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Movements in C minor: Vocal Soundscapes in Eastern Amazonia (Araweté)

Guilherme Orlandini Heurich
University College London (UCL)
United Kingdom

Introduction

The Araweté are an indigenous group of around 550 people who live in eleven villages in Eastern Amazonia in the Brazilian State of Pará. They have been in contact with Brazilian government representatives since the late 1970s and most of them currently speak Portuguese, though they mostly communicate with each other in Araweté, a Tupi-Guarani language. There have been several changes in Araweté livelihood since sedentarization in the late 1970s, most of which relate to their adoption of a more riverine lifestyle. Once settled on the Ipixuna River – a small tributary of the Xingu – from the early 2000s onwards, the Araweté started developing relationships with non-indigenous riverine populations.

Although maize cultivation is still very important, the consumption of manioc flour has increased significantly in the past two decades, largely replacing, or at least accompanying, the consumption of maize flour in most meals. Another important development connected to this more riverine livelihood has occurred in Araweté people’s modes of transport, as they have adopted the building of canoes and piloting of outboard motor boats. Today, it is common to see young boys of ten to twelve years old take a group of elders hunting. These boys skillfully pilot the outboard engine-powered boat or canoe carrying the hunting party. In contrast, none of the elders know how to pilot a boat or even build a canoe. In short, in the course of one generation, the Araweté have gone from living inland and having little knowledge of river navigation to establishing several villages on one of the major Amazonian rivers, building their own dugout canoes, fixing engines, and piloting different-sized boats to their hunting and fishing areas, as well as to and from the city of Altamira.

The Araweté today suffer the impact of the Belo Monte Hydroelectric Dam – the third largest in the world – which has dramatically changed the flow of the Xingu river, its fish stocks, and life in the nearby city of Altamira, where the population has doubled in the past six years (Fearnside 2012; Heurich 2015; ISA 2015). I started my fieldwork with the Araweté right before the construction of the dam in 2011 and accompanied the development of their relationship with the builders, contractors and administrators. Even though most of my work has been on the Araweté’s songs, the extent to which such large-scale processes have impacted my understanding of their life is difficult for me to assess.

I decided to study Araweté songs because of their pervasiveness in daily life. Groups of men sing during maize beer festivals every few months, and “shamans” sing new songs every other day and capture spirits during the night to make them sing before killing them. In only one village, there were four active shamans, and all of them sang at least two or three times a week. This meant that almost every night it was possible to hear a shaman singing, and these songs lasted from 30 minutes to up to four hours. This is not the only instance when music can be heard, since these songs are repeated by women and children during the day, and are also reproduced through recordings made by the Araweté themselves.

1. The most recent official data is from 2014 and mentions 467 Araweté (Si- asi/SESAII 2014). Based on the available official population data, there was an increase of 45% in population in the nine years between 2005 and 2014. One can then roughly estimate a further increase of ~80 people in the last eight years since 2014, giving us a total of around 550.


3. Solano (2009: 402-4) describes Araweté as a nominative-accusative language that uses morphological strategies of both suffixation and prefixation to agglutinate, that relies heavily on co-referentiality, and whose predicates are nominal in nature.
This article analyzes the capture of forest spirits (Anĩ) through song by Araweté shamans. Before killing such spirits, Araweté ritual specialists vocalize them and reveal to whomever is listening what the Anĩ think about themselves, the Araweté, and also the Mai gods. These songs therefore reveal what the Anĩ say just before being killed; they give us their “last words” through song. The capture of the Anĩ provides us with a context in which to discuss recent approaches in the anthropology of Lowland South America such as “perspectivism” (Viveiros de Castro 1998; Lima 1999) and “animism” (Descola 2014), especially where these approaches have changed the way in which we think about language and music (Cesarino 2011; Déléage 2009; Kohn, 2013). I argue that we should combine linguistic and musicological approaches to understand Amerindian songs better, which in turn will give us a deeper understanding of ways in which humans and non-humans act as subjects in Amazonia.

Araweté music

Araweté music is primarily vocal with rare instrumentals. There is a focus on voice and on the ability of people to utter the voice of others. The most popular songs are the “music of the gods” (Mai marakã), in which shamans voice deceased Araweté who are in the process of becoming Mai, i.e., gods. After being devoured by these cannibal gods, the deceased are remade into new persons, whom the Mai marry. Eventually, then, through cannibalistic actions and affinal ties, the deceased become Mai. The Mai are hugely important in Araweté cosmology and, as Viveiros de Castro (1992) pointed out in his ethnography, they are complex characters, for even though the Araweté see them as cannibalistic enemies, becoming Mai is, at the same time, every person’s destiny.

The “music of the gods” has a polyphonic structure, in which several enunciative positions are put together in chains of citations. Every verse of the song is also framed by a refrain or chorus, which is repeated before the verse, after the verse, or both. These songs are constantly being produced by shamans who visit the Mai and bring the deceased to sing among the living. Each song can only be sung once and cannot be repeated by the same or another shaman. However, songs can be reproduced by other Araweté and by mechanical means such as recorders, which raise interesting questions regarding the relationship between body, memory, and reproduction (cf. Heurich 2018a, 2020).

