

Internationale Zeitschrift
für Völker- und Sprachkunde
International Review
of Ethnology and Linguistics
Revue Internationale
d'Ethnologie et de Linguistique
Ephemeris Internationalis
Ethnologica et Linguistica

Cer. 17554.6144



ANTHROPOS

INSTITUTUM ANTHROPOS

K. J. Narr VOL. 69 - 1974
74 | 140

The Tibagy Kaingang

DAVID HICKS

The Kaingang, who together with the Aweikoma constitute the southern branch of the Gê-speaking peoples, are widely scattered about the four southern Brazilian states of São Paulo, Paraná, Santa Catarina, and Rio Grande do Sul. Several subtribes once inhabited the Misiones region of eastern Argentina, but these are now extinct. It is only to be expected that subtribes often separated from one another by many hundreds of miles should have developed idiosyncrasies, and substantial variation in culture and institutions have been reported as between the Northern group of subtribes (located in São Paulo) and the rest. The latter consists of the Southern subtribes (located in Rio Grande do Sul) and the Central subtribes (located in Paraná and Santa Catarina); between these subtribes lesser differences have been remarked. Thus while one can sensibly refer to something called "Kaingang culture" no blanket of uniformity covers the three or four thousand hunters, fishers, food collectors, and agriculturalists making up this tribe.

Now, in the Santa Catarina reservation of the Duque de Caxias, there formerly existed a subtribe that was studied between December 1932 and January 1934 by JULES HENRY who identified it as pertaining to the Kaingang tribe (1964: XXI et passim). This classification I have subsequently challenged¹, and I denote the Duque de Caxias community by the appellation "Aweikoma". Although this subtribe and the subtribes of the Kaingang possess (I employ the ethnographic present tense when referring to the now extinct Aweikoma) a number of similar cultural and institutional traits, their

¹ See HICKS (1966, 1971*a*, 1971*b*). The first draft of certain sections of the present essay formed part of the B. Litt. thesis which I submitted to the University of Oxford in 1965 for examination by Professor E. E. EVANS-PRITCHARD and Mr. FRANCIS HUXLEY both of whom I wish to thank for their useful comments on that earlier analysis. My supervisor at the time was Dr. RODNEY NEEDHAM who typically devoted intensive attention to my research problems. To him go my special thanks. The award of a State University of New York Faculty Fellowship for the summer of 1969 enabled me to re-write the previous draft with no financial preoccupations, and to the Research Foundation of that institution I express my grateful thanks.

differences are more fundamental and numerous than between even the most dissimilar of the Kaingang subtribes.

One effective method of distinguishing between peoples is by comparing their relationship terminologies. In HICKS (1971*a*) I demonstrated that whereas the Aweikoma utilize a cognatic terminology those Kaingang living on the two Paraná reservations of the Toldo das Lontras and the Posto Indígena do Ivaí and those resident on the two Rio Grande do Sul reservations of Nonoai and Guarita employ a terminology which is both lineal and two-section – a contrast so stark as to demolish any argument for the inclusion of the Duque de Caxias subtribe into the category “Kaingang”.

Because the relationship terminology of other Kaingang groups remained to be published, however, only these four subtribes were compared with the Duque de Caxias community so it might be claimed that a cognatic set of terms remains undiscovered in some poorly documented subtribe. If such information came to light my characterization of the Kaingang tribe as a people uniformly employing a lineal descent terminology, and perhaps possessing a terminology of a two-section type, would be rendered less convincing than at present.

However, while no set of terms for any other subtribe has to my knowledge yet been published, one bibliographic source does contain sufficient data to permit the terminological character of another Central Kaingang subtribe to be partly deciphered. This is the magnificent dictionary, compiled by BARCATTÀ, of the River Tibagy Kaingang who are located between the Northern Kaingang and the core of the Central Kaingang territory. The only information of ethnographic consequence on the Tibagy people is that contained in this impressive compilation, but even this is insufficient to establish the nature of their “kinship system”.

Despite being vague and inconsistent in attributing referents to certain of the relationship terms it contains, however, the dictionary nevertheless provides enough evidence to support my earlier contention that terminologically the Duque de Caxias community and the Kaingang differ in quite basic respects, and the intention of the present essay is to disclose and present this evidence.

The next section consists of all those relationship terms occurring in the dictionary. These I have extracted from the original text and collated with those referents given by BARCATTÀ. But as the reader will quickly appreciate, the total picture is confused. Thus we find that in several cases more than one radical term denotes the same genealogical position; in others unexpected and inconsistent positions are subsumed under the same radical; while the author is invariably guilty of failing to distinguish between these radicals and mere descriptive designations. Sense can be made from this assortment of categories and referents, nevertheless, and the following section reduces the multiplicity of terms to eleven. These seem to be those radical categories ordering relationships in the Tibagy classificatory system. Page 932 of my 1971*a* essay lists the terms employed by the other four Kaingang subtribes, and those interested in comparing the two categorical sets may easily do so. They may

then be contrasted with the Aweikoma terminology on page 934, and the reader can form his own estimation as to the more veridical of the two typological niches ("Kaingang" or "Aweikoma") to which to assign the Tibagy people.

I.

A number of qualifying terms modify certain radicals. The terms, *kaike*, *kaika*, *kankré*, are synonyms for "elder"; *xái*, *iavúve*, *iavé*, and probably *ianúve*, are synonyms for "younger"; *xi* is the diminutive; *fi* = "feminine"; *tantö* refers to "woman"; and *ton* = "without". BARCATTÀ uses the letter *j* where BALDUS, who provided the terminology analysed in HICKS (1971a), employs *i*, and to facilitate comparison between the two sets of categories I here follow the usage of BALDUS, whose accentuation (where it applies) has also been adopted.

