

Language and Text in the Austronesian World

Studies in Honour of Ülo Sirk

Ed. by

Yury A. Lander

Institute of Oriental Studies RAS, Moscow

& Alexander K. Ogloblin

The University of St. Petersburg

2008
LINCOM EUROPA

***Sureq* versus *lontaraq*: The Great Divide?**

SIRTJO KOOLHOF

*KITLV / Royal Netherlands Institute for Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies,
Leiden*

Bugis traditional literature, the language of which Ülo Sirk has presented us with such an excellent description (Sirk 1996), since its first mention in Western sources by John Leyden (1811) has attracted scant attention from Western scholars if compared to Javanese, Balinese, or Malay literature. The Dutch Bible translator B.F. Matthes (1818-1908) was the first to intensively study the language of the Bugis basing himself mainly on the abundantly available written sources. These manuscripts, called *lontaraq* or *sureq* in Bugis, contain a variety of texts, ranging from extensive genealogies and histories to religious tracts, manuals for boat- or house building and epic poems. Matthes published an anthology of these works in his two-volume *Boegineesche Chrestomathie* (Matthes 1864-1872), but did not attempt a thorough analysis of the different types of Bugis traditional literature. For him the texts were mainly a means of studying the language in order to prepare him for his main task: translating the Bible in Bugis. Following Matthes, several scholars have studied various Bugis texts and published editions or summaries of them (e.g. Kern 1939; Noorduyn 1955; Tol 1990; Fachruddin 1999). Like Matthes, however, none of them made an overall analysis of the different genres of Bugis literature, although Tol and Fachruddin addressed the question of the relations of the texts they published with other types of Bugis texts. It was Christian Pelras (1975, 1979) who was the first to attempt an extensive description and analysis of the corpus of Bugis traditional literature. Pelras's, Tol's and Fachruddin's studies remain to this day important sources of knowledge on Bugis traditional literature and its genres. However, as I will argue, they are also the source of an erroneous classification of Bugis literature into two broad categories, *sureq* and *lontaraq*, which finds no support within Bugis literary tradition itself.

Sureq* versus *lontaraq

In most studies of Bugis literature published since the 1970s discussions center around a division of Bugis traditional literature into two main groups: *sureq* and *lontaraq*. These, however, are only the two most frequently occurring terms that classify genres and physical forms of literature. In some instances regional differences exist in terminology, and the boundaries between the genres are not always clear. Most modern authors agree on a basic dichotomy in Bugis written literature of *sureq*, 'belles lettres' (Indonesian *sastra indah*) – usually a form of poetry, and more specifically the *La Galigo* –, and *lontaraq*, prose texts of a more practically oriented, often historiographic, nature.¹

Fachruddin Ambo Enre (1999:22-29, 85-89),² although not the first scholar to bring up the dichotomy *sureq-lontaraq*, presents the most detailed treatment of this primary classification

¹ See, for example, Pelras 1975:245-247, 1979:279-280; Zainal Abidin 1983:108; Tol 1990:3; Fachruddin AE 1999:22, 85-86; Rahman 1998:49-53; Akhmar 2003:21-22.

² Fachruddin's 1999 book is essentially his PhD thesis presented at the Universitas Indonesia in Jakarta in 1983. His thesis served as a source for a number of later publications.

of Bugis literary genres, which, however, is not always consistent and sometimes contradictory. According to Fachruddin *sureq* are literature (BI *sastra*), whereas *lontaraq* are not literature (BI *bukan sastra*). In the *sureq* category he includes *élong*, short three-line non-narrative poems, and *toloq*, heroic poems, both composed in metrical language (Fachruddin AE 1999:23-24). Based on another criterium, that is that *sureq* are 'narratives' (BI *cerita*), however, Fachruddin excludes *élong* from the category of *sureq* (Fachruddin AE 1999:88).

According to Fachruddin (1999:85-86) there are differences in the way of reading *sureq* and *lontaraq*: *sureq* are chanted to a particular melody (*laoang*), while *lontaraq* are not. Based on their contents *sureq* and *lontaraq* differ in that the first always are stories or narratives (BI *cerita*), and the second are 'manuscripts that usually contain genealogies, diary notes or collections of various notes, especially those concerning history' (Fachruddin AE 1999:86).³ The category of *sureq*, according to Fachruddin, can be classified based on their internal characteristics. Basing himself on metre, he differentiates two groups. First are the texts that have a fixed metre (*La Galigo* and *toloq*), and second those that do not have a fixed metre. To this he adds that '*sureq* in fact are prose that is read to a melody too' (Fachruddin AE 1999:86). Based on the contents of texts belonging to the *sureq* genre he distinguishes four types: the first is the *La Galigo*, the second writings containing stories (*pau-pau*) that 'are not aimed at a description of real life, although among them are those that mention countries or regions that are known'. The titles he mentions as examples of this second category of *sureq* all refer to works that are Bugis adaptations or translations of Malay texts (Fachruddin AE 1999:86).⁴ The third category of *sureq* are *toloq*, and the fourth are 'new stories' (*pau-pau baru*). These four categories are placed in a chronological framework in which the first category is the oldest, while the fourth is the most recent (Fachruddin AE 1999:86-87). There remain other literary works that Fachruddin does not include in the *sureq* category since they are not chanted, though their contents are stories (Fachruddin AE 1999:88), in which he includes, for example, the tale of *La Padoma Énnaja*.⁵ Although not clear at every point it seems justified to conclude that what according to Fachruddin constitutes the *sureq* genre are narrative, mainly fictional compositions, both prose and poetry, that are chanted to particular melodies.⁶

Before Fachruddin, Christian Pelras was the first to explicitly present the dichotomy *sureq-lontaraq* in the framework of categorizing Bugis literary genres. In an article on Bugis

³ Fachruddin here refers to a remark by A.A. Cense (1951:42-43) that 'for all these writings [Dutch *geschriften*] the loan term *lontaraq* is in use, a word that in general can refer to any written piece, but readily and specifically is used for these kinds of manuscripts with historical contents'.

