

RESEARCH

Open Access



Ethnoichthyology of the indigenous Truká people, Northeast Brazil

Carlos Alberto Batista Santos^{1,2*} and Rômulo Romeu Nóbrea Alves³

Abstract

Background: Historically, fishing is an important activity for riverine communities established along the São Francisco River, including indigenous communities. In the present study, we researched fishing activities in two villages of the Truká ethnic group, both located in the State of Pernambuco along the sub-middle section of the São Francisco River, Northeast Brazil. We recorded the richness and uses of the fished species and the ecological knowledge on these species, the fishing techniques employed and the perception of the indigenous people regarding current environmental impacts on the São Francisco River that influence local fishing.

Method: The information was obtained through interviews with 33 Truká fishers (27 men and six women), including 17 interviewees from Central Village (Cabrobó) and 16 from Tapera Village (Orocó).

Results: Using five fishing techniques, the interviewees caught 25 fish species, including 21 native and four exotic species. All species are used as food, and two species are used in traditional Truká medicine. The interviewees revealed that fishing currently has less importance in their subsistence. They indicated that this situation is occurring because of several factors, such as the introduction of exotic species, pollution and urbanization, that have impacted the São Francisco River, resulting in a decline of fishing resources. Nevertheless, we found that the indigenous people who are still fishing have a broad knowledge of the habitat and ecology of the target fishing.

Conclusion: Although fishing is declining in importance among the Truká, we found that the individuals who are still practicing this activity have a broad knowledge about the habitat and ecology of the target species and apply that knowledge to fishing methods. Knowledge about the ecology of the species and the environmental impacts that have affected them can support basic research on local fish populations and research investigating the environmental impacts, resource management and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.

Keywords: Ethnobiology, Ethnozoology, Fisheries, São Francisco river, Traditional knowledge

Background

Fishing is one of the oldest activities in human history [1] and has continued to play an essential role in the subsistence, economy and culture of many human communities worldwide [2–8]. In Brazil, home to a large diversity of coastal and continental aquatic ecosystems, fishing activities are employed by indigenous communities and by different traditional communities that were formed during the

European colonization, persisting in many regions of the country to the present as an activity of great social and cultural importance [9].

Artisanal fishers are recognized for having developed an elaborate knowledge about the biological resources exploited, which includes aspects of ecology, taxonomy and ethology [10–14]. This knowledge has been examined through ethnozoological studies, which indicate that information from fishers can support academic research on the biology of the exploited species or research directed toward the development of management and sustainability plans for the exploited resources [15–23].

Considering the importance of fishing in Brazil, many ethnoichthyological studies have been conducted in the country, especially in the riverine fishing communities of

* Correspondence: cacobatista@yahoo.com.br

¹Programa de Pós Graduação em Etnobiologia e Conservação da Natureza, Departamento de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Rua Dom Manoel de Medeiros, s/n, Dois Irmãos, 52171-900 Recife, PE, Brasil

²Departamento de Tecnologia e Ciências Sociais, Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Avenida Edgard Chastinet, s/n, São Geraldo, 48905-680 Juazeiro, BA, Brasil

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



the Amazon, in the *Caiçara* communities of the south-eastern coast and in the estuarine-marine areas of the northeast [19]. In reservoirs and rivers within the Caatinga (Brazilian savanna) morphoclimatic domain, a few studies have been conducted on the exploitation of fishing resources by artisanal fishing communities. Usually, these studies have focused on the fishers from the banks of the São Francisco River [24–27].

Ethnoichthyological studies involving indigenous populations of the Brazilian semi-arid regions are rare, although many indigenous ethnic groups (i.e., the Tuxá, Pankararu, Pankararé, Kantaruré, Xucuru Kariri, Atikum and Truká) have practiced fishing for many years. Fishing has historical importance, especially for the ethnic groups settled along the São Francisco River, where, naturally, they had access to the river wildlife, which made fishing one of the main sources of protein for these communities [28]. This scenario, however, has undergone profound changes in recent decades with the damming of the São Francisco River in many areas, leading to hydrological alterations and flooding of the territories of these indigenous populations. Thus, fishing, once an activity of paramount importance for these populations, has lost its leading role.

This study is the first ethnoichthyological research conducted with the Truká ethnic group inhabiting the semi-arid region of the State of Pernambuco. This is a descriptive study that sought to 1) assess the richness of the fished species and the fishing techniques employed by these people, 2) investigate whether fishing remains an important activity as a source of protein, and 3) analyse the local knowledge on the fished species that are important in the organization of fishing activities. Moreover, the present study also considered the perception of the indigenous people regarding the alteration in fishing practices resulting from changes made in recent years in the São Francisco River with the construction of local hydroelectric plants.

Methods

Study area

The study was conducted in two Truká villages located in the north-eastern semi-arid region, along the sub-middle section of the São Francisco River, State of Pernambuco, Brazil (Fig. 1). One of the communities, called Aldeia Mãe (Mother Village), is located in Assunção Island, municipality of Cabrobó (8° 31' 07.11'' S x 39° 22' 20.87'' W), and the other village is located in Tapera Island, municipality of Orocó (8° 36' 24.4'' S x 39° 34' 54.9'' W), 39.85 km from Aldeia Mãe. Both villages are located within the Caatinga domain [29, 30], where the main economic activity is agriculture, followed by animal husbandry and handicraft production. Fishing and hunting

are elements of the cultural tradition that identify and differentiate the ethnic groups [31].

