ARTICLE

Wars and looting: differential appropriations and incorporations of alterities among the Jê peoples – Southern 'Cayapó'

DOI

http://dx.doi.org/10.11606/ 2179-0892.ra.2020.178850

Marcel Mano

Federal University of Uberlândia | Uberlândia, MG, Brasil marcelmano@ufu.br | https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0373-104X

ABSTRACT KEYWORDS

This essay intends to intervene in the theme of the wars of the Jê peoples—Southern Cayapó'—in the 18th century, with a view to showing how these groups differentially incorporated the enemies and their goods in the historical context of the contacts. From the analysis of documents referring to the region known today as the south of Goiás, Triângulo Mineiro and northern São Paulo, the article dialogues with Anthropology and History and intends to show that, through the wars of looting, these indigenous groups put into action simultaneously different symbolic evaluations and political incorporations of their otherness.

Indigenous in Brazil, indigenous history, southern 'Cayapó', identities and aterities

To be or not to be an artisanal fisherwoman? Female work, recognition and social representation among shellfish collectors in the Campos Basin, RJ

ABSTRACT This papper aims to intervene in the matter of the southern 'Cayapó'—wars in the eighteenth century to show how these groups differentially incorporated enemies and their goods into the historical context of contacts. Based on an analysis of documents referring to the region known today as south of Goiás, Triângulo Mineiro and north of São Paulo, the papper dialogues with Anthropology and History and intends to show that, by means of the wars of loot, these indigenous groups put into simultaneous action different symbolic evaluations and political incorporations of their alterities.

EYWORDS

Indians in Brazil, indigenous history, southern 'Cayapó', identities and aterities

FROM HISTORY TO ETHNOLOGY

In an application dated January 23, 1762, a widowed mother, on behalf of herself and her children, asked the king D. José debt moratorium for five years. This would be a common case if it were not for the justification given by the applicant: her husband had died "in its work [...] together with forty-three slaves, due to the attack by the indigenous Cayapó" (AHU–ACL–CU–008–cx. 18–doc.1072¹).

From a banal case, the document then evokes the allegories of colonization: a family torn apart, annihilated, a mother alone to raise her children due to an attack by barbarian Indigenous, cruel, treacherous, privateers, savages, and so many other negative adjectives that fill them. The descriptions made in the 18th century of the Jê groups, documentedly treated as 'Gentile Cayapó'.

And as history has always been written by the empires, in these same documents nothing can be read that recalls the sufferings when, in 1742, in the struggle for war against the "barbarian Gentile of the Cayapó nation, and the most infested on the way to town in the mines of Goiaz", d. Luiz de Mascarenhas orders that "the so-called Gentiles not surrendering, and when their hands are taken, they will pass the sword without distinction or difference of sex" (D.I². vol. 22: 168). In spite of the different visions that the documents evoke, the common feeling is that of what this war really was: one of the longest, cruelest and bloodiest in Portuguese colonial America.

For both sides, but in different ways, the history of contacts between Indigenous and non-Indigenous in the 18th century in the present-day southern regions of Goiás, Triângulo Mineiro and north of São Paulo seems to have been, in itself, a history of wars. However, a story that can no longer be reproduced is either the civilizing and official view or the romantic view of passive indigenous people. After all, there were indigenous wars and colonial wars; and this implies understanding how they were part of the structuring mode of the Portuguese overseas empire, as well as of the relational and symbolic of these Jê groups with some of their otherness.

In view of this, the accounts of the attacks that these groups carried out against different enemies in the 18th century can help us to better understand their strategies of symbolic evaluation and cultural appropriation of the goods of their different ones. The point of inflection in this approach is to think about how, at that moment, these indigenous groups incorporated into their semantic field of meanings different alterities and, despite the war as a modality of relationship with some of them, acted in different ways, with specific approaches and strategies for each category of enemy.

In this way, the range of themes opened here does not only touch on the versions or narratives of historical facts, but also on a series of properly ethno-logical themes. Among them, war as a mechanism at the same time of opening to the outside world

1 Handwritten documents are identified in the body of the text by its codices; and the full indications are listed in the references as Manuscript Documents.

2 | Abbreviation here and henceforth used for the series of publications of the Documentos Interesting for the History and Customs of São Paulo. In the body of the text, the abbreviation is followed by the volume and page from which the citation was extracted. The indication completes if find in references like Printed Documents.

and incorporation of contact goods and spoils in the production of the interior world. In the case of these Jê groups – southern 'Cayapó', this implies in the relativization of the centrifugal – centripetal binomial to think about the distinctions between Tupi and Jê peoples in Brazilian ethnology (Cunha; Castro, 1985; Fausto 2001), and temporally deepens the diagnosis that these indigenous groups have put into action differential symbolic structures for the classification and appropriation of the goods of their different others.

Based, then, in part on historical documentation from the 18th century, this essay aims to present how these indigenous peoples, when engaging in wars of looting, differentially consumed and incorporated things and people from their enemies. Through them, these groups do not seem to have closed themselves in a centripetal trend, because they remained continuously open to different evaluations and appropriations of otherness.

THE JÊ PEOPLES - SOUTHERN 'CAYAPÓ'

When, in the first quarter of the 18th century, written documents about the south of Goiás, Triângulo Mineiro and north of São Paulo began to appear, this was an area of continuous, but not exclusive, occupation by groups documented by 'Cayapó' that, in ethnology, because of their location, are called southern. However, the construction of this term to refer to a collective of indigenous people has to be viewed with some caution, as it does not seem to correspond to a social ethnotaxonomy. On the contrary, there are signs that it is a historical product of social and political interactions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous, and therefore a generic classification irremediably associated with the practical, legal and symbolic circumstances in which the contacts took place.

Since at least 1723, when the first historical record of the term is made among groups located in the present south of Goiás, they are portrayed as extremely violent. The backcountry man who first described them, Antonio Pires de Campos, already recorded that "their greatest exercise is that of being corsairs of other Gentiles from various nations and cherish one another among them whom more people will kill" (Campos, 1976: 181). Although there appears to have been no incident of belligerence in this first documented contact, it would not be long before all the narratives came to light filled with the attacks that these indigenous people were making not only against other indigenous groups (as the fragment indicates), but against farmers, travelers and miners; "since no traveler or train driver arrived at this village [Vila Boa de Goiás] that he would not come making repeated complaints about the insults that the same Cayapós are continually doing" (BN–MS 575 (1) – doc. 7).

In this practical context of hostility, with attacks that started to be launched by both sides, the Jê groups—treated as 'Gentile Cayapó'—served to update the allegories

of the hostile, savage, brave, enemy, such Indigenous as it appears in that petition for moratorium of the widowed mother and her children. In fact, in the backlands of the mines of Goiás and Minas Gerais in the 18th century, these groups should correspond to the category of independent Indigenous, that is, those who were not yet under the domain of the Portuguese Crown, therefore not catechized or civilized. That is why, the indigenous policies of Goiás turned to them, whose project was precisely that of ridding the Captaincy of non-assimilated Indigenous and bringing them to the authority of the Church and the State; even if for this the authorities and the settlers used the extermination and disinfestation (Karash, 1992: 397–410), as illustrated by Luis de Mascarenhas' Order of gang to order "the sword without distinction or difference of sex" and enslave those under ten years old, as "boys and des annos pa girls. low [...] will lead them to this Va. to take from them the fifth of S. Mage. And the most are divided by whoever touches" (D.I., 22: 168).

War conceived as just and as an offensive practice, the attacks against the 'Gentile Cayapó' in the interior of the Goiás mines in the 18th century reedited or adapted war as a structuring mode of the Portuguese overseas empire, even based on the use of friendly Indigenous or allies to fight enemy and hostile Indigenous. In the region and period in focus, the readaptation in this way became effective in a policy of settlement of indigenous people transferred from other parts of the colony ('Bororo', 'Xakriabá', 'Pareci', 'Karajá', 'Javaé') to the region of the current Triângulo Mineiro (Lourenço, 2015; Mori, 2015; Ravagnani, 1987/88/89). Although these groups of indigenous villaged—colonial—may have developed forms of participation in this project (Amantino, 2013: 165), they were the image of the "gentle Indigenous", as they were the colonial workforce and soldiers in the wars against hostile Indigenous of the hinterland.

