

Funding Freedom, Popularizing Politics

Abolitionism and Local Emancipation Funds in 1880s Brazil

Celso Castilho and Camillia Cowling

Voltado às amplas repercussões da mobilização abolicionista dos anos 1880, este artigo ressalta os fundos de emancipação locais no Rio de Janeiro (Corte) e em Recife como espaços importantes para a articulação da política popular. Examinamos dois tipos de fundos locais, o primeiro criado por iniciativas populares no Recife e o segundo produto da câmara municipal da Corte. Salientamos, na primeira parte, que os significados políticos dos fundos de emancipação mudaram ao longo da década de 1880, esta trajetória um exemplo do percurso conturbado da política da abolição. Os fundos de emancipação locais também alteraram as dinâmicas tradicionais da política, modificando as interações entre as esferas locais e nacionais, entre grupos populares e a elite. Na segunda parte, analisamos as operações quotidianas dos fundos. O uso de rituais públicos e a procura de donativos locais estenderam o alcance dos fundos a setores sociais previamente afastados do processo político. Os próprios escravos, particularmente as escravas, utilizaram seu pecúlio, informações colhidas nas ruas, e o patrocínio de maneiras inovadoras para ganhar sua liberdade, ao invés de recebê-la passivamente, através dos fundos. Enfim, os fundos de emancipação merecem a atenção dos historiadores porque se intercalaram de maneira importante com outros fenômenos de pressão política e social, como fugas de escravos e lutas jurídicas, que transtornaram a política brasileira na década de 1880 e aceleraram o decreto da abolição da escravatura.

Introduction

In the northeastern Brazilian city of Recife in 1881, Maria, a domestic slave, sent a letter to João Ramos, secretary of the Sociedade Nova Emancipadora. One of a plethora of abolitionist societies springing up across Brazil in the early 1880s, the Nova Emancipadora operated a fund providing compen-

Luso-Brazilian Review 47:1

ISSN 0024-7413, © 2010 by the Board of Regents
of the University of Wisconsin System

89

sated slave emancipation. Like other enslaved people around the country, Maria was fully aware of the opportunities this presented. Her request to Ramos, whom she had apparently met before, was for a loan of 100 *mil-réis*, the amount she lacked from her savings to buy her freedom. She implored, in the name of “God, charity, and . . . his wife and little son,” that he remember what he had “promised” her. Underlining the difficulties of earning money for freedom, Maria added: “for a slave like me there is neither a holy day nor a Sunday when I can go out.” Her petition ended in anguish: “Sir, you cannot imagine how I live in this house, helplessly watching my master calling my three freed daughters slaves and beating them . . .”¹

A few years later in 1886, 1,500 miles to the south in the imperial capital, Rio de Janeiro, another mother, Maria Rosa, petitioned Empress Teresa Cristina, wife of Emperor Pedro II.² Teresa Cristina would shortly be presiding over the next of a series of lavish ceremonies held to free slaves through the Municipal Council’s emancipation fund, the *Livro de Ouro*. Although Maria Rosa was, unlike Maria, no longer a slave but “a poor black freed-woman,” like Maria she evoked her status as a mother to generate sympathy for her request. She asked that her enslaved daughter Ludovina, “a miserable child who is almost always ill and on the point of coughing up blood, and who has three young children,” be freed at the coming ceremony. Maria Rosa evoked Teresa Cristina’s family as well as her own, wishing Teresa long years of happiness “together with your August Family.”³

This article explores how local emancipation funds used by Maria and Maria Rosa became a central focus for the popular political participation that characterized Brazilian abolitionism, the collective efforts to end slavery that coalesced in the 1880s.⁴ The local emancipation funds were part of a concerted response to the delayed progress of the government’s program for gradual emancipation—the 1871 “Free Womb” Law.⁵ The law stated that children born to enslaved women after September 28, 1871 would be considered legally free. Furthermore, article three of the law stipulated the creation of a national emancipation fund to reduce the population of Brazil’s 1.5 million slaves.⁶ By the early 1880s, however, it was evident that the national emancipation fund had proved a feeble abolition strategy; it had freed less than one percent of the enslaved population during its first decade of operation.⁷ Abolitionists thus decried the crawling pace of the “Free Womb” Law, for under such an emancipationist framework, slavery would have endured well into the twentieth century.⁸

Abolitionists’ frustrations with the national fund have influenced how historians have dealt with – or, generally, not dealt with – the scores of private and municipal emancipation funds springing up across Brazil during the 1880s.⁹ During this decade, the funds were a fundamental part of the decentralized popular mobilization transforming the Brazilian political arena. Yet

the historiography on compensated emancipation has focused on the small number of manumissions achieved by the national government through the 1871 “Free Womb” law.¹⁰ Perhaps applying similar reasoning to the private and municipal funds, historians have assumed them unworthy of serious attention. Yet stories like those of Maria and Maria Rosa, and of the local emancipation funds entwined with their destinies, are surely worth hearing. They reveal intriguing, complex activities of social and political actors from across Imperial society, connecting slaves to abolitionists, municipal and national politicians and even the Imperial family. Women, both enslaved and free, were the funds’ principal beneficiaries and became important agents in the process of funding freedom. These stories are used here as a way of exploring a much broader social universe of abolitionist activities, and also serve to promote new inquiries about gender and abolitionism in Brazil.¹¹

This article uses the abolitionist practice of funding freedom to illuminate how popular mobilization for abolition both produced specific political change and broadened the political sphere generally in late-nineteenth-century Brazil.¹² It examines two varieties of local emancipation funds – the first, private initiatives by the abolitionist movement in Recife, and the second, a municipal-sponsored fund in Rio de Janeiro. It thus analyzes two different kinds of abolitionist pressure in two major urban contexts in very different regions of Brazil, each of which was linked to the other and to the unfolding context of parliamentary politics based in Rio de Janeiro.

The local funds emerged in a political context in which abolition remained highly contentious, the institution of slavery representing a bulwark of the Brazilian political edifice since independence.¹³ Pro-slavery elites continued to exercise a strong influence on national government policy in a country which, although undergoing rapid urbanization and marked by increased regional variation in slaveholding, remained predominantly rural and where landholding and political sway went hand in hand.¹⁴ Recife was at the center of the north-eastern sugar-producing province of Pernambuco, one of Brazil’s first enclaves of wealth and power based on slaveholding. Yet Recife, then Brazil’s third-largest city, also produced a strong urban abolitionist movement as well as politicians who shaped the national parliamentary anti-slavery agenda.¹⁵ Meanwhile, the rapidly-expanding national capital was at the heart of – but administratively separate from – the strongly pro-slavery coffee-producing province of Rio de Janeiro. Funding freedom stirred up long-standing political tensions within the Court city between the municipal council, the increasingly reactionary pro-slavery national government, and the imperial family itself. Thus, while local emancipation funds freed only small numbers of slaves, their potential for fuelling the charged political debate on slavery was tremendous. In each case, they spurred unprecedented levels of popular political participation and cre-

ated sites of local opposition as the national government continued to resist abolition.

Divided into two sections, the article first charts how the political ramifications of local emancipation funds changed as the national government's stance on abolition evolved over the 1880s. It then explores how the daily business of funding freedom expanded the political sphere through the use of broad local campaigns, emancipation rituals, and the participation of enslaved people and their relatives, such as Maria and Maria Rosa.

Local Emancipation Funds and Evolving National Politics

The practice of funding freedom was central to the development of an abolitionist movement in the 1880s. Composed of numerous groups that cultivated links with one another, the movement emerged locally in response to developments in national politics.¹⁶ Shifts in regional and national politics over the 1880s, however, lent different meanings to the use and significance of the local emancipation funds. In the early part of the decade, the funds were the movement's principal tool, the instrument used to marshal popular political participation and push for abolition in the face of the national government's recalcitrance. Popular political pressure in turn led local governmental bodies like Pernambuco's Legislative Assembly (1883) and the Municipal Councils of Recife (1884) and Rio (1884) to adopt their own funds in a relatively conservative bid to reassert control over the emancipation process. Yet in the mid-to-late 1880s, as the national government hardened its opposition to abolitionism, the local emancipation funds became sites of contestation in ways that their founders had not predicted.

A thwarted effort to establish a parliamentary path to end slavery provided the catalyst for a popular abolitionist movement. In August 1880, a young Liberal from Pernambuco, Joaquim Nabuco, attempted to introduce a bill before the Chamber of Deputies to establish 1890 as the year to terminate slavery. Opposed by most deputies across the political spectrum, Nabuco's bill was quashed before even reaching the floor. This failed attempt demonstrated Parliament's stern opposition to the idea of abolition and drove Nabuco to broaden his efforts, seeking change through popular pressure. Two weeks later, he presided over the formation of the Sociedade Brasileira Contra a Escravidão, the society generally credited with launching the national abolition movement. Founded on 7 September 1880, Independence Day, the Sociedade Brasileira Contra a Escravidão published a newspaper, *O Abolicionista*, circulating monthly from November 1880 to December 1881. The Sociedade Brasileira counted five deputies in the current legislature, two former provincial presidents, engineers, and naval officers among its members.¹⁷ A product of the Brazilian elite, these men nonetheless voiced

political views separating them from their social peers.¹⁸ The five deputies all lost their parliamentary bids for re-election in 1881, another example of the anti-abolitionism sentiment prevalent within traditional spheres of Brazilian politics.

The expansion and vitality of the abolitionist movement in the national capital depended on the involvement of popular sectors. The politicization of printers, railway conductors, journalists, and of medical, engineering, and military students helped catapult abolition onto a public stage. The movement in Rio evolved from a particularly volatile urban setting, and adopted a comparatively more combative tone than that which emerged in Recife. A number of Rio's abolitionist leaders, including José do Patrocínio, the fiery Afro-Brazilian journalist who assumed a central role locally and nationally, had participated integrally in the January 1880 riots over tramway fares, and a sharp sense of political protest informed their abolitionist activism.¹⁹ Popular unrest continued on Rio's streets, with a week-long strike by market vendors, marked by the vociferous presence of black women, in October 1885, drawing key abolitionist organizers into the debate.²⁰ The proliferation of popular republican groups in early 1880s Rio also created a more charged public political arena, as discussing abolition became, for many, intertwined with overthrowing the monarchy.²¹ The first abolitionist societies in Rio established emancipation funds to galvanize public opinion as well as manumit slaves.²²

In Recife, local abolitionist mobilization commenced around the same time as Nabuco formed his Sociedade Brasileira.²³ The Club Abolicionista do Recife, for example, initiated by students at the Recife Law School formed on August 11, 1880, the anniversary of the school's charter. Six weeks later, a group of middling merchants founded the Sociedade Nova Emancipadora, which alongside the Club Abolicionista set in motion the development of an abolitionist movement in early 1880s Recife. To be sure, these were not the first instances of antislavery activism in the northeastern capital city. The nineteenth-century chronicler, Francisco Augusto Pereira da Costa, noted that at least six antislavery societies had formed (and dissolved shortly thereafter) between 1860 and 1871, with some also organized by law students.²⁴ The abolitionist poet, Antônio de Castro Alves (1847–1871) and the future statesman, Rui Barbosa de Oliveira (1849–1923), were among the notable activists at the law school in the late 1860s, their antislavery positions an inspiration to later waves of student mobilization in the 1880s.²⁵ In contrast to the earlier precedents, however, the abolitionist societies of the 1880s envisaged themselves as an integral part of a larger, national movement. In Recife, as in Rio de Janeiro, politicians avoided the issue of slavery and abolitionism evolved instead from the Law School, where “. . . a commitment to the abolition of slavery formed part of the Brazilian law student ideal.”²⁶

Early Varieties of Local Emancipation Funds

The local emancipation funds operating in early 1880s Rio and Recife represented a criticism of the national government's faltering commitment to ending slavery; they showcased how local groups were outperforming the national government's emancipation fund. Nonetheless, the national government, while opposed to immediate abolition, did not attempt to suppress the abolitionist movement until 1886.

