

Dossier

Weaving the world and the origins of life as we know it: Notions of growth, fabrication and reproduction in Yukpa origin myths

Ernst Halbmayer

Marburg University, Alemanha

ernst.halbmayer@staff.uni-marburg.de

ABSTRACT: This paper deals with the meaning of life among the Yukpa as depicted and verbalized in their origin myths. Yukpa myths transmit particularly conceptualized knowledge about life-processes, partly conceptualized as skilled craftsmanship, and transformations that create the conditions and forms of life as we know it. By focusing on the processes that create life as it is known today the life-processes of growing, fabricating and reproducing are identified and differentiated. It is argued that life-processes among the Yukpa go beyond a biological self-referential reproduction of different species and instrumental activities of fabrication. Life is conceptualized both spatially as continuing localized relational activity and as metamorphical cyclical transformation. From the localized perspective to leave or disappear from a relational activity are forms of dying or being born. Life in its metamorphical sense includes ongoing existence in co-existing worlds. A definite end of life will only occur if these metamorphical and cyclical transformations come to an end.

KEYWORDS: Yukpa, origin myth, life-processes, craftsmanship, fabrication, growth, reproduction, life as localized relational activity, life as metamorphical cyclical transformation.

This paper deals with the meaning and inception of life among the Yukpa as depicted in their origin myths.¹ It starts from the question of how living beings and liveable conditions in the world came into being, focusing on the processes that create life as we know it today. The analysis starts with the role of myth for understanding conceptions of life, and identifies and differentiates the life-processes of growing, fabricating and reproducing. Mythical narrations among the Yukpa deal not with the origins of life but represent and transmit particularly conceptualized knowledge and verbalized explanations about life-processes, partly conceptualized as skilled craftsmanship, and transformations that create the conditions and forms of life as we know it.

Obviously, such a focus on conceptualized knowledge stands in contrast to phenomenological approaches highlighting perceptions and pre-conceptual lived experience (e.g. Ingold, 2011). A focus on myths necessarily centres on verbalized concepts and stresses explanations over sentient perceptions and the generalized immersion of those who grow and make in their environment. Looking at mythical narrations offers, much more, the opportunity to inquire and recognize differently articulated objectifications of life, the principles the living and different forms of life are based on (Pitrou, 2014)². Mythical explanations form at the same time an intrinsic part of everyday practices and perception as they postulate and affirm basic principles of understanding, exemplifying normally invisible and imperceptible aspects of the world, explaining transformational changes including historical events³ and demonstrating consequences of human behaviour. From such a perspective, not pre-objective or pre-ethic perceptions but forms of objectification and conceptualization come into focus.⁴ In the following example, a differentiated spectrum of activities becomes visible that contributes to the creation of life as it is known today. Fabrication and making play therein an important role and are in specific ways related but not identical with growing and reproducing (Pitrou, 2015).

The result of this exercise, as will become clear, raises doubts about an ontological priority of growing over making in the Yukpa perspective. Growing does not necessarily become “the form of becoming from which the forms of the artificial take shape” (Hallam & Ingold, 2014: 5). But it also questions the reverse argument put forward by Fernando Santos Granero (2009) who identified different Amazonian object regimes and argued for a common symbolic frame of fabrication. Fabrication encompasses the distinction of persons and things and he places craftsmanship, which “provides the model for all creative acts”

prior to sexual procreation (2009: 8). Despite these insights, Santos-Granero's notion of fabrication remains a theoretical black box, of which we do not know what it contains and which forms it may assume.⁵ The experiment I will undertake in the following is to ask which forms of growing, fabricating and reproducing life can be found in Yukpa origin myths on the basis of the verbal and linguistic forms used to depict these activities.

In Yukpa myths, sound images figure prominently within verbalized narrations. They may be icons that ignore the difference between the symbol and the object it refers to, or indexes indicating something not represented, as Eduardo Kohn has demonstrated (2013) for the Napo Runa. Despite the importance of sound images in mythical narrations as well as in real life interactions with non-human beings, their role is not the same in both areas. Within Yukpa myths sound images, icons and indexes, are not indications of non-human actors but more generally express action, transformation and change. They make narrations vivid and are used in a way broadly comparable to sound symbols in comics. Most of the communication between and among humans, spirits and animals in myths is literally and therefore symbolically represented, often by directly quoted direct speech. In contrast to interactions with non-human beings in everyday life, their representation does not rely on "an ecology of life beyond the human" based on non-symbolic signs such as icons and indexes (Kohn, 2007, 2013). In myths animals, spirits and culture heroes are knowledgeable in the use of symbolic signs and speech, as are humans. Myths explain how this situation changed and life as it is known today became to be. Looking at life processes in Yukpa myths, one may, however, question if the shared use of symbolic signs and therefore culture is a sufficient criteria for a mythical non-differentiation of animals and humans. Are animals really ex-humans as Viveiros de Castro (1998) has argued or did they become contemporary animals exactly because they were not fully human?

The meaning of myth is not just represented in verbalized speech acts and sound symbols. A mythical narration unveils its meaning in relation to its performance, including the gestures of the narrator and the lived experience of the audience. Its meaning unfolds not just in relation to other myths but in relation to the environment, the landscape and the beings that dwell in it. It emerges in relation to manufactured objects, and in relation to rituals and social practices. "It is not possible for human beings", as Uzendoski and Calapucha-Tapuy write, "to live in purely 'oral' worlds, worlds without inscription and textuality" (2012: 9). There is no need that such inscriptions take the form of

alphabetic writing. Inscriptions take place through weaving (see Guss, 1989; van Velthem, 1992, 1998), pictographic memorization (Severi, 2015), designs (Lagrou, 2012), making a house (Barándiaran, 1966; Halbmayer, 2010), hunting (Århem 1996) or clearing and planting a field. Myth is therefore inscribed into practices, places (Santos-Granero, 1998, 2004; Halbmayer, 2004a) objects and bodies (Uzendoski, 2012; Fortis, 2014). Meaning therefore emerges not just from verbalized speech but from the relationship, the similarities and differences, between the actions depicted in the narratives and everyday practices and observations. Perceptible differences that make a difference⁶ are then not just sounds, noises or indications of natural changes but may be perceived as signs uttered by co-present but invisible non-human beings. Such utterances may manifest themselves in the fog, in lightning, an earthquake or the behaviour of animals or dreams. Myths may also be inscribed in places that in turn become visible signs of past mythical events. These forms of representation, communication and textuality go beyond the oral and the written, the human and non-human and the social and the natural. It is in this relational sense based on the capacity to be inscribed in other textual forms that myth becomes – as Malinowski once argued – “not merely a story told but a reality lived” (1948[1926]: 100).

While meaning emerges from the relationship between spoken words and everyday practices and perceptions, the performance of a myth does not establish a lived relational interaction with other beings. Myths depict and represent the interaction and interchange between different beings but myths are not – at least among the Yukpa – a way or tool to perform such an interchange. On the contrary, the act of narrating a myth creates an extraordinary situation as it temporarily eliminates the ever-present possibility of transspecies communication. Narrating the myth of the journey into the land of the dead does not imply entering into contact with the spirits of dead. In telling a myth about subaquatic or celestial beings, one does not establish contact with those whose actions are described in the myths. Neither the narrator nor the audience is going to transform into a jaguar or anaconda. Myth is not ritual, dream or shamanic action. In talking about and representing, myths, rather, temporarily abolish the possibility of interaction with non-human beings. Everyday actions have inherent in them more options to direct contact, consciously or unconsciously, with non-human beings than in the time a myth is told. Although Lévy-Strauss compared the structural composition of myth to that of music, music, which is the preferred Amerindian language to communicate with spirits (Brabec,

2012) is not myth. This interactive non-relationality beyond the human audience also indicates that these beings are unable to understand the spoken language of myth. The narrations with their own discursivity establish in their enactment a temporally verbalized representation of their own.

