CHAPTER I

Introduction

This chapter presents a narrative overview of Makassarese history as glimpsed through the Gowa and Talloq chronicles, then assesses the historiographical issues related to the interpretation of the chronicles as historical sources and historical narratives.

The chronicles' history of pre-colonial Makassar

A narrative reconstruction of Gowa and Talloq's past begins with oral legends incorporated into the *Gowa chronicle*. As the chronicle tells it, the rulers of what would become Gowa descended from the marriage between a *tumanurung*, or mythical being who descended from the Upperworld and in whose veins noble white blood flows, and a stranger named Karaeng Bayo. Karaeng Bayo may have come from the southern Makassarese coastal area of Bantaeng, an early trading spot in which important archaeological finds have been unearthed, or from Sanrabone, another coastal community long linked to external trade routes. The name Bayo probably derives from *bajo*, a term which referred to those who came from the seas. Structurally, then, the origin story of Gowa follows a widespread Austronesian pattern in which a stranger-king from overseas marries a local woman, though in this case one who mysteriously descended from above (compare Bellwood 1996; Fox 1995; Sahllins 1985). Indeed, the *tumanurung*'s unearthly origins ensure that the line of *karaeng* who came from her union with Karaeng Bayo can claim a descent and status unequalled by any other rival rulers in Makassar. Asserting and defending the uniqueness of the rulers of Gowa was a central purpose of the chronicles (Cummings 2002).

The *tumanurung* and Karaeng Bayo's child, Tumassalanga Barayang ('the one with uneven shoulders'), was born with deformities that signified his otherworldly nature and hinted at supernatural powers of sight, hearing, and smell beyond those of normal humans. The *Gowa chronicle* says nothing of Karaeng Bayo's fate, though it describes how the *tumanurung* disappeared without a trace. From each of his parents Tumassalanga Barayang inherited

objects that would become the central regalia of the rulers of Gowa: half of a necklace named Tanisamaang and the sword Sudanga, borne by Karaeng Bayo's brother Lakipadada. Culturally connected to the founding figures that possessed them, subsequent rulers could point to these sacred objects (*kalom-poang*) as tangible proofs of their illustrious, indeed incomparable, descent.

Tumassalanga Barayang disappeared as abruptly as his mother, and was succeeded by his son. The chronicles tell us nothing more than the names of the four rulers after Tumassalanga Barayang. It is likely that the impressive and important origins of Gowa were considered important to remember, but the details about these rulers were not as valued. When the *Gowa chronicle* was composed later, chroniclers could only report that their wives, children, wars, and the lengths of their reigns are not known 'because nothing is said of it'.

Unlike the dramatic and otherworldly origins of Gowa, the origins of Talloq were a matter of succession politics (Cummings 1999). The sixth ruler of Gowa, Tunatangkalopi, had two sons, Batara Gowa and Karaeng Loe ri Sero. After a quarrel over an unknown matter, Karaeng Loe ri Sero left Gowa and journeyed westwards. When he returned, he discovered that not all of the local lords whom his father Tunatangkalopi had assigned to him had switched their allegiance to Batara Gowa. With these few loyal followers and their households, he established a new settlement close to the sea in the mid to late fifteenth century. This community, Talloq, was distant enough from inland Gowa to retain its independence for several generations.

The founding of Talloq as described in the chronicle is pervaded by mythical tropes. As Ian Caldwell notes, the tale of a quarrel between brothers, the younger of whom is forced to leave and seek his fortune by starting a new settlement beyond the pale of civilization, is an ancient pan-Austronesian theme common in South Sulawesi (Caldwell 1995:413-4). The presence of the outrigger canoe is also reminiscent of Austronesian stories of settlement. The very notion of a community led by a chief being analogous to a ship led by a captain is likewise an Austronesian theme, and may have its origins in the actual voyages by which bands of Austronesians spread through and beyond Southeast Asia (Bellwood 1996, 1997; Fox 1996; Manguin 1986). Cultural mythology may have trumped geography here, for travel from Gowa to Campagaya does not require a ship, though it may have been the easiest way to journey from Bangkalaq to Campagaya. Additionally, while it is possible that following their dispute Karaeng Loe traveled to Java it is far from likely. To Makassarese the term 'Jawa' referred to peoples from the western archipelago, more often Malays than Javanese. In the story here, it may mean that Karaeng Loe journeyed to meet Malay traders on the coast in a place like Garassiq, that he visited offshore islands, or that he traveled to a nearby destination such as a Malay community across the Makassar Strait

