Revealing Misinterpretation on the Meaning of *Bharata* for Political Target by Buton to Four Surrounding Kingdoms in the 17th - 20th Centuries

Aderlaepe
University of Halu Oleo, Kendari, Indonesia

Widhiya Ninsiana
State Islamic University (IAIN) Metro, Lampung, Indonesia

Tambunan
University of Halu Oleo, Kendari, Indonesia

Abstract---Language is not only used as a means of communication but also as a device of achieving dominance. This article aims at describing and analyzing the real meaning of *bharata* and reveals misinterpretation on the meaning of *bharata* by Buton Kingdom for political dominance device on four surrounding kingdoms: Muna, Tiworo, Kaledupa, and Kulisusu in the 17th – 20th centuries. The study was designed descriptively qualitatively with four steps of framework: (1) exploring data, (2) data verification, (3) analysis, and (4) writing results of analysis. Data were analyzed by applying Wodak's critical discourse analysis approach (CDA). The results of the analysis concluded the real meaning of *bharata* is "front area and center of battle". The term of *bharata* was firstly acquainted by Laki Laponto, the king of Buton at the beginning of 16th century when he organized a military alliance by involving the four surrounding kingdoms to face Ternate's threat. Since at the beginning of 17th century, people of Butonese misinterpreted the meaning of *bharata* subjectively for political interest. Buton kingdom then established their misinterpretation institutionally and performed hegemony to the four surrounding kingdoms by the assistance of the Dutch after welcoming and signing a bilateral coalition with Dutch at the beginning of the 17th century.

Keywords---Bharata, Buton Kingdom, critical discourse analysis, Muna Kingdom, political device.

54

Introduction

Different interpretation concerning the meaning of *bharata* between the people of Butonese and Munanese in South East Sulawesi (Indonesia) has been becoming a central debate by the two groups of people for several decades. The issue of *bharata* seems has been becoming the most sentimental historical discourse for them. The discourse is perceived as important since it has implications to the historical prestige of each group. People of Butonese claim Buton kingdom was superior in long ago and four surrounding kingdoms of Buton: Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa were inferior. The claim is closely related to the four kingdoms' status in the 16th century as *bharata patapelena* 'four *bharata*'. The status was actually given by Laki Laponto, the sixth king of Buton in the 16th century when he initiated and declared a military coalition of Buton and the four surrounding kingdoms (Hadara, 2015). Since in the 17th century, Butonese people interpreted the term of *bharata* extremely based on political interest. *Bharata* is the wings territory that propped certain kingdoms. Thereby, four surrounding kingdoms of Buton namely Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa as *bharata patapelena* 'four *bharata*' in the 16th century were claimed by Butonese people as the wings territories and propped Buton kingdom (Christomy, 2011).

People of Munanese never accepted Buton's claim concerning the meaning of *bharata*. To Munanese people, the four surrounding kingdoms of Buton namely Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa as *bharata patapelena* 'the four-*bharata*' were not the subordinate (wings territories) and did not propped Buton kingdom. In this case Buton have been making a real purposely distortion of history. However, The claim of Buton is actually contrary to the two historical facts. Firstly, in 1652 the king of Muna, La Ode Kadiri was under arrest by Dutch in Lohia harbour Muna for his rejection to cooperate with Dutch and Buton kingdom. The arrest was a knavery and deceit strategy of Sultan of Buton and Dutch (Couvreur & Van Den Berg, 2001). The king of Muna, La Ode Kadiri was invited to attend a party by Sultan of Buton on a sheep that was anchored to the strait of Buton near Lohia harbor Muna. When La Ode Kadiri got on the ship he was immediately under arrest and brought to Buton, then he was sent to exile Ternate. This tragedy occurred since the king of Muna, La Ode Kadiri did not agree to the Sultan of Buton's offer to cooperate with Dutch and to accept Dutch in Muna territory. This tragedy was evidently a proof that Muna kingdom was not a subordinate or wing territory that propped Buton kingdom in long ago. Secondly, the position of Muna and Tiworo kingdoms in the Gowa's side when the war of Gowa versus Buton occurred in 1667. Muna and Buton aided Gowa's fleet in attacking Buton.   If it was true that Muna and Tiworo were the subordinate (wings territories) and propped Buton, certainly they had supported and strengthened Buton in the battle.

