Introduction

ᡃ

This book looks at slaves and masters in Santos, São Paulo, a sliver-shaped coastal township in southeastern Brazil. The period of study begins with Brazil's independence (1822), and ends when slavery was abolished (1888). I present evidence of differing slaves' conditions of life and work, their treatment, and most important, the causes for this variation. Some slaves may have been privileged relative to other slaves (and even relative to some free poor), but slaves belonged to the "most disadvantaged element in society" because they lacked basic citizenry and property-holding rights and were socially degraded by their categorization as chattel.[1] Nevertheless, the brutality that was endemic to slavery was not shared equally among slaves; this book seeks to explain why. Fundamentally, I argue that owners' status impacted on the options available to their slaves.[2] Slaves owned by masters with greater social and economic prestige stood a better chance of living healthier lives, working in relatively safer jobs, surrounding themselves with family and community, and even finding pathways out of slavery. For most other slaves, these paths remained unjustly blocked.

Many other historians have presented slaves as living in a hierarchical world, but few have collected information on how and to what degree changes in owner status affected the lives of slaves. For example, historians studying slave families in Brazil and the economics and demography of slavery have found that slaves lived and worked in a great range of environments.[3] As enslaved farmers twisted tobacco on small Bahian farms, trammers pushed wagons through the subterranean tunnels of Mineiro (Minas Gerais) gold mines, and palanquin-bearers hefted gilded carriages over the cobblestone streets of Rio de Janeiro, Brazilian slaves navigated their restrictive worlds in numerous ways. Furthermore, contemporary observers and the first historians of slavery never doubted that conditions varied, even widely so, but this was generally attributed to the different treatment slaves received and the places they lived.[4]

Today, scholars place nearly as much weight on the choices slaves made as they do on the behavior of their masters. It is now common to assert that bondspeople took steps semi-independently to form families or communities, to save for their manumission letters, or to resist some wish of authority. In fact, some slaves were able to profoundly change their lives, even though power within the master-slave relationship could hardly have been more unequal. This commonly accepted idea of limited autonomy does not conflict with the fact that masters treated their slaves in different ways, and while treatment could be indifferent, kind, or cruel depending on the character of a master or mistress, it also varied generally between groups of owners, depending on their status. Drawing inspiration from Eugene Genovese, "treatment" was the degree of freedom of choice, security, and access to legal pathways out of slavery given to slaves or their descendents. Day-to-day living conditions such as food, clothing, housing, and conditions of labor mattered enormously, but a small number of lucky slaves moved from bondage to nearly complete citizenship and lived full lives within sustaining communities.[5] The majority survived against awful odds.

Since the 1960s, historians of slavery have increasingly avoided the word *treatment* because it can give a misleading impression that slaves ultimately lacked agency.[6] Many scholars of slavery have questioned the idea that slaves' autonomy and decision making were always tempered by their owners' actions and preferences. Today the master-slave relationship is often seen as one of negotiation, albeit with vastly unequal terms.[7] For every ounce of agency that slaves had, masters had a pound, and the actions that owners directed at their slaves should be recognized as they were. Still, we need not deny that slaves had a minimal degree of autonomy of behavior in order to view *treatment* as the set of actions taken by masters toward their slaves.

In multiple ways, the life conditions that Santista (Santos) slaves faced were comparable to bondspeople in other parts of Brazil. Santos was a modestly sized coastal township with a port city connected to international trade, but it was not the center of commerce or political rule. Santista slaves were mostly traded locally and in small numbers, as they appear to have been elsewhere.[8] Marriage was closed to slaves except to those owned by mostly wealthy masters, yet childbirth was likely, irrespective of owner background or holding size.[9] Bondspeople were disproportionately targeted by the police for minor offenses, although physical punishments directed at slaves were removed from the town's legal code after 1850.[10] While the social environment presented risks, it was the physical environment where Santista slaves confronted their worst fears. In this they were not alone. Slaves throughout Brazil suffered

