

Orang Besar – Orang Kaya: **The Big Man – Rich Man in Malay Society**

Zainal Kling
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris

“... dan pada suatu masa bahawa fakir duduk pada suatu majlis dengan orang besar-besar bersenda gurau. Pada antara itu ada seorang orang besar, terlebih mulianya dan terlebih besar mertabatnya daripada yang lain.” (*Sejarah Melayu, Samad Ahmad, DBP, Kuala Lumpur, 1979: 2*)

Translation: “I happened to be present at an assembly of **the learned and noble**, when one of the **principal persons** of the party observed to me...” (*Malay Annals, John Leyden, translator, MBRAS, Kuala Lumpur, reprint 20, 2001: 1*).

The Initial Conceptual Links

The Malay concepts of the traditional elites as ‘*orang besar*’ and ‘*orang kaya*’ can be literally translated as, respectively, ‘big man’ and ‘rich man’. The concept of ‘*orang besar*’, in general as recounted in the above quotation, signifies the titular location within the hierarchy of senior officials in the traditional governance of a Malay kingdom. Generally speaking, the *Orang Besar* (big man) officials were always organised into several levels of descending senior officials who derived their authorities from being appointed by the ruling King (*Raja*) or Sultan. The most senior were the bureau of *Orang Besar Berempat* (the Four Wazir or Viziers) among whom the chief was the Prime Minister who was always the person entitled as *Orang Kaya Bendahara* with various appendages behind his title such as *Sri Maharaja* or *Paduka Raja* depending on localised royal traditions and occasionally the line of family heritage. The next level of *Orang Besar* would be the *Orang Besar Berlapan* or the Eight Big Man and carrying behind their names various titles indicating their level of seniority. The last two levels would be the *Orang Besar Enam Belas* (the Sixteen Big Man) and the *Orang Besar Tiga Puluh Dua* (the Thirty Two Big Man). For each of the *Orang Besar* the prefix title of *Orang Kaya* would be appended in front of their titles.

The *Orang Kaya* literally means ‘rich man’ signifies both the titular designation as a prefix to their names and titles, as well as the term of public address to the bearers of such a title. For instance, the Chief of the Ministers would be the *Orang Kaya Bendahara* and he is addressed as *Orang Kaya Bendahara*. It may be inferred, therefore, that officials of high rank within the traditional governmental system were

literally appointed among persons of rich families whose power and authority within the kingdom enabled them to accumulate properties and eventually became 'rich man' (*orang kaya*). However, the legends and histories recorded on their being within the hierarchy of officials indicated that they were also from among the families of the ruler. As such, by virtue of their heritage and affinity to the power of the state and thus their position within the social hierarchy, they were perhaps, able to accumulate surpluses of wealth. This is well illustrated by the case of the Bendahara Seri Maharaja, Chief Minister among the Four Viziers of the ancient Melaka Sultanate. The *Bendahara*, who managed to accumulate so much wealth during his tenure of office, which was always life long, that he gave away gold for his grandchildren to play with. Conversely, only the rich would be able to attract the favour of the ruler through gifts and presents that they were made officials of the state, by virtue of which also would enable them to accumulate power and wealth.

Superficially perhaps, the two concepts – *Orang Kaya* and *Orang Besar* – certainly strike a very high identity with the Melanesian and Polynesian conception of 'chiefs' as presented by Marshalls D. Sahlins (1963) four decades ago. Reviewing an extensive bibliography of ethnographic studies of the Melanesian and Polynesian societies by various scholars and observers, Sahlins sketched what he regarded as the 'ideal types' of the political leaderships in the Pacific areas and characterised them as 'rich man' and 'big man'. At a glance, those who are familiar with the ethnographies and history of the Malay Archipelago would not miss the identity of the traditional social hierarchy instituted by the aristocratic and noble groups (*bangsawan*) and constituted a kind of estate class structure of elite groups within a stratified Malay society similar to position of the the Big Man and Rich Man of Melanesia and Polynesia.

It is this superficial glance that attracted my attention towards attempting a comparative study of this wide spread traditional political model and organization within the entire Pacific region – the Malay Archipelago and the Western Pacific Islands. This attempt would only be largely exploratory since much work has to be undertaken to gather more detailed ethnographies and ensure greater validity and utility to the conceptual formulation of societal formations. My objective is to draw attention towards the existence of a social and cultural dimension to a very well-known discipline in the Pacific region, the linguistic prehistory of the Austronesian societies, traditionally known as the Malayo-Polynesian language bearers. It was historical linguistics that created the conceptual framework of a linguistically united yet highly diversified societies within the Pacific region. Perhaps, there is a deeper ethnographic dimension and affinities to the linguistic findings already depicted by several distinguished scholars in the Pacific studies.