The Yukpa and their origin myths

The Yukpa are a contemporary northwestern outpost of Carib-speaking Amerindians. They live on the Venezuelan as well as the Colombian side of the Sierra de Perijá south of the Arawak-speaking Wayuu, southeast of the Chibcha-speaking groups of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (Kogi, Arhuaco, Wiwa and Kankuama) and north of the also Chibcha-speaking Barí. This is a region where Andean, Amazonian and Mesoamerican influences meet. And the Yukpa, a Carib-speaking group that penetrated into a region variously labeled as Chibcha area (Kirchhoff, 1943), intermediate zone (Haberland, 1957) or Isthmo-Colombian area (Hoopes & Fonseca, 2003), have selectively adapted to it.

Different Yukpa subgroups inhabit several river valleys of the Sierra de Perijá (see Halbmayer, 2013b). They speak different dialects and have oral traditions with marked variations in their details. These are best understood as transformative versions of common themes and mythical structures that complement and shed light on each other. In the following I will refer to data collected among three of the Yukpa-subgroups: the Venezuelan Irapa among whom I worked on several occasions between 1991 and 2009, the Colombian Iroka where I did field work a number of times between 2009 and 2014 and the Colombian Sokorpa where I did research most recently in 2014. I will in each case mention from which group the ethnographic details and names derive and will use, unless otherwise mentioned, a transcription of the Iroka dialect since the core narration I will cite from is an Iroka myth. That said, while bringing complementary information from different groups together allows for a meta-reflection to emerge, it will hardly do full justice to each particular version of the local variants.

Broadly speaking there are four central mythical complexes that deal with the transformation of the world and the creation of forms of life as the Yukpa know it today. A first series of narrations deals with the creation and transformation of this world and the

establishment of animal and human life. A second one, a version of the twin myth, depicts how the night sky became populated and explains seasonal changes between dry and rainy seasons. And a third one deals with the origin of cultivated plants, especially maize, while the fourth one deals with the whites and their technology. I will focus on the first mentioned complex of myths in which a culture hero named *Amoricha* [Irapa] or *Otompa* [Iroka] descends to earth, transforming the world and creating animal as well as human life as we know it today. Today this culture hero is also referred to as *Maipore* [Irapa], *Aponto* [Iroka, Sokorpa] or *Papsh tyos*, that is, God-father. These terms refer to the Christian God and indicate that the mythical culture hero and the Christian God are considered today by many Yukpa to be one and the same.

These narrations are understood by the Yukpa as valid explanations of how contemporary modes of existence and contemporary beings came into being, how the world took its actual shape and which rules should be respected to maintain the tempered liveable conditions on earth established by these processes. While the versions of the Irapa and to some extent of the Sokorpa highlight how the unlivable conditions in the world became transformed into liveable and tempered ones that make life possible, the Iroka emphasize how basic elements of this world came into existence and reproduction became possible. Interestingly, however, in all these myths the terms being alive *oshepa* (an adjective deriving from *shepa* – green, a green wood or plant for example) or to live *osesapa* [os- rfl. being living or residing oneself in a place] are not mentioned.

These myths are not reflecting the question of being alive or not, of living and non-living, but deal with the formation and transformation of the forms and conditions of life. Through these transformations, specific conditions and forms of existence are established on earth and the notions of living, being born and dying will be reconsidered in this context.

There is not a single myth I am aware of in which artefacts transform into humans or act on their own behalf. Thus, the cultural hero's activities establish a common "symbolic frame of fabrication" in which not the fabrication of classical artefacts is important but the "fabrication" of the world and of living beings as such. Making life as we know it means to initiate significant transformations. At the same time the myth articulates that fabrication is necessary but enables just incomplete, not self-reproducing forms of reproduction.

Amoricha, as the Irapa call their culture hero, is a condensed expression of this observation. Multiple references and analogies associate this mythical being with different levels of meaning. Etymologically the term Amoricha derives from the verb *-amó-* to construct or to build a house⁷ or more basically an enclosure, the nominalizing possession marker *ri-* and the humanizing suffix *-cha* indicating a deceased person. So Amoricha may be translated as the deceased person who possessed [the knowledge or capacity of] constructing or building. The term indicates that this being is not associated with a life giving force.⁸ Much more, Amoricha is the one who constructs and fabricates forms of life as we know them today. He is not creating life as such, as there is no creation *ex nihilo* among the Yukpa. There is life before the culture hero's transformative activities started⁹ and there are, as I recently showed in a discussion of Yukpa death rituals (Halbmayer, 2013a), elaborated forms of life even after physical death. Life has no absolute beginning or end, neither that of individual persons nor that of the world, but there are radical and significant transformations and changes that made the specific forms and conditions of life as we know it today possible, and to live, to be born and to die as plants, animals or human persons do, has to be understood in this context. This seemingly contradictory situation that one may die without an absolute beginning of or end of life will, I hope, become clear after a closer look at the articulations of life in the Yukpa origin myths.

The space-time in which Amorichas activities took place is called *owaya tamoiya*, the time the world was in construction, an original hyper-transformative time often also referred to as mysterious. Today as the culture hero is associated and partly fused with the Christian God, the Yukpa tend to associate more or less loosely this original *owaya tamoiya* with the Christian genesis. However, in the light of possible dangerous changes of the world, as experienced during the exceptional drought in 2014 or an eclipse (see Halbmayer, 2004b), the Yukpa fear the return of this original space-time and its non-tempered conditions on earth.

The origin as metamorphosis: leaving from an enclosure

At the very beginning the Iroka myth mentions that the culture hero existed for himself *twapa*, expressed by the infinitive for intransitive verbs [*tw-*], the verb to be [*-a-*] and the humanization suffix *-pa*.

The narration starts like this:¹⁰

God-father was existing alone [*twapa*]. At that time God-father was a cocoon [*monseno*]. ... From there with his silk thread he came down, from there the world [*owaya*] above. From there he was sewing, God-father. God-father's mother [was] spider, thus her name was spider [*aĉhaya*]. [With the] silk thread he came down here from there above. Therefore God-father was a cocoon. When God-father was a cocoon he left [*netokanako*] from it, God-father. So he left from his skin-cover [*yusĉh*]. There the cocoon was his skin-cover. In its middle it split [into two]. Down it went to this earth [*nono*]. Above in there [is the other] world. From there he came down, God-father. So God-father grew [*natának*]. He straightened up at the earth [*nĉkĉntanak*]. All his skin-covering became like earth. There he straightened up. So it was and God-father said: "No, this earth is small" he said. At once [he had the] desire and he spoke again. Large it was transforming, large he was transforming [*naĉhopnak*] the earth. The earth was small. Large he was transforming the earth. Large it was transforming.¹¹

Let us have a closer look at this initial sequence, to which I will return in the later part of the paper. It establishes that God was a living being, the child of a spider living in a cocoon, obviously in a state of metamorphosis¹². In other versions it is also mentioned that his name was *otompa*, which was the original name of the sun, today called *wechu*. So the culture hero is a spider, an aspect of the sun, he came down to earth like a sunbeam through the fog in form of a silk thread¹³ and he is today associated with the Christian God. When called Amoricha and acting on the earth in his human form he is considered a deceased human person, as indicated by the suffix *-cha*, possessing the knowledge of construction.