Based on the two historical facts, the interpretation of *bharata* in the phrase of *bharata patapelena* as "subordinate" or "wing territory" and the claim that Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa kingdoms as the subordinate or wing territories of Buton kingdom was a subjective and a real misinterpretation. The misinterpretation was actually a legitimation device for the Sultan of Buton to did hegemony on the four kingdoms. To enforce the hegemony, since at the beginning of 17th century in 1613 Buton commited a bilateral coalition with Dutch that

signed by the fourth Sultan of Buton, La Elangi and Appolinius Scott (Schoorl, 2003).

Relates to the description above, this article focuses the discussion to answer two problems: (1) what was the real meaning of *bharata* in the phrase of *bharata patapelena* 'the four-bharata' as the status of four surrounding kingdoms of Buton (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, Kaledupa) in the 16th century? and (2) What were the political strategies done by Buton kingdom to legitimate their purposely misinterpretation concerning the meaning of *bharata* and to reinforce their claim that Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa were the subordinates and propped Buton kingdom since the 17th until 20th centuries? These two problems are actually the scope of this article and accordingly the objectives are (1) to describe and analyze the real meaning of *bharata* and (2) to describe and analyze the political strategies of Buton in misinterpreting the meaning of *bharata* and reinforcing their claim that Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa kingdoms were the subordinates and propped Buton kingdom since the 17th until 20th centuries (Gilbert, 2022; Higgins & Coffey, 2016 Listo, 2018).

Materials and Methods

This part presents theoretical framework of the study in critical discourse analysis (CDA), theoretical review of critical discourse analysis (CDA), and methodology of the study. The three items are important element of the study.

Theoretical framework

This article is a result of study that employed critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach proposed by Wodak (2004). The approach is a historical discourse one which explains that to conduct an analysis of a discourse should be done by looking at the historical factors in a discourse. Therefore the appropriate method of CDA according to Wodak is Discourse-Historical Method. Wodak (2004), argues that all discourses are historical and can only be understood with reference to their context that refers to extralinguistic factors such as culture, society, and ideology. Wodak explains more detail that however, every script of discourse (oral or written) has own historical development thereby the frame work of critical discourse analysis (CDA) emphasizes the crucial of notion of context that explicitly includes socialpsychological, political and ideological components and accordingly CDA applies an interdisciplinary procedure.

This study adopted Wodak's theory/concept to analyze the real meaning of *bharata* in the phrase of *bharata patapelena* 'the four-bharata' that declared in the 16th century by the sisxth king of Buton, Laki Laponto. The theory/concept is also used to analyze and reveal Buton's strategy to misinterpret the meaning of *bharata* by political interest to did hegemony to the four surrounding kingdom from the 17th until 20th centuries.

Theoretical review of critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is developed from discourse analysis. Both of the analysis are linguistic studies that have the same object, it is a discourse and

have the same attention to analyze language meaning based on text and context. Linguists treat discourse as the same with text. Halliday (1989); Van Dijk (1985), treat discourse as a text, it is not only written language or written document but also includes oral language. Based on the Halliday's and Dijk's views, the term of *bharata* in the phrase of *bharata patapelena* 'the four-bharata'is a discourse.

Foucault (1979) views discourse as a social reality that does not only produce knowledge, but also social dominance. Other scholar, Fairclough (1989), defines discourse as a form of social practice that impacts to the exitence of dialectic between language and social condition. Language is a social phenomenon, the using of language is influenced by social surroundings, whereas social life can not be separated from language interaction as a social practice.

Discourse as social reality that produces dominance (Foucault's view) and as social phenomenon that can not be separated from social life (fairclough' view), critical discourse analysis (CDA) is used to reveal the using of language by certain group/class in a community as a device of hegemony to another groups/class. Wodak (2004), asserts the crucial of historical development of a discourse that influences the meaning. For Wodak, critical discourse analysis (CDA) concerns on this aspect to investigate the culture, ideology, and social condition which are the context of discourse. However, this Wodak's view is the base concept that used to analyze the real meaning of *bharata* as the first objective as well as the second objective of the this study.

Methodology of the study

Since the discourse is historical, the interpretation of *bharata* must be considered the elements of historical context relates to social, culture, and ideology of Buton kingdom and the four surrounding kingdoms in the 16th century when the term of *bharata* was issued. This study was in linguistic field but the object of study seems closely related to history since the supporting data was historical narration. Therefore, the procedure of this study employed historical framework that adapted from Kuntowijoyo (2005), in this case there were four steps: (1) heuristics or exploring relevant information occurred in long ago, (2) verification or source critic, (3) interpretation or analysis, and (4) historiography or writing the results of interpretation/analysis.

