Some aspects of structure
in Kuikuru society

Gertrude E. Dole

Introduction

Some 3,000 years ago a branch of Southern Caribs separated from the large block of Caribs in the Guiana region (Durbin 1972). Contemporary survivors of that southern branch include the Kuikuru, Kalapalo and Matipú-Nafuquá in the Upper Xingú region of Central Brazil. Because of their separate social and ecological history it is not surprising that these groups differ in many respects from those in the North.

Significant differences occur also among the Carib groups in the Upper Xingú region. By the 1880s the Kalapalo and Kuikuru, for example, had been separate long enough to develop regular dialect differences and, as we shall see, Kuikuru culture differs in numerous other respects from that reported for the Kalapalo.

Sufficient data are now available to make comparisons among the various Carib societies and to permit an analysis of the variations. I therefore take this opportunity to present some details of Kuikuru organization in the hope of stimulating comparison.

The various aspects of a society may be structured according to different principles. Residence, for instance, may be matrilocal in a society that reckons descent patrilineally. Or people may reckon kinship through bilateral filiation even though succession to leadership is patrilineal. In the following description, therefore, I will deal separately with leadership, economic organization, residence patterns, and kinship organization.[1]

---

[1] Most of the data in this paper represent conditions as they were during the period of my field work in 1953-1954, before the Kuikuru left their settlement on the twin lakes Kuikuru (or Kufikugu) and Lamakuka to the south of the Parque Indígena do Xingú. These data are supplemented by additional information collected by Robert Carneiro in 1975 at the reservation settlement of Afanítafagï, to which the Kuikuru where moved in 1961.

I want to stress at the outset that native models of cultural[2] patterns are only one of several kinds of information available. As a matter of fact Kuikuru informants seldom speak in terms of what must or should be done. Instead they state their interpretations of what is done. Their statements often represent not societal norms but individual informants' versions of social practices and often differ from one informant to another. This generalization deserves some explanation.

Kuikuru households, and to some extent individual families, maintain a respectful, if not suspicious, social distance from one another. The extent of social isolation in this small supposedly communal society is perhaps a surprising contrast to the constant, sometimes relaxed and intimate, interfamily communication among friendly neighbors that characterizes relations in some complex societies. Because of family isolation Kuikuru concepts of both ideal and actual behavior are influenced largely by particular experiences, and to the extent that each person experiences the details of social relations differently, his or her perception of tribal custom is unique. Hence informant statements do not necessarily represent either norms or practices that are common to the whole society. To insist on cultural rules in these circumstances runs the risk of imposing ethnographers' concepts on the data rather than deriving patterns and concepts from the data.

For these reasons I will give full consideration to observed practices as well as to native models or concepts of ideal behavior. By noting discrepancies between actual behavior and stated norms on the one hand and the range of individual variation on the other, I hope to clarify some issues regarding the nature of Kuikuru social organization.

Norms and practices: leadership

The community (*ete,* or *ito*)[3] is a politically autonomous group, i.e. a tribe (see Dole 1968). Other indigenous Upper Xingú groups are referred to as *ukuge*, "my people," in contrast to outlying Indian peoples, referred to as *ŋikogo*, "enemies," and white people, who curiously enough are called Karaíba (*Kagaifa* in Kuikuru phonology). There is no political integration of these indigenous groups except for the influence of the Brazilian government through the presence of the Indian Service, FUNAI.

In the Kuikuru tradition of a minimal hierarchy of leadership, one person is recognized as headman, with a category of subordinate male and female leaders, or "helpers." Both classes of leaders are called *aneti.* Although there in no special term

---

[2] I use "culture" here to include not only symbolic systems, beliefs and concepts, but also social organization and artifacts.

[3] The term *otómo* recorded by Basso as being the "Xingú Carib" term for village or people (1970) is not the Kuikuru term for community but was heard among the Kuikuru only from in-marrying Kalapalo. The Kuikuru name for the settlement visited by Basso is Afanítafagï and not Lafatuá. Although the Kalapalo apparently refer to the Kuikuru as Lafatuá, that is not the name by which they themselves or other Xinguanos refer to them but rather the name of a site they occupied in the 1950s.

for headman, priority and deference are accorded the headman by acknowledging him to be the owner of the settlement plaza, a symbol of his authority to make political decisions and represent the group in intertribal contacts. In contrast with *aneti* all other members of the community are referred to as *isandagï* or *kamaga* (reportedly a native adaptation of the Brazilian term "camarada").

Although Kuikuru society is generally cognatic, succession to leadership status is ideally patrilineal in an uninterrupted line of local ancestry. In practice, however, it seldom happens that a headman is succeeded immediately by his son. In a sequence of twelve headmen in recent generations, leadership passed only once directly to a son. In most instances it passed to another family and was assumed by a mature male whose father also had been headman at some time in the past. Thus leadership alternates among several patrilines and lineal succession is usually delayed.

From this record, it can be seen that the norm of patrilineal succession represents only the right to succeed, subject to a number of conditions. In actuality, leadership is largely achieved. If a son does succeed, it is not necessarily the oldest but rather one who shows leadership qualities, including a desire to lead. His authority must be validated by earning the respect of the community.

In principle, sons of former leaders in other tribes who have married into the Kuikuru settlement are not eligible for the position of headman, even though they may be effective leaders in many internal economic and ceremonial activities. Informants explicity denied that one such man, the son of a former Mehinaku headman, would succeed in the event of the current headman's death. Nevertheless, after the latter died in a measles epidemic the "Mehinaku" did assume the leadership role and was explicitly acknowledged as having been headman by at least some Kuikuru informants a generation later, although other informants named a different man as having been the successor.

This incident illustrates an important aspect of Kuikuru social organization. Not only may there be a discrepancy between tradition and practice, and wide differences of opinion about who should or will succeed, but also as a supreme example of the variable nature of Kuikuru society there may be lack of agreement about who is headman at a given time, as was the case in 1954 and again in 1975. In the latter year a young grandson of a former outstanding headman was acknowledged by many to be owner of the plaza and the proper headman. He represented the group in intertribal ceremonies but apparently felt himself to be too young or inexperienced to exert his authority by haranguing the community. At that same time an older and overtly more ambitious man, who himself was grandson of a former headman and nephew of another, undertook to harangue the group and in other ways assert his own right to the position.

Opinion in the society was sharply divided as to whether the latter was in fact headman, some saying that he was too old and already "dead." Resentment at what was seen by some as an attempt to usurp the authority of the younger man led to a temporary division of the tribe into two local groups. Both competing headmen remained in the same division, however, and the seceders later rejoined that group.

