

# **THE PARADIGM OF MALAYNESS IN LITERATURE**

IDA BAIZURA BAHAR

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD in the Languages  
and Cultures of South East Asia

2010

Department of South East Asia  
School of Oriental and African Studies  
University of London

ProQuest Number: 11010464

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 11010464

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

SOAS LIBRARY

**Declaration for PhD thesis**

I have read and understood regulation 17.9 of the Regulations for students of the School of Oriental and African Studies concerning plagiarism. I undertake that all the material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person. I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I present for examination.

Signed: Ida Baizura Bahar

Date: 7 December 2010

---

## ABSTRACT

This study is a study on the paradigm of Malayness in literature, taking as its point of departure the understanding of Malayness in Malaysia. A prominent Malaysian social anthropologist, Shamsul Amri Baharuddin (Shamsul A. B.), has outlined a contemporary understanding of Malayness in Malaysia based on an authority-defined social reality: the three pillars of Malayness comprising *bahasa*/language (Malay), *agama*/religion (Islam) and *raja*/monarchy (the Malay rulers). I hypothesised in this study, however, that a broader understanding of Malayness is reflected in the works of literature in the form of an everyday-defined social reality consisting also of *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity apart from the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers.

The focus of this study centres on an exploration of the paradigm of Malayness in a body of English and Malay literary works on the Malay World based on six elements of the paradigm of Malayness I hypothesised, namely the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity. The hypothesised paradigm of Malayness is employed as a conceptual framework where analyses of selected works in both English and Malay literature are conducted based on a close textual analysis approach. The results from the analyses are then compared and contrasted.

This study has determined that Shamsul's three pillars of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality cannot be corroborated in the works of literature because I found that the paradigm of Malayness in literature is in fact an everyday-defined social reality. It is understood to refer to not only the three pillars but to a broader understanding comprising *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity as I hypothesised. The paradigm of Malayness is found to be an everyday-defined social reality based on a local and broad understanding and therefore contests the current understanding of Malayness as an invented tradition conceptualised ideologically during colonial times.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah Azzawajalla, without the blessing and guidance from the Almighty, this thesis would never have materialised. My utmost gratitude to Allah the Most Divine and the Most Gracious for this infinitesimal knowledge bestowed upon me.

Firstly, I would like to express my appreciation to Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), Serdang, Selangor, for the financial sponsorship which enabled me to pursue my research at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London. In particular, I would like to express my extreme gratitude for the professional support given by the former Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) of UPM, Professor Dato' Dr. Kamel Ariffin Mohd. Atan, the former Dean, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, UPM, the late Professor Dr. Mohd Shaik Noor Alam S. M. Hussain, and the Vice-Chancellor of UPM, Professor Tan Sri Datuk Dr. Nik Mustapha Raja Abdullah.

Without the encouragement, support, understanding and patience from my esteemed Supervisor, Emeritus Professor Dr. E. Ulrich Kratz, I would have long ago discarded my initial research and opted for a less 'ambitious' one. My utmost appreciation to Professor Kratz for allowing me to broaden my horizons and for believing in me. *Hancur badan dikandung tanah, budi yang baik dikenang juga.*

I would also like to thank Professor Dato' Dr. Shamsul Amri Baharuddin (Shamsul A. B.) for his unceasing enthusiasm and interest in my work. Leiden and Sorbonne in the Summer of 2004 were eye-openers. My recognition also goes to Dr. Nureeyan Saleh, Dr. Annabel Teh Gallop and Zaharah Othman for the invaluable friendship made in London.

Without the professional collaboration and personal alliance from Associate Professor Dr. Washima Che Dan, Associate Professor Dr. Noritah Omar and Dr. Zalina Mohd. Kasim, I would not have had the courage to endure such a laborious endeavour. My thoughts are also with my two friends, Hizairi Othman and Faisal Tehrani - the latter

---

for convincing me that I would be in good hands with 'Pak Kratz'; the former for leading me towards a love for my own literature.

Thank you also to my friends from my days at Warwick and Nottingham for the meaningful friendship and words of encouragement over the years: Azlina Ahmad, Shereen Nasir, Nina Haslinda Umar, Azlina Hussain, Fazlin Abu Hassan Shaari, Nuraishah Abdul Muthalib, Y. M. Raja Fernaliz Raja Harris, Dr. Nurul Salmi Abdul Latip, Hasdina Lynn Hashim, Nur Sharmila Shaheen, Zalita Zaidan, Shasha Kartini Mohd. Ridzam, Norini Abas and Dr. Aniza Abu Bakar. Towards the end of my research journey, I was very blessed to have had the ears and shoulders of these special people to cry on: Marliza Kamel Ariffin and Ainuddin Wahid Abdul Wahab, Nurul Fazmidar Mohd. Noor, Nor Azlin Aminuddin and Hafizah Abdul Kadir.

I am forever grateful for the unconditional love and emotional support from my father and my mother, Encik Bahar Mohd. Atan and Puan Rashidah Ismail, as well as my six siblings, Badroel Hisham, Badroel Rizwan, Isma Rizal, Nor Saadah, Mohd. Hafiz and Intan Shafinaz. Mention should also be made of my extended family, Masytah Saad, Munirah Khairuddin, Reeza Fadzlee Abdul Hamid, Balqis Mardhiyya Badroel Hisham, Umar Zafran Badroel Rizwan, Muhammad Qayyum Badroel Hisham, Uzair Zafran Badroel Rizwan and Rayyan Zafran Badroel Rizwan for their wonderful presence. I am also obliged to my mother, youngest sister, in-laws, Haji Razali Ismail and Hajjah Rahimah Dato' Wan Hassan, as well as relatives in Surrey, London and Leeds for providing me companionship, time and space during the writing-up of this thesis in Barking, Cranfield and Bedford.

Such exceptional gratitude must surely go to my dearest husband, Mohammed Feizal Razali, for his love, support and sacrifice. For the times spent together and for those spent apart. Such indescribable joy can only be ascribed to our beautiful daughter, Lily Maryam, for bringing sunshine and laughter in the middle of my occasional despondent moments during research. It is to them as well as my parents that I dedicate this long-awaited thesis.

*Untuk Abah dan Mak,*

*Feizal dan Lily.*

*Untuk Kesabaran dan Pengorbanan.*

*PAHLAWAN*

*jika hilangmu tanpa pusara  
jika pusaramu tanpa nama  
jika namamu tanpa bunga  
penjajah mengatakan engkau derhaka  
maka engkau adalah pahlawan yang sebenarnya*

“Pahlawan Kemerdekaan”

Sasterawawan Negara Dato’ Usman Awang (1929-2001)

*Untuk zaman riang kanak-kanak  
Atuk dan Nenek di Sungai Pelek, Sepang  
Cumé dan Tok di Padang Matsirat, Pulau Langkawi*

*Say not, ‘I have found the truth,’ but rather, ‘I have found a  
truth.’*

*Say not, ‘I have found the path of the soul.’ Say rather, ‘I have  
met the soul walking upon my path.’*

*For the soul walks upon all paths.*

*The soul walks not upon a line, neither does it grow like a  
reed.*

*The soul unfolds itself, like a lotus of countless petals.*

“Of Self-Knowledge”

*The Prophet*

Kahlil Gibran (1883-1930)

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>13</b>
 <b>PART I</b>	
 <b>CHAPTER ONE</b>	
<b>THE PARADIGM OF MALAYNESS AND ITS CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDING</b>	<b>28</b>
• Introduction	<b>28</b>
• Malayness from the perspectives of the Malaysian social anthropologist, Shamsul Amri Baharuddin (Shamsul A. B.)	<b>28</b>
• An overview of discourse on the paradigm of Malayness in literature	<b>35</b>
• Conclusion	<b>45</b>
 <b>PART II</b>	
 <b>CHAPTER TWO</b>	
<b>SELECTED WORKS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE MALAY WORLD</b>	<b>48</b>
• Introduction	<b>48</b>
• The Malay World (1895-1959) in the works of Conrad, Maugham and Burgess	<b>48</b>
• Joseph Conrad and his Malay trilogy Joseph Conrad (1857-1924)	<b>54</b>

- 
- Studies on Conrad's Malay trilogy 58
  - Somerset Maugham and his Malayan short stories  
Somerset Maugham (1974-1965) 67
  - Studies on Maugham's Malayan short stories 69
  - Anthony Burgess and his Malayan trilogy  
Anthony Burgess (1917-1993) 72
  - Malaya and the Malays in the eyes of Burgess 74
  - Studies on Burgess' Malayan trilogy 75
  - Conclusion 80

### **CHAPTER THREE**

#### **MALAYNESS IN SELECTED WORKS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE MALAY WORLD**

82

- Introduction 82
- Malayness and the Malay language 82
- Malayness and Islam 92
- Malayness and the Malay rulers 111
- Malayness and *adat*/culture 120
- Malayness and ethnicity 123
- Malayness and identity 132
- Conclusion 137

### **PART III**

#### **CHAPTER FOUR**

#### **SELECTED WORKS IN**

#### **TRADITIONAL AND MODERN MALAY LITERATURE**

145

- Introduction 145
- On the selection of works 145

• Studies on <i>Hikayat Hang Tuah</i>	149
• Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi and <i>Hikayat Abdullah</i> Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi (1796-1854)	155
• Studies on <i>Hikayat Abdullah</i>	155
• Ishak Haji Muhammad, <i>Putera Gunung Tahan</i> and <i>Anak Mat Lela Gila</i> Ishak Haji Muhammad (1909-1991)	161
• Studies on <i>Putera Gunung Tahan</i> and <i>Anak Mat Lela Gila</i>	163
• Shahnnon Ahmad and <i>Ranjau sepanjang jalan</i> Shahnnon Ahmad (b.1933)	168
• Studies on <i>Ranjau sepanjang jalan</i>	170
• Muhammad Haji Salleh and <i>Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu</i> Muhammad Haji Salleh (b.1942)	174
• Studies on <i>Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu</i>	176
• Usman Awang and “Melayu” Usman Awang (1929-2001)	181
• Studies on “Melayu”	182
• Conclusion	183

## CHAPTER FIVE

### MALAYNESS IN SELECTED WORKS IN MALAY LITERATURE 187

• Introduction	187
• Malayness and the Malay language	188
• Malayness and Islam	192
• Malayness and the Malay rulers	208
• Malayness and <i>adat</i> /culture	222
• Malayness and ethnicity	232
• Malayness and identity	237

• Conclusion	250
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>255</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>275</b>
<b>APPENDIXES</b>	<b>302</b>
• <b>APPENDIX 1:</b> My understandings of the terms race and <i>bangsa</i> as sourced from various dictionaries	<b>302</b>
• <b>APPENDIX 2:</b> A note on two postcolonial theories: Orientalism by Edward Said and Exoticism	<b>305</b>
• <b>APPENDIX 3:</b> Brief background of Shamsul Amri Baharuddin (Shamsul A. B.) (b.1951)	<b>307</b>
• <b>APPENDIX 4:</b> Review of papers presented at the International Symposium on “Thinking Malayness” by Hisao (2004) “Old and new aspects of Malayness in the contemporary ‘ <i>Dunia Melayu</i> ’ movement” and by Tirtosudarmo (2005) “The <i>Orang Melayu</i> and <i>Orang Jawa</i> in the ‘Lands below the winds’	<b>310</b>
• <b>APPENDIX 5:</b> Episode from <i>Hikayat Hang Tuah</i> involving a dancing incident in Inderapura	<b>316</b>
<b>APPENDIXES 6 TO 14</b>	
Synopses of selected works in English literature on the Malay World	<b>317-324</b>
• <b>APPENDIX 6:</b> <i>Almayer’s folly</i> (1895)	<b>317</b>
• <b>APPENDIX 7:</b> <i>An outcast of the islands</i> (1896)	<b>318</b>

- 
- **APPENDIX 8:** *The rescue* (1920) 320
  - **APPENDIX 9:** “The force of circumstance” (1926) 321
  - **APPENDIX 10:** “The outstation” (1926) 321
  - **APPENDIX 11:** “The yellow streak” (1926) 321
  - **APPENDIX 12:** *Time for a tiger* (1956) 322
  - **APPENDIX 13:** *The enemy in the blanket* (1958) 323
  - **APPENDIX 14:** *Beds in the east* (1959) 324
  - **APPENDIX 15:** Final section of Maugham’s  
“The yellow streak” 325
  - **APPENDIX 16:** “Melayu Johor” by  
Usman Awang (1999b: 226-228) 327

#### **APPENDIXES 17 TO 19**

Synopses of selected modern Malay literary works 329-331

- **APPENDIX 17:** *Putera Gunung Tahan* (1937) 329
- **APPENDIX 18:** *Anak Mat Lela Gila* (1941) 330
- **APPENDIX 19:** *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* (1966) 331
- **APPENDIX 20:** “Melayu” by Usman Awang  
(1999b: 229-231) and my own English translation  
of the poem 332

- 
- **APPENDIX 21:** Episodes from *Sulalatus Salatin* (*Sejarah Melayu*) based on the 1979 edition by A. Samad Ahmad, which correspond to the episodes composed by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1981b) in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, and my own English translations of the episodes **336**
  
  - **APPENDIX 22:** My own English translations of extracts from the selected works in Chapter Five **348**
  
  - **APPENDIX 23:** Brief background of Mohd. Taib Osman (b.1934) and Syed Muhammad Naguib Al-Attas (b.1931) **353**
  
  - **APPENDIX 24:** Further discussion on *An introduction to the development of modern Malay language and literature* by Mohd. Taib Osman (1986) **355**
  
  - **APPENDIX 25:** Further discussion on *Preliminary statement on a general theory of the Islamisation of the Malay-Indonesian Archipelago* by Syed Muhammad Naguib Al-Attas (1969) **356**
  
  - **APPENDIX 26:** The phrase *bangsa* as it appears in *Sejarah Melayu* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah* **360**

---

## THE PARADIGM OF MALAYNESS IN LITERATURE

### INTRODUCTION

That there exists a view which suggests the creation of a 'Malay identity crisis' as a result of the undermining and erosion of 'elements of Malayness', namely the Malay language and *adat/culture* (Nagata cited in Shamsul A. B., 1983: 399), in contemporary Malay society in Malaysia has led me to presuppose that there is actually a juxtaposition of two different understandings of what I term as the paradigm of Malayness. Yet the scholarly demands made by this presupposed juxtaposition make it more difficult and challenging for me to grasp this combination without at least searching for evidence to support this hypothesis. The assumption here is that this juxtaposition deviates from the norm of acknowledged understandings of Malayness, such as in the case of its current understanding in the form of the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers, through the ambiguity and unreliability of a so-called paradigm of Malayness. The main question then is how deviations of such a case create difficulties in acknowledging or even accepting a juxtaposed and broader understanding of Malayness for contemporary Malay society in Malaysia.

It is presumed that contestations in the acknowledged understanding of Malayness challenge persuasive viewpoints in discourse on this subject and cause scholars in Malay cultural studies and English studies to spend more time explaining or resolving the contesting elements, such as *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity, rather than exploring the understandings of the juxtaposed and broader paradigm. In my opinion, this broader juxtaposition can be found reflected in works of literature, more so in English and Malay literary works which centre on the Malay World. It is really this presumption which has led me to engage in a study on an exploration of the paradigm of Malayness in literature.

---

By paradigm I mean a typical example or pattern of an understanding or a set of all the different forms or elements of an understanding (Hornby, 2008: 1056), in this case of the term Malayness. Another definition of the word paradigm is borrowed from its counterpart in the Malay language, *paradigma*, which means a comprehensive list or body or a clear example or model of theoretical knowledge (*Kamus dewan*, 2007: 1139), in this study pertaining to the discourse on Malayness. *Paradigma* is also defined as contextual thought at a time which is influenced by the experience, knowledge, skills, and awareness of existing knowledge (*Kamus bahasa Melayu nusantara*, 2003: 1985), here of the understanding of the term Malayness. Therefore, based on all the definitions of the term both in English and Malay, paradigm in this study is understood to refer to a pattern of Malayness as well as a set of all the different elements of the term Malayness. Paradigm in this study is also understood to refer to a comprehensive body and model of Malayness as a theoretical knowledge, which is also influenced by the experience, skills and awareness of existing knowledge on Malayness.

Why engage in an exploration of the paradigm of the Malayness solely in the field of literature? This is because literary works, in the words of Eagleton (1996: 2), are ‘vehicles for ideas’, ‘a reflection of social reality’ and ‘the incarnation of some transcendental truth’. Works of literature also contain a ‘structure of values which informs and underlies our factual statements’ described also as ‘the ways in which what we say and believe connects with the power structure and power-relations of the society we live in’ (Eagleton, 1996: 13). Literary works also comprise ‘modes of feeling, valuing, perceiving and believing which have some kind of relation to the maintenance and reproduction of social power’, in this case, of the maintenance and reproduction of the paradigm of Malayness. As I see it, works of literature are documentations of social realities and contain reflections of the paradigm of Malayness.

A pervasive view in current discourse on this subject has pointed to the existence of what has been termed as colonial knowledge and the construction of a modern identity, which is Malayness. It has been posited that, following the discourse on Malay identity in Malaysia, one could argue that ‘the colonial method of accumulating facts and insights and the resultant corpus of knowledge’ in literature on

the Malay World 'have been critical in providing not only substance but also sustenance to the endeavour of writing about Malayness' (A. B. Shamsul, 2000a: 48). It has also been postulated that 'the sheer volume of 'facts' that have been accumulated and amassed by the British' on, for instance, traditional Malay literature, has established 'the hegemony of colonial knowledge in Malaysia's intellectual realm, where the discussion about Malay identity takes place' (A. B. Shamsul, 2000a: 48).

A point of departure in which to trace an early understanding of Malayness in Malaysia is a view that the Malays should look deeper into themselves, at what their basic Malayness is so that they do not lose it. What is important is what has been generally accepted as giving the ambience of Malayness and the total sum of the traditions that the Malays have. However, we need to ask this pertinent question: what indeed constitutes basic Malayness in addition to what indeed has been generally accepted as representing the ambience of Malayness? One view is that Malayness can be delineated by one who is a Muslim and uses the Malay language but is not necessary ethnically Malay (Syed Husin Ali, 1981: 2). There is also a prevailing belief in current debates on Malayness that, prior to the British rule, the term *Melayu* (and hence, the delineation of one's Malayness) only applied to those who designated themselves to the polity of the Malay rulers, the rulers' subjects and the societies residing around the palace (Shamsul A. B., 1996c: 18). There is also a growing scenario among a fraction of contemporary Malay society in Malaysia who has rejected many traditions and rituals in the Malay *adat*/culture on the basis that these practices are 'un-Islamic' and does not represent the ideal Malay identity. Indeed, the growing importance of this subject has been described by Andaya and Andaya (2001: 340) as, 'With the passing of time understandings of Malayness broadened and became more regionally inclusive, but Islam remained a vital component.'

A notable study by Nagata discusses a major aspect related to Islam with a view on Malayness. Nagata (1981: 98-99) suggests that the economic and political strength of Islam during the European presence in the Malay islands beginning the 16<sup>th</sup> century pushed Islam to be 'equated with membership in local Malay communities'. This is therefore the reason why the phrase 'to enter Islam' (*masuk Islam*) carried the same meaning as 'to become a Malay' (*masuk Melayu*). To her, this is because Islam, as a religion, has become 'an intrinsic element' in defining

Malayness. This also explains the status of converts into Islam and their offspring; they are considered as ‘full’ Malays because being Muslim is no longer just an attribute to Malayness, it has become integral. As Nagata sees it, ‘no non-Muslim could claim Malay status’ if they were not followers of the Muslim faith. As a result, Nagata summarises, ‘the association of birth and religion’ becomes strengthened in the process of defining Malayness. Nagata (1981: 108) however raises concerns regarding the final requirement of practising the *adat* to define Malayness as, to her, this practice has never been seriously assessed for doubt remains even to this day of what *adat* really is.<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, the Malaysian scholar, Shamsul Amri Baharuddin, a foremost thinker on this subject, has conceptualised a more definitive contemporary understanding of Malayness. It is this understanding that will provide a starting point for much of the discussion in this thesis, and which will be discussed briefly below.<sup>2</sup>

In view of the scope of this study, which is to explore the paradigm of Malayness in literature, it is imperative for us to have an insight into its contemporary understanding from the perspective of a prominent Malaysian social anthropologist who has written extensively on this subject in Malaysia. Shamsul A. B., as well as A. B. Shamsul, is the penname for Professor Dato’ Dr. Shamsul Amri Baharuddin (b.1951), who has conducted extensive in-depth studies on social, economic, political, cultural as well as educational and literary aspects pertaining to the Malays. His doctoral thesis was published as *From British to Bumiputera rule: local politics and rural development in Peninsular Malaysia* by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies,

<sup>1</sup> On the Malay *adat*, see Nagata (1973: 331-350), Mohd. Taib Osman (1986, 1988, 1989, 2004: 141-144); Wazir Jahan Karim (1992); Khoo Kay Kim (2001a: 157-184, 2001b: 185-210).

<sup>2</sup> Apart from Shamsul’s comprehensive studies on Malayness, the growing importance of Malayness as a subject matter is evidenced through an international symposium aptly named “Thinking Malayness” which was organised by the Centre for Documentation and Area-Transcultural Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Japan, and was co-sponsored by the Visual Material Archives Group and Research Institute for Languages and Culture of Asia and Africa of the same university in Japan (19-21 June 2004). In “Thinking Malayness”, discussions on Malayness focus on attempts to define the Malay World, Malayness as a continuation and transformation of Malay identity, the historical perspective on Malayness, Malayness as a subject pertaining to ethnic minorities and the nation-state, Malayness at the crossroads, Malayness as a form of ethnic consciousness and indigenism in contested space, Malayness in cultural production and practices, and reflections on the relation between Islam and Malayness. The growing importance of Malayness as a subject matter is also evidenced through the publication of a collection of essays in *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries* by the Singapore University Press in 2004. It is edited by Timothy P. Barnard and contains eleven essays on various aspects of Malayness as well as a *syair* on the fates of the Malays. Another recent move which highlights the increasing attention given to this subject is an international workshop organised by the Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore (20-21 January 2009) on “Race and nation, family and economy: Malayness and its debates”.

---

Singapore in 1986. It was a two-year case study (1971-1981) of village politics and the implementation of the National Economic Policy (NEP)<sup>3</sup> in a predominantly Malay *kampung* (village) called 'Kampung Chempaka'.

A brief review of Shamsul's studies is important as it acts as the elemental backdrop to the conceptual framework which I have hypothesised as a tool to explore the paradigm of Malayness in literature in my study. In a nutshell, Shamsul's perspective on Malayness begins with his study on the ongoing debate on identity in Malaysia: "Debating about identity in Malaysia: a discourse analysis" (Shamsul A. B., 1996a: 476-499). In this study, Shamsul (1996a: 477) outlines his approach to his debate on identity in Malaysia by way of two types of 'social realities'. The first is termed 'authority-defined' social reality, described as 'one which is authoritatively defined by people who are part of the dominant power structure'. The second term, 'everyday-defined' social reality, is explained as 'one which is experienced by the people in the course of their everyday life'. According to Shamsul (1996a: 480), the social category of Malay as understood in the contemporary sense in Malaysia is the result of an authority-defined context.

Therefore, Shamsul suggests that Malay and Malayness as a social category has never been 'problematized' or seen as 'something constructed, invented or artificial'. This is despite the fact that what 'Malayness means' and what 'Malayness is' have always been altered, redefined and reconstituted' with its 'boundaries expanded according to specific social-historical circumstances'. These circumstances have been occurring especially after what Shamsul views as the introduction of 'colonial racism' and 'racial category' into the sphere of authority-defined and everyday-defined social realities in British Malaya (Shamsul A. B., 1996a: 480).

---

<sup>3</sup> The NEP was a socio-economic restructuring affirmative action programme for the Malays, which was mooted by Malaysia's second Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak (1922-1976), soon after the racial conflict of 13 May 1969. The programme began in 1971 and ended in 1990. Its objective was to eradicate poverty and to restructure the economy of the Malays in order to eliminate the identification of a particular ethnicity with economic function. It also targeted a 30% share of the economy for the *bumiputera*. On the NEP, see Jomo Kwame Sundaram (1989, 1990); Mahathir bin Mohamad (1999). On the origins and objectives of the NEP, see Shamsul A. B. (2004b: 190-194). The most notable work on the 1969 racial conflict is *The Malay Dilemma* (Mahathir bin Mohamad, 1970). An immediate response to the racial conflict by the Malaysian government led by the Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak, is the publication of *Revolusi Mental* (Senu Abdul Rahman, 1971).

As Malayness is viewed by Shamsul at this point in his study as a construction of an authority-defined social reality context during the era of British Malaya, I now move on to Shamsul's next study, "Identity construction, nation formation and Islamic revivalism in Malaysia" (Shamsul A. B., 1997a: 207-227). Opening with a discussion on ethnicity, identity and religion, which he refers to as Malay, Malayness and Islam, Shamsul (1997a: 209-211) states that 'the social categories of "race" and "nation" only came into the Malaysian worldview through European colonisation'. Shamsul (1997a: 209) argues that the ideology of Malayness and the aim for a 'Malay nation' only came into being through the effects of British rule as posited in his earlier study. Citing views from previous studies on this subject (Roff, 1967; Ariffin Omar, 1993), Shamsul posits the view that the concept of 'Malayness' eventually became accepted as an 'official' aspect of colonial and local politics although the British themselves did not establish 'a unified Malay nation'.

What the British did instead, according to Shamsul, is to endorse 'a union of Malay principalities' which he translates as *kerajaan*. Following this then are the three pillars of Malayness, defined in terms of *agama* ('Muslim religion'), *bahasa* ('the Malay language'), and *raja* ('the aristocrat government of the sultans'). These pillars were further consolidated when they were eventually written into the Malaysian Constitution of 1957 as a foundation for defining one who is a Malay.<sup>4</sup> The problem this creates, as Shamsul suggests, is that the constitution deems it compulsory for all Malays to be Muslims. For non-Malays converting into Islam, for example through marriage to a Muslim, their offspring are eventually categorised as Malay. To Shamsul, this is in fact a phenomenon known as *masuk Melayu* ('to become a Malay'). In his conclusion, Shamsul (1997a: 222) suggests that, due to the *dakwah* (proselytism) movement, Islam as one of the pillars of Malayness is propelled forward to the Malaysian politics and society which resulted in a redefinition of Malay identity.

---

<sup>4</sup> In the Federation of Malaya Constitution (1957) Article 160 (2), enshrined on Independence Day, 31 August 1957, Malay is defined as follows: "Malay" means a person who professes the Muslim religion, habitually speaks the Malay language, conforms to Malay custom and - a) was before Merdeka Day born in the Federation or born of parents one of whom was born in the Federation, or is on that day domiciled in the Federation; or b) is the issue of such a person (Sheridan, 1961: 145).

---

Based on Shamsul's views so far, I suggest then that when the paradigm of Malayness is discussed, it is imperative that we identify the yardstick from which and where they measure. It is highly probable that Malayness has been developed and influenced by colonial perceptions. I strongly believe however that the paradigm of Malayness has been simultaneously a local and broad concept before and during the presence of the colonial in the Malay World onto which colonial perceptions of a shifted and narrowed understanding, as exemplified by Shamsul's conceptualisation of the three pillars, was enforced upon the local and broad understanding of the paradigm. In my opinion, this shifting process transpired during the colonial presence and remained so up until the period prior to the independence of Malaysia. However, I also believe that there is a possibility that the paradigm may have now shifted from its narrowed understanding to its original local and broad concept as it had always been or that it has always remain local and broad, and that this process can be explored in English and Malay literary works on the Malay World.

As such, this study shall make as its point of departure the three pillars of Malayness conceptualised by Shamsul, namely language (Malay), religion (Islam) and monarchy (the Malay rulers). However, in the works of literature, I argue against the conventional view of Malayness in his conceptualisation: that is has been shaped by the Malaysian constitutional definition of Malay and is thus an authority-defined social reality comprising the three pillars. I propose instead that the paradigm of Malayness in literature is in fact an everyday-defined social reality which has as its roots a local and broad understanding consisting of the following elements:

1. The Malay language:

From a purely linguistic point of view, Malayness is understood to refer to whoever speaks Malay as their first language. These speakers of Malay include the Malayo-Polynesian although they are not *suku bangsa Melayu* (Malay ethnic group).

2. Islam:

From a religious point of view, Malayness is understood to refer to all people who speak Malay, even if it is not their first language, and are Muslims.

### 3. The Malay rulers:

Malayness in this aspect is understood to refer to the supreme institution of monarchy consisting of the Malay rulers, also known as the sultans. The rulers are also Islamic religious heads of their respective states. Here, Malayness is also understood to refer to those who uphold the principle of loyalty to the Malay rulers in the form of a diabolical relationship between the Malay rulers and the subjects, known as *daulat* and *derhaka*.

### 4. *Adat*/culture:

Malayness is understood to refer to anyone who lives a way of life based on a set of customs, system of beliefs as well as a substratum of older beliefs and a cultural heritage which is exclusive to, and have continued to exist among, the Malays. Because of the broad understanding I have proffered, I have decided to combine two terms, *adat* and culture, to represent this category of Malayness.

### 5. Ethnicity:

Malayness here is understood to refer to *suku bangsa* (ethnic group) whose *Bahasa Melayu* is its *bahasa ibunda* (first language) who in the end becomes a Muslim. Malayness in this aspect is also understood to refer to the understandings of the terms race as well as *bangsa* which represent the Malays as a group of people (Appendix 1 contains different definitions of race and *bangsa* sourced from various dictionaries which account for my understanding of ethnicity).

### 6. Identity:

By identity, Malayness is understood to refer to those who display a sameness in terms of the characteristics, which makes the entity of *paradigma Kemelayuan* (hence, the paradigm of Malayness) definable and recognisable, covering both tangible and intangible ideas, knowledge, experiences, expertise, skills and awareness of anything exclusive to the heritage of the Malays and the Malay World, including oral traditions in the form of proverbs and sayings, music and songs, traditional sports and games as well as the performing arts.

The elements I have presented above cover a range of uses and, perhaps, misuses, of the term but they actually demonstrate how the paradigm has been used

---

and is still being used in Malaysia. Different understandings of Malayness have been illustrated to be used in different kinds of way but the narrowest understanding of Malayness, however, remains with the ethnic point of view, which defines Malayness as referring to *suku bangsa Melayu*.

Following the above argument, I hypothesise in this study that the current understanding of Malayness in literature is rooted in a local and broad understanding as it subsists before and during the European presence in the Malay World. Its understanding then shifted to become narrower during the period of European presence and remained in its narrowed understanding prior and up to Malaysian independence. However, I argue for a probability that the contemporary understanding of the paradigm of Malayness in literature has always remain broad and local despite the narrowed understanding conceptualised during British Malaya. This hypothesis, I contend, can be discerned through an exploration of literary works in English and Malay literatures on the Malay World.

With regard to the thesis structure, this thesis consists of three parts. Chapter One forms Part I of this thesis which presents a discussion on the paradigm of Malayness and its contemporary understanding confined to Malaysia. It is limited only to the Malaysian context because I am a Malaysian who aims to explore the paradigm of Malayness in literary works which are well-known to the Malaysian public. However, I do acknowledge that the discourse on Malayness is an important subject to Malaysia's neighbouring country, Indonesia, as seen in the various studies conducted to date on Malayness specifically on Indonesia and its literary works (Andaya, 2001, 29-68; 2003: 117-137; Barnard, 2004c: 107-120; Derks, 2004: 181-202; Sutherland, 2004: 76-106; van der Putten, 2004: 121-134).

Chapter One begins with a review on studies by Shamsul A. B., where the following studies have been singled out for review:

1. "The construction and transformation of a social identity: Malayness and Bumiputraness re-examined" (Shamsul A. B., 1996c: 15-34),
2. "From *Orang Kaya Baru* to *Melayu Baru*" (A. B. Shamsul, 1999: 86-110),

3. "Colonial knowledge and identity formation: literature and the construction of Malay and Malayness" (A. B. Shamsul, 2000a: 49-64),<sup>5</sup>
4. "Why is Malaysia not disintegrating? Islam, the economy and politics in multiethnic Malaysia" (Shamsul A. B., 2001: 1-18).
5. "A history of identity, an identity of a history: the idea and practice of 'Malayness' in Malaysia reconsidered" (Shamsul A. B., 2004a: 135-148).<sup>6</sup>

This is followed by an overview of discourse on the paradigm of Malayness in literature which begins with a review of significant papers presented at the "Thinking Malayness" symposium followed by essays in *Contesting Malayness*. It closes with a discussion on main studies which have explored the paradigm of Malayness in literature.

The moot point of my study is presented in Part II and Part III of the thesis which is to explore the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised consisting of the aforementioned elements in selected English and Malay literary works on the Malay World. An exploration of the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised through its representation and manifestation in the study of literature is useful as it not only helps us to discover how Malayness has come to be reflected and understood in contemporary Malaysia through literature but it would also be able to assist us in understanding the role of literature in demonstrating the development of the understanding of the paradigm. As an approach for analysis, I have employed a close textual reading of the selected works and have also examined the authors' representations of characters which I perceive to be Malay.

Part II of this thesis comprises Chapters Two and Three. Chapter Two is a discussion on the selected works in English literature on the Malay World, which begins with a definition of the Malay World to account for my selection of authors, namely Joseph Conrad, Somerset Maugham and Anthony Burgess, as well as their selected works: Conrad's Malay trilogy of *Almayer's folly*, *An outcast of the islands* and *The rescue*, Maugham's Malayan short stories of "The force of circumstance", "The outstation" and "The yellow streak", and Burgess' Malayan trilogy of *Time for a*

---

<sup>5</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Shamsul for mailing me a copy of this study from Malaysia.

<sup>6</sup> This study is part of a collection of essays in *Contesting Malayness* (Barnard, 2004a) but was first published in the *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* October 2001 issue.

---

*tiger*, *The enemy in the blanket* and *Beds in the east*. The following sections in this chapter are brief discussions on the literary backgrounds, basis and resources of the selected works of the authors followed by reviews on the existing body of scholarship conducted to date on their works, which discuss issues related to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. This is because it is important for us to discover whether the paradigm of Malayness has been explored with regard to the selected literary works up till now. The reviews begin firstly with Conrad, followed by Maugham and ends with Burgess.

Chapter Three presents my analysis of the abovementioned selected works on the Malay World by Conrad, Maugham and Burgess in order to obtain evidence which can account for the understanding of Malayness in literature as I have hypothesised. In total, there are six novels and three short stories which have been selected for analysis. The analysis is presented thematically according to the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised, namely the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity.

This shall be followed by discussions on and an analysis of selected traditional and modern Malay literary works in Part III because it is highly imperative that we go back to these Malay works which are written in the Malay language about the Malay World in order to determine whether the Malay works themselves reflect the paradigm of Malayness which I have hypothesised. The selected works in Malay literature come from two fields, namely traditional and modern Malay literature. It must be mentioned that the works have been selected based on my own examination with regard to the important places they hold in the history of Malay literature. Two texts from traditional Malay literature have been selected, namely *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Hikayat Abdullah*. From modern Malay literature, the following works have been selected: *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*, *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* and “Melayu”.

Part III of this thesis comprises Chapters Four and Five. Chapter Four is a discussion on selected works in traditional and modern Malay literature. It begins with a brief rationale on my selection of works in order to explore the paradigm of Malayness as I have hypothesised. This is followed by sections containing discussions

---

on the authors of the selected works (except for *Hikayat Hang Tuah* because the author of the text remains unknown until now) and reviews of previous studies on the selected works to date in traditional and modern Malay literature: *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi and *Hikayat Abdullah*, Ishak Haji Muhammad and *Putera Gunung Tahan* as well as *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, Shahnnon Ahmad and *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*, Muhammad Haji Salleh and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, and finally, Usman Awang and “Melayu”. I have narrowed the reviews to those relevant to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness.

The analysis of the aforementioned selected works in traditional and modern Malay literature is presented in Chapter Five. My analysis of *Hikayat Hang Tuah* is confined to the duel between Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat while only the final section of *Hikayat Abdullah*, which I refer to as the ‘ending’, is analysed. The reasons for this decision are presented in Chapter Four. The other selected works, namely the novels *Putera Gunung Tahan*, *Anak Mat Lela Gila* and *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*, the collection of poems *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* and the poem “Melayu” are analysed as a whole. Again, as with Chapter Three, the analysis is presented thematically according to the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised, namely the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity.

My original contribution for this study is contained in the approach, of the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised as a conceptual framework where the results from the analyses of selected works in both English and Malay literatures will be compared and contrasted in the Conclusion chapter of this thesis. It is by undertaking this approach that we will be able to determine if Shamsul’s three pillars of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality could stand or that the paradigm of Malayness in literature is an everyday-defined social reality which is understood to refer to not only the three pillars but also has a broader meaning, comprising *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity as I have hypothesised.

With those perspectives in view to justify my decision to employ my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness as a conceptual framework, I also discuss briefly my views regarding two postcolonial theories, namely Orientalism by Edward Said (1935-2003) and Exoticism. Here, I explain why I have chosen not to engage in a

---

theoretical framework or approach in this study in order to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in the selected works in English literature on the Malay World.

Indeed, any discussion on the selected three authors cannot be complete without mentioning two postcolonial theories, namely Orientalism and Exoticism (Appendix 5). My own understanding of these theories is that they deal with debates on a Western understanding of the East and I therefore perceive them to be Western paradigms. This is in fact the very same approach which my study intends to circumvent, as Said (1995: 7) in his Introduction to *Orientalism* succinctly reasons, 'There is in addition to the hegemony of European ideas about the Orient, themselves reiterating European superiority over Oriental backwardness, usually overriding the possibility that a more independent, or more sceptical, thinker might have had different views on the matter'.

Because of this, I feel that I cannot rely entirely on the theoretical frameworks to speak on behalf of the works for I prefer the works to speak for themselves. And the works can only speak for themselves when I choose to give them that opportunity; by presenting textual evidence based on a close textual reading. Perhaps the validation for my approach can fit into Said's view; that as an 'Oriental', I may have my own independent thinking and differing views and that I am quite sceptical about employing a Western concept to help me rationalise and account for my own arguments and understanding of the paradigm of Malayness. Indeed, my approach in exploring the paradigm of Malayness by employing a close textual reading is not new or atypical. For example, a recent study by Simmons (2006) on Conrad's Malay trilogy does not engage in any theoretical discussion of Orientalism and Exoticism but nevertheless proffers refreshing views on reading Conrad as a writer.

What I attempt to rationalise here is that what really interests me in this study are the literary works themselves. This is indeed what prompted me to embark on this study in the first place. I have decided to use literature and to discuss the paradigm of Malayness solely within the confines of literature in order to explore how the paradigm used by authors and scholars on this subject match those invoked by evidence in the works. Up to a certain point in the study on Malayness, the paradigm

as manifested in literature has been taken up by certain Malay elites and I believe that the English literary works also demonstrate a reflection of the paradigm of Malayness.

I am keen to point out that my study is not an examination of any theory but is based on an exploration of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. I must also emphasise that the analysis in my study is not based on a theoretical framework but a conceptual one and is based on a close textual reading of works as an attempt to justify my analytical approach. To engage in this approach means to present enough quotations from the works in order to enable us to see the evidence contained in the works. This is undertaken with the aim to justify the interpretations given. I must state here once again that my interest in this study is not on the theories and theoretical frameworks on how the West has constructed the East, or in Said's words, 'the Western conceptions of the Orient', but rather whether the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised are manifested and reflected in the selected literary works.

With those justifications in view, the final part of the thesis is the Conclusion chapter of the thesis which begins with a re-examination of evidence from the analyses. It is based on a comparison between the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised as manifested and reflected in the English and Malay literary works on the Malay World as discussed in Chapters Three and Five. It therefore attempts to address the research questions as follows:

1. 'Do the selected works conform to a local and broad understanding of the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised where it is an everyday-defined social reality reflected in English and Malay literary works on the Malay World?'
2. 'Do the selected works challenge the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised where it is actually an authority-defined social reality as conceptualised by Shamsul A. B. reflected in English and Malay literary works on the Malay World?'
3. 'Do the selected works demonstrate any shifting processes whereby they begin with a local and broad understanding of the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised then narrowed to the three pillars as conceptualised by Shamsul A. B.?'

In the Conclusion chapter of the thesis, I wish to discover if the works conform to the broader understanding of the paradigm of Malayness as I have hypothesised, whether it is an everyday-defined social reality reflected in English and Malay literary works on the Malay World. I also seek to discover in the Conclusion if another prospect is possible, whether the works conform to Shamsul's conceptualisation of the paradigm of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality manifested in English and Malay literary works on the Malay World. Another aim of this study which I hope to achieve in the Conclusion is to discover whether the selected works demonstrate any shifting processes whereby they begin with the broad understanding of the paradigm of Malayness as I have hypothesised, then narrowed to the three pillars as conceptualised by Shamsul but has shifted again to its initial broad understanding.

In addition, this thesis contains twenty-six appendixes to assist me in my discussions as clearly outlined in the Table of Contents.

---

## PART I

### CHAPTER ONE

# THE PARADIGM OF MALAYNESS AND ITS CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDING

## Introduction

This chapter begins with a review of existing scholarship on Malayness by the prominent Malaysian social anthropologist, Shamsul Amri Baharuddin (Shamsul A. B.). This section is the most important part of this chapter as it presents the social anthropological settings to the conceptual framework which I have employed to explore the paradigm of Malayness in literature. Following this is a brief review of significant papers presented at an international symposium in Japan, “Thinking Malayness”,<sup>7</sup> and of relevant essays in *Contesting Malayness* (Barnard, 2004a). Both sections also make up an overall review of recent scholarship exploring the paradigm of Malayness in literature. The chapter closes with my own summation and hypothesis regarding the contemporary understanding of the paradigm of Malayness in literature and the usefulness of literature as a tool to explore the paradigm.

## **Malayness: from the perspectives of the Malaysian social anthropologist, Shamsul Amri Baharuddin (Shamsul A. B.)**

Earlier in the Introduction chapter, I discussed briefly Shamsul’s fundamental views on Malayness in Malaysia as an authority-defined social reality. I have also been able to discover Shamsul’s own conceptualisation of Malayness, defined as the three pillars of Malayness: ‘Islam (*agama*/religion)’, ‘Malay (*bahasa*/language)’ and

---

<sup>7</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Shamsul for providing me a majority of the papers presented at this symposium.

‘Malay rulers (*raja*/the aristocrat government of the sultans)’. In this section, I discuss in detail how these pillars of Malayness came into being as proposed by Shamsul. Here, I refer to another study by Shamsul, “The construction and transformation of a social identity: Malayness and Bumiputraness re-examined” (A. B. Shamsul, 1999: 86-110), which illustrates his construction of what he calls ‘the three pillars of Malayness’. This study is indeed noteworthy despite the fact that the title points to a discussion on the cultural construction of the Malay ‘New Rich’ (*Orang Kaya Baru*).

The preoccupation of Malay identity as a ‘race’ is suggested by Shamsul (1999: 93) as a direct result of European colonial presence, a view he has posited in his other studies as I discussed earlier in the Introduction chapter. However, a new perspective is given in this particular study where Shamsul points to the influx of Chinese immigrants into Malaya from the 19<sup>th</sup> century as another reason for this preoccupation with identifying Malay as a ‘race’. It is through this phenomenon, according to Shamsul (1999: 93), that the concept of Malay as ‘a race and a source of identity became popular’. Shamsul (1999: 93-94) demonstrates how it was ‘readily accepted, developed, debated and elaborated by Malay journalists, creative writers, literary figures and intellectuals’, such as Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi (Munsyi Abdullah), Ishak Haji Muhammad and Mahathir Mohamad.

While Islam is viewed by Shamsul as the most important pillar among the three pillars of Malayness as I have shown in the Introduction chapter, another study by Shamsul, “Why is Malaysia not disintegrating? Islam, the economy and politics in multiethnic Malaysia” (Shamsul A. B., 2001: 1-18), demonstrates how his view on Islam has indeed come about. A brief albeit important discussion on Malayness by Shamsul (2001: 4) is outlined here where he states that religion, understood to be Islam, has indeed become the definite ‘ethnic identifier’ for the Malays. Shamsul is of the opinion too that Islam has also become ‘the source of legitimacy’ for the Malay rulers through the hierarchical institution of *kerajaan*. To him, Islam and Malay identity became fused during the Islamisation process of the ruling community despite a strong pre-Islamic cultural influence handed down from the days of Hindu and pre-

Hindu practices.<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, Shamsul is also of the opinion that the *adat*, or customs as described by Shamsul, observed by the rulers and the subjects (*rakyat*) still held remnants of pre-Islamic cultural practices. Shamsul describes that Malayness, at this point, had two main pillars, namely Islam as ‘the religious and universal one’, and *adat* as ‘the local moral one’. However, the pillars of Malayness are suggested by Shamsul as having been expanded during the British era of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, a perspective highlighted in Shamsul’s other studies as discussed earlier in the Introduction chapter. Shamsul (2001: 7) further suggests that Malayness as understood and practised in contemporary Malay society centres on Islam, as its essential pillar, together with ‘ethnicity, language, custom, provincial identity and culture’.

The overlapping of perspectives in the above studies by Shamsul shall soon be understood as I now move on to the rest of the studies which I believe express explicitly and succinctly the paradigm of Malayness as conceptualised by Shamsul. I begin with a study in which he discusses Malayness as a construction of a social identity, “The construction and transformation of a social identity: Malayness and Bumiputraness re-examined” (Shamsul A. B., 1996c: 15-34). Shamsul locates his discussion on the concept of *bumiputera*<sup>9</sup> within the continuous debate on Malayness in Malaysia. Shamsul (1996c: 17) argues how the three pillars of Malayness, namely, ‘*bahasa, agama, dan raja*’, translated by Shamsul as ‘language, religion/Islam and the royalty’, are ideological constructs that emerged over the last century or so, especially

---

<sup>8</sup> On the Islamisation of the Malays, see Mohd. Taib Osman (1988, 1989, 1997); Khoo Kay Kim (2001a: 157-184); Khoo Kay Kim et al. (2006).

<sup>9</sup> The term *bumiputera* carries the same meaning as *bumiputra* (albeit without the letter ‘e’) and is used interchangeably. Translated into English as ‘the son of the soil’, this term is also conferred on those defined by the Malaysian Constitution as Malay. It was first introduced together with the implementation of the NEP in 1971 as a consequence of the racial conflict of 13 May 1969. It carries with it a meaning which has come to be simultaneously referred to as the Malay special rights and refers to the special positions and provisions for Malays under Article 153 of the Malaysian Constitution. Clause (1) of the Article states: ‘It shall be the responsibility of the Yang di-Pertuan Agong to safeguard the special position of the Malays and natives of any of the States of Sabah and Sarawak and the legitimate interests of other communities in accordance with the provisions of this Article’ (Legal Research Board, 1990: 143-144). Clause (3) of this Article also states: ‘The Yang di-Pertuan Agong may, in order to ensure in accordance with Clause (2) the reservation to Malays and natives of any of the States of Sabah and Sarawak of positions in the public service and of scholarships, exhibitions and other educational or training privileges or special facilities, give such general directions as may be required for that purpose to any Commission to which Part X applies or to any authority charged with responsibility for the grant of such scholarships, exhibitions or other educational or training privileges or special facilities; and the Commission or authority shall duly comply with the directions’ (Legal Research Board, 1990: 144). These are thus the special privileges safeguarded for and bestowed upon those who are constitutionally defined as Malay in Malaysia.

---

after the arrival of the British, a perspective echoed in Shamsul's previous studies as outlined earlier in the Introduction chapter.

Shamsul (1996c: 18) further discusses the origins and development of Malay and Malayness by citing a previous study by Milner (1982). Shamsul points to Milner's study on Malay dynastic polity or *kerajaan* where Milner has argued that the notion of 'race' or '*bangsa*' to describe *Melayu* was non-existent prior to the 1511 conquest of the Portuguese. The term was believed to be 'the social referents within the *kulturkreis* acknowledged as the Malay world back then' which really turned out to refer to 'lineage' or 'status'. However, Shamsul also proposes through his analysis of Milner's study that conflicting accounts on Malacca, notably the *Suma Oriental* (1512-1515) by Tom Pires, suggest the opposite. Shamsul proposes that the term *Melayu* was already widely used to describe a group of people who were already inhabitants of the city state of Malacca. Among those exemplified were the Javanese and the Acehese from the Malay Archipelago while the others, such as the Indian, the Chinese and the Arab, were considered as coming from outside the region.

Shamsul also suggests that the term *Melayu* then was not used as an ethnic identity but as a category to refer to the place of origin from where the Malays came from, namely the Riau-Lingga region. This region is seen as the place whose language was undoubtedly the *lingua franca* for the Malay Archipelago province. Shamsul is also of the opinion that, prior to the British rule, the term *Melayu* only applied to those who designated themselves to the polity of the Sultan, the Sultan's subjects and the societies residing around the palace. Shamsul believes that it was not until the 18<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries that the term *Melayu* was widely used as how it is understood today as documented by Southeast Asian historians (Cushman and Milner, 1979; Matheson, 1979; Andaya and Andaya, 1982).

To further demonstrate the link between what we have already discovered so far in Shamsul's studies with the British colonial influence in the shaping and endorsement of the construction of Malayness, I now review another study by Shamsul, "Colonial knowledge and identity formation: literature and the construction of Malay and Malayness" (A. B. Shamsul, 2000a: 49-64), which is of specific relevance for it is here that Shamsul discusses the role played by literature with regard

---

to the construction of Malay and Malayness. In his introduction, Shamsul (2000a: 49) states that he aims ‘to explore the role of literature in the construction of Malay as an ethnic category and Malayness’, especially in the context of what he terms as ‘colonial knowledge’. Of importance too is Shamsul’s view that ‘the presence of the colonial rule and conquest should not be seen merely in the form of physical domination but also a cultural invasion in the form of a conquest of the native epistemological space’.<sup>10</sup> Shamsul also posits the view that ‘the history of contemporary Malay identity and Malayness is largely a colonial-orientalist construction which was dominated, shaped and factualised culturally by colonial knowledge’.

In discussing colonial knowledge and its role in the construction of the modern Malay identity, Shamsul (2000a: 53) exemplifies a colonial legacy in Malaysia, namely the Malay Reservation Enactment of 1913, as a point of argument. This Act is explained by Shamsul as ‘an obvious attempt to firstly define who is a Malay’, and secondly ‘to define the scope of the use of land categorised as Malay’. The problem with this Act, as argued by Shamsul, relates to how the eleven different *negeri*, translated by Shamsul as ‘province’, in Malaya sought to define who is a Malay. This is because each *negeri* (state) possesses its own constitution and, as such, defines who is a Malay differently. For example, as Shamsul points out, a person of Arab descent is not categorised as a Malay in Johor but is defined as one in Kedah. Another example given by Shamsul is that a person of Siamese descent is not categorised as a Malay in Negeri Sembilan but is defined as one in Kelantan. Thus, based on the evidence shown through the Act and the processes involved in defining a Malay, Shamsul (2000a: 53) posits the view that ‘Malay and Malayness is not only created and represented but also became contested through a single Act’, namely the Malay Reservation Enactment of 1913.

Shamsul (2000a: 56) is also concerned with the possibility that historical evidences from a study by Reid (1997) could also be read in many different ways. For example, ‘an alternative analytical construct’ could also be offered in view of

---

<sup>10</sup> According to Shamsul (2000a: 49), this term refers to ‘the dismantling of native thought system hence disempowering it of its ability to define things and subsequently replacing it with a foreign one through a systematic application of a series of colonial investigative modalities’.

historical evidence presented in Reid's study. Shamsul suggests that 'the fact that the British reconstituted the meaning of Malay and Malayness and, in the process, almost completely ignored its sense of *ethnie*' is quite enlightening. From this view by Reid, Shamsul (2000a: 56) posits his own view of how the British, through colonial knowledge, had then constructed and introduced various names and categories which have been accepted as 'natural' and 'primeval'. It is in this context that literature comes in to play a very important role where, to illustrate his argument, Shamsul further discusses the roles and contributions of three British colonial administrators-scholars whom he describes as constructing Malay and Malayness 'through their individual efforts in studying and writing various aspects of Malay literature and on the general topic of Malay culture': Stamford Raffles (1782-1826), R. J. Wilkinson (1867-1941) and R. O. Winstedt (1887-1966).

Shamsul (2000a: 57) is of the opinion that Raffles is indeed responsible for giving the Malay a nation and history, and for developing what is proposed by Shamsul as 'Malay colonial knowledge'. As evidence of Raffles' contribution, Shamsul reproduces an extract from an essay by Raffles, "On the Malayu nation, with a translation of its maritime institution".<sup>11</sup> This extract, reproduced below for emphasis, is also believed by Shamsul to be the yardstick by which to measure subsequent Malay and Malayness discourses among Europeans and later by Malays:

I cannot but consider the Malayu nation as one people, speaking one language, though spread over so wide a space, and preserving their character and customs, in all the maritime states lying between the Sulu Seas and the Southern Oceans, and bounded longitudinally by Sumatra and the western side of Papua or New Guinea. (Raffles, 1816: 103 cited in A. B. Shamsul, 2000a: 57)

Based on this extract as evidence, Shamsul (2000a: 56-57) thus posits the view that Raffles was in fact the first scholar who not only introduced the concept of a 'Malay nation' but also elaborated on the concept of the 'Malay race', 'the Malay world' and 'the Malay language'.

These perspectives then bring us to another study by Shamsul, "A history of identity, an identity of a history: the idea and practice of 'Malayness' in Malaysia

---

<sup>11</sup> This essay was originally published in 1809 and was republished in the journal *Asiatic Researches* as Volume 12 of the 1816 publication, pages 102 to 158.

---

reconsidered” (Shamsul A. B., 2004a: 135-148), who reiterates his earlier views on the role played by Raffles without discussing the roles played by other colonial-administrators, such as Wilkinson and Winstedt, in this particular study. Instead, Shamsul discusses the role played by William Marsden (1754-1836) in the construction and propagation of the Malayness paradigm where he attempts to link their roles with the idea of the practice of Malayness in Malaysia. Shamsul (2004a: 144-145) discusses Marsden’s contribution in the form of the publication of *The history of Sumatra* (1811).

What have followed from this perspective on Marsden by Shamsul are his views on a series of political events in Malaya/Malaysia which are believed to have contributed to a gradual construction in the paradigm of Malayness. According to Shamsul, Raffles’ concept of ‘Malay nation’ eventually developed into ‘Malay race’ soon after the establishment of the Straits Settlement in 1824.<sup>12</sup> ‘Malay race’ as an identity then became accepted by both the Malays and the colonial powers themselves which, as Shamsul has reiterated in his earlier studies, was ‘a result of the growing presence’ of other people whose ‘race’ was construed as either ‘European’ or ‘Chinese’. Of importance is Shamsul’s view that it is indeed the writer Munsyi Abdullah who had ‘introduced’ the term *bangsa Melayu*, which Shamsul translates as ‘Malay race’ or ‘Malay people’, into the public domain.

Other examples of events are also discussed in this study, for instance, the 1891 colonial census implemented by the British which ‘recognised three racial categories’, namely ‘Malay’, ‘Chinese’ and ‘Tamil’ as well as the Malay Reservation Enactment of 1913 which ‘provided a legal definition of ‘Malay’ and helped fix the idea of ‘Malayness’ in the public mind’, a point I highlighted earlier. Shamsul (2004a: 146) states how the formation of the Federation of Malaysia in 1963 had further ‘introduced a new dimension to the understanding and definition of ‘Malay’ and ‘Malayness’’. This is described by Shamsul as a result of ‘the addition of the Muslim groups in Sabah and Sarawak, such as the Dusun and Murut in Sabah and the Melanau in Sarawak’, who are non-Muslim native inhabitants of Malaysian Borneo.

---

<sup>12</sup> For the history of the Straits Settlement which from 1824 consisted of Penang, Melaka and Singapore, see Rose et al. (1940).

---

Shamsul (2004a: 147) thus posits the view how these events act as evidence that ‘the need to define the borders and margins of a concept can have far-reaching effects on its central content’. In turn, these events are argued by Shamsul as evidence of how ‘flexible the concept or category of ‘Malay’ is’ as well as that the ongoing debates on Malayness are simultaneously ‘important and irrelevant’. The synchronised elements of the debates prove, according to Shamsul, that the meaning of the concept can easily be shifted or can adapt itself whenever a new situation arises.

As shown above, Shamsul’s studies on Malayness have demonstrated how the contemporary understanding of Malayness in Malaysia has come about. More interestingly, Shamsul’s own conceptualisation of what he calls ‘the three pillars of Malayness’ comprising *bahasa* (the Malay language), *agama* (the religion of Islam) and *raja* (the aristocrat government of the sultans) as an authority-defined social reality has made further contributions to another important field of study, namely the sociology of literature. Therefore, I now move on to the next section which is a review of current scholarship which explores the subject of Malayness in literature.

### **An overview of discourse on the paradigm of Malayness in literature**

This section begins with reviews of significant papers presented at the “Thinking Malayness” symposium followed by relevant essays in *Contesting Malayness*. It closes with a discussion on main studies which have explored the paradigm of Malayness in literature.

I begin with a paper presented at the “Thinking Malayness” symposium by Andaya (2004a: 1) who acknowledges that constructions of Malayness have often been based on ‘colonial and post-colonial knowledge’ as posited by scholars in *Contesting Malayness*. He highlights how ‘the few attempts to determine what Malayness meant in the pre-colonial period’ only managed to demonstrate different priorities apart from the lack of materials. As such, Andaya suggests that research on Malayness must be aimed at its ‘historical reconstruction’. Therefore, Andaya focuses

on *Sejarah Melayu*<sup>13</sup> and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*<sup>14</sup> in order to determine the definite moot point for the historical development of Malayness. He suggests that ‘the alliance of kinship networks mediated through a ruler with superior descent formed the basis of the Malay polity in much of the pre-colonial period’. However, as he sees it, this relationship, which ‘favoured families over the ruler’, was ‘reversed’ around the 18<sup>th</sup> century ‘as a result of the major expansion of international trade flowing through the Straits of Melaka’.

The above circumstances are seen as a crucial point in which Malay ethnic identity began to regard the ruler compared to the powerful families as ‘the pre-eminent force in society’. This resulted in ‘the transition of Malay identity from one based on a polity dominated by the powerful families to one which was ruler-centred’. Andaya (2004a: 2) suggests that ‘it was only late in the history of the Malay people that the ruler came to be regarded as an essential and inseparable part of Malay ethnic identity’ contrary to current views. According to Andaya (2004a: 18), it was during this period of time that the Malay rulers or sultans eventually became an important symbol of and synonymous with ‘the distinctive Malayu ethnicity and identity’. As Andaya sees it, ‘failure to support the ruler became tantamount to rejecting Malayu culture and identity’. Andaya (2004a: 19) is of the opinion that this change also affected the ideas of Malayness, they have been formed by the late 18<sup>th</sup> century ‘in reference to kingship, a state of affairs which was then maintained and promoted by both the colonial and independent governments in Malay(sia) until well into the twentieth century’.

While Andaya has called for a historical reconstruction of Malayness which should ideally begin with the two most renowned traditional Malay literary works, *Sejarah Melayu* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, Malayness has also been discussed in view of Malay identity in the Indonesian context in *Contesting Malayness*.<sup>15</sup> One notable

---

<sup>13</sup> *Sejarah Melayu* is a renowned traditional Malay literary text written by Tun Seri Lanang around 1612. Its original title is *Sulalatus salatin* in Arabic which means *The genealogy of the kings* in English and *Perteturun segala raja-raja* in Malay.

<sup>14</sup> *Hikayat Hang Tuah* is another renowned traditional Malay literary text believed to have been written in mid-17<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>15</sup> Barnard (2004b: 107-120) discusses the ‘transformation of Malay identity in the 18<sup>th</sup> century’ based on an analysis of *Hikayat Siak* (believed to have been composed in 1855). A different approach of discussing Malay identity is employed by Sutherland (2004: 76-1-6), on the process of adapting a sense of identity from 1660 to 1790 in the case of the Makassar Malays. van der Putten (2004: 121-134)

study has so far discussed specifically the origin of Malayness which focuses on the Malaysian context, namely Reid (2004).

Reid (2004: 3) opens his study by defining the term *Melayu* where his arguments are formed similarly along the lines of a discourse on the origins of *Melayu* by Andaya (2004b: 56-75) on 'the search for the 'origins' of Melayu'. For example, Reid (2004: 3-7) discusses the historical development of the term *Melayu* based on its uses in ancient and foreign writings, Javanese and Malay literary texts as well as epigraphic evidence. Reid (2004: 4-5) also discusses the use of *Melayu* in *Sejarah Melayu* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, views which have been discussed by scholars engaging in research on the origins of *Melayu* in traditional Malay literary texts (Matheson, 1979: 351-371; Milner, 1992: 43-59, 1998: 151-169, 2002, 2003: 1-24).<sup>16</sup> According to Reid (2004: 7), the concept of Malayness only came into being either in the 16<sup>th</sup> or the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries and had maintained two associations in maritime Southeast Asia. The first is 'a line of kingship acknowledging descent from Srivijaya and Melaka or Pagarruyung (Minangkabau)'. The second denotes 'a commercial diaspora that retained some of the customs, language and trade practices developed in the emporium of Melaka'.

Of importance to this study is Reid's discussion on 'the English understandings of 'Malay''. Reid (2004: 10) suggests that Raffles 'should probably be regarded as the most important voice in projecting the idea of a 'Malay' race or nation, not limited to the traditional Malay sultans or even their supporters, but embracing a large if unspecified part of the Archipelago'. According to Reid, 'like the other influential English writers of the period', namely Marsden and John Crawfurd (1783-1868), Raffles was also influenced by the Scottish Enlightenment view that 'peoples should be scientifically classified'.<sup>17</sup>

Reid (2004: 10-11) discusses Raffles together with John Leyden (1775-1811) as being influenced by the Enlightenment approach: to form 'their vision of the

---

focuses on a collection of letters written by a Bugis living in Riau in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, 'Haji Ibrahim', to a European scholar based in Riau, 'Herman Von de Wall'.

<sup>16</sup> I have been unable to obtain a copy of Milner's latest study, *The Malays* (2008), for review because it was only available after I had completed my writing-up of the thesis.

<sup>17</sup> The Scottish Enlightenment was the period in 18<sup>th</sup> century Scotland characterised by an outpouring of intellectual and scientific accomplishments.

Malays as one of the language-based ‘nations’. Reid (2004: 11) also suggests that Raffles is responsible for providing the Malays a sense of ‘history’ through his attempt at ‘renaming’ ‘the major traditional Malay literary text as *Sejarah Melayu* in Malay and *Malay Annals* in English’. This is despite the fact that the original title of the text was, to Reid (2004: 11), ‘a description of a line of kings and their ceremonial’: ‘*Sulalat Us-Salatin*’ in Arabic and ‘*peraturan segala raja-raja*’ in Malay.<sup>18</sup> Reid proposes that Raffles’ insertion of the new titles in the 1821 English translation of the text by Leyden appears to show that the text was the story of the Malays as a group of people. Therefore, Reid postulates that what Raffles had executed is to move ‘the Malays on from a nation to a race’, a view also shared by Shamsul as discussed earlier.

Reid (2004: 11) also discusses Marsden’s *The history of Sumatra* which he believes has led to a widespread misconception on the Malays: ‘that the idea of the Peninsula as ‘Malayan’ or ‘Malay’ was of exclusively European origin’ had ‘confused many into thinking’ that the place of origin for the Malays is indeed the Peninsula. Reid (2004: 11-12) is also of the opinion that the term *tanah Melayu*, which he translates as ‘the land of the Malays’, for the Peninsula is more difficult to date although he does suggest that this term was possibly influenced by the English. Reid (2004: 12) nonetheless concedes that ‘*Hikayat Hang Tuah* is the only pre-modern Malay text to use this term’ and suggests ambiguities in its usage, ‘sometimes applying to Melaka and sometimes to a broader area where there are Malay kings’.

Reid (2004: 12-14) further outlines what he describes as three 19<sup>th</sup> century understandings of Malayness which I propose can be seen as a step towards tracing the origins of Malayness: ‘*Melayu* as the vestige of concern with royal lineage’, ‘*Melayu* as an emerging notion of modern nationality or race’, and ‘Malayness as urban superculture’. The first understanding is based on ‘a growing concern to establish principles of Malayness which were bigger than the frequently unworthy individual king’ on evidence, for example, in the works of Raja Ali Haji (1808-1873). The second understanding is based on the works of Munsyi Abdullah, where Reid posits the view that Abdullah had replaced ‘the lineage of Malay *rajas*’ as the focus of

---

<sup>18</sup> The title in Malay is quoted from Reid’s study while I myself refer to this text by its other accredited title in Malay, namely *Perteturan segala raja-saja*.

his works which up till the 19<sup>th</sup> century is suggested as ‘the key definition of Malayness’. According to Reid (2004: 13), ‘this developing idea of Malayness’ in the Straits Settlement as ‘an essentially racial category, with its own ethnic origin and genealogy, its own language and its own relatively broad boundaries against other ethnicities, was the newest of the three versions of Malay in the nineteenth century’. Reid suggests that Malayness was in fact ‘a new identity acquired in the ethnically competitive world’ of the port-states of the Straits Settlement.

Of importance is a discussion by Reid (2004: 14-18) which charts the development of Malay as a ‘race’, a term he translates as *bangsa Melayu*. Highlighting the works of Wilkinson and Winstedt in the field of education in Malaya, Reid (2004: 14-15) suggests that their move in introducing ‘‘classic’ court texts’ in schools had ‘stressed unswerving loyalty to the ruler as the key element of Malay identity’ as well as ‘encouraged the modern Malay nationalist understanding of Malayness’. Reid (2004: 16) also suggests that ‘identity took shape around *bangsa Melayu*, a term proposed as going back at least to Munsyi Abdullah but was more widely internalised from the 1920s as the equivalent of ‘Malay race’ in English’. Other important historical developments in Malaysia as outlined by Reid (2004: 16-18) ‘in which the centrality of Malayness was explicitly expressed’ include the rise of Malay nationalism in the 1930s and 1940s, the controversy regarding the Malayan Union in 1945-1946, the establishment of the Federation of Malaya as part of Malayan independence in 1957 and the formation of Malaysia in 1963.

While Reid’s study is presented as an attempt to ‘trace the term and content of Malayness historically’ and ‘to establish what this core culture represents’ (Reid, 2004: 3), a study by Vickers (2004: 25-55) contests Malayness as ‘Malay identity’ in the form of ‘modernity’, ‘an invented tradition’ and ‘forms of knowledge’. Vickers (2004: 26) raises concerns regarding views which suggest that Malayness is ‘essentially colonial’ and is the result of colonial constructions of identity. In his opinion, the study of literary texts should be able to give insights into what he proposes to be ‘a more complex and ambiguous ‘Malay’ identity’. Vickers counters views put forward by notable scholars on this subject (Milner, 2003; Reid, 2004; Shamsul A. B., 2004a) and suggests instead that Malayness ‘is not a matter of a colonial ‘invented tradition’, but is a local construction onto which colonial forms of

---

hegemony were imposed'. Vickers posits the view that Malayness may have been 'part of invented traditions in Malaysia', 'but they were not invented from nothing'.

Vickers illustrates the problematic aspects of defining Malay in Malaysia which he suggests is 'a fraught term' at least in practice. According to Vickers (2004: 27), 'a hegemonic Malay identity based on the difference between supposedly indigenous Islamic Malays and 'outsiders', namely Chinese and Indians', has been maintained by 'the ruling class of the nation state of Malaysia'. Quoting views from studies on this subject (Kessler, 1992; Loh Kok Wah, 1992), Vickers highlights that the process of inventing Malay identity to become synonymous with Islam is 'problematic', especially for the indigenous peoples of Sabah and Sarawak as well as the *Orang Asli*, because many of them are Christians and followers of other 'indigenous religions'.

Vickers (2004: 33-37) also discusses the use of 'literature to question colonial authority', a move initiated in Malay studies by Sweeney (1987). Based on his discussion on earlier studies which have employed this approach (Maier, 1988; Drakard, 1988; 1990; Koster, 1983; Skinner, 1985; Rattiya Saleh, 1988; Abdul Rahman Kaeh, 1989; Siti Chamamah Soeratno, 1991; Zaini-Lajoubert, 1987), Vickers (2004: 36) goes on to suggest that Malayness has been shown to be 'almost peripheral to these texts'. As he sees it, Malayness has been demonstrated to be 'the product of all that is outside what is now regarded as 'Malay''. This suggests in turn 'the impossibility of an autochthonous Malay identity, or of a 'Malayness' indigenous to the Malay Peninsula'.

Apart from Vicker's study which discusses Malayness as a form of Malay identity, Malayness has also been explored by scholars focussing specifically on traditional Malay literary works.

In one of his studies on Malayness as 'confrontation, innovation and discourse', Milner (1992: 55) states that 'narrowing the scope of Malayness appears to have been a cultural project of even the British colonial state' in the form of 'the first modern history of the Malays' by Winstedt (1938). In addition, Milner (1992: 56) discusses the topic of Malayness in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and proposes that the text

invokes a ‘Malayness of Malacca and other sultanates located on, or in the region close to, the Peninsula’. He further suggests that ‘narrowing the scope of Malayness’ through the promotion of the legend of Hang Tuah has been one, if not ‘a consistent policy, of the Malayan leadership’ in Malaysia ‘for nation-building purposes’.

In his 2003 study on ‘who created Malaysia’s plural society?’, Milner (2003: 7) states how both ‘the Melaka texts’, the ‘*Malay Annals*’ and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, show that ‘“Malayness” began to be formulated in a manner that gave it the potential to become a broad ‘ethnic’ classification’. This in turn meant undoubtedly ‘more than a local identification’. Based on evidence in the form of ‘Malay customs and ceremonial, Malay games, Malay dance, Malay dress and a Malay style of music’, Milner (2003: 8) posits the view that Malayness in these two texts represents a ‘civilizational style that could be communicated or transferred to people living beyond the Melaka context’.

Milner suggests that Malayness at this point contains aspects of ‘transferability’ which also includes ‘the fact that Malayness did not involve an insistence on common descent’ as depicted in an episode from *Hikayat Hang Tuah* involving a dancing incident in Inderapura (Appendix 3). Milner’s view is formulated based on studies by Maier (1992; 1997; 1999; 2004), it refers to an episode when Hang Tuah goes to Inderapura which Milner (2003: 8) suggests is located in Sumatra. This identification of Inderapura in Sumatra, however, has been questioned by Md. Salleh Yaapar (2005). According to Salleh (2005: 26), although Milner locates Inderapura in Kampar in line with Wilkinson who identified it as located in Siak (both places are located on the island of Sumatra), evidence suggests otherwise. As demonstrated by Salleh, the text as well as *Sejarah Melayu* unambiguously points to a place not far from Melaka with a coastline like Terengganu. It is reachable also by land. Therefore, Salleh suggests that Inderapura is not located in Sumatra but clearly refers to the state of Pahang.

With regard to the dancing episode, Maier and Milner propose that Hang Tuah has suggested that there is no such thing as ‘real Malays’ or ‘pure Malays’ as all Malays are ‘hybrid Malays’ since they are mixed with the Javanese of Majapahit. Describing this scene as leading to the concept of Malayness as ‘playing relatives’,

---

both Maier and Milner highlight this incident as evidence of ‘the transferability of Malayness’.

Milner (2003: 8) also exemplifies his views based on *Hikayat Bandjar*<sup>19</sup> from southeast Borneo where ‘a ruler is said to declare that the people of his country should not depart from their old ways and customs by adopting Malay (or other foreign) dress and customs’. To Milner, this text confirms that Malayness ‘is something that could be acquired (or at least to some extent), or rejected’. Linking evidence from this text with ‘the hybrid Malay’ from *Hikayat Hang Tuah* as mentioned earlier, Milner posits the view that ‘the idea of Malayness had become a classification based on culture or civilization rather than a primarily toponymic identity, such as *orang Melaka*’.

Milner (2003: 8) links the above view with how the existence of ‘Tjina and Malaju’, compared to ‘orang Djohor, orang Atjih, orang Malaka’ in *Hikayat Bandjar*, shows that *Melayu* is now ‘a broader identity that transcended specific geographic locations’. The changing in the meaning of *Melayu* leads Milner to propose that ‘the expanding application of Malay as a classifier in foreign writings’ demonstrates ‘the rate at which the people themselves were adopting a civilizational understanding of Malayness’. Milner also suggests that ‘the increased currency of ‘Malay’ as a classifier and the ideological experimentation that accompanied it could be seen to form a basis for the building of modern Malay identity’.

Milner states that critical developments and events in late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries have consolidated Malayness which in turn is ‘fostered from the outside’. This includes the ‘idea of ‘race’ as a scientific concept for classifying humankind’ during this period which was then the current practice in England as well as across Europe. Milner (2003: 8-9) is of the opinion that this scientific concept of race is indeed responsible for influencing ‘the conceptualization of ‘Malay’ or ‘Melayu’ in Southeast Asia’, a view also posited by Shamsul and Reid as discussed earlier.

---

<sup>19</sup> This text is believed to have been composed in or soon after 1663 (Ras, 1968: 181).

---

As we have seen so far, scholars have made considerable attempts to analyse traditional Malay literary works in order to explore the subject of Malayness. Attempts however have also been made by scholars to explore this subject in modern Malay literary works.

In his 'analysis of cultural and political beliefs among Malay writers' focussing on 'the literary response and the social process', Tham Seong Chee (1975: 88) outlines four 'cognitive dimensions' which constitute 'the ideational framework of the Malays being implicitly or explicitly adhered to throughout the evolution of the society': 'the behavioural precepts that relate to human relationships within the framework of the agrarian character of Malay society; the institution of the sultan and the sultan as head of the *adat* and Islamic religion; Islam as the absolute ideal of existence and human relationship and the Malay language as the cultural manifestation of Malayness'.

In his discussion on the ideational framework, Tham (1975: 87, 91) describes Islam as 'a symbol of Malayness' while the Malay language is described as 'the single most manifest indicator of Malayness'. Tham (1975: 94-96) examines the religious theme and the issue of the Malay language as indicators of loyalty in the selected writings of, among others, Ishak Haji Muhammad and Shahnnon Ahmad. According to Tham (1975: 102), the literary manifestations in his analyses of the writings demonstrate four 'ideational dimensions': the 'Malay customs, the monarchy and its related institutions; Malay religion or Islam; and the Malay language or bahasa Malaysia'.

Tham (1975: 103) concludes that the above 'four ideological and cognitive assumptions' are 'associated with the concept of Malayness (*Kemelayuan*)' as shown 'throughout the period of evolution of Malay society' in his examination of the literary writings. Tham's study however focuses on 'how the political elites have influenced Malay literary response culminating in the dominance of the Malay political-bureaucratic elites in the realm of ideas, beliefs, and ideology'. Despite this, his study has been shown to be useful in relation to the scope of my own study where Tham (1975: 85) has attempted 'to explore the larger connections between literature

and society principally in the context of modern Malay literature' in order to discover the ideational system related to 'the concept of Malayness'.

Another recent study on Malayness has been conducted by Zawiah Yahya (1988) who examines the Malay characters represented in Malaysian novels in English since 1946 and attempts to reconstruct the portrayal of the Malay image. Zawiah (1988: 12) states that her study comprises two categories, the first is 'a truly literary attempt to explore characterization' and the second is 'a sociological probe into what Malayness may be exhibited'. Indeed, Zawiah's study is exceptional because I believe it is thus far the only one which explores the paradigm of Malayness in works set in the Malay World written in English, in Malaysian literature in English dating from early 20<sup>th</sup> century. In her study, Zawiah defines a Malay character as follows:

A character is a Malay when the writer tells you that he is. If the writer is silent on this issue, the Muslim name is a sure indication, unless he is further described as a convert or an Indian Muslim. His cultural background, if it is given, will confirm his identity.

As for the Malay as a race, I prefer the social and cultural definition, not as the Malaysian constitution defines it. (Zawiah Yahya, 1988: 13)

As seen above, Zawiah does not employ the Malaysian constitutional definition of Malay in her study but relies instead on a definition given by an unnamed Malaysian 'social scientist' which I have identified as Syed Husin Ali:<sup>20</sup>

For my purpose therefore, I will enlist the help of the said social scientist whose definition I will now use:

... the term refers to not only those who are settled in the Peninsula, but also includes those in the larger area of the Malay Archipelago, embracing the Malay Peninsula and thousands of islands which today form the Republics of Indonesia and the Philippines. Although they are divided into many dialects, linguistic and cultural experts always consider them as belonging to the same stock, known as the Malays or Malaya-Indonesia. (Zawiah Yahya, 1988: 13-14)

To examine the texts, Zawiah (1988: 14-15) employs the analytical framework of identifying 'major' and 'minor' characters as well as 'flat' and 'round' characters first introduced by the English author, E. M. Forster (1879-1970). Since her focus is

---

<sup>20</sup> Syed Husin Ali (b.1936) was a Professor of anthropology and sociology at Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur for 28 years and is the author of the book, *The Malays: their problems and future* (1981).

on the construction of the Malay image through an analysis of the Malay characters, Zawiah (1988: 77) demonstrates how one Malay writer 'has captured the Malayness of the atmosphere through a combination of rustic dialogues and mosaic patterning of the kampung way of life'. Zawiah's study nonetheless centres more on how the 'narrative details identify the characters as Malay', 'identified by their trades, not their traits' where 'the Malay character in fiction will be put in his ethnic perspective [of Malayness] in order to gauge the extent of his representation' (Zawiah Yahya, 1988: 14, 78).

## Conclusion

Discourse on Malayness as debated extensively by Shamsul A. B., as presented at the "Thinking Malayness" symposium and as discussed in *Contesting Malayness* clearly demonstrate the increasing far-reaching and influential issues pertaining to the paradigm of Malayness.

As I have demonstrated, discussions on Malayness focus on issues centring on or related to Malay identity and the role of Islam; for example, the polarisation of the Malay-Muslim identity tag and as a social construction of an ethnic identity. Malayness is also viewed thus far as a concept which is a product of colonial rule and is therefore a colonial invention and an invented tradition. More importantly with regard to my study is that debates on Malayness have focussed on the paradigm as a sociological phenomenon reflected in traditional and modern Malay literary works.

A new and important view on Malayness that I have ascertained is the time period in which Malayness was conceptualised and eventually came to be ideologically formulated, understood, embraced and practised in contemporary Malaysia. At least three scholars have offered their perspectives; Shamsul suggests the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century when the Malays were beginning to identify themselves as subjects of a Muslim ruler under a form of government called *kerajaan*. The year 1891 is identified as the specific year in which this ideological concept of Malayness was legalised, commencing with the participation of the British through the implementation of the Straits Settlement Census of 1891. Both Andaya and Reid

---

agree that the late 18<sup>th</sup> century can be identified as the period in which Malayness came into being as it is currently understood although Milner puts forward an alternative time period which is the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

What has been determined from the discourse on Malayness in this study so far is that literature has indeed been proven as a useful tool to explore the subject of Malayness as demonstrated in studies discussed earlier: A. B. Shamsul (2000a), Andaya (2004a), Reid (1997; 2004), Vickers (2004), Milner (1992; 2003), Tham Seong Chee (1975) and Zawiah Yahya (1988). However, I believe that the paradigm of Malayness has not been explored at length in English literature on the Malay World. In particular, Zawiah's study cannot be seen as a significant attempt at exploring the paradigm of Malayness in English literature on the Malay World because she focuses on the reconstruction of the image of the Malay character in Malaysian novels in English since 1946 through the delineating of their aspects of Malayness. Therefore, her study is based on the writings of Malaysian authors and not on those by European authors which my study seeks to explore.

Because of this substantial disparity in data, I strongly believe that we need to engage in an exploration of the paradigm of Malayness in English literary works on the Malay World as findings from analyses of the selected works will be able to refine our current understanding of the paradigm of Malayness in literature, whether they reflect the paradigm as an authority-defined social reality or an everyday-defined one. In addition, an exploration of the selected works in English literature on the Malay World may provide a new interpretation of the paradigm of Malayness in literature, that they not only reflect understandings pertaining to the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers but also to a broader understanding comprising *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity. In my opinion, literary works in English literature on the Malay World written from the late 19<sup>th</sup> to the mid-20<sup>th</sup> centuries need close attention because this is indeed the period in which most scholars have suggested as playing a significant role in the 'fluid' and 'shifting' categories of Malayness based on, among other, their analyses of traditional Malay literary texts. This lack of examination on Malayness as explored in works in English literature on the Malay World during this period will therefore be addressed in this study because I believe that these works do

contain reflections of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness and, perhaps, reflect changes in the current conception and understanding of the paradigm.

As such, I continue with Chapter Two of Part II which is a brief discussion on the literary backgrounds of selected authors in English literature whose works centre on the Malay World followed by reviews on existing scholarship conducted to date on their selected works. The analysis of the selected works is presented in Chapter Three of Part II of the thesis.

---

## PART II

### CHAPTER TWO

#### SELECTED WORKS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE MALAY WORLD

##### Introduction

I begin this chapter with a brief discussion on my definition of the Malay World to account for my selection of authors, namely Conrad, Maugham and Burgess, for analysis in this study. This includes a justification of why I have chosen their works to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. The subsequent sections are brief discussions on the literary backgrounds, basis and resources of the selected works of the authors followed by reviews on existing scholarship conducted to date on their works. The review begins firstly with Conrad, followed by Maugham and ends with Burgess.

##### **The Malay World (1895-1959) in the works of Conrad, Maugham and Burgess**

Without going into a detailed discussion of the history and politics of this region, I refer to the Malay World in this study as comprising present-day Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Brunei as well as the southern provinces of Thailand and the Philippines. The definition of the Malay World here is also a cultural one for I have combined my own definition of the term for this study with another given by Kratz (2009: 105), 'the Malay World comprises most parts of island Southeast Asia where there are Muslims and where the Malay language has been used for centuries in diplomacy, teaching and trade; or, in other words, where a knowledge of a range of registers of Malay was essential in order to communicate ...'. As Kratz describes it, the term also refers to a

Malay World ‘as a cultural region’, one which ‘cuts across and negates colonial and all of today’s national borders’.<sup>21</sup>

This definition of the Malay World leads us next to the justification of why I have chosen the works of the three authors for analysis. The first reason is due to the fact that my initial reading of their works has shown that their works, which are set in the Malay World, do indeed fit into the cultural definition of the Malay World as posited in this study. Secondly, the positions of Conrad, Maugham and Burgess as prominent authors who have written extensively on this cultural region have indeed been established in the canon of English literature as seen in notable surveys of literary works set in Southeast Asia (Christie, 1986; Hill, 1991; Dingwall, 1994). The final reason why I have chosen the works of these three authors is because their works have been discussed and debated at length by scholars in English literature (Fernando, 1990: 59-78; Yeow, 2007: 273-290), and Colonial and Postcolonial literatures in English (Hooper, 1997; Wagner, 2002). They are also usually quoted by postcolonial Malays when speaking of colonial perceptions regarding the region (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1996: 190-231; Zawiah Yahya, 2003a).

With regard to my choice of Conrad, we know for a fact that he is not English but was born a Pole, and that his fluency in English comes third after Polish and French (Karl, 1979: 7-262; Watt, 1980: 1-24). Yet, I strongly believe that we cannot disregard Conrad’s works on the back of his multilingualism for, although Conrad was a ‘polyglot’, his laboriously written works in English is yet to be satisfactorily acknowledged. Indeed, as Dettmar and Wicke (2004: 943) in their opening sentence on Conrad in *The Longman anthology of British Literature* correctly states, ‘One of the ironies of twentieth-century British literature is that many of its greatest writers were not conventionally “British”’.

Conrad is widely known for his novels *Heart of darkness* (1899) and *Lord Jim* (1900), which are works ‘at the heart of modern British literature’ (Dettmar and Wicke, 2004: 945). However, his earliest attempt at writing fiction started with works

---

<sup>21</sup> According to Kratz, this definition of the Malay World as a cultural region has in effect sidelined the following groups: the Malay diasporas of Sri Lanka and the Cape, the Moluccans of the Netherlands and Javanese of the Suriname, the Cham, the indigenous population of Taiwan and Hainan, and the Malays of Liverpool.

which are set in the Malay World, namely Malaya and Borneo: *Almayer's folly* (1895), *An outcast of the islands* (1896) and *The rescue* (1920). Described in this study as Conrad's Malay trilogy, the novels are set at a time when the Malay World had experienced approximately three hundred years of European colonialism. Important time frames, and monumental historical events and developments in the Malay peninsula and Borneo due to the presence of the Europeans begin with Portuguese Malacca (1511-1641) followed by Dutch Malacca (1641-1824), the Anglo-Dutch Treaty (1824), the Straits Settlement (1826-1946), the Kingdom of Sarawak (1841-1946), the Pangkor Treaty (1874) and British Malaya (1874-1957).<sup>22</sup>

I shall examine Conrad's Malay trilogy in this study and have decided not to include another of Conrad's novel, *Lord Jim*, with Borneo as its historical setting, because I believe that these are Conrad's often overlooked key works set in the Malay World. During the course of reviewing previous studies on Conrad's works set in the Malay World, I discovered that *Lord Jim* has indeed been analysed at length by scholars from diverse perspectives, such as in relation to its source for the characterisation of Jim, who is James Brooke (1803-1868)<sup>23</sup> (Gordan, 1938: 625-634), the source of the important event in the story which is also the focus of the first part of the novel, namely the sinking of the pilgrim ship, *Jeddah*, near Singapore (Sherry, 1966: 41-86), its representation of colonial history (Boo Eung Koh, 1996: 163-181), its narrative methodology (Shires, 1985: 19-30) as well as the psychological groundwork for the protagonist, Jim, in the novel (Baines, 1960: 241-252).

Another reason why I have limited my selection to Conrad's Malay trilogy is because I feel that little attention has been paid to Conrad's Malay characters, especially in *The rescue*. For instance, Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 88-121) has undertaken a study with the aim of demonstrating 'a strategy for demystifying power in discourse' in Conrad's *Almayer's folly*, *An outcast of the islands* and *Lord Jim* as part of resisting colonialist discourse but quite unexpectedly did not include an analysis of *The rescue*. This is indeed surprising for it is really in *The rescue* that the presence of the colonial is most noted. Krenn (1990: 136) maintains that the novel is in fact the

<sup>22</sup> For detailed discussions on the history of Malaysia, see Andaya and Andaya (2001); Hooker (2003).

<sup>23</sup> Brooke was the first 'White Rajah' of Sarawak (1841-1868). On the reign of the 'White Rajah', see Reece (1982; 2004); Barley (2002).

only one of the trilogy to address ‘Conrad’s ideas on European imperialism’ while Hampson (2000: 16) believes that *The rescue* contains aspects of ‘a history of the archipelago presented from the perspective of resistance to European domination’.

