Variation in Bugis Manuscripts

CC Macknight and IA Caldwell

'Voor een beschrijving van de geschiedenis

van Z.W. Celebes is een philologisch en

historisch-critisch onderzoek van de producten der

Makasaarse en Buginese historiografie onontbeerlijk.'

Noorduyn 1955:stellingen

'Writing the history of Southwest Sulawesi

inescapably involves an investigation,

by philologists and critical historians,

of the products of Makasar and Bugis historiography.'

after Noorduyn 1955:stellingen

This paper looks at the ways in which manuscript copies of works written within the Bugis traditional context in South Sulawesi differ one from another; it then explores the consequences of these variations for the modern editor. This consideration of the form of manuscripts has arisen from our efforts to use the content of these manuscripts to write history. While much of our discussion is necessarily detailed and precisely focussed on Bugis materials, we are also conscious of more general issues concerning the use of sources created in other technological and cultural contexts.

These more general issues have been extensively investigated in relation to oral sources for much of this century. More recently, the implications of printing have been elucidated and even the effects of more modern technology have been discussed. The study of manuscripts, however, is far older and, it could be argued, lies at the heart of the European humanist tradition. Yet, it is no simple matter to take over the methods of studying the Latin, Greek and Hebrew texts of the European tradition into other cultural contexts, and it is important not to assume

that cultural categories can be easily transferred from one situation to another. In each cultural and historical context, each issue, such as the purpose of committing information to writing, the expected readership or the mechanics of creating a manuscript record, needs to be examined afresh.

At first glance, Bugis manuscripts appear relatively straightforward. Since the early nineteenth century, scholars have collected many such materials in South Sulawesi which are now stored in European collections, in Jakarta, in Makassar and to a minor extent elsewhere. Within Bugis-speaking communities themselves, many people, especially those with connections to the former courts, still hold manuscripts. Most existing manuscripts date from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, though a few rare examples may be older. The contents cover a very wide range of genres and subjects.[1]

In discussing these matters, it is essential to use the English terms precisely. Some words are so vague or ambiguous that they are perhaps better avoided altogether, such as, for example, 'book' or 'author'. The following description of the process of creating and using a manuscript is intended to define certain terms for later use in this paper. The more important of these terms are italicized. A *scribe* writes a *text* (any written representation of language) either with ink on the pages of a codex or, prior to the introduction of paper and occasionally since, by incision on a palm leaf strip which is then sewn end to end with others to form a strip-roll (Macknight 1986: 222). This text may be newly created by the scribe (a so-called autograph) or the scribe may *copy* a pre-existing written text or *represent* an oral *performance*. Note that the term 'copy' does not necessarily imply an exact copy, but merely a *version* of the *model*. In the same way, a written *representation* of spoken (or sung) words cannot normally convey intonation, accent or other subsidiary information, and there are often verbal differences between what is spoken and what is written. The result of the scribe's work is a *manuscript*. This manuscript allows access to the words of the text either by *silent reading* or (perhaps more commonly for manuscript texts) by *reading aloud*, whether as a mumble or as declamation or, for an audience, by *hearing* the reader's voice.

An important concept, to be distinguished from those so far introduced, is that of a *work.* In a previous paper Macknight (1984) has explored the concept of a work in the sense of a body of text which, once at least, possessed a unity of some sort in the mind of its creator. This unity is often shown by some form of internal structure. Such a definition does not preclude the quotation of other material in a work nor misunderstanding and misuse of a work by readers and, especially, later copyists. The first or newly created version of a work may be oral, and later written down. The written work may then be presented orally. Pelras (1979) deals extensively with the close inter-relationship of the spoken and written in Bugis literature, and describes how a work may move back and forth between the two registers. To conclude our definitions, in this paper we are concerned with variations between various manuscript versions of works.