in Borneo. Unlike his successor's three-year journey overseas to Melaka and Banda, explicitly described in the chronicle, the travels of Karaeng Loe are too vague for certainty.

Beginning in the sixteenth century the two chronicles provide detailed accounts of the reigns of the rulers of Gowa and Talloq. It is important to emphasize that these chronicles are not general histories of these two communities, but descriptions of their rulers. Events, places, and people are included insofar as they were connected to the ruling *karaeng*. These are related thematically, not chronologically. In general, the account of each reign begins by stating the ruler's names and titles, after which come three basic kinds of information. Marriages and significant offspring are described first; followed by the conquests, important events, and developments that took place during that *karaeng*'s reign; and finally the character or personality of the *karaeng* is briefly assessed. The greatest portion of each narrative account consists of genealogical information. This information was crucial for succession politics. Makassar society seems to have become increasingly focused on ordering society along the lines of ascribed rank. Later observers universally remarked on the careful marking of rank and the politics of status rivalry evident in Makassar.¹ Genealogical closeness to the ruler generally corresponded to social importance and political power, though this was tempered by the fact that a ruler's closest rivals were typically siblings of similar rank.

Gowa and Talloq did not remain small communities that are of interest primarily because of the complexity of their kinship politics, however. During the course of the sixteenth century Gowa came to dominate most of South Sulawesi. This process began with Karaeng Tumapaqrisiq Kallonna, the first Gowa ruler whose reign the *Gowa chronicle* describes at length. While his accomplishments are perhaps all the more impressive because of the paucity of information about his predecessors, there is no doubt that decisive changes during his reign transformed Gowa. Ruling from late 1510 or early 1511 to late 1546, Tumapaqrisiq Kallonna laid the foundation for Gowa's later domination of Makassar. Among his accomplishments the *Gowa chronicle* mentions the first written records, laws, and declarations of war. With Gowa's long list of conquests of other Makassar society communities during his reign the dramatic rise of Gowa's influence throughout Makassar began. Many of those 'conquered' were defeated in battle and forced to acknowledge Gowa's sovereignty, but this did not mean permanent submission or immediate incorporation into Gowa's growing empire. Ties of marriage, exchanges of sacred *kalompoang*, commercial access to overseas valuables brought to Gowa, population resettlement, and other factors had to do their slower work before early relations based on defeat

¹ Bulbeck 1996; Chabot 1996; Cummings 2002; Pelras 2000; Reid 2000.

in war could give way to more stable links tying and subordinating outlying Makassarese communities to Gowa. At the same time, Gowa employed its growing and formidable military might as far afield as Bugis Boné and Sidénréng, while signing a treaty with Luwuq. Gowa's horizons moved quickly from the small stage of local politics to wars, treaties, and trade with polities across the peninsula and beyond. During his reign too Makassarese traded at Melaka and welcomed Portuguese merchants to Gowa.

