Published in *Ethnohistory* 65:4 (Oct 2018): 597-620.

Pre-formatted version.

Makers and Keepers of Networks: Amerindian Spaces, Migrations and Exchanges in the Brazilian Amazon and French Guiana, 1600–1730

Silvia Espelt-Bombin, *University of Exeter*

Abstract. This article focuses on the geographical space between the Amazon delta and the Maroni River (nowadays Brazilian Amapá and French Guiana) in 1600–1730. An imperial frontier between France and Portugal South American possessions, it has been conceptualized as a refuge zone for Amerindians fleeing European colonization. On the contrary, this article argues that the migrations and movements of people toward and within this Amerindian space have to be understood as a continuation of a pre-European set of indigenous networks. Through the reconstruction of multilingual and multiethnic networks, this article brings to light connections and exchanges that make of this space an Amerindian center as well as a European frontier. It analyses conflicts, gatherings, celebrations, migrations, and alliances between European and Amerindian groups, including the Aruã, Maraon, Arikaré, Palikur, and Galibi. Rather than a refuge zone, this space remained central to Amerindian life and to the upholding of indigenous autonomy due to the maintenance of inter- and intra-ethnic connections and the regular use of routes across this space.

Keywords: Amazonia, French Guiana, Aruã, Galibi, Frontier

Located between Amazonia and the Guianas, the disputed territories of Amapá (Brazil) and eastern French Guiana, which until 1900 had been claimed both by Portugal/Brazil and France, have been considered a frontier zone by scholars. The long history of European frontier rivalries and diplomatic conflicts has been relatively well studied, leading to a recognition of how the colonizing processes shaped the region.[1] Addressing the absence of European strongholds between the Amazon River and Cayenne in 1650–1750, Cruz and Hulsman defined this area as an "indigenous space/territory."[2] Pierre and Françoise Grenand, tracing processes of ethnogenesis through ethnography, argued that the lands and waters between the Amazon and the Oyapock Rivers became "de facto un refuge pour les groups indigènes fugitifs jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIème siècle" because it was a frontier space.[3] Likewise, Gomes considered Amapá a "safe haven" for maroons in the second half of the eighteenth century.[4]

This article removes the European lenses (frontier, lack of European hegemony, indigenous refuge zone from Europeans) and focuses on the indigenous peoples living in the northeastern Amazon and the eastern Guianas. Rather than seeing this space as a European frontier, I conceptualize it as a regional center for indigenous northeastern South America. I argue that it was the indigenous peoples who maintained this region's autonomy, despite being affected by European colonization, because it was an indigenous core first and only later became a borderland. By thinking about this space as permeated by indigenous networks of exchange and with a history of Amerindian migrations, we can recast the Europeans as another group that moved in but that did not dominate it until the late eighteenth century.

This reconceptualization is based on the reconstruction of Amerindian regional networks, migrations and high degree of mobility between the Amazon delta and the Maroni River between 1600 and the 1730s, significantly focusing on the Aruã, Maraon, Arikaré, Galibi, and Palikur. This is no easy task, given that the period, in contrast to the later eighteenth century, remains understudied. To overcome these difficulties, this article takes an interdisciplinary approach that incorporates original archival research, existing anthropological research—particularly on the contemporary Palikur, Kali'na, and Wayana—and recent archaeological and linguistic studies.[5]

Due to the complexity of researching lands and waters that are transnational and multilingual, two notes of caution are in order. As Simone Dreyfus's classic article on networks in the western Guianas highlighted, the geographical area studied is limited by the sources available and that I have been able to acces.[6] The Amerindian networks went beyond the coastal areas, significantly upriver, inland and on to the western Guianas, but these are beyond the scope of this article. Second, multilingual sources mean that ethnonyms were transliterated into different languages, which makes identification of ethnic groups open to discussion, notably with the Maraon.[7] Some ethnonyms, such as "Aruã," refer to both

indigenous groups and subgroups (elsewhere called "bands"), while others, like "Ariane," might refer to a differentiated ethnic group or the self-denomination of a subgroup of Aruã. Ethnic identification is made even harder by ongoing processes of ethnogenesis and multilingualism. While the analysis is built on micro-scale interactions between indigenous groups over 130 years, it also provides an overview of the groups that seemed to dominate the area though this time.

Dropping the European Lenses

To be sure, Amapá and eastern French Guiana constituted a space over which no European power had hegemony. Having destroyed most of the English, Irish, and Dutch trade spots and plantations on the riverbanks and islands of the Amazon delta by the 1630s, the Portuguese claimed sovereignty over the northern territory. But the only Portuguese settlements right up until the foundation of Macapá in the mid-eighteenth century were short-lived forts and missions. Cabo do Norte remained a *sertão* (backlands) where the Portuguese would venture to extract resources and find labor. Farther north, after several attempts to settle in the eastern Guianas—all of which were undermined by the Dutch, English, and Amerindians—France established a permanent settlement in the 1660s. France's presence beyond Cayenne's area was limited to trading, military and exploratory expeditions, and a few itinerant missionaries; only in the 1720s were missions and a fort established on the Oyapock River. The border between the French and Portuguese colonies was established by the Treaty of Utrecht, but it continued to be contested until 1900.[8]

What makes this space Amerindian? Defining it as Amerindian space because it lacked European strongholds means defining it according to the limits of European expansion. The same applies if it was a 'refuge' for indigenous peoples from European colonial threats. This analysis blurs Amerindian exchanges and polities as well as European interests in the area. A space of refuge is self-contained, limited, and safe; none of this was

the case for the lands and waters under consideration. Whitehead has already demonstrated that what he called the "tribal zone" was affected by European colonization, while work on borderlands has explored the variety of exchanges that took place.[9] Portuguese expeditions into this space were harmful: *descimentos* and *tropas de guerra* and *resgate* "descended" Amerindians into missions and villages along the banks of the Amazon River, mostly near Belém and São Luís do Maranhão. Portuguese aggressiveness on the Amazon riverbanks meant that some indigenous peoples chose to flee their homes and migrate north, refusing to settle in missions, but not all of them did so.[10] Pierre Grenand suggested that Amerindians migrated north because they knew France forbade their enslavement. More likely, I suggest, Cayenne's small population and need for indigenous allies may have resulted in decreased pressure on Amerindians living nearby.[11] After all, the French bought captives enslaved by the Portuguese (legally, until 1739) and occasionally enslaved indigenous peoples themselves.[12] This article argues Amerindian migrations and the autonomy of this space were more than simple reactions to and consequences of European innitiatives.

