

CULTURAL HISTORY OF THE PACIFIC AND THE BARK CLOTH MAKING IN CENTRAL SULAWESI

Eija-Maija Kotilainen
University of Helsinki

Archaeologists, anthropologists and linguists are now in general agreement about the prehistory of the Austronesian-speakers, but most details are still obscure. The Philippines and the eastern part of Indonesia (Sulawesi, Ceram, Halmahera, Irian Jaya) in particular have received very little attention in research into the cultures of the Pacific region and the settling of the area by the Austronesian peoples.

Using ethnographical and linguistic evidence bark cloth making has generally been considered a common feature of the Austronesian-speakers who spread from Southeast Asia into Pacific (see Bellwood 1978, 1985). In this paper I examine in some detail the bark cloth production of the Kaili-Pamona speakers¹ in Central Sulawesi (Celebes) and discuss how the study of their bark cloth may add to research into the cultural history of the Austronesian peoples.

Simon Kooijman (1972: 431–32) has extensively compared the bark cloth tradition of the Eastern Indonesian peoples with Polynesian *tapa* complex and has found a number of common features. His research clearly indicates that the techniques used and results gained in the Central Sulawesi bark cloth tradition were far superior to those of other areas, approaching paper in their

How to cite this book chapter:

Kotilainen, E. (2021). Cultural History of the Pacific and the Bark Cloth Making in Central Sulawesi. In J. Siikala (ed.), *Culture and History in the Pacific* (pp. 202–216). Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. <https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-12-13>

fineness. This is one reason why the Kaili-Pamona speakers of Central Sulawesi are an interesting group as regards the cultural history of the Pacific, and the origin of bark cloth manufacture in particular. In addition, Kaili-Pamona bark cloth making is well documented by descriptions and objects in museum collections.

Kaili-Pamona speakers have preserved in their culture until this century a number of features which were present within linguistically reconstructed Proto-Malayo-Polynesian society. The preservation of these cultural features among them was aided by the fact that the region they inhabited in the mountains in the centre of the island was difficult to traverse, and by the nature of their culture. Their religion was based on ancestor worship, and the will of the deceased ancestors determined the fate of people. According to Adriani and Kruyt (1951 II:2) the life of the To Pamona (the East Toraja) in the 1890's was dominated above all by the thought of doing nothing that the ancestors had not done before in order to avoid their displeasure. These ancestors watched over the continuing observation of the ancient customs, and they punished everyone who went against them.

This "way of the ancestors" coincided well with the reconstructed culture of Proto-Malayo-Polynesian society. According to their tradition Job's-tears and millet were known to the To Pamona earlier than rice. Many old To Pamona told Adriani and Kruyt that, before rice, people ate only Job's-tears and millet. At the end of the 19th century people still planted Job's-tears and millet in small amounts "so that the food of the ancestors may not be lost, inasmuch as they have handed it down to us so that we might preserve it" (Adriani and Kruyt 1951 III:152-53). Some To Pamona claimed that their ancestors ate only yam and taro. Before the arrival of the Dutch Government in Central Sulawesi, the To Pamona cultivated their rice solely in dry fields. (Adriani and Kruyt 1951 III:3, 7.)

Adriani and Kruyt (1951 III:253) also suggested that the To Pamona did not become familiar with buffaloes until relatively recent times. Pigs, chickens and dogs were commonly kept as domesticated animals, and they also played a central role as sacrificial animals. Most reconstructed features of early Austronesian tribal societies mentioned by Bellwood (1985: 150-58), such as headhunting, bark cloth making, betel chewing, megalith constructions, secondary burial rituals, shamanism, beliefs centered on spirit animism and ancestor cults were all still present in the culture of the Kaili-Pamona speakers at the end of the 19th century.

Bark cloth is still made in some parts of western Central Sulawesi. The Swedish zoologist and ethnologist Walter Kaudern wrote

(1921 II:5) that traditional handicrafts still flourished in the southwestern parts of Central Sulawesi when he visited the region in 1917–1920, and local products still had not been ousted by European or Japanese goods. True, factory-made cotton fabrics had already spread among the highlanders, but the people there still had not assimilated the manner of clothing of the coastal region and made clothes of cotton according to the traditional designs used for bark cloth garments.