The Club Abolicionista's creation of an emancipation fund in Recife marked the early stirrings of a local movement. Counting nearly "fifty gentlemen among its membership", the Club Abolicionista emerged, like the Sociedade Brasileira, squarely from the elite but quickly pursued policies that broadened participation in its campaigns. Initially, the Club targeted mainly the student body for contributions to finance its local emancipation fund. With the donations secured over a six-week period, the Club Abolicionista helped free 16 slaves at its first public function, held as Brazil celebrated the anniversary of the 1871 "Free Womb" Law on September 28, 1880.²⁷ A harbinger of the intense abolitionist politicization of the law school in the 1880s, the Club Abolicionista's initial endeavor brought a range of students into contact with the movement, including many that were not originally from Pernambuco.

Quickly, the number of abolitionist societies in Recife swelled from two in late 1880 to 14 in 1883, all with their respective emancipation funds. Of these, 10 evolved from the law school, where students organized according to their regional backgrounds; those from Ceará, Maranhão, Sergipe, Rio Grande do Norte, and Pará, for example, formed abolitionist societies. With strong ties to their native provinces, these student groups were simultaneously engaged locally and regionally. The Pará students, for example, ran an emancipation fund in Recife, but in 1882 also petitioned their provincial government to abolish the inter-provincial slave trade.²⁸ The funds were a major part of the "new political style" developing across early 1880s urban Brazil, "taking politics to the city's streets and squares."²⁹ The politics of those streets and squares then influenced regional and national agendas.

The consolidation of the movement in Recife and its first major breakthrough occurred in 1883. The formation of the Central Emancipadora do Município do Recife, a federation of the abolitionist societies in the provincial capital, facilitated in July 1883 a successful public campaign to force the provincial government to intervene in the struggle for abolition by creating its own provincial emancipation fund.³⁰ This signified a notable shift in the local government's attitude toward abolitionism, the legislative assembly having previously completely ignored the antislavery campaign. Although

the 135 people freed via the provincial emancipation fund between 1883 and 1885 hardly signaled a precipitous drop in Pernambuco's mid-decade slave population of around 70,000, the measure underscored a reduced distance between the "politics of the street" and the "politics of the legislature."³¹

The political gains in Recife were echoed by abolitionist movements across the country in 1883 and 1884. In Rio, the *Confederação Abolicionista*, which unified over a dozen abolitionist societies in the imperial capital, formed in 1883. Its links to nationally-renowned abolitionists like José do Patrocínio and André Rebouças, and to international figures such as Antonio Maceo, Frederick Douglass, and Victor Schoelcher, showcased the *Confederação's* prominence.³² Meanwhile, in the northeastern province of Ceará, an unrelenting abolitionist movement surfaced in late 1880, which within three years had freed 28 of 57 municipalities.³³ The notion adopted in Recife that local government could and should enact policies to hasten the process of emancipation attested to the growing influence of the abolitionist movement.

Before long, the growth of Rio's popular movement spurred a similar initiative by the capital city's municipal government to "take a salient position within the emancipation movement" by adopting an emancipation fund.³⁴ In early 1884, as full abolition in Ceará was celebrated with huge street parties in Rio and around the country, the council set up its "Livro de Ouro" fund.³⁵ The brainchild of Conservative councilor José Ferreira Nobre, the fund had the explicit intent of ensuring "order", "within the limits of the law". Nobre evoked "the great national interests of agriculture and commerce."³⁶ Councilors did not use the word "abolition" until 1886, and even then, they differed significantly about the fund's purpose.³⁷ Yet from the start, the aim was to free all slaves in the *Município Neutro*.³⁸ Unlike in Recife, the abolitionist movement did not directly push for the *Livro de Ouro's* creation. The *Livro* was not a central focus for abolitionists, who, when they did discuss it, veered between praise and scorn as circumstances dictated. Yet the *Confederação Abolicionista* and council did collaborate with each other in funding freedom.³⁹ In a heated political context that was increasingly polarized around the abolition question, it was difficult for the council or its fund to remain neutral. Divided and instinctively conservative, councilors nonetheless became significant participants in the public debates over abolition.⁴⁰ Complicating matters further, councilors forged ties between the *Livro* and the imperial family. The Emperor signed the first page of the commemorative book that gave the *Livro* its name, and attended emancipation ceremonies along with his wife and their daughter, the heir to the throne, Isabel. The Fund became a source of tensions at the political heart of the Empire between the council, the local abolitionist movement, the monarchy, and the national government.

Local Emancipation Funds amid the Pro-Slavery Parliamentary Turn

Founded in May 1884, the *Livro* appeared at a seemingly hopeful moment for abolitionism. Amazonas would soon follow Ceará in abolishing slavery, and in June 1884 a reform ministry headed by Liberal Senator Manoel Pinto de Souza Dantas came to power, endorsing a bill, shocking to many, to free slaves over sixty *without compensation*.⁴¹ Yet a crisis in legitimacy saw Dantas replaced by another Liberal, José Antônio Saraiva, by early 1885. Saraiva differed greatly from Dantas, advocating less, not more, government involvement with abolition and eschewing the plan for (limited) uncompensated manumission. As the stalemate over the emancipationist bill continued, the emperor then chose the Conservative Bahian Senator, João Mauricio Wanderley, Baron of Cotegipe, to form what would be a steadfastly anti-abolitionist cabinet. Cotegipe oversaw the passage of the Sexagenarian Law in September 1885, a measure that in its terms and spirit hardly resembled the intent of the original Dantas bill.⁴² The final outcome infuriated abolitionists, especially in Rio, who called it a “monstrous, infamous project.”⁴³

Abolitionists’ frustrations with the new political context transformed the implications of emancipation funds. By July 1885, one municipal councilor, in light of the reactionary evolution of the Sexagenarian Law, now described the *Livro de Ouro* as “expressing, on the part of the first municipal council of the Empire, a protest in the name of civilization and liberty against a regime of oppression and opprobrium.”⁴⁴ Although founded as a conservative measure, during the Cotegipe era (August 1885–March 1888), the *Livro* now became emblematic of local political resistance at the nation’s very center.

After the passage of the Sexagenarian Law, Cotegipe continued to reverse previous abolitionist gains. In January 1886, he oversaw a particularly fraudulent election which removed all abolitionist politicians from parliament—including Joaquim Nabuco and José Mariano from Recife. In June 1886, Cotegipe’s cabinet approved a series of regressive regulations for the Sexagenarian Law, collectively dubbed the “Black Regulation” by abolitionists. Crucially, the “Black Regulation” effectively reopened the slave traffic between the imperial capital and the surrounding province of Rio de Janeiro after the Sexagenarian Law had banned the internal slave trade. This potentially exposed the Corte’s 30,000 remaining slaves to sale to coffee plantations.⁴⁵ It also allowed slaves to enter the city, undermining the Council’s intentions of ridding the Corte of slavery.⁴⁶ Amid a revived abolitionist campaign in Rio against the Regulation, José do Patrocínio turned to municipal politics as a platform from which to resist what abolitionists saw as

the iniquities of the Cotegipe ministry. In July 1886 he was elected municipal councilor with a sweeping majority.⁴⁷

After the Regulation and the elections, the Livro de Ouro finally helped ignite the long-standing tensions between the Municipal Council and the Imperial Cabinet to which it was subordinated. At the emancipation ceremony of July 29, 1886, in front of the Emperor and assembled cabinet dignitaries, the council's president, João Pereira Lopes, made an incendiary speech. Arguing that "the council cannot be indifferent to the will of the sovereign when he demonstrates desires that are in harmony with the people," he said the council was demanding freedom, "that sacred and inalienable right," which had been "stolen" from slaves.⁴⁸ He argued that "the regulation of June 12, which annexes the Corte to the province of Rio de Janeiro," would "delay abolition and hence the country's progress," and appealed directly to the Emperor to revoke it.⁴⁹ At the September 7 Independence Day ceremony later that year, as Nabuco and others campaigned nationally to draw attention to recent horrific punishments meted out to four slaves in Paraíba do Sul, of whom two had died, Lopes added his voice to the general condemnation and told the Emperor: "Your father proclaimed independence, and you will proclaim the extinction of slavery."⁵⁰ While subsequent and previous speakers at ceremonies returned to the more conservative language employed in earlier ceremonies, the overall evolution of the council's political position on the Livro de Ouro stoked the flames of abolitionism.⁵¹

In both Recife and Rio, as the national government resisted abolition during the 1880s, local emancipation funds – even when intended as moderate or conservative – became visible, active sites of abolitionist political opposition. Funding freedom became a tool in power struggles that emerged over the abolition question between local and parliamentary governments, the popular abolitionist movement, and the monarchy. The following section will explore some of the daily local practices of funding freedom, and their implications for popularizing politics.

Practices and Implications of Funding Freedom

By March 1883, Recife's various emancipation funds had freed around 500 slaves – about four percent of the municipality's 1882 enslaved population of 11,544.⁵² Rio's Livro de Ouro fund freed 797 slaves in a series of nine emancipation ceremonies held between 1885 and 1887. This represents only about three percent of the overall 1884–7 decrease in the city's enslaved population (which was due to mortality, manumission and the continued sale or transfer of slaves away from the city).⁵³ The funds, then, did not make a significant dent in either city's enslaved population.

