

Caribe



CONSELHO NACIONAL DE PESQUISAS
INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE PESQUISAS DA AMAZÔNIA
BOLETIM DO MUSEU PARAENSE EMÍLIO GOELDI

NOVA SÉRIE

BELEM — PARÁ — BRASIL

ANTROPOLOGIA

N.º 38

23, DEZEMBRO, 1968

**CEREMONIAL REDISTRIBUTION IN TAPIRAPÉ
SOCIETY (*)**

JUDITH SHAPIRO
Columbia University

In Tapirapé society, as in others where labor is highly individualized and the means of production also individually owned, economic integration takes place not so much through cooperation in work or division of labor as through exchange of the results of that labor. There is, to be sure, division of work among the Tapirapé — as among all peoples — in this case primarily along the lines of sex and age, but the major locus of such division is within the nuclear family group; economic ties between domestic groups within a village are based more on a flow of goods than on communal labor.

With the exception of certain communal efforts such as fish drugging (1) of joint clearing of gardens (2), economic activities are usually performed by individuals working alone. A man most frequently hunts and fishes alone. In the early morning, Tapirapé men can be seen sitting alone in front of their respective houses weaving (3). When a man is at home during the day, he works by himself on the manufacture of bows, arrows, ornaments or baskets. Women's activities, which include cooking, spinning cotton and harvesting crops, are also carried out on an individual basis. If a group of women go to the gardens together, as is frequently the case due to the distance between village and garden plot (one to two hours' walk) and the resulting fear on the part of the women to go alone, upon arrival each goes off

M.G
COL.2

in her own direction and gathers her own supply of food. The major exception to this rule of individual labor is the team formed by husband and wife who cooperate in agricultural work. It is also the case that the central axis in the division of labor is the one which separates the economic roles of husband and wife and which constitutes the most fundamental "dual organization" in American aboriginal societies.

As concerns property, gardens belong to nuclear family groups (4). Objects of personal use — hammocks, containers, a woman's cooking utensils, a man's bows and arrows — are privately owned. Children have the same rights over their property as do adults, which will be discovered by the ethnologist who tries to obtain through parents an object which is considered to belong to a child (5). Goods which have found their way into the Tapirapé economy more recently — axes, knives, rifles and ammunition, articles of clothing — are, for the most part, subject to the same norms of ownership, exchange and gift-giving as are the more traditional items of material culture (6).

This individualization of production and ownership is balanced by patterns of exchange, some of which are of an ordinary day-to-day nature and some of which are connected with more formalized or ceremonial behavior. The present paper will concentrate upon the latter. We will first examine ceremonial exchanges involving food and then proceed to those concerning the redistribution of private property such as weapons, household utensils, ornaments and other such items of personal use.

* * *

Distribution of food beyond the nuclear family unit goes on as a part of everyday life. People may obtain products from one another's gardens. The group of women going off to harvest together may all get food from the garden of one, though each gathers her own supply. Certain

households regularly provide one another with food. When a man returns with a good number of fish, some of these are given to others outside his own domestic group. A woman who has prepared a large pot of *kāwi* (7) distributes it among certain of her relatives; she frequently gives to "mothers", "aunts" and "sisters" (8) portions of the manioc flour she makes.

In addition to these usual daily exchanges of food, however, there are also special ceremonial occasions which are characterized by communal feasting, and thus the redistribution of food provided and prepared by individual nuclear family units. Most events in the Tapirapé ceremonial cycle involve such communal meals; women participate in some of these feasts, but their role is more frequently confined to the preparation of food, the men alone partaking of the meal.

There is sometimes an element of communal food-gathering in connection with ceremonial events, notably hunting expeditions in which a large number of men participate. But each man goes off on his own to hunt and, at the conclusion of the expedition, each brings his own game home to be prepared by his wife for the communal meal. Furthermore, many ceremonies involve the designation of two families — usually on opposite sides of the village circle — as responsible for providing food for the communal feast. Thus, if a man has a good amount of manioc in his garden at a time when others are running out (9), he may be designated as one of the "masters of the feast". In one case, a man was so designated as a result of his having had better luck than his companions during the communal hunt.

Some ceremonial occasions on which communal feasting was observed were the following:

— the ceremony of *tawā*. This ceremony, which involves the ritual representation of hostilities perpetrated against the Tapirapé by their Kayapó and Karajá neighbors, is

concluded by a large communal feast which takes place in the men's house (10). As is the case in other such feasts where men alone participate, the men eat in two groups according to moiety affiliation (11).

