Gestalt analysis of wiraism in puteri gunung ledang

Muhammad Jailani Abu Talib

2018

Muhammad Jailani Abu Talib. (2018). Gestalt analysis of wiraism in puteri gunung ledang. Master's thesis, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10356/73185>

<https://doi.org/10.32657/10356/73185>

NANYANG
TECHNOLOGICAL
UNIVERSITY

Gestalt Analysis of *Wiraism* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

MUHAMMAD JAILANI BIN ABU TALIB
School of Art, Design and Media
2017

Gestalt Analysis of *Wiraism* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

MUHAMMAD JAILANI BIN ABU TALIB

SCHOOL OF ART, DESIGN & MEDIA

A thesis submitted to the Nanyang Technological University
in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts (Research)

2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The formulation of this thesis has been a constant cause of worry for myself. The support of various institutions and individuals, however, have greatly smoothen the process. I would like to express my gratitude to Asian Languages & Culture Academic Group, National Institute of Education for their kind and generous support in providing me with a scholarship to pursue my masters degree. Of special significance are Associate Professor Dr. Roksana Bibi, Dr. Sa'eda Buang and Dr. Aidil Subhan who have provided me with kind support and guidance throughout the journey. I would also like to extend my appreciation to my media guru, Cikgu Asnida Daud from Ministry of Education's Educational Technology Division who gave me the necessary support and inspiration to embark on this scholarly journey.

Equally incumbent towards the completion of this thesis was Yayasan Mendaki in conferring me with the *Goh Chok Tong Youth Promise Award* (2016). The award marked a significant chapter in my life and serves as a constant reminder of my duty towards the society.

Similarly, I would also like to thank my supervisor, Associate Professor Wong Chen-Hsi for her many insights and valuable critiques. Assistant Professor Dr. Kenneth Feinstein has also been instrumental, particularly in suggesting useful reads in the early stages of my studies.

A heartfelt gratitude would also be extended to my beautiful wife, Nuraini binte Abdul Malik and son, Muhammad Arfan Junayd, as well as my parents and parents-in-law who were understanding towards my work and academic pursuit. Together with my good friend, Ustaz Ahmad Saiful Rijal, they consistently remind me the value of seeking fruitful knowledge that would positively impact the community and loved ones.

Content	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii-iv
Abstract	v
Chapter 1 Introduction	1-16
Background	
<i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
Martial Values in Ancient Malacca	
Hang Tuah as a Symbol of <i>Wiraism</i> in the Malay Society	
Representations of Hang Tuah in Film	
Applying Gestalt Theory on <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
Chapter Outline	
Chapter 2 Malay Narratives and Adat	17-31
Adat in Malay Narratives	
Malay 'Wiraism' in the Face of Modernity	
Traditional Narrative Discourses in the Malay World	
Extension into Filmic Narratives	
Filmic Representations of Hang Tuah in <i>Hang Tuah</i> (1957), <i>Hang Jebat</i> (1961), <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (1961) and <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
Chapter 3 Defining A Gestalt Reading of Hang Tuah	32-41
Kurt Koffka (1935)	
Rudolf Arnheim (1954, 1957)	
Reuven Tsur (2012)	
Framing Gestalt Theory in Relation to <i>Wiraism</i>	
Law of Pragnanz	
Law of Past Experience	
Law of Similarity	
Law of Proximity	
Law of Closure	
Law of Figure/Ground Segregation	
Heroism vs <i>Wiraism</i>	

Chapter 4	Gestalt Analysis of Dialogue in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	42-56
	Understanding Poetic Dialogue in Malay Tradition	
	Poetic Dialogue in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
	Rhyme Patterns & Stanza Structure	
	Length & Time of Dialogues	
Chapter 5	Gestalt Analysis of Cultural Forms in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	57-71
	Charaterising Wiraism in Hang Tuah	
	<i>Keris, Cindai</i> and <i>Pending</i> as Stimuli	
	<i>Keris</i> in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
	<i>Cindai</i> in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
	<i>Pending</i> in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
Chapter 6	Gestalt Analysis of Cultural Forms in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	72-85
	The Influence of Colours and Contrast in Figure-Ground Segregation	
	Colours in The Malay World	
	Red	
	Yellow	
	Green	
	Black	
	White	
	Blue	
	Grey	
	Colour and Contrast in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
	Red in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
	Grey in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
	Yellow in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
	Contextualising <i>Wiraism</i> in <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
Chapter 7	Conclusion	86-91
	Hang Tuah as a Paradigm for Ideal Malay Man	
	Rewriting Hang Tuah	
	The Impact of <i>Puteri Gunung Ledang</i> (2004)	
	Where Does The Thesis Go From Here?	

References	92-98
Appendices	99-128

ABSTRACT

The politics of cultural and national identities have long been marked by the presence of heroes to stimulate a sense of pride and faith in a particular community. While governmental policies help negotiate the borders through which a community stands on, narratives and mythology often shape the psychology and ideology of a nation. For such a reason perhaps, the identification of Hang Tuah as a symbol of 'Malayness' has long been a subject of fantasy for various scholars in the field of Southeast Asian studies (Kassim, 1966; Khoo G. C., 2006; Maier, 2004; Shaharuddin, 2014; Siti, 1993). In spurring this discourse forward, this report would study *wiraism* within *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) and observe how "a feudal hero such as Hang Tuah can figure as a national hero in postcolonial Malaysia" (Khoo, 2006: p. 18) through the effective use of both verbal and non-verbal cues. The study will use gestalt as a lens in approaching the film and examine the construction of wiraism through the use of dialogue(s), cultural form(s) and colour(s) and contrast, in examining how the film "shifts the understanding of Hang Tuah in the perception of the Malay audience" (Putten & Barnard, 2007, p. 247).

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background

This thesis seeks to understand the construction of Hang Tuah as a wira with respect to Malay identity in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). While Hang Tuah was originally cast as a hero in 16th and 17th-century epics, *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, the narrative of Hang Tuah has taken a life of its own beyond these texts and have continually recurred in discussions on *wiraism* and the formulation of an 'ideal Malay man'. Ibrahim Mahmood, a founding member of United Malay National Organisation (UMNO) and close associate of Dato Onn Jaafar, the first President of UMNO, even remarked in his book, *Tun Biajid Anak Hang Tuah* (1966) on the need for Malays to recognise Hang Tuah as a model Malay, "not only for knowledge and remembrance but also to appreciate the moral points hidden and buried in it" (pp. 11-12).

Using *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) as the central focus of my research, I seek to understand the construction of the ideal Malay male image through values engrained in *wiraism* and perceptible in Hang Tuah as a mythical character and symbol. I argue Hang Tuah to be a paradigm of the classical silat warrior and *pendekar*. According to Burhan Baki (2008), Hang Tuah is "the locus point (among the *rakyat*) to which all Malay "culture", power and allure must return, as the alpha-male capable of the greatest mental and physical feats, the knight-cum-scholar-cum-monk who personifies the Melayu paradigm in all its esoteric ceremonies, beliefs, loyalties and secrets."

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004) was Malaysia's first entry in a major international film festival and was featured in the 61st Venice International Film Festival. It was "the first time a Malaysian movie is sharing the same stage with world-class films" (Washington Times, 2004). *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) was also noted to be a film that "shifts the understanding of Hang Tuah in the perception of the

Malay audience. Instead of focusing on nationalistic sentiments, the film portrays the complex hero as a romantic, martial arts aficionado with few political undertones" (Putten & Barnard, 2007, p. 247). The 'depoliticisation' of the film, however, is particularly intriguing due to the close proximity between Tiara Jacquelina and Malaysian politics whose husband, Tan Sri Datuk Seri Mohd Effendi Norwawi, was a Cabinet Minister at the time of the film's release.

According to the film's director, Saw-Teong Hin, "Tan Sri Effendi had an important role behind the scenes. Even when we blew our budget after production, he would be there to push us on" (Teong-Hin, personal communication, January 31, 2017). Mulaika Hijjas (2010), an esteemed scholar in Malay literature also noted a correlation between *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) and Malaysian politics which may have influenced "the recurring tussles over Hang Tuah, the brandishing of a *keris* in the 2005 UMNO General Assembly by the then Head of the Youth Wing of the party, and the constant and often malapropic quotations of classical literature in the speeches of cabinet ministers" (p. 249).

This study aims at studying how *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) has been successful in enunciating Hang Tuah's function as champion of lost traditional Malay values (Haron Daud, 2001) and the elements that have been instrumental towards the construct.

***Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)**

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004) sought to elevate the status of Malay(sian) films and reintroduce popular Malaysian classics to the Malay(sian) audience (Tan, 2007). Working on a script provided by Mamat Khalid, it was directed by first-time film director, Saw Teong-Hin and featured a line-up of first-timers, including Mahyuddin Sidik who was given his first break at heading the film's costume design department following the untimely death of his mentor, Mahmood, who was originally

tasked with the job. Mahmood passed away immediately before the start of the film's pre-production phase.

The film explores the relationship between Gusti Putri (Puteri Gunung Ledang), Hang Tuah and Sultan Mahmud. Emphasising on the tale of forbidden romance between Puteri Gunung Ledang and Hang Tuah, the film outlines the story of a Majapahit princess who willingly leaves her palace life to travel to Mount Ledang to be reunited with her lover. Her departure was not well received by Gusti Adipati Handaya Ningrat, King and brother of Puteri Gunung Ledang who was threatened with an attack by the Sultanate of Demak. Desperate to quell the invasion, the king offered his sister's hand in marriage to Sultan Mahmud of Malacca.

Hang Tuah was ordered to head the royal delegation to present a proposal to Puteri Gunung Ledang. Initially happy at being in the presence of Hang Tuah, Puteri Gunung Ledang became upset after realising Hang Tuah would not forsake the Sultan's wish to be married to the princess. Following a series of twists, Hang Tuah later resigned from his position as *laksamana* (admiral) to avoid upsetting the Sultan. Hang Tuah's unwavering loyalty towards the Sultan led him to prefer a life as a commoner as opposed to upsetting the Sultan.

The story perpetuates the notion of the sultan as the divine ruler and "endowed, by virtue of his supernatural origin and divine preordination, with sacral energy or power, *daulat*, which makes him a focus and a custodian of the social order" (Braginsky, 1990, p. 406). Through references to Sultan Mahmud Shah, Hang Tuah and Gusti Putri, the story explores the intricate relationship between the Sultan of Malacca and Hang Tuah, an intricacy that can also be found in early texts such as *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Sulalatus Salatin*.

It was in such a spirit that *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) was made. Citing the main drive behind the film, Mamat Khalid professed:

The younger generation no longer knew the significance of folk

stories and traditional Malay values. They were no longer aware of their Malay selves. It was then that I realised that the situation was becoming dire and kids no longer know Mat Jenin and the likes. I later voiced my concern to Tiara who wholeheartedly agreed (personal communication, March 4, 2017).

There was a strong drive within Mamat Khalid and Tiara Jacquelina to revive and re-establish traditional values through the film. Since its initial production run in 2004, efforts to stress on its continuing relevance and legacy alive continued with its 10th-anniversary celebration in 2015. The film also left a visible footprint through a series of musical productions in 2006 and 2009, a book in 2007 and finally a concert in 2015.

Particularly for Mamat Khalid, the film provided him with an avenue to present Hang Tuah. He firmly believed that "Tuah represents modern Malays. Not ancient Malays. Modern Malays should all strive to be like Hang Tuah, loyal to a cause" (personal communication, March 4, 2017). In Hang Tuah do we see martial values often associated with *pendekars* and *wiras*.

The film seals the image of Hang Tuah as an elite warrior of ancient Malacca whose love towards Puteri Gunung Ledang ultimately led to the fall of the kingdom. Ultimately however, the film resonates with Tiara Jacquelina's view of the film as a response to her concern that "society is changing so quickly that we have forgotten our roots. The simple things in life are being passed by as we chase our dreams (as cited in Tan, 2007, p. 18)".

Martial Values in Ancient Malacca

Ancient Malacca holds a special significance to the Malay society and is a paradigm of an ideal society and "a glorious page in the nation's history" (Kim, 1992, p. xvii). For the contemporary Malay society, ancient Malacca is a utopian society

where ancient martial and social values still retain its currency (Abu Hassan Sham, 1993). The glorious age of ancient Malacca was also punctuated with figures who embodied values such as intelligence, wisdom, commitment, and strength beyond the typical reach of common folks (Blackburn & Hack, 2012).

Malacca marked the height of Malay pride and glory with its territory extending from modern-day southern Thailand to the eastern coast of Sumatra. It was also a well-respected empire, earning the cooperation and respect from other civilisations such as the Ming empire (China), Ryukyu kingdom (Japan), Safavid dynasty (Persia), Muzaffarid dynasty (Gujarat) and Arabs (Ahmad Sarji, 2011). In one of its illustrious point in history, Sultan Muzaffar Shah ordered an army of 200 ships, led by Tun Perak and 19 Malaccan silat warriors to capture Pahang. Pahang was eventually successfully captured by Malacca with its maharaja Dewa Sura, and princess Wanang Seri held captive and presented to the Sultan of Malacca (Winstedt, 1938).

At its core, however, the strength of the Malaccan sultanate lay in the presence of nine elite *pendekars*, namely Hang Tuah, Hang Jebat, Hang Kasturi, Hang Lekir, Hang Lekiu, Hang Ali, Hang Iskandar, Hang Hasan and Hang Husain (Reid & Marr, 1991). These *pendekars* were hallmarks of ancient Malacca and embodied strong Malay martial values. They were heralded as icons for the Malay society.

The conception of Malacca as a utopian society formed the bedrock of Malay civilisation, a concept which later continues to be extolled in future narratives on Malay culture (*adat*), identity, politics and society (Barnard, 2004). Under such a landscape, Malay martial values such as those observed by silat masters and warriors are continuously rhapsodised as a reminder towards the Malay society's glorious past.

Hang Tuah as a Symbol of *Wiraism* in the Malay Society

The most illustrious in Malacca's lineup of *pendekars* was Hang Tuah who was fluent in twelve languages including Mandarin, Arabic, Javanese, Persian and Japanese as well as being skilled in the use of the sword, *keris*, long *keris*, bow, crossbow and spear (Reid & Marr, 1991). Hang Tuah was a symbol of the Malaccan empire itself and that "while he was alive, Malaka was prosperous. With his death, Malaka collapsed. As time passed, he came to embody the hopes and aspirations of the Malay people" (Liaw, 2013, p. 405). Hang Tuah was the only Malay hero "whose character successfully captures the essence and history of the 15th century Malaccan kingdom and its Malay ruler which consequently allow for the Malays to propagate their purported noble origins and superior status against all other human beings in the land" (R. Hamdan, 2013, p. 270).

Hang Tuah embodied the goal in which every Malay man would want to pursue. He represented the archetypal hero whose values should be emulated. Hang Tuah's mastery of silat not only earned him the right to be regarded as a *laksamana* (admiral) or *pendekar* (silat warrior) but ultimately shaped his character to be of a larger movement within the society. Explaining the significance of Malay martial values and *pendekars* to the Malay community, Suryo Ediyono (2013) surmised:

Pendekars are not only revered, but exemplary. They are icons of both silat as well as the community. A *pendekar* has to preserve and uphold cultural values such as conviction, patience, earnesty, valour and loyalty, alongside guiding the society as to what can and cannot be done. (p. 356)

The importance of *pendekars* becomes more profound when the community was in need of leaders within its society. In the absence of the Sultan, *pendekars* filled the gap and strengthened the position of the Malays in the society. Such a significance can be observed in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) when Hang Tuah was

entrusted by the Sultan in sending a personal invite to Pangeran Benowo of the Demak Sultanate, to the Sultan's proposed wedding to Puteri Gunung Ledang before subsequently leading a delegation to ask for Puteri Gunung Ledang's hand in marriage to the princess. While the *Bendahara* (Prime Minister) could only offer his views and advice to the Sultan, it was Hang Tuah himself who played a more important role in these matters.

More importantly, the role of silat warriors and masters extended beyond the age of ancient Malacca and Malay sultanates and permeated through contemporary times. Razha Rashid (1990) explains:

It was significant, that the guru silat provided a particular kind of leadership for Malays during the period of British intervention. In the years after independence in 1957, there were no cases of violence of this kind until the eve of 13th May 1969, when clashes broke out in Kuala Lumpur between the Malays and the Chinese. Almost spontaneously, an army of silat exponents from a variety of silat groups united under one banner to form a special force that spearheaded the formation of a massive impromptu army known as 'Selendang Merah'. (pp. 87-88)

Silat masters provided a sense of security where security was not discernible and would shift from being custodians of a martial culture to guardians of the community and culture itself. They functioned as protectors of the community against enemies and foes, regardless of the seen or unseen (Farrer, 2009). It is in such a spirit that *pendekars*, *pahlawans*, silat masters, *satrias*, *laksamanas*, and *wiras* regularly place the benefits of others before themselves and reflect "on society, and the relations between the microcosmos, their own body, and the macrocosmos" (Barendregt, 1995).

The consistent effort in painting Hang Tuah as a hero suggests a pattern and the need to take a closer investigation at the design in which Hang Tuah is presented. Going beyond traditional texts such as *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Sulalatus Salatin*, the story of Hang Tuah continues to be told and retold in hopes of keeping his legacy relevant and alive. Steeped in Malay martial values, Hang Tuah continues to be a wira for the contemporary Malay society.

Representations of Hang Tuah in Film

To better understand the construction of Hang Tuah as a wira, one has to be acquainted with the primary source of narratives on Hang Tuah, namely *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Both the *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah* became the genesis of future narratives on Hang Tuah. *Sulalatus Salatin* was written, "to emphasise the sovereignty and the greatness of the Malay rulers" (Fang, 2013, p. 352) while *Hikayat Hang Tuah* further advanced the notion of the Malay rulers' greatness through the presence of specific desirable traits in Hang Tuah.

Alongside Hang Jebat, Hang Tuah's antithesis, the narrative of Hang Tuah remained unchanged over the years and formed the basis of early films such as *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (1961), *Hang Tuah* (1957), and *Hang Jebat* (1961), which were all made at a period when Malaysia just gained independence in 1957. Therein also lay the need to promote solidarity within the newly formed nation by drawing attention to the character of Hang Tuah as a wira whose traits would encourage peace and harmony through a culture of subservience to the interests of the ruling government (Kessler, 1992; Chandra Muzaffar, 1979; Alatas S. H., 1972; Shahrudin Maaruf, 1984).

An equally strong belief amongst a small fraction of the Malay community was that Hang Tuah never really died and that he still lives in spirit (Haron Daud, 2014). The notion of Hang Tuah's continuing existence manifested itself in *Tuah* (1988)

when Hang Tuah was shown reappearing in a contemporary setting to rescue a man from a group of criminals.

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004), however, tried to justify Hang Tuah's existence by modelling him in a more realistic setting and instead focused on presenting Malay values, culture, and heritage. Aside from the ability to engage in a telepathic conversation and leap in mid-air during a fight, Hang Tuah was otherwise portrayed with ordinary human qualities. It is important to note that these feats, as extraordinary as they may seem, are perceived as hallmarks of a highly-skilled *pendekar*. Specifically in the film, both Teong-Hin and Mamat Khalid believed that in order for Hang Tuah to be relatable to the common man, it was imperative for him to be perceived in a most realistic manner (Mamat Khalid, personal communication, March 4, 2017 & Teong-Hin, personal communication, January 31, 2017).

Differentiation between Hang Tuah and other characters in the film had to be subtle. Hang Tuah's character, in that regard, became more nuanced with a focus on language and other subtle aspects of Malay culture (Teong-Hin, personal communication, January 31, 2017). In discerning these aspects, I propose the use of gestalt theory as a lens to approach my thesis.

Research Framework

Gestalt has been used by Hassan Muthalib, a notable Malaysian film critic and historian, in approaching Malay films. Its use, however, seems to present a limited understanding of the nature of gestalt in which his interpretation of gestalt was limited to the understanding of good gestalt as good form. His use of 'gestalt' was not thoroughly expounded. In his article, *Good Gestalt in Come Hell or High Water by Sheril A Bustaman* (2015) for example, his use of 'gestalt' stops short at a translation of the term as 'form' and his understanding of a good film as one that leaves you with a good feeling. Such an understanding can also be analysed in his later article, *Redha by Tunku Mona Riza : Of Hardships, Hope, Sacrifice and Salvation* (2016)

where his only reference towards gestalt was in, "The resulting gestalt (form) is what makes Redha a satisfying watch" (Hassan, 2016).

This research would be an opportunity for better understanding gestalt in Malay films as well as an attempt to develop the gestalt function of various elements in the systemised pattern of looking at films. Herein lies the advantage of gestalt psychology over other theoretical frameworks such as semiotics where its focus is not on the signifier and the signified but rather on the operants of aesthetics and film. The methodology typically applied in semiotics tends to pay a greater concentration on the analysis of the text without seeing how it fits within a larger context. Elaborating on its limitations, Paul McDonald (1997) argues that semiotics "has the effect of divorcing the film text from history" (p. 324).

Gestalt theory instead focuses its efforts on the study of forms and analyses the different elements that make up a whole. Through this research, I acknowledge Koffka as a founding authority in gestalt psychology and his significant contribution in publishing his understanding of gestalt in the English language. Since his initial publication of *Principles of Gestalt Psychology* (1935), the use of gestalt psychology as a systemised pattern continues to have an effect and has extended itself towards understanding film. Film theorists such as Rudolf Arnheim (1957), Sergei Eisenstein (1949) and Bela Balázs (2010) developed principals of visual organisation and builds on the premise that every single entity is built upon the foundations of an organised structure and characteristic elements, and that the various parts of a whole lead towards the formation of a gestalt. Christian Metz (1968), a prominent semiotician and film scholar, was also influenced by gestalt psychology in that film studies cannot just focus on the physical form but must also include a study of its constituents (Penley, 1989).

Metz (1968) recognised film as releasing "a mechanism of affective and perceptual participation in the spectator. They spontaneously appeal to his sense of belief - never, of course, entirely, but more intensely than do the other arts" (p. 4).

Film, therefore, is packaged in such a manner that it is to be accepted as it presents itself.

To better understand the 'mechanism' in which Metz makes mention of, we must first comprehend Kurt Koffka's principles of gestalt. A common understanding of gestalt often attributed to Kurt Koffka is that 'the whole is other than the sum of its part' and that the whole exists independently in man's perceptual system. This research extends the understanding of gestalt theory on modern film and builds upon gestalt theories forwarded by Rudolf Arnheim (1954), Leonard Meyer (1956) and Reuven Tsur (2012).

Arnheim (1954) forwarded the idea of gestalt psychology in approaching art and develop a deeper understanding of the subject. Using gestalt psychology, Arnheim sought to uncover the process that takes place when artists create works of arts in its various forms. His work drew heavily from earlier works by Koffka and forms one of the most important works on gestalt theory. Arnheim argues that works of art are never created in a vacuum but instead heavily depend on its context to influence its perception. Arnheim also believed that the way in which we perceive art is also dependent upon the way we are conditioned to perceive such an art form.

Expanding the narrative of gestalt psychology, Leonard Meyer (1956) used gestalt theory in order to comprehend the existence of emotion in music. He theorised that one's perception of emotions within the spatial realm of music is conditioned by the cultural context of the emotive experience. He goes on to say that "a stimulus or gesture which does not point to or arouse expectations of a subsequent musical event or consequent is meaningless. Because expectation is largely a product of stylistic experience, music in a style with which we are totally unfamiliar is meaningless" (p. 35). Meyer's work formed the basis for future works on cognitive psychology in music.

Both of Rudolf Arnheim and Leonard Meyer's work subsequently informed Reuven Tsur's take on gestalt theory as a basis for approaching readings of poems.

He argues that one's reading of poetry, as well as the impression it creates, is often defined by contemporary conventions of such a reading and that "we 'prefer' to perceive shapes that are 'strong' in this sense" (Tsur, 2012, p. 41). Tsur draws from Arnheim's theory of 'perceptual forces' in which one's perception of aesthetics within poetry reading is equally dependent on the caesuras or silences that punctuate a reading. Tsur suggests a methodology to discuss prosody as visual images in which the 'unseen' are equally crucial towards the development of a rhythmical performance.

Rudolf Arnheim (1954), Leonard Meyer (1956) and Reuven Tsur (2012) all pay homage to Koffka (1935) whose gestalt theory facilitated a deeper understanding of various art forms beyond visual organisation. Gestalt theory illuminates a critical understanding of art by breaking it up into its constituent elements while simultaneously recognise the impact played by one's experience in the perception of the artform. Arnheim, Meyer, and Tsur are all indebted to Koffka in their respective understanding of Gestalt theory.

Applying Gestalt Theory on *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The theory will be useful in exploring the interrelation between various elements in the film and the film itself. In looking at these elements, I argue that the various elements are each developed through a series of stimuli to aid in the construction of Hang Tuah as a wira. These stimuli are independent constituents that come together as a systemised pattern to form a 'whole' within the film itself. I will explore the independent constituents as dialogue(s), cultural form(s) and colour(s) and contrast. These elements come together and work as a whole in defining Hang Tuah as a wira.

Incumbent towards the originality and validity of this research would be the understanding of the research question through the acknowledgement and advice of various key individuals that would shed light on the subject matter. The research

would involve first-person interviews with Executive Producer, Tiara Jacquelina; Scriptwriter, Mamat Khalid; Director, Saw Teong Hin; Costume Designer, Mahyuddin Sidik.

Tiara Jacquelina was the Executive Producer of the film and played the role of Puteri Gunung Ledang in the film. Her presence on the film can be felt both on and off-screen in which she was responsible for turning the original script into a film. Together with her husband, then Minister of Special Functions in the Prime Minister's Department, Datuk Seri Mohd Effendi Norwawi, they were the main financiers in the film. The film eventually won Tiara the Best Actress award at the Asia Pacific Film Festival and the Best Producer award at the Asian Film Festival.

Mamat Khalid was the original 'architect' of the story that led to the subsequent development of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). Motivated by a desire to create a Malay film that would be on par with stories like *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (2000), Mamat Khalid envisaged a film that would cast Malay culture in the forefront and focused on the subtleties that makes it unique. He was responsible for juxtaposing the narratives of Hang Tuah with the legend of Gunung Ledang (Tan, 2007). His insight as a screenwriter is important to gain a structural understanding of the film and seeing how various elements fit into its overall aim.

Equally influential in the conceptualisation of the film was first-time film director, Saw Teong-Hin, who was responsible for interpreting the script and positioning it as a 'world-class film'. Teong-Hin changed the direction of the original script from focusing on the romance between Hang Tuah and Puteri Gunung Ledang to a story that focused on highlighting traits which he felt were unique to the Malay(sian) culture. He was responsible in the way the film was shot as well as the characterisation of the film's characters.

Lastly, I will interview Mahyuddin Sidik, a last-minute replacement for his mentor, Mahmood, who passed away shortly before production began. Mahyuddin Sidik had to quickly pick up the pieces and was only left with one month to figure out

his costumes. He mainly referred to *The Malay Annals* to gain inspiration in drawing up the costumes needed for the scenes. He was also responsible for giving advice towards the colours to be used by each character.

