Voices of Anticolonial Resistance in Toloq Rumpaqna Bone: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Classical Bugis Texts

Syamsudduha – Andi Muhammad Irawan – Sultan

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2026.19.02.05

Abstract
This paper investigates voices of anticolonial discourse manifested in the classical Bugis text, *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone*. Analyzed through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), we seek to understand how resistance discourse is constructed in classical texts. Though CDA typically examines contemporary materials, this study shows that resistance has been historically embedded in anticolonial texts. Using Fairclough's three-dimensional framework, the analysis focuses on how resistance discourse operates through linguistic mechanisms (description), manifests in discursive elements (interpretation), and exists within socio-political practices (explanation). We examine 12 stanzas and categorize them into 5 thematic strands: mobilization, valor, unity, memory, and reawakening. Together, these strands articulate how Bugis people deconstructed colonial domination through linguistic mechanisms anchored in poetry. The findings suggest that classical texts served as crucial sites of political contestation against colonial power.
Key words: critical discourse analysis, resistance discourse, voices of anticolonialism, classical Bugis text

Introduction

The study of resistance discourse has increasingly attracted scholarly attention across the humanities and social sciences, particularly in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In earlier times, CDA studies were primarily concerned on how texts and talk are employed as instruments to gain and maintain power, reinforce social inequalities, and perpetuate discrimination (van Dijk, 1993; Foucault, 1990; Pennycook, 1994). Within this framework, discourse is strategically constructed to frame individuals or social groups in a negative light through various discourse themes and linguistic operationalizations (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1993).

However, much of this body of literature has disproportionately focused on analysis from the perspective of dominant groups, often neglecting the voices of marginalized communities and the alternative narratives produced by minority or powerless groups (Medina, 2011b; Lazar, 2005). This creates a critical gap in understanding how marginalized or oppressed groups actively resist domination through discourse, limiting the comprehensiveness of CDA studies. In this context, resistance discourse refers to the study of how discourse is constructed by specific social groups – often categorized as oppressed groups, whether at the community or national level – to challenge, oppose, and subvert dominant power structures, ideologies, and narratives (Foucault, 1990; Medina, 2011a; van Dijk, 1993).

This line of inquiry provides a platform for marginalized groups by highlighting their discourse constructions across various genres as a means of resisting domination and discrimination (Annisa & Irawan, 2023; Magarati & Bist, 2025; Susanto, 2022). It recognizes that marginalized communities actively produce their own discourses, either as a defensive strategy to preserve their identities and beliefs or as an assertive effort to discursively challenge dominant narratives (Spivak, 1988; Fairclough, 1995; Irawan, et al., 2022). Despite these insights, there is limited research that systematically explores historical instances of resistance discourse, leaving the dynamics of past marginalized voices underexplored. In socio-political and cultural contexts, the study of resistance discourse is essential for fostering

counter-discourses and narrative balance, ultimately contributing to the creation of a more just and equitable society (Lazar, 2005; Medina, 2011b; Pennycook, 1994).

Despite the increasing scholarly interest in applying CDA to investigate how marginalized groups construct resistance, there remains a notable gap in focused research examining how such resistance was discursively constructed within historical colonial contexts (Latjuba, 2013). Contemporary studies have convincingly demonstrated that, in various social and political settings, minority or less powerful groups employ discourse to defend their identity and existence, as well as to create alternative narratives of resistance (Rahmayati, 2020; Magarati & Bist, 2025; Prameswari et al., 2025). However, understanding how historical communities engaged in discursive resistance is crucial for tracing the evolution of resistance strategies and for contextualizing contemporary forms of marginalized discourse. However, comparatively little attention has been paid to how individuals in the past - whether at the national or community level - with limited access to diverse discourse genres, engaged in discursive resistance against colonial powers (Ravichand, 2025).

Historical records, particularly from the 19th and 20th centuries, reveal that numerous powerful nations colonized many regions worldwide through physical domination, including slavery and armed violence. To consolidate their dominance, discriminatory and often racist discourses were deliberately constructed to serve as justifications and legitimizations for physical colonization. Colonizers frequently portrayed themselves as superior bearers of a civilizing mission, while depicting colonized people as uncivilized, inferior, and primitive (Prasetyo et al., 2023; Harahap et al., 2023; Putra et al., 2023). These unequal and racist portrayals were strategically employed to rationalize violence and exploitation.

Historical evidence of colonization is abundant across many regions worldwide, particularly in Asia and Africa. Within the Asian context, Indonesia - comprising diverse ethnic groups - endured centuries of colonization, notably under Dutch rule (Putra et al., 2023; Prasetyo et al., 2023). For approximately 350 years, the Dutch exerted control and exploited natural resources throughout the Indonesian archipelago, spanning from east to west, including the sovereign Kingdom of Bone in South Sulawesi (Alamsyah, 2018).

During this prolonged period of colonization, various forms of resistance arose among both the aristocracy and common people of Bone against Dutch oppression. These acts of defiance are documented in several historical texts, most notably in *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone*. This historical text is a Bugis literary work composed in poetic form, recounting the heroic endeavors of a king defending his kingdom's honor and sovereignty against foreign invasion.

Although presented poetically, the narrative is grounded in historical fact. The manuscript represents classical Bugis literature, characterized by rich symbolism and metaphorical language (Prameswari et al., 2025; Rahmayati, 2020). Due to its focus on resistance and heroism in the face of colonization, the text contains numerous discursive constructions of resistance, making it a valuable subject for analysis of resistance discourse (Magarati & Bist, 2025; Zulfikarni et al., 2025).

This evidence underscores that discourses of resistance have long existed throughout history and socio-political conflicts, predating their formal academic conceptualization. This includes colonial contexts such as Dutch colonialism in Indonesia, demonstrating that spaces for resistance by marginalized or vulnerable groups consistently emerge amid processes of colonization, discrimination, and domination. Resistance took both physical forms and discursive struggles, between colonizers and local authorities, as well as between the populace. From the perspective of resistance discourse analysis, less powerful individuals or groups deliberately construct multiple or varied discourses across different textual genres to

challenge or delegitimize the negative representations imposed by dominant groups (Spivak, 1988; Annisa & Irawan, 2023; Cahyaratri et al., 2024).

Theoretically, this paper advances the study of resistance discourse within CDA by extending its application beyond contemporary issues to encompass broader historical and colonial contexts, thereby enriching existing scholarship (van Dijk, 1993; Wodak & Meyer, 2009; Ravichand, 2025). By focusing on the *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* manuscript, this study directly addresses the gap in historical analyses of resistance discourse, demonstrating how marginalized voices articulated opposition within a colonial setting. Furthermore, building on the concept of resistance in CDA, this study demonstrates that in every process of colonization, discrimination, or marginalization, resistance by less powerful groups inevitably arises. Practically, this research reveals that within the Bugis society of South Sulawesi during the colonial era, the community - represented by the King of Bone - possessed advanced intellectual and literary capacities, as evidenced by the *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* manuscript. This manuscript serves as a historical legacy that documents discursive resistance against colonial domination (Prameswari et al., 2025; Zulfikarni et al., 2025).

