European Travelers and Local Informants in the Making of the Image of "Cannibalism" in North Sumatra

HIROSUE Masashi

Introduction

For as long as the historical record has existed, "cannibalism" has been one of the more popular topics when the discussion turns to "foreign" cultures. Travelers, missionaries and ethnologists alike have from time to time referred to the custom of eating human flesh being practiced in such regions as Latin America, the Pacific Islands, Papua New Guinea, Southeast Asia and Africa within a context ranging from religious belief to simple gastronomy. However, as Arens argues,[1)] it seems highly problematic to recognize "cannibalism" as a historical fact, except for extraordinary cases in which people had no other choice than to eat human flesh or perish. Arens, by examining the bias held by those who maintain a crude cultural dichotomy between "we" (Europeans) and "they" (non-Europeans)[2)] when discussing cannibalism, has shown the historical unreality in most of the descriptions regarding "cannibalism" by European "observers."

In this article, I would like to discuss the role of local informants in forming the image of "cannibalism" in Southeast Asia, as well as how European travelers and researchers got into the act. Although scholars like Arens are inclined to pay more attention to the biases of Westerners toward "exotic" cultures and customs, it is a fact that their descriptions and images about those cultures and customs were often based on data and information provided by their informants.[3)] Therefore, the question of whether the people of the region were really eating human flesh is of secondary importance to the present article. Although it goes without saying that much caution is needed to prove "anthropophagy" as historical fact; there is no doubt that the practice was in fact widely believed by Arabian, Chinese and European travelers to have existed in various parts

of Southeast Asia,[4] despite the fact that those foreign visitors did not (at least until the nineteenth century) usually travel to the inland locations where the inhabitants were suspected of being "cannibals." When they did begin to venture there during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, most of their descriptions were based on information provided by local chiefs, who seemed to go out their way to circulate stories about "cannibalism" among foreign visitors.

North Sumatra, the geographical locus of this article and one of the "hot beds" of "cannibalism" within Southeast Asian ethnography, was from the era of Śrīvijaya in the seventh century a well-known producer of good quality camphor and gold.[5] Then from at least the ninth century, the region was frequently said to be inhabited by anthropophagates.[6] During the early modern era, when north Sumatra became the stage for the fairly prosperous coastal entrepôts of Pasai and Aceh for pepper, talk of inland "cannibals" was widely spread and amplified among foreign visitors. These rumours continued into the nineteenth century, when north Sumatran coastal cities again attracted many foreign visitors after trade around the Straits Settlements became active.[7]

The research to date has tended to argue that "cannibalism" rumours discouraged foreign visitors from approaching the north Sumatran coast. For example, O. Wolters in his discussion of the rise of Śrīvijaya infers that the northern Sumatran coast, which had no easily navigable river from the sea, was probably isolated in early times, because it was vulnerable to attack from the interior.[8] Instead of north Sumatra, he emphasizes the importance of south Sumatra in the rise of Śrīvijaya, because of its navigable river habour open to the sea. However, such a view cannot satisfactorily account for the historical fact of Pasai and Aceh becoming prosperous habours and rumours of northern inland "cannibals" becoming more and more rampant than ever before.

Here I will attempt to show that north Sumatran coastal rulers, their entourages and local chiefs were the primary sources of stories about "cannibalism" among the inland people. The north Sumatran case suggests that by means of "cannibalism" rumours, coastal rulers were better able to control local trade with foreign merchants by frightening them out of making direct contact with inland people. Then after those coastal rulers were subjected to European colonial rule during the nineteenth century, it was inland chiefs who took up the campaign to advertise "cannibalism" among their villagers, for the purpose of appealing to foreigners the importance of their role in mediating between foreigners and the

local "cannibals".

1. "Cannibalism" and Prosperity in the Coastal Entrepôts

Rumours about "cannibalism" in various parts of Southeast Asia seem to have circulated since early times. For example, Ptolemy's *Geographica*, written in the second century, mentions that the inhabitants of the islands of Barusai, which scholars suggest may be identified with the islands facing the western Sumatran coast at Barus,[9] were anthropophagous. The seventh century Chinese chronicle, *Liang-shu* 梁書, also states that the people of "P'i-k'ien," which was subject to Funan, devoured criminals and foreign merchants. The research to date suggests that P'i-k'ien was either somewhere on the Southeast Asian mainland[10] or located on Sumatra.[11] Although it is difficult to identify the locations of Barusai and P'i-k'ien exactly, some parts of Southeast Asia seem to have since antiquity been well-known for "cannibalism."

From at least the ninth century, Arabic materials began to refer frequently to north Sumatra as producing precious mineral and forest products, while at the same time being populated by "man-eaters." Akhbār al-Ṣīn wa'l-Hind (ca. A. D. 850) says that on the island of Ramni (Lambri in north Sumatra), gold and good quality camphor were produced and that its inhabitants were cannibals.[12] Also, the ninth century description by Ibn Khurdādhbih mentions that Balus (north Sumatra), which was two days' sailing distance from Kilah (Kedah), produced good quality camphor and that its inhabitants were anthropophagous.[13] In the tenth century, 'Ajā'ib al-Hind described the people between Fansur (present day Barus) and Lambri and those in Kedah and the island of Nias as cannibals.[14]

To Arabian travelers, north Sumatra and the west coast of the Malay Peninsula were important entry points into Southeast Asia. Their location, gold and good quality camphor attracted these travelers to Lambri, Fansur and Kedah despite rumours of "cannibalism."[15] The above ninth and tenth century Arabic sources generally suggest that Arabian travelers first arrived at either north Sumatran ports, Nias or Kedah, then sailed to the central port of Zābaj. Descriptions of "cannibalism" in north Sumatra continued to appear after many Chinese merchants began sailing into the Indian Ocean during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[16] This was also the case during the early modern era, when north Sumatra became one of the major pepper producing centres in Southeast Asia.

Why did such rumours of "cannibalism" persist for such a long time among foreign travelers?