Legal and ethical aspects

Considering the ethical aspects, before each interview, the purposes of this present study were explained and permission requested to register the information through the presentation and signing of the Informed Consent Form (ICF) and the authorization of image use form. The authorization to access the traditional knowledge associated to the genetic heritage was granted by the Research Ethic Committee (Legal view N°723.750), of the National Historic and Artistic Heritage Institute (N° 013/2013 legal process n° 01450.010527/2013-30), and the clearance to ingress in Indian territories was granted by the National Indian Foundation, supported the Lower São Francisco Regional Coordination.

Data collection

The data were collected from July 2013 to February 2014, with an effort of 4 days per month in each village surveyed, totalling 32 days for each village over the course of the study. The information was obtained through interviews with 33 Truká fishers (27 men and six women), including 17 interviewees from Aldeia Mãe (Cabrobó) and 16 from Tapera Village (Orocó).


A non-probabilistic purposive sampling method was applied to select the interviewees [32] using the snowball technique [33]. Indigenous fishermen and fisherwomen living in the villages, who were 18 years of age or older, were interviewed. Information on traditional ecological knowledge and the local use of the ichthyofauna was obtained through semi-structured questionnaires using free interviews and informal conversations [32, 34]. Questionnaires contained questions about the fish species caught, fish uses, capture methods and habitat of the fished species.

Specimens were identified through consultation with experts, through examination of specimens acquired directly from the fishers and through photographs taken during the interviews. All specimens were deposited in the Zoology Museum, Fish Division, Feira de Santana State University (Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana-UEFS). Questionnaires, photographs, and recorded interviews were deposited in the Opará Indigenous Training and Research Centre (Centro de Formação e Pesquisa Indígena Opará), Bahia State University (Universidade do Estado da Bahia-UNEB).

Results and discussion

Species used

The Truká interviewed cited a total of 25 fish species used in the villages surveyed. Higher species richness ($n = 24$) was mentioned in the Cabrobó village



compared to the Orocó village ($n = 15$) (Table 1). The most cited species were *Myleus micans* (pacu) ($n = 30$ citations), *Leporinus cf piau* (piau) ($n = 22$), *Leporinus obtusidens* (true piau) ($n = 21$), *Prochilodus argenteus* (crumatá) ($n = 19$) and *Metynnis maculatus* (spotted metynnis) ($n = 18$).

Considering the species richness recorded for the São Francisco River basin, which totals 244 fish species, we found that 10.3 % ($n = 25$) of these species are recognized and used by the Truká people who inhabit the villages surveyed. A total of 21 (84 %) fish species cited by interviewees as being currently fished are native, which highlights the Truká preference for these species compared to exotic species that have been introduced in the São Francisco River Basin and, according to Sato and Godinho [35], have established populations in the river. Those authors highlight the following species among the fish introduced in the area: peacock bass (*Cichla* spp.), South American silver croaker (*Plagioscion squamosissimus*), carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), African catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*), tambaqui (*Colossoma macropomum*), and

tilapia (*Oreochromis* sp. and *Tilapia* sp.), three of which were mentioned by the interviewees. The production of some of these species has been encouraged among riverine inhabitants of the São Francisco River, including in the area surveyed. The São Francisco Valley Development Company (Companhia de Desenvolvimento do Vale do São Francisco-CODEVASF) provided access to technology for the farming of tambaqui (*Colossoma macropomum*) in the Cabrobó village.

The four exotic species cited by respondents were recently introduced (from the 70s onwards) [35–37], and they represent only a small fraction of part of the ichthyofauna locally used by the Truká people. Fish farming has increased in recent years in the sub-middle section of the São Francisco River, made possible by the existence of large dam reservoirs. However, aquaculture is not part of the traditional culture of indigenous fishers and involves skills and significance far from those associated with traditional fishing [38]. The nature of this situation is such that artisanal fishing in the sub-middle section of the São Francisco River, where fish has always

Table 1 Fish species used by the Truká people from the Cabrobó (Aldeia Mãe) and Orocó villages

Family/Local species name	Scientific species name	Origin	No. of citations (villages)	
			CA	O
Sciaenidae				
Pescada	<i>Plagioscion squamosissimus</i> Heckel, 1840	E	10	10
Cichlidae				
Apairi	<i>Astronotus ocellatus</i> Agassiz, 1831	E	5	–
Tucunará	<i>Cichla ocellaris</i> Bloch & Schneider, 1801	E	8	9
Serrasalmidae				
Tambaqui	<i>Colossoma macropomum</i> Cuvier, 1818	E	10	4
Characidae				
Pirambeba	<i>Serrasalmus brandtii</i> Reinhardt, 1874	N	8	5
Piranha	<i>Pygocentrus piraya</i> Cuvier, 1819	N	6	5
Pacu	<i>Metynnis maculatus</i> Kner, 1860	N	8	10
Pacu-preto	<i>Myleus micans</i> Reinhardt, 1874	N	15	15
Dourado	<i>Salminus cf. brasiliensis</i> Cuvier, 1817	N	8	–
Erythrinidae				
Traíra	<i>Hoplias malabaricus</i> Bloch, 1794	N	6	4
Bryconidae				
Matrinchá	<i>Brycon reinhardtii</i> Lütken, 1875	N	3	–
Anastomidae				
Piau	<i>Leporinus cf. piau</i> Fowler, 1941	N	9	13
Piau-verdadeiro	<i>Leporinus obtusidens</i> Valenciennes, 1836	N	6	15
Prochilodontidae				
Crumatá	<i>Prochilodus argenteus</i> Agassiz, 1829	N	12	7
Loricariidae				
Cananã	<i>Hypostomus margaritifer</i> Regan, 1808	N	5	8
Cascudo	<i>Pterygoplichthys etentaculatus</i> Spix & Agassiz, 1829	N	6	–
Xotó	<i>Hypostomus macrops</i> Eigenmann & Eigenmann, 1888	N	6	–
Cari	<i>Rhinelepis aspera</i> Spix & Agassiz, 1829	N	9	5
Pimelodidae				
Pirá	<i>Conorhynchus conirostris</i> Valenciennes, 1840	N	4	–
Surubim	<i>Pseudoplatystoma coruscans</i> Spix & Agassiz, 1829	N	5	–
Pseudopimelodide				
Pacamã	<i>Lophiosilurus alexandri</i> Steindachner, 1877	N	–	3
Auchenipteridae				
Caboge	<i>Parauchenipterus galeatus</i> Linnaeus, 1766	N	6	–
Heptapteridae				
Mandim	<i>Pimelodella cf. vittata</i> Lütken, 1874	N	4	1
Sciaenidae				
Cruvina	<i>Pachyurus francisci</i> Cuvier, 1830	N	4	–
Gymnotidae				
Sarapó	<i>Gymnotus cf. carapo</i> Linnaeus, 1758	N	4	–

