

La Lengua Pescadora:

The Lost Dialect of Chimu Fishermen

Joel Rabinowitz
Johnson Museum
Cornell University

Sometime between the years 1555 and 1560, a young Spaniard in his late teens made a journey with his parents from Quito to Lima. This young man was later to become famous as Fray Reginaldo de Lizárraga, Dominican friar and author of an important geographical description of Spain's South American empire (Lizárraga 1916). For most of their journey, Lizárraga and his parents traveled by the road which ran along the coast itself. The family must have stayed a few days in the Chicama Valley; apparently during this sojourn the youthful Lizárraga met Fray Benito de Jarandilla, a Dominican then actively engaged in preaching the word of God to the Indians of that valley (Lizárraga 1916, I: 66-67; Melendez 1681, I: 558-559). Lizárraga, at any rate, was in the Chicama long enough to have noted the following tidbit of information, which he has passed on to us:

Los indios deste valle tienen dos lenguas, que hablan: los pescadores una, y dificultosísima, y otra no tanto; pocos hablan la general del Inga; este buen religioso [Jarandilla] las sabia ambas, y la más dificultosa, mejor (Lizárraga 1916, I: 67).

The Indians of this valley have two languages which they speak: the fishermen have one, and it is most difficult, and another that is not so difficult; few speak the common tongue of the Incas; this good missionary [Jarandilla] knows both languages, and the more difficult one he knows better. [Author's translation.]

In addition to Lizárraga, three other Spanish colonial sources refer to a special language or dialect spoken by the fishermen of the

north coast of Peru, but Lizárraga's "ear-witness" account happens to be the earliest in terms of the date that the information was obtained. It is important to emphasize that this information comes from the pre-reducción period, that is, prior to the implementation of Viceroy Toledo's policy of "reducing" or concentrating the native populations of the Andes into newly established and more easily administered towns (Malaga Medina 1974). This policy, which was implemented during the 1570s and 80s, had a major impact upon the fishermen and farmers of the north coast, often forcing the abandonment of their former habitations and the consolidation of previously segregated groups. Lizárraga's report of a fishermen's dialect is the most direct testimony we have that such a dialect was prehispanic, rather than the result of social upheaval or changes brought about in the wake of the reducciones.

The three other documentary sources that mention a north coast fishermen's tongue refer to it variously as "la lengua pescadora," "la lengua yunga pescadora," and simply "la pescadora." For want of a better label, I have given the name "Pescadora" to this dialect.

Since Pescadora is the subject of this paper, it is appropriate at this point to address a fundamental question: What is so significant about an obscure and evidently extinct fishermen's dialect from the north coast of Peru? While I would certainly not wish to claim that this subject is earth-shaking, it does have at least three important scholarly contexts.

The first context that should be mentioned is the ongoing investigation of the indigenous forms of socio-economic and political organization that had developed on the Peruvian coast during the late prehispanic periods. Both archaeologists and ethnohistorians have contri-

buted much to our present understanding of this broad subject. The Peruvian scholar María Rostworowski has been in the forefront of the ethnohistorical efforts. In publication after publication, Rostworowski (1970, 1975, 1976, 1981) has presented evidence that both north and central coast societies were organized according to a principle of strict occupational specialization. Indigenous political structure was based on clearly segregated groups of farmers, fishermen, merchants, potters, and so on, each having its own local lord.

With regard to the native Andean fishermen specifically, the documentary information pulled together by Rostworowski (1973, 1975, 1981) and others (Netherly 1977; Ramirez-Horton 1978, 1981) indicates an almost caste-like role for these maritime specialists. Until the reducción policy was imposed--some forty years after the Spanish conquest--the fishermen lived in their own villages along the seacoast, strictly separated from the farmers and others. They did not engage in agriculture. They worshipped their own gods. They maintained their own roads and may have functioned as coastal relay messengers along them (Hoces 1978: 120; Rostworowski 1975: 315-316; Rabinowitz 1980: 96-99). There is even evidence to suggest that endogamous marriages were the rule within the fishermen's subculture (Rostworowski 1975: 315; Rabinowitz 1980: 5, 95-96).

Clearly, the evidence that north coast fishermen spoke their own distinct dialect fits well with the overall picture of a segregated but nonetheless important socio-economic class with its own subcultural identity. Further, it is significant that of all the occupational specialist classes of the north coast, only the fishermen are mentioned by the early colonial sources as having their own speech.

A second context for the present study is the historical linguistic research that focuses upon the aboriginal languages of the north coast of Peru, in particular the so-called Yunga language that was once native to the coastal valleys from Lambayeque to Viru. Unfortunately, by comparison with the wealth of data that exists for the various dialects of Quechua, the amount of information available for Yunga and the other coastal languages is scanty indeed. Nevertheless, some contributions have been made to this field, most notably by the Germans Ernst Middendorf (1892) and Enrique Brüning¹ around the turn of the century, and more recently by Paul Rivet (1949), Jorge Zevallos Quiñones (1943, 1946, 1948a, 1948b), and Louisa Stark (1968, 1972b, 1973).

