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Preface

This thesis has two objectives: to present in Romanized transcription and English translation a number of Bugis texts, and to discover what these, combined with other published texts, can contribute towards a historical picture of South Sulawesi from about A.D.1300 to the first decades of the seventeenth century. The two elements are linked by an enquiry into the structure, sources, social function and historical evidence of the texts, an enquiry which runs throughout the thesis.

The thesis arose from an interest in the pre-European history of island Southeast Asia, linked to a more general interest in indigenous chronicles and genealogies. European sources on South Sulawesi date from the sixteenth century, with the arrival of the Portuguese, but the accounts left us by these early visitors are limited, covering for the most part a small area of the west coast of the peninsula between the years 1542 and 1547, and are concerned mostly with the conversion and baptism of several hard-to-identify west-coast rulers. Only occasionally do we learn something of the social organization of South Sulawesi; what information we are provided with is difficult to relate to indigenous records, as well as to the present-day geography of the peninsula (Pelras 1977).1

South Sulawesi sources written in the Bugis-Makasar script are, however, much more extensive for the early period. These contain information dating back (to judge by internal chronologies) to around 1300, and have the notable advantage of reflecting indigenous concerns rather than the interests of foreign visitors. Several of the more important Bugis and Makasar historical texts – chronicles and court diaries belonging to the larger kingdoms – have been edited and published, and they provide us with a reasonably detailed framework of the pre-European history of the the kingdoms to which they refer. But for three large kingdoms – those of Luwu², Soppêng and Sidênrêng – we have, as yet, only a handful of short texts published in

1 A detailed account of Portuguese sources on South Sulawesi and the problems of their relationship to Bugis west-coast genealogies is given in Pelras 1977. After about 1600, Dutch sources (and to a lesser extent, English and French sources) give a broadly reliable outline of events in South Sulawesi. This outline is supported, and often significantly added to, by indigenous, Bugis and Makasar writings.
the Bugis-Makasar script in the nineteenth century by the Dutch scholar and mission-linguist, B. F. Matthes.

My first plan was to edit a major historical text belonging to one of these kingdoms – ideally a chronicle of Luwu\(^c\), reputedly the oldest of all the South Sulawesi kingdoms. However, after searching at length through microfilms of Bugis manuscripts I had discovered only three short texts relating to Luwu\(^c\): a legend, a king list and a list of vassals. A similar pattern was repeated when I looked for a chronicle of Soppeng: while Sidênreng was found to possess what might be termed a chronicle, for the period before A.D. 1600 this consisted simply of four short texts similar to those discovered for Luwu\(^c\) and Soppeng, placed one after the other with little attempt at integration.

I therefore decided to look in a more general way at Luwu\(^c\), Soppeng and Sidênreng, from their earliest historical records to the formal acceptance of Islam in the first decades of the seventeenth century. In the course of research I came across a number of other short pieces relating to individuals or events described in the texts originally identified; in addition, I found that a detailed genealogy linked to the western Cênran region included seventeen members of the traditional "King List of Cina", a long-vanished kingdom of early South Sulawesi.\(^2\) This kingdom I also included within the terms of the enquiry.

The conclusions drawn from the evidence on these kingdoms are set within a more general examination of pre-Islamic South Sulawesi from published Bugis-Makasar sources. This examination is neither exhaustive of the the ten texts presented in chapter two, nor of manuscript sources for this period in general. There remain dozens, if not hundreds, of Bugis and Makasar texts, ranging from treaties to popular legends, through to genealogical records of the smaller kingdoms and principalities, which would clearly repay examination. Given the inadequate cataloguing of Bugis manuscripts in public collections and the number of unexamined manuscripts held in private collections, important new texts, and many other versions of known texts, may well await future discovery.

The present thesis may be seen as a counterpoint to a widespread interest in texts among modern historians. In The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes from

---
\(^2\)For reasons of style, the period 1300-1600 is referred to variously in the following chapters as "early" or "pre-Islamic".
French Cultural History, Darnton takes a number of texts, ranging from nursery rhymes to a police inspector's report, which he uses to investigate "ways of thinking" in eighteenth-century France (Darnton 1984). In the preface to his study of the Merlin legend, Tolstoy writes that "Modern scholars are less concerned with establishing a precariously-founded history, than in painstaking evaluation of the varied sources. Precisely how old is a given heroic elegy from the Welsh? In what circumstance and for what purpose was it written? Was it an original creation in its existing form, or does it reflect an older composition or convention?" (Tolstoy 1985)

This interest in texts is shared by several historians of Southeast Asia. Milner's study of Malay kingship is based on two nineteenth-century Malay texts from Patani and Sumatra (Milner 1982). Wolters' study of the Vietnamese Annals (Wolters 1986), Day's articles on the Javanese court poet Ranggawarsita (Day 1982) and the exile to Ambon of Pakubuwana VI (Day 1983) and Jane Drakard's unpublished M.A. thesis on Barus (Drakard 1984), are all based upon texts and the manner of their interpretation.

Most of the above studies draw to a significant degree upon the ideas of modern French literary philosophers, in particular those of Derrida and Barthes, and the historian Foucault. Some recent literary studies of texts, such as Maier's study of nineteenth-century European perceptions of the Malay Hikayat Merong Mahawangsa (Maier 1985), Maier and Koster's analysis of the Syair Ikan Terubuk (Maier and Koster 1986) and Koster's study of the Syair Buah-Buahan (Koster 1986), also draw upon the ideas of these literary philosophers. By and large, such studies focus not on the surface argument of a text, but on its internal contradictions, tensions and ambiguities, so as to reveal hidden concerns, or to suggest information deliberately suppressed by its author.

The ideal subject for this type of analysis, which is sometimes referred to as "textual deconstruction", is a long narrative text dealing with a subject of known political or social tension; a tale in which "much is at stake" in the telling (personal communication, Gijs Koster). The majority of Bugis historical texts are, however, short, usually just a few pages in length. Most of the texts examined in this thesis, furthermore, date from a period long after the events of which they speak. One may reasonably presume that, by virtue of their distance from the date of composition of the text in which they appear, these events have lost most of their original political
and social tensions. (See, however, the case of the Attoriolonna Soppêng on pages 197-202.) While the use of these theories has been largely precluded by the nature of the particular texts used, I trust that they have helped me avoid an over-simplified view of Bugis (and other historical) texts in general.

The present study having been set against other modern studies centred around texts, it is fitting to mention some earlier scholars whose work has made this thesis possible. Scientific studies of Bugis and Makasar languages, history and culture begin with the pioneering work of Dr B. F. Matthes (1818-1908). Matthes spent twenty-three years in South Sulawesi, between 1848 and 1880, during which time he produced Dutch-language dictionaries of Makasar and Bugis (Matthes 1859 and 1874), wrote numerous articles on the culture, literature and legends of South Sulawesi, and published two large collections of Makasar and Bugis texts, the Makassarsche Chrestomathie of 1860 and the Boeginesche Chrestomathie of 1864 and 1872. Matthes can be said to have laid the foundations for all future textual and historical studies of South Sulawesi through the production of the dictionaries. The Makasar dictionary has since been superseded by a new dictionary based in large part upon it (Cense and Abdurrahim 1979), but the Bugis dictionary remains to this day the most authoritative dictionary of this language. A definitive biography of Matthes and his work is provided by Van den Brink 1943.

The only other nineteenth-century European scholar to make an important contribution to the study of Bugis manuscripts was George Karel Niemann (c.1823-1905), a close friend of Matthes, whom he had replaced in 1848 as sub-director of the Dutch Missionary Society when Matthes set off for the Indies. Niemann, who later became an academic in Holland (Poensen 1906), published in Bugis-Makasar script a text edition of the Chronicle of Tanêtë (Niemann 1883). Some of the work done by Dutch officials, such as Ligtvoet (1880) and Braam Morris (1889), also made use of Bugis texts, many of which they collected or had copied: Jonker’s great collection of La Galigo texts was made between 1886 and 1896 (Drewes 1958:351).

3To set the present study into context it may be useful to mention my own background and training. My formal historical training has been slight: my first degree was in Indonesian and Malaysian studies at the University of London, where, in addition to a knowledge of Indonesian and Malay, I acquired a basic introduction to the principles of philology. At the same time, I studied Social Anthropology for two years at University College. My training (and continuing interest) in Social Anthropology is reflected in the historical picture of pre-Islamic South Sulawesi presented in Chapters Four and Five. During my postgraduate work, the most significant personal influence has been that of my supervisor, whose training in archaeology and early history has helped shape my own thinking.
Little work was done for thirty years after Matthes' death in 1908, either in the area of manuscript collection or research into their contents. Apart from a collection of short translations by Kern (1929), it was not until Cense arrived in Makasar in 1930 as a recently-appointed taalambtenaar (language specialist), that the intensive study of South Sulawesi manuscripts resumed.

This study received a considerable boost with the setting up in 1933 of the Matthesstichting (Matthes Institute) as a centre for linguistic and philological studies in South Sulawesi, with Cense as its head. Over the next ten years a collection of over two hundred manuscripts was built up by the Matthesstichting, most of them painstakingly copied from borrowed originals by a small team of Bugis and Makasar employees. Cense, unfortunately, delayed publication of his individual research and the greater part of his research material was lost in the 1942-1945 war. His publications are listed in Noorduyn 1978b.

Noorduyn's publication in 1955 of a Chronicle of Wajoi marked an important step forward, being the first real attempt both to judge and to use Bugis or Makasar writings as historical sources. Prior to the 1950s, the handful of scholars who could read these sources had concentrated on surveying, cataloguing and occasionally publishing them, rather than evaluating or drawing upon their contents. Noorduyn examined his Chronicle of Wajoi against contemporary Dutch sources and found it generally sound: for the sections that pre-dated Dutch contact he reserved judgement, but the usefulness of such sources for the writing of history had been demonstrated.

The 1970s saw the publication of a further two chronicles and, from the late 60s onwards, a number of articles and books appeared on the early history of South Sulawesi, both by Bugis and Makasar-speaking Indonesian scholars and by Western historians. All of these drew, in whole or in part, upon Bugis and Makasar written

---

4 The bulk of twentieth-century publications on South Sulawesi texts are listed in Noorduyn 1965:154-155. To this might be added Kern's monumental survey of the manuscripts of the I La Galigo (Kern 1939 and 1954), a short translation from that epic (Kern 1947), "A Makasar Heroic Poem" (Kern 1932) and translations into Dutch of a number of short texts from Matthes 1864 (Kern 1929).

5 Mention should also be made of Noorduyn's articles on the Islamisation of Makasar (1956) and Arung Singkang (1953), both of which draw upon indigenous sources.

6 The chronicles of Goa (Wolhoff and Abdurrahim n.d.) and Tallo (Rahim and Boharima 1975), being transcriptions and Indonesian-language translations of Matthes' published versions, with no attempt at critical analysis. The Chronicle of Boné is currently being prepared for publication by Macknight and Mukhlis.
While the present thesis is neither the first study of early South Sulawesi, nor (as we have seen) the first to use Bugis and Makasar sources, it does differ in a number of ways from the majority of earlier studies. While the general characteristics of Bugis (and Makasar) historiography have been accurately described for writings concerned with the seventeenth century and later (Noorduyn 1962, 1965), few texts purporting to speak of an earlier period have been examined. One of the aims of this thesis is to demonstrate the caution with which this material must be approached for the writing of history, if one is to avoid major errors of interpretation and historical reconstruction. Historical analysis — as Noorduyn has observed — must be preceded by careful philological and historical enquiry, which takes into account such matters as sources, construction, social function and genre, if one is to understand the evidence of a written source. The reader, nevertheless, will, I trust, be persuaded that a convincing and consistent picture of pre-Islamic South Sulawesi can be developed from such texts.

Another difference is that I have drawn for my interpretation of the texts upon anthropological and archaeological data, most of which were not available as recently as ten years ago. Anthropological and archaeological data can be used both to interpret texts and to date them. Millar's excellent unpublished Ph.D. thesis, which shows through a study of Bugis weddings how an ideology of status is adapted to the social reality of power and influence — and also the reverse — (Millar 1981), provides the key to the marriage strategies reflected in the genealogical records of the pre-Islamic kingdoms. In addition, a recent Indonesian-Australian archaeological survey of the hill settlements named in one text as the origin of the people of Soppeng, enables us to date both the text and the historical events upon which its author based his claim, to the eighteenth and late seventeenth centuries respectively.

---

7 A selection of articles is given in the bibliography. Other Indonesian-language articles were published in the Indonesian journal *Bingkisan* between 1967 and 1970: European language articles have appeared in *RIMA, Archipel, Indonesia* and *BKI*. Books include Abidin's study of Wajo in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Abidin 1983), a collection of essays (Abidin 1985), and Andaya's study of the seventeenth-century Arung Palakka (Andaya 1981).

8 Voor een beschrijving van de geschiedenis van Z. W. Celebes is een philologisch en historisch-critisch onderzoek van de producten der Makassaaarse en Buginese historiografie onontbeerlijk" (Noorduyn 1955: Stellingen 1); cf. also Noorduyn's important article on fifteenth-century Majapahit, where he writes "I have proceeded from the firm conviction that philological spadework is the only sound basis for historical research of the type that is dependent on written sources" (Noorduyn 1978a:265).

9 See page 104.
One might, finally, touch on the production of sources, in the form of the edited texts. Conventional historians, even when using archival sources, generally assume the possibility of a reader’s checking up on their sources. For linguistic and technical reasons described in the following chapter, it is unrealistic to expect that the readers of this thesis can check up on its sources, some of which do not exist outside private collections in South Sulawesi. Indeed, due to the nature of the Bugis-Makasar writing system, it is impossible to read written Bugis without continuously selecting from a range of semantic possibilities: in addition to this there is (in the case of a text existing in more than one version) the problem of textual variation.

For these reasons, I believe it to be of fundamental importance that the historian of early South Sulawesi produce his texts, stating clearly the manuscript sources of each text, and the philological principles which he has followed. As such, he may be compared to the prehistorian, who, when arguing from archaeological data, is expected to present that data in the form of a site report. By producing his texts, the historian not only makes his sources available for checking and makes clear his assumptions, but enables other scholars to re-interpret those sources or to use them for different purposes. There is nothing new or unusual in such an approach. One may cite no less a historian than O. W. Wolters, who, in his introduction to the *The Fall of Srivijaya in Malay History*, defines the central task of the modern student of Southeast Asian history as “the ploughing of new fields of study by making available hitherto unpublished sources” (Wolters 1970:xii).

The thesis is divided into five chapters. Chapter One sets out the method and philological principles used in the selection, editing and historical analysis of the texts. Transcriptions and translations of the Bugis texts are given in Chapter Two, each preceded by a short introduction. In Chapter Three, a number of methodological problems, such as textual chronology and the origin of writing, are examined, and the textual findings are summarized. Chapter Four looks at the general impression of pre-Islamic state and society given by Bugis and Makasar sources, and in Chapter Five a number of questions as to South Sulawesi’s political history are re-examined in the light of the findings of this thesis.
Abstract

The text sets out to examine ten Bugis works written in the Bugis-Makasar script, which purport to speak of South Sulawesi before the formal acceptance of Islam in the early seventeenth century.

Chapter One discusses the various philological problems of transcribing, translating and editing Bugis works, and sets out the methodology to be followed.

Chapter Two consists of the texts in Romanized transcription and English-language translation. Each text is prefaced by a brief introduction which discusses the previous history of publication (if any), the manuscript versions representing the work and the selection of a single manuscript for editing; the date of composition and the work as a historical source are briefly discussed.

Chapter Three looks at the relationship between history and writing for the pre-Islamic period. This leads to an examination of the evidence for the origins of literacy in South Sulawesi, and the definition of the period covered by the following historical enquiry as circa A.D. 1300-1600. The characteristics of Bugis sources for this period are then briefly outlined.

Chapter Four describes the general features of pre-Islamic South Sulawesi Society as they appear from Bugis and Makasar sources. Where possible, the evidence offered by the sources is examined against anthropological and archaeological data.

Chapter Five looks at some questions regarding the political history of pre-Islamic South Sulawesi. These questions concern the location and origins of specific chiefdoms, their internal organization, their historical expansion or decline, and their influence, if any, outside the region with which they have been more recently associated. In setting into context the conclusions suggested by the new data, the evidence of published Bugis and European sources is briefly re-examined.
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Chapter 1
Philological Introduction

In Chapter One some words used in a restricted sense are defined and the problem of identifying a "work" in the Bugis manuscript tradition is noted. Bugis and Makasar manuscript sources for the study of pre-Islamic South Sulawesi are described and sources on the Bugis language are discussed. The Bugis-Makasar script is introduced and questions as to its origin and development are briefly examined: the semantic choice offered by the script and problems of orthography are then discussed. The choice of a diplomatic edition is defended and the systems of transcription into Roman script are described and demonstrated.

1.1. Terminology

A number of words used in a restricted sense are defined in this section. The use of these words is consistent throughout the thesis.

The first of these words, and the most difficult to define, is work. As Macknight has observed, one of the fundamental problems faced by a prospective editor working in a manuscript rather than a printed tradition is that of defining the appropriate unit on which to concentrate his efforts. According to Macknight, this difficulty arises in particular with the Bugis manuscript tradition, because our concern for the "work" as the basic conceptual unit of transmission does not seem to have been shared to the same degree by the Bugis scribes, whose unit of reference was rather the codex\(^1\) into which they copied what interested them (Macknight 1984:103,111).

In his discussion of the Balinese Kidung Panji Malat Rasmi, Vickers draws for his definition of "text" and "work" on the ideas of the French structuralist Roland Barthes:

\(^1\)See page 5.
"In Barthes' terms, any manuscript of the Malat would correspond to a "work", the Malat in all its possible forms to the "Text"" (Vickers 1984:75).

Observing that the Balinese notion of the Malat goes beyond that of the written form, Vickers includes within his notion of "text" a number of non-written forms of representation in which the themes of the written Malat may be found: dance-drama performances, known as gambuh, the shadow-puppet-theatre equivalents called wayang gambuh, and painted works. According to Vickers, individual expressions of a Malat theme in any of these artistic categories should be regarded as "works" which are part of "the Textual process" (ibid., p. 75). In Barthes' words:

"it is the work which is the imaginary tail of the Text; or again, the Text is experienced only in an activity of production" (Barthes 1977:157).

Vickers' definition seems to fit the evidence of the Malat; and, through the questions that arise from it (such as those of the relationships between the written and the dramatic or painted forms and how an "author" working in one form draws upon others), opens the way for new enquiries. Could such a definition be applied also to the sources examined in this thesis? While these exist only in the form of written documents, there is indeed evidence that in a number of cases they derive in part from oral traditions. In general, though, I do not think Vicker's definition of "work" and "text" is a useful one for Bugis historical sources.

The reason for this lies in the fundamental difference between the nature of the romance, such as the Malat, or literary epic, such as the I La Galigo, and that of the genealogies and chronicles. The Malat and the I La Galigo belong to literary categories in which there was an evident degree of creativity in the "copying" of an episode, the episode being the basic unit of both traditions. This creative freedom makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the relationships between various versions of the same episodes. Each version of an episode of the Malat or I La Galigo is best regarded as a new work, albeit one which draws heavily on an established tradition (in Vickers' terminology, the "text"). It is difficult, if not impossible, to speak of one Malat as being more "authentic" than any other, in that all are equally part of the Malat tradition, there being no "original" Malat to which all later Malats aspired. For such a genre, the central object of study should be the

---

2 Failure on the part of earlier generations of scholars to grasp the nature of similar literary works in several parts of the archipelago led to the application of unsound philological procedures: see section 1.4.
tradition itself, rather than the recovery of an imaginary original.³

However, in the case of each of the Bugis works examined in this thesis, their manuscript versions can be shown, by virtue of their close structural and linguistic similarity, to have descended from a single ancestor.⁴ Each versions of a work can be shown to be more or less faithful than other versions to the ancestor from which they are descended (in philological terminology, the archetype). There is no evidence of creativity involved in the copying of such works; copyists aimed simply at reproducing those parts of an exemplar that interested them.⁵ This is not to say that an experienced Bugis scribe did not recognize some "units" among the material he copied, nor that he would not have recognized (for example) different versions of the Chronicle of Bone as having a great deal in common (cf. Macknight 1984:108).

We are now able to re-introduce the idea of authenticity, in the form of authorial creativity. Despite drawing on earlier sources, each of the works presented in Chapter Two is clearly the product of one individual, who arranged the material in its present form. In doing so, the author (compiler or redactor is in many ways a better word) produced a work with a specific social function, a function that was in many cases unconnected with the sources used. For instance, the author of the Royal Genealogy of Cina (section 2.4) used a legend from Luwu⁶ and a genealogy from the western Cênranana region to provide evidence of the ascriptive status of a seventeenth-century ruler of Bone, while the author of the eighteenth-century Attoriolonna Soppeng (section 2.5) used a number of earlier oral traditions to produce a work supporting the authority of the ruler of Soppêng over that of his chiefs.

Work is therefore defined here as "an original composition", a new and unique "act of putting together" which has come down to us in one or more manuscripts. None of these fully represents the work which it contains, though in most cases it is possible to learn more about the work by a careful comparison of its manuscripts.⁶ It must be frankly admitted that our recognition of an "act of putting together" is, in the end, arbitrary. In theory, too, a problem remains as to just how much difference

³This conclusion is reached independently by Behrend (1987) in his study of the Jatiswara.
⁴This is a slight simplification, but the exceptions do not seriously challenge this conclusion.
⁵Selective copying seems to have applied not just at the level of the codex, but also to the unit copied, particularly in the case of longer works, such as the Chronicle of Bone. Evidence for selective copying at both levels is presented in Chapter Two.
⁶This definition partly encompasses Vickers' use of the word, in that each version of the Malat (or I La Galigo) is in a sense a new and original composition. For Vickers' "text" I use the word "tradition", a word which I feel better describes the mental universe within which such works are created.
or creativity is required to constitute a new act of putting together. (In the terminology defined below, as to how much substantial variation is required for a new work.) There is no completely satisfactory answer to this question and the decision in the end is one for the editor's judgement. In practice there is usually little difficulty, and in those few cases where there is, there is no alternative to spelling out what is involved in the particular case.

The rest of the terms are easier to define. *Text* is used in its general sense to refer to a body of writing. Version is an abbreviation for manuscript version. Versions may differ in their degree of variation, ranging from minor stylistic variation (see below) to major redaction (i.e. recasting, reformulation), but always retain the theme, structure and generally much of the language of the work as found in other versions. *Manuscript* (or MS.) refers simply to the paper on which a version of a work is written and is used mainly to indicate that the pages of a codex are being referred to, as in "MS. page 11". *Variation* is the difference between two or more versions of a work. It is defined as occurring in two forms. The first of these is *stylistic variation*, that is, variation in style produced by the re-arrangement, omission or substitution of elements, generally at the level of the complex or word (cf. Sirk 1983:75-78), in such a way as not to change the informational content. (For example, both naianapa and ianaä can be translated "Here is / This concerns".) *Substantial variation* is variation which adds to or alters the information conveyed by a particular version. It is the more important of the two forms, in that a substantial variant can in most cases be used to establish the relationships between a set of related manuscripts.

---

7 Observant readers will have noticed that the subtitle of this thesis should read "Ten Bugis Works", or "Thirteen Bugis Texts". In the title and the preface text is used in its fashionably ambiguous sense to cover (in my terms) work and text.

8 This is examined in detail by Caldwell and Macknight, "Variation in Bugis Manuscripts", forthcoming. The division into stylistic and substantial variation is our own: indicative errors (*leitfehler*), which enable the construction of a stemma (Maas 1958:42), are almost always substantial in Bugis manuscripts.
1.2. Resources for the Study of Early South Sulawesi

1.2.1. Bugis Sources

The Bugis works referred to in this thesis are from published and unpublished sources. All but one of the published sources consists of a transcription in Latin script of a Bugis or Makasar historical work accompanied by a translation into Indonesian, Dutch or English, and (in most cases) an introduction.¹

Unpublished sources are for the most part found in codices (singular codex), bound folios of imported European paper in the form of a book. Each contains a single work or a number of works. Codices held in the major European and Indonesian collections are for the most part copies made under the instigation and direction of Europeans of other codices borrowed for the purpose. Although no systematic check has been made, there seems no reason to suspect these to be anything other than reasonably faithful copies of the originals, most of which are probably now lost (Macknight 1984:105).

A typical codex contains a disparate miscellany of items. Macknight cites a codex of two hundred and fifty-four pages which contains one hundred and eighty-three items, although the number is usually much less. While some degree of commonality can be detected among the contents of many codices, any title attached to a codex is likely to be misleadingly incomplete or uselessly general. The exception is the case of a codex which contains a single item, but there is nothing to suggest that this represents anything more significant than a lack of space, the length of the item, or failure to complete the codex (Macknight 1984:105-106).

Bugis scholars divide codices into two types. Those called sureň²,³ which contain episodes from the I La Galigo,³ are sharply divided off from codices called lontara², which contain items such as calendars, diaries, genealogies, and religious and histori-

¹ The Chronicle of Tanète (Niemann 1883) uses the Bugis-Makasar script and is without translation. Some other works were published in Bugis-Makasar script by Matthes in the Makasar and Bugis Chrestomathies; it is more convenient here to refer to them in their manuscript versions or published Romanized transcriptions.

² The word sureň may, however, be used within a non-sureň works to introduce its subject, for example in the words Iana sureň poaadadaenngi . . . "This is the writing that tells of (such and such a thing)".

³ The position of other forms of poetry is uncertain, but they should probably be included in the sureň category.
Abidin states that the earliest Bugis writing (in the Bugis-Makasar script?) was called surei (writing) but offers no evidence (Abidin 1971:162). Surei is an Arabic-Malay loan-word (Wilkinson 1901-1902:418), while lontara is evidently derived from Javanese lontar (writing, document), being a transposition of rontal (leaf of the Dracaena tree). It therefore seems unlikely that this important division dates back earlier than the sixteenth century.

All the works set out in Chapter Two are found in lontara codices. Items within codices are generally distinguishable by a number of devices listed by Macknight (1984:106-7). Despite these devices, the end of one work and the beginning of another is not always clear, particularly in the case of genealogies, which may be divided in a number of places by the Arabic loan-word tammat (end), written in the Arabic script.

Unpublished sources are referred to by a combination of letters and numbers denoting the collection or library in which they are held. These are, by and large, the designations by which the manuscripts are known in the libraries to which they belong. For example:

CCM 16 refers to reel 16 of the 24 microfilm reels of the manuscripts of the Yayasan Kebudayaan Sulawesi Selatan dan Tenggara (South and Southeast Sulawesi Cultural Institute) and other material photographed by Dr C. C. Macknight in Ujung Pandang between 1972 and 1978. I have consulted the microfilms in the library of the Australian National Library.

KITLV Or. 272 refers to manuscript 272 in the Oriental collection of the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology), Leiden.

Leid Or. 6163 refers to manuscript 6163 in the Eastern Manuscript Collection of the library of the State University of Leiden.

---

4 A concise introduction to Bugis historical literature is found in Cense 1951 and Pelras 1985. Tol (forthcoming) observes that the sure / lontara division corresponds closely to the "soothing" / "useful" categories proposed as the two dominant functions operating in Malay texts by Koster and Maier (1985). Thus sure may be described as texts which "were primarily enjoyed for their playful rhetorics; for their play on sounds, rhythm and rhyme, for the elegance of their comparisons, and for their amplifications and elaborations", while lontara correspond to "those texts which served directly to uphold the legal and political order . . . [and] provide[d] standards of conduct and function as sources of relevant knowledge" (ibid., p. 445).
MAK 188 refers to manuscript 188 (according to the old catalogue) in the Bugis and Makasar manuscript collection of the Yayasan Kebudayaan Sulawesi Selatan dan Tenggara, Ujung Pandang.\(^5\)

LAL 1985 refers to the "Lontarak Akkarungeng Luwuk 1985", a manuscript of that name held in the Bidang Sejarah dan Nilai Tradisional, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Kompleks Benteng, Ujung Pandang.

NBG 99 refers to manuscript 99 in the Bugis and Makasar manuscript collection of the Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap (Dutch Bible Society) (Matthes 1875, 1881), currently held in the library of the University of Leiden.

Salim 1 refers to a manuscript owned by Drs Muhammad Salim in Ujung Pandang. A copy of this manuscript is held in the library of the Australian National University.

Salim 2 refers to a manuscript owned by Drs Salim containing a number of South Sulawesi genealogies drawn up in the form of trees. A copy of this manuscript is held in the library of the Australian National University.

VT 136 refers to manuscript 136 in the Verschillende talen (Miscellaneous Languages) collection of the Museum Nasional (National Museum), Jakarta.

YKSST 3058 refers to manuscript 3058 (according to the present catalogue) of the Bugis and Makasar manuscripts in the Yayasan Kebudayaan Sulawesi Selatan dan Tenggara, Ujung Pandang.

The page and line numbers of a manuscript may also be given. For example:

MAK 188:5.10 refers to page 5, line 10 of manuscript MAK 188.

In the case of the material photographed by Macknight, most microfilm reels contain several items. The number of the item referred to is given following the reel number. For example:

---

5 These have since been recatalogued twice. As far as I am aware, no record was kept of the previous catalogue numbers during the most recent re-cataloguing, making it difficult to identify the manuscripts from the numbers given here. The MAK numbers are used by Noorduyn (1955) and in the microfilm copies of these manuscripts in the library of the Australian National University and the library of the State University of Leiden.
1.2.2. European and Other Indonesian Languages

Sources written in European and Indonesian languages (other than Bugis and Makasar) are mostly in published form and are referred to in the conventional way.

1.2.3. Dictionaries

There are to date just two published dictionaries of the Bugis language. One of these, the *Kamus Bugis-Indonesia* (Said 1977), is a dictionary of modern spoken Bugis with Indonesian translations. The editor, Muhammad Said, is himself a Bugis, and his dictionary would have been a valuable source for the correct orthography of Bugis words were it not for the large number of typographical errors it contains. These make the dictionary unreliable other than as a source of the meanings of entries and their use in Bugis sentences.

The earlier dictionary, and by far the superior, is Matthes' *Boegineesche-Hollandsch Woordenboek* of 1874 (hereafter abbreviated *Woordenboek*). This was based on a study of more than twenty years by Matthes of the Bugis language and draws upon numerous manuscript sources, some of which Matthes published in the *Boeginesche Chrestomathie* (Matthes 1864, 1872a and 1872b).

By and large, the arrangement of entries in Matthes' dictionary is to incorporate words having the same root in one entry. This makes using the dictionary difficult without a knowledge of Bugis grammar, due largely to the morphophonemic changes common to morpheme junctions (cf. Noorduyn 1955:11). Where the reader is referred to an entry in the *Woordenboek* I have therefore provided the number of the page on which it may be found. While Matthes' orthography of Bugis words is not always reliable, particularly in the case of words containing final glottal stops, the *Woordenboek* remains a valuable source for the study of manuscript Bugis, and contains numerous examples of the use of words in sentences as well as ethnographic commentaries. The supplement to the *Woordenboek* (Matthes 1881) is essentially an extended list of addenda and errata, and contains little of importance concerning the language of traditional Bugis literature (Sirk 1983:27).

Matthes had little published information on which to base his dictionary. The only previous guide of any substance to what was, in the the nineteenth century, a
widely spoken language, was the word list compiled by the Danish missionary L. G. Thomsen in Singapore in 1833. Matthes was, however, able to draw on the knowledge of amateur Bugis linguists and scholars, who in his day were mostly elderly women of aristocratic origin. Chief among his informants was his friend Arung Pancana, Colli pujie, a daughter of the ruler of the little west-coast kingdom of Tanete. Two other informants were Arung Mandalie, the ex-Regent of Kekang, and his father, Daeng Memangung (Swellengrebel 1974:150).

A word should be said here about Matthes' use of the terms "Old Bugis" (abbreviated O.B.), "Basa Bissu" ("Bissu" language, abbreviated B.B.) and "La Galigo" (abbreviated La Gal), which I have included in footnote and textual references to the Woordenboek. These terms, which Matthes does not explain, have been examined in detail by Sirk, who has determined that the term "Old Bugis" and "Basa Bissu" are used in the Woordenboek to indicate "spheres of functioning of lexical units", while references to literature, such as the I La Galigo, are rather "to document words and expressions ... rarely used in spoken language" (Sirk 1975:230,231). After examining some of the sources used by Matthes, Sirk concludes that:

"It may be supposed that abundant use of the B.B.-words was a characteristic feature of the 'inspired' speech of Bissus and other high-ranking persons who, no matter why, wanted to become similar to them. Quite naturally, it was not obligatory that such an inspired speech pursued a magic aim; that speech was possible in other situations too . . . " (ibid., p. 234).

According to Sirk, "Old Bugis" appears to be linked by a number of isoglosses with the languages of Central and Eastern Sulawesi, and by implication the Luwu region, traditionally associated with the I La Galigo cycle. Indeed, "Old Bugis" seems in some way to have originated from the I La Galigo material. Sirk also notes that, at least in some situations, "Old Bugis" and "Basa Bissu" could be paired together to form compound words such as tabumaloa (from O.B. tabu "food" and B.B. maloa "many") (ibid., p. 235).

---

6 A Vocabulary of the English, Bugis and Malay Languages (Mission Press, Singapore 1833). This was based on local sources and provides English translations for its 2000-odd Bugis and Malay entries arranged in parallel columns. It is completely superceded by the Woordenboek. For further information on Thomsen and the publications of the Mission Press, see Noorduyn 1957.

7 A widow of about forty years of age, a woman of genuine scholarship, who usually drafts all important correspondence for her father, and who understands not just the high language of Bone but who seems to be not unskillful in the old language of the I La Galigo, which is now quite obsolete" (Reisverslag dated October 1852, in Van den Brink 1943:172; cited in Swellengrebel 1974:150).

8 Bissu are the transvestite ritual specialists associated with the pre-Islamic Bugis religion. Hamonic (1987) provides a detailed study of the Bissu and their rituals.
1.3. The Bugis-Makasar Script

The Bugis-Makasar script has been used for several hundred years, both by the Bugis and the Makasar, and may, therefore, be called the Bugis-Makasar script. The script was widely used well into the twentieth century, not only to write the Bugis and Makasar languages, but also various other languages of Sulawesi, such as Mandar, Duri, Enrikang and Toraja, and also for Bima. Today the Bugis and Makasar languages (and hence the script) are less commonly used as a means of written communication than is Indonesian, although the script is still taught to primary school children in Bugis-speaking areas of South Sulawesi; Grimes and Grimes (1987:27) have even seen the script being used by university students.

Like the majority of Indonesian scripts, the Bugis-Makasar script has its ultimate origin in an Indian model (Casparis 1975:67, Jensen 1970:397). There is, however, no evidence that the Bugis-Makasar script developed in a linear fashion from an introduced script, such as one of the so-called Old Javanese scripts, which developed in this way from an Indian model. While some similarity can be detected between certain Bugis and Old Javanese akṣara, this could be accounted for by assuming the Bugis-Makasar script to have been invented by someone familiar with the principles and certain akṣara of an Old Javanese script.

The characteristic feature of these Indic scripts, of which there are about a dozen, is that they are syllabic, not alphabetic. Each symbol, or (Sanskrit) akṣara, of which there are twenty three in Bugis, stands for a consonant plus an "inherent" vowel a; thus ˒ produces Ka, ˓ produces Pa, etc. (The frequency of the vowel a in Sanskrit exceeds that of all other vowels and the same may be true of all Indonesian languages.) The value of the vowel may be altered by the addition of diacritics placed above, below, before or after the akṣara. Thus ˓ (Pa) produces ˒ (P₁), ˓ (Pu), ˒ (P₆), ˓ (Po) and ˒ (P₇). The single

---

1 The following description is based largely upon Sirk 1983:24-26 and Mills 1975:600-03

2 See however page 159, footnote 1, which states that "the lontara" of the raja of the Mandar, Duri, Enrikang and Sangalla-Toraja regions were generally written in the Bugis language, as the royalty of these areas had genealogical ties to the Bugis aristocracy. I have myself seen an early-twentieth-century version of a local chronicle written in the Mandar language in the Bugis-Makasar script which is in the possession of Drs Darmawan in Ujung Pandang. Zollinger (1850, insert between pages 134 and 135) gives a table of the "Bima alphabet", which is evidently based upon the "Old Makasar" script (see page 12 of the thesis), alongside an approximate rendition of the modern Bugis-Makasar script.


4 One page of a randomly selected Bugis prose text (Matthes 1884:582) produces the following vowel counts: a 238, ˒ 103, u 60, ˒ 54, o 45, ˒ 34. In percentage terms this translates as: a 44.6, ˒ 19.3, u 11.2, ˒ 10.1, o 8.4 and ˒ 6.7.
exception is the akṣara ॐ, which produces the inherent vowel a without a preceding consonant.5

1.3.1. Origin

The origin of the Bugis-Makasar script6 and the date of the introduction of its prototype to South Sulawesi, has never been properly determined. Noorduyn has pointed out that the Indian origin of the script shows that the art of writing was known before the introduction of Islam in the early seventeenth century; for, had the Bugis or Makasar no system of writing at that time, they would surely have adopted the Jawi-Malay script (Noorduyn 1962:31).7

Noorduyn is understandably cautious in suggesting a more precise date, restricting himself to the observation that the chronicles, while originating from a later date, are in large part concerned with the sixteenth century, their account of which may have been based on written documents dating back to those years (ibid., p. 30). Scott (1984) presents important evidence that the pre-hispanic Philippine baybayin scripts are derived from a script from South Sulawesi, due to the inability of the babayin scripts to express a final consonant:

"The Buginese, Makassarese and Mandar alphabets of Celebes (Sulawesi) to the south share this shortcoming with the Philippine alphabet, although it is a less serious handicap for the Bugis since their language only requires nasals or a glottal catch in this position. But the Sumatran ka-ga-na scripts use as many as 13 diacritical marks to express vowels, common consonantal endings like n and ng, and the equivalent of the virama,[8] and even several radical characters to represent consonant clusters in the middle of a word — like the nd in landok. The failure of the Philippine baybayin to have developed similar devices to meet its own phonetic needs, argues, like its limited distribution, for a comparatively recent introduction into the [Philippine] archipelago.

Scott concludes that:

"Considering the baybayin's inability to express consonants at the end of syllables, its model was probably a script employed by a Sulawesi people like the Bugis whose language [unlike Tagalog] makes little use of final consonants" (Scott 1984:61)

5 Sirk (1983:25) does not hold ॐ to be an independent vowel symbol since he considers it able to convey a pre-glottalized vowel (thus 骀a, a, etc.); Mills (1975:600) appears less certain, simply indicating the possibility with a question mark. As the glottal stop is never indicated in the Bugis-Makasar script, there being no way of representing it, the point seems a fine one.
6 See section 3.2 for my own conclusions as to the origin of the Bugis-Makasar script.
7 Cf. Jones (1986:139), who argues that the adoption in the fourteenth century by the Malays of a modified form of the Arabic script suggests that they did not posses a previous written literary tradition.
8 A small oblique stroke placed under a consonant to denote that it has no vowel inherent or otherwise pronounced after it (Monier-Williams 1899).
1.3.2. Development

Little is known of the development of the script subsequent to its introduction into South Sulawesi. The large majority of Bugis (and Makasar) manuscripts are nineteenth-century copies; eighteenth-century manuscripts (these being for the most part late-eighteenth-century) are few in number, and seventeenth-century ones are rare. Such a pattern reflects, in part, the late development of Western scholarly interest in South Sulawesi. Most of the manuscripts held in European collections are copies made for nineteenth-century scholars, such as Matthes, Ligtvoet, Niemann, Jonker and Schoemann.9

Crawford (1856:74) ascribes the invention of the script to the Bugis. Until the eighteenth century, however, there was at least one other script in use in South Sulawesi. This was the so-called “Old Makasar” script, which there is reason to believe was once the usual Makasar script, which was gradually replaced by the relatively simpler Bugis(-Makasar) script. Several manuscripts written in this script have survived (a brief list is found in Noorduyn 1985:22). Among these are three manuscripts which contain the chronicles of Goa and Tallo and the original Makasar-language version of the Treaty of Bungaya of 1669 (one page of this treaty is reproduced in Stapel 1939, vol. 3, p. 343). A contract in Dutch and Makasar dated October 16, 1791, bears the signatures in this script of two Makasar Karaéng (a noble title), which shows that it was still used at the Makasar court, but not by the scribes who worked for the V.O.C., in the last decade of the eighteenth century (Noorduyn 1985:22).10 If the present-day Bugis-Makasar script is of Bugis origin, then its general adoption could be due in part to the political domination of South Sulawesi by Bone from the late seventeenth century to the nineteenth century, as well as to its relative simplicity compared with the surviving examples of the “Old Makasar” script.

Abidin states that the ancestor of the present script consisted of eighteen aksara. He cites the tradition that the aksara (Ha) was introduced by Abdul Ma’mur,
Chatib Tunggal, Dato Ri Bandang, one of the seventeenth-century Islamic teachers credited with the introduction of Islam to South Sulawesi, to enable the transliteration into written Bugis of Arabic terms. Abidin also states that invention of the four pre-nasalized consonants, \( \text{NGK}_{a} \) \( \text{NR}_{a} \) \( \text{MP}_{a} \) and \( \text{Na} \) is attributed to Colli\'pujiê, an eighteenth-century Arung Pancana (1971:162). Fachruddin identifies Colli\'pujiê with Matthes' friend and informant of that name who was also ruler of Pancana,\(^{11}\) and throws doubt on such an origin of the pre-nasalized consonants by observing that none of the I La Galigo manuscripts copied by her, or under her direction, contain these characters (there are, on the other hand, numerous nineteenth-century manuscripts not copied by her which contain these characters) (Fachruddin 1983:41). Fachruddin points instead to the similarity between these four \( \text{aksara} \) and certain \( \text{aksara} \) of the South Sumatran scripts: he also observes that while the sound represented by the \( \text{aksara} \) \( \text{Ha} \) is rare in Bugis, it does occur in certain dialects, such as those of Sinjai and Soppêng, and that the shape of the \( \text{aksara} \) \( \text{Ha} \) bears a closer resemblance to the “Kawi” \( \text{aksara} \) \( \text{Ha} \) than it does to the Arabic \( \text{H} \).

The similarity between the Bugis script and those of Sumatra (and in particular the scripts of Lampung and Rejeng) has been frequently observed.\(^{12}\) Fachruddin, however, sets out in a table the “Kawi”, Bugis(-Makasar) and “Sumatran”, \( \text{aksara} \) and concludes that the physical relationship between the Bugis-Makasar \( \text{aksara} \) and their “Kawi” counterparts is as close, if not closer, than their Sumatran equivalents (ibid., p. 33). On this evidence, it is as easy, if not easier, to imagine a common origin for both the Sumatran and Bugis-Makasar scripts from a Kawi script as it is to imagine a direct relationship between the latter two scripts. Fachruddin does not state the source of his “Kawi” script, which bears a close similarity with Holle’s examples of ninth-century Javanese scripts (Holle 1882): while this similarity is indeed striking, as is shown in Chapter Three, the evidence of the Bugis-Makasar sources points to a much later date for the development of writing. Considering the relative lateness of extant Bugis-Makasar manuscripts, none of which pre-date the late seventeenth century, the present writer agrees with Macknight (1986:227) that it is probably impossible to determine the relationship of the Sumatran, South Sulawesi and

\(^{11}\) It is difficult to know who is in error here: it is unlikely that there were two Arung Pancana with the same name within a single century.

\(^{12}\) This observation can be traced back at least to Raffles, who writes in the History of Java that “The form of the character[s] is peculiar, and more nearly resembles that of the Bitas on Sumatra than any other we know of” (Raffles 1817:clxxvii).
other apparently related scripts simply on the basis of the shapes of their akṣara.\footnote{See in this regard Thomas' review of Juan R. Francisco's \emph{Philippine Palaeography (Philippine Journal of Linguistics, Special Monograph Number 3; June 1973) in RIMA 14}, pp. 153-162.}

Little stylistic development in the script can be detected in the manuscripts examined in this thesis, most of which date from the mid-nineteenth century.\footnote{See in this regard Kern (1939:581,1075), who states that some of the I La Galigo manuscripts are noted for their extensive use of variant forms of symbols; also Ricklefs and Voorhoeve 1977:35-36, who record the same for two manuscripts of the I La Galigo. Mention should also be made of the so-called cipher script which was sometimes employed in the nineteenth century to record Jlong, in which the independent symbols of the Buginese-Makasar script are replaced by Arabic figures (Sirk 1983:26).} The linguistic values of the akṣara are quite regular, though occasionally MP may be used to indicate geminate P. It seems possible that this usage has its origin in the historical transition MB > MP, MP > PP (Sirk 1983:16).

One text examined in this thesis does, however, contain three previously unrecorded akṣara. MAK 100:136.1-137.12 uses ने for NG, ने for S and ने for B, the last of these being replaced, apparently at random, by the usual akṣara. MAK 100 is a twentieth-century copy of a codex owned by the Opu Patunru Luwu\textsuperscript{5} (the holder of a high office in the former kingdom of Luwu\textsuperscript{5}).

Prior to the introduction of paper, possibly by the Malays in the sixteenth century,\footnote{The history of paper in the Indonesian archipelago is as yet unstudied. It is possible that paper was introduced to South Sulawesi by the Portuguese, or perhaps via earlier contact with Java or the Malay world: there is evidence to suggest that by the fifteenth century the Malay court at Malacca was using imported paper to record Persian-inspired literary works (Jones 1986).} writing seems to have been recorded on prepared leaves (Abidin 1971:161). Abidin reports that lontara\textsuperscript{6} written on leaves are today of great rarity, existing only among the Tolotang people:\footnote{The Tolotang people live in the Sidérangé area. They are believed to have originated in the village of Tatoni in Wajo\textsuperscript{5}. While they claim to be Muslim, they rarely observe Islamic practices (Abidin 1971:163, footnote 13). For a useful account of the Tolotang of Amparita see Maeda 1984.} according to Andi Makkaraka, "an expert and collector of lontara\textsuperscript{6}"; episodes of the I La Galigo written on rolled aka\textsuperscript{2} leaves using an eighteen-character syllabary are still to be found in Luwu\textsuperscript{5} (Abidin 1971:162, Makkaraka 1967:20).

On the basis of some rather slim evidence, it appears likely that prior to the general use of paper (which in remote areas may have been as late as the present century) the normal method of preserving written information was on strips of leaves, each containing a single line of writing. The strips were then stitched or glued end to end so that they could be read continuously. The attached strips appear to have been wound on to spools set in a wooden holder and read by winding
the strip from one end of the holder to the other.\textsuperscript{17}

The earliest reference to this form of document occurs in the Chronicle of Boné. Having named two of the five children of the first ruler of Boné, the Chronicle adds, "As for the [names of the] others, they remain in the chronicles which are rolled up" (Macknight and Mukhlis, forthcoming). A more contemporary account is given in the Adatrechtbundels (1929:288) of a reading of a lontara\textsuperscript{2} from Kampung Mario in the regency of Camba in 1904, which was in the form of a "roll of palm leaves attached to one another that were turned on a sort of mill".

1.3.3. Orthography in Latin Transliteration

The Bugis-Makasar writing system, particularly in its seventeen-akṣara form, is structurally deficient for the recording of the Bugis language (Noorduyn 1955:8). This structural deficiency can hardly result from an inability on the part of its users to provide sufficient symbols for the accurate representation of the Bugis language. The deficiency is, without reasonable doubt, a deliberate one. It will be rapidly discovered by anyone attempting to edit a Bugis work under the guidance of Bugis scholars that the script’s structural deficiencies lie exactly in those areas where speakers of different regional dialects are most likely to differ, namely the occurrence of the glottal stop, the geminate consonants and pre-nasalization. What would be deemed an accurate transliteration by one Bugis colleague would be "corrected" by another from a different dialect group in precisely these areas. This problem is largely avoided by the Bugis-Makasar script.\textsuperscript{18}

In the Bugis-Makasar script, only the nucleus of a syllable and its preceding consonant or consonant-group is generally recorded. Thus for each syllable recorded one finds just the vowel forming the syllable summit and the preceding consonant or consonant group, unless the vowel itself starts the syllable. A consonant which is not followed by a vowel cannot be represented by the script. Such a consonant only occurs in word-final position. Thus geminate consonants (which may be considered as consisting of paired vowel-final and vowel-inital consonants), glottal stops and the

\textsuperscript{17}Examples of lontara\textsuperscript{5} constructed in the form of a continuous strip of leaves on which is etched a single line of writing, held in a wooden "spool", are found in several collections. An illustration of such a lontara\textsuperscript{5} is shown in Koleksi Pilihan Museum Nasional (Selected Collections of the National Museum, Jakarta) 1980, volume one, item no. 47 (no pagination, no author). For a fuller discussion of the evidence for spooled lontara\textsuperscript{5} see Macknight 1986:222.

\textsuperscript{18}Of these three features the glottal stop poses the most problems. Geminates may sometimes be regarded as "optional", while pre-nasalization is more rarely a matter for contention.
velar nasal ng where it occurs at the end of a word cannot be shown by the script. All three linguistic features are phonologically significant, being necessary for the understanding of the written Bugis word and for its accurate transcription. The inability of the Bugis script to differentiate between a number of phonetic possibilities, some ruled out by the phonotactic restrictions of the language and others by chance not occurring as actual words, means that the correct reading of a Bugis word has to be based on the context in which it occurs and with reference to independent linguistic knowledge. In addition, while the script is capable of indicating the (semantically productive) pre-nasalization of Ka, Pa, Ra and Ca, in practice this is rarely done.

Mills states that, the phonologic incompleteness of the script makes the reading of texts, even for a Bugis or Makasar, extremely difficult, due to the constant choice of reading proffered by the script. I personally did not find this so. During fieldwork in South Sulawesi I was constantly impressed by the ease with which my Bugis-speaking colleagues (who were all scholars) could read material written in the Bugis-Makasar script. Such difficulties as they encountered were inevitably produced by archaic words or expressions, or textual corruption. The possibility of misreading what a text says is, however, a danger the non-Bugis-speaking translator has to learn to live with, especially when dealing with archaic material. In theory, every combination of two akṣara offers a minimum of six and a maximum of nine lexical possibilities. Mills (1975:600) presents the example of the combination PaPa, which can represent the "words" papa, pappa, pampa, papa⁴, pappᵃ, pampa⁴, papang, pappang and pampang. However, according to the data given in the Woordenboek, only the first, second and fifth of these occur as actual words, yielding a total of six semantic entries.

One difficulty faced when transcribing manuscript Bugis is that of dialectal variation. While the language of the majority of Bugis prose works "displays certain features of a supradialectal standard . . . that seems to have emerged in the Bone region" (Sirk 1983:23), as was previously noted, the structural deficiencies of the Bugis-Makasar script mask important features of the spoken word, which have to be included in a transliterated transcription and must be derived either from a dictionary or an informant. These features — geminate consonants, pre-nasalization and the glottal stop — appear to vary considerably between different dialects.¹⁹

¹⁹ This point can be illustrated by a comparison of the text of the Attoriolonna Soppêng in Kallupa et al. 1988 with the text on pages 106 to 108 of this thesis. The former is based upon the latter, but has been re-edited by the speaker of a Soppêng dialect.
Grimes and Grimes (1987:31-32) divide the Bugis language into eleven dialects, the distribution of which roughly corresponds to the traditional territories of the former Bugis kingdoms. Dialectal variation is significant: the shared lexical similarity of these dialects is as low as 82 per cent (ibid., figure 6). It was my impression that the glottal stop was less common in Soppêng than in Sidrap, and that Matthes' dictionary, like Said's, conforms more closely to the latter. I was unable to form any impression of the Bone dialect. While none of these regions can be said to offer a "standard Bugis", in the same way that the Home Counties do for spoken and written English, or Paris does for the French language, those of Bone (Palakka) and Soppêng are described by Grimes and Grimes as "prestige dialects" (cf. Sirk, above).

One solution to the problem of the correct indication of geminate consonants, prenasalization and glottal stops, therefore, might be to use the dialect of Soppêng or Bone as a standard. Unfortunately, neither Matthes' nor Said's dictionary gives any consistent information as to the origin or regional variation of its entries, nor is it always possible to secure the help of a Bone or Soppêng-dialect-speaking scholar. I was, however, fortunate to obtain the help of Drs Muhammad Salim from Alakuang in Sidrap, who read each of the transliterations and offered many suggestions, both as to the correct transcription of the manuscript texts and their translation. Where Drs Salim's reconstruction of the spoken word differs from that of Matthes, I have in most cases followed the reconstruction suggested by Drs Salim.