This study addresses the following research questions: How is resistance discourse constructed in the *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* text, and what discourse topics are presented within it to challenge or oppose power imbalances?

Resistance Discourse in CDA

CDA nowadays has emerged as an important interdisciplinary approach, with various analytical tools, to investigate how language constructs, reinforces and challenges power relations in society (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1998a). The main concept within it is that discourse is recognized as an active site of struggle of domination and resistance, not only as a reflection of social realities. In its theoretical foundation, resistance is inherently in and inseparably from the elements of power relations (Medina, 2011a; Foucault, 1990).

The existence of power, and then power abuse and domination, is always challenged by resistance, either in a subtle form or overt opposition. This means that the establishment and maintenance of power, and its abuse, one of which is through dominant narratives, may be challenged by alternative narratives created by dominated groups (Li, 2024; Wu & Moshirzadeh, 2025).

Within this framework, resistance discourse is defined as practices of communication where marginalized or subjugated groups oppose and challenge domination, including the exercise of dominant ideologies and narratives (Foucault, 1990). Further, it is conceptualized as counter-discourse, offering alternative perspectives to challenge and subvert domination or hegemony and enabling marginalized voices to articulate identity, agency, and opposition (Van Dijk, 1993; Rogers, 2004). These counter-discourses may be constructed in various genres and communication modes, including political speeches, media texts, literary works and everyday conversations, both in the contemporary and historical worlds.

Numerous empirical CDA studies have unraveled the importance of examining resistance discourse across diverse contents in recent decades. Roger (2004), for example, has identified resistance discourse in political activism, revealing how the counter-discourse is strategically used to undermine dominant ideologies. Similarly, Wodak (2009), explored how minorities employ some discursive strategies to oppose exclusion and discrimination in multicultural societies. Another similar study revealed that resistance discourse is created to oppose racist ideology (Tilbury, 2000) and to resist negative stereotypes and underestimation in the workplace (van Laer and Janssens, 2010) and in organizational settings (Putnam, et al., 2005).

In relatively new studies, resistance discourse is constructed in various contemporary issues to oppose global imperialism, racism, and education reform.

Stankiewicz (2020) analyzed how resistance discourse is presented to challenge higher education reform in Poland. Wu & Moshirzadeh (2025) examined the construction of resistance discourse to build anti-imperialism and anti-hegemony in the global political context. In a similar vein, Mansouri & Parina (2023) investigated how racism or racial inequality is strategically opposed through anti-racism, reflected in various resistance discourses in online media. These studies convincingly show that, in power domination found in various social and political contexts, national or global, resistance discourses are created to challenge it.

In the context of postcolonial and indigenous studies, CDA has been used to uncover how marginalized or oppressed groups build their resistance discourse against colonial and neo-colonial narratives. Discourse here is employed to contest colonial legacies (Blommaert, 2005), arguing that such a discourse is deliberately constructed to reclaim identity and agency within a dominant context. Although some studies focus on contemporary texts, limited research investigates resistance discourse in historical or classical texts, especially in Southeast Asian contexts.

The application of CDA, especially through the lens of resistance discourse, to examine historical texts in a colonial context is relatively new. Some scholars, such as Fairclough (1992) and Blommaert (2005), state that this approach is effective in revealing how colonial power is maintained and resisted through language. Studies on colonial resistance discourse have mostly concerned the discourse of nationalist and colonial resistance, with less emphasis on classical texts that may also contain rich discursive resistance. Indigenous classical texts, which were transmitted orally and poetically, have been understudied in ways that could construct resistance against colonial domination.

Building on theoretical and empirical foundations of resistance discourse analysis, this paper conceptualizes resistance in *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* as a deliberate and strategic discursive practice. Besides narrating historical events, this text also ideologically constructs counter-narratives opposing Dutch colonial domination built through the discourse of inferiority and subjugation. This text is seen as a site of struggle between colonial narratives and anticolonial discourses of resistance. This study seeks to uncover how the classical Bugis text may contribute to the ongoing struggle for agency, sovereignty, and self-determination under the colonial power structure.

Toloq Rumpaqna Bone and the Narratives of Resistance

Toloq rumpaqna Bone, as a classical Bugis literary text, holds a significant position in Indonesia's literary heritage, especially as a narrative of resistance against colonialism. Although it has cultural and historical significance, this text has received little scholarly attention in the field of CDA, particularly through the lens of resistance discourse analysis. This fact denies the opportunity to explore its potential contribution to understanding how the local kingdom and its people create opposition and resistance to colonial rule and narratives through language and literature.

This text is a literary work in the form of a poem. It was composed by I Mallaq Daeng Mabela, Arung Manajeng and captured the fall of the Bone Kingdom in 1905 to Dutch colonial forces. *Toloq* is known as a traditional Bugis literary form that not only serve as a record of historical trauma but also as a powerful vessel through which the Bugis people articulate loss, loyalty and resistance. It is one of the few indigenous texts that address the colonial conflict from the Bugis perspective.

Its poetic form is characterized by a strict syllabic pattern, typically eight syllables per line. It belongs to a formulaic expression, performed in oral and written storytelling traditions in Bugis culture. Further, it is constructed using repeated phrases and patterned structures, which not only advance its aesthetic values but also serve as a vessel of cultural memory through memorability and recitation. The version

we have today was originally transmitted orally, then written in Lontara script and later transliterated into Latin for wider access.

Set during colonial aggression against the Bone kingdom, the text reflects the conflict between indigenous sovereignty and foreign domination. It simultaneously depicts heroic leaders, sorrowful defeat, and loyalty. The fall of Bone presents both a military defeat and a spiritual and cultural fracture. This remains a memorable history of the kingdom, reflects the courage of indigenous people, and discursively manifests a struggle against foreign power.

Bugis literature, including *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone*, is distinguished by its deep connection to the social and political landscape and collective identity of the Bugis people in South Sulawesi. This tribe has a rich cultural tradition of oral and written literature, characterized by poetic forms established through metaphor, allegory and historical narrative (Pelras, 1996; Cummings, 2007). Regarding this *Toloq*, besides serving to preserve history and reinforce cultural values, it also articulates political authority. Additionally, such texts reflect underlying social hierarchies and dynamics between rulers and subjects, especially during conflict and colonial periods (Macknight et al., 2020; Amin, 2023). This reveals how power, domination, and resistance are negotiated and represented within Bugis society.