Thus, in the processes of contact and historical record of the term 'Cayapó', a practical context of hostility was fed back to an indigenist policy that differentiated allied Indigenous from enemy Indigenous, regulating the type of treatment they should receive from settlers and missionaries (Perrone-Moisés, 1992). To that In addition to this, also a colonial imaginary used a division of the Indigenous into Tupi and Tapuia. Forged by Tupi or Guarani language groups from the coast to refer to groups speaking other languages (Monteiro, 2001), This division was sometimes associated with a linguistic differentiation (Cardim, 1980: 103), and sometimes with a cultural differentiation we (Tupi-Guarani) and others (Vasconcelos, 1977: 109) quite generic, because, as we know today, the term Tapuia covers a big linguistic and cultural heterogeneity. Thus, when used in the mines hinterland in the 18th century, the term Tapuia was applied generically to all and any groups that did not resemble the cultural characteristics shared by the alde Indigenous, settlers, missionaries and military troops who in the 18th century swept the path of mines.

Based on this framework, a critical reading of the documents shows why the generic designation 'Cayapó' was a significant one constructed based on experiences and representations that these agents made of the hinterland; An inhospitable and faded place occupied by jaguars, gentiles and blacks who had fled, since in the hinterland without prior "it would have happened some danger from some Negroes, Gentiles, thirst for some beast" (BN – 18.2.6 – doc. 34).

That is why the indigenous groups identified as 'Cayapó' were described in the 18th century as Tapuias, "because their language is different from the general one" (Braga, 1976: 126); as those who "take everything from treachery and prey" (Campos, 1976: 182); as the "most traitor of all" (Camello, 1976: 115); as "a nation that does not have a fixed abode, nor plants or crops" (Barros, 1976: 148); as those who "war with treachery [...] and sustain themselves on the filth of the bush" (Barros, 1976: 148–149); like naked savages because "the costume of these barbarians is to live naked, both men and women" (Campos, 1976: 182); as cruel and merciless enemies because "having been with such barbaric cruelty that not even children forgive" (D.I., 22: 185).

In light of these circumstances, it is clear that the indigenous groups that occupied and/or roamed the region of what is now southern Goiás, Triângulo Mineiro and north of São Paulo formed a contingent of 'gentiles' still free from colonial authority who, regardless of ethnicity, were called 'Cayapó'. Certainly, they must all share the characteristics that associated them with the series of 'Gentiles' to be united under the same designation. However, rarely named, autochthonous groups such as ixQuirixá'/'Araxá', 'Goiá', 'Akroá', 'Puxavante', 'Xiquiabá' were treated anonymously in most documents. This is verified even in that order of war of d. Luis de Mascarenhas in 1742 against the "Barbarian Gentile of the Cayapó nation, and the most infested the way [...] in the mines of Goiaz" (D.I., 22: 168). Hidden as "the most", instead of all of them, the term 'Cayapó' became the common place for documents from the period to describe or narrate facts associated with the hinterland indigenous.

Thus, and as has already been shown that groups documented as Coroado – Guayaná in the interior of the state of São Paulo were, in part, groups of the southern Jê - Kayngáng and Xokléng (Monteiro, 1992); the term 'Cayapó' in the presente north regions of São Paulo, Triângulo Mineiro and south of Goiás has to be taken as a generic term that should encompass not only the southern 'Cayapó', but also different groups of the linguistic family Jê of Trunk Macro-Jê, associates, surely, to the universe of the northern Jê and probably the central Jê. In the first case, it seems to be consensual the association of the 'Cayapó' groups from the 18th century to the current 'Panará' or 'Kreen-Akarôre', contacted in the 1970s in the region north of Mato Grosso, on the banks of the Peixoto de Azevedo river. Based on linguistic and cultural data a number of ethnologists (Ewart, 2015: 203; Giraldin, 1997: 121; Heelas, 1979: 2; Turner, 1992: 312–313, Schwartzman, 1987: 264–265) have already concluded for the relationship 'Cayapó' - 'Panará'; and considering that the last of these groups speak

a language of the Northern Jê peoples subfamily which includes, in addition to the 'Panará', the 'Mebengokré', the 'Suya', the 'Apinayé' and the 'Timbira' languages, it is right to think that part the groups recorded in the sources as 'Cayapó' in the south can be associated with the linguistic groups of the Northern Jê peoples. But as the appellation 'Cayapó' was a generic term, it can also probably be associated in period documentation with groups of the Central Jê ('Xavante', 'Akroá', 'Xacriabá'). In the 18th century, however, 'gentile barbarian and gentile Cayapó' were terms associated with indigenous groups portrayed, regardless of ethnicity, as violent, fierce, of strange appearance and customs, of languages different from the general one and that, in a way, if they placed obstacles in the paths of the mines; therefore, regardless of ethnicity, recognized by modern ethnography as groups of Northern and/or Central Jê. This is due to the fact of the term 'Cayapó' is not even ethnotaxonomy, but a word of Tupi or Guarani origin that means "like a monkey" (Turner, 1992: 311). Given this broad spectrum of data, there seems to be enough evidence not to treat the term 'Cayapó' as an indisputable empirical reality. Before, and as proposed, it should be thought of as a historical construct within symbolic and pragmatic frameworks in which contacts between Indians and non-Indians in the region took place.

* * *

As history has revealed, the confrontation between different logics and interests of indigenous and non-indigenous was constant throughout the 18th century and reshaped both. On the one hand – that of the Portuguese Crown – the region was strategic for the flow of mining wealth in Goiás. On the other hand, and according to their own historical accounts, the various groups identified as Jê – 'Cayapó' in the south occupied and they roamed intensively through this region, having in it large and numerous villages. The shock was inevitable!

The documents produced throughout the history of these contacts have always pointed towards a large and dense occupation of these indigenous groups in the region. The sertanista who first described them in the present-day south of Goiás, in 1723, commented that "the Gentile called kaiapó [...] is from villages, and inhabits a lot of land for being many people, each village with its chief, who is the same as governor" (Campos, 1976: 181). Almost sixty years after this first registration, in 1781, the field regent Ignácio Correa Pamplona still mentioned such a dense population groups: "from the Paranaíba River, I followed the verification of the hills of this Captaincy [Minas Gerais] with that of Goiáz and São Paulo [...] arriving at the place called Glória, there I found the great traces of the Gentile Cayapó, and part of its lodge.to"; and in the headwaters of the Dourados River, a tributary of the Paranaíba, "we found three lodgings of the Gentile Cayapó, each with twenty or so

houses" (APM-CC-cx.87, doc. 20256). Throughout the 18th century, instructions and letters from newcomers to the region of the current Triângulo Mineiro and south of Goiás constantly confirmed this information; be it because "the Country you are going to enter is infested with gentile" (BN-18.2.6-doc.5); or because "the extension of this gentile barbarian can give the name [...] of an emperio, by its great Greatness" (BN-18.2.6 – doc. 19); or because the "housings in which the Gentiles [were] as populous as they would be" (BN 1.4.001 – doc. 17).

Archeological studies carried out since the 1980s in the municipalities of Perdizes and Centralina, located in the Paranaíba valley in the Triângulo Mineiro, have also revealed indigenous occupations of long temporal depth. In one of these sites – Rezende – the traces point towards a long-term continuity, since "in addition to the antiquity of Rezende, it is important to highlight its cultural diversity, occupied by hunters and gatherers – nomadic populations aimed at hunting, gathering and fishing [...] and by ceramist populations in the process of sedentarization" (Alves, 2002: 201). Although we do not want to propose a direct cultural relationship between these two horizons of occupations, and even less between these and the groups historically registered in the region, the recent excavation in this same area of historic pottery farming sites, dating from the mid-eighteenth century and mid-19th century, associated with the southern 'Cayapó' (Magalhães, 2015), confirm similarities with pre-colonial pottery sites³ and the dense occupations reported in 18th century documents, treated in the archaeological data as various spots dark corresponding to the dwellings.

and historical) that point to a possible continuity of occupation that would documentally associate them with the Jê groups - 'Cayapó'. Based on the intersection of these data, it is then possible to draw a picture of

indigenous occupations of long temporal depth and a dense population contingent of groups associated with the Jê peoples. From the first quarter of the 18th century onwards clash of these groups with the colonial fronts was inevitable. From the point of view of the colonial order, these groups updated the allegories of the barbarian Gentile and the indigenous policy of Goiás at the end of the 18th century turned to them, whose project, according to Karasch (1992: 397–410), was precisely to carry out the wars of extermination and enslavement. For the 'Cayapó' groups, these practices were constant from an early age and it is estimated that in a single year (1741) approximately eight thousand of these Indigenous had been enslaved by paulistas (Karasch, 1997: 33).

