

editorial
editorial

entrevista
interview

artigos submetidos
submitted papers

tapete
carpet

artigo nomads
nomads paper

projeto
project

expediente
credits

próxima v!rus
next v!rus

V!16

issn 2175-974x | ano 2018 year

semestre 01 semester



PT | EN

Rodrigo Pereira is a Social Scientist and holds both a Master in Social Sciences and Archeology as well. He is a member of the Laboratory of History of Religious Experiences and a Lecturer at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, where he studies and guides research on religions and religiosities, especially Afro-Brazilian religions. In Anthropology, he explores Candomblé, debating micropolitics in terreiros, succession events and liminality-related themes.

How to quote this text: PEREIRA, R. Memories of the Terreiro da Gomeia: between sacredness and desacralization. V!RUS, Sao Carlos, n. 16, 2018. [e-journal] [online] [online] Available at: <http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/_virus16/?sec=4&item=1&lang=en>. [Accessed: 16 July 2018].

Abstract:

Memory can be conceptualized as that human capacity to preserve specific information, feelings, and experiences that allow individuals to update past impressions or information, or to reinterpret them as the past. However, such action frequently takes place in the present and is not imbued with positions on the recollected facts. From archaeological excavations undertaken in the remnants of terreiro da Gomeia (at the city of Duque de Caxias, Rio de Janeiro State) and the recollections gathered about its operation and succession crisis, this article aims to discuss the function of memory in the construction of narratives about that place, its functioning, the succession, and later destruction crisis. Gomeia was one of the major candomblé spots at Rio de Janeiro, having worked from 1951 to 1971 when its leader passed away and an inheritance crisis began. The formation of three strands on these facts demonstrates how political memory is, and how it aims at supporting some positions and points of view. The collected memories in research will be used as one of the supports for the construction of the archaeological interpretation of this candomblé terreiro at Rio de Janeiro.

Keywords: Memory, Archeology, Candomblé, Terreiro da Gomeia

1 Introduction¹

In the 1940s a Bahian babalorixá migrated to Rio de Janeiro. João Alves Torres Filho, with the nickname of Joãozinho da Gomeia, left Salvador and went to the then Federal Capital. Tata Londirá, his religious name, is identified as belonging to religious tradition of Angola Candomblé and Caboclo of Bahia (Chevitarese; Pereira, 2016). We consider this situation one of the reasons for the transfer of the leader to Rio de Janeiro. As Capone (1996) argues, he was included in a "religious march" of *pais/mães de santo*² who left Bahia and settled in Fluminense soil in search of a religious market not dominated by the yalorixás of Salvador. Another reason for the march was the prejudice that the babalorixá suffered for being homosexual, dancer and musician, which may have been decisive for Rio de Janeiro to be seen as a place that allowed a new trajectory (Chevitarese; Pereira, 2016).

In 1951, Joãozinho da Gomeia inaugurated his terreiro in the midst of a wide coverage of the newspapers, because the leader was not only a father of a saint, but already he was active in the carnival of Rio de Janeiro (jornal Correio da Manhã, December 9, 1951). In the carnivals of the 1950s and 1970s he performed at parties in clubs in the Southern Zone, paraded in the samba schools and also acted as one of the choreographers of the Casino Urca and João Caetano Theater, all in the then Brazilian capital (Chevitarese; Pereira, 2016). The Manso Bantuqueno Ngomenssa Kat'espero Gomeia or terreiro da Gomeia began its

activities by installing itself in the city of Duque de Caxias - metropolitan region of Rio de Janeiro. The house became a referential point for artists and politicians who sought more than religious advice, the friendship with Joãozinho da Gomeia rendered recommendations to these and works to facilitate political and economic situations (Chevitarese; Pereira, 2016).

filhos de santo ³

Seci was the daughter of Kitala, one of the daughters of a saint who moved from Salvador to Rio with Father João. Kitala was his elder's daughter and we respected her for it. She had axé and command strength Seci ?? Seci did not have this, never had. She [Kitala] was the mother of Seci's blood, but that made the girl was Joãozinho. You know, carnal mother can not start her own daughter. Seci was born within Gomeia. Who gave birth was not a doctor, but the caboclo of Father João. After she was born Iansan came down in Father João and indicated that the girl would be his successor, but we never gave ball to that, we did not expect him to die how he died The Seci was made pro [sic] holy baby because it was a very sick, weak child ... Seci was raised outside the terreiro, there in Copacabana. She was raised by a godmother who studied, put her in French, in dance. But everything was paid for by Father João. She [Seci] had the good and the best, but she was not raised with us in Gomeia. She showed up there just for [sic] parties. When she was chosen for Gomeia we knew she was weak for the thing, she would not have the pulse to command Gomeia. She was a child. How could a child stand in front of things? I could not and we could not let it all die (E 12, our translation).

The succession was fierce when the biological mother of the deceased leader chose to sell the land where Gomeia was located and move to Salvador (BA). As it was verified among the oral sources, this act led to a certain group of filhos de santo to obtain the legal possession of the terreiro, which influenced the continuity of the place. The successive quarrels were exponentiated due to an accusation of "theft" by opposition groups to what it acquired from the terreiro and its dependencies.

terreiro da Gomeia entered into disuse or total abandonment only in the late 1980s, the approximate date for this was the period from 1985 to 1988⁴, because the oral sources are not sure and unanimous about the fact. However, oral data indicate that the site continued to initiate filhos de santo through Mametu Kitala and others who remained in the area during the 1980s. However, the severe crisis and closure of the site prevented this continuity.