The interpretation of a single word of *bharata* to know and determine its real meaning by applying CDA approach and Discourse-Historical Method, social and political condition in the 16th century when the term of *bharata* was officially issued is very crusial. Social and political phenomena in the 16th century are actually extra linguistic elements which influence the determining the real meaning of *bharata*. Also social flaming occurred during in the 17th until 20th centuries in political relationship between Buton kingdom and four surrounding kingdoms: Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Keladupa are needed to describe and reveal Buton's strategy in misinterpreting the term of *bharata* and doing hegemony to the four surrounding kingdoms (Sriwimon & Zilli, 2017; Li et al., 2018; O'Halloran, 2005).

Both the social and political phenomena in the 16th century and the historical events occurred during the 17th until 20th centuries were data of the study. The data were taken through documentation and interview techniques. Documentation technique was employed to take data from libabry sources, whereas interview was done to take oral source from story tellers. The people of Munanese and Butonese nowadays still maintain oral tradition include historical stories which are inherited orally to the youngers. Oral tradition in this case is all kinds of discourse which are conveyed and spreaded in a community orally without written documentation (Pudentia, 2007).

Results and Discussions

The real meaning of *Bharata*

The term of *bharata* is not found in the vocabulary of Buton family languages or Muna language in South Sast Sulawesi Indonesia. But in the governmental structure of Muna Kingdom there is *kino bharata* 'head of bharata' that consist of three persons, they are *Kino Bharata Laghontoghe* 'the head of bharata Laghontoghe', *Kino Bharata Lohia* 'the head of bharata Loghia', and *Kino Bharata Wasolangka* 'the head of bharata Wasolangka'.

The phrase of *bharata patapelena* 'the four-bharata' was the status of four surrounding kingdoms of Buton kingdom, namely the kingdoms of Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa. The status was given by Laki Laponto, the sixth king of Buton (also the first Sultan of Buton). At the beginning of his government in the 16th century, Laki Laponto initiated a military alliance together with the four surrounding kingdoms. It was told by Zaenu, that published in the Blog of Department of History Education University of Halu Oleo (p.3-5) that Laki Laponto formed a military alliance after he got information about Baabullah' threaten, the Sultan of Ternate. Baabullah would attack Buton since Laki Laponto previously had killed Bolontio, a commander of Ternate military in the battle at Boneatiro beach Buton. Hearing the threaten from the king of Ternate, the king of Buton (Laki Laponto) discussed with his younger brother, La Posasu the king of Muna. Based on his brother's suggestion to involve the four surrounding kingdoms in facing Ternate's attack, Laki Laponto officially formed an alliance of military defense between Buton kingdom and the four surrounding kingdoms (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa). The military defense alliance then symbolized with *Soilaompo Torumbalili*. Denotatively, the term of *soilaompo* refers to handy plait " made of bamboo to catch fish or shrimp, and *torumbalili* means "moveable head". *Soilaompo* was a symbol of "a strong military coalition", whereas *torumbalili* was the symbol of "a movable crown", means the commander of the coalition was in rotation (among Buton and the four surrounding kingdoms).

Hadara (2015), states that the place where Laki Laponto made a meeting with delegations from the four surrounding kingdoms was at Kapeo-peo, a village that located at the border of Buton and Muna kingdoms territory. The results of the meeting which were accepted together of all delegations furtherly named as *Konvensi Kapeo-peo* 'Kapeo-peo convention'. Hadara continues, as the commander of the military alliance Laki Laponto decided the area of Kulisusu