Nineteenth and early twentieth century European travelers claimed that they had verified the rumours of human flesh consumption during their explorations in north Sumatra. According to these "eyewitness" accounts, the Batak people who dwelled around Lake Toba would occasionally execute wounded prisoners who were judged unsuitable to be slaves and men who had committed adultery with the daughters of chieftains, then ate them.[17] Such a practice might have existed from early times; however, what is important to the argument here is that prior to the nineteenth century, accounts concerning "cannibalism" in Sumatra were not based on eyewitness experiences. It is therefore highly probable that the coastal inhabitants who had contact with the inland people were their main sources of information. Marco Polo, who visited north Sumatra in 1292–93, gives us some useful information on this point. When in the company of about two thousand men on a mission from Kublai Khan to take a princess to Persia, Polo stopped at Samudra (Pasai) and stayed there for five months waiting for favourable weather. He writes that the ruler of Samudra was powerful and rich and called himself a subject of Kublai Khan, and that the people of the city were "wild Idolaters". He also states,[18]

> When Messer Mark [Marco] was detained on this Island five months by contrary winds, (he landed with about 2000 men in his company; they dug large ditches on the landward side to encompass the party, resting at either end on the sea-haven, and within these ditches they made bulwarks or stockades of timber) for fear of those brutes of man-eaters; (for there is great store of wood there; and the islanders having confidence in the party supplied them with victuals and other things needful.)

Polo was so fearful of "cannibals" among the inland people that he stuck to the coast and even constructed defensive fortifications there. However, in due course the local people came to trust the visitors. Polo was unable to verify the existence of "man-eaters". Before arriving at Samudra, he also refers to inland "cannibals" in the north Sumatran port of Perlak, where, according to his account, some of the coastal inhabitants had just become Muslims.[19]

> This kingdom [Perlak], you must know, is so much frequented by the Saracen merchants that they have converted the natives to the Law of Mahommet –I mean the townspeople only, for the hill-people live for all the world like beasts, and eat human flesh, as well as all other kinds of flesh, clean or unclean.

Besides Pasai and Perlak, Polo also mentions the inland "cannibals" of the port of Dagroian, which he says was located between Pasai and Lambri.[20] As was the case in Pasai, Polo kept exclusively to the coast. Neither the above description of the hill-dwelling cannibals of Perlak nor that of the inland cannibals of Dagroian was based on his own observation.

Whenever foreigners dropped in at a port, they would first pay a visit to the ruler of the port city in order to pay homage to him and clarify their purpose for being there. When J. Anderson, a staff member of the English East India Company, visited the north Sumatran port cities of Deli and Batubara in 1823 and paid his initial visit to the local rulers, he was told by some guardsmen that they had come from the inner Batak region and that they had eaten human flesh a number of times.[21] To those foreigners who had not entered the hinterland from the port cities, such stories appeared highly reliable. Marco Polo may have also gained information about the "cannibalism" of the inland people from port city rulers or members of their entourages.

Polo and his companions not only safely sojourned without incident in Pasai and Dagroian, whose rulers claimed to be subjects of Kublai Khan, but also in Perlak, the ruler of which was a Muslim. This was also the case of Odoric[22] (fourteenth century) and later European travelers during the early modern era,[23] who generally referred to the existence of inland "cannibals" in north Sumatra, but all safely returned from Lambri (Aceh), Pasai, Barus and other north Sumatran ports. No matter how widely the rumours of "anthropophagy" spread among foreign travelers, coastal rulers guaranteed their safety while in the ports under their jurisdiction. Those travelers who were reluctant to come into direct contact with inland people for fear of "cannibalism" chose to stay in the coastal entrepôts, like Marco Polo, who even constructed bulwarks to protect himself. It was in this way that coastal rulers played a crucial role of intermediary between foreign visitors and the inland people.

2. Relations Between Coastal Rulers and the Hinterland People

In order to attract foreign visitors, coastal rulers needed to make close connections with the inland people nearby to guarantee a steady supply of forest, mineral, and food products. Here is one interesting example from the chronicle of the royal family of Pasai (*Hikayat Raja-Raja Pasai*).

Its kingdom was established around the end of the thirteenth century, just before Marco Polo's visit to north Sumatra, and became a prosperous port polity during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The chronicle was likely written around the middle of the fourteenth century with the purpose of legitimizing the family's rule over its kingdom. According to it, the first king of Pasai, Merah Silu, was the offspring of a bamboo girl who was found in the forest and raised by a north Sumatran king and a boy who was brought up in the forest by a white elephant.[24] Bamboo often represents the vital energy of botanical plants, and the elephant is regarded as the king of beasts. The child was therefore believed to share the powers of the flora and fauna in the Sumatran forests.

While still in his youth, Merah Silu successfully changed galley worms into gold by boiling them and tamed many wild buffalos using the powers given him by his parents. He became very rich and famous among the local people of Beruana (Bireuen), his north Sumatran coastal home. However, he had a falling out with his brother, who became highly jealous of his fame. Merah Silu then left Beruana and traveled into the headwaters of the Pasangan River to find a new home. The inland people of Buloh Telang, which according to the chronicle was a prosperous agricultural region, allowed him to stay among them. There he spent most of his time gambling. When he lost, he would pay the sum waged, but he never asked for anything when he won. He even gave every visitor a buffalo he had tamed. The people praised his wealth and generosity and agreed that he should be their king. With the support of these people, Merah Silu was able to build a city, which he named "Semudera" (Samudra=Pasai),[25] and rule over it.

Then a chief of Rimba Jeran by the name of Sultan Maliku'l-Nasar, who also claimed kingship over the people of the upper Pasangan River basin, declared war on Merah Silu. With the support of the people of Buloh Telang, Merah Silu was able to capture Maliku'l-Nasar's stronghold in the inner mountainous region of north Sumatra and bring it under his rule. The chronicle relates that one night after the victory, Merah

Silu had a dream of the Prophet Muhammad, who revealed Islam to him and told him that soon a ship would come to Pasai from Mecca carrying Syaikh Ismail. Upon his arrival, Ismail converted Merah Silu to Islam and proclaimed him Sultan Maliku'l-Saleh over the Islamic kingdom of Pasai. It was in this way that the authority of the first king of Pasai was legitimized by virtue of his bamboo-elephant heritage, his support by hinterland people of the upper Pasagan River and Islam.

Since the hinterland of Pasai produced gold, camphor and, from as late as the fifteenth century, pepper, connections with the inland people were very important to the city. The conversion to Islam was significant to Pasai in order to attract Muslim merchants from west Asia and south India. Sultan Maliku'l-Saleh was a historical figure who, according to the description on his tomb, died in 1297 (or 1307).[26] The chronicle also states that Maliku'l-Saleh's successors were generally pious Muslims. Tomé Pires, a Portuguese trader who visited Sumatra in the 1510s, relates that there were many rich Muslim merchants from Arabia, Persia and Bengal at Pasai during first half of fifteenth century.[27] Despite the fact that Pasai became one of the most prosperous coastal entrepôts in maritime Southeast Asia during that time, relations between the royal family of Pasai and the hinterland people were based upon Sumatran tradition. Sultan Maliku'l-Nasar, who had declared war on Merah Silu, may have been a Muslim as his title says, but Islam was by no means an important factor when Merah Silu first established connections with inland peoples.

