Journal of Islamic Studies and Civilization
Volume 04, Number 1, 2026 (PP : 1 - 48)
https://doi.org/10.61680/jisc.v4i1.69

Political Power And Religious Authority In The Bone Kingdom, 1775–1812

Muh. Zulkifli
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
E-mail: muh.zulkifli2306@gmail.com

Hasaruddin
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
E-mail:hasaruddin@uin-alauddin.ac.id

Abd. Rahim Yunus
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
E-mail: abd.rahim.yunus@uin-alauddin.ac.id

Abstract

Studies on Islamization in South Sulawesi have predominantly focused on the seventeenth century, leaving the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries relatively understudied. This article addresses that gap by examining the Bone Kingdom during the reign of Sultan Ahmad Saleh (1775–1812). Using historical method with library research, it draws on the Lontara Bilang manuscripts, the Nur Al-Hadi treatise, and VOC archives. The findings reveal that the integration of political power and religious authority in Bone was not merely a matter of the Sultan's personal piety but a structural transformation. By embedding Islamic institutions

within the existing adat framework, the Sultan fused genealogical legitimacy with charismatic authority, making sara' the normative basis of governance. This produced a durable Islamic polity that outlived him. The study contributes to the historiography of Islam in South Sulawesi and, through a brief comparison with Gowa, Aceh, and Mataram, suggests a comparative framework for understanding religion and power in pre-modern Southeast Asian kingdoms.

Keywords: Bone Kingdom; Sultan Ahmad Saleh; political power; religious authority; Islamization

A. INTRODUCTION

The Islamization of the Indonesian archipelago was a complex and multifaceted process that unfolded through various channels, including trade, marriage, Sufi missionary work, education, and political conquest. In South Sulawesi, the acceptance of Islam in the early seventeenth century was deeply entangled with the rivalry between the Gowa and Bone kingdoms. While Gowa embraced Islam in 1605 and used it as an instrument of political expansion, Bone initially resisted, viewing the new religion as inseparable from the identity of its traditional enemy. The musu selleng (war of Islamization) ended with Bone's defeat in 1611, and Islam was imposed as the religion of the defeated kingdom. However, this initial conversion was only the beginning of a long process of adaptation, negotiation, and institutionalization that would continue for centuries. The historiography of Islam in South Sulawesi has predominantly focused on the seventeenth century, the period of initial Islamization and consolidation under Arung Palakka. The eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries remain relatively understudied, despite being a crucial phase when Islam moved from formal acceptance to institutional maturity. This article addresses that gap by

examining the relationship between political power and religious authority in Bone during Sultan Ahmad Saleh's reign (Omar, 2003, pp. 1–5; Andaya, 2021, p. 132; Ridha, 2013, p. 89).

The relationship between political power and religious authority in Islamic history has been a subject of extensive scholarly debate. In the classical Islamic tradition, the ruler was often regarded as the zillullah fi al-ardh (shadow of God on earth), entrusted with the dual responsibility of maintaining political order and upholding religious law. This conception of leadership found diverse expressions across the Muslim world, from the Ottoman caliphate to the dispersed sultanates of Southeast Asia. In the Malay-Indonesian world, the fusion of political and religious authority was particularly pronounced in the institution of the sultanate, where the ruler served as both temporal leader and spiritual guide. The Bugis kingdom of Bone in South Sulawesi presents a compelling case study of this phenomenon. Unlike Java, where the process of Islamization has been extensively studied through the lens of Clifford Geertz's influential work on the religion of Java (Geertz, 1960, pp. 121–127). Or Aceh, where the sultanate's Islamic character has been well documented, the Bugis kingdoms of South Sulawesi have received comparatively less attention, particularly regarding the post-seventeenth-century period.

Among the works closest to this period, Ridhwan (2016) surveys Islamic education in Bone across several centuries, (Ridhwan, 2016) and Ridhwan and Nuzul (2021) examine the institutional role of the Petta Kalie in the development of Islamic law. (Ridhwan & Nuzul, 2021). Both studies, however, adopt a broad diachronic approach and treat the Sultan primarily as a patron of institutions rather

than as an agent whose daily practices and textual production shaped the integration of political and religious authority. Neither makes systematic use of the Lontara Bilang of Sultan Ahmad Saleh as a primary source for analyzing that integration in a single reign. This study addresses that gap by focusing on the reign of Sultan Ahmad Saleh, the twenty-third ruler of Bone, whose thirty-seven-year reign (1775–1812) represents a critical juncture in the kingdom's religious and political development.

The theoretical framework of this study integrates three major perspectives: Anthony Giddens' structuration theory, Max Weber's sociology of religion, and Clifford Geertz's interpretive anthropology. Giddens' theory provides a lens for understanding how Sultan Ahmad Saleh, as an agent, both reproduced and transformed the existing structures of power and authority (Giddens, 2005, pp. 2–15). The concept of the duality of structure—where structures are both the medium and the outcome of the practices they recursively organize—is particularly relevant for analyzing how the Sultan navigated the complex terrain of Bugis adat and Islamic law. Weber's typology of authority—traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal—offers a framework for understanding the sources of the Sultan's legitimacy. His concept of hybrid authority, which combines elements of traditional and charismatic legitimacy, is especially useful for explaining how Sultan Ahmad Saleh consolidated his power by drawing on both his genealogical descent from the Tomanurung and his personal piety and religious knowledge (Weber, 1963, pp. xxxiv, 29). Geertz's notion of the "theatre state" and his definition of religion as a cultural system provide tools for interpreting the symbolic dimensions of the Sultan's rule, including his use of rituals, regalia, and textual production to project power and shape collective

identity (Geertz, 1980, pp. 13, 16; Geertz, 1992, p. 5). Additionally, the concept of acculturation, as discussed by Koentjaraningrat and Pether Sobian, helps explain how Islamic and local Bugis elements merged without erasing either, producing a distinctive form of vernacular Islam (Koentjaraningrat, 1985, p. 202; Sobian, 2022, p. 13).

The primary research question guiding this study is: How did the relationship between political power and religious authority shape the dynamics of Islam in the Bone Kingdom during the reign of Sultan Ahmad Saleh (1775–1812), and how did this relationship itself change over the course of his thirty-seven-year reign? This question is significant because it moves beyond the narrative of Islamization as a one-time event or a top-down imposition, revealing instead a continuous process of interaction, negotiation, and mutual reinforcement between the political and religious spheres. It also highlights the role of indigenous agency in shaping the form and character of Islam in a local context. By focusing on a single reign and tracing shifts over time, the study provides a depth of analysis that is often lacking in broader surveys of Islamic history in the region.

The sources for this study are unusually rich for a pre-modern Southeast Asian context. The Lontara Bilang (daily chronicles) of Sultan Ahmad Saleh and his son La Mappatunru, preserved in the British Library, provide an intimate view of the Sultan's daily activities, including his religious observances, political decisions, and personal reflections. The Nur Al-Hadi, a Sufi treatise authored by the Sultan himself, offers direct insight into his theological and spiritual thought (Anonim, n.d.). The Rapanna Arung Rioloe, a Bugis-Makassar legal text, documents the normative framework within which the Sultan operated (Abu &

Munasriana, 2025). The VOC archives from the Nationaal Archief in The Hague provide an external perspective, recording the Dutch perceptions of and interactions with the Bone court (Cense, 1966, p. 424; Ridhwan, 2016, p. 32).

B. METHOD

This study employs historical research methods with a library research approach. The object of study is a past event that must be reconstructed from contemporary sources. The historical method was chosen because the object of study is a past event that cannot be observed directly but must be reconstructed based on contemporary sources (Arikunto, 2006, p. 11; Madjid, 2014, p. 74). The library research approach was employed because all data analyzed originate from manuscripts, archives, and written documents stored in various institutions, both domestic and foreign (Kuntowijoyo, 2018, pp. 108–109). Data collection and analysis were conducted in five operational stages: corpus selection and bounding, transliteration and translation, external and internal criticism, triangulation, and interpretation and synthesis.

A crucial feature of this method is the application of source criticism to two distinct types of primary sources: the Lontara Bilang (the Sultan's own diary) and the VOC archives (colonial administrative records). These sources are not treated as neutral repositories of fact. The Lontara Bilang is read as a form of self-representation, in which the Sultan recorded not only what he did but also how he wished his reign to be remembered. The VOC archives are read as a counter-narrative produced by a colonial institution with its own commercial and political interests. External criticism was applied to verify the authenticity of each source—through handwriting analysis, chronological

coherence, and inventory verification—while internal criticism was applied to assess the credibility of its contents, distinguishing between routine entries that can be treated as factual, performative entries that function as claims to authority, and symbolic entries that require interpretive reading. The findings presented in this article are therefore not a simple summary of what the sources say, but an analysis of how political power and religious authority were constructed, contested, and negotiated in the Bone Kingdom. The five operational stages of this method are described in detail below.

