Introduction

THE APOCRYPHAL STORY, STILL told in the tourist guidebooks, is that the residents of Airão fled to escape a plague of ants. What they left behind is now a particularly photogenic "phantom city" on the banks of the Rio Negro, one of the main tributaries of the Amazon River (Figure I.1). One can wander among the overgrown ruins of houses, the central market, and the church, imagining how easily the place must have been abandoned by its residents. "There wasn't much here to begin with," visitors might remark to each other, "and how quickly the jungle takes over again."

For many modern-day observers, the trajectory of a place like Airão would seem emblematic of the inevitable decline and abandonment of settlements in the Amazon. But there is much that the tourists do not see—and do not even look for—on their treks through the ruins of Airão. They do not see the plots of rich, black earth (*terra preta*) that still surround the village site, produced by pre-Columbian Amazonians who added charcoal and organic material to improve the fertility of the soil.[1] Beyond the crumbling stone walls of the old church, nothing visible remains of the mission, Santo Elias do Jaú, founded in 1694 by Carmelite friars. There is no sign of the descendants of the Tarumã, Manao, and Baré Indians, who left their original territories to settle in Carmelite missions along the riverbank, and who may have convinced the friars to establish Jaú in its fertile, bluff-top location after several previous mission sites proved untenable. Standing on the bluff, looking down at the Rio Negro, travelers cannot see the traces of the thousands of canoes that have

crisscrossed its tea-colored waters, mooring at the village for trade or a visit with family and friends.

The two and a half centuries that Jaú/Airão existed as a community seem less meaningful, less deserving of study, in part because its ultimate abandonment (in 1964) fits so neatly into the standard narrative about the limitations of the Amazonian environment, the cultural tendencies of its native peoples, and the nature of the colonial enterprise.[2] I have had to grapple with this narrative as much as anyone who studies the region's past. The Amazon has long been framed as a "counterfeit paradise" or "wet desert," an environment that thwarted human agency and cooperation through the ages.[3] By the law of environmental limits on culture, any attempt to establish sizable, permanent settlements would be doomed to fail. In this "land without history," as one of Brazil's most famous writers called it, Indians and their mixed-race descendants formed the majority of the population until at least the mid-nineteenth century.[4] These types of people have not been given much credit as stable, long-term settlers, in light of the critique, dating back to the earliest years of colonization, that depicted native Amazonians as inherently prone to an unsettled existence and likely to flee at the first attempt to root them in place.[5] Most scholarship on colonial-era settlement has thus implied that *all* of it was forced, and that much of it happened during a flurry of imperial reforms back in the mid-eighteenth century. From this perspective, Amazonian settlements were entirely artificial creations, held together by little more than imperial will. Their decadence in the nineteenth century and again in the twentieth century, after the end of the rubber boom, was therefore predestined.[6]

There is a kernel of truth in these assumptions. In its unmodified state, Amazonian soil is indeed nutrient poor and insufficient for permanent cultivation, and a host of insect and animal pests have frustrated large-scale agriculture over the centuries. Many native groups did flee colonial settlements, preferring to live in nomadic bands in the remote, upland areas of the Amazon Basin. And the Portuguese colonial enterprise in the Amazon was brutal, often relying on forced migration and enslavement to establish the outposts of an empire. But emphasizing static constraints of nature, culture, and colonialism without also exploring innovations and opportunities for change or growth constitutes a narrow view of Amazonian history and ignores a compelling body of evidence.

In this book I am able to describe colonial settlements that adapted to their environment rather than being thwarted by it. These were com-

Figure I.1 Ruins of Airão, a "Phantom City" on the Rio Negro, 2010. Courtesy of Francis Maglia.

munities built by generations of native Amazonian villagers and migrants, with histories that went much deeper than the period of colonial reforms in the 1750s. I also describe a mode of living typical of most colonial Indian men, which involved spending many months of the year canoeing and trekking through the interior. In contrast to studies that equate indigenous mobility with community abandonment and rejection of colonial rule, the central argument developed in this book is that engagement in these forms of mobility was a means of consolidating and sustaining colonial Indian communities. This is not a simple story about "native agency," though its protagonists are people who followed their own interests and tried, against significant constraints, to act independently. It is, rather, a story of how diverse groups of people with their own ideas of place and community adapted to new, colonial ideas and practices and often made them their own.

