

New perspectives on early South Sulawesi history. A thesis summary and comment by David Bulbeck (Division of Pacific and Asian History, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra 2601, Australia).

Most of this piece deals with my PhD thesis *A Tale of Two Kingdoms. The Historical Archaeology of Gowa and Tallok, South Sulawesi, Indonesia* (Australian National University, 1992), supervised by Campbell Macknight and Peter Bellwood. I would also like to comment on Ian Caldwell's report of his Luwu field trip (see this Baruga) based on the pre-publication copy which he sent me. My thanks to Kristine Alilunas-Rodgers for her comments on an earlier draft of my piece. As a last introductory point, I prefer to spell the names of kingdoms and ethnic groups by the conventions of modern Indonesian, but to use the modern (or most recent) official spelling for place names. Hence 'Makasar' for the people (as recommended by Ian Caldwell in Baruga 8:5-6) but 'Makassar' for Ujung Pandang's former name - a seemingly artificial distinction, but one which encodes the two main meanings of an otherwise ambiguous word.

The Makassar War and its background

In 1667, naval forces of the Dutch East India Company (VOC) combined with disaffected Bugis troops to besiege and occupy the port-city of Makassar. Control over Makassar was critical to the VOC's goal of monopolizing the most lucrative aspects of the trade with eastern Indonesia, particularly its spices. For several decades Makassar had harboured various Asian and European trading communities behind a seemingly impenetrable line of fortifications, and patrolled the seas with a navy of up to 700 ships and 30,000 men. Makassar's importance and prosperity had grown particularly rapidly after 1605, the year when the local governing families, Gowa and Tallok, adopted Islam and became sultanates. In an expansionist policy ended only by the Makassar War, the sultans spread their political suzerainty under the banner of Islam through much of South Sulawesi, subjugated numerous territories to the east, and established political bonds cemented by intermarriage with the Sumbawa sultanates.

All this is well-known, but many related issues have been shrouded in uncertainty. What was the exact nature of the fortifications? How old is Makassar as a trading centre, and how did this question relate to the origins of Gowa and Tallok? What were the power bases of these kingdoms and the social mechanisms which enabled them to manage Makassar jointly? To address these questions I designed an archaeological survey to identify and understand the sites referred to by the Gowa and Tallok texts.

The Makassar fortifications

Figure 1 shows my reconstruction of Makassar's benteng (forts) and approximately ten kilometres of coastal brick wall. The chronology and purpose of the fortifications, as interpreted by a careful comparison of the textual and archaeological evidence, can be summarized under four groupings. (Archaeological survey was not feasible in the modern built-up area between Benteng Somba Opu and Tallok, but fortunately the historical records cover this area in detail.)

(1) At the north lay Tallok's palace centre, the only Makassar fort to combine masonry with brickwork. It was built by Tallok's Sultan Abdullah in 1615.

(2) Immediately south was the area of beach ridges, defended by Benteng Ujung Pandang and the associated strip of coastal defences

which Abdullah erected in 1634. His recognition of the strategic importance of this area dates to at least 1620, when he relinquished the Tallok throne to his son and moved to Bonto Alak. Later, following the Makassar War, the VOC occupied Ujung Pandang, built its masonry walls and renamed it Fort Rotterdam, whilst the leader of the Bugis rebels (Arung Palakka) based himself in Bonto Alak. The colonial city of Makassar subsequently developed around Fort Rotterdam and Bonto Alak.

(3) To the southeast lay Gowa's traditional palace centre of Kale Gowa. In c. 1550 Tunipalangga replaced its original earth walls with brick walls, and after 1615 Alauddin thickened and probably extended the brickworks. The toponym Datak shows where Abdul Jalil, the prince who inherited the Gowa throne after Makassar's defeat, built his palace in 1694. (Benteng Anak Gowa, to the south, was also built by Tunipalangga in c. 1550, at a time when the kingdoms further south still presented a threat.)

(4) The delta of the Jeknekberang (then the Garassik) River contained the Makassar entrepôt. By at least 1638 it was zoned into a northern section for foreign merchants, and a section from Somba Opu southwards for the Makasar. Archaeological evidence supports the textual suggestion that Tunipalangga built Somba Opu shortly after 1550 and relocated his palace there. Between 1631 and 1635 Gowa and Tallok carried out a joint program to strengthen Somba Opu and build the associated coastal wall and minor forts. After 1660, in the face of growing threats from the VOC, Gowa's Sultan Hasanuddin extended these fortifications and dug the canal separating Garassik and Somba Opu. The VOC and Arung Palakka destroyed Somba Opu in 1669 after Gowa and Tallok had resisted the terms of the peace settlement.