During fieldwork in South Sulawesi, I also encountered a number of minor problems with the grammatical sketch of the Bugis language given by Noorduyn (1955). The first of these concerned the initial geminate consonants which Noorduyn says are a feature of certain verbal forms (Noorduyn 1955:15, section 8.3; 16-17, sections 9.2.1-9.3). Theoretically, the presence of these geminate consonants is indicated by the contrast between verbal pairs such as wawa/mpawa, rēwē'nrēwē', which presume a historical infix *-um-, from which the vowel element has dropped (Noorduyn 1955:15, footnote 11: cf. Dahl 1976:119,128) However, neither I nor any of my Bugis colleagues were able to detect audibly the initial lengthening or pre-glottalizing of verbs as described by Noorduyn. If, on occasion, a
slight lengthening of the initial consonant was detected in a verbal form, as compared with a non-verbal word based on the same root, this could always be explained, so it seemed me, by a shift in stress leading to a reduced emphasis on the initial part of the word, as in, for example, the words tudang (to sit) and tudângêng (a seat). I therefore decided not to indicate initial geminate consonants.23

The second problem concerned the akṣara \( \Rightarrow \), which Noorduyn transcribes as NRa, but which is audibly pronounced ndra, at least among the Bugis in Soppêng and Sidênrêng. As I do not have the linguistic skills to decide whether the d should be considered part of the pre-nasalization of r, or whether the akṣara represents a cluster of three consonants before the vowel, in contradiction to Noorduyn’s statement that this does not occur (Noorduyn 1955:12, section 4.3), I have continued to represent it as NRa.

The third problem concerned the forward and backward (i.e. progressive and regressive) assimilation of word endings (ibid., p. 11, sections 4 to 4.2). Noorduyn’s examples in section 4.1 show that in all cases of morphophonemic changes, the assimilated consonant leads either to the gemination of the initial consonant of the following morpheme (the example he gives is Arung Tanêtê > AruṭTanêtê) or to a change in the assimilated consonant (Arung Bêlawa > AruṭBêlawa) or to a change in both the assimilated and initial consonant (Arung Bonê > Arumponê). To put it simply, nothing is “lost” during the process, as each element is accounted for in the new construction. In reality this did not seem to be always the case. While there could be little doubt of the rule in cases of assimilated consonant change to a value different from that of the following initial consonant (e.g. Ujung Pandang > Ujumpandang), and assimilated and initial consonant change (e.g. Watang Bonê > Watampone), in certain instances where the assimilated consonant should have produced a gemination of the following initial consonant, none could be detected. One example of this was the name of the provincial capital Watang Soppêng, which was pronounced WataSoppêng rather than WataSoppêng. It was also my impression that the second a in WataSoppêng had lengthened slightly. In the transcription, however, the system set out by Noorduyn is followed consistently.

---

23. The two other phenomena described by Noorduyn in section 8.3 (n occurring before r and mp in place of w) were clearly audible and are indicated in the transcription.
1.4. Principles of Editing

1.4.1. The Diplomatic Edition

There has been a lively debate in recent years as to the type of text edition that editors of Malay and Javanese manuscripts should aim at producing. The debate, which must be of relevance to an editor of any Austronesian-language text, has centred around the suitability of the approaches and techniques of classical philology to the manuscript traditions of these two languages.

The core of the debate concerns the applicability of the text-critical method (alternatively referred to as "textual criticism") to Malay and Javanese literature. Originally developed in the study of Biblical and ancient Greek and Latin manuscript traditions, the aim of the text-critical method is to produce, through a three-stage process, a text as close as possible to the manuscript from which a single manuscript, or a group of manuscripts, is believed to derive (Maas 1958:1). The text-critical method, and a number of assumptions on which it rests, is summarized as follows:

There are no surviving autograph manuscripts of the Greek and Roman classical writers, and no copies which have been collated with the originals. The manuscripts we possess are derived from the originals through an unknown number of intermediate copies and are consequently of questionable trustworthiness. The first task of an editor therefore is to establish, through a careful comparison of their differences, the family relationships of a work's manuscripts. In philological terminology, this stage of the process is called recensio (or recension). The relationships of a work's manuscripts are usually expressed diagrammatically, in the form of a family tree or stemma codicum. Using the stemma, a process of logical reasoning leads to the

---

1. The debate originated with a review by Kratz of Brakel's edition of the Hikayat Muhammad Hanafiyah (Kratz 1979). The merits of single-text editions of Malay works versus multi-text "critical" editions were debated by Jones and Brakel (Jones 1980, Brakel 1980) and Kratz published an important article on the editing of Malay manuscripts in 1981. Both Kratz and Jones argue convincingly for the abandonment of the text-critical method in favour of single manuscript editions; both agree, however, that such an edition should also take into consideration the tradition in which such a manuscript is located. "Hence in preparing his edition, the editor will have to concentrate on the edition of one particular manuscript, transferring other, comparative material to his notes, or indicating his own editorial efforts in such a way as not to obscure the testimony of his guiding manuscript as a witness to its own time and place" (Kratz 1981:238).

2. An excellent introduction to the methods and history of textual criticism is provided by the Encyclopaedia Britannica (15th edition), Vol. 18, pp. 189-195. The following summary is based on Maas' short but definitive handbook (Maas 1958): a modern, if less concise, exposition of the text-critical method is found in West 1973. An introduction to the history of the Greek and Roman manuscript traditions is provided by Reynolds and Wilson 1974.
creation of a text resembling as closely as possible that of the manuscript from which the earliest detectable split in the transmission of the work occurred. This manuscript is called the *archetype*. ³

*Recensio* rests on three assumptions: one is that each copy made since the primary split in the tradition reproduced one exemplar only and that no copyist has combined two or more exemplars to produce a “contaminated” text (also referred to as “horizontal transmission”); the second is that each copyist either consciously or unconsciously deviates from his exemplar in one or more places; the third is that the copyist tries to reproduce faithfully the text that he has before him.

The next stage of the process, *examinatio* (or examination), is to examine this text to determine whether it may be regarded as faithfully reproducing the original from which it is descended (“the appeal from manuscripts we have to a source which is lost”), which is rarely, if ever, the case. The third stage of the process, *divinatio* (or emendation), is, therefore, the attempt to reconstruct the original by conjecture, or at least to identify where the text differs from the original. (These differences are termed “corruptions”.)

Kratz has pointed out that two of the three assumptions on which the text-critical method rests do not seem to hold for the Malay manuscript tradition. These are (page 20) that the copyist is working from a single exemplar, and that he is attempting to reproduce its text faithfully. It is a well-known characteristic of Malay literature that the copying of manuscripts is considered not so much a mechanical process of reproduction as a creative process (Kratz 1981:233), though the extent and exact nature of the creative element, and the degree to which various genres encouraged or placed limits on such a process, has only recently begun to be examined. ⁴ Kratz excludes from his remarks “directly translated” texts (i.e. Islamic theological works: personal communication, Dr E. U. Kratz), the contents of which were carefully translated, often at the expense of Malay syntax, and Roolvink too warns against the tendency to describe every Malay copyist as a joint author

---

³In the case of a single surviving manuscript this procedure is obviously unnecessary. In such a case, *recensio* consists of describing and deciphering the manuscript as accurately as possible.

⁴See for example Proudfoot 1984 regarding variation within the manuscripts of the Hikayat Pelanduk Jenaka, and Behrend 1987 regarding the history of the Javanese poem Jatiswara. The extent to which the same may be said of “historical” Malay texts, such as those of the Hikayat Raja Pasai, is equally uncertain.
There is no evidence of substantial creative re-writing in any of the Bugis works examined in the following chapter. As was stated in section 1.1, the extant versions of each work can be shown to have descended from a single archetype. In most cases, too, we possess enough versions to reconstruct a useful stemma. Choosing between substantial variants therefore poses little problem: in most cases the original reading can be identified by reference to the stemma. But stylistic change (particularly with regard to the modal suffixes) is a characteristic feature of the Bugis scribal tradition. It would seem that while a Bugis copyist was concerned to transmit accurately the substance of his exemplar, he felt little constraint when it came to matters of style. Thus the second assumption on which the text-critical method rests — that the copyist is trying to faithfully reproduce his the text he has in front of him — does not hold either with regard to Bugis manuscripts. While the relationship between manuscripts can be determined in most cases, it is impossible to chose between stylistic variants on such a basis, which therefore rules out the construction of a critical edition. I have thus taken the approach of selecting a single version to represent each of the ten works presented in Chapter Two. Additional information from other versions is provided in footnotes to the text and in commentary notes to the translation.

1.4.2. Transcription

Three systems of transcription are used in this thesis. The first is identical to the system of transliteration used by Sirk (1975, 1983), in which each aksara is allocated a single or a cluster of capitalized consonants and a vowel, with the exception of .Sequence which is represented by the letter Q and the appropriate vowel. This is the simplest of the three systems in that it indicates only the aksara found in the manuscript, which, as we have seen, do not record geminate and word-final consonants. In this system, for example,  Sequence is rendered Kedo (kêdo, “to move”),  Sequence as Wenni (wenni, “night”),  Sequence as Elong (êlong, “poem”) and so on. The disadvantage of this system is its inability to express the developed form of a written word, and thus (in most instances) its meaning. It is used sparingly in foot-

5 Roolvink gives as evidence the fact that “The stories in the Hikayat Bakhtiar that were taken from the Bustan al-Salatin have been copied fairly accurately, and the differences are subject to the normal rules of philological criticism . . . . Real freedom of the copyist is usually found in the kind of literature that is also orally transmitted” (ibid., p. 262). Jones traces the dictum, generally associated in the English speaking world with Sir Richard Winstedt, as to the Malay copyist being at the same time a co-author, to the Dutch scholar Ph. S. van Ronkel (Jones 1985:10).
notes to indicate variant spellings of names or place-names, and the unusual spelling of words where an akṣara is made to carry two diacritics. Thus, for example, (sapposisěkku, "my cousin") is footnoted as SaPoSiěKu.

The other two systems are based on the systems described by Noorduyn (1955). The difference between the two is simply the retention in one system of the letters W and Y where these occur as glides between two vowels, the first of which is (respectively) O or U, and Ė or I. The use of W and Y as glides in written Bugis appears to be largely a matter of style. For example, the word puang (lord) may be spelt either PuQa or PuWa and the word riasěng (called, named) either RiQaSě or RiYaSě, with no change in pronunciation in either case. By retaining the glides in all cases it is possible to reproduce virtually all the features of a Bugis manuscript.

The system that retains the glides, which are regularly found in Bugis manuscripts, is used in the main body of transcription (the "text") for each work set out in Chapter Two. The system that omits the glides is used outside of the main body of transcription to avoid inconsistent spellings in examples of written Bugis not directly linked to a manuscript text. Other than in the omission or retention of these glides the two systems are identical and the following remarks apply to both.

In line with Noorduyn’s principle of basing his transcription of Bugis as closely as possible on the spelling of Indonesian (Noorduyn 1955:9, footnote 2) I have adapted the spelling conventions to accord with the changed value of the consonants in the 1972 revised spelling of Indonesian. Thus

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tj} & \text{ becomes } c \\
\text{dj} & \text{ becomes } j \\
\text{nj} & \text{ becomes } ny^* (* \text{ see below)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{j becomes } y
\]

I have made also a number of small alterations to Noorduyn’s system. The first concerns the akṣara ~ (Noorduyn: NYC) which I have transcribed NC, in keeping with modern Indonesian conventions. Secondly, I have transcribed ~ as Ñ (Noorduyn: NJ [modern spelling NY]) and geminate NG as NGNG (Noorduyn: 

---

6a Thus Goa, not Gowa — though the latter is now more current in Sulawesi.
NNG). Finally, the "punctuation" of the selected manuscript is preserved by using the symbol \ to indicate the (Bugis) pallawa, a chain of three dots sloping down to the right which divides the text into rhythmico-lexical units. Transcriptions are not punctuated, other than by the manuscript pallawa.

The strength of Noorduyn's system lies in the fact that it adds any consonants not indicated by the script, allowing a choice to be made between the semantic possibilities of a text, and thus enabling its meaning to be fixed. As what is added are those parts of the spoken word which are not capable of representation in the Bugis-Makasar script, or which are inconsistently indicated, it is possible, with only slight effort, to ensure that the original manuscript text can be "recovered" from the developed transcription. For example, geminate consonants and the glottal stop are never indicated, so their presence in a transcription can be ignored. Pre-nasalization is irregularly indicated in Bugis manuscripts: in the system followed in the main body of the texts all editorially-imposed pre-nasalization is placed within square brackets [thus]. All other additions to the text of the manuscript are also enclosed in square brackets. Where an akṣara carries more than one diacritic this is indicated in a footnote. The principles of the system are demonstrated with the following example:

\[W\]ē Tappācinna \ siala \ Anakaji \ nawawani \ wawinēna \ lao \ ri Luuc

(We Tappācinna married Anakaji and he took his wife to Luuu.)

In the first word, \[W\]ē, only the vowel ē is shown as occurring in the manuscript, so the manuscript must read Qē. The second word, Tappācinna, must read TaPaCiNaNa as neither geminate consonants nor glottal stops can be shown in the Bugis-Makasar script. The next six words are all of a consonant-vowel + consonant-vowel construction and have no glottal stops or bracketed additions. We know therefore that these must be written SiQaLa \ QaNaKaJi \ NaWaWaNi \ WaWiNeNa \ LaQo \ Ri. In the final word, Luuu, we know that the glottal stop cannot be shown in the Bugis-Makasar script: Luuu must therefore be written LuQu in the manuscript. We now see that underlying the developed transcription is the manuscript text:

---

7 The only features of a manuscript text not represented in the transcriptions are instances where an akṣara and its diacritic are separated by a line break. These are quite common and their indication would quickly become tiresome.

8 Luuu is to be standardized to Luwu outside transcriptions to reflect the modern Indonesian spelling.
A few dialect-forms or archaic spellings regularly met with in manuscript Bugis are preserved in the transcription. The most common of these are lattu⁵ (modern Bugis lēttu⁴, “to arrive”), anē⁶ (ana⁴, “child”) and makkada (makkēda, to say). In addition, the suffix -ang, a dialectal (and possibly archaic) form of -ēng, has been retained in almost all cases.

Morphophonemic change (sandhi) poses a particular problem owing to its frequency in spoken Bugis, where it occurs irregularly at the junctions of two free morphemes (independent words) and regularly at the junction of free morphemes and certain bound morphemes (prefixes and suffixes), as well as at the junction of two such bound morphemes (Sirk 1983:34-37). I have, therefore, indicated morphophonemic changes in the latter two cases but not in the first, unless such change is indicated by the manuscript text. Thus the complex RiLaLeSoPēToPa, “also in Soppēng”, which is constructed from ri lalēng (in) Soppēng (the place-name Soppēng) plus the modal suffixes -to (also) and -pa (nevertheless), is transcribed as rila lēng Soppētpa, showing the assimilation of the -ng of Soppēng with the t of the suffix -ta but without morphophonemic change at the junction of lalēng and Soppēng.⁹ A second example is TēLuWelNi (three nights), which is composed of two independent words, tēllung (three) and wēnni (night), and is transcribed tēllung wēnni. But TēLuPēNi, which shows that the w of wēnni has changed to a p, and by implication that the -ng of tēllung has changed to an m (Noorduyn 1955:11, section 4.1), is transcribed tēllumpēnni.

Like Sirk, I have avoided doubling the letters b, d, g or j, which may be preceded by the sign ʾ, thus ʾb, ʾd, etc., to indicate either geminate or pre-glottalized consonants. The consonants c, k, l, m, n, ng, ē, p, r, s and t are never pre-hamzaed, other than in the case of a bound morpheme following a free morpheme ending in a glottal stop (e.g. anaʾna, “child of”), or, in the case of certain personal and place-names formed of two joined complexes, the first ending in a glottal stop. These consonants may, however, be doubled to indicate geminate consonants,

---

⁹This would, however, generally be pronounced rila lēng Soppētpa with the -ng of lalēng assimilated to the s of Soppēng.
Finally, I have decided not to follow the style of recent linguistic literature produced by local scholars, which separates out certain morphemes. Instead, I accept the argument set out by Sirk (1983:75-78) that when transcribing a text written in the Bugis-Makasar script, larger complexes are more appropriate. (On the problem of word boundaries, see Sirk 1983:37-40.)

1.4.3. Layout

Layout has been determined to a large degree by the limitations of the computer editing programme used and by the specified format of the A.N.U Ph.D. thesis. Each edited text in Chapter Two is preceded by a philological introduction, which deals in turn with (1) the work represented by the selected text and any history of publication, (2) the manuscript versions of the work and the selection of a single version for editing, (3) the date of composition of the work and (4) the work as a historical source. This is followed by the text, which is without paragraphs and broken only by page-breaks, except where the text itself has significant internal divisions, which are then followed. Corrections to the text are indicated in footnotes. The translation and commentary notes come last. The same layout is followed for all edited texts.

---

10This thesis was produced on a Digital Corporation VAX computer using Unilogic's Scribe Document Production System. The diacritics were produced by a programme designed by Dr Avery Andrews of the Faculty of Arts, A.N.U.
Chapter 2
Texts and Translations

In Chapter Two, ten Bugis works are set out in Romanized transcription and English-language translation. Each is prefaced by an introduction covering (1) the general nature of the work and history of publication, (2) manuscript versions, relationships between versions and the selection of one version for editing, (3) the date of composition of the work and (4) its usefulness as a historical source.

2.1. The Lontara'na Simpurusia

This work was published in Bugis-Makasar script by B. F. Matthes in the first volume of the Boeginesche Chrestomathie (Matthes 1864), under the title "Oudste geschiedenis van Luwu?" (The Earliest History of Luwu?). It forms one of a series of Bugis texts dealing with the early history of various kingdoms, a series which makes up the greater part of the first volume of the Chrestomathie. As we shall see, the present work is not a history, in the sense of a methodological record of past events and individuals, but three short legends which have been gathered together by a redactor. I have therefore followed the appellation given in the version selected for editing and called it the Lontara'na Simpurusia (hereafter LS), the "Writing concerning Simpurusia". The Royal Genealogy of Luwu? (section 2.2) names Simpurusia as the first first historical ruler of Luwu? and the progenitor of its ruling lineage.

Matthes' version of the LS was based on that found on pages 217.5-220.8 of NBG 99, a codex that Matthes had personally commissioned. Matthes' editorial emendations to the NBG 99 version were recorded directly on the manuscript, which was then sent to the printer in Amsterdam for typesetting.1 No introduction was

1Many of Matthes' emendations appear arbitrary by modern standards. These include the deletion of y[a]ja on MS. page 217.8, the alteration of agana to angkana (219.6), londi to lętni (219.6), the deletion of lašaš (220.3-4) and sašaš (220.5), as well as the extensive deletion and addition of of pullaws throughout the text in order to make them serve more clearly as punctuation.
provided, but a set of notes dealing with obscure readings and the Romanized orthography of names and toponyms was provided in the third volume of the *Chrestomathie* (Matthes 1872b:93-94). A summary of Matthes’ published text appeared later in the *Boeginesche en Makassaraarsche Legenden* (Bugis and Makasar Legends) (Matthes 1885:4-6 / Van den Brink 1943:379-80).

Matthes’ alterations to the text of NBG 99 were based not just on his personal knowledge of the Bugis language, but also upon two other versions of the LS (Matthes 1872b:60-61). These can be identified from the descriptions of their codices as NBG 101:41.10-42.22 and NBG 111:33.1-35.2. The second of these was provided by Daeng Mêmangung, the copyist of NBG 99 and NBG 111, with an interlinear translation in Jawi Malay (Matthes 1875:43-44), no doubt as an aid to Matthes’ understanding of the Bugis text. Matthes’ use of NBG 111 is confirmed by the addition of the word marola in line 15 of the published text, this being one of the three additional words that NBG 111 has to offer NBG 99.2

In 1929 a translation of Matthes’ version appeared, together with a number of other pieces from the first volume of the *Boeginesche Chrestomathie*, under the title “Boeginesche scheppingsverhalen” (Bugis Creation Stories) (Kern 1929). In the introduction to his translations, Kern rejected the notion that such works were historical, characterizing them instead as “brieven van adeldom” (letters of nobility) which served to legitimize the ruling Bugis lineages by providing them with heavenly ancestors in the form of tomanurung (heavenly descended beings) (Kern 1929:297).3 Kern’s translation is rather free, and neither the brief introduction to the work, nor Kern’s commentary notes add more than superficial detail to Matthes’ version.

2.1.1. Versions of the LS

There are at least ten versions of the LS extant. These are shown in table 2-1. These are henceforth referred to by the letter given in the right-hand column.4

---

2 The others are makkunrai, “woman” (MS. page 33.4) and cêmmê, “to bathe” (34.11).
3 Most high-status families in South Sulawesi trace their status to one or more beings who are believed to have descended from the upperworld, and subsequently installed as the first “kings” of South Sulawesi.
4 There are several catalogue entries needing further investigation. Other versions of the LS are likely to be discovered under general categories, such as “Boegin. scheppingsverhaal met oud-Boegin. en Moslimse elementen” (Bugis Creation Story with Old Bugis and Muslim Elements: VT 139 [IV], pp. 1-11, described in Cense, unpublished:14) or “Sedjarah Barru, Tanete dan lain-lain” (Histories of Barru, Tanete and other former kingdoms: MAK 722 passim described in a YKSST manuscript list of 1954) (Macknight, “A Check-list of South Sulawesi Manuscripts and Related Materials in Canberra Libraries”, unpublished.).
Table 2-1: Versions of the LS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pages-Line</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KITLV</td>
<td>Or. 272 Id</td>
<td>1.1-2.16</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>160.1-161.23</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34.10-35.32</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>146.1-147.32</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>217.5-220.8</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>41.10-42.22</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>33.1-35.2</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>41.1-45.15</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>142.1-143.17</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>339.16-341.18</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the ten versions of the LS reveals extensive and detailed agreement both in form and content. That all versions are descended from a common ancestor is the only reasonable explanation for this similarity. No manuscript can be dated earlier than the mid-nineteenth century and four are twentieth-century copies.\(^5\)

One version, H, stands out from the rest. This differs from all other versions in that it consists of three, rather than two, genealogically-linked stories, the extra story preceding the others. The central character of the extra story is the tomanurung, Simpurusia, the first ruler of Luwu\(^6\) following the reputed "age of I La Galigo",\(^6\) while those of stories two and three are his son, Anakaji, and grandson, La Malalaë.

The three stories may be summarized as follows:

1. Simpurusia journeys to the heavens in search of advice from their ruler, Patotoë, concerning the proposed marriage of Simpurusia’s daughter.

\(^5\)It is interesting to note that of the ten manuscripts only K does not appear to have been commissioned by a European scholar.

\(^6\)Traditional Bugis historiography places the "age" of the I La Galigo epic before the coming of the first tomanurung.
2. Anakaji marries Wē Tappa'cinna, the daughter of the ruler of Mancapai. Ridiculed by her mother-in-law, Wē Tappa'cinna returns to Mancapai; her husband follows her. Husband and wife are reunited and return to Luwu with a gift of the earth that descended with the tomanurung of Mancapai.

3. La Malalaē is taken down to the underworld by his father. On his return to the earth his grandfather gives him magical objects.

A further feature of $H$ is that it contains one extra line, and what appears to be a complex missing from the second line of other versions (represented here by $A$):

\[
\begin{align*}
A & : \text{Inai ana' manédara} \\
H & : \text{Ana' Wē Manédara} \\
& \text{ri uloi: e ri yawo[tung]} \\
& \text{ri lappa'téllang} \\
& \text{madéppa' ri lappa'téllang}
\end{align*}
\]

As all ten versions are evidently descended from an archetype, which we shall call $ω$, the first question to ask is whether the extra story in $H$ (and, presumably, the additional line in the poem) was found in $ω$, and later omitted in an ancestor of the remaining nine versions or whether it is an interpolation, a later addition to the LS.

There are three reasons why the former is almost certainly the case. The first is that $H$ gives us the longest and most detailed readings of stories two and three. Its extra material is spread throughout the text and contains a number of archaic words and difficult readings. These readings are hard to conceive of as additions; it seems more likely that they were a part of $ω$ and were omitted from one or more ancestors of the other nine versions.

The second is that the first story makes coherent to an otherwise puzzling work. If we accept for the moment Kern's hypothesis that the "function" of the LS is the legitimization of the ruling lineage of Luwu through the provision of a heavenly-descended progenitor, the logical place for the the LS to start is with the founder of that lineage, the tomanurung Simpurusia, rather than with his son, Anakaji.

The third reason for assuming that the extra story belonged to $ω$ is that $H$ sets each of its stories in one of the three spheres, or levels, of the Bugis cosmos:
Botilling (the heavens), Kawa (the earth) and Uriliung (the underworld). Other versions, by contrast, include just the latter two.

If Kern’s hypothesis, which may be more generally stated as an account of the origin of status, we are left with the question of what social usefulness the remaining nine versions could have had, and why the first story was omitted, presumably in a single ancestor from which the nine are descended. To answer the second question first, it is possible that the version from which this ancestor was copied contained a damaged or missing page, and that a copyist using it as his exemplar, being unable to make sufficient sense of the surviving body of writing, moved directly to the second story, adding to it his own introduction. The first question is more difficult to answer: one can only suggest that the status of its subjects in oral tradition and other textual sources was sufficient to ensure its transmission from one codex to another.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that the first story of H was found in ω. By virtue of its extra story and additional readings, H appears to contain the version of the LS that is closest to the archetype of the ten extant versions. Other versions appear to be separated from H by a common ancestor that omitted the first story. This ancestor we shall call α.

What can be said of the relationships between the remaining nine versions? A line-by-line comparison of all ten versions (page and line numbers are from H) reveals the following:

1. H and K share a reading of La Malalaë (42.21) for the first occurrence of the name of the ruler of Mancapai, while ABCDEFGJ give Sëllamalama or a close variant. K and H are in error here; Sëllamalama occurs twice in each version, once in the poem (H Sëmmalamala, K Sëllamalama [43.11-12]) and once in the prose text (H Silamalama, K Salamalama [44.12]), where he is clearly identified as the ruler of Mancapai. La Malalaë is the grandson of Simpurusia and the central character of story three.

---

7 This three-part division of the cosmos is common throughout Indonesia. The Bugis divided the universe into an upper-world populated by gods, the earth, ruled by representatives of the gods, and an underworld populated by powerful beings (Hamzah et al., 1984:60). Cf. Errington 1979 on how the traditional Bugis house mirrors the pre-Islamic cosmos.
2. \( H \) and \( K \) share a reading of \textit{cangkiri}\(^{\circ} \) (\( H \) ca[ng]\textit{kiric}) \((43.3) \) (cf. Malay \textit{cangkir}, "a cup") for the container in which \( \text{We Tappa'cinna} \) brings her fragrant oil to Luwu\(^{\circ} \), while \( ABEFGJ \) share \textit{piduang} \( (\)a small vessel or bottle\( ) \). \( D \) omits both vessel and oil.\)

3. \( H \) and \( K \) share a reading of \textit{raung} \((43.3) \) \((O.B., "incense") while \( ABEFGJ \) have \( \) (variously spelt) \textit{raung jëppu} \( (jëppu: unknown) \).

It is clear, as a result of these shared readings, that \( K \) is more closely related to \( H \) than are the other eight versions. Since we have established that, like \( ABEFGJ \), \( K \) is related to \( H \) through \( \alpha \), which omitted the opening story found in \( H \) and the additional line of the poem, \( ABEFGJ \)’s deviations from \( K \) must have occurred after \( \alpha \). Three possibilities suggest themselves:

1. That \( ABEFGJ \) are separated from \( K \) by an ancestor in which the name \( \text{La Malalae} \) was corrected to \( \text{Sellamalama}, jëppu \) was added to \( \text{raung} \) and \( \text{cangkiri}\(^{\circ} \) altered to \( \text{piduang} \).

2. That "contamination" has occurred.

3. That the copyist of \( K \), or of one of its ancestors, spontaneously produced the same three variant readings found in \( H \).

The third possibility is too remote for serious consideration: the second possibility can also be ruled out, as it supposes an ancestor of \( H \) being used to produce one error and two insignificant substantial variants, while the extra story and additional line of the poem was ignored. The first possibility, namely the existence of a single ancestor \( \) (in philological terminology a \textit{hyparchetype}) as the source of \( ABEFGJ \)’s variant readings, is obviously the best explanation. This ancestor we shall call \( \beta \).

One last objection must be examined. If the first explanation is correct, the erroneous reading of \( \text{La Malalae} \) for \( \text{Sellamalama} \) in \( K \) and \( H \) \( (\)variant one, above\( ) \) must have occurred in \( \omega \). Is it reasonable to suppose that the archetype itself contained this mistake? If so, why is it not found in versions which descend from \( \beta \)? Both questions are readily answered: there is no reason why \( \omega \) should have been the autograph \( \) (the original copy of the redactor who first set down the LS) rather
than a later copy; the error is plain to see, and appears to have been corrected in \( \beta \) along with the other revisions.\(^8\)

Our conclusion regarding the relationships between the ten versions of the LS is the simplest possible explanation based on a process of accumulated scribal error and periodic revision of the transmitted work. The actual history of the transmission of the LS was doubtless more complex, but must have involved at least the two revisions outlined above. The relationships of the ten versions is illustrated in the following diagram.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2-1:** Stemma of Versions of the LS

The version selected for transcription and translation is \( H \). In dealing with textual problems \( K, D \) and \( E \) (the latter two versions are good examples of the \( \beta \) group) have been consulted in that order.

2.1.2. Dating the LS

The Royal Genealogy of Luwu\(^\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\) (section 2.2), the archetype of which can be dated to the late eighteenth century,\(^9\) draws for its opening section on the LS. The Royal Genealogy's vocabulary shows its source to have descended from \( \beta \), that is, the origin of the shorter version of the LS. (The logic of the relationships between the LS versions makes the reverse relationship virtually inconceivable.) The LS is therefore shown to have existed in its later, short recension by this date.

---

\(^8\)While autograph manuscripts of any reasonable length inevitably contain mistakes, those mistakes are unlikely to be of this magnitude.

\(^9\)See page 58.
The earliest date by which the LS could have existed in a form similar to $H$ is difficult to determine. The additional textual difficulties of $H$ provide the only arguable evidence for a significantly earlier the existence of $H$ or its ancestors. The inclusion in $H$ of To Panangi (sic. To Apanangi), the first arguably historical ruler of Luwu\textsuperscript{2}, whose rule can be dated to c.1475-c.1500\textsuperscript{10} as the son of La Malalae [and thus as a grandson of Simpurusia] can be dismissed as a later insertion.

2.1.3. The LS as a Historical Source

Despite having as its subjects the legendary founder and immediate descendants of what is widely believed to have been the earliest kingdom of South Sulawesi, the LS is neither a history of Luwu\textsuperscript{2} nor a direct attempt to legitimize its ruling family through the provision of a tomanurung progenitor. There is no emphasis on the appearance on earth of the tomanurung Simpurusia or his wife, such as we find in the Chronicles of Bone and Goa, or the Attoriolonna Soppêng (section 2.5), all of which are patently concerned with the origin of kingship. The "events" of the LS post-date the appearance of Simpurusia and the subsequent establishment of kingship in Luwu\textsuperscript{2}, an event which the author mentions in order simply to locate the three stories he wishes to tell.

Two "themes" may be said to unite the three stories of the LS: the genealogical relationship of father, son and grandson between the three subjects, and the linking of the founding family of Luwu\textsuperscript{2} with the great powers of the three levels of the Bugis cosmos. Two of the latter are drawn from the pre-Islamic Bugis cosmology of the I La Galigo; the third represents the Javanese kingdom of Majapahit. The second theme involves the production of "signs of power", both in the form of useful advice and magically-charged objects (regalia). In this sense at least the LS does provide political legitimacy, though the recognition of the status of Luwu\textsuperscript{2}'s ruling family by Botillangi\textsuperscript{2}, Uriliung and "Mancapai".\textsuperscript{11}

The LS belongs to a genre of "popular" or "folk" legend, woven, like the similar stories about Dewaraja, a later and indisputably historical ruler, around ancient

\textsuperscript{10}See page 59
\textsuperscript{11}No support can be found in the present work for Errington's hypothesis as to the role of regalia in Luwu\textsuperscript{2} (Errington 1983).
memories of Luwu's rulers. It is derived from oral tradition: each of the three stories would originally have been an independent "unit", by which means legends centred around the early rulers of Luwu would have been transmitted. This oral tradition we shall call the "Simpurusia legend" to differentiate it from its written forms.

A second version of the Simpurusia legend is found in the Cina genealogies (including the Royal Genealogy of Cina, which can be dated to around 1700 [section 2.4]). While some names are different from those of the LS, the basic structure of the legend is the same. A third version of the Simpurusia legend is reflected in the fragment of the poem preserved in the second story of the LS. It is evident, therefore, that by the eighteenth century there were at least three versions of the Simpurusia legend to be found in Sulawesi.

There is, however, no reason to assume that the surviving sources have preserved more than a part, or at most the bare outline, of the Simpurusia legend. The differences between the LS and Royal Genealogy of Cina's version of the Simpurusia legend consist essentially of transformations, or "mirror images" of certain characters, the structure of the legend being the same in each. It would thus appear that the Simpurusia legend allowed its narrators little deviation from a story familiar to perhaps the majority of their audiences, a conjecture which is supported by the cursory introduction that its characters receive in the LS. Indeed, details attached to some of its characters suggest that these characters were once the subjects of other, related traditions. For instance, we are told that on Anakaji's return to Luwu, his daughter Wē Mattêngñaempong was "already queen of the crocodiles" (my emphasis); similarly Wē Démmikoro's act of enclosing a garden "in which she planted flowers" must refer to a well-known tradition for this brief reference to have made any sense.

12 MAK 85:272-276 contains a number of legends centered around Dewaraja. In November 1986 I visited the leader of the Tolotang Islam (one of the two Bugis communities that have retained a number of pre-Islamic beliefs and practices) in Amparita, Sidereun, who, I was informed, knew a number of stories about Dewaraja. Unfortunately, I was unable to extract any of these from my host, who excused himself on the grounds that my written stories were no doubt superior to his oral ones.

13 The oral transmission of legend and its subsequent incorporation into written works is discussed in section 2.8.3.

14 See page 171; a detailed version of the legend is found in LAL 1985:101-.

15 This fragment displays a number of the features found in orally-composed literature; note how lines 3, 4 and 10, 11 echo each in content (parallelism), while the prefix tēmp- is repeated at the beginnings of lines 9, 10 and 11, as is deff in lines 18, 19 and 20 (Cf. Lord 1960:32, "linking of phrases", (ibid., p. 35) "systems"). Though it is possible that the poem derived directly from oral tradition, it is also possible that in a society where literature is read aloud to an audience, these features may function as conscious literary devices in written works.

16 There is, of course, no evidence that more than one of these was in written form. The section borrowed by the Royal Genealogy of Cina is short enough to have been quoted from memory; the same can be said of the poetic fragment in the LS.
How was the LS used in its written form? As Bugis literary works (surēf) are inevitably poetic and can run to considerable length (a tolo² - the genre of the poetic fragment in story two - can run to ten thousand lines) it seems unlikely that the LS was ever intended to be read or chanted aloud. The LS is barely four pages in length, and seems more likely to have served as a mnemonic for a more leisurely oral creation. It appears to have survived the loss of a larger oral tradition (and the tolo² quoted in the LS) through the continued interest of a small number of people who copied it from time to time. It is, however, just possible that detailed oral versions may still be found in Luwu² or in other remote areas of South Sulawesi.

The imagery of the LS, whose god-like characters are able to travel at will between the heavens, earth and underworld, is strongly reminiscent of the I La Galigo; indeed, La Malalae's descent to the underworld may well be patterned on the similar journey undertaken by Sawarigading, outlined in the Legenden (Matthes, 1885:3 / Van den Brink 1943:378). While the lack of a scholarly edition of the relevant sections of the I La Galigo material makes it difficult to demonstrate any such relationship, the I La Galigo (not necessarily in the form of a written version) remains the obvious source of thematic models for the Simpurusia legend. The characters of the Simpurusia legend, however, are placed later in Bugis historical tradition than are those of the Galigo. If such a borrowing could be shown to have taken place this would support an interpretation of the Simpurusia legend as a “mythologization” of historical personalities, rather than pure myth, an interpretation to which I am personally inclined.

Comparative evidence indeed suggests that the Simpurusia legend may be based, ultimately, on historical memory.¹⁷ In his study of the origins of the Merlin legend, Tolstoy has shown that the sources used by medieval writers contained a substratum of historical material dating from the sixth century A.D. Although the poems and legends in which some of these sources have come down to us were written in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, “the language in which these poems are written is frequently archaic and obscure, and it is clear that the medieval transcriber could not understand all he copied” (Tolstoy 1985:24), a description which could equally be applied to the versions of the LS.

17Local historians in South Sulawesi, assuming a substantial degree of historicity to the legend’s characters, have tended to place Simpurusia’s rule around 1300, largely, it would seem, on the evidence of the in the mid-fourteenth-century Javanese poem Nāgarakṛtīgama, which mentions Luwu² in connection with two other South Sulawesi place-names.
Given the evidence for a historical Merlin, there seems no reason why the Simpurusia legend may not have also contained an identifiable substratum of historical truth dating back several centuries earlier than the archetypes of its modern witnesses. A word of caution, however, must be sounded against a too-ready identification of the characters of the LS as historical individuals. Bugis names – at least those of the nobility, as found in the historical sections of the royal genealogies – are composed of one or two elements, from which there can be extracted (in most cases) a plainly-understood meaning. Personal names are indicated by La or Wē, signifying man or woman; alternatively a teknonym, indicated by To (father) or Da (mother) may be given instead of, or in addition to, a personal name. Thus one finds, for instance, in the Royal Genealogy of Cina, Da Pagē⁵, “mother of the fence”, Da Wanua, “mother of the land”, To Batu, “father of the rock”, La Patēnrēngi, “he who sits astride”, Wē Tēppodinro, “she who is without mercy” and To Pasampa⁶ “father of the one who supports”. Similarly, in the Royal Genealogy of Soppēng can be found Wē Tēkēwanua, “she who carries the land”, Wē Baku (a baku is a basket woven from palm leaves used to store rice), La Passapoi, “builder of fences”, Wē Tēnripalēsē “she who is not turned” and Wē Alu (an alu is a rice-pounding pestle). Many of these names contain elements reflecting the concerns of a settled agricultural community: genealogical names are, furthermore, closely linked to inland settlements, many of which can be identified on modern maps. We do not find more than the barest hint of a world outside the agrarian kingdoms of South Sulawesi.

The names of the Simpurusia legend are, however, more like those of the I La Galigo. These may be characterized as referring to natural phenomena, such as thunder, lightning and storm, or features of the natural landscape.¹⁸ Reference to water is frequent. There we find such names as La Wēro Ilē⁶, “flash of lightning”, To Lēttē Ilē⁶, “thunder of lightning”, Punnaē Toja, “lord of the waters”, Ulu Wongēng, “origin of the rain” Linrung Kēssi, “haven of the strand”, Mata Solo⁶, “eye of the river” and La Punna Liung, “lord of the depths” (cf. Pelras 1983:80-81). The names of the Simpurusia legend – Wē Matēngngaempong, “in the middle of the waves”, Bataritoja, “goddess of water”, Daēng Talaga, “princess of the lake” (from the Royal Genealogy of Cina), Linruttalaga, “shadow/shelter of the lake” (RGC), Acang Kuling, “droplets of dew”, La Tuppusolo⁶, “he who holds back the river” –

¹⁸In the I La Galigo these are also many names of the “genealogical” type. But names of the type described here occur only in the I La Galigo and the Simpurusia legend.
are clearly of the same type as are the names of the I La Galigo, and have little in common with the names found in the later sections of the genealogies. The names of the LS, coupled with its crocodile queen, underwater kingdom and aquatic elements of the proto-Malay myth of origin (cf. Ras 1968), produce a vivid impression of a coastal and riverine world very different from that provided by the names found in the genealogies, with their emphasis on agricultural activities and the minutiae of everyday life in an inland, farming community (cf. Abidin 1974:163).

We may conclude that the LS records a version of a legend (or rather three genealogically-connected legends) whose central characters may be based, ultimately, upon historical rulers of Luwu. It seems unlikely, however, that any version of the Simpurusia legend preserves the actual names of these rulers, these evidently having been mythologized. Specific details of the stories, such as the reference to Majapahit, must be understood within the context of the legend and cannot be dated to any particular period. The usefulness of the LS for the pre-Islamic history of South Sulawesi is plainly limited to its evidence of the mythic and cultural world of the Bugis.

19Cf. Bernet Kempers' statement that in Balinese historical tradition "Majapahit" ... stands for the 'Primordial Time' of mythic terminology" (Bernet Kempers 1978:41).
2.1.4. Text, H


20 Patēya'jala read Pātia'jala, as below.
21 aso / langēng read asolangēng
22 manurēngngē read manurungngē
23 kamai read komai or kumai
makkedai \ Patoto'e \ no'no'reno' \ riya^{24} \ ri yale lino \ narekko \ lattu'reno' \ alani \ ana'mu \ makku[n]raiyë \ mupasibawai erunna \ muto[ng]ko'ri \ sekkorëng \ sang karuda \ nagënënë'pa \ tellungësso \ têllu[m]pënni \ muinappana \ ti[m]pa'ri \ purai \ ripauwang \ Si[m]purusiya \ massimanni \ ri Patoto'e \ nano'no'reno'na^{25} \ ri lino \ napolëna \ manurungngë \ Si[m]purusiya \ napogau'ni \ napowadae \ Patoto'e \ ri Botillangi^{2} \ aga génë'ni \ tellungësso \ têllu[m]pënni \ nati[m]pa'ni \ sekkorëng sang karudaë \ naitani \ ana'na duwa \ madi[n]ru \ situdangëng \ de' amasingënna \ padapa \ yi[a] duwa \ akëssingënna \ makkoniro \ appongënna \ tênnarilêmë'më'sa \ érunna \ wijanaë manurungngë \ Si[m]purusiya \ apa' \ singa[ng]kë'fi \ érunna \ watakkalëna \ jajini \ pada botting \ yi[a] duwa \ ana'na \ manurungngë \ Si[m]purusiya \ nayi[a] ana'na \ orowanë \ Si[m]purusiya \ riasëngngë \ Anakaji \ taniya \ kupomabusing yi[a]na \ sipowawinë \ riasëngngë \ Wë Tappa'cinna \ nayi[a] \ [n]caiyannëngngi \ Wë Tappa'cinna \ ana'na \ manurungngë \ ri Ma[n]capai \ riasëngngë \ La Malalæ^{26}

(43) sialaë \ riasëngngë \ Bara[ng]jawëlë^{27} \ [n]caiyangngëngngi \ Wë Tappa'cinna^{28} \ [W]ë Tappa'cinnana \ siala \ Anakaji \ nawawani \ wawinëna \ lao \ ri Luuë \ marola \ noripatiwi \ ri [i]na \ siuku[rëng] raung \ sica[ng]kiri'ë \ minñaë \ sangiyang \ sipitëë \ wënnang sutara \ riyatëunië \ napawawayi[a]ngngi \ ana'na \ manurungngë \ ri Ma[n]capai \ mallainë \ maittani \ mo[n]ro \ ri Luuë \ mallainë \ [n]caiyanni anaë \ taniya kupomabusing \ riasëngngë \ Wë Mattëngnga \ jej[m]pong^{29} \ ana'toni \ riasëngngë \ To Panangi \ ëngkana séuwa \ êsoo \ natërri \ Wë Mattëngngaë[m]pong \ nariakkëlonganaë \ ri nêne'na \ makku[n]raiyë \ riasëngngë \ Wë Patëya'jala^{30} \ wawinëna \ Si[m]purusiya \ makkedai \ ëlonna \ Ananë \ Wë Manëdara \ riulofêë \ ri yawopé[tung] \n
---

^{24}The akosara RiYa are repeated at the beginning of the following complex. They are omitted in the translation.
^{25}This is spelt NaNooNa.
^{26}All other manuscripts (except K, which contains the same mistake) read Sëllamalama. Sëllamalama is followed in the translation. La Malalæ is the grandson of Simpurusia and protagonist of the third story of the present text.
^{27}Bara[ng]jawëlë read Bara[ng]jawëll, as in E and in Matthes1 version (D Batawëll, K Wë Tëniwëlëng).
^{28}The opening line of MS. page 43 appears confused: I have paraphrased slightly it in the translation.
^{29}Mattëngnga \ empong read Mattëngngnaëmpong
^{30}Patia'jala, as above.
madēppaʾē ri lappaʾtēllang
lē[w]uʾ \ ri lapiru \ lali31
batīʾna \ anaʾ sēmmu32
wijana \ Sēmmalamala33
manurungnĝé \ ri yawo \ pēttung
to[m]poʾē \ ri busa ē[m]pong
ṭenriuloʾna lagi
ṭeʾbanawaē naola
tellōpē \ napolaliēnga
lēte \ ri wēnnang sīla[m]paʾ
tsutara \ riyatēuṇi
pasoroʾ \ dēngngēnga
mai[n]rai[n]ra \ asu pa[n]ting
ajaʾ nara[n]ruʾ \ naruwa
silējaʾ \ tangka \ wale34
dēʾē \ tana \ sitēkkēna
dēʾē ca[ng]kuling kēttēʾna
dēʾē \ tai marakkōna

namagēllina \ Wē Tappaʾcinna \ nae[ng]kalingana \ əlōnna \ matuwanna
nasapuwanni \ miṅñaʾ sangiyanna \ natunutoni \ raung sakēʾna \ nawakkasangnĝi
wēnnang sutaranna \ naolai \ lisu paimēng \ ri Ma[n]capai \ napolēna \ lakainna
riyasēngnĝé \ Anakaji \ sappaʾi \ wawinēna \ nadēʾna \ napolēi \ makkēdani
to[m]poʾē \ ri busa ē-

(44) [m]pong \ ri yanaʾna \ Anakaji \ lisui \ ri Ma[n]capai \ wawinēmu
nalaona \ masigaʾ \ Anakaji \ molaiwi \ wawinēna \ lēte \ ri wawo uwaē
nalattuʾna \ ri Ma[n]capai \ sitani \ matuwanna \ makkēdani \ manurungnĝé ri
Ma[n]capai \ magotu \ Anakaji \ mupolē \ tadarawara \ ri Ma[n]capai
makkēdani \ Anakaji \ a[n]riʾku puwang \ kuwolai \ makkēdani \ manurungnĝé \ ri
Ma[n]capai \ nasēngnĝi \ alesai \ Wē Tappaʾcinna \ ritutturi \ ri [i]naurēna
makkēdai \ Anakaji \ wērēmmuwaʾ \ puwang \ a[n]riʾku \ Wē Tappaʾcinna
kutiwiʾi \ lisu \ ri Luwuʾ \ narēkko \ napasē�kaduwai \ adanna \ siyajimmu
napotēyaē \ a[n]riʾku \ Wē Tappaʾcinna \ tēkkēyanaʾni riyappuwan \ puwakku
manurungnĝé \ mallaibinē \ naripalisuna \ paimēng \ ri lakkainna \ Wē

31lapiru \ lali read lappaʾ tulali, as in E.
32sēmmu read sē[n]rīme, as in E.
33Sēmmalamala read Sēllalamala, as in K.
34tangka waliē read tangkawangnĝē

(45) narilékékang / uwàë / më[n]rëë / ri la[ng]kanaë / ri Luwu² / jo'jo² / muisã38 / maëlo² no² / cëmmë / ri salo'ë / teyai cëmmë / uwàë nilékëëë / ri batili salabëttëë / mamë'jumuisa39 / maëlo² / no² / ri salo'ë / aga / naripano'na / cëmmë / ri salo'ë / La Malalaë / naridupaina / ri yamanna / naripano² / ri Përëtiwi / asëra / wënnina / nariapisu paimëng / ri yalë lino / naripawawayina / ri nëné'na / ana'bëccinna sujikamana / silao / patangarëng / asënna / silao / laëlaë / silao / dapo² / balibongana / We Dëmmikoro / asënna / [n]cujangngëngngi40 / dapo² balibongae / nayi[a] / toPërëtiwijë² / nasilaongangngë / mo[m]po² / La Malalaë / tiwirangngëngngi / puang datunnna / lisumanëmmui / paimëng ri Përëtiwi / métu'ë / mëmmau² / bau² tolinò / napalëne' ranëmmui / ri potta[n]aëngngë / ana'bëccingngë / sujikamaë / laëlaë / patangarëngngë / We Dëmmikoro / mani41 / mo[n]ro / attawarëng / ri linoë / nakkëtaurëna / rëppa² / dapo² balibongana / aga nayi[a] / napagawu² / We Dëmmikoro / mappalla'pallaë² / tanëng bunga / bunga /

35 Silamalama read Sëllamalama, as in D.  
36 datunnana read datunna  
37 Popo / Ca[ng]kuli read Acang Kuling  
38 jo'jo² / muisã read jo'jo'muisa  
39 mamë'juisa read ma'dajumuisa (K ma'dajumini)  
40 [n]cujangngëngngi read [n]cujungngëngngi  
41 Dëmmikoro / mani read Dëmmikoromani
2.1.5. Translation

This sets out the writing concerning the one who descended, Simpurusia. It tells of the things which came down with him from Botillangi and of the things which came up with him from Pétetiwi, and the deeds of all the rulers. May my mouth be torn open, may my tongue be torn out, may my head be split open [should I cause offense]; may I not swell for setting out in order the descendants of the great ones. Now he who was called Simpurusia descended into the world and she who was called, may I not swell, Patiajala arose also [from the foam of the waves]. She married Simpurusia, may I not swell. Then there was a Pajung in Luwu and the red umbrella shaded, accompanied by dodo, piduang and rupa aju. Then a child was born to the the Pajung of Luwu, a beautiful girl. When the child of he who descended, Simpurusia, was grown up, two tomanurung of equal status requested his daughter’s hand in marriage. They were both equally tomanurung who proposed, and they were equally marriage partners, as they were both equally nephews. The one who descended, Simpurusia, was angry with his wife. The one who descended, Simpurusia, said to his wife, “What you have done will bring ruin and destruction to the land. You have only one daughter but you have accepted them both equally as marriage partners.” May I not swell, We Patiajala said, “Why should I not accept both their proposals, they are equally my nephews and [to]tomanurung.” Simpurusia withdrew to his sleeping chamber. He

42 All manuscripts are in general agreement with the present version's reading of Simpurusia. The name is possibly a corruption of Simhapurasia, a transposition of (Sanskrit) purusavatiha, “man-lion”; this would fit well with the meaning of the name of Simpurusia’s wife. Alternatively, the first part of the name may be E.E. simpuru, a synonym for ulu, “head, the handle of a knife or tool, the upper watershead of a river”. This would produce “head/upper part of SIQa” (cf. Simpurutoja, “head/upper part of the lake”); there are several possibilities for SIQa; none of them satisfactory.

43 A kingdom of the upper-world of the I La Galigo.

44 The underworld of the I La Galigo which takes its name from the Hindu goddess and personification of the earth, (Sanskrit) Prthvi. It is not clear whether Uriliung and Pétetiwi, whence Simpurusia’s grandson La Malalae obtains magical objects, are the same place; one realm appears to be under the earth and the other under the sea; see footnote 79 on page 46.

45 As in other parts of Southeast Asia, in South Sulawesi it was considered disrespectful to refer to one’s superiors by their personal names; among the Bugis it was believed that the spirits of the departed had the power to cause swelling.

46 ABBEGB PaTiQ/YaJaLa, FK PaTeQ/YaJaLa, H both, D PaTJaLa. The name is probably derived from (Sanskrit) pati, “lord” and jal, “net”, thus “snare of her lord” (cf. jal, “fishing net”, or a type of boat [Niemann 1883:8 line 19]).

47 From the foam of the waves: see line 8 of the poem starting on page 44.

48 Umbrella: this was the title of the paramount ruler of Luwu.

49 The colour of the state umbrella of Luwu is confirmed by the Chronicle of Boné: “It was actually a red umbrella, the umbrella of the Dutu of Luwu which was captured” (Macknight and Mukhia, forthcoming).