Though the relationship that a shaman establishes with the Mai aims at bringing deceased kin from the Mai’s land to sing among the living, a shaman can also direct this relationship to the capture of certain beings called the Anĩ. The Anĩ are spirit-like beings who capture stranded Araweté when they are alone in the forest, and who also shoot arrows at the Araweté from the outskirts of the villages. They are responsible for a good many deaths amongst the Araweté, and shamans frequently set out at night to capture them. These captures are semi-public, spoken-sung performances called Anĩ píhi – literally, “capturing” (-píhi) the Anĩ. Just before killing the Anĩ, a shaman voices them, and in these brief moments we can hear what the Anĩ have to say and how/what the world is from their point of view.

There is, in these songs, a clear and sharp distinction between two moments or blocks that are repeated as a set several times. In the first block, a shaman voices the Anĩ, and in the second block, he voices the Mai. The Anĩ are voiced right after being captured and just before being killed, while the Mai gods sing after each spirit’s demise. The Anĩ’s speech (the first block) has a flexible melodic line, syllabic pattern, and a broad vocal range. The second block is the shaman’s utterance of the Mai’s chant-like words: it has a monotone voice that utters each syllable on a single note, the length of each line changes according to the semantic content, and, in some cases, the last syllable of a line is uttered at a higher pitch. In brief, these spoken songs combine a spoken block and a sung block, and through the empirical relationship between these two blocks one can also explore, in the capture of the Anĩ, the more abstract relationship between sound and language.
Sonic and linguistic perspectives

Although thinking about music through language and vice-versa can be traced as far back as the works of Franz Boas and his colleagues, it was perhaps the work of Murray Schafer (1977) on soundscapes and acoustic ecology that inspired a whole generation of anthropologists and ethnomusicologists to take up the idea of “doing anthropology in sound” (Brenneis and Feld 2004). Many research streams emerged out of this, but two of them are particularly relevant for the purpose of this article. Firstly, there is the idea that musicians “spend a great deal of time and productive social energy talking about music” (Feld et al. 2005) – this couldn’t be truer for the Araweté, who spend a lot of time listening to, talking about, and discussing what the Araweté singers sing. Interestingly, the singers themselves only ever talk about other singers’ songs, not about their own (Heurich 2018a). Perhaps of the biggest importance to this article, however, are the debates around an anthropology of the voice, in which “poetics meets performance” and “the singing voice produces a site where speech and song intertwine to produce timbral socialities” (Feld et al. 2005: 323, 341). It is in this empirical search for the “grain of the voice” (Barthes 2009), that we see the fundamentals of social life, but in the Amerindian context, one must always ask: who gets to be included in “social life”? What kinds of beings and what shapes of voices make up the social world?

The position, rather than the condition, of being a person (or being human) has been a central concern in recent ethnographies and theory of Lowland South America (Viveiros de Castro 1998; Lima 1996; Descola 2014). Several authors have posited that, judging by Amerindian understandings of what humans are capable of, the idea of “personhood” is not exclusive to humans. Rather, it is a condition shared by animals, divinities, plants, spirits, and also indigenous people themselves; that is, humanity is a position that various beings can access, beings that western metaphysics would label non-human (cf. Vilaça 2002, 2005; Viveiros de Castro 2014). In these contexts, humanity appears to be not what one is but a point of view that other beings, too, have access to, where “being human” is a cultural capacity shared by humans and non-humans.

Whatever possesses a soul is a subject, and whatever has a soul is capable of having a point of view. Amerindian souls, be they human or animal, are thus indexical categories, cosmological deictics whose analysis calls not so much for an animist psychology or substantialist ontology as for a theory of the sign or a perspectival pragmatics. (Viveiros de Castro 1998: 476)

In the past 20 years, the concept of Amerindian perspectivism (Viveiros de Castro 1998; Lima 1999) has influenced anthropological scholarship in Amazonia and elsewhere (Strathern 1999; Latour 2009; Holbraad and Pedersen 2017) and has received its fair share of criticism (Turner 2009; Ramos, 2012). Since perspectivism foregrounds the role of non-humans in social life – especially in ritual contexts – ethnomusicologists have picked up on this expanded notion of personhood to understand how sound shapes particular points of view (Bastos 2007; Tugny 2011; Brabec de Mori, Lewy and Garcia, 2015). Amerindian perspectivism contributed, for example, to rethinking the classic definition of music as “humanly organized sound” (Blacking 1973: 3) and suggest that any “musical scholarship excluding non-human animals cannot ultimately describe “how musical is man”” (Keller apud Brabec de Mori and Seeger 2013: 270-271). In other words, to understand how musical humanity is, we must include songs, sounds, and senses conveyed by beings such as gods, spirits, animals, and others. Furthermore, these scholars have also emphasized that Amerindian perspectivism is usually depicted as a visual problem – something that can be illustrated with the statement, “What a jaguar sees as maize beer, we see as blood” – and that very little attention has been paid to how sounds shape perspectives (cf. Seeger 2015). Although the notion of “point of view” as used by anthropologists in Amazonia is not restricted to the faculty of vision (cf. Viveiros de Castro 2007), I believe that an exploration of a “perspectivist soundscape”, so to speak, is
worth pursuing. Such a pursuit can be enriched by approaches that combine an attention to sounds, songs, speech, and language with detailed understandings of what constitutes the social world in each ethnographic context. For instance, Deisy Montardo (2009) shows that, for the Guarani, there is no music which is not connected to their relationship with divinities. Here, music, landscape, and cosmology are deeply intertwined. Together, they give us another perspective on what language means in this ethnographic context. Looking at the rhythm, the scales, and the genres of Guarani music through their thinking about their land and the beings that inhabit it, Montardo (2009: 151) reframes questions about language (ayvu), perhaps the most talked about concept in the literature. Drawing on Feld’s (1982) idea that Kaluli poetics derive from the language of the birds, Montardo highlights that the Guarani’s ayvu cannot be understood from a purely linguistic perspective. You need music, you need dance (Montardo 2009: 158). It is through this combined approach that you will find the path, the path to living together with the divinities once more – a crucial aspect of Guarani sociality.

