

CHAPTER 4. LINEAGE GROUPS AND HISTORY

4.1 Status Lineages, Genealogies and Lineage Groups

As just explained the social organisation of the Kasepekan Konjo, shown more pronouncedly by the 16th-17th century Makassar, is built around patrilineal aristocratic cores forming the vertical structure within horizontally bilateral kinship space. Gullick (1988:65-75) describes such structures among the 18th-19th century Malay peninsula kingdoms, including Negri Sembilan whose predominantly Minangkabau population otherwise practised matrilineal descent.¹ Gullick describes them as "status lineages" because, unlike the Nuer patrilineal segmentary lineages, they served to mete out status more than to carve society up into descent groups. Palmier (1969) describes the same system among the 20th century Javanese aristocracy, and points out that descendants derive more status from a high title the more recent its tenure by an ancestor.

Fox (1990) notes the existence of superficially different conventions among other Austronesian societies which, however, also allowed the elite to claim a separate origin from commoners, and thus to form socially exclusive descent groups with precedence over restricted resources. The pattern characterises societies which have undergone crowding after an earlier phase of lateral expansion, and reaches its most elaborate expression in "apical demotion systems". In these systems the comparative status of lines and their members is continually reassessed depending on which line, and ultimately which member, holds the most prestigious title. This individual represents the apical point against which other lines (and their members) automatically lose status unless they can curtail their genealogical distance (Fox, 1990).

By applying Fox's model to the South Sulawesi situation we can see why marriages, alongside status, have been the central social preoccupation of the Bugis and Makassar (see especially Millar, 1989). During the 16th and 17th centuries

¹ The same applied in Minangkabau proper (de Josselin de Jong, 1980:10).

a few prominent warlords (e.g. Tunipalangga, Sultan Abdullah, Sultan Sahaduddin) rose and established themselves as the new apical point in their society, leading to a comprehensive reassessment of the respective statuses of their own and other lines. Status was acknowledged through the titles an individual held, while relationships by marriage constituted the link along which a usually patrilineal title could be transmitted. The frequency with which major titles were passed between father- and son-in-law, or grandfather- and grandson-in-law, is shown in Figure 4-1.

Figure 4-1 also provides a comparatively simple example by which to explain the conventions I use in my genealogical diagrams. Time, shown on the vertical scale, is represented in 30-year intervals to reflect average male generation length, and includes a single S.D. error of ten years for the period preceding Tunijallok's birth in 1545 (2.5.1). The symbols for individuals are stretched between upper and lower points which represent dates of birth and death. The acronyms identifying the individuals come from Tables 3-3 to 3-14, including question-marks for people of unrecorded name. Marriages are shown by horizontal lines whose vertical position marks when the marriage occurred. Sometimes the spouses could not be juxtaposed and so the "lines of marriage" cross symbols standing for other individuals, as indicated by the horizontal lines which intrude into a symbol from either side. Individuals resulting from a depicted marriage are joined by a vertical line to the line of marriage. When only one parent is depicted, descent is shown by slanting lines, including slanting bifurcations for full siblings. Dashed lines divide genealogical time-space into the "lineage groups" in which the individuals belong; as the lineage groups are defined on the basis of titles (see below), individuals with more than one of these titles straddle the respective lineage groups.

Further conventions which appear in the subsequent genealogical diagrams (Figures 4-6 to 4-17) are as follows. Although for simplicity's sake, Figure 4-1 does not distinguish between my estimates (which are based on "best-fitting") and recorded dates, the later diagrams use

black dots to identify those years of birth, death and marriage which are precisely known from the texts. Specifically, dots at the top or the bottom of an individual represent stated year of birth and death respectively, while dots at either end of a horizontal "line of marriage" represent a stated year of marriage. Individuals of unknown gender are shown as rectangles. Conjectural genealogical reconstructions are indicated by a question-mark standing outside the symbols. A cross within a symbol indicates that the individual died without leaving any offspring. Long vertical lines of descent (without intervening symbols) are sometimes used to connect a forebear and a distant descendant. Lines of marriage between individuals on opposite sides of the diagram are shown as though the diagram were wrapped around a cylinder, with an arrow from the female partner to the male. Brides of unidentified lineage groups are shown in the lineage group of their husband. Finally, divorces are shown by short paired lines across the line of marriage.

The various lineage groups have been recognised primarily to chart the passage of the major, usually patrilineally inherited titles, so as to demonstrate the relationship between marriage strategies and political change (Tables 4-15 to 4-20). The term "lineage group" embraces variable specificity to reflect the significance of the detail as seen from the position of the Makassar royalty. For instance, since any son of a Gowa or Tallok raja who failed in the succession concurrently lost any direct claim on the title for his sons, he can be considered to have started a new patriline (3.6). Nonetheless the possibility remains that the subsidiary patriline recognised a common interest, namely the elevation of the royal patriline from which they had sprouted, and hence their origins and inclusive patrilineal relationship is charted by labelling them "Gowa Sub-1", "Gowa Sub-2" etc., according to the order in which they had budded off.

But these fine divisions are unwarranted in the case of lesser Makassar status lineages or non-Makassar status lineages. In the former case, the lower status of the

defining title or titles reduced the emphasis on patrilineal descent, thus approximating the pattola described for the Kasepekan Konjo (3.6), and hence the main point of interest was an individual's membership within a bilateral kindred. In the latter case, the fine points of organisation of the Bugis and Nusatenggaran status lineages are not reconstructible from the Makassar sources, while their frequency of marriages with the Makassar lineages can only be analysed statistically if pooled beforehand into useful categories. These generalisations will become clear during analysis. For the moment it is enough to note that the term "lineage group" is deliberately ambiguous to accommodate status lineages within a descent group, descent groups, and aggregates of descent groups.

Women are assigned to their father's status lineage hence their father's lineage group, even if the mother's status lineage was higher, for two reasons. Firstly, the father's title was the major influence on the offspring's title irrespective of gender, and the systematic demotion observed in the opposite-sex next-of-kin comparisons held true between brothers and sisters (3.4.2). Secondly, the notion that women should marry at their own level or upwards (3.1) implies that the husband enjoyed either equal or greater authority. The latter point does not imply that daughters left their father's status lineage upon marriage; the frequency of divorces, and the occasional instances of women marrying within their own status lineage (see Figures 4-6 to 4-17) imply that many never did. However, the offspring were born within their father's status lineage, either as potential status-achieving members in the case of boys, or as members to be strategically married in the case of girls.

4.2 Expansion of the Empire

A general account of the military conquests of Gowa and Tallok forms an essential context for understanding the marital relations forged during the period.

4.2.1 The victory of Gowa

As pointed out by Pelras (1977), the Makassar texts give an account of the glorious military accomplishments of Tumapakrisik Kallona (r. 1511-1547) which is not corroborated by the Portuguese accounts written in the 1540s. A crucial event in Gowa's early 16th century history, whose date Pelras (1977:254) guessed was around 1530, allows us to fix the earliest possible date for Tumapakrisik Kallona's major campaigns. The relevant passage (SG:20-21) translates as follows.

'These karaengs [of Gowa] were sheltered by three of the kingdom's banners; Kg Lakiung with the kingdom's banner called "Garudaya", and the populace of Mangasa, Tombolok and Saumata went there too, he [Kg Lakiung] himself preceded and defended Barok Bosok, he who opposed the people of West Polombangkeng; the king of Gowa [Tumapakrisik Kallona] himself accompanied the kingdom's banner called "Sulengkaya" to defend Rappocinik, along with the populace of Sudiang, Manuju and Borik Sallo, [whereas] the populace of Tallok along with Dg Massuro [who was a Bajeng, i.e. Polombangkeng prince] were those who opposed the king of Gowa; Kg Datak, alongside the kingdom's banner called "Cakkuridia" defended Tamamangung along with the populace of Pattallassang, Bontomanaik and Paccellekang against the Marusuk people.

After the fighting the people of Tallok, Marusuk and Polombangkeng fled; the people of Polombangkeng returned to Polombangkeng in their prahus; the people of Marusuk fled from Tamamangung to Marusuk; the people of Tallok simply retreated into Tallok.'

SSPHAP's archaeological survey (see Chapter 5) locates the Lakiung and Datak karaengships within Benteng Tua or "Gowa" (Chapter 6), while inspection of the Gowa regal names (Table 3-3) shows that Kg Lakiung and Kg Datak were, respectively, Tunipalangga and Tunibatta before they themselves reigned. As we can assume that borht were adults before leading in the battle field, say 18 years of age or more, the battle can be dated after 1535 (cf. Table 2-3). It should also be dated at least a few years before Tumapakrisik Kallona's demise, unless we are to surmise that the Makassar texts have

fantasised in describing his military accomplishments. This period 1535-1544 would also fall in the reign of Tunipasukruk who, as the texts note, was the Tallok king who once fought Gowa (ST:9; cf. Figure 4-1).

From maps and other sources I have located the nine communities and the battle fronts involved,² and laid them over the c.1500 geopolitical map (Figure 2-1) with Garassik expunged (see 4.3). The nine communities which fought with Gowa presumably correspond to Gowa's Bate Salapang, or council of nine, at around the time of Gowa's victory.³ The six which accompanied the king's sons were among those which had sided with Batara Gowa in his succession dispute with Kgloe ri Sero (12.2.1). As regards the three which fought alongside the king, not only did they emanate from outside of Gowa's original "geopolitical polygon", but also two of them fall inside the polygons drawn for Polombangkeng and Maros. The three battle fronts fall along the border between Gowa's and Tallok's polygons (Figure 4-2).

Hence the battle account leads to the interpretation that Polombangkeng and Maros allied with Tallok during an attempt by Tallok to defeat Gowa. The decision of the communities in north Polombangkeng and south Maros to fight alongside Gowa's king suggests that they recognised Gowa's growing prowess, and that this was also the factor which prompted Maros, Tallok and Polombangkeng to band together in an attempt to

² The identification of Barok Bosok with Ujung Tana is explained elsewhere (Bulbeck, 1990), while the other identifications are explained in the archaeological chapters (5 to 12).

³ Patunru (1983:137) states that, at some stage after 1565 and before 1894, Gowa's Bate Salapang comprised Tombolok, Mangasa and Saumata (west Gowa); Pattallassang, Paccellekang and Bontomanaik (central Gowa); and Manuju, Bori Sallok and Sudiang (east Gowa) - i.e. an exact counterpart to the organisation of Gowa's forces in the battle described here. Mukhlis (1975:62) describes this as Gowa's organisation when the 1667 Bungaya Treaty was signed, but his only reference is (an earlier edition) of Patunru, and Patunru as usual does not cite a reference. Since other information available to Mukhlis allows him to present a sequence of the Bate Salapang otherwise complete by reign between Tunipalangga and Mohammad Said, Mukhlis has apparently fitted Patunru's statement to fill his gap on the Bate Salapang under Hasanuddin. But clearly the primary sources would date Patunru's list to the latter part of Tumapakrisik Kallona's reign, about two decades before 1565.

stamp out the new menace. Yet their very attempt suggests that Gowa had not quite yet become the region's domineering military power. As a final interpretation, the involvement of Tunipalangga and Tunibatta as commanders suggests that it was their inspiration, more than Tumapakrisik Kallona's, which gave Gowa the vital edge in this and subsequent engagements.

4.2.2 The wider, early 16th century battle front

Figure 4-3 shows those polities I can identify which Tumapakrisik Kallona reportedly defeated, or made vassals, or with whose leaders he devised a treaty (SG:18-22). His depicted victories do not include cases where he defeated a king or its people - as cited specifically for Tallok, Maros, Polombangkeng and Bone - because all of them are represented among the six treaties, and the first three probably refer to Gowa's victory in self-defense (4.2.1). Leaving the details to later sections, we can see that one set of campaigns was restricted to the peninsula's southwest corner, while the wider campaigns were scattered throughout Bugis-Makassar lands.⁴

The reported victories (ST:9-10) of Tallok's king Tunipasukruk, and of Tumenanga ri Makkoayang at the age of 14 (i.e. 1535), are geographically more dispersed, apart from Tunipasukruk's victory over Garassik (Figure 4-3). To explain this strange pattern, I can merely suggest that the only victories attributed to Tallok are those which preceded Tuniapsukruk's treaty with Tumapakrisik Kallona and which fell beyond the range of Gowa's campaigns; that is, some of the other polities might have first been defeated by Tallok and later defeated again by Gowa.

⁴ Patunru (1983:map between pp.157 and 158) appears to identify the Parigi defeated by Tumapakrisik Kallona with Parigi in Central Sulawesi, but my identification is more parsimonious. I also see no discord in having Tumapakrisik Kallona defeat such minor polities, close to Gowa, as Lembangang (possibly, however, Lambengi immediately south of Gowa, see Figure 3-1) and Bontomanaik (which could have tried to break away from Gowa at some point during his reign).

4.2.3 The middle to late 16th century battle front

During his 18 years as king of Gowa (1547-1565), Tunipalangga appears to have embarked on a barrage of military campaigns throughout South Sulawesi, with a couple of further excursions to the north (Figure 4-4). In essence, only arch-rival Bone remained undefeated, and Tunipalangga grew mortally sick on the battle field after more than six years of fighting against Bone (SG:23-29). A worse fate met his brother and successor, Tunibatta, who was beheaded warring against the Bone forces after only 40 days as king (SG:33-34).

Tumenanga ri Makkoayang, who ruled Tallok throughout Tunipalangga's reign but had not yet been installed as Gowa's regent (3.5.1), is not attributed any victories during this period. He appears to have profited from Gowa's misfortunes, being appointed regent and receiving Soppeng as a "vassal" immediately after Tunibatta's death, and subsequently achieving a few further military victories as well as renewing the subservient status of the areas defeated by Tunipalangga (ST:10; SG:40). While Makkoayang was still regent Tunijallok, who replaced Tunibatta, also achieved some further victories (SG:53; Figure 4-4).

4.2.3 The 17th century empire

Gowa's campaigns possibly impinged on Ternate's "suzerainty" as soon as Selayar was defeated (cf. Andaya, 1981:30), but it was during the 17th century that greater Gowa's empire grew dramatically at the expense of Ternate's (Figure 4-5). The cluster of early 17th century victories over the Bugis mostly occurred during the Islamic Wars when Abdullah forced the Bugis agrarian kingdoms to adopt Islam (Pelras, 1985). The wider victories during the early 17th century, some of which are attributed both to Abdullah (ST) and to Alauddin (LB), extended to Sumbawa at the south, almost to Ternate at the east, and to Lombok and west Kalimantan in the form of protection pacts (LB:88-90, 93-94, 99, 109, 115, 123, 130; SG:70-73; ST:15-17, 26). Further victories along eastern Sulawesi not specified in the Makassar texts (Manado and

Muna) can be deduced from the relevant articles in the Bungaya Treaty requiring Gowa to return these lands to Ternate (Andaya, 1981:306).

Oddly enough, even during this period of empire-building Abdullah took the opportunity to defeat Maros (apparently first defeated by Tunijallok) and to inflict Bulukumba's fourth and fifth defeats. Or rather these are extreme examples of a quite general pattern of multiple conquest. The pattern implies that the victories and "subjugations" were raids more than routs, and presumably had to be followed with reminder visits when the tribute failed to appear. Andaya (1981) poignantly describes the world of shifting alliances in South Sulawesi during the 16th-17th centuries as the various kingdoms re-aligned their allegiances according to their perceptions of where protection lay. As we shall see, the signal of more durable political alliances lay not in treaties but in the recognition of shared interests through strategic marriages.

4.3 The Absorption of Garassik (Makassar)

Garassik coincides with the area which later became the great entrepôt of Makassar. The geopolitical map (Figure 2-1) suggests that Garassik had been a small and potentially vulnerable kingdom. The available historical records suggest that control of Garassik by a larger kingdom changed several times before finally stabilising with Gowa. The relevant genealogical information, laid out in Figure 4-6, has been prepared from the sources given in Table 4-1.