Chapter Outline

In line with the arguments laid out above, this chapter has established the essentiality of the research and the research question that would steer the direction of the research. Anchoring the study through the use of gestalt theory to approach *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) as its primary subject matter, the research unravels the construction of Hang Tuah as a wira in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). Succeeding this chapter, the following chapters will provide a nuanced account towards the inquiry, elaborating on the gestalt analysis of *wiraism* within the context of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004).

Chapter Two presents the overarching context of Malay film and narratives and the significance of *wiraism* in Malay culture. This chapter explores how changing perceptions, largely in lieu of different challenges and problems over time, have necessitated *adat* (Malay culture) to be presented in a more nuanced manner. The chapter will also discuss the influence of *pendekars* on the Malay culture and the connotation of *wiraism* often paired with the term. The chapter will also briefly discuss the Malay films and narratives, and how *wiraism* has taken various forms over the course of history. It develops on Shaharuddin Maaruf's theory of Malay heroism as explored in *Concept of a Hero in Malay society* (1984) and examines *wiraism* and specific traits within Hang Tuah that resonate with a contemporary Malay audience. The chapter also discusses Hang Tuah as a paragon for the modern Malay and previous representations of Hang Tuah in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (1961), *Hang Tuah* (1957), and *Hang Jebat* (1961).

Chapter Three deals with my understanding of gestalt and a review of *Principles of Gestalt Psychology* (1935), *Film as Art* (1957), *Art and Visual*

Perception (1954) and *Poetic Rhythm, Structure, and Performance: An Empirical Study in Cognitive Poetics* (2012). It will finally culminate with a sub-chapter delineating my understanding of gestalt theory in the thesis. The chapter acknowledges my indebtedness to gestalt theoreticians who have been vital in the research trajectory of this thesis.

Chapter Four advances the study through a gestalt analysis of Hang Tuah's dialogue(s) in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). The chapter will look at *wiraism* as a gestalt, characterised by Hang Tuah's position as a servant, mortal and caliph of the Malaccan Sultanate. Beginning with an investigation of rhyme patterns and stanza structure of Hang Tuah's speech within the film. The study would take readers through an analysis of Hang Tuah's speech over the course of six main scenes in the movie. The chapter maps out the speech of Hang Tuah and would bring the analysis forward through the understanding of gestalt in Reuven Tsur's *Poetic Rhythm* (2012).

Chapter Five will develop the study through a gestalt analysis of forms in presenting Hang Tuah in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). Focusing its attention on the use of forms in establishing Hang Tuah in the film, the research would make references to the costumes and props worn by Hang Tuah. In particular, the analysis in this part would analyse the law of past experience in the development of Hang Tuah in the film and would make an inquiry into the use of specific props that have impacted Hang Tuah's image as a wira in the film.

Chapter Six will expand the breadth of the research through a study of the scenes in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) and would look at the use of colours in influencing Hang Tuah as a wira in the film. The analysis of scenography would look at twenty-six scenes in the film, focusing on scenes featuring Hang Tuah as a primary subject. The chapter will study the relationship between colour(s), contrast and gestalt theories of perception and supplemented by a study of colours in the traditional Malay world by Che Husna Azhari (1997).

Chapter Seven will consolidate the arguments and findings laid out in

previous chapters and present a summary of the key findings. It will also make recommendations towards future research before rounding off the thesis with a final paragraph reiterating the significance of the research.

Each chapter will look at distinct discursive dimensions of the thesis, in which when viewed in perspective, provides for an understanding of how Hang Tuah was constructed as a wira in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004).

CHAPTER 2

Malay Narratives and *Adat*

Malay films, particularly those of the 50s and 60s, were recognised as 'marginalized literature' by Timothy P. Barnard (2006) who makes the case that Malay films should "be considered as vibrant and as important as that written and discussed in literary circles" (p. 176). Particularly in Malay film studies, scholarly efforts tend to focus on P. Ramlee, a prominent icon in Malaysian films whose works have significantly influenced the development of Malay films in the region.

There are similar features between film and literature. Film and literature are both forms of narratives which hold significance to the Malay society. This is particularly true when considering the history of Malay literature which has been long rooted in oral literature. Explaining the significance of film to the Malay society, Barnard (2006) argues:

If Southeast Asians originally obtained their literature orally, today they consume it both visually and orally through television and cinema. While the average Malay youth has never read *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, they are undoubtedly familiar with the 1956 film version of the tale, which is constantly shown on television in Malaysia and Singapore. (p. 164)

Over time, the way in which literature is understood has necessitated film to be part of the overall scheme of Malay narratives (Sugeng Riyadi, 2014). Film supplements the appreciation of Malay narratives and can be seen in Khoo Gaik Cheng's *Reclaiming Adat* (2006) in which Malay films are analysed alongside Malay literature to have a better understanding of *adat* being continually reclaimed, reconstructed and reconstituted in the face of modernity.

This chapter serves to present the sublimation of '*adat*' through the concept of *wiraism* within the context of Malay film and narratives. It will provide an argument

of narrative discourse in the Malay world, beginning with an introduction towards folk literature and modern Malay literature. It will examine how literature has been incumbent towards the notion of *adat*. The chapter will later progress with a discussion on Malay filmic narratives before discussing *wiraism* as a voice in which *adat* is sublimated in the face of modernity.

***Adat* in Malay Narratives**

Adat plays a salient role in the Malay psyche and is consistently perceived to form the crux of Malay identity (Tenas Effendy, 2006; Ahmad, 2007; Henley & Davidson, 2008; Zainal Abidin Borhan, 2013; Mohd Taib Osman, 2004; Hooker, 1974). *Adat* is important in that it not only describes the manner in which Malays live but also prescribe the laws that Malays subscribe to. *Adat* provides a cultural blueprint for the Malay society. According to Hooker (1974), "*adat* is not only part of the general Malay culture but is also a portion of the technical legal system. Students of *adat* must thus come to grips with the total body of *adat* but, this, because the Malay is also Muslim, necessarily includes Islam" (p. 88).

Passed down from generation to generation, either through verbal or non-verbal means, *adat* is periodically cross-referred in ensuring that contemporary Malay ideals are in line with values of traditional Malay society. *Adat* is held in high esteem by the society as can be observed in proverbs like '*biar mati anak, jangan mati adat*' (allow the child to perish, do not allow *adat* to die), '*biar mati bini asal adat tidak mati*' (your wife may die so long as *adat* survives), and '*biar berbaju buruk asalkan beradat elok*' (though the jacket be tattered, this is of no consequence as long as *adat* is maintained) (Tenas Effendy, 1997). *Adat* is observed as a crucial element in ensuring that the Malay identity remains intact and stays relevant in modern times. According to Wazir (1992), *adat* functions as "a system of 'check and balances' between incompatible or conflicting ideological systems" (p. 230).

In moving this thesis forward, it is imperative to bear in mind the origin of *adat* itself and the way in which *adat* has shaped the Malay identity and discourse. The foundations of *adat* is widely believed to be formulated after the arrival of Islam in the Malay region. The term is derived from the Persian and Arabic language and can be loosely translated as 'habit' or 'customs'. Its use in Malay narratives can be traced to *Undang-Undang Laut Melaka* (n.d) in which *adat* is affirmed as the legal code by which other regional sultanates would later emulate and follow. The text is believed to have been compiled during the reign of Sultan Muhammad Shah (1424-1444) of Malacca and continuously expanded by succeeding sultans until the fall of the Malaccan Sultanate in 1511 (Liaw, 1976). The notion of *adat* is intrinsically linked to the ways of life in the era of Malaccan sultanates and cannot be separated from each other. For that reason, any discourse towards the case of *adat* and the Malay identity cannot isolate itself from discussions on the Malaccan empire or figures and stories surrounding that era (Khoo, 2006; Vaseehar Hassan Abdul Razack, 2017; Tengku Intan Marlina Tengku Mohd Ali & Salina Ja'afar, 2013; Ismail Noor & Muhammad Azaham, 2000).

As an integral element towards Malayness, *adat* continues to find its voice in modern times and permeates through modern Malay narratives, constantly being invoked for Malays to "enunciate their place and identity in global modernity, whether in literature or cinema" (Khoo, 2006, p. 5).

Malay *Wiraism* in the Face of Modernity

Changing times has pressured the need for *adat* to be continuously sublimated using various means or forms. According to Khoo (2006), "modernity facilitates the conscious and unconscious recuperation of *adat*, usually through a focus on sexuality or a return to forms of the archaic such as magic or traditional healing" (p. 4). It is of particular importance so that *adat* can remain relevant and assert itself as being able to balance the Malay-Islamic lifestyle and the demands of

modern society. Despite progressing into modern times, Malay traditional healers continued to be referred to better understand the world around them. More often than not, it would be expected for these magicians to be schooled in Malay martial arts where silat "is the moving embodiment of Malay magic and religion" (Farrer D. S., 2008, p. 29).

Silat warriors or *pendekars* play an important role as 'champions' of the Malay cause and fit into the larger context of *wiraism* in which *pendekars* have to first and foremost be proficient in silat whereas *wiras* may refer to individuals who have made a significant contribution to the Malay society. In this regard, specifically, when touching on the subject of silat warriors, both *pendekars* and *wiras* are used interchangeably.

Ediyono (2013) argues that "*Pendekars* are not only to be feared but also followed. *Pendekars* are not only silat icons but also serve as icons for the society. A true wira is one who prefers serving others and ensures the safety of others as opposed to being self-serving" (p. 356). In such a spirit, *wiras* represent the best of that in which the Malay society has to offer and serve a larger cause in upholding the integrity of the Malay identity. Along with such a concept, it would be vital to note that *wiraism* itself cannot exist without acknowledging *adat* as its essential spirit.

Hang Tuah represents the "best man that we would all like to be. The best versions of ourselves. Of all men" (Teong-Hin, personal communication, January 31, 2017). On that note, I make the case that Hang Tuah is in himself a manifestation of *adat* and emanates *wiraism* as a product of values imposed by *adat*. He personifies all the traits of a *pendekar* and represents the values of traditional Malays. His position as an archetypal hero was bolstered by narratives of his life and illustrious career as a laksamana. Explaining the significance of Hang Tuah as a wira, Siti Aisah Murad (1993) argues, "Hang Tuah is truly a wira of his time. He is ever ready to serve the king even if it may inconvenience himself or hurt others. His service is to His Majesty through whom he perceives divinity. There was hardly a stroke of

defiance in Hang Tuah, even if it were to defend himself" (p. viii), Hang Tuah prides himself in being a loyal servant to the Sultan and places the well-being of the Sultan above all else.

Interestingly, while the significance of Hang Tuah has often been ascribed to traditional Malay values, Haron Daud (2001) argues the need for Hang Tuah to be continuously examined to understand how the Malays can once again attain the glory it once had during the days of *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Hang Tuah was not only valuable for ancient Malacca but continues to be equally important today. His presence as a real human was significant in relating the notion of *adat* in modernity and making him relatable to a Malay audience. This is especially important considering that preceding heroes such as Raden Inu Kertapati and Panji Semirang from earlier traditions of literature prior to *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah* were often portrayed as demigods and immortals (Hooykaas, 1947).

In contrast, *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah* illustrated Hang Tuah as a regular human being who eventually made it as the great warrior of Malacca. His every move and action was to be emulated and followed in ensuring continued success for the Malays. To that end, a famous quote often attributed to him, "*Takkan Melayu Hilang di Dunia*" (Never shall the Malay race vanish from the face of the Earth) would later be the most famous rallying cry for Malay nationalism. According to Haron Daud & Abdul Rahman Haji Ismail (2014), "*Takkan Melayu Hilang di Dunia*" is a sacred verse that continuously plays in Malay minds, henceforth being the opium that encrusts their hearts so that they feel invincible and unfettered by modernity. (p. v) "

Hang Tuah advanced *adat* as a way of life and necessitated *wiraism* as a tool to connect him with a larger Malay(sian) audience who may no longer be familiar with the narratives of *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. According to Khoo Gaik Cheng (2006):

Adat is also manifest in the authentic male characters who embody it in their silat rituals and knowledge or by their running amok, and who arm themselves with their phallic traditional weapons, ever ready to defend race and nation (*bangsa dan negara*) in the face of great socio-cultural upheaval, rendered so by modernity and changing gender configurations. (p. 5)

Hang Tuah functions as a 'bridge' to connect *adat* to a modern Malay audience, a notion which subsequently pervaded in the form of *wiraism* in which "conceptions of Islam and *adat* enacted, performed, and embodied in the way Malays walk, talk, sit, stand, eat, step past a seated person, lie down and sleep" (Farrer D. S., 2009, p. 98).

Traditional Narrative Discourses in The Malay World

The case of Malay narrative enjoys a long history. Discussions on traditional narrative discourses typically centre around discussions on literature that existed in palaces or *sastera istana*. *Sastera Istana* existed within the palace and extolled the position of the Sultan and his family. According to Saleeh Rahmat (2014):

In *sastera istana*, the image of the king is exalted whereas the image of Western colonialists are disparaged as their actions are deemed to have caused chaos to the Malay Sultanate of whom the author serves. (p. 308)

While it was initially only available to a limited audience, particularly members of Malay palaces, *sastera istana*, initially limited to members of Malay palaces, eventually gave rise to *Sastera Sejarah* or historical literature, registering main events within a palace, focusing on the fortunes and key developments of the kingdom over the span of several generations (Liaw, 2013; Hooykaas, 1947; Braginsky, 1990). Scholars were however at odds with each other over the value of

sastera sejarah as legitimate sources of historical information. Among these scholars was J.C Bottoms (1962) who argued:

History to the Malays has not until recently been neither science nor art, but entertainment. Accuracy, completeness organised exposition were not the vital principles; what best pleased were *hikayat*, fantasy and a pleasant hotch-potch of court and port gossip. (p. 180)

Bottoms did not hold a favourable impression of *sastera sejarah* and viewed narratives of this genre as a juxtaposition of myth and fantasy alongside historical writings. He argued that *sastera sejarah* mirrored a development in the 20th century where academic historians began to approach history as a social science as opposed to an art. E. H. Carr, in his seminal work *What is History?* (1961) argued that history "is a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the past and the present" (p. 30). It called for a recognised method of approaching history; a method of which *sastera sejarah* could not provide for (Winstedt, 1969; Wilkinson, 1907).

On the other hand, several other scholars like Mohd. Khalid Taib (1981), Mohd Taib Osman (1965), Hurgronje (1888), Hosein Djajadiningrat (1965), and Winstedt (1969) strongly opposed these views and argued *sastera sejarah* as a medium to understand the Malay psyche and *adat*. These scholars found the lack of precise dates and creative imagination of *sastera sejarah* to be impertinent. What was more important was in recognising *sastera sejarah* as a trajectory into the Malay worldview. According to C.W Watson (1978):

Indigenous history is premised on a different set of assumptions from that of contemporary western historiography. In the indigenous tradition detail is insignificant, what matters is the way in which the community apprehended change.., From this perspective precise data is immaterial, the incorporation of

supernatural element into history is useful, if it serves the function of a convenient referential symbol, simplifying and understanding of past events. (p. 128)

Sastera sejarah was not to be approached as a historical text in its traditional sense but rather observed to be a portal in understanding and appreciating *adat*, and significant events in the course of history. It should be measured according to the customs of the period in which it was written and not be ascribed with prevailing scholarly traditions of the 20th century (Mohd. Taib Osman, 1965; A. Teeuw, 1958).

Yet, more interestingly, some scholars looked upon *sastera sejarah* as an appendage towards understanding *hikayats*, a genre of Malay narrative that often takes the form of a long prose to espouse specific characters in the Malay world. Characters were typically kings, members of the royal family and religious figures. They were not seen as two distinct genres, but rather as complementing forces to understand the Malay psyche. It is under the same understanding that both *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Sulalatus Salatin* were referenced to form a better understanding of the course in which this research should take. So indivisible were the two literary works that "Sejarah Melayu (*Sulalatus Salatin*) was once confused with *Hikayat Hang Tuah* because both use the same backdrop, which was the state of Malacca" (Salleh, 2010, p. 236). In such a context, *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) continues the narrative of *sastera sejarah* by positioning itself in the context of the Malaccan Sultanate, ultimately framing itself as a modern take towards *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Sulalatus Salatin*.

Extension into Filmic Narratives

Bangsawan and *sandiwara* were forms of traditional Malay opera and played the most important role in the development of Malay films. Through these two art forms, traditional forms of poetry continued to remain relevant and continued being actively used and performed (Mohd Fairuz bin Zamani, 2014). *Bangsawan* and

sandiwara also served as a catchment pool of which pioneers of Malay cinema hailed from (Hassan, 2013). *Bangsawan* is a form of traditional Malay opera performed by full-time *bangsawan* theatre troupes and emphasises on reading of the script, usually centering on life in the Malay palace. *Sandiwara*, on the other hand, were mostly performed by independent amateur hobbyists.

The significance of these actors can be observed in *Leila Majnun* (1934) whose main lineup consisted of popular *bangsawan* actors such as M. Suki, Fatimah Jasmin, Syed Ali Mansoor, Tijah Khairuddin, Yem, Shariff Medan and Ahmad Pahlawan. These actors were selected due to their ability to memorise long lines and improvise the scripts that they were working on. According to S. Roomai Noor (1973), a popular Malay film actor and director in the 1950s, "When Malay film directors are in search of talents, their primary concern is in his ability to act. They have no concern over whether or not the person knows how to read. This happens despite all scripts having to be first be written before being committed to memory" (pp. 357-358).

Attention was on the ability of these actors to look and feel 'exotic'. The argument was that Malays were part of the larger Indian society (S. Roomai Noor, 1973). This was cemented through Malay films directed by Indian directors such as B. S. Rajhans, S. Ramanathan, K. R. Seetharama Sastry, Phani Majumdar and D. Ghoss. Melodramatic scenes, including singing and dancing, soon became a staple in Malay films.

As a result of the influence of these directors, Malay films soon followed the direction of Indian cinema where films were "loosely structured, digressive narratives, where cause/effect, realism and psychological motivation are of minimal concern, while music and dance as spectacle and the emotional involvement of the audience are of paramount importance" (Heide, 2002, p. 163). This was well-received by Malay audiences who enjoyed song and dance. The British government even noted

that the Malays were "a songful race..every year sees a new crop of topical songs. Every native operatic troupe has its own versifier to write words to well-known tunes" (Wright & Cartwright, 1908, p. 208).

Beyond the use of songs and dance, Malay films in the 50s functioned as a representation of its environment and explored political and social issues. Malay films however, slowly took a dual trajectory with films produced by Cathay-Keris Studio and Shaw Brothers in Singapore urging Malays to be receptive towards changes in the society whereas films produced by Kuala Lumpur based Malayan Film Unit advanced the notion of Malays being comfortable with its rural environment and needed a hero to continuously serve the nation (Hassan Abd. Muthalib, 2009).

Such a concept pervaded into the 60s with producers seeing the need for films to be used as a tool in developing a national identity in the wake of a new found independence for Malaya. According to S. Roomai Noor (1973), director of the original *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (1961), "In the Malaysian society, Malaysian films have a role as a tool towards the nation's communication and propaganda as well as advance the nation's aspirations" (p. 362). Malay films were perceived to be a medium for promoting national identity and pride.

The call to use Malay films to promote a sense national identity and pride was sat in well with P. Ramlee who was heavily influenced by Phani Majumdar, a former Indian freedom fighter turned Malay film director (Abdul Wahab Hamzah, 2003). As a result of such influence, themes such as 'injustice' and his opposition towards political masters who were keen in upholding an unjust social system soon began to dominate his craft (Wan Hashim Wan Teh, 2003). Film was deliberately manoeuvred to address and respond to the social concerns of the time. Reiterating such a notion, Syed Muhd Khairudin Aljunied (2005) expressed:

Malay films produced in Singapore of the 1950s and 1960s coincided at a time when the island was undergoing rapid social,

political, religious and economic changes. Directed towards an audience whose avenues of visual entertainment were fairly limited in those days, Malay films often reflected and, at the same time, influenced Malay consciousness in such a context. (p. 2)

The use of film in constructing the Malay identity and advancing *adat* continued to remain relevant till the 1990s (Khoo, 2006). Despite rapid changes in technology and filmmaking, Malay films continued to adopt the 'Malay mindset' of "conservatism that encourages the sticking to old and tested ways; the avoidance of conflict; a reluctance to deviate from community norms; and resulting in an inability to embrace change and creativity" (Kwek, 2011, p. 211). Films continued to revolve around family lines and societal conflicts. The need for *adat* to be continuously enunciated remained a primary concern for Malay filmmakers. It is in such a context that I argue that *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) continues to extol *adat* as a virtue to be emulated and followed.

Filmic Representations of Hang Tuah in *Hang Tuah* (1957), *Hang Jebat* (1961), *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (1961) and *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The significance of Hang Tuah in forging the Malay identity did not go unnoticed by the British colonialists in Malaya who were quick in encouraging *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Sulalatus Salatin* as staples of Malay literature by publishing and promoting these works in the ubiquitous *Malay Literature Series* (Putten & Barnard, 2007). It was almost as though Hang Tuah was used as a management tool to coax the Malay society into a culture of subservience to its political masters. To that end, Hang Tuah continued to recur in the age of Malay films and was featured in *Hang Tuah* (1957), *Hang Jebat* (1961), *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (1961), *Tuah* (1988) and *XX Ray 2* (XX Ray 2, 1995). While the films of the 50s and 60s had strong political undertones and remain the most important of these films, the films of the 80s ensured that the memory of Hang Tuah remains etched in the Malay identity.

Hang Tuah (1957) provided a glimpse of Hang Tuah's early life and his friendship with Jebat, Kasturi, Lekir and Lekiu who as a group, went to Mount Ledang to seek the tutelage of Tok Guru Adi. He soon fell in love with Melor, a native girl of Mount Ledang. Upon acquiring sufficient mastery of silat, Hang Tuah had to bid farewell to his lover and left for Malacca. As luck would have it, in Malacca, they were faced with an episode where they saved the life of Bendahara Dato' Tun Perak when he was on his way to meet the Sultan. Following the episode, Hang Tuah and his friends were appointed as court warriors. Shortly after the appointment, Tuah and his friends accompanied the Sultan to Majapahit to marry Raden Mas Ayu. In Majapahit, in a test of wits and strength, Hang Tuah was asked to engage a famed Majapahit warrior known as Taming Sari. He won the duel, winning Taming Sari's magical kris in the process.

Hang Tuah's victory further encouraged his reputation as a warrior, gaining the affection of the Sultan who would seek his aid in important missions. In a separate mission, Sultan Mansur Shah ordered for him to seek and bring Tun Teja, a princess the Sultan had interest for, back to Malacca. Tun Teja was then already engaged to Megat Panji Alam. Hang Tuah created a ruse by courting Tun Teja, subsequently getting her to break off her marriage with Megat Panji Alam and return to Malacca with him. While en route back to Malacca, Hang Tuah finally revealed the truth to Teja who was disappointed to learn of her fate. Upon their return, Hang Tuah was greeted with the news that Melor had become a court maiden and belonged to the Sultan. Hang Tuah's love for Melor got the attention of the Sultan who ordered his execution for being in close relations to a court maiden. This upset Hang Jebat who ran amok to avenge the death of Hang Tuah. The Sultan began to regret his decision and laments that Hang Tuah was the only one who would be able to match Jebat's mastery of silat. Hearing this, Tun Perak reveals that he did not kill Hang Tuah but instead kept him away in hiding. The Sultan immediately pardoned Hang

Tuah and requests for him to tackle the situation at hand. Hang Tuah eventually managed to subdue and kill Jebat and was conferred with the title of 'laksamana'.

The exchange between Hang Tuah and Hang Jebat was later expounded by *Hang Jebat* (1961) which follows the journey of Hang Jebat in the course of seeking revenge for Hang Tuah. It extends from the earlier narrative of Tuah's unjust execution and Jebat's disappointment over the Sultan's decision. His dissatisfaction, however, was unbeknown to the Sultan who appointed him to succeed Hang Tuah. The appointment was well-received by Hang Jebat who was secretly plotting an act of revenge for Hang Tuah. An opportunity came through when the Sultan revealed that he would not be around for a short period due to fatigue. Hang Jebat used the opportunity to seize the palace. Tun Teja and Raden Mas Ayu, both now consorts to the Sultan, expressed how Hang Tuah would have been able to overcome the situation. It was then that the Bendahara revealed that Hang Tuah was never executed as per the Sultan's wish but instead living in hiding in the borders of Malacca. Hang Tuah was summoned by the Sultan who now orders for Tuah to manage the situation at hand. The film climaxed with Hang Tuah killing Hang Jebat.

The Tuah-Jebat narrative took a turn in *Puteri Gunong Ledang* (1961) which begins by featuring Sultan Mahmud Shah who was obsessed with a woman of whom he earlier dreamt as being of extraordinary beauty. Seeking the counsel of his court magician, the court magician later revealed that the woman that he had been dreaming of was Puteri Gunong Ledang who lives on the peak of Mount Ledang. It was unexplained as to why Puteri Gunong Ledang was living on Mount Ledang.

Fuelled by his new found passion towards the princess, the Sultan broke off his engagement with Dinda, another princess he was earlier engaged with. He subsequently approached an elderly Hang Tuah to seek Puteri Gunong Ledang to present the Sultan's marriage proposal. Hang Tuah, however, was never successful in reaching the peak due to the extensive injuries that he sustained over the course of travelling to Mount Ledang.

Hang Tuah later orders for a group of younger warriors to meet the Princess on his behalf. The group was met with various obstacles and problems of which only one Tun Mamat managed to survive the ordeal and present himself before Puteri Gunung Ledang who left him with seven conditions to be presented as dowry. Tun Mamat finally makes his way back to Hang Tuah who interpreted these conditions as a rejection and has failed in his mission, subsequently swearing never to return to Malacca. Tun Mamat later led the delegation back to Malacca.

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004) follows a similar plot with *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (1961) with a romantic twist in the relationship between Puteri Gunung Ledang (Gusti Putri) and Hang Tuah. Emphasising on the notion of a forbidden romance between Puteri Gunung Ledang and Hang Tuah, the film outlines the story of a Majapahit princess who willingly leaves her palace life to travel to Mount Ledang to be reunited with her lover. Her departure was not well received by Gusti Adipati Handaya Ningrat, King and brother of Puteri Gunung Ledang who was threatened with an attack by the Sultanate of Demak. Desperate to quell the invasion, the king offered his sister's hand in marriage to Sultan Mahmud. Puteri Gunung Ledang, however, was disinterested and rejected the proposal, a move that subsequently led to Hang Tuah deserting his position to be united with the princess.

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004) deliberately refrained from presenting itself as a political film and instead focused on presenting Malay culture and heritage. According to Mamat Khalid (as cited in Tan, 2007, p. 19), the film's screenwriter, "Puteri Gunung Ledang is a myth but she has cultural value and that is what I wanted to show in the movie - Malay culture and tradition. It has been more than 30 years since we've had a film about the glorious age of the Malay sultanate."