The key evidence for the story comes from local sources produced during the second half of the eighteenth century, the correspondence of hundreds of colonial administrators who were engaged in everyday affairs in the *povoações de índios*, the "Indian villages" of the two Amazonian captaincies of Pará and the Rio Negro. These village-level sources show that native Amazonians did not have to choose between moving on or settling down. In fact, spatial mobility and community formation worked as complementary processes in the second half of the eighteenth century, forging a uniquely resilient regional culture along the waterways. This culture—and not imperial will or state power—best explains why a large majority of the colonial Indian villages endured as settled places into the nineteenth century and beyond.

Rivers, Rebels, and Dots on a Map

Mobile Amazonians and their communities first became visible to me during a preliminary study of the Cabanagem Rebellion (1835–1840). The culmination of more than a decade of regional violence after independence from Portugal, the rebellion turned into a civil war that pitted white elites against a loose coalition of nonwhite peasants, slaves, and urban poor. When I came to do my first summer of archival research in Belém, the old colonial capital of Pará, the Cabanagem was still waiting for its historian.[7] I had a vague interest in the spatial dimensions of the uprising and the extent to which the rebels, many of whom were identified as Indians in the sources, coordinated their efforts across vast distances, making it the bloodiest, most geographically extensive rebellion in Brazil's history. (A contemporary's estimate of 30,000 casualties is probably exaggerated but still indicative of the scale of the violence.) Ultimately, I chose not to write about the rebellion and turned to an earlier and relatively more stable period of Amazonian history. But two findings during that initial trip shaped the kinds of questions I would ask in my subsequent research.

First, I found that the rebels did not stage an uprising in isolation, nor did they communicate only with other rebels. District military commanders' reports to the provincial president provided me with detailed information on local geography and the movements of both rebels and imperial troops in different parts of the province of Pará. The commanders often described waterways: not only rivers, but channels between islands (*furos*), narrow "canoe-paths" (*igarapés*), and headwaters of rivers

(*cabeceiras*). Small bands of rebels operated in these watery redoubts, where large artillery canoes could not pass, for several years into the repression phase of the rebellion. The rebels' tactical advantages were not only geographical; they were also social. As one commander lamented, "most of the leaders of the bands are sons of these environs. It seems that their fathers, mothers, siblings, and nephews warn them of the [imperial] expeditions, no matter how secret they may be."[8] This particular dispatch came from the Furos district, an area of labyrinthine channels around the old povoações de índios (and former missions) of Melgaço, Oeiras, and Portel.

The strategic use of rivers and the existence of dense social networks in this part of the Amazon seemed unsurprising, given its geography and pattern of riverine settlement. Yet I knew that the traditional historiography on the Cabanagem portrayed the rebels as isolated factions, operating with only faint awareness of events elsewhere in the Amazon Basin, their coordination impeded by huge distances and an ingrained "mentality of individualism."[9] In that depiction of the rebels, I saw obvious parallels with the way Amazonian *ribeirinhos*, or riverine peasant populations (Indian or mixed-race), have been portrayed by scholars working on different historical periods.[10] It became evident to me that within these partisan reports by military commanders lay hints of a reality apart from that described by historians—who until recently tended to conduct their research in overseas or national archives. I had stumbled upon the militarized field notes of contemporary observers, and some of their details resonated with the revisionist scholarship of anthropologists observing riverine communities today.[11]