My aim in this article is to attempt such an analysis by focusing on the shapes of sound in speech and the sound of words in song. In the Anĩ pihi, for example, the laughs and death cries that the Anĩ make, as well as the refrains that frame the verses of the Mai song, provide the material “grain” or “fiber” in this particular genre of Araweté vocal music. As such, the Anĩ pihi are unique in their combination of spoken and sung forms. They are spoken and sung, but they are neither entirely speech nor entirely song – and not entirely spoken songs or sung speeches. They are unique because they juxtapose spoken (ñe’e) and sung (niňa) blocks, but keep them separate, in one single event. The first block presents the Anĩ’s speech, and in the second block we hear the Mai singing. It is important to note here that it is the Araweté that make the distinction between “speaking” (-ñe’e) and “singing” (-niňa), and between who is heard in each block. In this sense, the Araweté’s Anĩ pihi seem like an ideal place to explore how particular sounds index the presence of others, thus allowing the reframing of the relationship between music and language in Amerindian vocal art.

Laughs and refrains

Anĩ are forest-dwelling spirits that approach Araweté villages at night, roam furtively around their houses, and hide behind banana trees, from where they shoot arrows and try to pierce the Araweté. The shaman sees, in his sleep, that the spirits are approaching and, on doing so, leaves his house to catch them with his rattle and with the help of the Mai. Moments before being killed, the captured Anĩ utters its final words through the shaman’s voice using intricate enunciations which contain embedded quotes with comments about the Araweté and others. The songs are structured in two different blocks, forming a set that is repeated many times over by the same shaman for every captured Anĩ, several of whom can be captured in one night. When this happens, you might hear, for instance, a shaman voice an Anĩ quoting its grandfather saying that the gods are armadillos.

One of the expressions that my Araweté interlocutors use to describe the Anĩ is “the ones who tickle us” (bide mojaro hã), who use their hands to make us laugh. The seeming lightness of this expression obscures the fact that these beings are also called “the ones who kill us” (bide jukä hã). The Araweté’s descriptions of the Anĩ thus encapsulate an ambiguity between the shared sense of intimacy conveyed by laughter and the disjunctive sense of alterity brought about by death. Laughter and death, however, are not just themes or ways of describing these spirits, for they are also sounds the Anĩ make when they are captured by the Araweté: these spirits laugh (or giggle) before and after every sentence they speak, and they give out death cries when killed by the shaman’s assistant. In its turn, the Mai-block – the bit that follows the speech and death of an Anĩ – is characterized by refrains that do not include laughter. The use of refrains is characteristic of any song in which the Mai are present. In contrast to the giggles and death cries of the Anĩ-block, the refrains set a melodic tone that frames the
rhythm of the song. Instead of the fast and irregular motion of the Anĩ-block, here we have a regular and constant movement that also gives a rhythm to the verses.

A quick look at spectrograms of these two blocks can give us an idea of how the lines in each block are framed.

8. The reader is strongly advised to listen to the audio files available for this article. The spectrograms are a three-dimensional analysis that includes the time (abscissa), frequency (ordinate), and the quantity of energy in decibel (color or thickness of the lines). I thank Estelle Amy de La Bretèque in providing these spectrograms for me. Any mistakes in the analysis are my own.

Extract from a song recorded by the author. 9 seconds.

In the figure above, there are six segments (A-F) divided by a purple line. Segment A is the Anĩ’s first laugh, which is followed by a short breath (B). In segment C, the Anĩ speaks, which is followed by another laugh (D), another short breath (E), and a soft, decaying tone (F). We can say that the Anĩ’s speech is demarcated by two short bursts of laughter, both in an intense bright red indicating loudness (decibels). These laughs have few harmonics and are in the same pitch as the main portion of the speech.

In comparison, figure 2 (below) shows us the Mai-block, and again there are six segments (A-F) divided by a purple line. Following an initial breath (A), the line of chant (B) is separated from the refrain (D-E) by another short breath (C). The refrain in segments D and E is at the same pitch as the line of chant in segment B.

