replaced (in the literal sense) a dark past: an uncivilized, wild world was superseded by civilization, represented most clearly through the domestication of plants and the introduction of agriculture as well as

¹⁹ See Núñez del Prado Béjar 1970:66, Marzal 1971:67-69, and Urbano 1993. For Quechua narratives, see Núñez del Prado Béjar 1970:63-67; B. Condori and Gow 1976: “Gentil inkamanta,” “Gentil inka”); Urbano 1980 and 1993; and a variation in Phuturi Suni 1997:246-47.

²⁰ Harry Tschopik (1951:202), for the Titicaca area, mentions the *chullpas* as “houses of the *gentiles*,” which the Aymaras believe “to be the remains of the dwellings of the ancient inhabitants of the region before the coming of the Aymara.” Jemio Gonzales (1993:112-13) mentions two Aymara stories: “Dark Time” and “The *Chullpas*,” but she does not give their texts.

²¹ For the impact *chullpas* can still have today, see, for example, the story “La gente chullpa” (in Albó and Layme 1992:54-57, Dillon and Abercrombie 1988:59-60, and Platt 2002:*passim*).

²² It is possible that in these traditions we find traces of the importance of the sun as deity, which was promoted by the Incas as their principal god but lost importance as soon as the Inca hierarchy and order were destroyed by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century.

Christianization. Thus the time of the *machu/chullpa* is conceived of as an era prior to the Quechua and Aymara, who are the descendants of a different people and generation.²³

The Chipayas, on the other hand, narrate a similar and yet substantially different story of their origin. They see the *chullpas* as their *own* ancestors, whereas—as the above mentioned Quechua and Aymara narratives show—the Quechuas and Aymaras do not see themselves as descendants of the first generation (see Table 2 below). But *chullpa* is the name of the first generations of Chipayas (Text 3, <C2:3>):

[Afraid of the Sun, which they believed to rise from the West,] they built the houses all oriented towards the East . . . but the sun never rose from the West. From the East rose the sun! The sun rays entered through the door. Then those who were on the hill burned. Thus the sun had risen with heat. Everything must have got burned. There wouldn't have been any harvest or any life. Afterwards some of them died from hunger, having eaten wild straw, having eaten soft straw, being sad. Of those who were close to the lake, some of them, very few, would have saved themselves. Then afterwards we came [as descendants of those who survived]. There are also our forefathers, grandparents [left]: nowadays the houses of the *chullpas* are [still] on the hills in this area. Those forefathers, our grandparents, they died because, living higher up, they could not get to the water.²⁴

In the region that coincides roughly with that of the ancient and modern Uru-Chipayas, remains of graves are found, “circular, square or rectangular buildings of stone or adobe” (Isbell 1997:163), many of which contain skeletons (Isbell 1997, ch. 5; see Illustrations 5 and 6 in the Appendix). These buildings are called *chullpas*. The Chipayas claim that these are the houses of their *chullpa* ancestors (see Text 3, <C2:3>).

²³ Sixteenth-century chroniclers of the Andes give a very similar idea of what primeval times were like: darkness is the most distinctive feature (Betanzos 1987 [c. 1551], primera parte, cap. I:11-12; Cieza de León 1985 [1550s], cap. III:3-5; cf. Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 1994). Based on the analysis of colonial sources and other, secondary evidence, Bouysse-Cassagne and Harris (1987:19-28) conclude that the Urus, like the Aymaras' ancestors, were related to an era of darkness and wild(er)ness. We can therefore assume that modern Andean ideas of the beginning of the world have their origins in their own cultural roots. However, the Bible starts in the same way: light is the first thing created by God after having made the earth (*The New Jerusalem Bible*, Genesis 1:3). The difference compared with Christianity is mainly that Andean “origin” stories—as mentioned above—do not really start with an origin from nothing, there is no creator god in the biblical sense, and the generations that follow each other after each change or catastrophe are fundamentally different from each other (cf. Urbano 1980:113), unlike the Christians for whom, in the Bible, care is taken always to connect them to the one original pair of human beings through genealogical descent. In the Andes, on the other hand, the past generations can have influence on the present ones because they are conceived of as somehow still alive and present (which in turn has to do with the Andean concept that everything can change shape but hardly ever disappears completely) (cf. B. Condori and Gow 1976:20). In this sense, the Chipaya version of themselves being the descendants of the first human beings is quite similar to the biblical device to tie the important persons to an “original” line of descent.

²⁴ M. Quispe (1985:1) says that “the *chullpas* lived with another sun” (“los chullpas vivían con otro sol”).

Table 2: Andean Eras

Era	Quechuas/Aymaras	Chipayas²⁵
Moon	generation 1 (= <i>chullpa</i> , <i>machu</i> , <i>gentiles</i>)	generation 1 (= <i>chullpa</i>)
Sun	generation 1 perishes or goes to live underwater or in the warm valleys—new generation 2 (= Inca) comes, related to the appearance of the sun: <u>rupture</u>	almost all of generation 1 die, BUT Chipayas survive by moonlight: <u>continuity</u>
Spanish = Christians	(Jesus Christ-Tatala)	and later become Christians (and implicitly able to live like them)
Present	Quechuas/Aymaras < sun: Generation 2 ≠ 1	Chipayas < <i>chullpa</i> : Generation 2 = 1

From the colonial European perspective the Uru-Chipayas—being fishers and bird-hunters—were not of much use to the Spaniards; early descriptions are limited to the classic image of the barbarian. All we learn about their origins is what José de Acosta, a leading Jesuit intellectual, wrote at the end of the sixteenth century: “These Urus are so stupid that they themselves don’t take themselves for human beings. It is said of them that when asked what people they were, they answered that they were not human beings, but Uros, as if it was a different species of animals.”²⁶

This opinion about the Chipayas and Urus became widespread and has been repeated endlessly. The Chipayas we spoke to still suffer from this image today (pers. comm., see also Text 2, <C1:3>). However, if we read Acosta’s description against the background of the contemporary Chipaya origin mythistory, it acquires a different, and less derogatory meaning: they were not human beings because they were of an earlier generation that had almost completely died out with the arrival of the sun—except for the Uru-Chipayas! Even in the twentieth century, the Chipayas insist that they are the oldest (and therefore only legitimate) people of the Altiplano.

The Chipayas have always been considered a special case: as we have seen, more often than not in a negative sense of the classical “other” or barbarian. Their own mythistory, although not static, has been conservative in the sense that the basic content has not changed. It is an excellent example of how it is not necessarily the text itself that undergoes changes but its interpretation by others or even by the authors themselves. Thus the reputation of the Chipayas

²⁵ Ariel de Vidas (2008:49) analyzes in similar terms, those of “historical-mythical memory,” the construction of the Mexican Huasteks’ ethnic identity. It is interesting that their mythistory has a lot in common with the Chipayas’: the flight from light as well as the perception of identity as being “no one” as opposed to the Spaniards.

²⁶ “Son estos uros tan brutales, que ellos mismos no se tienen por hombres. Cuéntase de ellos que, preguntados qué gente eran, respondieron que ellos no eran hombres, sino uros, como si fuera otro género de animales” (Acosta 1954 [1590]: lib.II, cap. VI). Note that Acosta is careful to quote an unknown source for his statement. See also, for example, Métraux’s image of the Chipayas’ lives as dirty, miserable, and monotonous (1931:109).

as being non-humans (which was already in place and probably created by the imperialist and utilitarian Incas²⁷) fit into the Spaniards' ideas of all kinds of odd beings populating this foreign world—not too far from the earlier ideas of people without heads, and the ever-persistent Amazons and cannibals (cf., for example, Amodio 1993). At the same time it was a handy “misunderstanding” that helped the dominant Spaniards to further marginalize the despised Chipayas.

Gaining and Losing Land

The catastrophe of the sun was survived by a small group of people, the ancestors of the modern-day Chipayas. These survivors moved between two ecological areas: the hills (Capilla Perdida) in the north and the lake in the south (Text 2, <C1:1-2>; Text 3, <C2:2,4>; see also Maps 3). Through these migratory movements they lost their land rights farther north and were finally confined to the lake area. Ever since, access to a variety of land and soils for different subsistence strategies has been a problem for the Chipayas living in the midst of Aymaras.

This episode can be explained in terms of century-old struggles between the Chipayas and their Aymara neighbors over land, which Wachtel (1990:336-48) corroborates with a detailed presentation and analysis of colonial documentation that dates at least to the seventeenth century. At times the Chipayas became servants of the Aymaras and were even used by them to pay off the Aymaras' *mita* (tribute in form of labor) obligations by being sent to the mines—for example, when they had lost an animal they had to pasture and had thus created a debt. On the other hand, there were times when Chipayas and Aymaras had reciprocal agreements for land and pasture use.

Today land is still contested by Aymaras and Chipayas. Sometimes stones are thrown at the neighbors. Title deeds are the subject of court litigation.²⁸ It would be interesting to see what claims are the basis for the court cases for title deeds. In many Andean documents the only justification for owning land is that it has belonged to the owner “since time immemorial,” an argument that is very clearly presented by our narrator: “We are the real established ones here, from before. They [the Aymaras] are people who came. [Added by the narrator in Spanish:

²⁷ The colonial sources are mentioned in Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 2007a:4, n. 5.