Until the decade of 2000 the land was used by the surrounding population as a space for children to play and for the celebration of June festivals. In the following decade a small wall was erected for the accommodation of the "Gomeia Sport Club" - a football team of the residents of the street - which did not last for a long time, since the place was used as a truck parking lot (Pereira et al, 2012). The destination of the area of Gomeia was defined in 2003, when the city of Duque de Caxias expropriated the place for the construction of a day care center (Gama, 2014). However, the project was not implemented by the municipality, leaving the land unused until the present time.

It is noteworthy that the events of succession were decisive for the establishment of a process that led to the disaggregation of the erected spaces of the terreiro. Conflict, or even disregard, may have been one of the factors that triggered the process of site destruction, either by the subtraction of elements or even by the lack of maintenance. In this article we will find out in this how a series of actions were carried out in the place that disarmed in the disaggregation and / or destruction of the spaces erected by Joãozinho da Gomeia.

After the conflict was established, in non-consensual chronological time between the oral sources, since the Justice had prevented the child chosen by the búzios from assuming total command of the terreiro⁵, a filho de santo in the house, through consultation with the group, took charge of the purchase of the land where Gomeia was located, since Joãozinho's mother had chosen to return to Bahia after the death of her son. The orality is unanimous in stating that the filhos de santo, each in his own way, contributed to the acquisition of the place, always expressing the idea that it remained open. Apparently, this has happened, but at this point the consequences vary according to the interviewee. Three memories of the destruction and closure of the place were formed. For one group (interviewees E2, E3, E5 and E11) the purchase was followed by an expulsion from the litigant group which saw succession in Sandra. This action would have occurred with the help of police forces that closed the access to the street where the Gomeia is located so that the personal and religious objects of this group were removed from the terreiro and placed in the street. When the litigants were able to arrive in front of this one, only they were able to collect their settlements, clothes and other ritual objects and were no longer allowed to enter the space. With the closure, part of Gomeia's material culture was transferred to another terreiro outside Rio de Janeiro. For this place they would have been transferred, according to orality, the settlements of the house⁶, the throne of the leader⁷ and object of this⁸.

For another group (interviewees E1, E4, E8 and E10), the instability of the succession was responsible for the fact that, after the purchase, the filhos de santo did not reach an agreement as to who should govern. Thus, the trio indicated by the justice for such purpose - Ogã Valentim, Mametu Kitala and Mametu Ileci - had no political and religious command to keep the terreiro open. This functioned for a few more years, including initiations after the death of the leader, being closed due to lack of resources and members between the years of 1985 and 1988.

Finally, a third reading shows that the house remained open, but had undergone a process of subtraction of tiles, doors and bathroom fixtures, which was dilapidating the house until it was impossible to operate (entrevistados E6, E7, E9 e E12). We suspect that there may have been an incentive to steal material culture from the group owning the land as a way to accelerate the destruction of the site. Or, concomitantly, that the surrounding population, from the need to build their residences, has acted in this subtraction. In both cases the result was the same: removal of material from the site and its dilapidation. It is worth noting that the archaeological excavations undertaken did not identify, for example, doors or windows in the archaeological record, which is indicative that they no longer composed the house at the time of its closure and destruction. Not counting funds for the reforms, the house would have been abandoned to its new owner, which in this version did not stop its operation.

It is on these three strands that this article will focus on elucidating the process of ruining the site, ie how the terreiro was destroyed, abandoned or transferred. We will cross the data of the excavations to the collected memories and in this interlocution we will observe how a memory of the process of destruction was developed that indicates the permanence and the loss of the sacred content of the place.

2 Gomeia data collect

The research chose to listen as much as possible to "voices" of what Gomeia was like (physically) and how their religious experiences⁹ were at the site. Thus, we selected twelve people to be interviewed for this purpose prior to the start of site excavations. Initially, some former Gomeia members were still alive (five people in total, three women and two men), aged 65-85 on average. The choice was made by the fact that the chronological age had references to the operation of the terreiro, as well as to inquire with other leaders about the participation of the interviewees in the trajectory of the terreiro. These first interviewees are, at present, leaders and ogãs of candomblé terreiros. It is noteworthy that of these only two women and one man remains in locations that are identified as belonging to Angola tradition of Candomblé of Joãosinho da Gomeia.

Still in the sample, two other male leaders were interviewed and, although they identify themselves as Angola and Gomeia's descendants, their terreiros are characterized by the use of terms and rites of the Nagô tradition for the deities and by the fact that parties were still used for Pomba-gira and Exus Catiços da Umbanda. Their age ranges from 65 to 80 years.

We also interviewed the descendants of houses that identify themselves as belonging to the Gomeia tradition, two men being interviewed. The average ages are between 25 and 35 years old. These do not live in Rio de Janeiro, being a resident of Recife (PE) and another of the state of São Paulo. Due to the distance, these interviews were given through videoconference with the previous sending of a script of subjects. The footage was transcribed at a later time and, like the others, followed by release of use by means of an image and audio assignment term.

The survey also heard residents from around the land where Gomeia is located (in all, three people), two women and one man, all over 60 years of age and who have been living in the area since the 1960s. possessed contact with Joãosinho da Gomeia and with the terreiro in operation.