8.

Audio Anĩ-block.

Audio Mai-block.
Extract from a song recorded by the author. 9 20 seconds.

Although the two images are the same size, figure 2 is at a different scale to present the different harmonics that the song produces. In the main segments – segment C in the Anĩ-block and segment B in the Maɨ-block – there are more echoes of the main frequency when the shaman is voicing the Maɨ than there are when he is voicing the Anĩ. In other words, the fundamental tone of the Maɨ’s singing provides more overtones than the Anĩ’s speech, in which only a few harmonics can be visualized.

Laughs and refrains do similar things here. They set the tone of what will be spoken by the Anĩ and sung by the Maɨ. They frame the lines of each block, but they also point to the voices being heard. In other words, these sounded frames, such as laughs and refrains, index the voices being heard. In short, laughs index the Anĩ and refrains index the Maɨ, thereby framing the words of these spirits and gods to the listener. Before one can even think about what the speeches and songs are saying, these frames set the tone of whose words we are about to hear.

The Anĩ-block

When a shaman goes out to capture the Anĩ, he roams through the entire village, passing between different houses to find them. The search occurs in silence and at a fast pace. While he walks, the shaman moves both his arms in a circular motion in front of him. In one of his hands he carries a rattle, which he uses to capture the Anĩ. It is only when he stops at a spot on the village boundary that he will voice them. One or two Anĩ are killed every time the shaman stops. To do this, the shaman stands and moves the rattle (which is held in his right hand) in a circle very quickly in front of him, while the left arm follows the same movement. This is the precise moment in which the Anĩ are captured. The shaman intercepts the spirits, and the gods hold them down until the shaman can throw them to the ground. The rhythm of the shaman’s rattle changes into a continuous sound, and its circular movement becomes a continuous, unidirectional arc towards the ground, at the end of which the rattle strikes the shaman’s left arm. With this movement, the red macaw feathers that adorn the rattle also move towards the ground and are stopped by the left arm, seemingly creating an invisible line towards a specific spot on the ground. This is the spot where the Anĩ now lies, and where the shaman’s helper strikes with his machete. The “shaman’s helper” is usually an older man who accompanies (or rather runs after) the shaman through the night. It is not an official position and requires no specific training.

The Anĩ are caught by surprise. They feel lost and ask for their bows and arrows.

Hehe Mi te ku heramuj c’e Hehe [laugh] Where could Grandpa be? [laugh]
Hehe Mi na ho itsi heramuj Hehe [laugh] Where is Grandpa really? [laugh]
Hehe Mi pu ku wi ha iku heramuj Hehe [laugh] “Where did they go,” says Grandpa
Hehe E’e rowi itsiiku heramuj Hehe [laugh] “There they are,” says Grandpa [laugh]
Hehe E’e irapā itsyiku heramuj Hehe [laugh] “There is the bow,” says Grandpa [laugh]
Hehe Miri ke te irapā me Hehe [laugh] Where is my bow? [laugh]
Hehe E’e heramuj jupe rowi itsi Hehe [laugh] Grandpa is over there again [laugh]
Hehe Maracañã nupe hete uka Hehe [laugh] And there is really a jaguar here [laugh]
Ah-hooo Ah-hoooo [death cry]
Heee...r-aaa...muuuj
Grrr...aaand...aaaaa
The Anĩ looks for its “grandfather” (-amuj), who in turn asks and answers the whereabouts of “someone” (wĩ), while searching for his bow. The Anĩ still can’t find its bow, while its grandfather is already after someone whom the Anĩ describes as a jaguar. At this point, it is still unclear what exactly the Anĩ are looking for and why they need their bows. It seems that they want to protect themselves from a nearby jaguar, which perhaps is a reference to the shaman and the Maɨ who have come to capture them. Only the speech of another Anĩ will clarify these lines, as the next example shows. Due to the length of some lines, I have presented this example first in Araweté and then in English, and not side by side as in the previous example.

hehe Nowĩ we oirapatsi dzihi
hehe Eru he o’i hereka’i hiná ku bide o’i tayahu rehe a’ino
hehe O’i raxi naxi imăₚăwe te ku he tejo’i mară a’ino
hehe Heramu’i nem’ä nere’ä iku wĩ
hehe Bide ru oirapatsi mară mară me we
hehe Tairuhu ye mi o’i hereka’i
hehe E’e te he irapä pihă ara ku he a’i

[laugh] Arrows are over there
[laugh] Bring many arrows, few arrows won’t do for peccaries
[laugh] I prepare my bow, arrows ready
[laugh] “Grandpa’s victim is there,” they say
[laugh] We ready our arrows
[laugh] Unlike children, with many arrows
[laugh] I brought arrows to use them in my bow

From this Anĩ’s point of view, this is a hunt. They’ve been surprised by pigs and quickly try to scramble for their weapons to hunt them down. After finding their bows, the Anĩ look for arrows, and these can’t be few arrows. Hunting peccaries (tayahu) can’t be done with “few arrows” (o’i hereka’i), for that is how children use their bows. O’i hereka’i is a poetic way of saying “few arrows”. The usual word for arrow is o’i, but this interesting poetic spin adds a diminutive suffix to a verb and not a noun, as is usually the case. Here, the act of bringing or carrying (-ereka) is what receives the suffix. The expression could thus be translated as a “small-bringing of arrows”. In sum, the Anĩ call each other to ready their bows and go after the wild pigs, but when reaching the pigs’ domain, they see their grandfather’s “victim” (-em’ã), i.e., the pig he just killed.

