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INTRODUCTION

A fundamental problem of South American ethnology concerns the present-day composition of the Indian populations. How many Indians are there in South America today, what is their geographical distribution, what languages do they speak? There are as yet no reliable answers to these relatively simple questions. Adequate population statistics for the different countries are not available and competent studies of contemporary indigenous cultures, which might be expected to close some of the gaps in our knowledge, are still very few in number.

Valuable demographic information for part of the Andean area is available in two published articles. In 1947, John H. Rowe published an analysis of the 1940 Census of Peru which has helped to make clear the broad outlines of Indian distribution in that country. A much less specific but still useful description of the Indian populations of Chile was made by Donald Brand in 1941.

For Bolivia, no such studies have been made, and the deficiency of precise data on the distribution of highland Indians and Indian languages is especially marked. Published information on the number and distribution of Inca and Aymaré, for example, is general and superficial, although these two native groups are numerically the most important component of the highland Bolivian population and are of great historical and cultural interest to ethnologists.

The statement that people who speak Aymaré predominate in the Department of La Paz and that people speaking the Inca language (usually called "Quechua") are found mainly to the south in the Departments of Cochabamba, Potosí, and Chuquisaca has commonly sufficed in scientific as well as in general descriptive literature. Except for the accurate delineation of the northern limits of Aymaré (in Peru), made by Harry Tschopik, Jr. in 1941 and shown by Rowe in the article mentioned above (1947, fig. 1, p. 205), nothing of a precise nature has been published about the distribution of either of these two important Indian groups. The situation is the same, or worse, for the numerous smaller tribes living in the foothill and lowland regions of Bolivia.

It seemed necessary, as a basis for language studies and for the formulation of future ethnographic projects, to see what more could be learned, through library research alone, about the modern distribution of Indians and Indian languages in highland Bolivia.
PROCEDURE

The core of the problem is to trace the limits of the Inca-speaking and Aymará-speaking populations in Bolivia by bringing together all of the pertinent but scattered data that could be found in available publications. In doing so, it was necessary also to determine the limits of Chiriguáná and Yuracaré territory, since these two groups define parts of the eastern boundary of Inca. To complete the highland picture, the location of the surviving remnants of Uru speech has also been traced. The mapping was done by collecting all the specific references to villages and settlements where one of these five Indian languages is spoken, plotting the points referred to on a map, and drawing boundaries between the points determined.

Several criteria governed the choice and use of references. The primary criterion, that the information used should be the result of an author's own first-hand observation, at once restricted research to the writings of individuals who had travelled or lived in Bolivia. Another requirement was that the author's statement should be specific in locating a place -- a valley, a point on a river, a village, for example -- and in stating the language spoken by the inhabitants. A wholly arbitrary criterion, which further narrowed the field of research, was that only works published since 1900 were to be used as sources.

It was impossible of course to adhere rigidly to these requirements. However, only the most obvious inferences have been drawn from the material. If a traveler's muleteer, for example, was said to speak only Quechua and served as interpreter in particular villages, it could reasonably be assumed that inhabitants of those villages were also Quechua-speakers. Localities not named specifically could sometimes be identified by tracing the author's itinerary on a large-scale map. Occasionally, references from works published before 1900 have been used, particularly when the identified village extended the limits of one of the four groups; omission of these references would give a knowingly distorted picture of the language distributions. Finally, it was necessary to approach even specific statements with considerable caution because an author's ability to distinguish Aymará from Inca was sometimes questionable. Wherever possible the accuracy of such references has been checked by comparison with the statements of authors whose reliability is above suspicion.

The information compiled according to these criteria has been used to construct a map which shows the present-day distribution of Inca and Aymará speakers, and of Chiriguáná and Yuracaré.

DISTRIBUTION MAP

The map is on a base drawn from the American Geographical Society 1:5,000,000 Map of the Americas. Points on the map are plotted according to the Society's 1:1,000,000 Map of Hispanic America. The map index identifies villages by name, cites the references used, and gives direct quotations or comment from a work when the information is especially significant or unusual.
In assessing the accuracy of the boundaries drawn on this map, the reader should keep at least two important factors in mind. It is quite evident that the difficulties of travel in Bolivia, at least for the foreigner, somewhat distort the apparent distributions of the different Indian groups. Writers from whom information has been drawn have all been restricted to the easiest (even though often very difficult) and most-travelled routes -- whether by road, by trail, or by railroad. Consequently, nothing specific can be learned from them about the inhabitants of hundreds of settlements which happen to lie off the beaten track. Another possible source of distortion is the movement of population that takes place in some parts of the country with the shifting of mine or farm laborers and tradesmen from one locality to another. Sometimes whole communities may move several hundred miles in order to take work in mines, and they may not return to the home village for several years.