— the ceremony of *kāo*. This ceremony, which culminates in the festival of *kāwio*, to be discussed in detail below, goes on for a period of weeks. It involves singing and dancing both at night and at dawn, in which men participate according to moiety affiliation and women according to the group affiliation of their respective husbands. Sometimes, at the conclusion of a night's dancing women will bring food to the central plaza in front of the men's house in order for the moieties to engage in communal feasting (12).

— the *macirō*, or communal clearing of gardens. This activity, which also involves the men's moieties, includes a communal feast at the conclusion of each day's work. The women set dow plates of food on a path leading from the village to the gardens, each women providing food for her husband's group (13).

* * *

Thus far we have been discussing ceremonies where the redistribution of food via communal feasting is one activity among others and not necessarily the central one. There is, however, a set of ceremonial groupings the major purpose of which is the distribution of food beyond the nuclear family unit. These are the feast groups, or *tātāopāwa*, which meet from time to time during the year, either singly or en masse, in order for their members to partake of communal meals.

There are, or were at one time, nine such groups, whose names are as follows: *cākānepera*, *āpirāpe*, *awaiki*, *mani?itiwera*, *pānāniwāna*, *kāwāno?i*, *kawano*, *tāwāopera*, *canetāwa* (41). Group names come from localities at which certain mythical beings are believed to have emerged. There

was a definite order of appearance, *āpirāpe*, for example, emerging first and then pulling *mani?itiwera* out of the ground. (Hence the latter's name which was explained to me as indicating the hole in which manioc is planted). I was unable to get a complete and coherent account of the advent of all these groups; my informants seemed able to give only isolated bits of information. However, while the ideology connected with these groups is not at present a part of exoteric knowledge and is in fact on the point of passing out of exoteric knowledge as well, the groups still continue to function, though no doubt to a more limited extent than in the past. Three of the groups, the last three on the list above, have become extinct for lack of members and another, *kāwāno?i*, with only two members, is on the verge of becoming so.

Baldus (cf. note 14) has mentioned a rule of parallel descent as determining affiliation to these groups: a girl joins her mother's group and a boy his father's. In his field notes, Wagley also records such a rule, adding that this rule was not very strictly followed. One wonders how it could be, since it is definitely expected that the groups contain members of both sexes. It is in fact thought desirable that a husband and wife belong to the same group and sometimes group affiliation is changed so that one spouse may join the other. In any event, since the feast groups have no connection with the regulation of marriage, a rule of parallel descent could not influence the kinship structure. At the time of my own visits in 1966 and 1967, parallel descent was no longer even an ideal rule. Children of either sex could and did belong to the group of either parent and sometimes individuals belonged to groups different from those of the parents. There were frequent cases of changes in group affiliation, though it was considered improper for a single individual to change more than once. It seems that a person may belong to any group in which he

has close relatives which, in the case of a small endogamous population, does not see really restrict the field at all.

Baldus describes two kinds of occasions on which the feast groups meet. A group will come together for a meal when one of its members has a supply of food, for example a large game animal, which is too large for the provider's own family but not large enough to be distributed among the members of the village at large. The feast group provides in such cases the framework for an "equitable" distribution (15). In addition to these meetings of individual feast groups, there are also times when all the groups gather together in the central plaza for a general feast. Baldus speaks of such a feast being held during the dry season around the time of the festival of "kāuihó" (= *kāwio*; cf. below); I myself observed such a gathering during this season in 1966.

The village headman, one of whose major roles is that of ceremonial coordinator, determined the day of the feast. This man arrived first in the plaza, carrying the ornamented bow which figures in almost all Tapirapé ceremonies. Then the other men began to arrive, taking their places in the plaza according to feast group affiliation (16). The women, with their children, arrived after the men, each bringing food for her own group. Although there was a bit of wandering around to sample another group's food, the members of each group tended, for the most part, to remain clustered around the plates of food provided by and for their own group's members. I was told that the *tātāopāwa* also meet together in this way at the harvest of green corn, towards the end of the rainy season, and also when there is an abundance of honey, at which time a honey *kāwi* is made.

Feast group membership does not involve any other form of communal activity. As Baldus points out, these groups constitute ties between people of different houses who form a social unit only when their group meets, either

alone or in conjunction with the others. These ties, by cross-cutting others, provide an additional axis along which the redistribution of food takes place.