The field of sociolinguistics provides the third context for la lengua pescadora. An examination of the evidence concerning this dialect is relevant to sociolinguistic studies of jargons, special parlances, speech play, and linguistic creativity. The possibility that Pescadora might have been an example of a highly evolved patois or argot is explored toward the end of this paper.

The Languages of Chimor

When the Incas conquered the coastal kingdom of Chimor around the year 1470, they ended the hegemony of a powerful and highly organized state that had managed to gain control of an incredibly long stretch of coast from Tumbes in the north to Paramonga in the south, and perhaps even further south to Carabayllo (Rowe 1948). The Chimu heartland, however, seems always to have been the Moche valley of the north coast (Anonymous Trujillano 1936), where the capital of Chan Chan was located.

As far as we know, a single family of related dialects was spoken

in the kingdom of Chimor's central or core zone, from just south of the Sechura desert in the north to the Viru valley in the south, and most likely further south than that. This language may be called "Yunga," following the usage employed in the 1644 grammar of Fernando de la Carrera (1939), which is still the single most important source for this now-extinct tongue. The term "yunga," of course, is Quechua, and it originally meant "hot land" or "valley" (Garcilaso 1943, I: 154), but the Incas--and later the Spaniards--applied the word specifically to the coast and to its inhabitants (González Holguín 1952: 371), and by extension, to the language they spoke as well.

In the Piura region to the north of the Sechura desert lived a group of peoples called Tallanes (Zárate 1944: 31), who were ethnically different from their coastal neighbors to the south. A unique 18th century document (Martínez de Compañón 1948) provides evidence--in the form of word lists--that the Piura communities of Colán, Catacaos, and Sechura spoke distinct but related languages (Stark 1968: 32-36, 37). Although the surviving word lists from these towns are meager, they are nevertheless sufficient to indicate that these languages were not genetically related to Yunga (Stark 1968: 32-34, 36).

In fact, all the evidence indicates that Yunga is unrelated to any of its nearest neighbors (Stark 1968; Rabinowitz 1980: 35-36). The most interesting examination of Yunga that has been done to date is undoubtedly that of Louisa Stark, whose extensive comparisons indicate that Yunga is not related to Quechua, Aymara, or the southern Chibchan languages (1968: 40-55), but is distantly related to Araucanian, Uru-Chipaya, and--notably--to the Mayan languages (1968, 1972b, 1973).

The evidence that the Yunga language was actually composed of three distinct dialects (Rivet 1949: 9-10) is contained in an important colonial source for the north coast, the Coronica moralizada of Fray Antonio de la Calancha (1638). Calancha was resident in the Augustinian monastery at Guadalupe in the Pacasmayo or Jequetepeque valley during the early decades of the 17th century. According to Calancha, the native language of the Chimu kings was called Quingnam (1638: 550). This dialect was extended by conquest to the Pacasmayo valley to the north, and as far south as Lima. Another dialect, Muchic, was spoken from Pacasmayo north to Motupe. The term "muchic" and its variations "mochic" and "mochica" are used by several 16th and 17th century sources (including three of the four that mention Pescadora), both as a language label and as a term of reference for the coastal ethnic group of the Lambayeque region of the north coast (Rabinowitz 1980; Espinoza Soriano 1975).² Calancha, however, is the only source to mention the name "Quingnam" (or "Quingnan") as the official language of Chimor.³ Nevertheless, my inclination is to accept Calancha's testimony that such a dialect existed (Rabinowitz 1980: 14, 17, 51-52), as do Rivet (1949: 9-11) and Netherly (1977: 88-89). Evidence that Muchic and Quingnam were in fact related comes from a particular passage in Calancha (quoted below) and from the introduction to Carrera's grammar, which indicates that Yunga was spoken in both Calancha's Muchic- and Quingnam-speaking zones (1939: 7-8).

Documentary Sources for--and against--Pescadora

To Muchic and Quingnam we may now add a third Yunga dialect: Pescadora. Calancha mentions Pescadora twice, each reference coming in the

context of a discussion of the various coastal languages. The following passage is excerpted from a description of the initial attempts to convert the Indians of the Jequetepeque valley:

El P. fr. Francisco de Monroy...fue enbiado por la obediencia para la conversion de los pueblos de San Pedro de Yoco, i Xequetepeque, entonces de gran gentio, i en tributarios de numerosa multitud, es la lengua que ablan la Muchic i la Quingnan [sic], escura i de escabrosa pronunciacion. La pescadora es en lo general la misma, pero usa mas de lo gutural; pocos la an sabido con perfeccion, i destos nuestros Religiosos la an comprendido con eminencia (Calancha 1638: 606).

Friar Francisco de Monroy...was sent by mandate of the [Augustinian] Order, to affect the conversion of the communities of San Pedro de Yoco and Xequetepeque, which at that time had large populations, and a great number of tribute-payers; the tongue they speak is the Muchic and the Quingnan [sic], rough-sounding and of harsh pronunciation. The Pescadora [tongue] is in general the same, but it uses more guttural sounds; few have known it fluently, and of these the men of our religious order have learned it outstandingly well. [Author's translation.]

