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ABSTRACT

Trade networks in the Indonesian Archipelago changed drastically during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. After the Portuguese conquered Melaka in 1511, Aceh, Banten, Gresik and Macassar (Makasar/Ujung Pandang) became more important not only in economic but also in political terms. Trading sites in Maluku and on the west coast of Sumatra, the sources of spices, attracted more Asian and European traders. In the early seventeenth century, further changes developed because of intense competition between English and Dutch traders, especially in important trading places such as the west coast of Sumatra, Banten and Maluku. During those two centuries, three types of trading places can be identified in the Indonesian Archipelago: Direct Trading sites, Complex Entrepots and Fort Regulated sites. The popularity of different sites rose and fell in relation to high competition in the spice trade and as local representatives (*Panglima*) became more independent.

There are gaps between historical and archaeological data when interpreting trading activities in the Indonesian Archipelago during those two centuries. Historical and archaeological data provide different types of information about
trading activities during this period. Historical sources based on the records of European traders often provide valuable information about the development of cities, especially in terms of maps and illustrations. These sources also give much information about the process of trading, such as the type of merchandise, the coinage, weight systems, competition in trading between traders, facilities provided by the local rulers, local customs and agreements between local rulers and the European traders. Also, they provide detailed descriptions of the voyages and of the political and economic achievements of the European traders. In contrast, archaeological evidence from Barus, Banten and Batavia provides more limited data about contact between local people and foreigners, based on inferences that can be drawn from excavation and artefacts. In particular, there are abundant examples of local and imported pottery of different types and forms, as well as remains of parts of equipment and ironwork, all of which can be used for interpreting local activities as well as trade activities.

A more comprehensive understanding of trading activities in the Indonesian Archipelago in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can be obtained by combining these two sources of data and using one source to confirm or extend the information provided by the other.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In the course of the sixteenth century the Indonesian Archipelago became an increasingly important source of commodities for world trade (van Leur, 1955; Israel, 1989; Tarling, 1992). In the early part of the century, the Portuguese were involved in the spice trade, together with west Asian, Malay, Chinese and locally-based traders (Cortesao, 1944; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962). The Portuguese established their major trading post in Melaka and also built warehouses in Maluku (Cortesao, 1944; van Leur, 1955; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Mengio, 1970; Hanna and Des Alwi, 1990). The Spanish arrived in Maluku in the middle of the sixteenth century and competed with the established traders to get permission from local rulers to build dwellings that could be used for storing merchandise (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Hanna and Des Alwi, 1990).
Several sites in the Indonesian Archipelago became well known to traders in the sixteenth century. Firstly, the Maluku Islands, with Tidore, Ternate and Banda, were known as important centres for nutmeg, mace and cloves (Dames, 1921; Cortesao, 1944). Secondly, sandalwood supplies from Timor and Flores were exploited by the Chinese traders (Dames, 1921; Cortesao, 1944; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962), who withdrew in the early sixteenth century from the fierce trade competition in the Maluku Islands. In the same period, several places along the east and west coasts of Sumatra and also along the Java coast became more important for the west Asian and Chinese traders who were displaced after the Portuguese conquest of Melaka in 1511 (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Djajadiningrat, 1983). Those areas produced pepper, forest products and foodstuffs (Cortesao, 1944) and, although the Portuguese traders were interested also in pepper, the local rulers did not always welcome them (Cortesao, 1944; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969; 1987; Kartodirdjo, 1987).

In the sixteenth century there were already many coastal settlements with markets which became the foci for local trade. These settlements included Aceh, Pasai, Jambi, Palembang, Barus, Tiku, Pariaman, Banten, Pontang, Sunda Kelapa, Tuban, Gresik, Ambon, Ternate and Tidore (Cortesao, 1944). However, some of these markets which were situated in locations with good port facilities, such as Pasai, Barus, Banten, Gresik and Banda then developed into large and important trading centres.
These centres became the collecting points for local products throughout a wide area and attracted both local middlemen and foreign traders (Cortesao, 1944; van Leur, 1955; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Bronson, 1977).

The involvement of the Dutch from the turn of the seventeenth century changed the trade system of the Archipelago. The Dutch took over the control of trade from west Asian and Chinese traders during the seventeenth century and built exclusive settlements for themselves in order to control the flow of spices into the world market. The Dutch East India Company (VOC) also came to regulate the flow of Chinese, Japanese and Asian merchandise into the Indonesian Archipelago (Sen, 1962; Bronson, 1977; Adhyatman. et. al. 1984). While the west Asian and locally-based traders became less important, in contrast the Chinese gained significantly, being used by the Dutch as middlemen.

Although there is plenty of evidence for the rapid growth of major settlements in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Indonesian Archipelago, archaeological research, which has only seriously been encouraged since 1974 (Laporan PELITA II, 1985), is still in a very early stage of development in this region. Archaeological research has been organised by period into three divisions, namely Prehistory, Classical (Hindu-Buddhist), and Islamic (Kartodirdjo, 1977). These divisions reflect the introduction of new religious beliefs and also the political influence of different kingdoms. The Indonesian
Prehistoric period is considered to end in the fourth century, the
date of the inscriptions found in Kutei (East Kalimantan) and
Pasir Angin (West Java) which mention the Hindu pantheon and
the names of the rulers (Kartodirdjo, 1977); these mark the start
of the classical period. From that time to the fifteenth century
there were both Hindu and Buddhist influences in the
Indonesian Archipelago, so this period is known as the Hindu-
Buddhist or Classical period. This period was followed by the
Islamic period which runs from the development of a new
Islamic kingdom in Demak which was founded in the last
quarter of the fifteenth century (Ricklefs, 1981) to the
eighteenth century, when the Dutch gradually extended their
political and cultural role in Indonesia.

There are, however, some difficulties with this
periodisation. Archaeological research in Indonesia has been
concentrated in Java, Nusa Tenggara Barat (including Lombok,
Sumbawa and Sumba) and Sumatra (Laporan PELITA II, 1985;
Laporan PELITA III, 1992), and the Prehistoric and Classical
periods have been more closely studied than the Islamic period.
Although the archaeological findings from both survey and
excavation are abundant, the record is concentrated on certain
periods and many formal reports have not yet been published.

Moreover, the periodisation model itself needs to be
reconsidered. Firstly, there is a problem in any attempt to
divide a culture into time periods, because there is always
overlap between one period and the next. Former elements of
culture will continue alongside the new, such as the Classical arts which have still been used in the Islamic period as shown in the architectural design of mosques, in grave complexes and in the layout of cities. Secondly, the periodisation is based mainly on data from Java, and ignores the evidence from other islands. For example, the definition of the period is based on the dating of the Demak kingdom, rather than that of Pasai on the east coast of Sumatra which developed in the thirteenth century (Ricklefs, 1993:3-4). Also, the Prehistoric period is considered to have ended with the first inscriptions, although prehistory continued until very recently in Irian Jaya.

The evidence for Indonesian history from the sixteenth century onward is mainly derived from European sources. Such data are inevitably unbalanced and the information about Indonesians is slight. The purpose of writing journals was not to record local activities but rather the successes of the traders themselves in the Indonesian Archipelago. So there is much information about merchandise, its production, systems of weights and coinage and trade competitors, but little about daily life and local customs. What account there is of local matters remains necessarily subjective. The descriptions are not always detailed or accurate since the writers gathered their information randomly from the local people, from other foreigners and also from other accounts. There are further difficulties when dealing with data derived from local languages, as the translations may have been imperfect. Also, the writers sometimes only saw part
of an activity and then created the rest of the account themselves. Foreign writers did not record the differences between indigenous cultures and the mixed culture arising from contact between Indonesians and foreigners. For example, the royal procession of the Ternate kingdom, the royal funeral customs of the Aceh kingdom, Javanese dancing and the costume of Bantenese soldiers (Eerste 1624, Ito, 1984; Reid, 1991) were described as entirely local in origin whereas they were clearly mixtures of indigenous cultural traits and newly established Hindu-Buddhist and Islamic concepts.

Nevertheless, these historical sources are still valuable because they provide contemporary descriptions of events that occurred among both local people and foreigners. They describe places and products accurately and provide supporting maps and illustrations. Also there are accounts of the agreements made by Europeans with local rulers, such as those of the Portuguese and Spanish in Maluku, the English in Aceh, Tiku, Pariaman and Banten, and the Dutch with the ruler of Sunda Kelapa, Aceh, Banten and the Maluku Islands (Eerste, 1624; Birdwood and Foster, 1893, Foster, 1934; 1940; 1943; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969).

This thesis attempts to indicate the value and limitations of integrating historical information and archaeological evidence for this period. The questions to be investigated are: What kinds of information can be matched? Which information is missing? And most importantly, what is the role of
archaeological evidence in helping reconstruct trading activities during those two centuries?

These aims can be achieved by comparing historical accounts and the archaeological evidence. Information about visitors in trading sites within the Indonesian Archipelago during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, about the contacts between locals and visitors, the commodities they exchanged, and other information related to trading activities can be collected from various European sources. This information is compared with the results of archaeological research carried out in Barus, Banten and Batavia (Jakarta). The first two sites have been chosen because they are the only relevant sites that have been studied archaeologically, for which reports have been published. Batavia has been chosen because it has an abundance of historical accounts as a major Dutch trading post in Asia. The archaeological information for these three sites is taken from published articles.

Chapter two of this thesis provides an overview of the trading activities during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as compiled from historical accounts. A classification of the different kinds of trading sites that appeared in those two centuries is presented in chapter three. In the following three chapters, evidence is presented from archaeological research in Barus, Banten and Batavia. Finally, the last chapter evaluates the use of both historical and archaeological evidence in these case studies. It directs attention to the gaps in the evidence
that might be filled by further archaeological research and suggests how this comparative approach might form a consideration for attempts to reconstruct trading activities elsewhere in the Indonesian Archipelago during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
CHAPTER TWO

TRADING CENTRES AND VISITORS
IN THE INDONESIAN ARCHIPELAGO
1511-1680

After the Portuguese conquered Melaka in 1511, the structure of the spice trade in the Indonesian Archipelago gradually changed. Trade moved from Melaka to the two cities of Aceh and Banten (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962), however, Gresik became more important (Map: 1). Other cities, too, exploited opportunities for trade presented by local circumstances. The competition in the spice trade increased, especially in the seventeenth century when European traders actively sought out spice markets themselves. Thus during two centuries many changes occurred in the Indonesian Archipelago as the importance of different cities arose and fell in relation to the
Three important trading markets in the Indonesian Archipelago during the sixteenth century.

externally driven spice trade and as local representatives became more independent. This chapter, based on foreign accounts, traces the development of various trading sites in the Indonesian Archipelago during the sixteenth and seventeenth
centuries. These centres attracted different groups of traders at different periods because international trade developed differently depending on the local political and economic situation. This chapter also discusses the international origins of the traders who were involved in trading activities in the Indonesian Archipelago during those two centuries and relates this to the development of the trade network.

The development of trading centres in the Indonesian Archipelago has been significant since early in the first millennium A.D. Arab and Chinese accounts provide information on trading centres in the northern part of Sumatra, especially Barus and Pasai (Drakard, 1989, 1990). It appears that camphor from Barus was distributed to Pasai by west Asian traders (Cortesao, 1944:163; Drakard, 1989, 1990). Trade on the east coast of Sumatra changed drastically when Palembang became more important not only as a political but also as a religious and economic centre. This centre was sustained economically by commodities from the interior, from Java and from India and China (Dawes, 1919; Cortesao, 1944; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Bronson, 1977).

The shift of trading centres from Sumatra to Melaka around 1400 A.D. changed the trading routes in the Indonesian Archipelago. Javanese, Chinese, Malay and west Asians trading as far as Maluku and with many ports in Sumatra all came to Melaka. The international exchange of merchandise integrated these and also other local commodities, bought from other
trading markets across the Archipelago, into world trade (Cortesao, 1944; van Leur, 1955; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; 1970; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969; Israel, 1979). In turn, commodities from China, India and elsewhere were then distributed within the Archipelago. The trading system, including methods of payment and weights, became similar from place to place in the Archipelago and adjacent places in Southeast Asia (Wicks, 1992).

Further developments in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are described in the following discussion in relation to three areas within Archipelago.

A. The Trading Networks of Sumatra and the Straits of Malacca.

The arrival of the Portuguese in the Southeast Asian trade region soon had political, as well as commercial, consequences. At first, in 1509, the Portuguese were welcomed as traders in Melaka; two years later they conquered Melaka and began to control the local trading activities, especially in the Malacca Straits. Next, instead of waiting for the Javanese and others to bring in the spices, they began to seek out supplies of spices themselves both in Sumatra and Maluku (Birch, 1880; Dawes, 1919; Cortesao, 1944). The Portuguese attempt to control the route along the east coast of Sumatra produced relatively little benefit, and their competitors, such as west Asians, Chinese and other Europeans, obtained increased profits from the markets on
the west coast of Sumatra. Those east Sumatran, Javanese and Chinese traders, who took advantage of the Portuguese political and economic action and supplied foodstuffs and pepper for the Portuguese in Melaka (Cortesao, 1944: 155-156; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962), also obtained less profit than the west Asian and Chinese traders who focused on the west coast of Sumatra. In the early seventeenth century, the Portuguese changed their political and economic strategy by sending more ships to Maluku to collect nutmeg, mace and cloves (Dawes. 1921; Cortesao, 1944). They also renewed the relationship with the Sultan of Aceh, but neither of these strategies worked successfully because the trading competition had increased drastically since other Europeans became involved in the spice trade.

In the 1520s, Aceh, which had become a powerful and independent kingdom, occupied areas along both the east and west coasts of Sumatra that had abundant local products, especially pepper (Cortesao, 1944; Boxer, 1969; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969). Between 1520 and 1524, Aceh defeated Pasai, Pidie and Daya, and by 1530 controlled the north Sumatra interior (Boxer, 1969; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969). The growing political power of Aceh changed the functions of other trading places in northern Sumatra. For example, Pasai, after 1520, became merely a source of commodities for Aceh. Places adjacent to Pasai, such as Aru and Piddie, which used to support Pasai, now also sent all their local products to Aceh. In contrast, Tiku and Pariaman on the west coast of Sumatra, after
acting as supply areas first for Barus and then for Aceh (Cortesao, 1944; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969, 1987), in the late 1520s became independent markets and sold all their local products directly to west Asian and Chinese traders (Birch, 1880; Dawes, 1919; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969, 1987:27).

Conflict and commercial competition between Aceh and the Portuguese continued on the east coast of Sumatra throughout the 1520s and early 1530s. Finally, Aceh attacked Melaka in 1537-1538. This action did seem to weaken the Portuguese control over the Malacca Straits, because there was evidence that a Turkish factory was established in Pasai in 1540 and that pepper ships left Pasai directly for the west Asian market (Reid, 1969). Aceh did not have a monopoly over the supply of pepper to west Asian markets, however, because traders from west Asia visited not only Aceh but also Barus, Tiku and Pariaman (Boxer, 1969; Reid, 1969; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969; 1989). In the 1560s, Aceh reached a peak in trading activities in west Asian markets because it also obtained pepper from Javanese traders who could now freely pass through the Malacca Straits.

Due to the local traders' preference for trading only with Muslims, the Portuguese had little success in the region. The Portuguese then tried to blockade Aceh but they were unsuccessful because their own power was failing. So Aceh, in revenge, again attacked the Portuguese in Melaka in 1568 (Kathirithamby-Wells, 1987). Thereafter, the Portuguese could
not trade freely but they still remained in Melaka because they obtained supplies of Banten pepper and some Maluku spices through the Javanese and Chinese traders and from their own expeditions to Maluku.

Cities along the west coast of Sumatra also developed significantly in this period. Aceh placed their own representatives (*Panglima*) in trading cities such as Barus, Tiku, Pariaman (along the west coast of Sumatra) to control the trade activities (*Kathirithamby-Wells*, 1969, 1987:32-33; *Drakard*, 1990:7). Although Aceh largely traded with Muslim traders, it seems they also welcomed some western traders. Jean Parmentier, who visited Tiku in 1529, reported seeing a *syahbandar* whose duty was to look after foreign traders (*Kathirithamby-Wells*, 1969; *Milksic*, 1979; *Dumarcay*, 1981). The west Asian traders benefited from this policy because they could anchor there before going on to Banten by the west coast Sumatra route, without having to stop and pay taxes in Melaka.