4.3.1 Garassik at c.1500

The first historical citation of Garassik (SG:14) translates as follows.

'Then Batara Gowa married with a a person from Garassik, who was the child of Somba Garassik; she gave birth to Tunijallok ri Passukik, whose personal name was ... Pakerek Tau; another child called Barataua had the Karaeng title of Karaeng Garassik; another child, a girl, was called Karaenga ri Bone, but her personal name is unknown'.

TABLE 4-1. SOURCES USED IN FIGURE 4-6 (GARASSIK)

SG:14-15, 48-50. ST:6, 12-14, 26, 46-47. LB:89-91, 93, 96, 99, 110-112, 115-116, 121, 125-126, 135, 139, 146, 152-153, 185. Ligtvoet, 1880: 221, 224. Andaya, 1981: 300, 303-304.

N.B. Barataua is elsewhere called Kg Barataua (SG:18). The Indonesian translation of his Garassik karaengship renders 'pakkaraenganna nikana Karaeng Garassi' as 'gelaran rajanya dikatakan Karaeng Garassi' (SG:14), but there is no reason to interpret the Makassar text as portraying his title as royal rather than noble (see main text).

My interpretation of ST:6 (verse 22), whereby Kg Kanjilo was the mother of four unsexed children by Tunilabu ri Suriwa, rather than Kg Panaikang (the last child listed) having been Kg Kanjilo's mother, stems from the lack of any other record identifying the possible existence of a Kg Kanjilo in a mid-16th century context.

The marriage described here appears to have occurred very early (Figure 4-6), given that Tumapakrisik Kallona was born of Batara Gowa's marriage after Kg Garassik's mother had died (SG:15), and that Gowa's eighth and childless raja, Tunijallok ri Passukik (see SG:14-15), preceded Tumapakrisik Kallona on the throne. The title of Barataua Kg Garassik (GR2 in Figure 4-6) specifically lacks the "Somba" prefix suggesting that, in contrast to when his grandfather-in-law ruled Garassik, Garassik now ranked as a local karaengship (3.3.1). Nonetheless the right to authority over Garassik appears to have been transmitted via Somba Garassik's daughter, possibly because Somba Garassik had no suitable heirs to follow him, possibly in response to military pressure from Gowa. Either way Garassik had lost its right to independent rule from Gowa by the initial 16th (Figure 4-7a).

Garassik makes two other appearances in the early records. Firstly the second Tallok raja, Tunilabu ri Suriwa, married a Karaeng Kanjilo in Garassik (ST:6) at c.1500 (Figure 4-6). Kanjilo falls on the border between Gowa and an independent Garassik (Figure 2-1) and could have marked Garassik's hinterland boundary. Secondly, Tuli Dg Mene Dg ri Pattukangang (ptk2) came from the marriage between Kare Saluk Gelarang Bontomanaik and a niece of Somba Garassik called I Dg Paikak (ST:12-13). Bontomanaik, although a common toponym, nonetheless has two occurrences near Garassik (Figure 6-1).

Pattukangang, which occurs in association with both marriages discussed here, borders Garassik (Figure 3-1).

4.3.2 Garassik during the early 16th century

Tallok's third raja Tunipasukruk is credited with defeating Garassik (ST:9), probably before the battle between 1535 and 1544 in which he fought against Gowa. Hence Tunipasukruk probably defeated Garassik when Barataua Kg Garassik ruled it (Figure 4-6), suggesting that Gowa then lost its newly acquired possession to Tallok (Figure 4-7c).⁵

The first external account of Garassik, which by this stage can be called Makassar entrepôt, is provided by the Portuguese merchant Antonio de Paiva, who had come to Sulawesi in 1544. On hearing that the sandalwood country was in revolt he docked at Suppak and discussed Christian concepts with the Suppak king. Paiva then proceeded to Siang, whose king he already knew, and held further conferences on Christianity. The Suppak king, accompanied by his fleet, then arrived at Siang where he was baptised along with many of his relatives. Later Paiva sailed to "Gowa" where envoys of the Siang raja invited him to baptise their lord. Paiva returned overland to Siang where he baptised the Siang raja and his followers, before returning to Melaka later in the year (Jacobs, 1966:280-282; Pelras, 1977:230-231).

Paiva's passage on "Gowa", given in the Portuguese by Jacobs (1966:294), reads: 'Now that the king of Suppak was baptised, and hearing the message of the Siang king that he had gone to a town called Lomtar,⁶ which means palm - well, I had sailed seven leguas [38.8 km] towards there to be in danger of being blown into [these coral reefs], and [the king of Suppak] went in his boat along with his [fleet] ahead of us. After he arrived (or, it transpired that) I went to the said port, which is a large town (or city) called Gowa, which

⁵ Reid (1983a:135) interprets the passage to mean that Tunipasukruk assisted Gowa's defeat of Garassik, but there is no supporting evidence. Rather, the fact that the Makassar texts ascribe Garassik's conquest individually to Tunipasukruk and to Tumapakrisik Kallona indicates that they were separate events.

⁶ Lomtar has not yet been clearly identified.

was originally of [belonged to] a vassal of the king of Siang and which was taken [by the king of Siang]. On Paiva's third day there, two messengers from the Siang raja arrived and beckoned Paiva to return to Siang and baptise their king.

The decision to dock at the Makassar entrepôt appears to have been inspired solely to avert the dangers of shipwreck. Paiva called the harbour Gowa because, presumably, it was then under Gowa's control. There is no hint that Paiva ventured ashore until he returned overland to Siang with what was apparently a well-defended party. We can only speculate on why Paiva did not interact, or did not report his interactions, with anyone other than his Suppak and Siang minders.

The passage translated above has been interpreted to mean that Gowa was formerly a vassal of Siang (Jacobs, 1966:259; Pelras, 1977:245-246; Andaya, 1981:19-20), and even directly mistranslated to that effect (Villiers, 1990:146). But as we can see, Paiva was referring to the harbour area, i.e. Garassik, and that Siang's "vassal" was the polity which had possessed the harbour before Siang itself took it. Actually, Siang's claims to vassals and military victories in this area appear suspicious because they emerge only in the context of Paiva leaving the place as quickly as possible, and certainly too soon for him to have formed his own independent judgments.⁷ Indeed Tumapakrisik Kallona may have already inflicted his defeat on Siang before Paiva's visit (cf. Figure 4-3), given that the Siang leaders would hardly have seen it in their interest to bother Paiva with such trifles.

Nonetheless it would be inconsistent to believe only a selection of the indigenous statements (whether reported by Paiva or by the Makassar texts) and to assign the other statements to gamesmanship. Hence we should interpret Paiva's brief remarks in the context of the Makassar texts. In that case Siang's "vassal" can be identified with Tunipasukruk's Tallok, and in "taking" Tallok Siang also took Garassik - a memory that would have lodged firmly in the minds of the Siang rulers even if nothing more than a brief raid had

⁷ The Makassar texts also fail to mention any such events, although then again texts describing the glory of Gowa and Tallok would be unlikely to dwell on the sorrier chapters.

occurred (Figure 4-7d).⁸ The event can be dated before Paiva's visit in 1544, and probably before the battle between Gowa and Tallok which occurred between 1535 and 1544. Thus Paiva's account supports the view that Gowa's major expansion occurred late, probably after 1544 (Pelras, 1977:254-255; Reid, 1983a:134), but (pace Jacobs, Pelras, Andaya and Villiers) it does not suggest that Siang ever enjoyed a glorious period of suzerainty over the peninsula's west coast. The first half of the 16th century appears to have been a time when the larger west coast kingdoms were of similar strength, temporarily allying with each other or raiding one another, in which context it is totally feasible Siang had briefly taken Garassik before 1544.

4.3.3 Garassik during the mid-16th century

Tumapakrisik Kallona's defeat of Garassik is mentioned twice during the summary of his campaigns (SG:18,22). The latter passage reads that '.... he was also the first to be visited by the Portuguese, in the same year that Garassik was defeated [by him], then Melaka was also defeated by the Portuguese'. The passage might appear to date the first Portuguese visits to 1511 when the Portuguese defeated Melaka, but the interpretation fails for want of evidence that the Portuguese visited South Sulawesi until the 1530s (Pelras, 1977:227-228). Nonetheless the passage could possibly be interpreted to date Tumapakrisik Kallona's victory over Garassik to 1511 (cf. Noorduyt, 1965:149-151). A map of Sulawesi drawn between 1533 and 1543 shows Gowa (Pelras, 1977:229-230), so by this juncture Gowa had probably retaken Garassik and begun to receive Portuguese visitors.⁹ Tallok's attack on Gowa between 1535 and 1544 might well have

⁸ Witness how Gowa's "vassals", for instance, often seemed to forget their subservience within a short time unless reminded (4.2.4), whereas Gowa not only remembered it but also put it in writing.

⁹ The map includes Tallok, Suppak and Bacukiki but fails to include Siang, further belying the notion of Siang's putative golden age. Pelras uses the map to reconstruct an inland sea from the peninsula's northwest coast to Lake Tempe, but palynological work (Gremmen, 1990) disproves this wild interpretation. It is quite clear that the map merely twists the southwest peninsula clockwise from its correct location.

been stimulated by the desire to regain Garassik, as the location of the battle fronts suggests (Figure 4-2). The full interpretation that Tumapakrisik Kallona had defeated Garassik twice, once in 1511 which saw Barataua Kg Garassik put in charge, and a second time between 1533 and 1543 (Figure 4-7), is possibly supported by the double citation of the victory in SG.

The passage which attributes Tunipalangga with building the first brick walls at Gowa and Somba Opu also notes that Tumapakrisik Kallona's walls had only been earthen (SG:26). This might possibly suggest that Tumapakrisik Kallona had first built Somba Opu as an earthen fort towards the end of his reign (Figure 4-7f). Supporting evidence comes from the Somba Opu karaengship held by one of his daughters (SOU1 in Figure 4-6). High-fired ceramics recovered at the site also point to major occupation by the early 16th century (11.32.). The suggestion matches Paiva's description. It is not totally impossible that Tumapakrisik Kallona ruled from Somba Opu during his last days, although Mukhlis (1975:57) delays Somba Opu's use as a palace until Tunipalangga's reign.

4.3.4 Garassik during the mid-17th century

The name Garassik disappears from among the recorded karaengships after Barataua Kg Garassik, but resurfaced at c.1600 with Kg Garassik (MAM1/BAR1/GR4 in Figure 4-6), a stepbrother of Abdullah. The compound karaengship of this Tallok noble, which also covered Barombong at Garassik's south and Mamampang (Manyampang) at the east (Figure 3-1), suggests that he exercised authority over the port, especially between 1618 and 1631 when the Gowa royalty returned to the original palace centre (6.4).

Somba Opu, also called Maccinik Dangang ("watch the trade"), was restored as Gowa's palace between 1631 and its destruction in 1669 (LB:92-93,96,98-99,104,112-3,137). The Garassik karaengship also reverted to a Gowa noble, GR4 in Figure 4-6, who may have partly derived his candidature owing to his relationship as grandson-in-law to the old Kg Garassik. After he died at the time of Gowa's defeat, someone else took over Garassik's karaengship, as implied by the

record of the birth of Karaeng Garassik's younger brother in 1687 (LB:172). I have no further information on this Kg Garassik, unless it was a further title of Dg Manarai Kg Mamampang (MAM2), a son of Kg Galesong and grandson of Sultan Hasanuddin (Figure 4-11), who had the people of Garassik entrusted to him in 1691 (LB:175) before his death in 1692 (LB:176). Garassik's implied connection with Galesong is supported by the 1693 Dutch map which shows Galesong re-zoned northwards by the Dutch to include Garassik and Mamampang (Manyampang). The details of MAM2 also suggest that Garassik and Mamampang were now alternate names for the same area, in which case Bahauddin Kg Mamampang (MAM3/SNXI in Figure 4-6), who also became Sanrabone's raja in the early 18th century (4.6), had probably taken over Garassik-Mamampang on the death of MAM2. That is, after reaching a suitably mature age he inherited the area previously ruled by his father.

Throughout the 17th century the Garassik-Mamampang karaengship remained an important post, reserved for high status individuals either one step removed from the Tallok royalty or two to three steps removed from the Gowa royalty. In line with the status of the post, we have evidence of familial inheritance, to a son and to a grandson-in-law.

4.4 The Marriage Of Gowa and Tallok

The sequence of royal marriages between Gowa and Tallok, shown in Figure 4-8, has been compiled from the sources listed in Table 4-2. It began when Tumapakrisik Kallona's marriage to Tunilabu ri Suriwa's child or children, unspecified in the passage, which resulted in four offspring - Tunipalangga (bon1/LAK1/GX), Tunibatta (DATA1/GXI), Kga ri Bone (BONE2) and Kga ri Somba Opu (SOU1) (SG:16). The only identifiable daughter of Tunilabu ri Suriwa is Reiaya Kgloe Bainea, the bloodsister of Tunipasukruk (TIII), both of whom were born of Tunilabu's marriage to the Siang woman Nyai Papete (Figure 4-8). A later passage confirms the identification. Tunijallok (LNG1/GXII), after accompanying his father Tunibatta to the battle where Tunibatta was decapitated, and after the burial of his uncle (Tunipalangga), returned to Gowa to be installed by the Gowa

TABLE 4-2. SOURCES USED TO PREPARE FIGURE 4-8

SG:13, 15-17, 29-32, 34-38, 43, 56, 58, 66-68, 74-5.
 ST:6-11, 13-14, 19-21, 23, 26-28. LB:87-88, 91-92, 94, 97,
 99, 100, 102-103, 105, 107-108, 110, 112, 114, 116-119, 125,
 131, 136, 138-139, 142-145, 147-148, 159, 161, 164, 170-175,
 178, 183. Ligtoet, 1880:182, 186, 189, 202, 205, 215,
 220-221, 224. Patunru, 1983:18, 155.

N.B. Verses 23 and 24 of ST (p.6) appear to refer to two daughters, one unnamed, by different marriages of Tunilabu ri Suriwa. But they refer to the same marriage, as the wife who was a woman from Siang (verse 23) was also Nyai Papete born of Kasuiang ri Lampasaile (verse 24). The evidence lies in the identification of Kasuiang ri Lampasaile as a Siang noble. "Kasuiang", which means "homage rendered to a sovereign", is in local Bugis etymology the source of the name "Siang" (Pelras, 1977:252). Lampasaile can be located on the map as Saile on the Sungai Lampe around seven km, east of Siang (Dutch 1:50k maps, sheet XXXIII-75A). I infer the man was only a noble and not Siang's ruler as otherwise a direct statement in ST might be expected. I accept that Siang probably existed as a kingdom by the late 15th century, when Kasuiang ri Lampasaile lived, even though there is no direct evidence.

regent, Makkoayang. Tunijallok then buried his ancestor, Kgloe Bainea (SG:40-42). Hence we can infer that Tunibatta and all three siblings cited above were born of Kgloe Bainea's marriage with Tumapakrisik Kallona.

When Tunipalangga (GX) married Kg Balua Maklonjoka (BAL), he married a woman who shared grandparents on both sides and was his kemanakan or "niece" on one side, by virtue of the fact that Kg Balua was the daughter of Tunipalangga's aunt (Kg Makeboka, or MAK) by the latter's marriage to Tunipasukruk (SG:29-30). That Tunipalangga and Kg Balua shared grandparents on both sides can be seen by tracing Tunipalangga's grandparents through Tumapakrisik Kallona and through Kgloe Bainea, which gives us three of Kg Balua's grandparents (Figure 4-8). The kemanakan relationship would be the distant variety used in Makassar kinship terminology (see Chabot, 1950:28), and requires us to follow Tunipalangga's descent back to the brothers Batara Gowa and Kgloe ri Sero, from which point Tunipalangga was indeed one generation above Kg Balua (Figure 4-3). The chronicle's statement of the couple's relationship therefore confirms the

accuracy of the early genealogical reconstruction in Figure 4-8.¹⁰

Between about 1535 and 1585, numerous Tallok royal daughters married the Gowa monarch, but only one Gowa princess (SOU1) married Tallok (Figure 4-8). Tunipalangga appears not to have had any sons by his high status marriages, except the short lived Kg Anak Gowa (see also other genealogical diagrams), and this would seem to explain why the Gowa throne passed to Tunibatta's children after the almost simultaneous demise of the two brothers.¹¹ At this juncture three of Tunipalangga's daughters married Tunibatta's sons (Figure 4-8).