It is on the basis of this important passage that Rivet (1949: 10) and Netherly (1977: 89) both conclude that Quingnam, Muchic, and Pescadora were related dialects. Unlike Netherly, however, Rivet suggests that the fishermen's dialect was substantially different from the other two, and was particularly difficult to pronounce. Calancha's statement that few individuals--that is, Spaniards--were able to learn it perfectly is reminiscent of Lizárraga's remark that the fishermen's speech was "difícultosísima." Nevertheless, the passage quoted above is unmis-takeable in its assertion that Pescadora was related to the other two Yunga dialects, rather than being a totally alien language.

In another passage, Calancha provides an even more graphic (as well as humorous) description of Pescadora. After describing the other lan-

guages of the Chimu kingdom--in particular the extension of Quingnam by conquest--Calancha says:

La que entre ellos se llama la Pescadora, mas parece language para el estomago, que para el entendimiento; es corta, escura, gutural i desabrida; con estas dos lenguas mas comunes se tenía la correspondencia de los valles, i se manejaba mucho el comercio i contrataciones destos territorios (Calancha 1638: 550).

That which among them is called la Pescadora, more resembles a language for the stomach, than for understanding; it is clipped, rough-sounding, guttural, and surly; with these two most common languages the communication of the valleys was held, and the commerce and business dealings of these territories was conducted. [Author's translation.]

My analysis of Calancha's remarks about the "two most common languages" is that he is referring to Quingnam and Pescadora (Rabinowitz 1980: 49). Thus, we may draw a tentative inference from this passage alone that the fishermen's dialect was used in all the Yunga-speaking valleys of the central portion of the Chimu kingdom--from Viru to Lambayeque.

In both of the passages quoted above, Calancha's use of the present tense in describing Pescadora provides evidence that it was still in use at the beginning of the 17th century. In addition, the very power of Calancha's description of Pescadora's less than sonorous qualities suggests that he himself might well have heard the dialect spoken. Although Calancha's own residence in the Jequetepeque valley dates to the early 1600s, and although his chronicle was written between 1631 and 1633 (Rabinowitz 1980: 145), it can be argued that, in a sense, Calancha is also a source of pre-reducción information (though not as direct a source as Lizárraga is). It is clear from the first passage quoted above that Calancha's predecessor, Friar Monroy, was in the Jequetepeque valley toward the beginning of the colonial period, before the initial

conversion of the Indians and before their numbers had been so greatly reduced by European diseases and other impacts of the conquest.

Calancha is, in fact, the most important of the four sources for Pescadora. Not only does he hint at the broader distribution of the dialect beyond the Jequetepeque valley, but, more important, his two references--meager as they are--provide the most descriptive information thus far available for the fishermen's distinctive speech.

The other two sources for Pescadora are both from the post-reducción period. One is the record of the pastoral visita (inspection) made in 1593-94 by the Archbishop of Lima, Don Toribio Alfonso de Mogrovejo (1920a, 1920b). This document makes three geographical references to la lengua pescadora.

The fourth source for Pescadora is a memorandum (Anonymous 1950) that may have originated in the Bishopric of Trujillo (Netherly 1977: 92). I have named this document after its publisher, Josefina Ramos Cabredo (1950). The document is unique among the four sources in that it is concerned solely with the north coast language situation. Based on internal evidence, the Ramos document can be dated to the year 1630 (Rabinowitz 1980: 61-62), thus making it the latest colonial record known for Pescadora, in terms of the date when the information was collected. In this memorandum, la lengua pescadora is listed as being spoken in various towns of the Viru, Moche, and Chicama valleys.

The 1644 grammar of Fernando de la Carrera is the very opposite of a source for Pescadora, in that it denies that major dialectical differences existed in the Yunga language (1939: 7). Not only is Pescadora

not mentioned anywhere in the text, but Carrera's list of Yunga-speaking towns (1939: 7-8) includes several that are mentioned by other sources as having been Pescadora-speaking communities. Did the gruff, guttural Pescadora dialect completely disappear in the short span of years between the writing of the Ramos document and the composition of Carrera's grammar?

My own analysis of Carrera's failure to discuss the specific dialects of Yunga (Rabinowitz 1980: 72-79) may be summarized as follows: Carrera grew up in the town of Lambayeque, where he learned the Muchic dialect of Yunga, and it is this dialect that is presented in his grammar. It remains open to question whether Carrera expected his Muchic-based grammar to be helpful to priests resident in Quingnam-speaking communities. Carrera's name appears in the Ramos document as a rival for the position of curate of Jayanca, a post then occupied by one Julio Pacheco, who, according to the document, was the only priest who knew Pescadora at that time (Anonymous 1950: 54, 55). It is possible that Carrera may have resented--or wished to belittle--his rival's knowledge of Pescadora (Richard Schaedel, personal communication). In Carrera's letter of dedication to his superior, he offers his grammar as that of "the most general and most elegant language of the Indians of the valleys" of the Diocese of Trujillo (1939: 3). This statement may be a veiled reference to Pescadora, which, as we know from Calancha, was evidently less "elegant" than the other Yunga dialects. Finally, significant gaps in Carrera's list of Yunga-speaking towns often correspond to Pescadora-speaking communities listed in the four sources. In short, Carrera's grammar is neither evidence that Pescadora did not exist, nor is it very good evidence that the fishermen's dialect had died out by the early 1640s.