⁴ Here Fachruddin mentions a *Sureq Baweng* 'The story of the parakeet', which is based on the Malay *Hikayat Bayan Budiman* (which in turn finds its origin in the Persian *Tuti-nama* 'Tales of a parrot' and the Sanskrit *Sukasaptati* 'Seventy tales of a parrot'). The title *Sureq Baweng*, however, usually refers to an original Bugis composition which, except for having a parrot playing the leading role in the story, has no relation to the Malay or Persian works, the most obvious difference being that it is not a frame story. There are texts based on the *Hikayat Bayan Budiman* in Bugis, for example, NBG 90, which begins with the words *Panessaé nngi bicaranna datunna bawenggé kuaé to ppa bicaranna saodagaraq monroé ri wanua riasenggé ri Yamang* 'This sets out the words of the lord of the parrots as well as the words of the trader from the land that is called Yemen'. See Van den Adel 1991; Matthes 1872:138-139; Winstedt 1996; Simsar (ed.) 1978.

⁵ *La Padoma Énnaja* 'The ill-fated La Padoma' tells the story of La Padoma and his beloved, and is written in the octosyllabic *toloq* metre; see Sikki and Sande (eds) 1983; Tang 2000.

⁶ Although *toloq* generally contain descriptions of historical events, Fachruddin explicitly states that they are not history (BI *sejarah*) (Fachruddin AE 1999:26).

literature Pelras classifies written Bugis literature according to whether it is metrical or non-metrical. *Sureq* are texts that have a fixed metre (Pelras 1975:245-246), whereas prose texts are generally called *lontaraq* (Pelras 1975:247). A few years later he revised this classification, stating that only materials belonging to the *La Galigo* are *sureq*, while all other writings are *lontaraq*, even if in the texts themselves they are identified as *sureq* (Pelras 1979:279, 1996:30-31; see also below). Tol (1990:2-4), although basing his analysis on Fachruddin's classification, employs yet another definition. *Sureq* are texts that are regarded as 'beautiful', usually are metrical, and are chanted to a particular melody with musical accompaniment. *Lontaraq* are foremost historiographic texts in prose, which are not chanted, although they can be read aloud to an audience (Tol 1990:3). In Tol's opinion *tolog* do not belong to the genre of *sureq*, nor to that of *lontaraq*. They take an intermediary position between the two genres: they are *sureq* because of the metre and the poetic language, *lontaraq* because they are historiographic and narrate real events and real personalities (Tol 1990:3-4). Finally, mention should be made of a distinction between *sureq* and *lontaraq* based on religious aspects, a division Pelras (1979:280) also hints at. According to the anthropologist Mattulada (1975:19, 1978:128 n.4) the *La Galigo* manuscripts are actually *lontaraq*, but the fact that for some Bugis people these texts are sacred prevents him from classifying *La Galigo* as *lontaraq*, since the latter are 'merely a creation of human mind'.⁷ This position he shares with Johan Nyompa (Nyompa et al. 1988:13; Nyompa 1992, II:41).

Apart from agreeing that the *La Galigo* belongs to the *sureq* genre, the above mentioned authorities differ considerably in their opinion on how to differentiate the various Bugis written texts according to the dichotomy *sureq-lontaraq*. It would appear from these differences of opinion that the boundary between these two genres is not as clear as each of them proposes. Indeed, when looking at the actual use of these terms in manuscripts the terms themselves may not be appropriate at all to distinguish between different genres of written texts. One frequently come across the use of the word *sureq* for the type of texts that according to the above-mentioned division should be classified as *lontaraq*. For example, in the collection of the Proyek Pelestarian Naskah we find the *Sureq attorionlong ri Boné* 'Sureq containing the Chronicle of Boné' (PPN 10/10), a historiographic prose text, and the *Sureq palakia* 'Astrologer's *sureq*' (PPN 25/35), a compilation of magical and divinational writings. A version of the Chronicle of Wajoq begins with the words *Ia naé sureq poada-adaé nngi pammulanna Arunngé ri Cinnotabbi* 'This is the *sureq* that tells of the beginnings of the rulers of Cinnotabbi' (Noorduyn 1955:154), and the *Latoa*, a compilation of sayings and opinions of former rulers and wise men, with *Ia naé sureq poada-adaé nngi bicaranna Latoa* 'This is the *sureq* that tells of the sayings of Latoa' (Matthes 1864-1872, II:1; Mattulada 1985:104).⁸

⁷ Pelras's earlier mentioned strict dichotomy between *sureq* and *lontaraq* in which only texts from the *La Galigo* belong to the *sureq* type, a dichotomy he does not elaborate on or mentions sources for, might be based on these remarks by Mattulada. That *La Galigo* is not composed by humans is an opinion that is not common; besides Mattulada's statement I have never come across it. Whenever the authorship of *La Galigo* is discussed it focuses on Sawérigading's son I La Galigo being it's author or not (see Raffles 1817, II:clxxxviii; Dajoh 1957:19; Nyompa 1992, II:40).