The expansion of Gowa's influence begun under Tumapaqrisiq Kallonna – militarily, economically, politically – continued throughout the early modern era. Gowa's sixteenth-century rulers descended from Tumapaqrisiq Kallonna. He was succeeded by his sons Tunipalangga (reign late 1546 to early 1565) and Tunibatta (ruled for forty days in 1565), Tunibatta's son Tunijalloq (reign 1565 to late 1590), and Tunijalloq's son Tunipasuluq (reign late 1590 to early 1593). The *Gowa chronicle* records impressive accomplishments during these reigns as well. Under Tunipalangga a range of specialized craftsmen began to work for the ruler: ironsmiths, goldsmiths, builders, shipwrights, blow-pipe makers, ropemakers, and more. Bricks were fired, gold smelted, and gunpowder mixed. Weapons and agricultural implements were improved. Earthen forts began to be buttressed with brick walls. Communities as far away as Mandar in central Sulawesi now acknowledged Gowa's suzerainty. Tunibatta died fighting the Bugis, but Gowa's rise continued during the reign of his son Tunijalloq. He worked hard to further the efforts of his predecessors. He strengthened defensive forts along the coast with powerful cannons, improved Makassarese ships and weapons, and patronized court scribes. Trade flourished, and Tunijalloq sent envoys abroad and made alliances outside of Sulawesi with the rulers of Mataram, Banjarmasin, Johor, and with rulers in Maluku and Timor. Tunijalloq built a mosque for the burgeoning Malay community, who themselves may have begun proselytizing among Makassarese. After some time Tunijalloq felt that Gowa was strong enough to challenge the Bugis again, and the Bugis kingdoms of Boné, Soppéng, and Wajoq banded together in a triple alliance in 1582 against Gowa. By the end of his reign Gowa was without doubt the preeminent power and commercial centre in South Sulawesi. The *Gowa chronicle* remembers Tunijalloq's son and successor Tunipasuluq as a despot known for arbitrary behavior. Only fifteen years of age when he came to power, Tunipasuluq exiled or seized the property of many nobles, presumably removing resistance to his efforts to centralize and reorganize Makassarese social relations and manpower obligations (Cummings 2005b). Many Malay traders and Makassarese fled during his brief reign, opposing his demands for subservience or fearful that his gaze would next fall upon them. Finally, the nobles of Gowa and Talloq collectively deposed Tunipasuluq, and he died in exile on the distant island of Buton twenty four years later.

The *Gowa chronicle* describes at length two great turning points during the sixteenth century. The first of these was a war fought between Gowa and its allies against the combined forces of Talloq, Maros, and Polombangkeng in the 1530s. Gowa was victorious, and simultaneously gained access to the manpower and rich agricultural lands of Maros and Polombangkeng and the maritime trade of coastal Talloq. This access must have been decisive in fueling Gowa's rise. Significant too was the beginning afterwards, as yet tentative, of a close partnership with Talloq that would flourish in the seventeenth century. The second major turning point came in perhaps 1561, when a group of Malays approached Tunipalangga and asked for a place to dwell. This was certainly not the first time that Malays and Makassarese encountered each other. Malays had been trading at Makassarese ports for decades, and some groups settled in Makassarese coastal communities after being forced from Melaka by the Portuguese conquest in 1511. Makassarese too may well have been known in Melaka: the Portuguese merchant Tomé Pires mentioned traders from the 'Macaçar islands', while the *Gowa chronicle* noted that Karaeng Tumapaqrisiq Kallonna came to power in the same year that Melaka was conquered. But now a pattern of intermittent or seasonal interaction with Malay merchants gave way to the regular, everyday contact that only a permanent community could facilitate (Cense 1978; Cummings 1998). More than any other group, Malay mercantile acumen and commercial contacts throughout the archipelago accelerated the pace and profitability of trade at Gowa. These two events were of profound importance for Gowa's later history.

The chronicles also reveal significant trends shaping Gowa and Makassar during the course of the sixteenth century. Most evident, Gowa's rulers began to create a hierarchy of positions and titles that would endure beyond the lifespan of personal and kinship links between individuals. The two most important were probably those of harbormaster (*sabannaraq*) and an advisor to the ruler known as 'The Speaker of the Land' (*tumabicarabutta*). Other officials included a trio of ministers (*tumailalang*) that acted as intermediaries within Gowa. Individual nobles now occupied these permanent positions, each of which had defined duties, privileges, and ritual roles. Some communities were transformed into appanages for the noble who held the title – the '*karaeng*-ship' – of that area. In addition, a bewildering variety of local titles were arranged over time into a coherent hierarchy. The most powerful rulers of important communities were titled *karaeng*; other local lords were titled *gallarrang*; leaders of smaller communities were called *kare*, *datuq*, *loqmoq*, or one of several other titles. The ruler of Gowa alone was addressed as *somba*. More important than these individual designations was the recognition that they represented particular ranks or positions within a Makassarese society whose pinnacle was in Gowa. Not rigid or unchanging, this evolving hierarchy of positions and titles nevertheless marked out a comparatively coherent

system of relative statuses and clear political and social relationships within an integrated whole.

