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Introduction

An ever-growing literature on West African slavery has, for obvious reasons, tended to concentrate on societies that developed complex forms of domestic slavery and/or were closely tied to the export trade. Three major collections on slavery published in the last ten years deal almost exclusively with such groups.1 The history of peoples who refused, at least in the beginning, to take captives for the purpose of selling them to outsiders or keeping them for themselves has been ignored. And yet these acephalous groups are very instructive. They illustrate how certain structural features and other cultural preferences may have impeded, or at least retarded, the development of indigenous slaving institutions.2

This paper discusses the role of slavery in a marginal area of the Upper Guinea coast. Emphasis will be placed on how practices surrounding the acquisition and disposal of captives were embedded in local institutions. Because these practices developed in the context of Africans dealing with each other, and not exclusively in the context of their dealings with the Europeans, they reflected modes of thinking and organizations intrinsic to certain forest groups of west Africa.3 A comprehensive history of why the Jola of Lower Casamance, Senegal, were slow to develop various kinds of slaving practices emphasizes their resistance to currents of change affecting the political economy of this region before, during, and after the heyday of the Atlantic slave trade.

II

Stages in the development of Jola slaving practices

This section outlines the history of slavery in the region(s) occupied by the Jola. In contrast to other neighboring peoples living in what is now Middle Casamance, among the Jola raiding
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for captives was first carried out as a strategy to extract cattle through ransoming. At least before the second half of the seventeenth century the Jola did not sell slaves to the Europeans. Similarly, their development of domestic forms of slavery later on was related to the demand for the performance of a unique sort of agricultural work. To show how slavery-related practices changed through time, one must place the various Jola groups in the context, not only of their interactions with Europeans, but also, and perhaps more important, in the context of their interactions with neighboring African peoples occupying what are now sectors of Gambia and Guinea Bissau. Chronologically, we will begin with the archeological evidence, continue with the first written records, move on to the nineteenth century, and end up with a discussion of old institutions enduring to this day.

1. Avoiding Outsiders: Pre-Fifteenth to Early Sixteenth Centuries.

The first records we have of peoples living in the mouth of the Casamance river comes from archeology. After A.D. 200 we are dealing with groups well-adapted to coastal habitats, who had spread out to the islands bordering the mouth of the Casamance river. Everywhere they lived, these ancient peoples gathered shellfish in the mangrove flats, fished out in the sea, practiced agriculture, and, most important, kept cattle in large numbers. In fact, the archeological deposits from Period II (A.D. 200 to A.D. 600) contained only cattle—no sheep and/or goats. These groups used metal instruments, like spear shafts, and possibly also agricultural implements made locally out of bog iron. All evidence suggests that these sedentary, cattle-owning, agricultural peoples were the ancestors of the Jola. At this point the Jola seemed to have been leading an insular, isolated life, except perhaps for latter-day contacts with the Niominka Serer of the Saloum river.

It is not known with certainty the exact year when the Portuguese first came into contact with the Fulup, the general name they gave to the Jola. Teixeira da Mota, the great authority on the history of Portuguese exploration from the Gambia to the Geba rivers, is of the opinion that the Casamance river was probably first discovered by Álvaro Fernandes in about 1446; not by Cadamosto as is often asserted. If so, Fernandes must have come into contact with the Fulup, who most likely were occupying the south-shore areas during these early times.

Another early explorer in the general area of the Gambia-Geba was Diogo Gomes (1456), but he did not traverse Fulup/Jola territory. His feat was to sail in 1456 far up the Gambia River, to Kantor (near the Barrakunda Falls), in order to establish trade links with the inhabitants. He met with rulers like Farisangul (Farim, or ruler, Sanya Kolli), of what is now the Lower River Division, and Ani-Mansa and Ouli/Wuli-Mansa, of what is now the Eastern Section (Upper Gambia Division). All of these people were probably Manding (see note 14). Therefore the Manding were already well entrenched in the middle to upper courses of the Gambia River by the time they came into contact.
with Europeans.

The next mention we have of the Fulup or Jola is by Valen-
tim Fernandes. Between 1506 and 1510 he reported events in
the Gambia-Geba region which were recounted to him, but which
he never witnessed. Fernandes mentioned that the Falupos
(Fulup) who lived on the shores of the Casamance River were
"great warriors, feared by all their neighbors." He talked
about a 'Mansa Falup' who demanded tribute and was cruel. Who
exactly was this character is hard to ascertain; Fernandes' use
of the word mansa may indicate that he was a Manding. Duarte
Pacheco Pereira, who wrote during this same period (1506-1508)
about things he saw, talked about the inhabitants of the Cas-
amance River being Manding. However, it is highly unlikely
that the Manding ever occupied the lower reaches of the Cas-
amance River. Thus when Pacheco mentioned that peoples of the
Casamance river were trading in slaves, he was certainly refer-
ing to the Manding of Middle Casamance, and not to the Fulup or
Jola living near the coast. At that time the Manding were
found along Lower and Upper Gambia, and inland along the Middle
Casamance and Geba rivers, where their rulers and middlemen con-
ducted a well-developed trade in slaves and gold. In contrast,
the Fulup or Jola, who were found along the coast, did not gen-
erally engage in trade with outsiders, nor had any chiefs to
speak of (see below). Instead of doing commerce with their
neighbors, they were in a state of constant hostilities against
other groups, including the Europeans. Because they were con-
sidered dangerous, they were bypassed by the Portuguese, who
sailed past them at the mouth of the Casamance and Cacheu rivers
in order to trade with other people further upriver. In short,
at least for the first decades of European contact, the Fulup
or Jola did not participate in any kind of external trade.

2. The Sixteenth century: Ransoming captives for Cattle:

The next full reference we have for the Fulup/Jola dates
from the sixteenth century, and was made by André Alvares de
Almada in 1594, based on his observations starting in the 1560s. In contrast to previous accounts, Almada's chronicle is unusually
complete, giving the name and placement of the different groups
occupying the river systems of Gambia, Casamance, and Guinea
Bissau. First, he located the Manding at the entrance to the
Gambia River below Cape St. Mary, in a region still called
Kombo. Just south of them, from the mouth of the Casamance
River all the way to the São Domingo River (the present Rio
Cacheu in Guinea Gissau) he placed the "Arriatas and Falupos." The Arriatas may never have existed as a distinct group. The
Falupos, as usual, are the Fulup/Jola living south of the Cas-
amance River. Up the Gambia for about 40 km, at about the latitude
of Ziguinchor, the present capital of Casamance, Almada located
three linguistically-related groups: the Jabundos and Cassangas
(Kasangas) on the north shore of the river, and the Iziguuchos
(who gave the name of Ziguinchor), on the south shore. He
clearly stated that all three groups spoke the "Banhun" lan-
guage. Jola interactions with the Banyuk are discussed below
in a separate section.

