Arawak Linguistic and Cultural Identity through Time:

Contact, Colonialism, and Creolization.

In, Comparative Arawakan Histories, (ed). F. Santos-Granero and J. Hill.

University of Illinois Press

Neil L. Whitehead

"To imagine a language is to imagine a form of life."

Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*

This chapter is concerned with the basis of linguistic classifications, the particular history of how the linguistic classification 'Arawakan' worked culturally in the region of northeastern South America during the colonial period, and the pitfalls that process presents to the uncritical identification of socio-cultural relatedness on the basis of such categories. The papers collected here show convincingly that such pitfalls can be negotiated and that there are many reasons for seeking to identify the long term historical trajectories among linguistically related groups. This issue has been particularly sensitive within the study of indigenous South America because models of historical evolution have tended to take a de-historicized view of linguistic

relatedness, assuming that such relatedness was itself supra-historical and so a given rather than a matter to be investigated (Greenberg 1987, Loukotka 1968, Rouse 1948a, 1948b, 1992). The papers collected here depart from such models by demonstrating the meaning of linguistic relatedness through attention to the archaeology, history and ethnography of Arawakan speakers. In this way they have broken that mold of glottochronological approaches to historical linguistic relatedness by emphasizing social and cultural historical trajectories over rates of linguistic change. The two phenomena are of course closely related but the ground breaking aspect of these studies lies in their attention to processes which produce glottochronological change, rather than seeing that change as evidence of historical relatedness in itself.

The emphasis on linguistic over historical relatedness really begins with the classification of languages by the colonial regimes throughout South America, the Caribbean and beyond. This was a powerful political tool since to identify a language was to simultaneously 'invent' a new culture. Thus, it was thought that the intellectual capacities and cultural proclivities of a culture stemmed from the workings and complexities of that language (Kroskrity 2000). As a matter of intellectual history it needs to be noted that the concept of "language" precedes that of "culture" and that to a large degree the pre-nineteenth century notion of a "language" was equivalent to the modern notion of "culture". Given this it should come as no surprise to find that the "identification" of indigenous languages in South America and the Caribbean was a highly political process. Moreover, since communication with colonial subjects was key to the success of the colonial project, gaining competency in native languages was a principal concern for colonial regimes. In this context missionary evangelism, centered on verbal communication of the gospel and textual ordering of indigenous speech, was pragmatically relevant to the colonial project as a whole. Nowhere is this more evident than in the initial contacts with indigenous American cultures in South America and the Caribbean (Whitehead 1999a, 1999b) and it is the purpose of this paper to examine how that moment came to exercise an influence on the subsequent linguistic ethnology of the whole region, and even beyond.

The Columbian Encounter and the Politics of Language.

It was Columbus himself who made the first and fundamental politico-linguistic distinctions with regard to the native population of the Americas and our subsequent failure to

understand our own cultural prejudices with regard to ideas of "culture" and "language" have served to perpetuate those distinctions and allowed them to become encrusted with glottochronological and historical linguistic theory (Whitehead 1995b). This has resulted in a rather confusing picture as to the ethnic identities and cultural relations that once pertained amongst the native peoples of Amazonia and the Caribbean.

Most obvious amongst these confusions is the question as to the ethnic and cultural nature of so-called "Island Carib" society, since it would appear that these people were neither Cariban (linguistically) -their natal language being Arawakan, nor islanders (exclusively) -as there is evidence that they were also settled extensively on the mainland, in the coastal area between the Orinoco and Amazon rivers (Whitehead 1995a). This paradoxical situation directly results form the initial ethnographic judgement made by Columbus and confirmed by other contemporaries, that there were two principal groupings of native peoples, one "tractable" (*guatiao*, *aruaca*) and the other "savage" (*caribe, caniba*). Although not a linguistic classification this ethnological scheme came to directly inform colonial policy, and so was also self-fulfilling (see Sued-Badillo 1995). Consequently, subsequent ethno-linguistic studies, as with the missionaries discussed below, reflected precisely these changes in native society induced by the consequences of colonial policy, reconfirming the initial discriminations and definitions of the colonizers. Also contributing to the perpetuation of this dualism was the ethnological substitution of the mainland *aruacas* (Lokono), for the *guatiao* of the islands, as the latter were destroyed or dispersed in the occupation of the islands in the sixteenth century[1]. This dualism was not simply a colonial projection, nor was it a purely linguistic judgement, but reflected real divisions in the native population. How such divisions functioned politically, linguistically and culturally is still a matter of controversy as new historical and archaeological evidence continues to emerge.

Modern anthropological approaches to the archaeology, history, linguistics and ethnography of the northern region of the South American continent and the Caribbean islands took these colonial schema as their starting point, especially as seventeenth century native

---

[1] The *guatiao* came to be known as the Taíno in the nineteenth century, following the terminology coined by the antiquarian C. F. Rafinesque (1836: I, 215-59). It is this term that

testimony as to their own cultural origins was itself already partly expressive of these dualistic cultural schema, as a direct result of Spanish colonial policies of ethnic discrimination and slavery of those designated *caribes* (see discussion below).

The analysis resulting from this set of assumptions was given its classic statement by Irving Rouse (1948a, 1948b) in his essays on "Arawak" and "Carib" for the *Handbook of South American Indians* and even in more recent publications (Rouse 1986, 1992), it is still maintained that "Island Carib" origins are linguistically and historically extraneous to the islands themselves. Thus the character of their society, as well as its political and military conflicts with other peoples in the Caribbean, is held to have resulted from a pre-Columbian military invasion and occupation of the Lesser Antilles by the "mainland Carib" (i.e. *Kariña*), as a result of which the Arawakan (i.e. *Igñeri, guatiao*) men of these islands were killed and cannibalized, while the women of these vanquished men were taken as concubines by the Kariña war-parties.

The linguist Douglas Taylor (1977) also maintained that the explanation of the different speech modes of the "Island Carib" (i.e. a natal language = *Igñeri*, and several jargons or pidgins used exclusively by men) were the result of this pre-Columbian conquest by a group of Kariña speakers of the Igñeri, using the example of Norman French supplanting Saxon English as his model for linguistic replacement. Certainly autodenominations within these gendered speech modes differed, *Karipuna* being used within the natal language, and *Kalinago* in the male jargons. Taylor further argued that the natal language of the Kariña fell into disuse as the offspring of the Kariña conquerors and their captive Karipuna wives evolved a new society, although the "fact" of this past conquest continued to be expressed in the gender polarity of the "female" Karipuna and "male" Kaliñago speech modes.

Luridly attractive though this tale may, other explanations of these speech patterns are equally possible and actually more plausible. For example, given both the frequent communication between the islands and mainland, which presumably facilitated this "conquest"

---

today is still used to suggest a profound cultural cleavage in the aboriginal population.

in the first place, as well as the fact that Kariña lived alongside Karipuna on the islands as well as the mainland, the pidgin-Kariña used by the Karipuna men could have easily had other origins (Whitehead 1988), not least since that pidgin was used with a Arawakan syntax (Hoff 1995: 49-50). Most probably, as the historian Sued-Badillo (1978) has also suggested, a political and economic adaptation and alliance to the emergent Kariña polity of the sixteenth century (Whitehead 1990a) resulted in the name 'Carib` often being applied, by indigene and colonial alike, without regard to strictly linguistic or cultural considerations; just as the Spanish used the term *caribe* to designate any and all wild or fierce Amerindians (see Whitehead 1988). French usage of the terms *Galibi* and *Caraïbe* to designate the difference between island and mainland ethnic groups was therefore more precise than the English *Carib* or Spanish *caribe* and it is significant to note that the Jesuit linguist Raymond Breton (1665:105) also refers to *Caraïbes insulaires*, implying that they were present on the continent as well, since he does not confuse them with the G*alibi*.