Legend: CA Cabrobó, O Orocó, N native species, E exotic species

constituted an important nutritional component for local human populations, has been declining each year.

For the interviewed fishers, food is the main objective of fishing. However, they claim that fish are currently used as a complimentary protein source, in contrast with a few decades ago, when fish accounted for a significant part of the diet in the villages surveyed. Such evidence reinforces observations reported in previous studies, which indicate that currently, the protein base of the Truká diet is composed of meat from domestic vertebrates, including cattle, goats, sheep and pigs [31]. This information suggests that there has been a change in the main protein sources of the Truká Indians. According to Aspelin and Santos [28], fishing was a very common practice among the Truká people. However, this activity has declined in importance as a result of fish shortages and the changes experienced by this ethnic group over the years through constant contact with non-Indians [39]. When there is a surplus in the fishing, the fishes are commercialized within the village among local indigenous families.

Changes in the diets of human populations resulting from factors such as urbanization and contact with nonindigenous populations have been recorded worldwide [40, 41]. Our results show that this situation has occurred among the Truká and possibly among other indigenous and nonindigenous communities who settled along the São Francisco River, which was one of the main sources of fisheries resources that supplied the fish markets of the northeast and southeast of Brazil [42].

In addition to the importance of fish as food, we recorded the use of fish in traditional Truká medicine. In Brazil, the use of animals, including fish, as medicinal resources is a fairly widespread and ancient phenomenon. Fish are among the most frequently used vertebrates for medicinal purposes in fishing and riverine communities [43, 44]. Although continental and semi-arid areas have a lower diversity of fish species in relation to the coastal areas, some of these species are used in folk medicine [45]. The use of fishes in popular medicine has been recorded in fishing communities in Brazil and many other countries in Latin America [44, 46–54]. The multiple use of fishes by humans is common [43, 55] and reinforces the importance of fish in the culture, livelihood and economic activities of fishing communities [5]. The reliance on traditional uses of animals as food and as medicine by communities around the world highlights the need for further interdisciplinary research in ethnozoology which can be used in strategies to conserve biodiversity [55]. In the surveyed area, it was not registered food taboos associated to fishes mentioned by interviewees. It differs from what has been reported in previous studies [54, 56, 57] that points out food taboos in

several fishing communities. For example, the consumption of some animals may be avoided because of their behavioral patterns and morphological characteristics [58], or in the belief that they are toxic [54].

The indigenous Truká fishers cited two fish species used as medicine, the trahira (*Hoplias malabaricus*) and spotted sorubim (*Pseudoplatystoma corruscans*). However, these species are mainly used for food, and at times, their by-products are used in folk medicine. The interviewees noted that trahira is used to treat earache, toothache and fatigue (asthma). The part used is the fat, which is warmed and rubbed on the affected body part. The trahira has medicinal use in several communities of the Brazilian semi-arid northeast and is one of the most important fish species in folk medicine in the region. Previous studies indicate that in addition to the whole animal, other parts of the fish are also used, including the fat, epidermal secretion, stomach, head, scales and meat. These products are prescribed to treat the following diseases: alcoholism, earache, inflammation, high cholesterol, sore throat, inflammation of the umbilical cord, bruising, ear inflammation, hearing problems, eye inflammation, urinary tract infection, deafness, asthma, muscle aches, erysipelas, wounds, bleeding, snake bite, conjunctivitis, oedema, rheumatism, glaucoma, and stroke [25, 43, 59–62]. This broad range of zootherapeutic uses and the various locations where such use has been recorded make *H. malabaricus* one of the fish species most extensively used in Brazilian folk medicine [59, 63, 64].

Regarding the spotted sorubim, in the areas surveyed, the spine is used to 'remove anger' (control bad temper/anxiousness) and 'evil eye'. For this purpose, the fish spine is pounded, toasted, and then used to prepare a tea, which the patient drinks to achieve the desired effect. Costa-Neto et al. [26] also recorded the use of the spotted sorubim for the treatment of burns by artisanal fishers in the region of the middle São Francisco River; however, in this case, the part used was the fat.

Capture techniques and general aspects of fishing among the Truká

In the villages surveyed, fishing can be practiced by men and women, although there is a predominance of the former. Children also participate in fishing when they accompany the adults during their fishing activities. The predominance of men may be explained by the fact that historically in Truká culture, as in other traditional communities, men are responsible for supporting and maintaining the family and women are responsible for caring for the home. Ethnozoological studies show that activities such as fishing and hunting, two of the main subsistence activities of indigenous communities, are practiced predominantly by

men, who end up developing greater knowledge about the species exploited and their biology, as this knowledge is important in the organization of fishing and hunting activities [5, 6, 65–68].