So during this period the Gowa throne acted as the apical point which attracted high status daughters to marry Gowa's monarch, or his brother as a second option, despite the palpable risk that the daughter would transmit access to the title of her status lineage (4.1). When Makkoayang (PTG1/TBB1/TIV) died his only adult descendants were two daughters married to Tunijallok, so the throne had to pass to a wife of Tunijallok unless Tallok were to instal an immature incumbent.¹² The resulting offspring of the woman appointed, Kg Bainea (PTG2/TIV), enjoyed the status of core members within the Tallok royal line despite only having a matrilateral rather than a patrilineal association, because Tallok's status as a lineage had become dependent on Gowa. Consequently the first born son of Tunijallok and Kg Bainea, Tunipasuluk (LNG2/GXIII/TVI/MRV), claimed the Tallok throne while patrilineally inheriting the Gowa throne (Figure 4-8).

¹⁰ Note that when Tunipalangga died, and his brother Tunibatta married Kg Balua and then almost immediately died (SG:38), the same relationship as stated for Tunipalangga must have held for Tunibatta. It is not mentioned, presumably because the point of interest here was Kg Balua's having been widowed twice in quick succession [SG:38].

¹¹ The explanation implied by SG would be the same as that given for why Tunibatta succeeded his brother to the throne, i.e. that none of Tunipalangga's children was yet an adult (SG:30), but I find it difficult to believe that all of Tunipalangga's daughters were still juvenile.

¹² Actually one of the two daughters I refer to, Kg Batu-Batu (BTBT1), could have already died before Makkoayang's death, but this does not affect my argument.

A lull followed in Gowa-Tallok royal marriages during the period when Sultan Abdullah (AG1/KNJ3/TBB2/TVII) restored Tallok's independent status (3.5.1). Indeed during his life Gowa princesses were attracted to his sons, as shown by the marriage between POPO3 and POPO2/TMJ4 (Figure 4-8), and a planned alliance between I Mene and MJN2 which failed owing to I Mene's premature death (Figure 4-11). After Abdullah's death there was a second flurry of princess exchange, once again with an emphasis on Tallok princesses marrying into Gowa (Figure 4-8), corresponding to the re-establishment of the Gowa throne as the apical point.

Although Hasanuddin (TBB4/MNGP4/GXVI) had plenty of sons to inherit the Gowa throne patrilineally, the chaos resulting from Gowa's defeat led to Hasanuddin's abdication and a rapid turnover in the succession. Finally, Abdul Jalil (CAM4/SNX/GXIX) embraced the political realities and stabilised the Gowa throne (Bulbeck, 1990), but at the cost of recognising Bone as the new apical point. As far as I can see Abdul Jalil had no sons, and only one daughter (PTK6) who had married Sahaduddin's chosen successor, Sultan Alimuddin (BXVI/SXVII).¹³ When Abdul Jalil died in 1709, all of Hasanuddin's other offspring were either dead or very aged (see the various genealogical diagrams). Because Gowa's (Abdul Jalil's) had become dependent on Bone, the offspring of the marriage enjoyed access to Gowa's genealogical core, and Ismail (GXX/BXIX/SXIX) came to rule Gowa as the first of his three royal titles (Figure 4-8).

Gowa's rule by a Bone Bugis affronted Makassar tradition and after two years Ismail was forced to abdicate by Gowa's

¹³ Alimuddin also absorbed Soppeng's throne some time after being installed as Bone's sultan and transmitted both thrones to his descendants. Along with their contemporary occupancies of the Gowa and Luwuk thrones, this constituted the single greatest concentration ever of royal Bugis-Makassar titles in a single status lineage. Alimuddin's claim on the Soppeng throne stemmed from his relationship as "son" of the Soppeng royal, We Adda, whom Arung Palakka (Sahaduddin) had married before engineering her installation as Soppeng's queen (Bulbeck, 1990). It is truly the great irony of a system so bound up in marriages and filial succession that South Sulawesi's greatest warlord and most decisive apical point, Sahaduddin, was himself childless, and that Alimuddin (his nephew) was only an adopted son.

Bate Salapang (Patunru, 1983:75-76), as was now possible with the approaching death and waning authority of Alimuddin. Ismail's replacement Sirajuddin (TXII/GXXI), who till then had ruled Tallok, naturally constituted a far more palatable ruler on grounds of tradition (Patunru, 1983:76). But in particular Sirajuddin's claims to genealogical precedence were just as strong as Ismail's, owing to his matrilineal descent from Abdul Jalil's brother and predecessor, Muhammad Ali (BIS2/GXVIII in Figure 4-8).

4.5 The Fragmentation of Polombangkeng

Polombangkeng was reportedly ruled by seven kings (Tumakgauka), all of them "brothers" (saudara), headed by Bajeng and otherwise including Mandallek, Jamarang, Jipang, Katingang, Sanrabone and Lengkesek as partners (SG:20). According to stories the founding rulers were seven brothers who descended from heaven at Bantaeng before settling in Takalar area. While all bore the title "Karaengloe" or "great king", Bajeng's ruler, the eldest, held the regalia (Reid, 1983a:124).¹⁴

Tumapakrisik Kallona successfully attacked or "enslaved" Jipang, Sanrabone and Katingang, and struck a treaty with Bajeng (Figure 4-3). The point suggests that the former three were the "West Polombangkeng" forces which unsuccessfully assaulted Gowa between 1535 and 1544 (Figure 4-2), and that the treaty with Bajeng specifically concerned Gowa's authority over these polities. Tunipalangga for his part then defeated Lengkesek and Bajeng (Figure 4-4). The fate of the Polombangkeng polities is echoed in their marriage relationships with Gowa, as shown in Figures 4-9 and 4-10 compiled from the sources cited in Tables 4-3 and 4-4.

¹⁴ Oral tradition in southern Takalar still recalls this confederation, along with the interesting addition that the name Polombangkeng, which means "cut legs", was bestowed on the region after its leaders had been cast into cauldrons of boiling water after their defeat by Gowa (fieldnotes, 16-6-87).

4.5.1 Jamarang

Jamarang can be identified as the most northerly of Polombangkeng's rulers (Figure 3-1) from the archaeological site which bears the name (Figure 13-1). According to the records Tumapakrisik Kallona once married a Polombangkeng person, the daughter of Kg Jamarang, with three offspring (SG:18; Figure 4-9). The number of offspring suggests the marriage had occurred fairly early in Tumapakrisik Kallona's reign. A later "Karaeng Jamarang" gave his daughter I Dg Mangkasarak (mns1) to Tunibatta, from which union Tunijallok resulted. My chronological reconstruction would tend to identify the latter Kg Jamarang with "Tumakgauka Jamarang", and allow him to have been the son of the first (Figure 4-9). The name Jamarang resurfaces with I Bissu Jamarang, a daughter of Tunijallok who died when still young (Figure 4-9). Her name suggests that Jamarang then lay under Gowa's control; indeed a subservient status had probably existed well beforehand, as suggested by Jamarang's apparent exclusion from the Polombangkeng forces which attacked Gowa. Afterwards Jamarang disappears from the records, implying that this polity which had once married its princesses into Gowa no longer even ranked as a significant karaengship.

4.5.2 Mandallek

Mandallek, identifiable as a large archaeological site (Figure 13-2), couples with Jamarang as a north Polombangkeng polity which did not attack Gowa and which escaped Gowa's wrath. Indeed Tumapakrisik Kallona's daughter, Kga ri Somba Opu (SOU1), married Kga ri Mandallek as the last of her three husbands (SG:17). Given that one of her daughters by a previous marriage, Kg Bainea (PTG2/SOU2/TV), was born at about 1551 (Table 2-3), SOU1 married Kga ri Mandallek in the 1550s or later, and the man concerned might well have been the son of "Tumakgauka Mandallek".

Mandallek subsequently disappears from the records until 1616 when "Lukmuk ri Mandallek" led a fleet of nine boats and defeated Bima (LB:88). His title suggests common origins, although Mandallek could have been his reward for his

successful raid. Just possibly he was the father of Kga ri Mandallek (MD4) who fathered Dg Sisila Kg Mandallek, or MD6 (see LB:121,157). The latter individual had already taken up the Mandallek karaengship by 1673 (LB:144), but his early death in 1679 at the age of 21 (LB:121,159), after apparently having fathered only one son who died as a child (LB:157), prevented any further possibility of the title's patrilineal passage (Figure 4-9). His successor, who died in 1690 at the age of 37 (LB:175), is identified by the editors of LB with Kg Mandallek Tulolo Tajuddin, the son of Kg Karunrung born in 1653 (LB:116). The dates confirm this identification. I label this individual MD5 because in March 1667, when Dg Sisila (MD6) was still juvenile, the areas of Mandallek as well as Aeng were surrendered to Tulolo Tajuddin (LB:133), possibly as an emergency measure triggered by the Dutch attack then looming (see Andaya, 1981).

Hence rule over Mandallek was passed from father to son on one and possibly two occasions (Figure 4-9).

4.5.3 Katingang

To my knowledge Katingang has not survived as a toponym into the 20th century, and identification of its probable location depends on the 1693 Dutch map (5.4.3). Even though listed among Tumapakrisik Kallona's victories (Figure 4-3), Katingang remained an important karaengship into the late 16th century. Hence the title "Karaengloe" (great karaeng) was bestowed on its ruler (SG:30) who married no less than four of his daughters to Gowa rulers (Figure 4-9). Of these Kga Warak (LAK2), the mother of Tuniawanga ri Kalassakanna (KNJ/TUNI), was a particularly prominent woman, and was used by the compilers of SG as the anchor to locate her sisters. Her father, Kgloe Katingang (KT2), appears to be distinct from the "Tumakgauka Katingang" (KT1) on both chronological (Figure 4-9) and on titular grounds.

Katingang disappears from the records after Kgloe Katingang, either because he had no sons, or because rule over Katingang passed to Gowa through one of the four princesses. The nearby karaengships of Popok and Kasuarrang appear to have been maintained by local lineages for one

generation after Kgloe Katingang, but thereafter the karaengships were held by either Gowa, Tallok or Sanrabone aristocrats (Figures 4-8 to 4-10). Katingang and its area appears to be a clear case where the demise of local autonomy was not the result of military defeat, but of gradual absorption into the surrounding status lineages.

4.5.4 Bajeng

The toponym Bajeng survives as a small kampung (see Figure 3-1), and although I have not surveyed it myself, I have been reliably informed that some antiques have come from there (fieldnotes, 9-4-1987). The story of Polombangkeng's origins points to Bajeng as the apical point which bound the seven status lineages together. Gowa apparently pacified Bajeng first by treaty and then by force of arms. I have no record of specific marriage relations unless Makkoayang's wife Kare Pakrisik, the child of a "karaeng" from Polombangkeng (ST:12), was a Bajeng princess. All in all, Bajeng's authority seems to have evaporated with the mid-16th century establishment of Gowa as the local apical point.

4.5.5 Lengkesek

After "Tumakgauka Lengkesek", Lengkesek next appears as one of Tunipalangga's conquests, and then in a reference to a man from ⁹Lengkesek was the father of one of Sultan Alauddin's wives (SG:58). In the mid-17th century Lengkesek became the karaengship of an important individual of the Lekokbodong (Marusuk) lineage group (LN1/TUM6a), indicating its direct rule from greater Gowa's central court by this time.

4.5.6 Jipang

Although Tumpakrisik Kallona made Jipang a vassal (Figure 4-3), any disruption to home rule appears to have been transient. The Jipang karaengship does not appear among the credentials of any male from the major lineages. Instead we find the title associated with two women, firstly the aunt of Tunijallok's wife Dg ri Rappocinik (SG:43-44), and then with

a daughter of Makkoayang (ST:13). These women may well have held the title by virtue of their marriage to the ruling Kg Jipang. if so, then the latter case indicates that by the late 16th century, Jipang was now a polity of sufficient status to attract a Tallok princess.

Support for this proposition comes from the mention of the death of Kg Jipang on three occasions - 1647, 1648 and 1686 (LB:108,110,171). The recording of the deaths but not the births suggests that greater Gowa watched the affairs of Jipang with interest but abstained from meddling. In summary, Jipang appears to have regained its autonomy as a small and unthreatening karaengship almost immediately after Tumapakrisik Kallona had made Jipang a vassal, an autonomy which Jipang maintained until the end of the 17th century.

4.5.7 Sanrabone and General Remarks

Sanrabone was also reduced to a vassal by Tumpakrisik Kallona (SG:22), but soon became a royal ally of greater Gowa (4.6). The kingdom is readily locatable from the brick fortress (Figure E-3).

The fragmentation of Polombangkeng cannot be directly explained by Gowa's mid-16th century conquests, because generally speaking the harsher Gowa's treatment, the better the polities fared subsequently. To a large degree, geographical proximity to Gowa can account for the order in which the Polombangkeng members disappeared from the records, although one of the closest (Mandallek) may have re-emerged with some degree of local autonomy. The unreciprocated marriages of Jamarang and Katingang princesses into the Gowa royalty appears to have sounded the death knell for these polities, indicating the peril to local autonomy of too enthusiastic a recognition of the highest status lineage. *Mutatis mutandis* Bajeng's irrelevance to the assignments of wider patterns of status appears to have spelled its coeval demise. Nonetheless the 1693 map of Polombangkeng (Figures 5-4 and 5-5) suggests that the area had sufficient population to provide its own power base, and the power vacuum created by the demise of Bajeng appears to have opened the way for Sanrabone.

TABLE 4-3. SOURCES USED FOR FIGURE 4-9 (POLOMBANGKENG)

SG:15-18, 30, 35-6, 42-44, 46, 48-49, 57, 59-60, 68, 77-78.
 ST:19-23. LB:87-88, 90-92, 97, 100, 107, 112, 116-117,
 121-123, 125, 130, 133, 135-9, 141-148, 150, 157, 159, 161,
 170, 172, 175. Ligtvoet, 1880: 189, 192, 209.

N.B. Figure 4-9 includes some Tallok genealogical details slotted into a conveniently unoccupied space. Now ST (p.8) has the extraordinary claim that one of the offspring resulting from the marriage between BRS1 and Tunipasukruk, Kg Bontokappok, was still alive when the Tallok chronicle was compiled, well over a century after Tunipasukruk's death. I tentatively suggest that the chronicle has confused this child of BRS1 and Tunipasukruk with the late 17th century man called Kg Bantokappung, and that this confusion may reflect a line of descent. Even so we would still infer that the former individual was the grandfather of the latter, or even another generation back. My suggestion would allow I Dg Jinne and main2, who entered into several noble marriages in the late 17th century (see also Figure 4-12), to be related back to the Tallok line via the "Tallok Sub-1" lineage. Their mother, mns4, would appear to be the granddaughter of Dg Tacao (Figure 4-7), also of Tallok descent (ST:12); but because the father and even the sex of the intervening individual, I Dg Mallakbang, are unknown (ST:12), this loosely inter-Tallok marriage cannot be included within my model.