The changes in the status of trading places in the northern part of Sumatra were based on political factors. Pasai became a support place for Aceh after Aceh had occupied the area, whereas Tiku and Pariaman, for example, even though they were nominally under Aceh control were quite distant from Aceh and so it was difficult to control their political and economical activities. In fact, the changes of trading status in those places were supported by Iskandar Muda, the Aceh Sultan, who placed in them *Panglimas* who could run the region
independently, especially in trading. The Aceh Sultans also gave permission to some foreign traders to collect pepper from west coast Sumatra sources (Markham, 1877; Foster, 1940; Boxer, 1969; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969, 1987; Strachan and Penrose, 1971) (Map: 2).

Map: 2

Distribution of merchandise in western Indonesia during sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
In the early seventeenth century, Aceh was still an important trading site for Asian and European traders. The Dutch and the English had factories and special houses from the Sultan of Aceh. The Chinese, Thai, Burmese, Orissans, Gujaratis, English, Dutch, French and Flemish possibly also received special services, but their benefits were less than those of the English and the Dutch because the amount of their trade was less (Eerste, 1624; Birch, 1880; Foster, 1934; 1940; Reid, 1991:25). They also paid fewer taxes than the English and the Dutch traders (Eerste, 1624; Foster, 1934; 1940, Ito, 1984:341-391). In contrast, the Portuguese and Spanish did not receive any services from the Sultan of Aceh. However, all traders exchanged the goods which they had brought and bought local products, especially pepper, in the Aceh market. The English and Dutch stored their merchandise in their factories, houses and their ships; the other traders, except the Portuguese, probably kept their goods in their houses. The Portuguese would send their cargo directly to Melaka after collecting some goods, especially pepper, from the Aceh market.

Starting in the 1620s, British and Dutch ships were sent directly to markets along the west coast of Sumatra, primarily to purchase pepper in return for their cloth. Western and Chinese traders exchanged cloth, iron goods, jewellery and ceramics for pepper. Chinese traders, working for European powers, were given orders to ship the pepper both to Batavia and Banten. Some of the Chinese traders also tried to collect pepper for
themselves, which they then resold in Banten, Batavia and other small markets in Java. West Asian traders also collected pepper and other merchandise from markets along the west coast of Sumatra, but their transactions were on a smaller scale than those of Chinese traders.

In 1630s, Aceh's power on the west coast of Sumatra declined significantly. Although it was still an important market where the European, Asian and local traders exchanged their merchandise, Aceh became more of a base camp for the traders, both local and foreign. These traders sent ships along the west coast of Sumatra to collect pepper by exchanging it for cloth, and then stored the pepper in warehouses or in their ships that were anchored at Aceh. The Dutch tried to restrict the pepper market at Aceh after they captured Melaka in 1641 and, under pressure from the Dutch, the new Aceh Queen lost her power to control pepper on the west coast of Sumatra. However, Aceh kingdom still received taxes from visitors, especially the private traders from west Asia, the Chinese and the English who brought pepper from west coast of Sumatra. The west coast Sumatra then became under the Dutch control, especially after the Dutch built fortification in west Sumatra area.

**B. The Trading Networks of Java**

During sixteenth century, there were two important markets on the north coast of Java. Firstly, Gresik in the east had acted as
an important market since the time of Majapahit, with Asian and Javanese traders based there both semi-permanently and permanently. The traders used this site for obtaining spices from Maluku small-scale traders. In contrast, Banten in west Java, which had been visited by Asian traders over a long period, gradually came to be used as a base for traders going on to Maluku. Also, Banten gained advantage from the capture of Melaka by the Portuguese in 1511. Traders sustained the growth of Banten until it became the largest market along the Java coast, especially after the political and religious centre moved from Banten Girang in the interior to the coast in 1552 (Djajadiningrat, 1983).

Although Gresik and Banten were both famous as spice markets, the two sites had different sources of supply. Gresik produced foodstuffs which came from the interior and adjacent areas (Cortesao, 1944). It also obtained nutmeg, mace, cloves and sandalwood from the eastern part of the Archipelago (Cortesao, 1944). These goods were brought by small-scale traders (van Leur, 1955; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962). In contrast, Banten produced pepper and foodstuffs (Cortesao, 1944), but also obtained other merchandise from places along the Java coast, and pepper from Silebar and Palembang (Djajadiningrat, 1983; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1987:28-29). It obtained nutmeg, mace and cloves, and sandalwood from traders who might well have come from Gresik. Also, there was Asian merchandise brought by Asian traders (Cortesao, 1944:159-160).
Thus, in the sixteenth century, three major trade centres developed in the Indonesian Archipelago. Aceh and Banten gained advantages from the Portuguese occupation of Melaka in 1511 (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962:80-84), whereas Gresik maintained its traditional prosperity from Majapahit times. Aceh and Banten were initially visited by traders who used to trade in Melaka, while Gresik because of its location on the important route to Maluku was visited by traders who wanted to collect spices in Maluku. These were small-scale traders within the Indonesian Archipelago. They brought goods from their home countries and trading sites and then exchange these for local merchandise, especially spices, the most valuable merchandise in the world. The traders who stopped over in Banten and Gresik were traders who were going to and coming from Maluku to collect local products, especially the cloves, mace and nutmeg. In contrast, the traders who visited Aceh were traders who wanted to obtain pepper or traders who tried to profit from selling merchandise that came from Java and Maluku. Gresik as a market lost importance after its occupation by Mataram and the Dutch trading system made the small-scale traders stop visiting Macassar and Gresik. Some caution is needed, however, not to over emphasize the decline of Gresik in the seventeenth century. Because the Dutch and English concentrated their attention on Maluku, Macassar and the spice trade, their accounts, on which we so much depend, are less complete in describing Gresik.
In 1600 in Banten, there were Portuguese, English, Dutch, Flemish, Danish, Chinese, Malay, Burmese, Thai, Arab, Turkish, Gujarati, Indian, Javanese, Makassarese, Buginese, Banjarese, Ternatean and Bandanese traders (Strachan and Penrose, 1843; Markham, 1877; Ijzerman 1923; Foster, 1905, van Leur, 1955; Bassett, 1958, Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962, Nayati, 1985a, 1987). They were living in specific locations within the city, inside and outside the city wall, as assigned by the Sultan (Nayati, 1985a, 1985b). The Chinese had occupied the land to the west of the city wall since the early sixteenth century. This was also the location of a Chinese temple, a small mosque and a market which opened daily (Nayati, 1985b). In this area too, the English and other Europeans, except the Dutch, leased houses from the Sultan of Banten. The Dutch built an exclusive fortification on the north-west corner of the city wall. To the east of the Cibanten river, the Buginese, Makassarese, Javanese and other traders from the Archipelago had enclaves granted by Sultan of Banten, and they built a small mosque and market (Serrurier, 1902; Nayati, 1985a). In this area, warehouses were also built (Nayati, 1985a, 1985b). Within the wall, the Bantenese lived with the west Asians, who had a special enclave with a small mosque as a grant from the Sultan of Banten (Nayati, 1985a).

The Chinese and west Asians formed special groups in Banten. They had an important role in the market and also in relating to the royal family. They were involved in the royal bureaucracy and held official positions such as syahbandar (van
Leur, 1955; Purbatjaraka, 1961:7; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962, Nayati, 1985a; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1989:31). This indicates that they have reached higher social statuses in the Indonesian social life.

Banten in the early seventeenth century acted as an important trading site in the Indonesian Archipelago. It had three markets which were run by the Sultan, the nobles and the Chinese (Eerste, 1624). The Dutch and English both established trading posts and factories in Banten (Markham, 1877; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962), whereas the Portuguese did not have a factory there but used Melaka as their main trading post, from where they sent their ships to collect spices. The Portuguese also obtained additional supplies of spices and foodstuffs from the Chinese and Javanese who brought their goods to Melaka from Banten (Burnell, 1885; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962).

The Dutch in their early years got into difficulties trading with the Banten and so, in 1610, they withdrew from Banten and established their factories in Sunda Kelapa (Cator, 1936; Heuken, 1982). In 1615-1616 there were conflicts between Banten, the Dutch and Mataram which made trading activities more difficult for all the traders. Thus the English too briefly opened a post in Sunda Kelapa. The Dutch in 1619 conquered Sunda Kelapa and renamed it Batavia, and this site soon became the major Dutch trading center (Cantor, 1936). However, Banten in 1619 was still visited by many traders from France, England, Holland, Spain, China, west Asia, Java, and Sulawesi (Strachan
and Penrose, 1971; Foster, 1934). After 1619, the Dutch tried to control Banten from their base in Batavia. At this time, the English still collected pepper and sold west Asian cloth in Banten, Sumatra, Macassar and Maluku, and were able to gain more profit than the Dutch. In practice, the Dutch were unable to get cheap pepper from the Banten market because their relationship with the Sultan and the Chinese was not as good as that enjoyed by the English. This situation made the Dutch concentrates in building their place in Batavia.

By 1635 the English still had a factory in Banten but it was no longer secure because fighting had broken out there between the Dutch and Banten in 1633. The English then switched to Semarang as a stopping place on the routes from Maluku and Macassar to Banten (Bassett, 1958). However, the English was not longer using Semarang as stopping place, especially because of the Dutch has used political action in gaining highest profit in spices trade in the Indonesian Archipelago.

The war between the Dutch and Banten arose because the Dutch had driven out the Bantenese from Maluku who were, in Dutch eyes, smuggling spices there. Also, the Bantenese refused trading rights to the Dutch in Banten. An agreement was reached between them in 1635 whereby the Sultan of Banten allowed the Dutch to trade in Banten and, on the other hand, the Dutch permitted the Bantenese to collect spices in Dutch territory in Maluku, especially in Seram, Ambon and Banda (Bassett, 1958; Hanna and Alwi, 1991).
In the 1640s the power of the Sultan of Banten was in decline, but Banten remained an important market for the English, Dutch, Portuguese, Flemish, Danish, west Asian, Macassarese, Buginese, Bimanese and Javanese traders (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Boxer, 1979, Nayati, 1987). The Portuguese became less involved in trading in Banten once their trading post in Melaka was captured by the Dutch in 1641, and they then moved their trading centre to Macassar. After a while, they moved out from the Indonesian Archipelago because of the Dutch supremacy in this place.

Although Banten markets in the 1650s were still crowded, this site was no longer important as a trading centre for the English. Many conflicts arose between them and the royal family and also with the Dutch. Moreover, the supply of pepper to Banten was getting scarcer because the older pepper plantations were producing poorer harvests (Hendraningsih, 1987) and the other sources of pepper such as Lampung, Silebar, Indrapura began trading directly with the foreign traders. Then Banten later came under Minangkabau power and within the sphere of Dutch supremacy. It only remained popular as a market for traders from the Archipelago, such as Bimanese, Macassarese and Javanese, and some Chinese and west Asian traders who had been living in Banten, however the English continued trading at Banten market until 1665 (Nayati, 1987).
C. The Trading Networks in the eastern parts of the Archipelago.

Maluku was important both for the Asian and local-based traders. Chinese, west Asian, Malay and Javanese traders collected nutmeg, mace and cloves from these islands and then resold these spices at Gresik and Banten (Cortesao, 1944; van Leur, 1955; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962).

From the time the Europeans arrived in Banten, the English and the Dutch regularly sent ships to Maluku to collect spices (Strachan and Penrose, 1843; Markham, 1877; Foster, 1940). However, the English ships were generally unsuccessful because the Dutch drove them away and prevented them making contact with the local people. The Dutch had developed important trading activities here since 1601 (Boxer, 1965), and they did not want another European competitor in Maluku.

Yet, despite the Dutch dominance in the early seventeenth century, Maluku was visited by many other trading nations. The traders were Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, and English and they also came from Turkey, Armenia, Bengal, Arabia, Persia, Gujerat, China and Java (Eerste, 1624; Markham, 1877; Foster, 1905, 1940; Cortesao, 1944; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Hanna and Alwi, 1990). There were, therefore, many foreign settlements in Maluku in the early seventeenth century. The Portuguese built their fort in Ambon (1604) and the Spanish in Tidore and Ternate. The Javanese and west Asians also had
settlements where they had lived in local villages since the sixteenth century.

The activities of the Dutch in Maluku became more dominant in the early seventeenth century. They captured the Portuguese fort in Ambon in 1605, but found it harder to establish themselves in Tidore and Ternate (Bassett, 1958; Subrahmanyam, 1988). Nevertheless, by 1607 they had an agreement with the Ternatens for supply of spices, and two years later the Dutch captured Banda which had been active in trading with the English (Markham, 1877). The Spanish, who had factories in Tidore and Ternate, tried to resist the Dutch but in 1610 Ternate was captured by the Dutch and the Spanish could only retain Tidore. Three years later the Dutch also captured Bacan, Makian and part of Halmahera. Banda, however, was still controlled by the English (Bassett, 1958). By capturing some islands in the Moluccans, the Dutch tried to monopolize the spices trade in the Indonesian Archipelago, however, this aim was not easy to gain because traders (west Asians, especially Javanese and local people and the English) were also there collecting spices. The Dutch competitors used Maccasar (now Ujung Pandang) as a trading base.

The English in 1613 opened their own factory in Macassar from where they sent their ships to Maluku, especially to their posts in Seram and Run, after the English recognised that the Dutch traded unfairly and always prevented the Maluku people making contact with the English (Bassett, 1958). The English in
Macassar were supplied spices from Maluku by the Javanese and local smugglers (Bassett, 1958). Moreover, the Portuguese used Macassar as their trading post and sent their ships to Maluku and also to Sumbawa, Solor, Timor, Flores and Larantuka to collect sandalwood and sapanwood (Bassett, 1958). The success of the Portuguese collecting commodities in east part of the Indonesian Archipelago was followed by the Dutch who sent ships to Solor (Bassett, 1958).

In 1616, the Dutch withdrew from Macassar and Sumatra and concentrated on trading in Maluku. Those actions were mainly because their monopoly policy did not work as they had predicted. Because of it, the Portuguese and English were freely explored local commodities in the Indonesian Archipelago. The Portuguese explored for sandalwood supplies in the eastern part of the Archipelago and, the English, collected pepper in Sumatra, Banten and also Maluku. The English and Portuguese were still trading with Javanese, Macassarese, Moluccans, Chinese and west Asian traders (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962), so they all have obtained some effort both in exchanges their commodities.

The Dutch, after they had occupied Sunda Kelapa in 1619, tried to control the Maluku regional trade from here. First’s Dutch action in monopolise the spices in Maluku was sent some Chinese from Batavia, now Jakarta, to settle in Ambon, the Dutch trading post (Knaap, 1991). The Dutch seems take an
advantage of their good relationship with the Chinese, their partnership in and outside Batavia.

In 1624 the English began to change their trading pattern, moving their main centre eastward. Firstly, they abandoned their settlements on the west coast of Sumatra, at Aceh and also at Banjarmasin in South Kalimantan (Bassett, 1958). They opened trade stations in Batavia, Jambi, Jepara and increased their trading activities in Macassar (Bassett, 1958; Knaap, 1991), while the Dutch tried to develop a trading contract with the Sultan of Gowa in Macassar.

Hasanuddin, Sultan of Gowa, had increased his power by capturing some areas of Sulawesi which had been part of Ternate territory before 1627, so the Dutch moved back to Batavia. The Sultan of Gowa was then so actively involved in the spice trade that in 1628 the English also moved from Macassar and restabilised their trading post in Banten.

In the 1630s, the Dutch again tried to monopolise all the spice trade in Maluku, possibly because they saw the advantages in controlling this area of the market and also because they had encountered problems in Batavia. During the 1620s, they had been attacked by Banten and Mataram (Djajadiningrat, 1983; de Graff and Piegeaud, 1984), and the Dutch depended on those kingdoms for food supplies. Moreover, Mataram under Sultan Agung controlled harbour cities along the north coast of Java which the English and the Dutch sometimes used as stopping
places. The loss of access to Jepara, Semarang, Tuban and Gresik was significant since access was lost for ship repairs and a reliable supply of rice and spices.

The Dutch tried, unsuccessfully, to control the spice trade in the eastern part of the Archipelago. In 1635 the Dutch captured Banjarmasin. They also blockaded Macassar and, a year later, war broke out between the Dutch and Sultan Hasanuddin in which the Dutch burned the ships and the city. The reason for this conflict was that the Dutch could not stop the smuggling activities and black market which were organised by the English and were under the protection of Sultan Hasanuddin. These Dutch actions affected the English capacity to export spices to Macao (Bassett, 1958). The Dutch in 1636 found it expedient to re-open their local factory in Macassar (Bassett, 1958). Firstly, they were losing power because some important sources of trade were now under the control of the Sultan of Gowa (Bassett, 1958), and also other competitors were freely trading in Maluku, along the east coast of Kalimantan, Nusa Tenggara, Java and in Sumatra, gaining more profits than the Dutch.