To catch fish, the interviewees cited five different fishing techniques: bow and arrow, rod and hook, cast net, fishing net and hand line (Fig. 2). The first technique is one of the oldest fishing techniques practiced by indigenous communities in Brazil [69]; however, according to the interviewees, currently, it is not widely used in the surveyed area because it requires a lot of skill.

According to interviewees, fishing activities do not require much time in the surveyed area. This is a common characteristic in the fishing areas of the Brazilian semi-arid region, where fishing trips usually last a few hours. This situation differs from estuarine and marine fishing, which in some cases can take several hours or even days [5, 8]. In the two villages surveyed, the travel to the fishing areas in the river is performed with the aid of canoes, with paddles (Fig. 3a) or a diesel engine (Fig. 3b) used as the driving force.

Ecological knowledge on fished species

Artisanal fishers develop an elaborate knowledge of the abiotic and biotic factors related to the fisheries resources they exploit [11, 13, 70–73]. This knowledge is important to the organization and success of fishing activities. The Truká fishers were found to have a broad knowledge of the distribution of fish species in the environment and their position in the water column, i.e., the depth the animals usually inhabit. This information is important when choosing the fishing gear to be used and for selecting the target species (Table 2). The fishing

technique used is chosen while taking into consideration the target species and the depth and vertical distribution of the fish. Moreover, fishermen also recognize a diversity of fish habitats, citing waterfalls, rapids, rock caves and vegetation patches as the preferred habitats of some species (Table 3).

Knowledge of the distribution, habitat, and ecology of fish species is an important driver of the capture strategies to be used. A previous study conducted with fishers in the Três Marias dam and other sections of the upper-middle São Francisco also revealed that this type of knowledge is applied to the selection of fishing techniques [74]. Those authors note that the compartmentalization of the aquatic ecosystem perceived by the fishers reduce the uncertainty of fishing because fish are a mobile resource and therefore uncertain. These ethno-habitats may be understood as ecozones, which were defined by Posey [75] as ecological areas recognized in other cultural systems and may or may not reflect the scientific classification. These findings reinforce previous studies that showed the importance of knowledge of abiotic and ecological factors in the organization of fishing activities, whether in coastal or inland areas [11, 14, 70, 71, 76, 77].

Environmental changes and their influence on fishing among the Truká

The fishers cited several problems that, according to them, have led to the decline of fishing in the villages surveyed. These problems include the growth of illegal fishing in the Truká territory by non-indigenous fishers, deforestation of the river banks, introduction of exotic species and pollution. These same factors were reported by Oliveira and Souza [36] to cause the



Fig. 2 Truká fishing techniques: (a) bow and arrow; (b) cast net; (c) net; (d) hook; (e) hand line



Fig. 3 Fishing canoe. (a) Paddle; (b) Diesel engine

decline of fishing stocks in the sub-middle São Francisco River. The introduction of exotic species in fresh water environments has been recognized as one of the greatest impacts to native species throughout the world [78–80]. In the case of the São Francisco River, several species have been introduced, and as indicated by the statements of the interviewees, these introductions have impacted the native species and caused changes in the traditional fishing activity of riverine populations. The species cited by the fishers included the butterfly peacock bass (*Cichla ocellaris*) and South American silver croaker (*Plagioscion squamosissimus*). These species were introduced to the Sobradinho Hydroelectric Plant Lake by the National Department of Works Against Drought (Departamento Nacional de Obras Contra as Secas-DNOCS) at the end of the 1970s [37]. In addition, many other species have been introduced species from fish farming experiments in the region, such as the oscar (*Astronotus ocellatus*) and tambaqui (*Colossoma macropomum*), generating

at times negative impacts on the native fish populations [37].

The local fishers also mentioned that pollution, use of pesticides and sewage from riverine cities discharged into the river are factors that have caused the decline of native fish species. The occurrence of these problems along the São Francisco River basin has been recognized in different studies and, as highlighted by Gisler and Vasconcelos [81], has led to a reduction in fish stocks in the region.

The Truká, as well as other riverside communities along the São Francisco River, have been heavily affected by environmental degradation, which has intensified as a result of the construction of a series of dams along the course of the river and the intensification of urbanization [28, 35, 42]. Hydroelectric dams have strong negative impacts on fishing and are among the main causes of the decline of fishing in rivers and freshwater environments in many countries [82, 83]. The regulation of the hydrological regime of a river through dams is generally

Table 2 Association between vertical habitat division, fish species and fishing artefact used by Truká fishers