²⁸ “At present, the Chipayas have presented a territorial demand of 158,000 hectares as their original community lands; however, the indemnification of the lands has not begun yet”—according to our consultants, not by 2006 either. (“Actualmente, los chipayas han presentado una demanda territorial de 168.000 hectáreas para sus tierras comunitarias de origen [TCO], sin embargo el saneamiento de tierras aún no ha llegado.” Anonymous 2005b; see also López Rivas 2004.) Felix Barrientos Ignacio (1990:35) gives the figure of 44,184 hectares as Chipaya land. The discrepancy between what the community has and what it claims seems too vast to have any chance of becoming reality.

colonos, “colonists, settlers.”] That’s what grandfather said” <Text 3, C2:4>.²⁹ Fifty years earlier F. Quispe had written (1955:139): “. . . our ancestors suffered from enslavement by the Aymaras; until today we are walled in by the Aymaras. There is no exit, no contact beyond the community-borders. They occupy most of our pastures. . . .”³⁰

Surnames

Chronologically most recent is an episode that narrates that the Chipayas went to Sabaya, a neighboring Aymara village, in order to “help” build the bell-tower (Illustration 7). There they were captured and baptized, receiving their surnames from a Christian priest (see Text 2, <C1:3>, see Table 3). Thus they explain their surnames through their first contact with Christianity and through the difficult language situation in which they found themselves.

Although all the names are still seen today as typically Chipaya, not only are there many families of Aymara and of European descent that have these names, but in the story itself it is also made completely clear that they derive from Aymara, as Aymara words are referred to as their origin (see Text 2, <C1:3>, footnotes 48 and 49). Moreover, some of the names are Spanish.³¹ On the one hand, this narrative is a recognition of the century-old domination of the Chipayas by Aymaras and Europeans;³² on the other, identifying with Aymara and European surnames and appropriating them as their own makes the Chipayas—although as descendants of the *chullpas* so essentially different from other Andean peoples—part of the larger Andean world. The imposition of the names through baptism can be seen as a key act of marking the

²⁹ According to one of our consultants, there are Aymaras who now claim to be descendants of the *chullpas* as well and thus hope to make their demand for territory as legitimate as that of the Chipayas. How a community’s claim to land is explained and justified through mythistory can also be seen in the case of the southern Peruvian village of Sonqo, where Catherine J. Allen (1988:99-101) found the story that, after clearly marked and discontinuous earlier eras, the most recent one was said to be characterized by three leaders called Anton Quispe, each of whom carried in addition to this name the name of the respective neighborhood where he lived. As the previous generation had been wiped out, the new generation had to come from outside and yet be related to the community land.

³⁰ “. . . que nuestros antepasados han sufrido una esclavitud de los aimaras[,] hasta hoy estamos amurallados por los aimaras[:] no [hay] salida[,] contacto [allá de los] límites intercantonales[,] que ellos ocupan nuestros pastales[,] la mayor parte . . .” (*[sic]*: the Spanish is that of a second-language speaker with little formal education; the translation is mine). E. Quispe (1985) gives a detailed history of the conflicts and of court litigation, partly based on (his understanding of) colonial and modern history. See also Iriarte 2009 for conflicts between Chipayas and Aymaras.

³¹ A similar phenomenon of “appropriation” can be observed in religious and ritual terminology, which, in Quechua and Aymara, is often of Spanish origin and only used in Spanish, such as *mesa*, for offerings (derived from *mesa*, “table,” or *misa*, “mass”), *altomisayuy* (derived from *alto*, “high,” *misa*, “table” or “mass,” plus the Quechua suffix *-yuy* which expresses possession), the *Tío de la mina*, “Uncle of the mine,” a tutelary spirit of the mine workers, and many more (cf. Albó 1999).

³² The system of Christian first names and surnames was introduced by the Spaniards. Before the European conquest, Andean names were most often related to elements and phenomena of nature as well as supernatural beings (see Valiente 1984 for Quechua, Medinaceli 2003:183 for Aymara). In her historical study of Aymara names of a certain region in Bolivia, Medinaceli (2003:157-83) explains the complexity of the nascent colonial Andean name structure, based on a Spanish tradition that at the time was in transformation and on an indigenous tradition about which we know little. With respect to the Chipayas, F. Quispe (1955:136) writes that they used to call each other with the terms used for clothing (also E. Quispe 1985:12).

Chipayas as the “vanquished,” but the Chipayas themselves see this introduction to Spanish culture (language, baptism, surnames) as a step towards civilization (see Text 2: <C1:3>).

What may look like an arbitrary array of folk etymologies actually represents the historical complexity of Andean society: the mixing of ethnic groups, such as Chipayas and Aymaras; the imposition of Spanish conventions and religion; and the translation, adaptation, and re-interpretation of this religion by the Andean people. Moreover, the uncertain origin of the Andean words (probably Aymara and/or Quechua) shows even more ancient underlying interethnic contact.

Table 3: The Names

Surname Thought to be Chipaya	Origin of Name (Medinaceli: 2003:Anexo 1)	Word Derivation	Explanation by Narrator C1 {Explanation by Quispe} [comment by SD]	(Possible) Etymologies (a) Aymara dictionary (Büttner and Condori Cruz 1984) (b) Aymara dictionary (Bertonio 1984 [1612])	Adaptation Process
Chino	Andean ³³ or Spanish? (Chinoca, Chimo)	<i>chinu</i>	because the person was captured and tied with a rope	(a) <i>chinu(-)</i> — <i>amarrar</i> , <i>soga</i> [to tie, rope] (b) <i>chino-tha</i> — <i>añudar</i> [to knot]	Aymara name (?)
Lázaro	Spanish	<i>lasu</i>	because the person was captured with a lasso {the <i>chullpas</i> built the bell-tower with clay and wild straw that seems to have been made into a kind of lasso (136-37)}	(a) <i>lasu(-)</i> — <i>lacear ganado</i> (cast.) [catch livestock with a lasso (Span.)]	Spanish and Andeanized word is similar to Spanish name
López	Spanish	<i>lupi</i>	because the person lives in the sun [strange because the Chipayas were originally afraid of the sun; Quispe's explanation is more feasible:] {Lupi was baptized during the day, by the light of the sun, (137)} [that is, he had already made the first step to come out of the darkness]	(a) <i>lupi</i> — <i>rayo del sol</i> (b) <i>lupi</i> — <i>rayo del sol</i> , <i>o resplandor</i> [sun ray or sunshine]	Andean word is similar to Spanish name
Huarachi	Andean	<i>warac hi</i>	because the person has been sprinkled with water [baptized?]	(a) <i>wara(-)</i> — <i>derramar agua</i> (b) <i>huara-tha</i> — <i>derramar agua</i> [to sprinkle water]	Andean word is identical with Aymara/ Quechua name

³³ See footnote 17.

Quispe	Andean (Quispe)	<i>qispi</i>	because the person has been rescued [saved?, word used in Christian texts]	(a) <i>qispi(-)</i> — <i>salvar</i> [to save] (b) <i>quespi</i> — <i>cosa resplandeciente</i> [something shining] <i>saluar</i> — <i>quespia-tha</i> [to save] also Quechua	Andean word is identical with Aymara/ Quechua name
Pirqa; Paredes³⁴	Andean (Pirca); Spanish	<i>pirqa</i>	because the person was closed into a house (“walled in”) {because the <i>chullpas</i> had constructed the bell-tower wall (137)}	(a) <i>pirqa</i> — <i>pared</i> (b) <i>pirca</i> — <i>la pared</i> [wall] also Quechua	Meaning of Spanish word is translated into Andean language OR Andean word is adapted to Spanish surname

F. Quispe (1955) gives further names:

Felipe	Spanish (Lipi)	<i>lipinta</i> <i>ta</i> <i>pfelipi</i> = <i>llipi</i>	{because the <i>chullpas</i> had trapped themselves in the ropes the Aymaras had put up as obstacles in order to capture them (136-37)}	(a) <i>llipi</i> — <i>trampa para cazar aves</i> [trap to hunt birds] (b) <i>lipi</i> — <i>soga con que rodean ganado, o las vicuñas para que no se huygan, por miedo de vnos fluecos de lana que cuelgan de la soga y se menean con el ayre</i> [rope with which they circle livestock, or the <i>vicuñas</i> , to prevent them from escaping, because they are afraid of some wool-tassels that hang from the rope and move in the air]	Aymara word sounds similar to variant of Spanish name
Alavi	? (Alavi)	<i>alala</i>	{the <i>chullpas</i> walked at night in the light of the moon (137)}	(a) <i>alalaw/ alalay</i> — <i>¡qué frío!</i> (b) <i>alalay</i> — <i>interjección de vno que padece frío</i> [both exclamations of someone who suffers cold] also Quechua	Aymara?

³⁴ The surname now used is Paredes, the Spanish equivalent of the Andean word *pirqa*. According to our main consultant there is still one man called Pirqa in Chipaya, but he has no family who could carry on the name.