To summarize, the Gowa court was based in Kale Gowa on at least three occasions (?- c. 1550, 1618-1631, 1694-?), and Somba Opu twice (c. 1550-1618, 1631-1669). Between 1620 and c. 1654 Tallok effectively had two palaces: Benteng Tallok for the sultan, and Bonto Alak for the regent (see below). Also, the massive scale of the fortifications during Makassar's heyday can be understood in terms of the large urban population being protected, and the even larger rural population available to carry out the works. As suggested both by the textual references which Anthony Reid assembled in 1987 ('Pluralism and progress in 17th century Makassar', Leiden workshop Trade, Society and Belief in South Sulawesi) and by the archaeological data which I have gathered, the city itself contained around 100,000 inhabitants, while at least 200,000 more people occupied the adjacent plains.

Origins

The oldest, extant Makasar writings appear to have been composed in the early 16th century. They incorporate what had presumably been orally transmitted accounts: a succession dispute between Batara Gowa and Karaengloe ri Sero, the former retaining Gowa and the latter establishing Tallok; and the father-to-son succession of Gowa rulers up to Batara Gowa. I used two approaches to date these protohistorical records.

Firstly, the average male generation length of the 16th-17th century Gowa and Tallok kings was 30 years. Although rather large by the standards of most pre-industrial societies, this span reflects the longevity of many of the kings, and the irrelevance of birth order in determining the succession. By backdating from the oldest securely dated births, the years of birth of the earlier kings could be estimated.

Secondly, the history of the surveyed sites could be understood from the associated sherdage of Chinese, Vietnamese and Thai ceramics. These included early monochromes and whitewares, dating mainly to the 13th and 14th centuries, and various classes of blue-and-white wares produced during the Ming and early Ching dynasties. Enormous quantities had been imported for burial with the dead or for domestic use by wealthy households; in all, not less than 37,629 tradeware sherds were documented. My analysis distributed the sherds among 50-year intervals, and then calculated the relative frequencies for each interval at each site to identify the places where wealth and influence had been concentrated in the past.

Application of these two approaches indicates that the legend of Gowa's origins corresponded to a real-life event. Gowa's first ruler was supposedly a white-blooded nymph who descended from heaven at Kale Gowa where she married a man 'from the south' called Karaeng Bayo (the Bajau king). The marriage would have occurred at around 1300 AD according to the backdating of Gowa's early line of succession. That a wealthy elite had indeed established itself at Kale Gowa by this time is confirmed by the strong concentration of early monochromes and whitewares which I recorded at the site. Moreover the commemorated grave of Karaeng Bayo at Bayoa ('Bajau'), Sanrabone, is associated with a wooden coffin dated by the radiocarbon method to c. 1350 AD. Hence it appears that Gowa originated as a hereditary line of chiefs at around 1300 AD, as the result of the marriage between a local aristocratic woman, and a Bajau leader from the place which later became Sanrabone (see Figure 2).

The concentration of early monochromes and whitewares found at Kale Gowa also characterized the sites within a four kilometre radius to the east and the south. That is, the fertile rice fields which contain these sites seem to have been well-populated by the 13th-14th centuries, and Gowa had emerged as one of a cluster of agrarian chiefdoms. (The immediate source of the ceramics had probably been the area which later became the Makassar entrepôt, even though its sites were poor in 13th-14th century sherdage.)

Subsequently, at a juncture which the royal genealogies would place at the end of the 15th century, Tallok was founded by Karaengloe ri Sero, the brother of the Gowa king Batara Gowa. Karaengloe ri Sero and a group of followers reportedly occupied Tallok after most of his followers had deserted him for Batara Gowa. The story implies a major population relocation which the recorded tradeware sherdage bears out. Tallok, poor in 13th-15th century sherdage was rich in 16th century sherdage; precisely the reverse was true of Sero and the other sites surrounding Kale Gowa; whereas Kale Gowa itself remained a focus of imported tradewares throughout. Thus there seems little doubt that Gowa achieved total political supremacy over its immediate surrounds at around 1500 AD, while the losing faction found a suitable refuge at Tallok.

