Introduction

We present, in this book, a transliterated transcription of the Bugis text of the work known as the Chronicle of Bone, together with an English translation and notes. The chronicle deals with the affairs of this traditional kingdom in South Sulawesi—almost exactly in the centre of modern Indonesia—from the fourteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth century CE.

Our introduction provides the information needed for others to make use of the chronicle for their own purposes, whether these be historical, literary, linguistic or ethnological. We deal with the complex philological issues involved—for this is only one version of the work—and outline the cultural and historical contexts within which the chronicle was written.

1. The Chronicle of Bone in Bugis historiography

The richness and diversity of written materials in Bugis and Makasar, the main languages of South Sulawesi, were noticed by Leyden, Raffles, Crawford and other British scholars in the first half of the nineteenth century, but the works themselves were not properly accessible until the numerous publications of the Dutch linguist and Bible translator Benjamin Frederik Matthes in the second half of the nineteenth century. In his dictionaries, grammars, chrestomathies and, not least, catalogues of manuscripts, Matthes laid the foundations for later study.¹ His interests were remarkably wide and he collected manuscripts dealing with a vast range of subjects, particularly those dealing with the past.²

---

1 There is a convenient list of Matthes's published works in van den Brink (1943: 163–5).

2 Matthes also collected a great deal of literary material, especially the La Galigo narrative poems, as well as manuscripts dealing with theological, technical and cultural questions.

A.A. Cense has characterised and discussed various types of historical information found in Bugis and Makasar manuscripts. He distinguishes source materials—that is, diaries, treaty texts, *adat* legal records and correspondence—from historiographical literature in the form of short accounts of particular matters and chronicles. He also discusses the historical worth of various forms of verse, especially the *tollo'*, or Bugis narrative poetry with an eight-syllable line. Noorduyn, in the introduction to his edition of a chronicle of Wajo, lists other related material under the headings of chronicles, king lists, treaties and episodes. A further category is that of genealogies (Cense 1951; Noorduyn 1955).³

This chronicle sets out the succession of rulers in Bone, one of the major traditional kingdoms, from the first ruler—that is, the *tomanurung* or 'Descended one'—until the confused and traumatic events of early 1667. Apart from a brief introduction and a little material at the very end, all the information presented is structured within accounts of the reign of a particular ruler. Each account follows a pattern, with modifications as may be appropriate to the individual case: it proceeds through the ruler's relationship with the previous ruler and the circumstances of accession; his (or her) names, titles, marriages and children; the personal qualities of the ruler; noteworthy innovations during the reign; wars and other events of interest, including some quite detailed accounts of particular episodes; the circumstances of the ruler's testament and death; and, finally, his (or her) death name. Fortunately for the historian, the length of the reign is also given in most cases and a few synchronisms are possible, but there is no consistent attempt to relate events to any external or absolute system of dating.⁴

The relationship of the chronicles to the other categories of historical literature is apparent and, from occasional comments, we can even glimpse the process of the creation of the chronicles. For example, in the account of the family of the first ruler of Bone, after giving the names of two children important to the events of the next reign and specifying that there were five children in all, the chronicler continues: 'As for the other names [that is, those of the three unnamed children], they remain

3 Further discussions of this historiographical literature, or parts of it, may be found in Noorduyn (1961, 1965); Cense (1966); Abidin (1971); Hamonic (1980); Teeuw (1984); Macknight (2000); and Druce (2009). Tol (1990) is an excellent edition of a *tollo'*. Caldwell (1988) provides the text of some shorter works and, in a later article (1998), analyses some genealogies.

4 See Appendix 2 for discussion of absolute reign dates.

in records which are rolled up. This work only tells of the succession of events in Bone in their proper order.⁵ We do, in fact, possess materials that set out the names of all five children.⁶ Genealogies often contain extensive information not set out in prose texts (Caldwell and Wellen 2016).⁷ Similarly, when we are told that no tale has come down from the reign of *Matinroé riBettung*,⁸ this probably means the chronicler had no episodes, to use Noorduy'n's term, at his disposal, though the purely oral transmission of such stories is also possible. The only available details, other than the circumstances of that ruler's accession and death, were genealogical and the length of his reign. This suggests the possibility of derivation from a king list—again, using Noorduy'n's term. There are many such lists for Bone, but none seems to be earlier than the chronicle and it is usually easier to derive the relevant sections of king lists from the chronicle than the reverse.⁹ As Appendix 2 shows, however, this is not always the case and the chronicle is far from the sum of all we can discover from the sources about the history of Bone.

The chronicles are not, however, mere compilations of data. The author of the Bone chronicle has selected material with an eye to the overall purpose of tracing the succession of power in Bone. Thus, in the account of the first ruler's family mentioned above, the two children named are the second ruler, *La Ummasa'*, and the mother of the third ruler, *Kerrampélua'*. Similarly, the more complicated genealogical matter in the account of the twelfth ruler, *La Tenripale'*, looks forward to the role that several of those mentioned will play in later sections. On a deeper level, the account of the reign of the eighth ruler, *La Icca'*, can be read as a justification for his murder and it is hard not to suspect some dramatic intention in the

---

5 See Chapter 1 in the chronicle. There are some minor differences between this version and the one found in Matthes (1864: 467), but these do not affect the general sense. Cense (1951: 54) gives a translation of this passage, but it is not clear on which version of the Bugis this is based.

6 Leid.F.Or.A9, p. 181, l. 5 up. (See Appendix 1 for details of this manuscript.) Blok (1817: Vol. 1, p. 36) also gives this information.

7 There is a very spectacular and extensive genealogy of the rulers of Bone held in the Leiden University Library collection (D Or. 295).

8 See Chapter 9 in the chronicle.

9 The most obvious is that appended by Matthes to his edition of the chronicle (1864: 499–501), though this also lists the rulers up to his own time in the middle of the nineteenth century.

story of the installation of the baby Kerrampélua' or the tale of the death of Boté'é. Although all the chronicles are concerned with the history of a particular polity, each has its own style and purpose.¹⁰

As well as the question of the date and circumstances of the production of the Bone chronicle, which are discussed in Section 8, there is the wider issue of the origin of the genre in Bugis and Makasar historiography, apparently in the seventeenth century. Macknight (2000) outlines aspects of the rich intellectual world from which the chronicles emerge. Many potential models, both religious and secular, in many languages could have stimulated an appreciation of historical method and the commitment to writing these relatively extensive narratives. Whatever influences may have been in play, however—whether Portuguese histories or Persian romances, Biblical stories or tales of the Prophet—the South Sulawesi chronicles are distinctive in the Southeast Asian context. As the discussion in Section 7 shows, the nature of the Bone chronicle bears close comparison with many European chronicles, even if no direct relationship can be established.

We have entitled the work published here *The Bugis Chronicle of Bone*.¹¹ Two issues are involved with this name. First, in sections 2 and 3, we turn to the question of whether we can distinguish a work in the sense of a unit properly amenable to editorial attention. This leads to a discussion of our editorial principles in sections 4, 5 and 6. Second, we deal, in sections 7 and 8, with the relationship of the work to the polity of Bone.

---

10 The Makasar chronicles of Gowa and Tallo—which may be regarded as a single unit—seem to be the earliest and are now available in Cummings's (2007) excellent edition. Noorduy'n's (1955) edition of an eighteenth-century chronicle from Wajo includes, especially in its opening sections, material drawn from a variety of works, and the tradition of chronicle writing in Wajo continued into the twentieth century. Abidin (1985) provides much of another Wajo chronicle, originally from the eighteenth century. Both Noorduy'n (1955) and Abidin (1985) list various versions of their central work and much other related material. The Tanete chronicle is a product of the late nineteenth century (Niemann 1883; Gising 2002). Caldwell (1988: vi) edits and translates several short works dealing with Soppeng, Sidenreng, Luwu and Cina, but as he observes, none of these amounts to a substantial chronicle. Druce (2009) also provides text and translation of some short works from the regions of Suppa' and Sawitto. Such short historical texts are found in great numbers, in both Bugis and Makasar, across the peninsula. Cummings (2002) provides translations of some Makasar examples.

11 The Bugis term *attoriolong*, which literally means 'an account of the people of earlier times', can be applied to various kinds of records of the past. It occurs only twice in this work and in both cases with reference to rolled up records in which further genealogical information can be found. It is also commonly used—but not in this work itself—to describe this work and a few other similar works, as discussed in the previous note. It is this sense of the term we translate as 'chronicle'. We further specify this as the 'Bugis chronicle' to avoid confusion with the English word 'bone' and as an aid to keyword searching.

2. The definition of the work

Most editors, even those working in a manuscript tradition, are able to define the object of their labours by means of a title and often identify an author. Not only is the corpus of Bugis historiography almost entirely anonymous, but, more fundamentally, the definition of any unit for editorial attention has to be established. It is in this sense that we use the term *work*. In other words, it is necessary to argue that the unit selected for editing represents a unit held at one time in the mind of its author (or authors).¹² This requires the assumption of deliberate creation or authorship, though it allows for the incorporation of earlier material. Even the original autograph of a work by its author may not represent quite what was in the author's mind, but the usual reality is that an editor has to deal with copies of the autograph at any number of removes. Leaving aside for the moment the question of variation arising from the process of copying in a manuscript register, we need to discern a work among the available manuscript materials.

Several arguments suggest that we are dealing with a work in this case. The most persuasive are the signs in the text itself of deliberate composition. The beginning sets out the subject of what follows—'the land of Bone and the ruling of Bone'—and indicates the method to be adopted, 'to set out in order the lineage of the ruling sovereigns'. The story starts at the beginning—that is, at the initiation of the polity, perhaps for the reasons discussed in Section 7. As the chronicle progresses, there is evidence for the selection of information and interrelationship between different sections of the account, as already discussed. Some weight should also be given to our subjective evaluation of the consistency of style and intent throughout the text.

Some indirect, but independent, support for regarding the chronicle as we have it as a work comes from consideration of the manuscripts themselves. As Appendix 1 shows, there are numerous examples of essentially the same text, to say nothing of the fragments of this text and other material derived from it. While one might still argue that the text comprises a collection of separate items that has become established as canonical, this view assumes a degree of reselection and rearrangement of

---

12 For a fuller discussion of the issue, see Macknight (1984).

material for which there is no evidence in this case. In other words, Bugis copyists have treated the present content—allowing for variations and some additions for particular purposes—as a unit.¹³

This leaves the problem of the abrupt end, which seems inappropriate for a consciously designed work. This issue is discussed in Section 8.

3. The manuscript

The chronicle of Bone is one of the most frequently copied works in the Bugis manuscript tradition. As explained in Section 4, we have chosen to present a diplomatic transcription of the Dutch Bible Society (Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap [NBG]) version in a single manuscript, known as NBG 101. A survey of some other versions of the work is provided in Appendix 1.

NBG 101

Dutch Bible Society (NBG) collection on loan to the Leiden University Library, Item 101. (There is a microfilm in the ANU Library.) The codex contains about 250 folios—that is, 500 pages—of European paper with Pro Patria and PB watermark and is bound in blue boards. The text terminates abruptly on page 248 and later pages are blank. Pages measure 32.5 x 20 cm, with a text written in a panel of 28 x 16.5 cm with 27 lines to the page. The text appears to be all by one hand and is written neatly in black ink on lines impressed from the recto of each folio. The *aksara* or characters are written continuously with no spaces between words, though some word divisions are marked by a *pallawa* or divider of three vertical dots. The scribe appears to have used a *kalam* or reed pen, rather than a metal nib. Several series of pagination occur, but the most useful page numbers are those written in large figures at the top left or centre of the pages. The contents are listed by Matthes (1875: 38–9). The chronicle text runs from the top of page 1 to the bottom of page 21. The first 12 pages of the text—that is, about half the chronicle of Bone—have been

---

13 Cummings (2007: 19), while agreeing on many of the causes of variation we describe for the Bone chronicle, takes a fundamentally different approach to the central issue for the Makasar chronicles: ‘Though they began to be written in the late sixteenth century, the Gowa and Talloq chronicles were composed progressively. That is, upon the death of a ruler a new reign account was composed and added to the existing chronicle. Each such reign forms a coherent narrative unit, and there is nothing in the structure of the chronicles that necessitates they be viewed as a single whole composed at one sitting or by one writer.’

extensively annotated by Matthes and occasionally by others.¹⁴ In these annotations, ‘DM’ (that is, Daeng Memangung) indicates NBG 99; ‘Ar P’ (Arung Padali) indicates NBG 100.¹⁵ The annotations supply alternative readings from other manuscripts and the Dutch translation of difficult passages. Thereafter only the successive reigns in Bone are numbered.