It clearly emerges from Almada's account that the Fulup/Jola were culturally very different from their more 'civilized' Manding neighbors in the Gambia. The latter had 'kings,' lived in villages, dressed in flowing robes, and conducted an active trade in slaves, cloth, wax, and honey with the Europeans. In contrast, the Fulup were regarded as 'barbarians.' They dressed in goat skins or palm leaves, refused to be circumcised, spent their time fishing, cultivating their fields, gathering palm-wine, and, very important, raising large herds of cattle: "they are great raisers of many cattle and sheep/goats in their land." At first, the Fulup continued to avoid trading with the Portuguese. This meant they did not regularly capture or sell slaves: "they do not trade in slaves because they do not trade with us." In contrast to the Fulup, who "do not have any commerce [of any kind] with us," the Manding had a flourishing commerce with the Portuguese. This included capturing the Fulup and selling them into slavery. Almada described how the Manding of the Gambia would set out in their large canoes down the coast to Fulup (south-shore Jola) and Arriata (?) country, "capturing many of them along the beaches and streams [marigots], as they fished and ate oysters together." Apparently, the Fulup did not at first flee or defend themselves.

By the time Almada wrote down his memoirs forty years later, however, the Fulup/Jola were already changing their tactics: "now they know better, and defend themselves, and kill or capture their enemies." The Fulup had even agreed to allow the Brames (the generic name for peoples like the Pepel and Manjaku of Guinea Bissau) to serve as intermediaries in ransoming Portuguese sailors they had taken captive. At this point the Fulup were still refusing to capture people with the intention of keeping them or selling them to the Europeans. "Since among these blacks they do not sell blacks, they grew so much that, not fitting in their land, they spread to the mouth of the São Domingos (the Cacheu) river..." And again, if the Fulup continue associating with the Brames, they will come to be completely tame, and there will be much trade, "because there [in Fulup land] is much cattle and there will be many slaves." In these passages Almada referred to the Fulup custom of taking captives in order to have their kin ransom them for cattle.

Many decades later some (though not all) Fulup/Jola groups were still holding themselves apart from full participation in commercial endeavors with their neighbors. Francisco de Lemos Coelho, whose work we will discuss in more detail later, referred to the land around the S. João river, which according to Teixeira da Mota is the area of the Kalisseye marigot in what is now called the Blis-Karon just south of Kombo, as being undiscovered, and its riches (wax, slaves, and honey), unexploited.
settled by the Fulup. To the south were the Sacalates, located near the mouth of the Casamance River, who were "lawless pirates and did not make peace with anyone... and those persons they capture, they ransom, and they do not even pardon a white [man], though they do not harm him, but having captured him force him to be ransomed." When it came to allowing the whites to ransom their slaves, the Sacalates often refused. Further on, Coelho describes a village called Buje (?) in the Casamance, which served as refuge for runaway slaves. The village was full of carpenters, blacksmiths, and caulkers, whom the inhabitants (probably Fulup), refused to ransom or resell to the whites for any money.

To summarize, the second stage in the unfolding of Jola slaving practices involved capturing other peoples, including Europeans, Manding, and probably other Jola, for the sole purpose of extracting a ransom. As we will see, they continued the strategy of extorting cattle from neighboring groups via kidnapping and ransom well into the middle of the next century. Ransoming was really quite different from outright sale in that it allowed the kin of a captured individual to redeem him. Of course, in many West African societies pawns could be redeemed, as among the Asante. In other societies people could be sold during times of stress and redeemed later on. The Jola/Fulup situation was different only insofar as it was then the predominant, possibly the only, reason for capturing people. At this time there was probably a limited need for extra labor, but apparently an insatiable need for extra cattle.

This raises another question as to why the Fulup/Jola did not simply raid for cattle and forget the dangerous business of capturing people? The answer, of course, is that they did raid for cattle, but under some circumstances capturing people was not only easier, especially if they were unsuspecting traders or persons out cultivating their fields, it was also a way of defending themselves and warning intruders like the Europeans and the Mandings to stay away. At this time it may have been difficult for Europeans to buy locally-born Manding individuals, as they were close partners in the slave trade. Hence, the obvious solution for the Jola was to demand a ransom and let Manding captives go free. Finally, and most importantly, sources like Almada clearly suggest that there was a strong moral objection in the part of the Fulup/Jola to selling their own people outright. The fact that these "blacks do not sell blacks," as Almada stated it, was a constant source of annoyance to the Europeans. In a very real sense then ransoming was the Jola's first form of participation in the external slave trade, and one that fit well into their cultural patterns. For the Jola still use cattle to transact with. Like slaves, cattle were, and are, stolen, hidden and hoarded (more on this point later).

3. Entering the Slave Trade: Late Seventeenth to Eighteenth Centuries.

The Jola entered the slave trade partly as a result of their complex involvement with the Banyuk. During the sixteenth
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In the sixteenth century, the Banyuk were generally located behind, that is to the east and upriver from, the Fulup. Banyuk territory started about forty kilometers, at the latitude of Ziguinchor (where the Iziguuchos, a related peoples lived), and extended east to the Soungrougrou river dividing Middle from Upper Casamance. They also occupied a large area to the north, all the way to the Hereges, now called the Vintang (Bintan) marigot, a southern branch of the Gambia river. Thus at that time they were spread over a huge area.

Apparently sixteenth-century Banyuk society was very different from Fulup/Jola society in being stratified and commercial. Like the Manding, the Banyuk were traders who had dealings with the Europeans. They traded with ships from the Cabo Verde Islands that came searching for cotton, and even tolerated Portuguese Christian traders living in their midst. Valentim Fernandes, one of the first chroniclers to describe the Banyuk, referred to them as gifted salesmen, holding market fairs every eight days. As many as seven to eight thousand persons, coming from as far as fifteen to twenty leagues away (ninety to 120 kilometers), attended these events. To maintain order, the Banyuk "king" forbade the carrying of arms and charged some persons with the task of seeing to it that no harm befell persons who came from other lands. It is interesting to note that these "fairs" are still being held among the Brames and Manjaku, who are neighbors to the Banyuk. That the Banyuk were 'pagan' and had not embraced Islam is suggested by the fact that the "nobles" drank great quantities of wine, and also used it to libate the shrines.

Although the Banyuk had occupied a large area of Lower Casamance during the sixteenth century, by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries they were beginning to retreat from much of their territory because Jola-speaking peoples had been expanding dramatically out from the south shore of the Casamance River, via marigots like those of Dioloulou and Bihona, into lands occupied by the Banyuk. This expansion continued during the next two centuries, with the result that the Banyuk today are only a remnant population occupying some thirty small villages around the city of Ziguinchor, and in the Fonji areas surrounding the town of Bihona.

Thus, by the time Coelho published his account (1669), the Banyuk and the Jola had endured nearly a century of protracted contact. As he made clear, both groups overlapped spatially in the regions of Buluf and Fonji, located respectively to the southwest and northeast of the town of Bihona. Coelho describes a flourishing trade in beeswax and honey between the north-shore Fulup and the Europeans, directly or through the intermediary of the Banyuk. He also mentioned that the Europeans bought some ivory, as well as some blacks, from Fulup-Jola country. It appears to be the first reference we have to the Jola selling captives to the Europeans, and it is not entirely devoid of ambiguity. If indeed the Jola had entered the export or external slave trade, they had done so only after many decades of warfare, and at the times cohabitation, with the Banyuk, a
trading nation par excellence. In another passage Coelho described three large Fulup/Jola villages called Bosol, Usol, and Sefunco, where much rice was grown and many blacks taken in canoes to Cacheu to be sold to the Portuguese. Peter Mark has identified the village of Usol mentioned by Coelho as being the large Jola village of Thionk-Essil in the Buluf. According to Mark, Thionk-Essil was founded by the Banyuk, and in fact had probably remained a Banyuk community until ca. 1600. Therefore he suggests, quite reasonably, that the Banyuk may have initiated the trade with Cacheu, which the Jola simply continued later when they took over Thionk.

