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ABSTRACT

The research on Homi Bhabha’s theory of mimicry in postcolonial literature is no longer new. However, in Malay literature, the application of mimicry in order to analyse such fiction is still rare. This paper seeks to utilise the conceptual framework of Homi K. Bhabha’s colonial mimicry in order to explain the portrayal of the Malay characters in Tun Tuah and eventually analyse the characters’ strength in terms of their Malayness in critical situations or crises. The conceptual framework have been explicated into three major parts for the analysis of the novels in terms of: a) contesting colonisation, b) metonymy of presence, and c) resisting colonialist discourse. Excerpts from the novels will be extracted and presented for analysis under each part of the conceptual framework as mentioned above. A close reading of Tun Tuah will be applied as methodology to explore how the strong Malay characters could be divided into either those who mimic the people of the West, those who truly fit the Malay identity as being conservative Malays or those having both Western values while also holding onto the Malay identity. This study then explains the findings from the analysis on how the Malay characters thrive towards success in the novel Tun Tuah, in the three processes of colonial mimicry. It is found that the final process of colonial mimicry, resisting colonialist discourse displays how the Malay characters in Tun Tuah, particularly Tun Tuah himself, Tun Perak and Sultan Alauddin Riayat Shah’s strategies for economical and life success consists of them challenging the colonialists’ way of life, while focusing on the Malay traditions and Islamic beliefs.
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INTRODUCTION

According to Homi Bhabha in The Location of Culture (1994), throughout history, colonialism could have taken power from the figures of farce where mimicry of the West/colonisers by the East/colonised is a way of spreading colonial power and knowledge. In a sense, colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as almost the same, but not quite. Mimicry is a complex strategy of reform, regulation, and discipline, which "appropriates" the Other as it visualizes power. As a part of postcolonial literature, Malay literature includes elements of mimicry, even in the representations of their Malay characters. Malayness in the Malaysian Constitution states that a ‘Malay’ is defined as someone who (in addition to fulfilling certain residential requirements) “professes the Muslim religion, habitually speaks the Malay language, (and) conforms to the Malay customs”. Affifudin Omar’s novels are filled with strong Malay characters who are either those who mimic the people of the West, those who truly fit the Malay identity as being conservative Malays or those having both Western values while also holding onto the Malay identity.
This study attempts to elevate the study of Malay literature and postcolonial studies, with focus on colonial mimicry. The study of colonial mimicry in media not limited to literature is abundant as can be seen in the thesis by Sengupta (2011). There are also a few theses written on the study of colonial mimicry in novels such as by Matsuura (2010). There is no doubt that there are many studies on postcolonial novels, revealing their elements of postcoloniality such as by Yahya Hassan (2008) on the Arabic novels and by Mohamad Saleeh and Awang Azman (2008) on Malay literature. However, the study of colonial mimicry in Malay literature is still very new. In Affifudin Omar’s novels, for instance have various examples where colonial mimicry is present in the Malay characters.

The study of colonial mimicry in literature could bring about the analyses of how the postcolonial writers utilise mimicry of the West as a strategy to display the strength of the postcolonial characters in their writing and not vice versa. Thus, the study of colonial mimicry in Affifudin Omar’s selected novels would open new doors toward the study of colonial mimicry in Malay literature and Malay novels by researchers inside and outside of Malaysia.

According to Homi K. Bhabha, colonial mimicry consists of three stages, contesting colonisation, metonymy of presence and resisting colonialist discourse. They can be simplified as the stages of copy, mock and resist. The evidences of colonial mimicry in Affifudin Omar’s Tun Tuah (2016) that strengthens the Malayness of the Malay characters in the novel consist of two stages, which include the second stage; metonymy of presence and the third; resisting colonialist discourse. The first stage can be seen whereby the Malay characters in the novel tend to display their initial weaknesses in terms of some moral situations and beliefs. However in the second stage, brought to light in the excerpts from the novel which highlight the utmost strength and success in terms of economic, civilisation and public relations of the Malay, mainly the protagonist Tun Tuah and the Malay empire in the 1400 AD.

When defining the Malay identity, according to Article 160 of the Constitution of Malaysia, a Malay is defined as a person who professes the religion of Islam, habitually speaks the Malay language, conforms to Malay customs and was before Merdeka Day born in the Federation or in Singapore or born of parents one of whom was born in the Federation or in Singapore, or is on that day domiciled in the Federation or in Singapore; or is the issue of such a person; as a result, Malay citizens who convert out of Islam are no longer considered Malay under the law (The Constitution of Malaysia, 1948). However, the definition of Malay traces back to the times of Thomas Stamford Raffles who is regarded as the most important voice in projecting the idea of a Malay race not limited to the traditional Malay sultans, but embracing it as a large Archipelago (Barnard, 2004, p. 4). Since then, there have been many debates of what constitutes as Malayness, more specifically, the pillars of Malayness.