From page 22, the codex contains the usual miscellany of items, dealing mostly with the history and affairs of Bone and other states. As Matthes notes in his listing of the contents, many items, including the chronicle of Bone, are shared with NBG 100 and the corresponding passages in other manuscripts are carefully referenced in the margin in a way that supports the description of the contents by Matthes.

At the front of the codex, after a blank flyleaf, there is a page with the following inscriptions: “NB” over “N.101”, possibly in Matthes’s hand; then, in another, very flowery, hand:

Kronijk
gevonden in de woning van de
vorstin van Bonie Basse Kadjoe
wara thans genaamd Aroe Pasem
pa bij de imam van Pasempa
op den 9 December 1859¹⁶

The codex was possibly obtained by J.A. Bakkers when Dutch troops looted the ArumPone’s house at Pasémpe’ on 9 December 1859 (Perelae 1872: Vol. 2, p. 151). The role of the imam mentioned in the inscription is unclear. The codex was probably brought back to Europe by Matthes in 1870 (van den Brink 1943: 90). Relevant items are noted in Noorduy’n’s (1955: 21–31) list of material relating to Wajo.

4. The choice of this version of the work

In Section 2, we have defined a work as ‘a unit held at one time in the mind of its author (or authors)’. The editor of such a work can choose one of two basic approaches to the material. A critical edition aspires to reconstruct the author’s intention by purging the text—perhaps

14 For example, two annotations on page 6 are signed ‘J.’, which probably indicates J.C.G. Jonker.

15 Correspondingly, in those manuscripts, NBG 101 is indicated by ‘B’ for Bone.

16 ‘Chronicle found in the house of the queen of Bone, Bessé Kajuara, currently known as Arung Pasémpe’, by the imam of Pasémpe’ on 9 December 1859’.

even an autograph itself—of anything not the intention of the author. The alternative approach is a diplomatic edition, which seeks to provide an exact account of a restricted body of data—usually one manuscript. That is the approach we have chosen here.

The first option—that of a critical edition—is appropriate and reasonably possible in many situations. The vast scholarly effort expended over the centuries on Biblical texts is an obvious example of this approach and there are many others, ranging from scholarly editions of the works of Greek and Roman antiquity to our almost unconscious emendation of spelling mistakes in a friend's email message. The decision to follow the other approach—that of a diplomatic edition—requires explanation and justification.

The primary materials for the chronicle of Bone are found not merely in the manuscript register, but more precisely in the form of manuscripts in the Bugis tradition, including the script.¹⁷ Macknight and Caldwell (2001) have argued that, while an awareness of philological and editorial practices generally is useful, procedures and expectations from other traditions are not necessarily applicable to the Bugis—and Makasar—manuscript tradition. It is not just that the South Sulawesi scripts are distinctive, but also the particular function of writing itself needs to be considered. One element of this is the reciprocal relationship between oral materials and written manuscripts as analysed by Pelras (1979).¹⁸ In this context, it is easier to understand a relatively loose attitude to the integrity of texts, including historical works such as this, as they are copied or reworked from one manuscript to another. The interests being served by the act of copying are those of the owner of the codex into which the text is copied; very often perhaps, the owner was also the copying scribe. Little attention was given to protecting the 'moral rights' of the original author. At least, that is an impression derived from familiarity with a great many of the codices that make up the Bugis manuscript tradition as a whole,

17 The printed version in Matthes (1864) can be traced back directly to the manuscripts available to him—namely, NBG 99, NBG 100 and NBG 101. Later Romanised versions and translations discussed in Section 10 are taken either directly from Matthes's version or, it would seem, from a single manuscript.

18 There is much evidence for knowledge of the content of the work independent of a written text. The Bugis ambassador who supplied Raffles with an account of the early parts of the chronicle seems to have been able to do so orally (Raffles 1817: Vol. 2, pp. clxxix–xxxii). In 1978, A. Muh. Ali, then head of the cultural office in Wátampone, was able to recall sections of the work without direct reference to a written text. In a Makasar context, Tideman (1908: 488–500) describes an oral account of the early history of Bajeng and notes particularly the absence of any manuscript on this occasion.

though there are some differences between genres. The consequence of this lack of respect for the integrity of the text combined with the widespread interest in this particular work is a plethora of texts exhibiting in full measure all the possibilities of variation described by Macknight and Caldwell (2001), ranging from minor differences in script to major reworking. This textual instability is compounded by our limited knowledge of early Bugis linguistic and literary conventions. We simply do not know enough to introduce stylistic suggestions with any degree of confidence. Any attempt to do so or to choose the textual detail of one manuscript rather than another ends up producing no more than yet another variant text of the work.

Yet the choice of which text to present is not quite as difficult as it might appear. To begin with, and as evident from the material described in Appendix 1, there are no major differences in content among a substantial number of versions. Moreover, in the absence of a stemma, we can be guided to some extent by extrinsic features of the manuscripts in which texts are found. NBG 101, which supplies the text for our transcription and translation, can be recommended on both intrinsic and extrinsic grounds.

The codex in which this version of the work is found came into Dutch hands in 1859. Although several other versions are known to have been in existence slightly earlier—such as the one known as Berlin 386, as described in Appendix 1—the middle of the nineteenth century is as far back as we can trace any of our present manuscript versions. In a few cases, we can determine a likely date for the actual copying of a codex, but more often, as for NBG 101, we have no means of estimating when exactly, between the manufacture of the paper and the collection of the codex, the copyist created the manuscript. Even if the abrupt ending of the text of NBG 101 on page 248 and the preparation of the following blank pages for writing suggest the text was being written shortly before the codex was collected in 1859, there may still have been a considerable time gap between the copying of the chronicle into the opening pages of the codex and the writing of page 248. It is enough to say that NBG 101 is among the oldest group of versions available.

More significantly, the codex was found on 9 December 1859 in the house at *Pasémpe* deserted by the *ArumPone* in her flight from Dutch troops. The house, which had been abandoned precipitately, also contained a supply of rifles and considerable quantities of household effects. The

ArumPone took only objects of great intrinsic value and the regalia (Perelaer 1872: Vol. 2, pp. 149–51). While there is no need to assume the codex belonged to the ArumPone herself, if it did not, it was probably owned by a senior court official. The high degree of common content between this codex and that obtained in 1861 by Matthes from Arung Padali in Wajo—that is, NBG 100—shows that many items, including most of the text of this chronicle, were available in other noble circles (van den Brink 1943: 214). It is not surprising to find a slightly preferable version in Bone itself. The substantial break in the text of the chronicle in NBG 100, however, suggests a more complex relationship between the two versions than Noorduy'n's (1955: 22) guess that his A5 in NBG 100 and his A6 in NBG 101 were very probably copied from the same model.

As Matthes (1875: 39) remarks in his catalogue, this manuscript is ‘neatly and clearly written’. It also has the advantage of relative consistency of language and, as shown by the scarcity of notes to the text, few points of textual difficulty.

Given the decision to present a diplomatic edition, there is no other single version of the work with so much to commend it.

5. Principles of transcription

Two sets of issues arise when transcribing a Bugis text originally found in Lontara’ characters into Latin characters. The first concerns the representation of the phonemes of the language and whether to divide up, in certain circumstances, the complexes or polymorphemic words that are such a feature of the language. Our policy on these issues is set out and exemplified in Macknight (2012). This amounts to an updated version of the system developed by Cense in the 1930s, as explained by Noorduy'n in his edition of a Wajo chronicle (1955). It is also consistent with the system used by Sirk (1996).¹⁹

In summary, this involves giving the 18 consonants, and four prenasalised consonants, the values they have in modern Indonesian and rendering the glottal stop with an apostrophe –’– or before voiced occlusives as a geminated consonant, thus –’b– becomes –bb–. The glide –y– is omitted after –é– and –i–, and the glide –w– is omitted after –o– and –u–.

---

19 A minor variation is to write the first-person possessive suffix as –ku’, rather than –ku.

The strong central vowel –é– is given an acute accent, while the weak vowel, schwa, has no diacritic mark, –e–. Polymorphemic complexes are not divided.

The second set of issues concerns the ‘style’ of transcription and transliteration. It involves questions specific to representing and transcribing a text written in the Lontara’ characters used for Bugis and Makasar. Five ‘styles’ may be distinguished:

1. **Facsimile reproduction.** Strictly speaking, this involves neither transcription nor transliteration. Given modern methods of reproduction, this is easy to arrange, but has limited use for most readers. It is, however, the form, in the medium of microfilm, by which we have consulted the text of most of the manuscript versions of this work.
2. **Transcription of the Lontara’ characters.** The Lontara’ characters of an original manuscript text can now be rendered in letterpress printing or by modern computer fonts. Although not technically a transliteration, a transcription in this style may involve editorial decisions relating to word division, doubtful readings and punctuation, as well as judgements on the text itself. The text of the chronicle published by Matthes in the first volume of his *Boegineesche Chrestomathie* (1864: 465–98) is a good example of this style.
3. **Literal Latin style.** By assigning a fixed Latin character to each Bugis phoneme, it is possible to render the Lontara’ characters with no ambiguity. It is, in effect, a literal transliteration. This can be useful when it is desirable to make easy reference to the original Lontara’ characters, without any assumption as to how they should be read. The usual convention in this style is to use uppercase characters for consonants and lowercase for vowels, with the vowel-only syllable introduced by Q–. The first phrases of the chronicle would thus be rendered: Qi.Qa.Na.Qé.Su.Re.Po.Qa.Da.Qa.Da.Qé.NGi.Ta.Na.Qé.Ri.Bo.Né. This is unambiguous, but not very helpful for most purposes. It also allows the same editorial decisions as a transcription of the Lontara’ characters.
4. **Expanded diplomatic style.** The remarkable efficiency of the Lontara’ script for writing Bugis depends on omitting information necessary for a full realisation of the language—most notably, geminated consonants, some nasalisation to closed syllables and the glottal stop. A Latin transliteration that purports to be a useful version

of the original Bugis text must involve expanding the information in the Lontara' characters to make the language comprehensible and that is what we do in this edition. While moving from Lontara' to Latin characters involves some matters of editorial judgement, we have been meticulous in allowing the original text in Lontara' characters to be unambiguously reconstituted by the application of standard rules for removing editorial decisions. These rules are:

- All word divisions are editorial decisions.
- The *pallawa* or divider, which is the only punctuation mark in the Bugis text, is indicated by a vertical stroke –|–.
- Initial uppercase characters are used for proper names and to indicate the beginning of phrases and sentences. This avoids the need to add further punctuation and leaves more room for alternative constructions of the Bugis.
- All geminated consonants are editorial decisions.
- All glottal stops are editorial decisions.
- All nasalisations at the end of a syllable are editorial decisions, except where provided by prenasalised Lontara' characters. The use of these prenasalised characters is, however, inconsistent and, where appropriate but omitted, the nasalisation is added in pointed brackets, < >.
- The use of glides, or their frequent non-use where strictly required by the rules, is as indicated.

The effect of these editorial decisions is to produce a text that is both easily comprehensible and yet preserves the minor inconsistencies of the original. In practice, it is very similar to the following standard style.

5. **Standard style.** It has long been recognised that one consequence of Matthes's nineteenth-century publications on Bugis, especially his dictionary and grammar, has been to establish the language as spoken in Bone as the normative form. Other forms of speaking can be regarded as dialects. Following the conventions set out by Macknight (2012) and described above, it is possible to write Bugis using Latin characters, whether based on an original Lontara' text or, indeed, from transcription of the spoken language. This standard orthography has the merit of being effectively phonetic—that is, it accurately represents the spoken language and can, in turn, be read aloud as the spoken language. In particular, this style represents the effects of elision or sandhi—that is, the phonetic results of running

morphemes together to produce complexes of various kinds. The most common instance arises from the combination of the title *Arung*, meaning ruler, and a following placename. Thus, in standard style, *Arung* + Palakka is written, as it is pronounced and as the original Lontara' characters indicate, *ArupPalakka*. Like the diplomatic style, it is possible to work from the Latin characters in the standard style back to Lontara' characters without ambiguity, though the *pallawa* is not usually indicated—and that, in either writing system, represents the formally correct spoken language.

6. **Hyper-correct style.** This is essentially a style based on individual morphemes without taking account of their combination in the spoken language. It divides up some of the complexes and this makes their component parts more easily recognisable. Thus, it writes the elements of a personal title separately, as Arung Palakka.

6. Principles of translation

No translation can satisfy every requirement that may be made of it. In offering this translation, therefore, it is as well to set out the purposes, and audiences, we have had most clearly in mind. These purposes have determined the principles of translation. But Bugis is not an easy language to translate.

