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Abstract—This research is intended to discuss the portrayal of the sociocultural situation of Dayak as indigenous people in Borneo through the locality in Through Central Borneo travel writing. This research also discovered the self and the other concept through the author’s interaction with people in visited places. The focus of this research is on the passage of the Mahakam River only. The locality studied in this research is bound to a specific cultural context in the East Kalimantan, particularly in the Mahakam River area. This research fits descriptive qualitative research. The data are taken from the travel writing only, in the form of words, phrases, and sentences that meet the aim of this research. The outcomes show that the locality defines the sociocultural situation of Dayak. It can be seen through the place, social organization, habit, object, convention, ecology, character, and belief. Many layers of the author’s choices in describing the sociocultural situation in the travel writing bring the issues of revealing the self and representing the other in the concept of ‘different’ between the author and the visited people.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Locality can generally be interpreted as an entity connected with a particular geographical area. From the standpoint of culture, that meaning is certainly not complete. In a cultural context, the limit is not just in the administrative area but in particular people or shared communities. Furthermore, the locality is a cultural setting that portrays the interaction of shared assemblies. Thus, locality relates to the art form of specific group identity.

Modernity in the era of globalization tends to erode locality. The locality then gets a lousy impact by this modernity as it is being eroded by a cacophony of foreign cultures that contradict the local cultures (Purwaningsih et al., 2020). The changes due to globalization affect the system of society, such as the shift into modern life and slowly leaving the traditional life behind (Takwa et al., 2022). In some phases, globalization benefits the locality. Locality loss is a trigger. Pressure on the locality makes people cherish local traditions.

The attention to local values is presented in many fields. Also, it happens in the academic field. The locality is an exciting aspect to discuss in academic spaces. Introducing the positive impact of maintaining locality to students can increase their concern about protecting their cultural heritage. In this case, the students' positive impact will lead them to good efficiency to apply in their life (Arafah et al., 2020). Educational institutions such as universities are required to be able to contribute to the existence of local values. Commonly, the lecturers need to give a course related to the locality, but in another way, it could be done by giving online seminars to the local people (Anggrawan et al., 2019). People nowadays tend to participate in social events actively and want to participate in a forum that requires social interaction with many people (Hasjim et al., 2020). Therefore the locality can be used as a brand for the area of excellence of an educational institution. Learning about values in an educational institution, especially related to local values, can help students to get knowledge about locality and also help them to shape their characters (Mokoginta & Arafah, 2022). In conclusion, modernity can be beneficial but destructive, depending on how it is used (Suhadi et al., 2022).

As an entity, the locality is recorded in many media. One of the media is travel writing. The locality is recorded in travel writing carried out by anthropologists. It is a text about a person’s journey in a particular geographical area. It indicates that a specific region’s travel writing would be full of local values. Travel writing is not a travel guide like tourism (Thompson, 2011, p.14). The form of travel writing is narrative prose with a description of the location following actual conditions. By its form, travel writing can be classified as a literary work. Through this literary work,
the condition of an environment can be presented and considered to enlighten the human awareness of the local cultures in a certain place (Siwi et al., 2022). In a discussion entitled *Lokalitas Dalam Sastra*, Maman S. Mahayana stated that locality in literature has two significant roles. First, the normative role is a marker of the setting of the place and the atmosphere of certain characters (society). Second, locality can describe the sociocultural situation, which becomes a space for the reader to interpret (Rahayu, 2018). Therefore, literary work in all genres can be used to learn the nature of specific values and cultural knowledge of one group of society (Sunardi et al., 2018).

Research that used travel writing as the object has been conducted. An example is a research by Maureen Amimo entitled “An Image of Africa in Sihle Khumalo’s *Dark Continent My Black Arse*.” Amino’s research is to use parody to encounter the image(s) of Africa in travel writing as the colonized country and the antithesis of Europe (Amino, 2019). Amino’s research strengthens that travel writing is not about reporting the world only; it is a space for interpretation. It is in line with the concern of travel writing. Those are reporting the world, revealing *the self*, and representing *the other* (Thompson, 2011). Thus, this research discusses the information about the sociocultural situation through travel writing and the more profound interpretation of *the self* and *the other*. The author represents *the self*, and *the other* tends to be native in the story of travel writing.