Although this temporary split illustrates the fact that family groups

sometimes disagree about public issues, harbor resentment and talk against one another in private, Kuikuru social structure has no provision for formal factions. Even during the temporary separation factions did not crystallize, nor are Kuikuru *aneti* leaders of factions as reported for the Kalapalo (Basso 1975). Kuikuru *aneti* are not the ones who usually express interfamily tensions; on the contrary they are a class of industrious adults who exemplify Kuikuru ideals of peaceableness and cooperation.

When a legitimate and acknowledged headman fails to exercise leadership in times of crisis, alternate mechanisms are used to maintain the integrity of the society. On one occasion in 1954 some informants expressed frustration with an ineffectual headman by claiming that the *real* leader was another person who, like the resident headman, was both the son and grandson of former headmen. Ironically that person no longer resided in the community, having left the Kuikuru settlement many years previously, after missionaries and journalists had made him notorious as the supposed grandson of the British explorer Colonel Percy Fawcett. Still, no effort was made to recall him, and political decisions were arrived at through the supernatural mechanism of divination by a shaman (see Dole 1964, 1966), and some aspects of local leadership were assumed informally by other *aneti*.

Succession to the status of subordinate *aneti* is mainly patrilineal, but a woman also may acquire the status from her father and may transmit it to her son. Here again there is uncertainty and disagreement, even among *aneti* themselves, as to who is and who is not a leader. With characteristic unwillingness to assign high status, one informant asserted that only an *aneti* himself knows whether or not he is one. Like the position of headman, subordinate leadership status is in part achieved and depends largely on personality and performance.

Economy

Although no parcels of real property are owned either by subgroups or individuals and boundaries between Upper Xingú tribes are indefinite, the area regularly exploited by the Kuikuru is claimed as their tribal territory. Interestingly, their concept of territoriality extends far back into the past and many miles from their settlement, for they still claim ownership of the very large Lake Tafonuno, on which their ancestors settled perhaps two centuries ago on their way into the Upper Xingú basin. They continue to use this lake as a major source of fish and maintain that other groups should ask their permission before exploiting it.

I will describe the organization of economic cooperation in terms of successively more inclusive groups of people who are linked by successively weaker kin ties, beginning with the intimate family groups. In contrast to the primary economic importance of extended family households as reported among the Kalapalo (Basso 1973: 43; 1975: 210), much of Kuikuru economy is conducted by and for individuals and small families. Staple food crops are usually cultivated and processed by the members of the nuclear family. Not infrequently, however, members of an extended family join together to perform tasks such as harvesting and preparing manioc and piquí fruit. The most common and most efficient of

these work groups are patrilocal and fraternal extended families. Fishing is sometimes done by individuals or separate nuclear families, but more frequently by small groups of men who are friends or close kin.

Other cooperating groups comprise members of multifamily households, formal friends (*ato*), and isogender (same-sex; see Dole 1957: 144-145) age mates. Within the multifamily houses various nuclear or extended family groups, whether closely related or not, share the use of major immovable equipment. All the families in a house store manioc flour in a single basket silo and draw from it for daily meals, use a single storage rack, and often cook on a common hearth. Groups of volunteer workers, sometimes including virtually the entire adult male population, cooperate to perform large tasks such as gathering and preparing food for a festival, hunting monkeys or grasshoppers, cutting and transporting woodskin canoes or house-posts, and constructing houses or fish weirs. On these occasions workers are recruited with the promise of a festive meal as their reward.

A basic principle of Kuikuru economics is that each person owns the product of his or her labor. Men own garden plots as long as they are maintained in cultivation, and crops are owned by the women (or men) who harvest them. Persons who organize projects with group labor own the products of that labor.

Most material goods are not inherited. At the death of the owner, significant items, including houses, should be destroyed or buried with the deceased. However, sources of perennial food harvests, such as fish weir emplacements and groves of fruit trees, may be inherited, usually by a son of the deceased owner, and in some circumstances even houses are used after the death of the builder-owner. Native songs and dances may be purchased by individuals, while those of foreign origin are acquired by learning them and paying performers with festive food. These also may be inherited by a son, or by a daughter in the case of the few women's ceremonies.

Trading, both domestic and intertribal, is conducted by individuals and not by kin groups or the tribe as a whole. Goods and services may be exchanged directly or through the partially standardized medium of beads, obviating the necessity of maintaining close or long-term interpersonal ties for the purpose of completing delayed exchanges. However, a man tries to cultivate a special friend (*ato*), usually not a close relative, in each tribal settlement to facilitate intergroup trading and visiting. (For further details on ownership and exchange, see Dole 1959).

On the whole the economic organization, like leadership, is characterized by individual initiative and nuclear family cooperation, supplemented by voluntary cooperation of other individuals who are compensated by direct payment.

Residence

Each of nine or more multifamily houses shelters from one to seven nuclear families. In contrast to the Kalapalo, among whom the household is equated with an extended family (Basso 1973: 50-51), the organization of Kuikuru households varies greatly. Some comprise all or parts of several extended families, and conversely, nuclear families that are closely related are often dispersed among several households, even among separate tribal settlements.

Ideally a couple lives with the husband's family, patrivicinal residence according to Carrasco's typology (1963). From the ideal of patrilocality it follows that there is an expectation of forming patrilocal extended family residence groups.[4] However, because of many exceptions to the ideal pattern few such groups occur. One of these exceptions is the usual trial marriage period of initial uxorilocal residence. The length of this period varies from a few days to years and depends on a number of socio-economic factors, including the demands of life crises, the strength of the bride's family, and the politics of family relations. In some instances the couple continues to reside uxorilocally for many years or indefinitely while the groom fulfills his obligations of bride service. In any case, a couple may live with the wife's family for some weeks or months both before and after the birth of a child, since giving birth ideally should take place in the prospective mother's parents' home.

As a result of these variable residence arrangements, a variety of family residence groups is formed, including virilocal and uxorilocal extended families, ambilocal fraternal extended families (groups of married brothers, married sisters, or both), virilocal polygynous families, and composites of two or more of these types.

Aside from the predictable changes under conditions already mentioned, individuals and families change residence in response to other contingencies such as disasters, overcrowding and interpersonal tensions or outright hostility resulting from failure to cooperate, or suspicion and accusation of delicts or witchcraft. Kuikuru frequently respond to such situations by leaving their house (or settlement) and taking refuge with friends or relatives elsewhere.