Villca	Andean	<i>willka</i>	{the Aymaras made them come out of the lake with a sign of the hand (137)}	(a) <i>willka</i> — <i>Dios Sol</i> (antig.) [Sun-God (obs.)] (b) <i>villca</i> — <i>el sol como antiguamente decía . . . ; adoratorio dedicado al sol . . .</i> [the sun as they used to say in former times . . . ; adoratory dedicated to the sun . . .] also Quechua (probably from Aymara)	Andean word is identical with Quechua/ Aymara name
Copa	Andean or Spanish? (Copa)	<i>copa</i>	{because they became friends and had alcoholic drinks from a goblet (137)}	(a) <i>qhupa</i> — <i>escarcha</i> [crystallized frost] also Quechua (b) <i>copa</i> — <i>luciérnaga</i> [glow-worm] <i>kopa-tha</i> — <i>apretar con la mano</i> [to squeeze with the hand] and Spanish: <i>copa</i> , goblet	Spanish word interpreted as Chipaya name; possibly also Andean word used for names

Eduardo Quispe (1985:6-7) supplies more surnames: “Machaca (new people [Aymara: *mächaqa*, ‘new’]), Cruz (blessed with the cross [Spanish: *cruz*, ‘cross’]) and Ramos [Spanish: ‘bouquets,’ maybe from Domingo de Ramos, Palm Sunday], Cayo (it is because they came on foot [Aymara: *kayu*, ‘foot’]), etc. . . .”³⁵ José Condori (1982:12) adds Chico and Guaca.³⁶

This episode reflects European chronology: colonialization and Christianization; whether it does so by drawing on Andean ways of building memory or reflects colonial-era Christian teaching is unclear—probably a combination of both. On the other hand—like the others—it is aetiological since it explains not only the modern surnames, but also, and importantly, Christianization and the interrelation of the Chipayas with old Andean traditions (for example, hunting with *bolas*), with their Aymara neighbors (some surnames are frequent in the Aymara population), and with the Spanish and Christian world (in the case of the Spanish surnames). However, in order to relate clearly this variety and multiplicity of influences back to themselves, the explanations are mythhistorically and folk-etymologically derived from the Chipaya language.³⁷ As individual narrators have partially different “typically Chipaya” surnames, it is

³⁵ “Machaca (nueva gente), Cruz (bendecido con la cruz) y Ramos, Cayo (es que vinieron a pie) etc. . . .”

³⁶ Condori does not explain the names. Medinaceli has Cayo, Condori, Chico, and Guaca. Jesús de Machaca is a village not far from Irohito where the present-day Urus live (see footnote 47).

³⁷ It is possible that, in etic terms, the names reflect marriage practices and ethnic exogamy and that, in emic terms, the Chipayas, although they must have integrated substantial numbers of outsiders, have managed to convey the image of being a closed society that is exclusively Chipaya.

possible that certain families or *ayllus* (communities; territorial or kin groups within a community) create folk-etymological explanations for their own group's names.

Interpreting Chipaya Mythistory: The Creation of Community Cohesion and Identity

The episodes of the story that relate migratory movements and surnames show that according to their memory the Chipayas have always lived in a tense relationship with the Aymaras. It seems that the Aymaras were also in the area from early times (our consultant <Text 2, C1:3> refers to Sabaya as always having existed). According to Chipaya mythistory, contact and tension were present in the remote past when the Chipayas became limited to a small territory by Lake Coipasa. At that time Aymaras and Chipayas apparently belonged to different “kinds” of people (not unlike what is reflected in the Acosta narrative): the Chipayas moved about in the darkness and lived from fishing, hunting, and gathering, whereas the Aymaras lived by daylight and were herders and peasants. An indication of the complex interpretation of the past is the place called “Capilla Perdida” (“Lost Chapel”). The Chipayas lost the place to the Aymaras because they forgot to go back regularly. It was originally their place, yet it is designated with a Spanish place name and may have received the qualifier “lost” when the Aymaras took it over.

Contact was not always conceived of as negative, yet the story says that the Aymaras gave the Chipayas sheep so that they could start breeding animals (see Text 1: <M:3>). The Chipayas mainly construct their difference as a disadvantage. They went to Sabaya to help build the bell-tower of the church. They belonged to another era, literally to the night, so they could not work during the day, which robbed them of the opportunity to interact with their neighbors. They had to work at night and were eventually captured by the Aymaras (with the same means used to capture wild animals). Contact could only be established once the Chipayas had learned Aymara. The Aymaras collaborated with the Spaniards, first against the Chipayas by capturing them, then through accepting their baptism by the priest, so that the Chipayas could be transformed from “uncivilized people” into Christians and thus integrated into contemporary humanity. Two of the names, which are of Spanish origin, refer to the way the Chipayas were captured, by lasso—Lázaro, and by enclosing the person within walls—Paredes; two other names, however, are of Aymara origin and refer directly to Christianization: one person was “sprinkled,” that is, baptized, and is therefore called Huarachi; the other one was “saved” (using in Aymara the Spanish word *salvar*, but in Chipaya the Aymara word *qispi-*) and therefore becomes Quispe. However, by assuring that the names are typically Chipaya, in mythistory the boundaries between Spanish, Aymara, and probably also Quechua origins become blurred. Anything “really” (in our terms) identified as Aymara or European becomes Chipaya; the other is integrated into one's own naming system, and non-Chipaya names are given a Chipaya etymology (which linguistically is not Chipaya), thus creating a unique identity, different from everyone else and yet closely related to the neighbors. Of course, such cognomens also occur in

Aymara families, but in contrast to those they are *the only* Chipaya surnames: community members with other Aymara names, such as *Mamani*, are declared not authentic Chipaya.³⁸

In this way the Chipayas' uncivilized status and identity is transformed and literally translated into a civilized, Christian status and identity. Plate (1999:7) captures this appropriation of the other as follows: "The other, by definition, cannot be defined. If the other can be discussed and thereby brought into the symbolic order, it ceases being other." Applying this idea to the cultural sphere of the Chipayas and their neighbors, we can say that they bring the other into their own symbolic order and thereby blur or even dissolve clear boundaries of identification—the Aymaras cease to be other because the Chipayas use Aymara names (at least names explained through Aymara words). In a way, the Chipayas incorporate the others into their own cultural identity while at the same time maintaining them as others by laying claim to the names as specifically Chipayas'. Clear identifying boundaries fade and modern Andean society with its fusions and tensions is thus explained and justified.

Variants in the overall discourse of Chipaya mythistory show the complexity of shifting meaningfulness. The versions we recorded clearly depict the Chipayas as uncivilized and the Aymaras as their enemies, whereas the 1955 narrative shows a more peaceful image: the Aymaras were appreciative of the secret help with the construction of their bell tower and wanted to get to know the helpers; the Chipayas wanted to belong to the Aymaras and become Christians, and they therefore helped build the tower (F. Quispe 1955:136; also E. Quispe 1985:4). Eduardo Quispe (*idem*) also makes it explicit that the priest ordered the Aymaras to capture the *chullpa*-Chipayas. The explanations found in the older stories are missing from the modern stories probably because they have been lost, but it is possible that for the Chipayas there is hope now that the situation can be changed through political action, and therefore an explanatory framework that is more conciliatory has been replaced by a more confrontational one.

Five hundred years later, the Chipayas, or at least some of them, are now empowered, by the descendants of the colonial powers, with the classical Western capacity to read and write. However, they maintain their oral tradition, and they adapt it—as they did before, and as the Spaniards did for their purpose—to their immediate concerns. An example of this adaptation is our consultant's opening of his narrative where he relates Chipaya mythistory geographically and thereby culturally to Lake Titicaca, several hundred kilometers further north, and to Lake Poopó, a considerable distance to the east (Text 3, <C2:1>):

I will tell of the life of our forefathers, narrated by the grandfather, narrated by our forefathers. We always lived on this big lake, on the Titicaca, also on the Poopó, also on the Coipasa, we always lived on the lake, it is said. We came from the North, from the big Lake Titicaca, the Desaguadero, along that river we arrived at Oruro, at the lake of Oruro. And we, one group, came from the West, from the Lauca, as we now call the river. . . .

³⁸ This practice, however, depends on the context. When there is resentment against a certain person by others (as was the case with an important functionary in 2005), some community members will claim that, as his surname shows, he is not really Chipaya, but they may have the name in their own family without seeing any contradiction in their statement. Cf. Barrientos Ignacio 1990:50.

From the introductory information disclosing that the forefathers had told this story, the listener (or reader) receives the impression that this is ancient memory. While that may be so, there is some indication that it was only in the twentieth century that the Chipayas integrated this knowledge into their own version on the basis of what anthropologists told them. Alfred Métraux (1931:100) and Nathan Wachtel (1990:226-32, 280)³⁹ state that the Bolivian Titicaca Urus, the Chipayas, and the Muratos did not have any knowledge of each other. But by the beginning of the twenty-first century, the consciousness of sharing the same culture has become part of the political discourse of the Uru-Chipaya groups (as demonstrated in a meeting in Oruro witnessed by the author in July 2005). It strengthens their new or re-found identity as an “Uru nation.” Looking at present-day life in these villages, the Chipayas have little in common with the Urus and Muratos: in terms of subsistence they no longer depend on water-based fishing and hunting (and have not for many years), but rather on herding and agriculture; with respect to their own language, only the Chipayas speak it at present. However, historical documentation, and also photographs from the first decades of the twentieth century, show similarities in architecture and clothing, and the strong relationship with water that the Chipayas still feel is a further indicator that they once formed part of the Uru “aquatic axis” (Wachtel 1990:350-57). Rather than an invention of a joint tradition, this seems to be an externally stimulated memory of a shared past, re-incorporated into contemporary mythistory by our narrator.