The hunt for peccaries is how the Anĩ see their relationship with the Araweté. They prey on them, make them victims of their weapons, and roast them for food. As I mentioned before, most deaths amongst the Araweté are Anĩ-related deaths, and several of my interlocutors talked about the huge roasting grill that the Anĩ use to prepare Araweté meat. Other Anĩ captured in the same night make further references to the hunting of the Araweté. They mention the muddy pits where peccaries spend their time, comment on the beauty of these pigs, and how their fatness would make them a good roast.

Eventually, what the Anĩ say starts to change. Instead of talking about the victims of their hunting parties, they start fearing and challenging the Maɨ. Unlike the predator-prey asymmetry through which the Anĩ conceptualize their relationship with the Araweté, they see themselves in a direct relationship with the Maɨ.

Here, the attitude has changed. The Anĩ need to stand up straight and stick together or they will “stink” (ide’a) later, i.e., they will become rotten corpses. They are cautious because the Maɨ don’t like seeing them and would not hesitate to kill them. The Anĩ’s grandfather, however, strikes a dissonant chord by saying that these “armadillos” (tatu) are “not people” (bide nà). According to my Araweté interlocutors, he is referring to the Maɨ and telling his “grandchildren” that the armadillo they see is not actually like them (i.e., a person, bide), and therefore it is permissible to kill it. In a different moment of the night, a different Anĩ mentions in its speech that “perhaps the Maɨ will be like armadillos,” again reinforcing the Anĩ’s desire for the gods to
become prey (i.e., armadillos) and not people like them (the Anĩ). It is as if the Anĩ try to use words to change what they see in front of them, or as if their reality is somewhat dubious and contestable. At the end of the excerpt above, the Anĩ mention that their grandfather shouldn’t say that, meaning that the Mai won’t like hearing that they are not people. The result is a sense of ambiguity, in which the Mai are both feared and laughed at by the Anĩ.

However, it seems that the grandfathers’ dissonant chord is not just a difference in opinion. They see the Mai as celestial beings just like the Araweté shamans see them. As several Araweté interlocutors explained to me, the Anĩ namuj – the grandfather Anĩ – are not just from a different generation, they are also ritual specialists similar to the Araweté shamans. As an Araweté interlocutor once told me, the Anĩ namuj can travel to the land of the Mai and bring them to sing and eat among the living Anĩ. However, since the Araweté shaman asks the Mai for help in capturing the Anĩ, and the Mai do provide that help, why would they also go to the Anĩ to sing to them and eat their meals? Why would the Mai play this “double-agent role,” in which, on the one hand, they let the masters of the Anĩ bring them to sing, and then, on the other hand, capture the Anĩ for the Araweté? What kind of creatures are the Mai?

The Mai-block

The Mai are the Araweté’s gods or divinities, who once lived with them but have abandoned the Araweté to live in a celestial abode (cf. Viveiros de Castro 1992). Araweté shamans develop a relationship with the Mai through the heavy use of tobacco, which transforms their bodies and makes them visible to the Mai. It is this relationship that enables them to bring the Mai to help in the capture of the Anĩ, which they do by surrounding the Anĩ from every side and allowing the shaman to encapsulate them in his rattle. Following the Anĩ’s execution, the shaman crouches and the Mai sing a short song. In this example, the right column is the song’s refrain. From my conversations with the Araweté, there is no clear translation for this specific refrain. This is also the case for most refrains.

- He jepe ahe moneme rewe a’i
dzidzi ti pipe
- Mai a ire ire ropi uja

dzidzi ti pipe
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

- Nhete monemeaho ujomopoipo’i uju
dzidzi ti pipe
- Nhete monemeaho ujomopoipo’i uju
dzidzi ti pipe
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

- He rehe katu pa pe no’i pue
dzidzi ti pipe
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

- Nhete monemeaho udzimonu’unu’u uju
dzidzi ti pipe
- Nupe monemeaho udzimonu’u de’ a noi
dzidzi ti pipe
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

I will come later with the great cotingas to the Mai’s house
dzidzi ti pipe
dzidzi ti pipe
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

Audio Mai-block.
There the great cotingas fly  
dzidzi ti pipe  
dzidzi ti pipe  
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

Are they talking to me?  
dzidzi ti pipe  
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

All these cotingas together  
dzidzi ti pipe  
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

All these cotingas here  
dzidzi ti pipe  
kadzite dzidzi ti pipe

The Mai describe the landscape of their territory, called Maipi. In this place, small cotinga birds (moneme) live in the canopies of immense trees that grow on both sides of a perfumed river. The birds are frequently called “cotinga feathers” (moneme aho rewe) in a pars pro toto figure of speech that designates the bird by its feathers and, at the same time, hints at the fact that the Mai – just like the Araweté – hunt these birds to make earrings. These items are hugely valued by the Araweté because they allow them to “become Mai” (odzimumuai), another expression of the Araweté’s continuous effort to connect with their divinities. Here, however, the cotinga birds are associated with the Anĩ, and the Mai comment, briefly, on the Anĩ’s activities and intentions by asking, “Are they talking to me?”

