

Introduction

TOWARDS THE END of the seventeenth century, António João Frias, parish priest of the Church of Santo André in Goa, completed a treatise. The clergy in this period often employed the art of writing not only to confirm the orthodoxy of the faith but also to express points of view and defend their beliefs. Frias argued that “the nations of India owe to the Lusitanians, who opened the way for the preaching of the Gospel in these territories, the knowledge that they have of the Faith in God, who is the primary cause and the true light that illuminate men with knowledge of the truth.” This was a frequent topos in religious writings of Portuguese origin. The intent was to justify not only the imperial presence of the Crown of Portugal in India, but also the hierarchical order of relationship between Portuguese and Indians. Frias’ metaphorical interplay drew attention to the semantic proximity of the words *Lusos* (Lusitanian) and *Luzes* (light/enlightenment) to underscore that the “enlightenment of the Occident, where they [the Portuguese] live” has taken “to the East the light of the Gospel”. Despite being “where the first Sun shines”, the regions of India had been in “profound darkness of the ignorance of true Law” until the Portuguese brought it to them.¹

Frias was not Portuguese. He was an Indian subject of the Portuguese Crown, which makes his discourse particularly symptomatic of the social order that operated in Goa at the end of the 1600s. His words provide a happy metaphor for two *longue durée* processes within the Iberian imperial formations. They serve, first, as a metaphor for the expansion of a historical narrative in which the Occident was the liberating and rationalising agent in other geographies. Frias witnessed the internalisation and dissemination of this narrative by people colonised by Westerners. He was at the

¹ Frias, *Aureola dos Indios*, 159.

crossroads of that grand narrative, since he was part of the Christianised and westernised native elites who conceived of themselves as liberating agents of *other* imperial territories. In his vision he was a colonial agent, the equal of the Portuguese who had been entrusted with bringing the light of the Occident to the East. For Frias and his peers, Ceylon, Africa, and other peripheries of the Portuguese empire emerged as territories where they could expand these enlightening ideas. In time, Frias' descendants too expected they would play similar roles in the centre.²

This parish priest's pronouncement was also a metaphor for the transition from pre-modern political systems to modern ones, especially of the articulation between political power and society, as well as the construction of social, cultural, and political identities of members of the polity. To ensure the perpetuation of its political order, the Portuguese Crown instrumentalised various institutions that enabled processes of social and cultural reproduction – such as the family, education, poor relief – through which the Crown aimed to mould its vassals to fit a desired imperial model.³ Some scholars have pointed out that this transition from pre-modern to modern polities was singularly manifest in imperial situations, making them early laboratories of modernity. For reasons of chronology, locality, and cultural contexts, these laboratories of modernity relied on devices that would today be considered problematic, such as the alliance between political and religious agents. However, the concord alleviated some of the difficulties that the imperial administration faced in the colonies. It facilitated not just the territorialisation of imperial power, but also its inscription in the minds and hearts of its subjects.⁴

As a “model vassal”, Frias was an emblem of the success of those

² See, for example, Bastos, “The Inverted Mirror”; and Bastos, “Medicina, império”.

³ Bourdieu, “Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction”.

⁴ Charles Boxer had already highlighted this: Boxer, *The Portuguese Seaborne Empire*, esp. Chapters 3 and 10.

two grand narratives and mechanisms of power. Nevertheless, his case simultaneously highlights the tensions provoked by such success in the imperial context. While becoming almost identical to the coloniser, Frias, the colonised, also disturbed the order of imperial relationships, and the hierarchy and difference that such an order necessarily presupposed.

Like Frias, many residents of the territories of Goa similarly constituted multiple (and micro) points of anchorage, not only of those grand narratives but also of the disquiets and contradictions that their imperial manifestations raised.⁵ This book invites attention to a double displacement in time and space to understand these processes. It intends to identify the situations that enabled the emergence, reproduction, and persistence of “social types” such as Frias. It also aims to understand how these people contributed to the durability of the Portuguese imperial presence in Goa and other domains.

The present book runs from the last phase of the reign of Dom Manuel I (1495–1521) to the reign of Dom Pedro II (1683–1705) and focuses on the territories that today form part of the state of Goa that – and in the context of the former Estado da Índia – were known as Velhas Conquistas, or Old Conquests. It comprises, therefore, Bardez, Salcete, and the islands of Tiswadi, Chorão, and Dívar.