terribly from and were killed by diseases such as tuberculosis, smallpox, and neonatal tetanus. If they were not killed by disease or injury, a small but fairly steady stream of slaves escaped bondage through manumission. As elsewhere in Brazil, it was mostly child and female slaves who received manumission letters that contained no burdensome stipulations.[11] Skilled working-age males, on the other hand, were the most likely to run away, just like their fugitive counterparts in Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais, and Pernambuco.[12] When emancipation approached in the mid-1880s, the Imperial government created an Emancipation Fund to hasten a gradual abolition process. Yet most of the funds were directed toward the wealthiest slave owners.[13] Santos was no different in the types of bondspeople chosen to be freed with this public money. There were other experiences that Santista slaves shared with most Brazilian slaves, but these examples suggest that the principal finding of this book—that slavery in Santos was sufficiently hierarchical such that opportunities for slaves were open or closed depending on owner position and treatment—existed within the larger system of slavery in Brazil.

Like all Brazilian townships, Santos also had characteristics that made it and the slaves who resided there unique. Climate, geography, and port commerce gave Santos much of its individuality. Its tropical climate was suitable for a particular set of agricultural goods that were often at the heart of slave toil in the region. Weather patterns differ along the Paulista (São Paulo) coast from those of the larger southeastern region, which included the provinces of São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Minas Gerais. Coffee and cotton never became important crops in the township, while some common local products such as rice, ocean fish and seafood, and tropical fruits were rarely or never gathered beyond the coastal mountains. Geography also helped distinguish Santos in another way: it gave the township one of the only viable ports for a province roughly the size of New York and Pennsylvania combined. The port reaped the benefits as more and more transatlantic ships embarked carrying coffee and cotton, and manufactured goods arrived. The township was also close enough to both Rio de Janeiro and the city of São Paulo and big enough for some of its politicians to achieve prominence in the Imperial government.[14] Equal to its role as a coffee port, Santos was also an important immigrant's port. Its harbor was one of the main entry points for European and Asian men and families looking for work and new lives in the Americas during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Most of these immigrants merely passed through Santos, but thousands remained. Today, a large immigrants' hospice, now abandoned and in ruins, stands testament to their passage.[15] The European or Asian "colonists," as they were usually called, did not arrive in large numbers until the last few years of

slavery in the 1880s, but those who stayed and worked in the city played a role in the abolition and Republican movements.

Many immigrants disembarked at Santos but rushed to escape fatal risks from "fevers." The biggest danger came from a set of infectious diseases confined to the coast that made the town infamous from the 1870s until the 1900s. Santos became so notorious for disease and epidemics that it was referred to as the "cemetery of the world," although it is yet to be proven whether health was worse there than in other Brazilian port cities. Much of the trouble was caused by the tiny *Aedis aegypti* mosquito, a common carrier of yellow fever, which thrived in Santos but died in the colder weather in and beyond the narrow band of coastal mountains.[16] Contemporaries drew numerous comparisons between the (allegedly) disease-ridden coast afflicted with yellow fever and the healthy highlands. Indeed, travelers and immigrants often rushed the arduous journey from boat, up and over the mountains, and into the highlands during epidemic years, yet the port's "unsanitary" conditions took the brunt of the blame when these individuals or families became sick and died en route.

An immigrant who arrived in Santos before 1880 and hurried from boat to train typically would have encountered slaves. Most bondspeople living in the township of Santos resided in the port city and should thus be classified as "urban slaves." Historians and contemporaries of slavery have traditionally drawn a sharp distinction between slaves who worked in cities and those who labored on farms. City slaves, especially *negros de ganho* (slaves for hire), are now generally perceived to have had much more autonomy than field slaves.[17] Analysis of these separate categories of bondspeople is rooted in earlier slave studies that focused on the typical plantation slave and the anomalous big-city slave. Recent research has shown, however, that the lives of slaves who labored for small landholders were more comparable to those of their free working-class neighbors than to the lives of large-plantation slaves, while bondspeople in Brazil's largest and richest cities such as Rio de Janeiro or Salvador lived in ways vastly different from slaves beyond these city limits.[18]

