

## **Canela Marriage: Factors in Change**

William H. Crocker

Smithsonian Institution, Department of Anthropology (NMNH).

In *Marriage Practices in Lowland South America*, pp. 63-98. Edited by Kenneth M. Kensinger. (Illinois Studies in Anthropology, no.14.) Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

2002: This chapter was reproduced on the Canela/Department of Anthropology/Smithsonian website with the permission of Kenneth M. Kensinger.

I have not changed the facts presented in this 1984-published article, but have altered many sentences and paragraphs with the help of Jean Crocker to enhance the comprehension of the reader. Data were updated where indicated. I collected materials for this article between 1970 and 1979.

Ethnologists have not usually utilized diachronic materials in resolving synchronic problems, or even for adding the perspective of time to their ethnologies, either because they lacked earlier pertinent studies of sufficient substance or because they simply have not tried to reconstruct the past, believing such attempts to be unreliable. For this study, focused on the institution of marriage, however, the earlier monograph of Nimuendajú is available, and I have specialized in developing techniques for reconstructing certain aspects of tribal life reaching back as far as 1900 for some trends, and earlier for others. Many of these changes, though included as relevant to the institution of marriage, are also pertinent to other institutions both in the two tribal societies analyzed here as well as in closely related tribes being researched by other ethnologists. This paper should serve to clarify certain trends and changes among the Canela as well as among these other culturally related societies, or at least to offer alternative materials for debate.

The Gê-speaking Ramkókamekra- and Apanyekra-Canela live in Brazilian savanna country (*cerrados*) some 100 miles from real *hiléia* tropical rain forests (W. Crocker 1972:225–28) and about 400 miles southeast of the city of Belém at the mouth of the Amazon. “Pacified” during the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Nimuendajú 1946:28–35),<sup>1</sup> they are now in close contact with local farmers and ranchers. The national Indian service has cared for them since the 1930s. Although they have adopted most of the technology and agricultural practices (slash-and-burn) of their Brazilian backwoods neighbors, and lost some of their old sociocultural patterns, they nevertheless still carried out most of their traditional customs in the late 1970s. The greatest changes have come from a loosening of the authority structure; the older generations have lost considerable control over the younger people (W. Crocker 1961:82–84).

Both populations are growing. The Ramkókamekra now [i.e., 1984] number somewhat over 700 and the Apanyekra around 300. In 1970, they were, respectively, just over 400 and around 225. Both groups occupy circular villages about 30 miles apart. They are characterized by uxorilocal residence and by bilateral extended kin with a matrilineal emphasis, but by no corporate, full-time descent groups (W. Crocker 1979:237–40). The two Canela tribes differ from the other Timbira tribes (Krahó, Krĩkatí, Pukobyé, Gavião, and Apinayé)<sup>2</sup> in their larger village size, in the more complete maintenance of their age class systems, in the greater extension of the R-Canela Crow-like characteristics, and in the relative permanence of their marriages when there

is a child to cement the union.

The Canela marry persons they consider to be “non-related” (*ka?khrít*), where the genealogical relationship has been lost: forgotten or very attenuated by social or spatial distance. All of ego’s kin (R-C *mēhũũkhyê*; A-C *mē?khwè*),<sup>3</sup> even out to third collaterals, and further if parallel cousins, may be considered “blood relatives” (*mēi-kaprôô-khwè*, my blood group), at least in theory. When these kin are of the opposite sex, they are considered unavailable for marriage or sexual purposes. They also sometimes “commit incest” (*to ayprè*) with relatives as close as third or second cross-cousins.<sup>4</sup> First cross-cousin sexual relationships and marriages, which occur very rarely, are held to be shameful and life shortening. Uterine sibling sexual contacts are thought to cause madness or death.

Quite clearly, there are no prescriptive or preferential marriage rules, nor do formal or statistically related alliances exist. The sororate (cf. Nimuendajú 1946:124) is practiced only occasionally but nevertheless is theoretically favored<sup>5</sup> whereas the levirate is not. Brothers do not marry into the same uxori-local family.

Sexual relations begin for girls between the ages of 10 and 13, and for boys between 12 and 14, that is, usually as young as possible. A lad is initiated into sexual relations by an experienced woman in her late teens; formerly, he was then ordered by his “grandfathers” to have sex only with older women in their forties and fifties for several years. When a young male takes a girl’s virginity (*kormã ?kuuni*, “still whole”), he has the choice of staying “married” to her (*mēhikhwa*, “they lie down”) or of withdrawing from the relationship, after which his kin must pay a significant fine (*kute-kukhën ya?pan-tsa-?nã*, “his-having-broken-in payment”). Every effort is made (largely exhortation by his kin and the elders) to keep a couple together,<sup>6</sup> and the girl’s family “buys” the young husband (*mēi wawè ?nã hãmyôr*, “our son-in-law for paid”) by means of a large meat pie ceremonially delivered to his family house late in the afternoon. (Today meat pies increasingly are exchanged between both families.) The meat pie purchase of the son-in-law used to occur before sexual relations, but now this rite almost always takes place after. This is an individual matter and these alternatives existed at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as well as now, but there has been a quantitative shift. Families often arranged engagements between children, a practice that is both old and current (*kutemë aypën tê*, “they-were for-each-other restricted”), but individual preferences prevail later. Just prior to and after puberty these engagements could be broken if the boy’s kin made a small payment for his release.<sup>7</sup>

Until the birth of a child, young couples did not live in the same house. Although they were “married,” young people were supposed to have sexual relations only very infrequently with persons of their own generation (including their spouses). Thus, a young man would only occasionally cohabit with his wife, and then usually just at night, on a platform bed raised high under the rafters for this purpose in her house (cf. Nimuendajú 1946:118). He returned to the plaza before the early morning dance (at 2 to 3 AM). Nevertheless, the Canela do call these liaisons “marriages.” During this early childless stage, before the girl has given a whole deer to her mother-in-law and had her ceremonial belt and body painted red with urucu (*Bixa orellana*) in return, the public aspects of her extramarital activities are restricted (W. Crocker 1964a:28 and 1974:187). After the belt-painting ceremony, however, which amounts to her husband’s family’s more complete acceptance of her, she is expected to be assigned as a girl associate (*kuytswè*) to

accompany male groups for the purposes of group sex. Her husband must not be jealous, though he increasingly objects these days, and maybe always did even in aboriginal times.<sup>8</sup> Between the painting of her belt and childbirth, she is classed as a *mēnkrekre-re* (slippery, free) person who must please most men with her sexual favors (W. Crocker 1962:115). If she does not, a group of men will waylay her to teach her to be generous. The group sex practices and the waylaying still occur among the Ramkókamekra but were abandoned long ago by the Apanyekra, an interesting and very important acculturative difference.

During these two periods—i.e., between virginity loss and belt painting, and from the belt ceremony to conception—a girl, formerly, was “married” several times. In the 1970 marriage case history study, however, the Ramkókamekra’s average for these periods was 1.5 marriages, while it was 1.8 marriages for the entire life cycle. With conception and the survival of a child, moreover, divorce is (and was, they say) almost impossible (seven cases in 96 marriages).<sup>9</sup> There are numerous separations, however, some lasting as long as a year. In contrast, divorce regardless of children is rampant among the Krīkatī (Lave 1967:249) and easier among the Apanyekra. This Canela difference is remarkable, since uxorilocal tribes are noted for their relatively high frequency of divorce.<sup>10</sup>

The main point of friction in the Canela sociocultural system is nevertheless between husband and wife. Tribal schisms, while rare, do occur, and political rivalries between age class leaders are relatively mild and suppressed by the high cohesiveness of the social structure and the great emphasis on generosity of spirit. Non-competitiveness and overt cooperation rather than a show of hostility are traits that are considered manly. “Women, animals and *kupē* (local Brazilians) fight,” the Canela say, “but Canela *men* bear up (*awkanã: agüenta*) under problems and adversity.” I estimate that at least 80 percent of the cases coming before the tribal council involve marital disputes.<sup>11</sup>

Nimuendajú claims (1946:129) that adultery *was* grounds for divorce. A trend may be developing in this direction but Nimuendajú was mistaken. In his time couples with children, that is most of the adult population, would seldom part because of adultery. A Ramkókamekra might come upon a man having relations with his wife on their platform bed, but even such a disrespectful act (especially on the part of his wife) would not be grounds for fighting, let alone divorce. Nevertheless, it would be sufficient reason for a payment between the two extended families to alleviate the husband’s shame.

Canelas can divorce and remarry if they are not raising children born to them. This happened in 1973 to a Ramkókamekra couple in their early forties, Tsêp-khà and Pre-?kapaa. There are numerous other childless couples, however, who remain married for a lifetime. I counted 14 in the village of Ponto in August, 1960. The oldest Ramkókamekra, Pù?tô, about 81 in 1970, died in May, 1973, ending a lifetime, childless marriage. His widow, Khùy, was in her late seventies. In the 1970 R-Canela marriage case histories, however, three young men left their wives, set free by their children’s death, and just two older men left their wives precisely because they could not bear children.

Many Ramkókamekra couples display great love and devotion to each other. When I asked if a spouse was considered a “blood relative” or not, there was some question in the informants’ minds because after years of sexual intercourse, it is believed that a couple’s blood has become interchanged. It was agreed that this mingling was enough to require the illness

taboos to be maintained between the couple, as among uterine siblings, but that spouses were nevertheless not considered *më-?kapróô khwè* (persons' -blood group).

When a Canela husband is traveling "in the world" (i.e., in Brasília, Recife, Salvador, Rio, etc.), as they often do for several months, a young wife without children lives in "mourning" conditions (no sex, singing, dancing, or body painting, and her hair growing long) with her mother-in-law's family (cf. Nimuendajú 1946:126–27). Old-timers say the change in this practice (the internment used to be in the wife's mother's house) is due to the fear of her husband's unsuppressed jealousy (*inkrùk-tsii*). If he made a fuss, they might lose him. To keep him, they might have to make a big payment to his family to "erase the shame from his face," shame that accrues especially in modern times. A wife's husband's family would surely confine her with greater care than her own mother's family.

When a wife dies, particularly if she leaves children, her family tries to persuade the widower to marry into their family again for the sake of the children. The family does not want to lose an economic asset, if he is a reasonably good one. The widower, nevertheless, usually leaves after several weeks of mourning if he has paid the grave diggers himself, or he is allowed to depart in three to six months if the deceased wife's family has paid the grave diggers. Quite similarly, after her husband's death, a widow is carefully watched by her deceased husband's family to see that she keeps her mourning restrictions for about six months; whoever breaks her sex restrictions has to pay a fine to her family if he does not stay with her, i.e., marry her.<sup>12</sup>

It is interesting that only a man's departures are restrained by fines. (They deduct these fines from what he would have to pay if he wanted to leave the marriage. See Da Matta 1979:120.) In contrast, if a woman absolutely does not want a man, he must leave, even if they were married for some time and she had children by him. In this case, neither of the parties' kin pays a fine, but such divorces rarely occur.<sup>13</sup> Whereas a husband can be coerced by pressure from his kin, his age class, the council of elders, and the ignominy of fines, a wife cannot be forced to change her mind through such pressures once she has taken a determined stand.

Husbands can be controlled, reasoned with, and restrained. Wives, in contrast, are the immovable solid blocks of society. (For comparable female immutability, see Da Matta 1979:123 and Vidal 1977:116.<sup>14</sup>)

Women may have great sexual flings between the belt-painting ceremony and the birth of their first child, but later they become embedded in the female matrix of domestic life. Uxorilocal residence and the dominance of their ubiquitous female kin hold women strongly in place. Additionally, there used to be occasional visits from special patrilateral male and female counselors to pressure them into conformity. Fear of vicious female gossip and, formerly, the danger of illness and death through witchcraft, motivated women to be reasonably cooperative and generous. Thus in marked contrast to men, women find their security in the permanence and continuity of generations of strongly maintained social and ceremonial positions. Women are so secure that they can afford to be irritable, changeable, and demanding, while their husbands must put up with such treatment.<sup>15</sup>

In the marital balance, the women are seen as suffering more: possible physical damage in losing virginity and in childbirth, strenuous work when carrying wood and hauling water, and lack of mobility while raising children and maintaining a household for their husbands.