Since the pioneering efforts of Wilhelm Schmidt and Wilhem von Humboldt¹ in the nineteenth century and later Grace (1959) and Dyen (1962)² and several others, much have been achieved in this area of studies. More recent comprehensive efforts by Blust (1977, 1978, 1980) and others have firmly developed more influential and persuasive conclusions of the relatedness in the family tree of the Austronesian languages. As Bellwood observed, "Comparative linguists are now in general agreement about the basic shape of the Austronesian family tree, although names given to particular subgroups have changed over the last decade". (1985: 107)

Based on the pre-historical linguistic findings it may be surmised that there was a strong possibility for an organizational identity among the major Austronesian linguistic groups that was carried over throughout history. This is not to say that there was a typically Austronesian ideal type of social organization with little variation imposed by differences in locality, separation through migrations and the eventual isolation in the various islands of the vast Pacific Ocean. Descriptive ethnographies of the many societies already undertaken by many expert researchers do not support such an assertion nor is it logical to expect such a possibility. Nevertheless, there might just be a possibility that a general pattern of the social organization survived the vast passage of space and time through which the variety of social groups has undergone in their historical experiences, as already speculated by several scholars³. There might be a replication of a system of social organization within a 'collective memory' brought over the vastness of space and time upon which the migrant Melanesian and Polynesian groups modelled their organization on traditional memory upon settling in a new and distant insular location. This replication would inevitably undergo some local variations as they continued their oceanic 'conquest of the Pacific', as Bellwood (1978) suggested, yet retaining the general societal feature: the big man, rich man chiefly type. It is to this hypothesis that I am implying in this comparative attempt.

Sahlins' Rich Man, Big Man

Sahlins' comparative study, *"Poor Man, Rich Man, Big Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia"* discussed the 'rich man – big man' phenomenon amongst the Pacific communities and it has certainly attracted a great deal of interests. I have no comprehensive bibliographies of the influence he left among scholars to enable a conclusion on the impact his writing. Of interest is certainly the rationalism he imputed on 'primitive economics' as witnessed by his now classic treatment of the 'original affluent society' which debunked the assertion of irrationality amongst the primitives. In line with his attempt at creating a comprehensive classification of 'primitive' social organization as advocated in his insights into the 'political types in Melanesia and Polynesia' it would be interesting to examine the 'caricature' of chieftainship, as he put it, compared to another societies in Western Austronesia. In this case I am taking the liberty of listing some of the features or characteristics of territorial chiefs amongst the Malays of Malaysia as comparison.

Sahlins distinguished the traditional Melanesian communities from the more advanced Polynesian political organization in that the Melanesian are more tribal and largely, "consists of many autonomous kinship-residential groups... The tribal plan is one of politically non-integrated segments – segmental... Local groups of the order of self-governing Melanesian communities appear in Polynesia as subdivisions of a more inclusive political body. Smaller units are integrated into larger through a system of inter-group ranking, and the network of representative chiefs of the subdivision amounts to a coordinating political structure".

He had a more positive view of the Polynesian structure and its ability to adapt to the onslaught of the Western pressures in the late eighteen century. "The Hawaiians, Tahitians and Fijians," he said, "were able to top successfully defended themselves by evolving countervailing, native-controlled states... these nineteen century states are

testimony to the native Polynesian political genius, to the level and the potential of indigenous political accomplishments”.

“Embedded within the grand differences in the political scale, structure and performance is a more personal contrast, one in quality of leadership. A historically particular type of leader-figure, the ‘big-man’ as he is often locally styled, appears in the underdeveloped settings of Melanesia. Another type, a chief properly so-called, is associated with the Polynesian advance.”

From this extensive quotation, I have distinguished an area of concern with the Polynesian type, as they represent a more advance model, corresponding the more stratified and state-based Malay traditional polity. For the purpose of further comparison, a closer examination of the ‘rich man, big man’ features would be necessary in order to elucidate the comparative data from the Malay case.

To begin with, Sahlins quoted several ethnographic statements to illustrate the standing of the Polynesian ‘big man’ chief. He is regarded as almost regal, “very likely he just is a big man’. He displays a ‘refinement of breeding, in his manner always that noblesse oblige of true pedigree and incontestable right of rule...he is, every inch, a chief”. The position of the Polynesian chief is characterized as a ‘nexus’, dependent on, ‘an extensive set of offices, a pyramid of higher and lower chiefs holding sway over larger and smaller sections of the polity.