This then brings us to a discussion on Maugham’s works which I have selected for analysis. They are Maugham’s three short stories, namely “The force of circumstance”, “The outstation” and “The yellow streak”, which were all published in a collection of short stories entitled *The casuarina tree* (1926).<sup>24</sup> Maugham’s works were written when Malaya and Borneo were known as the Federated Malay States (1895-1946),<sup>25</sup> the Unfederated Malay States,<sup>26</sup> and the Kingdom of Sarawak (1841-1946).

Of Maugham’s three short stories which I have selected for analysis, only “The force of circumstance” has been analysed critically in relation to its representation of Malay characters. This story is Maugham’s only work used in Zawiah Yahya’s (2003a: 122) study on searching for an alternative position of ‘reading colonialist discourse from a native perspective’.<sup>27</sup> Using a combination of the cultural schema theory and Mikhail Bakhtin’s idea of dialogism in discourse, Zawiah (2003a: 130) focuses on the combined strategy to enable ‘the native reader to interpret the silent language and gestures of native characters which can then be set against (or dialogised with) the speeches of colonial characters’.

While I myself am quite convinced by Zawiah’s proposed combined strategy with respect to the story, I believe that her analysis could have been made more persuasive if it had also included Maugham’s other short stories which are also

---

<sup>24</sup> According to Maugham (cited in Morgan, 1980: 296), the title came from a Malayan superstition that anyone who took a piece of the casuarina tree in a boat would have his journey impeded by country winds or perilous storms.

<sup>25</sup> The Federated Malay States (FMS) comprised four states, Selangor, Perak, Negeri Sembilan and Pahang, on the Malay peninsula which were protectorates of the British. For the history of the FMS, see Winstedt (1923); Khasnor Johan (1974).

<sup>26</sup> The Unfederated Malay States (UMS) was a name given to five Malay states, Johor, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Terengganu, on the Malay peninsula to distinguish them from the FMS. For the history of the UMS, see Winstedt (1923).

<sup>27</sup> I find the term native quite offensive and obsolete because it denotes elements of uncivilised or uncultured people. However, due to the fact that the term is used in some studies and in the selected works, I will therefore continue to use the term in this study to refer to local characters. In the Introduction to *Maugham’s Malaysian stories*, Burgess (1969: xvi) states that the term native is, ‘(a disparaging word in Maugham’s day, and even in ours, though everybody in the world is a “native” of one place or another)’.

peopled with 'native' characters. My main issue of contention with Zawiah (2003a: 137-138) is her broad generalisation of Maugham's representation of 'native' characters where she argues, 'Unlike Conrad's and Burgess's Malays, Maugham's native characters are seldom given the miracle of speech, the human property which normally distinguishes man from beast.' In addition, Zawiah (2003a: 138) states, 'Maugham's natives, ...communicate through non-verbal signals, in wild gesticulations or stylised posturings, as if they have neither the mental sophistication to deal with abstractions nor the rhetorical tradition necessary for neat, rational arguments'.

Another reason why I have decided to analyse Maugham's short stories is due to Zawiah's single choice of Maugham's work in examining Maugham's representation of Malay characters. In my opinion, Zawiah's study could have been more substantial if it had also looked at Maugham's other stories which are peopled by 'half-castes'.<sup>28</sup> This is considering the fact that the main issue in "The force of circumstance", the only work analysed in her study, is the existence of three 'half-caste' children who are the results of an earlier relationship between a white man and a 'native' woman and the consequences of this union as experienced by the white man's legal wife who is white. It is this depiction of mixed ethnicity characters that has made me chosen "The yellow streak"<sup>29</sup> which is Maugham's other story with a similar theme as "The force of circumstance". As shall be seen later in the analysis, the protagonist of the story is a man who struggles hard to keep his true ethnicity a secret – his mother is half-Malay and he views himself as a 'half-caste'.

We follow this then with a discussion on why I have chosen Burgess' works for analysis. Burgess' portrayal of Malaya in his work published as *The Malayan trilogy* (1972) comprises three novels: *Time for a tiger* (1956), *The enemy in the blanket* (1958) and *Beds in the east* (1959). Christie (1986: 16) categorises *The*

---

<sup>28</sup> As with the term native before, I find this term to be quite offensive and obsolete. However, since the term is used in some studies and in the selected works, I shall use it to refer to characters of mixed ethnicity.

<sup>29</sup> On Maugham's literary source for this short story, which contains events regarding Maugham's experience with the Bore (an inrush of water, of tidal-wave proportions, that sweeps upstream when high tide compresses it into the narrow channels) in the Lupar river, Sarawak as depicted in the story, see Curtis (1974: 155-157); de Freitas (1976: 2-8); Raphael (1976: 55-56); Morgan (1980: 253-255). Maugham himself had recounted this personal event in *A Writer's Notebook* (1951a).

---

*Malayan trilogy* under 'the literature of the transitional period, from colonial to expatriate society'. According to Christie (1986: 17), although there is some overlapping of time periods, this genre of literature can be distinguished from what might be called 'the classic literature of decolonisation'. It has as its main theme the impact on colonial society of the transition from colonial status to independence. The period in Burgess' trilogy which has acted as the historical background to his novels is the British colonial administration of British Malaya (1874-1957).

However, a different perspective of Burgess' works has been proposed by Zawiah Yahya (2003a). Identifying racial conflict as the gist of his novels, Zawiah (2003a: 79) describes Burgess' works as set 'in the twilight of colonial rule'. Despite showing differences in categorising Burgess' works, I believe that both Christie and Zawiah have achieved an accord in describing Burgess' work, *The Malayan trilogy*, a particularly significant example of English literature on Malaya prior to its independence. Burgess (1963: 465) himself has written of his motive for writing the trilogy, 'Juxtaposition of races and cultures was the underground stimulus, the thing that wanted to be expressed. I really wrote this novel, and the two that followed, because I wanted to record Malaya'. It is also for this reason that I have selected *The Malayan trilogy*.

Therefore, based on the aforementioned reasons, I believe that the works by these three authors should indeed be analysed in order to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness for I view them as also contributing to the ongoing discourse on Malayness. The Malay World represented in their works encompasses themes and issues which can help us to explore the paradigm of Malayness as hypothesised in this study, namely the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity, through a close textual reading of the selected works.

Before I present the analysis of the selected works in the following chapter, I shall first present a brief discussion on the literary backgrounds of the three authors to provide us with some details regarding their works. This includes reviews on studies which have been conducted to date on the selected works. I have limited my literature reviews on the studies to those which I believe are relevant to the paradigm of

Malayness which I have hypothesised in this study due to the vast number of existing scholarship on the works. I now begin with a review on Conrad and his Malay trilogy.

### **Joseph Conrad and his Malay trilogy** **Joseph Conrad (1857-1924)**

Joseph Conrad was born on 3 December 1857 as Jozef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski in Berdyczów, Poland. From 1887 to 1888, Conrad sailed a total number of four times to the Malay World as first mate beginning in February 1887 aboard the *Highland Forest* which sailed for Java. Later, in August 1887, he joined the *Vidar* based in Singapore for a voyage to the Borneo. After a lengthy travel on sea, Conrad returned to settle briefly in London and started writing his first fiction and the first of his Malay trilogy, *Almayer's folly*, in 1889 (Knowles and Moore, 2000: 4-5).

Conrad then continued with his sea travels to places such as the Congo and Europe in 1890, and only managed to complete *Almayer's folly* in 1894. It was only in April 1895 that *Almayer's folly* was published. In March of the following year, his second novel and the second of his Malay trilogy, *An outcast of the islands*, was published. Conrad finally published the last of his Malay trilogy, *The rescue: a romance of the shallows*, in 1920 after beginning the draft in 1896.<sup>30</sup>

Conrad's three novels have been described as a 'trilogy-in-reverse' (van Marle, 2002: 284) because the novels were written and published in inverted setting chronologically. *Almayer's folly* is set in the latter days of the protagonist, Captain Tom Lingard, and concentrates on his connection with his business partner, Kasper Almayer. *An outcast of the islands* covers Lingard's days as the *Rajah Laut* (King of the Sea) and delves into his friendship with his protégé, Peter Willems. *The rescue* explores Lingard's romantic relationship with a married woman and sea traveller, Mrs Travers.

---

<sup>30</sup> On events in Conrad's life which had interrupted his writing of *The rescue*, see Schwarz (1982: 105-114); Krenn (1990: 83-103).

Conrad's sea travels to the Malay World have been discussed in detailed chronological order by Sherry (1966: 119-138) who also traces and identifies the historical setting of Conrad's three novels as being based in 'an eastern River' of Berau, Borneo. Sherry (1966: 139-141) also highlights the importance of 'Malayan settings and Malayan peoples' in Conrad's novels where he shows the nature and the extent to which they had borrowed heavily from 'serious travellers' tales'. Speaking of borrowing, Clemens (1939) has earlier suggested that Conrad had relied more heavily on a book, *The Malay Archipelago* (1869), by Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913) as the main source and basis of his Malay trilogy instead of his sea travels.

Perhaps due to this reliance on secondary sources as his major source of inspiration and reference for his Malay novels, Conrad has been criticised for his representation of the Malay characters by Hugh Clifford (1866-1941)<sup>31</sup> as not representing or resembling 'real' Malays (Clifford, 1990: 16). Conrad himself admitted in the Author Note to *A Personal Record* (1912) that, during his first meeting with Clifford, Clifford had accused him of 'knowing nothing about the Malay mind' because 'he never lived into the life of the brown people' (cited in GoGwilt, 1995: 71). Conrad replied that 'Of course I don't know anything about the Malays. If I knew only one hundredth part of what you and Frank Swettenham<sup>32</sup> know of Malays I would make everybody sit up'. However, GoGwilt (1995: 72) credits Conrad with providing more accurate representations of the 'real Malay' compared to earlier attempts by Clifford and Swettenham because, to him, Conrad had written about the Malays as a literary artist and not merely as a colonial administrator who had written about the Malays using the practice of ethnographic representation of the Malays.

Despite criticisms of his reliance on secondary sources, the plot and characters of *Almayer's folly* bear strong resemblances with Conrad's own real-life experiences.

---

<sup>31</sup> Clifford arrived in Malaya when he was seventeen in 1883, started his career as a cadet in the civil service and served mainly in Pahang (1887-1900). Spending twenty years in Perak, Clifford also learnt the Malay language and culture and socialised with the Malays. Clifford is a scholar of Malay and author of several books on Malay life, the most noteworthy being *In court and kampong* (1897) and *Studies in brown humanity: being scrawls and smudges in sepia white and yellow* (1898).

<sup>32</sup> One of the earliest memoirs of the Malays was published by Swettenham (1859-1946). He arrived in the Malay Peninsula in 1871 and, in the following years, he was appointed the British Resident in Selangor and Perak, the Resident General of the Federated Malay States and, finally, the Governor of the Straits Settlement and the High Commissioner to the Malay States in 1901. Swettenham's most outstanding book, which deals with anecdotes and descriptions of his life with the Malays in British Malaya, is *Malay sketches* (1896) with a chapter on "The real Malay".

The protagonist, Captain Tom Lingard, is modelled after a real-life person named Captain William Lingard (1829-1888) whom Conrad had never met but only heard through reputation. Gordan (1938: 622), nonetheless, suggests that Conrad had also based Lingard partly after the famous life of Brooke. While recuperating in Singapore due to an injury suffered on a trip to Java, Conrad made the acquaintances of a person of mixed parentage (Dutch and Indonesian) and the representative of Captain Lingard, William Charles Olmeijer (1848-1900).

The plot of *Almayer's folly* borrowed heavily from Olmeijer's genuine fascination with obtaining gold. However, the fictional Almayer family differs from the actual one where Olmeijer is a Eurasian<sup>33</sup> and is not a Caucasian and a country-born colonial, the real Mrs. Olmeijer is a Eurasian daughter of a Dutch colonial soldier and not a Malay of Sulu origin while the actual Olmeijer family produced eleven children compared to the fictional Nina who is a single child (Knowles and Moore, 2000: 5). The Arabs, who are Almayer's nemesis in *Almayer's folly*, are genuine prototypes of Arab traders living in Singapore (Sherry, 1966: 195-210). The jungle and river setting of *Almayer's folly*, Sambir,<sup>34</sup> is based realistically on Conrad's first-hand experience of Borneo<sup>35</sup> (Sherry, 1966: 16-40; Knowles and Moore, 2000: 43-44). The 'eastern port' referred to throughout *Almayer's folly* is the port of Singapore (Sherry, 1966: 174-194).

The reason Conrad continued writing on the Malay World after *Almayer's folly* was due to his own fascination with the Malays, 'You see that I can't get away from Malays. I am devoted to Borneo' (cited in Page, 1986: 73). Originally titled *The two vagabonds, An outcast of the islands* is set in Sambir around 1872, between ten to twenty years earlier than the period in *Almayer's folly* (Knowles and Moore, 2000:

---

<sup>33</sup> This term denotes a person of European and Asian heritage. It was legally introduced as a category on its own in the Straits Settlements census reports in 1849 (Braga-Blake, 1992: 12).

<sup>34</sup> Sambir has been identified by contemporary scholars as the remote coastal area of Berau in north-eastern part of Borneo, now known as Kalimantan, Indonesia, based on its physical geography (Knowles and Moore, 2000: 43).

<sup>35</sup> The world's third largest island straddling the equator, Borneo became caught between two powerful trading rivals in the Malay World, the Dutch East India Company (the 'Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie' or VOC) and the British East India Company (EIC). Originally a Dutch stronghold, the north-west coast of Borneo fell to the British when an English adventurer and British subject, Brooke, helped the uncle and heir to the Sultan of Brunei, Rajah Muda Hassim, to defeat the revolution led by the Dayaks and was made the Rajah of Sarawak as reward. His reign lasted 100 years (Knowles and Moore, 2000: 43-44).

264-268). As a trilogy progressing in inverse chronological order, the novel is peopled with ‘transtextual’ characters (Watt in Knowles and Moore, 2000: 373-374).<sup>36</sup> This means that Conrad has re-introduced and included in this saga characters from the first instalment, such as Lingard, Almayer, Mrs. Almayer, Nina, Lakamba and Babalatchi. However, since the protagonist of *An outcast of the islands*, Peter Willems, does not appear in *Almayer’s folly*, his character was killed off at the end of the story.

Conrad’s final instalment of his Malay trilogy which he began writing in 1896 but was eventually published within a gap of about twenty years is titled *The rescue: a romance of the shallows*. The novel was apparently written based on a range of historical individuals<sup>37</sup> and sources<sup>38</sup> and was originally envisioned as *The rescuer* before being published in sequential form as *The rescue: a tale of narrow waters*. *The rescue* was soon available as a volume publication with a new subtitle, *a romance of the shallows* and was published in book form in 1920 (Knowles and Moore, 2000: 308-311).

As befits its description as a trilogy in reverse chronological order, *The rescue* is set circa 1860. It revolves around the young and ambitious version of the protagonist, Lingard, as compared to his middle-aged self at the prime of his life in *An outcast of the islands* and a much older and jaded Lingard of *Almayer’s folly*. It chronicles Lingard’s infatuation with a white, married woman, Edith Travers, also known as Mrs Travers. Lingard’s story is juxtaposed with his steadfast loyalty and pledge to two Malay royals, Pata Hassim, a prince and deposed heir to the Wajo throne in Celebes, now known as Sulawesi, Indonesia, and his younger sister, Mas Immada. In the novel, Lingard has pledged to help the Wajo royals to reinstate their toppled kingdom. *The rescue* hence lays the foundation for the two sequels and explains the root of Lingard’s wealth and reputation as the *Rajah Laut* of Sambir.

---

<sup>36</sup> This is a literary term coined by Watt and forms part of ‘transtextual narratives’. It also refers to certain family connections which occur in Conrad’s works especially when the narrative covers two or more texts and often brings with it repeated settings and characters.

<sup>37</sup> On Conrad’s real-life prototypes for the characters Pata Hassim, Mas Immada and Jaffir, see Gordan (1938: 620-623).

<sup>38</sup> On Conrad’s inspiration for *The rescue* which came from Brooke’s own real-life experience, see Gordan (1938: 622-624). Of note is a discussion on Conrad’s source of a particular episode in the novel which can be traced to writings by Mundy (1848: 39) and Keppel (1853: 147-181).

## Studies on Conrad's Malay trilogy

While reviewing previous studies on Conrad's Malay trilogy, I had come to realise that there are evidently notable studies dedicated to them (van Marle, 1978: 161-166; McLauchlan, 1979: 113-141; Watt, 1980: 34-54). However, I have also become conscious that, although many have investigated in detail the Malay characters prominent in them, only one study has contributed its discussion to the paradigm of Malayness (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1996: 205).

I begin my discussion firstly with studies which have examined at length the Malay characters in *Almayer's folly* and *An outcast of the islands*, namely the half-Malay and daughter of Almayer, Nina; Nina's Sulu-descended mother and wife of Almayer, Mrs. Almayer; Nina's lover of Balinese origin, Dain Maroola; the Rajah of Sambir, Lakamba; his political advisor, the one-eyed Babalatchi; and the Wajo royals, Pata Hassim and Mas Immada as well as the **Illanuns** (pirates)<sup>39</sup> of *The rescue*. I also discuss in brief the female protagonist, Aïssa, of *An outcast of the islands*.

*Almayer's folly* is most notable for the events experienced by the half-Malay Nina, in particular her dilemma of self-identity which is described by Lee (1969: 120-132) as, 'the depressing aspects of the relation of white man and native woman, and of the half-caste'. Lee (1969: 129-130) focuses on Conrad's portrayal of Nina as a 'half-caste' where he argues how her 'native blood' drove her to be split in regards to her identity, 'You can make them native, but you cannot make them white.' Lee also adds, 'She [Nina] is conscious of her in-between existence and seeks for some identity of her own from her savage mother.'<sup>40</sup> Lee (1969: 131), however, praises Nina's choice of identity as a 'courageous' and 'admirable' one even if it meant rejecting her own white father.

<sup>39</sup> In contemporary Malay, pirate is known as *lanun*.

<sup>40</sup> As both the terms native and half-caste, I find the term savage to be loaded with misleading connotations and interpretations. I prefer not to delve into recent debates on the use of this term but choose to acknowledge its use by other scholars. I have also chosen not to focus my analysis on the use of this term because a discussion on this term in this study will only deviate from my research focus. On this aspect of Conrad's Malay trilogy, see Krenn (1990: 63-65); Tagge (1997: 106-111); Hampson (2000: 169-171); Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 111-114).

---

As we note the influence of Mrs. Almayer on Nina's choice of identity, Krenn (1990: 20) and Tagge (1997: 107) both forward the view that Nina's choice of her Malay heritage has much to do with not just Mrs. Almayer but with her own rejection of the white man which also happens to be the heritage of her father, Almayer. This predicament is further cemented when her lover is represented by a character originating from Bali, Dain Maroola.

This apparent contradiction in reasons for Nina's choice of Malay as her identity has been explored further in a study by Hampson (2000: 99-107) on the concepts of hybridity, cultural diversity and originary identity. Basing a huge amount of his discussion on Homi Bhabha's theory of hybridity, Hampson argues against a one-dimensional account of Nina's decision for her choice of identity; that it is just a straightforward matter of choosing between being 'brown' or 'white'. In view of that, Hampson's argument is apt because he argues for another way of reasoning with Nina's own reason or quest to identify with one single identity – either brown or white. Hampson (2000: 106) describes Nina's predicament of a single choice of identity as 'a myth of originary identity'. Accordingly, Hampson describes this dilemma of choosing between being either brown or white as impossible because Nina, whether she likes it or not, is both brown and white although she lives in a world where the browns do not live with the whites. Hampson (2000: 107) argues instead that more emphasis should be given to the contextual sequence of events in the novel which can lead us to a better understanding of her choice and decision.

Following this then is a discussion on the emotional growth of Nina's mother, Mrs. Almayer, which has been examined in detail by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 205-207) and Hampson (2000: 103, 105-107). While both studies also relate it to the issue of Nina's own identity, Muhammad (1996: 205) links his discussion of Mrs. Almayer's identity with a view on Malayness, 'She [Mrs. Almayer] becomes in fact her own woman with a strong sense of Malayness even though brought up by Lingard, a man not too respectful of Malay virtues'. Muhammad arrives to this conclusion based on the circumstances and treatments Mrs. Almayer had had to endure as a foster daughter of a white man, Lingard, and as the wife of a white man she hates, Almayer. Muhammad (1996: 205) states that Mrs. Almayer's identity has

been built by her 'pride of race' because it is retaliation towards the 'insensitivities' of a 'rough and repugnant' man.

Muhammad (1996: 206) also proposes that Mrs. Almayer's sense of Malayness can be traced to her choice of lifestyle which is the Malay culture. Although she has been adopted by the Dutch Lingard and brought up as a Christian, Muhammad singles out scenes in the novel which show strongly Mrs. Almayer's preference for her own identity. Describing this act as 'Mrs. Almayer's ostentatious return to culture and ways of the Malays... as a confirmation of identity', Muhammad (1996: 206-207) connects this act of a choice between identity and culture to his discussion on Nina where her return to Sambir, after being educated in the European culture in Singapore, signals her 'return to being Malay'.

In contrast, Hampson employs the concepts of cultural diversity and cultural recoding in his discussion on Mrs. Almayer. He describes Mrs. Almayer as a character who represents a 'different aspect of the cultural diversity of Sambir' (Hampson, 2000: 103). Hampson quotes examples from the novel which shows a 'recoding' of artefacts from one culture to another where, for example, Mrs. Almayer uses the little brass cross from her early days in the convent as a talisman against 'some bad Djinn'. Here, the little brass cross represents her convent education which she gained after being adopted by Lingard while the reference to the Djinn is encoded in her background as the daughter of a Sulu pirate.

As in most studies I have discussed earlier, the focus has been on Dain Maroola and the role he plays in *Almayer's folly* in relation to Nina's choice of identity. I would like however to touch on the issue of Dain Maroola's ethnicity as it has also been discussed at length by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 200-201). Muhammad (1996: 200) highlights what he believes is a misleading depiction by Conrad of Dain Maroola as a Brahmin from Bali although Clemens (1990: 22) and GoGwilt (1995: 82), for example, describe him as a Brahmin prince from Bali. Instead, Muhammad identifies Dain as Buginese through Conrad's ethnocentric physical description of the character.

As Muhammad points out, in ethnic terms, Conrad's use of the title Dain is a mistake as Dain, more precisely Daeng, is an aristocratic title among the Buginese of Celebes. Another reason given by Muhammad is that the Balinese have different titles from the Buginese and that they are more 'insular' and, as such, do not embark on long journeys outside their domain like the Buginese. Muhammad (1996: 201) deduces that Conrad's inaccurate portrayal of Dain Maroola as a Brahmin Balinese, but whose representation in reality is based on the ethnocentric description of a Buginese, may have been due to his contact with some Buginese sailors, settlers or inhabitants during his sea travels to the Malay World.

The issue of ethnicity has also been discussed in studies with regard to characters described as Malay in *The rescue*, namely the Wajo royals, Pata Hassim and Mas Immada, as well as Daman, who is a member of the pirates. Here, I would like to highlight views by Clemens (1941), GoGwilt (1995) and Hampson (2000) who have described Hassim and Immada as Conrad's portrayal of Malays of Bugis descent.

While Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 204) clearly refers to Hassim as a 'Malay' character of note, Hampson (2000: 177) states that Conrad's strategy of writing using an 'aesthetic visionary narrative' approach can be seen as an indication of Hassim's ethnicity, '...the introduction of Hassim can be read as grounded in the material culture of the Bugis.' This he exemplifies through the ethnographic plate of Hassim and Immada as portrayed by Conrad in the novel. On the one hand, although Clemens does not express clearly the ethnicity of Hassim and Immada as Malays of Bugis descent (in fact, she refers to them as Malay throughout her study), we can deduce as much because she draws specific attention to the 'Malay costume' worn by Hassim and Immada as depicted by Conrad in the novel. For instance, Clemens (1990: 24) points to the *sarong* worn by Immada in the novel as indicating her origin and, we can also say in light of her statement, ethnicity, 'We even learn that because Mas Immada was from Wajo in Celebes her sarong was in the "national check of grey and red"'. .

While Clemens may have involuntarily identified Hassim and Immada as Malays of Bugis origin in her study through Conrad's depiction of their attire and

through her reference to 'Celebes', GoGwilt is nevertheless more direct. In linking his discussion to earlier criticisms directed towards Conrad, of misrepresenting the 'real' Malays in his works, GoGwilt defends him by way of a previous study by the Indonesian historian, G. J. Resink (1968), 'Clifford did not realise that Conrad's best known Malays were in fact Buginese' (cited in GoGwilt, 1995: 77). GoGwilt points to the plot of the novel, where Lingard promises to help restore the Wajo heirs to their kingdom in Celebes, as evidence that the characters are indeed Bugis in ethnicity. Celebes, as GoGwilt states, is in fact a Bugis principality situated between Borneo and the Maluku Islands.

Apart from the above, Conrad's representations of Lakamba and Babalatchi in *Almayer's folly* and *An outcast of the islands* have been discussed at length also by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 200-204) and Hampson (2000: 100, 107-109). Dividing these two characters into two types of Malays in Conrad's novel, Muhammad (1996: 200) describes Lakamba and Babalatchi as representing the first group, 'those who are in power or in the process of achieving power'. Muhammad suggests that the first group plays an integral role in the plot of Conrad's novels although they are portrayed as only secondary or supporting characters. Meanwhile, the second group is represented by servants and sailors who only make cameo appearances.

Muhammad's analysis of Babalatchi, particularly Conrad's portrayal of the character in *An outcast of the islands*, is highly relevant to my study as he delves into the question of Babalatchi's 'race'. Although I recognise that Hampson (2000: 100) also examines Conrad's representation of Babalatchi, he however does so within the topic of piracy. Hampson (2000: 107), I also readily admit, discusses rather interestingly about Babalatchi as a 'vagabond' but again he does so within the scope of cultural diversity, a topic related to a postcolonial theory which I feel does not contribute much to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness.

Going back to Muhammad's study, his analysis of Babalatchi as 'a race of Orang Laut' is based on Conrad's representation of Babalatchi in terms of his profession, 'who live and earn their living from the sea, and besides the usual trading are also involved in piracy and other related professions', as well as his mannerism,

'fiery and courteous in the Malay style' (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1996: 202). The ruler, Lakamba, however is examined rather severely by Muhammad (1996: 203) for he is described as a 'negative' character that is totally dependent on Babalatchi during times of crisis in the novel. In addition, Muhammad (1996: 203-204) describes Lakamba as falling prey to his own weaknesses instead of overcoming them, not as opinionated and practical as Babalatchi regarding the non-Malay characters who have settled on his land, and quite conceited for he is only interested in saving himself from the internal infightings between the British and the Dutch. However, an earlier study by Clemens (1990: 23) praises Conrad's representations of 'Malay leaders' for they are involved in defending their ancestral kingdoms and made attempts to conduct amicable friendships with the Europeans and other non-Malay characters.

As we note the mention of non-Malay characters, only Fernando (1990: 78-90) has discussed their representations in Conrad's novels. Dividing the characters in the novels into two types, the first group consists of 'central' characters that are made up entirely of Europeans. The second group consists of 'secondary Malaysian characters-Malay, Arabs, Eurasian, and Chinese' (Fernando, 1990: 63). I have highlighted Fernando's study here because he has described the Malay characters in the novels rather interestingly where they 'are the most prominent, are depicted as noble, given to intrigue, practical, or unreliable' and 'represent the principal challenge the Malaysian region offers to the alien invaders' (Fernando, 1990: 63). Of the aforementioned view, Fernando suggests that Conrad was influenced by 'certain stock assumptions' in his portrayal of the Malay characters.

This postulation of 'certain stock assumptions', or 'stereotypes' for want of a better word, may have led some scholars to describe a much examined central female character in *An outcast of the islands*, Aïssa, as Malay in their studies. She is described as Malay by Schwarz (1980: 17) and Tagge (1997: 106) while her ethnicity has been identified in several ways in the following studies: 'Arab-Malay' (Fernando, 1990: 65), a character of 'mixed parentage' although Aïssa's ethnicity is not stated clearly (Krenn, 1990: 62), a 'young part-Arab woman' (Hampson, 2000: 117, 118), and 'of mixed racial origin' (Knowles and Moore, 2000: 2). As we can see, the views on Aïssa's ethnicity are clearly divided; she has been described as a Malay and of

mixed ethnicity, Arab and Malay, while Lee (1969: 122-124) refers to her character as a 'native' woman.

However, Muhammad Haji Salleh clearly disagrees with the description of Aïssa as a character of mixed ethnicity. According to Muhammad (1996: 205), Aïssa is of Arab origin. Although he refers to Mrs. Almayer and Nina in his study as 'Malay women' (this is of course an anomaly as Nina is more appropriately half-Malay or Eurasian due to her mixed ethnicity), Muhammad singles out Aïssa as being different in characterisation and temperament due to her Arab ancestry. We have to take note of these views regarding Aïssa's ethnicity as there are indeed some extracts in the novel, which I shall demonstrate later in the analysis, that I believe may have led some scholars to identify Aïssa as Malay.

Other Malay characters in *The rescue*, such as Daman and his **Illanun** cohorts, have been examined by Clemens (1941: 338-346) and Warren (2001: 43-69) focussing on the role of piracy in the islands within the practice of Islam. Indeed, according to Lester (1981: 137), 'Islam is such a prominent feature of Conrad's early fiction that it is surprising that it has attracted such little critical attention'. I agree wholeheartedly with Lester's statement in his essay "Conrad and Islam" because, as far as Islam is concerned, I believe that only three studies have contributed critically to Conrad's portrayal of Islam which is most evident in *The rescue*.

Conrad, it is suggested, had relied heavily on his readings relating to Islam which were available during the Victorian era. They include translations of the *Qur'an*, the holy book of Islam, in Polish, French and English writings based on the contents of the *Qur'an* as well as books about Islam and the Prophet Muhammad. Lester (1981: 176) lists, among others, writings on Islam which may have contributed towards the creation of Conrad's Muslim Malays, such as *The Jew, the gypsy and el Islam* (1898) by Sir Richard F. Burton (1821-1890), *The life of Mohammad* (1861) by Sir William Muir (1819-1905), *The darvishes or Oriental spiritualism* (1868) by J. P. Brown (n/av), *A year among the Persians* (1893) by E. G. Browne (1862-1926) and *Mogreb-El-Acksa* (1898) by R. B. Cunningham-Grahame (1852-1936). However, Lester (1981: 166-168) firmly states that Sir Richard Burton's *Personal narrative of a pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah* (1855-1856) was, without a doubt, Conrad's

---

main source of knowledge on Islam as he presents textual evidence between Burton's book and extracts from Conrad's *The rescue* which indeed proves his point.

I believe, however, that a study by Clemens (1990: 21-27) on the Malay characters in Conrad's novels is an important one, especially in relation to the role played by Islam in uniting them. Referring to Islam as 'Mohammedanism',<sup>41</sup> Clemens' discussion on Islam is quite remarkable as she makes a connection between the roles played by the religion with the spread of the Malay language. She exemplifies the 'Malay language spoken in the Menangkabo district of Sumatra' as the language chosen to be adopted by 'Mohammedan traders' for the purpose of proselytism because it was then the 'common language' and 'trade speech of the islands'. According to Clemens (1990: 23), 'Those who learned it became Mohammedan with it. As the proselytizing language of the Moslems, it became impregnated with expressions peculiar to that faith'.

The Muslim Malay characters, simultaneously referred to as 'Mohammedan Malays' in Clemens' study, are seen as 'the chief native characters' although she also points out the existence of another ethnic minority group of 'Mohammedan' who are slowly emerging as a force to be reckoned with in the islands. I refer here to the Arabs who are described as, 'leaders in commerce and in religion who have identified themselves with the Malays through intermarriage and yet kept aloof as a superior power' (Clemens, 1990: 23). Clemens makes a comparison between the Muslim Malays and the Muslim Arabs through an emphasis on their Islamic custom where, in her opinion, the Arab characters are more 'painstaking' in 'observing the practices of the Mohammedan-ablutions and prayer, alms-giving, fasting, and pilgrimage'. Nevertheless, she concedes that the Muslim Malays do use 'devout Islamic expressions' in the novels.

With regard to the two different types of Muslims, Lester (1981: 168) suggests that Conrad's Muslim Malays are less religious than his Muslim Arabs simply

---

<sup>41</sup> This term is of course entirely misleading. A most useful way of explaining this problem is best ascribed to Said (1995: 60), 'One constraint acting upon Christian thinkers who tried to understand Islam was an analogical one; since Christ is the basis of Christian faith, it was assumed-quite incorrectly-that Muhammad was to Islam what Christ was to Christianity. Hence the polemic name 'Mohammedanism' given to Islam,...

because they are more inclined to practise their faith within the realm of their own culture. According to Lester (1981: 169), this includes Malay superstitions and traditional practices. In his opinion, such information was used by Conrad to create his Muslim Malay characters as there is evidence to suggest that he may have relied on writings by Swettenham on the Malays entitled *Malay sketches* (1896). The most possible influence is “Malay superstitions” as written by Swettenham in his sketches on the Malays.

Lester’s study on Burton’s influence on Conrad’s Muslim Malays is further expanded by van Marle (1985: 139) who confirms that Conrad was indeed heavily indebted to Burton’s documentation on Islam. This is evidenced by the textual analyses of works by both writers as well as of concordances on *The rescue* where van Marle looks at phrases relating to Islam in Conrad’s *The rescue* and in Burton’s *Personal narrative of a pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah*. Another phrase introduced by Burton, which is also used by Conrad, is Mohammedan (van Marle, 1985: 142 fn 34).

As we note the mention of the Malay language in Conrad’s novels, this aspect of the trilogy has been examined in detail in many ways. Apart from the concordances of Malay to *Almayer’s folly* (Briggum, 1978) as well as to *An outcast of the islands* and *The rescue* (Bender, 1984; 1985), there is also a study on the glossary of Malay words in *Almayer’s folly* (Higdon and Eddelman, 1978: 63-79). The role played by Malay has also been investigated not only in connection to Islam but also to culture, ethnicity and identity. This is especially true with regard to a study by Hampson (2000: 167-176) based on an exploration of the dialogue and the staging of encounters which involves the switching of languages.

Although Hampson focuses only on *The rescue*, he does provide some examples from *An outcast of the islands* (Hampson, 2000: 167-168) where, in “Dialogue and the stage”, Hampson (2000: 171-176) explores the issue of ‘cultural difference through the staging of different languages’. Hampson (2000: 172) exemplifies the first appearance of Hassim and Immada aboard the stranded ship as the first step towards ‘the staging of simultaneous conversations in different languages’. However, Hampson points out that this staging of different languages has

been presented to us by Conrad through the dialogue of the European characters. According to Hampson, we are only made aware that Lingard and the two Malay royals had indeed conversed with each other in Malay simply because we are told that Mrs Traver could not understand Malay. This then indicates a cultural difference in terms of a lack of knowledge of Malay on the part of the European visitors.

Clemens (1990: 25), however, does not feel that Conrad made good use of Malay in his trilogy because, to her, Conrad had only known 'the trade Malay language'. Clemens clearly thinks highly of Malay as seen in her opinion of the language, 'Malay is a florid, highly ornamented language, full of figures of speech, bits of poetry... coined words, proverbs, and special vocabularies for particular moments of the day, occupations, places, or occasions. In itself the language tells a world about the Malay mind'.

### **Somerset Maugham and his Malayan short stories** **Somerset Maugham (1874-1965)**

Somerset Maugham, the English novelist and theatre playwright, was born William Somerset Maugham on 25 January 1874 in Paris, France. Maugham is known in English literary circles for his collection of short stories set in the Malay World, namely Borneo, the FMS and Singapore. Although Maugham is widely known for what I refer to as his 'Malayan' short stories, not much has been written of the sources behind his Malayan inspiration. Only Morgan (1980) has produced the most detailed and reliable information on the literary basis and resources behind Maugham's Malayan short stories.

Maugham and his American secretary, Gerald Haxton, set off for the FMS in October 1920 where they travelled via New York. By March 1921, they caught a boat to Singapore from Sydney, Australia and remained in the Malay states until August. They also made a side trip to Sarawak on the island of Borneo in March, 1921<sup>42</sup> (Raphael, 1976: 55; Morgan, 1980: 247). According to Morgan (1980: 251), Maugham had spent little time in Malaya, only six months in 1921 and four months in

---

<sup>42</sup> Curtis (1974: 155) provides the year 1922 instead of 1921.

1925,<sup>43</sup> but these travels appear to have been fruitful for, soon after, the first collection of Maugham's Malayan short stories was published entitled *The casuarina tree* (1926).<sup>44</sup> This was followed by a second collection, *Ah King* (1933).<sup>45</sup>

Maugham soon published a selection of stories from both collections as a single volume in *Collected short stories: volume III* (1951b). Latter attempts have been made to compile and publish Maugham's short stories in post-independence Malaya. The first collection, which contains "The force of circumstance", is entitled *Maugham's Malaysian stories* (1969a) and was selected and introduced by Anthony Burgess. Another collection of Maugham's short stories is compiled under the title of *Maugham's Borneo stories* (1976a) and was selected and introduced by G. V. de Freitas. "The outstation" and "The yellow streak" are included in this collection.<sup>46</sup>

Maugham himself has shared his perspectives on what he describes as his short stories set in Malaya. Indeed, Maugham's views are based on his travel experiences to the Malay World. In his Preface to *Collected short stories: volume III*, Maugham (1951b: 8) states, '... I put the stories I wrote in which the scene was laid in Malaya'. In his Preface to *Maugham's Malaysian stories* (1969a), Maugham writes of the places he visited and the peoples he encountered during his travels to the places then known as the FMS:

The countries of which I wrote were then at peace. It may be that some of those peoples, Malays, Dyaks, Chinese, were restive under the British rule, but there was no outward sign of it. The British gave them justice, provided them with hospitals and schools, and encouraged their industries. There was no more crime than anywhere else. An unarmed man could wander through the length of the Federated Malay States in perfect safety. The only real trouble was the low price of rubber. (Maugham, 1969a: xix)

---

<sup>43</sup> In his Introduction to *Maugham's Borneo stories*, de Freitas (1976: 2) states that Maugham's later visit to 'the Far East was in 1929'.

<sup>44</sup> *The casuarina tree* consists of "Before the party", "The force of circumstance", "The letter", "The outstation", "P & O" and "The yellow streak".

<sup>45</sup> *Ah King* comprises "Footprints in the jungle", "The door of opportunity", "The vessel of wrath", "The book-bag", "The back of beyond" and "Neil MacAdam".

<sup>46</sup> McIver (1936: 31) identifies only "The yellow streak" as being set in Borneo while the other two are set in the FMS.

## Studies on Maugham's Malayan short stories

As with the previous literary review on Conrad's Malay trilogy, I have narrowed my selection of studies on Maugham's Malayan short stories to "The force of circumstance", "The outstation" and "The yellow streak". I have also limited the studies on the three short stories to those which relate to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness and to discussions related to the unnamed mistress of the protagonist, Guy, in "The force of circumstance", the Malay servants in "The outstation" and the protagonist, Izzart, of the "The yellow streak".

As we note Burgess' (1969: xv) reference to the Malay characters in Maugham's short stories 'as the native peoples of the East', I have also found different terms used by scholars to refer to Maugham's representation of Malay characters. Guy's unnamed mistress in "The force of circumstance" is referred to as a 'Malay mistress' by McIver (1936: 32) and is also referred to simultaneously as 'a coloured woman', 'a native woman' and 'a half-caste woman' by Curtis (1974: 158). Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 122-152) refers to Guy's mistress as both 'native' and 'Malay' where she is also believed to be a Muslim. This can be seen below in her discussion on 'articulating the silences through cultural dialogue' where she discusses in passing the role played by the Malay language in determining the ethnicity of Guy's mistress:

(We are assuming here that the native woman is Malay, although Maugham seems to use the ethnic term interchangeably with "Dyak", a non-Muslim native community with its own set of moral codes. However, Doris's reference to her as a Malay and other circumstantial evidence such as the Malay Muslim servant (Abdul) talking to her in a language she can understand point to the greater possibility that she is Malay and therefore a Muslim). (Zawiah Yahya, 2003a: 148-149)

The character that is presented by Maugham as of English-Malay ethnicity, Izzart, of "The yellow streak" has also been described in various ways: as 'a half-caste' (Cordell, 1969: 176), as a character of 'mixed native and white blood' (Curtis, 1974: 156-157) and as one who 'has native blood in his veins' (Raphael, 1976: 556). Similarly, the Malay characters in all three short stories are also referred to in more than one way. For example, they are referred to as 'the Orientals' (McIver, 1936: 35) as well as 'natives' (Cordell, 1969: 176-177).

No matter how they are referred to in studies, there have indeed been criticisms directed towards Maugham's inability to expand on the Malay characters as well as on the exclusion or few inclusions of Malay characters. Although Burgess (1969: xvi) points to some exceptions to the rule, he also concedes that 'these characters are not as fully drawn as the European characters who provide the substance of the story'. Another criticism is described by Curtis (1974: 159) as, 'He [Maugham] does not grant his native characters fictional parity of esteem with his white ones: they are either sinister or shadowy figures in the background'. This is especially true with regard to Guy's mistress who is really the force behind all the circumstances in Guy's life in Kuala Solor.

Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 191-200) discusses at length the ten-year relationship between Guy and his mistress in a chapter on 'colonial constructs of native women: a postcolonial reading'. While her discussion provides useful reading for those interested in postcolonialism, her study does not reveal anything related to the paradigm of Malayness. This is because her discussion is limited to the 'stereotypical images of the white man and native women engendered by patriarchal and colonial ideologies' (Zawiah Yahya, 2003a: 194).

Of "The outstation", three studies have discussed in brief the two English characters stationed in a remote area of Sarawak, the Resident, Mr. Warburton, and his Assistant, Alan Cooper. Focussing on the theme of snobbery, references to the Malay characters are made when describing the characterisation of Cooper, for example, 'He is tactless with the natives' (Cordell, 1969: 176) and 'The assistant is ...tactless with the natives' (Morgan, 1980: 295). References to the Malay characters are also made when discussing the death of Cooper, for instance, 'Finally Cooper is killed by an outraged native' (Cordell, 1969: 176) and '...his assistant is killed by a native he has mistreated, ...' (Morgan, 1980: 295).

The same though cannot be said of Izzart of "The yellow streak". This character is discussed at length in studies since he is the protagonist of the short story. For example, Morgan (1980: 296) praises this story as a successful 'subtle study in cowardice [where] Izzart the half-caste saves himself...' and '...Maugham shows that the problem is not Izzart behaved like a coward in a crisis but that his nature will

make him blame his companion in order to throw off suspicions that exist mainly in his own mind'. Indeed, the theme of cowardice also refers to the meaning of the title used by Maugham in the form of an English idiom, 'yellow streak'.

However, Maugham's portrayal of this character is also seen as unconstructive. For instance, Cordell (1969: 177) poses the following question, 'Why does the author make the coward a half-caste? Would a hundred percent Englishman never fail to be valorous?'. Curtis (1974: 156-157) suggests that Izzart's cowardice as experienced during the Bore can be traced to his ethnicity, 'it is the fact of his mixed native and white blood'. It is along this same line that Izzart has been described by others: 'Izzart, in "The yellow streak," is the son of a half-caste woman living in London. He is secretly ashamed of his tainted blood' (McIver, 1936: 32), and 'The coward has native blood in his veins and his inferiority complex feeds his paranoia' (Raphael, 1976: 56). It is interesting to note here that only McIver has referred to Izzart's half-Malay mother, Mrs. Izzart.

Indeed, I feel it necessary to return to criticisms levelled at Maugham, particularly that Maugham has centred his short stories on Europeans who live in distant surroundings and, for example, 'capable of identifying only with the ruling caste' (Curtis, 1974: 159). Burgess, however, offers the following reasons to explain Maugham's attitude to the Malay World and its people:

In the nineteen-twenties and 'thirties, the East Indian territories which were under Dutch and British rule or protection were not yet moving in the direction of independence. ...Sultans and rajas paid visits to Europe, but they were merely colourful Oriental figures; they were not associated with power or responsibility. When a European paid a visit to the East Indies, the only Malays, Indians and Chinese he would meet were coolies on the rubber estates, houseboys and cooks in bungalows, barmen in clubs and hotels, clerks in offices, orderlies. He tended (especially if he could not speak their languages) to regard them as mere colourful "extras", with no opportunity to star in the drama of Oriental life. (Burgess, 1969: xv-xvi)

Of the criticism that Maugham undermined his representations of the local characters, Burgess justifies it as follows:

A visitor like Maugham would talk and eat with these people (and their wives) [the Europeans in the colonial society], and the Malays and Chinese would merely bring

drinks and serve dinner. Maugham cannot be blamed for making his stories centre on these Expatriates, since they were the only people he could really get to know. (Burgess, 1969: xvi)

As both the above quotes show, Burgess readily admits that Maugham's local characters are not fully explored and delved into as their European counterparts who are chiefly the protagonists of his stories.

Burgess also proposes that Maugham's short stay in Malaya resulted in him making contacts with only Europeans, such as planters, colonial officers or businessmen. As Burgess (1969: xv) sees it, 'there is little evidence to suggest that Maugham gained, or wished to gain, any direct knowledge of the lives and customs of the native peoples of the East'. Burgess, though, 'gained direct knowledge of the lives and customs of the native peoples of the East' as we shall later see. With this in view, we now move on to a discussion on the next selected author, Burgess himself, followed by a review on existing scholarship on *The Malayan trilogy*.

### **Anthony Burgess and his Malayan trilogy** **Anthony Burgess (1917-1993)**

Anthony Burgess was born John Anthony Burgess Wilson in Manchester, England on 25 February 1917. Burgess was teaching at the Banbury Grammar School (1950-1954) when he was offered a job as a teacher and an Education Officer in the British Colonial service in Malaya (Coale, 1981a: 433). Burgess' period in Malaya (1954-1957) is notably that of a historical and monumental change. He arrived in the middle of a conflict and, occasionally, warfare between the Malayan Government and the Malayan Communist Party where the Government had declared this particular period as the Malayan Emergency (1948-1960).<sup>47</sup>

Burgess was initially posted to the Malay College which was located in Kuala Kangsar, the royal town of Perak, a state on the west coast of the Malay peninsula.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> For the history of the Malayan Emergency, see Mackay (1997); Mohd. Azzam Mohd. Hanif Ghows (2006).

<sup>48</sup> Perak was then part of the FMS and the college is now known as Malay College Kuala Kangsar (MCKK). On Burgess when he was then known as John Burgess Wilson where he taught English for one term to the fifth formers, Cambridge Class of 1954, see Abdullah Ahmad (1999).

This public school, called the 'Eton of the East', is the one upon which the Mansor School in the first volume of *The Malayan trilogy*, *Time for a tiger*, was based. While in Kuala Kangsar (1954-1955), Burgess incurred the wrath of then principal, J. D. R. Howell, in a quarrel over accommodation for himself and his wife. As a result, he was transferred to the Malay Teachers' Training College in Kota Bharu, Kelantan (1955-1957), a state on the east coast of Peninsular Malaya. It was his experience in Kelantan that formed the backdrop to the second instalment of his Malayan trilogy, *The enemy in the blanket*.

Burgess himself held very strong views on religion, especially Islam, where he had seriously contemplated converting to Islam at one point when he was learning the Malay language in the late 1950s (Aggelar, 1979: 10). Burgess was struck by the reasonableness of Islam and was initially attracted to the philosophical aspects of Islam for he views them to be similar to Catholicism (Coale, 1981a: 438). This consideration of embracing Islam was further motivated by his closeness to the Malays. It was well known that Burgess spoke and wrote the Malay language well, which was back then in the Arabic script, *Jawi*.

Burgess also socialised with the Malays much to the mortification of his colonial colleagues (Stinson, 1991: 10). Nevertheless, this particular closeness with the masses, especially with the Muslim Malays, had exposed Burgess to several flawed characters whose un-Islamic ways of life are modelled upon and recreated in his trilogy, and eventually led to his disenchantment with Islam. Just like the English character, Rupert Hardman, in the second instalment of *The Malayan trilogy*, *The enemy in the blanket*, Burgess soon lost interest in Islam specifically in what he views as the lacklustre appeal of the *Qur'an* (Coale, 1981a: 438).

The first of Burgess' Malayan trilogy, *Time for a tiger* (1956), was published under Burgess' two middle names, Anthony Burgess. The success of his first novel soon led to two sequels in his trilogy on Malaya; *The enemy in the blanket* (1958) was eventually followed by the final instalment, *Beds in the east* (1959). The three novels were published as a single narrative entitled *The Malayan trilogy* (1972) in Britain. It

was soon published as *The long day wanes* (1981)<sup>49</sup> in America with a subtitle, *a Malayan trilogy*. The trilogy focuses on the experiences of a British character, Victor Crabbe, a history teacher who faces complications in his personal and professional life.

### **Malaya and the Malays in the eyes of Burgess**

As his biographer Roger Lewis (cited in Byrnes, 2007) describes it, ‘John Wilson went to Malaya and came back as Anthony Burgess’. Burgess (cited in Byrnes, 2007), in acknowledging his dues to Malaya, states, ‘The Malay language... changed not just my attitude to communication in general but the whole shape of my mind’. Indeed, such nostalgia can be found in his one and only Introduction to *The Malayan trilogy* where he shares his views on Malaya and the Malays:

Malaya consisted of a number of sultanates or rajahdoms which, except for Negri Sembilan, professed Islamic law and, in a somewhat eccentric way, subscribed to the Islamic religion. The Malays, a brown, handsome, lazy, wholly attractive race, had been converted to Islam by Arab traders. (Burgess, 2000: viii)

The beauty of Malaya, according to Burgess (2000: viii), lies in its ‘multiracial territory’ and ‘the profusion of race and culture and language’. This ‘most attractive aspect of Malayan life’ is one that he tried to capture in the trilogy covering the time from 1955 to 1957, which is the year of independence.

Burgess (2000: x) closes his Introduction by highlighting the role played by Islam in Malaya, by stating that one also needs to understand the nature of Islam in trying to understand the nature of the East. Without a doubt, Burgess has, in the past, admitted to a certain allure about the religion as it is practised in the Malay World:

... there’s a charm about Islam in a country like Malaya or Borneo, where it has to stand on its own and jostle up against other religions. See how it gets on. And it’s very amusing. It’s very touching to see how it gets on. You know, up against Shintoism and Buddhism and Christianity and what you will. (Burgess cited in Coale, 1981a: 439)

---

<sup>49</sup> According to DeVitis (1972: 39), the title was taken from *Ulysses* (1842) by Alfred, Lord Tennyson (1809-1892).

As pointed out by Coale (1981b: 38), 'The overriding culture of Malaya is Islam, and Burgess was particularly fascinated by Malayan Islam'. This aspect of the trilogy, as we shall see in the next section, has been recognised in most studies but in my opinion only in brief.

### **Studies on Burgess' Malayan trilogy**

In this section, I have limited my discussion to studies which have examined Burgess' representation of Malay characters in the trilogy, especially Rahimah of *Time of a Tiger*, 'Che Normah Abdul Aziz and the Abang of *The enemy in the blanket*, and Syed Omar, Syed Omar's son, Syed Hassan, and Nik Hassan of *Beds in the east*. I have also included reviews on studies which have discussed issues related to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness.

All studies on *The Malayan trilogy* have focussed on Burgess' representations of Malaya during the demise of the British Empire and the dawning of Malayan independence. However, within the more obvious issues of political themes, concerned with ethnic tensions and undercurrents of feeling, national identity as well as cultural diversity, are other aspects related to the paradigm of Malayness. The religious, cultural and ethnic aspects of the trilogy are the most evident issues discussed in the studies.

We begin firstly with *Time for a tiger* where the divorced-mother-of-one Malay character, Rahimah, has been discussed in relation to her position as Crabbe's mistress. Occasionally described as a 'native' mistress (DeVitis, 1972: 43; Zawiah Yahya, 2003a: 176), Zawiah (2003a: 176) describes Burgess' representation of 'Salmah'<sup>50</sup> as 'a half-hearted attempt to shatter the myth of the submissive Oriental woman'. This is because Rahimah resorts to black magic in order to win back Crabbe after he turns down her suggestion to wed her as his second wife and later leaves her. Their relationship is also discussed in Zawiah's study from an economic perspective. Describing it as 'basically a demand-supply relationship' (Zawiah Yahya, 2003a:

---

<sup>50</sup> Zawiah (2003a: 153-200), at times in her discussion, interchangeably refers to Rahimah as 'Salmah'.

196), Zawiah suggests that Rahimah wants to hold on to Crabbe more so for financial reasons rather than emotional ties.

'Che Normah, the twice-widowed wealthy female Malay character of *The enemy in the blanket*, has been examined in more detail compared to Rahimah, particularly her relationship and eventual marriage to the albino-skinned and destitute English lawyer friend of Crabbe's, Rupert Hardman. Discussions of both characters centre mainly on the role played by Islam and its effect on the relationship. For example, DeVitis (1972: 51) suggests that the relationship between 'Che Normah and Hardman was presented to demonstrate 'facets of the complicated religious and ethnic patterns that the novel explores'. Mathews (1978: 26) describes their marriage as 'the cultural integration of East and West' but with an added weight, 'in this marriage of Catholic and Moslem... there is involved most dramatically this question of integration'. This can be evidenced through 'Che Normah's 'rage for possession of his soul' where she demands that Hardman severs his relationship with the French Catholic priest, Father Laforgue, and embrace Islam (DeVitis, 1972: 51; Mathews (1978: 23-24). Coale (1981b: 36) refers to 'Che Normah's two marital requirements before marrying Hardman as to 'give up his Christian friendships and practise Islamic customs'.

Despite this unconstructive view of 'Che Normah, Aggelar (1979: 44) describes her as the most interesting 'native' character in the novel apart from the Abang. Interestingly, Aggelar (1979: 42) explains, 'she is also a strongly-willed and very orthodox Muslim'. Stinson (1991: 32), referring to 'Che Normah as an 'Islamic' widow, discusses Hardman's feelings after his marriage as 'being swallowed by her possessiveness and voracious sexual appetite'.

As with the discussions on 'Che Normah and Hardman, the Abang, the emissary of the senile ruler of Dahaga, is discussed in studies with regard to his relationship with Fenella Crabbe, Crabbe's second wife. Described as 'perhaps the greatest comic character of his sort' (DeVitis, 1972: 57) and a 'local potentate' (Mathews, 1978: 23), the Abang's portrayal as a wealthy bogus royalty, womaniser and money-orientated Malay character is the focus of studies although they also touch on the political role he plays in the novel. For instance, DeVitis (1972: 55-56) states

how 'The new politics mystify the Abang' where he discusses the Abang's concern regarding the new government in which 'white faces will no longer give orders'. As indicated previously, Aggelar (1979: 44) ranks the Abang as a character highly, apart from 'Che Normah in the novel, because he is 'an enlightened man who has a clearer understanding than most Malays of what the British mean to Malaya'. He is also described as 'a feudal lord of Dehaga [sic] whose rule, along with that of the British, is about to pass' but will survive the transitional phase due to his amassing of wealth which he plans to live on when he goes on exile abroad with Fenella (Aggelar, 1979: 44; Coale, 1981b: 35; Stinson, 1991: 32).

Of the three Malay characters I have discussed so far, Syed Omar, his son, Syed Hassan, and Nik Hassan of *Beds in the east* are the least examined Malay characters in studies as discussions on the novel centre on Crabbe's musical protégé, the Chinese boy, Robert Loo,<sup>51</sup> and the Tamil secretary, Rosemary Michael.<sup>52</sup> Syed Omar is sometimes referred to in studies as a 'Malayan' whose character represents the hostile relationship between 'the Malaysians' and the Jaffna Tamils, especially Maniam whom Syed Omar suspects of trying to get him sacked from his job (DeVitis, 1972: 58; Mathews, 1978: 28). The role of Syed Omar's son, Syed Hassan, is discussed in relation to his childish robbery attempt along with his friends on Maniam and his eventual time in jail as he mistakenly believes that Maniam is responsible for his father's loss of job (Mathews, 1978: 29; Aggelar, 1979: 41). The other Malay character in the novel, Nik Hassan, is also mentioned in studies with regard to Crabbe's drive for ethnic unity when he suggests to Nik Hassan that Loo's 'Malayan' musical composition is played for the upcoming independence celebration (DeVitis, 1972: 60; Mathew, 1978: 28; Aggelar, 1979: 47).

In her study on 'presenting uncomfortable images of imperial decline and a realistic portrait of a country in all its diversity, its richness and ugliness, and from an essentially Malayan, as opposed to a colonial perspective' as Burgess' ideological project in the trilogy, Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 165, 168) discusses the use of 'native' words as Burgess' attempt to lend a form of 'authenticity' to his descriptions.

---

<sup>51</sup> Mathews (1978: 27) has incorrectly described Robert as 'a talented young Malay composer'.

<sup>52</sup> DeVitis (1972: 59) and Mathews (1978: 28) have incorrectly referred to Rosemary as 'a Malay schoolteacher'.

However, in her view, Burgess' attempt is in reality typical of colonial travel writings and discourse. Zawiah (2003a: 174) expresses concern with Burgess' 'facetious use of the Malay words', such as **Iblis** as the name of a Malay ruler, that 'equally unpalatable Malay words have been used as place-names', such as **Kenching** (to urinate), and that Malay has been described disparagingly in the trilogy as 'an impoverished language', such as **not a real language**.

Islam, nonetheless, has been discussed at length as one of the examples of the religious encounter between the East and the West. According to Christie (1986: 22), the trilogy demonstrates that Islam is 'essentially an import, a religion of the towns, alien from the traditions of the ra'ayat and the amorphous 'numen' of the jungle'. Mathews (1978: 18) alludes to Crabbe's refusal to marry Rahimah as an example of a 'cultural' instead of a religious encounter of Western convention as opposed to Eastern tradition when he asks, 'Does it, after all, make good sense to have more than one wife?' Aggelar (1979: 38-39) credits another Muslim character, the Punjabi corporal Alladad Khan, of *Time for a tiger* for revealing to us what Islam is all about in the East, 'He is one of the dark-skinned characters in the trilogy who feel the erotic and cultural pull of a lighter civilisation, and through him we gain some insights into the Islamic culture that so fascinated Burgess'.

As shown earlier, the philosophy and practice of Islam are the main issues faced by Hardman before and during his relationship with 'Che Normah for 'The case of Hardman shows how Islam might lose its enchantment for an Englishman, as it once did for Burgess, even if he has much to gain by embracing it' (Aggelar, 1979: 42), and that 'He must accept Islamic customs, even though he believes in none of them' (Coale, 1981b: 32). Indeed, Hardman's decision to embrace Islam upon his marriage to 'Che Normah and Father Laforgue's opposition to it have been discussed from many perspectives. For example, it has been described as a form of 'professional concern' on the priest's part rather than an actual belief in Catholicism itself (DeVitis, 1972: 52) and as a comparable situation to Father Laforgue's as the priest himself is paradoxically influenced by the teachings of the Chinese Confucius (Mathews, 1978: 22; Aggelar, 1979: 42; Stinson, 1991: 32). It is interesting to note however that Hardman's conversion to Islam has been linked to the issue of identity by Morris (1986: 75), 'Hardman... seeks to revitalize himself, mend his finances, and "become"

the East through his marriage to Che Normah... which entails surrender of identity through change of name and conversion to the Moslem faith’.

Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 174-175) suggests some form of ‘conspiratorial attack on Islam’ where she argues, ‘*Trilogy* is crowded with sinners and religious hypocrites from sultans to men of religion and everybody in between, who seem to have conspired en masse with Burgess to make a mockery of what, in reality, is highly revered by the Malays’. However, Zawiah (2003a: 175) does not think that Burgess himself has a personal vendetta against Islam as she feels that ‘Burgess’ own response to Islam is ambivalent’. She believes that Burgess is more interested in the liberal practices of Islam in Malaya as a result of the religion’s encounter with the West which he feels are against the Tenets of Islam rather than the philosophy of Islam itself.

As demonstrated previously, discussions on the Malay rulers focus on the role played by the Abang as an upstart of the impotent sultan and the seducer of Fenella. Only Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 173) highlights Burgess’ display of ‘playing around’ with his historical material in his narrative on the history of the Malay sultanate in *Time for a tiger*.

While the theme of cultural diversity is evident in studies,<sup>53</sup> references to Malay culture itself is only found in discussions on the **wayang kulit**, where it is referred to as ‘shadow play’. It has been described in different ways in studies; as a ‘native shadow play’ (Coale, 1981b: 37), as ‘a native ceremony, one much like a shadow play and Hindu in origin’ (DeVitis, 1972: 62), and as a reminder of ‘religious purpose’ for Crabbe (Mathews, 1978: 31).

Apart from that, Burgess’ representation of the Malay characters in the trilogy is seen by scholars as a discussion on the ethnicity of the Malays. For instance, Stinson (1991: 31) suggests that, despite perceiving some of the Malay characters in his trilogy as ‘fools’ or ‘knives’, Burgess also views the negative characteristics as

---

<sup>53</sup> Mathews (1978: 18), for example, states, ‘In the trilogy Burgess exposes the myths about the British way of Empire, as set against the more primitive Malay traditions, including tribal religions and even voodoo’.

---

‘invariably a part of human life and thus not susceptible to any kind of meaningful correction’. Nonetheless, Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 174) states that Burgess has resorted to the typical colonialist writing of stereotypical and conventional images in his representation of Malay characters, for example, ‘the same repetition of laziness as a racial characteristic of the natives’ and ‘on native inherent irrationality ranging from the lack of logic to temporary loss of sanity’.

## Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that existing scholarship on the selected works of all three authors has highlighted issues related to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. Most of the studies have also discussed the authors’ representations of Malay characters, despite variations in describing the characters, but only in relation to the characterisation of non-Malay characters. The only exception to this is a study by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996) who has analysed the Malay characters in Conrad’s works, especially the aspect of Malayness described in his discussion on Mrs. Almayer in *Almayer’s folly*. Even then, Muhammad’s views need to be expanded so that it will contribute more to our understanding of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in Conrad’s Malay trilogy. Although scholars have indeed discussed Conrad’s portrayals of Malay characters in his Malay trilogy at length, none has made any attempts at exploring the subject of Malayness in detail in Conrad’s Malay trilogy.

The same is also said of studies on Maugham’s Malayan short stories. Although Zawiah Yahya (2003a) has looked at Maugham’s writing, her discussion is limited only to “The force of circumstance” and has not contributed much to our understanding of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in Maugham’s Malayan short stories. In particular, in view of Zawiah’s statements as discussed earlier, I shall demonstrate later in this thesis that the other two short stories which I have selected for analysis may in actual fact produce a different perspective of Maugham’s representation of Malay characters altogether. I will attempt to demonstrate that there are indeed Malay characters in the stories which are quite unlike Zawiah’s summation of Maugham’s ‘native’ characters.

---

As shown earlier, the focal point of studies on Burgess' trilogy is Crabbe, Fenella and Hardman. Although studies have been conducted on other non-Malay characters in the trilogy, for example, the Jaffna Tamils, Robert Loo and Rosemary Michael, little has been said of the Malay characters which are in actuality abundant in the trilogy. An exception to the rule is Rahimah who has been mentioned in previous studies but only in relation to her role as Crabbe's mistress. The other character discussed in the studies is 'Che Normah whose character has indeed been examined but only in relation to the English character, Hardman. The same is argued for Syed Omar whose antics are discussed in the studies but only in relation to the rest of the Jaffna Tamil characters. Despite an abundance of Malay characters in his trilogy, no notable studies have contributed critically to our understanding of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in Burgess' *The Malayan trilogy*.

As such, due to this void with regard to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in previous studies on the selected works by these three authors, I shall make an attempt to fill this gap in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER THREE

### MALAYNESS IN SELECTED WORKS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE MALAY WORLD

#### Introduction

In this chapter, I present my analysis of nine selected works in English literature on the Malay World by Conrad, Maugham and Burgess. They are Conrad's Malay trilogy, *Almayer's folly*,<sup>54</sup> *An outcast of the islands*<sup>55</sup> and *The rescue*,<sup>56</sup> Maugham's Malayan short stories, "The force of circumstance",<sup>57</sup> "The outstation",<sup>58</sup> and "The yellow streak",<sup>59</sup> and Burgess' Malayan trilogy, *Time for a tiger*, *The enemy in the blanket* and *Beds in the east*.<sup>60</sup> I have employed a close textual reading of the works in order to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness and have also examined the authors' representations of characters which I perceive to be Malay. The analysis of the works is presented thematically according to the hypothesised paradigm, namely the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity. The synopses for the selected works are presented in Appendixes 6 to 14.

#### Malayness and the Malay language

I begin my analysis with Conrad's *Almayer's folly* which opens with a Malay word, **Makan** (Eat): "**Kaspar! Makan!** (Conrad, 2002a: 3). It is uttered by Mrs. Almayer, wife of Kaspar Almayer, who is described in the novel as a descendant of **the Sulu**

<sup>54</sup> All references are from Conrad (2002a).

<sup>55</sup> All references are from Conrad (2002b).

<sup>56</sup> All references are from Conrad (1950).

<sup>57</sup> All references are from Maugham (1969b).

<sup>58</sup> All references are from Maugham (1969c).

<sup>59</sup> All references are from Maugham (1976b).

<sup>60</sup> All references to the trilogy are from Burgess (2000).

pirates<sup>61</sup> (Conrad, 2002a: 13) and through her description in the narrative, ‘...**she pictured herself the usual life of a Malay girl-**’ (Conrad, 2002: 18). These are examples that Mrs. Almayer is a character who speaks Malay and is also Malay as indicated by her ethnicity, a Malay girl of Sulu origin. Indeed, the Malay words in the novel form part of the vocabulary of Malay characters when they speak, not in the form of whole sentences in Malay but in the form of anomalous yet recurring Malay words, as seen in the example above (**Makan**) (Eat). They also refer to verbs to describe the actions performed by Malay characters, for instance, (**dapat**) (to get). Most of the Malay words used in the novel are nouns to describe places (**Gunong Mas**) (Mountain of Gold), people, (**Mem Putih**) (White Madam), and objects (**Ubat**) (Medicine).

In *An outcast of the islands*, the use of Malay is signalled by the Malay characters’ use of the language. The Malay words in the novel are used throughout the novel as a means to assist Conrad in his narrative. For instance, the word **Orang-Putih** (White-People) is used in Lakamba’s dialogue with Babalatchi regarding his description of the female character, Aïssa (Conrad, 2002b: 39), and **Orang-Laut** (Sea-Gypsies) is used in Conrad’s descriptions of the male characters, Lakamba and Babalatchi (Conrad, 2002b: 42). As with the findings in the earlier novel, the speech of the Malay characters are also not in the form of whole sentences in Malay but in the form of atypical yet recurring Malay words.

This brings us to Conrad’s final Malay trilogy, *The rescue*. Again, the speech of Conrad’s Malay characters in this novel are similar to those in the two earlier novels, they are depicted as speaking not in the form of whole sentences in Malay but in the form of the odd yet recurring Malay words. Some of the Malay words used in the novel, such as **Rajah Laut**<sup>62</sup> (King of the Sea), **prau** (a type of boat) and **sampan** (a type of boat), are used multiple times as nouns. One word, **sarong** (ankle-length cloth wrapped from the waist down), is used to describe the physical appearances of characters, for instance, in the description of attires worn by Malay characters who are

<sup>61</sup> The Sulu people are ‘a Moro people originally from the Sulu Islands, located off the northeast coast of Borneo’, and ‘were especially “well known for their audacious piracy and slave-dealing”.’ (Knowles, 1995: 170; Mallios, 2002: 168).

<sup>62</sup> According to van Marle (2002: 286), ‘the Malay title ‘Rajah Laut’ was actually bestowed upon the historical Captain Lingard by the Sultan of Gunung Tabur (in Berau) in 1862, perhaps as a reward for assistance rendered in a fight with the praus of the neighbouring Sultan of Bulungan.’

siblings of royal descent, Pata Hassim and Mas Immada (Conrad, 1950: 60-61). Although a majority of the Malay words in Conrad's trilogy indicates that Clemens (1990: 25) has been correct in her views, that Conrad had only used 'the trade Malay language', my analysis shows that the Malay words and its role in the novels as used by Conrad, especially exemplified in Mrs. Almayer's use, have indeed been put to good use as it helps us to identify the ethnicity of the character as Malay. This is particularly true as found in Conrad's narrative in scenes in *Almayer's folly* involving Nina, only daughter of Almayer and Mrs. Almayer, and her lover, a Brahmin prince from Bali, Dain Maroola.

Indeed, the role of the Malay language in Conrad's trilogy is especially highlighted through the love affair between Nina and Dain. Our first encounter with Almayer's daughter, Nina, when she first arrives in Sambir after her stay in Singapore, shows her conversing to Almayer in Malay:

**..., and a soft voice asked in Malay, "Is it you, father?"**  
**"Yes, Nina. ..."** (Conrad, 2002a: 13)

The narrative as shown above signals to us that Nina is a character who speaks Malay but we are also made aware that Nina is able to speak in English as indicated in a latter scene where Almayer appears astonished when he first hears Nina addressing him in English:

**She turned her head slightly towards her father, and, speaking, to his great surprise, in English, asked-** (Conrad, 2002a: 37)

Almayer's astonishment shows us that he expects Nina to continue conversing to him in Malay since, after all, she is half-Malay due to her mother's Sulu origin where, in her earliest physical description in the novel, Nina is described as **tall for a half-caste** (Conrad, 2002a: 13). Nina's ability to speak in English is explained to us in the narrative as due to her ethnicity also for her father is Almayer who is Dutch. However, throughout the novel, Nina communicates with Almayer in Malay which can be seen as her show of preference for her ethnicity and identity. This view will become clearer when we discuss aspects regarding Nina's ethnicity and identity in the following sections.

The important role played by Malay in the relationship between Nina and Dain can be discerned by the implied fact that they both converse with each other in Malay. This is especially true when Almayer uncovers the deception and the clandestine affair between his own daughter and the supposedly dead Dain, and tracks down the lovers as they are about to set sail for Bali. At this unexpected turn of events, Almayer makes a desperate plea to Nina to return to him. Nina, who has experienced a dilemma after being rejected by the white society in Singapore as a 'half-caste', however, chooses to abandon her white father in favour of her Malay lover. Here, Nina is asked by Dain to explain her reasons and actions to Almayer in English as seen through Dain's choice of words:

**“Speak to him in the language of his people,”** (Conrad, 2002a: 139).

Here, Nina is asked by Dain to speak to Almayer **in the language of his people** in order to stress the importance of their circumstances. Therefore, we can state that the importance of the Malay language is illustrated in the novel as the main marker embraced by Nina in asserting her preferred ethnicity and identity which is Malay.

The above examples also illustrate what has been aptly rejected by Hampson (2000: 106), the idea that Nina's predicament is simply a straightforward matter of choosing between being either 'brown' or 'white'. Indeed, I have taken up a suggestion by Hampson (2000: 107), where more emphasis should be given to the contextual sequence of events in the novel which can lead us to a better understanding of Nina's choice and decision, and have come to the same conclusion as Hampson, that Nina is able to negotiate her identity based on her mixed ethnicity as seen through her ability to converse in both languages when circumstances deem it necessary. Here, the Malay language can be said to represent a paradigm of Nina's own sense of Malayness, especially when she chooses to speak to Almayer in Malay most of the time but also converses with Almayer in English when events in the novel make it necessary for her to do so.

The role of Malay is also highlighted in a scene in Conrad's *The rescue* where the protagonist, Captain Lingard, is involved in a rescue mission and engages in a dialogue with the stranded European travellers aboard a schooner, the *Hermit*. When

Lingard is interrupted by the sudden appearance of Hassim and Immada aboard the *Hermit*, the presence of the Malays astounds the travellers, especially the English lady, Mrs Travers. In the middle of his conversation with Mrs Travers, Immada, upon realising that the travellers are merely stranded strangers to Lingard, urges him not to save them but to:

**‘Let them die!’ cried Immada, triumphantly.**

**Though Lingard alone understood the meaning of these words, all on board felt oppressed by the uneasy silence which followed her cry. (Conrad, 1950: 120)**

Conrad’s narrative as above indicates that Lingard communicates with Immada in Malay. In addition to not understanding Immada’s request to Lingard, which she utters in Malay as seen in the fact that only Lingard could comprehend what Immada is saying simply because they are conversing in Malay, the travellers nonetheless could comprehend the meaning behind Immada’s outburst in Malay as a result of Lingard’s **uneasy silence**. This particular scene indeed fits into a view by Hampson (2000: 172) who suggests cultural differences as a result of the staging of simultaneous dialogues in different languages by Conrad. However, Hampson’s view that we are only made aware that Lingard and the two royals had indeed conversed with each other in Malay simply because we are told that Mrs Travers could not understand Malay as indicated through the dialogue of the European characters is not entirely accurate. This is because my example above demonstrates that we are indeed made aware that Lingard and the two royals had indeed conversed with each other in Malay because Immada has been depicted as engaging in a dialogue with Lingard in Malay. This is also implied through the travellers’ inability to understand their spoken words.

On the other hand, in Maugham’s “The force of circumstance”, we are able to deduce that the language spoken by the unnamed mistress of the protagonist, Guy, is Malay because we are told from the perspectives of other characters that she indeed speaks Malay. For example, the first appearance of Guy’s mistress occurs within the earshot of Guy’s English wife, Doris, where she hears a commotion between Guy and an unidentified woman:

**He said two or three words in the local dialect and she could not understand.**

...**“Did you speak to her?”**

**“I asked her what she wanted and she said something, but I couldn’t understand.”** (Maugham, 1969b: 48, 49-50)

Through Doris’ inability to understand the language spoken and through the word **local**, we can presume it to be Malay at this point of the story.

The role played by the Malay language also points to the existence of ‘half-caste’ children who can be said at this point in the story is of Malay ethnicity. This can be seen in a subsequent scene where Doris shares her observation with Guy of children she had met during her morning activity of the day. While walking through the **kampong**, Doris had stopped to watch a man sending a chained monkey up a coconut tree. At that point, she had noticed also the presence of some children:

**“...I wondered if they were half-castes. I spoke to them, but they didn’t know a word of English.”**

**“There are two or three half-castes children in the kampong,”...**

**“Who do they belong to?”**

**“Their mother is one of the village girls.”**

**“Who is their father?”**

**“A lot of fellows have native wives,...** (Maugham, 1969b: 50)

As seen above, the children’s inability to comprehend Doris’ English can be seen as an indication that they are local since they cannot understand English and can only, we assume, understand Malay. We know that Doris cannot speak the ‘native’ language, which is believed to be Malay, because it is implied later in the narrative:

**...one morning when she [Doris] was sitting in the shaded room studying Malay grammar (for she was industriously learning the language)...** (Maugham, 1969b: 57)

We are also able to deduce through the characterisation of Guy who **spoke the language like a native** (Maugham, 1969b: 60) that he is fluent in Malay. And through his characterisation, we discover, in his recollection to Doris about his early life in Kuala Solor, that his mistress is indeed Malay. This is because when she was first brought to his house by his servant, Abdul, both Guy and his mistress, who was then fifteen, conversed with each other in Malay as implied through the narrative:

**She was shy, of course, but cool enough, and when I said something to her she gave me a smile. ...We began to talk.** (Maugham, 1969b: 62)

All the examples above, in particular the final example involving Guy and his young mistress, are evidence that the Malay language is a main marker in identifying the 'native' and 'local' characters in the short story as Malay. This view correlates with a passing statement by Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 149) who calls the above examples 'circumstantial evidence' due to 'the servant Abdul, who is described as a 'Malay Muslim', 'talking to her in a language she can understand [which] point[s] to the greater possibility that she is Malay and therefore a Muslim'. However, more of this will be discussed in the next sections on Islam and ethnicity.

In "The outstation", the unnamed head-boy is a major male 'native' character who is the servant of the Resident, Warburton, and also the uncle of Abas who is the servant of Warburton's assistant, Cooper. The named character, Abas, is a marked departure from Maugham's distinct style of nameless major 'native' characters but he is in fact not given a dialogue despite being given a name. Abas' actions are recounted from third-person perspectives, for example, from the views of his uncle, Warburton's unnamed head-boy. Abas' actions are also recounted from the views of Warburton and Cooper. Through Warburton, who is portrayed speaking to them in their 'native' language which is Malay, we can deduce that the 'native' servants are Malay. Here, we are told in the narrative that Warburton speaks in Malay to Abas:

**Mr. Warburton looked on him with approval, and his manner insensibly softened as he spoke to him in fluent and idiomatic Malay.** (Maugham, 1969c: 65)

While Abas is not given any dialogue, Warburton's head-boy is portrayed conversing with Warburton, for instance, when he informs Warburton what the locals think of Cooper ("**...a bad man; not good with the Malays**") (Maugham, 1969c: 82). Warburton's head-boy is also the spokesperson for Abas, for example, regarding Cooper's mistreatments of Abas and its possible consequences ("**If the Tuan continues to use him ill there will be a misfortune.**") (Maugham, 1969c: 85). In another scene, when Cooper is found with a *kris* in his heart, it is Warburton's head-boy who pleads with Warburton to reconsider his decisions regarding Abas, his

nephew (“**Tuan, you would not hang him?**”) (Maugham, 1969c: 93). All the examples clearly illustrate that, although Warburton’s Malay head-boy is nameless, he is indeed given dialogues compared to the character Abas who, despite being given a name, is not given any dialogue. Nonetheless, we do know that Abas as well as his unnamed uncle are Malay because, in an earlier scene, we are told in the narrative that Warburton converses to Abas in **fluent and idiomatic Malay**.

Meanwhile, in “The yellow streak”, we are indeed aware that the characters converse in Malay because we are told in the narrative that they use Malay as their medium of communication, for example, in the depiction of the protagonist, Izzart. We are told through Izzart’s characterisation that he speaks fluent Malay and is able to learn Dayak because he is a descendant of Malay ethnicity due to his mother’s mixed ethnicity. We also note that it is due to his upbringing as the son of a woman of mixed ethnicity and his subsequent fluency in Malay that Izzart has secured a career in Sembulu:

**It was owing to his father’s position and his own knowledge of Malay, for his mother always spoke it to him, that after the war, finding himself with nothing to do, he had managed to enter the service of the Sultan of Sembulu.**  
(Maugham, 1976b: 21)

The above example indicates that Izzart is able to speak both Malay and English but is more fluent in Malay. Indeed, this is the obvious hint to his secret that has driven his paranoia, that he is of mixed ethnicity:

**...And then a thought came to him which made him go hot and cold: he knew that the secret which he had guarded so long was a secret to nobody. ...Why should he speak Malay with such ease and have learned Dayak so quickly?**  
(Maugham, 1976b: 41-42)

As illustrated above, Izzart’s ability to speak Malay fluently, which eventually points to him as a character with Malay ethnicity inherited from his mother, has helped us to identify and define the paradigm of Malayness through the Malay language as represented by his characterisation.

Compared to Maugham’s short stories, the Malay language is a pervasive element throughout Burgess’ three novels in *The Malayan trilogy*. As evidence, about

one hundred and forty-eight Malay words are used in the trilogy for a number of reasons. Firstly, nearly all the characters identified as Malay in the novels are given dialogues in English interspersed with Malay or they are given dialogues in Malay to indicate that they are indeed Malay. Malay phrases in the novels represent a functional purpose for the characters involved, as an indicator of their ethnicity and identity.

The role of the Malay language is also evident in a scene in *Time for a tiger*. We are given a brief view on how the Malay language is used and spoken in Malaya where it is depicted through a police lieutenant, Nabby Adams, who happens to be fluent in Urdu:

**...Nabby Adams always pronounced ‘Kuala’ as ‘Cooler’. He could not take Malay seriously. It was not a real language, not like Urdu or Punjabi.** (Burgess, 2000: 61)

Nabby Adams, who finds Malay a less authentic language than Urdu, appears unhappy with the use of what seems like a distortion of spoken Malay with a mixture of English by two characters. What this particular scene shows however is a view of the way in which Malay, as a language widely spoken in Malaya, is heading. Perhaps this corruption of the proper use of Malay as a language indicates a bigger yet implicit problem:

**...Soon two officers of the Malay Regiment came in, morbidly eupeptic. One was Major Latiff bin Haji Mahmud, the other Captain Frank Harley. They spoke a facetious mixture of Malay and English which made Nabby Adams shudder.**

**“Selamat evening.”**

**“Good malam.”**

**“Apa news?”**

**“What khabar?”**

**Rivers called to the waiter, “Siap meja.”**

**“Tuan?”**

**“Get the billiard-table ready. Kita main snooker.”** (Burgess, 2000: 67)<sup>63</sup>

<sup>63</sup> *Selamat*. (Good); *malam*. (evening); *Apa*. (What); *khabar*. (news); *Siap meja*. (Get the table ready); *Kita main snooker* (We play snooker).

The importance of Malay is also illustrated through a statement made by Crabbe's wife, Fenella, to him. In a scene when Fenella returns home, she informs Crabbe that she never made it to the meeting with the Film Society in a town called **Timah** (Tin) because the car, driven by Alladad Khan, had broken down on the way there. Crabbe asks the following of Alladad Khan and Fenella goes on to discuss her view of Malay:

**“He spoke in English?”**

**“No, Malay. But I could follow him. I really must get down to learning the language, Vic. It's silly not to know Malay when you're living in Malaya.”**

**“Really, my dear. This is quite a new note.”**

**“Well, actually, there was a lot I wanted to find out tonight, but nobody spoke English. Everybody knew some Malay.”** (Burgess, 2000: 83)

This scene is an indication of the important role played by the Malay language as the main medium of communication in Malaya as seen in Fenella's statement: it is silly not to know Malay when you are living in Malaya because Malay is indeed the language of communication in Malaya.

The role of Malay is also discussed by an Anglophile Chinese character, Lim Cheng Po, of *Beds in the east*. Lim points out a rather pessimistic view of the future of Malay as a language for uniting all the ethnic groups in Malaya because, as he sees it, Malay is not a **civilised** language because it is not a language familiar to all:

**“...There's no common culture, language, literature, religion. ...Damn it all, their language isn't civilised,...”** (Burgess, 2000: 415)

Despite Lim's sceptical view of Malay as a **common language** yet to be shared by all ethnic groups in Malaya, what is definite here is that Malay has indeed become an important paradigm of Malayness.

All the above examples from Burgess' trilogy have demonstrated paradoxical perspectives of the Malay language as a paradigm of Malayness. Firstly, there have been implicit criticisms of the value and the use of the language, as exemplified in scenes involving Nabby Adams (**not a real language**) and Lim Cheng Po (**language isn't civilised**). Secondly, the trilogy highlights the improper and corrupted use of the language as evident in the dialogue between the two officers in the Malay Regiment.

What can be said here is that Burgess is presenting a worrying scenario regarding how Malay is being used for he may have believed that, for the language to be embraced and used by all ethnic groups in Malaya, it must be spoken correctly according to its appropriate grammar. Thirdly, the use of some Malay words in the trilogy, such as **Lanchap** (To masturbate) and **Kuala Hantu** (Ghost Estuary) as place-names, and **Sultan Iblis** as the name of a Malay ruler, certainly raises concern as correctly stated by Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 165, 168), they are ‘facetious’, ‘unpalatable’ and ‘disparaging’. Examples of the use of these words are to be found in the following sections.

### Malayness and Islam

References to the second paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised, Islam, is quite abundant in Conrad’s *Almayer’s folly*. However, only the Malay character, Babalatchi, the one-eyed advisor to the Malay ruler, Lakamba, is portrayed in the novel with references to Islamic rulings, namely through a ban of eating pork for Muslims. For example, as the novel returns to a scene on hand, Babalatchi admonishes a character, Mahmet, who is trying to get hold of a piece of jewellery on a corpse they have found, believed to be Dain:

“**Silence, Mahmet; enough!**” said Babalatchi, “**and take thy eyes off his anklet, thou eater of pig’s flesh...**” (Conrad, 2002a: 77)

What Babalatchi has done in the above extract is to insult Mahmet as **eater of pig’s flesh** which is a more covert way of insulting Mahmet in relation to his practice of Islam. As a Muslim, the eating of pork is forbidden<sup>64</sup> but the scene above indicates that Mahmet has committed a religious sin by consuming the forbidden meat and hence the insult by Babalatchi.

Meanwhile, the reference to the pejorative term **Kaffir** to describe a non-Muslim or infidel and the phrase **son of a dog** made by Babalatchi regarding Dain in

<sup>64</sup> In Islamic ruling, it is referred to in the Arabic word, *haram*. It is used to refer to anything prohibited by the faith. The opposite of *haram* is *halal*, meaning lawful or legal, designating any object or an action which is permissible to use or engage in according to Islamic ruling.

the following scene are actually forms of insult. It is related to, firstly, Dain's faith where we are informed through the insult that he is a non-Muslim and, secondly, to the Islamic ruling which forbids Muslims from keeping dogs. Another reference to Islamic ruling is the allusion to alcohol in the phrase **strong water** for Islam bans the consumption of alcoholic drinks for its followers:

**“Lay him there,” said Babalatchi to Almayer’s men, pointing to a pile of drying planks in front of the verandah. “Lay him there. He was a Kaffir and the son of a dog, and he was the white man’s friend. He drank the white man’s strong water,” he added, with affected horror. “That I have seen myself.”** (Conrad, 2002a: 82)

The conversations of the Malay characters in *An outcast of the islands* are also peppered with references to the Islamic faith, in particular the five Tenets of Islam.<sup>65</sup> For instance, in a scene where Lakamba becomes irritated at Babalatchi's talk of a union with his rival, Patalolo, and accuses Babalatchi of meandering talks, Lakamba's affront towards him is quickly pacified by Babalatchi, who invokes the ninety-nine attributes of the Muslim God, Allah, (**“Verily, our only refuge is with the One, the Mighty, the Redresser of...”**) (Conrad, 2002b: 39). We can also deduce through the narrative that Babalatchi is Muslim through one of his many conducts which indicates that he is a Muslim as seen through his characterisation as well as the use of words normally associated with Islam:

**...had even struggled in a pious throng for the privilege of touching with his lips the Sacred Stone of the Holy City. He gathered experience and wisdom in many lands, and after attaching himself to Omar el Badavi, he affected great piety (as became a pilgrim), although unable to read the inspired words of the Prophet.** (Conrad, 2002b: 42)

**the Holy City** in the above extract refers to the Muslim holy city of Mecca where the fifth Tenet of Islam is to perform the *Haj* pilgrimage. One of the stages of the pilgrimage includes touching **the Sacred Stone** believed to have been touched by the Prophet Muhammad himself, hence the phrase **struggled in a pious throng for the**

---

<sup>65</sup> The five Tenets of Islam are (1) Professing the *Syahadah*, meaning professing Allah as the sole God and accepting the Prophet Muhammad as the final Messenger of God, (2) *Solat* or performing prayers five times a day, (3) *Zakat* or alms-giving to the poor, (4) *Saum* or compulsory fasting during the Islamic month of *Ramadhan*, and (5) To perform the *Haj*, a pilgrimage to the holy city of Mecca in Saudi Arabia.