It should also be observed that the presence of Inca-speakers in dominantly Aymaré cities -- La Paz and Oruro, for example -- is by no means unusual, although it is impossible to judge in every instance whether or not this represents an actual extension of Inca at the expense of Aymaré. My general impression is that such an extension is probably taking place in the region between Cochabamba, Sicasica, Pari, and Oruro (0.10, 1.3-0.31, 1.4-0.17, and 1.12, respectively, on the map) inasmuch as this area marks a path of trade and new Inca-speaking settlements -- small clusters of dwellings and shops -- have evidently grown up recently along the railroad.

Boundary lines have been drawn simply to enclose the extreme limits of particular language distributions and, as with all distribution maps of this sort, the boundaries are in some respects generalized. Dashed lines indicate sectors where the boundary is not at all certain, in my opinion. Certain places -- notably Pari and Uyuni for Aymaré-Inca distributions, Abapo for Chiriguaná, and Saimapata for Inca (the eastern limit) -- are definitely stated to be dividing points between languages. A number of references of a general character, on which it has been impossible to check, suggest the extension of boundaries beyond the plotted points. This is particularly the case in respect to the gap intervening between Inca and Chiriguaná. The empty area on the map is obviously not unpopulated country, although large portions of it are evidently only sparsely populated, and it is probable that settlements of Inca-speakers may be found in some sectors east of the broken line shown on the map. The western boundary of Chiriguaná appears to be fairly accurate as shown.

No attempt has been made in this study to delineate extensions of the Inca language in areas lying outside of Bolivia, but certain points have been plotted on the map to indicate that Inca reaches into Northwest Argentina and Chile. The former Territory of Los Andes in Argentina is said to have a small population "composed almost exclusively of Quechua Indians" (Ricossa, 1943, p. 252). The extension of Inca across the southwestern Bolivian border into the Río Los region of Chile is extremely interesting, especially in view of the presence of Aymaré-speakers in the neighboring village of Toconce (1.46 on the map).
The Aymará boundary south of Lake Titicaca at the Peru-Chile-Bolivia border has been purposely left open. General statements by Brand (1941) indicate an Aymará segment in northeastern Chile. The northern limit of the Aymará in Peru, as already mentioned above, is drawn in generalized fashion according to the line shown in Rowe (1947, fig. 1, p. 205).

General remarks in the literature about the location of Yuracaré bands justify drawing in the boundary for this group as it is shown on the map. Yuracaré settlements along the river banks or in small clearings are not permanent and little would be gained by trying to plot every temporary site. The places specifically indicated, however, provide a check on the general distribution.

NUMBERS OF INCA AND AYMÁRA SPEAKERS

Bolivian governments have taken altogether six censuses since the first one in 1851. The most recent count, taken in 1900, was the only one to be published in full and, in this, a total counted population of 1,555,000 was reported (all totals are given in round numbers). With allowance made for errors and omissions and with the addition of a highly uncertain estimate of 91,000 for the tribes of the eastern lowlands, the total census population was calculated to be 1,766,000. This is a significant figure because all subsequent official estimates as well as all other serious scientific estimates have been directly or indirectly based upon it.

The latest available official estimate of total population, made by the Director General of Statistics for Bolivia, is 3,785,000 for the year 1946 (Gutiérrez, 1947, pp. 41-42). Fifty-three percent of this total is vaguely classified as Indian. On the other hand, Gutiérrez estimates that over 60% or 2,271,000 speak Inca and Aymará. My analysis of certain other percentages and estimates by departments suggests that nearly all of these Inca and Aymará speakers live in the six highland departments where they form at least 65% of a total highland population estimated at 3,025,000.

The Inca-speakers are estimated to comprise 35% of the total population of Bolivia or 1,324,000, while the Aymará-speakers comprise 25% or 946,000. If these figures are accepted, as I believe they can be, on the basis of other demographic data and the distributions worked out in this study, the Inca-speaking population is nearly double Rowe's low estimate of 752,000 (Rowe, 1947, p. 211). The figures indicate also that Inca, not Aymará, is the chief Indian language of Bolivia.