My second finding during this initial research was that the rebels were ethnically diverse but often had common origins in the old povoações de índios. A series of prisoner rolls from the rebellion, in five bound codices, enumerated more than a thousand prisoners, each with a name, age, race, occupation, marital status, place of origin, and place of imprisonment. The majority were identified as Indians, but a significant number of mixed-race individuals—*mulatos*, *mamelucos*, and *cafuzos*—appeared as well, along with smaller numbers of whites and black slaves.[12] The lists represented only a fraction of the prisoners taken during the repression and an even smaller fraction of the total number of rebels, but they suggested that the Cabanagem had been a truly multiethnic movement. It also had spread across a vast region. The prisoners came from all corners of Pará—an area roughly the size of France—ranging from the outpost of Turiaçu, on

the eastern border, to the village of Faro, on the western side.[13] Their places of imprisonment were often hundreds of miles away from their hometowns.

To get a sense of the geographical extent of the rebellion, I began trying to locate and contextualize the settlements listed as rebel hometowns. This task presented some difficulties, but not for the reasons I had expected initially. The settlements had not, in fact, disappeared; most could be found with a bit of sleuthing on historical and modern maps. Their names had occasionally changed, and sometimes their locations had shifted, but many were still identifiable as former povoações de índios, founded as missions in the seventeenth or early eighteenth century. The difficulty came, rather, in trying to find contextual information about individual settlements in the available published sources. Traveling officials or foreigners had described some of them between the late eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries, but coverage was selective and their comments rarely went beyond the impressionistic observations of outsiders.[14] There were also several narratives in the form of "chorographies" (literally, place-writings) that described each settlement's location, demographic composition, and economic activities in a highly formulaic way.[15] None of these sources revealed much about these places as communities with historical roots in centuries past. They still appeared to me as little more than dots on a map.

I finished my first stint in the archives wondering about the emergence of a mobile, mixed population in the Portuguese (later, Brazilian) Amazon. How had it formed out of the colonial experience of missionary and then secular administration of the native population? How had people on different rivers of this immense territory become socially integrated over time, in ways that eventually provided the context for regional rebellion? Most of all, I wanted to find out more about the povoações de índios that would become focal points of resistance in the nineteenth century. What had made these communities so durable, when their residents were constantly on the move?

Mobility and Community

This book answers those questions by turning to the second half of the eighteenth century. The period is unique for its sources and their continuity: it offers more than forty years of village-level documentation, beginning in 1757, when some sixty missions in Portuguese Amazonia were

turned over to civil "directors," under a new system of administration known as the Indian Directorate (which was later extended to the main colony of Brazil).[16] This has been characterized as the definitive "coming of the state" to the Amazon, with all of the negative consequences for native autonomy that this implies. The present work, however, joins other recent studies in attributing the period's relative stability not to the imposition of royal control, but rather to the process of negotiation and compromise that played out on the local level between colonial officials and *índios aldeados*, the members of corporate Indian communities.[17] Challenging the still-prevalent idea that Indians could find autonomy only by fleeing the colonial system, these works suggest that spaces of autonomy—however limited—could be carved out from within.[18]

Spatial mobility, I argue, is key to understanding this process of finding a place within the colonial sphere. Most scholars who have treated the topic of indigenous mobility in the Amazon focus on movements that were either forced (Indians being displaced to locations not of their choosing) or fugitive (Indians fleeing colonial authority and rejecting fixed residence), and both types of movements have been seen as thoroughly detrimental to colonial Indian communities.[19] There was certainly much forced displacement over the course of Amazonian history, and evasive movements were common. But during the Directorate period, Indians often left their villages because they were obligated or encouraged by colonial authorities to do so *and* because it suited their interests. Relocating, exploring, and trading across vast distances, they staked out an important position within the colonial system. They selectively engaged in forms of state-sponsored mobility to expand their social networks, to pursue economic opportunities, and to accumulate prestige or political leverage. And Indians did so in ways that often fortified their home communities, by bringing material resources or new people from the frontier to settle in the villages.