**privilege of touching with his lips.** Meanwhile, **unable to read the inspired words of the Prophet** refers to Babalatchi, although now a *Haji* because he has performed the *haj* pilgrimage, is unable to read the *Qur'an*, where the *Qur'an* is believed to have been transcribed verbatim by the Prophet Muhammad based on the words spoken directly to him by the Muslim God, Allah.

Dialogues between non-Muslim and Muslim characters in *The rescue* also reveal aspects related to Islam, for example, phrases relating to Islam are noted in conversations between Lingard and Jaffir, a Malay character who is Hassim's loyal servant. Jaffir's dialogue indeed contains references to the ninety-nine attributes of the Muslim God, Allah; for example, in a scene where he explains to Jörgenson, Lingard's old Norwegian friend, the importance of the emerald ring he is asked to deliver to Lingard (**by Allah, Our refuge is with Allah and By the mercy of Allah, the compassion of the Most High**) (Conrad, 1950: 307-308).

Another example connected to Islam is to be found in a scene where Lingard claims he never did receive Hassim's emerald ring as a signal of distress and help and, in his explanation to Lingard, Jaffir says: **'We gave it to the white woman – may Jehannum be her lot!'** (Conrad, 1950: 365). Here, Jaffir is expressing his anger towards Mrs Travers by cursing her to basically 'go to hell' for not passing the emerald ring to Lingard where the term **Jehannum** is an Arabic word for Hell. Therefore, the dialogue as manifested in the conversations of Lakamba, Babalatchi and Jaffir as well as the narratives in the novels as I have just discussed do indicate that they contain 'devout Islamic expressions' as rightly pointed out by Clemens (1990: 23).

Of Conrad's Malay trilogy, *The rescue* by far contains the most explicit references to Islam which are portrayed by the Malay characters in various episodes. The first episode refers to the weekly Friday prayers which is compulsory for male Muslims and led by the pirate Ningrat as *imam* (head) of the prayer congregation. The reference to Ningrat's long speech to the attendees is attributed to the Friday sermon:

**Next day, which was a Friday, Ningrat after reading the prayers in the mosque talked to the people outside. He bleated and capered like an old goat,**

**prophesying misfortune, ruin, and extermination if these whites were allowed to get away.** (Conrad, 1950: 143)

Other examples in the novel which support the view that the pirates are Muslims can be found in a picture of Daman given from Hassim's view:

**Daman sat crosslegged upon a little carpet with an open Koran on his knees and chanted the verses swaying to and fro with his eyes shut. ...The Koran, in a silk cover, hung on his breast by a crimson cord.** (Conrad, 1950: 182, 183)

As the above example indicates, the mention of the holy book of Islam, **Koran**, and the implicit reference to its use demonstrate that the **Illanuns** are indeed Muslims. The extract suggests a picture of Daman reciting the *Qur'an* on the prayer mat for Conrad writes how he **chanted the verses to and fro with his eyes shut**. The example then indicates that the Malay pirates subscribe to the Islamic faith.

Through the depiction of another Malay character, the pirate Belarab, whose appearance in the novel is recounted from Jörgenson's memories in his conversation with Lingard, we can see traces of Islamic undertone as indicated in the phrase **Mohammedan**:

**'I was the white man who advised the chiefs of Manangkabo. There was a lot about me written in the Dutch papers at the time. They said I was a Frenchman turned Mohammedan—'** (Conrad, 1950: 91)

The significance of this episode is with regard to the phrase **Mohammedan** for here we can clearly see, in his conversation with Lingard, Jörgenson mentions how his past association with the Muslim community in the region had earned him the misleading label of a **Frenchman turned Mohammedan**. He is actually a Norwegian who, due to his close relationship with Muslims, is thought to have embraced the Islamic faith. The term **Mohammedan** traces its origin to the 19<sup>th</sup> century Western world which erroneously identified the followers of Islam according to the name of its prophet as rightly highlighted by van Marle (1985: 142 fn 34).

Another example pertaining to Islam is to be found in a flashback scene where, prior to the reunion between Mrs Travers and her kidnapped husband, Lingard

presents Mrs Travers with a **scarf** before they are about to enter into a hostage negotiation with the pirates:

**Lingard said hurriedly to Mrs Travers that the man had met white people before and should he attempt to shake hands with her, she ought to offer her own covered with the end of her scarf.** (Conrad, 1950: 139-140)

**He pulled out a long and wide scarf of white silk embroidered heavily on edges and ends, and begged her to put it over her head and arrange the ends so as to muffle her face, leaving little more than her eyes exposed to view. – ‘We are going amongst a lot of Mohammedans,’ he explained...** (Conrad, 1950: 235)

The covered handshake as instructed by Lingard to Mrs Travers in the first extract above refers to a particular norm which is actually part of Islamic rule prohibiting contact between both Muslim men and women who do not share family ties with each other or are strangers. The second extract refers to Islamic ruling regarding the veiling of the head for females. These rules refer to the concept of *mahram* in Islamic syariah legal terminology where females are only allowed to shake the hands of *mahram* and to unveil their heads for *mahram* only. The reason for this instruction is presented through a dialogue between Lingard and Mrs Travers; they are about to enter the domain of the **Illanuns** who are **Mohammedans**, meaning Muslims.

The above scene regarding the veiling of the head is also reminiscent of a portrayal of the character Aïssa of *An outcast of the island*. Through Lingard’s reference to the same faith which she shares with the Arabs, in a scene where Lingard chastises and advises her to leave Willems and join Syed Abdulla, **who is your own faith** (Conrad, 2002b: 190), we know for sure that Aïssa is a Muslim. Another example can be seen through Willems’ objection to her veiling herself:

**The upper part of her body was wrapped up in the thick folds of a head covering which was pulled down over her brow, and one end of it thrown across from shoulder to shoulder hid the lower part of her face. Only her eyes were visible –** (Conrad, 2002b: 99-100)

As demonstrated by the above examples from *An outcast of the islands* and *The rescue*, some depictions of the cultural practice in the novels are fused with Islamic rulings, for instance, the veiling of the head is in accordance with the Islamic

requirement of concealing one's head with a veil for female Muslims but the practice of covering up the face is questionable with regard to its cultural origin. One possible view is that it has been the practice of female Arab Muslims and has been adopted by Muslims elsewhere. This depiction of Islamic practice is best explained by Knowles and Moore (2000: 178-179) as a result of Conrad's contacts with Arabs in Singapore (1887-1888). Hence, the exposure to the religion of Islam through his earlier contacts with the Arabs may have prompted Conrad to set the background of his Malay trilogy with references to the region's predominant religion because this would render his trilogy more believable. Indeed, Conrad's Malay trilogy demonstrates that Conrad had investigated Islam deeply and had created his representations of Islam in his novels appropriately. As van Marle (1985: 139) claims, Conrad had almost a century ago begun a valiant effort to present Islam as best as he could from within. This he undertook on the basis of factual descriptions within his reach rather than looking at Islam through traditional glasses in a depressing manner.

Although Islam is a dominant aspect in Conrad's novels, there is no overt mention at all of Islamic rulings or practices in all of Maugham's short stories. My analysis of Islam, which points to it being absent in Maugham's short stories, is also another reason why I am quite perplexed as to why Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 148-149) has identified Guy's mistress as a Muslim. As I see it, Zawiah has arrived to this conclusion through her own assumption based on Maugham's representation of Guy's servant, Abdul: the 'Malay Muslim servant (Abdul) talking to her in a language she can understand point[s] to the greater possibility that she is Malay and therefore a Muslim'. I would like to conjecture here then that Zawiah may have deduced that Guy's servant is Muslim through Maugham's use of the name Abdul, which originates from Arabic (meaning 'servant'), as a name belonging to a Muslim in the Malayan context. Nonetheless, while Islam is non-existent in Maugham's short stories, the opposite is true for Burgess' three novels. In *The Malayan trilogy*, Islam is illustrated predominantly as one of the paradigm of Malayness, its presence both explicit and implicit.

*Time for a tiger* opens with a chapter which contains an explicit reference to Islam in a scene depicting a call to prayers by the muezzin. This particular scene includes the first part of *Syahadah*, *La ilaha illa'lah* (There is no God only Allah), the

first Tenet of Islam where one proclaims belief in the mono-deity of Allah as God. A mention of **a trip to Mecca** refers to the fifth Tenet of Islam, to perform the *Haj* pilgrimage in the holy city of Mecca in Saudi Arabia:

*“La ilaha illa’lah.”*

Like a lonely Rhine-daughter he sang the thin liquids, remembering again the trip to Mecca he had made, out of his own money too, savings helped by judicious bets on tipped horses and a very good piece of advice about rubber given by a Chinese business-man. Gambling indeed was forbidden, *haram*, but he had wanted to go to Mecca and become a *haji*. By Allah, he had become a *haji*, Tuan Haji Mohammed Nasir bin Abdul Talib, and, by Allah, all would be forgiven. Now, having seen the glory of the great mosque at Mecca, the *Masjid-ul-Haram*, he despised a little his superstitious fellow-countrymen who, ostensibly Muslim, yet clung to their animistic beliefs and left bananas on graves to feed the spirits of the dead. He had it on good authority that Inche Idris bin Zainal, teacher in the school and a big man in the Nationalist Movement, had once ordered eggs and bacon in a restaurant in Tahi Panas. He knew that Inche Jamaluddin drank brandy and that Inche Abu Zakaria sneaked off to small villages during the fasting month so that he might eat and drink without interference from the prowling police.

*“La ilaha illa’lah.”* (Burgess, 2000: 11-12)

The above extract also contains a mention of *haram* which alludes to practices strictly forbidden in Islam. The first is gambling where the money won from the practice cannot be used for any purposes related to the Tenets of Islam. In the case of **Tuan Haji Mohammed Nasir bin Abdul Talib**, we are told that he had used his winnings from gambling (**savings helped by judicious bets on tipped horses**) to pay for his pilgrimage to the *Haj*. This act is, of course, *haram* according to Islamic ruling. Secondly is the worship of other entities apart from Allah which entails *syirik* where Muslims are forbidden to share their worship of Allah with that of any other creatures and to ascribe partners to Allah as sharers of His Divinity. In the extract, examples of such *haram* practices are **animistic beliefs** and leaving **bananas on graves to feed the spirits of the dead**. Thirdly is the consumption of forbidden meats, such as pork, as seen in the case of **Inche Idris bin Zainal** who consumed **bacon** in a restaurant in **Tahi Panas** (Hot Excrement). Next is the consumption of alcoholic drinks as portrayed by **Inche Jamaluddin** who **drank brandy**. Lastly is the non-compliance of fulfilling the fourth Tenet of Islam, namely the obligatory fasting during the Islamic month of *Ramadhan* from sunrise to sunset. This is depicted in the scene by **Inche Abu Zakaria** who had **sneaked off to small villages during the fasting month so that he might eat and drink without interference from the prowling police**.

In one of the scenes in the *The enemy in the blanket*, the Islamic ban on alcoholic consumption is stated explicitly in a dialogue uttered by a non-Muslim character to a Muslim Malay character: **it is forbidden by your religion**. There is also a satirical reference to **Agents of the Supreme Council of Islam**, perhaps to describe the existence of Muslim officers from Islamic institutions who are tasked to keep tabs on activities by Muslims in the town. In the scene, an owner of **the Grand Hotel, Auntie**, tries to collect a drinking debt (**One hundred and fifty dollars**) from a Muslim Malay customer (**Che Abdul Kadir bin Mohamed Salleh**) through the telephone:

**“I have my way to pay too. I have my creditors to meet. If you cannot afford to drink then you should not drink. Besides, it is forbidden by your religion to drink...”** She intoned to the tea-drinkers: **“Che Abdul Kadir bin Mohamed Salleh. Haji Ali College. One hundred and fifty dollars.”** The tea-drinkers listened, the slightest pain of sympathy in their eyes. One or two men took down the name on cigarette packets. **Blackmailers? Agents of the Supreme Council of Islam?** (Burgess, 2000: 208-209)

In addition, the role of Islam as a religion is questioned by a Muslim Malay character, Abdul Kadir, in *The enemy in the blanket*. He manages to pose **provocative questions** regarding Islam (**“What is religion?”; “Why cannot Islam develop a more progressive outlook?”**) even when he is intoxicated:

**...He regularly apologised for the fact, calling at friends’ houses to express regret for his inability to return past hospitality, continuing the apologies over the hastily-laid extra dinner-place, the beer that had to be sent for, forgetting the apologies over the final nightcap, when he would ask provocative questions as: “What is religion?” “Why do we allow the white man to stay?” “Why cannot Islam develop a more progressive outlook?”** (Burgess, 2000: 230)

It is also interesting to note how Abdul Kadir’s embarrassed friends excuse his transgressions as a Muslim (**swigging a whole bottle of Benedictine at a sitting**) by linking it to his ethnicity (**he was no true Malay**):

**His friends were, in a distracted way, ashamed of him, but the shame was of such long standing that it had transmuted itself into a kind of social affection. His penury was looked upon as a sort of holy idiocy, and he was granted such privileges as swigging a whole bottle of Benedictine at a sitting, being sick in the ash-trays, using vile English obscenities he had learned in the Navy. Much could be excused him anyway, for he was no true Malay.** (Burgess, 2000: 230)

The depictions of the hypocritical practices of the wayward Muslims in the trilogy as I have just presented help to explain why Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 174-175) has suggested that Burgess had formed some ‘conspiratorial attack on Islam’ and had made ‘a mockery of what, in reality, is highly revered by the Malays’. While the analysis explicitly points to this view, another rational explanation can be ascribed to Burgess’ own personal feelings towards Islam where he was initially struck by the reasonableness and philosophical aspects of Islam (Coale, 1981a: 483) but grew disillusioned when he must have been exposed to what he perceived to be un-Islamic ways of life of some Muslim Malays when he socialised with them while he was in Malaya (Stinson, 1991: 10).

In my opinion, however, these depictions of wayward Muslim Malays can be construed as Burgess’ implicit appeal to the Malays to reassess how their liberal practices of Islam have led to the negative perceptions of Islam in the eyes of non-Malays as an unreasonable and a bigoted religion, a point which will be discussed later in this section. This view – Burgess’ implicit appeal to the Malays to reassess their liberal practices of Islam – can be discerned through the advice given by the French Catholic priest, Father Laforgue, of *The enemy in the blanket* in a scene involving Hardman, who is contemplating his conversion to Islam upon his marriage to ‘Che Normah:

**“...If you are going to be a Muslim why not be a real one? It is better than being tepid...”** (Burgess, 2000: 241)

Such advice coming from a non-Malay and non-Muslim character strengthens my view, that Burgess in actuality held the philosophy of Islam highly as emphasised by Aggelar (1979: 10). That is the reason why Father Laforgue is keen to point out that if one were to become a Muslim, one must be a genuine one and not a half-hearted one. Such view is also shared by Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 175) when she concedes, despite her earlier censure of Burgess, that she does not think that Burgess has a personal vendetta against Islam but that his response to Islam is ‘ambivalent’. In my opinion, it is ambivalent because there are rare instances in the trilogy when Islam

is portrayed to be a noble religion in principle as seen in Father Laforgue's advice but is more often depicted negatively in terms of its practices by its followers.

The negative perceptions of Islam as an unreasonable and a bigoted religion in the eyes of the non-Malay characters due to its practices by some Muslim Malays, as we can see in the following example, have led one of the Jaffna Tamil characters, Parameswaran, of *Beds in the east* to present his overall perceptions of the Malays with references to their Islamic practices:

**"...There's a core of shiftlessness about the Malays. They know they're no good, but they try to bluster their way out of things. Look what they're trying to do here. They're trying to close the bars and the dance-halls and the Chinese pork-market, in the sacred name of Islam. But they've no real belief in Islam. They're hypocrites, using Islam to assert themselves and lord it over people..."** (Burgess, 2000: 408)

As seen above, the Malays are viewed deprecatingly by non-Malay characters as hypocrites who are trying to assert their power through **the sacred name of Islam** and imposing its ruling upon non-Malays (**They're trying to close the bars and the dance-halls and the Chinese pork-market**). This view is understandable considering the transgressions committed by some Muslim Malays who have not indeed practised Islam according to its tenets as we have seen in the earlier examples. This is also why it is assumed by non-Malays that Malays are not true believers of Islam and are hypocrites who are merely using Islam to wield influence and power over them. Such belief, as voiced by a Tamil character, is also repeated by a Chinese character, Lim Cheng Po, who links the subject of Islam with the subject of nation-building. Highlighting a non-existent common religion among the people of Malaya in order to unite all the ethnic groups, a direct criticism in the way Islam is practised by the Malays is contained in the view that: **"...their version of Islam is unrealistic and hypocritical."** (Burgess, 2000: 415).

Burgess' trilogy also demonstrates that Islamic law is a thorny subject with non-Muslim societies as it is looked upon by members of other religious faiths with anxiety as seen especially in the above examples. Islamic law as implemented by Muslim Malays in the trilogy highlights a number of transgressions in the eyes of

Islam, such as consuming alcoholic drinks, engaging in prostitution and committing adultery. They are in turn described as **crimes**. The trilogy shows that Islamic law does not only apply to Muslims but also anyone, meaning non-Muslims, who are conspirators in these **crimes (report any Malayan of any race or religion whatsoever found assisting or encouraging any Muslim to commit these crimes)**. As seen below, the Muslim character Syed Omar of *Beds in the east*, a clerk with the police force, is in the Police Headquarters busy typing out new orders:

**...He had just typed out orders to the police, instructing them that, on high religious authority, they must arrest any Muslim found drinking intoxicants, any Muslim woman plying the trade of dance-hostess, café-waitress or lady-of-the-town, any Muslim – man or woman – found in the act of committing or being about to commit or having committed adultery. They must also report any Malayan of any race or religion whatsoever found assisting or encouraging any Muslim to commit these crimes...** (Burgess, 2000: 431-432)

But the hypocrisy of the Islamic ruling, as the novel indicates, lies not with the Islamic law itself but with its implementation by its own followers. Syed Omar, for example, despite being one of the law, immediately breaks the rule when he orders brandy and ginger ale in a restaurant owned by a Chinese character, Loo Kam Fatt:

**...Syed Omar loudly ordered a brandy and ginger ale. Loo Kam Fatt said: "Cannot do. You Malay. Police say no." Syed Omar said "I am the police. You can serve me. You must serve me. I am the police."** (Burgess, 2000: 439)

Interestingly, when he is denied the order by the owner, Loo, it is not due to his religion but to his ethnicity (**Cannot do. You Malay**). Nowhere in the scene does it state explicitly that Syed Omar cannot be served alcohol because he is a Muslim. This suggests then a concurrent view of this understanding: a Malay is a Muslim.

This overlapping of Malay-Muslim identity as an issue faced by the Malays is also one which is represented in the novel through Syed Omar. When he discusses issues concerning **the Malay youth** with his son, Syed Hassan, and friends, he does so by highlighting issues pertaining to Islam, for example, about the fate of Islam in Malaya:

**"...What's happening to the Malay youth of to-day?" he said. "Where are the good old Muslim principles your elders tried to teach you?"..."What will**

**happen to Islam when it's left to milksops like you to defend it?..."** (Burgess, 2000: 439-440)

When one of Syed Hassan's friends, Hamzah, jokes with Syed Omar that he can win a fight with him after five rounds, Syed Omar responds with the following:

**"That's right," he said. "Pick on me, the enemies of Islam and the enemies of the Malays are all around you, and you talk about knocking me out. Me, the same age as your father, me, a member of your own race. You sit there drinking horrible sweet drinks, and all around are enemies"** (Burgess, 2000: 440)

As seen above, Syed Omar makes a distinction between issues regarding Islam and issues regarding the Malays when speaking of the Malays in general. Among the Malays themselves, as represented by Syed Omar in his conversation with his son and friends, it is suggested that there is a different dilemma and problem altogether. It appears that Islam is a separate issue on its own in intra-Malay society: **the enemies of Islam and the enemies of the Malays are all around you**. There are, as indicated in the novel, two types of **enemies** faced by the Malays: **the enemies of Islam** (those who pose a threat to their religion) and **the enemies of the Malays** (those who pose a threat to issues perceived to be important to the Malays, one of them, it is assumed, being their religion, Islam).

In the novel, for instance, **the enemies of Islam** come in the form of the non-Muslims and the non-Malays, for example, when Crabbe is sent to a local Anglo-Chinese School to investigate a strike by its pupils, this particular incident is somehow believed to be a consequence of Syed Hassan's juvenile exploit of breaking into the house of a Jaffna Tamil character, Sundralingam, with his friends but is however caught. As seen in the following extract, Syed Hassan's action has started a series of events among the community:

**And this tiny revolt, by some kind of chain reaction, was connected to Syed Hassan's foolish escapade. ... The Malays, it was said, had started to rise: parang and kris were being sharpened. They had begun to make a breakfast of the Tamils, they licked their lips at the prospect of a great Chinese dinner. ... Now he was out on bail of five hundred dollars, which Crabbe, of course, had had to find. And now there were some who were saying that Crabbe was behind the coming rising of the Malays: he had, they said, secretly married his amah and had entered Islam.** (Burgess, 2000: 464)

As seen above, animosity on the part of the non-Malays is detected when Crabbe is believed to have become part of the Malay rising as indicated by his rumoured embracing of Islam (**entered Islam**) by secretly marrying his **amah** (servant). Therefore, what this shows is that Crabbe is assumed to have ‘become’ one of the Malays because he has embraced Islam and become a Muslim. Thus, by becoming a Muslim, it is simultaneously assumed that Crabbe has become a Malay. This is also why I have suggested earlier that **the enemies of Islam** are both the non-Muslims and the non-Malays. We can deduce, however, that **the enemies of the Malays** are depicted as based on ethnicity, the non-Malays, as the extract above depicts the Malays starting **to rise** against the **Tamils** and the **Chinese**.

A reference to the act of conversion to Islam, as indicated by its literal translation from Malay (*masuk Islam*), **enter Islam**, is also depicted in the trilogy through the representation of the Malay characters. For example, the Malay character, Rahimah, Crabbe’s divorced mistress of *Time for a tiger*, is described as one of the many Malays who have been forced by society into prostitution due to her stigmatised status as a divorcée. Islam, as shown in the extract below, is a humane and conventional religion but it is juxtaposed with the rigidity of law as opposed to society’s sense of humanity:

**She was a divorcée, thrown out by her husband on some thin pretext backed by the grim male force of Islamic law. She had one child, a small boy called Mat. Two unlaborious professions only were open to Malay divorcées, and in practice the higher embraced the lower. A dance-hostess earned little enough in such places as this, and the descent from polygamous wedlock to prostitution seemed a mere stumble.** (Burgess, 2000: 38)

As indicated above, the novel contains references to Islamic marital law which permits the practice of polygamy, where a Muslim man is allowed to marry and maintain four wives at a single period of time. In one scene, for instance, a desperate Rahimah impels Crabbe to leave **Kuala Hantu** and live together with her. When Crabbe reminds her of the existence of his wife, Fenella, and refuses, Rahimah provides the only possible solution to his marital hindrance:

**“You could enter Islam. Four wives are allowed. But two surely would be enough.”** (Burgess, 2000: 70-71)

As seen above, the phrase **enter Islam**, referring to the act of converting to Islam, is again noted. Rahimah informs Crabbe that converting to Islam allows Crabbe, as a Muslim, to practise polygamy and thus wed Rahimah as his second wife. Crabbe's refusal to marry Rahimah, however, has been described rather erroneously by Mathews (1978: 18) as an example of a 'cultural' 'Eastern tradition' whereas we know that marrying Rahimah as his second wife is not a 'cultural' 'Eastern tradition' unless one is a Muslim and of course this is now a religious matter.

As we recall Crabbe's predicament regarding Rahimah's request for conversion to Islam in order for him to legally marry her as his second wife, the issue of conversion to Islam also involves the quandary faced by the non-Muslim and non-Malay character, Hardman, of *The enemy in the blanket*. It involves the dilemma faced by Hardman when he is informed that marrying Muslim women entails a conversion to Islam (**enter Islam**). The rationalisation given by his best friend, the Malay character, Haji Zainal Abidin, as seen below prompts Hardman to reconsider his decision to marry the Malay widower, 'Che Normah, as marrying her means he has to change his religious faith:

**"There's no way out, is there?" said Hardman. "If I marry her I'll have to enter Islam."**

**"And why should you not?" stormed Haji Zainal Abidin. "It is the true religion, you Christian bastard. It is the only one. The rest are mere imitations."**

**"Oh, you just don't understand." Hardman felt hopeless again. Soon he said, "You'll have to help me find a name. A Muslim name." (Burgess, 2000: 217)**

Such puritanical response to Hardman's hesitation to embrace Islam is illustrated by Haji Zainal Abidin when he replies that Islam is **the true religion** while **the rest are mere imitations**. The above extract demonstrates indeed Hardman's true internal dilemma that, to him, a conversion to Islam necessitates a conversion of identity as seen by his request to Haji Zainal Abidin to help him **find A Muslim name**. This is indeed the reason why Morris (1986: 75) has suggested that his marriage to 'Che Normah 'entails surrender of identity through change of name and conversion to the Moslem faith'. Morris' view however is not quite true as, technically, the process of conversion to become a Muslim has to be undertaken first followed by a change of name, only if one wanted to.

Hardman's plan to convert to Islam upon his marriage to 'Che Normah has made Father Laforgue persuade Hardman to reconsider his decision:

**"...I haven't apostatised; I'm just pretending to be a Muslim."  
 "It isn't just a question of what you believe but of what you do," said Father Laforgue. "By the mere act of going to the mosque..."  
 "But I shan't go to the mosque."  
 "But you will not be able to receive the sacraments, go to mass. You'll be under Islamic law, remember. Islam is mainly custom, mainly observance. There is very little real doctrine in it, only beliefs in one God, which they think so original." (Burgess, 2000: 239-240)**

While the above extract shows criticism of Islam (**very little real doctrine in it**) as Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 174-175) has objected to, Father Laforgue also acknowledges the practical aspect of Islam (**isn't just a question of what you believe but of what you do**), that it is a religion which is a way of life, hence the words **custom** and **observance**. This then ties in with Burgess' own depictions of the wayward Muslims as I analysed earlier for it is indeed their ways of life which have disillusioned others from respecting Islam as a religion because its philosophies, Tenets of Islam, are not in principle practised by its followers.

Burgess' representation of Hardman also contains another example of Islamic marital law in the trilogy which is the Islamic legal practice of divorce, **nusus**, an Islamic term to apply to women who refuse cohabitation with their husbands. When Hardman tries to convince Father Laforgue that he will only be cohabiting with his Muslim wife without having carnal knowledge, Father Laforgue warns him of the possible consequence of Islamic marital law:

**...“You know your own nature well enough. Human nature. And I think you must know the law of Islam on that point. She can claim divorce in the grounds of non-consummation. They have an Arabic term for it.”  
 “Nusus.” (Burgess, 2000: 240)**

As seen above, Burgess has however presented a satirical depiction, in that it is Hardman who will be faced with **nusus** if he were to refuse cohabitation with 'Che Normah.

The depiction of Hardman also contains references to the fourth Tenet of Islam, namely the compulsory fasting during the Islamic month of *Ramadhan*. Hardman has converted to Islam upon his marriage to 'Che Normah and the following scene shows Hardman's predicament in trying to fulfil the Islamic obligation of fasting:

**...The khaki police scoured the town in the name of the Prophet and found easy prey in Hardman. On the third day of the fast he absently lit a cigarette on Jalan Laksamana, was apprehended by two bony constables and carried off to the Chief Kathi.**

**"You can no longer claim the privilege of the white man. You are to us no longer a white man but a son of Islam. It is breaking the fast, contrary to the law, to smoke a cigarette. It is, moreover, foolishness to do so in public. Fined ten dollars."**

**"But smoking isn't the same as eating. I mean, the smoke goes into the lungs, not the stomach."** (Burgess, 2000: 317)

What the above extract shows is that Hardman is now viewed by the Malays of the town not based on his ethnicity as a white man but based on his religion, as a Muslim, due to his conversion to Islam upon his marriage to 'Che Normah (**You are to us no longer a white man but a son of Islam**). Thus he is caught and fined by the Muslim officer, **Chief Kathi**, for **breaking** his fast due to his smoking. However, this also shows us that Hardman does not fully grasp the philosophical reason behind the Islamic practice of fasting as he rationalises that **smoking isn't the same as eating**.

The portrayal of Hardman in Chapter 19 of *Beds in the east* is especially interesting because it is presented in a different technique compared to the earlier chapters. This chapter comes in the form of a diary entry: **This is the diary of a Pilgrim's Progress**. (Burgess, 2000: 365). As we read further, we discover that the diary has been written by Hardman, containing nine dated entries. He is onboard a Dutch ship which is bound for Mecca and hence the reference to his journey on a pilgrimage to perform the *Haj* (**a Pilgrim's Progress**). In his third entry dated June 17<sup>th</sup>, we are told that Hardman has taken to reading the collection of books in the ship's library. He has found an English translation of the holy book of Islam, the **Koran**, and below are his feelings upon reading the holy book:

**...I wonder how, with such a repetitive farrago of platitudes, expressing so self-evident a theology and an ethic so puerile, Islam can have spread as it has. And**

**then I remember that I am, officially, a Muslim. Nay, I am even a Muslim pilgrim.** (Burgess, 2000: 367)

Indeed, the depictions of Hardman as a Muslim convert, as exemplified in his disenchanted views regarding his conversion to Islam, his marital practice, the compulsory fasting during *Ramadhan* and the *Qur'an*, have led Coale (1981b: 32) to propose correctly that 'Hardman must accept Islamic customs, even though he believes in none of them'. As I see it, Aggelar (1979: 42) and Coale (1981a: 483) are right in their assessments of Hardman, that he is an echo of Burgess who lost interest in Islam due to what he perceived as the lacklustre appeal of the *Qur'an* as well as his exposure to the flawed Muslim Malays he encountered whilst in Malaya.

While the internal dilemmas faced by one who is a Muslim, as presented through references to the Tenets of Islam, are represented by the non-Malay Hardman, the internal dilemma of a Muslim is also highlighted by a Malay character, Nik Hassan, of *Beds in the east*. In the extract below, he confesses his internal dilemma to Crabbe not as a Malay but as a Muslim. This is indicated in a scene when Nik Hassan informs Crabbe of a rumour about his impending posting to Australia which prompts Crabbe to congratulate him. Nik Hassan, nevertheless, is more worried about another matter:

**Nik Hassan did not seem really pleased. "They're watching me, that's the trouble. Watching me all the time, seeing if I'm up to it. And you're never sure whether you're doing the right thing. If you drink, you're going against Islam, and if you don't drink you've got no social talents. If you've got more than one wife, they say that won't go down well in a Christian country. But, damn it."** (Burgess, 2000: 426)

The extract above demonstrates the pressures of being a Muslim as indicated by Nik Hassan's anxiety of being judged (**Watching me all the time**) presumably by the Muslim community, of whether the teachings of Islam are upheld or compromised by transgressions such as consuming the banned alcoholic drinks. On the other hand, Nik Hassan is aware that, if he were to practise polygamy in Australia, a **Christian country**, he would not be looked upon with favour because polygamy (**If you've got more than one wife**) is not a practice condoned by Christianity.

Meanwhile, other references to Islam (**Koran; mosque**) are also to be found in the opening chapter of *Time for a tiger* in its description of the state, **Lanchap**:

The river Lanchap gives the state its name. It has its source in deep jungle, where it is a watering place for a hundred or so little negroid people who worship thunder and can count only up to two. They share it with tigers, hamadryads, bootlace-snakes, leeches, pelandoks and the rest of the bewildering fauna of up-stream Malaya. As the Sungai Lanchap winds on, it encounters outposts of a more complex culture: Malay villages where the Koran is known, where the prophets jostle with nymphs and tree-gods in a pantheon of unimaginable variety. Here a little work in the paddy-fields suffices to maintain a heliotropic, pullulating subsistence. There are fish in the river, guarded, however, by crocodile-gods of fearful malignity; coconuts drop or are hurled down by trained monkeys called beroks; the durian sheds its rich fetid smell in the season of durians. Erotic pantuns and Hindu myths soothe away the depression of an occasional accidia. ...Where the Lanchap meets the Sungai Hantu stands the royal town, dominated by an Istana designed by a Los Angeles architect, blessed by a mosque as bulbous as a clutch of onions, cursed by a lowering sky and high humidity. This is Kuala Hantu. (Burgess, 2000: 25)

Nonetheless, the above extract also indicates the existence of another system of belief apart from Islam among the Malays in the villages near **Sungai Lanchap** (Masturbate River) and **Sungai Hantu** (Ghost River) away from the royal town, **Kuala Hantu**, such as **the prophets jostling with nymphs and tree-gods in a pantheon of unimaginable variety** and **Hindu myths** soothing away depression.

The same details related to Islam are demonstrated in *The enemy in the blanket*. In the opening chapter of the novel, the description of the town, **Kenching**, is filled with images of Islam such as the mosques and cries of muezzins to prayers. The role of Islam is very dominant in this novel where the word Islam itself is mentioned explicitly as seen in the following extract:

The chief town, **Kenching**, was bulbous with mosques and loud with the cries of many muezzins. Islam was powerful. During the fasting month police squads dragged out sinful daytime eaters from house or coffee-shop. Non-attendance at the mosque on Friday – if discovered – was heavily fined. Polygamy was practised and divorcée prostitutes were thick on the evening streets. But ancient Hinduism and primitive magic prevailed in villages and suburbs. The bomoh, or magician, cured pox and fever, presided at weddings and grew rich on the fees of fishermen who begged prayers for a good catch. Gods of the sea and gods of the rice-grain were invoked, threatened, rewarded. And from the north came Siamese Buddhism to complicate further the religious patterns of Dahaga. (Burgess, 2000: 195)

Confirming that Islam is indeed a powerful pillar of the town, the novel follows with further references to Islam in the forms of Tenets of Islam and Islamic rulings such as the obligatory fasting in the Islamic month of *Ramadhan*, the compulsory Friday prayers for Muslim men and the practice of polygamy.

However, the extract also contains depictions of a way of life and system of belief which, in principle, are against the philosophies and teachings of Islam. For instance, there are **divorcée prostitutes** offering their trades in **the evening streets** while **ancient Hinduism and primitive magic** are practised in **villages and suburbs**. **The bomoh, or magician**, are consulted by the villagers in order to cure **pox and fever** where they are revered by the villagers when they are asked to preside **at weddings**. Their influence is not limited to offering medicinal assistance or being touted as important dignitaries at village ceremonies but they are also consulted and eventually become rich with regard to becoming the messenger of God in requesting for good fortune: **and grew rich on the fees of fishermen who begged prayers for a good catch**. But the magician's God is not the mono-deity Muslim God, Allah, but are multi-deity Gods as indicated here: **Gods of the sea and gods of the rice-grain were invoked, threatened, rewarded**. In fact, we can say that the villagers have committed *syirik* as they have worshipped a deity other than Allah and are thus sinful idol-worshippers in the eyes of Islam due to their practice of animism.

The extract above also suggests that the Malays in the villages seem to be more faithful to their older beliefs, those which predate Islam, as seen in the ways they live their lives. Islam, it is suggested in the novels, is only wholly embraced by the urban Malays for a faith or power stronger than Islam, which manifested itself much earlier, remains more powerful than Islam outside the towns. This is particularly true when we analyse the extract in the closing chapter of *Beds in the east* below:

**...And it was finally to the jungle-gods that the Malays would be most faithful. The sun of Islam, disguising itself cunningly as a sickle moon, was appropriate only to the clearings, which meant the towns with their refrigerators and mosques, where the muezzin's call mingled well with the music of the bars. ...Some Arab theologian-philosopher had said that Islam decayed in the towns. Only when the decay of Islam brought the decay of the cities, when the desert, with its frail tented communities, reasserted itself, only then could the faith be renewed. But there was no desert here, no dominion of sun and oasis. There was**

**nothing to believe in except the jungle. That was home, that was reality.**  
(Burgess, 2000: 537)

The trilogy indicates that the teachings of Islam can work philosophically in tandem with progress and modernisation for these are what towns are all about. The realities of how Islam is perceived to be and how it is practised by the Malays in the trilogy seem to suggest that Islam is an artificial belief to the Malays outside the towns, the villagers. The idea that the towns corrupt Islam (**Islam decayed in the towns**) and its followers are an antithesis here because the trilogy shows that it is ironically the towns that reinforce the values of Islam, as evidenced by the existence of **mosques** with the **muezzin's call** to prayers, while the villages obstructs and limits the practice of Islam because its followers in the villages still practises pre-Islamic beliefs. This is due to the fact that the villages are the places where their beliefs in animism had taken root and continue to thrive – they are close to and are surrounded by **the jungle**. Thus Christie (1986: 22) is quite accurate when he describes Islam as ‘a religion of the towns’, where it is ‘alien from the traditions of the ra'ayat’ and the ‘amorphous numen’ of the jungle.

### **Malayness and the Malay rulers**

Scenes from Conrad's *Almayer's folly* demonstrate that Nina's mixed ethnicity beauty, whose exquisiteness in the 19<sup>th</sup> century is looked down upon as a ‘half-caste’ product, is portrayed as a form of tribute to an otherwise ostracised union. The novel shows that the origin of Mrs. Almayer, presented as descended from a Sulu Rajah, indirectly highlights the eminent position held by the Malay monarchs in the eyes of the Malay subjects. For example, Mrs. Almayer prefers Almayer to ally himself to Lakamba, the Rajah, and their constant arguments in turn cause Mrs. Almayer to become more aware of her ethnicity which is linked to her Malay royal background. This awareness is viewed by her as one much superior to Almayer's:

**...the glories of the Sultan of Sulu, his great splendour, his power, his great prowess; the fear which benumbed the hearts of which men at the sight of his swift piratical praus...** (Conrad, 2002a: 33)

This notion is further enhanced by Nina's own view of her mother's celebrated ethnicity. Reminded constantly of their illustrious regal past, Nina herself becomes assured that her identity is in fact Malay in addition to the rejections she suffered from the white society as a result of her mixed ethnicity.

The subject of Malay rulers is also manifested in a scene involving Nina's first meeting with Dain which occurs at her house when Dain appears as Almayer's guest in order to discuss trade. His arrival is highly welcomed by Mrs. Almayer for he is, in her eyes: **A great Rajah** (Conrad, 2002a: 41). The appearance of Dain, the Balinese prince and son of a great Rajah, into Mrs. Almayer's life emphasises this value. It is not coincidence that the kidnapped daughter of a Sulu Rajah would want her daughter to become the Ranee and consort of another great Malay Rajah. The emphasis laid on this aspect of Dain underscores the magnitude of Malay sovereigns and their influence over their subjects. As recalled, unbeknown to Almayer, Nina and Dain soon fall in love; on his part, for her rare beauty and, on her part, Nina identifies in Dain her other self: **the ideal Malay chief of her mother's tradition** (Conrad, 2002a: 51). Their affair is further encouraged by Mrs. Almayer who dreams of a marital alliance between Nina and Dain for she regards Dain as: **a great and powerful chief** (Conrad, 2002a: 52). Indeed, it is shown in the novel that Malay monarchs are not only symbols of power but are also symbols of prestige for the representation of Dain suggests clearly their worth in the eyes of their subjects; this is why Nina seeks to marry a Malay prince and not just any Malay.

If Babalatchi were pictured in Conrad's first two novels as cunning and manipulative, it is only with the noblest of intentions: to save his ruler and his people. This is because Lakamba, as the sovereign of Sambir, is a hesitant and unstable ruler whose reign is entirely dependant on the shrewd and farsighted Babalatchi. For instance, in a scene in *An outcast of the islands*, we see Babalatchi trying his best to divert Lingard from obtaining information regarding the whereabouts of Willems who is in league with the Malays of Sambir to betray him to the Arabs. When Lingard accuses him **in Malay** (Conrad, 2002b: 176) of acting upon rage and not reason, Babalatchi responds to Lingard's accusation by highlighting the survival instinct of his own people, **an Orang Laut**, and of his loyalty as a **Servant** to Lakamba:

**“I am not angry. What am I to be angry? I am only an Orang Laut, and I have fled before your people many times. Servant of this one-protected of another:...”**  
(Conrad, 2002b: 177)

In fact, I agree with views put forth by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 203-204) regarding Lakamba and Babalatchi, that Babalatchi is a more responsible character despite his shrewdness and manoeuvring compared to Lakamba as seen in his negative characterisation in the narrative as emphasised below:

**He declared himself to be a man from the east, from those parts where no white man ruled, and to be an oppressed race, but of a princely family. And truly enough he had all the gifts of an exiled prince. He was discontented, ungrateful, turbulent; a man full of envy and ready for intrigue, with brave words and empty promises forever on his lips. He was obstinate, but his will was made up of short impulses that never lasted long enough to carry him to the goal of his ambition.** (Conrad, 2002b: 41, emphasis underlined)

In *The rescue*, two royal Malays of Wajo origin are portrayed struggling to restore their deposed kingdom. There is a marked comment on the nature of aristocratic Malays as seen in the narrative where we see Hassim engaging in a discussion with Lingard:

**The talk conducted with hearty friendship on Lingard’s part, and on the part of the Malays with the well-bred air of discreet courtesy, which is natural to the better class of that people, touched upon many subjects and, in the end, drifted to politics.** (Conrad, 1950: 69)

The reference to the phrase **on the part of the Malays with the well-bred air of discreet courtesy** indicates that Lingard is now aware of Hassim’s royal background (**natural to the better class of that people**). We eventually discover that the talk regarding **politics** has turned to a request by Hassim extended to Lingard to assist him and Immada in their mission: to reinstate them back to their toppled kingdom.

Hassim and Immada are also depicted as strong and brave Malays with dynamic spirits where they are both not averse to seeking help even from a foreigner such as Lingard in ensuring the success of their mission. This is especially true as presented in another scene where Jörgenson, who has been tasked by Lingard to look after the *Hermit*, reports to Lingard and thus reveals the emotional states of Hassim

and Immada as they appear unexpectedly at the *Hermit*. They have become aware of Lingard's involvement in another rescue mission, this time to negotiate the release of the kidnapped European travellers. What has happened instead is that Hassim and Immada have taken it upon themselves to negotiate with the captor, the **Illanun** headed by Daman, on behalf of Lingard. As shown in the scene below, both the Malay royals are keen to close the deal with Daman (**to give the arms he was asking for**) in return for the release of the hostages so that they can continue with their own rescue mission (**the Wajo expedition**) with the promised assistance by Lingard:

**Immada wanted me to give the arms he was asking for. The girl is beside herself with fear of something happening that would put a stopper on the Wajo expedition. She has set her mind on getting her country back. Hassim is very reserved but very anxious, too...** (Conrad, 1950: 146-147)

Unfortunately, soon after in the novel, we discover that Hassim and Immada have been seized by Tengga, who happens to be Belarab's enemy, on their journey home from Daman's compound. To request for rescue, Hassim sends off his servant, Jaffir, to hand over his emerald ring as a signal of danger to Lingard:

**Hassim slipped the emerald ring from his finger stealthily and Jaffir got hold of it by an almost imperceptible movement... 'Fail not to give it the white man,' he murmured.** (Conrad, 1950: 305)

After the shocking news, that the *Emma* had been blown up by Jörgenson together with Hassim and Immada onboard reaches Lingard, a dying Jaffir is still intent on conveying his master's last message to Lingard. As Lingard meets him for the last time, Jaffir's message is clear but filled with extreme grief:

**'The Rajah wished to hold your hand once more,' whispered Jaffir so faintly that Lingard had to guess the words rather than hear them. 'I was to tell you,' he went on – and stopped suddenly... 'To forget everything,'** (Conrad, 1950: 364)

As we can see, the above extracts from *The rescue* have illustrated a positive representation of the Malay royals in the form of their dignity and selflessness. The extracts also call to mind views put forward by Clemens (1990: 23) and Fernando

(1990: 63) who have praised the representation of the Malay rulers in Conrad's trilogy as noble, involved in defending their ancestral kingdoms and successful in their attempts to conduct amicable friendships with the European characters. Ironically, this representation of the Malay rulers indicates the important role they play in reigning over their inherited kingdoms and, more importantly, the role they play in the eyes of their subjects. This is evident in their sheer ability to inspire intense loyalty in their subjects as represented in the trilogy, for example, through the characterisations of Babalatchi and Jaffir.

There are however only brief references to the Malay rulers in Maugham's short stories. In all the stories, the rulers are referred to in general as **the Sultan**, for example, **the old Sultan** and **the Sultan of Perak**. For instance, in "The force of circumstance", Doris' unhappiness over the arrangement and the circumstances of the 'half-caste' children is reasoned by Guy through the mention of an unnamed Malay ruler in the first extract below while a reference to another unnamed Malay ruler is noted in a description of Warburton of "The outstation" in the second extract:

**"The old Sultan didn't think it was a white woman's country," he said presently. "He rather encouraged people to – keep house with native girls..."** (Maugham, 1969b: 50).

**...He held under his arm a gold-headed Malacca cane which had been given him by the Sultan of Perak.** (Maugham, 1969c: 50-51)

Both Guy and Warburton work for this nameless **Sultan** while Campion of "The yellow streak" encountered an unnamed **Sultan** in his journey:

**Campion was a mining engineer whom the Sultan on his way to England had met at Singapore, and finding him at a loose end had commissioned to go to Sembulu and see whether he could discover any mineral which might be profitably worked.** (Maugham, 1976b: 13)

The above evidences from the short stories indicate that Maugham's works do express the existence of the Malay rulers which is the third one in my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness albeit sparingly.

The institution of the Malay rulers is nonetheless a very conspicuous presence in Burgess' *The Malayan trilogy*. In *Time for a tiger*, the history of its state, **Lanchap**, begins with details on the history of the ruler, a prince from Malacca. We are told that the state of Lanchap was eventually ruled by **the royal house of Malacca**, with a number of Malay rulers referred to (**Ahmad; Muhammad; Aziz; Hussain**):

**A prince of Malacca who settled on its river at the time of the Portuguese invasions. He had known the old days of quiet and leisure, the silken girls bringing sherbet, the long, subtle theological debates with visiting Islamic philosophers. ...Now the royal house of Malacca began to substantiate its old hypothetical claim to overlordship of the entire peninsula. Bendahara Yusuf set a meagre palace on the swampy shore of the Lanchap and tried to divert the outrageous revenues collected by the chiefs into his own coffers... (Burgess, 2000: 26)**

The **prince of Malacca** described in the extract above is a reference to Paduka Sri Maharaja Parameswara (1344-1414), the prince from Palembang who had been based in Singapore before he founded Malacca in 1400. This means that he did not settle in Malacca during the Portuguese invasion, which was in 1511, when Malacca fell to the Portuguese as depicted in the above extract. It was Parameswara's descendants who eventually became the **royal house of Malacca** and claimed overlordship over the whole of the Malay peninsula. These depictions of the Malay rulers are indeed based loosely on the historical narrative of Malacca detailed in the well-known traditional Malay literary *magnum opus*, *Sulalatus salatin*, also known as *Sejarah Melayu* in Malay and *Malay annals* in English, believed to have been composed somewhere in 1612 by Tun Seri Lanang. After the fall of Malacca to Portuguese, Parameswara's descendant (in the novel depicted as **Bendahara Yusuf**), who is the actual Muzaffar Syah, son of the last ruler of the Malacca Empire, Sultan Mahmud Syah (1488-1528), was invited to rule Perak (**Lanchap**) and eventually became its first ruler, Sultan Muzaffar Shah I Ibni Almarhum Sultan Mahmud Shah (1528-1549).

Depictions of the Malay rulers as they reigned in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century are also to be found in *Time of a tiger*. For instance, there is a portrayal of the ruler of Lanchap, **Sultan Iblis**, a descendant of **Bendahara Yusuf**, who lived during **the time of Stamford Raffles's first appointment, while in the East India Company Offices in Penang** (Burgess, 2000: 26). The reference to **Stamford Raffles** points to the British colonial officer who arrived in 1805 to work with the East India Company

office in Penang, an island on the north-east coast of the Malay peninsula then known as the Prince of Wales Island. In addition, as seen below, Crabbe's school, the Mansor School, is named after one of the Malay rulers of Lanchap, **Sultan Mansor**, who inherited the crown albeit after the ravages of civil wars and intervention from the British:

**After the death of Sultan Iblis there was trouble again. Five chiefs claimed the throne, only one of them – the Crown Prince Mansor – with any right. ...It was now that the British intervened. Mansor fled to Singapore, imploring help from the Governor. Yes, yes, he would most certainly accept a British Resident if he could be guaranteed a safe throne, a permanent bodyguard and a pension of \$15, 000 a month. And so the wars gradually died down like a wind, though not before some British blood had been spilled on that inhospitable land. (Burgess, 2000: 27)**

The portrayal of **Sultan Iblis** in the extract above is indeed based on the actual Sultan Ali Al-Mukammal Inayat Shah Ibni Almarhum Sultan Shahabuddin Shah (1865-1871) of Perak. After his death in 1871, his heir apparent, Raja Abdullah (**the Crown Prince Mansor**) was supposed to inherit the kingdom but the Raja Bendahara, Raja Ismail, was crowned instead as the ruler. As a result, Raja Abdullah sought the help of the British to regain his throne which led to the Pangkor Treaty of 1874 with the following agreement: that firstly Raja Abdullah was acknowledged as the legitimate Sultan, Sultan Abdullah Muhammad Shah II Ibni Almarhum Sultan Jaafar Muazzam Shah (1874-1876), to replace Sultan Ismail Muabiddin Riayat Shah Ibni Almarhum Syed Sheikh Al-Khairat (1871-1874) who would be given a title and a pension of 1000 Mexican pesos a month, and secondly the Sultan would receive a British Resident, whose advice had to be sought and adhered to in all matters except those pertaining to the religion and customs of the Malays (Andaya and Andaya, 2001: 33-64, 102-116, 147-159).

In *The enemy in the blanket*, the Malay ruler of the state of **Dahaga** (now known to be based on Kota Bharu, Kelantan) is called **Yang Maha Mulia Sultan Idris ibni Almarhum Sultan Yassin** and his reign over the state is assisted by an aristocrat known as **the Abang**:

...And there the Adviser had found, and his successors found still, that the State was only nominally in the hands of a Sultan. Dahaga was ruled feudally by an hereditary officer called the Abang, a man with such titles as Scourge of the Wicked, Friend of the Oppressed, Loved of God, Father of a Thousand, who claimed descent from the faeces of the White Bull of Siva. (Burgess, 2000: 194)

The above depiction of the Abang is a satirical reference to the history of the Malay rulers in *Sejarah Melayu*. In Chapter III of *Malay annals*, Parameswara's ancestor is identified as the Srivijayan prince from Palembang, Sri Maharaja Sang Utama Parameswara Batara Sri Tri Buana (also known as Sang Nila Utama) (1299-1347), who founded ancient Singapore (then known as Temasek) and defined the legal relationship that should exist between a Malay ruler and his subjects, the social covenant which defines the Malay principle of *daulat* and *derhaka*.<sup>66</sup> The various titles of the Abang are satirical versions of the title descriptions of the Malay rulers found in *Malay annals*; for example, as seen in the title description of 'Tun Bambang, son of the Sri Agar Raja of Petani, with a command from the Ruler in the Lower Reaches *fa'innahu sharf al-makani w'al-zamani* (of a truth is he the glory of his place and time)' (Brown, 2009: 12). Meanwhile, **descent from the faeces of the White Bull of Siva** is a reference to the birth of Sri Tri Buana from 'foam out of the mouth of a white cow' as narrated in Chapter III of *Malay annals* (Brown, 2009: 23). Therefore, the Abang is embraced by the Dahaga subjects as Malay royalty because he claims to be a descendant of a royal believed to have been born out of the mouth of a white cow, namely Sri Tri Buana. The slightly accurate but satirical depictions of the Malay rulers have indeed led Zawiah Yahya (2003a: 173) to correctly suggest that Burgess had 'played around' with his historical material in his narrative on the history of the Malay sultanate.

The existence and the destiny of the Malays are indeed tied to the positions and roles played by the Malay rulers and this is particularly true as depicted in *Beds in the east*. The positions and roles played by the Malay rulers are highlighted in this novel in view of the cries of *Merdeka* (Independence). Here, an account of the Malay political uprising is incorporated in a narration on the Abang's reign:

---

<sup>66</sup> This aspect of the relationship between the Malay rulers and its subjects is further elaborated in Chapter Four of the thesis.

The rule of the Abang, in an age when the techniques existed to lapidify any rule to permanency, was, because, of the very rise of a party, doomed. There was this new thing, politics; there were these cries of *Merdeka!* A new class was arising – small intellectuals, failed B. A.s, frustrated lawyers, teachers with the gift of the gab. (Burgess, 2000: 279)

As seen below, the importance of the Malay rulers in Malaya can be determined through the consideration of their fates (**Sultans would be in anomalous position**) as a result of the impending independence:

...Sultans would be in anomalous position, and Abangs would be in no position at all. Centralisation, directives, much paper, a spectacled bureaucracy, but this time not a haughty white face to be seen anywhere in the air-conditioned offices. The British would be pulling out soon and, with them, the last of the feudal rulers. (Burgess, 2000: 279)

There were the people to consider, the *ra'yat*, the proles. Their lot would not be improved. The *kampong*-life, the *padi*-planting, the fishing, the magic, the superstitious mumbling of the Koran, the poverty – these would continue. And the rulers would be far from them, forging with pain a new language, apt for governmental directives, which the peasant would not understand. Malay hegemony would mean nothing to the real Malay. (Burgess, 2000: 280)

a new language, apt for governmental directives in the second extract refers to the introduction of a new form of the Malay language, *Bahasa Melayu*, to be enshrined as the national language of an independent Malaya. This had been agreed upon in the Merdeka Constitution led by Tunku Abdul Rahman (1903-1991), leader of the ruling Malay party, United Malay National Organisation (UMNO), in dealings with the British colonial government which formed the Reid Commission in 1956 headed by a Lord of Appeal, Sir William Reid. In the novel, there are concerns that the **real Malay**, suggested to be the *ra'yat*, would not benefit from independence (**Malay hegemony would mean nothing to the real Malay**) for they would still be living their own separate lives (**The kampong-life, the padi-planting, the fishing, the magic, the superstitious mumbling of the Koran, the poverty**) away from the Malays in towns made up of the new middle-class (**small intellectuals, failed B. A.s, frustrated lawyers, teachers with the gift of the gab**).

As recalled, the depictions of the Malay rulers and aristocrats in the extracts above have been touched upon rather sparingly by scholars, with focus on the British who are depicted as no longer wielding any power along with the Malay rulers

(DeVitis, 1972: 55-56; Coale, 1981b: 35; Stinson, 1991:32). Only Aggelar (1979: 44) has correctly surmised the role played by the Abang as ‘an enlightened man who has a clearer understanding than most Malays of what the British mean to Malaya’. This is particularly true when we see in the second extract above how the effects of the Malay political scene on the Malays are seen by the Abang as inextricably tied to the fates of the Malay rulers as later agreed upon with the British colonial government in the Merdeka Constitution (Andaya and Andaya, 2001: 274-277).

The final extract above suggests that the ‘real’ Malays would not be able to fully comprehend the idea of Malay supremacy and thus benefit from independence because their rulers would not be there to be of guidance to them and to see to their welfare (**the rulers would be far from them**) if their fates were left to the British to decide. What has happened instead is that the Malays themselves, in the form of UMNO, have requested for the special positions of the Malays to be safeguarded in the Merdeka Constitution through the responsibility given to the ‘paramount’ Malay ruler, Yang diPertuan Agung (Andaya and Andaya, 2001: 276). Indeed, this is how the fate of the Malays is dependent on and tied to the fate of the Malay rulers as Malaya is about to achieve independence as depicted in the novel and how the real situation transpired.

### **Malayness and *adat*/culture**

The manifestation of *adat*/culture, which can be seen as representing a paradigm of Malayness, is implied in a scene in Conrad’s *Almayer’s folly*. As the years pass, we note how Mrs. Almayer has turned into a shrew in retaliation to her forced marriage to Almayer, described by Conrad using the term ‘savage’:

**While she was burning the furniture, and tearing down the pretty curtains in her unreasoning hate of those signs of civilization, Almayer, cowed by these outbursts of savage nature... Almayer sitting huddled up on a pile of mats...**  
(Conrad, 2002: 21, 22)

As seen above, Mrs. Almayer’s actions of destroying the interiors of their house and through Almayer’s action of sitting down not on a chair but on a **pile of mats** indicate

that she is asserting her own paradigm of Malayness by retaliating against Almayer's imposition of what she deems as related to Almayer's cultural practice, the furniture and the curtains. The above scene corresponds to views by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 106-107, 205) who suggests that Mrs. Almayer's preference for Malay culture as her choice of lifestyle is also an indication of her own way of asserting her sense of Malayness which has been built through her 'pride of race' as revenge against her forced marriage to Almayer. However, I have not found any instances of 'cultural diversity' or 'cultural recoding' by Mrs. Almayer in the novel as suggested by Hampson (2000: 103) to indicate that the recoding of cultural artefacts, as part of the concept of cultural diversity to represent Mrs. Almayer, is a manifestation of the paradigm of Malayness in relation to *adat/culture*.

While Malayness and *adat/culture* is evident in one of Conrad's novel, this paradigm is not to be found in any of Maugham's short stories.

However, the multi-dimensional aspect and complexity of what is understood to be the Malay *adat/culture* are highlighted through Nabby Adams and Crabbe in Burgess' *Time for a tiger*. In the following extract, we are presented with a depiction of the practice of the Malay *adat/culture* in the form of an art, *wayang kulit*, as practised by the Malays of the town, **Kenching**. It is described rather generally by Nabby Adams as **a kind of shadow-play**:

**...The car parked under the stars, the four walked down the main drive, Nabby Adams, huge, a minaret to the upturned eyes of the open-mouthed children. They stopped by the *wayang kulit*.**

**"This is a kind of shadow-play," explained Nabby Adams unnecessarily.**  
(Burgess, 2000: 94)

Another depiction of the *wayang kulit* is to be found in Burgess' *Beds in the east* when Crabbe stops at a small town called **Mawas** (Monkey) while on his way to the Durian Estate to investigate the murder of the school's Headmaster. In Mawas, he meets Temple Haynes, an American linguist, and they soon drive into the village to attend a *wayang kulit* performance. In Crabbe's observations of the *wayang kulit*, the

art is described as an amalgamation of various forms of beliefs, namely Hinduism and Islam, as seen in the following extract:

“Hindu in origin,” said Crabbe to Hayne. “Hardly a trace of Islam in the whole thing. Take your shoes off,” he said as they began to mount the steps. “That’s the custom.” ...But the master, cool, brown, entranced, now uttered the word “Om”, identifying himself for the instant with God Himself, calling in many gods and devils to be kind and patient, not to take offence at the crude representation of their acts soon to come, not to be incensed at the ox-hide caricatures of their numinous essences. He offered a delicacy – scorched rice; he abased himself before their greatness. And he remembered the one true religion, invoking the protection of the four archangels of the Koran. ...“The whole cycle,” said Crabbe, over the oboe’s sinuous cantilena, the gong and the drums, “takes a week. It’s Hindu epic, the age-long struggle between gods and demons, the...” (Burgess, 2000: 515-516)

As seen above, the *wayang kulit* is depicted as a form of art deriving its origin from a mixture of beliefs. While Crabbe states explicitly that it is **Hindu in origin** and a **Hindu epic** without any Islamic influence, the narrative indicates that there are attempts to link the art to Islam as seen in the reference to the **Koran** through the recitation by the **master** who is actually the storyteller called the *Tok Dalang* in Malay.

On the other hand, through Burgess’ description of the state, **Dahaga**, and its people in *The enemy in the blanket*, the Malay *adat*/culture appears to be a combination of art (**shadow-plays**), system of belief (**sympathetic magic**), and a way of life which alludes to pre-Islamic cultural heritage (**love-potions**) as seen below:

...The future would be like the past – shadow-plays about mythical heroes, bull-fights and cock-fights, top-spinning and kite-playing, sympathetic magic, axeing, love-potions, coconuts, rice, the eternal rule of the Abang. (Burgess, 2000: 196)

Although Coale (1981b: 37) and DeVitis (1972: 62) have described the *wayang kulit* as a ‘native’ ceremony of shadow play which is Hindu in origin, the narrative shows that the *wayang kulit* is indeed part of the Malay *adat*/culture despite being presented as a Hindu epic. This is because the art has been combined with references to Hinduism and Islam as befits the religious history of the Malays in the Malay World where the ancestors of the Malays were first followers of the ancient belief of

animism, followed by Hinduism, Buddhism and then Islam, a view which will be elaborated later in the Conclusion chapter of this thesis.

### Malayness and ethnicity

The paradigm of Malayness in the form of ethnicity can be found in Conrad's *Almayer's folly*. For instance, in a scene in the novel, we see how Nina's appreciation for her Malay ethnicity is heightened by her mother's constant reminder of her own celebrated Malay lineage, that she is indeed descended from the lines of powerful Malay Rajahs who are natural seafarers and fighters unlike her European ancestors. The following phrase shows how Nina becomes enthralled with this foreign yet splendid people: **where men of her mother's race shone far above the orang Blanda** (Conrad, 2002a: 33). Here, the Malay words, **orang Blanda**, refer to the Dutchman who represents Almayer's ethnicity.

In another example, Nina's decision to choose Dain over her father Almayer is reasoned with reference to her ethnicity:

**"I have been rejected with scorn by the white people, and now I am a Malay! ...I love you no less than I did before, but I shall never leave him, for without him I cannot live."** (Conrad, 2002a: 141)

The first sentence in the example above may indeed have led Krenn (1990: 20) and Tagge (1997: 107) to suggest that Nina's choice of Dain over Almayer is a clear-cut choice between her mother's ethnicity (**Malay**) and her father's (**the white people**). But what the above extract also demonstrates, especially in the section on Malayness and the Malay language as discussed earlier, is that Nina's own rejection of the white society is only secondary to the deep feelings of affection she feels for her Malay lover (**without him I cannot live**) as well as her mother whose ethnicity is ridiculed by Almayer (**a savage**) as seen in the following scene:

**"What made you give yourself up to that savage? For he is a savage."...**  
**"You call him a savage! What do you call my mother, your wife?"** (Conrad 2002a: 140-141)

What we know for sure is that the paradigm of Malayness and ethnicity can be discerned through Nina's preference for her Malay ethnicity due to Almayer's contempt for the ethnicity of her mother and herself apart from the rejection she suffered at the hands of the white society and her passionate love for Dain.

In view of Dain's ethnicity, the narrative of *Almayer's folly* states:

**He said he was from Bali, and a Brahmin, which last statement he made good by refusing all food during his often repeated visits to Lakamba's and Almayer's houses.** (Conrad, 2002a: 45)

As we know, Dain's full name in the novel is **Dain Maroola** but Dain is actually an altered form of a title of distinction, 'Daeng', among the Bugis, described as part of the Malay tribe from Celebes (now known as Sulawesi) (Mallios, 2002: 167), and is therefore not a proper name. The actual name of the character of Nina's lover is in fact Maroola. This thus corresponds to a view by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 210-202) that Conrad has been inaccurate in his portrayal of a character with the name of a Buginese as originating from Bali while Clemens (1990: 22) and GoGwilt (1995: 82) may have been unaware of the significance of the Buginese title 'Daeng' which have led them to identify Dain as a Brahmin from Bali.

In actual fact, Bali is a small island near the east coast of Java and has been traditionally associated with the cultural practice of Hinduism. According to Knowles (1995: 181), since Dain is described as a Brahmin, he should indeed be a Hindu of the highest caste. Despite these uncertainties, of whether Dain is a character of Bali or Bugis descent, I have found another example in the novel in which another character, Ali, states: "**A great Malay man has come,**" (Conrad, 2002a: 40). Here, Dain is also described as **Malay** in the narrative and that he is **great** because he is a prince.

On the other hand, there is no uncertainty whatsoever regarding the ethnicity of Lakamba and Babalatchi as it is described clearly in *An outcast of the islands* although both characters appear earlier in *Almayer's folly*. Their portrayals are in reality unflattering but their descriptions in the novel show clearly their ethnicity – Malay:

**They were Malay adventurers; ambitious men of that place and time; the Bohemians of their race. ...He was a vagabond of the seas, a true Orang-Laut, living by rapine and plunder of coasts and ships in his prosperous days; earning his living by honest and irksome toil when the days of adversity were upon him.** (Conrad, 2002b: 41, 42)

From the words **Malay adventurers, Bohemians** and **Orang Laut**, we know for sure that both characters are Malay from the Sea-Gypsies group of people who have settled around the coastal areas of Borneo (now known as Kalimantan), Celebes and the southern part of the Philippines (van Marle, 2002: 294). The **Orang Laut** is indeed a group of maritime Malays, who are also known as Sea-Nomads, and are described as people who have no country earning their living through piracy. In fact, Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 202) lauds Conrad's truthful portrayal of Babalatchi as a representative of the **Orang Laut** through Conrad's description of Babalatchi's profession as a pirate as the above example demonstrates (**living by rapine and plunder of coasts and ships**).

The most challenging and, possibly, illusory character portrayal is to be found in *An outcast of the islands*, namely the female character, Aïssa. The novel explicitly states that her ethnic origin is Arab; her father, Omar el Badavi, is Arab and her mother is described as originating from Baghdad:

**"Her mother was a woman from the west; a Baghdadi woman with veiled face..."** (Conrad, 2002b: 39)

Her father's surname, el Badavi, suggests that he is of Arab ethnicity and that he is a member of the Bedouin, a group of nomadic, desert Arabs (van Marle, 2002: 287). Her mother, described as **a Baghdadi woman**, is proposed as originating from Baghdad in Iraq which is a Persian country situated in the Middle East. This is the evidence why Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 205) has decided not to identify and analyse her character as Malay because both her parents are of Arab origin, a perspective which I myself wholeheartedly agree with.

However, she is also described as a character of mixed ethnicity in the novel by Willems: **a damned mongrel, half-Arab, half-Malay** (Conrad, 2002b: 207-209). This then explains why she has been described in studies as a character of 'mixed

parentage', an 'Arab-Malay' (Fernando, 1990: 65; Krenn, 1990: 62; Hampson, 2000: 117, 118; Knowles and Moore, 2000: 2). The two above examples are also evidence from the novel that she cannot possibly be identified as a Malay or 'native' character as put forth erroneously by Lee (1969: 122-124), Schwarz (1980: 17) and Tagge (1997: 106).

On the other hand, the ethnicity of the characters of royal background in *The rescue* is given clearly in the following extracts which detail their origins and characteristics:

**They were natives of Wajo and it is a common saying amongst the Malay race that to be a successful traveller and trader a man must have some Wajo blood in his veins.** (Conrad, 1950: 63)

**But he, too, was a native of Wajo where men are more daring too, and quicker of mind than other Malays. More energetic, too, and energy does not go without an inner fire.** (Conrad, 1950: 303)

The first extract shows that Hassim and Immada are of the Malay ethnic group, as implied by the phrase **amongst the Malay race**, originating from Wajo which is situated on the east of Celebes. Indeed, a Wajo Kingdom was founded during the 15<sup>th</sup> century and the remainder of the old monarchy now exists in the form of a Wajo Regency in the South Sulawesi province of Indonesia established in 1959 (<http://www.legalitas.org>). The description of the Malay characters as exiled royals from the Wajo kingdom near Celebes clearly shows that they are Malays of Bugis descent (**quicker of mind than other Malays**) as suggested by Hampson (2000: 177) and Gogwilt (1995: 77). This is despite the fact that Clemens (1990: 24) and Muhammad Haji Salleh (1996: 204) refer to them simply as 'Malay' characters.

Indeed, compared to Conrad, one conspicuous difference in the representations of the Malay characters in Maugham's short stories, or the 'natives' as he calls them, is a constructive representation regarding their personality, traits and conducts. The theme of the 'native' is linked to the 'half-caste' which is more appropriately referred to as 'half-Malay' or 'of mixed ethnicity with Malay ancestry', especially in "The force of circumstance" and "The yellow streak".

I must state here that I have not found any evidence from “The force of circumstance” to support Zawiah Yahya’s (2003a: 148) view that Guy’s mistress is Malay due to ‘Doris’ reference to her as a Malay’. In fact, nowhere in the story does it state clearly that she is Malay. The only clue to her ethnicity is indicated through descriptions of the ‘half-caste’ children as belonging to a ‘native’ woman or that the woman speaks in a **local dialect** as presented in the examples in the earlier section on Malayness and the Malay language. In fact, the only mention of the word Malay is to be found in the scene involving Doris who is in the middle of studying **Malay grammar** as we are told that she could not understand the language. Hence, it is safe to suggest that it is not through Doris’ reference to her as a Malay but only through the implied references to the Malay language as spoken by Guy and Abdul to the unnamed mistress as well as the fact that Doris could not understand Malay when speaking to the ‘half-caste’ children that we can carefully deduce that Guy’s mistress is in fact Malay. Furthermore, the examples regarding her use of the Malay language prove that the identification of Guy’s mistress as Malay has been put forth correctly by McIver (1936: 32) whereas Curtis (1974: 158) is clearly uncertain as seen in his summation of the Malay mistress as ‘a coloured woman’, ‘a native woman’ and ‘a half-caste woman’. Curtis must have been led into thinking that the ‘half-caste’ children in the story must surely belong to a ‘half-caste woman’.

In “The yellow streak”, we are informed that Izzart’s mother is a ‘half-caste’ as seen in the narrative below. From Izzart’s memory of her mother, we obtain more information of the ethnicity of Izzart’s ‘half-caste’ mother, Mrs. Izzart, as well as Izzart’s:

**...Because his father had been dead so long and during the later part of his career was stationed in the most remote of the Malay States, Izzart felt fairly sure that no one in Sembulu knew anything about her, but he lived in terror lest someone, running across her in London, should write over to tell people that she was a half-caste. ...Izzart was twelve years old when his father died and then he could speak Malay much more fluently than English. (Maugham, 1976b: 20)**

**...He wondered whether by any chance the men at Kuala Solor with whom he was so hail-fellow-well-met suspected that he had native blood in him. (Maugham, 1976b: 21)**

“You see, I had a Spanish grandmother,” he answered, “and when I’m under the weather it always come out. I remember at Harrow I fought a boy and licked him, because he called me a damned half-caste.”

“You are dark” said Hutchinson. “Do Malays ever ask you if you have any native blood in you?”

“Yes, damn their impudence.” (Maugham, 1976b: 22-23)

The first example above shows that Izzart grew up speaking more Malay than English. Thus, we can safely assume then that Izzart’s mother speaks Malay as her mother tongue and Izzart in turn has become fluent in Malay because he grew up speaking Malay to his mother as seen in the example given earlier in the section on Malayness and the Malay language: **...and his own knowledge of Malay, for his mother always spoke it to him.** (Maugham, 1976b: 21). Therefore, it is safe to suggest that Mrs. Izzart has Malay ancestry because we are told that Izzart’s mother is a ‘half-caste’. We can also say, as a result of his mother’s Malay ethnicity, that Izzart is of mixed ethnicity with Malay ancestry (**native blood**). It is also safe to state then that, in the story, the terms ‘native’ and ‘half-caste’ also refer to the Malay ethnicity. What the evidence from the story illustrates then is that Izzart is not technically a ‘half-caste’ as stated by Cordell (1969: 176) because his mother is already a ‘half-caste’. Rather, Izzart can be described as a character with ‘mixed native and white blood’ (Curtis, 1974: 156-157) but is more ideally a character with English and Malay ethnicity or, in the words of Raphael (1976: 556), one who has ‘native blood in his veins’.

In the following scenes, Maugham depicts the experience of Izzart and Campion who are both caught in a Bore. They are onboard a skipper when the Bore overtakes their boat and it capsizes. Izzart is trying to save himself and, at this point in the story, Maugham introduces Izzart’s servant as denoted by the word **boy**:

**Izzart’s first impulse was to swim for the shore, but his boy, Hassan, shouted to him to cling to the boat. ...“Help me, quick, quick,” he said to Hassan. Hassan understood him at once. By a miracle one of the oars was floating quite close to them and he pushed it into Izzart’s reach. He placed a hand under Izzart’s arm and they struck away from the boat. “Tuan, a boat is coming,”** (Maugham, 1976b: 27-30)

As seen above, Izzart has been saved by his Malay servant, **Hassan**. With regard to Hassan’s ethnicity, we know that he is Malay because Izzart is seen asking for

Hassan's help and Hassan understood his request at once. This is not surprising since we know that Izzart speaks Malay fluently.

The narrative during the Bore incident also indicates that there are two types of 'natives' in the story as seen below:

**At that moment two dug-out, with Malays in them riding the Bore, passed swiftly by them. They shouted for help, but the Malays averted their faces and went on.** (Maugham, 1976b: 28)

**Hassan put his arm round his shoulder and raised him to his feet. He made his way through the thick grass to the edge of the water, and there he saw a dug-out with two Dayaks in it.** (Maugham, 1976b: 31)

The two examples above show that Maugham has indeed distinguished two types of 'natives' based on their ethnicity, Malay and Dayak. The first example is seen through the eyes of both Izzart and Hassan where they had called out to a group of **Malays** to assist them. The second group is identified clearly as **Dayaks** because Hassan describes them so through the narrative.

As we can see, Maugham's representations of characters with Malay ethnicity, though far and few in between, are positive and honourable. Only Izzart, the 'half-caste', is depicted as a vulnerable character whereas Hassan is portrayed as the Malay servant who has saved his master's lives through his negotiation with the Dayaks. As recalled, Burgess (1969: xvi) has noted how Maugham 'tended to regard them [the Malay characters] as mere colourful "extras", with no opportunity to star in the drama of Oriental life'. Nevertheless, in spite of Burgess' view, my analysis shows that Maugham's depiction of his Malay characters are sympathetic and, perhaps in an ironic way, receptive towards the circumstances of the 'natives'. In the case of Hassan, Maugham had indeed given him the opportunity to shine as a 'star' in the 'drama' involving Izzart.

Nonetheless, Maugham's depiction of Izzart's paranoia regarding the secret of his mixed ethnicity, which he believes had led him to behave like a coward during the Bore, has correctly given rise to the criticism by Cordell (1969: 177), why has Maugham made the coward a half-caste? Another way of looking at Maugham's representation of Izzart is this: why does Maugham make the half-caste a coward?

There have been suggestions that Izzart is a coward because of his 'native blood' and that he suffers from inferiority complex not because he is a coward but because he is ashamed of his 'tainted native blood' (McIver, 1936: 32; Curtis, 1974: 156-57; Raphael, 1976: 56). But the story suggests clearly that Izzart's mixed ethnicity has nothing to do with his cowardice because, at the end of the story, we discover that Champion himself had abandoned Izzart during the Bore and admits that he himself behaved like a coward (Appendix 15). Here, I would like to paraphrase a view by Morgan (1980: 298), that the problem is not Izzart behaved like a coward in a crisis but that it is human nature, instead of his, that will see people behave like cowards during times of crisis and eventually lead them to blame anyone in order to throw suspicions that exist mainly in their own minds as a result of 'the yellow streak'.

Meanwhile, in Burgess' *The Malayan trilogy*, the subject of ethnicity is presented in relation to the characterisation of Abdul Kadir of *The enemy in the blanket*. Abdul Kadir's ethnicity is discussed in relation to his **eccentric** behaviour as depicted in the following extract:

**He was a mixture of Arab, Chinese and Dutch, with a mere formal sprinkling of Malay floating, like those red peppers, on the surface. His friends, complacently pitying this eccentric product of miscegenation, would forget the foreign bodies in their own blood. Haji Zainal Abidin would cease to be mainly Afghan; 'Che Abdullah no longer spoke the Siamese he had sucked from his mother; little Hussein forgot that his father was a Bugis.** (Burgess, 2000: 231)

The above extract tells us that not only is Abdul Kadir not a true Malay because his ethnicity is a mixture of Arab, Chinese and Dutch but his friends are also of mixed ethnicity, such as Haji Zainal Abidin who is Afghan, 'Che Abdullah who is a descendant of Siam on his mother's side and Hussein who is a descendant of Bugis on his father's side.

The subject of ethnicity is also presented in a different manner in Burgess' trilogy as seen in the depiction of Syed Omar and his children of *Beds in the east* described below:

**Syed Hassan, the eldest, his sleeping mouth pouting as into a microphone, his delinquent hair tousled; Sharifah Khairun, only four, her sarong kicked off, her perm glossy on the pillow. All the boys Syeds, all the girls Sharifahs, proud little**

**trumpets before their individual names, proclaiming them to be of the line of the Prophet.** (Burgess, 2000: 380)

As seen in the extract above, Syed Omar and his family are described as descendants of the Muslim Prophet Muhammad (**of the line of the Prophet**). This then indicates that they are Muslims of Arab ethnicity because they are descended from the Arab Prophet Muhammad. However, the narrative of the novel also indicates that Syed Omar perceives himself to be Malay, for instance, when he reprimands his son, Syed Hassan, and his friends in a restaurant for taunting him, he reminds them **the enemies of Islam and the enemies of the Malays are all around you, ...Me, the same age as your father, me, a member of your own race** (Burgess, 2000: 440). As indicated by the words, **your own race**, we can deduce that Syed Omar is referring to his **race** or ethnicity as Malay because he is earlier speaking about the **enemies of the Malays** as opposed to **the enemies of Islam** which denotes religion.

Syed Omar is also perceived to be Malay by non-Malay characters when we recall the scene in which the Chinese restaurant owner, Loo Kam Fatt, refuses to serve him alcoholic drinks because he is a Malay: **Cannot do. You Malay** (Burgess, 2000: 439). In my opinion, it is implicitly understood that Islamic rules apply to all Malays simply because Malays, as far as non-Malays are concerned, are concurrently identified as and understood to be Muslims. The ethnic identity, it seems, is foregrounded in the novel compared to the religious identity although, as we have seen earlier in the section on Malayness and Islam, the boundaries between both identities are quite blurred and vague. What has happened in the novel is that the ethnic and religious identities have become fused and intertwined with each other.

As I see it, the depictions of Syed Omar and his family as Muslim Malays are based on a prototype of a different type of Malay whom Burgess had encountered when he was in Malaya. This may also help to explain why Syed Omar has been described as a 'Malayan' instead of a Malay character (DeVitis, 1972: 58; Mathews, 1978: 28) because the phrase in the above extract, which states that he is a descendant of the Prophet Muhammad, implies that he is of Arab ethnicity.

## Malayness and identity

Identity, as the final paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised, is most evident in Conrad's *Almayer's folly*. For example, in the final scene of the novel, Almayer, in persuading Nina to leave Dain and return to him, did not stop to consider Nina's own inner dilemma over her self-identity and the rejection she has had to endure from the white community due to her mixed ethnicity. In her final conversation with Almayer, Nina explains to him how she still remembers the teaching she obtained whilst in Singapore:

**"...Have you forgotten the teaching of so many years?"**

**"No. ...I remember it well. I remember how it ended also. Scorn for scorn, contempt for contempt, hate for hate. I am not of your race. Between your people and me there is also a barrier that nothing can remove..."** (Conrad, 2002a: 140-141)

It appears from the example above that Nina's choice of asserting her identity as a Malay is tied to her preference of her ethnicity, her mother's instead of her father's. This may have been the reason why Lee (1969: 129-130) has argued that it was Nina's 'native blood' which has driven her to be split with regard to her identity. However, I doubt that the reason can really stand as evidence from the story suggests that it was not her Malay ethnicity which created her self-identity predicament but rather the mistreatment (**Scorn for scorn, contempt for contempt, hate for hate**) she suffered at the hands of the white society in Singapore which had led her to prefer her Malay ethnicity. I would also argue that her preference for her identity, to be known as a Malay, has much to do with her own rejection of the white society (**your race; your people**) which also happens to be the ethnicity of her father, and not just because of her preference for her mother's ethnicity. The paradigm of Malayness as manifested in the case of Nina lies in her decision to prefer her Malay ethnicity rather than her white one as her identity.

On the other hand, the subject of identity is linked to a portrayal of the character of the Malays as manifested in Maugham's short story, "The outstation". In "The outstation", it is only logical that respectable characteristics of the Malays, as part of their identity as an ethnic group, are presented so that we are able to empathise

with Abas when Warburton allows for him to be spared the hanging noose for murdering Cooper. This is seen as a positive reaction towards Abas since we discover that he had indeed been provoked by Cooper and had acted in effect. This is also possibly a method to highlight Warburton's deep tenderness for them due to the virtuous identity of the Malays as a whole, especially when we recall that Abas' unnamed uncle is a loyal servant of Warburton: **The boy [Abas' unnamed uncle] had been with Mr. Warburton for fifteen years** (Maugham, 1969c: 75). For instance:

**He liked their courtesy and their distinguished manners, their gentleness and their sudden passions. He knew by instinct exactly how to treat them. He had a genuine tenderness for them.** (Maugham, 1969c: 62-63)

**"The Malays are shy and sensitive," he said to him. "I think you will find that you will get much better results if you take care always to be polite, patient and kindly."** (Maugham, 1969c: 64)

**"You do not know the Malay character. The Malays are very sensitive to injury and ridicule. They are passionate and revengeful..."** (Maugham, 1969c: 86)

The three examples above demonstrate the identity of the Malays as understood by Warburton in terms of their characteristics which defines and recognises them as exclusively Malay and in turn reflects their paradigm of Malayness: **their courtesy, their distinguished manners, their gentleness and their sudden passions** and that they are **shy and sensitive, very sensitive to injury and ridicule, and passionate and revengeful**.

Maugham's overall constructive representations of the Malays in the story, in terms of their characteristics as I have shown above, clearly does not substantiate the view by Curtis (1974: 159), that Maugham 'does not grant his native characters fictional parity of esteem with his white ones: they are either sinister or shadowy figures in the background'. As recalled, based also on extracts from all Maugham's short stories exemplified in the earlier sections, there are indeed 'native' characters that are not merely sinister or shadowy characters. For example, Abas has acted 'sinisterly' by finally murdering Cooper but only because he has acted in revenge against the mistreatments he had endured at the hands of Cooper although he had been patient and tolerant all the while. Meanwhile, his uncle has also acted 'decently' because he had in advance warned Warburton about Cooper's misdemeanours

towards Abas which might end in tragedy. Both characters are viewed by Warburton on the same level of respect and high regard as befit the Europeans. In fact, in Maugham's other story, "The yellow streak", it is Hassan, the 'native', who has saved Izzart's lives during the Bore. The only shadowy 'native' figure can be ascribed to Guy's unnamed mistress of "The force of circumstance" although Curtis (1974: 158) concedes that his affair with the 'half-caste' woman proved to be more durable than his marriage despite it starting off as a force of circumstance.

Meanwhile, the subject of identity is most apparent in Burgess' final trilogy, *Beds in the east*. For instance, the Jaffna Tamils are portrayed in a scene in the novel discussing Syed Omar and his children. Their views of the Malay characters are based on their own notion of the negative identity of the Malays as a group of people (**just can't do the work; they never do anything; Lazy, truculent, dishonest**) as seen below:

**"The Malays just can't do the work. The fools won't see it, they won't accept it..." ... "You'll have to be careful. He is very hot-blooded."**

**"It is all talk," smiled Maniam. "They talk and talk and shout but they never do anything..."** (Burgess, 2000: 387)

**... "I know the family and the family is rotten. I've taught seven of Syed Omar's children. The eldest, Hassan, is the lowest of the low. Lazy, truculent, dishonest, with his long hair and his American clothes, slouching round the town with companions equally low."** (Burgess, 2000: 407)

**"... There's a core of shiftlessness about the Malays. They know they're no good, but they try to bluster their way out of things. Look what they're trying to do here. They're trying to close the bars and the dance-halls and the Chinese pork-market, in the sacred name of Islam. But they've no real belief in Islam. They're hypocrites, using Islam to assert themselves and lord it over people. They pretend to be the master-race, but the real work is done by others, as we know, and if Malaya were left to the Malays, it wouldn't survive for five minutes."** (Burgess, 2000: 408)

The final extract is quite illuminating as the Jaffna Tamil characters rationalise the identity of the Malays, with a certain sense of **shiftlessness**, together with their own ideas of how the Malays practise their religion, Islam (**no real belief in Islam; hypocrites, using Islam to assert themselves and lord it over people**). The identity of the Malays, as the extract indicates, is inextricably linked to their ethnicity (**the master-race**) and religion (**Islam**).

The novel continues with perspectives on the identity of Malays which are delivered by Lim Cheng Po. In a conversation with Crabbe, Lim argues that Malaya is a country with no identity of its own (**a mixed-up place**) and does not even deserve to be called a country (**There's no nation**) because all the ethnic groups in Malaya are believed not to have anything in common with each other. Lim's reasoning is couched within his own understanding of the identity of the Malays as an ethnic group:

**...But self-determination's a ridiculous idea in a mixed-up place like this. There's no nation. There's no common culture, language, literature, religion. I know the Malays want to impose all these things on the others, but that obviously won't work. Damn it all, their language isn't civilised, they've got about two or three books, dull and ill-written, their version of Islam is unrealistic and hypocritical.**" (Burgess, 2000: 415)

In one sentence in the above extract, it is implied that the Malays want to **impose** on the non-Malays what I believe can be viewed as the Malays' own understanding of identity, comprising **culture, language, literature and religion**. This is despite the fact that the non-Malay character feels there is no such thing as a 'Malayan' identity based on the Malays' idea of one.

The issue of identity is further illustrated in a scene in the novel, on the identity of a **true Malay** as opposed to a **true Islam** (Muslim). It is suggested in the novel that, in the eyes of non-Malays, when Malays themselves speak of 'Malay' issues (**Malay self-determination**), they subconsciously refer to issues relating to their religion, Islam, as well as to their practice of Islam (**too fond of the bottle to be good Muslims; they even kissed women and ate doubtful meat**) as seen here:

**...When they talked about Malay self-determination, they really meant that Islam should frighten the Chinese with visions of hell; but perhaps they did not even mean that. They themselves were too fond of the bottle to be good Muslims; they even kissed women and ate doubtful meat. They did not really know what they wanted. The middle-class of Kenching who carried Muslim names and were not too dark, not too light, were united by the most tenuous of bonds. One of these bonds was 'Che Guru Abdul Kadir, the hairy-legged goat who carried their sins on his back, who defined a vague smoky image of the true Malay (who did not exist), the true Islam (not really desirable) in terms of what these things were not. Certainly a beer or two and an occasional Friday abstention from mosque did not seem so heinous when Abdul Kadir lay cursing in his vomit.** (Burgess, 2000: 231)

As seen above, it is also suggested in the novel that the identity of a **true Malay** in Malaya does not exist except a vague one combined with a less Islamic one as exemplified by the character Abdul Kadir who drinks beer and gets intoxicated but still performs the obligatory Friday prayers occasionally. It appears from the novel that the middle-class Muslim Malays of **Kenching** are a mixture of both ethnic and religious identities: a vague identity of the true Malay and an undesirable identity of the true Muslim.