After another capture, they sing a long verse in which the cotinga motive takes up most of the lines, then suddenly mention the Anĩ again. The reference is unmistakable: “Look, she is saying build a large jurã,” the Mai sing.

Atete monemeoho rewe ro de’a  
See this great cotinga here

Atete monemeoho rewe ro de’a  
See this great cotinga here

Kapoiwahu rewe uju  
With the kapoiwã tree

Atete monemeoho rewe ro de’a  
See this great cotinga here

Nupa monemeoho rewe ojomopoïpoï uju  
Maybe this great cotinga will come flying

Kapoiwahu rehe te ku uju  
On the kapoiwã tree

Atete monemeoho rewe ro de’a  
See this great cotinga here

Kapoiwahu rehe te pa to  
On the kapoiwã tree, is it?

Ujumopoïpoï te monemeoho rewe uju  
This great cotinga will come flying

Kapoiwahu rehe uju  
On the kapoiwã tree

Ujumopoïpoï te monemeoho rewe uju  
This great cotinga will come flying

Kapoiwahu rehe uju te pa pue uju  
On the kapoiwã tree

Xane ku monemeoho rewe odzymunül uju  
See these cotingas are getting closer together

Xane ku hekapue jurãoho mujimují uka  
Look, she is saying build a large jurã

A jurã is a large wooden structure placed above a fire to roast and smoke game. The Araweté use it to smoke what they hunt, and, according to them, the Anĩ use it to roast the
meat of their victims. Since the Mai do not possess culinary skills – they eat their food raw or cook it in the sun – this line could refer to nothing else but the Anĩ’s jurã. The third and final reference to the Anĩ comes at the very end of this event, after seven Anĩ have already been captured, and thus the seventh time that the Mai sing. The Mai say, “See, I made your face rotten,” alluding to the destruction of several Anĩ throughout the night.

The Anĩ call the Araweté pigs and try to hunt them with their bows and arrows, and call the gods armadillos and think of roasting them. The gods ignore the Anĩ, mock their bonfires and surround them with their songs. Finally, the Araweté see the Anĩ as spirits who can be captured by the shaman’s rattle and killed with a machete. From each point of view, there is a different understanding of who is actually “people” (bìde) (i.e., who is human) and who is prey (i.e., pig, armadillo, spirit, etc.) that can be hunted down. A shaman’s utterance not only makes these relations visible but also points to the different worlds embedded in the quotes. Mai, Araweté, and Anĩ all have the ability to speak, but their words describe very different worlds. The Anĩ call the Araweté wild peccaries and the gods armadillos, and they see their relationship to the Araweté from a hunter’s point of view: humans and gods are game animals that can be hunted with bows and arrows. From the Araweté perspective, the Anĩ must be caught and killed as if they were at war; that is, as if they were all humans. As a result, what the Anĩ see as hunting, the Araweté perceive as warfare.

In contrast to the Anĩ’s speech, the Mai’s song follows one single motive. This motive depicts a heavenly landscape in which beautiful birds abound. The Mai never mention what they are doing, whereas the Anĩ describe all sorts of things: different actions and movements, different voices (such as the grandfather’s). Although the Mai don’t mention their own actions, they do refer constantly to the movements of a small bird, a cotinga, a bird that the Mai associate with the Anĩ. But even here, the Mai avoid a direct description of what is going on: it is only through the third person bounded pronoun (h-) and not by any direct mentioning of the Anĩ that this association is made. Masters of poetic indirection, the Mai hover over the scene, never directly referring to anything.

The Mai sing in a continuous monotone that creates a regular flow of words in which each syllable is sung on a single note. There is no difference between the lines in terms of vocal quality: the monotone is maintained throughout the Mai-block, whether the line refers to the god’s earrings (the “great cotingas”) or to the Anĩ. Here, we can see how the contrast between the sonic characteristics of the two blocks – fast-spoken laughs on the one hand and melodic refrains on the other – is also a contrast between the scene of a hunting party (in the Anĩ-block) and the landscape of small birds in the forest canopy (in the Mai-block).

These two blocks, however, are also different in terms of the linguistic mechanisms that they employ. If the Anĩ’s speech mainly uses direct speech citations, the Mai-block only mentions the speech of others as indirect comment or glossing.

