Ethnicity in the Diaspora:
The Slave-Trade and the Creation of African ‘Nations’ in the Americas

DOUGLAS B. CHAMBERS

There is abundant evidence that, throughout the Atlantic world in the era of the slave-trade, many enslaved people identified themselves, or were so identified by others, as members of African-derived named groups.1 Much of this evidence is ascriptive, and was used by Europeans to identify individual slaves in terms of ‘types’ of Africans.2 The enslaved people themselves, however, could be active agents in defining the names of these ‘nations’, as Christian Oldendorp found in the Lesser Antilles c.1770. In attempting to define one such group of displaced Africans, Oldendorp noted that the ‘Negroes call one of their own nations Kassenti, but the nation calls itself Tjamba [Chamba]’. He then explained that, ‘because they usually called out Kassenti, that is, I do not understand you, when they fell into the hands of the marauding Amina [Akan], the latter have given them that expression as a name.’3

In general, the structure of the transatlantic slave-trade tended to concentrate rather than to disperse peoples from broad regions into a limited number of entrepôts, with the great majority sent from just one or two ports per African coast.4 The remarkable new slave-trade database of over 27,000 voyages published in 1999, hereafter referred to as the Du Bois Database, suggests that 76 per cent of Gold Coast slaves were sent from two places; in the Bight of Bénin, about two-thirds were taken from just one site; and in the Bight of Biafra nearly 80 per cent were shipped from two ports.5

This tendency toward concentration occurred largely because commerce in human cargoes ran on credit, which required personal relationships, and on coercion. On the European side, merchants and captains specialized in certain coasts because they had to meet demands for particular assortments of trade-goods, and did so at the sufferance of local African trade-kings; enforcement of European mercantilist policies further limited points of trade on any one coast. On the African side, coastal elites drew on regional
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trade networks, brokering exchanges and disbursing goods on the ‘trust’ system, and/or fomented warfare in their hinterlands to generate captives. In both cases, rulers played a direct role in the creation and distribution of wealth by mobilizing resources for the violence that undergirded the slave-trade. The networks that supplied coastal entrepôts, however, were also those of general long-distance trading, and were likewise limited by the necessity of relationships (linking persons, peoples, polities) and by reliance on regional middle-men trading groups.6

Hence, Europeans tended to load their ships at only one or two African ports, where captives had been funnelled from a regional hinterland. Since most Africans lived in small-scale polities, or mini-states, nationality in any one region was highly fragmented. Slavers manipulated this fragmentation to generate captives, and slaving aggregated people from broad culture-areas who normally would not have identified with each other. Their role as captives and forced migrants, or the shared experiences of enslavement and displacement, and the necessity of levelling localistic differences to unify disparate though related groups, may well have encouraged the creation of koiné (cultural as well as strictly linguistic) in the diaspora.7

Political fragmentation, and the consequent multitude of mini-ethnies, was mirrored in the great variety of ethnonyms in Atlantic Africa. In the Americas, a superficial listing of all known group-names in any diasporic region also yields a similarly bewildering variety.8 But this should be expected. What needs explaining is why, upon closer examination, most Africans in any American region identified with a more limited set of diasporic ethnonyms, and did so in a way that suggests they were ethnic groups. Although the evidence itself is limited, it seems that the great majority of ‘named Africans’ fell into a relatively few major groupings. Also, the great majority of Africans taken from a general ‘coast’ tended to group themselves into just two or three major ethnies, and once established the names of these groups remained remarkably stable over time.

To rediscover what it may have meant to be Canga or Chamba, or Eboe or Coromantee or Lucumí, in particular times and places in the Americas, especially in comparison to any one of the ancestral sub-ethnies,9 much less the modern African ethnic groups,10 we must, as David Geggus some time ago suggested, ‘decipher rather than dismiss’ this lexicon of historical diasporic ethnicity.11 To this end, I argue that it is useful to see these named groups as artifacts of the transatlantic slave-trade, the result of diasporic ethnogenesis, that is, as emergent ‘ethnies’.12 Furthermore, they may well have represented the initial step in a long-term process of African-derived cultural adaptation which I term ‘historical creolization’.