Distribution of Pescadora

All of the available information concerning the early colonial distribution of Pescadora is summarized in Table 1. The four primary sources are compared in terms of the valleys and towns where they each report that the language was spoken. In addition, the other three Yunga language labels (Quingnam, Muchic, and Yunga) are also listed if a particular source reports that a language given one of these names was spoken in any of the towns or valleys where there is evidence for Pescadora. The Carrera column is added for comparative purposes: his list of towns where Yunga was spoken in the early 1640s is important in terms of how it overlaps with the information on Pescadora derived from the other sources. It is important to bear in mind that the term "yunga," as it is used by both Carrera and the Mogrovejo visita, is essentially a cover designation for one or more of the three related dialects. Although in both sources the term seems to designate the Muchic dialect for the most part, the other two dialects may also be subsumed under this label in certain instances.

A cursory examination reveals immediately where there is the strongest evidence for Pescadora: it is the Chicama valley, where three out of four sources provide definite reports that Pescadora was spoken. By contrast, Mogrovejo is the only source to report specifically that Pescadora was spoken as far north as the Lambayeque region (1920b: 238). The distribution shown in Table 1 skips the Zaña valley, for which there is no definite report on Pescadora. However, Calancha's reference to Pescadora as one of the two most common tongues of the Chimu coastal valleys provides inferential evidence that both the Zaña and Lambayeque valleys might have been loci of Pescadora-speakers. Although the village

TABLE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF PESCADORA ACCORDING TO COLONIAL SOURCES

(With comparative information on the other dialects or language labels mentioned for the same areas)

VALLEY PUEBLO	SOURCE:	<u>Calancha</u>	<u>Lizárraga</u>	<u>Mogrovejo</u> <u>visita</u>	<u>Ramos</u> <u>document</u>	<u>Carrera</u>
	WHEN WROTE: DATE FOR INFO.:	1631-33 post-contact to ca. 1625	late 16th c. 1555-60	1593-94 1593-94	1630 1630	1640?-43 1640?-43
Lambayeque		M; P?		Y; M; P	M	Y
Magdalena de Eten				P		Y
Eten				Y		
Jequetepeque		M; Q; P		Y	M	Y
Jequetepeque		M; Q; P?		Y	M	Y
Sanc Pedro de Lloco		M; Q; P?		?	M	Y
Chicama		Q; P?	P; ?	P; ?	P; M	Y
Magdalena de Cao				P	P	Y
Sanctiago (de Cao)				P	P	Y
Moche		Q; P?		?	P	
Guanchaco					P	
Manciche					P	
Sanc Estevan					P	
Guaman					P	
Moche				?	P	
Viru		Q; P?		?	P	
Guañape				?	P	
Viru					P	

P = Pescadora M = Muchic Q = Quingnam Y = Yunga

Notes for Table 1

1. A blank indicates that the pueblo or valley is not mentioned by the source.
2. A single question mark means that a language is referred to by the source, but no name for the language is given.
3. A letter followed by a question mark indicates that an inference can be drawn from the text that this language was spoken in the designated valley or pueblo.
4. Spelling generally follows that of the Ramos document.

of Chérrepe seems to have been both the pre- and post-reducción locus for the fishing community--or "parcialidad"--that supplied the town of Zaña with maritime produce (Hoces 1978; Zevallos Quíñones 1943: 221), Mogrovejo's visita does not name the language spoken in Chérrepe, which leaves open the question of whether or not Pescadora was used there.

There is simply not evidence that Pescadora was spoken in every ethnohistorically known fishing parcialidad of the north coast during the early colonial period. This is clearly demonstrated by Table 2. In this table, a list of pre-reducción north coast fishing parcialidades is presented. This information is reconstructed from various sources, including unpublished documents quoted by modern scholars. Also listed are the post-reducción towns to which the original communities were relocated; in some cases the names are the same, and occasionally the reducción locations are also likely to have been the same, as was definitely the case with Chérrepe (Ramírez-Horton 1978: 92). It should be stressed that the last column--"Evidence that Pescadora was Spoken"--refers to the original fishing hamlets, not to their relocated counterparts. Thus in the case of Chichi, for example, a good inference can be made that Pescadora was spoken there. Since Chichi was the capital of the old polity or señorio of Guaman (Lozano 1976: 124), its population was almost certainly relocated to the post-reducción town of Guaman, which was a locus of Pescadora-speakers, according to the Ramos document (Anonymous 1950: 336-337).