Nonetheless, the process of funding freedom forged new links between abolitionism and the popularization of politics. Enslaved women were central participants in this process. The funds were explicitly designed to prioritize freeing women, especially younger women and those with children.⁵⁴ The funds' founders offered no explanations, as if the reasons were obvious. Freeing enslaved women reinforced paternalist mores and, more importantly, continued the "free womb logic" that had long formed the basis of emancipationist projects in Brazil, including the 1871 law.⁵⁵

The Politics of Ritual

Public ritual played a vital part in the workings of emancipation funds. The elaborate emancipation ceremonies staged in each city at times reinforced gradualism and "order," while at others, they contested social and political hierarchies. Reaching both elite and everyday spaces of urban life, the rituals embodied the political activism and public spectacle of Brazilian abolitionism.⁵⁶

From 1880 on, Recife's Club Abolicionista and Sociedade Nova Emancipadora organized evenings of pageantry to toast the achievements of their respective emancipation funds. These gala events featured theatrical and musical performances, culminating with the distribution of manumission certificates to slaves.⁵⁷ Over time, the ceremonies grew larger, as did the number of slaves freed. Whereas 16 slaves were freed in the first emancipation ceremony of 1880, by September 1883 hundreds of people gathered at the Santa Isabel Theater to enjoy both an evening's festivities and the freeing of 200 slaves.⁵⁸ Pernambuco's provincial government also assumed a larger ceremonial role over time, so that in 1883, it was a municipal judge who distributed the certificates of freedom. This use of public ritual, with the government now portrayed as the protagonists, aimed to reinforce a "properly" gradual and orderly way of ending slavery, preserving the idea of freedom as generously granted, not taken or won.⁵⁹

On the other hand, the early emancipation funds' mobilization around the anniversary of the 1871 "Free Womb" Law (September 28) also provided a challenge to the parliamentary government's agenda.⁶⁰ In preparing activities for a day the government wished to use to commemorate its own emancipation efforts, abolitionist societies built "a contestatory discourse out of the official one," as did other social movements in late nineteenth-century Latin America.⁶¹ In August 1882, as the Club Abolicionista commemorated its second anniversary, it published an open letter to the prime minister pressing the government to refocus attention on abolition. The letter made a pointed assessment of the effectiveness of local initiatives versus the national government's efforts: "[We] have freed close to one hundred slaves up to the

present. We have spent six hundred, eight hundred, and sometimes even more than one thousand *mil-réis* to manumit individual slaves; these figures are eloquent, compare them with the numbers of the Emancipation Fund Commission.⁶² The annual rituals underscored this element of criticism.

If criticism from the provinces was forceful, its impact was even harder to ignore in the national capital. The lavish Livro de Ouro emancipation ceremonies became a public and powerful anti-slavery symbol in the Corte. Held at the Municipal Palace on birthdays of imperial family members and the anniversary of Brazilian independence (September 7), the ceremonies performed the triple function of promoting abolition, the council, and the monarchy.⁶³ The rituals became “a repeated political fact to which the Crown itself was committed.”⁶⁴ A commemorative portrait of the first 1885 ceremony, commissioned by the council at the vast expense of 10 *contos de réis* – an amount that would have been enough to fund another emancipation ceremony in itself – demonstrated the hope that the rituals’ significance would be venerated in the city long after the crowd went home.⁶⁵ Yet regular caricatures of the ceremonies mocking the councilors and imperial family appeared in the city’s irreverent *Revista Illustrada* newspaper, contesting the very depiction and public memory of the rituals’ “invention of tradition.”⁶⁶

Like any political act, such rituals generated controversy. The municipal ceremonies in Rio during the later 1880s exposed the widening rifts between the municipal council, the imperial family, and the Cotegipe cabinet over slavery.⁶⁷ The council and Cotegipe’s minister of empire, Ambrósio Leitão da Cunha, Baron of Mamoré, faced off over the Livro de Ouro in 1886. The imperial family, although at odds with the ministry’s position, attempted to avoid a public confrontation.⁶⁸ Yet the significance of the family’s public role at Livro de Ouro ceremonies, with their every look and word commented on by the press, was not lost on anyone.⁶⁹

In April 1886, the council asked Princess Isabel to head a “ladies’ commission” to fundraise for the Livro de Ouro.⁷⁰ The Princess’s husband, the Conde d’ Eu, consulted Mamoré and was told brusquely that “the Cabinet does not advise that Her Highness the Imperial Princess lend the great prestige of her position” to the council’s initiatives, and “that she retain neutrality.” Mamoré said the council’s initiative “oversteps its mandate and cannot be approved by the Government” as it allegedly exceeded the limits of the 1885 Sexagenarian Law.⁷¹ Isabel and the Conde d’ Eu ceded to Mamoré’s concerns on this occasion. Historian Roderick Barman, examining this exchange, concluded that Isabel and her husband “played no part in this drama [the radicalization of abolitionism] that dominated public affairs during 1886.”⁷² Yet attention to funding freedom yields a different interpretation. Isabel’s public distribution of manumission certificates at earlier Livro de Ouro ceremonies reveals she had deliberately and visibly associated

herself with abolitionist causes since 1885. She continued to do so, against the express desires of imperial ministers, throughout 1887.⁷³

Ministers, infuriated by the Imperial Family's public attendance at emancipation ceremonies where councilors made strident antislavery speeches, soon plotted a fittingly public revenge.⁷⁴ Protocol dictated that the Imperial Family be accompanied at ceremonies by a cortège of dignitaries, including, crucially, the ministers of Empire and Agriculture.⁷⁵ Following Pereira Lopes' overt protest over the "Black Regulation" at the July 1886 ceremony, Mamoré failed to attend the next ceremony on September 7 (Independence Day) 1886. In December that year, on Pedro's own birthday, not a single one of his ministers attended. The newspapers pounced gleefully on these public humiliations for the monarch, using the episodes to criticize both the total refusal of the ministry to concede to abolitionist pressure and the weak position of the Emperor himself.⁷⁶

Rituals were political in other senses too. The act of having an enslaved person kneel and receive a certificate, chiming with the imagery of abolitionist societies across the Atlantic World, both underscored and in some ways contested social hierarchies.⁷⁷ It involved publicly performing ties of patronage and symbolically promising future obedience from slaves and benevolence from manumitters, as elites fretted over long-held fears of violence or vagrancy following abolition.⁷⁸ The act echoed similar ceremonies sponsored by the *national* emancipation fund, with one vital difference. In the national fund's ceremonies, slaves' owners handed them the certificates.⁷⁹ The local funds replaced slaveholders with outside figures of authority. Princess Isabel, local judges, and sometimes abolitionists themselves gave out the certificates, at once performing the benevolent heroism they believed they possessed and recasting an "official" ritual as a "contestatory" one by removing slave owners from the stage.

Thus, while the imagery of gratitude was still strongly present at local funds' ceremonies, it shifted from the owner-slave relationship towards wider social ties of patronage. This publicly confirmed the uncomfortable political consequence of the 1871 "Free Womb" Law for slaveholders: the increased power of outside individuals and of the state to intervene in what slaveholders preferred to see as a purely private relationship with their slaves.⁸⁰ Slaves, of course, had long appealed to both the state and individual allies in their struggles with owners, and were now doing so in increased numbers.⁸¹ Maria Rosa, in Rio de Janeiro, followed a tradition of slaves seeking monarchical patronage. Appeals like hers increased the tensions between the monarchy and the Cotegipe cabinet over abolition. Slaves like Maria, in Recife, had opened possibilities for freedom by actively mobilizing – not passively receiving – patronage, that staple of Brazilian political culture.⁸²

Patronage mattered significantly when abolitionist societies or municipal councilors pored over lists of potential slaves to be freed. Prisciano de

Albuquerque Lins, a sugar planter who had ceremoniously freed his slaves in 1874, requested a favor from João Ramos of the Nova Emancipadora in June 1881. He explained that Eustaquio, a free *pardo*, needed 200 *mil-réis* to complete a suit to free his daughter, Nympha. The Nova Emancipadora's president suggested they comply "not just because the amount was small, but mainly because Major Prisciano was a worthy citizen and behaved well toward slaves."⁸³ Similarly, before the Club Abolicionista's 1881 meeting to select the slaves it would free, a letter to the *Jornal do Recife* demanded that the slave Rufina not be overlooked in favor of better "connected" slaves. The letter illustrated how much it mattered who advocated on one's behalf.⁸⁴ It also underscored slaves' persistent efforts toward their own freedom, even if overlooked by emancipation-fund committees.

Funding Freedom

Unlike the government-sponsored national emancipation fund, the activities necessary to finance local emancipation funds forged links between the abolitionist movement and a wide variety of local actors. In both Rio and Recife, funds came largely from donations and business connections.⁸⁵ For its first event, the Nova Emancipadora secured a special presentation of a theatrical performance from a traveling theater company, with all proceeds allocated to the emancipation fund.⁸⁶ Concerts, bazaars, and other public events were also held in Rio for the Livro de Ouro.⁸⁷ Rio's Municipal Council levied a one *mil-réis* tax for the Livro upon municipal residents who had the means to pay it.⁸⁸ This brought accusations that the tax monies, like most municipal funds, were being mismanaged by a council so notorious for corruption that it had previously been labeled "a municipal mudhole." In Rio, the issue of slave emancipation thus rapidly spilled over into broader questions about the workings of local government.⁸⁹

Voluntary local donations, a significant source of cash for each fund, drew on a broad range of contributors. Recife's Club Abolicionista initially sought donations from professors and students at the Recife Law School, from which many members came. Soon, their efforts expanded, with commissions of young men soliciting donations in the city's largest neighborhoods: Recife, Boa Vista, São José, and Santo Antônio. The commissions were raising popular awareness of their cause as well as money. The results were published in the newspapers, filling several columns with the small amounts contributed by a broad base of donors. On seeing their names in print in association with abolitionism, ordinary people were drawn in, helping pull the movement away from the formal political arena to become a public, social concern. Rio's Municipal Council also used local commissions of councilors, justices of the peace and police commissioners' deputies to raise money in specific neighborhoods, echoing urban abolitionist strategies

of targeting particular streets or areas.⁹⁰ Funding freedom was internationally visible too – a donation of five pounds was even sent from London.⁹¹

Donations had implications for local politics far beyond the aim of freeing slaves. Donations to the Livro de Ouro were, for example, a way of gaining favors from the council. In June 1886, the Companhia Industrial Fluminense asked that the council reconsider a decision to remove its stall from a city street, where it had apparently been obstructing traffic. Pleased with the offer of 500 *mil-réis* “made spontaneously by the petitioner for the Livro de Ouro,” councilors decided that the stall would not pose such a traffic obstruction after all.⁹² When Francisco Machado de Freitas, who sold onions at the Praça do Mercado, decided he wanted to sell fresh fish as well, he offered the council 500 *mil-réis* for “municipal education and the Livro de Ouro.” Councilors only partially granted his request, allowing him to sell dry fish only, but accepted his donation.⁹³

Funding freedom provided ways to bolster male donors’ public profiles and political or business careers.⁹⁴ Donors and uncompensated manumitters, especially those making large contributions, were almost all male in each city. Elite men were more likely than women to have both disposable income of their own and the incentive of a public career that could be bolstered though public munificence. Yet women did feature disproportionately among owners who freed slaves in exchange for compensation from the funds. Such owners usually freed one or two slaves each, mirroring patterns of urban slaveholding where many people owned only a few slaves for essential domestic or day-wage labor.⁹⁵ In each city, women made up about 50% of these manumitters – a far higher figure than women’s proportion among slaveholders overall.⁹⁶ Manumitting one’s slave was also possibly seen as a “womanly” action, intertwined with growing “feminized” notions of charity.⁹⁷ Given women’s scant employment opportunities and large numbers of single or widowed women, the decision to manumit may also reflect many women’s poverty. This might tempt them into making a quick profit by selling their remaining slaves while they were still worth anything before abolition, even when they depended on their labor.⁹⁸ Women were also simply more likely to own female slaves, often using them within their own feminized labor activities.⁹⁹ Whatever the explanations, the sex ratios of donors and manumitters suggest new questions about gender, slaveholding, and abolitionist activities that demand the attention of future researchers.