According to Anthony Milner (2008), there exists an anxiety among the Malays that ‘the Malays will disappear from this world’ due to various reasons. The Malaysian Malays hold onto the definition of being Malay in the Malaysian Constitution that states a ‘Malay’ is defined in the Malaysian Constitution someone who (in addition to fulfilling certain residential requirements) “professes the Muslim religion, habitually speaks the Malay language, (and) conforms to Malay customs” (Milner, 2008). However, due to various reasons, these three aspects of Malayness, which are the Muslim religion, the Malay language and the Malay customs are highly debatable considering those who are considered as Malay outside of the Malayan Peninsula (Milner, 2008). Therefore, this study will examine how literature, particularly contemporary novels by Affifudin Omar, represents the three main
aspects of Malayness, which are the Muslim religion, the Malay language and the Malay customs as strengthening the Malay characters in the novels.

_Tun Tuah_ is probably one of the most overlooked Malay novels which entails the lifetime of Tun Tuah, the protagonist in the novel as not only a feared Malay warrior in Malay history, but also as an intelligent diplomat, economist, leader and sea captain of the Malay empire in the 1400s. The successes led by Tun Tuah in the novel has shaped the reign and highest growth of the Malay empire during that time. The novel covers Tun Tuah’s lifetime as warrior, diplomat, economist, leader and sea captain during the time of Sultan Mansur Shah, and his successor Sultan Alaudin Riayat Shah, and finally Sultan Mahmud Shah as the rulers of the Malay empire of the Malacca port at that time. The novel ends with the end of the Malay reign in Melaka as an independent land, being colonised by their first colonisers, the Portuguese. The novel also goes hand-in-hand with another novel by Affifudin Omar, _Tun Perak_ (2017) which tells the story of the rise and fall of the Melaka Empire through the eyes of and during the lifetime of Tun Perak, the right-hand of the King, as well as the closest acquaintance to Tun Tuah as the first knight of the King.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

There is a doctoral thesis which utilises an adoptable framework which states that mimicry is essential in creating a postcolonial national identity by Sengupta Aparajita from University of Kentucky with the thesis entitled _Nation, Fantasy, and Mimicry: Elements of Political Resistance in Postcolonial Indian Cinema_ (2011). Sengupta examines the extent to which Indian cinema represents an anti-colonial vision through nation, fantasy and mimicry as political resistance to colonial and neo-colonial norms in creating a national identity (2011). Sengupta’s study highlighted the use of mimicry and self-parody in Indian cinema as political resistance to neo-colonial norms despite the Eurocentric historicising by the West, the minoritarian third world filmmakers in India have rewritten their own histories, taken control over their own images, spoken in their own voices to provide the truth over the European lies (2011). These cinemas act as counter-truths and counter-narratives from the perspective of the anti-colonialists by reclaiming and reaccentuating the past events in a majority of remapping and renaming (Sengupta, 2011). Sengupta’s study focuses on the relationship between cinema and nationalism in India, with attention to the creation of a cinematic discourse on the nation, the unrealistic elements in Indian cinema and their relationship to nationhood, and the issue of nationality and national identity in the context of colonial and postcolonial mimicry and parody (2011).

Under colonial and postcolonial restrictions, the power of mimicry is apparent in obstructing cultural homogenisation in the native culture (Sengupta, 2011). Mimicry holds the potential for self-reflexivity in post-globalization popular Indian cinema to fight off an invasive global capitalist economy (Sengupta, 2011). Many of the recent mainstream films from India give way to self-parody instead of taking affront at the constant criticism directed at them, in a manner that is not only an appreciation of this important element of the Indian identity, but is also an acceptance of those critique (Sengupta, 2011). Therefore, the self-consciousness of recent Indian cinema interprets self-reflexivity as the reflection of a gradually solidifying national consciousness and establishes its own sense of self, in the form of its national identity (Sengupta, 2011).

Mimicry in Indian cinema according to Sengupta also leads to cultural and political resistance (2011). Contrary to Frantz Fanon’s ideas, V. S. Naipaul’s ideas on mimicry in the Caribbean context relies in the symbiotic relationship between colonialism and mimicry, as a
complex performance, rather than an unavoidable aftermath of colonial systems of cultural imposition as whiteness is established as the only form of physical, cultural and political perfection, the Other must put on the mask of whiteness in order to have access to acceptable cultural identity (Sengupta, 2011).

Sengupta’s study could be said to be one of the closest in terms of the postcolonial concept of mimicry to the present study, with the difference in focus of Indian cinema as media instead of the novel. There are various aspects in Sengupta’s study, especially how mimicry creates the notion of the strong national character that could be utilised in the present study.