The transitive verb used to indicate the process of leaving the cocoon is *-etoka-*,¹⁴ to leave from, to go out of an enclosure, an egg for example, in the case of a girl from the menstruation hut or in this case from the cocoon. There are other verbs beside *-etoka-* used in this myth for leaving. One is *-eke-* to appear, to leave, to become visible, like the rising sun in the morning or the plants from the ground. A third way of expressing such appearances is to articulate the action of appearing by the sound image *chep, chep, chep*.

While *etoka* expresses the perspective and action of the one who is leaving from an enclosure, *-eke-* refers to the perspective of the observer and *chep* is the sound symbol indicating the action of appearing.

The split cocoon becomes the basis of a layered universe. A part of it comes down whereas the other one stays above and this creates different worlds *owaya*. This world as the space between the firmament and the ground *nono* and an other world above the sky, here also called *owaya*, came into existence.

Ways to enlarge and weave the world

After having enlarged the originally small land, the culture hero started to construct or build the world in different activities. The verb used in this context of enlarging the earth is *-aĉho-* normally translated as to transform, but the precise meaning is to make that something is happening. *Naĉhopnako* [n-aĉho-p(a)-nako; 3p-make happening-Prog-pasH], he was making it happen in the historical past. In other versions the verb “to grow” is used for this process of making something happen. He made the earth grow.

By enlarging the ground *nono* he was however not automatically rising and enlarging *owaya*, the space between the firmament and the earth. According to some Irapa and Sokorpa versions, such an enlargement became necessary as it was so hot on earth that the water in the rivers and the lakes was boiling. The firmament was near to earth and there were two suns in the sky, so it never became dark. Amoricha was shooting (*-ama-*) arrows with dull black wax bee-heads to the sun and so the firmament started to rise. And he shot into the eye of one of the suns, who turned dark and became moon.¹⁵ So he established the necessary distance and created the differences between day and night, cold and hot, dry and wet and thereby created liveable conditions on earth. Shooting with the bow and arrow is in this case an activity that does not intend to kill. It is not a predatory activity. Much more it is an activity that establishes contact, transforms the other and creates the necessary distance for liveable conditions. Amoricha is enlarging the world *owaya*, the space between the earth *nono* and the firmament, that one is dwelling in.

According to the Iroka versions, the culture hero was weaving (*-tkape-*) the mountains, the trees and the leaves to provide shade and was thereby forming the actual

shape of the world. God-father therefore established life as we know it today and created the conditions for life, which rest on the tempered alternation of differences, the formation of the actual shape of the world and the creation of life-forms.

Then it dropped in his own memory [*otoway nantanako*] of God-father [God-father thought]: “No, I am alone here” At once [he asked] “Who will be like my companion?”¹⁶

The stones were first like his companions. For himself he wove stones. A big stone for himself he was weaving and an other one, two stones. And afterwards God-father thought: “No, but that is not like a companion”. Annoyed in turn [he was] of this companion-like stone. “What’s that, might be they will not reproduce [*epameĉhaĉh*] these stones? No, these are no companion-likes. No, how may they be my companion-likes? God-father said.”¹⁷

At that time he had already made everything, the trees and mountains and was walking through the forest. He first met a female (proto-)tapir and took her as his wife.

First he met a tapir, with the tapir he joined. “Who are you? Why do you have such big buttocks?” he said. She was like a woman. So he went and joined with her, God-father. With this tapir he joined himself. He said: “You are a beautiful wife.” “I like you a lot” the Tapir said to God-father. “You will be a good wife for me” he said. “I don’t have children” he said, “with you I will reproduce.” He took her with him. With his words [*ywonktse*] he made a house like those of the whites to live in. He used to weave a house with his words. Like this, [he] used to weave the house. He carried the tapir with him like his wife, like his wife. The two were sleeping together. After a while he was thinking. God-father said “No, you are not reproducing. Why? Are you a sterile wife? You are sterile. A sterile wife you are. You will be without children” he said and thought: “Leave, go to the forest, your name will be *achache* (tapir)”.¹⁸

After the culture hero had transformed the tapir he met *wayé*, the sloth:

“Afterwards he was thinking again and he came across the sloth. The sloth he met, the sloth. He said “You are a women.” “With you I will reproduce [*epams ya*]” to the sloth he said. “How [what for] is this women? “You will be my female companion, my wife” he said to the sloth. He was saying to her. Then he took her with him to where tapir was his wife. [where he had lived with tapir]. He made a house with the words he said, like a white man’s house. There it was. It was like this then, like this. Afterwards he gave young animals [*ynépĉh*] to her. A few young [*ynépĉh*], like this. (...) It was like this, he gave her. The little he had woven he gave to her. “Take the children. You will grow them like children.” God-father was saying to the sloth. He was already giving the animal-like children

[*ynéçhpe*] as little human children [*machukapash*]. She was growing [fostering] them [*satunkapo*]. And again he gave her more, our little children [*machukapash*] he was weaving, [and] already giving. Again he gave her children [*machukapash*]. Once more he had woven and was giving to her, putting [them] into her hand. Once more he gave her, once more. Then he gave her both hands full, ten [children] to her he gave, he gave to her. Afterwards she grew them, she grew them [and] they began to fly. They were God's children. He thought "they will be birds". These were his first children."¹⁹

The myth depicts a succession of gendered pairs intending to reproduce, from the less human-like partner the stones, which turned out to be no companions, to the tapir, a companion that finally did not give birth, to the sloth, who was raising God's children but – as we will see – engaged in an incestuous relationship. The proto-animals are finally transformed into animals and sent off to live in the forest. Such "pairs of reproduction", units of two that procreate, are the basic economic and social entities among the Yukpa and represent the normal and adequate form of living. To be and exist alone – as the culture hero did – is, by contrast, an incomplete state of existence. Reproductive units may not, so the message of this and other myths, be formed by individuals that are either too distant, as reproduction becomes either impossible or monstrous, or too close, which would be incestuous.²⁰

Weaving, raising children and transforming animals

Fabrication seems the general form to make something happen in the myth. The culture hero is weaving the world, mountains, trees, leaves, stones and even his first children. To weave and construct is, as the myth exemplifies, not reproduction or multiplication [*-epame-*]. One may fabricate alone and on one's own, but not procreate. Reproduction needs an other. In fact, sexual procreation and reproduction remains impossible with the original others, the proto-animals. Mythical proto-animals are therefore, despite the fact that they share language and culture with humans, only Yukpa-like, *Yukpape* but not Yukpa.

Reproduction becomes possible with the sloth, but it is still not physical reproduction based on sexual procreation. Reproduction is based on fabrication by weaving

and by raising the children in a quasi-adoptive relationship²¹. It is this relationship of familiarization (Erikson, 1987; Fausto, 1999) that the Yukpa use up today to raise and foster the young of hunted animals. It is indicative that two different terms for the woven children are used in the myth. God is giving *ynépčb*, young animals to his wife, indicating thereby that the children he wove are animal, not human children. She raises them, however, as if they were her own young human children *machukapash*. To raise or foster children is expressed as to make them grow (see below). *Attn[a]-ka-po*, a personified form of growing [*attna*] something progressively is used. While the children are grown like human children, they begin to fly and become different species of birds of prey *epuko*.