Saving Slaves

Most slaves kneeling “gratefully” to receive their certificates at the ceremonies had in some measure provided for their own freedom. They achieved

this with the tools that any political actor in imperial society needed, strategically deploying not just patronage but also information and cash.

Slaves were well aware of the funds' existence. Along with public rituals, constant publicity in local newspapers kept funds in the public eye. The funds' organizers assumed written publicity would reach the enslaved as well as their owners. In September 1880, Recife's Club Abolicionista explicitly invited "all slaves who meet the existing criteria to submit petitions for freedom." Livro de Ouro advertisements did not mention slaves themselves, but councilors receiving multiple slave petitions knew that slaves were aware of the possibilities the fund offered them. Officially, literate slaves – especially women – were extremely rare. Yet through multiple connections to free(d) people in work, family and on the street, urban slaves had long gained access to the tools of written culture to access manumission in Brazil, as elsewhere in Latin America. Petitions about the funds coming from far beyond Recife's and Rio's urban boundaries suggest these information networks were much wider than the cities in which the funds operated.¹⁰⁰

Once slaves knew about the funds, they needed to turn knowledge into action. Funding freedom depended on negotiation between funders, slaves, and owners. Because the 1871 "Free Womb" law only obliged slaveholders to free slaves who could provide full remuneration for their established value, enslaved people who needed a third party's contribution to make up their price had to advocate their cases to owners and others. A key mechanism was the use of petitions, often made directly by slaves at abolitionist societies' meetings. Three hundred such appeals were recorded by Recife's Nova Emancipadora from 1881 to 1884, implying that a very large proportion of slaves freed had made a significant effort toward attaining that freedom. Although actual surviving petitions like those of Maria and Maria Rosa are rare, we can assume they represent the tip of a much larger iceberg of slave activity under the surface of funding freedom and of the historical record.¹⁰¹

Recife's slaves – mainly women – provided the bulk of their indemnization prices (see Table 1). The sole surviving list of slaves freed located to date yields insights into slaves' roles in the manumission process. The Club Abolicionista, in its 1881–1882 emancipation fund campaign, adhered closely to its guidelines regarding gender, as 30 of the 33 slaves selected (91%) were women, mainly in their twenties or thirties. Only four of the women – and none of the three men – freed were over 50. On average, women's savings accounted for 71% of their total indemnization price. In some cases, it was even higher – one Maria, aged 50, furnished 500 *mil-réis* of her 580 *mil-réis* price (86%).¹⁰² In a sense, such women followed a longer tradition of self-purchase, widely practiced before 1871. Yet after this date, self-purchase took on new meanings: owners whose slaves possessed enough money to free themselves no longer had the right to prevent them from doing so.

This represented a tremendously significant political shift in the balance of power between owners, slaves and the state. The financial contributions of the enslaved to “funding freedom” took on a powerful new meaning in this altered context.¹⁰³

Data on slaves’ contributions to manumission through Rio’s Livro de Ouro were not kept by the council, but evidently slaves’ savings and bargaining initiatives, especially those of women, were central to the process of funding freedom.¹⁰⁴ In November 1887, aware of the approaching December emancipation ceremony, a young enslaved woman, Josepha, proposed a deal to the council. She requested 200 *mil-réis* from the council, to be added to her 100 *mil-réis* savings, making up the 300 *mil-réis* price claimed by her owner’s heirs.¹⁰⁵ After an apparent bargaining process, Josepha was finally freed for only 150 *mil-réis*, of which price her savings represented two thirds.

Josepha was one of 766 people freed with compensation in Rio by the Livro de Ouro, 76% of whom were women (see Table 2).¹⁰⁶ Notably, the existence of a sizeable male minority contradicted the council’s intentions of targeting women. The percentage of women decreased over time, from 100% in the first ceremony in July 1885, to only 57% by the sixth ceremony of September 1886. Soon afterwards, councilor Germack Possolo protested that “the number of those being freed of the male sex almost leveled with those of the other sex, when the spirit of the municipal emancipations has the opposite intention.” The council resolved to free only female slaves, and especially those with children, in future.¹⁰⁷ The following ceremony freed 100% women. Yet by the last two ceremonies in 1887, 44% and 35% men respectively were freed. This may be because, in a city whose households functioned on the basis of mainly female domestic labor, anxiety about post-abolition labor was considerable.¹⁰⁸ Some owners perhaps chose to keep valued female domestic slaves and manumit men.

Also contradicting the council’s aims, most women freed in Rio were childless. Those who were mothers usually had only one child.¹⁰⁹ It may not have been possible to find enough mothers whose owners wished to manumit them. Rio’s enslaved women had low fertility rates and child-rearing was difficult for domestic servants.¹¹⁰ Owners were also probably reluctant to lose *ingênuos*’ labor by freeing their mothers, just as they resisted the option offered by the 1871 law of turning these children over to the state.¹¹¹ Nonetheless, most women freed in each city were certainly of childbearing age. Their future potential to give birth to the first fully “free” generation of Brazilians lay at the heart of the decision to free them, despite the difficulties, possibly created by the urban labor market, of putting it into practice. Motherhood, simultaneously, informed the petitions and initiatives of many women like Maria and Maria Rosa. Through rituals and practices of funding freedom, emancipation funds became a stage on which local political actors shaped the daily dramas of national politics.¹¹²

Conclusion

The study of local emancipation funds sheds important new light on the dynamics of abolitionism as well as on pervasive broader changes within the practice of politics in 1880s Brazil. Long (mis)judged because of the relatively low numbers of slaves freed, emancipation funds highlighted two key features of abolition: a vibrant, often antagonistic, interchange between local and national politics that belies any simplistic idea that Brazilian nineteenth-century politics was made from the capital city outwards, and a constant interplay between abolitionist projects and the organic involvement of a wide public including the enslaved themselves, making funding freedom much more than simply a “top-down” abolitionist initiative.

The political implications of local emancipation funds shifted over the 1880s, reflecting and influencing the larger ebbs and flows of 1880s antislavery politics. Initially, mobilization around criticism of the national emancipation fund made local funds emblematic features of abolitionist activism across Brazil. Around 1883–85, amid the polarizing of both national government and abolitionist positions, the connotations of local funds changed. Even as a more confrontational abolitionist posture began to cast the idea of compensated emancipation in a comparatively conservative light, the proslavery turn in national politics made local emancipation funds an important source of opposition.

The popular mobilization and creative pursuits for freedom connected to the local funds ensured not principally the decline of the slave population, but rather the broadening of the political sphere. Diverse social groups, historically outside political debates, pushed the agenda of abolition in new localized directions. Participating in “funding freedom” by mobilizing patronage and petition, information, and savings, ordinary people – and especially women like Maria and Maria Rosa – created new political spaces amid everyday routines, advancing a cause the national government preferred to ignore.

Such politics were made locally and felt nationally. Yet they were also commented on internationally. Speaking in Madrid to the Spanish Abolitionist Society shortly after both Spain and Brazil had passed their respective “Free Womb” laws in 1870 and 1871, university professor Salvador Torres Aguilar said the Brazilian law went further in curtailing slavery than did Spain’s 1870 Moret Law. He described how actions outside parliament, including those of early emancipation societies, had helped put the Brazilian 1871 law on the political agenda. This law itself, he said, provided for both national and private initiatives for compensated manumission. He contrasted this with rigidly-controlled colonial Cuba and Puerto Rico, where the Spanish government “does not imitate the Brazilian government in putting itself, as it ought, at the head of this noble propaganda; in the Antilles, the existence of emancipation societies is prohibited; [...] there is no press freedom for

abolitionists . . .” He added bitterly: “Do you think . . . the things we discuss and do here . . . are even known about in the Antilles? Do you think we can communicate with the slaves, whose benefit we are seeking? No!”¹¹³

While it is beyond the scope of this article to evaluate Torres Aguilar’s comparisons in detail, it is instructive to view Brazilian processes of funding freedom through the eyes of activists in Spain, the other New World power that retained slavery into the 1880s.¹¹⁴ While Brazilian abolitionists condemned the national emancipation fund’s inefficiency, used local funds to mobilize popular opinion and “communicate with the slaves, whose benefit we are seeking” and eventually started rejecting compensated emancipation altogether, their peers on the other side of the Atlantic noted their own inability to imitate such developments in Puerto Rico and Cuba. Joaquim Nabuco, greeted rapturously by the Spanish Abolitionist Society in a Madrid trip in January 1881, complained of the limitations of Brazil’s 1871 law. Spanish abolitionist Rafael de Labra countered him, wishing circumstances in Cuba were more like those of Brazil, and asking: “[W]ould it not be legitimate to ask the powers of the State to permit, in Cuba . . . , the formation of societies that could contribute to the great work of redeeming the slave, whether by exciting abolitionist opinion, [or] fomenting partial manumissions . . . ?”¹¹⁵

Meanwhile, in 1880s Brazil, enslaved people and their free allies would shape funding freedom in ways that emancipation funds’ founders had not predicted, building not just “freedoms given” but “freedoms won.”¹¹⁶ The new spaces for political action opened by the process of funding freedom also helped different participants define what that freedom meant.¹¹⁷ In Madrid, Nabuco had grandly declared the need to “give a fatherland” to Brazilian slaves. Most freedmen and all freedwomen would continue, after abolition, to be denied active political citizenship.¹¹⁸ Yet the experiences of funding freedom would not be forgotten with abolition in 1888 or the declaration of a republic in 1889. Rather, future studies will perhaps reveal how they would provide non-elite Brazilians with tools for participating in political life despite poverty and marginalization. As the experiences of funding freedom would not be forgotten by participants, so they deserve to be remembered by today’s historians of Brazil.