* * *

Another form of ritualized behavior which influences the distribution of food in Tapirapé society consists in a fairly complex system of food taboos, involving game animals and, to a lesser extent, fish. These taboos apply differentially to men, women, young girls and boys, adolescent males about to undergo initiation, and couples with young children, the latter two groups being subject to a particularly large number of restrictions. Some prohibitions involve only the distinction of sex, there being many foods that only men may eat. Other proscriptions involve all but adult males and still others indicate foods that may be eaten by adult males and young boys, excluding women, girls, adolescent males, and men with young children. Some examples are the following: armadillo is eaten by all men, but forbidden to women; mutum, jacamim and various other wild fowl may be eaten by adults of both sexes, but not by children, adolescent males about to undergo initiation, or parents of young children; tapir and deer may be eaten by men and boys, but not by women, girls, adolescent males or men with young children. It seems, though information on this point is somewhat conflicting, that older women past menopause are considered sociologically similar to males in the matter of food taboos. Thus, I was told that an old woman may eat deer if she wants to. However, since women have become used to avoiding this food, many continue to do so all their lives.

There are also certain regulations on the mixing of different kinds of foods: peanuts, bananas and various sweet things should not be eaten on the same day as fish or meat, and vice versa. I was told by most informants

that such rules apply only to children who are sure to fall ill from mixing these foods (17).

I was not able to do an ethnoscientific study of these taboos and so cannot provide a clear account of the ideology underlying the system of proscriptions. I was told, for example, that if an adolescent boy eats deer, his hair will fall out, rendering him unable to undergo the initiation ceremony, which involves his dancing for over twenty-four hours wearing an enormous headdress tied to his hair. The meat of the tapir and armadillo is unfit for women because it is "ugly". Such isolater bits of information are, of course, far from a satisfactory account of the beliefs connected with these dietary regulations.

Food taboos have been subject to a variety of interpretations. From an ecological point of view, it has been said that the taboos serve to maintain a balance between human and animal populations. Taboos may have a medical-epidemiological significance guarding the human population against certain diseases transmitted through animals acting as reservoirs. When the taboos involve the differentials found in the system under consideration here, they may act to effect a certain distribution of nutrients among various sectors of the population. From the sociological point of view, it has been said that dietary laws have the function of defining a social group, of setting it off from its neighbors. In the case of the Tapirapé, it may be said that the category discriminations serve to set off, or symbolize, various social units within the group: the men, who may eat foods the women may not; the husband and wife, who may not; the husband and wife, who may eat foods that are prohibited to their children; the adolescent males, who are subject to restrictions that set them off from adult men and young boys alike and temporarily classify them with women. Then there are, of course, the purely ideological aspects of food taboos, their place in a people's general world view, in the categorization of natural and supernatural phenomena.

While all of these approaches are applicable to the question of Tapirapé dietary laws, there is another point to be made about these taboos in connection with the theme of the present paper. Since the taboos differentiate among statuses within a nuclear family and since, in certain cases — like that of a hunter who is also the father of a small child — the provider cannot also be the consumer, food is frequently given away to other families (18). The two or three wild fowl a man gets on a hunting trip may be too much for himself and his wife and, since the meat may not be eaten by his children some will be given to a "brother", "mother", etc. (cf. note 8). A man returning with game that neither he nor his wife may eat due to the fact that they have a very small child (and it should be pointed out that a hunter does not always refrain from shooting something that is forbidden to him) will give this game to relatives outside his immediate family (19).

* * *

Having discussed certain forms of ritualized behavior which serve to effect the distribution of food beyond the unit of production formed by the individual married couple, we will now turn to an examination of ceremonial mechanisms effecting a redistribution of privately owned items of material culture.

The most important of these mechanisms is provided by the festival of *kāwio* which occupies a prominent place in the Tapirapé ceremonial cycle and which is highlighted by a general redistribution of property. This festival concludes the ceremonial period of *kāo* mentioned above. Preparations for *kāwio* are as follows: two adolescent girls, and their, and their respective families, are appointed "masters of the feast". It is these girls who prepare the corn *kāwi* which gives the feast its name (20) and it is in their two houses (21) that the singing and dancing take place.