A more complete description of Fulup/Jola dealings with the Banyuk during the seventeenth century is found in the accounts of Jajolet de la Courbe in 1685/1687. Starting off for Cacheu, Jajolet de la Courbe sailed in a small boat to the Gereges (Vintang) marigot, to the village of the same name (Bintan). All along the southern border he encountered the "kingdom" of Faugrit (present-day Foni), which was populated by the "Feloupes." Further inland the Fulup overlapped spatially with the Bagnons (Banyuk). "The Bagnons are civilized, but the Feloupes are in their great majority savage, and because they recognize [the Banyuk ruler] as their king, only under duress, [the king] often makes war upon them, and we buy the slaves that he sells." Here Jajolet de la Courbe's original account ends, but we pick up his missing narrative in Labat's plagiarized account of 1728. Three leagues (eighteen km) south of Hereges, Jajolet de la Courbe encountered a caravan of blacks who were waiting to join him in fear of being pillaged by the Fulup. He then went on to describe Fulup compounds as being surrounded by five or six rows of palisades. Access to the inside was through small doors that were placed in such a way as to make it difficult to find one's way. At another village called Pasqua (?), the "king," a Banyuk, kept a garrison to maintain the Fulup at bay. Further on, Jajolet de la Courbe reached the Soungrougrou river, which now divides Lower Casamance or Jola country, from Middle Casamance or Manding country. Here, he rested in the house of Banyuk blacks "who are mixed together with Fulup." The next stop was at James, where he again encountered Fulup "idolaters, only this time commerce has rendered them civilized. The do not recognize any sovereign, and they live in a Republic under the peaceful government of their elders." Pushing on to the Casamance river, Jajolet de la Courbe described how both shores are populated by Fulup, who are "savages in Portuguese terms; those people do not wish to have any communication with the whites, and they are almost continually at war with their neighbors..." Further along, he came to another Banyuk village where he again rested, for he was "not sure to be able to pass by the larger of the marigots for fear of being insulted by the savage and brave Fulup, who often attack the boats with their bows and arrows." With these remarks, Jajolet de la Courbe's account, as plagiarized by Labat, ended.

Jajolet de la Courbe's account is important because it emphasized the following processes. First, that the Fulup who had
commercial dealings with the Europeans and lived in association with the Banyuk, were becoming 'civilized.' By this he meant that some Fulup sub-groups were beginning to hold regular trading relations with outsiders. Secondly, that the Banyuk and Europeans (mostly Portuguese) were at the mercy of the more 'savage' Fulup, who were already pushing well inland, into Banyuk-occupied areas. Although Jajolet de la Courbe noted that, when these 'savages' misbehaved they were sold into slavery by the Banyuk, he also revealed that the 'savage' Fulup were having a great deal of success making war on the Banyuk. Jajolet de la Courbe did not actually say if the 'savage' Fulup were actually capturing Banyuk individuals in order to sell them to the Portuguese. However, they certainly did so later on. Meanwhile, the Portuguese were trading in slaves on a grand scale: 7000 to 8000 persons shipped from Gambia each year and some 12,000 to 15,000 others taken out through the Casamance, Cacheu, Geba rivers and neighboring islands. Although the large majority of slaves were being supplied by Manding rulers and Banyuk middlemen, a good number was also probably coming from the Fulup.

Processes leading to assimilation and/or conflict between the Fulup/Jola and the Banyuk continued during the first decades of the eighteenth century. Moore (1738) talks about the "country of Fonja," which reached to the "river Vintan" and was governed by two emperors, "who are of the Banyoon Race, which is a sort of Floops." When these countries were first discovered, he went on to say, they were very large, but they have been considerably reduced in size and population by having their rulers "sell into slavery infinite numbers of their subjects."40 Caught between the Portuguese and the Manding on the one hand, having opened their land to Euro-African lancado traders, and finding themselves under constant attack by the advancing Fulup on the other hand, the Banyuk were killed, sold into slavery, or acculturated into Jola society.

In contrast to their complex relations with the Banyuk, Fulup/Jola relations with the Manding were unequivocally hostile. As Moore remarked, the Fulup of inland areas, away from the river and from Vintang, are "in a manner wild: they border close to the Mundingoes, and are bitter enemies to each other." Despite the absence of 'kings' or 'chiefs' among them, the Fulup "unite so firmly that all the forces of the Mundingoes (though they are very numerous) cannot get the better of them."41 In trading partnership with the Portuguese, the Manding of the Gambia river were bringing thousands of slaves from areas far upriver, such as Bambara country, to sell them for the flourishing Atlantic trade. Besides these inland peoples, the Portuguese continued to buy many slaves along the Gambia river itself. These were people who had been stolen or had been condemned for committing crimes, for "since the slave-trade has grown, all punishments are changed into slavery."42 Doubtless it was those people who had 'government,' that is, had rulers the Portuguese called "notables," "kings," or "chiefs," and who had ancient forms of trade, who early on sold their own or other people into slavery. Not only did they sell slaves, they also kept them. In Moore
we have one of the first descriptions of Manding forms of domestic slavery. At that time, most slaves were family slaves, that is, persons who had been born into Manding households. These persons could not be sold unless they had committed very serious crimes, and even then only with the consent of the other slaves.

Again, it is very unlikely, or at least unproven, that the Fulup/Jola kept slaves for domestic use much before the nineteenth century. In fact they do not seem to have had elaborate forms of dependent labor until they entered the rice trade (see below).

The Nineteenth century and Jola forms of domestic slavery

To my knowledge few accounts exist covering Fulup/Jola history during the period spanning the late 1700s to the middle of the 1800s. Many important changes in the dynamics surrounding slavery must have taken place in Lower Casamance during this period. Beginning in 1808 some colonial countries had passed important anti-slavery legislation, although full effect of these measures was not felt until the 1840s. And what they then encouraged was an escalation of domestic slavery among people like the Manding, who were involved with raising cash crops for the external market.