Thus in spite of an ideal of ultimate patrilocality, residence is in fact irregular and unstable with respect to both settlement and focal relatives. It is difficult to discern a representative pattern of residence at any one time. Nevertheless, if one considers residence in the context of the widest circle of kin, the data not surprisingly show a tendency toward uxori-patrilocality in contrast to the pattern of matrilocality attributed to Caribs in the Guiana region.

Descent, filiation and kin groups

If residence conformed to the ideal of patrilocality, the local group would be a patriclan in Murdock's terms (1949: 66), comprising the families of married males but not their married sisters or daughters. As we have seen, however, uxorilocal residence and frequent shifts from one community to another, prevent the emergence of such a clan structure. The entire community is generally regarded as a single kin group. Kin ties are reckoned bilaterally and to this extent kinship is characterized by filiation alone rather than by descent, but there are many irregularities in the application of this principle with the result that kin ties are often ambiguous, as will be explained.

---

[4] "Extended family residence group" is used here because the groups of related families who live in the same house often differ in composition from the extended families that cooperate in food production and use.

A consideration of kin groups also reveals variation, ambiguity and flexibility of membership from the largest to the smallest units. With respect to the tribe, membership is somewhat indefinite, and informants may disagree on the tribal status of individuals. Although former members of the community currently residing elsewhere are usually still regarded as tribal members, persons who have married into the Kuikuru community from other tribes may be classed variously depending in part on their compatibility and the length of their residence with the Kuikuru. Offspring of intertribal marriages tend to be classed as Kuikuru if the father is Kuikuru and if the family resides with the Kuikuru, suggesting a patrilineal emphasis in tribal membership.

The kin community is not necessarily the same as the maximal kindred for any person. Members of one's personal kindred are referred to as *ufisuïngi*, a general term that may be glossed as kindred, relative, sibling or brother. In its widest meaning one's *ifisuïngi*[5] includes those persons, living and dead, both in the Kuikuru community and elsewhere, to whom a genealogical relation is either known or stipulated. The Kuikuru claim no totemic ancestor, do not identify any lineages, and have no corporate descent groups other than extended families. All extended families, whether patrifocal, matrifocal of bilateral, are shallow, comprising no more than two generations of adults.

A major source of ambiguity arises from the fact that in this, as in other cognatic societies, people characteristically recognize relationships to one another through two or more sets of genealogical links. A person may be one's cross (and hence affinible) relative through one parent and at the same time a parallel relative through the other parent. Choices of which set of kin ties to recognize often vary according to one's purpose. Recognition of genealogical ties sometimes shows the influence of sameness of sex and length of residence in the community. An emphasis on patrifiliation is shown by the fact that individuals sometimes recognize kinship to half-siblings and cousins only through male relatives. Another source of irregularity is that kinship is quantifiable, in the same sense that Kariera, for example, speak of "close-up" and "far-away" kin (Radcliffe-Brown 1930).

In some instances reckoning of relationship appears quite inconsistent, as when one woman classified differently each of three own brothers in the same context, referring to one as "cross cousin" (*ufqi*), another as "brother" (*ufisi*), and the third as "unrelated" (*telo*).

In sum, although kinship among the Kuikuru is generally cognatic, the manner of reckoning kin ties is flexible and varies both from one informant to another and from one situation to another.

Kin terms

The pattern of reference terms[6] in general use among the Kuikuru is Bifurcate

[5] Initial *u*- indicates the first person singular form; *i*- indicates third person singular.
[6] Data on kin terms were obtained by several methods, including 1) observation of native use, 2) participation in the kinship system by virtue of being spontaneously assigned fictive kinship status by

Generation. That is, the three medial generations alternate between the Bifurcate Merging and Generation types. With few exceptions the reference terms are used in address as well. As with other classificatory nomenclatures, use of these terms is characterized by a considerable amount of polysemy. For example the generic term for brother, *ifisuïngï*, may also refer to male parallel cousins, to all siblings and parallel cousins, to any relative in one's generation, or to all one's relatives.

It will be seen from the list in Figures 1 and 2 that separate terms are used for affines, including parents-in-law, spouses, and siblings-in-law. (A child-in-law is usually referred to by name or through teknonymy by combining terms for child and spouse.) It is important to note that none of these affinal terms bears the meaning of cross relative. This point will be discussed further in connection with the Cross Cousin pattern of nomenclature.

In general communication all cousins are referred to with sibling terms. However, at the level of greatest specificity these terms contrast with another term, *ufqï*, that may be tentatively glossed as cross cousin of either sex. This term occurs among the Kalapalo as *ufaï*, which Basso represents as allogender cross cousins only and potential spouses (1970: 407). In either case the term corresponds to the distinction between cross and parallel relatives in the first ascending and descending generations. Its use is thus a feature of the Dakota-Iroquois component of the Bifurcate Merging pattern. It does not constitute the so-called Dravidian pattern identified and described by Fison and Morgan (Morgan 1871: 582) and named Cross Cousin by Hocart (1928: 180-182; see Dole 1957, 1972).

The Cross Cousin pattern makes a rigorous distinction between all cross and parallel relatives in the three medial generations *according to marriage category or type of genealogical ties,* no matter how distant. By contrast the Dakota-Iroquois pattern of terms among the Kuikuru and wherever it occurs, classes all cousins according to the sex of their *linking parent relative to Ego's linking parent* alone, without regard to other genealogical ties. This pattern obscures the distinction between cross and parallel ties beyond first cousins and results in an inversion of the Cross Cousin pattern for cousins beyond the first degree. In the same way the Bifurcate Merging pattern classes all avuncular relatives, near and distant, according to their *sex relative to Ego's linking parent,* and nepotic relatives are classed according to the *sex of their linking parent relative to Ego,* all without regard to genealogical ties. Finally, in the Cross Cousin pattern, terms for cross relatives *also function as affinal terms;* there are no special affinal terms such as are used among the Kuikuru and Kalapalo.

The Kuikuru translate the term *ufqï* as "primo," the Portuguese word for cousin, or as child of father's sister or mother's brother (*etsí mukugu, auajú mugu*), contrasting it with MSiSo/D and FBSo/D. This term is of special interest for several reasons. For one thing it is rarely heard and its use is restricted primarily to private conversations. Nevertheless, in spite of its illusive character, the cross cousin term is a key to a common heritage of kinship organization among Carib

the natives, 3) the "genealogical method" of obtaining genealogies and asking for relations among the persons named, 4) eliciting from many informants their kin terms for all other Kuikuru, and 5) asking for terms for kin types as represented in a traditional diagram of relationships.