In the 1640s in Macassar, the English, Portuguese, Danish, Spanish, Dutch, Malay, Javanese, Moluccan traders and local people exchanged cloth for spices and rice. In order to extend his influence further, the Sultan of Gowa opened up trade with the Philippines (Bassett, 1958). The Macassar trading port became important market in the east part of the Indonesian
Archipelago. However, the Dutch was not able to join them in Macassar. The Dutch felt that their position in Maluku was in danger because of the Macassar trading market, where the traders could able to have spices from Maluku from the smugglers.

The Dutch still remained in Maluku, especially in Ambon where they competed with the smugglers, but they also burned the English vessels which were sent from Macassar to stop the smuggling (Bassett, 1958). The Dutch also tried to undermine English supremacy in Macassar by flooding the market with cloth (Bassett, 1958), intending to force the prices of cloth and spices to fall so much that the English would not be able to obtain much profit. However, this strategy proved unsuccessful, so the Dutch again withdrew from Macassar in 1652 and concentrated their trading activities in Sumatra and Java (Bassett, 1958; Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969). Because the Dutch concentrated on competition with English, the Portuguese, the Spanish and local rulers could trade freely in Tidore until 1650, where they only had to compete with the Macassarese smugglers in obtaining spices from the local people.

Since the 1640s the Dutch had been increasing their political power in eastern part of the Indonesian Archipelago. In Nusa Tenggara, they captured Solor in 1646 (Bassett, 1958), which made it difficult for the Chinese to profit from transporting sandalwood to Macassar where the Portuguese were the main buyers. Following 1664 the Dutch also tried to
monopolise sapanwood in Bima (Bassett, 1958). Finally, the Dutch captured Macassar in 1667 so that all the foreign traders moved away; the Portuguese fled to Flores, Timor and Macau; the Danish abandoned trade in the Archipelago; the Spanish moved to Ternate until 1678 and then to the Philippines. The Dutch political action in eastern part of the Indonesian Archipelago effected the trading networks in the Indonesian Archipelago. The English moved back to India and concentrated their trading in India. By the 1670s the Aceh kingdom, the Banten kingdom and the Islamic Mataram kingdom were all effectively under Dutch domination, which means all places in the Indonesian Archipelago were under the Dutch control, including the trading network.

The local and the Asian traders, who settled in the the Indonesian Archipelago, were continuing their trading, however, they only exchanged local commodities. This situation make the varieties of commodities in the Indonesian Archipelago were less varied than before. It infers that since the Dutch dominated in the Indonesian Archipelago, there were some cultural changes including in personal consumption.
CHAPTER THREE

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF TRADING SITES IN THE INDONESIAN ARCHIPELAGO 1511 - 1680

The rising demand for spices in the sixteenth century was followed by the development of trading sites along the coast of the Indonesian Archipelago and changes in trading patterns. Chinese, west Asian and local traders sought local commodities within the Archipelago on a small scale, moving from one trading site to another. This pattern sustained the growth of trade centres, especially on the coastline. (van Leur, 1955; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Reid, 1988:85; 1993:62, 65; Manguin, 1993:201). Some trading centres produced an abundance of commodities but others acted in support networks for bigger trading centres. This chapter classifies trading centres in the
Indonesian Archipelago. This classification will be useful for understanding the historical information about trading centres within the Archipelago. It also allows us to see the gaps between historical and archaeological evidence that will be discussed in chapters four, five and six.

A. A Classification of Trading Sites in the Indonesian Archipelago

There was significant growth of trading sites in the Indonesian Archipelago during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Some had developed in earlier centuries but their existence was first recognised when Europeans recorded them in their accounts. Three kinds of trading sites may be distinguished: Direct Exchange Sites, Complex Entrepots and Fort Regulated Sites. Those three types of trading centres are defined on the basis of the methods of trading used, the status of the controllers of the trading activities, the facilities in the trading centres and the varieties of merchandise traded.

A.1. Direct Exchange Sites

In the first kind of centre, the Direct Exchange sites, traders exchanged their merchandise directly for local commodities. This is a different concept from the 'Direct Trading' of Meilink-Roelofs (1962:8), which refers to trade between one place and another, for instance, between Java and
Melaka. Direct Exchange sites were controlled by independent rulers or by a vassal of such a ruler. A direct Exchange site usually had an abundance of one or two commodities which attracted traders from other places. These traders sometimes came directly to this site, but often they arrived after stopping in many other places along their route. However, traders did not always stay permanently in such cities because they came only to collect local commodities which were carried to other places. Some traders perhaps did stay permanently in Direct Exchange sites, but lived side by side with the local people and adapted local cultures. The rulers did not provide special activities areas for the traders. Those traders who did stay permanently usually were middlemen who connected local traders with the visitors.

Several Direct Exchange sites developed during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Archipelago. Trading centres along the coast were recorded by Europeans in their accounts, such as Pasai, Pidie, Jambi, Barus, Sunda Kelapa, Tidore, Ternate and Banda. However, many Direct Exchange sites also developed inland, and because of this Bronson (1977:39-52) proposed an upstream-downstream trading pattern. The inland trading centres worked hand-in-hand to support the trading centres located on the coast (Bronson, 1977:44-47), from where the small scale traders maintained, and took over the distribution of local commodities (see former chapter). The visiting traders exchanged their merchandise for local products using coinage, for instance sandalwood flower coins, Chinese
Cash, local ruler’s coins, and Dutch coinage (Eerste, 1624; Cortesao, 1944; van Leur, 1955; Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Widiyoko, 1986; Wicks, 1992) (Plate: 1).

Plate: 1

Coinage used in the Southeast Asia in the sixteenth Century
From: Eerste, 1624: plate 44b; Wicks, 1992:255

Also, the traders exchanged their cloths, iron goods, ceramics and foodstuffs for local products by using local weight standard such as the *gantang* (Plate: 2, 3), *bahar* and *pikul* (Eerste, 1624; Cortesao, 1944; Corney, 1855; Foster, 1905; 1943).
Plate: 2
The standard *Gantang* weight of the sixteenth century.
in Maluku
Adapted from: De Eerste, 1624: plate 14

Plate: 3
The standard *Gantang* weight of the sixteenth century,
in Banten
Adapted from Eerste, 1624: plate 28.
A.2. Complex Entrepot sites.

In a Complex Entrepot, the trading activities were overseen by rulers who controlled large areas and/or were powerful traders. They controlled and monopolised valuable local products such as spices that were supplied by adjacent source regions. These places attracted both local and foreign traders because they had better, or more specialised, facilities than the Direct Exchange sites. Complex Entrepots controlled various commodities, both local and foreign, in both small and large amounts. In this type of trading the basic system of trade was similar to the in that Direct Exchange sites. However, the prices of certain commodities were more expensive than in the Direct Exchange markets but cheaper than in the Fort Regulated markets discussed below. This happened because the traders brought local commodities into the Complex Entrepot sites, which means the local commodities on the middlemen traders' hands, the bureaucrats and the Chinese. Also, the merchandise in entrepots was controlled by the middlemen who had good connections with the rulers.

The rulers built facilities to encourage the trading activities in these Complex Entrepots. Trading was more clearly regulated than in the Direct Exchange sites. The visiting traders knew the types and amount of the taxes they had to pay before and after trading (Ito, 1984). Moreover, markets were opened at certain times, commodities that were needed by buyers were
always in good supply, houses and warehouses were provided for the visitors, and also there were harbours and places for repairing the ships (Eerste, 1646; Nayati, 1985, 1987). In return, the rulers obtained profits from the trade and taxes, particularly because they also had the power to control who could trade in their centres. The traders could obtain privileges from the rulers if they brought letters of authority from their own kings or trading companies asking permission to trade, if they brought presents and also if they displayed cooperation in their trading.
The rulers controlled the trading activities in several ways. They monopolised the main and most valuable merchandise. Also, the rulers chose people to work on their behalf as *Syahbandar, Juru bahasa* (Malay/Indonesia: translators), and traders. Moreover, the rulers also developed special settlements for the visiting traders, which were set apart from the administrative, religious, and political centres. The visiting traders were not allowed to go around in the city. Because of it, there are no much information about local people derived from the journals.

The commodities traded in Complex Entrepots varied. The localities themselves usually produced few commodities so that the markets were supplied by goods from adjacent places and also from foreign countries. The traders exchanged their commodities both with the local traders and also through middlemen. After having completed their transactions, the traders kept the merchandise they had bought in their houses and in the warehouses provided by the rulers. Some traders preferred to store their merchandise in their ships and junks, especially if they felt that houses and warehouses were not secure. Trading activities were pursued not only in the markets and while unloading in the harbours, but also out at sea, especially when the traders tried to avoid paying taxes (Nayati, 1987).
A.3. Fort Regulated Sites

The Fort Regulated sites were places that had fortifications separate from local settlements. They were owned by Europeans who built forts in order to protect themselves and their merchandise, as in Tidore, Ternate, Banda, Banten and Batavia. The Portuguese and Spanish in Maluku did not have power to control large areas, but the Dutch from the first tried to build strong and independent forts to control the spice trade. After 1610 the Portuguese and Spanish fortifications came under Dutch control.

Therefore, the category of the Fort Regulated site is relevant only for Dutch trading posts in the Archipelago. The Dutch took over Direct Exchange sites from the local rulers, then changed them into exclusive trading posts that had complete facilities, such as Banda, Tidore, Ternate, and Batavia. As in the Direct Exchange and Complex Entrepot sites, the fort owners controlled the visiting traders.

The fort owners collected local products for their central markets themselves. They sent their ships to Direct Exchange sites and Complex Entrepots to buy such merchandise as was useful and profitable in Europe. Some of the ships, after loading up with Indonesian products, then went directly to Europe or other areas of Asia, while others returned to collect more products from the Indonesian market centres. The merchandise they bought was then stored together with the goods they had
brought from their home countries or elsewhere in Asia to trade for local products.

Although the commodities available in the Fort Regulated markets varied, the buyers were limited. Traders who frequented these places were mainly Europeans and Chinese who had a lot of money and/or a lot of merchandise that was in high demand in the Indonesian Archipelago. The fort owner had not only money but also local products that were stored in warehouses, and also money and power to control the buyers, the range of the merchandise and the prices in order to maximise profits. The prices of local products in the Fort Regulated markets were more expensive than in the Direct Exchange and the Complex Entrepot markets. The owners of these forts, at first, did not want to sell their Indonesian merchandise in their market because they preferred to sell it in European markets that yielded higher profit (Israel, 1979). However, in a later period, when individual officials became involved in trading activities, they sold their local merchandise to other buyers (Boxer, 1975). Both the fort authority and the visiting traders then exchanged merchandise, which was stored in warehouses provided by the fort authority and rented to the visitors.
B. A DESCRIPTIVE MODEL OF TRADING SITES IN THE INDONESIAN ARCHIPELAGO

All these kinds of trading situations affected the characteristics of the trading sites. These were correlated with the kinds of commodities that were traded, the people who visited and lived there and also with the methods they used in trading. From the historical data about Barus, Banten and Batavia, predictions are offered concerning the types of specific trading sites, the peak trading periods, the types of political and administrative activities and the commodities traded.

B.1. Barus

The Barus city lay-out was similar to Aceh but smaller in size. Barus after the 1620s was under Aceh's dominion and a representative Islamic ruler (Panglima) was placed there. The Panglima's house, like Southeast Asian houses in general, was probably made from wood. The European traders probably stayed only for brief visits, living for the period in similar houses.

Some commodities could be left as archaeological evidence for the trading activities of Barus. Local products are hardly likely to be recognised because pepper and forest products perish quickly, and anyway may have been transferred to other places. In contrast, some foreign merchandise such as beads, ironwork, ceramics, coinage and weights might survive to be found archaeologically.
There were two types of traders visiting in Barus: the Asian traders who lived permanently or semi-permanently in Barus and the Europeans who came to Barus only for short periods. These two groups can be distinguish in term of the material culture they left behind such as coins and ceramics. Since the first contacts of west Asian and Chinese traders with Barus occurred before the sixteenth century, there should be found material culture dated to before the sixteenth century in this site.

However, considering the flow of the visitors, there should be a greater abundance of material culture. The material culture mostly dated to the seventeenth century rather than the sixteenth, because in the seventeenth century the Chinese and Europeans regularly visited Barus and exchanged of their merchandise for pepper. Nevertheless, it could be some material culture dated before the seventeenth century are exist in this area, because the Arabs mentioned this place in their journals.

According those data, it can be assumed the material culture which will be found in Barus. Ceramics and coins from Asia and Europe could be acted as a mediator in the exchange. Some material culture relate to the local daily life could be easily found in this area. Also, other artefacts which could be used in explaining this type of trading site, including the grow of this site.
B. 2. Banten

Historical sources clearly describe Banten city. It had palaces, mosques, settlements, markets, warehouses and walls. The settlements were divided into groups with each group under a leader. The Chinese, English, Dutch, and Javanese had special hamlets which were located outside the city wall. However, the west Asians and local people lived in the city.

Material culture dated to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can be differentiated. There are some European artefacts dated to the seventeenth century because regular contact with Europeans started at the end of the sixteenth century. Moreover, there are Chinese ceramics dated to the seventeenth century from this site due to the export of bulk ceramics from China. In contrast, the west Asian material culture decreased at this time.

Archaeological evidence of commodities should be more varied and abundant than in Barus. Banten was a meeting place for traders who collected valuable products. The small scale traders brought not only spices but also other merchandise from different places along their routes, both from the eastern and western parts of the Indonesian Archipelago. The Asian and European traders brought to Banten their merchandise from home countries and other places where they stopped over.
The locations of markets in Banten can be determined. Traces of the actual stalls will be difficult to obtain because they used non-permanent materials. However, an indication of the market setting can be determined from traces of material culture, especially ceramics.

Coinage from different periods and origins have been found in Banten. The traders used Portuguese *Cruzeiros*, Chinese *Cash*, Banten local coins, and Dutch coins, some of which have broken because of bad quality or because of time.

It predicts that archaeological data of this site are varies, not only the types but also in term of periods. Those data could be explained many aspects such as the growing of the city, the distribution of merchandise, the consumption of the people and the population from time to time.


There are two city layouts in Batavia can which be distinguished, Sunda Kelapa/Jayakarta and Batavia. Sunda Kelapa/Jayakarta was similar to Banten but smaller in size, because Sunda Kelapa up to 1619 was under the control of Banten. In contrast, after 1619, Sunda Kelapa required permanent buildings used as houses, offices, warehouses, and fortifications. Different types of material culture will possibly be found related to the origins and social statuses of the
inhabitants. This should help interpretation of the characteristics of these sites.

Archaeological evidence related to coinage and merchandise in Batavia is different from Barus and Banten. In Batavia, only ceramics and cloth from Asia were acquired in exchange for spices. The spices were collected in Batavia's warehouses before being shipped to the Netherlands. The coinage used in Batavia were Chinese Cash and VOC coins.

Although evidence of trading activities in the three above-listed trading sites can be traced, only some part of the trading activities can be established conclusively. The best evidence consists of artefacts that are long lasting, such as metals, coins, bottles and porcelain. Such evidence could be spatially spread out, or accumulated in certain places depending on the trading situations. The commodities that were traded will be difficult to trace archaeologically, because most of them were taken away from the trading place.

Archaeological evidence regarding the people who came and traded in these centres is also difficult to obtain. Many traders left after a few months while others died and were buried there. So the number of graves does not represent all the people who came to those places. However, some artefacts such as bricks, door handles, keys, nails and also ecofacts such as post holes and fireplaces can be used as evidence for the nature of settlements.
The artefacts and ecofacts that are evidence of the trading activities, both local and international, are incomplete. Firstly, humans do not leave all their daily life recorded in lasting form. Secondly, the evidence moves because of human and geomorphological activities, so that the evidence that is found in one place sometimes correlates with other evidence in other places. Moreover, some of the evidence is under the land surface and so needs to be excavated. Nevertheless, if the excavation is not total, the evidence is still incomplete. Some part of the evidence, however, remains important and useful for archaeologists in understanding these early trading activities.
CHAPTER FOUR

DIRECT EXCHANGE SITES

Direct Exchange sites in the Indonesian Archipelago were visited by both local and foreign traders. However, such sites were only small and did not have many facilities for people to dwell permanently. The Direct Exchange sites only acted as accumulation centres where traders regularly visited for short periods in order to collect local products. In the Indonesian Archipelago during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, several such Direct Exchange sites were recorded by European traders (Cortesao, 1944; Dames, 1921; Eerste, 1646; De Eerste, 1646). However, the historical records mainly cover Sumatra, Java and Maluku, so places like Barus, Tiku, Pariman, Indrapura, Silebar, Banda, Ambon, Ternate and Tidore are familiar. Some of those sites had developed in the sixteenth century. All these places had spices, from local sources and also from adjacent places.
Among Direct Exchange sites, so far Barus has been studied archaeological. So it provides the only available place for a case study to indicate the comparative roles of historical sources and archaeological evidence in reconstructing details of Direct Exchange sites in the Indonesian Archipelago (map: 3).