“The pivotal paramount chief, as well as the chieftains controlling parts of chiefdom, were true office holders and title holders... they hold positions of authority over permanent groups. The honorific of Polynesian chiefs ... (refer) to their leadership of political divisions – here “The Prince of Danes” not “the prince among men”. The Polynesian chiefs... “were installed in societal positions.”

“In Polynesia, people of high rank and office *ipso facto* were leaders, and by the same token the qualities of leadership were automatically lacking...”. A Polynesian high chief “inherited by divine descent as the *mana* which sanctified his rule and protected his person against the hands of the commonality... In Polynesian view, a chiefly personage was in the nature of things powerful... his power was of the group rather than of himself. His authority came from organization, from an organized acquiescence in his privileges and organized means of sustaining them”. “Masters of their people and ‘owners’ in a titular sense of group resources, Polynesian chiefs had right of call upon the labor and agriculture produce of households within their domains”. “Most significantly, he has generated a politically utilizable agricultural surplus... Redistribution of the fund of power was the supreme art of Polynesian politics... use of the chiefly funds included lavish hospitality and entertainment for outside chiefs and for chief’s own people...”

“In most advanced Polynesian chiefdoms, as in Hawaii and Tahiti, a significant part of the chiefly fund was deflected away from general redistribution towards the upkeep of the institution of chieftainship. The fund was siphoned for the support of a permanent administrative establishment”. Much of them were appropriated for the upkeep of retainers, close kinsmen and specialized warrior corps... whose force could be directed internally as a buttress against fragmenting or rebellious elements of the chiefdom. Rebelliousness seemed to appear in the form of ‘status rivalry’ in the contest for position or perceived despotism. Rebellion and dissatisfaction over lavish chiefly spending and ungenerous display laid the seeds for fragmentation of extensive chiefdom into smaller areas of authority.

“Polynesian chiefs were the more effective means of societal collaboration on economic, political, indeed all cultural fronts.” The lengthy quotes are necessary to capture the essence of the Polynesian chief characteristics as described by Sahlins. Within this context only can we compare with some of the features of the Malay ‘big man, rich man’ phenomenon as portrayed by the classical text and kept alive within contemporary political system. The comparison may not have to be feature-for-feature. I would like to highlight some distinct cultural elements especially the coherent connection of political power, its mobilization in economic sphere by way of mystical and perhaps magical means. This thesis is specifically formulated to clarify a certain assertion among scholars, especially the orientalist, that the political power exercised by the Malay chiefs and kings over their subjects was the terminal acculturation of Hinduistic mystical elements of the past. The fact that Sahlins demonstrated the art of power sustenance of the Hawaiian chiefs in the mobilization of the *mana* mystical power in economic and political dealings seems to indicate the indigenous origin of the practice. As I assumed earlier, the passage of time and space might have just retained certain elements of the original cultural constitution of the Austronesian in spite of separation in time and space. The Melanesian tribal dynamics of leadership may be regarded as the ‘survival’ of the primordial condition which has undergone tremendous change within the Polynesian as well as Malaysian situations. This thesis is of course a long short in anthropology in an attempt at understanding the political dynamics of human societies.

The Big Man, Rich Man as Malay Traditional Elite

The Malay hierarchical socio-political structure locates the king (*raja*) or sultan at the epical point. He is supported by a series of subordinate class structure composed of a class of royal children (*anak-anak raja*) and a hierarchy of ranked ‘orang besar’ (*big man*), the freemen (*orang merdaheka*) and the ‘slaves’ (*hamba, ulun, sahaya*) who were normally the assistants and helpers of the *orang besar* rather than slaves (legal property with absolute obedience) at such. The *orang besar* then would be composed of the non-royal officials and chiefs with aristocratic antecedents – the son or descendent of former nobles and big-men.

There would be two classes of *Orang Besar* – the ‘inner’ group or ‘*orang dalam*’ who are closely related and located near the king’s palace, living within the palace compound or immediately within the surrounding villages. The outer group or ‘*orang keluaran*’ lives in separate vilages slightly away from the precinct of the lace compound. The *Orang Besar* headed these vilages and identified as such: such as, ‘The Bendahara Village’ (*Kampung Bendahara*) or ‘The Laksamana Village’ (*Kampung Laksamana*). Each *Orang Besar* would head a closely-knitted servants, helpers and assistant who were regarded as ‘the people’ or ‘followers’ of the *orang besar*. The people will form the retinue of the *orang besar* wherever he goes or whenever they are called in for any official and social activities and even in war undertakings.