As Santos grew from a small town into a midsized city during the nineteenth century, it maintained connections to local agriculture despite the port's eventual prominence. For this reason, the lives of its enslaved residents do not comfortably fit into the urban-rural dichotomy that has long marked slave studies. For example, the town's only defined edge was its waterfront, while its broad backsides blurred into fairly populated semi-circles of town homes and country houses, and blurred again into a zone of farms, fields, brush, and marsh. Townspeople often owned one home in town and another in the country, and their slaves moved between the

two. Slave owners often rented out their slaves to households on the out-skirts of town for tending small fields, feeding livestock, and performing a multitude of rural tasks. In these settings, Santos slaves may have had much in common with the majority of Brazilian slaves in hundreds of small- to moderately sized towns and villages in Brazil, who lived and worked in country settings but maintained urban connections. The few large cities such as Rio de Janeiro or Salvador would have struck Santista slaves (and most Brazilian slaves) with awe and bewilderment. Research is only beginning to look closely at this semiurban population. If Santos is representative, the line between urban and rural slaves may blur when the conditions of life and work display characteristics of both categories.

Santos shares an island with São Vicente, one of the oldest European settled towns in the Americas. Here, the first Portuguese explorers and colonists in Brazil built their homes and dug fields in the sixteenth century. In fact, this small part of the Brazilian coast was one of the first regions in the Americas to adopt slave labor as an engine to produce a commodity (sugar) for global markets. Although its economy turned inward after the seventeenth century, Santos and its neighboring townships remained far more dedicated to slavery than other parts of the captaincy or province until the middle part of the nineteenth century.[19] Only by the end of that century could some imaginative residents or visitors foresee the commanding position that Santos would attain in the national and world economy. Today Santos is home to about half a million residents and is one of the busiest ports in the world, serving as the entrepôt for nearly all of the agricultural and manufactured goods of Brazil's indus-trial powerhouse, the state of São Paulo. Santos, therefore, played a role in global affairs in the sixteenth century and again in the mid- to late nineteenth century, and in both instances depended heavily on African- and Brazilian-born slaves. Despite the importance of this section of the long Paulista coast and the slave labor that dominated the economy, no history of slave life in this region has yet been compiled.[20]

Long after the early colonial sugar boom but before Santos took its strong commercial and maritime position, the town's population was relatively small and production was minor. During the first few decades after independence, the persistence of colonial social and political struc-tures was more noticeable than the town's slow transformation. After 1849, as coffee surpassed sugar as São Paulo's most exported good, the British began construction of a provincial railroad, terrible new epidemics struck the coast, and thousands of European immigrants landed dockside at the town, all conspiring to move Santos away from its long colonial era and toward its contemporary form as an international port and cos-mopolitan city. To follow the quickening pace of these trends, this book

relies on social and economic maps that track the changing boundaries of wealth, status, and slaveholding. Maps such as these create demographic profiles of slave-owning and non-slave-owning households in both the urban parts of the port city and rural areas of the township. In order to understand when and why major opportunities opened for some slaves but not for others, the first part of this book investigates wealth and material conditions of households, neighborhoods, and farming communities. Additionally, information on owner and slave occupations, familial connections, and a myriad of overlapping social ties creates a picture of a diverse city undergoing significant changes, including an evolution and adaptation of institutions linked to the slave system.

The second part of this book continues to focus on changing social and demographic trends while emphasizing slaves' life conditions and treatment. Here I present evidence that these trends diverged significantly between groups of bondspeople, principally in the degree to which the different groups were able to avoid sale outside of their families and communities, create or re-create families, work in relatively safe jobs, and avoid punishment for behavior authorities deemed criminal. Owners' social position and their treatment of their slaves also influenced slaves' ability to remain healthy; avoid risk of disease, injury, and violence; and receive effective medical care. Finally, social hierarchy also influenced the pathways slaves had to freedom, via either manumission or flight, and, after death, how their remains were handled by owners, friends, and family.