These materials are written, for the greater part at least, in the standard Bugis-Makasar script.[2] Caldwell (1988, 1998) has argued that writing was introduced into Bugis society about AD 1300, and that the easiest assumption is that the system and form of this writing were fairly closely related to the standard script of later centuries. While the system of the script shows its ultimate Indic derivation — one is tempted to suggest the neologism of an aksary from the Sanskrit word *aksara* for its basic characters — its immediate source is by no means clear. The form of the characters as a whole cannot be related in any systematic way to any other set of characters. In several respects the script is deficient in representing the language; in its standard form, it does not indicate double consonants or most glottal stops, both of which are productive elements in Bugis. Another deficiency in the script is the lack of any means of 'suppressing the vowel', that is indicating a consonant without a following vowel. This limitation can be tolerated because of a peculiarity of the major South Sulawesi languages: syllables may only conclude with an open vowel, a nasal or a glottal stop (the last two are often assimilated to a following consonant). Such a limitation would be impractical for most languages and it is important to note that this limitation is not shared either by superficially similar scripts such as

those from Sumatra (Jaspan 1964) or by those from Java with which easy historical links can be made.[3]

The script is thus limited to showing a series of consonant + vowel units or plain vowels. It can be represented in Latin script by upper case consonants and lower case vowels, thus Bo.Né, and using Q for the 'blank' consonant. Two slight refinements to this system are used irregularly. Firstly, there are four 'pre-nasalized' consonants, so that one can write Qa.Ru.MPo.Né for Arumponé (but one also finds Qa.Ru.Po.Né). Secondly, the intervocalics or glides -Y- and -W- can indicate the absence of a glottal stop after the first of certain adjacent vowels (but one finds, for example, both Go.Wa and Go.Qa for the major Makasar state and thus the absence of the intervocalic character is not a reliable guide to the presence of a glottal stop).

Whatever the general similarities between the Bugis-Makasar writing system and other scripts in the archipelago, we would stress the need, particularly at this stage of research, to focus on the specific nature of the Bugis case. Not only is the system itself distinctive — it is not just the Malay or Javanese systems with differently formed characters — but the social, cultural and even technological context is that of South Sulawesi, not elsewhere. Thus, for example, there are no stone or metal inscriptions comparable with those in the western parts of the archipelago and the use of palm-leaf as a writing medium is radically different from that in other traditions.

However careful, talented and experienced a scribe may have been, it is almost inevitable that a manuscript version of a work will vary from the model from which it was copied. Indeed, one should not assume any intention by the scribe to produce an identical text, except in the case of forgery, of which we know no examples. The most common form of variation (with which we do not deal in this paper) is the individual form of the characters or letters by which one might recognize the handwriting of particular individuals or, in a more general sense, the handwriting

of particular periods and educational backgrounds. There are also relatively rare examples of improvements, or at least changes, to the script's system. While there may perhaps be some scope for a more systematic study of Bugis and Makasar paleography, even the broad outlines of the script's historical development are not yet established.[4] More useful information on most manuscripts is likely to come from a study of the paper on which the text is written. The variation with which this paper deals concerns greater or smaller differences in the sequence of characters on the page, using the standard script. We distinguish five levels of variation, each larger than the last in the extent of difference.

1.   Script alternatives. The script itself, despite its limitations described above, also allows some alternative renderings of the same spoken word. A very common example is the word *naia*, which often does little more than introduce a new sentence. Strictly, this should be rendered Na.Qi.Ya, but one also finds Na.Qi.Qa. and, as an abbreviation, Na.Yi. Similarly, the pre-nasalized characters, –NGKa–, –MPa–, –NRa– and –NYCa–, which are used in writing Bugis (but not Makasar), are by no means always used, and the same word can be rendered variously on the same page.

2.   Scribal errors. The standard of accuracy in spelling, syntax and other formal requirements is usually quite high within the Bugis tradition, but examples can be found of all the usual slips: repetition of phrases, omissions, incorrect or incomplete characters, and so on. As we shall show, there are particular problems in representing words from other languages. While this level of variation encompasses several kinds of mistake, arising from different processes in the mind of the scribe, they all involve some formal error. It would be possible to distinguish and analyse various categories of error found in the specific circumstances of Bugis, just as is commonly done in the context of other scripts and languages, but our concern here is with broader levels of variation between manuscripts.

3.   Alternative wording. In prose and even in some cases in verse, it is possible to substitute one word for another word of similar meaning, to add or

subtract a descriptive phrase or personal name, without significantly changing the sense conveyed. Such differences cannot be put down to error since both copy and, presumably, model are formally correct; the easiest explanations are concerns on the part of the scribe for clarity or for euphony. Such a suggestion, however, implies a more casual attitude towards maintaining the exact comparability of model and copy than that which we are used to in the Western tradition. We may also expect some genres to be more affected than others by variations of this type, reflecting in turn perhaps differences in the intended use for a manuscript.