Although the chronicle mentions that those inhabitants of Pasai who refused to embrace Islam fled to the upper reaches of the Pasangan River,[28] in general, good relations between Pasai and the hinterland people were closely maintained. In fact, the hinterland people who brought commercial products to Pasai while cultivating their own crops respected the authority which the royal family of Pasai claimed and associated with the Sumatran forests.[29] It was in this way that the ruler of Pasai on the coast became a mediator between the inland Sumatran world and the Islamic world, not vice versa.

Another north Sumatran chronicle eulogizing the royal family of Downstream Barus (Barus Hilir), which existed between around the beginning of the sixteenth and nineteenth century, shows an interesting agreement between a coastal ruler and the hinterland people. As mentioned above, "cannibalism" among the inland people of Barus was well documented from early on, at least in the Arabic world. The chronicle

claims that the first king of Downstream Barus, Sultan Ibrahim, traveled around its hinterland and established firm connections with the interior people.[30] He is said to have stayed with his one thousand subjects in the forest product regions of Silindung and Pasaribu and in Bakkara, one of the rice production centres on the shore of Lake Toba. The story goes that he was welcomed among those peoples and asked to be their king. The chronicle also says that Ibrahim appointed deputies in Silindung and Pasaribu and a vice-king of Sing Maharaja (Si Singa Mangaraja) in Bakkara. The reverence held by the people of these regions for Ibrahim was based on their ancestor worship that one of their holy ancestors had moved to an island off the west coast of Barus and was granted invulnerability by the Batak high god, which was also associated with agricultural productivity.[31] They perceived Ibrahim to be a mediator between them and the holy ancestor. In return, Ibrahim ordered them to bring tribute regularly to Barus, lest their agricultural productivity should wane.

The chronicle also mentions that an agreement was made between the chiefs of the hinterland nearest to Barus and the first king of Downstream Barus concerning the intrusion of outsiders,[32] to the effect that they would fight against all enemies from the sea, except the Malay people, and from the inland, except the Batak people. To the hinterland people, foreigners were very dangerous beings, because they often brought in sickness while hunting them as slaves. The Barus case suggests that the coastal ruler took responsibility for defending local hinterland people against outsiders from the sea in return for a stable supply of hinterland commodities and the defense of his rear.

In any case, Barus had become a very prosperous coastal entrepôt, according to Tomé Pires' early sixteenth century observation,[33] and during the latter part of the seventeenth century, Dutch East Indian Company sources mention that good quality camphor and benzoin were being brought to Barus by hinterland people.[34] Ties between Barus and its hinterland peoples were well maintained until the late nineteenth century, when the Dutch placed them all under their colonial regime.

This is the social context within which stories of "anthropophagy" became very important for both the coastal rulers, who needed constant supplies of inland products and the hinterland people who needed to defend themselves against intrusion by outsiders. As a matter of fact, rumours of "cannibalism" tended to be more rampant in areas such as north Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, where geographically foreigners could have made contact with inland people more easily, as compared to

south Sumatra and Java, where hinterland people generally lived far away from the coast. The relations between coastal rulers and hinterland inhabitants of north Sumatra were to some extent similar to the case of the Andamans, Nicobar and Nias, where stories of "cannibals" were also circulated by Arabian travelers and Marco Polo.[35)]

3. "Cannibalism" on the Rampage in Early Modern Sumatra

There is no doubt that Southeast Asia played a significant role in international maritime trade during the early modern period, as evidenced by merchants from both East and West making their appearance to trade in pepper, nutmeg, cloves, and everything else of value the forests and mineral deposits of the region could produce.[36)] Sumatra was no exception as one of the region's major pepper and forest product and mineral production centres. This onslaught by foreign merchants worked to forge links between coastal entrepôts and their hinterlands more tightly than ever before, and fanned the flames of cannibalism rumours among foreign travelers to a frenzy. In the words of Nicolò de' Conti, who visited north Sumatra in 1435,[37)]

> He afterwards went to a fine city of the island Taprobana, which island is called by the natives Sciamuthera[Samudra]. He remained one year in this city (which is six miles in circumference and a very noble emporium of that island), and then sailed for the space of twenty days with a favourable wind, leaving on his right hand an island called Andamania, which means the island of gold, the circumference of which is eight hundred miles. The inhabitants are cannibals. No travelers touch here unless driven so to do by bad weather, for when taken they are torn to pieces and devoured by these cruel savages. He affirms that the island of Taprobana is six thousand miles in circumference. The men are cruel and their customs brutal ...They are all idolators. In this island pepper, larger than the ordinary pepper, also long pepper, camphor, and also gold are produced in great abundance... In one part of the island called Batech[Batak], the inhabitants eat human flesh, and are in a state of constant warfare with their neighbours. They keep human heads as valuable property, for when they have captured an enemy they cut off his head, and having eaten the flesh, store up the skull and use it for money. When they desire to purchase any article, they give one or

> more heads in exchange for it according to its value, and he who has the most heads in his house is considered to be the most wealthy.

Despite the precious trade items available on the Andaman Islands and Batak, Conti, who resided in Pasai for a year, never stepped foot on either out of fear that he would be torn to pieces and devoured by the natives. Consequently, Pasai became a "fine" and "noble" emporium where foreign visitors were able to trade safely in local products. According to other European travelers, namely Tomé Pires and Mendez Pinto of the sixteenth century, the location of "Batech" appears to have been located in north Sumatra, slightly north of the present day Batak region.[38] Pires describes how Pasai merchants traded with inland people as follows.[39]

> The kingdom of Singkel is bounded on one side by the kingdom of Baros and the other by the kingdom of Melabah [Mancopa] or Daya, and in the interior by strong, savage, bestial people who eat men. This king is a heathen. This (kingdom) has benzoin, silk, some pepper, a little gold... They say that throughout this kingdom they eat men who are enemies. They trade here from Pase [Pasai] and in the kingdoms of Baros, Tico, Priaman.
>
> The kingdom of Mancopa or Daya (it has both names) is bounded on one side by Singkel and on the other side it goes almost as far as the islands hard by the land of Lambri. This king is a heathen. In the interior it is bounded by [land inhabited by] strong brutal people of the mountain range that goes above Pase and Pedir. This king's country is large. Inside the country he is a powerful warrior king. The enemies they capture they eat. They trade there from Pase and Pedir.