Map: 3
Location of Barus, west coast of Sumatra
Adapted from: Nurhakim, 1989; Drakard, 1990 (with modification)
This chapter analyses both the findings of the archaeological research and the historical sources relating to Barus. Do these two set of data support each other, or do they raise further question about trading activities at this site?

A. History of Barus

Historical sources provide information about the development of Barus. Barus in the middle of the eighth century was known as P'o-lu-shih by the Chinese (Wolter, 1967:17; Miksic, 1980:59; Drakard, 1990:3; Wicks, 1992:233). Drakard (1989:59; 1990:4) found out from Malay texts that in the ninth century, the kingdom located in Lobo Tua changed its name from Fansur to Barus. After a period, this place was attacked by orang Gergasi. The inhabitants of Lobo (sic. Lobu) Tua then moved across the Aek Si Raha river and created two new settlements in Kuala Barus. Furthermore, another Malay text mentions that Barus was then occupied by orang Tarusan from the southwest of Sumatra who created two other new settlements (Drakard, 1989:59). There are no dates for these changes, but Drakard (1989:59-60) assumes that the last one happened between the period of Acehnese influence and the arrival of the Dutch, which means between 1510 and 1600. Chinese accounts agree with Pires that Barus was an independent kingdom (Cortesao, 1944:160-161; Dumarcay, 1986:85-86; Wicks, 1992:233), but later on Barus came under the rule of Aceh (Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969; Drakard, 1990:7). Jean and Raoul Parmentier
mentioned that Barus in 1529 was a small hamlet with a king named Megalica (Dumarcay, 1986:85-86). Perhaps the independent kingdom reported by Pires around 1512 was ruled by a person who came from southwest Sumatra as in the Malay text and the Parmentier brothers met with a Panglima, a representative of the Sultan of Aceh.

Barus had been steadily visited by west Asian and Chinese traders since the sixth century (Cortesao, 1944:161-162; Drakard, 1989; Wicks, 1992:233). On the basis of surviving historical data, the port was located on a main sailing route and was well known as a source of camphor, mercury, gold and pepper sources by Chinese and west Asian traders (Cortesao, 1944:161; Drakard, 1989:56-57, 62-65). Arab accounts dated to the ninth century mention that the local people exchanged coconuts, sugar cane and bananas for iron (Wicks, 1992:234-235). Another Arab account from the eleventh century states that the people of Nias, offshore from Barus, used ingots of copper as articles of exchange, and they treated copper like the Arabs treated gold (Wicks, 1992:234-235). The existence of Nias traders in Barus was also reported by Pires (Cortesao, 1944:161). The traders who visited Barus also visited Pasai because there was camphor there (Pires, 1944:163; Wicks, 1992:233). During the sixteenth century, Gujarati merchants visited Barus regularly. Pires on the information available to him in Melaka reported that:

............... One, two or three Gujarati ships visited Barus every year to exchange their cloth for
Moreover Pires obtained information in Melaka that Persian, Arab, Orissan and Bengali traders knew about Barus (Cortesão, 1944:161). Other nations to visit Barus were the French and Chinese, as mentioned in their accounts (Dumarcay, 1986:85-86; Drakard, 1989; Drakard, 1990:3). During the sixteenth century, it seems that Barus was famous not only under this name but also with the old name Fansur, Pansur, or Panshur as mentioned in journals.

In the sixteenth century, there were several Direct Exchange sites on the west coast of Sumatra which became more important. Barus became less popular than Pariaman and Tiku, which were visited not only by Chinese and west Asian traders but also by Europeans (Burnell, 1885; Foster, 1905; 1940). This was different from the earlier period when Tiku and Pariaman were not visited by many traders because they were too difficult to reach, as mentioned by Pires (Cortesão, 1944:160-161).

The sixteenth century saw changes in the demands for and distributions of commodities. The commodities were getting more specific, from forest products to pepper. The later was collected from adjacent regions (Cortesão, 1944:160-162). Local people distributed pepper not only to Barus but also to Pariaman and Tiku, which mean the traders who purchased pepper could choose the best pepper at the lowest prices. Also, reasonably similar merchandise from outside the west coast of Sumatra reached these three places.
in the same period because European ships usually visited them successively and at regular intervals, as shown in the European journals.

B. Archaeological Research in Barus

Our archaeological knowledge of Barus comes chiefly from the work of Hasan Ambary (1985) and Nurhakim (1989). Evidence of contact between local and foreign people was found in several places within this place. Ceramics from different origins and periods, metal, glass, coinage, and beads have been found in Barus (Ambary, 1985; Nurhakim, 1989). Also, there are Muslim graves and inscriptions in Tamil reported to have been found in Barus (Miksic, 1979; Ambary, 1985; Drakard, 1989; 1990).

Several ceramics styles of different origins and date represent exchange between foreign and local people. The Chinese ceramics dated from the Tang to the Qing Dynasties, Thai and Vietnamese ceramics from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries and Dutch ceramics from the nineteenth to twentieth centuries, are found in this place (Ambary, 1985; Nurhakim, 1989:48) (Table: 1). According to the table 1 it can be seen that ceramics from Asia dated from the eighth to the twentieth centuries were continuously used in Barus, but Dutch ceramics only appeared in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.
### Table: 1
Classification of ceramics found in Barus
Adapted from Nurhakim, 1989:48).

Also there are several kinds of archaeological evidence which can be used for interpreting daily life such as pottery, charcoal, glass, beads, and coinage (Nurhakim, 1989: 47-48) (Table: 2). Although there are no published descriptions of these items, they are an indications of activities in Barus.

### Table: 2
Archaeological finding in Barus
Adapted from: Nurhakim, 1989:48 (with modification).
Graves and inscriptions have been found within Barus. There are Muslim graves found in Bukit Hasang and Lobu Tua. In Bukit Hasang, there is a grave of a person called Tuanku Batu Badan dated to the Islamic year 972 (Nurhakim, 1989:45), which corresponds to 1637 AD. However, in Lobu Tua, there is the grave of Maesurah to which Nilakanta Sastri gives a date of 1088 AD. (Miksic, 1979). On the other hand, Ambary (1985) gives this grave a date of 1206/7 AD. and Drakard (1989:73) dates it to as late as 1565 AD.

Ambary argues there were two harbors in Barus: Lobu Tua and Kedai Gadang. He claims that Lobu Tua was the original port, which was later moved to Kedai Gadang. His assumption is based on the Chinese ceramics dated from the Song Dynasty (AD. 960-1279), whilst in Kedai Gadang the ceramics dated from the Yuan (AD. 1280-1368) to the Qing Dynasties (AD. 1644-1912) and to the European period.

Ambary's interpretation is based on the proportion that ceramics provide the main basis for dating and reconstructing chronological developments within the settlement. Because only Song ceramics were found in Lobu Tua, so Ambary infers that Lobu Tua was used as a port only for a certain period before, for whatever reason, it had to be moved to another location (Ambary, 1985). However, further archaeological research revealed that there are other Song ceramics found within Barus. Nurhakim (1989:48) classified 265 Song sherds found in Lobu Tua, 113 found in Bukit
Hasang and 13 found in Kedai Gadang (see Table 1). Nurhakim's classification of the Barus ceramics supports Ambary's argument. The ceramics found in Lobu Tua decreased drastically over time; for the tenth to the thirteenth centuries, there were 313 sherds found, but in the fourteenth to the twentieth centuries only 5. In contrast, in Kedai Gadang, there are 13 sherds dated to the tenth to the thirteenth centuries and 439 sherds dated to the fourteenth to the twentieth centuries.

C. Problems

Putting together the two bodies of evidence, several questions and issues arise. Firstly, there is the issue of the shift in the location of the port which was followed by the development of new settlements to the east of the Aek Batu Geringis (Drakard, 1990 map 2), or Batugarsi river as mentioned in Nurhakim (1989 map 1). Ambary and Nurhakim have not offered any further evidence which would indicate that the earlier site of Barus was so unsuitable that the port site had to be moved to another location. The changing of the name from Fansur to Barus mentioned in the Malay text suggests a settlement shift from Lobu Tua to Kuala Barus located across the Aek batu Geringis, Batugargasi river, so this could be used as supportive evidence for the shift.

Given this agreement between the historical sources and the archaeological evidence concerning the port and settlement shift in the early sixteenth century, I assume that the site of Kedai Gadang
was not used until the period of conquest from Tarusan or Aceh. Evidence from ceramics as shown in table 1 suggests that the occupation of Kedai Gadang began sometimes around the sixteenth century. This place has ceramics from China, Thailand, Vietnam, and Europe but this does not mean that only east Asians and Europeans live here. I assume that local people and west Asians lived there also, based on artifacts found and listed in table 2. It can probably be assumed that Kedai Gadang was a better location for trading activities and dwellings.

The Malay texts record the development of other new settlements, but such developments have no been recognized in the archaeological evidence. The toponyms in Barus help us to understand the characteristics of the sites. For example, Ladang Baru means a new place/area for settlement or for farming. Ladang Tengah means an area located between two other areas. Pasar Baru means new market—perhaps it replace an old market which was submerged or flooded, as shown by the name Pasar Terendam. These new settlements probably followed the shifts of administrative area, market and port in the Barus region.

Ceramics are also an indicator of contact between local and foreign people. However, the ceramics were imported from China, Thailand, Vietnam and Dutch only. They do not indicate the origins of all the people recorded as actually visiting Barus. Historical sources indicate that west Asians, south Asians, Chinese, Portuguese, French, English and Dutch visited Barus, but there is no direct archaeological evidence which points to the Portuguese,
French and English. In contrast, the west and south Asian visitors cannot be recognized using ceramics but their existence in Barus can be interpreted from jewelry incised in Arabic script, from Muslim grave stones and inscriptions.

As yet, it is difficult to estimate when different groups of traders visited Barus. The west and south Asian traders regularly visited Barus after the ninth century. Also, they visited Pasai and Thailand, based on similarities of coinage (Wicks, 1992) and Muslim graves (Ambary, 1989). In contrast, it is difficult to know the dates of Chinese involvement in Barus because the Chinese ceramics date from the Tang to the modern period. Tang ceramics are not proof that they reached Barus in the Tang period because the ceramics have been circulation for long period.

There are no available sources for west Asian and Chinese in Barus from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries. However, there is archaeological evidence which can be used for interpreting their existence in Barus, such as Jewellery incised with Arabic script, inscription in Tamil (Miksic, 1979), and Muslim graves. Although the Asian ceramics from Thailand and Vietnam may indicate contact between local Barus people and these traders, Thai and Vietnamese traders are not mentioned in any accounts. In contrast, Malay traders who are mentioned in accounts have left no archaeological evidence of their existence in Barus.

European traders are also difficult to trace from archaeological evidence. Historical sources mention the arrival of
Europeans in Barus, especially the Portuguese who were the earliest Europeans to collect pepper at Barus in the 1510s (Dames, 1921). However, this effort was not successful because the Aceh kingdom, together with west Asian traders, monopolized the pepper trade on the west coast of Sumatra (Kathirithamby-Wells, 1969; 1987). The Portuguese were followed by the French traders who arrived Barus in 1529 (Dumarcay, 1986), and after that, in 1601, the English became the first traders to obtain permission from the Sultan of Aceh to collect pepper, not only in Barus but also in Tiku and Pariaman (Foster, 1940). After that time, other Dutch also collected pepper in the Direct Exchange sites along the west coast of Sumatra, including Barus, but the Panglimas did not always welcome them. The English, in the 1610s, then preferred to collect pepper in Tiku and Pariaman rather than in Barus because they could obtain more there (Foster, 1934; 1940).

According to historical information, English, French and Dutch traders visited Barus, but they did not permanently stay there. Only the Dutch company in 1668 establish a trading post in Barus (Drakard, 1990:6-7). Archaeological evidence in Barus is not able to prove the arrival of Portuguese, French and English traders in Barus. This is understandable because they only collected pepper without staying permanently. This is in contrast to the south Asian and Dutch traders who had trading post in Barus, so those two nations are recognizable from the material culture left.

There are questions arising about the trading activities in Barus. The historical data mention that south Asian traders visited
Barus in order to collect local products (Fires, 1944). This is supported by the Tamil inscription from Labu Tua dated 1080 AD according to Ambary (1985), or 1088 according to Sastri (1932; Miksic, 1979). This mentions that a south Indian merchant guild had founded a trading centre there in eleventh century. This leads to the assumption that Tamil traders visited the west coast of Sumatra and that a semi-permanent group of Tamil resided in Lobu Tua in the eleventh century.

Local people from Barus and adjacent places were also involved in trading. People from near Barus sent their local commodities to Barus (Fires, 1944:159-162). It may be that these local products were collected in certain places by the Panglima and local Bureaucrats. The Chinese could also have been involved, but the only available data come from the middle of the seventeenth century when the Chinese from Batavia carried local commodities from the west coast of Sumatra to Batavia.

The media of exchange changed significantly over time and space. Coinage inscribed with a sandalwood flower was used in Barus (Wicks, 1992:225-226). A similar motif on different size of coinage has also been found in Thailand and Java (Wicks, 1992). Also, there was probably a barter system in Barus. Local people traded their commodities for jewellery and ceramics. According some journals, cloth was valuable merchandise so that the English and Dutch exchanged this for spices.
Even without referring to the associated archaeological information but only using the Barus inscriptions themselves, it can be inferred that Indian merchants were trading in Barus in the eleventh century. However, the south Indian guild was replaced by Gujarati traders at the end of the fifteenth century (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962"92). Pires mentions that in the sixteenth century the Gujaratis traders became more important and they became wealthy (Cortesao, 1944:162). This change is not recognized in the archaeological sources.

There is a problem in understanding the contact with west Asian by using Muslim graves. According to the Ambary scheme of dating, the Maemunah grave stone is 90 years older than the Pasai grave stones (Hall, 1977:215; Ricklefs, 1993). However, there are similarities with a Muslim woman’s grave stone from Leran (east Java) dated in the Islamic year equivalent to 1082 AD, and another grave from Phanrang, Thailand (Ambary, 1991:11). The Leran grave inscription is for a woman named Fatimah, whose father's name was Maimun and grandfather's name was Hibatallah. The Thai Muslim grave is for Achmad, son of Abu Ibrahim and grandson of Abu 'Arradah alias Abu Kamil, who died in 29 safar 431 Muslim Calendar, equivalent to 1039 AD (Ambary, 1991:11). In contrast, the Muslim grave stone in Barus do not mention any ancestry but based on the name Maesurah, it can be assumed it belong to a Muslim woman. In contrast, Drakard assumes the woman's name is Maesurah and that she died in 1565 AD (Drakard, 1989:73). This
new perception about the dating makes the Fatimah in Leran the oldest Muslim in Indonesia.

The similarity in Muslim graves in Barus-Leran and Phanrang is also supported by coinage. There is a similarity between coinage found in Barus and in Thailand, although the coins from Thailand are larger (Wicks, 1992:225-226). This coinage was used in the tenth to twelfth centuries, although, similar coinage was used in Java and Bali before that period (Miksic, 1979; Wicks, 1992).

It would seem that the south Indian and Gujarati traders both lived semi permanently in Lobu Tua. The Tamil inscription, if it is in situ, and also the Maemunah grave stone can help the interpretation of the pattern of their settlement. Another possibility is that the Chinese traders also visited Barus and lived in Lobu Tua. Perhaps they brought the Chinese ceramics that probably were exchanged for local products.

The Gujaratis presumably lived side by side with local people. Their daily life may have been quite similar to that the local people and they would have adapted to the local material culture. This is possibly the reason why there are almost no west Asian material cultural remains in Barus, or in other places in Indonesia, even though the historical sources mention that these people visited and stayed in the Indonesian Archipelago.

I assume that these foreign traders exchanged such merchandise as glass, carnelian beads, some small stones and gold ring, for local products. These artefacts can be identified as foreign
merchandise because some gold ring were incised in Sanskrit and Arabic scripts (Mksic, 1979). The foreign traders probably also used coins because there were finds several small golden bullet-shaped objects inscribed with the Javanese character 'ma' that are assumed to be coins. This coinage is spread throughout the western Indonesian Archipelago and also the waist coats of India (Mksic, 1979). Probably the coins were also used for paying taxes not only in Barus but also in other places.