As both Table 1 and Table 2 clearly show, the evidence for Pescadora is heavily weighted toward the Chimu heartland of the Chicama, Moche, and Viru valleys. Yet one may certainly postulate (based on the same evidence) that the actual prehispanic and early colonial distribution of

TABLE 2: A LIST OF PRE-REDUCCION FISHING PARCIALIDADES FROM LAMBAYEQUE TO VIRU

Valley	Fishing Parcialidad	Reducción Town	Colonial Source or Modern Reference	Evidence that Pescadora was Spoken
Lambayeque	[belonged to polity of Jayanca (no name given)]	Jayanca?	Gama 1975 [1540]	
	Cuchimic Currimic Jencoic Manucuyi Pilcoan	(belonged to polity of Túcume)	Mocchumí (Mochumí)	Zevallos Quiñones 1943 Rostworowski 1975 Netherly 1977
	[belonged to polity of Chuspo (Callan- ca) (no name given)]	Monsefú?	Rostworowski 1975 Zevallos Quiñones 1943	
	[belonged to polity of Lambayeque (no name given)]	San José??	Netherly 1977	
	(Magdalena de) Eten	Magdalena de Eten (Puerto de Eten)	Mogrovejo 1920b [1593-94] Rostworowski 1975	in Mogrovejo <u>visita</u>
Zaña (Chaman River)	Chérrepe	Chérrepe (later to Pueblo Nuevo)	Hoces 1978 [1572] Zevallos Quiñones 1943	
Jequetepeque	Puemape	Xequetepeque	Netherly 1977	inference from Calancha
	Lloco	San Pedro de Lloco	Burga 1976	inference from Calancha
Chicama	Cao	Magdalena de Cao	Mogrovejo 1920b [1593-94]	in Mogrovejo <u>visita</u> and Ramos document
	(Sanctiagó)	Sanctiagó (de Cao)	Mogrovejo 1920b [1593-94]	
Moche	Guanchaco	Guanchaco	Anonymous 1950 [1630]	in Ramos document
	Lloc (<u>mitmag</u>); other?	Mansiche	Netherly 1977	inference from Ramos document and Calancha
	Chichi	Guaman	[Lozano] 1976 [1550] Rostworowski 1976	inference from Ramos document
	Xacon	Moche	[Lozano] 1976 [1550] Rostworowski 1976	inference from Ramos document
Viru	Guañape	Guañape	Espinoza Soriano 1975	in Ramos document

Pescadora was uninterrupted from the fishing villages of the Lambayeque region to as far south as the Viru coast. This possibility may be put in the form of a hypothesis that could be tested if further relevant documents were to surface (Rabinowitz 1980: 85-86). An alternative or competing hypothesis for the distribution of Pescadora might stick more closely to the present evidence by postulating that the fishermen's dialect was originally limited to the Chimu heartland area, and that any evidence for Pescadora north of the Chicama valley (such as we have at present only for Magdalena de Eten) might indicate that the Chimu relocated some of their own fishermen to the more northern coast in order to gain more direct control over the maritime resources of their conquered territory (Rabinowitz 1980: 88-90).

The question of Pescadora's original distribution is connected with the problem of its relationship to the other two Yunga dialects. Again, two alternative hypotheses may be formulated. Netherly (1977: 92) has suggested that the fishermen's dialect and Quingnam were closely related, based on evidence from the Ramos document. This seems to be a much more likely possibility than that Pescadora and Muchic were the most closely related of the three dialects, given the present distribution evidence. A hypothesis that Pescadora was more closely related to Quingnam than it was to Muchic would be a corollary of the second (Chimu heartland) distribution hypothesis mentioned above (Rabinowitz 1980: 88-89). However, we are still left with the possibility that Muchic and Quingnam were reasonably similar but that Pescadora was quite different from both. This idea is supported by Calancha's statement that Pescadora was more guttural than either of the other two dialects. A hypothesis that the fishermen's dialect was quite divergent from both Muchic and Quingnam

fits best with the first (Lambayeque-Viru) distribution hypothesis suggested above (Rabinowitz 1980: 85-86).

The Nature of the Pescadora Dialect

What kind of a dialect was Pescadora? How did it develop? What distinguished it from the Yunga elucidated by Carrera? In the absence of an actual grammar of Pescadora, we can only conjecture about the answers to such questions. Nevertheless, it is appropriate to explore the sociolinguistic implications of this dialect, given that it was exclusive to a particular class of economic specialists, who shared in common a set of cultural traits directly connected to that specialization. Although the descriptive information provided by Calancha is extremely scanty, we may supplement that information with relevant sociolinguistic studies and with inferences about Pescadora that are based on an understanding of the north coast fishermen as an occupational caste.

In sociolinguistic terms, the Chimu fishermen constituted a distinct "speech community" (Gumperz 1968; Rabinowitz 1980: 93-102). The likelihood that fishermen from diverse sections of the north coast interacted frequently with each other is underscored by the fact that the preferred coastal road connected their villages in pre-reducción times (Lizárraga 1916, I: 64-65), and by documentary evidence that the fishermen may have functioned as message runners along this road (Rabinowitz 1980: 96-99).

Given the nature of their work, it is a certainty that the fishermen's patois contained a lengthy lexicon of specialized terms for the gear of their fishing technology, for the many species of fauna that inhabited their maritime environment, and for the meteorological features of that environment. Lexical specialization is the primary defining character-

istic of job-related argots or jargons (Fromkin and Rodman 1974: 272-273); the context of the job situation creates its own speech community within that of the larger society.