Accompanying and making possible this growing hierarchy was the increasing power of the ruler of Gowa. From being an adjudicator of disputes and first among equals, the Karaeng Gowa became an august ruler with considerable power. In Gowa's early years the ruler's main source of support was the followers of local *gallarrang* who otherwise possessed considerable autonomy. During the course of the sixteenth century, however, more and more prestige, resources, and influence lay with the titled positions and *karaeng*-ships established over the course of the sixteenth century. The ruler of Gowa and a handful of *karaeng* dominated Gowa's affairs, making decisions and reaping the economic and political benefits that stemmed from their privileged positions. Yet this power was not unlimited. Tunipasuluq's arbitrary actions established the boundaries beyond which rulers could not go, and the belief that rulers must be lawful rather than rapacious remained a potent ideal.

During the seventeenth century these trends and the general pattern of Gowa's expansion and rising power continued at an even swifter pace. Following the deposition of Tunipasuluq, the influential statesman and ruler of Talloq Karaeng Matoaya installed on the throne of Gowa Tunipasuluq's brother (and his own nephew) who would come to be known as Sultan Ala'uddin (reign 1593 to 1639). The new ruler of Gowa was a young boy at the time, and it was Karaeng Matoaya who supervised the rebuilding of a Gowa empire that Tunipasuluq's actions had threatened to destroy. Sultan Ala'uddin remained under Karaeng Matoaya's tutelage for most of his long reign until Karaeng Matoaya's death. Sultan Ala'uddin considered his uncle his closest advisor, and he followed Karaeng Matoaya's lead in all things.

The account of Karaeng Matoaya's reign is by far the longest in the *Talloq chronicle*, and it is effusive in describing the accomplishments of his reign. Chief among these were extensive conquests in Makassarese and Bugis lands, innovations in warfare and naval technology, extension of Makassarese domination overseas, construction of elaborate fortifications, attainment of a high level of craftwork, and the growth of Makassar into an important trading entrepôt. From 1593 to 1636, when Karaeng Matoaya died, Gowa and Talloq flourished. By all accounts a gifted, industrious, and wise man, Matoaya presided over Gowa's rise from a local power within South Sulawesi to a key power within the Indonesian archipelago (Reid 1981). Crucial to this success were the close bonds the rulers of Gowa and Talloq forged beginning with Matoaya and Ala'uddin. During this period, outsiders often assumed the two kingdoms were one, living up to the famous and long-remembered Makassarese pronouncement that Gowa and Talloq had 'only one people but two rulers' (*segreji ata narua karaeng*).

Punctuating this continuing narrative of rulers overseeing the expansion of Gowa during the seventeenth century was another important watershed: conversion to Islam. Muslim Malays had been visiting and residing in Makassar for a century or more before the rulers of Gowa and Talloq converted to Islam. Quite probably individual Makassarese converted before 1605, but on 22 September of that year Karaeng Matoaya formally and publicly embraced Islam, followed soon thereafter by Sultan Ala'uddin (the Islamic title by which this first Muslim ruler of Gowa is known). In a society where rulers were the focus of social life and its norms, other Makassarese quickly followed these rulers. There was resistance to formally accepting Islam by some Makassarese, and 'conversion' itself is best understood as an ongoing process rather than a single transformative event.² For example, lowland Makassarese populations participated in Islamic practices and identified themselves as Muslims long before highland Makassarese, who often equated entering Islam with political submission to Gowa. Nevertheless, Karaeng Matoaya and Sultan Ala'uddin fundamentally changed South Sulawesi. Matoaya and Ala'uddin launched campaigns known as 'Wars of Islamization' throughout and beyond the peninsula. Between 1608 and 1611 all the major polities of South Sulawesi south of the highland Toraja were forcibly converted to Islam. Overseas areas conquered or under the influence of Gowa, such as Bima on the island of Sumbawa, were similarly compelled to convert to the new faith (Noorduyn 1987). This explicitly Islamic Makassarese identity did not cause major social changes in the pre-colonial period, but it did become an important idiom in which Makassarese political relations were expressed, and it did establish Gowa as an Islamic polity on a par with Aceh, Banten, and the other major Islamic courts dominating the archipelago during the seventeenth century.

