



CHAPTER 12

ARCHAEOLOGY AND IDENTITY: THE CASE OF THE GUAMBIANOS

Luis Guillermo Vasco

Translated from the Spanish by Cristóbal Gnecco

The Guambianos are indigenous peoples who dwell in the highlands of the Cordillera Central in southwestern Colombia. They call themselves Namuy Misak, “our people,” or speakers of the Wam language, “our language,” initially classified as Chibcha but currently unclassified. Spanish conquest and domination fractured Guambiano society in several *parcialidades*, a division that still lingers in the communities of Guambía, Quizgó, Totoro, Ambaló, La María, San Vicente, and others of smaller size. In this chapter I will only refer to Guambía. For their subsistence they depend almost exclusively on agricultural production, both for local consumption and for the markets: potato, onion, *ulluco* (a highland tuber), lima beans, corn, garlic, and wheat, plus domestic animals such as guinea pigs, chicken, horses, pigs, sheep, and cattle. They buy foodstuffs, cloth, and other consumer goods in the local markets. A few Guambianos work as teachers, government clerks, carpenters, shoemakers, or have transportation vehicles. Some old production processes are still retained, especially those regarding cloth making. Women weave wool on four-log vertical looms of pre-Columbian origin, making their skirt-like *anacos* and the ponchos used by their men. Smaller, forked looms are used for weaving *chumbes*,¹ with which *anacos* are tied to the waist and children are secured when carried on the back. A few men still make rounded hats, *tambalkuari*, made with a long band woven with vegetal fiber.

Guambiano territory, measuring 20,000 ha, is recognized by Colombian law as a *resguardo*,² communal land that cannot be sold

This chapter was originally published as “Arqueología e identidad: el caso guambiano” in *Arqueología en América Latina hoy*, edited by Gustavo Politis, pp. 176–191 (Fondo de Promoción de la Cultura, Bogotá, 1992). Translated and reprinted by permission of the publisher.

or given away and is allotted by the *cabildo*³ to the members of the community. A large part of their best land, especially that suitable for corn and wheat, had been taken away by landlords gradually since colonial times and converted to cattle farming. The workforce was recruited among Guambianos themselves through sharecropping—in “exchange” for small plots and poor housing, they had to perform free work for the landlords a number of days every month. Sharecroppers were outside communal life and beyond the authority of the *cabildo*. A severe land scarcity determined the current settlement pattern. Most people cluster in a few narrow valleys along the main rivers (Piendamó, Cacique, Michambe, and Juanambú), although many have *trabajaderos* (work places) in the highlands further up or farther away from their dwellings, where they stay for variable periods devoted to agriculture. Cold, rain, and strong winds are good reasons the Guambianos have for avoiding steeper hills or mountain ridges. Land scarcity, the need to diversify agricultural products, and the influence of the values of the national society have resulted in the division of extant communal lands in minute plots; very little land is allotted to each family and it is normally located in several places, both inside and outside the *resguardo*. Thus, many Guambianos were forced to emigrate, but conserve social ties with those left in the *resguardos*; they are still considered part of the community and participate in exchange networks of goods, work, and marriage.

Despite the long-time strong pressure from landlords, politicians (basically from the two traditional Colombian parties, Liberals and Conservative), priests, and white teachers, Guambianos preserve an identity based on their own thought, language, beliefs, cloth, family organization, communal works, kinship system, authority, and territory; however, these aspects and their own identity have been diversely affected, shattered, and weakened as a result of domination. Since 1980, the almost 17,000 members of Guambiano society started a fight for “recuperating everything,” from authority and territory to language, education, thought, history, and autonomy. In this fight the need to rediscover and strengthen their identity plays a central role.

As victims of negation and deculturation for almost 500 years, many things have been lost, others are “hidden” or only remain in the memory of the elders, while the younger people decry them, ashamed. But now the leaders and many members of the community are willing to uncover those things, retrace the steps of the forebears, and become themselves again. Only so, they reason, will they be able to resolve the complex and difficult current problems without recurring to outside people and without compromising their identity. But, how to proceed? Let the Guambianos speak for themselves:⁴

“In the old times, before Columbus, we Guambianos had everything to live: our territory, our authority, our economy, our organization, our customs, our thoughts, everything our own.”