kingdom becomes "the center" or "the front area" of battle to face Ternate's attack. Laki Laponto then mentioned Kulisusu related to its function as "the center" or "the front area" of the battle as *bharata*. It means the satatus of Kulisusu kingdom at that time was *bharata*. Accordingly Laki Laponto decided the member of the alliance from the four surrounding kingdoms (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa) as *Bharata Patapelena* 'the four-bharata'. It means the four surrounding kingdoms function "as the centers" or "the front lines" of the battle to face Ternate's attack. Laki Laponto was sure Ternate's fleet would come from the North East side of Buton by taking a direct route, certainly they would pass Kulisusu territory before reaching Buton. So they would be faced at Kulisusu. However, if Ternate's fleet took other alternative routes as a strategy, another surrounding kingdoms territory would become the center or the front line of the battle. If Ternate's fleet took the route from the Sast side of Buton kingdom, they would pass Kaledupa kingdom and certainly they would be faced at Kaledupa; Kaledupa territory would be the center or the front line of battle. If Ternate's fleet took the route from the North side of Buton, they would pass Muna kingdom and automaticly Muna territory would be the central or the front line of the battle. When Ternate took the route from the West side of Buton, they would be faced at Tiworo and the territory of Tiworo kingdom would be the center of the front line of the battle.

Based on the functions of the four surrounding kingdoms as "the center of the battle" or "the front line of the battle" to face Ternate's attack, the meaning of *bharata* is not "the wing territory" or "the subordinate" such as the interpretation of Butonese people. The real meaning of the term of *bharata* relates to its context of social and political situation in the 16th century when it was firstly issued is "the central of battle" or "the front line of battle" to face enemy's attack. Therefore, the phrase of *bharata patapelena* 'the four-bharata' which refers to the four surrounding kingdoms of Buton namely the kingdoms of Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa in the 16th century related to their function as "the central and the front lines" of the battle to face Ternate's attack. The status of the four surrounding kingdoms certainly were not the wings territory of Buton kingdom, and they were not the subordinates of Buton kingdom. And also they did not propped Buton kingdom, but they aided Buton kingdom as the member of military alliance from a dangerous attack (Bell et al., 2013; Jones, 2007; Hashemi & Ghanizadeh, 2012).

Purposely misinterpretation on the meaning of Bharata as political strategy of Butonese people

Different interpretation on the meaning of *bharata* between the people of Munanese and Butonese has been becoming a debatable discourse for several decades. However the discourse has multiimpact in social and politic. As proposed by Foucault (1979), that discourse can impact dominance and of course the dominance includes in political affairs. It seems the people of Butonese have been practicing this issue during in the 17th century until nowadays.

One century after *Konvensi Kapeo-peo* 'the convention of Kapeo-peo' was approved where the kingdom of Buton and the four kingdoms surrounding Buton (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa) were agree to establish military alliance in the

16th century, Buton changed their political commitment since in the 17th century. For this reason the people of Munanese claimed the people of Butonese were traitors.

Aderlaepe (2021), argues three political strategies of Buton broke the convention of Kapeo-peo. This phenomenon actually was a serious hindrance to the relationship of Muna and Buton, also the relationship of Buton with another kingdom surrounding Buton (Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa) since in the 17th century. The three betrayal strategies of Butonese people were:

- Purposely misinterpreted the meaning of *bharata* for political interest and established their version of interpretation institutionally.
- Extended a warm welcome to the arrival of Dutch and committed bilateral coalition with Dutch;
- Performed hegemony to Muna kingdom and other kingdoms nearby Buton (Tiworo, Kulisusu, and *Kaledupa*) by the assistance of Dutch.

The people of Buton interpreted the meaning of *bharata* based on political motive. The real meaning of *bharata* is previously analyzed and described above based on the context of social and politic when the term of *bharata* was firstly issued in the 16th century. *Bharata* means "the front area and center of battle". On the other hand, people of Butonese interpretation on the meaning of *bharata* was strange. They neglected its context related to social and political condition when the term of *bharata* was firstly introduced in the 16th century. They did not involve the extralinguistic aspects to determine the meaning of *bharata*. Cook (1989), asserts the interpretation of a certain term or word will never reach the real meaning if it is separated from its context.

The interpretation concerning the meaning of *bharata* according to the people of Butonese as "the wing territory" or "the subordinate" certainly can not be accepted. Accordingly their claim that the four surrounding kingdoms (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa) were the wing territories or subordinate of Buton kingdom that functioned propped Buton kingdom can not be legitimated. However it was not suitable to the social and political situation in the 16th century when the term of *bharata* was firstly issued. Laki Laponto, the sixth and the first sultan of Buton organized military alliance with the four surrounding kingdoms (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa) asked for the help of the four kingdoms in facing Ternate's fleet. So the four surrounding kingdoms were not the wing territories or sub parts/subordinate of Buton kingdom because they were equal of one to another. Of course Buton's version in claiming the meaning of *bharata* was not purely done, but had political motive.