Further evidence of these close social and political relationships was the use of a Kariña pidgin, or even Kariña itself, by other Amerindian groups as a *lingua geral*[2] in the Antillean -Amazonian corridor (Barrère 1743, Biet 1664, Boyer 1654, Pelleprat 1655). Moreover, gender polarity in speech, as well as the use of special male jargons, is noted both from Kariña itself (Chrétien 1725) and from Arawakan languages, like Palikur (Grenand 1987) and Lokono (Stæhelin 1913 II-2:170), as well as from the Tupian (Maghæles 1527:33), whose speakers had further notable cultural homologies with the native peoples of the islands. Given this complexity and variety in indigenous linguistic practice the burden of explanation seems rather to fall on those who insist that there was a 'conquest` by Kariña-speakers, since, if this was indeed the case, why didn't the natal Karipuna (or *Igñeri*) language die out, given the facility with which contacts with Kariña-speakers could be maintained? In any case the first modern efforts to give the conquest theory a scientistic footing -by attempting to correlate the data of archaeology with that of linguistics (Rouse & Taylor 1956) -produced contradictory results as to the time-depth of a Karipuna (or *Igñeri*) presence in the Lesser Antilles, which remain unresolved. Accordingly it

---

2. Comparison with the formation and usages of *neêhengatú*, a Tupi based pidgin would seem to be particularly appropriate.

is necessary to examine the theoretical origins of this situation through an appraisal of the ethnological and anthropological judgements of Columbus and his contemporaries[3], discussion of the linguistic theories that informed later missionary accounts of Arawakan and Cariban languages, and an assessment of how that has affected current anthropological thinking.

Most recent work on Columbus's interpretations and inferences about the native Caribbean, are keen to emphasize the extent to which the ethnological categories he uses derive from his own cultural expectations (see Greenblatt 1991). Thus the expectation of encountering Asia leads Columbus to construct the *caniba* as soldiers of the "Great Khan", the expectation of encountering human monstrosity leads him to note the existence of people with tails or without hair, and, most notoriously, by the second voyage, the expectation of anthropophagism, deriving from Columbus, leads Chanca into interpreting funerary customs on Guadeloupe as evidence of anthropophagism (i.e. *cannibal*-ism).

Nonetheless, whatever the intellectual origins of these categorical anticipations it is legitimate to ask what elements in the resulting interpretations derive from the unique experience of the Caribbean encounter. In particular the contradictory and confusing way in which the term *Carib* and similar terms, such as *caniba, canima, canibales* are used in the texts is generally held to be expressive of Columbus's own confusion and inability to understand what was being told to him -which of course it is. However, this does not mean that this uncertainty may not also reflect the complex and contradictory nature of native socio-political reality, although the manner of its refraction through the Columbian lens is certainly difficult to reconstruct.

Equally, the Columbian presentation of the *caribe* as fierce and warlike, wild and man-eating,

---

3. In a relatively brief presentation such as this it will be necessary to concentrate on a few key texts; the *Journal* and *Letter* of Columbus, the *Letter* of Chanca, and the *Life of the Admiral* by Hernando Colon - for a more extensive discussion see Whitehead 1995a.

although most often thought to derive from the need to justify the colonial ambitions of the Spanish -which it certainly later came to do -in the first instance may be seen as actually reflecting the opinions of the ruling elite of *Aitij / Bohío* (Hispaniola). Columbus's adoption of their viewpoint manifestly leads him and others into a number of contradictory propositions within their texts, especially as regards the timidity, civility and lack of anthropophagy of those who are not *caribe*.

For Irving Rouse (1948a/b, 1986) these confusions are due to the unreliability of the historical data in general and the scheme of "fierce Carib" and "timid Arawak" is chosen from a number of possibilities that the ethnographic observations of Columbus actually permit. The reasons for this choice are many and are not properly part of this paper, but the fact that the idea of a group of men advancing through the islands eating enemy men and copulating with their women is so powerfully resonant for our own culture may be the most relevant consideration here, rather than native Caribbean behavior in 1492. In any case, as was indicated above, both native testimony as to conflict between the "Island Carib" and the "Arawak" (Lokono) in the seventeenth century, as well as the work of seventeenth century missionaries in the field of linguistics, have been misunderstood as directly verifying the "conquest theory".

However, the extent to which the "conquest theory" also relies on a misreading of Columbian texts is nicely illustrated from the well known *Journal* entry for November 23rd, 1492. At this point Columbus is sailing off *Colba* (Cuba) towards Bohío in the company of some Amerindian captives. We read;

> " ... those Indians he was carrying with him... said... that on it [Bohío] there were people... called *canibales*, of whom they showed great fear. And when they saw that he was taking this course, he says they could not speak, because these people would eat them, and are well armed. The admiral says that he well believes there was something in this, but that since they were well armed they must be people with reason; and he believed that they must have captured some of them and because they did not return to their lands they would say that they ate them. They believed the same thing about the Christians and about the admiral the first time some of them saw them.

> (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:18)

There are a number of features in this passage that could well stand as an example of how the Columbian texts have been poorly analyzed in anthropological readings. Firstly, the identification of the Spanish, as rapacious conquerors, with the *canibales,* is most striking, and often commented upon, as is the empathetic treatment of the political consumption of those captured (see also Whitehead 1990b). Secondly, the link between military capability and being *gente de razon* is an explicit anthropological principle to be found throughout the Columbian texts. Its significance is illumined by this identity of Carib and Spaniard; the Spanish of course having just completed their own *Reconquista.* However, since these observations and interpretations relate to the heartland of "non-Carib" settlement -Bohío -they have been ignored or suppressed in the analyses of subsequent commentators, as in the later Columbian texts, rather than being treated as evidence of the inadequacy of the resulting dualistic ethnographic schema. Similar contrasts in the ethnographic observations of the *Letter* and *Journal* emerge concerning the diversity of language and custom present in the islands, material culture and the identification of cannibalism with the *caribes* (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:12,13,15,21,26) . Indeed Columbus is quite explicit in his *Letter* that;

> In all the islands I saw no great diversity in the appearance of the people or in their manners or language; on the contrary they all understand one another, which is a very curious thing..

(Hulme & Whitehead 1992:13)

Nevertheless, by the second voyage we find that Columbus is making greater discriminations and notices some lexical differences between those he suspects of being *caribes* and others in the islands; although this is a long way from being the profound cultural difference that is implied by the conquest theory since we are told that his native interpreters "... understood more, although they found differences between the languages[4] because of the great distances between the lands."

---

4. It should also be emphasized that the use of the term *lenguaje* did not necessarily carry the sole meaning of "language" in its modern linguistic sense but would have meant a manner of speech, or dialect.

(Hulme & Whitehead 1992:25). Las Casas (*Historia Apologetica,* chap.197) also tells us that there were three languages spoken on Bohío which were not mutually intelligible, thus further emphasising how deceptive an appearance of linguistic homogeneity may have been.

However, such ambiguities were not an idle question of scholarly dispute but intimately connected to the pragmatics of conquest. Consequently, subsequent accounts attempt to resolve issues of variation in dialect as well as appearance, for the *caribes* are described by Columbus in the *Journal* as wearing black body-dye and long hair tied with parrot feathers (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:25). Chanca's "official" anthropology, incorporating Columbus's first ethnography, achieves this by the consistent application of a political decision to use the *caciques* of Bohío, not the soldiers of the *el Gran Can*, as a bridgehead into the regional native polity. Accordingly the ambiguities and uncertainties surrounding the identity of *caribes* within the ethnoscape of the sixteenth century Caribbean are resolved by casting *caribes* in the role of ferocious man-eaters and *guatiao* or *aruacas* as tractable and pliant. Thus, for Chanca, the recovery of human long-bones on *Turuqueira* (Guadeloupe) is linked to cannibalism (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:32), but on Bohío the recovery of human heads is linked to funerary rites (Gil & Varela 1984:168-9). More generally the *caribe's* cannibalism of the natives of *Burequen* (Puerto Rico) and the other islands is given continual emphasis, although it is also briefly noted that;

> "... if by chance they [of Burequen] are able to capture those who come to raid them they also eat them, just as those of *Caribe* do to them." (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:36)

This residual ambivalence as to the nature of the *caribes*, as well as its manner of resolution within Chanca's text, is then fully revealed in his closing remarks on Turuqueira. Chanca writes first that;

> "These people seemed to us more polished than those who live in the other islands. [...] They had much cotton [...] and many cotton cloths, so well made that they lose nothing by comparison with those of our own country... [but later adds that]... The way of life of these *caribe* people is bestial." (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:33)

Such an analytical distinction, if not an actual contradiction, must clearly derive from the political purposes of the text.