⁸ In the manuscript (NBG 120) this phrase is followed by *lontaraqna tau Ugiqé 'lontaraq* of the Bugis people' (Mattulada 1985:80). Most likely this was included by the writer of the manuscript, Colliq Pujié from Tanété, because the manuscript was written for the Dutchman B.F. Matthes on his request (Matthes 1872:108-109, 1875:48). Many more examples of the use of *sureq* for texts that are regarded as *lontaraq* are available. See, for example, PPN 11/12, 14/18, 20/26, 26/9; Matthes 1864-1872, I:537, 571, 581; Mulya 1985/1986:1; Hidayah (ed.) 1992/1993:9; Caldwell 1988:106. Matthes translated the

Sultan Ahmad as-Salleh Syamsuddin of Boné (ruled 1775-1812) referred to the daily register (or diary) he kept as *sureq bilang* (Omar 2003:31). On the other hand, the word *lontaraq* is only occasionally used to introduce a particular text.⁹ Often introductions of texts only say *Ia naé poada-adaé nngi ...* 'This is what tells of ...', or *Pasaleng panessaé nngi ...* 'This is what sets out ...'.¹⁰ In other instances a text can be introduced as being a tale, *pau* or *pau-pau*, a story, *carita*, or an account, *rampé-rampé*.¹¹ Chronicles usually are presented as *attoriolong* 'that which concerns the ancestors' (for example, Matthes 1864-1872, I:502, 520).

Apparently the meaning of the word *sureq* thus is traditionally not restricted to those texts that can be described as purely or mainly *belles lettres*, whereas *lontaraq* rarely occurs as a term that refers to a particular text. In his Bugis-Dutch dictionary (1874), Matthes gives as the meaning of *sureq* 'writing [Dutch *geschrift*], letter',¹² and for *lontaraq* 'used for the palmyra palm, *Borassus flabelliformis*, of which the leaves are used to write on with a stylus; therefore also used for a palmyra leaf; hence, a writing [Dutch *een geschrift*], a book, a letter'. In the supplement to the dictionary (Matthes 1889) the synonyms for 'alphabet', *ina sureq* and *ina lontaraq*, are given. The terms thus appear to carry an almost identical meaning. Apart from *lontaraq* being used to refer to the palmyra palm and its leaves, the main difference is the meaning 'a book' for *lontaraq*, which is not mentioned under *sureq*. However, in the Bugis-Indonesian dictionary compiled by Ide Said (1977) that distinction is much less clear. There the meanings 'book' (*buku*) and 'letter' (*surat*) are given for *sureq*, whereas *lontaraq* is translated as 'palmyra palm' (*lontar*) and 'manuscripts in the Bugis-Makassar language written in the *lontaraq* script' (*naskah-naskah dalam bahasa Bugis-Makassar yang ditulis dengan huruf Lontarak*). Yet, in both instances the terms seem to refer in the first place to the physical objects on which texts are written and a reference to specific texts and their contents is secondary. There is no indication that either *sureq* or *lontaraq* refers to any particular genre or type of writings or texts.¹³ The two terms are often used interchangeably: *sureq bilang* (Matthes 1943:211; Cense 1966:425) and *lontaraq bilang* (Matthes 1874:sv *lontaraq*) 'daily registers'. Andi Zainal Abidin (1999:4-5) uses both *sureq attoriolong* and *lontaraq attoriolong* for chronicles and explains the Bugis *sureq allaorumang* in Indonesian as *lontaraq pertanian*, 'agricultural *lontaraq*'. In the colophon of a manuscript containing various historiographical texts the manuscript is referred to with both terms, *sureq lontaraqna tana Ugiq 'lontaraq sureq of the Bugis countries'* (LC Bugis (6), cited in Tol 2003:71).

Andi Zainal Abidin (1983:108, 1999:4, 65) has noted that some Bugis are of the opinion that *sureq* is an older term for *lontaraq*, which indeed is very likely. *Lontaraq* is a loan from

title of his *Boegineesche Chrestomathie* (1864-1872), an anthology of Bugis texts, in Bugis as *Ia naé sureq Ugiq sakkeq rupa* 'These are various Bugis *sureq*'.

⁹ Examples can be found in Caldwell (1988:38) *Panessaé nngi lontaraqna manurunngé Simpursia* 'This sets out the writing [*lontaraq*] concerning the one who descended, Simpursia', Caldwell (1988:151) *Naripammula riokiq lontaraq attoriolonngé ri essona Isnaineq* 'The writing of the chronicle was begun on Monday', and CCM 10/3 *Salamaq. Ia naé lontaraq attoriolonngé mula ritimpaqna Wajoq* 'This is the chronicle of the opening up of Wajoq'. In one case a *La Galigo* text is introduced by the words *Iaé lontaraqna Apunna [sic] Wareq, sureq selléang asenna* 'This is the *lontaraq* of Opunna Wareq, called the chanted *sureq*' (SK 14).

¹⁰ See, for example, Matthes 1864-1872, I:465; Ahmad Yunus 1991/1992:16.

¹¹ For example, *Ia naé poada-adaé pau-paunna Sulettanuleq Injlai* 'This is what tells the tale of Sultan Injlai' (Matthes 1864-1872, I:28), and *Ia naé riaseng caritana I Masé-Masé* 'This is what is called the story of I Masé-Masé' (SK 26). See also Sikki (ed.) 1977:1.