In the following pages I argue that Goa – that is, the territory today called Goa – was invented in the context of the Portuguese imperial experience. I analyse the role played by the population of Indian origin, which constituted the demographic majority, in this construction, and how this invention was critical for the conservation of the Portuguese empire. Catarina Madeira Santos has, in her study, examined the political and institutional context of how Goa

⁵ Cooper and Stoler, eds, *Tensions of Empire*, esp. their Introduction, “Between Metropole and Colony”. In the same volume, see also Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man”; Comaroff, “Image of Empire, Contests of Conscience”; and Stoler, “Sexual Affronts and Racial Frontiers”.

became “the key to the whole of India”.⁶ She has analysed the construction of the city of Goa as a political centre in the context of the Estado da Índia. In doing so, she has problematised and historicised a taken-for-granted assumption concerning the central political status of the port city of Goa, which sustained most of the scholarship dealing with the subject.⁷ The Goa of Madeira Santos is, above all, the city of Goa; and its main characters are almost always of metropolitan Portuguese origin.

The Goa I explore is different. Though linked to the city of Goa, without which it could not have existed, and with which it shared many of its chronologies and spatialities, the Goa of this book is mainly rural Goa and its inhabitants. Teotónio R. de Souza and P.D. Xavier have studied these spaces,⁸ but both privilege an analytical and predominantly synchronic description of the various dimensions of their social life rather than a dynamic analysis of their transformation.⁹

Luís Filipe Thomaz’s “Goa: Uma sociedade luso-indiana” addresses the question of transformation, attempting to explain the characteristics of the society that resulted from secular interactions between Portuguese and Indians in the context of the imperial colony.¹⁰ Some of the arguments I develop may appear similar to those in the works of Thomaz, as well as in Maria de Jesus dos Mártires Lopes’ *Goa Setecentista*.¹¹ However, my book differs substantially from theirs in moving away from the Luso-tropicalism and Orientalism that inform those works.

⁶ Madeira Santos, *Goa é a chave de toda a Índia, passim*.

⁷ See, among others, Fonseca, *An Historical and Archaeological Sketch*; Saldanha, *História de Goa*; Aiala, *Goa Antiga e Moderna*; Souza, *Goa Medieval*; M.J.M. Lopes, *Goa Setecentista*.

⁸ Souza, *Goa Medieval*; P.D. Xavier, *Goa: A Social History*.

⁹ The dimension of “time” is not absent in these works, but the object of analysis is not the process of cultural transformation. In that sense, this book is closer to Mendonça, *Conversions and Citizenry*.

¹⁰ Thomaz, “Goa: Uma sociedade luso-indiana”.

¹¹ M.J.M. Lopes, *Goa Setecentista*.

I argue that the majority of the population of the villages of the Old Conquests consented to live under Portuguese imperial rule. This consent was essential for the invention of Goa, as well as for the conservation of Portuguese imperial power.¹² The manifestations of this consent were not limited to contributing to the economic, financial, and military sustainability of the imperium: the consent was internalised to the extent that the imperial cause became, for many, their own.

Most studies focused on the processes of Christianisation in these territories refer to the existence of local populations but almost always render them as *a priori*, rather than as dynamic subjects who intervened *de facto* in the historical processes within which they were involved. Like Frias, but in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, some of the authors of this literature were themselves priests. They privileged the actions of actors and institutions of European and Christian origin, often unconsciously ignoring the agency of the converted.¹³ This implicit Orientalism – which the continuing use of the adjective “oriental” reiterates – determined the focus, the archive, the sources, the modes of reading, and consequently the interpretations.¹⁴

In the last few years a significant body of literature has come to

¹² The term is used here in the sense attributed by A.B. Xavier and Madeira Santos, “Cultura Intelectual”.