The political factors that had informed Chanca's anthropology changed over the next 20 years or so, not least due to the extinction of the native elites of Bohío and Burequen. As a result, and since Chanca's anthropology had been given legal force through Queen Isabella's proclamation of 1503 which rendered all *cannibals* who resisted the Spanish liable to enslavement, it was necessary to conduct a second ethnographic exercise -in one sense, precisely because of the ambiguity between the status of *cannibal* (i.e. eater of human flesh), and that of *caribe* (i.e. native resistant to the Spanish) that the proclamation itself implied.

To this end the *licenciado*, Rodrigo Figueroa, was dispatched by Charles V in 1518, to determine the exact locations where *caribes* were to be found. However, the ethnographic criteria for their identification had simplified under the political necessities of colonial establishment, as foreshadowed in the proclamation of Isabella, and mere opposition or intractability towards the Spanish, rather than anthropophagic customs, was deemed sufficient to consider a given population as *caribe*. At no time, however, was any kind of dialect or other linguistic feature suggested as a way of achieving this discrimination. It should thus be very evident that it was the politics of colonialism that determined the ethnological agenda, and so, in turn, the creation of the ethnographic observations and linguistic descriptions that were thought to verify it.

However, these colonial linguistic and ethnological texts were not composed of seamless arguments and perfect data sets but were often mere accumulations of unsorted observation and secondary testimony. As a result such texts also contain many indications for other kinds of interpretations of the native Caribbean and, when combined with later sources and the data from archaeology, may be used to provide a more adequate and more complete interpretation of the situation encountered by Columbus, and in particular the significance of the terms *carib / caniba*, and *aruaca / guatiao*.

In short, the social interdependency and cultural similarity of *caribe* and *aruaca* is a possibility that was still ignored within earlier anthropological schema which all relied on the assumption that the *caribe* were invasive or external to a primordial "Arawakan" or "Taíno" cultural context. Yet evidence of social continuity underlying an ethnic and cultural interchange between *caribe* and *aruaca* is present, as we have seen, in the early Columbian documentation;

particularly in regard of that behavior considered definitional of the *caribe* -anthropophagy. Thus, aside from the ambivalence of Columbus and Chanca we learn that the natives of Bohío;

> "... les pagan [los caribes] en la misma moneda, pues descuartizan a un canibal ante los ojos de la demas, lo asan, lo desgarran a rabiosas dentelladas y lo devoran."

> (Anghiera 1530: II, 9-12)

While Hernando Colon (1947) stated that Caonabo, one of the principal chiefs of Bohío, was himself a *caribe* and a stranger. Traces of such cultural homology also seem to be reflected in the way in which the much abused term *taino* has registered in the speech of the Karipuna. Thus, Taylor (1946) gives the orthographic form *ni'tinao* -formal friend (ws)[5] or progenitor (ms/ws), Raymond Breton (1665:454, 1666:19,315) giving the form *ne'tegnon* -and *nitino / neteno* -husband's father, husband's mother or daughter's husband (ws).

Mutuality in the ethnic definition of *caribe* and *aruaca* is also clearly implied by evidence from the myth cycles of native Bohío, as recorded by Pané (1496) and Oviedo (1535). Thus, during the journey of *Guayahona*, their mythical progenitor, in search of the mystic alloy *guanin*, he traveled to the lands south and east of Bohío -that is the Lesser Antilles and the mainland -taking with him their women and children. At the *isla de guanin* golden objects were collected but the women and children lost, providing a symbolic alternative to the gastronomic context in which most commentators, from Chanca onwards, have evaluated the claims by the ruling caciques as to their "consumption" by the *caribes*. So too, by initiating the exchange cycle of women for *guanin*, *Guayahona* may also be said to represent the first *caribe* cacique of Bohío, becoming an ideological model for the authority of Caonabo (see above) and thus providing a myth-charter for the chieftains of Bohío and legitimizing their marriage exchanges, or marriages-by-capture, with the *caribes* who controlled access to *guanin* (Whitehead 1996a, 1998a: 70-90).

---

[5] That is; ws - woman speaking, ms - man speaking

It is thus evident that European fascination with the consumption of human flesh, as in the case of Columbus, led to a total identification between "caribism" and "cannibalism"; but, as has been argued above, it is evident from the Columbian texts that there were a variety of orthographically related terms (i.e. *caniba, caribe, canima, caribal*) in usage in the Antilles, which it can be argued had two referents, not just one. One pole of reference amongst these terms, deriving from the politics of the ruling elite of Bohío, was the meaning of "mainlanders / enemy people from the south", as de Goeje (1939) suggests, and as is indeed the contextual sense, since the form *caniba* occurs alongside, not just as an alternative to, the term *caribe* in the Columbian sources. Taylor (1946) in particular gave much attention to the derivation of such terms but only as ethnic designations and did not consider the second, supra-ethnic, pole of reference, orthographically represented by *caribe* (or *caraïbe* in the later French sources), and for which there is a wealth of evidence from the mainland through the widespread use of the terms *caraybe / caraïbe / karai* as Tupian spiritual honorifics or Cariban designations of a martial prowess, associated with the possession of related anthropophagic rituals.

Missionary Linguists and the Cultural Inscription of Language.

If then the earliest reports belie later interpretations it remains to examine how explicit consideration of native language by the missionaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries consolidated an erroneous ethnological dualism in the Caribbean and northern South America, in which the Arawakan "Island Carib" came to stand as an icon of "caribness" (Whitehead 1995b, Trouillot 1991). The missionaries brought a variety of different ideas to the task of conversion and the evaluation and recording of the speech practices of linguistic communities effectively set the agenda for evangelism. Thus, those with the capacity for rational understanding and spiritual enlightenment were separated from those whose primitive and undeveloped speech required military chastisement rather than spiritual suasion. In the word of one Jesuit missionary "they do not hear the Voice of the Gospel where they have not first heard the echo of gunfire".

For instance, Raymond Breton, a Jesuit missionary to Dominica states that the *Caraïbe*:

> "have no words to express the power of the soul, such as the will, the understanding, nor that which concerns religion, [or] civility. They have no honorific terms like Our Lord. They express however some acts of the understanding and of the will, such as to

remember, to wish." (Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 110)

However, a later account, written by a lay Protestant traveller, Charles Cesar de Rochefort, notes that the *Caraïbe* word for rainbow is "God's plume of feathers" (Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 122) and emphasizes the complexity and creativity of the Karipuna language. In short, the cultural positioning of the reporter had a fundamental influence on the nature of linguistic representation. Accordingly, I will briefly discuss Cesar de Rochefort, Raymond Breton, and the accounts of two other Catholics, the missionary Jean Baptiste du Tertre, and a layman Sieur de la Borde, who wrote from a Jesuit mission, in terms both of the influence that the French Enlightenment had on their analyses of native language and the way that their analyses further influenced French Enlightenment thought. The contrast between Catholicism and Protestantism in their approaches to language is also relevant and reminds us that linguistic description was not the simple recording of "natural" facts, but a complex argument about "moral" capacities.

For seventeenth century thinkers language was an important indication of the capacity for "Civility", "Polity" and "Religion" [6] which set human beings above animals and corresponded to the historical level of development of society as a whole. In this way analysis of native languages was integral to the development of colonial and missionary policies. Breton (quoted above) asserted that the Caraïbe did not have words that would enable or reveal cultural development and so by implication provided justification the French colonial project in Dominica.

In religious debates of the era concerning the evolution of human society and the role of divine creation, understanding the origin of language was as relevant for the doctrine of natural law as it was for Biblical criticism[7]. In turn many Enlightenment philosophers were profoundly influenced by the work of the missionaries. Indeed Jean-Jacques Rousseau used du Tertre's characterization of the Caribs as "noble savages" as a point of departure in his writings on human nature and society (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:128) and the influence of both missionary

---

[6] During the fifteenth century the evangelization of Brazil French missionaries likewise formulaically judged many indigenous groups to be "sin loi, sin foi, sin roi" and so the more difficult to convert (Whitehead 1993b, see also Bono 1995).