Much of the existing studies on Bugis literature have focused on linguistic aesthetics, narrative structures, and cultural symbolism (Wahyuddin, 2021; Alamsyah, 2022; Musliadi & Yusrini, 2022), with less attention to the political dimensions of power dynamics manifested in texts. Although heroic epics and historical narratives in *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* have been recognized as expressions of valor and sovereignty, the examination of discursive strategies of resistance to subvert colonial domination remains underexplored. This gap opens an opportunity to explore how language serves not only as an instrument of cultural memory but also as an important tool for creating ideological resistance.

As an object of study in CDA, this poem offers a unique case for exploring resistance discourse. It documents the heroic efforts of the local kingdom with its people in defending their sovereignty against Dutch colonial incursions. It contains intensive use of symbolic language and metaphorical expressions, which provide rich ground for analyzing how discursive resistance is constructed. These resisting expressions are constructed through depictions of heroism, sovereignty, or counter-narratives to colonial depictions of inferiority.

Method

The design of this study is qualitative research grounded in the theoretical and methodological principles of CDA. It is a multidisciplinary approach that identifies how the use of language in particular contexts and genres may reflect, reinforce, and challenge power relations in society (van Dijk, 1993; Fairclough, 1995; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). This approach is best used to investigate how discourse may serve as a tool of resistance against discrimination and marginalization. CDA aligns with the concern of this study, which identifies the discursive construction of resistance in the *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* manuscript. The qualitative approach of this research allows for a detailed analysis or in-depth examination of linguistic features, thematic concerns, and socio-political dimensions, thereby enabling an exploration of resistance discourse produced in the past within the context of colonial oppression and domination.

Toloq Rumpaqna Bone, a classical Bugis literary work presented in poetic form, is the primary data source for this research. In the study of resistance discourse, this manuscript is historically relevant and significant, as it provides information on how the King of Bone and his people resisted Dutch colonial forces during a prolonged period of domination and subjugation in the South Sulawesi region. There are several reasons why this manuscript was selected in this study, namely:

1. It provides a valuable example of how indigenous people construct resistance discourse in a historical colonial context. It thereby fills a notable gap in CDA literature (Latjuba, 2013; Ravichand, 2025);
2. In capturing complex constructions of identity, power, challenge and opposition (Rahmayati, 2020; Prameswari et al., 2025), the manuscript is rich with symbolic, metaphorical, and poetic language presenting resistance; and
3. The manuscript not only serves as a literary artifact, but also a socio-political document that manifests collective memory and resistance.

The manuscript is accessed in its original Bugis written form and in its Indonesian translation. The excerpts selected are then translated into English. Hundreds of excerpts are available in a book entitled *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone*, compiled by Muhammad Rapi Tang. This compilation consists of 244 pages and was published by the Centre for Language Development and Promotion, Indonesian Ministry of National Education, in 2000. The material selection was guided by criteria of relevance to resistance discourse, historical significance, and richness of linguistic and thematic content.

The reliability of the data is ensured by sourcing the manuscript from an authoritative publication, while each translation and excerpt selection underwent careful verification against the original text. Cross-referencing with historical accounts and previous studies further validated the contextual accuracy and authenticity of the manuscript. These procedures strengthen the trustworthiness of the data and the findings derived from it.

In collecting the data, a systematic process of text segmentation and annotation is performed. The manuscript is divided into manageable units such as stanzas, narrative episodes or thematic sections. Each unit was carefully examined to identify passages that explicitly or implicitly construct resistance, ensuring comprehensive coverage of the manuscript's discursive strategies. This process allows for detailed analysis of discursive features, focusing on passages engaging in resistance discourse both implicitly and explicitly. During the process of analysis, notes and memos are maintained to categorize or record emerging themes, linguistic mechanisms, and discourse strategies employed. All annotations and memos were organized in a data coding sheet to facilitate transparency, traceability, and replicability of the analytical process.

This study employs a comprehensive framework of CDA that operates Fairclough's analytical model of textual, interdiscursive, and socio-political practices. This framework is enriched by the conceptualization of resistance discourse as developed by van Dijk (1993) and Media (2011a). The triadic framework of analysis performed in multilayered analysis integrates the detailed analysis of linguistics and socio-political meanings.

At the textual level, the analysis focuses on the linguistic and theoretical features used in the manuscript to build resistance. This analytical level includes the identification of specific discourse strategies, such as nominalization, figurative language, argumentation, lexicalization, modality, and social demarcation, employed to present the Bugis king and the people in a positive light while delegitimizing colonial powers. This reflects identity construction and ideological stances.

In the discursive practice level, the analysis identifies how the discourse is produced, distributed, and consumed within its historical and cultural contexts. This analytical level examines how the manuscript constructs social identities (for example, freedom fighter vs evil; heroic rules vs foreign invaders; or civilized vs uncivilized). Another point is analyzing intertextuality and interdiscursivity by exploring how discourse from different sources, e.g. statement or arguments in the

past, is transformed or textualized in the manuscript. The procedure includes tracing historical sources and cross-referencing events, figures, and narrative accounts to verify the manuscript's contextual accuracy.

At the socio-political level, the analysis situates the resistance discourse within the broader historical, political, and cultural context of Dutch colonial rule in South Sulawesi (or Indonesia). This analysis explores how the resistance discourse reflects and negotiates unequal power relations between colonizers and colonized. Further analysis reveals the role of discourse in maintaining identity, fostering solidarity, and challenging colonial domination. This implies the role of discursive practices in understanding historical resistance and its relevance to contemporary postcolonial theory.

This study examines publicly available historical texts and involves no human participants. Although no human participants were involved, the research acknowledges the cultural heritage and intellectual tradition of the Bugis people. Further, this study also attempts to avoid misrepresentation and a negative impact to cultural sensitivity. It recognizes the significance of the manuscript as a legacy of resistance. Ethical considerations were incorporated by respecting the integrity of the original manuscript, providing accurate translations and acknowledging the cultural ownership of the Bugis community.

Findings

The study employs Fairclough's three-dimensional frameworks of CDA, namely textual, discursive, and socio-political analyses, to examine how resistance discourses are constructed and perpetuated in a classical Bugis literary text of *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone*. The analysis unravels how the use of language, cultural practices, and ideology is interconnected to build a powerful narrative of moral-political resistance. Analyzed closely through the textual examination (descriptive level), interpretation of discursive practices (interpretative level), and situating the findings within broader social practices (explanatory level), the findings show that various stanzas collectively articulate various resistance discourses that defend Bone's identity and struggle against colonial domination.