Tallok's establishment was part of a broader pattern of more intensive settlement along the coast and the growth of trade. The initiation of these long-distance trade networks can be largely attributed to local communities of Bajau 'sea gypsies', as first argued by Anthony Reid in 1983 ('The rise of Makassar', *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 17:117-60). Not only was Karaeng Bayo from Sanrabone the apparent male ancestor of Gowa's royal line, but also the toponym Bayoa occurs at the other major historical ports along the southeast coast (Tallok, Makassar and Galesong). During the 15th century, however, north Javanese traders largely displaced the Bajau. Thus the Sanrabone dynasty was initiated by a man 'from north Majapahit' (Figure 2), while Gresik in north Java

spawned the kingdom of Garassik within the Makassar entrepôt area (Figure 1). Garassik's growing prosperity must have whetted the appetite of its neighbours, for during the early 16th century Gowa and Tallok, and probably even a Bugis kingdom (Siang, shown in Figure 2), battled to control Garassik. After Gowa re-established its dominance in the mid-century, it entered into pacts to protect the resident trading communities such as the Malays. These historical indications of the rising importance of Sanrabone and Garassik/Makassar are amply supported by the recorded tradeware sheritage.

Management of Makassar

Gowa developed a para-bureaucracy to administer Makassar. The post of harbourmaster was established in the early 16th century, while the first guildmaster and 'minister for internal affairs' were appointed during Tunipalangga's reign (1547-1565). The latter post, which grew to three levels of management by the time of the Makassar War, was responsible for mediating between Gowa's nine community headmen and the central court. The regent supervised internal security and acted as closest advisor to the Gowa king; in this case the post was established by the king of Tallok for him to assist Tunipalangga's youthful successor. Other appointments included the 'military commander' in the various battles, and Islamic religious posts after 1605.

The posts of high status were generally held by powerful families. The regent was always a Tallok aristocrat apart from some brief interludes, such as the years between 1577 and 1590 when the post went unfilled (Tallok then being ruled by a queen married to Gowa's king). The 'ministers for internal affairs' were generally appointed from the nobility of Maros (see Figure 2) and Pattekne after these kingdoms were subjugated by Gowa. The two late 17th century guildmasters were Tallok nobles, while the last of the 17th century harbourmasters was a noble of Maros descent.

Paradoxically, Gowa aristocrats seem to have been effectively barred from the above posts. Their role lay in superintending the major territories which had been independent kingdoms before being incorporated into Gowa. Transfer of control was usually legitimized by marriage between the daughter of the subjugated king, and the Gowa king or one of his sons. The fate of these once-independent kingdoms surrounding Gowa varied enormously. Some were swallowed up as titles to be awarded from the central court (e.g. lord of Garassik); some periodically re-established 'home rule' through the local nobility (e.g. Galesong); Maros ceased to be a single administered area, but its nobility re-emerged as a powerful family within Makassar; while Tallok retained nominal or real independence apart from a brief period of rule by Gowa (1590-1593).

Tensions remained ever present in an administrative system dominated by a few families seeking to cement their power through strategic marriages. Thus, during Gowa's period of greatest territorial expansion (c. 1550-1593) it enjoyed total control over Makassar, made its aristocrats the lords of territories previously under the jurisdiction of neighbouring kingdoms, and drew its nine headmen from communities which covered the rice plains from Tallok to Sanrabone. The signs of Gowa's monopolization of power included a poorly reciprocated pattern of local aristocratic women marrying into Gowa, the temporary abolition of the regency, and Gowa's occupancy of the Tallok and Maros thrones by 1593. All these trends were reversed by Tallok's Karaeng Kanjilo (later Sultan Abdullah) who restored first the regency and then the Tallok throne, and later brought the entire Makassar coastal strip under Tallok's control

(while Gowa withdrew to Kale Gowa). Most importantly, Abdullah's restoration of political pluralism at home (including balanced aristocratic marriages) allowed him to summon Makassar's talent for the thrust into eastern Indonesia.

The fortifications programme managed jointly by Gowa and Tallok between 1631 and 1635 (noted above) marked a new period when old territorial jealousies were overruled, and the entire human resources of the area were utilized for common goals. Competition within the dual sultanate was as strong as ever, but the overt tensions focussed on how to handle the growing menace posed by the VOC and its allies. Significantly, Makassar held fast in the face of a two-month siege during the Makassar War, only acquiescing to a treaty when Makassar's erstwhile allies began to realign with the VOC (see L.Y. Andaya, *The Heritage of Arung Palakka*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1981).

Wider patterns of Bugis-Makassar kingship

Figure 2 summarizes the available evidence on the antiquity of the Bugis-Makassar kingdoms, as indicated by the date of the founding Tomanurung or 'descended ones', and the date of the first rulers whose reign is described in detail. As regards the Bugis kingdoms, my main source was the genealogies and kinglists in Ian Caldwell's 1988 PhD thesis (*South Sulawesi A.D. 1300-1600: Ten Bugis Texts*, Canberra, Australian National University). To estimate the dates I used Caldwell's recommendation of an average reign length of 25 years, in concert with my own figure (explained above) of 30 years per average male generation length. Two qualifications deserve to be noted. Firstly, none of the Bugis chronologies is supported by hard archaeological data except in the case of Soppeng (B. Kallupa et al., *Survey Pusat Kerajaan Soppeng 1100-1986*; see Baruga 6:8-10). Secondly, some kingdoms might appear older than others simply because they achieved literacy earlier, allowing them to write down genealogical information which might otherwise have been forgotten (Campbell Macknight and Ian Caldwell, pers. comm.).