By connecting the behavior of slaves with a systematic analysis of their social conditions I am attempting to find a middle ground between two diverging modes of interpreting and understanding slavery. In the last three decades, as some historians have searched for ways Brazilian slaves found their own voices and carved out a culturally or socially independent space within an oppressive society, other historians have turned to the structural aspects of slavery, usually through quantitative methods and an emphasis on demographic or economic history. Following Stanley Stein's masterful *Vassouras: A Brazilian Coffee County, 1850–1890*, originally published in 1957, some of this research on slavery has also become quite regionalized.[21] I cannot claim to be the first to attempt to bridge what might be characterized as a divide between slaves' actions and the social or economic groups to which they belonged. One successful strategy has been to painstakingly re-create a biography of a slave or a freed slave and his or her family in order to witness the decisions these individuals made within a number of changing structural constraints. Sandra Lauderdale Graham's *Caetano Says No* or Zephyr Frank's *Dutra's World* center on a slave and freeman, respectively, while Nancy Pricilla

Naro, in *A Slave's Place, a Master's World*, used judicial court cases to look at the decisions slaves and their owners made within rural Rio de Janeiro. Brazilian historians have also integrated the intimate experiences of slaves with the changing setting of the economy and society.[22]

Because slaves in Brazil and most other places left so few written narratives, scholars have turned to the many boxes of dusty *processos-crime* (judicial records) to discover the actions of slaves in specific situations and their ability to be autonomous actors. Two other sources—*mapas* (census records) and *testamentos* and *inventarios* (inheritance records)—have also been scrutinized, principally by those interested in the structural side of slavery. Inheritance records often provide meticulous descriptions of households and material culture as well as the occasional contentious passage regarding the bequeathing of slaves and goods to heirs. They also allow historians to look at the important relationship between slaveholding and general wealth holding, with recognizable limits. Census records, especially from São Paulo and Minas Gerais, were often made in such detail that household production, race, age and civil status can be followed in pursuit of important trends. More and more years of these census *mapas* have come under close examination, sometimes in combination with one or two other sources that permit cross-listing of the names of slaves and their owners.[23]

Historians' use of these sources has produced several important new discoveries about Brazilian slavery:

- Sizes of slaveholdings varied enormously, with small numbers often the norm for the purposes of food and commodity production for household and local market.[24]

- Brazilian households were more commonly organized around a nuclear family than an extended family, or headed by a lone individual with or without slaves.[25]

- Slaves were able to form and maintain families under certain conditions and within particular areas.[26]

- The large and populous province of Minas Gerais was not in economic decline after its eighteenth-century gold boom; rather, it had a dynamic economy and was likely one of the few places in Brazil where the slave population experienced natural increases.[27]

- Prior to the coffee boom, the growing African slave labor force in São Paulo accompanied its economic expansion.[28]

- The increasing purchase price of slaves dampened economic mobility for many people during the second half of the nineteenth century.[29]

These findings have challenged the idea that Brazilian society was typically composed of large, extended families that held the majority of slaves on sugar or coffee plantations. Historians have also questioned the idea that slaves were not allowed or were unwilling to create families, and have challenged commonly held beliefs regarding the regional histories of Minas Gerais and São Paulo. By doing so, these studies have altered our understanding of the history of slavery in Brazil and of the history of Brazil as a colony and nation.

Some of these demographic and economic histories noticeably return to a pre-1960s model of scholarship that relied on slavery to describe other trends, such as economic growth.[30] Three important unpublished dissertations—by Robert Slenes (Stanford University, 1976), Pedro Carvalho de Mello (University of Chicago, 1977), and Roberto B. Martins (Vanderbilt University, 1980)—have been credited with a new phase of economic and demographic reanalysis of Brazilian history. These dissertations were important for prompting a number of debates, especially over the nature of the Mineiro economy in the nineteenth century. At the same time, Gilberto Freyre's heavy emphasis on plantation slavery has continued to be questioned, as scholars reexamine the consequences of slavery for the national narrative of Brazil.