FIGURE 1
KUIKURU KIN TERMS OF REFERENCE: CONSANGUINEAL KIN

Generation	Term	Meaning
+3	apitsikueŋgï	great-grandfather, other male relatives
	kokojokueŋgï	great-grandmother, other female relatives
+2	apitsi	grandfather, other male relatives
	aųpïgï	
	kokojó	grandmother, other female relatives
	jtsï	
+1	apaju	father, father's male relatives
	uŋuï, ųuï	father; sometimes also father's male relatives
	amañu	mother, mother's female relatives
	uisi	mother; sometimes also mother's female relatives
	auaju	mother's brother, mother's male relatives
	(-)jogu[a]	mother's brother, mother's socially close male kin
	etsí	father's sister, father's female relatives
0	ufisï	brother, male relative; younger brother (male speaking)
	ufiñano	older brother, older male relative (male speaking)
	ufisuïŋgï	brother, male parallel cousin, sibling, cousin
	ufonifï otofono	own sibling
	uiŋansu	sister, female relative
	ufasï	older sister/female relative (female speaking)
	uikene	younger sister/female relative (female speaking)
	kikeneko	baby sister (female speaking)
	jaja	older isogender sibling; sometimes also older sibling or cousin of either sex
	ufąj	cross cousin
	pamï[b]	
—1	umugu	son, child (male speaking); son of isogender sibling or cousin
	(u)mukugu ·	son, child (female speaking); son of isogender sibling or cousin
	uindisï	daughter, daughter of isogender sibling or cousin
	ufati	daughter of allogender sibling or cousin
	ufatųï	son of allogender sibling or cousin
	añï	young child, allogender child
	ipï	son, male relative, young child (male speaking)
	ijï	daughter, female relative, young child (female speaking)
—2	ufigï	grandchild, relative
	uititï	namesake grandchild
—3	ufigïkueŋgï	great-grandchild

[a] In its bound form in combination with other relationship terms, *-jogu* has a much wider range of meaning and may be used to refer to virtually anyone who is in close kinship or friendship relation with the speaker. This usage expresses affectionate license and appears to correspond somewhat to our use of

expressions such as "funny face," "old thing" or "my old lady (man)," for socially close-relations.

ᵇ In the Upper Xingú *pamî* appears to be a word borrowed from the Bakairí, whose dialect forms a separate subdivision of Upper Xingú Carib (Durbin 1977: 35). It is used by the Kuikuru in the same manner as *ufɐ̂*. Basso's assertion that *pamî* is not a kinship term among "Xingú Carib" and is used differently from *ifɐ̂* (1970: 412) does not apply to the Kuikuru and should be restricted to the Kalapalo.

FIGURE 2
KUIKURU KIN TERMS OF REFERENCE: AFFINAL TERMS

Generation	Term	Meaning
+1	ifīsofo	parent-in-law
0	uño, -iso	husband
	ufitsï	wife
	ufametigï	isogender sibling-in-law
	uakene	allogender sibling-in-law
	ufañitsú	husband's brother, wife's sister
	ifitsïmbïgï	former spouse, separated

peoples. Cognate terms are used for cross cousins or siblings-in-law, actual or potential, among many other Carib peoples. I have listed 15 such groups (1969: 112), to which may now be added the Trio (Rivière 1969a: 284), Kalapalo (Basso 1970), Maroni River Carib (Kloos 1971: 133ff.), Galibí (Arnaud e Alves 1975), and Panare or E'ñapa (Villalón 1978). From the wide distribution of similar terms with the same meaning it is clear that a common term must have been used among Caribs before the separation of the Upper Xingú branch. Further, the use of a common term for cross cousins and/or siblings-in-law suggests that a Cross Cousin pattern may have been formerly used among Caribs, as it is today among the Yanomamö, Jivaroan groups and Campa. Its replacement by sibling terms in general usage is correlated among the Kuikuru with a loss of the distinction between cross and parallel cousins.

Marriage

Marriage among the Kuikuru is not structured by a prescriptive rule or by any proscriptions other than the genealogical definition of incest. The prohibited categories include, in addition to primary and lineal kin, parents' siblings, one's first parallel cousins, and siblings' children. Generally the same prohibitions apply also to extramarital sex relations. An occasional breach of these incest rules illustrates the permissive nature of Kuikuru society, for incest is not punished, nor is the deviant couple reproached, although people are said to be "unhappy" about it.

Exogamy and endogamy

In the absence of other marriage rules it is necessary to discuss exogamy and

318

endogamy[7] specifically with reference to the various units of Kuikuru society, beginning with the language block. Stated preferences in choice of mates differ from one informant to another. Some express a general preference for marriage with Carib speakers, and there is in fact a strong tendency toward language group endogamy. Others, perhaps influenced by the current availability of eligible mates, prefer marriage with someone in a particular non-Carib group. Expressed norms are permissive also with respect to marriage within the household unit. Some informants indicate that marriage to a member of one's own household is acceptable, and marriages do occasionally unite persons who already live in the same house.

With respect to the tribe, some people prefer marriage with other Kuikuru, whereas others prefer mates from a particular non-Kuikuru tribe. At one time in the recent past at least ten different tribal communities were represented in the Kuikuru settlement. Some of those outsiders had joined the Kuikuru as refugees from other small groups who suffered depopulation.

Depopulation

The Xinguanos have a 300-year history of demographic disturbance through warfare, depopulation and merging of tribal groups. The Kuikuru themselves tell of Karaíba (white people) entering their region a very long time ago wearing blue and yellow kerchiefs ("bándas") around their necks. These "bandeirantes" killed Kuikuru and other Indians with "swords" and destroyed crops and food stores. Many more natives died from lack of food. The ancestors of the Kuikuru fled to the very large Lake Tafonuno, on the eastern edge of the Upper Xingú basin. Karaíba came again and killed more people. Some of the Carib-speaking resisted, and five groups of them joined to form a single settlement in the region of the Kulisefu (Kuliseu) River, from which the Kuikuru later moved to the lake they named Kufikugu. The grandfather of the grandfather of a contemporary elder witnessed this latter massacre, which might therefore have taken place around 1755.