4.   Changes in content. This means introducing content which could not be derived from the model or omitting content so that the substantive meaning of the model is not transferred to the copy. It may sometimes be hard to draw an entirely firm line between this level of variation and the previous one. The most common occasion for additions is the scribe's desire to explain or specify something that seems obscure, though the result may not always help a modern reader. Omission at this level of variation must involve a conscious decision by the copyist, rather than mere scribal error. Another way of describing this level of variation is to say that the scribe has shown as little concern with integrity of the model's content as with its form.

5.   Structural change. The limits to this level are somewhat uncertain on both extremes. On the one side, there can be no clear measure as to how many or how great changes in content, as just described, need to be before the variation can be described as structural change. On the other side, the demarcation between large-scale, structural variations among the versions of one work and the creation of separate works may require a degree of judgement. Two examples, however, illustrate the utility of this level of analysis. The process of oral composition for performances of the I La Galigo epic involves, by definition, the re-creation of material at each performance and yet the oral composers will maintain that they are merely reproducing a particular work. It would be inappropriate to separate the manuscript representations of oral performances which, in the oral register, are kept together by their creators. A second example can be seen in texts that begin with

several paragraphs which are versions of passages in the Chronicle of Boné and degenerate into a mere list of rulers. These texts are wholly dependent on some version of the complete chronicle and it seems sensible to describe them as yet further versions of that work, albeit at the limit of variation.

The first three levels of variation can tell us a little about scribal practice. Close comparison of texts, as illustrated by a few specific examples below, suggests that transmission from one manuscript version to another was, essentially, by way of sound rather than by the appearance of the writing. In practical terms, the scribe may have read aloud the words taken from the model text and then written down the characters representing those heard sounds, or the reader and the scribe may have been different individuals. There is undoubtedly some degree of phonetic realization in most contexts where copying is involved — as also in the original creation of text — but the nature and prevalence of variation in Bugis manuscripts at the first three levels indicate the particular importance of sound in this tradition.

It is unfortunate that we have almost no direct evidence on the circumstances under which Bugis manuscripts were produced. Particularly for longer texts, it is possible to imagine a reader dictating to one or more scribes or, especially for works in verse, including I La Galigo, it may be a question of somehow representing in writing an orally composed performance. Many Bugis codices, however, seem to be more in the nature of a personal collection of pieces, often quite short, and in these cases it is probably better to think of copying involving only one person. In a letter to Macknight, the late Dr Voorhoeve suggested that such copying by a solitary scribe acting on his own initiative seemed rather 'un-Indonesian', but we would point to the unusually heterogeneous nature of the materials in these codices. Some internal evidence, as discussed below, and the naming of some individual copyists also suggest that the many manuscripts produced at the direct behest of Europeans such as Schoemann, Matthes, and Cense were copied by a solitary scribe from a model manuscript. This is also discussed below. Moreover, the importance of a phonetic realization of the text would not be surprising given the nature of the

script and literacy skills probably somewhat less than those of most modern scholars. There are also many parallels from a wide variety of time and place.[5]

The clearest demonstration of an oral element in transmission is the effectively random variation in the representation of a word such as *naia.* The various script alternatives chosen by a scribe to represent *naia* do not correlate with other distinctions between manuscripts. The same applies to the very variable use of the pre-nasalized consonants and the intervocalics generally as noticed above. The role of sound rather than appearance in the transmission of texts is confirmed by certain scribal errors. For example, in one version of the Chronicle of Boné[6] the scribe has written the meaningless form *kenne'nana* for *genne'nana* or *genne'na* found in many other variants and giving good sense. The substitution of *ke–* for *ge–* is easily explained as an aural slip; there is little resemblance between the two characters. It may also be distinguished from a homophonic substitution — such as 'their' for 'there' — in that the error produces an unfamiliar, as well as meaningless form. This example also illustrates the third level of variation; the second *–na* is a modal suffix indicating completion, but in this particular context it is effectively redundant. Its presence or absence, like the occurrence of script alternatives, is no guide to significant distinctions between manuscripts.