¹² Also an example is given, *sureq lopi* 'ship's pass'.

¹³ Dutch *geschrift* can both refer to the physical object and the contents of written texts.

Javanese,¹⁴ whereas *sureq* goes back to proto-South Sulawesi *sura(t), and ultimately to proto-Austronesian *surat 'to write' (Mills 1975:833). Both terms appear to have the same basic meaning, that of a material piece of writing, be it a codex or a palm-leaf manuscript. Besides retaining its original meaning, the earlier term *sureq* developed an additional meaning of piece of writing as a particular work or text, as can be seen from the examples given above. Traditionally, the meaning of *lontaraq* appears not to have referred to particular works, or only did so in a very limited respect; it commonly refers to a codex¹⁵ in its physical form, which can contain one or more texts or works.¹⁶ Disregarding codices containing *La Galigo* materials for the moment (since they generally contain no other materials), a 'typical *lontara*' codex comprises a more or less disparate miscellany of items' (Macknight 1984:105). As a result, the term *lontaraq* has probably obtained a more general connotation of 'writings typically contained in such a codex', without, however, referring to individual works or genres. A.A. Cense, discussing the historiography of the Bugis and Makasar, and referring to daily registers, chronicles, and compilations of writings of various nature, notes that 'for all these writings [Dutch *geschriften*] the loan term *lontaraq* is in use, a word that in general can refer to any written piece, but readily and specifically is used for these kinds of manuscripts with historical contents' (Cense 1951:42-43).¹⁷ In conclusion, it appears safe to assume that traditionally the terms *sureq* and *lontaraq* carry the same semantic value, namely that of a physical object of writing, either a codex or a palm-leaf manuscript. *Sureq* also carries the connotative meaning of 'writing as a composition, a particular text', whereas *lontaraq* in a more specific sense has the connotation 'a codex containing texts of a various nature (often historiographical or practical, but not exclusively so)'. The clear dichotomy *sureq-lontaraq* as a classificatory model of particular types of literature within the corpus of Bugis writings, as introduced in the 1970s and followed by most, if not all, scholars since then, apparently does not find any support in the tradition itself or in earlier scholarly studies. This dichotomy appears to originate from a desire by scholars to clearly classify genres of writing, even when the Bugis themselves traditionally did not feel such a need. Although not explicitly stated, this dichotomy appears to be based on the Western distinction between literature as *belles lettres* – Literature with a capital L – on the one hand and on the other, factual, straightforward and often non-fictional prose writings.

***Toloq* and other types of traditional literature**

If the terms *sureq* and *lontaraq* obviously do not refer to any traditional classification of genres of Bugis writings, one might wonder whether in fact there are other expressions that do so. As mentioned earlier, sometimes other terms are found in the introduction of particular texts; terms that can also refer to orally transmitted narratives. The distinction between these

¹⁴ The Javanese word *lontar* 'palmyra leaf' is a metathesis form of *ron* 'leaf' and *tal* 'palmyra palm'. In Bugis palmyra leaf would be *raung taq* or *daung taq*. It can have entered the Bugis language either directly or via Malay.

¹⁵ It is unknown if the word *lontaraq* in the past ever referred specifically to writings on lontar leaves. Both Bugis and Makasar languages – the latter having two cognate terms to refer to writings, *suraq* and *lontaraq* – have at least since the nineteenth century specific terms to refer to lontar-leaf manuscripts as opposed to manuscripts written on paper: *sureq daung taq* (Matthes 1874) or *lontaraq daung taq* (Cense 1951:42 n.3) in Bugis, or (*lontaraq*) *lékoq balloq* in Makasar (Matthes 1885; Cense 1951:42 n.3, 1979); *daung taq* (Bg) and *lékoq balloq* (Mk) both mean 'lontar leaf'.

¹⁶ Even codices containing episodes of the *La Galigo* are generally referred to as *lontaraq*.

¹⁷ In a later article Cense (1966:425) refers to daily registers as *sureq bilang*.

terms, however, appears to be as vague as those between *sureq* and *lontaraq*. A good illustration is provided by the *Toloq Rumpaqa Boné* (Akhmar 2003), where in the prose introduction, the text is referred to as *sureq* (l. 1), *pau-pau* (ll. 16, 23), as well as *carita* (l. 28). The *Toloqna Arung Labuaja* is introduced by the author as *pau-pau* (Tol 1990:136). The story of the tabby cat is introduced as *Ia naé galigona méong mpalo bolomngédé, rampé-rampéna cokié* ‘the *galigo* of the black tabby cat, the story of the cat’ (Salim 1972:1; Rahman 1990:150). Occasionally manuscripts containing *La Galigo* materials contain an introduction that refers to the contents as *carita* (KITLV Or. 367), *galigo* (Kern 1939:970, Ms. Schoemann VI.11)¹⁸, or as a *téreng* ‘episode’ (CCM 11/7). In a letter to Matthes, Colliq Pujé, the queen mother of Tanété, refers to *La Galigo* texts as *bicaranna Sawérigading* ‘the words of Sawérigading’ (Matthes 1864-1872, II:249), or as *Sureq Galigoé* (Matthes 1864-1872, II:226). The term *bicaranna* is also used, for example, in the introduction of the *Latoa* (Matthes 1864-1872, II:1; Mattulada 1985:104). The expressions *pau-pau*, *rampé-rampé*, *carita* seem to have a general meaning of ‘story, narrative’, and do not refer to a specific genre. *Téreng* refers to an episode of *La Galigo*, while *bicara* appears to refer only to the words or sayings of people. The word *galigo* has different meanings; it can refer a narrative (for example, the story of the tabby cat, or, in one instance, to a *La Galigo* text). In the Wajo region, however, *galigo* is the common term for what in other Bugis-speaking regions of South Sulawesi is referred to as *élong*, three-line non-narrative poems. Texts belonging to the *La Galigo* are in that area called *sureq selléang* ‘chanted *sureq*’, or *carita Sawérigading* ‘Story of Sawérigading’. The term *galigo* is only incidentally used with the meaning of ‘story’, and then only refers to metrical texts.¹⁹