Nonetheless, as the dates stand, the oldest South Sulawesi kingdoms appear to have been Cina, Wajok, and Soppeng (which also then ruled the port of Suppak). That is, the social processes which led to the establishment of South Sulawesi's historical kingdoms apparently first affected the lowland Bugis along the peninsula's major river system (see Figure 2). This contradicts the conventional wisdom which views Luwuk as the oldest South Sulawesi kingdom. Here I suspect that Luwuk's reputed seniority rests on a garbled memory: although not particularly ancient, Luwuk was the most powerful kingdom during the 15th century (as I interpret Luwuk's vassal list presented in Caldwell's thesis). Several related points bear comment:

(1) The origins of the oldest Bugis kingdoms evidently preceded the rise of the Majapahit empire in Java, and hence would not appear to reflect influence from Majapahit.

(2) Nonetheless the origins of some of the later kingdoms (Luwuk, Sanrabone and Gowa's second ruler) are explicitly tied to Majapahit. Note that the identifiable South Sulawesi toponyms mentioned in the Majapahit literature - Makassar (a generic term for the peninsula's southeast corner?), Bantaeng, Selayar and Luwu - fall well away from the area of South Sulawesi's oldest kingdoms.

(3) Pre-Islamic burial rites within the cluster of Bugis kingdoms between Suppak and Bone involved cremating the dead, as was also the case in Java. This is a paradox because these same Bugis kingdoms offer no other apparent evidence of links with Majapahit. Even more paradoxically, Luwu and the coastal region between Siang and Selayar

(where evidence of links with Majapahit is found) adopted the burial practice then becoming popular in the Philippines, i.e. interment of the dead with exotic grave goods. So the geography of South Sulawesi's pre-Islamic burial practices either reflects internal processes rather than external influences, or else it reflects influences from sources other than Majapahit Java.

(4) One reading of the evidence would conclude that large agrarian societies preceded large trade-based societies in South Sulawesi. But as an equally viable reading, the priority of the trend towards large societies (including agricultural intensification) within the Bugis heartland might have been tied up with pre-Majapahit trading contacts, possibly extending as far back as Srivijaya's last days. In either case, the rise of Makassar was the climax of a pattern established several centuries beforehand in South Sulawesi, a pattern involving agricultural intensification as well as regular trading contacts with the wider archipelago (cf. C.C. Macknight [1983], 'The rise of agriculture in South Sulawesi before 1600', *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 17:92-116).

Comment on Ian Caldwell's fieldwork in Luwu

Readers of this copy of *Baruga* will find an interesting report by Ian Caldwell which suggests, among other things, that western Luwu was involved mainly in forest produce and eastern Luwu in the iron industry. Further, while my Figure 2 locates Luwuk's origins at Palopo, I agree with Ian Caldwell that Malangke would appear to have been the older centre. Nonetheless there are some additional points of information that should be stated.

(1) Caldwell apparently has no qualms about accepting the Sung identification made by a local antiques dealer for the celadons and monochromes looted at Malangke. This reminds me of the collection of 'Imported ceramics in South Sulawesi' identified under the tutelage of local dealers (Hadimuljono and C.C. Macknight [1983], *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 17:66-91), in which the Sung outnumber the Yuan pieces by a factor of ten. Such a preponderance of Sung wares would contrast strangely with the pattern observed elsewhere in the archipelago; for instance, J.S. Guy ('Ceramic excavation sites in Southeast Asia: A preliminary gazetteer', *Research Centre for Southeast Asian Ceramics Papers* 3, 1987) maps only eight sites with 10th-12th century ceramics as opposed to 25 sites with 13th-14th century ceramics. Elsewhere J.S. Guy, in his study of *Oriental Trade Ceramics in South-East Asia Ninth to Sixteenth Centuries* (Oxford University Press, Singapore, 1986), explains why China's early period of ceramic exports peaked between the end of the Sung and the very early Ming dynasty:

'In 1216 an edict was issued officially encouraging the export of porcelain, and in 1219 an official declared that [manufactured items including porcelain, rather than gold and silver, should be traded]' (p.14). 'China's maritime trade continued to expand...under the Yuan...[who] introduced regulations to ensure that they benefited directly from the expansion in the ceramic industry' (p.24). 'The prohibition on foreign trade [in 1371] reflected Hongwu's concern over the growing wealth and independence of the sea-merchants of South China' (p.31). (Hongwu was the first Ming emperor. Guy then goes on to discuss the initial success of the tribute missions and contraband trade in partly circumventing Hongwu's prohibition.)