This study analyses 12 stanzas to examine how resistance discourses are constructed in the classical manuscript. The presentation of the findings is organized into various analytical themes that capture the underlying patterns of resistance within the text. The stanzas are presented in the following Table 1.

Table 1. Excerpts of Multiple Stanzas Shaping Resistance Discourse

No	Stanzas
1.	*Tinio to palanroe; Mai ri launa lona;* *Kulabuna napekkatu; Pabbuno ri tengnga padang*
2.	*Buaja botto gaggareng; Pasipopoi kannana;* *Pallaga bessi malela; Mattumpuk tellao soro*
3.	*Raja pangulu lompona; Bone mattanrasulae;* *Mattonra ola watanna; Piseangngengngi Sijelling*
4.	*Samanna tonasolori; Tonsura temmiseng bajak;* *Malluru tellao soro; Tennaparibabuani*
5.	*Mewai mappuli-puli, Pabbarani ripilem;* *Koroneli bettaede; Tenrek sirimu labela*
6.	*Malluru demma manenni; Pabbarani maegae;* *Barisik ritunruanna; Raja pangulu lompona*
7.	*Bone mattanrasulae; Ala mallawangppada;* *Oninna ballilik-ede; Mariang massadda lette*
8.	*Bone mattanrasulae; Apak engkai manorang;*

	Mattumpiik kuae bonga; Mabbitte kuae tanringeng
9.	*Sianriggi tessitaro; Siak temmaddampeng soro; Tellepek lalo adanna; Betta Ponggawana Bone*
10.	*Naiyyak mappaddiolo; Pakkasangngi tanra-tanra Perang; Lingkajo kati pammusu; Mai ri launa Lona*
11.	*Inaooa memengngi beta; Paranruk rukka mawekkek; Betta Ponggawana Bone; Kuakkeda nawa-nawa*
12.	*Natuju mata wekgangngi; Rebba sisulle-sulleang; Barisik ritunruanna; Pabbarani maegana*

Based on the close analysis of the stanzas, there are five interconnected analytical themes emerge namely 'Mobilization and Call to Action', 'Valor and the Ethic of Bravery', 'Unity and Leadership as Collective Agency', Memory, Heroism, and Cultural Continuity', and 'Reawakening and Spiritual Resilience'. All of these themes position the people of Bone as active agents of resistance and these are identified either in the analyses in textual, discursive, and socio-political dimensions.

Mobilization and Call to Resistance Actions

The main theme constructed in *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* is the discourse construction of mobilization. It is the process that the literary text calls the community to physical and moral action. This can be identified in stanzas 1, 4, and 10 in which imperative verbs are frequently found, such as *Mai ri launa lona* (come to the open field) and *Pakkasangngi tanra-tanra perang* (Prepare the signs of war) constitutes rallying calls for collective movement.

The selection of these linguistic choices is not neutral; they are socially constructed to encourage struggling. Fairclough (1992) states that imperative verbs ideologically function to organize social subjects into action-oriented positions. In this context, the audience is hailed as warriors rather than subjects; it is the agent of collective revolt, not a passive recipient of colonial domination.

Examined through textual analysis, these imperative verbs and repetitive clause structures discursively build urgency and rhythm, employed to reinforce a performative sense of movement. Recurring spatial imagery, for instance, launa lona (open field) and tengnga padang (middle plain), is the process of transforming the physical landscape into an ideological dimension; thus, becoming the arena of confrontation. This type of open plain is often used to symbolize visibility and honor. By urging people to enter this field, the poem encourages resistance against colonial domination.

From a discursive practice perspective, this stanza is an oral call-and-response chant to foster collective solidarity and warrior identity. It performs a call to action for both physical and psychological aspects that could effectively unite the audience around a shared challenge. Further, the use of sequential syntax, namely calls, gathering and readiness to confrontation, reflects an organized military entity and ritual that strategically re-empowers continuity to face a threat. These calls can also be interpreted as motivational speeches aimed at fostering resistance. The rhythm and parallelism built into the stanzas can assist in constructing a memory of struggle or sovereignty transmitted among the audience across generations.

Within the socio-political practice, these stanzas may serve as acts to build counter-hegemony against colonial domination. It discursively reflects an ideological position central to Bone's social fabric: the necessity to defend its territorial sovereignty. The call, such as 'come to the open field', metaphorically challenges colonial hegemony by demanding visibility to reclaim their land and voice. The

discourse manifests the rejection of passivity and frame resistance as an ongoing social and cultural obligation.

Further, at this level of analysis, the discourse can be understood as an opposition to hegemonic narratives perpetuated by colonial power that negatively portray Bone's society as disorganized and submissive. Such discourse asserts a culture of proactive resilience that emphasizes Bone's autonomy in social, political and economic spheres. Thus, the discursive theme of mobilization and call of action demonstrates that linguistic command is discursively bound to political activism, making language as a vessel for resistance.

Valor and Bravery

The second narrative theme is the discourse of valor, which is still closely tied to the mobilization theme. This is grounded in the Bugis moral concept of *pabbarani* that means bravery or courage. The theme is foregrounded in stanzas 2, 5, and 6 through the construction of martial and animal metaphors. In stanza 2, for instance, the image of *Buaja botto gaggareng* (strong crocodile surfacing) reinforces the natural strength of moral determination.

The crocodile is often used metaphorically as a culturally resonant figure deliberately symbolizing territorial defense and latent power. When this metaphorically imaged figure is interrelated with *Pallaga bessi malela* (iron shines brightly), the stanza unites the concept of nature and technology that assert the adaptive and organic strength of Bugis people. This metaphor could be seen as opposition to colonial domination through the reinforcement of the image of bravery and the steadfast endurance of iron.

Additionally, stanza 5 explicitly connects bravery with honor; *Pabbarani ripilem / Tenrek sirimu labela* (Let bravery shine / Do not let your banner fall). The ethical concept of *siri'* is invoked to transform bravery into moral obligation. The concept of *siri'* represents the Bugis worldview; defending honor must be performed to defend their identity. Based on this analysis, it can be argued that the textual recurrence of pabbarani is not only to glorify war but also to encode cultural ethos and a specific moral system to justify resistance as a legitimate action.

From a discursive point of view, these stanzas likely were disseminated as a motivational mantra before battles or communal gatherings. The ethos of *pabarani* is deliberately and performatively repeated to turn individual bravery into collective identity. This concept is taken from the moral ethos of *siri'* and is intertextually transformed in the context of war or resistance. The image of *pabbarani* is strategically transformed into the context of war against Dutch colonial invasion of Bone's territory, as the reawakening of the main socio-cultural character of Bone's people when faced with threats to their honor and ideals.