Whereas the corpus of Bugis literature, written or orally transmitted, appears to defy a clear division in broader categories of different types of works, there are clear delineations of particular genres. *Attoriolong*, for example, are chronicles, written in prose and concerning the history of a specific kingdom, built around the genealogy of the royal house. *Élong* (*galigo* in Wajo) are three-line, non-narrative poems, and *sureq bilang* (or *lontaraq bilang*) daily registers. For one genre some confusion exists, *toloq*, usually translated as ‘heroic poem’. These are narrative poems, composed in an eight-syllabic metre and making use of a literary language that has much in common with the language used in *La Galigo* texts (but see below). The current authority on *toloq* texts, Roger Tol, also states that their contents are of a ‘heroic-historical’ nature (Tol 1990:20); Matthes, however, also includes other types of octosyllabic narrative poems in the category of *toloq*. In his dictionary (Matthes 1874) he defines *toloq* as ‘a kind of poem, sometimes a heroic song, sometimes of a romantic, and sometimes of an erotic nature’. In the comments to his edition of the *Ménrurana Petta Malampéqé Gemmeqna* he presents a more elaborate description, stating that the poem

belongs to the *toloq*, a kind of long poems, somewhat comparable to the Malay *syair*, and, like these, sometimes of an epic nature [...], sometimes of a romantic, sometimes of an erotic, and sometimes of another nature. The metre of such a *toloq* always consists of feet of eight syllables with the stress on the penultimate and feet of seven syllables with the stress on the ultimate syllable. (Matthes 1872:248.)

¹⁸ Kern (1939:970 n.1) remarks that this use of the word *galigo* is ‘strange’ and he only came across this particular usage in a few manuscripts in the Schoemann collection.

¹⁹ Chandra (1970:71) mentions a *Galigona La Menrurana*, which might refer to the *toloq* with Arung Palakka as its main character; that, however, would not comply with Chandra’s remark that this text is usually read at weddings. The latter makes it more likely that it refers to a *La Galigo* text.

In accordance with this definition he classifies the story of the tabby cat, which is composed in the octosyllabic metre, as *tolog* (Matthes 1875:70). Yet, other octosyllabic texts he does not explicitly classify as *tolog* (for example, the *Sureq Baweng*; see Matthes 1872:138-139, 1875:60).

If Matthes' explanations of what a *tolog* is are taken as a starting point, and one takes the octosyllabic metre and the use of literary language as the defining characteristic of *tolog* texts, then the aforementioned works, as well as, for example, the story of *La Padoma Énnaja* and the *Sureq Manajéng To Gaggana Tana Wajo* (Palippui et al. 1993/1994) should be classified as *tolog*.²⁰ The tradition itself is of little help here, since to my knowledge there are no texts that introduce themselves as *tolog*. What all these texts have in common – besides the metre and language – as compared to the two other main narrative written genres *La Galigo* and the chronicles, *attoriolong*, is that they are not built around a genealogy (Tol 1996:230). They are either of a biographical nature (for example, *Toloqna Arung Labuaja*, *Ménruranana Petta Malampéqé Gemmeqna* and *La Padoma Énnaja*), or describe one particular event over a limited (but not necessarily short) period of time (*Toloq Rumpaqa Boné*, *Toloqna Daéng Kalebbuq*, *Sureq Baweng*, and *Sureq Manajéng To Gaggana Tana Wajo*).²¹ The all important genealogies that form the backbone of *La Galigo* and *attoriolong*, and which are essential to their authority, are absent from *tolog* texts. It is telling that the author Arung Manajéng places the historical and genealogical information that serve as the background to his *Toloq Rumpaqa Boné*, in the prose introduction to his poem (Akhmar 2003:36-45).²²

The heroic poems, often exclusively identified as *tolog*, share a characteristic that distinguishes them from the non-heroic *tolog* and that points to another label that might be more appropriately attached to them. All heroic-historical *tolog* begin with and show an abundant use throughout the text of the formula *makkedi la ménrurana* 'The ménrurana says', a formula not found in the non-heroic *tolog*.²³ *Ménrurana*, in Matthes's dictionary (1874) only explained as an Old Bugis word for 'ruler, king', is commonly used to refer to the most well-known heroic poem, *Ménruranana Petta Malampéqé Gemmeqna* 'Ménrurana of the Lord with the Long Hair' that narrates the adventures of the most famous ruler of Boné, Arung Palakka (c. 1635-1696), but can also refer to other heroic *tolog* (Fachruddin 1999:79; Tol 1990:20). *Ménrurana* is thus probably traditionally the most proper term to refer to the heroic poems and as such form a sub-genre within the broader category of *tolog*, octosyllabic, narrative poems. Since these heroic *tolog* make up the large majority of octosyllabic poems,

²⁰ The term *sureq manajéng* might have been taken from the name of the well-known writer of, for example, the *Toloq Rumpaqa Boné* and the *Toloqna Arung Labuaja*, I Mallaq Daéng Mabéla Arung Manajéng, who lived in the early twentieth century (see Tol 1990:35-37). A *manajéng* is, according to Palippui et al. (1993-1994:4) a Bugis literary work that has a tendency to a 'novel' (BI *roman*) and is composed in an octosyllabic metre, like a *tolog* or the *Méong Mpalo Karellé*.