Habitat	Fish species (Cabrobó)	Fish species (Orocó)	Fishing artefact
'Water surface' (30 cm)	–	–	–
'Shallow' (100 cm)	<i>Hoplias malabaricus</i>	<i>Hoplias malabaricus</i> and <i>Lophosilurus alexandri</i>	Bow and arrow Hand line
'Moderately deep' (160 cm)	<i>Cichla ocellaris</i> , <i>Serrasalmus brandtii</i> , <i>Salminus</i> cf. <i>brasiliensis</i> , <i>Conorhynchus conirostris</i> , <i>Pachyurus Francisci</i>	<i>Serrasalmus brandtii</i>	Rod and hook Hand line Cast net Paddle canoe
'Deep' (starting at 200 cm)	<i>Pseudoplatystoma Coruscans</i> , <i>Pimelodella</i> cf. <i>vittata</i> , <i>Leporinus</i> cf. <i>piau</i> , <i>Metynnis maculatus</i> , <i>Pterygoplichthys etentaculatus</i> , <i>Astronotus ocellatus</i> , <i>Colossoma macropomum</i> , <i>Hypostomus</i> cf. <i>margaritifera</i> , <i>Plagioscion squamosissimus</i> , <i>Brycon reinhardtii</i> , <i>Prochilodus argenteus</i> , <i>Conorhynchus conirostris</i> , <i>Pygocentrus piraya</i>	<i>Pimelodella</i> cf. <i>vittata</i> , <i>Leporinus</i> cf. <i>piau</i> , <i>Metynnis maculatus</i> , <i>Cichla ocellaris</i> , <i>Colossoma macropomum</i> , <i>Hypostomus</i> cf. <i>margaritifera</i> , <i>Plagioscion squamosissimus</i> , <i>Prochilodus argenteus</i> , <i>Pygocentrus piraya</i>	Rod and hook Fishing net Motorized canoe
'Mud' (450 cm to 1000 cm)	<i>Hoplias malabaricus</i> , <i>Hypostomus macrops</i> , <i>Pterygoplichthys etentaculatus</i> , <i>Gymnotus</i> cf. <i>carapo</i> , <i>Parauchenipterus galeatus</i>	<i>Pterygoplichthys etentaculatus</i>	Cast net Rod and hook Fishing net

Table 3 Association between river sections, fish species and fishing artefacts informed by Truká fishers

Habitat	Fish species (Cabrobó)	Fish species (Orocó)	Fishing artefact
'Waterfalls'	<i>Hoplias malabaricus</i> , <i>Serrasalmus brandtii</i> , <i>Conorhynchus conirostris</i> , <i>Pachyurus Francisci</i>	<i>Hoplias malabaricus</i>	Rod and hook
'Rapids'	<i>Astronotus ocellatus</i> , <i>Colossoma macropomum</i> , <i>Hypostomus cf margaritifer</i> , <i>Plagioscion squamosissimus</i> , <i>Prochilodus argenteus</i> , <i>Pygocentrus piraya</i> , <i>Cichla ocellaris</i>	<i>Cichla ocellaris</i> , <i>Colossoma macropomum</i> , <i>Hypostomus cf margaritifer</i> , <i>Plagioscion squamosissimus</i> , <i>Prochilodus argenteus</i> , <i>Pygocentrus piraya</i>	Rod and hook
'Rock caves'	<i>Salminus cf. brasiliensis</i> , <i>Pseudoplatystoma Coruscans</i> , <i>Hypostomus macrops</i> , <i>Pterygoplichthys etentaculatus</i> , <i>Conorhynchus conirostris</i> , <i>Parauchenipterus galeatus</i> , <i>Gymnotus cf. carapo</i> , <i>Pimelodella cf. vittata</i> , <i>Pterygoplichthys etentaculatus</i>	<i>Serrasalmus brandtii</i> , <i>Lophiosilurus alexandri</i> , <i>Pimelodella cf. vittata</i>	Rod and hook Cast net
'Vegetation patches'	<i>Leporinus cf piau</i> , <i>Brycon reinhardtii</i> , <i>Metynnis maculatus</i>	<i>Leporinus cf piau</i> and <i>Metynnis maculatus</i>	Cast net ^a Fishing netRod and hook

Legend: ^aCited only by the indigenous Truká fishers from Orocó

recognized as one of the most devastating forms of habitat degradation of inland waters [84]. Several causes may be attributed to the decline of fishing in the São Francisco River, such as pollution, improper use of soil, inadequate fishing laws, overfishing, habitat destruction and damming. All of these factors are recognized by the Truká as causing impacts and as they note, have changed the way of life not only of the Truká people but of other ethnic groups associated with the river.

Conclusions

Our results demonstrate that fishing is still an activity that persists among the Truká, who use the considerable richness of native fish species (and some exotic ones) as a food resource. Among the species used for food, two have by-products that are used in local traditional medicine. Despite the persistence of fishing and the use of fishes by the Truká, the testimonies of the interviewees indicated that this activity has less importance to their subsistence than in the past and that this shift has taken place due to a series of factors that have impacted the São Francisco River and caused the decline of fish stocks in the communities surveyed. This situation is an example of how environmental degradation has affected the subsistence culture of indigenous communities.

Although fishing is declining in importance among the Truká, we found that the individuals who are still practicing this activity have a broad knowledge about the habitat and ecology of the target species and apply that knowledge to fishing methods. The Truká also provided information on the impacts related to population declines in the fish fauna of the São Francisco River. Knowledge about the ecology of the species and the environmental impacts that have affected them can support basic research on local fish populations

and research investigating the environmental impacts, resource management and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

CABS-Data collection; CABS and RRNA-Writing of the manuscript, literature survey and interpretation, and analysis of taxonomic aspects. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

A special thanks to the Truká people who contributed the information and knowledge for this study. We also thank the experts who contributed to the identification of fish species, Paul Roberto Duarte Lopes, MSc, and James Tavares de Oliveira Silva, MSc, from UEFS. Thanks also to the National Council of Technological and Scientific Development (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico-CNPQ) for the research productivity scholarship granted to RRNA and for financial support (Process 476460/2012-3).

Author details

¹Programa de Pós Graduação em Etnobiologia e Conservação da Natureza, Departamento de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Rua Dom Manoel de Medeiros, s/n, Dois Irmãos, 52171-900 Recife, PE, Brasil. ²Departamento de Tecnologia e Ciências Sociais, Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Avenida Edgard Chastinet, s/n, São Geraldo, 48905-680 Juazeiro, BA, Brasil. ³Departamento de Biologia, Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Av. das Baraúnas, 351/Campus Universitário, Bodocongó, 58109-753 Campina Grande, Paraíba, Brasil.