These same incidents are recalled by the Kalapalo in a "legend" told to the brothers Villas Boas, a famous team of pioneers and Indian agents. According to the Kalapalo account, many generations ago a very cruel white man called Paí Pero appeared in their settlement, which was then very far from their present location. A song that his companions sang in chorus as they walked, which was learned and is still sung by the Kalapalo, implies that those companions were other Indians. When Paí Pero left he took some of the natives with him. He later returned without these natives and asked more to go with him. When the natives refused, he and his men shot some and killed many others with machetes. Others ran and hid, and

---

[7] Of course the terms endogamy and exogamy have meaning only when used with reference to specified groups or categories. I have used them with explicit reference to language group, tribe, local group (community), household, and kin categories. It is not "impossible to specify" the extent of endogamy or exogamy, nor does it obscure the range of native choices as Basso asserts (1970: 402, 411). On the contrary, analysis of endogamy and exogamy of specific social units clarifies the extent and nature of those choices.

when Paí Pero withdrew, carried by his men in a hammock as was his custom, natives shot an arrow into his hammock. He never returned (Ferreira [1951]: 78).

These incidents are also recorded in historical sources. "Bandeiras" of gold seekers and Indian fighters invaded the region of the Rio das Mortes some one hundred miles East of the Upper Xingú basin as early as 1663. At that time many Indians were taken away as prisoners. A century later a notorious third-generation "bandeirante," Antônio Pires de Campos, Junior, made several expeditions to the same region, where he decimated Indians with sword and gun ("a ferro e a fogo") because they were reported to be a menace to pioneer settlers in the region. In 1775 Pires de Campos with his band of 50 Bororo Indians, who called him Paí-Pirá, again attacked a group of natives on the Rio das Mortes and "caused a terrible loss of life among the natives." On this occasion he was wounded by an Indian arrow and was carried back to his headquarters in a hammock by his Bororo companions. He died of the wound soon afterward (Ferreira [1951]: 36-37).

The striking correspondence among these three versions indicates that the ancestors of at least some Upper Xingú Caribs were on the Rio das Mortes two centuries ago and that they fled westward into the Upper Xingú basin. It also indicates that a large number of them died as a result of hostilities with pioneers.

When the first ethnologists surveyed the Upper Xingú region in 1884 there were still some 3,000 natives there (Galvão und Simões 1964: 136). But in the present century pioneers have continued to explore the area in search of gold and diamonds. More scientific expeditions were followed by missionaries, adventurers and journalists. Finally, in 1945, the Expedição Roncador-Xingú entered the region to open Central Brazil to air traffic. No sooner had the work party arrived than epidemics of influenza and other introduced diseases spread among the Indians (Ferreira [1951]: 77, 86).

As a result of these contacts the first half of this century was a period of drastic depopulation in the Upper Xingú region. In 1954 only about 700 people remained and the number of settlements had decreased. However, in spite of radical depopulation in the region as a whole, the size of the Kuikuru settlement remained relatively stable for many decades, partly by absorbing remnants of other Carib groups as well as some Arawak-speaking Yaulapití families. It should be recognized, however, that the population decrease that caused remnant groups to coalesce in the past century is only the latest episode in a long process of social disruption as ancestors of the Kuikuru fled or were driven out of the Guiana region and came into conflict with new neighbors.

It is common practice for remnant families from moribund tribes in the region to take refuge with larger friendly groups. Coalescing of these groups has important implications for the incidence of endogamy. Since refuges would not usually have been close relatives of the categories prohibited in marriage, their absorption has brought potential spouses into the Kuikuru community and thereby increased opportunities for *local* endogamy. Thus marriage of Kuikuru to offspring of immigrant families, which would have been locally exogamous before the merger, is now locally endogamous.

To establish whether or not amalgamation has in fact increased local

endogamy, it must be determined which marriages took place before the mergers and which took place afterward. Although such data are not directly available, I have arrived at an approximation. Starting with the stated tribal affiliation of parents and estimated ages of their offspring based on informants' recall of events for which dates have been published, it is possible to calculate the approximate dates of marriages. By comparing those dates with published dates of tribal mergers, I have made a determination in each instance as to whether a marriage took place before or after a merger. These calculations indicate that the proportion of local endogamy has increased since the beginning of this century. This increase coincides with the period of marked reduction in both regional population and number of settlements in the Upper Xingú and with the period of recorded mergers of remnant tribes with the Kuikuru. At present about 75% of the Kuikuru marriages are locally endogamous. Since the Kuikuru generally regard the entire community as a cognatic kin group, marriage within the local group may be seen also as kin-group endogamy.

It has been argued that serious depopulation leads to increased exogamy (Basso 1970: 414), but that reasoning overlooks the effect of tribal mergers in maintaining the size of surviving communities. Only if and when there are no eligible women in the community must members of a group "marry out or die out." So far this condition has been avoided among the Kuikuru and Kalapalo, in part through tribal mergers.

Cross cousin marriage

Preferences vary regarding particular kin categories as potential mates. A pattern preferred by some informants is the marriage of persons regarded as cross cousins of some degree (*ifǫ́*). A young person's parents speak with his or her father's "sister" (*etsí*) or mother's "brother" (*auaju*), who are said to be "speakers" (*kitofo*) in arranging such a marriage. If a young man's *etsí*, for example, has a daughter it is understood that the aunt may "give" her daughter to the young man and that he may have sexual relations with (*kupitsï ake*, "namorar") or marry ("casar") his *ifǫ́*.

At present, cross cousin marriage constitutes only a small proportion of Kuikuru marriages and few marriages of persons classed as first or second cross cousin endure long enough to produce offspring. Similarly, marriages involving the exchange of siblings or parallel cousins are rare now, but data from personal genealogies indicate that these may have been more common in the recent past. (A numerical analysis of these data appears in Dole 1983).

Informants insist that arranged cross cousin betrothals are not binding, and, in fact father's sister and mother's brother seldom become one's parents-in-law. Rather, young people are said to make their own choice of mates before the parents negotiate a betrothal. Understandably, marriage with a lover (*ajo*) is preferred by some. It is said that such marriages are more enduring than other types and that arranged cross cousin marriages are sometimes broken by *ajo*.

Special cross cousin terms are both statistically and functionally correlated

with the cross cousin marriage among a large number of relatively unacculturated tribal peoples (see Dole 1972), and it is clear that traditionally among the Kuikuru, parents have a right to claim a cross niece or nephew as the first spouse for their offspring and that the term *ifaʝ* is related to the norm of cross cousin marriage here (see Dole 1957, 1969). The Kuikuru themselves believe that cross cousin marriage was more common in the past. One man volunteered a statement that in former times people married their *ifaʝ* regularly ("bem direito") but that today men want to marry other relatives, including mother's "sister." That informant was well aware of the implications of the change, commenting that it ruined ("atropalha muito") the system of kin relations. As we shall see, it does indeed contribute to ambiguity in the classification of relatives.