“When the whites came many changes happened and are still happening; those changes were leaving Guambiano society as if empty, not really empty but silent.”

“The invader cut the tree, our tree, and left a single trunk. And we Guambianos ask how the rest was.”

“In 1980 we started to recover our own things: our *cabildo* and our lands. And the question about how was the rest of the tree was became important because we now want to recover everything, our whole life.”

“We want to know how are the roots and the branches to let it be know to the *cabildo*, to the people, to the kids. We must follow the steps of the forebears.”

“Archaeology must excavate from the trunk downward, looking for the roots. We did archaeology; we are currently doing it. And we have found some things. We have come to know something. And we have gained some clues.”

“In order to follow those clues, in order to interpret what we are finding, we found it necessary to talk to the elders, because in their heads rests the knowledge of Guambiano history and our own thought is preserved. We did studies of oral tradition.” (Script of the House and Museum of Guambiano Culture)

Thus, Guambianos want archaeology to uncover the objects of the forebears, their material remains, their traces. In doing this job they have been discovering that things do not speak by themselves, that the objects recovered during excavation are mute by themselves, and that it is necessary to make them speak so they can utter the words. In this regard two discourses are heard: one is that of archaeologists and ethnohistorians, which Guambianos take in consideration but which does not satisfy them; the other one is that of the elders, who talk about what they know but which is not enough in the current conditions. Thus, it was necessary to find the words jointly, confronting both discourses: “We had to confront the stories (of the elders) with the histories that come from the papers.”

The Guambianos summoned archaeologists Martha Urdaneta and Sofia Botero, with whom they shared their problems. Guambianos know by oral tradition that they belong there, that these lands have been their own forever although they were invaded for centuries by white landlords. But whites despise these arguments and maintain that the Guambianos

were brought from Peru and Ecuador by Spanish conquistadors as *yanaconas*, “service Indians.” To face the white’s word, Guambianos want archaeology, also a white’s word and thus authority and power, to show with white’s arguments their continuity in these lands “well before Columbus.”

In order to live now and to recover their identity they need to find roots, history, memories, and the words of the past for walking along them toward the future, following the steps of the ancestors. In Guambiano thought the past is ahead and the future behind. Thus, the history that is being currently lived needs to travel the road opened by the forebears with their steps, the traces they left; only so will it be a true Guambiano history. Many of these things are “hidden,” and those that are remembered or remain have no arguments of authority any longer before many members of Guambiano society, greatly influenced by teachers, priests, and other agents of Colombian society. The hidden has to be uncovered, excavated, and presented with arguments of authority and power in order to allow recovery, to allow the Guambianos to walk again “following the thoughts and steps of the Guambiano *taitas*.”⁵

At the beginning of the archaeological collaborative research between scholars and the community, the *cabildo* appointed 15 Guambianos to “accompany” (*linchap*) us, so three of them could work every day; but dozens of men, women, and especially children have participated, coming to the roads to give us bags with sherds from all over the *resguardo* or telling stories about the “steps of the ancestors.” We have discussed with the *cabildo* when and where to dig and how to preserve the sites from agricultural activities while archaeological research lasts. The *cabildo* has obtained from land holders the permissions needed to carry out excavations, some of them in the middle of planted fields.

Numerous terraces are found throughout the *resguardo*, most of them likely for dwellings. Two main types can be defined: (1) isolated and placed at the bottom of hills and on top of small elevations in flat lands (according to Guambianos this type is the most recent and may belong to the houses of sharecroppers and commoners), and (2) clustered and located on high hills and along mountain ridges above 3000 m. More than 350 terraces of this type have been found and seem to be the oldest since they do not accord to the Guambiano settlement pattern, as “nobody would live that up high because the wind would tear off the roofs of the houses.”

The ridges of some mountains are cut by large parallel ditches, called “snake trails” by Guambianos. James Ford (1944) found similar ditches to the north, in Jambaló, and thought they were made for defensive purposes; yet, the very nature of these traces renders that explanation unlikely.