Since there has been an offensive war against these indigenous groups since the 1730s, the inevitable flight from their villages, depopulation, and the abrupt social, political and economic sarticulation had drastic consequences for their production and social reproduction regime groups and their relationship strategies with alterities. In addition, this new game of forces marked by disputes and intense conflicts, typical of colonialist environments, placed these groups in contact with differente alterities: non-Indigenous, indigenous village, runaway blacks, and other indigenous groups

3 | Ceramic manufacturing techniques, recurrence of

shapes, absence of painting and engobe, and burning in

excavated ovens (Magalhães, 2015: 68, 551) are some of the

similarities between both ceramist horizons (prehistoric with whom they had probably had contacts since pre-colonial time.

A possible history of these encounters from the documentary accounts shows that the ways in which these groups acted in their relations with these different others were not unanimous, as they were changing and changing depending on the situation and of the agents involved. War, commerce, peace, alliances, mutual defense of interests, etc. they were not excluding strategies of these indigenous groups, even when treated with the same category of alterity (Mano, 2011), which leads to the proposal of coexistence of different historical lines of action in the relationships of contacts with the different alterities; and a non-fixed or binary model of identity.

Despite this, for a short period of time, between the second and third quarters of the 18th century, these groups of the Jê - 'Cayapó' - seem to have used war as a preferential form of contact with two categories of enemies: non-Indigenous and other indigenous groups. But even there, where the preferred form of contact was the same, defined as a relationship of war and looting, the content of predation indicates the existence of different symbolic structures of classification and appropriation that are also different for the goods of these different others.

THE WARS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: ENEMIES AND THEIR GOODS

If we consider an indigenous attack from the perspective of the victims, it must be a horror. In the imagination and sensibility of the 18th century, the crossing of the hinterlands itself was partly filled with fear in the face of a possible encounter with the various beasts, and the mere suspicion of the presence of Indians considered hostile should already be enough to cause panic. In the backlands of the mines corresponding to the present south of Goiás, Triângulo Mineiro and north of São Paulo, this fear was amplified by the current news of barbarian, hostile, treacherous, savage Gentiles — called 'Cayapó'— who mercilessly attacked farmers, travelers and miners. His attacks against non-Indigenous (mestizos, miners, travelers, black slaves, rural people) seemed not to differentiate places, nor to spare casualties or minimize damage; and their various strategies almost always produced the expected results.

Sometimes, positioned at a distance, they launched attacks against the population of the villages: "in the Abelhas River [today Araguari River] a stretch of kayak, with a hundred and many bows, coming from the Paraná hinterland, began to shoot arrows from elevation and killed many residents" (Vasconcelos, 1974: 181). On other occasions they invaded, they killed and plundered: "they invaded the district, killed a Negro, stole tools and made it possible for slaves to escape" (AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 27, d. 1773). In these invasions and attacks they should, in addition to arrows, use the club or bobbin "[...] garrotes, which are four- or five-palm spade with a large, well-made head, and drawn, with which they make a shot far away, and so sure they never go wrong the head; it is the weapon they trust most, and it is very much appreciated"

(Campos, 1976: 182). On still other occasions, they carried out ambushes, burned and killed:

The Gentile Cayapó has been following me for 11 days now, burning all the lodgings after I leave that place, he is an enemy that does not fight openly, having made a thousand mistakes (...) this enemy is used to falling in dead hours, they arrive subtly, set fire to the grass huts and set themselves aside with ash, to close everyone who leaves with the sudden fire, all at once. (APM-CC-cx.154-doc. 21531).

There did not seem to be anyone safe from what the authorities called the 'insolence of the Gentiles'. Whether in villages, on roads, on farms, in fields or wherever, settlers and newcomers to the interior of the Goiás mines in the 18th century were constantly tormented by the atrocities of these attacks:

[...] killing and robbing Travelers who come and go, and roceyros insulting them in their own houses, queimando them citios, and the payoys in which they have collected their fruits also killing their slaves, horses, pigs, and more creations taking place with such barbaric cruelty, that neither children forgive nor give quarters to anyone (DI, 22:185).

Spread panic, attack fiercely, kill as many enemies as possible, burn property, destroy crops and creations, and steal. These appeared to be the guidelines of all reported attacks against non-Indians in the period. They were quick, fulminating and aimed at physical, material and moral annihilation. In the different news, there did not seem to be time for the victims to defend themselves. They took them by surprise, and on them they threw themselves in fierce attacks and their warriors, invariably brave, always acted "with such barbaric cruelty and their customary ferocity" (AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 2, d. 179). They burned, killed and took away the spoils of the war: movable material goods, as they were "stealing the travelers" (D.I., 22: 185) and "carrying the spoils" (UNB. AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 20, d. 1220). In view of these data, the way in which the relationship of these indigenous groups with the outside non--Indian world was clearly one of looting. With quick and accurate attacks, they killed, destroyed and appropriated material elements of the culture of its victims (plants, firearms, metal tools and exotic objects). Furthermore, there is another constant in the attacks against non-Indigenous: they never targeted captives. Although there is ample and copious, documentation produced in the 18th century about the attacks of these Jê groups-'Cayapó', in none of them is there any report of abductions, hostages or captives made among non-Indigenous. On the contrary, they always killed everyone or as much as they could, because "having behaved with such barbaric cruelty [...] they don't even give barracks to anyone" (DI, 22: 185).

Thus, a structure and content common to the attacks carried out against non-Indigenous make it possible to define them as plunder wars without captives⁴. When they launched themselves against this otherness, they appropriated and incorporated material goods—things—and not people. The absence of captives in the interethnic wars of these Jê groups have already been explained based on the argument that these indigenous groups "did not take captives to their enemies because there was no possibility of being incorporated into their 'SDG' or 'clans'" (Giraldin, 1997: 50; Heelas, 1979: 79); this model indirectly related to a supposed centripetal tendency of the Jê groups.

It turns out, however, that the war was a constant opening to the outside world with the explicit objective of internal incorporation of goods and wealth. The continued appropriation of movable material goods by non-Indigenous must have made an amount of consumer goods that should have been used to flow into these groups appreciated for their aesthetic and functional qualities, especially metal tools. How and in what form these objects circulated within these groups will remain, at least for the time being, unknown. Based on ethnological data from the modern 'Mebengokré' and 'Panará', we can only consider as certain the internal circulation of movable objects removed in the wars against non-Indigenous. On the 'Mebengokré wars' against Brazilians, Turner (1992: 329) stated that "the only reason [...] for attacks on Brazilians was to obtain firearms and goods manufactured goods: war was [...] a form of circulation of goods". And about the 'Panará' custom of visiting Brazilian cities, Ewart (2015: 216–217) wrote: "[...] place to stay for a while, get valuable goods, and then leave again [...] and there is, therefore, a certain degree of anxiety in relation to the redistribution of goods bought in the cities and brought back to the village". Certainly, the concrete facts point, then, to a constant search and circulation of these goods, only compatible with the total contempt for their original owners.