Appendix 1: Transcripts of Letters by Maria and Maria Rosa

Maria to João Ramos, Recife, s/d [approx. 1881]

Senhor

João ramos eu Maria escrava de vossa Senhoria pesso lhe pelo amor de Deus e pela caridade e pela vida de toda sua familia e pela vida de sua mulher e seu filinho que não se esqueça do que me prometeu

Vosce bem pode qualquer ora que uma escrava como eu não ha dia Santo nem domingo nem da que posso sair
 Não tenho de quem me valer nem tenho quem vala com sem milreis emprestado para depois eu pagar
 Eu pesso a vossa Senhoria que me arrange os sem milreis emprestado que eu depois pago com o meu trabalho
 O senhor não se imagina como eu vivo nesta casa vendo minhas tres filhas forras o senhor dizeres que ellas são cativas e serem espancadas sem eu poder dar remedio.
 S (or) João ramos eu lhe pesso pelo amor de Deus que vosce me fasa esta caridade eu Maria escrava de vossa senhoria

Maria Rosa to Teresa Cristina, Empress of Brazil, Rio de Janeiro, 6 March 1886:

A Sua Magestade Imperatriz do Brazil. Rio de Janeiro.

Magestade,

É uma pobre negra liberta que atreve-se hoje humildemente vir impetrar aos pes de Vosso throno a Imperial Clemencia de Vossa Magestade.

Na fausta recorrenca do Vosso anniversario, com a mais honravel intenção a Cammera Municipal da Côte vai consolar a uns pobres infelizes a quem deve sorrir a aurora da liberdade esta festa da humanidade com que a Illma Cammera quer solemnizar Vosso anniversario, deve fazer estremeçer de jubilo o Vosso Magnanimo Coração porque demasiadas provas ja destes do Vosso amor è da Vossa caridade pela infeliz classe dos escravizados. Pois bem senhora; eu so mãe de uma infeliz criatura a qual esta quase sempre infirma á ponto de butar [brotar] sangue pela bocca, e com tres filhos menores e ainda sob o jugo do captiverio e espero que Vos dignareis indicar o nome d'ella a Illma. Cammera Municipal, a fim de que possa entrar no numero d'aquelles que no dia 14 corrente irão obter a liberdade sob o Vosso Augusto Patrocinio. Minha filha Ludovina, natural do Rio de Janeiro, tem 38 annos é escrava do Dr José Perreira Peixotte.

Eis o que implora essa pobre mãe á Magnanimidade de V.M., ao mesmo tempo que faz votos afim de que este fausto anniversario se repita ainda por muitos e longos annos, sempre acompanhado da felicidade que tanto mereceis, juntamente a Vossa Augusta Familia.

A liberta Maria Rosa.

Rio de Janeiro 6 de Março de 1886

Appendix 2: Slaves Freed through Recife's and Rio's Emancipation Funds

Table 1. Slaves Freed by the Club Abolicionista's Emancipation Fund, 1881–1882

	N. of Slaves Freed	Average Age	Average Value ^a	Average Slave Peculium	Slave Peculium as Average % of Value
Women	30	34	336	241	71
Men	3	28	370	270	73
Total	33	33	339	244	72

Source: *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 5 October 1882, 2. The data corresponds to 29 September 1881 – 28 September 1882.

Table 2. Slaves Freed by the Livro de Ouro Municipal Emancipation Fund, 1885–1887^b

	Number of slaves freed	Average Age	Average Price ^a
Women with children	116	29	N/A
Women without children	418	30	N/A
Total women	582	30	241
Total men	184	32	210
Total	766	30	234

Sources:

Ceremony 1 (29 July 1885): *Boletim* (29 July 1885): 29

Ceremony 2 (7 Sept 1885): *Boletim* (10 September 1885): 115–117

Ceremony 3 (2 December 1885): *Gazeta de Notícias* (2 December 1885), 1

Ceremony 4 (14 March 1886): *Boletim* (18 March 1886): 122

Ceremony 5 (29 July 1886): AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.1.61, 29 July 1886, 74

Ceremony 6 (7 September 1886): *Boletim* (16 September 1886): 89–93

Ceremony 7 (2 December 1886): *Gazeta de Notícias* (3 December 1886): 2

Ceremony 8 (7 September 1887): AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.1.41, 7 September 1887, 44

Ceremony 9 (2 December 1887): *Boletim* (2 December 1887): 69

^a In mil-réis.

^b The data represents slaves freed with compensation to owners where data was available for each ceremony. Slaves freed gratis, who represented about 4% of slaves manumitted, have not been included.

Notes

The authors wish to thank the staff of the Arquivo Geral da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro (especially Ana Lucia Bulcão) and the Arquivo Público Estadual de Pernambuco. We thank the Institute for the Study of Slavery (University of Nottingham, UK), the Leverhulme Trust (UK), the University of California, Berkeley, and the Fulbright Commission for research funding. Thanks to the following people, who were kind enough to read and comment on various incarnations of the manuscript: Brandi Brimmer, Jane-Marie Collins, Mark Cowling, Marshall Eakin, Dick Geary, Jorge Giovannetti, Scott Ickes, Tony Kapcia, Hendrik Kraay, Jane Landers's "Comparative Slavery" seminar, Linda Lewin, Ivana Stolze Lima, Jessica Long, Hebe Mattos, Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, Mariza de Carvalho Soares, Camilo Trumper, and Edward Wright-Rios.

1. Maria to João Ramos, n.d., [approximate date, 1881] Instituto Arqueológico Histórico e Geográfico Pernambucano (hereafter, IAHG), Coleção João Ramos (hereafter, CJR). It is unclear whether this letter, authored in the first person, was written by Maria herself or whether she had a literate acquaintance or scribe pen it for her. The same uncertainty exists for writings of most non-elite Brazilians, as discussed throughout this article and beyond. On slaves' use of writing, see Sandra Lauderdale Graham, "Writing from the Margins: Brazilian Slaves and Written Culture," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49:3 (2007): 611–36.

2. In this article, "Rio de Janeiro" denotes the city of Rio de Janeiro rather than the province surrounding it, unless otherwise stated. "Corte" and "Município Neutro," contemporary terms for the city, are also used interchangeably.

3. Maria Rosa to Empress Teresa Cristina, Arquivo Geral da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro (henceforth AGCRJ), Coleção Escravidão, Emancipação (henceforth E:E), Book 6.1.41, 6 March 1886, 35.

4. Conceptual differences distinguish abolitionism from emancipationism. Unlike the former which referred to popular mobilization to end slavery, the latter entailed programs aimed at curtailing the expansion of slavery. Emancipationist measures came to reflect the position of the national government, which, until the final abolition law of May 13, 1888, never endorsed a project that affixed a terminal date for slavery. "Antislavery" in this article connotes attitudes critical of slavery. Such beliefs are as old as the institution itself, yet during the 1880s popular sectors transformed antislavery sentiment into collective, abolitionist action aimed at ending the institution. Our understanding of these terms is indebted to Christopher Leslie Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 17, and Célia Maria Azevedo, *Abolitionism in the United States and Brazil: A Comparative Perspective* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1995), 34.

5. We use quotation marks to reflect the fact that the law was not immediately recognized as the "Free Womb Law" at the time. The exact legal status of enslaved women's wombs was left undefined by the law and was instead negotiated in complex ways afterwards. This had vital political implications for the status of this generation of children, who gradually became known as "ingênuos." We retain the

term because in retrospect it has become the general shorthand for this law. See Sidney Chalhoub, *Machado de Assis, historiador* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2003), 171–82, 266–9.

6. For the translated text of the 1871 law, see Robert Conrad, *The Destruction of Brazilian Slavery, 1850–1888* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 305–9.

7. Evaristo de Moraes, *A campanha abolicionista, 1879–1888*, 2nd ed. (Brasília: Editora da Universidade de Brasília, 1986 [1924]), 24.

8. Joaquim Nabuco, *O abolicionismo*, facsimile ed. (Recife: Editora Massangana, 1988 [1883]), 207.

9. For examples of local funds in Porto Alegre, Paraíba do Norte, Petrópolis, Paraíba do Sul, and Bahia respectively, see Roger Kittleson, “Women and Notions of Womanhood in Brazilian Abolitionism,” in *Gender and Slave Emancipation in the Atlantic World*, eds. Pamela Scully and Diana Paton, 99–140 (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 102; “Assambleia Legislativa Provincial da Parahyba do Norte,” (30 July 1887), Arquivo Nacional, IJJ9 571, 34; “Livro de Ouro da Câmara Municipal de Petrópolis,” Arquivo Histórico do Museu Imperial em Petrópolis (henceforth AHMIP), CMP 17, 1884–1888; *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 5 February 1884, 2; Wlamyra R. de Albuquerque, *O jogo da dissimulação: abolição e cidadania negra no Brasil* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2009), 81–93.

10. Conrad, *Destruction*, 104–05, 110–16; Maria Lúcia Lamounier, “Between Slavery and Free Labour: Experiments with Free Labour and Patterns of Slave Emancipation in Brazil and Cuba c.1830–1888” (Ph.D. diss., London School of Economics, 1993), 300–6; Emília Viotti da Costa, *The Brazilian Empire: Myths and Histories*, revised ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 165. For a reassessment of the national emancipation fund, see Fabiano Dauwe, “A libertação gradual e a saída viável: os múltiplos sentidos da liberdade pelo fundo de emancipação de escravos” (M.A. diss., Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, 2004), 9–33.

11. The involvement of women and discourses of gender in Brazilian abolitionism have both received some attention from historians, but remain relatively under-researched. See Camillia Cowling, “Debating Womanhood, Defining Freedom: The Abolition of Slavery in 1880s Rio de Janeiro,” forthcoming; Kittleson, “Women and Notions of Womanhood,”; Roger A. Kittleson, “Campaign of All Peace and Charity: Gender and the Politics of Abolitionism in Porto Alegre, Brazil, 1846–1888,” *Slavery and Abolition*, 22 (2001): 83–108; Luzilá Gonçalves Ferreira, “A luta das mulheres pernambucanas,” in *Suaves Amazonas: Mulheres e abolição da escravatura no nordeste*, eds. Luzilá Gonçalves Ferreira et. al. (Recife: Editora UFPE, 1999), 41–110; June E. Hahner, *Emancipating the Female Sex: The Struggle for Women’s Rights in Brazil, 1850–1940* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1990). Wiebke Ipsen’s dissertation also highlights elite women’s role in charity and public ceremonies during the Paraguayan War. See Ipsen, “Delicate Citizenship: Gender and Nationbuilding in Brazil, 1865–1891,” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Irvine, 2005).

12. A source of historiographical debate for over a century, the role of the abolitionist movement within the process of emancipation has been, at different times, exalted, ignored, or disparaged. Our intention is clearly not to aggrandize or contribute to the myth-making of the movement in general or of any figures in par-

ticular; instead, we suggest that the movement provides a framework to approach, together, the social and political dimensions of abolition. For a recent review of the Brazilian abolition historiography that notes a renewed need to study the abolitionist movement, see Barbara Weinstein, "The Decline of the Progressive Planter and the Rise of the Subaltern Agency: Shifting Narratives of Slave Emancipation in Brazil," in *Reclaiming the Political in Latin American History: Essays from the North*, ed. Gilbert Joseph (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), 84.