¹³ See Manoel, *Missões dos Jesuítas*; Telles, “Ordens religiosas”; F.X. Costa, *Anais Franciscanos*; Lobo, *Memória Histórico-Eclesiástica*; A. Correia, *A dilatação da fé*; Lopes, “A expansão portuguesa”; D’Costa, *The Christianisation of the Goan Islands*; Meersman, *The Ancient Franciscan Provinces*; Meersman, *The Friars Minor*; Wicki, *Missionkirche im Orient*; Wicki, “Kânara und die dortige Jesuitenmission”; J.P.O. Costa, “A colonização portuguesa na Ásia”, J.P.O. Costa, *A missão de João de Brito*; Thekkedath, *History of Christianity in India*; Borges, “Christianization of the Caste System”; Borges, *The Economics of the Goa Jesuits*; Velinkar, *India and the West*.

¹⁴ See also, besides the scholarship already cited, M. Dias, “The Hindu-Christian Society of Goa”; M.J.M. Lopes, ed., *O Império Oriental, 1660–1820*; R.S. Brito, *Goa e as Praças do Norte*.

focus on the local population.¹⁵ A good part of this new literature is of Indian, and above all Goan, authorship, with some of it participating in the postcolonial critique of Orientalism and imperialism. Many such writings, however, continue to articulate “nationalist” interpretations.¹⁶ Albeit influenced by the Subaltern Studies school of thought, a number of them deny different types of agency to groups of local origin in the design of the imperial order, drawing attention almost only to the more violent aspects of Portuguese colonialism and Goan resistance.¹⁷ Many of them presuppose the existence of a Goan nation before the arrival of the Portuguese, ironically reinforcing Orientalist assumptions about the organisation of rural life in India and its unchanging nature.¹⁸ Other studies characterise the Goan population as immune to Portuguese influence. In general, the behaviour of the local population is shown within a classic Orientalist scenario dominated by communities, castes, and Hinduism. Moreover, in these studies most “colonised” identities survive the colonial period practically untouched.¹⁹

While trying to recover the role played by the richly diverse population that lived in the Goan territories over the making

¹⁵ Historical anthropologists have contributed to challenge these images. Besides the already cited work of Bastos, see also Perez, ed., *Histórias de Goa*; Perez, ed., *Os Portugueses e o Oriente*; Robinson, *Conversion, Continuity and Change*; Robinson, “Sixteenth-century Conversions”.

¹⁶ Among others, see T.B. Cunha, *Denationalisation of Goans*; Priolkar, *The Goan Inquisition*; Gomes, *Village Goa*; Shirodkar, ed., *Goa: Cultural Trends*.

¹⁷ Panikkar, *Asia and Western Dominance*; Souza, *Goa Medieval*; Shirodkar, “Evangelization by Missionaries”; Kamat, *Farar Far*.

¹⁸ F.N. Xavier, *Bosquejo Histórico*; F.N. Xavier, *Collecção de Leis Peculiares*; Azevedo, *As comunidades de Goa*; Baden-Powell, “The Villages of Goa”; Gune, *Ancient Shrines*; Feio, *As Castas Hindús*; Phal, *Society in Goa*.

¹⁹ However, proposals such as those of Ghantkar, *History of Goa*, and Moraes, *Kadamba Kula*, are very important. See also G. Pereira, *An Outline*; R.G. Pereira, *Goa – Hindu Temples*; R.G. Pereira, *Goa. Gaunkari*; Kulkarni, “Marathi Records”; Kulkarni, “Portuguese in the Deccan”; and Mitragotri, *Socio Cultural History*.

of Portuguese imperial rule, I neither attempt to write a history from below nor offer a vision of the vanquished (*Vision des Vaincus*).²⁰

The histories outlined above have inspired the ensuing analysis – specially by recognising the centrality of the multiple voices that reflected imperial experiences. Their identification of the languages of dominance, subordination, and revolt is also part of my inquiry. Yet these histories rarely include and consider the “subaltern” population as active participants in the constitution of political power and seldom look at local populations as committed – or even habituated to commit themselves – to power. Instead, they tend to view these populations as accomplices forced into a partnership; as a result they continue to structure their arguments around the fixed dichotomies of “dominant/dominated” and “coloniser/colonised”.²¹

The present book suggests that such dichotomies in Goa were less rigid. Its focus draws inspiration from Christopher Bayly’s *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire*,²² as well as scholarship suggesting, in the wake of Jawaharlal Nehru, that for some people imperial configurations allowed them to become aware that the world was much bigger than they had imagined.²³ However, I do not intend to engage in the kind of revisionism that could be confused with pro-imperialist feeling.