Scholars have tended to think of these named groups merely as social remnants, initially as ‘tribal’ survivals,13 or more commonly as curiously ill-
defined signs that reflected imposed European semantic categories or stereotypes rather than historical African (or neo-African) realities, and are thus notoriously difficult to identify ethnographically. More recently, they are taken as evidence for the continuing relevance of specific continental language-communities, even as others recognize that the ethnicity of these diasporic named groups differed substantially from that of their ancestral analogs. At this point, however, we have only begun to grasp that being Eboe or Coromantee or Lucumí (or Carabalí, Mina, Nagô) and so forth was socially meaningful in the context of enslavement, transportation, and the initial confrontation with chattel slavery, that is, that these named groups may well have been emergent ‘identity groups’ (ethnies) in the African diaspora.

Although it is tempting to follow the terminology of contemporary sources and think of diasporic named groups as ‘nations’ (nacións), as John Thornton for example has done, or as ‘countries’, it is more appropriate to see them specifically as emergent ‘ethnies’ or nascent ethnic-groups. The concept of a ‘nation’ normally presupposes a political formation (a polity), or the aspiration for one, as in the Royal Spanish Academy’s 1884 definition of nación as ‘the aggregate of the inhabitants of a province, a country or a kingdom’. But the diasporic groups generally did not correspond to the names of known African polities, except for the most localistic ones, where indeed ethnicity was a direct expression of a strictly local form of nationality (as in Koelle’s ‘respective districts and countries’).

Diasporic named groups did not signify specific political identities or known aspirations for separate nation-states, and generally did not have their own written languages. But they appeared to have been ‘affinity groups’, or intentional communities with a shared proper name, language, cultural identity, links to a homeland, collective memories and, as significantly, ‘shared amnesias’. As Benedict Anderson noted regarding ‘imagined communities’, such amnesias necessarily signal profound shifts in consciousness, out of which ‘in specific historical circumstances, spring narratives’. Therefore, one could be Eboe or Coromantee without identifying in any substantive way with the ancestral sub-groups of either collectivity. In effect, then, these diasporic ‘nations’ may well have been ethnies.

An ethnie is ‘a named human population with myths of common ancestry, shared historical memories, one or more elements of common culture, a link with a homeland and a sense of solidarity among at least some of its members’. Ethnicity refers to that cultural intangible which members of an ethnie have in common, recognizing of course that any group or individual has no single identity, but a variety which overlap to a lesser or greater degree, depending on the situation. Ethnies and ethnicity, therefore, exist only when people are in direct contact with others unlike themselves,
and are used to distinguish ‘us’ from ‘them’. These social-cultural definitions can serve any number of functions, marking out what Fredrik Barth termed ‘units of ascription’ by establishing and maintaining boundaries (which by definition were permeable), or to assert group honour and kinship (especially in competition over scarce resources), or by using symbols to unify people into discrete groups (perhaps particularly so in oppressive circumstances). Because of the imperative of being in direct contact with ‘others’, and the ‘willed’ or socially constructed nature of ethnies, it is analytically impossible to equate ‘ethnicity’ and ‘tribalism’.

In general, African survivors of the Atlantic crossing in any particular American region usually comprised a limited set of ‘types’, with the vast majority falling into about ten major groups. For example, for Jamaica, Long listed a dozen named types of Africans, of which ten get prominent mention. A sample of over 1,000 Jamaican fugitive slaves advertised between c.1791 and 1814 generates a total of 23 named types, but of these only nine major groupings account for 94 per cent of all Africans with a named ethnicity. A similar contrast between the diversity of all known named types, and a preponderance of a much smaller set of major groups, obtained in Cuba, in St. Domingue, in Trinidad, and most certainly elsewhere, including North America. Fernando Ortiz generated a list of 96 named African types in Afro-Cuban history, but a large sample of plantation inventories (1760–1870) suggests that about 90 per cent of Africans fell into just 8 major groups, with this concentration even more pronounced before 1820. For St. Domingue, Curtin listed a total of 71 named types, but with 81.4 per cent (N=1,527) in ten major groups; a much larger sample of 13,334 shows 26 named types, with ten major ones accounting for 83 per cent of the Africans listed. Perhaps the most detailed listing is one for Trinidad in 1813, heroically compiled by Barry Higman. He counted over 120 ethnic and regional named groups, and yet again, a relatively small set of just 16 major ones comprised 85 per cent of his sample (N=13,747).