Mamat Khalid felt an urge for stories that expound Malay cultural values to be reintroduced to the Malay society for fear of it being forgotten. In this regard, however, while the film was initially targeted for a young audience, Tiara Jacquelina sensed the potential in the film and made the decision to turn the script into a film.

The decision spurred Mamat Khalid to look at Tiara Jacquelina as a source of inspiration and shift the original focus from Hang Tuah to Puteri Gunung Ledang and bind them through a romantic tale. According to him, " Tiara was my muse. She's a superb woman. Unique. So, I asked myself, what if, Tiara became Puteri Gunung Ledang. To me, Tiara was at that level. It was my homage to her. My tribute to Tiara. For it to work as a film, Tiara has to be part of it. So, she'll be playing Puteri Gunung Ledang" (Mamat Khalid, personal communication, March 4, 2017).

Tiara was a influential figure throughout the conceptualisation process of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) and was in a position to make key decisions on the direction of the film. For such a reason perhaps, it was necessary for Mamat Khalid to devise a script that would appease her senses. Teong-Hin however chose to realign its focus towards elements he felt would highlight the 'beauty' of the Malay culture and projected a strong Malay identity within the film. Defining what he meant by 'beauty' and 'identity' Teong-Hin explained:

I am referring to the beauty of the Malay language. The court protocols. The language. The mysticism. The things we believe in till today. For that to come through. Because, ask yourself, what is a Malay film? If it's just a fighting, action story, it can be any film. But what will make it a Malay film? (Teong-Hin, personal communication, January 31, 2017).

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004) was an attempt by the filmmakers to produce a film that could speak to an international audience while maintaining its Malay identity.

CHAPTER 3

Defining a Gestalt Reading of Hang Tuah

The research is indebted towards the understanding of gestalt psychology through its exposition and application put forth by Kurt Koffka (1935), Rudolf Arnheim (1954, 1957), Leonard Meyer (1956) and Reuven Tsur (2012).

Kurt Koffka (1935)

Kurt Koffka (1935) laid the ground for studies on perception and formulated the basic premise behind gestalt psychology. His works chartered the development of gestalt theory and helped followers of the gestalt movement to consolidate and reaffirm their understanding of the theory.

He differentiates himself from previous scholars by reformulating the conventions surrounding the appreciation of art during that period. Koffka describes gestalt theory as "the function of a physiological theory in psychology, the relation between consciousness and the underlying physiological processes, or in our new terminology, between the behavioural and the physiological field" (Koffka, 1935, p. 53). Gestalt theory proposes that the overall mental experience is built on the organisation and patterning of one's perceptions.

In understanding organisation within one's perception, Koffka conceptualised field theory, an important concept within the gestalt movement. Through the theory, he delineated the difference between the *geographical field* and the field of experience in which the *geographical field* is the environmental field that facilitates the perception of observers while the field of experience lies in the realm of observers' mind. In essence, the *geographical field* is a representation of the world in which perception is formed, in which "what happens to a part of the whole, is determined by intrinsic laws inherent in this whole" (Wertheimer, 1938, p.7). *Geographical field* is an important aspect of gestalt theory that will be touched on in subsequent chapters.

Rudolf Arnheim (1954, 1957)

Rudolf Arnheim applied gestalt psychology to gain a deeper understanding of visual perception. In *Film as Art* (1957), he argued for film to be considered as an art. It was written at a time where film was considered a 'mechanical reproduction of reality'. He argues that art "is not simply an imitation or selective duplication of reality but a translation of observed characteristics into the forms of a given medium" (1957, p. 3).

Film mediates reality within its limitations to create art. In *Art and Visual Perception* (1954), he applied gestalt psychology to gain a deeper understanding of forms and colours as a means of visual communication. He argues that "there is no point to visual shapes apart from what they tell us" (Arnheim, 1954, p. 8).

He later asserts that "form always goes beyond the practical function of things by finding in their shape the visual qualities of roundness or sharpness, strength or frailty, harmony or discord" (Arnheim, 1954, p. 97). It works on the premise that forms are significant in art as a way in which the work is characterised. It suggests that forms are sometimes used in art as a means of representing something larger. The chapter shapes the way in which cultural forms within *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) should be approached and contextualising its use in constructing Hang Tuah as a wira in the film.

Investigating colours, Arnheim posits that "all visual appearance owes its existence to brightness and colour" (1954, p. 332). Colours are held by Arnheim as a stimulus that serves to heighten the perceptual appeal of art. In this regard, colours have a role in creating a nuanced understanding. It further argues that "in any successfully organized composition, the hue, place, and size of every color area as well as its brightness and saturation are established in such a way that all the colors together stabilize one another in a balanced whole" (Arnheim, 1954, p. 345). Incumbent towards this research, the chapter facilitates the manner in which colour should be handled within the framework of gestalt psychology in this thesis.

Reuven Tsur (2012)

Reuven Tsur advanced the study of gestalt theory by studying rhythmical performance within poetry readings through *Poetic Rhythm, Structure, and Performance: An Empirical Study in Cognitive* (2012) Tsur filled an important gap in the development of gestalt psychology and approached versification beyond the field of linguistics and acknowledges its overlap with the field of aesthetics. Tsur applies gestalt psychology in the analysis of poetry readings or versification and argues the ideal length of iambic rhythm to be ranging between 10-11 syllables, a range that resonates with Malay pantuns. Discussing his concept of analysis through 14 chapters, Tsur aims at investigating how a poetry performance accommodates patterns and speech within a verse to promote aesthetic quality.

Extending gestalt theory to literature, Tsur follows the footsteps of Rudolf Arnheim (1957) and Leonard B. Meyer (1956) who both explored the boundaries of gestalt theory and applied them in studies of pictures and music. He argues gestalt laws to be a key concept that can be used to understand poetic rhythm. Using a method Tsur described as 'back-structuring', Tsur approached each verse in the poetry that he approaches as a closed gestalt before working backwards in applying various gestalt laws to understand the aesthetic quality of each reading.

In an attempt at giving empirical evidence towards cognitive theory, Tsur uses recordings of poetry readings and interprets them accordingly using gestalt. Using the body of recordings that he has amassed, Tsur examines the minute details in the readings such as in the varying lengths and tone of different phonemes, demonstrating that a metrical set is often a gestalt structure that appears in the mind of readers.

Framing Gestalt Theory in Relation to *Wiraism*

Views held by Koffka, Arnheim and Tsur are instrumental towards the completion of this thesis. While I acknowledge its significance, their views fall short at

a clear explanation on the various visual phenomena. One of these examples include a lack of clarification in explaining how dashes are perceived as being a 'whole' to form a gestalt. I intend to overcome the limitation by correlating the visual and aural make-up of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) with characteristics of the proximal stimulus. It is equally vital, therefore, to analyse the elements within the film and corroborate its existence or the phenomena behind its existence through gestalt theory.

The study elucidates the need to understand *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) as the *geographical field* in which audiences' perception is derived. In understanding the physiological process that goes towards the perception of the *geographical field*, Koffka found the answer in Wertheimer's concept of isomorphism. Koffka proposed the understanding of the *physiological process* as a *molar phenomena* or "isomorphism between a system of signs and the structure of the world" (Grossman, 2013, p. 63). Gestalt theory advanced the notion of viewing art holistically as opposed to viewing it in an atomistic manner.

This thesis views *wiraism* as a 'whole' in which its gestalt is built upon *gestalten* elements, henceforward identified as dialogue(s), cultural form(s) and colour(s) and contrast. These elements are crucial in navigating the understanding of *wiraism* as a construct, through the methodology adopted by Reuven Tsur (2012) and Arnheim (1954, 1957). The approach adopted by these scholars mark the trajectory in which the research should progress and will be anchored by Koffka's law of *pragnanz*, law of past experience, law of similarity, law of proximity, and law of closure which will be further explained below. It is imperative, however, for readers to realise that these laws may not always work in silos and may sometimes work in relation to each other in forming a perception.

A key principle towards proposing *wiraism* as a gestalt is through the understanding of its construction as an "integration of quantity, order, and meaning" (Koffka, 1935, p. 13). In essence, *wiraism* is built upon the recurrence of concepts

and ideas that are arranged in an orderly fashion to develop a meaning towards its understanding. These concepts, essentially stimuli, facilitates "interpretive skills of identifying the main idea, inferring, concluding, predicting, extending, and evaluating can be processed" (Bell, 1991, p. 247).

Law of Pragnanz

Gestalt law of pragnanz is the most fundamental principle within gestalt theory. It is commonly misunderstood as 'a perfect form'. In truth, however, law of pragnanz argues that our perception tends to be skewed towards things that are simple, clear and ordered. Even under the circumstances where we are confronted with convoluted objects or shapes, we tend to reorganise these items into simpler wholes. In this respect, even when tales or images of ancient Malacca, Puteri Gunung Ledang or Hang Tuah is organised in a manner which is different from what audiences are already familiar with, they tend to fall back on images built in the past. Understanding the concept, the construction of *wiraism* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) hinges upon familiar perceptions of Hang Tuah constructed and stored in one's memory.

Law of Past Experience

Gestalt law of past experience works on the premise that stimuli may be categorised according to past experience. In that sense, should two objects usually be observed in close proximity to each other or within small intervals, these objects would be perceived as being together. It is an important concept within the framework of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) and would help illuminate the aesthetic choices made in the production.

Law of Similarity

Gestalt law of similarity argues that our eyes tend to build relationships between corresponding elements within a scene. Similarities may be achieved

through the formulation of similar characteristics such as colour, shape, size and texture. In this respect, viewers may build relationships between elements found in the film.

Law of Proximity

Gestalt law of proximity argues that objects that are 'proximate' to each other display a tendency to be grouped. Explaining it as a phenomenon known as phi phenomenon, Koffka argues that rapid sequences of movements would project itself as being united as a single gestalt. An example of this is the projection of a motion picture in which the whole is the sum of smaller parts within the unit.

Law of Closure

Gestalt law of closure argues that humans tend to prefer complete shapes or perceptions. In this case, should an image found to be incomplete, the user will 'complete' the image by filling in any missing bits of information. The basic premise behind the law is that our minds tend to react to patterns that are readily perceptible.

Law of Figure/Ground Segregation

Gestalt law of figure and ground segregation proposes that the mind differentiates between the figure and ground by processing visual inputs based upon a set of patterns. The perceptual decision is made through a set of visual cues. In essence, understanding the law of figure and ground aids the perceptual process of images. Specifically in films, however, the concept is most prominent in the use of colours as cues and casting the background in an out of focus effect or bokeh, an effect rendered by the camera's lens in which the background of a subject is blurred so as to guide one's attention towards a particular area of the scene.

Heroism vs *Wiraism*

The choice to use *wiraism* instead of heroism was made out of deliberation. While Hang Tuah fits the typical profile of a "warrior who lives and dies in the pursuit

of honor" (Schein, 1984, p. 58), His profile as a protagonist in Malay culture and literature is slightly more nuanced and steeped in martial and social values drawn within the parameters of *adat* and Islamic syariah law. While heroism does shed some light on how *wiraism* is to be approached, the concept of *wiraism* is too complex and steeped in martial values for it to not hold its own. It is heralded through the manifestation of both *adat* and Islamic values. Heroes also do not necessarily subscribe to martial values. So intertwined is the concept of *wiraism* to martial values that the root of *wiraism* studies itself began with Kassim Ahmad (1964) who drew the concept of *wiraism* from Hang Tuah in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Understanding Islamic Syariah is a key thrust of the concept of Islamic leadership can be understood through Ibnu Khaldun (1967) who explains:

(God) made the caliph His representative to handle the affairs
of His servants. He is to make them do things that are good and
not those that are harmful. (pp. 401-402)

The relationship between Islam and the Malay society is deeply intertwined with the laws of Islam being deeply engrained in the Malay psyche. On such a note, Islam has also played an important role in discussions on *wiraism* in the Malay society (Siti, 1993; R. Hamdan, 2013; Shahrudin, 1984). Islam elucidates the concept of *wiraism* and *wiras* as individuals who not only display strong leadership skills but can negotiate between the laws of *adat* and Islam. Reiterating the above notion, R. Hamdan and S.B Md. Radzi (2013) argues:

It is clear that Hang Tuah is only a heroic character to boost the
self-esteem, cultural identity and a model leader for the Malay
communities helplessly facing the onslaught of Western
colonialism. Yet he constrained himself in treading a fine
balance between seeking worldly and spiritual (*duniawi* and
ukhrawi) happiness. (p. 271)

Wiraism lies in one's ability to conciliate *adat* and syariah. The laws of *adat*

and syariah, therefore, must permeate through his actions. Highlighting Islam as a key element in *wiraism*, Syed Hussein Alatas (1972) draws three key elements towards *wiraism*:

The first in the nobility and loftiness of the ideal towards which the particular actions of the hero are directed. The second is the courage, dedication ardour and determination with which the deeds are accomplished. The third is his success and accomplishments. (p. 116)

Further illuminating the concept, Shaharuddin Maaruf delineated the values of *wiraism* as "love of learning, social justice, ethical integrity, good leadership, honesty, respect for the rule of law and the love of reforms" (Shaharuddin, 1984, p. 9). While Shaharuddin Maaruf's conception of *wiraism* through *Concept of A Malay Hero* (1984) acknowledges the role of Hang Tuah as a character that has shaped the concept of *wiraism* in the Malay society, he stops short at recognising Hang Tuah as a wira for the modern Malay society and instead consider him as a wira for the feudal age of Malay sultanates. He argues that Hang Tuah's thoughts and actions do not reflect a consideration towards Islamic ideals.

At this point, however, I contest that various other iterations of Hang Tuah in being knowledgeable about Islam is enough cause to consider him as a wira of all times. In fact, equally incumbent towards his construction as a wira in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, other than his loyalty to the Sultan, is the journey he took to the Holy Land of Mecca to perform Hajj and the spiritually uplifting experience he had during the journey, indicating the spiritual bond between him and god. In one of such instances, he reportedly met Prophet Khidir (pbuh), a prophet of great significance in Islam for being one of four prophets blessed with immortality.

Upon completing his hajj, Hang Tuah then travelled to Egypt, a land considered by Muslims as 'Bumi Anbiya' or Land of Muslim Prophets to drink from the Nile River in which he believed "that the water of this river in Egypt that flows

from upstream comes from heaven itself" (*Hikayat Hang Tuah*, 2008, p. 501).

His spiritual sojourn eventually found him seeking knowledge about Islam from a Gujarati Sheikh at Bukit Jugara. According to *Hikayat Hang Tuah* (2008, p. 541), "Thus it was that the sheikh and the Admiral were staying on Bukit Jugara, diligently studying the commands of Allah day and night, while no longer did the Admiral think about worldly matters, other than his duties to Allah alone".

Despite his celebrated status as a laksamana, Hang Tuah went to great lengths in seeking knowledge about Islam and was prepared to 'strip' himself of the luxury he had in Malacca to learn more about his *deen* (religion). In doing so, he manifests the spirit of 'love of learning' in which Shaharuddin argues to be a trait of *wiraism*. He was not only a man of *adat* but also a man of syariah, two fundamental concepts that build the idea of *wiraism* as a gestalt. Through his acts, Hang Tuah demonstrated the belief to constantly humble oneself towards knowledge, a concept that can perhaps be best understood through the martial laws of warriorship in silat which continuously espouses these values (Razha, 1990; Wilson, 2002; Farrer D. S., 2009; Ediyono, 2013; Abdul Rahman Ismail, 2009).

Understanding *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) as a Geographical Field

The geographical field is the source in which one's perception is formed. It forms the 'reality' in which audiences' base their experience of the film and bears a causal relationship to one's *behavioural field*. Koffka further explains that any repulsion or attraction towards a certain work only happens in the *behavioural field* and is symptomatic of one's perception towards the *geographical field*. In essence, the understanding of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) as a *geographical field* is an acknowledgement towards the film as the primary source of subsequent perceptions and interpretations on Hang Tuah.

In this respect, while the film draws its influence from past narratives of Hang Tuah, the various elements in the film play an essential role in reestablishing Hang

Tuah as a wira for a modern and contemporary audience. The film also helps audiences to contextualise their knowledge of Hang Tuah and observe him in his 'natural environment'.

CHAPTER 4

Gestalt Analysis of Dialogue in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The gestalt analysis of dialogue(s) in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) will deal with the investigation of *wiraism* through the use of poetic dialogue and rhythmical performance. The research will follow previous steps undertaken by Reuven Tsur (2012) and Yves Marie-Visetti (2004) and will focus on the patterns within a speech by which rhymes are perceptually organised. It will take a closer look at the rhyme patterns and stanza structure in the dialogue(s) of Hang Tuah and trace its roots to traditional Malay poetry.

It would, however, be pertinent to firstly acknowledge two key aspects of the process, the first being poetic rhythm can only be analysed within a 'performance' and that "one must bestow an operationally defined psychological meaning upon the assertion that the performance of a given verse in rhythmical" (Tsur, 2012, p. 49). A fundamental axiom of gestalt theory's law of *pragnanz* is that "psychological organization will always be as 'good' as the prevailing conditions allow..It embraces such properties as regularity, symmetry, simplicity and others" (Koffka, 1935, pp. 86-87).

In this respect, a good reading or 'performance' would be one in which "the reader commits himself to a metric pattern and operates with it thoroughly, as if it were the only plausible one" (Tsur, 2012, p. 57). A good reading would be one that follows an established convention that is recognisable to its immediate audience.

This chapter emphasises the notion of *wiraism* as a gestalt, offering "a much richer and deeper unity between perception, action and expression" (Visetti, 2004, p. 258) through the use of language in "guiding visual organization, and priming our search for visually salient groups" (Dhande, 2003, p. 18). It uncovers Hang Tuah's pattern of speech in positioning him as a *wira* in the film.

Understanding Poetic Dialogue in Malay Tradition

Poetry plays a very big role in Malay tradition and is often featured in songs, weddings and official functions in the forms of *pantun*, *syairs* and *gurindams* (Akmal, 2015). Most important in the analysis of dialogue(s) in Malay tradition, however, is in the *pantun* which forms the essence of Malay aesthetics. Muhammad Haji Salleh (1979) posits "*pantun* forms the essential core of aesthetics (in Malay). In it can one examine cultural and intellectual values of the Malay people" (p. 1).

Through the typical use of short phrases consisting of 8-12 syllables ending with *A-B-A-B* rhyme schemes, *pantuns* continuously surface in Malay literature, events and activities. The significance of the *pantun* to the Malays can perhaps be best understood through the words of R.O Winstedt (1961) who assert "one cannot understand the psyche and thought flow of the Malays should one not understand the *pantun*" (p. iii). So important are *pantuns* to the Malays that one cannot be considered a Malay unless the individual is well versed in the tradition of *pantun* (Akmal, 2015). *Pantuns* are intrinsically linked to the Malay psyche and *weltanschauung* and cannot be separated from discussions on the concept of poetry within the analysis of Malay dialogues. Through the use of poetry, words are underlined by various layers of meaning.

The concept of aesthetics in Malay dialogues is one of paradox and balance in which there is a constant need to seek 'balance' and harmony in everything that revolves around it. Working similarly to the concept of 'yin' and 'yang' in Chinese philosophy, Malay philosophy holds on to the concept of 'budi' and 'badi' in describing how contrastive forces may interact in creating a sense of harmony. Lim Kim Hui (2003) explains:

The general understanding of good and bad semangat among the Malay folks was further developed into the notion of budi and badi respectively. Budi is said to correspond to the good

(virtue, wisdom, intelligence, kindness etc.) whereas *badi* is said to signify the bad (i.e. bad influence, weirdness, animal-like). (pp. 46-47)

Elaborating the notion, Syed Ahmad Jamal (2010) defines Malay aesthetics as one of paradox and balance. Citing an example from *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, he illustrates the need for the Malay author to seek balance within various elements and characters by presenting Hang Tuah and his friends with traits not usually associated with masculinity or warriors. Hang Tuah and friends were presented as warriors, who despite their masculine demeanour, were well versed in art and literature, humble and hold a general dislike towards attention. Masculinity was not defined by physical strength alone but also depended on the understanding of his inner emotions. Balance must exist on all fronts. It is in this faculty that poetry exists in the Malay mental framework. Arguments and confrontations are often coupled with poetic dialogue to 'balance' itself between the good and bad. Sardar (2000) explains:

Direct confrontation is never the Malay way; convulsion is the essence, coming at things indirectly, preserving face and the illusion of general agreement, even undiluted support among consenting parties, no matter how bitter the actual difference and depth of the divide. (p. 148)

Arguments often take a symbolic turn with references often being made towards irrelevant objects and instances from its environment. To that effect, "the more abstract we are, the more it would seem as though we are making an effort towards being polite" (Indirawati Zahid, 2008, p. 120). The ability to be indirect, coupled with the use of consistent rhymes in reason and speech gives rise to the illusion of control over undesirable situations and is a cherished trait of the Malays.

Badi (raw physical force) is coupled with *budi* (refined emotionality) to create a sense of balance in a dialogue. Afterall, Malays understand the significance of poetic dialogue as being more than an intermediary and are "beautiful

representatives that bring along with them values, *bahasa*, verbal and body language and decorum. He who is *halus* (refined) achieves this and will always have a high place in society" (Muhammad Haji Salleh, 1991, p. 36). It is a style of speech which can only be competently uttered by those who are masters of the poetic tradition and "understood by those who are competent in its cultural form for a specific society" (Mohd Anis Md Nor, 2003, p. 490). Mastery of using traditional Malay poetry in speech is celebrated and is actively seen as a manner to develop one's sense of Malayness and foster a spirit of nationalism (Zainal Abidin Borhan, 2000). Through poetic dialogues of the Malay tradition can we observe the diffusion of content, rhythm, music and performance to form a holistic entity of Malayness (Amin Sweeney, 1974).

Poetic Dialogue in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The use of poetic dialogue in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) is enunciated through the use of appropriate rhyme patterns as well as the length of each dialogue. This is most apparent in the speech of Hang Tuah where his speech were typically constructed using short sentences and punctuated with long pauses or facial expressions. His speech heavily relied on allegories and figurative speech to bring his point across, often appearing non-confrontational and indirect. Teong-Hin took inspiration from Mamat Khalid in characterising Hang Tuah and was careful in referring to Mamat Khalid and ensuring that Hang Tuah stood out against other characters. According to Teong-Hin:

The gentleness. The beauty of the language. The quiet sophistication. They're not obvious. Mamat presented a strong Tuah vibe. I mean, look at Mamat. Intelligent and well read. He knows all sorts of music and when he gets on the piano, he's amazing. But, when you look at him, you would not think that he's a pianist. You would not think that he's a romantic at heart.

(personal communication, January 31, 2017).

Teong-Hin chose to highlight Tuah's character based on his interactions with Mamat Khalid. In contrast, Mamat Khalid felt that "the strength of the script was in how poetic it was. Despite being poetic, the language was easily understood by the masses" (Mamat Khalid, personal communication, March 4, 2017). The simplicity in the dialogue and the 'sophistication' of the Malay language through which Teong-Hin interpreted as being calm, subtle and consciously ambiguous was in itself a product of deliberation and was instrumental in the construction of Hang Tuah as a wira. This effect is achieved through the use of figurative speech and archaic words as well as the appropriation of caesuras to stress on the various moods and meanings within a scene.

Such a reading impacted the manner in which the script was to be delivered. The time needed to deliver dialogues were deliberately lengthened for dramatic effect and to highlight the subtle nuances of the Malay language. For him, Mamat Khalid's script encapsulated three main traits of the Malay society, its gentleness, the beauty of the language and its elusiveness (Teong-Hin, personal communication, January 31, 2017). This attempt at interpreting the script and replicating the sophistication of the Malay society can subsequently be observed in the film's profound use of figurative speech and poetry in the dialogue(s) of Hang Tuah. The use of poetic dialogue in the dialogue(s) of Hang Tuah is an attempt at substantiating *wiraism* within Hang Tuah and construct him as a wira that "encapsulates all traditional values of the Malay race" (Siti Aisah Murad, 1993, p. viii).

Rhyme Patterns & Stanza Structure

The dialogue of Hang Tuah spans across 52 scenes throughout the length of the whole movie. Despite this, Hang Tuah's speech can only be observed in six main scenes. Interestingly, while Hang Tuah is a major character in the film, he can only be observed to be speaking thirty-four times throughout the film.

His opening dialogue(s) can be observed in a scene lasting between 00.04.23-00.07.33 when Hang Tuah was introduced to the audience amidst a ruckus created by a pirate who demanded that the daughter of a market seller followed him back to meet his leader.

Throughout the scene, however, Hang Tuah only spoke thrice, with each speech lasting about 5-8 seconds. Signalling his presence, Hang Tuah stopped the pirate in his tracks by articulating, "*Tiada siapa perlu melakukan apa yang bukan kemahuan hatinya*" (No one should have to do anything against their will). The inclination to use poetic dialogue as an instrument in the construction of *wiraism* was evident from Hang Tuah's introductory speech in the film.

The above speech presents a pattern within the speech of which words ending with an /a/ and /an/ were repeated across several words. At first glance, while the speech does not follow a discernible pattern following the metrical set of pantun, it follows the rhyme scheme set out in traditional pantuns whereby rhyming syllables would be peppered between each stanza. Such a strategy mirrors that of pantuns where the ends of each line are deliberately rhymed through the use of alliteration and assonance.

Maintaining his role in Malacca, Hang Tuah thereon asserts, "*selagi ianya di bumi Melaka, ia menjadi tugas hamba. Lepaskan dia. Cinta dan restu tak boleh dipaksa*" (All that happens in Melaka is my concern. Let her go. Love cannot be forced). The above dialogue(s) displays a conscious use at repeating /a/ towards the end of every speech. Each line is strategically rhymed to manipulate audiences' perception of the dialogue.

The tendency to end words with vowels is deliberately used for dramatic effect and can be observed in key scenes throughout the film. Aside from the scene illustrated above, such an effect can also be observed between 00.54.47-00.56.01, 00.59.17-01.07.23 and 01.42.41-01.49.02. The scenes above rely heavily on

assonance to project the poetic image of Hang Tuah in the film, an element vital towards his construction as a wira.

Rhyme is a key element in the dialogue(s) of Hang Tuah and functions as a rhetorical cue, predominant across most of his speech. The lack of rhyme due to circumstances are minimal and limited to situations whereby he needs to engage in lengthy conversations to deliver an intended message. Such deviations, however, are normal in which one "may deviate from "ordinary" speech under the pressure of the rhythmic and the expressive needs" (Tsur, 2012, p. 335). Hang Tuah's steady reliance on the use of rhymes gives rise to a 'rhythmical performance', facilitating the construction of Hang Tuah as a wira in the film. Delivering short sentences marked with the common use of rhymes and frequent caesuras between lines, Hang Tuah surrounds himself in an air of elusiveness, a common quality amongst silat warriors and *pendekars* (Suryo Ediyono, 2013; Farrer D. S., 2009). Indeed, being elusive and shrouding oneself in an air of mystery is a common trait among silat warriors who often use figurative speech so as to ensure that they can only be understood by those who are closely associated with them. According to Johari Mokti, a *Pendekar* of the Tapak Suci Puteri Muhammadiyah Silat Order:

Silat warriors are sworn to secrecy and loyalty towards their masters. Silat is in itself a secret in which it can only be understood by those in its inner circle. Within the written is the unwritten and everything about silat is bound to be loaded with secrets beyond the understanding of the common man (Johari Mokti, 2017).