Important life-processes are conceptualized as forms of fabrication. While animals and children may be made and manufactured, artefacts may be grown, as we will see. However artefacts are not conceptualized as living beings among the Yukpa. The things one is weaving or fabricating generally belong to the intimate or possessed things among the Yukpa. They are marked by a specific possessive pronominal prefix indicating whose things (mine, yours, his) they are and do not exist without such an indication of intimate ownership. These possessed substantives include body parts, close kin, manufactured objects and the results of physical interventions in the environment, such as a cleared field. It is impossible to say just ,nose', it is always ,my nose', ,your nose' or ,his nose' – *ena*, *yena* or *yona*. Whereby the 3rd person singular *yona* is used when one speaks simply of , a nose'. Beyond body parts, the place where one sleeps, one's house, one's bag, one's pipe, one's mat, one's clothes, weapons and field are intimate possessed substantives over which one has extended mastery and which others have to respect. One should not enter without permission, take things or even touch them. They are extensions of the person and share that person's spirit. That is why they have to be destroyed or cannot be used, like the fields, after the death of a person. In this sense the mountains, forests and trees and birds of prey originally fabricated by the culture hero are possessed extensions of his person and not the result of reproduction, which would imply the participation of others to take place. And as adequate reproduction is not possible with these original others, they are banished.

The culture hero sends his wives and children into the forest and in doing so transforms them into contemporary animals. That is the alternative and distancing movement by which possessed self-extensions become others. A conflict, as we will see below, or the impossibility to reproduce leads to separation. In the myth, such separations

are accompanied by a standardized procedure, including the attribution of names, the assignment of a place to dwell, an indication what the animals will eat and in turn the relationship they will establish with other beings. In this process, formally human-like proto-animals are transformed into actual animals, incomplete spouses transform into prey.

As an Irapa myth demonstrates, Amoricha's "knowledge to transform" [*tʰwantasha* – *tʰwan-ta-sha* knowledge - is (for making) - this is for that] is not just based on attributing names, food habits and places to live but on the fabrication of bodily attributes by sharpening nails, claws and teeth and by distributing them to different species while singing powerful songs [*irimi*], which are known as *alemi* in Guiana.²² God is distributing and implanting, for example, different forms of teeth to snakes, woodpeckers and humans, whose teeth are made from maize. But all in all the differentiation of species goes beyond a process of fabricating bodily differences, it implies the assignment of different eating habits, relations to other beings and ecological niches and relies on making the transformation happen by means of songs. Proto-animals were Yukpa-like, *Yukpa-pe*, but they were not Yukpa. In fact, their difference becomes visible as procreation remains impossible or – as we will see – they violate the incest taboo. They turn into animals because they are not fully human.

Making it happen [-*aĉho-*], the knowledge to transform [*tʰwantasha*] and making it grow [-*atʰnka-*] (see below) are activities that do not necessarily refer only to physical interventions and instrumental activities of fabrication. To make something happen is not just a technical manipulation of material but may be done by words (*wonkʰ*), spells (*pshkech*), songs (*yoĉhème* [iro] *yorimi* [ira]) or thoughts. He made the earth grow thinking. Spells *pshkech* are mentioned at various occasions in the Iroka myth. *Pshkech*, the culture hero wanted to be drunk, and there was beer ... *pshkech* he wanted to be served, and they brought him a calabash to drink ... *pshkech* he wanted that these animals would leave and live far away in the forest... *pshkech* he sent them to the high trees. So he made that things happen. The common ground of these instrumental, communicative and cognitive actions is that they are simultaneously (re-)organizing and (re-)structuring physical, social and cognitive relations between materials, beings and thoughts.

Finally, the culture hero is also rejecting and transforming sloth's brother the crimson-crested woodpecker *sakúĉhas* and his own children, the birds of prey, *epuko*.

The reason is in this case not the impossibility of reproduction. As we have seen, a certain, although incomplete reproduction occurs with sloth-wife. The reason is much more a wrong form of reproduction. The transformation from proto-animals into animals is in Irapa myths related explicitly to the fact that the animals were violating the incest taboo during a feast when they were drunk. The Iroka version states that God's sloth-wife, his children and sloth's brother did not behave well during a chicha feast. They were offering the culture hero maize beer in a dirty calabash and gave him an old and dirty mat to sit on. The sloth was singing, dancing and enjoying herself with her younger brother without caring about her husband. So God became angry, distorted the sloth's and woodpeckers' feet, transformed both into animals and sent them to the forest. That is why the sloth and the woodpecker have deformed feet – so much so that they are hardly able to walk on the flat ground. He said the sloth will nourish itself from buds and tender shoots and the woodpecker from worms [*kwĉhasha*]. The living beings are therefore defined by their specific forms, their form of reproduction and their relations to other beings.

Ways of growing

In the introductory lines of the myth, a verb for growing *-atá-* is mentioned. Sun-spider was growing *n-atá-nak* [3p-grow-pasH] in the historic past. This verb *-atá-* refers to the growth of plants, hair and teeth, which grow on their own behalf in the sense of to stick out or to sprout. Sun-God was in his cocoon growing like a plant. In contrast, when he came down and transformed *-aĉho-* the earth, it is said that he made the earth grow *-attna-*. Both *-attna-* and *-atá-* are intransitive verbs, indicating that the process of growing is grammatically and in common Yukpa life conceptualized as something that is happening out of itself, without the intervention of anyone.

What is significant here is the difference between the two forms of growing *-atá-* and *-attna-*. While *-atá-* is, as indicated, used for the growth of plants, hair, teeth or fingernails, *-attna-* by contrast refers to the growth of personalized beings that are considered to have blood, like animals and humans. While sun-spider was growing like a plant, the earth is growing like a personalized being having blood like animals and humans. It is not by chance that the Yukpa tell stories about *non-piri* the earth-penis penetrating and

impregnating Yukpa women, that one should never sitting on the ground without using a woven mat or a piece of wood. Before planting maize [*me*] one should make the soil sweet by planting other fruits like potato [*shá*], sweet manioc [*pó*], squash [*kuwé*] or peas [*kumáta*]. Among the Yukpa not only the soil but even stones hear, attack, come up against or enclose someone. Stones, even if they are no proper companion and do not serve to procreate, are referred to as being tame [*kowaso*] or wild [*esó*] and are equipped with agency. The same is true for the stars.

While these two ways of growing are conceptualized as something that is happening out of itself, one of them may turn into a transitive verb by means of the transitive marker *-ka*. Growing thereby becomes an activity initiated by external intervention, “someone is making it grow”. Thus, personified [*-attna-*] and impersonal forms of growing [*-atá-*] may occur out of themselves, but only [*-attna-*] may be initiated by someone. The impersonal form of growing *-atá-* could theoretically be transformed in a transitive verb, but this practically never happens. *Atá* remains impersonal growing that happens out of itself. Only personified beings or possessed and intimate things may be made to grow.

To make something grow is therefore at the same time a capacity, a form of power or mastery one is exercising. Thus, growth is no longer a quasi biological and self-referential process happening out of itself but becomes a form of making. While the growth of the sun-spider is happening on its own behalf, the earth is made to grow by God. Not all growth is therefore fabrication and dependent on external or human action, and craftsmanship does not provide the model for all creative acts. Not only most plants²³ but larvae and cocoons, like the culture hero during his metamorphous state, but also girls during their menstrual seclusion are growing on their own. In contrast, children are, as we will see, made to grow when fed and cared for.

So while not all growing is fabrication and being grown, fabrication may be a sort of growing. Artefacts like baskets, mats or bags grow progressively in the process of making *attpepo*. Growing may therefore be an auto- or an exo-activity performed on something. The latter may be practiced by those who possess and have the power to exert influence over others. These mastery performing *uatpe* may be humans or animals’ and plants’ masters²⁴ and by making and growing one may make oneself *uatpe* of something. And last but not least, growing as an exo-activity of making grow [*-attnka-*] or of making that something was happening [*-aêho-*] relies not just on a range of instrumental manipulations

of matter (to weave; to feed, for example) but on non-instrumental activities (singing, uttering spells for example). These processes are based on the simultaneous restructuring of cognitive, social and material relations.