The travel writing examined in this study is travel writing accomplished by a Norwegian-born anthropologist who is a professional explorer named Carl Lumholtz (King, 2013). It is written in a book entitled *Through Central Borneo*. The book contains Lumholtz’s travel from New York to the area around the Mahakam River in East Kalimantan. The focus of this research is on the passage of the Mahakam River only. The locality studied in this research is bound to a specific cultural context, especially in the Mahakam River area. The text in travel book writing has been observed using cultural or traditional courses to make it easier to interpret in terms of cultural context (Arafah et al., 2020). Furthermore, the language based on cultural context contains meaningful messages with more cultural values (Yulianti et al., 2022). Thus, this study aims to discuss the portrait of the sociocultural situation of the Dayak tribes in East Kalimantan through locality recorded in travel writing.

This research aims to show locality in the era of globalization, especially in East Kalimantan, through travel writing. This research is to strengthen travel literature as a historical source. This research resulted in a reputable journal publication. It produces scientific seminar proceedings and tropical cultural teaching materials.

In general concept, locality refers to a particular geographical area. Meanwhile, in the cultural context, the locality is undoubtedly not only limited to the region but also refers to the sociocultural area related to (human) specific cultural communities. It is a cultural setting. It relates to the cultural value system where society performs good attitudes as a standard in sociocultural life (Takwa et al., 2022). Thus, the locality forms are closely related to cultural forms in geographical regions.

Newmark defines culture as a pattern of life recorded in a particular community. Culture is expressed through language. There are five cultural categories according to Newmark, (1) ecology (flora, fauna, climate, weather), (2) cultural objects (food, clothing, housing, transportation), (3) social culture (activities at work and leisure), (4) organization, customs, and ideas, (5) gestures, habits (Newmark, 1988). Meanwhile, another opinion divides cultural forms into four categories, (1) environment (ecology, place name), (2) cultural heritage (religious beliefs, historical events, folklore, objects), (3) social culture (agreements, beliefs, habits, social organization), and (4) linguistic culture (expressions, idioms) (Guerra, 2012). In line with Guerra’s opinion, the environment becomes a part of cultural life needed to protect because a good environment can create good behaviour in sociocultural life (Arafah et al., 2021). The good behaviour of one society can be the sign, characteristic, or identity that shows where the people belong (Arafah & Hasyim, 2019).

“... just as tourism does not travel, the guidebook is not a travel book” (Thompson, 2011, p.14). It is a statement by Fussel in the book entitled *Travel Writing*. It is to emphasize that travel differs from a travel guidebook in tourism. Travel writing is empirical data anthropologists find when visiting a particular geographical area. The form of travel writing is narrative prose. It tends to be like a short story. The language used is organized with words and phrases to describe the visited places by providing the information carefully to ensure everything is clear about the areas that do not make sense (Iksora et al., 2022). Another peculiarity of travel writing is that their portrayal of certain places matches facts. Travel writing is not a history book, but because they are full of facts and information, this writing can be used as a reference.

Travel writing can be classified as a literary work by its narrative prose form. Literary works as cultural products represent the existing reality. It means a literary work contains cultural information from various sociocultural backgrounds of a particular time (Asriyanti et al., 2022). It describes a real-life situation with value inside through the author’s experiences in the past (Afiah et al., 2022). Griffith explained in his book *Writing About Literature* that at least three aspects state that literature contains the value of truth. (1) Factual accuracy, description of the story based on facts in the real world, (2) Literature as expression, literary work is an expression of the author. Thus, the values possessed by the author are represented in work. (3) Literature is experiential; literature is produced from real experiences experienced by the author (Griffith, 2010, pp. 23-26). As a product of art in a society that describes the reality of human life, the author explores the local phenomena around him (Fadillah et al., 2022) and works on it in order to not only create a book of his thoughts and experiences but also as a medium to communicate to the world (Mutmainnah et al., 2022). Each region utilizes its history and cultural heritage of locality, and the potential to develop tourism increases.
along with the effort to maintain the local wisdom (Hasyim et al., 2020).