In contrast, other characters surrounding Hang Tuah were more direct and steered away from the metrics and rhyme standards of Malay poetry. Juxtaposed against the non-uniformity in prosody employed by other characters, Hang Tuah was configured to stand out from the other characters around him.

Where the speech gets significantly longer, Hang Tuah maintains his rhythmical performance by relying on frequent caesuras and pauses to punctuate his

speech. The caesuras can be understood as "a rhetorical or extrametrical pause or phrasal break within the poetic line" (Tsur, 2012, p. 109). Such can be observed in Hang Tuah's lengthiest dialogue in the whole film, taking place between 01.43.38-01.44.44 :

Tunjukkanlah dirimu dinda! Tunjukkanlah dirimu. Kanda rela bermuntahan darah dari hidup sepi tanpamu..Demi segala pengorbanan yang dinda lalui, demi segala penderitaan yang dinda alami, dan demi segala kemungkinan yang patut Kanda lakukan, Kanda mohon maaf. Kanda buta dinda..Kanda buta. Kanda rayu dinda..Kanda rayu..

(Show yourself, my love! Show yourself. I'd suffer the curse and die than live without you. For all that you have sacrificed, for all that you have suffered and for all the things I should have done, please forgive me, my love. I was blind, love! I beg you, my love. I beg you.)

Set towards the end of the film, the dialogue registers Hang Tuah's desire and desperation in wanting to be reunited with Puteri Gunung Ledang. Arguably, it was an attempt at humanising Hang Tuah and fortify his character as a modern-day hero, who despite his celebrated status and reputation, recognised his fallible self and was susceptible towards humanly emotions such as love. The length of his speech, while steering away from 'ordinary' circumstances, does not impede in his construction but instead reinforces Hang Tuah's character as a wira who is "perfect in physique, spirituality, mentality, actions and the way in which he deals with others" (Haron Daud, 2001, p. 119).

Despite the length of the above speech, there was little prosodical shift in Hang Tuah's speech. Hang Tuah displays gestalt's law of *pragnanz* to an established pattern within the script. The length of the dialogue instead facilitated to a return to a pattern after "there has been something different which was understood as a

departure from the pattern" (Meyer, 1956, p. 151).

The delivery of the above speech was deliberately stretched across 66 seconds with 11 caesuras in between lines and a long 17-second pause between '*Kanda rela bermuntahan darah dari hidup sepi tanpamu*' and '*Demi segala pengorbanan yang dinda lalui*'. In light of the significantly longer dialogue, gestalt theory argues the mind's "tendency to perpetuate any initial pattern and to impose on the patterns perceived the simplest structure that the prevailing conditions allow" (Tsur, 2012, p. 293). Therein lay the need to break up the dialogue into shorter fragments to conform to the prevailing pattern within the context of Hang Tuah's poetic mannerism and speech.

Riding on the traditional meter and structure of traditional Malay poetry, Hang Tuah's position as a wira is continuously elevated in the subconscious memory of the society. The dialogue of Hang Tuah was, in essence, a tool used in focusing Hang Tuah as "a romantic, martial arts aficionado with few political undertones" (Putten & Barnard, 2007, p. 247).

Length & Time of Dialogues

Equally pertinent to the construction of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah is the inquiry of length and time in which speech(es) and dialogue(s) were made. Expanding Syed Ahmad Jamal's (2010) thesis of balance within Malay aesthetics, Hang Tuah's dialogue can be examined on two main fronts of which they counteract with each other and develop two different personalities running parallel to one another. It was important that Hang Tuah was presented to be of fallible character as opposed to being almighty and powerful. According to him, "Malay aesthetics displays a deeper appreciation towards that which is less than perfect for total perfection would be less intriguing" (p. 6).

The length and time of the dialogues play an important role in highlighting Hang Tuah's contrastive personality. Most significant in this inquiry is the switch

between using short bursts of emotions to lengthier expressions. Despite Hang Tuah's speech only being observed thirty-four times throughout the film, his on-screen presence was augmented by the use of caesuras to drive his message forward. Particularly apparent through his dialogues with Puteri Gunung Ledang, Hang Tuah's emotions and unspoken desire to be with Puteri Gunung Ledang was articulated through the use of silences.

As opposed to the use of silences as syntactic markers, the lack of speech in parts of Hang Tuah's dialogue served emotive functions. Illustrating the skilful use of silence in delivering key messages and emotions, Michael Ephratt (2008, p. 1916) explains, "within the emotive function, where the speaker (not the outside world or the Other) is at the center, this speaker through his or her words or silences expresses his or her emotions, internal experiences". Through the frequent use of pauses, audiences are given the opportunity to explore the chaotic state of Hang Tuah's mind in having to choose between his loyalty to the Sultan and his love for Puteri Gunung Ledang.

They serve an emotive function in capturing the internal experience of the warrior. Capturing the emotional chaos that begins to stir through Hang Tuah's inner psyche, the script below details the length of silence in between each part of the dialogue:

Hang Tuah 01.43.38-01.43.41 Total Length: 3s. Caesuras to next speech: 3s.	<i>Tunjukkanlah dirimu dinda!</i> Show yourself, my love!
Hang Tuah 01.43.44-01.43.45	<i>Tunjukkanlah dirimu</i> Show yourself.

<p>Total Length: 1s.</p> <p>Caesuras to next speech: 3s.</p>	
<p>Hang Tuah</p> <p>01.43.48-01.43.51</p> <p>Total Length: 3s.</p> <p>Caesuras to next speech: 19s.</p>	<p><i>Kanda rela bermuntahan darah dari hidup sepi tanpamu.</i></p> <p>I'd suffer the curse and die than live without you.</p>
<p>Hang Tuah</p> <p>01.44.10-01.44.34</p> <p>Total Length: 24s.</p> <p>Caesuras to next speech: 6s.</p>	<p><i>Demi segala pengorbanan yang dinda lalui, demi segala penderitaan yang dinda alami, dan demi segala kemungkinan yang patut Kanda lakukan, Kanda mohon maaf. Kanda buta dinda. Kanda buta.</i></p> <p>For all that you have sacrificed, for all that you have suffered and for all the things I should have done, please forgive me, my love. I was blind, love!</p>
<p>Hang Tuah</p> <p>01.44.40-01.44.44</p> <p>Total Length: 4s.</p> <p>Caesuras to next speech: 30s.</p>	<p><i>Kanda rayu dinda..Kanda rayu.</i></p> <p>I beg you, my love. I beg you.</p>
<p>Hang Tuah</p> <p>01.45.14-01.45.16</p> <p>Total Length: 2s.</p> <p>Caesuras to next speech: 4s.</p>	<p><i>Maafkan Kanda dinda.</i></p> <p>Forgive me, my love.</p>
<p>Hang Tuah</p> <p>01.45.20-01.45.32</p>	<p><i>Jika Dinda izinkan kanda berpijak di tanah ini dan menghirup nafas bersama degupan jantung dinda, berilah petunjuk.</i></p> <p>Should you allow me to step on this earth and breathe the same</p>

Total Length: 12s. Caesuras to next speech: 2s.	air as per the beats of your heart, give me a sign.
Hang Tuah 01.45.34-01.45.35 Total Length: 1s. Caesuras to next speech: 6s.	<i>Berilah kanda petunjuk.</i> Give me a sign.
Hang Tuah 01.46.01-01.45.06 Total Length : 5s. Caesuras to next speech : -	<i>Sesungguhnya, kanda cintakan dinda.</i> Truly, I love you.

Hang Tuah's sense of loss and regret towards potentially being eternally separated from the princess was expressed in lengthy utterances, breaking away from his earlier prosodical style of using conventional rhythms found within traditional Malay poetry. Where the utterances get shorter, the length of caesuras were stretched to provide for dramatic effect. Unlike the use of pauses as syntactic markers, typically created through physiological needs such as breathing, the above dialogue aids in the construction of Hang Tuah as a romantic warrior. This is in direct contrast to earlier scenes such as below where the length of pauses in between lines were significantly shorter:

Hang Tuah 00.05.22-00.05.27 Total Length: 5s.	<i>Tiada siapa perlu melakukan apa yang bukan kemahuan hatinya.</i> No one should have to do anything against their will.
--	--

Caesuras to next speech: 1s.	
Pirate 00.05.28-00.05.30 Total Length: 2s. Caesuras to next speech: 9s.	<i>Siapa cakap 'tu? Siapa cakap 'tu?</i> Who said that? Who said that?
Pirate 00.05.39-00.05.48 Total Length: 9s. Caesuras to next speech: 1s.	<i>Tugas hamba, bawa gadis ini kepada ketua hamba. Datuk tak payahlah masuk campur!</i> It is my duty to take this girl to my leader, Sir. This is not your concern.
Hang Tuah 00.05.49-00.05.57 Total Length: 8s. Caesuras to next speech: 1s.	<i>Selagi ianya di bumi Melaka, ia menjadi tugas hamba. Lepaskah dia. Cinta dan restu tak boleh dipaksa.</i> All that happens in Melaka is my concern. Let her go. Love cannot be forced.
Pirate 00.05.58-00.06.01 Total Length : 3s. Caesuras to next speech : 5s.	<i>Ini perintah ketua hamba. Bagaimana kalau ini tugas Datuk Laksamana?</i> Those are my orders! What if they were yours, Lord Admiral?
Hang Tuah	<i>Kalau 'nak menurut, biar berakal. Kalau mengikut, biar pintar</i>

00.06.06-00.06.13	To follow, be sensible. To obey, be wise.
Total Length : 7s.	
Caesuras to next speech: -	

In line with the arguments laid out by Tsur (2012, p. 412), "Poets who deviate from the archetypal iambic line do this to generate perceptual problems, for which a rhythmical performance is a perceptual solution. Deviation from versification patterns generates tension only if the versification pattern, as well as its nearest superordinates, are preserved in active memory." The deviation of manner in which the script was delivered, though long, sits in well with rest of the film with little noticeable difference. It brings to light the argument that rhythmical performance is a "perceptual solution to a perceptual problem: when the linguistic and versification patterns conflict, they are accommodated in a pattern of performance, such that both are perceptible simultaneously" (Tsur, 2012, p. 360).

The pauses in between lines serve a procedural function to mark the various elements of the discourse. The focus was on the aesthetics of the spoken as opposed to the unspoken, as was the case for the earlier example in which the inner psyche and emotions of Hang Tuah took a more prominent role in the scene.

Poetic dialogue within the speech of Hang Tuah in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) was especially important in developing a film that permeates itself into the social memory of a contemporary Malay audience. Following the meter, rhyme and structure of *Bahasa Istana*, the dialogue of Hang Tuah was engineered towards advancing his status as a modern Malay wira. Positioning Hang Tuah as a chivalrous and romantic individual, his inner psyche and emotions are articulated through the appropriation of silences. Propounding the notion of *wira* in Hang Tuah, the dialogue(s) help ensure that the intended message gets delivered effectively, sparing

little room left for alternative interpretation towards the character. Through the dialogue(s) *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004), particularly in the dialogue of Hang Tuah, the protagonist was cast into the spotlight, framing him as a wira to be respected, revered, and emulated.

CHAPTER 5

Gestalt Analysis of Cultural Form(s) in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The cultural forms of the *keris*, *cindai* and *pending* are crucial to the image of a *pendekar* (Mahyuddin Sidik, personal communication, March 17, 2017). To *pendekars*, these artifacts are manifestations of ancient martial values and embody the essence and *semangat* (spirit) of Malay warriors. *Pendekars* after all function as custodians of a great Malay culture and active carriers of tradition (Wilson, 2002; Abdul Rahman Ismail, 2009; Farrer D. S., 2009; Razha, 1990). Through silat lies the inherent need to acknowledge and preserve facets of material and non-material culture, including rituals, dance, jewellery, symbols and language (Farrer D. S., 2006).

Keris, *cindai* and *pending* goes beyond its practical function as costumes and props and were reappropriated as stimuli to characterise *wiraism* as a Gestalt and enunciate Hang Tuah as a character with strong values of Malayness. Under such a premise, the use of Gestalt theory will be useful in illuminating the circumstances in which *wiraism* is constructed. These cultural form(s) function as physical stimuli and "the causes of the excitations of our sense organs" (Koffka, 1935, p. 79).

Characterising *Wiraism* in Hang Tuah

The analysis of cultural form(s) has to first and foremost acknowledge *wiraism* as a Gestalt. A good Gestalt is "the result of forces which do not only segregate the figure from the rest of the field, but hold it in equilibrium with the field" (Koffka, 1935, p. 132). In essence, Gestalt is a product of interactions between different stimuli. The construction of *wiraism* as a Gestalt hinges upon familiar iterations of Hang Tuah in audiences' perception and memory. Gestalt law of *pragnanz* works under the premise that humans are wired to perceive and experience good Gestalt. Even in circumstances where there is a kaleidoscope of contrasting elements and notions within an artwork, we are innately driven to discern

elements to form parts of a pattern, giving rise to the idea of it being simple, orderly, unified or balanced.

How does this happen? One of the ways in which *wiraism* is constructed is through the recurrence of concepts and ideas that are arranged in an orderly fashion. Hang Tuah's attire is consistently differentiated from attires worn by commoners. It suggests an order in the way attires are worn. In contrast, the difference becomes less pronounced when compared with other members of the royal palace. Where there are gaps or areas of concern in the way Hang Tuah is constructed in the film, or in this instance, in the way he dresses, our mind fills in the gaps through a process of reification. Reification is a process in which our mind fills in informational gaps by attempting to match what we have seen with familiar patterns in our stored memory.

Figure 1. A still frame of Hang Tuah sheathing his *keris* after killing Hang Jebat. Taken from *Hang Jebat* (Hussein Haniff, 1961). Copyright 1961 by Cathay-Keris Film Productions.

In constructing Hang Tuah in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004), Mahyuddin Sidik deliberately chose to stick to conventions and seek inspiration from previous representations of Hang Tuah (Mahyuddin Sidik, personal communication, March 17, 2017). To speak to a modern Malay audience, however, it was necessary for Hang

Tuah to be at the top of the Gestalt hierarchy and distinguish himself as a wira. According to Koffka (1935), the strength of the Gestalt character is defined "by the degree of interdependence of the parts. The stronger the Gestalt, the more will each of its parts depend on the rest, and the more will this dependence affect every aspect of the parts" (p. 650). The *keris*, *cindai* and *pending* are interdependent parts that assist in mapping *wiraism* as a Gestalt. In this respect, they are not to be perceived as independent pieces but rather as an established ensemble. Understanding it through Gestalt's law of past experience, the use of these three elements are crucial towards enculturing Hang Tuah as a *pendekar* in the film.

It is also a means of differentiating Hang Tuah from other characters in the film. Hang Tuah is differentiated from Tun Mamat with the use of a *cindai* as a waistcloth, a *pending* and two *keris(es)* by his side, one of which is *Keris Taming Sari* while the other being the lesser known *Keris Tempa Melaka*. The basic design of the *keris* follows the construction of *keris penyalang* (long *keris*), a *keris* typically held by the Sultan or his most important official(s) (Zakaria bin Abdullah, 2007; Frey, 1988; Gardner, 1936). In contrast, Tun Mamat wore a regular *keris* on his waist while holding on to a *golok* (machete), a weapon of less significance to the *keris* (Gardner, 1936). In being at the top of the 'Gestalt hierarchy', it was imperative for the stimuli to be clear and corroborate *wiraism* in Hang Tuah. More importantly, these stimuli had to synchronise and form a pattern within the construction of Hang Tuah to effectively work as a visual stimulus. According to Arnheim (1957), "any sense organ can register only one stimulus at a time so that the eye in order to produce a two-dimensional recording has to consist of numerous receptors that operate one next to the other. The mosaic that results from this collaboration of the receptors depicts three-dimensional space and volume as best it can" (p. 189).

Figure 2. A still frame of Hang Tuah stopping Tun Mamat from interfering in his soon-to-be duel with Adipati Handaya Ningrat. In this scene, *Keris Taming Sari* is neatly tucked into his waistcloth while holding on to the *Keris Tempa Melaka*. Taken from *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Both *Keris Taming Sari* and *Keris Tempa Melaka* bear the benefit of context in the Malay world view. The scale of the *keris* also alters the way in which the geographical environment is perceived. This can be understood in Gestalt theory as a phenomenon whereby fields in which cannot be directly altered "must be entirely determined by the internal forces of organization obtaining between those field events which are aroused by direct stimulation" (Koffka, 1935, p. 145). In this regard, the presence of other similar forms within a larger composition functions to provide the order in which we perceive things.

Hang Tuah is dependent upon the internal forces of the *keris*, *cindai* and *pending* to map a Gestalt understanding of *wiraism*. While all the *keris*(es) in the film are similar in terms of its design, "hierarchies in the strength of Gestalt relationships are important in composition and comprehension because they define what is seen and in what order" (Jules, 1984, p. 55). Particularly in the *keris*, hierarchy is built through the reinforcement of relativity between *Keris Taming Sari* and *Keris Tempa Melaka*.

Keris, Cindai and Pending as Stimuli

The construction of *wiraism* through the use of cultural form(s) in the film is achieved through the organisation of symbols pivotal to the gestalt. According to

Norman Yusoff (2007), "the perception of the world is a process of organization, of ordering given sensory data to make them conform to a certain number of basic categories and innate "laws" of the brain's functioning" (p. 36).

Gestalt argues that perception is an ongoing process that incorporates incoming stimuli (Avant & Helson, 1973). In the case of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004), the reappropriation of *keris* and *cindai* is to facilitate in differentiating Hang Tuah and aid in the construction of *wiraism* in himself. While *Keris Taming Sari* and the *Keris Tempa Melaka* stress on Hang Tuah's significance and authority, the *cindai* enunciates his status as a "nobleman and warrior believed to possess magical powers to protect himself from any misfortune" (Maziah Ab. Rashid, 2005, p. 52).

Mahyuddin Sidik consciously used these items to differentiate Hang Tuah from other characters in the film. While less skilled warriors would be wearing a set of "pants, shirt, waist cloth, headgear and waistcloth" (Maziah Ab. Rashid, 2005, p. 76), Hang Tuah was the only one in the film who was wearing a *cindai*, a cloth believed to "give good spirit and protect its wearer, usually worn around the waist with its ends let loose" (Maziah Ab. Rashid, 2005, p. 78).

Figure 3. A still frame of Hang Tuah with a *cindai* wrapped around his waist. Taken from *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

The use of the *cindai* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) was something that Mahyuddin Sidik relished. According to Mahyuddin Sidik (2017), "Zubaidah Shawal introduced the *cindai* to me. Hang Tuah was the only person in the film to be wearing

the *cindai*. It was far too special to allow any other person to be wearing it. It was an authentic piece. I bought it from Kak Zu herself." The *cindai* was used as an instrument to establish Hang Tuah as a wira. In establishing Hang Tuah's position in the film, it was necessary for Hang Tuah's image to remain as close as possible to existing perceptions on the image of *wiraism*. The *cindai* asserts Hang Tuah's position as a wira and "fixate the image so that it may be preserved and looked at again at any time" (Arnheim, 1957, p. 162).

Mahyuddin Sidik's attempt at highlighting Hang Tuah's place in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) extended into the use of the *pending*. The use of *pending(s)* in the film were limited to Hang Tuah and the Sultan himself with the only difference between the two being its size. It seems to suggest Hang Tuah's place in history. Looking at the various narratives about Hang Tuah as opposed to the Sultans of Malacca, it would not be far-fetched to assert that Hang Tuah is as equally important to Malacca as the Sultans of Malacca themselves.

The importance of Hang Tuah is further pronounced when analysing his *keris(es)* in the film. Hang Tuah was the only character to have carried two *keris(es)* throughout the film. To that end, even the Sultan carried only one *keris* despite long *keris(es)* being more typically associated with Sultans in placing curses towards his people (Abu Talib Ahmad, 2012).

***Keris* in Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004)**

The value of the *keris* as a sublimation of *wiraism* and *adat* stems from the notion of the *keris* as a symbol of Malayness and a source of pride for the Malay society (Mohamad, Rahman, & Samian, 2012; Tenas Effendy, 2008; Frey, 1988). Malay males hold a unique relationship with the *keris*, often regarding it as a mirror of himself. So unique was the relationship between the *keris* and the possessor that a marriage can be solemnised with the presence of the *keris* as a proxy, in place of its owner (Farish Noor, 2003).

The appreciation of the *keris* goes beyond aesthetic values, bearing significant meaning as a cultural artifact that encapsulates the Malay *semangat* (spirit). In essence, the *keris* is a sublimation of Malay *adat* and lends strength to the possessor's actions through the collective energy of the Malay *semangat* and continued to play an important role in modern society as can be observed by the likes of "Bung Karno (Sukarno), General Soedirman and Pak Harto (Suharto) who each owns *kerises* of their own to reel in a sense security and authority to themselves" (Al-Mudra, 2009, p. 32). It is believed that the possession of a *keris* can provide for one's charismatic leadership through the political properties of the *keris*. They each follow a tradition prevalent in the Malay archipelago whereby the *keris* is used to "legitimise one's political position due to the symbolic power of the *keris* and its long history with the spread of Islam and supremacy of Islamic kingdoms in Java" (Burhan Nur Hakim, 2016, p. 4).

On such a note, a true Malay wira would not be complete without a *keris* of his own (Haji Hashim bin Haji Mohd. Noor, 2004). According to Farish Noor (2003):

From earliest times, it was regarded as more than a weapon. It was both spiritual guardian of its owner and symbol of power and status. A *keris* could endow a warrior with inhuman strength and could also be sent as a token of his authority. A sultan would send his *keris* with his emissaries to ensure that they were respected. and his orders obeyed. (p. 119)

As the most distinguished warrior of the Malaccan Sultanate, Hang Tuah was blessed with the famous *Keris Taming Sari*, a magical *keris* which would grant its owner invincibility and immunity against enemies' attacks and the lesser known *keris Tempa Melaka*, a *keris* reputedly made of twenty-one types of metal. Between the two *keris(es)*, *Keris Taming Sari* plays a more active role in the construction of *wiraism* in the film. To such a degree, an attempt at casting focus towards *Keris Taming Sari* can be seen between 00.41.24-00.42.18, 00.43.00-00.43.40 and

01.16.38-01.16.55, offering audiences a closer look at the *keris*. The scenes place emphasis on the handle and sheath of the *keris*, suggesting that it was made out of gold. The fittings as well as the type of material used to make the *keris* stress on the stature of Hang Tuah within the royal palace of Malacca. Reportedly, only *keris(es)* fitted with handles following *Jawa Demam* (Shivering Javanese) or *Pekaka* (Kingfisher) designs were allowed (Khamis Mohamad, Nik Hassan Shuhaimi, & Samian, 2012) while *keris(es)* made of gold can only be worn upon the mandate of the Sultan (Gardner, 1936).

Figure 3. A still frame of a scene focusing on *Keris Taming Sari*. Taken from *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Keris Taming Sari was observed twenty times throughout the film, of which only once was the *keris* featured without Hang Tuah as its owner. Out of the twenty times in which the *keris* was featured, the *keris* was only drawn from its sheath twice, once in a romantic moment between Hang Tuah and Puteri Gunung Ledang, and once more in a duel between Hang Tuah and the Sultan of Majapahit. The frequency in which the *keris*, sheathed or unsheathed, is shown is critical to the construction of *wiraism* as a Gestalt in the film. The recurring reference towards *Keris Taming Sari* is necessary to substantiate *wiraism* in Hang Tuah. This can be observed in a scene depicting Hang Tuah showing the sheathed *keris* to Pangeran Benowo to legitimise his presence in inviting him to a proposed wedding reception between the Sultan of Malacca and Puteri Gunung Ledang.

The 'power' of *Keris Taming Sari* was invoked in convincing Pangeran Benowo, who was himself initially supposed to be married to Puteri Gunung Ledang, to attend the supposed wedding reception between the princess and the Sultan of Malacca. Pangeran Benowo's ready acceptance of the invitation indicates that the reputation of *Keris Taming Sari* was known in other parts of the Malay world. It was, even then, common knowledge that the *keris* was in the ownership of Hang Tuah, making him a powerful figure in the Malay region. *Keris Taming Sari* confers power, stature and legitimacy towards the construction of Hang Tuah as a wira.

More importantly, it was also seen as a manifestation of Malay values and Malay supremacy, of which its non-existence would greatly alter the course of Malay history. Its importance was articulated by Malaysian Prime Minister, Datuk Seri Abdullah bin Haji Ahmad Badawi (2003) who stressed:

Taming Sari Keris is a symbol of power manifested today in the government. Hang Tuah, a Malay warrior-hero, today is represented by UMNO. An UMNO that is hurt by lies and slander, just as Tuah was undermined, will surely lose its credibility and lose its place in government.

The construction of *wiraism* greatly depended on *Keris Taming Sari* - to not only legitimise Hang Tuah's place as a wira but also to express the need for Malays to recognise *adat* as a source of strength and power for the Malays.

Cindai in Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004)

A key differentiation between Hang Tuah and other characters in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) was in the presence of a *cindai*, a type of traditional Malay fabric, wrapped around his waist (Mahyuddin Sidik, personal communication, March 17, 2017). The *cindai* is perceived to be a 'weapon' of the highest order in silat, of which one has to attain a certain rank before being taught on how to effectively use the *cindai* as a weapon. Among others, when effectively used, the *cindai* can be used

as a heavy whip and used to block oncoming attacks. The cloth can also be used to suffocate opponents by using it to wrap around the opponents neck or face (Farrer D. S., 2009). Though not as popular as the sinuous *keris* due to the latter often being associated with mysticism, the *cindai* is equally potent and valuable as a weapon.

Effective use of the *cindai* demands for the silat warrior to be highly skilled and knowledgeable on the various weapons of the Malay world. For that reason, particularly in the Gayong system of silat, the *cindai* is rarely taught and is only passed on to silat masters who are deemed worthy of such recognition. The Gayong system of silat holds on to popular belief that the *cindai* is the only weapon that can overpower *Keris Taming Sari* (Abu Syakirin, 2011). Interestingly, the belief is ascribed to Sang Adi Putra and Sang Persantanala, two of Hang Tuah's silat masters.

The use of the *cindai* as a weapon, however, is not demonstrated in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004), leaving its possible use to the imagination. The *cindai* is always worn around his waist regardless of circumstances. While he stripped himself of *Keris Taming Sari* when he considered himself to have failed in his mission, the *cindai* was the only piece of garment left that suggests his status as a wira. The scene echoed a similar situation in *Hikayat Hang Tuah* when Hang Tuah was left in a dilemma in having to face the treacherous Hang Jebat who betrayed the Sultan. Hang Jebat was then in possession of *Keris Taming Sari*, having assumed the *keris* when he was briefly promoted to the rank of Laksamana in Hang Tuah's absence. Hang Tuah then wore a "caliph belt the length of seven turns around his waist and adorned with supplications from the koran" (Kassim Ahmad, 2008, p. 353). Even though the *cindai* was never effectively used as an instrument of *wiraism* itself, it was an important stimulus that serves as a distinguishing feature to punctuate *wiraism* in Hang Tuah. According to Arnheim (1957), "In a good work of art, however, everything must be clear—if anything indistinct is to be shown, it must be distinctly indistinct" (p. 136).