Fabricating the plant-grown Yukpa

When the culture hero had transformed his wife the sloth, her brother the woodpecker and his children the birds of prey into animals and sent them into the forest, he was alone again.

There were no ancestors. There was the woodpecker. God was alone in his house. He was alone. The woodpecker had withdrawn far from where God-father was. But he was approaching God again. He came close and was singing *wek wek*.

“Huy, why did you come back?” [God asked.]

The woodpecker said “No papa, I found a big tree in the savanna and when I was knocking on it with my beak, the tree started to cry and bleed.”

“Where is it? In the savanna? Is that true [what you are saying]?”

“Yes its true, there it is.” [the woodpecker said]

The culture hero was finally convinced and accepted to go there and took his axe with him. The woodpecker led the culture hero on a long trip with many detours along the most difficult route through the forest because he wanted to take revenge on God for his expulsion. Finally, after many days he showed him the tree that was actually near the place where God lived. Once they arrived the woodpecker told God to cut *-uka-* logs out of the tree and to carry them to his hut.

In this tree called *manuĉhacha* or *caricai* in local Spanish the Yukpa were living. The suffix *-cha* indicates the former humanness of this tree in contrast to commonly used suffix for trees *-yi*. This tree has a red liquid resin that drips like blood if cut with a machete. As the crimson-crested woodpecker was picking the tree it started to bleed and that is how he got his bloody red breast. Today the Yukpa are still convinced that they were made out of this tree. As one Yukpa once said to me “there are still Yukpa in there”.

In some Irapa versions, two women emerged from the logs. Amoricha took them as wives with whom he procreated. In the Iroka and Sokorpa version, men as women are made out of the tree and start to procreate among themselves. Today not only Yukpa but also the *wateya*, the whites, are said to emerge from that tree. In older mythical versions, whites did not emerge from the *manthhacha* tree but were considered monstrous beings resulting from both incestuous sexual relations and masturbation. (Wilbert, 1974: 92f) or were made from a different wood called *kiriya*.²⁵

In the Irapa and Sokorpa versions the culture hero, after having cut the logs and placed them in his house, he left next morning to go to work in the forest. When he came back in the evening food had been cooked. He wondered who might have done that. The logs were still lying in the hut. The following day the same happened again. The third day he observed his house from a distance and saw two women coming out of the logs and doing the work. The woodpecker told him to go and catch (*-puchu-* to catch, to take with the hand) and tickle them (*sutankarapma* to tickle the ribs) and make them laugh. So he did. Once they started to laugh they did not transform any longer and stayed human. As an additional measure, in the Sokorpa version the culture hero destroys their cover, the wooden enclosure from which they emerged before he made them laugh. So they have no more chance to return. The same word enclosure (*yushru* [sok], *yusĥh* [iro]) is used for the wooden logs and God-spider's cocoon.

In the Iroka version the culture hero says:

“There they slept in the cut tree but they had left their footprints already [when they were cooking]. [So God-father knew]. “Get up [*twanse*] as we do.” [he said]. With his words he made children. When they were getting up and he saw them he was happy. “Huy, who are you? You are my children. Forever you will reproduce [*epamse*]. You look like me. You will always reproduce. You will be growing [*matánato*]. The Yukpa and the whites [as both left from the tree] will always be like me.”²⁶

When the Yukpa left the tree, they were still as stiff as wood. So he started to break them and made them joints so that they could move and work better. When they were finished, all the animals already had children but not the Yukpa. Finally they learned how to reproduce sexually from the birds.

“Well, you want to know how to make it” the birds said. “Bring your wife. [To learn] How to embrace the woman to have children.”

They showed them the bodily technique of how one has to take the wife to have children. And the birds gave them their young to raise. “Ok, children are like this” the Yukpa said. And finally the birds explained that they have to insert [*tpatacho*²⁷] their penis deeply to get children.

So the first Yukpa, in contrast to the proto-animals, are not expelled into the forest. They were brought from the forest to God-father’s house. They already existed in the *manũchacha* tree and were discovered by the woodpecker. Carved into logs, they leave their enclosure and transform into human beings. They grow out of the tree and quasi automatically assume female or gendered tasks, like whites and Yukpa, who have different skills and capacities from the very beginning. Later God makes them joints. As the Yukpa are already living, obviously fully developed, in the tree, God does not fabricate them but merely refines them, adding joints in a discontinuous processes of an ‘operational sequence’ (*chaîne opératoire*) (see Pitrou, 2014; Lemonnier, 2012; Coupaye, 2013). And finally, in a situation where all animals knew already how to procreate sexually, they learn the skills of sexual reproduction mimetically from the birds.

Relational and transformational notions of life: from spatialized dwelling to metamorphosis

So what does the common symbolic frame of fabrication contain among the Yukpa? As mentioned above, manufactured artefacts are neither persons nor transform into body parts²⁸ nor do they have the power to transform into other things. Even if the Yukpa emerge from a tree, it is not the transformation of things into subjects that forms the focus of the common symbolic frame of fabrication. Much more it is the transformation, conceived as the liberation of already existent beings from an enclosure and their additional technical refinement.

The life processes conceptualized and verbalized in this myth comprise quite different forms of fabrication, several notions of growing and sexual and non-sexual forms of reproduction. These processes may be distinguished in those relying on making that

something is happening [-*aĉho-*], in autonomous growth and sexual reproduction. The first category, the making that something is happening is certainly the most complex of these three, as it contains different forms of how to make conditions and forms of life with words, thoughts, technical skills and by changing relationships (weaving, cutting, shooting, thinking, singing, ...). Not all these activities rely on craftsmanship alone. They imply communicative and cognitive skills as well as operational sequences and gendered cooperation in the case of adoptive non-sexual reproduction. And last but not least, making that something is happening includes -*attnka-* the making of personified growth.

Autonomous growth out of itself, by contrast, takes place in impersonal [-*atá-*] and personal [-*attna-*] forms, whereas only the latter may become a form of making grow [-*attnka-*]. Clearly differentiated from fabrication and the ways to make something happen as well from growing is sexual reproduction [-*epame-*], based on gendered pairs that are neither too distant nor too close.

The aspects of the world fabricated or transformed by these processes may be located on different levels. On a macro-level it is the layered universe and this world, which are enlarged and transformed and become liveable as a result of growing, shooting, and the rising of the firmament and differentiating sun and moon, day and night and their tempered cyclical alternation. On an intermediate level on this earth, stones, mountains and trees were woven, as were at a micro level the house and some animals, who are the culture hero's children.

However none of grown, woven or transformed aspects transforms into a Yukpa; reproduction remains adoptive and non-sexual. Prototypical animals, like the tapir or the sloth, turn out to be not fully human, as procreation remains impossible or becomes incestuous. Proto-animals are, as a consequence, transformed into contemporary animals, with their particular ways of living and relations to other beings at specific places in the forest assigned to them by the culture hero.

So the shared symbolic frame of fabrication (Santos-Granero, 2009) is at first glance defined by the culture hero's activities of constructing/making. Clearly, craftsmanship precedes childbearing. But does craftsmanship really provide the model for all creative acts? Are all differences between organism and artifact really erased, all biological processes fabricated? The sun-spider is weaving, filing, carving and cutting, but there is growing [-*ata-*] that does not rely on fabrication and the meaning of fabrication exceeds

common notions of craftsmanship. The culture hero is not only performing manual and technical skills but is weaving with words and thoughts, transforming with songs and making things happen by the means of spells. To fabricate obviously relies on the realization of thoughts, intentions and desires and implies processes of material, cognitive and social making. The culture hero possesses the power to make things happen through processes that encompass instrumental and interactive skills. To make things happen in a world where relations with non-human beings and various personalized aspects of the world are social relations may hardly be a process restricted to instrumental activities. It implies the knowledge and power to make things happen by thoughts and communication (singing and uttering words), and it implies the transformation of social relationships. God-father ensures the necessary distance by shooting with a bow and arrow, transforming Yukpa-like proto-animals into animals with different dwelling places and food habits and establishing intimate relationships by taking women and infusing human sentiment by tickling them and making them laugh. Fabrication therefore goes beyond technical skills and the formation of bodily differences, implies the weaving of ideas and thoughts through spiritual interventions, interactive communicative and technical instrumental activities. The latter are embedded in and part of the former. To fabricate in this broad sense extends beyond craftsmanship and is closely related to making something happen and to making something grow.