On the one hand, recent research in Amazonian spatial history and Amerindian spatial knowledge has shown, through story maps and story tracks, that knowledge of places and routes once important for Amerindians are still remembered through myths, oral tradition, and performative acts.[13] Working with the contemporary Palikur, Green and Green were told the story of a man who had been born in Belém to an enslaved Palikur man. When the father died, the son left Belém and traveled 450 kilometers following the path described in one of the father's stories to a specific settlement on the Urucauá River, close to the Oyapock River.[14] Now, as then, it is likely that memories of places once inhabited, and routes traveled, were preserved and passed on to the next generation and retraced when necessary. While the early modern archival record only refers to the Amerindians' physical presence in a place, the reconstructions of their movements and connections show the occupation and incorporation

of the space through use and experience. Rivers, islands, and settlements might have acted as limits for ethnic dwellings (e.g., the Oyapock River and Cayenne Island), but they were not limits for trade, war, rituals, and migrations. Amerindians migrated but also maintained long-distance relations, and European borderlines (the Oyapock River) or settlements (Belém, Cayenne) did not act as limits to Amerindian mobility. Rather, these were gradually incorporated into the Amerindian space in which autonomous Indians lived and interacted.[15]

On the other hand, recent work on Arawak-speaking groups in ancient Amazonia and the Guianas suggests that the expansion of these peoples may not have been solely due to waves of migration, but was also a consequence of the migration of smaller groups. Those who migrated maintained trade and other exchanges with their kinspeople living in the place where they came from while integrating themselves into the local communities where they resettled. This space was characterized by multilingual and multiethnic networks and populations, and it is with this new mindset that this research goes beyond ethnolinguistic limits to reconstruct movements and exchanges.[16]

Thus, this article conceptualizes the space located between the Amazon and Maroni Rivers as an Amerindian space through the reconstruction of coastal indigenous networks roughly using the connections evidenced by trade, rituals, politics, migrations, and relocations. While there was significant continuity in space and time, actors changed, and some groups took prominence over others over time. This article attempts to reconstruct the history of once-powerful groups including the Aruã, Maraon, Ariane, Arikaré, Galibi, and Palikur and the impact they had on European colonization.

[Figure 1 about here]

Amerindian Migrations, Wars and Alliances: From the Araguarí to the Maroni

Migration along the coast from the Orinoco River to Cayenne (west-east) and from the Amazon to beyond the Oyapock (south-northwest) are attested, and, at least until 1400, Cayenne acted as a contact zone for two coastal archaeological cultural traditions between the Orinoco and the Amazon. Archaeologists have uncovered diverse ceramic styles and funerary practices, which point to a continuous set of migrations, exchanges, and contacts rather than a unilineal migration.[17] European arrival caused further migrations, and the Oyapock River became the center of the Aristé archaeological culture, which incorporates archaeological traditions from southern Amapá, clearly pointing to Amerindian migration northward until 1750.[18]

Combining archaeological studies with archival sources, Gérard Collomb suggested the existence of a "cultural frontier . . . inscribed in a warring front" between the Carib speakers living between Cayenne and the Maroni River and the mostly Arawak speakers east of the Oyapock in the seventeenth century.[19] This Carib-Arawak warring front, in which the Oyapock River and Cayenne were differentiated dwelling sites, each hosting one group and its allies, has been represented as a Yao-Carib rivalry in the first half of the seventeenth century, and as Palikur-Galibi confrontation from then onward. Although ethnogenesis changed these ethnic groups, and despite the centrality of the Palikur-Galibi confrontation in myths, memories, and historical narratives of indigenous peoples living now in the region, early modern reality seemed to have been less clear-cut.[20] The argument here is that there was no clear frontier between dwelling sites and that, while conflicts existed, reconfigurations of power entailed movements of people within these spaces. Conflicts between Yao/Palikur and Carib/Galibi were recurrent but discontinuous, and as some Amerindians became more prominent than others, alliances changed and were not always determined by language. This

section looks at the confrontation between the Carib/Galibi and other Arawak-speaking groups between the Araguarí and Maroni Rivers during the seventeenth century.

The Yao, probably Carib speakers, had arrived east of the Oyapock after being driven out of the Orinoco area by Spanish-Arawak alliances before 1600. The Yao had two main settlements: one near the Mayacary River and lake complex, and the other one on the Oyapock River, although they also dwelled in the vicinity of the Caw and Maroni Rivers. Hence, while they were in control of the space between the Araguarí and the Oyapock Rivers under the "principal" Anakyury, their influence extended as far as the Essequibo. According to European sources, the Yao were allies of the Arracoris, Marounias (Maraon?), Sapayos and Arikaré and were at war with the Charibes (later the Galibi), who lived roughly between the Approuage and Maroni Rivers, and with the Mayés, living east of the Oyapock.[21]

Van den Bel has argued that the "deadlock war between Cayenne and the Oyapock" might have been due to the competition to secure exclusive trade with Europeans in the area since the 1590s.[22] By the late 1620s, Dutch and English traders had abandoned most trading outposts on the Oyapock, which coincided with their expulsion from the Amazon by the Portuguese, and went to settle along the coast west of Cayenne and in the Lesser Antilles.[23] Could it be that Yao leadership decayed when the English—Yao allies—and Dutch traders left? This may explain why by 1666 only one Yao village of 35–40 people remained on the Oyapock. Although their leader was named Anacaiouri, the eponymous grandson of Anakyury, and they were still enemies of the Galibi, the Yao had no precedence over other peoples; from then on, they disappeared from the written record probably because they integrated themselves among other Amerindian dwellings.[24]

However, the confrontation between different Amerindian groups continued even after the temporary decline of European trade. Already in the 1610s–1620s, Mocquet and

Harcourt noted that the conflicts between "Caribes" and Yaos were not constant, hinting that there might be more than one reason for the existence of these conflicts, as I explore below.[25]

By the 1640s, just as the French were trying to colonize the area, the Palikur, Arikaré (Arecarets), and Galibi had become key actors in the Cayenne-Araguarí space. In 1644 the Galibi were at war with the Palikur, the Arikaré, and their allies, and the French perceived the Galibi and the Palikur to be long-standing enemies.[26] When the French settlement in Cayenne was attacked by their closest neighbors and suppliers (the Galibi) in 1652, the French retaliated by attacking the Galibi and sought to ally themselves with the Palikur. The French were unable to locate the Palikur, but they encountered the Maraon and Norak (Nouragues) up the Oyapock River, so the Palikur might have intentionally hidden from the French.[27] In the 1660s, the French returned to establish a permanent settlement in Cayenne having secured consent from the Galibi, who also accepted itinerant missionaries, and the French-Galibi alliance remained a constant thereafter. At the same time, the French tried to gain the favor of the Palikur who lived west of the Oyapock—with whom they were already trading—by sending an itinerant Jesuit mission that failed due to an epidemic that affected many between1674 and 1676.[28] The Palikur, and those living alongside them, continued to maintain their autonomy and continued to trade with the Dutch boats fishing off their coastal dwellings. The Dutch were still interested in the area and established a fort on the Oyapock (1676–77) and briefly took over Cayenne in 1676.[29]

The Galibi-Palikur warfare suggests that these wars may have been part of rituals significant to social reproduction.[30] By 1664, the Palikur and Galibi continued to fight each other but less frequently, but the Palikur no longer attacked Galibi settlements near Cayenne.[31] The French suggested that this was the result of their own presence in Cayenne, of Galibi interest in trading with Amerindians from the Amazon River,[32] and because the Galibi infrequently came out as victors in these confrontations.[33] The wars nevertheless

continued. In 1670, the Galibi living in a village in the Kourou River area prepared for a war that was due to take place in a moon's time. When the time arrived, all the men left the dwelling, leaving only the women behind.[34] Another scheduled and ritualized war took place around 1686, after which the Galibi held a four-day gathering on the Sinnamary River, west of Cayenne.[35] The festivities celebrated the Palikur's defeat and the capture of a Palikur prisoner. The Galibi warrior who had taken the Palikur prisoner ended a lengthy period of fasting with a bout of copious drinking.[36] This gathering attracted Galibi from across French Guiana, among them one of the main Galibi headmen, Trompette. The gathering was so numerous that a big canoe carrying a load of fish from the Approuague River (east of Cayenne) was arranged.[37] The meaning and symbolism of this four-day ritual is unclear, yet it is evident that the Palikur captive had a symbolic role.[38]

However, Galibi-Palikur confrontations did not dominate indigenous interactions in the area. In the mid-seventeenth century, the Arikaré became more dominant in the regional networks. This shift might have resulted from the widening of the regional network and the intensification of the contacts with distant Amerindians between the Amazon and Maroni Rivers. Whereas in 1644 the Galibi fought against the Palikur, the Arikaré, and their allies,[39] in 1652 the French deemed the Arikaré ("Arecarets") of the Mayacarí ("Maricary") lakes as a "neutral nation" living side by side with the Palikur and occasionally helping the Galibi.[40] That same year, the Galibi living on the island and river of Cayenne and by the Macouria River went to visit the Arikaré on Mayacarí to convince them to move closer to their dwellings.[41] By 1666, the French distinguished between "oriental" Arikaré—those in the Mayacarí lake complex—and "occidental" Arikaré who lived close to Cayenne.[42] In 1666, owing to conflicts with the Portuguese of the Fort of Desterro on the mouth of the Parú river, four hundred Arikaré moved into the vicinity of Cayenne.[43] Between 1652 and 1666, other

Arikaré may have settled without the French noticing, but it is evident that, from the 1660s onward, some Arikaré were permanently settled close to Cayenne.