One of the issues that many indigenous groups have to deal with is title deeds for their land. In the case of the Chipayas, this is above all their need to gain or at least not to lose more fertile land to the neighboring Aymaras. This is a matter where the antiquity of their origin plays an important justificatory role. Based upon being the sole descendants of the primeval era, they automatically have land rights that go back much further than those of any other Altiplano group. Thus the *chullpa* story serves a timely purpose, namely to make and justify territorial claims.

The narratives show that the Chipayas construct their mythistory in order to portray themselves as the most ancient people of the region. Their area is practically defined through their mythistory: the lake to the south (Coipasa, which was larger than it is now), the barren plain where Chipaya lies, and hills in the north (Maps 3). This construction implies their ancient rights to live there. In spatial terms this can be seen as an indigenous method of mapping the territory; in terms of chronology the most ancient memory is designated, an era that we would call “prehistoric times.” The fact that there are still burial buildings called *chullpas* conserved in the Altiplano, some close to Chipaya, connects the present to the past and at the same time creates a physically existent territory that is justified by oral, mythistorical tradition and visual, archaeological evidence.

Conclusions

The Chipaya mythistory as a whole fulfills a number of functions: it explains the delimitation of the territory (which is still in dispute, more land recently having been formally

³⁹ Wachtel traveled in 1974 and 1976 with some Chipayas to the Muratos, and in 1978 with some Chipayas and Muratos to Irohito (Urus on Lake Titicaca).

claimed by the Chipayas); it also explains both the tensions with the neighboring Aymaras over territory as well as the continuing relationships with them, as they intermarry and Chipayas live in Aymara villages. The mythistorical narrative also establishes permanent relationships with the Aymaras and mainstream Bolivia (formerly Christian-Spanish society) through the Spanish and Aymara surnames, which at the same time are distinctly Chipaya because of the etymologies provided. What may at first look like a curious and arbitrarily blended composition turns out to be a meaningful and therefore community-strengthening explanation for who the Chipayas are, why they are *who* they are, and why they are *where* they are—in other words, a coherent mythistoriography.

Their origin is conceived of as special and different from the other surviving Andean peoples, and yet their more recent identity—through their names—is closely related to their Aymara neighbors and the dominant Spanish-language-based national culture. This close relationship with, and in part direct interpretation of, mythistory as relevant for present-day life explains why it is common knowledge today. Chipaya mythistory is used to explain a complex identity that involves Andean as well as European roots and that relates the people to their neighbors by interlacing important events and concepts. Thus a mythistorical narrative ties together what is vital to Chipaya self-comprehension and definition: an origin rooted in their present territory, the explanation of their close relation to the aquatic world, and the reasons for their being hunters and fishers as well as peasants and herders. At the same time, all these achievements and self-defining elements root them in Andean prehistoric and colonial society, relating and attaching them to their neighbors and providing explanations for their ambiguous relationships.

While Chipaya architecture, clothing, and even language are losing importance as vital means of self-identification, the mythistorical narrative is ever-present, and the memory of the *chullpa* ancestors and what followed after their disappearance still has a palpable effect on people's lives, in their names as well as in their relationship with the neighboring Aymaras. Chipaya mythistory reinforces the feeling of commonality, of belonging to a community. It separates the group from others and at the same time ties it to them.

As for the narrators of Chipaya mythistory, the basic content is known by every member of the group. For some it is simply a story one knows (like the language one speaks), without necessarily applying it consciously to any practical purpose. Others use the mythistory to propound their particular point of view, like Wachtel's consultant who gives a pentecostal version that integrates elements of Chipaya mythistory into his scenario of the end of the world, when, as in the ancient times, only some people will survive: after the disappearance of the sun and the moon, a fire-rain will come and the survivors will be like the *chullpas* (Wachtel 1990:636-37).⁴⁰ For yet others, the narrative becomes an overt historico-political instrument in their interaction

⁴⁰ Christian elements are also found in the mention of the Great Flood by our consultant (Text 3, <C2:3>) and in the story "Las chullpas de Coipasa" collected by Porterie (M. Quispe 1984). F. Quispe (1955:134), for example, writes that the destructive sun came out at Easter. José Condori (1982) and Eduardo Quispe (1985) relate the sun disaster to the final judgment.

with the Bolivian authorities⁴¹ in order to achieve concrete goals, in this case certified land rights. Those who are community-elected or self-named representatives, especially the members of CILNUCH (the Council for the Implementation of the Native Uru-Chipaya Language), are the ones who interact most with supposedly influential outsiders. Similarly to historians in our society, these representatives work to create an authoritative narrative to explain the past, to help understand the present, and to shape the future.

Thus the Chipayas' mythistorical narrative fulfills multiple purposes, all of which reflect the concept of mythistory as presented above. Past events are brought together in a narrative that aims at reinforcing and maintaining the group's cohesion and identity. The narrators and the context of the narration play an important role, especially when, in public discourse, they legitimize the Chipaya point of view and are used for concrete political objectives. This manifold function makes mythistory a highly creative, flexible, and practical narrative.

University of Stirling

⁴¹ When telling us outsiders his story, our consultant (Text 3, <C2:4>) mentions explicitly the supposedly long-standing consciousness of the Uru-Chipaya groups as being related; he also emphasizes that the Aymaras are newcomers. This emphasis shows that he tries to influence and even mold our image of his people, much like a historian with a certain agenda.

Appendix⁴²

Text 1 <M>

Chipaya mythistory narrated by a consultant to Alfred Métraux (1935b:396-97) in Chipaya.⁴³

<M:1>

In the old times, they say, the sun rose from the west.	Toki tiempo taxata tuñi š-tekuškiskija.
Thus [they said]: "Let's build our doors towards the east."	Nekstan: "Tuanču sančis čum k ^x oila."
Then the sun rose from the eastern parts.	Nekstanaki tuanta-naka tuñi tekskuči.
Then the people died at the entrance of their houses.	Nekstanaki k ^x oil-kama-lus šoñi-ki tiks.
Then they all died in their houses.	Nekstanaki k ^x oi-l pača tiks.
Thus the sun killed the <i>chullpas</i> .	Tuñi š-tikskalja (tiskškaja) čul'paki.
Then [some] got into the water, they escaped.	K ^x askis luškalja, tisk ^x apkalja,
Then these people (this couple) lived in this Chipaya village.	nekstan šetkalja ⁴⁴ ni šoñiki (luk ^x utuñi).
This Chipaya village is in a bare place.	Ti Čipaya watkis k ^x ar watkis šelja.
In the bare place they built their houses.	K ^x ar watkis k ^x oya-tkalja.
From two persons the Chipayas multiplied.	Pukultanšoñikistan mirk ^x aljā Čipayaki.
When the sun rose, they would go into the water.	Tuñi teuktan (teukštan), k ^x as-kis lušnitakalja.

⁴² Rather than applying strictly syntactical criteria for marking units in the texts, I have opted for a mixture of phrases/clauses and rhythmic units that emphasize stylistic features. One of the most important issues in some circles of the Chipaya community is the alphabet. Toward the outside it is used as a symbol of identity, uniqueness, and unity. At the request of the community, the Bolivian government through a ministerial resolution declared the alphabet the Chipaya linguistic committee had elaborated as official (Anonymous 2005a, cf. Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 2007b). Despite this token of unity, different alphabets are being used. Deeper tensions within the village surface when some community members boycott each other's alphabets in order to highlight their disagreement. The texts in this Appendix follow their authors'/creators' orthographical conventions.

⁴³ The text was first published in Spanish by the Swiss anthropologist Alfred Métraux in 1931 (112-13), dictated to him in Chipaya by the "oldest man of the tribe" ("el hombre más viejo de la tribu"); he then had it translated into Aymara (112). The Chipaya text appeared in a French (Métraux 1935b) and in a Spanish version (Métraux 1935c). I made the English translation from the Chipaya text (published in Métraux 1935b), and it was then verified by our consultant (C2). I have kept Métraux's original transcription. He explains the Chipaya sound system and his orthography (1936:340-42) and mentions it also in 1935a (89-90): "č correspond au «ch» espagnol, š au «ch» français; ĵ est une affriquée qui en français serait transcrite par «dj»; x est le «j» espagnol et l' le «l» ou l mouillé de la même langue. Le signe combiné k^x est une mi-occlusive dont la détente produit un son voisin du «j» espagnol" Although Métraux (1935b:398) considered the text to be a disfigured and altered fragment of an older myth, the present setting of the text shows a certain stylistic pattern.

⁴⁴ Métraux (1935b:396) has *renacirent* in his French translation; in his Spanish version the verb is written "šatkalja" and translated as *renacieron* (1935c:65). Our consultant translated as follows from the Chipaya in the Spanish edition: *había corrido*, "had run," from the verb *šat-š*, "to run." Since the French version has *šetkalja*, this would be "they/he lived," derived from *želh-š*, "to be, exist," also *žeti*, "life, health" (for the vocabulary, see DOBES Project 2007).

The two escaped.

When the sun sank at night, coming out of the water,
they would walk around.