In the epic battle between Hang Jebat and Hang Tuah in *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, Hang Jebat managed to see himself out of the battle scene while wrapping his injury with the *cindai* and subsequently continue running amok. He only really died when Hang Tuah deliberately removed the *cindai* that was wrapping his injury. The understanding of this story is fundamental towards the use of the *cindai* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). It holds the necessary 'data' for *wiraism* to be continuously observed and analysed. Even in instances where *wiraism* becomes convoluted with Hang Tuah renouncing his role as a member of the royal court, the *cindai* relies on Gestalt's law of pragnanz to reorganise audiences' perception of *wiraism* through the understanding of the *cindai* holding superior against the *keris*. While the *keris* is important to complete 'the whole', the *cindai* and the *pending* facilitates audiences' ability to 'close' the image of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah.

Figure 4. A still frame of Hang Tuah disarming himself and handing over his attire to Tun Mamat to be returned to the Sultan as a symbol of his failure in his mission. Taken from *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Despite the turn of events in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) and having to part ways with the Malaccan entourage and choosing a life of self-exile, the *cindai* fortifies his position as a wira, regardless of his former status as a court warrior. Even though Hang Tuah was no longer a 'wira' in terms of rank and stature, his reputation as a wira have been established through earlier scenes and episodes. The *cindai*, in effect, serves as a stimulus to continue the thread of *wiraism* within Hang Tuah and

guide audiences' continued perception of Hang Tuah as a wira in the film. The *keris* enunciates Hang Tuah's position in film by 'speaking' to a Malay audience, reminding them of Hang Tuah's exalted position in Malay history. Its use as a stimulus should be perceived "not according to its absolute qualities, but in relation to the norm level established in the person's mind" (Arnheim, 1957, p. 137).

Pending in Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004)

While the *cindai* was key in differentiating Hang Tuah from the rest, Mahyuddin Sidik introduced the *pending* (belt buckle) into Hang Tuah's wardrobe to make the differentiation more pronounced. Using a golden coloured *pending*, the accessory contrasted well against Hang Tuah's usual deep red costume. According to Kent Tobey (1988), "An important item of personal adornment for Malay men was the *pending*, an oval-shaped belt or sash buckle. The convex surface is usually decorated with chasing techniques, although repousse work is not uncommon" (p. 60). It was traditionally observed as an indicator of one's wealth and prestige within a society (Sheppard, 1972).

I suspect, however, that the choice to have it represented in the film was made without any prior reference to *Hikayat Hang Tuah* or *Sulalatus Salatin* in which no mention of *pending* was ever used by Hang Tuah or any other figures in the two texts. Its use is believed to have been popularised sometime in the 18th and 19th century (Mohd. Kassim, 1990). In one account, Sultan Syarif Ismail Abdul Jalil Jalaluddin Ismail, the ruler of Siak Sri Indrapura in the 1820s, wore "a most magnificent *pinding*, set with brilliant diamonds of a large size" (Anderson, 1971, p. 173). Members of nobility favoured the use large and bulky *pending(s)* to complete their regal costume. Raimy Che-Ross (2012), however, suggests that *pendings* were not limited to members of the nobility and were also worn by commoners so long as they could afford such a luxury.

This is immaterial in the construction of *wiraism* in the film in which the focus

was on visually representing *wiraism* as opposed to being a visual representation of *Sulalatus Salatin* or *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. It would have been more important to reproduce the essence of *wiraism*. According to Arnheim (1957), "Visual representation must either reproduce its subject with mechanical accuracy or—in the higher, aesthetic sense of the term—render its essentials faithfully" (p. 162). Even though the *pending* may not be period accurate to the film, it serves its purpose as a stimulus by capturing the necessary data in ensuring that Hang Tuah's position as a wira stays at the top of the Gestalt hierarchy.

In *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004), *pending(s)* are worn by the Sultan and Hang Tuah with the difference between the two being the latter's smaller size. Otherwise, both seem to be made of gold. According to Raimy Che-Ross (2012), "Big, heavy *pending* are extremely cumbersome to wear. They rest painfully on the nether regions when one is seated, and unless the belt fastened to it is tightly secured, a *pending* is liable to slip off at the most awkward moments" (p. 79).

Hang Tuah's position within the framework of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) required him to be agile and mobile at all times. Perhaps, such may be the reason as to Hang Tuah's smaller *pending*. In line with the views shared above, the use of the *pending* affirms Hang Tuah's status in the film. As per assertions made by Mamat Khalid, Teong-Hin and Tiara Jacqueline, *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) was never meant to be read as a register of Malay *adat* or documentary. Mahyuddin Sidik's deliberate choice to use the *pending*, therefore, was made with the sole intention of setting both Hang Tuah and the Sultan apart from other characters in the film. It was imperative for Hang Tuah to be punctuated with an object that will visually stand out against the background and support the notion of *wiraism* as a Gestalt. It formed part of a whole that "should be held together by stronger forces than the ground" (Koffka, 1935, p. 187). Koffka argues that in order for law of figure and ground to apply, and for Gestalt to manifest itself, it has to be visually substantiated by salient forces that resist the intrusion of other elements. The *pending* essentially played such a role and

functioned as a stimulus to support the overarching concept of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah.

Figure 5. A still frame of Hang Tuah, wearing a *pending* on his waist, during his period of self-imposed exile. Taken from *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Like the *cindai*, Hang Tuah wore his *pending* throughout the entire duration of the film and was never removed during his self-imposed exile. Unlike *Keris Taming Sari*, Hang Tuah kept his *pending* even at his 'lowest point' in the film. It was evident that the *pending* had a role in the construction of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah. While he made an effort to 'resign' from his status as a court official of the Malaccan Sultanate, Gestalt psychologists would argue that change can only materialise with a complete submission of his own will and accord to enforce that change. According to Koffka (1935, p. 369), change can only take place through the understanding of "relations between the geographical and the behavioural or psychophysical environment and in the changes which, owing to this relationship, the latter undergoes in any behaviour act".

True change can only occur "when one becomes what he is, not when he tries to become what he is not. Change does not take place through a coercive attempt by the individual or by another person to change him" (Biesser, 1970, p. 77). Despite handing over all articles that made reference to his exalted position within the royal palace, Hang Tuah held on to his *pending* and wore it during his period of

exile. Despite surrendering his *tengkolok* and clothes, Hang Tuah still held on to his image as a wira.

Hang Tuah's decision to hold on to his *pending* despite handing over all other articles to Tun Mamat indicates his desire to maintain his position as a wira in the film. It asserts Teong-Hin's stand that despite the challenges and subsequent 'failure' of Hang Tuah, he is "the best man that we would all like to be. The best versions of ourselves" (Teong-Hin, personal communication, January 31, 2017).

CHAPTER 6

Gestalt Analysis of Colour(s) and Contrast in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

Beyond the use of dialogue(s) and cultural forms, *wiraism* continued to be extolled through the appropriation of colour(s) and contrast as stimuli. This chapter will investigate the use of dominant colours within the various scenes in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). For this inquiry, only twenty-six scenes featuring Hang Tuah as a primary subject will be analysed

It will follow the method adopted by Benjamin Whorf (1956) and Zena O'Connor (2015) who studied the relationship between colour, contrast and Gestalt theories of perception. This chapter will be further supplemented by a study on symbolisms within Malay costumes by Che Husna Azhari (1997). Colours play an important role in illuminating the patterns of outlines that belong to the stimulation.

The chapter will begin with an analysis of colours based on seven colours traditionally recognised in the Malay world, namely black, white, red, yellow, green, blue and grey (Asmah Haji Omar, Bahasa Malaysia Saintifik, 2005). It will subsequently develop with an analysis of the usage of these colours in the construction of Hang Tuah before analysing the visual makeup of the scenes through an analysis of figure-ground segregation. Colours used in the film will be referred through the use of the *Pantone Matching System*, an established system recognised as an industry standard in films. The system was also used by Mahyuddin Sidik in planning the colours used in the film.

The Influence of Colours and Contrast in Figure-Ground Segregation

Figure-Ground segregation can be defined as the perceptual grouping of objects in facilitating the perception of images. In essence, it is the means by which a figure is identified from the background. Colours act as a cue in defining the figure-ground segregation in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). Colours and contrast help distinguish the figure against the background and aid in the overall construction of a

scene (Arnheim, 1954). Stressing its significance, Zena O'Connor (2015) iterates:

colour and contrast play important roles in processing of visual data. Visual perception begins with the eye receiving incoming visual information in the form of light-waves, and this incoming visual information is received by rod and cone receptors which are embedded in the human retina, the light-sensitive tissue that lines the inner surface of the eye. (p. 86)

Certain colours play a more significant role than others in defining the figure-ground segregation. Colours assist the construction of *wiraism* by adding depth and meaning to Hang Tuah. Meaningful regions within a visual landscape will be more likely perceived as figures as opposed to less meaningful regions (Peterson, 1994; Peterson & Gibson, 1991; 1993). The use of colours such as red and grey in Hang Tuah's wardrobe play an important role in highlighting his significance in the film. The use of specific shades of red for Hang Tuah's costumes assists in subconsciously defining him as a wira. It illuminates a view held by Irvin Rock (1975) who asserts that past experience can influence the perceptual organisation of an image. To fully appreciate the impact of certain colours in shaping one's visual perception of figure-ground segregation, the succeeding sub-chapter will provide a better overview of colours in the Malay world.

Colours in The Malay World

Colours are potent with symbolic messages and meanings, offering us the ability to read into one's cultural perspective (Boaz, 1927; Bellwood, 1997; Siti Zainon Ismail, 1985). The analysis of colours in the Malay world allows us to have a glimpse of the Malay mental framework. Such a concept becomes more nuanced when we examine the primary colours that exist in the Malay culture. The concept of colours in the Malay world is relatively understudied and have only been briefly touched upon by Asmah Haji Omar (2005) and Che Husna Azhari (1997). Traditionally, the Malay

culture only recognises seven main colours, namely black, white, red, yellow, green, blue and grey (Asmah Haji Omar, 2005). Of the colours mentioned above, white, yellow, red, and black is deemed to be the primary colours, of which all other colours are perceived to be combinations of the above colours (Che Husna Azhari, 1997).

The concept of these colours is acquired from their environment, limited only by what they can come into contact with. For such a reason, not all colours readily recognisable in the western world are discernable to the Malay society. According to Benjamin Whorf (1956), one's experience of colours is limited by the language in which he experiences. Not all concepts can be sufficiently expressed in a particular language. This exponentially impacts one's perception of colours. Such a concept is equally relevant in the Malay world where certain colours are indistinguishable from the other. An example of this phenomenon is red and brown where brown is simply perceived to be another variant of yellow and/or red. Brown was later properly introduced to Malay culture at a later, unspecified period (Asmah Haji Omar, 2005). This can be observed by the translation of 'brown' itself in which Malays recognise as *chocolate* or chocolate. It would not be far-fetched, therefore, to assume that brown was only properly introduced to the Malay culture after the invention of chocolates in the early 19th-century. A similar colour, *perang* refers to the colour red.

Acquiring colours off their environment, Malays use colours extracted from plants around them to colour their furnitures and clothes, functioning as a medium of identification and non-verbal communication (Siti Zainon Ismail, 1985; Rehayati, 2013). To that extent, colours are traditionally used by the Malay society to express their loyalty and subservience to the king. As yellow was strictly reserved for the Sultan and his officials, it was neither allowed to be worn nor featured in any part of one's home (Achmad Sopandi Hasan, 2004; Blackburn & Hack, 2012). While its significance no longer holds in today's context, the notion of using colours to express loyalty to the king can still be observed in today's society whereby red, yellow and green are symbolic towards the Malay society (Lemiere, 2015). A protocol still

observed in official ceremonies graced by the Sultan is that the general public is asked to refrain from wearing the same colour as the Sultan.

Red

Red is the most important colour in traditional Malay literature (Che Husna Azhari, 1997). The colour is traditionally used to denote courage, bravery, heroism and loyalty, ideals of which every Malay male should strive for (Blackburn & Hack, 2012). So important is the colour to the Malays that the colour is represented by at least 26 known variations. Sweetenham (1922) also regards *merah kesumba* or blood red as symbolic towards the Malay identity. According to Syed Ahmad Jamal (2010, p. 25), "Malays love to use red as well as colours of similar chromatic values, even though the 'warmth' of these colours are 'cooler' than being blood red" (p. 25).

Yellow

Yellow is the second most important colour in the Malay world and is symbolic to the sovereignty of the king (Siti Zainon Ismail, 1985). It is commonly perceived to be a royal colour and reserved for the Sultan and court members (Wan Yahaya Abdullah, 2004).

So important was the colour that there was also a whole chapter dedicated to it in *Undang-Undang Melaka* (1976), a legal code of the Malaccan Sultanate between 1400-1511. The significance of the colour and its prohibitions were also spelt out in *Sulalatus Salatin* in which no use of yellow is permitted in public.

The only exception, other than being of royal descent, is if one is a shaman or traditional healer and uses the colour in performing healing rites. According to J. G. Frazer (1911), "the magician shares with the king the privilege of using cloth dyed yellow, the royal colour; he has considerable political influence and he can compel people to address him in ceremonial language" (p. 362).

The significance of yellow as a royal colour in the Malay mind may have been inherently linked with a similar tradition in China in the Ming (1368–1644) and Qing

dynasty (1644-1911) whereby its use was restricted to the emperor, empress, crown princes and princesses. It was highly favoured due to the notion of it representing gold (Han, 2016). A parallel can be drawn between the Chinese tradition and Malay tradition. Yellow is observed by Achmad Sopandi Hasan (2004) as being a symbol of eminence and status of its wearer with the sole purpose of grandeur. There are at least 13 known variations of yellow in the Malay mind (Che Husna Azhari, 1997).

Green

Green is symbolic for the Malays as a colour representative of Islam and represents loyalty and faith towards its teachings (Nizami Jamil, 2005). Its use in the Malay world is usually coupled with complementing colours such as red and yellow, and rarely stands on its own (Syed, 2010). *The Malay Annals* recorded its use in the court as being for lower-ranked officials. There are at least 10 known variations of green in the Malay mind (Che Husna Azhari, 1997).

Black

Black is perceived to be a negative influence and manipulates the perception of colours (Syed, 2010). It is cast in a negative light and recognised to be the cause of misfortunes or illnesses (Che Husna Azhari, 1997). It forms part of the black-white dichotomy in the Malay *weltanschauung* of which black is associated with badi, a force which brings bad influences from the realm of evil spirits and ghosts (Lim, 2003).

It can, however, shift from being negative to positive when used on its own or worn by someone with strong 'budi' (Syed, 2010). It can also sometimes be attributed to one's status as a warrior (Che Husna Azhari, 1997). There are at least 15 known variations of black in the Malay mind (Che Husna Azhari, 1997).

White

White is the only colour that is perceived as being superior to yellow and is

strictly reserved for the Sultan or those whom he deems fit. In one of the anecdotes written in *Sulalatus Salatin*, Hang Tuah was delivering a message by Sultan Alauddin Shah of Malacca and was warmly welcomed by Sultan Muhammad of Pahang with a big white umbrella to shield him from the sun. Such an instance is rare as the white umbrella is deemed to be "superior to the yellow one, because it is seen conspicuous at a greater distance, was also confined to the raja while the yellow umbrella was confined to his family" (Walter William, 1900, pp. 34-35). This is significant in informing us of the perception of Hang Tuah as an equal to the Sultan of Pahang.

It forms the other half of the black-white dichotomy and is perceived to be a positive influence, symbolising goodness and purity. While black symbolises all that is bad, white is perceived to be a balancing element that can neutralise the negativities often associated with black (Lim, 2003). There are at least 12 known variations of white in the Malay mind (Che Husna Azhari, 1997).

Blue

Blue symbolises sadness, solitude and depression (Siti Zainon Ismail, 1985). It has little direct significance to the Malay world other than being used to describe the environment in which the Malays live in. There are at least 6 known variations of blue in the Malay mind (Che Husna Azhari, 1997).

Grey

Grey is the least significant of all the colours mentioned above and is typically used to describe the environment. There are at least three known variations of grey in the Malay mind (Che Husna Azhari, 1997).

Colour and Contrast in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The use of colour and contrast in the construction of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah is particularly revealing in that only three colours, red, brown, and grey, are dominant in his wardrobe selection. As explained above, brown and red are perceived to be of

the same colour spectrum in traditional Malay perspective. In facilitating this discussion, therefore, brown would be identified accordingly in this sub-chapter and later categorised as red in succeeding sub-chapters.

Playing a less dominant role in the construction of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah is yellow which is identifiable as golden in the film. While golden is less noticeable in Hang Tuah, its use was limited as accents to highlight his place in traditional Malay society.

Remaining colours such as black, white, green and blue are absent from the construction of Hang Tuah in the film. Despite this, green and blue can still be observed in the colour palettes of the various scenes, primarily forming the background of each scene.

Red in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

Echoing the significance of red in traditional Malay texts, red is the most frequently used colour in the construction of Hang Tuah in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). According to Syed Ahmad Jamal (2010), "Red is the colour of *wiraism* and shows bravery. For example, red is used on the body of the Laksamana in wayang kulit" (p. 25). While other colours may also surface in depictions of Malay cultural figures, red is especially significant in attributing traits encapsulated in *wiraism*. The significance of red is also illustrated in classical texts such as *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Misa Melayu* where red is only used for court officials and warriors (Siti Zainon Ismail, 1980). Visually, red is an intense colour that can dominate a scene (Arnheim, 1954). Its potency within *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) is in its context and meaning which lends significance to the overall construction of *wiraism* in the film. According to Arnheim (1954), "the pregnancy or variability of any color is reduced when it is put in a context" (p. 362).

Red is heavily utilised in the film for Hang Tuah's *baju layang* (overcoat) and *tengkolok* (headgear) and is employed in 25 and 14 scenes respectively out of the 26

scenes analysed. There were a total of five varying colours used for Hang Tuah's baju layang, out of which there were two shades of red and three shades of brown. They were represented with *pantone* 1815c (13 scenes), *pantone* 7589c (1 scene), *pantone* 4725c (3 scenes), *pantone* 1545c (2 scenes), and *pantone* 440c (5 scenes). In contrast, Hang Tuah's *tengkolok* was represented with two shades of red and 2 shades of brown accordingly with the colours being represented by *pantone* 7553c (4 scenes), *pantone* 7552c (1 scene), *pantone* 504c (3 scenes) and *pantone* 7615c (6 scenes).

The profound use of red and brown in the film is indicative of Mahyuddin Sidik's intent on projecting the image of *wiraism* through conventions that he was already familiar with. According to Mahyuddin Sidik (2017), "It would be crazy for me to not refer to traditional texts such as *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Sulalatus Salatin* in coming up with the right colours to represent Hang Tuah. While I may not be an expert, there is a need to work with the foundations by which warriors are represented. I then aligned these textures and colours based on what I knew would work for film."

It was not his intention to remain faithful to the texts. While *Hikayat Hang Tuah* (2008) speaks of Hang Tuah as wearing "yellow trousers with a smooth cloth wrap of bright crimson, its edges finely embroidered, on his shoulder a yellow sash of fine silk, a shirt of bronze green and a headdress of the colours of the rainbow" (p. 196), what was important for him was the ability to translate the intended emotions within each scene. It was with this realisation that red played a critical role in the construction of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah. Red "shows the internal psyche of the person such as being energetic, angry, calmness, spirituality, and so on. The presence of a *saka* or spiritual being in the person's presence is usually associated with red. Red is usually paired with something that is driven by deep-set anger and energy, and is closely associated with spirituality" (Yohan Kurniawan & Stark, 2017, p. 51).

The idea of mysticism dovetails with the construction of Hang Tuah being a warrior steeped in mysticism and blessed with mystical abilities far beyond those of mortal men (Shaharuddin, 1984; Kassim Ahmad, 2008; Abdul Rahman Ismail, 2009; Farrer D. S., 2009; Putten & Barnard, 2007; R. Hamdan, 2013). Colours were consistently used to mark *wiraism* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). Despite the varying tones and shades of red in the film, the recurring use of *pantone* 1815c across 13 scenes in the film played a crucial role in navigating *wiraism* in the film. The consistent use of *pantone* 1815c, a deep shade of red close to maroon, made no adverse impact towards the construction. The diverse use of red was immaterial as stronger patterns will dominate psychologically weaker patterns within a Gestalt (Pickford, 1976). This can be substantiated through the understanding of Josef Alber's thesis in *Interaction of Colour* (2006) that audiences often have poor colour memory. Elaborating on the thesis, Bruce A. Block (2008) argues, "This lack of color memory can be used to your advantage in the control of color. The hue, brightness, and saturation of an object's color can be manipulated from sequence to sequence and the audience will be unaware of the color change" (p. 159).

The key towards good Gestalt is organisation and it is in that respect that Mahyuddin Sidik contributes towards the construction of *wiraism* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). Good Gestalt holds on to the basic premise that "psychological organization will always be as 'good' as the prevailing conditions allow, (where) the term "good" is undefined (but) embraces such properties as regularity, symmetry, simplicity and others" (Koffka, 1935, p. 110).

The consistent use of red also facilitates in defining Hang Tuah as an important figure in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004). Hang Tuah was the only character to be consistently dressed in red. In scenes where there were no other characters involved, his background would be blurred to achieve a bokeh effect, ultimately guiding audiences' visual focus on Hang Tuah.

Figure 6. A still frame of Hang Tuah in a scene introducing him as the film's protagonist. Taken from *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Grey in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The use of grey as a dominant colour in the construction of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah is limited to one scene of which grey was represented with *pantone* 431c. In that scene, Hang Tuah met Puteri Gunung Ledang and exchanged promises to be with each other in a dream-like status. The scene also marks a dialogue between the two which eventually seeped its way into 'Bagaikan Sakti', one of two theme songs for the film (Akmal Abdullah, 2004).

It was designed with the 'end mood' in mind. According to Mahyuddin Sidik (personal communication, March 17, 2017), "Mood to me was everything. I designed according to what was in the script and as per the directions of the director. In situations where Hang Tuah needed to depart from his position as a 'hero' in the film, I would use other colours other than red to depict him". The dominant use of grey as opposed to red signalled a short respite from being a laksamana to a romantic.

The achromatic nature of grey did not infringe upon Hang Tuah's primary construction as a wira in the film. Instead, its presence accounts for the sense of uncertainty within Hang Tuah. Eva Heller (2009) argues, "grey is too weak to be considered masculine, but too menacing to be considered a feminine color. It is neither warm nor cold, neither material or spiritual. With grey, nothing seems to be decided" (p. 226). The notion of grey being a colour of indecisiveness is appropriate when understanding the situation that Hang Tuah was in. He was caught in a

situation whereby he had to choose between his love for Puteri Gunung Ledang and his loyalty towards the Sultan of Malacca.

Figure 7. A still frame of Hang Tuah in a scene depicting Hang Tuah and Puteri Gunung Ledang sharing a private moment. Taken from *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Mahyuddin Sidik recognised that grey was not a colour typically associated with *wiraism* but used the colour nonetheless with the belief that it suited his character and mood for the specific scene. He asserts, "The film was never intended to be a documentary for Discovery Channel. Colour choices are made based on its character. So long as the colour does not seem out of place according to the period in which this film is set in, I do not see any issue" (Mahyuddin Sidik, personal communication, March 17, 2017)

Yellow in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

Yellow is used sparingly throughout the film, primarily as an accent to reinforce the notion of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah. Represented as golden (*pantone* 4495c), the colour is used in seven scenes throughout the film and is limited to Hang Tuah's *pending* (belt buckle) and *Keris Taming Sari*, suggesting that the two items were made of gold.

The use of gold is of particular importance in cementing Hang Tuah's position in viewers' perspective. Highlighting its significance in the traditional Malay world, Jaime Koh & Stephanie Ho (2009) argues, "the fashioning of gold ornaments owed

much to the patronage of the Malay royalty, who wore gold jewellery during official functions and ceremonies. An important item of the ceremonial dress was the *pending* (belt buckle), often encrusted with precious gems" (p. 53).

The use of yellow/gold in the construction of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah is of particular importance due to its elevated status in the Malay culture whereby "yellow or gold is understood as a colour that represents greatness and nobility. When used in a *keris*, it can be understood as being symbolic of dignity and power" (Anggraini, 2014, p. 70). It highlighted his eminence and status, pointing at his privilege at wearing gold-coloured items that were the "prerogative of royalty in Malacca" (Gardner, 1936, p. 31).

Yellow/gold played a denotational role in the film. Even though Hang Tuah's character may have functioned equally well in the film without the use of these colours, Mahyuddin Sidik made a deliberate choice in using these colours as tools to advance Hang Tuah's status in the film. This was obvious in his choice to replicate the design and colour of Hang Tuah's *keris* according to the specifications of the alleged *Keris Taming Sari* currently held in the safe custody of Sultan Azlan Shah as part of the Perak's royal regalia.

Figure 8. *Keris Taming Sari* held as part of Perak's Royal Regalia. (Norman, 2005)

The only difference between the prop used in the film and the actual *keris* was fully encased in gold, the film's *Keris Taming Sari*'s top sheath was made of wood before being painted over in gold. The choice of material, however, gave no disadvantage to the film with the golden hue of *Keris Taming Sari* still adding a sense of grandeur in Hang Tuah, ultimately validating his status in the Malay mind.

Interestingly, even the Sultan's *keris* seem to pale in comparison, being made of wood. More care was placed over Hang Tuah's *keris* as opposed to the Sultan's, alluding to his more significant stature in the film. This is hardly unsettling when considering that it was Hang Tuah who "confirms the superiority of Melaka" (Heide, 2002, p. 74). The superiority of Melaka as the hinge for the whole region by holding "the ethnic and religious solidarity that connected each foreign colony in the town to its mother country [and] the solidarity of its neighbourhood that bound them together under the local ruler and local law" (Thomaz, 1993, p. 79). The golden hues attached to Hang Tuah through his *keris* and *pending* functions as giving the context and premise in which Hang Tuah is built upon. Like red, yellow is perceived by Koffka as an intense colour that can "link up the insistency of objects produced by intense and sudden stimuli with the sharp gradient by which they emerge from the field" (Koffka, 1935, p. 362).

Figure 9. A still frame of Hang Tuah using *Keris Taming Sari* to attest for his invitation to Pangeran Demak to attend the supposed wedding between the Sultan of Malacca and Puteri Gunung Ledang. Taken from *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Contextualising *Wiraism* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The three colours discussed above play a crucial role in negotiating the significance of Hang Tuah in the film. Using these three colour, in various tones and hues, the director draws attention to the protagonist and separates him from other elements in the film. Especially in the use of colours, the image of Hang Tuah is constructed in a manner whereby his presence is differentiated from his surroundings. According to Zena O'Connor (2015), "Colour and contrast not only help to distinguish contours, detail and depth, but they also help to attract and divert attention" (p. 91).