The primary sources for this study include the Lontara Bilang manuscripts of Sultan Ahmad Saleh (Add. MS. 12356), his son La Mappatunru (Add. MS. 12357), and a letter to the Sultan of Johor (Add. MS. 12354), all held at the British Library in London. The Lontara Bilang Add. MS. 12356 contains entries from 1775 to 1795, covering religious, political, social, and personal events. The Lontara Bilang Add. MS. 12357 contains entries from 1800 to 1809. Also used are the Lontara Bilang ADD 12350 (Basiah, 2024), which records the death and burial of Sultan Ahmad Saleh in July 1812; the Nur Al-Hadi (VT 23) at the National Library of Indonesia, a Sufi treatise written in Bugis in seven chapters; and the Rapanna Arung Rioloe (VT 125 A Jilid 4), a Bugis-Makassar legal text translated by Anggraini Abu and Munasriana. VOC archival documents from the Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, provide external corroboration and additional perspectives, including inventories 1.04.02/8261, 8263, 8260, 7944, 3944, 3765, 3818, 3780, 3863, and 7952.

Secondary sources include books and articles on South Sulawesi history, Islamization, and Bugis culture, such as works by Andaya (2021), Omar (2003), Palloge (2006), Ridhwan (2016), Ridha (2013), and Azra (2004). These

sources were used to contextualize the primary data and to engage with existing scholarship on Islam in South Sulawesi. The study adopts a multi-dimensional approach: historical, religious, political, anthropological, and economic. The historical approach is used to trace the process of Islamization in Bone from the seventeenth century to the reign of Sultan Ahmad Saleh, including the musu selleng, the Bungaya Treaty, and post-treaty political dynamics (Kartodirjo, 1992, pp. 136–139). The religious approach is used to analyze how Islam functioned as a system of values influencing political, social, and cultural life. The political approach is used to analyze the relationship between the Sultan's political authority and the policies he adopted. The anthropological approach is used to analyze the concept of pangngadereng as a normative system, the integration of sara' into pangngadereng, and the rituals that combined adat and Islamic elements (Mattulada, 1983, pp. 232–233). The economic approach is used to analyze how trade policies, port management, and the agrarian base of the kingdom influenced the Sultan's legitimacy and provided the material foundation for the institutionalization of Islam (Reid, 2014, pp. 180–185).

Theoretically, this study integrates three main frameworks. First, Anthony Giddens' structuration theory (Giddens, 1984, pp. 2–15) is used to analyze the dialectic between structure and agency, showing how Sultan Ahmad Saleh both reproduced and transformed existing structures. The concept of the duality of structure—where structures are both the medium and the outcome of the practices they recursively organize—is particularly relevant for analyzing how the Sultan navigated the complex terrain of Bugis adat and Islamic law. Second, Max Weber's sociology of religion (Weber, 1963, pp. xxxiv, 29) provides concepts of traditional

and charismatic authority, and the role of religious ethics in social action. Weber's typology of authority—traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal—offers a framework for understanding the sources of the Sultan's legitimacy. His concept of hybrid authority, which combines elements of traditional and charismatic legitimacy, is especially useful for explaining how Sultan Ahmad Saleh consolidated his power. Third, Clifford Geertz's interpretive anthropology (Geertz, 1980, p. 13,16; Geertz, 1992, p. 5) treats religion as a cultural system and introduces the notion of the "theatre state," where symbols and rituals are used to project power and legitimacy. Geertz's definition of religion as a system of symbols that establishes powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations provides a framework for interpreting the Sultan's use of rituals, regalia, and textual production. Additionally, the concept of acculturation, as discussed by Koentjaraningrat (Koentjaraningrat, 1985, p. 202) and Sobian (Sobian, 2022, p. 13), helps explain how Islamic and local Bugis elements merged without erasing either, producing a distinctive form of vernacular Islam.

The research procedure was conducted in five operational stages. Stage 1: Corpus selection and bounding. The corpus was bounded by three criteria: (a) temporal proximity to the reign of Sultan Ahmad Saleh, (b) direct relevance to the relationship between political power and religious authority, and (c) availability of transliteration or translation. Sources falling outside these criteria were excluded.

Stage 2: Transliteration and translation. The Bugis-language manuscripts were transliterated using the standard Lontara script conversion system, following the conventions established by Muhlis Hadrawi (2020) and the Lontara Sakke' Attoriolong Bone edition. Transliteration was

performed line by line, with each entry cross-checked against the published translations where available (Basiah, 2024). For entries without published translations, transliteration was verified by comparing parallel passages in related manuscripts. Arabic loanwords embedded in the Bugis text were identified using the Kamus Bugis-Indonesia and verified against standard Arabic dictionaries. Dutch-language VOC documents were translated using the Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal and cross-referenced with published Dutch-Indonesian translations where available.

Stage 3: External and internal criticism. External criticism was performed to assess the authenticity of each source. The Lontara Bilang Add. MS. 12356 was verified as an original diary written by Sultan Ahmad Saleh based on handwriting consistency, internal chronological coherence, and the presence of personal details that would not have been added by a later copyist. The VOC documents were verified as authentic colonial records through their inventory numbers, official seals, and the presence of signatures of known VOC officials. Internal criticism was performed to assess the credibility of each source's content. For the Lontara Bilang, this involved identifying passages that may reflect self-representation rather than neutral reporting. For the VOC archives, this involved identifying passages that may reflect colonial interests or biases rather than objective observation.

Stage 4: Triangulation. The diary entries and VOC documents were matched using three strategies. First, events recorded in both sources were compared to identify points of agreement and disagreement. Second, where the diary records an event but the VOC does not, the silence of the VOC was treated as significant and interpreted in light of

the VOC's own priorities. Third, where the VOC records an event but the diary does not, the omission was treated as potentially revealing of what the Sultan chose not to record. This triangulation strategy does not assume that either source is neutral; rather, it uses the differences between them to reconstruct a more nuanced picture of the relationship between political power and religious authority.

Stage 5: Interpretation and synthesis. The data were interpreted using the theoretical frameworks described above and synthesized into a historiographical narrative. The interpretation process involved both analysis—breaking down the data into its constituent parts—and synthesis—reassembling the data into a meaningful whole. The context of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in South Sulawesi was taken into account in the interpretation (Abdurahman, 2011, pp. 20–21).

C. Discussion

1. Theoretical Review

The theoretical framework of this study is not a collection of interchangeable lenses but a coordinated analytical apparatus in which each theory performs a distinct function. Giddens' structuration theory provides the mechanism of historical change, Weber's sociology of authority provides the content of legitimacy, Geertz's symbolic anthropology provides the medium of power, and the concept of acculturation provides the outcome of the process. Together, they form a single argument about how political power and religious authority were integrated in Bone.

Giddens answers the question of how structure and agency are related. His concept of the duality of structure

explains why Sultan Ahmad Saleh could not simply impose his will but had to work through existing institutions even as he transformed them. Giddens thus provides the mechanism by which the Sultan's actions both reproduced and modified the structures of the Bone kingdom (Giddens, 1984, pp. 120, 132). Without this framework, the analysis would risk either reducing the Sultan to a passive product of structural forces or exaggerating his freedom to act independently of them.

Weber answers the question of what kind of authority the Sultan wielded. His typology—traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal—allows for a precise characterization of Sultan Ahmad Saleh's authority as hybrid: traditional by descent from the Tomanurung, charismatic by personal piety and tarekat connection, and increasingly rational-legal through the institutionalization of religious offices. Weber thus explains why the Sultan's authority was both durable and adaptable—durable because it drew on multiple sources of legitimacy, adaptable because it could shift emphasis as circumstances changed (Weber, 1963, pp. 51, 54, 74).

Geertz answers the question of how power was made visible and compelling. His concept of the theatre state and his definition of religion as a cultural system explain why rituals, regalia, and textual production were essential instruments of power, not mere decorations. The Sultan's participation in Friday prayers, his celebration of Maulid, his possession of the Gowa regalia, and his authorship of the Nur Al-Hadi were performances that projected a cosmic order onto the political realm. Geertz thus explains how the integration of political and religious authority was made tangible and persuasive to both subjects and foreign powers (Geertz, 1980, pp. 13, 16, 109; Geertz, 1992, p. 5)

The concept of acculturation answers the question of what kind of Islam emerged. The integration of sara' into pangngadereng, the use of Bugis in religious texts, and the retention of adat rituals within an Islamic framework are examples of acculturation that produced a distinctly Bugis form of Islam—neither a wholesale adoption of foreign norms nor a simple continuation of pre-Islamic practices, but a creative synthesis (Koentjaraningrat, 1985, p. 202; Sobian, 2022, p. 13). This concept prevents the analysis from treating Islam and adat as mutually exclusive categories, showing instead how they were combined in practice.