Many colonial Indians found advantages in their distinct legal status as índios aldeados, which entailed obligations as well as rights and privileges.[20] Under the Directorate, índios aldeados were required to be loyal "vassals" of the Portuguese monarch, pay agricultural tithes, and render various types of service to the state. In return, they were entitled to collectively owned assets, such as land, canoes, and tools; crown sponsorship of village enterprises (agricultural, artisanal, and extractive); and representation and protection by their own native officials. This book shows that colonial Indians also staked claims and sought compensation through

spatial mobility: they took on roles organizing and leading expeditions to negotiate with independent native groups or to explore unknown territories, and they made themselves indispensable as canoe crewmen and river guides. Colonial officials rewarded these services by granting certificates of office and labor exemptions, as well as additional licenses and funds to travel into the remote interior.

The Portuguese colonial system depended on these regional forms of movement and travel, often carried out on terms dictated or influenced by Indians. Governors, magistrates, and metropolitan officials still railed against native Amazonians' tendency to live far outside the village center, to participate in far-flung social circles, and to spend part of the year engaged in subsistence gathering, on the assumption that these forms of independent mobility were detrimental to "civilized" life. But at the same time, these high-level officials encouraged Indian villagers to go on long-distance expeditions that served economic and geopolitical aims. Village directors, for their part, usually condoned any trip or movement that did not threaten their own agendas, and they encouraged those that benefited them directly.[21]

As Stuart Schwartz once reminded an audience of Latin American historians, "telling the story of European iniquity and native destruction is always possible, but there are other tales that need to be heard." Paying attention to these other stories—which include stories of adaptation and collaboration—does not diminish the damage wrought by colonialism on native societies, nor does it "exculpate the conquerors."[22] Rather, it is a means of recognizing that Amazonian history is more than a history of colonial domination punctuated by futile acts of resistance. The anthropologist Peter Gow puts it this way: native Amazonians "[did] things for their own reasons long before Europeans turned up," and they "continue[d] to do such things afterwards."[23] It is now a commonplace to assert that these were people who had agency, who engaged in self-directed action. But understanding their actions (and the meanings they assigned to them) requires more than abstract categories. Instead, we need to explore the deeper traditions that structured their choices—insofar as this is possible—and the social, political, and material circumstances under which they lived. We can then turn to the big-picture question of how local decision making affected larger systems of colonial governance.[24]

This book, then, examines the complexity and dynamism of native Amazonians' choices within a colonial context. It makes fruitful connec-

tions with the literature on native participation in Spanish American institutions and markets, much of it written by historians of the Andean highlands and central Mexico. In her introduction to the important edited book *Ethnicity, Markets, and Migration in the Andes*, Brooke Larson casts Indians' engagement in colonial markets as one part of a whole "ensemble of social reproductive strategies that allowed them to meet their multiple obligations to the state and their kinsmen, as well as to the church and the local deities, while providing for their immediate and future subsistence needs."[25] Another contributor, Steve Stern, suggests that Indians may have selectively interacted with European institutions in order to avoid more onerous types of service or to influence the terms of their participation in a system that was stacked against them.[26] In this light, relying on our familiar categories of voluntary or coerced becomes problematic. Kevin Gosner has recently tried to reframe the issue, in response to an earlier literature on Indians' involvement in colonial credit institutions (*repartimiento de comercio*) in Mexico. "We should recognize," Gosner writes, "that the *repartimientos*, and other systems that structured colonial economic and political relations, could be both empowering and alienating at the same time—it is the interplay in this dynamic that makes them so interesting."[27]