The total numbers of speakers of Inca and Aymará in the whole continent are impressive and serve to emphasize the importance of these two South American languages. Adding to the number of Aymará-speakers in Bolivia (946,000), the 265,000 in Peru who according to Rowe's analysis are native speakers of the language, and Brand's estimate of 40,000 in Chile, gives a total of 1,251,000 Aymará-speakers. Rowe estimates 1,250,000 Inca-speakers in Ecuador and calculates 2,589,000 in Peru;
there are 1,324,000 speakers of the language in Bolivia and about 50,000 in Northwest Argentina and Chile: a total of 5,213,000 Inca-speakers.

Uru, a third native language of highland Bolivia, is spoken by two small, geographically separated groups, the Uru and the Chipaya. They are of considerable scientific interest, although numerically unimportant. Métraux (1935) believed there were not more than 320 Indians remaining in the village of Chipaya in 1931 (see 4.2 on the map, north of Lake Coipasa). Less than 100 Uru remained in the Desaguadero River region, near Lake Titicaca, in 1931 according to Métraux (1936). Enrique Palavecino, who had earlier visited the Uru in their one-time permanent village of Iruito (4.1 on the map), states that severe droughts in 1939 and the following years caused the group to disperse, so that by 1942 only six Uru men and a few women and children remained. The survivors of both the Uru and Chipaya groups live within the Aymara area and speak Aymara in addition to Uru.

No recent estimates are available for either Yuracaré or Chiriguaná. It would be safe to say, however, that there are less than 1,000 Yuracaré and probably not more than 20,000 Chiriguaná in Bolivia today.

CONCLUSION

The distribution map permits certain very general conclusions about Inca and Aymará, and at the same time it serves to focus attention on some problems for study.

The highland area of Bolivia has been historically the most densely populated part of the country and it remains so today. Within it, the native population appears at present to be relatively stable, without any major changes resulting from improved communications and movement of labor. There are some minor changes evident from the literature reviewed in this paper, however; Inca speakers are apparently moving into the area between Cochabamba, Sicasica, Pari and Oruro, as noted above, and there is some Inca colonization eastward into the lowland country. A few Inca families have taken up agriculture within the Yuracaré area, in a movement paralleling the Inca colonization of the Peruvian montaña noted by Mishkin in 1942. More significant, perhaps, is the movement of Inca labor southward to the agricultural localities of Northwest Argentina.

In broader historical perspective, the Inca-speaking area has shown a very remarkable expansion since the end of the fifteenth century when the Inca government first introduced the language into what is now Bolivia. The spread of Inca went on in the colonial period at the expense of a large number of local languages, most of them now forgotten, and to some extent at the expense of Aymará. Aymará, while losing some territory to Inca, has gained also at the expense of Uru and other local languages since lost, like Puquina; its persistence in the face of Inca and Spanish encroachments is as remarkable as the Inca expansion and well deserves further study.
Attention is drawn to the numerous opportunities that exist for specific studies of acculturation and of culture contact in communities along the boundaries of Aymará and Inca. The basic culture of Inca-speaking (Quechua) Indians in Bolivia has not been adequately studied; it should be, and its relationship with the Aymará, in localities where the two adjoin, should be defined.

* I am grateful to Dr. John H. Rowe for his encouragement of this research and for his many helpful suggestions.
MAP INDEX

Data for each reference point on the map are arranged in the following order: number (key to location on map; asterisk, if present, indicates place not shown on map); name of place; source of information; quotation or remarks.

Inca

0.1; Sansana, Argentina; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118.
0.2; Escaysache, Argentina; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118.
0.3; Mojo; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118.
0.4; Tarabuco; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118 / Rouma, 1933, p. 43; "On the road between Padilla and Sucre one finds about every 40 kilometers a place of two thousand or more inhabitants. In plan these large towns, mostly consisting of full-blooded Indians, indicate their pre-Spanish origins." (Schmieder)
0.5; Yamparaez; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118.
0.6; Puna; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118.
0.7; Otuyo; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118.
0.8; Vitiche; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118.
0.9; Sucre; Schmieder, 1926, p. 118.
0.10; Cochabamba; Schmieder, 1926, passim.
0.11; Sacaba; Miller, 1917b, p. 267; "...nearly all the inhabitants are Quechua Indians..."
0.12; Cuchicancha; Miller, 1917b, p. 267; "The Indians speak practically no Spanish..."
0.13; Incachaca; Miller, 1917b, pp. 268, 271.
0.14; Locotál; Miller, 1917b, pp. 268, 271.
0.15; Miguelito; Miller, 1917b, pp. 268, 271.
0.16; San Pedro; Nino, 1913, p. 46; "Nada de particular se puede admirar en este lugar, sus habitantes son en mayoría indios quichuas..."
Le village de Paría se trouve exactement sur la limite qui sépare les Quichuas des Aymaras; sa population est composée d'un mélange des deux races. Les deux langues sont parlées par les divers sujets, toutefois le Quichua domine."