Yahya Hassan from Universiti Putra Malaysia examines in his doctoral thesis entitled A Postcolonial Reading of Selected Arabic Novels translated into English, the Arabic novel from the postcolonial and structural perspective using the eclectic approach (2008). According to Yahya, the Arabic novel rose in the twentieth-century due to political, cultural and historical factors during which the Arabic society is moving towards modernity (2008). Yahya found that an overwhelming mimicry in a non-West character would eventually lead to the character’s downfall could be proven in this study otherwise, as this part of Yahya’s analyses is minor in his thesis. Therefore, the present study analyses in greater depth, whether or not mimicry in the characters actually leads to their downfall or vice versa.

Yoshiko Matsuura of Purdue University published her doctoral dissertation entitled Behind the Mask: Rereading Tachihara Masaaki’s Literary Works from Postcolonial Perspectives on using the concepts of hybridity and mimicry in analysing Tachihara Masaaki’s literary works (2010). Matsuura questions conventional criticism in order to examine the impact of Tachihara’s mimicry towards the readers as well as the literary mainstream (2010). It is important to note that Tachihara took a turn in his writing as he adapts from writing as a colonised towards writing as a writer who has assimilated into Japan (2010). Matsuura concludes her findings with the exclamation that Tachihara Masaaki’s post-colonised texts mimic the coloniser’s discourse to show that they never want to be associated to the coloniser as identical and this is done through the process of exchange of positions of the coloniser and the colonised in their texts (2010). She found that Tachihara neither perfects mimicry nor copy popular fiction and their style of writing (Matsuura, 2010).

Muhammad Haji Salleh’s contributions as a renowned author toward the development of a local theory can be seen in his effort to uphold traditional Malay literature through the eyes of the indigenous (Awang Azman, 2008). He excavates the concepts and essences of Malay literature in order to measure literary poetic theories and research on the hundreds of fables and other traditional poetic genres (Awang Azman, 2008). Awang Azman believes that a postcolonial reading of Muhammad Haji Salleh’s works and attitude is the best in order to unveil Muhammad’s postcolonial involvements in the literary world with the development of a local literary theory as the utmost product (Awang Azman, 2008). This study referred to Awang Azman’s thesis in its aspect of how Muhammad Haji Salleh’s works are successfully researched as a postcolonial writer, and this study will attempt similarly with Affifudin Omar’s Tun Tuah with an in-depth analysis on mimicry as a postcolonial literary concept.

Mohamad Saleeh found that the Occidentalism in Malay literature is different from Darwinism philosophy, a basis of European colonialism, where the authors have the Islamic and East philosophies and their agendas are non-hegemonic (Mohamad Saleeh, 2011). They write so in order to recover their pride, self-confidence and ego as an Independent and powerful nation (Mohamad Saleeh, 2011). In his introduction, Mohamad Saleeh mentions that in the process of colonialism, the role of literature in strengthening imperialism and colonialism is vital and Orientalist writings are a systematic process (Mohamad Saleeh,
However, the colonised, especially the postcolonial writers of the colonised worlds begun to intellectually revolt against orientalist and colonialist texts (Mohamad Saleeh, 2011). These colonialist texts were fought using Occidentalism texts by replacing the subject being discussed, where in Orientalism, the West is the subject which discusses the East as the objects and Occidentalism, the East is the subject which discusses the West as the objects (Mohamad Saleeh, 2011). Mohamad Saleeh found that the indigenous writers of the east do not apply a principle of dichotomy, which is a basis of Western intellect, whereas these writers are open in their way of thinking, while some even included pro-West influence with some special features in Occidentalism (Mohamad Saleeh, 2011). Therefore, Occidentalism in literature is an act of seeking independence from a colonised mind. In order to break those minds free, the textual attacks by the colonisers have to be fought using textual forms, thus giving birth to Occidentalism articles in literature (Mohamad Saleeh, 2011). Seeking independence from a colonised mind is also a method of strengthening an ethnicity’s social identity. In the case of Malay identity and Malayness a strategy for strengthening and empowerment could come from colonial mimicry as will be discussed in this paper.

Similarly in her thesis, Nurulida has successfully applied the postcolonial concepts of colonial discourse, hegemony, empire, ambivalence, mimicry and mockery to examine the novel Urih Pesisir in terms of its colonial elements, euro centricity and ruling strategies (2014). The research also takes into account the political turbulence and ruling structures of Brunei during the time of the novel (2014). In sum, Nurulida found through the research that the colonialists see themselves as representatives of their race with a superior stance as opposed to the civilisations of other races (2014). Through the colonial subjugation by the Europe towards the other colonialised nations, these nations eventually legitimize colonial power and colonial rule over them (Nurulida, 2014). Overall, Nurulida found that colonial discourse and the justification of power in the text being analysed is a sort of attack discourse which challenges the Marginal and the Marginalised or settlers encapsulating the opposition between the two (2014).