[7] Ricken (1994: 140) notes, "every... theory of the origin of language also contains considerations of the origins of society …but also as it pertained to the nature of the human

linguistic judgments, and the philosophical assumptions of Enlightenment thinkers, are still very much present in modern anthropology, as we have seen.

Raymond Breton

By contrast with Rousseau the views of Raymond Breton (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:107-116) on the origins of Karipuna society were fully consistent with his negative views of their language. Breton concedes that the Karipuna are not monstrous cannibals, as was the Columbian representation, but he does see them as truly *sauvage,* lacking strict marital laws, and so apt to practice incestuous relations. They lack the capacity for human affection and merely mate out of instinct and a desire to reproduce. Crucially, he claims that there is a separate language for men and women, and this is reflected in his massive two volume *Dictionnnaire* (Auxerre 1665-6) which paradoxically expresses a supposed absence of linguistic complexity, via an excess of lexical notation and cultural explanation. The *Dictionnnaire* also systematically favors male speech forms over female in the representation of the Karipuna speech community. Breton thus firmly, but incorrectly, inscribes the notion that male speech-forms, referred to as *Kalinago*[8], constituted a distinct language. Breton's account of the Karipuna language of course reflects European colonial thought and the cultural construction of the colonized. Indeed, even as the "Island Caribs" provide Rousseau with an icon of noble savagery, so too they function as the "wild man" of the European imaginary. Bartra (1994: 124) neatly summates the attitudes encapsulated in this icon of the colonized and its connection to theories of language and civilization;

> "The wild man did not have language, but took words by storm in order to express the murmurings of another world, the signals that nature gave to society. The wild man spoke words that did not have literal meaning, but were eloquent in communicating sensations that civilized language could not express. His words were devoid of sense, but expressed

species at the beginning of human history."

[8] Lexically this jargon was based on Cariban *Kariña* but employed an Arawakan syntax, consistent with the natal language, *Karipuna*, of its male users (Hoff 1995).

feelings."

In just the same way Caliban, in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, is a ghostly reminder of the reality of Karipuna survival in a colonized Caribbean and the notions of linguistic superiority that underpinned that colonization;

" ... I pitied thee,

Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour

One thing or other. When thou didst not, savage,

Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like

A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes

With words that made them known."

(Act I, Scene II, lines 353-8)

Jean Baptiste du Tertre

A similar depiction, consonant with the same general linguistic analysis, emerges in the account of fellow Jesuit Jean Baptiste du Tertre (Hulme & Whitehead 1992:128-137), who wistfully stresses the rude superiority of the Karipuna over the civilized nature of the Europeans, which isolates them from their simpler and gentler natures;

"So, at the very word Savage, most people imagine in their mind's eye the kind of men who are barbarous, cruel, inhuman, without reason, deformed, as big as giants, as hairy as bears: in a word, monsters rather than reasonable men; although in truth our Savages are Savages in name only, just like the plants and fruits which nature produces without cultivation in the forests and wildernesses, which, although we call them wild, still possess the true virtues in their properties of strength and complete vigor, which we often corrupt by our artifice, and change so much when we plant in our gardens." (Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 129)

Thus du Tertre, while accepting Breton's ideas about the origins of Karipuna culture and language, sees the "Caraïbes" as exemplifying a noble simplicity, and he stresses the difficulty in learning their language, that it is "impoverished and imperfect" (Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 137). Breton is accordingly congratulated for having made their conversion more possible

through his notation of their speech and the main obstacle to evangelism becomes the poor treatment they have learned to expect from the Europeans. This contrast between Breton's and du Tertre's account is interesting for the way in which it highlights shifting missionary attitudes, but notice that the ethnology, captured in the linguistic judgements of Breton, goes unchallenged. Du Tertre writes;

> "They have good reasoning, and a mind as subtle as could be found among people who have no smattering of letters at all, and who have never been refined and polished by the human sciences, which often, while refining our minds, fill them for us with malice; and I can say in all truth that if our Savages are more ignorant than us, so they are much less vicious, even indeed that almost all the malice they do know is taught them by us French."
>
> Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 130

A linguistic incapacity, whatever its origins, thus still remains the key trait of "primitive" society.

Sieur de la Borde

While de la Borde was not a missionary, he was influenced by the Jesuit missionaries with whom he worked, especially Father Simon. He was either part of the French military and naval presence or a functionary of the local administration. De la Borde shares with Breton the idea that the *Caraïbes* are savages, with no trace of the nostalgia for simplicity that du Tertre shows. Nonetheless de la Borde does provide an important description of the myths and spiritual beliefs of the *Caraïbes*, although he treats most of these beliefs as primitive superstitions, he does acknowledge that the *Caraïbes* are capable of forming ideas of spirituality and divinity, albeit regarding the devil and evil spirts. He writes;

> "Their language is very destitute: they can only express what is obvious. They are so materialist that they do not have a term to designate the workings of the spirit, and if the beasts were able to speak I would want to give them no other language than that of the *Caraibes*. They have not one word to explain matters of religion, of justice, and of what pertains to the virtues, the sciences, and a great number of other things about which they

have no notion. They are not able to converse, as I have said elsewhere."

<div align="right">(Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 153)</div>

However, it is again a contradiction and irony that de la Borde provides detailed descriptions of the complex spiritual beliefs of the *Caraïbes*, only to suggest that they are linguistically impoverished. Nonetheless, he precedes this passage with the following comments;

> "Although there is some difference between the language of the men & that of the women, as I have said in the chapter on their origin, nevertheless they understand one another. The old men [also] have a jargon when they are dealing with some plan of war, which the young do not understand at all." (Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 153)

Borde also refers to a copious linguistic study made by one Father Simon that "will be useful to those who might plan to acquire some awards in the conversion of these infidel peoples" and one wonders if this lost work might have given a very different view of gender, age and the linguistic practices of the *Caraïbes* given these few tantalizing remarks.

Charles de Rochefort

Charles de Rochefort provides an account of the *Caraïbes* which notably differs from that of Breton, du Tertre and de la Borde. This contrast is certainly connected to the fact that he was a Protestant in the service of a particularly anti-clerical governor in Dominica and his discussion of the *Caraïbe* speech practice is therefore revealing. He immediately stresses the unity of human speech practices noting that, "The *Caribbians* have an ancient and natural language, such as is wholly peculiar to them, as every nation hath that which is proper to it." (Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 118) and emphasizes that;

> "What advantage soever the Europeans may imagine they have over the *Caribbians,* either as to the natural faculties of the mind, or the easiness of the pronunciation of their own language, in order to the more easie attainment of theirs, yet hath it been found by experience, that the *Caribbians* do sooner learn ours than we do theirs." (Hulme and Whitehead 1992: 119)

Rochefort actually offers a quite detailed account of the Karipuna language and consonant with the idea that attitudes to language are part of a wider cultural interpretation, also challenges the established theory, so often advanced to explain gender differences in speech, of a Carib

invasion from the mainland. Certainly his work was controversial in its own day because of the explicit challenge it made to Jesuit views of the Karipuna and he was accused of having plagiarized the work of Du Tertre. Subsequent commentators, no doubt because of the ethnographic authority of du Tertre's's own work, due to its association with that of Raymond Breton, have also largely accepted du Tertre's published accusation against Rochefort. Nevertheless, Rochefort's account is accurate and intelligent for the way in which it recognizes a plurality of influences in the linguistic repertoire of the *Caraïbe*s. He also illustrates the complexities and idiomatic uses of Karipuna speech, noting that besides their "ancient and natural language";

> "... they have fram'd another bastard-speech, which is intermixt with several words taken out of foreign languages by he commerce they have had with the Europeans... among themselves they always make use of their ancient and natural language..." (Hulme and Whitehead 1992:118)

In short we have here clear testimony as to both the propensity for the formation of creolized or pidgin languages by the Karipuna due to the presence of the Europeans, as well as gender and age differences in the use of similar jargons formulated via interactions with other indigenous peoples. None of these complexities have been adequately recognized in the missionary or later accounts.