This quandary is further demonstrated through the depiction of 'Che Normah who is identified on the back of her ethnic and religious identities (**a good Malay and a good Muslim**) as seen below:

**'Che Normah was a good Malay and a good Muslim. That is to say, her family was Achinese and came from Northern Sumatra and she herself liked to wear European dress occasionally, to drink stout and pink gin and to express ignorance about the content of the Koran.** (Burgess, 2000: 232)

But the narrative of the novel as indicated above makes this distinction, that she is in fact **a good Malay and a good Muslim** because her family is **Achinese** who hailed from **Northern Sumatra** (from Aceh, Sumatra). I suggest that this depiction of 'Che Normah, as hailing from Aceh and hence **a good Muslim**, is due to the fact that Islam was first established in the Malay World through the Aceh region as early as the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Aceh is also known within the Malay World as *Serambi Mekah* (Verandah of Mecca). Nonetheless, the characterisation of 'Che Normah, despite this seemingly constructive identity of 'the Malay-Muslim', is contrary to her description of one. In the context of the novel, we can question whether she deserves to be called **a good Malay** because we are told that **she herself liked to wear European dress occasionally**. We can also question if her description as **a good Muslim** also stands because she is depicted as living an un-Islamic way of life where she consumes the forbidden alcoholic drinks (**to drink stout and pink gin**) and does not read the *Qur'an* (**to express ignorance about the content of the Koran**). What we cannot question however is that the depiction of 'Che Normah's identity shows that the ethnic identity has been fused with the religious one.

Paradoxical depictions of 'Che Normah in the novel have certainly led to erroneous views regarding her character where she has been described as a 'very orthodox Muslim' (Aggeler, 1979: 42) and as an 'Islamic' widow (Stinson, 1991: 32). In my opinion, 'Che Normah cannot be described as an 'orthodox' Muslim because, as I have stated earlier, she does not practise the Islamic way of life. I believe that Aggeler has been led to believe that she is 'orthodox' because of the religious marital requirements she made to Hardman as Coale (1981b: 36) correctly suggests, that is to convert to Islam upon marrying her and to 'practise Islamic customs'. The term 'Islamic', it seems, has appeared to be a confusing one; indeed, 'Che Normah is not an 'Islamic' widow but more correctly a 'Muslim' widow because to describe her as 'Islamic' means that she is a follower of Islam who practises the religious beliefs ardently. This is of course an anomaly because 'Che Normah herself is not 'Islamic' due to her un-Islamic way of life despite being a Muslim.

## **Conclusion**

As presented earlier, I have analysed nine works by three authors which demonstrate my hypothesised paradigms of Malayness through distinct and numerous ways of manifestations. Here, I present the conclusion of this chapter thematically according to the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised.

I begin with my findings on Malayness and the Malay language which I suggest can be divided into its roles and its uses. The roles of the Malay language are manifested clearly in all works to indicate the other elements in the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised, namely ethnicity and identity. For instance, with regard to Conrad, Malay has been used to indicate the ethnicity of the Malay characters such as Mrs. Almayer and Nina. Malay has also been used in Conrad's novels to indicate the identity of the character, for example, in the depiction of Nina. In Maugham's works, however, there are very few Malay words used but its role as a language is highlighted in the narrative to indicate the ethnicity of characters as seen in the depiction of Guy's mistress, the Malay servants and Izzart.

Nevertheless, the role of Malay is illustrated clearly in Burgess' works. Not surprisingly, some of the Malay words used in Burgess' trilogy are quite as Zawiah Yahya has objected to for they are indeed 'facetious', 'unpalatable' and 'disparaging'. Yet there are also instances when its proper role and use have been highlighted by Burgess. This view can be seen in examples involving Nabby Adam and his revulsion towards what he perceives as an improper use of Malay as seen in the dialogue between two Malay officers in the Malay Regiment conducted in both Malay and English, as depicted by Fenella who highlights to Crabbe the importance of Malay when she states that it is silly not to know Malay when living in Malaya, and as argued by Lim Cheng Po that Malay is not a common language shared by all ethnic groups in Malaya because it is not perceived to be a civilised language. Indeed, these examples from the trilogy point to one definite view: that the role and use of Malay are manifested explicitly and implicitly in all the works to indicate simultaneously its importance as a paradigm of Malayness.

Although Islam is a dominant pillar in Conrad's and Burgess's novels, there is no mention at all of Islam or references to its practices in all of Maugham's short stories. This particular finding can possibly be explained through a view by Burgess (1969: xv), 'there is little evidence to suggest that Maugham gained, or wished to gain, any direct knowledge of the lives and customs of the native peoples of the East'. Indeed, if Maugham did gain any direct knowledge of the lives and customs of the Malays in the Malay World, he would then surely recognise that Islam is such a prominent element associated with the Malays that Conrad and Burgess had incorporated many facets of this paradigm in their representations of the Malay characters and in the narrative of their trilogies as I have analysed earlier.

In Conrad's trilogy, Islam has been linked to a practice of what is depicted as Malay *adat*/culture as exemplified by the veiling of the head for female Muslim Malays. However, the covering of the face is questionable as it is believed to be a culture of the Arab Muslims. References to Islam in Conrad's novels are also peppered with devout Islamic expression peculiar to that faith as Clemens has rightly suggested indicating also the ethnicity of the characters as Malay such as Babalatchi, Lakamba, the **Illanuns** and Jaffir. This illustrates then an overlapping of Islam as a paradigm of Malayness with *adat*/culture and ethnicity.

On the other hand, Islam, in terms of its philosophies, teachings and rulings, is the most dominant paradigm as a manifestation of Malayness in all of Burgess' works. This is especially evident in the depictions of wayward Muslim Malays such as Abdul Kadir, Haji Zainal Abidin, 'Che Normah, Syed Omar and Nik Hassan. Meanwhile, the dilemma faced by Muslim converts in the form of Hardman highlights a prevailing misconception regarding the conversion to Islam, 'to become a Muslim' (*masuk Islam*), with its literal translation in Burgess' novels as **enter Islam**, which has been confused by many as entailing a conversion of ethnicity and identity, 'to become a Malay' (*masuk Melayu*). This is why Hardman has asked Haji Zainal Abidin to help him find a Muslim name as part of his new identity once he converts to Islam.

Another example of the overlapping of Islam as a paradigm of Malayness relates to ethnicity and identity where the depiction of what is understood to be Malay to represent ethnic identity is now foregrounded with Islam to represent religious identity. Hence this is why, in Burgess' novels, when Islamic law is implemented, it refers specifically to Malays and not explicitly to Muslims. This concurrent view of the Malay-Muslim identity tag is one especially shared by non-Malay characters when they speak of the Malays in general. However, among the Malays themselves, it is indicated in Burgess' novels that there are two types of issues which are addressed individually by the Malays, those pertaining to ethnicity (the Malay race) and to religion (Islam). This finding is based on the depictions of Syed Omar and his son, Syed Hassan.

With regard to the Malay rulers, evidence from Maugham's short stories indicate that his works do express the existence of the Malay rulers albeit sparingly. More importantly, however, the mention of the Malay rulers in Maugham's short stories shows that they play a substantial role in Malay society in the Malay World and that their presence is not only noted by their subjects but also by non-Malay subjects, in this case Maugham as a writer who specifically visited the Malay World as a professional writer in search of materials. Maugham's few passing mentions of the Malay rulers can be traced to Burgess' (1969: xv) view, that in the eyes of Maugham as a writer during the 1920s and 1930s, the 'Sultans and rajas' 'were merely colourful Oriental figures' and were 'not associated with power or

responsibility'. Perhaps this is why Maugham does not feel it necessary to elaborate on their roles and presences where otherwise they have played prominent roles and are distinguished presences in Conrad's and Burgess' trilogies as I have demonstrated earlier.

This is despite the fact that Burgess, in particular, had played around with his historical material, sourced from *Sejarah Melayu*, in the satirical retelling of the history of the Malay rulers in *Time for a tiger*. In fact, the importance of the Malay rulers as a paradigm of Malayness has been linked to the subject of ethnicity as exemplified in the depiction of the fates of the Malays as an ethnic group through the Abang's musings regarding the impending Malayan independence. The Malay rulers are also associated with the identity of the Malays as an ethnic group where it is implied through the narrative that their roles are important in order to determine the outcome of the progress and development of the Malays. We do know by now that the Malay rulers have been given the 'paramount' responsibility to safeguard the special positions of the Malays as enshrined in the Malaysian Constitution.

Of *adat/culture*, Maugham's non-representation of any aspects related to the Malay *adat/culture* is best surmised by Burgess (1969: xvi), 'A visitor like Maugham would talk and eat with these people (and their wives) [the Europeans in the colonial society]... and they were the only people he could really get to know'. It is obvious from Burgess' view that Maugham experienced close contacts with the Europeans but that there were no attempts to socialise with the Malays because they were the ones 'who would merely bring drinks and serve dinner'. Hence, this social barrier means that Maugham did not obtain any direct knowledge regarding their sets of custom, system of belief or way of life. Therefore, I believe that this is the main reason why there is not to be found any manifestations of Malayness and *adat/culture* in any of Maugham's short stories. This is despite the fact that there are indeed manifestations of *adat/culture* in Conrad's trilogy in the form of attire and way of life whereas *adat/culture* is manifested in Burgess' trilogy through the art of *wayang kulit*, with a link to the Malay characters' practice of Islam and pre-Islamic system of belief and way of life. This also shows that *adat/culture* is also related to Islam as a paradigm of Malayness.

My analysis of Malayness and ethnicity once again shows an overlapping with the findings on Malayness and the Malay language. This is especially true in the case of Mrs. Almayer and Nina. My analysis illustrates that Mrs. Almayer communicates in Malay because she is depicted as a Malay of Sulu origin. Therefore, it is implied in the novel that speaking in Malay demonstrates a connection to ethnicity, namely Malay. Meanwhile, we are told that Nina has chosen to speak in Malay because she is half-Malay due to her mother's ethnicity. Again, the role of Malay in Conrad's work demonstrates a link with the subject of ethnicity to delineate the character's paradigm of Malayness.

The subject of ethnicity is also manifested in Conrad's trilogy through his depictions of what he believes to be other types of Malays such as Mrs. Almayer who is a descendant of a Sulu Rajah as well as Dain Maroola who is in actuality of Buginese origin and thus could not possibly be from Bali. Another example involves the Wajo royals, Hassim and Immada, who are identified also as Malays of Bugis descent due to their place of origin which is Wajo, Celebes known to be the place of origin for the Bugis people. These depictions thus fit into what I describe as different types of Malay ethnic group (*suku bangsa Melayu*), namely the Sulu and the Buginese.

The same can be said of Maugham's works where the terms 'native', 'local' and 'half-caste' have been used in the short stories as representations of the characters' ethnicity, namely Malay. However, we are able to identify the characters as Malay because we are told in the narrative that the characters, either Malay or non-Malay, speak to each other in the Malay language. For example, we are told in the narrative of "The force of circumstance" that Doris is learning Malay grammar because she is unable to understand the 'local' dialect and that the 'half-caste' children could not understand her language because it is not a 'local' one. This thus means that the language spoken around her as well as by Guy to his 'native' servants and his mistress in the 'local' dialect is Malay.

Another example which connects ethnicity to the Malay language as a paradigm of Malayness is to be found in the scene where we are told in the narrative of "The outstation" that Warburton **speaks in idiomatic and fluent Malay** to his

servants. This then implicitly indicates that the ethnicity of the servants is Malay. We are also told in the narrative of “The yellow streak” that Izzart’s fluency in Malay is partly due to his ethnicity where his mother is half-Malay and he in turn grew up speaking Malay to her because Malay is after all his ‘native language’ or ‘mother tongue’. Indeed, the ethnicity of the characters is determined in Maugham’s works through a mention of the language they use to communicate to each other, namely Malay.

In Burgess’ trilogy, the subject of ethnicity is simultaneously linked to the subject of identity. It is also linked to Islam. As concluded earlier in my analysis on Malayness and Islam, a conversion to Islam (*masuk Islam*) has erroneously led to the misconception that it entails a conversion of ethnicity, in this case to become a Malay (*masuk Melayu*). It also, at the same time, inaccurately means a conversion of identity as exemplified by Hardman’s request for a new Muslim name. Another important finding relates to the identification of the characters’ ethnicity as an automatic identification of their religion, namely Islam. This is especially true with regard to Syed Omar whose request for alcoholic drinks is denied by the Chinese restaurant owner, Loo Kam Fatt, where he states specifically that Syed Omar is a Malay and not a Muslim.

Malayness and identity in Conrad’s trilogy is most apparent in the dilemma faced by Nina where her choice of identity has been based on her choice of ethnicity. Obviously, in Nina’s case, she is able to choose which ethnicity to embrace simply because she is half-Malay due to her mother’s ethnicity as a Malay of Sulu origin. Here, we can clearly see an overlapping between identity and ethnicity as a paradigm of Malayness. On the other hand, the subject of identity is manifested in Maugham’s works in the form of the characteristics of the Malays. This is especially true in the case of Warburton’s tenderness for the Malays due to what he believes are characteristics of their identity as an ethnic group. Again, we see here how identity has been fused with ethnicity when we speak of aspects which delineate the paradigm of Malayness of the Malay servants in Maugham’s works.

Another way the subject of identity has been manifested as a paradigm of Malayness is to be found in Burgess’ trilogy which can be seen through the depictions

of the Malay characters as viewed by the non-Malay characters. In the case of the Jaffna Tamils, the identity of the Malays is discussed in relation to their characteristics as an ethnic group as well as their Islamic practices. This thus shows an overlapping of identity with ethnicity and Islam. Meanwhile, Lim Cheng Po speaks about the Malays in general as wanting to impose unto the non-Malay ethnic groups what I also believe can be understood to refer to the paradigm of Malayness: culture (including literature), language and religion. Here, we see an overlapping of identity as a paradigm of Malayness with ethnicity, *adat/culture*, the Malay language and Islam.

Nonetheless, my analysis also points to a distinction made in Burgess' work, in particular his depictions of wayward Muslim Malay characters such as Abdul Kadir and 'Che Normah. In the case of Abdul Kadir, it is suggested through the analysis that he is a representation of two types of identities associated with the Malays: a vague one of the true Malay and the undesirable one of the true Muslim. What can be said here then is that the Malays do not have a clear identity of themselves because it is implied in the novel that there is no such thing as a true Malay or a true Muslim. It can also be said then that the true Muslim, meaning one who practises the Tenets of Islam faithfully, is perhaps not welcomed in Malaya not only by the Malays but also by the non-Malays because it is stated in the novel that the image of the true Muslim is an undesirable one.

Another distinction occurs in the depiction of 'Che Normah who has been described in the narrative based on two types of identities: a good Malay and a good Muslim. It is implied then through the narrative that, when we speak of the Malays, we also speak of aspects of themselves which are related to their ethnicity, in 'Che Normah's case this refers to her place of origin (Sumatra), what she wears (attire) and how she has chosen to live her life (*adat/culture*). It is also implied in the narrative that, when we speak of the Malays, we also speak of how they practise their Islamic faith. For example, 'Che Normah's way of life is linked to her practice of her religion, namely Islam, where we do know that she cannot be described as a good Muslim because she does not practise Islamic teachings. This is based on her depiction in the novel where we are told that she consumes alcoholic drinks and that she cannot read nor understand the *Qur'an*. Another example of this distinction when we speak of the

---

Malays is to be found in the depiction of Nik Hassan who feels that his identity as a Malay is constantly judged by his fellow Malays not through aspects related to his ethnicity, such as speaking Malay and practising Malay *adat/culture*, but to how he practises his faith, Islam.

Therefore, we can carefully state that there are common characteristics shared within the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised, namely the Malay language, the Malay rulers, Islam, *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity, in works by Burgess. Although Conrad's works also reflect all the elements I have hypothesised, a more overt reflection of the paradigm as an everyday-defined social reality is to be found manifested in Burgess' *The Malayan Trilogy*. This is because Burgess had actually lived the 'lives of the brown people' as Clifford once said while Conrad had relied more on writings on the Malays in the composition of his trilogy. In Maugham's works, we observe a limited use of the Malay language, passing mentions of the Malay rulers and the absence of any manifestations of Islamic practices and the *adat/culture*. It has to be remembered, however, that the above findings can be attributed to Maugham's own limited knowledge of the Malays as reasoned by Burgess. Thus, I state here that it is in *The Malayan trilogy* that I found manifestations and reflections of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness as an everyday-defined social reality.

## PART III

### CHAPTER FOUR

#### SELECTED WORKS IN TRADITIONAL AND MODERN MALAY LITERATURE

##### Introduction

In this chapter, I begin firstly with a brief rationale on my selection of works from traditional and modern Malay literature which I have chosen for analysis in this study. This is followed by sections which discuss briefly the literary backgrounds of each author (except for *Hikayat Hang Tuah* whose authorship remains unknown until now)<sup>67</sup> and contain reviews on existing scholarship on the selected works to date. The order of the reviews is presented chronologically as follows: *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi and *Hikayat Abdullah*, Ishak Haji Muhammad and *Putera Gunung Tahan* as well as *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, Shahnnon Ahmad and *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*, Muhammad Haji Salleh and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, and finally, Usman Awang and “Melayu”. I have narrowed the reviews to those relevant to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness.

##### On the selection of works

The first work I have chosen for analysis is *Hikayat Hang Tuah*,<sup>68</sup> also listed in the United Nation’s Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation’s (UNESCO) Memory of the World Programme International Register in 2001 (Kratz, 2004: 122-

<sup>67</sup> For debates on the authorship of the text, see Sutrisno (1981: 283); Braginsky (1994: 173); Kratz (2004: 123).

<sup>68</sup> For the synopsis of the text, see Kassim Ahmad (1966: 53-58).

148), because of its unique position in the canon of traditional Malay literature. It is unique because it is an epic story of a Malay subject, Hang Tuah, whose story can also be found in another traditional Malay literary *magnum opus*, *Sulalatus salatin* (*Sejarah Melayu*)<sup>69</sup> (A. Samad Ahmad, 1963: 3-5; Sutrisno, 1983: 416-422; Maier, 1999: 352-354; Muhammad Haji Salleh, 2008a: 40-45). It is one of the oldest texts in Malay literature<sup>70</sup> but there is yet to be a thorough study on the paradigm of Malayness as manifested in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* through the character Hang Tuah despite its description as a text which represents the very essence of all things Malay, 'the most Malay of Malay writings' (Ismail Hussein, 1966: 13), and is the only truly Malay epic (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: xvi).

Studies on the text have focussed on its historical (Md. Zahari Md. Zain, 1970: 410-417; Braginsky, 2004: 465-478), ideological (Parnickel, 1976: 403-417; Junus, 1984b: 42-64), structural (Errington, 1975; 1979: 27-41; Sutrisno, 1981: 259-286; 1983) and sociological (de Josselin de Jong, 1965: 140-155; Matheson, 1980: 183-195) aspects but have overlooked a more obvious aspect of *Hikayat Hang Tuah*: its values and elements, or paradigm of Malayness. This overlooked aspect of the text has however been touched upon rather generally by scholars who are very assured in their appreciation of Hang Tuah as the archetypal Malay, a Malay literary figure that symbolises the paradigm of Malayness (Iskandar, 1970: 46; Hatta, 1984:31). As Teeuw (1964: 352) views it, the author of *Hikayat Hang Tuah* may have focussed on constructing a foundation of the Malay self based on a concept of Malayness as represented by the main Malay warrior, Hang Tuah. Indeed, I have chosen this text for analysis specifically for its theme of loyalty to the ruler which can help to explore one of the paradigm of Malayness hypothesised, namely the Malay rulers.

The second text from traditional Malay literature which I have chosen for analysis is *Hikayat Abdullah* by Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi or better known as

<sup>69</sup> For studies on *Sejarah Melayu*, see Iskandar (1964: 484-492); Siti Hawa Haji Salleh (1987; 1995: 107-149); Braginsky (1993; 2004).

<sup>70</sup> The actual date of composition has never been determined and scholars have not thus far reached a consensus as to its actual date of composition. The text may have been composed in mid-17<sup>th</sup> century although Muhammad Haji Salleh (2000b: 27) suggests that it was perhaps created orally in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. On studies which have discussed its possible dates of composition, see Parnickel (1962: 148-149); Kassim Ahmad (1963: 20; 1997: xiv-xv); Sutrisno (1983: 67); Hooker (1991: 79); Braginsky (1990: 399-412; 2004: 467-471); Kratz (2004: 123).

Munsi Abdullah. Abdullah's prominence in Malay literature can be seen from research on Abdullah and *Hikayat Abdullah* where the issues can be divided into two aspects, namely regarding Abdullah's role and his contribution through his work, *Hikayat Abdullah*. No other author has polarised scholars both local and foreign in their views of his work, namely *Hikayat Abdullah*, for example, on his position as 'father of modern Malay literature' (Skinner, 1959: 2-6; Hassan Ahmad, 2004: viii).<sup>71</sup> Also, no other author has attracted controversy with regard to his own literary background in the study of Malay literature, for instance, regarding his ethnicity (Traill, 1979: 68-81; 1982: 129-130; Annas Haji Ahmad, 1988: 156-160).<sup>72</sup>

While I am aware of those who might question my choice of *Hikayat Abdullah* for analysis due to Abdullah's mixed ethnicity background of Arab-Tamil origin, I strongly feel that the text should not be judged or penalised on the back of the author's ethnicity.<sup>73</sup> As Tham Seong Chee (1983: 213) succinctly describes it, Abdullah 'had the advantage of being objective in his appraisal and thus avoided the emotional identification associated with one growing up and living in a culture'. Most importantly, I have selected *Hikayat Abdullah* due to its eminent position as a 'social document *par excellence*' (Kassim Ahmad, 2004: xx) and for Abdullah's perceptive analysis on Malay life and society in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

From modern Malay literature, I have chosen two novels by Ishak Haji Muhammad, *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila*. The decision to analyse Ishak's novels is due to the fact that he is seen by many in the Malay literary scene as a symbol of 'the spirit' of modern Malay literature (Hooker, 2000: 385). This is in addition to the fact that his novels are still considered as prevalent and authoritative in post-independence Malaya. For example, *Putera Gunung Tahan* has been chosen as a Malay Literature Component text for the Malay Language subject beginning 2001, where the component has been offered to students in the most senior secondary

<sup>71</sup> Other issues include views of Abdullah as an 'Anglophile' (Winstedt, 1940: 144), 'pro-British' (Roolvink and Datoek Besar, 1953: x), a 'British stooge' (Traill, 1981: 41) and 'Abdullah Padri' (Tan Chin Kwang, 1986: 101).

<sup>72</sup> Other issues on *Hikayat Abdullah* include whether Abdullah's postulated audiences was the British (Sweeney, 1980: 16), whether his intended audience was not just the British but also the Malays (Murtagh, 2005), Abdullah's use and standard of Malay (Zain Al-Abidin bin Ahmad, 1940: 142-162) as well as whether the text is an 'autobiography' (Bottoms, 1960: 647), a 'modern' work (Skinner, 1982: 1) or a piece of 'journalistic writing' (Annas Haji Ahmad, 1988: 159).

<sup>73</sup> For discussion on this aspect of Abdullah, see Sweeney (2008: 61-71).

schooling in Malaysia which is the Fifth Form. This decision is evidence that Ishak's novel is still respected and is regarded highly in contemporary Malaysia. This is also seen as a noble move to reinstate Ishak's exceptional position in the history of modern Malay literature as *Putera Gunung Tahan* had been banned at one point in Malaya because of its criticisms of the British establishment and the Malay aristocrats and leaders (Radin Soenarno, 1960: 21).

The next writing I have chosen for analysis is a novel *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* by Shahnnon Ahmad. This novel has been selected because of its eminent position in and significant contributions to the study of modern Malay literature, both local and foreign. It not only made a profound impact on the local literary scene but also pushed Shahnnon further into the international arena. In 1973, the panel of Australia's *The Sydney Morning Herald* ranked this novel among the top ten most appealing novel for 1972. Identified as the pinnacle of his literary career, the novel was adapted into a screenplay and filmed as *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* where it premiered on 27 October 1983 and went on to win the 'Best Film' category for the 4<sup>th</sup> Malaysia Film Festival. The novel has also been selected as one of the compulsory texts which make up part of the literary component for Malaysian students undertaking the subject Malay Literature in the Sixth Form. The examination which requires the novel to be studied critically beginning in the 1970s is the *Sijil Tinggi Persekolahan Malaysia* (Malaysian Higher School Certificate).

A collection of poems by Muhammad Haji Salleh, *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, based on various themes in the most renowned traditional Malay literary text, *Sejarah Melayu*, is the next work selected for analysis. I have chosen this particular work as it represents 'the best of both worlds' in the sense that, not only do we have access to a traditional Malay text, but we would also be able to explore whether my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness is articulated in the form of a modern version based on its (original) traditional text. It needs to be mentioned here that Muhammad also attempted an analysis of and edited his own version of *Sejarah Melayu* based on the oldest known text of *Sejarah Melayu*, the MS. Raffles No. 18 edition, which was published as *Sulalat al-salatin* in 1997. In fact, Muhammad shares his techniques on the composition of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* in his essay on the publication of his edition of *Sejarah Melayu*, entitled "*Sulalatus salatin: adikarya akal budi Melayu*"

(“*Sulalatus salatin*: an introspective composition of the Malay”) (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 2008b: 3-35).

The final work selected for analysis is a poem by Usman Awang, “Melayu”. I have chosen this poem because of its social relevance to contemporary Malay society in Malaysia. When “Melayu” was published in the Malaysian daily *Mingguan Malaysia* on 27 October 1996, Malaysia was about to undergo a severe economic recession along with the rest of Southeast Asia. There existed a sense of unease and trepidation in Malaysia on how this economic crisis would affect the Malays politically, economically and socially. More importantly is the uncertainty among the Malays of whether they would survive this grave crisis and how they would fare in the long-run. Publishing this poem during this turbulent period in Malaysia is seen as an attempt to galvanise the Malay thinking and spirit into appropriate action and hence unity. It needs to be mentioned that “Melayu” was written in 1992 at the height of power of the then fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamad (1981-2003). Malaysia was at the peak of its economic and political successes.

As I have shown so far, the works I have chosen for analysis have been based on a personal and eclectic selection as to what is largely available. They have also been chosen due to their pertinent characteristics as I have discussed earlier which may help me explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. With this in view, I now move on to the next section which is a review of studies on the first selected text from traditional Malay literature, *Hikayat Hang Tuah*.

### **Studies on *Hikayat Hang Tuah***

*Hikayat Hang Tuah* is a well-known traditional Malay literary text which chronicles the story of Hang Tuah, an eminent literary figure whose story of loyalty to his ruler is now as renowned as his story of personal dilemma - of the choice between loyalty to the Crown or to his own best friend. I refer here to the most legendary scene from the text which is the duel between Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat that ends with the death of Hang Jebat at the hands of his own best friend and brother-in-arm, Hang Tuah. Contemporary Malays have now pointed to Hang Jebat as the hero of this text

(Kassim Ahmad, 1966: 25; Khadmi, 1967: 246-247) while there are those who still perceive Hang Tuah as the ultimate Malay hero (Mohd. Taib Osman, 1981: 120; Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1986: 26; 2000b: 29). The heroic idealism of Hang Tuah and the conception of Hang Jebat as the hero instead can be seen in the many forms of artistic manifestations of the duel, for example, in plays (Ali Aziz, 1960; Usman Awang, 1992a), novels (Abdul Samad Ahmad, 1954; Darus Ahmad, 1960), films<sup>74</sup> and video sharing websites.<sup>75</sup> This thus shows that the duel still exists very much in the psyche of contemporary Malay society. It is for this reason that I have chosen to limit my analysis of *Hikayat Hang Tuah* to only the duel in order to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness.

One major aspect of the text which ought to be mentioned here is the nature of the relationship between Hang Tuah and his (unnamed) ruler.<sup>76</sup> This relationship is viewed as a symbol of Hang Tuah's sense of loyalty to the ruler as part of his conception as the ideal Malay (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1991b: 155; Noriah Mohamed, 1997: xxix-xxxii). It is also discussed together with the importance of *periksa* (to investigate thoroughly or to verify carefully) as part of the prerequisite of an honourable ruler (de Josselin de Jong, 1965: 150-152; Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1991a: 116, 143; 2000b: 27-47; Braginsky, 2004: 475-478; Kratz, 2004: 122-148). According to Hooker (1991: 79), the text is an example of a description of 'the behaviour of the ideal Malay, Hang Tuah, who dedicates his life to serving his ruler'. Thus this relationship is viewed as a presentation of 'a model which all Malay rulers and subjects should emulate'. Another way of analysing the relationship is offered by Kratz who links it to Hang Jebat's treason:

Despite the fact that Hang Jebat's treason has been portrayed as an individual tragedy in the *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, I am in no doubt that any moral lesson to be gained from

---

<sup>74</sup> *Hikayat Hang Tuah* has been adapted into a film as "Hang Tuah" in 1955 which was produced by the Shaw Brothers Limited, Singapore. Another film, "Hang Jebat", was produced by Cathay Keris Film Productions, Singapore in 1960, designating Hang Jebat as the hero instead of Hang Tuah.

<sup>75</sup> Segments of the Hang Tuah-Hang Jebat duel from both the above films are available from the video sharing website, <http://www.youtube.com>.

<sup>76</sup> Hang Tuah's loyalty to the Sultan can be traced back to the Malay psyche constructed in the form of the sacred social contract or covenant as presented in *Sejarah Melayu*. On the oath between Sang Utama Sri Tri Buana (the ruler of Palembang from whom all Malay royalties are believed to have been descended) and Demang Lebar Daun (his minister who represents the *rakyat*), see A. Bakar Hamid (1979b: xiii-xvi); Kratz (1993: 74-79).

this careful and moving account was directed as much at the ruler as it was at his voluntary, yet loyal subjects. (Kratz, 1993: 95)

The nature of the relationship between Hang Tuah and his ruler is also viewed as a flaw in Hang Tuah's character (Kassim Ahmad, 1966: 34-50; Parnickel, 1976: 416). Hooykaas (1963: 143), however, is ambivalent in his discussion of Hang Tuah's sense of loyalty to the ruler. Although he describes Hang Tuah as a subject who holds absolute loyalty to his ruler, he also questions whether Hang Tuah's loyalty is based on 'blindly' (*membabi buta*) following all the orders issued by the ruler. Meanwhile, Kassim's identification of Hang Jebat as the ideal Malay hero is justified at the expense of his characterisation of Hang Tuah:

There is something sinister about his sense of absolute loyalty to his master. It is well-nigh blind. It brings him into the most tragic conflict of his life. It brings him into head-on clash with his greatest friend. Yet did he regret it? There is no evidence and, judging from our understanding of his character, he could not have regretted it. (Kassim Ahmad, 1966: 42)

In Kassim's eyes, the personification of the ideal Malay lays not with Hang Tuah, the 'blindly loyal servant', but Hang Jebat, the rebel.

Nonetheless, Teeuw (1964: 352) describes Hang Tuah as the symbol of an ideology of the ideal Malay self in its most artistic form while de Josselin de Jong (1964: 140, 151) describes Hang Tuah as the ideal embodiment of the Malay people. According to Muhammad Haji Salleh (2000b: 29), Hang Tuah is 'the ideal human being who serves and sacrifices for the Melaka king, Melaka's name in history and its people, the Melayu people'. Muhammad (2000b: 41) also states that, although not much has been said regarding Hang Tuah's Islamic conducts in terms of 'prayers, fasting and belief', Hang Tuah is also 'as religious in his generosity, altruism and service to the king'. As Muhammad sees it, these are also 'main elements in the Islamic perception of religiosity'.

One of the most important issues gleaned from research on *Hikayat Hang Tuah* is the one regarding the traditional Malay belief system of *derhaka*. It has been

explored by Kratz (1993: 68-97) who discusses *durhaka* as the concept of treason in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*:

It is in my view that the purpose of the Hang Jebat story is to express criticism of the sultan's rule in the only way possible, by creating a figure whose deeds were so bad that they obscured their original cause. (Kratz, 1993: 80)

This aspect of *Hikayat Hang Tuah* in Kratz' study, which delves into the famous scene of a duel between Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat, is an examination of Hang Tuah's sense of loyalty to the ruler in opposition to Hang Jebat's act of treason which is described as *derhaka*. This also explains why, rather than looking at the text as a whole, I shall look at key passages focussing on events during the duel including its aftermath: Chapter XVII of *Hikayat Hang Tuah* (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 346-370). In due course, I realised that different titles have been allocated for the same chapter which contains the duel in the text, for instance, Abu Hassan Sham (1975: 78-82) names this episode '*Bab XIII Pertikaman antara Hang Tuah dan Hang Jebat*', the title '*Bab xviii Hang Tuah bertikam dengan Hang Jebat*' is given by A. Bakar Hamid (1979b: 107-118) while Sutrisno (1983: 104-105) calls this episode *Hang Jebat mendurhaka*.

One definite finding from studies is the consensus that the Hang Tuah-Hang Jebat duel is the most important episode in the text where this episode is viewed as a serious reflective representation of Hang Tuah's values (Kassim Ahmad, 1963: 20, 1997: xvi-xvii; Sutrisno, 1983: 148-154; Teeuw, 1964: 349; de Josselin de Jong, 1965: 152-154; Iskandar, 1970: 43-44; Parnickel, 1976: 405, 408-411, 417; Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1991a: 141-143; 2000b: 43-44; Kratz, 1993: 80-95; 2004: 122-148; Braginsky, 1994: 200-202; 2004: 470-471, 476-478). For example, Parnickel (1976: 405) describes the duel as, '[a] culminating scene of the HHT [*Hikayat Hang Tuah*]' while M. Khalid Taib (1993: 26) suggests that the duel demonstrates how Hang Tuah had followed the Sultan's order blindly (*membabi-buta*). However, Khalid justifies Hang Tuah's conduct as due to a weak understanding and implementation of Islamic law which, in reality, advocates thorough investigation in order to arrive at justice in all aspects of life. Muhammad Haji Salleh (2000b: 44), on the other hand, describes the duel as 'the most realistic and extremely touching movement of emotions, loyalties, regrets and ideals'. Nonetheless, Khalid (1993: 21-

22) and Maier (2004: 90) have questioned the merit of this episode where it has been described as ‘the most hilarious and most bizarre scene of the Tale’ (Maier, 2004: 90) by virtue of Hang Tuah resorting to tricks in order to kill Hang Jebat.

Of the many studies conducted on *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, a study by Maier (2004: 1), where he describes the text as a ‘handbook’ for all things Malay, is the most applicable to my study. Maier discusses the importance of the duel and what it means to ‘many modern Malay intellectuals on the Peninsula’ (Malaysia) (Maier, 2004: 105-106). According to Maier (2004: 105), ‘the bloody fight between Hang Jebat and Hang Tuah, closest friends and alter egos, has come to summarize the problem that all self-appointed Malays on the Peninsula had to come to terms with’: how to share the land they live on with the ‘European, Chinese, and Indian immigrants’. To do so, Maier believes that the Malays on the peninsula were ‘forced to take a stand on the question whether their form of Malayness, an invented tradition indeed, should be defined in terms of Hang Tuah or Hang Jebat’. Among the questions Maier posits are ‘Who was the real Malay?’ and ‘Was it the supporter of feudalism or the defender of justice?’

As indicated above, Maier (2004: 105) suggests that Malayness is ‘an invented tradition indeed’ and links his conclusion with the Hang Tuah-Hang Jebat duel. Maier (2004: 105) states that Malayness, as interpreted by many modern Malays in Malaysia, is being defined in terms of whether it is Hang Tuah (‘the supporter of feudalism’) or Hang Jebat (‘the defender of justice’) who is ‘the real Malay’. This leads Maier (2004: 105) to discuss issues surrounding the current understanding of Malayness in Malaysia where he believes that the sultans are ‘the ultimate symbols of Malayness’ in view of their roles as ‘guides of customs and religion’ albeit also as ‘guardians of feudalism and nepotism’. He is aware, however, that the relevance of the sultans as ‘symbols of Malayness’ has been challenged in modern Malay society in Malaysia. Maier asks:

Is a Malay allowed to revolt against his ruler for the sake of friendship, humanism, relatives, and justice-or should he, at all costs, be loyal to his ruler in the name of Malayness and defend him against others? (Maier, 2004: 105-106)

Maier also queries the role of Islam in this ‘problem’:

---

And what role should Islam play in this new definition of Malayness? (Maier, 2004: 106)

By 'new' here, Maier is referring to differing views which have appointed Hang Jebat as the ultimate hero instead of Hang Tuah in the consciousness of modern Malays as I have discussed earlier.

However, Maier's concern is not new because an earlier perspective related to Islam as analysed in the duel has been offered by de Josselin de Jong (1965). de Josselin de Jong (1965: 154) suggests that heightened Islamic consciousness among the Malays in early 20<sup>th</sup> century makes a case 'against hero-worship of Hang Tuah' since Islam requires its followers to exist on 'personal responsibility' and conviction. Therefore, he states that this religious teaching seems to sway in favour of Hang Jebat when we speak of 'the whole nature of the Hang Tuah – Hang Jebat conflict'.

Apart from the above, another notable study on Malayness in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* has been conducted by Maier (2004: 1-8) where he discusses the issue of Malayness based on an episode from the text involving a dancing incident in Inderapura (Appendix 3). While I agree that Maier (2004: 9-34) has contributed extensively to the role played by language and writing in his discussion of *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, I feel that the rest of his discussion does not contribute much to the aims of my study because it focuses on the philological aspect of the Malay language. Therefore, in my attempt to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in Chapter Five of this thesis, I will only address issues I have highlighted earlier in Maier's discussion on Malayness apart from focussing on the role played by the Malay ruler as articulated in the famous Hang Tuah-Hang Jebat duel in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. This is in addition to the aforementioned issues raised in previous studies on the duel.

As such, I now move on to present a brief discussion on the literary background of Munsyi Abdullah followed by a review of studies on *Hikayat Abdullah* limited to those related to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. Due to the huge number of existing scholarship on this text, I have also narrowed my review to studies

which have discussed specifically Abdullah's perspectives on the Malay rulers and the Malay society.

**Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi and *Hikayat Abdullah*  
Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi (1796-1854)**

Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi was born on 12 August 1796 in Malacca which would eventually become part of the British Straits Settlement in 1826. A descendant of Arab and Tamil through his paternal grandparents, Abdullah was brought up in Malay society in Malacca by his father, Abdul Kadir, who was a linguist, language instructor and scribe. Due to Abdul Kadir's disciplined teachings, Abdullah was brought up within a strict Islamic tradition and scholarly pursuits. His own linguistic proficiency, especially in Malay, led him to become the Malay language instructor to the British scholar-administrator, Raffles, who went to Malacca in December 1810 as representative of Lord Minto (1751-1814), the Governor General of India (1807-1813) (Kassim Ahmad, 2004: xix-xx).

Abdullah also taught Malay to European Christian missionaries in Malacca and Singapore, another British territory in the Straits Settlement. He was hired in Malacca by William Milne (1785-1822) of the London Missionary Society (LMS) to teach him Malay. In June 1819, Abdullah went to Singapore to earn his living as an interpreter and became Malay teacher to Claudius Thomsen (1782-?) and Benjamin Keasberry (1811-1875). It was another missionary, however, the American Alfred North (1807-1869) who encouraged and guided Abdullah to write his own life story which he completed in 1843. Abdullah then revised the final 1849 lithographed edition and it was published at the Mission Press, Bukit Zion, Singapore by Keasberry (Sweeney, 2008: 5, 29-31).

**Studies on *Hikayat Abdullah***

The most widespread issue in existing scholarship pertaining to *Hikayat Abdullah*, which has been translated into English by Hill (1970), is Abdullah's criticism of the Malay rulers and Malay society (Datoek Besar and Roolvink, 1953: xiv; Li Chuan

Siu, 1966: 7-8; Yahaya Ismail, 1976: 4-5; A. Bakar Hamid, 1979a: 8; Kassim Ahmad, 1981: ix-xii; 2004: xxvi-xxix; Mohd. Taib Osman, 1986: 25-26; Tan Chin Kwang, 1986: 100-101; Annas Haji Ahmad, 1988: 157-158; Carroll, 1999a: 179; Hadijah Rahmat, 2001: 231-234; Sweeney, 2008: 171-173). Indeed, Abdullah's writings on the Malay rulers, namely *Darihal Tengku Panglima Besar*, *Darihal Tengku Long*, *Darihal Tuan Crawford dengan Sultan Husein Syah Negeri Singapura*, *Ini Silsilah Asal Penghulu Naning* and *Darihal Sultan Husein Syah Singapura* in *Hikayat Abdullah*,<sup>77</sup> have been examined by scholars, for example, *Darihal Tengku Panglima Besar* has been discussed by Sweeney (2006: 236-237) while A. Bakar Hamid (1979a: 8) and Carroll (1999b: 98-99) have discussed *Darihal Sultan Husin Syah Singapura*.

According to Tan (1986: 100), 'Abdullah is right in putting the blame for Malay backwardness principally on the ruling group'. Tan reasons Abdullah's criticism of the Malay rulers as the ruling group by way of their inability to set positive examples to their subjects:

Abdullah found... that one of the reasons the Malay was not interested in education was that his *raja* and chiefs and his equals never did so. And far from stimulating the *rakyat* towards that interest, the *raja* were setting a negative example in neglecting the upbringing of their own children. (Tan Chin Kwang, 1986: 100-101)

Kassim Ahmad (2004: xxvi-xxvii) also supports Abdullah's criticism of the Malay rulers and the Malay society where he states that the criticism is indeed appropriate as it touches on the cruel reign of the Malay rulers, their neglect in upbringing their offspring to become knowledgeable and respectable people, obsolete beliefs and anti-scientific innovations as well as negative and regressive *adat/culture*. However, Hassan Ahmad (1976: 289) questions Abdullah's criticism of the Malay rulers and Malay society as he believes that the Malay rulers and Malay society have been objects of ridicule in the text. Hassan (1976: 290) states that Abdullah did not truly understand the values of the Malay society and had formulated his perceptions of the Malays based on the values of foreigners.

---

<sup>77</sup> The references are from the 2008 edition by Sweeney.

Carroll (1999b: 92-129) discusses how *Sejarah Melayu* played an important role in influencing Abdullah's writing of *Hikayat Abdullah* as it is known that Abdullah had edited a shorter version of *Sejarah Melayu* (published in about 1831) (Carroll, 1999b: 92). Carroll (1999b: 93) states that Abdullah viewed himself as an insider and as a Malay whose aim of writing the text was to protect Malay culture and heritage. In particular, Carroll points out how Abdullah 'believed that ignorance, superstition and the rule of the despotic Malay sultans had weakened the fabric of Malay society'.

In the course of reviewing studies on *Hikayat Abdullah*, I became conscious that the final section of the text has been discussed rather sporadically by scholars. The final section of *Hikayat Abdullah* is published as *Kata penghabisan* (Final words) in the Datoek Besar and Roolvink (1953: 422) edition. The translated version of *Hikayat Abdullah* in English by Hill (1970: 310) assigns the title *Volume II* for this final section of the text. According to Hill (1970: 310), the earliest printed texts of *Hikayat Abdullah* contain the sub-title *Bab yang kedua* as 'a short epilogue' to the core chapters. Hill speculates that this section was written between 1846 and 1854 'when Abdullah left Singapore for Mecca'.

In another study, Tol (2001: 119) states that Abdullah had added 'a few more pages' after he finished his original work in 1843. Tol suggests that, when it was copied by the Buginese, Husin bin Ismail, Husin had also copied them. The added pages are described by Tol as an 'addendum' which he believes is the same one referred to by Hill (1970: 310) as "Volume two". As Tol states, 'Although the wording is a bit different, the dating is identical, as is the structure of the text in "two volumes"'.

Traill (1982: 126-129) looks at Abdullah's first manuscript of *Hikayat Abdullah* which was handwritten in *Jawi* in 1843 and makes a comparison with the lithographed edition of 1849. Traill (1982: 128) discovers that 'the so-called "*Bab yang kedua*"' in the 1849 text can be found in the 1843 text but that it does not have any heading. To Traill, this section is a finale to the whole text which appears to be 'merely a censorious postscript to what should be the end of the *Hikayat*'. According

to Traill, ‘Indeed it is now clear that when writing the original draft of the Hikayat Abdullah did not then give any indication of a second volume’.

Traill adds, ‘Even in the 1849 jawi text the “postscript” of the 1843 text is not headed “*Bab yang kedua*”’. Traill attributes the heading of ‘*Bab yang kedua*’ in the 1849 text to an editorial mistake by ‘Shellabeare’ [sic] in his Romanised edition of the text. To Traill, this means that we should not then view this section as ‘being the beginning of a second volume’. Abdullah’s phrase in the ‘postscript’ of the 1849 text - “*kitab-ku bab yang pertama*”, “the first volume of my book” - is seen by Traill as an implication that Abdullah may have wanted to write a second volume but this same phrase is not to be found in the 1843 text. Therefore, Traill concludes that ‘it is clear that the “postscript” itself is not the beginning of the envisaged volume two’. ‘Shellabeare’, Traill suggests, may not have seen the 1843 text which contains the ‘postscript’, and was misled into thinking that the ‘postscript’ could have been ‘the start of volume two’ in addition to the phrase used by Abdullah in the 1849 text, ‘the first volume of my book’.

Milner (2002: 33) refers to this final section of Abdullah’s *hikayat* as an ‘epilogue’ while this section of the text is called *Bab XXIX* (Chapter 29) and is given a title *Penutup* (Ending) in the 2004 edition of *Hikayat Abdullah* annotated by Kassim Ahmad. Kassim (2004: 362), however, states that this section is actually part of *Bab XXVII* (Chapter 28) of the transliterated version of Abdullah’s *hikayat* and does not have a title. The latest version of *Hikayat Abdullah* has been edited by Sweeney (2008) based on a comparison between the 1843 original *Jawi* text and the following editions: the Congress edition copied in 1843, the North edition copied before 1845, the Thomson edition copied in 1846, and the 1849 lithographed edition published by Keasberry.<sup>78</sup> Sweeney’s version of this text is hence the most thoroughly researched edition and the final section is called *Lampiran-tanpa judul* (Attachment-without title) (Sweeney, 2008: 541).

---

<sup>78</sup> See <http://mcp.anu.edu.my>. This Malay Concordance Project (MCP), initiated by Ian Proudfoot of the Australian National University, is a very useful search engine which offers a searchable corpus of over 4 million words of pre-modern Malay text.

I would like to highlight here a study by Carroll (1999b: 108) who suggests that Abdullah's text follows a pattern set by *Sejarah Melayu* through the use of the Malay literary device, *nasihat*, as 'one means... to present the moral quite overtly'. Comparing the number of times the word *nasihat* is used in *Sejarah Melayu* and *Hikayat Abdullah*, Carroll states:

The *Hikayat* follows this pattern where in a longer work [of *Hikayat Abdullah*] *nasihat* are used at least thirteen times, but none occur in the less traditional *Bab yang Kedua*. (Carroll, 1999b: 108)

As we can see above, Carroll refers to the final section of the text as '*Bab yang Kedua*'.

As I have shown earlier, studies on the text as a whole have been examined and discussed based upon many different perspectives while the final section of the text, whose discrepancies in its name itself – 'final words', 'volume two', 'postscript', 'addendum', 'epilogue', 'without title' and 'ending' – as discussed previously, has not been the subject of analysis by itself. This is then the reason why I have decided to narrow my analysis to only the final section of *Hikayat Abdullah* for I believe that its role as part of a wider research focus on the text has not been examined critically thus far. For the purpose of discussion in this study, the final section of *Hikayat Abdullah* is referred to as an 'ending' as I consider it as the most appropriate term to describe this section after a close reading of the text.

On the paradigm of Malayness, there are in fact studies conducted on *Hikayat Abdullah* which have examined the paradigm from varying angles. In discussing Abdullah's 'epilogue', Milner (2002: 35) praises the 'second volume' as having the 'character of an essay or treatise'. Milner (2002: 33) discusses Abdullah's 'epilogue' which he claims Abdullah had presented with 'clarity and brevity his views about Malay society'. Milner (2002: 34) states, 'the epilogue focuses on the mode of life of the Malay people and the foregrounding of the Malay ethnic group in this manner demands careful attention'. Milner (2002: 34-35) links his discussion on 'the theme of the Malay condition of Malay backwardness' in Abdullah's 'epilogue' with the *kerajaan* system (Milner, 1982). For example, Milner highlights 'the oppression of

the *rajas*' as emphasised by Abdullah including 'the rulers' failure to control their rapacious children' and 'their refusal to encourage education'. Milner also states:

Abdullah lays the blame for the miserable condition of the Malay community on their rulers, and in doing so he implicitly acknowledges the centrality of the ruler, or *raja*, in Malay life. (Milner, 2002: 15)

Milner (2002: 50-54) also discusses Abdullah's text under the sub-topic of 'Race' where he suggests that 'the race (*bangsa*) was the primary community' for Abdullah and not the *kerajaan* (Milner, 2002: 51). However, Milner also offers the following:

It is true that at one point in the 'epilogue', when complaining of the way rulers treated their subjects, he writes of Malays as members of the Islamic community, as "servants of Allah". This could have had a rhetorical purpose in that it drew attention to the fact that the rulers' behaviour contravened even the injunction of their own religion. (Milner, 2002: 51)

According to Milner (2002: 52), 'Abdullah's preoccupation with the Malay race, therefore, is best examined in the context of the growing currency of the phrase at the time he wrote'. This refers to his earlier discussion where Milner examines Abdullah's use of the term *bangsa* in *Hikayat Abdullah* and 'the growing sense of Malayness' in 19<sup>th</sup> century Malaya. Milner (2002: 51) discusses the etymology of the word *bangsa*, which includes references to its 'Sanskrit' origin, and its use in '*kerajaan*' texts.

In another study, Maier (2004: 211) states that Abdullah has become 'a metaphor', 'a touchstone' and 'a test case in the discussions about Malayness on the Malay peninsula' together with the Malay literary figure, Hang Tuah. Maier discusses *Hikayat Abdullah* by examining Abdullah's use and promotion of the Malay language in terms of *kacukan* (the 'muddled' language) and *betul* (the 'correct' language). While Maier's discussion on the Malay language in Abdullah's text is indeed informative, his discussion does not contribute much to my study for he focuses more on the advantages of printing in the development of Malay writing.

As we have seen now, studies on *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Hikayat Abdullah* have indeed examined the paradigm of Malayness although not much can be seen as contributing to our understanding of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. As such, I now move on to a discussion on the first selected author in modern Malay literature, Ishak Haji Muhammad. The next section begins with a brief literary background of Ishak followed by a review of studies on his two novels, *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila*. As with the previous texts, I have limited my review to studies related to the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised.

**Ishak Haji Muhammad, *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila*  
Ishak Haji Muhammad (1909-1991)**

Dr. Ishak bin Haji Muhammad was born Awang bin Haji Muhammad on 10 November 1910 in Kampung Saguntang, Temerloh, Pahang. In 1930, Ishak enrolled at the prestigious MCKK as part of his training as a Malay Administrative Service (MAS) officer but, after eighteen months, Ishak began to feel bored and decided to resign from MAS in 1935. Ishak was also a prolific writer who used to write under many pseudonyms, such as *Anwar*, *Hantu Raya* (The Great Ghost), and *Pandir Moden* (The Modern-day Pandir). His writings were published beginning 1937 in various Malay newspapers, such as *Warta Malaya*. He was appointed Assistant Editor of *Warta Malaya* (1937-1939) and was also on the Editorial Board of *Utusan Melayu* (1939). It was during this tenureship that Ishak began to write short stories and novels (Wan Shamsuddin Mohd. Yusoff, 1976: 97).

Ishak is also popularly known as ‘Pak Sako’ in modern Malay literature, a moniker which is an altered form of the name, ‘Isako-San’, acquired during the Japanese Occupation of Malaya<sup>79</sup> (Li Chuan Siu, 1978: 199). Ishak’s writings cover issues prevalent during his time, namely colonialism versus nationalism. Aveling (1993: 4) states that Ishak’s ‘orientation was to Malay culture itself’ and ‘valorised it against what was to him a decidedly inferior if endlessly and ruthlessly aggressive British colonialism’. Among Ishak’s literary contributions were short stories, novels

<sup>79</sup> On the Japanese Occupation, see Kratoska (1998); Cheah Boon Kheng (1979; 2003).

and articles in various publications spanning a total of seven decades but his works never reached the fervour or made a remarkable impact on the modern Malay literary scene as both his satirical novels, *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila*.

According to A. Samad Ismail (1987: back sleeve blurb), pre-war Malay society was one which was influenced by the values of the colonialist and it was only people like Ishak, a Malay and English educated writer, who was able to expose and ridicule the hypocrisy of the colonialist. Ishak has been described as a writer whose main intention was to instil and inflame nationalistic sentiment in the Malays (Abdul Latiff Abu Bakar, 1977: 151; Li Chuan Siu, 1978: 201; Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 31) and was a Malay political activist and nationalist whose strong political views were often publicly expressed through his writings, much to the discomfort and displeasure of some quarters (Li Chuan Siu, 1978: 199-201). He was arrested by the British in 1941 due to his involvement with Kesatuan Melayu Muda (KMM) (The Union of Malay Youths), a Malay organisation fighting for independence, and was again detained by the British colonial government during the height of the Malayan Emergency. At this point in his life, Ishak had become one of the leaders of Parti Kebangsaan Melayu Malaya (PKMM) (the National Malayan Malay Party) (Wan Shamsuddin Mohd. Yusoff, 1976: 97-98).

Ishak's own political contemporary, Ahmad Boestamam (1920-1983)<sup>80</sup> describes him as a man with many a 'first' in the history of modern Malay literature. According to Ahmad (1988: 80), Ishak was the first author to write a political satire in the form of *Putera Gunung Tahan* while *Anak Mat Lela Gila* was the first Malay novel to contain messages of political and philosophical beliefs. According to Shahrom Mohd. Dom (1988: 86), an often overlooked contribution by Ishak is his involvement in the Malay opposition towards the formation of the Malayan Union (1936-1948).<sup>81</sup> Shahrom states that it was Ishak who had suggested the inclusion of Malay as the official language among ten of the Citizen Constitution.

---

<sup>80</sup> Ahmad Boestamam is the pseudonym of Abdullah Thani bin Raja Kechil, a political activist, writer, journalist and orator.

<sup>81</sup> The Malayan Union was a confederation of the Malay states and the Straits Settlements excluding Singapore which was placed as a crown colony under direct British rule. It was the successor to British Malaya and was conceived to simplify the administration of British colonies in the Malay peninsula. It was formed on April 1, 1946 by the British. On the Malayan Union, see Stockwell (1979); Mohamed Noordin Sopiee (2005).

Despite his previous imprisonments, Ishak was not short on accolades and had left a huge impression on the Malay literary scene. As gratitude for his extensive and diverse contributions to modern Malay literature, Ishak was bestowed the Honorary Doctorate in Literature by Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur on 29 June 1973 which carries the title 'Dr.'. Ishak was also awarded the esteemed title, *Pejuang Sastera*, (Literary Champion) on 29 May 1976 by the Malaysian Federal Government together with five other writers, A. Samad Ismail (1924-2008), A. Samad Said (b.1935), Kamaluddin Muhammad (1922-1992), Shahnnon Ahmad (b.1933) and Usman Awang (1929-2001). A posthumous award, *Tokoh Kewartawanan Negara* (National Figure of Journalism), was bestowed upon Ishak in 1995 by the Malaysian Federal Government as recognition for his journalistic achievements.

### **Studies on *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila***

In a Malaysian television programme, *Komentar*, aired on 27 June 1973, Ishak (in the pre-Preface of *Putera Gunung Tahan* (2001: iv)) states his aim of writing *Putera Gunung Tahan*: as a tool for achieving independence and justice, and to drive away the colonialist. Ishak began writing his first novel, *Hilang di mata*, on 14 February 1937 which took him six months to complete. The original title, roughly translated as *Gone missing*, was initially chosen as Ishak wanted to illustrate the ghastly way in which the two main characters, Tuan William and Tuan Roberts, meet their end due to their own foolishness (Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 40). Ishak regarded the novel as his 'constitution' (Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 29) and eventually changed the title to *Putera Gunung Tahan*, which is a reference to Mount Tahan in Pahang, to symbolise the strength of the Malays.

*Putera Gunung Tahan* was first published in *Jawi* in 1937 with a publication in Romanised Malay in 1973. The novel was translated into English by Aveling as *The prince of Mount Tahan* and was published in 1980. In *Ingatan Pengarangnya* (Author's Preface), Ishak (2001: xiii) informs readers his reasons for writing the novel: for readers to be aware of their responsibilities towards their homeland (*tanahair*), race (*bangsa*) and *adat*/culture (*adat resam*) and, from that awareness, Ishak hopes that readers would then protect their religion (*agama*), *adat*/culture (*adat istiadat*) and homeland (*tanahair*) from destruction.

Ishak's second novel, *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, was published in *Jawi* in 1941 followed by a publication in Romanised Malay in 1960 (Li Chuan Siu, 1978: 202-203). The novel was translated into English by Aveling as *The son of Mad Mat Lela* and was published in 1983. According to Ishak, *Anak Mat Lela Gila* was inspired by his travels throughout what was then known as *Tanah Melayu* (Abdul Latiff Abu Bakar, 1977: 149). Ishak was especially concerned with the wretched state of affairs he witnessed in Malay societies along the east coast of the Malay peninsula states of Pahang, Terengganu and Kelantan.<sup>82</sup> He was also extremely disturbed by what he observed, particularly regarding the 'why' and the 'how' that the Malays there have succumbed to such poverty and despair. If *Putera Gunung Tahan* was seen by Ishak as his 'constitution', then *Anak Mat Lela Gila* was perceived by Ishak as his 'manifesto' (Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 29).

Scholarship on *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila* does cover wide-ranging issues associated with the paradigm of Malayness despite its obvious anti-colonialism theme. For example, Abdul Latiff Abu Bakar (1977: 114-172) highlights Ishak's attitude towards the Malay rulers and aristocrats and Malay society through both novels where, according to Latiff (1977: 148-149), Ishak's first novel with its nationalist sentiment was based on his own experiences with the British. Latiff is referring here to Ishak's working experience as well as his own socialising with the Malay rulers and aristocrats in his capacity as a MAS officer which eventually became the basis of *Putera Gunung Tahan*. Latiff states that this novel is Ishak's subtle criticism of the Malay rulers and aristocrats whom he claims have neglected the welfare of the Malay subjects through their own ambitious social climbing.

While Ishak's working experience may have led him to compose his first novel, Latiff (1977: 149) states how it was Ishak's travels throughout the Malay peninsula, which had made him aware of the dire circumstances of the Malay society, that had inspired him to write his second novel, *Anak Mat Lela Gila*. Although Ishak also criticised the colonial government in this novel, Latiff is of the opinion that Ishak

---

<sup>82</sup> Ishak's concern is nonetheless not new. The same observation has been recorded by Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi (1838) much earlier in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century as *Kisah Pelayaran Abdullah Sampai Ke Negeri Kelantan*.

highlights more on the attitudes of the Malays and internal differences among themselves through his satirical narrative.

Mohd. Taib Osman and Abu Bakar Hamid (1988: 307-309) describe Ishak's two novels as 'satires' on the 'impotency of the traditional Malay leadership' and a rejection of 'the western way of life'. According to Taib and Bakar (1988: 308), the journey into the hinterland of the country made by Bulat, the protagonist of *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, based on the advice given by the Sakai Mandur Alang can also be seen as symbolising the Malay search for identity as they are faced with losing their own identity and *adat*/culture due to an 'onslaught of Western culture'. As they view it, the ending of the story, in which Bulat and his biological parents prepare for their trip to perform the *Haj* pilgrimage in Mecca, confirms the Islamic consciousness which can also be detected throughout the story. In fact, both novels are described by Taib and Bakar (1988: 309) as 'a composite of modern, traditional and Islamic consciousness' [sic].

A study by Abdullah Tahir (1989: 27-63) provides a different perspective on both novels as part of Ishak's process of composing his novels, namely Ishak's diaries and life experiences. Apart from highlighting the arrogance and deceit of the British colonial powers through *Putera Gunung Tahan* based on his notes in his diaries, Abdullah (1989: 42) states that Ishak also criticised the Malay aristocrats as a group of Malays who no longer wanted to make sacrifices for the betterment of their own subjects, and disapproved of Malays who still practised archaic Malay custom based on his personal observations of the Malays.

However, the second novel, as Abdullah (1989: 51, 52) views it, focuses on the social issues faced by Malay society where he states that the Malay race must search for its self-identity and discover its roots. Indeed, Ishak wanted the Malays to be more aware of their rights and heritage and, as such, Ishak believed that they should aspire to a kind of model or 'manifesto' as he called it. This manifesto is seen as crucial for the Malays in order to propel them to better themselves in all aspects of their lives, especially in terms of progress and development. Ishak envisioned his manifesto through *Anak Mat Lela Gila* as a spiritual one where it encompasses the Malay spirit as well as going back to basics and establishing a strong Malay identity.

Ishak believed that the Malays have a 'disease' in the form of corruption in every aspect of their lives where this social disease has in turn disadvantaged the Malays (Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 58). According to Abdullah (1989: 57), Ishak had selected several characteristics of what he viewed as the Malay's own identity which he hoped to deliver through Bulat. One of Ishak's characteristics which is emphasised through the novel is Bulat's own journey to find his biological parents as, to Ishak, Bulat's journey is also a symbolic journey for the Malays to search for their own national identity (Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 61)

Aveling (1993: 1-8) examines the two novels based on 'the major principles' of postcolonialism, namely 'the nature of non-imperial culture', 'relationship with the centre' and 'language'. Aveling (1993: 5) states that Ishak's criticism in *Putera Gunung Tahan* is directed also at 'upper class Malays' and not only towards the British where Ishak had singled out the Malay rulers for yielding themselves to the British 'in exchange for wealth, titles and medals'. Aveling believes that Ishak was 'disgusted with his own people' for allowing their culture to be corrupted by colonialism and this eventually led him to 'construct a pure Malay society... beyond the deuterio-Malay world of the larger cities'. The novel is viewed by Aveling (1993: 6) as emphasising the 'crisis of Malay identity'.

Of *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, Aveling (1993: 6) states, 'The satire is internal to the Malayan Peninsula'. While highlighting Ishak's criticism of Malays who are materialistic and liberal in their views of 'human sexual desires', Aveling also discusses Ishak's portrayal of 'a new type of Malay' who was beginning to emerge in Malaya where 'Pure Malays are starting to work together, to support each other in business, and through this mutual co-operation to prosper as a community'. More importantly, Aveling (1993: 6) suggests that Ishak 'praises the moderate practice of Islam, safe from fanaticism'.

In his Foreword to the English translation of the novel, Thomas (1983: vi) states how it is not an easy task in post-colonial Malaysia to define who is and who is not a Malay but Ishak had made a considerable effort to deliver his messages on religion, culture and identity through *Anak Mat Lela Gila*. Describing Bulat as 'the embodiment of what the new Malay should be' (Thomas, 1983: viii), Thomas (1983:

ix) also states that Ishak wants to deliver this particular message to the Malays through the character Bulat, 'It is not enough to be a Malay, one must also be competent'. Thomas (1983: vii) suggests that Ishak did not simply reject Western progress but had redefined the understanding of progress in such a way that it must be 'synonymous' with a 'purified and perfected' development of Malay culture and the practice of Islam. According to Thomas:

Religion as one of the primary marks of Malay identity is an area which cannot be understood or meddled with by the colonialist. It is, therefore, a field which Malays can develop as their contribution to future progress. (Thomas, 1983: ix)

While most scholars have been complimentary in their analyses of Ishak's novels, especially his second one, Annas Haji Ahmad (1988: 226) nonetheless describes *Putera Gunung Tahan* as a lesson on Geography akin to a tourist report in a newspaper and an unconvincing fiction which is of poor quality. The same view may be shared by Hooker (2000: 111), 'The work begins like a geography and history text about the Malay state of Pahang (there is even a footnote as a sign of verification)'. However, Hooker's study is the only one so far which contains a useful discussion on Ishak's two novels pertaining to the paradigm of Malayness.

In a chapter on 'the power of parody: responding to western technology and rationalism', Hooker (2000: 110) states that Ishak 'is more concerned with group values than individual development, and uses his characters as representatives of 'types''. Hooker does not believe that Ishak wanted to promote the importance of either Muslim or Western education in his 'two allegorical narratives' as part of improving the seriously declining position of the Malays, but that the novels 'stressed instead how indigenous skills and experience pre-dating Western influence, and still available to the present generation, are the key to a re-awakening of the national pride and energy' through a historical and mythical retelling of the past. According to Hooker:

In presenting the historical processes he wishes to highlight, Ishak constructs a 'pure' value system based on a past which was not materialistic, not selfish and which would also serve the present. During the course of making his points Ishak delineates aspects of 'Malayness', which he sees as authentically Malay. (Hooker, 2000: 110)

Under the heading of 'telling tales', Hooker (2000: 119-122) discusses in detail 'the nature of Malayness' in Ishak's two novels as 'representations of change and destruction'. Hooker (2000: 120) states that Ishak 'explores the nature of 'Malayness' in both books' and 'describes qualities which he designates as characteristics of Malays'. Hooker exemplifies a scene from *Putera Gunung Tahan* in which Robert is able to identify the old woman as Malay through her language, 'When she speaks, she does so with Malay respect and courtesy'. Another example given by Hooker is that William is able to identify the male character Kusina as Malay 'because of his dress and his courtesy'. Hooker (2000: 121) also suggests that 'Ishak maintains this presentation of Malayness' in *Anak Mat Lela Gila*. She exemplifies a scene where Bulat meets Alang, the Sakai chief, for the first time but is unable to differentiate him from a Malay. As Hooker states:

If 'Malayness', as described by Ishak, is not based on descent and blood, but on behaviour, dress and language, it is a fluid category, able to encompass anyone who adopts these traits. Thus Alang can move in and out of 'Malayness' as it suits him, depending on whether he is in the city or the jungle. If it is fluid, anyone, even the British Mem, can 'become Malay' but also, if it is based only on clothes and manners, it can easily be lost, and it is this loss which concerns Ishak. (Hooker, 2000: 121)

As seen above, Hooker discusses 'Malayness' together with '*Melayu* characteristics' as analysed in Ishak's two novels. It is interesting then to see if the same views can be discerned through discussions on the next selected author and work. As such, I now proceed to the next section which is a brief discussion on the literary background of Shahnnon Ahmad followed by a review of studies on his novel, *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. Due to the vast number of scholarship available, I have narrowed the studies to those relevant to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness.

### **Shahnnon Ahmad and *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* Shahnnon Ahmad (b.1933)**

According to Ismail Hussein (1974a: 25), Shahnnon Ahmad only writes about his own race, and the bigger problem faced by his race in Malaysia is seen from this aspect, from the aspect of Malayness. Indeed, in modern Malay literature, Shahnnon Ahmad,

or his full designation Professor Emeritus Dato' Dr. Haji Shahnnon bin Haji Ahmad, is the foremost Malay writer ranked on a par with another outstanding Malay *sasterawan* (literary figure), A. Samad Said (b.1935) (Baharuddin Zainal et al., 1981: 46-51; Ahmad Kamal Abdullah et al., 1992: 237-239; Hooker, 2000: 389). Shahnnon was born on 13 January 1933 in Banggul Derdap, Sik, Kedah, a remote village and one of the poorest peasant villages in the northern state of Peninsular Malaysia. With his background as a son of a peasant but educated in an upper-class school and surrounded by genteel schoolmates, his educational years at college were benchmarks in his writing years where he first became interested in literature.

Shahnnon was also inspired by and developed a keen interest in the works of poets and writers known within the Malay literary circle of that period as *Angkatan Sasterawan 50* (ASAS 50).<sup>83</sup> In his acceptance speech, "Love", as the second *Sasterawan Negara* (National Literary Laureate),<sup>84</sup> Shahnnon (in Solehah Ishak, 1998: 82-86) reveals his deep belief in the ultimate love for God, an attribute that is most evident in his most famous novel to date, *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. On 29 May 1976, Shahnnon was awarded the esteemed title, *Pejuang Sastera*, (Literary Champion) by the Malaysian Federal Government together with five other writers, A. Samad Ismail, A. Samad Said, Ishak Haji Muhammad, Kamaluddin Muhammad and Usman Awang.

Due to his outstanding role in and contributions to literature, Shahnnon was bestowed the eminent honour *Dato' Setia Diraja Kedah* by His Royal Highness the Sultan of Kedah in 1980 which carries the title '*Dato*'. In 1982, Shahnnon was appointed Professor of Modern Malay Literature and, upon his retirement, held the prominent post of Director of Pusat Islam, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) (1984-1996). In 1993, Shahnnon was bestowed by USM the most prestigious academic accolade, Professor Emeritus, for his various academic and literary contributions consisting of short stories, novels, essays, literary criticisms and research.

<sup>83</sup> On ASAS 50, see Ismail Hussein (1974b); Ahmad Kamal Abdullah et al. (1992); Ungku Maimunah Mohd. Tahir (2003: 87-96).

<sup>84</sup> The first *Sasterawan Negara* was Kamaluddin Muhammad (Keris Mas), awarded in 1981.

### Studies on *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*

*Ranjau sepanjang jalan* is Shahnon's third novel after *Rentung* (1965a) and *Terdedah* (1965b). It was published in 1966 and is Shahnon's second novel with a plot on the life and story of Malay peasants after *Rentung*. The novel was translated into English by Adibah Amin and was published as *No harvest but a thorn* in 1972.<sup>85</sup> According to Shahnon (1991a: 374), the novel took three months to complete and, during this stage, he was obsessively disturbed by one issue: the poverty of the Malays. Shahnon (1991a: 375) is keen to point out that the Malay peasants are blessed with children but are also ironically blessed with poverty. He explains that the poverty he portrayed was not a figment of his imagination but rather a harsh reality he grew up with, witnessed and experienced in his own village of Kampung Banggul Derdap (Shahnon Ahmad, 1991b: 362).

One of the most evident features of the novel is Shahnon's use of regional Malay language in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* which has been discussed by Mohd. Yusof Hasan (1976; 1984: 296-322) and Johns (1984: 18-19). For example, Yusof (1984: 298-319) discusses the aesthetical use of regional language in the novel in terms of names, adjectives and characteristics of the regional words while Johns (1984: 19) discusses Shahnon's contribution to the development of the Malay language and literature through the use of regional language in the novel. While their discussions are indeed beneficial for the development of Malay in literary studies, they unfortunately do not reveal much in relation to the focus of my study.

The main issue of Malay poverty as depicted in the novel has been discussed in studies with regard to Lahuma's strong faith in his religion, Islam, and his veneration to his God, Allah Azzawajalla (Kassim Ahmad, 1984a: 134-139; 1984b: 142; Banks, 1984: 71-74; 1987: 113-143; Jassin, 1984: 119-122; Md. Salleh Yaapar, 1984: 198-199; Thumboo, 1984: 91-109; A. Wahab Ali, 1988: 278-281; Mohd. Yusof Hasan, 1989: 48-65; Metzger, 1991: 63-74; Ungku Maimunah Mohd. Tahir, 1998: 115-137; Aveling, 2000: 98-136). For instance, Kassim (1984a: 137; 1984b: 142)

---

<sup>85</sup> Adibah Amin (1972: viii) states that the original title may be translated literally into *Traps along the way*. Banks (1987: 117) has translated the title into *Difficulties the length of the road*. Mohd. Taib Osman (1986: 113; 1988: 79) has translated *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* as *Stakes all along the way* and *Obstacles all along the way*.

states how Shahnnon's inference, that the Malay peasants only had themselves to blame for their poverty because it was all fated by God, raises the question of character authenticity because, to him, the Malay peasants are more resilient in real-life and are not as defenceless as portrayed in the novel. Salleh (1984: 198) however argues that Lahuma's total submission to Allah smacks of fatalism although certain scenes in the novel demonstrate contradictions in this particular character portrayal where, for example, Lahuma does not simply rely on Allah to change his fortune but indeed works hard to improve his living conditions for the sake of his family.

According to Jassin (1984: 119), Lahuma and his wife, Jeha, are people who are devoted to God where their principle in life is defined by how 'life and death as well as suffering and happiness are in the hands of God, in the hands of Allah Azzawajalla'. This strong belief in faith of Lahuma and Jeha in their God, as seen in the opening sentence of the novel, has been described by Ungku Maimunah Mohd. Tahir (1998: 125) as a 'maxim' which is 'woven into the characters' conviction and world-view' while Hooker (2000: 272) calls it a 'refrain' which is Lahuma's 'philosophy of life'. Thumboo (1984: 91-96) focuses on the religious doctrine, Islam, as the only factor that influences the spiritual, emotional and physical environment of Lahuma and his family. As I see it, Thumboo suggests that, through the depiction of the lives of the Malay peasants, the novel also shows how Islam, as the religion of the Malays, plays an important role to the Malays in general. This view is also highlighted by Metzger (1991: 70) where, to him, the most important aspect in the novel is Shahnnon's 'perception of the Islamic religion and the part such religion plays'.

The above views are also highlighted in a study by Banks (1984) on Islam and political change in rural Malay society. Under the topic of 'poverty' in his examination of the novel, Banks (1984: 73) points to the religion of Islam, apart from the differences in social status, as one of the reasons why the Malay peasants in the novel are portrayed as passive human beings. Banks (1984: 73) believes that their faith in God made them passive in attitude and this particular representation evoked strong emotions among the Malays. While Banks (1984: 73) acknowledges that both Lahuma and Jeha are indeed religious people and do not blame God for their

sufferings, he also draws attention to the shortcomings of the novel in terms of the role played by Islamic organisations as a whole.

In his other study, Banks (1987: 129-131) discusses in detail about Islam in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* and poses this question: 'what does Shahnnon's novel tell us about Islam in the lives of the peasants?' (Banks, 1987: 129). As Banks views it, Islam emerges in the novel as 'an important part of the identities of the characters' where he states:

They think of themselves as Muslims, even though Islam does not appear to offer them clear alternatives when important problems arise. (Banks, 1987: 129)

Banks maintains that Shahnnon has suggested 'a deeper, pervasive role for Islam in Malay rural life' where he explains:

Islam's influence is present yet it exists largely outside of the formal structure of Islamic roles. (Banks, 1987: 129)

Under the topic of 'culture and morality', Banks (1987: 131-133) discusses how the novel provides the Malays with 'the moral materials necessary to confront moral dilemmas'. Banks (1987: 131) posits the view that Shahnnon had 'confronted the ways that Malays make use of group social consciousness to solve important social issues'. According to Banks:

Shahnnon sees Islam as an essential building block in the group moral process. He does not mean Islam of formal religious institutions necessarily, but rather the Islamic faith possessed by individual believers which is, after all, the goal that these institutions seek to achieve. (Banks, 1987: 133)

More importantly in Banks' study is his view on the role played by Islam in the paradigm of Malayness:

The attempt to resolve this dilemma [between the moral concerns of the individual, such as Lahuma, and a group social consciousness] seems to be the reason that Shahnnon has chosen Islam as a moral center of Malayness,... (Banks, 1987: 133)

Banks (1987: 147-148), despite examining Shahnnon as a writer who offers a concept of ‘the essential features of Malay values’, can also be seen as discussing ‘the essential features’ of the paradigm of Malayness in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. In his view, Shahnnon considers ‘Islam the essence of Malay culture that should direct the nation’ and that the novel is about a rural community that ‘reflect[s] a search for aspects of Malayness that have continuing relevance in the modern social context’. Banks also suggests that the novel’s ‘cultural characteristics of Malayness’ has received more positive treatment in studies on this subject.

In another study, Mohd. Yusof Hasan (1989: 48) is of the opinion that Shahnnon examines the relationship between individuals with nature and Allah in the novel where ‘there is the fact of man’s belief and trust which views such trials as decrees of Allah which must be accepted’. As Yusof further explains:

Islam teaches the acceptance of fate as the sixth pillar of Faith. This is the core of Shahnnon’s view of life as developed in this novel. ...Man must leave his fate in the hands of God and never lose his faith. Islam teaches man to accept the situation, but never to surrender. Therefore, Lahuma is not fatalistic in the face of natural calamities; he works and struggles constantly in order to survive. (Mohd. Yusof Hasan, 1989: 64)<sup>86</sup>

In his chapter on ‘Islam and rural existence in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*’, Aveling (2000: 98) describes Lahuma as ‘a model of an authentic lay piety – the submission of the ordinary man to the will of God in every aspect of life’ despite his extreme poverty and hardship. Under the topic of ‘The hard God of *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*’, Aveling (2000: 112) points to the opening sentence of the novel as ‘The rational discourse of the sovereignty of Allah Azzawajalla [which] plays a dominant role in the overall structure of religious concepts in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*’. Aveling’s subsequent discussions on ‘Women’s work, men’s power’, ‘Jeha’s madness’ and ‘The Headman’ are worthy of note but unfortunately do not relate to

---

<sup>86</sup> With regard to the view on the acceptance of fate as the sixth Islamic Pillar of Faith, the complete six Pillars of Faith in Islam are (1) Belief in Allah as a mono-deity, (2) Belief in the Angels, (3) Belief in Allah’s Revealed Books, (4) Belief in the Prophet and the Messengers of Allah, (5) Belief in the Day of Judgement, and (6) Belief in Al-Qadar. The final belief is belief in Divine Predestination in life but this does not mean that human beings do not have free will nor the choice to do what is right or wrong.

my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness as they focus on the relationship between Islam, power and gender.

In her Introduction to the English translation of the novel, Adibah Amin (1972: v) states how Shahnong views 'the Malay peasant of the 1960s as a man following a way of life not very different from that of his ancestors,... still steeped in old attitudes and values, and upholding with great courage the old belief about his predestined lot in life'. Indeed, the issues of traditional beliefs and cultural practices have been explored by Thumboo (1984: 103) and Hooker (2000: 271-273). Thumboo concedes that, although the theme of the novel is Lahuma's strong belief in faith and fate, there are also other forms of beliefs which influence Lahuma, namely his belief in traditional myths. Hooker (2000: 272) further expands the above view by relating it to the characters' belief in God where she suggests that the characters are presented by Shahnong as 'acknowledging God's Will, but also as having a strong belief in supernatural forces and omens'. Hooker highlights other scenes in the novel, apart from Jeha's near calamity with the cobra, which involves Lahuma's own paradoxical beliefs in both his God and the traditional ones.

As demonstrated so far, studies have focussed on Shahnong's principal preoccupation in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* which deals inherently with the couple's fervent faith in their religion, Islam, and God as one of the 'aspects' of Malayness. With this in view, we now move on to a discussion on the next selected author and work, Muhammad Haji Salleh, and his poetic composition of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, based on various themes from the traditional Malay literary text, *Sejarah Melayu*. The section begins with a brief discussion on Muhammad's literary background followed by a review limited to studies conducted on this work which are related to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness.

**Muhammad Haji Salleh and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*  
Muhammad Haji Salleh (b.1942)**

According to Zawiah Yahya (2003b: 3), Professor Dr. Mohamad Haji Salleh, or better known as Muhammad Haji Salleh in modern Malay literature, is renowned through

his works as a literary figure who is preoccupied with self-examination and self-journey as well as a 'redefinition of his Malay identity as he returns to his roots for a rebirth'. A writer who started composing in English but soon switched to Malay as part of his own attempt at redefining himself, this resulted in most of his discourse, 'perpetually in dialogue with some unseen detractors sceptical of his Malayness' (Zawiah Yahya, 2003b: 3). Born on 26 March 1942 in Taiping, Perak, Muhammad became a tutor in the English Department at Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur upon his return to Malaysia after studying in the United Kingdom and Singapore. Muhammad wrote a thesis on the history of modern Malay and Indonesian poetry where this period of his life is considered as Muhammad's turning point in writing because he soon began composing in Malay while earlier he had been prolific in producing works in English. Muhammad was also encouraged by a six-month research and stay in Indonesia which exposed him to a more modern, verbal and stronger structure and texture of the Malay language. In 1970, Muhammad pursued a doctoral degree in Southeast Asian Literature at Michigan University, United States of America.

Among his prominent positions after his return from abroad, Muhammad was the first holder of the European Chair of Malay Studies at Leiden University, the Netherlands (1993-1995), Director of Institut Alam dan Tamadun Melayu (Institute of the Malay World and Civilisation) at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor (1995-1999), and Fellow at the Centre for South East Asian Studies, University of Kyoto, Japan (1999-2000). He is at present Professor of Literature at USM. For his various contributions to the Malaysian literary world, including articles and papers in journals and proceedings, chapters in books, editorial committees, literary involvements, translations as well as academic research, Muhammad was awarded the South East Asian Write Award, Bangkok, Thailand in 1997 (Fadillah Merican, 2001: 12-32).

Muhammad's possible ultimate academic achievement in the development of modern Malay literary scene is his theory of Malay literature which was delivered as his Professorial inaugural lecture on 30 August 1989, *Puitika sastera Melayu – satu pertimbangan* (*The poetics of Malay literature – a consideration*). It was soon published as a book entitled *Puitika sastera Melayu* in 2000 (Muhammad Haji Salleh,

2000a) and the English version of the book, *The poetics of Malay literature*, was published in 2008 (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 2008c). Muhammad himself has conducted studies on the images of the Malay in the works of the English author, Joseph Conrad (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981a: 318-322), and has also examined the representation of fictional Malay characters in European and Asian literatures where he is highly engaged in discovering how the Malay identity is viewed by non-Malay writers (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1996: 190-230).

Just like the Malays in *Sejarah Melayu* who travel physically, Muhammad believes that writers too should travel albeit figuratively. In 1991, when he was made recipient of Malaysia's most prestigious literary award, Malaysia's sixth *Sasterawan Negara*,<sup>87</sup> Muhammad shares his high regards for writers of traditional Malay literary texts in his acceptance speech, "Our people must sail the seas of the world". In his speech, Muhammad (in Solehah Ishak, 1998: 211) calls for the literary community to embrace wholly their achievements.

Indeed, his esteem for the said writers had prompted Muhammad to undertake a study on the most renowned traditional Malay literary text, *Sejarah Melayu*, which resulted in the creation of an anthology of poems based on various themes in the text, entitled *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b). The original composition of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* is based on several versions of *Sejarah Melayu* and, thus, this could be a reason why Muhammad later felt the need to edit the oldest known text of *Sejarah Melayu*, the MS. Raffles No. 18 edition. This resulted in the publication of *Sulalat al-salatin* (Tun Seri Lanang, 1997).

### **Studies on *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu***

*Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* is a collection of poems written over a period of seven years based on various themes in *Sejarah Melayu* where it underwent several sketch versions before finally materialising in book form in 1981 (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b). It has also been translated into German in 1994. In an interview with Md.

---

<sup>87</sup> After Shahnun as the second recipient, it was awarded in 1983 to Usman Awang, in 1986 to A. Samad Said, and in 1988 to Muhammad bin Abdul Biang (Arena Wati) (1925-2009).

Salleh Yaapar (2003: 32), Muhammad admits that he has been on a journey aimed at finding and defining the Malay identity and had turned to *Sejarah Melayu* to discover his roots. This self-discovery journey resulted in him ‘reworking and reinterpreting passages, characters and situations’ based on the chapters of *Sejarah Melayu* published as a whole volume titled *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. As Muhammad sees it, this anthology is his attempt ‘to be closer to the traditional roots’.

Muhammad’s method of experimenting with new forms based on old notions in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* has been described as delving into the connotation of *bangsa* (race). Muhammad aims to transcend beyond contemporary sense and substance and has experimented with form, approach, language and themes in trying to present a retrospective thought through this work. He also recognises that there existed connotations of a superior self, a unique race and enduring wisdom in tradition as espoused in his collection of poems (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: back sleeve blurb). In his essay on the publication of his edition of *Sejarah Melayu, Sulalat al-salatin* (Tun Seri Lanang, 1997), entitled “*Sulalat al-salatin: adikarya akalbudi Melayu*” (“*Sulalat al-salatin: an introspective composition of the Malay*”), Muhammad (2008b: 21) explains his method of writing *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* as combining questions on language and truth as well as also keeping closely to the meaning of the questions with the actual texts. According to Muhammad (2008b: 22), the modern author picks on the questions in order to bring about contemporary meanings together with contemporary analysis.

*Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* is the focus of studies which have examined the work based on diverse perspectives such as a re-conceptualisation of the diabolical relationship between the raja and subject – between the Malay ideologies of *daulat* and *derhaka* (Ruzy Suliza Hashim, 2003: 86-105), from a comparative point of view between *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* and other traditional Malay literary texts (Junus, 1984a: 155-162; Kukushkin, 1994: 37-44), an analysis of Muhammad’s theme of intellectualism (Abdul Rahman Napiyah, 2003: 111-112), and an examination of the

manifestation of Malayness and Islam through the poetries of Muhammad and Kemala<sup>88</sup> (Badrul Redzuan Abu Hassan and Fauziah Ahmad, 2003: 197-225).

Braginsky (2001: 286) calls Muhammad's work 'a poetical-book dialogue' and describes it as 'filled with many new realistic psychological details [which] is eventually re-created so as to sanctify Muhammad's idea about patriotism, self-esteem and social justice with the authority of antiquity and the heroic deeds of the ancestors.' Conversely, Zawiah (2000: 30) states that the anthology is Muhammad's 'attempt at rehabilitating ethnic memory and history as a vital part of contemporary consciousness by drawing themes from traditional texts and transforming them into modern issues'. Junus (1984a: 155, 160) describes the work as a series of 'highlighted' events in a set of stories which in turn contain stories which highlight other events, and is of the opinion that events in *Sejarah Melayu* have been viewed by Muhammad based on contemporary perspectives and thus given present meanings without having to change the actual events.