13. See Ilmar Rohloff de Mattos, *O tempo Saquarema* (São Paulo: Hucitec, 1987). Also, Márcia Regina Berbel and Rafael de Bivar Marquese, "The absence of race: slavery, citizenship, and pro-slavery ideology in the Cortes of Lisbon and the Rio de Janeiro Constituent Assembly (1821–4)," *Social History*, 32:4 (November 2007): 415–33.

14. Richard Graham, *Patronage and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Brazil* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 16.

15. For a comprehensive view of the politics of antislavery in Pernambuco, see Celso Castilho, "Abolitionism Matters: The Politics of Antislavery in Pernambuco, 1869–1888," (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2008).

16. Among important works on the interplay between national and local movements in Brazilian abolitionism see Azevedo, *Abolitionism*, 6–7, Conrad, *Destruction*, 183–209; Robert Toplin, *The Abolition of Slavery in Brazil* (New York: Atheneum, 1972), 194–246; Moraes, *Campanha*, 37–53 and 185–230.

17. For a reprint of the failed Nabuco bill see *O abolicionista* (Rio de Janeiro), 1 January 1881, 6. For the parliamentary session see Joaquim Aurelio Barreto Nabuco de Araujo, August 24, 1880, *Annaes do Parlamento Brasileiro. Câmara dos Senhores Deputados* (henceforth ACD), Sessão de 1880:3 (Rio de Janeiro: Typographia Imperial & Constitucional de J. Villeneuve & Cia., 1880), 336. On the founding members of the Sociedade Brasileira, see Rebecca Baird Bergstresser, "The Movement for the Abolition of Slavery in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1880–1889" (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1973), 100–3.

18. Broadly, we agree with Célia Maria Azevedo about important differences between abolitionism in the U.S. and Brazil. Arguing that Brazilian abolitionists were a Eurocentric elite divorced from the majority population of color around them was useful for her comparative argument and in order to correct a previous tendency to "canonize" abolitionist figures, addressed in Célia Maria Azevedo, "Quem precisa de São Nabuco?" *Estudos Afro-Asiáticos*, 23:1 (January June 2000): 84–97. Yet the generalization risks oversimplifying complex Brazilian political developments in the 1880s. It obscures the major political differences among the elite; the alliances and connections, however unequal, between the elite and the population of color; and the emerging urban groups that do not comfortably fit either classification. Here, we are interested in highlighting emerging spaces for political action by a broad range of people spanning elites and non-elites – actions that did involve connection, if not always unison or harmony, with one another. Azevedo, *Abolitionism*, 48–80.

19. Sandra Lauderdale Graham, "The Vintem Riot and Political Culture: Rio de Janeiro, 1880," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 60:3 (August 1980): 447. For a view of abolitionism as complicated, plural, and conflicted, see Albuquerque, *O jogo da dissimulação*, 39.

20. See Juliana Barreto Farias, “Mercado em greve: protestos e organização dos trabalhadores da Praça das Marinhas, Rio de Janeiro/ século XIX,” *Anais do XIX Encontro Regional de História: Poder, Violência e Exclusão*, ANPUH/SP-USP, São Paulo, 8–12 September 2008, Cd-ROM.

21. A recent study of the politicization of urban spaces by republican groups in 1880s Rio is Maria Tereza Chaves de Mello, *A República consentida: cultura democrática e científica do final do Império* (Rio de Janeiro: ANPUH, 2007), 95–106. See also Thomas Holloway, “The Defiant Life and Forgotten Death of Apulco de Castro: Race, Power, and Historical Memory,” *Estudios Interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe* 19:1 (January-June 2007), <http://www1.tau.ac.il/eial/>, for an acute analysis of race and popular politics in early 1880s Rio. On urban centers and popular mobilizations around republicanism and abolitionism, see also June E. Hahner, *Poverty and Politics: The Urban Poor in Brazil, 1870–1920* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986), Chapter Two.

22. *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 15 January 1884, 2–3; 1 February 1884, 1; 23 February 1884, 3. On early emancipation funds see Conrad, *Destruction*, 177, 184.

23. *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 21 September, 1880, 2.

24. Francisco Augusto Pereira da Costa, “A idéia abolicionista,” *Revista do Instituto Archeológico e Geográfico Pernambucano*, 42 (Recife, 1891): 262–65.

25. The legacy of Castro Alves, in particular, remained present in the cultural imaginary of 1880s abolitionists in Rio de Janeiro and Recife. On the ten-year anniversary of his death, a budding literary society in Rio published, *Homenagem do Gremio Litterario Castro Alves* (Rio de Janeiro: Typographia Nacional, 1881). In Recife, Alfredo de Carvalho gathered information from contemporaries of Alves’s for his, *Castro Alves em Pernambuco: Recordações de um Amigo* (Recife: Typographia do Jornal do Recife, 1905), 4–17. For a fuller view of Alves’s years in Recife (1862–67), see Afrânio Peixoto, *Castro Alves: O poeta e o poema*, 5th ed. (São Paulo: Comp. Editora Nacional, 1976 [1922]), 11–17; Lamartine Moraes, *Itinerário de Castro Alves no Recife* (Recife: Editora Bagaço, 1997).

26. Andrew J. Kirkendall, *Class Mates: Male Student Culture and the Making of a Political Class in Nineteenth-Century Brazil* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 144.

27. *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 13 August, 1880, 2. We estimate that around 10% of the student body became involved with the Club Abolicionista. Clovis Bevilaqua published lists of the graduating classes of the Recife Law School, and based on these numbers for the early 1880s, we calculated an annual student population of between 450 and 600 per year. Clovis Bevilaqua, *História da Faculdade do Recife*, 2nd ed. (São Paulo: Instituto Nacional do Livro, 1977 [1927]), 118–30.

28. *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 29 September 1882, 2.

29. Lauderdale Graham, “The Vintem Riot,” 432.

30. *Jornal do Recife*, 17 July 1883, 1.

31. Conrad, *Destruction*, 292.

32. Osório Duque-Estrada, *A abolição: esboço histórico, 1831–1888*, intro. Rui Barbosa (Rio de Janeiro: Leite Ribeiro & Maurillo, 1918), 105.

33. *Ibid.*, 112–13. The classic study is Raimundo Girão, *A abolição no Ceará* (Fortaleza: Editora A. Batista Fentenele, 1956).

34. José Ferreira Nobre, speech on Livro de Ouro, AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.1.61, 21 January 1884, 18. For details on the council, see the unpublished, undated, untitled 1980s introduction to the council records held at the AGCRJ, written by Hebe Mattos and a team of researchers, herein referred to as Mattos, et. al., “Livro de Ouro,” 7–8.

35. On the celebrations of Ceará see the commemorative edition of the *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 26 April 1884. In Recife, the Ceará commemorations drew upwards of 2,000 people to the streets. See Francisco Augusto Pereira da Costa, *Pernambuco ao Ceará, o dia 25 de março: historico das festas celebradas em Pernambuco* (Recife: Typographia Central, 1885). The *Diário de Pernambuco* also registered major celebrations of Ceará in Paraíba. See *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), April 10, 1884, 2.

36. José Ferreira Nobre, speech on Livro de Ouro, *Boletim da Ilustrissima Câmara Municipal da Corte* (Rio de Janeiro: Typ. Imperial e Constitucional de J. Vileneuve & C.) (henceforth *Boletim*), 1 May 1884, 49.

37. Council President João Pereira Lopes first referred to “the abolition of slavery” in the emancipation ceremony of 14 March 1886. *Boletim*, 18 March 1886, 122.

38. Speech, José Ferreira Nobre, AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.1.61, 21 January 1884, 19. Various proposals for ending slavery in the city were subsequently made. In July 1885, for example, councilor Visconde de Santa Cruz proposed a municipal lottery through which slavery in the city could be ended within 18 months. Such ideas were later rejected by the Ministry of Empire, to which the council was subordinated. Visconde de Santa Cruz, speech, *Boletim*, 25 July 1885, 30; *Relatorio apresentado à Assembleia Geral Legislativa na primeira sessão da vigesima legislatura pelo Ministro e Secretario do Estado dos Negocios do Imperio, Barão de Mamoré* (Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional, 1886), 23; *Boletim*, 15 April 1886, 34.

39. The council allowed the Confederação to use municipal halls for its meetings from 1883, but in 1887 it refused to continue this practice, generating indignation. The council also refused to allow abolitionist propaganda on the streets in 1884, prompting the *Gazeta da Tarde* to denounce the Livro de Ouro as “a lie” that was simply “para inglez ver.” João Clapp to Municipal Council, AGCRJ, E:E Book 6.1.41, Rio de Janeiro, 22 June 1883, 6; *Boletim*, 22 December 1887, 91; “A Municipalidade e a Abolição,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 2 May 1884, 1. A running personal feud also continued between Patrocínio and Nobre. In 1886, Patrocínio denounced Nobre, a lawyer, for defending slaveholders in court even as he presided over the Livro de Ouro. In the same year, Nobre attempted to block Patrocínio’s electoral victory. *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 13 October and 8–24 November 1886.

40. The history of Rio’s municipal government has been neglected by historians, and much remains to be discovered about the careers and persuasions of nineteenth-century Rio’s municipal councilors. A recent study correcting this trend, focusing mainly on the council’s role in controlling food supply and distribution in the Corte, is Juliana Teixeira Souza, “A autoridade municipal na corte imperial: enfrentamentos e negociações na regulação do comércio de gêneros (1840–1889),” (PhD. diss., Unicamp, 2007). Hebe Mattos et. al. found that that the council had traditionally been dominated by coffee elites but changed in makeup after the 1881

electoral reform act, with councilors now emanating largely from the liberal professions, and that this influenced its decision-making. Mattos, et.al., “Livro de Ouro,” 3, 10. Candidates for positions on the council in 1886 included a pharmacist, a medical doctor, and the owner of a hat shop. *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 25 June 1886, 3; 30 June 1886, 3. Many councilors certainly owned slaves, whom they gradually freed as part of their efforts.

41. Duque-Estrada, *Abolição*, 135.

42. The law only immediately freed those slaves over 65 and imposed harsh penalties for harboring runaway slaves. The most recent and detailed analysis of the 1885 Sexagenarian Law is Joseli Maria Nunes Mendonça, *Entre a mão e os anéis: a lei dos sexagenários e os caminhos da abolição no Brasil* (Campinas: Unicamp, 1999). For an English translation of the 1885 law, see Conrad, *Destruction*, 310–16.

43. *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 28 September 1885, 1.

44. Dr. Fernando Francisco da Costa Ferraz, “Exposição,” *Boletim*, 25 July 1885, 27. Resistance by Rio’s Municipal Council to its subordination to the Ministry of Empire had proved a small but persistent thorn in the side of imperial cabinets since the 1834 Additional Act stripped capital cities’ councils of their previous powers. See Richard Graham, *Patronage*, 48, 86.