The testimony of Calancha and Lizárraga that the fishermen's tongue was exceedingly difficult to learn in comparison with the other Yunga dialects it resembled suggests that there may have been something of a "secret language" quality to Pescadora. Examples of the secret jargon and disguised speech phenomena have been highlighted in many socio-linguistic studies (see the bibliographic survey in Kirshenblatt-Gimblett [1976: 193-195]). A relevant Andean example is the Machaj-juyai secret language of the Callahuayas of Bolivia (Stark 1972b). This elaborate argot is spoken by the Callahuaya curanderos to maintain the secrecy of their curing rituals.⁴ Machaj-juyai is formed by applying the grammatical structure of Quechua, the native language of the Callahuayas, to a vocabulary derived mostly from Pukina, an extinct language that was once spoken in the region. It is interesting that the Machaj-juyai secret language--like Pescadora--is restricted to an occupational specialist group.

Of course, most secret argots are dependent upon standard languages for their derivation. But what if a highly evolved argot were to develop that in time became the native tongue of the members of its speech community? Is such a phenomenon possible? Pidgin languages, which begin as simplified lingos in areas of contact between speakers of different languages, can sometimes evolve into the native languages called creoles (Fromkin and Rodman 1974: 267-269). The evidence concerning Machaj-juyai demonstrates that a supposedly artificial secret language can be

passed on from generation to generation over some 300 years, given that Pukina apparently became extinct by around 1650 (Stark 1972b: 199).

The question of whether argots might conceivably evolve into full-fledged dialects has never really been explored, as far as I know. Perhaps this is because sociolinguists are aware that such jargons, no matter how complex or elaborate they might be, are not only dependent upon a mainstream language for the vocabulary, phonetics, and syntax they alter, but also, if they are secret lingos, they actually require the existence of a standard language around them.

Nevertheless, there is a well-documented case of an elaborate jargon that came exceedingly close to achieving "independence" from its parent language. This is the case of Boontling, the "lingo of Boonville," an English-based jargon that developed in an isolated valley of northern California around the turn of the century (Adams 1971). The mechanisms by which Boontling generated its slang lexicon were highly versatile and creative. Some, such as vowel substitutions, contractions, and the dropping of front- or end-phoneme clusters might have had their parallel mechanisms in Pescadora; it is possible to infer from Calancha's description of Pescadora as clipped, extra harsh, and more guttural than the other two Yunga dialects that these qualities were deliberate. Boontling, at any rate, had become so pervasive by 1910 that youngsters apparently used it all the time outside the classroom (Adams 1971: 25). One informant even testified that when he joined the army in 1917, he had trouble readjusting to standard English (Adams 1971: 23). It is easy to imagine that if the speakers of Boontling had migrated en masse to an uninhabited island, their lingo would have become their native language.

It is my hypothesis that the Pescadora dialect originated as an

elaborate argot that served to reinforce the subcultural identity of its speakers: a fishermen's lingo that could not be understood by non-fishermen who spoke Muchic or Quingnam. The isolation of the Chimu fishermen as a separate speech community led to the development of this argot into a full-fledged dialect that was the mother-tongue of its speakers. It had the following features: 1) an extensive, specialized vocabulary of terms and expressions related to the occupation and technology of fishing and to the maritime environment and its fauna; 2) a deliberate gutturalization of certain Yunga vowels and consonants; 3) additional alteration of Yunga words by some form of clipping, contraction, and/or dropping of phonemes; and 4) other means of generating slang vocabulary.

The Potential for Further Research Concerning Pescadora

The hypotheses that have been presented in this paper are not worth very much if they cannot be tested. Realistically, the only way these hypotheses could be tested would be if additional Yunga grammars and dictionaries were to surface, works that would predate Carrera's grammar and that would shed light on the differences among the three dialects.

Indeed, it is known that several earlier grammars and vocabularies of Yunga were compiled by Spanish priests (Zevallos Quiñones 1948a), but unfortunately these have been lost, or at least they remain to be re-discovered. Although there is no evidence that anyone wrote a grammar of Pescadora specifically, there are very good indications that the earliest lost grammar of "Yunga" is actually a grammar of Quingnam that might also contain information on Pescadora.

The story of this grammar brings us back to the Chicama valley, where Lizarraga first learned that the fishermen had their own separate

"language." Lizárraga's testimony that Friar Jarandilla was conversant in Pescadora is very believable, for by the time of Lizárraga's journey down the coast, Jarandilla had been resident in the Chicama valley for about ten years. According to Fray Juan Melendez, who wrote a history of the Dominican Order in the New World (1681), Jarandilla and a certain Fray Pedro de Aparicio arrived in Peru in the company of the Licenciado Pedro de la Gasca (Melendez 1681, I: 558), which would date their arrival during the year 1547. Both priests were sent to the Dominican Monastery in the Chicama valley.

It is Jarandilla's colleague, Pedro de Aparicio, who is Melendez's main focus of attention, because of his renown as a language expert (1681, I: 558-559). Melendez reports that Aparicio soon became well-versed in the local language, and that although he died only a few years after his arrival in the Chicama, in the time allotted to him he managed to compose "a grammar, and a dictionary, and many sermons, lectures, and prayers [in the native language], which others have since found valuable" (1681, I: 559). According to Zevallos Quinones (1948a), Aparicio's works on Yunga are the earliest known to have been written. They would date well before the Spanish reducciones of the coastal Indian communities, and nearly a century before Carrera's grammar was published.