The relationship among these four components can be summarized as follows. Giddens explains the mechanism of change (structure-agency dialectic). Weber explains the content of authority (hybrid legitimacy). Geertz explains the medium of power (symbolic performance). Acculturation explains the outcome (vernacular Islam). They are not interchangeable because each addresses a different analytical question: how change happens, what authority is, how it is communicated, and what it produces. Together, they form a single argument: that the integration of political power and religious authority in Bone was a dynamic, agent-driven, symbolically mediated process of institutional and cultural synthesis.

This division of labor also clarifies the contribution of the study to existing scholarship. While Ridhwan (2016) and Ridhwan and Nuzul (2021) have documented the institutional infrastructure of Islam in Bone, they have not analyzed the mechanisms by which political and religious authority were integrated in practice. By combining Giddens' emphasis on agency, Weber's emphasis on legitimacy, Geertz's emphasis on symbolism, and the concept of acculturation, this study offers an analytical framework that

can explain not only what happened but also how and why it happened—and what kind of Islamic polity it produced.

D. Research Result

1. Proposition One: Integration was structurally asymmetric—the Sultan controlled religious institutions while remaining bound by their norms

The relationship between political power and religious authority in Bone is often described as one of mutual reinforcement. This description, while accurate, obscures a structural asymmetry that the sources reveal. The Sultan controlled the apparatus of religious authority, yet the same apparatus imposed normative constraints on him. The evidence presented in this section demonstrates that integration was not fusion but a managed asymmetry.

The Bone Kingdom possessed a highly stratified social and political structure, rooted in the cosmological narrative of the Tomanurung—the heavenly being who descended to establish order. The Arumpone (king) stood at the apex, regarded as the holder of both political and religious prerogatives. As Palloge (Palloge, 2006, p. 152) notes, the king was the "prerogative holder in both political and religious fields." This dual authority was not absolute; it was constrained by the pangngadereng, the comprehensive customary system that regulated social behavior. The Rapanna Arung Rioloe explicitly outlines five offenses that could undermine a king's position: violating taboos, ignoring taboo violations, sacrificing adat, killing in anger without the council's consent, and dispensing unjust punishments between family and commoners (Abu & Munasriana, 2025, pp. 23–24). These rules functioned as both resources and constraints for the king's agency (Giddens, 1984, pp. 129, 138).

Below the king, the Ade' Pitu (Council of Seven) represented the original seven wanua (territories) and acted as a constitutional check on royal power. The Tomarilaleng served as the chief executive, while other officials handled specific portfolios: Arung Ujung for information, Arung Ponceng for police and prosecution, Arung Ta for education and civil affairs, Arung Tibojong for justice, Arung Tanete Riattang for finance, Arung Tanete Riawang for public works, and Arung Macege for general governance and economy (Zainol et al., 2020, p. 7). This elaborate bureaucracy ensured that power was distributed among the aristocratic elite, preventing absolutism. The diffusion of power among multiple officeholders poses a puzzle: how could the Sultan exercise effective authority without centralizing it? Giddens' concept of the duality of structure suggests that the diffusion was not a weakness but a structural condition that made governance possible across vast distances (Giddens, 1984, pp. 130–135). Each officeholder became a node in a network of reciprocal obligations, and the Sultan's authority was exercised through this network rather than over it. This interpretation rules out the reading that the Ade' Pitu was merely a constraint on royal power; it was also the mechanism through which royal power reached the periphery. The king could not rule unilaterally; he had to work within the framework of adat and consult with the council on matters of importance. This distribution of power was not merely a practical necessity but was deeply embedded in the cosmological understanding of kingship, where the king was seen as the center of a harmonious cosmic order that had to be maintained through proper relations with the council and the people (Palloge, 2006, p. 80).

After the official acceptance of Islam in 1611, a parallel religious structure, the Parewa Sara', was gradually established. At its head stood the Kadi (or Petta Kalie), the highest religious authority, who advised the king on sharia matters, adjudicated cases of inheritance, marriage, divorce, and waqf, and supervised religious education. Below the Kadi were the Imam (prayer leader), Khatib (preacher), Bilal (muezzin), and Doja (mosque caretaker). This hierarchy mirrored the adat structure, extending from the capital to the palili (vassal territories) and down to the village level (Palloge, 2006, pp. 301–304). The integration was formalized through the concept of sara' as the fifth pillar of pangngadereng, alongside ade', rapang, wari', and bicara. As the Lontara Latoa states, "When Islam came, sara' was included, making five elements: ade' improves the people, rapang strengthens the kingdom, wari' reinforces kinship, bicara fences in arbitrary action, and sara' is the support of the weak and honest" (Mattulada, 1983, p. 232). This formulation placed Islamic law not above or below adat, but as an integral, complementary component. The relationship between the Kadi and the king was one of mutual dependence. The Kadi was appointed and dismissed by the king, and his tenure typically ended with the king's death (Palloge, 2006, p. 301). Yet the Kadi also had the duty to remind the king of his religious obligations and to check royal excesses. The Sultan's appointment of the Kadi poses a puzzle: why would a ruler with absolute power to appoint and dismiss religious officials need the Kadi at all? Weber's framework suggests that the Sultan's authority was not self-sufficient. Traditional legitimacy alone could not resolve disputes requiring specialized religious knowledge—matters of inheritance, marriage, and divorce that demanded expertise in Islamic jurisprudence. The Kadi filled a

structural gap: he provided the legal-rational component that traditional authority lacked (Weber, 1963, pp. 54, 74). This interpretation rules out the reading that the Kadi was merely an instrument of royal power; he was a structural necessity for the functioning of Islamic governance.

The Kadi's authority was further bolstered by his scholarly lineage (sanad), often linked to the Haramayn (Mecca and Medina). Eight of the eighteen Petta Kalie of Bone are recorded as having studied in Mecca, including Arab Harun, who served Sultan Ahmad Saleh (Ridhwan & Nuzul, 2021, pp. 70–72). This connection to the global Islamic scholarly network gave the Kadi a charismatic-rational legitimacy that reinforced the king's own religious standing. It also meant that the religious authority in Bone was not isolated from broader developments in the Islamic world but was connected to the networks of learning and spirituality that spanned the Indian Ocean. This connection is particularly important for understanding the "neo-Sufism" that Azra describes, which emphasized harmony between sharia and tasawuf and was propagated by scholars linked to the Haramayn (Azra, 2004, p. 3). The presence of Meccan-educated scholars in Bone suggests that the kingdom was not a peripheral backwater but was actively engaged with the intellectual currents of the broader Islamic world.

Symbols of power also played a crucial role in maintaining authority. The arajang (sacred regalia), such as the royal umbrella, the samparaja' banner, and other heirlooms, were considered vessels of spiritual power and legitimacy. Sultan Ahmad Saleh carefully maintained these objects and performed rituals around them. For instance, on 12 December 1777, he recorded the washing of the samparaja' banner, which was believed to strengthen the people of Bone (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 11v). The ritual washing

of the samparaja' poses a puzzle: why would a piece of cloth require periodic ritual purification, and why would this purification be recorded in the royal diary? Geertz's concept of sacred regalia suggests that such objects are not mere symbols but material embodiments of the polity's spiritual power. Their pollution would threaten the kingdom's well-being; their purification would restore it (Geertz, 1980, pp. 13, 109). The ritual was therefore not a decorative ceremony but a form of political maintenance. This interpretation rules out the reading that the ritual was merely customary or ornamental.

The regalia were not merely decorative objects but were believed to embody the spiritual power of the kingdom. Their possession and proper maintenance were essential for the well-being of the realm. This belief system created a powerful symbolic economy in which control over sacred objects translated into political legitimacy. The VOC's demand for the return of the Gowa regalia can be understood in this context as an attempt to seize not just physical objects but the spiritual power they represented (Geertz, 1980, pp. 121–122).

2. Proposition Two: Integration was enacted through ritual and symbolic performance, not secured by decree alone

If Proposition One establishes the structural form of integration, Proposition Two addresses its mode of enactment. Administrative acts—appointments, decrees, judicial rulings—established the framework of integration, but they did not make it visible or compelling. This was achieved through ritual and symbolic performance. The evidence presented in this section demonstrates that integration became real only when it was enacted before an audience.

Sultan Ahmad Saleh inherited this dual structure and actively used it to deepen the integration of Islam into the state. One of the most concrete manifestations of this integration was his direct control over the appointment of religious officials. On 21 January 1785, he recorded: "I appointed the Kadi in Bone, namely Imam La Pate; I was informed by the Kadi that the one appointed as Imam was La Beddu" (Anonim, n.d.-a, fol. 49v). This entry shows that the highest religious office was filled by royal decree, ensuring that the religious establishment aligned with the king's political agenda. The Kadi was not an autonomous power but a part of the royal administration, subject to the king's authority. This control over religious appointments was a crucial mechanism through which the Sultan ensured that the religious establishment supported his political program. It also meant that the boundaries between political and religious authority were blurred; the same person who held political power also controlled the institutions of religious authority (Ridhwan & Nuzul, 2021, p. 74).