The misinterpretation on the meaning of Bharata by Butonese people was established institutionally

Misinterpretation of Butonese people concerning the meaning of *bharata* and their political claim on the position of the four kingdoms nearby Buton were followed by their strong attempt. They established both of their purposely misinterpretation and political claim institutionally through governmental institutions of *Kesultanan Buton* 'the kingdom of Buton' and knowledge legitimation. Through

the governmental institution, the kingdom of Buton produced *syarana bharata* 'law of bharata'. It was the law that regulated the four surrounding kingdoms (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa) as *bharata patapelena* 'the four-bharata' related to the obedience and right in their relationship with the kingdom of Buton. Unfortunately the four surrounding kingdoms never knew and were not involved by the kingdom of Buton when *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata' was produced and officially legalized (La Ode Baenawi, in the interview on 20th September 2021).

The document of *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata' kept by Abdul Mulku Zahari, many sub parts of its substance are strange. The section number 22, it is stated explicitly that the four kingdoms surrounding Buton had to pay *jawana* 'tax' to Buton kingdom. Sido Thamrin (in the interview on 14th August 2020) explained that Muna kingdom never payed tax to Buton kingdom. Moreover every event of Sultan 'king' inauguration in Buton, it required the presence of the king of Muna. If the king of Muna did not yet arrive, the inauguration of sultan Buton 'the king of Buton' could not be performed (La Ode Dirman, in the interview on 16th of September 2021). Historically the first sultan of Buton and the eighth king of Muna in the 16th century were brother, they were the sun of Sugi Manuru the sixth king of Muna. Therefore all sultans of Buton and all kings of Muna after the 16th century were the descents of Sugi Manuru, the sixth king of Muna. So the argumentation that the inauguration of *Sultan Buton* 'the king of Buton' required the arrival of *Raja Muna* 'the king of Muna' is undebatable.

The manuscript of *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata' was documented in the 19th century in the era of Sultan La Ode Muhammad Idrus Kaimuddin, the 29th sultan of Buton. In the manuscript of *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata' kept by Abdul Mulku Zahari, it is stated that the document was also signed by the king of Muna, La Ode Ismail. The people of the Munanese claimed the signature was fail since the name of La Ode Ismail was not found in the list of Muna kings. Maybe the name of La Ode Ismail in the document referred to La Ode Sumaili, the 18th king of Muna but the king was impossible to sign the document if his name was not written correctly. La Ode Ismail and La Ode Sumaili indeed was different.

Other gaffe found in the script of *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata' is the structure of Muna kingdom. In the script it is stated that one of the core structure of Muna kingdom is *bhonto bhalano* 'prime minister' that consist of two persons. This error is fatal since *bhonto bhalano* 'the prime minister' in the kingdom of Muna is only one person according to the governmental structure of Muna kingdom (Aderlaepe, 2017). However this proof evidently strengthen the argument of Munanese people nowadays that the process of producing *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata' by Buton kingdom did not involve Muna and other kingdoms nearby Buton (Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa).

Besides using kingdom institution of *Kesultanan Buton* 'the king of Buton' by producing *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata', the people of Butonese also using education field to establish their subjective interpretation about the meaning of *bharata*. They produced many historical books where they can freely express their subjective interpretation on the meaning of *bharata* as well as their claim to Muna and other kingdoms nearby Buton. On of the book was written by Susanto

Zuhudi entitled *Sejarah Buton yang Terabaikan: Labu Rope Labu Wana* 'the neglected Butonese history: Labu Rope Labu Wana' (2010). The phrase of *labu rope labu wana* is a symbolic expression by the people of Butonese related to condition of *Kesultanan Buton* 'Buton kingdom' in long ago. According to Christomy (2011), the term of *labu rope labu wana* was Butonese strategy in facing threat from Ternate, Gowa, and VOC (Dutch) in the 17th and 18th centuries. *Labu rope labu wana* in local language means 'anchor the front and behind' a metaphoric phrase that assumed the struggle of Butonese people which was never ended to save Buton kingdom from enemies' attack. The kingdom of Buton was illustrated as a vessel that always attacked by the storm. *Labu rope* means 'guard the front side' and *labu wana* means 'guard the back side', *Rope* in *labu rope* denotatively means 'front part of vessel' and *wana* in *labu wana* means 'back part of vessel'. The front side of Buton in this case refers to Ternate because the position of Ternate kingdom is at the East side of Buton (the East is treated as the front side where the sun rises). On the other hand, the back side refers to Gowa because the position of Gowa kingdom is at the West side of Buton (the West is treated as the back side where the sun sets). So *labu rope labu wana* was the metaphoric illustration of Butonese people to save Buton kingdom from the attack that came from the East side (by Ternate) and from the West side (by Gowa). Related to this condition, Christomy (2011), asserts that by the existence of *bharata patapelena* 'the four bharata' which propped Buton, the kingdom of Buton was never conquered by the enemies. He interpreted the meaning of *bharata* as "the wing territories which propped Buton kingdoms".