The study by Anne uses Du Bois’ concept of veiling and double consciousness with regards to a person’s identification to themselves as a white or black as in the main character in the novel being studied (2009). This double consciousness is mainly a result of how black children and youth have experienced the cruelty during the apartheid era and together with the Bantu education system, which forcibly teach the black children to serve as employees for the whites with very low level of education in its strategy (Anne Jayaselvi, 2009). Anne has found that the text being analysed supports postcolonial theorists which says that the colonial subject at hand has a double consciousness or double vision as their way of perceiving the two worlds of the coloniser and the indigenous community and the outcome of the novel shows the protagonist having a positive ending as a character with a double consciousness (2009). Anne’s thesis demonstrates how the concept of double consciousness, akin to hybridity is utilised to analyse an African American novel Fiela’s Child. In comparison, this study seeks to analyse how colonial mimicry acts as a tool to empower Malayness in the Malay characters in Tun Tuah.

An important figure in postcolonial theory, who has defined a method in resisting colonialist discourse in literature, particularly the literature of the non-West is Zawiah Yahya. Zawiah defined a method of reading literatures without the bond of the coloniser’s gaze in her book Resisting Colonialist Discourse. To Zawiah, those who do not practice their rights to resist such colonialist discourse have failed in their intellectual responsibility as readers (1994). In order to resist colonialist discourse, the reading must be done by undoing the text through questioning its premises and its assumptions of its utterance (Zawiah, 1994). Zawiah
points out how textual structures of colonialist discourse shape and control our reading and we as non-West are usually vulnerable to such coercion (1994). These textual structures have utilized advertising, ideological propaganda and gender, class and ethnic prescriptions towards the vulnerability of the non-West readers (Zawiah, 1994). However, if the readers are aware of their misuse, they could have had the choice whether to resist or to give in (Zawiah, 1994). Thus, they could be convinced of the importance of resistance as their way of thinking and reading (Zawiah, 1994). Sequentially, Zawiah asserts that her study aims to deconstruct Eurocentric and monocultural claim for a transcendent validity as representative and universal (1994). Therefore, as such a Malay viewpoint is an equal alternative available to the reader, compared to relying solely on the colonialist viewpoint (Zawiah, 1994). Zawiah has successfully demonstrated the shift of reading orientation from a Eurocentric viewpoint to an ethnocentric viewpoint to provide range of reading positions in cultural centres (1994). This can be seen from the similar objections toward colonialist discourse from postcolonial non-European critics such as Spivak who argued for the connection between humanist subject production and the process of colonialism and Bhabha who argued that the West normalises its own history of expansion and exploitation by writing the history of the other in a fixed hierarchy of civil progress (Zawiah, 1994).

An article by Nor Hashimah Jalaluddin explicated the concept of ‘rasuah’ or bribery in classical works namely Sejarah Melayu, Hikayat Hang Tuah, Hikayat Terung Pipit and Hikayat Raja Pasai as one of the typologies of corruption as first introduced by Syed Hussein Alatas (2008). Hashimah has found that the concept of to pay back in return or ‘membalas budi’ has made corruption almost permissible in the perception of the Malays in the works being analysed (2008). The current study in contrast, looks at how the strength of Malayness as a whole is portrayed in selected novels by an author rather than the concept of corruption and bribery in selected classical Malay novels as in the study by Hashimah.

An article by Misran Rokimin examines the connection between Malaysia’s Rukunegara and the novel Anak Din Biola by Maaruf Mahmud (2006). Misran found that the author has successfully projected the Rukunegara values through the characters and plot of the novel being analaysed, thus cultivating and spreading the government’s national ideology in regards of Rule of Law and Good Behaviour and Morality in Malaysia’s Rukunegara (2006). In contrast to Misran’s study, the current study analyses how the author Afiffudin Omar manages to capture the strength of Malayness in the Malay characters of his novels, especially at the plot resolution of his novels.

Looking at challenges in the study of ethnicities, Kauthar Ismail manages to explore a facet of the issue using the Extended Case Method (ECM) (2018). Kauthar experimented on the challenges in ethnicity studies without the researchers neglecting their identity and position (2018). He also found that ethnicity studies in Malaysia is linked closely to the Malaysian structural system and requires the researcher to have more than just a prior knowledge as a member of a particular ethnic group (2018). In concordance to Kauthar’s study, the current study takes into account such challenge and includes more than just prior knowledge on the Malays, with references from various theses and articles by non-Malay researchers and studies encompassing Malay literature and the Malay world.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This study focuses on utilising the conceptual framework of Homi K. Bhabha’s colonial mimicry to explain the portrayal of the Malay characters in Affifudin Omar’s Tun Tuah and eventually analyse the characters’ strength in terms of their Malayness in critical situations or
crises. The conceptual framework have been explicated into three major parts for the analysis of the novels in terms of; a) contesting colonisation, b) metonymy of presence, and c) agency of the colonised or resisting colonialist discourse. Excerpts from the novels will be extracted and presented for analysis under each part of the conceptual framework as mentioned above.