Received: 19 November 2015 Accepted: 23 December 2015

Published online: 06 January 2016

References

- Alves RRN. Relationships between fauna and people and the role of ethnobiology in animal conservation. *Ethnobiology and Conservation*. 2012; 1:1–69.
- Rocha MSP, Mourão JS, Souto WMS, Barboza RRD, Alves RRN. Uso dos recursos pesqueiros no Estuário do Rio Mamanguape, Estado da Paraíba, Brasil. *Interciência*. 2008;33:903–9.
- FAO - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2008. Rome Italy: FAO Fisheries Department; 2009.
- FAO—Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. What future for inland fisheries? In: The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2010.

- Rome, Italy: FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; 2010.
5. Pinto MF, Mourão JS, Alves RRN. Use of ichthyofauna by artisanal fishermen at two protected areas along the coast of Northeast Brazil. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2015;11:1–32.
 6. Pinto MF, Mourão JS, Alves RRN. Ethnotaxonomical considerations and usage of ichthyofauna in a fishing community in Ceará State, Northeast Brazil. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2013;9:1–11.
 7. Begossi A, Silvano RAM, Amaral BD, Oyakama OT. Uses of fish and game by inhabitants of an extraterritorial reserve (Upper Juruá, Acre, Brazil). *Environ Dev Sustain*. 1999;1:73–93.
 8. Mourão JS, Nordi N. Pescadores, peixes, espaço e tempo: uma abordagem Etnoecológica. *Interciencia*. 2006;31:358–63.
 9. Diegues AC, Arruda RSV, Silva VCF, Figols FAB, Andrade D. Os Saberes Tradicionais e a Biodiversidade no Brasil. 1st ed. São Paulo: Ministério do Meio Ambiente; 1999.
 10. Paz VA, Begossi A. Ethnoichthyology of Galviboa fishermen of Sepetiba Bay, Brazil. *J Ethnobiol*. 1996;16:157–68.
 11. Alves RRN, Nishida AK. A ecdise do caranguejo-uçá, *Ucides cordatus* L. (Decapoda, Brachyura) na visão dos caranguejeiros. *Interciencia*. 2002;27:110–7.
 12. Seixas C, Begossi A. Ethnozoology of caiçaras from Adventureiro, Ilha Grande. *J Ethnobiol*. 2001;21:107–35.
 13. Nishida AK, Nordi N, Alves RRN. Mollusc gathering in Northeast Brazil: an ethnoecological approach. *Hum Ecol*. 2006;34:133–45.
 14. Nordi N, Nishida AK, Alves RRN. Effectiveness of two gathering techniques for *Ucides cordatus* in Northeast Brazil: implications for the sustainability of mangrove ecosystems. *Hum Ecol*. 2009;37:121–7.
 15. Gadgil M, Berkes F, Folke C. Indigenous knowledge for biodiversity conservation. *Ambio*. 1993;22:151–6.
 16. Berkes F, Folke C, Gadgil M. Traditional ecological knowledge, biodiversity, resilience and sustainability. 1995. Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics.
 17. Capistrano JF, Lopes PFML. Crab gatherers perceive concrete changes in the life history traits of *Ucides cordatus* (Linnaeus, 1763), but overestimate their past and current catches. *Ethnobiology and Conservation*. 2012;1:1–21.
 18. Alves RRN, Souto WMS. Ethnozoology: a brief introduction. *Ethnobiology and Conservation*. 2015;4:1–13.
 19. Alves RRN, Souto WMS. Ethnozoology in Brazil: current status and perspectives. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2011;7(22):1–18.
 20. Silvano RAM, Begossi A. What can be learned from fishers? An integrated survey of fishers' local ecological knowledge and bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*) biology on the Brazilian coast. *Hydrobiologia*. 2010;637:3–18.
 21. Begossi A, Svetlana SV, Andreoli TB, Clauzet M, Martinelli CM, Ferreira AGL, et al. Ethnobiology of snappers (Lutjanidae): target species and suggestions for management. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2011;7(11):1–22.
 22. Begossi A, Silvano RAM. Ecology and ethnoecology of dusky grouper [garoupa, *Epinephelus marginatus* (Lowe, 1834)] along the coast of Brazil. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2008;4(20):1–14.
 23. Premauer JM, Berkes F. A pluralistic approach to protected area governance: Indigenous Peoples and Makaira National Park, Colombia. *Ethnobiology and Conservation*. 2015;4:1–16.
 24. Marques JGW. Aspectos ecológicos na etnoictiologia dos pescadores do complexo estuarino-lagunar Mundaú-Manguaba. Alagoas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas; 1991.
 25. Marques JGW. Pescando pescadores: etnoecologia abrangente no baixo São Francisco alagoano. São Paulo, BR: NUPAUB-USP; 1995.
 26. Costa-Neto EM, Dias CV, Melo MN. O conhecimento ictiológico tradicional dos pescadores da cidade de Barra, região do Médio São Francisco, Estado da Bahia, Brasil. *Acta Scientiarum*. 2002;24:561–72.
 27. Thé APG, Nordi N. Common property resource system in a fishery of the Sao Francisco River, Minas Gerais, Brazil. *Human Ecology Review*. 2006;13:1–10.