Another non-local item was also exchanged for pepper. Sandalwood flower coinage with a 'ma' inscription was also as a medium of exchange in Barus. This kind of coinage has been found in central Java, Bali, begkulu, and in several places in Thailand, and was used from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries (Wicks, 1992:219-226). However, this coinage was later replaced by Chinese coinage although archaeological evidence for cash has not yet been found in Barus.

On the basis of such evidence, it can be seen that archaeological evidence provides support for the historical sources about the nature of trading activities in Barus and vice versa although both archaeological and historical sources do not pinpoint the place for trading in Barus.

Once Barus had declined significantly, Tiku and Pariaman to the south of Barus attracted more visiting traders, so that some of the Barus local products were sent to these trading centres (Foster, 1940). The English traders preferred to anchor their ships in front
of Tiku and Pariaman, and sent special junks to collect pepper in Barus (Foster, 1934; 1940). Tiku and Pariaman had more merchandise and this was attractive for the traders who wanted high profits. Moreover, the Aceh ruler gave the English traders permission to trade in Tiku and Pariaman (Foster, 1940). It seems that the taxes were also lower, and maybe the security at those places was better than Barus, which was different from the situation in the early sixteenth century when Pires (1944) mentioned that the area south of Barus, included Tiku and Pariaman, was not secure. Perhaps, Tiku and Pariaman, at first were to visited by European traders because local west Sumatran traders sent their merchandise to Barus. Nevertheless, some foreign traders continued to visit Barus. Based on ceramics found by Ambary in Kedai Gadang, it can be seen that Chinese and European products still reached Barus up to the twentieth century.

Unfortunately, there is no information about the context of the artefacts found during the archaeological research in Barus. Thus interpretation must be based on simple listing of material culture, such pottery, ceramics and charcoal. It can be assume that the Barus inhabitants preferred to used Asian ceramics even though ceramics from Holland were available. Those Asian ceramics could be obtained by exchange for pepper and / or local commodities.

The local people were influenced by the foreign luxury goods, such as beads, necklace, ring and glass (Miksic, 1979, Nurhakim, 1989). It can be inferred that there was some changes in consumption which it could create and reinforce differences in
social status. People who had gold rings and carnelian bead necklaces would have been higher in status than people who lacked these luxury goods. Social status can also be inferred from the locations in which they lived.

D. Conclusion

The archaeological evidence of trading activities in Barus is scarce and only provides limited information about the contact between local and foreign people. Moreover, the activities involved in the exchange of merchandise and also the land use of Barus are still unclear.

Ceramics in Barus are important evidence for the shift of the harbor, as indicators of the contact with foreigners and also as indicators of the commodities exchanged for local commodities. Historical sources also provide these kind of data. So that, the two kinds of data support each other for understanding some part of the trading activities in Barus.

The historical and archaeological remains help the interpretation that the foreign traders brought merchandise from outside Barus. However, it is difficult to understand the way they traded and how the transactions operated, especially in the seventeenth century. The distribution of merchandise suggested by Bronson (1977) may involve not only the distribution up and down a river but also from place to place along the west.
Historical sources mentioned the weights used for local merchandise. Pepper was used weighed by *gantang, pikul* and *bahar*, but there is no archaeological evidence from which to infer the weight system used in Barus. Moreover it is still difficult to establish the actual location where trading took place because the merchandise which were traded, were taken out by the buyer from the trading location.

The historical sources provide some good data for understanding the contact between local and foreign traders. However, this is difficult to match with archaeological data. The gap arise mainly because the archaeological study of Barus has not yet been undertaken intensively. I suggest that further archaeological research could be done in Barus so that the changing port and trading activities in this Direct Exchange site can be recorded and explained. Intensive archaeological research could help in understanding the development of Barus region as unit.

I assume that more archaeological evidence could be found in Barus, including Barus Mudik, because this location changed from being an international trading place centuries ago to become a small district, so that modern development of this area has not been as fast as in other big cities along the west coast of Sumatra and we can therefore expect to excavate a relatively undisturbed site.
CHAPTER FIVE

COMPLEX ENTREPO T SITES

The Complex Entrepots in the Indonesian Archipelago that flourished during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are better sites to study than the Direct Exchange sites because they were visited by Europeans such as Portuguese, English and Dutch, who usually recorded their activities during the times they traded and lived permanently there. The historical sources consist not only of written texts but also include illustrations and maps, all of which can help in developing an understanding of the situation in these places. Moreover, the Complex Entrepots continued over longer period than the Direct Exchange sites so the data, both historical and archaeological, are more abundant than for the Direct Exchange sites.

Banten is a good example of a Complex Entrepot for which there is an abundance of all sorts of data. This site is also
interesting as an example of the gap that arises between the relevant archaeological and historical information which can be used for interpreting a Complex Entrepot during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This site raises the question of the extent to which those data support each other in explaining the trading activities during this period.

Banten, in western Java, reached its peak of development at this time. A broad outline of the site can be derived from a survey of the ruins of major buildings (the Surasowan palace, the Kaibon palace, the Speelwijk fort), and the minaret of Pecinan mosque, from the Tasik Ardi lake and water filtering structures, and from buildings which are still being used, such as the great mosque and the Chinese temple (Map: 4). There are also significant quantities of artefacts which have been collected on the surface. The picture of Banten becomes even clearer through reference to the historical sources, including reports, maps and illustrations.

A. History of Banten

The rise and decline of Banten is well described in local historical sources. Banten was recorded before 1512 as a small harbour, together with Pontang and Sunda Kelapa (Cortesao, 1944:160; Djadjadiningrat, 1983). It benefited from the Portuguese conquest of Melaka in 1511, because the traders who used to trade there moved to other trading centres within Indo-
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Indonesia, and especially to Banten (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962). Banten soon developed as an important harbour because the political, economic and religious centres of the Banten kingdom moved from the interior (Banten Girang) to the coastal area in 1552 (Djajadiningrat, 1983: 36; 125,144).

Banten was regularly visited by Asian and European traders because it had a reliable supply of foodstuffs, rice, pepper and other commodities from the eastern part of Indonesia, and especially of spices from Maluku (Cortesao, 1944:168-172). Moreover, these traders could obtain other valuable merchandise at Banten, such as ceramics and cloth, which could then be traded for Indonesian products. Banten as an entrepot declined gradually after 1682 (de Graff, 19) and came totally under the control of the Dutch in 1813 (Michrob; 1991).

The history of Banten can be extracted from a range of historical sources, both local and foreign. Before Banten became the capital of Banten Kingdom, the centre of political and religious activities was in Banten Girang, 15 km south (Djajadiningrat, 1983). The archaeological remains, especially Chinese ceramics, help to support this account. The excavation at Banten Girang produced a Chinese sherd dated to the Five Dynasties period (907-960), earlier than any of the ceramics found in Banten. Based on this sherd, it is likely that Banten Girang was occupied before Banten (Ambary, 1977:10). Moreover, this interpretation is also supported by the fact that
there are more Chinese sherds dated to the Song Dynasty (960-1280) in Banten Girang than in Banten (Ambary, 1977:10; Harkantiningsih, 1983:393). So it seems clear from archaeological data that Banten Girang is older than Banten, and this view is supported by the historical data which mention that Hasanuddin moved the central activities of his kingdom from Banten Girang to Banten in 1552 (Djadadinrat, 1983:36,125,144). However, although the archaeological data do suggest support for the historical sources, in my opinion more archaeological data are needed. This scepticism is based on two reasons: firstly, the archaeological work in Banten has been more intensive than in Banten Girang, so that the numbers of artefacts found are in unbalanced proportions. Secondly, the sites for previous research had to be determined almost at random, being influenced by the availability of currently vacant areas because Banten is being developed as a new settlement and many sites are now built over.

The historical development of Banten can also be interpreted based on old maps drawn by the Dutch. There are seven maps dating after 1596 which may be used to analyse the chronological development of Banten from 1596 up to 1900 (plates: 5,6,7,8) (Nayati, 1985a). Over these four centuries, the great mosque, the palace and the square were established as the core of Banten. The Sultan of Banten built city walls (which divided the core of Banten from the settlement for foreigners), canals, new settlements, the Tasik Ardi lake and the water
filtering structures, and many religious places both inside and outside the city wall (Nayati, 1985a). All these structures were planned to form a coherent whole, despite being built at different times.

Plate: 5
Banten in 1596
Adapted from Eerste, 1646.
Aristocratic compounds:
1 Court of the young king
2 The Temenggung
3 Kiai Kanga Pamman
4 'a great nobleman, close in blood to the king'
5 Ratu Bagus Panta, 'of the king's family'
6 Patra Sari, a former resident of Batavia
7 Kiai Wadon Adi, 'a principal noble'
8 Pangeran Ania Papati
9 Pangeran Sambang Loor, 'the king's nephew and counsellor'
10 Kiai Agus
11 Sim Suan, 'formerly... one of the principal Chinese'

Plate: 6
Banten in 1624
Adapted from Reid, 1993: 84
Plate: 7
Banten in 1659
Adapted from Ijzerman, 1923
Plate: 8
Banten in 1900
Adapted from Serrurier, 1902.
Aerial photography supports and adds some important insights to other forms of historical and archaeological evidence. Firstly, aerial photography makes it possible to map accurately many buildings of archaeological interest, such as the Surasowan fort-wall, the great mosque and the minaret, the Chinese temple, and the Pecinan minaret (Nayati, 1985a). Secondly, the north part of the city wall can be clearly traced from the air (Nayati, 1985a): it runs east-west and is located north of the road between Karangantu and the Chinese temple. From the aerial photographs, it can be shown that the wall formed a zig-zag which confirms the information shown in the 1624 map. From personal observation, the structure of the wall and also the joining structure between the Dutch fort and the city wall can easily be distinguished. So, in Banten, aerial photography is effective in recognised some archaeological evidence, especially building material. So the aerial photography's research give advantages in recognising the pattern of the Banten.

Banten was built over many years. A priority of the builders was to maintain security, both against foreigners and internally. Based on the series of maps it can be seen how they built walls and canals to defend the city, palaces and the great mosque, locating the foreigners outside the city wall and also placing local settlements strategically at each corner of these walls (Nayati, 1985a). It appears that Banten was modelled on the Moncopat-moncolimo town plan common in central Java.
which ensured city security by a grid plan that allowed every central point to be safeguarded by other centres in all four directions (Moertono, 1968). Not only was this system effective against external threat, but it was useful for internal security also because the heads of the quarters (Pangeran) and the inhabitants were responsible for their own areas and had access to quick information about newcomers from neighbouring quarters. The system also regulated the movement and location of the daily markets which moved in a cycle according to the five Javanese weekdays: Pon, Wage, Kliwon, Legi and Paing.

B. Archaeological Research in Banten

The archaeological research undertaken so far in Banten has been mainly based on the Serrurier map of 1900 (plate: 11). This research has been continued up to now by the Archaeological Research Centre (Pusat Penelitian Arkeologi Nasional) and the Office for the Preservation and Conservation of Historical and Archaeological Remains, West Java Province (Kantor Suaka Peninggalan Sejarah dan Purbakala Propinsi Jawa Barat). The often random excavations have produced a great quantity of artefacts of all kinds. Several journal articles have been published about Banten, but only three formal reports have been published (Ambary, 1977; Mundardjito, 1978; Harkantiningsih, 1988). In the following discussion I have used these published reports and articles as well as my personal

In general, the aim of the recent archaeological research in Banten is to understand the city as a complex of political, economic, social, and religious centres, using the 1900 Serrurier map as a base (Ambary, 1977:3; Mundardjito, 1988:8-9; Nurhadi, 1988:15-17). This map is particularly valuable because Serrurier mentioned and explained 33 names of suburbs and buildings in detail. Although this map has been used as the main source of information for reconstructing Banten, additional suburbs have been identified by comparing several old maps dating between 1596 and 1900 (Table: 3) (Nayati, 1985a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pe(a)cinan</th>
<th>Tambak</th>
<th>Pabean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pekojan</td>
<td>Kajoran</td>
<td>Selokan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mataram</td>
<td>Kabalen</td>
<td>Kalalang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kasemen</td>
<td>Karangsepatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Kawiragunan</td>
<td>Langgeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjunan</td>
<td>Pajantran</td>
<td>Pamarican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penjaringan</td>
<td>Kepandean</td>
<td>Panggeraongan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajagang</td>
<td>Pasar Anyar</td>
<td>Kafakifan/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kefakihan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karayar</td>
<td>Pagebangan</td>
<td>Pesantrian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: 3
Suburbs in Banten from 1596-1900
Adapted from Nayati, 1985a, *Tabel: 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panalanggang</th>
<th>Kebantenan</th>
<th>Kasatrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kali[r]gangsa</td>
<td>Kasunyatan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajang</td>
<td>Kagonan</td>
<td>Kaloran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadunanggang</td>
<td>Kraton</td>
<td>Kawangsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karangantu</td>
<td>Pamaranggeng</td>
<td>Pratok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawilahan</td>
<td>Pakawatan</td>
<td>Kamandalikan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The suburbs mentioned by Serrurier can be classified in five groups. First come the settlements for the bureaucrats: Kawangsan is the place for Pangeran Wangsa; Kabantenan the place for Pangeran Banten; and Kefakihan the place for the Fakih, Muslim leader. Second come the settlements for the workers: Panjunan is the place for pottery/earthenware makers; Pakawatan the place for making goods from copper and fishnets and Kepandean the place for iron makers. Third come the settlements for people from different places and origins: Pekojan is the place for west Asians; Pecinan the place for Chinese and Kebalen the place for Balinese. Moreover, Serrurier also recorded as the Surasowan palace, the Kaibon palace, the great mosques, and the Spelwijk (Dutch) fort. Although there are some features in the Serrurier map which cannot be recognised, such as the building where the spices were collected, some of place names mentioned in the map are still in use, such as the
Surasowan palace, the Kaibon palace, the great mosque, Panjunan, Karangantu and Pakojan. Moreover, the local people still remember the old suburb names.

There are other important clues for interpreting the function of various sites in Banten. Firstly, there is a suburb called Pamarican by Serrurier. This name derives from *mrica* in Javanese and Sundanese meaning pepper, so Pamarican could be a place for handling pepper. Harkantiningsih (1988:59) argues that Pamarican was an area for storing pepper because of her interpretation of stone grinding equipment found there. However, there is no other direct evidence of bags or weights systems for handling or trading in pepper in this area.

Serrurier explained that Pabean meant a place for paying taxes. Harkantiningsih (1989:59) assumes that this site was both a settlement and a grave complex. Also it was a place where ceramics were stored and a variety of ceramics were found there which had been burned. Historical sources record the Pabean area was burned in 1800 (Harkantiningsih, 1988:59).

Pecinan was undoubtedly a Chinese settlement, based on its name. Several structures located on the west bank of the Cibanten river include the Chinese cemetery, the Chinese temple, the ruin of a minaret and part of the Pecinan mosque, and a Chinese house. During a visit to this area in 1985, I found several Chinese ceramic sherds from different dynasties, and
also Chinese grave stones now used as drain covers. According to analyses sources record that Pecinan moved at least three times from the coast to inland and to the west bank of the Cibanten river (Nayati, 1985b). Moreover, it shows a map dated to 1624 shows (plate: 6) that Pecinan was a well-planned settlement and there was also an English settlement on the west bank of the Cibanten river not shown elsewhere. Perhaps the English settlement was located within the Chinese area because, around the 1620s the English traders were active trading in Banten.

The modern technique of aerial photography provides valuable support for the information about Banten available in historical maps (Nayati, 1985a). Firstly, through aerial photography it has been possible to locate many of the historical buildings in Banten. The aerial map of Banten could be used as a basic guide for further archaeological work and to identify new sites (Nayati, 1985a). The shoreline of 1740, which was shown in the Serrurier map, is still identifiable on land which is now used as fishponds. Secondly, aerial photographs have also revealed the old harbour, shown in the 1596 map, which is now located in the fishponds. Thirdly, an area interpreted as a place where ships were repaired has been identified to the west of Banten. Fourthly, aerial photography is able to trace the changes of course of the Cibanten river over time and the increasing control of the river flow.
Along the Cibanten, a new site was located in Kradenan suburb where, from personal observation in 1985, some glass beads and local pottery were found. This site was discovered because of the activities undertaken by the Indonesian Construction Department (Departemen Pekerjaan Umum) in order to deepen and widen the river. This activity covered some Muslim grave stones, which has not been known before, both from maps and surface evidence. However, these construction activities have now destroyed not only the Kradenan site but also part of the Kaibon palace yard and Panjunan, a pottery making site which was located outside the city wall. Yet although archaeologists have missed some important evidence, especially about the context of the remains, further archaeological research should still be done in these important areas.