When we again pick up the Jola in records beginning at the middle of the nineteenth century, certain important changes had already taken place. To begin with, the Fulup had expanded dramatically, taking over most of Banyuk territory north of the Casamance river. Bertrand-Bocanède, the French official in charge (résident) of the island of Karaban (Carabanne), where the French had established a permanent post in 1837, left no room for doubt that the Banyuk were in full retreat. They had been chased out of the fertile north-shore valleys by the Fulup, while their relatives, the Kassangas, had been expelled out of their south-shore villages by the Balanta. In addition, the Fulup/Jola were now engaged in a special kind of trade. Bertrand-Bocanède described a flourishing trade in rice being conducted at the mouth of the Casamance River: "the small ships from Gorée and Gambia come there [to Karaban] to buy rice from the Fulups." And, again, "they [the Fulup/Jola] harvest abundantly to feed themselves, and can contribute to the subsistence of Gorée and Gambia." Elsewhere, he described this trade as being in the hands of Luso-Africans living in Ziguinchor. They acted as grumetes, that is, persons employed to navigate crafts and build and repair boats. The grumetes travelled in their canoes to Fulup villages to obtain "rice in exchange for cattle, locally woven and dyed cloth, and cotton." Thirty years later the grumetes of Ziguinchor were still monopolizing the trade, exchanging rice for cattle with the Fulup/Jola living in neighboring villages, and selling it to the French, who resold it in Gorée and Saint-Louis. To my knowledge only those Jola living relatively near Ziguinchor regularly travelled into town to sell
1. Esudadu
2. Pte. St. Georges
3. Jembering
4. Kabrouse
5. Ziguinchor
6. Fogny (Fon) area
7. Kujamaat (Kajaamutay)
8. Karaban
9. Blis Karon
10. Buluf
11. Binona
12. Kaountine
13. Bayot'
14. Banjal
15. Cacheu
16. Sinjan

Fig. 2
their products. The rest relied on outsiders serving as middlemen, who came to them to barter cattle and cloth for Jola rice.

The Fulup were able to produce a surplus of rice because they used particularly intensive agricultural techniques. One of the most common practices was to carve out new rice fields from mangrove swamps: "Everywhere where the mangrove, by retaining mud, has pushed back the edge of the marigots and the flooded land, the Floups cut down these trees and set out to transform salty mudflats into fertile rice-fields." Although they possessed some of the least auspicious lands in Africa "they have undertaken great works to render them fertile, and they have become one of the wealthiest peoples in Africa."

Bertrand-Bocandé recognized a great number of Fulup sub-regions. With an ethnographer's eye, he described the differences among them. He begins with a clarification: the name Fulup was given these people by the Portuguese; the name Jola was given to them by Wolof sailors from Gambia and Gorée; in their own tongue, they call themselves Aiamats (Ajamat), the name the Jola north of the river used then. One by one, Bertrand-Bocandé described each Jola sub-group: the Joats of Jembering, who spoke a different language but were otherwise of the same culture as the rest—the Karone (Blis-Karon), the Jigouches (Buluf), the Banjars (Banjal), the Baiotes (Bayot), and the Kajamoutes (Kujamaat). Elsewhere, he remarked that all these groups were selling each other: the Banjal attacked the Jembering inhabitants; the Karon (the inhabitants of the islands directly north of the Casamance River mouth) once in a while fell on the village of Jícoumol (Mlomp in Pte. Saint Georges); the Buluf pillaged everywhere, stealing from each other and selling their captives to the Manding of Gambia.

Given the general escalation of violence, the Jola were finally participating wholeheartedly in the slave trade.

Bertrand-Bocandé mentioned two additional facts that are crucial to our discussion of Jola slavery at this time. He first said that "one of the inhabitants of Jembering owns about 300 cattle and about 100 slaves." Elsewhere, he added: "Thus, the Manding who are dedicated to commerce, and the Floups of the coast, who owe their richness to agriculture, invest all their fortune in acquiring slaves, and cattle which can also be used to acquire slaves." Writing at about the same time, H. Heckard (1850), who took much of his material from Bertrand-Bocandé, also observed in passing that if a Floup or Yola (Jola) elder found a person guilty of adultery or theft, and if that person could not pay, the elder "can sell his debtor or make him his slave." These are the first clearcut references we have of the Jola keeping slaves for their own domestic use.

Further on Bertrand-Bocandé went on to remark that the Kujamaat, or Jola north of the River, sold people, including Portuguese settlers, to the Manding, who took them far away. Thus, when the Jola finally consented to sell people to outsiders on a grand scale, it was mostly to other Africans who were involved in the internal slave trade. The Manding, on the other
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hand, travelled freely throughout the country once the Portuguese no longer exported slaves. From Bertrand-Bocandé's accounts it seems to have been mostly the inhabitants of Jembering--and perhaps also other Jola living near the mouth of the Casamance River, like the inhabitants of the Buluf--who were keeping slaves. This was where the greater part of the trade in rice was taking place. The north-shore Jola, who did not participate in the rice trade, sold their slaves to the Manding.

Thus certain variables seem to have been causally related. The end of the European slave trade had encouraged some people like the Manding to search for alternative markets. One of these was in cash crop production, which in turn created a shortage of agricultural labor. On the other hand, the Jolas' participation in the rice trade, their arduous recovery of mangrove swamps for the growing of rice, and their final acceptance of domestic slavery were also probably causally related (more on this point below).

In the light of the evidence given above, the following remarks made at the end of the nineteenth century, should have been qualified:

"The Feloupes do not generally keep slaves, it being too difficult to keep them in a country covered and crisscrossed with marigots; thus, while the trade flourished, they would hasten to sell their war prisoners, to whom they added their own children. Nowadays, when the slave traders are chased out to sea and America buys slaves less readily, they sell their captives and their children to peoples in the interior, particularly to the Manding of Fouta Djalon".

Or, again: "The Felupes never would make slaves, nor sell their own people, which their neighbors did, and from this fact a great penal difference results..." viz., that they would not punish offenses with slavery. Bérenger-Feraud and Carvalho were doubtless both referring to the great majority of Jola who did not indeed enslave their own people for criminal acts, nor keep domestic slaves. However, as we can gather from Bertrand-Bocandé's and Heckard's accounts, some groups certainly did both. As we will see below, Jola living at the entrance to the Casamance River actually began to keep captives as agricultural laborers, putting them to work on special kinds of fields.

III

Domestic Slavery and Oral Accounts

As indicated above, the Jola finally developed domestic slavery during the nineteenth century in connection with the commercialization of rice at two European posts: Karaban, which the French had purchased from the inhabitants of Kañut in
1836, and Ziguinchor, which the Portuguese had controlled since the seventeenth century. One of the areas where domestic slavery developed was Pte. Saint Georges, a peninsula on the south shore of the Casamance River mouth, then and now inhabited by a Jola sub-group that calls itself Esudadu. Archaeological date suggests a long-term Jola occupation of this area. Nowadays, the most important Esudadu villages are Mlomp, Kajinol, Kañut, and Samatiit. Both Robert M. Baum and I have collected oral accounts describing slaving practices among the Esudadu Jola during the nineteenth century. At the time the Esudadu were actively engaged in the internal slave trade, both as its victims and as its profiteers. From the area of Buluf/Jugut (Djougoutes) directly north of Pte St. Georges, other Jola would come to raid the Esudadu Jola and sell those they captured to the Manding of Gambia. I was able to ascertain that many of the raiders came from the town of Essil (Thionk Essil) in the Buluf. For example, an elder recounted to me how a relative of his was cultivating one day when a group of Essilian raiders saw him and stalked him silently in a canoe. Before the village was alerted, they captured him. Fortunately, he escaped, or his relatives would have had to ransom him. The usual sum was six cows, which was paid for a woman as well as for a man.