In these wars of plunder without captives, the southern 'Cayapó' seemed to be putting men and things under simultaneous scrutiny. Among men, during the entire period in question, there was never any gesture of alliance or peaceful trade, as attacks and deaths always took place. They figured then, in the symbolic evaluation of these groups, as enemies and despicable creatures that should be killed, and this attitude is perhaps explained in relation to the division of humans into two categories, as pointed out by the ethnographies on the modern 'Parará'. Either as 'kaben' (Heelas, 1979: 64) or as 'hi'pe' (Schwartzman, 1987: 93; Ewart, 2013), both cognates of the term 'Kayapó's –'kuben' (white), in these categories they incorporate any groups not 'Bread'. Sometimes translated as enemy, according to Schwartzman (1987: 231), it is through relations with the 'hi'pe' that the 'Panará' identity of warrior and brave is built. Therefore, it is possible that in the southern 'Cayapó' wars of the 18th century the Indians offered material goods and symbolic goods such as bravery for the internal construction of bodies and people⁶. Therefore, while they were despicable and

^{4 |} This proposal to define wars against non-Indigenous as "wars of plunder without captives" can only be extended to the Jê peoples – 'Cayapó' groups, and cannot, therefore, be treated as a constant among the Jê groups. According, for example, to documents from 1788 on the pacification of the 'Xavante', there is evidence to the contrary (Freire, 1790: 25-26).

^{5 |} In this text we have been using the term 'Cayapó' with 'C' so far because it is historical spelling, and to differentiate these from the groups 'Kayapó' with 'K', as they are spelled by ethnographies.

⁶ More than once modern authors (Giraldin, 1997: Turner, 1992; Schwartzman, 1987) have mentioned the important role played by war expeditions in organizing the main rituals of the 'Panará' and 'Kayapó'. The naming ritual of perforation of lips, ears, and scarification, which denote the social production of the person, depend to some extent of these expeditions. They are mostly pain rituals that man endures because enemies have made them angry. In other words, the ideal of the warrior and brave only comes true in the relationship with enemies.

should be killed, in the indigenous assessment, non-Indigenous were powerful enemies, holders of certain powers and goods materialized in their objects. Under these conditions, the assessment could be that the possible wealth of non-Indigenous was in their objects and in the opportunities they offered to the Indians to show bravery, but never in themselves. The appropriation of the creative, aesthetic, functional and symbolic capacities of this otherness took place through the appropriation and warrior incorporation of their objects, and not their bodies⁷, a trend that seemed to be quite different when it was another category of enemy: other indigenous groups.

7 | This historical truth obviously changed over the course of contact, as the domain and interest in non-Indigenous knowledge were necessary to even guide their political actions in contact relationships.

The region in focus here has been, since the pre-colonial period, an area of occupation by the Jê groups. Archaeologically associated with the Aratu Sapucai ceramist Tradition "represented by the presence of edges of twin vases and shards of possible igaçabas" (Fagundes, 2015: 120), and documentedly related to the 'gentile Cayapó', these groups cannot, as we tried to show above, be taken as a whole and single group. Homogenization by the ceramic fossil guide and/or by a constructed signifier both have the defect of erasing the internal diversities and dynamics that escape exogenous classification systems. In this sense, it is very likely that different groups belonging to the Jê linguistic family of the Macro—Jê stem had been reenacting, since before the non-Indigenous penetration, the contacts stories in this region.

Although rare, the documentary evidence from the 18th century points exactly in this direction. In 1781, a sertanista who had known the area since at least 1769, wrote from the headquarter of the headwaters of the Dourados River, a tributary of the Paranaíba: "how shall I conquer, settle and populate a conquest with thirteen men, these are [illegible] with four nations of Gentiles by the names of their Cayapó nations, Araxás, Puxavante, Xiquiabá and the most feared" (APM-CC-cx .87-doc.20256); and four decades earlier, the administrator of the contracts for the entrances to the mines of Goiás warned of the "insults that continue by the Gentile Cayapó and Acroassû on the paths that enter the Goyas mines" (AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx 4, d. 326). Although sparse within a wide historical documentation, all the terms used to refer to the hinterland barbarians ('Cayapó', 'Araxá', 'Xavante', 'Xakriabá' and 'Akroá') can be identified in modern times as indigenous groups of the Jê family. 'Cayapó' is a homonymous language of the Jê family of the Macro–Jê stem, and the 'Akroá', now extinct, spoke the "Akuen" language (Apolinário, 2003: 86), the same language spoken by the 'Xakriabá' and 'Xavante', and considered a language of the Jê family of the Macro–Jê stem (Rodrigues, 2002). To consider that part of these southern 'Cayapó' groups are the current Panará ('Kreen–Akarôre') are open, as mentioned above, the relations of the southern 'Cayapó' groups recorded in XVIII sources with the universe of Northern and/or Central Jê peoples.

In turn, the 'Araxá', who disappeared from the documentation in the 18th century⁸ and did not have their language identified, may, from the descriptions made of them, also be indirectly associated with the Jê groups. The Anhanguera flag found the 'Quirixá' ('Araxá') in 1722 when it entered to the discovery of the Goiás mines. After crossing the Grande River towards the current Triângulo Mineiro, the flag was lost when it found "gentiles ranch and their fires". Silva Braga, who reported this entry, after using the term "Tapuia" to refer to these indigenous people "because their language is different from the general language" (Braga, 1976: 126), complemented his description:

8 | More recently, non-village indigenous groups living in cities in the Triângulo Mineiro and Alto Paranaíba – MG, gathered in the ANDAIÁ Foundation (Association for Indigenous Cultural Development and Exchange of the Araxá Region), claim recognition as remnants of the 'Katu awá – Araxa'; theme that still lacks specific study.

This Gentile Quirixá was called, he lives in a village, uses his bow, arrow and club [...]. There were nineteen round huts, quite tall, and covered with hearts of palm, with holes in the ground instead of doors; in each of these, 20 and 30 couples lived together, the beds were made of buritis baskets, which served as mattresses and blankets; there were just over 600 souls; this entire village was located, next to a large stream [...] (Braga, 1976: 128).

In this first historical description of an 'Araxá' group, several elements combine to bring them closer to the Jê: the absence of the hammock, the different language in general and the use of bobbins. The first of these items – the hammock – is a element ethnographically associated with Tupi groups (Laraia, 1986: 45) and, therefore, its absence reveals that it is not Tupi or Guarani groups; certainty confirmed in the description of the language 'Kirixá' as different from the general one. They were, therefore, Tapuias, as the document. Furthermore, as in the first historical description of the 'Cayapó', from 1723, the 'Araxá' described a year earlier also wielded the club or garrote as described. A weapon continually mentioned in the 18th century among indigenous groups in the hinterland, its use was so widespread among the Jê – 'Cayapó' that some authors (Mead, 2010: 67–77; Monteiro, 1994: 63; Neme, 1969: 114–117) have already raised the hypothesis that in the 17th century they were known as Bilreiros or Ibirajara, "masters of the club" according to Schaden (1954: 397). If this hypothesis is accepted, in the region in focus it should include the 'Araxá', whose first historical description also pointed to the use of bilbo (Braga, 1976: 128).

If 'Bilreiro' – 'Cayapó' – 'Araxá' were groups related to each other, perhaps we will never actually get to know; but they were certainly groups, as well as the others mentioned in the documental sources of the 18th century, that modern ethnography would identify as linguistically associated with the Northern and/or Central Jê peoples. Moreover, even if the documents do not allow us to think about the existence (or not) of political and cultural similarities between the 'Cayapó' and the 'Araxá', they do allow us, however, to follow the contact relations for a very short period between these two groups. Between 1749 and 1753, there are some documented reports of attacks by 'Cayapó' groups on 'Araxá' groups that lived "over the passage of the Rio

Grande on the way to S. Paulo" (AHE–GO, Special Book 4, doc. 125).

Very little known, the history of contacts between Indians can help us to draw a broader picture of the relationships of identities and alterities between different social agents. Although the presence of non-Indians and villagers can having intensified and modified the traditional forms of relationships that different indigenous jê groups maintained among themselves, the resulting scenario can help us better understand the contact strategies as a result of differential symbolic structures of classification and appropriation of the goods of their different others.