Three main aspects of travel writing are Reporting the World, Revealing the self, and Representing the other (Thompson, 2011). Reporting the world in travel writing is in line with Mahayana’s statement about the normative role of travel writing. It tends to send information about an entity in a particular cultural setting. The concept of the self and the other is the concern of post-colonial studies. It can be a medium for the authors to complement the beauty of an environment by exploring certain places even with a cross-cultural language but still deliver an understandable book to read (Arafah & Kaharuddin, 2019). It is a discussion of the colonizer and colonized. Tyson says that “The colonizers saw themselves as the embodiment of what a human being should be, the proper “self”; native peoples were considered ‘other’” (Tyson, 2006, pp. 419–420). Then, the concept of the self and the other, in travel writing, is the relationship between the author and people in visited places. It drives us to discuss the ‘different’ between the self and the other. It leads to the analysis of rational and irrational, civilized and savage, superior and inferior.

Carl Lumholtz was born in Norway in 1851, and he studied religion and biology but became an anthropologist. He is a traveller. He explored the US, the Mexican desert, and New Guinea in 1890. Due to unsafe conditions in New Guinea, Lumholtz abandoned his trip and moved to Kalimantan. Lumholtz’s first mission was in Kalimantan’s south on the Barito River. From the Barito River, he went to the Mahakam River. Lumholtz’s voyage was supported by the Norwegian government, British and Dutch student groups, and wealthy Americans and British. His expeditions are detailed in Through Central Borneo. Lumholtz died in New York in 1922 of tropical fever (King, 2013, p. 243-46).

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This research belongs to descriptive qualitative research. Descriptive research relies on sentences, not numerical or statistical data, to describe the analysis (Malang, 2005, p. 18). Data sources in qualitative research can be humans and their behaviour, events, documents, archives, and other objects (Heribertus, 2006, pp. 56-61). Thus, the source of data is the travel writing by Lumholtz. The data of this research are the locality in travel writing that shows the normative role of travel writing, i.e., reporting to the world; and the concept of the self and the other. Lumholtz’s biography is also needed to identify the author’s representation of the self. Data collection is done by reading and taking-note techniques. Yin in Sutopo stated that the technique of recording documents is a way to find various things according to the needs and objectives of his research (Heribertus, 2006, p.81).

After collecting data, locality forms were grouped for analysis. Then, the analysis identifies the normative role of locality in reporting to the world. Later, it examines the self and the other in travel writing.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Sociocultural Situation of Dayak

The sociocultural situation means the condition of a particular society (shared community) related to cultural aspects. This research first discusses the forms of culture found in Lumholtz’s travel writing.

(a). Place Name

Few place names were mentioned throughout the book. They were as in the following quotations. “A few minutes later, we saw the Mahakam river” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 210). Mahakam was the name for the river that connected the village where the author stayed to other villages. It was described as forty to fifty meters wide, with a calm stream, and surrounded by hills. The river connected nearly 10,000 Dayaks tribes. Another place’s name is Sungei Lobang, as seen in “The Penihing kampong, Sungei Lobang, was soon reached” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 210). Sungei Lobang is the name of a village where the Penihing lived and the author stayed for a while. The village was newly made as the habit of Dayaks to change their settlement every fourteen or fifteen years. The village was located on a steep high bank. “Two men arrived from Nohaci, a neighbouring kampong, to sell two pieces of aboriginal wearing apparel, a tunic, and a skirt” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 212). Nohaci was the name of the neighbouring village from where the author stayed.