 28. Aspelin PL, Santos SC. Indian areas threatened by hydroelectric projects in Brazil. IWGIA Document 44, International Workgroup for Indigenous Affairs. 1981. p. 201.
 29. SBG. Projeto cadastro de fontes de abastecimento por água subterrânea. Diagnóstico do município de Cabrobó, Estado de Pernambuco. CPRM/ PRODEEM. 2005.
 30. SGB. Projeto cadastro de fontes de abastecimento por água subterrânea. Diagnóstico do município de Orocó, Estado de Pernambuco. CPRM/ PRODEEM. 2005.
 31. Batista MRR. Descoberto e recebendo heranças: As lideranças Truká. PhD Thesis. Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. 2005.
 32. Albuquerque UP, Cunha LVFC, Lucena RFP, Alves RRN. Methods and techniques in ethnobiology and ethnoecology. New York: Springer; 2014.
 33. Bailey K. Methods of social research. New York: Free Press; 1994.
 34. Huntington HP. Using traditional ecological knowledge in science: methods and applications. *Ecol Appl*. 2000;10:1270–4.
 35. Sato Y, Godinho HP. Peixes da bacia do rio São Francisco. In: Lowe-McConnell RH, editor. Estudos ecológicos de comunidades de peixes tropicais. São Paulo: Edusp; 1999. p. 401–13.
 36. Oliveira LMSR, Souza JM. (Des) caminhos da pesca artesanal no submédio São Francisco. *RDE-Revista de Desenvolvimento Econômico*. 2011;12:86–90.
 37. Almeida MJ. O drama do São Francisco. Brasília: Gráfica do Senado Federal; 1971.
 38. Sigaud L. O efeito das tecnologias sobre as comunidades rurais: o caso das grandes barragens. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*. 1992;7:18–28.
 39. Vieira HTG, Oliveira JEL, Neves RCM. The intermediality relationship among Truká Indians, in Cabrobó-Pernambuco. *Saúde e Sociedade*. 2013;22:566–74.
 40. van Vliet N, Quiceno-Mesa MP, Cruz-Antia D, Tellez L, Martins C, Haiden E, et al. From fish and bushmeat to chicken nuggets: the nutrition transition in a continuum from rural to urban settings in the Tri frontier Amazon region. *Ethnobiology and Conservation*. 2015;4:1–12.
 41. Popkin BM. Global nutrition dynamics: the world is shifting rapidly toward a diet linked with noncommunicable diseases. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2006;84:289–98.
 42. Godinho AL, Godinho HP. Breve visão do São Francisco. In: Águas, peixes e pescadores do São Francisco das Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte: PUC Minas; 2003. p. 15–23.
 43. El-Deir ACA, Collier CA, Almeida Neto MS, Silva KMS, Policarpo IS, Araújo TAS, et al. Ichthyofauna used in traditional medicine in Brazil. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med*. 2012;2012 (ID 474716):1–16.
 44. Alves RRN, Rosa IL. Zooterapeutic practices among fishing communities in North and Northeast Brazil: a comparison. *J Ethnopharmacol*. 2007;111:82–103.
 45. Alves RRN. Fauna used in popular medicine in Northeast Brazil. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2009;5:1–30.
 46. Martinez GJ. Use of fauna in the traditional medicine of native Toba (qom) from the Argentine Gran Chaco region: an ethnozoological and conservationist approach. *Ethnobiology and Conservation*. 2013;2:1–43.
 47. Barros FB, Varela SAM, Pereira HM, Vicente L. Medicinal use of fauna by a traditional community in the Brazilian Amazonia. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2012;8:1–19.
 48. Silva AL. Animais medicinais: conhecimento e uso entre as populações ribeirinhas do rio Negro, Amazonas, Brasil. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Göeldi*. 2008;3:343–57.
 49. Figueiredo N. Os 'bichos' que curam: os animais e a medicina 'folk' em Belém do Pará. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Göeldi*. 1994;10:75–91.
 50. Branch L, Silva MF. Folk medicine in Alter do Chão, Pará, Brasil. *Acta Amazônica*. 1983;13:737–97.
 51. Vázquez PE, Méndez RM, Guaiascón ÓGR, Piñera EJM. Uso medicinal de la fauna silvestre en los Altos de Chiapas, México. *Interciencia*. 2006;31:491–9.
 52. Apaza L, Godoy R, Wilkie D, Byron E, Huanca T, Leonard WR, et al. Markets and the use of wild animals for traditional medicine: a case study among the Tsimané amerindians of the Bolivian rain forest. *J Ethnobiol*. 2003;23:47–64.
 53. Alves RRN, Alves HN. The faunal drugstore: animal-based remedies used in traditional medicines in Latin America. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2011; 7(9):1–43.
 54. Begossi A, Braga F. Food taboos and folk medicine among fishermen from the Tocantins River. *Amazoniana*. 1992;12:341–52.
 55. Alves RRN, Oliveira TPR, Rosa IL. Wild animals used as food medicine in Brazil. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med*. 2013;ID 670352:1–13.
 56. Meyer-Rochow VB. Food taboos: their origins and purposes. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2009;5:1–10.