The other class would be the territorial chief – the ‘*orang besar jajahan*’ who were appointed or dispatched to govern a territory away from the central government. For instance, a ‘governor’ from among the senior *orang besar* would be appointed by the King of Malacca to govern the State of Pahang when it was overrun by the

Malaccan fighters in the middle of the 15th century prior to the appointment of real and permanent 'king' for the state. Or, in the case of the territory of Kelang, located some distance along the coast of the Malay Peninsula, was governed by an *Orang Besar* of the *penghulu* rank (chief of lower rank) in the person of Tun Perak. He was later recalled to the royal palace in Melaka port city to be the chief *orang besar* (*Bendahara*) after he proved his strategic competence in routing the Siamese attack on Melaka.

It has been described that the class of officials in Melaka was ranked variously in what is known as the 'mandala'⁴ pattern of concentric circles, with the king as the apex. The series of outer circles emanating from the apical centre would be composed of the series of non-royal *orang besar*, variously ranked from the most senior being the big man of four (*orang besar empat*), the big man of eight (*orang besar delapan*), big man of sixteen (*orang besar enam belas*) to the most junior, the big man of thirty-two (*orang besar tiga puluh dua*). This of course was the ideal prescription, since there was very seldom any clear cut division made out for each and every one of ranked class nor were the members of each class fully appointed at any time. Nonetheless, the *orang besar* as a series of ranked official class existed to support the administration of the kingdom, and were designated with various capacities of administrative functions. The set up remained a significant institution of traditional politics in the modern Malaysian sultanate of Perak, Pahang, Terengganu and Selangor. Various levels of *orang besar* are constitutionally instituted within the state as a legal means of the assurance for the preservation and thus succession of rulers in the state. The more elaborate system has been instituted in Perak which claimed to have the rightful inheritance of the Malacca sultanate and its predecessor traditions from the Srivijayan empire (6-13 AD).

As mentioned earlier, the most senior of the *orang besar* was the *bendahara* – the chief of the *orang besar* and the chief minister, who were traditionally appointed from among the relatives of the king through marriages of female kin members, especially sisters and daughters to the ruler's kinship circle. It was the custom for the chief minister to let the king know of the availability of his daughter in marriage, failing which relationship between them may soured to the extent of creating schism and jealousy.

Next to him would be the *temenggong*, the minister of internal affairs and security. Then there would be the *penghulu bendahari* in charge of the palace and state treasury. The last would be the *laksamana*, *shahbandar* or *perdana menteri*, depending very much on the set up of the state bureaucracy. The *laksamana* would be the defence minister, and especially in the case of a maritime power, he would be the 'admiral' in control of a large expanse of island territories. The *shahbandar* would be the 'port minister' in charge of all the foreign traders and assisted by a number of junior *shahbandar* allotted with the control of traders from various countries of origin. The *perdana menteri* would, under certain circumstances be a senior minister allocated with specific function of the state.

Subordinated to the four senior ministers would be the 'big man of eight' being either the junior to the senior minister or wazir or in were charge of a unit of the administration. The most senior among the second echelon of officials would be the '*bentara*' who was the king's intermediary in external relation. He received all the communications from and to other sovereign states. If the *laksamana* was not part

of the senior most official he would be the most senior second echelon official in charge of the personal security of the king, bearing with him the state regalia especially the long kris (*kris panjang*) which represents the king's worldly power and authority. Various other officials would be entrusted with other functions of inter-states relation, territorial law enforcement and internal duties by the order of the king.

A special function was allocated for territorial chiefs who received their appointment from the king by way of the presentation of a set of partially complete regalia, especially the *gendang nobat* – royal musical drum - usually without the accompaniment of other pieces of the regalia such as the *nagara* drum piece. Accompanying the set would be the *payung iram-iram* – the state umbrella. The major duty would be of course to transmit *ufti* or territorial tax to the king in the manner of a feudal lord paying tax to his king. He would be the sole 'big man' of the territory and would have almost the power of the king except in the case of murder and the sentence of beheading to the guilty person. As an official of the state he is completely responsible for the running of the territory, collecting taxes and administering the state law. As a result, under certain circumstances, very often a territorial chief could manipulate the economic output of his area of jurisdiction to accumulate surpluses and utilize them to gather powerful followers and thus challenge the king at the centre. This was the source of the 'centrifugal' pattern of power structure where the central power of the king could be challenged and thus creating the need for the support of various officials at the central court – the *orang besar* – as well as 'warriors' (*hulubalang*) to put down uprisings in outlying territories. The *bendahara* would play the major role in mobilizing the state military apparatus by selecting and appointing the appropriate officials for the task of subduing a rebellious territory.