Two women called I Tanik lived at the same time, one the daughter of Dg Kalula (LB:92) and the other the daughter of Tumailalang [Jaranika] (LB:147). I ascribe the marriages with Kg Karunrung in 1670 (LB:139) and with Kg Bangkala in 1674 (LB:145) to the former I Tanik, and identify her father with Kg Tamalakba whose Daeng name was Dg Kalula (ST:23). The second I Tanik, who married Kta ri Mangalliki in 1672 and then again in 1674 after a brief divorce (LB:142,145,149-50), is shown in Figure 4-12. Finally, I identify the daughter of POPO2/TMJ4, called Dg Talebang (ST:22), with the woman of the same name who married Kg Kaballokang in 1674 (LB:147).

TABLE 4-4. SOURCES USED TO PREPARE FIGURE 4-10 (SANRABONE)

SG:15-18, 30, 35-6, 42-44, 46, 48-49, 57, 59-60, 68, 77-78.
 ST:19-23. LB:87-88, 90-92, 97, 100, 107, 112, 116-117,
 121-123, 125, 130, 133, 135-9, 141-148, 150, 157, 159, 161,
 170, 172, 175. Ligtvoet, 1880: 189, 192, 209.

N.B. A further marriage of Tumenenga ri Campagana (SNVI) was with Dg Saraba, described as a "sibling" of Kg Segeri, who bore him nine offspring (IALS). The titles but not the sex of these offspring are given by IALS, and I have not been able to relate to people in the Gowa-Tallok genealogies, so they are excluded from my genealogical analysis. The Kg Segeri mentioned here does not appear to be Sultan Abdullah or his prematurely deceased son Kg Segeri, and so presumably arose from the local royalty at a time when Segeri was autonomous.

In explaining the origins of Kga ri Bontoa (BON2), the mother of Sultan Mohammad Said, SG (pp.57-58) identifies the mother as Kga Warak (LAK2) and the father as Dg Malu. The latter was the child of a karaeng from Paria, shared grandparents on both sides (sepupu duakalinya) with Kga Warak, and had been killed at the time of Tunibatta's ill-fated foray into Bone (1565). The karaengship of Dg Malu (Kasuarrang, or KSR1) is then stated. The marriage between LAK2 and KSR1 must have occurred prior to the marriage between LAK2 and Tunijallok, given no mention of Tunijallok having divorced LAK2; rather, the records indicate that LAK2 died whilst in wedlock with Tunijallok at some point prior to the marriage between Kg Bainea and Tunijallok (SG:42-43). The records are therefore internally consistent in placing the birth of BON2 no later than 1566, even though this gives BON2 an unusually long child-bearing period and life (Figure 4-5).

LAK2 and KSR1 would have shared grandparents on both sides if, firstly, Kg Paria had been the brother of LAK2's mother, and secondly KSR1's mother had been the sister of KT2, as shown in Figure 4-10. Alternatively Kg Paria could have been the brother of KT2, and the mothers of LAK2 and KSR1 could have been sisters, but the lack of details on Kg Paria's origins suggests he should be moved to the furthest possible genealogical peripheries. I have not found a suitable Paria, unless we accept Parialauk or Pare-Pare, but the toponyms Anak Sappuk, Katingang and Kasuarrang all fall close together (Figure 3-1). Anak Sappuk and Paria appear to have been small local polities, even though the karaengship of SAP1 and Kg Paria, as given in the Makassar text, has been interpreted as "raja" in the Indonesian translations (SG:42,58). Note that the genealogical reconstruction given here suggests that data3, a further wife of Tunijallok who is also described as sharing grandparents on both sides with LAK2 (SG:49), would have been the full sister of KSR1 (Figure 4-10).

Dg Marannu (mru2), who married Sultan Mohammad Said with whom she shared a grandparent in common, was the daughter of a Sanrabone woman called I Ranga (SG:68). If mru2 and Sultan Mohammad Said shared either LAK2, PTG2/SOU2/TV or LNG1/GXII as the common grandparent, then this should have surfaced elsewhere in the genealogical information. The lack of information on I Ranga suggests that the common grandparent was KSR1, by his marriage to some woman other than LAK2, as reconstructed here (Figure 4-10).

4.6 Sanrabone

Sanrabone's prominence is indicated by the existence of a brief chronicle of her rulers, "Ini Adat Lama Sanrabone" or IALS (2.2.4), which appears to have been composed in three parts. The first part lists the descent of Sanrabone's rulers prior to and excluding Abdul Jalil's occupancy of the Sanrabone throne. The second and third parts detail the immediate families of the two most prominent of the independent Sanrabone rajas, Tumenanga ri Parallekkena and Tumenanga ri Campagana.

Presumably this text also featured among the uncited books and lontarak which Ibrahim (1985:45-52) says he used to write a short history of Sanrabone. Thus assuming Ibrahim's advantage in this matter, I will follow Ibrahim's kinglist as the primary reference, at least up to Tumenanga ri Campagana (SNVI), and cite any variations based on my reading of IALS as subsidiary information.

SNI. Karaeng Pancabelong. According to IALS, Kara Pacabelo, also called Kara Pamatowa, a man who originally hailed from northern Majapahit.

SNII. Karaeng Tunijallok ri Pakrasana. IALS states Tunilonjok Kapparane, who ruled alongside Raja Tunipalangga and was the child of SNI.

SNIII. Karaeng Massewaya. According to IALS, the child of SNII.

SNIV. Karaeng Tonibasara. IALS gives Karaeng Tunibatta, the child of SNIII.

SNV. Tumenanga ri Parallekkena. According to IALS, he was the child of Tunibatta by a Javanese woman, I Ganna Bilang. He descended to earth after his kettle drum had sounded and became wealthy, before being slain alongside Tunibatta and dying in his premises. IALS further states that he married Kg Mapekdaka, Tunijallok's sister, and gives a list of the children which substantially agrees with the list of Kg Mapekdaka's children given elsewhere (SG:36).

This cross-reference allows us to estimate the chronology of the early Sanrabone kings (Figure 4-10) but also highlights the problems in the early kinglist of IALS. It is almost impossible that SNV's great grandfather (Tunijallok ri

Pakrasana) could have reigned at the same time as Gowa's Tunipalangga, the brother of SNV's father-in-law. The recurrence of the nickname Tunibatta is also worrying. Given that SNV had over seven children by the daughter of the Gowa raja Tunibatta (IALS; SG:36), SNV could hardly have died at the same time as Gowa's Tunibatta. If SNV had died at the same time as SNIV, whom IALS calls Tunibatta, then we would have to infer that there was a battle or a palace revolution during which a very old Sanrabone raja (SNIV) and his son were simultaneously slain. Another complicating factor is that, according to my chronological reconstructions, Sanrabone was a vassal of Gowa during the time when Gowa's Tunibatta was an adult, and so Gowa's Tunibatta may well have commanded Sanrabone before succeeding to the Gowa throne. This could explain why SNV is simultaneously described as the son of Tunibatta (read son-in-law) and as a tomanurung-like figure who descended, as though he had commenced or restored a dynasty. It is also of concern that three honorific titles associated with the first five Sanrabone kings (Tunijallok, Tunibatta and Tumenanga ri Parallekenna) are also associated with three of the Gowa kings between Batara Gowa and Tunijallok (see Table 3-3).

I suspect that Gowa's mid-16th century lordship over Sanrabone has confused the oral record of Sanrabone's early kings as recorded in the Makassar original to IALS. My preferred solution (Figure 4-10) has taken a conservative course by suggesting that SNIV, who should properly be called Tonibosara, may have died alongside Gowa's Tunibatta.

SNVI. Tumenanga ri Campagana. Clearly the Kg Sanrabone of ST (p.26) and the Kg Sanrabone I Pammusurang of SG (p.45).

SNVII to SNIX. At least three Sanrabone rajas occupied the throne between Tumenanga ri Campagana and Abdul Jalil. A Sanrabone raja, who can be identified with Campagana unless yet another Sanrabone raja is to be added, died on 31 March 1642 (LB:103). The new Sanrabone raja died on 13 July 1642 (LB:103), and a Sanrabone raja then died on 12 November 1647 (LB:109). Then on 23 November 1658 Kasim Puanna Jenalak Raja Sanrabone fled to Tallok in response to rumblings to expel

him (LB:121).¹⁵ After an interregnum lasting a decade, Kg Campagaya (later Abdul Jalil), a son of Gowa's Sultan Hasanuddin, succeeded to the Sanrabone throne at the request of the people (SG:75; LB:135). 1668 was of course a critical juncture - Makassar had been occupied, Hasanuddin was probably on the point of abdication and likely to be succeeded by a stepbrother of Kg Campagaya (Figure 4-1) - so Kg Campagaya's movement to Sanrabone probably represented flight rather than territorial expansion.

Ibrahim's kinglist traces the succession after Campagana through I Pucu (a daughter of Campagana, according to IALS) and Kg Banyuanyarak (I Pucu's son, according to IALS). Elsewhere this Kg Banyuanyarak (BNY2/SNVIII? in Figure 4-10) is referred to in a way which does not clarify whether he was the Sanrabone raja or not (SG:74-75). In favour of Ibrahim's reconstruction, Kg Banyuanyarak was the father-in-law of Abdul Jalil who thus could have gained entry into Sanrabone's genealogical core through his mother.

IALS implies differently. I Pucu and Kg Banyuanyarak are merely placed with Campagana's other children, whereas Kg Bambanga and Tumenanga ri Buttana occur in the section dealing with the kings up to Jenalak's expulsion. A straight interpretation would hold that Kg Bambanga (BMB1/SNVII?) succeeded his brother Campagana, but that he was already an old man and died in the same year as his brother. After Kg Bambanga's death, Campagana's son Tumenanga ri Buttana (SNVIII?) occupied the throne, to be succeeded by Buttana's son, Jenalak (SNIX). In this case, Sanrabone's throne was transmitted patrilineally through to Puanna Jenalak.

However, IALS conceivably might have placed Kg Bambanga and Tumenanga ri Buttana in the first section merely to explain Jenalak's origins, not because they ever ruled Sanrabone. Both kinglists discussed here seem equally possible, and so I include both (Figure 4-10).

Ibrahim (1985:50) states that a sister of Abdul Jalil, I Jata Tojeng Bontomajannang, occupied the Sanrabone throne after Abdul Jalil. However, I-Ata Tojeng Bontomajannang

¹⁵ Puanna Jenalak is ignored by Ibrahim, who possibly follows some oral or other source which wishes to bury the odium surrounding Jenalak's expulsion.

(Islamic name Syaifulmuluk) was a son of Mohammad Said (SG:69) who moreover died in 1669 (LB:105,135). Ibrahim's kinglist then follows with Pakkanna Kg Pangkajeknek, the son of Kg Bontojeknek by the Bima sultan Ambela, but none of the offspring of this marriage corresponds to such a person (Figure 4-15). Abdul Jalil's successor on the Sanrabone throne was apparently Bahauddin Kg Mamampang, by 1717 (see Ligtvoet, 1880:193, 243-4). He may have been entitled to the Sanrabone throne through his marriage to Abdul Jalil's niece, Kg Tana-Tana or TNTN1 (Figures 4-7 and 4-8). The Sanrabone karaengship then passed to Bahauddin's son, Kg Beroanging, in 1731 (Ligtvoet, 1880:213). Hence Jenalak's expulsion apparently provided the occasion for the Gowa aristocracy to absorb the Sanrabone throne. In 1734, however, Sahaduddin Kg Alluk was appointed Sanrabone's raja (Ligtvoet, 1880:216), and as his parentage is unstated I infer that he was a local Sanrabone aristocrat.¹⁶

4.7 Galesong

Kota (township) Galesong is today a planned town with suburban population densities. It was the scene of one of the key battles of the Makassar War (Andaya, 1981) and has clearly been a population centre under local rulership during the colonial period (Ibrahim, 1985). A polity by the name of Galesong had existed by the 16th century, given the record of its defeat by Tumapakrisik Kallona (SG:22), and the archaeological evidence indicating that Kota Galesong was already a population centre by that date (13.1).

According to Reid (1987:8-9), Galesong has its Tomanurung who brought the kingdom's regalia. But according to Ibrahim (1985:122), oral tradition in Galesong recognises a first Galesong karaeng who derived from Gowa, and a period (between 1610 and 1636) when those who held the position of Karaeng Galesong must not now be named. The first reported Karaeng Galesong can be identified from SG, while the reported taboo period, between 1610 and 1636, coincides with the time when

¹⁶ He was also the uncle of the man who compiled the Royal Diary in the late 18th century. This strengthens the case for believing that his parentage would have been noted if he had come from any of the major lines.

Galesong was apparently ruled from Campagaya Lama, five kilometres to the north (Figure 13-3). Galesong was still sited there when it was attacked by the Dutch in 1635, as can be inferred from the associated report that Sultan Alauddin spent the night in Bebak (LB:96), i.e. the kampung which abuts Campagaya Lama (Figure 11-4). The Dutch attack may well have prompted the relocation of Galesong's rulership to its original centre as a more defensible location.

GLS1. Before its defeat and "enslavement" by Gowa (SG:22), Galesong presumably had its rulers notwithstanding the lack of substantiating records. The first known Galesong ruler was Tappu Kg Galesong, the son of Tunibatta by a Galesong woman (SG:38). My chronological reconstruction suggests that this was the Kg Galesong who married Lotong Kga Bone after the latter had been widowed by Tunijallok's death (SG:32).¹⁷ I estimate that I Tappu Kg Galesong lived between about 1550 and 1600, and ruled Galesong during the late 16th century.

GLS2. According to my informant at the archaeological site of Campagaya Lama, Hamzah Koda Dg Bundu, the first three Galesong rulers are buried in the site's Islamic graveyard (Figure 13-3). My reconstruction inserts these individuals between the first and second Galesong rulers as recognised in Kota Galesong folklore. Accordingly, Kg Campaga from Bulukumba, whom Dg Bundu recognises as the first Galesong ruler, is here treated as GLS2. The information given by Dg Bundu, that this individual died in 1613 at the age of 60, fits with the suggestion that he had succeeded Tappu Kg Galesong. The inferred excision of Galesong from Gowa's control at the end of the 16th century can be seen as part of Abdullah's policy of decentralising the power structure of greater Gowa (13.3.3). Accordingly, Kg Campaga's reign at Galesong is here dated between c.1600 and 1613.

GLS3. According to Dg Bundu, Kg Campaga was succeeded by Kg Ganna who ruled in 1614.

¹⁷ I would be happier with the identification if the textual reference had mentioned a samposikale relationship (cf. Figure 4-11), but the lack of that confirming information (SG:32) is insufficient reason to reverse my procedure of reducing the genealogical records to the smallest number of discrete individuals (3.3.2).

GLS4. Dg Bundu told me that Kg Ganna was succeeded by Kg Jare, who ruled from 1614 or 1615 until his death sometime before 1662. A terminal date of 1633 is suggested by the report of the death of Kg Galesong in that year (LB:94). According to Dg Bundu, Kg Jare married a woman called Kirikung ri Biring Bangia.

Kg Campaga, Kg Ganna and Kg Jare are all buried together (Figure 13-3) which implies a family link.¹⁸ Furthermore I was told that Kg Campaga had married a woman from Tallok called Kg Sakking. Now, a son of Tunipasukruk called Yaneng Dg Palenguk had a grandson called Yandulu ri Galesong (ST:8). Fitting the dates (Figure 4-11) suggests that the daughter of Dg Palenguk may have been Kg Sakking and that Yandulu ri Galesong was either Kg Ganna or Kg Jare. Possibly the identification with Kg Ganna is preferable because the lack of the individual's titulation in ST suggests that the individual was not prominent, in accord with his fleeting reign, and because of the tentative identification of Kg Jare with an individual prominent enough to have had his karaengship of Galesong recorded in LB. Interestingly, the identifications discussed here stand out as the only case I found where locally collected traditions appear to complement and extend the genealogical information given in the Makassar texts.

GLS5 and GLS6. These would be the second and third rulers of Galesong as remembered in Kota Galesong. One of them is mentioned in 1636 (LB:97), but I have no other dates on them.