The interviews did not follow previous planning. They were asked to talk about their correlation with Gomeia and what they thought was important about the topic. When a subject, such as the building of the terrain, needed further study, the research intervened in the speech requesting a deepening of the subject. Each interview lasted, on average, 60 minutes and were transcribed afterwards. Previously, terms of consent for the interview were produced, these being signed authorizing their publication, but conditioning the non-delivery of the participant's name and the obligation to suppress identification of people and places that could indicate who the interviewee would be.

The interviewees specification follows in Table 1.

INTERVIEWEES	GENDER	AGE	PARTICIPATION	DATE OF INTERVIEW
E1	F	92 years old	Former member of Gomeia and currently a Candomblé director	July 20 th , 2015
E2	F	54 years old	Former member of Gomeia	August 18 th , 2015
E3	M	59 years old	Former member of Gomeia and currently a Candomblé director	March 8 th , 2017
E4	M	54 years old	Former member	May 10 th , 2017
E5	M	60 years old	Former member and Candomblé director	August 18 th , 2016
E6	M	35 years old	Candomblé director	June 5 th , 2017
E7	M	40 years old	Candomblé director	April 19 th , 2017
E8	M	25 years old	Candomblé director	February 20 th , 2017
E9	F	65 years old	Neighbor of the terreiro	August 14 th , 2015
E10	F	69 years old	Neighbor of the terreiro	August 14 th , 2015
E11	M	55 years old	Neighbor of the terreiro	August 19 th , 2015
E12	F	50 years old	Former member and Candomblé director	March 15 th , 2016

Table 1. Interviewees profile. Source: Author, 2018.

Archaeological research at Gomeia took place between the years 2015 and 2016 for a total of 30 days of excavation. These took place in two camps of fifteen days, with the participation of archaeologists, archeology students from UFRJ, students and post-graduate students of the same university, volunteers and afro-religious who volunteered to contribute to the action. The excavation had the logistical support of the Municipality of Duque de Caxias and the Secretary of Culture and Tourism of the same municipality. With this support we were able not only to clear the land for the excavations, but also to use machinery for the implementation of soil verification activities.

After excavation activities, the archaeological research in Gomeia obtained a material culture that can be classified into three main axes: objects of religious use (referring to Candomblé), secular uses (applied to non-religious daily practices) and mixed classified as such by the duality of being in religious contexts or day-to-day practices). This cleavage allowed the research to observe that a terreiro is also a living space, food and other elements that, although known at the present time, it was not known if they would leave vestiges in the archaeological record.

This material culture was classified into the following categories of constituent materials: metal objects, vitreous, organic, ceramic (earthenware ceramics and pottery), fabrics, plastics and rock. This allowed us to infer forms of use, rites, everyday practices, as well as to ascertain the historical depth of the use of some elements, such as plastic, for example, in candomblés.

From the obtained, it is clear that the religious practices of Candomblé left vestiges in the archaeological record. Our sample obtained 278 pieces of material identified as secular (42.7% of the sample), 177 for religious (27.2%), 166 considered as mixed (26%) and 30 pieces without identification (4.1%). If we add the mixed values to the religious we will get a value of 455 pieces that indicate religious practices (53.2% of the excavated). That is, by the sum accomplished, more than 50% of our excavated material culture represents practices, rites and religious objects in the archaeological record of the Historical Archaeological Site of terreiro da Gomeia.

3 Memories on Gomeia

Before we talk about the memories of the destruction, it is interesting to look at the nominations that terreiro da Gomeia possessed in Kimbundo dialect¹⁰ collected from oral sources: Bantuqueno Ngomenssa Kat'espero Gomeia or Atim Mossó Candengó Ingomesssa Catispero. The first form can be translated - Manso: Aldeia; Bantuqueno: Old and correlated to the Bantos in Africa; Ngomenssa: drums; Kataspero: Joãozinho's home in Bahia and Gomeia refers to the location of the terreiro in Salvador. In other words, we could translate it as "Ancient Village of Bantu [of] Drums of Kataspero da Gomeia". The second name was not found translation, because this did not make sense in the attempts of translation by the ex-members of the place¹¹.

The presence of two names, before being a problem related to the sources, is considered in this article as a data to be worked on by the concept of collective memory (Pollak, 1989; Halbwachs, 2006). For Halbwachs (2006) all memory has in its existence a psychological character: for something to be narrated and remembered, it becomes necessary that there be an individual and the occurrence of a fact to be described. Thus, what the author defends is individual memory (Halbwachs, 2006). However, for the author, even if apparently private, the memory refers to a group; the individual carries the memory in himself, but is always interacting in society, since "our memories remain collective and are remembered to us by others, even if they are events in which only we have been involved and objects that only we have seen" (Halbwachs, 2006, p. 30, our translation). In this way, we have the concept and correlation between collective memory and individual memory - one not existing without the other.

In the case of Gomeia it is interesting to reflect how the memories emerge from the contacts of the members and between the slopes of memory already described. Another factor to be considered was the finding that the memories of the destruction were "truncated" and tended to an appropriation and significance of the facts occurred. Thus, the episode of remembering or forgetting an event relates to the places that individuals occupy or no longer occupy as members of a particular group. Halbwachs (2006) relates memory to participation in a social group or an affective community. In this sense, the simple realization that there are two nominations to the site tells us how each person tended to develop a subjective process, but that is also social: remember or forget the name of the place or just name it terreiro da Gomeia.