Bark cloth in Central Sulawesi at the beginning of the 20th century

When Kaudern visited Sulawesi in 1917–1920, bark cloth (*fuya*,² as the Dutch called it) was still being made by the To Lore, To Kulawi and To Pipikoro living in the centre of the island. Along the coasts where Buginese culture had long been influential the making of bark cloth had been discontinued much earlier, even in the Palu Valley. Only in a couple of villages further south did people still make thin, white bark cloth; the inhabitants did not use it themselves, however, but sold it.

Large quantities of bark cloth were bought by the Chinese, who took it to China where it was used to enshroud corpses and as a protective layer inside wooden vessels when they lined them with a layer of sheet copper. Also the Gorontaloese and the Minahassans bought bark cloth from Central Sulawesi and traded it further. Adriani and Kruyt (1912 II:326, 1951 III:301) wrote that a representative of the Chinese firm Sie Boen Tjong in Gorontalo, who had been engaged in extensive trade in the Gulf of Tomini since 1857, said that during the last century bark cloth was an important item for export to Surabaya and Singapore, where it was used as an underlayer in connection with the coppering of vessels. This indicates that bark cloth might earlier have been a significant article of commerce in some areas.

By the time Kaudern visited Lindu (the West Torajas) the local people were no longer making bark cloth and bought it from Kulawi instead. But when the missionaries Adriani and Kruyt visited area in 1897, three out of nine villages were still making bark cloth (Kaudern 1921 II:7). The making of bark cloth enjoyed a revival during the slump of the 1920s in Central Sulawesi, when there were no other fabrics available (Adriani and Kruyt 1951 III:273).

The garment traditionally worn by To Kaili men, and still worn by Tole men when the Finnish missionary Edvard Rosenlund stayed in the area in the 1920s, consisted of a shoulder cloth (*kumu*) made of bark cloth. The *kumu* is a cylinder-like garment about two metres long usually worn folded over the shoulder. Even at the beginning of the 20th century it was still a vital element of clothing, but by that time it was made of cotton. In addition men also wore trousers, a head cloth, a knife, and a bag containing tobacco, lime and betel, and a fur *palape* which was a little mat attached by a tie around the waist. The knee-length trousers like swimming trunks generally worn by men were also made of cotton. (Kaudern 1921 II:37–39; Rosenlund, n.d.(a))

At the beginning of the 20th century women were still wearing their traditional costumes in Central Sulawesi (Kaudern 1921 II:39). Adriani and Kruyt also reported (1951 III:273) meeting women who as late as the 1890s did not wish to wear cotton clothes, preferring bark cloth. And for sacrificial festivals, in particular, all women would wear bark clothes.

The fact that the bark cloth garments remained in ceremonial use after being replaced by cotton and other manufactured fabrics for everyday wear is an indication of the religious and magic connotations given to the bark cloth. White, painted bark cloth played a particularly important role in rituals. The bark cloth blouses also reflect the gradual penetration of the area by the outside world. The first sign was the use of cotton thread and pieces of single-coloured cotton cloth in the ornamentation of the blouses, then the use of patterned cotton fabrics and imported colours instead of natural ones. Finally the imported fabrics superseded the bark cloth altogether, first in men's and then in women's wear.

In speaking of the influence of Christianity on the use of bark cloth Adriani and Kruyt (1951 III:273–74) wrote that, following their conversion to Christianity, the To Pamona ceased to use it during their sacrificial rites and other events where man came into contact with the God. However, they continued to believe that the female leader of the harvest should be dressed in bark cloth, that the corpse of a deceased person should be wrapped in at least one piece of bark cloth, and that a widow should wear a headband, jacket or a shawl *of fuya* as a sign of her widowhood.