In short, the apparent 'Yuan gap' in South Sulawesi's sequence of imported Chinese wares, as reiterated by Caldwell for Malangke, reflects the Sung identification which local dealers have automatically assigned to many 13th-14th century wares. The same

error has been reported for the Philippines by that country's best known archaeologist, Robert Fox (1979:186-7):

'The huge celadon plates found in the Philippines...are often attributed to the Sung Dynasty. John Alexander Pope, on the contrary, believes that these are Yuan or early Ming, for in his years of study...he has not been able to attribute a truly large plate to the Sung Dynasty.' ('Chinese pottery in the Philippines', in M. Garcia [ed.] *Readings in Philippine Prehistory*, pp.178-96, Manila, The Filipiniana Book Guild)

(2) Caldwell cites an 'evidently ancient' dammar trade as the main factor behind Sabbang's early prominence. Sabbang's pre-Islamic importance was apparent to Campbell Macknight and myself in 1985 when we inspected Baebunta, a site with thousands of looter's pits less than a kilometre from Sabbang. The ceramics which had not yet been sold were mainly Thai and Vietnamese, accompanied by contemporary and earlier Chinese wares.

On the other hand, I do not see why dammar was necessarily Sabbang's main trade item in pre-Islamic times, or at any point before the late 19th century. In 1856 John Crawford, in *A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries* (London, Bradbury), cited Sumatra, Java and Borneo as the chief sources of commercial dammar (p.118). Available trade data are very incomplete before the late 19th century, reflecting the status of dammar as a minor product which used to be traded mainly on the 'black market'. Nonetheless the available data set out below support Crawford's observation. Yet they also indicate that 'Celebes and its dependencies' (more or less the southern half of Sulawesi) became an important supplier soon afterwards, at one stage the single main source in the archipelago.

It is of course a big step to use regional data to particularize about Sabbang, and indeed local studies alone can delineate the details of the industry. Nonetheless the hypothesis that Sabbang become an important outlet for dammar only within the recent past merits attention. (W.J.A. Willems in 1938 noted that Sabbang had been an important centre but was deserted by the time he arrived: 'Preliminary report on the excavation of an urn-burial ground at Sa'bang near Palopo (Central Celebes)', pp.207-8 in F.N. Chasen and M.W.F. Tweedie (eds) *Proceedings of the Third Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East*, Singapore, Government of the Straits Settlements.) This is not to deny Ian Caldwell's suggestion that Sabbang's pre-Islamic importance was probably based on highlands forest produce. But we can be sure that the economic allure of the various forest products, including dammar, has changed radically over the past.

Dammar Trade Statistics, 1830-1914, Netherlands India (Metric Tons)

| Annual average by period: | -- Java imports from -- | | Exports overseas from | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------|
| | Celebes | Sumatra & Borneo | Java | Celebes | Other N-I |
| 1830-1839 | 0.04 | 125 | 11 | ? | ? |
| 1840-1849 | 0.7 | 457 | 110 | ? | ? |
| 1850-1855 | 2.6 | 581 | 257 | ? | ? |
| 1875 | ? | ? | ----- | 2102 | ----- |
| 1880 | ? | ? | ----- | 5451 | ----- |
| 1886-90 | ? | ? | 1139 | 1537 | 1347 |
| 1891-4 | ? | ? | 1072 | 165 | 1446 |
| 1897-1906 | ? | ? | 1728 | 776 | 2199 |
| 1913 | ? | ? | ? | 2-3000 | 5-6000 |

1830-55 data from G.F. de Bruijn Kops (1858) *Statistiek van den handel en de scheepvaart op Java en Madura sedert 1825* (Batavia, Lange & Co.). 1875-80 data from N.P. van den Berg (1895) *The Financial and Economic Conditions of Netherlands India since 1870* (The Hague, Netherlands Economical & Statistical Society). 1886-1906 data from Departement van Financien (various years of an incomplete set) *Statistiek van den handel, de scheepvaart en de in- en uitvoerrechten in Nederlandsch-Indie* (Batavia, Ogilvie & Co./Landsdrukkerij). 1913 estimates calculated from Encyclopaedisch Bureau (1915) *De Buitenbezittingen 1904 tot 1914, Aflevering X, Deel I*, pp.272-3.