GLS7. Dg Manaba I Patudangi Dg Polo Kg Matinrowa ri Parallakkenna, the fourth ruler as remembered in Kota Galesong, and whose nickname "Tau Battua ri Sapanjang" means the person who enlarged Galesong (Ibrahim, 1985:122). Ibrahim (1985:122) further dates the commencement of his rule to the interval 1656-1662. Hence his immediate successor could well have been "GLS8" who was born in 1655 (Figure 4-11).

GLS8. Mannindori Kare Tojeng Kg Galesong, the son of Sultan Hasanuddin. Although he was reportedly appointed by the Galesong people (SG:76-77), his appointment would have been consistent with greater Gowa's policy of extending

¹⁸ Regrettably I did not think to solicit any genealogies.

direct rule to the south coast (13.3.3). He reigned until his flight from Sulawesi in the early 1670s (Andaya, 1981:212) and died in Banten in 1678 (LB:161).

GLS9. Dg Malewa, the new Kg Galesong in 1677, who assisted Bone's Sahaduddin in his final assault on Benteng Tua (see Andaya, 1981:184) and his assassination of Arung Bakkek in 1681 (Andaya, 1981:237).

TABLE 4-5. SOURCES USED TO PREPARE FIGURE 4-11 (GALESONG)

SG:15-17, 29-30, 32, 34-35, 38, 42, 60, 67, 77-78. ST:6-8, 19-20. LB:87-88, 91, 94, 97, 100, 107, 112, 116-118, 120, 138-139, 144, 147, 161, 167-168, 176, 184. Ligtvoet, 1880:178. Andaya, 1981:184, 222. Ibrahim, 1985:122. Fieldnotes, 26-9-86 (information from Hamzah Koda Dg Bundu).

N.B. For convenience sake, I have used Figure 4-11 to depict some extraneous genealogical information, including a marriage shown between Panneng I Mene, the daughter of Sultan Alauddin by I Tobo, and Kga Majannang (MJN2). Actually they were only engaged before I Mene's death at a young age. The fact that this engagement is mentioned twice (SG:37,60) suggests that it had been planned as an important marriage.

TABLE 4-6. SOURCES USED TO PREPARE FIGURE 4-12 (MARUSUK)

SG:14-15, 17, 44, 47, 50, 56, 59, 61-64, 67-68, 74-75, 77-78. ST:7-8, 12, 21, 23. LB: 87, 90-91, 97, 99-100, 102, 107, 111-112, 114, 116-120, 122-125, 128-130, 136-138, 140, 142-143, 145, 148, 150, 153, 161, 175-176, 181, 183, 186. IALM. Ligtvoet, 1880:182, 189, 209. Patunru, 1983:18.

N.B. The daughter of LEK2 called I Ralu married Dg Mangalle (SG:47), probably the Dg Mangalle of unknown descent who went to fight in Kabaenna (cf. LB:95) rather than the later Dg Mangalle shown in Figure 4-12.

The Indonesian translation of one passage (SG:63) reads '...seorang lagi bernama I Linga...dialah neneknya Karaenga ri Tabaringang (dan) ibu dari I Mappatamba...'. However, since Kg Tabaringang was the mother of I Mappatambak Abdul Gafar Kg Ballok (LB:107), the '(dan)' inserted into the Indonesian translation should be deleted and the passage translate as "...another [child] was called I Linga....and was the ancestor of Kga ri Tabaringang [who was] the mother of I Mappatamba'. Also, the Indonesian translation of the second karaengship of BMT2/LAK5 wrongly gives it as Kg Laikang rather than Kg Lakiung (SG:68).

The available information on the parentage of I Tanik and BKK1 (LB:142,175) only gives their father as Kg Jaranika (JAR1/TUM6c), and I have inferred that they resulted from his marriage with Kga ri Bontojeknek by consideration of their

probable birth in the early 1660s and the lack of evidence that Kg Jaranika then had any other wife.

TABLE 4-7. SOURCES USED TO PREPARE FIGURE 4-13 (LEKOKBODONG)

SG:61, 63. ST:12-13, 23, 26, 28. LB: 87-92, 96-97, 100, 102-103, 107-108, 110-112, 116-117, 119, 122, 128, 131-132, 136-138, 144-145, 147-149, 153, 155-156, 162, 170, 173, 178, 181-182. Ligtvoet, 1880:181, 191-192, 199, 211. Patunru, 1983:68.

N.B. I identify Rikong Dg Tanang (SG:61) with the Tanang who was Kg Karunrung's first wife (cf. LB:107), labelling her "rkng4".

Dg Makruppa who fathered Tumailalang Lekokbodong (LB:148) is of unknown parentage, but given that his son combines the Lekokbodong toponym with a position in the internal ministry, I suspect Dg Makruppa was a Lekokbodong noble.

Ligtvoet (1880:250) identifies Qasim Puanna Teko, the Agongnionjok raja born in 1649, with Mappajanci Dg Mattajeng Matinroe ri Sumpampoba, the Agongnionjok raja who died in 1716. They could have been two individuals, had Qasim Puanna Teko ruled during the interval between 1676 (cf. LB:148-9) and 1680 (cf. LB:162), but the lack of any evidence to this effect indicates that Ligtvoet's identification is logical. Ligtvoet (1880:241) also recognises two women contemporarily holding the title of Kg Bontorambak. The editors of LB (e.g. pp.154 and 173) collapse these two women into one, but then vaguely follow Ligtvoet by calling her "Karaeng Bontorambak II" (LB:178). There is no evidence of more than one Kg Bontorambak who is here called BRM1 (Figure 4-8).

TABLE 4-8. SOURCES USED TO PREPARE FIGURE 4-14 (PATTEKNE)

SG:14-17, 35-36, 42-43, 45, 54, 62-64. ST:6-7, 11, 13-14, 19-20. LB:87, 89-90, 92-94, 96-97, 106, 109, 112, 114, 117, 125-128, 135, 138, 142, 146, 148, 153, 160-1, 164-165, 167, 170, 175, 181-182, 186. Ligtvoet, 1880:176, 183, 190, 192, 197, 224-225.

N.B. The daughter of SULI1/TUM5b, Dg Singarak (sin1), was apparently the mother of Bahauddin Raja Sanrabone (MAM3/SNXI) by Kg Garassik (GR4). Given that she died in 1673 (LB:148), it was another Dg Singarak who had three high status marriages between 1674 and 1691, one to a man (PNKJ1) who became a Tumailalang in the 18th century, and one which produced a son (PUTE2) who enjoyed the same appointment (Ligtvoet, 1880:183,221). This second Dg Singarak (sin2) is of unknown parentage, as is her brother Abdurrahman Kta ri Bonto Kamase.

4.8 Marusuk (Maros)

At the end of the 16th century the kingdom of Maros lost its independence to Gowa. In return the Maros aristocracy apparently received tenure of the Tumailalang post in greater Gowa's central court (3.5.3). I call the latter, bilateral kin network "Lekokbodong" after the most frequently recurring karaengship. The associated genealogical details, shown in Figures 4-12 and 4-13, are reconstructed from the sources cited in Tables 4-6 and 4-7.

4.8.1 The succession of Maros rulers

My reading of "Ini Adat Lama di Maros" or IALM (2.2.4) gives the Maros succession as Sangajigaddongmo Kgloe ri Pakerek, Kg Loeya, Patannananglangkana, Tunikakassang, and Tunipasuluk, with the last clearly the Gowa raja who briefly reigned in the early 1590s. IALM unambiguously cites Tunikakassang as the last local Maros raja by stating he protected Tumenanga ri Gaukanna (Sultan Alauddin, born in 1586), but died when the latter was still small. Except for Kg Loeya these rajas also appear in SG, in contexts which match the order given in IALM. However, SG (p.53) adds a further raja by specifying Karrang I Dg Marewa, the son of Tunikakassang by a Bugis woman, as the Maros raja subjugated by Tunijallok.

IALM further states that Pasilemba Kg Barassak Tumamaliang ri Tallok (BRS1), who married the third Tallok raja Tunipasukruk by whom she had numerous children (cf. ST:7-8), was the full sister of Patannananglangkana. One of the children of this marriage was Tumenanga ri Makkoayang, born in 1521 (Table 2-3), which would imply that BRS1 was born before c.1505 and that Patannananglangkana was born at a similar date. These dates do not resolve the conflict over who was the last Maros raja, and my solution is tentatively offered on the grounds of parsimony, pending philological study.

MRI. IALM seems to say, albeit obscurely, that Tumanurunga ri Pasada and Tumanurunga ri Luuwuk had a boy called Sangajigaddongmo, while Dg Masiya Gelarang Pakkareji Kgloe ri

Pakerek was the first Maros raja. The lack of further information suggests Sangajigaddongmo was the birth name (3.2) of the first Maros raja.¹⁹

MRII. After Sangajigaddongmo died, the son who succeeded him was Kg Loeya (IALM).²⁰

MRIII. I Yakkumabussung I Mappasomba I Dg Uraga Patannanglangkana, son of Kg Loeya and brother of Kg Barassak Tumamaliang ri Tallok (IALM). SG (pp.19-20) specifies Tumenanga ri Bulukduaya as the individual's posthumous title, and identifies him as the Maros raja who joined Polombangkeng in assisting Tallok's assault on Tumapakrisik Kallona, which I date between 1535 and 1544 (4.2.1).²¹

MRIV. Tunikakassang, the son of Patannanglangkana, who became the Maros raja on the latter's death (IALM). According to SG (p.17) "Kg Tunikakassang" was the first husband of Kga ri Somba Opu (SOU1), without issue. I estimate the lady's birth at c.1523, implying that the marriage occurred c.1540²² and Tunikakassang was born c.1520 or beforehand. From IALM we would infer that this raja had lived for around 70 years, apparently without having produced descendants (3.5.3), and as an old man he had adopted the infant who later became Sultan Alauddin. We would further suggest his lesser names were I Karaeng I Dg Marewa²³ and that the the Gowa chroniclers, noticing the time lapse between Tunikakassang who had married Kga ri Somba Opu and Dg Marewa who was subjugated by Tunijallok, reconstructed a filial relationship.

MRV. Tunipasuluk (GXIII) as stated without elaboration by IALM. While we may wonder how gleefully the Maros people chose Tunipasuluk as their raja (cf. SG:56), the lack of a

¹⁹ The kinglist of Makkulasse (1986:50) also gives Kgloe ri Pakerek as the first Maros raja.

²⁰ Makkulasse's kinglist provides no equivalent.

²¹ SG (pp.18-19) identifies Kgloe ri Pakerek (MRI) as the Maros raja with whom Tumapakrisik Kallona entered into treaty, which if true would tag the treaty to some other event before Tallok's assault on Gowa.

²² Either after the battle referred to above, or possibly beforehand and indeed prematurely terminated because of that battle.

²³ Makkulasse (1986:50), in his kinglist, identifies the third Maros raja by these names alone.

suitable local candidate agrees with my reconstruction in which the Maros royal line withered away with Tunikakassang.

MR6. I Yunyi I Dg Mangemba Kga ri Marusuk who, during Tunijallok's reign, succeeded I Dg ri Mangallekana as Tumailalang on the latter's death (SG:50). He was presumably also the Kga ri Marusuk cited as one of the individuals who did not flee during Tunipasuluk's brief reign (SG:56), and may well have received the Marusuk karaengship as his reward in assisting Tunipasuluk's expulsion. The need Kg Matoaya (Abdullah) apparently felt to defeat Marusuk (Figure 4-5) could have been to stamp out local resistance against Dg Mangemba's appointment.²⁴

The statement that Kg Botoroka, a child of Kg Barataua (Kg Garassik, i.e. GR2), had a child called Kg Marusuk (SG:15), fails to match any other information which could allow this Kg Botoroka to be identified with MRIII or MRIV. The only other individual possibly referred to is Dg Mangemba, leading to the genealogical reconstruction given in Figure 4-12. It looks suspicious that the brother of Pakerek Tau (GVIII) could have had four children who included Kg Loaya and Kga ri Taipaya, whilst Kgloe ri Pakerek also had four children who included Kg Loeya and Kg Tappie (Figure 4-12). Furthermore the genealogy which produces Kg Marusuk (MR6/TUM3a) looks "stretched out", and most of the titles involved are Maros toponyms. Possibly the Gowa chroniclers had some awareness of the Marusuk royal genealogy but were confused by the recurrence of the toponym Pakerek or the title of one of GR2's descendents. When the same name is repeated in an oral genealogy, transposition of blocks of names is common, particularly in the middle part of the list (Vansina, 1985:181).²⁵

Possibly the most parsimonious resolution would suppose that Kg Garassik's marriage with a Bila (Maros) woman

²⁴ Makkulasse's kinglist cites him as the fourth Maros raja, but the present reconstruction indicates that he was appointed from the Gowa central court.

²⁵ When the two genealogies are placed side by side, it even looks as if Batara Gowa had been one of the Maros Tomanurung (Figure 4-12). However, this is probably coincidence rather than attempted tampering with the genealogies to derive Maros from Gowa, because none of the sources explicates the point.

produced a noble Gowa-Maros lineage which resided in Maros. When the time came for Maros to provide a Tunailalang, and no royal representative was available, Tunijallok honoured a Maros individual, Dg Mangemba, who carried Gowa links. After his later installation as the karaeng of Maros had elapsed, Maros was apparently no longer represented by any single leader.

4.8.2 Lekokbodong

Several commentators, following the Dutch sources, conclude that the productive rice fields of Maros produced little local political power in the 17th century, and amounted to a pawn in the hands of the powerbrokers in Makassar (e.g. Reid, 1981:5-6; Andaya, 1981:193, 248, 156-6). Certainly the Maros lands were treated this way after the Makassar War (see Andaya, 1981), and by the early 17th century one Gowa prince (Kg Bulok Sipong) had his karaengship based in Maros (see Figure 3-1). Against this view Kamaruddin et al. (1985-6:128), following Ligtoet (1880), include an assortment of important Makassar nobles in what they call 'keturunan raja Maros' (descendants of the Maros raja).

The evidence reviewed proposes an intermediate stance, whereby the generation of a powerful descent group arose from intermarriage between the Gowa and Maros aristocracy. The dual constitution of the descent group is also evident in the recurring karaengships - Lekokbodong in Makassar (11.4.1) and Cenrana in the hills attached to Maros (cf. Andaya, 1981:266). I have already pointed out the unclear genealogical origins of Dg Manassa Kg Cenrana or CEN2/TUM5a (3.5.3) and Dg Mangemba or MR6/TUM3a (4.8.1). The origins of yet another key figure, Abdul Gafar Kg Jaranika (JAR1/TUM6c), are also not spelled out; although as I have not found any contrary indications, I follow the inference of Kamaruddin et al. (1985-6:112) that he was Kg Lengkesek's full brother. The occasionally unclear parentage of key figures suggests that bilateral membership was more important than patrilineal position, while the weakly patrilineal passage of the descent group's Tumailalang post (3.5.3) resembles the succession of

the pattola titles among the Kasepekang Konjo (cf. Rössler, 1987; Röttger-Rössler, 1989).

As reviewed here the records would point to Gowa's Kg Garassik (GR2) as the descent group's original apical ancestor, in much the same way as the Gowa noble called Dg Bunding represents the apical point among the Kasepekang Konjo (3.1). However, were it available, a view of the origins of the descent group from Maros rather than Gowa might give a quite different picture. In any case it appears that the Maros nobility exchanged independence, and even direct administration of the Maros lands (13.3.4), for a key rôle in Gowa's organisation during the 17th century.