/iku/ & /pue/

Araweté vocal music frequently uses reported speech, a characteristic that these songs share with daily conversational practices, and with the telling of mythical narratives and news from other villages (cf. Heurich, 2018b). This is quite clear in the Anĩ’s speech, where the direct speech marker /iku/ is used to quote another’s speech, as in the following example, seen in a previous section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bìde</th>
<th>źã</th>
<th>iku</th>
<th>he-r-amuj</th>
<th>tatu</th>
<th>re</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>said</td>
<td>-R-grandfather</td>
<td>armadillo</td>
<td>in.relation.to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Not people,” said my grandfather about armadillo.
This marker also makes it possible to place a citation inside another citation through its simple repetition, e.g., “‘not people’ iku heramuj iku wi”, or “‘not people’ said my grandpa, said they.” While the Anĩ use /iku/, the Mai use the particle /pue/ in order to mention what the Anĩ are saying. From a linguistic point of view, /iku/ is a marker that closes a quote and /pue/ is a reportative evidential particle that, in contrast to /iku/, may indicate indirect speech.13 If the Anĩ mention everyone – i.e., Maɨ, Anĩ and Anĩ namuj – through embedded citations, the Maɨ never quote the spirits’ speech directly.

Xane ku h-eka pue jurã-oho muji-muji u-ka
Look TOP 3-to.continue say grill-big to.make-to-make 3-to.continue
Look, she is saying build a large jurã.

The verb /pue/ is used here to report something that the Anĩ have said. The main action of the scene is the “making” (muji) of a large wooden grill to smoke and roast armadillo’s meat, and the sentence is in the third person.14 It seems clear that we are not dealing here with a direct speech sentence, but with some form of paraphrasing in which /pue/ is the reporting verb. In other words, the spoken block of the Anĩ pihí uses embedded citations to add voices to the shaman's uttering of the Anĩ's speech, but the shaman's voicing of the Mai’s song only briefly resorts to the voices of others, and, when it does, it uses a form of paraphrasing.

The relationship between utterance and alterity – such as the one exemplified by the Araweté /iku/ and /pue/ – is a major theme in the works of Mikhail Bakhtin and V. N. Vološinov. According to the former, language is inherently dialogical, suffused with alterity and characterized by a "fundamental heteroglossia" that prevents us from analyzing it as something solely univocal and closed: as is well known, Bakhtin (1981) insisted on the importance of the relationship between unity and multiplicity in the analysis of language. Vološinov (1973), who worked closely with Bakhtin,15 distinguishes between a linear style of reported speech in which the integrity of someone's discourse is kept and the identity of the utterer is played down, and a pictorial style in which that integrity is destroyed and the utterer may color someone else's discourse with his/her own opinions. Focusing mainly on Russian, German, and French, Vološinov emphasizes how indirect speech is rare in the medieval forms of these languages, and how it emerges in the nineteenth century along with a form of critical, individualistic style that “involves a severe debilitation of both the authoritarian and the rationalistic dogmatism of utterance” (1973: 121-122), eventually leading to “the dissolution of the authorial context” that characterizes the early twentieth-century form of relativistic individualism. On the same subject, Bakhtin wrote:

When someone else’s ideological discourse is internally persuasive for us and acknowledged by us, entirely different possibilities open up. Such discourse is of decisive significance in the evolution of an individual consciousness: consciousness awakens to independent ideological life precisely in a world of alien discourses surrounding it, and from which it cannot initially separate itself. (Bakhtin 1981: 345)

It seems rather difficult to equate the difference between the use of /iku/ and /pue/ in Araweté speech to the distinctions that Vološinov makes between linear and pictorial styles of reported speech. When we take a closer look at the Mai-block, we can see that it does not have one of the main characteristics of the pictorial style, which is the decomposition of authorial content. The use of /pue/ aims to say that the content of the Anĩ’s utterances is not

13. So far, linguists working with the Araweté language (Alves 2008; Silva 2009; Silva, Picanço & Rodrigues 2010; Solano 2009; Vieira & Leite 1998; Zorzetti 1998) have not addressed reported speech. My analysis of reported speech should be seen as preliminary.

14. The third person singular or plural distinction is derived from context in the Araweté language, which means that we could also translate this sentence as "they" or "he" instead of "she."

15. As is well known, there is a controversy about whether Bahktin or Vološinov is the author of Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. I have decided to keep them separate here because it seems to be the current consensus (cf. Brandist 2002).
shared by the Mai, and that the latter moreover despise the former, who are, in fact, unable to harm them. Bakhtin’s and Vološinov’s focus on the relationship between the development of indirect speech and the emergence of modern-day individualistic ideology prevents me from stating that the /pue/ form is a simple form of indirect reported speech. It seems to me that their analyses cannot be divorced from the particular notion of personhood that emerges from their writings, one where a conscious, creative writer is struggling to find her own voice (cf. Bakhtin 1981: 348). Even though /pue/ does not easily fit into the pictorial style, it is clear to me that /pue/ involves some sort of paraphrasing that is different from the most common form of reporting speech in the Araweté language, i.e., the /iku/.