The Arikaré settlements around Cayenne served as a meeting point and became central to the interactions that were to dominate this Amerindian space. In 1670, the French Jesuit Jacques Brun visited an Arikaré village located three miles from Cayenne, where he was welcomed and the inhabitants began building him a house and chapel.[44] Brun did not settle there permanently, but the village might have lain along the route of itinerant Jesuit missionaries. Sometime around 1673, another Jesuit, Phillipe Prévost, visited a village located four or five miles from Cayenne that was home to about five hundred Arikaré and Galibi. Despite living side-by-side, the two indigenous groups remained differentiated enough for Prévost to tell them apart.[45] Whether the Arikaré and the Galibi were simply living together or starting to become a single group through ethnogenesis, they remained highly mobile. Prévost's main complaint about his time among the Galibi, the Arikaré and the Maraon ("Marones") was that they frequently split into small groups of five, ten, or twenty-five people and moved far or into "unhabitable lands," making it very difficult for missionaries to follow them.[46]

By the mid-1680s, the Arikaré had not only integrated in the newly settled area but also had maintained contacts with their former home and were respected mediators of a regional network that extended from the Amazon to the Maroni. The Jesuit Jean de la Mousse witnessed a conflict resolution process mediated by the Arikaré somewhere between Cayenne and Sinnamary. It involved Aruã and Maraon ("Maraones"), who had come from the Amazon River. The Aruã and the Maraon were on the verge of war because the Maraon had killed and injured several Aruã, but the two groups instead sought advice from the Arikaré headman ("capitaine") Ammonoie.[47] He interrogated one Maraon, asking him whether it was traditional for them to kill each other in their festivities. The *capitaine* told him that when the

Arikaré had differences among themselves, all they did was drink, dance, play instruments, and then go to sleep. The Maraon was reprimanded but not killed, in Ammonoie's words, because "ta nation ne fut jamais ennemie de la mienne," and the punishment was meant to teach him a lesson so that he could become wiser.[48]

The Arikaré might have been central to increased exchanges and migrations within the networks. Amerindians traveled long distances for Arikaré wisdom, and each visit or relocation reinforced connections within the networks. Ultimately, these ritualized visits might have helped establish new alliances and future migrations. Indeed, in 1686 another gathering brought together Galibi, Maraon, and Aruã, who had arrived from the Amazon, in a populous village located near an Arikaré village on the Oyak River, east of Cayenne.[49] Central to the gathering were flutes that the Maraon had brought from the Amazon. These were placed in the hands of the Amerindian "captain" of the village, either an Arikaré or a Galibi, after which all danced and drank copiously.[50] Such an exchange could have reinforced mutual recognition and respect, and reaffirmed a loose network that involved counseling, migrations, celebrations, visits, and social integration of several groups. Only a year later, four hundred Aruã relocated to the vicinity of a Jesuit plantation on Cayenne Island, and some of them, who came from Portuguese missions on the Amazon delta, had already been instructed in Christian doctrine.[51]

By the late 1680s, members of the Aruã, Arikaré, Maraon, and Galibi peoples, among others, were living together or in close proximity in the Cayenne-Sinnamary area. They were part of an Amerindian network that extended to the Amazon, where other kin lived. It is evident that they remained in contact with their kinspeople, for in 1697 the French were able to access this Amerindian network and receive assistance to take over two Portuguese forts on the Amazon River, Parú and Macapá. The French obtained indispensable food provisions from the Aruã, Maraon, Ariane, and Tucujús while attacking and defending the Portuguese

forts. The Palikur acted as hosts en route, while the Aruã served as soldiers and rowers.[52] This was partially achieved through the ability of the French to secure alliances, as they had already established trade with the Aruã and Tucujú living in villages close to the Gurupá fort in 1686 and again in 1695, and with other groups beyond the Parú River, up the Jarí, and maybe as far as the Tapajós.[53] However, it was significant that all these Amerindian groups were already in close contact and probably agreed to provide timely support to the French against the increasingly intrusive Portuguese.

Tracing Links between the Amazon and Cayenne through Maps and Linguistics: The Aruã, Maraon, and Ariane, 1600–1700

This section proposes a linguistic and source-based analysis to associate ethnonyms and toponyms. It places the Aruã, Maraon, and Ariane side by side in coastal Amapá and on the Amazon delta of the early seventeenth century. In so doing, it establishes their Amazonian origins and connects them to the exchanges between the Araguarí and Maroni discussed above (until 1697) as well as those in the early eighteenth century discussed in the following section.

There is a consensus that the Aruã lived on the Amazon delta, particularly along the northern bank, on small islands and northern Marajó.[54] Ley placed the "Arowa" on both sides of the Amazon and also on three islands off the coast.[55] The small island of Sapno (off the northern bank) and its surroundings were a lively Amerindian trading spot where Europeans often stopped.[56] De Forest noted the presence of the Maraon there and named a nearby island and the village located there as "Arouen."[57] O'Brien del Carpio stated that those Amerindians named themselves "Arrua."[58] Maraon and Aruã lived side by side, and their systematic distinction in the sources throughout the early modern period makes it unlikely that they were the same people.[59]

While “Aruã” and “Maraon” are attested to as toponyms and ethnonyms, “Ariane” appears seemingly in only two sources as a toponym during the 1620s, and in French sources from the 1670s onward. In De Forest’s account, “Quariane” is the toponym for an island located in front of Sapno and farther north from the island of “Arouen.”[60] In an anonymous Dutch map surveying the Lower Amazon and coastal Guianas, three islands on the mouth of the Amazon are named “Narianen,” “Arrowen Eyl,” and “Jarrianen” (fig. 2).[61] While Arrowen is clearly an island (Eyl. stands for *eiland*, “island” in Dutch), Narianen and Jarrianen could be toponyms or ethnonyms, and it is through linguistics that I suggest that the toponyms point to the ethnic group living there.

[Figure 2 about here]

The Aruã, Palikur, and Marawan languages belong to the same branch of the Arawakan language family tree.[62] The Aruã and Marawan languages are now extinct, but before Aruã disappeared, Penna identified it as an Arawakan language,[63] and Rivet and Reinburg identified Marawan as an Arawakan language through comparative linguistics.[64] Palikur still exists and is one of the most diverse Arawakan languages, having entered in contact with “Carib and other unknown languages.”[65] The common Arawakan origin of the Aruã, Marawan, and Palikur languages and the centrality of pronominal prefixes allow me to suggest that “Narianen” and “Jarrianen” on the map in figure 2 and “Quariane” from De Forest’s account point to “Ariane” being both a toponym and an ethnonym. Aikhenvald proposes that [i-] was a second-person prefix (singular and plural) and [na-] a third-person prefix (plural) for Proto-Arawak and in contemporary Palikur.[66] “[N-]arianen” and “[J-]arianen” could have been possessive prefixes that indicated the relationship of the person speaking the word to the islands. “[Q-]ariane” could be the positive (attributive) prefix [ka-], meaning “having” Ariane.[67] This interpretation is plausible since the indigenous peoples naming the islands to De Forest and the anonymous creator of the Dutch map spoke an

Arawakan language. Thus, this means that the islands were "having" Ariane living on them or that they were "inhabited by"/"belonging to" the Ariane.