It is highly probable that Pasai merchants visited these west coast entrepôts through inland trade routes, which were already well established in earlier times, as McKinnon shows.[40] Pires also says that local merchants frequently traveled via inland routes between Aru and Barus.[41] To foreign travelers, however, it was no doubt very difficult to attempt direct access to the inland people located between west coast outlets and the east. Other Portuguese travelers, Barros and Barboza, also mention that "cannibals" dwelled inland.[42]

After developing into a powerful coastal state from the 1530s until the first half of the seventeenth century, Aceh brought both the north

Sumatran ports and the gold and pepper producing west coast outlets of Tiku, Pariaman and Salida in central Sumatra under its control, and in the process, caused a new wave of cannibal-phobia among foreign visitors concerning also the hinterland of central Sumatra. French commodore, A. de Beaulieu, who resided in Aceh for about seven months during 1621 related,[43)]

> It is very certain, there is a great deal of Gold to be found in this Island ...This Gold the Natives truck with the Inhabitants of Manimcabo [Minangkabau] for Rice, Arms, and Cotton Cloth, and with those of Pariaman for Pepper, Salt, Surat Cloth, and Musulipatan Steel. Ticow, and other Kingdoms, they have but little Commerce with. As for Strangers, they have no Dealings with them, but murder and eat them where-ever they catch them, as well as their Enemies...

Rumours of "cannibalism" in the hinterland by no means connote that relations between coastal cities and their hinterlands were disrupted. To the contrary, such relations in Sumatra were temporarily disrupted during the eleventh century by expeditions of Cola from south India and in the 1530s by the rise of Aceh. Foreigners at these times did actually venture inland and made direct contact with hinterland people. South Indian merchants of the eleventh and twelfth centuries entered into north Sumatra and established commercial networks there, as McKinnon states.[44)] Also, in 1539 a Portuguese traveler, Mendez Pinto, entered the "Bata kingdom" in the hinterland of Singkil and took part in the war against Aceh. No description of "cannibalism" appears either in the Tamil inscriptions or Pinto's accounts of the inland people. To the contrary, Pinto prefers to describe the cruelty of the king of Aceh toward his enemies.[45)] "Cannibal" stories resurfaced in the later writings of Marco Polo and Odoric, rather than the Cola expeditions, and also in the account of visitors like Beaulieu after Aceh conquered the port kingdoms of north and central Sumatra and became a powerful coastal state; that is, as soon as relations between coastal rulers and hinterland people were reestablished.

Rumours of "cannibalism" in the hinterland of Aceh and the inner region of Minangkabau were toned down during the latter part of the seventeenth century and disappeared altogether in the eighteenth century, partly because most of the hinterland inhabitants there had been con-

verted to Islam and partly because they were occasionally open to foreign visitors. From the end of the seventeenth century, Aceh expanded the cultivation of pepper and rice by sending colonists into the hinterlands of both the east and west coasts of north Sumatra. Then after Aceh's influence on the west coast of central Sumatra declined, Minangkabau chiefs began to make direct contact with the Dutch, resulting in the Painan treaty with the Dutch East Indian Company in 1663.[46] On the other hand, foreigners continued to face difficulty in gaining access to the inland region between Barus and Deli (Aru) until the nineteenth century,[47] due to the ability of the coastal rulers of Barus, Singkil, Deli, Batubara and Asahan to control and intermediate trade between foreign merchants and the hinterland peoples.

4. European Travelers and Local Informants

Rumours of "cannibalism" in the Batak region attracted more and more attention from Europeans as they started to become more and more interested in the inner regions of north Sumatra for both commercial and colonial interests. From the latter part of the eighteenth century, the British established trading posts in north Sumatra, at such places as Natal, Tapanuli and Barus, selling cheaper cotton clothing manufactured in India than what was being supplied by the Dutch. In order to expand their business, the British started to peddle their wares further into the inner regions from those trading posts.

In 1772, the British East Indian Company ordered two of its employees, Miller and Holloway, to venture into the hinterland of Tapanuli in order to establish direct commercial ties with the inhabitants there who gathered cassia bark.[48] So the two took a journey up to Batangonan, one of the main gathering spots of forest products, to get some information about cassia. The villagers were, however, uncooperative because of their firm connections with the royal family of Downstream Barus. While at Lumut, one of the nearby Tapanuli villages, the two Englishman noticed a human skull hanging in front of the village's guest house. The village chief explained to them that it was the skull of an enemy whose body had been eaten two months previous. So much for the cassia bark trade in the hinterland.

On the other hand, the Batak people under the influence of the British made use of the cannibalism hype in order to gain the latter's support for the endless civil wars they were conducting. For example, in

1775 a Batak chief by the name of Niabin launched an attack on a neighbouring village and killed its chief.[49] The victimized village happened to be under the influence of the British, who had a post at Natal. The family of the murdered chief complained to the head of the Natal post, a fellow by the name of Nairne, that the body of the dead chief had been carried off and eaten by Niabin. Nairne accepted their prayer for redress and set out with a party of fifty or sixty soldiers for Niabin's village to avenge the dead chief. However, the village was tightly defended. A fight ensued and Nairne himself and two of his soldiers were shot to death by the villagers. The rest of the English troops were forced to retreat, only managing to bring back Nairne's body to the post, leaving the other two slain bodies near the village. After arriving at the post, they reported to the British authorities that the two were more than likely eaten by the villagers, arguing that north Sumatrans outside the influence of the British were cruel "cannibalists."

Batak chiefs were always ready to become mediators between there local "cannibals" and Europeans. After the establishment of their base at Penang and Singapore, the British became more actively involved in foreign trade around the Strait of Malacca. In 1823, the English East India Company sent J. Anderson, a staff member at Penang to north Sumatra in order to expand British trade networks. After visiting such main coastal cities as Deli, Serdang, Batubara and Asahan, Anderson decided to sail upstream from Asahan to the trading point of Muntopanei, whose inhabitants were generally Bataks. He was welcomed by a powerful Batak chief, who, according to Anderson, held authority over twenty villages and frequently traveled down to Asahan to trade.[50] The chief spoke to Anderson in fluent Malay with a friendly tone. In the conversation that ensued, Anderson asked the chief about the custom of "cannibalism" in the area. The chief then ordered a villager to bring the skull of a victim whom he said had been eaten six days previous. Anderson was strongly impressed by the chief's explanation that the corpse had been devoured in about five minutes. However, the chief graciously offered to play an intermediary role in any further relations between the Company and the Batak "cannibals."