What I argue instead is that there are no durable processes of dominance without the consent, in varied forms, of dominated populations – and that this is also true of Goa. The consent is not merely the fruit of hegemonic supremacy; it can equally be the

²⁰ Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*; Wachtel, *La Vision des Vaincus*.

²¹ See especially, the critique by Ruud, “The Indian Hierarchy”. The essay by Dipesh Chakrabarty – on who can speak of the Indian past, and the ways in which it is spoken about – is also critical: Chakrabarty, “Postcoloniality and the Artifices of History”.

²² C.A. Bayly, *Indian Society*; C.A. Bayly, *Empire and Information*.

²³ Pagden, *Povos e Impérios*, xxiv.

product of a complex process through which some local groups internalise the imperial narrative. In Goa, these groups comprised pre-existent local elites who adjusted to the demands of the new imperial order to retain their power. Sometimes simultaneously, the subaltern population also recognised a window of opportunity in the imperial order, exploiting it to engender expectations that were not possible within the older order.

The participation of the local population was as varied as were subjects, groups, histories of subordination, and local forms of power. Interactions of these with the imperium depended in good measure on local political culture and other immediate and contingent factors. The different modalities of hegemony resulted from this variety of interactions and negotiations.²⁴

From this perspective, the Portuguese colonisers and the Indian colonised mutually constituted each other. The character of their relationship changed over time, depending on the power dynamic and on the ways in which local populations interpreted it. In other words, the material order was constituted as much by the relationships among different subjects, groups, and communities as by the dominant discursive order. This discursive order framed how the Goan “social reality” was textually expressed and meanings attributed to the practices and experiences of subjects. The ways these discourses interpreted reality and its multifaceted meanings contributed to a continuous reinvention of the imperial order and the meanings attributed to it, and in so doing stimulated the making of new imperial realities.²⁵

In the case of Goa, the distance between resident Portuguese

²⁴ This argument is inspired by Foucault, *A Microfísica do Poder*. See also Hespanha, *Panorama da História Institucional*, 19–24, 31–8, on the dispersion of “power” in the Estado da Índia.

²⁵ Foucault’s understanding of the order of the discourse (Foucault, *L’Ordre du Discours*) and its theoretical-methodological implications inspire this book, too. A discussion on these implications for colonial experiences can be found in A.B. Xavier and Madeira Santos, “Cultura Intelectual”.

and local population tended to diminish for a complex group of reasons. The discourses produced by Goan elites of local origin show that, to a certain extent, they stopped seeing themselves as the colonised. This reduction of distance between the perceived status of people of Portuguese origin resident in Goa on the one hand, and local elites on the other, became manifest first in the Goan territories and then in the peripheries of the empire, i.e. Ceylon and Africa. In time the same discourses spread elsewhere in the empire, especially in the second half of the eighteenth century, and particularly after the decree of 1761.²⁶ It was at this time that the colonised began to emerge as key contributors to the metropolitan power sphere, reaching their apogee in the nineteenth century with their appearance in the Portuguese parliament under a liberal monarchy.

What allowed this reduction of distance and caused the transfiguration of the colonised into coloniser? Between *which* colonisers and *which* colonised did this happen? Moreover, how did this imaginary influence the emerging imperial order?

If it were possible to isolate a single variable or instance to explain this transformation, the choice would fall upon the Christianisation and cultural conversion of the local populations.²⁷ The gradual transformation of local ways of thinking, doing, and being, and of conceiving time and space and the present and the past in the framework of Christianity had long-lasting reverberations. It was not so much the religious conversion as the cultural conversion that ensued – of many of the inhabitants of the 150 villages of the Old Conquests – that was responsible for the conservation of Portuguese imperial power. This cultural conversion was also responsible for the tensions and opportunities that characterised the

²⁶ This royal decree stated that subjects of the Portuguese king who were original inhabitants of India should be preferred for honours and offices in the Estado da Índia. See Silva, *Collecção da Legislação Portuguesa*, Vol. 1, 793–5.