It seems clear that the Ariane, Aruã, and Maraon all lived on the coast of Amapá in the early seventeenth century. It is unclear whether Ariane was a self-denomination of a group of Aruã or a different ethnic group. In any case, early connections can explain why in 1674 some Maraons ("Maprouanes") living on the Ouya River (close to Cayenne) stated that they had recently moved there after fleeing Portuguese and Ariane persecution.[68] It can also explain the joint appearance of some Maraon and Aruã seeking Arikaré counsel as well as Galibi friendship in the 1680s, as discussed above. By the 1690s the Ariane sought French assistance while complaining about Portuguese aggressions.[69]

What remains in doubt is whether the Maraon that appear throughout this Amerindian space were all the same and whether it is only the transliteration of ethnonyms that clouds our understanding. When the Grenands classified the Maraon people as Karib, they opened the door to considering them "peut-être caraïbisés."[70] Given recent research on multilingualism in the Guianas, the Maraon could have been speakers of a now-lost Arawakan language who used Galibi (Carib) or/and Aruã as a lingua franca, depending on where they lived. For instance, the Maraon living around Cayenne in the 1720s might have learned Galibi.[71] In 1687–89, the Portuguese used Aruã interpreters to communicate with the Maraon ("Maraunizes," "Maruanís") living in Mayacarí lakes complex.[72] Ultimately, it is undeniable that despite the challenges presented by these sources, we can turn to ethnonyms, exchanges, and networks to explain the multiethnic alliance that agreed to help the French in 1697.

Missions and Networks of Trade and Resistance between Belém and Kourou, 1690–1730

It was the Aruã who took the defeated French back to Cayenne in 1697. The Aruã were excellent rowers and pilots and were well known for traveling long distances to trade and

transport people. The Portuguese knew that the Aruã lived in small groups, on many islands and lands, and moved freely, often opting to remain independent and not settle in missions.[73] This section develops the indigenous space following the Aruã and the set of connections that they embodied, giving the space cohesion via networks of trade and resistance.

The Aruã traded items within the Amazon delta and beyond. Already before 1674, M. Le Roy de Gomberville remarked on Galibi interest in the Amazonian green stones, which they acquired mostly through trade, although they occasionallytraveled to the Amazon to obtain them themselves.[74] In 1691, it was the Aruã who brought to the Galibi living in a Jesuit mission on the Kourou river cotton textiles (used to make sails), lines of rounded shells (*okayes*), and the green stones (*tahouraia*). In exchange, the Aruã got knives and axes that the Galibi had obtained from the French. The Aruã might have come from Portuguese missions, as they kissed the Jesuit's sleeve and attended mass, or they might have wanted to show respect for the Galibi's new practices.[75] The trade must have continued and by 1725 the Jesuit Chrétien stated that while the Galibi used two different types of shell necklaces, their most precious valuables were still the green stones from the Amazon River.[76] These green stones, probably the *muiraquitã*, were indicators of social standing and highly valued by their owners.[77] The continued trade in green stones and shell necklaces despite resettlement of many Amerindians in missions, as discussed below, demonstrates not only the persistence of the regional network but also the incorporation of European missions into it.

From the 1690s onward, Amerindians from Cabo do Norte were systematically taken into missions, sometimes enticed with gifts, sometimes by force, and occasionally taken elsewhere as captives.[78] The new royal division of missionary areas in the Amazon (1693) intensified Portuguese activity in Cabo do Norte,[79] but the 1697 French attack exemplified the threat that Amerindian-French alliances posed to the Portuguese settlements' northern frontier. Subsequent Portuguese policies in the area were partially aimed to counteract French

influence, despite the 1700 Provisional Treaty signed between France and Portugal establishing that indigenous peoples living between the Amazon and the Oyapock Rivers should not be disturbed.[80]

Not only did the Portuguese systematically target Cabo do Norte's Amerindians, but Portuguese missionary orders also decided that Amerindians should settle in missions located far from their original homes to avoid problems and satisfy labor demands. Some Aruã were moved from missions in Cabo do Norte to the Franciscan missions on the island of Marajó in 1699,[81] and close to Belém and São Luís in 1703.[82] In 1709, some Maraon ("Maraunun") were recorded as living in the Jesuit mission of Mortigura.[83] By 1721, about 7,000 "Mouranj" (maybe Maraon?) had been taken to the missions of Caycaybâ, Mortigura, and Moribina, and other indigenous peoples from the northern bank of the Amazon, such as the Guayanazes, had also joined missions.[84] Great numbers were needed to replace the hundreds who died from epidemics, maltreatment, and overwork, or those Amerindians who left the missions.[85]

Some of the relocated Amerindians resisted by fleeing, attacking other Portuguese missions, and refusing to permanently settle in the missions—sometimes moving between their old and new homes. The escape and migration routes followed the connections that crossed Amapá and French Guiana as evidenced by the indigenous peoples' presence throughout the space and time. Many—notably the Aruã—refused to stay in the Franciscan missions, to the point that in 1706 the king recommended keeping newly missioned Aruã away from work for their first five years in residence.[86] It was the royal response to a few turbulent years in Marajó's Franciscan missions. In 1702, over the course of five months, fifty Aruã living in several Franciscan missions in Marajó had been abused, underfed, and forced to row and fight by the *capitão mor* of the Cabo do Norte troops.[87] These Aruã might have been part of the Portuguese expedition against other indigenous groups (the Mamayana, Coxiguara, Guayana, and Sacacá) that rebelled and killed two Franciscan friars in another

mission in Marajó in 1701.[88] Other Aruã from missions in Marajó escaped in 1702 and, according to their missionary, headed north, where ". . . vão buscar a [amizade] dos Francezes com que viverão sempre."[89] The Amerindians' aim was not to seek French protection but to go back to their own dwellings or to those of their kin.

The Amerindian space remained integrated, and migrations and visits between the different groups continued. In 1709 some Aruã visited the Galibi settled in the Jesuit mission on the Kourou River, holding a gathering that involved drinking and dancing.[90] A year later, some Galibi from a village on the Kourou (maybe the same?) traveled east to two other Galibi villages, one in Counomama and the other in Macaïa Patari (perhaps the Mayacarí?), to hold two similar gatherings with music and dancing. Because of this visit, one of those Galibi villages agreed to return home to the village on the Kourou that they had left years before.[91] In 1711, the superior of the French Jesuits received two separate requests from the Aruã and the Palikur to send a missionary to settle among them. He refused but invited them to settle in the Jesuit missions, which some Aruã did.[92]

By the 1720s, long-distance relations only got stronger, and indigenous peoples left missions and resettled across this Amerindian space, retracing existing routes and heading north-north-west of the Araguarí. The trends of the 1670s and 1680s of different indigenous groups settling in the same place continued, both within and beyond the missions.