The Enlightenment and Linguistic Representation

As is anticipated in the account of Rochefort, Enlightenment philosophies increasing emphasized the idea that language was not a pre-ordained product of divine intervention but the result of human experience and custom and as such open to human manipulation (see Ricken 1994, Bono 1995). Principal among the proponents of this view were John Locke in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) and Etienne Condillac *Lettres Philosophiques sur les Anglais* (1734). For Locke there were no innate ideas and all human thought and classification had its origin with sensory experience, understood as both sensation and reflection, or memory. In short, God did not invent language but placed humanity in the world with a capacity for such, and in this way modern theory, supplanting God by the inheritable cognitive and motor abilities which support speech behavior, remains embedded in Enlightenment analysis. This line of

reasoning was a radical departure with the Cartesian and pre-Cartesian traditions of seeing humans differing from animals through the possession of a faculty of *raison*, of which language was the prime symptom. For Descartes animals were mere automatons, lacking *raison* and so the ability to use or learn language. For Locke, however, both humans and animals show cognitive activities that develop on the basis of sense perception, yet only for humans do these reach such a level of abstraction that they become expressed in words.

This sensualist philosophy was further developed by Condillac (Ricken 1994:80) who places the origins of language and thought in a phylogenetic, or evolutionary and historical, perspective, rather than the ontogenetic relationship pictured by Locke. Again this debate is still current in modern linguistics as the resurgent interest in the materialist theories of Vygotskii (1986, 1994) illustrate.

The entanglement of linguistic philosophy and ethnological observation is extensively and overtly developed in the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1959), who broadly adopted Condillac's sensualist philosophy but added to that a distinct historical sense of the conflicts and differences that arise as a result of the contradiction between the social nature of human beings and the inequalities of their social existence. Rousseau therefore explicitly links language theory and anthropological theory through sensualist philosophy. The result is the re-discovery of the primitive as a subject free from the constraints and inequalities of the civilized, and expressing a unique, untranslatable and even impenetrable, cultural outlook. It is arguable that we have yet to divest ourselves of such notions as recent debates on cultural commensurability and comparability would suggest (Obeyesekere 1992, Sahlins 1995). Moreover such ideas are still relevant to anthropological theory since advocates of linguistic relativity in cognition supplant the Lockean notion of "innate ideas" with the Whorfian argument that anthropological linguistics would be another way through which the culture and mentality of a particular linguistic community could be uniquely revealed - as in the well known example of the supposed absence of recognizable temporal terms in the Hopi language (Whorf 1962:58).

However, for these reasons ideas about the origins and development of language are not just matters for linguistic description and analysis but reverberate in current anthropological theory in a number of ways. In archaeology the assumption of a close "fit" between language and

culture is necessary for the idea that linguistic groups represent historical (archaeological) cultures (Lathrap 1970). This is not to suggest that there are never continuities and historical equivalences between a speech community and a socio-cultural group (Loukotka 1968); but it does mean that these have to be demonstrated before glottochronology can be used to substitute for history or other kinds of temporal sequencing (Renfrew 1987, Whitehead 1993a). This much is clearly shown by the divergence between linguistics and archaeology over the time-depth of "Island Carib" occupation in the Caribbean discussed above and in the utter failure of attempts to distinguish the "Carib conquest" as a discrete style emerging in the ceramic sequence for the Lesser Antilles (Boomert 1985: 30-33). Moreover, the wider implications of the over-identification of language with a cultural "world-view" become evident in the work of Greenberg (1966, 1987) who, with the geneticist Cavalli-Sforza et al. (1996), has recently grouped most of the world's languages into just eighteen primal groupings. On the basis of genetic similarities among modern speakers from these groupings, these language distributions are also held to be expressive of a "race" history.

Certainly, the idea of a close the integration of language and culture has also been often contested and has led repeatedly to the formation of theories concerning the role language plays in the development of specific representational and cognitive modes within a given linguistic community. However, what should have become very clear from a consideration of the case of the "Island Carib" is that while a language is a Wittgensteinian "form of life", a cultural phenomenon, it is also an historical one, and this fundamentally affects the character of its development and so the relevance and validity of any comparative exercise.

This history of the Karipuna and the way it is reflected in linguistic usage through time makes the search for an Arawakan cultural-linguistic substrate that might function to identify "Arawakan" peoples in the historical past appear quite pointless. The Arawakan Karipuna have been "caribe" for so long that even today ethnologists are unable to quite let go of the idea that they are Caribs in some sense - for indeed that is indeed the opinion of their modern descendants, the Garifuna, themselves. The story of the Garifuna of Belize is therefore instructive as to the meaning and colonial origins of the categories of "Arawak" and "Carib", the creolization of an Arawakan language, and the confusion this causes to an anthropology still dependent on the

dualism of the colonial past and wedded to the idea of language as a cultural substrate that produces social continuity through time.

The Garifuna are the descendants of African slaves who fled to St.Vincent from the sugar plantations of Barbados. The wreck of a slave ship off St Vincent in 1635 greatly augmented the black population who were integrated into Karipuna society, as they had been throughout the previous century as well (see Hulme & Whitehead 1992:38-44). Over the next 150 years the "Black Caribs", as they were known, grew in political significance within the colonial rivalries of the French and British for control of the Lesser Antilles. The Carib War by the British against these Karipuna communities in 1795 lasted three years with the result that the British deported the entire "Black Carib" community to an island off Honduras from where they gradually migrated to the mainland of Honduras and Belize. Their communities have survived into the present day and still speak the Garifuna language, unlike their fellow "Amerindian" or "Red" Caribs in St. Vincent and Dominica who retain only a few words and phrases of Karipuna.

For the eighteenth and nineteenth century colonial regimes of this region, however, these *caribes* were quite different from the *aruacas* who were retroactively identified with the lost populations of the Greater Antilles. In fact the term *aruacas* historically referred to the Lokono[9], settled from the Amazon north to the Essequibo along the Atlantic coast and into the uplands at the head of the Demerara, Berbice, and Corentyn rivers. The Lokono quickly allied with the Spanish who were attempting to settle the Orinoco and Guyana coast in the sixteenth century, since they received Spanish military assistance in occupying rivers to the north of the Essequibo, including the Pomeroon, Orinoco and parts of the Caribbean coast of Venezuela. Here the Lokono drove out the existing population comprised of Kariña, Warao, Yao, Nepoyo and Suppoyo. The Lokono were also given black slaves by the Spanish to work the tobacco plantations they had pioneered in the lower Orinoco. These events were the origin of a lasting

---

[9] *Aruaca* derives from the Lokono word for manioc flour, *aru*, that was their principal item of trade to the Spanish, just as the name *Pomeroon* derives from *baurooma*, a ball of such flour (Bennett 1989), reflecting the strategic nature of that river in the trade with the Spanish.

military exchange between the Lokono and the Kariña, who in turn made use of Dutch and French allies in opposition to the *aruaca* occupation of the Essequibo and Orinoco regions (Whitehead 1988).

The Karipuna played into this situation as allies of the Kariña (hence their honorific in the men's jargon *Kalina-go*) and as war and trade partners of the Lokono. The tradition of raid for women and *guanin* (gold work) between the Karipuna and Lokono was thus expressive of their basic cultural similarities; *Loquo* was the first man in both Karipuna as well as Lokono myths of origin, and the sources of the magic metal *guanin* lay in an exchange of women for this substance with the mythical ancestor *Guahayona*. In this way Lokono and Karipuna conflicts and exchanges in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries reproduced the military and ritual exchanges in the fifteenth and sixteenth century that were described by Columbus. However, none of this was understood (or at least it was ignored) by earlier commentators who saw in the tales and practices of Karipuna and Lokono raiding another aspect of a supposed manichean struggle between Arawak and Carib across the whole of northern South America. In this way as the ethnologists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries moved to classify and delineate major cultural and linguistic relationships, the scheme of "Arawak vs. Carib" seemed a ready made heuristic device. This model then attracted further confirmation as a specifically linguistic style of comparison deriving from the work of missionary evangelists encrusted this distinction with further evidence - notwithstanding the gross anomalies this created in describing and interpreting perhaps the best documented and most studied Arawakan population in the whole of the Americas - the Island Caribs. It thus transpires that the category "Arawak" is no less historically and culturally complex than its twin "Carib" and the Karipuna utterly transgress such ethnic, cultural and linguistic boundaries.