However Buton kingdom was never got threatened by VOC (Dutch). Moreover Buton extended a warm welcome and signed bilateral coalition with VOC/Dutch in the 17th century (Schoorl, 2003). Besides that, Buton and Ternate since in the 17th century were friends. The war happened in 1667 between Buton and Gowa, Ternate and VOC/Dutch helped Buton (Aderlaepe, 2022). Therefore the statement of Zuhudi in his book (2018) that *Labu Rope Labu Wana* was the strategy of Buton to face the threaten from Ternate, VOC/Dutch, and Gowa in the 17th and 18th centuries is confused and certainly can not be legitimated.

Butonese people extended a warm welcome and committed bilateral coalition with VOC/Dutch

Since the people of Buton extended a warm welcome to the arrival of VOC/Dutch to Buton kingdom territory at the beginning of 17th century, the relationship between Buton and Muna kingdoms began was not harmonic. For the people of Munanese, welcoming the arrival of VOC/Dutch was a real violation of Kape-peo convention. It also broke the agreement that had been commited in the 16th century by two brothers, Laki Laponto as the sixth king and the first Sultan of Buton and La Posasu as the eighth king of Muna. They commited both of the kingdoms would never support imperialism politic (Batoa, 2003). Unfortunately one century later, at the beginning of 17th century the fourth Sultan of Buton, Sultan Dayanu Ikhsanuddin or La Elangi (1597-1633) extended a warm welcome to VOC/Dutch and commited bilateral coalition with VOC/Dutch. Schoorl (2003), states that Sultan Dayanu Ikhsanuddin and Appolonius Scott signed *coorte verklaring* 'short bilateral agreement' between Buton and Dutch at Bau-bau beach

Buton on 15th January 1613. The agreement by the people of Butonese was said *janji bhaana* 'the first agreement'.

La Elangi or Dayanu Ikhsanuddin was not the only one sultan of Buton who signed the bilateral agreement with Duth. Hadara (2015), states that another sultans of Buton after Dayanu Ikhsanuddin who signed the bilateral agreement with Dutch were:

- La Simbata or Sultan Adilil Rakhia (1964-1969), the 10th Sultan of Buton signed bilateral agreement with General Speelman twice. The first time was on the ship of Thertolen, 31st of January 1667. Secondly the agreement was signed on the ship of Thoff Van Zeeland, 25th of June 1667.
- Sultan Muhammad Asikin (1906-1911), the 33rd Sultan of Buton signed bilateral agreement with John Brugman on 8th April 1906.

Buton Kingdom performed hegemony to Muna and other Nearby Kingdoms by the assistance of Dutch.

The main point of *koorte verklaring* 'short bilateral agreement' of Asikin-Brugman in 1906 was the establishment of *Afdeling* and *onder Afdeling* (Hadara, 2015). Both of these institutions were the parts of structural government of Dutch imperialism in Indonesia. The *Afdeling* was administratively headed by an *Asisten Residen* 'The Resident Assistant' that taken from the Dutch. *Onder Afdeling* structurally was under the *Afdeling* and it was headed by a *Controleur* that also taken from Dutch.