After migrating, most Christianized Amerindians, or at least those willing to convert, settled in missions. In 1723, the Jesuit mission of Kourou was made up of several Amerindian groups living in nearby but separate houses, each with their headmen.[93] There were two hundred and fifty Galibi (the "locals"), thirty to forty Coussaris who had settled there eight years before and had become bilingual after learning Galibi, thirty Maraon who had come from the Amazon and who spoke a language very similar to Galibi, and about fifty Aruã—with more arriving every day—who had been converted to Christianity by Portuguese

missionaries. However, as the Jesuit Prévost had done in 1673, in 1725 Kourou's missionary Chrétien complained that the Galibi and the other Amerindians living with them moved dwellings too frequently.[94]

Those who wanted to remain independent preferred to settle between the Araguarí and Cayenne, but their connections reached from the Amazon to Suriname. The paper trail of a 1728 *guardacosta* expedition to Cabo do Norte provides a glimpse of groups, among them Aruã and Maraon, that used the paths and waterways within the network. They consisted of those who, travelling with the Portuguese, would try to convince their relatives to live with them in the missions. They included the "Principal dos Maraunões" (Maraon) from the mission of Mortigura, close to Belém, and the principal of a Franciscan mission on Marajó Island.[95] On the other hand, there were also those who had left Portuguese missions and migrated to Cabo do Norte, whom the Portuguese wanted to capture. This diverse group included the Aruã Belchior and his "brother" Bernardo who, despite having been on good terms with the Portuguese in the missions, decided to move to Cabo do Norte—supposedly to live and trade with the French—taking with them Neengaiba women from another mission.[96] There were also Mamayannas from the missions of Arucará and Aricurú (west of Belém).[97] A third group headed by a certain Gonsalo had escaped Portuguese missions twice—once from Maranhão—and were trading between the Amazon and Cayenne.[98] Finally, there were two Amerindian headmen who, after leaving the missions, had been attacking missions in Sao Luís and Belém from a "hidden" base in the "Alayacahy" (Mayacarí). The Mayacarí lake complex had been home to the Yao, Arikaré, Palikur and other groups in the seventeenth century. By 1728, it was still home to the Palikur and other non-subdued Amerindians ("Indios das nações Paricurazes e outras bravas"),[99] including the Aruã and the Maraon. One of the headmen was Caráyman, who in 1725 was accused of having killed and eaten a young man and burning his boat. By 1728 Caráyman traveled from the Amazon to Surinam to

"vender escravos que daqui fogem e lá vão parar para ás ditas suas terras."[100] The other headman was the Aruã Guaymã, who in 1722 had attacked the Tupinambá of the Murubira mission located close to Belém.[101] That same year, the Mexianas (Aruã living on Mexiana island off the northern bank of the Amazon) assaulted the village of Arapijo on the Xingu river. Guaymã had been sentenced to death, but had escaped with the Mexiannas to the French-Portuguese border, and in 1728 he was trading with the French in the area.[102] The Portuguese read these indigenous migrations northward to new homes close to the French colony as a desire for French protection. It should be clear by now that they had been using the existing networks and connections to preserve their autonomy and continue living independently of European settlements. Their lifestyles involved living in small groups and frequently relocating and interacting with other indigenous groups with whom they shared territory and with whom they interacted within a multilingual exchange network that also included the French, the Portuguese, and the Dutch.

Conclusion

Through the analysis of a period covering more than 130 years, this article has presented an indigenous history of an Amerindian space. These lands, rivers, lakes, and coasts were inhabited by multilingual and multiethnic groups that maintained exchange networks based on trade, rituals, alliances, and wars, which ignited several processes of ethnogenesis. Such connections made this an Amerindian space because what gave unity and centrality to the space were the interactions between indigenous peoples, their occupation and use of lands and waters, their patterns of use, and their frequent migration within this space. These migrations and networks existed before the arrival of the Europeans and, while European colonization changed regional power relations, some indigenous peoples maintained their autonomy within this space, which was not defined by the physical limits of European expansion, nor was it a refuge from European violence. This space incorporated European

settlements such as Belém, Cayenne, and surrounding missions, and was not limited by European borderlines as the Oyapock River. While Amerindian dwellings may have seemed restricted to certain places, this article has shown that the exchanges between peoples, even across lands and waters occupied by enemies, rendered the European border irrelevant for the Amerindians living in a multicentred space in a state of flux and continual change.

European intervention in this space through trade, enslavement, and *descimentos* affected the area's existing populations, reconfiguring relations as well as forging new social formations. Control of European trade and alliances helped to bring some groups to prominence, while losing control of these might have brought about their decline, as in the case of the Yao.

However, reasons for prominence were not solely linked to trade with Europeans. After the mid-seventeenth century, the Arikaré became central to the reconfiguration of the exchanges, and in the second half of the seventeenth century, they received some form of political recognition from other groups. The Arikaré's prominence had to do with Amerindian reconfigurations of power and their relocation within and beyond missions, as was also the case for the Aruã. While warfare was not at the center of this analysis, wars were common. Warfare caused displacements of people and further reconfigurations, reinforcing social reproduction when it did exist—for instance, between Palikur and Galibi. Otherwise, its absence meant other kinds of alliances between different indigenous groups were forged, as in the case of the visits and trade between the Aruã, Maraon, and Galibi, or the Palikur and the peoples living alongside them.

The Aruã remained central to the networks of exchange, and the places occupied by their dwellings continued to expand throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The high degree of mobility throughout the decades was related to their roles as traders, seafarers, and riverine navigators. Engaged in trade with Amerindians and Europeans

from the very beginning, they continued trading in European and indigenous goods into the 1720s and beyond. As early (and perhaps earlier than) the 1680s, they began settling among and alongside other groups such as the Galibi. Given the Aruã's omnipresence at a time when most Amerindian peoples struggled to maintain their numbers, the question remains whether "Aruã" gradually became an ethnonym that included several groups who shared a common language and participated in the same network. In turn, we may also ask if the revealed processes of ethnogenesis contributed to the perceived prominence of this particular indigenous group.

Notes

This research was funded by the Leverhulme Trust/British Academy Small Research Grant (SG132847) and the Sir Ernest Cassel Educational Trust Fund. I thank Mark Harris, Martijn Van den Bel, Pablo Ibáñez-Bonillo, Jean-Sébastien Balzat, and Tomi Bartole for their comments.

[1] Reis, *Limites e demarcações*; Rocha, "'Domínio' e 'posse.'"

[2] Cruz and Hulsman, *Brief Political History*, 72, 92, 115.

[3] Grenand and Grenand, "La Côte d'Amapa," 2, 8.

[4] Gomes, "'Safe Haven.'"

[5] Grenand and Grenand, "La Côte d'Amapa"; Green and Green, "Space, Time," 166; Chapuis, "Dynamic Approach"; Gallois, *Mairi revisitada*; Passes, "Hearer," 4–6.

[6] Dreyfus, "Les réseaux politiques," 76–78.

[7] On the complexity of identifying peoples and ethnonyms, see Grenand and Grenand, "La Côte d'Amapa."

[8] Lorimer, *English and Irish*; Reis, *Limites e demarcações*, 200–206; Cruz and Hulsman, *Brief Political History*, 64–65, 68, 72–75, 92–93.

[9] Whitehead, "Tribes Make States"; Barr, "Geographies of Power."

[10] Nimuendajú, "Aruã"; Gallois, *Migração, guerra e comércio*, 82–87.

[11] Grenand, "Que sont devenus?" 116. Cayenne's population was 1,682 in 1685 and under 3,500 in 1722; see Pritchard, *In Search of Empire*, 43–44.

[12] Hurault, *Français et Indiens*, 44, 46, 111–14; Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance*, 120–22.