The enforcement of sharia was another key arena of integration. Sultan Ahmad Saleh personally adjudicated serious cases, often in consultation with the Kadi. On 23 April 1777, he ordered the drowning of a man guilty of incest, a punishment consistent with Islamic law (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 10r). In a civil case on 11 April 1777, the Kadi informed him that a marriage was invalid because the woman had been married twice without her consent; the Sultan upheld the annulment (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 9v). These examples show that sharia was not merely a set of personal beliefs but a functioning legal system enforced by the state. Yet the relationship between the Sultan and the Kadi was not one of simple subordination or harmonious complementarity. The Kadi was appointed and dismissed by

the Sultan, and his tenure typically ended with the death of the reigning king (Palloge, 2006, p. 301). At the same time, the Kadi's judicial authority in matters of Islamic law was, in principle, independent of royal will. The criteria for a qualified judge explicitly required the Kadi to remind the king when the latter punished someone outside the pangngadereng and to warn him about matters related to sharia (Tanal et al., 2023, p. 176). The very existence of this requirement suggests that royal overreach was a recognized possibility and that the Kadi was expected to serve as a check on it (Ridha, 2013, pp. 141–145).

The diary of Sultan Ahmad Saleh reveals moments when this tension became visible. In the 11 April 1777 case, the Sultan's response is recorded in a phrase that deserves close attention: and Arung Mangkau closed his eyes regarding its invalidity (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 9v). The phrase suggests not enthusiastic endorsement but reluctant acceptance: the Sultan did not overturn the Kadi's ruling, but neither did he celebrate it. A more dramatic case of failed integration occurred under La Maddaremmeng (1631–1644), whose radical attempt to abolish non-hereditary slavery provoked a civil war and his overthrow, demonstrating that when religious reform threatened elite interests, the political establishment could mobilize against it (Side, 1971, pp. 28, 33). These tensions do not undermine the argument that political and religious authority were integrated in Bone; they clarify its nature. The integration was not a harmonious fusion but a negotiated and contested relationship, in which the boundaries between royal authority and Islamic law were continuously redefined through practice. The Kadi was neither a mere instrument of the Sultan nor a fully independent power; he was a structural counterweight whose authority was real but

conditional (Giddens, 1984, pp. 142–143; Weber, 1963, p. 51).

The Sultan also took measures to enforce public morality. On 5 June 1780, the Tomarilaleng began halting all gambling activities in the market, a policy likely initiated by the Sultan himself (Omar, 2003, p. 187). Gambling had been a source of tax revenue, so its prohibition represented a material sacrifice for the sake of Islamic ethics. This prohibition poses an analytical puzzle: why would a ruler willingly sacrifice a stable source of tax revenue? A purely political reading might interpret the move as a concession to religious pressure. Weber's concept of value-rational action suggests a different explanation. The Sultan's legitimacy did not rest solely on material resources; it depended on his perceived commitment to Islamic norms (Weber, 1963, p. 97). By forgoing gambling revenue, he was making a visible investment in his religious authority. The prohibition, in other words, was not a cost but a strategic reallocation of resources from fiscal to symbolic capital. This interpretation rules out the reading that the Sultan was forced into the prohibition by religious elites. This policy is particularly revealing because it shows that the Sultan was willing to sacrifice economic benefits for the sake of religious principles. It also demonstrates the penetration of Islamic values into the realm of public policy, transforming the state from a purely political entity into an instrument of moral reform. The prohibition of gambling was not an isolated act but part of a broader program of moral purification that characterized Sultan Ahmad Saleh's reign (Omar, 2003, p. 187)

Support for Sufi orders and education was perhaps the most distinctive feature of Sultan Ahmad Saleh's religious policy. He was a devoted follower of the

Khalwatiyah Yusufiyah, a tarekat introduced to South Sulawesi by Sheikh Yusuf al-Makassari. In the late 1780s, he declared Khalwatiyah the official tarekat of the kingdom (Omar, 2003, p. 252). This move transformed a personal devotional practice into an institutionalized state religion, creating a standardized doctrinal framework for the elite. The Sultan himself authored a Sufi treatise, Nur Al-Hadi, in Bugis, demonstrating his role as a spiritual teacher. In the preface, he writes: "In the land of Bone, I, Ahmad as-Salih Syamsi Lillahiddin, at the age of thirty-two, composed this book... part of it I derived from my understanding of the book of our master, Sheikh Haji Yusuf al-Makassari al-Khalwatiyah" (Anonim, n.d.-d, pp. 3–4). By writing in the vernacular, he made Sufi teachings accessible to a local audience, while also asserting his own authority as a religious scholar. The production of this text was not merely a literary act but a political one, establishing the Sultan as a source of religious authority in his own right, independent of the Kadi or other ulama (Ridhwan, 2016, p. 32).

The Sultan's engagement with education was continuous and hands-on. His diary records numerous sessions where he invited scholars to read and explain classical texts. On 22 October 1792, he summoned Imam Bontoala to teach Minhaj (a Shafi'i fiqh manual) and Hajji Teko to teach Durra (a Sufi text), while two Khatib read from both (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 81r). This simultaneous study of exoteric and esoteric knowledge reflects the "neo-Sufism" described by Azra, which emphasized harmony between sharia and tasawuf (Azra, 2004, p. 4). By sponsoring such sessions, the Sultan positioned himself as the patron of both legal and spiritual learning, strengthening his charismatic authority (Weber, 1963, p. 97). These educational sessions were not merely private devotions but public events that

demonstrated the Sultan's commitment to Islamic learning. They also served to train a cadre of religious scholars who would staff the expanding apparatus of the Islamic state (Ridhwan, 2016, pp. 96–97).

Rituals and symbolic performances were central to the integration of politics and religion. The Sultan regularly attended Friday prayers, celebrated Maulid, and visited the tombs of ancestors and early Islamic missionaries. On 1 May 1776, he recorded: "A Maulid was held throughout Bone, and I gave 40 real in charity" (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 5r). These events were not merely religious observances; they were public spectacles that displayed the king's piety and generosity, reinforcing the bond between ruler and subjects.

The scale of the Maulid celebrations poses a puzzle: why did a ritual with no precedent in pre-Islamic Bugis culture become a massive public event requiring enormous resources? Geertz's concept of the theatre state suggests that new rituals are not adopted passively; they are deployed to project a particular image of power (Geertz, 1980, pp. 13, 130). The Maulid was not merely a religious observance but a spectacle of generosity that created obligations among recipients and projected the Sultan as a source of bounty. This explains why the celebration grew in scale over time—from 40 real in 1776 to a feast involving 3,375 eggs, 108 chickens, and 5,000 areca nuts in 1808 (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 5r; Anonim, n.d.-c, fol. 168r). This interpretation rules out the reading that the Maulid was simply a private devotional practice. The celebration of Maulid was particularly significant because it was a distinctly Islamic observance that had no precedent in pre-Islamic Bugis culture. By promoting it, the Sultan was not only affirming his own piety but also creating a new public ritual that reinforced the Islamic identity of the kingdom. The scale of these

celebrations, as recorded in the diaries, indicates that they were major events involving the entire community and requiring substantial resources (Omar, 2003, p. 230).

The integration of political and religious authority was also evident in the Sultan's dealings with foreign powers. He used Islamic symbols to assert his sovereignty, particularly in the dispute with the Dutch East India Company (VOC) over the Gowa regalia (kalompoang). The VOC demanded the return of these sacred objects, which they claimed were rightfully theirs. Sultan Ahmad Saleh refused, arguing that they were ancestral heirlooms. In a letter to the VOC Governor, he stated: "It is impossible for me to surrender the royal ornaments" (Dehong & Reyke, 1788, p. 238). His control over these symbols gave him a source of legitimacy that the VOC could not control. Moreover, his followers, including Makassarese rebels and even bandits, refused to pay taxes to the VOC without his permission, instead placing themselves under the protection of the Gowa regalia held by the Sultan (Diefhout, 1788, pp. 415–416). This shows that religious and symbolic authority translated directly into political and economic power. The refusal to pay taxes was not merely an act of economic resistance but a statement of political loyalty, affirming that the Sultan, not the VOC, was the legitimate authority in the region (Geertz, 1980, p. 115).

The Sultan also used Islamic oaths to bind political agreements. In a report to the Governor-General, Governor Reyke noted that a certain Sipoki had sworn on the Quran to support the Bone cause (Reyke & Rudolph, 1789b, pp. 12–13). This practice demonstrates that Islam had become a formal instrument in political contracts, reinforcing the idea that religious authority was inseparable from political legitimacy (Weber, 1963, pp. 124–125). The use of the Quran

for oath-taking indicates that Islamic symbols had penetrated the realm of diplomacy and international relations, providing a shared vocabulary for political agreements. This was not merely a matter of form but of substance; an oath sworn on the Quran carried religious sanctions that made it more binding than a secular promise (Susanto, 2023, p. 133).