In the analysis of Socio-political practice, valor functions as a form of ideological capital. To some extent, this discursive presentation is used to redefine the bravery of Bugis warriors as self-determining and sovereign historical actors, thereby countering colonial narratives of inferiority. Through the ethic of bravery or courage, resistance becomes a sacred duty, upheld by moral principles and cultural values.

Unity and Leadership

The third discursive construction of resistance is the dissemination of the unity-and-leadership theme. This theme frequently presents the concept of the great king of Bone through leadership titles such as *raja, pangulu,* and *betta*. In the stanzas 3, 6, and 7, these titles are intertwined with the concept of unity and collective imagery, where the king is imagined as a unifying figure. The repeated use of *Bone mattanrasulae* (Bone rises again) along with *raja pengulu lompona* (the great king) in the three stanzas clearly acts as declaration and invocation. In the grammatical point

of view, this portrays Bone's people as active agent which construct the concept of agency and collective level (Fairclough, 1995).

The theme of unity and leadership as collective agency is again reinforced in *barisik ritunruanna/raja pengulu lompona* (the warriors beneath his command, the great leader) [stanza 6]. This syntactic structure presents a hierarchical concept, in which the warriors are united under their legitimate indigenous authority (the king of Bone). In a linguistic-analytical dimension, this pattern reflects the political ideology of solidarity, in which the great king or leader is reaffirmed as an actor in political restoration.

At the interpretive level of discursive practice, these stanzas might be used to empower, revive, and strengthen loyalty and solidarity, especially during periods of internal division and under external invasion. The themes of unity and loyalty are often conveyed in political speeches to build social cohesion during crises. The leader here has a crucial position in uniting his people to face any internal and external threats.

When dealing with threats, many Bugis oral compositions are strategically used in certain contexts to reconstruct social unity and cohesion, especially in times of crisis. The repeated rhetorical strategy of 'Bone rises' and references to leadership enacting unity are not only apprehended as a thematic but also performative construction. This rhetoric might be understood as a linguistic mechanism to reinforce collective identity and moral solidarity. Language here is transformed as an instrument of social cohesion and cultural resilience. While describing unity, the compositions may shape a proper response to a crisis.

Socio-politically, at the explanatory level of analysis, the discourse of unity emerges as a direct response to social and political fragmentation enforced by colonial interference. The linguistic construction of Bone as one community under the leadership of a strong leader; the stanzas perform a strategic function of sovereignty, reclaiming it from colonial fragmentation. The underpinning of unity under strong leadership is not feudal nostalgia, but could be seen as a deliberate and strategic reclaiming of indigenous power or governance to legitimize opposition and resistance against colonial rule.

Reviving the Memory of Heroism

Another thematic construction emerging in the stanzas is the collective memory and the preservation of heroism. This theme is salient and clearly presented in stanzas 8, 9, and 11. They function to transform collective memory into resistance. In stanza 9, it reads *Tellepek lalo adanna / Betta Ponggawana Bone* (Do not let his name fade, Commander of Bone). It performs a direction or command urging people to injunction against forgetting. According to Nartey (2018, 2020), reviving the heroic leader image can be used as a rhetorical strategy to serve as a framing resistance discourse. In textual analysis, the stanzas use direct address and urge the audience to remember.

The appeal of *Betta Ponggawana Bone* (translated as 'local commander of Bone') serves to historicize and personalize the narrative of resistance. This form of resistance foregrounds the existence of historical figures as indigenous heroes that, at the same time, challenge colonial historiography that erased local agency. Through oral repetition, the naming of heroes strategically sustains and circulates the discourse of sovereignty as a mnemonic instrument within collective memory. Through this text, the poet recentres indigenous historical actors within the collective memory of heroic acts, remembrance of these heroes as a framing strategy to construct an ongoing mode of resistance.

Complemented by stanza 8, the text then connects heroism to sacrifice through the following excerpt *Mattumpiik kuae bonga / Mabbitte kuae tanringeng*

(Crushed red flowers, blood spilling). The metaphorical expression of red flowers (*bonga*) entangles natural beauty with the image of spilled blood, which then forms the aesthetic of martyrdom. The visual metaphor of redness is employed to construct an elegy and a rallying symbol.

Within the discursive practice analysis, the memory of heroism perpetuated in the stanzas would have been circulated through ceremonies to commemorate fallen warriors. The commemoration becomes a site for ensuring the transmission of resistance values among the Bugis generation. In addition, the theme of heroism disseminated in ceremonies often serves as a narrative to reawaken the spirit of resistance. In the lens of socio-political practice, the heroism theme functions to ensure the purpose of cultural continuity. To some extent, keeping the memory alive across generations serves as a tool of ideological resilience, for example, by preserving the names and the sacrifice. This often becomes an effective strategy to prevent the colonial intention to erase the narrative. In this sense, discourse serves both as a reflection of reality and as social reproduction – an effective strategy for sustaining collective identity over time (Fairclough, 1995).

Reawakening Moral and Spiritual Resilience

The final thematic narrative is that related to reawakening moral and spiritual resilience and endurance. This theme is clearly constructed in stanzas 3, 7 and 12 and encapsulates how Bone people should strengthen and continually revitalize their moral and spiritual values. The phrase *Bone mattanrasulae,* recurring like a mantra, forms the act of awakening again. It unites political revival with spiritual rebirth. From a linguistic point of view, the verb *mattanrasulae* (to awaken or rise) carries a theological undertone of resurrection, which could align national revivalism with divine sanction. Through the use of Fairclough's model, we can examine the ideological function of this metaphor, transforming political struggle into moral and spiritual transcendence.

This theme is deepened in stanza 12 through the following phrases *Rebba sisulle-sulleang/Barisik ritunruanna/Pabbarani maegana* (Broken, then reassembled; the warrior regains his bravery). The repetition of the sounds in the words *rebba/sulle-sulleang* reflects the rhythm of repair. Meanwhile, the sequence of semantic meaning, namely breakage followed by restoration, symbolizes resilience after defeat. This rhythmic pattern linguistically embodies the process of healing and makes the establishment of performative of recovery.

In the analysis of discursive practice, the stanzas may have been employed to provide support for the community after loss. Another point is that the stanzas could be understood as a reminder that defeat is temporary and renewal is inevitable. At the socio-political level, this theme reawakens an awareness that colonial domination is not permanent in suppressing the Bugis spirit. The repeated refrain "Bone rises again" could linguistically serve as an act of decolonization through attempts to reclaim voice, history, and faith in the future. The text serves both as the vessel of resistance narration and the instrument to reawaken optimism.