50 Matthes 1874:393 gives dodo, “mask”; alternatively, a small, doll-like figure (Saim). A piduang is a “a mask, a small bottle”, or, “according to some Bisu [transvestite ritual specialists] an ornament of some kind” (Matthes 1874:112): rupa aju is perhaps “wooden mask” (literally “wooden form”). The text is listing part of the regalia of Luwu; all three items were probably Bisu ritual equipment that accompanied the ruler of Luwu in procession. The reference to the regalia serves simply to set the following stories subsequent to the founding of Luwu.
burnt all the incense that had come down with him from Botillangi, and he ascended to Botillangi. May I not swell, he who descended, Simpurusia, went up before

(42) Patotoë in Botillangi. Patotoë said, "What brings you here to Botillangi?" Making obeisance, Simpurusia said, "I have a child, a beautiful daughter who is now of age. Two lords, my equals in rank, have asked for her in marriage. Your servant, Wë Patia'jala, has accepted them equally as marriage partners. I have no idea what to do; that is why I have come here, lord, I have come up to Botillangi." Patotoë said, "Is there not your child's afterbirth, which you kept when she was born?" Simpurusia said, "There is indeed, lord. It is stored in a jar." Patotoë said, "You go down to the world. When you get there, take your daughter and afterbirth and place them under a garuda basket. When three days and three nights have passed, open it." When he had been told this, Simpurusia took leave of Patotoë and descended to the world. When the one who descended, Simpurusia, arrived, he did as he had been told by Patotoë in Botillangi. When three days and nights had passed, he opened the garuda basket and saw two children, twins, sitting together. They were identical; one was as beautiful as the other. "That is the origin of [the custom whereby] the descendants of the one who descended, Simpurusia, do not bury their afterbirths." Both her afterbirth and her body were wedding partners, they were both children of the one who descended, Simpurusia. Now Simpurusia's son was called Anakaji, may I not swell. He married the one who called Wë Tappacinna. Now she who

51Patotoë, "he who apportions men's fates", also known as Palanroe, "the creator", the highest of the gods of the upper-world of the I La Galigo (Matthes 1864:377).

52The garuda (Sanskrit, garuđa) is the giant bird of Indian mythology (sang is an honorific). The basket is presumably a larger version of the type used to cage fighting cocks. Under sëkkö karuda, Matthes (1874:668) offers the following: "a sort of circular or square canopy which is hung above the sleeping place of him or her who hopes to be influenced by a higher spirit, and thus become a bissu. Such a canopy is called a sëkkö karuda. Underneath (daarin) are hung two imitation bëkkö karudas [garuda birds]. In such a sëkkö karuda one can find, among other things, a lawolo, an entwined strand of blue, red, white and back cotton thread, which serves as a representation of the umbilical cord, which the natives regard as the beginning of life."

53This line does not appear to form part of the original story: it is probably a later addition.

54Simpurusia’s dilemma, and its solution, bears a notable resemblance to the story of Mandu Dari in the Hikayat Sri Rama, the Malay version of the Indian Ramayana epic. In the guise of an ascetic, the rakasa Rawana tricks Dasarata, the ruler of Isfaha Boga, into granting him a request. Rawana asks for Dasarata’s wife, Mandu Dari. Bound by his promise, Dasarata orders Mandu Dari to bathe and to adorn herself before being given to Rawana. Mandu Dari withdraws and, by kneading her body, obtains a ball of dirt from her skin the size of a chicken’s egg. She lights incense and prays over the ball of dirt, transforming it first into a green frog and then into an image of herself. Mandu Dari adorns her double and orders her to present herself before Dasarata. The false Mandu Dari is handed over to Rawana, who departs with her. Mandu Dari then appears before her surprised husband telling him of her cunning (Ikram 1980:143-144). Zeiseniss (1963:108) lists the story as being of Indian origin.

55Royal child”. This sentence introduces the second story.

56Heart’s wish fulfilled”.
gave birth to We Tappa'cinna (the child of the one who descended at Mancapai\textsuperscript{57} who was called Sêllamalama)\textsuperscript{58} was

(43) called [We] Barangaweli.\textsuperscript{59} We Tappa'cinna married Anakaji, and he took his wife to Luwu\textsuperscript{z}. The child of the one who descended at Mancapai took with her a number of things her mother had given her: a bundle of incense, a jar of sangiang\textsuperscript{60} oil and a length of silk thread dyed yellow with turmeric. When they had been living for a long time in Luwu\textsuperscript{z} as man and wife, a child was born, may I not swell, called We Mattêngngaëmpong,\textsuperscript{61} and also a son called To Panangi.\textsuperscript{62} Now one day We Mattêngngaëmpong began to cry, so her grandmother, whose name was We Patia'jala, the wife of Simpurusia, sang her a lullaby\textsuperscript{63} which went like this:\textsuperscript{64}

"The child We Manêdara,\textsuperscript{65}

he who was lowered in a bamboo,\textsuperscript{66}

he who emerged from a bamboo segment,

lying in a bamboo segment,

the origin of the royal child,

the descendant of Sêllamalama,

\textsuperscript{57}Mancapai is apparently the fourteenth and fifteenth-century Javanese kingdom of Majapahit. Matthes 1872b:94 mentions a Mancapai in Bone and another in Wajo\textsuperscript{z} but this is not in keeping with the theme of the present work, which is to link Simpurusia and his descendants with the great rulers of the three levels of the pre-Islamic Bugis cosmos.

\textsuperscript{58}The name Sêllamalama is meaningless: it is possibly of Sanskrit origin. Matthes offers just sêlla\textsuperscript{c}, "to moan, wail loudly", and lama, "incense; bough, shoot; during" (Matthes 1874:745,557).

\textsuperscript{59}The name Barangaweli is meaningless; it is possibly of Sanskrit origin. Matthes (1874:189) offers just barang, "perhaps; sweat".

\textsuperscript{60}According to Matthes 1874:674, sangiang is "a sort of deuata [Sanskrit: god] . . . also [a term] used in poetry in reference to rulers of god-like origin." Here perhaps it refers to a type of oil used in religious ceremonies.

\textsuperscript{61}This is probably To Apanangi of the Royal Genealogy of Luwu\textsuperscript{z}, who can be estimated to have ruled c.1475-c.1500. His name does not occur in other versions; see page 33, above.

\textsuperscript{62}The poem is described as an elông, a poetic genre "of various types, though the majority of them consist of three lines per verse, each line being of eight, seven and six syllables in length" (Fachruddin 1983:17). This description does not fit the present poem, which, despite considerable corruption, is clearly of an eight-syllable-per-line construction, this being the usual metre of the tolo\textsuperscript{c} and mênrurana genres.

\textsuperscript{63}The inclusion of the poetic fragment in the present work may be compared to the so-called "Song of the Sword" in Genesis iv 23-24: "Adah and Zillah, hear my voice./ O wives of Lamech, give ear to my speech:/ I have killed a man for wounding me,/ A boy for injuring me./ If Cain be avenged sevenfold,/ Then Lamech seventy-sevenfold." which is generally held to owe its inclusion in the "Line of Cain" (Genesis iv 17-26) to the mention of Cain in the last couplet (Speiser 1964:37).

\textsuperscript{64}manêdara, O.B. "serving maid". The subject of the poem is We Tappa'cinna.

\textsuperscript{65}The opening line of the poem suggests that the subject particle -e should be translated as "she" rather than "he"; this, however, does not make sense in the overall context of the poem. I have, therefore, assumed the subject of this and the following line to be the tomanurung Simpurusia. Cf. Braam Morris 1889:550 regarding how Bataraguru, the first of the I La Galigo's god-rulers, descended to earth in a bamboo, along a rainbow.
he who descended in a bamboo,  
[and] she who arose from the foam of the waves,  
no longer lowered, \(^{67}\)  
not by boat did she follow,  
not by boat did she cross, \(^{68}\)  
[but] over a bridge of a single thread,  
of silk dyed yellow with turmeric,  
driving away the angry spirits, \(^{69}\)  
racing against the dog-ghosts, \(^{70}\)  
so that they would not crowd around,  
and trample on her oil; \(^{71}\)  
not a clump of earth,  
not a bitter cake filling,  
not a dry turd,  
[did she bring with her to Luwu\(^2\)]".

Wē Tappa'cinna became angry when she heard her mother-in-law's elong. She rubbed on her sangiang oil, burnt her incense, unwound her silk thread and crossed over [the ocean] on it, and returned to Mancapai. Her husband, who was called Anakaji, came looking for his wife, but could not find her. She who arose from the water foam

(44) said to her son Anakaji, "Your wife has returned to Mancapai." Anakaji set off without delay and followed his wife across the bridge over the water. Anakaji arrived in Mancapai, where he met his father-in-law. He who descended at Mancapai said, "What is the matter, Anakaji? Why do you come in such haste to Mancapai?" Anakaji said, "I am following my little sister, lord." He who descended at Mancapai said, "Wē Tappa'cinna claims that she was humiliated by her aunt." Anakaji said, "Give my little sister Wē Tappa'cinna to me, lord; I will take her back to Luwu\(^5\). Now if my mother says anything further that my little sister Wē

---

\(^{67}\) Kern (1929:311) translates this as "not even made to smell sweet", from O.B. ulo\(^5\), "fragrant".

\(^{68}\) The poem refers to Wē Tappa'cinna's crossing of the Indian Ocean to South Sulawesi.

\(^{69}\) This translation is based on Matthes 1872b:93.

\(^{70}\) Dog-ghosts: asu panting, "a kind of ghost having the form of a dog. If approached, however, it will withdraw. When an asu panting eats a person's excrement, that person will develop dysentery and his or her anus will become enlarged" (Matthes 1874:899).

\(^{71}\) The translation of this and the preceding line is uncertain.
Tappa'cinna does not like, my lords who descended will no longer have a child.\textsuperscript{72} We Tappa'cinna was returned to her husband, and earth that had descended with Sëllalamama at Mancapai was dug up and brought to Lwu.\textsuperscript{6} The men of Wage, Tëmpë and Singkang accompanied their earth. Then they met at Tampangëng. Thus they were called "The lands which are kept".\textsuperscript{573} Husband and wife arrived back in Lwu.\textsuperscript{7} May I not swell, We Tappa'cinna's daughter, who was called We Mattëngngaempong, was already grown up and already queen of the crocodiles; she was married to the one who was called [La Tuppusolo]\textsuperscript{75} Acang Kuling.\textsuperscript{76} She gave birth, may I not swell, to the one called La Malalæ,\textsuperscript{77} and girl called Da La Ia\textsuperscript{78} Da La Ia was taken down to Uriliung\textsuperscript{79} by her father.\textsuperscript{80} La Malalæ cried continuously, for he wanted to go down to bathe in the river, but he was not brought down by him who descended, [Simpurusia].

(45) Water was borne up to the palace at Lwu, but La Malalæ refused to comply; he wanted to go down to bathe in the river. He refused to bathe with the water that had been carried up in the porcelain bowl and did not stop pleading to go down to the river. So La Malalæ was taken down to bathe in the river. He was met by his father, who took him down to Peretiwi for nine nights before returning again to the earth. [Before he departed] his grandparent gave him what are called ana"bëcëcëg, sujikama and patangarëng, as well as laelæ and dapø"balibonga.\textsuperscript{81} We Demmikoro\textsuperscript{82} was the name of the one who carried the

\textsuperscript{72}That is, "I will disown my own mother and father."

\textsuperscript{73}—b: This passage do not appear to form part of the original story: it is a reference to overlordship by Lwu [Wage, Tëmpë and Tampangëng are settlements close by Singkang [modern-day Singkang]]. The passage is probably derived from a Wajo\textsuperscript{6} tradition; cf. Abidin (1985:202), where the words tana polë ri Mancapai\textsuperscript{[7] (the lands which came down from Majapahit) may be found in connection with the same three settlements.

\textsuperscript{74}This sentence introduces the third story.

\textsuperscript{75}He who holds back the current

\textsuperscript{76}Droplets of dew

\textsuperscript{77}The root of this name appears to be O.B. maillala, "separate, divide, sever", thus "he who separates", etc.

\textsuperscript{78}Mother of La Ia

\textsuperscript{79}Bottom of the deep", an underwater realm presumably believed to lie under the Gulf of Bone.

\textsuperscript{80}J group manuscripts add that she had been cast under a spell.

\textsuperscript{81}Matthes 1874:194 describes ana"bëcëcëg laelæ as "a kind of amulet (duiveldrijver)", and laelæ (ibid., p. 619) is similarly defined. Sujikama (ibid., p. 719) is an amulet made of iron, and patangarëng (ibid., p. 280) "a sort of apparatus made of tin which [they] sometimes wear on their heads in the form of a small cage." Dapo" balibonga (ibid., p. 387) is possibly a kind of dapo\textsuperscript{6} (cf. Malay dapur, "stove, kitchen") formerly used by the sanro (medical specialists) as a censer in exorcism ceremonies, but elsewhere (ibid., p.211/689) "a great earthen cooking pot." Matthes illustrates a number of these "amulets" in his Ethnographic Atlas of 1885. Figure 1 on plate 9 shows an ana"bëcëcëg. Two varieties of laelæ are shown in figures 15 and 16, a sujikama in figure 5 and a dapø\textsuperscript{6} in figure 34 on plate 11. Said (1977:36) describes ana\textsuperscript{6} bëcëcëg as "a type of musical instrument (bunyi-bunyi), which is sounded at mid-day (pada waktu siang) for a number of days after a woman has given birth." See also Zerner (1981:90), who translates Toraja dapo\textsuperscript{6} as "forge hearth".

\textsuperscript{82}The elements of this name appear to be dëmmi, "noose" and koro", "shrink, contract".
dapo'balibonga. Then the people from Pērētīwi who had come up with La Malalaē returned to their lord, all of them returned again to Pērētīwi, as they were afraid of smelling the scent [of] the people of the world. They just placed the ana'bēccing, sujikama, laēlaē and patangarēng down on the earth. Only We Dēmmikoro remained on the earth, as she was afraid that her dapo'balibonga would break. So she lived on the earth where she fenced in a garden and planted flowers.
2.2. The Royal Genealogy of Luwu

The Royal Genealogy of Luwu (hereafter RGL) is the name I have given to the work (or perhaps works) represented by the eighteen manuscript texts listed in table 2-2. Each sets out in chronological order a list of the rulers of Luwu, beginning with Simpurusia, the founder of Luwu’s ruling lineage following the “age of I La Galigo”, and extending down to eighteenth or nineteenth-century rulers. Matthes published the text of one of these manuscripts in the first volume of the Boeginesch Chrestomathie (Matthes 1864:529-530). Matthes did not mention his source, but his list of rulers is almost identical with those found in codices NBG 100 and 101 (cf. Matthes 1872b:60-61). It is also possible that Matthes obtained his list from Tajuddin, a Makassar-domiciled Malay, who was responsible for the important codex NBG 208, in which a similar list is found (Matthes 1864:3,61; 1881:6-16). A set of notes dealing with the correct orthography of names and titles was later published in volume three of the Chrestomathie (Matthes 1872b:94-96).

2.2.1. Versions of the RGL

Manuscript versions of the RGL are shown in table 2-2. These are henceforth referred to by the letter given in the right-hand column.
Despite their common subject matter, the extent of the disagreement among the eighteen versions regarding the number, order and names of Luwu’s rulers before A.D. 1600 is remarkable. While some versions record as many as fourteen rulers, one names as few as seven.¹

We shall therefore examine these textual differences with the aim of discovering what can be learnt of the relationships between the eighteen versions. In keeping with the limits of this thesis, the enquiry will end with the first Muslim ruler of South Sulawesi, La Patiware, Daeng Parébung, Sultan Muhammad Walî Mużhir (or Mużähir) al-din, Matinroë ri Warë (“He who sleeps at Warë” [the former

¹There seems to be little disagreement as to the names and sequence of rulers after 1600.
palace-centre of Luwu², close to Palopo]), whose acceptance of the Islamic faith in 1603 [correctly, February 4 or 5, 1605 (Pelras 1985:109)] is mentioned in most versions.² As we shall be examining only a part of each version, all conclusions regarding the relationships between them should be regarded as provisional.

A single example will suffice to demonstrate the method used to determine the relationships between versions. In figure 2-2 below is shown the relative position of one ruler of Luwu², Dèwaraja, along with his teknonym, the name of his father and the name of his son, as found in the eighteen versions.

Two groups of texts can be discerned: ABDFGHJKLMNPQ, versions of which list

²It was common practice among Bugis and Makasar chroniclers to refer to deceased rulers by posthumous "titles", which describe how or where they died, or where they were cremated or buried.
Dewaraja as ruler of Luwu and CEORS, versions of which do not. Dewaraja’s historical existence is confirmed in the Chronicle of Bone (Macknight and Mukhlis, forthcoming), a Chronicle of Wajo (Noorduyn 1955:70,73) and the Lontara Sukku’na Wajo (Abidin 1985:202,231-239), all of which describe Dewaraja as Datu, or ruler, of Luwu. CEORS must be mistaken in omitting him from their lists of rulers and can be set aside for the moment.

Turning to the thirteen versions of the first group (ABDFGHJKLMNRJ), it will be seen that nine agree regarding to Dewaraja’s position within the list of rulers, ten agree regarding his teknonym, ten agree regarding to the name of his father and twelve agree regarding the name of his son. At this stage it is tempting to avoid the problem of variant readings by stating that according to most sources (BFGKLMNPQ), Dewaraja, alias To Sangerreng (or Sangireng) was the eleventh ruler of Luwu, that his father was La (or To) Malalaë, and that his son was To Apaio. The temptation to do so increases when we find that that the objections raised by three of the four remaining versions are easily overcome. As we proceed with the analysis, however, we shall see that all but one of the attributes of this statement are, in all likelihood, wrong.

Turning to the four versions which disagree with one or more of the above readings, we find that D’s listing of Dewaraja as the tenth, rather than eleventh, ruler of Luwu, is explained by its accidental omission of one of the preceding rulers. H and J do likewise with no less than three earlier rulers, one of whom is La Malalaë; in addition, both versions confuse Dewaraja’s teknonym, To Sangerreng, for the name of his father. DH and J can therefore be added to the group BFGKLMNPQ.

The objections raised by A, however, resist such ready explanation. The list of rulers preceding Dewaraja provided by A is radically different from those of BDFGHJKLMNPQ, and Dewaraja’s position in A as the sixth ruler of Luwu simply cannot be explained as the result of scribal error. A, moreover, states that To Apanangi was both the father of Dewaraja and of the following ruler, Bataraguru.

---

3CES list Dewaraja simply as a son of To Apanangi, while OR omit him completely.
4Following the chronology provided by the Chronicle of Bone, Dewaraja’s rule can be dated to the early sixteenth century. The Chronicle states that Dewaraja was defeated in battle by Bone’s fifth ruler, La Tëbrisuki (ruled c.1512-c.1540). Noorduyn’s Chronicle of Wajo states that one year prior to his unsuccessful attack on Bone, Dewaraja concluded a treaty with the fourth Arung Matoa of Wajo, La Tadampare, who ruled c.1490-c.1520 (Abidin 1971:169; 1985:230-232). Dewaraja’s defeat can therefore be placed between c.1512 and c.1520.
The eighteen versions can now be divided into three groups: $BDFGHJJKLMNPQ$, for which the reading is agreed, $CEORS$, upon which we have suspended judgement, and $A$, whose variant readings cannot be explained as the result of scribal error.

By repeating this process for the rest of the individuals identified as rulers, we arrive finally at the conclusion that all eighteen versions can be divided into just two distinct groups. The first of these consists of versions $BDFGHJJKLMNPQ$ and produces a list of fourteen rulers to A.D.1600. Versions belonging to this group present their information in the form of a simple and obviously idealized father/mother—son/daughter inheritance of rulership, adding little or no additional genealogical or anecdotal information. The list of rulers produced by versions belonging to this group can be confidently established, the full list being found in $GKLMPQ$.

The second group consists of versions $ACES$. Versions belonging to this group present their information in the form of a genealogy, and produce a list of twelve rulers, though with less certainty than for the list of fourteen rulers produced by the first group. The two list (represented by versions $A$ and $M$) are shown in figure 2-3.

---

5To Sangkawana and La Malalaë are listed as rulers of Luwu in C; in A they occur simply as the children of Bataraguru, while ES list To Sangkawana as ruler but omit La Malalaë. In addition, CES list a Datu Makkunrai (“the female ruler”) before Matinros ri Warë. Part of the difficulty lies in the smaller number of versions belonging to this group.
Versions within each group differ only in the sort of detail that, as we have seen above with the case of Dēwaraja, can be accounted for as the product of simple or accumulated scribal error. It would thus appear that the two groups derive from independent sources—dealing with the same subject.

The genealogies produced by versions A and M may be compared with the paired genealogies found in Genesis 4 and 5 (figures 2-4 and 2-5). The Genesis genealogies are generally agreed to have been drawn from from two separate sources, the "Yahwist" (J) and the "Priestly" (P), both of which derive from oral traditions; their range of variation is similar to, if not smaller than, that shown by A and M.⁶

⁶For a discussion of these and other biblical genealogies, see Wilson (1977), chapters 3 and 4.
Figure 2-4: Genealogical Variation in the RGL

Figure 2-5: Genealogical Variation in Genesis 4 and 5
The final task is to decide which of the two lists of rulers is historically more accurate. There are a number of circumstantial reasons for supposing versions belonging to the group ACES to contain a more reliable tradition than those of group BDFGHJKLMNOPQR. Versions ACES are certainly more impressive than versions BDFGHJKLMNOPQR, in that the former contain several times the information of the latter. While it would be easier to understand how a list like that found in versions belonging to the first group might derive from the more complex genealogy found in those of the second, there is no internal evidence for such a process.

By a stroke of good fortune there exist two short texts against which we can compare the two groups of versions. These texts are the Attoriolongngé ri Dëwaraja, (History of Dëwaraja) (MAK 100:136.14-136.30, hereafter Dew) and the Atturunna To Apanangi (Descendants of To Apanangi) (MAK 66:1.1-1.11 [to “1600”], hereafter Apan). The first of these texts traces four generations of Dëwaraja's descendants, only one of whom (La Malalae) appears in the RGL. The second text provides a genealogy of To Apanangi's descendants, seven of whom appear as rulers in versions belonging to either or both groups of the RGL's versions. While the titles of Dew and Apan are probably no more than tags attached to them by later copyists, it is clear that, while pursuing different genealogical lines, Dew and Apan agree very closely with the genealogy produced by ACES and hardly at all with the list of rulers produced by BDFGHJKLMNOPQR. Indeed, the close agreement between Dew, Apan and ACES strongly suggests that all, ultimately, share a common source. Furthermore, the additional information provided by Dew and Apan helps to account for many of the differences between the list of rulers produced by versions belonging to the first group and those of the second.

By comparing the genealogies in Dew and Apan with A and M, we shall attempt to demonstrate not only Dew's and Apan's support for versions ACES over those of BDFGHJKLMNOPQR, but also to reconstruct something of the source which appears to lie beneath Dew, Apan and ACES. (Edited texts and translations of the four sources are given on pages 60 to 73, together with an analysis of names.) The paraphrase will start with the first ruler of the RGL, Simpurusia and continue.

---

7 As only one version each of Dew and Apan can be found, the question of whether they represent separate works or fragments of a larger work will be avoided here.

8 These differences are: (1) in A, To Apanangi is the fifth ruler of Luwu; in M he is the third; (2) in K, Datu [ri D'a]e]pira is the fifth ruler of Luwu; in A she is the wife of To Apanangi; (3) in A, Dëwaraja is the brother of Bataraguru; in M he is the great-great-grandson of Bataraguru; (4) in A, Datu Masogé is the wife of Bataraguru; in M she is the eighth ruler of Luwu; (5) in A, To Sangkawana is Bataraguru's son; in M he is Bataraguru's grandson; (6) the twelfth ruler of M, To Apaio, is not found in A.
through to the last ruler of our period, Matinroëri Warë. Justification for the selection between the variant readings of the four texts will given as the reconstruction precedes.

- Simpurusia is the first ruler of Luwu following the age of I La Galigo. He marries Wë Patia'jala. Simpurusia’s son is Anakaji (AM).

- Anakaji is the second ruler of Luwu (AM). Anakaji marries Wë Tappa'cinna, the daughter of the ruler of Majapai. Anakaji’s daughter is Wë Mattëngngaëmpong (A).

The structure and language of this passage in A shows clearly that its source was descended from the β recension of the Lontarana Simpurusia.

- Tampabalusu, is the third ruler of Luwu. He marries Da Oë. Tampabalusu’s son is Tanrabalusu (A).

There is no genealogical connection in A between Anakaji and Tampabalusu, neither does Tampabalusu appear in the Lontarana Simpurusia, Dëw or Apan. We may conclude, both on internal and external grounds, that the author of the RGL turned here to a second source. (The problem of M’s variant reading will be examined shortly.)

- Tanrabalusu, is the fourth ruler of Luwu. Tanrabalusu’s son is To Apanangi (A).

The occurrence of the teknonym Da Oë (“Mother of Oë”: oë is the term used by children of common birth to address their elders) between the names Tampabalusu and Tanrabalusu greatly reduces the possibility that Tanrabalusu is an accidental misreading of Tampabalusu: the akṣara MPa and NRa are easily confused owing to their similar shapes.

- To Apanangi is the fifth ruler of Luwu. He marries Datu ri Daupira (A, Apan). His children are Ajiguna (from C) Dëwaraja, Bataraguru (A, Apan), Ajiriwu, Sadaraja and Racëpuja (A).

So far we have followed A’s account of rulers and their offspring rather than that of M. The reasons for this are as follows. Firstly, as has been observed, M’s idealized and unbroken father-son series of rulers renders its historical reliability suspect: A provides a more complex argument, particularly from its fifth ruler onwards. Secondly, from To Apanangi onwards, A is

---

9This spelling A: the Lontarana Simpurusia has Majnajcapai.
10See page 31.
broadly supported by Apan and Dēw. Thirdly, M's fifth ruler, Datu Daupiira, is the wife of To Apanangi in A. As it would seem considerably easier for a copyist to accidentally mistake the name of a wife for that of a ruler than vice-versa, A's reading is preferred. Finally, as the sequences of rulers from To Apanangi onwards in Apan does not include Tampabalusu, we may conclude that he must precede To Apanangi as in A, rather than succeed him as in M.

- Dēwaraja is the sixth ruler of Luwu² (A). His teknonym is To Sangērrēng (M). Dēwaraja's children are Sangaji Batara and Sangaji La Mua (A, Apan, Dēw). Sangaji Batara goes to the east (to Makasar?) where he marries and has a daughter, Rajadēwa. On reaching adulthood, Rajadēwa returns to Luwu² and marries La Malalae, the son of [To Sangkawana] the Datu Luwu² (A, Dēw). Rajadēwa bears La Malalae four children. Their names are Sēttiē, To Luwu²-mangura, Unitańāra and To Luwu²-bēbē. Rajadēwa then marries her father's brother's son, by whom she has two children, Patiwarasa and Patimajawari. Rajadēwa re-marries La Malalae (Dēw), whom she bears two children: Sagariāja, who is also known as Patipaduri, and Sagarilau² (A, Dēw), who is also known as Macangngē (A). Sēttiē, Rajadēwa’s son by her first marriage, is driven out of Luwu² by the people of Luwu², with the agreement of his younger brother, Luwu²-mangura. Sēttiē buys land at Mamutu and lives there. He has a daughter, Magalika, who is married at Patunru (Dēw).

The close correspondence between A and Dēw (and initially Apan) provides clear confirmation of a common source. The historicity of this passage is at once apparent. Its detailed account of the births, marriages, re-marriages and fraternal conflicts of the ruling family of Luwu² are presented in a dry and factual manner, providing us with a tantalizing glimpse of early-sixteenth-century political alliances and conflicts.

- Bataraguru is the seventh ruler of Luwu² (A). He marries Datu Maogē (A, Apan). His son is To Sangkawana. To Sangkawana's son is La Malalae (AM, Apan).

- Datu ri saolē²bi is the eighth ruler of Luwu² (A). He marries Maningo ri Jappuē. Their child is Maningo ri Bajo. He or she is titled Oputta Opunna Rawē (A, Apan).

---

11 See footnote 5 on page 52.
• Maningo ri Bajo is the ninth ruler of Luwu\textsuperscript{c} (A). Maningo ri Bajo marries Datu ri Balubu and their son is Matinroe ri Waré\textsuperscript{c} (A, Apan).

• Matinroe ri Waré\textsuperscript{c} is the tenth ruler of Luwu\textsuperscript{c} (A).

From Bataraguru onwards, both A and Apan show signs of confusion, while M's sequence bears little relationship to either of them. The relationship of Datu ri saolé\textsuperscript{bi} to other members of the genealogy is questionable: A introduces him without mentioning his origin, while Apan appears to identify him as the son of Ajiriwui, the brother of Dewaraja mentioned in CES. Agreement is restored in all three texts with the names of the last two rulers, Maningo ri Bajo and Matinroe ri Waré\textsuperscript{c}, Luwu\textsuperscript{c}'s first Moslem ruler.

It is clear from the above comparison that versions A, Dëw and Apan share, in part, a common source. A was based upon three sources. These were: a \(\beta\) group version of the Lontara\textsuperscript{a}na Simpurusia, an unknown source which provided the names of two (apparently later) rulers and one of their wives, and the common source of Dëw and Apan, which appears to have been a genealogy of pre-seventeenth-century rulers of Luwu\textsuperscript{c}. M's sources were evidently quite different from those of A, unless we accept that M (and BDFGHJKLNOPQR) is descended from an ancestor of A via an oral source which radically re-structured the tradition contained within this ancestor.

2.2.2. Dating the RGL

Without examining the entire work in detail, it is difficult to suggest a date of composition for the RGL. An obvious problem is that some copyists have added the names of later rulers, thus keeping their versions "up to date". Eight versions of the RGL end with the names of three children of Matinroe ri tengnganna Patiro (she who sleeps in the middle of Patiro), which enables us to date them to the late eighteenth century (cf. Matthes 1864:530, 1872b:95);\textsuperscript{12} others end at various times up to the early twentieth century. Thus the present form of the RGL probably dates from the late eighteenth century.

\textsuperscript{12}GHJKLNMQ
2.2.3. The RGL as a Historical Source

The RGL is of limited historical value, due partly to the fact that it offers us little evidence for the period before 1500, and partly to remaining uncertainties as to the relationships between certain individuals found in its post-1500 section. Despite our efforts at reconstruction of its major source, the RGL continues to provide more questions than answers regarding the names and relationships of Luwu's sixteenth-century rulers. External sources are little help: the Lontara Sukku'na Wajo' tells us that Dëwaraja's father was La Busatana (Abidin 1985:202), who can reasonably be identified with To Apanangi (father of Apanangi). But YKSST 3024, "book" 8, p. 145 (apparently another Wajo' source) states that Dëwaraja was succeeded by his brother, Daëng Lëba, who was also known as Sagaria (=Sagariaja in A?), while the Chronicle of Bone records a quarrel between Bongkangnge (c.1565-c.1581), the seventh-recorded ruler of Bone, and a Datu Luwu named Sangkaria. Further research is needed to solve these problems: in the meantime, the evidence of the RGL and its reconstructed source must be used with caution.
2.2.4. Text, A

Datuë riasëngngë Simpurusia\textsuperscript{13} yi[a]muto riptutati\textsuperscript{14} Patia'jala manurungngë ri busa uwaë ko\textsuperscript{15} ri Ta[m]pëngngë\textsuperscript{16} najajiangngi Anakaji manurungngë ri Majapai riasëng Sëllalamala yi[a]na siala Batarawëli\textsuperscript{17} najaji Wë Tabacinna\textsuperscript{18} sëukurëng raung jëppu sëpidupu\textsuperscript{19} miñña\textsuperscript{2} sëpitë\textsuperscript{2} wannang\textsuperscript{20} sutara riatëuni\textsuperscript{2} naripawawai rinunu\textsuperscript{21} lao marola ri Luu\textsuperscript{2} najajina Wë Mattangaëmpong\textsuperscript{22} nariakkëlongang rinëne\textsuperscript{2} na\textsuperscript{23} inaurëna A\textsuperscript{24} makkade


\begin{itemize}
\item inanga yi[a]na mamana\textsuperscript{25}
\item ri lapatëllëng
\item lë[w]u\textsuperscript{2} ri lappa\textsuperscript{2} tulala\textsuperscript{26}
\end{itemize}

nai[a]napa Anakaji Anakajina siala Wë Tappa'cinna najajiangngi Wë Mattëngngae[m]pong nai[a]napa Ta[m]pabalusu yi[a]na siala Da wOë najaji Tanrabalusu nai[a]napa Tanrabalusu yi[a]na jaiyangngi To Apanangi nai[a]napa Datu ri wanuanna nai[a]napa La Mariawa nai[a]napa Datu ri Dawupira\textsuperscript{27} nai[a]napa To Apanangi To Apanangi powawinëi Datu [ri Dau]pira najaji Dëwaraja najaji Bataraguru a[n]rangngë Ajiriuwa a[n]rëngngë Sadaraja ë[n]rëngngë Rëceuja nai[a]tapa\textsuperscript{28} Dëwaraja Dëwaraja najajiangngi Sangaji Batarà Sangaji La Moa\textsuperscript{29} naSangaji Batarana lao ma'bawinë ri timoro nakkëanë\textsuperscript{2} sëuwa woroanë riasëng

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13}Bold type is used throughout the transcription to indicate words or groups of words that are found in the left-hand margin, either parallel, or within reasonable proximity, to the text to which they refer, into which they have been included here. There are no palla'Wa; instead the complexes are separated by spaces, in the European tradition. The present version was made for Ligtvoet by an unknown copyist in the mid-nineteenth century.
\item \textsuperscript{14}riputati: a corruption. The structure of this sentence, and a comparison with C's opening words, manurungngë ri pëttung riyasëngngë Simpurusia, suggests that the ancestral reading of both texts was iamuto riasëngngë manurungngë ri awo pëttung. This conjecture is followed in the translation.
\item \textsuperscript{15}ko: meaning unknown. It is omitted in the translation.
\item \textsuperscript{16}Ta[m]pëngngë read Tampangëng
\item \textsuperscript{17}Batarawëli read Barangawëli, as in version E of the Lontara'na Simpurusia.
\item \textsuperscript{18}Wë Tabacinna read Wë Tappa'cinna, as in version H of the Lontara'na Simpurusia.
\item \textsuperscript{19}sëpidupu read sëpiduang
\item \textsuperscript{20}wannang read wënnang
\item \textsuperscript{21}rinunu read ri [i]nanna
\item \textsuperscript{22}Wë Mattëngngaeëmpong, as below.
\item \textsuperscript{23}This is spelt RiNëëNa.
\item \textsuperscript{24}This symbol apparently indicates the beginning of the poem. An identical symbol can be found at the beginning of version D of the Lontara'na Simpurusia.
\item \textsuperscript{25}This line is corrupt: it is replaced in the translation by the first line of the poem in version E of the Lontara'na Simpurusia, which reads ana' Wë Manëdara.
\item \textsuperscript{26}tulala read tulali
\item \textsuperscript{27}C's reading of Daupira is followed in the translation.
\item \textsuperscript{28}naiatapa read naianapa
\item \textsuperscript{29}Dëw's reading of Sangaji La Mua is followed in the translation. CES omit.
\end{itemize}
Rajadēwa naRajadēwana lisu ri Luwu\textsuperscript{2} napowawinēi anē\textsuperscript{30} na La Malalaē najajina Sagariaja Sagarilau\textsuperscript{2} naSagariajana riasēng Patipaduri naSagarilau\textsuperscript{2} na riasēng Macangngē Sagarilau\textsuperscript{2} na Patunru nai[a]napa Bataraguru Bataraguruna powawinēi Datu Maogē najaji To Sapuwana\textsuperscript{31} naTo jajiangngi La Malala\textsuperscript{32} nai[a]napa La Mariala\textsuperscript{33}

(2) nai[a]napa Datu ri saolē\textsuperscript{2}bi nasiala Maningo ri Ja[m]puē najajina Maningo ri Bajo Oputta Opunna Rawē polakkaiwi Datuē ri Balubu najaji Matinroe ri Warē\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{30} anē\textsuperscript{2}na read ana\textsuperscript{2}na

\textsuperscript{31} M's reading of To Sa[ng]kawana is followed in the translation. CES omit.

\textsuperscript{32} M's reading of La Malalaē is followed in the translation. CES omit.

\textsuperscript{33} La Mariawa, as above.
2.2.5. Translation

The ruler called Simpurusia. He was also called "he who descended in a bamboo". [Simpurusia married Wê Patiajala, the one who descended in the water foam at Tampangêng. They had a child, Anakaji. The one who descended at Majapai was called Sêllalama. He married Barangaweli and they had a child, Wê Tappa^cinna. Her mother gave her a bundle of incense, a pot of oil and a bobbin of silk thread dyed yellow with turmeric to take with her to Luwu. She gave birth to Wê Mattêngngaëmpong. Her grandmother sang her a lullaby, which went:

"The child Wê Manêdara,
[he who emerged] from a bamboo,
lying in a bamboo segment."36

Now concerning Anakaji. Anakaji married Wê Tappa^cinna and they had a child, Wê Mattêngngaëmpong. Now concerning Tampabalusu. He married Da Oe and they had a child, Tanrabalusu. Now concerning Tanrabalusu. He had a child, To Apanangi. Now concerning Datu ri wanuanna. Now concerning La Mariawa. Now concerning Datu ri Daupira. Now concerning To Apanangi. To Apanangi married Datu ri Daupira and their children were Dewaraja.

34 For the use of bold type, see page 60, footnote 13.
35 From tampang, "bind fast: in north Bone. The origin of Da Lakko suggests that the present version of the RGL was compiled in Wajo or Bone. Cf. the linking of Simpurusia with Lombo and Taîëtî in the Royal Genealogy of Cina on page 92. Abidin (1983:213) lists Tampangêng among the vassals of Luwu annexed by Wajo in the early sixteenth century.
36 The three gifts that Wê Tappa^cinna brings to Luwu, the birth of her daughter and the lullaby that her grandmother sings are taken from the Lontara Simpurusia, parl of which the author of the present work (or perhaps a later editor) can apparently recall from memory. The vocabulary used and the omission of the second line of the poem show the source to have descended from version 1 of the LS.
37 The second element of this name and the name of the following ruler, Tanrabalusu, is balusu, a type of sea shell which can be bored out to make a ring or bracelet. The meaning of the first element of each name is uncertain: the aëra Mpa is sometimes used in Bugis texts to represent a double Pa (and more rarely a single Pa), hence in its original form Tampabalusu may not have been pre-nasalized. Among the possibilities offered for TaMPa are tappa, "ascetic practice", tappa, "visible", tappang, "prospective, future", tappa, "shine, glimmer"; end (a variant of cappa), tampa, "a gift" and tampang, "to burn, as of the mouth with sirih." The combination TaNRa likewise offers more than one reading; among these is tanra, "sign."
38 According to Matthes (1874:897), oë is a term used by children of common birth to address their elders.
39 Meaning unknown: pana, "[water] spout" is a possible root.
40 The ruler in his [or her] land
41 Daupira is presumably a place-name.
42 (Sanskrit) devaraja, "god-king". All the children of To Apanangi appear to have Javanese-Sanskrit titles.
Bataraguru, Ajiriwu, Sadaraja and Racēpuja. Now concerning Dēwaraja. Dēwaraja’s children were Sangaji Batara and Sangaji La Mua. Sangaji Batara went to marry in the east. He had a child called Rajadēwa. Rajadēwa returned to Luwu and married the son of To Sangkawana, the Datu Luwu, whose name was La Malalaē. Their children were Sagariaja and Sagarilau. Sagariaja was called Patipaduri and Sagarilau was called Macangnge: Sagarilau [held the office of] Patunru. Now concerning Bataraguru. Bataraguru married Datu Maoge and their son was To Sangkawana. To Sangkawana’s child was La Malalae. Now concerning La Mariawa.

(2) Now concerning Datu ri saolē’bi, he married Maningo ri Jampue and

---

43 (Sanskrit) bhataraguru, “noble teacher”: the title in Java of the Hindu deity Śiva.
44 Meaning unknown. The name is probably of Javanese–Sanskrit origin, now corrupt: Aji is (Javanese) aji, “king” (Aji is one of the titles of Patoto, the ruler of the heavens in the I La Galigo); (Sanskrit) ajiha, “invincible, unconquerable” is a remote possibility. In Bugis the second element, riWi, produces riwu, “hundred thousand”, or riwu, “storm”.
45 (Sanskrit) sadārdja, “always a king”.
46 Meaning unknown: probably (Sanskrit) rājapūja, “worship of the king”, or perhaps here “lord of the buffalo sacrifice” (cf. Matthes 1864:121). C states that there were six children (the present text lists only five) and adds the name Ajiguna (meaning unknown) (E Ajiguna S Ajicutu) before Dewaraja.
47 E adds that Dēwaraja opened Mamutu, and that he “seized the child of the ruler of Sidēnreng” (ala ane na a’datuangnge ri Sidēnreng) an action which presumably refers to Luwu’s conflicts with Sidēnreng in the early sixteenth century, recorded in the Lontara Sukku’na Wajo (Abidin 1985).
48 (Javanese) sang is an honorific; (Javanese) aji, “king”; (Sanskrit) bhataruru, “noble lord”.
49 Mua, unknown.
50 In the east: ri timoro (=Makasar?).
51 “Ruler of the gods”, a transposition of Dēwaraja (cf. Sanskrit rajñīdeva, “queen of the gods”).
52 This conjecture solves the problem of the mismatched generations that the text produces between Rajadēwa and the “child of La Malalaē”. See also section 2.2.9.
53 These names are a pair: their final elements are respectively “in the west” and “in the east” (literally, “towards the mountains” and “towards the sea”).
54 Meaning unknown: the first element is perhaps (Sanskrit) pasti, “lord”; (Javanese), “first minister”.
55 “The clever one”
56 “Father of council” (Mundy 1848:155)
57 Meaning unknown: Maoge is presumably a place name. ECS state that Bataraguru married Datu ri Daupira.
58 Meaning unknown: sang is an honorific. ECS state that Bataraguru’s children were Datu ri saolē’bi (below) and We Raga (E We Ragi).
59 It is difficult to place La Mariawa within the genealogy. His name has occurred above (following the first mention of To Apanangi); here someone (presumably the copyist) has attempted to erase the name. The present text’s second mention of La Mariawa is found in the same position in CES, which add the names of two more unattached rulers, Datu Maoge (the wife of Bataraguru, above) and Datu Makkunraiē (“the female ruler”).
60 “The ruler in the splendid house”
61 The title Maningo is not found in Matthes 1874. This and the example on page 68 are the only occurrences of the title that I have come across. Jampu (cf. Malay jambu, a fruit) is a common place-name in South Sulawesi.
their child was Maningo ri Bajo\textsuperscript{62} [who was titled] Oputta Opunna Rawē.\textsuperscript{63} [Maningo ri Bajo] married Datu ri Balubu\textsuperscript{64} and their child was Matinroē ri Warē\textsuperscript{65}.

\textsuperscript{62}Bajo is presumably a place-name, which would appear to derive from the Bajo, or sea-gypsies, who lived scattered along the coast in various parts of South Sulawesi. Some copyists have added "Matinroē ri Bajo" as a gloss, but Maningo is evidently the ancestral reading.

\textsuperscript{63}C adds that she was also known as Matinroē ri Bajo, Paropoē, Sawungngê, Datu Bissu and Opu Narawē, and that her children were Sangaji Daēng Lēba, Opu To Tajiwa, Daēng Sorēa, To Alē, Daēng Mangēsa, To Apinajo, Daēng Macora and Batara Bissu. ES provide a similar list of names and titles.

\textsuperscript{64}A balubu is a large jar; here it is apparently a place-name.

\textsuperscript{65}He who sleeps at Warē\textsuperscript{6}, La Patiwarē\textsuperscript{6}, Daēng Para\textsuperscript{6}bung, the first Moslem ruler of Luwu\textsuperscript{6}. 
Figure 2.6: Royal Genealogy of Luvu
2.2.6. Text, $M$

Tania kupomabusung \ lakké\lakké'i \ wij a to m angk au'é \ Si[m]purusia \ [n]caijiangngi \ Anakaji \ Anakaji \ [n]caijiangngi \ To Apanangi \ To Apanangi \ [n]caijiangngi \ Ta[m]pabalosu$^{66}$ \ Ta[m]pabalosuna \ [n]caijiangngi \ Datu Apira \ Datu Apira \ [n]caijiangngi \ Ta[n]rabalosu$^{67}$ \ Ta[n]rabalosuna \ [n]caijiangngi \ Bataraguru \ iana mula manurung \ ri Luwu$^{2}$ \ Bataraguruna \ [n]caijiangngi \ Datu Maoge \ Datu Maogena \ [n]caijiangngi \ To Sangkawana \ To Sangkawana \ ſaijiangngi \ La Malalaë \ La Malalaëna \ ſcaijiangngi \ To Sangêrrêng \ iatona \ riasêng \ Déwaraja \ Déwaraja \ ſaijiangngi \ To Apaio \ To Apaiona \ ſaijiangngi \ Maniboë ri Bajo$^{68}$ \ Maniboë ri Bajo \ ſaijiangngi \ Matinroë ri Warë$^{c}$

---

$^{66}$ A's reading of Ta[m]pabalosu is followed in the translation.
$^{67}$ A's reading of Ta[n]rabalosu is followed in the translation.
$^{68}$ A's reading of Maningo ri Bajo is followed in the translation.
2.2.7. Translation

May I not swell for setting out in order the descendants of the lord Simpurusia. [Simpurusia's] child was Anakaji. Anakaji's child was To Apanangi. To Apanangi's child was Tampabulusu. Tampabulusu's child was Datu ri Apira. Datu ri Apira's child was Tanrabalusu. Tanrabalusu's child was Bataraguru; he was the first to descend at Luwu. Bataraguru's child was Datu Maoge. Datu Maoge's child was To Sangkawana. To Sangkawana's child was La Malalaé. La Malalaé's child was To Sangérréng, he was also known as Déwaraja. Déwaraja's child was To Apaio. To Apaio's child was Maningo ri Bajo. Maningo ri Bajo's child was Matinroé ri Ware.

---

69 In A and other MSS., Datu ri Daupira.
70 The author of the present work, or a later copyist, has apparently confused the Bataraguru of the La Galigo epic cycle with the historical individual of the same name. In Java, Bataraguru is a title of Siva, the highest god of the Hindu pantheon.
71 Meaning unknown. Some manuscripts have Sangiréng.
2.2.8. The Attoriolonna Dëwaraja, MAK 100:136.14-36.30

_Fasal_72 Yi[a]na riënë angëng rangënnë_73 attoriolongngë ri Dëwaraja nayi[a] appongënnë Dëwaraja \ yi[a]niritu Sangaji Batara lao ri timoro na³bawinë nakkëanë² sëuwa nariasëng Dëwaraja74 nayi[a] appongënnë Sangaji Batara enrëngngiang Sangaji La Mua yi[a]duwana anë²na Datuë ri Lëwu² \ naDëwarajana75 lisu ri Lëwu² ma³bawinë \ ri rajëna Datuë ri Lëwu² \ riasëngngë La Mëlaaë76 najajina Sëtti77 enrëngngiang To Lëwu²mangura \ enrëngngiang Unitanara enrëngngiang To Lëwu²bëbë \ na³bawinësi parimëng Dëwaraja78 ri anë²na Sangaji La Mëwa \ najajina Patiwarasa enrëngngiang Patimajawari na³bawinësi parimëng ri anë²na La Mëlaaë79 najajina Sangarilau80 \ enrëngngiang Sangariaja81 \ naSangariajana riasëng Patipaduri \ naSëttiëna ripassu ri Lëwu²ë nayi[a]mukana naripassu aënnëa situju siajina \ riasëngngë To Lëwu²mangura \ muka kuanana ritu naëllina tana Sëttië ri Mamutu nakkona monrona Sëttiëna ritu poanë³ Magalika naanë²na Magalika ripowawinë ri Patentru \ 

---

72 This text uses a number of unusual _akṣara_: see page 14.
73 _angëng rangënnë_: meaning unknown. These words are omitted in the translation.
74 Dëwaraja's name (strictly speaking, title) has been accidentally substituted for that of Rajadëwa. A's reading of Rajadëwa as the daughter of Sangaji Batara is followed in the translation.
75 _Rajadëwa_, as above.
76 This is spelt LaMaLa'ë.
77 _Sëtti_ read _Sëttië_, as below.
78 _Rajadëwa_, as above.
79 This is spelt LaMaLa'ë.
80 A's reading of Sagarilau² is followed in the translation.
81 A's reading of Sangariaja is followed in the translation.
2.2.9. Translation

Here is the history of Dewaraja's descendants. Dewaraja's child was Sangaji Batara. [Sangaji Batara] went to Timoro to marry. He had a child called Rajadēwa. [Dewaraja's] children were Sangaji Batara and Sangaji La Mua; they were both children of the Datu of Luwu². Rajadēwa returned to Luwu² to marry the child of [To Sangkawana] the Datu of Luwu², whose name was La Malalae. She bore him Sēttiē, To Luwu'mangura, Unitanara and To Luwu'bebē. Then Rajadēwa married again with the child of Sangaji La Mua and she bore him Patiwarasa and Patimajawari. Then she married again with the child of [To Sangkawana], whose name was] La Malalaē and bore him Sagarilau² and Sagariaja. Sagariaja was called Patipaduri. Now Sēttiē was driven out by the [people of] Luwu²; he was driven out, so it is said, with the agreement of his younger brother, who was called To Luwu'mangura. Because of that, Sēttiē brought land at Mamutu and lived there. He had a child, Magalika. His child, Magalika, was married to [the] Patunru.⁸²

⁸² "Father of Council": an office of the kingdom of Luwu² (Brooke 1848:155).
Figure 2-6: Decendents of Dewaraja
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2.2.10. Descendants of To Apanangi, MAK 66:1.1-1.11

Panessaëngngi atturëñna\(^\text{\textsuperscript{33}}\) datuë \ To Apanangi powawinei Datu [ri Dau]pira \ najaji Dëwaraja najaji Bataraguru Dëwarajana jajiyangngi Bataraguru\(^\text{\textsuperscript{34}}\) \ Batara La Moa \ Sangaji Guru \ Sangaji La Moa\(^\text{\textsuperscript{35}}\) \ Bataraguruna powawinei Datu Maogë \ sëuwa anë\(^\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\) najajiyang \ najaji To Sauwana\(^\text{\textsuperscript{36}}\) \ naTo Sauwanana\(^\text{\textsuperscript{37}}\) jajiyangngi La Malalae\(^\text{\textsuperscript{38}}\) Ajiri[w]u jajiyangngi Datu ri saolë\(^{\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\text{bi}}\) \ Datu ri saolë\(^{\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\text{bi}}\)bina siala Maningo ri Ja[m]puë \ najaji Maningo ri Bajo \ Oputta Opunna Rawë naOputta Opunna Rawë polakkaiwi Datu ri Balubu \ najaji Mati[n]roë ri Warë\(^{\text{\textsuperscript{e}}}\)

\(^{33}\) atturëñna read attorëñna

\(^{34}\) The inclusion of Bataraguru's name here is a mistake and is omitted in the translation.

\(^{35}\) There is obviously some confusion here. According to M and Dëw, Dëwaraja's children were Sangaji Batara and Sangaji La Mua. The present text's Batara La Moa and Sangaji La Moa are clearly the same person: only the title differs. Sangaji Guru is presumably Sangaji Batara, the name having been transposed and Guru (from Bataraguru?) substituted. In the translation the names given are Sangaji Batara and Sangaji La Mua.

\(^{36}\) To Sauwana can be identified as To Sangkawana, M's ninth ruler. To Sangkawana is followed in the translation.

\(^{37}\) To Sangkawana, as above.

\(^{38}\) This is spelt La Malalë.
2.2.11. Translation

This sets out the descendants of the ruler To Apanangi. [To Apanangi] married Datu ri Daupira. Their children were Bataraguru and Dēwaraja. [Dēwaraja's] children were Sangaji Batara and Sangaji La Mua. Bataraguru married Datu Maogē. Their child was To Sangkawana. To Sangkawana's child was La Malalaē. Ajiriwu's child was Datu ri saolēbi.89 Datu ri saolēbi married Maningo ri Jampue. Their child was Maningo ri Bajo; [he (or she) was also known as] Oputta Opunna Rawē.90 Oputta Opunna Rawē married Datu ri Balubu and their child was Matinroē ri Warēc.

---

89. This is highly questionable. Ajiriwu is the brother of Dēwaraja and Bataraguru in A. Here Ajiriwu's name appears without connection to any preceding member of the genealogy. The text is probably corrupt; there is no evidence elsewhere for such a relationship.
90. Our Opu, the Opu of Rawē.
Figure 2.7: Descendants of To Apanangi
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2.3. The Luwu\textsuperscript{c} Vassal List

This short work – scarcely half a manuscript page in length – sets out a list of seventy settlements, which it describes as \textit{palill\textsuperscript{n}a\textsuperscript{d} Luwu\textsuperscript{c}}, or vassals of Luwu\textsuperscript{c}. The Luwu\textsuperscript{c} Vassal List (hereafter LVL) is one of a number of similar lists available for all the large Bugis kingdoms and many of the smaller. The purpose for which these lists were compiled is unknown. As far as I am aware, no version of the LVL has yet been published.