The urge to group such cultural complexity and variety into finite categories has its intellectual roots in the western scientific project as a whole, but the immediate historical impulse to such an approach to cultural and linguistic typology was the colonial conquest itself. As we have seen the role of missionary evangelists in both constructing languages from the speech behavior of the native population, as well as their role in providing ethnological context for colonial policy resulted in a perfect identification of linguistic and ethnic identity. Of course

such keen observers were not unaware of the anomalies this produced in practice and the Jesuit missionaries of Orinoco were fully aware, and utterly frustrated, at the tendency of non-Cariban speaking groups to become *caribe* for the same political and economic reasons that the Karipuna did (Whitehead 1998b). Nonetheless, they pursued policies of settling evangelized populations in villages that were mono-lingual, thus directly acting to produce that "fit" of culture, society and language that was a theoretical desiderata of linguistic theories of the time.

In the absence of this missionary infrastructure, as in the Dutch, French, and British Guianas, an implicit system of ethnic ranking achieved the same effect. "Carib" groups were treated as wild but fierce mercenaries and were used to hunt down escaped black slaves and to provide a buffer against Spanish expansion beyond the Orinoco basin. "Arawaks" were used to guard the immediate plantation and to provide servants in the planter's household. They were also courted and co-opted by the missionaries as evangelical agents among the hinterland peoples, just as they had acted as military intelligence for the Spanish of the sixteenth century[10]. By underwriting and promoting a strong identification of language and political attitude the permeability of ethnic boundaries, clearly evident from the history of the Karipuna, was curtailed. Well-defined ethno-linguistic groups - something that was no less the object of "nationalist" policies in Europe of the nineteenth century - enabled better administrative control of the native population (Whitehead 1999c). As a result, by the end of the nineteenth century, European national political loyalties also spread amongst the Amerindians producing indigenous groups calling themselves "Spanish Arawaks" and British Arawaks", who then acted as the slavers and evangelists of their own and neighboring peoples (Whitehead 1990a, 1990b). It therefore would appear that the correlation between linguistic groups and socio-cultural ones is uncertain at best, for speech communities may be riven by political, economic and ideological divisions that in practice outweigh the notional ties of sentiment and cultural similarity that common speech modes would seem to imply.

This created no few problems for the linguists of the nineteenth century who, working from the missionary materials gathered in the widespread evangelization of native populations in

---

[10] In particular the native evangelist Jeptha, a Lokono from the Berbice river, provided the Moravians in Surinam with a continent-wide digest of the location of various ethnic groups and

the eighteenth century, were unable to properly classify the Karipuna population. Im Thurn (1883) was the first to attempt to resolve this situation by designating the Kariña as "True Caribs" and the Karipuna as "Island Caribs". This was partly done not just from the linguistic evidence but also via a general identification of cannibalism with the presence of "Caribs". William Brett (1868) having overseen the opening of some shell-mounds in the Pomeroon Barima river in north-west Guyana, interpreted the skeletal material uncovered to be the detritus of a cannibal feasts. He further inferred that the feasts must have been conducted by the local Kariña in conjunction with their "Carib" allies from the islands, given the estuarine position of the site. In fact such skeletal evidence is related to a much more ancient occupation of the region and is funerary in origin (Williams 1981). In this way Brett and Im Thurn perfectly recapitulate the false ethnological inferences made by Chanca in his fifteenth century account of Guadeloupe (discussed above) and so provided a revitalized basis for the persistence of the old Arawak / Carib dualism.

Other attempts to classify Arawakan languages moved to a new level with the work of Daniel Brinton (1871, 1891). Brinton (1871) demonstrated the stability of the Lokono lexicon through comparison with sixteenth century materials and made reference to the work done on the Lokono language by missionaries in Surinam (see Crevaux 1882, Quandt 1807, Stæhelin 1913). In his search for linguistic affiliates to the Lokono language and with the aim of identifying an Arawakan family of languages Brinton considered historical sources mentioning the term "Arawak" which suggested connections with western Venezuela and the Amazon north bank. However, it was in the Caribbean that he felt the closest connection would lie and so he attempted to reconstruct elements of the *Igñeri* or "Island Arawack" language as well as that of the Greater Antilles, though he chose not to term this "Taíno". Again, with regard to the story of "Carib conquest", Brinton wrote (1871:1);

"From the earliest times they [Arawaks] have borne an excellent character. Hospitable,

their associated political relationships with each other (Stæhelin 1913, II-2:174-5)

> peace-loving, quick to accept the humbler arts of civilization and the simpler precepts of Christianity, they have ever offered a strong contrast to their neighbor, the cruel and warlike Caribs."

Precisely because of his credulity with regard to this colonial scheme Brinton never attempted a comparison between Karipuna and Lokono lexicons and so did not even consider including the Karipuna in an "Arawakan" language grouping.

This same framework of historical and linguistic interpretation was unfortunately again adopted by de Goeje (1939) who had already done much to expand the recording of Lokono (de Goeje 1928). Still considering a ghost-language, *Igñeri*, to have been the aboriginal language of the Karipuna - i.e. before the supposed "Carib conquest" - he convincingly demonstrated continuities and relationships between Lokono, female word forms from Karipuna and the "language" of the Greater Antilles that he called "Taíno". However, he did take the suggestion made by Adam (1878) who had noticed that the male speech forms in Karipuna were close to Kariña, and those of the women were close to Lokono. He also realized that the still extant Garifuna were a source of further information on these linguistic relationships and included materials form the "Caribe du Honduras" for comparative purposes, and as an example of "Maipuran Arawak". However, although gender difference in lexical items was certainly apparent from these comparisons, in fact his tables (1939:3) actually show that in all but four out of the nine categories of lexical comparison, words forms in common between men and women exceed those that were distinct.

As already indicated, it is not surprising therefore that when the linguist Douglas Taylor and archaeologist Irving Rouse published a joint article (Taylor & Rouse 1955) on the peopling of the Caribbean, "We found ourselves in complete disagreement" (Rouse 1985: 18). On the one hand Rouse thought that the ceramic evidence showed that there had indeed been a movement from the mainland to the islands in late pre-history which he assigned to the "Carib conquest". However, Taylor had already recognized the inconsistencies in this position, especially the identification of "Taíno" with "Igñeri". This seems to imply that the Antilles were peopled by two distinct migrations of different Arawakan tribes.... In this case, it seems unnecessary to assume than any "conquest" or fighting took place." (1955:108-9)

Taylor also suggested that Karipuna was part of a "Nu-Arawak" family, which following Mason's suggestion that this grouping be so named for the invariable presence of *nu* as first person pronoun, included the Campa and Amuesha[11]. Thus Karipuna origins were still seen as extraneous to the islands but their linguistic affiliations and the fallacy of a "Carib conquest" theory was beginning to be recognized. In conjunction with the linguist Berend Hoff, Taylor was finally realized that the Kariña elements in the men's speech actually were assimilated using an Arawakan syntax (Taylor & Hoff 1980). However, this important finding was not integrated in archaeological understanding and Irving Rouse (1985), though now recognizing the Arawakan nature of "Island Carib", prefers to classify it along with "Taíno" as a separate "West Indian" branch of "northern" Arawakan. Rouse (1985, 1986) also now accepts that "immigration" into the islands best explains the nature of the ceramic evidence, but the idea of a conquest to explain gendered speech modes remains despite the many cogent archaeological reasons for rejecting it (Boomert 1995).