Few tombs, both isolated and clustered, have been excavated so far in order to avoid possible suspicion by commoners about easy gain and because Guambianos consider that bones and burial goods are dangerous and can cause disease and even death upon entering in contact with them. Many say that those remains do not belong to Guambianos but to *pishau*, about whom there is no agreement whether they are their ancestors or not (an elder, for instance, thinks that the *pishau* were *kallimachik*, ancient Nasa.)⁶

Participation of Guambianos in the research group has posed methodological and operational problems. Their solution demands confronting their points of view and those of archaeology, their way of doing things and that of archaeology; yet, they are also a source of enrichment on how to plan objectives, ask the pertinent questions, and carry out the survey, excavation, laboratory work, and interpretation. During the two field seasons completed so far, there have been obvious difficulties with the Guambianos “accompanying” excavations because “the levelings of the ancients have too much force and can make us sick.” But once in the task, we all decide how to proceed. For instance, during excavation “the basic horizontal control was done just by 1 x 1 m units, because doing such a control inside the units themselves was not popular among Guambianos,” who argued that materials roll down the slope, roots and worms bring together what was formerly separated, digging tools separate what was formerly together, and, at the end, everything is mixed up. What is horizontal control needed for, then? Thus “it was not possible to avoid that, often, little mountains of sherds were created inside the units.”

Discussions about stratigraphic control were and still are endless. What is the meaning of 30 cm of archaeological material on house floors? continuous occupation of people who did not sweep? several occupations? if so, how to define the limit between them? what happens if the house was expanded, remodeled, or torn down to be rebuilt in the same spot? When work stops due to these discussions we resort to the elders and traditional wise men to bring the work back and keep going ahead. For instance, the *moropik* think that “the large butterflies forced people to abandon the terraces... The butterfly was the spirit of the dead and with that spirit (*tror*) the medicine man said that no one could live there and the place had to be abandoned... because the house did not burn but rotted. [It collapsed and] this increased the deposit 10 cm”; this is a more plausible hypothesis than that of people not sweeping, burying themselves in their own dirt.

At the beginning, the decision about when to stop an excavation was hard to make. Sometimes it was necessary to decide, somewhat arbitrarily, to stop at a certain depth after levels containing material culture.

At some point we established that there was no cultural material in the brown yellowish stratum (the D stratum of an “ideal” profile) nor below it; we called excavations to a halt when we found such a stratum, although if doubts remained we dug around to make sure.

What should be done when community members come to “accompany” for the first time? Some times the entire excavation area was flooded by people willing to participate in the dig, so we had to introduce certain order, explanations, and orientations, about which even the Guambiano members of the team were not convinced. But, we are dealing with them themselves, with their own history.

During the first season Guambiano specialists in house building and wood differentiated between holes made by larvae, those resulting from the burial of umbilical cords (normally made near the hearth), and possible postholes. When the latter was identified “the work was closed for the Guambianos”; one of them said, “Now this has to start having meaning,” an expression of Guambiano vision conveying that everything begins in the house and, within this, in the kitchen. Even the territory develops in concentric circles with the house at its center; thus, it is an expansion of the house as much as the community is an expansion of the domestic group. The Guambianos say that their territory, the *nupirau*, is a large house where a single and large family dwells, the Guambiano family. When a house floor was identified, it was a starting point to unfolding the knowledge of the totality. In the lab the dialogue is continuous because, among other things, according to the purpose the Guambianos attribute to the work we do, “the labor of sorting out ceramic material is thought of as a medium and not as an end... It is a matter of defining criteria for a classification that helps to reflect about socioeconomic organization, technology, relationships with other people, etc.”

That is why “the idea is not to classify just for the sake of classification but to search for pottery elements that can reflect central aspects of the society whose remains, seen through factors external to pottery itself, can start speaking about the live systems behind classifications.” Archaeological categories, based on paste, decoration, tempers, and forms are confronted with those of the Guambianos, preexistent in the memories of the elders and basically based on function, with form and size playing a secondary role: pots for cooking during the *mingas*,⁷ pots for domestic cooking, pots for carrying and storing water, pots for preparing medicines, pots for fermenting the *chicha*, dishes for eating, skillets for roasting corn tortillas, and the like.