4.9 Pattekne

The Pattekne karaengship first occurs with the unsexed child of TII and Kga ri Kanjilo (KNJ1), then with the granddaughter of GR2 (Figure 4-14) whose "Gowa Sub-1 lineage" was based in Maros (4.8.1). These two early occurrences identify Pattekne as the are sandwiched between Tallok and Maros (cf. Figure 5-4) which hence fell in the overlap between those kingdoms' spheres of influence. Tallok and Maros could have married a noble daughter into the independent Pattekne nobility or, more probably, rulership over Pattekne first fell to Tallok and then to Maros (see Figure 13-9).

The genealogical details available for Tamanggoa Dg Arenne Kg Pattekne (PTE3/TUM3b) indicate he must have been born by around 1545 (Figure 4-14). Fairly late in his life, he received the Pattekne karaengship from Gowa's Tunipasuluk (r. 1590-1593) who also appointed him as Tumailalang (SG:54). He retained these titles until his death during Alauddin's reign, when he was replaced by his youngest son - but the son by his highest status marriage - Kg Maroanging (SG:62-4).²⁶ This had occurred by the early 17th century, given that Kg Maroanging (MRGM1/TUM4b) defeated Bima and Sumbawa in 1618 before dying in 1623 (LB:89). Maroanging is here synonymous with Pattekne (see Figure 3-1). A great grandson of

²⁶ Kg Maroanging also inherited the regalia from his father.

PTE3/TUM3b, SULI1/TUM5b, replaced Kg Maroanging as Tumailalang on the latter's death (SG:62, 64).

Despite these indications that a Pattekne descent group maintained a high status during the 17th century, the passage of the Pattekne karaengship itself cannot be followed. Three individuals held the title - Kg Pattekne (PTE4) who was the third husband of TAB1 (cf. SG:45) and who defected to Buton in 1644 (LB:106); his replacement Dg Mabela (PTE5) who died in 1663 (LB:106,127); and Fathuddin (PTE6) who was born in 1695 (LB:181). The parentage of these individuals is not given and I can only follow others (e.g. LB:106) in assuming that they had belonged to a Pattekne descent group, along the lines just indicated for Lekokbodong.

4.10 Genealogical Links with Eastern Indonesia

Of the five sultanates established on the island of Sumbawa between the 17th and the 20th centuries, Bima and Sumbawa were the most important (Noorduyn, 1985b). Most of their earliest history comes from the Gowa-Tallok royal diaries (Noorduyn, 1985b). The names and positions in succession of the earliest Bima and Sumbawa sultans, as given by Noorduyn (1985b:123-4), have been followed here (Table 3-3). Both Bima and Sumbawa were repeatedly raided from greater Gowa during the early 17th century (Figure 4-5), but then entered into regular marriages with the various descent groups in greater Gowa from 1646 onwards (Figure 4-15).

Marital ties between greater Gowa and Ternate were far more tenuous, as might be expected from their fierce competition in the spice trade (Andaya, 1981). One apparent link concerns I Asseng, Mohammad Said's child by his house servant called Lokmok Singarak (SG:68-9), who married "Raja Ternate" in 1672 (LB:143).²⁷ A Maluku noble called Kacili Kalimata, the brother of the Ternate sultan Mandarsyah,²⁸

²⁷ I infer that only one individual called I Asseng is involved, because otherwise it is hard to see why only one wife of any Raja Ternate appears in the Makassar records.

²⁸ For convenience sake I represent him as the stepbrother of the Ternate king who married I Asseng (Figure 4-15). I have not carried out the necessary background work to know his true relationship with Mandarsyah (Table 3-5).

married a Tallok noble called Kta ri Panaikang. However, the marriage does not imply any alliance with Ternate, for he had fled Ternate after a rebellion there before arriving in Makassar in 1656 (LB:119).

TABLE 4-9. SOURCES USED FOR FIGURE 4-15 (EASTERN INDONESIA)

SG:67-69. ST:19-20, 27. LB:87-88, 90-92, 97-98, 102-103, 108-110, 113-114, 116-120, 127-130, 136, 138, 140, 142-145, 153, 164, 166-174, 176-178, 181-182. Ligtoet, 1880:182, 203, 212, 221.

N.B. Kta ri Panaikang (PNK3) appears to have been closely contemporary with Kta ri Panikangcinik (PNK2) who was born in 1616 (Ligtoet, 1880) and died in Bima in 1680 (LB:162). I have followed the editors of LB who state that PNK2 was the sister of the mother of Sultan Abdul Khair Sirajuddin (I.II), and that she first married a Luwuk noble and then a Bulu-Bulu raja (LB:162). Given her date of birth, the Bulu-Bulu raja concerned was probably BB3 (see Figure 4-5).

Kta ri Bontojeknek (BJN1) and I.II had a daughter called Sitti Aminah in 1653 (LB:115) while their daughter Kta ri Bontomatekne died in 1671 at the age of 18 (LB:140). Sitti Aminah would therefore appear to be the birth name of Kta ri Bontomatekne.

Dta Dg Tamemang is described by the editors of LB as a sister of Kg Lengkesek (LB:169), and while the available dates make this suggestion unlikely (Figure 4-10), these individuals might have been related within the Lekokbodong house.

TABLE 4-10. SOURCES USED TO PREPARE FIGURE 4-16 (THE BUGIS)

SG:30, 32, 34, 47-48, 69, 76-77. ST:12, 14, 21-22, 27. LB:87-92, 96-97, 99-100, 102, 104-105, 110, 112, 116-117, 119, 122-123, 128, 131-132, 134-135, 137-139, 145-6, 148, 150-151, 154, 156-158, 163, 165, 167-169, 172, 182-183. Ligtoet, 1880: 178-179, 189, 197, 199, 203, 211. Andaya, 1981:103, 156, 160, 288, 300, 304. Patunru, 1983:68. Muttalib, 1981:36-38. Caldwell, 1988:126-129.

N.B. Roman numerals tracing the succession of Soppeng rajas are taken from Muttalib (1981). As regards the two Soppeng rajas shown in Figure 4-16 but not in Table 3-3, Puang Lipue is the name used by SG (p.34) to identify La Mataesso (SXI), while his father (SX) is called La De by Caldwell (1988:128-9).

As explained by the editors of LB, Speelman states that the marriage involving Macallaka Kanukunna (in 1666) was to Kg Bonto Marannu (MRU3), but this would appear to be a mistake because the Makassar source specifies MJN3 (LB:131).

The records of Sahaduddin's Makassar wives are interpreted as follows. I identify his wife I Minak, whom he divorced in 1673 (LB:145-6), with Mina I Dg Majannang, the daughter of Kg Popok (ST:22) - whom I also identify with the Dg Majannang who died in 1674 (LB:150). Dta Dg Majannang (mjn4) would appear to be distinct from Sahaduddin's wife called Dg Majannang (mjn5) given the slight difference in Daeng title, and the records that she had married and then separated from Sultan Amir Hamzah (GXVII) in 1671 (LB:140-141) before marrying MD5 in 1672 (LB:143). Also, Sahaduddin had two wives described as the sister of Kg Lengkesek, Kga Balang Jawaya (BLJ2) who was apparently Kg Lengkesek's full sister (LB:112), and Dg Talele who is described both as the 'sister of Karaeng Lengkesek' (Andaya, 1981:160) and as the younger sister of BLJ2 (Ligtvoet, 1880:203). Dg Talele may have been the full sister of BLJ2 but all I have inferred is that her father was CEN2/TUM5a.

TABLE 4-11. SOURCES USED TO PREPARE FIGURE 4-17

SG:32-33, 37-38, 59, 67-68, 76, 78. ST:12, 27. LB:87-88, 91, 97-98, 100, 103-106, 108-109, 114, 116, 119-120, 122, 125, 127, 131-2, 135, 138, 140-141, 145, 149-150, 152-3, 155, 160-161, 163, 180-182, 186. Ligtvoet, 1880:197, 205, 214, 221.

N.B. Kg Katapang, the child of Kg Datak (DATA2), served with distinction in the Gowa forces during the middle 17th century (LB:114; Andaya, 1981:48,58,65), but apparently did not marry anybody important.

Muhiddin Kta ri Beroanging (BER2) married Dg Tamemang I Makminasa in 1674 (LB:149) and, according to the editors of LB, had also married the daughter of Ratu Bulu-Bulu Dg Tatea (LB:181). I assume that only one woman is involved.

I have identified Dg Nisayu Kg Tarung, the child of Sultan Mudhaffar (ST:27), with the Kta ri Tarung who married Kga ri Batu-Batu, producing Bayang I Dg Masiang who married Hasanuddin (SG:78). I have further identified the latter woman with the Dta Dg Masiang who was born in 1647, married Hasanuddin in 1661 and then remarried Kta ri Bontonompok in 1671 (LB:108,125,140). I have further assumed that she was the full sister of I Munak, the child of Kg Batu-Batu (LB:152-153), and that this I Munak is the same as the Dg Memang I Munak who had married Kta ri Lekokbodong and, later, Arung Tanete Malolo (LB:145,163).

4.11 Genealogical Links with the Bugis

The Makassar texts give the impression that Gowa and Tallok had tightened their grip over the Bugis areas over time, and brought Bone to the conference table at least twice before finally defeating Bone (Figures 4-3 to 4-5). However, the first interaction between Bone and Gowa was probably as allies, when Bone's raja La Tenrisukkik obtained Gowa's help to retain the Cenrana delta from Luwuk's advances (Andaya, 1981:23; cf. SG:22). The battle can be dated between 1512 and 1525 (13.4.1), i.e. the initial stages of Tumapakrisik Kallona's reign. Gowa's involvement presumes coastal access, i.e. control over Garassik at the time, and so the event would predate the capture of Garassik by Tallok and then Siang (see Figure 4-7).²⁹

As indicated in Figure 4-16 (prepared from the sources cited in Table 4-10), few marriages occurred between Gowa or Tallok and the major Bugis nobility during the 16th and early to mid-17th centuries. Indeed two of the 16th century marriages shown - between We Dadi Kg Ballok (BLL1) and Tunipalangga, and between Kga ri Majannang (MJN1) and Tunijallok - involved Bugis woman whose nobility is an unknown quantity. Moreover Tunibatta married Puang Lipue's unnamed sister when, accompanied by his troops, he stopped at Soppeng on his way to the battle field at Bone (SG:34), so it need not reflect Soppeng's choice of marriage strategy.³⁰ Nonetheless it should be noted that Malikussaid (Sultan Mohammad Said), before he ascended the throne, was betrothed to the Arumpone's daughter, La Palang Matinroe ri Tallok, but she died in 1630 on her way to Gowa before the marriage eventuated (SG:66; LB:91).³¹ One can wonder whether realisation of this marriage might not have changed the

²⁹ The point further undermines the notion of a once-mighty Siang (4.2.3), since Siang rather than her putative "vassal" Gowa should have been engaged in this sort of long-distance adventure. Pelras (1977:252) interprets the records differently and dates the events to the 1530s, but in particular fails to address why Siang was not involved.

³⁰ Interestingly, though, Puang Lipue became a "vassal" of Tumananga ri Makkoayang in the treaty between the Gowa regent and Bone which followed Tunibatta's decapitation (SG:40).

³¹ The Arumpone concerned would have been La Makdaremmeng Matinroe ri Bukaka (see Andaya, 1981:303).

course of South Sulawesi's history. Formally Bone was ruled by greater Gowa for two decades between the 1640s and 1660s (Andaya, 1981), showing that greater Gowa then had the military supremacy to back up its political supremacy within the peninsula, but it could not engineer the marital ties with the major Bugis kingdoms of Bone and Soppeng which were essential for the subjugation of the Bone and Soppeng status lineages (cf. Bulbeck, 1990).

After the Makassar War, however, so many marriages occurred between the greater Gowa and Bugis aristocrats that they cannot all be fitted within a single diagram, and so have been slotted into available spaces in other diagrams. Hence it is more useful to discuss the implications within a general context (4.12.4).

4.12 Marriage Strategies and Political Change

4.12.1 Methodological points

To facilitate the demonstration of a relationship between marriage strategies and political transformations, I have tried to incorporate all relevant information in the genealogical diagrams. Indeed the last, Figure 4-17, based on the sources listed in Table 4-11, has been devised solely to accommodate information which could not be squeezed in elsewhere. Nonetheless some strategic marriages, indicated by an asterisk in Tables 4-12 to 4-14, could not be fitted into any diagram. Possibly the most important concerns Kg Barrung, who can be identified with the ruler of a small coastal Bugis kingdom in the area now called Barru (Figure 3-1), and which recurs as a toponym from 1667 onwards (Andaya, 1981:85-291 pass.)

The number of recorded marriages is large enough to allow statistical demonstration of the rôle of political events, as long as appropriate steps are taken to pool the recorded examples. Chronologically the marriages can be grouped according to the three phases of Gowa's history covered by the records (2.5.3 and 2.5.4). As regards social categories the marriages can be pooled by "lineage group" (4.1). The Makassar royal lines are treated as unpooled entities, but

the subsidiary noble lines (e.g. Gowa Sub-1, Gowa-Sub-2 etc.) are pooled to detect any overarching patterns. As regards the Bugis, the major kingdoms are treated separately from the minor kingdoms (3.2), and further subdivided to distinguish Bone and Soppeng (which spearheaded the successful Bugis assault on Gowa in 1667) from Luwuk, and to distinguish Gowa's staunch ally Bulu-Bulu (see Andaya, 1981) from the other minor Bugis kingdoms.³² I also pool the Makassar karaengships which fleetingly or irregularly appear in the genealogical records into a "minor Makassar karaengship" category, and analogously pool the Makassar Gelarang district heads. The pooling decisions are adumbrated in Tables 4-12 to 4-14 which not only list all the marriages considered, but also count those recorded offspring who apparently survived into adulthood (3.3) as a measure of success of the marriage.

The categories "wife givers" and "wife takers" are inappropriate for the Makassar system (Fox, pers. comm.), but we are nonetheless dealing with groups of related men who perpetuated their status lineage or descent groups by attracting wives from other lineages (4.1). Marriage strategies can therefore be shown by cross-tabulating the father's and husband's lineage groups (Tables 4-15 to 4-20).

4.12.2 Gowa's Initial Expansion

While Gowa's 16th century military campaigns throughout western Sulawesi were spectacular (Figures 4-3 and 4-4), the most solid achievement lay in restructuring the political landscape of South Sulawesi's southwest corner.

Polombangkeng, apparently the area's largest polity at the onset of the 16th century, lay in fragments, while at the end of the period Tunipasuluk briefly ruled Gowa, Tallok and Maros - the largest area ever directly ruled by Gowa.

This essentially local focus of political action is clear from the recorded marriages and number of resultant offspring, presented in Tables 4-15 and 4-16 respectively.

³² I am not sure where Wajok would fit in this scheme of Bugis kingdoms, but the point is not of concern here as Wajok was not involved in any of the marriages.