This study will then explain the findings from the analysis of the outcome of the Malay characters in the selected novel under the three pillars of Malayness by Shamsul A. B. in order to determine whether the elements of Malayness in the Malay characters in the selected novels were empowered or vice versa.

Homi Bhabha in his theoretical The Location of Culture (1994) mentions that throughout history, colonialism could have taken power from the figures of farce. In the turn of the high ideals of colonial imagination to its low mimetic effects, mimicry outstands in spreading colonial power and knowledge (Bhabha, 1994). According to Edward Said, the difference between the panoptical vision of dominance and demand for identity and the counter-pressure of the diachrony of history-change, difference; mimicry represents an ironic compromise (Bhabha, 1994). If one applies Samuel Weber’s concept of castration to mimicry, then colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite. Thus, the discourse of mimicry is made of ambivalence and in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference (Bhabha, 1994). This shows that mimicry is the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation, and discipline, which "appropriates" the Other as it visualizes power (Bhabha, 1994). Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate, but, a difference or resistance binds the dominant strategic function of colonial power, increases surveillance, and poses an impending threat to both "normalized" knowledges and disciplinary powers (Bhabha, 1994). Bhabha’s colonial imitation is thus formed by the gap between mimicry and mockery which leads the civilising mission of the colonialists threatened by the displacing gaze of its disciplinary double (Bhabha, 1994). This leads us back to how mimicry takes power from its slippage, its excess and its difference from the original Self.

When prompted with the question of the hidden threat of the partial gaze in mimicry, Freud comments that the Other is almost the same but not quite (Bhabha, 1994). The visibility of mimicry is always produced at the site of interdiction and is not merely that impossibility of the Other which repeatedly resists signification, but the desire of colonial mimicry as an interdictory desire may not have an object, but has strategic objectives which Bhabha calls the metonymy of presence (Bhabha, 1994). Some inappropriate signifiers of colonial discourse include the difference between being English and being Anglicized; the identity between stereotypes which, through repetition, also become different; the discriminatory identities constructed across traditional cultural norms and classifications, the Simian Black, the Lying Asiatic--all these are metonymies of presence (Bhabha, 1994). They are strategies of desire in discourse that make the anomalous representation of the colonized something other than a process of "the return of the repressed," what Fanon unsatisfactorily characterized as collective catharsis (Bhabha, 1994). These metonymies create instances of "a difference that is almost the same but not quite" involuntarily creates a crisis for the cultural priority (Bhabha, 1994). Mimicry does not merely end narcissistic authority through the repetitious slippage of difference and desire (Bhabha, 1994). It is the process of the fixation of the colonial as a form of cross-classificatory, discriminatory knowledge in the defiles of an interdictory discourse, and therefore necessarily raises the question of the authorization of colonial representations (Bhabha, 1994).
Furthermore, colonial mimicry demonstrates the agency of the colonised, and on the other hand, the anxiety of the coloniser in which this anxiety releases a space for the colonised to resist colonial discourse (Huddart, 2006). The anxiety of the colonisers is reconfirmed through mimicry, where the colonised adopts and adapts to the coloniser’s culture but is not a form of enslavement or mere slavish imitation, as the colonised are not being assimilated into the supposedly dominant superior culture of the colonisers (Huddart, 2006). Bhabha’s mimicry is defined as an exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners and ideas (Huddart, 2006). Thus, this study will examine the excerpts in the novels being studied which show that the Malay characters’ project mimicry in terms of the exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners and ideas of the West and determine whether or not the Malay characters’ Malayness are strengthened to achieve success in life and life’s challenges.

In short, this study seeks to examine how the repetitious slippage of difference between colonial power and the colonised appropriates power on the latter, in terms of the Malayness of the Malay characters in the contemporary novels by Affifudin Omar.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**Contesting Colonisation**

Contesting colonisation lies in the gap between mimicry and mockery where instances of mocking the colonisers is present in the novel. Mockery is the first stage of colonial mimicry in the novel.

An example of contesting colonisation in the novel is the presence of slave trade in the Melaka Empire at that time (p. 54). The slaves consist of war prisoners from Sulu, Jawa, Banjar, Siam, Burma, aborigine clans and some from India and China who were sold in markets just like they sell goods (p. 54).

Contesting colonisation can again be seen when Hang Tuah and his companions talk about their fear that one day they will have to face the temptation of being served with wine or even be forced to drink wine during royal ceremonies (p. 57). They are also aware that the King himself and the ministers were already drinking wine even though it is prohibited in Islam (p. 57).