For the Guambianos paste differences, central to most classifications, mean that the clay comes from various sources, generally not rich and so prone to exhaustion, and, therefore, a change of sources within the

same area. Paste differences can also mean provenience from several sources with different clays, all in the same temporal plane. The same behavior could be indicative of changes in temporal succession, preferred materials for certain pots, differences between potters, or trade. From the beginning the Guambianos argued that the most elaborate and decorated pottery belonged to the ancients and the less elaborate to the most recent inhabitants; these criteria can also be found among other Colombian native societies, such as the Embera-Chami of the Garrapatas River in the Cauca Valley, and was found to hold true in Guambía as the research went on. In the general analysis done by the Guambianos, however, “time seems to dissolve because the material was placed in a single temporal plane,” just as it happens in their historical thought, in which time is compressed until becoming “flat.” Archaeology has to reestablish, using its sequences and dates, the temporal depth necessary to face the arguments of the whites.

A central issue for the Guambiano members of the research team, both during excavation and the analysis of the cultural material, was the idea that the remains we were dealing with were their own, were “traces of the old Guambianos.” This represents a rupture with the previously held idea—widely shared by the Guambianos and popularized by the whites as a mechanism for severing their historical continuity, depriving them of their past and the consciousness surrounding it—that the remains belong to *pijaos* or *pisbau*, which were strange and enemy people. Thus, the development of the research under this idea created the bases for reestablishing the continuity of Guambiano history.

But, what to do when using the results to achieve the expectations Guambianos have regarding archaeology? The date obtained in the first excavation, AD 1620 \pm 50 years, affirmed the presence of Guambianos during that time in Santiago, one of the former farms recovered some years ago, a presence testified by Spanish chroniclers and by archive documents found through ethnohistorical research, especially the visit by Tomás López (see Calero 1997:62–64). Besides, the beginning of the work allowed us to define whatever “Guambiano” there was in the pottery.

According to the Guambianos, the paste comes from five different sources: (1) a paste with white dots, (2) a paste with red dots, (3) a paste with quartz, (4) a black paste with mica, and (5) a paste with a lot of mica. Pinpointing the sources appeared, then, as a must; this process is just beginning. But based on traditional archaeological criteria such as paste (color, hardness, texture, porosity, surface color, finishing, manufacture technique, decoration), the pottery recovered during the first season (9,098 sherds) was organized in seven basic groups. The second field season forced us to add a new group and to make small modifications in the definition of the initial groups.

Group 1 contains 70.7% of the material and Group 3 contains 19.5%; these groups are similar and their differences may be due to clay sources, firing, or use. This fact points to the hypothesis that they were produced and used by the same people, and that the pottery in other groups belong to other people and was “imported.” The Guambianos sorted out pottery function according to sherd thickness, size, and curvature in the following manner:

1. Single function, such as flat *cayanas* (of three kinds: for tortillas, for roasting corn, and for frying), large bowls for *mingas*, medicinal pots, water-carrying pots, and pots for fermenting corn beer.
2. Multiple functions, such as large-size pots for cooking during *mingas*, medium-size pots for domestic use, small size for cooking for two or three people, and extra small size for the use of one person, and bowls for eating (medium, small, and extra small).
3. Other objects, such as bases for supporting pots over the fire, figurines, and “candlesticks.”

This classification, however, leaves out most of the pottery, particularly small fragments. From the point of view of traditional archaeological classification, Guambiano pottery does not present radical discontinuities, except in form and decoration, through which to follow a developmental sequence established by dated sites; on the contrary, it is markedly homogenous. Thus, the classification just presented was adjusted to include seven formal categories using both the criteria of archaeologists and those of the Guambianos, although function was not worked out enough because it was considered that it was “too premature” to do it:

1. Globular or semi-globular pots of rounded or bell-shaped base and everted rims, some of which have traces of red paint as well as incised and imprinted decoration. This group accounts for 51.8% of the material.
2. Pots similar to the former but with everted rims. This difference has been established because, according to the Guambianos, these pots are smaller and handled by the rim. Some have imprinted decoration toward the rim. This group accounts for 5.1% of all the pottery.
3. Globular or sub-globular pots with neck and straight or semi-straight rim. About half of them have imprinted, painted, or incised decoration. This group accounts for 11.2% of the pottery.
4. Narrow-mouth pots (n = 7). Three of these have imprinted decoration toward the rim.
5. Bowls with straight-everted rims. Some have painted, printed, and/or incised and incised-applied decoration. This group accounts for 18.8% of the material.
6. Bowls with straight-inverted rim. Some have painted or imprinted decoration. This group accounts for 6% of the material.
7. One fragment of an everted rim bowl.

There are also 41 pot bases (most of them bell-shaped; others are leg-shaped), circular, flat, or conical spindle whirled, rollers, handles, and a few figurines. Fragments belonging to pots account for 68.9% of the sample and bowl fragments 24.9%.

The oldest pottery is similar to that of the Clásico Regional (Duque 1963) or Isnos (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1975) from San Agustín, a nearby region. Some sherds decorated with imprints and incisions resemble the “incised-pointed A” type defined by Julio César Cubillos (1959) in the Morro de Tulcán, in Popayán, while the imprinted sherds are similar to the “deep-incised” type defined by Cubillos for the Morro de Tulcán, Pubenza, and Tinajas phase (1984). The more recent material has traits in common with pottery found by Cháves and Puerta (1985) in Tierradentro.

Further research has given depth to the human occupation of Guambiano territory, taking it back to several centuries before the Spanish conquest in La Campana and Ñimbe, above an altitude 3,200 m. Those evidences date to before the Christian era, although it is still not possible from archaeological evidence to affirm if this oldest occupation was Guambiano; yet oral tradition has it that way. In this form the sense of “we belong here” has been confirmed and is strongly supported by Guambianos; even more, the Derecho Mayor⁸ has been endorsed from the point of view of the whites and has become the base for the fight to recover the territories they claim as being legitimate Americans, the first inhabitants of these lands.

But, what to do with archaeologically derived materials and data in order to make them speak to the community? “We also found that the members of the community keep materials of times past: archaeological, from burials and excavations, and ethnographic, used by the elders and even currently by some people. They were eager to donate these traces to the *cabildo*.”

“Thus, the idea of this museum arose out of the necessity to preserve the results of our work and for them to speak to the community.”

“But we do not want a museum like the ones the white people have in the cities— mute museums that are good only to show the works of the tribes—because in the hands of the whites the things of the Indians cannot speak; they are silent.”

“On the contrary, in our own hands these objects talk because they are not separated from their people and history. At first glance they look mute but upon discussing they talk a lot; even a tiny thing has a lot reasons to speak up.”

“We want to know the past, not just for the sake of knowledge but for tracing the road ahead.”

“In the time of the ancients and during the time of the chiefdoms there was a word, a very important one: ‘very pretty sunset, very pretty dawn.’

That was the word. It indicated to all of us the management, the unity, the community.”

“In the fourth generation the custom of parents advising their children was terminated. The word we have spoken became silent.”

“With the fifth generation our things are dimming, our thinking is terminating. In the sixth generation things are even worse. Some have produced eight generations and in them everything has been finished. The unity of the people is over.”

“That is why this museum must talk, must lift up this silence, must address the governor, the body of the *cabildo* Guambiano, the people, and the children, must transmit to the people what is to be done tomorrow and bring to all *veredas*⁹ the words of the ancients.”

“With the museum we want to show that all the pottery and all the traces found in our territory are our own and not of other people, that the *pishau* are our ancestors and not strange people. Thus we were born right here, in these lands and waters; we have not been brought from elsewhere, neither are we *venideros*¹⁰ from other worlds. This is our home.”

“We also want to show that the Guambiano people has traveled a long road, and that during that time these hearths were used, as much as these beds, these pots, these things that are in the roots.”

“And we want the museum to be the base for recovering our own education. The ancients were able to resist outrages because they had their own education; that is the basis of the community.”