45. On repercussions of the Sexagenarian Law and the “Black Regulation” in Rio, see Conrad, *Destruction*, 230–37.

46. A month earlier, councilors had voted to tax any slaves entering the municipality, and to only free those who had been registered there before 1886. *Boletim*, 1 April 1886, 15–16.

47. On the campaign see *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 19 June – 5 July 1886.

48. For previous evidence of such tensions around various issues, see *Boletim*, 6 May 1886, 88.

49. Speech, Pereira Lopes, *Boletim*, 5 August 1886, 39–41.

50. Speech, Pereira Lopes, *Boletim*, 16 September 1886, 92. The lash was officially abolished in October 1886.

51. See, especially, the speech by interim president, Dr. Carlos Cláudio da Silva, at the 3rd ceremony in December 1885. *Boletim*, 5 December 1885, 17–132 (page numbers reflect erratic numbering in original document).

52. For slaves freed by private emancipation funds in Recife, see Castilho, “Abolitionism Matters,” 266. For the slave population in Pernambuco, see *Falla com que o Exm. Sr. Conselheiro Francisco Maria Sodre Pereira abriu no 1º de Março de 1883 a Assembléa Legislativa Provincial de Pernambuco* (Recife: Typografia de Manoel Figueiroa e Filhos, 1883), 73–4.

53. Of the 797 freed through the Fund, 766 were freed with compensation and 31 gratis. For slaves freed at each of the nine emancipation ceremonies, see: *Boletim*, 29 July 1885, 29; *Boletim*, 10 September 1885, 115–7; *Gazeta de Notícias* (Rio de Janeiro), 2 December 1885, 1; *Boletim*, 18 March 1886, 122; AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.1.61, 29 July 1886, 74; *Boletim*, 16 September 1886, 89–93; *Gazeta de Notícias*, 3 December 1886, 2; AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.1.41, 7 September 1887, 44; *Boletim*, 2 December 1887, 69. Partly as a result of the 1886 “Black Regulation,” Rio’s enslaved population fell drastically by 24,615 from 1884 to 1887, leaving only 7,488 slaves in the municipality by 1887. Conrad, *Destruction*, 285.

54. On the Club Abolicionista's fund see *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 18 September 1880, 4. On Rio's Livro de Ouro fund see "Regulamento substitutivo para o Livro de Ouro," *Boletim*, 10 July 1885, 26. Information on other local emancipation funds (see note 9) suggests women were prioritized much more generally than in the funds discussed here.

55. For a closer look at "free womb" thinking in Brazilian slavery and emancipation see Cowling, "Debating Womanhood, Defining Freedom," forthcoming. On historical precedents for the "free womb" idea see Conrad, *Destruction*, 90. For a sophisticated analysis of the "free womb" in law and jurisprudence, see, Eduardo Spiller Pena, *Pajens da Casa Imperial: juriconsultos, escravidão e a lei de 1871* (Campinas: Editora Unicamp, 2001). For how the 1871 law and the national emancipation fund prioritized enslaved women with children, see Dauwe, "A libertação gradual," 76–7, 82, 100–1, 108.

56. Brazilian abolitionism resembled the "full-blown, Anglo-American variant of antislavery". This involved "mass propaganda, petitions, public meetings, lawsuits and boycotts, presenting anti-slavery action as a moral and political imperative." Seymour Drescher, "Brazilian Abolition in Comparative Perspective," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 68:3 (August 1988): 429–60.

57. *Jornal do Recife*, 30 September 1881, 2.

58. *Ibid.*, 17 September 1883, 1; *ibid.*, 26 September 1881, 1.

59. For elite strategies aimed at preserving senhorial privilege by controlling the way in which abolition occurred – literally attempting to "preserve the word 'senhor!'" – see Albuquerque, *O jogo da dissimulação*, 113–26.

60. *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 13 August 1880, 2; "Sessão Preparatória de Instalação," Memorandum, IAHGP, Coleção da Sociedade Nova Emancipadora (henceforth CSNE), 26 September 1880.

61. Nils Jacobsen and Cristóbal Aljovín de Losada, "The Long and Short of It: A Pragmatic Perspective on Political Cultures, especially for the Modern History of the Andes," in *Political Cultures in the Andes, 1750–1950*, eds. Nils Jacobsen and Cristóbal Aljovín de Losada, 9 (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).

62. *Jornal do Recife*, 11 August 1882, 2. The letter was published in August, to coincide with the law school's anniversary. It was signed by the president, Dr. Joaquim de Barros Sobrinho, and the first and second secretaries, Joaquim Felipe da Costa and Carizio de Barros.

63. Ceremonies were held on 29 July, 7 September and 2 December 1885; 14 March, 29 July, 7 September and 7 December 1886; 7 September and 2 December 1887. 29 July, 2 December, and 14 March were Isabel's, Pedro's and Teresa Cristina's birthdays respectively. For the program of one of the showy ceremonies, see "Programa da festa municipal pelos donativos do Livro de Ouro," *Boletim*, 28 July 1885, 55. On national days of festivity and the monarchy, see Robert Daibert Júnior, *Isabel: a Redentora dos escravos. Uma história da Princesa entre olhares negros e brancos (1846–1980)* (Baruru, São Paulo: Editora da Universidade do Sagrado Coração, 2004), 41–7, 58. For popular and elite understandings of days of festivity in Bahia in an earlier period, see Hendrik Kraay, "Definindo nação e estado: rituais cívicos na Bahia pós-Independência," *Topoi* (Rio de Janeiro), 3 (2001): 64–90. On the ways in which public ritual shored up monarchical power in Imperial Brazil see Lília

Moritz Schwartz, *As barbas do imperador: D. Pedro II, um monarca nos trópicos* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1998), chapter 10.

64. Mattos, et. al., “Livro de Ouro,” 13.

65. “Termo de contrato entre a Illma. Camara e Pedro José Pinto Peres para a pintura de uma tela commemorativa,” AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.1.42, 3 September 1885, 17–8. For comment, see *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 14 July, 1886, 2; for a reproduction of the picture see Daibert Júnior, *Isabel*, vi.

66. Brazilian society was undergoing major, rapid changes in this era, from urbanization and immigration to the ending of slavery envisaged by the 1871 “Free Womb” law. Indeed, “the impact that the extinction of slavery caused on a society that was constructed upon the legitimacy of property-holding in people cannot be expressed in numbers.” (Albuquerque, *O jogo da dissimulação*, 97.) Following Eric Hobsbawm’s suggestion that rituals and traditions are often “invented” precisely to create a sense of historic continuity at moments of rapid social and economic change, we should perhaps not be surprised at the Council’s attempts to “invent” rituals, invoking the institution of the monarchy and held on days of national festivity. See Eric Hobsbawm, “Inventing Traditions,” in *The Invention of Tradition*, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 4–5, 8 (Cambridge University Press, 1983). For satirical pictures of the ceremonies see *A Revista Illustrada* (Rio de Janeiro), 12 September 1885, 6.

67. Local emancipation ceremonies also led to political contestations in Recife. Senespleda Battaglia, an Italian opera singer, in 1881 defied both her troupe director’s orders and the express wishes of Pernambuco’s provincial assembly by appearing publicly at a manumission event. See Ferreira et. al., *Suaves Amazonas*, 54.

68. In interpreting the attitude of the Emperor and Imperial Family, we draw on what Sidney Chalhoub calls the “arte de bordejar,” or political zigzagging, employed by the Emperor in the run-up to the 1871 “Free Womb” law. The Emperor and Isabel certainly became more openly pro-abolition over the 1880s, but the term is still useful for this decade, as it captures the attempt to maintain the distance and neutrality seen as appropriate for a political institution like the monarchy, which infuriated abolitionists and slavocrats by turns. See Chalhoub, *Machado de Assis*, 139–55. On the Emperor’s support for abolition see José Murilo de Carvalho, *Teatro de sombras: a política imperial* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 3rd ed., 2007), Chapter Two.

69. For example, “Dous de Dezembro,” *Gazeta de Notícias* (Rio de Janeiro), 3 December 1886, 2; “Prosigam!,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 30 July 1886, 1; *A Revista Illustrada* (Rio de Janeiro), 8 January 1887, 3, 6.

70. *Boletim*, 15 April 1886, 28.

71. Gaston, Conde d’Eu, to Ambrósio Leitão da Cunha, Baron of Mamoré, Rio de Janeiro, 7 April 1886, AHMIP, 1.DLC-7.4.886, Orl.C.1-18; Mamoré to Conde d’Eu, Rio de Janeiro, 9 April 1886, AHMIP, M.196, 8885.

72. Roderick J. Barman, *Princess Isabel of Brazil: Gender and Power in the Nineteenth Century* (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2002), 175. Barman makes an interesting gender analysis of these and other exchanges, in which politicians sidelined Isabel, the heir to the throne, in favor of her husband.

73. Isabel also allegedly made a large financial contribution to the March 1886 ceremony. “Chronica do Bem,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 13 March 1886, 1.

74. The *Gazeta da Tarde* described ceremonies as “abolitionist” from 1886 and praised the council’s 1886 president, Dr. João Pereira Lopes, for his actions in the abolitionist cause. *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 23 September 1886, 1; “A Regencia e o ministro,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 12 August 1887, 1.

75. These dignitaries were present at ceremonies up to and including July 29 1886. *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 2 December 1885, 2; *Boletim*, 18 March 1886, 122; *Boletim*, 5 August 1886, 43.

76. “Sete de Setembro,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 7 September 1886, 1; “Libertação da Corte,” *O Paiz* (Rio de Janeiro), 3 December 1886, 1; “Semana Política,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 4 December 1886, 1; “Chronica,” *A Revista Illustrada* (Rio de Janeiro), 18 December 1886, 2. The ministers returned to the next ceremony in September 1887. *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 7 September 1887, 2.

77. The image of kneeling slaves was popularized by Wedgewood cameos in the 1780s, used by British anti-slave trade campaigners, and later taken up in North American antislavery campaigns. Claire Midgeley, *Women Against Slavery: The British Campaigns, 1780–1870* (London: Routledge, 1992), 37–8; 97–100. Decades later, the Spanish Abolitionist Society specified that “the emblem of the Society is a black man with one knee on the ground, his hands bound with a chain, in a supplicating attitude.” Sociedad Abolicionista Española, *Sesión del 23 de Enero de 1881* (Madrid: Imprenta de A. J. Alaria, 1881), 2. On the Society see Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, *Empire and Anti-Slavery: Spain, Cuba and Puerto Rico, 1833–1874* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 1999).

78. For one of Rio’s councilors, “Instead of conquerors and conquered, history will record the benevolent and the beneficiaries.” “Exposição lida pelo Dr. F. F. da Costa Ferraz,” *Boletim*, 10 September 1885, 115–7.