In 1824 Lieutenant-Governor of Bengkulen, Thomas Stamford Raffles, sent two Baptist missionaries to Silindung in the hinterland of Tapanuli, in order to make direct contact with the inland people. The two missionaries were welcomed by a local Batak chief who occasionally visited Tapanuli for trade and invited them to stay in his village. They en-

joyed his hospitality for ten days, during which they observed that Silindung was a very fertile area and that the chief was of so friendly a nature that he even entertained a visitor from an enemy village with hospitality and allowed him to depart without violence.[51] They also had occasion to ask the chief about whether or not he had eaten human flesh. The chief replied that he and his villagers had executed and eaten the twenty robbers who had occasionally attacked traders between Silindung and Tapanuli the year before,[52] suggesting that his form of "cannibalism" was being done in a righteous effort to defend the trade economy.

By the London Treaty of 1824 concluded between England and the Netherlands, Sumatra was again made a Dutch territory, and the British retired from the island. The Dutch reestablished its post at Padang on the west coast of Sumatra and forthwith became involved in the Padri war against the Minangkabau Muslim reformists who were trying to solidify trade networks in both the Minangkabau and Batak regions.[53] Then in 1834 the Dutch sent two American missionaries from the Boston Society to Silindung to establish a missionary station in the Batak region for the purpose of cutting off Islamic influence coming in from Minangkabau. However, the two were ironically suspected of being Muslim reformists by the people of Silindung, who had been attacked during the late 1820s and early 1830s by Padri Muslims, resulting in their being killed by the villagers of Hutatinggi at the point of entry into Silindung. The Dutch perceived that the two had been eaten by the local people.[54]

After finally suppressing the Padri movement in 1837, the Dutch annexed the Minankabau and south Batak regions into their territory and forced them to cultivate coffee from the beginning of the 1840s.[55] In order to extend their influence further over the neighbouring Batak region, where the two missionaries had been killed, the Dutch ordered F. Junghuhn, a physician, to explore the region.[56] Junghuhn stayed in the Angkola and Toba Batak regions for a year and a half during 1840-41 with the assistance of the Batak chiefs who had decided to cooperate with the Dutch. These chiefs were more or less aware that Junghuhn was highly concerned about "cannibalism" among the Batak people. One of them, Guru Sembilan of Silindung, guided Junghuhn to Hutatinggi and told him that the village which had once been populous and prosperous declined in both aspects after the villagers ate the missionaries. Junghuhn states in his book that the village declined into a poor hamlet as the result of God's vengeance.[57] The chief's statement can be inter-

preted as part of the cooperative attitude he decided to show toward the Dutch authorities.

Junghuhn claims that he saw victims being eaten on three different occasions during his stay in the Batak region. For example,[58)]

> [When a hated enemy is captured] the day is set upon which he should be eaten. Then messengers are sent to all allied chiefs inviting them to be present at the feast... Hundreds of people stream to the village. The victim is usually taken out of the village, but the feast is also held in the village, if it is large enough to receive all spectators. The captive is the bound to a stake in an upright position, a number of fires are lit around him, musical instruments are played, and all the customary ceremonies are observed... Usually the chief of the village where the ceremony takes place, steps forward draws his knife addresses the people... He explains that the victim is an utter scoundrel, and in fact not a human being at all, but a devil (*begu*) in human form, and that the time has come for him to atone for his misdeeds. During this address the audience waters at the mouth and feels an irresistible impulse to get a piece of the criminal in their stomachs, since this will reassure everyone that he will do them no further harm. This is the rationale they themselves use to explain their desire of cannibalism. They say that the pleasure which they feel in satisfying their revenge in this manner and the consoling quiet which it gives them cannot be compared to anything else. They all draw their knives. The raja or the insulted person cuts off the first piece, which varies according to his taste, being either a slice of the forearm or a cheek, if it is fat enough. That is his priviledge. He holds up the flesh and drinks with gusto some of the blood streaming from it. Then he hastens to the fire to roast the meat a bit before devouring it.

Junghuhn also mentions that such open executions were carried out in Silindung, Sigomplon and the upstream region of Bila. However, verifying whether the above description was really based on his own eyewitness experience is again of secondary importance to the purpose here. What is more important is that his descriptions were mostly based on information from the Batak chiefs, who would not have been reluctant to talk about "cannibalism" because Junghuhn was eager to find out as much as he could about the subject. They told him about a chief of

Bandernahor in Silindung who ate war prisoners in secret and another chief of Sihijuk in Angkola was so addicted to human flesh that he ate his slaves on a regular basis.[59] Junghuhn devoted one chapter of his book, "Ueber den Cannibalismus der Battaër insbesondere" (With special reference to Batak cannibalism) to such stories told to him by the Batak chiefs, who were intent on inducing Junghuhn to create an image of their region among Europeans as having a very unique custom.

After Junghuhn's exploration, the Dutch authorities proclaimed in 1842 that the Batak region of Angkola, Sigompulan, Silindung, Sipahutar, Pangaribuan, Sigotom and Silantom, where Junghuhn had stayed, was to be annexed into their colonial territory.[60] Although the Dutch control over these places commenced only from the 1870s, the colonial government was convinced that local influential chiefs were generally willing to submit to Dutch rule. The role of these chiefs as mediators between the Dutch and local people was highly appreciated by the colonial authorities.

5. The Final Stage of Talk about "Cannibalism"

Rumours about "cannibalism" did not flourish whenever relations between the Batak chiefs and the Europeans were disrupted in some manner. For example, as part of the Dutch colonial government's attempt to put the whole territory of Sumatra under its influence, from 1861, German Lutheran missionaries sent by the Rhenish Missionary Society began activities in Angkola and then spread into the Toba Batak region.[61] Some Toba Batak people were willing to accept the German missionaries and showed cooperative attitudes toward the Dutch authorities, while others were afraid of the transformation of power balances occurring among the people and resorted to protesting against Europeans under the banner of their holy king, Si Singa Mangaraja.[62] Under such disruptive circumstances, the most urgent theme for the Batak people became understanding the ultimate source of power that was causing changes in their society and how to gain access to it. "Cannibalism" did not become a major concern among the German missionaries, Dutch colonial officials or the Toba Batak people during that time.