“When going to their ladangs in the morning, the Dayaks passed my tent, following the tiny affluent Kai, from which the kampong received its name” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 213). Ladangs were areas where the people of Dayak grew their crops, while kampong was where Dayak settled. Kampong usually was placed near the river to reach another kampong, and the Dayaks used prahu, a water vehicle. “They were Kayans from Long Blu, en route to Upper Kasao to gather rattan” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 214). Long Blu was the name of a place from which the Kayans came. Kayans were one of the various Dayak tribes, and they were said to cross paths with the author on their way to gather rattan.

The travel writing reveals that the Dayaks valued location names at the time, and the names became part of the culture and may have a geographical meaning. The ladangs and kampong are not merely the name of the place. It tells the sociocultural situation that there were ladangs for agricultural activities. It also describes that some communities lived in a place named kampong.

(b). Social Organization

There were few mentions of the existence of social organization throughout the book, as in the following quotations. “Although he was considerate and generous, Penihing chief Blarey, apprehensive of coming evil, twice tried to kill
him, a fact of which the doctor probably was not aware at the time” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 210).

The quotes above about the chief imply a social organization. It is an organization’s leader. Also, the social organization mentioned in the travel writing is kapala. It is seen through “Through the good offices of the Long Kai kapala, people of both tribes were sent for and promptly answered the call” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 215). Both kapala and the chief show the sociocultural at that time that there was a leadership structure.

Another social organization or the existence of social structure could be inferred from the following quotation. “One morning, I entered the rooms of one of the principal blians, from whom I wanted to buy their shield, used as a musical instrument to accompany their song” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 216). Principal blians led the blian process. Blian was a ceremony to cure someone’s disease using animal blood and a shield. Brien exists in most Dayak tribes, albeit the technique varies.

Travel writing revealed that Dayaks practised social organization. Dayaks had a chief, kapala, and blians. Dayaks knew the election process for the chief, kapala, and blians at the time.

(c). Habit

Various habits of the Dayak tribes were also mentioned in the book, as in the following quotations. “It is newly made, in accordance with the habit of the Dayaks to change the location of their villages every fourteen or fifteen years” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 211). The quote suggests that the Dayaks move every 14 or 15 years. Patching up the utilized field was the goal. A steep high bank was chosen for the new village.

Next, the habit of Dayak is the method of husking rice. It is explained that Bukats and Punans have the same method of husking rice as Penyahbons, Spartans, and Penihings, i.e., using their hands. It was different from the Kenyans and Kayans. Kenyans and Kayans used their feet to gather the rice grains back under the pestle (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 211).

Another habit is the way the Penihings dressed. As the Penihings had not been affected by the Mohammedan Malays’ teaching, they did not cover their torso and never considered nudity shameful. Mohammedan Malays were Islamic teaching continuously spread in Malay, one of which was covering the upper body (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 215).

The habit of Bukats and Punans is also about their diet. “The natural food of both peoples is serpents, lizards, and all kind of animal and birds, the crocodile and omen birds excepted” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217). It explained the diet of the Punans and Bukats. They were allowed to eat almost all kinds of animals except crocodiles and omen birds. It was also explained that the Punans and Bukats preferred to eat pig meat when it was ten days old as it was the freshest the meat would be. “The meat of pig is often eaten when ten days old, and is preferred to that which is fresh” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217)

Dayak habits reveal their culture. It describes Dayak nomadism. They move every 14-15 years, and Dayaks husk rice using their hands and feet. Dayaks rarely cover their torsos. It applies to hot tropical climates. It shows that Islamic doctrine had not reached them. Dayaks consume animals except for crocodiles and omen birds, revealing their culture. It shows that Dayaks consume 10-day-old piglets.