C. Problems

Despite the claim of Harkantiningsih, there are problems in reconstructing the historical development of Banten. Using the archaeological remains and historical sources, Harkantiningsih (1988: 61) claims strongly that there are correlation between the two sets of data. However, she accepts that it is difficult to identify the function of many sites, so she suggests the need to concentrate on context and to analyse the variability of the remains. Moreover she points out that
comparisons with similar activities which are still practised are also important to supplement the archaeological and historical records in understanding Banten (Harkantiningsih, 1988:61). It can be seen that a multi-disciplinary research approach is needed to understand the past of Banten in more detail.

The Surasowan palace is a particularly interesting subject for study. This palace was the core of Banten and housed 22 successive rulers between 1552 and 1813. After 1945, it was used as a dwelling for ordinary people, who have now been moved to a new suburb near Benteng Spelwijk (the Dutch fort). The buildings within the palace itself have gone, but it is still possible to recognize the wall surrounding the palace and several places within the palace, as mentioned in the map (Plate: 9), such as Rara (Lara; Kare) Denok. The wall surrounding the palace was built of brick and coral mortar, and was faced by coral blocks. The foundations of buildings within the Surasowan palace complex were mainly of brick.

The interpretation of the function of the Surasowan palace, the main palace of Banten, is derived from a combination of the description by Serrurier and the archaeological remains which have been obtained there since 1968. Harkantiningsih (1988:57) assumes that Surasowan palace was also used for a range of household activities, based on the variety of ceramics found there. However, no study comparing the varieties of ceramics which were used in the palace and outside the palace has yet been done. Such a study would be
useful in supporting Harkantiningsih's interpretation of the household activities in the palace. Moreover, a detailed analysis of the wall structures within the Surasowan palace could help to explain the differences in household activities in different areas within the Surasowan palace at different periods.
There is considerable archaeological evidence for the presence of the Islamic religion and culture in Banten. The great mosque was first built by Maulana Hasanuddin in 1552 (Djajadiningrat: 1983) as one of the main characteristics of an Islamic city. However, like a living monument, this mosque has been reconstructed many times, without any formal report or records by the local people, Dutch or Indonesian Governments. In consequence, there is evidence missing in the historical records about the development of this mosque, although it is known that it was built and added to by many Sultans and governments. Consequently, the condition of the Banten great mosque right now is different from the historical building during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries although the location is the same, as shown in maps dated in 1596; 1624; 1659, 1739; 1825/6, 1900 and 1985 (Nayati, 1985a). Furthermore, the European historical sources have not described the individual components within the mosque complex, such as mihrab, mimbar and Muslim graves, because the foreigners, who were non-Muslim, were not permitted to enter the mosque. Such information can only be obtained from archaeological evidence.

Archaeological activities in Banten have also paid attention to the Dutch Fort located in the west corner of the Banten city wall. This fort itself is still recognisable because the wall, the four corners and a canal still exist. However, the function of this site has changed since the Dutch period to become a grave complex and a sports field. Sketches of this
fort indicate the function of several areas, such as the hospital, arsenals, warehouses, church and offices. Archaeological research in this fort has uncovered some clay smoking pipes with a Gouda mark, and several yellow-brown ceramic bottles like those found in other forts such as Yogyakarta and Surakarta (Nayati, 1989). Further studies on these bottles and smoking pipes could help in understanding the daily activities of the foreigners during the time they stayed in Banten.

Another aspect which could be further studied in Banten is that of the markets. Historical sources mention that there were three markets in Banten; in Paseban, in Pecinan and in Karangantu (Eerste, 1646). Those three markets opened at different time and sold different merchandise. Paseban market opened once a week and sold local foodstuffs; the Chinese market (Pecinan; Pacinan) opened everyday; and Karangantu opened once a week. As there are no illustrations of the Chinese and Paseban markets, but based on a very detailed drawing of market (see plate: 4, chapter three, p. 36), I argue that the Karangantu market was more important and bigger than the other two markets. It seems that the Europeans were not allowed to come and trade in Paseban and Chinese market.

In the illustration of the Karangantu market there are some important data which could help us to understand the activities relating to trading and organisation, which are not found in the archaeological evidence. Historical sources record that spices, ceramics and meat were sold in warehouses,
whereas cloth, foodstuffs (fish, rice, fruits, vegetables, honey, nuts, onions, garlic, chicken and duck) and jewellery, belts, and iron goods were traded in the open air (Eerste, 1624). Interestingly, it can be interpreted that the spices were handled differently from pepper because the illustration shows pepper sellers standing outside the Karangantu market fence. Possibly the pepper sellers tried to avoid taxes, or maybe they were the agents of the Banten rulers.

The illustration also records the different styles of trading in this market (Eerste, 1646). For example, nuts, rice, pepper and sugar were sold in bags or sacks and honey was sold in jars. The cloth sellers stood holding up their merchandise for display during the transactions. Chicken and ducks were put in boxes, and foodstuffs were laid out on the ground. According those data, it can help us in explaining the trading process, especially in Banten around the late sixteenth century.

Furthermore, the origins and social status of the people who traded in Karangantu market are clearly depicted. The foreigners are shown wearing shoes, pants, and shirts. I assume that the people who had pony tails were Chinese, and those who wore hats were Europeans. Moreover, the illustration has been drawn to distinguish clearly between the locals and the foreigners, especially the Chinese and Europeans. The Europeans have umbrellas and were followed by other people who seem to come from a lower status (Plate: 10). The local
people are wearing a *sarong*, if male, and a *'kain'* and *'kemben'*,
if female (Plate: 11).
The Karangantu illustration can be used as tool to interpret the work organisation in the market. In this picture, the females sell water melon, cucumber and coconut and the sellers of other products are male. The males seem to be responsible for selling the main products, whereas females sell certain commodities such as coconuts which could be grown close to their homes and were only bought in small amounts. These differences could also be based on the weights of the products: rice and nuts were sold in bags or sacks which would be very heavy for females to carry.

It can be seen that the fish and meat sellers were put in one group and located in the east part of the market. The poultry sellers were also put in that corner of the market. Vegetables and foodstuffs, including rice, onion, garlic and spices, were located together near the main gate. Ceramics stalls were located separately in the south part of the market. The cloth sellers were put in the middle of the market and occupied the biggest area. It seems that the cloth sellers were particularly active selling their merchandise. They attracted the buyers by opening out their cloth and walking around seeking sales. In contrast the foodstuffs sellers, who were mainly local people or people from elsewhere in the Archipelago, would stand and wait for their buyers because their merchandise was bigger and heavier, so they had to put it on the ground.
My assumptions of the layout of Banten are based on comparison with major cities in other kingdoms, such as Cirebon, Yogyakarta, and Surakarta. The common layout identified the palace, the main square, the biggest mosque and the market. The city square is always located in front of the palace which always faces north; the great mosque, which is called Masjid Jami' or Masjid Besar, is always located to the west of the city square, and the biggest market, which is called Pasar Gede (Javanese) or Pasar Besar (Malay), is located to the Northeast of the square. In Cirebon, Yogyakarta and Surakarta, this city lay-out still exists. In Demak, the lay-out is still uncertain because the palace has not yet found but the three other parts of the city plan can be identified.

The Serrurier map shows that the Paseban market was located in the north of the city square. This was a special market for the local people provided by the rulers as protectors. Historical sources mentioned that this market only opened on certain days in the week, and only in the morning (Eerste, 1624). Moreover, it sold products for daily use only. It can be assumed that this market sold foodstuffs and products for daily local activities, such as local pottery and knives. Also it could be assumed that the quality of the cloth sold in this place was inferior to that in Karangantu market because this market was for the local people.
The other trading site in Banten was the Chinese market, which was located in the Chinese settlement. I assume that this market only provided for some daily needs and that it was also visited by people who lived within the city wall (Nayati, 1985b). Maybe goods which were unavailable in the Karangantu and Paseban markets were to be found in the Chinese market. It was possible to go to a market outside the city wall because the historical sources recorded that there was a gate in the west part of the city wall which could be used for contact between people who lived inside and outside the wall (Nayati, 1985b).

Local earthenware pottery is assumed to have come from Banten itself. There were two pottery making sites recognised in Banten: Pajantran and Panjunan. Serrurier described Pajantran as a place for weaving (Serrurier, 1902), but, based on the archaeological remains, Harkantiningsih assumes that it was also a centre for pottery (Harkantiningsih, 1988:58). The name Panjunan comes from *jun*, meaning pottery, so that Panjunan was also a place for potters. However, there is no Panjunan name in the Serrurier map dated in 1900, instead of a name 'palace' (see plate: 6). So that, the development of Panjunan is still questionably.

That point is important because the archaeological works in Banten named and used this place as Panjunan, a pottery site. Moreover, archaeological excavation and my own survey have produced much local pottery both under and on the surface
of this site. Some Chinese ceramics have also been found there, so Harkantiningsih \((1988:339-395)\) infers that these two places probably were used from the end of the Ming Dynasty and the early Qing \(\text{Harkantiningsih, 1987:389}\).

Ambary \((1977:9)\) and Harkantiningsih \((1988)\) agree that the potters mainly produced ceramics for daily use based on the variety of dishes, bowls, water jugs, stoves and spoons found in those two places. Mundardjito \((1978:31)\) assumes that the potters in Banten were using potters' wheels, anvils and moulds for decoration. However, no kiln has yet been uncovered. Using comparisons with different places in Java, the pottery makers lived outside the main town, as in Plered \((\text{Nayati, 1982})\), Yogyakarta and Cirebon. It seems the archaeological works in Banten use this comparison. This issue should be considered in reconstruct this city.

Pejantran and Panjunan interpreted producing local ceramics between 1360 and 1650. However, it is still difficult to date the beginnings of such activities. There is no Chinese pottery in Banten earlier than the Ming Dynasty because previously the people were using only local rather than foreign ceramics. Perhaps in the early seventeenth century, imported ceramics arrived in the Banten market in bulk so that their prices dropped. It could be that Ming ceramics arrived in Banten after the 1670s, due to the expansion of shipping, perhaps via other trading centres such as Aceh, Tiku, Pariaman,
Barus, Indrapura and Batavia rather than direct from China itself.

Also, based on the metal working equipment and the metal residues, there appears to have been an iron working site within Surasowan palace. Harkantiningsih cited Siswandi's assumption that there was a smith working in the palace, who made special goods such as coins and guns for the rulers (Harkantiningsih, 1988:57). However, there are no archaeological data which support the view that the smiths who worked in the Surasowan palace were different from those in other places within Banten. Based on archaeological evidence there were two other iron working sites in Banten; at Kepandean and Jembatan Rantai (Mundardjito, 1978; Harkantiningsih, 1988:58-59).

The name of Kepandean comes from the word pande, meaning smith. Metal products, slag and metal residues have been found in Kepandean (now Sukadiri) suburb (Mundardjito, 1978:47). In contrast, although Jembatan Rantai was also a metal working site, the name of the suburb does not seem to contain any reference to metal working. Jembatan Rantai actually means a bridge with a chain. On the basis of its location, Harkantiningsih argues Jembatan Rantai was also a market and, on the basis of a single fish hook, she suggests it was too a settlement for fishermen. However this claim also seems hasty.
The interpretation of Jembatan Rantai as a smithy however, is supported by archaeological evidence. Metal good has been found on the site which is interpreted as floor. Excavation has also uncovered some bronze goods (nails, a bracelet, a pair of tweezers, bells, some spiral wire, an iron knife and a ring made from lead) (Ambary, 1977; Mundardjito, 1978). In addition, sherds of Ming and Qing ceramics, local pottery and coins have also been found (Mundardjito, 1978; Harkantiningsih, 1983, 1988). The archaeologists assume that daily life activities probably took place at this site (Mundardjito, 1978; Harkantingsih, 1988). It is not clear which daily activities hold in this area. And, it is necessary to explain the type of daily activities, because the activity is very complex so the reconstruction is understandable both for the archaeologists and for non archaeologists.

Further interpretations about the correlation between the metal evidence and other remains have not been made. Mundardjito (1978) regards the archaeological remains from the excavations as discrete data because their associations were not recorded. He thinks the site has been disturbed. For example, in Sukadiri box VI (SKDVI) (Mundardjito, 1978), he excavated evidence dating from before and during the eighteenth century, as inferred from coins (two undated local Banten coins, one VOC coin dated to 1792 and one Republic of Batavia coin dated to 1808 (Mundardjito, 1978:11, 49-50; Widiyoko, 1989).
Mundardjito believes it is difficult to interpret the function and
dating of the brick structure.

I conclude that the smiths in Kepandean worked in
covered installations located within the suburb. Bricks and
coral were used only for the foundations of the buildings, while
the walls and roofs were probably built of perishable materials.

Based on my personal observations in several places, smiths
usually work in buildings separate from their living places. So it
is possible that the smiths who worked in Surosowan palace
actually lived in Kepandean because, based on comparison with
the Yogyakarta palace, only the ruler's family and the abdi
dalem actually lived in the palace. Unfortunately, in Banten no
different metal products have been found to distinguish between
the work of smiths at Kepandean and at other places such as
Surasowan palace and Jembatan Rantai (Harkantiningsih, 1988).

Harkantiningsih has successfully recognised the necessity
of using historical sources in helping to interpret the functions
of particular suburbs in Banten, but there are still several issues
outstanding. Firstly, archaeological research in Banten has
mainly been based on the 1900 Serrurier map. This map is
believed give a total overview of Banten, so it has been
reproduced. However there are some information in originals
appendix which are not mentioned in the original and vice
versa, such number 17, 31 and 33. The reproduction of the
Serrurier map 1900 which then has been using for
archaeological research is not complete and it is not similar as
original. It can be predicted that the reconstruction of Banten which based uncomplete reproduction will not get maximum data so the explanation about the development of Banten will not cover all conditions.

Although the Serrurier map is valuable for reconstructing the pattern of land use and the functions of different sites in the city, there are some difficulties in finding supporting evidence. For example, Harkantiningsih has not yet obtained archaeological data from Kebalen to demonstrate that this place was occupied by Balinese. In fact, there are many suburbs mentioned in Serrurier which lack supporting evidence from other sources because the remains have been removed or no longer exist.

D. Conclusion

Although several settlements in the Banten complex have been studied, not enough evidence has yet been obtained for an adequate interpretation of the functions of the sites. For example, the description by Serrurier of Kaloran, Kapurban, Kawangsan, and Kabantenan as bureaucrat i.e. settlements is based only on their names and on historical documentation. Kaloran could have been named for Pangeran Lor (Prince Lor, lor means north), Kapurban could have been named for Pangeran Purba, Kawangsan for Pangeran Wangsa, and Kebantenan for Pangeran Banten. The name Penjaringan is derived from jaring,
meaning fish net, and Kebalen means a place for Balinese. However, like the bureaucratic settlements, these sites have not yet yielded archaeological evidence useful for understanding their functions.

There are only a few archaeological remains which help to identify particular sites: these are the Surasowan palace, Panjunan, Panjantran, Pecinan, and the Dutch settlement. However, there are Chinese and European ceramics from different periods spread throughout the Banten site: on the shoreline, in fishponds, in the Muslim grave complex, in the Dutch fort, and in settlements. So further investigation is still needed on the Chinese ceramics used by both the local and foreign people. A classification of the decoration of ceramics and earthenware (based on personal information from Halwany Michrob, MSc there are more than 700 motifs) and their form will assist in differentiating between the ceramics used in the palace, by bureaucrats and by common people. The explanation about the social status and the different activities between those status can be inferred from that ceramics and earthenware. However, any interpretation based on sherds must take into account the obvious fact that small artefacts can easily be moved by human disturbance.

The name of the suburb, however, cannot always be identified from the archaeological record. It is difficult, for example, to recognize evidence for the Muslim leader's suburb or the bureaucrats' settlement because we do not have a parameter
by which we could differentiate between the status of such leaders and the common people. There are also some difficulties in interpreting the nature of the settlements of Pangeran Purba (Kapurban), Pangeran Banten (Kebantenan), and Pangeran Mandalika because we do not have only information about the differences in wealth and possessions between them. So our actual knowledge about the rich and the community leaders is still limited even though the historical sources record that these people had high social status.