At the end of 1749, the governor of Goiás, d. Marcos de Noronha wrote to the king about the arrival in Vila Boa of two missionary priests in charge of the reduction and settlement of the "Araxá" Indigenous and then informed that the

[...] Arachâs gentiles who live on the passage of the Rio Grande on the way that vay p. São Paulo, has asked that they want a missionary, and that they want to be ruled by white men [...] The most purposeful part for the creation of this village is next to the Rio das Velhas, because with it, that path will be better secured and will be less exposed to the hostilities that the Gentile Cayapó has repeatedly made in it (AHU–ACL–N–GO, doc. 427)

Two years later, that same governor notified "Pires de Campos to take care of the reduction of the Gentile Araxás who live on the passage of the Rio Grande on the way to S. Paulo [...] that the Gentile has done in it repeatedly Cayapó" (AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx.6, doc. 473). Shortly after, in 1753, the same situation was narrated in the provision of the king d. José to the governor of Goiás "about the hostilities that the Gentile Cayapó had made to those of the Araxás nation, they asked for a missionary" (AHU–ACL–N–GO, doc. 569).

In later documents there is no evidence about the 'Araxá' having or not been villagers (Mori, 2015). However, despite this gap, the data point us with some constancy to the fact that 'Cayapó' groups attack, kill and loot this group designated in the sources by 'Araxá'. So far nothing new, because in wars against indigenous groups the same structure and content of the wars against non-Indigenous that we already know seemed to be repeated: like these, other Indians could also be 'hi'pe' and, as such, goods suppliers and chances to prove bravery. However, the visible similarities hide an important differential: the existence of captives in wars against other indigenous groups.

[...] the kaiapó Gentile had made such hostility to the Arachah Gentiles, that not only had he made a great slaughter of them, but afterwards they had captivated all the women and children, which they took to their lodgings, to eat them because whenever they have occasion they sustain themselves on human flesh. With this novelty, it was necessary to take several measures, because, Arachas nation, was no more than dead, because men

completely extinguished the Gentile Cayapó. (AHU-ACL-CU-008, box. 6, d. 465)

In the absence of more direct information on the belligerence between these two indigenous groups, the picture that emerges can be reinforced by documents that, although without mentioning terms to refer to the indigenous groups attacked by the 'Cayapó', indicate certain similarities with the attacks against the 'Araxá'. Antonio Pires de Campos, the first chronicler to use the term, wrote:

[...] and their greatest exercise is to be corsairs from various other nations and cherish one another among them whom more people will kill, with no more interest than eating their dead, because they are very fond of human flesh, and in the assaults they give and the delights they make, they reserve the little ones they raise for their captives [...] and in their meadows they travel a lot of land belonging to other Gentiles to whom they cause much discomfort with their betrayals. (Fields, 1976: 181-182)

Mentions of captives are not exceptional in lowland South American ethnology; however, they are very scarce among the Jê – 'Cayapó' in the 18th century. In addition to this generic information from Pires de Campos, and the documents on the 'Araxá', only on one more occasion, when part of the 'Cayapó' groups were already present in the rescue troops, prisoners are mentioned. In 1784, a troop that continued to make contact with the Xayante in the north of Goiás

[...] he imprisoned some individuals from that rebellious nation, which I easily achieved through the dexterity of the domesticated Gentile Cayapó, [...] taking prisoner with him a brave Xavante, four Indigenous women and some children of the same nation (Freire, 1790: 10,11)

But in this case, unlike previous intertribal wars, the 'Xavante' prisoners were not incorporated by the indigenous people. Thus, although not exceptional, reports of war between the 'Cayapó' and other indigenous groups in the 18th century remain rare. Despite this, the little information we have allows identify some points where these attacks differed from attacks on non-Indigenous. Among the latter there was undifferentiated treatment for gender and age, they killed everyone: men, women and children. "It is said that these Indigenous will attack [...] and will kill José Severino's wife and little daughter, two other children and a slave" (Ataídes, 2005: 100). Meanwhile, in the wars against the 'Araxá', reported between 1749 and 1753, there seemed to be different treatments given to the gender and age of the enemies. They killed all the adult men "because [of the] Arachah nation was no more than dead, because the men extinguished, the Gentile Cayapó, totally"; while women and children were taken captive, because "they captivated all the women and children,

which they took to their lodgings" (AHU–ACL–CU–008, box 6, d. 465). Hence, the indication those wars against non-Indians are for looting without captives, and wars against other indigenous groups for looting with captives.

If the interpretation of the data is correct, the groups Jê - 'Cayapó' in the 18th century directed their opening to the outside world in a constant differentiated incorporation of the goods of their different others. A common framework of how to demonstrate power and strength against groups indistinctly seen as enemies —'hi'pe' or 'kaben'—, seemed to hide symbolic evaluations and different incorporations from their others. As they plundered the outer world, movable goods from the material culture of non-Indigenous foreigners flowed into the inner world; and women and children from other indigenous groups. In other words, the appropriation of the creative, aesthetic and functional capacities of non-Indigenous took place through the appropriation and incorporation of their objects alone; while the appropriation of the creative capacities of other indigenous groups also occurred through the people incorporation.

ETHNOLOGY AND HISTORY: SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE JÊ PEOPLES

The looting wars with captives circulated, even if shortly, bodies and subjectivities within these communities. According to the reports, the internal incorporation of this otherness poses an ethnological problem: the pofagia antrum, whose possible practice would bring these Jê groups closer to the Amazonian cannibal systems. However, here too, some caution is needed. Predation of enemy bodies beyond death in battle has never been directly described among these groups. Contrary to what happens with the abundant historical descriptions of anthropophagic rituals among Tupi-Guarani peoples, there is no description of cannibal predation among Jê peoples — 'Cayapó' in the 18th century. In only one document there is a description of the predation of bodies beyond death, according to which the 'Cayapó' were accused of killing some slaves and bastards owned by the farmers and of "[...] scraping them all the flesh off their bodies, leaving -hes only the head and orgnz hollowing the body" (AHU–ACL–CU–oo8, box 1–doc. 17). But even there, the practice of pofagia antrum is not observed, but the skinning of human remains.

It is good to remember that when anthropophagy was imputed to them, it was always indirectly, either "because they like human flesh" (Campos, 1976: 182) or "because whenever there is occasion, they support themselves with human flesh". (AHU–ACL–CU–008, box 6, d. 465); but, in fact, no eyewitnesses are known to have described or observed the cannibal devouring. Therefore, even if we accept as true the document that mentions the fleshing of enemy bodies, there is no report of the ritual ingestion of human flesh by these Jê groups. Therefore, we can define intertribal and interethnic wars as plunder wars, but not as cannibals. This assertion is

reinforced by the fact that the documents on the wars against the 'Araxá' mention that the 'Cayapó' killed all the men and "then captivated all the women and children, which they took to their lodgings to eat". Now, a ritual cannibalism would require the death of a warrior (adult male) and not women and children. That said, the documents about the wars against the 'Araxá' clearly do not fit the universe of anthropophagy, although, like this, it can be understood as predation.

Therefore, the attribution of the practice of anthropophagy to these Jê groups -'Cayapó' in the 18th century is associated with representations and images of the hinterland as a world of wild beasts, inhabited by "[...] three classes of enemies [...] wild Indigenous, runaway blacks and wild beasts" (Vasconcelos, 1974: 179). Anthropophagy, analogous to the image of wild beasts, fits with the aforementioned creation of the term 'Cayapó' as a fact associated with practical, legal and symbolic circumstances in which contacts took place and, therefore, as another element of the repertoire of allegories of colonization.

Nevertheless, if these arguments dispel the idea of these captives actually ending up in the belly of their enemies; they still don't explain what their fate is. One of the hypotheses already raised (Mead, 2010) is that these captives were destined to replace the human losses of these groups in the context of wars against non-Indigenous. Since since the 1730s there had already been a declared war against the Jê peoples- 'Cayapó' groups and a massive depopulation process resulting from diseases, slavery and deaths, the abduction of women and children may have been an alternative put into action by these groups.