The struggle of the Bugis scribe with materials from another language can be instructive. A case for which we have some external control is the text of the treaty of Bungaya agreed between Sultan Hasanuddin of Goa and Cornelis Speelman, commander of the Dutch East India Company forces, on 18 November, 1667. The Dutch text is given by Stapel (1922:237-47) and both Makasar and Bugis manuscript versions exist in some numbers. It is not clear whether there ever was an 'official' Makasar version and much of the negotiation leading up to the treaty was conducted in Portuguese and Malay (Stapel 1922:179,183), but it seems probable that the Bugis versions derive from the Makasar. Part of Speelman's title was Former Governor of the Coromandel Coast - 'oud Gouverneur van de Cust Chormandel' in the Dutch text. In one Bugis version,[7] this has ended up as '*riolona* [former], *goronadoro* [governor, from the Portuguese governador] *riko, setta,*

koroma[n]délé.'[8] (Commas represent the *pallawa* or line of three dots which punctuate Bugis manuscript texts.) The punctuation division within the attempt to render 'cust' is clear evidence that the meaning of the model (or the model's model) was not understood; the scribe has struggled to represent the sounds derived from the model.

Another version of the same passage displays an instructive variation.[9] This omits Speelman's name and begins '*riolona, goronadoro, kosetta, goronadoro, ma[n]délé.*' While 'cust' has remained as '*kosetta*', the aural similarity of the first two syllables of Coromandel and those of the word for governor seems to have confused the scribe, who was then left with a meaningless three syllables, '*ma[n]délé.*'

Another glimpse into scribal practice is provided in some of the I La Galigo materials among the Schoemann collection in Berlin. These manuscripts seem to have been collected by Schoemann himself, probably in 1849, and may have been copied to meet his request. There are many instances where the scribes have made corrections to their first written version. A mistake is crossed through, surrounded by a ring of dots or even erased; the new, and often obviously correct material is written over the old, or inserted above the line or in the margin as may be convenient. These errors, where they are still legible, take all the forms common at the second level of variation: repetition, omission, and so on. The easiest explanation of the origin of these errors is that a solitary scribe was copying from another manuscript as model. (The matter of an oral element in transmission has already been dealt with.) These Schoemann manuscripts seem not to represent either the performance of an oral composer, where that could be in question, or the spoken dictation of another. Even if dictation were involved initially, there has been a subsequent check by a scribe against the manuscript model.

The third level of variation and some of the difficulties it causes in relating manuscripts can be further illustrated by again referring to versions of the Bungaya treaty. While a Makasar version, in section 17 of the treaty,[10] twice refers merely to the Karaeng to indicate Sultan Hasanuddin of Goa, the two Bugis versions

mentioned above specify '*Karaéngngé, ri Ma[ng]kasa'*' in both cases. The Dutch version differs so much in construction that comparison at this level is not meaningful. More interestingly, this Makasar version of the section omits the word for 'three' against one of the kinds of guns in an inventory of arms, though this is found in both the Dutch and Bugis versions and can be reconstructed from the list's total as given in the Makasar version.

Section three of the treaty deals with material salvaged from two Dutch shipwrecks, those of the *Walvisch* and the *Leeuwin*. The two Bugis versions omit these names and refer to the shipwrecks merely by the place where they occurred. Just to complicate any simple idea of the relationship, the Bugis versions supply the Christian name, Jacob, for the commissary Cau who was involved in this business. This Christian name is not given in section three of the Dutch version, though it could be derived from section one.

Variation at these first three levels fairly closely equates with what Proudfoot (1984) has described as 'white noise' in the transmission of Malay texts. For materials in the South Sulawesi script, however, it is worth drawing these finer distinctions. There are yet other questions that can be investigated through some combination of the nature of the script, the pattern of scribal error and alternative formulations of the same content. To the extent that such variation is a matter of style, rather than error or mere randomness, it may be possible, with a great deal of minute analysis, to develop some sense of the stylistics involved. Another line to pursue is that of dialect and the effect on a text of the particular background of a scribe. Noorduyn (1955:10–11) and Cense in Le Roux (1935:706) draw attention to some dialectal variation of vowels which would be represented in script. In the same way, a legendary work in Bugis dealing with the minor state of Labuaja in the Sinjai area regularly uses *di*-(-) instead of the usual *ri*-(-) as a prefix and preposition.[11] This seems to be consistent with the data available in the systematic linguistic study by Friburg and Friburg (1988: esp. App.B). A point deserving particular attention because of the circumstances surrounding the copying of many nineteenth century manuscripts obtained through the efforts of European collectors is the effect of a

scribe whose primary language was Makasar in copying Bugis works. Macknight and Mukhlis (1979) give several examples of this in the unique manuscript of a work dealing with praus.