Wiraism in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) is not a byproduct of the film but rather, a result of organised structures by which Gestalt psychology stands upon. Conversely, *wiraism* is a construction by which colours and contrast outlines how Hang Tuah should be perceived.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

Hang Tuah as a Paradigm for Ideal Malay Man

Discussions on Tuah has periodically been eclipsed by Hang Jebat who is perceived as the seed of spirit of Malay rebellion and anarchism following his rebellion against Sultan Mansur Shah. *Hang Jebat* (1961) launched Hang Tuah as a "modern hero who did not participate in "feudal" worship of loyalty but made individualistic decisions in favour of his friends and family" (Putten & Barnard, 2007, p. 267).

The reexamination of Hang Jebat as a hero was made at a time when Malaya was still haunted by the effects of British Occupation and World War Two. In that light, Muhammad Haji Salleh (1991) postulates that Hang Jebat was the true hero for standing up against the unprincipled Sultan and critical of corruption within the society. Hang Tuah, henceforth, no longer served the needs of contemporary Malays and was relegated as a secondary character in discussions of Malay heroism (Putten & Barnard, 2007; Khoo, 2006).

The impression of Hang Tuah as a 'feudal' hero, however, began to change at the turn of the millennium with Haron Daud (2001) reasserting Hang Tuah's position as a paradigm for the Modern Malay. He argues the need for Hang Tuah to be continuously studied in order to foster a sense of Malay identity and maintains that the cause of degeneracy lies in the Malay attitude of not wanting to "read history and understanding his own history, resulting in the Malay society being naive, weak and easily manipulated" (p. 107). In other words, the inability to understand history as stimuli towards *wiraism* as a gestalt resulted in the Malay's state of degeneracy.

He views the concept of Hang Jebat as a hero is flawed by the presence of scholars who refuse to have a close examination of *Sulalatus Salatin* and *Hikayat Hang Tuah*, and instead hold on to romanticised constructions of Hang Jebat as

opposed to Hang Tuah who is irrefutable as a hero, a view that resonates with that of Henk M. J. Maier (2004) who laments:

The text (*Hikayat* Hang Tuah) greatness now lies in the fact that it still deals with the meaning of life, and such it could easily be read as a very strong novel which is well able to compete with other novels regarding depth and elegance. However, nobody on the Peninsula takes the trouble to read it. Instead of opening up the Tale and interpret it as yet another effort to understand the meaning of life, the Malays have put it away in the cupboard of heirlooms. (p. 127)

The view that Hang Tuah was a hero for both feudal and modern times began to have a rippling effect among contemporary scholars and critics who assumed a more favourable stand towards Hang Tuah. Interestingly, Muhammad Haji Salleh (2003) himself seems to have shifted his stance towards Hang Tuah and now maintains that "Hang Tuah dwells and stands out in a bigger world and the Malays not only utilise his respected features but also his wit. A capability to overcome obstacles no matter where he is. Wise in seeking the culture of the society that he often visits" (p. 4).

A key feature in Muhammad Haji Salleh's statement above is his new found argument on Hang Tuah's wisdom 'in seeking the culture of the society that he often visits'. Hang Tuah's expeditions to other parts of the world and the value it brings to him has never been thoroughly discussed in any of his early narratives. Instead, a strong focus on these narratives were on his portrayal as a great Malaccan warrior who wholeheartedly serves the Sultan and the Malaccan society.

It, however, fails to acknowledge lesser-known qualities about him such as his love towards knowledge and deep respect and interest towards Islam. Most, if not all, fail to acknowledge the deep complexities within his construction and his nuanced character as a wira. This was a point of contention for the construction of *wiraism* in

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004), a critical point towards the evolution of Hang Tuah from being the hero of *Hikayat Hang Tuah* to a 'hero of heroes' and paradigm for the Modern Malay society (Daud, 2001; R. Hamdan, 2013; Ismail Noor & M., 2000; Wan Hasmah, 2013; Hashim Musa, 2015). His love towards knowledge, particularly in the area of religious studies as well as his association with the laws of *adat* and *syariah* are in itself stimuli that lead to *wiraism* as a gestalt.

Rewriting Hang Tuah

It was a constant dilemma for the producers in shaping a narrative that has never enjoyed the benefit of a unified plot. Saw Teong-Hin was placed in a position to interpret a narrative that has gained multiple tracts over the years. He faced an uphill battle between negotiating a script steeped with Malay values and intricacies, and the pre-conceived notion of how Hang Tuah should be seen. He subsequently chose to focus on elements he felt were 'exotic' and would articulate the nuances of what makes Malay(sia) special, particularly focusing on 'the beauty of the Malay language' and mysticism.

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004) works under a different situational climate as compared to previous productions based on the narrative of Hang Tuah. Working in an environment where 'being Malay' was no longer popular among young audiences, Saw Teong-Hin worked hard at interpreting Mamat Khalid's script which was made with the purposeful argument of reintroducing Malay classics to Malay(sian) children.

In this regard, the findings presented in previous chapters may contribute to a better understanding of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) and how Gestalt theory can be utilised in illuminating an understanding of Malay films. I have argued that the construction of *wiraism* in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) through Hang Tuah is an act of deliberation with a systematic scheme on its portrayal. The Gestalt analysis of the film has revealed the pattern in which Hang Tuah is constructed. *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) gave filmmakers' the opportunity to re-engage the narrative of ancient

Malacca and shift the understanding of *wiraism* to "construct a personality that is in line with contemporary values and world-view" (Wan Abdul Kadir, 2001, p. 515).

They do so through strategies that evoke affective and visceral responses in viewers by engaging audiences' inner psyche as Malay(sians). It tugs at the strings of Malay(sians) by employing devices derived from the Malay tradition of literature, culture and aesthetics. Through preceding chapters, I have argued the way in which Hang Tuah speaks, wears and carry himself in *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) as being essential towards his construction as a wira.

The Impact of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004)

The impact of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) still echoes through the social memory of the Malay society today. The slew of efforts made since its inception indicates a recurring effort at keeping the legacy of *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) alive. More importantly, it is through this film that discussions on Hang Tuah versus Hang Jebat have gained a new tract, ultimately contributing to the narrative of *wiraism* within the context Hang Tuah when discussing Malay identity and Malayness (Putten & Barnard, 2007).

The formulation of this thesis was an uphill battle in dealing with the lack of resources on the subject of Malay culture and identity. Even much lesser were the amount of available resources on Malay films. This thesis, therefore, heavily relied on the support of the filmmakers in gaining an understanding of the film and paves the course for future research on the subject. The limitations I faced in the course of writing this research underscores its significance on the area of Malay(sian) studies and the value it possess as a stepping stone towards future discourses in Malay film. It ultimately fills a knowledge gap on the area of Malay arts and culture as well add to the limited discourse on Malay films.

Using *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) as the main subject of inquiry, this study analyses the mechanisms that have been significant towards the concept of *wiraism*

and how it has been constructed through the use of language, props and colours. By arguing *wiraism* to be a Gestalt within the context of the film, this thesis uses Gestalt theory in delineating the construction of Hang Tuah and his eventual image in the film. The thesis is built upon the central argument that the image of Hang Tuah is a construction with the elements mentioned above used as tools in advancing his image as a protagonist in the film.

Throughout this thesis, I have argued that the notion of *wiraism* in Hang Tuah is in itself a Gestalt which has been continuously made and remade over the years, constantly adapting itself to its surrounding environment. What may have sat well with ancient audiences with *Hikayat Hang Tuah* and *Sulatus Salatin* and the 1950s and 1960s with *Puteri Gunong Ledang* (1961), *Hang Tuah* (1957) and *Hang Jebat* (1961) may no longer be relevant with audiences today. *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) therefore is a film that speaks to an audience contemporary to the time and period of its release.

Where Does The Thesis Go From Here?

Beyond viewing *Puteri Gunung Ledang* (2004) as a film, I am hopeful that this thesis sheds light upon the notion of Hang Tuah, or other characters for that matter, as constructs within the realities of the film. It is important to realise such a principle to steer clear from conflating reality and fantasy - a problem one often faces when approaching subjects readily familiar to them. In essence, while I argue *wiraism* to be a gestalt within the film, I humbly acknowledge that film itself is too complex a subject to be justifiably conflated into a single 'whole'. Film, while being a gestalt in itself, is made up of smaller wholes within its larger context. It would be welcomed, therefore, to analyse other parts of the film in order to invoke a deeper understanding of the film as a phenomenon.

This thesis essentially constitutes an attempt to open up further discussions on Malay films and view its meaning or purpose within a larger social, national or

cultural context. While filmmakers take reference from global cinematic trends, one cannot contest the influence played by the filmmaker or audiences themselves in the reception of the film. It would also be important to realise the impact, however small, film bears over the society or the society over the film itself.

Sadly, despite the advancement of Malay films since the 1950s, there have been limited studies on Malay films, with a similar severity in the lack of studies pertaining to Malay culture and literature. This thesis, therefore, adds to the body of studies on Malay culture and would one day, hopefully, be a useful reference to develop an understanding of Malay film, culture and literature.

References

- A. Teeuw, T. S. (1958). *Sejarah Melayu*. Djakarta: Jakarta-Jambatan Publishers.
- Abdul Rahman Ismail. (2009). *Seni Silat Melayu: Sejarah Perkembangan dan Budaya*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Abdul Rahman Napiyah. (1994). *Tuah-Jebat dalam drama Melayu: Satu Kajian Intertekstualiti*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Abdul Wahab Hamzah. (2003). Kesedaran Sosial dan Keindahan Estetika dalam Filem-filem P. Ramlee dengan Rujukan Khusus Terhadap Filem Ibu Mertuaku, Antara Dua Sarjat dan Bujang Lapok. *P. Ramlee: Seniman Agung Dunia Melayu* (pp. 73-90). Kuala Lumpur: Arkib Negara Malaysia.
- Abu Hassan Sham. (1993). *Pemahaman dan penghayatan beberapa aspek Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Kajang: MASA Enterprise.
- Abu Syakirin. (2011, March 2). *Kenapa Cindai Bukan Keris*. Retrieved April 11, 2017, from Khalifah Gayong: <https://khalifahgayong.wordpress.com/2011/03/02/kenapa-cindai-bukan-keris/>
- Abu Talib Ahmad. (2012). *Utara Semenanjung Malaysia: Esei-Esei Warisan*. Penang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Achmad Sopandi Hasan. (2004, July 1). Nilai-Nilai Perwatakan Melayu dalam Imej Warna: Satu Penelitian Etnografi Seni. *Pluralitas dan identitas Melayu*. Senggarang, Tanjung Pinang, Riau.
- Ahmad Sarji, A. H. (2011). *The encyclopedia of Malaysia, 16 - The rulers of Malaysia*. Singapore: Editions Didier Millet.
- Ahmad, M. A. (2007). *NILAM: Nilai Melayu menurut Adat*. Singapore: Central Council of Malay Cultural Organisations Singapore.
- Akmal Abdullah. (2004, August 13). Siti, M Nasir tarikan terbaru PGL. *Berita Harian (Malaysia)*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: The New Straits Times Press (M) Bhd.
- Akmal. (2015). Kebudayaan Melayu Riau (Pantun, Syair, Gurindam). *Risalah*, 26 (4), 159-165.
- Al-Mudra, M. (2009). Melacak Asal-Usul Keris dan Peranannya dalam Sejarah Nusantara. *Sari*, 27, 27-44.
- Alatas, S. H. (1977). *The myth of the lazy native: A study of the image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from 16th to 20th Century and its Function in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism*. London: Frank Cass.
- Alatas, S. H. (1972). *Modernization and social change: Studies in modernization, religion, social change and development in South-East Asia*. Sydney: Angus and Robinson.
- Albers, J. (2006). *Interaction of color*. London: Yale University Press.
- Amin Sweeney. (1974). Professional Malay story-telling: Some questions of style and presentation. *Studies in Malaysian oral and musical tradition*, 8, 47-99.
- Anderson, J. (1971). *Mission to the East Coast of Sumatra in 1823*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Anggraini, R. A. (2014). *Simbol-simbol budaya dalam desain keris naga kamardikan karya Mpu Pathor Rahman*. Surabaya: Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Stikom.
- Arnheim, R. (1957). *Film as art*. London: University of California Press.
- Arnheim, R. (1954). *Art and visual perception: A psychology of the creative eye*. California: University of California Press.
- Asmah Haji Omar. (2005). *Bahasa Malaysia saintifik*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Asmah Haji Omar. (2008). *Ensiklopedia Bahasa Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Asmah Haji Omar. (2008). *Nahu kemas kini*. Kuala Lumpur: PTS Professional.
- Avant, L. L., & Helson, H. (1973). Theories of perception. In B. B. (Ed.), *Handbook of general Psychology* (pp. 419-448). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Aziz M. Osman (Director). (1995). *XX Ray 2* [Motion Picture].

- Badawi, D. S. (2003, June 17). *The Occasion of The Opening of The Annual Meetings of WANITA, PEMUDA and PUTERI UMNO MALAYSIA*. Retrieved April 9, 2017, from Malaysian Prime Minister's Office: <http://www.pmo.gov.my/ucapan/?m=p&p=paklahtpm&id=3256>
- Barendregt, B. A. (1995). Written by the hand of Allah: Pencak silat of Minangkabau, West-Sumatra. *ODEION: The Performing Arts World-Wide*, 12, 113-130.
- Barnard, T. P. (2004). *Contesting Malayness: Malay identity across boundaries*. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.
- Barnard, T. P. (2006). Film, literature and context in Southeast Asia: P. Ramlee, Malay Cinema, and History. In V. H. Cynthia Chou, *Southeast Asian Studies: Debates and New Directions* (pp. 162-180). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies & Leiden : International Institute for Asian Studies.
- Bell, N. (1991). Gestalt Imagery: A Critical Factor in Language Comprehension. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 41 (1), 246-260.
- Bellwood, P. S. (1997). *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago*. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Biesser, A. (1970). Paradoxical theory of change. In J. Fagan, & I. L. Shepherd, *Gestalt therapy now* (pp. 77-80). Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books.
- Blackburn, K., & Hack, K. (2012). *War, memory and the making of modern Malaysia and Singapore*. Singapore: National University of Singapore.
- Block, B. A. (2008). *The visual story: Creating the visual structure of film, tv and digital Media*. Oxford: Elsevier Inc.
- Boaz, F. (1927). *Primitive art*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.
- Bottoms, J. (1962). Malay historical works. In K. Tregonning, *Malaysian historical sources* (pp. 36-62). Singapore: Department of History, University of Singapore.
- Braginsky, V. I. (1990). *Hikayat Hang Tuah: Malay Epic and Muslim mirror: Some consideration on its date, meaning and structure*. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde*, 146 (4), 399-412.
- Burhan Baki. (2008, February 20). *Hang Tuah and Me*. Retrieved June 29, 2017, from Silat Melayu: Alam Terkembang Menjadi Guru: <http://silat-melayu.blogspot.sg/2008/02/hang-tuah-and-me-by-burhan-baki.html>
- Burhan Nur Hakim. (2016). *Sultan, kharisma, dan legitimasi kekuasaan Islam: Simbol keris pusaka pada kasultanan Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat*. Jogjakarta: Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga.
- Carr, E. H. (1961). *What is history?* United Kingdom: University of Cambridge Press.
- Chandra Muzaffar. (1979). *Protector? An analysis of the concept and practice of loyalty in leader-led relationships within Malay society*. Penang, Malaysia: Aliran.
- Che Husna Azhari. (1997, July). Teknologi warna alam Melayu. *Akademika* 51, 53-63.
- Dhande, S. S. (2003). *A computational model to connect gestalt perception and natural language*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ding, C. M., & Norhayati, B. M. (2011). Some common repetitions in pantun. *Southeast Asian Studies*, 21 (1), 287-303.
- Ephratt, M. (2008). The functions of silence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 1909-1938.
- Farish Noor, & Khoo, E. (2003). *Spirit of wood: The art of Malay woodcarving*. Hong Kong: Periplus Editions (HK) Limited.
- Farrer, D. S. (2006). 'Deathscapes' of the Malay martial artist. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice*, 50 (1), 25-50.
- Farrer, D. S. (2008). The healing arts of the Malay mystic. *Visual Anthropology Review*, 24 (1), 29-46.
- Farrer, D. S. (2009). *Shadows of the prophet: Martial arts and sufi mysticism*. New York City: Springer.
- Frazer, J. G. (1911). *The golden bough*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Frey, E. (1988). *The Keris: Mystic weapon of the Malay world*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.

- Gardner, G. B. (1936). *Keris and other Malay weapons*. Singapore: Progressive Publishing Company.
- Grossman, R. (2013). *Phenomenology and existentialism: An introduction*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Haji Hashim bin Haji Mohd. Noor. (2004). *Keris: Peranannya dalam masyarakat Melayu Brunei*. Brunei Darussalam: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Han, J. (2016). *The historical and chemical investigation of dyes in high status Chinese costume and textiles of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (1368-1911)*. Glasgow: University of Glasgow.
- Haron Daud, & Abdul Rahman Haji Ismail. (2014). *Hang Tuah wira bangsa*. Kota Bharu: Penerbit Universiti Malaysia Kelantan.
- Haron Daud. (2001). Kembalikan Hang Tuah ke Tempatnya. *Jebat* , 28, 107-122.
- Haron Daud. (2014). Kata Pengantar. In H. Daud, & H. I. Abdul Rahman, *Hang Tuah Wira Bangsa* (pp. 1-8). Kelantan: Kelantan University of Malaysia Press.
- Hashim Musa, & R. (2015). *Hang Tuah catatan Okinawa*. Serdang: Penerbit Universiti Putra Malaysia .
- Hassan Abd. Muthalib. (2009, March). 'Winning Hearts and Minds': Representations of Malays and Their Milieu in the Films of British Malaya. *South East Asia Research* , 47-63.
- Hassan, A. M. (2016). Redha by Tunku Mona Riza : Of hardships, hope, sacrifice and salvation. *Sinema Malaysia* , 36-38.
- Hassan, A. M. (2011, March 2). Good gestalt in Sheril Bustaman's Come Hell or High Water. *Thoughts on Films*. Retrieved from <https://thoughtsonfilms.com/2015/03/18/good-gestalt-come-hell-or-high-water/>
- Hassan, A. M. (2013). *Malaysian cinema in a bottle*. Petaling Jaya, Selangor: Merpati Jingga.
- Heide, W. V. (2002). *Malaysian cinema, Asian film: Border crossings and national cultures*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Heller, E. (2009). *Psychologie de la couleur: Effets et symboliques*. Paris: Pyramid.
- Henley, D., & Davidson, J. S. (2008). In the name of *Adat*: Regional perspectives on reform, tradition, and democracy in Indonesia. *Modern Asian Studies* , 42 (4), 815-852.
- Hooker, M. B. (1974). *Adat* and Islam in Malaya. *Anthropologica XVI* , 171 (4), 69-90.
- Hooykaas, C. (1947). *Over Maleise Literatuur*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Hosein Djajadiningrat. (1965). Local traditions in Indonesia historiography. In S. E. (eds.), *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography* (pp. 75-76). New York: Cornell University Press.
- Hunter, J. P. (2006). Seven reasons for rhyme. In Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Repetition in Early Modern British and European Cultures, *Lorna Clymer* (pp. 172-198). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hurgronje, C. S. (1888). Another thing regarding the Salasila of Kutai. *Bijdragen* , 37, 109-120.
- Hussein Haniff (Director). (1961). *Hang Jebat* [Motion Picture]
- Ibnu Khaldun. (1967). *The Muqadimmah*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1377)
- Ibrahim Mahmood. (1966). *Tun Biajid Anak Hang Tuah*. Pulau Pinang: Saudara Sinaran Berhad.
- Indirawati Zahid. (2008). Bahasa dan kesantunan Melayu. In Indirawati Zahid (Ed.), *Kuntum Budi Sumbangsih: Kumpulan Makalah untuk Profesor Emeritus Datuk Dr. Nik Safiah Karim* (pp. 107-120). Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya.
- Ismail Noor, & Muhammad Azaham. (2000). *Takkan Melayu hilang di dunia*. Subang Jaya: Pelanduk Publications.
- Jamil, R. (Producer), & Jamil, A. (Director). (1988). *Tuah* [Motion Picture]. Cathay Film Organization.

- Johari Mokti. (2017, October 15). Kaedah Juri Seni. *Seminar Presented at the Silat Juror Conference*. Buona Vista,, Singapore, Singapore: Ikatan Seni Silat Singapura.
- Jules, F. A. (1984). *A comparison of the application to architecture of the ecological and gestalt approaches to visual perception*. Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin Milwaukee.
- Kassim Ahmad. (1964). *Perwatakan dalam Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Kassim Ahmad. (2008). *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Kessler, C. (1992). Archaism and modernity: Contemporary Malay political culture. In J. Kahn, & K. W. Loh, *Fragmented vision* (pp. 133-157). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Khamis Mohamad, Nik Hassan Shuhaimi, N. A., & Samian, A. L. (2012). Falsafah perkerisan dalam masyarakat Melayu. *International Journal of the Malay World and Civilisation*, 30 (1), 105-119.
- Khoo, G. C. (2006). *Reclaiming Adat : Contemporary Malaysian film and literature*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Kim, K. K. (1992). Foreword. In M. Y. Hashim, *The Malay Sultanate of Malacca* (pp. xvii-xix). Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Koffka, K. (1935). *Principles of gestalt psychology*. London: Lund Humphries.
- Koh, J., & Ho, S. (2009). *Culture and customs of Singapore and Malaysia*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
- Kwek, I. (2011). Malayness as Mindset: When Television Producers Imagine Audiences as Malay. In S. Maznah Mohamed, *Melayu: The Politics, Poetics and Paradoxes of Malayness* (pp. 195-216). Singapore: NUS Press.
- Lemiere, S. (2015, January 7). *Gangsta to the roots: Gangsta beyond stereotypes*. Retrieved June 5, 2017, from New Mandala: <http://www.newmandala.org/gangsta-to-the-roots-gangsta-beyond-stereotypes/>
- Liaw, Y. F. (1976). *Undang-Undang Melaka*. Netherlands: The Hague.
- Liaw, Y. F. (2007). Naskah undang-undang Melaka: Suatu Tinjauan. *Sari*, 25, 85-94.
- Liaw, Y. F. (2013). *A history of classical Malay literature*. Singapore, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Lim, K. H. (2003). *Budi as the Malay mind: A philosophical study of Malay ways of reasoning and emotion in peribahasa*. Department of Austronesian Studies. Hamburg: University of Hamburg.
- Maier, H. M. (2004). An epik that never was an epic - The Malay *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. In J. Jensen, & M. M. Henk, *Epic Adventures: Heroic Narrative in the Oral Performance Traditions of Four Continents* (pp. 112-127). Münster, Germany: Lit Verlag.
- Majumdar, Phani (Director). (1959). *Hang Tuah* [Motion Picture]
- Maziah Ab. Rashid. (2005). *Kaedah tradisional pembuatan tekstil dan pakaian Melayu kajian kes Pantai Timur*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya.
- Mcdonald, P. (1997). Film acting and gender: Method acting and the male tantrum. In W. Nöth, *Semiotics of the Media: State of the Art, Projects, and Perspectives* (pp. 321-336). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Meyer, L. B. (1956). *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: Chicago UP.
- Mohamad, K., Rahman, N. H., & Samian, A. L. (2012). Falsafah Perkerisan dalam Masyarakat Melayu. *International Journal of the Malay World and Civilisation*, 30 (1), 105-119.
- Mohd Anis Md Nor. (2003). Form and Rhythm in Malay Story-Telling. In A. H. (Ed.), *The Genius of Malay Civilisation* (pp. 488-494). Tanjong Malim: Institute of Malay Civilisation, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.
- Mohd Fairuz bin Zamani. (2014). *Transkripsi dan analisis melodi gurindam terikat*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya.

- Mohd Taib Osman. (1965). *Kesusasteraan Melayu lama*. Kuala Lumpur: Federal Publications.
- Mohd Taib Osman. (2004). *Adat resam masyarakat Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Jabatan Perpaduan Negara dan Integrasi Nasional.
- Mohd. Kassim, H. A. (1990). *Barang kemas Melayu tradisi*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Mohd. Khalid Taib. (1981). 'Sastera Sejarah' in The Malay World: A Structural and Contextual Study of Folkloristic Elements in A Transitional Genre. *PhD Thesis*. Indiana University.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. (1979). Estetika Pantun Melayu (Aesthetics of the pantun). *Seminar Akar-Akar Kesenian Peribumi dan Perkembangan Kini*. Shah Alam: Malaysian Institute of Technology.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. (1991). *Yang empunya cerita*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Muhammad Haji Salleh. (2003). Hang Tuah bercakap oghang puteh: Terjemahan dan penjelmaan Hang Tuah dalam bahasa Eropah. *Seminar Kebangsaan Hikayat Hang Tuah: Takkan Melayu Hilang di Dunia*. Pulau Pinang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Mulaika Hijjas. (2010). 'The legend you thought you knew': text and screen representations of Puteri Gunung Ledang. *South East Asia Research*, 18 (2), 245-270.
- Nizami Jamil. (2005). *Buku pakaian tradisional Melayu Riau*. Pekanbaru: Lembaga Adat Melayu Riau.
- Norman Yusoff. (2007). Does Film Obey the Laws of the Mind? - Munsterberg, Cognitivism and the Films of Hussain Haniff. *Jurnal Skrin Malaysia*, 4, 31-56.
- Norman. (2005). Retrieved from *Keris Taming Sari*: <http://photos1.blogger.com/blogger/7857/1496/1600/taming%20sari.jpg>
- Peterson, M. A. (1994). Object recognition processes can and do operate before figure-ground Organization. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 3, 105-111.
- Peterson, M. A., & Gibson, B. S. (1991). The initial identification of figure-ground organization: Contributions from Shape Recognition Processes. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 29, 199-202.
- Peterson, M. A., & Gibson, B. S. (1993). Shape recognition inputs to figure-ground organization in three-dimensional displays. *Cognitive Psychology*, 383-429.
- Pickford, R. W. (1976). Defective vision and art. In D. R. Bothwell, *Beyond Aesthetics*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Putten, J. V., & Barnard, T. P. (2007). Old Malay heroes never die. In I. Gordon, M. Jancovich, M. P. Mcallister, I. Gordon, M. Jancovich, & M. P. Mcallister (Eds.), *Film and Comic Books* (pp. 246-267). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- R. Hamdan, & S. (2013). The concept of happiness of the Malay hero Hang Tuah. *International Conference on the Modern Development of Humanities and Social Science* (pp. 269-272). Hong Kong: Atlantis Press.
- Rahmah Bujang. (1975). *Sejarah perkembangan drama bangsawan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Saleeh Rahmat. (2014). *Oksidentalisme dalam sastera melayu: Sebelum merdeka hingga era Mahathir Mohamad*. Kuala Lumpur: Institute Terjemahan Buku Malaysia.
- Raimy Che-Ross. (2012). Malay silverware. *Arts of Asia*, 42 (1), 68-83.
- Rajhans, B. S. (Director). (1934). *Leila Majnun* [Motion Picture]. Singapore.
- Razha, R. (1990). Martial arts and the Malay superman. In W. J. Karim, *Emotions of Culture: A Malay Perspective* (pp. 64-95). Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Rehayati, R. (2013). Jati diri Melayu dan multikulturalisme: Kontekstualisasi jati diri Melayu di era global. *Toleransi*, 5 (1), 58-70.