Discussion

The five thematic constructions, namely mobilization, valor, unity, memory, and reawakening, are interconnected to build a comprehensive resistance discourse. They align with and dynamically interplay with Fairclough's three analytical dimensions: textual, discursive, and socio-political practices. These findings indicate that *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* acts as a multilayered system of resistance. Each level of analysis demonstrates various constructions that reflect and confront colonial domination.

Importantly, these findings extend existing research by demonstrating how a classical Bugis literary text functions simultaneously as a historical document,

performative discourse, and moral-political guide. Unlike previous studies that primarily analyze colonial resistance in modern or oral texts, this study reveals the sophisticated integration of poetics, ethics, and political ideology in pre-colonial written literature, highlighting a previously underexplored form of resistance discourse.

The manuscript converges poetics and politics and build linguistic architecture of resistance. Its recurrent themes demonstrate anticolonial ideology voiced in the Bugis language and worldview. It reveals that language can serve to represent reality while shaping and contesting it. In this context, the classical Bugis text manifests as a historical document and living discourse. It becomes the voice to continue evoking the principles of dignity (*siri'*), solidarity (*pesse*), and bravery (*pabbarani*) – all these representing the moral and political essence of Bugis resistance. Further, the twelve stanzas demonstrate how discourse is strategically used to mobilize collective consciousness, build moral legitimacy, and keep cultural sovereignty alive under colonial domination. This discussion explores these findings across interconnected domains, namely the language of resistance, identity, and the performative reconstruction of resistance.

In the language of the resistance domain, *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* manifests resistance through linguistic action rather than abstract ideology. According Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995), discourse is socially constitutive and socially conditioned. In this understanding, discourse constructions do not merely reflect power relations but also actively shape them. The phrases such as *Mai ri launa lona* (Come to the open field) and *Pakkasangngi tanra-tanra perang* (Prepare the signs of war) illustrate what Fairclough (1995) calls the interpellative function of discourse. In this function, language is seen as an instrument that positions the subject in particular roles. The audience here is personified as warriors (*palanroe*) that transform the position of Bone people from passive colonial subjects into struggle agents.

Another point is the repeated rhythm of *Bone mattanrasulae"* (Bone rises again), which serves as counter-discourse to colonial suppression. This exemplifies van Dijk's (1998) argument that, in resistance discourse, the identity of a particular social group is reconstructed through the creation of positive self-presentation. The negative presentation of Bugis people as 'rebellious natives' created by colonial actors is rejected and is redefined as moral agents act as the defenders of *siri'* (honor/dignity) and *pesse* (solidarity). In the manuscript, the inversion becomes a discursive instrument that reconstructs and redistributes symbolic power. Thus, it enables the reassertion of indigenous voices that build epistemic authority over their historical narratives.

In Foucault's (1978) perspective and Wodak's (2001) discursive resistance strategies, power in discourse operates not only to build domination but also to construct resistance. Such resistance discourse is employed to contest existing hierarchies. By transforming poetic language into a performative instrument, the text manifests the production of counter-hegemonic knowledge by marginalized communities. In this sense, *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* serves multiple functions, namely as an encounter against negative framing and the subversion of colonial power.

Another interpretive domain is the intersection of language, culture, and identity. This analysis reveals that the classical text endows resistance within Bugis indigenous epistemology, namely the moral concepts of *siri'* (dignity), *ade'* (customary law), and *pabbarani* (bravery). Through these concepts, moral values coexist with semiotic systems to construct identity and power. Dignity and bravery are two cultural values that define the moral values of the Bugis people. They determine how individuals are connected to the community and authority. The interconnection of resistance to these moral codes, *Toloq Rumpana Bone* provides a political struggle

with a moral compass. Thus, opposition to colonial power is not only seen as resistance but also as an attempt to maintain moral integrity.

Further, in the analytical level of textual practice, these lexical choices (*siri'* and *pabbarani*) serve as ideational metaphors as they encode social meaning. In stanza 5, for instance, the clause *Tenrek sirimu labela* (Do not let your dignity fall), grounds political defiance in moral and ethical duty. In this sense, the text transforms vocabularies containing ethical value into a political lexicon. In Fairclough's (1992) ideological recontextualization, this transformation linguistically converts meanings across social domains. Here, morality is transposed into the political realm that then produces specific political discourse.

In discursive practice, this transmission is mediated through oral performance. Through oral repetition, the construction of moral identity in political resistance is continuously attempted. The formation of collective ethical and moral values transforms the language into aesthetic and political actions. In the socio-political practice, dignity and bravery articulate resistance to colonial hegemony. In many places, colonial discourse often seeks to undermine local ethical systems as feudal and superstitious. *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone*, in contrast, reclaims local ethics and moral as central to legitimacy and unity. In this respect, resistance is not only perpetuated through arms, but through cultural endurance. It is an effort to reassert cultural identity and political survival.

Another important aspect found in the analysis is the embodiment of performative reconstruction. Resistance here is presented as an ongoing process of linguistic and cultural regeneration, not as an individual historical occurrence. The theme of reawakening, framed through the recurrent phrase Bone mattanrasulae and stanza 12's Rebba sisulle-sulleang (Broken then reassembled), manifests a performative reconfiguration; a recurring iteration of identity through language. Each phrase above rearticulates the awakening of Bone, which then becomes a continuous cultural episode, not only a single historical event. The rhythmic embodiment of 'rising again' converts collective trauma into strength that functions as performative recovery.

In the context of socio-political practice, the theme of reawakening accompanies defeat and subjugation, as an attempt to recentre indigenous identity. In this regard, some stanzas that present this theme build a reversal: Bone can be defeated and its people subjugated by external forces, but they will reawaken to preserve their dignity and sovereignty. *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* functions as a narrative of resilience that links political resistance with psychological recovery.

Viewed through the lens of text's ideological power, this poem lies in its dialectical interaction with colonial discourse. Within this interaction, the poetic text subverts negative portrayals framed by colonial power. Through the knowledge production, according to Anderson (2006), colonial authority often frames indigenous communities as barbaric, violent, and chaotic. This negative presentation is sometimes strategically used to justify the need for external control. The poem challenges this unequal representation by constructing a counter-narrative anchored in morality, bravery, and sovereignty. The repeated appeal to leadership, as in the phrase raja pangulu lompona (the great leader), serves to claim that local governance is rational, just, and impartial.

By co-opting the rhetoric of power, the poem opposes colonial epistemology. According to Wodak and Meyer (2009), CDA reveals how practices of language perpetuate or challenge domination. Here, linguistic reconfiguration serves as symbolic reterritorialization through discursive space reclaiming. When colonizers' negative framing is countered by Bugis' verbal repository', *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* becomes a voice of anticolonial discourse through reclaiming the right to define identity and reality.