Understanding Indians' evident willingness to participate in some types of state-sponsored expeditions, one of the focal points of this book, thus requires an appreciation for paradoxical or ambiguous meanings. While individuals' motives often remain shadowy, I have tried to illuminate as fully as possible the contexts in which they acted and the consequences of action that they themselves would have considered. Ethnohistory, as a bridge between history and anthropology, has provided a methodology for writing about the lives of people who left very few documents of their own authorship, and who only rarely spoke through the writings of colonial scribes and notaries.[28] This has meant developing an acute awareness of what archival documents do and do not say. They tell incomplete stories, only those that their authors considered worthy of writing down, and they offer half-truths, with just one side enjoying access (however limited) to paper, pens, and a culture of literacy. But on-the-ground sources, the backbone of this study, can be read for purposes their authors never intended, and their record of native actions can be analyzed apart from the authors' interpretations of those actions. Whenever possible, and much more often than I initially expected, I also have drawn evidence from the

small and scattered corpus of sources that purport to quote or represent native Amazonian voices. These include testimonies taken in the course of official inquiries (Chapters 1, 2, and 5) and petitions to higher authorities (Chapters 3, 5, and 6). While mediated by the officials who recorded them and dwarfed in quantity by sources written from a colonial or European perspective, these testimonies and petitions have led to some of the main insights of this study.

In a recent essay, John Monteiro called for a "dialogue between processes highlighted in the study of contemporary communities and similar processes taking place during the colonial period."[29] Modern ethnographic accounts of native Amazonians suggest that decisions to be mobile—whether to go trekking or to resettle in a new area—have been shaped by sociocultural processes within indigenous societies and are not uniformly "imposed from without."[30] This was true of mobility during the colonial period, too, and I hope that my discussion of these parallel processes will invite anthropologists and other scholars to comment. Similarities also can be found between colonial Indians' strategies of selective economic engagement and those of contemporary Amazonian peasants. Enmeshed in regional and world markets, and moving frequently between rural and urban zones, modern-day ribeirinhos likewise seek to maintain a degree of autonomy and a measure of local control over community affairs and resources.[31]

In its approach to the study of mobility, this book goes beyond the traditional focus on counting and mapping physical movements. While some quantitative and geographical analysis is pertinent to my analysis (particularly to that of Chapters 4 and 5), the focus is on the experiences of mobile people and the ties they maintained with their home communities, as well as the relationships they built en route and at their destinations. In large part, this approach has been dictated by the historical sources themselves. These tend to be unreliable as statistical portraits of a population but rich in their details about smaller groups of migrants and their communities.

The Portuguese naturalist Alexandre Rodrigues Ferreira wrote evocatively of the eighteenth-century Amazon that "all of the people in it can be likened to Noah's family, in the middle of the post-flood world."[32] The impression of low population density is accurate, as long as we are speaking of the postcontact era.[33] But as Daniel Usner has pointed out for the lower Mississippi Valley during the eighteenth century, the standard image of territorial vastness and sparse occupation "not only exaggerates the

boundlessness of life in the valley" but also causes us to overlook important intraregional connections. Like their counterparts in other frontier regions of the colonial Americas, Amazonians spoke a lingua franca, intermarried, exchanged local products for liquor and metal tools, and built economic relationships that linked people across culture and social status.[34] They converged for popular events like saints' festivals and markets, gathered for conversation in taverns, and deliberated in town councils.[35] Diverse groups of people were always passing through the settlements of the interior; it is telling that as early as the 1680s, there were royal prohibitions on soldiers, sailors, mamelucos, and blacks entering the *sertão*, or hinterland rivers and forests.[36] Higher authorities considered this mix of people to be a dangerously unruly one, but the sertão could not be cordoned off by decree. Attempts to do so may have made it even more alluring.[37]

The Amazonian waterways that made these interior social networks possible form the largest and densest river system in the world, with more than 12,000 miles of navigable routes.[38] Amazonians past and present have shared an "intimate everyday relationship with rivers," using and manipulating these and other features of the landscape in complex ways. Since at least the eighteenth century, and probably long before that, Amazonians have dug channels to create shortcuts to other rivers; drained swamps; and deepened, widened, and cleared brush from waterways.[39] These routes were used intensively during the colonial period, varying in accordance with the seasonal economy. During the low-water period, from about August to January, people traveled in search of fish and turtles, which migrated from the flooded forest to the more accessible channels and lakes of the region. For weeks at a time in this "summer" season, fishermen and their families lived at camps along the exposed beaches of the floodplain, enjoying the company of other sojourners. The high-water season, from roughly February to July, was a time for venturing farther afield; during those months, when aquatic resources were more scarce, Indian villagers went on forest collecting expeditions and then delivered their products to the downriver capital of Belém. After returning to their villages, with river levels beginning to fall again, they prepared their homestead-gardens for planting.[40] Seasonal rhythms of mobility and fixity have long shaped native Amazonians' "ways of belonging on the land." [41] And as Indians mixed and intermarried with non-Indians, what developed in the colonial Amazon was a pattern of settlement that permitted, and even fostered, significant mobility.