Variation at the fourth and fifth levels described above can be termed substantive. Such substantive variation often implies a use or context for the new version different from that of the model or performance from which the new version is taken. The scribe has deliberately added to or reshaped his model in the light of particular requirements. Substantive variations may also arise from factors such as the model missing a page, or lack of time for copying, or lack of space in the new codex.

Substantive variation can be seen in the body of material concerned with maritime law and associated with the name Amanna Gappa. The original version of this work is plausibly attributed to the head of the community of Wajo' traders based in Makassar at the beginning of the eighteenth century (Noorduyn 1987:16). There is no question that this is a work as defined above, in that what was attempted by Amanna Gappa was a codification, even if it derived in large part from older materials. Tobing (1977) has published a very useful edition of one version of the work and in his introduction discusses briefly another 17 versions. If we take just one of these versions[12] and look at how it compares with the published version,[13] the usefulness of our distinctions between levels of variation readily appears. The 21 published sections of the code have been expanded to 36, partly by addition of new material as noted by Tobing (1977:30-1) and partly by the expansion of the treatment of particular topics and the subdivision of sections. This amounts to structural change or level five variation. If we then look at just one short section, numbered five in Tobing and twelve in the longer version,[14] the 16 words of the former equate fairly closely with the first 18 words in the latter; the longer version then supplies another 52 words of elaboration. It is easy to find variation at the first three levels in the closely parallel sections, though that is not our concern here. It is the elaboration, in this case setting out in more detail the duties of various crew members, that exemplifies the fourth level of variation.[15]

We now come to the issue of editorial practice. There is general agreement among philologists working in the literatures of the Indonesian archipelago that most scholars would prefer to have access to a work in a 'diplomatic' text, rather than a 'critical' form. In other words, the first task of an editor is to present as accurately as possible a copy of one version of a work, with any emendations very clearly specified and perhaps with reference to variant readings in other versions or even complete copies of other versions in parallel. There is no cause to dispute this approach with respect to the publication of Bugis materials, especially since the ability of all modern scholars to engage in the aptly-named *divinatio* (or suggesting improvements for which there is no basis in the manuscripts) is so painfully limited by our lack of contextual knowledge.

Direct transcription of a text in the Bugis-Makasar script would be of limited usefulness. A minor complication, however, arises from the process of transliteration into the Latin script. In practice, one needs to distinguish a transliteration style of orthography, that is one which represents in a readable manner the characters and punctuation of a manuscript in a form which allows unambiguous reconstitution, from a standard style of orthography, that is one which meets standards of linguistic consistency. The differences are not substantial. (Both have to be distinguished again from the literal style of consonant and vowel as used above.)

A more important and challenging question is whether it is, or is not, generally useful or indeed possible to apply the critical method or *recensio* to the versions of Bugis works. A *stemma* asserts a phylogenetic relationship between available or asssumed texts. Here it is worth reminding ourselves that even in the world of the Greek and Latin classics, where the ambition of recreating an autograph is, in many cases, not so very far out of reach, the construction of a reliable *stemma* may not be as easy as traditionally supposed. As McDonald remarks in a pithy summary

(1970:1049): 'Seven manuscripts of Aeschylus suggested a *stemma,* seventeen have destroyed it, and there are more manuscripts of Aeschylus!'

There are some cases in which the attempt to establish a *stemma* is neither feasible nor necessary. This would be true for an edition of the autograph of a work or, if there were overwhelming reasons outside the text itself for asserting a close relationship of a copy to the autograph, for an edition of that copy. Where there is only one surviving copy of a work, there is normally little scope for suggesting a *stemma*, though some peculiarities of the text may suggest details of the transmission process, as in the case of the work on praus mentioned above (Mukhlis and Macknight 1979).