Consequently, the husband is continually rebalancing the marital “scales” by working hard and making small payments to his wife’s family.

In modern times, however, the balance is changing, because the husband, as a son-in-law, is becoming freer—released from the ancient social pressures that forced him to stay with his wife’s family for the sake of the children. He is now becoming a great asset because of his ability to contribute economically (sometimes becoming literate and obtaining odd jobs) to the increasingly important family group, which is oriented around his mother-in-law rather than around his wife’s MBs and GPs.

Nimuendajú reported that in earlier times a majority of Ramkókamekra youths were married in a collective wedding just after they had completed their age class initiation cycle (1946:122). After the termination of the final Pepyê initiation ceremony (their “graduation” into being an adult age class), they led each youth to his bride. It has fortunately been possible to verify in detail the former existence of this ritual. As Nimuendajú wrote, this ceremony was last held around 1913 and was *not* carried out in 1923 after the end of that ten-year initiation cycle. Considering the loss of this obviously significant ceremony, at least two important questions must be answered: (1) how did age class sanctions affect marriages, and (2) what changes have been brought about by the loss of this obviously important institution?

Reconstructing distant past events solely from the memories of a people, whether tribal or urban, is a notoriously difficult and not always reliable undertaking. Fortunately, however, I had the help in 1959 and 1960 of old Khà?po, who was about 34 in 1913. Mĩkhrô, the Canela-recognized tribal “culture historian,” whose class did go through the 1913 ceremony, also helped extensively. So did Ropkhà, the very class leader himself, whose wife’s pregnancy just after the 1923 initiation festival made it unpropitious to carry out the ensuing “marriage” rite that year, causing its abandonment. The lucid memories of certain women like Pyê-?khà, maybe 70 in 1964, and the female leader, Ter-khwèy, have served to round out the picture.

Each age class “graduate,” whose partner was not already pregnant, was led in turn from the plaza by a councilor (*pro-khãm*), usually some “grandfather,” to the house of his present or future parents-in-law where he was placed to lie with limbs intertwined with those of his fiancée or “wife,” while they were both admonished to care well for each other. The councilor then received a meat pie from the bride’s relatives and took it back to the plaza as a gift to the councilors. The procession was repeated for each youth, with the councilors marching in file. A ceremonial individual followed separately, considerably behind, singing a chant particular to that rite.

The class leader, as on other occasions, was the first to undertake his class’s activities. Thus, when his wife had become pregnant before the rite was to be performed, the councilors must have believed it would not be propitious to carry out the ceremony for *any* members of the age class. Class leaders are *hàmren*, that is, high in ceremonial status and strong in magical powers and prognostic ability (see W. Crocker 1978:17), unlike the class commandant and class deputy commandant (Nimuendajú 1946:193), who are just political figures. Therefore it is easy to understand that when an age class’s “seer,” with group-protecting and danger-sensing abilities, cannot be the first participant in the ceremony to test its propitiousness, it might well be safer and wiser not to carry out the rite at all. Until the age classes had brought the young men to their

spouses' houses in this manner, the young husbands were not supposed to visit these structures in the daytime. However, when most of the young husbands and even the class leader himself were seen to be ignoring this rule, there was little reason for the councilors to carry out an act the purpose of which was to enable the youths to do what they were already doing.

The ceremony described above certainly was a marriage rite, but it should be realized that almost all of the youths being led to their brides were already "married" to these girls in the sense that Canela use both the Portuguese expression *casado* and their own term *mēhikhwa*. A man (the "social" husband and maybe the genitor) with his own "biological" children<sup>16</sup> and their mother (the genitrix) are totally married, so he cannot become detached and married to anyone else by an act of sexual intercourse. If his wife's children are not seen as his "biological" children, however, and he has made an unattached woman pregnant, he would have to leave his wife and her children to marry the single girl with his "biological" child. Consequently, the rites of "contracting" marriage (*mēto aypēn tē*) before sexual intercourse, "adjusting" it afterward (*mē aypēn pa*, "they to-each-other listen"), and even the group ceremony conducted by the councilors—do not constitute crucial acts in becoming married. It is the performance of private sexual intercourse in connection with the woman's open demand and the man's public admission, when neither the man nor the woman is tied to another person of the opposite sex by a "biological" child, that constitutes the principal element in having become "married."<sup>17</sup>

Understood in this way, it is certain that most of the youths who were taken to their "brides" during the traditional age class wedding were already "married" to them. The ceremony served principally to reinforce and establish the permanence of the marriage. A youth was placed in a symbolic marital position with his fiancée or "wife" so that the councilors and most of the tribe could bear witness to the fact of their union. The collective wedding placed much of the tribe in such a position that they would become embarrassed if they should ever allow the marriage to dissolve.

This is a characteristic Canela behavioral pattern. A self-respecting Canela will not give orders or instructions, or witness acts, unless he expects the recipients to obey and comply. Otherwise, he experiences shame. Thus a principal purpose of the collective age class wedding was to bring virtually all the men in the tribe into a position of being obligated to enforce the various marriages. This may account to some extent for the relatively low Ramkókamekra divorce rate in spite of the tribe's uxorilocality and matrilineal-like characteristics.

These collective weddings ideally took place at a relatively late point on the progressing-into-total-marriage continuum for most of the young brides and bridegrooms.<sup>18</sup> My old informants of both sexes believed that most of the girls taking part in these weddings were considerably older than present brides and fully grown and well formed, and that the young men graduated as an age class considerably older than they do these days, perhaps between the ages of 16 and 25, or even 20 and 29. (I have been able to verify Nimuendajú's claim that a new Ramkókamekra age class is formed about every ten years.) Considering the extramarital possibilities, it is hard to believe that the novices would not somehow have been channeled into "fatherhood" by the time they were 18, and certainly by 22, but arrangements built into the system would have helped some of them avoid it until they were much older. Their post-puberty restrictions required not only very little sex for several years (maybe two or three) but also almost no sex with young girls, including their wives, because such contacts would weaken them. On

the other hand, the alternative and recommended sexual outlet—the experienced women in their late forties and fifties—were believed to magically impart strength and courage to them. Besides, with post-menopausal women, they would not run the slightest risk of contact with the contaminating effect of traces of menstrual blood.

By the time a youth was 16 to 18, he had become a clear-seeing hunter (*më-nto-kapôk*) and an endurance runner, ideally, through the practice of post-puberty restrictions. Thus, he had developed himself sufficiently so that he could begin relaxing these restrictive food and sex practices. Nevertheless, the available married women, with or without children, were not maritally entrapping. This was because, although they believed seminal contributions help to create a baby, such accretions still would not have made *him* the responsible “social husband,” i.e., a principal father (*pater*), even if she publicly claimed him as a “contributing father.”<sup>19</sup>

A young man was brought into the first stage of “matrimony” only, (1) if he had taken a girl’s virginity, (2) if an unattached non-virgin (with or without children) had proved too alluring, or (3) if he had broken a widow’s mourning restrictions. In all three cases, he could have avoided solidification of the marriage, however, (1) if he had bought his release, (2) if some other man had later won over his “wife,” or (3) if she had sent him away in dislike, any one of these events occurring before she had become obviously pregnant *while* he was her recognized “social husband.” Thus, it seems quite possible that a young man might be “married” several times without acquiring the responsibility of being the principal father and therefore in an “enduring” marriage until he was 25 or 29, or even later. His personal tactics and the advice of the significant counselors among his kin surely depended on his position in his age class, namely, whether he were older or younger. Social and family pressures on a young man were certainly very strong and effective in those days.

A girl was secured in an “enduring” marriage only with the man who happened to be her social husband at the time she became pregnant. Even then, if she lost the fetus or the baby in childhood, he might leave or she might send him away.<sup>20</sup>

Some of the brides were virgins at 10 to 13 and had been engaged, that is, contracted in childhood marriages with the older men in the age class. It is clear that a man’s marriage to a virgin in an age class collective wedding was so binding (see Nimuendajú 1946:119) that the councilors could take a chance on the marriage solidifying during the three to five years until likely pregnancy.

Other arrangements tended to delay the securing of an enduring marriage for women. A girl maintained postpubertal restrictions for perhaps one year, when she was supposed to have sex rarely and then only with men in their later forties and fifties. Until she had won her ceremonial belt as a girl associate of a men’s society and had had it painted by her mother-in-law, both her husband and other men tended<sup>21</sup> to let her alone sexually, especially if she were of high ceremonial status. These practices helped to reduce the chances of conception. However, after the painting of her belt, she became fair game for all non-related men, privately and in the group arrangements, a fact that would certainly have tended to bring on a pregnancy more quickly than if she were just left to her husband, a clandestine lover, or an occasional older man.

The aged informants were very certain that girls received their belts at an older age in earlier times. Husbands and youths were supposed to respect a girl who had not yet won her belt, having sex with her only rarely. The high-status girl associates (*Pepkahàk*, *Khêêtúwayê*, *Pepyê*,

and Wè?tè) and the younger of the middle-status girl associates (Hàk, Kukhùtre-?hò, Rop, and certain plaza group girls) had to be taken into these men's societies as virgins. Parents tried to keep them virginal so they could be chosen to fill these positions. In contrast, the older middle-status and the definitely low-status girl associates (Kôkayu, Kukhên, Mě?khên, and certain plaza moiety girls) were brought into the men's societies as non-virgins precisely for sexual purposes—to be used by the whole troop (see Nimuendajú 1946:228) but only at prescribed times. Service in men's societies and having to wait for the belt to be painted did tend to delay pregnancy.

The earlier Ramkókamekra collective wedding, as I reconstruct it, is characterized by, (1) the exclusion of a number of older novices and their wives because they had become fathers and mothers and were therefore no longer model individuals for the traditional marital process; (2) an average age of participating men of around 24 with a range of ages between 20 and 29, and (3) the presence of 10- to 13-year-old virginal fiancées, who would lose their virginity almost immediately, and 14- to 20- (or higher) year-old non-virgins. Fathers, obviously pregnant women, and mothers are similarly excluded from many other festival roles.

In the late 1950s, when the old Ramkókamekra spoke about the times of their ancestors, which really amounted to what their parents and grandparents had told them about life during the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they emphasized the fierceness and strength of the political chiefs, the councilors, and the GFs (including MBs and “MBs”) in their dealings with their GCs. They told of a long free period in the lives of young men and a shorter one for girls when they were quite unattached and had great sexual freedom and fun. Younger men (the internees or novices, the youngest graduated age class, and, for a few years, the next highest age class) lived as much or more for their age class activities as for their responsibilities to consanguines and affines. They roamed the countryside under the direction of their commandant and/or deputy commandant (or their class leaders). At night they danced, sang, and slept in the plaza with the childless women, whether older and barren or young and between their belt-painting rites and childbirth. The ungraduated novices and the pre-belt-painted girls were kept away from these fun-generating activities by the generalized force of the older generation exerted through the individual's kin, by his or her name giver, by chiefs in the course of public lectures, and through the direct orders of class commandants and/or class deputies (for boys). Ramkókamekra novices were publicly shamed and hazed for violations by their GF category counselors before a line of dancing women and the tribe assembled in the plaza. In 1958 and 1975, the Apanyekra held a public shaming ceremony in the plaza for men with their wives or lovers who had had sexual relations in spite of the Pepyê festival internment restrictions of the young men.<sup>22</sup>

Freedom ended for the girls with childbirth and the need to take proper care of their children. For men, freedom continued in the form of their age class activities even after they became fathers. Their consanguines and affines did make certain demands on them, but they still spent a lot of time with their age classes until they were much older, some informants insisted. Their estimations of age were expressed in terms of the four active age classes. The first graduated age class, the one just above the novices (average age over the ten-year period, about 30), was said to have been relatively free of consanguineal and affinal duties and to have marched everywhere together, whereas the second age class (average 40), being of the same moiety as the novices, was reported to have been very active in singing, dancing, and other

pursuits, but nevertheless was gradually settling down to consanguineal and affinal responsibilities. By the time a man had reached the age of the third age class above the novices, his group seldom assembled except for formal situations. By this period, he would be in his middle forties and early fifties and would have children and maybe even grandchildren.