Historians have also developed a useful set of tools for examining slavery in Santos. Many of the sources used for this book center much more on slaveholders than slaves. In these sources, I have attempted to find the composition of the larger society, how slave owners were socially positioned, and what those positions meant for the lives and work of the individuals they owned. Residents of Santos, like other Brazilians, lived in a society that was largely rural, deeply unequal in wealth and power, and permeated by the institution of slavery until 1888. Wealthy Brazilians owned hundreds of African- and native-born slaves, held a great deal of property, and grew a range of products sold locally and across the world, in sharp contrast to the many small families squatting on nearby land and the beggars who owned little more than a rope belt, threadbare shirt, pants, and sandals. The poorest free people in society lived highly uncertain lives and were often the first to suffer during times of hardship. They performed what jobs they could, migrated often, lived shorter lives, and held a less steady position in society than did the bondspeople of owners with means. Between the barons and the beggars were the vast majority of Brazilians, those who had sufficient but not abundant resources to endure a year of bad harvests, the death of one or more family member, price increases of basic necessities, and other ill luck.[31]

Considering this wide spectrum, what were the factors that separated groups of people from one another and created differences in wealth,

slaveholding, and power? In other words, what stratified society? This is a question often brought up by social scientists and historians for vastly different societies and periods of time and considered by sociologists to be a topic worthy of its own disciplinary field.[32] Looking at how other scholars have approached class, status, and mobility is one way to explain how I use *stratification* in this book.

Generally, sociologists hold that people are capable of categorizing themselves while being categorized by others into social and economic levels, based on perceived differences related to occupation, race, sex, or wealth. It was on this issue that Max Weber famously disagreed with Karl Marx, since he did not believe class struggle was at the heart of all social conflict. Instead, Weber argued that society is a constantly shifting arena, where individuals' status and accepted claim to a specific style of life, combine (or clash) with their defined roles within society, their range of opportunities that stem from material possessions, and their personal chances within the competitive market.[33] Considering the great amount of work done by historians of slavery to show that oppressed peoples often possessed a voice and some degree of power to influence their situations, this Weberian vision of society is arguably more compatible than the Marxist position, although most historians eschew any one-size-fits-all theoretical framework. On the other hand, we must continue to make assumptions about how people are positioned, and constantly adjust those assumptions for any society we examine carefully. Indeed, Latin American Studies has a long tradition of viewing society in terms of social divisions and organization, although the term *social mobility* is used more frequently than *social stratification*.[34] Sociologists rightfully consider the former to be an action that occurs within the organization of the latter.

When it comes to the social ranks of nineteenth-century Brazilian society, there is little doubt that deep inequalities existed, but historians do not always agree how this inequality was structured. Many historians regard civil condition—freedom or slavery—as the most important indicator.[35] Analyses that utilize income brackets correspond with this division because slaves were often the lowest income-earning group. Furthermore, bondspeople could not legally pass property to heirs, thus this categorization scheme places slaves below the free poor in their potential for holding wealth. Considering the extent and depth of poverty among free people, a few historians have questioned the notion that slaves were always at the bottom of the social pyramid. For Mary Karasch, the urban society of Rio de Janeiro had a "top layer" of "white Brazilians and a few *pardos* from elite families," a "middle layer" of "immigrants, white Brazilians and free people of color," and the "lowest layer" that was a

"mixed group." Whether one was free or enslaved was "important but not the sole determinant of a person's place in society."[36] Residential location and type of work may have been better indicators of social standing than civil status or income among certain occupational groups.[37]

In this book I draw inspiration from the sociologists who have done much work on stratification and from historians who recognize that income alone is insufficient to explain hierarchy. In the Weberian tradition, I hold status and material possessions to be closely related, and this position frames the connections made in this book between the life experiences of slaves and the wealth and status of their owners. Historical studies are always constrained by their sources, however, and this one is no different. Thus, when sources did not support these connections, I used different demographic groups that are also viable categories for comparing life conditions and treatment. A richer, more complex picture emerges when groups of slaveholders based on occupation, race, or title are not always placed together within the overarching and diminutive categories of class.