Special features of bark cloth making in Central Sulawesi

In speaking of bark cloth making in Central Sulawesi I refer chiefly to the accounts given by Adriani and Kruyt (1901: 441–, 1912 II:314–, 1951 III:301–), which mainly described the making of bark cloth by the To Pamona. The brief descriptions by Edvard Rosenlund (*Catalogue of the National Museum of Finland* VK 5002: 1) and H.C. Raven (1932: 372–79) support the assumption that the process by which bark cloth was made was virtually the same throughout the area inhabited by the Kaili-Pamona speakers. Raymond Kennedy, Walter Kaudern and Simon Kooijman did not personally witness the making of bark cloth in this area and referred to the reports of Adriani and Kruyt.

The raw material for making *fuya* was mainly taken from species of trees in the *Broussonetia*, *Artocarpus*, *Ficus*, *Antiaris* and *Brosimum* families. The following species of tree were used in Central Sulawesi: *umayo* (*Trema amboinensis*), *ambo* (*Broussonetia papyrifera*), *tea* (*Artocarpus blumei*), *impo* (*Antiaris toxicaria*), *bunta* (*Sloetia minahassae*), *leboni* (*Ficus leucantatoma*), *kampendo* (*Ficus* sp.), *nunu* (*Urostigma* sp.), *Hibiscus tiliacea* and two botanically unidentified species called *wanca* and *wowoli*. The ones most commonly used were *ambo*, *tea*, and *umayo*. (Adriani and Kruyt 1901: 140, 1951 III:302; Kooijman 1963: 56–57; Kennedy 1934: 242.)

One special feature of bark cloth making in this district was that the bark was boiled before beating to remove all juices and sap. To aid the process wood ash was also added. It seems that the only other area where bark was boiled before beating was Central Mexico (Hunter 1957: 26–27; Tolstoy 1963: 653). This enabled the people of Central Sulawesi to make white bark cloth from species of tree other than the paper mulberry, which did not require to be boiled.

Once it had been boiled the bark was softened by beating. The strips were then placed in water, where they were washed, and wrung dry. Then they were wrapped in palm leaves and left to ferment for one to twelve days, depending on whether the bark had been boiled and from which species of tree it was taken. This fermentation process is also known to have been used in Java, Halmahera, Buru and Borneo, in addition to Sulawesi (Kooijman 1963: 66).

Fermentation was also known in Eastern Polynesia, but not in Western Polynesia (Kooijman 1972: 415). The fermentation process may at one time have been used in Western Polynesia, but is no

longer practiced. I have not found any mention of fermentation as a preliminary stage in working bark cloth in the accounts of manufacturing in other areas, though most bark cloth makers did wet the strips of bark before working them.

For beating the bark cloth the To Kaili and To Pamona either erected a cabin outside the village or else they beat the bark under a rice storehouse. Bark cloth was never beaten in the home because of the noise. Nor could it be beaten during the harvest or death feasts. Before the women set to work, one of the older women made a sacrifice. She placed a *bomba* stick in the ground and tied to it a piece of bark cloth, spread betel in the grooves and chanted to the spirits of the earth (Adriani and Kruyt 1951 III:304):

Be not afraid, we are going to make a noise: in any case we are going to give you *fuya*.

Beating was started with an ebony tool (*pombobaki*), the same which they used to soften the finished cloth. The beating proper was done with a stone mallet (*ike³*), a tool with a cane handle round a grooved stone beater. The first mallet to be used (*pombayowo*) had three deep, wide grooves. Work then continued with a *pondeapi*, which had about five grooves, and then a *po'opi*, which had 11–15 grooves. (Adriani and Kruyt 1901: 153–55, 1951 III: 304.)

Kennedy wrote (1934: 237) that the stone bark cloth mallet was probably invented in Central Sulawesi. This cannot be true, however, for similar tools were already in wide use over Southeast Asia as part of the prehistoric “Neolithic tradition” (Heekeren 1972: 165; Ling 1962). Hunter also wrote (1957: 28) that around 1910 he observed Otomi Indians in Mexico making paper-like bark cloth with a tool similar to the bark cloth mallet of the Kaili-Pamona speakers. Elsewhere in Indonesia bark cloth was usually beaten with a square wooden mallet similar to that used in Polynesia. Copper-headed clubs were a specialty of the Javanese and Madurese and were assumed by Kennedy (1934: 237) to be a Javanese invention. In Africa, too, bark cloth was most commonly made with wooden clubs that varied considerably in their shape and material (Picton and Mack 1979).