As said earlier, the basis of appointment for senior and junior officials/chiefs – *orang besar* – basically was based on the legitimacy of inheritance through blood or marriage line. Blood line seemed to have priority over marriage as the basis of selection and appointment to a post. A *bendahara* post was always inherited by one of his sons, failing which a close descendent through marriage line may be considered. The same could be said of the other senior ministerial posts – *temenggong*, *bendahari*, *laksamana* or *shahbandar*. The junior officials would also inherit his senior post by way of appointment of close descendents, but post may also be transferred to other family lines depending very much on the favour of the king.

Each *orang besar empat* – the senior most officials – would reside in a 'village' (*kampung*) with all his people who would be identified as the 'people of the official', such *anak buah bendahara* (relatives of *bendahara*), *anak buah temenggong* (relatives of *temenggong*), *anak buah laksamana* (relatives of *laksamana*) even if the people are not related in any way either by blood or marriage to the senior official. By virtue being allowed to live within the village of official, a person, especially the freemen, will have an obligation to serve the official in ways that were determined by the official. Very often their labour would be mobilized freely through the institution of *kerah* (corvee) for certain work within the household of the king when the official was assigned by the king, or within the household of the official, in landed occupations or in other more significant tasks such as in war and military expeditions. In return, the people would be protected from unlawful intrusion in their life and free of tax levy from the state.

They will always be defended or even avenged in case of attack. More significantly was the obligation of the people to supply 'man' or 'children' for the purpose of serving the king in certain activities or ceremonial needs. Man and children were presumably taken over by the official to provide the king with 'presentation' to other sovereign kings and chieftains especially to accompany marriage of princes and princess to other lands. Presumably too, human presentation was something of an honour to the family and persons involved. In their perception, such an act would be regarded as '*memperhamba diri*' – honorable servitude. There was therefore an attitude of 'service' among the people for the *orang besar* and the king and thus symbolically for a service to the country.

The senior *orang besar* of course play a very crucial role in the politics of the kingship. A *bendahara* or *temenggong* would be the closest in the hierarchy of officialdom to the location of kingship power, symbolised by the closeness to the throne. Very often they were the king-maker, being entrusted by a dying king to ensure a rightful succession to the throne. In cases where the senior official have personal relations with the would-be-king such as his brother, even a brother-in-law or an uncle, there might just a possibility that the official's favourite would be enthroned, bypassing the rightful crown prince. Palace intrigue of this nature did occur to create internal palace *coup d'état* within the royal family. On the other hand, even among senior officials too, jealousy and envy may create intrigues that senior official may be accused of rebellion and usurpation of powers. As such kingship would always be deemed to be endowed with other powers, non-physical powers defined by the cultural system, to ensure public and general obeisance to the kingship. A mystical and incorporeal power embedded within the attitude of service to the king was the idea of *daulat* – the mystical power of the king or ruler to enhance his political authority. An unlawful disobedience and rebellion was regarded as *lawan daulat* and *derhaka* – rebellion – which would have to be quashed and the entire family would be sentenced to death, with their dwelling uprooted and thrown to the sea. Or, the rebel suffer a supernatural punishment known as *makan daulat* – (literally 'eaten by power'). This very harsh and punitive sentence means that such an act not only went against temporal power of the king but also his supernatural bearing. The rebel would be both a transgressor of the temporal power as well as of the mystical power of the other world. Malay cultural understanding of the position of a ruler is one who has been endowed with the position of the 'shadow of God on earth'. It is the duty of the senior officials to ensure that no such rebellion would occur even if the king was a 'despot' and 'cruel' in his dealing with the people – his subjects. This is the concept of 'loyalty' pledged to the ruler as embedded in the belief of a legendary *waad* or cultural contract, a sort of Malay 'magna carta'. Nonetheless, senior official did conspire with each other wherever there were elements of tyranny and oppression by the ruler. This case was well illustrated by the history of the Malaccan Sultanate (15 century) and modern history of the State of Johor (17 century)⁵.

