

This is an ongoing project to make available my 1988 PhD thesis in a slightly updated format.

*Please cite as:* Caldwell, Ian. South Sulawesi A.D.1300-1600. Ten Bugis Texts. PhD Thesis. The National University of Australia. Online version at [www.oxis.org](http://www.oxis.org).

Last updated 5 June 2013

Ian Caldwell

## Chapter One

### 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 book. 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 (see page 5) 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:

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 book? 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 epic, such as the Bugis 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.<sup>1</sup> For such a genre, the central

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

object of study should be the tradition itself, rather than the recovery of an imaginary original.<sup>2</sup>

However, in the case of each of the Bugis works examined in this book, their manuscript versions can be shown, by virtue of their close structural and linguistic similarity, to have descended from a single ancestor. (This is a slight simplification, but the exceptions do not seriously challenge this conclusion.) Each version of a work can be shown to be more or less faithful than other versions to the ancestor from which it is 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 Boné 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 term) 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 Luwuq and a genealogy from the western Cénrana region to provide evidence of the ascriptive status of a seventeenth-century ruler of Boné, while the author of the eighteenth-century Attorionlonna Soppéng (section 2.5) used a number of earlier oral traditions to produce a work supporting the authority of the ruler of Soppéng 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.<sup>4</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> This conclusion is reached independently by Behrend (1987) in his study of the Javanese poem Jatiswara.

<sup>3</sup> Selective 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 Boné. Evidence for selective copying at both levels is presented in Chapter Two.

<sup>4</sup> This definition partly encompasses Vickers' use of the word, in that each version of the Malat (or 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.

just how much difference 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.<sup>5</sup> *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 **ianaé** 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.<sup>6</sup>

## 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.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> Variation in Bugis manuscripts was later examined by Macknight and Caldwell (2001). The division into stylistic and substantial variation is their own: indicative errors (*leitfehler*), which enable the construction of a stemma (Maas 1958:42), are almost always substantial in Bugis manuscripts.

<sup>7</sup> The Chronicle of Tanété (Niemann 1883) uses the Bugis-Makasar script and is without translation. Some other works were published in Bugis-Makasar script by Matthes in the

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 *sureq*,<sup>8</sup> which contain episodes from the *La Galigo*,<sup>9</sup> are sharply divided off from codices called *lontaraq*, which contain items such as calendars, diaries, genealogies, and religious and historical works.<sup>10</sup> Abidin states that the earliest Bugis writing (in the Bugis-Makasar script?) was called **sureq** (writing) but offers no evidence (Abidin 1971:162). **Sureq** is an Arabic-Malay loan-word (Wilkinson 1901-1902:418), while **lontaraq** is evidently derived from Javanese *lontar* (writing, document), being a transposition of *rontal* (leaf of the Tal tree). It therefore seems unlikely that this important division dates back earlier than the sixteenth century.

---

Makasar and Bugis Chrestomathies; it is more convenient here to refer to them in their manuscript versions or published romanized transcriptions.

<sup>8</sup> The word *sureq* may, however, be used within a non-**sureq** works to introduce its subject, for example in the words **iana sureq poadaadaéngngi**. 'This is the writing that tells of (such and such a thing)'.

<sup>9</sup> The position of other forms of poetry is uncertain, but they should probably be included in the **sureq** category.

<sup>10</sup> A concise introduction to Bugis historical literature is found in Cense 1951 and Pelras 1985. Tol ([forthcoming](#)) observes that the **sureq** / **lontaraq** division corresponds closely to the 'soothing' / 'useful' categories proposed as the two dominant functions operating in Malay texts by Koster and Maier (1985). Thus *sureq* 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 **lontaraq** correspond to 'those texts which served directly to uphold the legal and political order [... and] provide standards of conduct and function as sources of relevant knowledge' (ibid., p. 445).

All the works set out in Chapter Two are found in **lontaraq** codices. Items within codices are generally distinguished 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 *tammāt* (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 University.

**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 University of Leiden.

**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.<sup>11</sup>

**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**

---

<sup>11</sup> These have since been re-catalogued 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 Noorduyin (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.

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 *Verskillende 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:

#### **CCM 16/4**

refers to item 4 in reel 16.