The pieces of bark cloth could be joined together in three ways: by sewing, by pasting or by felting. The felting technique was known for certain to have been used in Java and in Central Sulawesi. According to Kennedy (1934: 231) the pasting technique was unknown in Indonesia as a way of joining pieces of bark cloth. To generalise somewhat we may say that in Eastern Polynesia the

pieces of bark cloth were joined by felting and in Western Polynesia by pasting. The division was not, however, always as clear as this, for in Tahiti, for example, pasting was to be found alongside felting, and in Tonga, where the pasting techniques dominated, felting was used to some extent. Pieces were sewn together only on Easter Island and in Hawai'i, where this technique was used alongside felting (Kooijman 1972: 415–16).

The ornamentation of bark cloth and products made from it

Bark cloth for everyday use was seldom decorated by painting in Central Sulawesi, and decorated cloths were reserved for ritual and festive use. In some areas the painting of bark cloth was regarded as sacred. Among the To Lore living in the western highlands (Bada, Besoa, Napu) bark cloth was painted by shamans. They were extremely clever at it, compared with the women living on the plains.

In teaching a beginner the art of painting bark cloth, the older woman would take her hand and place it on the cloth seven times⁴, chanting: "Nothing evil will befall so-and-so if she paints". She would then blow on the hand four times. The beginner was thus initiated and presented to the spirits so that they would not regard her as an intruder and cause her harm.

There were also some restrictions on the painting of the bark cloth: a widow might not paint while in mourning or a woman during menstruation, for her colours would be not bright but watery. The times when painting was permissible were also clearly stated and adhered to, for anyone violating the rules might fall ill. These precautions and restrictions prove that while painting bark cloth the painter was in close contact with the spirits, and that the act of painting bore some religious significance. (Adriani and Kruyt 1951 III:307; Kooijman 1963: 68–69.)

Bark cloth was also decorated by stamping. The To Kaili and To Pamona also decorated their bark cloth with applique work as well as painting. There was applique work on the blouses for both festive and everyday wear, but this ornamentation technique did not bear the ceremonial significance of painting. There were no precautionary measures attached to applique work aimed at seeking protection against supernatural beings.

Embroidery was also used to some extent to decorate garments of

bark cloth, most often combined with applique work, but it was used far more widely to decorate cotton clothing. Embroidery was probably a late innovation in the handicraft tradition of Central Sulawesi. Embroidery did not look natural on bark clothes, especially if the artist only had light brown, untreated bast instead of colorful cotton thread.

The social and ritual significance of bark cloth

Indonesian textiles are heavily weighted with symbolic meanings and bear symbolic value in both the religious and the social spheres. Many scholars have recently been playing more attention to the Indonesian textile tradition and especially to woven textiles (see e.g. Adams 1980; Gittinger 1979). Bark cloth and other objects have received far less study.

As Mattibelle Gittinger (1979: 20) writes concerning Indonesian textiles in general: “Life-crisis periods such as marriage, birth, circumcision, and death are recognized times of exchange, and the ceremonies often centre on the moment when textiles are transferred”. The woven textiles and bark cloth were also an essential part of the gift exchange systems among the To Kaili and To Pamona, too. They had both symbolic and economic meanings in ritualistic exchanges between men and women, and between kin groups.

A ritualistic exchange between the sexes took place during the harvest feast (*mopasangke*) when two poles up to 3 or 4 meters high were erected. These poles were called *toko mpayope* (pole of descent) or *toko sora* (decorated pole). On one pole the girls hung home-made sleeping mats, *sirih* baskets, betel bags, rain mats, *fuya* head and shoulder cloths for men; on the other the men placed their gifts for the girls: pieces of cotton for jacket, skirts, large beads, waist bands. Finally, both poles were decorated with the consecrated clothes (*ayapa lamo*): one with the clothes that women wore when they appeared as shamans and leaders in field labour; the other with the consecrated clothes that the men wore at temple feasts. Before the presents were exchanged a man walked around the men’s pole seven times and boasted of his heroic deeds as a head-hunter. A woman did the same around the women’s pole singing of her trips to the Upperworld. (Adriani and Kruyt 1951 III:133; Downs 1956: 98.)