In another study, Ruzy (2003: 86) describes *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* as 'a re-conceptualisation of the stories of Malay kings'. Ruzy (2003: 90) highlights the importance of the 'prologue' of the work as it is in this section that Muhammad outlines his role and responsibilities 'as the modern storyteller': 'speak the true word, capture the metropolitan ambience of Melaka, appraise her people, expose reasons for its downfall [with the aim] to draw lessons from the past so that we do not repeat the same mistakes of our forefathers'. In discussing the 'diabolical relationship' between the Malay king and his subjects, Ruzy (2003: 91) brings into view how 'a Raja asserts sovereignty over his subjects by means of the ideology of *daulat* and *derhaka*'. Ruzy (2003: 91, 92) defines *daulat* as encompassing 'legal, cultural and religious' ideologies while *derhaka* is defined as 'failure to obey a royal command' which 'means a disregard for the ruler's *daulat*' thus making 'a subject *derhaka*'. Although Ruzy's study provides a similar perspective to my own study, I do not believe that it adds to our understanding of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness as Ruzy (2003: 94-103) examines four stories from Muhammad's work, namely the suicide of Bendahara Wak Raja as well as the stories of Tun Kudu, Tun Teja and Tun Fatimah,

---

<sup>88</sup> Kemala is the pseudonym of Ahmad Kamal Abdullah (b.1941), a Malay poet who has produced extensive works with religious and mystical themes.

using a postcolonial theory defined as ‘palimpsest’ to describe the framework used by Muhammad in his poems.

A study by Abdul Rahman Napiah (2003: 106-126) needs to be highlighted here for he discusses Muhammad’s ‘Malayness’ in general. Rahman employs his own theory of ‘textdealism’ in his analysis of Muhammad’s authorship in his poems, *Aksara usia* (1998), and links his findings with *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. According to Rahman (2003: 111), Muhammad’s theme in his poems ‘constantly relates to his Malayness, to the root of primordial images and the Malay collective consciousness’. These are indeed Muhammad’s own ‘Malayness’ as described by Rahman which are embedded in his poems for, as Rahman views it, ‘*Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* would not have existed if Muhammad’s authorship was not rooted in his Malayness.

A more well-defined viewpoint of Muhammad’s ‘Malayness’ is, nevertheless, discussed in a study by Badrul Redzuan Abu Hassan and Fauziah Ahmad (2003: 197-225). Badrul and Fauziah (2003: 197) contrast the works of Muhammad and Kemala by posing these two questions, ‘Has Muhammad Haji Salleh been less Islamic in his intellectual poetry?’ and ‘Has Kemala marginalised Malayness in his Islamic poetry?’ The framework of their study is derived from views by Abdul Rahman Napiah on Muhammad’s perspective of Malayness, the constitutional definition of Malay and one ‘facet’ of Malayness as conceptualised by Shamsul A. B. They argue that the Malaysian constitutional definition of Malay is problematic due to the possibility of the notion of Malayness being polarised ‘between being Malay and being Muslim’, and pinpoint three possible identities being produced as a result of this polarisation: the ‘Malay’ Malay, the ‘Muslim’ Malay and the ‘New’ Malay, with the last identity conceptualised by Malaysia’s ex-Prime Minister, Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamad. This final definition integrates ‘Malay nationalism, Islam and intellectualism as a framework of Malayness’ in order to engineer an elite generation of Malays.

However, a notable disadvantage in their study lies with its framework as it does not state clearly which ‘facet’ of Malayness as conceptualised by Shamsul A. B. that has been employed. We are left to our own devices to infer and deduce that their study focuses on the Malay rulers as conceptualised by Shamsul A. B. based on views

given in their study, ‘...it is rather difficult to assume the homogeneity of the Malay identity. For instance, although obedience or loyalty to one’s leader or superior is a practice to [sic] Malayness, however, it is no longer applicable to some Malays, who have embraced open demonstration and rebellion against their superiors’ (cited in Badrul and Fauziah, 2003: 201).<sup>89</sup> Badrul and Fauziah (2003: 200) admit that ‘the definition of Malayness and being a Malay is difficult to pin down due to numerous interpretations’ because ‘Malayness is no more than a state of mind, and therefore, is cultural’.

Although I believe that their study offers the most constructive discussion on the paradigm of Malayness in one of Muhammad’s literary work, namely “si tenggang’s homecoming” (1979), it unfortunately does not examine *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. With regard to their analysis of Muhammad’s poem, Badrul and Fauziah (2003: 222) state, ‘the notion of Malayness has exposed its basic vulnerability, that is, it is a highly “fluid concept” that allows itself to be approached not only from a constitutional viewpoint, but also from the religious, cultural, intellectual, political and business viewpoints too’. Badrul and Fauziah (2003: 222) also add that ‘Malayness is merely a “construct”, and it will always be “under construction” and contested between dominant or popular ideological movements’.

Based on my earlier review of the studies, we can deduce that Muhammad’s work is indeed worth examining in order to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. With this in view, we proceed to a brief discussion on the literary background of the final selected author, Usman Awang, followed by a review of his selected work, the poem “Melayu”.

---

<sup>89</sup> Shamsul’s own words in Malay were translated by them into English but in my opinion their translation does not reflect Shamsul’s original views which I reproduce here, ‘...agak sukar untuk melihat identiti Melayu kini sebagai sesuatu yang homogen. Misalnya, persepsi dahulu bahawa semua Melayu taat setia kepada ketua, iaitu satu ciri kemelayuan. Kini mungkin hal ini tidak boleh dipakai disebabkan sebahagian orang Melayu terang-terangan melaungkan demokrasi serta berprotes dan sanggup berdemonstrasi dan tidak membuta tuli mengikut ketua’ (Shamsul Amri Baharuddin cited in Badrul and Fauziah, 2003: 201).

**Usman Awang and “Melayu”  
Usman Awang (1929-2001)**

Dato’ Dr. Usman Awang, the author widely known by his pseudonym ‘Tongkat Warrant’ (Warrant Staff) in modern Malay literature, was born Wan Osman Wan Awang on 12 July 1929 in Kampung Tanjung Lembu, Kuala Sedili, Kota Tinggi, Johor to a poor fisherman’s family (Baharuddin Zainal et al., 1981: 416). Usman is a prolific poet, dramatist, novelist and writer of many short stories and his position in modern Malay literature was enhanced by his participation in writers’ organisation and activities. Among Usman’s prominent roles are as founder of *Ikatan Persuratan Melayu Melaka* (IPM) (the Malay Literary Council of Malacca), Secretary of ASAS 50 in Singapore, and First Head of *Penulis Nasional* (PENA) (National Association of Writers) (1962-1965). Usman also created a mark in the history of modern Malay literature by being the first Malay literary figure to recite a poem at the Palestinian Parliament in 1987 upon an invitation by the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO). This was due to Usman’s poetic input on the plights and fights of the Palestinians.

Usman’s outstanding role in and contribution to modern Malay literature garnered him major awards and recognitions. On 29 May 1976, Usman was conferred the title *Pejuang Sastera* (Literary Champion) by the Malaysian Federal Government together with A. Samad Ismail, A. Samad Said, Ishak Haji Muhammad, Kamaluddin Muhammad and Shahnnon Ahmad. In 1982, Usman was chosen as a recipient for the South East Asia Award in Bangkok, Thailand. This was followed by an honorary doctorate in literature from Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur in 1983. His achievement in modern Malay literature was recognised in Malaysia when Usman was bestowed the most prestigious literary honour in 1983, as the third *Sasterawan Negara* after Kamaluddin Muhammad (1981) and Shahnnon Ahmad (1982) (Zurinah Hassan, 1990: 10-11). In his speech as Malaysia’s third *Sasterawan Negara*, “A writer’s voice of humanity”, Usman (in Solehah Ishak, 1998: 120) states how he has ‘not demarcated race, nationality, beliefs or the colour of the skin’ through his ‘voices’ although he strongly believes that ‘one common language [the Malay language] and culture will emanate from the usage, hope and dreams shared by all races’ of Malaysia. In 1999, Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, Malaysia’s then fourth Prime Minister, presented the award of *Seniman Agung* (Eminent Artist) to Usman.

## Studies on “Melayu”

The poem “Melayu” made its first appearance in a poem recital at *Minggu Sastera Malaysia* (the Malaysian Literary Week) in London (9-14 September 1992), an event organised and sponsored by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur, the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London and Southbank. The poem eventually appeared as part of an anthology of poems, *Cempaka: an anthology*, published in 1992 (Usman Awang et al., 1992) as contribution to the literary festival in London. The poem also appeared in English in *Cempaka* and the journal, *Tenggara*, entitled “The Malays”, translated by Muhammad Haji Salleh (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 2001). “Melayu” was subsequently published in the Malaysian mainstream Malay newspaper, *Mingguan Malaysia*, on 27 October 1996 when Malaysia was about to undergo a severe economic recession along with the rest of Southeast Asia.

The poem was also published subsequently in 1999 as part of Usman’s personal anthology of creative writings in *Tongkat Warrant: Ini saya punya kerja*, edited by Othman Puteh. “Melayu” (Usman Awang, 1999a) is grouped together with Usman’s other poems, namely “Melayu Johor” (1988) (Usman Awang, 1999b) (Appendix 8) which was originally published in the Malay magazine *Mastika* in 1989. The poems emphasise Usman’s firm idealism and faith in championing the Malay race and nation where “Melayu Johor” is seen as Usman’s first attempt at conceptualising his definition of Malay before it finally materialised into a more definitive poem on the Malays entitled “Melayu”. It is noted that Johor, as the last important state of the Melaka Sultanate Empire, plays a significant part in representing the ‘true’ Malays to Usman.

In the course of conducting research on “Melayu”, I discovered that “Melayu Johor” and “Melayu” have not been mentioned much by scholars let alone discussed critically. For example, Rahman Saari (2000: 84) does not rate “Melayu Johor” highly compared to Usman’s earlier poems and describes it in passing as an ‘occasional’ poem because it was composed as a reaction to a then ‘occasional’ political crisis in Malaysia. Only one study has discussed “Melayu”, namely Ahmad Kamal Abdullah (2004: 151-171).

Ahmad (2004: 165-166) identifies “Melayu” as one of Usman’s final poems that deals with the question of the homeland and the meaning of Malayness itself. According to Ahmad (2004: 166), the poem has ‘political significance’ as it is a re-evaluation of what the Malay means and in response to the call of the ‘New Malay’. As Ahmad (2004: 167-168) views it, Usman has touched upon the supposed new definition and new open-mindedness of the ‘New Malay’ analytically albeit with humour in the poem. In his brief analysis of the poem, Ahmad (2004: 168) queries: ‘Who is the Malay in contemporary understanding?’

The poet, Ahmad suggests, opens his poem with contradictions in the Malay attitude whose pure traditional values are seen as having been compromised. Other aspects of the poem discussed by Ahmad are the ‘types’ of Malays categorised in the poem, the loss of the strong Malay spirit in terms of achieving progress compared to their ancestors, and the traditional Malay traits of tolerance and virtue as ingrained in a majority of the Malay *gurindam* which are in reality no longer of relevance and use. While acknowledging that Usman is critical in his evaluation of the Malays, Ahmad also stresses Usman’s message to his fellow Malays to be wary of their future all the time as seen in the final stanza of the poem.

As seen now, the above brief discussion on “Melayu” shows that the poem indeed contains significant issues relevant to my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness. Since no study thus far has engaged in an exploration of the paradigm in “Melayu”, I strongly believe that “Melayu” should indeed be analysed in order to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness based on its important characteristics in evoking about ‘the Malays’.

## **Conclusion**

My literature review based on the selected works of the selected authors in both traditional and Malay literature has clearly demonstrated various issues. For the selected texts in traditional Malay literature, *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Hikayat Abdullah*, I have discussed studies which have examined the paradigm of Malayness in both texts. In *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, Malayness has been explored in relation to an

episode from the text regarding the dancing incident in Inderapura (Maier, 2004). Although findings from most studies demonstrate the importance of the duel between Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat, only Maier (2004) has so far examined the paradigm of Malayness in this particular episode in the text. I believe that Maier's significant questions raised in his own examination of the duel need to be considered and that is one of the reasons why I decided to explore my hypothesised paradigm of the Malayness in this important episode of the text.

The same conclusion as *Hikayat Hang Tuah* is suggested for *Hikayat Abdullah*, there are indeed studies which have examined the paradigm of Malayness in the text where they in turn illustrate many issues based on their analyses (Milner, 2002; Maier, 2004). Despite this, Malayness as examined in this text seems to lack certain fundamentals; for example, we still need to expand on the views discussed in Milner's study while Maier's study focuses more on the advantages of printing in the development of Malay writing in relation to Malayness. In particular, we still need to explore how Malayness is manifested in the often overlooked final section of Abdullah's work, the 'ending'.

For the selected works in modern Malay literature, two novels by Ishak Haji Muhammad, *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, have been chosen as a more contemporary exploration of Malayness in both novels are highly essential. This is because only one study thus far has examined Malayness in *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, namely Hooker (2000). Even then, Hooker has only discussed Malayness in relation to other issues discussed in the novels and reiterates similar views on Malayness as a 'fluid' category based on a general examination of both novels.

While Ishak's novels are in need of more investigation due to the lack of a more thorough study on Malayness as manifested in the novels, the same is also said of the selected work by Shahnnon Ahmad, *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. Ironically, although this novel does not suffer from a lack of scholarly debates as many studies have been conducted on Shahnnon's novel with numerous issues dissected and discussed both by local and foreign scholars, I have not found any specific study on the paradigm as manifested in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. This is with exception to the

study by Banks (1987) who has stated his views related to Malayness rather generally. This apparent void with regard to Shanon's most notable work must indeed be rectified and hence this is why I have chosen to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in Shanon's *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*.

The final work selected for analysis is a collection of poems by Muhammad Haji Salleh, *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, based on various themes in the most renowned traditional Malay literary text, *Sejarah Melayu*. Indeed, I have discussed two studies which have examined the paradigm of Malayness in Muhammad's poems (Abdul Rahman Napiah, 2003; Badrul Redzuan Abu Hassan and Fauziah Ahmad, 2003) but these studies have not examined the paradigm of Malayness in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. This is despite the fact that Badrul and Fauziah have made a remarkable attempt to outline a more definitive understanding of Malayness in Muhammad's works. It is about time then that an exploration of the paradigm of Malayness in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, a modern work based on various themes manifested in a traditional one, *Sejarah Melayu*, is conducted because we are in actuality obtaining a thorough insight into the 'best of both worlds'.

The paradigm of Malayness in the selected work of Usman Awang in the form of his celebrated poem, "Melayu" also needs to be further explored. This is due to a serious need for academic scholarship on the poem as well as on the paradigm as reflected in "Melayu". As discussed earlier, only one study so far has discussed the paradigm of Malayness in "Melayu" (Ahmad Kamal Abdullah, 2004) but, in my opinion, this one study has not provided well-defined views on how Malayness has been conveyed by Usman through his most celebrated poem.

The lack of specific studies on the exploration of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in these selected works in traditional and modern Malay literature as I have just discussed makes it imperative for us to remedy this problem. Despite contributions of significant views to the discourse on the paradigm of Malayness in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Hikayat Abdullah* in traditional Malay literature, further exploration needs to be conducted in the selected works of prominent Malay writers in modern Malay literature in order to help us understand more about my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in their selected works. I shall then make an

attempt to explore my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness as manifested in these chosen works in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### MALAYNESS IN SELECTED WORKS IN TRADITIONAL AND MODERN MALAY LITERATURE

#### Introduction

In this chapter, I shall attempt to analyse selected works in traditional and modern Malay literature. Two works have been selected from traditional Malay literature, namely *Hikayat Hang Tuah*<sup>90</sup> and *Hikayat Abdullah*.<sup>91</sup> From modern Malay literature, five works have been selected: *Putera Gunung Tahan*,<sup>92</sup> *Anak Mat Lela Gila*,<sup>93</sup> *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*,<sup>94</sup> *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*<sup>95</sup> and “Melayu”.<sup>96</sup> Close textual readings of the works have been employed and, where applicable, the authors’ representations of characters which I perceive to be Malay have been examined with the purpose of exploring my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in their works.

I have not included the synopses for *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Hikayat Abdullah* in the Appendix because only specific extracts from the texts have been chosen for analysis, namely the Hang Tuah-Hang Jebat duel and the ‘ending’ of *Hikayat Abdullah*. I have presented only the synopses for *Putera Gunung Tahan*, *Anak Mat Lela Gila* and *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* (Appendixes 17 to 19) as well as the poem “Melayu” (including my own English translation of the poem in Appendix 20) because my analysis spans the whole of these works. Subsequent discussions on analysis of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* and “Melayu” can be referred to in their respective Appendixes. Appendix 21 contains relevant episodes for discussion from *Sulalatus salatin (Sejarah Melayu)* based on the 1979 edition by A. Samad Ahmad

<sup>90</sup> All references are from Kassim Ahmad (1997).

<sup>91</sup> All references are from Sweeney (2008).

<sup>92</sup> All references are from Ishak Haji Muhammad (2001).

<sup>93</sup> All references are from Ishak Haji Muhammad (1960).

<sup>94</sup> All references are from Shahnnon Ahmad (1997).

<sup>95</sup> All references are from Muhammad Haji Salleh (1981b).

<sup>96</sup> All references are from Usman Awang (1999a).

which correspond to the episodes composed by Muhammad Haji Salleh in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. Appendix 21 also contains my own English translations of the selected episodes for discussion. Meanwhile, Appendix 22 contains my own English translations of extracts from the works as discussed in this chapter. The following analysis is presented thematically according to the hypothesised paradigm of Malayness: the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity.

### **Malayness and the Malay language**

This section begins with views on the Malay language as the first paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised, highlighted explicitly in the ‘ending’ of *Hikayat Abdullah*. It touches on the issue of language although this topic is first introduced by way of the Malay traditional *adat*/culture which is believed to have neglected the use and the scholarly study of the Malays’ own language. In the ‘ending’, the attitude of the Malays towards their own language is described as unconcerned (**membuangkan**) and indifferent (**tiada mengendahkan**) (Sweeney, 2008: 547)

In the ‘ending’, the learning of one’s own language as the foundation of a successful race and hence nation is also stressed. The Malays are compared to other races, such as the Arabs, the Europeans, the Chinese and the Indians, who are believed to have become successful and intellectual races because they are literate and are able to write in their own languages (**pandai membaca surat dan menyurat**). We are told that these aforementioned races have become successful races due to their constructive attitudes towards the roles and uses of their own languages, namely being proficient in their own languages (**mengerti bahasanya**), preserving the purity of their own languages (**memelihara bahasaanya**), and appreciating their own languages as a proper branch of study (**memuliakan bahasanya**) (Sweeney, 2008: 547).

For the Malays to be a successful race, it is proposed implicitly that Malays must first be literate and proficient in their own language, namely the Malay language. The Malays are asked to be aware of the importance of possessing a strong

grasp over their own language and to make the study of Malay as a branch of educational subject. Indeed, the ‘ending’ in *Hikayat Abdullah* contains an advice for all Malays to appreciate their own language, to engage in a proper study of the Malay language and to uphold its purity. This is because history has proven that a nation and its race become great because their language is used and held in esteem (**suatu bangsa yang besar itu, maka bahasanya pun besarlah**) (Sweeney, 2008: 548).

Another way of highlighting the importance of the Malay language as a paradigm of Malayness is to be found in *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, where its importance is illustrated implicitly. In the first novel, Malay is used as an indicator to identify the ethnicity of an unnamed old woman whom the English character, Robert, has met in a Sakai dwelling:

**Extract 1**

**Setelah itu berpalinglah perempuan itu kepada Tuan Robert seraya berkata padanya dalam Bahasa Melayu.** (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 2001: 20)

The narrative above clearly indicates that the woman speaks in the Malay language although she is in the middle of a Sakai dwelling.

In the extract below, it is the woman’s use of the Malay language (**pandai dan fasih bercakap Melayu**) which has convinced Robert that she is indeed Malay (**perempuan tua itu ialah perempuan Melayu**). Robert’s conviction of the woman’s ethnicity as Malay is followed by his observation that she is also attired in clothing which he believes to be exclusive to how the Malays would normally dress in (**pakaiannya pun menunjukkan ia sebenarnya orang Melayu**) as depicted here:

**Extract 2**

**Maka telah sah dan nyatalah pada pendapat Tuan Robert bahawa perempuan tua itu ialah perempuan Melayu kerana ia pandai dan fasih bercakap Melayu dan pakaiannya pun menunjukkan ia sebenarnya orang Melayu.** (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 2001: 23)

As demonstrated above, the old woman has been identified as Malay by Robert through her language and attire.

The role of the Malay language is also depicted in a latter scene in *Putera Gunung Tahan* which involves another Englishman, William. William has lost his way in the forest and soon finds himself stranded near a waterfall. In the following extract, William meets an unknown male character:

**Extract 3**

**Orang itu ganjil kerana ia berpakaian lengkap dan bersih. Di tangan kanannya ia memegang sebilah tombak dan pada pandangan Tuan William nyatalah ia seorang Melayu. ...“Ini suatu perjumpaan yang tidak disangka-sangka, tetapi yang sangat dihajati kerana kita di sini sentiasa di dalam kesunyian dan saya ucapkan selamat datang kepada tuan,” berkata orang muda itu dalam bahasa Melayu dengan hormatnya. (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 2001: 48)**

As seen in the above extract, we can say that the character is identified implicitly by William as Malay because we are told in the narrative that he is indeed Malay based on his attire and appearance (**ia berpakaian lengkap dan bersih; memegang sebilah tombak; nyatalah ia seorang Melayu**). Another explicit role of the Malay language is depicted in the dialogue of the unidentified man which further points to his ethnicity being Malay (**berkata orang muda itu dalam bahasa Melayu**). We are later informed that the Malay man is Kusina, right-hand man of the ruler of Mount Tahan, Ratu Bongsu.

We are also made aware of the importance of the Malay language through the characterisation of Ratu Bongsu who only speaks Malay. In the novel, Ratu Bongsu is depicted as not being able to understand the conversation between two officers in a house he is looking at through an entity which resembles a ‘talking’ tree, called *Beringin Bercakap*, because they are not conversing in Malay (**Tetapi saya tidak mengerti apa-apa yang dicakapkan mereka itu kerana mereka tidak menggunakan bahasa Melayu**) (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 2001: 72-73). It is shown in the novel that both officers are actually conversing with each other in English and not Malay. Thus this is the reason why Ratu Bongsu is unable to understand the language spoken because it is a language foreign to him. However, it is through William that the ethnicity of the officer is determined; he is Malay as indicated by his attire (**yang berpakaian cara Melayu**) and the fact that he is an offspring from an aristocratic background (**Pegawai Melayu itu ialah keturunan anak baik-baik**). As we can see

here, William distinguishes the ethnicity of the officer as Malay not due to his language but due to his attire and his royal background.

On the other hand, in *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, the role of the Malay language is presented through the depiction of the character of an Aborigine Sakai, Mandur Alang, who is seen from the perspective of the protagonist, the Malay character, Bulat. In the novel, Bulat is confused of the true ethnicity of Alang, whether he is a Sakai or a Malay (**Mandor Alang yang sa-benar-nya berupa saperti orang Melayu**). This is because Alang is depicted as fluent in Malay (**berchakap Melayu pandai**) and is dressed in Malay attire (**bersongkok, pakai kain pelekat**) (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 76-77). What the novel wants to inform us here, based on the depiction of Alang above, is that the Aborigine represents wholesome and unadulterated Malay principles and values as demonstrated by his choice of language and attire which are known to be exclusively Malay. These values, which are represented as ethnicity and identity markers through the use of Malay in the novel, suggest that the paradigm of Malayness can be perceived as 'fluid' in certain ways as proposed by Hooker (2000: 120-121). However, I also suggest that it is entirely impossible for the Malay language to be viewed as a fluid aspect of the paradigm of Malayness because there is indeed a proviso attached here.

As the examples from the two novels show, Malay is expressed implicitly as an embodiment related to the Malays and hence should be perceived as an integral part of the ethnicity and identity kits of Malay. In my opinion, it is suggested in the novels that the survival of the Malay language depends on its treatment by the Malays themselves. It is also suggested in the novels that Malay should continuously be used because it is indeed an uncompromising paradigm of Malayness. The role of the Malay language is shown to be highly important because the above examples demonstrate that its use is imperative in identifying the ethnicity of a person, in this case the Malay ethnicity, compared to attire and mannerism which I suggest can be seen as representing identity. In this view, Hooker (2000: 121) is certainly right when she states that the author of the novels is concerned with this loss of a vital paradigm of Malayness, especially if Malayness is to be delineated through only attire and mannerism (which I suggest as representing identity) and not through descent and blood (which I propose as indicating ethnicity). This is because, as Hooker also states

correctly, anyone can ‘become Malay’ if they were to adopt traits identified as Malay through attire and mannerism but can also lose them once they decide not to adopt them any longer.

Another way of highlighting the importance of the Malay language is presented in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. Its importance is highlighted in the *Mukadimah* (Prologue) where the bard is reminded to be aware of the role and use of the language in his retelling of the history of the Malays (Appendix 21 p. 337). My analysis here thus fits into a view proposed by Ruzy Suliza Hashim (2003: 90), that the *Mukadimah* does contain the role and responsibilities of the bard to ‘capture the metropolitan ambience of Melaka’ and to ‘appraise her people’ as a reminder to contemporary Malays.

As seen in *ceretera yang kedua puluh enam (i)* on *Pemerintahan Sultan Mahmud Syah* (Appendix 21 p. 343), it was at one point in the history of the Malays during the reign of Sultan Mahmud Syah (1488-1511), identified to be the zenith of the Melaka Empire (1400-1511) in which the port of Malacca on the Malacca Straits was the most important port for trades (**di pelabuhan kita seluruh dunia bertemu**), that the *lingua franca* of the Malay World was indeed the Malay language itself (**bahasa kita dipilih**). The importance of Malay is illustrated in the poem through its eminent position in the history of the Malays during the Melaka Empire. We can deduce here that, despite the many languages spoken in Melaka, it was indeed the Malays’ own language that had been held in esteem and chosen as the *lingua franca* as implied through the use of the words **bahasa kita** (our language). Since we know that the poem is a retelling of the history of the Malays, we can safely deduce that **bahasa kita** referred to in the stanza refers to the language exclusive to the Malay people, namely the Malay language.

### Malayness and Islam

This section begins with the duel in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* where, in the following extract, we note how Hang Jebat reasons with Hang Tuah that his rebellion is purely to avenge Hang Tuah’s death sentence:

#### Extract 4

Setelah Hang Jebat menengar kata Laksamana demikian, maka ia pun hairan, seraya berkata, “**Hai Orang Kaya Laksamana, keranamulah maka aku berbuat pekerjaan ini. Pada bicaraku, engkau tiada dalam dunia ini lagi. Jika aku tahu akan engkau ada hidup, demi Allah dan Rasul-Nya, tiada aku berbuat pekerjaan yang demikian ini.**” (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 355)

The overt reference to Islam is to be found in the words **demi Allah dan Rasul-Nya**. This in fact is Hang Jebat’s form of swearing an oath in the name of his God, **Allah**, and Allah’s Prophet as signified by the word **Rasul-Nya**, where **Rasul-Nya** refers to the Muslim Prophet Muhammad. In this context, Hang Jebat avows in the name of Allah and Allah’s Prophet, the Prophet Muhammad, that he would not have committed treason if he knew that Hang Tuah was still alive (**Jika aku tahu akan engkau ada hidup... tiada aku berbuat pekerjaan yang demikian ini**). What we can say here is that the seriousness of the situation is highlighted by Hang Jebat who swears an oath in the name of his religious faith, Islam, to signify his own innocence regarding the matter.

However, as seen below, Hang Tuah does not share Hang Jebat’s sentiment on rebelling against the ruler which he paraphrases in regard to the proper conduct expected of followers of Islam:

#### Extract 5

Maka sahut Laksamana, “**Hai Si Jebat, tersalah citamu itu. Adapun pekerjaanmu derhaka pada tuanmu itu berapa-berapa dosanya pada Allah, tiada bertanggung olehmu di dalam akhirat jemah. Akan sekarang engkau hendak membunuh orang yang tiada berdosa pula berpuluh-puluh ribu itu; benarkah bicaramu itu?**” (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 355)

Here, Hang Tuah is referring to the act of committing treason against the ruler (**pekerjaanmu derhaka pada tuanmu itu**) which to him is tantamount to the worst sin in the eyes of their God, Allah (**berapa-berapa dosanya pada Allah**). As we can see, Hang Tuah views that particular sin as one so appalling that he reminds Hang Jebat of its repercussion in the afterlife (**tiada bertanggung olehmu di dalam akhirat jemah**).

Indeed, we are made aware of Hang Tuah’s own strong faith in fate as destined by Allah as seen below:

### Extract 6

**Maka Laksamana pun berkata, “Hai Si Jebat, bahawa tiada dengan kuasaku membunuh engkau; bahawa Tuhanku Yang Amat Kuasa membunuh engkau. Insyallah Taala, mati juga engkau dalam tanganku.”** (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 359)

The extract above depicts Hang Tuah’s act to proceed with the ruler’s order which he expresses within an Islamic framework, that it is not merely a case of following the ruler’s order to take Hang Jebat’s life but that, even if he attempts to take it, the outcome of his attempt can only be decided by God the Al-Mighty (**tiada dengan kuasaku membunuh engkau; bahawa Tuhanku Yang Amat Kuasa membunuh engkau**). Thus Hang Tuah reasons that it is also with the command of Allah that will allow Hang Jebat to die in his hands (**Insyallah Taala, mati juga engkau dalam tanganku**).

My analysis of the above extracts calls to mind views which suggest that heightened Islamic consciousness among the Malays in the 20<sup>th</sup> century makes a case ‘against hero-worship of Hang Tuah’ since Islam requires its followers to exist on ‘personal responsibility and conviction’ (de Josselin de Jong, 1965: 154), and which question the role that should be played by Islam in this new definition of Malayness which appoints Hang Jebat instead of Hang Tuah as the hero in the consciousness of modern Malays (Maier, 2004: 106). In my opinion, justifying Hang Tuah’s act within the Islamic framework has to be done according to the values dominant during his time, that the judgement has to be a contextual one. This means that it is rather impractical for us to pass judgement on Hang Tuah’s act based on a 20<sup>th</sup> century value judgement but that it should be based on what was then the most important value to uphold during Hang Tuah’s time, namely the social covenant of *daulat* and *derhaka*.

It is clear from the extracts that the ruler is regarded as the representative of God on earth due to what is described as the aura of sanctity better known as the concept of *daulat* as I stated earlier. There is indeed evidence from a Malay legal digest, the *Undang-Undang Pahang*, believed to have been compiled during the reign of Sultan Abdul Ghafur Muhaideen Shah (1592-1614), that the existence of a *raja* was justified through verification from the *Qur’an*, that Allah deems it necessary for Kings to be God’s representatives on earth: ‘*Inni ja ilun f’l-ardi Khalifah*’ which

means ‘I would like to appoint Kings on earth as my representatives’ (Khoo Kay Kim, 2001c: 23). Thus it is not surprising that Hang Tuah himself has framed his act of obeying the ruler’s order within an Islamic framework because, to him, obeying the ruler means simultaneously obeying Allah. This is also why Muhammad Haji Salleh (2000b: 41) has reasoned that Hang Tuah is ‘as religious in his generosity, altruism and service to the king’ which are also indicative of the ‘main elements in the Islamic perception of religiosity’.

As I see it, the view that Hang Tuah’s act of ‘blindly’ obeying the ruler’s order may have been due to a weak understanding and implementation of Islamic law which advocates thorough investigation in order to arrive at justice in all aspects of law (M. Khalid Taib, 1993: 26) has merit although I would suggest that, instead of highlighting Hang Tuah as at fault, we should also highlight the role played by the ruler who had issued the wrong edict in the first place. As recalled, the ruler had not investigated the slander against Hang Tuah thoroughly and hence Hang Jebat’s uprising against him. This is where Kratz (1993: 95) has been right, that ‘any moral lesson to be gained from this careful and moving account was directed as much at the ruler as it was at his voluntary, yet loyal subjects’.

While Islam appears to be a background factor in the duel in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* with regard to the role played by the ruler, Islam, as a paradigm of Malayness, is manifested clearly in the ‘ending’ of *Hikayat Abdullah* through the influential role it plays with regard to the Malay rulers and its subjects. The ‘ending’ deals with the concept of ownership involving the rulers which will be discussed in detail later in the section on Malayness and the Malay rulers. The ‘ending’ demonstrates how the rulers take for granted that both the subjects and the subjects’ material possessions belong exclusively to them. This is exemplified through the rulers’ desire for local maidens or request for material goods. The reference to Islam is presented in the form of a criticism regarding the conducts of the rulers who are believed to have shown their own disregard to the plight of their own subjects as well as towards the teachings of their religion, Islam (**dengan tiada menjadi sesuatu kesusahan atau takut kepada Allah, dan lagi tiadalah kepada timbangan dan kenangan atas ra‘yatnya**). (Sweeney, 2008: 542). This is implied by the reference to the name of the Muslim God, **Allah (takut kepada Allah)**.

The role played by Islam is also shown in the ‘ending’ where the rulers are reminded of their existence and purpose in life as dictated by **Allah**: to lead their followers to virtue and to lead them away from vice (**Adapun dijadikan Allah raja2 itu sebab hendak memelihara segala manusia dan menyuruhkan ia berbuat baik dan melarangkan ia berbuat jahat**) (Sweeney, 2008: 544). Indeed, the immoral conducts of the rulers and their families are viewed as a bad omen for it is indicated that evil would also befall the nation and its subjects as a result of the vices committed by the rulers. Islam is indeed depicted as an influential force overriding the lives of not only the subjects but also the rulers. It is also demonstrated in the ‘ending’ how the transgressions committed by the rulers upon their subjects are linked to religious prohibitions as dictated by Allah and His Prophet (**larangan Allah dan Rasul-Nya**). In fact, the importance of a strong Islamic faith as a prerequisite of a fair ruler is stressed here because, without it, the ruler will fall foul to the manipulation of the Devil (**Iblis**) which happens to be the adversary of **Allah Ta‘ala**. It is implied in the ‘ending’ that the rulers’ lack of a strong Islamic faith and practice have led them to their oppressive rule. The Devil and those who succumb to the Devil’s temptation through a lack of strong Islamic faith (**maka dapatiada Iblis itu serta segala orang yang menurutkan kehendaknya itu**) have been identified as reasons that have swayed the rulers from being honourable and just (Sweeney, 2008: 543-545).

A covert reference to Islam is to be found in the extract below which speaks of the role played by Islam through an emphasis on the importance of religion as the root of development. Words such as **agama** (religion), **dosa** (sin) and **pahala** (reward) can be understood here to refer implicitly to the philosophies of Islam and are linked to the concern with progress, that it can be achieved if the Malays were willing to abandon their obsolete *adat*/culture upheld at the expense of their religion:

**Extract 7**

**Maka sekalian itu bukannya agama menyuruhkan dan bukannya pula mendatangkan kebajikan dari sebab itu, hanya bertambah2 bodoh dan ditertawakan oleh bangsa lain2 akan dia, sebab jikalau perkara itu ditinggalkan, tiada mendatangkan dosa, dan jikalau diperbuatnya tiada mendatangkan pahala bagi dirinya,...** (Sweeney, 2008: 545)

From the concern of the condition of the Malays as presented in the earlier examples, it is suggested that progress and development can be achieved by the Malays if their rulers educated and equipped themselves with proper knowledge and education together with a strong Islamic foundation. Although the overt role played by Islam is not mentioned in the 'ending', it is understood that Islam plays an important role in Malay society that references to the religion can be detected throughout the 'ending' itself. This is perhaps a reason why the way Islam is practised by some Malays has been expressed as a main concern in the 'ending'. It can be observed through the 'ending' that the Malays cling to obsolete *adat*/culture which not only goes against the teachings of their religion, Islam, but also hinders their progress. By the consistent yet implicit mention of Islam in the 'ending', Islam is subconsciously manifested as one of the paradigm of Malayness in the text through its important role for the rulers and the Malays.

My above analysis therefore does not substantiate views by Carroll (1999b: 93), that 'ignorance, superstition and the rule of the despotic Malay sultans had weakened the fabric of Malay society'. In my opinion, 'the fabric of the Malay society' had been weakened through lack of knowledge regarding one important factor, Islam, and it supersedes other factors such as 'ignorance, superstition and the rule of the despotic Malay sultans'. Even 'the rule of the despotic Malay sultans' can be traced to their lack of strong Islamic faith as discussed earlier. Hence, Islam, in the form of belief and practice, appears to be the bigger force and only factor that can be ascribed to the dire conditions of Malay society. Here, I agree with Milner (2002: 51) who has suggested that, in the 'ending', 'when complaining of the way rulers treated their subjects', the Malays are described as 'members of the Islamic community, as "servants of Allah"'. Indeed, Milner is right when he adds how 'this could have had a rhetorical purpose in that it drew attention to the fact that the rulers' behaviour contravened even the injunction of their own religion'.

Another manner in which Islam is expressed as a paradigm of Malayness is manifested in *Putera Gunung Tahan*. As recalled, this particular scene in the novel has been touched upon in the earlier section on Malayness and the Malay language and will be discussed further in a latter section on Malayness and ethnicity. The scene focuses on the plight of Robert who has been brought to a Sakai dwelling where he

meets an unnamed old woman at the Sakai's place of abode and makes attempts to identify the woman's ethnicity:

**Extract 8**

**Pada rupanya nyatalah perempuan itu seorang Melayu dan Tuan Robert percaya begitu kerana perempuan itu tidak mahu makan daging babi yang diperjamukan itu. (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 2001: 20)**

As seen above, Robert believes that he has been successful in identifying the woman's ethnicity as Malay, (**nyatalah perempuan itu seorang Melayu**). We are told that the deduction has been based on the meal served to the woman, namely pork, which she has declined to eat (**perempuan itu tidak mahu makan daging babi yang diperjamukan itu**). This depiction of the woman indicates implicitly that she is a follower of the Muslim faith where pork consumption is forbidden in Islam. What the extract above implies to us is that her religious belief, Islam, has been used to indicate her ethnicity, Malay. Therefore, what appears here then is the overlapping of Islam and ethnicity where Islam has been the foregrounding factor in identifying a character's ethnicity. There is now indeed an intersecting factor, being a Muslim is projected to be simultaneously understood to refer to being ethnically Malay.

Another example of Islam as a paradigm of Malayness in the novel is to be found in a scene where William and Ratu Bongsu engage in a conversation on Islam and *adat*/culture. We are told by William that there are no longer any religious or cultural barriers between the East and the West. However, Ratu Bongsu disputes William's view, that the Muslims are still religious and abide by God's prohibitions (**Orang-orang Islam amat kuat imannya dan berpegang teguh kepada tegahan-tegahan Tuhan**):

**Extract 9**

**"Saya tidak percaya sama sekali-kali. Orang-orang Islam amat kuat imannya dan berpegang teguh kepada tegahan-tegahan Tuhan," kata pula Ratu Bongsu. "Tetapi tuanku, patik baharu sahaja melawat negeri-negeri Melayu di sekeliling mercu gunung ini dan patik telah saksikan dengan mata kepala patik sendiri akan hal pergerakan orang-orang Melayu. Hampir-hampir lima puluh peratus daripadanya telah mengikut adat dan peraturan cara Barat." (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 2001: 63)**

Interestingly, as seen above, Ratu Bongsu discusses the plight of the Malays by using the words, **Orang-orang Islam** which means those of the Islamic faith. But William, in his rebuttal to Ratu Bongsu, continues to speak of the Malay people (**orang-orang Melayu**) living in the Malay states (**negeri-negeri Melayu**) who have embraced the Western culture. Again, as with the extract earlier, Islam has overridden ethnicity, where to speak of the Malays now as an ethnic group is akin to speaking of them as Muslims.

More importantly is this embedded message in the novel that the Malays should not compromise their belief and practice of Islam although the Western way of life is beginning to be embraced by some Malays. I agree unequivocally with Thomas (1983: vii) who has proposed that the novel does not simply reject Western progress but had redefined the understanding of progress in such a way that it must be 'synonymous' with a 'purified and perfected' development of Malay *adat*/culture and the practice of Islam. As we see here, the discussion on Islam has now branched out to include *adat*/culture while, earlier, the discussion on Islam has also touched upon the subject of ethnicity.

In *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, the reference to Islam is made clearly in the final scene of the novel. It ends with Bulat happily reunited with both his biological parents and, although he invites them to join him on a trip to Cameron Highland to visit his mentor, Alang, they both decline. Elis suggests that they travel to Mecca instead as seen here:

**Extract 10**

**“...Aku fikir lebih baik kita ambil dua tiga tiket pergi ka-Makkah kerana aku dan ayah-mu sudah tua patut benar menyempurnakan Rukun Haji yang kelima,” kata ibu-nya. (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 131)**

As the extract shows, Elis is keen to fulfil her obligations as a Muslim according to the Tenets of Islam. We know that she is referring to the *Haj* pilgrimage because the fifth Tenet of Islam is represented through the words **Rukun Haji yang kelima** and **pergi ka-Makkah**. Indeed, this supports views that *Anak Mat Lela Gila* contains subtle references to the moderate practice of Islam as well as evidence of Islamic consciousness which can be detected throughout the novel exemplified through the

preparation to perform the *Haj* pilgrimage in Mecca by Bulat and his biological parents (Mohd. Taib Osman and Abu Bakar Hamid, 1988: 309; Aveling, 1993: 6).

Meanwhile, *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* opens with an overt reference to Islam in the form of a declaration of faith (**pegangan; Dipegang oleh Allah Azzawajalla**) as the foundation of the protagonist of the novel, Lahuma, his wife, Jeha, and their seven daughters:

**Extract 11**

**Mati hidup dan susah senang dipegang oleh Tuhan. Dipegang oleh Allah Azzawajalla. ...Kesenangan dan kebahagiaan diterima dengan penuh kesyukuran. Diterima dengan ucapan alhamdulillah seribu kali. Dan penderitaan serta malapetaka yang menimpa pun diterima juga dengan kesyukuran. Dengan ucapan alhamdulillah seribu kali juga. ...Dan ketujuh-tujuh anak betina itu pun Lahuma dan Jeha cukup percaya bahawa mereka akan mempunyai pegangan yang sama. (Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 1-2)**

This declaration of faith occurs five times throughout Chapter One of the novel. As the above extract indicates, to Lahuma and his family, whatever comes their way and whatever fate decrees, be it good fortune or bad luck, is accepted as coming from Allah Azzawajalla. The extract here shows how this faith is their only salvation and solace amidst their life of extreme poverty. This strong faith in fate as espoused by Lahuma's religion is understood to be Islam as seen from the word **alhamdulillah** which means 'praise to God'. As seen above, their strength of character is defined through their fervent faith in Allah Azzawajalla which is also their source of force in life regardless of happiness or suffering.

The above depiction of Islam as a faith held strongly by Lahuma and his family fits into views that Islam is a 'maxim' or a 'refrain' 'woven into the characters' conviction and world-view' as a 'philosophy of life' and that Islam, as the religious doctrine, is the only factor that influences the spiritual, emotional and physical environment of Lahuma and his family (Jassin, 1984: 119; Thumboo, 1984: 96; Ungku Maimunah Ungku Tahir, 1998: 125; Aveling, 2000: 112; Hooker, 2000: 272). This is especially true when we note the important role played by Islam in the lives of the Malay characters which has been rightly highlighted by Metzger (1991: 70) as the most important aspect of the novel.

We discover later in the novel how Lahuma's injury, acquired when he steps on a spine from a palm frond (**duri nibung**) whilst clearing the rice-field, does not hamper his determination. In the midst of it all, we note how Lahuma's sense of survival remains powerful and intact. At this juncture in the novel, the injury has unfortunately turned into nauseating pus but we are shown how Lahuma responds to this latest adversity: through his willpower in attempting to heal his injury. He is still defiant in trying not to succumb to his injury but, nevertheless, acknowledges that the thorn is now his enemy and the barrier to his family's well-being and continued existence:

**Extract 12**

**Lahuma cukup percaya. Tuhan tidak akan mencabut nyawanya sematamata kerana duri nibung yang seinci panjangnya. ...Biar bisanya melarat ke mana yang dia suka. Tuhan tentu berada di sampingnya. Kalau perlu Lahuma rasa dia akan turun juga ke sawah dalam keadaan begitu. Sakit boleh ditahan asalkan Tuhan berada di sampingnya. (Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 88)**

What the above extract regarding Lahuma's experience shows is that Banks (1984: 73) may have misread this scene as evidence of Lahuma's total veneration to God without any effort to change his destiny in life and is thus a passive human being. But, through the extract above, we can clearly see that Md. Salleh Yaapar (1984: 198) has been more accurate in his assessment of Lahuma that, although there are scenes which smack of fatalism, there are also contradictions to Lahuma where he certainly works hard to improve his living condition for the sake of his family and does not simply rely on Allah to change his fortune. Indeed, Lahuma's agony can be explained in the following statement:

**Extract 13**

**Tuhan itu adil. (Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 90)**

Lahuma's constant anxieties over his family's fate, the state of their rice-fields and his own life are expressed explicitly in that one sentence. There is little and nothing else left for him to do but to wait for death but we do know by now that Lahuma responds to this latest tragedy through extreme resilience and is simply not passively accepting his circumstances.

Further references to the practice of Islam are manifested in scenes involving Lahuma and his impending death. Here, it is shown how Lahuma's family and the peasant community are all aware that Lahuma has reached the last days of his life:

**Extract 14**

**...Dan apabila muka Lahuma menjadi biru, Jeha baru memanggil jiran-jiran malam itu. Tapi kedatangan mereka cuma untuk membaca surah Yasin sahaja. (Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 117, 118)**

As the above extract demonstrates, the Malay peasant community (**jiran-jiran**) are indeed concerned with the plight of Jeha and her family as Lahuma's death looms but it is limited to only a prayer for his soul due to his impending death as indicated by the words, **surah Yasin**. **surah Yasin** is the thirty-sixth chapter of the *Qur'an*, which is normally recited to a person on the verge of death and soon after. This particular scene may have prompted Banks (1984: 73; 1987: 129) to correctly suggest that there is not be found any role played by Islamic organisations in the novel to assist Lahuma and family where the influence of Islam is indeed present but exists largely outside of the formal structure of Islamic roles. Nonetheless, there is also evidence from the novel which suggests a different possibility.

As the novel moves on to underline Jeha's plight, we note that her mental condition deteriorates rapidly soon after Lahuma's demise. It turns out that the peasant community of Banggul Derdap are now witnesses to Jeha's mental deterioration and, led by the head of village (**tuk penghulu**), they make attempts to cure Jeha of her insanity. We note that their first attempt to cure Jeha is to put her in a man-made cage (**perangkap**) as it appears that this method has indeed been successful in treating previous villagers who actually became crazy during the rice-planting season. Jeha's resistance against the villagers' action is documented here:

**Extract 15**

**Jeha sedar apa yang orang-orang itu akan lakukan. Dia meronta dan mencarut-carut, tetapi tok penghulu tidak juga melepaskan pegangannya. Diheretnya Jeha masuk kurungan. Diikat mati pintu pagar itu. Dan Jeha mengganas di dalam pagar itu macam beruang liar masuk perangkap. (Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 199-200)**

As the above extract illustrates, there are indeed collective efforts by the peasant community to assist Jeha but their efforts seem to be minimal and simplistic (**Diheretnya Jeha masuk kurungan. Diikat mati pintu pagar itu**). Here, my analysis of the extract corresponds to a view by Banks (1987: 129) who has stated that the Malay peasants ‘think of themselves as Muslim, even though Islam does not appear to offer them clear alternatives when important problems arise’. Indeed, I agree with another view by Banks (1987: 133), that ‘the attempt to resolve this dilemma’, ranging from the moral concerns of the individual, such as Lahuma and Jeha, to a group social consciousness, is the reason why Islam has been chosen as ‘a moral centre of Malayness’ in the novel. In my opinion, Islam has been projected unmistakably so far in the novel as the ‘essence of Malay culture that should direct the nation’ and that the novel is the story of a rural Malay community that ‘reflect[s] a search for aspects of Malayness that have continuing relevance in the modern social context’ (Banks, 1987: 147-148). However, I would paraphrase Bank’s view to this, that Islam is projected in the novel as one of the essences of the paradigm that should direct the nation in the Malays’ own search for their understanding of Malayness. In addition, this understanding - of projecting Islam as the core of the paradigm - should have continuing relevance in the modern social context.

The final chapter of the novel reinforces the above perspectives regarding Islam where it opens with a failed rice-planting season for the peasant community of Kampung Banggul Derdap. Despite an attack by the **tiak** crab, they still persevere and leave their fates to Allah Azzawajalla as seen here:

**Extract 16**

**Padi tidak berhasil. Dan penduduk-penduduk Kampun Banggul Derdap bermurung. Tetapi kemurungan itu hanya terbatas kepada diri mereka sahaja. Tidak dikaitkan dengan Allah Azzawajalla. Tuhan tidak dimaki-maki oleh mereka.** (Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 253-254)

As the above extracts demonstrate, *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* presents issues related to the supposedly Malay trait of *berserah pada takdir* (to render oneself entirely to fate). As recalled, one possible issue is whether it is right and acceptable for Lahuma and his family as Muslims to simply rely entirely onto their fates as destined by Allah without making any concerted effort to improve their lives. It must be stated then that

the implicit (*tersirat*) messages in the novel are more important than the explicit (*tersurat*) ones as Mohd. Yusof Hasan (1989: 64) correctly posits, 'Islam teaches the acceptance of fate as the sixth pillar of faith' where 'man must leave his fate in the hands of God and never lose this faith' but 'Islam teaches man to accept the situation, but never to surrender'. It needs to be emphasised here that the novel opens with an explicit reference to Islam and the following phrases refer to the faith and its practices: **Allah Azzawajalla**, **alhamdulillah**, and **surah Yasin**. Islam is both a covert and overt presence in the novel and this evidence suggests that it is a non-negotiable aspect of the paradigm of Malayness.

The overt presence of Islam is to be found in an episode from *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* composed as *Ceretera yang ketiga puluh dua (i)* which contains eight stanzas. It is based on Story XII, vignette 6, paragraph 2 of *Sejarah Melayu, Makhdum dipersenda muridnya*. It revolves around a scene between a religious sage who has travelled from Jeddah to Melaka, named **Makhdum Sadar Jahan**, and one of the ministers in the court of Sultan Mahmud Syah, named **Orangkaya Seri Rama**. In the scene, Seri Rama is served with his favourite drink laced with alcohol where he eventually becomes inebriated during one of the court meetings with the Sultan, attended also by Sadar Jahan. Upon witnessing Seri Rama's intoxicated state, Sadar Jahan becomes deeply upset and immediately rebukes him by quoting an Islamic verse pertaining to Islamic law regarding alcoholic consumption.

This episode in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* is presented in the form of a dialogue between the two individuals (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 77-78) (Appendix 21 pp. 344-345). By utilising this technique, we are given insights into the heated argument through a trading of insults between two of the Sultan's most trusted and respected individuals of his court. The stanza opens with a monologue attributed to Sadar Jahan. In the stanzas, the use of the word **larangan** (ban) in the final line of Stanza 1 refers to a ban on alcoholic consumption in Islam. Earlier in the stanza, the effects of alcoholic consumption on a person are described, namely to make a person imprudent, lacking in judgement and prone to sinful temptations. In Stanza 2, the effects of alcoholic consumption on a person are elaborated such as possessing wild thoughts tantamount to foolish talks and uncontrollable behaviour. An inebriated person is depicted as prone to committing sins in the eyes of Islamic law such as

committing unlawful relationships with women due to their uncontrollable frame of mind and hence behaviour.

These two stanzas, which are monologues attributed to Sadar Jahan, are followed by six stanzas (Stanzas 3 to 7) presented through the voice of Seri Rama. Seri Rama's explanation pertaining to the sin he has committed with regard to alcoholic consumption is presented in Stanza 3 where he argues that the sin will be borne by himself. The poem continues with a portrayal of Seri Rama who addresses Sadar Jahan on the issue of religious sermon. In the stanza, Seri Rama insinuates how condescending Sadar Jahan is in delivering his sermon (**dengan bahasa dan suara menghina**). The sermon relates to religion, implied here to be Islam, as evidenced by the ban on alcoholic consumption which is a ruling referring to Islam as well as on the issue of moral conduct (**agama dan ibadat**).

In my opinion, this portrayal of the practice of religious sermon relates to a certain type of Muslim preacher. As we can see, through the voice of Seri Rama, it is indicated that Sadar Jahan's own conduct are tantamount to transgressions in the eyes of Islam. They are described by Seri Rama as being equivalent to the sin regarding alcoholic consumption (**lihat ahmak tuan**). The poem describes Sadar Jahan's flaws through Seri Rama's voice, namely his constant need to be revered by others, his arrogant mannerism, and his endless boasting of the superiority of his ancestors as well as his land of origin. Sadar Jahan's final flaw expressed by Seri Rama is implied by his superiority over the fact that he is a descendant of the Prophet Muhammad due to his origin from the same homeland of the Prophet, namely Jeddah in Saudi Arabia. Here, Sadar Jahan is portrayed as a patronising and self-righteous preacher.

In the next stanza, Sadar Jahan's other conduct are further elaborated by Seri Rama where we are presented with the opportunity to become witnesses to the ongoing row given through the dialogue. As such, the poem is injected with a more reflective meaning. Upon the public rebuke by Sadar Jahan, Seri Rama is quick to point out Sadar Jahan's own other flaws. In Stanzas 3, 4, 5 and 6, Seri Rama dismisses Sadar Jahan's sermon by reminding him that it is only he, himself, who would be answerable to God and hence be judged and punished for his sins by God. Seri Rama argues that, to him, Sadar Jahan should not be preaching about sins when

he himself should be questioned over his motives for coming to Melaka. Not only does he disapprove of Sadar Jahan's condescending attitude and superiority complex, Seri Rama also accuses Sadar Jahan of manipulating his ancestry and status as a cleric to satisfy his sexual desires (**sudah berapa orang anak dara melayu/telah tuan peristerikan**). Sadar Jahan is also charged by Seri Rama as a greedy person when he questions Sadar Jahan's demands for material possession in the form of land acquisition.

Seri Rama's final monologue is presented in Stanza 7 where Sadar Jahan's intention in travelling to and eventually settling down in Melaka is further queried. In the stanza, Seri Rama finally puts forth an upfront question to Sadar Jahan: what exactly is he trying to achieve in Melaka? We note Seri Rama presenting his own presumptions over Sadar Jahan's true intentions: to preach about Islam (**mengembangkan agama**), to gain material wealth through being a preacher of Islam (**mencari harta melaluinya**), or to manipulate his holy background in order to achieve fame and fortune through being a preacher of Islam (**bersembunyi di sebalik keturunan**).

The vignette closes with Stanza 8 which is a monologue by Sadar Jahan. Here, Sadar Jahan dismisses Seri Rama's talk as merely drunken meanderings (**cakapmu mabuk**) and further degrades Seri Rama by saying that he lacks good deeds and piety (**ibadatmu kurang**). We can say that, to Sadar Jahan, Seri Rama's words should not be taken seriously for they are uttered when he is under the influence of alcohol. We can also say that Seri Rama is thought of by Sadar Jahan as a morally lesser person than he is for Sadar Jahan perceives himself as a man of God and is more superior in terms of status and piousness. In my opinion, Sadar Jahan's final dismissal of Seri Rama is based on his assumptions that Seri Rama is a person with lesser religious spirituality and conduct. As the poem demonstrates, through giving voices to both characters in order to articulate their views, the hidden conduct of patronising and self-righteous Muslim preachers whose words mask their religious pretence and hypocrisy are exposed.

The above analysis of the episode pertaining to Islam in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* may help to explain why Badrul Redzuan Abu Hassan and Fauziah Ahmad

(2003: 197-225) have highlighted what they perceive to be an apparent lack of Islamic values in the author's works since Islam is not included and spoken of overtly as one of the paradigm of Malayness in his other works. However, my analysis of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* suggests a contradictory view as seen in the episode on the row pertaining to the practice of Islam. Indeed, drawing upon this particular episode from the traditional Malay literary text, *Sejarah Melayu*, which is related to Islam, can also be counted as evidence of the continuous important role played by Islam for the Malays in the eyes of the author as succinctly described by Junus (1984a: 160): events in *Sejarah Melayu* have been viewed by the author based on contemporary perspectives and thus given present meanings without having to change the actual events. It is suggested through this episode that Malays should always be cautious of how they practise their religion, Islam; in this case, without the need for self-righteousness and pomposity because it is indicated that only Allah can pass judgement over another.

A different way in which Islam is manifested as a paradigm of Malayness is to be found in "Melayu" although expressed in an implicit manner (Usman Awang, 1999a: 229) (Appendix 20 p. 332). In the poem, the **Arab** and the **Pakistani** are described as automatically Malay while the **Mamak** and the **Malbari**, who are converts to Islam from the Indian ethnic group, are absorbed into becoming Malay. The same process is referred to where even a **Mualaf**, an Arabic term to refer to a new convert to Islam regardless of colour and creed, is classified as Malay. As we can deduce, the evidence of a shared similarity among those mentioned earlier remains with their religious faith, namely Islam. This is implied by the final line which refers to the process of circumcision for followers of Islam ((**Setelah disunat anunya itu**)). However, we note how Islam is not mentioned or presented in an overt manner in "Melayu". I believe that the reason for this is the fact that Islam is an overriding element of the work that there is no obvious need for it to be expressed explicitly. Another reason could be attributed to the background of the poet who had admitted that his works do not 'demarcate race, nationality, belief or the colour of the skin' but that they are visions of one wish, that 'one common language [the Malay language] and culture will emanate from the usage, hope and dreams shared by all races' of Malaysia (Usman Awang in Solehah Ishak, 1998: 120).

## Malayness and the Malay rulers

The most evident manifestation of the Malay rulers as a paradigm of Malayness is reflected in the duel between Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. In the passages at the start of the confrontation, Hang Jebat is called out by Hang Tuah where he challenges Hang Jebat to a duel four times in the text (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 354, 355, 356, 357). This scene occurs at the beginning of the duel where the first challenge is issued by Hang Tuah and is a foregone conclusion to Hang Jebat as far as he is concerned for he knows beyond a shadow of a doubt that Hang Tuah will proceed with the ruler's order to kill him when Hang Tuah brings up the subject of loyalty, as emphasised below:

### Extract 17

**Maka Laksaman pun berseru-seru, katanya, "Hai Si Jebat derhaka! Tiadakah setiamu pada tuanmu? Jika engkau berani, marilah engkau turun bertikam dengan aku sama seorang, kerana aku pun lamalah tiada bertikam."** (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 354, emphasis underlined)

In the following extract, we note a presence of an emotion akin to a crack in Hang Tuah's façade when Hang Jebat questions his determination to continue with the ruler's command to kill him. Further hints of remorse can be detected as Hang Tuah continues to converse with Hang Jebat who accuses him of succumbing to a royal command that can mean the death of one or both of Melaka's finest warriors. I believe that it is precisely at this moment that Hang Jebat can sense Hang Tuah's own dire predicament in obeying the royal command. In the extract below, Hang Tuah informs Hang Jebat that he would have done anything on Hang Jebat's behalf to save him from the death sentence issued by the ruler although he understands the total impossibility for that happening since Hang Jebat has sinned and that his sin is *derhaka* (treason) as implied by the words, **dosa ini**:

### Extract 18

**Maka kata Laksamana, "Sungguh seperti katamu itu; pada hatiku pun demikianlah. Sayang engkau berdosa. Jika lain daripada dosa ini, tiada engkau mati, barang tipunya dayaku pun kuperlepaskan juga engkau daripada mati."** (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 359-360)

As we can see below, Hang Tuah's disclosure affects Hang Jebat so intensely that he breaks down and weeps. Here, he seems to comprehend Hang Tuah's hint of inner misery at carrying out the death sentence and Hang Tuah himself appears to be in a dilemma for he is depicted to be in extreme grief over what fate has decreed for the two of them:

**Extract 19**

**Maka Hang Jebat pun menangis mendengar kata laksamana demikian itu. Maka Laksamana pun menangis kasihan hatinya akan Hang Jebat.** (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 360)

The above extracts are indeed evidence which can be used to address views by Kassim Ahmad (1966: 42), that 'there is something sinister' about Hang Tuah's 'sense of absolute loyalty to his master' which he describes as 'well-nigh blind'. Kassim further queries: 'Yet did he regret it? There is no evidence and, judging from our understanding of his character, he could not have regretted it'. In my opinion, the above extracts are indeed evidence which dispute the view that 'there is something sinister' regarding Hang Tuah's internal emotion over carrying out the ruler's order. Indeed, we need to question why Kassim has suggested that Hang Tuah's obedience is 'sinister' and equivalent to 'well-nigh blind' because it is assumed to be a portrayal of Hang Tuah's sense of 'absolute loyalty to his master'. However, as I shall demonstrate later, there is indeed evidence from the duel that Hang Tuah holds a certain sense of loyalty to his master although I do not agree that it is 'absolute' nor is it 'sinister' or 'well-nigh blind'. In my opinion, we must not mistake Hang Tuah's sense of loyalty to the ruler with him not harbouring any regret over having to kill his own best friend.

This is particularly true in the following scenes when Hang Jebat states that his rebellion is to avenge Hang Tuah's unjust death sentence. We note that Hang Jebat has blamed his treasonous actions on the ruler's own behaviour where the **raja** has issued a death sentence over Hang Tuah without investigating thoroughly the accusations against Hang Tuah (**kerana raja itu membunuh tiada dengan periksanya**):

### Extract 20

Maka kata Hang Jebat, “Aku pun kerana melihat engkau dibunuh oleh bendahara tiada dengan dosanya; sebab itulah maka sakit hatiku. Akan istimewa aku pula orang sepermainan tiada akan dibunuhnya, kerana raja itu membunuh tiada dengan periksanya...” (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 360)

A rather telling manner in which Hang Tuah views the ruler’s actions as reasoned by Hang Jebat can be seen through his words **Sungguh seperti katamu itu** in the extract below. It is implied here that the words refer to Hang Tuah’s tacit agreement with Hang Jebat’s criticism over the ruler’s hasty behaviour. But Hang Tuah also reminds Hang Jebat of their roles and places in life which are to obey and serve the ruler (**tetapi akan kita ini diperhamba raja ini hendaklah pada barang suatu pekerjaan itu bicarakan sangat-sangat**) as seen below:

### Extract 21

Maka kata Laksamana, “Sungguh seperti katamu itu, tetapi akan kita ini diperhamba raja ini hendaklah pada barang suatu pekerjaan itu bicarakan sangat-sangat, seperti kata orang tua-tua: ‘Baik mati dengan nama yang baik, jangan hidup dengan nama yang jahat,’ supaya masuk syurga jemah.” (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 360)

As I see it, Hang Tuah is implicitly referring to the social covenant of *daulat* and *derhaka* in his reminder to Hang Jebat as illustrated above. This evidence thus fits in with a view by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1991a: 116), that Hang Tuah of Melaka was defined by the relationship of the kings with their subjects. This is also why Hang Tuah later informs Hang Jebat, by using a Malay saying (**Baik mati dengan nama yang baik, jangan hidup dengan nama yang jahat**), that it is better to die with a good name rather than live with a bad one. Another reference by Hang Tuah to their responsibilities as virtuous subjects is implied through the words **supaya masuk syurga jemah** which can be seen as a reminder of their religious faith, Islam. Here, we can say that Hang Tuah equates obeying and serving the ruler on earth as akin to obeying and serving Allah, and that the result of this obeying and serving means going to heaven in the afterlife. A better understanding of this concept has been discussed earlier in the section on Malayness and Islam (Khoo Kay Kim, 2001c).

It transpires soon after the duel that, as Hang Tuah leaves behind an injured Hang Jebat, Hang Jebat takes the opportunity to leave the palace and ventures into the city to create further chaos by running amok just as Hang Tuah has predicted. After three days and three nights of slaughter, with the death toll amounting to thousands, the ruler soon realises that something is amiss. In the extract below, the ruler ponders on the fates of both his finest warriors:

### Extract 22

Maka titah raja pada segala rakyat yang lari itu. “Hai segala kamu, adakah kamu melihat Laksamana itu? Ke mana perginya sekarang maka diberinya Si Jebat itu mengamuk?” Maka sembah segala rakyat itu, “Patik sekalian lihat Laksamana sudah menikam Hang Jebat itu. Maka patik lihat Laksamana terjun dari istana itu berjalan pulang. Pada penglihatan patik, kalau luka itulah maka ia pulang ke rumah, maka tiada datang mengadap Duli Yang Dipertuan.” Setelah raja menengar sembah orang itu, maka raja dan bendahara pun terkejut fikirkan Laksamana itu, kerana hulubalang besar Laksamana itu dengan bijaksana. ...; maka raja pun memandang kepada Bentara Tun Kasturi; maka titah raja, “Hai bentara, dapatkah engkau kutitahkan pergi ke rumah Laksamana itu?” (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 365-366)

As seen in the extract above, that Hang Jebat does not die immediately can be read as Hang Tuah’s first own way of subtle rebellion against the ruler’s command in order to overcome his pent-up grief. Further evidence to suggest Hang Tuah’s own unspoken regret is when Hang Kasturi had to seek him by order of the ruler, also urged by the *Bendahara* (Prime Minister), to investigate the outcome of the royal command. This moment is a crucial one in interpreting Kassim’s earlier view of Hang Tuah’s ‘blind and absolute loyalty’ to the ruler because Hang Tuah has been shown here as not projecting blind and absolute loyalty to the ruler as evidenced by his blatant refusal to immediately report to the ruler the result of the ruler’s order.

In fact, it was only after the death of Hang Jebat that Hang Tuah goes back to the palace to report to the ruler. Indeed, Hang Tuah had waited for at least four days to allow Hang Jebat to run amok and create more chaos in Melaka before continuing to witness Hang Jebat’s death before his very own eyes. Only after Hang Jebat had breathed his final breath does Hang Tuah make the conscious effort to report to the ruler. In an emotive manner below, Hang Tuah valiantly responds to the ruler’s query over the whereabouts of Hang Jebat’s body, as all **orang derhaka** have to be brought before the ruler, by appealing for Hang Kasturi to be allowed to accompany him to

the body so that the two of them are able to pay Hang Jebat their final respect in privacy:

**Extract 23**

**Maka sembah Laksamana, “Daulat Tuanku Syah Alam, patik mohonkan ampun dan kurnia, hendaklah Duli Yang Dipertuan menitahkan Bentara Tun Kasturi ia pergi melihat bangkai Hang Jebat derhaka itu, kerana ia sahabat patik seperti saudara patik; dari kecil berkasih tiada bercerai dengan patik lima bersahabat ini; kerana hal dunia ini tuankulah maklum.”** (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 368)

As the above extract illustrates, it is only after Hang Jebat’s death that Hang Tuah finally expresses in an understated manner to the ruler that Hang Jebat’s death sentence was not an easy duty for him to perform for the simple reason that Hang Jebat had been as close to him as any brother could be. We note how the ruler comprehends this implicit request as Hang Tuah’s own subtle form of criticism towards him. Thus, this is the reason why the ruler bestows his blessing to the request with the full knowledge that this is Hang Tuah’s own way of avenging his best friend’s death due to the royal command as well as inaudibly criticising the ruler over his earlier injudicious and hasty behaviour in sentencing Hang Tuah to death due to slander which in turn had led to Hang Jebat’s own rebellion against the ruler.

The extracts above therefore demonstrate that Hang Tuah’s actions during and after the duel can be seen as his way of accepting his fate, of coming to terms with his deed, and of seeking solace regarding a moral dilemma over the choice of loyalty between a friend and country. Indeed, Hang Tuah’s conflict and regret call to mind a paradoxical view by E. M. Forster: ‘I hate the idea of causes, and if I had to choose between betraying my country and betraying my friend, I hope I have the guts to betray my country’ (Forster, 1951). As shown above, a break from the important royal protocol, whereby a subject reports immediately to the ruler after carrying out a royal command, can be read as a definite moment when Hang Tuah decides to reproach the ruler regarding what has happened to both him and Hang Jebat albeit in a subtle manner. Indeed, Kratz (1993: 80) is correct in his view, that ‘the purpose of the Hang Jebat story is to express criticism of the sultan’s rule in the only way possible, by creating a figure whose deeds were so bad that they obscured their original cause’.

As we follow the passages in the duel in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, Hang Tuah's overall personification comprising duty, loyalty, moral integrity, courage, honesty and services becomes apparent. As such, I do not agree with views which have described the duel as 'the most hilarious and most bizarre scene of the Tale' (M. Khalid Taib, 1993: 21-22; Maier, 2004: 90) because my analysis shows that the duel is indeed 'the most realistic and extremely touching movement of emotions, loyalties, regrets and ideals' (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 2000b: 44). In just one event, we become aware of two important things: how Hang Tuah defines his relationship with his ruler and his friend, and how the hasty behaviour of the ruler has been criticised both explicitly (through Hang Tuah allowing Hang Jebat to create further chaos after the duel in open disregard to the ruler's order to put Hang Jebat to death without delay) and implicitly (through Hang Tuah's palpable refusal to report back immediately to the ruler upon carrying out the ruler's order).

This is because we read Hang Tuah's compliance not necessarily in the form of loyalty to the ruler but more importantly loyalty to himself, first and foremost. The duel points to the view that Hang Tuah cannot disobey the ruler simply because to disobey the ruler would be to disobey his own moral and ethical self and, along the way, violate the covenant of Bukit Siguntang which has ruled his underlying principles over the years. As long as he, the servant, respects the throne, it does not matter to him whether he has to kill his own flesh-and-blood if it meant upholding those values. Hang Tuah is aware that the ruler is the legitimate power even if he does not issue legitimate commands. Therefore, this is also the reason why he accepts the ruler's two unjust death sentences over him and why he agrees to end the life of his own best friend. The duel demonstrates that Hang Tuah is not interested in moralising over the ruler for, to him, the ruler holds the legitimate power thus his command must be obeyed. Whether or not his command makes any sense to anyone, it does not matter so long as the subjects carry it out. Should the ruler's command turn out to be a detrimental one, the duel illustrates through the characterisation of Hang Tuah that it should be left to Allah to right the wrong.

With that I attempt to answer questions put forth by Maier (2004: 105), 'who was the real Malay?', 'was it the supporter of feudalism or the defender of justice?' It is plausible to suggest that the real Malay was indeed the supporter of feudalism who

I believe was also at the same time the defender of justice, Hang Tuah. In my opinion, it is not quite viable to pigeonhole Hang Tuah as simply the supporter of feudalism while Hang Jebat is merely the defender of justice. My analysis above has shown how Hang Tuah has also displayed some sense of justice on behalf of his friend when he refuses to immediately report back to the ruler after performing the ruler's order and also does not concur with the ruler's order to hang Hang Jebat's corpse immediately but to request a private moment with his dead friend together with Hang Kasturi. If we were to describe Hang Jebat as the defender of justice, we also need to question this: is it justice to cause chaos through his cavorting with the palace women and running amok as a form of rebellion against the ruler as Hang Tuah himself has highlighted?

However, I agree with Maier who states that the rulers are 'the ultimate symbols of Malayness' in view of their roles as 'guides of customs and religion'. However, Maier (2004: 105-106) has attempted to draw upon this duel as a challenge against the relevance of the rulers as 'symbols of Malayness' in the consciousness of modern Malays when he asks whether a Malay is 'allowed to revolt against his ruler for the sake of friendship, humanism, relatives, and justice-or should he, at all costs, be loyal to his ruler in the name of Malayness and defend him against others?' To that question, I argue instead that such value judgement can only be made contextually, in that it is rather undeserving for Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat for us to impose modern expectations upon their tragedy. The Malay subjects are indeed bound to their rulers by the social covenant of *daulat* and *derhaka* and as such should be loyal to their ruler in the name of Malayness.

The paradigm of Malayness and the Malay rulers are also manifested in examples of the rulers' tyrannical reign listed in the 'ending' of *Hikayat Abdullah*. It begins with the author's statement on why he has asserted that the reign of the rulers is cruel and unjust. The first reason is explained with regard to the rulers' perception and attitude towards his subjects, that they degrade their subjects and deem them as akin to animals (**menghinakan ra'yatnya, seolah2 pada pemandangannya akan ra'yatnya itu seperti binatang adanya**) (Sweeney, 2008: 542).

The next example deals with the concept of ownership. It is demonstrated in the 'ending' how the rulers take for granted that both the subjects and the subjects' material possessions belong exclusively to them. This is exemplified through the rulers' desire for local maidens or request for material goods (**apabila raja2 itu mengkehendaki baik anak2 perempuan atau barang suatu harta benda ra'yatnya, diambilnya/431 sahaja dengan tiada menjadi sesuatu kesusahan atau takut kepada Allah, dan lagi tiadalah kepada timbangan dan kenangan atas ra'yatnya**) (Sweeney, 2008: 542). Indeed, the conduct of the rulers shows their own disregard to the plight of their own subjects as well as towards the teachings of their religion, Islam. As recalled, this aspect has been discussed earlier in the section on Malayness and Islam.

Subsequently, the following example illustrates the rulers' method of governing which is suggested as discriminatory and unfair because they practise nepotism (**seperti orang yang dikasihinya diringankannya, dan orang yang dibencikannya diberatkannya**) and that they are driven by their selfish impulses when administering verdicts during trials. This view is then followed by another example on the rulers' prejudiced jurisdiction when it comes to wayward members of the royal family (**dan lagi kalau bagaimana jahat atau aniaya anaknya atau keluarganya atas ra'yatnya dan negerinya, dibiarkannya dan disembunyikannya**) (Sweeney, 2008: 542). As we can see here, the rulers' unfairness and partiality are manifested in their actions of concealing and casting a blind eye over the transgressions committed by members of the royal family.

The 'ending' continues with an example regarding the rulers' indifferent attitude and conduct towards their subjects where they are depicted as treating a human being as insignificant as the life of an animal such as the tiny ant (**dan lagi ia membunuh manusia itu seperti laku membunuh seekor semut saja**). Finally, we are presented with an example of the rulers' selfishness when faced with problems where they only think about themselves without any thought to their subjects when solving problems (**dan lagi sekali2 tiada ia mencarikan jalan selamat bagi segala ra'yatnya, melainkan bagi dirinya sahaja**) (Sweeney, 2008: 542). In my opinion, both examples describe the rulers' callous method of governing over the Malay subjects referred to in the 'ending' as **rakyat**.

The second reason given regarding the rulers' cruel reign relates to what is deemed as the lack of manners (**adab dan tertib dan sopan dan malu...dan hormat**) together with the lack of knowledge and intellect (**ilmu dan kepandaian**) evident in the offspring of the royal family. Here, the importance of these aspects is linked to parental role. It is demonstrated that the rulers do not bother to educate or teach their children social etiquette and decorum when they are still young. It is also illustrated how most royal children lack the following positive attitudes: basic good manners, humility, knowledge, intelligence, responsibility and respect (**adab dan tertib dan sopan dan malu dan 'ilmu dan kepandaian dan hormat**) (Sweeney, 2008: 542). The royal children are taught to indulge in petty whims and amusements, such as given a harem and a weapon (**keris**) while growing up as well as gambling together with their fathers. As a result, they are preceded by this notorious reputation among the community when they become adults due to this lackadaisical upbringing.

We are told how it is too late for the offspring to be disciplined by the rulers when they are grown up as all advice on leading a respectable life will be dismissed (**Maka jangankan bapanya melarangkan, jikalau sepuluh orang yang seperti bapanya itu pun tiadalah diendakkannya**). Indeed, the effects of this shortcoming in the upbringing of the royal children are shown in the form of two Malay proverbs. The first is **pada tatkala rebung tiada dipatah, maka ketika sudah menjadi aur apakah gunanya?** (educating a person has to be done when they are still young as what is the point in teaching them when they older?), and the second is **api itu pada tatkala kecilnya yaitu kawan, apabila besar menjadi lawan** (minor misdeeds must be reprimanded before they become out of control and hence become more difficult to control) (Sweeney, 2008: 543). Although these proverbs are presented in question forms, I believe that they are indeed implicit pieces of advice as seen from their meanings.

The third reason is presented in the next paragraph where a connection between how the royals practise the Malay '**adat** and the importance of knowledge and education is made (**'ilmunya dan pengetahuannya**). We are told in the extract below that the rulers should emphasise knowledge and education so that they will be more aware of what is good and what is bad in life. This is so that they can become good role models for their subjects (**supaya tabi'atnya yang baik itu boleh menjadi**

turut2an kepada segala rakyatnya dan supaya yaitu boleh menjadi obat kepada segala ra'yatnya) (Sweeney, 2008: 543). These circumstances therefore lead to a dilemma over the future of the Malay subjects given the wretched state of the royal households and administrations. Among the questions and quandaries identified are:

**Extract 24**

- ...jikalau raja2 itu tiada ber'ilmu dan pengetahuan, bagaimanakah boleh ia menghukumkan ra'yatnya dan memerintahkan negerinya?
  - Dan jikalau ia duduk dalam kejahatan, bagaimanakah kelak ia hendak menyuruhkan ra'yatnya berbuat baik?
  - Maka jikalau kiranya raja2 Melayu itu tiada boleh menghukumkan anak2nya serta dibiarkannya akan dia mengharu-birukan ra'yatnya, maka bagaimana boleh ia menghukumkan sendirinya akan ra'yatnya?
- (Sweeney, 2008: 543-544)

This scenario is explained by using metaphorical language: the fearsome royal children are represented by the fearful tigers. They are simultaneously depicted as fences which are supposed to protect the crops, representing the subjects, from outsiders or beasts intent on destruction. It is questioned in the 'ending': if the fence itself was intent on the destroying the crops, what would then happen to the crops? The final question exposes here the unspoken sentiment: that the destruction and wickedness caused by the rulers will make the subjects suffer.

In the next paragraph, the conditions of the Malays and examples of the rulers' oppressive and tyrannical rule over their subjects are further outlined. Here, the Malay subjects are described as living in fear of the rulers' unreasonable laws where examples of the fears experienced by the subjects are subsequently given. Through the examples given, we can see what are considered as impractical customs imposed (**berlarang dan pantang**) upon the subjects (Sweeney, 2008: 544). They include a law when meeting the rulers such as a ban on eye contacts, a ban on certain aspects of the Malays' everyday life such as the wearing of shoes and the use of umbrella as these are considered to be luxuries only to be enjoyed by the rulers, the terror suffered by affluent Malays who live in constant fear that the rulers might one day just decide to seize their hard-earned wealth, and the despair experienced by parents of beautiful daughters as the rulers might just choose to acquire them as a concubine regardless of their marital status. Hence, the moral of the 'ending' lies with the denunciation of the

ruthless reign and cruel practices of the rulers. Significantly, the importance of a strong Islamic faith as a prerequisite of a fair ruler is also stressed as discussed earlier in the section on Malayness and Islam.

Compared to the duel in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, the same cannot be said for the 'ending' in *Hikayat Abdullah* in terms of a subtle approach regarding the criticism towards the rulers. The 'ending' of *Hikayat Abdullah* is indeed as Hadijah Rahmat (2001: 227) has described, it is a concluding epilogue on self-reflection. It is shown in the 'ending' that to define the Malays is to look at the important aspects of their lives and these important aspects in turn are believed to express implicitly the paradigm of Malayness: in the form of an explicit criticism of their rulers. In this, I agree with views that the rulers were setting a negative example in neglecting the upbringing of their own children to become good role models for their subjects, through a lack of education and not possessing a strong faith in Islam (Tan Chin Kwang, 1986: 100-101; Kassim Ahmad, 2004: xxvi-xxvii).

By stressing the need for the improvement of the rulers in order to improve the conditions of the Malays as a whole, it is acknowledged in the 'ending' a non-negotiable aspect of the paradigm of Malayness: the existence of the Malay rulers. The paradigm of Malayness in the 'ending' is clearly manifested through this emphasis: for improvement in the intellectual development of the Malay rulers. My view based on the analysis corresponds to a view by Milner (2002: 15), that by laying 'the blame for the miserable condition of the community on their rulers', the author also 'implicitly acknowledges the centrality of the ruler in Malay life'. This is despite the fact that the author had, at times, formulated his perceptions of the Malays based on foreign values as Hassan Ahmad (1976: 290) has appropriately highlighted.

A different way of exploring the paradigm of Malayness with regard to the Malay rulers is to be found in *Putera Gunung Tahan* (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 2001: 65). In the novel, we are presented with circumstances which have befallen the Malays, both royal and subject, through William. Referring to the poverty of the Malays as the poverty of a race (**kemiskinan atau kepapaan orang-orang Melayu bangsa tuanku**), the novel details the grave economic condition of the Malays under the governance of the Malay rulers through Ratu Bongsu. In fact, William empathises

with Ratu Bongsu's disapproving views of the Malay rulers regarding their roles and contributions under the counsel of the colonial government as this implicitly means that they have disregarded their own roles and responsibilities towards their subjects (**Pegawai-pegawai putih itu telah meletakkan raja-raja Melayu itu di bawah pengaruhnya dan mendudukkan pembesar-pembesar dan pegawai-pegawai Melayu itu di hujung telunjuk mereka itu**). This is because, as he sees it, Ratu Bongsu is a descendant of genuine Malay kings (**sebab tuanku keturunan daripada raja-raja Melayu yang asli**).

The examples from the novel corroborate views that the rulers have been criticised in the novel as no longer wanting to make sacrifices for the betterment of their subjects because they have allowed themselves to be influenced by the self-seeking agendas of the British and have yielded to them as they in turn have neglected the subjects' welfare (Abdul Latiff Abu Bakar, 1977: 148-149; Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 42; Aveling, 1993: 5). As I see it, directing the criticism regarding the dire conditions of the Malays towards the rulers indicates clearly one thing, that the rulers are indeed an important paradigm in delineating Malayness. In fact, the criticism of the rulers in this novel is parallel to the earlier attempt I have just discussed in the 'ending' of *Hikayat Abdullah*, both works 'implicitly acknowledge the centrality of the ruler in the Malay life' (Milner, 2002: 15) when the Malay rulers are held accountable for the dire conditions of their subjects.

Meanwhile, the subject of the Malay rulers as a paradigm of Malayness is manifested in the *Mukadimah* of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, containing ten stanzas (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: vii-x) (Appendix 21 pp. 336-337). The poem opens with an extract from *Sejarah Melayu* which is based on Story I, vignette 1, paragraph 1 of *Sejarah Melayu*, *Menjunjung titah raja*. It begins by invoking the name of the most authoritative subject after the ruler, the *Bendahara*, as contained in *Sejarah Melayu*, understood to be **mamak bendahara tun mamat**. This line is a call for a reminder of the history of the Malays (**sejarah melayu**) during the once great empire of Melaka. The phrase borrowed from *Sejarah Melayu*, which speaks of **hikayat Melayu dibawa orang dari Goa**, is followed by what the ruler expects from the bard.

I discuss firstly the significance of the place-names in the stanza. The first place-name **siguntang yang tinggi** is understood to refer to the legendary and magical Bukit Siguntang, believed to be located near Palembang in the south-east of Sumatra, one of the islands which make up present-day Indonesia. Bukit Siguntang is stated in *Sejarah Melayu* as the place of origin for the people known as *Melayu*. Apart from that, the stanza also refers to **jawa** and **bugis** in the *Mukadimah*. In my opinion, both elements represent the inhabitants of the islands of Jawa and Sulawesi which are part of what is now Indonesia. The next line **rakyat di sawah, hutan dan pasir** (people in the rice-fields, the forests and the shores) refers to the traditional mode of livelihoods for the Malays while the last reference to **siguntang yang tinggi, jawa** and **bugis** indicates that the present history of the Malays extends beyond present-day Malaysia.

The opening stanza of the *Mukadimah* is immediately followed by views by the ruler regarding the poet: his persona and role as a **pujangga**. From the stanza, we can deduce that the ruler does not view the bard's role as an easy one. In fact, the bard is reminded of his huge responsibilities which bear a very heavy burden on his conscience. Here, the bard is reminded by the ruler of his task: to highlight the importance of language, the chain of events and the sovereignty of the country as well as to safeguard the people's welfare. However, the ruler also emphasises to the bard that his greatest role (**yang amat agung**) is to deliver the truth (**benar**) because truth is the substance and the heart of history. According to the ruler, truth is also a means in which to put right those in power and to remind those who tend to forget. Truth also acts as the most important guide to an honest account of history which would not be open to contentions. From this stanza, we can see that the main responsibility of the bard is as a messenger and reminder (**pengingat**) of truth as highlighted by the ruler.

In the next stanza, the importance of justice (**keadilan**), which can be strengthened by evidence (**bukti**) from the past, is highlighted by the ruler. We are told to beware of slander (**racun fitnah**) and it is demonstrated in the stanza that hearsay can lead to sedition and, eventually, trouble within society. Indeed, the importance of evidence from the past is presented through examples of the supreme power and the concept of **daulat** where the supreme power and the **daulat** are implied as belonging to the Malay rulers. Power is portrayed in the stanza as originally pure

like water but that it can be contaminated and become corrupted through slander and sedition.

As demonstrated also, the effects of hearsay, which can topple and weaken those in power, are painted in the stanza. Presented metaphorically, the first effect is described in the line **mereputkan lantai istana** which I suggest is an allusion to the Malay rulers and aristocrats from the description of ‘the floor of the palace’. The second effect is seen from the line **mematahkan tiang singgahsana** which I view as an allusion to the court ministers and aristocrats from the representation of ‘the pillar of the throne’. As I see it, the court ministers and aristocrats are those who sustain the maintenance of power through the allusion of them as ‘pillars of the ruler’s throne’. Finally, the line **mengalir ke perigi rakyat di kota atau di kampung jauh** is believed to represent the fabric of society, be they the villagers or the urban dwellers who make up the subjects.

It is suggested in the next stanza that power is indeterminate and uncertain because those in power themselves exist in a very fragile state. Describing power as mist which comes and goes, those in power, represented here by the **mamak bendahara** and the court ministers (**datuk-datuk beta serta orangkaya di balainya**), are reminded that they can also suffer the same fate. Their powers are described in the stanza as fragile as the mist. In my opinion, the reference to the word **rakyat** (subject) in the stanza suggests that, at the end of the day, it is indeed the **rakyat** who stays on and bears the ultimate power as we recall the covenant of Bukit Siguntang between Demang Lebar Daun and Sri Tri Buana in *Sejarah Melayu*. Unlike those holding power, who are portrayed as existing temporarily like the mist, the people remain and exist on a more permanent basis just like the country, believed to be represented here through the reference to nature, namely river (**sungai**) and water (**air**). We can deduce here that the **rakyat** have the responsibility to ensure that power, albeit within their rights (**hak**), is held by those who uphold truth and justice, and are not swayed by temptation to commit corruption (**jangan lupa/akan bayang emas yang selalu bersinar**). Indeed, we are told that the bestowed power should also be administered accordingly. As such, the *Mukadimah* ends with the opening phrase, **tulislah** (do write), which is in fact the ruler’s instructions to the **pujangga**, to write

about the history of the Malays so that the history of their honour (**kebesaran**) and integrity (**kebenaran**) will be an example and a beneficial guide for all in future.