If Quingnam was indeed the dialect spoken by non-fishermen in the Chicama valley, as Calancha reports, it most likely would have been the dialect explicated in Aparicio's grammar. In light of Lizárraga's remark that Friar Jarandilla knew the fishermen's dialect better than the other one, it is reasonable to suppose that Aparicio would have specialized in Quingnam (thus complementing his colleague's expertise) but would also have been familiar with Pescadora. If that was the case, it is very

likely that his grammar contained some explanation concerning the nature of the dialect differences he found between the speech of fishermen and non-fishermen in the Chicama valley.

In the middle of the 16th century, only two decades after the conquest, the number of speakers of the three Yunga dialects was much greater than in Carrera's day, and the dialects themselves were in a more pristine state of usage than they were to become in the post-reducción period, when they were liable to undergo some merging as fishing and farming populations were brought together in the new towns. Thus, in contrast to Carrera, Aparicio surely would have been anxious to pass on to other priests a knowledge of both of the "languages" he and Jarandilla found in the region. If so, Aparicio's grammar and accompanying vocabulary list would be an excellent source against which to test the hypotheses that have been presented here.

Melendez's information that others later made use of Aparicio's work is evidence that his grammar was passed on, probably among the Dominicans. Several manuscript copies may have been made. Copies of Dominican documents from Peru were regularly sent to Rome (Sabina McCormick, personal communication). Thus, if any such copies survived, they might well be stored today in some forgotten vault of the Dominican archives in Lima or Rome. Although it is apparently next to impossible for a non-member of the order to gain access to its archives, it is not inconceivable that the aid of a friendly Dominican might be employed in the search for Aparicio's lost grammar.

Clearly, a concerted effort to locate this work should be a high priority of ethnohistorians interested in recovering information about the indigenous cultures of the north coast of Peru. It is my belief

that the grammar and dictionary of Pedro de Aparicio--if found--will settle many of the unanswered questions that now surround the lost dialect of Chimu fishermen.

Footnotes

1. The bulk of Brüning's material remains unpublished, in the form of diary and field notes presently housed in the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg. According to Richard Schaedel (personal communication), the Brüning archive includes a Yunga vocabulary classified into such categories as flora, fauna, agricultural terms, and place names. Fortunately, Schaedel has undertaken the task of examining and bringing to light the valuable Brüning manuscripts, including the linguistic data.
2. This ethnic group probably corresponds to the archaeologically-known Lambayeque culture, whose florescence predated that of the Chimu state. As Espinoza Soriano has argued rather too forcefully (1975), these "historic" Mochicas should not be confused with the Early Intermediate "Mochica" or "Moche" culture that was originally centered in the Moche valley, although the existence of Moche V period sites in the Lambayeque area obviously argues for some connection between the two areas and cultures.
3. In his examination of Middendorf's Yunga grammar, Schaedel (personal communication) found the term "kingnäm" as a supine (verbal noun) form of the root "king," which means "to spin." Perhaps as Schaedel has suggested, the Chimu made a metaphorical connection between spinning and speaking, as we do in English ("to spin a tale," for example). "Kingnäm," at any rate, is the best etymology available for Calancha's "Quingnam."
4. For an interesting archaeological perspective on Callahuaya itinerant curanderismo and its implications for the development of Middle Horizon iconography, see Isbell's paper in this volume.

References

- Adams, Charles C.
1971 Boontling: an American lingo. With a dictionary of Boontling.
University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Anonymous
1950 Corregimientos y Doctrinas de los llanos y los que saven la Lengua [1630]. Document published as Anexo "C" in Ramos Cabredo 1950, pp. 53-55.
- Anonymous Trujillano
1936 (Fragmento de una historia de Trujillo) [1604]. Revista Histórica 10(2):231-239. Published under the title La fecha de la fundación de Trujillo, with introduction by Rubén Vargas Ugarte, pp. 229-239.

Burga, Manuel

- 1976 De la encomienda a la hacienda capitalista: el valle de Jequetepeque del siglo XVI al XX. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Lima.

Calancha, Antonio de la

- 1638 Coronica moralizada del orden de San Augustin en el Peru...
Pedro Lacavalleria, Barcelona.

Carrera, Fernando de la

- 1939 Arte de la lengua Yunga [1644]. Edited and annotated by Radames A. Altieri. Universidad Nacional de Tucumán publicación 256. Instituto de Antropología, Tucumán, Argentina.

Espinoza Soriano, Waldemar

- 1975 El valle de Jayanca y el reino de los Mochica: siglos XV y XVI.
Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Etudes Andines 4:243-274.

Fromkin, Victoria, and Robert Rodman

- 1974 An introduction to language. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Gama, Sebastián de la (visitador)

- 1975 Visita hecha en el valle de Jayanca por Sebastián de la Gama año 1540. Document published in Espinoza Soriano 1975, pp. 260-272.

Garcilaso de la Vega, El Inca

- 1944 Comentarios reales de los Incas [1604] (two vols.). Emecé Editores, Buenos Aires.

González Holguín, Diego

- 1952 Vocabulario de la lengua general de todo el Peru llamada lengua quichua o del Inca [1681]. Universidad Nacional de San Marcos publicaciones del cuarto centenario. Instituto de Historia, Lima.