Talk of "cannibalism" did flourish when foreigners entered regions where relations with the local people were well maintained. By the end of the nineteenth century, not only Mandailing, where the Dutch had introduced compulsory coffee cultivation since the 1840s, but also most of

the regions of Angkola, Toba, Simalungun and Karo had come under Dutch influence, while another Batak region, Pakpak, was able to maintain its independence from European influence. European travelers who visited the Pakpak region between the 1880s and the turn of the century were told by their informants that they themselves had eaten large numbers of human beings.

In 1887, a German traveler, J. F. von Brenner, explored Pakpak and the northern part of the Toba region, both of which were still independent from Dutch control. In order to travel through the regions, von Brenner received financial and personnel support from the European plantation companies which were busy developing tobacco estates in Deli and Karo, as well as from the Dutch colonial authorities and the Rhenish Missionary Society.[63] His travelogue was later published in book form as *Besuch bei den Kannibalen Sumatras* (A visit among the Sumatran cannibals). His descriptions about "cannibalism" among the Pakpak people were again based on information given by a local, apparently cooperative chief in Pengambatan near Karo. The chief explained to von Brenner that he and his villagers had eaten eleven Chinese coolies who had escaped from the plantations.[64]

A similar case can be found in the report of a Dutch commandant, J. C. J. Kempees, who joined the expedition from Aceh through Gayo and Alas to the Batak region led by O. van Daalen in 1904 against Aceh warriors. Pakpak bordered on the Alas region, where Aceh guerillas had been conducting operations against the Dutch since 1873. When Kempees and his comrades marched into Pakpak after pacifying the Gayo and Alas regions, they were greeted by a local chief in Kutaraja, who informed the Dutch commandant that he and his villagers had previously attacked and eaten thirteen Aceh people who had been hiding near their village.[65]

After van Daalen's expedition, the Pakpak people themselves began to fear that they would before long be also put under Dutch rule, and they were also aware that the Europeans generally looked upon them as "cannibals." When another German traveler, W. Volz explored the Pakpak region in 1905 at the request of the Dutch authorities, his informant from Kutausan near Kutaraja, who was around the age of fifty, told him that he had eaten the flesh of more than fifty men.[66] Under a situation in which foreign travelers generally regarded the Pakpak people as "cannibals," Volz's informant had claimed to be himself "a voracious cannibal" in order to live up to his role as bona fide source of informa-

tion for the German traveler. Based on his informant's testimony, Volz assumed that the informant had eaten fifty men during his twenty five-year adult life and concluded that every Pakpak adult probably ate an average of two men per year. While Volz was still in Pakpak, another rumour of "cannibalism" reached him and the Dutch officials, according to which during a civil war among the villages in Kepas, located in the central part of Pakpak, eight women had been eaten,[67] an extraordinary event among the Batak people, since the usual custom was to execute male adults in such a way. Whether the rumour was true or not is not as important as the attempt by Pakpak informants to persuade Volz that cannibalist customs among the Pakpak people were far beyond European understanding.

It was in 1908 that all of the Batak regions, including Pakpak, were placed under Dutch rule,[68] and those Toba Batak and Pakpak Batak chiefs who showed cooperative attitudes towards the Dutch were appointed colonial chiefs, who were expected by the colonial authorities to act as mediators between the local people and the colonial government. It was in this way that they succeeded in maintaining their positions of leadership under colonial rule, but only while they themselves were alive, for the post was not always passed on to their descendants. Furthermore, from about 1915 on, the colonial government began appointing to the posts of district and assistant district chief (*demang, assistent demang*) Batak officials who had been educated at the Training School for Native Chiefs or had been working directly under Dutch colonial officials, giving them positions above the local Batak chiefs.[69] Also, assistant district chiefs were allowed to come into direct contact with common villagers in the course of their duties. The Batak chiefs who had played an intermediary role between the local people and the Dutch began to be removed from the important political scenes and were transformed into mere messengers of the colonial government. Finally, after the Dutch put the Batak region under their control, the colonial government prohibited "cannibalism," which consequently passed into the realm of Batak historical tradition.

Conclusion

From the early centuries of the Christian era to the beginning of the twentieth century, stories of "cannibalism" being practiced in inland north Sumatra were frequently told and retold among foreign travelers.

Local informants played a significant role in the circulation of such stories and in creating the image of the typical inland "cannibal." The north Sumatran case suggests that European travelers were most of the time told of the "savage" and "cruel" aspects of local people by those informants rather than discovering them themselves.

The development of these "cannibal" rumours does not necessarily imply any difficulty for foreign merchants to trade in north Sumatran products; rather, the stories tell us that relationships between coastal entrepôts and their hinterlands had been well established and stable, and that foreign visitors were able to safely trade in all local products whenever they chose to stop at one of the entrepôts. It is also interesting that the same type of rumours once flourished in other areas, like Latin America, Africa and Japan (in the later part of the thirteenth century, according to Marco Polo[70]) in a historical context similar to Sumatra. These other areas were also well-known for precious mineral deposits, and there were also locations where it was generally difficult for foreigners to directly trade with inland producers without some local intermediary. In addition, people were exposed to the danger of being commandeered into the slave trade, especially in Latin America and Africa.[71]

The prosperity of coastal entrepôts and the spread of rumours about "cannibalism" in their hinterlands can be considered opposite sides of the same coin. It is very probable that a classic type of "cannibal" story about Sumatra was formed during the early centuries, at the time when basic relations between coastal outlets and the hinterlands were established. Although there is one argument suggesting that the north Sumatran coast was probably isolated during the Śrīvijaya era because of its "cannibal" reputation, the ninth and tenth century Arabic materials mentioned above and also the Chinese *I-tsing* of the seventh century[72] tell us that foreigners often visited the north coastal entrepôts in early times. Also, Pasai and Aceh became prosperous, cosmopolitan port cities during the early modern era, despite rampant talk of inland "cannibalism" among their many foreigner visitors. The existence of "cannibalism" rumours during those times give us a very interesting and helpful perspective on the maritime history of Southeast Asia, especially concerning trade relationships developed among foreign visitors, coastal rulers and producers in the hinterland.