In the first place, the translation presents as complete a statement as possible of our understanding of the meaning of the Bugis text. Given the differences in the structure of Bugis and English and the remarkable compression of meaning in many Bugis complexes, it has been difficult to achieve a completely natural English style. Given the linguistic interest in an extended Bugis text and the relative lack of English translations of such material, we have not shied away from a slight tendency to pedantry. Words and phrases in parentheses, ( ), are amplifications or explanations not directly justified by anything in the Bugis text.

Our second purpose has been to provide a translation that will be accessible to those readers who know no Bugis. We have kept Bugis terms in the translation to a minimum and provided explanation of those used, especially those personal names that have a clear and relevant meaning in Bugis. With personal names, however, it is not possible to avoid using the Bugis name or, in some later cases, the Arabic name. This does not apply to the names of familiar places for which, in the English translation,

we use the contemporary Indonesian version of names, even when this is inconsistent with the Bugis form. Thus, we write Gowa, Wajo and Luwu (rather than Goa, Wajo' and Luu') and Bone without an acute accent on the final vowel. For the unfamiliar names of minor villages, we retain the Bugis form.

One term requires particular comment. Despite the danger of cultural misunderstanding, we have translated *arung* where it appears independently as 'king' or 'queen', depending on the sex of the individual, and kept the same equivalence in other forms such as 'kingship' for *akkarungeng*. Where *arung* is followed immediately by a placename, we have treated it as a title, as in Arung Ujung, with the placename in its Indonesian form. Frequency of use and familiarity with the standard style of transcription and transliteration excuse the slight exception of writing ArumPone, rather than 'Arung Bone' or the Bugis forms 'Arung Boné' or 'Arumponé'.

7. The nature of the work

The interpretation of a written source necessarily involves assumptions about the nature of the text in question. What did the author understand to be the nature of the work? In Section 1, we have described the work, within the body of Bugis historiography, as a chronicle. The question is, however, more general than that of genre and, in any case, we know far too little about older Bugis literature to be able to characterise genre with any assurance. Similarly, our inquiry need not be confined to the original function or purpose of the work, about which we have no external information at all, for we can consider later functions as well. Assuming we have a version of the work reasonably close to that in the mind of its creator, the most reliable evidence on the nature of the work will be internal; it will come from analysing the text itself.

An issue that presents itself immediately is orality. Over recent decades, scholars have increasingly recognised that virtually all premodern writing in the Indonesian Archipelago—and far beyond—was intended primarily to be heard. To anyone familiar with Malay materials, for example, the statement in the opening paragraph of the chronicle that it is 'for hearing' seems unexceptional. There is no cause to doubt the literal sense of 'telling' in the word *ripau* used later in respect of the work.

Yet the work is clearly not oral in the terms of either of the two main understandings of orality in recent scholarship. That is, first, there are no traces of oral composition, such as standard epithets, formulaic passages and repetition. In the classic discussion of oral composition (Parry 1971), these features are related to verse rather than prose, but the general thrust of the argument suggests that an orally composed prose style (if such be possible in this context) is far removed from the rather jejune style of the chronicle. Second, and more importantly, the work is not primarily a 'tribal encyclopaedia' in the sense of that phrase used by Havelock (1963). The central point of Havelock's argument is to distinguish between two mental attitudes—one committed to the implicit truth of memorised material, the other able to compare alternative accounts to analyse a subject. Whether a performer has the material to perform through a process of oral composition or as a result of memorising, in neither case is there any possibility of comparing accounts, and the values expressed in the performance relate necessarily to those of the audience—that is, they provide models and norms of behaviour for society.²⁰ As already discussed in sections 1 and 2, however, there is evidence within the text of the chronicle for the selection of material, including written sources, and the deliberate omission of material; this displays a quality of judgement quite impossible, according to Havelock, for a work limited to a purely oral context. If this applies to the work's creation, we may assume it tells us something about the context within which the work was to be first used.²¹ The initial audience for the work was, presumably, capable of appreciating the selection and discrimination between sources.

It would be possible to resolve the contradiction between the expressions of an aural and oral element in the initial intention of the work and the evidence of considered judgement found in the text itself by asserting that the words and phrases relating to hearing and telling are merely conventional and should not be taken literally—that is, they derive from earlier genres of storytelling. There may be some truth in that approach, but it seems insufficient.

---

20 The contrast could not be sharper between the various genres of Bugis historiography, including the chronicles, and the huge corpus of stories in the La Galigo cycle. For a discussion of the La Galigo material as oral composition, see Macknight (2003), and as tribal encyclopaedia, see Koolhof (1999).

21 This does not preclude later use of the work involving more or less precise memorisation as described in Note 17. Such memorisation may represent no more than knowledge of Bone's history, rather than reliance on the work as a 'tribal encyclopaedia'. We can also set aside the question of an oral rendition of the work in the process of creating a manuscript copy of the work, as this is essentially a secondary and technical phenomenon (Macknight and Caldwell 2001).

Another approach to this problem has been developed by Christian Pelras with, very fortunately, specific reference to Bugis materials. In a paper with important implications for many literary traditions, Pelras (1979) has examined the oral performance of several kinds of written texts. His central purpose is to show the equality of esteem and the mutual interaction of writing in manuscript form and oral performance across several present-day Bugis literary genres. He does not deal with historiographical materials such as chronicles, nor should we unquestioningly transfer his modern observations to some period in the past, but his examples of an oral performer's additions and explanations when performing a manuscript text suggest ways in which a text such as the chronicle might have been transformed in oral performance. It is critical to note that the written text is in the manuscript register; it is not printed. The introduction of printing introduces another level of dissociation between the oral and the written. Once free of any higher estimation of the written text over the oral, and remembering the limited readership of any single manuscript, it is even possible to push the argument a little further. For a work created to achieve some public effect—and, as we suggest below, that is a reasonable claim for the chronicle—an oral performance of some kind is required to realise the author's intention, even if the detailed circumstances and oral text of that performance or performances necessarily remain unclear. This introduces the question of the purpose of the work insofar as that may be determined on internal evidence.

Noorduyn has remarked that 'South Celebes historical writing is characterized by a certain terseness and matter-of-factness' (1965: 140). He refers to this chronicle, among other works, in support of this proposition and it is easy to find illustrations of the qualities he is describing. One might refer, for a relatively straightforward example, to the account of the fourth ruler, Makkalempié, at the beginning of the sixteenth century. We learn that she succeeded her father, that she also held other territory and that she was 'praised as having intelligence'. Then her marriage is recorded and the names are given of the only two of her nine children relevant to the concerns of the chronicle. The record of agricultural expansion, including a brief war, leads into details of the career of these two sons, her abdication in favour of one of them and, after she moves to live with the other, a brief account of the legend of her disappearance. A similar process of selection—sometimes for particular reasons, as discussed further below—applies to the greater part of the work and is enough, in itself, to suggest it would be unwise to accept the

chronicle as a mere catalogue of data. The need for such caution overall is confirmed by two other general features: the self-consciousness of the authorship and the ‘realism’ of the style.

We have argued above that the work is a conscious creation. Our previous purpose was to define the work and relate it to other forms of Bugis historiography, but we can now see another consequence of this self-consciousness. Any work that is deliberately produced and is more than a chance combination of information will have some model and some purpose. We may not be able to fully specify either the genre or the function of a particular work, but that does not mean the work was produced without precedent or purpose.

A second feature of the chronicle’s style is its ‘realism’. The text purports to describe actual events. In the celebrated first chapter of his book *Mimesis* (1953), Erich Auerbach develops the contrast between the Homeric poems that do not, in themselves, demand literal belief—whatever position one may take on the poems’ actual use to the historian—and the early books of the Hebrew scriptures, which do purport to describe actual events. Yet it is just this comparison between the chronicle and the Hebrew scriptures that suggests caution. The intention of the creators of these early books of the Bible would seem to be to demonstrate divine concern with human affairs and to specify the appropriate human response. Reduced to essentials, this is no more than the familiar claim that history provides a guide for the present and the future. This claim requires, of course, a reliable record of the past and that implies a ‘realist’ style.²² There is no reason to doubt the force of this logic in the Bugis, as in the Western, tradition.

This self-consciousness and realist style do not mean we should accept the account of the past that the chronicle offers as true. Indeed, one could argue these qualities are just what should alert our suspicion; what line are we being sold? Our author may be prepared to qualify his belief in the historicity of, say, the mysterious disappearance of the fourth ruler, Makkalempié (‘She who disappeared in Cina’), but that implies the veracity of other information. Perhaps we should not accept the implication.

---

22 The argument is not invalidated by the literal belief accorded some literary works, such as the Homeric poems or even the La Galigo stories, at some times and in some places. This false belief arises from mistaking a literary text for a historical source. Even the use of a literary work as a ‘tribal encyclopaedia’ or exemplar of values can apply only to the period of the work’s creation, or at least as imagined to be appropriate by the work’s creators. Literary works such as historical novels do not, in themselves, provide evidence for the values of an earlier period in which a narrative may be set.

Such scepticism is excessive. There is no reason to doubt the essential reliability of the chronicle's account of most of the events described. For the events at the very end of the last section involving the Dutch, there is abundant supporting evidence in European sources and, from about the reign of the seventh ruler, Bongkangngé, in the middle of the sixteenth century, if not earlier, the Bone account is corroborated by corresponding material from Gowa and other kingdoms. Even in the information from the earliest reigns, there is a geographical logic that can be discerned through the lists of territorial conquest and alliance.²³ We need not, of course, believe that every word of direct speech is a verbatim account of what was said on a particular occasion, and perhaps the author of the chronicle could remark with Thucydides that

my method has been, while keeping as closely as possible to the general sense of the words that were actually used, to make the speakers say what, in my opinion, was called for by each situation. (Thucydides 1.22, in Warner 1954: 24)²⁴

Both we and the chronicle's author are left with a more difficult problem: the supernatural elements at the beginning of the work. The sources for the early chapters apparently included certain episodes or stories that seem to us to be difficult to explain in the context of normal human experience. That they appeared in the same light to the author is shown by his use of the word *garé* (translated as 'so the story goes') or other disclaimers such as *riasengngi* ('it is said'). A clear example is the tale of the disappearance of Makkalempié at the end of Chapter 4. Cense (1951: 55) has drawn attention to a slightly fuller version of this story among a collection of episodes dealing with early Bone.²⁵ Comparing the two passages, one finds not only some editing by the author of the chronicle, but also the insertion of two *garé*. The word is used three times in the description of the enthronement of Kerrampélua' as a baby and subsequent arrangements. It also appears right at the beginning of the *tomanurung* episode, where it is quickly followed twice by *riasengngi*. Given the overall 'realist' style of the work, how is the inclusion of these episodes to be understood?

23 Macknight (1983) has exploited this logic to trace the expansion of wet rice agriculture.

24 Thucydides 1:22 in Warner (1954: 24).

25 This is to be found at pages 173–223 in Leiden F.Or.A9 following a version of the chronicle itself. The passage translated by Cense (1951: 55) is at page 202, lines 2–7. Cense's suggestion that the author of the chronicle had edited the story with Muslim sensibilities in mind may be true, but it is not a necessary conclusion. It should be noted that the version of the chronicle found earlier in this manuscript has only one *garé* in the relevant passage (p. 152).

In approaching this problem, we need to recall that the chronicle is not a single narrative unit. As explained in Section 1, it is a series of accounts of successive reigns or, to put the point more generally, accounts of ruling. This is, after all, how the work announces itself: ‘This work tells of the land of Bone and the ruling of Bone.’ The relevance of this point to the end of the work will be discussed in the next section, but here we are concerned with the earlier chapters. At the risk of oversimplifying what might have been a rather complicated process, we can see how this structure of accounts of successive reigns has been filled out in the earliest reigns with certain material, some of which raises ‘realist’ doubts. The most notable example, of course, is the story of the appearance of the *tomanurung* at Matajang, which takes up much of the first chapter. No details are given about the appearance of his wife, the *tomanurung* at Toro’, but we are left to assume an equally supernatural process. Other examples of the supernatural can be seen in the explanations of the titles or non-personal names by which the early rulers are known: the first ruler, the *tomanurung*, was known only as Matasilompo’é, or ‘The Eye of the whole plain’, because he could judge the number of his people or perhaps because he could see all the territory he controlled; the second ruler, La Ummasá, is described as To Mulaiépanreng, or ‘He who first had a grave’, to emphasise the point that his parents disappeared without a grave; the name of the third ruler, Kerrampélua, refers to the detail that his hair stood on end at his birth, though the whole story of his early life is intensely realistic; his successor, Makkalempié, acquired the name Mallajangngé riCina, or ‘She who disappeared in Cina’, directly as result of her mysterious death. This theme of descent from on high and continuing contact with the supernatural carries the implication of high status and is found widely across South Sulawesi. A *tomanurung* figure stands at the head of most genealogies across the peninsula, sometimes linked with a *totompo*’ figure who has risen from the waves.²⁶ A striking feature of these stories is that the high status of these figures is recognised beyond the particular community they come to rule. That means the high status of the descendants of any *tomanurung* can be acknowledged when seeking a marriage partner.