In short the Karipuna have continued to challenge conventional forms of linguistic and cultural classification and this suggests that our categories of classification are simply inadequate to the complexity and dynamism of indigenous linguistic practices - just as the linguistic exogamy of Tukanoan groups in the western Amazon confounded historical linguists into suggesting a compression of previously dispersed populations, instead of appreciating the way in which language was manipulated as a cultural and ethnic marker by native people, themselves

---

[11] Taylor noted that Karipuna was such a language and so unlike Lokono, Goajiro or reconstructed Taíno which have a prefixed marker of first person singular with apical stop (T-dA, L-dA, G-tA) not nasal as for "...Island Carib, Campa and probably the majority of Arawakan languages" (1954:154).

rarely mono-lingual anyway (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1996). As Sorensen realized in his analysis of multilingualism in northwest Amazonia; 'A linguistic theory limited to one language / one group situations is [itself] inadequate to explain ... actual linguistic competence` (1972, 91). A point strongly reiterated by Colson as regards groups of northeast Amazonia (1983a, 11; 1983b).

Conclusion

I have tried to show how the category "Arawak / *aruaca*", originally political as well as linguistic in its meaning, subtly evolved into a colonial cultural classification that in turn constrained the development of both historical and ethnographic understanding of the indigenous people in the Caribbean and north-eastern South America. This suggests that a linguistic connection or relatedness by itself does directly not translate into social and cultural propinquity but are produced by processes of historical transculturation, such as occurred in the case if the 'Island Caribs'. This implies that the relationship between language and the rest of culture is a matter for historical investigation, through archaeology, linguistics and historiography such as is carried out in the papers collected here. The evidence of the comparative Arawakan histories presented through the case studies in this volume show many such relationships. The substantive comparisons that emerge from this volume proceed by reference, not to the mere presence of linguistic similarity, but also to the cultural products of shared historical circumstance, such as ritual discourse. For example, the Karipuna *areyto*, a ritual forum for male and female oratory about the past and its continued presence in a landscape of mythic significance (see discussion of *guanin* and Guayahona above), is clearly analogous to the ways in which musicality, enchanted landscapes, and supra-ethnic sodalities have produced and defined ethnic consciousness in multiple contexts, both "Arawakan" and otherwise - as in Reichel-Dolmatoff's (1996) discussion of the Yuruparí myth of the Tukano. This may not uniquely define "Arawakans" as opposed to others, but such long term cultural features do demonstrate a substantive historical aspect to Arawakan identity. Similarly, a wide range of evidence presented in the following chapters strongly indicates long term continuities and similarities in the local socio-cultural practices of Arawakan speakers. This is particularly important where the archeology and history (see Heckenberger, Vidal and Zucchi this volume) produces striking analogies with contemporary or recent ethnographic description of the ritual use of landscape and the practice of social hierarchy

(see Hvalkof, Passes, Pollock, Gow and Wright this volume). However, very distinct kinds of historical and socio-cultural experience are also present among Arawakan speakers, as is shown by the contrasting social and military orientations of, say, the Matsigenka and Piro (Gow, Rosengren - this volume) to the Palikur or Karipuna (Passes, Whitehead - this volume). This suggests that we can already demonstrate strong local or regional historical and cultural relatedness among Arawakan groups and that an even broader relatedness is to be expected. Moreover, notions of 'Arawakaness' do not emerge only from contemplation of the peoples discussed in this volume, but take shape from the similar relatedness of other language families, such as the Tupi-Guaraní. However, five hundred years of colonial conquest has badly damaged our ability to reconstruct the historical and cultural interactions of many peoples and that process itself has marked modern indigenous consciousness of history and cultural identity (Hill 1996). It has been the aim of this chapter to show how that process has to be carefully thought through, as in the case of the 'Island Caribs', in all the local and regional contexts that we encounter Arawakan speakers. However, what the papers here clearly indicate is that, despite these obstacles, Arawakans share a substantive cultural repertoire that has proved highly resilient to such external intrusions, producing a distinct historical trajectory that is still being played out. In this way the identification of the nature of that Arawakan historicity has become integral to all future archaeological, historical and ethnographic understanding, not just of Arawaks, but of indigenous South America overall.

Bibliography

Adam, Lucien

1878   *Du parler des hommes et du parler des femmes dans la langue caraïbe*. Mémoires de l'Academie de Stanislas. Paris.

Anghiera, Pietro Martire d',

1530   *De Orbo novo*. Compluti, apud Michele d'Eguia.

Barrère, P.

1743   *Nouvelle Relation de la France Equinoxiale*. Paris.

Bartra, R.

1994   *Wild men in the looking glass : the mythic origins of European otherness.* Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Press.

Basso, Ellen B. (ed),

1977   *Carib-speaking Indians : culture, society, and language*. Tucson : University of Arizona Press.

Bennett, John

1989   An Arawak-English Dictionary. *Archaeology and Anthropology 6 (1,2)*

Biet, A.

1664   *Voyage de la France Equinoxiale en l'isle Cayenne*. Paris: F. Clouzier.

Bono, James J.

1995   *The Word of God and the Languages of Man, Interpreting Nature in Early Modern Science and Medicine. 1: Ficino to Descartes.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Boomert, Aad

1995   Island Carib Archaeology. In: N. L. Whitehead (ed.) *Wolves from the Sea. Readings in the Archaeology and Anthropology of the Island Carib, pp.23-36.* Leiden: KITLV Press. Boyer, C.

1654   *Veritable Relation de [...] l'Amérique Occidentale.* Paris.

Breton, R.

1665   *Dictionnaire caraïbe-françois*. Auxerre: Giles Bouquet.

1666   *Dictionnaire françois-caraïbe*. Auxerre: Giles Bouquet.

Brett, William Henry

 1868   *The Indian tribes of Guiana : their condition and habits. With   researches into their past history, superstitions, legends, antiquities, languages*. London : Bell and Daldy.

Brinton, D. G.

1871   The Arawack Language of Guiana in its Linguistic and Ethnological Relations. *American Philosophical Society Transaction 14:427-44.*

1891   *The American Race. A linguistic Classification and Ethnographic Description of the Native Tribes of North ans South America.* New York: N. D. C. Hodges.

Cavalli-Sforza, L. L., Paolo Menozzi, & Alberto Piazza.

1996   *The history and geography of human genes*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press,

Chrétien, J.

1725   *Lettre inédite sur les Galibis*. [Extrait du Mss. 847, Biblioteque Méjane]. Chantilly:
        Archives des jésuites   des Paris.

Colson, A.

1983a   A comparative survey of contributions. *Antropologica 59/62:9-38.*

1983b   The spatial component in the political structure of Carib speakers (Guiana Highlands).
        Antropologica 59/62:73-124.

Crevaux, Jules, P. Sagot, & L. Adam

1882   "Arawakisch-Deutches Wörterbuch", in *Grammaires et vocabulaires roucouyenne,
        arrouague, piapoco et d'autres langues de la région des Guyanes.* Paris : Maisonneuve,
        1882.

de Goeje, C.H.

1928   The Arawak Language of Guiana. *Bijdragen   :1-47,246-267*

1939   Nouvel Examen des langues des Antilles. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes
        31:1-120.*

Gil, J. & C. Varela (eds.)

1984   *Cartas de particulares a Colón y relaciones coetáneas*. Alianza Editorial: Madrid.

Greenberg, Joseph H.

1966   *The Languages of Africa.* Bloomington; Indiana University Research Center in
        Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics ; 25.

1987   *Language in the Americas*. Stanford University Press

Greenblatt, S. J.

1991   *Marvelous Possessions. The Wonder of the New World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Grenand, F. & P.

1987   La Côte d'Amapa, de la Bouche Amazone à la Baie d'Oyapock à travers la tradition
        orale Palikur. *Boletim Museu Goeldi (sér. Antropol.) 3(1):1-77.*

Hill, J (ed.),

 1996   *History, Power and Identity, Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1492-1992.* Iowa City:

University of Iowa Press.

Hoff, Berend

1995   Language, contact, war and Amerindian historical tradition. The special case of the
        Island Carib, in N. L. Whitehead (ed.) *Wolves from the Sea. Readings in the Archaeology
        and Anthropology of the Island Carib, pp. 37-60.* Leiden: KITLV Press.
        Hulme, P. & N. L. Whitehead,

1992   *Wild Majesty. Encounters with Caribs from Columbus to the Present Day.* Oxford:
        Clarendon Press.