The nomenclature also varied systematically over time and space, so that if Eboe/Moko was used to denote people from ‘Calabar’ (Bight of Biafra), then Carabalí generally was not used, and vice versa, and so with Mandingo/Bambara, Coromantee/Mina, Nagô/Lucumí, and others such as Mungola/Mondongue, and including even lesser groups like Cangá/Misérables. Thus there were observable onomastic patterns, which varied systematically and persisted through time.

These diasporic terms, however, were usually not commonly used in continental African contexts, at least in the early modern era. Even though generalized ethnic or ‘national’ names were often originally pejorative or satirical terms ascribed to groups by outsiders, those meta-ethnonyms (such as Igbo, Akan, Yoruba and so forth) that made it into the ethnographic
literature, often in the later nineteenth century, diverged significantly from the set of names used in the diaspora. In the African context, many of the diasporic terms were largely meaningless (as ethnonyms) and this onomastic divergence has been a major obstacle to identifying ethnologically their modern descendants in Africa. For example, slaves from the Cape Mesurado hinterland in modern-day Liberia were often called ‘Canga’ in the Americas, a term which in Akan meant ‘barbarous outsider’ and thus was presumably applied to them by neighbouring groups to the east. The limited evidence on the language spoken by ‘Kanga’ in St. Croix c.1770 suggests that it was a diasporic koiné, the result of levelling differences between the various dialects of the Mesurado region so as to be mutually intelligible among those dialect-speakers who had found themselves thrown together into slavery. The multiplicity of local dialects on the Gold Coast, noted repeatedly by Barbot in the 1680s, also contrasts with the diasporic observation that ‘Coromantee’ constituted a single identifiable language. At about the same time, however, Olfert Dapper (1668) noted that the peoples on the Gold Coast between ‘Shama and Kormantin’ and to the north, including the “Akanist’ kingdom’, spoke ‘the same language – or “mostly” the same’. Therefore, even the supposedly ‘tribal’ language spoken by Canga, or by Coromantee, may have been diasporic creolisms, koinés, rather than pre-existing lingua francas. Similarly, other groups clearly encountered ‘African’ ethnonyms for the first time only in the diaspora, such as recaptured Africans from the Bight of Biafra, who told Koelle (c.1840s) that they were called “Ibos” even though “they never had heard it till they came to Sierra Leone”.

Even the most famous diasporic African group, the Coromantee (Akan), were a group whose name was meaningful only in a limited sense on the Gold Coast and its hinterland in the slave-trade era. Jean Barbot, who had traded extensively on the Gold Coast in the 1680s, never referred to ‘Coromantee’ as a ‘nation’ even though he made frequent reference to the fort and associated coastal village of Cormantin. The general point that ‘Coromantee’ did not correspond to a known Akan ethnie led one pioneering historian to note in 1973 that, ‘This can be confusing, since the records often speak of Koromantin blacks, despite the fact that no such tribe existed.’ And it is doubly curious that the supposed connection with the early English trade castle called ‘Cormantin’ (effective English occupation 1645/47–64) has been stressed so often in the secondary literature, since the term ‘Coromantee’ appears to have come into wide use only after the Dutch captured the fort (1665), and changed the site’s name to Fort Amsterdam, though apparently the associated village was still called Cormantin. By this logic, one would expect that Gold Coast slaves, who were taken in much greater numbers by the English after c.1660, would have been called
something like ‘Cabocorsos’, since after 1664 Cape Coast Castle was the most important English entrepôt in the region, and remained so for the balance of the slave-trade era.39