---

26 Caldwell and Wellen (2016) deal with this theme and, especially, its Malay expression.

The stories also connect with two themes found widely across Austronesian-speaking societies. The first is the cosmological structure of upper, middle and lower worlds. High-status beings from the upper world, or sometimes the upper world and the lower world, come together to initiate status and all that goes with it in the middle world. Nowhere is this more clearly described than in the Bugis La Galigo cycle, which begins with, in effect, its own *tomanurung* story, but the theme is found in many variations in other societies (Macknight 2003). The second theme is that of the stranger king where an outsider is needed to establish the status hierarchy, though usually in association with some local power as well.²⁷

For the author of the chronicle—or some unknown predecessor, since there is no reason to suppose the chronicle was the first work to take this step—the supernatural elements in the early chapters serve two purposes. First, they provide some content for the account of the early rulers, even if that requires a disclaimer. More importantly, the association with the supernatural justifies the assumption of rule. Kern (1929: 297) writes of the gods providing ‘letters of nobility [*brieven van adelendom*]’. This can be restated more generally as explaining the concept of ascribed status. The elaboration of the ‘people’s’ role in accepting the *tomanurung* as their ruler is significant in this argument. Their acceptance is an acknowledgement of the validity of the first ruler’s status.

There is a sense in which the whole chronicle is about status. The genealogical details for each ruler demonstrate his or her links with the *tomanurung* as a class and hence the correct ascription of status. The events of each reign show the operation of this status. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the account of the madness of the eighth ruler, La Icca’. The final justification for his killing is the claim that ‘he is no king’—that is, he has forfeited his status. The incorporation of these supernatural elements—above all, the *tomanurung* story—into the structure of the chronicle provides an answer to the central question: what is the nature of rule, or power, in Bone? The ideological answer—as distinct from the political answer—is that some people are born to rule.²⁸

27 Among the articles in the special issue of *Indonesia and the Malay World* devoted to stranger kings in Indonesia and beyond (Vol. 36, No. 105, July 2008), the most relevant are Fox (2008) and Henley and Caldwell (2008).

28 For the mechanisms by which ideology is adapted to reality—or reality to ideology—see the brilliant ethnography of Millar (1989). There are abundant traces of comparable processes at work in Bugis society at all periods for which we have records.

It would be too simple, however, to claim that the chronicle serves merely to justify the status quo. For one thing, we would need to know much more about the particular political circumstances at the time of the work's creation before being able to make such an assertion and, second, we would need to have some idea of the circumstances in which it was designed to be heard. On neither of these issues is there reliable information. The next section offers some speculation.

8. The date of the work and the problem of the end

In Section 2, we argued that the chronicle is, essentially, a unified work. Thus, although it undoubtedly incorporates information from earlier materials, the work in the form we have it cannot pre-date the latest events described. Fortunately, the events on Butung recounted at the very end of the chronicle can be firmly dated by reference to other records. The defeat of Karaeng Bontomarannu and the army of Gowa, including a forced contingent from Bone, took place over the first four days of 1667. Not only are there the vivid and detailed Dutch records of the great expedition against Gowa under the command of Cornelis Speelman—which include much information on Arung Palakka's activities and contact with the troops from Bone pressed into Gowa's service (Stapel 1922: 105–9; Andaya 1981: 76–8)—but also the date of Karaeng Bontomarannu's surrender on 3 January is confirmed in a Gowa diary (Cumming 2010: 101) and the Malay poetic account of the war gives some insight into the attitude of the Gowa court (Skinner 1963: 99–105). No event could be more securely fixed in time.

If that is the earliest possible date for the composition of the work, the latest possible date is the early nineteenth century. In 1814, John Crawfurd collected in Sulawesi 'several native writings, both in Bugis and Macassar language, of which translations were made into Malay for the author's use. The originals are in his possession' (Crawfurd 1820: Vol. 2, p. 390n.). Although no Bugis text of the chronicle is included among the many Crawfurd manuscripts now in the British Library, a Malay translation demonstrates that he once had access to a version.²⁹ The presence of the

---

29 British Library, Department of Oriental Manuscripts and Printed Books, Add. 12396, in Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 109).

chronicle in other manuscripts collected in the first half of the nineteenth century confirms its widespread distribution at that time. Thus, the Berlin 386 manuscript came from the collection of the well-known German scholar A.W. Schlegel, who died in 1845. The Schoemann VII, 4 manuscript, also in Berlin, which contains a substantial fragment of the chronicle, seems to have been collected in 1849, while Matthes was collecting or commissioning manuscripts now in the Dutch Bible Society collection in Leiden from his arrival in Makassar in 1848 onwards.

Having set those outer limits, as it were, how can they be narrowed? One attractive, but probably misleading, argument needs to be confronted. Two individuals who died after 1667 are referred to by their death names. The most important—he could hardly be more important—is Arung Palakka, *Matinroé riBontoala'*, who died on 6 April 1696 (Andaya 1981: 296; Cummings 2010: 167). The other is La Maddaremmeng, *Matinroé riBukaka*, who died on 5 August 1678 (Cummings 2010: 136). Both death names are mentioned several times towards the end of the chronicle and one might argue that this means the work could not have been written before 1696. The weakness with this argument is the prominence of the two men involved. A later copyist, knowing the overall format of the regnal entries, could easily have added in such well-known names or substituted them for others. This is exactly the kind of minor content variation that occurs very frequently between manuscript versions of a Bugis work (Macknight and Caldwell 2001).

Another line of approach is to look for references to the work in a source dated before the middle of the nineteenth century and thus establish an earlier date by which the work must have existed. The difficulty with this argument is that, although there is some evidence of the history of Bone being known to Europeans from the time of Speelman on, as set out in the next section, such information does not necessarily imply access to this particular work. The information could have come from other historical works, including those sources used in the creation of the chronicle. That is not to say, of course, that it is not highly likely that the chronicle, as we have it, did exist in the eighteenth century; we just cannot demonstrate that conclusively.³⁰

---

30 The extensive genealogy of the Bone rulers held in the Leiden University Library (D Or. 295) appears to date from the eighteenth century and is headed by an extensive quotation from the opening passage of the chronicle up to the marriage of *Matasilompo'é*. This suggests, unsurprisingly, that the work was known before 1800, but the date of the source is not certain.

To go further involves a degree of speculation, but the interest of the matter justifies the attempt. Two tenuous lines of argument suggest that the work, in the sense defined in Section 2, was created at some point within the last three decades of the seventeenth century—that is, between about 1670 and 1700.

The first argument arises from looking more generally at the historiographical tradition of South Sulawesi. Within the category of chronicles, the examples most similar to the chronicle of Bone are the Makasar chronicles of Gowa and Tallo, which, it is argued, are intimately related to each other (Cummings 2007: 21–3). The Makasar works demonstrate much interest in genealogical matters—rather more, in fact, than the Bone chronicle shows.³¹ In this context, however, the similarities of the works are more relevant: they are all divided into reigns; they all begin with some apparently legendary material before lapsing into the ‘realist’ style; and all end in the seventeenth century without describing the cataclysmic events associated with the wars of the late 1660s. There is a clear stylistic difference between these three works and the more discursive narratives of the eighteenth-century Wajo chronicle edited by Noorduyn (1955) and much other material from Wajo (Abidin 1985). Much shorter works, such as those from Luwu or Soppeng, which are sometimes described as ‘chronicles’, turn out to be essentially legendary material and probably date from after 1700 CE (Caldwell 1988).³² Whatever the interest of these minor works, any comparative dating of the Bone chronicle can be limited to comparison with the material from Gowa and Tallo.

Cummings (2007: 24), in his careful discussion of the manuscript versions of the Gowa and Tallo chronicles, states that with the death of Sultan Hasanuddin in 1670, ‘chronicle composition ceased’ and Cornelis Speelman, the leader of the Dutch in the wars of the 1660s, described versions of those two chronicles in his *Notitie* of 1670 (2007: 21).³³

---

31 This point is also made by Noorduyn (1961: 33).

32 See Section 1.

33 Cummings sees the manuscripts with which he is dealing as representing the end of a tradition of chronicle writing. He says that ‘though they began to be written in the late sixteenth century, the Gowa and Talloq chronicles were composed progressively’ and ‘the sheer variety of endings is evidence that multiple manuscripts existed that were based on originals composed at different points during the seventeenth century’ (Cummings 2007: 19). We see the Bone chronicle as essentially a singular creation because of its many internal inconsistencies, though the author has obviously made use of prior sources and some of the many variant forms of the work in the manuscripts indicate the particular interests of later copyists.

Cummings stresses the genealogical character of the Gowa and Tallo chronicles; moreover, he believes ‘this genealogical character was politically significant’ and ‘the genealogical-infused chronicles are social maps of the extent and substance of the realm’ (Cummings 2007: 11). Elsewhere, Cummings (2002) has laid out in detail the relationship he sees between writing and ascriptive status. At least in general terms, it seems reasonable to associate the production of chronicles with the expansion and apogee of the political power of Gowa and Tallo in the mid-seventeenth century.

The Bone chronicle can be seen, in a sense, as a response to the Gowa and Tallo chronicles, or as emulation of them. There were certainly plenty of opportunities for young nobles from Bone, especially Arung Palakka, to observe the ways of the Gowa and Tallo courts before the wars of the late 1660s (Andaya 1981: 51). The Bone chronicle, however, is more focused than its presumptive models. The less expansive genealogical compass is carefully directed towards the succession of rulers, rather than the nobility of the whole realm. Moreover, from the account of the reign of the ninth ArumPone, La Pattawe’, in the late sixteenth century, the ground is prepared for justifying the succession of Arung Palakka in 1672 by recording the marriage of his grandfather La Tenrirua, later the eleventh ArumPone, and his grandmother Dangke’, followed by the birth of his mother, Wé Tenrisui. Later, in the account of the reign of La Tenripale’, Matinroé riTallo’, the twelfth ArumPone in the early seventeenth century, this is followed by setting out the names of his mother, the ArumPone’s sister, and of his father and other children in the family. Given the Bone chronicle cannot be earlier than 1667, as explained above, and Cummings’s date for the Gowa and Tallo chronicles is not after 1670, it is an attractive suggestion that the Bone chronicle reflects the circumstances of a period when Arung Palakka was ArumPone—that is, between 1672 and his death in 1696—or at least when his influence was strong.

A second argument leads to the same conclusion. Most of the complete manuscript copies end with the events on Butung in 1667; that seems to be the conclusion of the work in the sense used above. How is this abrupt ending to be explained? Consider what might follow. Given the structure of the chronicle, it would be necessary to begin the account of Arung Palakka’s reign as ArumPone. If he were still the reigning ArumPone, there would be obvious difficulties in attempting the normal treatment of the reign by topics. Yet, as just explained, the author is even more aware of the importance of Arung Palakka than his substantial achievements until 1667 might suggest.

There is a further, more subtle, point. The chronicle makes it appear as though nothing further of relevance to the history of Bone was effected by La Maddaremmeng, Matinroé riBukaka, after he was defeated, captured and sent into exile in Siang. There, 'he was no longer king of Bone' and the account that follows appears to cover an interregnum until the end of the chronicle. This is a very partial account indeed. The Gowa diary tells us he was brought to Makassar on 23 July 1644 (Cummings 2010: 63). Nearly two years later, on 19 June 1646, he was sent to Siang after the Gowa ruler had returned from defeating Bone again at Pasémpe' (Cummings 2010: 66). Then, on 7 February 1667, he was taken to Bone and reinstalled as ArumPone (Cummings 2010: 101) until, apparently, forced to abdicate in favour of Arung Palakka in 1672. He did not die until 1678 (Cummings 2010: 136). He was buried at Bukaka on the outskirts of Watampone, which suggests he was living nearby at that time. Although La Maddaremmeng is the last person in the chronicle whose name is preceded by the phrase 'may my belly not swell'—since he had after all been ArumPone for 15 years before 1644—the failure to mention his second period of rule from 1667 to 1672 is striking. Perhaps Arung Palakka refused to recognise this reinstallation as valid. Such underplaying of La Maddaremmeng's career only casts Arung Palakka's achievements in a more favourable light.