In this sense, the memory of Gomeia's name can be understood as selective: it depends on the values of the individual, the historical moment and the interests of the social group, which always refer to conflicts of definition of identities (Pollak, 1989). An absence of oneness as to the naming of the place can be related to the establishment of several slopes of a collective memory where each group, or even individual, tended to develop in the context of filho de santo or at the moment of the crisis of succession and later ruin of the house. Remembering or omitting the name of Gomeia relates to processes that aim to "remember", in the sense of valuing the past of the place or of "forgetting" a leader and space seen as spurious. In another reading about memory, as Schwarzstein (2001) argues, "forgetting" can also relate to the suffering / pain that the accessed memories cause. Not "remembering" is a way of not accessing the trauma.

Thus, two distinct processes regarding the memories of the Gomeia can be observed: the forgetting of the place (and a consequent desacralization) and the maintenance of a positive memory, which is linked to the permanence of the sacred in that space. In this article this axiom interests us: in the present day the ground where the built rest of the Gomeia and the material culture present in its soil, coming from the human activities occurred there, are seen as sacred to the descendants of the terreiro or he has nothing but elements secular These poles allow us to debate the question of the presence or absence of sacredness in the remnants of the terreiro. Analyzing these memories do not throw us into the past, but to the present, for "the elaboration of memory occurs in the present and to respond to the demands of the present" (Meneses, 1992, p. 11 our translation). That is, to the actors who transited there, as children of a saint, does the place still have sacredness or does it no longer exist due to destruction?

For Gomeia, then, the memories will relate, first, to the category Time: the time the terreiro worked and the time in which it no longer works. However, separation is more an instrumental that aims to account for two moments of the trajectory of the place than, in fact, a separation of periods - be it the present or the past of religious quarrels. From our interviews, we observe that "remembering" or "forgetting" has developed a mechanism for building a time: in the present one means or resigns the past - for some the terreiro has no sacredness, but for others, yes. Thus, a question such as "who inherited the Gomeia" and "who acted in an erroneous manner that generated its end" provoked a deepening in this correlation between memory and archeology. Who, therefore, is currently responsible for what happened? For the oral sources consulted, being, observing or transiting in the remnants of the terreiro, at present, may mean "reviving" the trauma or memory of the trauma (Seligmann-Silva, 2005), but it also means updating the debate about the actions undertaken.

In the meantime, the Space category has become meaningful in the elaborations of memories about Gomeia:

The place transcends its objective reality and is interpreted as a set of meanings. In this sense, monuments, works of art, as well as cities are places because they are a set of meanings. On the other hand, when the place no longer stands as a set of meanings, most of the time because of the technology that transforms all places into homogeneous spaces into true 'landscape clones', places become non-places (Lencioni, 2009. p. 154, our translation).

For some voices, Gomeia remains a terreiro, a sacred one and one that owes obedience for this, are the material concretization of the memory of João Alves and his action. For other interviewees it does not mean anything else, because there is nothing sacred in that space, because everything has moved from there. It becomes a place without reference, without meaning, a place of passage and without fixation. This is how one interviewee E4 says: "There is nothing left. Everything was taken to [delete the name]. Why do you think there's something there? There's nothing, it's empty ground. " The interviewee concludes that: "Gomeia lives in another place and within me, but not there."

From this concept, we can reflect that if Time and Space represent and actualize a past period in Gomeia, the value given to the place is defined as a sense for the present and the future. To think of the relation between the two within the memories of Gomeia consists in some way of thinking about a reality that is established between what was and is the terreiro and what is defined as present identity - the factor that identifies voices in their positions nowadays.

We can analyze Gomeia's desacralization as follows: if nothing else in that space is sacred, its soil is not, structures are not, and, finally, even the memory is no longer sacred, because it has been erased with what we call of site blasting process. Out from the interviewed by the research, the interviewees E1, E4, E8 and E10 don't believe the ground is sacred anymore, for there isn't anything else that allows it to build the intermediation between material and spiritual level. If there are no more sacred objects, in the same way, nothing else is referred to the plan of the gods. The holy character was also extinguished or extinguished with the death of the leader.

According to the cosmology of Candomblé - Santos (1984) or Rocha (2000) - if all the rites of withdrawal and transfer of the sacred were realized and the new house that received this material gave continuity to Gomeia, she is alive in another place. Thus, according to this slope of memory, the progeny of João Alves was maintained. What remained on the ground reminds one of a certain past, but this one is actually living in another terreiro. Nothing in Duque de Caxias refers to the plan of the gods. If they no longer live there, the terrain has lost its sacred content. This strand is based on what we call an "Official Belief", that is, by the transfer rites and by the cosmology of Candomblé there is nothing else there that allows access to the sacred. This belief is as vivid as the rest, but tends to be based on formal religious aspects.

In our reading, it is interesting to note that Gomeia's desacralization is in fact an intentional act, since they can support the continuity of Joãozinho's work in another terreiro that received his objects and this still relates today to an opposition to successor chosen in 1971. This provision tells us that in order to maintain the holy content, the land should contain certain elements that are absent today. Desacralization was due to the loss of elements that made up the connection between the physical world and the spiritual world, severing the bond is undone the sacred meaning of the remnants of the terreiro.