### **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 nineteenth century, a widely spoken language, was the word list compiled by the Danish missionary L. G. Thomsen in Singapore in 1833.<sup>12</sup> 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, Colliqpujié a daughter of the ruler of the little west-coast

---

<sup>12</sup> *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 superseded by the *Woordenboek*. For further information on Thomsen and the publications of the Mission Press, see Noorduyn 1957.



kingdom of Tanété.<sup>13</sup> Two other informants were Arung Mandallé, the ex-Regent of Kékéang, and his father, Daéng Mémangung (Swellengrebel 1974:150).

A word should be said here about Matthes' use of the terms 'Old Bugis' (abbreviated O.B.), 'Basa Bissu' ('Bissu<sup>14</sup> 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 Luwuq region, traditionally associated with the I La Galigo cycle. Indeed, 'Old Bugis' seems in some way to have originated from the 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).

### 1.3 The Bugis-Makasar Script

The Bugis writing system<sup>15</sup> 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

---

<sup>13</sup> '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 Boné 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).

<sup>14</sup> **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.

<sup>15</sup> The following description is based largely upon Sirk (1983:24-26) and Mills (1975:600-03).

as Mandar, Duri, Énré kang and Toraja, and also for Bima (Abidin 1971:159).<sup>16</sup> 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 *aksara*, this could be accounted for by assuming the Bugis-Makasar script to have been invented by someone familiar with the principles and certain *aksara* of an Old Javanese script.<sup>17</sup>

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) *aksara*, of which there are twenty three in Bugis, stands for a consonant plus an 'inherent' vowel a; thus  $\partial$  produces Ka,  $\partial$  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.)<sup>18</sup> The value of the vowel may be altered by the addition of diacritics placed above, below, before or after the *aksara*. Thus  $\partial$  (Pa) produces  $\partial$  (Pi),  $\partial$  (Pu),  $\partial$  (Pé),  $\partial$  (Po) and  $\partial$  (Pe). The single exception is the *aksara*  $\partial$ , which produces the inherent vowel a without a preceding consonant.<sup>19</sup>

### 1.3.1 Origin

---

<sup>16</sup> See however page 159, footnote 1, which states that 'the lontaraq of the raja of the Mandar, Duri, Énré kang and Sangallaq-Toradja 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 Dr. 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  $\partial$  of this thesis), alongside an approximate rendition of the modern Bugis-Makasar script.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. the case of the invention of the Cherokee script and its relationship to the Latin script (Jensen 1970:241-243).

<sup>18</sup> One page of a randomly selected Bugis prose text (Matthes 1864:582) produces the following vowel counts: a 238, i 103, u 60, é 54, o 45, e 34. In percentage terms this translates as: a 44.6, i 19.3, u 11.2, é 10.1, o 8.4 and e 6.7.

<sup>19</sup> Sirk (1983:25) does not hold to  $\partial$  be an independent vowel symbol since he considers it able to convey a pre-glottalized vowel (thus qa, 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.

The origin of the Bugis-Makasar script<sup>20</sup> and the date of the introduction of its prototype to South Sulawesi, has never been properly determined. Noorduynd 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 (Noorduynd 1962:31).<sup>21</sup>

Noorduynd is cautious about 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 *baybayin* 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*,<sup>22</sup> 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).

### 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

---

<sup>20</sup> See section 3.2 for my own conclusions regarding the origin of the Bugis-Makasar script.

<sup>21</sup> 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 possess a previous written literary tradition.

<sup>22</sup> A small oblique stroke placed under a consonant to denote that it has no vowel inherent or otherwise pronounced after it (Monier-Williams 1899).

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.<sup>23</sup>

Crawfurd (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 the Old Makasar script have survived (a brief list is given by Noorduynd (1985:22). Among these are three manuscripts which contain the chronicles of Goa and Talloq 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 (Noorduynd 1985:22).<sup>24</sup> 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 Boné 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 *ð* (Ha) was introduced by Abdul Maqmur, 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, *ð* (NGKa) *ð* (NRa) *ð* (MPa) and *ð*

---

<sup>23</sup> As was mentioned in the preface, the Matthesstichting (now the Yayasan Kebudayaan Sulawesi Selatan dan Tenggara) was established in 1933 to further the copying of Bugis and Makasar manuscripts under the direction of Dr A. A. Cense. More than two hundred manuscripts were copied, many of them borrowed from important Bugis and Makasar families. Many of these copies are still held in the Yayasan, though a sizeable number was lost during the Japanese occupation and during the war of independence, and in the internal disturbances of the 1950s and 1960s.