"The mountain range breaks down rapidly east of Samaipata, but the road to Santa Cruz is, nevertheless, neither an easy nor a level one...There are no more Quechus, nor is their language spoken; after many months we were once again in a Spanish-speaking world."

"Los indios de Cavari y Mohozo que comprenden y hablan el dialecto de estos últimos Quichua lo aprendieron con el continuo roce q'tienen con los pobladores Cochabamba."

"Sicasica is notable in another way. It is the meeting-place, as it were, where the two distinct Indian races, the Aymaras and the Quichuas, come front to front. Heretofore in southern Bolivia it was the Quichua race I had met and their language I had heard, but from Sicasica on the Aymaras were my study...Aymara was predominant, and its barking sounds were heard in sharp contrast to the sharper accents of the Quichua. I wandered into a girls' school...The primer was in Aymara."

village between Tupiza and Totora at about 10,000 ft. altitude; Bingham, 1911, p. 98; located approximately by checking against map of Bingham's itinerary.
0.33; Escara; Bingham, 1911, p. 105.
0.34; Quirve; Bingham, 1911, p. 105.
0.35; Laja Tambo; Bingham, 1911, p. 113.
0.36; Potosi; Bingham, 1911, p. 126.
0.37; Tupiza; Pinochet, 1909, p. 175.
0.38; Cotagaita; Pinochet, 1909, p. 175.
0.39*; Arce; Miller, 1919, p. 277.
0.40*; Cghilka; Miller, 1917c, p. 409; illustration of a "Quichua blanket" from Cghilka, which is said to be about eighteen miles from Sucre.
0.41*; Sacamolla; Miller, 1919, pp. 277 f.
0.43*; Parotoni; Miller, 1919, pp. 277 f.
0.44; Vinto; Miller, 1919, pp. 277 f.
0.45; Potolo; Rouma, 1913, p. 12.
0.46; Challa; Herndon and Gibbon, 1854, pp. 128 ff.
0.47; Chaqui; Rouma, 1933, p. 57.
0.48; Novillero (Navillero); Rouma, 1933, p. 77.
0.49; Punata; Rouma, 1933, p. 91.
0.50; Cliza; Rouma, 1933, p. 91.
0.51; Arani; Rouma, 1933, p. 91.
0.52; San Benito; Rouma, 1933, p. 91.
0.53; Vacas; Rouma, 1933, p. 102.
0.54; Colomi; Rouma, 1933, p. 109.
0.55; Cororo; Rouma, 1933, p. 43.
0.56; Quechisla; Overbeck, 1935, p. 300.
0.57; Aiquina, Chile; Hanson, 1926, p. 372; "On the other side of the border are settlements exactly like their own...speaking their languages, Quechua and Aymara. The former is spoken in Aiquina and Caspana..."
0.58; Caspana; Hanson, 1926, p. 372.
0.60; Colcha; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.61; Rio Blanco; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.62; Chati; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.63; Toropalca; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.64; Culta; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.65; Tolapampa; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.66; Olco; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.67; Allito; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.68; Tocla; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
0.69; Pulacayo; Woods, 1935, p. 38.
0.70; Lasana, Chile; Nichols, 1929, p. 133; "To the rear and above and below Lasana are Quichua farms and irrigated fields."
0.71; Pucara, Chile; Nichols, 1929, p. 133; "Some of the better buildings have been re-roofed and are now inhabited by Quichua farmers."