As far as I can see this act symbolizes the different but complementary roles of men and women in the To Pamona society.

A Pamona woman maintained the well-being of her village as a cultivator, by giving birth and, in the celestial sphere, as a shaman. A Pamona man took care of his co-villagers by headhunting, there being a general idea that the health of the villagers and their crops depended on the taking of heads. The *anitus*, a distinct group of ancestors of great importance who lived under the roof of the temple, were fed with the scalps and heads of enemies.

It seems likely that woven textiles have now largely replaced bark cloth in these gift exchange systems as marriage portions, where they represent both the ritual and economic wealth controlled by kin groups. However, bark cloth which carried great religious meaning preserved until this century an important role in all religious rituals. It was present during shamanistic healing rites, sacrifices, girls' consecration rites, festivals following a death, headhunting, and fertility rites; in other words, at all rituals where the To Pamonas were closely connected with the gods, deified ancestors, and other supernatural beings.

In several rituals bark cloth was used symbolically as a bridge between the human sphere and the world of the supernatural. Ritual surroundings were commonly decorated with strips of *fuya*. To each leg of an offering table was fastened a stalk to which a strip of bark cloth was tied; nearby was placed a wooden pole with a piece of *fuya* attached. During the invocation to the village spirits in the headhunting ritual the members of the family put their hands on the lower end of a rice pounder, or hold on to *fuya* strips in order to take part in the invocation. (Adriani and Kruyt 1950 I:363.)

The sacredness of bark cloth is indicated also by the fact that, in the old days, girls were not allowed to come into contact with cotton at the consecration feast for shamans. At the end of the feast a piece of cotton was counted off from one to seven on the hand of the girls by a shaman, after which they were again allowed to touch this material. (Adriani and Kruyt 1951 III:273.)

A couple of times during their stay in Central Sulawesi at the end of the 19th century Adriani and Kruyt came across old people who protested against the fact that cotton was increasingly being given to the dead to take into the afterlife. *Fuya* had been the clothing of the ancestors, and one person even claimed that the soul was not admitted into the Underworld if it arrived there clothed in cotton. (Adriani and Kruyt 1951 II:492.)

Textile hangings placed around a ritual area may also serve a spiritually protective function among the To Pamona. For example, a widow or widower was surrounded by a small cubicle of rain mats and pieces of bark cloth in which she or he remained as a rule for three days, sometimes less, until the shaman had finished her

work. Also a corpse was laid on a mat in the most appropriate part of the house and a canopy of cotton or bark cloth (*batuwali*) was built over it. (Downs 1956: 78, 84.)

Costumes may also express social role and rank. Among the Kaili-Pamona speakers, shamans, headhunters and initiated girls had special costumes. Information on the social significance of the men's headdress (*sig*) is given by Adriani and Kruyt, according to whom the patterns on the *sig* were connected with head-hunting. Kaudern (1944: 176–77) however, pointed out that the *sig*s in his collection could not be classified according to the criteria laid down by Adriani and Kruyt. Kooijman (1963: 19–20) regarded the vagueness of Kruyt's information the biggest problem when it came to classification, mainly due to the absence of illustrations.

Cultural history of the Pacific and the making of bark cloth

Using ethnographical and linguistic evidence, bark cloth making has generally been regarded as a common feature of early Austronesian culture (Bellwood 1985: 151–52). Ethnography informs us that bark cloth making was known in large areas of Southeast Asia and Oceania, and also in Africa and Central and South America. The importance and position of bark cloth as part of the culture of the Austronesian people is illustrated by the persistence of its manufacture in many places. As in Central Sulawesi, bark cloth played an important role in rituals and religious practices in Polynesia too.