<M:2>

A man saw the *chullpas*, and he went to tell the
authorities.

The priest came, then he blessed them.⁴⁵

<M:3>

In the old times they pastured sheep in Huachacalla.

Every year the Huachacalla people gave them a sheep.

From one sheep they multiplied,
then there were many sheep.

In the old times, the *chullpas* had not had sheep;
they cultivated *cañahui* and *quinoa*.

They started living [appeared] in this village of
Santa Ana, in a bare place.

In the old time they lived over there in Sabaya,
the Chipaya people.

Pukultan tisk^xapkalja.

Tuñi k^xatanaki wen, k^xaskistan ulšku ok^xlañitakalja
(ulšnok^xlañitakalja).

Šinta šoñiki čertaĵa čulpaki iliriškis mastakalja (parto
taak^xalja).

Ni kura štonk^xalja, al'anekstan windiskataĵa.

Toki tiempo uši isñitak^xalja Wačakal'akis.

Sapa wata tsi usi laknitak^xalje Wačakal'ia-šoñi.

Tsi usakistan mirinitakalja,
al'anekstan tamakisija usa.

Tuki tiempo anatakalja oiwičis čulpaki;
kañavi, k^xula čaknitakalja niki.

Ti Santana wakis k^xar wakis paresitkalje.

Toki tiempo Sabayakis tēkis šelxni Čipaya.

Text 2 <C1>

Chipaya mythistory narrated to Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz by a consultant in 2002.⁴⁶

<C1:1>

Well, I will tell a story of the lives of the ancestors.

In very ancient times this village of Chipaya
did not exist, they say.

The village was in the north, where Capilla
Perdida [Lost Chapel] is, it is said;

so there was the village.

bueno werh tshi k'int'asača tukita timpu mathñillaž
qamta

tukit tuki timpuki ti chipay wathak tiw ana želatča
khiča

wathaki nawkh uža kapilla perdida khita

xalla niwkhutakiž wathaki

⁴⁵ Métraux comments that he was told that the blessing was to make them abandon their nocturnal life (1935b:397).

⁴⁶ One evening the then seventy-two-year-old man came to see us to tell us about his life. He insisted on being audio-recorded, and when he had finished his well-prepared life story, I asked him spontaneously about the origin of the Chipayas. He then told us—a collaborator and myself—the following story, first in Chipaya, then in Spanish. This is my translation of the Chipaya narrative (after having had it transcribed and provided with a draft translation by a Chipaya consultant, I verified and reworked the transcription phrase by phrase with another consultant). The alphabet used is very close to the official one and has been developed among project members and consultants. eCompanion: [http://journal.oraltradition.org/issues/27i/dedenbach-salazar_saenz#myGallery-picture\(11\)](http://journal.oraltradition.org/issues/27i/dedenbach-salazar_saenz#myGallery-picture(11))

And there was a lake here.

Here, by the shore was a lake, a big lake.

There were fish, birds, eggs.

So those Chipaya people used to come here,
it is said, to fish and to kill birds.

They also went back north to Capilla Perdida,
it is said.

That was very far away—they got tired;

so they, the people, built a house over here,
a small house.

That little house must have been called *ch'ipha*.

Then, they also made a boat of rush, so they
could enter the lake.

So over here in the little house they used to
leave the boat.

Thus then they walked and walked more,
until from Capilla Perdida they came exactly
to this village, to this *ch'ipha* village.

Over here they built many houses until they did
not go back there, not to Capilla Perdida;
they left it.

So then gradually, until now, the people
probably multiplied.

So, that what was called *ch'ipha* was a little house;
then it must have become a whole village.

Afterwards, in the end, it must have become
Chipaya;

so then, now this village is Chipaya.

Then this village was called Chipaya;

first, it is said, it had been called *ch'ipha*.

Thus is the tale of the old times.

<C1:2>

Now even Capilla Perdida has definitely been lost;
now the Aymaras have taken it away.

These ancestors never thought of it [that they
should have also stayed in Capilla Perdida so as
not to lose it to the Aymaras].

They certainly should have gone towards the
mountain there.

This is how it is now: one cannot go
towards the mountain;

neqhstan teqhs tshi qota zelatkiž

teqhsi ti ti thikiš qota paqh qota

neqhš ch'isnaka wešlanaka šinina zelatž

xalla nikhtan niwkh chipay žonakak thonchikiž tiwk
ch'istani wežla koni

neqhstan užasaq qaqhchan kapilla perdida khita xalla
niwkhu

neqhstan ažkinpacha xayrašiki

ninaka ni žonaka neqhš tshi qhuya qhuychikiž teqhs tshi
qhuyalla

ni qhuyallak ch'ipha khitatakižni

neqhstan tshi warkusaq phitkišan pächitakiž xalla ni
qota luššapa

xalla neqhš ni qhuyallkiš ekñitakiž ni warku

xalla neqhstan iya nižta oqhlaychi oqhlaychi hasta ni
kapilla peridkišan q'ala tiwk thoñchikiž ti wathkiš
ti ch'ipha wathkiš

neqhš wakchi qhuyanaka qhuychikiž hasta ana ni kapilla
perdida ana niwk oqhchikiž ekchikiž

xalla neqhš ni wiri wiriñ hasta teqhs mirchan žonakaki

xalla neqhstan ni ch'ipha khita qhuyallak

hasta wathapachallažlan

neqhstanak oltimkiš chipaya

xalla nuž thuthžtažni xalla neqhstan anš chipaya ti
wathak anš

nužkhita thüchiš ti wathak chipaya

piramira ch'iphataž khiž tik ch'ipha

nužuz ni tukita kintuki

xašik hasta kapilla peridam pertitaž

xašik tožagaš hasta qhañchi

ti mathñillanakak ana wira pinsichiž

nuk'an nawk kurquñi oqhchukataqalž

nik xašik yasta anaž kurquñi oqh

everything there has an owner;	tuñuchhkamaž
the Aymaras took it away [from us].	tožak hasta qhañchiča
So now this [village of] Chipaya is what is left of the <i>chullpas</i> ;	nužuz añs ti chipayak chullpa puchuča
it has remained from the <i>chullpas</i> .	chullpikštan žetchiča
<C1:3>	
And there is also another story.	nižaša tshi kintušaqa želhča
In the old time only the moon existed, the moon, they say.	tuki timpu hasta jışqa želhñitakiž jış
These <i>chullpas</i> used to work in the moonlight only.	jışkišqa trawajñitakiž ti chullpanakaki
So they herded the <i>vicuñas</i> only at night.	neqhštanak ap apchikiča hasta oka wen
Ah, in Sabaya [its people] worked at the bell-tower—the Aymaras in Sabaya. (Illustration 7.)	wa šawakiš kampanturi lanqžnatkiž ni šawa tožanakak
It seems that the village of Sabaya has always existed;	ni šawa ni watha pantažkhił
there was definitely always a priest over there.	kurami želatžkhił neqhši
Then they arrived at the bell-tower over there— thus our ancestors suddenly arrived there.	xalla ni kampanturi neqhš neqhš makhatchikiž neqhš thamxatchikiž ni awilunakaki
Well now, they moved the stones; they wanted to build a wall. ⁴⁷	yaw ni thisinchikiž ni mašnaka pirqiš pekchikiča
They must also have come at night.	wen šaqa thončan
On the following day the Aymaras followed the footmarks;	xaqatažuk hasta ni tožanakak qhxocha thoqčan
oh—the stones had been moved—	wa thisinta ni mašnaka
“What persons have moved them?”	čhhul žoñit thisin nik
“So we have to watch out, to catch them,”	hasta žwila žtanla
thus agreed the Aymaras from Sabaya.	xalla nuž qaššikiž ni šawa tožanakaki

⁴⁷ Wachtel (1990:222) shows that the bell-towers are *mallku*, powerful beings, following in power and importance the highest mountain peaks (cf. 57-58). From the perspective of the Sabayans themselves the bells were particularly important because they sounded three times in order to mark the arrival at mass of Tata Sabaya, the patron spirit of the Sabayans, who resided in the mountain of the same name. Once, when Tata Sabaya arrived late and the priest had started mass without him, Tata Sabaya locked the priest up. When he was freed, he excommunicated Tata Sabaya and the whole village. The village fell into decay and was repopulated later (Rivière 2008:98-99). Maybe both stories contain the same element—the necessity to rebuild the bell-tower—but contextualize it in different ways that are meaningful to each group.

An interesting parallel with Chipaya mythistory is Lorenzo Inda C.'s narrative on Uru mythistory, which tells how the church of Jesús de Machaca kept falling apart while it was being built. Therefore, sacrifices (animal and human) had to be made, and Urus were abducted and sacrificed there, so that the church—according to Inda C. (1988:29)—was built with the blood of the Urus (cf. Astvaldsson 2000:253). While this story seems to differ substantially from the Chipayas' relation with the church in Sabaya that they wanted to help to build, the unstated outcome is similar: a difficult relationship with the neighbors and yet a certain affiliation with them through being part of the process of building the churches in the neighboring Aymara villages.