**Aymara**

1.1; Ocuri; Bingham, 1911, p. 153; "At Ocuri, we entered the country of the Aymaras—for whom this is a kind of outpost town."
1.2; Challapata; Bingham, 1911, p. 163.
1.3; Sicasica; Pepper, 1906, pp. 304 f.; see Inca, 0.31.
1.4; Paria; Rouma, 1913, p. 12; see Inca, 0.17.
1.5; Calamarca; Herndon and Gibbon, 1854, pp. 117 f.
1.6; Ayoayo; Herndon and Gibbon, 1854, p. 121.
1.7; Eucalyptus; Overbeck, 1935, p. 235.
1.8; Rivera; Overbeck, 1935, pp. 241, 247.
1.9*; Cañaviri; Rouma, 1933, p. 138 / La Barre, 1948, p. 94.
1.10; Pillapi; Rouma, 1933, p. 138.
1.11; Umala; Rouma, 1933, p. 117.
1.12; Oruro; Middendorf, 1910, p. 518.
1.13; Chayanta; Middendorf, 1910, p. 524.
1.14; Aullagas; Middendorf, 1910, p. 524.
1.15; Sorata; Forbes, 1870, p. 90./ Peck, 1912, p. 43.
1.16; Timusa (Timus); Forbes, 1870, p. 90.
1.17; Coroica; Forbes, 1870, p. 90.
1.18; Quiabaya (Quibaya); Forbes, 1870, p. 32.
1.19; Santiago de Machaca; Forbes, 1870, p. 62./ LaBarre, 1948, p. 145.
1.20; Machacamarca; Peck, 1912, p. 40.
1.21; Guarina (Huarina); Peck, 1912, p. 42 / LaBarre, 1948, p. 7.
1.22; Achacachi, Peck, 1912, p. 42 / LaBarre, 1948, p. 7.
1.23; Umapusa; Peck, 1912, p. 45.
1.24; Sabaya; Métraux, 1935, p. 114.
1.25; Tiahuanaco; LaBarre, 1948, p. 7.
1.26; Guaqui; LaBarre, 1948, p. 7.
1.27; Pucarina; LaBarre, 1948, p. 7.
1.28*; Lucurmate; LaBarre, 1948, p. 7.
1.29; Camata; LaBarre, 1948, p. 129.
1.30; Jesus de Machaca; LaBarre, 1948, p. 129.
1.31; San Andres; LaBarre, 1948, p. 129.
1.32; Carabuco; LaBarre, 1948, p. 137.
1.33; Callapa; LaBarre, 1948, p. 137.
1.34; Ulloma; LaBarre, 1948, p. 138.
1.35; Corocoro; LaBarre, 1948, p. 142.
1.36; Corque; LaBarre, 1948, p. 142.
1.37; Achiri; LaBarre, 1948, p. 145.
1.38; Calacota; LaBarre, 1948, p. 145.
1139; Berenguela; LaBarre, 1948, p. 145.
1.40; Arqa; LaBarre, 1948, p. 152.
1.41; Collana; LaBarre, 1948, p. 156.
1.42; Inquisivi; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
1.43; Mocomoco; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
1.44; Salinas de Garci Mendoza; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
1.45; Luribay; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
1.46; Toconce, Chile; Hanson, 1926, p. 372; "...some Aymara is spoken in Toconce."
1.47; Escara; Matraux, 1936, Plate II (B).
1.48; Andamarca; Matraux, 1935a, p. 115.
1.49; San Pedro; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
1.50; Cohoni; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
1.51; Achocalla; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.
1.52; Lajo; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 336.

Chiriguana

2.1; Abapo; Nino, 1913, p. 151; "some families."
2.2*; Aguai; Schmieder, 1926, p. 153; a settlement.
2.3; Aguairenda; Schmieder, 1927, p. 153 / Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82 / Rosen, 1924, p. 214.
2.4; Bellavista; Nino, 1913, p. 129.
2.5; Mission San Pascual de Boicovo; Schmieder, 1926, p. 149 / Nino, 1913, p. 63 / Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82; Nino estimated 370 Chiriguana.
2.6; Cabayu Iguia; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 98, fig. 64; photograph of women identified as Chiriguana.

2.7; Caipipendi; Métraux, 1930, p. 454.

2.8; Caiza; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, pp. 86, 88-89; photographs of Chiriguana women from Caiza.

2.9; Campero; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, pp. 94-95, figs. 61-62.

2.10; Carandaiti; Schmieder, 1926, p. 153.

2.11; Caruruti; Métraux, 1930, p. 341 et passim.

2.12*; Catamindi; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 101, fig. 65.

2.13; Charagua; Nino, 1913, p. 144.

2.14; Chimeo; Schmieder, 1926, p. 148; only one family.

2.15; Cuevo; Métraux, 1930, p. 465.