2.3.1. Versions of the LVL

The three versions of the LVL work examined here are shown in table 2-3. These are henceforth referred to by the letter given in the right-hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pages/Lines</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>119.25-20.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>136.22-37.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>63.1-63.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Owing to the brevity of their contents, it is not possible to establish any firm relationships between the three versions of the LVL. I have therefore chosen to edit the most legible manuscript, A, against which variant readings in B and C have been examined.

2.3.2. Dating the LVL

While the present form of the LVL (i.e. the present arrangement and spelling of names) may not be particularly old, the list itself appears to date from the fourteenth or fifteenth century. This is because more that one half of the LVL's vassals appear to be located along the south and south-west coast of the peninsula, a region which Goa brought under her control in the first half of the sixteenth century. The historical situation to which the list refers must therefore date from before the sixteenth century.

\textsuperscript{1}The complex \textit{palill\textsuperscript{n}a} is constructed from the root \textit{lili\textsuperscript{f}}, "around", the noun-forming prefix \textit{pa}- and the possessive suffix \textit{-na}, thus "something around [a centre] that belongs to it", or "vassal".
2.3.3. The LVL as a Historical Source

The LVL provides important confirmation of Luwu's political influence outside the region to which that name is applied today. There can be little doubt that the LVL is based upon historical memory: the relationships it records are supported by the Nāgarakṛtāgama, a fourteenth-century Javanese poem, which links Bantaeng with Luwu (see page 184), while the reliability of the vassal lists as a whole is supported by the Soppěng Vassal List (section 2.7), the evidence of which fits well with archaeological data from that kingdom.²

The toponyms of the LVL appear to be clustered in two main groups: those numbered between one and about thirty in the following list can be identified in the general Luwu region, while those between thirty and seventy lie (with the exception of Sidérēng) along the south and south-west coast of the peninsula. The two groups are separated by the complex palili'na, "her vassals are", which occurs twice within the space of two settlements (Seppu [unidentified] and Bēnamo on the south-west coast). The LVL is further divided by the expression napanoē rakalana "and then the plough of [Luwu] went down", which occurs once in the first group of settlements and three times in the second. The significance of this expression, which evidently unites together certain settlements, is unclear.

The twenty five settlements that can be identified with reasonable confidence are shown in figure 2-9 on page 79, following the text and translation.³ While it is impossible to draw any significant conclusion from a single identified reference, the clusters of toponyms around the present-day capital of Luwu and the southern coast of the peninsula point to an important political association between the two regions.

²It is worth noting in this regard that lists such as that of the LVL are seen by anthropologists as characteristic of societies making the transition from illiteracy to literacy, or of societies in which writing is confined to only a small number of people. Several examples of this phenomenon may be cited. Three quarters of the extant Mesopotamian cuneiform inscriptions are administrative documents - in essence, lists. Two thirds of Ugaritic texts (fourteenth to thirteenth century B.C.) are basically lists, including lists of people and geographical names. In contemporary Egyptian scribal manuals the whole structure of the cosmos can be broken down into enormous lists to be learnt as part of a scribe's training, including the ninety-six towns of Egypt and names of foreign places and people (Wood 1985:133). In South Sulawesi, the extensive genealogical records dating from the fifteenth century contain largely unstructured information in the form of long lists of names and relationships.

³These were identified on Sheet SA 51-9, Edition 1, 1:25,000 Joint Operations Graphic (Ground) Series 1501, (1957), Army Map Service, Washington D.C., and 1:50,000, U.S. Army Map Service 1943 reprints of Dutch Topografischen Dienst maps.
2.3.4. Text, A

Waré² palili'na \ Baæbu[n]ta \ Bua \ Ponrang \ Matana \ Mëngko[ng]ka \ 
Pa[n]tilang \ Bolo \ Ro[ng]kong \ Ta[m]pa[ng]kë \ Suso \ Waropo \ Loda \ Bajo \ 
Balabatu \ Lë³ba'ni \ Lëlewawo \ napano'ë rakalana \ Ta[m]pina \ Na[m]pa \ 
Malili \ Patimang \ Cilëllang \ Lamunrë \ Suli \ Wata[n]larompong \ Sirigading \ 
La[n]rang \ Sëngëng \ Cë-

[120] rèkang \ Babangë \ Lao \ balilina⁴ \ Sëppu \ Bënamo \ palili'na \ 
Sidënënëng \ Bala \ Cënépo[n]to⁵ \ Sapanang \ Tino \ To[n]rokasi \ napano'ë 
rakalana \ Aculoë \ Kala[m]pang⁶ \ Pajëllao \ Bulubulo \ Pätëllëssang⁷ \ Jobë \ 
Pañtëuna \ [A]ru[ng]këkë \ Todotodo \ Botoropo \ Pao \ Karoa \ Cino \ 
To[n]ra \ Ru[m]bia \ Tolo \ Ba[ng]kala \ napano'ë rakalana \ Tanatoa \ 
Palëngung \ Malasoro \ Garasiga \ Masara \ Rukuruku \ Laikang \ napano'ë 
rakalana \ Patopangkang⁸ \ Pañlængka \ Punaga \ Ca[n]rai \ Cikoang \ 
Pangkajëné \ Barana \ alëlënamua \ Bëroanging \ alëlënamua \ tammat

⁴balilina⁵ read palili'na
⁵Cënépo[n]to read Jënéponto: the akṣaras C and J are easily confused.
⁶Kala[m]pang read Kalumpang
⁷Pätëllëssang read Patalassang
⁸Patopangkang read Patopakang
2.3.5. Translation

Warē's vassals are: Baebunta, Bua, Ponrang, Matana, Mengkongka, Pantilang, Bolo, Rongkong, Tampangkē, Suso Waropo, Loda, Bajo, Balabatu, Lēba'ni and Lēlewawo, then the plough of [Luwu] went down [to]9 Tampina, Nampa, Malili, Patimang, Cilēllang, Lamunrē, Suli, Watanlarompong, Sirigading, Lanrang, Sēngēng, Cērēkang,

[120] Babangē and Lao; her vassals are:10 Sēppu, Bēnamo; her vassals are Sidēnrēng, Bala, Jēnēpo[nto, Sapanang, Tino and Tonrokasi, then the plough of [Luwu] went down [to] Aculoē, Kalapang, Pajēllawo, Bulubulo, Patalassang, Jobē, Pañutuna, Arungkēkē, Todotodo, Botoropo, Pao, Karoa, Cino, Tonra, Rumbia, Tolo and Bangkala, then the plough of [Luwu] went down [to] Tanatoa, Palēngung, Malasoro, Garasiga, Masara, Rukuruku and Laikang, then the plough of [Luwu] went down [to] Patopakang, Pānālangka, Punaga, Canrai, Cikoang, Pangkajēnē, Barana, and on its own11 Bēroanging, on its own.

---

9 The precise meaning of this expression, and its function in the present text, is unclear. It appears to separate groups of vassal settlements either geographically or in relationship to Luwu.

10 C ends here with the entries "Baba 20,000 Pao 3822 Balili 425 Sēppu 500". The significance of these numbers is unknown.

11 The significance of this expression is unknown.
Figure 2-9: Locatable Toponyms of the LVL
## Key to figure 5-1

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arungkéké</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baëbunta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bua</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>BuloBulo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jënëponto</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Laikang</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Malili</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Matana</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Patalassang</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Patopakang</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rukuruku</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sidënreng</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. The Royal Genealogy of Cina

The Royal Genealogy of Cina (hereafter RGC) is the name I have given to a work described by Matthes as the "lijst der afstammeling van Simpoerosiya, den eersten uit den Hemel gedaalden vorst van Loewoe" (list of the descendants of Simpurusia, the first, heavenly-descended ruler of Luwu) (Matthes 1875:34). Matthes' description is a reasonable one, for Simpurusia, the legendary first ruler of Luwu following the reputed "age of I La Galigo", is here the first member of a genealogy which spans some sixteen generations to the mid-seventeenth century and which contains the names of more than one hundred individuals.

The "focus" of most versions of the genealogy is La Tênritatta, the seventeenth-century Arung Palakka; having reached him, the genealogy returns twice to an earlier generation in order to add further information about his ancestry. Although these parts of the RGC may be later additions, there can be little doubt that the work was designed to link La Tênritatta with Simpurusia, the legendary founder of South Sulawesi's most ancient ruling lineage, in order to demonstrate his high ascriptive status.

The "central line" of the RGC follows the traditional list of Cina's twenty or twenty-two rulers (cf. Abidin 1983:219). Several versions of this list can be found, among them YKSST 3057:136, LAL 1985:101.25-3 and Salim 2:149-152. The list and the relationship of its members to the RGC, is as follows:

1) Simpurusia
   Luwu's first ruler following the "age of I La Galigo". Generally regarded as the earliest of South Sulawesi's rulers, Simpurusia was known to seventeenth-century genealogists through a number of legends associated with him and his immediate descendants. RGC generation 1.

2) We Jangkêwanua
   In versions of the Simpurusia legend associated with Cina, she is the daughter of Simpurusia. RGC generation 2.

---

1 Two versions, MAK 187:53.18-54.36 and MAK 223:140.28-142.4, end before reaching La Tênritatta; these probably represent fragments of the RGC rather than an earlier form of the work.

2 As the title by which he is best-known suggests, La Tênritatta came from the middle-ranking aristocracy. His mother, We Tênrisui, the ruler of Marioriwawo, appears to have been the daughter of the eighth-recorded ruler of Bone, La Icca, and a sister (or possibly a half-sister by a mother of lower status) of the twelfth-recorded ruler of Bone, La Tênpaiâ, Matiroö ni Tallo. La Tênritatta's father was La Pottobunö, the ruler of Tanaêngua in Bone; his mother was a ruler of Sidêrêng.

3 In this MS. the list has been "embedded" into a version of the RGC.

4 This list is based upon more than one source.
(3) La Malalaë

The grandson of Simpurusia. YKSST 3057:136 adds "of Bangkangpate". RGC generation 3.

(4) La Wéwanriwu

In YKSST 3057:136, La Wéwangénni. The first of four rulers who apparently pre-date the introduction of writing but whose names are not associated with Simpurusia. None of the four are found in the RGC.

(5) We Ampélangi

Identified in a number of versions as We Ténrilé"biréng (generally both names are given).

(6) La Balaoni

Variously given as La Balauni and La Baloténgngi. YKSST 3057:136 adds that "he was the first to own the sword that forms part of the regalia of Pammana to the present day."

(7) La Mula Datu

"The first Datu". The last of the set of four "pre-genealogical" rulers.

(8) La Sengngéng

"The whole one". Some sources have La Sëngngé[m]ponga (La Sëngngéng Bonga: bonga is O.B. "noble"). La Sengngeng is the subject of a number of legends (see for example YKSST 3034 "volume" 17, page 320). While he starts what I have identified as the genealogical source in the in the RGC, his name suggests a legendary rather than a historical figure. RGC generation 4.

(9) La Patauë

Probably a historical figure. RGC generation 5

(10) La Pasangkadi

La Pasangkadi, the Arung of Pammana, is one of three brothers whose names start detailed, related genealogies (see for example NBG 99:241.6-245.6). RGC generation 6.

(11) Wë Materrëë

RGC generation 7.

(12) La Mappaléppëë

In the RGC we find instead La Pañorongi, who is remembered as having established settlements at Sumali and Baringéng (both in north Bone). His marriage to Wë Ténritaë"biréng, the sister of the fifth-recorded ruler of Soppéng is found both in the Royal Genealogy of Soppéng (section 2.6) and the RGC (generation 8).
(13) La Paleléang The RGC gives La Malle: the root of both words is lele, “around”; both evidently refer to the same person. RGC generation 9.

(14) La Wë'dolimpona There are several versions of this name: YKSST 3057:136 and Salim 2:152 add that her title was Datu Malotong[ung]ë. RGC generation 10.

(15) La Kompëng The Puang of Taë, a settlement in Bonë. RGC generation 11.

(16) La Makkarangëng Also known as To Lë'ba'ë, “father of the wide one”. RGC generation 12.

(17) La Padasajati Not found in the RGC. La Padasajati is a brother of La Pasangkadi (number 10 above, RGC generation 6). His position in the King List varies between 17 and 20.

(18) Wë Tënrisi'da A daughter of La Makkarangëng. RGC generation 13.

(19) La Sangaji The Karaëng Loë (great ruler): both name and title are generally given. RGC generation 14.

(20) La Tënrijëllo “He who was not killed by the amok.” He is not found in YKSST 3057:136 or the RGC.

(21) La Sangaji Also known as To Aji Pammana; according to legend, the ruler who requested on his deathbed that the name Cina be changed to Pammana. Not in the RGC.

2.4.1. Versions of the RGC

There are least seven versions of the RGC extant. These are shown in table 2-4. These will henceforth be referred to by the letter given in the right-hand column. As manuscript G is virtually illegible, owing to “print through” caused by acid ink, it is omitted from the following discussion.
Table 2-4: Versions of the RGC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pages/Lines</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>144.26-145.40</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>53.18-54.36</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>140.28-142.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>236.1-241.5</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.1-32.27</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>30.27-33.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136.24-?</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The close structural and linguistic similarities between versions leaves little doubt that all are descended from a common ancestor. A comparison of the six versions of the RGC suggests that they can be divided into two groups, as is demonstrated by the following examples (manuscript page and line numbers cited below are from D):

1. At 236.1-2, B and C describe Simpurusia as manurungngē ri Lo[m]po, "he who descended at Lompō", while ADEF read yi[a]na tipangngi Lo[m]po, "it was he who opened Lompō". Since tomanurung are generally identified as having descended at particular locations, BC's reading is probably the better one. (All versions add that he opened Talëttu.)

2. At 236.4, B and C have ripakkarung, "made Arung" (the title of the ruler of a minor kingdom or principality), while ADEF read ripaṭdatu, "made Datu" (the title of the paramount ruler of Luwu). Here what is presumably the older reading appears to have been altered in an ancestor of ADEF.

3. At 236.8, B and C have La Tuppusolo (cf. page 46) instead of ADEF's Datu Pusolo. BC's reading is evidently the better one.

4. At 237.9, B and C have La Wēdōli[m]pona for ADEF's Wēdōli[m]pona, the loss of the prefix La presumably having occurred, as with the previous variations, in an ancestor of ADEF.
The simple division of the six manuscripts into two clearly defined groups, one offering apparently superior readings of substantial variants, is complicated by a comparison of manuscript lines 237.12-238.7. While the readings provided by ABDEF are very similar, C pursues a quite different genealogical line to 237.8, before briefly rejoining that of ABDEF and ending at 238.10 with a new subject, the Puang of Pada:

ma³bawinetoi La Wë³doli[m]pona siala Wë Madupa \ ana³i La Ko[m]pé ritëllæ Puwang ri Ta² \ ana³i La Palapalori Puwang ri Pada \ purani

La Wë³dolimpona married Wë Madupa, and their child was La Kompê, who was titled Puang of Ta². Their child was La Palapalori, Puang of Pada.

To further complicate matters, version B, which otherwise follows ADEF’s genealogical line, ends at 239.8 with the concluding words of C’s variant section! (Compare the italicized words below with the previous quotation.)

Karaëng Loëni ma³bawine ri Ganra \ siala Wë Madupa \ ana³i La Ko[m]pé \ ritëllæ Puwang ri Ta² \ ana³i La Pa[lapa]lo \ ri Puwang ri Pada \ purani

Karaëng Loë married at Ganra with Wë Madupa, and their child was La Kompê, who was titled Puang of Ta². Their child was La Palapalori, Puang of Pada.

While Wë Madupa, her son and grandson are clearly misplaced (Wë Madupa having occurred previously in B at 238.9-10), the sudden appearance in B of C’s variant section is puzzling, to say the least. It is difficult to conceive of a stemma that would convincingly explain all these features, and I am forced to concede that in the present case the division of manuscripts into loose groupings is as far as we are able to proceed in establishing the relationships between manuscripts.⁵

As for the group ADEF, it is clear that not only does D provide a more detailed genealogy than AEF, but that parts of AEF are either ambiguous or misleading, as a result of accumulated omissions by previous copyists. A single example, that of manuscript lines 239.6-9 (arranged here in lines of arbitrary length), will suffice by way of example:

⁵To add a final mystery, A ends abruptly at 145.40 at the foot of a manuscript page, as if the copyist had either lost interest in it or had accidentally turned two pages in his exemplar. (In many respects A is a careless copy; the break comes in mid-line, and a new work starts on the following page.) Is it simply a coincidence that A ends at almost exactly the same place in the same line as does B?
We Tēnrisi'da
the child of To Lē'ba'e
married at Uju[m]pulu
with La Malamalaka
(his teknonym was To Acca)
and their child was Karaeng Loē.
married at Ganra

It will be seen that not only does F lacks the useful retrospective reference for We Tēnrisi'da, which helps us to locate her accurately in the genealogy, but that it omits the second mention of Karaeng Loē found in A. Had this been retained, it would have enabled us to spot the corruption of ana'ni (their child was) to ana'na (the child of) through the loss of a diacritic. This process of condensation, or contraction, of the contents of historical works through the accumulation of accidental omissions, and sometimes too the deliberate omission of what a copyist considered either unnecessary, or of minor interest, can also be found within other sets of manuscripts, such as those of the Lontara'na Simpurusia.
The obvious candidates for selection for editing are C or B; C providing a number of better readings and B the longer text. Both are evidently closer in terms of content to the group's common ancestor than are ADEF. The shared disadvantage of BC, however, is that neither offers the terminus post quem that DEF do, in the figure of La Tènritatta. D has therefore been selected for editing with the aim of providing the most useful text from a chronological point of view. In establishing the translation, particular attention has been paid to the variants in BC and much of their extra material has been incorporated into the commentary notes. Where BC are not available to help with textual problems, I have followed AEF in that order. In the absence of any clear relationships between the six manuscripts my "improvements" on the text of D are chosen simply on a semantic basis, rather than in combination with the usual consideration of the stemmatic relationships of the manuscripts in which they are found.

Lastly, the additional line found in B at manuscript page 238.3 and several lines found only in CEF at manuscript page 240.7 have been included in the translation, but in such a way as to show that these additions do not form part of the base manuscript.

2.4.2. Dating the RGC

The RGC can be confidently dated, by virtue of its central focus, to the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century: while it is likely to have been written during Arung Palakka's lifetime, or at least within a few years of his death in 1696, it is unlikely to have been composed before his final victory over Goa in 1669. The two "additional" sections following the initial mention of Arung Palakka are perhaps slightly later than the main body of the work.

2.4.3. The RGC as a Historical Source

The RGC is a valuable historical source, providing detailed evidence of a number of agricultural chiefdoms lying on fertile, rice-growing land south of the river in the upper Cëänrana valley. The evidence of the King List of Cina and other traditions (cf. Abidin 1983:220) suggests that these settlements were united (perhaps rather loosely) under that name of Cina. Ignoring its legendary first three generations, the period covered by the RGC is approximately A.D. 1350 to 1600. The RGC also provides valuable evidence of the introduction of writing and the existence of genealogical records: this is examined in Chapter Three.
2.4.4. Text, A


(237) Wê Têppê'dirona[20] \ La Pabaturi[21] \ siala massapposisêng \ ana[21]na \ La Pasa[n]kadi ri Pammanna \ ana[22]ni \ Wê Matêrê[22] \ Da Sau asêng ri ana[22]na \ ana[22]ni La Pañorongi yi[a]na ti[m]pangngi Sumuli[23] \ nayi[a]pasî \ ti[m]pangngi

---

7 B's reading of tempo[6] is followed in the translation.
8 BC's reading of ripakkarung ri Luwu[9] is followed in the translation.
9 BC's reading of Wê Ja[ng]kê'wanuwa is followed in the translation.
10 We Jangke'wanuwa, as above.
11 BC's reading of ana[9]na is followed in the translation. This error appears to have led the copyist of the present text, or an earlier version, to ascribe Linruttalaga to the third generation rather than to the first.
12 ABCEF's reading of Li[n]ruttalaga is followed in the translation.
13 This should read 1, as in the translation.
15 The Arabic  is used for 5:  is used for 4, while  (5) is used for the zero of 10. This usage is consistent throughout the text.
16 BC's reading of Wawolo[n]rong is followed in the translation.
17 The copyist uses both Arabic and European numerals. European numerals are shown in bold. Arabic numerals are used to indicate the number of generations by which a member of the genealogy is removed from Simpurusia, and European numerals how many children he or she had.
18 This should read 6, as in the translation.
19 B Wê Têkkawâtêng: Wê Têkkê'watêng is followed in the translation.
20 C's reading of Wê Têppodî[n]ro is followed in the translation.
21 na \ La Pabaturi read na La Pabaturi
22 BC's reading of riasêngngê is followed in the translation.
23 Sumul read Sumuli
The second occurrence of *ana'daranna* La Pabaturi is omitted in the translation.

25 We Téppé'dirona, as above.

26 B's reading of asèng ri aíjëna (*B ana'na*) is followed in the translation. All other versions share what appears to be an accidental reversal of name and teknonym, which is corrected in the translation.

27 romoro read riaja: the words *an'darana Datue ri Soppëng* siala massaposisèng are written vertically down the left hand side of the page, starting just above line 6 (the preceding line break) and ending at line 9. The words are linked to the main body of the text by the Arabic "2", written at the beginning of the words and also above the place in line six where they should be inserted. Cf. manuscript page 240.13 where a similar insertion is made.

28 *an'ni* read *ana'na*

29 *an'ni* read *ana'na*

30 *ACEF*a's reading of Tua is followed in the translation.

31 *BC*s reading of La We'doli[m]pona is followed in the translation.

32 *F*s reading of Wé Aputtana is followed in the translation.

33 *an'ni* read *ana'na*

34 Wé Kawali, as below.

35 *ACEF*a's reading of Wé Inalë is followed in the translation.

36 The second occurrence of Wé Kawali is ignored in the translation.

37 B adds *ana'ni* To Ma'déwata To Ma'déwatana ma'bawme ri Alimu siyala Wé Panaungi. B's reading is approximately one manuscript line in length and solves both the problem of the present text's spurious *ana'na* To Ma'déwata and the awkwardly placed *ana'na* La Pagë in the previous manuscript line. It is therefore included in the translation in such a way as to show that it does not form part of the base manuscript. (This conjecture is supported by LAL 1985:105.)

38 Wé Ma'déwata, as above.
Wadèlli[m]pona\(^3^9\) \| ana'ni \| La Mallèli \| La Mallèli\(^4^0\) ma'бавнe \| ri Lo[m]пeнгёг \| siala Wë Madupa \| ana'ni \| La Ko[m]пeнг \| yi[a]мuto riasёng Puang ri Ta\(^2^\) \| 11 Puang ri Ta\(^2^\) \| ma'бавнe \| ri Soppёng \| siala \| Wë Pautu\(^2^\) \| [a]nani La Makkarangёг \| yi[a]mu[to] riasёng To Lëba'ёг \| 12 To Lëba'ёг \| ana'na Puang ri Ta\(^2^\) \| ana'na \| Puang ri Ta\(^4^1\) \| ma'бавнe \| ri Alliwёngёг siala \| Të[n]риjarangёг\(^4^2\) \| 7 ana'na jaijang \| La Sa[n]rangёг \| To Kёlli\(^\circ\) asёng ri ana'na \| La Pammase La Sёktati \| Wë Kocci\(^\circ\) \| tammat

\((239)\) 13 Wë Të[n]risi'da\(^2^\) \| Wë A[n]rakati \| 13 La Sa[n]rangёг \| ma'бавнe \| ri Tёlli\(^\circ\) \| siala Wë Boa \| ana'ni Wë Kёlli\(^\circ\) \| 14 Wë Kёlli\(^\circ\) \| ana'na \| La Sa[n]rangёг \| siala \| La Sappёng \| ri Atakka \| ana'ni \| La Ma'гамang 15 La Ma'гамang \| ana'na Wë Kёlli\(^\circ\) \| ma'бавнe \| ri Pattojo ana'ni \| Datu Aliё ana'ni \| La Tёpporitu\(^4^3\) \| 144 Wë Të[n]risi'da\(^2^\) \| ana'na To Lëба'ёг \| mallakkaï \| ri Uju[m]pulu \| siala \| La Malamalaka\(^4^5\) \| To Acca \| asёng ri ana'na \| ana'ni \| Karaёг \| Loё \| 14 Karaёг Loё \| ma'бавнe \| ri Ga[n]ra \| siala ana'na \| Mati[n]roэ \| ri asёlёng \| riasёng \| Të[n]risamarёг \| ana'ni \| La Saliu\(^\circ\) \| 15 La Saliu\(^\circ\) \| ma'бавнe \| ri Soppёng \| siala \| Wë Të[n]ria[m]bёг \| ana'ni \| To Pajurangang \| ana'ni \| Da Wauwu \| ana'ni \| Da Pagё \| ana'ni Wë Raiё \| 13 Wë A[n]rakati \| ana'na \| To Lëба'ёг \| mallakkaï \| ri Lo[m]pulё \| siala Paca[ng]kangi \| ana'ni To Wa[w]o \| 14 To Wawo ana'na Wë A[n]rakati \| éppona \| To Lëба'ёг \| ma'бавнe ri Ga[n]ra

\((240)\) siala Të[n]risamarёг \| \| Da Riё \| asёng ri ana'na \| sitolai \| massapposiёг \| riasёngngёг \| Karaёг Loё \| ana'ni \| La Pottobunё \| 15 La Pottobunё \| ma'бавнe \| ri Marioriwa\| siala Wë Të[n]risui \| ana'ni La Të[n]ritatta \| To U[n]ruё \| asёng ri ana'na \| yi[a]мuto riasёng \| Mala[m]пёг \| gémmё\| \| yi[a]muto riasёng \| To Riso[m]paё \| polёna \| ri Angkё \| ana'ni \| Da U[n]ruё \| ana'ni \| Da I[n]ra \| ana'ni \| Da O[m]poё \| ana'ni \| Da È[m]ba\(^4^6\) 

---

\(^3^9\)La Wë\(d\)olimpona, as above.

\(^4^0\)The second occurrence of La Mallèli is ignored in the translation.

\(^4^1\)The second occurrence of ana'na Puang ri Ta\(^2^\) is omitted in the translation.

\(^4^2\)Të[n]риjarangёг read Të[n]риjarangёг

\(^4^3\)ABEF's reading of La Tëpporina is followed in the translation.

\(^4^4\)This should read 13, as in the translation.

\(^4^5\)ABEF's reading of La Malaka is followed in the translation.

\(^4^6\)P adds La Sёktёti \| ma'бавнe ri Mario \| riawa \| siala Wë Mulia \| ana'ni Wë Cёriwu \| Wë Cёriwu mallakkaï \| ri Lau[m]puлёг \| rilаuё \| siala La Musu \| ana'ni ritёllё \| Juruamu \| Juruamu \| siala Da Luwa \| ana'daranna La Bunnё \| To Basё \| asёng ri ana'\| jaijiangngёngёg \| To Riso[m]paё \| tammat: \(E\) contains a similar passage. The additional material is included in the translation in such a way as to show that it does not form part of the present manuscript.
12\textsuperscript{47} La Pammasē \ anaⁿna \ To Lēⁿbaⁿe \ maⁿbawinē \ ri Alimu \ siala \ We Pali[n]rungi \ anaⁿni \ Wē Pacēro \ 14 Wē Pacēro siala \ La Pawiseang \ ri Pattojo \ anaⁿni \ Wē Maⁿdaung \ 15 Wē Maⁿdaung \ siala massapposīsēng \ riasēngngē \ To Batu \ anaⁿni Wē Pacing \ 16 Wē Pacing mallakkai \ ri Kēbo \ anaⁿni To Pasa[m]paⁿ \ 17 To Pasa[m]paⁿ siala\textsuperscript{48} \ anaⁿni \ Da Ra[w]ē \ anaⁿni \ Da Pagē\textsuperscript{c} \ 13 La Pammasēmuto anaⁿna To Lēⁿbaⁿe \ maⁿbawinē \ ri Marioriawa \ siala massapposīsēng\textsuperscript{49} riasē-

(241) ngngē \ I Mata \ ritēllaē \ Mappaloē \ anaⁿnani La Wawo\textsuperscript{50} \ anaⁿni La Pagē\textsuperscript{c} \ anaⁿni Wē Sakē\textsuperscript{c} \ 14 To Wawo siala Wē Bēllē\textsuperscript{c} \ Wē Tēmmarowa\textsuperscript{51} \ anaⁿni La Tēmmaroa \ 15 La Tēmmaroa siala \ anaⁿdaranna \ Arungngē ri Massēpē \ riasēngngē \ Wē Makku[n]rai anaⁿna La Pēsaro \ anaⁿni La Botto \ anaⁿni La Sina[m]pē \ \textit{tammat}

\textsuperscript{47}This should read 13, as in the translation.

\textsuperscript{48}The name of To Pasampa’s wife has been omitted in an ancestor of DEF.

\textsuperscript{49}The words siala massapposīsēng are written in the right margin slightly above the line. As on manuscript page 237.6, the addition is linked to its place in the text by the Arabic “2”.

\textsuperscript{50}To Wawo, above and below, is followed in the translation.

\textsuperscript{51}Wē Tēmmarowa [=La Tēmmaroa, following] is omitted in the translation.
May I not swell for setting out in order the descendants of the lord who descended, called Simpurusia. He descended at Lompo and then he went down and opened Talëttu. Then Da La Akko arose in Luwu. When he knew that his wife had arisen in Luwu, Simpurusia went down to Luwu. His wife came, she who was made Arung at Luwu. They had two children, one called Bataritoja and (generation 2) one called We Jangkèwanua. (Generation 2) Bataritoja was made Datu of Luwu. We Jangkèwanua (generation 2) married her cousin, the child of Linruttalaga of Uriliung, [that is,] the sister of Da La Akko. He was called La Tuppusolo. Their child was (generation 3) La Malalae. (Generation 3) La Malalae married his cousin, the child of Bataritoja, who was called Wé Mattèngngaèmpong, and their child was (generation 3) La Sëngngeng. (Generation 4) La Sëngngeng married Wé Matatimo and their child was (generation 5) La Patau. (Generation 5) La Patau married Wé Tëniwëwëng and their children were (generation 6) La Pottoanging, the Arung of Wawolonrong (there were three brothers), La Pasangkadi, the Arung of Pammana and (generation 6) La

---

52. The opening section of the RGS is based on a variant version of the Simpurusia legend found in the Lontara na Simpurusia; see page 34. A more detailed account of the present version of the legend can be found in LAL 1985:101.

53. Flat; valley, dale; unidentified. In order to look in detail at the structure of the text, I have attempted to translate as many of the RGC’s names as possible. Some of these provide clear and unequivocal meanings, while others produce less certain, if not plainly doubtful, meanings. This is due to a number of abbreviations, textual corruption and archaic words or constructions, as well as my limited knowledge of the Bugis language.

54. Enclosure; unidentified. The linking of Simpurusia with Lompo and Talettu reflects a regional localization of a legend which appears to have arisen in Luwu (cf. section 2.1); both settlements are probably in the upper Cénarana region. Cf. the case of Patiajalá, who “descended in the water foam at Tamangéng” in the Royal Genealogy of Luwu, on page 62.

55. Mother of La Akko; the spelling is consistent in all MSS.

56. Arung is a title used by rulers of minor kingdoms or principalities. This reading is based on BC; AEF have Datu, the title of the ruler of Luwu.

57. Godess of water; Bataritoja occupies the same structural position as Anakaji in the version of the legend found in the Lontara na Simpurusia; we might therefore expect Bararatoja ("god of water"), however the present reading is found in all versions. LAL 1985:101- (which also gives Bataritoja) adds the title "Daeng Talaga" (ruler of the lake). According to Salim, toja (OB: water) more commonly means river.

58. Span of the land

59. Shadow of the lake; a euphemism for "crocodile".

60. The underworld of the I La Galigo.

61. Whole one; the subject of a number of legends in YKSST 3024, book 17, page 320.

62. Eye of the east (i.e. the Sun); possibly a corruption of Ma'ditimo, "in the east"; cf. Salim 1:149.

63. Instiller of fear

64. Not shaken

65. Tornado; cf. Matthes 1874:783, potto ri anging-kanging këttëng, "a grooved armband, or an armband with ‘little moons’ attached, through which the wind plays."

66. Come of age; in north Boné.

67. Pair of women

68. Meaning unknown; in north Boné.
Padasajati, the Arung of Têtwatu. (Generation 6) La PottoangiTëkkêwatêng, and their children were (generation 7) La Pabaturi and

(237) Wê Têppodinro. La Pabaturi married his cousin, the child of La Pasangkadi, at Pammana. She was called Wê Matêrre (her teknonym was Da Sau). Their child was La Pañorongi. It was he who opened Sumali, and he also opened Baringêng. La Pabaturi’s sister, who was called Wê Têppodinro, married at Balubu with La Paliburêng. Their child was La Ua (To Pajung was his teknonym). He returned to Luwu to marry. La Pañorongi, (his brother [in-law] was [La Makkanêngnga] the Datu of West Soppêng) the child of La Pabaturi, married at Soppêng with the sister of La Makkanêngnga, called [Wê] Tênrita“birêng. Their children were La Mallelê and La Têrênga. La Mallelê, the child of La Pañorongi, married at Tua with Wê Tênribau. Their children were [La] Wê’dolimpona and Wê Sa’bamparu. La Têrênga, the child of La Pañorongi, married at Luwu with Wê Aputtana. Their children were [Wê] Tênriaadudu and La Sappê. The child of La Têrênga, called La Sappê, married

69. Equally empty*
70. Stone bridge”; in Soppêng.
71. Crosses the body [of the land”; other sources have Tênriêkkek, “Not moved”.
72. Thrower of stones
73. Without mercy*
74. In other sources Matêrre raung: “Many leaves” (cf. Salim 1:150.3; NBG 237:2).
75. One who parries”; LAL 1985:105 adds that La Pañorongi had an elder brother, La Mapalêppê, whom it states succeeded Wê Matêrre raung as Mattola (ruler; cf. Matthes 1874:364) of Cina.
76. In north Bone.
77. O.B. Wood; “perhaps formerly a type of tree” (Matthes) or “ladder, staircase” (Salim); a settlement in north Bone. LAL 1985:105 states that La Pañorongi was Mattola of Baringêng.
78. Jar or pot; unidentified. Possibly the Balubu of the Royal Genealogy of Luwu (page 64).
79. Leave untouched*
80. An abbreviation for La Tabusasa, “dispersed, scattered”.
81. Father of the royal umbrella”; Pajung was the title of the ruler of Luwu.
82. The Royal Genealogy of Soppêng also records this marriage, but states that Wê Tênrita birêng (below) married at Baringêng with La Pañorongi. We may deduce from this that the expression “he/she married at X” refers to the ruling family of X and not necessarily to the place of the wedding, which in modern Bugis society is generally held at the girl’s house.
83. Place in the middle”; or “compassionate” (Salim). According to the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng, La Makkanêngnga was the fifth ruler of Soppêng.
84. Not treated by a dukur”, i.e. “healthy”.
85. LAL 1985:105 has La Palêbang; both can be translated as “one who goes around”.
86. Not fragrant”; alternatively Tênribau, “not noble”.
87. Perhaps originally Te’hêlimpona, “many lands”.
88. New spaces”; LAL 1985:105 states that she was known as Datu Mapute, “the white Datu”.
89. Earth dew.”
90. She who is not loved”; B adds a second daughter, Wê Tê[n]risapêrêng.
91. Meaning uncertain; LAL 1985:105 states that he was known as Datu Maloangngê, “the wide Datu”; C adds that his teknonym was To Coê.
his cousin, called We Sa'bamparu, the child of La Mallélé. Their children were We Kawai, We Ijë and We Inalé. (Generation 11) We Kawai married at Sallé with the Arung Sallé, who was called To Lëngngang (238) and their child was To Icoi. (Generation 12) To Icoi, the child of We Kawai, married at Amali with We Tënrempali. She was the Arung of Amali and their children were La Pagé, and To Ma'dëwata. To Ma'dëwata married at Alimu with We Panaung and their child was We Ma'dëwata. (Generation 13) We Ma'dëwata, the child of To Ma'dëwata, married To Asalëssé and bore him two children, both of whom died. We Ma'dëwata and To Asalëssé were divorced, and We Ma'dëwata married again at Bunne with La Tënrigëgë and they had four children. (Generation 10) La We'dolimpona, the child of La Mallélé, married at Lompëngë with We Madupa. Their child was La Kompëng; he was also called Puang of Ta. (Generation 11) The Puang of Ta married at Soppeng with We Pautu. Their child was La Makkarangëg; he was also called To Lë'ba'ë. (Generation 12) To Lë'ba'ë, the child of the Puang of Ta, married at Alliwëngëg with [We] Tënrirangëg. They had seven children: La

92 C adds that she had six or seven children, these being [We?] Cëba, We Iko, We Të[ri]li, We Tamono, We Tapa (whose teknonym was Da Wi) We Inalé and We Tëkkë. C also provides the names of five brothers and sisters, La We'dol[pona], We Saupi, La Si, We Të[m]bua and ! La Mallélé. Of all these names, only We Sa'bamparu’s daughter, We Inalé, and brother, La We'dolimpona, are found in the present text. The following section, dealing with the children of We Kawai and To Lëngngang, is missing from C, which continues with La We'dolimpona and We Madupa, their child La Ko[m]pé, and his child, La Palapalori, the Puang of Pada, who does not appear in the present text.

93 A type of knife.

94 ‘Free, fearless’

95 ‘Father of [the one who] swaggers’

96 In Bone, near the border with Soppeng.

97 ‘Fence, enclosure’; B adds that he was the Arung of Amali.

98 ‘Father of [the one who] carries out ceremonies for the gods’

99 ‘She who gives shade’.

100 ‘a—c: from B.

101 Meaning uncertain; salëssé is ‘to massage’. B adds that his father was To Amég.

102 A type of tree: in Bone.

103 ‘Not shaken’. According to other sources, La Tënrigëgë was Arung of Bunné; B adds that he was the brother of Da Cule.

104 ‘Objective, aim, goal’; unidentified.

105 In other sources We Padupa or We Adu; this is perhaps We Tënradiudu, the daughter of La Tërgëgë, above.

106 ‘To sag, as of a slack rope’.

107 A tree, the leaves of which were used as writing materials; in Bone.

108 ‘The one who arranges’

109 ‘Father of the great [one]’

110 ‘Crossing place’ (as of a river); in Soppeng, near Lomputë.

111 ‘Not mistress of a vessel’
Sanrangeng,\(^{112}\) (his teknonym was To Kellie\(^{2}\)),\(^{113}\) La Pammase,\(^{114}\) La Sekati, We Kocci\(^{115}\)

(239) (Generation 13) We Tënrising\(^{2}\)da\(^{116}\) and We Anrakati.\(^{117}\) (Generation 13) La Sanrangeng married at Tëllg\(^{118}\) with We Boa and their child was We Kellie\(^{2}\).\(^{119}\) (Generation 14) We Kellie\(^{2}\), the child of La Sanrangeng, married La Sappéang at Ataka\(^{2}\) and their child was La Ma\(^{2}\)gamang.\(^{122}\) (Generation 15) La Ma\(^{2}\)gamang, the child of We Kellie\(^{2}\), married at Pattojo.\(^{123}\) His children were the Datu Ali\(^{24}\) and La Tëpporina. (Generation 13) We Tënrising\(^{2}\)da, the child of To Lë\(^{2}\)ba\(^{26}\) married at Ujumpulu\(^{125}\) with La Malaka\(^{126}\) (To Acca\(^{127}\) was his teknonym). Their child was Karaeng Loë. (Generation 14). Karaeng Loë married at Ganra\(^{128}\) with the child of Matinroë ri asëlëng,\(^{129}\) called [We] Tënrisingamarëng.\(^{130}\) Their child was La Saliu\(^{2}\).\(^{131}\) (Generation 15) La Saliu\(^{2}\) married at Soppéng with Wë Tënriambëng.\(^{132}\) Their children were To Pajurangang, Da Wanua,\(^{133}\) Da Pag\(^{2}\) and Wë Rai\(^{6}\).\(^{135}\) (Generation 13) Wë Anrakati, the child of To Lë\(^{2}\)ba\(^{26}\), married at Lompullë\(^{136}\) with [La] Pacangkangi. Their child was To Wawo.\(^{137}\) (Generation 14) To Wawo, the child of Wë Anrakati and grandchild of To Lë\(^{2}\)ba\(^{26}\), married at Ganra

\(^{112}\) O.B. a well; or an outlet pipe set into a dam (Salim).

\(^{113}\) ·Father of the bamboo fence·

\(^{114}\) ·Gift·

\(^{115}\) ·Curly, kinky· (of hair)·

\(^{116}\) ·Did not become·

\(^{117}\) ·Gold [bird, fish, etc.]·-trap·. Only six children are listed; B supplies a seventh child, We Paccing, who is included in the translation.

\(^{118}\) A type of grass or reed, from which bird cages are woven; in Bone, near the border with Soppéng.

\(^{119}\) See To Kellli, above.

\(^{120}\) The act of hanging something; cf. La Sappé, above.

\(^{121}\) A tree of about six metres in height.

\(^{122}\) ·One with keen insight·

\(^{123}\) Possibly derived from tojo, ·stiff·; about five kilometers south of WatasSoppéng.

\(^{124}\) ·The One who derives the rulership from both Sides· (i.e. from his mother and father).

\(^{125}\) ·End of the mountains·

\(^{126}\) ·Prosperous· (cf. Matteis 1874:263 lipu malaka, ·a prosperous land·.)

\(^{127}\) ·Father of the clever [one]·

\(^{128}\) ·Spinning wheel·; about five kilometers east of WatasSoppéng.

\(^{129}\) ·He who sleeps in his origin·

\(^{130}\) ·Not regarded as a commoner·

\(^{131}\) ·Mist, fog·; according to other sources, La Saliu\(^{2}\) was the Arung of Ujumpulu.

\(^{132}\) This is Patépuangnég, an early seventeenth-century ruler of Sidénręng; cf. Salim 1:119 and MAK 129:2, where this marriage is recorded.

\(^{133}\) ·Mother of the land·

\(^{134}\) ·Mother of the fence·; according to other sources, Wë Tënriskawarëng, Datu Bulubangi in Sidénręng.

\(^{135}\) ·The raft·

\(^{136}\) In Soppéng.

\(^{137}\) ·Father of [the one who is] above·
(240) with [We] Ténrisamaréng (Da Rië was her teknonym) after she and her
cousin Karaëng Loë were divorced. Their child was La Pottobuné.

(Generation 15) La Pottobuné married at Marioriawo with Wé Ténrisui.

Their child was La Ténritatta (To Unru was his teknonym). He was also known as
Malame'gë gëmmë"na, as To Risompaë and "polëna ri Angke". Their
other children were Da Unru, Da Inra, Da Ompo and Da Ëmba.

La Sekëtta married at Marioriawa with Wé Mulia and their child was Wé Cëriwu.
Wé Cëriwu married at Laumpulë'rilau with La Musu and their child was the
one titled Juruamu. Juruamu married Da Lua, the sister of La Pottobuné (his
teknonym was To Bases), whose child was To Risompaë.

(Generation 13) La Pammase, the child of To Lë'baë, married at Alimu with Wé Palinrunji. Their
child was Wé Pacéro. (Generation 14) Wé Pacéro married La Pawsaë at
Pattojo and their child was Wé Ma"daung. (Generation 15) Wé Ma"daung
married her cousin, who was called To Batus, and their child was Wé Paccing.

(Generation 16) Wé Paccing married at Kebo and her child was To Pasampa.

(Generation 17) To Pasampa married [name omitted] and their children were Da

---

138 "Heavy bracelet"
139 "Upper Mario"; in north Soppeng.
140 "She who[se worth] cannot be calculated"
141 "He who is not struck"
142 "Probably a shortened form of To Appatunru", He who subdues" (Skinner 1963:232).
143 "He whose hair is long"
144 "Father of the one to whom obeisance is made"
145 "He who came from Angka", the river of that name which flowed through the Bugis kampung in
Batavia.
146 "Nimble, adroit".
147 "Rise up, emerge"
148 "Incomparable"
149 "One hundred"
150 "One thousand"
151 "East Laumpuléng"; in Soppeng, about three kilometres north of Ca"bengnge.
152 "War, battle"
153 "Flare up, or boil over"
154 "from B."
155 "She who gives shade"
156 "Spout, spray"
157 "The one who guides the perahu".
158 "Leafy"
159 "Father of the rock"
160 "Pure"
161 "White"; in Wajo, near the border with Soppeng.
162 "Father [of the one who] supports"
Rawe\textsuperscript{163} and Da Pagë\textsuperscript{5}. (Generation 13) La Pammase, the child of To Lëebae, married at Marioraiwa with his cousin, who was called

(241) I Mata\textsuperscript{164} and who was titled Mappaloë.\textsuperscript{165} Their children were To Wawo,\textsuperscript{166} La Pagë\textsuperscript{5} and Wë Sakkë\textsuperscript{6}.\textsuperscript{167} (Generation 14) To Wawo married Wë Belle\textsuperscript{6} and their child was La Tëmmaroa.\textsuperscript{169} (Generation 15) La Tëmmaroa married the sister of the Arung of Massëpë,\textsuperscript{170} who was called Wë Makkunrai,\textsuperscript{171} the child of La Pësaro.\textsuperscript{172} Their children were La Botto\textsuperscript{173} and La Sinampë.\textsuperscript{174}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{163} 'Almost the same'
\textsuperscript{164} 'Eye'
\textsuperscript{165} 'Wears a hat'
\textsuperscript{166} 'Father of [the one who is] above'
\textsuperscript{167} 'Complete'
\textsuperscript{168} A type of fish-trap.
\textsuperscript{169} 'Not crowded'
\textsuperscript{170} Approximately one kilometre south of Bulu Lowa in Sidërrëng.
\textsuperscript{171} 'Female'
\textsuperscript{172} 'Wages, profit'; or pësaro: 'fortune'
\textsuperscript{173} 'Small hill'
\textsuperscript{174} 'A moment'\
\end{flushright}
Figure 2-10: Royal Genealogy of Cina
2.5. The Attoriolonna Soppêng

The fifth work is another member of the series of "early histories" published in Bugis-Makasar script by Matthes in the first volume of the Boeginesche Chrestomathie (Matthes 1864:520-523). The title Attoriolonna Soppêng (History of Soppêng) (hereafter AS) is my own. It is derived from the title Attoriolongne ri Soppêng (The History from Soppêng), which is found only in MAK 90:30.11-32.11 and evidently is not part of the original work. Most versions of the AS begin with the words, Iana suré poadaadaëngni tanaë ri Soppêng, "This is the writing that tells of the land of Soppêng), to which the copyist of one version has added, "in the time of the ancient lords". However, will be seen below, an earlier form of the introduction began simply with the words Panëssaëngni yi[a]siyë ripau, "This sets out that which is told."

Matthes' version of the AS was based on that found in NBG 99:221.1-224.9, which was copied by Arung Mandallê from a codex owned by his father, Daeng Mêmangung of Kékêang (Matthes 1872b:60, Swellengrebel 1974:160). As with the case of the Lontara`na Simpurusia, the work which precedes the AS in NBG 99, Matthes' emendations were based in part upon two other versions of the AS, NBG 100:76.10-78.2 and NBG 111:36.1-38.11 (Matthes 1872b:60-61) and were executed directly upon the manuscript from which the published version was prepared. The published version runs thirteen manuscript lines into the following work, the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng (section 2.6), which Matthes appears to have used as the basis of his own King List on pages 524-526 of the first volume of the Chrestomathie. The inclusion by Matthes of the first thirteen lines of the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng appears to have been deliberate, for the end of the AS is clearly marked in NBG 99. The opening section of the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng contains an interesting anecdote about Wê Têkêwanua, the fourth-recorded ruler of Soppêng, which Matthes seems to have wished to include in the Chrestomathie. A set of notes dealing with obscure readings and the Romanized orthography of names and places was provided in Matthes 1872b:89-91 and a summary of the AS appeared in the Boeginesche en Makasaarsche Legenden (Matthes, 1885:7-9/Van den Brink, 1943:381-382). A Dutch-language translation of Matthes' version was later published by Kern (Kern 1929:298-301).
2.5.1. Versions of the AS

There are at least eleven versions of the AS extant.¹ These are listed in table 2-5. Versions will henceforth be identified by the letter given in the right-hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pages/Lines</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>43.5-43.15</td>
<td>A²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITLV</td>
<td>Or. 272 L</td>
<td>4.8-6.10</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30.11-32.11</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21.23-23.23</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5.1-7.29</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>182.1-183.31</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>221.1-224.9</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.10-78.2</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>48.1-49.28</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36.1-38.11</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>135.1-136.21</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All versions display a close similarity in content, structure and language. As with the case of the Lontara４na Simpurusia and the Royal Genealogy of Cina, this can only be explained by assuming them to have descended from a single archetype.

One version, E, stand out from all others. This is fully one-half as long again as any other; its additional material is spread throughout the text, enlarging upon the account provided by the other ten versions. This additional material is descriptive and adds little of importance (though much of interest) to the accounts of the other versions. In the light of our previous findings regarding related versions of the same work, it seems reasonable to assume that the additional material has come down to us from the archetype of the AS, and that it has been edited out of an ancestor from which ABCDFGHJKL are descended.

¹In Sulawesi I came across several further versions; these added little to the picture obtained from those listed above.

²There are no page numbers marked in A. The numbers given are arrived at by counting the remaining pages of this damaged manuscript. Folios appear to be confused; page 44 does not continue the AS but a separate work.
Version E is therefore selected for editing. As it produces few textual difficulties, and (with the exception of a variant opening section and what seems to be a missing line) other versions add nothing of substance, there is no need to establish the relationships between versions.

The only version to add anything of significance to E is B, which contains a longer and more detailed introduction. It seems clear from a comparison of B with E that B's introduction is the older:

\[
\begin{aligned}
Fasal & \text{Panessaênggi} \ \text{yi[a]}siyê \ \text{ri pau} \ \text{yi[a]} \ \text{matênana} \ \text{La Padoma} \\
& \text{matêtoni arungngê} \ \text{ri Kawu} \ \text{puttamànëttoni arung mënrê} \ \text{ri Galigo} \\
& \text{riwêlaini} \ \text{Sêwo} \ \text{sibawa} \ \text{Gattarêng} \ \text{lo}^b\text{bammanânni} \ \text{wanuwa} \\
& \text{nakkarungngiyê} \ \text{La Padoma} \ \text{sibawa} \ \text{akkarungêñna Opunna Kawu} \ \text{apa} \\
& \text{pada puttai} \ \text{aga} \ \text{napada no'ni masêuwa} \ \text{ri Soppêng} \ \text{tòKawuë} \\
& \text{tòGattarêngngê} \ \text{lo}^b\text{bammanânni} \ \text{akkarungngêñna} \ \text{La Padoma} \ \text{arungngê} \\
& \text{ri Kawu}.
\end{aligned}
\]

This sets out that which is told. La Padoma was dead, and dead was the Arung at Kawu; destroyed too were all the rulers whose ancestry could be traced to the age of [I La] Galigo. Sêwo and Gattarêng were left, and the settlements ruled by La Padoma and the Opu Kawu were all empty. [Sêwo and Gattarêng] were both destroyed, so the people of Kawu and the people of Gattarêng went down and formed one settlement at Soppêng. All the settlements ruled by La Padoma and the Arung of Kawu were empty.

Compare this with the introduction found in E:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{Yi[a]nae} \ \text{surec} \ \text{poada[a]daengngi} \ \text{tanae} \ \text{ri Soppêng} \ \text{yi[a]} \ \text{cappu'nana} \ \text{tê}^c \ \text{ri Galigo} \\
& \ \text{nawêlaini} \ \text{Gattarêng} \ \text{Sêwo} \ \text{no'ni} \ \text{ri Soppêng} \ \text{ma}^c\text{banuwa} \\
& \ \text{tawuë}.
\end{aligned}
\]

Here is the writing that tells of the land of Soppêng. Those whose ancestry could be traced to the age of [I La] Galigo were no more. Gattarêng and Sêwo were left and the people came down and settled at Soppêng.

Both versions now continue:

\[
\begin{aligned}
(B) & \ \text{yi[a]na} \ \text{tòSêwoyê} \ \text{riyasêng} \ \text{Soppê[n]riya} \ \text{to Gattarêngngê} \\
& \ \text{riyasêng} \ \text{Soppê[n]rilauw}^c\end{aligned}
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
(E) & \ \text{nayi[a]} \ \text{tòSêwoë} \ \text{yi[a]na} \ \text{riasêng} \ \text{Soppê[n]riya} \ \text{nayi[a]} \\
& \ \text{toGattarêngngê} \ \text{yi[a]na} \ \text{riasêng} \ \text{Soppê[n]rilauw}^c
\end{aligned}
\]

The people of Sêwo were called [the people of] West Soppêng and the people of Gattarêng were called [the people of] East Soppêng.