In Eastern Polynesia *tapa* played a large part in traditional religious rituals and magical practices. In the religious context *tapa* was often associated with or used for wrapping figures and symbolic representations of gods. The skulls of deceased priests and chiefs were provided with a new *tapa* skin, thus making them symbols and carriers of an almost divine power in the social and religious life of the community. In Western Polynesia bark cloth was made and ornamented primarily for socially important ceremonial presentations. Also, decorated *tapa* in particular often served to indicate the high social status of wearer as well as to mark special occasions. (Kooijman 1972.)

Certainly, we are not able to say anything about the age and the origin of bark cloth making from ethnographic sources alone. But I consider it relevant to study ethnographical material in order to

discover interesting problems and to make suggestions about the techniques of making bark cloth, and the social and ritual roles of bark cloth in early Austronesian societies. We may leave the linguists and archaeologists to search for indisputable proof of the use of bark cloth in prehistoric times.

According to Blust (1984: 235) the linguistic evidence for the presence of bark cloth is restricted to Oceanic and eastern Indonesian languages⁵, but it is likely that bark cloth has history going back to at least Proto-Oceanic times.

The problem in defining the antiquity of bark cloth production has been to put a date on the archaeological finds of beaters. This is partly due to the poor conditions of archaeological preservation in Southeast Asia, since wooden bark cloth implements have not been preserved. Although bark cloth beaters probably dating from prehistoric times have been found in South China, Taiwan, the Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, Borneo and Sulawesi, there are only a few to which a date can be applied (Beyer 1949; Kennedy 1934; Ling 1962; Lynch and Ewing 1968; Sieveking 1956).

In Taiwan, where the Initial and Proto-Austronesian cultures were probably located, several types of stone bark cloth beaters have been found. These include oval pebble beaters, straight-backed beaters, stone beaters with a separate handle, and horned stone beaters. Unfortunately, almost all lack accurate dating.

On the western coast of Taiwan there has been found sites belonging to a culture with corded-marked pottery, termed the Ta-p'en-k'eng culture by Chang. The artefacts of the Ta-p'en-k'eng culture possibly include a stone bark cloth beater. These sites are probably dated between 4300 BC and 2500 BC (Chang 1970: 63–64). By the late third millennium BC the Ta-p'en-k'eng culture had apparently differentiated into two separate archaeological complexes; (1) The Yuan-shan culture in North and East Taiwan, and the (2) "The Lungshanoid" cultures of mainland Chinese type in the west and south. A fragment of a stone bark cloth beater with a polished and grooved surface was discovered from the corded ware stratum of the Yuan-shan shell mound in Taipei in 1953.

Yuan-shan items included also spindle whorls of clay, which suggests that a knowledge of weaving, perhaps using hemp fibers on a backstrap loom, was present (Bellwood 1985: 216). But clay spindle whorls do not occur archaeologically south of Luzon. According to linguists (Blust 1984: 233) the loom was known to speakers of a language ancestral to at least Malay, the Batak languages and various languages of northern Luzon. Blust suggests that a minimum time depth of 4000 years would have to be implied.

The most important archaeological sites in the territory of the

Kaili-Pamona culture are Kalumpang and Minanga Sipakko, on the middle course of the Karama river in west-central Sulawesi. According to Bellwood (1985: 247) these have produced the most remarkable Late Neolithic assemblages of any sites in Indonesia. The assemblages include quadrangular and lenticular-sectioned stone adzes, ground slate projectile points, a stone bark cloth beater, pottery, and some possible stone reaping knives. Unfortunately, these sites are not dated, but Bellwood (1985: 248) suggests an age of perhaps 3000 years. The decoration of this Kalumpang pottery resembles both the decoration of Lapita ceramics found in Melanesia, and the ornamentation of Central Sulawesi and Western Polynesian (Samoa, Tonga, Fiji) bark cloth.⁶

On the Southeast Asian mainland bark cloth beaters have been discovered in Malaya, Vietnam and Thailand.⁷ It is probable that Austronesian-speakers did not settle the Malay Peninsula before 1000 BC, and it is perhaps best described as a point of overlap for both the earlier mainland Ban Kao Neolithic culture and the later north-western limits of Austronesian settlement. (Bellwood 1985: 258, 265.)