“Because we strive for the right, we want to create a country of laws based on our beliefs; not for creating laws between Guambianos but in order that our rights are recognized. Such is the purpose of our work.”

“To teach our children, to establish an organization, to maintain a multiplication.”

“Our own education started in the house, the family, and from there it was amplified to the global. From the kitchen (*nakchak*), with the family reunited around the hearth, flows the management of a community. And from there another thread starts: the respect for love. It is passed on to the new life and to multiplication, entering the living room (*wallikato*) and the *pishiya* (a small room, separated from the house, where the valuables are kept).”

“This museum is a house from where to nurture the *cabildo* and the people.”

“During the time of the chiefdoms this land was global, it was a territory, it was the house of the Namuy Misak, our people.”

“The house is the family itself; it gives life and management, and it also multiplies itself until reaching a territory. From there flows the whole unity of its people.”

“That is why we want the museum to be a house that gives life with its kitchen, its room, and its *pishiya*.”

“*Nak* is the fire; *pem* is for cooking many things, not just meals. *Chak* is the place of the fire, is the work of the organism, is the function of how to live.”

“The *wallikato* contains many things in the global sense of the community.”

“The *pishiya* is for storing the valuables that cannot get lost and that must be kept; it also keeps an eye on the behavior of fiancés in order to give advice.”

“This museum is not only for showing things. The objects, once on display, look silent. To make them speak we have to find their words with the community elders, we have to investigate our past. When we recover the words these things will speak out and will be silent no longer. In this way teachings could be delivered.”

In order to “find the words,” Guambianos began researching oral tradition with elders and traditional wise men. I was invited by the *cabildo* to “accompany” this research and to work with the community’s History Committee; they expected that my word as anthropologist, together with that of the elders, would produce new words, based on tradition but adequate for the new living conditions. The ethnographic, archaeological, and ethnohistorical words must “accompany” those of the community to talk to the people, to recover the voice, and to break the silence. Thus, it is spoken about the kitchen, the heart of the house, and the society:

“In the kitchen lies the fire, like a mother to us because it gives us meals and heat. It is the cradle of the youngsters who live with their parents before finding a mate.”

“From it arises the management of the community. From it the thread of respect for love is taken. That is why we say that our laws come from the kitchen.”

“There, around the hearth, sitting on their wood benches, the elders talk and in their voices the wisdom and knowledge of the ancients walk. Through their advice the children learn to behave; there the Guambianos are made.”

“Likewise, just to make a comparison, a pot for cooking in the house stores many things, so many that one can get tired mentioning them.”

“So, when her father-in-law arrives the daughter-in-law must serve him first, then serve her mother-in-law, then her husband, then her brother-in-law, and then the others. But not as it pleases her: she must not spill on the ground, neither throw the kitchen ware, nor serve in the same plate. She must serve and mix things properly, not just water or little water, not too much to some and too little to others. This is

the advice of respect and equality; this is the advice that comes from women.”

“The large pot used for *mingas* tells us how much to serve to each one so there will be enough for everybody. And the woman knew how to distribute because she had the dream and her hand is healed. In only two *veredas* are there women capable of distributing food during *mingas*. If they die, whom shall we ask to come distribute food?”

“And the advice given to the men—how to love their families, how to receive meals from their wives without forgetting to say *dios pay unkua* (God thanks you). Today men receive without saying a word and then leave.”

“There in the museum, the children sitting on their little benches around the hearth, in the *nakchak*. The things will give new voice to the words of the ancients, and the silence will be over.”

“This is the way of this museum. Because in order to teach all this it is not necessary to read, write, sing, or pray; the only thing needed is to see the people, to be recognized as Guambianos, and to fight for unity” (Script of the House and Museum of Guambiano Culture).

In the old house of one of the recovered farms the Guambianos built a museum, which reproduces a traditional dwelling; the purpose was to erect a house in the Guambiano way, with kitchen, rooms, and *pishiya*. The museum is visited by schoolchildren, youngsters, and elders. There they hear the word and listen to the objects speak through the voice of the elders who know, who have investigated. The visitors are reached by the voice of the forebears, who point to the road that must be followed in order to live. From this place, from this house, the forebears expand their voice to the community. In *veredas*, schools, *mingas*, and the *cabildo*, daily activities are being shaped by these voices, although with difficulty and effort. And from that point of departure, with the bases provided by the museum and the continuing works, the other Guambianos are contributing to retrieve the voices of the once-forgotten ancestors.