Some works, however, are found in a dozen or so versions and it seems attractive to attempt to relate them to each other by means of a *stemma.* These are not necessarily just longer or more important works, since Caldwell (1988) has shown that there are multiple versions of even quite short works. There are undoubtedly even more versions than he lists for his works, since even when catalogues are available, they often fail to distinguish and identify short sections of text. The peculiar difficulty for the critical method with Bugis manuscripts is that, in addition to all the normal limitations of the method, variations especially of level one type (script alternatives) and of level three type (alternative wording) occur randomly and, in some cases, with considerable frequency. Differences between versions of the level four type (changes in content) and level five type (structural change) provide broad indications of relationships, but are unlikely to indicate detailed phylogeny.[16]

A way forward in this difficulty is to make a distinction between grouping and phylogeny. More specifically, one should not allow the utility of grouping particular versions of a work together to lead one directly into attempts to establish a sequence of copying events. The two processes can be kept apart. In the manuscripts of the Chronicle of Boné , for example, it can be suggested on grounds of provenance and from some textual indications that one group of versions has been copied in Makassar and another group is associated with Boné itself. Within

each group, however, the prospects of untangling a neat succession of copying seem slight; there are too many minor differences of level one and level three type and too great a possibility of 'contamination' between versions of such a well-known work.[17] Caldwell (1988) has dealt in detail with the relationships between the various versions of the ten historical works he presents in 'diplomatic' form. It is instructive that he is only able to produce a *stemma* for some of these.[18]

As these various examples make clear, editorial practice may vary from case to case. Even if 'critical' editions present difficulties, the process of grouping versions and the study of alternative readings may help to elucidate particular textual difficulties in the 'diplomatic' edition of a single version. In every case, philology must be a handmaiden for a better understanding of the work in question.

Many of the points made in this paper will seem familiar to philologists working with Javanese, Balinese or Malay texts — and perhaps further afield. The debate on these matters goes back a long way, as van der Molen (1983) has shown and there have been more recent contributions by Brakel, Jones, Kratz, Sweeney and Proudfoot on Malay matters; Worsley, Day, Kumar, Ras, Behrend and Vickers on Javanese and Balinese matters. There is an excellent summary of the many views in Robson (1988). Within the compass available here, we have deliberately avoided drawing parallels on both theoretical and practical grounds. Firstly, it seems worth making the point that the several manuscript traditions across the archipelago should not be lumped together. In addition to the peculiarities of the Bugis-Makasar script, we should expect other features of the various manuscript traditions which do not apply to them all. Secondly, we have sought in this paper to develop, from first principles, concepts which can, with confidence, be used specifically for understanding and editing the Bugis manuscript tradition. We still have much to learn from a close study of the variations in Bugis manuscripts, many of which are, as yet, hardly examined.

REFERENCES

Caldwell, I.A., 1988, South Sulawesi A.D. 1300-1600; Ten Bugis texts. [Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.]

—, 1998, 'The Chronology of the King List of Luwu' to AD 1611', in: Kathryn Robinson and Mukhlis Paeni (eds), *Living through Histories: Culture, History and Social Life in South Sulawesi*, Canberra: Department of Anthropology, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Friberg, T., and B. Friberg, 1988, 'A Dialect Geography of Bugis', *Papers in Western Austronesian Linguistics*, No. 4 (*Pacific Linguistics*, A-79): 303-330.

Jaspan, M.A., 1964, *Folk Literature of South Sumatra: Redjang Ka-Ga-Nga Texts*, Canberra: Australian National University.

Le Roux, C.C.F.M., 1935, 'Boegineesche Zeekarten van den Indischen Archipel', *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* 2nd series, 52:687-714.

McDonald, A.H., 1970, 'Textual Criticism' in: N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard (eds), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd. ed., Oxford: Clarendon.

Macknight, C.C., 1984, 'The Concept of a "work" in Bugis Manuscripts', *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 18 (summer):103-114.

—, 1986, 'Changing Perspectives in Island Southeast Asia', in: D.G. Marr and A.C. Milner (eds), *Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th Centuries*, Singapore and Canberra: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies and Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Macknight, C.C., and Mukhlis, 1979, 'A Bugis Manuscript about Praus', *Archipel* 18:271-282.

Molen, W. van der, 1983, *Javaanse Tekstkritiek: Een Overzicht en een Nieuwe Benadering Geillustreed aan de Kunjarakarna*, Dordrecht: Foris.

Noorduyn, J., 1955, *Een Achttiende-eeuwse Kroniek van Wadjo': Buginese Historiographe*, 's-Gravenhage: Smits.

—, 1987, 'The Wajo' Merchants' Community in Makasar', Paper presented at the South Sulawesi: Trade, Society and Belief workshop, Leiden, 2-6 November 1987.

—, 1991, 'The Manuscripts of the Makasarese Chronicles of Goa and Talloq; an Evaluation', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 147:454-484.