Since diasporic ethnies had proper names, which distinguished groups of ‘us’ from ‘them’ within communities of enslaved Africans in the Americas, the fact that they were named groups presupposes the establishment and maintenance of ‘boundaries’, which further presupposes cultural boundary-markers, or ‘indices of difference’. But not all of such markers were of equal importance. Certain ‘deep markers’ or primary indices such as kinship (fictive or genetic), commensality (in-group equality, shared foodways), and cult (shared values, symbols, religious praxis) are the fundamental ‘building blocks of ethnicity’ and together constitute a ‘single recursive metaphor’ of belonging.40

In the context of slavery, such ‘metaphors’ were probably open secrets, known to the slaves but necessarily kept hidden from the masters. For example, Monk Lewis’s plantation in western Jamaica c.1815 included a large contingent of Eboe, who acted in concert at times. The slaves also grew a mysterious bean in every garden. Lewis noticed this so-called ‘arsenic bean’, but noted that it was ‘neither useful for food nor ornamental in its appearance; nor can the negroes, when questioned, give any reason for affording it a place in their gardens; yet there it is always to be seen’.41 If seen as an ethnie, the members of this named group (Eboe) defined ethnicity (Eboe-ness) in terms of blood (kinship), substance (commensality – all grew the ‘arsenic bean’), and cult (the ethic of honour symbolized by the oath-draft or poison-ordeal). In 1816, some 250 Eboe in the area apparently drew on their ethnicity to organize a revolt, electing a ‘king’ and two ‘captains’, one of whom was eventually discovered hiding in the hut of an obeah-man.42

Secondary markers, such as language, physical features (including circumcision, scarification) and dress, were important but not essential to defining ethnicity. Indeed, in the Americas, there is much evidence of multilingualism among Africans, and very little of diasporic scarification. For example, 1790s Jamaican runaway advertisements included mention of an Igbo who ‘speaks Moco may pass as Moco’; a Mandingo woman who spoke Coromantee (and English); a Chamba who ‘speaks Coromantee well’; and someone who was ‘Moco, but speaks Ebo’.43 In 1791, for a further example, a young man ran away from his plantation in western Jamaica, and his master noted that Brutus ‘calls himself a Creole, but is supposed to be from Africa, as he talks both the Eboe and Coromantee languages very fluently’.44 Scarification, though, was rare. In 1785 in piedmont Virginia, however, an unnamed ‘likely mulatto wench’ (hence, likely Virginia-born) ran away, and her master described her appearance in clearly African terms as ‘outlandish, and [she] has some of her country marks on one of her cheeks’.45
Lastly, tertiary indices include social things such as architecture, ritual calendars and specific taboos. To remain meaningful, however, secondary and tertiary indices must make concrete the abstractions of primary ones, that is, must ‘stand for and imply differences in blood, substance, and cult’, or they will be abandoned. Groups may maintain their ethnicity even without secondary and tertiary indices, but those which ‘lose’ primary ones simply fail to persist, except as names in the historical record (‘historical isolates’).46

Indeed, it is possible that all of these diasporic African groups were merely historical isolates, without ‘recursive metaphors’ of belonging, whose names had been imposed by the masters as stereotypes, and which, since they made it into print, merely appear to have been real. The sheer abundance of types and names (Long’s ‘varieties of Negroses’) suggests that many simply were such historical isolates, though not from being imposed from above so much as having been abandoned from below (and for good reasons). But there is too much evidence of historical agency, especially of the major named groups ‘doing things’, both in the earliest generations and through time and space, for the major groups to have been socially meaningless to the great majority of enslaved Africans who found themselves identified in those meta-ethnic terms.