Moreover, the archaeological evidence for identifying some settlements is now missing because of ecological conditions and also the condition of the materials. For example, it is difficult to find archaeological evidence about the activities of making utensils from bamboo, coconut shells and marine shell, or the use of bamboo in buildings. Moreover, some of the suburbs mentioned in Serrurier no longer exist because they have been combined and/or the name has changed. For example, Pajantran and Kepandean have now been combined as Sukadiri, and Kawangsan and Kaloran are now together called kampung Baru.

Archaeological finds can usefully be classified according to their functions. However, although archaeological research has found many building sites in Banten, there are problems in reconstructing house types and, in more detail, the divisions within them, such as kitchens and working areas. An understanding of the specialised divisions within house sites
could help in understanding the function of a settlement, allowing us to differentiate between a working site and a bureaucratic settlement. Moreover, careful analysis of tiles, roofs, and structures, as well as a detailed record of an old Chinese house could be useful in reconstructing former household buildings. In my opinion, a better knowledge of house divisions would help to reconstruct the settlements. However, the method of classification of artefacts presented in available reports does not permit much speculation in this matter.

Archaeological remains do provide an insight into the materials used in building the city. In Banten there are bricks, parts of roof tiles, floor tiles, block of coral, and mortar made from coral and shell. Historical sources have not recorded information about those building materials or about the builders. However, archaeological remains, especially the coral blocks, help to extend our understanding about the use of building materials in an area where no stone except coral was available. More widely, there are unexplored questions about the specialized skills and organisation of builders, as well as those of the potters, smiths, Muslim leaders, and aristocrats.

The buildings and surface remains in Banten have been added to, moved and also re-used over the years, so that it is difficult to date the remains. Moreover, it is likely that a given building was not built all at one time. For example, there are more than five different foundations within the Surosowan palace complex. It is evident that other buildings were built at
different times, as shown from the different materials and different quality of work. So, even in the case of this one important building, it is difficult to date accurately the period in which it was built and used. Those remains which do exist are often moveable and some of them clearly came from outside Banten, such as sherds (local pottery and ceramics), pipes, coins and beads. For example, the Chinese, Vietnamese, and Burmese ceramics could have been used in Banten at very different periods from the same kinds of ceramics found in Barus, Jakarta, Maluku, Ujung Pandang and in their places of origin. The coins which were found in Banten could have been used earlier in other places, such as the Direct Exchange markets in Sumatra, Java or Maluku, or in other Entrepots and Forts, so that even if a coin records a certain date, it is still difficult to use this for exact dating of a site.

Another issue about interpretation relates to the visitors who came to Banten. Archaeological evidence in the form of ceramics (west Asian, Chinese, Japanese, Annamese and European), coins (Banten, Chinese, English and Dutch), and also graves, support the historical records. However, it must be recognized that the presence of particular ceramics and coins does not always mean the presence of visitors from the manufacturing nations. Chinese ceramics, Chinese coins and Dutch coins could have been brought and used by Malays, west Asians, Nusantara people, Europeans and the Chinese traders themselves. Moreover, these materials could have circulated
within Asia before reaching Banten. Therefore, it is difficult to prove the existence or absence of traders from nations not represented by coins and ceramics, such as Malays, Portuguese, Flemish, French, and Danish traders, all of whom were mentioned in historical sources. In contrast, Japanese ceramics has been found in Banten but historical sources do not mention evidence of such traders.

These varied visitors seem to have been allocated special areas by the Sultan of Banten where they were grouped according to nation, religion, race and profession (Nayati, 1989:295). However, they also grouped themselves on the basis of the size of their community. The Flemish, French and Danish traders lived with the English, perhaps because they were all from Europe (Nayati, 1987). The English did not live close to the Dutch because both nationalities had big communities and also the Dutch concentrated on hard bargaining for profit whereas the English preferred a personal approach both to the rulers and local traders. Historical sources mention that every time an English ship arrived at a trading port, a letter from the King was presented to the local rulers. After they were granted permission to stay and trade, the English then settled some people there not only for trading but also to learn the local culture and language. The Arabs and Turks may have lived in the same group because they shared a religion. These people lived in Pekojan which means a place for people from Koja, or west Asia and I assume that the west Asians
lived together with local people of both high and low social status. It could be that they were given that privilege because, like the local rulers, they were Muslim.

Historical sources enable the trading activities in Banten to be reconstructed in part. Trade occurred in markets, but only Karangantu market was open to both local and foreign people. The merchandise traded and the methods used are clearly described in the historical sources, but for the archaeologist the only remains which can be used to determine the trading activities in Banten are coins, ceramics and jewellery. The origins of the traders can only be inferred from ceramics and coins and some additional evidence is available from the ruins of the buildings and settlements.

Information about Banten as a Complex Entrepot can thus be inferred from both historical and archaeological evidence. Firstly, the city walls, the palaces, the mosque, the Dutch fort and canals, can still be traced. Archaeological research is able to identify the city walls, which had a zigzag form and were later covered by the Dutch fort. Secondly, foreign and local settlements can be differentiated in relation to the city walls. Moreover, the names of the suburbs and ruins of the buildings can also assist in interpreting these reconstructions. The iron working and potting settlements have been determined both from the names of the suburbs and from some archaeological remains. Social status can be inferred to some extent from the names of the suburbs, illustrations in contemporary sources, and
jewellery. The changing site of the port can be identified by using a combination of old maps and aerial photography.

Nevertheless, there are major gaps in the information available from the historical sources. For example, the building materials and building structures are not described in these sources. Moreover, the variety of the ceramics and pottery can be identified only from the sherds which were found. On the other hand, archaeological evidence alone would be insufficient to provide an adequate understanding of the ways in which trading was conducted but an understanding of some of the trading activities can be derived from the findings of jewellery, ceramics and coins.

According to these conclusion from the Banten case study, it is clear that although historical sources can be used to reconstruct the past, these records are best supplemented by information available from archaeological remains. By using the evidence of archaeological finds of artefacts, we can interpret the daily life of the past, especially for local people. The context is also important to support the interpretation. For example, much of our knowledge about the arts and technology of the past has to be inferred from archaeological evidence because such activities were not described by foreign visitors who did not have much contact with the local people and who were not allowed to go beyond their settlement.
It can be seen that in some circumstances historical sources are more helpful for reconstructing the past but at other times archaeological remains provide the most detailed information about the past. Historical documents provide detailed information about commodities traded in certain places and at certain times, including the system of weights which archaeological study so far cannot demonstrate. Nevertheless, archaeological evidence can be useful in throwing light on the activities of local people which are not explained in historical documents.
CHAPTER SIX

FORT REGULATED SITES

The Fort Regulated sites in the Indonesian Archipelago during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are different from the other two types of trading sites in that they were controlled by Europeans, instead of the local rulers. They had living areas exclusively for Europeans, including warehouses, offices, hospitals and other communal buildings. Moreover these residents recorded their experiences in new environments and their contacts with local people, especially their trading contacts. Although little intensive and systematic archaeological work has been undertaken on these sites, reconstructions of the Fort Regulated sites can be made by exploring relevant documents and existing buildings. Batavia, which acted as the control point for Dutch trade in Asia, is the
most obvious example for such an investigation of the records and existing structures.

**A. History of Batavia**

The arrival of the Europeans changed the nature of trade in the site which later became Batavia. In the early sixteenth century, the site was well known as Calapa (Cortesao, 1944:172), Sunda Kelapa (Ambary, 1977) or Jayakarta, and functioned as a Direct Exchange site. Pangeran Wijayakrama, otherwise known as Tubagus Angke, controlled the site, including the trading activities, and received people from throughout the Archipelago and Malay Peninsula, west Asians, Chinese and Portuguese, to trade local products which were mainly foodstuffs (Cortesao, 1944:172,177,180; Taylor, 1983). After the Dutch and English became involved in this region, however, they tried to control the local ruler (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1962; Vlekke, 1946:86; Djajadiningrat, 1983:46). The Dutch, who established themselves in the Chinese section of the city (Blusse, 1981:166; Heuken, 1982:19), built a stronger dwelling without permission from the Pangeran Jayakarta. This led to a complicated series of conflicts involving the Dutch, the English and the Chinese, as well as local rulers. The final outcome, in 1619, was the consolidation of Dutch power in a new fort, which was given the name Batavia (Vlekke, 1946; Surjomihardjo, 1977; Heuken, 1982). The Dutch tried to control the spice trade in the
Indonesian Archipelago from here. They sent ships to collect spices, forced the local rulers to sell their products only to the Dutch and effectively controlled the price in European markets. Moreover, they also controlled the traders in Batavia, so the local and west Asian traders were not able to visit this place as freely as they had been able to in the sixteenth century.

The Chinese soon became important in Batavia. They were the biggest tax payers and this tax was then used for the development of the city (Blusse, 1981:167). The importance of the Chinese for the Dutch is shown by the Dutch keeping records of Chinese activities and population (Cator, 1936:10-11, 36; Faille, Chinese Raad: 310). The development of sugar plantations by the Chinese was particularly important (Cator, 1936:11).

Illustrations, sketches and maps supplement the written documents for reconstructing Batavia, whether in 1619 or into the eighteenth century (Plates: 12, 13, 14, 15).
Map: 12
Batavia in 1619
Adapted from Taylor, 1983:180
Plate: 13
Batavia in 1627
Adapted from Taylor, 1983:181
Plate: 14
Batavia in 1635
Adapted from Surjomihardjo, 1977
CAPTION:
a. BURGH (Dutch)
b. VIERKANT (Dutch)
c. OUWUNO RIVER

d. GRONINGEN (Dutch)
e. OVERRUSEL (Dutch)
f. FRIESLAND (Dutch)
g. WADDEN (Dutch)
h. OUD UTRECHT (Dutch)
i. ZEELAND (Dutch)
j. KOKSTRAAT (Dutch)

ON THE EASTERN SIDE OF THE CITY ARE:
1. WATERPOORT (Dutch)
2. BRUGSTRAAT (Dutch)
3. NIEUWE KERK (Dutch)
4. CITY HALL
5. COURT HOUSE
6. AMSTERDAMSCHERGRACHT (Dutch)
7. Oosterbegijngracht (Dutch)
8. LEDONWONERGRACHT (Dutch)
9. DELFTGRACHT (Dutch)
10. KALVERSTRAAT (Dutch)
11. OUD GELDERLAND (Dutch)
12. PROESTRAAT (Dutch)
13. SEESTRAAT (Dutch)
14. HOUSES OF THE PEOPLE FROM MALABAR
15. KROESTRAAT (Dutch)

A. CASTLE
B. AMSTERDAM
C. MIDDELBURG (Dutch)
D. ROTTERDAM
E. ENDEBROEK (Dutch)
F. GELDERLAND (Dutch)
G. ORANIE (Dutch)
H. NEW (Dutch)
I. HOLANDA
J. GRONINGEN (Dutch)

Plate: 15
Batavia in 1650
Adapted from Surjomihardjo, 1977
In addition, there are written documents such as journals of travellers, the *Daghregister* and *Plakkatboeken* which provide information about political and economic life in Batavia from time to time, recording in great detail much information about individuals (Blusse, 1981:161). Such data, however, mainly concern Dutch activities and interests, rather than what happened in the Chinese suburb and other suburbs located outside the city wall. There is information, though, about the departure, death and absconding of Chinese (Cator, 1936:11), and the promotion of people to important official positions (Cator, 1936: 13; Blusse, 1981:167).

*B. Historical Study of Batavia*

Much of old Batavia during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries may be reconstructed by combining these historical data. Moreover, the canals built by the Chinese under the supervision of Jancon and Phoa Bingham can be traced in Jakarta. Examples of these are the canals that connect the Ciliwung river and Kali Krukut, Tanah Abang, Harmoni, Lapangan Banteng, Jalan Medan Merdeka and Jalan Majapahit (Surjomihardjo, 1977:28-29; Blusse, 1981:166).

Some Dutch buildings, dating from the seventeenth century, are described in great detail in the documents and also depicted in illustrations. Thus, we know about the fort itself,
Kasteel Batavia, with its guardhouses, the apartments and offices of the Governor-General, the Council Chamber of the Dutch East India Company, accommodation for the councillors, the barracks, the church, the warehouses, the arsenal, the courtyards, the armoury and the dungeons (Surjomihardjo, 1977; Godard, 1993:216-217). All this, however, was destroyed in the nineteenth century. Some other buildings are still being used, such as the Stadhuis and godowns (warehouses) (Surjomihardjo, 1877; Heuken, 1982:23-26). The bridge which was built in J.P. Coen's period is now in Jalan Pos. Nieuport and Diestpoort are now known as Pintu Besar and Pintu Kecil (Surjomihardjo, 1977).

The streets built by the Dutch East India Company as Batavia expanded are still recognisable. Jalan Cengkeh used to be Prinssestraat, Rijswijkstraat became Jalan Majapahit and Jacatraweg now is Jalan Pangeran Jayakarta. Jalan Gunung Sahari, Jalan Kramat, and Jalan Salemba mark the line of the road to the southeast that was built in 1678 (Surjamihardjo, 1977; Proyek, 1978; Heuken, 1982). Jalan Hayamwuruk and Jalan Gajahmada were built at the end of the seventeenth century when the old Dutch settlement on Tijgergracht became inconvenient. The eighteenth century house still being used by the National Archives (Proyek, 1978:47) was built on this road. Mangga Dua used to be a Chinese quarter which was developed by the first Chinese Captain, a man named So Bing Kong, also known as Bencon (Cator, 1936:13; Faille, Chinese Raad:12) or Su Ming-Kang (Blusse, 1981:167).
These remnants of Batavia during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are concentrated in the northern part of Jakarta, especially in the area of Jakarta Kota. Other parts of Batavia, however, cannot be so easily recognised. Firstly, there was much redevelopment of Batavia itself in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; for example, the Stadhuis is the third such building on the same site (Heuken, 1982:33). Secondly, the development of Jakarta as the capital of Indonesia has caused the destruction of much that was built in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as well as in more recent centuries. Buildings in several places such as Ancol, originally called Slingerland, or along Jalan Pangeran Jayakarta, Jalan Hayamwuruk and Jalan Gajahmada have been demolished. The Harmonie building built in 1776 has been replaced with modern buildings for offices, shops and houses in the last few years.

The situation of Jayakarta is known only from the written sources. New buildings have been constructed on the west bank of Ciliwung river, so that the core of old Jayakarta is obscured, but Heuken (1982:21-22) suggests that it was located about 500 meters northwest of the Stadhuis. The layout of Jayakarta was probably the same as that of Banten with a palace, square, mosque and market, since Jayakarta was under the control of Banten before the Dutch conquest (Heuken, 1982:18-20; Taylor, 1983:3). In the same way, Yogyakarta and Surakarta, which were laid out during the eighteenth century, provided the model for other regional settlements such as Purworejo, Kebumen and
Banyumas. It may be assumed that the palace, square, great mosque and market in Jayakarta were smaller than those in Banten because Jayakarta was under Banten's control not only in political terms but also as an administrative centre. This dependence on Banten means that the great mosque of Jayakarta probably looked more like the mosques in Banten than like the masjid Marunda or masjid Anke in the area today, which were built in the eighteenth century.

C. Problems

There are some problems in reconstructing the Fort Regulated site of Batavia. The first issue is to find archaeological evidence which reflects the shift from Sunda Kelapa to Jayakarta to Batavia. Historical sources provide information about the change of authority from Pangeran Jayakarta to J.P. Coen, the Dutch Governor-General. However, not much material evidence dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has yet been found and it is difficult to collect material in the relevant area, since it is largely covered by recent buildings. Only a few of the Dutch buildings of that period, which were built of solid materials, can now be traced. In contrast, the sixteenth century buildings and other local buildings mainly used perishable materials such as wood and have now disappeared.
The second issue concerns the pattern of life in Batavia and its neighbourhood. Historical sources from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries mention mainly foreign activities, especially in the development of Batavia (Taylor, 1983) and the trade of the Company (Glamann, 1982). They have less to say about daily activities either within the Dutch settlement in Batavia or in local settlements outside the fort and canals of Batavia. The distinct areas of settlement for the exclusive Dutch and for various local inhabitants can be readily seen on the maps of Batavia dated to 1619, 1627, 1635, and 1650 (see maps: 12,13,14,15). Although some historical records from the sixteenth century mention the variety of inhabitants in Sunda Kelapa (Cortesao, 1944:172), the later documentation from the Dutch does not give detailed information about this matter. The activities of people from elsewhere in the Archipelago and west Asia, who settled during the sixteenth century, are still to be discovered.