An interesting parallel to this situation is reported from the Vaupés region of Brazil, where the highest ranked sibs among the Tucanoan Uanano take care to adhere strictly to the rules of both language group and local exogamy because "a deviation [from this practice] would upset the terminological system. 'It would create chaos,' and 'you would not know what to call anyone' " (Chernela 1983).

The Kuikuru disagree among themselves about how the term *ifaʝ* may, or should, be used. Some informants stated that it should not be used *in address* because of embarrassment (*ifïsu*; cf. Kalapalo *ifútisu*, Basso 1970, 1975), but others indicated that it is used even in address and that no *ifïsu* is associated with its use. As informants, Kuikuru do not use the term in discussing marriage. Even though the norms and practices of marriage, eligible mates, extramarital relations, genealogies and kin terms were discussed with numerous individuals, who spoke freely on these subjects, the term *ifaʝ* did not surface in these discussions. On the other hand, it was used spontaneously *outside* the context of marriage discussions in the responses of a few informants when asked to identify relations with other Kuikuru, listed alphabetically.

A survey of current Kuikuru marriages shows a tendency to marry into adjacent generations, although parents' own siblings and one's own siblings' children are still prohibited in principle. A man may marry a woman who is classed as "niece" *(ufati)* if she is a "little distant," that is, the daughter of a female cousin and not of own sister. As Rivière notes with respect to the Trio, cross-generation marriages appear to be an adaptation of the cross cousin marriage pattern (Rivière, 1966a: 739). I would suggest further that among the Kuikuru this form of adaptation may be an adjustment to the occasional scarcity of cross cousins or other eligible mates in one's own generation resulting from depopulation, as has already been documented for the Barama River Caribs (Adams n.d.).

Parallel cousin marriage

Even more disruptive to a system of cross cousin marriage is the marriage of parallel cousins, which occurs among the Kuikuru. To understand how this can occur we need only recall their general failure to distinguish cross from parallel relatives beyond first cousins. The use of sibling terms for all cousins allows for variable interpretation of relatedness. Marriage partners in many instances are

merely assumed to be related by virtue of the fact that their parents use kin terms for each other. This fact has several interesting consequences:

1. The exact genealogical links to offspring of father's "sister," for example, may not be known.
2. The daughter of *etsí* (F"Si") may be a parallel as well as a coss cousin.
3. *Ufǫ̃ĩ* as a term for the daughter of *etsí* may even denote parallel cousins.
4. Hence marriage to *ufǫ̃ĩ* may unite genealogically parallel cousins who are assumed to be cross cousins.

In other words, although Kuikuru conceive of persons of the *ifǫ̃ĩ* category as cross cousins they are often not, and are in fact often parallel kin, although in many instances the degree and kind of genealogical relation is not known.

Telo

The inability to distinguish cross from parallel cousins beyond the first degree leads some people to prefer as mates persons who are not known or assumed to be related (*telo*). The most general meaning of this term is "other, different," but in the context of marriage it may be glossed as "non-kin." Like kin terms, *telo* is quantifiable, as when a man refers to the daughter of a classificatory "sister" as "a little bit *telo*," and a wish to marry a particular cousin may be rationalized by referring to the intended mate as *telo*.

Unlike the so-called Dravidian system, referring to a relative in this way serves to place that person in a class of potential affines by equating him or her with outsiders rather than with cross relatives. It seems evident that in such instances *telo* is used purposefully as a device to imply social distance or lack of kinship bonds in order to express affinibility. It suggests further that people who use *telo* in this way may regard cross cousins as non-kin and therefore as potential affines. In this respect, it serves the same function as the traditional cross cousin term *ifǫ̃ĩ* which it seems partially to replace.

The same usage is found also among other Carib groups. As in the case of *ifǫ̃ĩ*, cognates of *telo* are used with the meaning of cross cousin among the Kaliña (Ahlbrinck 1931), Galibí (Arnaud 1968; Arnaud e Alves 1975), and Maroni River Caribs (Kloos 1971), all far removed in both space and time from the Upper Xingú Caribs, further supporting the suggestion that a tradition of distinguishing cross from parallel cousins is of long standing among these Caribs, and that a failure to distinguish them is a departure from that tradition.

Alliance: wife-givers, or kin vs. affines

The fact that most Kuikuru marry persons other than cross cousins brings into question the existence of marriage alliances. Marriage alliance systems are usually maintained by continued intermarriage of units or kin categories that are identifiable either by separate location or distinctive labels, egocentric or sociocentric. The Kuikuru lack these structural patterns as we have seen.

Without spatial separation or distinctive labels such as kin terms or group

names, marriage alliances can be maintained only if the offspring of two families intermarry generation after generation. Since exchange marriages among relatives are rare among the Kuikuru, there are no regularly intermarrying units and no categories of affines "transmitted from one generation to the next" (see Dumont 1968: 205). Indeed, there is no recognized category of affines other than persons to whom actual or fictive marriage ties are traced. Included in the category of fictive ties are the special friends of parents-in-law. When a person marries, he or she acquires as parents-in-law not only his or her mate's parents, but also the latter's *ato*, persons with no previous kinship relations necessarily.

It is clear that affinibility among the Kuikuru is not determined on the basis of a distinction between cross and parallel bonds as defined by ethnologists, or by membership in a particular category of relatives as in either two-line alliance or lineal systems. Rather it is determined on the basis of a variable concept of social distance measured in part by supposed or stipulated genealogical links, but also to some extent by interpersonal relations, place of residence and tribal affiliation. Any attempt to maintain the opposition of kin and affines as finite mutually exclusive categories is vitiated by the marriage of parallel relatives, the practice of unrestricted marriage to non-relatives, the assignment of fictive parents-in-law, and the common use of Generation cousin terms.

Since cross and parallel ties are confused, except among the closest kin, and parallel kin beyond first cousins may marry each other, it is not the case here that all the parallel kin of one's parallel kin must be one's own parallel kin, which is a diagnostic trait of the Cross Cousin two-line alliance system. Without a category of affines as opposed to consanguines, there is no division of wife givers or wife receivers. Of course cross cousins, persons from other communities, and non-relatives might be regarded as wife givers and receivers, but each of these categories is ambiguous or variable. No category of affinibles is characteristic of the society as a whole because both ideal and actual marriage practices differ from one person to another.

Because cousins are included in the personal kindred and are also eligible as mates, they can be seen as a type of consanguineal kin that are at the same time potential affines, in the same way as cousins were recognized as both kin and legitimate mates in many Stratified Segmented societies and in 19th-century England and America (see Dole 1957, 1965, 1972).