The first presence of white men in Melaka is witnessed by Hang Nadim, where he believes they are not Arabs from the look of their clothing (p. 303). This marks the first signs that Melaka is about to fall into the hands of the whites. The white men were then brought to meet general Tun Mutahir, and they have explained that they have resided in Goa since the last five years, through an expedition brought forth by Vasco da Gama back in 1490 A. D. (p. 304-305).

**Metonymy of Presence**

Metonymy of presence is a type of stereotyping the identities. In the novel Tun Tuah, it can be seen that the Malay characters have almost copied some of the traits of the west which may have led to their own downfall. At the end of the novel, it shows the ultimate downfall of the Melaka Empire which fell into the hands of the Portuguese, the first colonisers of the Malay land.

Discussing about state property, Hang Tuah (Hang Tuah being the former title before he gained the higher title of Tun Tuah) reminds his companions Hang Lekiu and Hang
Kasturi that even though the state property of Melaka at its peak, deserves to have the leaders to save up rather than spend all the riches (p. 45). Hang Tuah suggests that by not overspending the state property and treasury, Melaka could avoid the downfall that came to Srivijaya Empire where their precious state property and treasury has completely been lost due to over expenditure (p. 45). This would entail a protest and upheaval from their colonised states.

Another display of initial weakness in the Malay characters can be seen in the excerpt where the Malay traders and shop owners are mentioned as always weary of their wealth as to not overshadowing the wealth of the King nor the palace ministers (p. 54). It is claimed in the novel that the jealousy of the Malay aristocrats in Melaka have led numerous millionaires to succumb to slander, thus leading to them being punished and all their possessions confiscated (p. 54).

A tragic flaw that brings about the fall of an empire is often discussed in western philosophy. The Melaka Empire seem to also possess a significant tragic flaw that leads to display a metonymy of presence in the novel.

The Malays’ tragic flaw in the novel can be seen in their extreme loyalty towards the King even if it means they would lose their lives, their families or their friendships. This trait is often seen in the chivalric constitution of the subservience of the west during medieval times where knights submit their full loyalty to their Kings. If the Malay characters in the novel have followed the true Islamic way, placing Allah (God in Islam) and the Islamic teachings as first before the Sultan (King), they would not have waivered or fallen due to their worldly desires and lusts as influenced by the lifestyle of the colonisers.

The first example of the subservience of the knights towards their King is when Hang Tuah was challenged by a Chinese warrior of Canton who is well-versed in Kung-Fu martial arts (Affifudin Omar, 2016, p. 39). Hang Tuah expressed his regret that a man’s strength is measured by his fighting skills rather than his religious practices. To Hang Tuah, that symbolises that man has not achieved the highest level of civilisation and insisted that a man’s strength should only be displayed at times of war (p. 39). One of Hang Tuah’s closest acquaintances, Hang Lekir agrees with Hang Tuah by exclaiming that their team has ultimately became some sort of mere fighting cocks for the King (p. 42).

A copy of this can be seen in the novel when Hang Tuah was commanded by the Sultan to fight his friend Megat Panji Alam to the death merely because the Sultan wanted to wed Megat’s fiancée (p. 172). Megat remarks that both of them have become the victims of the Malay’s undying loyalty towards their Sultan (p. 172). They also hope that one day the Malays would not merely follow the demands of the Sultan so blindly (p. 172).

This loyal but blind following of the King’s orders among the Malay people at that time can again be seen when Hang Tuah was slandered by Patih Kerma Wijaya saying that Hang Tuah had slept with the Sultan’s favourite concubine, the Sultan without investigations, sentenced Hang Tuah to death (p. 212). Hang Tuah’s wife, Dang Kemala accepts the fate as a loyal citizen should not question the wants of the Sultan. It is Tun Perak’s civility and wit to go against the Sultan’s orders that he decided to not kill Hang Tuah, but hides him to learn more about Islam instead (p. 212).

While learning more about Islam under the teachings of Syeikh Mansur, Hang Tuah learned that the biggest weakness of men is their lust for the pleasures of the world, thus it will forever be used as a weapon against humanity by the Iblis or devils (p. 216). This is a reference to the lust of the Sultan that led him to sentence Hang Tuah to his death despite Hang Tuah being innocent and loyal to him.
When the tables have turned for Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat’s friendship, Hang Jebat questions the Malay’s undying loyalty to the Sultan and why must Tun Perak not be punished as he is for saving Hang Tuah’s life despite the Sultan’s orders to kill Hang Tuah (p. 240). Hang Tuah learns that when his people decided that the rakyat should never question the Sultan’s orders, the Sultan’s cruelty towards the people have not been mentioned at all (p. 240). Hang Tuah now believes that there should be a balance in the loyalty to the Sultan whereby a cruel Sultan should be stopped if he is doing more harm than good to his people.