The opening lines of B are in part based upon the Bugis poem La Padoma Énnaja (The Tragedy of La Padoma). This poem provides the references to La Padoma and the Opu Batara Kawu (or Kau), the purpose of which is to account for the abandonment of Sêwo and Gattarêng.
The story of La Padoma Ėnnaja can be summarized as follows: La Padoma, the only child of the ruler of Bulu, visits Kau, where he is the guest of the Opu Batara Kau, the son of the ruler of the settlement of that name. Opu Kau's sister, Wê Dênradatu, spies La Padoma from an upstairs window; La Padoma catches her gaze and the two are immediately attracted to each other. Despite his engagement to Wê Mangkawani, a princess of Gattarêng, as well as a promise to his host that should he desire his sister, he will propose in the proper manner, La Padoma seduces Wê Dênradatu. Opu Batara Kau discovers La Padoma in his sister's bedroom: despite Wê Dênradatu's pleas, La Padoma goes out to fight him and is killed. The following morning, news of La Padoma's death is conveyed to his parents; grief-stricken, the men of Bulu march on Kau to recover the body of their dead prince. That evening, La Padoma's cousin, the Opu Batara Soppêng, arrives in Bulu. La Padoma's body is carried to Bulu Kaméññang (Kaméññang mountain) where he is buried. Opu Batara Soppêng calls on the assembled chiefs to join him in an attack on Kau: it is suggested that before attacking Kau, the ruler should be called upon to surrender his daughter, Wê Dênradatu, in order that she may accompany La Padoma in the afterlife. An envoy is sent to Kau, but the ruler refuses to surrender his daughter. Opu Batara Soppêng leads an attack on Kau and inflicts heavy casualties. Horrified by what she believes to be the death of her brother, as well as the general carnage, Wê Dênradatu is overcome by grief. Suddenly the spirit of La Padoma appears to Wê Dênradatu and summons her to join him in the afterlife. Wê Dênradatu falls to the ground lifeless. Discovering the body of his sister, her brother calls a truce, and informs Opu Batara Soppêng of Wê Dênradatu's death. Having seen for himself Wê Dênradatu's lifeless body, Opu Batara Soppêng leads the attacking army home.

Most of the places named in the poem can be identified. Bulu is probably Bulumatanre (perhaps the Bulu mentioned in Matthes 1874:788), a settlement formerly located on the summit of a one thousand metre mountain to the south-west of WatasSoppêng. Sêwo and Gattarêng were located on the tops of two ridges along the trail leading from WatasSoppêng to Bulumatanre. Kawu is probably in the same region, although in Sikki and Sande's version of the poem it is linked with Tonra in south Bonè.

---

3 This summary is based upon Sikki and Sande 1979. This is a transcription and Indonesian-language translation of a nineteenth-century version of the poem, which is currently in the possession of Drs Muhammad Salim. This version begins abruptly, La Padoma having already arrived in Kau, and the ending is confused and incomplete.
2.5.2. Dating the AS

In December 1986, a team of four Indonesian and Australian archaeologists and myself surveyed several sites in Soppeng. Sëwo and Bulumatanrë provided firm evidence of occupation from the fourteenth century to about 1700, when they were both abandoned. Patterns of ceramic sherd deposits on the surface of the sites, which formed the basis of our dating techniques, were remarkably similar at both places. Gattarëng, which was subsequently located, provided similar evidence of desertion about 1700 (Kallupa et al. 1988).

The AS must therefore postdate 1700. It seems probable from the evidence of the simultaneous abandonment of Sëwo, Gattarëng and Bulumatanrë that they were evacuated by force of arms, probably in a single campaign, and almost certainly from WatasSoppeng. From AS’s introduction it would seem that those who survived the attack were taken down to the Walanaë Valley and divided up between a number of settlements.

The reference to La Padoma shows that at the time of composition of the AS, the forced evacuation of Sëwo, Gattarëng and Bulumatanrë (and possibly a number of other settlements) was still part of popular memory. The author of the AS clearly meant the tragic death of La Padoma, the only son of the ruler of Bulu, and the death of Opu Batara Kau (who does not die in the Sikki and Sandi version of the poem) to be linked in his audience’s minds with the abandonment of Sëwo and Gattarëng. Later, when memory had faded and the need for a more acceptable account of events was no longer required, this element of the AS’s introduction was dropped in an ancestor of ACDEFGHJKL.

The oldest version of the AS is A, which appears from the microfilm to be written on good quality European paper attributable to the early nineteenth century. A, however, contains a short introduction typical of all versions but B. The ancestor of ACDEFGHJKL in which the references to La Padoma and Opu Batara Kau were deleted must pre-date the early nineteenth century. The AS can thus be

---

4 A report is being prepared (Kallupa et al. forthcoming): all interpretations, for which I take responsibility, are to some extent provisional. The archaeological evidence is examined in more detail in Chapter Five.

5 Nowhere in the poem is there any mention of their abandonment.

6 This interpretation is supported by the fact that B has an unusually condensed central section and ends with the posthumous titles of a number of eighteenth-century individuals, suggesting that from an early date its line of descent has been removed from that shared by ACDEFGHJKL.
securely dated to the eighteenth century: the loss of the reference to La Padoma by the early nineteenth century suggests that the AS was composed in the first half of the eighteenth century.

2.5.3. The AS as a Historical Source

The purpose, or function, of the AS is to legitimize kingship in Soppêng and to support the authority of the Datu of Soppêng against that of his chiefs. This it sets out to do by the describing how the headmen of East and West Soppêng invited the tomanurung who appeared at Sekkanilî and Liburen to become their first rulers. The tomanurung agree, but only after the headmen (the most prominent of whom are those of Botto, Bila and Ujung) have promised to obey them faithfully.

The AS was written some two hundred years after the unification of East and West Soppêng, and a minimum of five hundred years after the development in Soppêng of a local elite. Despite this distance, and allowing for the spurious origin of the people of Soppêng provided by its opening lines, historical traditions dating back to the pre-Islamic period are clearly contained within the AS. Tinco, a settlement which had probably been abandoned by the time of the composition of the AS, is named in it as the site of the palace of the ruler of West Soppêng. This, and the importance of the Matoa Tinco in the AS, is difficult to explain other than as a memory of the time when the rulers of West Soppêng had their palaces there.

The pre-sixteenth-century division of Soppêng is well known in the present-day kabupaten and confirmed in several independent written sources. In the capital WatasSoppêng may be heard many legends connected with local sites, such as the road-island in front of the former palace of Soppêng, where are buried three stones. These stones are said by local residents to mark the unification of the two kingdoms. It seems reasonable, therefore, to assume that the settlements named as belonging to East or West Soppêng are correctly ascribed; the division of settlements between the two kingdoms is broadly supported by local traditions.

7 See Chapter Five.
8 The archaeological evidence from Tinco supports this interpretation. The site is particularly rich in ceramic sherds, including a remarkable proportion of early monochromes.
2.5.4. Text, E

Yi[a]nae surë poada[a]daängngi tanae ri Soppêng \ yi[a] cappu'nana téfé ri Galigo \ nawelaini Gattarêng \ Séwo \ no'ni ri Soppêng ma²banuwa tauwe \ nayi[a] toSëwoei \ yi[a]na riasêng Soppê[n]riaja \ nayi[a] toGattarêngngê \ yi[a]na riyasêng Soppê[n]rilau² \ énnêng pulona pammatoangêng \ Soppê[n]rilau² \ naduwa Soppê[n]riaja \ napa'duwanâ alêna toSoppêngngê \ nayi[a] Saloᵗungo \ Lo[m]po'o² \ Ku'râ \ Pani[n]cong \ Talagaë \ Riatassalo² \ Ma[ng]kuto² Maccilë \ Watuwatu \ Akka[m]pêng \ pa'duirênnâ Soppê[n]rilau² \ nayi[a] Pêsse \ Sëppang \ Pising \ Laanga \ Matabulu \ Ara² \ Lisu \ Lawo \ Ma'déllorilau² \ Ti[n]co pa'duirênnâ \ Soppê[n]riaja \ nayi[a] Cë[n]rana \ Salo²karaja \ Malaka \ Matoanging \ ri laleŋ Soppêttopâ \ naduwangini \ malai pa'duirêng \ pîtu lapi'nî \ dé² puwanna \ toSoppêngngê \ puppu²¹⁰ té² ri Galigo \ nayi[a]mani matoa énnêngngê pulona \ paoto² palëwu²tanae \ namanurunna pëtta ri Sekkânilî \ napaisêenna Matoa Ti[n]co¹¹ \ napoadani Matoa Botto \ Matoa Ujung \ Matoa Bila \ makkêdaë \ ê[ng]karo \ [to]manurung \ ri Sekkânilî \ makkêdanı Matoa Bila \ Matoa Botto \ Matoa Ujung \ mädéêngngni tapaisêngngi toSoppê[n]rilau²⁶ \ aga [êng]kani Matoa Saloᵗungo \ makkêdasi kadoni toSoppê[n]riajaë \ toSoppê[n]rilau²⁶ \ makkêdanı Matoa Ujung ëesso laippi talao makkarangngi alê \ makkêdai Matoa Saloᵗungo takkalai² madëppu²dëppungêng \ mädéênnisa takkarang alê \ sarëmamašämî \ talai puwêng¹² \ nayi[a] dongiri tênnatipai² \ salipuri têmmadingiwi² [m]pêsseï têmmakapai² \ [m]pawai² ri mawê² ri mabela \ namau ana'ta \ pattarota \ natëyaiwi tatëyaitoi \ ñia¹³ purai kua laoni matoae¹⁴ énnêngngê pulona \ napalattu'ni ri tomanurungngê \ makkêdanı ri¹⁵ Matoa Ujung \ Matoa Botto \ Matoa Bila \ yi[a]na kiê[ng]kang \ maiê La Marupê² \ mae'lôkêng

(6) muamasèi \ aja'na maullajang \ naikona kipopuang \ mudongiri têmmatipakkêng \ musalipuri têmmadingiikêng \ muwëssé têmmakapakkêng muwëssé têmmakapakkêng¹⁶ \ naikona [m]pawakkêng ri mawê² ri mabela \ namau

⁹ Mangkuto read Mangkutu
¹⁰ This is spelt Puu.
¹¹ D adds jënnamêppë ængkana matowa pa'duisêngngê toSoppê[n]riaja. (Similar readings are found in other versions.) The additional words are included in the translation in such a way as to show that they do not form part of the present version.
¹² puwêng read puwang
¹³ tatëyaitoi \ sìa read tatëyaitoisia
¹⁴ matoae read matoa
¹⁵ ri is omitted in the translation.
¹⁶ The words muwëssé têmmakapakkêng are accidentally repeated at the beginning of a new line: they are omitted in the translation.
anacmëng \ pattarommëng mutëaiwi kitéaito \ makkëdai tomanurungnë \ tania sangkammu riolalë\footnote{This is spelt RioLaLi.} puatta\footnote{puatta read puammu} naë laono mai kulaëngngëkko muttered \ lokkani lattu'ë makkëdai puatta manurungnë \ polë pëgako matoa \ makkëdai polë muka lolallolang \ naë [ëng]kairo toSoppëngnë \ yi[a]manëng \ makkëdai Matoa Botto Matoa Ujung \ Matoa Bila \ Matoa Ti[n]co \ yi[a]na kië[n]kang maiyë La Marupë\footnote{Mauëkëkëng muamasë \ aja'ëa muallajang \ naikona kippu\ëwë \ muongiri têmmatipakkëng musalipuri têmmadingikkëng \ ri mawë\ë ri mëbëla \ namau anacmëng patarommëng mutëaiwi \ kitéaitoi \ makkëdai pëtta manurungnë \ pëkkuna\ë matoa \ me[n]rë\ë ri Soppëng \ nadë\ë bolaku sama métëtëni matoaë \ ënnëngnë pulona \ ënkkënna La Marupë\ë \ ma²boloko \ makkëdasi pëtta agasi matoa rilisëkkiyangnëg \ bolë \ nadë\ësa ataku \ makkëdai matoaë \ yi[a]pa pattëkkako ana'ëku \ ëppoku \ makkëdamusi pëtta manurungnë \ agasi kupu[n]rëangngi lïsë\ë bolaku \ sama métësëi matoa pa²dûisëngnë \ rë aja \ rauë \ makkëda \ ëkénéna laowakkorumë \ makkëdani pëtta manurungnë \ ri Sëkkañi \ têmmubalëcëcorna[n]ga'mënnang tëmmusalakaë lëssëga apaë \ yi[a] makkëdamu[a] \ mau ana'ëku \ pattaroku \ mutëyaiwi kutëyaito\footnote{Immediately following this complex is an accidental repeat of the previous twenty three akara, starting from yi[a]: these are omitted in the translation.} \ yi[a] makuto mau ana'ëku pataroku \ mutëyaiwi \ kitéaito \ sicë[ppa]ni mutowa\footnote{mutowa read matoa} ënnëngnë pulona \ pëtta manurungnë \ ç[ëng]kamanënì bissë \ ramëramëngnëg \ adidëwatang\footnote{Little sense can be made of the grammatical structure of this complex, which appears to refer to ceremonies carried out on behalf of the gods of the pre-Islamic pantheon.} \ nalëkë'ë \ me[n]rë\ë ri Soppëng \ nakkuna ri bolana Matoa Ti[n]co ripatakakkappo \ na²pangujumanënni matoa ënnëngnë pulona \ l[a]o me[n]rë\ë ri bulë\ë mafë\ëbang \ napaisënna pëtta manurungnë \ nata[m]paimanënni pammatowangëngnëg \ Soppë[n]rilau² Soppë[n]riaja \ makkëdai pëtta manurungnëg \ yi[a] uta[m]paiyakko \ iko silisë\ë \ ajë[a]mu \ mue[n]rë\ë mafë\ëbang \ ri bulë\ë \ kadoni toSoppëngnëg \ ëga wënnini \ poëni gütte² kîlë'ë \ naturunna urë[n]riwuë² \ pitung êssë \ pita[m]pënni \ samanna \ [ë][lo]² maruttung langë \ namarutu[n]rutunna bulë\ë \ nayi[a] aju marajaë \ maukëkk'ëkkë'ëni \ napolëna le[m]pë'ë namali²manënna ajuë ri bulë\ë \ nayi[a] aju malë\ë \ narëkkë lattu'ë ri attana Ti[n]co ta[ng]si \ ajuë \ nabukëna aju saloë² \ ri atta[na] Ti[n]co nakkuna turung toSoppëngnëg \ mafë\ëbang \ na-
(7) patettonnə la[ng]kana ri Ti[n]co tépui la[ng]kanaē \ tudassīSoppēssii
pammatoangēngē \ makkēdana pētta manurungngē \ yi[a] upoadako \ iko silisē
toSoppēngngē \ ē[ng]katu sapposisēkku24 manurung ri Liburēng \ madēcēngngi
muakkarangalēmu duppaiwi \ kudua sapparakko mupodēcēngngē \ nayi[a'] Datu ri
Soppē[n]riaja \ nayi[a]tonasa Datu ri Soppē[n]rilau' \ purai kuwa laoni matowa
ēnnēngngē pulona \ lattu'ni ri Liburēng \ kua riasēngngē ri goariē \ napoleina
tomanurungngē \ tudang ri balubu a'dēparēnna \ makkēdai Matao Ujung \ Matao
Botto \ Matao Bila \ yi[a]na mai La Marupē\ ki[ē]ngka \ maelo'kēnŋ muamasēnŋ \ aja'na mualalajang \ iko kipopuwan \ mudongiri tēmmatipakkēŋ
musalipuri tēmmadingikkēŋ muwēssē tēmmakkapakkēŋ \ muwawakēŋ ri mawē\ ri
mabēla namau ana'mēnŋ mutēaiwi kitēyaito \ makkēdai
manurungngē ri goarinna \ tēmmubalēccora[n]ga\ tēmmusalaka\ lēsso'ga \ apa\ mau yi[a] ana'ku \ pattaroku mutēaiwi \ kutēaito \ makkuluadassi manurungngē \ matoaē \ yi[a]naro akkuluadangēnna \ toSoppēngngē matowaē \ lattu\ ritorimo[n]rina datuē \ navorimo[n]rina25 matowaē \ tammat

\[a\]Apa\ yi[a] tēkkēana\ tēkkēēppo'napa \ pētta manurungngē yi[a] duwa \ Matao
Botto Matao Ujung \ Matao Bila \ poadaï ada nasamaturur'siyē \ matoa
ēnnēngngē pulona \ ala ada massu\ ala ada muttama \ kuwaētopa ala ada ri lalēŋ
Soppēŋ \ naē kkēana'ni \ pētta manurungngē \ yi[a] duwa \ naē kkēepponi
ē[ng]kana Pangēpa \ ē[ng]kana Pa'da[n]rēng yi[a]tosi samasituru'turu\ Arung Bila
Datuē \ Datuē26 ri Botto \ Datuē ri Ujung \ torilalēŋ Soppēngngē yi[a]manēŋ
\ ala ada massu\ \ ala ada muttama \ ala ada ri lalēŋ Soppēŋ narēkko
ē[ng]kamanēnni situru\ sikuwaēro tē[n]rigilinni adaē \ tammat27

---

22. This is spelt NaPaTēoNa.
23. This is spelt TuDaSioPēSL.
24. This is spelt SaPoSīKu.
25. torimo[n]rina read torimunrina.
26. The second occurrence of Datuē is omitted in the translation.
27. a— a: This section is separated from the main body of the text in most versions.
2.5.5. Translation

This is the writing that tells of the land of Soppeng. Those whose ancestry could be traced to the age of Galigo were no more.28 Gattaréng and Séwó29 were left, and the people came down and settled at Soppeng. The people of Séwó were called the people of West Soppeng and the people of Gattaréng were called the people of East Soppeng. There were sixty headmanships in East Soppeng and West Soppeng and the body of the people of Soppeng was divided in two.30 Salotungo, Lompoè, Kuéba, Panincong, Talagaé, Riatassaloè, Mangkutu, Macclé, Watuwatu and Akkampeng comprised East Soppeng. Pessé, Sëppang, Pising, Laanga, Matabulu, Araè, Lisu, Lawo, Maèdélorilauè and Tinco comprised West Soppeng. Cenrana, Salokaraja, Malaka and Matoaing were also in Soppeng and were divided up and included [in the two groupings].31 For seven generations32 the people of Soppeng were without lords. Those whose ancestry could be traced to the age of Galigo were no more, and the sixty headmen alone ruled the land.33 Then our lord descended at Sekkañili.34 His appearance was made known by Matoa Tinco,35 Jënnampéssé36 [was the] headman who made this known to the people of West Soppeng.37 Matoa Botto, Matoa Ujung and Matoa Bila38 spoke, saying, "There is a tomanurung over at Sekkañili." The headmen of Bila, Botto and Ujung said, "It

---

28. The "age of I La Galigo", which was supposed to have preceded the appearance of the historical rulers of South Sulawesi.
29. Séwó was located on the small hill of that name behind WataSoppeng; Gattaréng, "a flat ridge top", was situated on the ridge directly to the south-west of Séwó. Archaeological evidence suggests that both settlements were abandoned around 1700.
30. The former division of Soppeng is supported in a number of independent written and oral sources. East and West Soppeng were united in the early sixteenth century by La Mataesso, the ruler of West Soppeng (Abdurrazak 1967:10).
31. Most of the settlements listed can be identified on a map of Soppeng: see page 199. Salotungo (river bend), Talagaé (the water), Riatassalo (south of the river), Watuwatu (stony), Sëppang (the name of a tree) and Salokaraja (river toll) are the only ones with clearly identifiable meanings.
32. generations: lapifè, "layers"
33. The motif of a rulerless period of seven generations preceding the appearance of a tomanurung is almost certainly based upon a similar motif in the Chronicle of Bone, the opening pages of which appear to have provided the model for the present work.
34. According to the Royal Genealogy of Soppeng (section 2.6), Sekkañili was the origin of the ruling lineage of West Soppeng. The name Sekkañili today appears to refer solely to the clearing in Kampung Pêta Balubuè (our lords of the jars), desa Turutappæ, approximately two kilometers west of Leworéng, approximately eighteen kilometers north of Soppeng, where there are two well preserved, pre-Islamic jar-burial sites. The higher and larger of these contains the remains of a large, fifteenth-century green-celadon Chinese jar. The site is said to be that of a woman; it is just possible that the jar is the one in which the ashes of Wë Tekéwanua, the fourth-recorded ruler of West Soppeng, who married at Leworéng, were buried.
35. Matoa can be roughly translated as "headman". Tinco appears to have been the early capital of West Soppeng: see page 111, footnote 47.
36. It is not clear whether Jënnampéssé is a title of the Matoa Tinco or a separate individual. Jënnang is a political office, Wëssé is a rice sheaf.
37. -a: from D.
38. Henceforth referred to as "the headmen of ... ". Bila Botto and Ujung are today within the urban boundaries of the provincial capital WataSoppeng. Their former rulers are described by Matthes (1874:788, under épà)39 as three of the four great lords of Soppeng.
would be good if we made this known to the people of East Soppêng." Then there was the Matoa Salotungo.\textsuperscript{39} He said that the people of East Soppêng agreed with the people of West Soppêng. Matoa Ujung said, "On another day we will go and arrange ourselves." Matoa Salotungo said, "We have already come together. It would be good for us to arrange ourselves. He may take pity on us. We will take him as lord. He will protect [our fields] from birds so that we are not without food, cover us so that we are not cold, bind our rice sheaves so that we are not empty and lead us near and far. Should he reject even our wives and children, we too will reject them." So the sixty headmen set off. When they reached the one who descended\textsuperscript{40} the headmen of Ujung, Botto and Bila said, "We have come here, O blessed one, to ask

(6) you to take pity [on us]. Do not disappear. We take you as as lord. You protect our fields from birds so that we do not lack food. You cover us so that we are not cold. You bind our rice sheaves so that we are not empty and you lead us near and far. Should you reject even our wives and children, we too will reject them."\textsuperscript{41} The one who descended said, \textquoteleft May it not be ... our lord.\textquoteright\textsuperscript{42} Now come here and I will lead you." They set off, and when they arrived [where the other headmen were waiting], our lord who descended said, "Where are you headmen from?" [The headmen] said, "We come from all around." Then there were all the people of Soppêng. The headmen of Botto, Ujung, Bila and Tino said, "We have come here, O blessed one, to ask you to take pity [on us]. Do not go away. We take you as lord. You protect [our fields] from birds so that we do not lack food. You cover us so that we are not cold and [you lead us] near and far. Should you reject even our wives and children, we too will reject them." Our lord who descended said, "How will it be, headmen, if I come up to Soppêng, for I do not have a house." The sixty headmen replied together, "We will build you a house, O blessed one." Our lord said, "Will you headmen fill the house? For I have no servants of my own." The headmen said, "We will send over our children and

\textsuperscript{39} The Matoa Salotungo represents the people of East Soppêng in the present work. Salotungo lies one kilometer south-east of Ujung.

\textsuperscript{40} From what follows, would seem that the tomanurung is approached first by the headmen of Botto, Bila and Ujung, while the other headmen wait at a distance. There is no hill at Sekkanili, which lies in a flat rice-growing area of the central Walanae valley.

\textsuperscript{41} Cf. a similar passage in the Chronicle of Bone, which appears to have served as a model: "Here we come to you, lord. We want you to have mercy [on us], and to establish yourself here in your land. Do not disappear. You we will make lord. Your wish is what we wish, just as commands are. Even our children and wives [if you reject them, we also reject them in turn. If only you will stay here, then you will have us as slaves. You will protect us against lack of food" (Macknight and Mukhlis, forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{britania sangkamu riolali puatta.}
grandchildren." Our lord who descended said, "How will I feed the people of my house?" The headmen who comprised West [and] East [Soppêng] replied together, saying, "We will go and open fields." Our lord who descended at Sekkañili said, "You will not all act treacherously towards me? You will not wrongfully depose me?" So they said simply, "Should you reject even our wives and children, we too will reject them." The sixty headmen made an agreement with our lord who descended. Then there were all the bissu in great numbers, making offerings to the gods, as [our lord] was carried ceremoniously up to Soppêng. When they had assembled at Matoa Tinco's house, the sixty headmen made ready to ascend the hill [of Tinco] to fell [the trees]. Our lord who descended made an announcement, and he summoned all the headmen of East Soppêng and West Soppêng. Our lord who descended said, "The reason I have summoned you all is simply so that you do not go up the hill to fell [the trees]." The people of Soppêng agreed. When night fell there came thunder and lightning and a great storm arose. For seven days and seven nights it was as if the sky were falling. The great trees were uprooted, then a flood came and carried all the trees down the hill. The trees that had been driven down the hill came to rest south of Tinco, and blocked the river south of Tinco. So the people of Soppêng went down to collect [the trees].

(7) and they began constructing a palace at Tinco. When the palace was completed the headmen rested in Soppêng. Our lord who descended said, "This it what I have to say to you, all you people of Soppêng. There is a cousin of mine, [who] descended at Liburêng. It would be good if you arranged yourselves and went to meet him. We will both seek what is good for you. I will be the ruler of West Soppêng and he the ruler of East Soppêng." So the sixty headmen set off [and shortly] came to Liburêng, [where there was] the one who was called ["He who

43 Cf. the Chronicle of Bone: "Your thoughts are not double. You do not lie."
44 cr. the Chronicle: "Your thoughts are not double. You do not lie.
45 Probably Tinco Baru, at the foot of the hill.
46 collect: mañbang, "fell"
47 The building of the palace suggests that the early "capital" of West Soppêng was at Tinco [Tinco Lama], which was situated on the ridge of a low hill some seven kilometers north of WatasSoppêng. Archaeological evidence supports this interpretation: Tinco Lama is particularly rich in ceramic sherd deposits (including early monochromes) and shows clear evidence of occupation by an elite-group from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. In addition, there are a number of jar burial sites at the north-west end of the ridge, where, until recently, fertility ceremonies appear to have been conducted. There is also a local tradition of there once having been a palace [langkana] on top of the hill.
48 Desa Liburêng, approximately twelve kilometers south of WataSoppêng.
descended] in the sleeping chamber." The one who descended had arrived in a jar from which he had emerged. The headmen of Ujung, Botto and Bila said, "We have come here, O blessed one, to ask you to take pity [on us]. Do not disappear. We take you as lord. You protect [our fields] from birds so that we are not without food [and] you cover us so that we are not cold. You bind our rice sheaves so that we are not empty and you lead us near and far. Should you reject even our wives and children, we too will reject them." The one who descended in his chamber said, "You will not act treacherously towards me? You will not wrongfully depose me?" [The headmen replied,] "Should you reject even our wives and children, we too will reject them." The one who descended and the headmen made an agreement. That was the agreement of the people of Soppeng and the headmen that has come down to the descendants of the rulers and to the descendants of the headmen.

While our two lords who descended had no children and no grandchildren, the headmen of Botto, Ujung and Bila ruled [Soppeng] in agreement with the sixty headmen. [They] sent orders out and sent orders in [and they] sent orders inside Soppeng. Then our two lords who descended had children and grandchildren. There were [instituted the offices of] Pangêpa and Padanrêng. They were obeyed by the Arung Bila, Datu Botto and Datu ri Ujung and all the people of Soppeng, [they] sent orders out and sent orders in [and they] sent orders inside Soppeng. They were obeyed by all, for the orders could not be changed.

---

49. In the sleeping chamber: ri goariê (Makasar), perhaps here a place name. In kampung Goariê, desa Liburêng, can be seen what appears to be a well-preserved jar-burial site. In WatasSoppeng I was shown a recent photograph of the bissu charged with the keeping of the Soppeng regalia performing a ritual at this site.

50. emerged: a "dêpparênna, "hatched", as from an egg.

51. Cf. page 123, footnote 54.

52. Pangêpa was the more important of the two offices. Here the AS accounts for the difference by making the children of the tomanurung the first Padanrêng, and their grandchildren the first Pangêpa.

53. d—d: It is not clear whether this passage is part of the AS or a later addition; the present version, like others, separates it from the main body of the AS by the word tammat.
2.6. The Royal Genealogy of Soppeng

The Royal Genealogy of Soppeng (hereafter RGS) is a genealogy of the ruling family of Soppeng. Starting with the La Téemmamala, the tomanurung of Sekkañili, it records some fourteen of the former kingdom’s pre-Islamic rulers and nearly one hundred of their descendants.

As was previously stated, Soppeng originally consisted of two kingdoms, Soppenriaja (West Soppeng) and Soppenrilau (East Soppeng). Each of these was evidently a separate political unit, though regular intermarriage between their ruling families is almost certain. (One such marriage is recorded in the RGS.) East and West Soppeng were unified in the sixteenth century by La Mataesso, West Soppeng’s eleventh ruler, who drove his cousin, La Makkaroda, out of East Soppeng (Abdurrazak 1967:10). For the first ten generations, therefore, the RGS traces just the West Soppeng family.

Matthes’ published a brief list of Soppeng’s rulers, which was evidently based upon one or more versions of the present work (Matthes 1864:524-26, 1872b:91-93). It would be a simple matter to prepare such a list from any of the longer versions of the RGS, or from a manuscript list of Soppeng’s rulers, such as NBG 208:133.1-133.19.

2.6.1. Versions of the RGS

Versions of the RGS are shown in table 2-6. These will henceforth be referred to by the letter given in the right-hand column. Page and line numbers extend to the second mention of La Ténribali (c.1659-1676), the fourteenth recorded ruler, or to the point at which the text ends, if this occurs first. A and H are simply lists of rulers and are omitted from the following discussion.

---

1 The present work names La Sekati, La Mataesso's elder brother, as the eleventh ruler.
2 The first five rulers are described as Datu of West Soppeng, while three of the remaining five are identified as rulers by what appear to have been personal titles.
3 It is my opinion that these lists have been extracted from longer versions of the RGS, such as CDGJ. This is in keeping with the evidence so far that material is generally lost rather than added in the repeated copying of Bugis historical sources for the period before 1600. For a contrasting view regarding the Malay historiographic tradition, see Roolvink [1967:311], who argues that the Sejarah Melayu was developed by adding material to an earlier king list; how this material was transmitted before its incorporation is not discussed.
Table 2-6: Versions of the RGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Page.Line</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.1-33.14</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37.34-38.16</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>146.2-148.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>224.10-230.6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.23-91.7</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49.26-50.13</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>45.16-50.4</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>133.1-133.20</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>136.22-139.16</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the variations found in the seven versions indicates that they can be divided into three groups. The basis of this division can be illustrated by a comparison of their opening sections. Page and line numbers are from D and orthography is standardized to avoid unnecessary complication.

1. At 224.11 BDEFJ have nalao ma'bawine ri Suppa² while C has iatona Arung ri Soppêng ri aja naia siala and G iatona pammula Datu ri Soppêng ri aja naia siala.

2. At 225.1 BDEFJ have ma'bawine siala while CG have ma'bawine ri Suppa² siala.

3. At 225.1-2 BEF have iana nrêwê² ri Suppa² Datu while DJ have iana nrêwê² Datu ri Suppa²: C omits this passage, while G has iana napolê Matinroê ri Pamatingêng sibawa a'datuangngê ri Soppêngngê ri Soppêng.

4. At 225.5 CG omit the anecdote about Wê Têkêwanua and resume at 225.10 with the words Wê Têkêwanua mallakkai.

5. At 225.7 BEF have natujuna apa while DJ have (correctly) natujui attampang. The copyist of G appears to have noticed the error and corrected it by adding the aksara Ta above the line.
6. At 225.8 BEF omit DJ's attampang.

7. At 225.9 BEF have ri wanua ia toNēpo while DJ have siwanua toNēpoē.

It can be seen from the above examples that versions BEF consistently agree with each other, as does D with J. CG differ from BEF in four places, the most significant differences being the omission of the anecdote about Wē Tekewanua (example 4 above). C and G provide different readings for two of their three other variations, but, more importantly, both differ at the same places. D and J agree consistently; both contain CG's missing anecdote and share five minor deviations from BEF.

The close linguistic and structural similarity between versions leaves little doubt that all are descended from a single ancestor. We shall call this archetype ω. The next task is to establish the relationships between the seven versions. Our conclusions are as follows:

1. If BDEFGJ's anecdote was a part of ω then it must have been omitted in an ancestor of CG. If the anecdote was not a part of ω, then it must have been added in an ancestor of BDEFGJ. That the former is more likely can be argued on the grounds of the anecdote's symbolic (and seemingly archaic) language and its reference to a late-fourteenth-century ruler, little memory of whom is likely to have survived outside of a written source. We shall call the version which excluded the anecdote α.

2. The close agreement between versions BEF suggests that they share a recent ancestor. BEF end earlier than do CG, with the statement that La Makkanēngnga was the fourth ruler of West Soppēng. BEF must, therefore, be separated from CG by an ancestor which omitted the later rulers. We shall call this version β. DJ, however, share CG's ending as well as BEF's anecdote. DJ's line of descent must therefore have separated from that of BEF before β. This could have occurred either before or after CG's line of descent broke away from that of BEF, though DJ's general closeness to BEF suggests the latter.

---

4 C and G offer essentially the same reading at 224.11 (example 1) while G's problematic reading at 225.1-2 (example 3) may have been omitted in an ancestor of C. G also shows signs of orthographic "correction" of a number of names, some of which are footnoted in the translation.
The family relationship of the seven versions is illustrated diagrammatically in figure 2-11. This is the simplest possible relationship, based on the assumption of a process of accumulated scribal error and periodic revision of the text.

$D$ is selected for editing for three reasons. Firstly, like $CG$, it offers a longer text than do $BEF$. Secondly, it contains the anecdote omitted in $CG$. Thirdly, $D$'s copyist has simplified the task of editing the RGS by dividing it into fifteen numbered "sections" (the use of parenthesis is to avoid confusion with the present thesis' divisions), each "section" representing one generation of Soppeng's rulers. Nevertheless, $D$ is not without problems. While the existence of a minimum of three other versions (two of which belong to a separate line of descent) throughout the work makes choosing between substantive variants a relatively straightforward task, it is clear that $\omega$ itself contained a number of textual errors and omissions.

In keeping with the objectives of this thesis the text of $D$ is edited and translated to the end of "section" fourteen, the subjects of "section" fifteen falling outside the period of reference. Lastly, I have deviated from the usual layout of text and translation by following the text's own division into "sections", and marking manuscript page-breaks within these sections in the text only. This makes both the text and translation easier to follow.

---

5 Of the other five versions, only $J$ has these divisions. $J$ is in some ways a superior version to $D$, but was not available to me until recently.
2.6.2. Dating the RGS

If we assume the endings of versions CDG to reflect a similar ending in the group's archetype, ω, the RGS can be dated to the seventeenth century. An earlier date is unlikely, due to the use of posthumous titles for two of the three children of Soppêng's fifteenth-recorded ruler, whose names conclude the RGS.

2.6.3. The RGS as a Historical Source

The absence of legendary elements and the occurrence throughout of names which reflect the features of an inland, agricultural society, suggests that the sources of the RGS were genealogical records. The reliability of these records for the period after 1400 seems beyond serious question: two fifth-generation members, one sixth-generation member, and possibly two eighth-generation members, can be cross-referenced with the Royal Genealogy of Cina, a work which draws upon what is clearly an independent tradition. As will be seen from the chronological evidence of the RGS and other genealogies examined in section 3.1, the names of the first four generations of Soppêng's rulers probably derived (via written sources) from an oral tradition and may be less reliable. The names of these rulers, however, are of the same general type as the others and thus must derive from a similar historical background.
2.6.4. Text, D

Taniya upomabusung\(^6\) \ lakkë\(^7\)lakkë\(^i\) \ wiya toma[ng]kau\(^7\) \ La Tëmmammala \ asënna \ manurungngë \ ri Sékkânli \ nalao ma\(^b\)bawinë \ ri Suppa\(^z\) \ siyala \ Wë Mappupu \ ana\(^n\)nani \ La Maracinna \ (225)

2

7 La Maracinana \ ma\(^b\)bawinë \ siyala Wë Kawa \ ana\(^n\)ni \ La Bo[\(m\)]bang \ yi[a]na [n]rëwë\(^z\) Datu ri Suppa\(^z\) \ ana\(^n\)ni \ La Bang \ yi[a]na Datu Soppë[n]riyaja

3

La Bassi \ lao ma\(^b\)bawinë \ ri Balusu \ siyala Wë Tima[n]ratu \ ana\(^n\)ni \ Wë Tëkëwanuwa

4

Wë Tëkëwanuwa Datu \ Soppë[n]riyaja \ yi[a]na \ [m]pawa tana \ ri Suppa\(^z\) \ napuei malë\(^b\)ba\(^z\) \ napoloi malla[m]pë\(^z\) \ nattanëng të\(^bu\) \ nalolo\(^z\) bërebë \ natiro tapparëng \ natuji \ atta[m]pang \ toSidë[n]rëngngë \ natiro tapparëng \ natuji atta[m]pang \ toNëpoë \ manu\(^z\) \ bëkku tiro tapparëng \ natuji atta[m]pang \ toMariyoriyawaë \ tiroi tasi\(^z\) \ siwanuwa \ toNëpoë \ nay[i]a \ Wë Tëkëwanuwa \ maloloë\(^z\) \ yi[a]na \ Datu \ ri Suppa\(^z\) \ nallakkai \ Wë Tëkëwanuwa \ ri Lëworeng \ siyala \ La Tëmmapest\(^2\) \ pitu ana\(^n\)na \ ana\(^n\)ni \ La Wadëng \ yi[a]na sëppëi \ Bila \ yi[a]na mula Mangëpa ri Soppëng \ nay[i]a \ a[n]ring sirappi\(^z\)na La Wadëng \ riyasëng La Makkëngnga \ yi[a]na Datu Soppë- \(226\) [n]riaja\(^10\) \ ana\(^n\)ni \ La Dumola \ ana\(^n\)ni \ La Tubë \ ana\(^n\)ni \ Wë Baku \ ana\(^n\)ni \ Të[n]ritabirëng \ Të[n]ritabirënga \ nallakkai \ ri Baringëng \ sïala \ La Pañorongi \ ana\(^n\)ni \ La Të[n]rilëë \ ana\(^n\)ni La Tërënga \ ana\(^n\)ni La Tëssipalla\(^11\) \ ana\(^n\)ni \ La Karëkkëng \ ana\(^n\)ni Wë Lirojaji \ ana\(^n\)ni \ La Tëmmata

---

\(^6\)The manuscript text is heavily annotated and the original reading frequently uncertain, particularly when read from a microfilm. Where in doubt, I have chosen what appears to be the better reading.

\(^7\)Arabic numbers are used throughout. As with the Royal Genealogy of Cina, \(5\) is used for 5.

\(^8\)This is spelt NaLoo.

\(^9\)This is spelt MaLooQe.

\(^10\)BEF end here.

\(^11\)G’s reading of La Tënripalla\(^z\) is followed in the translation.
La Makkanêngnga \ mababine\textsuperscript{12} \ ri Bulumata[n]ré \ siyala \ Wë Tëna \ anaⁿi \ La Karélla \ \\
6
La Karélla \ siala \ massapposisêng \ anaⁿa \ Arung Bila \ La Wadêng \ riasëng \ Wë Bolossugi \ anaⁿi \ La Pawiséang \ anaⁿi \ La Matagima \ anaⁿani \ Wë Raië\textsuperscript{13} \ anaⁿi \ Wë Bao \ anaⁿani \ Wë Bulutana \ anaⁿi \ Të[n]ripalesê \ \\
7
La Pawiséang \ siala \ Wë Tëmmupagë\textsuperscript{14} \ ri Pising \ anaⁿi \ La Pasappoi \ yi[a]muto riasëng \ Soro[m]palië \ anaⁿi \ La Pawawoi \ anaⁿi \ La Pawawu \ anaⁿi \ La Warani \ anaⁿi \ Wë Tëkëlë\textsuperscript{15} \ anaⁿi \ Wë Jampucinna \ (227) \ \\
8
La Pasappoi \ maⁿbawine \ ri Baringëng \ yi[a]muto riasëng \ Core[m]palië\textsuperscript{16} \ siala \ Wë Tappatana \ Da Wiring asëng \ ri anaⁿa \ anaⁿi \ La Mannussa \ To wAkkarangëng \ asëng \ ri anaⁿa \ yi[a]muto riasëng \ Mati[n]roë \ ri tanana \ anaⁿi \ La Mapaⁿompaa \ anaⁿi \ Wë Sidamanasa \ aga natêllu \ si[i]na siama \ Mati[n]roë \ ri tanana \ \textit{tammat} \ \\
9
La Mannussa \ To Akkarangëng \ Mati[n]roë \ ri tanana \ siala massapposisêng \ anaⁿañe \ Wë Tëkëlë\textsuperscript{17} \ ri asëng \ Wë Tëmmagopa \ anaⁿi \ La Dë \ anaⁿi \ La Co \ La Wadêng \ siala \ Wë Bubu \ anaⁿi \ La Pasajo \ anaⁿi \ Wë Të[n]riaⁿbang \ anaⁿi \ La Ga \ lupang\textsuperscript{18} \ anaⁿi \ Wë Bolossugi \ anaⁿi \ Të[n]risamungëng \ Wë Bolossugi \ siala \ La Karélla \ anaⁿi \ La Makkanêngnga \ La Galu[m]pang \ siala \ Wë Cà[n]kêwaniwâ \ ri Baringëng \ \\

\textsuperscript{12} mababine read maⁿbawine
\textsuperscript{13} Corë[m]palië read Soro[m]palië, as above.
\textsuperscript{14} La Ga \ lupang read La Galumpang
\textsuperscript{15} anaⁿi read anaⁿa
La Dē ma'bawine \ ri Marioriawa \ siala \ Wē Tēmmabulēng \ yi[a]muto riasēng \ Mabolongngē \ ana'ni \ La Sikati18 \ To Sawamēga \ asēng ri ana'na \ yi[a]muto riasēng \ Mallajangngē ri asēlēng \ ana'ni \ La Mataēsso \ yi[a]muto riasēng \ Puang lipuē \ ana'ni \ La Walēng \ yi[a]muto riasēng Masaraungngē \ ana'ni \ La Parēmma2 \ yi[a]muto riasēng \ To wAkkatērru \ asēng ri ana'na \ yi[a]na \ najallo'bawi \ ana'ni \ I Patē'dungi \ Da Cama \ asēng ri ana'na \ ana'ni \ Wē \ Pancai \ Da Tē[n]riwewang \ asēng ri ana'na \ tammat

La Sikati19 \ yi[a]muto riasēng \ Mallajangngē \ ri asēlēng \ siala Wē Soda \ ri Lo[m]pēngēng \ Da Riē \ asēng ri ana'na \ aluni20 La Makkatērru \ To wĒpēo \ asēng ri ana'na \ ana'ni \ Tē[n]risamarēng \ Da Ripē \ asēng ri ana'na \ yi[a]muto riasēng Mattē'du[m]pulawēngngē \ ana'ni \ La Malalæ \ ana'ni \ La Mapula \ Wē Cama \ mallakkai \ ri Uju[m]pulu \ siala Karaēng Loē yi[a]muto riasēng \ La Sangaji \ ana'ni \ La Salawu \ La Makkatērru \ ma'bawine \ ri Bila \ siala Wē Tē[n]risokē \ ana'ni \ La Pababari \ ana'ni \ La Jēmmu \ tammat (229)

La Mataēsso Puang lipuē \ pada uroanei21 \ I La Sēkati \ ma'bawine ri Ga[n]ra \ siala \ Tē[n]rianiang \ ana'ni \ La Mappalēppē2 \ yi[a]muto riasēng \ Patolæ \ ana'ni \ La Tanaparēng \ Datu Tēllariē \ ana'ni \ Wē Pawē[m]pē \ ana'ni \ Wē Pamadēng \ Wē Pawē[m]pē \ mallakkai \ ri Marioriawa \ siala \ La Pagē2

16 Wē Luwu2 read Wē Alu, as above.
17 CJ's reading of La Pottobunē is followed in the translation (G: La Bottobunē).
18 CJ's reading of La Sēkati is followed in the translation (G: La Sakati).
19 La Sikati read La Sēkati, as above.
20 CJ's reading of ana'ni is followed in the translation (G: yi[a]na [n]cajiyanngi).
21 uroanei read worowanē
La Mappalepê2
d Patolaê 
 ma’bawine ri Pattojo 
 siala 
 massapposiêng 
 (230)
 riasêngngê 
 \ \ \ Wê \ Tê[n]riwêwang 
 ana’ni \ Wê \ Pa[n]cai 
 ana’ni \ Baoê26 
 ana’ni \ Wê \ Tê[n]rigêlla 
 \ \ \ Wê \ Tê[n]rigêlla 
 siala 
 Arungngê 
 ri \ Ma[m]pu 
 riasêngngê 
 La \ Ma’dusila 
 To \ Aki asêng ri ana’na 
 ana’ni 
 La \ Tê[n]ribali 
 Mati[n]roê ri datunna 
 tammat

14

Bëoê 
 \ \ \ Datu ri Soppêng 
 \ \ \ deê ana’na 
 nallakkai 
 ana’daranna 
 riasêngngê 
 Wê \ Tê[n]ri 
 gêlla27 
 siala 
 Arungngê 
 ri \ Ma[m]pu 
 riasêngngê 
 La \ Ma’dusila 
 To 
 Aki asêng ri ana’na 
 ana’ni 
 La \ Tê[n]ribali 

---

22 CGJ’s reading of La Panaungi is followed in the translation.
23 CGJ’s reading of Bila is followed in the translation.
24 CGJ’s reading of Rajamulia is followed in the translation.
25 La Mapamadêng read Wê Mapamadêng, as above and in CG.
26 Baoê read Bëoê, as below.
27 Tê[n]ri 
 gêlla read Tenrigêlla
2.6.5. Translation

May I not swell for setting out in order the descendants of the lord called La Temmammala who descended at Sekkañili. He went to marry at Suppa with Wē Mappupu. Their child was La Maracinna.

2

La Maracinna married Wē Kawa. Their children were La Bombang, who returned [as] Datu of Suppa, and La Bang, the Datu of West Soppeng.

3

La Bang went to marry at Balusu with Wē Timaranatu. Their child was Wē Tekewanua.

4

Wē Tekewanua was Datu of West Soppeng. She ruled at Suppa. She broke the broad and split the long. She planted sugarcane and ants swarmed. She looked down at the lake: she summoned the people of Sidênrêng. She looked down at the lake: she summoned the people of Nêpö [to come like the?] turtle doves. [She]

---

28. "Does not want": G adds "he was the first ruler of Soppeng".
29. "In kampung Pēta Balubê, desa Turutappâ: see 109, footnote 34.
30. A coastal settlement close to Parêpârê.
31. Probable mappupung, "to gather": several readings are possible for the akâra PuPu.
32. Possibly Marancinna, "half-ripe desire".
33. Among other readings, O.B., "earth": G adds "at Suppa".
34. Wave.
35. Bang is the root of mamış bang, "to fell (trees)".
36. A large jar: Balusu is a relatively common place-name in South Sulawesi.
37. Received as ruler.
38. Carries the land.
39. Ruled at: mpawa tana, "brought earth".
40. The language of this passage is symbolic, but its general meaning is clear. "She split the broad and broke the long" suggests a firm and just rule (Matthes [1872b: 90] translated this as "She returned what had been misappropriated to the rightful owners"). "Long" is used in the Chronicle of Boné as a metaphor for wealth, though its use here may be purely figurative. The metaphor of ants being drawn to sugar is used widely in Indonesian societies to describe the attraction of people to a means of livelihood. Here it suggests the attraction of settlers to the shores of Lake Temê owing to the prosperity of Wē Tekewanua's rule. The remainder of the passage is difficult to translate due to the uncertainty of its subject, though the general meaning is still clear.
41. Summoned: natujui attampang, which can also be translated "invited".
42. Evidently the kingdom of that name to the north of Soppeng.
43. A deserted settlement in the north-west hills bordering the Wâlanaê valley, remembered in the "long: Dua natajêng naenro / Coppo'nâ Nêpö Nêpö / aînëa Sidênrêng: "Two she awaits / a prince of Nêpö / or noble of Sidênrêng."
looked down at the lake: she summoned the people of Marioriawa. She looked down at the lake, and they settled together with the people of Népo. Wé Tékéwanua was young. She was Datu of Suppa. Wé Tékéwanua married at Léworëng with La Témnapéo. They had seven children, [among them] La Wadëng, who ruled Bila; he was the first Mangëpa of Soppëng. The younger brother of La Wadëng, called La Makkanëngnga, was Datu of West Soppëng. Their [other] children were La Dumola, La Tubë, Wé Baku and [Wé] Tënritabirëng. [Wé] Tënritabirëng married at Baringëng with [the Datu Baringëng] La Pañorongi. Their children were La Tënriïleê, La Tërënga, La Tënripalla, La Karëkkëng, Wé Lirojaji and La Tëmmata.

La Makkanëngnga married at Bulumatanrë with Wé Tëna. Their child was La Karëlêla.
La Karêlla married his cousin, the child of the Arung Bila La Wadêng, whose name was Wê Boissugi. Their children were La Pawisêang, La Matagima, Wê Raiê, Wê Bao, Wê Bulutana and [Wê] Tênripalêsê.

La Pawisêang married Wê Têmmupagê at Pising. Their children were La Pasappoi (he was also called Sorompaliê), La Pawawoi, La Pawawu, La Warani, Wê Têkêlopî and Wê Jampucinna.

La Pasappoi married at Baringeng (he was also called Sorompaliê) with Wê Tappatana (her teknonym was Da Wiring). Their children were La Mannussa (his teknonym was To Akkarangêng and he was [posthumously] called Matinrôe ri tanana), La Mapañompa and Wê Sidamanasa. Thus there were three full brothers and sisters, [the children of] Matinrôe ri tanana.

---

68 From bolong, "black" and sugi, "wealthy, powerful".
69 The one who paddles [the perahu].
70 Meaning unknown: the first element is probably mata, "eye".
71 The raft.
72 Meaning unknown: perhaps originally bau, a measure of land (Matthes 1874) or noble title (Salim).
73 Mountain earth.
74 Not turned.
75 Meaning unknown: the second element is probably O.B. pagê, "fence".
76 Meaning unknown: approximately ten kilometers north of WatasaSoppêng. According to Salim, batu pising means "buried stone".
77 One who fences in.
78 The one who pushes aside.
79 One who carries.
80 Brave.
81 Carries the perahu.
82 Jampu is the Malay jambu fruit: the second element is probably chinna, "desire".
83 Sunlight of the land.
84 Meaning unknown: according to Abidin (1969:26), he was also known as Baso Soppêng, [Crown Prince of Soppêng]. Abidin states that before being appointed Datu of Soppêng, La Mannussa studied in Luwu with Maccaê ("the clever one"), for whom the office of To Luwu ("father of Luwu") had been created by Dewaraja, an early-fifteenth-century ruler of that kingdom. The internal chronologies of the RGS and the Royal Genealogy of Luwu are compatible with such a tradition.
85 Father of the rulership.
86 He who sleeps in his land.
87 Possibly meaning "pays the bride-price."
La Mannussa, ([his teknonym was] To Akkarangéng [and he was posthumously called] Matinroë ri tanana) married his cousin, the child of Wé Tekelopi, whose name was Wé Témmagópa.88 Their children were La Dé99 and La Co.90 La Wadéng married Wé Bubu91 and their children were La Pasajo, Wé Ténriabang,92 La Galumpang, Wé Bolossugi and [Wé] Ténrisamunungéng. Wé Bolossugi married93 La Karélla, the child of La Makkanéngnga. La Galumpang married Wé Cangkéawanua94 at Baringéng and their children were La Pasoréang,95 Wé Alu96 and Wé Bérrigau.97 Wé Alu married La Pacikkéng98 [at] East Soppéng, and their children were La Pottobuné99 and La Pammase.100 La Pottobuné married Wé Tekelopi and their child was Wé Témmagópa.