²⁷ In this book, conversion – more immediate and political – is dissociated from Christianisation, which was a gradual process.

local colonial context and the relation between the metropole and the colony, both of which statuses were, for a variety of reasons and over time, ambivalent.²⁸

The Goan elites, in the main, experienced a colonisation of their imagination – *la colonisation de l'imaginaire*, to use the words of Serge Gruzinski about Mexican experiences in the same centuries. Alternatively, it could be said they experienced a colonisation of their conscience – to use the term in Jean and John Comaroff's critical work on nineteenth-century South Africa and twentieth-century colonial experiences.²⁹

A variety of strategies that combined military and technological instruments with more amenable tools – such as education and poor relief, associating the agents of political and military power with other powers and other agents – was needed to disseminate the discourse on the supremacy of the Western model (in this case Western *and* Christian). These strategies aimed to mould the social practices of the local populations to ensure that they recognised such supremacy.³⁰

In the early-modern period, the relevance of the association of the typical agents of power with other agents to ensure the conservation of the empire was unquestionable. The advice given in 1555 by Dom Luís, brother of King Dom João III (1521–1557), in a letter to the viceroy of India, Dom Pedro de Mascarenhas, for example, is telling. Dom Luís informed the viceroy that the monarch was sending twelve members of the Society of Jesus to Goa, stressing that “they are there to convert the world and it is certain that you should value them more than many of the warriors.”³¹

²⁸ See Rambo, “Theories of Conversion”, and the discussion on the different forms of religious conversion and their goals.

²⁹ Gruzinski, *La Colonisation de l'Imaginaire*; Comaroff and Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution*.

³⁰ Some of these ideas are already present in Said, *Orientalism* and idem, *Culture and Imperialism*, here in dialogue with Gramsci's concept of hegemony; Gramsci, *Selections*.

³¹ Letter of Dom Luís to D. Pedro de Mascarenhas, in 1555, in Wicki, *Documenta Indica* (henceforth DI), Vol. 3, 280.

Dom Luís represented the Jesuits as soldiers of a different order (as did they themselves), as agents of informal power and “soft” violence. This type of analogy demands renewed attention for an understanding of the political role that religious actors had in the construction of early-modern imperial experiences.

But what precisely were the combinations of men and institutions that in effect constructed the hegemony of Portuguese imperialism?³²

Responding to this question requires knowledge of the attitudes of the inhabitants of the villages of Salcete, Bardez, Tiswadi, Chorão, and Divar towards the missionaries – above all the Franciscans and the Jesuits – as religious and political agents of the Crown who intended to transform “hearts and minds, signs and practices”.³³ How did these missionaries convince the local populations that their God and social practices, their ethical references and aesthetics, were better than those that had prevailed indigenously? How did they convince the local communities that the “darkness of ignorance of the true Law” had characterised their history? How did they persuade them that those from the West were their liberators? How did they eventually manage to get local elites to adopt Portuguese as their mother tongue? How did they manage to turn their own political geographies and cultures – of Portugal, Europe, and the West – into the organising frameworks of local consciences?³⁴ Furthermore, how exactly did local communities appropriate these frameworks? How did the somewhat “egalitarian” discourses, such as that of Frias, fit with them? How did these challenge the relationship between rulers and the ruled – the hierarchy of power that the imperial order presupposed – and the ruptures that such discourses introduced?³⁵

³² The concept of imperialism used in this book follows Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, 29.

³³ Cited from Comaroff and Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution*, I, xi.

³⁴ About the links between reference and experience, see Quine, *The Roots of Reference*; and Ferry, *Les Puissances de l'Expérience*.

³⁵ Concerning the contradictions between the Christian discourse and empire, and the tensions conversion to Christianity entailed, see Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines*.

My book remains within the first episode of this history and its vicissitudes, with no promise of a sequel. On the one hand it proposes a history of the profound transformation of the populations that lived in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Goa, and the impact this transformation had on their descendants' identities and behaviour. It offers a history of the early response of these groups – eventually the holders of visions of new worlds inflected by the discourse and practices of the colonisers – but stops at the beginning of the eighteenth century and does not traverse the colonial order. Moreover, it does not explore contestations of the colonial order in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries or the liberation movements of the twentieth century. Finally, it does not consider the processes of local identity reinvention in the late-twentieth and twenty-first centuries promoted via the official tourism board of Goa.