Hang Tuah is further enraged by the Sultan’s power craze after ordering him to kill Hang Jebat his closest friend and by then ordering Hang Jebat’s lifeless body to be displayed to the public (p. 245). Hang Tuah further believes one should not merely be loyal to a Sultan who is cruel and unjust towards his people.

Not long after Hang Jebat’s execution at the hands of Hang Tuah, Hang Tuah has a debate with Tun Perak regarding the origins of the loyalty towards the King among the Malays. Tun Perak explained to Hang Tuah that ever since Deman Lebar Daun made a contract with Sang Sapurba, there is never a case of disloyalty towards the King nor does the King has to follow the whims of the people (p. 246). Hang Tuah argues that once during the reign of Raja Bersiang in Kedah, its people had to remove the King due to his cruelty (p. 246).

Another entailment of Hang Jebat’s execution is how the enemies of the state, Seri Betara and Patih Gajah Mada favours the upheaval of an anti-ethos element that would challenge the undying loyalty of the Malays in Melaka (p. 251). This strengthens the views of Hang Tuah where rather than blind subservience to the Sultan, the Malays in the novel should have followed the teachings of Islam and not succumb to pure worldly lusts and desires leading to the downfall of the Empire.

Other than blind subservience towards the King, a demand for brothels that came from foreign traders that came to Melaka also tainted Melaka’s own good name. Melaka once known as the centre for the spread of Islam began to be destroyed by immoral influences such as brothels, gambling houses and opium all due to the demand brought about by foreign traders who came into Melaka (p. 268). These negative activities also brought about infectious diseases such as consumption (now known as tuberculosis) and various genital diseases such as gonorrhoea, syphilis and herpes (p. 269).

During Sultan Alauddin Riayat Shah’s reign, the increasing amount of foreign trade also brought about bribery among the Melaka leaders as well as competitions among them in gaining social standing (p.271). Thus, leading the middle class towards bribery, fraud and robbery also as means to gain social standing (p. 272). Despite such negative activities, both Tun Tuah and Tun Perak remain righteous and never gotten involved in such immorality (p. 272).

After the demise of Sultan Alauddin Riayat Shah, his son, Sultan Mahmud has a completely different approach in ruling the state of Melaka. Sultan Mahmud is described to have been exposed to the hedonistic culture that came with the success of Melaka as a major trade centre in the Malay world (p. 298). The riches of the palace led Sultan Mahmud to be involved in negativities such as gambling, fornication in brothels and taking opium (p. 298). Despite teachings of Islam by famous Islamic scholars, Sultan Mahmud failed to reject his own lusts for worldly desires which will soon cause the downfall of Melaka and finally led Melaka to fall into the hands of the Portuguese. With his misdeemeanant character, Sultan Mahmud has sentenced various innocent individuals of the palace to death, thus strengthens Tun Tuah’s views that should one fall into complete subservience to their sultan despite the wrong ways of the sultan, particularly, those against the teachings of Islam. Also during
Sultan Mahmud’s reign, the increase of bribery is adamant. This can be seen where traders from Gujarat and China who came into Melaka without any need for protocols and therefore continue to bribe the palace with treasures and women, leading to the increase in brothels (p. 302-303).

Melaka’s downfall continues when Sultan Mahmud, influenced by his minister Seri Dewa Raja to have an escape plan to Muar, Kota Tinggi or Kampar (all in the present Johor state) together with the Malaka national treasures in the case should Melaka fall into Portuguese rule (p. 323). Another minister, Tun Umar also helped in confiscating the national treasures to Muar, Kota Tinggi and Kampar (p. 324).

Tun Tuah and Tun Perak both fall victim into more injustice death sentence and killings by Sultan Mahmud and his evil ministers, particularly Seri Dewa Raja. Tun Perak lost his own son from Sultan Mahmud’s injustice and also Raja Zainal was killed merely because of his good looks that has attracted many women in Melaka (p. 328).

According to the novel, at seventy years old, Tun Tuah managed to plan his disappearance from Melaka after an effort to oust him from the palace by Sultan Mahmud. Tun Tuah and his son, Tun Mamat were ordered to climb Gunung Ledang in order to propose to the elven princess said to reside at its peak for the sultan (p. 335-344). With his strong belief in Islam and Allah, Tun Tuah knows that even though genies exist but their world and the human world can never be conjoined by marriage, thus Tun Tuah concocts a story that he met the elven princess and she requested some very impossible requests as dowry (p. 344). Tun Tuah then disappears living a life beyond Melaka. In the year 1511, ten years after Tun Tuah’s disappearance, Portuguese has surrounded Melaka (p. 345). Led by Alfonso de Albuquerque, Portuguese defeated Melaka and began their reign on its land (p. 345).