The last implication of the findings is treating the classical text as the instrument to evoke the collective memory of resistance. In stanza 9, *Tellepek lalo adannanya* (Do not let his name fade), the remembrance of collective and cultural memory is awakened. In the context of resistance against colonial power, collective memory becomes a field of contest. The remembrance of *Betta Ponggawana Bone* revitalizes indigenous historiography by embedding resistance within cultural consciousness. In evoking this consciousness, the indigenous discourse is operated strategically to reshape historical understanding. It examines the role of language in decolonizing the mind and restoring indigenous people's position as agents, not as colonized subjects. Through the reawakening of collective memory to resist, *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* manifests linguistic decolonization by resisting colonial narratives while reclaiming the historical agency.

These insights highlight the study's novelty by showing that resistance discourse in Toloq Rumpaqna Bone is not only historically situated but also performs active ideological, ethical, and social functions, thereby bridging linguistic analysis with postcolonial theory in a unique way.

In addition, these findings contribute to the field both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the study extends critical discourse analysis by showing how classical literary texts can simultaneously serve as historical documentation, performative discourse, and moral-political guidance, thereby revealing previously underexplored intersections among language, morality, and socio-political agency. Practically, the study provides insights for cultural preservation and education, demonstrating how historical texts can foster collective identity, resilience, and critical awareness of past and present power structures.

Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated the important role of classical Bugis texts in resisting colonization and external forces. Through the use of Fairclough's three-dimensional framework, namely textual, discursive, and socio-political practices, the analysis provides how resistance is strategically constructed in multiple stanzas to challenge colonial domination. Through the lens of CDA, this study reveals that attempts to construct and maintain domination are always met with opposition and resistance.

Besides contributing to historical understanding, the discourse of *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* also broadly contributes to a deep understanding of voice and representation in postcolonial studies. This study provides an affirmative answer to the question famously asked by Spivak (1988), 'Can the subaltern speak?'. It demonstrates that the subaltern (marginalized, colonized, or subjugated) not only speaks but also opposes, challenges, and subverts dominant power. Through the transformation of oral poetry into collective voices of resistance, this CDA study rearticulates the importance of positioning anticolonial and colonial discourses as dialectical relationship. In this sense, the silence imposed by colonialism through negative framing is subverted by the voices of subalterns presented through various textual genres.

In modern terms, this voice illustrates Fairclough's (1995) concept of social agency manifested in discourse. This concept is actualized by revitalizing the indigenous ethical framework and transforming it into political language. The poem suggests that decolonization should begin with taking control of language. The reactivation of indigenous ethical and moral systems and their conversion into political lexicons would be strategic for contesting external forces. In multiple stanzas tailored in *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone*, each imperative verb, recurring phrase, and named hero serves as acts of re-empowerment.

This resonates with the contemporary trend in CDA that underlines resistance discourse as a constructive rather than a reactive force (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2017). Within this understanding, *Toloq Rumpaqna Bone* should not be apprehended as merely opposing colonialism, but rather as envisioning an alternative moral and social universe where bravery, honor, and unity serve as defining features of humanity, to voice the anticolonial discourse strongly.

Theoretically, this study contributes to CDA by demonstrating how historical texts can be analyzed to reveal patterns of resistance and social agency, expanding the field beyond contemporary contexts. Practically, the findings underscore the importance of preserving historical manuscripts as sources of cultural knowledge and as examples of marginalized communities actively shaping discourse. Societally, the study highlights that voices of subaltern groups, even in historical periods, challenge dominant power structures, providing lessons for contemporary struggles against oppression and for the recognition of marginalized perspectives.

Building on these findings, future research could explore resistance discourse in other classical or indigenous texts across Indonesia and Southeast Asia to examine similarities and differences in strategies of cultural and political resilience. Comparative studies could examine how oral and written forms of resistance interact with or diverge from one another in historical and contemporary contexts. Additionally, interdisciplinary approaches combining CDA, literary studies, and postcolonial theory could provide deeper insights into the socio-political, ethical, and cultural functions of resistance discourse, enriching both historical scholarship and contemporary CDA research.

Declaration of Generative AI Use

The author(s) declare that generative artificial intelligence (ChatGPT) tools were used solely for language improvement in some parts of the paper, clarity enhancement, to gain critical insights, and achieve better outcomes. The author(s) take full responsibility for the content, interpretation, and conclusions presented in this manuscript.

Bibliographic references

Alamsyah, A. (2018). The political dominance of the Bugis in the coastal region of Indonesia from the 17th century to the 19th century. Journal of Maritime Studies and National Integration, 2(1), 36-47. https://doi.org/10.14710/jmsni.v2i1.12963

Alamsyah, A. (2022). The political dominance of the Bugis in the coastal region of Indonesia from the 17th century to the 19th century. Journal of Maritime Studies and National Integration, 6(1), 51-60. https://doi.org/10.14710/jmsni.v6i1.12963

Amin, K. F. (2023). A cross-cultural reference of the 17th century Bugis community in the 22nd king of Bone's diary (Study of historical literature). Jurnal Multidisiplin Madani (MUDIMA), 3(2), 416-424. https://doi.org/10.55927/mudima.v3i2.2391

Anderson, B. (2006). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism (Rev. ed.). Verso.

Annisa, N., & Irawan, A. M. (2023). Resistance discourse against gender discrimination in Ms. magazine: A Critical Discourse Analysis study. Journal of English Language and Literature, 12(1), 11-22. https://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/ell/article/view/119525

Cahyaratri, H. K., Susanto, S., & Warto, W. (2024). Jogja Ora Didol: A discourse of resistance to domination through music. Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, Education and Culture Series, 1(1), 80-90. https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/jsshecs/article/view/72621

Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and power. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.
Flowerdew, J., & Richardson, J. E. (Eds.). (2017). The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies. Routledge.
Foucault, M. (1978). The history of sexuality: An introduction (Vol. 1). Pantheon Books.
Harahap, S. H., Perangin-angin, D. R., Purba, J. I. S., Sembiring, S. H., & Zalukhu, D. (2023). Language and colonialism: A historical study on the development of Dutch loanwords in Indonesian. Warisan: Journal of History and Cultural Heritage, 2(3), 131-141. https://mahesainstitute.web.id/ojs2/index.php/warisan/article/view/2665
Irawan, A.M., Samad, I., Nur, S., Iskandar, I., Afifuddin, A. & Syurganda, A. (2022). Arguing against Political and Religious Discriminations: Critical Discourse Analysis of Indonesian Ahmadiyya. Muslim World Journal of Human Rights, 19(1), 53-76. https://doi.org/10.1515/mwjhr-2021-0024
Latjuba, A. Y. (2013). Discourse analysis of power in colonial texts in Indonesia. Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 3(9), 41-47. https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/RHSS/article/view/6931
Lazar, M. M. (2005). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse. Palgrave Macmillan.
Li, Y. (2024). Resistant discourse strategies in social media in China's epidemic prevention context. Discourse & Society, 36(2), 226-247. https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265241257950
Magarati, S. L., & Bist, R. B. (2025). Discrimination and resistance: An analysis of discourse and counter discourse in an anthology of Nepali poetry. Creative Academic Research Journal on Interdisciplinary Approaches in the Humanities, 2(1), 15-27. https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/craiaj/article/view/79903
Mansouri, M. E., & Parina, J. C. M. (2023). The Battle Cry of Resistance Against Inequality and Injustice: A Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis. Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies, 10(3), 128-143. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48736797
Macknight, C. C., Paeni, M., & Hadrawi, H. (Eds.). (2020). The Bugis Chronicle of Bone. ANU Press. https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/bugis-chronicle-bone
Medina, J. (2011a). Toward a Foucaultian Epistemology of Resistance: Counter-Memory, Epistemic Friction, and Guerrilla Pluralism. Foucault Studies, (12), 9-35. https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i12.3335
Medina, J. (2011b). The epistemology of resistance: Gender and racial oppression, epistemic injustice, and resistant imaginations. Oxford University Press.
Musliadi, & Yusrini. (2022). Bugis culture deconstruction in novel La Galigo 2. Literature and Literacy, 1(1), 20-30. https://doi.org/10.21831/litlit.v1i1.16
Nartey, M. (2018). 'I shall prosecute a ruthless war on these monsters …': A critical metaphor analysis of discourse of resistance in the rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah. Critical Discourse Studies. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2018.1535987
Nartey, M. (2020). Voice, agency and identity: A positive discourse analysis of 'resistance' in the rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah. Language and Intercultural Communication. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1722686
Pennycook, A. (1994). The cultural politics of English as an international language. Longman.
Prameswari, N. P. L. M., Banda, M. M., & Putra, I. N. D. (2025). The discourse of resistance against patriarchal culture in short stories by three Balinese women writers. Mudra: Jurnal Seni Budaya, 40(1), 45-56. https://jurnal.isi-dps.ac.id/index.php/mudra/article/view/3034
Prasetyo, D., Salleh, M. A., Al-Fayez, A. H., & van Leeuwen, T. (2023). Civilising mission or colonial experiment? Unmasking the Dutch Ethical Policy in Indonesia.

Senarai: Jurnal Sejarah dan Pendidikan Sejarah, 3(1), 16-28. https://tunasharapanummat.or.id/index.php/senarai/article/view/33
Putra, W. E., Kistanto, N. H., & Suryadi, M. (2023). Colonial discourse and resistance in the novel Perawan Desa by W. R. Supratman. Suar Betang: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial, 8(1), 31-42. https://suarbetang.kemdikbud.go.id/jurnal/index.php/BETANG/article/view/453
Putnam, L. L., Grant, D., Michelson, G., & Cutcher, L. (2005). Discourse and Resistance: Targets, Practices, and Consequences. Management Communication Quarterly, 19(1), 5-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318905276557
Rahmayati, R. (2020). Roehana Koeddoes's resistance to Dutch colonialism in Belenggu Emas by Iksaka Banu. Humaniora, 32(1), 53-62. https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.62578
Ravichand, M. (2025). Language, power, and resistance: A critical study of discourse in postcolonial contexts. Janaka Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1(1), 1-12. https://janakajournal.in/index.php/1/article/view/5
Rogers, R. (Ed.). (2004). An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410609786
Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.
Stankiewicz, Ł. (2020). Discourse, resistance and organization. Critical discourse analysis of the 'revolt of the humanities' in Poland. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 43(3), 483-495. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2020.1830032
Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.
Susanto, D. (2022). Indonesian Islamic poets' ambivalence under the Dutch colonialism in the 1930s. Akademika: Jurnal Pemikiran Islam, 27(2), 255-270. https://e-journal.metrouniv.ac.id/akademika/article/view/4294
Tilbury, F. (2000). Challenging racist discourses: A positive contribution to discourse analysis. Proceeding at the Conferences in Sociological Sites/Sights. Adelaide, Australia: TASA 2000 Conference.
Van Laer, K., & Janssens, M. (2010). Diverse resistance to diversity discourses: Minority professionals' enggagement with diversity discourses in the Flemish workplace. Stream 4 (Diversity is not enough: Interrogating difference and inequality in organisations) of the 2nd 'Equal is not enough'. Antwerp Belgium. Retrieved from https://lirias.kuleuven.be/handle/123456789/302777.
van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. Discourse & Society, 4(2), 249-283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006 (Original work published 1993)
van Dijk, T. A. (1998a). Editorial: Discourse and Ideology. Discourse & Society, 9(3), 307-308. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003001
van Dijk, T. A. (1998b). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. Sage Publications.
Wahyuddin. (2021). Between the past and the possible: Bugis identity in motion. Humaniora, 33(1), 16-25. https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.98353
Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about: A summary of its history, important concepts, and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), Methods of critical discourse analysis (pp. 1-13). Sage Publications.
Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). Methods of critical discourse analysis (2nd ed.). Sage.
Wu, T., & Moshirzadeh, H. (2025). Resistance Discourse in Iran's Foreign Policy: A Genealogy. Middle East Critique, 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2025.2536939
Zulfikarni, S. A. L., Anggraini, D., Henanggil, M. D. F., & Ulya, R. H. (2025). Minangkabau women's resistance: A critical discourse analysis of Sara Mills.

Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Linguistics (ICLAVE 2023), 15-21. https://eudl.eu/doi/10.4108/eai.5-12-2023.2354885

Words: 9064
Characters: 66 376 (37 standard pages)

Dr. Syamsudduha, M.Hum. (Corresponding Author)
Department of Indonesian Language and Literature
Faculty of Languages and Literature
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Daeng Tata Raya Street, Makassar, South Sulawesi
Indonesia
syamsudduha@unm.ac.id
ORCID: 0009-0002-0800-2919

Andi Muhammad Irawan, S.S., M.Hum., Ph.D.
Department of English
Faculty of Languages and Literature
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Daeng Tata Raya Street, Makassar, South Sulawesi
Indonesia
andimuhammadirawan@unm.ac.id
ORCID: 0000-0003-3458-9573

Prof. Dr. Sultan, M.Pd.
Department of Indonesian Language and Literature
Faculty of Languages and Literature
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Daeng Tata Raya Street, Makassar, South Sulawesi
Indonesia
sultan@unm.ac.id
ORCID: 0000-0003-1819-1549