Attacking to Araxá to abudct their women and children was, in part, in the attempt to replenish village populations depleted of war (women and children, after all, were the most common victims of Pires de Campos and other flag leaders). The social disruption, territorial displacement and population loss associated with Portuguese contact and war made abudction women and children a viable alternative for the Cayapó (Mead, 2010: 123)

However, this may only be part of the answer. Because even if we accept the practicality, there are two problems. The first is that intertribal wars of plunder with captives have always been a constant among peoples South American lowland indigenous, and even among modern Jê groups (Verswijver 1992). This raises the possibility of the abduction of women and children from other indigenous groups being a strategy prior to contacts with non-Indigenous; a hypothesis that can be confirmed in the first historical description of these Jê groups—'Cayapó', in which Pires de Campos described that in the "assaults they give and prides they make reserve the little ones they raise for their captives" (Campos, 1976: 182). Taking prey and captives of other indigenous groups was, then, what seemed to be repeated in the middle of the 18th century when these groups attacked the 'Araxá'.

O segundo problema do rapto como consequência da situação colonial está em pensar: porque mulheres e crianças não indígenas não serviram aos mesmos propósitos? Neste caso, parte da resposta pode estar em pensar as guerras não apenas em relação às estruturas práticas da situação colonial; mas também em relação às estruturas simbólicas de avaliação dessas alteridades e dos seus modos de incorporação.

The second problem with kidnapping as a consequence of the colonial situation is to think: why non-indigenous women and children did not serve the same purposes? In this case, part of the answer may lie in thinking about wars not only in relation to the practical structures of the colonial situation; but also in relation to the symbolic structures for evaluating these othernesses and their modes of incorporation. It will certainly remain unknown how and in what way objects and people circulate within these groups. But the absence of historical materials and direct documents should not discourage research. The way to fill some of the gaps may be to compare the historical data with the ethnography of Jê groups, including the modern 'Cayapó' and the modern 'Panará'. According to the ethnology of these groups, the differentiated appropriation of alterity did not only take place in the history of contacts of the Jê—southern Cayapó. Northern Central Brazil Groups, 'Xikrin', 'Mebengokré', 'Menkragnoti' and 'Kren—Akrore' ('Panará'), ethnographed from the 1960s and 1970s onwards, revealed forms of conflict with their others that could, despite their heuristic character, illuminate the history of the Jê peoples contacts in the 18th century.

By taking this path, points of convergence between historical data and ethnography can be seen at several levels. When in the 1970s Lux Vidal undertook her fieldwork among the 'Xikrin', she wrote about their attacks on the 'Gorotiré' groups.

One of the goals of the disputes with the Gorotire was to steal children and women. The captured children were adopted and subjected to the socialization process like any other kid. [...]. Adult men were killed, never imprisoned. (Vidal, 1977: 46)

The similarity of these attacks with those reported in the mid-18th century is striking. In both cases they killed the men and kidnapped women and children. They are, therefore, also wars of plunder with captives. Ethnographic data from other groups of the Jê 'Cayapó' also suggest approaches consistent with the wars of the southern 'Cayapó'. Based on the ethnography of 'Cayapó—Menkragnoti' groups, Verswijver (1992) suggested two main forms of conflict between these groups. The first, defined as external wars, were attacks by groups of young warriors on brazilians business and aimed above all at booty. The second type, defined as internal wars, moved almost all the men in the village and were directed at other 'Cayapó' indigenous groups and also aimed at the abduction of women. Among the groups attacked by the 'Menkragnoti' were the 'Panará' or 'Kren-Akrore', groups then linguistically related, such as the 'Xikrin'—'Gorotiré' described by Vidal (1977).

Through the similarities between historical and ethnographic facts, it can be proposed that the 'Araxá' groups were subgroups of a larger inclusive unit that encompassed the 'Cayapó', and that this war of the 18th century was an internal war between related groups. Although the documents do not indicate political and/or cultural similarities between these two groups that allow confirmation, they do allow, on the other hand, recognizing that both were groups that modern ethnography would identify with the Jê peoples, as mentioned above. Therefore, even if they were not related to each other, they could represent linguistically close groups. The importance of linguistic kinship, or in its absence, of a language learning process, can be confirmed with other ethnographic information from Vidal's (1977) work among the 'Cayapó-Xikrin'. Concerned about the fate of abducted women from non-Cayapó indigenous groups, she wrote: "I asked if they took these women for immediate sexual purposes, they said: 'No, they don't know how to speak; first to tame, talk and then marry' (Vidal, 1977: 47); or even, from the work of Luckesh, (1976: 77): "[...]. Anyone who knows how to speak your language is considered a their; which is valid until today".

Linguistic kinship and language learning could then be the capabilities required for the social incorporation of children and women from foreign indigenous groups. This partly explains the predilection for captives from linguistically close groups and, associated with appearance, the exclusion of non-Indigenous captives. According to the ethnography, "the kidnapped children were subjected to the socialization process like any other child". If they are right, this allows us to overcome two old certainties about the southern 'Cayapó'. The historical certainty edited by Pires de Campos, the first chronicler to describe 'Cayapó' groups, that children abducted from other groups were raised for their captives; and the ethnological certainty that these Jê groups did not make captives because there was no institution that would incorporate them socially (Heelas, 1979: 79, Giraldin, 1997: 50). By the assumptions raised, not only children could be socially incorporated, but also women. As Vidal (1977: 47) observed, "the interest in kidnapping women [from other 'Cayapó' groups], especially girls, was that they were immediately suitable for sexual and common life purposes, as they spoke the same language and shared the same culture". Having become wives, abducted women could represent a gain without the counterpart of loss, as proposed by Clastres (2004) from Lévi–Strauss. Denial of exchange as symmetrical reciprocity, the war of looting with captives focuses on an incorporation of the other that is not limited to the looting of bodies and objects, but also of people.

If, on the one hand, the bodies of young girls abducted from other linguistically related groups were immediately 'usable', on the other hand this was not the case when it came to abducted women of other ethnicities. The ethnographic data presented by Vidal (1977: 47) and Verswijver (1992: 152) suggest that one of the objectives of the abduction of young girls belonging to non-Cayapó' groups was to learn songs and ceremonies through them.

They certainly took captives from foreign groups, especially women and children. [...], foreign women were captured with the explicit purpose of teaching them songs and ceremonies, hence the preference for the abduction of young girls. [...] sexual relations and/or marriage with such foreign young women did not occur before they went through a process of 'domestication' or 'socialization' (in other words, relatedness), marked in the discourse of the informants, especially with regard to to language learning. (Gordon, 2006: 124, 125.

9 | This perhaps explains the existence, in archaeological sites of the studied region, of piriform ceramics, typical of the Tradition 'Aratú-Sapucaí' (associated with the Jê groups), with treatment polychrome aesthetic, typical of the 'Tupiguarani' Tradition.

Whether as wives or captives, the young foreign women abducted from other indigenous groups served to circulate and put into operation a network of knowledge. Through them, their appropriators obtained songs, names, dances, ceremonies, techniques and knowledge. Just as the war of looting without captives circulated material goods from foreigners, the war of looting with captives also circulated people and knowledge. Although the exercise of classifications and differentiated appropriations of alterities is at stake, in common both wars were producing wealth. An internal production that implied the destruction and incorporation of the goods of their different alterities. In this way, since the 'Cayapó' wars in the 18th century, history leads us to problems ethnological studies on the Jê groups.

TO COMPLETE

Emerging from the dustbin of history, the data about the different appropriation of alterities among the Jê peoples – 'Cayapó' pose problems at various levels of ethnological interpretation. The first refers to the supposed centripetal tendency associated with them. After all, the historical data presented here show how warfare has functioned as a back-and-forth hinge among these groups; for it was as much opened to the other and outward in a centrifugal tendency, as it closed in on itself in a centripetal tendency. In their wars, these groups do not seem to have exercised the cannibal predation that characterizes Tupi centrifugal systems; and they were not even closed in the spatiality and reiteration that characterizes the Jê centripetal systems. In other words: they do not fully fit into any of the systems. Based on this, it is supposed that the dichotomous models are important to think about the continuum of possibilities between them and not the antagonistic poles themselves, of which the Jê – 'Cayapó' in the XVIII, with the exercise of a symbolic open to otherness, combined with the Closed Incorporation of Wealth, seem to be a good example.