The Dutch East India Company's internal records provide further evidence of how the Sultan's religious authority was perceived and documented by colonial officials. The secret dag-register of Governor Willem Beth contains observations on the Bone court's religious activities, noting that the Sultan's participation in Friday prayers and Maulid celebrations was a matter of public knowledge and political significance (Beth, 1790, p. 33). The dag-register of Fort Rotterdam records the Sultan's visit to Makassar in 1787, where he was accompanied by a thousand armed men and received by the Governor with full diplomatic honors—an event that the VOC interpreted as a display of both political and religious authority (Alting & Voort, 1787, p. 220). In a notula of an extraordinary meeting of the Makassar Council, the Council discussed the Sultan's request for assistance against the British and noted his role as a religious leader whose cooperation was essential for regional stability (Boelen, 1783, p. 199). These archival records demonstrate that the VOC recognized the Sultan's religious authority not merely as a private matter but as a public and political reality that had to be taken into account in diplomatic and military calculations. The Company's awareness of the Sultan's religious standing is further confirmed in a letter from Governor Reyke, in which he reported that the Sultan's refusal to surrender the Gowa regalia was reinforced by his religious prestige and that any

attempt to coerce him would likely provoke widespread resistance (Reyke, 1788b, p. 180). The VOC archives thus provide an external, colonial perspective that corroborates the central argument of this article: that political power and religious authority in Bone were inextricably linked and mutually reinforcing.

3. Proposition Three: Integration was textually mediated-documentation functioned as governance

A third dimension of integration has received little attention in the existing scholarship on Bone: its textual mediation. Ridhwan (2016) and Ridhwan and Nuzul (2021) have documented the institutional infrastructure of Islam in Bone, but neither has treated the production of texts as itself a mode of governance. The evidence presented in this section demonstrates that documentation was not merely a record of integration but a mechanism for producing it.

The elite of Bone, led by Sultan Ahmad Saleh, were not merely passive recipients of Islamic tradition; they were active agents in institutionalizing it within the state apparatus. Drawing on Giddens' (Giddens, 1984, pp. 120, 132) concept of the agent, the Sultan can be seen as someone who both reproduced and transformed existing structures. He inherited a kingdom with a dual adat-sara' system but took it further by making Islam the normative foundation of governance. This process of institutionalization was not a single event but a continuous process that unfolded over the course of his thirty-seven-year reign. It involved the creation of new institutions, the expansion of existing ones, and the incorporation of Islamic norms into the daily operations of government (Giddens, 1984, pp. 132–133).

One of the most significant steps was the appointment and management of religious officials. The

Kadi, as the head of the Parewa Sara', was a key figure. His duties included advising the king on sharia, adjudicating cases of inheritance, marriage, divorce, and waqf, leading religious ceremonies, and supervising education (Tanal et al., 2023, p. 176). The Sultan ensured that the Kadi was not only learned but also loyal. For instance, he appointed Imam La Pate as Kadi in 1785, and later Arab Harun, a Meccan-educated scholar and grandson of a previous Kadi, served as Petta Kalie from 1775 to 1809 (Ridhwan & Nuzul, 2021, pp. 74, 78). Arab Harun's international education and scholarly network further strengthened the religious authority of the Bone court. The relationship between the Sultan and the Kadi was not merely professional but also personal; the Sultan referred to Pekki Yusuf, one of his Kadis, as "Anreguru" (my teacher), indicating a bond of respect and affection that went beyond official duties (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 49r).

The Kadi's role in the judiciary was particularly important. The Sultan's diary records numerous cases where the Kadi acted as a judge. On 3 April 1786, a case involving a slave's death was settled by the consensus of the Kadi and Imam (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 55r). On 22 March 1786, the Sultan ordered a captured criminal to be brought before the Kadi to be judged according to religious law (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 55r). These examples show that Islamic law was not just a set of ideals but a practical system administered by trained officials. The Kadi's decisions were respected by the Sultan, reinforcing the independence and authority of the religious judiciary. This independence was crucial for the legitimacy of the legal system; it meant that justice was not merely the will of the ruler but was based on a body of law that applied equally to all, including the elite (Tanal et al., 2023, pp. 176–177).

The elite also played a crucial role in the integration of sara' into pangngadereng. The Lontara Latoa states: "Syariat respects adat, and adat respects syariat. Adat cannot cancel the decision of syariat. Syariat also cannot cancel the decision of adat" (Ridhwan & Nuzul, 2021, p. 74). This principle was not just rhetorical; it was implemented in daily governance. In the royal council, the Kadi and adat officials sat facing each other, with the king at the center, symbolizing the balance between the two authorities (Rahmawati, 2017, p. 24). The seating arrangement poses a puzzle: why would the physical positioning of officials be codified and preserved? Geertz's concept of the theatre state suggests that spatial arrangements are not neutral but are themselves symbolic statements about the nature of authority (Geertz, 1980, p. 109). The king at the center, mediating between two equal but distinct authorities, projected an image of balanced rule. This interpretation rules out the reading that the seating arrangement was merely a matter of protocol. The seating arrangement was not merely a matter of protocol but a visual statement of the kingdom's constitutional structure, in which political and religious authority were separate but equal, united in the person of the king (Mattulada, 1983, p. 233).

Documentation and archiving were another arena where the elite institutionalized Islam. The Lontara Bilang themselves are a prime example. Sultan Ahmad Saleh meticulously recorded his daily activities, including religious observances, appointments, legal decisions, and dreams. These records served not only as personal diaries but also as state archives, providing precedents for future rulers. As Cense notes, these chronicles were consulted during later ceremonies and legal proceedings (Cense, 1966, p. 424). The Sultan also commissioned the copying of over thirty

treatises by Sheikh Yusuf al-Makassari and his disciple, making the Bone court a center of Sufi textual reproduction (Ridhwan, 2016, p. 98). The Nur Al-Hadi itself is a monument to this institutionalization, as it codified Sufi teachings in the local language and asserted the Sultan's role as a spiritual guide (Anonim, n.d.-d, fols. 3–4). The practice of documentation was not merely bureaucratic; it was a way of establishing continuity and precedent, ensuring that the Islamic character of the kingdom would survive the death of individual rulers (Giddens, 1984, pp. 126, 149).

The elite's role in institutionalizing Islam was also evident in their diplomatic activities. Sultan Ahmad Saleh corresponded with the Sultan of Johor, referring to him as a kinsman and using Islamic brotherhood as a basis for alliance (Anonim, n.d.-a, fol. 29r). He welcomed envoys from Mecca and Medina, receiving letters and gifts that enhanced his prestige. On 30 September 1780, Hajji Bukku brought him a letter from the Sheikh of Medina and a letter from Imam Shafi'i, along with two books (Anonim, n.d.-b, fol. 29v). These transnational connections pose a puzzle: why would correspondence with distant Islamic centers matter for the Sultan's authority at home, where his power already rested on genealogical descent and personal piety? Weber's framework suggests that legitimacy is not only produced internally but can be imported from recognized external sources (Susanto, 2023, p. 133). By receiving letters and gifts from Mecca and Medina, the Sultan could claim recognition from authorities whose prestige was independent of local politics. This interpretation rules out the reading that the correspondence was merely diplomatic courtesy; it was a mechanism for converting external recognition into domestic authority.The ability to communicate with the centers of the Islamic world demonstrated that Bone was

not an isolated kingdom but part of a broader Muslim ecumene, sharing in the prestige of the great centers of learning and piety (Omar, 2003, pp. 248–249).

The elite also used marriage alliances to strengthen the link between political and religious authority. Sultan Ahmad Saleh married We Padauleng, his cousin, and had eleven children. He also had blood ties to Sheikh Yusuf al-Makassari, being a descendant of La Temmassonge' Arung Baringeng (Ubaedillah, 2017, p. 218). These genealogical connections blurred the lines between political and spiritual elites, creating a cohesive ruling class that shared both adat and religious prestige. Marriage was not merely a personal matter but a political strategy, creating alliances that strengthened the position of the ruling family and ensured the continuity of its religious and political authority. The fact that the Sultan married his cousin indicates the importance of maintaining the purity of the aristocratic lineage, which was seen as a source of both political and spiritual power (Palloge, 2006, pp. 301–302).