Since the Kuikuru do not make a clear distinction between distant cross and parallel relatives based on marriageability, their kinship system, and specifically their use of *ifaj* and *telo*, do not fit either Dumont's structure of kin vs. affine (1953a, 1953b) or Yalman's "closed circle" of kinsmen where there are no in-laws (1962: 553). Although Dumont characterized the Cross Cousin kinship system as dividing a society into kin and affines, he also suggested that "there is likely to be an affinal content in terms which are generally considered to connote consanguinity or 'genealogical' relationships (such as 'mother's brother' etc.)" (1968: 205). A similar condition has been observed among the Trumaí, another Upper Xingú tribe.

In the field of kinship, between the two poles of consanguinity and affinity, there is a series of situations where an individual A can modify his relationships to an individual B, according to residence, factional alignment and individual desire. One can be a little, more, or less in a consanguineal relation (or affinal) (Monòd-Becquelin 1978: 2).

It seems probable that the distinction of kin from affines may be most pronounced and meaningful in strictly exogamous unilocal or lineal structures, where persons are classed as being either members of one's own kin group or not members. By contrast, cognatic societies that have no prescriptive marriage rules but only prohibited genealogical categories may class cross relatives as both kin and potential affines. In these societies a consanguine becomes an affine only as a result of marriage. Affinity is then a de facto category dependent upon marriage. It might be useful for the purpose of analyzing this type of structure to recognize a class of "consanguineal affines," that is, kin with whom marriage is permitted.

Summary and discussion

Summarizing the data presented here, there are some indications of a native ideal of a patrifocal, if not patrilineal, structure, with patrilineal succession, patrilocal residence and a patrilineal emphasis in reckoning kinship. At the same time there are also suggestions of a two-line cross cousin marriage alliance system as an ideal. Although these patterns are quite compatible, the preponderance of observed practices do not conform to either pattern. In fact a salient feature of Kuikuru organization is that, in spite of these central tendencies, social relations are marked by variation in individual ideal patterns and by deviations from those patterns in practice rather than by structural oppositions.

Specific features that differ from the ideal of a two-line system of kinship and marriage include the following:
1. Cross relatives beyond first cousins are not distinguished from parallel kin.
2. Few marriages unite cross cousins.
3. The category of affines is distinct from cross relatives.
4. There are no marriage alliances.
5. Generation terms are commonly used for cousins.
6. The cousin term used to designate eligible mates is of the Dakota-Iroquois, not the Cross Cousin, pattern.
7. Avuncular and nepotic kin terms are of the Bifurcate Merging rather than Cross Cousin pattern.

A comparison of norms with actual practices suggests that some of the variations in Kuikuru social relations can be interpreted as resulting from the relaxation of structural norms. In support of this suggestion, comparative linguistic data, native statements about former practices, ethnohistoric evidence of demographic disturbance, and statistical data on increasing kin-group endogamy point to a change away from alliance structure with either Dakota-Iroquois or Cross Cousin terms, such as has been documented for numerous other peoples (see Dole 1969).

Data on marriage in the ethnographic literature have been notoriously

inadequate, partly for lack of uniformity and precision in the use of the terms exogamy and endogamy, and partly because ethnographers have tended to take informant statements as representing actual customs. Nevertheless, it is clear that many societies with kinship nomenclature of the Bifurcate Generation pattern have undergone social changes that led to relaxation of kin-group exogamy and in some instances to the marriage of men with their parallel cousins or with daughters of sisters or female parallel cousins. All of these marriage patterns result in a terminological equation of parallel with cross relatives, thus removing the principal social distinction on which special cross cousin terms are based.

Such a change is not necessarily very recent among the Kuikuru; it may well have occurred gradually over centuries as part of general social adjustments. Nor do I maintain that kin-group endogamy is the only cause of a change to Generation cousin terms. However, cross-cultural data demonstrate that it is a major determinant. Generation terms are not only statistically correlated with kin-group endogamy in world ethnography but are functionally related as well, whereas the Dakota-Iroquois and Cross Cousin patterns are correlated with local kin-group exogamy (Dole 1957, 1969; see also Murdock 1947).

In the context of change the continued use of cross cousin terms is an example of culture lag. When a marriage practice lapses there is a tendency to retain the traditional kin terms to "clothe" a newer practice. An ·instance of this tendency occurs among the Guiana Carib Wayana. When a Wayana man marries a parallel cousin, he changes the status of her brother from parallel to cross relative by using the term for cross cousin (Lapointe 1970: 124). In this way relationships may be altered to conform to a structural norm and the society retains the fiction of conforming to the norm.

The suggestion of modification in the use of kin terms as a result of changing marriage customs has been misinterpreted as evolutionist[8] by several social anthropologists, including Basso, who rejected it as unnecessary to an understanding of "Xingú Carib" kinship. Instead Basso attempted to explain the "internal logic of kin-class assignment in this system" through a " 'conceptual analysis' in the fashion of Schneider" (Selby 1972: 307). Assuming a "common cultural model in use among the Xingú Caribs" she described an ideal two-line marriage alliance system based on the Kalapalo native model and attributed that system without qualification to all other Caribs in the region (1970: 404 ff.). However, the Kuikuru data differ in numerous respects from the structure represented for the Kalapalo. The alliance structure reported for the Kalapalo does not occur among the Kuikuru and the kinship nomenclatures differ somewhat both in form and use. There is clearly no single "Xingú Carib" terminology and marriage pattern.

Explaining the system of kinship terminology and marriage of a society on the

[8] This hypothesis has been misinterpreted as an evolutionist explanation of adaptive modification in a "sequence of developmental stages" (Basso 1970: 415-416). Far from being an example of evolution as measured by its hallmark, that is, increase in complexity, the loss of structural opposition characteristic of a two-line alliance system posited in this instance is a *regressive* or devolutionary step, because it represents a *decrease* in complexity. (For an evolutionist interpretation of kinship see Dole 1972).

basis of a native model or "specific rules of behavior" (Basso 1970: 403) leaves several questions unanswered. In the Kuikuru instance it is not the native model or ideal that needs to be explained. The use of a distinctive cross cousin term and its relation to cross cousin marriage are not in question (see Dole 1957, 1969). In this instance the native model represents an ideal to which actual practice does not conform, and the model cannot account for the extensive deviations from it. Thus a description of Kuikuru organization in terms of the two-line model alone is of dubious utility and appears to be generated by the model rather than by empirical data of Kuikuru practice.