2.16*; Ibitibi; Rosen, 1924, p. 191; a village of about 300 people.

2.17; Ibo (Ivo); Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82.

2.18; Ibopeyti; Métraux, 1930, p. 296.

2.19; Iguembe; Schmieder, 1926, p. 153 / Métraux, 1930, passim.

2.20*; Ibirapucuti; Nino, 1913, p. 146.

2.21*; Imi (Mission); Nino, 1913, p. 149; all Chiriguana.

2.22*; Isirie; Métraux, 1930, p. 469, Plate 87.

2.23; Itatiqui; Schmieder, 1926, p. 152.

2.24; Itatki; Nino, 1913, p. 15 / Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82; Nino saw not more than twenty or twenty five Chiriguana.

2.25; Ivu (Ivo), see 2.17 above; Métraux, 1930, p. 296; "...sans doute, celle ou les anciennes coutumes chiriguano ont subi le moins de modifications."

2.26; Lagunillos; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82.

2.27; Machareti; Schmieder, 1926, p. 148 / Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82 / Métraux, 1930, passim.

2.28*; Masavi (Mission); Nino, 1913, p. 149.
2.29*; Murucuyali; Schmieder, 1926, p. 153.
2.30; Nancarainza; Nino, 1913, p. 129.
2.31*; Ovai; Nino, 1913, p. 146.
2.32; Mission de San Francisco del Parapiti Grande; Nino, 1913, p. 136. / Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82.
2.33*; Nawirenda; Mètraux, 1930, p. 296.
2.34; Piriti; Nino, 1913, p. 146.
2.35; Saipuru; Nino, 1913, p. 148.
2.36; San Antonio; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82.
2.37; San Francisco, se 2.32 above.
2.38; San Luis /Schmieder, 1926, p. 150 / Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82.
2.39; Santa Rosa de Cuevo; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82.
2.40; Sipotindique; Nino, 1913, p. 129.
2.41*; Tabacal; Mètraux, 1930, p. 466.
2.42*; Tacuaremboti; Nino, 1913, p. 146.
2.43*; Tapuita; Nino, 1913, p. 146.
2.44; Tareiri; Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82.
2.45*; Tasiti; Mètraux, 1930, p. 434.
2.46; Tigruipe; Schmieder, 1926, p. 150 / Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 82.
2.47; Timboy (Saladito); Mètraux, 1930, p. 295.
2.48*; Tintapaw; Mètraux, 1930, p. 434.
2.49*; Tiwiraiti; Mètraux, 1930, p. 469, Plate 87.
2.50*; Tuyunti; Mètraux, 1930, p. 431.
2.51; Yacuiva (Yacuiba); Chervin, 1908, vol. 1, p. 86.
2.52; Yumbia; Mètraux, 1948, p. 468.
2.53; Animbo; Sociedad Geográfica Sucre, 1903, p. 20.
2.54; Arcos; Sociedad Geográfica Sucre, 1903, p. 22.
2.55; Atirimbia; Sociedad Geográfica Sucre, 1903, p. 24.
2.56; Bañado; Sociedad Geográfica Sucre, 1903, p. 27.
2.57; Pipi (Bipi); Sociedad Geográfica Sucre, 1903, p. 31.
2.58; Boyuibi; Sociedad Geográfica Sucre, 1903, p. 32.
2.59; Coripoti; Sociedad Geográfica Sucre, 1903, p. 80.

Yuracare

3.1; Puerto Marquez; Mather, 1920, p. 53.
3.2; Río Ichoa (along either bank); Mather, 1920, p. 53.
3.3; Puerto Patino (on the Río Eteramasama); Mather, 1920, p. 52.
3.4; Mission de San Antonio (twelve miles downstream from Todos Santos on the Chaparé River); Mather, 1920, p. 45. / Miller, 1917, p. 450; Mather notes about fifty families -- Miller notes about 400 Indians.
3.5; Todos Santos; Miller, 1917b, p. 280.

Uru

4.1; Iruito; Palavecino, 1949, footnote p. 59; "En 1939 y en los siguientes años una persistente sequía destruyó los totarales y obligó a los Uru a dispersarse, a tal punto que en 1942 solamente quedaban seis hombres uru y algunas mujeres, viejos todos, y alguno niños mestizos aimara. "Los otros, los que había conocido en 1938, dice Vellard, murieron o se han dispersado. El grupo está prácticamente destruido."
4.2; Chipaya; Métraux, 1935, p. 114.
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