**Resisting Colonialist Discourse**

The final stage of colonial mimicry is in how the colonised resist colonialist discourse. This could be defined in how the colonised adopts some parts of the colonisers’ culture, but does not assimilate into it. Instead, the colonised flourish in their own ways and become successful almost removed from the binds of colonialism.

An example of resisting colonialist discourse can be seen when Tun Perak and Hang Tuah both agree that they would not let their King bring about the downfall of their Melaka Empire due to his own greed for worldly lust (p. 266). Hang Tuah also compares the situation to how the Malay Srivijaya Empire in the past fell after 600 years of prosperity merely because of the extreme lust of its leaders (p. 267). Hang Tuah also relates the situation to how Hang Jebat lost to him in combat because he spent ten days living like the King with all the worldly pleasures and that had weakened him into losing to Hang Tuah (p. 267). Hang Tuah mentions that if Hang Jebat had kept his religion strong and not go against his Islamic beliefs, he might not have succumbed to his own lust and lost to it (p. 267).

In 1477 A. D. Sultan Alauddin Riayat Shah came into reign and during his short lifespan, Melaka flourished once more with the incoming of thousands of traders from Gujarat, India, China, Arab, Persia, Burma, Siam, Vietnam and Japan (p. 271). Thus, increasing the tax collection at the trading ports. Also during Sultan Alauddin Riayat Shah’s reign did the sultan led Tun Perak and Tun Tuah to disguise themselves as commoners in order to find the cause and stop the robberies that have been widespread in Melaka during that time (p. 273). It is through these disguises and investigations did they find there are many people from other states coming to Melaka to find occupations but when they found none, it forced them into homelessness (p. 275). Thus, Tun Tuah suggested that the sultan propose a
building of a bridge to Muar which will also provide jobs to the homeless who came into Melaka at that time (p. 275). Also during Sultan Alauddin’s reign, a nation called Haru in 1480 A. D. wreaked havoc in Pasai, thus causing turbulence in Melaka’s trade (p. 293). Tun Tuah’s intelligence in maritime war led Melaka into victory in defeating the Haru army, thus forcing them to sign a peace treaty and saving Melaka’s trade (p. 293).

It is revealed in the novel that the lentil sails was first introduced by the Malays in order for their ships to sail towards various directions with ease (p. 320). This technology was later adapted by the Arabs into the Mediterranean Sea and also by the Portuguese (p. 320).

At sixty-nine years old, Tun Tuah led Melaka into victory against the Portuguese for the second time (p. 321). His strategy was to destroy and burn the rowers of the Portuguese galleys during the night breaking into war (p. 321). The Melaka warriors won against the Portuguese at this time and the Portuguese escaped into India (p. 321).

**CONCLUSION**

All in all, the novel *Tun Tuah* began with demonstrations of mockeries towards the values of the West as can be seen in the Malay characters views toward the slave trade and wine dinking as brought about by the West and other non-Malay cultures. This displays an effort of contesting colonisation as the first strategy for colonial mimicry.

Some of the Malay characters in *Tun Tuah* not only copy the values of the West as in metonymy of presence, as demonstrated by characters such as Sultan Mahmud Shah and in some excerpts, by Hang Jebat, various other Malay characters move towards resisting colonialist discourse altogether.

Finally, there exist various strong Malay characters in the novel who display such evident resistance toward colonialist discourse that they thrive as some of the best characters in the novel. This can be seen in the characters of Tun Tuah, Tun Perak, and Sultan Alauddin Riayat Shah as well as Tun Tuah’s closest companions, Hang Jebat, Hang Kasturi, Hang Lekiu and Hang Lekir.

Thus, it is prominent in the novel *Tun Tuah* that the Malay characters display colonial mimicry. The Malay characters who resist colonialist discourse have shown strong characteristics and life success while upholding the most of Malayness such as *adat* (Malay customs) and Islam, the religion of the Malays in Tanah Melayu (Malaysia).

The study of Malayness as a strategy for colonial mimicry is still new even today. Even so, the study of postcolonial writing and colonial mimicry in Malay literature has had its heritage as example, by Zawiah Yahya (1994), Awang Azman Awan Pawi (2008), Mohamad Saleeh Rahamad (2011) and Anthony Milner (2008).

The development of postcolonial study is still new in Malaysia as compared to in Western countries, where the study is a basis for various fields of knowledge. A study as such in Malaysia will lead to postcolonial study as a basis of knowledge for future studies in Malaysia, especially in literary studies, whether within the same framework of colonial mimicry, or with alterations to the framework. Thus, other researchers would benefit greatly when they utilise or criticise the framework.

This study attempts to bring to light the study of Malay literature and postcolonial studies, with focus on colonial mimicry. The study of colonial mimicry in various artworks is prolific as can be seen in contemporary theses by Sengupta, Matsuura, Yahya Hassan, Mohamad Saleeh and Awang Azman. However, the study of colonial mimicry in Malay literature is still very new.
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