Coromantee in Suriname are a good example. One of the earliest descriptions of ‘Coramantien’ as an African ‘nation’ was in the romantic novel *Oroonoko* by Aphra Behn (c.1640–89), written at least partly from her personal experience in Suriname (pre-1665), and widely read in English upon publication (1688). Her account of the noble slave Oroonoko (Caesar in Suriname) may have had a germinal role in constructing, for literate Englishmen at least, the master ‘recursive metaphor’ of Coromantee as a ‘very warlike and brave’ nation of noble savages. The slave Oroonoko/Caesar had been a prince before enslavement, and then a trusted plantation servant. After being reunited with his fellow-Coromantee love, he led the slaves in escaping to the woods, and when caught, bravely swore his revenge, forsaking suicide for the shame of a scourging in order to live long enough to exact his revenge on the overseer, then sacrificing the pregnant Imoinda to ‘free’ her from slavery, and finally, stoically standing to be drawn-and-quartered until he died ‘without a groan, or a reproach’.47

In 1701, Christopher Codrington, in a letter to the Board of Trade about a recent Coromantee-led uprising in Antigua, expanded this metaphor of Coromantee-as-noble-savage, nearly plagiarizing Behn:

> They are not only the best and most faithful of our slaves, but are really all born Heroes … There never was a raskal or coward of that nation, intrepid to the last degree, not a man of them but will stand to be cut to pieces without a sigh or groan, grateful and obedient to a kind master, but implacably revengeful when ill-treated.48
Historically, however, Coromantee in Suriname may well have enacted a specifically African-derived ‘recursive metaphor’: a warrior-society whose name explained the circumstances of their enslavement as the heroic victims of Asante imperialism. From as early as c.1712, the most terrifying oath that an Asante could utter was ‘Akromanti Miminda’ (Kromanti Saturday), from the death of the founding asantehene Osei Tutu in battle, which resulted in the utter annihilation of the mini-state of Kromanti, on a Saturday. The early eighteenth century saw the greatest growth in maroon communities in Suriname; for example, between 1712 and 1730 one maroon group increased from a single village with 25 houses to five villages with some 440 houses. The Dutch slave-trade to the colony boomed after about 1715; nearly 75 per cent of Africans taken to Suriname were imported between 1715 and 1774, which was the era of maximum Asante expansionism. A sample of nearly 50,000 Africans from the Du Bois Database (whose coastal provenances are known) bound for Suriname between 1721 and 1760, shows that just over half were from the Gold Coast, and the vast majority of these new slaves likely would have been the heroic victims of Asante imperialism (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Guinea</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bight of Bénin</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bight of Biafra</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-Central Africa</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=48,035

During the wars of independence which were ended by treaties with the various Maroon groups in the 1760s, the Kromanti medicine men ‘had formed the backbone of armed resistance against the planters and their mercenaries’, and were in effect the ‘big men’ of the eastern Maroon communities (which numbered between 5,000 and 6,000 people). By the 1770s (at the latest), the Maroons (Saramaka) had transformed the old plantation-based weekday-name system, with its Friday-Saturday-Sunday orientation (Piki-saba, Gran-saba, Dimingo in Sranan), and instead aligned it with the dictates of Asante’s Golden Stool to mark Thursday as the week’s holy day (Wednesday/Piki-saba, Thursday/Gran-saba, Friday/Dimingo). Once established among the Saramaka, this ‘Asante’ dayweek-system
remained the norm well into the twentieth century. At the same time, ‘Kromanti’ became a specialized warrior-society in-group among the Saramaka, associated with a sacred martial fearsomeness, protective ‘gadus’ (charms) and spirits, a secret language, and an explicit power to wage war against the common enemy, the whites.

Ethnogenesis happens under specific historical conditions, either from a process of subdivision among already existing groups, or by expanding a zone of contact (a ‘system’) that brings formerly discrete peoples into contact for the first time. On a broad scale, this is precisely what the transatlantic slave-trade did, bringing previously discrete peoples into contact and creating cultural opportunities, albeit under great duress, throughout the Atlantic world, which persisted for a longer or shorter time depending on local circumstances.