Overview

If the second half of the eighteenth century was a time of relative stability for most of the povoações de índios in the core areas of the Pará and Rio Negro captaincies, the frontiers were another story—and one that Nádia Farage has already told in impressive detail for the Rio Branco region.[42] For this reason, I have left out of my analysis the cluster of povoações around the forts of São Joaquim (on the Rio Branco) and São José de Marabitanas and São Gabriel da Cachoeira (on the upper Rio Negro). Founded almost entirely on the basis of geopolitical considerations, these frontier settlements followed a very different historical trajectory than that of the former missions in the colonial core.

Frontier conflicts and conspiracies are, however, still important to the story told in these pages, because they provoked a host of new policies and priorities for the region as a whole. After the Treaty of Madrid (1750) between Spain and Portugal, controversies swirled over the implementation of the agreement and the demarcation of boundaries in the Amazon, and it was in this context that the Portuguese-settled portion of the basin became a prime target of imperial reforms. [43] Named after Portugal's powerful prime minister the Marquês de Pombal, the Pombaline reforms included economic initiatives, labor reforms, settlement and transportation experiments, and attempts at social engineering. A key element was the consolidation of a system of productive, European-style urban nuclei that would help guarantee Portuguese possession of the main channel of the Amazon River and its major tributaries. At the same time, these nuclei would serve as "civilizing" arenas for the Indians, who could then be more easily called upon to serve the state in exploring, defending, provisioning, and settling the frontier.[44]

The literature on the Pombaline reforms can give the impression that the Amazon was a blank slate before the reforms, and that almost overnight, by royal decree, the Amazon filled with new villages. The first chapter of the book offers a corrective to this version of Amazonian settlement history. It argues that what crown reformers did was significantly less ambitious and more pragmatic than historians have assumed: they appropriated what was already there, more than sixty missions that had been established by the Jesuits and three other religious orders. When the state came to the Amazon, in other words, it found colonial Indian communities that had a prior history and traced their identities to an earlier time and order of things. And in contrast to parts of Spanish America, where

parallel processes of secularization played out, the transition to civil administration in the Portuguese Amazon did not involve the divestment of communal assets.[45] It occurred smoothly in most of the former missions, because the índios aldeados found that they were able to maintain their old community lands and structures of village governance, as well as their dispersed patterns of settlement. The villagers also tended to resist subsequent, sporadic efforts on the part of colonial authorities to restrict their customary mobility.

Chapters 2 and 3 explore the ways in which índios aldeados fulfilled their service obligations under the Directorate system while following their own itineraries beyond the confines of the villages. Chapter 2 focuses on the state-sponsored collecting expeditions, which annually departed each village for the interior rivers and forests in search of cacao, sarsaparilla, and other wild products for export. The very nature of the collecting expeditions made close supervision impossible, and crewmen found ample opportunities to engage in contraband trade, to visit other settlements, and to mix with independent native groups and fugitives. Drawing evidence from the crewmen's own testimonies on the expeditions, Chapter 2 provides an explanation for why some índios aldeados evidently preferred to participate in this form of labor over other types of service.