- Reid, A., & Marr, D. (1991). *Perceptions of the past in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: MacMillan.
- Rock, I. (1975). *An Introduction to perception*. New York: Macmillan.
- S. Roomai Noor (Director). (1961). *Puteri Gunong Ledang* [Motion Picture].
- S. Roomai Noor. (1973). Film sebagai penyata kebudayaan kebangsaan. *Asas Kebudayaan Kebangsaan* (pp. 355-399). Kuala Lumpur: Kementerian Kebudayaan, Belia dan Sukan Malaysia.
- Salleh, S. H. (2010). *Malay literature of the 19th century*. Kuala Lumpur: Institut Terjemahan Bahasa Malaysia.
- Sardar, Z. (2000). *The consumption of Kuala Lumpur*. London: Reaktion Books Ltd.
- Saw, T. H. (Director). (2004). *Puteri Gunung Ledang* [Motion Picture]. Malaysia.
- Schein, S. (1984). *The mortal hero: An introduction to Homer's iliad*. California: University of California Press.
- Shaharuddin Maaruf. (1984). *Concept of a hero in Malay society*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press (M) Sdn Bhd.
- Sheppard, M. (1972). *Taman Indera: Malay decorative arts and costumes*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Siti Aisah Murad. (1993). Pengenalan. In S. A. (ed.), *Konsep Wira dalam Sastera Melayu* (pp. vii-xiv). Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Siti Zainon Ismail. (1980). *Pakaian dan perhiasan tradisional*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Siti Zainon Ismail. (1985). *Getaran, jalur dan warna*. Petaling Jaya: Penerbit Fajar Bakti.
- Sugeng Riyadi. (2014). Penggunaan film adaptasi sebagai media pengajaran sastra. *Bahasa & Sastra*, 14 (2), 241-251.
- Suryo Ediyono. (2013). Makna pendekar dalam beladiri pencak silat. *Etnografi : Jurnal Penelitian Budaya Etnik (Ethnography : Journal of Ethnic Culture)*, XIII (2), 348-357.
- Sweetenham, F. (1922). *Also and perhaps*. London: John Lane.
- Syed, Ahmad Jamal (2010). *Rupa dan jiwa*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Syed Muhd Khairudin Aljunied. (2005). Films as social History — P. Ramlee's "Seniman Bujang Lapok" and Malays in Singapore (1950s–60s). *The Heritage Journal*, 2 (1), 1-21.
- Tan, K. M. (2007). *Puteri Gunung Ledang: The spirit and the journey*. Kuala Lumpur: MPH Group Publishing Sdn Bhd.
- Tenas Effendy. (1997). Petalangan society and changes in Riau. *Riau in Transition*, 171 (4), 630-647.
- Tenas Effendy. (2006). *Tunjuk ajar Melayu*. Yogyakarta: Balai Kajian dan Pengembangan Budaya Melayu & Adicita.
- Tenas Effendy. (2008). Keris dalam budaya Melayu Riau. *Seminar Keris Nusantara: Bengkel Keris Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Akademi Pengajian Melayu, Universiti Malaya.
- Tengku Intan Marlina Tengku Mohd Ali, & Salina Ja'afar. (2013). Simbol kebesaran daulat, mahkota dan keris dalam *Hikayat Hang Tuah*. *Jurnal Melayu Jilid 11*, 99-109.
- Thomaz, L. F. (1993). The Malay Sultanate of Melaka. In A. R. (ed), *Southeast Asia in the Early Modern Era: Trade, Power, and Belief* (pp. 69-90). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Tobey, K. (1988). Emblems of privilege. *Archaeology*, 41 (4), 58-61.
- Tsur, R. (2012). *Poetic rhythm, structure and performance : an empirical study in cognitive poetics*. Brighton and Portland: Sussex Academic Press.
- Vaseehar Hassan Abdul Razack. (2017). *The Malay leadership mystique*. Kuala Lumpur: August Publishing.

- Visetti, Y. M. (2004). Language, space and the theory of semantic forms. In A. C. (Ed.), *Seeing, Thinking and Knowing - Meaning and Self-Organisation in Vision and Thought* (pp. 245-275). 245-275, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Walter William, S. (1900). *Malay magic: Being an introduction to the folklore and popular religion of the Malay Peninsula*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Wan Abdul Kadir. (2001). Imej Melayu dalam masyarakat Melayu. In Y. H. (Ed.), *Kosmologi Melayu* (pp. 507-523). Kuala Lumpur: Akademi Pengajian Melayu, Universiti Malaya.
- Wan Hashim Wan Teh. (2003). Kesenimanan dan jati diri P. Ramlee sebagai reformis sosial. *P. Ramlee: Seniman Agung Dunia Melayu* (p. 328). Kuala Lumpur: Arkib Negara Malaysia.
- Wan Hasmah, W. T. (2013). Daripada kertas kepada layar: Transformasi kisah Hang Tuah daripada *Hikayat* Hang Tuah dan Sulalat al-Salatin kepada "Puteri Gunung Ledang". In M. A. Halimad, & A. R. Mohamad Luthfi (Eds.). Penang: Penerbit Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Wan Yahaya Abdullah. (2004). *Malaysian destar heritage: A selected collection*. Kuala Lumpur: Department of Museums and Antiquities, Ministry of Culture, Arts and Heritage Malaysia.
- Washington Times. (2004, September 2). Malaysian film raises great expectations. The Washington Times, Retrieved from <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2004/sep/2/20040902-094100-5307r/>
- Watson, C. W. (1978). Depati Parbo : a case study in indigenous History. In *Archipel* (Vol. 15, pp. 123-143). France: Persee.
- Wazir Jahan Karim. (1992). *Women and culture: Between Malay Adat and Islam*. Boulder: Westview.
- Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, thought and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Wilkinson, R. (1907). *Malay literature*. Kuala Lumpur: FMS Government Press.
- Wilson, I. D. (2002). *The politics of inner power: the practice of pencak silat in Western Java*. Murdoch University, School of Asian Studies. Western Australia: Murdoch University.
- Winstedt, R. (1969). *A history of classical Malay literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Winstedt, R. (Ed.). (1938). The Malay Annals or The Sejarah Melayu. *Journal of Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 16 (3), 1-226.
- Wright, A., & Cartwright, H. A. (1908). *Twentieth century impressions of British Malaya: Its history, people, commerce, industries, and resources*. London, Durban, Colombo, Perth (W. A.), Singapore, Hongkong, and Shanghai: Lloyd's Greater Britain Publishing Company, limited.
- Yohan Kurniawan, & Stark, A. (2017). Kajian saka dari perspektif sains berdasarkan warna aura. *Melayu: Jurnal Antarabangsa Dunia Melayu*, 10 (1), 43-65.
- Zainal Abidin Borhan. (2000). Pantun dan peribahasa Melayu: Persoalan jati diri dan patriotisme. In A. L. Bakar, & O. P. (Eds.), *Globalisasi dan Patriotisme dalam Sastera Melayu* (pp. 45-58). Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Zainal Abidin Borhan. (2013). *Adat istiadat Melayu tradisi*. Perlis: Universiti Malaysia Perlis.
- Zakaria bin Abdullah. (2007). *Rahsia keris dan senjata warisan Melayu*. Kota Bharu: D Warisan Darul Naim dengan kerjasama Persatuan Senipurba and Kraftangan Kelantan.
- Zena O'Connor. (2015). Colour, contrast and gestalt theories of perception: The impact in contemporary visual communications design. *Color Research and Application*, 40 (1), 85-92.

Appendix 1

Puteri Gunung Ledang (2004) script

Scene 1 : Majapahit

Bendahara 00.00.24- 00.01.03	Penghujung kurun ke-15 di Tanah Melayu. Di waktu kesetiaan maruah dan kedaulatan padu. Melaka terkenal indah perkasa, menebari kegemilangan ke segenap manusia. Di tika inilah, kisah bermula. Dua insan bercinta, berjauhan di mata. Menjalinkan janji untuk bersama, merentas samudera, membelah gunung, sebuah cerita cinta yang agung.
PGL 00.02.47- 00.03.06	Aku ingin menjadi sebahagian dari impiannya. Satu waktu nanti kami pasti bersama. Dia akan datang padaku.
Bayan 00.03.18	Apa sudah difikir betul?
PGL 00.03.22	Ini sudah ditekadku Embok.
Bayan 00.03.45- 00.03.51	Besok akan Simbok hantar ke Melaka. Ke Gunung Ledang.

Scene 2 : Marketplace, Malacca

Market Seller 00.04.23- 00.04.41	Ah! Cepat-cepat! Cepat-cepat datang sini ya! Hah! Siapa cepat dia dapat. Siapa lambat, kempunan dia sepanjang hayat. Hah kalau tak dapat hajat di hati, macam kerbau hidup dikasi. Hah cepat! cepat! cepat! Siapa cepat dia dapat, siapa lambat dia melepas!
Pirate 00.04.42- 00.04.43	Nah! Kau ikut aku!
Market Seller's Daughter 00.04.44	Ayah?
Pirate 00.04.45- 00.04.51	Si dara ini akan dikahwinkan dengan ketua kami! Kau restukan saja. `
Market Seller's Daughter 00.04.54	Ayah?
Market Seller 00.05.01- 00.05.10	Maaflkanlah hamba. Hamba tak sanggup melakukan ini. Janganlah ambil anak hamba. Ambillah wang Tuan Hamba kembali.
Pirate 00.05.11	Dasar tua kutuk!
Market Seller 00.05.12	Tolonglah hamba.
Pirate 00.05.13	Lidah bercabang!

Market Seller's Daughter 00.05.16-00.05.18	Jangan! Saya ikut kamu.
Pirate 00.05.20	Cepat!
Market Seller's Daughter 00.05.21	Ayah
Hang Tuah 00.05.22-00.05.27	Tiada siapa perlu melakukan apa yang bukan kemahuan hatinya.
Pirate 00.05.28-00.05.30	Siapa cakap 'tu? Siapa cakap 'tu?
Pirate 00.05.39-00.05.48	Tugas hamba, bawa gadis ini kepada ketua hamba. Datuk tak payahlah masuk campur!
Hang Tuah 00.05.49-00.05.57	Selagi ianya di bumi Melaka, ia menjadi tugas hamba. Lepaskah dia. Cinta dan restu tak boleh dipaksa.
Pirate Daughter 00.05.58-00.06.01	Ini perintah ketua hamba. Bagaimana kalau ini tugas Datuk Laksamana?
Hang Tuah 00.06.06-00.06.13	Kalau 'nak menurut, biar berakal. Kalau mengikut, biar pintar

Scene 3 : Pantai Melaka

Mak Inang 00.07.34-00.07.38	Periksa lagi. Jangan sampai ada yang tertinggal.
Mak Inang 00.07.49-00.08.06	Kalau memang kuat hembusan angin Melaka, kedatangan Gusti Putri 'kan sampai juga ke telinganya.
PGL 00.08.44	<Yang aku lakukan ini sudah betul. Yang aku lakukan ini sudah betul.>

Scene 4 : Kadipaten, Majapahit

-	No dialogue.
---	--------------

Scene 5 : Istana Melaka

Hang Tuah 00.11.09	Datuk Bendahara.
Bendahara 00.11.13-	Bagai menatang minyak yang penuh.

00.11.16	
----------	--

Scene 6 : Gunung Ledang

PGL 00.12.00- 00.12.07	Restu dan jasmu akan menjadi kekuatanku.
Bayan 00.12.24	Ayuh semua siap-siap berangkat.
Majapahit Warrior 00.12.29	Ijinkan saya menemani Gusti.
Bayan 00.12.30- 00.12.38	'gak perlu. Gusti Puteri sudah ada yang menemani. Ayuh! Kita kembali ke Tanah Jawa.

Scene 7 : Istana Melaka

Palace Announcer (Melaka) 00.12.50- 00.13.14	Yang Amat Mulit Raja Ahmad masuk menghadap. Menjunjung titah perintah ke bawah Duli Yang Amat Mulia Paduka Seri Baginda Sultan. Istiadat pertabalan Raja Ahmad, putera sulung baginda sebagai Raja Muda, waris pertama kerajaan Melaka akan dizahirkan.
Mak Inang 00.13.42- 00.14.16	Sepertinya harum dan suci air mawar dan bunga rampai. Begitu juga Tanah Melaka di bawah pimpinan Raja Muda. Dengan keris kebesaran Raja Muda, maka rasmlah Raja Ahmad diangkat sebagai Raja Muda, pewaris takhta kesultanan Melaka. Bunga panca bicara bertangkuk lima menghiasi tengkolok Raja Muda, lambang upacara pertabalan diperkenankan baginda Sultan.
Mak Inang Tengku Teja 00.14.18	Sudah berbaloi Tengku Teja. Kini putera Tengku telah menjadi putera mahkota.

Scene 8 : Kadipaten, Majapahit

Palace Announcer (Majapahit) 00.14.34- 00.14.40	Ke hadapan Yang Mulia Gusti Adipati Handaya Ningrat, Pangeran Benowo dari Demak berkenan menghadap.
Pangeran Benowo 00.14.42- 00.15.05	Dengan nama Allah yang maha pengasih lagi maha penyayang, Sultan Demak mengajak Gusti Adipati, Penguasa Kadipaten, Tanah <i>Pendekar</i> Majapahit untuk menerima Demak sebagai pelindung yang baru. Demak akan menjamin keselamatan rakyat dan kerajaannya.
Gusti Adipati 00.16.06- 00.16.19	Keselamatan? Dari ancaman apa? Demak yang perlu diselamatkan!

Scene 9 : Open field

Village Guardsmen 00.17.01- 00.17.07	Lari! Pasukan Demak menyerang! Lari!
---	--------------------------------------

Scene 10 : Kadipaten, Majapahit

Gusti Adipati 00.18.03- 00.18.16	Kita lawan Demak! Sampai titik darah penghabisan. Jalan dewa ada jalan pedang, kalau menyangkut kehormatan tanah ini.
Patih 00.18.20- 00.19.14	Nyatanya pengikut mereka semakin hari semakin banyak. Peperangan itu ibarat membuat perjanjian dengan maut. Walaupun mereka memiliki perbedaan kepercayaan, tapi jika Gusti Adipati memberi ijin, Gusti Puteri akan jadi tali pengikat dari dua kekuasaan. Nescaya..nescaya kedamaian akan kita dapatkan
Gusti Adipati 00.19.18	Oh! Adikku?

Scene 11 : Waterfall, Gunung Ledang

PGL 00.19.20- 00.20.15	<Javanese tune>
-------------------------------------	-----------------

Scene 12 : Kadipaten, Majapahit

Gusti Adipati 00.20.20- 00.20.45	Oh! Pahitnya lidahku. Butuhkan apa lagi ini? Orang rendahanku sendiri - numpang hidup dalam istanaku, berani menikamku. Bicara paman!
Patih 00.20.44- 00.20.46	Hamba ini
Gusti Adipati 00.20.59	Pancung? Pancung masih cukup setimpal. Hukuman apa yang pantas untuk rendahanku yang berani melawan rajanya.
Gusti Adipati 00.20.20- 00.20.45	Oh! Pahitnya lidahku. Butuhkan apa lagi ini? Orang rendahanku sendiri - numpang hidup dalam istanaku, berani menikamku. Bicara paman!
Gusti Adipati 00.21.03- 00.21.14	Jagat raya? Iblis apa yang telah merasukinya? Kau dengar Paman Pati? Bahkan dia sudah berani menentang maut.
Mak Inang 00.21.14- 00.21.26	Gusti Yang Mulia, tugas dan kewajiban hamba hanya mengabdikan. Begitulah yang hamba laksanakan Gusti.
Gusti Adipati 00.21.29- 00.21.42	Tanyakan Paman Pati! Tanyakan! Kenapa dia berani mempengaruhi Gusti Puteri sampai berani meninggalkan Majapahit? Tanyakan!
Mak Inang 00.21.42- 00.21.58	Ampuni hamba Gusti Adipati yang mulia, demi Sang Hyang Pencipta, hamba hanya mengikuti Gusti Puteri yang ingin mencapai kebahagiaannya.
Mak Inang 00.22.01- 00.22.16	Itulah sembah bakti hamba kepada Gusti Puteri dan hamba sanggup menerima hukuman kerana telah mengajak Gusti Puteri mengejar cintanya. Mengejar harapannya, Gusti Adipati.
Gusti	Aku sendiri yang akan bunuh harapan itu.

Adipati 00.22.17- 00.22.20	
---	--

Scene 13 : Mak Inang's Room, Majapahit

00.22.23- 00.22.59	<Javanese tune>
-----------------------	-----------------

Scene 14 : Gunung Ledang

PGL 00.23.00- 00.23.19	<Javanese tune>
-------------------------------------	-----------------

Scene 15 : Mak Inang's Room, Majapahit

00.23.20- 00.23.41	<Javanese tune>
-----------------------	-----------------

Scene 16 : Gunung Ledang

00.23.42- 00.24.00	<Javanese tune>
-----------------------	-----------------

Scene 17 : Mak Inang's Room, Majapahit

00.24.01- 00.24.24	<Javanese tune>
-----------------------	-----------------

Scene 18 : Gunung Ledang

PGL 00.24.25 - 00.25.12	<Javanese tune>
--------------------------------------	-----------------

Scene 19 : Mak Inang's Room, Majapahit

PGL 00.25.12- 00.25.30	<Javanese tune>
-------------------------------------	-----------------

Scene 20 : Melaka

Shahbandar 00.26.19- 00.26.22	Gusti Adipati dari Majapahit di gerbang istana.
Datuk Shahbandar 00.27.01	Datuk Laksamana,
Hang Tuah 00.27.03	Datuk Shahbandar,
Shahbandar 00.27.07- 00.27.22	Hamba bersama Gusti Adipati menunggu masuk menghadap ke bawah duli Tuanku. (Whisper : Berkenaan dindanya, Gusti Puteri, entah mengapa agaknya)
Hang Tuah 00.27.33	Gusti Adipati.
Gusti Adipati 00.27.47- 00.28.04	Kedamaian Kadipaten terancam kerana ulahmu. Cinta adikku padamu hanya akan mendatangkan bala. Kalau bukan kerana baginda Sultan Melaka, sudahku cincang kamu.

Hang Tuah 00.28.06	Kalau bukan kerana baginda Sultan...
Bendahara 00.28.19	Datuk Laksamana!
Bendahara 00.28.29- 00.28.38	Gusti Adipati, ke bawah duli Tuanku memperkenalkan Gusti masuk menghadap. Mohon dipersila.
Bendahara 00.28.46- 00.28.54	Hamba kira ada baiknya agar Datuk Laksamana tidak turut serta.

Scene 21 : Malaccan Palace Court

Hang Tuah 00.29.41- 00.30.10	Ampun Tuanku. Duli Tuanku mengisytiharkan bahawa ke bawah duli Sultan Tuanku mengampuni, bersetuju untuk memperkenalkan harapan hati dari rakyat Majapahit untuk Gusti Puteri Retno Dumilah, adinda Gusti Adipati Handaya Ningrat, dijadikan permaisuri baginda.
Court Audience 00.30.11	Daulat Tuanku!
Sultan 00.30.19- 00.30.23	Apa tidak molekkah cadangan beta itu Datuk Laksamana?
Hang Tuah 00.30.26- 00.30.35	Ampun Tuanku. Jika itu kehendak Tuanku, patik junjung di atas batu jemala patik. Ampun Tuanku.
Bendahara 00.30.47	Menjunjung titah Tuanku.

Scene 22 : Gunung Ledang

-	-
---	---

Scene 23 : Melaka Beach

Bendahara 00.34.47- 00.35.00	Mudah-mudahan, dengan perkahwinan ini, kerajaan Melaka akan dapat menghentikan serangan Demak, Gusti Adipati.
Gusti Adipati 00.35.01- 00.35.07	Selesaikan dulu urusan Tuah, kehadirannya hanya akan menyulitkan keadaan. Mari pulang...

Scene 24 : Sultan's Room

Bendahara 00.35.57- 00.36.00	Kanda lakukan ini kerana kewajipan.
Tengku Teja 00.36.04- 00.36.12	Pura-pura cari ayam, ekor mata di anak orang.
Tengku Teja 00.36.18- 00.36.22	Bukankah perkahwinan kita ini juga satu kewajipan Kanda?
Tengku Teja	Pura-pura cari ayam, ekor mata di anak orang.

00.36.04- 00.36.12	
Tengku Teja 00.36.18- 00.36.22	Bukankah perkahwinan kita ini juga satu kewajipan Kanda?

Scene 25 : Gunung Ledang

Bendahara 00.36.56- 00.37.00	Nuwun Sewu Kang Mas Gusti Adipati..
---	-------------------------------------

Scene 26 : Melaka Beach

PGL 00.37.01- 00.37.05	Apakah diajeng sudah tidak dianggap? Mengapa langsung menghadap Sultan Melaka?
Gusti Adipati 00.37.06- 00.37.21	Apakah kamu mahu menerima kedatanganku? Perempuan macam apa kamu ini? Seperti wanita sejati yang diberi kemuliaan tetapi masih sanggup mengejar laki-laki yang tidak sedarjat. Apa kamu sudah hilang akal?
PGL 00.37.22- 00.37.32	Apakah yang salah Kang Mas? Untuk sekali ini diajeng menurut di kata hati sendiri, sebelum segalanya hilang. Apa yang salah?
Gusti Adipati 00.37.34- 00.38.17	Kata hati. Sejak kapan seorang puteri dari Keraton Tanah Jawa sanggup mengikut kata hati? Durhaka namanya! Darahmu 'pun mengalir dalam diriku Diajeng. Darah kita milik leluhur. Tapi kehendak takdir, kamu berusaha berada di sini juga. Kita semua memiliki mimpi Diajeng. Tapi kenyataannya, kita harus lakoni yang seharusnya kita jalani. Jangan ingkari takdir yang kita miliki.
PGL 00.38.18- 00.38.26	Ingkar Kang Mas? Ingkar mengopo Kang Mas? Dari kehidupan yang tidak pernah saya inginkan? Yang ngak pernah saya pilih?
Gusti Adipati 00.38.27- 00.38.43	Sudah! 'dak usah bermimpi menghadap cinta. Terimalah Sultan Melaka Diajeng. Akan tenanglah rakyat kita nanti. Atau sudah lupakah kamu pada rakyat dan tanah kelahiran kamu sendiri?
PGL 00.38.45- 00.38.58	Jikalau saya menerima Baginda Sultan, itu ertinya sepanjang hidup saya akan berhadapan dengan Tuah. Saya tidak akan sanggup.
PGL 00.39.01 - 00.39.07	Kalau begitu, Diajeng akan abdikan sahaja diri kepada Pangeran Demak. Demi rakyat.

Scene 27 : Istana Melaka

Bendahara 00.39.09- 00.39.34	Kalau Melaka izinkan Gusti Puteri mengahwini Pangeran Demak, ianya seperti menconteng arah ke muka sendiri.
Bendahara 00.39.43- 00.40.02	Jika ke bawah Duli Tuanku berkenankan, teringin benar patik pohon menganjurkan satu cadangan. Ampun Tuanku.
PGL 00.40.10- 00.40.15	Datuk Laksamana, Tuanku, adalah harapan kita.

Scene 28 : Demak

Gusti Adipati 00.40.47- 00.38.17	Salam'mualaikum Tuah.
Hang Tuah 00.40.50- 00.41.14	Wa'alaikumsalam. Ya khodiyal hajat. Ke bawah Duli yang maha mulia Paduka Seri Sultan Mahmud Melaka mempersilakan Pangeran Benowo dari Demak ke <i>istiadat</i> perkahwinan baginda dengan Gusti Puteri Retno Dumilah, Puteri Majapahit.
Pangeran Benowo 00.41.16- 00.41.20	Menurut khabar dari angin yang saya terima, tidak begitu.
Hang Tuah 00.41.24- 00.41.30	Taming Sari ini menjadi saksi akan jemputan yang patik bawa. Pangeran.
Pangeran Benowo 00.41.32 - 00.41.52	Saya terima undangan itu. Karena yang membawa adalah panglima tertinggi kerajaan Melaka. Tapi, kalau ternyata khabar dari angin itu betul, dengan ijin Allah, Demak pasti serang Majapahit.
Hang Tuah 00.41.24- 00.41.30	Taming Sari ini menjadi saksi akan jemputan yang patik bawa. Pangeran.
PGL 00.42.09 - 00.42.21	<flashback> Apa mungkin seorang gadis seperti adinda ini bisa melukai Laksamana Melaka yang tersohor. Atau jiwa Kanda gentar disentuh adinda?

Scene 29 : Istana Melaka

Bendahara 00.43.40- 00.43.56	Tindakan hamba bukan melulu. Kesemuanya hamba susun supaya rambut yang ditarik, tepung tidak berselerak.
Orang Kaya 00.43.57- 00.44.00	Hamba, Datuk, akan cuba sedaya upaya hamba.
Bendahara 00.44.03- 00.44.05	Semua hati di Melaka ini, hamba jaga,
Orang Kaya 00.44.10- 00.44.13	Semuanya sudah siap, Datuk Setia?
Datuk Setia 00.44.14 - 00.44.19	Sudah, Orang Kaya. Tujuh dulang semuanya.
Sultan 00.44.25- 00.43.56	Bilakah rombongan peminangan ini akan bertolak, Datuk Bendahara?
Orang Kaya 00.44.29- 00.44.36	Selepas sembahyang subuh besok, Tuanku. Pacal Tun Mamat akan melepaskan rombongan.
Bendahara 00.44.38-	Beta amat berkenan sekali jika Datuk Laksamana dapat mengetuai rombongan ini.

00.44.43	
Bendahara 00.44.45- 00.44.59	Ampun Tuanku. Mungkin ada baiknya, dalam keadaan begini Tuanku, Datuk Laksamana bersama patik.
Sultan 00.44.59 - 00.45.07	Perkahwinan beta dengan Gusti Puteri tak dapat kita bendung lagi. Ini janji beta pada Tanah Jawa.
Bendahara 00.45.08- 00.45.12	Jika itu yang ke bawah duli Tuanku perkenankan.
Sultan 00.45.15 - 00.45.16	Datuk Laksamana.
Hang Tuah 00.45.17 - 00.45.21	Titah dijunjung. Daulat disemat utuh. Ampun Tuanku.
Datuk Setia 00.45.46 - 00.45.54	Ketaatan Datuk Laksamana kepada Melaka memang tidak boleh dinafikan.