There is a particular juncture when it would have served the interests of Arung Palakka to be presented as an appropriate and even necessary ArumPone. Although the details are obscure, La Maddaremmeng seems to have hoped that his son, La Pakkoko'é, would succeed him as ArumPone and, when that did not eventuate, La Pakkoko'é and other disaffected interests mounted a serious rebellion in late 1672 and early 1673 (Andaya 1981: 148–51). It may be relevant to remember here that Arung Palakka was childless, despite having many wives. In a context where Arung Palakka was seeking recognition and legitimisation, the chronicle as we have it places him firmly in the long series of those who have ruled in Bone. Whether or not one can tie the usefulness of the chronicle closely to Arung Palakka's struggle with La Maddaremmeng and his party in 1672, an early date in the reign seems more likely than a later date for the creation of such a work.

9. Early Western-language comment on the events of the chronicle

Bone and its history only came to have significant relevance to the affairs of Europeans in the Indonesian Archipelago during the 1660s, when it became mutually advantageous for Arung Palakka and those who followed him to join with the Dutch East India Company forces in military operations—first, on the west coast of Sumatra and then, second and more importantly, in the eventual overthrow of Gowa and its allies in South Sulawesi. Although Dutch interest in the peninsula remained chiefly focused on the southwestern area until the beginning of the twentieth century, the Dutch relationship with Bone largely determined the pattern of politics and no general account of the area can pass over Bone. Most of the writers offering such an account have something to say about Bone's history, but one must distinguish carefully between comment based on the work presented here—that is, the chronicle in this form—and a more general knowledge of names and events. This general knowledge often reflects contact with educated Bugis who probably had access not only to oral sources, but also to other forms of historical writing about Bone.

The earliest of these accounts is the *Notitie* of Cornelis Speelman, the commander of the Dutch East India Company's forces in the 'eastern quarters' between 1666 and 1669. This lengthy document, which was presented to his superiors in Batavia on 17 February 1670 (Stapel 1936: 72–4), contains a wealth of detail on many matters concerning South Sulawesi.³⁴ Speelman deals with each of the peninsula's states in turn, coming to Bone after Luwu. He comments specifically that he lost certain notes.³⁵ His account begins just before the middle of the sixteenth century—that is, more than a century before his own time—with the alliance of the sixth ArumPone, Boté'é, and the ruler of Gowa, Tumapa'risi' Kallonna, against Luwu. The account that follows brings the narrative up to the 1640s.³⁶ There is nothing in this account that requires knowledge of the chronicle and much that must come from elsewhere. Indeed, a few details suggest a lack of knowledge of the chronicle. For instance,

34 Noorduynd (1983: 100–1) describes the various surviving copies of this document. In the following references, we use the folio numbers of his copy A—that is, the copy now in the *Overgekomen Brieven, Inkomend Briefboek Makassar* [Letters Received, Inbound Letter Book Makassar], 1671 KA 116, Folios 684–1007. We are grateful to Dr Noorduynd for a photocopy of relevant typescript pages.

35 Folio 726A.

36 Folios 726A to 729A.

Speelman glosses over the drama of the reign of La Icca' with the bland statement that he was slain by his relatives since his reign brought no joy.³⁷ Speelman then justifies the succession of La Pattawe' by the new ruler's marriage, supposedly to a sister of La Icca', rather than by the descent of La Pattawe' from Makkalempié, and his interest in replacing the man who had killed his father. Here, as in several other places, Speelman's account of Bone's affairs seems to reflect information derived from sources primarily concerned with Gowa. It remains, of course, extremely valuable for any comprehensive history of the period it covers, but it can be passed over in the attempt to understand more about the chronicle.

The political and cultural circumstances within which Speelman's successors managed the affairs of the Dutch East India Company in South Sulawesi usually gave little opportunity or incentive for gathering specific detail on the earlier history of the several kingdoms. The position of observers not associated with the company was even less favourable. Thus, for Nicolas Gervaise, writing at the end of the seventeenth century but whose testimony is rather questionable, the events of the 1660s are already legendary and there is little mention of kingdoms other than Gowa. The single sentence devoted to Bone does no more than confirm Bone's contemporary importance (Gervaise 1701: 60).³⁸ A good index of the lack of European knowledge on the period before the seventeenth century is its almost complete absence from François Valentijn's great compilation of data about Sulawesi—and much else—in the early eighteenth century. His account, which is very detailed, if somewhat unreliable, of matters that can be derived from Dutch sources has little more than a few guesses on matters earlier than 1600 (Valentijn 1858: Vol. 3, p. 120).

By far the most important eighteenth-century discussion of Bone's early history is to be found in Roelof Blok's *History of the Island of Celebes*, completed, but not published, in 1759.³⁹ In his preface, Blok criticises the errors in Valentijn's account of 'native Maccassar affairs' and, recalling

37 Folio 726B.

38 The original French edition, published in 1688, seems to be based on information from two Makasar nobles he met in Thailand and accompanied back to France. There is no evidence Gervaise himself visited Sulawesi.

39 Blok was the Dutch East India Company's governor and director in Makassar from 1756 to 1760. The preface to the work is dated 31 December 1759. The original work, or a copy, seems to have been retained in Fort Rotterdam and was accessible to J. von Stebenvoll, who, during the English period, made an English translation; this was published as Blok (1817). A Dutch version was published in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië*, Vol. 10, 1848, pp. 3–77.

Speelman's admission of some lost notes, implies he has access to 'the manuscripts of the Boneers and Maccassars'. Even more explicitly, he asserts

that the ancient Histories of these countries are found among very few people, and that of Bone with the present King only, who has often declared to me his intention to burn them, if ever the Boneers should dethrone him (which may very easily happen,) for he should then consider his posterity unworthy of being acquainted with the origin of their ancestors ...

The writer, in compiling this [account], has followed the manuscripts of Bone, and of the Maccassars, respecting the more ancient events, and the notes of Mr. Speelman, in regard to the intermediate History, in such a manner, that, where some contradictions appeared, he selected the most probable account.

Concerning the latter times, he has used the above mentioned manuscripts, and the journals, and memoirs of the successive Governors, lodged in the Secretary's office, and also such credible information, as he obtained from some aged native Kings and Princes. (Blok 1817: Vol. 1, pp. i-ii)

There can be no doubt Blok had access to some Bugis material on the history of Bone and, as the head of the Dutch East India Company's affairs in Makassar, was in a good position to have them translated. He begins his account with the first ruler, Matasilampo'é, and the general outline of his narrative is easily matched with the chronicle. Yet it is easy to find details in Blok's material that cannot be drawn from the chronicle in the form we have it or even that contradict statements in the chronicle. For a simple example, Blok supplies the names of all five children of the first ArumPone, where the chronicle is very explicit in giving only two (Blok 1817: Vol. 1, p. 36). A more interesting case concerns the death of Boté'é, the sixth ArumPone, who was slain by his brother's son. Blok adds a note: 'This is according to the notes of Speelman; but the manuscripts of Bone mention nothing of it' (Blok 1817: Vol. 1, p. 38).⁴⁰ Yet the chronicle, in its account of the murder of Boté'é, is quite explicit that this is what happened, thus suggesting Blok did not have access to the chronicle. It would be hard, however, to prove conclusively from these and other examples that Blok had not seen the chronicle as we have it, for he notes himself 'some contradictions' from which he 'selected the

---

40 This is as stated in Speelman's *Notitie*, Folio 726A.

most probable account' and he may well have had a source rather like the chronicle. His general outline of events is accurate. He is also perceptive: when asserting the early importance of Luwu, he notes 'this both the Boneers and Maccassars deny, though the fabulous History of the Boneers themselves make[s] it very clear' (Blok 1817: Vol. 1, p. 3).

Blok's account was not immediately available to everyone and the English captain Thomas Forrest, who was not allowed to land in Makassar in 1763, knew nothing of it (Forrest 1792: 72–3). The Dutch Rear Admiral J.S. Stavorinus, however, on his visit to Makassar in 1775, was sufficiently senior and inquisitive to have 'the perusal' of a translation of the Gowa chronicle and Blok's manuscript fell 'into my hands'. His slight information on early Bone is credited to Blok (Stavorinus 1798: Vol. 2, pp. 191, 193, 214–15).

The attention of the British scholars at the beginning of the nineteenth century was primarily focused on the history of the western parts of the archipelago, though the British period in Makassar did result in the translation of Blok's manuscript. Other information about early Bone appears in the oral account delivered to Raffles by 'the Bugis ambassador' in 1814.⁴¹ After a short introduction, possibly drawn from some La Galigo material, the ambassador gave a remarkably full account of the *tomanurung* story and the reign of the first ArumPone, Matasilompo'é. This certainly shows a familiarity with material very like the first sections of the chronicle. The lack of further information is probably due to the circumstances of the visit and the need for someone to translate and transcribe. It is not clear what language the ambassador was speaking, but it was probably Malay (Raffles 1817: Vol. 2, pp. clxxix–xxxi).

As noted above, John Crawford had a Malay translation of the chronicle and possibly a copy of the Bugis text obtained on his visit to Makassar in 1814 (Crawford 1820: Vol. 2, p. 390n.). He also had material from Gowa and in some cases it is difficult to decide whether particular items of information come from the Gowa or the Bone chronicles or from another source altogether. For example, when dealing with the spread of Islam from Gowa, Crawford describes the approach of the ruler of Gowa to the ArumPone, offering 'to consider him in all respects as his equal' if

---

41 Cense (1966: 426–7) quotes extensively from a Bugis diary that describes a visit to see Raffles in Bogor over several days in May 1814. A microfilm of the diary may be found in the Cense papers, Or. 545, item 269 in the Leiden University Library. Though the diarist does not mention giving this oral account of early Bone, this is the most likely occasion on which it could have occurred.

only he would convert (Crawfurd 1820: Vol. 2, p. 385). This sounds like an abbreviated version of material in the Bone chronicle in the reign of La Tenrirua, Matinroé riBantaéng. On the other hand, the account of La Maddaremmeng aggressively trying to spread his religious ideas to other states, which then appealed to Gowa for protection, is in neither relevant chronicle (Crawfurd 1820: Vol. 2, p. 386). The most interesting aspect of Crawfurd's work in relation to early South Sulawesi is his attempt to assign dates to early reigns by counting back average reign lengths from a known point (Crawfurd 1820: Vol. 2, pp. 380–1). Though the arithmetic is not clear, this leads him to date the accession of La Ummasá, the second ArumPone, to 1366 CE. He then grants the following ruler, La Saliwu, a reign from 1398 to 1470, or 72 years, as stated in the Bone chronicle. Crawfurd also knows that La Saliwu's daughter, Wé Benrigau', Daéng Maroa, succeeded him and her son, La Tenrisukki', succeeded in turn, allegedly in 1490 (Crawfurd 1820: Vol. 2, pp. 485–7). All these names and relationships are given for the relevant early rulers in the Bone chronicle and it is difficult to see where else Crawfurd could have found them.

Another account of Bone's early history is found in the second part of a general history of Sulawesi, probably put together by W.R. van Hoëvell and published by him in 1854. This includes a well-informed summary of the material covered in the Bone chronicle, though there is no indication of the source of the information (van Hoëvell 1854: 213–15).

10. Previous editions and published translations of the chronicle

Strictly speaking, the first printed version of the chronicle is to be found in the first volume of B.F. Matthes's *Boegineesche Chrestomathie* published in Makassar in 1864 (Matthes 1864: 465–501). The whole work, as understood here, is followed by a list of ArumPone up to 1860. As noted above, this is all in Bugis characters and probably had few readers, especially non-Bugis readers, before the notes appeared in the third volume of the work, published in Amsterdam in 1872 (Matthes 1872: 60–78). Matthes explains in the introduction to his notes that the text is based on what became NBG 99, and the relevant pages of that manuscript are heavily

annotated by Matthes. It seems likely the manuscript itself was used by the printer, though with some minor emendations by Matthes based on the manuscripts that became NBG 100 and NBG 101.