Some of the manuscripts were microfilmed by Cense in the 1950s. The current collection of the YKSST was photographed by Dr C. C. Macknight in 1972 and 1974. The microfilms are now in the library of the Australian National University. Since 1972 more manuscripts have disappeared from the YKSST.

<sup>24</sup>Tables of the 'Old Makasar' script are found in Raffles (1817:clxxxvii), Mills (1975:603), Holle (1882) and Fachruddin (1983:33).

(Nya) is attributed to Colliqpujié, an eighteenth-century Arung Pancana (1971:162). Fachruddin identifies Colliqpujié with Matthes' friend and informant of that name who was also ruler of Pancana,<sup>25</sup> 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 *aksara* and certain *aksara* of the South Sumatran scripts: he also observes that while the sound represented by the *aksara* *ð* (Ha) is rare in Bugis, it does occur in certain dialects, such as those of Sinjai and Soppéng, and that the shape of the *aksara* *ð* bears a closer resemblance to the 'Kawi' *aksara* *ð* (Ha) than it does to the Arabic *ð* (H).

The similarity between the Bugis script and those of Sumatra (and in particular the scripts of Lampong and Rejeng) has been frequently observed.<sup>26</sup> Fachruddin, however, sets out in a table the 'Kawi', Bugis(-Makasar) and 'Sumatran', *aksara* and concludes that the physical relationship between the Bugis-Makasar *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 other apparently related scripts simply on the basis of the shapes of their *aksara*.<sup>27</sup>

Little stylistic development in the script can be detected in the manuscripts examined in this book, most of which date from the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> 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.

<sup>26</sup> This observation can be traced back at least to Raffles, who wrote in his *History of Java* that 'The form of the character[s] is peculiar, and more nearly resembles that of the *Bátas* on Sumatra than any other we know of' (Raffles 1817:clxxxvii).

<sup>27</sup> See in this regard Thomas' review of Juan R. Francisco's *Philippine Palaeography* (*Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, Special Monograph Number 3; June 1973) in *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 14, pp. 153-162.

<sup>28</sup> See in this regard Kern (1939:581,1075), who states that some of the 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 La Galigo. Mention should also be made of the so-called cipher script which was sometimes employed in the nineteenth

The linguistic values of the aksara 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 book does, however, contain three previously unrecorded *aksara*. MAK 100:136.1-137.12 uses  $\partial$  for NG,  $\partial$  for S and  $\partial$  for B, the last of these being replaced, apparently at random, by the usual *aksara*. MAK 100 is a twentieth-century copy of a codex owned by the Opu Patunru Luwuq (the holder of a high office in the former kingdom of Luwuq).

Prior to the introduction of paper, possibly by the Malays in the sixteenth century,<sup>29</sup> writing seems to have been recorded on prepared leaves (Abidin 1971:161). Abidin reports that *lontaraq* written on leaves are today of great rarity, existing only among the Tolotang people:<sup>30</sup> according to Andi Makkaraka, 'an expert and collector of *lontaraq*', episodes of the I La Galigo written on rolled **akaq** leaves using an eighteen-character syllabary are still to be found in Luwuq (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.<sup>31</sup>

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

---

century to record **élong**, in which the independent symbols of the Buginese-Makasar script are replaced by Arabic figures (Sirk 1983:26).

<sup>29</sup> 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).

<sup>30</sup> The Tolotang people live in the Sidénréng area. They are believed to have originated in the village of Tatoni in Wajo. 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.

<sup>31</sup> Examples of **lontaraq** 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 **lontaraq** 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 discussion of the evidence for spooled **lontaraq** see Macknight 1986:222.

is given in the Adatrechtbundels (1929:288) of a reading of a **lontaraq** 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-aksara 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 rapidly be 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.<sup>32</sup>

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-initial consonants), glottal stops and the 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

---

<sup>32</sup> 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.