TABLE 4-12. MARRIAGES AND OFFSPRING C.1500 TO 1593

1. ? (daughter of GR1) to GVII (Garassik to Gowa): 3 offspring
2. KNJ1 to TII (Garassik to Tallok): 4 offspring
3. Nyai Papete tp TII (Siang [minor Bugis] to Tallok): 2 offspring
4. I Dg Paikak to Gelarang Bontomanaik (Garassik to Gelarang Bontomanaik): 3 offspring
5. ? (daughter of Gelarang Bontomanaik) to Kg Jonggoa (Gelarang Bontomanaik to Gowa Sub-3): 1
6. ptk2 to PTG1/TBB1/TIV (Gelarang Bontomanaik to Tallok): 3 offspring
7. ptk2 to LNG1/GXII (Gelarang Bontomanaik to Gowa): 0 offspring
8. Dg Tamaga to PTG1/TBB1/TIV (Gelarang Dataka to Tallok): 4 offspring
9. ? (family of Gelarang Tombolok) to DATA1/GXI (Gelarang Tombolok to Gowa): 1 offspring
10. Kgloe Bainea to GIX (Tallok to Gowa): 4 offspring
11. MAK to TIII (Gowa to Tallok): 2 offspring
12. BAL to LAK1/GX (Tallok to Gowa): 4 offspring
13. BAL to DATA1/GXI (Tallok to Gowa): 0 offspring
14. BPL to DATA1/GXI (Tallok to Gowa): 2 offspring
15. ? (sister of BPL) to DATA1/GXI (Tallok to Gowa): 1 offspring
16. BTBT1 to LNG1/GXII (Tallok to Gowa): 0 offspring
17. PTG2/TV to LNG1/GXII (Tallok to Gowa): 8 offspring
18. SOU1 to PTG1/TBB1/TIV (Gowa to Tallok): 2 offspring
19. KNJ2/TUNI to AG1/KNJ3/TBB2/TVII (Gowa to Tallok): 7 offspring
20. A Polombangkeng person to GIX (Polombangkeng to Gowa): 2 offspring
21. mns1 to DATA1/GXI (Jamarang [Polombangkeng] to Gowa): 4 offspring
22. BILI to LAK1/GX (Katingang [Polombangkeng] to Gowa): 1 offspring
23. LAK2 to LNG1/GXII (Katingang [Polombangkeng] to Gowa): 1 offspring
24. MDA to LNG1/GXII (Katingang [Polombangkeng] to Gowa): 0 offspring
25. POP01 to LNG1/GXII (Katingang [Polombangkeng] to Gowa): 1 offspring
- 26.* I Kare Pakrisik to PTG1/TBB1/TIV (Polombangkeng to Tallok): 0 offspring
27. data3 to LNG1/GXII (Anak Sappuk [minor Makassar] to Gowa): 0 offspring
28. ? (daughter of KT1) to Kg Paria (Katingang [Polombangkeng] to Anak Sappuk [minor Makassar]): 2
29. LAK2 to KSR1 (Katingang [Polombangkeng] to Anak Sappuk [minor Makassar]): 1 offspring
30. ? (daughter of SAP1) to KT2 (Anak Sappuk [minor Makassar] to Katingang [Polombangkeng]): 3
31. SOU1 to MD2 (Gowa to Mandallek [Polombangkeng]): 1 offspring
32. BLB1 to DATU PABOLIK (Mandallek [Polombangkeng] to Pabolik [Minor Makassar]): 1 offspring
33. MAP to SNV (Gowa to Sanrabone): 9 offspring (or more)
34. BONE3 to LNG1/GXII (Gowa to Gowa): 0 offspring

TABLE 4-12. MARRIAGES AND OFFSPRING C.1500 TO 1593 (CONT.)

35. I Dg Malele to LNG1/GXII (Gowa to Gowa): 0 offspring
36. BONE3 to GLS1 (Gowa to Gowa Sub-2): 1 offspring
37. I Dg Sangging to UJG1 (Gowa to Gowa Sub-4): 1 offspring
38. BRS1 to TIII (Maros to Tallok): 8 offspring
39. SOU1 to MRIV (Gowa to Maros): 0 offspring
40. ? (Sister of LAK2) to PTE3 (Katingang [Polombangkeng] to Pattekne): 1 offspring
41. I Dg Mangamu to BNK1 (Gowa to Bangkalak [minor Makassar]): 1 offspring
42. SP1 to LAK1/GX (Suppak [Minor Bugis] to Gowa): 0 offspring
43. ? (Daughter of La De) to DATA1/GXI (Soppeng to Gowa): 0 offspring
44. BLL1 to LNG1/GXII (Lamuru [Minor Bugis] to Gowa): 0 offspring
45. MJN1 to LNG1/GXII (Soppeng to Gowa): 0 offspring

TABLE 4-13. MARRIAGES AND OFFSPRING C.1593 to 1667

1. I Tobo to GXIV (Gowa Sub-2 to Gowa): 0 offspring
2. LMP1 to GR5 (Gowa to Gowa Sub-5): 0 offspring
3. BMT1/LAK5 to BLL2 (Gowa to Gowa Sub-6): 1 offspring
4. mns2/ptg5 to UJG2/LAK4/GXV (Tallok to Gowa): 0 offspring
5. TGL1 to UJG2/LAK4/GXV (Tallok to Gowa): 0 offspring
6. PBN2/RAJA to TBB4/MNGP4/GXVI (Tallok to Gowa): 1 offspring
7. Dg Sangging to TBB4/MNGP4/GXVI (Tallok to Gowa): 0 offspring
8. LMP1 to KNJ4/TVIII (Gowa to Tallok): 1 offspring
9. I Dg Mappasang to GXIV (Tallok Sub-4 to Gowa): 1 offspring
10. I Tadumai to SPG1 (Tallok Sub-2 to Gowa Sub-5): 2 offspring
11. kli1 to KNJ4/TVIII (Tallok Sub-2 to Tallok): 1 offspring
12. POPO3 to POPO2/TMJ4 (Gowa to Tallok Sub-6): 0 offspring
13. rkng4 to KAR1/TBB5 (Gowa to Tallok Sub-8): 1 offspring
14. SNG1 to BSG1/TBB8 (Gowa to Tallok Sub-9): 0 offspring
15. TMS2 to KAR1/TBB5 (Tallok Sub-2 to Tallok Sub-8): 2 offspring
16. I Kare Balluruk to GXIV (Tallok Gelarang to Gowa): 1 offspring
- 17.* byng2 to POPO2/TMJ4 (Gowa Gelarang to Tallok Sub-6): 4 offspring
18. sin1 to GR5 (Pattekne to Gowa Sub-5): 3 offspring
19. TAB1 to PTE4 (Gowa to Pattekne): 0 offspring
20. Ralle Dg Paikak to UJG2/LAK4/GXV (Lekokbodong to Gowa): 1 offspring

TABLE 4-13. MARRIAGES AND OFFSPRING C.1593 to 1667 (CONT.)

21. BJN1 to JAR1/TUM6c (Gowa to Lekokbodong): 2 offspring
22. TAB2 to KTT1 (Lekokbodong to Gowa Sub-6): 2 offspring
23. TGL1 to LN1/TUM6a (Tallok to Lekokbodong): 0 offspring
24. mngp3 to CEN2/TUM5a (Tallok to Lekokbodong): 4 offspring
25. BLJ2 to MRU3 (Lekokbodong to Tallok Sub-2): 0 offspring
26. BLJ2 to KAR1/TBB5 (Lekokbodong to Tallok Sub-8): 1 offspring
27. I Petak Dg Nisali to TBB4/MNGP4/GXVI (Sanrabone to Gowa): 4 offspring
28. I Dg Talele to TBB4/MNGP4/GXVI (Sanrabone to Gowa): 1 offspring
29. TAB1 to SNVI (Gowa to Sanrabone): 4 offspring
30. PKK1 to KNJ4/TVIII (Sanrabone to Tallok): 0 offspring
31. mr7 to SNVI (Tallok to Sanrabone): 1 offspring
32. I Tadampali to GXIV (Pabolik [minor Makassar] to Gowa): 0 offspring
33. BON2 to UJG2/LAK4/GXV (Anak Sappuk [minor Makassar] to Gowa): 1 offspring
34. byng3 to TBB4/MNGP4/GXVI (Batu-Batu [minor Makassar] to Gowa): 0 offspring
- 35.* PAC1 to PTU1 (Gowa to Pattung [minor Makassar]): 2 offspring
36. SNG1 to KGA BUNGAYA (Gowa to Bungaya [minor Makassar]): 1 offspring
- 37.* PTU3 to POPO2/TMJ4 (Pattung [minor Makassar] to Tallok Sub-6): 2 offspring
38. TRNG1 to BTBT2 (Tallok to Batu-Batu [minor Makassar]): 2 offspring
39. ? (daughter of PTE3/TUM3b) to PTU2 (Pattekne to Pattung [minor Makassar]): 1 offspring
40. BB2 to BB1 (Gowa to Bulu-Bulu): 0 offspring
41. TMS2 to BB3 (Tallok Sub-2 to Bulu-Bulu): 0 offspring
42. Dg Tanacinik to BB3 (Sanrabone to Bulu-Bulu): 1 offspring
- 43.* I Dg Saraba to SNVI (Segeri [minor Bugis] to Sanrabone): 9 offspring
44. OPU PESO to GR5 (Luwuk to Gowa Sub-5): 0 offspring
45. TMS2 to LXVI (Tallok Sub-2 to Luwuk): 1 offspring
46. MACALLAKA KANUKUNNA to MJN3 (Soppeng to Gowa Sub-7): 0 offspring
47. BMT2 to CAM4/SNX/GXIX (Bima to Gowa): 0 offspring
48. BJN1 to I.II (Gowa to Bima): 5 offspring
49. BJN1 to U.II (Gowa to Sumbawa): 0 offspring
50. PNK3 to U.II (Tallok to Sumbawa): 0 offspring
51. PADUKKA DOMPU to Dta Dg Mattiro (Bima to Tallok Sub-8): 0 offspring
52. PADUKKA DOMPU to LEK3 (Bima to Lekokbodong): 1 offspring
53. Ralle Dg Paikak to I.II (Lekokbodong to Bima): 0 offspring
- 54.* PNK2 to BB3 (Bima to Bulu-Bulu): 0 offspring

TABLE 4-14. MARRIAGES AND OFFSPRING 1667 to 1700

1. PRPR1 to KNJ5/TXI (Gowa to Tallok): 2 offspring
2. main2 to GXVII (Tallok Sub-1 to Gowa): 0 offspring
3. main2 to CAM4/SNX/GXIX (Tallok Sub-1 to Gowa): 0 offspring
4. LAN1 to KAB1 (Gowa to Tallok Sub-8): 1 offspring
5. SNG1 remarried to BSG1/TBB8 (Gowa to Tallok Sub-9): 1 offspring
6. BON3 to MD5 (Gowa Sub-6 to Tallok Sub-8): 0 offspring
7. BRM1 to KNJ5/TXI (Tallok Sub-8 to Tallok): 0 offspring
8. LK2 to BNP1/TMJ5 (Tallok Sub-2 to Tallok Sub-6): 0 offspring
9. main2 to MD5 (Tallok Sub-1 to Tallok Sub-8): 0 offspring
10. I Tanik to KAR1/TBB5 (Tallok Sub-7 to Tallok Sub-8): 0 offspring
11. I Dg Talebang to KAB1 (Tallok Sub-6 to Tallok Sub-8): 0 offspring
12. LAN1 to LEK3 (Gowa to Lekokbodong): 0 offspring
13. CAM5 to LBG1/TBB7 (Gowa to Lekokbodong): 0 offspring
14. I Tanik to MNGI1 (Lekokbodong to Gowa Sub-10): 0 offspring
15. BON3 to BKK1 (Gowa Sub-6 to Lekokbodong): 0 offspring
- 16.* Dta Dg Tamemang to KNJ5/TXI (Lekokbodong to Tallok): 0 offspring
17. PSI2 to JAR1/TUM6c (Tallok to Lekokbodong): 0 offspring
18. I Dg Jinne to JAR1/TUM6c (Tallok Sub-1 to Lekokbodong): 0 offspring
19. I Dg Nisayu to I Dg Makruppa (Tallok Sub-8 to Lekokbodong): 1 offspring
- 20.* I Dg Talarra I Mene to GXVII (Laikang [minor Makassar] to Gowa): 0 offspring
21. CAM5 to MD6 (Gowa to Mandallek [minor Makassar]): 0 offspring
22. I Rukiah Dta Dg Mami to BMN (Gowa to Bontomanaik [minor Makassar]): 0 offspring
23. I Munak to KG PAMMOLIKANG (Batu-Batu [minor Makassar] to Gowa Sub-5): 0 offspring
24. byng3 to BNP1/TMJ5 (Batu-Batu [minor Makassar] to Tallok Sub-6): 1 offspring
25. I Tanik to BNK3 (Tallok Sub-7 to Bangkalak [minor Makassar]): 0 offspring
26. I Munak to LEK3 (Batu-Batu [minor Makassar] to Lekokbodong): 0 offspring
27. Dg Tamemang to BER2 (Bulo-Bulo to Bungaya [minor Makassar]): 1 offspring

TABLE 4-14. MARRIAGES AND OFFSPRING 1667 to 1700 (CONT.)

28. LAN1 to AG5 (Gowa to Agongnionjok [minor Bugis]): 0 offspring
29. LAN1 to SW1 (Gowa to Sawitto [minor Bugis]): 0 offspring
- 30.* CAM5 to KG BARRUNG (Gowa to Barru [minor Bugis]): 1 offspring
31. rkng2 to SG1 (Gowa Sub-8 to Siang [minor Bugis]): 0 offspring
32. PBN2/RAJA to SD1 (Tallok to Sidenreng [minor Bugis]): 0 offspring
33. I Dg Nisayu to AG4 (Tallok Sub-8 to Agongnionjok [minor Bugis]): 0 offspring
- 34.* BRM1 to KG BARRUNG (Tallok Sub-8 to Barru [minor Bugis]): 2 offspring
- 35.* ARUNG PATTIRO to LXX (Agongnionjok [minor Bugis] to Luwuk): 0 offspring
36. PTK6 to BXVI/SXVIII (Gowa to Bone): 3 offspring
37. LAN1 to SXVII (Gowa to Soppeng): 0 offspring
38. I Rukia Dta Dg Mami to ARUNG BELO (Gowa to Belo [Soppeng]): 0 offspring
39. LAN1 to ARUNG TEK0 (Gowa to Teko [Bone]): 0 offspring
40. PSI2 to ARUNG TEK0 (Tallok to Teko [Bone]): 1 offspring
41. LK2 to BXV (Tallok Sub-2 to Bone): 0 offspring
42. mjn5 to BXV (Tallok Sub-6 to Bone): 0 offspring
43. I Dg Nisayu to MRGB (Tallok Sub-8 to Maroanging [Bone]): 1 offspring
44. BRM1 to ARUNG TANETE MATOA (Tallok Sub-8 to Tanete [Bone]): 1 offspring
45. I Dg Nisayu to ARUNG TEK0 (Tallok Sub-8 to Teko [Bone]): 1 offspring
46. BLJ2 to BXV (Lekokbodong to Bone): 0 offspring
47. I Dg Talele to BXV (Lekokbodong to Bone): 0 offspring
48. I Munak to ARUNG TANETE MALOLO (Batu-Batu [minor Makassar] to Tanete [Bone]): 0 offspring
- 49.* PUANNA I MATTAK to BXVII/SXX (Tanete [Bone] to Bone): 1 offspring
50. TNTN1 to I.IV (Gowa to Bima): 1 offspring
51. I Asseng to RAJA TERNATE (Gowa to Ternate): 0 offspring
52. BMT2 to TX (Bima to Tallok): 1 offspring
53. TMS3 to U.IV (Tallok to Sumbawa): 1 offspring
54. Dta Dg Tamemang to I.III (Lekokbodong to Bima): 0 offspring

TABLE 4-15. 16TH CENTURY MARRIAGES BETWEEN LINEAGE GROUPS

Father's Lineage Group	Husband's Lineage Group												TOTAL
	Gowa Core	Gowa Nobles	Tallok Core	Gar- assik	Gowa Gelarang	Polom- bangkeng	Sanra- bone	Minor Makassar	Patt- ekne	Maros	Minor Bugis	Soppeng	
Gowa Core	2	2	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	11
Gowa Nobles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tallok Core	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Garassik	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Gowa Gelarang	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Polombangkeng	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	11
Sanrabone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Makassar	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pattekne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maros	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Minor Bugis	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Bone-Soppeng	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	23	3	9	0	1	2	1	4	1	1	0	0	45