The first direct translation of a major part of the work appeared at much the same time, in a long article by Johannes Anthonius Bakkers. A friend of Matthes's, with whom he shared various journeys in South Sulawesi, Bakkers initially had a military career. In 1849, at age 40, he transferred into civil administration and spent the next 27 years closely involved with the affairs of the area. He served as governor of Celebes and dependencies from 1865 to his death in 1876. He was attached, effectively as the political officer, to both the 1859 and 1860 Dutch expeditions against Bone and it is tempting to believe he was present when the ArumPone's house at Pasémpé' was looted on 9 December 1859. He also spent time in Bone after the war. On 10 December 1863, he completed an extensive account of all he had discovered about Bone (Bakkers 1866). This contains two items of interest. The first is a detailed genealogy of Bone's rulers and their families from Matasilompo'é to the 27th ArumPone, Bessé Kajuara, who fled from Pasémpé' (Bakkers 1866: 154–68). The second is a translation of roughly half the chronicle—that is, to a point about halfway through the account of the reign of Bongkangngé, Matinroé riGucinna, and based explicitly on the looted manuscript, now NBG 101 (Bakkers 1866: 169–83). The translation was probably done by Bakkers's regular translator, J. Bensbach, and Bakkers admits that Matthes might have done a better job (Bakkers 1866: 9, 169).⁴² In fact, it does follow the text fairly closely. Bakkers also adds to both genealogy and chronicle references to Crawford's dates and he is aware of the imminent publication of the first volume of the *Boegineesche Chrestomathie*. Given the friendship between Matthes and Bakkers, it is easy to understand how the manuscript had been made available to Matthes while preparing the text of his volume and how it ended up in Matthes's collection as NBG 101.

Although Matthes suggests translations of various difficult passages in his notes to the text, his only treatment of a longer passage from the chronicle is a close paraphrase of the *tomanurung* section in a collection of Bugis and Makasar legends (Matthes 1885: 6–7). The same section has

42 It is a suspicious coincidence that Matthes's detailed annotations to the manuscript cease only a page and a half after the point at which Bakkers's translation ends.

been very carefully translated, explicitly based on the text in *Boegineesche Chrestomathie*, by Kern (1929: 307–10), alongside similar passages relating to Soppeng, Tanete and Luwu.

In 1981, the text of the whole chronicle, transliterated into Latin characters and provided with an Indonesian translation, was published in Jakarta as one element in an anthology of Bugis historical texts (Chairan et al. 1981). Four of the items, including the Bone chronicle, are credited to Tamin Chairan. Most of the volume—perhaps all of it—is drawn directly from *Boegineesche Chrestomathie*. The system of transliteration differs somewhat from that used here, but it is carefully done, and the translation is clear and effective.

A similar, but less careful, volume appeared in 1992–93 (Hamid and Kartikasari 1992–93). The manuscript on which the text is based is not stated and the transliteration is rather careless. The translation is much more stilted than in the previous volume.

Finally, a much longer version of the chronicle, in Lontara’ characters, has recently been published (Muhlis et al. 2018). This brings the narrative up to the middle of the twentieth century. For the earlier parts of this version, reference is made to other manuscripts of the work as understood here. The editors suggest the archetype of much of the later text may have been written in the nineteenth century, with sections later than that written after Indonesian independence (Muhlis et al. 2018: xxv–vi).⁴³

11. Commentary on the chronicle

While the chronicle is a major source for the early history of Bone, any full historical account would need to consider other Bugis and Makasar works, as well as the results of archaeological investigations and other relevant information. This is not the place for such a task. The following commentary draws attention to various historical and cultural aspects of the chronicle and is intended to help those wishing to make use of the work for their own purposes.

---

43 For the sake of completeness, we also mention an unpublished typescript Indonesian translation of the *Boegineesche Chrestomathie* text made available to us by the late Christian Pelras.

Chapter 1

The chronicle opens with a statement of its subject: '[T]he land of Bone and the ruling of Bone.' The Bugis wording is a standard expression for the contents of a section of manuscript, so that this first sentence amounts to a title for the work. Before the chronicle proper begins, however, there is an elaborate statement of exculpation, excusing the author from the consequences of naming high-status individuals. This exculpation is continued in the frequent occurrence throughout the chronicle of the expression 'may my belly not swell' before the first mention of an ArumPone's personal name.⁴⁴ The personal names usually begin with *La* for males and *Wé* for females, while *I* can be used for either. This mark of respect for a name that represents the person himself or herself relates directly to the all-pervasive status system in the society, and similar restrictions are found in many cultures. To avoid the problem of repeated use of personal names, other elements in the naming system are used. The most common in the chronicle is the necronym or name applied at the time of death and usually associated with some aspect of that death—for example, the eleventh ArumPone is known as *Matinroé riBantaéng* or 'He who sleeps at Bantaeng' because he died and was buried there, where his grave is still preserved. He also held, at least at the outset of his reign, the independent posts as Arung or king of Palakka and of Pattiro. Another less frequent naming strategy, at least for the very highest level, is the teknonym or naming a man after his child; the twelfth ArumPone was thus named *To Akkempéang*. Several ArumPone have nicknames that are used freely; thus, the name *Kerrampélua*, for the third ArumPone, derives from the fact his hair stood up immediately after his birth. The introductory section ends with a statement about the structure of the chronicle, which is to follow the genealogical line of the rulers.

The chronicle then addresses the issue of ultimate origins; if its structure depends on the succession of rulers, what came before the succession began in Bone? There is brief reference to the succession of rulers in the *La Galigo* cycle of stories that holds such a prominent place in Bugis culture.⁴⁵ Concepts of kingship and status lie at the heart of this

44 Cummings (2007: 51) notes that some versions of the Gowa chronicle begin with very similar passages and a parallel expression of exculpation occurs throughout both the Gowa and the Tallo chronicles.

45 The similar reference to the *La Galigo* cycle in the Soppeng chronicle (Caldwell 1988: 109) is probably inspired by the Bone chronicle. Stephen Druce points out in a personal communication that such references are not found in texts from the western coast of the peninsula.

‘tribal encyclopaedia’, but this is a world that is generally admitted to have gone.⁴⁶ For the purposes of a chronicle, setting things out in order, the obvious place for the La Galigo stories is before the real story begins. This then leaves a chronological space, here reckoned at seven generations, for a period of chaos. The descriptive elements applied to this period have the ring of set tropes; they refer to the lack of settled arrangements, whether formally constituted or mere custom, and especially in relation to agreed and acknowledged status. The reference to fish eating one another goes back to Indic sources (Basham 1971: 87).

The beginning of the sequence of kings is explicitly announced and the chronicle launches into an elaborate *tomanurung* story. These stories are found across South Sulawesi and, as noted above, serve to explain, or least justify, the system of ascribed status. The significance of the events about to unfold is marked by a week of lightning, thunder and an earthquake strongly reminiscent of the signs around the birth of Hayam Wuruk as recorded in the *Deśawarnana*.⁴⁷ Thunder and lightning also mark the disappearance of the first ruler and his consort.

The role of the ‘people’ in seeking a social contract with the *tomanurung*, and then agreeing to one, has been much commented on (Henley and Caldwell 2008), and this agreement is explicitly passed down the line of succession.

The name Bone is used here—and very often later in the chronicle—in a geographical sense. A royal hall was set up here for the *tomanurung*. This was in the centre of the modern town of Watampone, which means the ‘capital of Bone’. Etymologically, the name, which is found in various forms throughout the peninsula, seems to refer to the sandy nature of the site. The scale of events at this early stage is limited to Matajang, just outside the centre of Bone, and Toro’, a few kilometres to the east. No other rulers are mentioned beyond the immediate family of the first ArumPone. The work of the ruler is seen in his role in establishing legal arrangements, especially for trade, and in the possession of a war banner.

---

46 There were some attempts in Luwu to link La Galigo rulers with the historical series, but these seem to be late rationalisations. For further discussion of the cultural significance and affiliations of the La Galigo cycle, see Macknight (2003).

47 *Deśawarnana*, 4.3, 4 in Robson (1995: 26).

Figure 1 The genealogy of the early rulers

Chapter 2

With the accession of La Ummasa', the second ArumPone, the chronicle takes on a strongly 'realist' style, as discussed above. The necronym of 'Our lord who first had a grave' indicates the chronicle is now moving beyond legend and into an account of the deeds of real people who die and need to be buried. The geographical range of interest is extended to other nearby settlements through conquest and marriage.

The major part of the chapter is given over to the story of snatching the ArumPone's infant nephew from Palakka and installing him as the succeeding ArumPone. The need for this dramatic intervention is spelt out explicitly: since the two sons of La Ummasa' lacked sufficient status because of their low-status mother, they could not succeed, but the sister of La Ummasa', who shared his status, brought that to her marriage with the king of Palakka, whom it is assumed derived his status by descent from another *tomanurung*, so their child does inherit appropriate status from both parents. This is a very clear demonstration of the mutual recognition of status between polities. The ceremony associated with the baby's umbilical cord and afterbirth in Bone marks his identification

with Bone, rather than Palakka. The reality of the baby's authority is emphasised by the need for La Ummasa' to seek permission for something as unexceptional as travel.

Chapter 3

The account of the long reign of Kerrampélua' opens with a recapitulation of the story of his installation as a baby. It should be noted that the name most used for this king, Kerrampélua', or 'Standing hair', refers to his appearance when born; the use of the name itself is a reminder of these events. The realism of the story is then confirmed and extended by a description of the practical arrangements by which the rule of the baby was organised. The care with which these matters are set out strongly suggests the author of the chronicle in the seventeenth century felt the need to explain the obvious problem of a baby exercising the responsibilities of rule. This concern for a seventeenth-century audience confirms the essential unity of the chronicle as a work in the mind of its creator.

During this reign, Bone established its supremacy across the coastal plain and into the neighbouring hills.

Although described in terms of placenames, the listing of the military forces makes it clear that the essential element was the control of people, rather than of territory. The same point can be seen when Makkalempié, the daughter of Kerrampélua', is set up as the ruler of Majang, one of the places conquered by her great uncle La Ummasa'. It was necessary to move people from Bukaka, close to Bone in the north, to Majang, about 4 kilometres southwest, presumably to offer support to Makkalempié. The process of expansion was not straightforward and Anrobiring, which was another of the places conquered by La Ummasa', had to be reconquered. Three lists of conquests are given and, since the names fall into groups progressively further out across the plain, they may represent distinct campaigns. Even further away, there were rulers who were happy to merge their lands with Bone and, in the important case of Kaju, this was confirmed by the marriage of its ruler with Makkalempié.

Map 1 South Sulawesi

Map 2 The early expansion of Bone

Macknight (1983) has argued that this record of conquests reveals an expansion of wet rice cultivation through increased control of water sources. This was supported by military and political successes leading to a multiplier effect by which various elements of development lend each other mutual reinforcement. The reference to Kerrampélua' initiating a system of cursing enemies might relate to some innovations in ceremony and the supernatural belief system that would also provide another element in change.

Another aspect of the economy is mentioned with the settlement of people to the north-east at Panyula', about 4 kilometres downstream on the minor river that flows near Bone. These slaves, who belonged to Kerrampélua' himself, along with those also settled at the settlement of Lipenno, supplied fish and provided personal services as paddlers bearers.

Figure 2 The descendants of Wé Benrigau', Makkalempié

Note: This lists those who became ArumPone with their number in the sequence of chapters distinguished in the chronicle. It also provides a more complete account of the names and titles of each individual. The genealogical information in the figure is by no means complete and has been selected to illustrate the main points made in the chronicle in relation to succession as ArumPone.

4. Wé Benrigau', Makkalempié, Daéng Maroa, Bissu reLalempili', Arung Majang, Puatta riLawélaeng, Mallajangngé riCina

5. La Tenrisukki', Mappajunggé

6. La Ulio, Boté'é, Matinroé riTterung

7. La Tenrirawé, Bongkangngé, Matinroé riGucinna

8. La Icca', Matinroé riAddénénna

9. La Pattawe', Arung Kaju, Matinroé riBettung

10. Wé Tenritappu, Matinroé riSidénréng

11. La Tenrirua, Arung Palakka, Arung Pattiro, Adam, Matinroé riBantaéng

12. La Tenripale', To Akkempéang, Arung Timurung, Abdullah, Matinroé riTallo'

13. La Maddaremmeng, Arung Timurung, Salih, Matinroé riBukaka

La Tenriaji, To Senrima, Arung AwamPoné, Pawélaié riSiang

La Tenritatta, To Unru', Arung Palakka, Datu Mario-Riwawo, Daéng Sérang, Sa'aduddin, Petta Malampé'é Gemme'na, Matinroé riBontoala'

Chapter 4

The only child of Kerrampélua' mentioned in the previous chapter was a daughter, Makkalempié, and she succeeded to the position of ArumPone following the explicit wish of her parents. The fact she was a woman occasions no special comment. As a girl, she had previously been installed as the ruler of Majang, as noted above, and married the ruler of Kaju, further south. As in the account of the first ArumPone, only two of the nine children of the marriage are named and they both have a later role in the narrative.