(d). Object

Many objects were mentioned in the book, from garments to fort. They were described in the following quotations, “Two attractive young girls sold me their primitive necklaces, consisting of small pieces of the stalks of different plants, some of them odoriferous, threaded on a string” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 212). The first object mentioned was Primitive necklaces. It was a piece of jewellery made from small pieces taken from stalks of various plants and threaded on a string. Other objects are a tunic and skirt. It is the pair of Aboriginals wearing apparel in the form of a tunic and a skirt. The Dayaks people used these necklaces and garments as their daily apparel. “Two men arrived from Nohdacilat, a neighbouring kampong, to sell two pieces of aboriginal wearing apparel, a tunic and a skirt” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 212)

The other objects of culture mentioned through travel writing are rattan, shield, and benting. “They were Kayans from Long Blu, en route to Upper Kasao to gather rattan” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 214). Rattan is a climbing plant often used for handicrafts by the Dayaks. A shield is an object that was used for the blian ritual. “Among the Penihings this shield is specially made for the blian’s use, and unless it is new and unused, he will not sell it because the blood of the sacrificial animals has been smeared on its surface and the patient would die” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 215). Next, benting is a building that acted as a military encampment that seemed to be under the command of the Dutch nation. “It was quite agreeable to see a flag again, the symbol of the Dutch nation being hoisted every day on the hill where the military encampment was located, usually called benting (fortress)” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 214).

The object as a cultural form also helps to describe the sociocultural situation at that time. The objects show the production of Dayaks which relates to the local environment. They produced primitive necklaces, tunics, and skirts. They used it daily. They also sold it to the visitor. It shows the sociocultural situation of production and sale. The travel writing also talks about rattan and shield. It shows the rituals of curing illness using a rattan shield. The bending of the Dutch describes the situation at that time under the Dutch’s colonialism.

(e). Convention

Throughout the book, there were few conventions among the Dayak tribes mentioned. Dayaks’ most important rule is not to kill their kin in their tribe, and the punishment for doing so is incarceration. The Dayak blians ceremony uses
animal blood to heal patients (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 212).

“Among the Penihings this shield is specially made for the blians’ use, and unless it be new and unused he will not sell it, because the blood of the sacrificial animals has been smeared on its surface and the patient would die” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 215).

Blood from a sacrificed animal was spread on a shield to be played during the ritual. The principal blians would sing and do actions like keeping their head down behind the shield, hitting with their right or left hand, and stomping the floor fiercely. “While he sings, he keeps his head down behind the shield, which is held upright, and he strikes either with right or left hand” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 216). The activity would end as the principal blians were in a trance, seemingly possessed. “He stamped one foot violently upon the floor, ceased playing, and seemed to be in a kind of trance, but recovered himself quickly” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 216).

Next is the convention for eating a rusa. “With the Bukats, rusa must not be eaten unless one has a child, but with Punans, it is permissible in any case” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217). The above quote mentions Bukat and Punan diets. Bukats could consume rusa if they had a child, whereas Punans did not.

The marriage of Punans and Bukats also becomes a part of the convention in culture. The Buckets and Punans were both monogamous and had severe punishment if adultery happened in a marriage. “Both tribes are strictly monogamous and distinguished by the severe view they take of adultery, which seldom occurs” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217). They also have strict rules about unfaithfulness in marriage. “While it is regarded as no detriment to a young girl to sleep with a young man, matrimonial unfaithfulness is relentlessly punished” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217). If the wife committed adultery, the Punan husband had to cut the head of the wife, and the partner then isolated himself for up to two years. “The injured Punan husband cuts the head from both wife and correspondent and retires to solitude, remaining away for a long time, up to two years” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 218). If the Punan husband fails to punish his wife, the wife’s brother must become the executioner. “If the husband fails to punish, then the woman’s brother must perform the duty of executioner” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 218). It was more severe for the Bukats as the husband must cut off the head of the wife, and then his head had to be cut by the wife’s brother. “The husband of an erring wife must kill her by cutting off her head, and it is incumbent on her brother to take the head of the husband” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 218).