Beside the broad area of fabrication as making something happen and making something grow there is an area of autonomous growth. The Yukpa recognize impersonal and autopoietic, quasi biological forms of growth beside the broad field of fabrication. In fact, not only many plants, trees etc. grow out of themselves. The two central characters – the culture hero and the Yukpa – grow like plants [-*atá*-] and in the case of the Yukpa out of plants. Both sun-spider and the Yukpa already existed in another form before they finally left from their enclosure, their skin-cover *yusçh* and erected themselves.

To leave from an enclosure -*etoka*-, an egg-shell or a rind is an indication of being born, to appear and to leave and become visible -*eke*- in this world. To be perceived as appearing and rising, to erect oneself, to stand up is a sign that one is living. As mentioned above, while -*etoka*- expresses the perspective and action of the one who is leaving from the enclosure, from one place or state to the other, -*eke*- implies a relation and refers to the perspective of the observer.

These processes of life (being born, growing, fabricating and reproducing) are also implicating processes of degeneration, and finally of regeneration and transformation as a specific life process. If one's former enclosure, the *yusĉh*, the corpse, the dead wood, is no longer alive, *oshepa*, one has died or expired and left from it. At the same time one is born, become visible outside or in an other place.²⁹ The notions of being born, living or dying seem therefore strongly spatialized and positional among the Yukpa and only partially correspond with the beginning and end of the biological reproduction of a single individual organism. This spatialized meaning is also a relational one: one leaves from an enclosure and appears and later disappears for someone or in relation to a place. To live, *osesapa*, means being living or residing oneself in a place. Life in this sense is a continuing localized relational activity. Leaving from such a localized relational activity is a form of dying, appearing a form of coming into life or being born.

The notion of life has beside its spatialized nature a transformational and transpositional meaning. In its transformational sense, dying [leaving] from one place means coming to life [to appear] in another. One leaves one's enclosure but continues in another form or another place. The Yukpa are therefore set apart in a transformational and reproductive cycle of their own initiation. After death they go to the land of their ancestors, but will not transform into prey or animals (see Halbmayer, 2013a). They stay Yukpa as long they behave correctly, even if they change their form after dying and go from this world to the world of the dead. Nevertheless, the danger is articulated that by behaving incorrectly and committing incest for example, a transformation into animals may occur and the original unliveable conditions of *owaya tamoiya* may reappear.

The metamorphosis, the transitional period evoked by the picture of the cocoon is associated with the ability to leave or change one's skin during times of transformation after death or when becoming *atĥne*, a grown person in seclusion. While some beings, as Irapa myth exemplifies, such as snakes (*kiripo*, especially among them *yatama* and *owataku*), scorpions (*wasapu*), crickets (*kttrashu*) and cockroaches (*kishirap*) live forever because they have the ability to change their skin and rejuvenate, the Yukpa, who lack this ability to change their skin, die or leave forever and rejuvenate in the land of the dead (Halbmayer, 2013a). Changing the skin and continuing living in the same form at the same place as snakes or scorpions do therefore implies eternal life. Were such a continuity cannot be assured, sexual reproduction becomes necessary. Metamorphosis, the change of form and

place, implies only from a spatialized and relational view birth and death, the end and beginning of life. Viewed from the one undergoing the metamorphosis, there is however a continuity of existence across different forms of appearances and different worlds or dwelling places. That is why there are elaborated forms of life even after physical death. Life in this metamorphic sense has no absolute beginning or end, neither for individual persons nor for the world. But there are, as I have demonstrated, radical and significant transformations and changes in the conditions and forms of life that make life as we know it today possible.

If life goes beyond the life of an organism, and the life of an organism is part of larger cycles of transformation and metamorphosis, then usually only parts of such transformations may be observed. Even if not always or only partially observable, dying and being born are embedded in such a metamorphic logic among the Yukpa. Therefore, the beginning and the end of life become unclear as physical death, the leaving behind of an enclosure or the corpse is not social or spiritual death. That is why the notion of life may appear opaque and is verbalized among the Yukpa as appearing and disappearing, *-eke-*, to appear, to become visible, or *-eka-* to die, to expire or to fade. To live or to be dead then is not an essential condition of an organism but the partial and relational view embedded into overarching processes of transformation and metamorphosis. My analysis of Yukpa myth therefore supports the assumption that “we have to study life as a positional quality” (Praet, 2013: 93), however, as the example shows, this positional quality may not be captured by a simple binary opposition between life and death. It is associated with the coming into and out of the focus, expressed by the beginning and end of continuing localized relational activity. That is why the Yukpa, when someone had died, simply say, *me*, he has gone, gone to enjoy life in the land of the dead. But life in its metamorphical sense goes beyond this localized relational activity and includes different forms of existence in this and co-existing other worlds. The real and definite end of life, a second and final death occurs if these metamorphical and cyclical transformations will not take place or come to an end. God-spider would not have erected himself in this world, and the dead Yukpa who left their corpse in this world could not enjoy life in the land of dead. Such a notion of life goes beyond the autopoietic reproduction of physical organisms and is dependent on a double recreation. The recreation of continuing localized activity in the face of death through sexual reproduction and the recreation of continuing metaphomorphic transformations

across different worlds and forms of life. Such objectivations of life conceptualized and verbalized in myth and relevant for social praxis go beyond a pre-conceptual lived experience, generalized and theoretically condensed in phenomenological concepts such as life-lines or meshworks³⁰.

Endnotes

¹ A first version of this text was presented at the international workshop “Des êtres vivants et des artefacts. L'imbrication des processus vitaux et des processus techniques: Mésoamérique & Basses-Terres d'Amérique du Sud” at the Collège de France, Paris organized by Perig Pitrou and Laura Rival.

² Interestingly in current ontological approaches (Descola, 2005; Viveiros de Castro, 1998) the analysis of myth does not figure prominently. Myths, rather, serve as a generalized baseline for stressing the original unity of animals and humans and the highly transformative character of animist conceptions of the world. The ethnographic gaze of new animism and perspectivism therefore rarely focused on mythical texts, linguistic structures or the verbal arts of indigenous discourses. At the centre of attention was much more the perception of lived relational practice between humans and non-humans and not mythical discourses and their verbalized conceptualizations of the world.

³ For the debate on history and myth criticizing Claude Lévy-Strauss' distinction between cold and hot societies see (Hill 1988) as well as Peter Gow's (2001) more recent alternative position focusing on the history of myth developed from the final part of Claude Lévi-Strauss' *Mythologica*. For the incorporation of historical events into myth see also Guss (1981, 1989).

⁴ In the sense of the original Latin verb *concipere*, such conceptualizations are not necessarily concepts in the sense of a plan or design imprinted upon the world but forms of conceiving.

⁵ Although in a later paper he juxtaposed his constructional view of beinghood against a perspectival one (Santos-Granero, 2012), he did so without specifying the notion of fabrication

⁶ The classical definition of information by Gregory Bateson (1972).