Just as a historian who identifies "classes" or "ranks" must choose somewhat arbitrary dividing lines, there is also a degree of subjectivity to finding the order of a society by social, status, or demographic groups. I believe the only way around this problem is to find and use categories used by slaveholders and slaves themselves. For example, one way of looking at the different opportunities available to slaves is to examine occupational groups. The slaves tending sugarcane fields or rice paddies led very different lives than those who regularly washed their neighbors' laundry in town. Or, as another example, *pardos* may not have always felt solidarity with each other, but their midtone skin color and perceived social position was an often-used and important identifying feature, and people often acted differently toward them because of this characteristic. The racial or social categories Brazilians used offer another way of comparing life conditions and treatment.[38]

There is another body of literature that frequently highlighted the hierarchies within slavery. Europeans and Americans who traveled to Brazil in the nineteenth century frequently observed hierarchies based on types of owners, the treatment of slaves, the work they performed, and the resources they displayed. Some observers claimed that treatment varied between the provinces to the degree that slaves in the southern provinces were so notoriously abused that slave owners in the north would threaten their slaves with sale southward if they misbehaved.[39] Other travelers observed that jobs on the sugar plantations and gold mines were worse than those on most coffee *fazendas* (plantations or farms). They observed differences in treatment according to the type of owner: Brazilians were sup-

posedly better masters than the Portuguese, men were better than women, clergy were better than government officials, and slaves and former slaves were "more oppressive overseers and slave-drivers than whites."[40] Many of these accounts were impressionistic and their hierarchies are questionable, but more important is the fact that many travelers observed slaves living and working in a diverse range of conditions and wrote in diaries and published books asserting that they had witnessed slaves treated with inhumane cruelty as well as with emotion and care.

Work was another variable that travelers used to categorize slaves. Slaves who lived in cities and had urban occupations or independently earned a wage for their owners or for themselves and their families could slowly and strenuously improve their position in Brazilian society. City slaves were often characterized as having an easier life, but some thought the enslaved stevedores worked harder than all other slaves.[41] Some travelers wrote that *negros de ganho* (slaves for hire) had a great deal of autonomy, but their conditions depended on their ability to save and willingness to spend. Finally, domestic servants often appeared to be better housed, clothed, and fed than slaves who worked on the street, but they displayed fewer freedoms of action compared to the *negros de ganho*.[42]

Travelers were sometimes shocked to see certain slaves and free blacks in finery and jewelry. Thomas Ewbank, an American traveler, wrote in 1856 while in Rio de Janeiro, "I have passed black ladies in silk and jewelry, with male slaves in livery behind them. Today one rode past in her carriage, accompanied by a liveried footman and a coachman."[43] When C.S. Stewart visited Rio in 1852 he observed that "two black African women, richly and fashionably attired, came sauntering along with the most conscious air of high-bred self-possession. They were followed by black female slaves, also in full dress, carrying a black baby three or four months old, and decked out in all the finery of an aristocratic heir."[44] For Americans unaccustomed to seeing blacks in elegant clothing, these slaves and free people of color exposed their deep racial prejudices.[45]

Opulence such as this was mostly limited to the few big cities in Brazil, especially Rio de Janeiro, but in these places the richly attired slaves could confound distinctions of race and class, especially as material conditions improved for many slaves during the second half of the nineteenth century. Addressing the Brazilian Parliament in 1871, Perdigão Malheiro, a nineteenth-century Brazilian lawyer who wrote an influential book on slave law, said "today it is very common to see slaves better dressed than any of us, and judging by them no one could tell who is a slave, and their masters condone this and even grant them other favors."[46] Rita, a Bahian slave who escaped her master in Rio de Janeiro in 1855, was described as wearing a dress that was secured by buttons made of white gold. Simi-

larly, Helena, who also fled her *Carioca* (Rio de Janeiro) master in 1865, carried rosettes of gold and precious stone. Neither description indicated that these were stolen goods. Slaves such as Helena and Rita may have been limited to a city like Rio de Janeiro, although travelers also reported numerous luxuries available to the large landowners far from Brazil's big cities, some who were even compared to feudal lords.[47]