Convention as cultural terms also discussed the situation of childbirth. “Neither of these monadic tribes allow a man present when a woman bears a child” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 218). It covered labour etiquette and postpartum care. Bukats and Punans men are not allowed at birthing. Women would get four days off following childbirth. “After childbirth, women abstain from work for four days” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 219).

Dayaks follow convention. It explains Dayak sociocultural situation. It states Dayaks do not kill tribe members, and they trust the blian ritual to heal. Eating rusa has rules. Also, Dayaks are monogamous and forbid adultery. If they disobey, they will be beheaded. Dayaks have a childbirth ritual. During labour, men were not allowed, and women were off-duty.

(f). Ecology

There was only one mention of ecology, as in the following quotation. “On the hills of the locality grow many sago palms, to which the natives resort in case rice is scarce” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 213). Sago palms yield edible tubers. When the rice was scarce, Dayaks produced sago palms as a food reserve. As the Dayaks' settlement was near a hill, sago palms were planted there.

(g). Character

Characters of various Dayak tribes were also described throughout the book, as in the following quotations.

“The Penihings of Long Kai are good-natured and pleasant, and it was refreshing to be among real, natural people to whom it never occurs that nudity is cause for shame; whom the teaching of Mohammedan Malays, of covering the upper body, has not reached yet” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 215).

The character of The Paintings of Long Kai has explicitly mentioned in the quotation that the Penihings of Long Kai were people with friendly and agreeable personalities. “They were much afraid of being photographed, and most of the Bukats declined” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217). It mentioned the character of Bukat. Many Bukats declined to be photographed, which suggests they are wary of strangers. Some opened up when rewarded. “A Bukat woman had tears in her eyes as she stepped forward to be measured, but happily smiled happily when receiving her rewards of salt, tobacco, and a red handkerchief” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217).

The next character is that both Punans and Bukats are monogamous. “Both tribes are strictly monogamous and distinguished by their severe view of adultery, which seldom occurs” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217). The quote shows Punans and Bukats' marriage attitudes. Both tribes were monogamous and punished adultery severely.

The other characters of Punans and Bukats are good at making sumpitans. “The Punans and the Bukats have not yet learned to make prahus, but they are experts in the manufacture of sumpitans” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 218). The quotation indicated the handicraft skill of the Punans and Bukats. “They are also clever at mat-making, the men bringing the rattan and the women making the mats” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 218). Both tribes were excellent at creating sumpitans, but not prahus. Punans and Bukats women were also proficient at crafting rattan mats.

Dayaks were very adaptable people as they could adjust their way of making palisades when the author moved to
Long Tjehan, another Penihings kampong, by having it done the same as the previous Penihings kampong they had visited. “They also made a palisade around it as they had seen it done in Long Kai, for the Dayaks are very adaptable people” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 219).

Dayaks’ localities shape their sociocultural position as their character. Lumholtz says Dayaks are kind. Some were camera bashful. They welcomed strangers. Moreover, Dayaks made rattan mats (sumpitans). Dayaks were adaptive since they moved every 14-15 years.

(h). Belief

The book also quotes Dayak beliefs about healing illness and what to do when someone dies. Dayaks believed summoning antohs could cure disease. The Dayak summoned antohs by executing a blian ceremony with a shield. “The gall of the bear is used as a medicine internally and externally” (Lumholtz, 218). It explained that the Punans and Bukats used the bear’s gall as an internal and external medicine. “In fractured bones, a crude bandage is made from bamboo sticks with leaves from a certain tree” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 218). The medical procedure is done for a person with fractured bones. The Punans and Bukats would make a bandage from bamboo sticks and leaves. “For curing disease, the Punans use strokes of the hand” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 218). Another way of curing the Punans was to use hand strokes to cure disease.

The Punans and Bukats would flee from where the dead person was, leaving the corpse alone to its fate. “When anybody dies the people flee, leaving the corpse to its fate” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 219).