Apparently, the inhabitants of Thionk-Essil still keep alive oral traditions recounting these raids. "It is recounted that pirogues filled with as many as forty warriors would prey upon the people of Kasa." The captives taken were forcibly adopted into Essilian and local lineages and within one generation changed their patronyms and inherited rice fields from their adopted families. However, those that were disloyal to their adoptive families were usually sold to the Manding. There is some indication that at Thionk domestic slaves were used to cultivate rice fields. As we will see below, this practice was not unique to the Jola of Buluf/Jugut.

But the Esudadu themselves also raided their neighbors and kept some of the people they captured. As Robert Baum (oral communication) points out, raiding was carried out among the Esudadu in either a socially accepted way, or in another way considered to be wrong. The acceptable form involved the seizure of captives in war, who were brought to the family compound, placed in fetters, and held until they were ransomed for cattle. Baum goes on to explain that captives who were not ransomed were kept as slaves or sold in other villages. The second kind of slavery involved the kidnapping of children without the possibility of ransom. The captives that were retained were given small amounts of land to farm, and according to Baum they were also kept as ritual and social inferiors.

Exactly how did 'slaves' actually farm the land, and what rights did they have with respect to the rice fields? In order to answer this question, I interviewed a series of Esudadu elders and was able to confirm what Baum had discovered, namely, that slaves were given small amounts of land to farm and were also allowed to keep at least part of the harvest. However, not only were the parcels they were loaned very small so they would not have the chance to enrich themselves, it was also the case
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that 'slaves' were loaned particularly poor land. My informants emphasized that "a slave (amiikeZ) always knew that the land allocated to him was not good." In fact, what emerged from these interviews was that slaves were given the swampy lands located near the mangrove, in order to have them improve them through their labor. Carving paddyfields out of saline lands covered by mangrove vegetation was, and still is, arduous work. By putting slaves to the task of recovering the most difficult, but potentially most productive lands, like the mangrove-covered saline areas near the marigots, the elders were able to improve and extend their holdings. It was suggested to me, though not explicitly acknowledged, that once the slaves improved a piece of land they were then moved to another area to do the same over again.

Another Jola sub-region where domestic forms of slavery developed during the end of the nineteenth century was in Kabrus (Kabrousse), and in the village of Jembering mentioned by Bertrand-Bocandé. Like Esudatu, these two large villages are located at the mouth of the Casamance River, near the source of the nineteenth century European rice trade. In Jembering slaves were treated particularly harshly. As an Esudatu elder in Jembering put it to me "they tired their slaves; they made them work, and what they harvested they had to give to their owners." Doubtless, this was a real form of chattel slavery. To this day there is an endogamous ward in Jembering whose inhabitants are said to be descended from slaves. That Jembering slaves were only allowed to marry among themselves was further corroborated to me by Esudatu elders. In any case, according to Marzouk, the village is still divided between descendants of slaves (kumiikeZ) and free men (hubook).

North of the Casamance river, in areas where the Jola lived closer to the Manding and where the rice-trade was unimportant, slave-related practices took a different course. Apparently, in the Kajaamutay the Jola did not keep slaves for their own use. They did not use them as a labor force to work in the rice-fields. As an elder of a village said to me "they did not keep slaves or wars would never end." Here, the nineteenth century pattern was for the Jola to raid other Jola villages, or Manding and Banyuk settlements, in order to take captives and sell them to the Manding, who would use them as laborers to work in their groundnut fields. Jola elders actually know persons who had relatives that had been enslaved by the Manding. If we recall, the eighteenth-century description of Manding slavery by Moore referred mostly to household slaves. By the next century, however, the Manding were fully involved in groundnut production as a cash crop and were short of labor.

IV

How Jola Cultural Patterns Persist

The early European sources describing the Fulup or Jola are unequivocal on one point: these people were bellicose,
anarchic, and egalitarian. To recapitulate, Fernandes (1506-1510) refers to them as great cattle owners, palm-wine tappers and warriors, the fear of all their neighbors. Almada (1594) called them "negros bravos" (rebellious blacks). A century later, Jajolet de la Courbe described them as idolaters who do not recognize any sovereign, living in a republic under the peaceful government of their elders. During the eighteenth century the Fulup/Jola were still being described by Moore as wild and independent, "under the government of no chief." In the nineteenth century both Heckard (1852) and Bertrand-Bocandé (1856) remarked on the absence of organized government among the Fulup inhabiting the mouth of the Casamance river. Earlier on Lopes de Lima had talked about Fulup villages having a "king or magistrate," but he hastened to add that his functions were limited. His vote carried no more weight than the vote of others, and he cultivated the land like everyone else: "In general, the most perfect equality flourishes among these people."

Doubtless, then, for most of recorded history the Jola were organized into fairly unstratified villages, under the authority of elders who controlled ritual matters. Although some elders may have benefited from the labor services of younger men, and during a short period even had slaves to work their land, this was far from being a ranked society, where asymmetries of power and social status were clearly marked and institutionalized. Although the role of secular chief was introduced during the nineteenth century by French administrators, it was largely as an expedient for bringing the Jola under colonial control. Hence the Europeans could not secure the cooperation of native chiefs and middlemen in order to facilitate the slave trade simply because no such roles existed in Jola society. To this day the Jola are a classic example of an acephalous group. In the Esudadu villages that I have studied, moral sanctions are in the hands of shrine spirits who punish transgressors with disease. The role of propitiator of the important shrines is rotated regularly among important elders belonging to different agnatic groups. In this context the Jola can be most aptly described as a gerontocracy. However, younger members can aspire to becoming elders eventually. And women, as well as men, hold a great deal of ritual power.

When domestic forms of slavery finally developed among some groups living near the mouth of the Casamance river, they assumed a special guise. Captives were used in the more difficult aspects of agricultural labor. Esudadu slaves were loaned poor land that needed improvement and were allowed for a while to harvest from these fields. Whether their social and ritual inferiority was much greater than, say, that of a junior or uninitiated member of Jola society, is not an easy question to answer. In any case, given past descriptions and present circumstances, it is very unlikely that being a slave was a highly differentiated status in nineteenth century Esudadu society. This may be why it went unnoticed by European observers like Bérenger-Feraud and Dias de Carvalho. Jembering, where real
chattel slavery developed, was a special case. Its inhabitants speak a language called Kwaatay that is independent from the Jola cluster of languages. Although the internal organization of this large village has not been studied in detail, my impression is that it is structured along more hierarchical lines than the Esudios villages.

At least two additional aspects of the deep structure of Jola society were crucial in retarding the development of domestic and exporting types of slavery. To begin with, one must remark on the relatively minor role initially played by organized commerce. In contrast to the Banyuk, whose trade fairs were the marvel of Portuguese explorers, and the Manding, who have delegated trade to a special group of middlemen called dyula, the Jola did not organize market-place exchanges, nor liberate people from full-time agricultural work so they could dedicate themselves entirely to commercial endeavors. Even when they bartered large amounts of extra rice for cattle, they did so mostly through grumetes who served as intermediaries. No or few Jola have ever become full-time traders; they sell what they produce. Later on, during the second half of the nineteenth century when the rice trade failed due to French imports from their Indochinese colonies, the Jola turned to collecting first palm kernels, then red rubber from the vine *Landolphia*. The kernels, or the oil they extracted from them, were often exchanged for rice, especially in times of drought. Rather than receiving cash for their rubber—which incidentally was of poor quality when compared with Gambian rubber—the Jola often exchanged it for clothing, iron, and guns.