VOC/Dutch in 1910 formed *Afdeling Buton and Laiwui* that was located in Wolio, the capital town of Buton kingdom. Besides it, the Dutch also formed *Onder Afdeling of Muna* that located in Raha, capital of Muna regency nowadays. Viewed from structural hierarchy, the existence of *Onder Afdeling of Muna* was under the *Afdeling of Buton and Laiwui.* Political implication of this matter was very significant. The Dutch placed the kingdom of Muna was under the kingdom of Buton. Of course this decision made the kingdom of Buton was superior and the kingdom of Muna was inferior in their relationship. Political implication of this matter was the kings of Muna had to obey the sultans of Buton. Also the kings of Muna was appointed by the sultan of Buton and Dutch. This reality was evidence that Buton kingdom did hegemony on Muna kingdom by the assistance of VOC/Dutch. La Ode Sirad Imbo (in the interview on 14th December 2021) stated the kings of Muna in that period rejected loyal to the sultan of Buton, they preferred to resign from the position as the kings than to obey the sultans of Buton (Flowerdew, 1999; Othman, 2019; Putrayasa, 2017).

Conclusion

This article describes how language functions in social life that is not only as a means of communication but also a device to achieve political dominance. It seems as an additional function of language, but actually, it is social phenomenon and becomes the concern of the article by applying critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach. The using of language as a device of political goal is analyzed in this article. Different interpretation on the meaning of the term of

bharata has been becoming a political and historical discourse in the relationship between Buton kingdom and the four surrounding ones namely Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa since at the beginning of 17th century.

The term of *bharata* was firstly issued at the beginning of 16th century by the first Sultan of Buton kingdom, Laki Laponto. When he got information about Ternate's threat to attack Buton for the death of Bolontio (Ternate soldiers commander) in the battle at Boneatiro beach Buton, Laki Laponto issued the term. To face Ternate's attack, Laki Laponto involved the four surrounding kingdoms by initiating and organizing a military defense coalition and it was declared with the four kingdoms delegations at Kapeo-peo village Buton. The declaration of the coalition was namely *konvensi kapeo-peo* 'the convention of kapeo-peo'. Of course social and political conditions in that time were extra-linguistic elements which must be considered in analyzing and determining the real meaning of *baharata.*

Through the analysis by involving its extra-linguistic elements, the real meaning of *bharata* is "the front area and center of battle". Accordingly, *bharata patapelena* 'the four-bharata' referred to four kingdoms nearby Buton were the front areas and centers of battle in facing Ternate's attack. This real meaning is rather different from the interpretation of Butonese people. They interpreted *bharata* as "wing territory and propped Buton kingdom". They claimed the four surrounding kingdoms (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa) were the wing territories and propped Buton kingdom. Butonese misinterpretation and claim certainly were not accepted by the people of Munanese and other people from Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa either.

The people of Butonese attempted to use their purposely misinterpretation and claim for political dominance and hegemony to the four surrounding kingdoms. They applied any betrayal strategies. Firstly, they established their version of the interpretation and claim institutionally. They produced *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata' and published many books where in the books they explicitely explained their misinterpretation and claim. One item in the substance of *syarana bharata* 'the law of bharata' was stated that all nearby kingdoms (Muna, Tiworo, Kulisusu, and Kaledupa) have to pay *jawana* 'tax' to Buton kingdom. The matter of presenting tax to Buton kingdom by the four nearby kingdoms had never been obeyed. Secondly, they extended a warm welcome to the arrival of VOC (Dutch) at the beginning of 17th century and the fourth Sultan of Buton, La Elangi (Dayanu Ikhsanuddin) signed *corte veeklaring* 'short bilateral agreement of coalition' with Appolonius Schott (Dutch) on 15th January 1613 at Buton beach. The people of Butonese named this event in local language as *janji bhaana* 'the first treaty'. By historical exploring, the sultans of Buton after La Elangi who signed *corte veerklaing* 'short bilateral agreement of coalition' with VOC (Dutch) were La Simbata and Asikin. Thirdly, they applied hegemony to Muna kingdom and other kingdoms nearby Buton (Tiworo, Kulisusu, and *Kaledupa*) by the assistance of Dutch. In 1910 in South East Sulawesi Dutch formed governmental institutions namely Afdeling Buton and Laiwui and Onder Afdeling Muna. Afdeling Buton and Laiwui was located in Wolio, the capital town of Buton kingdom whereas Onder Afdeling Muna was located in Raha, the capital town of Muna regency nowadays. Structurally, the existence of Onder Afdeling Muna was under the Afdeling Buton and Laiwui. Accordingly, the existence of the king of

Muna structurally was under the king of Buton. The political implication of this matter was very hard for Muna since this system was designed and decided by the imperial government of Dutch. Since in that period (at the beginning of 20th century), the kings of Muna must be approved by the kings of Buton and Dutch. In history, many kings of Muna in that period would resign rather than obeyed the king of Buton.