The Dayaks’ belief describes the sociocultural condition in travel writing. The belief of Dayaks is associated with the blian ritual in curing illness. They believe in antohs as a god. It is antohs who help the curing of any illness. It also interacted with the curing of bone fractures by using bamboo. They used hand strokes as parts of the ritual and the galls of a bear as medicine.

B. Reporting the World, Revealing the Self, and Representing the Other

Locality in culture is more than a geographic territory. It describes a place’s sociocultural situation. Locality can be seen through cultural forms to understand a community’s sociocultural situation. Lumholtz’s travel writing explores place, social organization, habit, object, convention, ecology, character, and belief. They can not be separated. It must be viewed holistically. The author of travel writing wants to enlighten the world about distinct areas and inhabitants. Lumholtz describes the sociocultural situation of Dayaks in his travel writing. Travel writing says Dayaks valued the identified place name. Dayaks had a social organization. Also, it describes Dayaks’ location-changing, rice-husking, dressing, and eating habits. The travel writing describes Dayak conventions such as unlawful killing, the blian ceremony, consuming rsa, monogamy, and marital infidelity. It includes Dayak-made items. Lumholtz’s travel writing highlights sago palm as a rice-alternative diet ecology. It also demonstrates Dayaks’ nice, quiet, good-at-making-sumptans, adaptive character. The story also reveals Dayak beliefs, especially the blian ritual’s antoh belief. Travel writing reports the sociocultural situation of Dayaks at the time.

Then, the concept of revealing the self and representing the other in travel writing is described clearly by Thompson in his book Travel Writing. He explains it by illustrating a British expedition visiting the Canadian Arctic. The British met the Inuit—the aboriginal people in the Arctic. Then, they exchanged gifts.

“More to Inuits’ taste, however, was the seal oil which the British were using as a lubricant and as a fuel in lamps. …, when ‘the same man [was] offered some oil’, he drank it with much satisfaction, admitting that was really good” (Thompson, 2011, pp. 130-131).

The British gave seal oil as lubricant and lamp fuel, but the Inuit drank it. The contrasting diet of the British and Inuit explains the issue of the self and the other. The travel writing author always notices the ‘different’ between the visitor and the visited place. It makes the self refers to the author of travel writing. The native becomes the other. Suppose both British and Inuit use seal oil similarly, for example, as a drink. It means no ‘different’ in the understanding of seal oil. Then, the author would overlook the story of seal oil. They will think it needed to be more interesting to be recorded in travel writing.

In Lumholtz’s Through Central Borneo Travel Writing, the ‘different’ is seen in many localities. For example, Dayaks are nomadic tribes; it can be inferred from the story that Dayaks change their location every fourteen or fifteen years. The ‘different’ can be suggested between nomadic and settled people. Lumholtz also puts the ‘different’ in husking rice by Dayaks. Some Dayaks use their hands to husk rice. Some others use their feet. The dress of Dayaks for not covering their torso is included in Lumholtz’s travel writing. It raises the ‘different’ dress between the author, who possibly uses clothes and covers his whole torso. Another suggestion related to the dress of Dayaks is that throughout the story, Lumholtz says that Islamic teaching had not reached Dayaks near the Mahakam river. It shows that on his last visited places, he met natives who covered their torsos because of Islamic teaching. The ‘different’ is also shown in the eating of a pig ten days old by Dayaks. It tells that for Lumholtz, eating a pig ten days old is too long, and he is worried about its health impact.

The object made by Dayaks also tells the concept of the self and the other. Dayaks made things by using natural resources in the forest. They use rattan and plants to make handmade necklaces, tunics, skirts, prahus, and shields. The ‘different’ might be in the process of making by manual hands or by the resources used by Dayaks.