On the first night of the festival, the men gather in the men's house, arranging themselves according to moiety affiliation. They begin to sing from within the men's house (22) and the women join in from where they are clustered outside the door. The moieties alternate in leading the singing. Each moiety has a song leader. (One of these two men was also the village headman). The men presently come out, each with his ceremonial partner (cf. note 12), and remain dancing for a while in the central plaza. Then, still in their ceremonial groupings, the men dance down a path towards the house of one of the two sponsoring families, followed by the women and young children. Upon arrival, the men make a circle around the bowl of corn *kāwi*, which has been set down in the middle of the house. The two moiety leaders stand in front, holding their ceremonial bows; the women and children stand around on the fringes in back of the men. After singing and dancing in this house for a couple of hours, all leave and make their way to the other sponsor's house, the men leading and the moiety leaders, with their dance partners, at the very head of the procession. Here the singing and dancing is repeated around the second bowl of *kāwi* (23). Subsequent to this, a communal feast is held for the moieties in the central plaza.

Early the following morning singing begins as it does on every morning the *kāo*, led by the two moiety leaders who arrive first and build fires on either side of the plaza. Boys and young men begin to gather in the men's house where they don *buriti* masks representing spirits (*ācina*) and run back and forth with long sticks held between their legs. These "penises" are thrust through the walls of the men's house. The young men and boys are then led out of the house by two men — in this case, the village headman and one of the older men, an ex-shaman (cf. note 22). They go first to one of the sponsoring houses where the young girl is to offer them water to drink. In the ceremony I witnessed, one of the girls was too afraid or embarrassed

to do so because of the ritual phallic aggression involved in the young men's dancing: they rush at the young girls, poking them with their "penises". The other girl did offer water to these "spirits", but kept her skirt carefully tucked between her knees. In addition to giving the "spirits" water, the girls also offer them some of the corn *kāwi* which the men take in their mouths and spit out again.

The next and major activity of *kāwio* takes place the following dawn. A bowl of the corn *kāwi* is carried around the village from house to house and those individuals of relatively high prestige and wealth (designated at present by the Portuguese term "capitão") wash out their mouths with this "bad" *kāwi*, thereby constraining themselves to give to any person who swallows some of the *kāwi* immediately afterwards any personal possession that this person may request. If more than one person drinks after a "capitão", all may ask for things. Since the corn *kāwi* is indeed a nauseating beverage, and is in fact quite difficult to keep down, it is considered humiliating to drink it; a person in so doing shows himself or herself to be inferior to those who only rinse out their mouths. However, in compensation for this differential prestige is the fact that the drinker is able to gain material wealth from the "capitão" (24).

I was told that just about anything could be asked for, though no one would demand another's only hammock or other such indispensable items. The headman, who had expressed concern over not having anything good to give, brightened when he remembered his fine large canoe which he had obtained from his Karajá co-parent-in-law (25). Among items which changed hands during the *kāwio* which I witnessed in 1966 were cooking pans of both clay (cf. note 25) and aluminum, machetes, bullets, an axe, spun cotton, beads and some red dye of the type used in ceremonies. The headman kept his canoe that year, but upon returning the following year, I learned that he had just lost in that season's *kāwi* a heavy wool blanket which had been given

to him by a tourist in return for some particularly well-made artifacts.

Both men and women may be "capitães" and some are children who have been so designated by their parents, who themselves must be "capitães" (26). In such cases, it is the parents who give property to those who drink after the child. Since generosity is felt to be the most important trait of a "capitão", a child who is badly behaved and demanding cannot be given this honor (27).

* * *

Another ceremonial institution acting to effect a redistribution of private property is that of formalized friendship, or *āciwāwā*. The relationship is set up between two individuals of the same sex, often with the help of an intermediary such as the parent or spouse of one the prospective "friends". The role of the intermediary is a function of the ritual avoidance observed between *āciwāwā* once the relationship has been established. The tie involves extreme respect behavior; were "friends" to be coming towards one another on a path, for example, the two would have to turn away in order to avoid an encounter.

I was told that *āciwāwā* give one another their most valuable possessions: hammocks, mackaws, clay cooking vessels, beads, rifles, etc. Such friends also give food to one another and the initial setting up of the relationship involves a prestation of *kāwi*, but the most important transactions connected with formalized friendship seem to involve items of personal property other than food. One man told me that he once gave to his "friend" his best hunting dog; the "friend" in turn gave him an axe and a machete. All communication between the two took place via their wives, who would receive the gifts destined for their respective husbands. Sometimes parents may initiate *āciwāwā* relationships on the part of their children and, in

such cases, the sets of parents carry on exchanges until the children are old enough to do so themselves.