⁷ This process refers to the construction of a house out of timber posts, different wooden sticks for the walls and the roof's skeleton, as well as palm leaves for the roof. As the palm leaves are woven in the process of thatching the walls, one may also refer to the process of building a house as to weave it.

⁸ As is for example “The One Who Makes Live” among the Mixe (Pitrou 2012, 2014).

⁹ God's mother, for example, is mentioned in the Iroka version. If all the proto-animals like the tapir or the sloth referred to in the myth were made by God or if he is only transforming them remains unclear. I got different answers in this respect. However it was never argued that God made his central and in several respects even more knowledgeable counterpart the carpintero *sakú'Chas* [íro] or *sakú'rare* [íra].

¹⁰ This version was told by José Manuel García. I am grateful to Wilson Largo for his support in the

oma pkaika yʉn yʉntunako kantk yʉn yʉntunako, kantkat, yʉn ntunako. Wenaye ʉhpʉt kantk natʉnankotk, natʉnankotk twāse tweshnako. Oʉh papsh tyos ywʉshnʉ kantka oʉh otoway twanta tweshnak. Peshatk oʉhna kasenop ywʉshnʉ.

²⁰ Incest implies the risk of a reverse transformation into *owaya tamoiya* and into animality (see Halbmayer, 2004b).

²¹ On the prominence and forms of adoption among the Yukpa see Halbmayer (2004c).

²² These song-spells are known in Guiana in different versions as *alemi, ademi, aremi, eremu* and *eremi* among different groups such as the Wayana, Yekuana, Waiwai, Waimiri-Atraori, Trio, Kariña, Pemón, Barama River Caribs, Akuriyo and Apalai. These songs and chants that are labeled invocations, incantations and magical songs, but also as tradition with rigid and exact texts (Civrieux, 1980: 16) in the literature. They are means for spiritual communication (Guss, 1986: 422; Magaña, 1986: 43), may influence the spirits (Civrieux, 1980: 16) or serve as curative or preventive medicine against illness (Arvelo-Jimenez, 1971: 209).

²³ But see footnote 24 for plants that have master spirits and are made grown.

²⁴ Some plants that have their own master spirits and are cultivated, like maize and sweet manioc, are made growing. The maize *uatpe* is even fed and nourished by putting hunted hummingbirds in the maize field. But there are also some important wild growing plants that have their own master spirits, like healing-plants or *puk*, the plant the material for weaving baskets or mats is made from.

²⁵ The *kiriya* tree species (guarumo, *cecropia sp.*) have in contrast to the *manʉʉbacha* tree a white milky, caustic and mucilaginous sap that turns black when exposed to the air. Many herbivores avoid these plants as most *Cecropia* are *myrmecophytes* (ant-plants), housing Azteca ants in hollow stems in a symbiotic relationship. These ants vigorously defend their hostplant against getting eaten and defend the tree especially against the Leafcutter Ants (*Atta sp.*), *kiavu*, which are considered symbolic enemies and also eaten by the Yukpa.

²⁶ *oy oʉhpʉt oʉh twʉntkatk saʉhp ytapnako, pena pʉhk kantk twansenak task epʉ ywontkʉ tʉt mashukash tweshnak twanse nak kantk key nensaʉhayna nyatemanakotk papsh ah, noʉh kach amóʉha, amóʉha, awʉ nʉshnʉ, amóʉha pʉhk epams manto nanape tak mena awʉ epaye pʉhk epams manto nanape amóʉh epams mant choʉh amóʉha pen matanato nʉkanakotk wateya na ʉhpʉt oʉha ʉhpʉt tk nʉkanako, amóʉha ʉhpʉt wateya pʉhk oʉh manto amóʉha nanape pʉhk awʉ epaye es manto tak men yukpe pa nay... nanape pʉhk es manto, awʉ epaye nʉkanakotk yʉna*

²⁷ To bury or stick for example a pole into a hole.

²⁸ Although they are possessed extensions of the person that made them.

²⁹ On the topic of death and regeneration see Bloch and Parry, 1982.

³⁰ see Ingold, 2011.

Bibliography

ÅRHEM, Kaj

1996 "The Cosmic Food Web: Human–Nature Relatedness in the Northwest Amazon". In DESCOLA, P. and PÁLSSON, G. (eds.), *Nature and Society. Anthropological Perspectives*. Londres and New-York, Routledge, pp. 185-204.

ARVELO-JIMÉNEZ, Nelly

1971. *Political Relations in a Tribal Society. A Study of Ye'cuana Indians*. Ithaca, tese, Cornell University.

BARANDIARÁN, Daniel de

1966 "El habitado entre los indios yekuana". *Antropológica*, Caracas, vol. 16, pp. 3-95.

BATESON, Gregory

1972. *Steps Toward an Ecology of Mind*. San Francisco, Chandler.

BLOCH, Maurice and PARRY, Jonathan P. (eds.)

1982. *Death and the Regeneration of Life*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BRABEC DE MORI, Bernd

2012 "About Magical Singing, Sonic Perspectives, Ambient Multinatures, and the Conscious Experience." *Indiana*, Berlin, vol. 29, pp. 73-101.

CIVRIEUX, Marc de

1980. *Watunna. An Orinoco Creation Cycle*. San Francisco, North Point Press.

COUPAYE, Ludovic

2013. *Growing Artefacts, Displaying Relationships: Yams, Art and Technology amongst the Nyamikum Abelam of Papua New Guinea*. Nova York, Berghahn.

DESCOLA, Philippe

2005. *Par-delà nature et culture*. Paris, Gallimard.

ERIKSON, Philippe

1987 “De l’apprivoisement a l’approvisionnement: chasse, alliance et familiarisation en Amazonie amérindienne”. *Techniques & Culture*, Paris, v. 9, pp. 105-140.

FAUSTO, Carlos

1999 “Of Enemies and Pets: Warfare and Shamanism in Amazonia”. *American Ethnologist*, Malden/ MA, v. 26, n. 4, pp. 933-956.

FORTIS, Paolo

2014 “Artefacts and Bodies among Kuna People from Panamá”. In HALLAM, E. and INGOLD, T. (eds), *Making and Growing: Anthropological Studies of Organisms and Artefacts*. Farnham, Ashgate Publishing Ltd., pp. 89-106.

GOW, Peter

2001. *An Amazonian Myth and its History*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

GUSS, David M.

1981 “Historical Incorporation among the Makiritare: from Legend to Myth”. *Journal of Latin American Lore*, Los Angeles, v. 7, n.1, pp. 23-35.

1986 “Keeping it Oral: a Yekuana Ethnology”, *American Ethnologist*, Malden/MA, vol. 13, n. 3, pp. 413-429.

1989. *To Weave and Sing: Art Symbol, and Narrative in the South American Rain Forest*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Londres, University of California Press.

HABERLAND, Wolfgang

1957 “Black-on-red Painted Ware and Associated Features in Intermediate Area”, *Ethnos*, Stockholm, vol. 22, n. 3-4, pp. 148-161.

HALBMAYER, Ernst

2004a "Timescapes and the Meaning of Landscape: Examples from the Yukpa". In HALBMAYER, E. e MADER, E. (eds), *Kultur, Raum, Landschaft: Die Bedeutung des Raumes in Zeiten der Globalität*. Frankfurt, Brandes & Apsel, pp. 136-154.

2004b "Elementary Distinctions in World-making among the Yukpa", *Anthropos*, St. Augustin, vol. 99, pp. 39-55.

2004c "'The One who Feeds Has the Rights': Adoption and the Relations of Kin, Affines and Enemies among the Yukpa and the Carib-speaking Indians". In BOWIE, F. (ed), *Cross-cultural Approaches to Adoption*. Londres, Routledge, pp. 145-164.