In the twentieth century the Jola north of the Casamance river have increasingly been cultivating groundnuts as a cash crop. They have done so now for several decades, selling it through state-organized cooperatives. But, again, they entered the cash-crop market relatively late in their history. Some small-scale internal sales and exchanges go on continually, and a few Jola women go to places like Ziguinchor and Bihona to sell vegetables or pottery at the market, while men harvest palm-wine in the dry season to sell it in the cities. But this is small-scale, local trade, done in the off season, and not a full-time occupation. It is not commerce as practiced by Manding or Fula itinerant traders, who do little else. In addition, I do not know of any Jola village to this day that holds a periodic market in its own locale. The Jola market in the town of Bihona, which I studied briefly in 1966, did not have a single Jola vendor in an important position. All selling posts were occupied then by Fulani (Peul), Wolof, or even Mauritians. And this is the most important town in the predominantly Jola region north of the Casamance River. The absence of formal institutions facilitating commercial endeavors doubtless retarded the Jolas' participation in the Atlantic slave trade.

Though reluctant to engage in commerce as a full-time occupation, the Jola have always been enthusiastic participants in all sorts of exchanges having to do with cattle. Early on, European travelers seem to have noticed their large herds and their preoccupation with accumulating cattle. For centuries,
the Fulup/Jola took persons captive in order to have them ransomed for cattle. Without being a pastoralist people, the Jola to this day are very concerned with their herds. In the Esudadu villages of Pte. St. Georges, cattle have many uses. They are sacrificed to the spirit-shrines. A particularly powerful shrine, who has 'trapped' someone that has socially transgressed by making him ill, must be propitiated and appeased by sacrificing a bull. At a funeral, the deceased is placed on a stretcher adorned with the horns of bulls. To commemorate the death of a particularly important elder, be it a man or a woman, up to forty head may be slaughtered and their meat carefully distributed. The number of slaughtered cattle may be in the hundreds when it concerns the boys' initiation or bukut, taking place (in theory) every twenty-five years. A dying man can put a curse on his fields, and if his kin want to cultivate them, they must sacrifice a bull to lift the curse. In the not-too-distant past, before the men became involved in palm-wine tapping as a remunerative activity, people would produce great quantities of extra rice that they would exchange against cattle. The dung from cattle is collected in the courtyard where the animals are tied up at night, to serve as fertilizer. And so on...

North of the river, in the Kajaamutay, cattle play an equally important though different role. Since the Jola of these areas were converted to Islam at the beginning of this century, they no longer sacrifice cattle to their shrines. Nonetheless, cattle are still killed at funerals and initiation by the agnatic kin of the deceased, or of an initiate, to feed strangers and visiting family. Cattle are hoarded by an elder until he dies, at which point his children slaughter several head and inherit the rest. Unlike rice fields, which devolve upon the individual male sons at the time they marry, a man's herd is inherited as a unit by the collectivity of his sons at the time he dies. An appropriate bridewealth payment in this area is a bull, which goes to the bride's father. A man who wants to get back his child conceived out of wedlock, must ransom it by giving a bull to the mother's kin. A man with a land deficit may pledge a cow against a field; when the lender needs the field back, he must return an equivalent animal. To avoid taxation and the envy of others, a man may hide his cattle with a friend in a neighboring village. Now that the ox plough has finally begun to be accepted by the north-shore Kujamaat, another category of bovidae, the hefty oxen has made its appearance. Draft oxen are given special names; they are fed special diets and are rounded up at night in a special corner of the compound. In short, cattle also hold a special place among Muslim Jola of the north-shore. As an elder put it to me: "my cattle are my children."

To summarize, the Jolas' reluctance to participate in the export slave trade, or in the domestic use of slave labor, until very late in their history, and then only by some groups, was deeply rooted in their social institutions. When they did engage to capture people, they did so primarily with the purpose of acquiring cattle through ransom. Since there seems never to have been a category of really dependent labor among the Jola,
free farmers regularly performed slave-like labor. Later on, when the Jola put people to work for them, it was probably to improve the land to raise production for the rice trade. But this trade was largely within the colony; it went to feed the garrisons in Cap Vert and Gorée. As soon as the French developed their other colonies, it was superseded by Indochinese imports. Jola rice-growing for the market was never cash-crop production in the scale of the Manding groundnut trade, which was based in the extensive use of slave labor. In short, the Jola resisted the worst excesses of the export trade, and never developed anything like a slave mode of production, because they lacked commercial institutions and marked social classes, preferring instead to concentrate on amassing cattle and extending their rice fields.

Epilogue

In the last two decades, an interesting controversy has grown around the question of whether most groups living in the Upper Guinea Coast had forms of domestic slavery before the arrival of the Europeans. Arguing against the view proposed by J.D. Fage that native forms of slavery had encouraged the slave trade, Walter Rodney observed that "one is stuck by the absence of references to local African slavery in the sixteenth or even seventeenth century." More recently, Fage has reiterated his earlier views, marshaling a great deal of documentation in order to show that, even within the Upper Guinea coast, internal forms of slavery were common. He remarks that the absence of references to internal slavery in the early Portuguese sources may be due to the general absence of descriptions of the common people.

A review of the evidence presented here inclines me to agree more with Rodney than with Fage. Some Upper Guinea coastal groups did not have domestic forms of slavery and/or participate in the enslavement of people, at least in the beginning. These groups included, not only the Fulup/Jola, but also the Bijagos, Balanta, and perhaps other people of the Gambia-Geba area. Those groups that did have domestic forms of slavery, like the Brame, were probably under direct Manding domination. Other groups like the Banyuk probably did keep domestic slaves in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries. However, the only full description we have of slave-keeping practices in Banyuk society at that time comes from the 1685 reference by Jajolet de la Courbe to a mulatto lady keeping girls as personal domestic slaves. Certainly, Pacheco Pereira did not mention that the Banyuk kept domestic slaves. He only noted that the Banhaus (Banyuk again), as well as the Guogolis (Landuma) and Beafares (Biafades), in what is now Guinea Bissau, the Capes (present-day Sapes) and Jalungas (Yalunka of Republic of Guinea) exchanged slaves against Portuguese goods.