Gumperz, John J.

- 1968 The speech community. In International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, pp. 381-386. Macmillan, New York.

Hoces, Juan de (visitador)

- 1978 [Visita de Chérrepe] [1572]. Document published in Ramírez-Horton 1978, pp. 96-121.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara (editor)

- 1976 Speech play: research and resources for the study of linguistic creativity. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Lizárraga, Reginaldo de

- 1916 Descripción colonial [1560-1602] (two vols.). Biblioteca Argentina 13, 14. Buenos Aires.

Lozano, Rodrigo (plaintiff)

- 1976 Relacion sacada de la probanza fecha por parte de Rodrigo Lozano en el Pleito que trata con Melchor Verdugo sobre el Prencipal Guaman e sus sujetos [1550]. Published as appendix to Rostworowski 1976, pp. 121-147.

Malaga Medina, Alejandro

- 1974 Las reducciones en el Perú (1532-1600). Historia y Cultura 8: 141-172.

Martínez de Compañón, Baltazar Jaime

- 1948 Plan que contiene 43 voces castellanas traducidas a las ocho leguas que ablan los indios de la costa, sierras, y montañas del Obispado de Truxillo del Perú [ca. 1781]. Document published in Zevallos Quiñones 1948b, p. 119.

Melendez, Juan

- 1681 Tesoros verdaderos de las Indias (three vols.) Nicolas Angel Tinassio, Rome.

Middendorf, Ernst W.

- 1892 Das Muchik oder die Chimu-Sprache. Volume 6 of Die einheimischen Sprachen Perus (1890-92). F.A. Brockhaus, Leipzig.

Mogrovejo, Toribio Alfonso de (visitador)

- 1920a Libro de Visitas: diario de la segunda visita pastoral, que hizo de su arquidiócesis el ilustrísimo señor Don Toribio Alfonso de Mogrovejo Arzobispo de Los Reyes [1593-94] (first installment). Revista del Archivo Nacional del Perú 1(1):49-81.

- 1920b Libro de Visitas...continuación (second installment). Revista del Archivo Nacional del Perú 1(2):227-229.

Netherly, Patricia

- 1977 Local level lords on the north coast of Peru. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.

Rabinowitz, Joel B.

- 1980 Pescadora, the argot of Chimu fishermen. Unpublished Masters report, Department of Anthropology, The University of Texas at Austin.

Ramírez-Horton, Susan E.

- 1978 Chérrepe en 1572: un análisis de las visita general del Virrey Francisco de Toledo. Historia y Cultura 11:79-121.

- 1981 La organización económica de la costa norte: un análisis preliminar del período prehispánico tardío. In Etnohistoria y antropología andina, Segunda Jornada del Museo Nacional de Historia, 9-12 de enero, 1979, edited by Amalia Castelli, Marcia Koth de Paredes, and Mariana Mould de Pease, pp. 34-45. Lima.

Ramos Cabredo, Josefina

- 1950 Ensayo de un vocabulario de la lengua tallan o tallanca. Cuadernos de Estudio, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú 3(3):11-55.

Rivet, Paul

- 1949 Les langues de l'ancien diocèse de Trujillo. Journal de la Société des Americanistes (nouvelle série) 38:1-52.

Rostworowski de Diez Canseco, María

1970 Mercaderes del valle de Chíncha en la época prehispánica: un documento y unos comentarios. Revista Española de Antropología Americana 5:135-177.

1973 Urpayhuachac y el "símbolo del mar," Arqueología Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú 14:13-21.

1975 Pescadores, artesanos y mercaderes costeños en el Perú prehispánico. Revista del Museo Nacional 41:311-349.

1976 El señorío de Changuco, costa norte. Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Etudes Andines 5:97-111, 121-147.

1981 Recursos naturales renovables y pesca, siglos XVI y XVII. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Lima.

Rowe, John Howland

1948 The kingdom of Chimor. Acta Americana 6(1-2):26-59.

Stark, Louisa Rowell

1968 Mayan affinities with Yunga of Peru. Ph.D. dissertation, New York University. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.

1972a Machaj-juyai: secret language of the Callahuayas. Papers in Andean Linguistics, University of Wisconsin, Madison 1(2):199-227.

1972b Maya-Yunga-Chipayan: a new linguistic alignment. International Journal of American Linguistics 38:119-135.

1973 Glottochronology and the prehistory of western South America. In Lexicostatistics in genetic linguistics, Proceedings of the Yale Conference, April 3-4, 1971, edited by Isidore Dyen, pp. 100-107. Mouton, The Hague.

Zárate, Agustín de

1944 Historia del descubrimiento y conquista del Perú [1555]. Edited and annotated by Jan M. Kermenic. D. Miranda, Lima.

Zevallos Quñones, Jorge

1943 Toponimia preincaica en el norte del Perú. Cuadernos de Estudio, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú 2(5):205-247.

1946 Un diccionario yunga. Revista del Museo Nacional 15:163-188.

1948a Los gramáticos de la lengua Yunga. Cuadernos de Estudio, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú 3(1):40-67.

1948b Primitivas lenguas de la costa. Revista del Museo Nacional 17:114-119.