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 invariably those of 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 *aksara* 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**, **papaq**, **pappaq**, **pampaq**, **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.

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).<sup>33</sup> It was my distinct impression that the glottal stop was less common in Soppéng than in Sidénréng-Rappang (Sidrap), and that Matthes' dictionary, like Said's, conforms more closely to the latter. I was unable to form any impression of the Boné 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 Boné (Palakka) and Soppéng are described by Grimes and Grimes as 'prestige dialects' (cf. Sirk, above).

One solution to the problem of the correct indication of geminate consonants, pre-nasalization and glottal stops, therefore, might be to use the dialect of Soppéng or Boné as a standard. Unfortunately, neither Matthes' nor Said's

---

<sup>33</sup> For a detailed discussion of Bugis dialects and subdialects, see Friberg and Friberg (1985): on page 39 the authors place the shared lexical similarity of Bugis dialects as low as 77 per cent. A table of words showing dialect variation between the eleven Bugis dialects is found in Grimes and Grimes (1987:98-199).



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 Boné or Soppéng-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 regarding 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).<sup>34</sup> Theoretically, the presence of these geminate consonants is indicated by the contrast between verbal pairs such as **wawa/mpawa**, **réweq /nréweq**, 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 audibly detect the initial lengthening or pre-glottalizing of verbs as described by Noorduyn.<sup>35</sup> 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, by a shift in stress leading to a reduced emphasis on the initial part of the word, as in, for example, the words **tüdang** (to sit) and **tudängeng** (a seat). I therefore decided not to indicate initial geminate consonants.<sup>36</sup>

The second problem concerned the *aksara* *ð*, which Noorduyn transcribes as NRa, but which is audibly pronounced *ndra*, at least among the Bugis in Soppéng and Sidénréng. 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 *aksara* 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

---

<sup>34</sup> I gather from Noorduyn's remarks on page 10 that gemination and glottalization should be audible.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Kaseng (1982) who does not indicate initial gemination.

<sup>36</sup> 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.

consonant of the following morpheme (the example he gives is Arung Tanété > ArutTanété) or to a change in the assimilated consonant (Arung Bélawa > AruqBélawa) or to a change in both the assimilated and initial consonant (Arung Boné > Arumponé). To put it simply, nothing is 'lost' in the process; each element is accounted for in the new construction. In reality this did not seem always to be 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 Boné > Watamponé), 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 Soppéng, which was pronounced WataSoppéng rather than WatasSoppéng. It was also my impression that the second a in WataSoppéng had lengthened slightly. In the transcriptions, however, the system set out by Noorduyn is followed consistently.

## **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.<sup>37</sup> 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

---

<sup>37</sup> The debate originated with a review by Kratz of Brakel's edition of the Hikayat Muhammad Hanafiyyah (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). For the debate as regards the editing of Javanese manuscripts, see Van der Molen (1983), in which a more spartan definition of a single-text edition is pursued, and Gonda's response in defense of the text-critical method (Gonda 1986).

single manuscript, or a group of manuscripts, is believed to derive (Maas 1958:1). The text-critical method, and a number of important assumptions on which it rests, is summarized as follows.<sup>38</sup>

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 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*.<sup>39</sup>

*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, 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 15) that the copyist is working from a single exemplar, and that he is

---

<sup>38</sup> An excellent introduction to the methods and history of textual criticism is provided by the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (15th edition), Vol. 18, p.p.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).

<sup>39</sup> In 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.

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.<sup>40</sup> Kratz excludes from his remarks 'directly translated' texts (i.e. Islamic theological works: personal communication, Dr E. U. Kratz, November 1987), the contents of which were carefully translated, often at the expense of Malay syntax. Roolvink, too, warns against the tendency to describe every Malay copyist as a joint author (Roolvink 1967:262).<sup>41</sup>

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 choose 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

---

<sup>40</sup> See 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.

<sup>41</sup> Roolvink gives as evidence the fact that 'The stories in the *Hikayat Bakhtiar* that were taken from the 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).