Finally, the elite managed the delicate balance between Islamic law and local custom. They did not seek to eradicate pre-Islamic practices but to integrate them. For example, the bissu—transgender priests who had formerly served as spiritual advisers—were not eliminated but reassigned to care for the arajang and practice traditional medicine (Palloge, 2006, p. 301). This acculturation, as Koentjaraningrat (Koentjaraningrat, 1985, p. 202) and Sobian (Sobian, 2022, p. 13) explain, allowed Islam to take root without causing cultural rupture. The result was a distinctly Bugis form of Islam, in which sharia and adat coexisted in a productive tension. The treatment of the bissu is particularly revealing because it shows that the Islamization process was not a zero-sum game in which the

new religion completely replaced the old. Instead, elements of the old religion were preserved and given new meaning within the Islamic framework. The bissu continued to play a role in the spiritual life of the kingdom, but that role was now subordinate to the Islamic authorities and limited to the care of sacred regalia and traditional healing (Ubaedillah, 2017, pp. 218–219).

4. Proposition Four: Integration produced a durable but unintended legacy

The preceding propositions describe the form, enactment, and mediation of integration. None of them, however, addresses its afterlife. What happened to the integration that Sultan Ahmad Saleh built after his death? The evidence presented in this section demonstrates that integration produced a durable legacy, but one that also generated consequences the Sultan did not anticipate.

The integration of political and religious authority under Sultan Ahmad Saleh had profound and lasting impacts on the dynamics of Islam in Bone. First, it greatly strengthened the legitimacy of the king. By combining genealogical descent from the Tomanurung with charismatic piety and control over religious institutions, the Sultan created a form of authority that was both traditional and charismatic, making his rule virtually unassailable. As Weber would predict, this hybrid authority was more resilient than either type alone (Weber, 1963, pp. 29, 54). Even in the face of VOC pressure, the Sultan's religious standing gave him a source of power that the Dutch could not easily undermine. This resilience was demonstrated during the dispute over the Gowa regalia, when the Sultan's refusal to surrender the sacred objects did not lead to his overthrow but instead strengthened his standing among his followers. The VOC, despite its military and economic power, was unable to

translate its material superiority into political control over Bone because it could not overcome the symbolic and religious authority of the Sultan (Reyke, 1788a, p. 228).

Second, the integration led to the deep institutionalization of Islam in the social order. The sara' became an integral part of pangngadereng, meaning that Islamic norms were embedded in the legal and moral fabric of society. The Kadi and other religious officials became indispensable parts of the bureaucracy, and their decisions affected all levels of society, from the elite to the commoners. Religious education flourished in mosques and langgar, and the celebration of Islamic holidays became public events that reinforced communal identity. This institutionalization meant that Islam was not merely the religion of the elite but was woven into the everyday life of the entire population. The presence of religious officials at the village level ensured that Islamic norms were transmitted to the grassroots, creating a society in which Islamic values were taken for granted as the natural order of things (Ridhwan, 2016, pp. 96–97).

Third, the integration produced a distinctively Bugis Islamic culture. The use of the Bugis language in religious texts, the integration of Sufi practices, and the retention of adat rituals created a form of Islam that was both universal and local. This acculturation was not a sign of syncretism or compromise but a creative synthesis that allowed Islam to become deeply rooted in the local context. As Geertz would argue, this was a cultural system in which symbols and practices gave meaning to the political order (Geertz, 1980, pp. 13, 16). The Nur Al-Hadi, written in Bugis and drawing on both local and international sources, exemplifies this synthesis. It is neither purely Bugis nor purely Arabic but represents a new form of Islamic literature that speaks to

the specific needs and sensibilities of the Bugis people while remaining firmly within the bounds of Islamic orthodoxy (Anonim, n.d.-d, pp. 3–4).

Fourth, the relationship with the VOC became a testing ground for this integrated authority. The Sultan used Islamic symbols, such as the kalompoang, to assert his sovereignty and to mobilize his followers. The refusal of Bone subjects to pay taxes to the VOC, citing their loyalty to the Sultan and the sacred regalia, demonstrates that religious and political authority had real economic and military consequences. The VOC's inability to force the Sultan to surrender the regalia, despite issuing a formal Manifest and launching limited military operations, shows that the symbolic power of the Bone kingship was not easily broken (Reyke, 1788a, p. 228). This episode reveals the limits of colonial power in the face of a well-integrated indigenous authority structure. The VOC could win battles but could not win the war for legitimacy because it lacked the symbolic resources that the Sultan commanded (Chatterjee et al., 2019, pp. 61–62).

The VOC's own records reveal the extent to which the Sultan's religious authority translated into political and economic power. In a register of documents compiled by the VOC to prove that the current King of Bone had no right to the Makassar throne, the Company claimed that Bontoala and Kampung Bugis belonged to the VOC and that the Bone kings were merely granted residence there as a favor (Reyke, 1789, pp. 20–21). Yet the very existence of this register—and the extensive documentation it contains—demonstrates that the VOC felt compelled to justify its claims against the Sultan's persistent assertion of sovereignty, which was rooted in his control over the sacred regalia and his religious standing. Furthermore, the dag-register of April

1789 records that the Sultan continued to press his claims over the Gowa regalia at Batavia, refusing to yield despite the VOC's threats (Reyke & Rudolph, 1789a, p. 316). These records show that the Sultan's religious authority, symbolized by his possession of the regalia, was a major obstacle to the VOC's colonial ambitions. They also confirm that the integration of political and religious authority in Bone was not merely a domestic arrangement but had direct consequences for the kingdom's relations with foreign powers.

Finally, the legacy of Sultan Ahmad Saleh's reign continued after his death in 1812. His son and successor, La Mappatunru, maintained the policies of his father, including the celebration of Maulid, the patronage of religious scholars, and resistance to foreign demands. The succession was smooth and orderly, reflecting the institutionalized nature of royal authority. Even the funeral of the Sultan was a grand Islamic ritual, with charity distributed, slaves freed, and prayers recited (Basiah, 2024, pp. 103–105). This continuity demonstrates that the integration of political and religious authority had become a structural feature of the Bone Kingdom, not merely a personal achievement of one ruler. The fact that the transition from one ruler to the next did not disrupt the religious policies of the kingdom shows that those policies had been institutionalized to the point where they were no longer dependent on the personal qualities of any individual leader (Giddens, 1984, pp. 142–143).

The continuity of Sultan Ahmad Saleh's religious policies is further evidenced in the diary of his son, La Mappatunru, which records the ongoing celebration of Islamic rituals at the court during the Sultan's lifetime. On 18 May 1808, while Sultan Ahmad Saleh was still reigning, La

Mappatunru noted that his father "celebrated the Maulid with the people of Bone, sitting in a row" (Anonim, n.d.-c, fol. 168r). The entry demonstrates that the Maulid celebrations, which Sultan Ahmad Saleh had promoted since the beginning of his reign, remained a central public event decades later and were witnessed and recorded by his heir. Similarly, on 6 November 1800, La Mappatunru recorded that he went to Friday prayer with his father, and after the prayer, they visited the tomb of Petta Maddanrengnge and crossed to Cenrana together (Anonim, n.d.-c, fol. 84v). These entries show that the integration of political and religious authority was not merely a personal project of Sultan Ahmad Saleh but had become an established tradition within the royal family, actively transmitted to the next generation while the Sultan was still alive. The diary of La Mappatunru thus serves as crucial evidence that the institutionalization of Islam in Bone was already preparing for its own continuity, ensuring that the religious policies initiated by Sultan Ahmad Saleh would endure beyond his eventual death in 1812.

The impact of Sultan Ahmad Saleh's reign extended beyond the borders of Bone. His reputation as a pious and learned ruler attracted scholars and Sufis from other regions, making Bone a center of Islamic learning in eastern Indonesia. The Nur Al-Hadi was copied and circulated, spreading its teachings beyond the kingdom's borders. The Khalwatiyah Yusufiyah order, which the Sultan had supported, became a major spiritual force in South Sulawesi, influencing the religious life of the entire region. After the Sultan's death, however, the exclusive nature of the Khalwatiyah order, which had been limited to the aristocracy, provoked a reaction. Commoners began to flock to the Khalwatiyah Samman, a more populist order that

emphasized loud communal zikr rather than the silent individual zikr of the Yusufiyah (Ubaedillah, 2017, pp. 219–224, 237). This development shows that the religious policies of Sultan Ahmad Saleh had unintended consequences, creating a dynamic of religious competition and innovation that continued long after his death. The shift from the Yusufiyah to the Samman order was not merely a matter of religious preference but reflected broader social and political changes, including the decline of the old aristocracy and the rise of new social forces (Giddens, 1984, pp. 149–150).

The pattern of integration between political power and religious authority observed in Bone can be usefully compared with other pre-modern Southeast Asian kingdoms, though such comparison must remain cautious given the distinct historical trajectories of each polity. In Gowa, the neighboring Makassarese kingdom, Islam was adopted in 1605 as an instrument of political expansion, and the ruler used it to legitimize hegemony over other kingdoms (Ridha, 2013, p. 39). Yet in Gowa, the integration of Islam and adat appears to have been more centralized and more directly tied to military conquest, whereas in Bone, the process was more negotiated and gradual, with adat and sara' coexisting as parallel pillars of the pangngadereng.