Scene 30 : Gunung Ledang

PGL 00.47.50- 00.47.59	Tidak akan mungkin Tuah rela aku kahwin dengan Sultannya. Apa mungkin?
Tun Mamat 00.48.19	Ada apa Datuk Laksamana?
Orang Kaya 00.48.59- 00.49.09	Nenek, siapakah gerangan nenek? Dan, apa tujuan nenek berjalan seorang diri dalam hutan ini?
Nenek Kebayan 00.49.10- 00.49.13	Nenek memang tinggal di sini 'cu.
Tun Mamat 00.49.16- 00.49.26	Nama cucu, Tun Mamat. Nenek pernah berjumpa dengan Gusti Puteri tak?
Nenek Kebayan 00.49.26	Ah! Pernah.
Bendahara 00.43.29- 00.43.31	Bila? Di mana?
Nenek Kebayan 00.49.35- 00.49.45	Di air terjun, sebelah timur sana. Bila nenek ke sana, Puteri pasti ada di sana.
Datuk Setia 00.49.48- 00.49.56	Kami sebenarnya dalam perjalanan meminang Puteri yang berada di puncak gunung ini. Dan, nama cucu, Datuk Setia.
Nenek Kebayan 00.50.01 - 00.50.03	Peminangan untuk siapa 'cu?

Datuk Setia 00.50.04 - 00.50.07	Baginda Sultan Melaka. Sultan Mahmud, Nek.
Nenek Kebayan 00.50.12- 00.50.22	Jangan berangan meniti laut, takut air menjadi api.
Hang Tuah 00.50.23 - 00.50.27	Kami menjunjung titah Paduka Sultan.
Nenek Kebayan 00.50.32 - 00.50.42	Baguslah 'cu. Taat yang tiada kesudahannya. Tiada penghujung.
Hang Tuah 00.52.45- 00.52.54	<Telepathic conversation with PGL> Dinda, Dinda benarkan Kanda bertemu Dinda. Tidak inginkah Dinda bertemu Kanda lagi.
Datuk Setia 00.53.22- 00.53.25	Rasakan penangan parang terbang.
Tun Mamat 00.53.26 - 00.53.33	Hamba rasa, lebih baik kita beralih ke tempat lain. Yang lebih selamat.
Datuk Setia 00.53.34	Boleh Orang Kaya.
Datuk Setia 00.53.47- 00.53.55	Dengar semua! Kita bergerak sekarang. Kumpulkan barang yang ringan. Jangan lambat-lambat.

Scene 31 : Cave

-	-
---	---

Scene 32 : Flashback (PGL and Hang Tuah)

PGL 00.54.47 - 00.54.53	Kita sudah saling terikat jika <i>adat</i> menyucikan kaki ini kita lakukan.
Hang Tuah 00.55.05 - 00.55.11	Setapak melangkah. Dua langkah ingatan kanda pada Dinda.
PGL 00.55.13- 00.55.34	Adinda bersumpah. Jikalau Kakanda tidak kembali, Adinda akan menyusul Kakanda. Menginjak pada tanah yang sama, bernafas pada udara yang sama,
PGL 00.55.39 - 00.56.01	Berlayar berbelok-belok, sauh dibungkar di tempat tenang. Yang tinggal hati tak elok, yang pergi hati tak senang. Bila sampai waktu, kita akan bersama

Scene 33 : Cave

-	-
---	---

Scene 34 : Gunung Ledang

Hang Tuah 00.56.20- 00.56.22	Bersediakah kita Datuk Setia?
Datuk Setia	Iya. Sudah Datuk Laksamana.

00.56.24	
Hang Tuah 00.56.26	Kalau begitu kita...
Tun Mamat 00.56.27- 00.56.37	Sebentar Datuk Laksamana, Datuk Bendahara menyuruh hamba seorang sahaja pergi berjumpa Gusti Puteri.
Hang Tuah 00.56.43- 00.56.48	Mengapa? Hamba dititah oleh Baginda Sultan
Tun Mamat 00.56.51- 00.57.04	Datuk Bendahara hanya ingin hamba sampaikan kata-katanya. Semua tindakan adalah untuk kepentingan Baginda Sultan. Dan, kepentingan Datuk Laksamana juga.
Hang Tuah 00.57.10- 00.57.19	Tuanke telah memperkenankan pemergian hamba ini, Orang Kaya..dan hamba akan menunaikannya.

Scene 35 : Waterfall, Gunung Ledang

Hang Tuah 00.59.17	Dah lama tunggu?
PGL 00.56.21	Iya Kakanda,
Hang Tuah 00.59.25 - 00.59.27	Berpijak juga Dinda pasir tanah Kanda.
PGL 00.59.31 - 00.59.33	Apa dengan tongkat rajawali kelmarin?
Hang Tuah 00.59.34 - 00.59.35	Demi cinta tiada gunung terlalu tinggi.
PGL 00.59.43 - 00.59.57	Kini kita sama-sama berada di puncaknya. Bagai mimpi rasanya Kakanda berkata-kata cinta kepada adinda.
Hang Tuah 01.00.00 - 01.00.09	Suaramu membuka hatiku yang merindu. Kiniku rasa deruan angin menusuk dada.
PGL 01.00.14 - 01.00.18	Mengapa cinta Dinda diuji sebegini jauh Kakanda?
Hang Tuah 01.00.21 - 01.00.23	Kanda lupa cinta Dinda seagung Maya.
PGL 01.00.26 - 01.00.31	Kalau cinta Kakanda? Bukan semesta luasnya?
Hang Tuah 01.00.31 - 01.00.33	Masih kecil berbanding cinta Dinda.
PGL 01.00.34 - 01.00.37	Tetapi Kanda ke mari juga.
Hang Tuah 01.00.40 - 01.00.44	Laksana insan haus dahaga, bertemu air satu telaga.

PGL 01.01.10 - 01.01.12	Kanda teguh memegang janji.
Hang Tuah 01.01.18 - 01.01.34	Dinda, tapi Kanda datang membawa harapan yang menggunung tinggi. Harapan yang Dinda sedia maklum.
PGL 01.01.36 - 01.01.42	Kanda. Tolong katakan Kanda ke mari bukan atas titah Sultan Melaka semata-mata.
Hang Tuah 01.01.51 - 01.02.03	Dinda, tiada cinta dari hati Kanda untuk yang lain kecuali Dinda. Cinta Kanda melepasi puncak Ledang ini, melepasi batas jasad ini, Dinda.
PGL 01.02.06 - 01.02.15	Cinta Kanda terlepas daripada jasad sendiri? Tergantung di langit?
Hang Tuah 01.02.20 - 01.02.33	Apakan daya, tangan terikat di langit, kaki terpasak di bumi, jasad tidak setanding mimpi.
PGL 01.02.40 - 01.02.44	Dinda tetap bahagia meskipun cuma hidup dengan harapan.
PGL 01.02.53 - 01.03.15	Jangan Kakanda turuti perintah ini. Cinta Kanda yang Adinda harapkan. Bukan dari yang lain. Kanda tahu betapa hati Dinda terasa damai kerana dapat bertemu kembali dengan Kanda?
PGL 01.03.34 - 01.03.45	Rupanya waktu telah membutakan hati Kanda. Kanda sambut kehadiran Adinda dengan niat melukai.
Tun Mamat 01.03.54 - 01.04.14	Yang Mulia Gusti Puteri, patik Tun Mamat datang bersama-sama Datuk Laksamana ini, berharap benar jika Gusti Puteri dapat menerima lamaran Baginda.
Tun Mamat 01.04.33 - 01.04.42	Hancurlah hati kami, menyembah Sultan Melaka yang kami cintai, tanpa Gusti Puteri sebagai Permaisuri.
PGL 01.04.49 - 01.04.53	Apa benar Datuk Laksamana?
PGL 01.05.00 - 01.05.21	Apakah diam Datuk Laksamana satu kebenaran? Apa kalian tidak tahu bahawa saya sudahpun membuat keputusan untuk menerima Pangeran Demak?
Tun Mamat 01.05.23 - 01.05.47	Gusti Puteri, keputusan itu tiada bermakna bagi Demak lagi kerana Datuk Laksamana Hang Tuah sendiri telah ke Jawa bumi, berutusan dengan Pangeran Demak, bagi menyampaikan hasrat peminangan ini.
PGL 01.06.07 - 01.06.16	Biar seribu air mengukir batu, tetapi Tuah tetap Tuah.
PGL 01.06.24 - 01.06.42	Baiklah. Jikalau itu yang Datuk inginkan. Saya setuju. Saya terima lamaran itu asalkan permintaan saya ini dituruti.
PGL 01.06.46 - 01.07.20	<Javanese Murmurs>
PGL 01.07.20 -	Apakah maksud kata-kata Jawa ini?

01.07.23	
----------	--

Scene 36 : Adipati's Room, Kadipaten, Majapahit

Patih 01.07.28 - 01.05.32	Belum lagi ada khabar dari Melaka, Gusti.
Adipati 01.07.39 - 01.07.46	Menurut Paman, apa masih akan diberi masalah?
PGL 01.07.47 - 01.08.20	Tuah? Terbitlah sang perkasa matahari, sinarmu yang gemilang menerangi segalanya. Serahkan segalanya pada Yang Maha Agung, Gusti.

Scene 37 : Dance Scene

-	-
---	---

Scene 38 : Gunung Ledang

Adipati 1.10.34- 1.10.56	Seperti sungai mengelilau. Kau hasut adikku, kau cari muka di depan. Seluruh harapanku kau hancurkan dengan kepalamu yang tidak sepadan dengan telapak kakiku.
Hang Tuah 1.11.00- 1.11.07	Terlalu tajam dan biadap lidahmu Engku, tidak sepadan darjatmu.
Adipati 1.11.08- 1.11.12	Tidak lebih tajam dari pedangku, Tuah.
Adipati 01.11.14 - 01.11.33	Kau kacaukan kedamaian negeriku. Kau injak-injak martabat rakyat dan leluhurku, celaka kau Tuah! Baik, kita ukur kesaktian kita.
Adipati 01.11.36 - 01.11.40	Aku tidak gentar denganmu. Melayu!
Hang Tuah 01.11.41 - 01.11.43	Kamu semua jangan masuk campur.

Scene 39 : Duel Scene, Sea

-	-
---	---

Scene 40 : Duel Scene, Cave

Adipati 01.14.40- 01.14.43	Aku lurutkan nyiur, untukmu.
---	------------------------------

Scene 41 : Duel Scene, Sea

Hang Tuah 01.15.13- 01.15.19	Tidak. Nyawamu tidak akan mententeramkan jiwaku.
Hang Tuah 01.15.43- 01.15.59	Khabarkan baginda Sultan, hamba telah gagal melaksanakan perintahnya dan hamba tak sanggup memperlihatkan diri walau sejenak dari pandangannya.
Hang Tuah 01.16.36- 01.16.49	Selagi Taming Sari tenggelam di dasar sungai ini, hamba tidak akan kembali.

Adipati 01.17.13- 01.17.20	Kau bertarung untuk dirimu, aku bertarung untuk rakyat dan negeriku.
---	--

Scene 42 : Istana Melaka

Tun Mamat 01.17.32- 01.17.43	Hamba mohon maaf Datuk Bendahara, hamba tahu semua ini berpunca dari kegagalan hamba menahan Datuk Laksamana..
Sultan 01.17.43- 01.17.54	Terima kasih Orang Kaya, hamba rasa Orang Kaya tentunya kepenatan. Ada baiknya Orang Kaya pulang ke rumah.
Sultan 01.18.10- 01.18.15	Hanya kerana keadaan ini, Tuah fikir dia sudah gagal melaksanakan perintah Beta?
Sultan 01.18.20- 01.18.41	Hah...Oh Tuah..ketaatan Tuah tak ada tandingannya. Pemergiannya membuktikan itu. Datuk Bendahara!
Bendahara 01.18.45	Ampun Tuanku.
Sultan 01.18.46- 01.18.50	Beta titahkan Datuk supaya mencari dan membujuk kembali Tuah ke bumi Melaka.
Bendahara 01.18.57	Menjunjung titah.

Scene 43 : Pintu Masuk Istana Melaka

Narrator 01.19.05- 01.19.08	Ke utusan peminangan. Kumpulkan segala cerdik-cerdik pandai di Melaka ini.
--	--

Scene 44 : Balairong, Istana.

Palace Narrator 01.19.37- 01.19.44	Syarat-syarat peminangan yang diterima, tujuh sulap kata semuanya.
---	--

Scene 45 : Marsh, Gunung Ledang.

PGL 01.20.04- 01.20.05	Tuah tetap Tuah!
-------------------------------------	------------------

Scene 46 : Balairong, Istana.

Palace Narrator 01.20.10- 01.21.00	<p>Pertama, air mata dara yang tidak berdarah, tujuh tempayan banyaknya. Jawabannya, tujuh tempayan anak dara sunti.</p> <p>Kedua, pinang, bukannya kahwin kerana tidak tua, merah darahnya. Tujuh tempayan banyaknya. Jawabannya, tujuh tempayan air pinang muda.</p> <p>Ketiga, merangkak bebas di dataran, darah juga kehendaknya.</p>
---	---

	Sifatnya, tujuh dulang banyaknya. Jawabannya, tujuh dulang hati hama.
--	---

Scene 47 : Marsh, Gunung Ledang.

PGL 01.21.13- 01.21.53	Tanah mana yang aku pijak? Berdirinya aku, kasih berluhuran. Pasir mana yang aku genggam? Berat tanganku, semakin layu bunga berkembang. Bumi yang luas, aku seorang. <laughs>
-------------------------------------	--

Scene 48 : Balairong, Istana.

Palace Narrator 01.22.43- 01.24.00	<p>Keempat, terbang bebas di udara, darah juga kehendaknya. Sifatnya, tujuh dulang banyaknya. Jawabannya, tujuh dulang hati nyamuk.</p> <p>Kelima, darah putih rakyat untuk menambat darah kuning dari tapak ke takhta. Jawabannya, jambatan perak dari Melaka ke puncak Gunung Ledang.</p> <p>Keenam, darah merah rakyat, untuk menambat darah kuning dari tapak ke takhta. Jawabannya, jambatan emas dari Melaka ke puncak Gunung Ledang.</p> <p>Ketujuh, darah segantang tetap mengalir (reverb), badan bersilih menanti, sebatil. Jawabannya..</p>
Palace Narrator 01.24.02	Darah putera beta..
Palace Narrator 01.24.55- 01.26.02	<p>Ampun Tuanku beribu-ribu ampun, sembah patik harap diampun. Kesemua permintaan ini amat kecil berbanding dengan kebesaran ke bawah duli Tuanku. Dan kebesaran tuanku itu, teruja dengan permintaan yang begitu tinggi hasratnya. Apakah nilainya hanya nyawa seorang Tengku Mahkota kita berbanding dengan ribuan nyawa rakyat Jawa?</p> <p>Akan tetapi, apakah nilainya ribuan nyawa rakyat Jawa yang bukan jajahan Melaka? dan hanya untuk memenuhi syarat hantaran perkahwinan Tuanku? Ampun Tuanku beribu-ribu ampun.</p>
Sultan 01.27.38- 01.28.53	Biar diketahui semua, tanggungjawab beta bukan sekadar memberi titah. Putera beta atau tanah Jawa? Semua ini peritnya seperti menelan hempedu. Bagai racun menusuk kalbu. Tetap, ia bukan penghalang!
PGL 01.29.38- 01.30.17	Ampun Tuanku. Pengorbanan demi cinta adalah indah dan pengorbanan demi negara sungguh mulia. Tapi apalah ertinya berkorban dengan tanah berlumuran darah, manusia yang tidak berdosa. Apa Tuanku sanggup melakukannya? Mungkin masih kurang jelas bagi Tuanku kalau permintaan saya sebetulnya satu penolakan.
Sultan 01.30.28- 01.31.05	Apakah ini semua hanya satu permainan? Beta sanggup berkorban demi rakyatmu dan kamu memperkecilkan usaha beta ini? Berani kamu mempersendakan beta. Mempersendakan beta yang ingin melindungi kedaulatan kerajaanmu.

PGL 01.31.07- 01.31.27	Sungguh mulia niat Tuanku itu, tapi apakah itu niat yang keluar dari hati? Saya sudah membuat keputusan untuk kembali ke tanah Jawa untuk bersama Pangeran Demak, tapi mengapa hasrat saya itu juga Tuanku halangi?
Sultan 01.31.28- 01.31.43	Kamu sadar kepada siapa kamu berkata ini? Beta bukan rakyat kecilmu. Untuk kamu perlakukan sedemikian rupa.
PGL 01.31.45- 01.31.57	Rakyat kecil saya? Rakyat kecil saya yang demi mereka Yang Mulia Tuanku sanggup korbakan Puteri Mahkota itu?
PGL 01.32.00- 01.33.04	Apa ada di kalangan kalian yang pernah bertanya, mengapa saya datang ke negeri ini? Saya hanya menuruti kata hati. Itu hak saya. Hak setiap manusia. Hak untuk memilih. Saya tidak ingin layu di keraton. Saya ingin merdeka, bebas untuk mencintai dan dicintai. Bukan mengingkari kebesaran Melaka. Jikalau betul kebesaran Melaka berada di telunjuk tuanku, mengapa perlu perkahwinan ini untuk menyelamatkan negara saya?
Sultan 01.33.07- 01.33.29	Kamu bicara tanpa beralas. Kamu lupa yang bumi Melaka ini bumi berdaulat? Sehiris luka yang beta terima di atas tanah yang kamu pijak ini, seMelaka sakitnya dirasa.
Sultan 01.33.42- 01.33.45	Pilu beta dengar hirisan katamu itu.
PGL 01.34.14- 01.34.34	Saya hanya ingin terus berdiam di atas puncak Gunung Ledang supaya tidak melukai hati sesiapaupun. Ijinkan saya Tuanku.
Sultan 01.34.14- 01.35.24	Beta perkenankan permintaan kamu. Tetapi, perbuatanmu ini tetap derhaka. Dan sesungguhnya bumi Melaka ini bumi berdaulat. Kamu akan keseorangan di puncak ledang sahaja. Tidak boleh dipandang sesiapa sesudah subuh kelak, nescaya dia yang memandang, beta sumpah hilang nyawa bermuntahkan darah.
PGL 01.35.32 - 01.35.59	Memang besar daulat Melaka, tapi sayang, Tuanku mensia-siakannya. Daulat Tuanku. Semoga Tuanku bertakhta hingga ke akhir zaman.
Sultan 01.36.10 - 01.36.13	Pengorbanan cinta itu indah.

Scene 49 : Marsh, Gunung Ledang.

Datuk Bendahara 01.37.24- 01.38.45	Sesudah subuh kelak, sesiapa yang memandang akan hilang nyawa, bermuntahkan darah. Rasanya Datuk Laksamana lebih mengetahui akan kesungguhan hamba untuk mengelakkan daripada berlakunya perkara seumpama ini. Namun begitu, ianya banyak menyedarkan hamba bahawa kita ini hanya boleh merancang, tetapi ketetapan nya bukan milik kita. Apakah yang menjadi dalang di dalam pengorbanan ini Tuah? Cinta yang begitu indah terpaksa dikorbankan.
---	---

Scene 50 : Peak of Gunung Ledang

-	-
---	---

Scene 51 : Hut, Gunung Ledang

Bendahara 01.39.05-	Pergil! Pergilah sekarang, sebelum terlambat.
-------------------------------	---

01.39.12	
Bendahara 01.39.53- 01.39.57	Ayuh! Kembali ke istana kita.

Scene 52 : Gunung Ledang

Bendahara 01.42.41- 01.43.15	<PGL cries>
Hang Tuah 01.43.38- 01.44.44	Tunjukkanlah dirimu dinda! (41) Tunjukkanlah dirimu (44-45). Kanda rela bermuntahan darah dari hidup sepi tanpamu(48-51). Demi segala pengorbanan yang dinda lalui, demi segala penderitaan yang dinda alami, dan demi segala kemungkinan yang patut Kanda lakukan, Kanda mohon maaf. Kanda buta dinda..Kanda buta (01.44.10-01.44.34). Kanda rayu dinda..Kanda rayu.. (01.44.40-01.44.44)
Hang Tuah 01.45.14- 01.46.06	Maafkan Kanda dinda. (16) Jika Dinda izinkan kanda berpijak di tanah ini dan menghirup nafas bersama degupan jantung dinda, berilah petunjuk. (20-32) Berilah kanda petunjuk. (34-35) Sesungguhnya, kanda cintakan dinda.
Puteri Gunung Ledang 01.48.34- 01.49.02	Ku hinakan diriku sendiri untuk merengkuh cinta sejati. Cintamu bagai cahaya mentari yang membakar wajahku. Meski sekilas kurasakan, namun akan menjadi bekal hingga akhir zaman. Aku juga mencintaimu Tuah.

Scene 53 : Aerial Shot of Gunung Ledang

Bendahara 01.49.12- 01.50.00	Cinta agung yang tidak bersemi. Tetapi masih tetap termeteri, umpama rindu bulan mengelilingi bumi, menyinari kegelapan di malam hari. Sejak itu tiada khabar berita, tentang kedua insan bercinta. Namun, Gunung Ledang menjadi tanda keagunungan dan keluhuran cinta mereka. Pengorbanan cinta indah.
---	---

▲ Hang Tuah warning a group of pirates to observe the peace and order in Malacca. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#37211f	30.6%
	#5d4838	23.9%
	#150c0f	16.8%
	#937e5f	11.3%
	#7f846f	6.8%
	#4d4841	4.1%
	#b49264	2.8%
	#814d41	2.7%
	#cdc8aa	1.1%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#4d3a30	54.4%
	#1e1510	19.2%
	#6c3a31	14.2%
	#887b62	8.8%
	#754b2a	3.0%
	#869ca4	0.4%

▼ Hang Tuah sensing Puteri Gunung Ledang's arrival in Malacca. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▲ Hang Tuah watching on as Puteri Gunung Ledang presents a dance to the Sultan of Malacca and his entourage. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#13090c	60.8%
	#431b17	27.0%
	#1e202d	8.8%
	#6f472d	1.7%
	#514e40	1.7%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#433225	55.2%
	#51543c	19.9%
	#363b38	9.0%
	#1d1513	5.8%
	#612c1e	5.2%
	#704932	4.3%
	#8ca493	0.4%
	#b2967f	0.2%

▼ Hang Tuah admiring the Malaccan palace with the Bendahara. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▼ Hang Tuah shares an intimate moment with Puteri Gunung Ledang through dance. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▲

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#3d321f	63.2%
	#9c8784	11.9%
	#a06f5e	10.1%
	#61321e	5.3%
	#696115	4.3%
	#918b0d	2.8%
	#93794c	1.1%
	#865e1e	0.6%
	#e0cfb4	0.4%
	#626235	0.3%

Hang Tuah showing keris Taming Sari to Pangaran Benowo. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#a09789	75.9%
	#402b20	10.6%
	#584a3f	7.4%
	#261710	4.5%
	#835041	1.6%

▼
Hang Tuah sharing intimate moment with Puteri Gunung Ledang. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▲ Hang Tuah in coronation ceremony of Raja Ahmad.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#1a0f08	50.8%
	#533d29	38.1%
	#ac9c6f	4.6%
	#827038	3.5%
	#a6ada8	2.5%
	#7b736d	0.5%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#42291a	41.5%
	#1a0f08	40.6%
	#66492e	6.1%
	#765228	5.5%
	#957444	3.5%
	#763220	2.8%

▼ Hang Tuah upon hearing his appointment to head delegation to
Gunung Ledang. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Hang Tuah upset at the presence of Gusti Adipati.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#402304	82.5%
	#643f07	17.5%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#673f25	44.5%
	#949492	29.0%
	#bc982d	11.3%
	#5c556b	10.3%
	#937d31	2.8%
	#978164	2.1%

Hang Tuah ready to head delegation to Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Hang Tuah arriving at Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#587884	42.3%
	#27323d	38.8%
	#695473	7.5%
	#afc7e9	4.5%
	#c4d7e0	3.8%
	#4f78a6	1.6%
	#afa7ca	0.5%
	#54624d	0.5%
	#8dc1ad	0.4%
	#677349	0.3%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#75804f	61.9%
	#bfc9b3	26.1%
	#7d9049	12.0%

Hang Tuah seeking Puteri Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▲ Hang Tuah sensing the impeculiarities in the jungle's hostile treatment towards the delegation. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#514840	79.2%
	#86949c	5.5%
	#c0d4dd	4.4%
	#b5c39d	3.7%
	#516154	3.1%
	#96626b	1.7%
	#a6805b	1.4%
	#6a744a	0.9%
	#b08a9f	0.3%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#4c310b	53.6%
	#976608	20.5%
	#cf4405	20.1%
	#62503c	5.8%

▼ Hang Tuah in a moment of solitude. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004). Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▼ Hang Tuah pleased at seeing Puteri Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▲	Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
		#b2a99b	42.7%
		#332728	37.3%
		#5c281a	7.8%
		#7f3639	5.7%
		#96705e	5.1%
		#8f5833	1.4%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#dce7e2	32.1%
	#272623	22.6%
	#604034	21.8%
	#a39c84	6.2%
	#768c8b	4.8%
	#767657	4.3%
	#a08677	3.7%
	#495d54	3.4%
	#444873	0.8%
	#51202c	0.5%

Hang Tuah accepting Gusti Adipati's challenge to a duel.
 Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
 Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Hang Tuah preparing to throw Keris Taming Sari into the sea.
 Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
 Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▲
Hang Tuah running in search of Puteri Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#8295b8	43.4%
	#2a2021	27.4%
	#c3d0e9	19.6%
	#393f51	5.7%
	#734f39	1.6%
	#9a7352	1.1%
	#785b53	1.1%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#554c45	36.0%
	#312f31	20.8%
	#a3a0a1	17.8%
	#c3c6ce	11.6%
	#80b5a5	5.9%
	#b0d9b6	4.4%
	#50777d	2.1%
	#b4ad94	0.6%
	#6da279	0.4%
	#916e53	0.3%

▼
The Bendahara advising Hang Tuah to seek Puteri Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▲ Hang Tuah racing against time to meet Puteri Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#c0d49c	45.5%
	#786965	33.1%
	#392429	12.3%
	#67404d	6.3%
	#865e52	2.1%
	#aa8a60	0.6%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#262728	37.0%
	#3b4354	31.9%
	#5977a7	18.2%
	#9eb5d8	4.3%
	#7d8192	3.3%
	#d3e0ee	2.8%
	#507775	1.2%
	#80b2c4	0.7%
	#4c8671	0.4%

▼ Hang Tuah racing against time to meet Puteri Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

▲
Hang Tuah unaware that Puteri Gunung Ledang was right behind him. Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#465a48	56.1%
	#1c1c1a	28.8%
	#59443c	7.8%
	#877d7d	5.7%
	#57475d	1.6%

Proportional Palette	Hex Colour	Area
	#506249	52.8%
	#222319	23.6%
	#343f2e	12.6%
	#5a732e	6.5%
	#6b8823	2.1%
	#808885	1.0%
	#7f6860	0.5%
	#6f5737	0.3%
	#a7bf60	0.3%
	#98c0aa	0.3%

▼
Hang Tuah seeking Puteri Gunung Ledang.
Taken from Puteri Gunung Ledang (Saw, 2004).
Copyright 2004 by Enfiniti Vision Media.