Then at night they must have come then.
 As a matter of fact people came, very large
 people [the Chipaya people] came, immediately.
 Soon they [the Aymaras] captured them,
 some six persons,
 that's how many they captured;
 some persons escaped.
 After having caught them, they bound them;
 then they walled them up in a house.
 Afterwards they took them to the priest;
 nothing did they understand, neither
 Aymara nor Spanish,
 they must have spoken [only] the Chipaya
 language, the Puquina language.⁴⁸
 Then for some time they must have been like this;
 then afterwards they must have learned Aymara,
 those people, those uncivilized people.
 Then afterwards the priest asked them,
 "How did they catch you?"
 "I was caught with a lasso," he [one of them] said,
 "I was caught with a lasso."
 Saying "Lázaro," he [the priest] gave him
 that name then, Lázaro.

Then,
 "After they captured you, what did they do to you?"
 They bound him;
 then he must have said, "I was caught with a rope."
 "Ah, so [it is] Chino [The One Tied With A Rope],"
 thus saying, the man [the priest] named him so.
 "After they captured you, what did they do to you?"
 "I was closed into a house, I was walled in," he said.
 "Ah, then you would be *Pirqa* [Wall], now you
 will be *Pirqa* [Wall]."

hasta hasta wen hasta thonaćhan hasta hasta
 cheqapan thonchikiź žonaka nuspa lachhś žonaka
 thonchikiź ni tirikchukpacha
 wax tantakiź
 hasta ni žonaka tshi soxta
 hasta niźta tantakiź
 parti atipchikiź žonaka
 tanź hasta ćhelhtakiź
 hasta qhuykiś pirqantitakiź hasta
 neqhśtan kurźkin chhichhtakź
 ana wira intintikiź ninaka aymara anaśa kastillanu
 hasta chipay taqut ćhićhan pukin taqu
 xalla niźtikiśtan aźqa nik źelhćhan
 xalla neqhśtanak aymara niki yateqchiźlani
 ni ni žonakak ni k'it žonakaki
 xalla neqhśtan kuraki pekunchikićha
 qhaź tantat am khikan
 werhk lasuntitu xalla nuź khichikiź
 lasuntitu
 lasaru khikan nik hasta thū qhaychikiź lasaru

neqhśtanak
 tanźku qhaź khitat am
 ćhelhćhićha
 hasta chinuntitu khićhan
 a entonces chino xalla nuź khikan tshi žoñik qhaychikiź
 tanźku xaśi am qhaź khitat
 werhk qhuykiś chawkźtaź pirqantitaź khiź
 a entonces pirqa am khell xaśi khekź pirqa

⁴⁸ Up to the present, the Chipayas call their native language Puquina. Since this is also the name of a language unrelated to Chipaya, which became extinct in the seventeenth century, some Chipayas call their language Chipaya.

Afterwards they must also have asked another person:	neqh́stan tshi zoñisaq́s pewḱzan
“How do you live in your house?”	qhaž qamñamt am qhuykin
“I live in the rays of the sun.”	werhk sillikiš lupillar qamaritnāx ⁴⁹
“Well, you will be called <i>Lupi</i> now, <i>Lupi</i> [Sun Ray].”	a lupi am khekž xašik lupi
Afterwards they must have sprinkled one with water.	neqh́stan ni qhaštan wa thawq́chan
“So now what?” he says.	neqh́stan xašik qhažt
“You have sprinkled me with water,” he must have said.	khīw warxatistaw khičhan
“Ah, now you are Warachi, now [you are] Warachi [The Sprinkled One].”	a xašik warachiž am xašik warachi
Then another one, he must have been saved,	tshik hasta xašik ni salwaýchan
he must have been rescued,	nik hasta qhxispíchan ⁵⁰
thus [they called him] Quispe [The Saved One].	entonces qhxispi
Thus in the old times the ancestors received the names.	xalla nuž tuki timpu hasta ni awilunakak hasta nuž thū qhaychikičha
Therefore, the surnames exist.	neqh́stanž ni apilliduk želh́cha
Now [there are]: Lázaro, Pirqa, Chinu, Lupi, Warachi.	xašik lasaru pirqa chinu lupi warachi
Then they became Christians, the people.	neqh́stan jekhchu cristianu khissiz̄ zonakaki
So this is the story of Chipaya.	nižtaqaš ni chipay kintuki

Text 3 <C2>

Chipaya mythistory narrated by a consultant (C2) to DOBES Chipaya team members in 2005.⁵¹

<C2:1>

I will tell of the life of our forefathers,	ti werh kint'ača ti učunakaž achchinakaž qamta
narrated by the grandfather,	maqñhillaž kint'ita
narrated by our forefathers.	učunaka achchiš kint'ita

⁴⁹ Said first in Chipaya: “werhki *sillakiš*” (*silla*, “sun” in Chipaya); then partly in Aymara (underlined): “lupillar qamirita nayaxa” (*lupi*, “sun” in Aymara). Because the priest did not understand Chipaya, the Chipayas had to use the Aymara word for sun.

⁵⁰ The first time the Spanish loanword *salvar* is used, then the Aymara word *qispi*–: “tshik hasta xašik ni *salwaýchan* nik hasta *qhxispíchan* entonces qhxispi.”

⁵¹ One of our main project consultants told us this version of the Chipaya origins and past. He is a Chipaya native speaker, lives mostly in the village, and is in his forties, married, with children; he is literate in Spanish and Chipaya. The story was told by him to our team for audio-recording (not spontaneously, but prepared overnight). It was then transcribed by another speaker. Later the narrator himself provided it with a literal translation into Spanish and “corrected” the Chipaya orthography; the present transcription follows the official alphabet (but with some corrections). Finally, I translated it into English, taking the narrator’s own Spanish translation into account as well.

We always lived on this big lake,	u'chunakki ti lagu ti chawkh qota
on the Titicaca, also on the Poopó, also on the Coipasa,	titicaca nizaša ti popo nizaša ti qhuypaš qota
we always lived on the lake, it is said.	qotkišpan u'chun qamin'chu qamin'chumtaž khila
Thus they said:	xalla nuž khiñita'cha
We came from the North, it is said	u'chunki użatan thontaž khila
from the big Lake Titicaca,	ni titicaca chawkh qotkištan
the Desaguadero, along that river we arrived at Oruro, at the lake of Oruro.	ni desaguadero xalla ni pujuranpacha nizaša ururkiš ni urur qotkiš irantižkitaki'cha
And we, one group, came from the West,	u'chunštë tshi t'aqa taxatin thoñchiki'cha
from the Lauca, as we now call the river, from along that river.	ni lauka añš khiž u'chun pujun xalla ni pujuranpacha
Therefore, we are on the shores of lake Coipasa,	nužkiš qhuypaš qotkiš
that big lake, on that shore are we. (Map 3)	ni paqh qota ni atkiš u'chun

<C2:2>

Summary of following sections (very similar to the version narrated by our other consultant [Text 2]): Having come from the North and lived along the rivers and lakes, the Chipayas came to stay by the river Lauca, at a place called Capilla Perdida. Then, during the nights, they went to help build the Sabaya bell-tower (Illustration 7). They were caught by the Sabayan Aymaras. There they received Christian surnames from a priest and were baptized. Then they went away to live in different places—among them Descanso de Dios and Jilapata—until they founded Chipaya. Now they live in a very limited territory, confined by their Aymara neighbors who take away their territory:

We live in a small territory;	u'chun qamécha qolta yoqallchiš
around us are our neighbors who have stolen our land, they have taken it from us.	u'chunakä muytata khiñi u'chunaka wisinunakaž žothžta yoqa qhañta
That is how we live.	xalla nižtaž u'chun qamécha

<C2:3>

The grandparents also used to say:	nizaša mathñillaki khiñita'cha
We are certainly ancient people;	u'chunki tukita žon'chumpan'cha
remains of the <i>chullpas</i> , say the Aymaras.	chullpa puchu khiñiž aymaranakaki
We come from the <i>chullpas</i> ,	u'chunakki chullpikištan oqin'chumécha
they [our grandparents] used to say,	khiñita'cha
having always lived before the sun, in the light of the moon. ⁵²	ni thuñž tukitampan jiškiš qamta

⁵² Here the narrator goes back to the time of the *chullpas*, which, according to his own confirmation in a conversation, was before the episode of the Sabayan bell-tower and the surnames.

They must also have gone through the
Great Flood because they lived before it.

That's what they told us.

We, [that is] our forefathers, the *chullpas*,
lived only by the light of the moon.

There was no sun, it is said.

In that time they used to weave by the light
of the moon,

by the light of the moon they used to walk around.

Now we live with the sun.

But they lived like this,

not with the sun,

only in the moonlight.

When they were living in this way, a story
went round.

The sun will come out, it said,

from the West, from the South, from the East,
from the North,

that's how the story went.

Then:

it will come out from the West,

this was indeed confirmed.

So they built the houses all oriented towards
the East,

towards the East all the doors.

They had built them like this,

but the sun never rose from the West.

From the East rose the sun!

The sun-rays entered through the door.

Then those who were on the hill burned.

For the sun had risen with heat.

Everything must have gotten burned.

There wouldn't have been any harvest or any life.

Afterwards some of them died from hunger,

having eaten wild straw,

having eaten soft straw,

being sad.