Since the *āciwāwā* relationship is not supposed to be set up between close relatives (28), it creates a tie between individuals who would not be likely to exchange goods in the course of normal, everyday interaction. Ceremonial friendship thus acts to widen the sphere of distribution or redistribution of items of personal property, constituting an additional pair of statuses defined in terms of mutual prestations (29).

* * *

The various institutions described above, taken as a whole, contribute to a system in which goods, though produced by individual labor and privately owned, are also regularly changing hands. This system, however, is feeling the impact of a phenomenon that has already been described in any number of acculturation studies: contact with capitalist commercial enterprises (cf. notes 6, 27). Bonds within the social group are loosened as individuals form particular contractual relationship with representatives of regional enterprises. The individual character of most of this work does not itself constitute a departure from the most common traditional labor patterns. It is rather the new economic independence of the individual which leads to a decline of those institutions which acted to offset temporary inequalities at a time when the group's members were more dependent upon one another for survival. As a result of this new independence, a Tapirapé and his private property are no longer so easily parted. And the individual nuclear family, a fundamental economic unit in traditional Tapirapé society, is now isolated to a much greater degree than before; wider family units — the matrilineal extended families that once characterized Tapirapé residence patterns — have all but completely declined.

The traditional Tapirapé economic system was not, as we know, characterized by the "primitive communism" of the 19th century theorists — this concept has indeed long since been under attack by ethnologists. Still it was a system in which a set of institutions functioned to keep property from accumulating in the hands of a few and in which a set of norms dictated that it was more prestigious to give than to receive.

NOTES

- (*) — The Tapirapé are a group of Tupi-speaking horticulturalists living at present at the mouth of the Tapirapé River, a tributary of the Araguaia which forms the border between the states of Mato Grosso and Goiás. There are at present over 80 Tapirapé gathered in one village, a remnant population of a group which may have numbered close to 1,000 or more at the turn of the century.

The research upon which this paper is based was carried out during the course of two field trips. The first, from June to September, 1966, was financed by the Frontier Research Project, a grant made by the Ford Foundation to Columbia University's Institute of Latin American Studies; the grant was administered by the Institute's Director, Professor Charles Wagley, under whose auspices my own work was carried out. A return trip of one month's duration in August, 1967, was made possible as part of a research grant from the National Institutes of Health.

I was fortunate enough to be able to take with me to the field copies of Professor Wagley's own notes, gathered during a year's research among the Tapirapé in 1939-40. Many of the activities discussed in the present paper were already described in these own observations and interviews.

While in Brazil, I have on several occasions been offered use of the research and residential facilities of the Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, receiving particular assistance from Professor Eduardo Galvão, head of the Division of Anthropology. I would like to thank Professor Galvão for having read and commented upon the present paper.

Tapirapé terms appearing in the text have been rendered phonemically. The symbols *c*, *i*, *n* and ? have the following approximate phonetic values:

<i>c</i>	as in <i>church</i>
<i>i</i>	a nigh, mid vowel
<i>n</i>	as in <i>sing</i>
?	glottal stop

- (1) — This activity takes place as the dry season progresses, as waters recede leaving isolated lakes and slow-running streams. Expeditions to the larger lakes and streams may involve the entire village. On

other occasions, a single family may participate or, more frequently, one or two adult men will be accompanied by a larger number of women and children. Drugging is done with a vine; it is the work of the men to cut the vines, tie them into bundles and beat these bundles in the water until the poison has taken effect. When a large number of people are participating in the expedition, each man is responsible for cutting and preparing his own vine, but the beating is done together. All participate in the fishing: the women and girls use basketry strainers and containers, the men and boys use bows and arrows, and both sexes use machetes and smaller knives.

(2) — According to Baldus' account (1937), the Tapirapé cleared their own personal gardens individually and worked together on the clearing of a communal garden which was to provide food for the "spirits". During the dry season of 1966, when I was living among the Tapirapé, the clearing of gardens was begun by men working alone on their respective plots, but was completed by communal labor, which is known as *macirō* or *adacirō*. This group activity, which involved the felling of large trees, seems to have been performed on my behalf, the Tapirapé being extremely obliging to ethnographers. The *macirō* was not in progress when I returned in 1967; gardens were cleared by individual labor as they were during the period of Wagley's visit in 1939-40. The Tapirapé at present have no communal garden of the type described by Baldus.