Consequently, by relativizing the supposed closure in itself in favor of a constant opening to others, another ethnological issue arises: that of identity. For some time, and still strengthening the supposed centripetal tendency, the existence of a traditional binary identity was accepted (Turner, 1992) between the Jê groups — 'Cayapó',

according to which the social universe would be divided between a We ('Cayapó') and the generic others (non-'Cayapó'). However, the information points to a symbolic evaluation that differentiated the foreign categories based on the goods and riches each of them could provide. Both enemies from a military point of view, some offered material objects and bravery, and the others offered people; which supposes to think that both were not being evaluated as equal in a generic definition. These data, added to what has already been known about the alliance relations of the Jê -'Cayapó' in the south- with blacks fleeing slavery during that same period (Mano, 2015), definitively distance the existence of a traditional binary identity. In its place, a definition should emerge that more closely resembles the image of a mandala, in which varied points of intersections and diverse arrangements coexist. Applied to the history of contacts, this model has the advantage of designing processes and combinations of different encounters and intersections that generate hybrid mixtures, unexpected results and processes of continuous reconstruction of identities and otherness. Hence, these are not fixed categories, but rather contextual, as they depend as much on the structures of meaning as on the practical conditions. This means that these groups already recognized themselves, in the 18th century, in a fluid and relational identity.

In this tangle, whose braid consists of the various forms of internalization of differences, the 'Cayapó' wars in the 18th century also put facts about the history of these groups. Like its identity, this story must be thought of as an unstructured and undetermined, but unpredictable network, a synthesis of structures of meaning and fields of action that depended on the subjects, contexts, signs and interests involved, and may therefore even being changing and changing in space and time, as illustrated by the wars of looting, they imply the coexistence of different historical lines of action.

Lastly, but not finally, a final problem of the order of ethnology posed by historical data is that of the status of war itself. Apparently, it was not only "[...] the great task [...] for the occupation of the objective conditions of existence, whether for the protection and perpetuation of such occupation (of the soil)" (Marx, 1985: 69). Nor was it mere "[...] the result of unsuccessful [commercial] transactions" (Lévi–Strauss, 1976: 337). As well as not having only an integrative function whose "[...] social causes, [...] or topic determining factor, are of a magical-religious nature" (Fernandes, 1970: 355). After all, the 'Cayapó' wars in the 18th century evidenced differential symbolic and pragmatic structures of appropriation and incorporation of material and symbolic goods. Close here to the recente theories of wars as external predation for internal production (Fausto, 2001; Gordon, 2006), but they also deviate from them in relation to the supposed differences between cannibal predation and ceremonial predation. Historical data about the Jê –'Cayapó' wars in the 18th century suggest that the death of the enemy and the plunder of their wealth can dispense with devouring, but not

the destruction of bodies and the appropriation of objective and non-objectifiable parts of their otherness, of which anthropophagy seems to be just one way.

Marcel Mano holds a PhD in Social Sciences - Anthropology - from the Postgraduate Program in Social Sciences at the State University of Campinas. Associate of the Postgraduate Program in Social Sciences - PPGCS - Institute of Social Sciences and the Postgraduate Program in History - PPGHI - Institute of History of the Federal University of Uberlândia.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION: Not applicable

FUNDING: National Council for Scientific and Technological Development – CNPq

HANDWRITTEN DOCUMENTS

AHE-Arquivo Histórico Estadual de Goiás

AHE–GO, Livro Especial 4, doc. 125. Correspondência: Cuidar da resolução do gentio Arachay [...]. Lisboa, 19/01/1749, secção manuscritos.

AHU – Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino – Projeto Resgate CMD/UnB

AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx.1–d.17. Carta do superintendente das minas de Goiás ao rei [d. João V] sobre as hostilidades dos índios [...]. Goiás, 02/09/1735.

AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 2, d. 179. Carta do [governador e capitão–general de São Paulo] d. Luis de Mascarenhas ao rei [d. João V] sobre as atrocidades praticadas pelo gentio Cayapó [...]. Vila Boa, 30/03/1742.

AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 4, d. 326.
Requerimento do administrador dos contratos
das entradas das Minas de Goiás, Jorge Pinto de
Azeredo, ao rei [D. João V] solicitando providencias
quanto os insultos cometidos pelos índios
Caiapós e Acroá–Assú [...]. Goiás, 23/02/1747.

AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 6, d. 465. Carta de d. Marcos de Noronha sobra aldeamento [...]. Vila Boa, 24/01/1751.

AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 6, d. 473. Carta de d. Marcos de Noronha ao rei em resposta à provisão [...]. Vila Boa, 13/04/1751.

AHU–ACL–CU–008–cx.18–doc.1072. Requerimento de Rita Rodrigues Neves e os órfãos seus filhos [...] ao rei [d. José] solicitando moratória por tempo de cinco anos [...]. Goiás, 23/01/1762.

AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 20, d. 1220.

Oficio do [governador e capitão general de Goiás],

João Manuel de Melo, ao secretário de Estado
[da Marinha e Ultramar], Francisco Xavier de

Mendonça Furtado, sobre os novos ataques dos índios
Caiapós e Xavantes [...]. Vila Boa, 07/06/1764.

AHU–ACL–CU–008, cx. 27, d. 1773.

Ofício do juiz ordinário do julgado do Tocantins,

Mamede Mendes Ribeiro, ao [secretário de Estado
da Marinha e Ultramar] Martinho de Melo e Castro,
sobre a bandeira [...]. Traíras, 10/06/1774.

AHU–ACL–N–GO, doc. 427. Carta de d. Marcos Noronha ao rei sobre

a chegada dos padres missionários [...]. Vila Boa, 29/12/1749.

AHU–ACL–N–GO, doc. 569. Provisão do rei d. José ao governador Conde de Arcos [...]. Lisboa, 28/05/1753

APM – Arquivo Público Mineiro.

APM–CC–cx. 87, doc. 20256. Carta de Ignácio Correia Pamplona a d. Rodrigo José de Menezes. Quartel das Cabeceiras dos Dourados, 23/04/1781. Casa dos Contos.

APM–CC–cx. 154, doc. 21531.

Carta de Ignácio Correia Pamplona a d.

Rodrigo José de Menezes[...]. Serra dos

Pavoens, 05/05/1781. Casa dos Contos

BN – Biblioteca Nacional

BN–1.4.001–doc.17. Carta do Conde de Noronha a João Godói Pinto da Silveira. s/l, 11/01/1754. Secção de manuscritos, Arquivo Conde de Valadares. BN-18.2.6-doc.5.

Instruções que deve observar o comandante José Cardoso da Silveira [...]. s/l, 07/09/1769. Secção de manuscritos, Arquivo Conde de Valadares.

BN-18.2.6-doc.19

Carta de Ignácio Correia Pamplona ao conde de Valadares, s/l. 15/11/1769. Secção de manuscritos, Arquivo Conde de Valadares.

BN-18.2.6 -doc. 34

Notícia diária e individual das marchas (...) que fez o mestre regente de campo Ignácio Correia Pamplona, Fazenda do Capoto, s/d. Secção de manuscritos, Arquivo Conde de Valadares.

BN–MS 575 (1) – doc. 7. Carta de Ignácio Correia Pamplona ao conde de Valadares, s/l. s/d. Secção de manuscritos – Arquivo Conde de Valadares.

PRINTED DOCUMENTS

ATAÍDES, Jezus M. 2005. Documenta Indígena do Brasil Central. Goiânia: Editora Universitária UCG.

BARROS, Manoel de. 1976. "Notícia 7ª Prática – Roteiro verdadeiro das Minas do Cuiabá, e de todas as suas marchas [....]". In TAUNAY, Afonso (org). *Relatos monçoneiros*, pp. 141–147. São Paulo: Livrara Martins Editora.

BRAGA, Alferes Peixoto da Silva. 1976. "Notícia 1ª prática que dá ao P. M. Diogo Soares o Alferes Peixoto da Silva Braga [...]". In: TAUNAY, Afonso d'E. (ed.) *Relatos sertanistas*, pp. 121–137. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora. CAMELLO, João Antonio Cabral. 1976. "Notícias práticas das Minas de Cuiabá e Goiases, na Capitania de São Paulo e Cuiabá, [...] em 1727". In: TAUNAY, Afonso d'E. (ed.) *Relatos monçoneiros*, pp. 114–123. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora.