Enslaved Africans, because they tended to be funnelled from broad regions through a limited number of entrepôts and thus were thrown together with others culturally not unlike themselves, expanded the boundaries of ethnicity by restricting the indices of difference in the diaspora. They levelled localistic cultural idioms wherever they found themselves, and maintained primary ones above all else, to create meta-ethnicities or socio-cultural koinéss which initially were meaningful in the diaspora. In doing so, people created many living variants or common traditions out of loosely shared ancestral ones; the ethnicity of these neo-African named groups, therefore, were ‘invented traditions’ which combined the familiar with the functional. The process of creating new diasporic African-derived cultures in the Americas, ‘historical creolization’, was likely to have been a group phenomenon enacted out of shared roles as captives and forced migrants, rather than the supposedly random and ad hoc experimentation of ‘crowds’ of cultural strangers.
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2. Edward Long in Jamaica c.1770 recognized this directly, when he referenced ‘The Negro race (consisting of varieties) …’; Long, p.371.
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20. (re: Igbo); Koelle, p.8. Cf. Hobsbawm, pp.9–10; B. Marie Perinbam, Family Identity and the State in the Bamako Kafu, c.1800–c.1900 (New York: Westview, 1996). The other major element stressed by modern theorists of nations and nationalism, that is, a written language, was largely lacking for diasporic African nacións; cf. Gellner, p.17; Hastings, p.3. However, the role of languages (written or vernacular) in defining a nation itself is questionable; Hobsbawm, pp.51–63.


25. Hutchinson and Smith, ‘Introduction’, pp.9–10. Cf. ‘The first fact of ethnicity is the application of systematic distinctions between insiders and outsiders; between Us and Them. If no such principle exists there can be no ethnicity, since ethnicity presupposes an institutionalized relationship between delineated categories whose members consider each other to be culturally distinctive. From this principle, it follows that two or several groups who regard themselves as being distinctive may tend to become more similar and simultaneously increasingly concerned with their distinctiveness if their mutual contact increases. Ethnicity is thus constituted through social contact’, Thomas Hylland Eriksen, Ethnicity & Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives (London: Pluto, 1993), p.18.
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The editor of the new Oxford edition (p.289) notes that identifying the ‘arsenic bean’ is ‘an impossibility, but presumably some seed was poisonous enough to deserve the name’. However, it seems quite likely that the historical reference is to the well-known poisonous Efik *esere* or ‘Calabar bean’, e.g., *Physostigma venenosum*, used in eastern Nigeria in making oaths and for other purposes; Donald C. Simmons, ‘An ethnographic sketch of the Efik people’, in Daryll Forde (ed.), *Efik Traders of Old Calabar*, (London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1956), pp.22, 33. In an overland journey north of the Bight of Biafra from Opopo to Bende in 1896, an English official found that ‘the only way to pass through the country as far as Bende was to swear Ju Ju [i.e., make the oath-draught] in every town’; Maj. Arthur G. Leonard, ‘Notes of a Journey to Bende’, *Journal of the Manchester Geographical Society*, 14 (1898), p.194. For the importance of the ‘borrowing of cultural practices’ across ethnic and linguistic boundaries in this region, see Northrup, pp.16–17.


43. Mullin, pp.30–1.
44. H. Gauntlett (Black-River, St. Elizabeth’s), 6 June, *Royal Gazette* Postscript, 4–11 June 1791; Chambers, ‘Abstracts’, p.44.
48. Donnan, I, p.398 n.25, I suspect that Codrington drew on Behn as the correspondences are just too close, even though Codrington cites his father’s observations and experience as the authority for these attributed characteristics, concluding with, ‘My Father, who had studied the genius and temper of all kinds of negroes 45 years with a very nice observation, would say, Noe man deserved a Corramante that would not treat him like a Friend rather than a Slave, and all my Corramantes preserve that love and veneration for him that they constantly visit his grave’.
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