The old-timers pointed out that the ancestors were fierce (*valente: hààprâr*) (see W. Crocker 1978:17–18). It was not that the men fought each other all the time but that they recognized a “pecking order” based on a combination of tribal authoritative power and fighting ability. There were continual showdowns between men but only rarely open hostilities, because internal harmony was most highly prized. The old woman Pyê-?khâr said it must have been miserable to have become recognized as a soft man in those days (the 19th century) because there were stories of fierce men pulling weaker ones away from women in the very act of sexual intercourse and simply taking over. Any ensuing hostilities would then be frustrated by other nearby men, and continuing hatreds, pouting, and revenge were very much counseled against and lost in the all-consuming activities of age class life.

A man had very little influence in his marital home and in the disciplining of his children. His wife’s actual and classificatory brothers and mother’s brothers were responsible for counseling and ceremonial purposes and took a hand in controlling the children. They also provided food by leaving more than a token portion of the game they killed. Thus, a man gave a sizable piece of game in his Zs’ and M’s house and became seriously involved in their domestic problems as well. Moreover, a young man usually saved some of his game for his WMB. The surprise in these accounts is that old informants attribute significant *economic support* as well as ceremonial and juridical roles to male matrilateral relatives. If we look back far enough into their history, the neat division between the F’s and the MB’s roles—nurture versus ceremonialism—may not be as clear cut for the Ramkókamekra as some Timbira specialists would like to have us think. Quite obviously, the memories of the old-timers about their ancestral life are idealized and exaggerated but, if evaluated carefully, present clues about the past.

Returning to the question of what changes have been brought about by the loss of the age class collective wedding ceremony as a significant Ramkókamekra institution, I think it is preferable to see this loss as just one of the many changes that have occurred because of the loosening of the authority of the older Ramkókamekra generations. The question, therefore, cannot be fully handled here. A few of the contributing factors and lines of thought may suffice.

With the loss of warfare as a part of life, the fierceness described above, which was decried by some local Brazilians as being “savage,” ceased to have a *raison d’être*. By the beginning of the twentieth century, however, the Ramkókamekra’s image of themselves had evolved to the point where they did not see themselves as “savages” like their ancestors, “eating rotten wood and raw meat and killing people.” Nevertheless, certain vestigial remains of this fierceness could be expressed during occasional rituals, such as the hazing of youths for their infractions of the puberty restrictions in front of a line of women. With the arrival of the federal Indian service personnel in 1938, however, even this form of discipline had to be discontinued for fear of embarrassment. With it went the last real shaming, and therefore the last sort of effective control that the older men could bring to bear upon the younger ones.

The above description is a simplification of what actually has been going on between the

Ramkókamekra generations for over a hundred years, but it serves to make the point that the aboriginal control of the old over the young was partly derived from a kind of personality expression through which the youths were terrorized into considerable submission. When we realize that the elders, in the roles of the GF and the MB, largely prevented their GCs and ZCs from having sexual relations with members of their own age group and allowed sex only with older men and women, we can well imagine how quickly this custom would be dropped once the elders had lost their power, and this is exactly what happened.

The old Rop-khà, whose age class was interned roughly between 1913 and 1923, said in August, 1960, that he and his age class mates still had sexual relations mainly with older women and seldom with girls their own age during their two to three post-puberty years, and that sex with young girls had to be largely hidden from their “GFs” (including “MBs”)<sup>23</sup> for fear of drastic hazing and shaming in the plaza. For Kaapêr-tùk, the deputy commandant of the age class being formed between 1923 and 1933 (Nimuendajú 1946:182), sex with the older women was still the practice but relations with young girls were easier because the “GFs” caused less trouble. In contrast, the age class of Kaarà-?khre, 1934 to 1940, only occasionally had sexual relations with the older women, and the age class of the younger Kaapêr-tùk, 1941 to 1951, *never* had sex with older women. He said it just was not done anymore out of respect for their age.

Another contributing factor in the breakdown of authority is the loss of tribal self-sufficiency. It is not possible to know exactly when the two Canela tribes first became deficient in supporting themselves. Old Brazilians of the region assure me that the Ramkókamekra were agriculturally self-sufficient and even affluent in a village site (A?khrã-?khà-?tèy) they occupied between the middle 1890s and about 1904. Nimuendajú also gives this impression for his period (1929–36). Apparently, however, between about 1905 and 1917, when they were living away from the Santo Estêvão stream, and again between 1936 and 1940, they suffered serious agriculture deficiencies. The arrival of Indian service post personnel after 1938 (principally Sr. Olímpio Martins Cruz) reversed this process temporarily, but ever since 1947 the Ramkókamekra have not raised sufficient staples in their farm plots to prevent endemic semi-malnutrition, and the Apanyekra have had a similar record starting somewhat later.

The Canela response to this problem in both tribes has been to abandon the circular villages during the lean part of the year, about September through January, and to spend it fragmented into small groups living beside backland farm communities within a 50-mile radius of their home villages, trading their labor and services for food and handouts. During these periods, the post-pubescent youths and girls do not see their “GP” counselors for long periods at a time; thus, they neglect their post-pubertal restrictions and perhaps begin to believe that these taboos are not very important after all. Moreover, the leaders of these groups are necessarily the F, not the MB, who is foraging elsewhere with his W and children. Partly because of this change in group composition and leadership has contributed to a shift in authority to the F taking place. However, the F and M had not traditionally dealt closely with the puberty restrictions, sexuality, and extramarital aspects of their adolescent children’s lives. Thus, these facets of growing up have changed and continue to change quite rapidly.

Most of the trends are in the direction of greater simplicity, ease, and immediate satisfactions for the young people, and toward local Brazilian practices. These changes can be understood in the perspectives of: (1) the loss of authority of the “GP” counselors, the “MB” and

“FZ” name givers, the tribal political chiefs, the council of elders, and the older generations as a whole, and (2) the shift in power from the GP class (including the MB and FZ) to the F and M and then in turn to the M’s and her Zs’ DHs.

I want to emphasize that I have not mentioned all of the factors contributing to these changes, let alone described and related diachronically the consequent trends and changes. Such a treatment of materials would require a volume in itself. Some of the other factors, however, are: (1) the impoverishment of existing gallery forest soils; (2) the limitation of especially the Apanyekra to a small geographical area (rectified recently); (3) the reduction in aboriginal abundance of game; (4) the turning away for reasons of prestige from excellent aboriginal crops (peanuts, sweet potatoes, yams, corn, etc.) to less nourishing local Brazilian bitter manioc as the principal staple; (5) the elementary schooling by the federal Indian service post personnel since 1944, which at first was so effective that six youths learned to read and write to some extent; (6) the continual exchanges with local farmers and ranchers arriving in the Canela villages almost daily to sell and trade food and goods; (7) the disillusionment with the Indian Protection Service when they terminated their paternalistic policies around 1956; (8) the effects of both Nimuendajú and Crocker living in their midst (largely the Ramkókamekra) as cultural acceptables; (9) the effects of several Indian Protection Service agents and National Indian Foundation personnel from setting the example that some non-Canelas were “good people,” leading to a breakdown in the strong Canela conviction that only their traditional way of life was decent, worthwhile, and satisfying; (10) the demise of the messianic movement (Ramkókamekra) of 1963, which was oriented toward the Brazilian way of life, and the deleterious effects of this orientation on the Canela’s faith in their aboriginal way of life; (11) the effects of a Summer Institute of Linguistics missionary and his family living in their (Ramkókamekra) village circle between 1968 and 1978 [2002: 1990]; (12) the conspicuously more effective medical treatment in the 1970s and early 1980s by the National Indian Foundation; (13) the legal acquisition of Canela lands by the Foundation, and (14) the obvious increase in the Foundation’s interest in their support and protection.<sup>24</sup> Surely, there are many other acculturative factors of almost equal importance.

Although Nimuendajú has left us with several sizable problems that have to be handled in any paper on Canela marriage, I have chosen to deal indirectly (or in footnotes) so far with most of our points of divergence (adultery, high platform bed “bundling,” what constitutes marriage, the sororate, etc.). However, I must deal more directly with his statement that the Ramkókamekra had matrilineal exogamous moieties (1946:79).

I agree with Lave (1967:110; 1971:341–43) that Nimuendajú erroneously saw matriliney in the all-pervasive uxorilocality and matrilinearity (including matriliney of up to four generations) of Canela society. In those days the concept was not always clearly defined and professionals did talk loosely about a society being “matrilineal” even if there were no clearly defined, daily operating unilineal descent groups (W. Crocker 1977:269–70; 1979:239–40). Nimuendajú did not identify any groups of this nature in a definitive manner, though there actually were several *occasionally*-operating, *ceremonial* matrilineal descent groups. It is these festival groups, which could be found in only about a quarter of the extended families and were not characteristic of all families, which must have caused Nimuendajú to label the Canela as being “matrilineal.” Thus, if the Canela were not unilineal, they quite clearly could not have had

“matrilineal exogamous moieties,” at least not in post-contact times.

A fascinating demographic point is that old informants claim Ramkókamekra men married much younger women—about ten years younger—but what should the expression “married” mean in this context? As explained earlier, conception cements the relationship between a woman and the man who happens to be her social husband. Hence I am taking the average spouse age difference of first conception-cemented marriages as being the principal measure of ideal marriage age separation between couples.

Reliable data for husband-wife age differences in “early” (no previous marriages) first conception-cemented unions and “early”-formed but long-enduring childless marriages were rare for husbands over 50 in 1970 because of remarriages owing to the deaths of spouses. The average age of marital separation was 6.5 years in four cases.<sup>25</sup> For the five marriages of this sort with husbands in their forties, the average age of separation was 10.0 years, while for the men in their thirties the difference was 4.3 years in 20 cases.<sup>26</sup> This same figure for 12 husbands in their twenties was approximately 5.1 years. Including “delayed” (husbands and/or wives previously married) first conception marriages, however, the figures for the same four categories in descending order are 7.3 (8 cases), 9.1 (16), 4.8 (27), and 5.4 (13); if marriages of *any* sort are examined, the four categories become 9.4 (10 cases), 9.2 (20), 5.3 (31), and 5.4 (13).<sup>27</sup>

Considering these data, it is indeed quite likely that formerly, men in “early” and “delayed” first conception-cemented marriages (ranging between 5 to 15 years in spouse age separation), or in marriage taken as a whole (ranging from zero to over 20 years in spouse age differences), were married to women about ten years their junior.

The substantial marital debtor-creditor cycle described by Melatti (1970:168; 1979:69–70) and by Carneiro da Cunha (1978:42) for a man in relation to his affines among the Krahó exists for the Ramkókamekra only to a considerably lesser extent. (Stronger aspects of this affinal relationship can be found among the Apanyekra.) This may be because the status of the Ramkókamekra son-in-law is rising in significance, so he is not in the weak position of owing his affines considerable amounts of material goods, though he certainly is obligated to pay them respect and services. I have seen fathers-in-law give new shotguns to their sons-in-law to keep them happy and working. Men, however, are always providing small gifts and doing nice things for their wives’ relatives, in order, they say, to retain their good will and assistance in keeping their wives interested in them rather than because of a strong debtor-creditor relationship. They also say they want these affines to counsel their wives favorably.