In Aceh, the sultanate developed a reputation as the "Veranda of Mecca," with a strong tradition of Islamic scholarship and a ruler who claimed the title of caliph (Azra, 2004, p. 3). But Aceh's integration was more centralized and the ruler's religious authority was more explicitly universalist, while in Bone the Sultan's authority remained firmly rooted in local genealogical legitimacy and the specific adat framework of the Bugis.

In Mataram, on the other hand, the sultanate developed a syncretic form of Islam that incorporated many Hindu-Buddhist elements, producing a cultural configuration quite different from Bone's (Geertz, 1960, pp. 121–127). These brief comparisons suggest that the Bone case represents a distinct model: one in which political and religious authority were integrated not through conquest or universalist claims, but through the gradual institutionalization of Islam within an existing adat framework, with the ruler serving as the mediating figure between the two. This model is not proposed as a universal template but as a heuristic device that may illuminate similar processes in other Southeast Asian kingdoms where adat and Islam coexisted as parallel normative systems (Gibson, 2012, p. 97).

5. Proposition Five: Integration was temporally uneven, intensifying at conjunctures of external pressure and internal maturation

The four propositions above describe the form, enactment, mediation, and legacy of integration. None of them, however, explains its timing. Why did integration intensify at certain moments and not others? The evidence presented in this section demonstrates that integration was not a continuous process but a response to conjunctures—moments when external pressure and internal maturation converged.

The relationship between political power and religious authority in Bone was not static over the course of Sultan Ahmad Saleh's thirty-seven-year reign. A diachronic reading of the Lontara Bilang reveals three distinct phases, each characterized by a different emphasis in the integration of political and religious authority.

The first phase (1775–1780) was a period of consolidation and learning. The Sultan focused on acquiring religious knowledge, receiving books from the Kadi, studying the Quran, and establishing basic religious policies such as the prohibition of gambling and the promotion of Friday prayers. His diary from this period is filled with entries recording his meetings with scholars, his reading of religious texts, and his charitable donations (Anonim, n.d.-b, fols. 9v, 10r). The emphasis was on personal formation and the establishment of a pious reputation, which would later serve as the foundation for more ambitious religious policies.

The second phase (1780–1790) witnessed the intensification of the Sultan's involvement with the Khalwatiyah Yusufiyah tarekat and the beginning of his confrontation with the VOC over the Gowa regalia. This period marked a decisive shift. Why did the Sultan declare Khalwatiyah the official tarekat of the kingdom only in the late 1780s, rather than earlier? Three factors appear decisive. First, by the mid-1780s, the Sultan had reached a level of personal religious maturity—he was thirty-two years old when he wrote the Nur Al-Hadi in 1787–1788—that allowed him to position himself as a spiritual teacher. Second, the presence of Kadi Arab Harun, a Meccan-educated scholar with a strong scholarly lineage, provided the institutional and scholarly support necessary for such a declaration. Third, the escalating pressure from the VOC, particularly over the Gowa regalia, created a political context in which a distinct and well-defined religious identity became a crucial resource for asserting sovereignty. The declaration of Khalwatiyah as the official tarekat was thus not merely a religious act but a political strategy that fused

spiritual authority with resistance to colonial encroachment (Ridhwan, 2016, pp. 83, 98; Ubaedillah, 2017, p. 218).

The third phase (1790–1812) was characterized by institutional consolidation and the transmission of religious authority to the next generation. During this period, the Sultan's religious policies became increasingly routinized and embedded in the daily operations of the court. His son, La Mappatunru, was actively involved in religious observances and began recording them in his own diary, signaling the institutionalization of the Sultan's religious program (Anonim, n.d.-c, fols. 84v, 168r). The Sultan continued to sponsor educational sessions, celebrate Maulid, and maintain the network of mosques and langgar, but the emphasis shifted from innovation to consolidation. By the end of his reign, the integration of political and religious authority had become a structural feature of the Bone Kingdom, no longer dependent on the personal charisma of the Sultan alone.

The most decisive factor in this diachronic process appears to have been the interplay between external pressure and internal religious maturation. The VOC's demands over the Gowa regalia, which intensified in the late 1780s, coincided with the Sultan's own spiritual and intellectual development, creating a critical juncture at which the Sultan could transform a personal devotional practice into an institutionalized state religion. This temporal convergence explains why the declaration of Khalwatiyah as the official tarekat occurred when it did, rather than earlier or later. It also explains why the Sultan's religious policies became more assertive and more explicitly political in the second half of his reign. The dynamics of Islam in Bone, in other words, were not simply the unfolding of a predetermined blueprint but the product of contingent

historical factors—personal, institutional, and geopolitical—that converged at specific moments to produce specific outcomes. This diachronic perspective transforms the answer to the research question from a static description of integration mechanisms into an analysis of how and why those mechanisms evolved over time (Giddens, 1984, pp. 142–143; Weber, 1963, p. 51; Geertz, 1980, pp. 121–122).

E. CONCLUSION

The relationship between political power and religious authority in the Bone Kingdom during the reign of Sultan Ahmad Saleh (1775–1812) was characterized by a deep and productive integration that shaped the dynamics of Islam in the region, but this integration was not static. It evolved over the course of the Sultan's thirty-seven-year reign, passing through three distinct phases: a period of personal consolidation and learning (1775–1780), a period of intensified tarekat involvement and confrontation with the VOC (1780–1790), and a period of institutional consolidation and transmission to the next generation (1790–1812). The declaration of Khalwatiyah as the official tarekat in the late 1780s was a pivotal moment in this evolution, driven by the convergence of the Sultan's personal religious maturity, the presence of a Meccan-educated Kadi, and the political pressure exerted by the VOC over the Gowa regalia. The study demonstrates that Islamization in this period was not a process of military conquest but of institutional integration, in which the Sultan, as the central agent, fused traditional genealogical legitimacy with charismatic religious authority. By appointing religious officials, enforcing sharia, supporting the Khalwatiyah Yusufiyah tarekat, sponsoring education, and using Islamic symbols to strengthen his rule, Sultan Ahmad Saleh created

a durable Islamic polity that endured beyond his lifetime. The integration of sara' into pangngadereng, the active role of the Kadi in governance, and the systematic documentation of religious and political life were key mechanisms through which this integration was achieved. The study also shows that the relationship between political and religious authority was not static but evolved over time, shaped by the Sultan's actions and the broader context of colonial pressure and regional politics.

Theoretically, the study demonstrates the value of Giddens' structuration theory for understanding historical agency, showing how Sultan Ahmad Saleh both reproduced and transformed the structures he inherited. It also confirms the relevance of Weber's typology of authority for analyzing hybrid legitimacy in pre-modern Islamic kingdoms, and Geertz's symbolic anthropology for interpreting the rituals and symbols of power. The concept of acculturation provides a useful framework for understanding how Islam and local Bugis culture merged without erasing either, producing a distinctive form of vernacular Islam. Together, these theoretical perspectives offer a robust analytical framework for the Bone case, and—as the brief comparison with Gowa, Aceh, and Mataram suggests—a potentially useful heuristic for other cases of Islamization in Southeast Asia, though further comparative research is needed to test its broader applicability.

Practically, the study highlights the importance of archival documentation in preserving historical memory and the relevance of ethical leadership models from the past. The Lontara Bilang and other manuscripts are invaluable sources for understanding the history of Islam in South Sulawesi and should be preserved and studied further. The model of leadership exemplified by Sultan Ahmad Saleh, which

combined political authority with religious piety and respect for local customs, offers lessons for contemporary Muslim leaders seeking to integrate Islamic values with local traditions. The study also underscores the importance of understanding the role of indigenous agency in the spread of Islam, moving beyond narratives that emphasize only external actors such as traders and Sufi missionaries.

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, it relies heavily on the Lontara Bilang of Sultan Ahmad Saleh, a self-documenting source in which the Sultan recorded not only what he did but also how he wished his reign to be remembered. While this study has attempted to read the diary critically—distinguishing between routine entries, performative claims, and symbolic passages—the risk remains that the Sultan's self-representation has shaped the findings in ways that cannot be fully corrected by triangulation with VOC archives, which have their own colonial biases. Second, the study focuses on a single reign, which limits the generalizability of its findings. The patterns of integration observed in Bone under Sultan Ahmad Saleh may not apply to other reigns, other Bugis kingdoms, or other Southeast Asian polities with different configurations of political and religious authority. Third, the sources are not evenly distributed across the thirty-seven-year reign. The Lontara Bilang Add. MS. 12356 covers 1775–1795, while Add. MS. 12357 covers 1800–1809, leaving gaps in 1796–1799 and 1810–1812. The analysis of temporal shifts in Proposition Four is therefore based on uneven documentation, and the periodization proposed there should be treated as provisional rather than definitive. Fourth, the study lacks systematic cross-kingdom comparison. The brief comparative reflections on Gowa, Aceh, and Mataram are offered as heuristic gestures rather

than as a fully developed comparative analysis, and they rely on secondary sources rather than primary archival research in those kingdoms. These limitations do not invalidate the findings, but they define the boundaries within which the claims of this article should be understood. The integration of political power and religious authority in Bone was a complex and contingent process, and this study offers one interpretation of that process—an interpretation that is grounded in the available sources but that remains open to revision as new evidence emerges.