[13] S. Vidal, "Kuwé Duwakalumi"; S. Vidal, "Arawak-Speaking Groups"; Green and Green, "Space, Time"; Santos-Granero, "Writing History"; Green, Green, and Neves, "Indigenous Knowledge," 387–89.

[14] Green and Green, "Space, Time," 176–77.

[15] Barr, "Geographies of Power," 18–21; Vieira, Amoroso, and Viegas, "Apresentação."

[16] Hornborg and Hill, "Introduction."

[17] Van den Bel, *Archaeological Investigations*, 590–10.

[18] Rostain, "Where the Amazon," 14, 16–21, 23–24.

[19] Collomb, "Les peuples," 167–73 (Arawak (Lokono) also lived west of the Maroni).

[20] L. Vidal, "Mito, História e Cosmologia"; Nimuendajú, *Indiens Palikur*, 88; Passes, "Hearer," 241–42; Grenand and Grenand, "La Côte d'Amapa"; Green, Green, and Neves, "Indigenous Knowledge," 384.

[21] Harcourt, *Relation of a Voyage*, 79–80, 173; Van den Bel, *Archaeological Investigations*, 611–21; Whitehead, "Carib Ethnic Soldiering," 362; Wilson, "Relation of Master John Wilson," 347; Hurault, *Français et Indiens*, 30 (mention of De Forest).

[22] Van den Bel, *Archaeological Investigations*, 616.

[23] Van den Bel, *Archaeological Investigations*, 620.

[24] Le Febvre de La Barre, *Description*, 17.

[25] Mocquet, *Voyages en Afrique*, 89 (Wiapoccoroes or Yapocos); Harcourt, *Relation of a Voyage*, 86 (Yaos); Wilson, "Relation of Master John Wilson," 344–45.

[26] Gomberville in Acuña, *Relation de la rivière*, 115.

[27] Biet, *Voyage de la France equinoxiale*, 149, 180.

[28] Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (hereafter ARSI), Galliae 106, fol. 343r–348v, Letter by Jean Grillet, Paris, 7 November 1676.

[29] Van den Bel and Hulsman, "Le fort Orange."

[30] Whitehead, "Tribes Make States," 143.

[31] Le Febvre de La Barre, *Description*, 34; Biet, *Voyage de la France equinoxiale*, 180; Cruz and Hulsman, *Brief Political History*, 73–74.

[32] Gomberville in Acuña, *Relation de la rivière*, 115.

[33] Le Febvre de La Barre, *Description*, 34–37.

[34] Bibliothèque nationale de France (hereafter BnF), Manuscrits, Moreau 841 (LVII, 1–34), "Copie d'une lettre du P. Jacques Brun, de la C^{le} de Jésus, escrite du pays des Arecarets, dans la terre ferme de l'Amérique, le 17^{e} janvier 1671", fol. 36r-45v (specifically fol. 43r–44v).

[35] La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 72, 80.

[36] La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 80.

[37] La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 71–72.

[38] For Collomb's analysis, see La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 262n4.

[39] Gomberville in Acuña, *Relation de la rivière*, 115.

[40] Biet, *Voyage de la France equinoxiale*, 148, 376.

[41] Biet, *Voyage de la France equinoxiale*, 370, 371–76.

[42] Le Febvre de La Barre, *Description*, 34–37.

[43] Le Febvre de La Barre, *Description*, 34. The French considered the four hundred Arikaré as enemies of the Galibi (vs. the 1652 group), but it seems unlikely that this was the case.

[44] BnF, Manuscrits, Moreau 841 (LVII, 1–34), "Copie d'une lettre du P. Jacques Brun", 17 January 1671, fol. 44v.

[45] ARSI, Galliae 106, Letter by Phillipe Prévost, Cayenne, 24 May 1673, fol. 335v.

[46] Prévost had been a missionary of the Galibi and Maraon on the Kourou River in 1672. ARSI, Galliae 106, fol. 334r-337v, Letter by Phillipe Prévost, Cayenne, 24 May 1673.

[47] On capitain(es), see Van den Bel, *Archaeological Investigations*, 612.

[48] La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 81–82.

[49] La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 99.

[50] La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 100–101, 268–69.

[51] Archives Nationales d'Outre-Mer (hereafter ANOM), Colonies, C14/2, fol. 101r–104v, "Mémoire des R. P. Jesuittes de Cayennes," Saint-Gilles, c.1686 ; La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 152; see also Espelt-Bombin, "Frontier Politics," 81.

[52] Espelt-Bombin, "Frontier Politics," 80-82.

[53] "Se lhe ordena faça por impedir a entrada que os Franceses fazem nas terras dos Aroans...," 20 February 1686, "Livro grosso do Maranhão," *Anais da Biblioteca Nacional* (1948) (hereafter ABN) 66, 70–71; Conselho Ultramarino to King, 22 November 1699, Arquivo

Histórico Ultramarino, Conselho Ultramarino (hereafter AHU-CU), Avulsos, Pará, cx. 4, doc. 358. See also the article by Harris in this issue of *Ethnohistory*.

[54] Nimuendajú, "Aruã"; Ibáñez-Bonillo, "Portuguese Conquest," 381–91.

[55] "Ley his pedigree" in Lorimer, *Sir Walter Ralegh's Discoverie*, 331.

[56] See the article by Ibáñez-Bonillo in this issue of *Ethnohistory*.

[57] De Forest, *Walloon Family*, 222–25.

[58] Lorimer, *English and Irish*, 264.

[59] Lorimer, *English and Irish*, 259n2, wrongly identifies the Maruan as Aruã.

[60] De Forest, *Walloon Family*, 224–25.

[61] Nationaal Archief, The Hague, Netherlands, NL_Ha_NA_4.VEL_2153. Hulsman, "Swaerooch," 193–94, dates the map to before 1625, but it could be dated later; see Brommer et al., *Grote Atlas*, 410. René M. Haubourdin of the Nationaal Archief facilitated this reference.

[62] Danielsen, Dunn and Muysken, "Spread of the Arawakan Languages," 178 (table 8.3), 179 (fig. 8.2).

[63] Penna, "Algumas palavras"; Nimuendajú, *Indiens Palikur*, 177–78; Grenand and Grenand, "La côte d'Amapa," 40–42.

[64] Rivet and Reinburg, "Indiens Marawan," 107–8, wrongly identified the Marawan/Maraon with the Palikur; see Grenand and Grenand, "La côte d'Amapa," 3–5.

[65] Danielsen, Dunn, and Muysken, "Spread of the Arawakan Languages," 187.

[66] Aikhenvald, "Arawak Languages," 448.

[67] Aikhenvald, "Arawak Languages," 449. It is likely that "Arrowen," "Narianen," and "Jarrianen" are plural forms in Dutch (-en ending), although Aikhenvald (personal e-mail communication) suggested that [-ne] could might as well be an Arawak plural (i.e., Na+aria+ne+en).

[68] Grillet in Acuña, *Relation de la rivière*, 205–6.

[69] Espelt-Bombin, "Frontier Politics," 83-85.

[70] Grenand and Grenand, "La côte d'Amapa," 41–42, 44–45.

[71] Grenand and Grenand, "La côte d'Amapa," 41–42, 44–45.

[72] Espelt-Bombin, "Frontier Politics," 78.

[73] "Sobre a guerra," 18 February 1724, *ABN* 67, 197–99; Conselho Ultramarino, AHU-CU-Avulsos, Maranhão, cx. 5, doc. 522, 22 March 1667; Nimuendajú, "Aruã"; the article by Ibáñez-Bonillo in this issue of *Ethnohistory*.