In any case I hope to have shown in this essay that there is no necessary causal relation between internal and external forms of slavery. Before the nineteenth century the Jola sold captives, without keeping slaves for their own use. In the eighteenth century the Manding kept family slaves but did not sell them except under duress. Put differently, the relationship between internal and external forms of slavery has always been
facultative and not obligative. Nor is there a necessary connection between capturing people and selling them to the Europeans for the export trade. For, as we have seen, the Jola/Fulup for a long time captured people with the primary purpose of having their kin ransom them back for cattle. It should go without saying that all sorts of variations in time and/or space seem to have characterized slaving practices among Upper Guinea groups. To concentrate, as Rodney and Fage seem to have done, whether slaves were, or were not kept, by this or that group, is to avoid the more important question of what structural features and minimal conditions must have been present for different forms of slavery to have developed, and what exactly was the connection between Africans keeping slaves for themselves and their selling them to the Europeans.
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NOTES

* This article grew out of my experiences of many years doing ethnographic research among the Jola of Sénégal. I am not, of course, a historian. My only qualifications for writing this article are that I have gathered oral accounts of latter-day slaving practices among the Jola and have discussed the subject extensively with them. First, I must thank the Jola, who consented to talk on the subject of domestic slavery even though they feel very little pride over it. Without the kind comments of the following colleagues, I would have made many more errors of fact and interpretation. M.H. Moynihan, J. Goody, J.D. Sapir, and J. Guyer made perceptive comments on the text, and their suggestions have been incorporated throughout. I am especially grateful to P.M. Weil, who spent many hours improving substance and presentation. Peter also sent me Xeroxed copies of relevant publications that have appeared recently but I had missed by being 'posted' in Panama. Logistic support was provided by M.L. Jiménez, whose skill in the word processor makes life considerably easier, and S. Churgin, our STRI librarian, who will get things down from Washington D.C. in no time at all.


2. It is not easy to provide a simple definition of slavery. As Watson notes in his introduction to Asian and African Systems of Slavery, slavery is a complex social institution. He defines slaves as persons acquired by purchase or capture, whose labor is extracted through coercion. P.E. Lovejoy, in his book Transformations in Slavery (Cambridge, England, 1983), 3, emphasizes that slavery is initiated through violence, including warfare, raiding, and kidnapping. Once people were taken captive, however, several things could be done with them. I have thus found it useful to distinguish domestic slavery, which is the indigenous use of captives as a labor force, from ransom, which is the release of captives through some form of repayment by their kin, from internal trade, which is the sale of captives to the Europeans for trans-Atlantic shipment.

3. Most experts who have written about societies that actively participated in the export trade have, of course, also emphasized the indigenous aspects of the trade. See, for example, J. Goody, "Slaves in Time and Place" in Watson, Asian and African Systems, 16-42.

4. Protohistorical occupations of islands and mainland areas surrounding the entrance to the river date from about 200 B.C. They continue to the time of contact with Europeans and slightly beyond, to about the 1700s (see O.F. Linares, "Shell Middens of Lower Casamance and Problems
of Diola Protohistory," West African Journal of Archaeology, 1 [1971], 23-54). Remains from the oldest deposits suggest that the first inhabitants of the area came from nearby areas upriver, and probably to the south. J.D. Sapir, in his article "West Atlantic: An Inventory of the Languages, Their Noun Class Systems and Consonant Alternation," Current Trends in Linguistics, 7 (1971), shows that Jola and the other Bak languages located in what is now Guinea Bissau are closely related.

5. It is highly unlikely that the Jola were pushed to the coast by the western expansion of Manding peoples, coming from the East. See B. Barry, "Economic Anthropology of Pre-colonial Senegambia From the Fifteenth Through the Nineteenth Centuries" in, The Uprooted of the Western Sahel. Migrants' Quest for Cash in the Senegambia, ed. L.G. Colvin et al., (New York, 1981), 27-57. Recently, it has been argued that such massive Manding migrations never took place and that the Senegambian Manding were autochthonous peoples who adopted Manding language and culture from traders or other small groups of migrants. See D.R. Wright, "Beyond Migration and Conquest: Oral Traditions and Mandinka Ethnicity in Senegambia," HA, 12(1985), 335-48.

6. There is no modern Jola sub-group calling itself Fulup. The linguistic connotations surrounding the term are discussed by J.D. Sapir in his "Diola in the Polyglotta Africana," African Language Review, 9(1970/71). I will use Fulup in the general sense used by the Portuguese to refer to all Jola sub-groups.


9. V. Fernandes, Description de la Cote Ouest du Senegal au Cap de Monte, Archipels, Monod, A. Teixeira da Mota and R. Mauny, eds. and trans., (Bissau, 1951)

10. For this reason his statements must be taken with caution. His doubtful assertions are numerous; Fernandes claimed the Balanta lived near the Soungrougrou marigot, when it was actually the Banyuk who probably lived there; he claimed the Fulup had large canoes which were manned by crews of 50 to 60 men, when it was probably the Bijagos; he asserted that the Fulup had 'kings', when he was probably referring to persons of authority among the Banyuk and Manding; and so forth.

11. Fernandes, Description, 61.


13. Teixeira da Mota, Mar, Além, Mar, 222; Pacheco Pereira, Esmeraldo, 178n132.


15. A. Alvares de Almada, Tratado Breve dos Rios de Guiné do
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16. Peter Mark, A Cultural, Economic, and Religious History of the Basse Casamance Since 1500, (Stuttgart, 1985), 20-22, argues that the term comes from a Jola expression meaning "do not eat each other" or "being related." According to him Almada was referring to the Jigouches of Mlomp village in the Buluf, and to the Esudadu of Mlomp village in the Pte. St. Georges, from where the former originated.

17. Banyuk (or Bānum, Bainouk, Banhun) is not one of the Bak languages of Lower Casamance (the Manjaku, Jola-Balanta cluster), but is remotely related to it (Sapir, "West Atlantic," 48-49 and personal communication).


19. Ibid., 60

20. Ibid., 62

21. Ibid., 61

22. Ibid., 60

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid., 62

25. F. de L. Coelho, Duas Descrições Seiscentistas da Guiné, D. Peres, ed. (Lisbon, 1953), 29; Teixeira da Mota, Mar, Além, fig. 12.


27. It is not clear who the Sacalates were, but they were probably a Jola sub-group.

28. By Coelho's time, however, some Fulup groups may have been selling captives to the Banyuk, and also directly to the Portuguese.

29. Fernandes, Description, 69-75.

30. Fernandes, Description, 164n132

31. Giving up wine may not always have indicated a good Muslim, however. For example, Gomes, writing at the same time as Fernandes, mentioned that the people of the Gambia river were Muslims, spoke Manding, and yet drank wine. On the other hand, making palm-wine libations to shrines is identified with the traditional religion still being practiced by non-Islamized Jola.

32. P. Mark, in Basse Casamance, 28-31 gives several reasons for the Jolas' expansion at the expense of the Banyuk during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He mentions that the Jola were better warriors, that their population had increased, and that they had acquired, through commerce with the Europeans, a new and abundant source of iron with which to make better weapons and better cultivation tools. He also suggests that population growth was accelerated by the Jolas' system of capturing and adopting people from other communities. "It may be that the Diola system of incorporating captives into their own society was in the long run an important source of new manpower...." That trade, iron, and the need for more land were somehow interconnected is not a new idea. As
Mark himself points out, Joseph Lauer was the first to
discuss this possibility in his "Rice in the History of
the Lower Gambia-Geba Area" (M.A. thesis, University of
Wisconsin, 1969). I have also discussed this issue in
my "Ritual, Labor and Technology: the Structuration of
Agricultural Practices among the Jola of Senegal" forth-
coming. However, Lauer did not mention that the Jola
incorporated Banyuk captives as a labor force, and I find
no evidence for Jola domestic slavery existing much before
the nineteenth century (see below).