57. Colding J, Folke C. The relations among threatened species, their protection, and taboos. *Conservation ecology*. 1997;1:1–6.
58. Silva AL. Comida de gente: preferências e tabus alimentares entre os ribeirinhos do Médio Rio Negro (Amazonas, Brasil). *Revista de Antropologia*. 2007;50:125–79.
59. Alves RRN, Santana GG, Rosa IL. The role of animal-derived remedies as complementary medicine in Brazil. In: Alves RRN, Rosa IL, editors. *Animals in traditional folk medicine: Implications for conservation*. Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2013. p. 289–301.
60. Ferreira FS, Fernandes-Ferreira H, Leo Neto N, Brito SV, Alves RRN. The trade of medicinal animals in Brazil: current status and perspectives. *Biodivers Conserv*. 2013;22:839–70.
61. Ferreira FS, Albuquerque UP, Coutinho HDM, Almeida WO, Alves RRN. The trade in medicinal animals in Northeastern Brazil. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med*. 2012;JID 126938:1–20.
62. Alves RRN, Oliveira MGG, Barboza RRD, Lopez LCS. An ethnozoological survey of medicinal animals commercialized in the markets of Campina Grande, NE Brazil. *Human Ecology Review*. 2010;17:1–7.
63. Alves RRN, Rosa IL, Santana GG. The role of animal-derived remedies as complementary medicine in Brazil. *BioScience*. 2007;57:949–55.
64. Silva JS, El-Deir ACA, Moura GJB, Alves RRN, Albuquerque UP. Traditional ecological knowledge about dietary and reproductive characteristics of *Tupinambis merianae* and *Hoplias malabaricus* in Semiarid Northeastern Brazil. *Hum Ecol*. 2014;42:901–11.
65. Alves RRN, Mendonça LET, Confessor MVA, Vieira WLS, Lopez LCS. Hunting strategies used in the semi-arid region of northeastern Brazil. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2009;5:1–50.
66. Alves RRN, Gonçalves MBR, Vieira WLS. Caça, uso e conservação de vertebrados no semiárido Brasileiro. *Tropical Conservation Science*. 2012;5:394–416.
67. Fernandes-Ferreira H, Mendonça SV, Albano C, Ferreira FS, Alves RRN. Hunting, use and conservation of birds in Northeast Brazil. *Biodivers Conserv*. 2012;21(1):221–44.
68. Mourão JS, Nordi N. Principais critérios utilizados por pescadores artesanais na taxonomia folk dos peixes do estuário do rio Mamanguape, Paraíba-Brasil. *Interciencia*. 2002;27:607–12.
69. Pezzuti J, Chaves RP. Ethnography and natural resources management by the Deni Indians, Amazonas, Brazil. *Acta Amazonica*. 2009;39:121–38.
70. Nishida AK, Nordi N, Alves RRN. The lunar-tide cycle viewed by crustacean and mollusc gatherers in the State of Paraíba, Northeast Brazil and their influence in collection attitudes. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2006;2:1–12.
71. Alves RRN, Nishida A, Hernandez M. Environmental perception of gatherers of the crab 'caranguejo-uca' (*Ucides cordatus*, Decapoda, Brachyura) affecting their collection attitudes. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2005;1:10.
72. Nishida AK, Nordi N, Alves RRN. Embarcações utilizadas por pescadores estuarinos da Paraíba, Nordeste Brasil. *Revista de Biologia e Farmácia*. 2008;3:1–8.
73. Silvano RAM, MacCord PFL, Lima RV, Begossi A. When does this fish spawn? Fishermen's local knowledge of migration and reproduction of Brazilian coastal fishes. *Environ Biol Fishes*. 2006;76:371–86.
74. Thé APG, Madi EF, Nordi N. Conhecimento local, regras informais e uso do peixe na pesca do alto-médio São Francisco. In: Godinho HP, Godinho AL, editors. *Águas, peixes e pescadores do São Francisco das Minas Gerais*. Belo Horizonte: Editora PUC Minas; 2003. p. 372–89.
75. Posey DA. Topics and issues in ethnoentomology with some suggestions for the development of hypothesis-generation and testing in ethnobiology. *J Ethnobiol*. 1986;6:99–120.
76. Nishida AK, Nordi N, Alves RRN. Molluscs production associated to lunar-tide cycle: a case study in Paraíba State under ethnoecology viewpoint. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed*. 2006;2:6.
77. Bezerra DMM, Nascimento DM, Ferreira EN, Rocha PD, Mourão JS. Influence of tides and winds on fishing techniques and strategies in the Mamanguape River Estuary, Paraíba State, NE Brazil. *An Acad Bras Cienc*. 2012;84:775–88.
78. Mills EL, Leach JH, Carlton JT, Secor CL. Exotic species and the integrity of the Great Lakes. *BioScience*. 1994;44:666–76.
79. Lodge DM, Stein RA, Brown KM, Covich AP, Bronmark C, Garvey JE, et al. Predicting impact of freshwater exotic species on native biodiversity: challenges in spatial scaling. *Australian Journal of Ecology*. 1998;23:53–67.
80. Kolar CS, Lodge DM. Freshwater nonindigenous species: interactions with other global changes. In: Mooney AH, Hobbs JR, editors. *Invasive species in a changing world*. Washington DC: Island Press; 2000. p. 3–30.
81. Gisler CVT, Vasconcelos RQ. Projeto de gerenciamento integrado das atividades desenvolvidas em terra na bacia do São Francisco. ANA/GEF/PNUMA/OEA. 2004.
82. Agostinho AA, Pelicice FM, Gomes LC. Dams and the fish fauna of the Neotropical region: impacts and management related to diversity and fisheries. *Braz J Biol*. 2008;68:1119–32.
83. Zhong Y, Power G. Environmental impacts of hydroelectric projects on fish resources in China. *Regul Rivers: Res Manage*. 1996;12:81–98.
84. Petts GE, Imhof J, Manny BA, Maher JFB, Weisberg SB. Management of fish populations in large rivers: a review of tools and approaches. In: *Proceedings of the International Large River Symposium Canadian special publication of fisheries and aquatic sciences*; Ottawa, Ontario. 1989. p. 578–88.

Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central and we will help you at every step:

- We accept pre-submission inquiries
- Our selector tool helps you to find the most relevant journal
- We provide round the clock customer support
- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- Inclusion in PubMed and all major indexing services
- Maximum visibility for your research

Submit your manuscript at
www.biomedcentral.com/submit