²¹ See also Tol (1990:20).

²² He does the same with fewer words in the prose introduction to the *Toloqna Arung Labuaja*, where he sets out the hero's descent (Tol 1990:136).

²³ The variants *ménrirana* and *ménrarana* occur often too (Tol 1990:20). The use of the latter two variants instead of *ménrurana* is likely to be caused by the wish to avoid the association of *ménrurana* with the very coarse word *ménruq* 'to fuck'. An exception to the rule that the formula *makkedi la ménrurana* occurs abundantly in heroic *tolog*, is the *Toloqna Musuq Boné* in which it never occurs (Matthes 1862; Tol 1990:34).

the term *toloq* appears also to be used with the more restricted meaning of heroic *toloq*, for which the term *ménrurana* would be more appropriate.²⁴

***Toloq*: Authority and/or poetry?**

To conclude the discussion of Bugis literary genres, Tol's analysis that *toloq* (in his understanding, heroic *toloq*) is the Bugis literary genre *par excellence* needs to be addressed. His reasoning is that because they hold a position between the poetic *La Galigo* texts and the prose *attoriolong*, chronicles, they are an intermediary genre between *sureq* and *lontaraq* and share the qualities of both (Tol 1990:30-32, 1996:228-230). However, as has been shown above, the *sureq-lontaraq* dichotomy does not in fact exist in the Bugis literary tradition. While, undeniably, the heroic *toloq* make use of a substantial part of the literary idiom as found in the *La Galigo*, the language of *toloq* also shows considerable differences with that of the *La Galigo*.

The most manifest of the differences in language use is the much more frequent use of loanwords that originate in European languages and Arabic. Examples of these are *koronéliq* 'colonel', *kompania* 'company (the Netherlands Indies authorities)', *sorodadu* 'soldier', *kadéra* 'chair', *lantéra* 'lamp'. Most of these terms refer to new concepts or objects introduced to the Bugis world. Existing concepts, however, can also be expressed in newly introduced words: *karéba* 'news' for *biritta*, *pikkiriq* 'think' for *mannawa-nawa*, *pahang* 'understand' for *isseng*, or *bandéra* 'flag, banner' for *tanra-tanra* or *tompiq*. In some instances words regularly occurring in *La Galigo* texts do not occur at all in *toloq*: *joncongeng* 'ship', for example, while the common word for ship, *lopi*, which is not used in the *La Galigo*, occurs frequently, as does the loanword *kappalaq*. The metric filler *lé*, most important in the *La Galigo*, does not occur in *toloq*, while the most frequent metric filler in *toloq*, *béla* or *la béla*, only incidentally is used in the *La Galigo*. The *toloq* register also appears to have its own specific expressions, for example, *pabbaju éja* for 'beautiful girls'. This expression is not found in *La Galigo* texts, while the latter's more or less equivalent *ati goari* 'heart of the room' and *liseq sinrangeng* 'passenger of a palanquin' do not occur in *toloq*. Another difference between *toloq* and *La Galigo* texts is that in the first the use of synonyms is more limited. For example, the Old Bugis term for gold, *sodda*, abundant in *La Galigo* is not used in *toloq*. Although this is not an exhaustive comparison of the vocabulary found in *toloq* and *La Galigo* texts it is sufficient to indicate that there are considerable differences between the language of these two genres. In many respects they do make use of the same lexicon, however their respective styles differ to a large extent. Further research is needed to determine the exact relation between the language of these two genres, as well as other Bugis poetical works, but it appears that there are such differences that it is not accurate to regard the language of all Bugis poetry as one language (see Tol 1990:7).

The historiographical subject matter these *toloq* share with *attoriolong* also differs significantly among the two genres. *Attoriolong* are essentially an elaboration of a genealogical core.²⁵ The genealogy defines the whole narrative and basically grants these texts great authority within the community of a particular kingdom or chiefdom. These are the

²⁴ The Bugis author Daéng Mamangung wrote around 1850 about *toloq* that these were 'especially appropriate to be sung during war since they make the heart passionate and firm' (cited in Tol 1990:33). He thus also most likely regarded the term *toloq* as referring primarily to heroic *toloq*.