33. Coelho, Duas Descrições, 30. When Coelho said that the
Banyuk purchased wax and some slaves it is not altogether
clear from whom they did so. He noted that on the north-
shore they were all Fulup, yet mentioned several reinos
here belonging to the Banyuk. Mark, Basse Casamance, 26,
referring to the same passage where Coelho says that wax
and slaves were purchased at a place called Jame, iden-
tifies Jame as being the present-day Jola region called
Kujamatay (from the verb ejam, to listen). I am more
inclined to identify "Jame" with "Jami," described much
later by E. Bertrand-Bocandé in 1849 (see footnote 47),
as the "principal market where the Portuguese purchase
wax." Bertrand-Bocandé went on to say that the inhabitants
of Jami had erroneously been called Fulup in the narratives,
but they were really Banyuk. Thus, I tend to see the
slave trade at this time as involving primarily the Banyuk,
though the Jola/Fulup were probably beginning to participate
in it (see also footnote 35).

34. Coelho, Duas Descrições, 33.

35. Mark, Basse Casamance, 28, is of the opinion that the
inhabitants of Thionk had, by the second half of the
seventeenth century, probably modified a pre-existing
system of domestic slavery "to provide captives for export." He
also says that some of the captives were kept as agri-
cultural laborers and assimilated into local lineages. I
have been unable to find any references to this phenomenon
in the seventeenth century sources, which makes me suspect
that domestic slavery developed considerably later in Thionk,
or that Thionk was really a very special case. Mark him-
self suggests that Thionk was unusual among Fulup communi-
ties.

36. P. Cultru, ed., Premier Voyage du Sieur de la Courbe fait
à la Coste d'Afrique in 1685 (Paris, 1913). Unfortunately,
the section where Jajolet de la Courbe described his 1687
overland voyage from the Heregues, (or Vintang marigot
mentioned above) to Cacheu, in what is now Guinea Bissau,
through Fulup-Jola controlled territories, is missing
from the original. However, there is an account, published
by J. B. Labat under the title Nouvelle Relation de l'Afrique
Occidentale, Tome V (Paris, 1728), in which Labat described
the fictitious travels made by André Brue, director of the
Senegal Colony, 1697-1702, to Cacheu. As Cultru, Premier
Voyage, discovered, Labat systematically plagiarized
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Jajolet de la Courbe's accounts, attributing them to Brüe with the intention of flattering him. A comparison of existing passages in Jajolet de la Courbe, for example his visit to the Gambia, to Labat's plagiarized account of the same voyage allegedly made by Brüe, reveals how slavishly Labat copied from the former. Every passage that appeared in Jajolet de la Courbe also appears in Labat, although at times re-arranged, out of strict order, and even embellished. We can thus assume with a great deal of confidence that the passages missing from Jajolet de la Courbe covering the crucial Gambia-Cacheu voyage re-appear in Labat. In fact Cultru is of the opinion that Labat had access to Jajolet de la Courbe's diary.

37. Cultru, Premier Voyage, 207.
38. Labat, Nouvelle Relation, 30-34.
39. Ibid., 42-45.
41. Ibid., 36
42. Ibid., 42.
43. Ibid., 43.
44. As Lovejoy points out, Transformations, 159-70, in 1808 an act of Parliament prohibited all British subjects from participating in the slave trade. In 1814 France agreed to limit the trade to its own colonies, in 1818 it abolished the trade, and in 1848 it emancipated the slaves in its colonies. In 1810 Portugal agreed to limit its trade to its own colonies, and in 1815 to its possessions south of the equator, and in 1869 it finally abolished slavery, though not its legal status until 1878. There were, of course, many ways of getting around these laws, and the slave trade, as well as domestic slavery, thrived in French and Portuguese colonies for many decades after these institutions were prohibited.
45. Ibid.
46. Mark, Basse Casamance, presents much fuller data than I do on certain aspects of Jola social change during the nineteenth century.
51. See George Brooks, "Perspectives on Luso-American Commerce and Settlement in the Gambia and Guinea-Bissau Region, 16th-19th centuries," Fourth International Congress of Africanists, (Kinshasa, 1978). Perhaps we should also
remember that Ziguinchor was, at least theoretically, a Portuguese possession long after Karaban became French. In fact, Karaban (Carabanne) had been "bought" from the Jola/Fulup of the village of Kanut in 1836 in exchange for annual payments. On the other hand Ziguinchor did not become a French possession until the year 1886.


63. L.-J.-B. Bérrenger-Féraud, "Etude sur les populations de la Casamance," *Revue d' Anthropologie*, 3 (1874), 449. America probably meant Cuba, which increased its demand for slaves after the 1850s, and Brazil, which did not abolish slavery until 1888.

64. H.A. Días de Carvalho, *Guiné* (República Portuguesa, 1944), 72-73.


67. Robert Baum made these observations in a paper on oral traditions that he read at the 22nd. Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association, Los Angeles, 1979.

68. The parcel is first girdled with a high dike, the mangrove vegetation is then cut down, women come in to harvest the wood, the field is allowed to be inundated by fresh water, then drained for at least three years running, and at the end the parcel is ridged and furrowed. All this is done by manual labor, with a long-handled tool they call *kanata* or *kangom*, depending on the shape of the scoop used to lift earth.


71. For example, the told me about a man called Lamin, whose Sinjan-born parents were sold as slaves in a faraway land. When he grew up, Lamin managed to escape to Sinjan (Sindian), where he died in 1984. Another old man, whom I knew in 1964, and who had been a famous *chef de canton* during French colonial days, had a brother called Demba who was a
slave in a Manding village near Pakao. He also escaped to Sinjan, and finally died in Gambia less than thirty years ago.

72. Moore, Travels, 43.
74. Fernandes, Description, 61.
75. Almada, Tratado, 59.
76. Labat, Nouvelle Relation, 43.
77. Moore, Travels, 36.
78. Heckard, "Rapport;" Bertrand-Bocandé, "Carbane."
81. Linares, "Ritual, Labor and Technology."
82. Sapir, "West Atlantic," 58.
83. Mark, Basse Casamance, places a different emphasis on the role played by commerce within Jola society than I do, being inclined to see trade as being earlier, and more central to Jola society. I argue that, relative to peoples like the Banyuk, Manding, and Wolof, the Jola were not, and are not, a trading peoples. This is not to deny that they have for a long time bartered what they have grown or what they have gathered in the forest, against European goods. But being a full-time cultivator is a different matter from being a full-time salesman or middleman. When it comes to the Jola selling their labor power as salaried workers by migrating to cities, which they are doing in great numbers nowadays, the Jola see this as work (borok). On the other hand, they do not see funom (a word which, means both "to sell" and "to buy") as work.
87. Cultru, Primer Voyage, 202; however, in Labat, Nouvelle Relation, 14, there is a reference to the dwellings of the king, his wives, his valets, and his slaves as making up a large village.
88. Pacheco Pereira, Esmeraldo, 72-77.
89. I find puzzling Fage's statement that "Pacheco says of the Banyun that they had many wars and many slaves" ("Slaves and Society," 300-01). I found no such assertion in the pages of Pacheco Pereira's work cited by Fage.