This here [the terreiro] still has axé, my son. There are people who see Caboclo [Pedra Preta] here at night. Come here in Lent, you will even see him walking the night. It's not because Joãozinho died that this has no value anymore. Here he planted his caboclo which he brought from Bahia. Even though he [the Caboclo] no longer lives here, here he is still the terreiro da Gomeia. This is where I was initiated, here is where I hit my head. Everything here has axé and it is not what happened that changes it.

On this point, it is interesting to analyze another aspect of maintaining sacredness narrated by the sources and observed in loco by the research: the terrain was never invaded by people to live in the place, a common fact in the Baixada Fluminense when there is a vacant lot¹². Concomitant to this, the day care center planned to be built by the Duque de Caxias City Hall was never erected, nothing developed in the place after the destruction of the built-up areas. The non-human occupation is indicative of the fact that the population around the terreiro still recognizes the land as sacred and is therefore a taboo or impeding their occupation. Living or building there could lead to Joãozinho's wrath over whoever did this.

From these examples the research can ascertain that the sacred is present on the ground. It has never been extinguished and, for the observed, it will not be. As expressed the interviewee E2: "As long as Joaozinho's memory is alive, Gomeia will also be alive. There, my son, axé never dies. Even though we have nothing, we have axé and we must respect this. That is only sacred. " It is this remembrance that maintains the sacredness of space. Visiting it triggers the "remembering" about initiation, the experiences of parties or gatherings. This updates and re-elaborates the sense of belonging to the place, regardless of whether it is preserved or not.

During archaeological excavations that took place in 2016, we received some ex-members from Gomeia to visit the activities. An 80 year old lady, in particular, who had over 50 years of initiation by João Alves, provided us arguments that validate this article's reading that the holy character of that place wasn't lost. This lady, with immense locomotion difficulties, on reaching the excavation area, took off her sandals and bowed to the structures in evincement. She informed us that the deference was necessary, for Gomeia had never been extinguished; it was there, in those structures. Energies were emanated from those erected remains. According to her speech: "I was made here, in there, inside that room you're seeing. Here is my Sacred and it never got lost. I'm happy to be able to see it again. Gosh, I've been through so many good things here. I've been so happy here. Look how much energy is emanated from there".

Thus, it is clear that there has never been a de-sacralization of that place, which is our position in this article. There was a physical process of erasure and destruction of structures preceded by the transfer of material culture to another terreiro. However, the religious character had never been extinguished through these events. The "Believed Life" actualizes and maintains the local sacrative category. Memories about the terreiro "remember" and keep alive the memories and the sacred tone of that place.

What the example of this lady allows us to ascertain is that the memory and beliefs lived remain sacred, because they generate a sense of belonging, life and identity, even if there is no Gomeia anymore. Therefore, the religious experiences held in Gomeia not only give meaning to memory, but anima (in the sense of giving life and meaning about it). It is they who maintain the sacredness of the place.

It creates a collective memory that not only keeps alive the memory of the leader, but "fights against the inertia of everyday life, captures the fragments that it feels significant or useful and works to energize them" (Zumthor 1997, p. 27, our translation). Sacred memory does not nullify past quarrels in succession, but re-elaborate them, excluding from it elements that disclose a past that one wishes to remember and maintain. In this sense, the Gomeia never ceased to be sacred. All these points indicate that the sign of the sacred remains in the place.

4 Archaeological reading of the ruining process at Terreiro da Gomeia: some conclusions

From a material point of view, what did the death of João Alves in 1971 mean? As we have seen, there was a dispute over succession. What did this impact on the maintenance of Gomeia until the middle of the years of 1985 or 1988, when the terreiro closed? Invariably, archaeological and oral data indicate a process of ruining the house. We obtained three oral aspects about the end of Gomeia and this process: the depletion of structures, the abandonment and deprecation of the erected spaces (followed by a subtraction of elements) and the transfer of Duque de Caxias objects to another terreiro.

We may think that if one reading is true, the other would not be. If there was an abandonment, it is not possible that there was a transfer of material culture, for example. However, linking archaeological data to oral sources, archaeological research concluded that each of the interest groups narrated one of the elements that led to the end of Gomeia. They do not oppose, but are, in fact, complementary.

This fact allows us to understand how different versions about the end of Gomeia were elaborated from what Parés (2007) indicates is a "selective simplification" of memories: in the case in question, to reinforce or even highlight a position in succession litigation or at the end of the terreiro, the memories are simplified, redirected or even dilapidated for the construction of a narrative that privileges a religious or political fact or position.

Thus, for the case of the destruction, it is plausible to conclude that there was a partial abandonment of the terreiro after some years of continuity of Gomeia. One of the groups that took power should not have been able to maintain the order and the operation of the house, since the succession was questioned. Concomitant to this fact, with the absence of a leader accepted by all interest groups and the partial abandonment of the dependencies that were only used during the holidays, events of subtraction of structural elements (doors, windows and etc.) must have occurred by members of rival groups who wished to tarnish the image of those who ruled the terreiro.