²⁵ Tol (1990:31) notes the absence of long genealogies in *toloq* as opposed to chronicles. However, he does not address the structural difference that chronicles are, in contrast to *toloq*, basically a genealogical core around which the narrative is built.

genealogies that sanction the position of the ruling line. Such authority, based on a solid genealogy, the chronicles share with the *La Galigo* which in its essence also is no more than an elaborated genealogy. Seen from this perspective *La Galigo* and *attoriolong* have structurally much more in common than either of these genres have with heroic *tolog*, that even appear to intentionally exclude genealogical references in their texts (see the example of *Tolog Rumpaqa Boné* and *Toloqna Arung Labuaja* above). Proper descent is the source of authority, not only in Bugis literary works, but also in daily life; in this light, one can wonder if *tolog* really are authoritative texts as is proposed by Tol (1990:30-31). Or do they perhaps deliberately defy being authoritative? By treating as their subject matter the lives of individual heroes or particular events not taking longer than a period of one generation the authors of heroic *tolog* avoid being restricted by the accuracy of accepted genealogies and histories, which provides them with the freedom to bring to the fore their own view and interpretation of historical persons and events. *Tolog* appear not to be authoritative but, on the contrary, anti-authoritative, or perhaps anti-traditional. Whereas the authors of traditional works like *La Galigo* and the chronicles are unknown (they had no individual author), the author of almost all heroic *tolog* are known by name. By ignoring the rules that existed for traditional literary compositions, albeit at the same time making use of some of the literary techniques, the individual authors created a space to tell a story that was different from the accepted histories, but also was similar enough to be accepted by the traditional audience, rulers and common people alike. Like the *Hikayat Abdullah* in the Malay speaking world they appear to have heralded the farewell of purely traditional literature, and the arrival of a form of modern Bugis literature, in which the author stepped out of the shadow of the text. Unfortunately, and unlike Munshi Abdullah in Malaka, the authors of *tolog* have not been blessed with a considerable amount of successors, and Bugis 'modern' literature never stepped beyond the initial stages of the *tolog*. Bugis literature, be it in the form of *tolog*, *sureq*, *lontaraq*, or any other type, has become a relic of the past, or, to speak in the words of La Side (1968:67) is 'museumized' (*digedungartjakan*).

References

Manuscripts from the following collections

CCM	Microfilms made by C.C. Macknight in 1971; copy in Leiden University Library
KITLV	Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Leiden
LC	Library of Congress, Washington
NBG	Collection of the Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap on permanent loan in Leiden University Library
PPN	Microfilms of Proyek Pelestarian Naskah, Makassar
SK	Photocopies of manuscripts in the collection of Sirtjo Koolhof

Published sources

Adel, Edith van den. 1991. *Sureq Baweng*. M.A. thesis, Leiden University.

Ahmad Yunus, H., et al. 1991/1992. *Lontarak Luwu daerah Sulawesi Selatan*. S.l.: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

- Akhmar, Andi M. 2003. *Toloq Rumpaqna Boné: Edisi teks dan kajian kesastraan*. Makassar: Masagena Press.
- Caldwell, Ian. 1988. South Sulawesi A.D. 1300-1600; Ten Bugis texts. Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Cense, A.A. 1951. Eenige aantekeningen over Makassaars-Boeginese geschiedschrijving. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 107:1-19.
- Cense, A.A. 1966. Old Buginese and Macassarese diaries. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 122:416-428.
- Chandra, Indra. 1970. Persadjakan ditanah Bugis. *Bingkisan* 3-5/6:70-83.
- Dajoh, M.R. 1957. Memperkenalkan: H.S. Daeng Moentoe; Tokoh sastra, agama dan politik di Sulawesi. *Lagaligo* 1(5/6):19-20.
- Fachruddin Ambo Enre. 1983. Ritumpanna Wélenrénggé; Telaah filologis sebuah episode sastra Bugis klasik Galigo. Ph.D. thesis Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Fachruddin Ambo Enre. 1999. *Ritumpanna Wélenrénggé; Sebuah episode sastra Bugis klasik Galigo*. Naskah dan Dokumen Nusantara Seri 14. Jakarta: École Française d'Extrême-Orient/Fakultas Sastra Universitas Indonesia/Yayasan Obor.
- Hidayah, Zulyani (ed.). 1992/1993. *Lontarak Soppeng*. S.l.: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Ide Said DM, M. 1977. *Kamus Bahasa Bugis-Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Kern, R.A. 1939. *Catalogus van de Boeginesche, tot den I La Galigo-cyclus behoorende handschriften der Leidsche Universiteitsbibliotheek alsmede van die in andere Europeesche bibliotheken*. Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek.
- Leyden, John. 1811. On the languages and literature of the Indo-Chinese nations. *Asiatic Researches* 10:158-289.
- Macknight, C.C. 1984. The concept of a "work" in Bugis manuscripts. *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 18:103-114.
- Matthes, B.F. 1862. *Boeginesch heldendicht op den eersten Bonischen veldtocht van 1859*. Makassar: Eekhout.
- Matthes, B.F. 1864-1872. *Boeginesche chrestomathie*. Makassar: Sutherland, Amsterdam: Spin. 2 vols.
- Matthes, B.F. 1872. *Aanteekeningen op de Boeginesche chrestomathie*. Amsterdam: Spin.
- Matthes, B.F. 1874. *Boeginesch-Hollandsch Woordenboek met Hollandsch-Boeginesche woordenlijst en verklaring van een tot opheldering bijgevoegden ethnographischen atlas*. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.
- Matthes, B.F. 1875. *Kort verslag aangaande alle mij in Europa bekende Makassaarsche en Boeginesche handschriften, vooral die van het Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap te Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap.
- Matthes, B.F. 1885. *Makassaarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, met Hollandsch-Makassaarsche woordenlijst, en verklaring van een tot opheldering bijgevoegden ethnographischen atlas*. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.
- Matthes, B.F. 1889. *Supplement op het Boeginesch-Hollandsch woordenboek*. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.