Given that the colonial archive is conceived very broadly, the historical sources have multiplied, raising problems concerning the criteria for selecting documents.³⁶ An enlarged bibliography is a consequence of these epistemological choices too. Studies of the imperial experiences of the British in India, and of the Spanish in the Americas, are relevant to an understanding of the Portuguese imperial experience. The first, because of their playing out in the same geography; and the second, because of a similar cultural configuration, chronology, and other common ground. The theories that emerged from within the anglophone academy – namely, those concerning the critique of Orientalism,³⁷ *Cultural Studies*, and *Postcolonial Studies*³⁸ – are also critical to my work. They invite

³⁶ See the idea of the archive in Foucault, *L'Archéologie du Savoir*. About its relevance to the study of the experiences of the Portuguese Empire, see, *in genere*, A.B. Xavier and Madeira Santos, "Cultura Intelectual".

³⁷ In addition to Foucault, see Said, *Orientalism* and *Culture and Imperialism*; Inden, *Imagining India*; Trautmann, *Aryans and British India*. These books have, among others, inspired me to rethink the relationship between historical sources and the imperial archive in relation to what concerns Portuguese imperial experiences.

³⁸ Besides Cooper and Stoler, eds, *Tensions of Empire*, this book was

us to integrate the study of the Portuguese experience into more general synchronic studies and diachronic histories in the colonial and postcolonial register,³⁹ while adhering to the connected histories method proposed by Sanjay Subrahmanyam.⁴⁰

The impossibility of knowing, in equal measure and with the same depth, both the historiography on the Portuguese Empire and Portugal and on other empires and other places, not to speak of the theoretical debate and methodologies related to them, is reflected in the bibliographic eclecticism of my book. One of the results of my theoretical wanderings within a vast intellectual terrain – as also the need for the book to adhere to a word limit – is that all of the literature directly or indirectly relevant for an analysis of the Christianisation of the territories of Goa has not been brought into play here.⁴¹ But to alert readers to the limits and constraints within which this book – like every other – works should not obscure a larger fact about its purpose: that what it seeks to illuminate – *pace* Frias – are situations that would otherwise remain undocumented.

First of all, I assume that the territories of Goa were not as culturally homogeneous as Orientalist interpretations have suggested. The multiplicity of experiences and histories that characterised the political culture of local populations made them keenly dynamic. These populations were used to external domination; they possessed the intellectual and material wherewithal to manage

substantially inspired by the perspectives of Dirks, ed., *Colonialism and Culture*; Breckenridge and van der Veer, eds, *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*; Prakash, ed., *After Colonialism*.

³⁹ Comparisons with experiences of Christianisation in other imperial contexts, whether similar (like the Hispanic), or distinct (like the British), are particularly enriching. See, among others, Ballhatchet, *Caste, Society and Catholicism*; and Gruzinski, *La Colonisation de l'imaginaire*.

⁴⁰ Subrahmanyam, *Explorations in Connected History*; and Gruzinski, *Les Quatre Parties du Monde*.

⁴¹ One example is the publication of the volumes edited by M.J.M. Lopes, *O Império Oriental, 1660–1820*. The same happened with Perez, ed., *Os Portugueses e o Oriente*.

situations perceived as reiterations of domination. In other words, the Portuguese presence was perceived, received, incorporated, and filtered through local past experiences and political culture.

The first two chapters chiefly explore the period between 1530 and 1540. In them I suggest that the political and administrative reorganisation of imperial territories conceived of in the reign of Dom João III resulted in a specific *idea of empire*. A reformulation of the relationship established by the kings of Portugal with the people under their rule, with its singular expression in Goa, made this idea material. The first chapter, dedicated to the historiography of the government of Dom João III, analyses the Portuguese presence in mid-sixteenth-century India using the concept of “reform” rather than, as is more common in the scholarship, that of “crisis”.

The adoption of “reform” as a theoretical framework has resulted in a reassessment of the scholarship on European cultural and political experiences in the early-modern period, the argument being that the interdependence of political and religious power in the European monarchies (Catholic and Protestant) was crucial to processes conducive to the centralisation of power and a homogenisation of the polity, and thus to laying the foundations of modern European societies. This historiography has not only altered our understanding of early-modern European history but also been critical in creating new understandings of relations between metropole and colony in the Portuguese empire.