10

La Dé married at Marioriawa with Wé Témmabuléng (he was also called Mabolongnge101). Their children were La Sekati (his teknonym was To Sawaméga and he was also called Mallajangnéri aséléng102), La Mataéssso103 (he was also called Puang lipue104), La Waléng (he was also called Masaraungné105), La Parémma (his teknonym was To Akkatérru; he destroyed a great number of

88 Meaning unknown: perhaps originally Témmagéppa, "not struck", or Témmagémpa, "not swollen".
89 Meaning unknown: other sources read déa, a species of lalang grass.
90 Meaning unknown: other sources have La Coa, "The old one". The remainder of this "section" deals with the descendants of La Wadéng, the son of Wé Tekéwanua (see "section" 4 above). Its purpose appears to be to provide a pedigree for Wé Témmagópa, La Mannussa's wife.
91 A type of fish-trap. There are several possibilities for this name.
92 Not seen.
93 CG add "with her cousin".
94 Probably Jangkaswanua, "span of the land".
95 The one who brings us to shore
96 An alu is a rice-pounding pestle.
97 Meaning unknown: perhaps originally Ténrigau, "not acted upon".
98 Meaning unknown: perhaps originally La Patikkéng, "the one who seizes".
99 Large armband: C adds La Daka, G La Padaka.
100 The one who shows pity.
101 The black one.
102 "He who vanished in the place of his origin".
103 The Sun.
104 Lord of the settlement.
105 "Shaded by the great umbrella"
enemies in battle\textsuperscript{106}, I [Wê] Patêdung\textsuperscript{107} (her teknonym was Da Cama) and Wê Pancai (her teknonym was Da Tênriwêwang).

11

La Sêkati (he was also called Mallajangngê ri asêlêng) married Wê Soda at Lompêngeng (her teknonym was Da Rie). Their children were La Makkatêrru (his teknonym was To Épêo), [Wê] Têrisamarêng (her teknonym was Da Ripê and she was also called Mattêdumpulawêngngê\textsuperscript{108}), La Malalaê and La Mapula. Wê Cama\textsuperscript{109} married at Ujumpulu\textsuperscript{110} with Karaêng Loê,\textsuperscript{111} who was also called La Sangaji.\textsuperscript{112} Their child was La Salawu. La Makkatêrru married at Bila with Wê Tênrisokê and their children were La Pababari and La Jêmmu.\textsuperscript{113}

12

La Mataesso ([he was also called] Puang lipue and his brother was I La Sêkati), married at Ganra\textsuperscript{114} with [Wê] Tênrianiang. Their children were La Mappalêppê\textsuperscript{115} (he was also called Patolæ\textsuperscript{116} La Tanaparêng ([he was also known as?] Datu Têllariê\textsuperscript{117}), Wê Pawêmpe\textsuperscript{118} and Wê Pamaðêng. Wê Pawêmpe married at Marioriawa with La Pagë.\textsuperscript{119} Their children were [La?] Mappaloë,\textsuperscript{120} La Panaungi\textsuperscript{121} and La Patêdungi. [La Tanaparêng, the Datu?] Têllariê married Wê Supê. Their children were Wê Têmmaliro (her teknonym was Da Eke\textsuperscript{122}) [and] Wê

\textsuperscript{106} destroy a great number of enemies in battle: najallo\textsuperscript{6}bawi [tauê], to run amok like a wounded pig; used of somebody who single-handedly destroys a great number of enemy in battle (Matthes 1874:226).

\textsuperscript{107} "The one who gives shade"

\textsuperscript{108} "Shaded by the golden umbrella", the title previously held by La Sêkati. This seems to be a mistake, as La Sêkati’s brother La Mataesso inherited the rulership. It is possible that the original reading was ana'na riasêngngê Matêdumpulawêngngê, "the child of he who was called 'shaded by the golden umbrella'."

\textsuperscript{109} The daughter of Wê Patêdungngi (Da Cama), above.

\textsuperscript{110} "End of the mountain"

\textsuperscript{111} "Great Karaêng": Karaêng is a Makasar title sometimes used by Bugis rulers.

\textsuperscript{112} (Javanese) sang, an honorific, and (Javanese) agi, "king"; a relatively common modern Bugis name.

\textsuperscript{113} Jêmmu is to knead with the hand.

\textsuperscript{114} "Fog, mist": about seven kilometers north-east of WatasSoppeng.

\textsuperscript{115} "Sets free"

\textsuperscript{116} "The one who succeeded [to the rulership]": a title of the ruler of Soppeng (Matthes 1874:545).

\textsuperscript{117} "Does not flee"

\textsuperscript{118} "Climber"

\textsuperscript{119} O.B. "fence"

\textsuperscript{120} "Wears a hat".

\textsuperscript{121} "The one who gives shade"

\textsuperscript{122} The text omits the usual ana'ni, "their child was".
Makkunraiselli.[123] [We Makkunraiselli] went and married at Citta[124] with To Pawawoi [and their child was] We Tênrijêka. [We Tênrijêka] married at Pacciro with La Mapaê [and their child was] We Tênrisolo. [We Tênrisolo] married at Bila with To Ipa and their children were La Musu [and] To Kêssi [and] To Wutu Puang[125] and Rajamulia[126] (her teknonym was Da Lalaê) (there were four children by the same mother). "La Mappalêppê ([he was also called] Patolaê and was Datu of Soppêng), La Tanaparêng ([who was?] Datu Têllarie and Arung of Ganra), We Pawêmpê (she married at Saogênnêng) and La Mappamadêng, the Arung of Salotungo.[127] He also inherited Saolapê and [was the] Angépakêng[128] of Soppêng. He was also "may I not swell, called "He who[129] lengthened and ended.""[130]

La Mappalêppê ([he was also called] Patolaê) married at Pattojo with his cousin, who was called We Tênriwewang. Their children were We Pancal,131 Bêoe and We Tênrigêlla. We Tênrigêlla married the Arung of Mampu, whose name was La Ma'dusila (his teknonym was To Aki). Their child was La Tênribali,132 [posthumously called] Matinroê ri datunna.133

Bêoe was Datu of Soppêng.134 He had no children. His sister, who was called We Tênrigêlla, married the Arung at Mampu who was called La Ma'dusila (his teknonym was To Aki). Their child was La Tênribali.135

---

123 The first element of this name is makkunrai, "woman".
124 About sixteen kilometers measured in a straight line south-east of WatasSoppêng.
125 "lord".
126 (Sanskrit) raja, "king, ruler" and mûlpa, "value, price, worth", thus "one who has the worth of a king".
127 In East Soppêng, about one kilometer from WatasSoppêng.
128 Evidently a political office.
129 "-b: from G.
130 "-o: this passage repeats the information given above regarding the children of La Mataesso. It is taken from a different source; instead of We Pamadêng it lists a La Mappamadêng; We Pawêmpê marries at Saogênnêng instead of Marioriawa.
131 The sister of La Mataesso (above) also has this name.
132 "Did not return"
133 "He who sleeps in his rulership"
134 Bêoe became the first Moslem ruler of Soppêng following the defeat of Soppêng by Goa in 1609.
135 Datu of Soppêng c.1659-1676.
2.7. The Soppeng Vassal List

The Soppeng Vassal List (hereafter SVL) is a list of approximately sixty three settlements\(^1\) which are described as *palili*\(^2\), or vassals of Soppeng. The SVL is one of a number of similar lists which exist for all of the large kingdoms of South Sulawesi and many of the smaller. The purpose for which such lists were compiled (other than to preserve such information) is not known. As far as I am aware, no version of the SVL has yet been published.

2.7.1. Versions of the SVL

The six versions of the Vassal List examined here are shown in Table 2-7. These will henceforth be referred to by the letter given in the right-hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pages.Lines</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBG 100</td>
<td>26.25-27.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG 100</td>
<td>116.21-117.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG 101</td>
<td>72.21-73.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG 101</td>
<td>133.22-134.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG 112</td>
<td>56.7-56.17</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG 123</td>
<td>62.1-62.9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All versions contain, in virtually the same order, an almost identical list of place-names, and must therefore derive from a single version. On the basis of a small number of substantial variants, the six versions can be divided into two groups, *ACEF* and *BD*. Owing to the brevity of the work, it is not possible to establish a more detailed stemma. *D* has been selected for editing on the basis of textual clarity; one additional place-name found in *ACEF* is incorporated into the text of the edited version and a few well-supported substantial variants are provided in footnotes to the translation.

\(^1\) The number varies slightly between versions.
2.7.2. Dating the SVL

The SVL probably dates from the sixteenth or seventeenth century. Bulumatanrê and Gattarêng, which are listed as vassals, were abandoned around 1700 and never re-occupied. This would seem to preclude a later date of composition.

2.7.3. The SVL as a Historical Source

The SVL provides an illuminating political map of Soppêng. More than thirty of the settlements it names can be identified using 1:50,000 Dutch maps of the Walanaê valley. Twenty six of these are shown in figure 2-13 on page 135. Most settlements are located at the southern end of the Walanaê Valley, near WatasSoppêng; the most distant is Lamuru.

The settlements of the SVL are separated into two groups, the first consisting of twenty-nine settlements and the second of thirty five settlements. The two groups are divided by the by the expression napano⁻rê rakaḷâna Soppêng "and then the plough of Soppêng went down", an expression which is found also in the Luwu⁶ and Sidênrêng Vassal Lists.

The second group contains fifteen of the twenty settlements described in the At­toriolonna Soppêng as comprising East and West Soppêng, as well as one of the four settlements which were "later divided up and included" into East and West Soppêng. All the identified settlements belonging to the first group are close to WatasSoppêng.

Settlements of the first group lie at a greater distance from WatasSoppêng. Furthermore, five versions of the SVL are followed in their respective codices by a series of short vassal lists belonging to twelve of the settlements named in the first group as vassals of Soppêng. These are (in approximate order): Lamuru, Mario, Patojo, Citta, Goagoa, Ujumpulu, Lompêngêng, Baringêng, Tanatêngnga, Marioriwa, Ampungêng and Kirukiru. We may conclude from these lists that each of these settlements was an important centre in its own right before its incorporation into Soppêng.

The structure of the vassal list suggests that all the places named in the first group were of a similar relationship to Soppêng. We may therefore conclude that the SVL records approximately twenty eight formerly-independent political units.
(group one) allied to the political unit comprised by approximately thirty five settlements located around WatasSoppêng (group two).
2.7.4. Text, D

Sompêng pa³lili³na\(^2\) \ Lamuru \ Marioriawo \ Goagoa \ Patojo \ Uju[m]pulu \ Lompêngêng \ Baringêng \ Tanatêngnga \ Apanang \ Bêlo \ Ga[n]ra \ Bakê³ \ Lëworêng \ Marioriawa \ Citta \ pa³lili³ Baicuna \ Ja[m]pu \ Galung \ Gattarêng \ Bua \ Bëcoi \ Palakka \ A[m]pungêng \ Bulumata[n]rê \ Ka[m]piri \ Kadi\(^4\) \ Balosu \ Kirukiru \ napano³ê \ rakalana \ Sompêng\(^2\) \ Bila Saloᵗungo \ Ku³ba \ Pao \ Pani[n]công \ Macopë² \ Maccilê \ Ma[ng]kutu \ Akka[m]pêng \ Ujung \ Cê[n]rana \ Paccirop \ Alo \ Têllang \ Pasakâ \ Kajuara \ Arêppa \ Ti[n]co \ Madèllorilau² \ Tapparêng \ Botto \ Sêppang \ Pëssê \ U[n]cing \ Laanga \ Wëcoi \ Kulo \ Watu Laia Ara \ Matobulu \ Cirowali \ Adungêng \ Maingêng \ Lisu \n
\(^2\)This is spelt PaLiiNa.
\(^3\)This is spelt PaLii.
\(^4\)ACEF add Pad[u]mpu, which is included in the translation.
\(^5\)Sompêng read Soppêng
2.7.5. Translation

The vassals of Soppêng are: Lamuru, Marioriwawo, Goagoa, Patojo, Ujumpulu, Lompêngêng, Baringêng, Tanatêngnga, Apanang, Bêlo, Ganra, Bakê, Lêworêng, Marioriawa, Citta; [its] vassals are Baicuna, Jampu, Galung, Gattarêng, Bua, Bêcoi, Palakka, Ampungêng, Bulumatanré, Kampiri, Kadi, Padumpu, Balosu and Kirukiru; then Soppêng went down and ploughed Bila, Salotungo, Ku'ba, Pao, Panincong, Macopê, Maccilê, Mangkutu, Akkampêng, Ujung, Cênrana, Pacciro, Alo, Têllang, Pasaka, Kajuara, Arêppa, Tinco, Madêllorilau, Tapparêng, Botto, Sêppang, Pêssê, Uncing, Laanga, Wecoi, Kulo, Watu, Laia, Ara, Matobulu, Ciroali, Adungêng, Maingêng, and Lisu.

---

6 AC E F Baicuê
7 ABC Ulo
8 AC E F Madêllor Lawo
9 AC E F Ka[mj]piri
10 Cf. Bêcoi, above.
11 In the Attoriolonna Soppêng, Matobulu.
12 Ciroali is named also in the Vassal List of Sidênrêng (section 2.10).
13 AC Udangang EF: Odungung
Figure 2-13: Locatable Toponyms of the SVL
### Key to figure 2-13

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Akkampêng</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apanang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Botto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bulumatanré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Citta</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ganra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jampu</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kampiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mangkutu</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pacciro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Saloťungo</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Šëppang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ujung</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Watu[watu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bêlo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cênrana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gattaréng</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Goagoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lisu</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Panincong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tinco</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tëllang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ciroali</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Madëllorilauç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pëssé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8. The Chronicle of Siděnrěng

The Chronicle of Siděnrěng (hereafter CSid) is a work hitherto unknown outside South Sulawesi.\(^1\) As far I am able to determine, Matthes and other European scholars working on Bugis sources were unaware of its existence. The version examined below traces the ruling family of Siděnrěng from the time of Siděnrěng’s foundation to an early nineteenth-century ruler.

The use of the term chronicle to describe the present work requires qualification. Even by Bugis historiographic standards, the CSid—a work of some ten manuscript pages—seems barely substantial enough to warrant such a description. Unlike the Chronicles of Goa, Tallo\(^2\) and Boné (and to a lesser degree Noorduyn’s Chronicle of Wajo\(^3\)), there is no sense of narrator, nor any detectable attempt to to integrate the CSid’s source material within an authorial framework. Indeed, as far as the pre-Islamic period is concerned, the CSid is simply a chronological arrangement of previously-independent items which (as will be seen below) are for the most part derived from oral tradition. A summary of the CSid appeared in Mukhlis 1985: a published version of the complete chronicle has yet to appear.

2.8.1. Versions of the CSid

At present there are two known versions of the CSid. Both of these were copied by Drs Salim from a privately-owned manuscript in South Sulawesi in 1974. The copy made by Drs Salim is designated Salim 1: one version of the CSid is found on pages 1-13 and the other on pages 16-26. The two versions do not appear to be directly related and probably draw upon different sources. As a copy of this manuscript was obtained late in my research, I have examined only the second version, as far as the first Moslem ruler of Siděnrěng, La Patiroi.

2.8.2. Dating the CSid

It is difficult to suggest any date either for the composition of the CSid or for its written sources. Considering the apparent scarcity of copies and the transparency of its structure, we may hazard a guess that the CSid is a nineteenth or even twentieth-century work.

\(^{1}\) I am grateful to Dr G. Hamonic for bringing the Chronicle of Siděnrěng to my attention and for kindly presenting me with a copy.
2.8.3. The CSid as a Historical Source

Interest in the CSid lies more with its sources than with the chronicle as such. In the section to c.1600, the CSid draws upon at least three written sources: two of these recorded oral traditions concerning Siděnřêng's pre-Islamic rulers. The third written source was the Royal Genealogy of Siděnřêng, which is examined in the following section.

There are three oral traditions lying behind the first two sources of the CSid. These traditions, the beginnings and ends of which are clearly discernable within the CSid, may be compared to the basic units, or "building blocks", used by the evangelists in the writing of the Christian Gospels. These units are generally termed "pericopes" (Koine Greek pericope: section, pericopae: collections of sayings) by Biblical scholars. Like the initial sources of the present work, the Gospels derive from an oral tradition; pericopes are the units by which this oral tradition was passed on. New Testament pericopes are:

"essentially disconnected stories... set down one after another with very little organic connexion, almost like a series of snapshots placed side by side in photograph album. These paragraphs are sometimes externally related to one another by a short phrase at the beginning or end, but essentially each one is an independent unit, complete in itself, undatable except by its contents, and usually equally devoid of any allusion to place. By the same token, the minor characters in these stories, unless they had some special significance for the early Church, are very summarily described and hardly ever named" (Nineham 1963:27-28).²

Pericopes are identified by their form; in the Gospels each sets out to convey a particular aspect of Christ's ministry. Each was originally a complete unit in itself, with a beginning and an end. Most may be classified according to a number of general types. There are (among others) teaching pericopes, healing pericopes, pericopes dealing with the controversy between Christ and the Jewish religious authorities and pericopes which serve to reveal the unique nature of Jesus of Nazareth.³

²Nineham adds in a footnote that while some stories contain specific references to time or place, it will always be found that in such cases the reference serves a practical purpose; it is necessary for the full understanding of the contents of the pericope.

³Examples of each of these in St Mark are (in the above order): the parable of the sower (iv 1-9), the casting out of the demons into the swine (v 1-15), the parable of the wicked husbandman (xii 1-12) and the feeding of the five thousand (vi 30-34). The Qur'an is also constructed, at least in part, from oral pericopes (Wansbrough 1977:20-29, cf. Johns 1987), as are the texts of the Pali canon (cf. Gombrich 1987).
In the present work four such oral units may be discerned. While their subject matter is clearly different from that of the Gospels, they display between them all the features of the Biblical pericopes described in the above quotation: a clearly defined beginning, an overall objective, minimal reference to person or place (just sufficient for the achievement of the pericope’s objective) and a clear ending.

The oral pericopes which make up most of the pre-Islamic section of the CSid are concerned with political relationships both within Sidênrêng and with its neighbouring kingdom, Rappang. Pericopes one and two set out the correct relationship between the Aêdatuang and the lords of Sidênrêng; pericope three outlines the the relationship between Sidênrêng and Rappang, while four sets out the rights of the Aêdatuang and the duties of the lords of Sidênrêng.

Many of the characters portrayed in the pericopes were probably historical individuals. We should, however, be cautious in assuming the events which constitute the “message” of the pericope to be historically linked to those individuals. While we cannot disprove the historicity of these traditions, it seems likely that their messages are apocryphal, and that the pre-Islamic rulers function as sources of authority through an appeal to antiquity. The problem of extracting historical information from these sections of the CSid is therefore a difficult one. Methods similar to that used by New Testament scholars seem the most appropriate, although until more material of this type has been examined our conclusions must remain tentative.4

4In addition to the historical-critical method (the interpretation of texts in the context of their historical setting), the form-critical method appears to offer a useful method of analysis. This method is essentially a hybrid of historical and literary criticism which begins with the recognition that a particular biblical text or part of that text may have had a history of its own, independent of the work in which it is now located. Its objectives include the identification of established literary types, and the principles lying behind the use of words, style and construction of each formerly independent unit, as well as the practical purpose for which each was designed. The form-critical method is derived from a group of nineteenth and early twentieth-century scholars, known as form critics, of which H. Gunkel is the most notable. For a concise summary of the techniques of Biblical interpretation and exegesis, see Achtemeier 1985:132 and the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th edition, Vol. 14, pages 849-850. The standard English-language introduction to the form-critical method is Koch 1969.
2.8.4. Text, Salim 1:16.1-20.19

Passalèng pannëssaèngngi ri wëttu mula rimitpaⁿ na tanaè ri Sidënréng \ mulana èngka Arung ri Tanatoraja riasèng La Maⁿdarëmméng anaⁿ na Arungngé ri Sangalla³ \ asërai mappada worowanè \ 1 La Maⁿdarëmméng \ 2 La Wëwa[n]riwu \ 3 La Togèllipu \ 4 La Pasa[m]poi \ 5 La Pakolongi \ 6 La Pababarëng \ 7 La Panaungi \ 8 La Mappasëssu \ 9 La Mappaturu⁶ \ naLa Maⁿdarëmménnna coccong ri Tanatoraja naëwamanëngngi pada worowanëna aruwaè sisala ri Tanatoraja \ naëwamanëngngi pada orowanëna aruwaè⁵ \ namëssëna ininawanna pada orowanëna aruwaè \ nasituruⁿ na salaiwi Tanatoraja \ nanoⁿ na ri lappaè kajoⁿkajoⁿka sappaⁿ on-rowang yi[a] aruwa mappada orowanè \ nayi[a] maⁿdëppëⁿ na ri bulu maniyanna Tanatoraja natironi tapparëngngé natoli napëtuju na napolëna téppa ri lappaè ri watt-tang tapparëng \ napada madëkkana maëloⁿ minung \ nasappaⁿ laëlëng maëloⁿ naola noⁿ ri tapparëngngé nadëⁿ naita laëlëng \ nasirënëng renënna aruwa mappada worowanè \ natakko èngkana laëlëng naita pole wattang lao ri timorëng mattëru mattuji ri tapparëngngé \ nälëttuⁿ pada minung \ nayi[a] pada purana minung pada tudanni ri wirinna tapparëngngé inapasi pada diyodiyo ri tapparëngngé \ purai pada diyo tudassi paimëng massituruⁿ pada makkëda okkonï ri urai tapparëng madëcëng pada monro idiⁿ mappada orowanè \ napada laona sappaⁿ onrong sibawa sibawanna napada maⁿdarëⁿ darëⁿ \ tëlëng taungi maⁿdarëⁿ sawëni asëna sawëtoni sibawanna tanëttanënna \ pada maⁿbëpagana sipulung \ nayi[a] nasituruⁿ si aruwa mappada worowanë makkëdaè padapadamanëngngiⁿ aruwaè mappada worowanè \ yi[a] kìya

(17) kakaⁿ matoiha kakaⁿ è anringnegè matoiha anringnegè \ naagiagi èloⁿ na kakaⁿ ta yi[a] na kuwa \ nărëkko èngkana bicaratta sibawatta idiⁿ massituruⁿ putë tangngaⁿ \ têtaissëppi tatiwirëngi kakaⁿ ta natalanggai \ naagiagi èloⁿ na yi[a] nì kuwa \ nayi[a] nakko idiⁿ putë sisala baraⁿbaraⁿ na mattërrukiⁿ lao ri kakaⁿ ta macowaè \ naagiagi pattarona yi[a]ni kuwa \ napëdë sawëmuwa asëna ènëngnegè tanëttanënna sawëtoni têdonna aënarënna \ namëgatona sibawanna maⁿbanuwa ri wattang tapparëng \ nariyasënni ri toSoppëngnegè ri toBonëwë toraja mattrapparëngnegè \ narimakkuwananoro massituruⁿ toBonëwë toSoppëngnegè masëngngi tana naonroiyë maⁿbanuwa toraja mattrapparëngnegè tanaè ri ajang tapparëng \ nayi[a] ro tujuna puraè naonroi sirënëng renënë aruwa mappada worowanë nasënë tanaè ri Sidënréng \ nayi[a] rimunri matënana aruwaè mappada

⁶The second occurrence of naëwamanëngngi pada orowanëna aruwaè is omitted in the translation.
worowané ěngkasi anà'na La Ma²darémméng polé ri Tanatoraja silao lakkainna yi[a]na mula A²daowang ri Sidënřèng \ najajiyanna tèllu anà² \ sè² di riasëng La Makkarka yi[a]na A²daowang ri Sidënřèng \ yi[a]na riasëng A²daowangngë La Kasi \ yi[a]na Arung masërro tèya riyalà Arung ri toSidënřèngngë nasabë makkëdana kasiyasiya² ubongngo² \ yi[a]mana nakado riyalà Arung makkëdanami sumpung lolona sibawa toSidënřèngngë elo²mu kuwa adammu tongëng \ naripawëkkëkkë'na adëë nariraiyang abiaisang ri sumpung lolona sibawa ri toSidënřèngngë \ makkëdëa ikkëna mupoasogirëng ikkettona mupojiowë ikkettona mupalaorumu ikkettona pinrusëkkëno pammulana ri kale arung ri Sidënřèng \ Datuë ri Pantilëng⁵ malasa ja oli nalao pali³ alëna ri mabëlaë \ natëppana ri Tanatoraja napobawëniai anà macowanna La Ma²darémméng ri [Tana]toraja⁷ \ nayi[a] polëna ri toraja lëppangngi ri Rappëng⁸ najajina yi[a]na

(18) makkarung ri Rappëng \ tèllu anà² najajiyang \ sè² di makkunrai yia]na makkunrai� mcowà \ makkarunni ri Sidënřèng \ yi[a]naro Arung namatojo toSidënřèng \ nayi[a] dappi macowaë makkarunni ri Rappëng nalaona toRappëngngë sèllëi \ makkarëdëi toRappëngngë madëcënçngi puwang ikona lao ri Rappëng makkarung naana³borowanëmu sèllëo makkarung ri Sidënřèng \ naLa Maliburënnà A²daowang ri Sidënřèng \ okkoni ěngka gau² salaë nataro jogë² \ najajina Arung Rappëng Arung Sidënřèng marana³dara \ na²jancina⁹ makkarëdëa matë èli² Rappëng matë arowëŋngi Sidënřèng lettë makku kwà dë² napinrinprina jancinna Rappëng Sidënřèng \ purani napaduppa annëssana jancinna Arung Rappëng \ ëngkanëngka sëuuwa wëttu ri munrìnaëëo nanrië alë nanu salaë ri Sidënřèng ri arowëŋngë \ nariassurona birittaiyang \ makkarëdëna Arung Rappëng agana mi lëppë² Arungngë ri Sidënřèng \ makkëdana sùroë alënami marana² malaowë sibawa cokinna sè² di \ purai kuwa no²manëttino Arung Rappëng ri tanaë \ naiannà natunu salaëa ri Rappëng riëëë \ nasabë \ a²jancinëlla marana²boraëë \ naLa Maliburëssi jajiyang aruwa anà² \ yi[a] nala padakkala ri Lasalarna² aruwaë \ nayi[a] dappi malolëwë yi[a]na riyasëng La Pawawoi \ naLa Pawawoisì A²daowang ri Sidënřèng \ La Pawawoi jajiyang anà² pitë \ yia]na macowaë riyasëng La Pawëwangá \ yi[a]na Arung ri Tellulatë² \ yi[a]si rappina yi[a]na riyasëng La Makkaraka yi[a]si A²daowang ri Sidënřèng \ yi[a]na pobainëi Pajungngë ri Luwu² \ yi[a]na napamulana napanëssanëssë

⁶Pantilëng read Pantilang
⁷The words ri toraja are omitted in the translation.
⁸Rappëng read Rappang
⁹na²jancina is omitted in the translation.
siajancingëna toSidënrengngë napuwananamula taroadë pa\textsuperscript{2}bicarannamaraja
puwanannamakèrranaadë\textsuperscript{2}napuwanannamase\textsuperscript{2}toru ri adë\textsuperscript{2}nara
aruwai mappadaworowane Arungngë ri Sidënreng \ aruwato

(19) padakkalana \ nayi[a]naæ ma\textsuperscript{j}anci padakkalana aruwæ \ najêlokettoni ton-
rong alë\textsuperscript{e} nalai ongko \ nakkèdana A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë agana napolisé\textsuperscript{e} salassæ \ makkèdani pada worowanëna pituë \ yi[a]na\textsuperscript{e} napolisé\textsuperscript{e} salassamu \ makkèdasi
A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë ri Sidënreng birittamitu yi[a]\textsuperscript{2} \ ikomitu pituë punna salassa \ makkèdani pituë \ pitumï\textsuperscript{f} punna salassa si'\textsuperscript{d}imi makkèsalassa ri Sidënreng \ makkèdasi
A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë aruwaki\textsuperscript{f} palë punna salassa \ makkèdasi padakkala pituë
aruwaki\textsuperscript{f} massituru\textsuperscript{f} pitiuwa\textsuperscript{f} buwanggni wakkèlé\textsuperscript{f}ku riko \ makkèdasi A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë
La Kasi kègana tanranna mubuwangèng wakkèlé\textsuperscript{f}mu \ makkèdani matowaè aruwæ
kipalaloko taro sumpampala \ alai pëfjëwë otaæ icöë naikomi massuro ma'\textsuperscript{b}alu \ dë\textsuperscript{e}
rilaimmuwë \ makkèdani A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë anukku pëfjëwë anukku icöë \ anukku
otaæ \ makkèdatopi matowaè aruwæ alatoi anu makalailaingngë \ makkèdasi
A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë anukku calabaïè tau pance\textsuperscript{ë}e tau bulèngngë \ wërettowa\textsuperscript{e} mai jowa
tallimamu uwalai assimèmèngngëng ri boné\textsuperscript{f}balla\textsuperscript{f} \ makkèdatopi A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë
èngkamupa uwèllau \ makkèdani matowaè aruwæ agapi muwèllau \ makkèdasi
A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë nakko èngka waramparan gappa\textsuperscript{ë}nkèngngi alëna ri salassæ
mupasu\textsuperscript{f}pi muwalai angkè\textsuperscript{f}na pata[n]\textsuperscript{\textcircled{R}}ella lama \ ma\textsuperscript{j}ancisi A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë matowa
aruwæ mappadaworowane \ makkèdai pituë nayi[a] bicarakki\textsuperscript{f} ikomuwa maraja
A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë \ yi[a]na napolisé\textsuperscript{e} salassamu \ tènripsatalèkïyang waramparaku
nærèkko mènè\textsuperscript{f}i ri salassæ \ yi[a]\textsuperscript{f}matoha pano\textsuperscript{f}yi[a]\textsuperscript{f}mato[ha] tarowangèkko
pakkatènni adë\textsuperscript{e} \ nærèkko ucaccïi utarowangngëko yi[a]\textsuperscript{f} matoha lukkai \ makkèdasi
A\textsuperscript{2}daowangngë agatopi muwattjuwang riya\textsuperscript{f} iko pituë \ alao pattumaling
pakkalawingngëpu kipalalotoko mala tausala \ Wè Tappalangisi\textsuperscript{10} A\textsuperscript{2}daowang ri
Sidënreng \ yi[a]tona

(20) Datu ri Suppa\textsuperscript{e} \ najajiyang ana\textsuperscript{e} tellu \ sé\textsuperscript{e}di riyasëng Wè Pawawoi yi[a]na
makkarung ri Bacukiki së\textsuperscript{e}di riasëng La Të\textsuperscript{e}dulolo yi[a]na Datu ri Suppa\textsuperscript{e} \ Wè
Pawawosi mallakkai ri Sidënreng yi[a]to\textsuperscript{11} ana\textsuperscript{a}na manurungngë ri Lowa riasëngngë
Suku[m]pulawëng \ yi[a]si makkarung ri Sidënreng \ najajiyang ana\textsuperscript{e} së\textsuperscript{e}di riasëng La
Bataranaka makkarung ri Sidënreng nalaö ma'bainë ri Bulucènranasiala
Arungngë ri Bulucènranasì Wè Cina \ najajiang ana\textsuperscript{e} tellu së\textsuperscript{e}di riasëng La Pasa[m]poi

\textsuperscript{10} Wè Tappalangi read Wè Tèpulingè, as in the Royal Genealogy of Sidënreng (section 2.10).
\textsuperscript{11} yi[a]to read siala
sédi riaséng We yAbéng \ sédi riaséng La Mariase\ yi[a]na makkarung ri Sidénérg \ yi[a]na pobainéi ana se La Botillangi\ ri\¹² Arung Mario riyaséngngé We Tappatana \ najajiang ana sédi riyaséng La Paté\'dungi \ La Paté\'dungisi A\'daowang ri Sidénérg nalao ma\'bainé ri Rappéng najajiyang ana sédi riaséng La Patiroi \ La Patiroisi A\'daowang ri Sidénérg namula tama séléng tauwe taung 1602 nasitujuwangngé taung 1518 hijérriya \ yi[a]tona riaséng Matinroé ri Massépé aséng maténa \ 

¹²ri is omitted in the translation.
2.8.5. Translation

This section tells of the time when the land at Sidenrêng was first opened.\(^{13}\) There was an Arung in Tanatoraja called La Ma\(\text{d}\)darémmêng,\(^{14}\) the son of the Arung of Sangalla\(^2\).\(^{15}\) There were nine brothers:\(^{16}\) (1) La Ma\(\text{d}\)darémmêng (2) La Pabarârêng (3) La Wëwanriwu (4) La Panaungi\(^{17}\) (5) La Togêlipu\(^{18}\) (6) La Mappaséssu (7) La Pasampoi\(^{19}\) (8) La Mappaturu\(^2\) and (9) La Pakolongi. Now La Ma\(\text{d}\)darémmêng oppressed his brothers in Tanatoraja, he fought with his eight brothers in Tanatoraja. The eight brothers were saddened, and so they decided to leave Tanatoraja and go down to the plain to look for a place to live, did the eight brothers. When they drew near to the hills south of Tanatoraja they saw the lake. They continued on until they came to the plain to the west of the lake. They were thirsty and wanted to drink. As they wished to continue down to the lake, they looked for a path, but could not see one. Hand in hand, the eight brothers lead each other forward.\(^{20}\) Suddenly they saw a path running from east to west which led directly to the lake. When they arrived at the lake they drank; when they had finished drinking they sat down at the side of the lake and bathed themselves in the lake. When they had finished bathing they sat down again to agree [what they should do]. Together they said, “Here at the west of the lake is a good place for us brothers to live.” So they and their followers\(^{21}\) set off to look for a place to live, where they could open fields. For three years they cultivated [the land], and their rice harvest and their other crops and the number of their followers multiplied each year. The eight brothers agreed, saying, “Among us eight brothers the (17) elder brother remains elder brother, the younger brother remains younger brother. Whatever the elder brother wishes shall be done. If there is something to be decided with our followers, the seven shall decide the matter. If we cannot reach

---

\(^{13}\)The first part of the Chronicle sets out a legend of the origin of Sidênrêng; cf. the legend quoted by Poi (1941:121) which tells of the founding of the “kingdom of the Toraja’s” by seven families from Luwu\(^2\).

\(^{14}\)Either “to rattle, boom, roar” (Matthes 1874:517), or “to tremble uncontrollably”.

\(^{15}\)The former principality of Sangalla\(^2\) in Tanatoraja, which had close economic and political ties with Luwu\(^2\). Cf. Nooy-Palm 1979, esp. pages 79-91.

\(^{16}\)The names of the brothers suggest that the legend achieved its present form in an inland, agrarian society. All but one are typical of those found in the South Sulawesi genealogies: La Wewanriwu, “shaking storm” is derived from the I La Galigo.

\(^{17}\)The one who gives shade

\(^{18}\)The elements of this name appear to be tongêng, “true, just, sincere”, and lipu, “land”.

\(^{19}\)The one who covers

\(^{20}\)A play upon the name Sidênrêng, which is believed to derive from sirênrêng, “to lead each other by the hand”; the etymology is formally set out below.

\(^{21}\)Thus providing an origin of the common people of Sidênrêng.
agreement, we shall forward the matter to our eldest brother. Whatever he decides shall be done. If we seven disagree about anything, we shall go straight to our eldest brother. His decision shall settle the matter.” Their rice crop and their vegetables flourished, and their buffaloes and horses grew more numerous, as did the number of their followers who had settled at the west of the lake. The people of Soppêng and the people of Bonê called them “the Toraja who lived at the lake.” Thus the people of Bonê and the people of Soppêng agreed to call the place where the Toraja who lived by the lake had established their settlements, “the land to the west of the lake.” The eight brothers who had led one another by the hand called the land “Risidênrêng.” Now after the eight brothers had died, a daughter of La Ma’darêmmêng arrived from Tanatoraja with her husband. She was the first A’daoang of Sidênrêng and she had three children. One of them was called La Makkaraka: he was the A’daoang La Kasi. He was the ruler who refused to be made Arung by the people of Sidênrêng because, as he said, “I am poor and foolish.” But he agreed to be made ruler. His family and the people of Sidênrêng all said, “Your wishes shall be obeyed and your words shall be the truth. Customary law shall become great and traditional usage increased by your family and by the people of Sidênrêng.” They said, “We shall be your followers, we shall be your people, we shall cultivate [the land], we shall build you a palace.” Now here is spoken of the origin of the Arung of Sidênrêng. The Datu of Pantilang was afflicted by leprosy. So he went into exile in distant lands. When he reached Tanatoraja, he married the eldest child of La Ma’darêmmêng. Then he left Tanatoraja. When he arrived in Rappang he

---

22The end of the first pericope
23Cf. Ajattapparêng (west of the lake), the name generally given to the “confederation” of Sidênrêng, Rappang, Sawitto, Alitta and Suppa.
24led each other by the hand in single file: sidênrêng rênêng, the popular etymology of the name Sidênrêng.
25A double etymology, probably provided by the compiler of the written source upon which this section of the present text was based.
26The second version of the Chronicle names her as [We] Bolopatina: the opening clause is a redactor’s gloss.
27The Datu of Pantilang: see below.
28Evidently a contraction of A’datuang, “ruleship”; but possibly “the one who embraces”. A title of the ruler of Sidênrêng.
29Meaning unknown. In the genealogy given in the third pericope (below) La Makkaraka is the great-grandson of the daughter of La Ma’darêmmêng.
30family: sumpung lolo; according to Salim, “knot of intestines” or “placenta”, thus “blood relatives”.
31The end of the second pericope.
32Cf. the legend of the exiled princess of Luwu who was suffering from a skin disease, who is supposed to have founded the kingdom of Wajo (Abidin 1984:531, Noorduyn 1955:34).
I was installed as ruler of Rappang. He had three children. One was a daughter (the eldest daughter) who was made ruler at Sidènréng. She was the ruler who was hard of heart towards the people of Sidènréng. [Her] younger brother ruled at Rappang. The people of Rappang came to exchange [him with her]. The people of Rappang said, "It would be good, Puang, if you came to rule in Rappang, and you made your brother ruler at Sidenreng." Then La Maliburéng was A’daoang of Sidènréng. Here arose the sinful practice of joget dancing. The Arung Rappang and the Arung Sidènréng, who were brother and sister, made an agreement, saying, "What dies in the morning [in] Rappang dies [in] the afternoon in Sidènréng." To the present day this agreement between Rappang and Sidènréng has not been altered. The sincerity of the agreement was attested to by the following events. Some time after this, it happened that the palace at Sidenreng was burnt to the ground. When news of this reached the Arung Rappang she asked, "What did the ruler of Sidènréng manage to save?" The messenger replied, "Just himself, his wives and children, and one of his cats." So the Arung Rappang and her household descended [to the ground] and, that very morning set fire to the palace at Rappang, because of the agreement made with the brother. Now La Maliburéng had eight children. The eight [children] were ploughmen at Lasalama. The one but youngest brother was called La Pawawoi. La Pawawoi was the A’datuang of Sidènréng. La Pawawoi had seven children. The eldest was called La Pawewangi; he was the Arung at Tellulatece. The second eldest child was called La Makkaraka. He was the Arung at Tellulatece.

---

33. Here arose the sinful practice of joget dancing. The Arung Rappang and the Arung Sidènréng, who were brother and sister, made an agreement, saying, "What dies in the morning [in] Rappang dies [in] the afternoon in Sidènréng." To the present day this agreement between Rappang and Sidènréng has not been altered. The sincerity of the agreement was attested to by the following events. Some time after this, it happened that the palace at Sidenreng was burnt to the ground. When news of this reached the Arung Rappang she asked, "What did the ruler of Sidènréng manage to save?" The messenger replied, "Just himself, his wives and children, and one of his cats." So the Arung Rappang and her household descended [to the ground] and, that very morning set fire to the palace at Rappang, because of the agreement made with the brother. Now La Maliburéng had eight children. The eight [children] were ploughmen at Lasalama. The one but youngest brother was called La Pawawoi. La Pawawoi was the A’datuang of Sidènréng. La Pawawoi had seven children. The eldest was called La Pawewangi; he was the Arung at Tellulatece. The second eldest child was called La Makkaraka. He was the Arung at Tellulatece.

34. The distance between Sidenreng and Rappang is eleven kilometers, measured in a straight line.

35. Rulers' palaces were built of wood and raised from the ground on wooden piles. Once they had caught fire there was little that could be done, other than to enjoy the conflagration. The present fire, however, is not the record of the destruction of a particular palace at Sidènréng during the rule of La Makkara/Kasi, but a literary motif enabling the author of this particular section to demonstrate the loyalty of Rappang towards Sidènréng.

36. Cats are the favourite animals of both the Bugis and Toraja; cf. Wilcox (1949:113) who states that in the district of La’bo in Tanatoraja, the small Toraja cat known as sereh datu (cat prince), never sets foot on the ground outside the house in which it is born. When one dies, it is wrapped in a special mat and hung in the branch of a tree. It would even seem that in some districts a cat had to be appraised in formal words of its master's death, and then be carried to another house until the corpse was finally removed. Among the Bugis, cats are immortalized in Sureol Moompaol, the Poem of the Brindled (?) Cat; on a more prosaic note, cats protected their owner's clothes and fabrics from the voracious South Sulawesi rats.

37. The end of the second pericope and the end of the first written source.

38. Cf. the eight brothers of the first legend.

39. The three panels*: apparently a secondary palace at or near Sidènréng. The name derives from the three panels which were set above the doorway of a ruler's house (lesser nobles had one or two panels); such panels may be seen today at the former residence of the royal family of Goa at Sungguminasa, near Ujung Pandang.

40. Cf. La Makkara, above
He was the first to make firm agreements between the people of Sidénrêng and their lord. He was the first to fix laws and appoint ministers. He was a great ruler. His laws were splendid and people feared the law. The eight brothers\footnote{Above and below, seven brothers, later eight.} of the Arung of Sidénrêng were also the eight (19) ploughmen. The eight ploughmen made an agreement with the Aćdaoang of Sidénrêng. Also they presented him with exclusive rights over the central body of the forest. The Ađdaang said, "Who shall fill the palace?"\footnote{I.e. provide servants and retainers.} The seven brothers said, "We shall fill your palace." The Ađdaang of Sidénrêng said, "I have just a title, it is you seven who own the palace." The seven replied, "Us seven own [the] palace, but there is only one who occupies a palace in Sidénrêng." The Ađdaang said, "It would seem therefore that eight of us own the palace." The seven ploughmen replied, "The eight of us are of one mind. We seven surrender our authority to you." The Ađdaang La Kasi said, "What sign will you give to show that you are surrendering your authority?" The eight\footnote{Correctly, seven.} headmen replied, "We will hand over to you what is caught in the mouth of the enclosure; [you] take the salt, the sîrih, the tobacco. Only you may order these sold, no-one other than you may do so." The Ađdaang said, "I will own the salt, I will own the tobacco, I will own the sîrih." The seven headmen said also, "[You] also take possession of unusual things." The Ađdaang said, "I will own the transvestites, the dwarves, the albinos. Each of you should also give me five followers whom I will take as special retainers in the palace. The Ađdaang said also, "There is something else I request." The eight headmen said, What is it you request?" The Ađdaang said, "When there are confiscated goods, send them up to the palace. When you have paid five old rial\footnote{A Spanish silver coin imported by English and Dutch traders. It was worth about two and a half Dutch Guilders.} you may take them." The Ađdaang and the headmen, the eight brothers, made a further agreement. The seven [headmen] said, "It is our decision that only you are the great Ađdaang. As for the contents of your palace, once they have gone up to the palace we shall have no further claim to them." [The Ađdaang said,] "I alone send [goods] down [from the palace], I too who ensure that you maintain traditional law. If I do not like something which I entrust to you, I alone untie it." The Ađdaang said, "What else will you seven give me? You give me serving girls and
personal guards. I give you permission to seize wrongdoers."45 Wē Tēpulingē was the A'daoang of Sidēnreng. She was also

(20) Datu of Suppa5. She had three children. One was called Wē Pawawoi, he ruled at Bācukiki. One was called La Tē'dullopo, he was Datu of Suppa5. Wē Pawawoi married at Sidēnreng with the child of [La Bangēngnge] the one who descended at Lowa, called Sukumpulawēng, and she ruled at Sidēnreng. They had one child, called La Batara. La Batara ruled at Sidēnreng. He went and married at Bulucēnrana with the Arung of Bulucēnrana, Wē Cina. They had three children: one called La Pasampoi, one called Wē Abēng and one called La Mariasē7; he ruled at Sidēnreng.46 He [La Pasampoi] married the child of La Botillangi5, the Arung Mario, called Wē Tappatana. They had one child called La Patē'dungi. La Patē'dungi was the A'daoang of Sidēnreng. He went and married at Rappang. He had one child called La Patiroi. La Patiroi was the A'daoang of Sidēnreng. He was the first person to accept Islam in 1602; that is, 1508 A.H.47 He was posthumously known as Matinroē ri Massēpē.48

---

45The end of the third pericope. The source for the remainder of the Chronicle to 1600 is the Royal Genealogy of Sidēnreng, which is examined in the following section.

46The Royal Genealogy of Sidēnreng states at Bulucēnrana.

47In European numerals: correctly 1018 A.H.; the Arabic "0" and "5" are easily confused. 1018 A.H. corresponds to the Christian year 1609, which is given in most Bugis and Early European sources as the date of Sidēnreng official Islamization.

48"He who sleeps at Massēpē"
2.9. The Royal Genealogy of Sidēnreng

The Royal Genealogy of Sidēnreng (hereafter RGSid) is the name I have given to a short genealogy tracing the ruling family of Sidēnreng from c.1475 to the early seventeenth century. The RGSid was one of the sources used by the author of the Chronicle of Sidēnreng, examined in the previous section. The independent versions of the RGSid are considerably more detailed than the version preserved (perhaps only in part) in the Chronicle, and are thus worth examining independently. As far as I am aware, no version of the RGSid has yet been published.

2.9.1. Versions of the RGSid

The five versions of the RGSid examined here are shown in table 2-8. These are henceforth referred to by the letter given in the right-hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pages.Lines</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KITLV</td>
<td>Or. 272 lb</td>
<td>1.1-3.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITLV</td>
<td>Or. 272 V</td>
<td>1.1-2.16</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEID</td>
<td>Or. 6163 &quot;book&quot; 150</td>
<td>1.1-4.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAK</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>81.22-83.10</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69.1-70.4</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five versions can be divided into two groups, \(ABDE\) and \(C\). Versions belonging to the first group agree closely with each other and show only minor differences. Three share the same colophon,\(^1\) which contains the Moslem date Isnain 26 (correctly, 28) Jumādi 'l-awwal 1243 A.H., and the corresponding Christian year 1827, this, evidently, being the date of copying of their common source.\(^2\) Version \(C\), while containing a number of inconsequential variant readings and several omissions, is similar in content to \(ABDE\).

---

\(^1\)KITLV Or. 272 V omits the colophon, but is in all other respects almost identical to the other three.

\(^2\)A contains a date of Khamis, 14 (correctly, 13) Jumādi 'l-awwal 1263 A.H. (29 April 1847). This is evidently the date on which \(A\) was copied.
Given the very close readings of \textit{ABDE}, a more complex stemma is unnecessary. \( E \) has been selected for editing on the grounds of textual clarity. One substitution, which is supported by all other versions, has been made in the transcription.

\textbf{2.9.2. Dating the RGSid}

All but one version of the RGSid is prefaced by a colophon dated 1827: the work itself ends with the posthumous titles of the first Moslem rulers of Sidénéng, Suppa\(^e\) and Sawitto. The RGSid can thus be roughly dated between the mid-seventeenth and the early nineteenth century.

\textbf{2.9.3. The RGSid as a Historical Source}

There can be little doubt that the RGSid was based on written genealogical records. The \textit{tomanurung} of Bacukiki and Lawaramparéng, La Bangëngngë and \( \text{We Téplingê} \), whose names begin the RGSid, are very likely historical figures. Their designation as heavenly-descended beings in the RSid serves to provide the appropriate status for the ruling family of Sidénéng. The usefulness of the RGSid is limited by the fact that it extends back only five generations from c.1600.
2.9.4. Text, E

Naripammula rioki\(^2\) \ lo[n]tara\(^2\) attoriolongngë riëssona Isnaïne\(^3\) ri 26 o[m]pona koromai ulëng Jumâdi 'l-awwal ri taung alipu \ hi[j]ratu 'l-nabi šallâ 'llahu 's-laihi wasallama 1243\(^4\) nay[i]a hejêrrana nabi Iza 1827 h-\(\nu\)r\(^5\) Aja\(^6\) mumabusung\(^6\) \ aja\(^6\) kumawë\(^7\)dawë\(^7\)da \ [n]ra[m]pë[a](m)[pêi \ asënna \ manurungngë \ ri Sidë[n]rëng \ ê[n]rëngngë\(^7\) manurungngë \ ri Bacukiki \ ê[n]rëngngë to[m]poë\(^7\) \ ri Lawaramparang La Bangëngngë \ asënna\(^8\) manurungngë \ yi[a]na makkarung \ ri Bacukiki manurungngë \ ri Bacukiki \ yi[a]na sianurungngëngë\(^9\) \ pitu salassa \ ri Cë[m]pa \ yi[a]na siala \ to[m]poë\(^6\) ri Lawara[m]parang \ sitomporëngngë \ lipa\(^6\) lumu\(^6\)na \ ori[m]pulawëng \ saji ulawëng \ lowa ulawëng \ sa[n]ru\(^6\) kaju ulawëng lollong si[n]rangëng \ yi[a]na riasëng Wë Tëpu玲ë yi[a]na makkarung ri Suppa\(^2\) \ najajiangana\(^2\) \ têllu \ si'di riasëng La Të\(^{'}\)dullopo yi[a]na makkarung ri Suppa\(^2\) \ si'di riasëng Wë Pawawoi yi[a]na makkarung \ ri Bacukiki \ si'di riasëng La Botillangi\(^2\) yi[a]na makkarung ri Tanëtëlangi\(^2\) orai\(^2\)na Bacukiki \ Wë Pawawoina mallakkai ri Sidë[n]rëng siala ana\(^2\)na] manurungngë \ ri Lowa \ riasëngngë Sukumpulawëng yi[a]na makkarung ri Sidë[n]rëng \ najajiangi riasëngngë La Batari\(^10\) \ yi[a]na makkarung \ ri Sidë[n]rëng yi[a]na lao ma'bainë \ ri Bulucë[n]rana \ siala ArungNGë \ ri Bulucë[n]rana \ riasëngngë Wë Cina najajiangana\(^2\) têllu \ si'di riasëng La Pasampoi yi[a]na makkarung ri Sidë[n]rëng \ si'di riasëng Wë Abëng si'di riasëng La Mriasë\(^2\) yi[a]na makkarung \ ri Bulucë[n]rana \ puattana La Botillangi\(^2\) ma'bainë \ Mario \ siala Arungngë \ ri Mario \ najajiangana\(^2\) si'di yi[a]na riasëng Wë Tappatina\(^11\) yi[a]na mallakkai ri Sidë[n]rëng siala A'daowangngë ri Sidë[n]rëng \ riasëngngë La Pasampoi najajiangi riasëngngë La Patë'dungi yi[a]na A'datuang ri Sidë[n]rëng \ puattana / La Të\(^{'}\)dullopo yi[a]na Datu ri Suppa\(^2\) \ yi[a]na ma'bainë \ ri Cë[m]pa \ siala Arungngë \ ri Cë[m]pa \ riasëngngë Wë Patuli najajiangi riasëngngë La Putëbulu yi[a]na Datu ri Suppa\(^2\) \ yi[a]na lao ma'bainë \ ri Mario \ siala Arung Mario \ 

\(^3\)Italicized words are Arabic.

\(^4\)1243 is written in Arabic numerals.

\(^5\)I am unable find any word either in Wehr 1961 or Lane 1881 which gives a helpful translation for h-\(\nu\)r (the root produces hayyir, "rash, precipitate, thoughtless, ill-considered, imprudent"): it is probably an abbreviation. (De Noordijn suggests kera - like Christian era, which makes easy sense.)

\(^6\)mumabusung read kumabusung.

\(^7\)[n]rëngngë is omitted in the translation.

\(^8\)Text in bold type is contained within circles within the main body of the text.

\(^9\)sianurungngë read sianurungngë

\(^10\)ABCD's reading of La Batara is followed in the translation.