Accordingly our present archaeological and linguistic knowledge suggests that early Austronesian-speakers manufactured and used both woven textiles and bark cloth. If the dates for the Taiwanese stone bark cloth implements are correct, it seems likely that the Austronesians were familiar with bark cloth as early as the time span of reconstructed Proto-Austronesian. The bark cloth and woven textile techniques are not exclusive but may exist side by side in the same area, or at the same time in different areas. Both of them underwent their own independent technical developments, which in some areas may have reached very high qualities.

It seems that rather significant changes were taking place as Austronesians expanded southward into tropical regions of the Philippines and Eastern Indonesia. Although some material culture traditions, for example pottery making, an economy based firmly on agriculture, fishing, and perhaps also bark cloth production were continuous, the activities of cereal cultivation, forest clearance and weaving received temporary setbacks during and after the period of Proto-Malayo-Polynesian culture.

One interesting detail with respect to the cultural history of the Pacific is the surprising similarity between bark cloth ornamentation in Central Sulawesi and Western Polynesia (Samoa, Tonga, Fiji), for which no exhaustive explanation has been found. In Kooijman's view the similarities are so specific and numerous that they could not have developed independently, so he concludes that they must have had a common cultural origin. The same decorative

motifs also appear on Kalumpang and Lapita pottery.

To my mind the vitality and important position of bark cloth as part of the culture of the Austronesian peoples is largely due to its central role in religious rituals and social practices. Bark cloth often indicates symbolically a bridge between the human sphere and the world of supernatural beings, or a bridge between human beings and their deified ancestors. Thus, it is associated with the most sacred powers which represent the continuity and immortality of the society.

Notes

1. In this paper I deal with the To Kaili and To Pamona, or the East and West Torajas as they were earlier called by Western scholars, but excluding the better-known Sa'dan-Toraja. I have not found any reference to bark cloth making by the Sa'dan-Torajas. I use here To Kaili to refer to all Kaili-speaking groups including To Lore, To Kulawi, and To Pipikoro.
2. Dealing with bark cloth making I have adopted terms used by Adriani and Kruyt (1901). Other native terms are equivalent to ones used by Adriani (1928), and Adriani and Kruyt (1950–51). I have, however, followed modern Indonesian spelling, which differs in certain regards from the spelling introduced by the Dutch, *oe = u*, *dj = j*, *j = y*, and *tj = c*.
3. The bark cloth beater was called *ike* all over Polynesia too. The anvil was called *totua* in Sulawesi and Polynesia. Both have been reconstructed as Proto-Central Pacific and Proto-Polynesian forms (Biggs, Walsh, and Waqa 1972).
4. Seven was the sacred number for the Kaili-Pamona speakers.
5. Buli (eastern Halmahera) *mal*, Proto-Oceanic *malo* = the paper mulberry (*Broussonetia papyrifera*), cloth of same.
6. Roger Green (1979: 14) has studied the relationship between the decoration on Early Lapita pottery, and the tattoo and bark cloth designs of Polynesia. He argues “that a number of the elements and motifs present in the surface decorative patterns had their origins in a decorative system once applied to pottery and probably to bark cloth, tattooing, and other items as well. The explanation offered is that certain elements, motifs, and structural combinations present as surface decorations on protohistoric and historic bark cloth, human skin, and wooden objects from various of the Polynesian islands are inheritances from an ancestral decorative style once applied to pottery”.
7. During his excavations in the cave of Gua Cha, Kelantan Province, northern Malay, Gale Sieveking found in 1954 a cylindrical stone bark cloth beater (Sieveking 1956: 83). According to carbon dates the Neolithic burials at Gua Cha were laid at an unknown time between