Im Thurn, E. F.

1883   Among the Indians of Guiana. London: Kegan Paul.

Kroskrity, Paul V. (Ed)

2000   *Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Polities, and Identities.* Santa Fe: SAR Press.

Lathrap, D.

1970   *The Upper Amazon.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Loukotka, Cesmir

1968   *Classification of South American Indian Languages.* Los Angeles: Latin American
        Center, UCLA.

Maghæles, P de

1576   *Historia da provincia santa Cruz a que vulgarmete chamamos Brasil.* Lisbon. [New
        York: Cortes Society]

Obeyesekere, G.

1992   *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook. European Myth-making in the Pacific.* New Jersey:
        Princeton University Press.

Oviedo, G. F. de

1535   *Historia general y natural de las Indias, islas y Tierra Firme.* Sevilla: Juan Cromberger.
        Pané, Ramón

1999   *An Account of the Antiquities of the Indians.* (Ed. J. J. Arrom). Durham: Duke University
        Press.

Pelleprat, P.

1655   *Relation des missions des pères jésuites*. Paris.

Quandt, C.

1807   *Nachricht von Suriname*. Amsterdam: S. Emmering.

Rafinesque, C. S.

1836   *The American Nations; or, Outlines of their General History, Ancient and Modern*. Philadelphia.

Reichel-Dolmatoff, Gerardo

1996   *Yuruparí. Studies of an Amazonian Foundation Myth*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

Renfrew, C.

1987   *Archaeology and Language*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Ricken, Ulrich

1994   *Linguistics, Anthropology and Philosophy in the French Enlightenment*. London: Routledge.

Rouse, I.

1948a   'The Arawak`, in: J. Steward (ed.) *Handbook of South American Indians (vol.4)., pp.507-546*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

1948b   'The Carib`, in: J. Steward (ed.) *Handbook of South American Indians (vol.4)., pp.547-565*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

1985   Arawakan phylogeny, Caribbean chronology, and their implications for the study of population movement. *Antropologica 63-64: 9-21*.

1986   *Migrations in Prehistory: Inferring Population Movement from Cultural Remains*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

1992   *The Tainos: Rise & Decline of the People Who Greeted Columbus*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rousseau, J.-J.

1959   *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inegalité parmi les hommes*. Paris: Bibliotèque de la Pléiade.

Sahlins, M.

1995   *How Natives Think. About Captain Cook For Example*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sorensen, A. P.

1972   Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon. In *Sociolinguistics.* eds. J. Pride & J. Holmes, pp.78-93. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Stæhelin, F. (ed)

1913   *Die Mission der Brudergemeine in Suriname und Berbice im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*. Paramaribo-Hernhutt.

Sued-Badillo, Jalil

1995   Searching for Ethnicity: An Economic Contextualization. In: N. L. Whitehead (ed.) *Wolves from the Sea. Readings in the Archaeology and Anthropology of the Island Carib, pp.61-90.* Leiden: KITLV Press.

Taylor, D.

1946   'Kinship and Social Structure of the Island Carib`, *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 2:180-212.*

1954   'Diachronic note on the Carib contribution to Island Carib`, *International Journal of American Linguistics 20:28-33.*

1956   'Languages and Ghost-Languages of the West Indies`, *International Journal of American Linguistics 22:180-183.*

1958   'The Place of Island Carib Within the Arawakan Family`, *International Journal of American Linguistics 24(2):153-156.*

1977   *Languages of the West Indies*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Taylor, D. & B. Hoff

1980   The Linguistic Repertory of the Island-Carib in the Seventeenth Century: The Men′s Language - A Carib Pidgin?, *International Journal of American Linguistics 46:301-312.*

Taylor, D. and I. Rouse,

1956   'Linguistic and Archaeological Time Depth in the West Indies`' International Journal of American Linguistics 21:105-115.

Tertre, J. B. du

1667   Histoire générale des Antilles habitées par les François. [4 vols.] Paris: Thomas Jolly.99

Trouillot, M-R.

1991   'Anthropology and the Savage Slot. The Poetics and Politics of Otherness`, in R. G. Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology, pp.17-44*. Santa Fe: SAR Press.

Vygotskii, L. S.

1986   *Thought and language*. (edited by Alex Kozulin) Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press.

1994   *The Vygotsky reader*. (edited by René van der Veer and Jaan Valsiner). Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass. : Blackwell.

Whitehead, N. L.

1988   *Lords of the Tiger Spirit. A History of the Caribs in Colonial Venezuela and Guyana, 1498-1820.* [KITLV Caribbean Studies Series, 10]. Dordrecht/Providence: Foris.

1990a   'The Snake Warriors -Sons of the Tiger's Teeth. A Descriptive Analysis of Carib Warfare, 1500-1820`, in J. Haas (ed.) *The Anthropology of War, pp.146-170*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1990b   'Carib Ethnic Soldiering in Venezuela, the Guianas and Antilles, 1492-1820`, *Ethnohistory 37(4):357-385.*

1993a   Historical Discontinuity and Ethnic Transformation in Native Amazonia and Guayana, 1500-1900. *L'Homme* 28:289-309.

1993b   Native American Cultures along the Atlantic Littoral of South America, 1499 -1650, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 81:197-231.

1995a   Ethnic Plurality and Cultural Continuity in the Native Caribbean. Remarks and Uncertainties as to Data and Theory, In: N. L. Whitehead (ed.) *Wolves from the Sea. Readings in the Archaeology and Anthropology of the Island Carib.* Leiden: KITLV Press.

1995b   The Island Carib as Anthropological Icon. In: N. L. Whitehead (ed.) *Wolves from the Sea. Readings in the Archaeology and Anthropology of the Island Carib.* Leiden: KITLV Press.

1996a   The Mazaruni Dragon. Golden Metals and Elite Exchanges in the Caribbean, Orinoco, and the Amazon. In, C. H. Langebaek & F. C-Arroyo (eds.) *Chieftains, Power & Trade:*

Regional Interaction in the Intermediate Area of the Americas, pp. 107-132.

1996b Ethnogenesis and Ethnocide in the settlement of Surinam, In: J. Hill (ed.), *History, Power and Identity, Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1492-1992, pp. 20-35.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

1998a *The Discoverie of the Large, Rich and Bewtiful Empire of Guiana by Sir Walter Ralegh.* (Edited, annotated and transcribed). American Exploration & Travel Series Vol. 71, Norman: Oklahoma University Press.

1998b Colonial Chieftains of the Lower Orinoco and Guayana Coast. In: E. Redmond (ed.) *Chiefdoms and Chieftaincy in the Americas, pp.150-163.* University Press of Florida. Foreword. In: E. Redmond (ed.) *Chiefdoms and Chieftaincy in the Americas, pp. ix-x.* University Press of Florida.

1998c Who is Carib? What is Carib Society? Ethnology, Ethnicity and History. *Paper prepared for the workshop on "Carib Societies", Georgetown, September 1998*

1999a The Crises and Transformations of Invaded Societies (1492-1580) - The Caribbean, In: F. Salomon & S. Schwartz (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Native American Peoples, vol.III, Chapter 10.* Cambridge University Press.

1999b Lowland Peoples Confront Colonial Regimes in Northern South America, 1550-1900, (in) F. Salomon & S. Schwartz (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Native American Peoples, vol.III, Chapter 14.* Cambridge University Press.

2000 'Tribes Make States and States Make Tribes: Warfare and the Creation of Colonial Tribe and State in Northeastern South America`, in: R. B. Ferguson and N. L. Whitehead (eds.), *War in the Tribal Zone; Expanding States and Indigenous Warfare, pp.127-150.* (2nd edition) Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Whorf, B.

1962 *Language, Thought and Reality.* Cambridge (Mass.): Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Williams, D.

1981 Excavation of the Barabina Shell Mound, North-West District. *Archaeology and Anthropology 4(1): 14-34*