I would guess that this Ramkókamekra-Krahó contrast might be due to current acculturative differences. It seems that the Krahó are more economically and agriculturally self-sufficient than the Canela, a contrast that gives a Krahó son-in-law less economic status than his Canela counterpart, whose labor is desperately needed. Apparently some Krahó even own cattle, which was almost impossible among the Canela (calves were eaten in hunger), though there are a few Ramkókamekra modern exceptions. Another reason for the difference might be the Ramkókamekra son-in-law’s ability to blackmail his in-laws if he discovered his wife to have been unfaithful even during festival situations. Both the Apanyekra and the Krahó may have become acculturated beyond this problem, their wives having far fewer chances at extramarital

relations. Consequently, the sons-in-law have less leverage with which to cause trouble for their parents-in-law, and therefore are in a weaker position. Moreover, individualization may have evolved more extensively among the Krahó so that a young husband does not want to live under a standing debt<sup>28</sup> to his in-laws, and therefore pays it off early to be free to leave his wife when he may need to apply such leverage against her family.

It seems, from studying the comparative literature on the Timbira, that the Canela are the least acculturated and best preserved tribes (the Apanyekra less so than the Ramkókamekra, because of their fewer numbers and the severer encroachments on their lands during the 19th century). Both tribes, however, were fortunate to live near the headwaters of streams and therefore out of the way of river-borne commerce and currently from highways. The Ramkókamekra were especially lucky to have maintained a higher population living in one village than any other Timbira tribe.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, there happens to be less rainfall in the Canela area (about 40 inches per annum) than in the areas farther west (near 60 inches). The Canela savannas may have been less advantageous to cattle ranchers and the gallery forests less interesting to local farmers than around the Krahó. Both Canela tribes, whether or not these factors account for their better state of preservation, represent models of the past that Timbira specialists must consider in their studies of the other Timbira and Northern Gê tribes. The Ramkókamekra cannot be simply subsumed under the category "Eastern Timbira" as largely identical to the Krahó and Krĩkatí (cf. Maybury-Lewis 1967:301–9).

Whether because of their state of better preservation or because of pre-pacification differences or both, the Ramkókamekra appear to be the most nearly matrilineal of the Timbira tribes. Their extensive Crow-like characteristics reflect this, such as certain families' ceremonial-only corporate descent groups or lineages. Marriage ties were very weak until the first child was born. They compensated themselves for these loose affinal connections with extra-familial institutions such as age classes and the council of elders as well as bilateral personal kindreds ("grandparents" and "grandchildren"). Consequently, they achieved the opposite effect, resulting in almost unbreakable marriages even though the husbands were still very much involved in the activities of their mothers and sisters and their age classes. Loss of authority among the GP class of individuals (including MBs and FZs) brought about dramatic changes in the aboriginal consanguineal-affinal balance, so that first-linked persons to female ego (or those merged as such: F, M, Z, B, H, MZ, MZD, etc.) assumed the principal responsibilities in the power vacuum. I suggest that the use of similar longitudinal perspectives may account for a number of Krahó, Krĩkatí, and Apinayé acculturative characteristics.

On a still broader scene, Scheffler and Lounsbury (1971:179) have compared the Ramkókamekra-Canela with the Apinayé, Kayapó, Nambikwara, Sirionó, Inca, and other societies, in the claim that certain ". . . basic structural principles are fairly apparent . . ." in the kinship systems of all these peoples. One of these distinctive principles they call "parallel-transmission," whereby in formal analysis ". . . there is a pronounced tendency for cross-collateral kintypes to take the terminological statuses of their parents of the same sex" (1971:179). I find from field data that their parallel-transmission rule (1971:110) does resolve the Canela consanguineal and affinal relationship systems in a more satisfactory manner than if a fortuitous mixture of Crow and Omaha Type-III reduction equations (Lounsbury 1964) is used

(Lave 1977:323).<sup>30</sup> Moreover, from other published data (Da Matta 1976:177–81, Bamberger 1979:136, Vidal 1977:52–53, and Turner 1966), I agree with Scheffler and Lounsbury that these rules can also be applied advantageously to the Apinayé and Kayapó relationship systems. This greater suitability will eventually be demonstrated in a monograph that is already in preparation.<sup>31</sup> Briefly contrasting these three tribes, however: the Canela stress uterine line succession bringing out Crow-like features, the Kayapó a kind of substitutive agnatic line transmission manifesting Omaha aspects, and the Apinayé both alternatives. There are still, nevertheless, the matters of cognitive validity and the identification of related social structural correlates, both of which must be satisfactorily handled in order to establish the “parallel-transmission” rules as being an accurate representation of an underlying cognitive reality of these relationship systems.<sup>32</sup>

If one talks to Canela informants about descent, systematic succession, or the replacement of one relative or affine by another, one soon finds they use the expression *hatsà yaahêr-tsà khâm* (“his/her-place fill-er in”: the person who fills in his or her place). Thus, it is clear that they do think in terms of physical substitution of one person by another. By far their strongest association and most likely volunteered response in this context is that a woman will “fill in” her mother’s place, and there is an extensive ideology for explaining this.<sup>33</sup> After discussing same-sex sibling substitution, they will soon come around to pointing out that a man does fill in his mother’s brother’s place (his *kêt*), but he does this, really, because he is very closely related to and responsible for his uterine sister. They are of the same “blood” (*kaprôô*) or “substance” (see Da Matta 1973:281, 1982:49). In fact, he takes his mother’s brother’s place most effectively when she takes her mother’s place. It is also clear, secondarily, that a man can take the place of *any* other relative in his *kêt* kin category, especially the position of his “naming uncle,”<sup>34</sup> but this creates a rather diffuse situation with respect to male replacement or succession to terminological kin status.

Informants do not volunteer that a man “fills in” the place of his father, but when I pointed out to them that he does this in three different situations, they recognized this process as “replacement,” using the same expression *hatsà yaahêr-tsà khâm*, for male intertribal (Timbira) membership, for “exchange peace chief” (*tâm-hâk*) succession (Crocker 1978:16–17), and for the man who becomes the next “ceremonial chief of the whole tribe” (*khrii kuuniá mēhōōpa?hi*).<sup>35</sup> The point is that while they feel strongly about D/M equivalence and explain this to be the case through the expression *mē-īpipēn* (“they the-same”) and consequently also recognize the associated ♂/♂MB (or more properly ♂/♂ZMB) replacement, they, in contrast, see other “ZS”/“MB” relationships as being considerably less important. The S/F succession is scarcely thought about but is very apparent ceremonially; it is also apparent to the considerable extent that ceremonial status performance does carry over into daily life role behavior.

Turning again to the Kayapó, instead of the D/M substitution line being strongly emphasized, it is the relationship of a man to his “adoptive” father that is held to be significant ceremonially and politically, giving the kinship system its Omaha-like terminological appearance. Similarly, a man’s much greater importance and integration into his affinal rather than his consanguineal home stresses the H=W tie over the B-Z relationship, again reinforcing Omaha-like cross-cousin terminological results (Da Matta 1976:191; Turner 1966:447; 1979:183).<sup>36</sup> The Apinayé situation is intermediate, reflecting both terminological resolutions (Da

Matta 1976:193). Thus, among other factors, it is the *relative marital balance*—the importance to a man of his family of orientation (Eastern Timbira) versus his family of procreation (Kayapó)—that is closely related to the appearance of Crow-like or Omaha-like cross-cousin terminology. Whereas a Canela gradually moves from—or partly remains in—his house of orientation after marriage (Nimuendajú 1946:126), the Kayapó breaks this relationship more completely and soon forms strong bonds in his family of procreation (Vidal 1977:141).

The Sirionó, also characterized by parallel-transmission according to Scheffler and Lounsbury (1971), differ from the Canela-Apinayé-Kayapó (the Northern Gê) principally in that they have a MBD-FZS “Spouse Equation Rule” so that marriage takes place between matrilineal cross-cousins instead of with “non-relatives” (*mě-ka?khrít*) as it is for the Northern Gê groups (unless certain communities have grown too small). This does seem more appropriate for forest-dwelling small bands, so one is tempted to see a proto-Canela form in the Sirionó: that is, if early Sirionó-like bands were to have expanded to become 500, 1,000, or more in population, they would quite reasonably have lost their matrilineal cross-cousin marriage practice and married “further out,” manifesting their more Crow- or more Omaha-like alternative characteristics depending on the ecology, culture contact situations, and other factors. Weakly supporting this hypothesis for the Canela—that they emerged from an “elementary” system similar to the one of the Sirionó—is the interesting “coincidence,” perhaps a cultural vestige found in current Canela terminology, that *atoktùyti* (your GM) or *atoktùyýê* (your HZ) (both female-to-female usage) could be the same person (♀FZD or ♀HZ) in a matrilineal cross-cousin marriage system. Similarly, in reference to a male speaker, *akêtti* (your MB) and *apreekêt* (your WF) could be the same person (see W. Crocker 1977:268).

While the Gê specialists generally see Crow or Omaha cross-generational terminology as being related to the basic dualism and fundamental compartmentalization among these societies—public/private, forum/household, social persona/physical substance (Maybury-Lewis 1979:305); one generation/another generation, male/female (Da Matta 1979:123)—I have come to appreciate an alternative associated structure. It is that parallel-transmission cognitive patterns rather than Crow-Omaha principles characterize the relationship systems, the political and social structure, the marital balances and consequent family role responsibilities, as well as this basic dualism and fundamental compartmentalization. This appreciation has been derived from a detailed and intensive field study (1978–79) of related Ramkókamekra ideology in the areas of marriage and family role relationships.

The Ramkókamekra speak of life as a constant movement outward horizontally in every direction (especially to the west) of “a descendant” (*tàmtswè*) from his ancestors (*kêt/tùy*); and that any marriage (or even an affair) transforms this flow (*kêt/tùy* to *tàmtswè*)<sup>37</sup> so that an identical blood (*kapróô* or “substance”) group is formed between all persons who have become “first-linked” through continual sexual intercourse and its products: H=W, M=D, F=S, M=S, F=D, B=Z, Z=Z, B=B.<sup>38</sup> Beyond this range, second- and further-linked people (a grandkin supercategory) are essentially the same (*kêt, tùy* or *tàmtswè*)—the mainstream of the “spreading” flow of humanity—though classificatory first-linked relatives do form an intermediate category for certain replacement purposes. With each genealogical link further away, nevertheless, the substance held in common between ego and alter becomes reduced, diluted by the “contributions” in marriage from another line of descendants. Thus it is really through marriage

that both the consanguineal and affinal relationship systems are generated (and both are extensive),<sup>39</sup> because before a marriage—in their thinking—there was simply an ancestor-to-descendant “spreading out,” with marriage making its continuation possible but altering just the first-link (and classificatory first-link) terminology. In the Ramkókamekra case, because of matrilocality, this model amounts to matrilineal spreading outward from a center with a brother attached to each woman at each generation—matrifiliation. Thus a MB and a MF (or, similarly, a FZ and a FM)<sup>40</sup> are terminologically the same because they are second-linked (which amounts terminologically, also, to being further-linked) with respect to ego and also because they are not reducible to first-link foci (the common blood group) through same-sex-sibling, half-sibling, step-kin, or Crow-Omaha III rules—or, more suitably, I believe, through parallel-transmission rules. Again, it must be emphasized that the cross-generation terminological characteristics can be largely accounted for in this manner—in the basic first-/further-link terminological and ideological distinction (cf. Da Matta 1976:188 and 1979:106).