CAMPOS, Antonio Pires de. 1976. "Breve notícia do gentio bárbaro que há na derrota das minas de Cuiabá e seu recôncavo, na qual declara—se os reinos [...]". In: TAUNAY, Afonso d'E. (ed.). *Relatos sertanistas*, pp. 181–200. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora.

CARDIM, Fernão. 1980. *Tratado da terra e gente do Brasil*. Belo Horizonte: São Paulo: Itatiaia.

D.I. 1913. Documentos Interessantes para a história e costumes de São Paulo. Publicação oficial do Arquivo Público do Estado de São Paulo. Tipografia Cardozo Filho.

FREIRE, José R. 1790. "Relação da conquista do gentio Xavante" [...]. Lisboa: Typografia Nunesianna.

VASCONCELOS, Simão. 1977. Crônica da Companhia de Jesus. Petrópolis: Vozes/NL/MEC.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

ALVES, Marcia Angelina. 2002. "O sitio Rezende: de acampamento de caçadores coletores a aldeia ceramista pré—histórica". Clio – Série Arqueológica, 15: 189 –203. https://periodicos.ufpe.br/revistas/ clioarqueologica/article/view/246996/35889

AMANTINO, Marcia. 2013. "Caiapós, Bororos, fronteiras e os projetos coloniais para o sertão do Campo Grande no século XVIII". In: LUZ, Guilherme Amaral; ABREU, Jean Luiz Neves e NASCIMENTO, Mara Regina. (eds.). Ordem crítica: a América portuguesa nas 'fronteiras' do século XVIII, pp: 151–168. Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço.

APOLINÁRIO, Juciene R. 2003. "A saga dos Akroá nas fronteiras do sertão". *Tellus*, 3(5): 83 – 94. http://dx.doi.org/10.20435/tellus.voi5.72

CLASTRES, Pierre. 2004. Arqueologia da violência: pesquisas de antropologia política. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify.

CUNHA, Manuela Carneiro da e CASTRO, Eduardo Viveiros de. 1985. "Vingança e temporalidade: os Tupinambá". *Journal de la Socièté dês Americanistes*, LXXI: 191–208. EWART, Elizabeth. 2015. "Fazendo pessoas e fazendo roças entre os Panará do Brasil Central". *Revista de Antropologia*, 48(1): 9 – 35. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-77012005000100001

2013. Space and society in Central Brazil: a Panará Ethnografy. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

FAGUNDES, Marcelo. 2015. "Histórico das pesquisas arqueológicas no Triângulo Mineiro" In: FERREIRA FILHO, Aurelino (ed). Índios do Triângulo Mineiro, pp: 99–146. Uberlândia: Editora Universitária UFU.

FAUSTO, Carlos. 2001. Inimigos fiéis: história, guerra e xamanismo na Amazônia. SP: Editora Universitária USP.

FERNANDES, Florestan. 1970. A função social da guerra na sociedade Tupinambá. SP: Pioneira.

GIRALDIN, Odair. 1997. Cayapó e Panará Luta e sobrevivência de um povo Jê no Brasil Central. Campinas, Editora Universitária Unicamp.

GORDON, Cesar. 2006. Economia selvagem – ritual e mercadoria entre os Xikrin Mebêngôkre. SP: Editora Universitária UNESP/ISA.

HEELAS, Richard. 1979. The social organisation of the Panará, a Gê tribe of Central Brazil. University of Oxford, Phd. Tese. St. Catherine's Colege,

KARASCH, Mary. 1997. "Conflito e resistência inter—étnicos na fronteira brasileira de Goiás, nos anos 1750 a 1780". *Revista da SBPH*, 12: 31–49.

1992. "Catequese e cativeiro – política indigenista em Goiás:1780–1889". In: CUNHA, Manuela Carneiro da. (ed.) *História dos índios no Brasil*, pp: 397–412. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

LARAIA, Roque de Barros. 1986. Tupi – índios do Brasil atual. SP: Editora Universitária FFLCH – USP.

LÉVI STRAUSS, Claude. 1976. "Guerra e comércio entre os índios da América do Sul". In: SCAHDEN, Egon (ed.). *Leituras de etnologia brasileira*, pp: 325–339. SP: Cia Nacional.

LOURENÇO, Luis Antonio Bustamante. 2015. "Populações indígenas e política indigenista no Triangulo Mineiro nos séculos XVIII e XIX". In: FERREIRA FILHO, Aurelino (ed.) Índios do Triângulo Mineiro, pp: 25–56. Uberlândia: Editora Universitária UFU.

LUKESCH, Anton. 1976. Mito e vida dos índios Cayapós. SP: Pioneira.

MAGALHÃES, Wagner. 2015. Estudo arqueométrico dos sítios arqueológicos Inhazinha e Rodrigues Furtado, município de Perdizes/MG. São Paulo, Dissertação de Mestrado, USP.

MANO, Marcel. 2011. "Contato, guerra e paz: problemas de tempo, mito e história". *Política & Trabalho*. 28(34): 193 – 212. https://periodicos.ufpb.br/index.php/politicaetrabalho/article/view/12189/7054

2015. "Negros e Índios nos sertões das minas: contatos e identidades". *Varia História*, 31(56): 511–546. http://dx.doi. org/10.1590/0104-87752015000200009

MARX, Karl. 1985. Formações econômicas pré—capitalistas. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

MEAD, David. 2010. *Caiapó do Sul: an etnohistory (1610—1920)*. Gainesville, PhD Dissertation, University of Florida.

MONTEIRO, John. 2001. Tupis, tapuias e os historiadores: estudos de história indígena e do indigenismo. Campinas, Tese de Livre Docência, Uniersidade Estadual de Campinas

1994. Negros da terra – bandeirantes e índios na formação de São Paulo. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

1992. "Os guarani e a história do Brasil meridional: séculos XVI – XVII". In: CUNHA, Manuela Carneiro da. (ed.). *História dos índios no Brasil*, pp. 475–498. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

MORI, Robert. 2015. Os aldeamentos indígenas no Caminho dos Goiases: guerra e etnogênese no sertão do Gentio Cayapó (Sertão da Farinha Podre) séculos XVIII e XIX. Uberlândia, Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia.

NEME, Mario. 1969. "Dados para a história dos índios Caiapó". *Anais do Museu Paulista*, 23:101–147.

PERRONE–MOISÉS, Beatriz. 1992. "Índios livres e índios escravos: os princípios da legislação indigenista no período colonial (séculos XVI a XVIII)". In: CUNHA, Manuela Carneiro da (ed.). História dos índios no Brasil, pp: 115–132. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

RAVAGNANI, Oswaldo Martins. 1987/88/89. "Aldeamentos goianos em 1750 – os jesuítas e a mineração. *Revista de Antropologia*, 30/31/32: 111–132. Ravagnani, Oswaldo M. "ALDEAMENTOS GOIANOS EM 1750 — OS JESUÍTAS E A MINERAÇÃO." Rev. Antropol., 30/32, 1987, pp. 111–132. JSTOR, w

RODRIGUES, Aryon. 2002. Línguas brasileiras: para o conhecimento das línguas indígenas no Brasil, São Paulo: Loyola.

SCHADEN, Egon. 1954. "Os primitivos habitantes do território paulista". *Revista de História*, 18: 396–411.

SCHWARTZMAN, Stephan. 1987. The Panará of the Xingu National Park, the transformations of a society. Chicago, PhD Dissertation, University of Chicago.

TURNER, Terence. 1992. "Os Mebengokre Kayapó: história e mudança social, de comunidades autônomas para a coexistência interétnica". In: CUNHA, Manuela Carneiro da (ed.). *História dos índios no Brasil*, pp: 311–338. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

VASCONCELOS, Diogo. 1974. História média de Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte: Itatiaia.

VERSWIJVER, Gustaaf. 1992. The club—figthers of the Amazon. Warfare among the Kayapó indians of Central Brazi". Gent: Rijksuniversiteit te Gent.

VIDAL, Lux Boelitz. 1977. Morte e vida de uma sociedade indígena brasileira: os kayapó–xikrin do Rio Catete. SP: Hucitec.

Received October 23, 2017. Accepted April 28, 2020