Chapter 3 examines a different type of state-sponsored project that involved long-distance travel: the *descimento* (literally, "descent") of independent native groups to settle in the colonial villages. Many índios aldeados maintained friendly, long-term contacts with uncolonized groups in the interior, and the individuals responsible for bringing these groups into the colonial sphere often received royal privileges in exchange for what was seen as an important service to the crown. This chapter presents new evidence on the participation of colonial Indians as informants, sponsors, leaders, and hosts of descimentos, and it explains why they took such active roles in what has generally been portrayed as a missionary- or state-run enterprise.

Movements typically seen as manifestations of resistance to colonial rule and settlement are the focus of Chapter 4. When Directorate Indians absented their villages without permission, some were indeed seeking to leave the colonial system. Many others, however, were looking for incorporation on their own terms. The analysis of more than 200 village absentee reports reveals that significant numbers of people moved from one colonial Indian village to another. Supporting documentation suggests,

furthermore, that these intervillage movements were not arbitrary or spurred simply by external pressures. Instead, they were multiply determined by family and ethnic affiliation, labor preferences, and relationships with local officials (who often sponsored or condoned the relocations of absentees). This chapter links absentee movements with community formation by showing that village membership criteria remained flexible enough for these migrants to assume the privileges and obligations of enrolled residents, if they chose.

Chapter 5 departs from the rest of the book in focusing on Indians and people of mixed race who lived "*sobre si*"—literally, on their own, apart from the corporate Indian villages and without the tutelage of the directors. For the state, this population represented lost productivity, as they lived outside—and energetically dodged—the Indian labor distribution system based in the villages. As antivagrancy campaigns in the 1770s and 1780s attempted to force thousands of "hidden" or "dispersed Indians" to relocate to the povoações de índios, individuals devised novel ways to live where they wished and to control their own labor. The campaigns inadvertently weakened the entire system of Directorate villages, as most of the forced migrants fled back to their original homes or to new, informal communities, and petitions for exemptions from aldeado status increased.

By the end of the century, these changes in Indians' status and residence were institutionalized in the form of the Directorate's revocation. Chapter 6 describes the shift to a more assimilationist system of administration, in which colonial Indians were assigned the same legal status as other free vassals of the crown.[46] The system also depended on private initiatives, rather than crown sponsorship of corporate village enterprises. This final chapter examines the impact of the new legislation on the former índios aldeados and their descendants in the early nineteenth century and offers an explanation for why, a little over a generation after the end of the Directorate, nearly all of the old povoações de índios joined the side of the rebels in the Cabanagem Rebellion.

Note on Terminology

The term "Indian" (*índio*) is ubiquitous in colonial sources and thus appears throughout this study, despite its inaccuracy. I also employ the term "índio aldeado"—denoting legal status rather than ethnicity alone—with reference to people under colonial administration. This term is more

precise because some índios aldeados self-identified or were identified by others as racially mixed (mameluco or cafuzo), rather than Indian. Other groups who were sometimes lumped together as Indians and among whom I have tried to distinguish include *gentio* ("gentiles," or unconverted native groups), *gente nova* (literally, "new people," referring to Indians recently resettled in the colonial sphere), and members of specific *nações* (Indian "nations" recognized by the Portuguese). Whenever possible, I have used the terms and categories that appear in the sources themselves.

The regional terms "Amazonia" and "Amazonian" also require some qualification. The Amazon River's drainage basin traditionally delineates the boundaries of Amazonia, but at closer inspection we find that the macro-region favored by scholars actually encompasses river systems in the Guiana Shield that drain into the Atlantic, rather than the Amazon River. Amazonia also includes areas of the southern Caribbean and the Orinoco that feature "Amazonian" culture-bearing units or language groups, some of whom have historically chosen to enter the Amazon River's hydrographic system during the flood season. Furthermore, these regional identifications have changed over time, as cultural traits overlapped and influenced one another, commercial patterns evolved, social ties were established and then broken, and river systems converged seasonally.[47] In the pages that follow, I have relied on these and other macro-regional terms for lack of better alternatives. At the same time, I have tried to remain alert to what ambiguous borders and shifting zones of interaction might have meant to the people who lived, worked, and traveled along those routes.