The above reporting applies to the family of orientation, but the extended family of procreation (or the extended affinal system) can be treated similarly. The result is that there is conspicuously more than just “. . . a pronounced tendency for . . . [across marital bond] . . . kin-types to take the terminological status of their parents of the same sex,” which amounts to applying the parallel-transmission pattern to the affinal domain (Scheffler and Lounsbury 1971:181). It happens to be the case that the agnatic lines can be “seen” more distinctly in the extended affinal relationship system.<sup>41</sup>

Whether Crow- or Omaha-like cross-cousin terms appear as parallel-transmission alternatives depends on the kind of marriage that dominates from tribe to tribe, as has been pointed out before. Even the ideology with respect to what goes into forming a baby changes with this shift of emphasis from the uterine line to the agnatic line, for while the Eastern Timbira believe that both father and mother contribute equally to forming the substance of the fetus, the Kayapó stress the father’s role (Vidal 1977:89), as do the Suyá (Seeger 1974:140 and 1981:123) and the Sherente/Shavante (Maybury-Lewis 1967:63). [2002: Field research in 1999 suggests that the Canela *may* be the same as the other Gê peoples in this respect.]

It has become very apparent to me that the parallel transmission rules must represent a very deep Northern Gê (and perhaps a Central Brazilian) cognitive pattern, partly because these rules resolve the Canela consanguineal and affinal terminologies very well (both the ideal models and their legitimate ideological variations), but also because they fit a general cognitive pattern that I have derived in other ways. Ramkókamekra dualism is characterized by both positive and negative “pairing” (*aypën katê*, “in-relation-to-each-other a-pair”), and this pattern of culturally perceived similarities, including even some crucial opposite characteristics, can be found in the domains of the festivals, relationship systems, colors, shapes of three dimensional objects, village plan and activities, religious syncretism, and many other domains.

Some pairs are necessarily “oppositional” (*aypën kunãã-mã*, “related opposite-each-other”),<sup>42</sup> such as “good” versus “bad” and one age class moiety against the other one. There are, however, ways for transforming certain oppositional pairs into complementary pairs (*ipipror*, “two only,” in parallel) or even into sets of overlapping complementary pairs (*hapàà*). Probably the best example of such transformations is that men and women, in general, are seen to be a pair

(*aypën katê*, “related a-pair,” oppositional or complementary), the two categorical members of which are in an *oppositional* relationship with each other, whereas when they marry, they are described as being in a *complementary* one.<sup>43</sup>

Similarly, a uterine sister and brother are “in parallel” (by blood “equality”), as are distant cousin cross-sex “siblings” after they agree to put their names on a same-sex child of such an opposite-sex sibling (*amyi-pùtâr*, “for-self take-over”) to convert their oppositional relationship into a complementary one. Turning to a more complicated transformation, one pair of siblings and another pair of siblings, each pair with one sibling in common, form a *më-hapàà*<sup>44</sup> of three “equivalent” persons. Three festival societies may be paired in this overlapping manner to form a *më-hapàà* in opposition to the one festival society across the plaza.

The pertinence of the parallel-transmission rules is that they transform oppositional human structures into complementary relationships—the great Ramkókamekra genius. Moreover, they “fit” the across-the-plaza village integration design, i.e., the web of patrilateral extensions of the generally matrilinear extended families, one of the principal tribal integrative networks. These across-the-plaza bonds begin their existence with a young man crossing to another part of the village to marry a non-related girl so that “opposing” families are neutralized by having a pair “in parallel.” Once the marriage is secured by a child and some time has passed, the connection, “out” along the generational lines between this man’s family of orientation and his family of procreation, lies in the relationship of this man with his sister (and her descendants on one side of the plaza) and with his daughter (and her descendants on the other side of the plaza). This relationship between the two extending matrilineal lines may continue long after the death of the original man who crossed over the plaza in order to marry, consequently making a *më-hapàà* by being paired in a complementary manner first with his sister and then with his wife, and eventually with his daughter who is “the same” as her mother. In this context a woman’s MMBDDD would be her third cousin, and though they would still have some attenuated “blood” in common, and males and females at this genealogical distance still should not marry each other for this reason (though today they occasionally do), nevertheless the parallel-transmission rules can “formally reduce” this somewhat distant quasi-oppositional kin relationship “into” its equivalent, the ♀BD kin type (“GD”), reconstructing a formal *më-hapàà*. Thus a woman and her MMBDDD, while still not “in parallel” or “identical,” are nevertheless very close (*aypën katsúwa*, “relation-to-each-other toward”) since they are formally in the same *më-hapàà* or “bridge.” In this way, certain distantly-linked relatives become “equivalent” in the formal sense to second-link relatives, and whenever they want to utilize this actual terminological equivalent they can behave in a manner very similar to a second link relative.<sup>45</sup>

In summary, following the lead of Scheffler and Lounsbury (1971), it does *appear* that the parallel transmission rules fit the Canela-Apinayé-Kayapó relationship systems (W. Crocker 1977), and that there are numerous social structural correlates and cognitive congruencies to support this representation for the Ramkókamekra-Canela. Field research must still be carried out (or provided in published literature) in order to cull additional Kayapó and Suyá details in support of this approach for representing an underlying cognitive pattern for the Northern Gê, or perhaps even for central Brazil and parts of Bolivia. With the MBD-FZS matrilinear cross-cousin marriage understood as a special feature of the Sirionó (and of the Suyá), however, it becomes easier to perceive a Sirionó-Canela basic resemblance, both characterized by a parallel

transmission-like *cognitive* pattern reflected in the relationship systems.

Finally, it is important for our understanding of the above materials to recognize: (1) that the Ramkókamekra see marriage as initiating the first-/further-link dichotomy in kin terminology and that such compartmentalization is manifested in a similar manner in several other domains;<sup>46</sup> (2) that ideologically they emphasize uterine line “position filling in” rather than the nevertheless coordinated ZS/MB replacement, but yet agree to three distinct examples of S/F succession; (3) that ideologically *both* parents contribute to forming the fetus for the Eastern Timbira tribes [2002: ?], while just the father contributes for the Kayapó and Suyá, and that this change in ideology corresponds with the shift in emphasis from the matriline to the patriline expressions of the parallel transmission alternatives; (4) that the cross-collateral form of the parallel transmission rule “fits” the patrilateral across-the-plaza network of integration of the Canela village plan, and the tribal structure, in its marriage-initiated cross-sibling “bridge” (*më-hapàà*); (5) that this cross-collateral form of the parallel transmission rule may even explain for the Kayapó why the brother-sister bond is weakened while the marital tie is strengthened (no genealogical *më-hapàà*) when the agnatic line of reduction equivalence is given priority (i.e., patriline emphasis); (6) that eventually such comparisons may be extended to include parallel-transmission-related variations found among the Suyá, Sherente/Shavante, Bororo, Nambikwara, Sirionó, and other tribes; and (7) that the parallel-transmission pattern is in accord with the great Canela genius for transforming opposing paired elements into complementary ones. In contrast, with the B-Z bond disregarded or broken for the more agnatic-line-oriented societies that still are nevertheless all uxorilocal, the analyst would expect the agnatic line expression of a parallel-transmission-like cognitive pattern to increasingly assume either ceremonial and political forms rather than genealogical ones, such as the F to S inheritance of the political chieftainship among the Xikrin-Kayapó (Vidal 1977:150), or to increasingly manifest agnatic line characteristics such as a group of full brothers marrying a group of full sisters, as among the Suyá, or patrilineality itself, though shallow, as among the Shavante.

In this paper, I presented, first, an ethnography of *marriage* and *separation* and then focused not only on the *balance between the sexes* but also on how this intersex relationship and the institution of marriage have *changed* over the years. Some special questions—such as the *differences with Nimuendajú*, the poorly understood institution of *age class marriage*, and the nonexistence of *matriliny* and *exogamous moieties*—were largely resolved, at least for postcontact times. Then, I shifted the paper’s focus to the relative position of the Canela on the Northern Gê and Central Brazilian scenes, at least hypothetically, and to the possibility of the existence of a basic cognitive pattern (“psychological reality”) represented in the relationship systems in terms of formal *parallel-transmission* rules (Scheffler and Lounsbury 1971). Through this inspection, the nature of Canela *dualism* was seen as being closely related to these parallel-transmission patterns, and the nature of marriage and marital roles was shown to vary depending on which aspect of the rules (Crow-like or Omaha-like, or uterine line or agnatic line) was given more emphasis in each particular society. Whereas marriage played a significant societally integrative role among the *genealogically-oriented*, uterine-line-emphasizing Canela, it seemed to be less important as a societally integrating factor among the less genealogically-oriented, more agnatic-line-stressing Kayapó, where *political* factors seemed to predominate.

## NOTES

1. Much of the material presented in this paper is a result of research based on the original materials furnished in Nimuendajú (1946). Rather than referring to that great Brazilian ethnologist's volume frequently, I wish to acknowledge a personal and professional indebtedness to him of very sizable proportions. Beyond these expressions of general recognition, I will cite his important points only to support or differ with them.

Most of this research has been carried out with the support of the Smithsonian Institution in the United States and, in Brazil, under the auspices of the Museu Paraense "Emílio Goeldi." I want to thank the Brazilian federal organizations, the Fundação Nacional do Índio and the Conselho Nacional de Pesquisas, for their authorizations to carry out research among the Canela, for which I am immensely grateful.

2. Krahó: Melatti (1970) and (1978); Křikati: Lave (1967); Pukobyé: Newton (1971); Gavião: Laráia and Da Matta (1967), Arnaud (1975), and Arnaud *et al.* (1977); Apinayé: Da Matta (1971, 1976, 1979).

3. 2002: The orthography utilized herein is based largely on a phonemic analysis made by Jack and Jo Popjes (SIL translators) (1982). While the orthography found in W. Crocker (1990:9) is followed, a practice is introduced to facilitate the use of diacritics with computers and HTML-language websites: The dieresis is used to nasalize a vowel phoneme as well as the tilde.

4. Sixty-nine R-Canela couples in 1970 believed themselves to have been consanguineally "non-related" before marriage whereas 30 considered themselves to have been related. I found one couple to be related as first cousins; two as first cousins once removed; two, second cousins; five, second cousins or further (because of their genealogical uncertainty); one, third cousins; six, third cousins or further; two, fourth cousins or further; four, related before marriage but uncertain how; and one couple were GCs of *amyi-pùtâr* "siblings" (i.e., distant cross-sex sibblingship, strengthened by the naming of one of each other's same-sex children). Four couples had married each other as siblings through "contributing father" relationships. One pair were step-relatives and another were S and GD of siblings by adoption. These latter six cases are most likely non-relatives consanguineally though they do reckon themselves as kin, so there were, in 1970, at least 24 consanguineal marriages genealogically (one-quarter). From a little different point of view, namely, what the couples believed they had called each other before marriage (two had forgotten) rather than what I could discover their genealogical relationships to be: thirteen had addressed each other as "B" and "Z"; nine as "GF" and "GD" (includes MB and [m.s.] ZD); two as "GM" and "GS" (includes FZ and [w.s.] BS); two as "F" and "D"; and two as "M" and "S."

5. I found six examples of the sororate through analyzing 204 individual R-Canela marriage life histories in 1970. The deceased W's Ps like to retain their DH for raising her children by providing the widower with the deceased W's Z, "Z," or some other female relative

who can be easily brought to live in the same household. In contrast, I found only two examples of the levirate.

6. Of the 96 marriages included in the 1970 R-Canela marriage life history study, 40 (41.7 percent) were first marriages for both H and W. There were also 40 other people who had been married only once, making 120 (58.8 percent) out of 204 alive-married and alive-formerly-married persons in the study who had been married only once.