In that interregnum occurred the event of purchase of the land of the giver of Joãozinho da Gomeia by a group of interest between the members of Gomeia. This purchase had the function to keep the terreiro in operation, but we realized that the result was not this, because it intensified the clashes. This group that acquired the land chose to transfer the most important religious materials from the site to another terreiro, allowing the other members to withdraw their settlements. Thus, elements of the leader were transferred. This maintained a continuity of the terreiro no longer in the Gomeia of Duque de Caxias, but in a terreiro that was assumed like continuation of the tradition of the leader. With the transfer of the materials, the house tended to end its activities definitively, which emptied the terreiro and transferred the litigating members to this action. At this moment the interest groups cooled down, because there was nothing left to fight about, everything was closed and transferred.

And how was the destruction of the site? Crossing the archaeological and oral data, we can conclude that, with the death of João Alves, the resources for the maintenance of the house decreased drastically, since there was no longer, for example, the money coming from the table of game of búzios (one of the main sources of funds of any terreiro), thus the income to finance the purchase of inputs tended to decrease. At the same time, after the death of the leader, the political quarrels have increased and become subjects like the maintenance of the secondary structures. Elements that were to deteriorate after the year 1971 may not have been replaced, as they were not identified in the excavations undertaken or were subtracted in an undefinable moment.

From the excavation data, it's possible to interpret that the house's management could make use of shares or monthly fees for the spaces' maintenance, but it's interesting to highlight that even this financial flow could not be the necessary for the terreiro's dependencies maintenance. Therefore, the place's impoverishment began. It is possible to conclude that the essential and necessary would be fixed, leaving aside other less important elements or those that could be done in another moment.

As the terreiro went through a process in which the leader no longer resided in him, Gomeia went through periods of almost population absence, because the adepts only went to the place in days of rites and celebrations. The possibility of theft of constructive elements should be considered in this context and was not impossible to occur. As discussed above, we suggest that litigants or other people may have done this, a fact expressed in the interviews collected. For the research in progress, and through the oral data collected, in this process where the place was ruining one of the solutions found, it was then transferred the religious elements to another terreiro, because the devastation and / or destruction of Gomeia was and it was necessary to safeguard the memory of João Alves. In fact, this occurs and we can not make a judgment on the stock. Whether she had merely religious interests to maintain Joãozinho's legacy or if it was an action that aimed to make notoriety and an idea of continuity of the terreiro in another place¹³, we can not infer about it.

However, the archaeological analyzes carried out together with the remnants built on the site and together with the material culture, indicated that the spaces erected underwent another process: there was a destruction of the structures with the use of machinery (possibly a tractor). When we looked at some archaeological contexts, this became clear to the research. Our reading is made understanding that, once transferred the material culture, it was intended to render space useless. As there were still "voices" and positions that intended to keep it open, it was necessary to bar it. The prohibition of the entrance into the place was followed by a destruction of it, since there was nothing more of religious there. The destruction occurred with the use of machinery that entered the terreiro and north-south (from the gate into the ground) and destroyed the walls of the shed, the pilasters that supported it, as well as the holy houses and other structures. Our reading is based on the verification that the hardware structures that made up the supporting beams of the buildings were all twisted and destroyed in this sense (north-south), which indicates a unique and violent event of destruction.

This situation was also analyzed corroborates with our theory during the excavation of the Ariaxé of terreiro¹⁴. In the upper layer of the structure there was an enormous amount of broken tiles that covered the structure associated to a sandy sediment, which we defended to be the layer with the presence of archaeological material. The arrangement of asbestos roofing tiles so brittlely must have been due to the use of the machinery for the destruction of the roof of the shed.

Has the ruin of Gomeia come about through a succession of dismantling and theft events followed by mechanical destruction? It was clear to us that, in order to stop the possibility of maintaining the site, after the transfer of its religious material culture to another terreiro, its structures had been destroyed, which would prevent its reoccupation (if it were not already prevented by the possession of the land by one of the litigating members who made the transfer). Thus, to destroy meant to render the spaces of the place unusable. That is, for a given group, space was no longer sacred, that is, passive intervention to generate destruction.

Thus, the process of ruining was not only responsible for the destruction of Gomeia, but also for a certain erasure of its presence in the landscape of Duque de Caxias. After all, if what is not seen is not remembered, to destroy the physical presence of the terreiro is to erase its presence and, in a way, its memories. This statement is made with the observation that, after the destruction, a layer of landfill with clay soil was implemented that aimed, in our reading, to erase the presence of the terreiro. As verified by the excavations, this layer lies on the remnants of the destruction with the clear intention of landing them. This layer with sealing function indicates an intentionality in erasing and obliterating Gomeia's physical presence. Its application can be read as an intentional action intended to de-characterize the land for a possible sale or even to cancel the presence or reminiscence of the sacrum in the place. Once Gomeia was buried, her sacrum would also no longer be visible and could only be accessed in the other house where the transferred objects meet. This action can also be understood as the victory of one of the litigating groups over the others, for burial triggers the sign of forgetfulness.

Thus, the process of ruining was not only responsible for the destruction of Gomeia, but also for a certain erasure of its presence in the landscape of Duque de Caxias. After all, if what is not seen is not remembered, to destroy the physical presence of the terreiro is to erase its presence and, in a way, its memories. This statement is made with the observation that, after the destruction, a layer of landfill with clay soil was implemented that aimed, in our reading, to erase the presence of the terreiro. As verified by the excavations, this layer lies on the remnants of the destruction with the clear intention of landing them. This layer with sealing function indicates an intentionality in erasing and obliterating Gomeia's physical presence. Its application can be read as an intentional action intended to de-characterize the land for a possible sale or even to cancel the presence or reminiscence of the sacrum in the place. Once Gomeia was buried, her sacrum would also no longer be visible and could only be accessed in the other house where the transferred objects meet. This action can also be understood as the victory of one of the litigating groups over the others, for burial triggers the sign of forgetfulness.