NOTES

1. Translator’s note: *chumbe* is a colorful band made of wool.
2. Translator’s note: *resguardo* is equivalent to “reservation,” although it has precise connotations, both in colonial and republican terms; that is why I use the Spanish word instead of its English equivalent.
3. A political-administrative corporation, the most important communal authority; it is renewed every year and is headed by a governor elected annually by all Guambianos older than 10 years of age.
4. Unless noted, all citations are taken from Urdaneta (1985, 1987, 1988), from where the archaeological information also derives.

5. Translator's note: *taita* is a title reserved for wise men, especially those with political authority.
6. Translator's note: Nasa is the vernacular name of a neighboring group, once known as Paeces, enemies of the Guambianos until recent times.
7. Translator's note: *minga* is a communal gathering for carrying out, basically, public works for the benefit of the community as a whole.
8. Translator's note: Derecho Mayor is the name given by Guambianos to their own legal system.
9. Translator's note: *vereda* designates clusters of dwellings, normally separated from each other. The word is used to single out relatively discrete groups in an otherwise homogenous settlement pattern.
10. Translator's note: *venidero* is a Spanish word that means someone who has recently arrived from abroad. It usually conveys a negative meaning, because it implies lack of roots and recent arrival, as compared to other people living in the area well before.

REFERENCES

- Botero, Sofía 1982 Relaciones familia-comunidad en Guambía. Unpublished manuscript, on file at the Department of Anthropology, Universidad Nacional, Bogotá.
- . 1984 Tras el pensamiento y pasos de los taitas Guambianos. Intentos de aproximación a su historia, siglos XVI-XVII-XVIII. Unpublished Honor's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Universidad Nacional, Bogotá.
- Calero, Luis Fernando 1997 *Chieftoms under Siege: Spain's Rule and Native Adaptation in the Southern Colombian Andes, 1535–1700*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Cháves, Álvaro, and Mauricio Puerta 1985 *Tierradentro*. El Áncora, Bogotá.
- Cubillos, Julio César 1959 El Morro de Tulcán (pirámide prehispánica): arqueología de Popayán, Cauca, Colombia. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología* 8:54–112.
- . 1984 *Arqueología del valle del río Cauca. Asentamientos prehispánicos en la suela plana del río Cauca*. FIAN, Bogotá.
- Duque, Luis 1963 *Reseña arqueológica de San Agustín*. Instituto Colombiano de Antropología, Bogotá.
- Ford, James 1944 *Excavations in the Vicinity of Cali, Colombia*. Yale University Publications in Anthropology no. 31. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Reichel-Dolmatoff, Gerardo 1975 *Contribuciones al conocimiento de la estratigrafía cerámica de San Agustín*. Banco Popular, Bogotá.
- Urdaneta, Martha Lucía 1985 En busca de las huellas de los antiguos Guambianos. Unpublished manuscript on file at the Department of Anthropology, Universidad Nacional, Bogotá.
- . 1987 En busca de las huellas de los antiguos Guambianos. Unpublished Honor's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Universidad Nacional, Bogotá.
- . 1988 Investigación arqueológica en el resguardo indígena de Guambía. *Boletín del Museo del Oro* 22:54–81.
- Urdaneta, Martha Lucía, Cruz Trochez, and Miguel Flor 1990 En busca de las huellas de los antiguos Guambianos. Unpublished manuscript on file at the Fundación de Investigaciones Arqueológicas Nacionales, Bogotá.
- Vasco, Luis Guillermo, Abelino Dagua, and Misael Aranda 1989 *Somos raíz y retoño*. Fundación Colombia Nuestra, Cali.
- . 1990 *Calendario Guambiano y ciclo agrícola*. Colombia Nuestra, Colección Historia y Tradición Guambianas no. 2. Fundación Colombia Nuestra, Cali.