As the examples from *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* illustrate, the ruler has projected his own concerns over the welfare of his subjects. The purpose and objective of the bard described in the *Mukadimah* is to inform us that the bard has been requested and entrusted by the ruler to deliver a truthful account of the histories of the Malays as a beneficial reminder and hence guide for the present and future Malays. Implicit within the *Mukadimah* is the ruler's call to the Malays that they should remember their own histories and remind themselves (**ingat**) so that they will obtain benefits in terms of ideals and principles (**faedah**). In addition, it is suggested in the poem through the ruler's call that the history of the Malays does not encompass modern-day Malaysia only as shown in the *Mukadimah* where it illustrates that the history of the Malays extends beyond Malaysia, covering also the Malay World. Indeed, the importance of the rulers is highlighted in the *Mukadimah* through a reference to the Malay concept of *daulat* and the strength of power possessed by the Malay rulers.

### Malayness and *adat*/culture

It needs to be mentioned firstly that the paradigm of Malayness in relation to *adat*/culture in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* has been touched upon earlier in the section on Malayness and Islam. A more in-depth exploration of the subject however is presented in this section. As recalled, in the passages at the start of the confrontation, Hang Jebat is challenged to a duel by Hang Tuah four times in the text (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 354, 355, 356, 357). The first challenge is issued by Hang Tuah in the form of "**Hai Si Jebat derhaka! Tiadakah setiamu pada tuanmu?**" (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 354). We note Hang Tuah's description of Hang Jebat as a traitor as exemplified by the word **derhaka**. Hang Tuah describes Hang Jebat's act of treason against the ruler (**Adapun pekerjaanmu derhaka pada tuanmu**) as a heavy sin against their God, Allah (**berapa-berapa dosanya pada Allah**) (Kassim Ahmad, 1997: 355).

The concept of **derhaka**, as we recall, is part of the Malay principle ingrained in the social covenant of Bukit SiGuntang as part of the Malay *adat/culture*. It has been described correctly by Ruzy Suliza Hashim (2003: 91) as a ‘diabolical relationship’ between the Malay ruler and his subjects. With regard to Hang Jebat’s treason, we can say that he has failed to respect the ruler and has shown disregard for the ruler’s *daulat* which refers to the ruler’s edict regarding Hang Tuah’s punishment of death due to slander by the Malay aristocrats of the court. However, Kratz (1993: 80) has described this concept of *derhaka* in a different manner when he states that Hang Jebat’s act of treason is actually a covert way of criticising the ruler who has himself acted in a questionable manner by not adopting the important prerequisite of an honourable ruler, which is to investigate thoroughly or to verify carefully (*periksa*) his sources before issuing decrees. Another way of analysing this act is proffered rightly by Kartz (2004: 130) where ‘a major issue of the *Hikayat Hang Tuah* is not so much that of loyalty versus treason as such, but that of the consequences of bad rule upon individuals and the state alike, and the dilemma of individuals in defining their loyalty and to find the right form of response to royal dereliction of duty’.

The subject of *adat/culture* can also be found in the ‘ending’ of *Hikayat Abdullah* for it contains views on *adat/culture* in an example which begins with the author first projecting himself as one of the Malays (**kita orang Melayu ini**). Indeed, the author speaks of reasons why he feels that Malays have not progressed or become knowledgeable or intellectual. The author feels that what he perceives to be ‘foolish’ traditional *adat/culture* of the Malays (**‘adat2 dahulu kala yang bodoh2**), which they still practise and refuse to abandon, are indeed to be blamed for their lack of progress in terms of intellect and civilisation (Sweeney, 2008: 545).

In another example in the ‘ending’, the Malay thinking is implicitly criticised where it is demonstrated how the Malay mindset is not open to progress. This is done by exemplifying the developments made by the British, who were once described as ‘uncivilised’ as the Malays are being described at that period of time, with the Malay way of thinking on matters related to progress (Sweeney, 2008: 545). The ‘ending’ finishes with views on the Malay practice of archaic *adat/culture* where the Malays are asked to think of the future generation, if they want their descendants to inherit their ‘stupidity’ (**bodohmu itu**) in the form of their obsolete *adat/culture* whereas

they should instead aspire to acceding to their descendants knowledge (**pandai**), wealth (**kaya**), civility (**baik**) and positive attitudes such as industriousness (**rajin**). It also contains an advice presented in the form of a proverb (**kalau baik benihnya, baiklah pohonnya, dan kalau jahat itu pun demikianlah adanya**) which carries the following meaning: if the ancestors were good, then the descendants would turn out to be good, if the ancestors were bad, then the descendants would also turn out to be bad.

In the ‘ending’, a comment on the Malays’ fear to abandon what is perceived to be flawed *adat*/culture practices is also made. Archaic Malay *adat*/culture inherited from their ancestors (**‘adat nenek moyang itu**) is suggested as a deterrent to progress because the Malays are believed to remain complacent about being in a state of idleness all their lives just as their ancestors had been (Sweeney, 2008: 548). In another example, the Malay mindset and the inability of the Malays, or perhaps reluctance, to accept innovations in their lives are highlighted. This unwillingness in the Malays is still viewed as apparent despite having witnessed aspects of modernisation through progress and civilisation understood to be brought to the Malay peninsula by the British. Indeed, the metaphor **tiada juga mereka itu mau membukakan kain selimutnya** (they refuse to open their blankets) refers to the condition of the Malays at that time where they are portrayed as remaining complacent in their ignorance with regard to their refusal to open their eyes to various forms of knowledge (**‘ilmu2 yang besar2**) and innovations (**perkara2 ajaib**) which would be beneficial for their future (Sweeney, 2008: 549).

Apart from the above metaphor, there are also other views in the ‘ending’ which are presented in the form of metaphors. In fact, the condition of the Malay mindset is described abundantly in proverbs as well as metaphors (Sweeney, 2008: 548-549). The Malays are asked to change their mindset especially in their method of child-rearing. It is stated in the ‘ending’ that knowledge and education (**‘ilmu dan kepandaian**) should be imparted when the children are young (**pada masa kanak2 dan muda inilah ketikanya**) and that the Malays’ outlook on education should be more positive. The implicit message here is that the pursuit of knowledge and education should thus become part of a ‘new’ system of belief for the Malays. The ‘ending’ also contains a criticism of Malay parents who are content to allow their children to indulge in behaviours which are not beneficial to them (**dibiarkannya**

akan dia barang sekehendaknya dengan bermain2 bernakal dan menggelumang lumpur pada sepanjang2 jalan) (Sweeney, 2008: 549).

So far in my analysis of the extracts from the ‘ending’ of *Hikayat Abdullah* regarding Malayness and *adat/culture*, I believe that I have not found any evidence to support a view by Carroll (1999b: 93), that the author’s aim of writing the text was to protect Malay culture and heritage. What I have found instead is that the author has been implicitly critical of the Malay *adat/culture* and heritage as discussed above; for example, regarding the Malay custom of child-rearing and their traditional system of belief regarding knowledge, education and progress.

After all the criticisms as discussed above, the ‘ending’ closes with the following statement:

**Extract 25**

**Bahwasanya kuringkaskan perkataannya, tetapi dengan sebesar2 harapku mudah-mudahan mereka itu mengambil ‘ibarat akan nasihatku ini. Tamat.** (Sweeney, 2008: 549, emphasis underlined)

As we have seen in the extract above from the ‘ending’ in *Hikayat Abdullah*, the author has consciously reflected and expressed his intention in writing this ‘ending’, as a piece of advice for ‘them’ (**mereka itu**) who are the Malays as emphasised above. This finding therefore contradicts a statement by Carroll (1999b: 108), that the *nasihat* (advice) is not to be found in the ‘ending’ which she refers to as *Bab Yang Kedua*. Carroll’s statement is contrary to what has been illustrated in the extract above because my analysis shows that the author himself closes this ‘ending’ by stating explicitly that the final section is indeed his **nasihat**. Therefore, the ‘ending’ can also be described as a long section of **nasihat** instead of merely a harsh criticism of the rulers and the Malays in general.

Meanwhile, the subject of *adat/culture* as a paradigm of Malayness in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* is to be found in an episode which opens with a scene of prayer, the *Subuh* (dawn) prayer. Yet the seemingly serene day unfolds disastrously as Jeha encounters a cobra whilst out clearing the rice-field with Lahuma. Though Lahuma is

depicted as saving Jeha from being bitten by killing the cobra (**Ular itu mematuk dengan deras tapi hanya udara yang menjadi sasarannya.**) (Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 33),<sup>97</sup> the experience leaves Jeha in a mental shock. Jeha is then depicted as deteriorating into a constant phobia and irrational fear of the animal. This episode seems to act as a cataclysmic start to their rice-planting season for there are dissenting voices among the villagers that Jeha's calamity is a premonition of a bad omen. The villagers' response to this catastrophe is described through their belief as seen below:

**Extract 26**

**“Baru saja mula nak buat bekas semai, dah berjumpa bala yang dahsyat.”**  
(Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 37)

This particular reference to **bala** (catastrophe) is believed to have been highlighted to show a deep belief in superstition among the Malays. It is exemplified in the novel by an unknown villager who voices that Jeha's mishap is a definite sign of a bad and an adverse season.

As a result of the **bala**, Jeha is depicted as being extremely apprehensive over her inability to assist Lahuma. As such, she begins to wonder about the supposedly 'unspoken' **bala**, namely **ketam**, **kemarau**, **banjir** and **burung tiak**, and questions loudly her fears to Lahuma. In the following extract, we note how Lahuma's response appears to underline his own superstition:

**Extract 27**

**Lahuma terkejut mendengar kata-kata bininya itu. ...Mengapa isterinya seberani itu menyebut bencana-bencana itu? Lahuma pantang menyebut nama-nama bencana itu kuat-kuat. Akan menimpakah bencana yang teruk tahun ini?**  
(Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 55)

As the above extract shows, we now see a different trait in Lahuma's character: a deep-rooted belief in tradition and superstition where it is regarded by Lahuma as taboo to speak of the **bala** aloud. Nonetheless, Lahuma is also depicted as defiant in

---

<sup>97</sup> This episode has been found to be misunderstood and thus misinterpreted; for example, Banks (1987: 117, emphasis underlined) states, 'First, Jeha is bitten by a cobra; then Lahuma steps on a thorn.' while, according to Metzger (1991: 68, emphasis underlined), 'Jeha, Lahuma's wife is first bitten by a snake, but it does not deter Lahuma's family from starting to clear the land to prepare the paddy-field.'

the face of the catastrophes and resorting to his fervent faith in Allah Azzawajalla as seen here:

**Extract 28**

**“Tahun ini tidak akan ada apa-apa bencana. Tuhan melindungi kita dan anak-anak kita.” Lahuma meyakinkan hati bininya.** (Shahnon Ahmad, 1997: 56)

Indeed, what the above extracts demonstrate is that Adibah Amin (1972: v) has been correct in her assessment of the Malay peasants in the novel, that they lead a life not different from their ancestors ‘still steeped in old attitudes and values’. The above finding also corresponds to views posited by Thumboo (1984: 103) and Hooker (2000: 272), that there are also other forms of beliefs which influence Lahuma in the novel, namely belief in traditional myths, apart from his strong belief in Islam. This thus clearly shows Lahuma’s paradoxical beliefs in both his God and traditional superstitions and myths as rooted in the ‘supernatural forces and omens’.

Another way of engaging in the subject of *adat*/culture is to be found in a poem on the concept of the Malay *adat*/culture which is set in opposition to the concept of *derhaka* in *Ceretera yang ke lapan belas* of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 48-49) (Appendix 21 p. 340). It comprises eight stanzas and is based on Story VII, vignette 7, paragraph 2 of *Sejarah Melayu, Ditolak bumi Melaka*. This episode tells the story of the untimely death of **Tun Besar**, the son of Bendahara Paduka Raja, at the hands of **Raja Muhammad**, the son of Sultan Mansur Syah, due to an accident during a game of **sepak raga**. This unintentional knock on Raja Muhammad’s **destar** (headgear) to the ground by Tun Besar is seen by the latter as total humiliation and degradation to him. This particular feeling of humiliation ties in with a concept embedded in the Malay *adat*/culture where the head is viewed as the supreme symbol of respect and face-value of a Malay. Hitting the headgear is seen as synonymous to shaming Raja Muhammad and leads to indignity and disgrace in the eyes of the shamed Raja Muhammad. Although Tun Besar is the son of the *Bendahara*, the most powerful subject of the Sultan as he functions as the Sultan’s eyes and ears in his government, Raja Muhammad, as the Sultan’s son and heir, does not hesitate to draw his *keris* and eventually stabs Tun Besar to death.

The poetic composition of this particular episode opens with a perspective portrayed through the eyes of the shocked and saddened villagers. By retelling this episode as part of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* through their eyes, we are indirectly asked to experience and articulate the trauma and ordeal of the villagers (**kesedihan kampung**). The death of Tun Besar (**rebah di pasir panas**) is depicted in the stanza as equivalent to paying the price for playing a game through his unintentional act of knocking down the headgear of a Sultan's son and heir (**membayar harga raga di kepala anak raja**). Tun Besar's death, at the age of 35, is depicted as a pointless and meaningless death; its pointlessness is described as an allusion in the form of payment for playing a meaningless game.

This tragedy is further enhanced when we read the proclamation by the father of the deceased, **datuk bendahara**. What makes this story tragic and appalling is that the villagers cannot do anything but stand aside and witness this awful scene as demonstrated in the stanzas. The stanzas inform us here that the villagers behaved in this manner so as not to be accused of committing treason (**derhaka**). As illustrated in the stanza, the villagers are informed: **kata datuk bendahara/adat melayu tak pernah menderhaka**. Through the words of the **datuk bendahara**, we are told that it is part of the Malay *adat*/culture not to commit **derhaka** (treason). This is because this particular concept is embedded in the Malay system of belief, represented in the stanza through the use of the word **adat Melayu**.

We are told that proper justice is best left to God and a just ruler in order to salvage the horrific situation judging by the anger of the villagers as seen in the last two lines of the final stanza (**maka marah kami serahkan/kepada keadilan tuhan dan raja**). Underneath the stoical and seemingly impassive villagers, the stanza highlights undercurrent feelings of dissatisfaction and discontent with regard to the use and abuse of power. The abuse of power due to arrogance by people who hold it is indeed observed as a serious criticism in the stanza. Perhaps we can link this episode to a view by Badrul Redzuan Abu Hassan and Fauziah Ahmad (2003: 201), that 'the obedience or loyalty to one's leader or superior' is no longer 'a practice of Malayness' because there are some Malays who question this form of allegiance to the leader due to past examples of abuse of power. In this case, the poet has proceeded to achieve

just that regarding the Malay *adat*/culture as Braginsky (2001: 286) aptly states, the poem is an attempt ‘to sanctify’ the poet’s idea about ‘social justice’.

On the other hand, the poem “Melayu” presents the subject of *adat*/culture in a mocking and ironical tone (Usman Awang, 1999a: 229) (Appendix 20 p. 332). In the poem, the Malays are simultaneously and gently rebuked for forsaking their positive traits and succumbing to dishonourable ones. The mood of the poem here is neither funny nor comical. The Malays’ *perumpamaan* and *pepatah* (proverbs and adages) are criticised for it is suggested that adopting such thinking as enshrined in them can lead to hypocrisy and double-standard. The poem contains criticisms regarding the hypocrisy of some Malays by exemplifying three proverbs as stereotypical for the Malay behaviour as the reality is actually different.

As indicated in the poem, there are indeed criticisms directed towards Malays who are believed to have turned against the central and core Malay values that underscore affirmative actions instead of resorting to disreputable ones. The poem also tells us here about the traditional perceptions of the Malays which can lead to more harm than good as the values can be manipulated and driven implicitly by greed and corruption. In order to have a better understanding of the three proverbs as presented in this poem, a comparison has been prepared:

#### Use of proverb in “Melayu”

#### Original Malay proverb

**Berani jika bersalah  
Kecut takut kerana benar**

*Berani kerana benar,  
Takut kerana salah*

**Janji simpan di perut  
Selalu pecah di mulut**

*Biar pecah di perut,  
Jangan pecah di mulut*

**Biar mati adat  
Jangan mati anak**

*Biar mati anak,  
Jangan mati adat*

The comparison above shows how the traditional Malay proverbs have been used in the poem together with the original Malay proverbs. Based on the comparison, we can clearly see that the order of the original proverbs as used by the Malays has been reversed in the poem.

The significance of the first original Malay proverb referred to *Berani kerana benar, takut kerana salah* (Brave because of truth, afraid because of wrong) is first discussed. This proverb carries the meaning that Malays should be brave when championing truth and be afraid when committing wrong. In the poem, the proverb has been reversed to **Berani jika bersalah, kecut takut kerana benar**. The reversed proverb now conveys an entirely new meaning: that the Malays are now believed not to be afraid of championing deceit but instead are fearful of advocating truth.

The second original Malay proverb alluded to is also a form of metaphor, *Biar pecah di perut, jangan pecah di mulut* (Let it be expressed through the stomach, let it not be expressed through the mouth). This proverb refers to an action whereby, when Malays are sworn to secrecy, they are reminded that no matter how bad the situation is or how desperate someone else is in order to have access to the secret, they should try their hardest to honour the promise to keep the secret even to the detriment of themselves. In this poem, the proverb has been switched to **Janji simpan di perut, selalu pecah di mulut**. This switch suggests that the Malays are now believed to be betrayers of trusts, in whatever form they could be, and do not uphold loyalty.

The third and final original Malay proverb which has been touched upon is *Biar mati anak, jangan mati adat* (Let the child die, let not *adat*/culture die). This particular proverb reveals how highly the Malays regard their *adat*/culture that they would rather sacrifice their own children (*anak*) than see their *adat*/culture erode and die away. Both entities have been swapped in the poem to **Biar mati adat, jangan mati anak**. This swapping in the poem indicates that it is not the *adat*/culture but the welfare of the children that should be prioritised first. It is also suggested that children, as family, should not be sacrificed in favour of *adat*/culture.

I suggest here that the reversal of these proverbs is indeed a call for Malays to challenge traditional Malay thinking. The reversal of traditional Malay thinking in the

poem reveals that the Malays are asked to start evaluating and exploring their mindset and values in order to structure a more constructive and sensible Malay character. By presenting what is deemed as the negative character of the Malays through highlighting its weaknesses by way of the reversed proverbs, the poem is in actuality performing a favour for the Malays. A reversal of the traditional *pepatah Melayu* (Malay proverb) in the poem is a clever attempt at using traditional thinking by manoeuvring it to what the poem sees are the strengths as well as the weaknesses of the Malays. In my opinion, the poem deals here with the hypocrisy existing in the Malays where it has simply turned the proverbial Malay thinking the other way around to what Malays should be and what Malays ought to represent.

However, the poem also shows that the kindness of the Malays can be carried to an extreme (**Baiknya hati Melayu itu tak terbandingkan**) and can sometimes border on the absurd (**Segala yang ada sanggup diberikan**). This view is exemplified through the conception of another well-known traditional Malay proverb (**Sehingga tercipta sebuah kiasan**). The proverb used here in the poem carries the idea that the Malays are too kind a people that they will do anything to prepare a meal for a passing stranger as well as feed a monkey in the forest. This kindness is performed at the expense of a husband returning home hungry after a hard day's work and their own children suffering due to hunger. In a bigger picture, I believe that the Malays are reminded that they have been too obliging in certain situations that they are driven to sacrificing whatever is precious to them at the expense of their own loss and destruction.

The traditional Malay perceptions are also criticised as illustrated in the poem where the Malay mindset is challenged to actually reflect on the meaning and interpretation and perhaps the absurdity of such *adat/culture*. Here, the Malays are reminded to consider properly and appropriately their traditional principles in life which are part of their *adat/culture* and not to allow these values, especially those which can hinder their progress, to represent the basis of their mindset as well as to dictate and influence their thinking, judgement, values and actions. My own perspectives of the poem therefore correspond with a view by Ahmad Kamal Abdullah (2004: 168), that the poem highlights traditional Malay traits of tolerance

and virtue as ingrained in a majority of the Malay *gurindam* which are in reality no longer of relevance and use.

### Malayness and ethnicity

Ethnicity, as the fifth paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised, is to be found in the following extract from *Putera Gunung Tahan*. It demonstrates Bulat's perspectives regarding the appearance of Alang:

#### Extract 29

**Ada pun yang me-lebeh<sup>2</sup> menyebabkan ia hairan ia-lah mengapa ia di-suroh belajar kepada orang Sakai? Mandor Alang yang sa-benar-nya berupa saperti orang Melayu – bersongkok, pakai kain pelekat dan berbaju. Badan-nya berseh, tidak kurap dan berchakap Melayu pandai.** (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 76-77, emphasis underlined)

As recalled, the above extract has been discussed earlier in the section on Malayness and the Malay language, where the role of the Malay language has been used implicitly in Bulat's attempt to identify the true ethnicity of Alang. As emphasised above, Bulat's confusion regarding Alang is due to his attire and use of language because, in his eyes, these aspects are supposed to indicate Alang's ethnicity as Malay whereas Bulat knows that Alang is descended from the Sakai ethnic group. Thus, this is why Bulat is unable to identify Alang's true ethnicity.

Another example from the novel which deals with the subject of ethnicity is to be found in a scene where Bulat has arrived in Singapore. He is invited to a party by a female singer who is identified by another Malay character, Sudin, as **Miss Elis Sakti**. As shown below, Bulat is keen to discover the ethnicity (**apa bangsa-nya**) of Elis Sakti, whether she is Malay or Filipino:

#### Extract 30

**"Macham mana rupa-nya Elis Sakti itu Din dan apa bangsa-nya – Melayu-kah atau Filipino?"** (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 105)

However, as the following extract shows, Sudin himself is unable to confirm her ethnicity as pure Malay (**bangsa Melayu jati**) because her name does not identify her

as being ethnically Malay. In other words, the name, Elis Sakti, is not a name exclusive to the Malays, as seen here:

**Extract 31**

**“Saya juga tidak mengetahui dengan sah dan nyata dan saya pun tidak kenal baik dengan dia, tetapi orang kata dia itu bangsa Melayu jati; chuma nama-nya sahaja ada ganjil sa-dikit...”** (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 104)

Another way of engaging in the subject of ethnicity in the novel is presented in a scene below where Bulat shares his observations regarding the various types of Malays in Singapore he has encountered during his search for his biological father:

**Extract 32**

**Bukan sahaja masak<sup>2</sup>an di-kedai itu membuka selera tetapi Bulat terikut peratoran hidup kaum Melayu Singapura ia-itu mesti menyokong sa-berapa daya-upaya akan perusahaan kaum-bangsa sendiri. Di-Singapura orang Melayu anak baik<sup>2</sup> jati ya`ani bukan peranakan atau kachokan di-paksa oleh atoran hidup chara baharu, ia-itu mesti menyokong perusahaan kaum-bangsa-nya jika tidak menjadi `aib yang amat besar dan boleh jadi orang<sup>2</sup> yang berbuat demikian akan di-pulaukan oleh kaum-nya. Orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu di-luar negeri ya`ani bukan asli penduduk<sup>2</sup> Singapura sangat kuat persatuan-nya dan pergerakan menjalankan hidup chara baharu – melebihi bangsa sendiri; bekerjasama dan ber-bantu<sup>2</sup>an antara satu dengan lain – sedang maju benar dan sedang di-ikuti oleh kaum-bangsa Melayu di-negeri<sup>2</sup> lain. (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 122-123)**

The above extract illustrates differences in the characteristics and attitudes of the peninsula Malays and the Singaporean Malays through Bulat’s stay in Singapore as highlighted in the descriptions of the term related to *Melayu*, namely **kaum Melayu** (Malay ethnic group), **orang Melayu** (the Malay people), and **kaum-bangsa Melayu** (Malay ethnic-race). For the term **orang Melayu**, the novel depicts them as being descended from pure Malay ethnic group without possessing any mixed ethnicity due to inter-racial marriages: **anak baik<sup>2</sup> jati ya`ani bukan peranakan atau kachokan** (pure Malays who are not descendants of mixed ethnicity or inter-racial marriages). What I suggest here then is that the term **Melayu jati** is understood to refer to descent and blood, namely ethnicity.

Meanwhile, the subject of ethnicity is alluded to in an episode based on Story IX, vignette 2, paragraph 1 of *Sejarah Melayu, Pemerintahan Sultan Mahmud Syah*. It

has been composed as *Ceretera yang kedua puluh enam (i) of Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* which tells the story of the Malay (**anak Melayu**) (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 61) (Appendix 21 pp. 342-343). This episode tells the tale during the reign of Sultan Mahmud Syah. He recalls a piece of advice from his late father, Sultan Alau'd-Din Riayat Syah (1477-1488), who was then at his death-bed. Sultan Alau'd-Din is dispensing a piece of advice which had been handed down to the Malay rulers since the days of the covenant of Bukit SiGuntang.

This poetic vignette, which is made up of four stanzas, begins with the word **melayu**. In my opinion, the word in the poem refers to various concepts, or more accurately paradigm, either tangible or intangible which are exclusive to the Malays, namely land (**tanah**), race (**bangsa**) and nation (**negeri**). It is suggested in the stanza that to be Malay is to encompass these three concepts. This is because the Malays can, should and will grow as a group of people by possessing authority over them as a ruler (**raja**) should. Just like a **raja**, the Malays possess the power and jurisdiction over themselves, to decide their own fates and to carve out their own future.

In the next stanza, we are told regarding the geographical aspects which describe and represent what is believed to be the Malay homeland. In the stanza, what is perceived to be the land exclusive to the Malay race is first outlined. In my opinion, the first line refers to the territory located in the Malay peninsula (**di semenanjung ini**), which is now known as Peninsular Malaysia. This is followed by references to the islands of **andalas** (which is the old name of Sumatra) and **riau**. Both islands are now part of Sumatra, Indonesia. Place-names which are located in Peninsular Malaysia, namely **kedah**, **pahang**, **kelang** (which is presently the capital city of the state of Selangor) and **muar** (an old town located in the state of Johor), are also highlighted in this stanza. I believe that these places represent the four corners of Peninsular Malaysia: Kedah is located on the northern part, Pahang is located on the east coast, Kelang is located on the west coast, and Muar is located on the southern part. Therefore, we can safely suggest that the places implied to in the stanza are believed to be the homeland of the Malay race (**ialah air dan bumi bangsamu**).

However, a more explicit way of embarking upon the subject of ethnicity is to be found in the poem "**Melayu**" (Usman Awang, 1999a: 229) (Appendix 20 p. 332).

It makes an explicit attempt to define *Melayu* and how *Melayu* is perceived to be in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The poem shows that the subject of ethnicity can be discerned through who can be described as ethnically Malay which is said to carry an extensive meaning (**luas maknanya**) in the Malay peninsula. In the poem, the **Jawa** and the **Bugis** are identified clearly as ethnically Malay. The **Banjar** is also referred to as Malay while the **Minangkabau** is definitely Malay. Descendants of the **Acheh** are also identified as ethnically Malay while the **Jakun** and the **Sakai**, who are otherwise categorised as *Orang Asli* (the Aborigines) in the Malaysian Constitution, are described as the original Malay (**asli Melayu**). The poem also states how the **Arab** and the **Pakistani** are automatically Malay while the **Mamak** and the **Malbari**, who are converts to Islam from the Indian ethnic group, are absorbed into becoming Malay (**serap ke Melayu**). The same process is alluded to when it is stated in the poem that even a **Mualaf**, an Arabic term to refer to a new convert to Islam regardless of colour and creed, is classified as Malay. We know that the term also refers implicitly to Islam because of the final humorous line in the poem (**Setelah disunat anunya itu**). This line indeed refers to the process of circumcision for Muslims.

In this poem, the variability of how embracing the term *Melayu* is in Peninsular Malaysia as well as how the term has come to be defined and perceived in the Malay World of the 21<sup>st</sup> century are discussed. In my opinion, the manner in which Malay is defined in Peninsular Malaysia is divided into two perspectives. The first perspective is proposed to be based on ethnicity and regional association criteria which consists of the Jawa, the Bugis, the Banjar, the Minangkabau, the Jakun and the Sakai. This first group of people, the Jawa, the Bugis, the Banjar and the Minangkabau, are understood to be *suku bangsa Melayu* originating from the Malay World comprising Sumatra, Jawa, Sulawesi and Kalimantan which have now become part of Indonesia. Meanwhile, the Jakun and the Sakai are understood to be the earliest people of the Malay peninsula who reside in the Malay hinterlands in the country now known as Malaysia.

The second perspective is proposed to be a criterion of religion, implied to be Islam, through the implicit reference to the process of circumcision in the final line of this stanza in the poem (**Setelah disunat anunya itu**). This second criterion of Islam covers the Arab, the Pakistani, the Mamak, the Malbari and the Mualaf. They are

understood to be followers of the Islamic faith compared to some members in the first group of ethnicity and regional association who may not subscribe to the Islamic faith such as the Jakun or the Sakai. What I suggest here then is that the irony of this situation is delivered in an implicit manner; they are identified as Malay solely due to their shared religion with the Malays, namely Islam, although they are not categorically Malay in descent and blood, namely ethnicity.

Here, we see attempts to discuss the general and public definitions as well as specific and personal perceptions of who is identified as and meant by the term Malay by utilising a tone which is witty but tinged with satire and scepticism. There is indeed no hesitation in conveying resolutely who is defined as Malay for Malay in Peninsular Malaysia is viewed here as encompassing and carrying an extensive as well as an eclectic demarcation: Jawa, Bugis, Banjar, Minangkabau, Jakun, Sakai, Arab, Pakistani, Mamak, Malbari and Mualaf. As I see, it is suggested in the poem that if a person possessed and adhered to certain characteristics and attitudes which are generally accepted as Malay, then he is in simple terms *Melayu*. The significance of the Malay characteristics and attitudes is however discussed in the next section on Malayness and identity.

This analysis based on what I suggest is the most important stanza from the poem "Melayu" related to my study can be presented as a response to a question posited by Ahmad Kamal Abdullah (2004: 168), 'Who is the Malay in contemporary understanding?' as he discusses the 'types' of Malays categorised in the poem. I believe that the paradigm of Malayness manifested in this poem through the subject of ethnicity has helped to answer Ahmad's question, that 'the Malay' as understood at present encompasses and carries extensive as well as eclectic meanings and that 'the Malay' is understood to refer to both ethnicity and Islam. I am not too sure however that Ahmad is right when he suggests that the poem has 'political significance' because it is a re-evaluation of what the Malay means and in response to the call of the 'New Malay'. In my opinion, the poem is more accurately described as possessing objective significance or an everyday-defined social reality of what 'the Malay' means as an element to delineate the paradigm of Malayness because it contains understandings of 'the Malay' as construed by reality experienced by everyday Malays.

## Malayness and identity

I begin this section by stating that the subject of identity as a paradigm of Malayness in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* is not discussed here but has been explored in the section on Malayness and the Malay rulers because I strongly believe that the subject of identity is dealt with in the text albeit implicitly. Nonetheless, the ‘ending’ of *Hikayat Abdullah* contains views which explore Malayness and identity explicitly. It begins with a recollection of the author’s life experiences and the observations he has made over the years. Because of his previous connections and relationships with many types of people and as an eye-witness to many important events and features of modernisation, the author believes that he is in the best position, apart from being the best person, to expound his wisdom (Sweeney, 2008: 541).

As such, he feels assured to construct his own notion regarding the identity of the Malays (**dalam hal ehwal kehidupan orang2 Melayu**) in the objective of the ‘ending’, presented as the author’s main concern as seen from the opening paragraph. Indeed, there are four aspects of the Malays which have raised the author’s concerns: their condition (**hal ehwal mereka itu**), their attitude (**tabiat mereka itu**), their behaviour (**kelakuan mereka itu**), and their *adat*/culture (**adat mereka itu**). This paragraph in the ‘ending’ highlights that the Malay race is not progressing intellectually (**kudapati bangsa Melayu itu ...makin pula bodohnya**) and the reasons are explained as the ‘folly’ of the Malays (Sweeney, 2008: 542).

Firstly, the ‘ending’ contains the author’s anxiety regarding the identity of the Malay race (**bangsa Melayu**) as an ethnic group with regard to their condition and future. It is indicated in the ‘ending’ that the Malay race is stupid (**bodoh**) and their wretched state (**kecelakaan**) can be attributed to the tyrannical reign of their rulers (**zalim dan aniaya perintah raja2nya berlebih2han**). The condition of the Malays as subjects (**rakyat**) is also described in the ‘ending’ in a metaphorical sense: their condition is like the soil which needs to be sowed in order to produce. Without the appropriate and necessary seed, the Malays will become like the trees in the forest which simply follow wherever the wind blows (Sweeney, 2008: 542).

The second cause of concern regarding the Malays illustrated in the ‘ending’ revolves around their identity as a submissive race where they are believed to accept meekly the rule and power of other races over them. Here, the Malay subjects are described using similes; they are portrayed like the small fish whose function is only as fodder for the big fish. Therefore, using allegories such as **sehingga hati rakyatnya itu menjadi seumpama tanah yang tiada berbaja lagi** (until the hearts of the subjects become like the land without its fertiliser), **ia hidup seperti pohon kayu yang dalam hutan, maka barang di mana ditiup angin, di sanalah ia rebah** (they live like the trees in the forests, so wherever the wind blows, there is where they fall), and **seperti ikan yang kecil-kecil, maka gunanya itu menjadi makanan segala ikan yang besar-besar adanya** (like the small fish, so its use is to become food for the big fish) (Sweeney, 2008: 542), the ‘ending’ contains the author’s reasons for holding the rulers responsible for the identity of the Malays as a group of people who lack intellectual, cultural and social progress.

All the examples in the ‘ending’ so far can be traced to one cause: lack of knowledge and education. This cause is illustrated through the use of a metaphor pertaining to a manual worker (the rulers) without his tools (knowledge and education) (**tukang... tiada berpekakas**). Without these necessary tools (**‘ilmu atau pelajaran**), the rulers would not be able to progress and hence this damaging identity of the rulers without their tools would become the object of disrepute and ridicule for other races and inadvertently reflects upon the identity of their subjects (Sweeney, 2008: 542).

The ‘ending’ also deals with the author’s perception of the identity of the Malays as a race which possesses an indifferent attitude towards knowledge and education which they explain by way of their state of poverty (**Apa boleh buat, karena sahaya orang miskin inilah hal sahaya dalam susah**). The issue of the poverty of material wealth here is linked to the poverty of the mind (**miskin ‘akalnya**) which in turn is attributed to a lack of intellectual development and a negative attitude or a hesitance towards pursuing knowledge (Sweeney, 2008: 546).

In the ‘ending’, three reasons are provided for the above perception regarding the identity of the Malays as lacking in motivation in their pursuit of knowledge,

firstly, their ancestors (**sebab orang tua2nya yang dahulu tiada berbuat demikian itulah ia pun tiada mau**), secondly, their rulers and aristocrats (**sebab raja2nya dan orang besar2nya, dan orang yang setara dengan dia tiada berbuat, maka itulah ia pun tiada mau**), and thirdly, their society (**sebab ia malu akan segala orang**). All three are illustrated as those who adhere only to traditional *adat*/culture which does not include learning and being educated intellectually. The ‘ending’ also contains a projection of the Malays metaphorically: as a piece of land which is trampled upon by other races due to their lack of intellect (**seumpama tanah tempat dipijak2 oleh segala bangsa manusia larian adanya**) (Sweeney, 2008: 546-547). Indeed, extracts in the ‘ending’ of *Hikayat Abdullah* which contain views on the Malays regarding their identity can also be seen as an advice on how to improve their mindset: by embracing the pursuing of knowledge and education as part of their new system of belief. This finding correlates with the theme of the poverty of the mind which was re-introduced by Zainal Abidin Ahmad (Za’ba) (1895-1973) more than a century later in his articles, “The poverty of the Malays” (1923a) and “The salvation of the Malays” (1923b).

Another way of dealing with the subject of identity as a paradigm of Malayness is manifested in *Anak Mat Lela Gila* although I have not found any evidence in *Putera Gunung Tahan* to support views on this subject as proffered by Aveling (1993: 6) and Hooker (2000: 110). In *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, Mat Lela has named the abandoned male baby he has found earlier as Bulat. The extract below shows that Mat Lela’s act of naming the baby Bulat can be linked simultaneously to the subject of identity to indicate ethnicity:

### **Extract 33**

**“...Ya, Bulat bin Mat Lela. Bulat itu nama Melayu betul.”** (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 18)

As the extract shows, the name Bulat can be seen as a manifestation of the paradigm of Malayness because it is suggested that Bulat is a name that can also reflect appropriately an intangible entity which belongs exclusively to the Malays (**nama Melayu betul**), namely identity.

Another example regarding identity in the novel involves the different types of Malays whom Bulat has encountered so far in his journey. We note the following types of Malays: wealthy married farmers who unselfishly adopt Bulat (**Johari dan Permai**), Johari's selfish and materialistic unpleasant second wife (**Siti Johariah**), a materialistic but destitute couple who leads a modern way of life or culture (**laki<sup>2</sup> dan perempuan moden**) and a wise Sakai who speaks Malay and is dressed in Malay attire (**Mandor Alang**) (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 76).

The types of Malays depicted in the novel can indeed be seen as representatives of different types of Malay identities emerging at that point in time, a view rightly posited by Hooker (2000: 110). However, I believe that the types of Malays depicted are actually the author's composite of what the identity of the Malays consist. Apart from the various identities of the Malays depicted with regard to their character (as represented by Johari and his wives), *adat*/culture (as represented by the modern couple) as well as the Malay language and attire (as represented by the Sakai, Alang), a more implicit depiction here is what the composite identity means. In my opinion, these types of Malays are symbols of what the Malays were, have become, are and should be. Another way of looking at it is that the Malays should not have become and should not become like some of the Malays depicted in the novel but that they should aspire to take on the identity represented by, ironically enough, one who is not Malay in descent or blood (which represents ethnicity), namely the Sakai, Alang.

Hence Bulat's encounter with the different types of Malays is a symbolic exposure to the different types of Malay identities one can choose from. Here, I agree with views that describe Bulat as a character which represents the symbolic Malay search for his own self-identity as well as national identity and what the new Malay should be (Thomas, 1983: viii; Mohd. Taib Osman and Abu Bakar Hamid, 1988: 308; Abdullah Tahir, 1989, 51, 52, 57, 58). This is because, during the period the novel was written, there were indeed debates centring on the 'crisis of Malay identity' (Aveling, 1993: 6). Thus, the different types of Malays Bulat has encountered can indeed be seen as representatives of the choices regarding the types of identities he can select from. Indeed, the last type of Malay identity in the form of Alang has been presented as the best choice in that the character is immediately thought of to be the

most ideal Malay identity because he speaks in Malay and is dressed in attire exclusively to the Malays as a form of identity. As the example demonstrates, these aspects are believed to be more indicative in delineating the paradigm of Malayness with regard to identity compared to character and *adat/culture*.

Another example which explores Malayness and identity is to be found in an episode where Bulat attends a show performed by Elis Sakti. Here, she speaks on the Malay songs and art as part of Malay *adat/culture* and as a means to foster the spirit of nationalism with the aim of achieving progress. At this point in the novel, Bulat has discovered that Elis Sakti is his biological mother he has been searching for. In the example below, Bulat questions Elis regarding her name:

**Extract 34**

**Pada suatu masa Bulat bertanya, “Saya dapat khabar emak memakai nama palsu, nama Elis Sakti bukan nama emak yang asli, nama itu nama orang Keristian bukan-nya elok kalau bagitu tolong-lah emak nyatakan nama emak yang sa-benarnya.” (Ishak Haji Muhammad, 1960: 118-119)**

As seen above, Bulat disapproves of his mother’s use of the name Elis Sakti for he suggests that it does not reflect her true identity and designates elements of Christianity instead. The extract above seems to suggest that the paradigm of Malayness can be manifested through the name of a person as an indicator of identity, in this aspect, implied here to be Islam. Highlighting the possibility that Elis Sakti might be misidentified as a Christian through the use of a name which does not appear to indicate rightly her identity as a Muslim means that the author has implicitly highlighted the importance of the religion of Islam for the Malays. This is indeed evident from the novel which proves a point posited by Thomas (1983: ix), that ‘religion as one of the primary marks of Malay identity is an area which cannot be understood or meddled with by the colonialist’ and ‘is therefore a field which Malays can develop as their contribution to future progress’. As I see it, it is suggested in the novel that the identity of the Malays can be delineated and also projected through the practice of their religion, Islam, and not merely through their ethnicity.

Another way of exploring Malayness and identity is manifested in the following stanza from *Ceretera yang kedua puluh enam (i)* on *Pemerintahan Sultan*

*Mahmud Syah* in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* which describes what the identity of the Malays should be. As seen below, the identity of the Malays should ideally be that of a person who respects knowledge and intellectualism, and hence the intellectuals. The identity of the Malays should also be that of a person who upholds loyalty and should be loyal to his own race although when faced with moments of dispute and discontent with other Malays:

**Extract 35**

Stanza 3:

**hormatilah orang berilmu,  
orang yang setia pada bangsamu  
betapapun tidak setujunya.** (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 61)

As seen above, respect (**hormat**) for intellectualism and loyalty (**setia**) as the underlying concepts of the identity of the Malay are stressed in the poem.

In the stanza below, which has also been discussed earlier in the section on Malayness and the Malay language, it is implied how the Malays should construct their identity as a prosperous race: through believing in and practising freedom. It is also demonstrated that the identity of the Malays should be underlined through confidence with their own abilities and possessing self-confidence which would then enable them to progress as they have proven in their history. It is also highlighted here that, at one point in history during the height of the Melaka Empire, the Malays had a strong identity as witnessed through the Malay harbour which had become the melting pot of international trade:

**Extract 36**

Stanza 4:

**melayu akan besar dengan kebebasan,  
dengan percaya bahawa mereka bebas dan besar.  
di pelabuhan kita seluruh dunia bertemu,  
bahasa kita dipilih, adat kita diteliti.** (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 61)

As shown above, the strong identity of the Malays can be seen through the accomplishment symbolised by their own language where it was indeed the Malays'

own language that had been held in esteem and chosen as the *lingua franca* (**bahasa kita dipilih**) despite the many languages spoken in Melaka. The strong identity of the Malays can also be seen through the accomplishment symbolised by their own *adat/culture* where, regardless of the many cultures observed in Melaka, it was the Malay *adat/culture* which had been practised, scrutinised, valued and studied (**adat kita diteliti**). Thus we can observe that language and *adat/culture* have overlapped with identity as a means to delineate the paradigm of Malayness. My analysis above thus corresponds to a view by Abdul Rahman Napiyah (2003: 111) who suggests that the subjects of the poem is delineated by the author's own conception of Malayness in particular to the root of primordial identity of the Malays and 'the Malay collective consciousness'.

The poem "Melayu", on the other hand, explores the subject of identity with a stanza which begins by describing the identity of the Malays as an intelligent (**bijaksana**) person (Usman Awang, 1999a: 229-231) (Appendix 20 pp. 332-333). The intelligence of the Malays is described in relation to qualities which are presented in two criteria, the negative which is balanced by the positive. This is seen from the use of words to describe the positive values of the Malays: **jenaka** (humorous), **budi bahasanya tidak terkira** (very courteous), **tetap santun** (still refined), **masih bersopan** (still polite) and **bijak beralas tangan** (gracious). At the same time, the qualities of the Malays which are seen as negative are also described: **nakal** (playful), **kurang ajar** (disrespectful), **menipu** (lying) and **mengampu** (pretending).

We are informed in the poem that, even when the Malay is being playful, he does so by mixing it with jest (**Nakalnya bersulam jenaka**). **Budi bahasanya tidak terkira** carries a positive tone as it can be said that the good qualities of a Malay are too many to mention. The line **Kurang ajarnya tetap santun** suggests that the Malays still abide by their moral values even at their worst behaviour. The identity of the Malays, it seems, is a combination of two qualities: they are capable of and skilful at resorting to their negative set of values while camouflaging them with their positive ones.

The subject of the identity of the Malays is also manifested in a stanza in "Melayu" which speaks of the achievements of the Malays in history. This important

aspect does not go unchecked in the poem where it is recalled in the poem how the Malays were once erstwhile sea travellers constantly on quests and journeys to spread their wings and soils on foreign lands. The identity of the Malays then was that of strength and vigour, they were not constrained by any form of barriers or afraid of embarking on new territories. However, this glorious identity of the Malays as a strong force to be reckoned with has been reduced to a mere narrow scope and has been unfortunately lost. At a glance, we can say that the poem is also referring to lands once owned and ruled by the Malays which include a large portion of what is understood to be the Malay World. In the actual sense, it is maintained that *Melayu* has now been confined politically to the country known as Malaysia. Through this implication, it is indicated that the meaning and the identity of *Melayu* itself has been narrowed and restricted due to the political boundaries.

Nonetheless, we can also say that it is the mindset of the Malays which is being simultaneously discussed in the poem. It appears from the poem that the mental and intellectual horizon and scope of the Malays used to be much broader than what they are at present time. We are told that the Malays used to be more progressive in their thoughts and thinking and were more willing to think ahead for the sake of progress and development. The Malay mindset was more constantly and consistently evolving and improving and this is exemplified in the poem through the ancestors of the Malays who were not one to be stagnant and stationary in mind. It is depicted in the poem how this positive value was eventually conceptualised in their actions and deeds, such as the **pengembara lautan**, for I believe that to *mengembara* (travel) can also mean to travel in the mind. Hence, in my opinion, it is suggested in the poem that Malays should challenge their minds in order to achieve the best in whatever endeavours they undertake.

My above view is augmented by what is described as the positive identity of the Malays. In the poem, the Malays are viewed as possessing a set of noble qualities in terms of their characteristics and attitudes as part of their identity. These sets of qualities in the Malays are listed as strong philosophies in life, a superior language, a productive *adat*/culture, and refined mannerism. However, the praise regarding the categorical identity of the Malays in the poem is followed by a more critical tone. The

negative identity of the Malays with regard to the complacency and ingratitude of the Malays, their pretentiousness, are immediately rebuked.

As exemplified in the poem, these types of complacent and ungrateful Malays are urged to adopt a more constructive identity, to start thinking and actually acting upon actions instead of constantly voicing their dissatisfaction (**kuat bersorak**). The damaging identity of the Malays with regard to those who are easily swayed by the lure of material wealth (**Terlalu ghairah pesta temasya**) to the point of easily giving away (**tergadai, sejalur tinggal sejengkal**) the most important things in their lives, their inheritance and possession in the form of land and property (**kampung sawah** and **tanah**), are also criticised. It is clearly indicated in the poem that these types of Malays do not value nor treasure what they possess.

In the poem, the Malays are also reminded of their identity in the eyes of others because they are viewed as fortunate for they are blessed in many ways. Yet, it is suggested in the poem that the Malays are not using or taking advantage of all the resources that they possess and have access to. Nor are they making full use of the opportunities that they have been given (**Meski telah memiliki telaga**). Indeed, the resources and opportunities represented here refer to the political power and the Malay special rights enshrined in the Malaysian Constitution as discussed in Chapter One. It is also suggested in the poem that Malays do not bother to revolutionise their thinking (**Tangan masih memegang tali**) as they are not ambitious enough nor are they forward-thinking.

It needs to be remembered here however that the poem is not about condemning nor is it inherently against Malay tradition and its values. In my opinion, the poem instead contains criticism regarding the unconstructive identity of the Malays as a group of people who are seen as ungrateful and complacent (**kuat bersorak**), and who keep on harping about the social injustices and unfairness of their conditions by blaming them on others. This is despite being presented with ample opportunities and assistance. It appears from the poem that these types of Malays are further damaging the otherwise positive identity of the Malays as presented in the earlier stanza because these Malays do not stop to actually perform the thinking on

their own and act upon more innovative ideas and actions. They would rather be fed upon instead of trying to feed themselves.

As demonstrated in the poem, the Malays now possess an identity as a vulnerable group of people where possible consequences which can befall the Malays if they did not rise to the competition against more advanced societies (**Sedang orang mencapai timba**) are painted. The possible consequences are austere but true, the first consequence noted is **Berbuahlah pisang tiga kali** (So the banana bears fruit thrice). Indeed, this line is an allusion to another well-known Malay proverb, *Pisang berbuah dua kali* (So the banana bears fruit twice). This proverb describes the impossibility of situations as akin to the banana bearing fruit twice as, scientifically, bananas only bear fruit once in their life span. Therefore, the impossibility of the situation, as impossible as banana bearing fruit two times let alone three when it states **Berbuahlah pisang tiga kali**, is actually emphasised in the poem. It is also stressed in the stanza how extremely difficult it would be for Malays to progress if they were still not progressing and were conservative in their thoughts and actions compared to their immediate counterparts. We are informed how Malays would still be building castles in the air (**Melayu itu masih bermimpi**) when the rest of society are already on solid grounds and achieving progress in reality.

Another consequence related to the subject of identity here as demonstrated in the poem is how the Malays are still observed as a group of people who are unable to develop intellectually and to make their mark as a successful group of people globally although they have been properly and are highly educated (**Walaupun sudah mengenal universiti**). The Malays are still trapped in their traditional thinking and are not brave enough to venture outside their safe cocoon as seen from the reference to the Malays still engaging in trade within the safety net of their own homeland (**Masih berdagang di rumah sendiri**). This is contrasted with the rest of society who have ventured outside of their domain in order to progress and make a mark in history as part of improving their civilisation.

The Malay temperament and nature are also discussed in the poem which I believe can be compartmentalised as part of their identity. It is suggested in the poem that Malays are not without their ire. It is proposed that, even when the Malays fight

or are engaged in a dispute (**Berkelahi cara Melayu**), they behave and do so in a civilised manner. This behaviour is performed in many ways, such as through the use of literature, **pantun** (poetry); facial expressions, **senyum** (smiling); or even conduct, **merendah** (to be humble).

However, we are also cautioned regarding the established identity of the Malays as a group of people who clearly detest enmity and hostility (**menolak permusuhan**) and uphold loyalty and tolerance (**Setia dan sabar tiada sempadan**). When aggravated, the Malays are frightful and ghastly (**marah tak nampak telinga/Musuh dicari ke lubang cacing/Tak dapat tanduk telinga dijinjing**). Here, the Malay rage is described in terms of two traditional Malay proverbs, namely **Musuh dicari ke lubang cacing**, and **Tak dapat tanduk telinga dijinjing**.

The first proverb (**Musuh dicari ke lubang cacing**) carries the meaning of how the Malays will try their hardest in hunting down their enemies even through they will have to resort to the most illogical means such as looking for their enemies who could possibly be hiding in an impossible place like the hole of a worm. The second proverb (**Tak dapat tanduk telinga dijinjing**) implies that the Malays are a group of proud people who harbour vendettas that they would make do with showing to the world that they have managed to overcome minor disputes and problems, such as obtaining the ear of an enemy, even if they had not been able to overcome major ones, such as obtaining the horn of the enemy. Thus, it can be said that the Malays are described in the poem as passionate and zealous people.

We are also told that the honour (**maruah**) and the religion (**agama**) of the Malays should not be censured (**dihina jangan**) for it is indeed sacrilegious to attack their honour and religion. We are reminded that the Malays will defend these two entities passionately and zealously (**Hebat amuknya tak kenal lawan**) as the infamous identity of the Malays known as the amok phenomenon is alluded to in the poem. However, it is not mentioned explicitly in the poem what the religion of the Malays is but we do know that the religion of the Malays in Malaysia is understood to be Islam. Indeed, the identity of the Malays on the whole are constructive where they are described as possessing positive virtues but are also capable of expressing

negative values if what they hold dear to them, in this case their honour and Islam, were under attack, spiritually, emotionally, mentally and physically.

It is highlighted also in the poem the more encouraging identity of the Malays which consist of their temperament such as the beauty of their truce and the fact that they are good at forgiving and forgetting once an apology is proffered. It is demonstrated in the poem that the forgiving nature of the Malays can be attributed to how high they look upon true friendship (**Silaturahmi hati yang murni**).

The poem ends by challenging the conventional identity of the Malays as a group of people who uphold traditional *adat*/culture. We are asked to reflect on how the Malays will fare when the 21<sup>st</sup> century arrives. It is questioned in the poem whether the Malays will still be timid and reserved as the 21<sup>st</sup> century approaches. In my opinion, the line of questioning (**Masihkah tunduk tersipu-sipu?**) in the poem is a metaphorical way of asking whether the Malays will still be intellectually, politically, economically and socially backward and not become more progressive in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The Malays are reminded to act upon what they really are and what they should be for the opposite of most traditional values are the better choice and the more superior. In the poem, the Malays are asked to adopt a more progressive identity: not to be afraid of confronting traditional values (**Jangan takut melanggar pantang**), not to be embarrassed of defying conventional values (**Jangan segan menentang larangan**) and not to be ashamed of proclaiming self-confidence (**Jangan malu mengucapkan keyakinan**).

Indeed, it is reinforced in the poem that Malays should aspire to the following aspects in their lives: progress (**kemajuan**), truth (**kebenaran**) and justice (**keadilan**). The Malays are asked not to be restrained by traditional taboo (**pantang**), conventional restriction (**larangan**) and reticence (**malu**). In my opinion, this final stanza is by far the poem's most serious criticism of the Malays for its approach here is very persuasive: it explicitly calls for a transformation of the Malay mindset, attitude and character as part of the identity of the Malays.

The call for the Malays to be an intellectual race in the poem is noted (**Jadilah bangsa yang bijaksana**). Even though the term **bijaksana** is used, I view it also as a

symbolic appeal to the Malays to be smart in discovering ways to reclaim the economy (**Memegang tali memegang timba**). It is implicitly suggested in the poem that the economic progress of the Malays is being currently dictated by and is being left to the other groups of people which make up the fabric of the Malaysian society. This particular line is also a repetition of an earlier scenario presented in an earlier stanza (**Tangan masih memegang tali/Sedang orang mencapai timba**). For the Malays to be an intellectual race as well as a skilful one, it is suggested that they should ideally be in control of their economy (**Memiliki ekonomi**), build upon their productive culture (**mencipta budaya**), and lead in all ventures they undertake as leaders in their own independent country (**Menjadi tuan di negara Merdeka**).

As the entire poem demonstrates, what appear from “Melayu” are highly critical and analytical views of common Malay stereotypes and beliefs which make up part of their identity. The Malay mindset is urged not be afraid to challenge traditional perceptions and the way of doing so is the utilising of conventional Malay proverbs, by way of a reversal of principles and values, to underscore the points. It is illustrated in the poem how it is extremely unsympathetic and judicious of hypocrisy and censures those who succumb to pretence and deception. It recounts that, in the past, the Malays have a positive identity as signalled by good character, attitude and resources but warns that negative and destructive attitudes make Malays forget their own ethics.

At times, the identity of the Malays as a group of people is viewed in the poem as negative, that they are unable to appreciate what they possess and instead ignore them. This in turn makes them forsake their positive values and digress instead of progress. The paradigm of Malayness with regard to identity in the poem is manifested in the form of attitude and character and that the Malay mindset should constantly be challenged and expanded to broader horizons and not be hindered by pretentiousness. Ahmad Kamal Abdullah (2004: 168) is certainly right when he states that the poem contains contradictions in the Malay attitude whose pure traditional values are seen as having been compromised. In particular, I agree with Ahmad who points out the loss of the strong Malay spirit, which can also be seen as the loss of the strong Malay identity as a paradigm of Malayness, in terms of achieving progress compared to their ancestors. Ahmad is also correct when he suggests that Usman’s

most important message to the Malays can be found in the final stanza of the poem where he stresses to his fellow Malays to be in command of their future even if it means that they have to adopt a more uncompromising identity.

## Conclusion

Now, I discuss the conclusion of this chapter thematically according to the paradigm of Malayness I have hypothesised. Earlier, I have analysed seven works from traditional and modern Malay literature which reflect my hypothesised paradigms of Malayness through various manifestations.

The importance of the role played by the Malay language as a paradigm of Malayness is manifested especially in *Hikayat Abdullah*, *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. Malay has also been determined to be an overlapping paradigm of Malayness together with ethnicity and identity where it has been used as an ethnic identifier, represented also through attire known to be exclusive to the Malays, as seen in the role it plays in *Putera Gunung Tahan*. On the other hand, its role as a symbol of unity and success through its proper position, use and study as the foundation of the ideal identity of the Malays as an ethnic group is outlined and implied in *Hikayat Abdullah* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*.

Meanwhile, Islam appears to be a non-negotiable paradigm not only in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* but is also most evident in *Putera Gunung Tahan*, *Anak Mat Lela Gila* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. However, Islam is not touched upon in an overt manner in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, *Hikayat Abdullah* and “Melayu”. A reason for this is believed to be the fact that Islam is seen as an overriding element of the works that there is no obvious need for it to be manifested explicitly. In *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, the important role played by Islam is tied to the importance of *daulat* and *derhaka* which is the basis of the social covenant expressing the diabolical relationship between the Malay rulers and the Malay subjects. As recalled, it is stated in the *Qur'an* that God has appointed the King as His representative on earth and this belief has been couched within an Islamic framework as presented through Hang Tuah. As shown in the analysis, Hang Tuah is an early example of a good Muslim even if he does not refer to

Islam explicitly in attitudes and actions but through innate expressions of the virtues of a Muslim.

The role of Islam is also found to overlap with the Malay rulers, *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity as a paradigm of Malayness in *Hikayat Abdullah*. In the ‘ending’, Islam is projected to be the superseding element which must first be embraced by the Malay rulers through a thorough education and knowledge of its philosophies followed by its proper teachings and practice in order to set positive examples to the royal offspring and hence the subjects. Islam must also be the paramount belief to lead the Malay rulers and also the subjects in the quest for the Malays to become successful as an ethnic group. This must also be done by abandoning obsolete *adat/culture* which is at crossroads with Islam and the quest for a constructive Malay identity.

Islam is also an overlapping element with the Malay rulers, *adat/culture* and ethnicity in *Putera Gunung Tahan*. This is especially true when we recall the issue of Western culture being practised by some Malays at the expense of their own *adat/culture* as highlighted by Ratu Bongsu, the ruler of Mount Tahan. Meanwhile, the overlapping of Islam with ethnicity and identity is also to be found in “Melayu” where ethnicity has been overridden by Islam in order to identify anyone as Malay on the back of their shared religion, Islam. What this could mean then is that the Malay phrase to *masuk Islam* can also be equated with to *masuk Melayu*, that to become a Muslim is to become a Malay. This also shows a concurrent understanding that religion equates ethnicity but ethnicity need not necessarily equate religion. A point to support this view is that the Jakun and the Sakai are also categorised as *Melayu* in the poem but we do know that they do not subscribe to the Islamic faith.

The importance of the Malay rulers is manifested clearly in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* as the core Malayness paradigm. The diabolical relationship between the ruler and the subject necessitates the honouring of the Malay principle of *daulat* and *derhaka* as part of the Malay *adat/culture*. As I concluded earlier on Malayness and Islam, its importance is also tied to Islam and *adat/culture*. This is also most evident in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* where the phrase **adat Melayu tak pernah menderhaka** occurs in the episode regarding the death of the son of the *Bendahara* at

the hands of the son of the Malay ruler. Not surprisingly, I have not found any evidence from *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* and “Melayu” which explores the subject of Malayness and the Malay rulers. This could be due to the fact that the works focus on the relationship between a Malay and his belief in Islam as well as the attitudes of the Malays and internal differences among themselves where, among others, they are urged to search for their own definitive character in living their lives in order to form the basis of a strong Malay identity (Abdul Latiff Abu Bakar, 1977: 148-149; Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 51-57).

Precise examples which can help to explore the subject of *adat/culture* as a paradigm of Malayness however are not to be found in *Anak Mat Lela Gila*. This is despite the fact that some scholars have touched upon this aspect in their studies on the novel (Thomas, 1983: vi; Mohd. Taib Osman and Abu Bakar Hamid, 1988: 307-309; Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 42; Aveling, 1993: 5). *Adat/culture* as a paradigm of Malayness however is manifested in many ways; for example, in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, it is associated with the Malay rulers and Islam in the form of system of belief as I have just concluded earlier. In *Hikayat Abdullah* and *Putera Gunung Tahan*, *adat/culture* is also manifested in view of Islam, ethnicity and identity as I have just concluded earlier on Malayness and Islam. In *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*, *adat/culture* in the form of a substratum of pre-Islamic older beliefs is contrasted against the philosophies and teachings of Islam to delineate the paradigm of Malayness. Meanwhile, in “Melayu”, *adat/culture* is touched upon in view of a criticism of the traditional Malay proverb, *biar mati anak, jangan mati adat*. This is linked to an aspiration for a more constructive Malay identity which I believe can be seen as a form of delineating the paradigm of Malayness.

In turn, “Melayu” shares one exceptional aspect with *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, they both contain descriptions of different types of Malays representing ethnicity and identity. In “Melayu”, different types of Malays are represented both by Islam and ethnicity. On the other hand, in *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, I have found different ways of describing the Malays, as **kaum Melayu**, **kaum-bangsa Melayu**, **orang Melayu**, **anak baik<sup>2</sup> jati ya`ani bukan peranakan atau kachokan** and **Melayu jati**, as well as different categories of Malay identities which have emerged over time within Malay society with the ideal identity advocated to be embraced by the Malays

represented by the Sakai, Mandur Alang. This is because, in the novel, Alang is depicted as speaking in the Malay language and is attired in clothing exclusive to the Malays even though he may not be Malay in ethnicity or even a Muslim.

Both ethnicity and identity are also spoken of overtly in *Hikayat Abdullah* in the outlining of necessary changes in the way the Malay rulers reign and how they practise Islam and their *adat/culture* in order to make the Malays, as an ethnic group (*bangsa Melayu*), a successful race. This is where their identity comes in, in the form of ideas, knowledge, expertise, skills, awareness, attitude, behaviour and character, so that their identity as a Malay race can be seen by other races as more progressive and positive. The same is also found in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* where the paradigm of Malayness manifested is similar to those in *Hikayat Abdullah*. In both works, ethnicity is linked to the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat/culture* and identity as the paradigm of Malayness.

“Melayu”, on the other hand, expresses succinctly the paradigm of Malayness which encompasses implicit references to Islam, ethnicity and identity. Apart from the conclusion presented earlier on Islam and ethnicity, identity in “Melayu” is manifested in the form of the proverbial Malay thinking, mindset, attitude and character. In *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, identity is manifested together with Islam and ethnicity in the form of this prospect: what is considered to be indicative of a person’s Malay ethnicity must be delineated through the person’s name which should also simultaneously be indicative of the Islamic faith. This is exemplified through the name Bulat described as **nama Melayu betul** while the name Elis Sakti has caused confusion as to the ethnicity of the person, either Malay or Filipino, because it is described in the novel as a name associated with another religion apart from Islam, namely Christianity. Thus we can see another pattern of overlapping where Islam has taken precedence over ethnicity to represent identity as a paradigm of Malayness.

Lastly, it must also be mentioned here that there is not to be found any evidence from *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* which explores the subject of the Malay rulers, ethnicity and identity as a paradigm of Malayness. Meanwhile, the role of the Malay language is also not to be found in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. However, I must state here that this is not a main focus of the study as the simple fact

that the works are written in Malay and are highly regarded as eminent works in traditional and modern Malay literature both by local and foreign scholars as discussed in Chapter Four show that the works have merit in representing the intangible aspects of delineating the paradigm of Malayness in the form of literature.

Indeed, a comparison based on the findings in all seven works reflects certain shared elements of the Malayness paradigm. The only exceptions are *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* which only contains manifestations of Islam and *adat/culture* in the form of system of belief as well as “Melayu” which does not contain any references to the Malay rulers. As a whole, certain shared elements between the works therefore support my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness as an everyday-defined social reality comprising the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity, with *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* identified as the prime example due to its overt reflections of the paradigm.

---

## CONCLUSION

### Introduction

This final chapter begins with a comparison between the findings in Chapters Three and Five. This is undertaken with the aim to provide reasonable answers to the first and second research questions as posited in the Introduction chapter based on comprehensive and concrete evidence. This is followed by a discussion on the contributions of this study to the field of literature which is simultaneously an attempt to offer solutions to the third research question. The chapter ends with suggestions for future research.

### Comparative viewpoint: English and Malay literary works on the Malay World

This section is an attempt to provide answers to the first research question posited in this study: 'Do the selected works conform to a local and broad understanding of the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised where it is an everyday-defined social reality reflected in English and Malay literary works on the Malay World?' The answer(s) should then be able to shed further light to the second research question: 'Do the selected works challenge the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised where it is actually an authority-defined social reality as conceptualised by Shamsul A. B. reflected in English and Malay literary works on the Malay World?'

As demonstrated in Chapter Three, only two of Shamsul's three pillars are manifested in Maugham's short stories, namely the Malay language and the Malay rulers. The second pillar, Islam, is not mentioned at all in any of Maugham's short stories. However, all three pillars are manifested in the works of Conrad and Burgess. In Conrad's Malay novels, the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers are reflected through the depictions of the Malay characters. More importantly, my

findings show that there are also other elements present in their works which have also been expressed as manifestations of the paradigm of Malayness, namely *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity. While the aforementioned elements are also present in Conrad's works, it is only in Burgess' works that more specific and overt manifestations and discussions of *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity are to be found. This is because the manifestations of my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness are reflected in Burgess' trilogy not only through the depictions of the Malay characters but also the non-Malay characters. The most enlightening finding is the fact that both the Malay language and Islam have been used as indicators to represent the ethnicity of the Malay characters. It is also implied in Burgess' trilogy that the Malay language, Islam and ethnicity can also refer to understandings of identity. In addition, it is in Burgess' works that a more definitive role played by the Malay rulers is linked to the identity of the Malays as a whole. In fact, there are also implicit manifestations of the roles played by the Malay rulers in the works of Conrad and Maugham but they are reflected more explicitly and elaborately in Burgess' trilogy.

What this also means then is that, in the works of Conrad written in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, there is indeed evidence to suggest the important roles played by the Malay rulers with regard to the Malays, especially in their capacity as leaders for the Malays in looking after their interests and welfare, politically, economically, socially and culturally. We see this manifested in the depictions of Lakamba and the Wajo royals where they in turn are served by their loyal subjects such as Babalatchi and Jaffir. These findings in Conrad's trilogy can be compared with my findings in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* where the social covenant of Bukit SiGuntang is upheld by Hang Tuah as a subject because it is the foundation of the Malay *adat/culture* to do so. It is also demonstrated to be an aspect related to the Islamic belief of the Malays as honouring the covenant through honouring the ruler simultaneously means honouring Allah.

Findings from Conrad's works can also be compared to my findings from the 'ending' of *Hikayat Abdullah* where the important roles played by the Malay rulers in view of the political, economical, social and cultural progress and development of the Malay subjects are stressed upon. In addition, it is explicitly emphasised in the 'ending' that, when the Malay rulers are progressive in tandem with the philosophies

and teachings of Islam, then the Malay subjects would definitely follow suit. These same findings are also to be found in *Putera Gunung Tahan*. Thus we can see an emerging and overlapping pattern of reflecting the paradigm of Malayness in the English literary works: the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity.

In view of the issues of the current understanding of Malayness as discussed in Chapter One, my findings show that *Hikayat Abdullah*, *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* do express the paradigm of Malayness similar to Shamsul's conceptualisation of an authority-defined social reality: the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers. However, more importantly, my findings also demonstrate that the paradigm of Malayness reflected in the works is also understood to refer to *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity. What this points to then is that the paradigm of Malayness in all the three works is not limited to only Shamsul's three pillars but that they encompass a broader understanding of the paradigm in the form of an everyday-defined social reality as I have hypothesised. Exceptions to this finding however are to be found in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* with only Islam and *adat/culture* manifested as a paradigm of Malayness while references to the Malay rulers are not to be found in *Anak Mat Lela Gila* and "Melayu".

The manifestations of only Islam and *adat/culture* in *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* can be traced to the main issue of the novel which deals with the subject of poverty as experienced by Malay peasants (Shahnon Ahmad, 1991a: 375). On the other hand, the absence of the Malay rulers in *Anak Mat Lela Gila* can be reasoned by the author's own admission for writing the novel, it is a 'manifesto' especially meant for Malay society on how to re-establish a strong Malay identity where the Malays must search for their self-identity and discover their roots (Abdullah Tahir, 1989: 58). Meanwhile, it is possible to state that the absence of the Malay rulers in "Melayu" is due to the likelihood that the poet was more concerned with the delineating of the paradigm of Malayness based on the common use and practice of the Malay language and *adat/culture* (Solehah Ishak, 1998: 120). As demonstrated in "Melayu", *adat/culture* can also be understood to mean a set of custom, system of belief in the form of the proverbial Malay thinking, mindset, attitude, behaviour and character as well as way of life.

My findings which point to the connection between the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity as a paradigm of Malayness in literature resulting from an everyday-defined social reality can be explained by brief discussions on studies by two well-known Malaysian scholars (Appendix 23). The first is a study by Mohd. Taib Osman (1986) on the development of the Malay language, *An introduction to the development of modern Malay language and literature* (further discussed in Appendix 24), and the second on the history of Islam in the Malay World by Syed Muhammad Naguib Al-Attas (1969), *Preliminary statement on a general theory of the Islamisation of the Malay-Indonesian Archipelago* (further discussed in Appendix 25). In my opinion, both studies can help to explain further my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in the works of literature as an everyday-defined social reality and debunks Shamsul's conceptualisation of the three pillars of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality.

Apart from the simplicity of the hierarchical structure of Malay as a factor of its position *par excellence* in the Malay World, another factor proposed in the study by Taib (1986: 3) is the role played by Islam. As Taib describes it, the embrace of Islam by the Malays saw the simultaneous spread of Malay through efforts by the Malays in spreading Islam. Thus, Taib believes that the Malay language was further developed, from the 13<sup>th</sup> or the 14<sup>th</sup> centuries onwards, as a tool of 'not only literary thought but also of religious and philosophical ideas'. It was also after the advent of Islam which allows us to pinpoint the exact nature of the use of Malay. It was during this era that Malay was identified as the language which helped to spread Islam and eventually displaced the dominance and influence of older civilisations such as Hinduism and Buddhism.

Concomitant with the spread of Islam through Malay, according to Taib (1986: 4-5), is the establishment of Malay as 'a language of the royal courts of the kingdoms' in the Malay World. These kingdoms were in turn 'centres from which Islam spread to the general populace'. Taib (1986: 4) also suggests it was under 'the patronage of these courts' that saw the flourishing of not only religious learning but also literature. It was also Malay which was used as a tool 'to convey laws, rules and

moral codes based on Islam'. As proposed in a study by Al-Attas (1993: 175),<sup>98</sup> the tool in which Islam produced further authority on the Malay worldview is through its holy book, the *Qur'an*. It is described as a sacred scripture still yet to be challenged in terms of its influence and impact on events since pre-Islamic Malay civilisation. Linking it with the development of the Malay language, Al-Attas (1993: 175) explains the association between the *Qur'an* and the development of Malay as, 'The *Qur'anic* conception of man as a rational animal, capable by means of his reason or intelligence ('*aql*) of understanding and appreciating the signs (*āyāt*) that point to God is made all the more significant in respect of the future development of the Malay language by the emphasis laid on the meaning of 'rational' (*nātiq*) as the capacity to speak (*berkata-kata* [*i.e.*, speaking]) – the emphasis on the faculty of speech.'

In my opinion, these studies indeed help to explain the use of devout Islamic expressions and phrases in the dialogue of characters depicted as Malays as well as when speaking about the Malays in the works of Conrad and Burgess, *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, *Hikayat Abdullah*, *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. In particular, Malay has been proven to be a paradigm to delineate Malayness as seen in the examples presented earlier from Conrad's trilogy, Maugham's Malayan short stories, *Hikayat Abdullah*, *Putera Gunung Tahan* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*.

Ethnicity is an element which is also present in all the works analysed and is associated with the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat*/culture and identity as a means to delineate the paradigm of Malayness. In particular, except for Maugham's short stories and *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*, Islam has been used to indicate the identity of a character to be based on another element: ethnicity. What has occurred in the respective works is that Islam is now the overriding element to define a person's ethnicity as Malay. It is also a means to represent the identity of the Malay where, when we speak of a Malay, we also speak of the person as a Muslim. Therefore, it is implied that there is no obvious need to explicitly mention the word Muslim to indicate that we are speaking of a Malay. This is most evident in Burgess' trilogy, *Putera Gunung Tahan*, *Anak Mat Lela Gila* and "Melayu". Here, I would also like to draw attention to my findings in the works of the European authors together

---

<sup>98</sup> I have referred to the 1993 impression in *Islam and secularism* (1993).

with “Melayu” where I found manifestations of different terms used to refer also to a Malay: different types of Malays with Malay as the umbrella term to refer to other *suku bangsa Melayu*, namely the Sulu and the Buginese (from Conrad’s works), ‘native’, ‘local’, ‘half-caste’ (from Maugham’s works), and the existence of Malays of various descents such as Abdul Kadir, ‘Che Normah and Syed Omar (from Burgess’ works). In my opinion, this pattern signifies *Melayu* to refer also to a culture of absorption and assimilation as a means to delineate the paradigm of Malayness.

From the Malay works, different ways of referring to the Malays as a group of people are to be found in *Anak Mat Lela Gila*, namely **kaum Melayu** (Malay ethnic group), **orang Melayu** (the Malay people), **kaum-bangsa Melayu** (Malay ethnic-race) and **anak baik<sup>2</sup> jati ya`ani bukan peranakan atau kachokan** (pure Malays who are not descendants of mixed ethnicity or inter-racial marriages) while **Melayu jati** is understood to refer to descent and blood, namely ethnicity. The various terms exemplified here, especially **peranakan** and **kachokan**, are of interest. Nagata (1981: 87-116) and Hisao (2004) have discussed these terms whose appearances can be traced to the self-identity debates by Muslims of Arabic and Indian origins in 1920s and 1930s Malaya. They sought to be identified as Malay on the back of the shared religion with the Malays which is Islam. It is not surprising then to discover that these terms have made their way into *Anak Mat Lela Gila* and Burgess’ trilogy because the novels were written and published soon after the height of these debates. These terms also call to mind a self-definition offered by a prominent Malay intellect and social critic, Za’ba, who wrote abundantly on issues regarding the Malays during this period. In “The poverty of the Malays” (1923a), Za’ba states:

Penulis in seorang Melayu – seorang Melayu yang penuh totok darah Melayunya, bukannya Melayu Jawi Pekan atau yang berdarah campur, tetapi ialah Melayu kampung, yang sejati-jati asal Melayu,... (Za’ba, 2000: 220).

Again, as we recall, it is shown in “Melayu” how the Malay is to be defined also based on Islam where anyone, regardless of their descent and blood (ethnicity), can be defined as Malay on the back of the shared religion, Islam. As I have stated earlier in Chapter Five, this somehow accepts as true the current phenomenon still prevailing in Malaysia, that to *masuk Islam* (become a Muslim) is to *masuk Melayu*

(become a Malay). This thus means that to embrace the religion is to embrace the ethnicity entailing also a change in identity. Perhaps this is also the reason why Burgess has presented this particular phenomenon in the form of Hardman in *The enemy in the blanket* because Hardman can also be described as a **Mualaf**, one who is a new convert to Islam. As such, he could indeed qualify being identified as a Malay albeit through his religion and not through his ethnicity.

Indeed, my evaluation so far based on a comparative viewpoint of the paradigm of Malayness in the selected works in English literature with findings in the Malay literary works demonstrates a shift in the paradigm from what has been initially conceptualised by Shamsul as an authority-defined social reality: there is now more definite manifestations of *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity to delineate the paradigm of Malayness in literature instead of merely the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers. Therefore, I state here that the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised conforms to my understanding of it as an everyday-defined social reality in the works of literature. This then means that the works challenge the conceptualisation of the paradigm of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality based only on the three pillars of the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers.

As seen from my findings, the paradigm of Malayness in literature is understood to refer to not only the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers but also to *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity. This means that the paradigm of Malayness in literature is an everyday-defined social reality and is not an authority-defined social reality. As stated earlier, the same results regarding the paradigm of Malayness are shared between the selected works of Conrad, Maugham and Burgess which cover the period from the late 19<sup>th</sup> to the mid-20<sup>th</sup> centuries, with Burgess' trilogy encompassing overtly all the elements I hypothesised. The same is also shared between all the works in Malay literature, with the paradigm of Malayness I hypothesised reflected clearly in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. Thus, we can safely state here that *The Malayan trilogy* is the best example of an English literary work on the Malay World which supports my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in literature as an everyday-defined social reality while *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* is the best example of a Malay literary work.

**From a paradigm of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality to a shifting paradigm of Malayness as an everyday-defined social reality: between *The Malayan trilogy* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu***

This section is an attempt to answer the third research question posited in the study: ‘Do the selected works demonstrate any shifting processes whereby they begin with a local and broad understanding of the paradigm of Malayness as I hypothesised then narrowed to the three pillars as conceptualised by Shamsul A. B.?’.

Based on the brief details on the development of the Malay language as discussed earlier, it is not surprising then for us to be presented with a scene in Burgess’ trilogy where Fenella states how it makes more sense to speak Malay in Malaya because everyone indeed speaks the language. As we can clearly see, this is hardly unexpected because Malay is a language which has been spoken widely not only in Malaya but the Malay World. This may also be the reason why Burgess has highlighted the important role of Malay as indicated through his concerns regarding its proper use because it is implied in his trilogy that Malay is not only a language to unite all the ethnic groups in Malaya but also because it has a historical significance in the Malay World.

Not surprisingly, earlier discussions on studies by Taib and Al-Attas also help to explain a scenario related to Islam specifically highlighted in Burgess’ works. It is represented by the dilemma faced by Crabbe and especially Hardman in regard to the issue of conversion to Islam. While Crabbe has been asked to convert to Islam so that he can practise polygamy but declined, Hardman converts to Islam due to his marriage to a Muslim woman. But the confusion faced by Hardman can be seen in the literal meaning of conversion used by Burgess in his novels: **enter Islam** (*masuk Islam*). Hardman is led to believe that he has to change his identity to that of a Muslim and has lost his own identity as a white man. This is especially true when he requests for a Muslim name to reflect his new belief as a Muslim. A further example is when he is caught and fined by the Islamic authorities for not performing the obligatory fasting during *Ramadhan*. This is because, in their eyes, he no longer possesses the identity of the white man but that he is now judged on the back of his religion, Islam. Another implicit way of highlighting this confusion is manifested in the scene where the non-Malays express their animosity towards Crabbe because he is thought to have

sided with the Malays when he is wrongly assumed to have ‘entered Islam’ due to marriage to his Malay **amah**. It appears here then that, to the non-Malays, Crabbe has now ‘entered Malay’ because he has earlier ‘entered Islam’. We note here again the overlapping of ethnicity and Islam and the drawing of attention to the prevailing phenomenon in Malaysia, that to *masuk Islam* is to *masuk Melayu*.

Burgess’ depictions of the *wayang kulit* as Hindu in origin and the description of Dahaga and its people’s way of life, which is presented as an amalgamation of pre-Islamic system of beliefs, can be explained through a brief discussion on a study by Mohd. Taib Osman (1989) on ‘Malay folk beliefs’. As viewed by Taib (1989: 12-13), the Malay World is believed to have possessed a civilisation of its own prior to the arrival of Islam in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Taib accepts as true the fact that a basic ancient civilisation had been heightened through contacts with at least three types of civilisations. However, he does not agree with the theory put forward by scholars who often used the term ‘Hinduization’ and ‘Hindu period’ to describe the process, that the history of the Malays’ civilisation began with the Indian one. Taib (1989: 13) does concede, nonetheless, that ‘the Malay Peninsula had been subjected to successive domination by three great Hinduized empires’, namely ‘the Hindu Empire of Funan in Cambodia’, ‘the Buddhist empire of Srivijaya’ based on the southern part of Sumatra and, prior to the coming of Islam, ‘the Sivaistic empire of Majapahit based in central Java’. Due to the Indian cultural influence, Taib suggests that the Malay society can now be characterised as ‘feudalistic’.

We need to bring into discussion Taib’s perspectives on the historical and socio-cultural setting of the Malays in order to further help explain Burgess’ depictions of the *wayang kulit* as a Hindu epic. Taib’s use of the term ‘system of belief’ or ‘belief system of the Malays’ in his study is divided by Taib (1989: 18-43) into three phases represented by three elements: the old indigenous civilisation, the nature of Indian influence and the Islamisation of the Malays. According to Taib (1989: 18), ‘the indigenous, Hindu and Islamic elements in the Malay system of belief’, referred to also as ‘folk belief’, are in fact ‘the products of the different phases’ of the history of the Malays.

Although Taib (1989: 30) concedes that very little is known about the indigenous period before the arrival of Hinduism in the Malay peninsula, except from the practice of *Adat Perpatih*<sup>99</sup> in Negeri Sembilan which was brought by the Minangkabau from West Sumatra, and *Adat Temenggung*<sup>100</sup> in the rest of the Malay peninsula, the general picture of the Malay World during this particular period applied also to the Malays. This is because, as Taib (1989: 31) views it, the peninsula was under the influence of the Indianised empires of Funan, Sriwijaya and Majapahit at numerous times in its history. Therefore, Taib (1989: 32) suggests that the influence of the Indian heritage on the peninsula had also affected the Malays. A prime example of this effect is the legacy left behind by the Brahmanic influence as seen in, for example, the Malay marriage ceremony reminiscent of Hindu rituals as well as the *wayang kulit*. As such, Taib (1989: 33) concludes that the heritage of the Hindu period is still retained by the Muslim Malays in certain areas of its history after more than five hundred years and still forms part of their *adat/culture* despite a transformation of their system of belief as seen in their conversion to Islam.

As I see it, Taib's views help to explain why the *wayang kulit* art should be viewed and described as a manifestation of Malay *adat/culture* because it had existed during the indigenous period and had been retained during and simultaneously influenced by the Hindu period. Despite this early Hindu influence and the latter influence of Islam, the *wayang kulit* cannot surely be described as a Hindu epic and is Hindu in origin as Burgess has done because to describe it as so is to describe it on the back of religion while, as Taib explains, the *wayang kulit* is an art which belongs to the Malays as a group of people and has existed as part of their 'ancient civilisation'.

With regard to the subjects of ethnicity and identity where depictions of Malay characters of various origins are highlighted in Burgess' works, I would like to discuss here the classification as Malay instead of Arab in the form of Syed Omar and his family as found in *The Malayan trilogy*. As discussed earlier, this phenomenon can be explained by Nagata's 1981 study based on written documentations available during the Straits Settlement administration of Penang. Apart from identifying the Malay based on 'descent of blood' which also indicates ethnicity, Nagata (1981: 103)

<sup>99</sup> On *Adat Perpatih*, see Wong and Patel (1992); Norhalim Ibrahim (1993).

<sup>100</sup> On *Adat Temenggung*, see Wilkinson (1971); Norhalim Ibrahim (1993).

highlights the role played by Islam in compartmentalising ‘other types of Malay races’. This refers to the term ‘Mussulmans’ used in census-keeping from 1881 to 1921 which includes the Indian Muslims and the Arabs who were given separate identities, especially for the Arabs who demanded this separation on the basis of their claim to descent lines. Nagata (1981: 104) notes that it was after the year 1921 that the Arabs were asked to choose between ‘Malay’ or ‘other’ identity as it was doubtful at that period in time for the remaining Arabs to claim themselves as ‘Arab’ as few spoke Arabic or had a parent who was born in Arab for them to be legally considered as ‘Arab’.

It was during this period that Nagata suggests had pre-empted a major crisis of identity for the Arabs. In the 1920s and the 1930s, Islam became the main forerunner in the quest for ‘identity reform’. Arabs of that time employed a political self-examination, they demanded to be identified as ‘Malay’ on the strength of their shared religion with the Malays, namely Islam. As Nagata sees it, two elements of identity eventually became fused as a result of this development: religious and political. The ethnic status of the Malay had been opened to those who were once on the periphery of Malayness, with the once overriding phrase, *masuk Islam/masuk Melayu*, becoming more authoritative, practised and, importantly, legal. Nagata (1981: 108) posits the view that it was during the developments in the 1920s and the 1930s of Malaya, when the Malays and other Muslims were heavily involved in debates on self-identity, that the administrative classification of Malay later became embodied in the official definition of ‘what is a Malay’. Indeed, this is the reason why Syed Omar and his family view themselves and are in turn viewed as Malay in Burgess’ novel.

Compared to *The Malayan trilogy*, my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness has been expressed as overt manifestations in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. In the *Mukadimah*, for example, it is the ruler who expounds the bard’s role as custodian of historical episodes pertaining to the Malays. It is also the ruler who reminds the bard of his sole purpose which is to provide a re-visioning of past episodes whilst simultaneously offering modern-day interpretations and, where possible, needed and achievable, for contemporary Malay society to benefit from them.

My analysis illustrates that the paradigm of Malayness in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* lies with its purpose and its objective: a yearning for a more progressive future for the Malays in view of how the Malays were and how the Malays should ideally be. The poem is a drawing of an idealistic portrait of an ideal Malay society which is believed not to exist in present time. By recalling the glorious days of the Melaka Empire, it is implied in the poem that contemporary Malays do not possess nor care about what constitutes the paradigm of Malayness as they have sold out to many modern temptations, such as abuse and misuse of power and religious hypocrisy. Contemporary Malays are also viewed as regressing instead of progressing in facing modern-day challenges by falling victims to misinterpretations of concepts embedded in the Malay *adat/culture*. The corruption of contemporary Malay identity and a cry for the Malays to go back to basics and reclaim their roots are, therefore, suggested as conflicts which should be resolved by contemporary Malays. Hence, the paradigm of Malayness in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* is manifested as encompassing the ideal Malay identity who represents the positive attitudes of Malay ethnicity, namely loyalty and intellectualism. It is also expressed within the concepts of tangible and intangible heritage exclusive to the Malays: the Malay language, *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity as well as land which is part of the Malay World. The paradigm of Malayness in the poem is also reflected in the form of loyalty to the supreme institution of the Malay rulers as well as a moderate practice of Islam.

In fact, the paradigm of Malayness as manifested in this poem is not believed to be a 'fluid' concept as Shamsul has suggested because my analysis demonstrates that the poem is firmly rooted in the Malay tradition and traditional thinking of the Malays comprising aspects related to its everyday-defined social reality: the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers, *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity. It is conceded nonetheless that the paradigm of Malayness in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* is also expressed along the lines closest to the Malaysian constitutional of Malay and the three pillars of Malayness conceptualised by Shamsul as an authority-defined social reality, namely the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers. However, more importantly, my analysis also proves that the paradigm of Malayness in literature is more clearly an everyday-defined social reality comprising also *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity as found in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*.