\(^11\)Wë Tappatana, as well below and in other manuscripts, is followed in the translation.
siala \ masapposisëng \ riasëngngë Wë Tappatana \ puraë \ napobainë \\
A'sdaowangngë ri Sidënrenëg \ riasëngngë La Pasa[m]poi najajianni riasëngngë \\
Makkarië \ yi[a]na Datu ri Suppa² \ yi[a]na mappadaworowanë \ si[i]na \\
A'datuangngë \ ri Sidën[r]ëng \ riasëngngë La Patë'dungi yi[a]na lao ma'bawinë ri \\
Sawitto \ siala ana'na Wë Gë[m]po² riasëngngë \ riasëngngë¹² Da [M]bala \\
anina¹³ Arung Rappëng \ riasëngngë La Pakolongi lakkainna puatta \ Wë \\
Gë[m]po² \ yi[a]na rioiano² \ ri A'datuang ri So[m]pëo ñi Sawitto riasëngngë \\
Palëtëangngë najijiattoni¹⁴ riasëngngë \ La Cëlla'mata \ yi[a]na A'datuang ri \\
Sawitto \ yi[a]tona riappan[n]ënaang asu balabangëng \ ri Karaëngngë ri Goa \\
riru[m]pa'na Sawitto Suppa² \ ana'natopa \ puatta Wë Gë[m]po² ri ArunRappëng \\
riasëng Wë Rë[n]rittana mappada makku[n]rai \ si[i]nasiamanni Da [M]bala \\
yi[a]na polakkaiwi \ A'datuangngë ri Sidën[r]ëng \ riasëngngë La Patë'dungi \\
najajianni riasëngngë La Patiroi La Patiroi yi[a]na A'datuang ri Sidën[r]ëng \ \\
yi[a]na mula muttama sëllëng \ yi[a]na riasëng Mati[n]roë ri Massëpë asëng \\
matëna \ puattana Wë¹⁵ Rë[n]rittana \ tana¹⁶ \ polangkaiwi¹⁷ sapposisënya \\
anan’na puatta La Cëlla'mata riasëngngë La La¹⁸ Pa[n]cai najajianni riasëngngë \\
Wë Passullë yi[a]na A'datuwang ri Sawitto yi[a]tona \ Datu \ ri Suppa² yi[a]tona \\
mula muttama sëllëng yi[a]tona riasëng Mati[n]roë ri \\

(70) Mati[n]roë \ ri¹⁹ mala \ asëng matëna riasëttoi Datu Bissuë \ yi[a]tona \\
massapposisëng Mati[n]roë ri Massëpë \ puattana \ La Cëlla'mata \ yi[a]na \\
A'datuang ri Sawitto \ yi[a]na riasëng puatta déë'ë gocinna puattana La Pa[n]cai \ \\
yi[a]na A'datuang ri Sawitto \ yi[a]na matë) rijallo \ yi[a]tona punna gajang \ ula⁵ \\
ruraungngë \ yi[a]na riasëngngë Tëmmaruling \ tammät 

¹² The second occurrence of riasëngngë is omitted in the translation.
¹³ anina read ana’na
¹⁴ najijaittoni read najajiatttoni
¹⁵ This is spelt Wëë.
¹⁶ tana is an accidental repeat of the last two aksara of the name Wë Rë[n]rittana. It is omitted in the translation.
¹⁷ polangkaiwi read polakkaiwi.
¹⁸ The second occurrence of La is omitted in the translation.
¹⁹ The second occurrence of Matinroë ri is omitted in the translation.
2.9.5. Translation

The writing of this historical text was begun on Monday the 26th day of the moon [in the] month of Jumādī 'l-awwal in the year alif 1243 [after] the era of the prophet, God bless him and give him peace; that is, [after] the migration of the prophet Jesus, 1827. May I not swell, may I not weaken for mentioning the names of the tomanurung of Sidēnrēng: he who descended at Bacukiki, and she who arose at Lawaramparang. La Bangēngnge was the name of the one who descended. He ruled at Bacukiki, the one who descended at Bacukiki. The seven palaces at Cēmpa descended with him. He married the one who arose at Lawaramparang. With her arose her “moss” sarong, a gold pot, a gold rice ladle, a gold pot, a golden vegetable ladle and a palanquin. She was called Wē Tēpulinge and she ruled at Suppa. They had three children: one named La Tēddullopo, he ruled at Bacukiki; one named Wē Pawawoi she ruled at Bacukiki; and one named La Botillangi. He ruled at Tanētelangi, to the west of Bacukiki. Wē Pawawoi married at Sidenreng with the child of the one who descended at [Bulu] Lowa, who was called Sukumpulaweng: She ruled at Sidenreng. They had a child who was called La Batara. He ruled at Sidēnrēng. He went and married at

20: historical text: lontara\textsuperscript{2} attoriolong.
21: era: (Arabic) \textit{hijra}, literally “migration”; cf. the use of \textit{hijra} below, which suggests a partial understanding of the word.
22: Jumādī 'l-awwal 1243 fell on a Saturday; the date should presumably read 28 Jumādī 'l-awwal 1243, or 17 December 1817. The discrepancy is probably due to the fact that the establishment of the new month relied upon sightings of the moon, or to errors in a table used to establish the new month (cf. Hurgronje 1906:196). The designation \textit{alif} refers to the eight year Muslim calendar cycle, in which the years are named after eight letters of the Arabic alphabet. For further details see Mattheson and Andaya 1982:311, footnote 2.
23: Writhing rocks: According to Pelras (1977:240, footnote 16) Bacukiki was originally situated on the boulder-strewn summit of Bulu Aruang, south of Pārēparē.
25: Meaning unknown.
26: The name of a tree.
27: Literally, “wood-gold-ladle”.
28: Perfect uterus.
29: Great umbrella.
30: Bring above.
31: Top of the Sky.
32: A hill settlement, now deserted.
33: Old hill; a small, cone-shaped hill about a kilometre north of Amaparita. The tomanurung of Bulu Lowa is not named.
34: A small gold coin.
35: A title derived from (Sanskrit) \textit{bhaṭāra}, “noble lord”. The ruler of Majapahit was known as (Javanese) \textit{bhaṭāra}. Cf. Manuel Pinto’s statement that the ruler of Sidēnrēng “was a very great lord, who was called emperor” (Pelras 1977:248).
Bulucénrana36 with the Arung of Bulucénrana, who was called We Cina.37 They had three children: one called La Pasampoi,38 he ruled at Sidénréng; one called We Abéng,39 and one called La Maríasè;40 he ruled at Bulucénrana. Our lord La Botillangi3 married at Mario41 with the Arung of Mario. They had a child called We Tappatana.42 She married at Sidénréng with the A'daowang of Sidénréng, who was called La Pasampoi.43 They had a child who was called La Paté'dungi.44 He was A'datuang of Sidénréng. Now [returning to] our lord La Teddullopo, we was Datu of Suppac.45 He went and married at Mario with his cousin the Arung Mario, who was called We Tappatana.46 He was Datu of Suppac. He went and married at Mario with his cousin the Arung Mario, who was called We Tappatana, after she was no longer the wife of the A'daowang of Sidénréng who was called La Pasampoi.47 They had a child who was called [La] Makkariè.48 He was Datu of Suppac. He was the brother by the same mother of the A'datuang at Sidénréng who was called La Paté'dungi.49 He went and married at Sawitto with the daughter of Wé Gempö50 who was called Da Mbala51 the daughter of the Arung Rappeng who was called La Pakolongi, the husband of our lady Wé Gempö52. She was the child of the A'datuang at Sopoe53 at Sawitto who was called Palétéangngé.54 Another of his children was called La Cella'mata.55

36. Cénrana is the name of a tree with fragrant yellow, red or white flowers; thus "hill of the Cénrana trees": in east Sidénréng.
37. Other sources give Wé Cinadio.
38. The one who covers.
39. Wé Abéng is the wife of Sawarigading, the father of I La Galigo.
40. The one [who is] above.
41. Probably Marioriawa in north Soopèng.
42. Sunlight of the land.
43. Péiras' identification of Wé Tappatana as Juan de Eréidia's "Tamalina" (Péiras 1977:250-251) is not supported by the present text. It is possible that the text is corrupt, as La Pasampoi is here the nephew of Wé Tappatana, his wife.
44. Gives shade.
45. Goes around.
46. "White hair". The present text supports Péiras' identification of La Putebulu as the ruler of Suppac whom Antônio de Paiva baptized in 1544 (Péiras 1977:250). The ruler was then about seventy years old, "a mighty and warlike ruler, very much dreaded in the surrounding area" (Jacobs 1966:258).
47. C adds "[with the] daughter of La Botillangi [and the] Arung Mario, who was called Wé Tappatana". This line is missing in other manuscripts.
48. The root of this name appears to be ari, "sprout, shoot", thus perhaps "makes [s.t.] grow".
49. i.e. La Makkariè was the half-brother of the ruler of Sidénréng.
50. Probably gempö, "large".
51. Probably "mother of the house", from Makasar balla, "house".
52. Unidentified; presumably a place in Sawitto (B Sopoe C omits D Sopè).
53. The one who crosses over [as of a bridge]; the subject of this sentence is Wé Gempö.
54. "Red eyes"; Péiras' identification of La Cella'mata with Erédia's La Pituo (La Pétanp) is not supported by the present text (Péiras 1977:251).
He was Adatuang at Sawitto. He was eaten by the war dogs of the Karaeng of Goa when he defeated Sawitto and Suppa.\(^5^5\) Another child of our lady We Gempo\(^5^6\) and the Arung Rapeng was called We Rennittana.\(^5^6\) [She was] the full sister of Da Mbala. \(^5^5\) She married the Adatuang at Sidenneng called La Patedungi. They had a child who was called La Patiroi.\(^5^7\) La Patiroi\(^5^8\) was Adatuang at Sidenneng. He was the first Moslem\(^5^9\) and was posthumously called “He who sleeps at Massépé.” Our lady We Rennittana married her cousin, the son of our lord La Cellama, who was called La Pancal.\(^6^0\) They had a child called We Passulle.\(^6^1\) She was Adatuang at Sawitto and she was also Datu of Suppa. She was also the first [ruler of Sawitto and Suppa\(^5^5\)] to accept Islam, and she was known posthumously as Matinroë

(70) ri mala\(^6^2\) [She was] also known as “Datu bissu”.\(^6^3\) She married her cousin, Matinroë ri Massepë.\(^6^4\) Our lord La Cellama was Adatuang at Sawitto and was known as “Our Lord who had no Jar”.\(^6^5\) Our lord La Pancal was the Adatuang at Sawitto. He was killed by an amok. He was the one who owned the gold serpent keris. He was also known as Témmaruling.\(^6^6\)

---

\(^5^5\) The text is referring here to an incident during the conquest of Sawitto and Suppa by Tunipalaanga recorded in the Goa Chronicle. When, after a gap of approximately fourteen years, news of South Sulawesi reached Goa in 1559, it was learnt that Bacukiki had been conquered by Goa and that only “[We] Tamalina” remained alive (Pelras 1977:251).

\(^5^6\) Wall [of the] land

\(^5^7\) The subject of this passage is Da Mbala.

\(^5^8\) The one who sees

\(^5^9\) C adds “in 1602 (correctly 1609), or A.H. 1018”.

\(^6^0\) Other sources have La Pancalama.

\(^6^1\) The one who replaced

\(^6^2\) According to Salim, “She who sleeps in a grave”.

\(^6^3\) An incongruous title for a Moslem ruler.

\(^6^4\) He who sleeps at Massépé

\(^6^5\) Thus signifying that he was buried rather than cremated, as was the normal practice among the pre-Islamic elite. He was presumably a Christian, perhaps among the thirty or so nobles baptized with the ruler of Siang by Paiva in 1544.

\(^6^6\) Did not return
2.10. The Sidenrêng Vassal List

The final work is a list of the vassal settlements of Sidenrêng, the most important of the five principalities that controlled the fertile lowland plain lying between the central lakes and the west coast of the peninsula both before and after 1600.¹ The Sidenrêng Vassal List (hereafter SidVL) names approximately thirty-two settlements; these are divided into several groups by the use of three expressions, the precise meanings of which are uncertain. The purpose for which the list was compiled is unknown: as far as I am aware, no version of the SidVL has yet been published.

2.10.1. Versions of the SidVL

The three versions of the SidVL examined here are shown in table 2-9. These will henceforth be referred to by the letter given in the right-hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pages/Lines</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118.2-118.14</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>133.1-133.12</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>59.2-59.16</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names and order of settlements contained in each version is nearly identical, and it is clear that all three derive from a single version. Owing to the brevity of the work it is not possible to establish any firm relationships between versions. Version C omits a textual corruption shared by A and B and is therefore chosen for editing.

2.10.2. Dating the SidVL

It is difficult to suggest a date of composition for the SidVL. The comparative evidence of the Vassal Lists of Luwu² and Soppêng would suggest that the tradition which it records dates back to the pre-Islamic period.

¹The other principalities were Rappang, Suppa², Sawitto and Alitta.
2.10.3. The SidVL as a Historical Source

Thirteen of the SidVL's thirty-one settlements can be identified on Dutch maps of the Sidënreng region. These are shown in figure 2-15. No settlement is further than fifteen kilometers (measured in a straight line) from Sidënreng and all but one are closely associated with the region of wet-rice cultivation lying to the north and west of Lake Sidënreng. The other four members of the "confederation" of Limae Ajattapparêng – Rappang, Alitta, Suppa and Sawitto – are not named as vassals.

What the SidVL appears to record is a map of Sidënreng's political administration. Like the Vassal Lists of Luwu and Soppêng, the SidVL divides up its list of settlements into several of groups through the use of certain expressions. While the significance of all but one of these divisions is uncertain, the office of Arung is clearly associated with the first ten groups of settlements. It would seem that the settlements named in these groups were ruled through the office of Arung. The eleventh group – Massêpê, Alakuang, Têtaaji and Lisa – is introduced by the expression "then the plough of [Sidënreng] went down [to]". This appears to mark a major division in the text (cf. a similar use of the expression in the Soppêng Vassal List.) The settlements of this eleventh group do not appear to have been ruled by an Arung, the office of which is nowhere mentioned. In the case of Alakuang, this is confirmed by local tradition, which states that Alakuang had neither an Arung nor a high-status family of any importance (personal communication, Drs Muhammad Salim). The relationship of the remaining three groups, the first of which is divided from the preceding group by the word "Sidënreng", is unclear. Local enquiry into the divisions of the SidVL would probably be of help in sorting out these relationships.
2.10.4. Text, C

Siděnřěng \ palili'na \ Mawoiwa \ Bulucěnrana \ Oting duwa arung \ dě⁵ masala napolei bilabilana Siděnřěng \ ba₂ Bila \ těllu arung \ dě⁵ masala napolei bilabilana Siděnřěng \ Wala \ Botto Ugi \ Jampubatu \ duwa arung \ dě⁵ masala napolei Siděnřěng \ Baruku \ duwa arung \ dě⁵ masala napolei bilabilana Siděnřěng \ Bara₆ Mamasě \ duwa arung \ dě⁵ masala napolei bilabilana \ Siděnřěng \ Bětao \ duwa arung dě⁵ masala napolei bilabilana \ Siděnřěng \ Kalěmpang \ těllu arung \ dě⁵ masala napolei bilabilana \ Siděnřěng Latěnře \ Paraja \ Ampirita² \ Wawanio \ duwa arung \ duwato bilabilana Siděnřěng \ Běloka \ duwa arung \ duwato bilabilana Siděnřěng \ Cirowali Wěttě³ \ tammat Siděnřěng \ napano⁵e rakalana \ Massěpě \ Alěkkuwang⁴ \ Tětěaji \ Lisě⁵ \ Siděnřěng \ Guru \ ŏngka arunna \ mapano⁶tosia ri wanuanna \ Wala \ Sěrēa \ Liwuwu \ Aratěng⁶ \ ŏngka arung \ těmmapano⁶sa ri pabanuwanna \ Wěngęng \ Tělla tammat

²Ampirita read Amparita
³The modern spelling of Wattaë is followed in the translation.
⁴The modern spelling of Alakuang is followed in the translation.
⁵The modern spelling of Lisa is followed in the translation.
⁶The modern spelling of Aratang is followed in the translation.
2.10.5. Translation

Sidénrêng’s vassals are Mawoiwa,7 Bulucënranana, Oting, two lords of equal rank, then came Sidénrêng’s envoys, Bila, three lords of equal rank, then came Sidénrêng’s envoys, Wala, Botto, Ugi, Jamubatu, two lords of equal rank, then came Sidénrêng’s envoys, Baruku,9 two lords of equal rank, then came Sidénrêng’s envoys, Bara, Mamase,10 two lords of equal rank, then came Sidénrêng’s envoys, Betao, two lords of equal rank, then came Sidénrêng’s envoys, Kalêmpang, three lords of equal rank, then came Sidénrêng’s envoys, Latènrê Paraja, Amparita, Wawanio, two lords, also two envoys [of] Sidénrêng, Beloka,11 two lords, also two envoys [of] Sidénrêng, Ciroali,12 Wêtëfë. Then Sidénrêng’s plough went down [to] Massépê, Alakuang, Têteaji, Lisa, Sidénrêng, Guru,13 these lords go down to their lands, Wala, Sëréa, Liwuu, Aratang, these lords do not go down to their lands, Wëngëng and Tëlla.

7 Unidentified: the only one of Sidénrêng’s vassals to possess its own vassals, which are listed after the present work in all MSS. AB have Mawoiriawa.
8 envoys: bilana: “the bila-bila is a leaf of the lôntar with a number of knots on it, specifying the number of days at the extinction of which the vassal is expended to attend” (Raffles 1817:clxxv; cf. Kern 1948:6, footnote 1)
9 AB Baroku
10 possibly Bara+mamasë.
11 On Dutch maps, Biloka.
12 Ciroali is named also in the Vassal List of Soppêng.
13 AB Buru
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alakuang</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amparita</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bila</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Botto</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sidënrëng</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tëtëaji</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wattaë</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wala[tëdong]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3

Bugis Texts as Historical Sources

Before beginning to use the works set out in the previous chapter as historical sources, there remain two important tasks to carry out. The first is to develop a means by which to date the evidence of the works—how far back do they date and how can we know this? The second is to examine the relationship between the development of writing and the nature of Bugis-Makasar society. Do the beginnings of written records reflect an important change in the nature of the society? Or is there a simpler explanation? Finally, a summary of the general features of the textual evidence is given.

3.1. Chronology

Chronology—the arrangement of individuals and events according to date or order of occurrence—is obviously central to most historical enquiries. Unfortunately, none of the Bugis sources examined in the previous chapter contains any dates or reign-lengths by which the events and individuals of which it speaks can be dated. Neither is it possible to turn to contemporary European sources for help, for these do not start until the arrival of the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, and deal mainly with the west-coast kingdoms of Suppa and Siang (Pelras 1977). Post-seventeenth-century European sources are of little help either, as the relevant parts of these are based, either directly or indirectly, upon indigenous sources similar to those examined here.

The solution of this problem lies in the royal genealogies and chronicles. By taking a known and securely dated person late in a genealogy and "backdating," using a fixed number of years for each generation, a chronological framework may be obtained for earlier individuals and events.\(^1\) The scattered information accompanying

\(^1\)The technique of backdating was first applied to South Sulawesi historical sources in the History of the Indian Archipelago (Crawfurd 1820), which includes a chart of Bugis and Makasar rulers in chronological order. Crawfurd's sources and the principles upon which he worked are not clear and I have not, therefore, made a systematic comparison between his conclusions and mine.
various individuals in these and other sources can then be placed within this framework.

The period generally used for backdating is between twenty-five and thirty three and one-third years (cf. Alcock 1971:11, Desborough 1972:324, Snodgrass 1971:11, etc.). Considering the number of inter-kingdom conflicts of the sixteenth century (Andaya 1981, Chapter One, Pelras 1977, passim), thirty years may seem a rather high figure. We may turn for guidance here to the chronicles of Goa-Tallo and Boné, each of which provides reign-lengths for a number of rulers before 1600. These are: (Bone) La Umasa 17, Kërrampelu 72, Makkalëmpë 15, La Tënrisukki 27, La Ulio 25, La Tënriawë 20; (Tallo) Tumëñanga ri Makkoayang 30, I Sambo 13; (Goa) Tumapërisii Kallonna 36, Tunipalangga 18, Tunibatta 0 and Tunijallo 24: some are estimates (Reid 1983:132-133, Macknight and Mukhlis, forthcoming). Their average is 22.84 years, slightly lower than we might expect from the evidence of roughly comparable sources. However, if Macknight is correct in assuming that inter-kingdom warfare arose largely after 1500 (Macknight 1983:100), this average, which relies heavily on sixteenth-century reign lengths, may be too low. If we ignore the case of Tunibatta, who died in battle in 1565 after ruling just “forty days”, the average reign length rises to 24.75 years, close to the minimum period generally used for backdating.

A figure of 25 years, or 15 years in the case of brother succeeding brother, is therefore chosen as the average reign-length for backdating. A firm starting point is provided by the well-documented conversion to Islam of individual rulers of the major kingdoms of South Sulawesi in the first two decades of the seventeenth century. Reign-dates obtained by backdating will be preceded by the abbreviation c. (circa).

In the following pages we shall examine the genealogical structure of several of the works examined in the previous chapter, to see what dates can be given to the rulers whom they name. As we have seen, Bugis historical writings may be based upon legend as well as upon more reliable historical sources, such as written genealogical records. For several of the works to be examined here, we not only know what sources their authors used, but where one source ends and the next

\[2\] Cf. Alcock 1971:11 on the early British genealogies, the evidence of which points to an average reign length of twenty five years.
begins. This will enable us to compare the structural chronologies of those works with regard to the type of sources used in each.

As Luwu was believed to have been the first Bugis kingdom to exercise any widespread authority in South Sulawesi, we might expect the Royal Genealogy of Luwu to produce the longest sequence of rulers of any of South Sulawesi's royal genealogies. In this respect the Royal Genealogy is a disappointing work, for it produces no individual who can be backdated earlier than the late fifteenth century. In section 2.2 the Royal Genealogy of Luwu was shown to be based to A.D. 1600 on three sources. These were (1) a short recension of the Lontara Simpurusia, which provided the first three rulers, Simpurusia, Anakaji and La Malalae, (2) an unidentified source which provided the fourth and fifth rulers, Tampabalusu and Tanrabalusu, and (3) a written genealogy beginning with To Apanangi and extending over five generations to the first Moslem ruler of Luwu, Matinroë ri Warë.

We may note that the rulers of the first source have no genealogical connection with those of the second source. Evidently the author of the Royal Genealogy was unwilling to join together what he considered to be two separate traditions. In addition, while the last ruler of the second source, Tanrabalusu, is stated to be the father of To Apanangi, the first ruler of the third source, the fact that each derives from an independent source argues against such a relationship. Thus, only the last six rulers provided by the third genealogical source can be backdated. The earliest of these, To Apanangi, can be estimated to have ruled from c.1475 to c.1500.

By contrast, the Royal Genealogy of Soppeng offers a relatively straightforward record of West Soppeng's rulers (later the rulers of a unified Soppeng) and their close relatives over a period of fourteen generations to the early seventeenth century. The first of these rulers, La Têmrmama, can be backdated to c.1315-c.1340. While La Têmrmama is described as a tomanurung, he is identified with a settlement lying in the fertile, rice-growing central region of the Walanae valley, while his wife, Wê Mapupu, is identified as the ruler of the west-coast kingdom of Suppa. For reasons set out in Chapters Four to Six, I am inclined to view La Têmrmama and his wife as historical figures, to whom the status of tomanurung has been later attached. Little is evidently remembered of La Têmrmama, but by the time that the genealogy reaches his great-granddaughter, Wê Têkëwanua, who can be estimated to have ruled around the year 1400, the genealogy becomes ap-
preciably more detailed. Not only do we learn through an attached anecdote of the expansion of agriculture in Soppeng under Wē Tēkēwanua's direction, but her daughter, Wē Tēnrita’birēng, can be cross-referenced with the Royal Genealogy of Cina through her marriage to La Pañorongi (figure 3-1).

![Diagram of genealogical relationships between La Pañorongi and Wē Tēnrita’birēng in the Royal Genealogies of Soppeng and Cina.](image)

**Figure 3-1:** La Pañorongi and Wē Tēnrita’birēng in the RGS and RGC

Wē Tēnrita’birēng and La Pañorongi can be dated to c.1400-c.1425 in the Royal Genealogy of Soppeng and c.1430-c.1455 in the Royal Genealogy of Cina. This result is well within the range of error we might expect from such a crude method as backdating. In addition, the difference in the name of their son between the two genealogies (RGS: Tenrilele RGC: Mallele) suggests that each name came from a different source. (The variant spellings are consistent between versions of each work.)

Like the Royal Genealogy of Luwu', the pre-1600 section of the Chronicle of Sidēnrēng can be shown to have been based upon a number of sources, all but the last of which derived from an oral tradition. Each of these oral sources was formerly independent of the others; they are arranged in the Chronicle in approximate chronological order with little attempt at connection. Despite some superficial contradictions, some information as to Sidēnrēng's pre-Islamic rulers can be obtained from them, although the events to which they are connected are probably apocryphal. The last of the five sources, however, was clearly a written genealogy...
(or genealogies). Members of this source can be backdated to c.1475 by virtue of La Patiroi, who is recorded in most versions as having converted to Islam in 1611. Historical individuals named in the oral sources must therefore be placed earlier than c.1475.

The final work examined here is the Royal Genealogy of Cina. Like Luwu, Cina is believed to be one of the oldest kingdoms of South Sulawesi (Abidin 1983:218). It should, therefore, come as no surprise to find that the Royal Genealogy of Cina, like the Royal Genealogy of Luwu, derives its first three generations from the legend of Simpurusia. These legendary rulers are followed by a detailed genealogy, starting with La Sengngeng and extending through seventeen generations to the "focus" of the Royal Genealogy of Cina, La Tenrittata, Arung Palakka (c.1633-1696).

The Royal Genealogy of Cina does not, however, provide the full list of twenty-two rulers that tradition tells us preceded Cina’s change of name to Pammana. Nor are any members of its fourteen, "post-Simpurusia legend" generations named as rulers of Cina. These are identified as such by the King List of Cina (YKSST 3057:136), which provides the names of four more rulers between those of the legend of Simpurusia and La Sengngeng.

The two sources combined produce a list of twenty-two rulers up to and including La Sangaji Pammana, who can be dated to the first half of the seventeenth century. The first three rulers are undatable: they owe their inclusion in the Royal Genealogy (and their position) to the status of Luwu’s ruling family. Rulers four to seven are supplied by the King List: like Tanrabalusu and Tampabalusu in the Royal Genealogy of Luwu they are essentially undatable, but cannot be placed later than the early fourteenth century if we are to accept them as historical individuals. La Sengngeng, the King List’s eighth ruler, is found also in the Royal Genealogy (generation four), as is his son, La Patau (generation five). La Patau’s three sons — La Pottoanging, La Pasangkadi and La Padasajati — who can be dated to the first decades of the fifteenth century, provide the points of departure for a set of detailed, interlocking genealogies. This body of genealogies, of which the Royal

---

3 While some of the names are are different from those found in the Lontara Simpurusia (the Royal Genealogy of Luwu’s source) the legend is clearly the same. No evidence can be found to support Abidin’s assumption that Luwu’s Simpurusia and Cina’s “Simpurusia” are different individuals: both names are spelt the same way in the Bugis-Makasar script (Abidin 1983:218-219).
Genealogy is a part, extends down to at least the seventeenth century. Given the paucity of information available for the previous generations, the detail and complexity of these genealogies is striking. It would therefore seem that for Cina the limits of detailed genealogical knowledge lie, as they do for Soppêng, around the year 1400.

When the chronological findings are presented diagrammatically as in figure 3-2, we see that none of the legendary rulers who begin all but the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng, can be placed any later than the mid-fifteenth century. Indeed, the evidence of the King List of Cina suggests that the three rulers who begin both it and the Royal Genealogy of Luwu² must be placed before 1300 (if one need attribute any historicity to their names). As there is evidently no connection in any source between these rulers and the following generations there is no reason why they should not be placed earlier still, perhaps by as much as several centuries. We may conclude that the legendary rulers are simply undatable, and therefore need no longer concern ourselves with them.

On the other hand, we have sound evidence that genealogical records, upon which the later sections of each work were based, contained the names of historical individuals. Some of the individuals named by these records can be dated to the fourteenth century. The accuracy of these records from about 1400 is attested to by a number of cross references both between the four works and with other Bugis historical works. The historicity of the individuals who pre-date 1400 is less certain.

This leaves us with two unidentified sources: one which provided the fourth and fifth rulers of the Royal Genealogy of Luwu² and another which provided the King List of Cina's fourth to seventh ruler. While these individuals should presumably be placed between the rulers derived from the legend of Simpurusa and those which derive from written genealogical records, they are, like former, essentially undatable.

3.2. The Origins of Writing in South Sulawesi

We have now seen that, when stripped of their legendary elements, none of the four works examined contains individuals who can be backdated earlier than 1300. There is, in addition, both a qualitative and a quantitative difference in the information they provide for the fourteenth century, as opposed to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. No individual of the fourteenth century can be “cross-referenced”
Figure 3-2: Textual Chronology of the Northern Kingdoms
between genealogies, nor is there attached any anecdotal information of the sort that we find for individuals of the fifteenth and sixteenth century. Furthermore, the average number of individuals recorded for each generation in the fourteenth century is much less than that for the following two centuries. The Cina genealogies (the Royal Genealogy of Cina and related genealogies) record less than three individuals per generation during the fourteenth century, six in the first generation of the fifteenth century and eleven in the second generation. The Royal Genealogy of Soppêng produces similar figures: an average of little more than two individuals in the fourteenth century, nine in the first generation of the fifteenth century and thirteen in the second generation, while the average for the first half of the fifteenth century in both genealogies is broadly maintained for the six remaining generations to 1600. The increase in additional information — place names, personal relationships, teknonyms and anecdotes — is nearly as impressive, as can be seen from the extracts from these genealogies (figures 3-3 and 3-4 on pages 172 and 173) which sets out their information for the period c.1415-c.1565. In addition to the substantial increase in recorded information which these provide by the beginning of the fifteenth century, by about 1415 we are able to identify members of one kingdom’s ruling family in the genealogy of another kingdom’s ruling family with which they intermarried.

These features cannot be due to coincidence and almost certainly reflect a single underlying cause. The simplest explanation, and one which fits all the evidence, is that writing was first developed around 1400. This would account for both the paucity of information on fourteenth-century rulers and the apparently synchronous appearance of genealogical sources in the various kingdoms of South Sulawesi. The accounts of the origins of these kingdoms found in Bugis and Makasar written sources which can be dated to the fourteenth century or earlier, should therefore be treated with caution.

This date is broadly supported by the evidence of the South Sulawesi chronicles, from which little indeed can be learnt before 1400, after which time the historical record which they provide becomes considerably more detailed (Pelras 1981:174). None, however, offers us such clear evidence of the existence of detailed genealogical records dating back to 1400 as do the Royal Genealogies of Soppêng and Cina. We should also bear in mind that some time may have elapsed between the development of the script and its use in the recording of genealogies. If we consider the evident
Figure 3.5: The RGS, c.1150-c.1300
Figure 3.4: The RGC and Related Genealogies C.1415 - C.1565
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LA SENGNGE = O W B MATIMO

LA PATAS = O W B TENNIBWANG

LA POTONANGNI ARUNGI OF MAOLONRONG

LA PASANGHADI ARUNGI OF PAMMANA = O W B PADATOIA MARRIED AT PAMMANA

LA PASAKJATI ARUNGI OF TEBWATU = O W B SAMANA ? AT SALORD

LA PALLUMPENGI = O W B TEMBADINRONGA LA PAFAURI

= O W B MALENGNGE = O W B TEBWANGPEPA W E LUPARIU

= O W B TEBWADI MARRIED AT TEBAWATU

LA TEPPLI TO MALIGILA MARAJAE (?) AT CEPPA

= O W B TEBWAPE DA LA RIGA MARRIED AT TIMOND

= LA MALAPA
importance of genealogical records (to judge by the number of pre- and post-Islamic
genealogies found in the corpus of lontara literature) there seems little doubt that
this must have been one of its very first applications. The avoidance of personal
names through the use of teknonym, ascription or title meant that Bugis society was
subject to what Geertz and Geertz (1975:91) have termed "genealogical amnesia". (The very mention of the names of deceased rulers was fraught with danger, as we
see from the opening lines of the royal genealogies.) It is therefore difficult to argue
for a development of the Bugis-Makasar script much later than 1425 due to the
quantity of genealogical information that has come down to us from the fourteenth
century. A date around 1400 for the development of writing in South Sulawesi seems
most reasonable.

3.3. Textual Evidence: A Summary

The general findings as to the nature and historicity of the Bugis works examined
in the previous chapter may now be brought together and briefly summarized.

We have seen that in Bugis historiography - itself a category of Bugis writing -
there is a wide range of works of contrasting styles and subject matter. The range
of material (genealogies, legends, chronicles, vassal lists, accounts of the origin of
kingship) is clearly a reflection of the range of questions to which such material was
addressed in Bugis society. None of the works in Chapter Two seems to have been
composed before 1600: all date from the seventeenth or eighteenth century; and it
has even been suggested that the Chronicle of Sidénéng is a nineteenth or
twentieth-century work. However, it is clear that that the authors of all the works
drew extensively upon earlier sources, both oral and written, many of which (unlike
the works in which they are found) date from the pre-Islamic period. Our interest
in using the works as historical sources must, therefore, lie principally with an
analysis of these sources. However, in using the component sources of the ten works
as the basic units of our enquiry into the pre-Islamic period, we shall do well to
consider the aim or function of the work or works in which they are found. This
will in most cases tell us something of the way in which those sources were used by
the author of each work and how this might have affected the information which
they contained. We should also learn something of how these sources were viewed in
the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

1 Possible exceptions are the vassal lists of Luwu, Soppéng and Sidénéng, which cannot be dated by in-
ternal chronology or by identification of external sources. On the other hand, there is no evidence to sug-
gest an earlier date of composition than the genealogies and other works examined.
Noorduyn has shown that two of the major sources used by the writers of the chronicles of South Sulawesi were diaries (Noorduyn 1965:142). There is, however, no evidence for the the keeping of diaries before the seventeenth century. Cense (1966:422) stated that the oldest diary known to him was that of the ruling family of Goa and Tallo², which dates from the beginning of the seventeenth century, and that the oldest Bugis diary that had come to his notice was that of the famous Arung Palakka (c.1635-1696). For the earlier sections of the chronicles, Cense divided the sources into "stories, which have been handed down by oral tradition, or . . . written materials" (Cense 1966:424). This division is, however, not quite as simple as it first appears. Pelras' valuable study of written and oral traditions in modern-day South Sulawesi shows how transmitted information can move backwards and forwards between oral and written registers (Pelras 1979). This interaction between written and oral transmission seems to be true also for earlier periods. Textual sources which can only have derived from oral traditions, such as the legend of Simpurusia or the legend of the origin of Sidênrêng, can be seen, by the time of their incorporation into works such as the Royal Genealogy of Luwu² and the Chronicle of Sidênrêng, to have existed also in written form. While the author of the Chronicle of Tallo² attributed his version of the legend of the origin of that kingdom to a story heard from I Kare Baji', Daêng ri Buloae (Rahim and Boharima 1975:6), it is possible that this too derived in part from a written text.

An alternative approach would be to divide the sources into genealogical records (evidently deriving from sources contemporary with the individuals which they record) and what might be termed "narrative traditions", that is, oral or written sources which present their information in a narrative form, and in which a logical structure and overall objective can be detected. For instance, in the Chronicle of Sidênrêng the object of the third oral source was to spell out the close relationship between Sidênrêng and her neighbouring chiefdom of Rappang. Likewise, the three stories of the Lontara²na Simpurusia share a common aim of linking up the legendary first three generations of Luwu²'s post-Galigo rulers with the three great powers of the Bugis cosmos, namely the ruler of the Upperworld, the Earth and the Underworld. Any use of these narrative traditions for the writing of history must take account of the nature of these sources. It is not sufficient just to extract details without careful consideration of the role of those details in the overall structure of the work and its objective. In the case of the first example cited above, what is of interest are not so much the details of the financial obligations of the smaller
centres to the *Ai*datuang (which clearly date from the post-Islamic period) but the fact that the the formalization of such obligations is linked to a specific individual, La Makkaraka, who can be estimated to have ruled in the fifteenth century. In the second example, what is important is the status conferred upon the ruling family of Luwu by its association with the three great rulers of the Bugis cosmos, rather than the legendary marriage of a princess of Majapahit to a prince of Luwu.

Furthermore, it seems certain, both from the work of Pelras (1979) and from studies of oral traditions in other cultures and periods, that the narrative traditions which we possess must have developed and altered over time, in response to changing political and social conditions. Such a process must account for the inclusion of elements dating from a later period alongside other elements in a narrative tradition, as in, for example, the association of Majapahit with the legendary first rulers of Luwu, who evidently derive from an earlier period (cf. page 169). This admitted, and given the objectivity for which later Bugis historical writings are renowned, it would be foolish to dismiss such narrative traditions simply because we lack external confirmation of their subject matter. Rather, we should examine them individually, bearing in mind that none are historical records in the modern sense of the word, and that each of them sets out to achieve an objective through the manipulation of its individual parts, many of which may be historical.

It has also been seen that the dividing line between "legendary" and "historical" individuals is not always very clear. While rulers such as those of the legend of Simpurusia are plainly legendary, other indisputably historical figures (Luwu's fifteenth-century ruler Dèwaraja is an excellent example) may also become the focus of fantastic legends. This phenomenon is, of course, well known in Javanese historical-literary traditions, as can be illustrated by the case of Surapati (Kumar 1976). Indeed, it seems quite possible that behind every important legendary Bugis figure stands a historical individual. Whether anything can be learnt of that historical individual is another question: were we to know of Dèwaraja simply from the fantastic legends associated with him in MAK 108:161-166, which bear no apparent relation to historical reality, we would be unable to place him historically, let alone learn of the important decline in Luwu's power which took place during his reign.

---

2 A modern example of this process is reflected in a sign, erected by a local historical society, near the former settlement of Gittàng, in the hills behind Watasoppèng. This sign ascribes the erection of a large buried stone, which stands nearby, to the resolution of a conflict between the settlements of Sewo and Gattàng (cf. page 104). The wording of the sign reveals its claim to be based in part upon the Attoriolonna Soppèng, in which is recorded the desertion of Sewo and Gattàng, coupled (presumably) with a local legend. The stone, however, appears to be an Islamic grave marker, while archaeological data points to the destruction of Sewo and Gattàng by an army from Watasoppèng.
Perhaps most difficult to judge are those rulers who derive from sources which predate the keeping of genealogical records. Where such individuals are firmly linked to a reliable genealogical source, as are for example, the fourteenth-century rulers of Soppêng, it seems possible to accept them as historical figures, and to proceed on the assumption that their genealogical relationships are also basically correct. But rulers whose origins are independent of such sources, such as Tanrabalusu and Tam-pabalusu of the Royal Genealogy of Luwu⁵, or the four additional rulers of the King List of Cina, present a much greater level of uncertainty as to their historicity and period. Perhaps the most that one can do with such evidence is to cite them as prehistoric traditions.

However, when we turn to the second type of sources, the genealogical records used by the authors of the royal genealogies and chronicles, we see that their reliability from 1400 onwards is beyond reasonable doubt. This reliability points firmly to the conclusion that post-1400 genealogical information derives ultimately from records contemporary with the individuals recorded. In view of the evidence, no other conclusion will suffice. Even extant texts which have lost significant internal coherence due to accumulated corruption and contraction (such as most versions of the Royal Genealogy of Cina) can be restored, either in part or in whole, by reference to other texts preserving the same tradition, which have come down to us in a more intact state. These genealogies provide the basic chronology for pre-Islamic South Sulawesi, upon which we may locate the evidence of narrative and other sources.
Chapter 4

State and Society in Early South Sulawesi

This chapter describes the general features of pre-Islamic South Sulawesi Society as they appear from Bugis and Makasar sources. Where possible, the evidence offered by the sources is examined against anthropological and archaeological data.

4.1. The Kingdoms

The first thing that strikes one about the genealogies, vassal lists and chronicles of early South Sulawesi is the sheer number of place-names that they record. The majority of these can only have been small villages. But some names apply to much larger political units, the most important of which were Luwu, Soppeng, Bone, Goatallo, Wajo and Sidénéng. Seventeenth-century European descriptions of these larger political units show them occupying roughly the same areas as the modern administrative districts with equivalent names.

In the period from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, the significance of the small units in relation to the large units, in whose historical records they appear, is evident from the marriages that the ruling families of those large units made with the ruling families of the smaller units. A good example is the early-fifteenth-century marriage of La Makkanéngnga, the ruler of Soppeng, with Wé Téna of Bulumatanrë, a small political unit located in the hills to the west of Soppeng. The Royal Genealogy of Soppeng, in which this marriage appears, records other marriages with Balusu, Léworéng, Baringéng, Pising, Marioriawa, Lompréngén, Ujumpulu, Ganra, Télarié, Citta and Patojo. All but one of these smaller units, like Bulumatanrë, are named in the Vassal List of Soppeng as vassals of Soppeng, and all except Baringéng lie within the modern administrative boundaries of Soppeng.¹

¹ Télarié is unidentified.
Marriages between the larger units are only rarely recorded – the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng lists just one with Suppa at the beginning of the genealogy. If we assume that these marriages were made with a view to establishing or maintaining political relationships, it would seem that in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, relationships between the larger units were generally not as important as the maintenance of political alliances within them.

Another striking feature of the historical sources is their lack of any evidence of an administrative bureaucracy. Rarely do we come across the name of an office based on administrative function, as opposed to place. The most common political office is that of Arung, the title of a ruler of one of the smaller political units so plentiful in Bugis sources. The importance of these smaller political units, combined with the apparent absence of a bureaucracy, suggests that the large units were administered largely through the existing administrative structures of the smaller ones.

This picture is difficult to account for within the notion of a state. The evident importance in pre-Islamic South Sulawesi of the small political units recorded by the genealogies and chronicles argues against the degree of centralization of the means of administration, resources and political authority (generally under a single government or constitution) by which Weber characterizes the state. A state would also be expected to possess an administrative bureaucracy, “the most characteristic form of [state-level] governmental administration” (Sills 1968:207), a feature which is plainly not reflected in the historical records of South Sulawesi. Neither is there any emphasis on the “capital” or palace-centre of the large units: the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng does not even mention Tinco, where the rulers of West Soppêng had their palaces. But when we turn to a lower level of political integration, that of the chiefdom, the evidence of the genealogies and chronicles becomes more understandable. The picture revealed by the historical records of pre-Islamic South

2My definition of chiefdom is drawn from Flannery (1972). A chiefdom is a level of political centralization characterized by social stratification, generally in the form of ranked lineages, in which men (and women) from birth are either of “chiefl" or “commoner" descent, regardless of their individual capabilities. In such societies, the best agricultural land or fishing localities are generally owned by its highest-ranking members or lineages. "Chiefs" in rank society are not merely of noble birth, but are usually ascribed a divine origin, and are held to have special relationships with the gods which are denied commoners, by virtue of which they act as important ritual specialists. Furthermore, the office of "chief" exists apart from the man or woman who occupies it, upon whose death the office must be filled by a person of equally high status. Some chiefdoms (e.g. those of Hawaii) maintain elaborate genealogies to ensure a suitable succession, while high-ranking members of chiefdoms reinforced their status with sumptuary goods. Chiefdoms generally have large populations, with villages of paramount chiefs sometimes running into the thousands. Such societies exhibit a high degree of craft specialization but usually have no class of craft specialists: most craftsmen are also farmers (pp. 402-403). The "kingdoms" of South Sulawesi appear to be approaching the level of state organization, in that I would include the following as their detectable characteristics: no ranked descent groups, redistributive economies, hereditary leadership, elite endogamy, an appreciable degree of craft specialization, and, towards the end of the period under discussion, more complex social stratification, incipient kingship, codified laws, bureaucracy, military draft and taxation (these last six being the markers of state-level organization in Flannery’s table on p. 401).
Sulawesi shows a landscape occupied by dozens of chiefdoms of varying size and complexity, each of which belongs to— and helps comprise— the large political units of South Sulawesi.

It would seem from the existence of vassal lists belonging not just to the large units, but also to their component chiefdoms, that most of the latter were originally independent political units. Each evidently controlled a certain area, within which were found smaller units, some probably no larger than hamlets. The Vassal List of Soppêng names no less that twenty eight such chiefdoms. These were the units which (with the palace-centre of WatasSoppêng and its outlying villages) made up the great chiefdom of Soppêng.

How old are the great chiefdoms? It is evident that by the fourteenth century, when historical records start, Luwu' and West Soppêng were already the dominant powers in their respective regions. Other great chiefdoms, such as Bonê, Wajo' and Goa do not seem to have become major powers until the sixteenth century, though their early development can be traced back to about 1400. The memory of another major chiefdom, Cina, has come down to us only in legend; its existence must therefore pre-date the development of writing. (The evidence for this is set out in the following chapter.)

The process of unification, whereby one chiefdom emerged as the political centre in each of the large units, evidently dates back to the pre-historic period. South Sulawesi was one of the earliest regions of the archipelago to be settled by Austronesian seafarers, perhaps as early as three thousand B.C. (Bellwood 1979:123). From that time, small village communities must have been farming in the fertile plains and valleys of the peninsula, though not entirely replacing even older traditions in less favoured environments. Assuming a gradual improvement of farming techniques linked to increased capital and human investment in land (including irrigation and the laying out of fields) so communities would have become more permanent over time. As populations expanded over the centuries greater demands would have been made upon land and other resources. The territorial chiefdoms, the emergence of which probably dates back into the first millennium B.C., if not earlier, must have come increasingly into competition with each other for access to and control of these resources. This competition would have been one factor (probably through a series of defensive alliances) stimulating the gradual integration of the scattered chiefdoms into larger units offering physical protection for their members.
The emergence of these great chiefdoms appears to be largely unconnected to foreign technology or ideas. Unlike all other literate, pre-European Indonesian societies, those of early South Sulawesi developed largely uninfluenced by Indian ideas. Indianization – defined as the historic process of adaptation into Southeast Asian societies of a coherent set of pre-Islamic Indic ideas – appears to have had little impact in South Sulawesi. Unlike Java, South Sulawesi has neither monumental architecture nor vernacular-language versions of Indian literary and philosophical works. Sanskrit loans in the Bugis and Makasar languages are few by comparison with those of Javanese and Malay, while inscriptions are unknown. Reid has written that Indian concept of cakravartin (world-ruler) appears never to have taken root in South Sulawesi, and that "The chronicles and myths of the region show that the origin of its states was rooted in a animist culture still in full vigour" (Reid unpublished, p. 12) Perhaps the most convincing argument for the slightness of Indianization is that writing, a necessary pre-requisite for the effective spread and adaptation of Indian ideas (as can be seen from the close relationship of the origin of writing and Indianization in other Southeast Asian societies), does not appear to have developed in South Sulawesi until around 1400, at least one hundred years after the emergence of the first great chiefdoms.

4.2. The Ruling Elite

It is clear from the chronicles and genealogies that political power in each of the great chiefdoms was associated with a limited kin-group of very high status. The ruler was chosen from this kin-group and was usually the son or daughter of the previous ruler, or a brother or brother's child. The regular transfer of office within these ruling families points to a prevailing, pan-Bugis ideology in which eligibility for political office rested on ascriptive, not achieved, status. Status meant power. In the terms of the ideology, the personal qualities necessary for leadership were the result, not the cause, of an individual's status. That is not to say that individual achievement did not play an important role in the selection of a ruler. Broadly speaking, descent in South Sulawesi is bilateral, and it is clear from the genealogical sources that any one of a ruler's children – male or female, first-born or last – could be selected to succeed him. As the history of the seventeenth-century Arung Palakka shows, young men of outstanding ability could also be promoted within a ruling family's status hierarchy. Women, whose status was in theory fixed, acted as the markers of status within the group: they could move neither up nor down but
recorded the adjustment of the ideological system to stresses produced by the daily realities of power.\(^1\)

The continual intermarriage between these families makes it clear that the genealogies and chronicles record not a series of conical clans as defined by Kirchhoff (1959), but the successful members of a high-status class. Membership of this class cut across political boundaries. The ruling elite of one chiefdom recognized that of another, as the marriage records clearly show. By the sixteenth century, intermarriage between some great chiefdoms had become so regular that at times it is difficult to know whether to speak of intermarrying families or of a single, corporate body of related, high-status individuals.

One of the interesting features of the genealogies and chronicles is the ease with which high-status individuals move forwards and backwards across the landscape with little apparent effect on their potential prospects. The son of a ruler from chiefdom A moves to neighbouring chiefdom B where he marries the daughter of its ruler. Fifty years later, his granddaughter returns to chiefdom A to replace her great-uncle as ruler.\(^2\) Ruling families could and did disappear, but the important point is that they were always replaced by another high-status family, the origins of which can invariably be traced to another chiefdom. It is thus clear that the right to be selected as ruler was a prerogative of status rather than place, both in ideology and in practice. This right was self-identifying: there is in Bugis and Makasar sources no emphasis on charisma, no transference of divine grace (cf. Anderson 1972:22), no evidence of a Bugis or Makasar Ratu Adil.\(^3\) On the other hand, the notion of status is clearly evident in Bugis historiography, from the tomanurung legends which begin most chronicles and provide the ultimate source of status for the ruling family to which those works refer (Macknight 1983:98, Kern 1929:297), to the concern with the correct ascription of status indicated by the large number of genealogies dating from as early as 1400.

\(^1\)Millar (1981) set out in detail the means by which the ideology of ascriptive status is adjusted to personal achievement (or the lack of it) in the Bugis wedding ceremony. The adjustment is brought about by a communal "reassessment" of the ascriptive status of two families and other individuals at various stages of the wedding ceremony.

\(^2\)A graphic illustration of this mobility is given by the combined genealogy of the rulers of Sidénréng, Rappang, Suppa\(^5\) and Sawitto (Mukhlis 1985:119).

\(^3\)Such individuals can be found for later periods; see, for example, the case of I Sangkilang in Roessingh (1986), which the author attributes (along with several other such cases) to the disruptive effects of European involvement in South Sulawesi.
4.3. Trade

South Sulawesi is probably the richest source in Indonesia of Chinese and Southeast Asian trade ceramics. Most of these date from the thirteenth to sixteenth century, while a small proportion, perhaps ten percent, are from earlier centuries (Hadimuljono and Macknight 1983:18, Hadimuljono 1985, tables 1 and 2). According to present-day antique dealers in Ujung Pandang, almost all of the Song pieces they receive are found in Luwu and Selayar. Ceramics dating from the thirteenth to fourteenth century can, however, be found even in a land-locked region such as the Walanae Valley. This is not to argue that the ceramics actually measure the beginnings and development of trade: the quantities found are broadly compatible with other regions of Indonesia and the Philippines, and reflect rather the origins and development of Chinese (and Chinese-inspired Southeast Asian) exports of trade ceramics alongside metals, silk and other luxury goods.

This trade was evidently an important part of the political economy of early South Sulawesi. Luwu, traditionally the first of the great chiefdoms of South Sulawesi to exercise political power outside its immediate region, appears to have been almost solely trade-based. Historians have tended to locate Luwu's early capital in the region between Wotu and Malili, where her ruling elite could control the export of iron and nickel ore to other parts of the archipelago. The nickel may have been meteoric: the nickel deposits found at Lake Matano are lateritic and cannot be extracted by a simple smelting process (personal communication, Mrs Helen Jessup). Linguistic evidence suggests that Bugis involvement in this trade was relatively late (perhaps only after A.D. 1000). Most of the iron ore was traded to Java, where even today a certain quality of nickel inlay in Javanese keris is called pamor (damascene) Luwu (Solyom 1978:18).

A fourteenth-century development of the Bugis-Makasar script from an Indic-derived model points to trading contacts with the north coast of Java, though we should not dismiss the possibility of transmission through Javanese and Bugis trad-

---

1 The export of iron and steel is noted by Speelman (1670:43). The argument for locating Luwu's capital in the Wotu-Malili region is the location near Malili of sizable iron deposits and the region's importance in the La Galigo epic: see, however, page 195 for evidence that Luwu's pre-Islamic capital was at Wart, near Palopo.

2 It is not clear to me whether the nickel which produces the damascene effect in the blades of keris and other weapons was added to the iron ore (as in Solyom 1978) or whether the iron ore contained traces of nickel in a smeltable form.

3 Mills 1975:612 puts forward the hypothesis that the Wotu language, which is spoken by about four thousand people of the town of the same name, is a lingua franca developed from an isolated Bari base, in which the Bugis elements are but the most recent additions.
ing links with Sumbawa or other Lesser Sunda islands. Confirmation of Luwu's trade with Java (and presumably with other parts of the archipelago) is found in the Vassal List of Luwu. As its title implies, this work is a list of the chiefdoms which it claims were vassals of Luwu. The list has been transmitted from one copyist to another for several hundred years and many of its names are corrupt. But of the twenty four which can be identified, nine are in Luwu (five are close to the present-day capital of Palopo) and no less than thirteen lie on the south coast of the peninsula, twelve of these between Jeneponto and Bantaeng.