Of those who were close to the lake,

nizaśa ni chijñi mach'a watchizłani xalla nız tukita
qamta.

xalla nuż kint'iñitača

učunki učun achchinaka chullpanakaki jışkiśqaś
qamñitakiča

ana thuñi želhñitakiča

ni ora jışkiś watsñi

jışkiś oqlayñi

xalla añś učunakk ti thuñtanż qamča

xalla niżta śaqhś ninaka qamñitakiča

ana thuñkiś

jıştanqaś

xalla niżtikiś qaman kintu oqhchikiča.

thuñiz thewkhżkakiča khikan

täxatan wärutan tüwantan użätan

xalla niżta kintu oqhñitakiča

nużkiś

täxatanż thewkhż kakiż

khissikiż oltimkiś

nużkiś ninaka tuwañchu qhutchikama

tuwañchu śanchiškama ninakhż qhuya qhuychikiča

ninakaż nuż qhuytan

ana śinta thuñixay taxatan thewkhżkichikiča

tuwantan thewkhżkiči

qhuyśankiś sī luški

nużkiś ni kurkin khiñinakaste üjsikiča

nizaśa thuñi qhaqi thewkhżkičan

q'ala čhultaqinaka üjsiżlan

ana śqalami želhchiślan

nużkiś čherqhara mayja tikhśiż ninakaki

phith lulhchi

k'isi lulhchi

t'aqhiri

nizaśa qhaskin qotkežu khiñinakastë

some of them, very few,	nilla tshi qhažulla
they would have saved themselves.	ninakak salwitchan.
Then afterwards we came [descendants of the survivors].	xalla neqhstan oqhñiz učunakki
There are also our forefathers, grandparents [left]:	nizaša učunaka achchi ephnaka želhcha
nowadays the houses of the <i>chullpas</i> are [still] on the hills in this area.	añs chullpi qhuyanaka kurh qhuñitqi ti yoqhkiś želhcha
Those forefathers, our grandparents, they died because, living higher up, they could not get to the water.	nik učunaka achchi ephnakača ninakak tsewkhxapa qamku nužpiś, ana qhaś iranti atchižlan, nužkiś tikhši ninakak

<C2:4>

After concluding this episode of the past, the narrator returns to the different places where his ancestors who had survived the arrival of the sun may have gone to live; some of these places have *chullpa* graves (Illustrations 5 and 6). The end emphasizes the Chipayas' right to live where they do, delimiting themselves from the surrounding "newcomers." The legitimation comes as much from the narrator's story itself as from his sources, the grandparents, and ancestors:

This is why we come from the <i>chullpas</i> .	nižtikištan učunakki chullpikištan oqinčumpača
The majority are Aymaras who have a different language . . .	jila manq'až ti yaqha tawqchiś tožanakam aymaranakak . . .
We are the real established ones here, from before.	učunčha cheqan teqhś tuki julžtaki
They are people who came. [Added by the narrator in Spanish: colonos, "colonists, settlers."]	tinakaki thoñchi žoñinakaž
That's what grandfather said.	xalla nuž khiñitaž mathñillaki
This is the story then, thank you.	tikamaqašti kintuki sparakiča

References

- Acosta 1954 [1590] José de Acosta. "Historia natural y moral de las Indias." In *Obras del P. José de Acosta*. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 73. Estudio preliminar y edición de Francisco Mateos. Madrid: Atlas, 1954. pp. 2-247. Edición digital: Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 1999. <http://bib.cervantesvirtual.com/servlet/SirveObras/12471630833470495210657/index.htm>
- Albó 1999 Xavier Albó. "Entrecruzamientos lingüísticos en los rituales qullas." In *La lengua de la cristianización: catequización e instrucción en lenguas amerindias de Latinoamérica / The Language of Christianisation in Latin America: Catechisation and Instruction in Amerindian Languages*. Ed. by Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz and Lindsey Crickmay. Bonner Amerikanistische Studien, 32. Centre for Indigenous American Studies and Exchange, St. Andrews, Occasional Papers, 29. Markt Schwaben: Saurwein. pp. 249-76.
- Albó and Layme 1992 Xavier Albó and Félix Layme. *Literatura aymara. Antología*. I. Prosa. Literaturas Amerindias, 1. La Paz: CIPCA, Hisbol, JAYMA.
- Allen 1988 Catherine J. Allen. *The Hold Life Has: Coca and Cultural Identity in an Andean Community*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Amodio 1993 Emanuele Amodio. *Formas de la alteridad: Construcción y difusión de la imagen del indio americano en Europa durante el primer siglo de la conquista de América*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Anonymous 2005a Anonymous. "El alfabeto chipaya ya es oficial y entra a la escuela." *La Razón*, Edición Digital, 13 de octubre de 2005. <http://www.bolivia.com/noticias/autonoticias/DetalleNoticia29294.asp>
- Anonymous 2005b Anonymous. "Joya de los Andes." *Los Tiempos* (Cochabamba, Bolivia). 9 de diciembre de 2005.
- Ariel de Vidas 2008 Anath Ariel de Vidas. "Mémoire historico-mythique et construction identitaire chez les Teenek (Huastèques) veracruzains, Mexique." In *Pour une histoire souterraine des Amériques: Jeux de mémoires—Enjeux d'identités: Mélanges offerts à Nathan Wachtel*. Ed. by Anath Ariel de Vidas. Paris: L'Harmattan. pp. 45-69.
- Arnold 1993 Denise Y. Arnold. "Adam and Eve and the Red-Trousered Ant: History in the Southern Andes." *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies: Travesia*, 2:49-83.

- Astvaldsson 2000 Astvaldur Astvaldsson, in collaboration with Félix Layme Parumani. *Las voces de los wak'a. Fuentes principales del poder político aymara*. CIPCA Cuadernos de Investigación, 54; Serie Jesús de Machaca: La marka rebelde, 4. La Paz: Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado (CIPCA).
- Barrientos Ignacio 1990 Félix Barrientos Ignacio. *Chipaya: Reliquia viviente: Estudio monográfico*. Chipaya and Oruro: Ed. Quelco.
- Barth 1969 Fredrik Barth. "Introduction." In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Ed. by Fredrik Barth. Bergen and Oslo: Universitets Forlaget; London: George Allen and Unwin. pp. 9-38.
- Bascom 1984 [1965] William Bascom. "The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives." In *Sacred Narrative: Readings in the Theory of Myth*. Ed. by Alan Dundes. Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 5-29.
- Bertonio 1984 [1612] Ludovico Bertonio. *Vocabulario de la lengua aymara*. [Facsimile, based on the 1956 La Paz facsimile edition.] Cochabamba: Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Económica y Social.
- Betanzos 1987 [c. 1551] Juan de Betanzos. *Suma y narración de los incas*. Transcripción, notas, y prólogo por María del Carmen Martín Rubio. Madrid: Atlas.
- Bouysse-Cassagne and Harris 1987 Thérèse Bouysse-Cassagne and Olivia Harris. "Pacha: En torno al pensamiento aymara." In *Tres reflexiones sobre el pensamiento andino*. Ed. by Thérèse Bouysse-Cassagne, Olivia Harris, Tristan Platt, and Verónica Cereceda. Biblioteca Andina. La Paz: Hisbol. pp. 11-59.
- Burke 1991 Peter Burke, ed. *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Büttner and Condori Cruz 1984 Thomas Büttner and Dionisio Condori Cruz. *Diccionario aymara-castellano—Arunakan liwru: aymara-kastillanu*. Puno and Lima: Proyecto Experimental de Educación Bilingüe.
- Cieza de León 1985 [1550s] Pedro de Cieza de León. *Crónica del Perú: Segunda Parte [= Señorío]*. Edición, prólogo y notas de Francesca Cantù. Colección Clásicos Peruanos. Lima: Academia Nacional de la Historia and Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- B. Condori and Gow 1976 Bernabé Condori and Rosalind Gow. *Kay Pacha: Tradición oral andina*. Biblioteca de la Tradición Oral Andina, 1. Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Rurales Andinos "Bartolomé de Las Casas."

- J. Condori 1982 José Condori. "Los chullpas." In Porterie Collection 1982-85: Cond-1.
- Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 1994 Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz. "Texto y contexto: Releyendo las fuentes andinas a la luz de la pragmática y del discurso." *América Indígena*, 54, iv [Etnohistoria latinoamericana: Aportes metodológicos. Ed. by Sabine Dedenbach-Salazar and Iris Gareis], pp. 157-88.
- Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 2007a _____. "The Andean Uru-Chipaya Language (State of Research and Bibliography 2007)." <http://www.mpi.nl/DOBES/projects/chipaya/Chipaya%20state%20of%20research%20and%20bibliography%20%28Dedenbach%2C%2019-05-07%29.pdf>
- Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 2007b _____. "Chipaya official alphabet 2005 (revised)." <http://www.mpi.nl/DOBES/projects/chipaya/Chipaya%20alphabet%20and%20notes%20%28Dedenbach%2C%2010-05-07%29.pdf>
- Dillon and Abercrombie 1988 Mary Dillon and Thomas Abercrombie. "The Destroying Christ: An Aymara Myth of Conquest." In *Rethinking History and Myth: Indigenous South American Perspectives on the Past*. Ed. by Jonathan D. Hill. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. pp. 50-77.
- DOBES Project 2007 DOBES Project. "Vocabulario chipaya: Lista de palabras chipaya-castellano." DoBeS archive > Chipaya project > Linguistic data > Lexicon > vocabulario_chipaya_20-11-2007.pdf. http://corpus1.mpi.nl/ds/imdi_browser/?openpath=MPI77915%23
- Foley 2002 John Miles Foley. *How to Read an Oral Poem*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Finnegan 1992 Ruth Finnegan. *Oral Traditions and the Verbal Arts: A Guide to Research Practices*. London: Routledge.
- Hudson 1966 Charles Hudson. "Folk History and Ethnohistory." *Ethnohistory*, 13:52-70. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/480778>
- Inda C. 1988 Lorenzo Inda C. *Historia de los urus: Comunidad Irohito Yanapata*. Biblioteca de Autores Étnicos. La Paz: Radio San Gabriel and Hisbol.
- Iriarte 2009 Gregorio Iriarte. "Bolivia: ¿Un estado multinacional . . . ?" *Bolpress*, martes, 16 de junio de 2009. <http://www.bolpress.com/art.php?Cod=2007080810>