The wisdom behind the retelling of thematic episodes in *Sejarah Melayu* as an anthology of poems in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* is suggested as an attempt to express and reflect the paradigm of Malayness and where the poet, as a Malay, is coming from. My analysis demonstrates that the poet projects a type of Malay with intent and purpose, one who calls for a broader understanding of the paradigm of Malayness which translates into comprising *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity and not merely the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers. In literature, in the form of *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* at the very least, there is now a shift in understanding the paradigm of Malayness, it is not limited to being a reflection of an authority-defined social reality in the form of only the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers but it also extends to a broader meaning to refer also to *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity because it is a local documentation of an everyday-defined social reality.

The above findings thus demonstrate a link between the paradigm of Malayness in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*, which is a modern composition based on a traditional text, with the paradigm of Malayness in a traditional text itself, which is *Sejarah Melayu*. Therefore, we can safely state at this point that the paradigm of Malayness is expressed clearly in a literary work pre-dating the presence of the colonial, be it the Portuguese, the Dutch or even the British. This means that the manifestation of the paradigm can be traced to much earlier than the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and the colonial period, time periods first suggested by Andaya, Reid, Milner and Shamsul. Since *Sejarah Melayu* is believed to have been written in 1612, we can undoubtedly state that the paradigm of Malayness is manifested clearly in a literary work which predates the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Any attempts to trace the origin of Malayness then should ideally begin with an analysis of this text as rightly suggested by Andaya.

In Chapter One, numerous views of the paradigm of Malayness as a colonial invention have been discussed. However, we need to consider other possibilities when suggesting such views. When we speak of Islam and ethnicity as manifestations of the paradigm of Malayness, Marden's *The history of Sumatra* (1783), for example, clearly demonstrates a paradoxical view. Marsden himself has attempted to rectify the erroneous conception of the phrase as I have discussed earlier, that 'to become Malay' (*masuk Melayu*) is to be equated with 'to become Muslim' (*masuk Islam*):

It must be observed, indeed, that in common speech the term Malay, like that of Moor in the continent of India, is almost synonymous with Mahometan; and when the natives of other parts learn to read the Arabic character, submit to circumcision, and practise the ceremonies of religion, they are often said men-jadi Malayo, “to become Malays,” instead of the more correct expression sudah masuk islam, “have embraced the faith.” (Marsden, 1986: 42, emphasis underlined)

If the incorrect meaning of the phrase is attributed to colonial invention, then my study has proven that Marsden, as part of the colonial society, did record in writing his effort to correct this misconception.

Conflicting accounts nonetheless have been discovered regarding Raffles’ observation which is proposed to have led to the creation of a Malay nation as highlighted by most scholars, especially by Shamsul. Shamsul once again points to Raffles as being ‘guilty’ of twisting the truth: that there is no such thing as tangible as a Malay nation, the Malay language, the Malay character and the Malay custom within what is now known as the Malay World. All these are mere ideological constructs.

Perhaps Shamsul is indeed right in his own observation, that Raffles may have inadvertently contributed to this view of Malay and hence Malayness as a colonial invention in his attempt to conceptualise tangibly what he rightly believes is Malay and hence denotes the paradigm of Malayness. Therefore, Raffles is guilty by association. But I cannot readily agree that Raffles invented this out of his own figment of imagination but may have generated it from what is out there, perhaps from traditions invented by the Malays themselves. I support wholeheartedly a view by Md. Salleh Yaapar, that Malayness was not really invented by the British but were certainly ‘codified’ although not accomplished ‘*ex-nihilo*’. This is because analysis from my study also points definitely to this perspective: since *Sejarah Melayu* is a traditional Malay literary work identified as exclusively belonging to the Malay literary heritage, it is therefore also rightfully considered to be a local work. To borrow a view by Vickers, Malayness ‘is not a matter of a colonial invented tradition’ but is proposed to be ‘a local construction’, such as originating from a traditional Malay literary work, *Sejarah Melayu*, ‘onto which colonial forms of hegemony were imposed’. I agree strongly with Vickers, that Malayness may have been ‘part of invented traditions’ in Malaysia but is not believed to have been ‘invented from

nothing'. This simultaneously means that the paradigm of Malayness I hypothesised as manifested in the works of literature cannot possibly be described as a concept ideologically invented during the colonial times but is clearly a local reflection.

As discovered and demonstrated in my analyses on *The Malayan trilogy* by Burgess and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* by Muhammad Haji Salleh, the paradigm of Malayness not only encompasses elements understood to refer to the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers based on an authority-defined social reality but that it also refers to an everyday-defined social reality consisting also of *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity. It is also discovered in this study that the paradigm of Malayness in literature also represents what is understood to be *bangsa Melayu*. Here, I would like to highlight a definition given by Marsden which represents the earliest myriad of ways *bangsa* means to those known as *Melayu*:

*Baniak-lah jenis bangsa orang* there are many different race of men.

*Bangsa mana-kah tuan amba ini* of what family art thou, sir?

*Karna-nya iya orang iang hina papa iang tiada berbangsa* for he is a mean and indigent person of low birth. (Marsden, 1812: 41)

My finding above thus contradicts another view by Milner, Reid and Shamsul that it was Munsyi Abdullah who had 'introduced' the term *bangsa Melayu* into the public domain. In my opinion, Abdullah cannot possibly be credited with introducing the term *bangsa Melayu* because as we can see above as well as in *Sejarah Melayu* (Melayu **bangsanya**) and *Hikayat Hang Tuah* (**bangsa** baginda) (Appendix 26), the term *bangsa* had already existed in the consciousness of the Malays long before the writing of *Hikayat Abdullah*.

An overall conclusion shall thus be an attempt to provide answers to all the research questions posited earlier. Evidence based on my analyses shows that certain literary works have indeed challenged the paradigm of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality. This is especially true as found in *The Malayan trilogy* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. The main perspectives determined are the growing roles of *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity to refer to the understanding of the paradigm of Malayness in literature as an everyday-defined social reality which is not limited only

to the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers as an authority-defined social reality.

Findings from the analyses have shown that Islam became one of the paradigm of Malayness beginning with the Islamisation of the Malay World as early as the 12<sup>th</sup> century. In fact, Islam has become the definite identifier for Malayness as seen in *The Malayan trilogy*. It is nonetheless in *The Malayan trilogy* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* that the importance of practising Islamic philosophies and teachings in debunking the identity of the Malays as, among others, 'lazy' natives is highlighted. This is seen as an effort to challenge the negative stereotypes of Malay identity believed to be part of their set of custom, system of belief and way of life also described as *adat/culture*.

Islam further became foregrounded when it was instituted as the core values provider for the Malay rulers. This is the main view of Islam implied and propagated in all the works, especially in *The Malayan trilogy*, *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, *Hikayat Abdullah* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. Beginning with the important role of the Malay rulers as one of the earliest paradigm of Malayness, this then resulted in the embracing of Islamic philosophies and practices by the Malays due to the dynamic relationship established between the Malay rulers and their subjects. This unique relationship between the Malay rulers and the subjects is based on the deeply ingrained principle of *daulat* and *derhaka* as highlighted in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*.

Thus, as found in *The Malayan trilogy* and "Melayu", the notion of becoming a Muslim (Islam), to *masuk Islam*, became equated with the phrase to *masuk Melayu*, to become Malay (ethnicity). Together with the misconception brought about by the now well-known phrase, Islam became further consolidated due to an awareness of its role in uniting the Malays to represent *bangsa Melayu*. This is despite the fact that Shamsul has argued that *bangsa Melayu* is a colonial invention to mean 'race' in Western understanding and that it has also led to the creation of 'an imagined Malay nation'. More importantly, Islam has become the main ethnic identifier for the Malays, to represent a combination of ethnicity and identity as seen especially in *The Malayan trilogy* and "Melayu".

Evidence based on my findings thus suggests that the paradigm of Malayness in literature does not conform to the authority-defined social reality as conceptualised by Shamsul referring only to the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers. As we recall from my discussion in Chapter One, this has been proposed by Shamsul as ideological notions derived from the Malaysian constitutional definition of Malay. However, further evidence has demonstrated that, on the everyday-defined social reality level as manifested in literature, Malayness is not limited to only those three pillars. In my analyses, the paradigm of Malayness has been shown to also represent *adat/culture*, ethnicity and identity as reflected in the works of literature. Although Shamsul has suggested that Malayness ‘emerged’ vis-à-vis Malay identity because it had been ‘shaped’, ‘consolidated’ and ‘reified’ by the British, this view cannot be corroborated based on my findings in the literary works.

Nonetheless, I have to concede that the British helped to endorse this paradigm by enshrining it through the Malaysian Constitution but this was only made possible upon request by and with the agreement of the Merdeka Constitution led by Tunku Abdul Rahman representing UMNO. Indeed, I have not found any evidence to suggest that the British had created or invented what is defined as Malay which may lead to the understanding of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality. In fact, in my opinion, what has been enshrined in the constitution is only confined to what can clearly be codified due to its tangible existence, role and use, namely the Malay language, Islam, the Malay rulers and *adat/culture* whereas the more intangible aspects of Malayness, namely ethnicity and identity, have not been emphasised. This is despite the fact that ethnicity and identity have been demonstrated to be elements firmly rooted in the tradition of the Malays as my study has clearly demonstrated.

### **Towards new approaches in literature: Malayness as a literary criticism**

As shown in this study on the paradigm of Malayness in literature, the conceptual framework used as an approach based on my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness has been proven to be a useful tool for analysis. As recalled in the Introduction chapter and Chapter One, I started off making knowledge claims on the paradigm of

Malayness in literature based primarily on constructivist perspectives. This means that I had undertaken research for this study by initially looking at meanings historically and socially constructed, in this case the three pillars of Malayness as an authority-defined social reality conceptualised by Shamsul, with the intent of developing a theory or pattern, in this case my hypothesised paradigm of Malayness as an everyday-defined social reality comprising also of *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity in the works of literature. I have employed a strategy of inquiry in the form of selected English and Malay literary works on the Malay World, where I have analysed critically the data with the primary intent of confirming my hypothesised developing themes with regard to the paradigm of Malayness in literature. This step was undertaken because of earlier successful studies using a similar approach by Andaya, Reid, Milner and Tham Seong Chee. I have employed a close textual analysis approach and analysed characters perceived to be Malay as part of my exploration of the hypothesised paradigm of Malayness in literary works.

This study on the paradigm of Malayness in literature has also demonstrated the need to explore other areas for future research. Findings from this study could contribute to other approaches to look at Malayness from a literary point of view in, for example, a Colonialist Discourse. The paradigm of Malayness discovered in this study could also enrich the discourse on Islamic literature. Future research on Malaysian literature in English could be expanded by using the paradigm of Malayness posited in this study. This paradigm could also build upon views on studies which have looked at the formation of cultural identities.

Due to the huge corpus of literary works in English literature set in the Malay World from the late 19<sup>th</sup> to the mid-20<sup>th</sup> centuries, this study has managed to focus only on a selection of works by the three authors. Therefore, further research could be conducted on the authors' other works from this time period, for example, Conrad's *Lord Jim* (1900) and Maugham's other 'Malayan' short stories from the collection of *The casuarina tree* (1926) and *Ah King* (1933). We may also need to expand further

---

to include works on the Malay World by other authors such as *The soul of Malaya* (1931)<sup>101</sup> by the French author, Henry Fauconnier (1879-1973).

My study has also proven that an exploration of the paradigm of Malayness in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Hikayat Abdullah* in traditional Malay literature is indeed applicable and beneficial. As a form of literary criticism, the paradigm of Malayness posited in this study could be employed as an approach in a re-examination of *Sejarah Melayu* in order to determine a definite moot point for the origin of the paradigm as first suggested by Andaya. Indeed, another way of summarising this aspect of my study is that literature has also proven to be useful as a tool to explore the subject of Malayness.

This study has also looked at a variety of genres in English and Malay literatures: novels, short stories and poems. Future discussion on this subject may be enhanced by a more structured selection of works and discussions based on its respective genres. Another further exploration that could be undertaken is by comparing fiction and non-fiction works by the same authors. This is because little attention has been given to this aspect whereas there is a huge body of non-fictional works by them that could contribute to this subject.

Therefore, this brings us to the need to seek for answers and clarifications based on critical analyses of works in Malaysian scholarship for it is believed that much remains with local scholarship in view of their contributions to the paradigm of Malayness. As such, we need to look at works by Malaysian scholars apart from Shamsul A. B. who have contributed critically to Malaysian scholarship, for example, Za'ba, Syed Hussein Alatas (1928-2007), Syed Muhammad Naguib Al-Attas (b.1931), Khoo Kay Kim (b.1937) and Mohd. Taib Osman (b.1934). An approach that can be undertaken here is to discover the paradigm of Malayness in their works and to follow it up with a comparison with the paradigm of Malayness I hypothesised in this study.

---

<sup>101</sup> It was originally published in French as *Malaise* (1930) and won the prestigious Goncourt Award in 1930.

The accomplishment of my study lies perhaps with its attempts to enrich further discussion on Malayness by opening it up to include works from English literature. It has also expanded its approach by comparing the English literary works with those from traditional and modern Malay literature. This aspect of my study is seen as a contribution to Comparative Literature. What my study has achieved points to one definite suggestion: it is now time for future scholars to move forward, to focus on the paradigm of Malayness as an everyday-defined social reality as discovered in this study and not just discuss what the paradigm of Malayness is all about. The current understanding of the paradigm of Malayness in literature has indeed shifted from the three pillars of the Malay language, Islam and the Malay rulers as an authority-defined social reality to include *adat*/culture, ethnicity and identity as reflections of an everyday-defined social reality based on the findings of my study on English and Malay literary works on the Malay World. We must now engage in further research to delineate them methodically in the field of literature.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Internet Sources

<<http://jsse.revues.org/index128.html>>

Hooper, Glenn. 1997. Trading places: Somerset Maugham's tales from abroad. *Journal of the short story in English* 29.

<<http://mcp.anu.edu.au>>

*Malay Concordance Project*

[An electronic corpus of Malay texts; compiled and edited by Ian Proudfoot]

<<http://www.legalitas.org/database/puu/1959/uu29-1959.pdf>>

Undang-undang Republik Indonesia nomor UU 29 tahun 1959 tentang pembentukan daerah Tingkat II di Sulawesi.

<<http://www.mir.com.my/lb/un/99html.031099.htm>>

Abdullah Ahmad, Tan Sri. 1999. Ruffled feathers at MCKK.

<<http://www.independent.co.uk>>

Byrnes, Sholto. 2007. In pursuit of Anthony Burgess: bell bottoms in the rainforest.

<<http://www.postcolonialweb.org/uk/burgess/allusions.htm>>

Wagner, Tamara S. 2002. Entering a novel about the east: literary allusions in Anthony Burgess's Malayan Trilogy.

<<http://www.youtube.com>>

[A video sharing website where users can upload, view and share video clips]

### Published and Unpublished Sources

A. B. Shamsul. 1999. From *Orang Kaya Baru* to *Melayu Baru*. Cultural construction of the Malay 'New Rich'. In Michael Pinches. (ed.), *Culture and privilege in capitalist Asia*. Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University, Western Australia: Routledge, pp. 86-110.

A. B. Shamsul. 2000a. Colonial knowledge & identity formation: literature and the construction of Malay and Malayness. *Asian Culture Quarterly* XXVIII (1): 49-64.

A. B. Shamsul. 2000b. Redefining cultural nationalism in multiethnic Malaysia: a recent observation. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 1 (1): 169-171.

A. Bakar Hamid. (ed.). 1979a. *Diskusi sastera, jilid II: kesusasteraan moden*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

A. Bakar Hamid. (ed.). 1979b. *Peristiwa-peristiwa dari Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.

- A. Samad Ahmad. 1963. *Sejarah kesusasteraan Melayu II dan III*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pelajaran Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. 3<sup>rd</sup> edn.
- A. Samad Ahmad. (ed.). *Sulalatus salatin (Sejarah Melayu)*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- A. Samad Ismail. 1987. Pak Sako yang istimewa. In Hashim Awang and A. Karim Abdullah. (eds.), *Cerpen-cerpen Pak Sako*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, pp. 68-72.
- A. Wahab Ali, Dr. 1988. *Tradisi pembentukan sastera Melayu moden*. Petaling Jaya: Penerbitan Sarjana (M) Sdn. Bhd.
- Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi. 1838. (Jawi). *Kisah pelayaran Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi dari Singapura sampai ke Kelantan*. Singapura: Press of American Mission.
- Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi. 1849. (Jawi). *Hikayat Abdullah*. Singapore: Bukit Zion Mission Press.
- Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi. Kassim Ahmad. Annotated and Introduced. Hassan Ahmad. Head Editor. 2004. *Hikayat Abdullah*. Kuala Lumpur: Yayasan Karyawan.
- Abdullah Tahir. 1989. *Proses penciptaan novel: Ishak Haji Muhammad, A. Samad Said, Shahnnon Ahmad*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Abdul Latiff Abu Bakar. 1977. *Ishak Haji Muhammad: penulis dan ahli politik sehingga 1948*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Malaya.
- Abdul Rahman Kaeh. 1989. *Panji Narawangsa*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Abdul Rahman Napiah. 2003. Reading theory: *Puitika Sastera Melayu* by Muhammad Haji Salleh. In Zawiah Yahya. (ed.), *Critical perspectives on Muhammad Haji Salleh*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 153-170.
- Abdul Samad Ahmad. 1954. *Laksamana Tun Tuah*. Kuala Lumpur: Khee Meng Press.
- Abu Hassan Sham. 1975. *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Melayu.
- Adibah Amin. Translated and Introduced. Shahnnon Ahmad. 1972. *No harvest but a thorn*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Aggelar, Geoffrey. 1979. *Anthony Burgess: the artist as a novelist*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.
- Ahmad Boestamam. 1988. Pandangan peribadi seorang sahabat. In A. Karim Haji

- Abdullah. (ed.), *Pak Sako bistari*. Petaling Jaya: Binakarya Sdn. Bhd., pp. 79-80.
- Ahmad Kamal Abdullah et al. 1992. *History of modern Malay literature Vol. II*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- Ahmad Kamal Abdullah. 2004. Usman Awang: dasar estetika dan keakrabannya dengan puisi tradisi Melayu. In Halilah Haji Khalid. (ed.), *Usman Awang dalam esei dan kritikan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 151-171.
- Al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naguib. 1969. *Preliminary statement on a general theory of the Islamisation of the Malay-Indonesian Archipalego*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naguib. 1978. *Islam and secularism*. Kuala Lumpur: Muslim Youth Movement of Malaysia.
- Al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naguib. 1993. *Islam and secularism*. Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilisation.
- Ali Aziz. 1960. *Hang Jebat menderhaka*. Singapore: Malaya Publishing House.
- Andaya, Barbara Watson and Leonard Y. Andaya. 1982. *A history of Malaysia*. London: Macmillan.
- Andaya, Barbara Watson and Leonard Y Andaya. 2001. *A history of Malaysia*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.
- Andaya, Leonard Y. 2001. Aceh's contribution to standards of Malayness. *Archipel* 61: 29-68.
- Andaya, Leonard Y. 2003. Unravelling Minangkabau ethnicity. In Leonard Blussē and Felipe Fernandez-Armestros. (eds.), *Shifting communities and identity formation in early modern Asia*. The Netherlands: Research School of Asian, African and American Studies (CNWS), Universitet Leiden, pp. 117-137.
- Andaya, Leonard Y. 2004a. Rethinking Malay relationships: rulers and kinship groups. Unpublished. Paper presented at the International Symposium on 'Thinking Malayness', ILCAA – Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Andaya, Leonard Y. 2004b. The search for the 'origins' of Melayu. In Timothy P. Barnard (ed.), *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 56-75.
- Annas Haji Ahmad. 1988. *Sastera Melayu Lama dan Baru*. Petaling Jaya: MASA Enterprise.
- Ariffin Omar. 1993. *Bangsa Melayu. Malay concepts of democracy and community*

1945-1950. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

Aveling, Harry. Translated. Ishak Haji Muhammad. 1980. *The prince of Mount Tahan*. Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books (Asia).

Aveling, Harry. Translated. Ishak Haji Muhammad. P. L. Thomas. Introduced. 1983. *The son of mad Mat Lela*. Singapore: Federal Publications.

Aveling, Harry. 1993. Non-English postcolonial fictions? The Malaysian case. *SPAN: Journal of the South Pacific Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies* 36: 1-8.

Aveling, Harry. 2000. *Shahnon Ahmad: Islam, power and gender*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Badrul Redzuan Abu Hassan and Fauziah Ahmad. 2003. Muhammad Haji Salleh and Kemala: two perspectives of Malayness. In Zawiah Yahya. (ed.), *Critical perspectives on Muhammad Haji Salleh*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 197-225.

Baharuddin Zainal et al. (eds.) 1981. *Wajah: biografi seratus penulis*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Baines, Jocelyn. 1960. *Guilt and atonement in Lord Jim*. London: Weidenfield & Nicolson.

Banks, David J. 1984. Islam dan perubahan politik di dalam masyarakat Melayu desa: novel-novel Shahnon Ahmad sebagai data. In Safian Hussain et al. (eds.), *Tanggapan: pembicaraan karya-karya Shahnon Ahmad*. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia, pp. 69-90.

Banks, David J. 1987. *From class to culture: social science in Malay novels since independence*. Yale Center for International and Area Studies: Monograph Series 29/Yale University Southeast Asia Studies.

Barley, Nigel. 2002. *White Rajah: a biography of James Brooke*. London: Little Brown.

Barnard, Timothy P. (ed.). 2004a. *Contesting Malayness: Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Barnard, Timothy P. 2004b. Texts, Raja Ismail and violence: Siak and the transformation of Malay identity in the eighteenth century. In Timothy P. Barnard. (ed.), *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 107-120.

Bender, Todd K. 1984. *A concordance to Conrad's 'An outcast of the islands'*. New York: Garland Publications.

Bender, Todd K. 1985. *A concordance to Conrad's 'The rescue'*. New York: Garland

## Publications.

- Bongie, Chris. 1991. *Exotic memories: literature, colonialism and the fin de siecle*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Boo Eung Koh. 1996. Contradictions in colonial history in *Lord Jim*. *Conradiana* 28 (3): 163-181.
- Bottoms, J. C. 1960. Abdullah: ahli tradisi atau tokoh pembaharuan? *Dewan Bahasa* 4 (1): 642-647.
- Braga-Blake, Myrna. 1992. Eurasians in Singapore. In Myrna Braga-Blaka and Ann Ebert-Oehlers. *Singapore Eurasians: memories and hopes*. Singapore: Times Edition, pp. 11-35.
- Braginsky, V.I. 1990. Hikayat Hang Tuah: Malay epic and Muslim mirror: some considerations on its date, meaning and structure. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde* 146 (4): 399-412.
- Braginsky, V. I. 1993. *The system of classical Malay Literature*. Leiden: KITLV.
- Braginsky, V.I. 1994. Perbantahan budi dan nafsu atau keindahan taat setia. In V. I. Braginsky. *Erti keindahan dan keindahan erti dalam kesusasteraan Melayu klasik*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, pp. 194-202.
- Braginsky, V. I. 2001. *The comparative study of traditional Asian literatures. From reflective traditionalism to neo-traditionalism*. London: Routledge.
- Braginsky, V. I. 2004. *The heritage of traditional Malay literature: a historical survey of genres, writings and literary reviews*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Briggum, Sue M. 1978. *A concordance to Conrad's 'Almayer's folly'*. New York: Garland Publications.
- Brown, C. C. Translated from MS Raffles No. 18. 2009. *MBRAS reprint 28. Malay annals*. Volume 1. Kuala Lumpur: The Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- Brown, John Pair. 1868. *The darvishes or oriental spiritualism*. London: Publisher unknown.
- Browne, Edward Granville. 1893. *A year amongst the Persians*. London: Publisher unknown.
- Bullock, Alan and Trombley, Stephen. 2000. *The new Fontana dictionary of modern thought*. London: HarperCollins.
- Burgess, Anthony. 1956. *Time for a tiger*. London: Heinemann.

- Burgess, Anthony. 1958. *The enemy in the blanket*. London: Heinemann.
- Burgess, Anthony. 1959. *Beds in the east*. London: Heinemann.
- Burgess, Anthony. 1963. The corruption of the exotic. *The listener*. 26 September, 465-467.
- Burgess, Anthony. 1969. Introduction. In Somerset Maugham. *Maugham's Malaysian stories*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann, pp. xiv-xvi.
- Burgess, Anthony. 1972. *The Malayan trilogy*. London: Penguin.
- Burgess, Anthony. 1981. *The long day wanes: a Malayan trilogy*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Burgess, Anthony. With an Introduction by the author. 2000. *The Malayan trilogy*. London: Vintage.
- Burton, Richard Francis. 1855-56. *Personal narrative of a pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah*. 3 Vols. London.
- Burton, Richard Francis. 1898. *The Jew, the gypsy and el Islam*. London.
- Carroll, Diane. 1999a. Contribution of the Malacca missionaries and the *Hikayat Abdullah* to the birth of a Malay concept of Malay Studies. In K. S. Jomo (ed.), *Malaysian studies I. Rethinking Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Social Science Association, pp. 149-184.
- Carroll, Diane. 1999b. The *Hikayat Abdullah*: discourse of dissent. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* LXXII (2): 92-129.
- Cheah Boon Kheng. 1979. The Japanese Occupation of Malaya, 1941-45: Ibrahim Yaacob and the struggle for Indonesia Raya. *Indonesia* 28: 85-120.
- Cheah Boon Kheng. 2003. *Red star over Malaya: resistance and social conflict during and after the Japanese Occupation of Malaya, 1941-1946*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Christie, C. J. 1986. *A preliminary survey of British literature on South-East Asia in the era of colonial decline and decolonisation*. Hull: Centre for South-East Asian Studies Monograph.
- Clemens, Florence. 1939. Conrad's favourite bedside book. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 38 (3): 305-315.
- Clemens, Florence. 1941. Conrad's Malaysia. *College English* 2: 338-346.
- Clemens, Florence. 1990. Conrad's Malaysia. In Robert D. Hamner. (ed.), *Joseph Conrad: third world perspectives*. Washington: Three Continents Press, pp. 21-27.

- Clifford, Hugh Charles. 1897. *In court & kampong: being tales & sketches of native life in the Malay peninsula*. London: Grant Richards.
- Clifford, Hugh Charles. 1898. *Studies in brown humanity: being scrawls and smudges in sepia, white and yellow*. London: Grant Richards.
- Clifford, Hugh. 1990. The genius of Mr. Joseph Conrad. In Robert D. Hamner (ed.), *Joseph Conrad: third world perspectives*. Washington: Three Continents Press, pp. 11-19.
- Coale, S. 1981a. An interview with Anthony Burgess. *Modern Fiction Studies* 27 (3): 429-452.
- Coale, S. 1981b. *Anthony Burgess*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- Conrad, Joseph. 1895. *Almayer's folly: a story of an eastern river*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Conrad, Joseph. 1896. *An outcast of the islands*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Conrad, Joseph 1899. *Heart of darkness*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons.
- Conrad, Joseph. 1900. *Lord Jim*. Edinburgh: Blackwood.
- Conrad, Joseph. 1912. *A personal record*. London: Dent.
- Conrad, Joseph. 1920. *The rescue: a romance of the shallows*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons.
- Conrad, Joseph. 1950. *The rescue: a romance of the shallows*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Conrad, Joseph. Nadine Gordimer. Introduced. Peter Lancelot Mallios. Notes. 2002a. *Almayer's folly: a story of an eastern river*. New York: The Modern Library.
- Conrad, Joseph. J. H. Stape. Edited and Introduced. Hans van Marle. Notes. 2002b. *An outcast of the islands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cordell, Richard A. 1969. *Somerset Maugham: a writer for all seasons, a biographical and critical study*. Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press.
- Crawfurd, J. 1852. *A grammar and dictionary of the Malay language: with a preliminary dissertation*. 2 Vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co.
- Cunninghame-Graham, R. B. 1898. *Mogreb-El-Acksa*. London.
- Curtis, Anthony. 1974. *The pattern of Maugham: a critical portrait*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

- Cushman, J. W. and Milner, A. C. 1979. Eighteenth and nineteenth-century Chinese accounts of the Malay peninsula. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 52 (1): 1-53.
- Darus Ahmad. 1960. *Laksamana Melayu Hang Tuah*. Penang: Saudara Sinaran.
- Datoek Besar, R. A. and R. Roolvink. (eds.). 1953. *Hikajat Abdullah*. Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan.
- de Freitas, G. V. 1976. Introduction. *Maugham's Borneo stories*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann, 2-6.
- de Josselin de Jong, P. E. 1965. The rise and decline of a national hero. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 38 (2): 140-155.
- Derks, Will. 2004. A literary mycelium: some prolegomena for a project on Indonesian literatures in Malay. In Timothy P. Barnard. (ed.), *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 181-202.
- Dettmar, Kevin and Wicke, Jennifer. 2004. Joseph Conrad. In David Damrosch. (ed.), *The Longman anthology of British literature. Second compact edition*. New York: Pearson & Longman.
- DeVitis, A. A. 1972. *Anthony Burgess*. New York: Twayne Publishers Inc.; Brighton: In Print Publishing.
- Dingwall, Alastair. (ed.). 1994. *Traveller's literary companion to South-east Asia*. Brighton: In Print Publishing.
- Drakard, Jane. (ed.). 1988. *Sejarah Raja-Raja Barus. Naskhah dan dokumen Nusantara 7*. Jakarta: Angkasa and Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Drakard, Jane. 1990. *A Malay frontier: unity and duality in a Sumatran kingdom*. Ithaca: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1996. *Literary theory. An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.
- Errington, Shelly. 1975. *A study of genre: meaning and form in the Malay Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Unpublished. PhD Thesis, Cornell University, United States of America.
- Errington, Shelly. 1979. Some comments on style in the meanings of the past. In Anthony Reid and David Marr. (eds.), *Perceptions of the past in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: ASAA SEA Publication Series, pp. 27-41.
- Fadillah Merican. 2001. An interview with Muhammad Haji Salleh. In Zawiah Yahya. (ed.), 2003. *Critical perspectives on Muhammad Haji Salleh*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 12-31.

- Fauconnier, Henri. 1930. *Malaise*. Paris: Stock.
- Fauconnier, Henri. Eric Sutton. Translated. 1931. *The soul of Malaya*. London: E. Mathews and Marrot.
- Fernando, Lloyd. 1990. Conrad's eastern expatriates: a new version of his outcasts. In Robert D. Hamner. (ed.), *Joseph Conrad: third world perspectives*. Washington: Three Continents Press, pp. 59-78.
- Forsdick, Charles. 2000. *Victor Segalen and the aesthetics of diversity: journeys between cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forster, E. M. 1951. *Two cheers for democracy*. London: Harvest Books.
- GoGwilt, Christopher Lloyd. 1995. *The invention of the West: Joseph Conrad and the double-mapping of Europe and empire*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Gordan, J. D. 1938. The Rajah Brooke and Joseph Conrad. *Studies in Philology* 35: 619-625.
- Hadijah Rahmat. 2001. *In search of modernity (a study of the concepts of literature, authorship and notions of self in "traditional" Malay literature)*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya.
- Hampson, Robert. 2000. *Cross-cultural encounters in Joseph Conrad's Malay fiction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Hassan Ahmad. 1976. Sastra Melayu moden semenjak Munsyi Abdullah. In Anwar Ridhwan. (ed.), *Di sekitar pemikiran kesusasteraan Malaysia 1957-1972*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 284-302.
- Hassan Ahmad. 2004. Catatan Ketua Editor. In Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi. *Hikayat Abdullah*. Kassim Ahmad. Edited and Introduced. Kuala Lumpur: Yayasan Karyawan, pp. vii-viii.
- Hatta, D. B. 1984. *Sastra Nusantara: suatu pengantar studi sastra Melayu*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Hickling, R. H. 1987. The historical background to the Malaysian Constitution. In Tan Chee-Beng. *Reflections on the Malaysian Constitution*. Penang: Persatuan Aliran Kesedaran Negara, pp. 21-29.
- Higdon, David Leon and Eddleman, Floyed Eugene. 1978. A glossary of Malay words in Conrad's *Almayer's folly*. *Conradiana* 10 (1): 63-79.
- Hill, A. H. Annotated and Translated. Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir. 1970. *The Hikayat Abdullah*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, Lewis. Edited and Compiled. 1991. *A new checklist of English-language*

*fiction relating to Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei*. Hull: Centre for South East Asian Studies, University of Hull. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.

- Hisao, T. 2004. Old and new aspects of Malayness in the contemporary 'Dunia Melayu' movement. Unpublished. Paper presented at the International Symposium on 'Thinking Malayness', ILCAA – Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Hooker, V. M. 1991. "Swettenham's manuscript of *Hikayat Hang Tuah*." *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 64 (2), 79-101.
- Hooker, Virginia Matheson. 2000. *Writing a new society: social change through the novel in Malay*. Honolulu: Allen Unwin and University of Hawai'i Press.
- Hooker, Virginia Matheson. 2003. *A short history of Malaysia: linking East and West*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.
- Hooykaas, Christiaan. 1963. *Penyedar sastera*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Hornby, A. S. 2006. *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 7<sup>th</sup> edn.
- Ishak Haji Muhammad. 1937. (*Jawi*). *Putera Gunung Tahan*. Muar: Jamiliah Press.
- Ishak Haji Muhammad. 1941. (*Jawi*). *Anak Mat Lela Gila*. Johor Bahru: Annies Printing Works.
- Ishak Haji Muhammad. 1960. *Anak Mat Lela Gila*. Kuala Lumpur: Federal Publications Limited.
- Ishak Haji Muhammad. 1973. *Putera Gunung Tahan*. Petaling Jaya: Pustaka Budaya Agency.
- Ishak Haji Muhammad. 2001. *Putera Gunung Tahan*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications and Distributors Sdn. Bhd.
- Iskandar, Teuku. 1964. Tun Seri Lanang, pengarang *Sejarah Melayu*. *Dewan Bahasa* November: 484-492.
- Iskandar, Teuku. 1970. Some historical sources used by the author of the *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 43 (1): 35-47.
- Ismail Hussein. 1966. The study of traditional Malay literature. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 39 (2): 1-22.
- Ismail Hussein. 1974a. Sastra Melayu dan perpaduan kaum. In Ismail Hussein. *Sastra dan Masyarakat*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Pustaka Zakry Abadi, pp. 22-30.

- Ismail Hussein. 1974b. Sikap sasterawan Melayu di dalam tahun 50-an dan 60-an. In Ismail Hussein. *Sastra dan masyarakat*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbitan Pustaka Zakry Abadi, pp. 11-21.
- Jassin, H. B. 1984. *Ranjau Sepanjang Jalan*: novel ketiga Shahnnon Ahmad. In Safian Hussain et al. (eds.), *Tanggapan: pembicaraan karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 119-122.
- Johns, A. H. 1984. Karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad: manusia dalam alam tanpa belas kasihan. In Safian Hussain et al. (eds.), *Tanggapan: pembicaraan karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 1-3.
- Jomo Kwame Sundaram. 1989. *Beyond 1990: considerations for a new national development strategy*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya, Institute of Advanced Studies.
- Jomo Kwame Sundaram. 1990. *Beyond the New Economic Policy: Malaysia in the nineties*. Brisbane: Asian Studies Association of Australia.
- Junus, Umar. 1984a. *Sastera Melayu moden: fakta dan interpretasi*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka: Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- Junus, Umar. 1984b. *Sejarah Melayu menemukan diri kembali*. Petaling Jaya: Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd.
- Kamus bahasa Melayu nusantara*. 2003. Bandar Seri Begawan: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Brunei.
- Kamus Dewan*. 2007. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. 4<sup>th</sup> edn.
- Karl, Frederick R. 1979. *Joseph Conrad. The three lives. A biography*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Kassim Ahmad. 1963. Hikayat Hang Tuah. *Dewan Bahasa Januari*: 15-21.
- Kassim Ahmad. 1966. *Characterisation in Hikayat Hang Tuah (A general survey of methods of character-portrayal and analysis and interpretation of the characters of Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat)*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- Kassim Ahmad. (ed.). *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. 1975. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Kassim Ahmad. 1981. *Kisah Pelayaran Abdullah Ke Kelantan dan ke Judah, diberi pengenalan dan anotasi*. Kuala Lumpur: Fajar Bakti.
- Kassim Ahmad. 1984a. Shahnnon Ahmad: novelis pencari kebenaran asli. In Safian Hussain et al. (eds.), *Tanggapan: pembicaraan karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 140-150.

- Kassim Ahmad. 1984b. Pesimisme sepanjang jalan. In Safian Hussain et al. (eds.), *Tanggapan: pembicaraan karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 134-139.
- Kassim Ahmad. 2004. Pengenalan. In Abdullah Munsyi. *Hikayat Abdullah*. Kuala Lumpur: Yayasan Karyawan and Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. xix-xxxvii.
- Keppel, Henry. 1853. *A visit to the Indian Archipelago, in H. M. Ship Maender, with portions of the private journals of Sir James Brooke, K. C. B.* London: Richard Bentley, I, pp. 147-181.
- Kessler, Clive. 1992. Archaism and modernity: contemporary Malay political culture. In Joel S. Kahn and Francis Loh Kok Wah. (eds.), *Fragmented vision. Culture and politics in contemporary Malaysia*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, Asian Studies Association of Australia Southeast Asia Publications 22, pp. 133-157.
- Khadmi. 1967. Tinjauan kembali beberapa pentafsiran dan penghargaan terhadap Hikayat Hang Tuah. *Dewan Bahasa Jun*: 244-255.
- Khasnor Johan. 1974. *The administrative elite in the Federated Malay States: an aspect of Malaysian social history*. Unpublished. PhD Thesis, Monash University, Australia.
- Khoo Kay Kim. 2001a. Islam: a view of the pre-1942 scenario. In Khoo Kay Kim. *Malay society: transformation & democratisation*. Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, pp. 157-184. 3<sup>rd</sup> printing.
- Khoo Kay Kim. 2001b. The Malay Left (1945-1948). In Khoo Kay Kim. *Malay society: transformation & democratisation*. Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, pp. 185-210. 3<sup>rd</sup> printing.
- Khoo Kay Kim. 2001c. The peninsular Malay sultanates: genesis and salient features. In Khoo Kay Kim. *Malay society: transformation & democratisation*. Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications, pp. 15-50. 3<sup>rd</sup> printing.
- Khoo Kay Kim, Elinah Abdullah and Wan Meng Ho. 2006. *Malays/Muslims in Singapore, selected readings in history*. Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications and Centre for Research on Islamic and Malay Affairs (RIMA).
- Knowles, Owen. (ed.). 1995. *Almayer's folly*. London: J. M. Dent and sons.
- Knowles, Owen and Moore, Gene M. 2000. *Oxford reader's companion to Conrad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koster, G. L and Maier, H. M. J. 1985. A medicine of sweetmeats: on the power of the Malay narratives. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde* 141 (4): 441-461.
- Kratoska, Paul H. 1998. *The Japanese Occupation of Malaya: a social and economic history*. London: Hurst.

- Kratz, E. U. 1993. Durhaka: the concept of treason in Malay Hikayat Hang Tuah. *South East Asia Research* 1 (1): 68-97.
- Kratz, E. U. 2000. Yang tersurat dan yang tersirat. Historicity and historical truth. *Archipel* 60, 4 (3): 25-44.
- Kratz, E. U. 2004. Hikayat Hang Tuah, the epic: fact and fiction. In Ghulam-Sarwar Yousof. (ed.). *Reflections on Asian-European epics*. Singapore: Asia-Europe Foundation, pp. 122-148.
- Kratz, E. U. 2009. Malay Studies – 50 Years On. Opening address of the International Seminar on ‘Britain and the Malay World’. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 37 (107): 103-118.
- Krenn, Heliena. 1990. *Conrad's Lingard trilogy: empire, race and women in the Malay novels*. New York & London: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Kukushkin, S. V. 1994. *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu: kebijaksanaan masa silam dalam gaya puisi moden*. *Dewan Sastera* July: 37-44.
- Lee, Robert Francis. 1969. *Conrad's colonialism*. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.
- Legal Research Board. 1990. *Federal Constitution*. Kuala Lumpur: International Law Book Services.
- Lester, John. 1981. Conrad and Islam. *Conradiana* 13 (3): 163-179.
- Liaw Yock Fang. 1963. Sadikit tentang Hikayat Hang Tuah. *Dewan Bahasa* March: 114-116.
- Li Chuan Siu. 1966. *Ikhtisar sejarah kesustraan Melayu baru*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.
- Li Chuan Siu, Drs. 1978. *Ikhtisar sejarah kesusasteraan Melayu baru 1830-1945*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbitan Pustaka Antara. 3rd edn.
- Loh Kok Wah, F. 1992. (ed.). *Fragmented vision: culture and politics in contemporary Malaysia*. North Sydney: Asian Studies Association of Australia in association with Allen & Unwin.
- M. Khalid Taib. 1993. Konsep dan kedudukan wira dalam teks Melayu klasik terpilih: satu tinjauan dari sudut etika sezaman dan universal. In Siti Aisah Murad. (ed.), *Konsep wira dalam sastera Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, pp. 1-29.
- Md. Salleh Yaapar. Junaidah Salleh. Translated. 1984. *Nasib petani-petani Melayu dalam novel Ranjau Sepanjang Jalan*. In Safian Hussain et al. (eds.), *Tanggapan: pembicaraan karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 195-231.

- Md. Salleh Yaaper. 2003. A postcolonial poet with a quest for identity: interview with Malaysia Laureate, Muhammad Haji Salleh. *International Institute of Asian Studies Newsletter* November: 32.
- Md. Salleh Yaapar. 2005. Contesting Malayness: the quest for the elusive *Melayu*. *IIAS Newsletter* 37: 26.
- Md. Zahari bin Md. Zain. 1970. Kenapa Hikayat Hang Tuah bukan satu penulisan sejarah? *Dewan Bahasa* September: 410-417.
- Mohd. Azzam Mohd. Hanif Ghows. 2006. *The Malayan emergency revisited 1948-1960: a pictorial history*. Kuala Lumpur: AMR Holding Sdn Bhd & Yayasan Pelajaran Islam.
- Mohd. Taib Osman. 1981. Kesusasteraan Melayu klasik: suatu tinjauan ringkas. In Jamilah Haji Ahmad. (ed.), *Kumpulan esei sastera Melayu lama*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia, pp. 108-134.
- Mohd. Taib Osman. 1986. *An introduction to the development of modern Malay language and literature*. Singapore: Times Book International. Revised edn.
- Mohd. Taib Osman. 1988. *Bunga rampai: aspects of Malay culture*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. Reprinted edn.
- Mohd. Taib Osman. 1989. *Malay folk beliefs. An integration of disparate elements*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Mohd. Taib Osman. 1997. *Islamic civilisation in the Malay world*. Kuala Lumpur, Istanbul: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and The Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture.
- Mohd. Taib Osman. 2004. Definisi Melayu: antara sarjana dan seniman. In Mohd. Taib Osman. (ed.), *Budaya dan Bahasa Melayu. Masalah dan harapan*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Malaya, pp. 141-144.
- Mohd. Taib Osman and Abu Bakar Hamid. 1988. Continuity and change in the development of modern Malaysian literature. In Muhammad Haji Salleh. Edited and Introduced. *An anthology of contemporary Malaysian literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Ministry of Education, pp. 302-319.
- Mohd. Yusof Hasan. 1976. *Bahasa daerah dalam karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. Minden, Pulau Pinang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Mohd. Yusof Hasan. 1984. Kata-kata daerah dalam karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad. In

- Safian Hussain et al. (eds.), *Tanggapan: pembicaraan karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 296-322.
- Mohd. Yusof Hasan. 1989. *Novels of the troubled years: a study of Shahnnon Ahmad's novels, 1965-1978*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Mackay, Donald. 1997. *The Malayan emergency, 1948-60: the domino that stood*. London: Brassey's.
- Mahathir bin Mohamad. 1970. *The Malay dilemma*. Singapore: Marshall Cavendish.
- Mahathir bin Mohamad. 1999. *Jalan ke puncak*. Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications.
- Mahathir Mohamad, Dr. 2001. *Malays forget easily*. Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications.
- Maier, Hendrik M. J. 1988. *In the center of authority: the Malay Hikayat Merong Mahawangsa*. Ithaca: Studies on Southeast Asia, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University.
- Maier, Hendrik M. J. 1992. The Malays and the sea, the waves and the Java Sea. In V. J. H. Houben et al. (eds.), *Looking in odd mirrors: the Java Sea*. Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit, pp. 1-26.
- Maier, Hendrik M. J. 1997. 'We are playing relatives'. Riau, the cradle of reality and hybridity. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 153 (4): 672-698.
- Maier, Hendrik M. J. 1999. Tales of Hang Tuah. In search of wisdom and good behaviour. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 153 (3): 342-361.
- Maier, Hendrik M. J. 2004. *We are playing relatives. A survey of Malay writing*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Mallios, Peter Lancelot. 2002. Notes. In Joseph Conrad. *Almayer's folly: a story of an eastern river*. New York: The Modern Library, pp. 165-174.
- Marsden, William. 1783. *The history of Sumatra*. London: Publisher unknown.
- Marsden, William. 1811. *The history of Sumatra*. London: Publisher unknown.
- Marsden, W. 1812. *A dictionary and grammar of the Malayan Language, volume 1*. London: Cox and Baylish.
- Marsden, William. John Bastin. Introduced. 1986. *The history of Sumatra*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press. Reprint of 3<sup>rd</sup> edn.
- Matheson, Virginia. 1979. Concepts of Malay ethos in indigenous Malay writings. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 10 (2): 351-371.
- Matheson, V. 1980. "Sovereigns and scribes: life as reflected in some of the

literature of the Malays.” In J. J. Fox. (ed.), *Indonesia: The making of a culture*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, the Australian National University, pp. 183-195.

- Mathews, Richard. 1978. *The clockwork universe of Anthony Burgess*. California: Borgo Press.
- Maugham, Somerset. 1926. *The casuarina tree*. London: Heinemann.
- Maugham, Somerset. 1933. *Ah King*. London: Heinemann.
- Maugham, Somerset. 1951a. *A writer's notebook*. London: Heinemann.
- Maugham, Somerset. 1951b. *Collected short stories: volume III*. London: Heinemann.
- Maugham, Somerset. Anthony Burgess. Selected and Introduced. 1969a. *Maugham's Malaysian stories*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann.
- Maugham, Somerset. Anthony Burgess. Selected and Introduced. 1969b. The force of circumstance. *Maugham's Malaysian stories*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann, pp. 46-76.
- Maugham, Somerset. Anthony Burgess. 1969c. Selected and Introduced. The outstation. *Maugham's Borneo stories*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann, pp. 50-94.
- Maugham, Somerset. G. V. de Freitas. Selected and Introduced. 1976a. *Maugham's Borneo stories*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann.
- Maugham, Somerset. G. V. de Freitas. Selected and Introduced. 1976b. The yellow streak. *Maugham's Borneo stories*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann, pp. 11-49.
- McIver, Claude Searcy. 1936. *William Somerset Maugham: a study of technique and literary sources*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- McLauchlan, Juliet. 1979. Almayer and Willems – “how not to be”. *Conradiana* 11 (2): 113- 141.
- Metzger, Laurent. 1991. Continuity and change of the Malay novelist, Shanon Ahmad. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 22 (1): 63-74.
- Milner, A. C. 1982. *Kerajaan: Malay political culture on the eve of colonial rule*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Milner, A. 1992. “Malayness”. Confrontation, innovation and discourse. In V. J. H. Houben, H. M. J. Maier and W. van der Molen. (eds.), *Looking in odd mirrors: the Java Sea*. Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azie en Oceanie, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, pp. 43-59.

- Milner, Anthony. 1998. Ideological work in constructing the Malay majority. In Dru C. Gladney. (ed.), *Making majorities: constituting the nation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 151-169.
- Milner, Anthony. 2002. *The invention of politics in colonial Malaya*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milner, Anthony. 2003. Who created Malaysia's plural society? *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 76 (2): 1-24.
- Mohamed Nordin Sopiee. 2005. *From Malayan Union to Singapore separation: Political unification in the Malaysia region, 1945-65*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.
- Morgan, Ted. 1980. *Somerset Maugham*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Morris, Robert K. 1986. The *Malayan trilogy*: the futility of history. In Geoffrey Aggeler. (ed.), *Critical essays on Anthony Burgess*. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., pp. 68-79.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1979. "si tenggang's homecoming". In Muhammad Haji Salleh. *The travel journals of Si Tenggang II*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1981a. Imej Orang Melayu dalam karya-karya Joseph Conrad. In Muhammad Haji Salleh. *Imej dan cita-cita*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 318-332.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1981b. *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1986. Wira Melayu tradisional. In Muhammad Haji Salleh. *Cermin diri. Esei-esei kesusasteraan*. Petaling Jaya: Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd., pp. 25-44.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1991a. Central values of the Malay hero: Hang Tuah. In Muhammad Haji Salleh. *Yang empunya cerita: the mind of the Malay author*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 115-144.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1991b. The mind of the prologue: a traditional author on the threshold of literary creation. In Muhammad Haji Salleh. *Yang empunya cerita: the mind of the Malay author*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 3-26.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1994. *Malaiische Wanderungen: Gedichte/Mit Einem Vorwort, Erläuterungen und Aus dem Malaiischen übersetzt von Beate Carle*. Unkel/Rhein: Horlemann.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1996. Framed by fiction: Malay literary characters in the

literatures of Europe and Asia. In Lisbeth Littrup. (ed.), *Identity in Asian literature*. Surrey: Curzon Press, pp. 190-230.

Muhammad Haji Salleh. 1998. *Aksara usia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Muhammad Haji Salleh. 2000a. *Puitika sastera Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Muhammad Haji Salleh. 2000b. Romping around narrative space: making epical room for Hang Tuah. *Tenggara* 41: 27-47.

Muhammad Haji Salleh. Translated. 2001. The Malays. *Tenggara (Journal of Southeast Asian Literature)* 44: 22-24.

Muhammad Haji Salleh. 2008a. Hang Tuah dalam jiwa bangsa yang retak. In Muhammad Haji Salleh. *Permata di rumput, gilang. Sastera sebagai ruang bangsa*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 36-50.

Muhammad Haji Salleh. 2008b. *Sulalatus salatin*: adikarya akal budi Melayu. In Muhammad Haji Salleh. *Permata di rumput, gilang. Sastera sebagai ruang bangsa*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 3-35.

Muhammad Haji Salleh. 2008c. *The poetics of Malay literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Muir, William, Sir. 1861. *The life of Mahomet*. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

Mundy, George Rodney, Sir. 1848. *Narrative of events in Borneo and Celebes, down to the occupation of Labuan: from the journals of James Brooke, Esq. Rajah of Sarawak, and Governor of London. Together with a narrative of the operation of H. M. S. Iris*. London: John Murray.

Murtagh, B. 2005. *The portrayal of the British in traditional Malay literature*. Unpublished. PhD thesis, the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, United Kingdom.

Nagata, Judith. A. 1973. What is a Malay? Situational selection of ethnic identity in a plural society. *American Ethnologist* 1: 331-350.

Nagata, Judith A. 1981. In defence of ethnic boundaries: the changing myths and charters of Malay identity. In Charles F. Keyes. (ed.), *Ethnic change*. Seattle: University of Washington, pp. 87-116.

Norhalim Ibrahim. 1993. *Adat Perpatih: perbezaan dan persamaannya dengan Adat Temenggung*. Kuala Lumpur: Fajar Bakti.

Noriah Mohamed. 1997. Pengenalan Tambahan. In *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Yayasan Karyawan and Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. Xxvii-xlviii.

- Page, Norman. 1986. *A Conrad companion*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Parnickel, B. 1962. Johorskaya redaktsiya 'Povesti orang-orang Hang Tuahe' (The Johore recension of the tale of Hang Tuah. *Narody Azii I Afriki* 1:147-155.
- Parnickel, B.B. 1976. An epic hero and 'epic traitor' in the Hikayat Hang Tuah. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde* 132 (4): 403-417.
- Radin Soenarno. 1960. Malay nationalism, 1900-1945. *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 1 (1): 21.
- Raffles, Thomas Stamford. 1816. On the Malayu nation: translation of a Malayu manuscript entitled a history of former times containing an account of the first arrival of the Portuguese at Malacca. *Asiatic Researches* 12: 102-158.
- Rahman Saari. 2000. Sajak-sajak puncak Usman Awang. *Dewan Sastera* January: 81-84.
- Raphael, Frederic. 1976. *W. Somerset Maugham and his world*. London: Thames & Holson.
- Ras, J. J. (ed.). 1968. *Hikayat Bandjar*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Rattiya Saleh. 1988. *Panji Thai dalam perbandingan dengan cerita-cerita Panji Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Reece, R. H. W. 1982. *The name of Brooke: the end of White Rajah rule in Sarawak*. Kuala Lumpur; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reece, Bob. 2004. *The White Rajah of Sarawak: a Borneo dynasty*. Singapore: Archipelago Press.
- Reid, Anthony. 1988. *Southeast Asia in the age of commerce 1450-1680 (Volume One: the lands below the winds)*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Reid, A. (ed.). 1997. *The last stand of Asian autonomies: responses to modernity in the diverse states of Southeast Asia and Korea, 1750-1900*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Reid, Anthony. 2004. Understanding *Melayu* (Malay) as a source of diverse modern identities. In Timothy P. Barnard. (ed.), *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 1-24.
- Resink, G. J. 1968. *Indonesia's history between the myths*. The Hague: W. Van Hoeve.
- Roberts, Andrew Michael. (ed.). 1998. *Joseph Conrad*. Essex: Longman.
- Roff, William R. 1967. *The origins of Malay nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University

Press.

- Roolvink, R. 1967. The variant versions of the Malay annals. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde* 123: 301-324.
- Rose, J. Holland, A. P. Newton and E. A. Benians. 1940. *The Cambridge history of the British Empire. Vol. 2, The growth of the new Empire 1783-1870*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Ruzy Suliza Hashim. 2003. Yang empunya cerita: Muhammad Haji Salleh's revision of Sejarah Melayu. In Zawiah Yahya. (ed.), 2003. *Critical perspectives on Muhammad Haji Salleh*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 86-105.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Said, Edward. 1995. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books. Reprinted with new Afterword.
- Schwarz, Daniel R. 1980. *Conrad: Almayer's folly to Under western eyes*. London: Macmillan.
- Schwarz, Daniel R. 1982. *Conrad: the late fiction*. London: Macmillan.
- Senu Abdul Rahman. 1971. *Revolusi mental*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbitan Utusan Melayu.
- Shahnon Ahmad. 1965a. *Rentung*. Melaka: Penerbitan Abbas Bandung.
- Shahnon Ahmad. 1965b. *Terdedah*. Melaka: Toko Buku Abbas Bandung.
- Shahnon Ahmad. 1966. *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbitan Utusan Melayu.
- Shahnon Ahmad. 1991a. *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. In Shahnon Ahmad. *Sastera sebagai seismograf kehidupan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 374-384.
- Shahnon Ahmad. 1991b. *Rentong dan Ranjau sepanjang jalan: satu pengakuan yang nakal*. In Shahnon Ahmad. *Sastera sebagai seismograf kehidupan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 360-368.
- Shahnon Ahmad. 1997. *Ranjau sepanjang jalan*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications and Distributors Sdn. Bhd.
- Shahrom Mohd. Dom. 1988. Ishak sebagai ahli politik dan sasterawan. In A. Karim Haji Abdullah. (ed.), *Pak Sako bistari*. Petaling Jaya: Binakarya Sdn. Bhd., pp. 81-90.
- Shamsul A. B. 1983. A revival in the study of Islam in Malaysia. *Man: the*

*Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N. S.)* 18 (3): 399-404.

- Shamsul A. B. 1989. From urban to rural: the 'migration' of the Islamic resurgence phenomenon in Malaysia. *Proceedings of the congress on urbanism and Islam* 4: 1-34.
- Shamsul A. B. 1994. Religion and ethnic politics in Malaysia. The significance of the Islamic resurgence phenomenon. In Charles F. Keyes, Laurel Kendell and Helen Hadacre (eds.), *Asian visions of authority: religion and the modern states in East and Southeast Asian*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, pp. 99-116.
- Shamsul A. B. 1995. Inventing certainties. The dakwah persona in Malaysia. In Wendy James. (ed.), *The pursuit of certainty: religious and cultural formulation*. London: Routledge, pp. 112-133.
- Shamsul A. B. 1996a. Debating about identity in Malaysia: a discourse analysis. *Tonan Ajia Kenkyu* 34 (3): 476-499.
- Shamsul A. B. 1996b. Nations-of-intent in Malaysia. In Stein Tønnesson and Hans Antlov. (eds.), *Asian forms of the nation*. London: Curzon Press, pp. 323-347.
- Shamsul A. B. 1996c. The construction and transformation of a social identity: Malayness and Bumiputraness re-examined. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 52: 15-34.
- Shamsul A. B. 1997a. Identity construction, nation formation and Islamic revivalism in Malaysia. In Robert W. Hefner. and Patricia Horvatic. (eds.), *Islam in an era of nation-states: politics and religious renewal in Muslim Southeast Asia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, pp. 207-227.
- Shamsul A. B. 1997b. The economic dimension of Malay nationalism – the socio-historical roots of the New Economic Policy and its contemporary implications. *The Developing Economies* 35 (3): 240-261.
- Shamsul A. B. 1997c. The making of a "plural" Malaysia. A brief survey. In David Y. H. Wu, Humphrey McQueen and Yamamoto Yasushi (eds.), *Emerging pluralism in Asia & the Pacific*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, pp. 67-83.
- Shamsul A. B. 1998a. A question of identity: a case study on Malaysian Islamic revivalism and the non-Muslim response. In Tsuneo Ayabe. (ed.), *Nation-state, identity and religion in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 55-79.
- Shamsul A. B. 1998b. Bureaucratic management of identity in a modern state. "Malayness" in postwar Malaysia. In Dru Gladney. (ed.), *Making majorities: constituting the nation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 135-150.
- Shamsul A. B. 2000. Development and democracy in Malaysia. A comment on its

socio-historical roots. In Hans Antloev and Lu Wei-Ling. (eds.), *Cultural construction democracy in Asia*. London: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies & Curzon Press, pp. 86-106.

Shamsul A. B. 2001. Why is Malaysia not disintegrating? Islam, the economy and politics in multiethnic Malaysia. *Discourses on political reform and democratization in East and Southeast Asia in the light of new processes of regional community Building*, 14: 1-18.

Shamsul A. B. 2003. The Malay World. In Virginia Hooker and Norani Othman. (eds.), *Malaysia: Islam, society and politics*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, pp. 102-125.

Shamsul A. B. 2004a. A history of identity, an identity of a history: the idea and practice of 'Malayness' in Malaysia reconsidered. In Timothy P. Barnard. (ed.), *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 135-148.

Shamsul A. B. 2004b. *From British to Bumiputera rule. Local politics and rural development in Peninsular Malaysia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies. 2<sup>nd</sup> Reprint.

Shamsul A. B. 2004c. *Islamic resurgence & renewal in Southeast Asia: the Malaysian experience*. Text of a presentation for a roundtable on 'Islamic resurgence and renewal in Southeast Asia' at the EUROSEAS Conference 2004, Paris.

Shamsul A. B. 2004d. Malay, Malayness and Malay Studies: an organizational response. Unpublished. Paper presented at the International Symposium on 'Thinking Malayness', ILCAA – Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Shamsul A. B. 2004e. Texts and collective memories: the construction of "Chinese" and "Chineseness" from the perspective of a Malay. In Leo Suryadinata. (ed.), *Ethnic relations and nation-building in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, pp. 109-144.

Sheridan, L. A. 1961. *The Federation of Malaya constitution*. Singapore: University of Malaya Law Preview.

Sheridan, L. A. and Groves, Harry E. 1979. *The constitution of Malaysia*. Singapore: Malayan Law Journal (Pte.) Ltd.

Sherry, Norman. 1966. *Conrad's eastern world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shires, Linda M. 1985. The "privileged" reader and narrative methodology in *Lord Jim*. *Conradiana* 17 (1): 19-30.

Simmons, Allan H. 2006. *Joseph Conrad*. London: Palgrave.

- Siti Chamamah Soeratno. 1991. *Hikayat Iskandar Zulkarnain: analisis resepsi. SERI ILDER*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Siti Hawa Haji Salleh. (ed.). 1987. *Cendekia kesusasteraan Melayu tradisional*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- Siti Hawa Haji Salleh. 1995. Tiga pengarang agong kesusasteraan Melayu: mencari kesaksamaan dalam penilaian. *Jurnal Persuratan Melayu* 1 (1): 107-149.
- Skinner, C. 1959. *Prosa Melayu baharu*. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd.
- Skinner, C. 1982. *Ahmad Rijaluddin's Hikayat Perintah Negeri Bengkulu*. The Hague – Martinus Nijhoff: Bibliotheca Indonesia, Koninklijk Instituut Voor Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde 22.
- Skinner, C. 1985. *The battle for junk Ceylon. The Syair Sultan Maulana. Text, translation and notes. Bibliotheca Indonesia* 25. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Solehah Ishak et al. (ed.). Translated. 1998. *Malaysian Literary Laureates: selected works*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Stapes, J. H. 2002. Introduction. In Joseph Conrad. *An outcast of the islands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. xi-xxiii.
- Steel, Miranda. (ed.). 2009. *New Oxford English-English-Malay dictionary*. Shah Alam: Oxford Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.
- Stinson, John J. 1991. *Anthony Burgess revisited*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Stockwell, A. J. 1979. *British policy and Malay politics during the Malayan Union experiment, 1942-1948*. Kuala Lumpur: Monograph - Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society No. 8.
- Sutherland, Heather. 2004. The Makassar Malays: adaptation and identity, c. 1660-1790. In Timothy P. Barnard. (ed.), *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 76-106.
- Sutrisno, Prof. Dr. Sulastin. 1981. Hikayat Hang Tuah: antara konvensi dan inovasi. In Ayob Yamin and Hamzah Hamdani. (eds.), *Imej dan cita-cita. Kertas kerja Hari Sastera 1980*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia, pp. 259-285.
- Sutrisno, Sulastin. 1983. *Hikayat Hang Tuah: analisa struktur dan fungsi*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Sweeney, Amin. 1980. *Reputations live on: an early Malay autobiography*. California: University of California Press.
- Sweeney, Amin. 1987. *A full hearing. Orality and literacy in the Malay World*.

Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sweeney, Amin. 2006. Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi: a man of bananas and thorns. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 34 (100): 224-245.

Sweeney, Amin. (ed.). 2008. *Karya lengkap Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi. Jilid 3: Hikayat Abdullah*. Jakarta: KPG (Kepustakaan Popular Gramedia), École française d'Extrême-Orient, Perpustakaan Nasional RI.

Swettenham, F. A. 1896. The real Malay. *Malay sketches*. London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, pp. 1-11.

Syed Husin Ali. 1981. *The Malays: their problems and future*. Petaling Jaya: Heinemann.

Tagge, Anne. 1997. "A glimpse of paradise": feminine impulse and ego in Conrad's Malay world. *Conradiana* 29 (2): 101-112.

Tan Chee Beng. 1987. *Reflections on the Malaysian Constitution*. Penang: Persatuan Aliran Kesedaran Negara.

Tan Chin Kwang. 1986. The missing link in modern Malay literary history: a study of the influence of social and educational backgrounds on literary developments." *Archipel* 31: 97-115.

Teeuw, A. 1964. Tentang penghargaan dan pentafsiran Hikayat Hang Tuah. *Dewan Bahasa* 8 (8): 339-354.

Tham Seong Chee. 1975. Literary response and the social process – an analysis of cultural and political beliefs among Malay writers. *South East Journal of Social Sciences* 1 (1): 85-103.

Tham Seong Chee. 1983. *Malays and modernisation*. Singapore: Singapore University Press. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.

Thomas, Philip L. 1983. Foreword. In Harry Aveling. Translated. Ishak Haji Muhammad. *The son of Mad Mat Lela*. Singapore: Federal Publications, pp. v-ix.

Thumboo, E. Shamsuddin Jaafar. Translated. 1984. *Ranjau Sepanjang Jalan: karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. In Safian Hussain et al. (eds.), *Tanggapan: pembicaraan karya-karya Shahnnon Ahmad*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 91-118.

Tirtosudarmo, R. 2004. The *Orang Melayu* and *Orang Jawa* in the 'Lands below the winds.' Unpublished. Paper presented at the International Symposium on 'Thinking Malayness', ILCAA – Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Tirtosudarmo, R. 2005. The *Orang Melayu* and *Orang Jawa* in the 'Lands below the winds.' CRISE Working Paper 14, March.

- Tol, Roger. 2001. Master scribes: Husin bin Ismail, Abdullah bin Abdul Kadir Munsyi, their handwriting and the *Hikayat Abdullah*. *Archipel* 61: 115-138.
- Traill, H. F. O'B. 1979. An Indian protagonist of the Malay language: Abdullah "Munshi", his race and his mother-tongue. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 52 (2): 67-83.
- Traill, H. F. O'B. 1981. Aspects of Abdullah "Munshi". *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 54 (3): 35-56.
- Traill, H. F. O'B. 1982. The "lost" manuscript of the Hikayat Abdullah 'Munshi'. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 55 (2): 126-133.
- Tun Seri Lanang. Cheah Boom Kheng. Edited. Abdul Rahman Haji Ismail, R. Roolvink and R. O. Winstedt. Transcribed. 1997. *Sejarah Melayu. The Malay annals. New Romanised edition*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- Ungku Maimunah Mohd. Tahir. 1998. *Antara kampung dan kota: rural bias in the novels of Shahnun Ahmad*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Ungku Maimunah Mohd. Tahir. 2003. A reinterpretation of "art for society", the ideological underpinnings of the generation of the writers of the 1950s. In Ungku Maimunah Mohd. Tahir. *Readings in modern Malay literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 87-96.
- Usman Awang. 1989. Melayu Johor. *Mastika*, March.
- Usman Awang. 1992a. *Matinya Seorang Pahlawan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Usman Awang. 1992b. "Melayu." In Usman Awang et al. *Cempaka: an anthology*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 61-63.
- Usman Awang. 1996. "Melayu." *Mingguan Malaysia* 27 Oktober.
- Usman Awang. 1999a. "Melayu." In Othman Puteh. (ed.), *Tongkat Warrant: ini saya punya kerja*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications and Distributors, pp. 229-231.
- Usman Awang. 1999b. "Melayu Johor." In Othman Puteh. (ed.), *Tongkat Warrant: ini saya punya kerja*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publications and Distributors, pp. 226-228.
- Usman Awang et al. 1992. *Cempaka: an Anthology*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- van der Putten, Jan. 2004. A Malay of Bugis ancestry: Haji Ibrahim's strategies of survival. In Timothy P. Barnard. (ed.), *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 121-134.

- van Marle, Hans. 1978. Jumble of facts and fiction: the first Singapore reaction to *Almayer's folly*. *Conradiana* 10 (2): 161-166.
- van Marle, Hans. 1985. Conrad and Richard Burton on Islam. *Conradiana* 17 (2): 137-142.
- van Marle, Hans. 2002. Explanatory notes. In Joseph Conrad. *An outcast of the islands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 284-296.
- Vickers, Adrian. 2004. 'Malay identity': modernity, invented tradition and forms of knowledge. In Timothy P. Barnard. (ed.), *Contesting Malayness. Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp. 25-55.
- Wallace, Alfred Russel. 1869. *The Malay archipelago*. London: Macmillan.
- Wan Mohd. Nor Wan Daud. 1998. *The educational philosophy and practice of Syed Muhammad Naquib Al-Attas: an exposition of the original concept of Islamization*. Kuala Lumpur: International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization.
- Wan Shamsuddin Mohd. Yusoff. 1978. *Sejarah sastra Melayu moden (Sesudah tahun 1800)*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.
- Warren, James Francis. 2001. Savagism and civilisation: the Iranun, globalization and the literature of Joseph Conrad. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 74 (1): 43-69.
- Watt, Ian. 1980. *Conrad in the nineteenth century*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Wazir Jahan Karim. 1992. *Women and culture: between Malay adat and Islam*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Wilkinson, R. J. (ed.). P. L. Burns. Selected and Introduced. 1971. *Papers on Malay subjects*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Winstedt, R. O. (ed.). 1923. *Malaya: The Straits Settlements and the Federated and Unfederated Malay States*. London; Bombay; Sydney: Constable.
- Winstedt, R. O. 1938. Sejarah Melayu. *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 16 (3).
- Winstedt, R. O. 1940. A history of classical Malay literature. *Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 12.
- Wong, Nellie S.L. Tan and Patel, Vipin. (eds.). 1992. *Adat Perpatih: a matrilineal system in Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia and other matrilineal kinship systems throughout the world*. Kuala Lumpur: Wintrac.
- Yahaya Ismail. 1976. *Sejarah sastra Melayu moden*. Petaling Jaya: Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd.

- Yeow, Agnes. 2007. "Here comes the Nazarene": Conrad's treatment of the Serani and the racial politics of empire. *Conradiana* 39 (3): 273-290.
- Za'ba. 1923a. The poverty of the Malays. *The Malay Weekly Mail* 6 December 1923.
- Za'ba. 1923b. The salvation of the Malays. *The Malay Weekly Mail* 27 December 1923.
- Za'ba. 2000. Kemiskinan orang Melayu. In Abdullah Hussain and Khalid M. Hussain. (eds.), *Pendeta Za'ba dalam kenangan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 209-223.
- Zain Al-Abidin Ahmad. 1940. Modern developments (a chapter from *A history of Malay literature*. R. O. Winstedt). *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 17 (3): 142-162.
- Zaini-Lajoubert, Monique. 1987. *Abdullah bin Ahmad al-Misri. Naskhah dan dokumen nusantara 6*. Bandung: Angkasa and Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Zawiah Yahya. 1988. *Malay characters in Malaysian novels in English*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Zawiah Yahya. 2000. Si Tenggang's homecoming: negotiating tradition and modernity. *Indonesia and the Malay world* 28 (8): 22-31.
- Zawiah Yahya. 2003a. *Resisting colonialist discourse*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.
- Zawiah Yahya. 2003b. Who is Muhammad Haji Salleh? In Zawiah Yahya. (ed.), *Critical perspectives on Muhammad Haji Salleh*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp. 3-11.
- Zurinah Hassan. 1990. *Sasterawan Negara Usman Awang*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

## APPENDIX 1

### My understandings of the terms race and *bangsa* as sourced from various dictionaries

I consulted firstly a dictionary, *Dictionary of the Malayan language: in two parts, Malayan and English and English and Malayan. Volume 1* (1812) compiled by William Marsden which is kept in the Special Collections Reading Room (SCRR) of the SOAS Library. Of importance is the entry for *bangsa* which is translated and defined by Marsden as follows:

*bangsa*, HIND. race, family, tribe, caste. *Baniak-lah jenis bangsa orang* there are many different race of men. *Bangsa mana-kah tuan amba ini* of what family art thou, sir? *Karna-nya iya orang iang hina papa iang tiada berbangsa* for he is a mean and indigent person of low birth. *Iang korang bangsa ignoble*. *Bangsa orang putih iang lain deri-pada bangsa wallanda* a race of Europeans distinct from that of the Hollanders. (Marsden, 1812: 41)

I also consulted the two volumes of publications by John Crawfurd, *A grammar and dictionary of the Malay language: with a preliminary dissertation* (1852), kept in the SCRR, which are more comprehensive in terms of its linguistic details. Race is described as referring to lineage and is translated into Malay as follows:

*darah, turunan, pincher, poun, bangsa, kulawarga, kalurga, asal*. (Crawfurd, 1852: 141)

For more contemporary understandings of the term *bangsa*, I consulted firstly the *Kamus bahasa Melayu nusantara* (2003), a dictionary which contains Malay words compiled by linguistic experts on Malay from Malaysia, Indonesia and Brunei. Its eight definitions are as follows:

1. *kesatuan orang atau kumpulan manusia yg bersamaan asal keturunan, adat, bahasa, dan sejarahnya*; 2. *kumpulan manusia yg menjadi rakyat sesebuah Negara dlm satu ikatan ketatanegaraan dan berpemerintahan sendiri*; 3. *golongan manusia, binatang atau tumbuh-tumbuhan yg mempunyai asal usul yg sama dan sifat khas yg sama atau bersamaan*; 4. *macam; jenis*; 5. *kedudukan (keturunan) mulia (luhur); darjat tinggi*; 6. *jenis kelamin, jantina*; 7. *kumpulan manusia yg biasanya terikat krn kesatuan bahasa dan kebudayaan dlm erti umum, dan yg biasanya menempati wilayah tertentu di muka bumi*; 8. *klasifikasi dlm biologi sesudah kelas dan sebelum famili (suku); ordo*. (*Kamus bahasa Melayu nusantara*, 2003: 224-255)

With regard to my study, definitions numbers 1, 2, 3 and 7 correspond more to my understanding of *bangsa* while definition number 5 is the one referred to by most scholars in their analysis of traditional Malay literary text as discussed in the main sections of Chapter One.

More specific to the Malaysian context is the fourth edition of the *Kamus Dewan* (2007) published by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur. In it, *bangsa* is defined as:

*1. jenis manusia drpd satu asal keturunan; 2. kumpulan manusia dlm satu ikatan ketatanegaraan; 3. macam, jenis; 4. jantina, jenis kelamin; 5. darjat tinggi, keturunan mulia. (Kamus Dewan, 2007: 122)*

With regard to my study, definitions numbers 1 and 2 correspond more to my understanding of *bangsa* while definition number 5 is the one referred to by most scholars in their analysis of traditional Malay literary text as discussed in the main sections of Chapter One.

Another dictionary referred to, which is also more specific to the Malaysian context, is the second edition to the *New Oxford English-English-Malay dictionary* (2009) published by Oxford Fajar Sdn. Bhd., Kuala Lumpur. In it, the term race, which is relevant to my study, is defined and translated as:

*3. one of the groups into which people can be divided according to the colour of their skin, their hair type, the shape of their face, etc.; 4. a group of people who have the same language, customs, history, etc., bangsa; kaum, keturunan. (Steel, 2009: 674)*

For a more global contemporary understanding of the term race, I consulted the seventh edition of the international student's edition of the *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary* (2006) published by Oxford University Press, Oxford. In it, the term race, which is relevant to my study, is defined as:

PEOPLE *4. one of the main groups that humans can be divided into according to their physical differences, for example, the colour of their skin; 5. a group of people who share the same language, history, culture, etc. (Hornby, 2006: 1194)*

I also consulted the third edition of the fully revised and updated *The new Fontana dictionary of modern thought* (2000) published by HarperCollins, London, which provides an understanding of the term race within the Western academic tradition. In it, the term race is defined and described as follows:

A classificatory term, broadly equivalent to subspecies. Applied most frequently to human beings, it indicates a group characterized by closeness of common descent and usually also by some shared physical distinctiveness such as colour of skin.

Though the concept is a very commonly used one, it has been largely scientifically discredited. The consensus among social scientists today is that race is a social construction, rather than a genuine biological category. They recognize that all humans derive from a common stock and that groups within the SPECIES have migrated and intermarried constantly. Human populations therefore constitute a genetic continuum...where racial distinctions are relative, not absolute. It is also acknowledged that visible characteristics, popularly regarded as major racial pointers, are not inherited in any simple package and that they reflect only a small proportion of an individual's genetic make-up.

With the advent of MENTAL TESTING as a means of attempting to measure INTELLIGENCE, the concept of race became more controversial, with some researchers claiming that, because some groups of black children have performed badly on intelligence tests, they are genetically inferior to whites. The most recent version of this claim is popularized by Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray in their book *The Bell Curve* (1994). Critics of this notion point out that intelligence and other 'mental' tests are designed from a white, middle-class perspective that is skewed towards one group and will inevitably lead to poor performance by the other. They argue that intelligence is not distributed in the population by race, but arises from a combination of genetic and environmental sources. (Bullock and Trombley, 2000: 719)

## APPENDIX 2

### A note on two postcolonial theories: Orientalism by Edward Said and Exoticism

Edward Said's signature theory of Orientalism is to be found in his seminal work on 'the Western conceptions of the Orient' in his 1978 book, *Orientalism*. My understanding of Said's Orientalism is that he directly challenges the traditional thinking of Orientalism over a configuration of misrepresentation of the non-Western world as espoused by European scholars during the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In his Introduction to *Orientalism*, Said states, 'Orientalism is premised upon exteriority, that is, on the fact that the Orientalist, poet or scholar, makes the Orient speak, describes the Orient, renders its mysteries plain for and to the West' (Said, 1995: 20-21).<sup>102</sup> Said (1995: 21) adds, 'What he says and writes, by virtue of the fact that it is said or written, is meant to indicate that the Orientalist is outside the Orient, both as an existential and as a moral fact'.

Meanwhile, the term Exoticism traces its historical background to the word 'exotisme'. Its use was certified in 1845 where it was first used as an adjective form (Forsdick, 2000: 33). Exoticism itself has been acknowledged in some studies as a highly slippery term with various meanings and interpretations, as Forsdick (2000: 33) describes it, 'Looseness of definition associates the word with a ragbag of ideas linked indiscriminately with perception or experience of the foreign'. Forsdick (2000: 23) demonstrates the problems of 'defining the exotic' by looking at Exoticism as an approach to radical diversity. The difficulty of pinpointing an exact definition of the term can be seen from Forsdick's analysis in which he presents six different ways to define the term: by offering new perspectives on Exoticism, by presenting Exoticism as an Aesthetics of Diversity, by defining it in the field of the exotic, by discussing its representation and relation towards achieving a definition of Exoticism, by limiting it to the works on Exoticism by the French Victor Segalen (1878-1919) and the exoticist tradition, and by looking at the threats and responses of 20<sup>th</sup> century Exoticism (Forsdick, 2000: 23-57).

---

<sup>102</sup> I have referred to his 1995 reprinted edition.

---

On the other hand, Bongie (1991: 4) defines Exoticism as ‘a nineteenth-century literary and existential practice that posited another space, the space of an Other, outside or beyond the confines of a ‘civilisation’’. Bongie (1991: 134) identifies two types of Exoticism, namely ‘Imperialist Exoticism’ which takes upon itself ‘the superiority of civilisation over savagery’, and ‘Exoticising Exoticism’ which favours ‘savagery’ over ‘civilisation’. Basing his own definition of Exoticism on Bongie’s study, Roberts (1998: 124) offers the following definition, Exoticism is defined as ‘the literary and existential practice within both colonialist ideology and critiques of colonialism’. Indeed, Burgess (1963: 465) in “The corruption of the exotic” states, ‘There should be no such thing as an ‘exotic’ novel’. Thus, based on the aforementioned discussion, my own understanding of Exoticism is that this theory is not entirely clear, does not have a concrete set of ideas and does not seem to have a specific definition.

## APPENDIX 3

### Brief background of Shamsul Amri Baharuddin (Shamsul A. B.) (b.1951)

Professor Dato' Dr. Shamsul Amri Baharuddin is a Professor of Social Anthropology, and currently Founder Director of the newly established Institute of Ethnic Studies (KITA) at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi. He obtained his doctorate from Monash University, Australia in 1983. His research interests include the Malay World within Southeast Asia and as perceived from the outside as well as the development theories and planning of the Third World, peasant studies and the sociology of literature. His publications cover themes related to religion, identity and culture as well as nationalism. He is also a founding member of the Asian Network of Anthropological Studies, member of the Social Anthropologist of the Commonwealth, consultant to several research foundations, and a noted political analyst. His works have also been translated into other languages such as French, German and Dutch. Among his major publications are *Assessing democratic evolution in Southeast Asia* (Malaysia); *Trends in Southeast Asia* (ISEAS), "El future dels sindicats, et sindicalisme a l'era de la globalització: un enfocament critic" (Centre De Recerca Econòmica, Social de Catalunya), "Malay and Malayness in Malaysia reconsidered: a critical review", (*Communal/Plural*), "La dimension economica del nacionalismo malayo" (Nueva Sociedad), and "Malaysia" (*The encyclopaedia of politics and religion*).

Shamsul's other notable studies which have not been reviewed in this study include the following:

- A. B. Shamsul. 2000b. Redefining cultural nationalism in multiethnic Malaysia: a recent observation. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 1 (1): 169-171.
- Shamsul A. B. 1983. A revival in the study of Islam in Malaysia. *Man: the Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N. S.)* 18 (3): 399-404.
- Shamsul A. B. 1989. From urban to rural: the 'migration' of the Islamic resurgence phenomenon in Malaysia. *Proceedings of the congress on urbanism and Islam* 4: 1-34.
- Shamsul A. B. 1994. Religion and ethnic politics in Malaysia. The significance of the Islamic resurgence phenomenon. In Charles F. Keyes,

Laurel Kendell and Helen Hadacre (eds.), *Asian visions of authority: religion and the modern states in East and Southeast Asian*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, pp. 99-116.

- Shamsul A. B. 1995. Inventing certainties. The dakwah persona in Malaysia. In Wendy James. (ed.), *The pursuit of certainty: religious and cultural formulation*. London: Routledge, pp. 112-133.
- Shamsul A. B. 1996b. Nations-of-intent in Malaysia. In Stein Tønnesson and Hans Antlöv. (eds.), *Asian forms of the nation*. London: Curzon Press, pp. 323-347.
- Shamsul A. B. 1997b. The economic dimension of Malay nationalism – the socio-historical roots of the New Economic Policy and its contemporary implications. *The Developing Economies* 35 (3): 240-261.
- Shamsul A. B. 1997c. The making of a “plural” Malaysia. A brief survey. In David Y. H. Wu, Humphrey McQueen and Yamamoto Yasushi (eds.), *Emerging pluralism in Asia & the Pacific*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, pp. 67-83.
- Shamsul A. B. 1998a. A question of identity: a case study on Malaysian Islamic revivalism and the non-Muslim response. In Tsuneo Ayabe. (ed.), *Nation-state, identity and religion in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, 55-79.
- Shamsul A. B. 1998b. Bureaucratic management of identity in a modern state. “Malayness” in postwar Malaysia. In Dru Gladney. (ed.), *Making majorities: constituting the nation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 135-150.
- Shamsul A. B. 2000. Development and democracy in Malaysia. A comment on its socio-historical roots. In Hans Antloev and Lu Wei-Ling. (eds.) *Cultural construction democracy in Asia*. London: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies & Curzon Press, pp. 86-106.
- Shamsul A. B. 2003. The Malay World. In Virginia Hooker and Norani Othman. (eds.), *Malaysia: Islam, society and politics*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 102-125.
- Shamsul A. B. 2004c. *Islamic resurgence & renewal in Southeast Asia: the Malaysian experience*. Text of a presentation for a roundtable on ‘Islamic resurgence and renewal in Southeast Asia’ at the EUROSEAS Conference 2004, Paris.
- Shamsul A. B. 2004d. Malay, Malayness and Malay Studies: an organizational response. Unpublished. Paper presented at the International Symposium on ‘Thinking Malayness’, ILCAA – Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

- Shamsul A. B. 2004e. Texts and collective memories: the construction of “Chinese” and “Chineseness” from the perspective of a Malay. In Leo Suryadinata. (ed.), *Ethnic relations and nation-building in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, pp. 109-144.

## APPENDIX 4

### Review of papers presented at the International Symposium on “Thinking Malayness”

by Hisao (2004) “Old and new aspects of Malayness in the contemporary ‘*Dunia Melayu*’ movement” and

by Tirtosudarmo (2005) “The *Orang Melayu* and *Orang Jawa* in the ‘Lands below the winds’”

A different approach in exploring Malayness is presented by Tomizawa Hisao (2004: 1-15), where he examines ‘the nature of Malayness’ based on an analysis of politico-cultural agenda and activities centring on what he proposes to be the *Dunia Melayu* (Malay World) movement. This movement is suggested as activated under the leadership of a non-governmental but authoritative organisation in Malaysia, GAPENA (*Gabungan Persatuan Penulis Nasional Malaysia*), the Malaysian national association of writers. This association is described by Hisao as often been regarded as a symbol, translated as ‘*lambang*’ and ‘*ikon*’, of Malayness. His source of information is derived from newsletters published by GAPENA, *Warta Gapena* (*GAPENA News*).

The most important perspectives from Hisao related to the scope of my study are his outlines of the main ‘axes’ or ideological streams in the definitions of Malay and Malayness. Hisao (2004: 1-2) begins with definitions in ‘pre-colonial’ contexts and suggests that *Melayu* was an ‘*epithet*’ which was originally confined to members of the dynasty developed around a river called *Melayu* in Sumatra, and as such the term *Melayu* was initially associated more closely with ideas of stratification and hierarchy than with ethnicity or social boundaries. However, Melaka, which controlled the Straits of Melaka in the 15<sup>th</sup> and the 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, is believed to have wrenched away this ‘Malay/*Melayu*’ identity away from Sumatra and eventually set the standard of Malayness.

This, nonetheless, further changed by the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries where Malay and Malayness became associated with two elements: (i) a line of kingship acknowledging descent from Srivijaya and Melaka, and (ii) a commercial diaspora retaining the customs, language and trade practices of Melaka. Hisao echoes similar perspectives by Shamsul A. B. (2001), where ‘kingship’, described as referring to the

'*kerajaan*' and the royal family, was a prominent pillar of Malayness in the area around the Straits of Melaka while Islam was another pillar because it provided the concept of 'kingship' with some of its core values. In particular, the commercial diaspora constituted a group of people outside the Straits of Melaka area, Borneo, Makassar and Java, who are believed to have defined their Malayness primarily in terms of 'language' and 'custom'. The last two are thus suggested as the other pillars of Malayness.

As Hisao (2004: 2) moves on to discuss the colonial context, he quotes perspectives by Shamsul A. B. (1999; 2001), where he highlights Shamsul's view on how the construction of Malay and Malayness, specifically the creation of the pillars of Malayness consisting *bahasa* (language), *raja* (sultan) and *agama* (religion of Islam), came to be officialised and instituted during the colonial period. This process is believed to have occurred within the framework of colonial knowledge which was informed by a mixture of Social Darwinism and colonial investigative modalities. Hisao also highlights Shamsul's view on the creation of a 'plural society' in British Malaya as having provided the 'epistemological basis and space' for the 'ossification' of ethnic categories into lived reality, either by way of the authority-defined context as well as the everyday-defined context. It therefore does not only provide discourse on ethnic identities as widely believed. However, Hisao also compares Shamsul's view with those by Milner (2003), where Milner has tried to shed light on the influence of the indigenous social structure based on the '*kerajaan* economics'. It is in turn suggested as being based upon the intensification of the pre-existing and embryonic 'plural society'.