What does need to be explained is the general lack of conformity of existing practices with a native model in both marriage and kin terminology. Why do cross cousins seldom marry each other, and why do people commonly use the same terms for cross cousins as for parallel, instead of the distinctive cross cousin term? A related problem is a lack of internal consistency in the kinship nomenclature; the Generation pattern of cousin terms is inconsistent with the Bifurcate Merging pattern of terms used in adjacent generations. Why is the cross cousin term not used in general conversation here, whereas in other societies with two-line alliance structure cross cousin terms are a regular and overt part of the common kinship nomenclature? In other words why is the special cross cousin term so loosely integrated in the kinship organization?

Basso explained the common use of Generation cousin terms as being the polite way to refer to potential affines, who would be embarrassed to hear themselves referred to as in-laws (1970: 412). One must ask, however, why it is awkward or impolite to refer to a potential spouse with a cross cousin term in Kalapalo or Kuikuru society and not in all other societies with cross cousin terms of the Dakota-Iroquois or Cross Cousin pattern. What is it in this instance that makes it embarrassing to specify affinibility?

In view of the historical and ethnographic evidence for change in Kuikuru society, it seems unproductive to deny the relevance of social change to these problems. The model of a two-line marriage alliance is a static, internally consistent and well integrated structure, recognition of which is of undisputed value to ethnological science. In essence, it describes how a particular system should work. But the Kuikuru and most contemporary social systems are not as stable, internally consistent or well integrated as this model. A functional-dynamic approach may complement a structural analysis in reaching a better understanding of social systems that have undergone change.

In a discussion of cultural integration, Robert Anderson, following Linton (1936) and Kroeber (1948), assumed that various parts of a culture tend to become progressively well integrated and that "older complexes and elements will be better integrated into their surrounding systems than newer ones." He showed that cultures in the process of change could be identified by the occurrence of variant practices and that the degree of cultural integration could be measured by the incidence of "lesser and greater numbers of variant behaviors" (Anderson 1960: 51-52). These principles can be applied to the Kuikuru data, and specifically to the use of kin terms for cousins.

In small societies, such as the Kuikuru, latent tensions are a common feature of the social distance that characterizes affinal relations. Hostility between affines is often minimized mainly by ritual avoidance and exchanges, and by the formal etiquette of marriage proposals. In the ambivalent relations among affines, referring to a person as an affine implies a negative connotation of being an outsider as well as the positive implication of attraction to a potential spouse. It is because of the negative connotation in this relation that the use of affinal terms causes embarrassment.

Of course, if a community is exogamous, its members can discuss potential affines freely without being heard by them and hence without embarrassing them. It is only when prospective mates live in the same community that such discussions would be overheard by the potential affines and the use of cross cousin terms with their connotation of potential affinity would be a source of embarrassment. Then people must be circumspect and use affinal terms only out of hearing of the referents.

If the Kuikuru regularly practiced local exogamy, their eligible mates would not hear the affinal terms used in discussions of prospective marriage because they would be in separate local groups. However, for at least a century and probably much longer the Kuikuru, and the Kalapalo as well have from time to time incorporated remnants of other previously separate groups and have married within their own communities to some extent.

It is a very common custom to extend consanguineal terms *in address* to all members of a community as a gesture of courtesy and as a gentle way of manipulating relations. Since eligible mates live in the same group among the Kuikuru and Kalapalo today, sibling terms are extended to them in this way. And since public use of affinal/cross cousin terms in this situation is awkward, it is not difficult to see that "sibling" terms might be extended to cross cousins in reference as well as address.

Although Basso rejects a consideration of change as contributing to an understanding of Bifurcate Generation terminology there are inconsistencies in her material that can be reconciled only on the basis of variation and change. People who are referred to as *ifaⁿ* among the Kalapalo are said to be "the only kinsmen considered marriageable" (1970: 409), but at the same time "marriage with an *ifaⁿ* is not an ideal" (1970: 411). In another place we read that

only those ufau [sic] who are not "close" actually marry. Thus, children of biological siblings of opposite sex, though classed as marriageable never seem to actually marry. Only those distant persons...are actually married, that is, persons outside one's factional and household group, but usually within linguistic and kinship categories (Becker 1969: 65-66).

The genealogical relations of persons referred to as *ifaⁿ* (or *ifau*) are not clear, for "non-kin who are married may be called ifau, but no claims are made to a kinship relation" (Becker 1969: 81). And finally, "the Kalapalo cannot clearly state why ifándaw [the plural form of *ifaⁿ*] are appropriate spouses and lovers, and they are *unable to explain why they identify certain kinsmen as potential affines* and designate others as unaffinible" (Basso 1975: 209, emphasis mine).

From these statements, it seems clear that the Kalapalo have a tradition of cross cousin marriage but that current practice does not conform closely to that tradition. These statements reflect a variable condition similar to that among the Kuikuru.

The relevance of individual variation and change to a social system is expressed by Firth in distinguishing between social structure and social organization.

It is becoming increasingly clear that in order to understand both change in structure and change in detail, we must look to a closer study of the setting and results of individual choice and decision, as they affect activity and social relations (1954: 17).

To overlook the factor of change is to close one avenue to an understanding of the "individual choice and decision" that are characteristic of Kuikuru society.

Abstract

The Kuikuru are one of three Carib-speaking tribes in the Upper Xingú basin in Mato Grosso, Brazil. Their cognatic social organization is very permissive, and behavior is characterized by an unusual amount of variation in both norms and actual behavior, with few strict regulations and fewer formal penalties for nonconformity. Nevertheless, some of its social relations are ordered by concepts of opposition and lineality.

This paper outlines ideal and actual practices in spheres of leadership, economic organization, residence and kinship. Lineal and cognatic features are described, and the evidence for two-line marrige alliance structure is examined. Some characteristic features of the system of kinship and marriage are analyzed in the context of demographic and social change.

Resumen

Los Kuikuru constituyen una de tres tribus de habla Caribe de la cuenca del Alto Xingú, Mato Grosso, Brasil. La organización cognática de estos indígenas no es muy restrictiva y el comportamiento social se caracteriza por una variación excepcional no sólo en cuanto a las normas, sino también en cuanto a la conducta actual. Hay pocos reglamentos estrictos y no se penaliza la disconformidad. Sin embargo, algunas de sus relaciones sociales se organizan por conceptos de oposición y aun la linealidad.

Este trabajo presenta un esbozo de las prácticas ideales y reales en cuanto al liderazgo, la organización económica, la residencia y el parentesco. Se señalan los rasgos lineales y cognáticos y se examina la evidencia que existe en cuanto a alianzas matrimoniales de dos líneas. Se analizan algunos rasgos característicos del sistema de parentesco y de las alianzas matrimoniales en el contexto del cambio demográfico y social.