The Vassal List's picture, fragmentary though it is, offers evidence of trade between Sulawesi and other parts of the archipelago, perhaps as early as 1300. Reid (1983) has already laid out the evidence for Javanese commercial contacts along the southern coast of Sulawesi. The first of these is the fourteenth-century Nāgarakṛtāgama's confused list of "tributaries" of Majapahit:

also the countries of Bantayan, the principal is Bantayan, on the other hand Luwuk, then the (countries) of Uda, making a trio; these are the most important of those that are one island (Pigeaud 1962:17)

Pigeaud identifies Bantayan as Bantaeng and Luwuk as Luwu, while Uda remains unidentified. The Vassal List of Luwu and the Nāgarakṛtāgama are evidently talking about the same places. Both point to a close relationship between Luwu and the Takalar-Bantaeng region in the fourteenth century. The use of the term vassal (Bugis palili: something around a centre) should be used with caution, for it is easy to imagine that both the Takalar-Bantaeng chiefdoms and Luwu would have benefited from close co-operation, and the relationship is more likely to have been one of alliance than of crude military domination. Evidence from Javanese records suggests that the trade route to the Moluccas had been known from at least the fourteenth century. While most ships travelling from Java to the Moluccas can be assumed to have followed the northern coasts of the Lesser Sunda islands (cf. Cortesão 1944:220), it is clear from archaeological evidence and a number of scattered place-names – Soroboyo (Takalar and Bantaeng), Jipang (Takalar) and Garassi (at the mouth of the Jenébérang) – (Reid 1983:122-123) that ships from Java did from time to time visit the southern and south-western coasts of the peninsula. Macknight has also argued that there was trade between South Sulawesi and the southern Philippines. Evidence for this is found in Chao Ju-kua's Zhu-fan-Zhi

---

\(^4\)Or Luwuk on the south-east coast of Sulawesi, a highly unlikely identification. Pigeaud was possibly unaware that Luwu, which is spelt Luwu on modern maps, ends with a glottal stop.
(c.1225) which describes the way in which Chinese (and possibly Southeast Asian) ceramics were distributed from Mindoro by "savage traders" (Macknight 1983:95-96), and in the similarities between the South Sulawesi and Philippine scripts (cf. page 11, above).

Palopo sits at the foot of an important exit from the Toraja highlands and is ideally sited to control trade with this region. Luwu could supply iron and nickel ore and, it appears from the Vassal List's cluster of settlements around Palopo, gold, slaves and valuable forest products from the inland Toraja chiefdoms. The Chronicle of Bone and the Lontara Sukku'na Wajo (examined in the next chapter) provide evidence that Luwu was also controlling the mouth of the Cénrana River, in the upper watershed of which were located a number of agricultural chiefdoms.

Reid argues that trade between South Sulawesi and other parts of the archipelago was largely in the hands of Javanese and Malay traders. It seems probable, however, that the local collection of goods along the east coast of the peninsula and their transport to the Bantaeng region, and perhaps even in part their delivery to the north coast of Java, or to Sumbawa, was in the hands of the Bugis. This is due to the lack of any mention of foreign traders in Bugis historical sources as opposed to the evidence of Malay involvement in trade in the Chronicle of Goa, where there is the record of Malay traders in the Goa-Tallo region from the early sixteenth century (Reid 1983:137-138). Given the evident importance of trade in the fourteenth century, we should expect that were it dominated by foreigners they would be reflected in the Bugis sources. In the Sejarah Melayu, for instance, the foreign control of trade is at once apparent. Not only did foreigners dominate this trade, but they married into Malacca's ruling family to the extent that certain of its rulers were physically, if not culturally, part-Tamil (Hall 1981:226). There is no evidence of such intermarriage in the Bugis or Makasar sources. Neither are there the references to Majapahit (apart from the Lontara Sukuru's Mañcapai, which reflects popular memory of the Javanese kingdom) that we regularly find in Malay sources. Nor are there any Chinese names found in Bugis or Makasar sources: there is no evidence of any Chinese traders visiting South Sulawesi before the seventeenth century (Reid 1983:122).
4.4. The Spread of Wet Rice Agriculture

Unlike trade, which was dependent on foreign customers, the economic potential of wet-rice farming was limited only by the availability of suitable land and the people to work it. Moreover, an agricultural surplus could be used not just to attract followers and maintain loyalties (as could trade-exchanged prestige goods) but could also feed those engaged in the opening of new land. The Chronicle of Bonė tells how a late-fifteenth-century ruler bought a hill at Cina:¹

Our lady Makkalėmpė bought the hill south of Lalidong, and she bought it for thirty buffaloes. Following that, she ordered people to settle on the hill of Cina. She also ordered them to lay out gardens. She also ordered people to go to the hill south of Lalidong which she had bought (Macknight and Mukhlis, forthcoming).

Several members of the royal genealogies of Soppėng and Cina are remembered as having opened settlements. The earliest example comes from the Royal Genealogy of Soppėng, in an anecdote about Soppėng's fourth-recorded ruler:

Wė Tekėwanua was Datu of West Soppėng. She ruled at Suppa². She broke the broad and split the long.³ She planted sugarcane and ants swarmed.² She looked down at the lake: she summoned the people of Sidėnėrėng. She looked down at the lake: she summoned the people of Nėpo [to come like the?] turtle doves. [She] looked down at the lake: she summoned the people of Marioriawa. [She] looked down at the lake, and they settled together with the people of Nėpo (Royal Genealogy of Soppėng, page 122, above).

The language of the passage is symbolic, but its basic meaning is clear. Through a combination of just rule, security and attractive economic prospects, Wė Tekėwanua was able to attract to Soppėng settlers from three neighbouring chiefdoms. The anecdote points to agricultural expansion along the western shores of Lake Tėmpė about the year 1400.

This process of agricultural expansion through the opening of new land may have involved not just the direction but also the feeding of those so engaged. It is possible that newly-attracted or conquered populations would be settled in this way. There is evidence that at least in its initial stages, agricultural expansion was initiated not just by local rulers, but also by their full-brothers, all of whom were of

¹Not the chiefdom of this name, but a hill at the edge of the Bonė plain, south-west of Watamponė.
²i.e. her rule was firm and just.
³The image of ants being drawn to sugar is a well-known Southeast Asian metaphor for the way in which people are drawn to a means of livelihood.
equal status to the ruler. Younger (or elder) brothers unable to obtain suitable political offices within the chiefdom would move off with a group of followers in search of suitable uncleared land on which to establish settlements. Evidence for this can be found in the Chronicle of Sidênreng, in its account of how the eight younger brothers of the ruler of Sangalla², decided to leave their homeland.

When they drew near to the hills south of the Toraja highlands they saw the lake. They continued on until until they came to the plain to the west of the lake. . . They said, "It would be good if we three brothers lived here to the west of the lake." So they and their followers set off to look for a place to live, where they could open fields. For three years they worked the fields and their rice harvest and their other crops, and the number of their followers, increased each year.

While one need not accept the historicity of the legend, it presents a realistic and believable picture. There are no supernatural events; neither is any of its elements treated as unusual. We may reasonably conclude that at the time that the legend developed its present form, members of high-status families did move off to form new settlements. Centred around equally high status individuals, the new settlements were in effect new chiefdoms. Noorduyn's Chronicle of Wajo² also records how dissatisfied elements move off from Cinnotta²bi and "live off their farmland", led by three brothers of the ruler, while even the legitimate line moves "to clear a [new] settlement" (Noorduyn 1955:156).

As Macknight (1983:100) has observed, once such a system has been set up there is advantage (if not a degree of inevitability) in its expansion. Once one chiefdom starts to expand, so are its neighbouring chiefdoms encouraged to do so, in order not to be swallowed up. Competition for manpower and natural resources could be pursued not only by attracting settlers, but also (and perhaps more commonly) by military conquest, or through a series of tactical marriages. Reid (1983:136) describes how the dualism of the Goa-Talloc chiefdom was thrown into question by the ascension to the throne of Goa of Tunipasulu², who was able to claim the rulership of Talloc² from his mother as well as that of Goa from his father. Military conquest is well documented by the Chronicle of Bone, which records the expansion of Bone by such methods under its 4th- and 5th-recorded rulers.

The initial expansion of the chiefdoms was, I believe, linked as much to the acquisition of manpower as to the acquisition of land. It is clear from remarks as to the prosperity of the reigns of several fifteenth-century rulers that the early yields of agricultural expansion were regarded as impressive. Land was both fertile and readily
available, which suggests (not unreasonably) that populations were much smaller than they appear from seventeenth-century European records. The previously-cited anecdote about the fifteenth-century ruler of Soppeng records not her conquest of territory but her success in attracting new settlers. Such followers could be mobilized both as farmers and (increasingly in the sixteenth century) as soldiers, and directed in both capacities in the task of agricultural expansion. The increasingly aggressive nature of political expansion in the sixteenth century suggested by Macknight (1983:100,102-3,108), appears to be reflected in a number of of defence and peace treaties between the major chiefdoms that date from this century.

The evidence from Soppeng suggests that the change from trade to wet-rice agriculture as the basis of political power argued by Macknight (1983) was a fairly gradual process. The *origins* of settled agriculture, with an awareness of the possibilities of domesticated plants and animals, must of course date back several millennia. This complex is a major element in the cultural baggage of the Austronesian speaking people in their expansion into island Southeast Asia (Bellwood 1979): we are talking here only of the organized expansion of wet-rice agriculture. It is therefore interesting that our earliest evidence for a great chiefdom based on an agricultural economy comes from the Royal Genealogy of Soppeng (section 2.6). This opens with a marriage between a ruler of Suppa and a ruler of West Soppeng, and the genealogy maintains that for five generations the ruling family of West Soppeng provided the rulers of Suppa. Suppa is some eighty kilometers by road from the present-day capital of Soppeng; it is, however, Soppeng's nearest practical exit to the sea. The obvious explanation for this relationship (which seems likely to have been based largely on mutual interest) is trade. The scale of that trade is witnessed to by the abundance of sherds of imported stone wares and semi-porcelains dating from the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries found at numerous sites in Soppeng. Soppeng has no notable mineral deposits and whatever she was exporting in exchange for ceramics (and silk and cotton textiles) had to be carried for the most part overland. The obvious trade good, given Soppeng's wide and fertile valley, is rice. Writing in 1775, Stavorinus stated "[Soppeng] yields nothing but paddee" (Stavorinus 1798:228). The export of river-gold and valuable forest products in an earlier

---

4 Support for this claim is found in the Royal Genealogy of Suppa (MAK 119:66.1-33), where the same four individuals are named as rulers.

5 On the same page he stated that "the kingdom of Soping was anciently one of the most powerful states of Celebes".
period is a possibility, given archaeological and other European references. The origins of centrally-directed wet-rice agriculture, which constituted the basis of West Soppêng's political economy, would thus appear to pre-date our sources by perhaps a century or more.

There are several references to gold by earlier European writers; eighteenth and nineteenth-century references point to north Sulawesi. More concrete evidence is provided by the two gold death masks found at Pangkajene (Pangkêp) and Bantaêng (Reid 1983:124). See also Gervaise's account of the looting of an old tomb (Gervaise 1701:120), Stavorinus (1798:220) for a reference to gold from Luwu, and Bulbeck (1987:44) on gold reportedly associated with east-west burials along the south-east coast.
Chapter 5
Towards a Political History, 1300-1600

In this final chapter, a number of questions regarding the political history of pre-Islamic South Sulawesi are examined in the light of the works provided in Chapter Two. These questions concern the location and origins of specific chiefdoms, their internal organization, their historical expansion or decline, and their influence, if any, outside the region with which they have been more recently associated. In setting into context the conclusions suggested by the new data, the evidence of published Bugis and European sources is briefly re-examined.

5.1. The Decline of Luwu: 1500-1600

The chiefdom of Luwu, "the most highly esteemed of the Bugis kingdoms" (Noorduyn 1986), has long been regarded as the oldest, and at one time the most powerful, of the Bugis chiefdoms. Early writers state that formerly much of the peninsula was subject to Luwu. Speelman (1670:43) noted that a great deal of Bone, Bulubulu (the area behind Sinjai) and the south-east coast to Bantaeng was formerly subject to Luwu. Writing in 1759, Blok, who drew not only on European records but also upon indigenous written sources, stated that:

Before Maccassar, or Bone, had so much as a name, Lohoo was the most powerful, and the largest kingdom of Celebes: for, in addition to Lohoo proper, most part of Bone, Bolee Bolee, the point of Lassem [on the south coast], round to Bolecomba, together with all Toadjo or Wadjo, and probably all the country of Torathea, [Turatéa, on the south-east coast] were in subjection to Lohoo (Blok 1817:3-4).

Despite the evidence of European writers, it is no easy task to provide confirmation of the extent or nature of Luwu's influence from published Bugis historical sources. Luwu does not seem ever to have possessed a state chronicle, such as those we find for several of her neighbours. Furthermore, the Royal Genealogy of Luwu

1"n Meerendeel van Bone, Boeleboele en voort tot Bontaijn was 't hem onderdanigh".
(section 2.2), in which we might expect to find much valuable information on early Luwu\(^c\), turns out, on close inspection, to be a confused and disappointing work (cf. page 59). Far from containing the longest genealogy of the ruling families of South Sulawesi’s major chiefdoms, (Pelras 1981:178), it contains instead the shortest. For the centuries before 1500 all it provides us with is the names or titles of two rulers and one of their wives. As we have no way of knowing when any of these people lived, or indeed if their names reflect those of historical individuals, such information is of marginal usefulness.

Our sources for Luwu\(^c\) are thus largely the historical sources of her neighbours. Naturally, we can only expect these to tell us about Luwu\(^c\) in regard to events that concerned those neighbouring chiefdoms. Two of the most important of these sources are the Lontara\(^c\) Sukku’na Wajo\(^c\) and the Chronicle of Bone. The latter, or something like it, was evidently one of Blok’s sources: in a footnote to the previous quotation, Blok adds that “both the Boneers and Maccassars deny [the former greatness of Luwu\(^c\)], though the fabulous History of the Boneers themselves makes it very clear.”

Both the Chronicle of Bone and the Lontara\(^c\) Sukku’na Wajo\(^c\) record Luwu\(^c\)’s decline, from a confident and powerful chiefdom at the beginning of the sixteenth century to a minor regional power by the middle of the same century. The decline of Luwu\(^c\) is firmly linked to the growing power of her southern neighbours, Wajo\(^c\) and Bone, as well as the rising west-coast chiefdom of Goa.

The Lontara\(^c\) Sukku’na Wajo\(^c\) (hereafter LSW) states that Dewaraja, an early-sixteenth-century ruler of Luwu\(^c\), twice made a treaty with the ruler of Wajo\(^c\), La Tadampare\(^c\) (c.1491-c.1520); on the second occasion with the aim of organizing a combined attack on Sidênreng.\(^2\) The conflict appears to have arisen over the sale by the Datu Luwu\(^c\) to Sidênreng of a tortoise said to excrete gold, but which on delivery failed to bear out its reputation (Abidin 1985:228-229). The chronicler carefully distances himself from this improbable story, which he describes as “a well-known oral tradition”; the legend is found also in Noorduyn’s Chronicle of Wajo\(^c\), where “the writer relates with dry humour the disappointment of the buyer who did

\(^2\)The attack on Sidênreng can be dated to between c.1511 and c.1521. The LSW also states that Luwu\(^c\) had twice attacked Sidênreng without success before enlisting Wajo\(^c\)’s help (Abidin 1985:232). This information comes in a passage of reported speech, where Dewaraja is thanking La Tadampare\(^c\) for his assistance, and may be a literary device aimed at stressing the contribution made by Wajo\(^c\)’s forces.
not get what he expected" (Noorduyn 1965:138).  

Wajo's forces proceeded overland while Luwu's army travelled by boat (presumably up the Cénrana River) to Lake Témpé. Following the defeat of Belawa, Otting, Bulucénrana and Rappang, Sidēnṛēng surrendered without a fight (Abidin 1985:229-237).  

According to the Chronicle of Bonē, there were three armed conflicts in the first half of the sixteenth century between Luwu and Bonē, the chiefdom which was from that period onward to replace Luwu as the major east-coast power. The first of these conflicts is recorded almost verbatim in the LSW (its source is probably the Chronicle of Bonē), which places the conflict one year after the defeat of Sidēnṛēng (ibid., pp. 237-239). Led by the Datu Luwu, the Luwurese army landed south of Cēllu, and, after a few inconclusive skirmishes, met at Biru with the army of Bonē. The Chronicle of Bonē tells how the Luwurese army was distracted by a group of women captives who had earlier escaped and had taken refuge in the village of Attassalo, with the result that they found themselves caught between two attacking forces:  

They [the women and the people of Attassalo] were just coming out of Attassalo at the hour before dawn, when the Luwurese right there raised the war-cry. (The Luwurese) wanted to follow up their cry. But also the people of Bonē had settled into position at Biru. Just as the dawn of the day was breaking, the Luwurese spied (the people of Bonē), then (the Luwurese) saw the women in the road east of Anrobiring. For these (the Luwurese) charged ahead. The people of Attassalo struck at the Luwurese. The Luwurese were recognized by the people of Bonē. The Luwurese were put to disorderly flight. The umbrella of the Datu of Luwu was captured. Yet the Datu of Luwu was not wounded. It just happened that the Arumpone [the ruler of Bonē] restrained the people, saying, "Do not wound the person of the Datu of Luwu."  

Then (the Datu of Luwu) was followed eastwards right up to his ship. There were only twenty reaching the ship of the Datu of Luwu. It was only a small ship that he got to and departed in. He sat in it and went to his territory. So from this, there was again an umbrella in Bonē. It was actually a red umbrella, the umbrella of the Datu of Luwu which was captured. Hence La Tēnrisukki, may my belly not swell, was entitled Mappajungnge [the one with an umbrella] (Macknight and Mukhlis, forthcoming).  

---

3In Noorduyn's version of the legend, the animal is a crocodile.  
4The pattern and order of attack suggests that the Luwurese fleet landed on the northern shore of Lake Témpé, and that the combined forces moved in a wide arc eastwards to Rappang, potentially the most dangerous of Sidēnṛēng's allies.  
5Cēllu lies about three kilometers east of Watampone on the road to Bajoē. Biru (following) is three kilometers south-east from Watampone; Anrobiring is three kilometers and Attassalo eight kilometers south from Watampone.
The LSW adds that in revenge for his defeat, Dewaraja asked the Arung Matoa of Wajo to harass Bone on her northern borders. Following the surrender of Mampu and Lompoc to Wajo, the ruler of Bone returned Luwu's umbrella and sued for peace, the terms of which were formally set out in a treaty known as Polo Malêlaéri Uññi (Breaking Steel at Uññi). The LSW tells how the state umbrella of Luwu was graciously returned to Bone to remind her of her status as a "child of Luwu" (Abidin 1985:237-241).

It seems certain that Luwu's attack on Bone stemmed from disagreement over control of the lower Cënrana Valley. The LSW states that Dewaraja's forces departed from Cënrana (presumably the settlement of that name near the mouth of the Cënrana River) a region which it indicates was traditionally subject to Luwu (Abidin 1985:63). When we consider the Chronicle of Bone's detailed account of that chiefdom's expansion under La Tënrisukki (c.1512-c.1540) (Macknight 1983), the ruler whose forces defeated those of Luwu at Anrobiring, it would seem that, despite being cast as the aggressor in that particular conflict, Luwu was in fact attempting to maintain her traditional claim to the Cënrana region in the face of Bone's northward expansion.

This interpretation is supported by the Chronicle of Bone's account of a subsequent conflict with Luwu during the reign of Bongkangnge (c.1565-c.1581), who quarreled with the Datu of Luwu, called Sangkaria. Since again the Luwurese were unwilling to acknowledge Cënrana as territory of Bone, yet again the Luwurese attacked Cënrana. Thus there were two occasions when the land of Cënrana was captured by the people of Bone at the point of the sword (Macknight and Mukhlis, forthcoming).

While neither conflict is supported by independent sources, the laconic, matter-of-fact style of the Chronicle of Bone, and its author's careful self-distancing from the occasional supernatural event which his sources recorded, inclines the reader to accept the chronicle's account "not as imagined event, but as veritable fact" (Macknight and Mukhlis, forthcoming, "Introduction"). However, we should bear in mind that the accounts of these conflicts may derive, at least in part, from oral traditions, and that events which the chronicle records were separated from the

---

6 On page 248 we learn that Dewaraja had a palace at Cënrana.
chronicler by a period of up to one hundred and fifty years.\footnote{A date of c.1670-c.1700 for the composition of the Chronicle of Bone is suggested by Macknight and Mukhlis.}

One last piece of evidence regarding Luwu's former greatness is found in the LSW. This is its record of the annexation by Wajo in the early sixteenth century of Tempé, Singkang (modern-day Sengkang) Wagé and Tampangéng; all were Wajo's close neighbours and traditionally belonged to Luwu (Abidin 1985:202-204). Given the rapid expansion of Wajo in the early sixteenth century, there seems little reason to doubt the historicity of either the annexation of these settlements or their former relationship to Luwu. (Cf. the end of the second story of the Lontara na Simpurusia on page 46, where the three settlements are linked to Luwu.)

The consistency of the image of Luwu provided by the various traditions preserved in the Chronicle of Bone and the LSW is perhaps the best argument for accepting their accounts, if not as contemporary records then as later re-tellings of important historical events. Both the LSW and the Chronicle of Bone portray Luwu as a major power at the beginning of the sixteenth century, willing (and initially able) to defend her interests along the east coast of the peninsula. It is almost certain that Luwu's eclipse by the emerging agricultural chiefdoms to her south would have been remembered in some detail in those chiefdoms little more than a century later.

It is against this background that we may now examine the evidence of the Luwu Vassal List. This records some seventy settlements which were once palili (vassals) of Luwu. The term palili refers to a relationship between a political centre and a smaller outlying unit (cf. page 75, footnote 1). A number of settlements so described in the Soppeng Vassal List lie just a few kilometers from the early palace-centres of East and West Soppeng. We may therefore conclude that their relationship to those centres must date from a very early period in the formation of Soppeng.

Two distinct groups of settlements can be identified in the Luwu Vassal List. The first of these is clustered around the post-Islamic capital of Luwu, Palopo. In view of our ignorance regarding Luwu's pre-Islamic palace-centre, and the fact that the word palili can refer to settlements close to the political and ritual centre of a
chiefdom, the cluster of place names around Palopo is significant. Many historians have located the early political centre of Luwu\(^c\) in the region between Wotu and Malili, on the basis of that region's importance in the I La Galigo and because of the deposits of iron ore found there, which Luwu\(^c\) was evidently exploiting. Yet the evidence of the Vassal List, both in its cluster of Palopo-centred vassals and the absence of a similar cluster in the Wotu-Malili region, suggests that Luwu\(^c\)'s pre-Islamic political centre was at Palopo.

The second cluster of vassal chiefdoms lies on the south coast (most of the chiefdoms lie between Takalar and Bantaên). This cluster enables us to date the tradition preserved in the vassal list to around 1500, for in the sixteenth century the entire south coast of South Sulawesi became subject to Goa. The Chronicle of Goa states that during the reign of Tumapa'risi\(^c\) Kallonna (c.1512-c.1548) some kind of tribute was imposed upon Bulukumba and Selayar by Goa (Wolhoff and Abdurrahim n.d.:18). During the reign of Tunipalangga (c.1548-c.1566) the southern coast was brought more firmly under Goa's control. Aided by the ruler of Tallo\(^c\), Tumenanga rir Makkoayang (c.1547-c.1577), Goa attacked and defeated Binamou, Bulukumba and Selayar, thus gaining control of the important ship-building centre of Bira on the south-east coast (Wolhoff and Abdurrahim n.d.:25, Rahim and Boharima 1975:10-11).

The political alliances recorded by the Vassal List must pre-date the mid-sixteenth century, and may conceivably date back to the fourteenth century or earlier. As noted on page 184, the fourteenth-century Javanese poem Nagarakrtagama links the south-coast chiefdom of Bantaên with Luwu\(^c\).

It would thus appear that, before 1500, Luwu\(^c\) exercised control over large parts of the east coast, and presumably some way inland along the more accessible water courses. The picture of agricultural expansion found in the Chronicles of Wajo\(^c\) and Boné suggest that in the fourteenth century the interior of the west-coast of the peninsula was still rather sparsely settled by small groups of agriculturalists, from whom a surplus would have been difficult and often costly to extract.\(^8\)

Luwu\(^c\)'s decline may thus have been due in large measure to the increasing economic and military powers of her southern neighbours, whose increasingly centralized systems of wet-rice agriculture could support (and indeed encourage) steadily

\(^8\)Cf. the Lontara\(^c\) Sukku'na Wajo\(^c\)'s account of how the people of Boli fled from tax collectors sent from Luwu\(^c\) (Abidin 1985:64). While one need not accept the historicity of this account, the motif presumably reflects actual practice.
growing populations. Between harvests, the rice farmer could be engaged as a soldier in the conquest of new territory. Agricultural units - a cluster of settlements and their lord - doubled as military units (cf. the division of Bonē's army into three divisions, each comprising a number of settlements, in the reign of Kērrampēlu₃ in the Chronicle of Bonē. Other factors may have contributed, but we have no evidence of these.

From the Vassal List it also appears that Luwu²'s main interest lay in controlling and taxing trade with other parts of the archipelago. Palopo is located at the foot of an important exit from the Toraja highlands: the importance of trade between Palopo and the Toraja highlands is reflected in Toraja ritual verse (Zerner 1981:97-98) and in a detailed major nineteenth century study of Luwu² (Braam Morris 1889).⁹ The lower Cēnran River, control of which formed the core of Luwu²'s dispute with Bonē, was an important exit for the rice-growing region lying in its upper watershed. The south-coast chiefdoms recorded in the Luwu² Vassal List were evidently the places at which products from these inland regions, along with iron ore and possibly some nickel, were exchanged for imported cloths, ceramics and other luxury goods. Control of the two major exits at Palopo and Cēnran would have been imperative for any large east-coast, trade-based chiefdom.

The memory of Luwu²'s economic and military power in the fourteenth century (and perhaps earlier) clearly lies behind much of the respect with which she was regarded by her neighbouring chiefdoms long after her decline to the status of an unimportant backwater.¹⁰ There can be little doubt that Luwu²'s eclipse by the rising agrarian kingdoms to her south was the most significant event of the sixteenth century. Of all of Luwu²'s non-legendary, pre-Islamic rulers, only Dewaraja, who presided over the initial stages of Luwu²'s decline, is widely remembered both in the chronicles and legends of other chiefdoms. What is perhaps of greatest significance is that the process of political and economic centralization of scattered agricultural communities, a process which appears to have been well underway in Soppēng by the year 1300, gave rise only in the early sixteenth century to the first agrarian chiefdoms capable of effectively challenging the power of Luwu².

---

⁹ Speelman (1670:42) mentions the export from Luwu² of rice, sago, rattan and damar (a resin).

¹⁰ Cf. Brooke's remark that "It is difficult to believe that Luwu could ever have been a powerful state, except in a very low stage of native civilization" (Mundy 1848:155).
5.2. The Origin of Soppêng

Evidence for the origin and development of the chiefdom of Soppêng is found in a number of sources. Among these are the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng, the At­toriolonna Soppêng and the Vassal List of Soppêng. Unlike Luwu and Cina, we are able to identify the area of origin of Soppêng and to trace its ruling family from about the beginning of the fourteenth century.

In addition to the textual evidence, a recent archaeological survey of a number of places named in the At­toriolonna Soppêng and the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng provides a number of important archaeological data which can be used to check and enhance the evidence of these two works (see page 104). All the archaeological evidence cited in this chapter is based upon this survey: the interpretations are my own.

The At­toriolonna Soppêng (hereafter AS) sets out to support the idea of kingship in Soppêng. This its author does by presenting his work as a historical account of the origin of kingship. This requires him to adapt to his purpose a number of historical traditions current in his day. He tells us that in earlier times Soppêng consisted of two smaller chiefdoms, East and West Soppêng. (The division of Soppêng is confirmed in several other Bugis sources.) The main characters of the AS are the headmen of Botto, Bila and Ujung, who symbolize the ancestors of the three great lords of these settlements, who, at least in post-Islamic times, installed the ruler of Soppêng.

The AS is written with a marked emphasis on the importance of West Soppêng. The headmen of Botto, Bila and Ujung are the representatives of West Soppêng, yet they act on behalf of both chiefdoms by inviting the tomanurung of Sekkanili and Libuèng to become the rulers of West and East Soppêng respectively. East Soppêng is represented by the headman of Salotungo, who appears briefly for the purpose of agreeing with the other three headman. This emphasis on the importance of West Soppêng can readily be explained by the fact that West Soppêng absorbed East Soppêng in the first half of the sixteenth century, and that the AS was composed in the eighteenth century.

The AS lists two groups of settlements which it says comprised East and West Soppêng. (A third group of settlements is described as having later been incor-
porated within these two chiefdoms.) As the AS states that there were sixty head-
manships in Soppêng, it seems reasonable to assume that the two groups of settle-
ments described as constituting East and West Soppêng correspond approximately to
the original territory of each chiefdom. This assumption is supported by the Vassal
List of Soppêng, which names fifteen of the twenty settlements in its second group
of vassals (cf. page 131). The settlements named in the AS are shown on the map
on page 199.

We can see from this map that each chiefdom was associated with a small river
valley leading from the western hills into the larger Walanaê Valley. But whereas
the settlements of West Soppêng are firmly sited on the small northern valley, those
of East Soppêng are located not on the small southern valley, but immediately to
its east on the western side of the Walanaê Valley. Furthermore, Botto, Bila and
Ujung (the headmen of which represent West Soppêng and which do not appear in
any of the three lists) are located at the mouth of the southern, not northern, val-
ley, close by the Walanaê Valley settlements of East Soppêng.

A further puzzle is provided by the role in the AS of Tineo. Matthes’ dictionary
does not list the ruler of Tineo as one of the great lords of Soppêng (Matthes
1874:788), nor have I discovered any reference to Tineo in other Bugis works. Yet
it is the headman of Tineo who discovers the tomanurung of Sekkañili, and it is
at Tineo that the tomanurung builds his palace.

Tineo appears to have been situated on a small hill at the mouth of the northern
valley, overlooking the Walanaê Valley. This is the logical point from which to
control both the irrigation network supplied by the Lawo River, which flows out of
the northern valley, and communication and trade between the Walanaê Valley and
the mountain chiefdoms to its west. The role of Tineo in the AS suggests that
prior to the unification of East and West Soppêng, the palace-centre of West
Soppêng was there. (Tineo is today deserted, and appears to have been only
recently re-opened as ladang by local farmers.)
Figure 5-1: East and West Soppêng, according to the AS.
It may further be seen that the WatasSoppeng settlements of Botto, Bila and Ujung lie on low hills at the mouth of the southern valley. This is the logical point from which to control the irrigation system supplying the agricultural settlements named as belonging to East Soppeng, the first of which lies a few hundred metres from Ujung. From these low hills it would also be easy to control trade and communication between the Walanae Valley and the mountain settlements of Bulumatanre, Sêwo and Gattarêng (among others) which lay directly to the west of WatasSoppeng.

It seems reasonable, therefore, to conclude that prior to unification, the palace-centre of East Soppeng was at Botto, Bila or Ujung, or at the post-Islamic palace-centre of Soppeng, Lalêbêntêng, which lies between Botto and Ujung,¹ and that Tinco was the palace-centre of West Soppeng. The identification in the AS of the headmen of Botto, Bila and Ujung with West Soppeng rather than with East, suggests that sometime after the unification of the two chiefdoms in the sixteenth century, the ruler of Soppeng moved his palace from Tinco to Lalêbêntêng where he could more easily control his recently-expanded chiefdom.

This hypothesis appears to be supported by archaeological evidence from Tinco and WatasSoppeng. Tinco is by local standards a remarkable site. The three hundred by

¹It is of interest to note that the bissu who presently cares for the regalia of the former ruling family of West Soppeng periodically carries out religious ceremonies at a Pêta Goariê, a jar-burial site at Liburêng, where the founder of the ruling lineage of East Soppeng is supposed to have appeared. (I have myself seen a recent photograph of the bissu carrying out ceremonies at Liburêng.) When I spoke to the self-appointed caretaker of the jar-burial site at Sekkaiiili, no mention was made of any visits by the bissu of Lalêbêntêng.
one hundred metre area surveyed in December 1986 produced more than two thousand Chinese and Southeast Asian ceramic and stoneware sherds dating from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. No less than one hundred and fifteen of these sherds were monochromes, which were provisionally dated to the thirteenth to fourteenth century. In the centre of the site, where local inhabitants told us that a palace (langkana) formerly stood, was a large stone platform (possibly a jar-burial site) topped by the fossilized remains of a huge banyan tree, and several scratched and engraved rocks. In addition to the evidence of occupation from perhaps as early as 1200 by a high-status elite, at the northern end of the hill are the remains of several pre-Islamic jar-burials.

The regional capital WatasSoppêng was, not surprisingly, a more difficult site to survey. But a reasonably detailed picture of the former occupation of Botto, Bila, Ujung and Lalêbêntêng (all of which lie within the urban boundaries of WatasSoppêng) was obtained from the modest quantities of sherds obtained. Of these four sites, Botto and Lalêbêntêng produce the earliest evidence of occupation by a high-status elite. Like Tineo, both yielded sherds dating from the thirteenth to fourteenth century, while the sherds from Bila and Ujung suggest for these sites a later rise to importance.²

The quantity of sherds collected from Tinco point to its early importance.³ The decline in the number of sherds from about 1600 suggests a gradual loss of importance of Tinco from about that time, while the corresponding rise in importance of the WatasSoppêng sites in the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries (reflected by the quantities of sherds collected for each century) supports the textual evidence that the rulers of Soppêng moved from Tinco to WatasSoppêng, sometime after the political unification of the two chiefdoms. Due to the very different collecting conditions at each site, no comparison can, however, be made between the relative importance of Tinco or Lalêbêntêng before the seventeenth century.

Archaeological data would support a date sometime in the first half of the seventeenth century for a transfer of power from Tinco to Lalêbêntêng. Against this

²Ujung was particularly difficult to survey. Much of Ujung is now under asphalt, which reduced our survey to the Islamic graveyard and its immediate surroundings. The relatively small number of sherds thus collected may greatly underestimate Ujung's importance in earlier times.
³To some degree, the quantities of sherds recovered at Tinco must reflect the excellent collecting conditions there. The yields were, however, many times greater than those encountered under similar conditions in other areas of Soppêng.
must be set the reputed burial site of La Mataesso, the ruler who is said to have united East and West Soppêng, which is in Botto. It is, of course, quite possible that two palace-centres were maintained for some time following unification of the chiefdoms.

It may further be noted that the central role in the eighteenth-century AS of the Arung Bila is in accord with the archaeological evidence, which suggests that Bila was of little importance in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but expanded rapidly to play a much more important role in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Bila appears, in fact, to have become the religious and ceremonial centre of unified Soppêng in early Islamic times, and contains both Soppêng’s oldest mosque and the present-day graveyard of the former ruling family of Soppêng.

5.3. Pre-Islamic Sidênrêng

To date, very little information has been available on Sidênrêng from either Bugis or European sources. A European visitor to Sidênrêng in the sixteenth century left a brief account of its prosperity, linked to an incomprehensible description of the geography of the region of the central lakes (Pelras 1977:233). Neither Sidênrêng nor any of the Ajattaparêng kingdoms are represented in Matthes’ series of “early histories” (Matthes 1864), nor is there any significant information on Sidênrêng before 1600 in Blok (1817), or in the works of other early European visitors.

The historical records of her neighbouring chiefdoms give little impression of Sidênrêng as a power to be reckoned with before the fifteenth century. At the end of the fourteenth century, the Royal Genealogy of Soppêng lists Sidênrêng alongside Nêpo and Marioriawa, two minor kingdoms which lay, like Sidênrêng, on Soppêng’s northern borders (page 122). However, by the end of the first quarter of the fifteenth century, the royal genealogies of Soppêng and Suppa both record the transfer of control of Suppa, an important west-coast port, from Soppêng to Sidênrêng (cf. page 188). Suppa had been closely linked to Soppêng since at least the early fourteenth century, to the extent that the ruling family of Soppêng had provided the rulers of Suppa. The transfer of control of Suppa to Sidênrêng is probably indicative of a growth in Sidênrêng’s influence in the region north of the great lakes in

---

4 When we surveyed this site, we were told by several people that the jar in which his ashes rested had been sold to a Japanese collector. The site has been overtaken by urban development and is now crowned by the semi-permanent structure of an outdoor lavatory.
the early fifteenth century. One last piece of evidence comes nearly a century later, in the Lontara'na Sukku'na Wajo', namely the assault on Sidēnreng by Wajo' and Luwu' in the first decades of the sixteenth century, cited in section 5.1.

On the basis of this rather slim evidence, it would seem that Sidēnreng grew slowly from a small and relatively unimportant chiefdom in the fourteenth century, to a major regional power by the first quarter of the sixteenth century.

What do the three works referring to Sidēnreng in Chapter Two add to this picture? The Chronicle of Sidēnreng, a hitherto unknown work, was seen in section 2.8.3 to have been based, up to 1600, upon three written sources. But when we looked more closely, we saw that the first two of these were in turn composed of smaller units. These units derive from oral tradition and represent the basic units by which that particular tradition was passed on (in the terminology of Biblical scholarship, "pericopes"). It is a relatively straightforward matter to identify these units, each of which originally no had connection with the others. Each pericope is a source in its own right, and must be examined individually to determine whether it can tell us anything of the period of which it claims to speak.

The apparent aim of the first pericope is to account for the foundation of Sidēnreng. We are told how eight brothers of the Arung of Sangalla', a Toraja chiefdom to the north-east of Sidēnreng, left their homeland, and how they settled at Lake Sidēnreng. But this story serves simply to set the background for the central "message" of the pericope. This is to emphasize through the example of Sidēnreng's founders the correct relationship between the A'datuang and the great lords of Sidēnreng, symbolized by the eldest brother and his seven younger brothers.

The eight brothers agreed, saying, "Among us eight brothers the elder brother remains elder brother, the younger brother remains younger brother. Whatever the elder brother wishes shall be done. If there is something to be decided with our followers, the seven shall decide the matter. If we cannot reach agreement, we shall forward the matter to our eldest brother. Whatever he decides shall be done. If we seven disagree about anything, we shall go straight to our eldest brother. His decision shall settle the matter."

This decided, the chiefdom prospers:

Their rice crop and their vegetables flourished, and their buffaloes and horses grew more numerous, as did the number of their followers who had settled at the west of the lake.
The second pericope tells of the arrival in Sidērnēng of a daughter of La Ma’darēmmēng and her husband. She was installed as the first A’dądąang of Sidērnēng. She had three children, among them La Makkara, alias La Kasi. La Makkara was prevailed upon to succeed his mother as A’dądąang, an office he accepted only reluctantly:

But he agreed to be made ruler. His family and the people of Sidērnēng all said, "Your wishes shall be obeyed and your words shall be the truth. Customary law shall become great and traditional usage increased by your family and by the people of Sidērnēng". They said, "We shall be your followers, we shall be your people, we shall cultivate [the land], we shall build you a palace."

This is the central message of the pericope: the emphasis upon the authority of the A’dądąang, conferred upon him by his family and the people of Sidērnēng. (The pericope appears to have lost its conclusion: cf. the ends of the other three periscopes.)

The third pericope begins with the words "Now here is spoken of the origin of the Arung of Sidērnēng". At first sight this appears to be simply a variant version of the previous pericope. But while the characters are indeed the same, the aim here is to set out the close political relationship of Sidērnēng with the chiefdom of Rappang, which lies eleven kilometers north of Sidērnēng. We learn how the Datu of Pantilang (a Toraja chiefdom), was afflicted by a skin disease and went into exile. When he arrived at Sangallac he married the eldest daughter of La Ma’darēmmēng. The couple proceed on to Rappang where the Datu Pantilang was installed as ruler. He had three children: the eldest, a daughter, was installed as A’dądąang of Sidērnēng. This brings us to the central message of the pericope, namely the loyalty of Rappang to Sidērnēng, which is contained in the following passage:

She was the ruler who was hard of heart towards the people of Sidērnēng. [Her] younger brother ruled at Rappang. The people of Rappang came to exchange [him with her]. The people of Rappang said, "It would be good, Puang, if you came to rule in Rappang, and you made your brother ruler at Sidērnēng." Then La Malibureng was A’dądąang of Sidērnēng. The Arung Rappang and the Arung Sidērnēng, who were brother and sister, made an agreement, saying, "What dies in the morning [in] Rappang dies [in] the afternoon in Sidērnēng." To the present day this agreement between Rappang and Sidērnēng has not been altered.

To emphasize the sincerity of this agreement, the pericope concludes with a story of how this agreement was attested to by a fire which destroyed the palace at Sidērnēng. When the news reached the Arung Rappang, she at once had the palace at Rappang burnt to the ground.
The fourth and longest pericope begins with a genealogical introduction of La Makkaraka, who is presented as the great-grandson of the daughter of La Ma'darëmméng. (In the second pericope he is her son.) Having located La Makkaraka, the pericope moves swiftly to its central point:

He was the first to make firm agreements between the people of Sidënërëng and their lord. He was the first to fix laws and appoint ministers. He was a great ruler. His laws were splendid and people feared the law. The eight brothers of the Arung of Sidënërëng... made an agreement with the A'daoang of Sidënërëng.

We are then given a detailed account of the promises made to La Makkaraka by his brothers. These royal monopolies on the sale of salt, sirih and tobacco, ownership of the main body of the forest, albinos and transvestites (!) and the right to a levy on goods seized by his brothers. All these provisions we may assume had a basis in historical fact. The brothers are then rewarded with the right to act as the ruler's representatives and to seize wrongdoers.

What are we to make of these pericopes? Our first observation must be that they are manifestly not historical records, in the sense that one may use the word of genealogical sources. This is not to say that some of their characters were not historical individuals. In addition, the things which the pericopes speak of - the relationships between Sidënërëng and Rappang, the rights of the ruler of Sidënërëng to certain monopolies, etc. - almost certainly reflect historical realities. We may further deduce from the fact that there are seven younger brothers of the ruler in both the first and the third pericopes, that there were (at least in theory) seven great lords of Sidënërëng.

What we cannot be certain of, however, is whether the individuals thus named are contemporary with the other elements of the pericopes. In the absence of external evidence we cannot assume that the pericopes are older than the eighteenth or nineteenth century. There is therefore no reason to assume that in pre-Islamic times there were seven great lords of Sidënërëng, or that an agreement of friendship was concluded by the pre-Islamic rulers of Rappang and Sidënërëng. (That there were seven great lords, or that such an agreement once existed is probable.) The only elements of the four pericopes that we may safely ascribe to the pre-Islamic period are the names of some of their characters, who - if we accept their historicity - must date from before c.1475, simply because we have detailed genealogical records dating from this period in which they do not appear.
It is tempting to argue that the appeal to La Makkara as a source of authority reflects the memory of Sidënreb's growing importance in the fifteenth century. But he may simply reflect a literary type, namely the good and just ruler who sets out the rules, regulations and court ceremonial of a chiefdom (cf. Tumapa'risi Kallon in the Chronicle of Goa or Sultan Muhammad Shah in the Malay Sejarah Melayu [Brown 1952]). We must therefore conclude that apart from a handful of names, the oral traditions recorded in the four pericopes are of little use as historical sources for the pre-Islamic period.

The third source used by the chronicler was the Royal Genealogy of Sidënreb. While this is clearly based upon contemporary records, it unfortunately tells us little of Sidënreb, apart from the names and relationships of some thirty members of its ruling family, from about 1475 to 1600. But when set beside genealogies of the ruling families of the four other Ajattappareng chiefdoms (Mukhlis 1985:119) we see that their members are so closely linked by marriage that it is difficult to decide to which family many belong. One is given rather the impression of one large one ruling family, members of which are located at one of the five major political centres of Ajattappareng.

From this and the Vassal List of Sidënreb, it would seem that Sidënreb never gained control over its surrounding chiefdoms to the extent that Soppeng and Bone evidently did. The Vassal List of Sidënreb's component chiefdoms lie no further than a few kilometers from her palace-centre. The reasons for this must be largely geographic. Each of the five chiefdoms of Ajattappareng is located on a fertile plain: each plain is separated from the others by low hills or by water, and each possesses its own system of irrigation, fed largely by seasonal rainfall, the management of which would have required local direction and control. It is this requirement that would appear to lie behind the looseness of Sidënreb's control over Ajattappareng, as well as the relative equivalence of the resources each of the five chiefdoms could command. It is probably these geographical considerations too that explain why neither Sidënreb nor any of its sister chiefdoms ever became as formidable military power as Bone or Goa, despite the considerable wealth of the Ajattappareng region, "the rice bowl of South Sulawesi" (Maeda 1984:110). None of the five chiefdoms could, on its own, summon the equivalent economic or military power, while distance and topography set significant barriers to the integration of the five chiefdoms into a single unit.
5.4. The Disappearing Chiefdom of Cina

Along with Luwu, Cina is believed to be one of the oldest chiefdoms in South Sulawesi. It is an important place in the I La Galigo: Wē Cudai, the sister of Sawarigading, a prince of Luwu, marries there; and Sawarigading visits Cina on several occasions. More substantial evidence of Cina, however, is difficult to find. To date I have identified just two works which appear to relate directly to this elusive chiefdom. These are the Royal Genealogy of Cina and the King List of Cina (page 81). (Occasional references to Cina are found in other historical sources.) However, both these works raise more questions than they provide answers in relation to the existence of Cina. Indeed, we cannot even be certain that the Cina to which they refer is the same as that of the I La Galigo. Very importantly, no evidence of Cina can be found in early Dutch or Portuguese sources. Even the location of Cina is uncertain: some historians place it in Wajo, others in Bone.¹

The disappearance of Cina is accounted for in Bugis historiography by a tradition that when La Sangaji Ajipammana, the childless, twenty-second Datu Cina, was dying, he asked the members of the Adat Council and the Matoa (headmen) to change the name of Cina to his own. He further proposed one of five candidates living in Bone, Soppeng and Wajo to be elected as his successor. After his death, Cina was called Ajipammana or Pammana (Abidin 1983:219-220, after the accounts found in NBG 109 and MAK 115).

The legend is plainly apocryphal: the name Pammana appears in the Royal Genealogy of Cina some eleven generations earlier than does La Sangaji in the King List of Cina. Indeed, in the Royal Genealogy, Pammana is named as the settlement ruled by La Pasangkadi, one of the three sons of La Patau who head important, related genealogies, which extend back to the early fifteenth century (see figure 3-4 on page 173). In the Lontara Sukku Wajo, Pammana is also named on several occasions before the seventeenth century, when, on the intrinsic evidence of the King List, La Sangaji can be estimated to have died.

The legend of La Sangaji Ajipammana should not, however, be dismissed out of hand. The tradition of a change in name, if not literally true, might well record a historic re-focussing of power between Cina and Pammana, a minor chiefdom located

¹See page 210.
in the western Cénrana region. By examining the places named in the Royal Genealogy, it is indeed possible to find evidence of such a shift in political power. It is, furthermore, possible to link this shift to the change in the economic basis of political power in South Sulawesi around the year 1400, argued by Macknight (1983).

The legend of Cina's change of name to Pammana would make little sense were the two chiefdoms not neighbours. This narrows our search to the Cénrana Valley, along the border of Wajo and Boné, as the most likely location of Cina. An examination of Dutch maps of the area reveals a promising site comprising a bukit Cina, a sungai Cina and what appears to be a small settlement with the name of Cina, all within half a kilometer of each other, near the mouth of the Cénrana River (figure 5-1 on page 209). While the mouth of the Cénrana River offers little in the way of suitable rice-growing land, the land on either side consisting for the most part of salty marshland, a location such as that of bukit Cina would have been ideal for controlling the movements of goods and people up and down the Cénrana River. We can reasonably conclude that any substantial chiefdom situated near Bukit Cina at the mouth of the Cénrana River would have drawn its basic revenues from trade rather than from centrally-directed wet-rice farming.

The focus of the Royal Genealogy is, however, the western part of the Cénrana region. The settlements named by the Genealogy are all located on fertile rice-growing land to the south of the Cénrana River. Furthermore, the Royal Genealogy of Cina (the title, it should be recalled, is my own) does not mention Cina, nor can the name Cina be found on maps of this region further up the river, be it in connection with river, hill or settlement.

What should we thus make of the several, geographically-unlocated references to Cina in the historical literature, of which the most important is the King List's insistence that its first twenty-two members were the rulers of Cina? Of these rulers, seventeen are found also in the Royal Genealogy of Cina, where they form what could be called a "central line", firmly linked to a number of settlements in the western Cénrana region. Finally, if the legend of La Sangaji is apocryphal, what historical events lie behind its development?

2 Just a few kilometers downstream from Bukit Cina are the remains of the fortress built by the seventeenth-century Arung Palakka (Andaya 1981: Map 8). The location of these seventeenth-century remains suggests that the course of the Cénrana river has changed little in recent centuries.

3 On the northern side of the Cénrana River is a site called Lalébenténg, "inside the walls". The word benténg derives from the Portuguese and probably refers to a part of Arung Palakka's fortifications rather than to the chiefdom of Cina.
Figure 5-2: The Palace-Centre of Cina in the 14th Century
One possible solution is to accept the I La Galigo's Cina as representing a prehistoric chiefdom located near the mouth of the Cênarna River. This chiefdom appears to have disappeared by the beginning of the fifteenth century, when writing began. It seems to have been replaced by Luwu as the power which controlled this important river-mouth (Abidin 1985:63,248). The western Cênarna region has been occupied since at least 1400 by a number of small agricultural chiefdoms, including among others Baringeng, Pammana and Têtewatu. These chiefdoms, which were later incorporated into Bonê and Wajo, appear to have looked to the memory of the vanished, estuarine Cina as the source of status for their ruling families. This view of Cina may have extended to the installation of a Datu Cina as the nominal overlord of the region (Abidin 1983:220).

The strength of this rather speculative argument is that it accounts for all the data presented so far. Indeed, one might argue that the problem of reconciling the various traditions concerning Cina in Bugis historiography is precisely due to the fact that its period of importance in the region preceded the development of writing. This has enabled the use of the memory of Cina as a source of status (and hence political legitimacy) elsewhere in the Cênarna Valley. For example, the references to Cina in the Lontara Sukku'na Wajo occurs in its opening pages, where it functions as a source of status in a legend concerning the origin of Cinnotta'bi (Abidin 1985:65).

If we are correct in locating a pre-historic Cina near the mouth of the Cênarna River, its use as a source of ascriptive status by a number of chiefdoms located in the western Cênarna region would seem to imply that this region did not possess a ruling elite of respectable antiquity. This points to the relatively late centralization of authority in the western Cênarna region.

The historical problem produced by this tracing of the status of unrelated families to an earlier, pre-historic chiefdom, appears to be reflected in the tradition cited by Abidin that:

Cina . . . consisted of West Cina with its capital Alangkanangnge ri Latanete (the name [Alangkanangngê?] is still current in the district of Pammana) and East Cina (some people locate this second area in the part
of Bone now called Cina [presumably the hill of Cina]).

The full hypothesis may be succinctly restated as follows. It is argued that Cina was a trade-based, coastally-oriented chiefdom, the palace-centre of which was located near the mouth of the Cenrana River. The close linking of Cina and Luwu in the I La Galigo presumably preserves some element of historical veracity and is supported in a roundabout way by the evidence in historical sources of Luwu's claim to this region. By the end of the fourteenth century Cina seems to have disappeared, by which time while a number of nascent agricultural chiefdoms had appeared in the western Cenrana region. It seems probable that these chiefdoms were united into some kind of loose confederation called Cina which based its legitimacy and status upon the memory of the earlier, trade-based chiefdom of that name. It is finally argued that the traditional "King List" of Cina is (excluding its legendary elements) a list of rulers of these upper-valley chiefdoms, and not those of the Cina of the I La Galigo.

4 The identification of Cina with Cina in south-west Bone (the hill of Cina spoken of by the Chronicle of Bone) can be dismissed simply on the grounds of its distance from any means of communication, such as a major waterway. The authors of the Peristiwa place the capital of Cina at desa Sumpang Alek, some seven kilometers from Sengkang (Peristiwa 1976:1). A third possibility, which I investigated in December 1986, is the site located on the highlands between Bukit Topopangi (118 m.) and the hamlet of Sarapao (Topografische Dienst 1930, Blad 76/XXXII). Known locally as We Cudai's palace (We Cudai is the sister of Sawarigading in the I La Galigo), this hill is identified by residents as the former palace-centre of Cina. While the site is unsurveyed, it shows evident signs of earlier occupation: several thirteenth to fourteenth-century sherds were observed on the path leading up to the summit of the hill. The summit is overgrown with talang grass and provides a commanding view over the rice-bearing plains to the east. It also has an elaborate grave, probably of post-Islamic date and now vandalized.
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