- Isbell 1997 William H. Isbell. *Mummies and Mortuary Monuments: A Postprocessual Prehistory of Central Andean Social Organization*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Jemio Gonzales 1993 Lucy Jemio Gonzales. *Literatura oral aymara*. (Archivo Oral de la Carrera de Literatura [Universidad Mayor de San Andrés]). Primer informe elaborado del proyecto "Caracterización de la literatura oral boliviana." La Paz: Universidad Mayor de San Andrés.
- Keefe 1992 Susan Emley Keefe. "Ethnic Identity: The Domain of Perceptions of and Attachment to Ethnic Groups and Cultures." *Human Organization*, 51:35-43.
- Libro de tasas* 1575-91 *Libro de tasas. Libro donde está la cuenta y razón de las nuevas tasas que dió el excelentísimo señor don Francisco de Toledo visorrey de estos reinos a los indios de este pueblo de la ciudad de Cacaes de Chuquicota y sus anexos que son San Salvador de Sacari y de Badajoz de Curaguara así a los de la corona real como doña Mayor Verdugo—aymaraes y uros—Empieza desde principio del año de mil y quinientos y setenta y cinco*. Manuscript in Archivo Histórico de la Casa Moneda de Potosí (ACM), Caja Real, leg. 444. 147 folios.
- López Rivas 2004 Guisela López Rivas. "Etnias en extinción." *Periódico El Deber* (Santa Cruz) agosto 2004. <http://www.amazonia.bo/bibli/etnias-extin.pdf>
- Mali 2003 Joseph Mali. *Mythistory: The Making of a Modern Historiography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marzal 1971 Manuel M. Marzal. *El mundo religioso de Urcos: Un estudio de antropología religiosa y de pastoral campesina de los Andes*. Cusco: Instituto de Pastoral Andina.
- Marzal 1996 _____. "The Religion of the Andean Quechua in Southern Peru." In *The Indian Face of God in Latin America*. Ed. by Manuel M. Marzal, Eugenio Maurer, Xavier Albó, and Bartolomeu Meliá. Trans. by Penelope R. Hall. Faith and Cultures Series. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books. pp. 67-118. Originally publ. as *El rostro indio de Dios*. Lima: Universidad Iberomericana, 1991.
- McNeill 1986 William H. McNeill. "Mythistory, or Truth, Myth, History, and Historians." In his *Mythistory and Other Essays*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 3-22.
- Medinaceli 2003 Ximena Medinaceli. *¿Nombres o apellidos? El sistema nominativo aymara, Sacaca, s. XVII*. Lima: Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos; La Paz: Instituto de Estudios Bolivianos.


- Métraux 1931 Alfred Métraux. "Un mundo perdido: La tribu de los chipayas de Carangas." *Sur* (Revista trimestral publicada bajo la Dirección de Victoria Acampo, Buenos Aires) 1, iii:98-131.
- Métraux 1935a _____. "Contribution à l'ethnographie et à la linguistique des indiens uro d'Ancoacqui (Bolivie)." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, 27:75-110.
- Métraux 1935b _____. "Les indiens uro-čipaya de Carangas: La religion." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, 27:325-415 [with illustrations].
- Métraux 1935c _____. "La religión secreta y la mitología de los indios uro-chipaya." *Revista del Instituto de Etnología de la Universidad Nacional de Tucumán*, 3:7-84.
- Métraux 1936 _____. "Les indiens uro-čipaya de Carangas: La langue uru." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, 28:337-94.
- Munslow 1997 Alun Munslow. *Deconstructing History*. London: Routledge.
- National Research Council 1989 National Research Council, ed. *Lost Crops of the Incas: Little-Known Plants of the Andes with Promise for Worldwide Cultivation*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. <http://www.nap.edu/books/030904264X/html/>
- The New Jerusalem Bible* 1985 *The New Jerusalem Bible*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd.
- Núñez del Prado Béjar 1970 Juan V. Núñez del Prado Béjar. "El mundo sobrenatural de los quechuas del sur del Perú a través de la comunidad de Qotobamba." *Allpanchis Phuturinga*, 2:57-123.
- Phuturi Suni 1997 Ciprian Phuturi Suni. *Tanteo puntun chaykuna valen: Las cosas valen cuando están en su punto de equilibrio*. Ed. by Dario Espinoza. Lima: CHIRAPAQ, Centro de Culturas Indias.
- Plate 1999 S. Brent Plate. "Introduction: Images and Imaginings." In *Imag(in)ing Otherness: Filmic Images of Living Together*. Ed. by S. Brent Plate and David Jasper. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 3-13.
- Platt 2002 Tristan Platt. "El feto agresivo: Parto, formación de la persona y mito-historia en los Andes." *Estudios Atacameños* (San Pedro de Atacama), 22:127-55. http://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0718-10432002002200008&lng=es&nrm=iso&tlng=es

- Porterie Collection 1982-85 Fondo Liliane Porterie Gutiérrez: Chipaya Data. Internet edition prepared by Anne Armand and Duna Troiani. Villejuif: CELIA-CNRS. http://celia.cnrs.fr/FichExt/Fonds_Liliane/pres_fonds.htm
- E. Quispe 1985 Eduardo Quispe. "La historia tradicional de los Urus-Chipayas." In Porterie Collection 1982-85: Cahier 5.
- F. Quispe 1955 (Fernando) O. Martín Quispe. "Copia del cuadernillo de historia tradicional de los urus de Chipaya." *Khana* (Revista Municipal de Arte y Letras, La Paz), 3, xi-xii:134-39.
- M. Quispe 1984 Martín Quispe. "Las chullpas de Coipasa." In Porterie Collection 1982-85: VII-7, TE.
- M. Quispe 1985 _____. "Historia de los chipayas." In Porterie Collection 1982-85: VIII-1, TE.
- Rivière 2008 Gilles Rivière. "Amtat jan amtata . . . Caciques et *Mallku* dans les communautés aymaras du Carangas (Bolivie)." In *Pour une histoire souterraine des Amériques: Jeux de mémoires—Enjeux d'identités. Mélanges offerts à Nathan Wachtel*. Ed. by Anath Ariel de Vidas. Paris: L'Harmattan. pp. 71-99.
- Torero 2002 Alfredo Torero. *Idiomas de los Andes: Lingüística e historia*. Travaux de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines, 162. Lima: Institut Français d'Études Andines and Editorial Horizonte.
- Tschopik 1951 Harry Tschopik, Jr. *The Aymara of Chucuito, Peru. I. Magic*. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, 44.2. New York: American Museum of Natural History.
- Urbano 1980 Henrique(-Osvaldo) Urbano. "Dios Yaya, Dios Churi y Dios Espíritu: Modelos trinitarios y arqueología mental en los Andes." *Journal of Latin American Lore*, 6:111-27.
- Urbano 1993 _____. "Las tres edades del mundo: La idea de utopía y de historia en los Andes." In *Mito y simbolismo en los Andes: La figura y la palabra*. Ed. by Henrique Urbano. Estudios y Debates Regionales Andinos, 84. Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de Las Casas." pp. 283-304.
- Valiente 1984 Teresa Valiente. "Universo andino en el siglo XVI: Detrás de los nombres personales quechua." *Indiana*, 9:341-50.

Wachtel 1990

Nathan Wachtel. *Le retour des ancêtres. Les indiens Urus de Bolivie XX^e-XVI^e siècle: Essai d'histoire régressive*. Bibliothèque des Sciences Humaines. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.

Maps



Map 1: Uru-Chipaya language communities (DOBES project, 2002, 2005-07).

Illustrations



Illustration 1: Santa Ana de Chipaya (DOBES project, 2005).



Illustration 2: View from outside the village: river, salty soil, houses in pasture-lands, and mountains (DOBES project, 2005).



Illustration 3: Bird-hunting, drawn by a twelve-year-old boy (DOBES project, 2005).



Illustration 4: Attending the pigs' castration ceremony, in the pasture-lands (DOBES project, 2002).



Illustration 5: Archaeological *Chullpa* remains near Chipaya (DOBES project, 2005).




Illustration 6: *Chullpa* with human bones, near Chipaya (DOBES project, 2005).



Illustration 7: The bell-tower of Sabaya church (© Pascale Soubrane, 2009). http://www.flickr.com/photos/twiga_269/3600778465/

This page is intentionally left blank.