Just as slaves who wore finery were noticed by visitors to Brazil, privileged, skilled, high-status, and educated slaves and *libertos* (freed slaves) have received the attention of historians. Karasch reported that the dozens of jobs held by slaves in Rio de Janeiro included supervisors, goldsmiths, chambermaids, and the "white slaves" that carried the emperor on his outings. Julio César da Silva Pereira discovered a slave named José Alves who was given the "pompous" title of *1º cirugião da Real Fazenda e Paço de Santa Cruz* (1st Surgeon of the Royal Plantation and Town of Santa Cruz), a position that gave him authority over hundreds of other bondspeople on what was a huge and formerly Jesuit-run farming operation in Rio de Janeiro province.[48] Emília Viotta da Costa cited an advertisement for a slave that spoke French in addition to Portuguese. Sandra Lauderdale Graham described an African who could sign his name in a petition for a work license, while his sponsor "barely managed to scratch out his name and, moreover, referred to the African respectfully as 'senhor' (master)." Likewise, Zephyr Frank told the story of Antonio Dutra, a barber and musician who amassed a considerable fortune for his day, despite being African-born and a former slave.[49] Nancy Priscilla Naro discussed a judicial case of a slave named Eufrasia whose owner "showered" her with attention, "sending her dresses and taking her with him to 'public sports events and entertainment.'"[50] In the unusual case cited by Naro, Eufrasia might have been called an *escravo de estimação* by her neighbors, a term used in 1922 by Alberto Sousa in his account of the slaves who inhabited some of the fanciest houses in Brazil and sometimes slept in the same rooms as their owners. *Estimação* means "esteemed" or "prized" and is sometimes coupled with *animal* in Portuguese to refer to a favorite pet, such as a poodle. Naro reported that Eufrasia's owner treated her brutally in the end, but some skilled slaves had a bit of bargaining power. Stanley Stein quoted an owner who complained that he had to sell his skilled slave because he refused to work for him.[51]

Autonomy and knowledge may have been equally important as a slave's place within the community or his or her price on the market.[52] For example, domestic servants are typically seen to have had less autonomy than those working on the streets, especially compared to the *negros de ganho*, but autonomy among servants most likely depended on the

type of household and job. According to a manual on slaveholding written by a *fazendeiro* (plantation or farm owner), slaves would sometimes purposely do a task poorly if asked to perform a job they considered outside of their accepted occupation.[53] Conversely, small households often had one or two slaves who performed a wide range of jobs. Slaves who worked outside the home may have been less likely to be under constant supervision, but Katia Mattoso claims that at times domestic servants became so intimate and closely connected to their masters or mistresses that occasionally "it became difficult to tell who dominated."[54]

In sum, slaves that were unusually situated within society have not gone unnoticed, nor have slaves who suffered great abuses and cruelties. Despite the common recognition that slaves varied in their position and options, no one has undertaken a systematic search for variance stemming from owners' status. In Santos, and likely elsewhere, the social order within society (including conventional material markers but also extending to social and cultural positions) and the conditions that slaves endured were related. Recognition of this fact brings renewed attention to the older idea of treatment and pushes us to make the case that the ways owners acted toward their slaves should be taken into account as much as the ways slaves acted toward (or independently of) their masters.

In pursuit of these arguments I employ a new methodology. Historians have only begun to find connections between primary sources through large databases of slave and owner names, demographic information, and the unique historical data contained in each type of source, but rarely are more than two or three types of documents used in this manner. Because archivists in Santos preserved and organized an exceptional array of material, and because this was not a large city like Rio de Janeiro or Salvador, more than twenty historical sources from the nineteenth century could be combined and matched according to the names of slaves and slave owners. More than two thousand unique slave owners and three hundred slaves were identified in two or more sources. Out of nearly twelve thousand slaves, approximately five thousand were men, women, and children owned by masters who appeared in multiple sources. Despite the nuances and complexities of these data, the vast majority of cross-referenced names in the database open many new ways of investigating Brazilian slavery. For example, two primary sources on slave trading, *escrituras de compra e venda* (bills of sales) and *meia-sizas* (tax records), rarely give information about the former slave owner beyond his or her name. As a consequence, a number of questions regarding the slave trade have gone largely unanswered, such as the position and character of owners that typically purchased slaves. By combining information from these sources with census records and

almanacs, we can determine the birthplace, race, and occupation of more than half of the township residents who bought and sold slaves. Similar linkages were found between historical documents that related to slaves' manumission strategies, family formation, work, crime and punishment, health, burial, and flight from slavery. Each of these topics is important standing alone, but the primary purpose of this broad cross-referencing technique is to fit these discussions into a unifying narrative by identifying social patterns that constrained or opened slave choices. The cross-referencing methodology employed by this study, including its challenges and limitations, and the array of sources used, are described in the Appendix.