(3) — Among the Tapirapé, basketry is exclusively the work of men.

(4) — According to Wagley's notes, gardens were felt to be the property of women. My own experience was that the Tapirapé generally referred to a garden by using the name of the man who cleared it. I could not, though, get a definite answer as to whether a man or a woman is considered the "true" owner. It does seem that, subsequent to divorce, a woman may continue to obtain food from the garden that her ex-husband had cleared. Certain crops in the garden, like peanuts and cotton, are definitely considered to be the property of women — a fact which Wagley had already pointed out in his notes.

(5) — An example of the individualization of property within the nuclear family can be seen in the ownership of chickens. In one family where a total of seven chickens were owned two were the property of the head of the family, another two belonged to his wife, and the three children in the family, whose respective ages were five, three and one, owned one apiece. In another household, the division was as follows:

son, aged two	1 rooster
daughter, aged four	1 rooster
daughter, aged six	1 rooster
son, aged eight	1 rooster
daughter, aged thirteen	3 roosters, 1 hen
daughter's husband, aged ca. twenty-five	2 roosters
son, aged seventeen	1 rooster
adult woman	1 rooster

The head of the household did not in this case own any. The fact that this example involves an item introduced through contact rather than one "traditional" to Tapirapé society does not alter the situation, since these more recently acquired goods seem subject to the same rules as those which have been a part of Tapirapé culture for a longer period of time.

- (6) — This remark should be qualified by noting certain economic changes resulting from the establishment of individual contractual ties between various Tapirapé men and commercial fishermen, from labor which the Tapirapé perform for the resident priest in return for wages, and from the sale of artifacts to passing tourists. Those Tapirapé involved in such commercial relationships, for the most part younger men, are somewhat reluctant to give away the goods and money thus acquired. This matter will be brought up again below. The point to be made in the present context is that this departure from the traditional norms of giving is due not to the introduction of new goods per se, but to the kinds of relationships through which such goods are usually acquired.
- (7) — *kawi* is a soup made with either manioc, corn, cottonseeds, peanuts, rice or certain combinations of the above. A woman may prepare manioc or rice *kāwi* by taking up mouthfuls of the cooked liquid which is then spit back into the pot. However, the resulting beverage is drunk right away and not allowed to ferment. The Tapirapé do not at present have any alcoholic drinks.
- (8) — The author has described Tapirapé kinship in another article (Shapiro, 1968). Briefly, Tapirapé terminology is characterized by "Hawaiian" terms on ego's generation and a transitional form between bifurcate-merging and bifurcate-collateral terminology on the first ascending generation.
- (9) — Such shortages tend to occur during the dry season — which is also the major ceremonial season — since the supply of manioc from the older gardens becomes exhausted whereas that of the newer gardens has not yet come to maturity.
- (10) — The word *tawā* is translated by the Tapirapé into Portuguese as "cara grande" or "big face". This term indicates the large masks worn by two dancers who represent the Kayapó and Karajá respectively. The ceremony, which takes place in the daytime, is as follows: all the men gather in the men's house to dress the two masked figures. The two then dance out from the men's house along two especially cleared paths leading to houses on opposite sides of the village (the houses of the two "masters of the feast"). Following this, the two make their way from house to house all around the village circle, followed by a group of young men and boys disguised by hammocks over their hands and brandishing weapons. This group, who represent Kayapó, simulate an attack against each house. Still another group of men represent the Tapirapé — these men dress in everyday clothes (shorts and shirts), walk in pairs, each man with his ceremonial partner (cf. note 12) and behave in a generally restrained manner which is to contrast

with the wildness of those representing the enemy. When the tour of the village is completed, all the men return to the plaza in front of the men's house where there is a formalized shooting of the "Tapirapé" by the two masked figures. Then the men representing the Tapirapé enter the men's house while those representing the Kayapó remain out in the plaza shouting and running about. One by one, these "Kayapó" are abducted and carried into the men's house. When the last one — usually the youngest boys are permitted to carry on the longest — has been subdued, the communal feast begins. At present, the Tapirapé's Karaja neighbors are invited to participate in this feast; I do not know if they realize that one of the masks is a representation of themselves, dating from a time when relations between the two groups were considerably less amicable.