[74] Gomberville in Acuña, *Relation de la rivière*, 122–23.

[75] La Mousse, *Les Indiens*, 210–12.

[76] Chrétien, "Moeurs et coutumes," 47, 50–51. According to Chrétien, those making the green stones were the "Soncoyannes" (Toucouyannes—perharps the Tucujús?) and "Arranes" (perhaps the Aruã?).

[77] Boomert, "Gifts of the Amazons."

[78] "Sobre a Guerra" and "Sobre se darem aos Indios," 27 November 1699, *ABN* 66, 196.

[79] Bombardi, "Pelos interstícios," 70.

[80] Reis, *Limites e demarcações*, 102–16, 195–200 (treaty).

[81] "Sobre mudar os Indios Aruans," 9 December 1698, *ABN* 66, 180; "Sobre a Aldea," 27 November 1699, *ABN* 66, 195.

[82] "Sobre as duas Aldeas," 6 May 1703, *ABN* 66, 246.

[83] "Sobre o que obrou," 12 April 1709, *ABN* 67, 47.

[84] ARSI, Bras 10 (1), fol. 196r, Relação de Jacinto de Carvalho, Lisbon, 21 March 1721; "Em que se lhe avisa se remette. . . ," 4 June 1715, *ABN* 67, 127.

[85] Bombardi, "Pelos interstícios," 44–45.

[86] "Sobre varios particulares," 23 August 1706, *ABN* 66, 287.

[87] "Sobre o máo tracto"," 24 November 1702, *ABN* 66, 228–29.

[88] AHU-CU, Avulsos, Maranhão, cx. 10, doc. 1057, "Carta do Loco tenente Fernão Carrilho," 8 June 1702. Aruã were only listed among the culprits from 1702; see Bombardi, "Pelos interstícios," 121–22.

[89] "Sobre o máo tracto . . . ," 24 November 1702, *ABN* 66, 229.

[90] Labat, *Voyage du chevalier Des Marchais*, 439–43.

[91] Labat, *Voyage du chevalier Des Marchais*, 459–61.

[92] ANOM, Colonies C14/6, fol. 244r–251r, "Décisions sur une lettre du père Gouyé," 1711.

[93] Labat, *Voyage du chevalier Des Marchais*, 501–4.

[94] Chrétien, "Moeurs et coutumes," 49.

[95] "Neste Caderno . . . ," in Reis, *Limites e demarcações*, 226–34 (hereafter "Neste Caderno"). For the location of the Portuguese missions, see Bombardi, "Pelos interstícios," 25–26.

[96] "Neste Caderno."

[97] "Neste Caderno."[98] "Neste Caderno."

[99] "Regimento que há deguardar," 10 November 1728, in Reis, *Limites e demarcações*, 210–13.

[100] "Regimento que há deguardar," 10 November 1728, in Reis, *Limites e demarcações*, 210–13.

[101] "Sobre a guerra," 18 February 1724, *ABN* 67, 197–99; Bombardi, "Pelos interstícios," 123.

[102] "Regimento que há deguardar," 10 November 1728; "Justificação sobre as Terras do Cabo Norte . . . ," 19 July 1723; and "Termo de Interprete," in Reis, *Limites e demarcações*, 210–13, 215–21, and 224–26 respectively; "Neste Caderno."

References

Archival sources:

Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (Rome, Italy), Galliae 106; Bras 10 (1).

Archives Nationales d'Outre-Mer (Aix-en-Provence, France), Colonies, C14/2 and C14/6.

Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino (Lisbon, Portugal), Avulsos, Pará, cx. 4, doc. 358, and cx. 5, doc. 522; Avulsos, Maranhão, cx. 10, doc. 1057.

Bibliothèque nationale de France (Paris, France), Manuscrits, Moreau 841 (LVII, 1–34).

Nationaal Archief (The Hague, Netherlands), NL_Ha_NA_4.VEL_2153.

Published primary and secondary sources:

Acuña, Cristóbal. 1682. *Relation de la rivière des Amazones, traduite par feu M. de Gomberville. Sur l'original espagnol du P. Christophle d'Acuña Jésuite. Avec une dissertation sur la rivière des Amazones pour servir de préface. Journal du voyage qu'ont fait les Pères Jean Grillet et François Béchamel dans la Goyane, l'an 1674, rédigé par le P. Grillet*. Paris: C. Barbin.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. "Arawak Languages." In *Encyclopedia of Languages of the World*, edited by K. Brown, 446–48. Oxford: Elsevier.

Barr, Juliana. 2011. "Geographies of Power: Mapping Indian Borders in the 'Borderlands' of the Early Southwest." *William and Mary Quarterly* 68, no. 1: 5–46.

Biet, Antoine. 1664. *Voyage de la France equinoxiale en l'isle de Cayenne, entrepris par les François en l'année MDCLII*. Paris: F. Clouzier.

Bombardi, Fernanda A. 2014. "Pelos interstícios do olhar do colonizador: Descimentos de índios no Estado do Maranhão e Grão Pará (1680–1750)." MA thesis, Universidade de São Paulo.

Boomert, Arie. 1987. "Gifts of the Amazons: 'Green Stone' Pendants and Beads as Items of Ceremonial Exchange in Amazonia and the Caribbean." *Antropologica* 67: 33–54.

Brommer, Bea, et al., eds. 2011. *Grote Atlas van de West–Indische Compagnie.* Vol. 1, *De oude WIC 1621–1674*. Voorburg: Asia Maior.

Chapuis, Jean. 2006. "For a Dynamic Approach to the Social Organization of the Carib of Inner Eastern Guiana: An Overview of Wayana Ethnosociogenesis." *Ethnohistory* 53, no. 3: 507–42.

Chrétien, Jean. 1957. "Moeurs et coutumes des Galibi d'après une lettre inédite écrite en 1725 (Présentation de R. d'Harcourt)." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 46: 45–66.

Collomb, Gérard. 2015. “Les peuples qui habitent ces rivières . . .” In *Archéologie de l’Amazonie: Les premiers habitants de la Guyane côtière*, edited by S. Rostain, 167–73. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Cruz, Maria Odileiz, and Lodewijk Hulsman; with the collaboration of Reginaldo Gomes de Oliveira. 2014. *A Brief Political History of the Guianas: From Tordesillas to Vienna*. Boa Vista: EDUFRR.

Danielsen, Swintha, Michael Dunn, and Pieter Muysken. 2011. “The Spread of the Arawakan Languages: A View from Structural Phylogenetics.” In *Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia*, edited by A. Honborg and J. D. Hill,173–95. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

De Forest, Emily. 1914. *A Walloon Family in America; Lockwood de Forest and His Forbears 1500–1848, Together with A Voyage to Guiana, Being the Journal of Jesse de Forest and His Colonists 1623–1625*. Vol. 2. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dreyfus, Simone. 1992. “Les réseaux politiques indigènes en Guyane occidentale et leurs transformations aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles.” *L’Homme* 122–24: 75–98.

Espelt-Bombin, Silvia. 2018. “Frontier Politics: French, Portuguese and Amerindian Alliances between the Amazon and Cayenne, 1680–1697.” In *Locating Guyane*, edited by C. MacLeod and S. Wood, 69–90. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Gallois, Dominique Tilkin. 1986. *Migração, guerra e comércio: Os Waiapi na Guiana*. São Paulo: FFLCH/USP.

Gallois, Dominique Tilkin. 1994. *Mairi revisitada: A reintegração da Fortaleza de Macapá na tradição oral dos Waiãpi*. São Paulo: NHII/USP.