A broad range of life conditions and treatment are connected to the categories of a hierarchical society in a novel way. Few other histories of slavery have so actively sought the names of owners and slaves in sources; rather, they have relied on finding the broader, but important, demographic or economic trends. In fact, this is the first research of slavery that systematically gathers information on owner status and compares this information with the life conditions and treatment of slaves based on a wide range of topics. It is also the first slave system to be investigated using network analysis methods.

This book is divided into two parts. The first part ("Masters and Their Slaves") includes Chapters One through Three. It contains descriptions of a changing society and the economy in Santos, transformations that became more noticeable and hurried after 1850. Society is best portrayed as "interdependently stratified," that is, containing innumerable personal connections that cut through and across social and economic groups divided into ranks. To make this case, hundreds of marriage records and a number of other sources were analyzed that give network data. Networks were by no means clustered by neighborhood, yet each of the neighborhoods in the city and the countryside were unique in multiple ways. Owners and their slaves shared many attributes within neighborhoods, also true for the limited opportunities slaves had and for the treatment that they received.

In Chapter Two, I track some of the broader demographic, economic, and material changes that occurred during the century. The economy and society of the township largely revolved around the local production of goods, most of which was for local consumption. Some of the township councilmen who regulated the laws, collected taxes, and worked to increase trade and their businesses were from families that owned large plantations. These families typically owned one or two country estates, several pieces of property in town, and between twenty and eighty slaves, who mostly tilled, cut cane, distilled *cachaça* (sugarcane rum), or planted

rice or cassava. After 1850, a new class of men inserted itself into positions of power that previously had been reserved for planters. These newcomers made money in other ways, often by buying, storing, and selling coffee, sugar, and cotton to overseas markets. This merchant class sometimes bought rural property and built country homes, but they were more likely to buy town homes for themselves and tenements for their workers. Some spent a considerable amount of time in São Paulo, preferring a lengthy railroad commute over tracks laid by the British in 1869 to the hot and humid climate of the lowland coast of Santos. Even though they took their profits as service middlemen rather than producers, they relied nearly as much as the old elite on slave labor. Their slaves were less commonly farmers; instead, they worked as stevedores, wagon drivers, and warehouse workers.

In the third chapter, I describe the township's slave markets, its principal participants, market "nexuses," and markets as "gateways" for slaves into a hierarchical world. This story mostly takes place in the 1860s, when detailed historical sources are available. More of the town's elite were working in export commerce rather than regional agricultural production and these men looked to buy and sell particular slaves. Some were certainly pleased to have connections to men like Captain Gregorio Innocencio de Freitas, who largely traded slaves who were suitable for hauling bags of coffee.[55] Other townspeople looked for enslaved domestic servants and sought another prominent slave trader who had carved out a different but equally specialized niche.

The second part ("Slaves and Their Masters"), Chapters Four through Seven, situates slave life conditions and their treatment into the changing social and economic picture presented in the first part of the book. Chapter Four looks at family, work, crime, and punishment of slaves of Santos. By the midpoint of the century, both slave prices and coffee export profits were rising, and the new commercial elite often handled their slaves carefully. In fact, they chose to send them to the hospital for medicine and the jail for whipping, rather than perform medical services and punishment within their home as families had done for centuries. The fifth chapter turns to the public and private medical care of slaves, the afflictions from which they suffered and died, and how slaves and free people faced similar disease environments and risks with a few important exceptions such as yellow fever and tuberculosis. It includes a discussion of the dangers slaves faced in a city that was more and more densely populated and where many jobs were opening within an expanding service-oriented economy. Chapter Six details the history of slave manumission and flight, the two pathways to freedom open for a limited number of bondspeople. In the seventh chapter, I return to the

slaveholders and freed slaves in a description and history of the abolition movement. In that final, substantive chapter, I explore how a city that had been more dedicated to slavery than most other places in south-eastern Brazil could declare itself "free of slavery" two years before the "golden proclamation" ended official slavery in 1888. The Conclusion presents a summary of findings and a discussion of how stratification within the institution of slavery may have influenced its perception and perpetuation.