However, after the Dutch placed these coastal cities under their authority, the major intermediary role between foreigners and local people shifted to inland chiefs, who became informants for the European travel-

ers regarding local customs, including plenty of details about "cannibalism" among the Batak people. These rumours about north Sumatra vanished after the Dutch established colonial rule over the inland regions at the beginning of the twentieth century. The basic reasons for the disappearance was not only a colonial ban on the local custom of executing wounded prisoners and adulterers, but also the loss of the intermediary (informant) status held by Batak local chiefs and their replacement by colonial district and sub-district chiefs who were allowed make direct contact with local people in the performance of their duties. As local chiefs lost their importance as mediators, their stories about "cannibalism" lost their meaning.

Although the research on anthropophagy to date has inclined to pay specific attention to the bias of Westerners towards the exotic nature of non-Western cultures and customs, it is a fact that, at least on Sumatra, the descriptions of those Westerners regarding these cultures and customs were more times than not influenced by their local informants rather than direct observation. This article has been an attempt to reexamine the process of how the image of one particular custom, "cannibalism," was created in north Sumatra and the important role played by local informants in creating it.

NOTES

1) W. Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy*, (New York, 1979).
2) Such a view that maintains there is a fundamental distinction between East and West has been called "Orientalism" [E. W. Said, *Orientalism*, (New York,1978), and M. Vickery, *Bali: A Paradise Created*, (Hong Kong, 1990), pp. 77–130].
3) A couple of relevant works regarding this point are J. van der Putten, "Taalvorsers en hun informanten in Indië in de 19e eeuw: Von de Wall als politiek agent in Riau?", *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land-en Volkenkunde*, vol. 151, no. 1, (1995), pp. 44-75, and 弘末雅士『東南アジアの港市世界：地域社會の形成と世界秩序』，岩波書店，2004年，[M. Hirosue, *The Southeast Asian Port-City: Its Intermediary Role in the Establishment of the Local and World Order*, (Tokyo, 2004)].
4) See, for example, G. R. Tibbetts, *A Study of the Arabic Texts Containing Materials on Southeast Asia*, (Leiden and London, 1979), pp. 25–28, F. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill trans., *Chau Ju-Kua: His Work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the twelfth and thirteenth Centuries, entitled Chu-fan-chi*, (St. Petersburg, 1911), p. 150, H. Yule ed. and trans., *The Book of Ser Marco Polo: The Venetian Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, vol. 2, (London, 1903), p. 284

and pp. 292–294, and Stanley of Alderley ed., *The First Voyage round the World, by Magellan: Translated from the Accounts of Pigafetta, and Other Contemporary Writers*, (London, 1874), pp. 148–150.

5) *Hsin-T'angshu*, 222B (『新唐書』巻二百二十二下).
6) Tibbetts, *A Study of the Arabic Texts*, pp. 25–28.
7) J. Anderson, *Mission to the East Coast of Sumatra in 1823*, reprint, (Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, London and New York, 1971), pp. 147–148.
8) O. W. Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce: A Study of the Origins of Śrīvijaya*, (Ithaca, 1967), pp. 194–196.
9) G. E. Gerni, *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia*, (London, 1909), pp. 427–446, and Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce*, p. 181.
10) P. Pelliot, "Le Fou-nan", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, vol. 3, (1903), p.264, and Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce*, pp. 259–260.
11) For example, see R. Heine-Geldern, "Le pays de P'i-k'ien, le Roi au Grand Cou et le Singa Mangaradja", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, vol. 49, (1959), pp. 24–25.
12) Tibbetts, *Arabic Texts*, p. 25.
13) *Ibid*., p. 28.
14) *Ibid*., p. 45.
15) See also J. Drakard, "An Indian Ocean Port: Sources for the Earlier History of Barus", *Archipel*, vol. 37, (1989), pp. 56–65.
16) Tibbetts, *Arabic Texts*, p. 52, 56 and 58. Although the twelfth century Chinese record, *Liangwai Taita* 嶺外代答 and *Chu-Fanchi* 諸蕃志 of the thirteenth century make no explicit reference to the custom of eating human flesh in Sumatra, the latter mentions that people in Kampar (east coast) and Lambri were warlike and boasted to one another about how many men they had killed (Hirth and Rockhill, *Chau Ju-kua*, pp. 71–72).
17) W. Volz, *Nord-Sumatra*, vol. 2, (Berlin, 1909), p. 320, and F. Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra*, vol. 2, (Berlin, 1847), pp. 156-157, and E. M. Loeb, *Sumatra: Its History and People*, reprint, (Kuala Lumpur and Jakarta, 1972), pp. 34-36.
18) Yule, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, vol. 2, p. 292.
19) *Ibid*., p. 284.
20) *Ibid*., pp. 293–294.
21) Anderson, *Mission to the East Coast of Sumatra*, pp. 34–35.
22) H. Cordier ed., *Les voyages en Asie au quatorzième siècle du bienheureux Frère Odoric de Pordenone*, (Paris, 1891), p. 136.
23) A. Cortesão ed. and trans., *The Suma Oriental of Tomé Pires*, vol. 1, (London, 1944), p. 163, and M. L. Dames ed. and trans., *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, vol. 2, (London, 1921), p. 188.
24) A. H. Hill ed., "Hikayat Raja-Raja Pasai", *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 33, part 2, (June, 1960), pp. 46–59.
25) Later the centre of the kingdom moved to Pasai, which was slightly upstream Samudra. After the island itself began to be called Sumatra after "Samudra," the kingdom was then generally called Pasai.