Future research could delve deeper into the Nur Al-Hadi, the networks of the Khalwatiyah order, and comparisons with other Bugis kingdoms such as Wajo and Soppeng. The VOC archives, especially those in The Hague and Jakarta, still hold many untapped documents that could shed further light on the relationship between local kingdoms and colonial powers in the context of Islamization. Comparative studies of Islamization in different regions of Indonesia would also help to identify both the common patterns and the local variations in the relationship between political power and religious authority. Ultimately, the case of Bone under Sultan Ahmad Saleh shows that Islam, adat, and political power can coexist in a productive harmony, creating a strong state and a deeply rooted religious identity. This finding challenges simplistic narratives of Islamization as either a top-down imposition or a bottom-up conversion, revealing instead a complex process of negotiation and synthesis in which both rulers and ruled played active roles. While the Bone case cannot by itself establish a general model for all Southeast Asian kingdoms, the comparative sketch offered above suggests that the pattern observed in Bone—the gradual institutionalization of Islam within an adat framework, mediated by a ruler who fused genealogical

and charismatic authority—may have parallels elsewhere, inviting further comparative investigation.

REFERENCES

Abdurahman, D. (2011). Metodologi Penelitian Sejarah Islam. Penerbit Ombak.

Abu, A., & Munasriana. (2025). Rapanna Arung Rioloe (Hukum Adat Bugis-Makassar) VT 125 A Jilid 4. Perpusnas Press.

Alting, W. A., & Voort, P. G. van der. (1787). Petikan Catatan Harian (Dag-Register) Benteng Rotterdam di Makassar Mengenai Hubungan Militer-Diplomatik Kompeni (VOC) di Sulawesi Selatan dan Kawasan Timur. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 3765.

Andaya, L. Y. (2021). Warisan Arung Palakka: Sejarah Sulawesi Selatan Abad ke-17 (N. Simorok (ed.)). Penerbit Ininnawa.

Anonim. (n.d.-a). Lontara Bilang Bone ADD 12354. British Library, Add. MS. 12354.

Anonim. (n.d.-b). Lontara Bilang Bone ADD 12356. British Library, Add. MS. 12356.

Anonim. (n.d.-c). Lontara Bilang Bone ADD 12357. British Library, Add. MS. 12357.

Anonim. (n.d.-d). Nur Al-Hadi VT 23. Perpustakaan Nasional RI, VT.23.

Arikunto, S. (2006). Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Rineka Cipta.

Azra, A. (2004). The Origins of Islamic Reformism in Southeast Asia: Networks of Malay-Indonesian and Middle Eastern "Ulama" in The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. University of Hawai'i Press.

Basiah. (2024). Lontara Bilang ADD 12350 Catatan To Marilaleng Bone (1808–1813): Alih Bahasa. Perpusnas Press.

Beth, W. (1790). Catatan Harian Rahasia dari Tanggal 19 Oktober 1790 sampai dengan 31 Mei 1791. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 3944.

Boelen, D. (1783). Salinan Notula/Risalah Rapat Luar Biasa Dewan Makassar. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 8261.

Cense, A. (1966). Old Buginese and Macassarese diaries. Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde, 122(4), 416–428. https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-90002920

Chatterjee, I., Kunwar, J., & Den Hond, F. (2019). Anthony Giddens and structuration theory. Management, Organizations and Contemporary Social Theory, 60–79. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429279591-4

Dehong, G., & Reyke, B. (1788). Terjemahan Bahasa Belanda atas Surat Jawaban Bahasa Bugis dari Raja dan Tetua Kerajaan Bone Mengenai Manifest dan Perhiasaan Kebesaran Gowa. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 3780.

Diefhout, D. (1788). Laporan Pemungutan Pajak Sepersepuluh dan Daftar Bangsawan/Kawula yang Menolak Membayar Pajak. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 7944.

Geertz, C. (1960). The Religion of Java. University of Chicago Press.

Geertz, C. (1980). Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali. Princeton University Press.

Geertz, C. (1992). Kebudayaan & Agama. Penerbit Karnisius.

Gibson, T. (2012). Islamic Narrative and Authority in Southeast Asia from the 16th to the 21st century (S. Nurhady (ed.)). Penerbit Ininnawa.

Giddens, A. (1984). The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory Structuration. University of California Press.

Giddens, A. (2005). The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration (Elements of the theory of structuration). In G. M. Spiegel (Ed.), Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn. Taylor & Francis e-Library. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203335697

Kartodirjo, S. (1992). Pendekatan Ilmu Sosial dalam Metodologi Sejarah. PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Koentjaraningrat. (1985). Pengantar Ilmu Antropologi. Aksara Baru.

Kuntowijoyo. (2018). Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah. Penerbit Tiara Wacana.

Madjid, M. D. dan J. W. (2014). Ilmu Sejarah Sebuah Pengantar. Kharisma Putra Utama.

Mattulada. (1983). Islam di Sulawesi Selatan. In T. Abdullah (Ed.), Agama dan Perubahan Sosial. Rajawali Pers.

Omar, R. (2003). The History of Bone A.D. 1775-1795: The Diary of Sultan Ahmad as-Salleh. University of Hull.

Palloge, A. (2006). Sejarah Kerajaan Tanah Bone: Masa Raja Pertama dan Raja-Raja Kemudiannya Sebelum Masuknya Islam Sampai Terakhir. Yayasan Al Muallim.

Rahmawati. (2017). Islam Dalam Pemerintahan Kerajaan Bone Pada Abad XVII. Rihlah: Jurnal Sejarah Dan Kebudayaan, 5(1), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.24252/rihlah.v5i1.3180

Reid, A. (2014). Asia Tenggara Dalam Kurun Niaga 1450-1680 Jilid I: Tanah di Bawah Angin. In Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia: Vol. Jilid 1.

Reyke, B. (1788a). Manifest untuk Raja dan Tetua Kerajaan Bone atas Nama Pemerintah Tinggi di Batavia. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 3780.

Reyke, B. (1788b). Surat Dinas Gubernur Makassar B. Reyke kepada Gubernur Jenderal di Batavia. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 7952.

Reyke, B. (1789). Register Dokumen-Dokumen yang Membuktikan Bahwa Raja Bone Kini Tidak Berhak Sedikit pun atas Kerajaan Makassar. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 3818.

Reyke, B., & Rudolph, W. (1789a). Buku Harian Peristiwa-Peristiwa di Makassar untuk Bulan April 1789. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 3863.

Reyke, B., & Rudolph, W. (1789b). Surat Laporan Resmi Gubernur Bernard Reyke kepada Gubernur Jenderal Willem Arnold Alting Terkait Sengketa Perhiasaan Kebesaran Gowa dengan Raja Bone. Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, VOC, 1.04.02, Nomor Inventaris 8263.

Ridha, A. (2013). Islamisasi Kerajaan Bone. UIN Alauddin Makassar.

Ridhwan. (2016). Pendidikan Islam Masa Kerajaan Bone: Sejarah, Akar dan Corak Keilmuan Serta Peranan Kadi. Unimal Press.

Ridhwan, & Nuzul, A. (2021). The Petta Kalie's Contribution in The Development of Islamic Law During The Kingdom of Bone. Samarah, 5(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v5i1.8977

Side, L. (1971). Lontara Petta Malampe'e Gemme'na. Yayasan Lektur Batu Putih.

Sobian, P. (2022). Pengantar Antropologi. Penerbit Lakeisha.

Susanto, D. (2023). Sosiologi Agama Max Weber. PT Inovasi Pratama Internasional.

Tanal, A. N., Dahlan, M., & Santalia, I. (2023). "PAREWA SARA": OTORITAS PRA DAN PASCA PERISTIWA RUMPA'NA TANA BONE 1824-1931. El-Fata, 2(02), 168–183. https://doi.org/10.61169/el-fata.v2i2.70

Ubaedillah, A. (2017). The Rise of the Khalwatiyah Samman Sufi Order in South Sulawesi: Encountering the Local, Escaping the Global. Studia Islamika, 24(2), 213–245. https://doi.org/10.15408/sdi.v24i2.4186

Weber, M. (1963). The Sociology of Religion. Beacon Press.

Zainol, S., Dali, A. M., & Nordin, M. (2020). PEMERINTAHAN KERAJAAN BONE ABAD KE-14 SEHINGGA ABAD KE-19. Sejarah: Journal of History Department, 2(29), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.22452/sejarah.vol29no2.1