7. A distinction must be made between “contracting” marriage (*mě to aypěn tē*), “they for each-other restricted,” and “adjusting” the marriage (*mě aypěn pa*, “they to-each-other listen”—hold council). The former arrangement, though not commenced by any rite, constitutes an enduring relationship between the two families, including a casual and continuing exchange of services, whereas the latter situation amounts to some members of the two families holding an informal meeting and consenting to the marriage as well as counseling the couple either just before or soon after the taking of virginity. If there was no “adjusting” before virginity loss, the girl is said to have been “stolen” (*hà?khīya*) or that they came together because of “liking each other” (*mě aypěn khin*). If she then failed to obtain the seducer’s admission or prove her case in identifying him, she would be said to have “lost her money” (*i?pore pictor*). The acculturative trend is moving from “contracting” through “adjusting” first to “stealing” and “liking each other” and “adjusting” afterward, but not toward the virgin “losing her money.”

8. Lyon questions whether aboriginal sexual jealousy is a human universal (1974:183). Old Canelas in the late 1950s insisted, however, that sexual jealousy was traditional rather than learned from local Brazilians. Ramkókamekra males only create a fuss when confronted by talk or evidence of “infidelity.” It is a question of loss of face, the anger depending on who took the advantage, a friend or competitor. As a form of one-up-manship, an anxious husband will usually try to “catch” the competitor’s wife in return. I suspect the old Canela informants were right and that a wife’s having sex with a person other than her husband amounted to an invasion of her husband’s sphere of limited but recognized control. What he did not know would not hurt him, but when others knew he knew, he had to act. Thus, if such jealousy is a near human universal, the suggestion here is that such “possessiveness” would have a high sociopolitical component.

9. A decidedly “crazy” (very emotionally disturbed) father left his wife and then later a second one, both mothers of a child of his; another father of a child was sent away by its mother (his wife) as a half-wit; one woman was abandoned by an Apanyekra returning to his tribe; another mother was left twice, and one of these two ex-husbands was later interned in the Indian Foundation’s national correction center in Minas Gerais for other antisocial reasons; and one father who was sent away in 1970 returned in 1971. Viewed from 1970, however, this amounts to seven father-child separations.

10. Some reasons for Ramkókamekra marriage stability are: (1) very extensive extramarital sex practices (W. Crocker 1974); (2) extreme focus on the welfare of children (pre- and postpartum taboos, teknonymy, principal ceremonial roles, etc. [W. Crocker 1971:326]),

including that ego's family of orientation exists primarily for the raising of ego; (3) social sanctions applied by ego's "GPs," the tribal council, and chiefs of the tribe, which cause a man to return to his wife (W. Crocker 1964b:344); (4) the many sources of satisfactions in Canela life other than the marital link (group singing and dancing; hunting, racing and sports; festivals; joking relationships; verbal outlets in extended family hearings and in tribal council meetings, and recognition of personal problems, etc.) (W. Crocker 1962:120), and (5) factors such as age class ridicule and coercion.

11. Other cases coming before the tribal council involve theft, damage to crops, non-conformity with certain attitudes and, formerly, accusations of witchcraft.

12. For a man, deserting a widow after her first intercourse as a widow is like leaving a virgin after hers; i.e., a similar payment must be made in either case.

13. There were only two examples in the 204 life history cases of women requiring their social husband, the pater, and a believed-to-be genitor of their children, to leave the marriage entirely.

14. Since there is no direct or indirect formal exchange of spouses between marriage groups among the Canela, and for that matter since there are *not even any marriage groups*, there can be no question at all about whether it is wives or husbands who are "exchanged" in the classical sense. Quite clearly, a son-in-law and his services to her family are exchanged on several different occasions for ceremonial foods and his wife's services to him. Although the exchanges are seen as being between the extended families of the spouses, this interfamilial bond is not strengthened generation after generation into a traditional alliance pattern because brothers and their sons do not marry into the same families. They say that even full brothers may marry into the same household—there is no law against it—but actually they do not do this, and informants offer no taboos or reasons why full brothers and classificatory brothers avoid marrying into the same household and generally even into the same extended families. I suggest that brothers are not welcomed into the same matrilineal family group because the first-married-in male's wife's kin want to be able to control the later marrying-in sons-in-law, who if they were brothers or "brothers," might offer too much collective resistance to their traditional role of initial subjugation.

15. In Canela thinking, it is sons-in-law who "move" rather than wives who are being "exchanged," as in classical theory. A husband is portrayed as crossing the plaza diagonally, like a shooting star, to stay at the house of his wife on the village circle for one generation, thus enabling their sons to cross over diagonally to *different* houses, generation after generation—specifically not returning to the same houses because incest is at least theoretically reckoned to the second and third cross-cousin range, and further between parallel cousins. In addition matrilineal lines are "seen" as potatoes along a vine (a succession of daughters) to which men cross over from other vines to make possible the formation of a new daughter potato growing further down the vine. Moreover, we must think of the Canela women's daily dance line that is fixed in

space in the plaza while the men move before and around it. Also, in their imagery—including their complementary dualism, on which more will be given later—women are portrayed as being passive, generative, and sustaining while men are mobile, activating, and impermanent. Nevertheless, it was the women who used to take the initiative in setting up the traditional engagements between pre-nubile couples, and who still play the more active roles in seeking out effective sons-in-law when the young people leave it to them. A girl's mother approached a prospective son-in-law's mother, and if agreement were reached, they would then turn to their respective male kin for support. It is clearly sons-in-law who are exchanged for ceremonial food (meat pies, deer, etc.) in several rites, each step binding the young man more tightly to his wife's family. Whereas the ultimate control and command may have been theoretically held by the mother-in-law's male kin, it was certainly, then and now, the women who were and are more actively engaged in attracting and securing the young, married-in, work-force males of the matrilaterally extended family. These days, however, it is most likely the girl herself who chooses her mate by presenting her mother and their male relatives with a fait-accompli situation through her loss of virginity and his admission as the taker.

16. It does not matter whether or not ego's MH is actually his/her genitor because it is believed that any man who has had sexual intercourse with a woman after her pregnancy has become evident is a "contributing father" in the sense that his semen has helped to form the fetus. Later, the mother names certain contributors as "biological" fathers, but the "social" husband (the pater) nevertheless is held as the principal father even though conceivably, in modern scientific terms, he may or may not be the actual biological father.

17. Other elements in having become married, especially with non-virgins, are: (1) a man moving into a woman's house and supporting her; (2) what persons making love say to each other and their relatives about their intentions, i.e., whether marriage is eventually expected or not; (3) whether a man might be engaged and waiting for his fiancée to grow up or not; and (4) the relative political power of the parents and relatives of either party which is brought to bear upon the interpretation of all other marital approximation factors.

18. There are at least eight acts in the solidification of a marriage, and the age class marital rite was a ninth event that might have occurred at different stages of the continuum for different individuals. The first four steps are contracting, intercourse, and adjusting the marriage, followed often by a meat pie payment or, increasingly today, an exchange of meat pies. The next step follows when the girl wins her ceremonial belt and her mother-in-law paints it red. Later there is evident pregnancy, childbirth, and the rite ending postpartum restrictions. Ideally, the age class marriage rite would have occurred between belt painting and pregnancy.

19. At childbirth, the mother names the principal men with whom she has been having sexual relations during her pregnancy. A messenger then goes around the village circle to publicly designate the "contributing fathers," so they can immediately commence a kind of couvade.

20. According to my Ramkókamekra demographic data submitted for the September 1, 1970, Brazilian national census, in 38 cases with materials sufficiently reliable and pertinent to the study, the mother-firstborn age difference average (where no miscarriages had preceded) was about 16.5, making the conception age average about 15.75 years. Old informants reveled in their memories of the extensiveness of the fun and extramarital activities that used to occur between the belt-painting ceremony and childbirth. Married and unmarried childless girls and women used to sleep in the plaza (too visible to be done today) on the opposite side from their husbands, animating their companions. Many shifts in spouse alignments consequently used to occur (unlike today), with men winning over wives of other men or leaving their wives because of jealousy, until a couple was caught in a procedure not unlike “musical chairs” by her pregnancy. Then they were obliged to stay together for as long as they were raising their children.

21. As soon as she had lost her virginity, usually to her “husband,” and after a few months of privacy, other men occasionally tried “catching” her for private sexual relations. However, she was not indicated by the chief in a morning council meeting as one of the girl associates to accompany the men’s daily work group or an age class moiety hunting expedition until her belt was painted, nor was she expected to join the festival extramarital sex occasions.

22. I described a Ramkókamekra hazing rite elsewhere (W. Crocker 1961:78–79), but an Apanyekra one was as follows. Pepyê novices were made to kneel sitting on their heels in the plaza in a row facing their similarly “sitting” sexual partners, whether wives or otherwise. Chiefs and elders then proceeded to give them blistering lectures for their infractions, the severity of which I have never experienced among the Ramkókamekra.

23. The institution of the platform bed high under the rafters, furnished to the young H and his W in the house of her kin, is inconsistent with the general rule of no sexual intercourse being formally allowed young people by their GF category relatives. Only the WMF, among all her GF kin and none of her H’s GF kin, however, witnessed the young H’s occasional, quiet nocturnal visits to his W’s platform bed, since just he (the WMF) was a resident of the W’s kin’s house. However, he would have said nothing. My informants have been amused by the idea that youths might have climbed up to a girl’s high platform bed without having had sex with her (see Nimuendajú 1946:118). They say this could never have been the case because desire among youths is too overpowering and that the bed was elevated only after the girl had lost her virginity to her young husband and that he was the only visitor. I witnessed the elevation of my adopted ZD’s platform bed just after she had won her belt in 1957 and heard the relevant noises from my adjacent quarters below. In sexual matters, the Canela become embarrassed by what is seen, not by what is heard. A non-virginal, unattached young woman, of course, might have a variety of visitors.

24. The Ramkókamekra lands were legally demarcated, very much to their tribal advantage and against some local rancher opposition, between 1969 and 1971. [2002: The final legal demarcation steps were taken during the early 1980s.] A jeep or truck road directly from the *município* capital of Barra do Corda to the Ramkókamekra village of Escalvado was completed

in 1970, and it was extended to the Apanyekra village of Porquinhos in 1973. In 1970 and 1971, a sizable new post building and a schoolhouse were built in Escalvado as well as a soccer field. A gasoline generator provides electricity to light these buildings at night and parts of the village. The latter also draws water from a deep well and supplies a sending-receiving radio. Built as a model post, several guest rooms and running water were provided as well as an excellent Indian agent, Sebastião Pereira, a nurse and a schoolteacher. A special tuberculosis medical team identified prospective cases and prescribed medicines for the patients, and carried out a relatively successful program by convincing many of the Canela patients and their families of the necessity to submit to medical treatment continuously over a long period of time. By 1979 tuberculosis had all but been eradicated.

25. This figure for men over 50 in 1970 (the average age difference between spouses) has most probably been reduced (biased) by the death of the older men in the age classes.

26. The custom of youths sleeping with older women was abandoned between the initiation of these last two age classes, namely, the group of the principal chief, Kaarà-?khre (age 49 in 1970), and the group of the younger Kaapêr-tùk (age 38 in 1970).

27. In a number of late remarriages as well as for several obviously incompetent males, spouse age differences of over 20 years were found.

28. The three ritual payments sometimes made by the wife's relatives to secure her husband (his meat pie "purchase," a deer at the belt-painting ceremony, and further meat pies at the postpartum contributing fathers' rite) are repaid by the husband partly in his daily services rather than by extensive gifts, as described for the Krahó. The rest of the debt remains to be paid in case he should leave his wife. In that case, occurrences that must be paid for are: (1) the wife's loss of virginity, (2) the three ritual payments if they were made, (3) the birth of children, (4) the breaking of a widow's postpartum sex restrictions, (5) sexual relations when a wife was not interested, and (6) any insults or injuries she may have suffered because of her husband and his family. These debts are reduced by: (1) a return meat pie payment from his family to hers, (2) any shame the husband suffered because of her infidelities before his eyes, (3) her negligence in the performance of domestic duties, and (4) insults and injuries he may have suffered because of his wife or her relatives.