References

Aderlaepe. (2017). *Sejarah dan Kebudayaan Muna*. Jakarta: Daulat Express

Aderlaepe. (2021). *Kajian Semiotika Atas Soilaompo Torumbalili dan Barata Patapelena dalam Hubungan Kerajaan Muna dan Buton Abad ke -16.* Unpublish Report of Research

Aderlaepe. (2022). "Hubungan Kerajaan Muna Dengan Dunia Luar" in *Prasejaran dan Sejarah Peradaban Suku Tua Muna* (Editor Hadi Wahyudi, S.Si., M.E.), p. 74-109. Raha: Museum Bharugano Wuna

Batoa, K. (2003). *Profil Raja La Posasu, Raja Muna Ke-8 Tahun 1538-1551 M.* Raha: Dinas Pendidikan Nasional Kabupaten Muna Provinsi Sulawesi Tenggara

Bell, E., Robinson, A., & See, C. (2013). Do written mandatory accreditation standards for residential care positively model learning organizations? Textual and critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *50*(11), 1446-1458. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2013.01.011

Christomy, T. (2011). Susanto Zuhdi, Sejarah Buton yang terabaikan; Labu rope labu wana. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, Yayasan Kebudayaan Masyarakat Buton, 2010, xli+ 350 pages (including illustrations and maps). ISBN 9789797692292. Price: IDR 65,000 (soft cover). *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, *13*(2), 372-374.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.

Couvreur, J., & Van Den Berg, R. (2001). *Sejarah dan kebudayaan kerajaan Muna*. Kupang: Artha Wacana Press.

Fairclough, N. Norman (1989) Language and Power.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Description and interpretation in critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*(8), 1089-1099. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00049-1

Foucault, M. (1979). The History of Sexuality (London, Allen Lane).

Gilbert, C. (2022). The audit of public debt: Auditing as a device for political resistance in a neoliberal era. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *85*, 102263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2020.102263

Hadara, A. (2015). *Sejarah Lokal Sultra: Kesutanan Buton.*

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.

Hashemi, M. R., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2012). Critical discourse analysis and critical thinking: An experimental study in an EFL context. *System*, *40*(1), 37-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.01.009

Higgins, C., & Coffey, B. (2016). Improving how sustainability reports drive change: a critical discourse analysis. *Journal of cleaner production*, *136*, 18-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.01.101

Jones, P. E. (2007). Why there is no such thing as "critical discourse analysis". *Language & communication*, *27*(4), 337-368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2006.08.001

Kuntowijoyo, D. R. (2005). *Pengantar ilmu sejarah*. Bentang Pustaka.

Li, J., Pearce, P. L., & Low, D. (2018). Media representation of digital-free tourism: A critical discourse analysis. *Tourism Management*, *69*, 317-329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.06.027

Listo, R. (2018). Gender myths in energy poverty literature: a critical discourse analysis. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *38*, 9-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.01.010

O'Halloran, K. A. (2005). Mystification and social agent absences: A critical discourse analysis using evolutionary psychology. *Journal of pragmatics*, *37*(12), 1945-1964. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.10.018

Othman, A. A. M. (2019). Fundamentalist and tolerant islamic discourse in john updike's terrorist and jonathan wright's translation the televangelist: A corpus-based critical discourse analysis of semantic prosody. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *5*(6), 1-27.

Pudentia, M. P. S. S. (2007). *Hakikat kelisanan dalam tradisi Melayu Mak Yong*. Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya, Universitas Indonesia.

Putrayasa, I. B. (2017). The semantic study of languages politics. *International journal of linguistics, literature and culture*, *3*(2), 7-13.

Schoorl, J. W. (2003). *Masyarakat, sejarah, dan budaya Buton*. Djambatan bekerjasama dengan Perwakilan KITLV-Jakarta.

Sriwimon, L., & Zilli, P. J. (2017). Applying Critical Discourse Analysis as a conceptual framework for investigating gender stereotypes in political media discourse. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, *38*(2), 136-142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2016.04.004

Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Vol. 1 (Disciplines of Discourse); vol. 2 (Dimensions of Discourse); vol. 3 (Discourse and Dialogue); vol. 4 (Discourse Analysis in Society)*. New York: Academic Press.

Wodak, R. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. *Qualitative research practice*, *185*, 185-204.