Hisao also demonstrates how Shamsul has emphasised the impact of the aforementioned colonial knowledge upon the defining practice of Malay and Malayness in not only in the colonial era but also the post-colonial one. However, Hisao raises concerns with Shamsul's view of whether the two terms were 'created' or 'recreated' in the colonial era where he suggests that these terms are 'rather ambiguous expressions'. Despite this, Hisao supports the view that some of the pre-colonial pillars of Malayness were intentionally selected and intensified within the colonial framework.

Hisao (2004: 2-3) illustrates the following three types of ideological streams around the Malay peninsula during the colonial period based on views by Ariffin Omar (1993: 38-45). Hisao attempts this by simplifying the indigenous politico-cultural agenda or movements seeking the essence of *bangsa Melayu*, which he translates as Malayness, during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The first stream is suggested as where Malayness is basically defined in terms of birthplace (locally-born) and religion (Islam), for example, locally-born Muslim Arabs and Indians (*Peranakan*) were considered as *bangsa Melayu* in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The second stream is proposed as where Malayness is basically defined in terms of birthplace, religion as well as descent/blood (*keturunan*) although Islam is not regarded as an element of *bangsa* but just simply as a religion, for example, *Melayu Jati* (Pure Malays) to the exclusion of the *Peranakan*. The final stream is suggested as where the term *bangsa Melayu* is not limited to the Malay-speaking and Muslim groups, covering the whole of the far-flung Malayo-Polynesian (Austronesian) ethno-linguistic group including the Javanese, the Taiwanese, the Madagascans, and others, for example the concepts of Melayu Raya/Indonesia Raya advocated in the 1930s and 1940s. Hisao thus posits the view that the final type of stream fits into or is connected directly to the contemporary *Dunia Melayu/Diaspora Melayu* movement.

Views from Hisao (2004: 5) demonstrate that the explicit definition of Malayness in the *Dunia Melayu* movement is contained in the third stream of defining *Melayu* in the broadest sense, which is the Malayo-Polynesian/Austronesian ethno-linguistic stock. The term *Melayu* in this movement is not restricted to the *Melayu* people whose religion is Islam. Instead, it also covers *Melayu* who are followers of other religions. To Hisao, this thus means that the Islamic religious axis is not a must to fulfil the Malayness concept of *Dunia Melayu*. As examples to illustrate his findings, common factors, or described also as ‘pillars of Malayness’ in the form of language, physical or racial characteristics and customs including garments, are presented in order to demonstrate ‘the same root-ness’ among the diasporas of the Malayo-Polynesian stock.

Hisao (2004: 8-9) also suggests that the language and custom aspects play an important role as pillars of Malayness for those who describe themselves as Malay although they may not reside in Malaysia. Hisao (2004: 10-12) also proposes ‘the

'*kerajaan*' paradigm' – the *kerajaan* (kingship or royalty)-oriented ideological stream of defining Malayness. In his view, this concept of royal or aristocratic blood is a symbol of the purest type of Malayness.

Another aspect of Malayness discussed by Hisao (2004: 7-8) is the religious one played by Islam. Hisao (2004: 7) believes that, despite the view of Malayness as expounded within the Islamic framework, evidence suggests the contrary where, out of 85% of the total *Melayu* population as suggested by GAPENA, the rest are indeed not followers of the Islamic faith. This then leads Hisao to suggest that the pillar of religion as represented by Islam is 'sometimes selected as an index of Malayness but sometimes not'. Hisao (2004: 7-8) thus posits the view that the religion of Islam in this sense might be regarded as a less explicit and latent aspect of Malayness in the movement.

A study by Riwanto Tirtosudarmo (2005: 1-19)<sup>103</sup> is notable as he traces the historical development of the *orang Melayu* and *orang Jawa* in the 'lands below the winds'.<sup>104</sup> According to Tirtosudarmo, Malaysia and Indonesia constitute the core of the Malay World and that the overlapping histories of these two cultural identities long before the arrival of the Europeans can be found in certain historical development and contemporary literature. They are also proposed as part of the same fluid ethnic community prior to the arrival of the Europeans in 'the land below the winds', described as a vast area known as 'the Malay World' and now generally referred to as 'South East Asia'. Tirtosudarmo postulates that the contest among the Europeans to control the region resulted in the parcelling of the region into separated colonial states and is thus proposed as transforming the previously fluid and shifting ethnic boundaries into more rigid and exclusive ethnic identities. It is during the process of ethnic-formation in Malaysia, as Tirtosudarmo sees it, that Malayness was consciously manipulated by the colonial and post-colonial elites to define and formulate the Malaysian state and its ideology.

<sup>103</sup> I have referred to his study published in 2005 as it is a revised version of the one presented at the "Thinking Malayness" international symposium.

<sup>104</sup> According to Tirtosudarmo (2005: 4), this is a phrase found in a Persian-language, 17<sup>th</sup> century book by Muhammad ibn Ibrahim (1688), *The ship of Sulaiman*. It was then borrowed by Anthony Reid (1988) to form part of the title for his book, *Southeast Asia in the age of commerce 1450-1680 (Volume one: the lands below the winds)*.

Prior to the arrival of the Europeans, Tirtosudarmo (2005: 6) supports views by Vickers (2004), that the 'orang Melayu' had no essence, especially no national essence. Tirtosudarmo describes Malay as a hybrid identity which was formed by combinations of antipathies and interchanges predating the one-way street view of late 19<sup>th</sup> century colonialism. As a prelude to the founding of Malaysia as a nation-state, Tirtosudarmo quotes findings in a study by Milner (1992). As highlighted by Tirtosudarmo, Milner (1992: 5 cited in Tirtosudarmo, 2005: 7), suggests that the geographic and ethnic scope of Malayness was an especially urgent issue in a new state where loyalty to the *bangsa* had developed before loyalty to the nation. Tirtosudarmo (2005: 8 fn 4) states that *bangsa* has been translated to mean 'people' or 'ethnie' in his study whereas it has been translated as 'race' or 'nation' in other contexts.

I reproduce here Milner's argument in Tirtosudarmo's study as it contains a view pertaining to writings on the history of the Malays:

Narrowing the scope of Malayness appears to have been a cultural project even of the British colonial state. It is revealing that when the colonial civil servant, Sir Richard Winstedt, wrote what has been called the first modern history of the Malay he focussed on the Malays of the Malay Peninsula and the nearby Riau-Lingga archipelago (Winstedt 1921: 4). This history was published in 1921 and contrasts sharply with a 'History of the Malay World' written by the Malay author, Abdul Hadi, a few years later. Hadi's broader survey – which refers to Java, Borneo and Sumatra under the heading of 'Malay lands' – seems like support for a pan-archipelagic Melayu Raya (Abdul Hadi bin Haji Hassan 1925-1929: 43). (Milner, 1992: 55 cited in Tirtosudarmo, 2005: 8)<sup>105</sup>

Tirtosudarmo (2005: 12) quotes views from Shamsul A. B. (2004: 145) which suggest that the construction of Malayness in Malaysia has been represented by the important role played by demography, in particular, the immigration of the Chinese and the Indian to British Malaya in the 1900s. It is, in turn, seen as a result of the colonial construction of the Malay as a 'race' based on Raffles' concept of transformation of Malay from a 'Malay nation' to a 'Malay race'. Tirtosudarmo (2005: 13) also

<sup>105</sup> Melayu Raya refers to a term used by Malays in Malaysia advocated by Ibrahim Yaacob compared to Indonesia Raya used by Indonesians. Ibrahim Yaacob (1911-1979) was a leader of Kesatuan Melayu Muda (KMM) who fought for a common historical past, race and religion between the Malay peninsula and Indonesia during the interwar period. On Melayu Raya, see Cheah Boon Kheng (1979; 2003); Harper (2001). Tirtosudarmo (2005: 8 fn 5, fn 6) has translated Melayu Raya as Great Malay in his study and also states that *bangsa Melayu* refers to the Malaysian nation in his study while Malaysians are described as referring to a cultural group.

supports views by Reid (2004), that it was only in Malaysia that Malayness retained its 'core ethnies' and eventually became an important factor in Malay nationalism and then in the state ideology of Malaysia.

## APPENDIX 5

### Episode from *Hikayat Hang Tuah* involving a dancing incident in Inderapura

*Maka biduan itu, 'Baiklah tuanku; ragam apa diperhamba palu ini karena ragam orang Indrapura bukan Melayu? Sungguh beta Melayu, kacukan juga bukan seperti Melayu Malaka sungguh.'*

*Maka Laksamana pun tersenyum, seraya berkata, 'Orang Melaka gerangan Melayu kacukan, bercampur dengan Jawa Majapahit! Dayang pun satu sebagai hendak mengajuk beta pula'.*

*Setelah biduan lima orang itu mendengar kata Tun Tuah itu, maka ia pun berpaling, malu-malu bahasa, seraya berkata, 'Tuan ini pun satu, sebagai pula beta berkata benar menjadi salah'.*

*Maka Laksamana pun berpaling sambil tersenyum. Maka biduan lima orang itu pun tertawa sambil mengambil rebana lalu dipalunya. Maka piala itu pun dilarah oranglah kepada Laksamana. Maka rebana pun berbunyi kelimanya setala. Maka biduan itu pun bernyanyilah terlalu merdu suaranya. Maka Tun Jenal pun berbangkit menari; dua tiga langkah dianggapkannya kepada Laksamana. Laksamana pun berbangkit menari serta memperbaiki panjang kainnya dan mengiringkan keris panjangnya.*

*Maka kata Laksamana, 'Jangan sahaya diajuk, kerana orang Melaka dan tuannya bercampur, Jawa Majapahit; tiada tahu menari.'*

*Maka sahut Tun Jenal: 'Kata apa tuan katakan itu? Kita bermain adik-beradik; hendaklah jangan menaruh syak di hati' (Kassim Ahmad, 1975: 189 cited in Maier, 2004: 3)*

## APPENDIXES 6 TO 14

### Synopses of selected works in English literature on the Malay World

#### APPENDIX 6: *Almayer's folly* (1895)

The first of Conrad's Malay trilogy but chronologically the last in the instalment, *Almayer's folly* is set in around 1887. It opens with a prologue on Kasper Almayer in his half-built and rotting house, 'Almayer's folly', in Sambir in the Malay Archipelago. He dreams of obtaining large amounts of gold in *Gunong Mas* that will take him to Amsterdam and his half-Malay daughter, Nina, to live a luxurious European way of life. His dreams are assisted by the arrival of a Balinese prince, Dain Maroola, whom he employs to search for the gold. Almayer is the agent and protégé of Captain Tom Lingard, a sea-adventurer and trader, and manages Lingard's trading post in Sambir. He is ashamed of his twenty-five-year marriage to a Malay woman of Sulu origin, Mrs. Almayer, whom Lingard adopted after a battle with the Sulu pirates. Almayer's plan is ruined when Dain Maroola associates himself with the Rajah of Sambir, Lakamba. Nina, who has just returned from a ten-year stay in Singapore to receive European education, becomes cynical with the white society who rejects her due to her mixed ethnic background. Instead, she grows more interested in her mother's Malay heritage. At the same time, Mrs. Almayer, who detests Almayer and his European lifestyle, collaborates with Lakamba and his adviser, Babalatchi, against Almayer. While Almayer is busy planning a future life with Nina in Europe, Nina, who has fallen in love with Dain, plots to escape with Dain to Bali. Lakamba hatches a plan to pretend that Dain, who has blown up a Dutch ship killing two Dutchmen, has been drowned in a conspiracy to hide him from the Dutch authorities. Almayer falls for this scheme and mourns the loss of his future of wealth with Nina in Europe. Falling into despair, a drunken Almayer is awakened by a Siamese slave-girl, Taminah, who secretly pines for Dain, and she informs him that Mrs. Almayer and Nina have abandoned him. Through her, Almayer discovers Nina's plot to escape with Dain. Almayer tracks down the two lovers and confronts them; he fails in his pleading with Nina to leave Dain. Almayer's insistence on helping them escape is due to the humiliation of facing the islanders with the knowledge that his daughter has married a 'native'. A day after their escape, Almayer burns down Lingard's trading company as a way to forget his misfortune and past. He retires to 'Almayer's folly' and is discovered by a visiting European friend, Captain Ford, in a deteriorating condition six months later. All his belongings have been stolen; he has locked himself in a dark room and is now an opium addict. His only companions are his Malay manservant, Ali, and a Chinese opium addict, Jim-Eng. As Almayer lies dying, he receives news that Nina has given birth to a son in Bali who is now the heir to the throne. His trading rival, the Arab Syed Abdulla, is the one who gives him his final rites.

## APPENDIX 7: *An outcast of the islands* (1896)

The middle of Conrad's Malay trilogy, this novel is set around 1872 and is about fifteen years before the setting of *Almayer's folly*. Peter Willems, the 'outcast' of the title, has been taken up as Lingard's protégé when he was just a young sailor who had jumped ship in Semarang. Through hard work, Willems eventually becomes a confidential clerk with Hudig & Co. in Macassar. The novel begins with Willems' 30<sup>th</sup> birthday celebration and it soon transpires that he has been stealing money from Hudig, his employer, to pay off his gambling debts. Willems, who is ashamed of his marriage to a 'half-caste', Joanna, and has a baby son, Louis, is fired by Hudig two days later when his impropriety is discovered although he has repaid almost all the money he had stolen. In misery over his misfortune, Willems goes to the harbour where he is soon found by Lingard. Lingard discloses that Joanna is actually Hudig's illegitimate daughter and offers Willems a fresh new start: to take him along the secret river path to Sambir to join Almayer. In Sambir, three months later, Willems falls under the charms of the exquisite Aïssa, daughter of a former leader of the Brunei rovers, the now decrepit and blind Omar el Badavi of Arab ancestry. Willems is also courted by Babalatchi, a one-eyed Malay explorer and politician who plans to exploit Willems by bringing in the Arab traders in order to destroy Lingard's control over trading in Sambir. Five weeks later, Willems, hysterical over the sudden disappearance of Aïssa two days earlier, is seen asking for assistance from Almayer to set up a second trading post in Sambir. Almayer turns him down and informs him that Aïssa and Omar have been staying at Lakamba's *kampong* down the river. Willems threatens to betray Lingard to the Arabs, to inform them of Lingard's secret river passage, over Almayer's refusal to assist him. Willems then goes to Lakamba's *kampong* where he meets the Arab trader, Syed Abdulla, and informs him of the secret route. Omar, who detests Willems, tries to kill him with a *kris* but his attempt is foiled by Aïssa. Omar then puts a curse on Aïssa and, as a result, she refuses to follow Willems and remains behind in Lakamba's *kampong*. Lingard returns to Sambir six weeks later and is told of the disastrous affairs. Almayer informs Lingard that Willems himself navigated Abdulla's barque into Sambir and demanded supplies from Almayer. Almayer refused and, expecting assistance from Rajah Patalolo from across the river, Almayer realised belatedly that Patalolo did not want to get involved as he only wishes to go to Mecca before he dies. When Willems managed to invade and disarm Patalolo's defence the following morning, Almayer flew the Union Jack as a form of protection. Willems and Lakamba retaliated by hoisting a makeshift Dutch flag at the other end of the settlement and insisted that everyone pay homage by way of *salaam*. However, Willems' Chinese neighbour, Jim-Eng, refused and ran away from a mob led by Willems to seek protection from Almayer. When Jim-Eng grabbed Almayer's revolver and accidentally fired into the crowd, they were both caught and Almayer was sewn into a hammock by Willems' order, where he was taunted by Aïssa. All of Almayer's stock of gunpowder was instructed by Willems to be dumped into the river much to the shock of Babalatchi. That was the last Almayer saw of Willems. Lingard then discloses to Almayer that he has brought Joanna and Louis to Sambir with the hope of reuniting the family in order for them to start afresh in Palembang. Nevertheless, Almayer is not happy with Lingard's plan. When Lingard goes looking for Willems at Lakamba's *kampong*, he meets Babalatchi instead. Babalatchi invites Lingard to his hut and insinuates that Lingard should kill Willems from a window. Lingard refuses and continues with his search for Willems

---

and encounters Aïssa instead. Aïssa begs Lingard to spare Willems' life which Lingard promises to do. When Willems finally appears, he tries to shift the blame to Aïssa. Disgusted with Willems' cowardice, Lingard strikes and bloodies Willems' nose and denounces him to stay in Sambir forever with Aïssa, much to Willems' revulsion and rage. Almayer, anxious of Willems' continued existence on the settlement, decides to take matters into his own hands a few days later. He plots Willems' escape by bringing Joanna to Lakamba's *kampong*. Almayer sends a whale-boat to warn Lingard of his plans and becomes stuck in a narrow channel when he pilots his own boat. As Joanna arrives to join Willems to escape, Aïssa stumbles upon their reunion and is stunned to discover that Willems is married to a 'Sirani' woman and has a baby son. She threatens to kill Joanna and, when Willems struggles to reach for the revolver, Aïssa accidentally shoots and kills him instead. In the epilogue, a drunken Almayer recounts their saga to a travelling Romanian orchid-hunter many years later and informs him that Aïssa has been made subdued by Nina and is now part of his household servants.

## APPENDIX 8: *The rescue* (1920)

In terms of chronology, this novel is the first of Conrad's Malay trilogy although it is the last to be published. The setting is about 1860 and tells of Lingard's early years as the *Rajah Laut*. The novel begins with Lingard's brig, *Lightning*, marooned at sunset on Carimata, near the western coast of Borneo. In the dark, a row-boat draws near the *Lightning*, and Mr Carter, her commander, informs Lingard that a private schooner-yacht, *Hermit*, has been stuck on a mud flat for four days. Although Lingard agrees to help the stranded travellers, his reaction to the news surprises Carter. A flashback tells how Lingard has been gathering a coalition of 'native' forces for two years in order to embark on an armed expedition with the aim of restoring his Malay friend, Pata Hassim, and his sister, Mas Immada, the exiled prince and princess of the Wajo kingdom. The expedition is supposed to be launched from Belarab's secret colony on the 'Shore of Refuge', the spot where the travellers are stranded. Weapons have been purchased in Singapore by Lingard and have been stored in a dilapidated ship, *Emma*, under the guard of Lingard's Norwegian friend, the old Captain Jörgenson. When he arrives at the *Hermit*, Lingard is treated with derision by Mr Travers who accuses him of being a buccaneer who is only interested in ransom or salvage. While Mr Travers and a Spanish passenger, Mr d'Alcacer, are strolling along the river sandbank later that evening, Lingard takes the opportunity to explain his predicament to Mrs Travers. He pleads with her to persuade her group to go into the safety of his brig. However, in the middle of their long conversation, Mr Travers and Mr d'Alcacer are kidnapped by the Illanuns, who are headed by Daman; the pirates plan to loot the yacht. As a result, Lingard evacuates the *Hermit* into the *Lightning*. The following day, Lingard together with Mrs Travers set off to meet Belarab and negotiate the prisoners' release under his custody into the *Emma*. Unbeknownst to Lingard, Carter, who is in the dark of Lingard's quandary and is left in command, redrifts the *Lightning* and destroys the Illanuns' praus. This unseen incident means that Lingard has broken his promise and has to return the prisoners to Belarab. In the middle of all these, Hassim and Immada travel to negotiate with Belarab. Returning home, they are caught by Tengga, Belarab's enemy, and Hassim sends his loyal servant and follower, Jaffir, with an emerald ring to warn him of the impending trouble. When Jaffir reaches the *Emma*, Lingard is in the middle of negotiation with Belarab. As a result, the ring is given to Jörgenson instead. Jörgenson entrusts the ring to Mrs Travers and, not knowing the significance of the ring, she does not deliver the ring to Lingard when she sees him at Belarab's settlement as she does not trust Jörgenson. Due to Lingard's delay in making a decision, Jörgenson decides to take matters into his hands when he is approached by Tengga's representative requesting a meeting. Jörgenson demands that the meeting be held onboard the *Emma* and, as soon as everyone is aboard, proceeds to blow up the ship with his lighted cigar when he leaps into the hold of the ship. Lingard succeeds in his negotiation with Belarab and returns with the hostages. A wounded and dying Jaffir survives the explosion and finally delivers Hassim's last message to Lingard. Lingard becomes dejected for not honouring his promise to Hassim and bids a resentful farewell to Mrs Travers at Jaffir's grave near the bank. In turn, Mrs Travers throws the ring into the sea.

### APPENDIX 9: “The force of circumstance” (1926)

In *The force of circumstance*, Guy is a Borneon-born administrative officer stationed in a remote village in Sarawak who marries Doris on home leave after a whirlwind romance. Their marriage starts off blissfully until a spate of appearances of a nameless ‘native’ woman around their house together with three young children. Pestering both Guy and Doris whenever and wherever possible, Doris grows suspicious and confronts a tense Guy. The revelation is beyond shattering; the stalker is indeed Guy’s mistress and the children his own. Guy has been involved with the ‘native’ woman in a pre-marital relationship for ten years until the arrival of Doris. After giving six months to reconcile herself to the fact that Guy has had another ‘native’ family, Doris decides to leave him.

### APPENDIX 10: “The outstation” (1926)

*The outstation* revolves around the story of two British officials, the Resident, Mr. Warburton, and his assistant, Mr. Alan Cooper. The former is a snobbish British gentleman who likes to dress up for his meals while the latter is more laissez-faire. Their clash in social backgrounds soon develops into differences of opinions and a spar as both men rule the colony according to their own principles. Though a snob, Warburton understands and appreciates the temperaments of the ‘natives’ while Cooper seems to have little regards for their feelings. The climax of their quarrel reaches when Cooper dismisses his servant, a Malay boy named Abas. To Warburton, the repercussion Cooper receives in the end is just and deserving. He dies at the hands of a ‘native’.

### APPENDIX 11: “The yellow streak” (1926)

*The yellow streak* tells the story of two men, a planter called Campion, and a mining engineer, Izzart, who are caught in a vicious Bore when they are on a journey together up-country in Sarawak. During the life-and-death situation, Izzart is terribly terrified to the point of ignoring Campion’s pleas for help. Clutching on a floating oar, Izzart saves only his own life and swims to the safety of the shore. He imagines that Campion has drowned but becomes shocked to discover Campion alive and coming on the shore much later. Now that Campion is found to be alive, Izzart becomes paranoid that his cowardice, which he believes could be disclosed as a result of his mixed ethnic background, will be exposed by Campion. Meanwhile, Campion is blissfully unaware of Izzart’s inner turmoil; it is only when Izzart finally breaks down and reveals the reasons behind his extraordinary behaviour after the incident that he realises what Izzart has done.

---

**APPENDIX 12: *Time for a tiger* (1956)**

*Time for a tiger* revolves around Victor Crabbe who is sent to the district of Kuala Hantu in the state of Lanchap as part of the British Education Service. He is a history teacher and a resident master at the elite Mansor School for all ethnic groups in Malaya – Malay, Chinese and Indian. He is accompanied by his beautiful yet long-suffering second wife, Fenella Crabbe, who lives in the shadow of Crabbe's much-beloved yet dead first wife. Remaining guilt-ridden by the drowning of his wife in a car he had driven back in England during a dreadfully cold and icy January winter, Crabbe embarks on an affair with a Malay hostess, Rahimah, a divorcee with a young son, who works in a cabaret nightclub. Meanwhile, a male Malay servant, Ibrahim, who is a closet homosexual transvestite, tends to the Crabbe household and in turn lusts after Crabbe. The Crabbes' days in Kuala Hantu are enlivened by the presence of an alcoholic police lieutenant, Nabby Adams, and Alladad Khan, his junior sergeant, a Muslim of Punjabi origin who lusts after Fenella as the Crabbes shun and avoid the company of the rest of the British, colonial society. Nabby Adams acts as a middleman for Crabbe in purchasing a car for the couple in spite of the fact that Crabbe cannot drive. In an outing to an outskirts town, Gila (Mad), a drunken Nabby Adams, accompanied by Alladad Khan, drives Crabbe and Fenella in their new car into a jungle where they are then ambushed by Chinese communists whose existence also threatens the compounds of the Mansor School. Alladad Khan is shot and wounded while Crabbe returns late for the school's Speech Day attended by the ruler of the state, Sultan Iblis (Sultan Devil), and the state government officials. As Crabbe ends his affair with Rahimah, she seeks vengeance by enlisting Ibrahim's help to put a love-potion in Crabbe's drink with hopes that he would reconcile with her. At the same time, Crabbe clashes with the Headmaster, Boothby, over the liaison with Rahimah and the latter's antediluvian form of administration. Boothby, on the other hand, accuses Crabbe of inciting students to rebel against him and supporting Communism. Unbeknownst to Crabbe, his own Chinese student is secretly recruiting students to become members of the Communist Party and it is he who has spread the rumour of Crabbe's involvement with the Communists. As a result, Crabbe is transferred to another school. The narrative ends with a celebration of Christmas.

**APPENDIX 13: *The enemy in the blanket* (1958)**

In *The enemy in the blanket*, Crabbe is now transferred to Kenching (Urinat), an Islamic town in the state of Dahaga by the China Sea. He is appointed Headmaster of an English medium school, Haji Ali College, but his position is undermined by Fenella's discovery of his affair with Rahimah through an anonymous letter. Undaunted by Fenella's knowledge, Crabbe embarks on another affair, this time with a fellow Anglo, Anne Talbot, the wife of the State Education Officer, Mr. Talbot. While in Kenching, Crabbe meets his old friend during his university days, an albino-skinned, penniless lawyer, Rupert Hardman. Hardman, who is desperately in need of financial assistance, marries a wealthy, twice-widowed, Muslim, 'Che Normah, at the expense of his Catholicism as he has to convert to Islam and practise the Islamic tenets and way of life. Meanwhile, Fenella once again discovers Crabbe's infidelities and she finally decides to abandon him. Fenella then becomes involved with an old feudal ruler of the territory, the Abang, and departs from Malaya with him for Europe. Amidst the uproar, Crabbe emerges a hero when he managed to 'capture' a group of Communists from a nearby jungle led by Crabbe's former cook, Ah Wing, who persuades his own son-in-law to surrender to the Government. Impressed by Crabbe's negotiation with the Government over the capitulation of the Communists, Mr. Talbot offers him a promotion as State Education Officer. The novel closes with an episode of Hardman embarking on a holy pilgrimage to Mecca on a ship with a pregnant 'Che Normah. Distressed over the state of his matrimony to her, especially the Islamic culture he has married into, Hardman attempts a futile escapade by aeroplane - futile as the plane he pilots crashes.

**APPENDIX 14: *Beds in the east* (1959)**

In *Beds in the east*, Crabbe, now divorced from Fenella, is acting State Chief Education Officer and has moved to a different place. He takes a young, musically-gifted, Chinese boy, Robert Loo, under his wings and sponsors the boy's musical training with the help of the State Information Officer, Nik Hassan. In the meantime, Crabbe befriends a group of Jaffna Tamils, Maniam, Sundralingam, Arumugam and Vythilingam, as well as a Tamil schoolteacher, the Anglophile, Rosemary Michaels. The Jaffna Tamils are adversaries of a Malay, Syed Omar, an officer with the State Police Department, who suspects that Maniam is about to replace him with Maniam's own relative. At the same time, Syed Omar's eldest son, Syed Hassan, gets involved in hooliganism and seeks revenge for his father's loss of job by breaking into Maniam's house. Rosemary is the town's high-profile and sensational girl who is pursued by Emir Jalil, a lusty Muslim Turk; Vythilingam, a Jaffna Tamil State Veterinary Officer; and Robert Loo, Crabbe's composer protégé. Crabbe receives a message that the Headmaster of the Durian Estate School, a school deep in the jungle, has been murdered. He is asked to visit and investigate the crime. During his journey, he comes across a poem by his ex-wife, Fenella, in a British newspaper. When he arrives in the town of Mawas (Monkey), Crabbe meets an American linguist, Temple Haynes, who has met Fenella Crabbe, the poet, in London. They then embark on a journey to a local village to watch the *wayang kulit*. Unfortunately, Crabbe is bitten by a scorpion after the show. Upon his arrival with a cane at the Durian Estate, a large upriver plantation in the middle of nowhere, Crabbe meets the new manager, George Costard, a traditionalist and conservative British colonial of the type that Crabbe totally detests. In the middle of their conversation, Crabbe discovers that Costard had been his late first wife's secret lover and that they had planned to elope within the week after her death. Crabbe is shocked by the revelation and realises that his idealism and idolisation of his late wife have been in vain. Traumatized and in a hysterical state of mind with the only objective of leaving the estate, Crabbe tries to board the launch, slips and falls into the river; never to be seen again.

## APPENDIX 15

### Final section of Maugham's "The yellow streak"

He entered the rest-house and there, sitting on a long chair, with his legs stretched out, was Champion. He was reading the papers which had arrived during their absence in the jungle. Izzart felt a blind rush of hatred well up in him as he looked at the little, shabby man who held him in the hollow of his hand.

"Hulloa," said Champion, looking up. "Where have you been?"

To Izzart, it seemed that there was in his eyes a mocking irony. He clenched his hands, and his breath came fast.

"What have you been saying to Willis about me?" he asked abruptly.

The tone in which he put the unexpected question was so harsh that Champion gave him a glance of faint surprise.

"I don't think I've been saying anything very much about you. Why?"

Izzart looked at him intently. His brows were drawn together in an angry frown as he tried to read Champion's thoughts.

"I told him you'd gone to bed with a headache. He wanted to know about our mishap."

"I've just seen him."

Izzart walked up and down the large and shaded room; now, he thought it was still early, the sun was hot and dazzling. He felt himself in a net. He was blind with rage; he could have seized Champion by the throat and strangled him, and yet, because he did not know what he had to fight against, he felt himself powerless. He was tired and ill, and his nerves were shaken. On a sudden the anger which had given him a sort of strength left him, and he was filled with despondency. It was as though water and not blood ran through his veins; his heart sank and his knees seemed to give way. He felt that if he did not take care, he would begin to cry. He was dreadfully sorry for himself.

"Damn you, I wish to God I'd never set eyes on you," he cried pitifully.

"What's on earth's the matter?" asked Champion, with astonishment.

"Oh, don't pretend. We've been pretending for two days, and I'm fed up with it." His voice rose shrilly, it sounded odd in that robust and powerful man. "I'm fed up with it. I cut and run. I left you to drown. I know I behaved like a skunk. I couldn't help it."

Champion rose slowly from his chair.

"What *are* you talking about?"

His tone was so genuinely surprised that it gave Izzart a start. A cold shiver ran down his spine.

"When you called for help I was panic-stricken. I just caught hold of an oar and got Hassan to help me get away."

"That was the most sensible thing you could do."

"I couldn't help you. There wasn't a thing I could do."

"Of course not. It was damned silly of me to shout. It was waste of breath, and breath was the very thing I wanted."

"Do you mean to say you didn't know?"

"When those fellows got me the mattress, I thought you were still clinging to the boat. I had an idea that I got away before you did."

Izzart put both his hands to his head, and gave a hoarse cry of despair.

“My God, what a fool I’ve been.”

The two men stood for a while staring at one another. The silence seemed endless.

“What are you going to do now?” asked Izzart at last.

“Oh, my dear fellow, don’t worry. I’ve been frightened too often myself to blame anyone who shows the white feather. I’m not going to tell a soul.”

“Yes, but you *know*.”

“I promise you, you can trust me. Besides, my job’s done here and I’m going home. I want to catch the next boat to Singapore.” There was a pause, and Campion looked for a while reflectively at Izzart. “There’s only one thing I’d like to ask you: I’ve made a good many friends here, and there are one or two things I’m a little sensitive about; when you tell the story of our upset, I should be grateful if you wouldn’t make out that I had behaved badly. I wouldn’t like the fellows here to think that I’d lost my nerve.”

Izzart flushed darkly. He remembered what he had said to the Resident. It almost looked as though Campion had been listening over his shoulder. He cleared his throat.

“I don’t know why you think I should do that.”

Campion chuckled good-naturedly, and his blue eyes were gay with amusement.

“The yellow streak,” he replied, and then, with a grin that showed his broken and discoloured teeth: “Have a cheroot, dear boy.” (Maugham, 1976b: 48-49)

## APPENDIX 16

### “Melayu Johor” by Usman Awang (1999b: 226-228)

Melayu Johor,  
 Telah terlalu banyak kita kehilangan  
 Sawah ladang bertukar tangan  
 Pekan dan bandar kita menumpang  
 Teluk Belanga entah ke mana  
 Yang tinggal hanyalah pakaian  
 Sedarah sedaging hampir hilang  
 Yang ada hanyalah setulang  
 Selat Teberau kian sempit  
 Hati rindu jauh tergamit.

Di Johor  
 Jawa itu Melayu  
 Bugis itu Melayu  
 Banjar itu Melayu  
 Minangkabau itu Melayu  
 Aceh dan Siak adalah Melayu  
 Jakun dan Sakai lebih Melayu  
 Arab dan Turki pekat Melayu  
 Mamak dan Malbari jadi Melayu  
 Malah mualaf bertakrif Melayu.

Melayu itu maknanya bijaksana  
 “Jika menipu pun bersopan”  
 kurang ajarnya tetap santun  
 Dajalnya cukup selamba  
 Budi bahasa jangan dikira  
 Beraninya cukup benar  
 Tunduk bila bersalah  
 “Lembutnya cukup jantan”  
 Setia sampai ke kubur  
 Biar mati adat jangan mati sahabat.

Anak Johor  
 Luka di Tanjung Putri  
 Parutnya di Parit Raja  
 Muka biar berseri  
 Mulut biar berbahasa.

Berkelahilah cara Melayu  
 Menikam dengan pantun  
 Menyanggah dalam senyum  
 Marahnya dalam tertawa  
 Merendah bukan menyembah  
 Meninggi bukan melonjak.

---

Watak Melayu menolak permusuhan  
Jiwa Melayu mengangkat persahabatan  
Kasih sayang kekeluargaan  
Ringan tulang saling bertolongan  
Jujur memaafkan, ikhlas memberikan.

Berdamailah cara Melayu  
Silaturahmi yang murni  
Di mulut sama di hati,  
Maaf senantiasa bersahut  
Tangan dihulur bersambut  
Luka pun tidak lagi berparut.  
Melayu Johor saudaraku yang dikasihi,  
dalam kekeruhan ini carilah perdamaian  
Sifat terpuji setiap insan  
Bermuafakat supaya berkat  
Bersaudara dunia akhirat,  
Berikhtiar dengan tabah  
Kepada Allah berserah.

## APPENDIXES 17 TO 19

### Synopses of selected modern Malay literary works

#### APPENDIX 17: *Putera Gunung Tahan* (1937)

*Putera Gunung Tahan* revolves around two main characters, Tuan William and Tuan Robert, who are English officers with the colonial administration. They have embarked on an expedition to climb Mount Tahan during the monsoon season with an outward objective to study the botanical elements of the forest. In reality, they are actually on a secret mission to find a perfect spot to erect a British station. They are guided by a Malay man, Ali, and served by another named Awang. Robert later leaves William, after they are both trapped in a cave due to heavy flooding for seven days, with the intention of taking pictures of the waterfall and in search of more adventure. It transpires soon after that Robert has been captured by a group of Sakai, an aboriginal group living in the forests of Pahang. Robert meets an unnamed old Malay woman living among the Sakai and he is appointed *Datuk Batin Putih* by them. As he ridicules the Sakai and their beliefs, the old woman casts a magical love-spell over Robert. As a result, he falls in love with a Sakai woman and pursues her with the intention of marriage. After one month, he finally marries her but, when he tries to climb a tree to reach out to her during one of the Sakai wedding customs, he falls to his death. William, on the other hand, leaves the cave in search of Robert. However, he is met by a man, Kusina, from the supernatural world living in the forests, the *Bunian*. Kusina has been instructed by his ruler, Ratu Bongsu, the reigning King of Mount Tahan, to join his colony. Through Ratu Bongsu's equipment, such as a *Teropong Terus* (telescope) and *Beringin Bercakap* (magical talking tree), William discovers that his wife, Mem William, has been having an affair in England. Distressed, he writes to her to request that she joins him in Mount Tahan. Unbeknownst to Ratu Bongsu, William has included, in his letter to his wife, maps and instructions to Ratu Bongsu's settlement with the order to attack and destroy the place. Three months later, two aeroplanes fly over the colony, dropping bombs and poisonous gas. William is locked in a room in the palace while the rest of the community seeks shelter elsewhere. He dies due to his own foolishness after thinking that Ratu Bongsu is unaware of his deception. The only survivor turns out to be Mem William. After three months in a coma and three years living in Mount Tahan, Mem William agrees to Ratu Bongsu's proposal of marriage.

## APPENDIX 18: *Anak Mat Lela Gila* (1941)

*Anak Mat Lela Gila* begins with the story of Mat Lela who is perceived by his *kampong* community as a mad character. He finds an abandoned male baby near his windowless and doorless hut. He adopts the baby and names him Bulat. However, Bulat is soon kidnapped by a childless couple, Johari and Siti Permai, who make their living as farmers. After seven years, Permai becomes pregnant although Johari mistakenly believes that her pregnancy is a result of an affair. His suspicion is due to his feelings that he has been made sterile because of his previous womanising days. Johari then brings Bulat along to Kelantan to seek solace by engaging in Islamic studies in order to enhance his Islamic faith. Whilst there, he becomes infatuated with a divorcee, Johariah, and weds her as his second wife. Johariah forces Johari to divorce Permai and throws Bulat out of the house. Bulat is then left wandering and soon meets a modern, young couple who employs him as their servant on their holiday in Cameron Highlands. After two weeks, the couple leaves him behind, unpaid and penniless, as they have run out of funds due to their reckless spending. Once again Bulat is abandoned and he then wanders into the forest. In his sleep, he dreams of a fairy, *tuan puteri*, who instructs him to look for his biological parents who are now known as Alang Sukarti and Elis Sakti. The fairy also instructs him to seek a Sakai called Mandur Alang, who is a descendant of a pagan, proto-Malay headman named Batin Sukun. Bulat is also asked by the fairy to learn about the facts of life from Alang. Meanwhile, a pious Malay man, Tuan Haji Osman, has found a pumpkin containing information regarding Bulat's real parents in a letter. The letter was written by Bulat's mother, Siti Kalsom, about his father, Ja'afar Sidek. Tuan Haji Osman manages to track down Permai, who is now a wealthy single mother to Siti Khadijah, and tries to woo her. However, he dies due to tuberculosis before he could win Permai's hand in marriage. After three years of studying under Alang, Bulat leaves the forest and becomes a travelling medicine salesman and then a singer. He travels to Singapore and is then employed by an owner of a Malay theatre, Babji. Bulat also makes an effort to track down his real mother who is now a renowned singer named Elis Sakti. He soon meets his foster parents, Johari and Permai, who are now reconciled, together with their fifteen-year-old daughter, Siti Khadijah. Siti Khadijah and Bulat, at the same time, have fallen in love with each other. It transpires that Johari and his family are on their way to perform the *Haj* in Mecca. Through them, Bulat is reunited with his father, Alang Sukarti. This reunion occurs soon after Bulat has met his real mother after attending her show. As such, the whole family is finally reunited. Elis then takes the opportunity to explain to Bulat her circumstances leading to Bulat's abandonment. This is due to Alang Sukarti who has had to flee to Sumatra after accidentally taking the life of the rich, old fiancé of Elis. This is a result of them falling in love with each other and marrying secretly. As a celebration of their reunion, Elis suggests that they travel to Mecca much to Bulat's merriment as she has noticed the attraction between Bulat and Siti Khadijah for each other. Their travel to Mecca is also meant to fulfil their obligations as a Muslim according to one of the five Tenets of Islam, which is to perform the *Haj* pilgrimage in Mecca.

**APPENDIX 19: *Ranjau sepanjang jalan* (1966)**

The novel opens with the protagonist, Lahuma, a Malay peasant, who is anxious and apprehensive about the impending rice-planting season and shares his worries with his wife, Jeha – mother of seven daughters, Sanah, Milah, Jenab, Semek, Liah, Lebar and Kiah. They own fourteen *relung* of rice-fields and constantly ponder on and brood over the season's prospect. While starting work on the field, Jeha stumbles upon a cobra but is saved by Lahuma from further danger when it is killed with Lahuma's bare hands. The shocking experience leaves Jeha in a constant state of fear and phobia of the cobra. Yet Lahuma continues to work on his rice-field and is assisted by their two eldest daughters, seventeen-year-old Sanah and fifteen-year-old Milah, until Jeha is mentally and physically capable of resuming her work in the field. Disaster strikes when Lahuma steps on a spine from a palm frond which secretes itself in Lahuma's foot when he is the middle of clearing his land. The injury worsens and Lahuma dies a painful and slow death due to infection. With her mental capacity still in a fragile state following shock from the encounter with the cobra, Jeha is forced to take over Lahuma's place and to proceed with each phase of the rice cycle, again assisted by Sanah and Milah. The death of Lahuma and the burdens of protecting her crops from numerous disasters serve only to accelerate and heighten Jeha's unstable mind. Under extreme mental, emotional and physical pressures, Jeha's psyche deteriorates to craziness and she is taken to an institution for the mentally-ill, Tanjung Rambutan near Perak by the Tok Penghulu. Sanah, her eldest daughter, takes over in managing the season's toil and faces more adversity in the form of a pestilence and attacks from thousands of ferocious birds, *tiak*. Weeks pass and Jeha returns, still uncured. The crops are not profitable and Sanah closes the story with the dire and ominous realisation that she is now responsible for the daily and eternal struggle involving the toil and labour of the rice cycle, the fates of her six younger sisters as well as looking after a crazy mother, caged and screaming throughout the night for her dead husband and her rice-crops.

## APPENDIX 20

### “Melayu” by Usman Awang (1999a: 229-231)

Melayu itu orangnya bijaksana  
 Nakalnya bersulam jenaka  
 Budi bahasanya tidak terkira  
 Kurang ajarnya tetap santun  
 Jika menipu pun masih bersopan  
 Bila mengampu bijak beralas tangan.

Melayu itu berani jika bersalah  
 Kecut takut kerana benar,  
 Janji simpan di perut  
 Selalu pecah di mulut,  
 Biar mati adat  
 Jangan mati anak.

Melayu di Tanah Semenanjung luas maknanya:  
 Jawa itu Melayu, Bugis itu Melayu  
 Banjar juga disebut Melayu, Minangkabau memang  
 Melayu,  
 Keturunan Acheh adalah Melayu,  
 Jakun dan Sakai asli Melayu  
 Arab dan Pakistani, semua Melayu  
 Mamak dan Malbari serap ke Melayu  
 Malah muafak bertakrif Melayu  
 (Setelah disunat anunya itu).

Dalam sejarahnya  
 Melayu itu pengembara lautan  
 Melorongkan jalur sejarah zaman  
 Begitu luas daerah sempadan  
 Sayangnya kini segala kehilangan.

Melayu itu kaya falsafahnya  
 Kias kata bidal pusaka  
 Akar budi bersulamkan daya  
 Gedung akal laut bicara.

Malangnya Melayu itu kuat bersorak  
 Terlalu ghairah pesta temasya  
 Sedangkan kampung telah tergadai  
 Sawah sejalur tinggal sejengkal  
 Tanah sebidang mudah terjual.

Meski telah memiliki telaga  
 Tangan masih memegang tali  
 Sedang orang mencapai timba.  
 Berbuahlah pisang tiga kali  
 Melayu itu masih bermimpi  
 Walaupun sudah mengenal universiti  
 Masih berdagang di rumah sendiri.

Berkelahi cara Melayu  
 Menikam dengan pantun  
 Menyanggah dengan senyum,  
 Marahnya dengan diam  
 Merendah bukan menyembah  
 Meninggi bukan melonjak.

Watak Melayu menolak permusuhan  
 Setia dan sabar tiada sempadan  
 Tapi jika marah tak nampak telinga  
 Musuh di cari ke lubang cacing,  
 Tak dapat tanduk telinga dijinjing,  
 Maruah dan agama dihina jangan  
 Hebat amuknya tak kenal lawan.

Berdamai cara Melayu indah sekali  
 Silaturahim hati yang murni  
 Maaf diungkap senantiasa bersahut  
 Tangan dihulur sentiasa bersambut  
 Luka pun tidak lagi berparut.

Baiknya hati Melayu itu tak terbandingkan  
 Selagi yang ada sanggup diberikan  
 Sehingga tercipta sebuah kiasan:  
 “Dagang lalu nasi ditanakkan  
 Suami pulang lapar tak makan  
 Kera di hutan disusu-susukan  
 Anak di pangkuan mati kebuluran.”

Bagaimanakah Melayu abad dua puluh satu,  
 Masihkah tunduk tersipu-sipu?  
 Jangan takut melanggar pantang  
 Jika pantang menghalang kemajuan;  
 Jangan segan menentang larangan  
 Jika yakin kepada kebenaran;  
 Jangan malu mengucapkan keyakinan  
 Jika percaya kepada keadilan.  
 Jadilah bangsa yang bijaksana  
 Memegang tali memegang timba  
 Memiliki ekonomi mencipta budaya  
 Menjadi tuan di negara Merdeka.

## My own English translation of the poem "Melayu"

To be Malay means to be wise  
 His humour is woven with jest  
 His mannerism is bountiful  
 His haughtiness is still proper  
 Even when lying, it would still be done with proper.

Brave if guilty  
 Scared stiff because of truth,  
 Promise to keep the secrets in the stomach,  
 Always broken through the mouth,  
 Let the *adat* die  
 Do not let the child die.

Malay on the Malay Peninsula has a broad meaning:  
 The Jawa is Malay, the Bugis is Malay  
 Banjar is also mentioned as Malay, Minangkabau is definitely Malay,  
 Descendants of the Aceh are Malay,  
 Jakun and Sakai are the original Malay  
 Arab and Pakistani, all Malay  
 Mamak and Malbari are absorbed into Malay  
 Even the mua`laf is defined as Malay  
 (After his thing has been circumcised).

In his history  
 The Malay was a traveller of the sea  
 Creating waves in the annals of history  
 So vast was the district boundary  
 Alas all is now lost.

The Malay is rich with philosophy  
 Proverbs and analogies make up their heritage  
 The root of their mannerism is interspersed with effort.

Unfortunately the Malay is a victim of too much applause  
 Too zealous in celebrating  
 Whereas the village has been mortgaged  
 The rice-field is now only a span  
 A plot of land is easily sold.

Although have already owned the well  
 The hand is still holding the rope  
 When other people have reached for the dipper.  
 The banana then fruits thrice  
 The Malay is still dreaming  
 Though have known the university  
 Still engaged in trade at home.

Fighting the Malay way  
 Is thrusting with the *pantun*  
 Avoiding with smile,  
 His anger is with silence  
 To be humble is not to worship

To be proud is not to be arrogant.

The Malay nature detests enmity  
 But if angered even the ear is not spared  
 The enemy is hunted down even to the hole of a worm.  
 Not contend with the horn the ear is carried,  
 Honour and religion must not be censured  
 The strength of his amok knows no enemy.

To be offered the peace offering the Malay way is beautiful indeed  
 The friendship is based on an honest heart  
 Apology proffered is always accepted,  
 The hand extended is eagerly received  
 The hurt is no longer left with scars.

The kindness of the Malay is without comparison  
 All that he owns will be given  
 Until a proverb is then created:  
     “A passing stranger is fed rice  
     The husband comes home hungry  
     The monkey in the forest is given milk  
     The child in the lap dies starving.”

How will the Malay of the twenty first century fare,  
 Still bowed down in reticence?  
 Do not be afraid of breaching taboos  
 If the taboos obstructed you from progress  
 Do not be afraid to rise against prohibition  
 If you were confident of the truth;  
 Do not be ashamed to state self-confidence  
 If you believed in justice.  
 Do become an intelligent race  
 Holding the rope holding the dipper  
 Owning the economy creating culture  
 Becoming the Master in an independent country.

## APPENDIX 21

Episodes from *Sulalatus salatin (Sejarah Melayu)* based on the 1979 edition by A. Samad Ahmad which correspond to the episodes composed by Muhammad Haji Salleh (1981b) in *Sajak-sajak Sejarah Melayu* and my own English translations of the episodes

### Story I, vignette 1, paragraph 1 Sub-title *Menjunjung titah Raja:*

Wa ba'adahu adapun kemudian dari itu telah berkata fakir yang insaf akan lemah keadaan dirinya, dan singkat pengetahuan ilmunya; dan pada suatu masa bahawa fakir duduk pada suatu majlis dengan Orang Besar-besar bersenda gurau. Pada antara itu ada seorang Orang Besar, terlebih mulianya dan terlebih besar mertabatnya daripada yang lain. Maka berkata ia kepada fakir: "Hamba dengar ada Hikayat Melayu dibawa orang dari Goa; barang kita perbaiki kiranya dengan istiadatnya, supaya diketahui oleh segala anak cucu kita yang kemudian daripada kita, dan boleh diingati oleh segala fakir itu. Dan adalah beroleh faedah ia daripadanya." (A. Samad Ahmad, 1979: 2)

### *Mukadimah* based on Story I, vignette 1, paragraph 1: *Menjunjung titah Raja* as composed by Muhammad Haji Salleh:

Hamba dengar ada hikayat  
Melayu dibawa orang dari Goa;  
barang kita perbaiki kiranya  
dengan istiadatnya supaya  
diketahui oleh segala anak cucu  
kita yang kemudian daripada  
kita, dan boleh diingatkannya  
oleh segala mereka itu, syahdan  
adalah beroleh faedah ia  
daripadanya. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: vii)

#### Stanza 1:

Mamak bendahara tun mamat  
perbuatlah tuan hamba sejarah kita,  
sejarah melayu dan seluruh pulau-pulaunya,  
bawalah kita kembali ke siguntang yang  
tinggi,  
ke samudera di seberang,  
jawa di tenggara, bugis di perahu laut,  
kepada rakyat di sawah, hutan dan  
pasir. (Muhammad 1981: vii)

## Stanza 2:

tuan hamba ialah pujangga,  
 tugasnya berat, semuanya mesti dijaga,  
 bahasa dan urutan peristiwa,  
 kebesaran negeri dan hati kecil manusia,  
 tapi yang amat agung,  
 perkatakanlah yang benar,  
 kerana kebenaran itu isi sejarah,  
 pembetul raja dan pengingat orang lupa,  
 petunjuk yang lurus  
 dan tiada patah di bawah pukulan. (Muhammad 1981: viii)

## Stanza 7:

perkatakanlah keadilan  
 raja, putera atau menteri,  
 tunjukkan dengan bukti  
 bagaimana kebesaran dan daulat  
 tumbuh dari air saksama,  
 dan air yang dicurah racun fitnah,  
 dikeruhkan oleh bayang-bayang  
 raja atau menteri-menteri  
 yang bercermin diri,  
 akan membunuh sekaliannya,  
 mereputkan lantai istana,  
 mematahkan tiang singgahsana  
 dan mengalir ke perigi rakyat  
 di kota atau di kampung jauh. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: viii)

## Stanza 8:

dan mamak bendahara harap jangan lupa  
 akan bayang emas yang selalu bersinar  
 di mata datuk-datuk beta  
 serta orangkaya di balainya.  
 dengan segala upaya tuan hamba  
 lukislah betapa kuasa itu seperti kabus  
 cepat hilang dan menyisih,  
 yang perlu ialah sungai, air yang bertentu,  
 kasih sayang akan rakyat  
 dan tanggungjawab yang mengalir  
 dengan hak rasanya. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: vii)

## Stanza 10:

tulislah,  
 tulislah dengan segala alatan pujangga tuan hamba  
 supaya dari peristiwanya akan timbul kebesaran  
 dari sejarah kita dapat dipelajari kebenaran. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: x)

**English translation:**

I hear there is a  
 Malay story brought from Goa;  
 let us amend it  
 with its appropriate customs so that  
 the children and grandchildren know it  
 of ours who come later than  
 us, and can be reminded  
 by all then, so that  
 they would benefit  
 from it.

## Stanza 1:

Mamak bendahara tun mamat  
 let you sir write our history,  
 the history of *melayu* and all its islands.  
 do take us back to the siguntang which  
 is head and shoulders above,  
 take us to the sea across,  
 jawa in the south-east, bugis by the sea prow,  
 to the people on the rice-fields, in the forests and at  
 the shores.

## Stanza 2:

I am the bard,  
 whose task is onerous, everything must be looked after,  
 the language and the sequence of events,  
 the greatness of the state and the inner hearts of men,  
 but the most noble,  
 do speak the truth,  
 because truth is the essence of history,  
 the corrective of the ruler and the reminder for those who forget,  
 the straight guide  
 and will not break when beaten.

## Stanza 7:

do speak of the justice  
 of rulers, princes or ministers,  
 demonstrate with evidence  
 how greatness and *daulat*  
 spring from the water of just,  
 and how the water which is poisoned by slander,  
 is muddied with the shadows of  
 rulers or the ministers  
 who mirror themselves,  
 will kill everything,  
 rot the floor of the palace,  
 break the pillars of the throne  
 and flow into the well of the people  
 in the towns or far away in the villages.

## Stanza 8:

and *mamak bendahara* better not forget  
the shadow of the gold which always shines  
in the eyes of my nobles  
as well as the titled men in the audience hall.  
and with all your might  
do paint how power is like a mist  
quick to go and evaporate  
what is needed is river, certain water,  
the love for the people  
and responsibility which flows  
with right.

## Stanza 10:

do write,  
do write with all your bard's equipment  
so that from the events will then emerge greatness  
from our history we will be able to learn the truth.

**Story VII, vignette 7, paragraph 2**

**Sub-title *Ditolak bumi Melaka*:**

Sekali persetua, Raja Muhammad pergi bermain-main berkuda ke kampung Bendahara Paduka Raja. Adapun pada masa itu Tun Besar, anak Bendahara, sedang bermain sepak raga di lebu, dengan segala orang muda-muda. Maka Raja Muhammad pun lalu, ketika itu Tun Besar sedang menyepak raga; maka raga itu pun jatuh menimpa destar Raja Muhammad, jatuh ke tanah. Maka kata Raja Muhammad, “Ceh, jatuh destar kita oleh Tun Besar!” Sambil memandang mata penjawatnya. Maka berlari orang yang membawa puan baginda, ditikannya Tun Besar, kena belikat terus ke hulu hati. Maka Tun Besar pun mati. (A. Samad Ahmad, 1979: 142)

***Ceretera yang ke lapan belas based on Story VII, vignette 7, paragraph 2:***

***Ditolak bumi Melaka as composed by Muhammad Haji Salleh:***

Sekali peristiwa Raja Muhammad pergi bermain-main berkuda di kampung Bendahara Paduka Raja. Adapun kepada masa itu Tun Besar anak Bendahara bermain sepak raga di lebu dengan segala orang muda-muda. Maka Raja Muhammad pun lalu; Tun Besar tengah menyepak raga. Maka raga itu pun jatuh menimpai destar Raja Muhammad, jatuh ke tanah. Maka kata Raja Muhammad, “Cih! Jatuh destar kita oleh Tun Besar,” sama ia menendang penjawatnya. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 48)

Stanza 1:

petang itu disimpan oleh kesedihan kampung,  
jelas dititis oleh darah,  
seperti terasa tikaman panas petang pada kulit.  
kelapa longlai oleh hari, tiada angin, tiada bayu;  
kami dihalau oleh panas ke lebu.  
terbiar di pandangan kawan-kawan  
bola lesu mati menanti di kaki,  
udara bermusim gelisah. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 48)

Stanza 7:

tun besar rebah di pasir panas,  
membayar harga raga di kepala anak raja  
dan kemalangan yang datang pada petang remang  
dengan usia dan mata ketiga puluh lima. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 49)

Stanza 8:

kata datuk bendahara  
adat melayu tak pernah menderhaka,  
maka marah kami serahkan  
kepada keadilan tuhan dan raja. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 49)

**English translation:**

Once Raja Muhammad went playing while riding on a horse in the compound of Bendahara Paduka Raja. During that time Tun Besar child of Bendahara played *sepak raga* along the way with all the young ones. Raja Muhammad passed by while Tun Besar kicked the *raga*. And the *raga* hit the headgear of Raja Muhammad, which fell on the ground. Thus said Raja Muhammad, "Cih! My headgear fell down because of Tun Besar," at the same time he kicked his sheath.

## Stanza 1:

that evening was kept by the sadness of the villagers,  
clearly dripped by blood,  
the evening heat felt like a stab on the skin.  
the coconut weakened by the day, no wind, no breeze;  
we are driven by the heat to the road.  
left into the sight of the friends  
the ball limp and dead waiting by the feet,  
the atmosphere seasoned with anxiety.

## Stanza 7:

tun besar lay prone in the hot sand,  
paying the price for a *raga* at the head of the son of the ruler  
and the accident which came during a serene evening  
at the age and eyes of thirty-five.

## Stanza 8:

said datuk bendahara  
*adat melayu* is never to commit *derhaka*;  
thus our anger is welcome  
to the justice of god and ruler.

**Story IX, vignette 2, paragraph 1****Sub-title *Pemerintahan Sultan Mahmud Syah:***

Maka Sultan Alau'd-Din pun terlalu sukacita mendengar sembah segala mereka itu. Maka baginda memandang kepada muka anakanda bagina, Raja Mamad, maka titah baginda, "Hei anakku, adapun engkau hendaklah banyak-banyak sabar, dan ampunmu akan segala hamba sahayamu, dan baik-baik memelihara akan dia; kerana firman Allah Taala Inna'llahu ma'as sabirin, yakni bahawa Allah Taala serta pada segala yang sabar. Dan jikalau datang kepada dua pekerjaan, suatu pekerjaan Allah, dan suatu pekerjaan dunia, maka dahulukan olehmu pekerjaan Allah daripada pekerjaan dunia. Hendaklah engkau sangat-sangat menyerahkan dirimu kepada hadrat Allah Taala yang akan memelihara akan kamu, kerana wa man yatawakkal 'ala'llah. Dan segala anak Melayu bagaimanapun besar dosanya, jangan olehmu diaifi dia, dan sampai kepada hukum syarak derhaka, bunuhlah; kerana segala Melayu itu ketanahanmu, seperti kata Arab Al-'abdi tinu'l-maulahu, yang hamba itu tanah tuhanmu. Jikalau engkau bunuh ia tiada dengan dosanya, bahawa kerajaanmu binasa. Hei anakku, hendaklah engkau turut dan engkau ingatkan wasiatku ini, dan kaukerjakan, supaya berkat diberi Allah subha nahu wa taala." Setelah itu maka Sultan Alau'd-Din pun mangkat; maka ditanamkan oranglah seperti adat. Setelah baginda kembali ke rahmat Allah, kalu inna li'llahi wa inna ilaihi raji'un; maka anakanda baginda Raja Mamadlah kerajaan menggantikan kerajaan ayahanda baginda. Gelar baginda di atas kerajaan Sultan Mahmud Syah.

(A. Samad Ahmad, 1979: 174-175)

***Ceretera yang kedua puluh enam (i) based on Story IX, vignette 2, paragraph 1: Pemerintahan Sultan Mahmud Syah as composed by Muhammad Haji Salleh:***

Dan segala anak Melayu bagaimanapun besar dosanya, jangan kamu bunuh, melainkan dosanya durhaka; kerana segala Melayu itu tanahmu... (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 61)

Stanza 1:

melayu itu tanahmu,  
bangsa dan negerimu  
kau besar dan raja padanya. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 61)

Stanza 2:

laut dan pantai di semenanjung ini,  
pulau-pulau andalas dan riau,  
kedah dan pahang, kelang dan muar  
ialah air dan bumi bangsamu. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 61)

## Stanza 3:

hormatilah orang berilmu,  
orang yang setia pada bangsamu  
betapun tidak setujunya. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 61)

## Stanza 4:

melayu akan besar dengan kebebasan,  
dengan percaya bahawa mereka bebas dan besar.  
di pelabuhan kita seluruh dunia bertemu,  
bahasa kita dipilih, adat kita diteliti. (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 61)

**English translation:**

And all Malays no matter how big their sins,  
you do not kill, except his sin is *derhaka*;  
because all those Malays are your land...

## Stanza 1:

that malay is your land,  
race and your state,  
you are great and king to it.

## Stanza 2:

the sea and the coast on this peninsular,  
the islands of andalas and riau,  
kedah and pahang, kelang and muar  
are the water and land of your race.

## Stanza 3:

do respect the knowledgable,  
those who are loyal to your race  
no matter how little they agree.

## Stanza 4:

the malay will be great with freedom,  
with the belief that they would be free and great.  
at our harbour ports the whole world met,  
our language was chosen, our *adat* was scrutinised.

**Story XII, vignette 6, paragraph 2****Sub-title *Makhdum dipersenda muridnya*:**

Masa Seri Rama datang pada Bendahara Seri Maharaja, dilihatnya Bendahara sedang berkata-kata dengan Makhdum Sadar Jahan. Maka kata Seri Rama, "Mari beta turut mengaji." Maka kata Bendahara, "Marilah Orang Kaya duduk." Maka dilihat oleh Makhdum Sadar Jahan Seri Rama itu mabuk, dan mulutnya pun bau arak. Maka Makhdum Sadar Jahan, "Al-khamru ummu'l-khabaith," ertinya: arak itu ibu segala najis. Maka sahut Seri Rama, "Al-hamku ummi'l-khabaith: yang hamak itu ibu segala najis. Tuan turun dari atas angin ke mari ini, bukankah hendak mencari harta, dari hamaklah itu." (A. Samad Ahmad, 1979: 232)

***Ceretera yang ketiga puluh dua (i) based on Story XII, vignette 6, paragraph 2: Makhdum dipersenda muridnya as composed by Muhammad Haji Salleh:***

Maka dilihat oleh Makhdum Sadar Jahan Seri Rama mabuk itu, dan mulutnya berbau arak. Maka kata Makhdum Sadar Jahan, "Al-khamar ummu 'l-fawa-hish wa akbaru 'l-khaba 'ith (ertinya yang arak itu ibu segala najis). Maka sahut Seri Rama, "Al-hamku ummu 'l-khaba 'ith, (ertinya yang ahmak itu ibu segala najis). Tuan turun dari atas angin ke mari ini bukankah hendak mencari harta? Daripada ahmak itu." (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 77)

**Stanza 1 and Stanza 2:**

sadar jahan: orang kaya, arak itu melalaikan  
wapnya menipiskan ingatan  
menyuburkan pohon maksiat,  
tidaklah orang kaya pedulikan larangan?

lihat, bicara tuan hamba longgar  
semuanya jadi ketawa  
perkataan menjalar kepada perempuan  
tuan hamba membuat dosa.  
(Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 77)

**Stanza 3:**

seri rama: dosa arak ini  
saya tanggungkan di atas diri  
membayarnya dengan hati,  
tiada manusia lain yang mengetahuinya.  
(Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b:77)

## Stanza 4:

saya tidak datang pada tuan  
 untuk bersyarah dengan rasa bersih  
 tentang agama dan ibadat  
 dengan bahasa dan suara menghina.  
 (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 77)

## Stanza 5:

makhdum hanya tau menghukum  
 tapi lihat ahmak tuan,  
 tuan mau selalu disembah-sembah  
 tuan bercakap angkuh.  
 mengungkit keturunan,  
 menyebut negeri asal angin,  
 ketinggian orang dan tanahnya,  
 apakah melaka kurang  
 dan mengapakah tuan di sini  
 jikalau di negeri asal  
 semuanya sempurna?  
 (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 77-78)

## Stanza 6:

sudah berapa orang anak dara melayu  
 telah tuan peristerikan  
 dengan pangkat dan darah tuan,  
 dan berapa bidang tanah pula  
 diberikan kepada permintaan tuan?  
 (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 78)

## Stanza 7:

apakah yang tuan carikan di sini?  
 mengembangkan agama atau mencari harta  
 melaluinya.  
 tuan ahmak, bersembunyi di sebalik keturunan.  
 ahmak itu, seperti kata hadis, ibu segala najis.  
 (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 78)

## Stanza 8:

sadar jahan:

tidak aku mau berbicara dengan kamu  
 cakapmu mabuk, ibadatmu kurang.  
 (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1981b: 78)

**English translation:**

Thus it was seen by Makhdum Sadar Jahan  
 that Seri Rama was intoxicated, and his mouth  
 smelled of alcohol. Thus said Makhdum Sadar  
 Jahan, "Al-khamar ummu 'l-fawa-hish wa akbaru 'l-khaba  
 'ith (which means that alcohol is the mother of all filth). Thus replied  
 Seri Rama, "Al-hamku ummu 'l-khaba 'ith,  
 (which means that you fool are the mother of all filth).  
 You came down here from the land above the wind  
 Is it not to look for material possessions? From that foolishness."

## Stanza 1 and Stanza 2:

sadar jahan: noble man, that alcohol leads to neglect  
 its warmth diminishes the mind  
 fertilises the tree of wickedness,  
 do you not, noble man, take heed of the prohibition?

see, your talk has become loose  
 everything has become a joke  
 words will then spread to woman  
 you will then commit sin.

## Stanza 3:

seri rama: the sin of this alcohol  
 i will endure it upon myself  
 paying it with the heart,  
 no other human beings will know of it.

## Stanza 4:

i did not go to you sir  
 to lecture with a pure feeling  
 about religion and service to god  
 with a degrading language and voice.

## Stanza 5:

makhdum only knows how to punish  
 but look at your foolishness sir,  
 you always like to be worshipped  
 you are arrogant.  
 harking back on your ancestry  
 talking about the original land of the wind,  
 the greatness of the people and its lands,  
 is melaka wanting  
 and why did you come here  
 if in your original land  
 everything is perfect?

Stanza 6:

how many malay virgins  
have you wedded  
with your position and bloodline sir,  
and how many fields of land  
have been given upon your request sir?

Stanza 7:

what exactly are you looking for here?  
to spread religion or to look for material possessions  
through it.  
you foolish sir, hiding behind your ancestry.  
that foolishness is, according to the *hadis*, the mother of all filth.

Stanza 8:

sadar jahan: i do not want to speak with you  
your words are intoxicated, your services to god are less.

## APPENDIX 22

### My own English translations of extracts from the selected works in Chapter Five

#### Extract 1

After that, the woman turned to Mr Robert and spoke to him in the Malay language...

#### Extract 2

Thus it was confirmed and obvious in Mr Robert's opinion that the old woman was indeed a Malay woman because she was knowledgeable and fluent in Malay and her attire also indicates that she is in actuality a Malay.

#### Extract 3

That person is bizarre because he was fully dressed and clean. In his right hand, he was holding a spear and, in Mr William's eyes, he was definitely a Malay. This white man was not afraid at all and, when that regal person approached him, he stood up as a mark of respect. "This is an encounter truly unexpected but deeply desired because we here are always isolated and I wish a warm welcome to you sir," said the young man with full respect in the Malay language.

#### Extract 4

Upon hearing the Laksamana's words, Hang Jebat became astonished and thus said, 'Hey Orang Kaya Laksamana, it is because of you that I have committed this act. As I see it, you no longer exist in this world any more. If I knew you were alive, I swear upon Allah and His Prophet, I would not have committed this act.'

#### Extract 5

So the Laksamana replied, "Hey Si Jebat, your sentiment is wrong. Your act of treason against your Master is tantamount to committing sin against Allah; you would never be able to outlive this later in the Afterlife. And now you want to murder all these hundreds of thousands of innocent people; is that a noble act then?"

#### Extract 6

So the Laksamana said, "Hey Si Jebat, I have no power to kill you; only my Al-Mighty God kills you. God-Willing, you shall die in my hands."

#### Extract 7

Thus those practices were not dictated by the religion and do not bring any benefits because of that, they become more foolish and are sneered at by the other races, because if those practices were done away with, it would not be sinful, and if they were practised would not bring any reward to him,...

**Extract 8**

Mr Robert was seated in the middle of the group. On his left was the Sakai Head of Village and on his right was an old woman who was different from the rest of the women there in terms of her attire, behaviour and food. In his opinion, that woman was definitely a Malay and Mr Robert believes it to be so because that woman refuses to eat the pork meat which was served.

**Extract 9**

“I do not believe it at all. Muslims have very strong religious beliefs and abide strongly by God’s prohibitions,” more said Ratu Bongsu. “But Your Majesty, I have just visited the Malay states and I have seen with my own eyes the circumstances of the Malays. Nearly fifty percent of them have conformed to the western belief and custom as well as way of life.”

**Extract 10**

“...I think it is better if we booked two or three tickets to Mecca because your father and I are already old and it is really about time that we fulfil the fifth Tenet of *Haj*,” said his mother.

**Extract 11**

Life and death and adversity and prosperity were in the hands of God. In the hands of Allah Azzawajalla. ...Prosperity and happiness were accepted with utmost gratitude. Accepted with the phrase *alhamdulillah* a thousand times. And the suffering as well as the catastrophe which had occurred were also accepted with the phrase *alhamdulillah* a thousand times. ...Lahuma and Jeha really believed that those seven daughters also had the same faith. Life and death and adversity and prosperity were in the hands of God. In the hands of Allah Azzawajalla.

**Extract 12**

Lahuma truly believed. God would not take away his life just because of the tiny spine from the palm frond which was only an inch long. God was aware of the total number of his children. Seven of them altogether. They needed food. And the unhusked rice had been Lahuma’s food for generations. With those thought in mind Lahuma suppressed his pain. Let its venom spread wherever it liked. God was surely on his side. If needed Lahuma felt that he would still go down to the rice-field in that condition. Pain can be repressed if God were on his side.

**Extract 13**

God is fair.

**Extract 14**

...And when Lahuma’s face turned blue, only then did Jeha called the neighbours that night. But their presences were only for reading the *sura Yasin*.

**Extract 15**

Jeha is aware what those people are going to do. She struggled and cursed, but the Head of the Village still did not let go of his grasp. Dragged into the cage Jeha was. Tied strongly the door of the cage. And Jeha terrorised the cage like a wild bear caught in a trap.

**Extract 16**

The rice did not materialise. And the residents of Kampung Banggul Derdap mourned. But that mourning was limited only to themselves. Was not related to Allah Azzawajalla. God was not cursed by them.

**Extract 17**

So the Laksamana called out, saying, “Hey Si Jebat the traitor! Are you not loyal to your Master? If you are brave, come down here for a one-to-one duel with me, for I myself have not engaged in a duel for a long time.”

**Extract 18**

So the Laksamana said, “Your words are true, because my heart says so too. It is a shame though that you have sinned. If your sin were none other than this, you would not die, I would even resort to immoral means so as to spare you from death.”

**Extract 19**

So Hang Jebat thus wept upon hearing the Laksamana’s words. So the Laksamana also wept out of compassion for Hang Jebat.

**Extract 20**

So said Hang Jebat, “I also because seeing you killed by the bendahara without any sin; it is because of that I felt enraged. It is a foregone conclusion that I who am a playmate will also be killed, because the king kills without investigating...”

**Extract 21**

So the Laksamana said, “Your words are true, but we as the raja’s servants should be really cautious when we act upon something, as the old saying goes: ‘It’s better to die with a good name, let us not live with a bad name’, so that we would go to heaven.”

**Extract 22**

Thus the raja issued a command to all the scrambling subjects, “Hey all of you, have you seen the Laksamana? Where has he gone to that he has allowed Si Jebat to run amok?” So said the subject, “I saw the Laksamana stab Hang Jebat. So then I saw the Laksamana jumped from the palace and walked home. As I see it, it may be due to a wound that he has gone home, and did not meet Your Majesty.” After hearing the words of the subject, so the king and the bendahara also were shocked thinking of the Laksamana, because the Laksamana is wise. ...; so the king looked at Bentara Hang Kasturi: so the king commanded, “Hey bentara, can I command you to go to the house of the Laksamana?”

**Extract 23**

Thus the Laksamana said, “Hail Your Majesty Syah Alam, I beg for your forgiveness and blessing, may Your Majesty command Bentara Tun Kasturi to depart and set his eyes on the body of Si Jebat the traitor, because he was not only my comrade but also my brother; from when we were small we were never apart all five of us, this common knowledge I am sure Your Majesty is aware of.”

**Extract 24**

- ...if those rulers were not educated and knowledgeable, how is it possible for them to pass judgement over their subjects and to govern their state?
- And if he lived in sin, how is he supposed to ask his subjects to perform good deeds?
- Thus if those Malay rulers could not discipline their own offspring who are allowed to harass the subjects, thus how is it possible for them then to discipline their own subjects?

**Extract 25**

In that I make my words simpler, but with a big wish that I hope that they would take a leaf out of my advice.

**Extract 26**

“Just as about to start working on the field, already faced with catastrophe.”

**Extract 27**

Lahuma was shocked to hear his wife’s words. ...Why was his wife brave enough to utter those catastrophes? It is taboo for Lahuma to utter those catastrophes out loud. Will there be catastrophe this year?

**Extract 28**

“There will be no catastrophe this year. God protects us and our children.” Lahuma comforted his wife’s heart.

**Extract 29**

What was even perplexing to him was why had he been asked to study under a Sakai person? The real Mandor Alang looked like a Malay man – wearing the velvet cap, wearing the sarong and is fully clothed. His body was clean, with no ringworm and he spoke Malay well.

**Extract 30**

“How does Elis Sakti look like, Din, and what is her race – Malay or Filipino?”

**Extract 31**

“I also do not know for sure and clearly and I also am not well acquainted with her, but people say that she is of pure Malay race; except that her name is a bit peculiar, but, in this century, the name does not really matter.”

**Extract 32**

Not only was the cooking in the restaurants delicious but Bulat was influenced by the lifestyle of the Singaporean Malay people that was to support as much as you can the enterprises of your own race. In Singapore, good and pure Malays who were not of mixed racial heritage were forced by this new lifestyle, that was to support the enterprises of your race or else it became a huge embarrassment and there were chances that they may be shunned by their own race if they did not do so. The Malays overseas meaning those who were not pure Singaporean inhabitants were very active in associations and movements which focus on new

lifestyles – favouring their own races more; cooperating and helping each other – were really progressing and were being emulated by the Malay race in other states.

**Extract 33**

“...Yes, Bulat bin Mat Lela. Bulat is a genuine Malay name.”

**Extract 34**

At one time Bulat asked, “I heard rumours that you were using a false name, the name Elis Sakti is not your original name, that name is the name of a Christian and is not a nice name, as such could you please tell me your real name.”

**Extract 35**

Stanza 3:

do respect the knowledgable,  
those who are loyal to your race  
no matter how little they agree.

**Extract 36**

Stanza 4:

the malay will be great with freedom,  
with the belief that they would be free and great.  
at our harbour ports the whole world met,  
our language was chosen, our *adat* was scrutinised.

## APPENDIX 23

### **Brief background of Mohd. Taib Osman (b.1934) and Syed Muhammad Naguib Al-Attas (b.1931)**

Professor Datuk Dr. Haji Mohd. Taib Osman is an academician who specialises in aspects of Malay culture. He obtained his doctorate in 'Folklore and Cultural Anthropology' from Indiana University, United States of America in 1961. After obtaining his first degree in the Department of Malay Studies, Universiti Malaya in 1958, Taib started work in the same department as an academic assistant to Za'ba in 1959. He was eventually appointed as Professor of Malay Studies in 1968. His research interests include modern and classical Malay literature as well as Malay folklore and arts. Taib has also been active in UNESCO projects on Malay culture since 1970 and have been a member on the National Advisory Council for Culture and Special Curator for Ethnography at the National Museum, Kuala Lumpur. He was Head of Editor for a project called 'Islamic Civilisation in the Malay World'. It was organised by the Research Centre for Islamic History, Arts and Culture, an agency under the Organisation of Islamic Council. His most recognised publications include *An introduction to the development of modern Malay language and literature* (1986), *Bunga rampai: aspects of Malay culture* (1988) and *Malay folk beliefs* (1989).

Professor Dr. Syed Muhammad Naguib Al-Attas has been known to be a passionate scholar and philosopher of Islam. His love for education saw him first indulging extensively in his scholarly pursuit and his three-year study in Canada produced a Master degree with distinction on Islamic philosophy in 1962. It culminated with a thesis titled *Rānīrī and the Wujūdiyyah of 17<sup>th</sup> Century Aceh*. He then pursued his doctoral degree under the supervision of Professor Arberry and Dr Martin Lings SOAS, University of London, and produced, in 1965, another two-volume thesis on *The mysticism of Hamzah Fansuri*. This particular study has been hailed as one of the most outstanding and thought-provoking work on Sūfism to date and marked Naguib's exceptional stand in the world of Malay academe (Wan Mohd. Nor Wan Daud, 1998: 5). His study focused on the development of *Syair* where he verified that Hamzah Fansuri was indeed the creator of the Malay *Syair*. Al-Attas has published books as well as monographs in Malay and English. Translated into various

global languages, his works reflect his ardent passion in scholarly topics, which include Malay and Islamic histories, language, literature, metaphysics, philosophy and theology. Of merit are his works on *Preliminary statement on a general theory of the Islamization of the Malay-Indonesian Archipelago* (1969) and *Islam and secularism* (1978).

## APPENDIX 24

### Further discussion on *An introduction to the development of modern Malay language and literature* by Mohd. Taib Osman (1986)

According to Taib (1986: 1), the Malay language as we know it today had spread over a wide geographical area, 'from Madagascar in the west to Formosa in the East' and 'from Cambodia in the north to the people in Java in the south'. Taib (1986: 2) praises the Melayo-Polynesian language, as opposed to the Austronesian family of languages, as the only language which 'has spread so far and wide geographically'. In doing so, Taib postulates that 'the process achieved for itself a high status for the Malay language as it is known today, which is spoken by coastal Malays'. Of the coastal Malays, Taib (1986: 2 fn1) describes them as 'the people who speak the Malay language or a dialect of it, who live in the coastal regions of the Malay Archipelago; and are politically organised into Sultanates, such as the Malay states on the Malay peninsula, the east coast of Sumatra, and Brunei, Sambas, Banjarmasin and Pontianak along the coast of Borneo'. It is to them that Taib believes the credit of Malay as *lingua franca* should go. Calling the coastal Malays 'the original speakers of Malay', Taib goes on to suggest that their occupations as 'sailors and traders', as well as the fact that they enjoyed 'a higher form of civilisation from constant contacts' with 'China, India, Persia, Arabia and the West', had helped immensely in turning Malay into the *lingua franca* of the Malay World and 'the language of knowledge, art and literature'.

## APPENDIX 25

### **Further discussion on *Preliminary statement on a general theory of the Islamisation of the Malay-Indonesian Archipelago* by Syed Muhammad Naguib Al-Attas (1969)**

According to Al-Attas (1993: 170-171), the Islamisation process in the Malay Archipelago had undergone three distinct phases historically and culturally. Phase I, believed to have occurred in the period between 1200-1400, is termed by Al-Attas (1993: 170) as ‘the conversion of the body’. This process is described as where the Malays are thought to have converted and embraced Islam on the strength of their faiths in its teachings without necessarily understanding ‘the rational and intellectual implications’ of the conversion. Al-Attas posits the view that the roles played by important Islamic concepts, such as ‘the central Islamic concept of Unity of God (*tawhīd*)’, were still alien to the Malays back then.

Phase II (1400-1700) is suggested by Al-Attas (1993: 170) as an extension of Phase I. However, Al-Attas postulates how there appears to be an emphasis on the relation between ‘philosophical mysticism and metaphysics (*tasawwuf*)’ and ‘rational ideology (*kalām*)’ through the interpretation of *sharī‘ah*. Spiritual conversion is thus believed to have heightened through the existence of Sūfism and Sūfī texts. At this point in the Islamisation process, Al-Attas is of the opinion that ideas on the Islamic worldview are merged together with the old ones in order to introduce and expand on fundamental Islamic concepts. This is believed to have occurred so that they would be easier understood and embraced by the Malays.

The final phase, Phase III (1700 onwards), is proposed by Al-Attas (1993: 170-171) as a continuance of Phase I and an application of Phase II. He highlights this phase as the point in which western cultural influences began to infiltrate the Malay World through the arrival of the West. He terms this process as ‘westernisation’, defined as: ‘...the perpetuation of the rationalistic, individualistic and internationalistic spirit whose philosophical foundations were laid earlier by Islām.’ (Al-Attas, 1993: 171).

Al-Attas also offers his evaluation of the Malays' worldview, from the viewpoint of philosophy and religion, prior to the coming of Islam and the development of the abovementioned three phases. Al-Attas (1993: 171-172) identifies, firstly, Hinduism as a faith which he suggests had been embraced only by the ruling group but treated apathetically by the subjects. An indoctrination and imposition of this faith by the reigning group upon the Malay community is seen by Al-Attas as resulting in an enforced participation in its rites. As such, Al-Attas (1993: 171) hypothesises that it was rather the Malay-Indonesian dynasties which were Hinduized rather than the Malay-Indonesian society. The community were thought to be too ignorant of the philosophical and metaphysics concepts of Hinduism to practice them but were believed to be more aesthetically occupied with their own worldview and embraced only beliefs that could fit into their own worldview. Al-Attas also mentions the role played by literature at this juncture in his discussion. According to Al-Attas (1993: 171), Malay literature at this point in history contained what he suggests as 'Hindu-Malay' elements. They are described as infused with mythology and lacking in lyrical explanation and revelation. Their philosophical worldview is suggested by Al-Attas as projected mainly through art, such as the *wayang* (puppet play) based on Old Javanese literature.

Al-Attas (1993: 173) then illustrates how the next faith to arrive in the Malay World, Buddhism, is also believed to have functioned in similar style to Hinduism. To demonstrate his perspective, Al-Attas (1993: 172) exemplifies the situation in Sumatra which he highlights as not producing any Buddhist philosophers at any point in history although it was known to be the hub of Buddhism from the 6<sup>th</sup> to the 11<sup>th</sup> centuries. As Al-Attas sees it, the only great contribution of Buddhism to the Malay civilisation during this period was through artistic manifestations. As evidence, Al-Attas exemplifies the existence of the grand Borobudur building in Java. As such, Al-Attas contends that Buddhism and its followers, believed to be foreigners hailing from South India, were simply not interested in imparting new forms of worldview to the Malays. To him, their existence in Sumatra was purely for personal religious satisfaction and meditation. Hence, based on his arguments on the developments of both religions, Al-Attas (1993: 173) posits the view that both 'the Hindu-Malay' and 'the Buddhist-Malay' did not produce any notable philosopher or thinker during their respective civilisations.

Islam, on the other hand, fared better and differently in Al-Attas' (1993: 173-174) view. According to Al-Attas (1993: 173), Islam arrived in the Malay Archipelago expressed and expounded within the 'Sūfi metaphysics'. Terming the phases of Hinduism and Buddhism before the coming of Islam as 'pre-Islamic times', Al-Attas (1993: 173) pinpoints *tasawwuf* as the vehicle through which the mindset of the Malays became broadened: through the process of highly rationalistic and intellectual spirit of Islam. This then is proposed by Al-Attas as resulting in an awareness of intellectualism and rationalism which he believes simply did not exist in pre-Islamic times. As a result, Al-Attas postulates that the Malay worldview underwent a revolution in terms of intellect, rationale and regulation. Islam is believed to have transformed greatly the Malay worldview through the introduction of previously unfamiliar notions, such as the concepts of 'God', 'Being', 'Existence', 'Time', 'Religion', 'Man', 'the Self' and 'Will'. Al-Attas (1993: 174) thus maintains that Hinduism, being more influential than Buddhism in its cultural impact on the Malay worldview, was only tolerated and acknowledged by the Malays in terms of its 'aesthetic' and 'ritualistic' values. Other aspects of Hinduism were believed to be largely disregarded.

Al-Attas (1993: 176) further emphasises how Islam had enriched the lexis and aesthetic values of Malay through borrowings from Arabic and Persian languages. This borrowings process is proposed by Al-Attas as clearly adopted from the *Qur'an*. In fact, Al-Attas is of the opinion that Malay even became the medium of 'conversion' for Islam within the Malay islands and achieved the highest status around the 16<sup>th</sup> century. This is the period suggested as when Malay became the dominant language for religious and literary scenes. Of importance, Al-Attas reasons that Malay literature had in fact burgeoned during this period in time and was most probably initiated also in this Islamic period. A paramount example of this era illustrated by Al-Attas (1993: 177) is the first translation of the *Qur'an* into Malay founded on a prominent commentary by Al-Baydāwī's. Once again, we note Al-Attas's view how this historical period, the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, saw the Malay language at its zenith, described as, '...the unrivalled prolificness of Malay writing on philosophical mysticism and rational theology' (Al-Attas, 1993: 177). According to Al-Attas, this particularly high status of Malay was not observed at all during pre-Islamic times.

---

The Malay worldview is thus suggested by Al-Attas (1993: 177) as having undergone a cultural revolution. It is explained as transforming from an aesthetic to a scientific one, believed to have been made possible through Islam and its explanation on the concept of 'Being'. According to Al-Attas (1993: 178), Malay eventually matured into a new stream of language due to its role as the intermediary for 'philosophical' dialogue within the Malay islands. He distinguishes Barus, Sumatra as the point of origin with Pasai (later Aceh) as its nucleus and earliest base for Islamic teaching and learning. Islam, thus, is seen by Al-Attas as indirectly helping to create the 'modern' Malay language through its clear style and Islamic lexis. This in turn is suggested by Al-Attas as bringing to light a language governed by logical reasoning and scientific analysis through the influence of the *Qur'an*. Malay historical prose is also proposed to have prospered within this period. Hence, Al-Attas (1993: 179) posits the view that Islam and the Malay language, together with literature and history, both operated on and benefited from each other in exerting their prominence in the Malay worldview.

## APPENDIX 26

### The phrase *bangsa* as it appears in *Sejarah Melayu* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*

SM 2:26 ... Bendahara Seri Maharaja, cicit Bendahara Tutu Nara Wangsa, piut Bendahara Seri Maharaja, anak Seri Nara Diraja Tun Ali, anak baginda Mani Purindan qaddazallahu sirrahum, Melayu **bangsanya**, dari Bukit Siguntang Maha Miru, Malakat, negerinya Batu Sawar Daru`s-salam. Demikian katanya: "Tatkala hijratu'n-nabiyi sallallahu `alaihi wa sallama seribu dua puluh ... (based on the 1979 edition of *Sejarah Melayu* by A. Samad Ahmad in <http://mcp.anu.edu.au/cgi-bin/tapis.pl>)

Tuah 2:9 ... bertambah baik rupanya. Hatta berapa raja-raja hendak meminang dia, tiada juga diberinya oleh ayahanda bonda baginda, kerana segala raja-raja yang meminang itu tiada sama dengan **bangsa** baginda itu, kerana baginda itu raja keinderaan. Maka baginda pun bertitah kepada perdana menteri suruh memanggil segala ahlulnujum dan segala sastrawan. Maka segala ... (based on the 1975 edition of *Hikayat Hang Tuah* by Kassim Ahmad in <http://mcp.anu.edu.au/cgi-bin/tapis.pl>)