—, 1993, 'Variation in the Bugis/Makasarese Script', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 149:533-570.

Pelras, C., 1979, 'L'Oral et l'écrit dans la tradition Bugis', *Asie du Sud-est et Monde Insulindien* 10:271-297.

Proudfoot, I., 1984, 'Variation in a Malay Folk-tale Tradition', *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 18 (summer):87-102.

Robson, S., 1988, *Principles of Indonesian Philology*, Dordrecht: Foris.

Stapel, F.W., 1939, *Geschiedenis van Nederlandsche Indië* 3, Amsterdam: Van den Vondel.

Timpanaro, S., 1976, *The Freudian Slip; Psychoanalysis and Textual Criticism*, London: NLB.

Tobing, P.O.L., 1977, *Hukum Pelayaran dan Perdagangan Amanna Gappa*, Ujung Pandang: Yayasan Kebudayaan Sulawesi Selatan dan Tenggara.

---

[1] Much material has been microfilmed or photocopied in a series of projects over the last 50 years or so and this has helped to ensure preservation and provide access. Careful cataloguing has hardly begun and is much complicated by the general failure to indicate either authorship, date or title for particular items.

[2] Many texts have a few words or standard phrases in Arabic script and some codices have various items in different scripts. Our attention in this paper, however, is exclusively with materials in the standard Bugis-Makasar script and particular features of that script. Our conclusions probably apply also to materials in the so-called 'Old Makasar' script, but the number of manuscripts in this is very restricted.

[3] The similar lack of means to suppress the vowel in Philippine scripts is so troublesome that there have been numerous attempts to remedy it. This is strong evidence that the Philippine scripts are derived from a South Sulawesi model.

[4] The most helpful recent discussion of the script's development is by Noorduyn 1993. Although this article makes some most interesting suggestions, some worries remain in its methodology and the promised full discussion of all characters in a range of related scripts appears to have been overtaken by Dr Noorduyn's passing. There is also the absence of well-dated, contemporary evidence for the early use of the script.

[5] For a brief discussion of this phenomenon in the European tradition, see Timpanaro 1976:21-2,64. We are not sure of the potential for psychoanalytical discussion of variation in Bugis materials along the lines followed by Timpanaro, but it is possible in theory.

[6] Item 1 in the Netherlands Bible Society (NBG) collection Manuscript 100, held in the Leiden University Library. The particular passage is found on p.2, line 5 from the bottom.

[7] Item 3 in NBG 99.

[8] A vowel mark before '*riko*' suggests that this should perhaps be '*riréko*', but neither word makes sense in this context.

[9] Item 172 in NBG 208.

[10] Illustrated in Stapel 1939: opposite p.342. The original is manuscript 668/216, pp.76-7 in the collection of the Tropical Museum of the Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam. This manuscript is discussed in another connection by Noorduyn 1991:470-3. The passage is written in the so-called 'Old Makasar' script.

[11] Manuscript 67 (in the old catalogue system) of the Yayasan Kebudayaan Sulawesi Selatan dan Tenggara collection. Following Noorduyn 1955 this may be abbreviated to MAK 67.

[12] MAK 130.

[13] This follows the version in MAK 107.

[14] MAK 130:5, lines 1–14.

[15] It would be an interesting exercise to try to determine the particular circumstances which demanded a fuller statement of the legal code. A quick inspection suggests the plausible idea that the longer version represents the fruit of experience and perhaps some technological and social changes. An important

avenue of enquiry would be to consider the history of the codices within which the various versions are found, bearing in mind the added complication that we are dealing in most cases not with the codices used by the society, but with copies commissioned by Europeans.

[16] For texts which are representations of oral composition, it is important not to confuse the relationship of texts with the relationship of performances.

[17] By contrast, Noorduyn (1991:481-3) in his evaluation of the equivalent Makasar material for Goa and Tallo' thought it possible to produce 'the best possible edition of the text [...] taking into consideration all the relevant material in the manuscripts.' He was thus aiming for a critical, rather than a diplomatic edition, and this requires a *stemma*.

[18] In fact, he has a *stemma* for only two of his works. For the other eight, a *stemma* was deemed unnecessary for two, was not attempted for three due to the brevity of the work, for another was made impossible because of having only two versions, for another the differences reflected distinct oral versions, and for the last there were insoluble textual contradictions.