The last ruler described in the *Talloq chronicle* is Tumammaliang ri Timoroq (reign 1623 to 1641). The son of Karaeng Matoaya, he is described in lackluster terms, and is most known for marrying twenty times. He was succeeded by his brother Karaeng Pattingalloang (reign 1641 to 1654), who outside observers considered to be as sage and capable as Matoaya. It is puzzling that no extant chronicle manuscript contains an account of his reign. Possibly such an account was composed, but no copies of the chronicle containing that section survived. We are better served by *Gowa chronicle* manuscripts. All recount the reign of Sultan Ala'uddin's successor Sultan Malikussaid (reign 1639 to 1653), and many contain accounts of his successor, Sultan Hasanuddin (reign 1653 to 1669). Hasanuddin was the last independent ruler of Gowa, and the one who oversaw the debacle of the Makassar Wars (1666-1669), which ended in

² Andaya 1984; Cummings 2001; Noorduyn 1956; Pelras 1985.

Gowa's subjugation (Andaya 1981). Though the wars are not described in the chronicle, following the conquest he abdicated, and died soon after. With his death the *Gowa chronicle* ends too, a poignant recognition that a glorious era had come to a close.

Historiographical comments

We know nothing of the anonymous writers who composed and copied these chronicles, which perforce limits assessing their historiographical character to what we can learn from the texts themselves. For the most part, modern historians have been content to mine the chronicles for historical facts with which to construct narrative accounts of the rise and fall of Gowa. In contrast to historical texts from Java, texts from South Sulawesi have famously been pronounced 'sober' and 'factual' (Cense 1951; Noorduyt 1961, 1965). Yet these judgments were perhaps too hasty. We should first ask just what are we studying, and what do we presume this object of study to be like?

Most basically, what kind of histories do the chronicles tell or enable us to tell? An established empiricist strain in South Sulawesi studies offers one answer: the chronicles record a treasure-trove of by and large reliable, factual information about Makassar in the early modern period. This practical view has much to commend it, not least of all because without the information recorded in these two chronicles we would know little about Makassar history before the middle of the seventeenth century. It is no exaggeration to state that their narrative has been synonymous with Gowa's history in particular. Abdurrazak Daeng Patunru's *Sejarah Gowa* (History of Gowa, 1969) closely follows the chronicles, as do the works of Leonard Andaya (1981) and Anthony Reid (1981, 1983). Historians interested in empirical reconstruction of the main historical figures, events, developments, and patterns that have structured or characterized Makassar history are deeply in the debt of our anonymous chroniclers.

Yet, despite the presence of many useful facts, there are numerous topics about which the chroniclers remained silent. As accounts of the reigns of rulers, the chronicles are clearly not ambitious in scope. There is enough mention of inaugural events like the minting of gold coins, the arrival of foreign merchants, and establishment of standardized weights and measures to gain a sense of the rising importance of trade in Makassar, but very little information that would allow us to reliably chart economic developments. We know that Karaeng Tunipalangga of Gowa (reign 1546 to 1565) was described as wealthy, but in comparison to what? Tumammaliang ri Timoroq of Talloq (reign 1623 to 1641) was also described as wealthy, but did this have a different meaning nearly a century later? Ultimately, we can only reconstruct the volume and scope of trade at Makassar through the observa-

tions of Europeans and VOC records, as Noorduyn (1983) has done for the pre-colonial period and Gerrit Knaap and Heather Sutherland (2004) for the eighteenth century.