79. Dauwe, “A libertação gradual,” 95–100.

80. Chalhoub, *Machado de Assis*, 226–7.

81. On slaves’ litigation over the nineteenth century see Keila Grinberg, *Libertação: a lei da ambigüidade. As ações de liberdade da Corte de Apelação do Rio de Janeiro no século XIX* (Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 1994), 24–8. On changing traditions of slave appeals to monarchical figures see Russell-Wood, A.J.R., “‘Acts of Grace’: Portuguese Monarchs and Their Subjects of African Descent in Eighteenth-Century Brazil,” *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 32:2 (May 2000): 307–32; Kirsten Schultz, *Tropical Versailles: Empire, Monarchy and the Portuguese Royal Court in Rio de Janeiro, 1808–1821* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 165–76; Mary Karasch, *Slave Life in Rio de Janeiro, 1808–1850* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 339–41. On slaves’ increased tendency to appeal to the police in the 1870s and 1880s see Sidney Chalhoub, *Visões da liberdade: uma história das últimas décadas da escravidão na Corte* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1990), 175–81.

82. Graham, *Patronage*, 1–7.

83. Atas Nova Emancipadora, 5 June, 1881, IAHGP, CSNE.

84. *Jornal do Recife*, 10 September 1881, 2.

85. *Estatutos Nova Emancipadora*, 3–4. Other abolitionist societies in Recife also received contributions from members’ dues.

86. *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 5 October 1880, 1. The company, *Maravilhas*, was directed by the Count of Castiglioni.

87. “Regulamento substitutivo,” *Boletim*, 10 July 1885, 26, and *Boletim*, 14 October 1886, 4.

88. *Boletim*, 2 June 1885, 102–3.

89. For the accusations, see “Assumptos Municipaes,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 12 December 1887, 1. The Rio-based British newspaper *The Anglo-Brazilian Times* had previously deplored the “fathomless depths of municipal neglect and incapacity” in Rio, adding that, across Brazil, “the whole aim of the elect of the municipals [seems] to be to work elections and to create and favour [sic] jobbery.” In his 1886 municipal election campaign, Patrocínio explicitly differentiated his own abolitionist platform from the standard municipal corruption and pocket-lining. “A municipal mudhole,” *The Anglo-Brazilian Times* (Rio de Janeiro), 16 January, 1875, 3; “Eleição Municipal,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 28 June 1886, 1; “Eleição Municipal,” *Gazeta da Tarde* (Rio de Janeiro), 5 July 1886, 2.

90. “Resolução, Livro de Ouro,” *Boletim*, 2 June 1885, 103. For lists of donors, see AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.1.41, 19–24; *Boletim*, 25 July 1885, 27–8.

91. The donation, from the “conselheiro delegado do thesouro nacional,” arrived only in June 1888, after abolition was finally declared, and was put towards general charitable ends in the Município Neutro. *Boletim*, 28 June 1888, 23.

92. *Boletim*, 25 June 1886, 168.

93. *Ibid.*, 17 March 1887, 84.

94. This fits Richard Graham’s idea of an attitude towards political life based on the need to build a local “following” or clientele. Graham, *Patronage*, 22.

95. The Confederação Abolicionista estimated in 1887 that there were 7,421 slaves remaining in the Município Neutro, owned by 3,189 people – an average of 2.3 slaves per owner. “Representação da Confederação Abolicionista ao presidente e mais vereadores da Câmara municipal da côrte,” 1 May 1887, *Boletim*, 14 May 1887, 79–80.

96. A systematic study of slaveholding for late nineteenth-century Pernambuco does not exist. However, post-mortem inventories imply less than 10% of Recife’s slaveholders were women in the 1880s. For a preliminary analysis see José Raimundo Vergolino and Flávio Rabelo Versiani, “Posse de escravos e estrutura da riqueza no agreste e sertão de Pernambuco, 1770–1887,” *Revista de Estudos Econômicos*, 33:2 (April 2003): 353–93. In Rio, the white population was predominantly male. This, and men’s greater earning and purchasing power, implies a higher number of male than female slave owners, owning more slaves. *Recenseamento da população do Município Neutro e Paraná a que se procedeu em 1 de agosto de 1872* (Rio de Janeiro: n.p., 1872), 58.

97. Kittleson, “Women and Notions of Womanhood,” 101–5.

98. Maria Odila Leite da Silva Dias, *Power and Everyday Life: The Lives of Working Women in Nineteenth-Century Brazil*, translated by Ann Frost (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 9–19, 28–32, 74–93; Karasch, *Slave Life*, 342–5.

99. Zephyr L. Frank, *Dutra’s World: Wealth and Family in Nineteenth-Century Rio de Janeiro* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004), 160. While

Frank's study deals with an earlier period, this gendered pattern in slave ownership seems likely to apply here also.

100. For the advertisement in Recife, see *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 18 September 1880, 4. For an example of Livro de Ouro advertisements in Rio see "Liberções de Escravos por Conta dos Donativos do Livro de Ouro," *Jornal do Commercio* (Rio de Janeiro), 19 June 1885, 4. In 1872, 61 men and 26 women of 12,000 slaves in Recife and 220 men and 109 women of 48,919 slaves in Rio were officially literate. *Recenseamento da População de Pernambuco a que se procedeu no dia 1 de agosto de 1872* (University of Chicago Microfilm Project, Reel 19120, 1872), 214; *Recenseamento do Município Neutro 1872*, 58–9. On the "democratization" of street life and passing of information via speeches, oral culture, and images, see Mello, *A República Consentida*, Chapter One. On slaves and written culture in Peru see José Ramón Jouve Martín, *Esclavos de la ciudad letrada: esclavitud, escritura y colonialismo en Lima (1650–1700)* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 2005). While urban slaves were particularly well-placed to make use of written culture, rural slaves also certainly did so. See Sandra Lauderdale Graham, *Caetana Says No: Women's Stories from a Brazilian Slave Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). On the intimate links between rural and urban abolitionist actions by slaves and abolitionists alike, see Maria Helena Machado, *O plano e o pânico: os movimentos sociais na década da abolição* (Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ/EDUSP, 1994).

101. Atas Nova Emancipadora, n.d., IAHGP, CSNE. For further fascinating slave initiatives which merit more discussion than we can provide here, see AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.2.6, June–July 1885, 7, 24, 28, 34.

102. *Diário de Pernambuco* (Recife), 5 October 1882, 2. The data corresponds to 29 September 1881– 28 September 1882.

103. On the political significance of self-purchase negotiations see Chalhoub, *Machado de Assis*, 260–64, and Mendonça, *Entre a mão e os anéis*, 254–64. Local emancipation funds adopted the gradual reduction of maximum slave prices before this was formalized in the September 1885 law. "Regulamento substitutivo," *Boletim*, 10 July 1885, 26.

104. On prioritizing women with savings see *Boletim*, 2 June 1885, 102–3.

105. Josepha to Municipal Council, n.d. [approx. November 1887], AGCRJ, E:E, Book 6.2.9, 161–2; *Boletim*, 2 December 1887.

106. Full details about the 31 people freed gratis were not provided, so they have not been included in this discussion.

107. *Boletim*, 16 September 1886, 94, 99.

108. Sandra Lauderdale Graham, *House and Street: The Domestic World of Servants and Masters in Nineteenth-Century Rio de Janeiro* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988), 22; see also *Boletim*, 19 September 1888, 65; "Regulamento do Serviço Domestico," *Boletim*, 4 October 1888, 3–4.

109. Noticeably, 19% of *pardas* freed in Rio, but only 12% of *pretas*, had children. Around a third of slaves freed were described as *pardos* and the remainder as *pretos*. On manumission and skin color, see Karasch, *Slave Life*, 350–2; Stuart Schwartz, "The Manumission of Slaves in Colonial Brazil: Bahia, 1684–1745," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 54:4 (November 1974): 612–18.

110. Mary Karasch, "Anastácia and the Slave Women of Rio de Janeiro," in *Africans in Bondage: Studies in Slavery and the Slave Trade*, ed. Paul E. Lovejoy (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986), 83–6, 100.

111. Chalhoub, *Machado de Assis*, 274–5.

112. Freeing women and children also fitted other gendered ideas about slavery and abolition. They were seen as less physically threatening than adult men, at a time of mounting elite anxiety about the maintenance of social order after abolition. For an example of this logic see "Novos aspectos," *A Revista Ilustrada* (Rio de Janeiro), 456 (30 April 1886), 3.

113. Sociedad Abolicionista Española, *La abolición de la esclavitud en el Brasil y en España. Discurso pronunciado por D. Salvador Torres Aguilar, catedrático de la Universidad de Madrid* (Madrid: Secretaria de la Sociedad Abolicionista Española, 1872), 6–8; 10–13.

114. For comparative analyses of slavery's ending in Brazil and Cuba see Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, "Empires against Emancipation: Spain, Brazil, and the Abolition of Slavery," *Review* 31:2 (2008): 101–19; Celso Castilho, "Brisas atlânticas: la abolición gradual y la conexión brasileña-cubana," in *Haití: Revolución y emancipación*, eds. Rina Cáceres and Paul Lovejoy (San José: Editorial UCR, 2008): 128–38; Laird W. Bergad, *The Comparative Histories of Slavery in Brazil, Cuba, and the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), Chapter 8; Camillia Cowling, "Matrices of Freedom: Women of Color, Gender, and the Ending of Slavery in Havana and Rio de Janeiro, 1870–1888" (Ph.D. diss., University of Nottingham, UK, 2007); Drescher, "Brazilian Abolition"; Lamounier, "Between Slavery"; Rebecca J. Scott, Seymour Drescher, Hebe Mattos, George Reid Andrews and Robert Levine, *Exploring the Meaning of Freedom in Postemancipation Societies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1988).

115. Sociedad Abolicionista Española, *Sesión del 23 de Enero de 1881*, 4–6, 11–18. Slavery had by now been abolished in Puerto Rico (in 1873).

116. The phrases and the logic informing them are from Kim D. Butler, *Freedoms Given, Freedoms Won: Afro-Brazilians in Post-Abolition São Paulo and Salvador* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998).

117. On the "meanings of freedom" see Hebe Maria Mattos, "Os combates da memória: escravidão e liberdade nos arquivos orais de descendentes de escravos brasileiros," *Tempo*, 6:3 (December 1998): 125, 136; Ana Lugão Rios and Hebe Mattos, *Memórias do cativo: família, trabalho e cidadania no pós-abolição* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2005), 49.

118. Indeed, an 1881 electoral reform had recently reduced a quite broad male suffrage of over a million to less than 150,000. Graham, *Patronage*, 184. On the reform see Sidney Chalhoub, "The Politics of Silence: Race and Citizenship in Nineteenth-Century Brazil," *Slavery and Abolition*, 27:1 (April 2006): 73–87. For an overview of debates on black citizenship in post-abolition Brazil see *Quase-Cidadão: histórias e antropologias da pós-emancipação no Brasil*, eds. Olívia Maria Gomes da Cunha and Flávio dos Santos Gomes, (Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 2007).