TABLE 4-16. MATURE OFFSPRING RESULTING FROM 16TH CENTURY MARRIAGES

Father's Lineage Group	Husband's Lineage Group												TOTAL
	Gowa Core	Gowa Nobles	Tallok Core	Gar- assik	Gowa Gelarang	Polom- bangkeng	Sanra- bone	Minor Makassar	Patt- ekne	Maros	Minor Bugis	Soppeng	
Gowa Core	0	2	11	0	0	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	24
Gowa Nobles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tallok Core	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Garassik	3	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Gowa Gelarang	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Polombangkeng	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	14
Sanrabone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Makassar	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Pattekne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maros	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Minor Bugis	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Bone-Soppeng	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	32	3	32	0	3	4	9	5	1	0	0	0	89

TABLE 4-17. MARRIAGES BETWEEN LINEAGE GROUPS C.1593 TO 1667

Father's Lineage Group	Husband's Lineage Group														TOTAL
	Gowa Core	Gowa Nob.	Tallok Corek	Tallok Nob.	Gel- arang	Patt- ekne	Lekok- bodong	Sanra- bone	Minor Makassar	Bulo- Bulo	Luwuk	Minor Bugis	Soppeng	Eastern Indonesia	
Gowa Core	0	2	1	3	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	14
Gowa Nobles	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tallok Core	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	9
Tallok Nobles	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	6
Gelarang	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pattekne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Lekokbodong	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
Sanrabone	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Minor Makassar	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Bulo-Bulo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Bugis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Luwuk	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Bone-Soppeng	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Eastern Indo.	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
TOTAL	14	7	3	9	0	1	4	3	4	4	1	0	0	4	54

TABLE 4-18. MATURE OFFSPRING RESULTING FROM MARRIAGES C.1593 TO 1667

Father's Lineage Group	Husband's Lineage Group														TOTAL
	Gowa Core	Gowa Nob.	Tallok Core	Tallok Nob.	Gel- arang	Patt- ekne	Lekok- bodong	Sanra- bone	Minor Makassar	Bulo- Bulo	Luwuk	Minor Bugis	Bone- Soppeng	Eastern Indonesia	
Gowa Core	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	5	17
Gowa Nobles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tallok Core	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Tallok Nobles	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7
Gelarang	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Pattekne	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Lekokbodong	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Sanrabone	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Minor Makassar	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Bulo-Bulo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Bugis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Luwuk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bone-Soppeng	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern Indo.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	10	8	2	10	0	0	7	14	6	1	1	0	0	5	64

TABLE 4-19. POST-1667 MARRIAGES BETWEEN LINEAGE GROUPS

Father's Lineage Group	Husband's Lineage Group											TOTAL
	Gowa Core	Gowa Nobles	Tallok Core	Tallok Nobles	Lekok- bodong	Minor Makassar	Bulo- Bulo	Luwuk	Minor Bugis	Bone- Soppeng	Eastern Indonesia	
Gowa Core	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	3	4	2	16
Gowa Nobles	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Tallok Core	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
Tallok Nobles	2	0	1	4	2	1	0	0	2	5	0	17
Lekokbodong	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5
Minor Makassar	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
Bulo-Bulo	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Luwuk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Minor Bugis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Bone-Soppeng	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Eastern Indonesia	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	3	2	4	8	7	4	0	1	7	14	4	54

TABLE 4-20. MATURE OFFSPRING RESULTING FROM POST-1667 MARRIAGES

Wife's Lineage Group	Husband's Lineage Group											TOTAL
	Gowa Core	Gowa Nobles	Tallok Core	Tallok Nobles	Lekok- bodong	Minor Makassar	Bulo- Bulo	Luwuk	Minor Bugis	Bone- Soppeng	Eastern Indonesia	
Gowa Core	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	9
Gowa Nobles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tallok Core	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Tallok Nobles	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	6
Lekokbodong	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Makassar	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Bulo-Bulo	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Luwuk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Bugis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bone-Soppeng	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Eastern Indo.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	0	0	3	3	1	1	0	0	3	8	2	21

Almost all the marriages involved local Makassar polities. Even the Gowa Gelarang played a quite prominent rôle, and enjoyed enough status that their Gelarang district was recorded. True, four women from Bugis kingdoms of the west coast and the Walanae graben married into the royal Gowa core, but no offspring resulted, and only two of the Bugis brides were apparently royal. The sole procreative marriage involved Siang, the closest Bugis kingdom, into the Tallok royal core (see also Table 4-12).

Eight brides from other lineage groups married into the Tallok royalty. However, the dominant theme was marriage into the Gowa royalty, accounting for over half of the recorded marriages. Tallok and Polombangkeng provided most of Gowa's royal brides who additionally bore four of the six Gowa kings (GVII to GXII) of the period.

Gowa's weakly reciprocated absorption of brides from other lineage groups reflects her establishment as the new Makassar apical point. By the same token, lineage groups which failed to attract recorded wives soon disappeared from the records, as comparison between Table 4-15 and the subsequent tables shows. Examples include Garassik, an early source of brides, as well as Polombangkeng, more specifically Jamarang and Katingang. The fate of these polities contrasts with that of Sanrabone and Pattekne which attracted wives from other lineage groups and then persisted as independent lineage groups into the 17th century.

4.12.3 The golden period of greater Gowa

Table 4-17 and 4-18 give the marriages between lineage groups and resultant offspring in the "golden period" between Tunipasuluk's expulsion and the Makassar War (cf. Figure 4-5). Greater Gowa's wide sphere of political influence matches the geographical extent of lineage groups involved. Included are Gowa's Nusatenggaran allies Bima and Sumbawa, and Gowa's Bugis allies on the east coast, Bulu-Bulu and Luwuk. Greater Gowa's Gelarang still figure, but in a much reduced rôle, and we no longer learn precisely which Gelarang districts were involved (Table 4-13).

The Bulo-Bulo core recieved daughters from other lineage groups during the period, which might identify it as a high status lineage. However, Bulo-Bulo's absorption by Bone immediately after the Makassar War (see Andaya, 1981:Map 9) highlights its vulnerability, suggesting that Gowa and its allies bolstered Bulo-Bulo's status as part of a policy of preventing Bone's expansion southwards.³³

Greater Gowa's decentralised power structure is clearly reflected in the marriage patterns. The Gowa, Tallok and Lekokbodong nobilities now took a prominent part, while the frequency of daughter exchanges between the Gowa royalty and other lineage groups was reciprocal overall. Indeed the Tallok royalty provided rather than attracted wives; and by the end of the period the sultans of Gowa and Tallok both had mothers whose common origin is revealed by the lokmok title (Table 3-3).³⁴

Sanrabone was the only royal core to lose its throne during the period. Sanrabone had attracted wives during the long and successful reigns of SNV and SNVI, but then provided wives leading up to and during the period of chaotic succession which followed (4.6). The change is not apparent from the figures in Table 4-17 which are aggregated to reflect the political situation in greater Gowa rather than in Sanrabone. The Gowa prince (later Sultan Abdul Jalil) who absorbed Sanrabone's throne was either the matrilateral grandson or matrilateral great grandson of a Sanrabone raja (depending on how we intepret Sanrabone's mid-17th century succession). He could claim Sanrabone's throne based on his descent from a woman either right within or one step removed from the royal Sanrabone core (Figure 4-10).

³³ The argument does not work for Wajok, greater Gowa's other main Bugis ally of the period, for reasons which would presumably become clear from a detailed analysis of Wajok's marriage strategies during the period.

³⁴ Sultan Hasanuddin is one of Indonesia's "national heroes", so his lack of a high status mother disturbs Indonesian historians (e.g. Patunru, 1983:35). However, his succession to Gowa's throne was almost automatic as he was the only mature Gowa incumbent male at the time of his father's death (e.g. Figure 4-16). Similarly, after Sultan Mahmud's death in 1654 the choice of a (male) Tallok sultan was restricted to Kg Karunrung and Harrunarasyid (TX).

4.12.4 The survivors

Tables 4-19 and 4-20 show the last marriages between lineage groups and resultant offspring which I recorded. The very low number of offspring (21) compared to the number of marriages (54) may partly reflect my reduced attention to the 18th century records, but it does accord with the high rate of marriages ending in divorce (30/54) during the period. Overall the approximate number of offspring per recorded marriage appears to have declined from two during the 16th century, to one in the early to mid-17th century, and one third in the 17th century.

After the Makassar War, greater Gowa virtually ceased to attract women from outside status lineages and instead provided wives. Bulu-Bulu, which was immediately absorbed by Bone after the Makassar War, falls in the same pattern. The Bugis kingdoms which greater Gowa had previously dominated, a few of whom had provided greater Gowa with wives, now took up greater Gowa's daughters. In accordance with Sahaduddin's pre-eminence, Bone (including her main Arung) was dominant, but Soppeng, Siang, Agongnionjok (Segeri), Sawitto and Sidenreng also drew wives from greater Gowa (Table 4-14). So did the eastern Indonesian sultanates, now including Ternate. Greater Gowa's marriage strategies appear to have steered a course between securing protection through marriage into the military pre-eminence of Bone, and maintaining a wide suite of other aristocratic marriages as a buffer against absorption by Bone.³⁵

Marriage patterns within greater Gowa reflect the reorganisation of its internal power structure. The Gowa royalty and nobility provided wives, and the few wives they attracted from other lineage groups produced no offspring.

³⁵ Hence while Andaya (1981:302) correctly identifies Sahaduddin as South Sulawesi's new apical point, by stating that he '.... established in effect a single royal family linked by blood to his successor [Sultan Alimuddin]', greater Gowa's marriage strategies were vastly more complex than this. It is another marvellous irony of Sahaduddin's legacy that Soppeng, Bone's great ally, remained in Bone's clutches for a full generation after Sahaduddin's death, whereas Bone's control over the other Bugis-Makassar kingdoms was ephemeral.

Tallok and especially Lekokbodong attracted wives, even if not many offspring apparently resulted. The Tallok nobility was especially active in marriage exchanges, identifying it as Gowa's "power broker", a rôle centred on Kg Karunrung who became the single most powerful Makassar man. Thus after the Tallok sultan Harrunarasyid fled in the wake of Gowa's final military débâcle in 1667, Kg Karunrung managed to keep the royal Tallok patriline unbroken by installing the boy sultan Abdul Kadir (Abdaya, 1981; Patunru, 1983).

4.12.5 Specialisation of the Royal and Noble Lines

Greater Gowa's various lineage groups embraced different administrative specialisations, as schematically summarised in Figure 4-18 from an overview of the major titles held.

In the late 16th century the Gowa royalty effectively absorbed the post of regent (3.5.1) and occupied the Tallok and Maros thrones. In the late 17th century the Gowa royal core occupied the Sanrabone throne (4.6) and also briefly absorbed the regency (3.5.1).

Members of the Gowa nobility held the karaengships of Garassik and Galesong both in the 16th century and at the time of the Makassar War. Gowa nobles also held Mamampang (Garassik) twice in the late 17th century and the Sanrabone throne in the early 18th century (4.3; 4.6; 4.7). No Gowa noble ever held a non-territorial post.

The Tallok ruler was also the regent once in the 16th century and twice in the period 1593-1667. A Tallok ruler briefly ruled Segeri at c.1600 (ST:15) and a Tallok sultan occupied Gowa's throne in the early 18th century.

Three Tallok nobles were regents in the 17th century, two held the post of Tumakkajannangngang, one held the post of Tumailalang very late in the century, while one held the Garassik karaengship in the early 17th century.

Lekokbodong held the Maros karaengship early in the 17th century, in reflection of the origins of the lineage group, but no other major karaengships. However, seven of Gowa's 17th century Tumailalang have been assigned to Lekokbodong, and after the Makassar War Lekokbodong individuals also held the posts of the regency (very briefly) and harbourmaster.

These examples show that territorial control was primarily vested in Gowa, whereas the noble administrative posts were mostly held by Tallok and Lekokbodong. The Makassar War and its aftermath grievously diminished the area under greater Gowa's jurisdiction (Andaya, 1981), but without simplifying greater Gowa's administration. Consequently Gowa had become largely redundant to the survival of an organisation whose survival now lay in its capacity to resist the new territorial overlords, Bone and the VOC.

4.13 Makassar Aristocratic Organisation and Political Change

The analysis of Makassar titulation (Chapter 3), when placed alongside the prevailing patterns of how titles were held by, or transmitted across lineage groups, allows the following overview of the constants in the political landscape and the legitimisation of political change.

The key institutions were the bilateral descent groups composed of descendants of the inaugurators of hereditary titles. The most powerful of these were associated with a royal title closely guarded by a patrilineal core. Royal polygyny at the centre generated a bank of potential princes who ensured uninterrupted patrilineal passage of the title. *Ipso facto* it also generated unsuccessful candidates who, along with their patrilineal descendents, maintained a recognised place within the bilateral descent group if they achieved a karaengship. The more powerful the patrilineal royalty, the larger its following of attached noble patrilineal lines. In short, securing the patrilineal succession stimulated political expansion, to such a degree that the power of any monarch was closely related to his number of wives.

Royal polygyny also generated a bank of princesses who tended to marry other royal lines and entrench the royalty's genealogical distinctiveness. Yet because these daughters' status was systematically downgraded, they could also marry nobles either attached to some royal patriline or descended from local status lineages. This did not create any dangers for the royal patriline as long as it kept its position of

power. The offspring from these marriages were simply not admitted into the royal core.

If the system excluded by patrilineal descent towards the centre, it also included by bilateral descent towards the peripheries. Men from a higher status lineage could attach themselves to a wife from a lower status lineage, and the offspring could then belong to the wife's group.³⁶ This privilege allowed the powerful lineages to dump their superfluous proportion of well-born men towards the margins. The men then held exalted positions within their group which enjoyed greater prestige because of its attachment towards the centre. The privilege also allowed a powerful royal patriline to absorb territorial titles previously belonging to autonomous patriline. The powerful royal retained his membership within his natal group while his wife, as the princess from the weaker line, transmitted the right of office to her husband through marriage, or to their sons through bilateral descent.³⁷

In a very practical sense the king was the husband of his realm (cf. Joordaan and Josselin de Jong, 1985). The legitimacy of his control derived from his marriages, or those of his direct ancestors, to princesses within the cores of the subjugated domains. So during 1500-1593 the Gowa royalty attracted status wives from those areas which Gowa came to rule. The territorial ambitions of the Gowa royalty, and its ability to draw status wives, were then contained until the mid-17th century when Gowa legitimately absorbed Sanrabone. With the loss of Gowa's subjugated lands after 1667, Gowa now became "wife" to the two powerful royal lineages in Makassar, Bone-Soppeng³⁸ and Tallok.

³⁶ Hence the indigenous view which derives the nobility from the marriage between commoners and descendants of the Tomanurung.

³⁷ The Kasepekan Konjo do not permit men this right of affiliation or membership within two cores (Rössler, 1987:65), but the Gowa royalty did not observe this nicety during their territorial expansion.

³⁸ It is worthwhile pointing out that by this juncture Bone-Soppeng was largely based in Makassar. Sahaduddin's main palace centre was Bonto Alak, a short distance from the Dutch in Fort Rotterdam; Alimuddin frequently consulted with the Dutch during his reign over Bone; and one of his sons was briefly Gowa's sultan.

Although Abdul Jalil's death eclipsed the Gowa patriline, the rulership of Gowa remained the most prestigious title, and was finally absorbed by Tallok as the most powerful Makassar line. Tallok's Sirajuddin was preferred over Bone's Ismail owing to the depth of Sirajuddin's bilateral ties with the Gowa nobility, and his relationship one way or another to very many Makassar nobles. Sirajuddin's ascendancy, which bequeathed a disputed succession until his direct descendants finally monopolised the Gowa rulership late in the 19th century (2.5.4), is not conventionally registered as a dynastic change (e.g. Patunru, 1983). In the sense that the disputed succession involved closely related Makassar lineages, and that Tallok's origins are ultimately one with Gowa's (Figure 2-2), there was no dynastic change. Thus the principle of bilateral membership not only allowed the legitimate passage of authority between peer patriline, it also tended to ensure continuity of social organisation by resisting unrelated factions.