Although there are suburb names in Batavia such as Pekojan/Koja, kampung Bali, Paseban, Penjaringan, Pejagalan, Pademangan and Petukangan (Nas, et.al. 1979:26-31), there are problems in using these in the same way as was possible in some cases in Banten, since the characteristics of these areas cannot be recognised from artefacts found in archaeological contexts. Moreover, the modern population does not reflect the name of each suburb anymore and the boundaries of the suburbs have changed slightly because of changes of administration. In
particular, it is difficult to use the evidence of place names for tracing old suburbs because the old patterns of architecture and the layout of streets have not been maintained. In other cities such as Yogyakarta, Surakarta, Cirebon or Rembang, it is easy to recognize the Kauman district (an area for Muslim leaders located to the west of the great mosque) or Pecinan (the Chinese suburb). It is also difficult to date the use of an area in Batavia by a specific group in the absence of maps and records. Several new suburbs appeared in the eighteenth century and later, a period which is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, we must consider this point if want to reconstruct Batavia at a particular time. More than most cities, Batavia witnessed reasonably rapid change in population size and buildings.

The Chinese quarter was different from other foreign settlements in Batavia. Firstly, there are many records concerning it, such as the names of the Captains of the suburb and of people who developed the suburb and its facilities. It provided opportunities for entertainment, social insurance or mutual aid, as well as hospitals, orphanages and homes for the aged (Blusse, 1981:165). Secondly, it was located inside the city wall and was carefully planned. It is not surprising that this settlement was better than others because the Chinese played a special role in Dutch eyes and were often distinguished as a group in the *plakaatboek*. The Chinese were successful traders, freeburghers, builders, fishermen, farmers, gardeners, craftsmen, tailors and also good tax payers (Cator, 1936:13;
Vlekke, 1946:9; Blusse, 1981:161-168). Blusse (1981) claims that Batavia, between 1619 and 1740, was a Chinese colonial town under Dutch protection. He sees Batavia being similar to Manila, because the Chinese took the main role in the development of private trading activities. In contrast, Cator (1936) assumes that the Dutch included Chinese settlement within Batavia in order to control Chinese trading activities. This control was unsuccessful, however, because the Chinese obtained contracts for sugar plantations, striking coins, making wine (arak) and organising gambling activities so that they came to play a leading role in the development of Batavia.

Written records also provide little specific evidence for the activities of local people, the orang Betawi. Some idea of their life, however, can be inferred from studying more modern settlements around Jakarta which are devoted to supplying the city with many kinds of fruit. This produce is still carried into the city and sold by the pikul.

The next issue concerns the circumstances of the visitors to Batavia. Historical sources provide information about visitors both in Sunda Kelapa and Batavia, but after 1619 when Jayakarta became Batavia, there is little available beyond the Dutch Company records. Although they are very exclusive, these records are mostly written from a Dutch perspective. The English traders, who were licensed to trade and live in Jayakarta by Pangeran Jayakarta, still visited Batavia after 1619, but they, like the French traders, had many problems with the Dutch in
continuing their trade. There is no archaeological evidence demonstrating specific English contact with either Sunda Kelapa/Jayakarta or Batavia at this time.

The Dutch sources mention that the Chinese brought ceramics and silk for them (Adhyatman et. al, 1984). The Chinese traders did not stay permanently in Batavia and during their visits, they probably lived in the Chinese suburb. There is less mention in the Dutch accounts of other visitors, although west Asian and traders from elsewhere in the Archipelago sold their goods in the market located near the Stadhuis.

A fourth issue concerns practicalities of trade in a Fort Regulated site. Information on Dutch trading practices in Batavia during the seventeenth century are easily found. The Daghregister has information on trading policy, the varieties of commodity, the volume and weight of spices, prices, the arrival and departure of ships, and also the individuals appointed to collect commodities. The Fort Regulated site acted as a collection point, so that Batavia stored commodities from places within and outside the Indonesian Archipelago. There must have been warehouses for spices and also for another commodities such as silk from China, clothes from west Asia and ceramics from both Asia and Europe. However, the rapid development of Jakarta has made it difficult to find and interpret the archaeological evidence for these warehouses for storage and trade.
The problem of interpretation arises with the ceramics of different origins found near the Museum Bahari (Ridho, 1982:320-325). Ridho identified the origins and date of the ceramics as shown in table 4, but it is unclear whether these ceramics should be seen as commodities for exchange, perhaps for spices, or as items for private use within Batavia. Also there is no explanation of why those ceramics were dumped in the canal, as Ridho interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINS</th>
<th>CENTURY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMBODIA</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAM</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAN</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 4
Classification by origin and date of ceramics found in the canal in Jakarta (Batavia)
From: Ridho, 1982: 321 (with modifications)

One could argue that these finds came from warehouses for ceramics in Batavia. Ceramics were certainly important for exchange within the Indonesian Archipelago and those needed in the Direct Exchange sites and Complex Entrepots could have been supplied from Batavia.
The Cambodian (Khmer) ceramics found in Jakarta are similar to those found in Sulawesi, north Java, and Nusa Tenggara, and the Japanese ceramics have also been found in Lampung, Sumatra Selatan, Banten, Kalimantan Barat and Kalimantan Selatan (Ridho, 1982). The ceramics found outside Batavia might have come through there, carried by non Dutch traders. Many of the Chinese ceramics found in Batavia were not well made (Ridho, 1982) and perhaps these were used in exchange for spices. Many other interpretations are possible, however, and much further study of the distribution of ceramics within the Indonesian Archipelago is needed to refine the understanding of Batavia as a distribution point.

The same arguments can be used that Batavia was a distribution centre for cloth from west Asia and silk from China, but there would be no archaeological evidence in these cases.

There is still much to discover about trading activities within Batavia. The exact locations of the markets during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have not yet been determined, although the historical sources describe a market in front of the Stadhuis and another market with Chinese stalls.

It needs to be remembered that while the central purpose of the Dutch East India Company was always trade, the reason for holding Batavia was to avoid open trading in a market; the Company controlled trade on its terms. Thus much of the business, especially for commodities in bulk, was probably
conducted in the Company's offices and warehouses rather than in a market place.

D. Conclusion

The pattern of settlement in a Fort Regulated site differs from that in the other two types of trading sites. In the Direct Exchange and the Complex Entrepot sites, the foreign settlements were outside the centres of administration which were located in the palaces of the local rulers. In contrast, in a Fort Regulated site, the foreign settlement was in the administration centre and the local and minority groups were kept outside the city centre. In a Complex Entrepot, the local people were living inside the city wall. Although the evidence is not so clear about the pattern of the settlement in the Direct Exchange sites, there is no doubt that the ruler of the city, or at least the more powerful nobles, controlled the trading arrangements in these sites.

The written sources provide some good information about the process of changing authority from Sunda Kelapa/Jayakarta to Batavia and from a Direct Trading site under Pangeran Jayakarta to a Fort Regulated site under the Dutch East India Company. Also, the further development of the Fort Regulated site has been recorded in the Dutch archives and some of the buildings, streets and canals can still be recognised.
Although historical sources describe the market and daily life inside the city wall, this information cannot be confirmed from the archaeological evidence. The situation outside Batavia itself relating to people other than the Dutch and Chinese is still unclear, either from the written or from archaeological sources.

Even when some specific archaeological evidence is available, as with ceramics, interpretation of function is still very difficult. Thus, the trading activities in Batavia remain unclear in many details.

Neither written nor archaeological sources have given information about the way the Company and other traders bought ceramics and silks from the Chinese traders, the way they stored silks, ceramics and spices or the way they traded with other Europeans.

The development of Jakarta creates many problems for the archaeological study of Batavia. The names and other features of the old settlements have often been changed. Archaeological objects and sites have been destroyed or are still buried because the sites have been covered with buildings. Against these problems, however, must be set the abundance of historical data available because Batavia was the administrative centre of the Dutch Company's trading network from 1619 onwards.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

The patterns of trading activities in the Indonesian Archipelago changed significantly during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in large part as a result of competition between European and other traders in collecting and monopolising the supply of spices. Historical documentation and archaeological research provide evidence for the changes in three types of trading sites, especially in the western part of the Indonesian Archipelago. Historical documents describe the shift of trading activities from one market to another depending on the supply of local products, fluctuating prices, and the influence of local rulers on the trading activities; and archaeological evidence throws further light on the changes by comparing the material culture and archaeological remains across different periods. However, not all historical information
is supported by material culture or vice versa. Nevertheless, we are able to reconstruct to some degree the trading activities and also the growth and decline of the major centres in the Indonesian Archipelago over these two centuries. It is possible to show the shift of activities from one place to other place, development of the trading sites, the identity of visitors, the nature of trade and the circumstances of daily life.

Three types of trading centres have been defined: Direct Exchange sites, Complex Entrepot sites and Fort Regulated sites. This classification is based on the origins of the traders who visited the trading centres and the trading systems which operated there. The rulers and/or Panglima controlled the Direct Exchange sites. Traders visited such trading sites to collect local products that were highly valued, such as spices and sandalwood, by exchanging the commodities they brought from other places (such as foodstuffs, cloths, iron goods, and ceramics) directly with the first hand sellers, who were usually local people from the Direct Exchange site and the adjacent regions. By contrast, the Complex Entrepot sites, usually located in the capital of a local kingdom, were controlled by the Sultan. Traders from different nations brought commodities to this type of trading centre both from their home countries and from Direct Exchange sites. There were three main types of traders who visited the Complex Entrepot sites: the traders who brought luxury commodities from abroad, traders who brought local commodities from elsewhere in the Indonesian
Archipelago, and traders who lived in the Complex Entrepots. In contrast, only certain traders visited the Fort Regulated sites which were controlled by the Europeans. The owners of the forts controlled the supply and demand of their specialised commodities, such as spices, ceramics and cloth, which they stored in their own warehouses. The system of trading here was significantly different from that at the other types of trading sites. Since much of the trade was in bulk and could have been arranged in the offices or warehouses, markets were probably less important.

Although these three types of trading sites can be distinguished analytically, in reality they were related to each other. Traders collected local commodities from the Direct Exchange sites and then brought them in to the Complex Entrepots and the Fort Regulated sites. In the Complex Entrepots and Fort Regulated sites, the collector traders had permanent settlements, where they stored the local commodities they had obtained.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, several Direct Exchange sites and Fort Regulated sites developed within the Indonesian Archipelago, but only Aceh, Banten, Gresik and Macassar acted as Complex Entrepot sites. Although historical records exist for each of the three types of trading sites, only a few sites have been archaeologically studied. In the case studies presented here, the first type of trading site is represented by Barus on the west coast of Sumatra, which was
the subject of archaeological studies in 1978 and 1985. Banten has been excavated since 1967, so that it is taken to represent a Complex Entrepot and the third type is represented by Batavia (Jakarta) although no systematic archaeological study has been undertaken there. Batavia has been chosen, however, because by comparison with other Fort Regulated sites, it was the main Dutch trading post in Asia and is well documented in written accounts, illustrations and maps.

Some aspects of the trading activities between 1511 and 1680 in each of the three types of trading sites are well documented, mainly by Europeans. For example, there are records of exact dates, numbers of ships sent and the volume of local commodities collected. There are also accounts of first contact made with the local rulers and officials, and of the relationships between the local rulers and the traders.

The documents also provide a record of the growth of some centres by comparing the illustrations, sketches and maps of one place made over a period of time. However, these data are only recorded for the Complex Entrepots and Fort Regulated sites, where the writers stayed longer and even established settlements. By contrast, there are almost no comparable data about the development of the Direct Exchange sites or about the people, culture and trade to be found in such sites.

The archaeological evidence adds some particular kinds of information relating to activities in all three types of site.
Several classes of artefacts such as ceramics, jewellery, metal goods, and coins, found during the archaeological studies may be interpreted as the commodities that were brought from outside to the trading sites. Also, the fluctuations and the length of trading activities in the sites may be understood from the ceramics, coins and remains of buildings.

Ceramics from different periods and areas can help to reconstruct the rise and decline of the trading sites. For example, the shift of the ports in Barus, from Lobu Tua to Kedai Gadang, can be detected from the distribution of Chinese ceramics dated from Sung to Qing dynasties and of European ceramics found in those two places. Also, the change of the capital of Banten from Banten Girang to Banten can be interpreted using Chinese ceramics. In Batavia, however, ceramics are only useful to demonstrate that commodities from outside Batavia accumulated there. This confirms the position of Batavia as a trading centre controlling much of the Asian market.

It is important to observe that this interpretation of ceramics rests not on their ultimate function, mainly as utensils for daily life, but rather on the number and type of particular wares found as a trade commodity. There is also scope to interpret ceramics and particularly similar artefacts such as clay pipes and glass bottles as direct evidence for the circumstances of daily life, especially between local and the Europeans.
The written sources and archaeological evidence provide different types of information about trading activities during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The historical data do not explain the shift of the port in Barus. In Banten, however, written sources, both local and foreign, mention the shift of the capital from inland to the coast and this is confirmed archaeologically. The shift of power in Sunda Kelapa, Jayakarta and Batavia can be seen from the historical data, especially from maps, without any ceramic evidence.

Archaeological artefacts have not been found to confirm the whole range of recorded trading activities. There is much we only know from the documents relating to the conduct of markets, the arrangement of warehouses, the weights used, and the actual buyers and sellers. While some artefacts identify the non-local commodities such as iron goods, jewellery and ceramics, no evidence remains of local commodities, such as spices, that were key trade goods during those two centuries.

In Barus, historical data gives detailed information about the traders and the amounts of spices taken out from Barus, especially in the seventeenth century. The archaeological data not only support some of the historical information about the traders and the foreign commodities that were used in exchange for the local products but also provides additional information about Barus before and after these two centuries. The ceramics, jewellery and inscriptions support the records of different
traders who visited Barus and confirm the change in the port site and the identity of the controlling traders between the eighth and eighteenth centuries.

In Banten, a Complex Entrepot site, written sources and archaeological evidence are abundant. The Asian and European traders, some of whom stayed for a short time and others permanently, can be traced using both written and archaeological evidence. Some artefacts support the information from historical sources. The ceramics, glass and coins lead to a reconstruction of the different origins of the visitors. However, not all ceramics necessarily indicate the presence of foreign traders. For example, Japanese ceramics have been found in Banten but the sources have no mention of Japanese visitors here. Conversely, other nations, such as the Danish, Flemish and Portuguese, are mentioned in historical sources, but they did not produce any artefacts recovered from the site. It is difficult to match the information from historical sources exactly with the archaeological evidence about such visitors.

Information about coinage in the records does not always match with the archaeological evidence. There are several coins mentioned in the sources such as *cash*, *cruzados*, *real*, *tail*, but only Chinese *cash*, local Banten coins and European coins from the eighteenth century onward have been found in Banten. Also the sixteenth and seventeenth century coins that were found in Banten do not necessarily indicate the places of
trading, as such coins have been found in the Surosowan palace and local settlements located inside the city wall rather than in the market sites. One of the three markets in Banten can be reconstructed based on written sources and illustrations but there is no archaeological evidence to support that reconstruction and the information about trading details such as weights and measures. Conversely, archaeological artefacts provide information about the activities of daily life, such as cooking, building, pottery and iron making as well as religious and social activities, that are not mentioned in the historical sources.

Although there has been relatively little archaeological study of Batavia (Jakarta), the development of the Fort Regulated site can be traced from written sources, illustrations and maps. Those data provide not only descriptive details but also precise information on dates and measurements. Surviving buildings, canals and streets support the reconstruction of this trading place. Information about commodities, however, is less easy to find, except what can be inferred from the warehouses where they stored the commodities. Also, little is known about the transactions negotiated in this site because both historical and archaeological data are still lacking.

According to the comparison between three exchange sites in the Indonesian Archipelago between sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it can be seen that the type of archaeological findings are quite difference. This study can help
further archaeological research especially research relating to settlements including trading activities. A prediction of certain artifacts in certain type of exchange site is important before the research is done. However, the researchers should not only pay attention on artefacts they predict because every site has special data which could be and could not be similar to other places.

In conclusion, archaeological data do not always give support to historical data about the trading activities in the Indonesian Archipelago during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Those two different sources of data each give important information for reconstructing the trading sites, but they are not always in agreement. The historical data often provide an explanation of the city lay-out and land-use, the traders, commodities and also the trading system; but it only covers certain times, places and groups. Archaeological evidence can provide information about commodities arriving in trading sites but little about the local commodities taken out from these markets. Archaeological data can give clues about the local activities that lead to an understanding and explaining the past life. However, by using historical and archaeological studies, a promising explanation about the past is possible.
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