Most of the account of the reign is taken up with agricultural expansion, both by purchase and by conquest, in and around Cina and Laliddong at the base of the hills about 10 kilometres southwest of Bone. This area, which lies beyond Majang, clearly had some special attraction for Makkalempié as one of her sons was given control of both Cina and Majang and she herself abdicated and retired to Cina.

The author of the chronicle, who is now well into a 'realistic' style, seems at a loss to know what to make of the story of Makkalempié's death. Her necronym, 'She who disappeared in Cina', could not be avoided and needed some explanation, which the story provides, but the account of some sort of ball lightning removing her from the house sounds legendary.

Chapter 5

La Tenrisukki' inherited the role of ArumPone from his mother, Makkalempié, at a young age, though the figure of only 11 years found in this version of the chronicle is hard to believe and perhaps the 19 years found elsewhere is more credible, especially given a younger brother had already established himself in Cina at the time of their mother's abdication. Marrying his first cousin at least four years after the abdication does not decide the matter one way or another. Such a marriage was entirely proper, indeed perhaps preferable, in high-status Bugis society since it ensured the status of any resulting children.

La Tenrisukki' acquired his nickname, Mappajungngé, 'He who uses an umbrella', through the capture of the invading Luwu ruler's *pajung* or umbrella—a mark of high status. Again, we see in this and in the injunction not to harm the person of the Datu of Luwu the mutual respect of rulers. No reason is given for the invasion of Bone's territory by the army of Luwu. It may have been a deliberate attempt by Luwu to reassert earlier dominance in the central area of the peninsula; or it may simply have been a raiding party from the sea, possibly directed towards the capture of women rather than territory. The battle was fought out across the settlements 3 or 4 kilometres south of Bone that had been captured by the second ArumPone, La Ummasa'. The site of Cellu where the Luwu forces established themselves is about 2 kilometres inland, while the Bone base at Biru is another 3 kilometres further west. It is difficult to follow the fighting that transpired since the exact location of Attassalo is not known, but the rout of the forces of Luwu was decisive and the Datu was lucky to escape by sea with a handful of supporters.

The war with Mampu in the north looks like a more straightforward competition for territory. Its resolution, however, is cast in terms of incorporating the ruler, his family and his following into the status system of Bone. The possibility of plunder is explicitly rejected.

Both these conflicts show Bone beginning to deal with other significant polities to the north. The range of interaction has been considerably extended beyond that of earlier reigns.

Chapter 6

The succession of the Mappajungngé's son, La Ulio, Boté'é or the 'Fat man', was straightforward. After various personal qualities are mentioned, his marriage to the daughter of the ruler of Pattiro, nearly 20 kilometres down the coast to the south, is mentioned. Each of the four of the children whose names are recorded went on to play a significant role in later chapters.

Map 3 Bone and its immediate neighbours

The reign of Bot'é marks a further dramatic expansion in the field of war and politics, as well as growing sophistication in administration. Thus, a central figure in the customary law texts of later times, Kajao Laliddong or the Sage of Laliddong, is assigned to this reign. More immediately, the reign sees the beginning of the long and complex relationship with

the Makasar state of Gowa.⁴⁸ This began well enough with a treaty between Boté'é and Tumapa'risi' Kallonna, the Karaeng or ruler of Gowa, which was duly noted in the chronicle of Gowa (Cummings 2007: 32).⁴⁹ There was further conflict with Luwu and the alliance with Gowa was confirmed when the new ruler, Tunipalangga, succeeded his father. After a meeting between rulers on the Cenrana River in the north—perhaps in the course of the campaign against Luwu—Tunipalangga came to Bone itself and a detailed treaty was agreed to, covering reciprocal legal rights. There was then a further joint victory against Wajo in the north.

This interest in the north was confirmed by the ArumPone's second marriage, with the daughter of the ruler of Mampu, an area that had been conquered in the previous reign. The integration of this new northern territory and its people seems to have been incomplete, however, and Boté'é tried to resolve issues by making a clear distinction between his northern following and his southern following. This involved installing his young son, by the southern mother, as ArumPone and allowing northerners to identify as followers of his wife from Mampu. In what amounted to a family row, Boté'é ended up being killed at Itterung, which provided his necronym.

Chapter 7

La Tenrirawé, or Bongkangngé, had already been installed as ArumPone before his father's death. Perhaps to mend the division between north and south, he married a ruler from Timurung, well to the northwest, but neither of their children survived. After the usual list of personal matters, details are given of further administrative arrangements as well as a note on the introduction of guns.

Most of the long chapter, however, is given over to the struggle with Gowa, which had embarked on a policy of aggressive expansion. Contrasting views of events can be seen in the respective chronicles of the two sides. The opening episode reads almost as a cheeky story of a cockfighting

---

48 The other side of this relationship can be followed in the chronicles of Gowa and Tallo (Cumming 2007). Further information is supplied in the Wajo chronicle edited by Noorduynd and his introduction provides an excellent account of these interactions through the sixteenth century (Noorduynd 1955: 73–92).

49 Noorduynd (1955: 74) suggests this was signed in Gowa. The text of the treaty was published by Matthes (1864: 531–2).

victory by Bongkangngé, who had wagered his private possession of the people of Panyula', inherited from Kerrampélua', over his guest, presumably Tunipalangga, who lost a significant sum of money.

Before the struggle with Gowa began, Bone strengthened its position with an alliance 'west of the wood'—that is, in the north around Pampanua—and by further conquests or reconquests on the plain to the south. In the far south, three communities on the Tangka River—Bulo-Bulo, Lamatti and Raja—were made vassals of Bone.

Despite these defensive moves, the forces of Gowa invaded and there was a protracted battle south of Méru, which is very close to Bone itself. From the Gowa chronicle, we learn this was part of a widespread series of campaigns across South Sulawesi under Tunipalangga. Among many other places, the three communities on the Tangka River were conquered and it is noted specifically that only Bone was not conquered (Cummings 2007: 33–5). As the Bone chronicle records, in the peace treaty that concluded this episode, the southern boundary of Bone was agreed to be the Tangka River.

As a result of Gowa's aggression, various refugees arrived in Bone, including the ruler of Sawitto on the west coast⁵⁰ and the losing party in royal squabbles in Soppeng. The marriage of this Soppeng noble with the ArumPone's sister set up family ties between Soppeng and Bone. A more surprising refugee was Tunipalangga's nephew, known in the Gowa chronicle as Tunijallo' but in the Bone chronicle as Daéng Pabéta or, in a play on words, as Daéng Patobo'. This was the outcome of a romantic entanglement that caused offence, as detailed in the Gowa chronicle (Cummings 2007: 38).

The struggle continued with another attack by Gowa at Cellu, where Bone under Mappajunggé had fought off the forces of Luwu, but the usually victorious Tunipalangga was wounded and retreated. Two years later, he tried again, building a fort as a base. After a period of fighting, he became ill, retreated again and died.

Tunipalangga's brother, known in Bone as Daéng Parukka and in Gowa as Tunibatta, then took up the fight. After summoning his son, Tunijallo', to return to Gowa, he embarked on yet another campaign. This caused

---

50 Druce (2009: 83–4) has published an account of this from the perspective of Sawitto.

a degree of panic and desertion among Bone's allies and the forces of Gowa were able to build a fort at Pappolo only 3 kilometres or so north of Bone and destroy villages even closer in. In a final push, however, Tunibatta was driven back and killed.

In the face of this calamity, Gowa turned to the much respected ruler of Tallo, known to the Bugis as Daéng Padulung and to the Makasar as Tumenanga riMakkoayang. He and Kajao Laliddong, who served as adviser to both Bongkangngé and his father, Boté'é, sorted out the terms of a treaty; Tunijallo', who had after all fought with Bone against his uncle Tunipalangga, was allowed to succeed his father as Karaeng of Gowa and that presumably satisfied the victors.

There was then further conflict with Luwu in the north, with fighting at Cenrana on the river and the enslavement of people at Unyi, just south of the river. Whereas under Boté'é, Bone had been the enemy of Wajo, Gowa's recent aggression prompted a change and Wajo and Bone worked together against Luwu at Cenrana. This new alignment of powers was formalised in a grand alliance between Bone, Wajo and Soppeng. Soppeng, too, had been attacked by Gowa. This agreement, known as Tellumpoccoé or the 'Three Powers', was instituted at Timurung, a convenient central point, and was of enduring importance. It is convincingly dated to 1582 (Noorduyn 1955: 84).

Bongkangngé died two years later and, since he had no surviving children, he was succeeded by his brother, La Icca'. His death name, Matinroé riGucinna or 'He who sleeps in his urn', appears to be a reference to the pre-Islamic practice of interring the cremated remains of a notable person in a large Chinese jar.

Chapter 8

La Icca' inherited from his brother not only the kingdom, but also his wife, the ruler of Timurung, with whom he had three children. Of the two who survived, one, La Tenripale', became the twelfth ArumPone and the other, Wé Tenrijello', became the mother of the successor of La Tenripale'.

One final attack from Gowa ended inconclusively in the face of the joint Tellumpoccoé forces.⁵¹

---

51 The Gowa chronicle gives more detail on this but is difficult to interpret (Cummings 2007: 41).

In presenting an account of the dramatic events of the reign, the author of the chronicle admits to not knowing what La Icca' was thinking when he embarked on a series of unjustified murders and tyrannical decisions. The crisis came when a fire, lit by La Icca', spread throughout the settlement, causing widespread destruction. People fleeing the fire demanded something be done.

The places mentioned in the story provide an indication of the extent of settlement. The centre of Bone appears to have been more or less in the official area of modern Watampone and within the walls that were in place during the Dutch attack in 1859 (Perelaer 1872: Maps).⁵² Matajang lies less than 1 kilometre to the south and Macégé' is about the same distance to the west—both well within the modern town. The statement that the fire spread up to and beyond these places, however, suggests that fairly dense settlement extended well beyond the wall. The mention later in the story of all the houses within the wall being burnt confirms the existence of a wall at that time, possibly enclosing much the same area as in the nineteenth century. Majang is only about 4 kilometres to the southwest of the centre so the fire could easily be seen from there. If Da Malaka, the critical conspirator, was already coming from Mampu in the north and skirting west of Bone, it makes sense that he came through Palakka, about 4 kilometres northwest of Bone.

The discussion between the lord of Majang and his nephew Da Malaka over the propriety of regicide is revealing. The essential point is that no one subsidiary ruler can override the status of a paramount ruler—in this case, the ArumPone—but, given just cause, an alliance of subsidiary rulers can be justified in usurping power and, in this case, killing the ArumPone. It is not clear why the lord of Majang took a leading role in the rebellion, but perhaps his advanced age gave him particular respect.

Chapter 9

The choice of La Pattawe' as the new ArumPone was determined by the lord of Majang, who had played such an important part in killing La Icca', the previous ArumPone, and it involved a major shift in the line of descent. A sufficient nobility was assured through the father of La Pattawe', who was a son of the fourth ruler, Makkalempié (Figure 2). The genealogy

---

52 In Chapter 13, La Maddaremmeng is recorded as extending the wall to the east and south.

in the hanging chart in Watampone, described in Appendix 2, also traces his descent through his mother to his great-grandmother, who was a sister of the third ruler, Kerrampélua'. His father, Arung Pallenna, was one of those killed by La Icca', which presumably assured his opposition to the previous regime.

It is difficult to know how old the new ArumPone was at his installation; given he was a whole generation closer to Makkalempié than his two predecessors, one could argue he must have been a mature man, at least, but against this is the statement that his grandfather, the lord of Majang, was still alive and active. The only noteworthy features of his seven-year reign were genealogical developments important for future reigns.

Chapter 10

The succession of the previous ArumPone's daughter, Wé Tenritappu, Matinroé riSidénréng, continued the alternative line of descent. Her institution of a council of seven leading nobles seems to have been designed partly to compensate for her being a woman, but it can equally be seen as a measure to bind the central parts of the wider kingdom more tightly together. It is worth noting that her claim to be descended from the fifth ArumPone, Mappajungngé, is through her mother, the daughter of Boté'é's second marriage with Wé Tenrigau' in Mampu.

This reign saw renewed conflict with Gowa, this time associated with the spread of Islam. This series of wars is also described in the Tallo chronicle (Cummings 2007) and dated in *The Makassar Annals* (Cummings 2010). In the first campaign, Gowa and its allies from Ajattappareng were defeated by the combined forces of Tellumpoccoé—that is, Bone, Wajo and Soppeng. This seems to have been in 1607 (Cummings 2010: 35). The following year, Gowa attacked again and defeated the Tellumpoccoé forces. A year later, this victory was followed up by attacking Soppeng alone, which was defeated and forcibly converted. The next year, 1610, the same fate befell Wajo, and the ArumPone, presumably sensing the way things were going, visited Sidénréng and personally converted. Her sudden death meant the question of a wider conversion in Bone was unresolved.