1. <i>iogn</i>	F
<i>iogn iogn</i>	FF
<i>iogn ian iambö</i>	FM
<i>iogn alengre, iogn arengre</i>	FB
<i>iogn kaike, kaika, iogn kankré</i>	FeB
<i>iogn iavúve, iave</i>	FyB
<i>iogn ve</i>	FZ
2. <i>ia, ian, na, nha</i>	M
<i>ia ve iampefi</i>	legitimate M
<i>ianfi ian, nham nha</i>	MM
<i>ianfi iogn, iogn kankré</i>	MF
<i>ianfi iavu, ianve</i>	MZ
<i>ianfi, ia vuve</i>	MyZ
3. <i>iogne kankré</i>	MB
<i>kankré</i>	WF, HF
4. <i>be, ban</i>	FM, MM, WM, HM, FBZ
5. <i>arengre, alengre, lengre</i>	B
<i>kaika, kaike, kanké</i>	eB
<i>iavú ve, iaiüigh, iavé, regre, kürón, iavu'xi</i>	yB
6. <i>ve</i>	Z, FBD, MZD, MBD, FZD
<i>ve xái</i>	eZ
<i>ve tögtáng, vexi</i>	yZ
7. <i>pron, apron, kren</i>	W
8. <i>ilangné ve</i>	BW
9. <i>kaika pron</i>	eBW, WZ
10. <i>iambré, pronfi, iavü</i>	WB, DH
<i>iambré kotxin</i>	WBS
11. <i>bedn, ben</i>	H
12. <i>akotxi, kotxin, kre, kotxine, kotxin</i>	S
<i>kotxi</i>	yS
<i>kotxifi</i>	D
<i>rengre kotxi</i>	BS
<i>rengre kotxifi, rengre kotxifi tantö fi</i>	BD
13. <i>pron kotxi ne</i>	WS by another male
	HS by another female
14. <i>kotxin pron</i>	SD

15. <i>kotxinfi kotxi</i>	DS
16. <i>kotxifi-kotxifi</i>	DD
17. <i>kotxi pron, kotxi tantö</i>	SW
18. <i>rengré kotxitantöfi</i>	BSW
19. <i>be ton</i>	widow
20. <i>pron ton</i>	bachelor
21. <i>iogn ton</i>	orphan
22. <i>kaika ton</i>	without relatives.

II.

An attempt to find consistency in the above collection of categories and their genealogical specifications produces the following relationship terminology:

1. <i>iogn</i>	F, FB
2. <i>ia (ian, na, nha)</i>	M, MZ
3. <i>iogn kakré</i>	MF, MB
4. <i>kakré</i>	WF, HF
5. <i>be (ban)</i>	FM, MM, FZ, WM
6. <i>arengré (alengré, lengré)</i>	B
7. <i>ve</i>	Z, FBD, MZD, MBD, FZD
8. <i>pron (apron, kren)</i>	W, WZ, BW
9. <i>iambré</i>	WB, DH
10. <i>bedn (ben)</i>	H
11. <i>kotxin</i>	S, BS, D, BD, SD, DS, DD, SW, BSW.

Even when reduced to its simplest form, and shown to be comprehensible, the Tibagy terminology is decidedly more ambiguous than the system of categories discerningly represented by BALDUS, but even if one takes contrary indications (eg. FBD/MZD = FZD/MBD) into the reckoning the terminology appears as that of a lineal descent system. This is evinced by the following equations and distinctions:

F = FB	FB \neq MB
M = MZ	FZ \neq MZ
Z = FBD, MZD	
S = BS	
D = BD	

However, although the following equations are consonant with the presence of a two-section system they are too few to have compelling diagnostic value:

MBD = FZD
W = WZ, BW
WB = DH

The last equation hints the possibility that these Kaingang, like those described by BALDUS, practise oblique alliance, but alas, both terminology and published ethnography lack confirmatory detail.

Although the most that can be established, therefore, is that the Tibagy subtribe orders its relationship categories according to lineal principles and there are indications its affinal mode is of a two-section type, this conclusion is sufficient to strengthen the argument that a distinction exists between the terminologies of the Kaingang tribe and the Duque de Caxias community and by so doing subverts HENRY's assertion that the latter people are Kaingang.

Bibliography

BALDUS, HERBERT

1952 Terminologia de Parentesco Kaingang. *Sociologia* (São Paulo) 14: 76-79.

BARCATA DE VALFLORIANA, M.

1920 Dicionarios Kainjgang-Portuguez e Portuguez-Kainjgang. *Revista do Museu Paulista* (São Paulo) 12: 1-392.

HENRY, JULES

1964 *Jungle People: A Kaingáng Tribe of the Highlands of Brazil*. New York [1st Ed. 1941].

HICKS, DAVID

1965 *A Comparative Study of the Kaingang and Aweikoma of Southern Brazil*. [Unpublished B. Litt. Thesis, University of Oxford.]

1966 The Kaingang and the Aweikoma: A Cultural Contrast. *Anthropos* 61: 839-846.

1971a A Comparative Analysis of the Kaingang and Aweikoma Relationship Terminologies (Brazil). *Anthropos* 66: 931-935.

1971b A Structural Model of Aweikoma Society. In: *The Translation of Culture*, edited by T. O. BEIDELMAN. London.