29. Apinayé population in 1962 (Lave 1967:20) was 150 and 80; Krahó in 1963 (Melatti 1972:4) 169, 49, 109, 50, and 130; Gavião in 1962 (Laráia and Da Matta 1967:138) 23 and 17; Krĩkatí and Pukobyé in 1964 (Lave 1967:19) 152, 58, 90, and 25; Apanyekra in 1959 about 170; Ramkókamekra in 1960 (W. Crocker 1972:240) 269 and 143, but in very close contact and recent (1956) separation. In 1936 (Nimuendajú 1946:13-36), it appears that the Ramkókamekra were just under 300.

30. It has to be assumed (lacking space for clarification herein) that the professional reader knows about "formal analysis" of kinship systems through Lounsbury's approach (1964),

namely, Crow and Omaha Type-III extension or reduction equations, and through Scheffler and Lounsbury's orientation (1971) emphasizing parallel transmission rules. (See Nogle [1974:22–26] for a critique including other forms of semantic analysis.) Crow-Omaha principles, where most pertinent to the Canela, stress the MB/ZS terminological equivalences (through linking relatives), while the parallel-transmission rules emphasize uterine and agnatic line extensions or reductions (through linking relatives). Among the Ramkókamekra, however, the kinship ideology is more emphatic in its relationship to matrification than to avuncular replacement, so the parallel-transmission rules seem more pertinent. Moreover, a technical advantage of the parallel-transmission rules lies in their closer “fit” to the empirical data. For instance, a person's spouse's cross sibling's spouse is a spouse (WBW = W, HZH = H), just as a parent's cross sibling's spouse is a spouse (or an affine, if ego and alter are of the same sex: ♂MBW = W, ♀FZH = H; ♀MBW = ♀BW, ♂FZH = ♂ZH). These kin types are never addressed as consanguineal relatives, as they are in Crow and Omaha Type-III on one side of the paradigm, unless they actually are such “blood” relatives by birth, which does occur quite frequently. (Obviously, the reciprocals of these affinal kin types follow the same form.) The really greater advantage of parallel-transmission's better “fit” is found in the reduction of the very long affinal kin types crossing one or even three marriage bonds. Uterine and agnatic line terminological equivalences, through linking relatives, do exist, depending on certain known priorities, *wherever* ego and alter are further-linked (two links away or more), *and* involve cross collaterals or include a marital bond, provided that certain subcategory terms can be recognized correctly as being part of their principal category, semantically.

31. I collected these field data on kinship in 1966, 1969, 1970, and 1971 and re-confirmed them in 1975. The possibility that these data may support parallel-transmission rules among the Ramkókamekra was presented in a paper to the American Anthropological Association in 1976 (W. Crocker MS). [2002: I have given priority to the development of other materials than the special monograph on Canela kinship.]

32. Conceivably the parallel transmission rules, together with several other more basic rules (Scheffler and Lounsbury 1971:127), might resolve the terminological systems, i.e., reduce all kintypes to their categorical foci in a satisfactory manner—or extend all kin categories out to their various kin types—without reflecting or being congruent with native thought or their social institutions. Thus, it is necessary to demonstrate relatedness between the rules (*etic*) and the structure of the data from the field (possibly *emic*). Surely there are several culturally significant cognitive patterns in any society; surely, representations of the same pattern differ from one level of psychological reality to another. Thus, the question of congruence herein is at least difficult and may be even spurious, but I believe, nevertheless, that it should be pursued.

33. One Canela belief is that a woman, her daughter, her granddaughter, etc., all come off the same umbilicus and so are “the same,” at least as paired. (A woman is not, however, quite “the same” in “blood” composition as her granddaughter.) Another belief is that women are like squash or melons on a vine, growing on and on from mother to daughter to granddaughter, etc.—the same “blood.” Still another belief and its practices are that the afterbirth materials are buried

in a corner of the mother's birth enclosure room, that her daughter's similar materials will be added there, and that her granddaughter's will be interred there too. Thus, these down-the-generations burials are always in the same position in relation to the sun on the village circle as villages move. This practice is maintained until the female line dies out. The "permanence" of a female line at one point on the village circle, "forever" as they say, is very powerful symbolically.

34. Name transmission is stressed among the deculturated Krīkatí as forming the principal social and ceremonial structures (probably because they have lost most other integrative networks), but among the Ramkókamekra this "MB" to "ZS" name giving is only important ceremonially. It is the actual mother's brother (*kêt*), however, or some other *kêt* kin category counselor, who is usually more important in the socialization of his sister's son than that boy's naming uncle. "Brothers" and "sisters" (i.e., cousins of varying degrees) preferably transmit names to one same-sex child of such a cross-sex sibling in order to create a closer relationship between each other in a large society. Thus, exchanging names with a uterine sibling, who is already close, usually is carried out for some other reason.

35. Among both Ramkókamekra- and Apanyekra-Canela, Eastern Timbira tribal membership is by sex filiation. Thus, a woman belongs to the tribe of her mother and a man to that of his father "out" along the line "forever," they say. Similarly, a peace exchange ceremonial chief (a *tàmhàk*) took the place of his father, or his father's brother, or his father's father (contrast Nimuendajú 1946:99). The institution of the Ceremonial-Chief-of-the-Whole-Tribe (*khrii kuniá mēhō?pa?hi*) began around 1908 in order to unite the Ramkókamekra, who were split into two villages, each under a different political chief, both very hostile to each other. Such a ceremonial "peace chief" was chosen in each village by the other village; he was the "honorary chief" in the other village whom they could visit and who would protect them. The villages did in fact join in 1913, and these two "honorary" patrilineal lines still exist today and are enshrined very prestigiously in an intergroup peace-keeping dramatization in an act of the Pepkahàk festival—the most highly honored *api-kraw-kraw-re* rite. It is conspicuous that where there are no institutions like uxorilocality to prevent the "expression" of agnatic lines "spreading" (*mē-ipikràn*) "in parallel" (*mē-ipipror*) with uterine lines, this psychological "parallel" reality does seem to manifest itself. Curiously, they do say that these two intertribal descent lines are "in parallel" with each other, which seems inconsistent with the more characteristic male-female opposition, but items that are "in parallel" can be seen as such from different points of view—in this case, diachronically, where oppositions are nonexistent, instead of synchronically.

36. It may be pertinent that when the Canela refer to their ancestors, they use the expression *mē-nkētyē* (the mothers' brothers or the parents' fathers), but the Kayapó talk of their "fathers" (*djun-iyē*) (see Turner 1966:Ap. 1, xxvii).

37. In this case, they actually utilize the plural form of *tùy* (FZ, FM, MM), namely *mē-mpuṭswèyyē*, which I have not included here in order to avoid confusion. They also draw a line of "descendants," as if *kêt*, *tùy*, and *tàmṭswè* were in the same supercategory, distinguished only

by the “arriving” *tàmtswè* (either sex) and the “departing” old *kêt* (male) or *tùy* (female). However, when a man from one file of “descendants” crosses to marry a woman in another file of “descendants,” then all the other terminological categories are created, according to informants, largely because of, (1) shame surrounding the ongoing sex acts that one-link consanguines of the spouses must not think about, (2) the obvious conflicts of interest between affinals, (3) the need for consanguines to protect each other’s rights, and (4) the necessity to keep the sons-in-law working and in their places.

38. The mingling of male and female fluids, perspiration, and body odors in sexual intercourse soon make a husband and wife of similar “blood,” as are their children with each other and with their parents. As a result of sharing almost “identical” blood, these persons have to maintain strict food and sex restrictions for each other when any one of these first-linked persons (*not* classificatory first-linked relatives) is ill or in a weakened condition. Linguistically there is a distinction between those one-link relatives “who carry out restrictions for me” (*mëi-ipyakri-katêyê*) and all other relatives who share more attenuated blood (*mëi-yũũkhyê* or *mëi-khwè*). This semantically discrete and non-overlapping distinction exists at some levels of Ramkókamekra thought and not at other levels (see W. Crocker 1977:272), but nevertheless it most certainly results in an attitudinal and behavioral dichotomy.

39. Gê specialists who do not know the Ramkókamekra-Canela believe that all the Northern Gê did not extend their consanguineal and affinal kinship systems very far. From empirical data, I know of fifth cousins (parallel, and connected through all female links [ $\text{♂MMMMMZDDDDDD}$ ]) who still consider each other to be “brother” and “sister,” and third cross-cousins (through all female links except one [ $\text{♂MMMBDDDD}$ ]) who call each other “uncle” and “niece.” The spouse of such a “brother” may treat his “sister” as an affine (HZ), and the spouse of the “uncle” would most likely address his “niece” in the same way (HZ). Moreover, the across-the-plaza affinal terminological structure can sometimes cross two or three marriage bonds ( $\text{♀HMBSW} = \text{♀BW}$  or D;  $\text{♀HMMBDSW} = \text{♀BW}$  only).

40. Consequently, it must be clear that the reciprocals, a  $\text{♂ZC}$  and a  $\text{♂DC}$  or a  $\text{♀BC}$  and a  $\text{♀SC}$ , are terminologically the same, as are all GCs regardless of sex (*tàmtswè*).

41. Examples of “across-marital-bond,” further-link uterine and agnatic lines may be the following: HMM = HM = HZ = HZD = HZDD . . . ; WFF = WF = WB = WBS; WMBW = WMBD = WMBDD . . . = W; HFZ = HFZD = HFZDD . . . = HZ; WMF = WMB = WMBS = WB.

42. This expression *aypën kunãã-mã* is just one of a number of ways of expressing an oppositional but yet paired relationship, *aypën kuurê-tswèn* (relationship inimical) possibly being the most hostile one; in contrast, *aypën khay-nã* means “they are *off* with respect to each other” with no question of their being paired in any way. The Canela do not express every relationship in dualistic terms. In fact, they do not make pairs of most items at all.

43. Gê specialists have generally been aware of only one kind of dualism in these tribes (unlike Maybury-Lewis 1979:312). However, the Ramkókamekra do pair certain entities positively (+ or //) and others negatively (- or X). For instance, while the village (*khrii*) and the untouched forest (*a?kuuni*) are oppositionally paired (-), the plaza (*kàà*) and the houses (*ikhre*) on the village circle are perceived to be in a *complementary* paired (+) relationship. Considering the resolution of the forest-village negative pairing (nature versus culture), a garden (*pur*) is in a thicket (*a?khêt*), the burning of which helps it grow (+), and a thicket is part of (+) the forest and the garden helps the village survive (+). Thus by overlapping complementary pairings, the Ramkókamekra have created an all-complementary *hapàà* (forest//thicket//garden//village) between two distinctly oppositional entities (forest X village). (Contrast Melatti 1979:79.)

44. The morpheme “*më*” indicates the plural and also that Indians are involved, but that these persons must understand each other’s languages well. Thus “*më*,” besides indicating the plural, also means “Eastern Timbira” for the Canela, a distinction that excludes the Kayapó, whom the Ramkókamekra scarcely comprehend, and the Shavante, who are completely unintelligible to them. (Presumably the Apinayé and Krahó would have a different perspective, being nearer to the Timbira boundaries.) [2002: It is a question whether the Apinayé (Western Timbira) should be included. Nimuendajú indicates no (1946:12), while modern Canela say yes.] It is interesting that while *pî-yapàà* (“poles three-or-more-in-parallel”) means “bridge,” usually across a stream, *më-hapàà* implies that there are two or more pairs of Eastern Timbira persons (or groups) “overlappingly” in parallel. *Hapàà* suggests that there are two or more pairs of “items” (animals, *civilizados*, non-Eastern Timbira-speaking Indians, and things) with one item always in common to each pair. (I have usually found the overlapping feature to be necessary, but sometimes informants will align rows of positive and negative objects opposite each other without pairing them.)