Chapter 11

The appointment of the new ArumPone, La Tenrirua, Matinroé riBantaéng, represented a return to the previous line of descent in several ways. His mother, I Lémpe', was the sister of Bongkangngé and La Icca' and her husband and the new ArumPone's father, La Saliwu, was her second cousin—that is, he too was descended from Mappajungngé.⁵³ La Tenrirua's marriage to Dangke', the daughter of Wé Tenripauang, a sister of his mother, had already been noted in Chapter 9.

La Tenrirua reigned for less than a year in 1611. The events of this reign and the next, which led to the formal Islamisation of Bone, are exceptional in the history of the spread of Islam. The story begins with another attack by the forces of Gowa, apparently under the control of Sultan Ala'uddin himself, who built two forts, one to the south at Cellu, which had so often been the site of conflict with invading forces, and the other at Palletté, an easily defended coastal outcrop to the north. Gowa's intention was clearly conversion. La Tenrirua attempted to persuade his people to accept Islam both because that would represent a benefit in itself and because alliance with Gowa, rather than defiance, would be in Bone's long-term interest. He was unsuccessful and withdrew to Pattiro, a promontory to the south that he held separately to his position in Bone, but he had no more success there in urging conversion. He was left with only his immediate family and courtiers.

The people of Bone then sent an envoy to remonstrate with him. The exchange of views, which has a sense of authenticity, is remarkable and illuminates the nature of kingship in Bone. To Alaung, the envoy, accuses La Tenrirua of deserting his loyal followers: 'It is not that we do not want you, but you do not want us.' As spelt out for the very first ArumPone, the *tomanurung*, rule involves a contract between ruler and ruled. In more prosaic terms, it is a patron–client relationship writ large.⁵⁴ In reply, La Tenrirua appealed to his desire to lead his people to a better future as Muslims. Faced with this impasse, the people of Bone turned to La Tenrirua's first cousin, the son of La Icca' and thus in the same line of descent. The new ArumPone, La Tenripale', Matinroé riTallo', continued to defy Gowa.

53 In fact, as the Bone family tree shows, La Tenrirua was the great-grandson, not grandson, of Mappajungngé, through both his father and his mother. See also Figure 2.

54 Pelras (2000) explores the patron–client relationship in modern South Sulawesi society.

The narrative then shifts to the personal relationship between the ruler of Gowa, Sultan Ala'uddin, and the deposed ArumPone, La Tenrirua. A force was sent to relieve Pattiro, rescue La Tenrirua and bring him to Palletté. There he was received courteously and his continued ownership of various territories, or rather the people living in them, was acknowledged. Both sides agreed on the importance of conversion and Sultan Ala'uddin, who claimed Palletté by right of conquest, gave it to La Tenrirua as a token of goodwill. When Sultan Ala'uddin tried to follow this up with an expensive personal gift, La Tenrirua initially refused it as a bribe, but was then persuaded that it was an appropriate gift between families.⁵⁵

The terms in which the leaders then express their support for each other are remarkably personal and refer to their families and descendants. The presence of the ruler of Tallo at the time of the agreement is particularly significant. This was Karaeng Matoaya, Sultan Abdullah, who had acted as chief advisor to Sultan Ala'uddin since his accession, and the details of this campaign, along with many others in the wars of Islamisation, are given in the Tallo chronicle dealing with his reign. They are explicitly omitted from the Gowa chronicle (Cummings 2007: 44, 88).

Bone could not then hold out against the forces of Gowa and was defeated militarily, leading to the nominal conversion of the people of Bone by force and the reinstatement of La Tenrirua as ArumPone. This reinstatement could not last, however, and as soon as the forces of Gowa withdrew, La Tenrirua was driven out and fled to protection in Makassar. There he was instructed in Islam by Dato' riBandang—the teacher who had converted Sultan Ala'uddin six years earlier (Cummings 2007: 43)—and provided with the entirely suitable Muslim name of Adam. He then lived in retirement in Bantaeng on the south coast, where he died in 1631 (Cummings 2010: 42).

---

55 There is a significant problem with the chronicle's account of this. As it reads, the ruler of Gowa claims to be in a *besan* relationship with La Tenrirua—that is, a relationship of mutual in-laws. In fact, as set out in the following chapter and confirmed in the Gowa chronicle (Cummings 2007: 46), it was the next ArumPone, La Tenripale', and La Tenrirua's first cousin, whose daughter, Dabe', was promised to Daeng Mattola, or Sultan Malikussaid, the son of the ruler with whom La Tenrirua was dealing. All sources agree that Dabe' died in childhood. There is no easy solution to the problem. Was Sultan Ala'uddin using the *besan* link very loosely, perhaps thinking of Bone and Gowa as equivalent to families? Was La Tenripale' also at the meeting and did he, rather than La Tenrirua, receive the offer of the jacket, which seems unlikely given his continuing opposition to Gowa's demands?

Figure 3 The descent and siblings of La Tenritatta, Arung Palakka, as described in the chronicle

Note: For the descent of La Tenrirua, Adam, see Figure 2.

Chapter 12

The name and descent of La Tenrirua's successor, La Tenripale', Matinroé riTallo', had already been introduced in the previous chapter in the account of his temporary role as ArumPone. With the final departure of La Tenrirua, his first cousin, La Tenripale' was the obvious successor. After one final attempt to throw off the Makasar oppressor and escape conversion, the people of Bone and their vassals succumbed amid considerable destruction and accepted their new status as vassals of Gowa and as Muslims. La Tenripale' had no choice but to convert. The magnanimous terms imposed by the victors are credited in the Tallo chronicle to Karaeng Matoaya as a deliberate political move (Cummings 2007: 88) and they may have helped bring an end to the wars of Islamisation.

The genealogical details that follow trace out two lines of descent. The first runs through Wé Tenrijello', the younger sister of the ArumPone. Her eldest son was La Maddaremmeng, who was to succeed his uncle as ArumPone. Another son was La Tenriaji or To Senrima, who would also play an important role in the future. This line obtained two of the three minor kingdoms formerly held by La Tenrirua: Wé Tenrijello received Pattiro and La Tenriaji, AwamPoné. Family power was also affirmed by a third son becoming king in Cellu—the key defensive position near Bone.

The other line of descent goes back to La Tenrirua. His daughter, Wé Tenrisui, was the mother, most importantly, of La Tenritatta, Arung Palakka, but the full list of his siblings is given. The distinction between these two lines would be critical in the future.

The attachment of La Tenripale' to Islam and to the accommodation with Gowa and Tallo appears to have been genuine. He, too, was instructed in religion by Dato' riBandang and received a Muslim name. He also promised in marriage his only child to the son of the Gowa ruler, though she died young and no further marriage link was possible.⁵⁶ Towards the end of his life, he spent time in Makassar and *The Makassar Annals* records his death on 13 August 1630 (Cummings 2010: 41). Given his reign began in 1611, this fits with a total reign of 20 years as stated.

Chapter 13

The next ArumPone, La Maddaremmeng, Matinroé riBukaka, succeeded his uncle, but as explained in Section 8, the account of his reign is highly defective. It begins in the normal way with his names, marriage, son and a few details of the reign. The mention of his creation of a white umbrella—presumably in differentiation from the previous yellow umbrella—might be related to his enthusiasm for Islam. His extensions of the wall to the east and south probably brought it to about the same position as what the Dutch faced in 1859 (Perelaer 1872: Maps). This work on the wall suggests a state of some prosperity.

La Maddaremmeng's support for a firmer form of Islam and a quarrel with his mother over this matter are clearly important, but no details are given, though we know these from other sources.⁵⁷ This dispute led to an attack on his mother's base at Pattiro, which in turn led to another attack from Gowa under its new ruler, Sultan Malikussaid. The chronicle records succinctly that La Maddaremmeng was defeated, and that he fled to southern Luwu, but was captured, brought to Makassar and exiled to Siang. The Dutch and Makasar sources provide a much fuller picture

⁵⁶ This attempted marriage is also recorded in the Gowa chronicle (Cummings 2007: 46).

⁵⁷ Noorduyt (1955: 116) explains that the dispute concerned the question of whether Muslims not born into slavery could be kept in slavery, or whether, following some Islamic opinion, they had to be freed, as La Maddaremmeng believed. Andaya (1981: 40) sees this as an attack on Sufism, but the question deserves further research. There is a Makasar *sinrili'* (or literary work) dealing with this dispute between La Maddaremmeng and his mother in NBG 78, of which we have a transcription in the Cense papers (Leiden University Library, Mss D Or. 545, Item 75, d).

and allow us to date these events.⁵⁸ *The Makassar Annals* tell us that Malikussaid returned victorious to Gowa on 19 November 1643 and La Maddaremmeng arrived on 23 July 1644. He was not exiled to Siang until 19 June 1646 (Cummings 2010: 62–6).

The chronicle then moves back in time to deal with the revolt of La Tenriaji To Senrima, the younger brother of La Maddaremmeng, who seems to have fled to southern Luwu with his brother but managed to return to Bone. Again, we know from *The Makassar Annals* that Sultan Malikussaid left Makassar on 18 April 1646 to deal with this rebellion, inflicted a devastating defeat on Bone at Pasémpe' and returned home on 25 May 1646 (Cummings 2010: 62–6).⁵⁹ To Senrima and other Bone nobles were taken back to Gowa. It is not clear whether To Senrima was exiled to Siang at the same time as his brother, but the chronicle tells us he died there.

The final section of the chronicle is again not strictly in chronological order. It begins with the appointment of a Bone nobleman, To Bala, to oversee the governance of Bone; this appointment actually took place at the same time as Malikussaid returned to Gowa in 1643. There is some difference in the sources about the nature of To Bala's appointment and his relationship with the senior Gowa noble, Karaeng riSumanna' (Andaya 1981: 41–2; Cummings 2007: 49), but he seems to have weathered the crisis of To Senrima's revolt in 1646 and stayed in place for 17 years, until 1660. On 7 August 1660, he too fled from the indignity inflicted on Bone's labourers, including the nobility, digging defence ditches in Gowa and went into revolt. Three days later, an army from Gowa set out in pursuit; a little over a month later, this army defeated the Bone forces and To Bala was killed (Cummings 2010: 88–9).

It is only at this point that the chronicle introduces Arung Palakka, Matinroé riBontala', as an actor, though his genealogy has been set out in the previous chapter. It is possible he was brought to Gowa from Soppeng as a hostage as early as 1644 (Andaya 1981: 51), but he had joined To Bala and is reputed to have shown bravery and skill in eluding capture. He now appears leading a remnant force of Bone troops off to relative safety on Butung, which can be dated to 25 December 1660 (Cummings 2010: 90).

---

58 This period of history has received much attention from Speelman's *Notitie* onwards. Useful modern accounts are Noorduynd (1955); Andaya (1981); and, with particular reference to Bone, Abdurrazak et al. (1995) and Palloge (2006).

59 Andaya (1981: 42) wrongly dates this revolt to 1644.

The statement that it was this action that ended Bone's enslavement to Gowa is significant; it is his involvement that marks the beginning of successes to come.

The chronicle has no detail on the next seven years except that Bone was under the control of Arung Amali, an official appointed by Gowa. Late in 1667, he was ordered to take reinforcements for the army of Gowa under the command of Karaeng Bontomarannu, which was besieging Butung. There they met Arung Palakka and large numbers of troops went over to the side of Arung Palakka and the Dutch under Speelman. On 4 January 1667, Karaeng Bontomarannu and the other leaders of Gowa's forces surrendered to the Dutch (Andaya 1981: 76–7).

Even allowing for the need to restrict the focus of the chronicle to 'the land of Bone and the ruling of Bone', this is a very thin coverage of the eventful years between La Maddaremmeng's accession in 1630 and early 1667, to say nothing of the attempt to reinstall La Maddaremmeng as ArumPone recorded in *The Makassar Annals* for 7 February 1667, which is passed over entirely (Cummings 2010: 101). As far as the chronicle is concerned, La Maddaremmeng had ceased being ArumPone at least by the time of his exile to Siang in 1646. As discussed in Section 8, this treatment of La Maddaremmeng's reign is relevant to the date and circumstance of the creation of the chronicle.

Plate 1 The first page of the chronicle text as found in manuscript NBG 101 in the Leiden University Libraries

This text is taken from *The Bugis Chronicle of Bone*, translated and edited by Campbell Macknight, Mukhlis Paeni and Muhlis Hadrawi, published 2020 by ANU Press, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

doi.org/10.22459/BCB.2020.01