Three systems of transcription are used in this book. 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 *ə*, 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, *ə* is rendered KéDo (**kédo**, 'to move'), *ə* as WeNi (**wenni**, 'night'), *ə* as QéLo (**élong**, '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 footnotes to indicate variant spellings of names or place-names, and the unusual spelling of words where an *aksara* is made to carry two diacritics. Thus, for example, *ə* (**sapposisekku**, 'my cousin') is footnoted as SaPoSieKu.

The other two systems are based on the systems described by Noorduyn (1955).<sup>42</sup> 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 É 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 **riaseng** (called, named) either RiQaSe or RiYaSe, 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

tj	becomes	c
dj	becomes	j

---

<sup>42</sup> This was devised by Dr Cense. I understand that Dr Noorduyn presently uses a system based on that developed in part by Professor Fachruddin (1983).

nj becomes ny\* (\* see below)

j becomes y

I have also made a number of small alterations to Noorduyn's system. The first concerns the *aksara* *∂* (Noorduyn: NYC) which I have transcribed NC, in keeping with modern Indonesian conventions. Secondly, I have transcribed *∂* as 'N' (Noorduyn: NJ [modern spelling NY]) and geminate NG as NGNG (Noorduyn: 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 rhythmo-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 likewise enclosed in square brackets. Where an *aksara* carries more than one diacritic this is indicated in a footnote.<sup>43</sup> The principles of the system are demonstrated with the following example:

[W]é Tappaqcinnana \ siala \ Anakaji \ nawawani \ wawinéna \ lao \ ri Luuq

Wé Tappaqcinna married Anakaji and he took his wife to Luwuq.

In the first word, [W]é, only the vowel *é* is shown as occurring in the manuscript, so the manuscript must read Qé. The second word, **Tappaqcinna**, 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 \ WaWiN'Na \ LaQo \ Ri. In the final word, **Luuq**, we know that the glottal stop cannot be shown in the Bugis-Makasar script: **Luuq** must therefore be written

---

<sup>43</sup> The only features of a manuscript text not represented in the transcriptions are instances where an *aksara* and its diacritic are separated by a line break. Such instances are quite common and their indication would quickly become tiresome.

LuQu in the manuscript.<sup>44</sup> We now see that underlying the developed transcription is the manuscript text:

QéTaPaCiNaNa \ SiQaLa \ QaNaKaJi \ NaWaWiN'e'Na \ LaQo \ RiLuQu

[illegible]

A few dialect-forms or archaic spellings regularly met with in manuscript Bugis are preserved in the transcription. The most common of these are **lattuq** (modern Bugis **lettuq**, 'to arrive'), **aneq** (**anaq**, 'child') and **makkada** (**makkeda**, to say). In addition, the suffix **-ang**, a dialectal (and possibly archaic) form of **-eng**, 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 RiLaLeSoPéToPa, 'also in Soppéng', which is constructed from **ri laleng** (in) **Soppéng** (the place-name Soppéng) plus the modal suffixes **-to** (also) and **-pa** (nevertheless), is transcribed as **ri laleng Soppettopa**, showing the assimilation of the **-ng** of Soppéng with the **t** of the suffix **-ta** but without morphophonemic change at the junction of **laleng** and **Soppéng**.<sup>45</sup> A second example is TeLuWeNi (three nights), which is composed of two independent words, **tellung** (three) and **wenni** (night), and is transcribed **tellung wenni**. But TeLuPeNi, which shows that the w of **wenni** has changed to a p, and by implication that the **-ng** of **tellung** has changed to an **m** (Noorduyn 1955:11, section 4.1), is transcribed **tellumpenni**.

Like Sirk, I have avoided doubling the letters **b**, **d**, **g** or **j**, which may be preceded by the sign **q**; thus **qb**, **qd**, etc., to indicate either geminate or pre-glottalized consonants. The consonants **c**, **k**, **l**, **m**, **n**, **ng**, **ny**, **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. **anaqna**, '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,

<sup>44</sup> Luuq is standardized to Luwuq outside transcriptions to reflect the modern Indonesian spelling.

<sup>45</sup> This would, however, generally be pronounced **rilalesSoppéttopa** with the **-ng** of **laleng** assimilated to the **s** of **Soppéng**.

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 program used and by the specified format of the A.N.U Ph.D. book.<sup>46</sup> 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.

---

<sup>46</sup> This 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.