Another difficulty in interpreting the information contained in the chronicles derives from uncritical reliance on models of historical development that scholars have imported from outside Sulawesi. For example, the assumption that what developed in sixteenth and seventeenth century Makassar was an 'early modern state' is based on criteria derived from the European experience. Thus Ian Caldwell confidently writes, 'The chronicles of these kingdoms record, in the sixteenth century, the development of kingship, the codification of law, the rise of a bureaucracy, the imposition of a military draft and taxation, and the emergence of full-time craftsmen. These are all features of the modern state' (Caldwell 1995:418). Yet scholarship on the nature of the state suggests that this list of criteria is problematic and arbitrary.³ Furthermore, many of the features of the state that Caldwell sees as being evident in the chronicles are in fact only hinted at. We know little about the rise of a bureaucracy, for example, beyond the fact that several titled positions were created, and the same can be said for the codification of law, the imposition of a military draft, and taxation. Too often we are inferring that these processes were taking place on the basis of fragmentary, if suggestive, evidence. Such inferences risk conflating what Christian Pelras (2000:51) called 'spontaneous patterns' with 'consciously articulated models' when it comes to matters such as succession and bureaucratization. Other historians have made similar cautions that we should heed. Oliver Wolters emphasized the difference between centralization via meaningful structural change and ad hoc decisions that superficially resemble such change: 'I think that one needs to distinguish between genuine institutional change, designed to reform situations irreversibly and perhaps in the direction of more centralized rule, and improvisations in response to changing circumstances and in the form of time-honoured expedients' (Wolters 1999:138). In similar terms, Sunait Chutintaranond (1990) has argued that in the case of Ayudhya it is easy to mistake what were really 'spasmodic bureaucratic improvisations' for the introduction of centralized institutions. In short, while the chronicles do contain useful facts, they contain far fewer than we might wish, and this scarcity presents interpretive temptations when it comes to plotting the trajectory of Makassar history. We cannot be sure that the meager facts in the chronicles present anything more than ad hoc improvisations, though we would like them to be evidence of conscious policies.

³ Bentley 1986; Christie 1995; Day 2002; Lieberman 2003; Migdal 2001; Mitchell 1991; Tilly 1990.

Judging the utility of the information in the chronicles is but one historiographical issue confronting modern readers of the texts. It is also worth assessing the chronicles as historical works in their own right. Based on what we can infer from the texts themselves, the chroniclers' intent was to relate the truth about the rulers of Gowa and Talloq, as they saw it. It was not their intent to write what we conventionally term a 'history'. There is little evidence of concern with questions of causation or motive, for example, or interest in identifying patterns or themes in the past. The texts do not appear reflective about the past and, with the exception of remarks about the personality of rulers, show no interest in assessing, judging, or interpreting the past. Most importantly, chroniclers never recorded facts for their own sake. A wide range of people and events, observations and information, could conceivably have been included in the chronicles. But that was not their writers' purpose. Though I believe there is no reason to doubt the veracity of most of the information contained in the chronicles, this by no means implies that the chronicles share our historiographical sensibility. Containing facts does not make them factual, particularly if that connotes an objective evaluation of the past.

Two hallmarks of the Gowa and Talloq chronicles as historical narratives particularly merit discussion and interpretation. The first concerns their genealogical character and the second their significance in extending the authority of the rulers whose lives they chronicle. As we shall see, these two features are closely related.