The intense issues of ‘different’ can be seen in blian rituals—a ritual by Dayaks in curing illness. Dayaks trust in
The bell came from the fortress—"Even the striking of a bell every half-hour did not have bravery toward him. and certainly his behavior was puzzling" (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 212). It reveals that the Dayak women always tried to offer him things. Also, it mentions that those women in the following quotation. "They were eager to sell me their wares and implements, and hardly left me time to eat." (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 212). Another superiority in revealing the self is shown through the use of the word 'primitive' in describing the necklaces offered by the two Dayak girls. Again, the other two men of Dayaks also offered their things to Lumholtz. They tried to sell a tunic and a skirt. "Two men arrived from Nohacilat, a neighbouring kampong, to sell two pieces of aboriginal wearing apparel, a tunic and a skirt"(Lumholtz, 1920, p. 212). Another piece of information about how Dayaks offered him things to buy can be seen in the following quotation. “They were eager to sell me their wares and implements, and hardly left me time to eat.” (Lumholtz, 215). It tells that the Dayak women always tried to offer him things. Also, it mentions that those women offered the product many times, even when he was eating. The author’s way of telling the situation that Dayaks always think that he is a rich person that can buy things shows the inferiority of Dayaks. It tells that Dayaks needs his money. It also shows the superiority of the self, especially in the economic aspect.

The travel writing also tells that one of the chiefs of Dayak was afraid of him. "I was told that he was afraid of me, and certainly his behavior was puzzling" (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 212). It reveals about the self that Dayaks, even the chief, do not have bravery toward him.

The travel writing also describes the situation of his stay near the Mahakam river under the Dutch nation’s power. It was seen through the flag on the fortress. Lumholtz said he agreed and felt safe at the military camp near his stay. “Even the striking of a bell every half-hour seemed acceptable as a reminder of civilization” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 214). The bell came from the fortress—the military camp. He saw it as a reminder of civilization. It shows that the people around him at that place do not show civilization. His superiority toward Dayaks was reflected through the word of civilization.

In the travel writing, Dayaks were described as honest people. They do not steal and lie. It also happened to Dayak children. However, in stating those ideas, Lumholtz uses the phrase “jungle people.” It gives the nuance of inferiority to Dayaks as jungle people. As if jungle people do not know honesty. "None of these jungle people steals, and they do not lie, although children may do either" (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217).

Last but not least, the travel writing gives information that Dayak women would smile happily if they got rewards from Lumholtz. “A Bukat woman had tears in her eyes as she stepped forward to be measured, but smiled happily when receiving her rewards of salt, tobacco, and a red handkerchief” (Lumholtz, 1920, p. 217). It tells that Dayak women, especially Bukats were shy people, but if a person could give gifts to them, they would not be shy. It can be inferred that Lumholtz was a person who could give things like salt, tobacco, and a red handkerchief.

Thus, the concept of ‘different’ reveals the self and represents the other in Lumholtz’s travel writing. It is the ‘different’ between the author as the self and Dayaks as the other. Another way to discuss that issue is by showing the superiority of the author toward the inferiority of Dayaks. In this travel writing, superiority tends to be about the economic situation where the author is described as a more prosperous person than Dayaks.

IV. Conclusion

Travel writing can provide sociocultural knowledge about a community. Lumholtz's travel writing shows Dayak's sociocultural situation through its locality by connecting place name, social organization, habit, object, convention, ecology, character, and belief. These areas cannot be separated. It pertains to how the travel writer is reporting the world about Dayak culture.

The travel writing author faces many choices in selecting a story that will be put in his or her writing. It leads to
issues of the self and the other. In this travel writing, those concepts show the author’s position in revealing himself and representing people he met while travelling in the Mahakam river area. Lunholtz’s *Through Central Borneo* travel writing brings the issues of ‘different’ and superior-inferior in revealing the self and representing the other. It helps in seeing travel writing as a source of historical information. The reader needs to raise awareness of the choices of information put by the author of travel writing.

This research tells the idea of Dayaks in the past. It can be continued by checking the sociocultural situation of Dayaks in the present time. Other researchers may continue this research by using the ethnography of Dayak. It means visiting the location near the Mahakam river to compare past and present sociocultural situations under the umbrella of field research.
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