From the above we have determined that the process of ruining Gomeia was characterized by a sequence of events that began with the yard still functioning in the events after the death of the leader, but was quickly finished with the action of a machinery that destroyed the structures built to prevent its continuity. A political action was taken by the group that undertook it, since it erased from the landscape of Duque de Caxias one of the reference terrariums for the formation of Candomblé in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo (Silva, 1995).

The archaeological data obtained with the excavation campaigns showed us that there were no archaeological records on the doors, windows or other similar elements, which may be indicative that they no longer composed Gomeia in the final event of destruction. The amount of broken tiles, also present in the soil and impossible to account for, provide us with the reading that these were not totally subtracted, but were also destroyed by the machinery. Similarly, the absence of sanitary ware in the same register further reinforces our reading: they were withdrawn before the destruction.

Conclusively, the memories of destruction, when united, present a context of dilapidation both of the physical memory of the terreiro, but also the attempt of a de-sacralization of the place. However, even physical action does not erase the experiences and experiences of the sacred by which portions of our sources have lived. Therefore, the sacredness of the terreiro has never

been broken, perhaps by the sudden suspension of the quarrels with the destruction, but mainly by the action of the memory that reaffirms constantly what was lived. This creates a sense of continuity and belonging, as expressed by the sources heard.

Experiences, religious experiences, friendships and constructions of new family and religious arrangements were interrupted when the religious fabric failed to resolve their conflicts during the time of the leadership succession. The impasse generated by the memory, updated from the excavations carried out, remained (and is maintained), giving rise to a polyphony of values next to the group - what was left of the house legacy? Was leadership capable? Why was there ruin? We defended that the figure of João da Pedra Preta was the political agent that brought together all the political groups that should already be present while he was running the place. But with his death, a state was created in which they, not understanding themselves as to the demands of those who succeeded them, tended to dissociate themselves and create their own memories and narratives that correlate their yearnings and visions about the continuity of Gomeia. Thus, if on the one hand the terreiro was emptied of meanings until being abandoned in the late 1980s, at the same time we see the historical construction of narratives that justify both the permanence of political groups of interest and succession. The latter tended to associate themselves and create narratives that make them present up to now as those who "should have ruled," but also give meaning to a conflict generated by themselves.

Thus, from a material point of view, Gomeia's ruining process can be understood as an unresolved micropolitical question that culminated in a sequence of actions - abandonment, transfer of material culture or subtraction of this culture - regimented by different interest groups regarding continuity of the site and its leadership. Thus, Gomeia's breakdown was not only on the material plane, but also on the individuals who made up the terreiro. The memories collected by the research show how these memories of destruction update the debate about succession and still refer to the topic of who should have followed the terreiro.

When we insert the archaeological data in this research, we perceive how remember is an "island of edition" that selects facts and actors to give meaning to certain belongings or even political positions, never exempt from the sense that gives the position of the actor in the context of conflict occurred. The materiality of archaeological studies brings together another way of analyzing how this "edition" tends to be selective and update itself in the present of the collected discourses.

References

Capone, S., 1996. Le pur et le dégénére: le candomblé de Rio de Janeiro ou les oppositions revisitées. In *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, p. 259 - 292.

Chevitarese, A. L.; Pereira, R., 2016. O desvelar do candomblé: a trajetória de Joãosinho da Gomeia como meio de afirmação dos cultos afro-brasileiros no Rio de Janeiro. In *Revista Brasileira de História das Religiões*. Maringá, n. 9, p. 43 - 65.

Gama, E. C., 2014. Mulato, homossexual e macumbeiro: que rei é este? Trajetória de Joãosinho da Gomeia (1941-1971). *Duque de Caxias: APPH-CLIO*, v.2.

Halbwachs, M. 2006. *A memória coletiva*. São Paulo: Centauro.

Jornal Correio da Manhã. Rio de Janeiro. 9. dez.1951.

Jornal Correio da Manhã. Rio de Janeiro. 3. abr. 1971.

Jornal Correio da Manhã. Rio de Janeiro. 5. abr. 1971.

Lencioni, S., 2009. *Região e geografia*. São Paulo: EDUSP.

Meneses, U. T. B., 1992. A história, cativa da memória? para um mapeamento da memória no campo das Ciências Sociais. In *Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros*. São Paulo, n. 34, p. 9 - 24.

Mota, M. S. C., 2009. *Nas terras de Guaratiba: uma aproximação histórico-jurídica às definições de posse e propriedade da terra no Brasil entre os séculos XVI - XIX*. 334 f. Tese de Doutorado. Instituto de Ciências Humanas e Sociais. Programa de pós-graduação em Ciências Sociais e Desenvolvimento, Agricultura e Sociedade. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro.

Parés, L. N., 2007. *A formação do candomblé: história e ritual da nação jeje na Bahia*. São Paulo: Editora da UNICAMP.

Pereira, R.; Mourão, T.; Conduru, R.; Gaspar, A.; Ribeiro, M., 2012. *Inventário nacional de registro cultural do candomblé no Estado do Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Musas Projetos Culturais/IPHAN.