2010. *Kosmos und Kommunikation: Weltkonzeptionen in der südamerikanischen Sprachfamilie der Cariben*. Wien, Facultas Verlag.

2013a "Securing a Life for the Dead among the Yukpa: the Exhumation Ritual as a Temporary Synchronisation of Worlds", *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, Paris, vol. 99, n.1, pp. 105-140.

2013b "Mission, Food, and Commensality among the Yukpa: Indigenous Creolization and Emerging Complexities in Indigenous Modernities", *Tipiti: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America*, vol. 11, n. 1, pp. 65-86.

HALLAM, Elizabeth and INGOLD, Tim (eds.)

2014. *Making and Growing: Anthropological Studies of Organisms and Artefacts*. Farnham, Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

HILL, Jonathan (ed)

1988. *Rethinking History and Myth: Indigenous South American Perspectives on the Past*. Urbana, Chicago, University of Illinois Press.

HOOPEES, John W. and FONSECA, Oscar M.

2003 “Goldwork and Chibchan Identity: Endogenous Change and Diffuse Unity in the Isthmo-Colombian Area”. In QUILTER, J. e HOOPEES, J.W. (eds), *Gold and Power in Ancient Costa Rica, Panama, and Colombia*. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collections, pp. 49-89.

INGOLD, Tim

2000 “Making Things, Growing Plants, Raising Animals and Bringing up Children”. In INGOLD, T., *The perception of the environment*. Londres, Nova York, Routledge, pp. 77-88.

2011. *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. Londres, Routledge.

KARADIMAS, Dimitri

2003 “Dans le corps de mon ennemi: l’hôte parasité chez les insectes comme un modèle de reproduction chez les Miraña d’Amazonie colombienne”. In MOTTE-FLORAC, É. e THOMAS, J. M. C. (eds), *Les “insectes” dans la tradition orale*. Paris, Peeters: pp. 487-506.

2008 “La métamorphose de Yurupari: Flûtes, trompes et reproduction rituelle dans le nord-ouest amazonien”. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, Paris, vol. 94, n. 94-1, pp. 127-169.

KIRCHHOFF, Paul

1943 “Mesoamérica, sus límites geográficos, composición étnica y caracteres culturales”. *Acta Americana*, México D.F., Los Angeles, vol. 1, pp. 92-107.

KOHN, Eduardo

2007 “How Dogs Dream: Amazonian Natures and the Politics of Trans-species Engagement”. *American Ethnologist*, Malden/MA, v. 34, n.1, pp. 3-24.

2013 *How Forests Think: Toward an Anthropology Beyond the Human*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

LAGROU, Els

2012 “Perspectivismo, animismo y quimeras: una reflexión sobre el grafismo amerindio como técnica de alteración de la percepción”, *Mundo Amazonico*, vol. 3, pp. 17-42.

LEMONNIER, Pierre

2012. *Mundane Objects: Materiality and Non-verbal Communication*. Walnut Creek/CA, Left Coast Press.

MAGAÑA, Edmundo

1986. *Los Indios Wayana de Suriname*. Amsterdam, Cedla.

MALINOWSKI, Bronislaw

1948 [1926]. *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*. Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press.

PRAET, Istvan

2013. *Animism and the Question of Life*. Nova York, Routledge.

PITROU, Perig

2012 “Figuration des processus vitaux et co-activité dans la Sierra Mixe de Oaxaca (Mexique)”, *L’Homme*, Paris, vol. 202, n.2, pp. 77-111.

2014 “La vie, un objet pour l’anthropologie. Options méthodologiques et problèmes épistémologiques”, *L’Homme*, vol. 212, pp. 159-189.

2015 “Life as a Process of Making in Mixe Highlands (Oaxaca, Mexico): Towards a ‘General Pragmatics’ of Life”, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, London, vol. 21, n. 1, pp. 86–105.

SANTOS-GRANERO, Fernando

1998 “Writing History into the Landscape: Space, Myth, and Ritual in Contemporary Amazonia.” *American Ethnologist*, Malden/MA, vol. 25, n. 2, pp. 128-148.

2004 “Arawakan Sacred Landscapes: Emplaced Myths, Place Rituals, and the Production of Locality in Western Amazonia”. In HALBMAYER, E. and MADER, E. (eds.), *Kultur, Raum, Landschaft: Die Bedeutung des Raumes in Zeiten der Globalität*. Frankfurt, Brandes & Apsel, pp. 93-122.

2012 “Beinghood and People-making in Native Amazonia: a Constructional Approach with a Perspectival Coda”, *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, vol 2, n.1, pp.181-211.

SANTOS-GRANERO, Fernando (ed.)

2009. *The Occult Life of Things: Native Amazonian Theories of Materiality and Personhood*. Tucson, University of Arizona Press.

SEVERI, Carlo

2015. *The Chimera Principle. An Anthropology of Memory and Imagination*. Chicago, HAU Books.

TURNER, Terence S.

2009 “The Crisis of Late Structuralism. Perspectivism and Animism: Rethinking Culture, Nature, Spirit, and Bodiliness”. *Tipiti: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America*, vol. 7, n. 1, pp. 3-40.

UZENDOSKI, Michael A.

2012 “Beyond Orality: Textuality, Territoriality, and Ontology among Amazonian People.” *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, vol. 2, n.1, pp. 55-80.

UZENDOSKI, Michael et CALAPUCHA-TAPUY, Edith Felicia

2012. *The Ecology of the Spoken Word. Amazonian Storytelling and Shamanism among the Napo Runa.* Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

VELTHEM, Lúcia Hussak van

1992 “Das cobras e lagartas: a iconografia Wayana”. In VIDAL, L. (ed), *Grafismo indígena.* São Paulo, Studio Nobel/Fapesp/Edusp, pp. 53-66.

1998. *A pele de Tuluperê: uma etnografia dos trançados wayana.* Belém, Pará: PR/MCT/CNPq, Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi.

VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo

1998 “Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian Perspectivism”, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.)*, Londres, vol. 4, n. 3: 469-488.

2012 “Immanence and Fear: Stranger-events and Subjects in Amazonia”. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, vol. 2, pp. 27-43.

WILBERT, Johannes

1974. *Yukpa Folktales.* Los Angeles, University of California Press.

RESUMO: Este artigo aborda o sentido da vida entre os Yukpa tal como descrito e verbalizado em seus mitos de origem. Os mitos yukpa transmitem conhecimentos particularmente conceitualizados sobre os processos vitais, em parte concebidos como uma forma de arte que requer grande habilidade, e sobre as transformações que criam as condições e as formas da vida como a conhecemos. Ao focalizar os processos que criam a vida como ela é conhecida hoje, os processos vitais do crescimento, da fabricação e da reprodução são identificados e diferenciados. Argumenta-se que os processos vitais entre os Yukpa ultrapassam a reprodução biológica e autorreferenciada das diferentes espécies, e também as atividades instrumentais da fabricação. A vida é conceitualizada tanto uma atividade relacional espacializada e continuamente localizada, e como transformações metamórficas cíclicas. Da perspectiva localizada, que consiste em sair ou desaparecer de uma atividade relacional, estão as formas de morrer ou nascer. A vida nesse sentido metamórfico inclui a existência continuada em mundos coexistentes. Um fim definitivo da vida ocorrerá apenas se estas transformações metamórficas e cíclicas chegarem a um termo.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Yukpa; mitos de origem; processos-vitais; habilidade; fabricação; crescimento; reprodução; vida como uma atividade relacional localizada; vida como transformação metamórfica cíclica.