1250 BC and AD 1000, but possibly around 1000 BC according to parallels in southern Thailand.

References

- Adams, Marie Jeanne, 1980. "Structural Aspects of East Sumbanese", in J.J. Fox (ed.), *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia*. Cambridge.
- Adriani N., 1928. *Bare'e-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*. Leiden.
- Adriani N. and Alb. C. Kruyt, 1901. "Geklopte Boomschors als Kleedingstof op Midden-Celebes." *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie* 14: 139–191.
- 1912. *De Bare'e-Sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes I–III*. Batavia.
- 1950–51. *De Bare'e-Sprekende Toradjas van Midden-Celebes (de Oost-toradjas) I–III*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks 56, No. 1. Amsterdam.
- Bellwood, Peter, 1978. *Man's Conquest of the Pacific. The Prehistory of Southeast Asia and Oceania*. Auckland.
- 1985. *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago*. Sydney.
- Beyer, H. Otley, 1948. *Philippine and East Asian Archaeology, and its Relation to the Origin of the Pacific Islands Population*. National Research Council of the Philippines Bulletin 29. Quezon City.
- Biggs, B. G., Walsh, D.S. and J. Waqa, 1972. *Proto-Polynesian Reconstructions, with English to Proto-Polynesian Finder List*. Auckland.
- Blust, Robert, 1984. "Austronesian Culture History: Some Linguistic Inferences and their Relations to the Archaeological Record", in P. van de Velde (ed.), *Prehistoric Indonesia. A Reader*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijke Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 104: 218–241. Dordrecht.
- Catalogue of the National Museum of Finland No. VK 5002.
- Chang, Kwang-Chih, 1970. "Prehistoric Archaeology of Taiwan." *Asian Perspectives* 13: 58–77.
- Downs, Richard, 1956. *The Religion of the Bare'e-Speaking Toradja of Central Celebes*. Diss.phil. Leiden.
- Gittinger, Mattibelle, 1979. *Splendid Symbols. Textiles and Tradition in Indonesia*. Washington D.C.
- Green, Roger C., 1979. "Early Lapita Art from Polynesia and Island Melanesia: Continuities in Ceramic, Barkcloth, and Tattoo Decorations", in S.M. Mead (ed.), *Exploring the Visual Art of Oceania, Australia, Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia*. Honolulu.
- Heekeren, H.R. van, 1972. *The Stone Age of Indonesia*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 61. The Hague.
- Hunter, Dard, 1957. *Papermaking. The History and Technique of an Ancient Craft*. London.
- Kaudern, Walter, 1921. *I Celebes obyger I–II*. Stockholm.
- 1944. *Art in Central Celebes*. Ethnographical Studies in Celebes 6. Göteborg.

- Kennedy, Raymond, 1934. "Bark-cloth in Indonesia." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 43: 229–243.
- Kooijman, Simon, 1963. *Ornamented Bark-Cloth in Indonesia*. Meddelingen van het Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde 16. Leiden.
- 1972. *Taya in Polynesia*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 234. Honolulu.
- Ling, Shun-Sheng, 1962. "Stone Bark Cloth Beaters of South China, Southeast Asia and Central America." *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology Academia Sinica* 14: 195–212.
- Lynch, Frank X. and Franklin Ewing, 1968. "Twelve Ground-Stone Implements from Mindanao, Philippine Islands", in W. G. Solheim II (ed.), *Anthropology at the Eighth Pacific Science Congress*. Asian and Pacific Archaeology Series 2.
- Picton, John and John Mack, 1979. *African Textiles. Looms, Weaving and Design*. London.
- Raven, H.C., 1932. "Bark-cloth in Central Celebes. Natural History." *The Journal of the American Museum of Natural History* 32, 4: 372–383.
- Rosenlund, Edvard, n.d.(a). Bland huvudskallejägare i Central-Celebes. Tolefolket och dess sedvänjor. Manuscript. Ethnographical department of the National Board of Antiquities and Historical Monuments, Helsinki.
- n.d.(b). Bland huvudskallejägare i Central-Celebes. Under andarnas herrevälde. Manuscript. Ethnographical department of the National Board of Antiquities and Historical Monuments, Helsinki.
- Sieveking, G. de G., 1956. "The Distribution of Stone Bark Cloth Beaters in Prehistoric Times." *Journal of the Malayan Branch Royal Asiatic Society* 29, Part 3: 78–85.
- Tolstoy, Paul, 1963. "Cultural Parallels between Southeast Asia and Mesoamerica in the Manufacture of Bark Cloth." *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Series II, Vol. 25, No. 6: 646–662. New York.