In a similar vein, I argue that the Estado da Índia in the mid-sixteenth century became a kind of imperial refounding inspired by the model of Imperial Rome. This inspiration from ancient Rome then combined with a reformulation of languages and practices of religious and political alterity headed by metropolitan elites. The worldviews of the “reformers”, however, did not always coincide with the imaginaries of those credited with having “feito a Índia”, i.e. having “made India” – people who believed they had come under a “crisis”.

The translation, or implementation, of the practices of political, religious, and cultural homogenisation “planned” in Portugal

for the territories most crucial to the Estado da Índia constitute the object of the second chapter. In it I describe the political and administrative implementation of this model and its implications for the relationship between colonisers and the colonised. The chapter also develops the idea that parallel notions of empire coexisted in Portugal and the colony, resulting in an inevitable heterogeneity.

Heterogeneity characterised the clergy – the protagonist of the third and fourth chapters. Both these chapters analyse the strategies and tools developed by Franciscans and Jesuits in order to Christianise and culturally convert non-Christian populations in Goa. The third chapter focuses on the institutional framework implemented in the villages, and the powers accumulated by clerics in these spaces. It also analyses the manner in which missionaries sought to integrate themselves into the local context by manipulating information gathered through ecclesiastical networks, frequently taking advantage of pre-existing local structures of communication. The fourth chapter analyses two mechanisms of social and cultural reproduction: education and poor relief. It discusses how education and poor relief were used by Franciscans and Jesuits to favour distinct modes of cultural conversion.

The fifth chapter inverts the perspective by exploring specific episodes that illustrate the cultural conversion of places and people. Through an analysis of the process of collective conversion of the population of the island of Chorão, this chapter identifies the catalogue of behaviours that characterised the attitudes of local groups facing the mechanics of conversion, ranging from resistance to pragmatism. Inspired by Gauri Viswanathan's work on religious conversions in the context of British India, this chapter also explores the hypothesis that conversion allowed some Goans to express political dissent against the existing order.⁴²

Chapter 6 focuses on explicit forms of resistance against the Portuguese imperial administration: for instance, the intense episode

⁴² Viswanathan, "Coping with (Civil) Death"; Viswanathan, "Religious Conversion"; Viswanathan, *Outside the Fold*.

which came to be known as the “martyrdom of Cuncolim”, but also other less dramatic events and everyday forms of resistance.⁴³ These revolts and instances of resistance did not annihilate the Portuguese imperial presence. Memories of the repression of the Cuncolim revolt of 1583 were frequently evoked and weaponised by the Portuguese authorities to prevent future uprisings. Furthermore, the concessions made to the “collaborationists” by the Portuguese Crown after these revolts were so enticing that they perpetuated imperial governance. The growing participation of local elites in the imperial administration, and their gradual recognition by the Crown – manifested in the attribution of honours of the Order of Christ and other distinctions – indicate the efficacy of the strategies employed by the Portuguese in Goa.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the final chapter examines forms of conformity and adherence, whether pragmatic or not, to Portuguese rule. Chapter 7 discusses the change of behaviour of local elites which enabled profound cultural conversions in the medium and long term, as attested to by the example of Frias. Similarly, treatises on biblical history and the memory of Christianisation that emerged from the second half of the seventeenth century sought to provide genealogies of Goans as inheritors of pre-Christian and early-Christian traditions. Thus, these genealogies transfigured Goan families and elites into bearers of this spiritual lineage, which then indelibly associated them with the local nobility. These Goan elites assumed that they were those the Portuguese Crown could confide in, and consequently confer on them the principal available roles and appointments. Although the decree of 1761 partially satisfied these aspirations, the “Revolt of the Pintos” (1787) clearly demonstrated the incompatibility between social equality and empire, making it clear that the strategies employed by local elites and the objectives of the Portuguese Crown – but also the liberal monarchy – in the early-modern period had different aims and aspirations.

⁴³ These events are similar to those referred to in Scott, *Weapons of the Weak*, and Adas, “From Avoidance to Confrontation”.