45. Just how congruent to social structures and native thought does an etic “formal” principle have to be in order to be accepted as “representing” an emic pattern? As an example, let us take the nature X culture opposition, which is best represented in the Canela-Indian X game-animal relationship (*më-hiï X prùù-re*). Young hunters purify their “bodies” by undergoing very thorough food and sex restrictions, which themselves are “in parallel” with these youths in training (*më-hiï//ipiyakri-tsà*), so that the game animal grows to like them and even tries to approach them when the hunters (*më-nto-kapôk*) go hunting (*më-nto-kapôk//prùù-re*). Thus, a *hapàà* exists (*më-hiï//ipiyakri-tsà//më-nto-kapôk//prùù-re*) and the poor beast is thereby easily shot dead. Other “bridging” examples are the following: An Eastern Timbira X ghosts, but Eastern Timbira//shaman and shaman//ghosts; thus Eastern Timbira//shaman//ghosts or *më-hiï//kay//më-karõõ*. That is, ordinary Canela cannot deal with the supernatural but a shaman can do this for them.

46. Quite obviously, this paper throws some light on the Central Brazilian dialectical organization so extensively discussed and portrayed by the researchers of the Harvard Central Brazil Project (Maybury-Lewis 1979). I have been aware of the nature of the material presented in Professor Maybury-Lewis’s introduction (1979:12–13) for some time, and therefore was very

pleased to find some of his “oppositions” and “harmonious syntheses” expressed in certain Ramkókamekra linguistic terms. It might interest the reader to know what a careful study through informants of the semantic fields of such terms has revealed. Taking such expressions from Maybury-Lewis (1979:311), “nature” and “culture” have been interpreted already in the “forest” X “village” and “game animal” X “Eastern Timbira Indian” oppositions. Another example is “raw meat” (*hĩ-tàm*) X “cooked meat” (*hĩ-tsàr*), which becomes complementary as “raw meat” // “fire” (*kuhù*) // “wood” (*pĩ*) // “cooked meat.” “Individual” and “society” can be expressed as *amyiá-?khôt* X *harkhwa-?khôt* (“one’s-own-initiative following” X “orders following”), a very important Ramkókamekra opposition. I have discussed “male” and “female” already, and “ceremonial” and “instrumental” can be portrayed in *mě amyi-?khĩn katêyé* (“Eastern-Timbira festival people”) // *mě to-ipyapar katêyé* (“Eastern-Timbira something-raising/cultivating people”), but note that these elements are positively rather than negatively paired.

“Public” and “private” was not a contrast that I could identify with the help of informants in Ramkókamekra terms, unless it is the same as “society” and “individual.” Almost every situation seemed to be “public,” even household rites for individuals. From Maybury-Lewis (1979:305), “forum” (*kàà*) and “household” (*ikhre*) are paired in a complementary manner, as are “social persona” (*mě haprè-khôt*, Eastern-Timbira names-following) and “physical persona” (*mě kaprô-khôt*, Eastern-Timbira “blood”-following, or physical substance). However, the social persona comes just as much or more from a principal counselor (*to hapak-khre katê*, his advising person), as from a name giver (*haprè yôr katê*, name giving person), though both are traditionally of the *kêt* kin category. Professor Roberto Da Matta stresses male-female differences (already discussed) and generational contrasts (1979:123). However, it is interesting that Ramkókamekra informants will not allow either complementary or oppositional pairing to exist between parents and their children. There are no diachronic oppositions, only synchronic ones. The Canela see children as the products of “cultivation” by the parents, as are crops. Adjacent Ramkókamekra generations *are* generally in opposition, however; but this “gap” is bridged for parents and their children by the blood identity of genealogically first-linked people.

In summary, it seems that while some of the components of dualism are paired in opposition, other components are paired in a complementary manner, and that some pairs are “in opposition” under some circumstances and “in parallel” (complementary) in other situations. Most of the paired contrasts presented in Professor Maybury-Lewis’s volume could be adequately expressed by Ramkókamekra paired linguistic terms, but the public-private contrast could not be found (maybe a tribal difference). Moreover, the social persona was seen as including another important element besides ceremonialism. Generational differences (Professor Da Matta), where important to the kinship system, were interpreted as neither oppositional nor complementary but rather as diachronic products. My suggestions are that Central Brazilian Gê dualism is quite varied, that the paired components are of several kinds, and that further emic studies of this orientation among the various tribes are needed.

## References Cited

Arnaud, Expedito

- 1975 *Os índios Gaviões de Oeste: Pacificação e Integração*. Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, Publ. Avulsa 28. Belém.

Arnaud, Expedito, Roberto Cortez, and Ana Rita Alves

- 1977 Terminologia de parentesco dos índios Gaviões de Oestes (Parkateyê)—Tocantins, Pará. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi*, N.S., Antropologia no. 63. Belém.

Bamberger, Joan

- 1979 Exit and voice in central Brazil: The politics of flight in Kayapó society. In *Dialectical Societies: The Gê and Bororo of central Brazil*, ed. David Maybury-Lewis. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. Pp. 130–46.

Carneiro da Cunha, Manuela

- 1978 *Os mortos e os outros: Uma análise do sistema funerário e da noção de pessoa entre os índios Krahó*. São Paulo: Editora Hucitec.

Crocker, William H.

- 1961 The Canela since Nimuendaju: A preliminary report on cultural change. *Anthropological Quarterly* 34:69–84.
- 1962 A method for deriving themes as applied to Canela Indian festival materials. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- 1964a Extramarital sexual practices of the Ramkokamekra-Canela Indians: An analysis of sociocultural factors. In *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Südamerikas: Festgabe für Herbert Baldus zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hans Becker. Völkerkundliche Abhandlungen des Niedersächsischen Landesmuseums Abteilung für Völkerkunde, vol. 1. Hannover: Münstermann-Druck GMBH. Pp. 25–35. (Also in Lyon 1974:184–94.)
- 1964b Conservatism among the Canela: An analysis of contributing factors. In *Actas y Memorias*, vol. 35, Congreso Internacional de Americanistas. México, D.F.: Editorial Libros de México.
- 1971 The Canela (Brazil) taboo system: A preliminary exploration of an anxiety-reducing device. In *Verhandlungen* 3:323–31, XXXVIII Internationalen Amerikanerkongresses, Stuttgart-München (1968). Munich: Klaus Renner.
- 1972 The non-adaptation of a savanna Indian tribe (Canela, Brazil) to forced, forest relocation: An analysis of factors. In *Anais*, vol. 1, Encontro Internacional de Estudos Brasileiros, I Seminário de Estudos Brasileiros

- (1971). São Paulo.
- 1974 Extramarital sexual practices of the Ramkókamekra-Canela Indians: An analysis of socio-cultural factors. In *Native South Americans: Ethnology of the Least Known Continent*, ed. Patricia J. Lyon. Boston: Little, Brown. Pp. 184–94.
- 1977 Canela “group” recruitment and perpetuity: Incipient “unilineality”? In *Actes 2:259–75*, XLII Congrès International des Américanistes, Paris (1976).
- 1978 Estórias das épocas de pré e pós-pacificação dos Ramkókamekra e Apâniekra-Canelas. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi*, n.s., Antropologia no. 68. Belém.
- 1979 Canela kinship and the question of matrilineality. In *Brazil: Anthropological Perspectives (essays in honor of Charles Wagley)*, ed. Maxine L. Margolis and William E. Carter. New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. 225–49.
- 1990 *The Canela (Eastern Timbira), I: An Ethnographic Introduction*. Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology 33. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- MS The possibility of parallel transmission rules being applicable to the Ramkókamekra-Canela. Paper given before the American Anthropological Association (1976).

Da Matta, Roberto

- 1971 Uma breve reconsideração da morfologia Apinayé. In *Verhandlungen* 3:355–64, XXXVIII Internationalen Amerikanistenkongresses, Stuttgart-München (1968). Munich: Klaus Renner.
- 1973 A reconsideration of Apinayé social morphology. In *Peoples and cultures of native South America*, ed. Daniel R. Gross. New York: Doubleday.
- 1976 *Um mundo dividido: A estrutura social dos índios Apinayé*. Petrópolis: Voces.
- 1979 The Apinayé relationship system: Terminology and ideology. In *Dialectical Societies: The Gê and Bororo of central Brazil*, ed. David Maybury-Lewis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Pp. 88–127.
- 1982 A Divided World: Apinayé Social Structure. Trans. Alan Campbell. *Harvard Studies in Cultural Anthropology* 6. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Laráia, Roque, and Roberto Da Matta

- 1967 *Índios e Castanheiros: A empresa extrativa e os índios no médio Tocantins*. Corpo e Alma do Brasil, no. 21. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro.

Lave, Jean

- 1967 Social taxonomy among the Krikatí (Gê) of Central Brazil. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- 1971 Some suggestions of the interpretation of residence, descent and exogamy among the Eastern Timbira. In *Verhandlungen* 3:341–45, XXXVIII Internationalen Amerikanistertag, Stuttgart-München (1968). Munich: Klaus Renner.
- 1977 Eastern Timbira moiety systems in time and space: A complex structure. In *Actes*, vol. 2, XLII Congrès International des Américanistes, Paris (1976).

Lounsbury, Floyd G.

- 1964 The formal analysis of Crow- and Omaha-type kinship terminologies. In *Explorations in cultural anthropology*, ed. Ward H. Goodenough. New York: McGraw-Hill. Pp. 351–93.

Lyon, Patricia J. (ed.)

- 1974 *Native South Americans: Ethnology of the least known continent*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Maybury-Lewis, David

- 1967 *Akwẽ -Shavante society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Reprinted in paperback, New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.)
- 1979 *Dialectical societies: The Gê and Bororo of central Brazil*, ed. David Maybury-Lewis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Melatti, Júlio Cézar

- 1970 O sistema social Krahó. Tese de doutoramento na Antropologia da Universidade de São Paulo.
- 1972 *O messianismo Krahó*. São Paulo: Editora Herder.
- 1979 The relationship system of the Krahó. In *Dialectical societies: The Gê and Bororo of central Brazil*, ed. David Maybury-Lewis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- 1978 *Ritos de Uma Tribo Timbira*. Ensaios 53. São Paulo: Editora Ática.

Newton, Dolores

- 1971 Social and historical dimensions of Timbira material culture. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

Nimuendajú, Curt

- 1946 *The Eastern Timbira*. Trans. and ed. Robert Lowie. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, no. 41. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nogle, Lawrence Elwayne

1974 *Method and theory in the semantics and cognition of kinship*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Pike, Kenneth L.

1947 *Phonemics: A technique for reducing language to writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Popjes, Jack, and Jo Popjes

1982 *Ortografia Canela-Krahô*. Edição experimental. Brasília, D. F.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Scheffler, Harold W., and Floyd G. Lounsbury

1971 *A study in structural semantics: The Siriono kinship system*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Seeger, Anthony

1974 Nature and culture in the cosmology and social organization of the Suyá: A Gê-speaking tribe of central Brazil. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.

1981 *Nature and society in central Brazil: The Suyá Indians of Mato Grosso*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Turner, Terence S.

1966 Social structure and political organization among the northern Cayapó. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

1979 The Gê and Bororo societies as dialectical systems: A general model: Kinship, household, and community structure among the Kayapó. In *Dialectical societies*, ed. David Maybury-Lewis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Vidal, Lux

1977 *Morte e vida de uma sociedade indígena brasileira*. São Paulo: Editora Hucitec.