26) G. W. Drewes, "New Light on the Coming of Islam to Indonesia?", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, vol. 124, (1968), pp. 444–457, and A. H. Johns, "Islamization in Southeast Asia: Reflections and Reconsiderations with Special Reference to the Role of Sufism",『東南アジア研究』(*Southeast Asian Studies*), vol. 31, no. 1, (June, 1993), pp. 48–49.
27) Cortesão, *The Suma Oriental*, vol. 2, p. 240.
28) Hill, "Hikayat Raja-Raja Pasai", p. 59.
29) Pires mentions that the wishes of the hinterland people who brought pepper and forest products to Pasai would always prevail whenever disputes arose between them and the port city. (Cortesão, *The Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, p. 143). Also see K. R. Hall, "The Coming of Islam to the Archipelago: A Reassessment", in *Economic Exchange and Social Interaction in Southeast Asia: Perspectives from Prehistory, History, and Ethnography*, ed. by K. L. Hutterer, (Ann Arbor, 1977), pp. 223–224.
30) J. Drakard ed., *Sejarah Raja-Raja Barus*, (Jakarta and Bandung, 1988), pp. 194–202. This chronicle, *Sejarah Tuanku Batubadan*, was written during 1834–1872 and contains oral traditions among the royal family of Downstream Barus.
31) W. K. H. Ypes, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van de stamverwantschap, de inheemsche rechtsgemeenschappen en het grondenrecht der Toba- en Dairibataks*, (Leiden, 1932), pp. 423–424, and Heine-Geldern, "Le pay de P'i-k'ien", pp. 385–393.
32) Cortesão, *The Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, pp. 161–162.
33) VOC 1272, "Raport vanden ondercoopman Francois Backer aengaendesijn verrichiten voor Baros", (30 Aug. 1669), p. 1067, and J. Drakard, *A Malay Frontier: Unity and Duality in a Sumatran Kingdom*, (Ithaca, 1990), pp. 34–35.
34) Drakard, *Sejarah*, p. 205.
35) Tibbetts, *Arabic Texts*, p. 25, 45, 50, 56 and 58. Yule, *The Book*, vol. 2, p. 309. Furthermore, stories of island "cannibals" were often provided by rival islanders. For example, Pigafetta refers to "cannibal" stories in the early modern Molucca islands under the influence of Ternate told by an informant from Tidore (Stanley of Alderley ed., *The First Voyage round the World, by Magellan*, pp. 148–150) and see also Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, pp. 45–48.
36) A. Reid, *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450–1680*, vol. 2, (New Haven and London, 1993), pp. 1–131.
37) Nicolò de' Conti, "The Travels of Nicolò Conti, in the East" in *India in the Fifteenth Century*, ed., by R. H. Major, (London, 1857), pp. 8–9.
38) Cortesão, *The Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, pp. 145-146, and A. Vambery ed. and H. Cogan trans., *The Voyages and Adventures of Fernand Mendez Pinto, the Portuguese*, (London, 1891), pp. 36–43.
39) Cortesão, *The Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, p. 163.
40) E. E. McKinnon, "Kota Cina", (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted to Cornell University, 1984), pp. 336–342.
41) Cortesão, *The Suma Oriental*, vol. 1, p. 148.
42) M. L. Dames, *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, vol. 2, p. 188, and W. Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, reprint, (Kuala Lumpur, New York, London and

Melbourne, 1966), pp. 390–391.
43) "The Expedition of Commodore Beaulieu to the East-Indies", in *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca: A Complete Collection of Voyages and Travels*, ed. by J. Harris, (London, 1744), vol. 1, p. 742.
44) E. E. McKinnon, "New Light on the Indianization of the Karo Batak", in *Cultures and Societies of North Sumatra*, ed. by R. Carle, (Berlin and Hamburg, 1987), pp. 81–110.
45) A. Vambery, *Adventures of Mendez Pinto*, p. 44.
46) J. Kathirithamby-Wells, "Achehnese Control over West Sumatra up to the Treaty of Painan, 1663", *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, vol. 10, no. 3, (1969), pp. 453–479.
47) Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, pp. 388–395, and A. S. Bickmore, *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago*, (London, 1868), pp. 424–425.
48) Marsden, *The History of Sumatra*, pp. 369–373.
49) *Ibid*., p. 394.
50) Anderson, *Mission to the East Coast of Sumatra*, pp. 143–154.
51) "Verslag van eene reis in het land der Bataks, in het binnenland van Sumatra, ondernomen in het jaar 1824, door de Heeren Burton en Ward, zendelingen der Baptisten", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, vol. 5, (1856), pp. 275–305.
52) *Ibid*., pp. 299–300.
53) C. Dobbin, *Islamic Revivalism in a Changing Peasant Economy: Central Sumatra, 1784–1847,* (Copenhagen, 1983), pp. 117–192.
54) S. Coolsma, *De Zendingseeuw voor Nederlandsch Oost-Indië*, (Utrecht, 1901), pp. 305–306.
55) Dobbin, *Islamic Revivalism*, pp. 229–230, and M. Joustra, *Batakspiegel*, (Leiden, 1910), p. 37.
56) C. M. Pleyte, "De verkenning der Bataklanden", *Tijdschrift der Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, vol. 12, (1895), p. 80.
57) Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer*, vol. 2, p. 113.
58) *Ibid*., pp. 158–159, and Loeb, *Sumatra*, p. 35.
59) *Ibid*., pp. 161–162.
60) Joustra, *Batakspiegel*, p.31.
61) Coolsma, *De Zendingseeuw*, pp. 310–384.
62) W. B. Sidjabat, *Ahu Si Singamangaraja: Arti Historis, Politis, Ekonomis dan Religius Si Singamangaraja XII*, (Jakarta, 1982), pp. 151–318, and M. Hirosue, "The Batak Millenarian Response to the Colonial Order", *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 331–344.
63) J. F. von Brenner, *Besuch bei den Kannibalen Sumatras: Erste Durchquerung der unabhängigen Batak-Lande*, (Würzburg, 1894), pp. i–iv.
64) *Ibid*., p. 209.
65) J. C. Kempees, *De tocht van Overste van Daalen door Gayō, Alas- en Bataklanden*, (Amsterdam, n. d.), p. 199.
66) Volz, *Nord-Sumatra*, vol. 1, pp. 323–325.
67) *Ibid*., p. 323.

68) Joustra, *Batakspiegel*, p. 33.
69) B. J. Haga, "Influence of the Western Administration on the Native Community in the Outer Provinces", in *The Effect of Western Influence on Native Civilisations in the Malay Archipelago*, ed. by B. Schrieke, (Batavia, 1929), pp. 178–179, and M. Joustra, *Kroniek 1913–1917*, (Leiden, 1918), p. 14.
70) Yule, *Travels of Marco Polo*, vol. 2, p. 264.
71) Arens suggests very interestingly cases that Indios and Africans believed that Europeans were "cannibals," while European visitors generally wrote that Indios and Africans were "cannibals." Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, p. 20 and 59.
72) E. Chavannes trans., *Voyages des pèlerins Bouddhistes: Les Religieux éminents qui allèrent chercher la loi dans les pays d'Occident: Mémoire composé à l'époque de la grande dynastie T'ang par I-tsing*, (Paris, 1894), pp. 36–37, and J. Takakusu, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671–695)by I-tsing*, (Oxford, 1896), p. xi.