Pereira, R., 2015. Sucessão e liminaridade: o caso do terreiro da Gomeia. In *Tessituras*. Pelotas: Revista de Antropologia e Arqueologia. p. 372 - 402.

Pollak, M., 1989. Memória, esquecimento e silêncio. In *Estudos históricos*. v. 2, n. 3, p. 3 -15.

Rocha, A. M., 2000. *As nações Kêtu: ritos e crenças: os Candomblés antigos do Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad.

Santos, J. E., 1984. Os nagô e a morte: Padê, Asèsè e o culto Égun na Bahia. Petrópolis: Vozes.

Schwarzstein, D., 2001. História oral, memória e histórias traumáticas. In Revista História oral, n.4, p. 73-83.

Seligmann-silva, M., 2005. O local da diferença: ensaios sobre memória, arte, literatura e tradução. São Paulo: Editora 34.

Silva, V. G., 1995. Orixás na metrópole. Petrópolis: Vozes.

Thompson, E. P., 1978. The poverty of theory and other essays. London: Merlin.

Zumthor, P., 1997. Tradição e esquecimento. São Paulo: HUCITEC.

1 For clarification of the meaning of the candomblé religion terms used in the article, we suggest the Yorubá-Portuguese dictionary. Available at: <http://vidademacumbeiro.blogspot.com.br/2008/11/dicionrio-yoruba-portugues-5a-ed.html> [Accessed in 01 fev. 2017].

2 The term Pais or mães de santo refers to Candomblé religious authorities.

3 The Portuguese term filhos de santo refers to Candomblé believers.

4 The dating comes from the archaeological material that allowed the inference of this date through the use of coins present in the archaeological record for this purpose.

5 According to the Correio da Manhã newspaper of April 3, 1971, Sandra or Seci Caxi was chosen by the búzios to ascend to Gomeia's command. However, the minor was prohibited by the Duque de Caxias District Juvenile Judge - Eduardo Canotta - to take office due to age. The Curator of the case, Maria de Andrade Esqui, was expected to speak on the subject. According to Jessir Gonçalves da Fonte, the Juvenile Court of Niterói (a district that included Duque de Caxias), the parties, schedules and the presence of drunks could negatively influence the moral formation of the child, which could prevent her from assuming the position. The same newspaper published on the fifth day of the month indicates that the Juvenile Judge was holy son of Gomeia, which could go to the public some honesty about the process or even if it was directed to that Sandra did not take the job.

6 Material ensemble whose function is to operationalize the terreiro in its relations with the sacred. See in the dictionary indicated the term Ota and Ibá.

7 Chair where the leaders of candomblé command the celebrations and rites. Represents materially its power of command.

8 Some personal objects of João Alves are under the possession of the Historical Institute of Duque de Caxias. The site is located in the basement of the City Council of the municipality, located at Rua Paulo Lins, 41, Jardim Vinte e Cinco de Agosto, Duque de Caxias - RJ/Brazil.

9 For the present article, based on the concept of Religious Experiences of Thompson (1978), we defend that it should be conceptualized and understood as the set of information, contacts and even circulations that the interviewees had during their life inside the terreiro da Gomeia.

10 African dialect used in terreiros of the Angolan tradition of Candomblé in Brasil.

11 Despite this translation, Nicolau Parés (2007) gives us another origin for the term Gomeia: it would be related to a terreiro, of Jeje tradition, denominated "Agomé" that was located in the region where João Alves opened its terreiro in Salvador: "The 'terreiro of Agomé' (variant Agomea) located in Campinas, in the vicinity of Piraja, in the parish of Penha [in Salvador] ... The name of the terreiro derives surely from Agbomé, present Abomey, capital of the ancient kingdom of Daomé [...] It is probable that this terreiro of Agomé gave name to the district of Gomeia, located near São Caetano, to the South of Campinas. Arthur Ramos has already suggested that the toponym is a corruption of the portuguese form of Dahomey (Agomé, Dagomé in ancient documents), the country of Geges', and in support of this interpretation, Edison Carneiro added that "two of the three candomblés geges of Bahia - of Manuel Menezes and Falefá - are located in the neighborhood of Gomeia. Also there worked the terreiro of Joãozinho da Gomeia that, although of Angolan nation, presented, as Ramos note, important 'intromições jejes'. Eyewitnesses to the festivals of that house remember that 'there were many people who were jejes, it was Angola, but it touched candomblé hehe, it was very Omolu, Oxumarê, Nanã' (Parés, 2007, p. 154, our translation).

12 For this point, see text by Mota (2009).

13 One source says: "It is said that they took things only to close Gomeia, that it was no longer possible to keep it open. But I think, in fact, [suppressed the name] only took things to say heir to Pai João. He did not need to, he did not have to get us out of there and take things. It was just to have unity and to continue the house. It was a shame they took things from there, so what? Just to take Gomeia's name together? I think that's it, they wanted to take Gomeia with them and not Pai João".

14 Ariaxé can be a groove built in the ground, a pilaster that approaches the ceiling or even a pole attached to the roof of the terreiro and whose function is to link the material and religious plans for the exchanges of energy and presentification of

parties at the terreiro. It is also one of the energy centers whose function is to keep the terreiro in operation. He has, as a rule, an orixá / nkisi settlement implanted by the local leader.