Gomes, Flávio dos Santos. 2002. “A ‘Safe Haven’: Runaway Slaves, Mocambos, and Borders in Colonial Amazonia, Brazil.” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 82, no. 3: 469–98.

Green, Lesley J. F., and David R. Green. 2009. “Space, Time, and Story Tracks: Contemporary Practices of Topographic Memory in the Palikur Territory of Arukwa, Amapá, Brazil.” *Ethnohistory* 56, no. 1: 163–85.

Green, Lesley J. F., David R. Green, and Eduardo Góes Neves. 2003. “Indigenous Knowledge and Archaeological Science: The Challenges of Public Archaeology in the Reserva Uaçá.” *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3, no. 3: 366–98.

Grenand, Pierre. 2006. “Que sont devenus les Amérindiens de l’Approuague? Réflexions autour d’une histoire peu documentée.” In *L’histoire de la Guyane depuis les civilisations amérindiennes*, edited by S. Mam Lam Fouck and J. Zonzon, 105–26. Matoury, French Guiana: Ibis Rouge.

Grenand, Françoise, and Pierre Grenand. 1987. “La Côte d’Amapa, de la bouche de l’Amazone à la baie d’Oyapock, à travers de la tradition orale Palikur.” *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi* 3, no. 1: 1–77.

Harcourt, Robert. 1928. *A Relation of a Voyage to Guiana, 1613*. Edited with introduction and notes by Alexander Harris. London: Hakluyt Society.

Hornborg, Alf, and Jonathan D. Hill. 2011. “Introduction: Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia.” In *Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia: Reconstructing Past Identities from Archaeology, Linguistics, and Ethnohistory*, edited by Alf Hornborg and Jonathan D. Hill, 1–27. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

Hulsman, Lodewijk. 2011. “Swaerooch: O comércio holandês com índios no Amapá (1600–1615).” *Revista Estudos Amazônicos* 6, no. I: 178–202.

Hurault, Jean-Marcel. 1972. *Français et Indiens en Guyane, 1604–1972*. Cayenne: Guyane Presse Difusion.

Ibáñez-Bonillo, Pablo. 20106. "The Portuguese Conquest of the Amazon Estuary: Identity, War, Frontier (1612–1654)." PhD diss., Universidad Pablo de Olavide and University of St. Andrews.

Labat, Jean-Baptiste. 1730. *Voyage du chevalier Des Marchais en Guinée, isles voisines, et a Cayénne, fait en 1725, 1726 et 1727*. Vol. 4. Paris: Saugrain.

La Mousse, Jean de. *Les Indiens de la Sinnamary: Journal du père Jean de la Mousse en Guyane (1684–1691)*. Edited, with introduction and notes, by Gérard Collomb. Paris: Chandeigne, 2006.

Le Febvre de La Barre, Joseph-Antoine. 1666. *Description de la France equinoctiale, cy-devant appellee Guyanne, et par les Espagnols, el Dorado*. Paris: Jean Ribou.

"Livro grosso do Maranhão." *Anais da Biblioteca Nacional*. Vols. 66-67 (1948). Rio de Janeiro: Divisão de Obras Raras e Publicações.

Lorimer, Joyce, ed. 1989. *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon, 1550–1646*. London: Hakluyt Society.

Lorimer, Joyce, ed. 2006. *Sir Walter Ralegh's Discoverie of Guiana*. London: Ashgate for the Hakluyt Society.

Mocquet, Jean. 1617. *Voyages en Afrique, Asie, Indes Orientales et Occidentales, faits par Jean Mocquet.* Paris: J. de Heuqueville.

Nimuendajú, Curt. 1948. "The Aruã." In *Handbook of South American Indians*, vol. 3, edited by J. H. Steward, 195–198. Washington: USGPO.

Nimuendajú, Curt. 2002. *Mapa etno-histórico de Curt Nimuendajú*. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE.

Nimuendajú, Curt. 2008 [1926]. *Les Indiens Palikur et leurs voisins*. Paris/Orleans: CTHS.

Passes, Alan. 1998. "The Hearer, the Hunter and the Agouti Head: Aspects of Intercommunication and Conviviality among the Pa'ikwené (Palikur) of French Guiana." PhD diss., University of St. Andrews.

Penna, Domingos Soares Ferreira. 1881. "Algumas palavras da lingua dos indios Aruans." *Archivos do Museu Nacional do Rio de Janeiro* 4: 15–25.

Pritchard, James. 2004. *In Search of Empire: The French in the Americas, 1670–1730.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reis, Arthur Cézar Ferreira. 1993 [1947]. *Limites e demarcações na Amazônia brasileira*. Vol. 1 Belém: SECULT.

Rivet, Paul, and Pierre Reinburg. 1921. "Les Indiens Marawan." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 13, no. 1: 107–8.

Rocha, Rafael Ale. 2017. "'Domínio' e 'posse': As fronteiras coloniais de Portugal e da França no Cabo Norte (primeira metade do século XVIII)." *Revista Tempo* 23, no. 3: 528–45.

Rostain, Stéphen. 2012. "Where the Amazon River Meets the Orinoco River: Archaeology of the Guianas." *Amazônica* 4, no. 1: 10–28.

Rushforth, Brett. 2012. *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Santos–Granero, Fernando. 1998. "Writing History into the Landscape: Space, Myth, and Ritual in Contemporary Amazonia." *American Ethnologist* 25, no. 2: 128–48.

Van den Bel, Martijn. 2015. *Archaeological Investigations between Cayenne Island and the Maroni River: A Cultural Sequence of Western Coastal French Guiana from 5000 BP to Present.* Leiden: Sidestone Press.

Van den Bel, Martijn, and Lodewijk Hulsman. 2013. "Le fort Orange sur la Wiapoca." *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire de la Guadeloupe*166–67: 103–15.

Vidal, Lux Boelitz. 2001. "Mito, História e Cosmologia: As diferentes versões da Guerra dos Palikur contras os Galibi entre os povos indígenas da Bacia do Uaçá, Oiapoque, Amapá." *Revista de Antropologia* 44, no. 1: 117–47.

Vidal, Silvia. 2000. "Kuwé Duwakalumi: The Arawak Sacred Routes of Migration, Trade, and Resistance." *Ethnohistory* 47, no. 3–4: 635–67.

Vidal, Silvia. 2003. "The Arawak-Speaking Groups of Northwestern Amazonia: Amerindian Cartography as a Way of Preserving and Interpreting the Past." In *Histories and Historicities in Amazonia,* edited by Neil Whitehead, 33-57. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Vieira, José G., Marta Amoroso, and Susana de Matos Viegas. 2015. "Apresentação: Transformações das Territorialidades Ameríndias nas Terras Baixas (Brasil)." *Revista de Antropologia* 58, no. 1: 11–29.

Wilson, John. 1905–1907. "The Relation of Master John Wilson." In *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, edited by S. Purchas, vol. 16, chap. 14. Glasgow: James MacLehose.

Whitehead, Neil L. 1990. "Carib Ethnic Soldiering in Venezuela, the Guianas, and the Antilles, 1492–1820." *Ethnohistory* 37, no. 4: 357–85.

Whitehead, Neil L. 2001. "Tribes Make States and States Make Tribes: Warfare and the Creation of Colonial Tribes and States in Northeastern South America." In *War in the*

Tribal Zone: Expanding States and Indigenous Warfare, edited by R. B. Ferguson and N. L. Whitehead, 127–50. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

–

[Figure captions]

Figure 1. The Amazon delta and the eastern Guianas (digital map by author)

Figure 2. The coast of Amapá c.1625. Detail from anonymous map, courtesy of the Nationaal Archief, The Netherlands