- Matthes, B.F. 1943. Beknopt verslag van een paar tochten in de binnenlanden van Celebes, gedurende de jaren 1857 en 1861. In H. van den Brink (ed.), *Dr. Benjamin Frederik Matthes; Zijn leven en arbeid in dienst van het Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap*. Amsterdam: Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap, 189-220. [Originally published 1862.]
- Mattulada. 1975. Latoa; Satu lukisan analitis terhadap antropologi politik orang Bugis (A descriptive analysis of the political-anthropology of the Buginese). Ph.D. thesis, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Mattulada. 1978. Pre-islamic South Sulawesi. In H. Soebadio and C.A. du Marchie Sarvaas (eds), *Dynamics of Indonesian history*. Amsterdam/New York/Oxford: North-Holland, 123-140.
- Mattulada. 1985. *Latoa; Satu lukisan analitis terhadap antropologi politik orang Bugis*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Mills, Roger F. 1975. Proto South Sulawesi and Proto Austronesian phonology. Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Mulya, Abdul Kadir. 1985/1986. *Surek panngajakna nabitta Muhammad SAW*. Jakarta: Proyek Penerbitan Buku Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Noorduyn, J. 1955. *Een achttiende-eeuwse kroniek van Wadjo'; Buginese historiografie*. 's-Gravenhage: Smits. [Ph.D. thesis, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.]
- Nyompa, H.M. Johan et al. 1988. *Peperangan Karaeng Tompo dengan La Galigo di Cina (suatu studi terhadap naskah klasik I La Galigo)*. Ujung Pandang: Fakultas Adab IAIN Alauddin.
- Nyompa, Johan. 1992. *Mula Tau (Satu studi tentang mitologi orang Bugis)*. [Ujung Pandang]: Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Omar, Rahillah. 2003. The history of Boné A.D. 1775-1795: The diary of Sultan Ahmad as-Salleh Syamsuddin. Ph.D. thesis, University of Hull.
- Palippui, H., Muhammad Hatta and Aminuddin Palippui. 1993/1994. *Surek Manajeng, Togaggana Tana Wajo; Transliterasi dan terjemah naskah tua*. Sengkang: Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat I Sulawesi Selatan.
- Pelras, Christian. 1975. Introduction a la literature Bugis. *Archipel* 10:239-67.
- Pelras, Christian. 1979. L'oral et l'écrit dans la tradition Bugis. *Asie du sud-est et monde insulindien* 10-2,3,4:271-297.
- Pelras, Christian. 1996. *The Bugis*. The peoples of South-East Asia and The Pacific. Oxford/Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Raffles, Thomas Stamford. 1817. *The history of Java*. 2 vols. London: Black, Parbury and Allen/Murray.
- Rahman, Nurhayati. 1990. Episode Meong Palo Bolonge dalam La Galigo (Satu kajian filologi sastra Bugis klasik). [Tesis S2, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung.]
- Rahman, Nurhayati. 1998. Sompeqna Sawérigading lao ri Tana Cina (Episode Pelayaran Sawérigading ke Tanah Cina); Analisis filologi dan semiotik I La Galigo. Ph.D. thesis, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.]
- Salim, Muh. 1972. *Pangajaqna méompalo*. S.l.: Kantorog Pembinaan Kebudayaan Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappeng.
- Side, La. 1968. Akan kita gedung artja-kankah bahasa Bugis? *Bingkisan Jajasan Kebudajaan Sulawesi Selatan dan Tenggara* 2-1:62-71.

- Sikki, Muhammad (ed.). 1977. *Terjemahan beberapa naskah lontara Bugis*. S.l.: Proyek pengembangan bahasa dan sastra Indonesia dan daerah, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Sikki, Muhammad and J.S. Sande (eds). 1983. *Cerita Lapadoma*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Simsar, Muhammed A. (ed.) 1978. *Tales of a parrot by Ziya'u'd-din Nakhshabi*. Cleveland/Graz: Cleveland Museum of Art/Akademische Druck u. Verlagsanstalt.
- Sirk, Ülo. 1996. *The Buginese language of traditional literature*. Moscow.
- Tang, Muhammad Rapi. 2000. La Padoma Ennaja; Sebuah legenda dalam sastra Bugis klasik. *Warta ATL* 6(6):30-40.
- Tol, Roger. 1990. *Een haan in oorlog, Toloqna Arung Labuaja; Een twintigste-eeuws Buginees heldendicht van de hand van I Mallaq Daéng Mabéla Arung Manajéng*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 141. Dordrecht/Providence: Foris.
- Tol, Roger. 1996. A separate empire; Writings of South Sulawesi. In: A. Kumar and J.H. McGlynn (eds), *Illuminations: the writing traditions of Indonesia featuring manuscripts from the National Library of Indonesia*. Jakarta/New York/Tokyo: Lontar Foundation/Weatherhill, 213-230.
- Tol, Roger. 2003. Pengembaraan La Galigo ke Washington D.C. (memperkenalkan Husin bin Ismail, seorang Bugis terpelajar di Singapura). In Nurhayati Rahman, Anil Hukma and Idwar Anwar (eds), *La Galigo; Menelusuri jejak warisan sastra dunia*. Makassar/Barru: Pusat Studi La Galigo, Universitas Hasanuddin/Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Barru, 59-78.
- Winstedt, Richard. 1996. *A history of classical Malay literature*. MBRAS Reprint 12. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- Zainal Abidin, Andi. 1983. *Persepsi orang Bugis, Makasar tentang hukum, negara dan dunia luar*. Bandung: Alumni.
- Zainal Abidin, Andi. 1999. *Capita selecta kebudayaan Sulawesi Selatan*. Ujungpandang: Hasanuddin University Press.