- (11) — These ceremonial moieties and the three age grades into which each is divided have been described in another paper by the author, already mentioned above (cf. note 6). Baldus (1937) has also given an account of these men's groups.
- (12) — During the *kão*, the men's moieties are facing one another, each man dancing arm in arm with his ceremonial partner. Ideally, the two should be of the same moiety, as well as of the same age level, but in a couple of cases men who had lost their regular partners joined friends on the opposite side. The women dance hand in hand behind the men, a row of women in back of each moiety. The moieties alternate in leading the singing and women join in when their husbands are leading. Men and women do not sing the same melody and the women do not sing all of the words. The dance itself has been described by Baldus (1955).
- (13) — cf. note 2. Baldus (1937) has given an account of the communal work and of the feasting, dancing and racing that follows.
- (14) — According to Baldus, who has already provided a discussion of Tapirapé feast groups (1937), there are seven such groups which are rendered as follow (I have ordered the group names to correspond to my own list): Txankanépéra, Āmirampé, Avāikī, Maniitvivuéra, Pananivuaána, Kāuuānōí, Tāuuāupéra (p. 89). The reader may find it interesting to compare his account with the present one. These groupings clearly invite comparison with various Gê groupings. Baldus himself mentions the Canella plaza groups, but goes on to maintain that these are not really similar to the Tapirapé feast groups. However, given the proximity between the Tapirapé and various Gê-speaking peoples, as well as the fact that such an institution has not been reported for any other Tupi-speaking people, it would seem likely that this institution, like that of historically connected with the Gê institutions it does in fact resemble.
- (15) — "...aconece, às vezes, que o produto da caça ou colheita, que entre estes índios pode ser consumido por ambos os sexos e também pelas crianças (por exemplo: o porco do mato, mutum, jacú, tararuga, etc.), é grande demais para a família do caçador e pequeno

demaís para ser distribuído com justiça e proveito por toda a povoação da aldeia; nesse caso e precisamente para evitar um ato menos equitativo, faz-se a distribuição pelo grupo de comer, do qual faz parte o respectivo caçador." (Baldus, 1937 : 88). Baldus makes reference here to "foods that can be eaten by both sexes and by children as well"; this brings up the question of Tapirapé food taboos which will be discussed below.

- (16) — I am not sure if there are fixed places for the respective groups or if any order is possible as long as the groups are kept separate.
- (17) — Tapirapé are, in general, quite concerned with matters of proper and improper eating, considering the latter as a frequent cause — both natural and supernatural — of serious illness.
- (18) — This function of Tapirapé food taboos — that they cause food to be "left over" and thus to be given to people outside the family — was first pointed out to me by Christopher Tavener, who has been doing research among the Karajá Indians of the Araguaia region.
- (19) — It should be noted that food taboos are no longer as strictly observed as in the past. One factor is to be found in the changing ecological situation of the Tapirapé: in the past, hunting was a far more important activity, whereas in their present location on the Araguaia, the Tapirapé have turned more to fishing; since the system of taboos is concerned with game animals to a much larger degree than with fish the rules no longer have the same force. The presence of a less rigorous system of food taboos among their Karajá neighbors may also have influenced Tapirapé practices.
- (20) — The word *kāwio* is formed from *kāwi* (cf. note 7) plus the suffix -o, which acts as an augmentative or intensifier. It is here used to indicate that the *kāwi* in question is strongly disagreeable.
- (21) — In the *kāwio* festival I witnessed in 1966, as well as the one which took place the previous year and which was described to me, these two houses — like those of the masters of the *tawā* feast — were located opposite one another in the village circle. This seems to be generally the case in festivals involving two sponsors.
- (22) — The singing was initiated by two of the oldest men in the village, who had in the past been shamans. The two belong to the same age level in the same moiety and are ceremonial partners.
- (23) — I noticed that the two old ex-shamans (cf. preceding note) did not participate in the singing and dancing the *kāwi*, but rather stood off together somewhat to the side, smoking their pipes.
- (24) — Many stages of this ceremony were already described in Wagley's notes. Thus I was forewarned and did not rinse my own mouth with the *kāwi* as everyone implored me to do. A less fortunate visitor, who had attended the *kāwio* of the previous year, left behind a good part of his clothes, a blanket, a heavy sleeping bag, a suitcase, and a number of other valuables.