As noted in this chapter's overview of Makassarese history as presented in the chronicles, the texts are elaborately genealogical. Each of the chronicles is quite literally a chain of *karaeng*: an account of successive rulers bound together by descent from august, even sacred ancestors. The word for chronicle (*patturioloang*) means 'that which is of the ancestors' and underscores the fundamentally genealogical nature of the texts. Genealogy and the passage of generations, it seems, provided the structure in which time was conceptualized and change expressed. It was the reference point or measuring stick in the way that a linear time line is the modern historian's reference against which to plot events and place people. Events and people were chronicled in relation to rulers, not in an abstract framework. The early reigns of the rulers of Gowa and Talloq contain no dates at all; the lives of rulers alone was sufficient measure. A new conception of dating began with conversion to Islam in the early seventeenth century. Makassarese became aware of foreign systems for marking time: the Arabic lunar and Portuguese solar calendars. This form of temporal reckoning was expressed far more clearly in the Gowa court *lontaraq bilang* records than in the chronicles (Kamaruddin et al. 1969; Ligtvoet 1880). Even the increased interest in reign lengths and the years in which important events occurred in the final reigns of the chronicles does not

obscure the fact that they continued to be structured by the lives of the ruling *karaeng* (Cummings 2005a).

This genealogical character was politically significant. In an important essay Tony Day (1996) argued that Southeast Asian states be viewed as constituted by families and kinship relations. Day's article is a provocative offering, an invitation to think about Southeast Asian societies in new ways, rather than a systematically worked-out argument, but it encourages us to assess the degree to which Gowa as a polity was the sum of its kinship ties. In such a reading we need not cull through texts for the scanty evidence about institutionalization of offices and functions, but rather see in the kinship mappings of the Gowa and Talloq chronicles the architecture of the state. Certainly this accords well with our understanding that in Makassar marriages were highly political, outsiders' access to women contested, and that political expansion took place through both marriages and rituals which established 'fictive' kinship relations in the idiom of siblingship or parentage (Bulbeck 1996; Cummings 2002).

In other words, evaluating the chronicles on their own terms of what was considered important to record suggests that abundant genealogical information – chains linking individuals with their ascendants and descendants – should be read as more than just legitimizing descent, or even as being essential to the calculus of determining social rank according to the purity of one's noble white blood. More than just informative and functional, these genealogical passages constitute descriptions of the boundaries of the kingdom. Indeed, the extent of this familial polity unfolds before our eyes as we read of the wives, concubines, children, and grandchildren of successive rulers of Gowa. Though it is not a line of analysis I wish to pursue too far, it is valid to write that each of these figures is brought into being as part of the essential constitutive structure of the polity as they are named in the chronicle. Each is brought into being by virtue of their relationship to the rulers of Gowa and Talloq, the family heads of the kingdoms described in each chronicle. The genealogy-infused chronicles are social maps of the extent and substance of the realm.

In attempting to 'read past' the genealogical information in search of facts describing the creation of an early modern state – or in pursuit of evidence for other historical developments – we are failing to see the forest for the trees. Gowa may have developed into an early modern state (if we can agree on exactly what this is), but this is certainly not the history that the Gowa and Talloq chronicles relate. They speak instead of the expansion of a social order arranged and understood in terms of personal relationships, particularly kinship ties relying on familial metaphors. From this perspective, the chronicles embody a Makassarese view of the pre-colonial state.

Quite obviously, then, genealogy is intimately connected to authority in

the texts. It is especially closely connected to the authority of the ruling *karaeng*. The chronicles themselves were composed in a cultural, social, and historical context in which the rulers of Gowa sought to distinguish themselves from rivals and assert their dominance over Makassar. Historical writing played a crucial role in this effort (Cummings 2002). The kinship networks, chains, and connections of the two chronicles represent the growing extent of that authority. The chronicles inscribe the expansion of the authority of their rulers across and within generations. By textually making the argument that power derives from genealogical proximity to the ruling *karaeng*, they help foster or bring this vision of the social order into being. Historiographically, then, the Gowa and Talloq chronicles stand out not so much for the facts they contain but for their vivid conception of how authority, kinship, rulers, and identity were intertwined in pre-colonial Makassar. More than simple political charters or useful sources for the writing of new historical narratives, the chronicles of Gowa and Talloq are evocative representations of Makassarese political culture. In this light, we can read them anew as windows onto another world.