But what happens when there is direct speech in citations, and, in particular, when the Anĩ are embedding several quotes? Can we say that these involve Vološinov’s linear style? The main question here is whether the Anĩ are maintaining the integrity of the discourse of those being quoted. While the Mai take their time to say what they please in a continuous monotonic utterance, the Anĩ produce a speech cascade – a word commonly used to describe embedded quotation. The Anĩ’s voice presents us with fast, almost incomprehensible speech in which it rushes to fit every possible word into a single line and embed several quotes in the process. The use of citations aims to distinguish different speech layers and maintain their differential integrity, while the Anĩ’s vocal quality – its speed and high pitch – makes it difficult for a listener (even an Araweté listener, according to them) to differentiate between the quotes. In this regard, linguistic shapes (quotes, for example) and sonic shapes seem to have similar effects: while speed muddles speech, citations combine multiple voices. While embedding citations creates ambiguity in another’s discourse, speaking fast makes it very difficult to distinguish them acoustically.

Amongst the Amazonian Quechua, the use of direct and indirect speech contributes to the creation of a “sonic masque” (masque sonore) that multiplies the identity of the utterer (Choquevilca-Gutierrez 2011). Through the use of reported speech, the Quechua singer becomes a half-human and half-spiritual being. As other scholars have argued (Sherzer 1981; Basso 2008), reported speech practices such as the embedding of citations work as a linguistic or poetic device that coils discourse within itself by the simple repetition of quotatives. It creates a “figurative paradox” in which discourse is contained within discourse, “the image of a duplicated voice, of a voice ‘which utters itself’, specifying the statute of its own performance” (Choquevilca-Gutierrez, 2011: 202 n.16). This effect is ritually achieved by exploring the synesthetic character of the sound of language, in which a referent’s sonic aspect is foregrounded, for example, through the use of ideophones. The use of sonic images thus replaces the use of an animal’s or spirit’s name and plays “a decisive role in the Quechua shamanistic discourse’s set up” (Choquevilca-Gutierrez 2011: 210).

In this regard, the use of reported speech in the Araweté’s Anĩ pihi is very similar to the use of laughs and refrains mentioned in a previous section. The use of sonic images such as these can be seen as a way of exploring something that reported speech also achieves, i.e., the creation of a sonic masque that makes the identity of the shaman/utterer ambiguous. The Anĩ call the Araweté pigs, talk fast, and embed quotes in a cascade of words that conveys meaning through direct speech and vocal amplitude. This suggests that referents are juxtaposed in several layers in the spirits’ speech, and that a single utterance may contain several embedded points of view.

Furthermore, the multiplicity of points of view (or worlds, as I would like to call them) can be strengthened by looking more closely at the auditory domain. Different relations made visible by embedding citations are also made audible through the specific use of voice: the use of a fast and high-pitched voice by the shaman leaves us with no doubt that it is the Anĩ’s voice which is heard, the voice of those who call us pigs and desire to kill us. Moreover, the voice provides an acoustic context in which these different perspectives may resound.
Movements in C minor

Multitudes of Anĩ roam furtively around Araweté villages. They are the ones who kill us, and as such should be swiftly dealt with. Araweté ritual specialists set out to capture and kill them during the darkest hours of the night. In order to do so, the specialists ally themselves with the Maɨ, the gods. The act of capturing the Anĩ thus foregrounds a deadly reciprocity, so to speak: the possibility of occupying both the predator and the prey side of the equation. It is even possible to “hear” the shifts between the deadly perspectives in the capture of the Anĩ. We hear the Anĩ laughing; we hear the Maɨ singing. We hear the differences in speech and pace in each block, shifts which are movements in a context of capture in a minor key, or movements in C(apture) minor.

The capture of the Anĩ presents us with an interplay that is, from the start, grounded in particular shapes of sounds: the fast-spoken laughs of the Anĩ and the melodic refrain of the Maɨ. Looking more closely at what Anĩ and Maɨ are saying, another perspective, a linguistic one, emerges. With its use of abundant embedded citations, the Anĩ block introduces a polyphonic discourse that foregrounds the speech of other Anĩ. They talk about pigs, armadillos, enemies, and gods in a citational multiplication that is almost impossible to understand. Who, in the end, are the “people” (bíde)?

The Maɨ, however, focus on the vocal painting of a forested landscape. A landscape of birds and smells very familiar to the Araweté, refrains that they are used to, and only few references to another’s point of view. A melodic tone that eases the embedding of citations and merges them in a specific point of view. It is still the point of view of the Maɨ, of course, but it is one with which the Araweté identify.

The shaman’s utterance of the Anĩ pihi voices the words of the Anĩ and the songs of the Maɨ. It contrasts sounds such as laughs and refrains to index each voice’s difference and specificity. The material aspects of each sound affect the way in which another’s voice is reported within each block. Not that a particular sonic shape such as a laugh determines the use of embedded citations, but the two blocks do operate by systematic contrast: Anĩ and Maɨ, spoken and sung, fast and slow, laughs and refrains, direct speech and paraphrasing.

If perspectivism entails a “perspectival pragmatics” (Viveiros de Castro 1998: 476), the performance of the Anĩ pihi shows that a combined approach to music and language can further our understanding of how sounds and forms of reported speech can work as contrasts to expand multiple points of view. It might not be enough to dissolve the opposition between music and language, but a joint analysis will be an important step towards it.
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