- (25) — The Tapirapé do not at present manufacture either canoes or ceramics; both are obtained from Karajá, the latter often in exchange for garden products.
- (26) — Or at least so I was told by several informants. The behavior of a set of non-“capitão” parents who allowed their child to rinse her mouth out during the *kāwio* was felt to be wrong; these people did not have very much to give anyway and so no one drank after the little girl.
- (27) — I was told by many older Tapirapé that *kāwio* was no longer as good as it used to be, since people have in general become more reluctant to part with their possessions. There is, for example, one man in the village who has more personal wealth than any of the others, yet who refuses to be a “capitão” nor will he let any members of his family take on this role. This behavior is disapproved of by many of the others; in the past it might not have been tolerated at all. The ceremony of 1966 was affected by the absence of a majority of the young bachelors, possessors of a considerable number of trade goods, who had gone to the nearby Brazilian settlement. While it was possible that these young men thought that the *kāwio* was to take place at a later time, as they claimed, it is nevertheless also true that they do not entirely share their elders’ ideas on the value of giving.
- (28) — Nor does there seem to be any hereditary pattern in ceremonial friendships.
- (29) — Ceremonial friendship among the Tapirapé is reminiscent of certain Gê institutions. There is, for example, the custom of formalized friendship among the Eastern Timbira, as described by Nimuendajú (1946: 100-103). These relationships are characterized by the same mutual respect and ritual avoidance as is found among the Tapirapé. The Timbira institution, however, is quite a bit more complex. The friendships, though they may be initiated by voluntary arrangement, are more frequently associated with name transfers, which follow a very definite pattern. There are a series of special ceremonial obligations between “friends”. And whereas the Timbira friendships exist between both members of the same sex and of opposite sexes, Tapirapé “friends” are always of the same sex. To clarify the impression conveyed by the use of the present tense in this discussion of ceremonial friendship, it should be noted that this institution was no longer in operation at the time of my visits to the Tapirapé, though most adults had, in the course of their lives, had such relationships and remembered quite well the items given to and received from “friends”. In some cases, the “friend” had died; in other cases, the “friend” was still alive, but exchanges no longer took place as before. The older Tapirapé invariably expressed disapproval over the decline of this institution, including themselves in the general criticism: now Tapirapé are stingy with their things; they no longer want to give; a good man is a man who gives; there are no more good men.

SUMÁRIO

Trata-se neste artigo de vários mecanismos cerimoniais que servem para a redistribuição de bens numa sociedade onde o trabalho é altamente individualizado e onde os objetos de uso pessoal — armas, utensílios de cozinha, ornamentos, etc. — são sempre propriedade privada. Descreve-se em primeiro lugar instituições ligadas à distribuição de alimentos, passando-se depois a considerar as que se associam com outros tipos de bens. As instituições da primeira categoria incluem os “grupos de comer” (*tātāopāwa*) e um sistema de tabus sobre vários animais e peixes; as da segunda categoria incluem as festa do *kāwio*, onde os indivíduos mais importantes ganham prestígio em cumprimento a uma obrigação moral de ofertar a outros seus próprios bens ou pertences, e também a instituição do “amigo cerimonial” (*āciwāwā*) em que as relações entre dois indivíduos do mesmo sexo são definidas em termos de doações recíprocas.

Na conclusão, a autora chama atenção para a atual tendência de um declínio destas instituições, devida às novas relações econômicas entre os Tapirapé e os regionais.

BIBLIOGRAPHY CITED

BALDUS, HERBERT

- 1937 — “Os Grupos de comer e os grupos de trabalho dos Tapirapé”. In: *Ensaio de etnologia brasileira*. São Paulo, Ed. Nacional, 346 p., il., p. 86-111 (Brasiliana 101).

- 1955 — “As Danças dos Tapirapé”. In: *Anais do 31 Cong. Int. Amer.* S. Paulo, 1954, v. 1 : 89-98’

NIMUENDAJÛ, CURT

- 1946 — *The Eastern Timbira*. Transl. and ed. Robert H. Lowie. *Publ. Amer. Archaeol. and Ethn. Univ. California*. Berkeley, 41. 261 p.

SHAPIRO, JUDITH

- 1968 — Tapirapé kinship. *Bol. Mus. Pa. Emilio Goeldi*. Belém, n. ser. Antrop. 37, 32 p.

ENTREGUE PARA PUBLICAÇÃO EM 14/5/68