The idea of the *daulat* and *derhaka* would have to be understood as the cultural device for state control over senior officials as well the larger populace. Since state and political powers have to be constituted centrally and supported with financial surpluses through taxation, there could emerge personal and eventually a popular dissatisfaction

among royal brothers, officials and the populace at large. Officials who managed to gather great favour from the king could be viewed with envy and jealousy by others. Others may also took avenge of unjust favouritism among officials thus creating conspiracies and intrigues. With personal followers and attendants in villages ready to follow the command of an *orang besar*, rebellion could be easily initiated with the support of followers. The king therefore would have to rely on the loyalty of officials and people by instituting various means and leverages of control, be it through the physical present of *hulubalang* (warrior class) or spiritual and supernatural practice of *daulat*. The cultural construction of such mystical powers was well developed in Malay kingdom since the time of its root in the Srivijayan Empire. The presence of *sumpah* (curse) prescription on the *prasasti* (stone stele) dated at end of 7th century AD of the Srivijayan era, attested to the mystical leverages put in place by the kings. Presumably, the *Sejarah Melayu* (Malay Annal)⁶ text reminded Malays of their *waad* (oath of loyalty) to the king, that very seldom was rebellion went against the state as a whole, but rather towards the person of the king. A king may be displaced by his royal brothers or the *orang besar* through an act of vengeance or rebellion but the mystical belief of the effect of *daulat* remained a potent, deeply ingrained in the psyche of the people even to the present day.

The *orang besar* therefore would remain as the bed-rock of the Malay hierarchy of kingship support and has remained so for the last several centuries till today. While kingship survived in the Malay society and perhaps the only social system which has allowed it to proliferate when the surroundings have largely changed towards 'the people's power'. Other factors may have to be surveyed to determine its popular conservation within the contemporary Malay polity.

Comparative Observation and Conclusion

A short comparison may be undertaken to explicate the features of the institution of rich man, big man in both Polynesia and Malaysia. First, both communities have developed the institution of leadership far more advance than the Melanesian tribal and kinship based organization. The chiefs and kings in Polynesia and Malaysia are offices of the highest order in the socio-political organization of the nations. As such they are not anymore instituted through the dynamics of tribal power struggle but by way of fulfilling the necessary conditions of a constitutional office.

As posited by Sahlins, the personal requirements for fulfilling an office would not demand from a person leadership characteristics but merely inheriting the right kinship line and perhaps birth rank. This means that the person of the king would only need to be present at the point of the installation, failing which he may be disqualified by virtue of absenteeism.

Of more significant is the fact of the perpetuity or conservation of the whole kingship or chieftainship system. While physical leverages such the presence of large administrative establishment and a hierarchy of *orang besar* (big man) sustained the structure nevertheless modern historical development seemed to favour its abolishment. There are however enough popular support among the people to ensure its perpetuity. Thus, the emergence of the so-called 'constitutional monarchy' as the more preferred form of modern kingship system. Such a system of acceptable, therefore, could be

supported by the deeply ingrained psychic belief in the element of the *mana* and *daulat* - mystical power which seems to remain constant and pervades the institution. As an ancient and perhaps 'primitive' element in the institution of leadership and governance in the Austronesian society this indicates an interesting survival. Perhaps, the two conception of power – *mana* and *daulat* – pervading the leadership institution attests to the ancient link among the Austronesian societies in their migrations eastwards from the western section within the Malaysian Archipelago.

Further comparative studies may be able to yield more ethnographic information to enable a solid conclusion in Austronesian anthropology. Much of the work so far remained concentrated among scholars of the Pacific studies with little reference to the Malaysian end of the spectrum. Perhaps the time is now right to extent the area to be more inclusive and Austronesian wide.

Note

1. On the Origin of the Term "Malayo-Polynesian", Malcolm Ross, *Oceanic Linguistics*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Jun., 1996), pp. 143-145 (article consists of 3 pages), Published by: University of Hawai'i Press, Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3623036>
2. Dyen, I. "A Lexicostatistical Classification of the Austronesian Languages."
3. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Memoir, no. 19, 1965; Grace, G. W. "Austronesian Lexicostatistical Classification: A Review Article." *Oceanic Linguistics*, 1966, vol. 5, no. 1.
4. "Reconstructing Ancestral Oceanic Society," Journal article by Per Hage; *Asian Perspectives: the Journal of Archaeology for Asia and the Pacific*, Vol. 38, 1999; R. Blust, "Austronesian Sibling Term and Culture History," BTLV 140 (1993). No. 1, Leiden.
5. Mandala is a Sanskrit word that means "circle". In the Hindu and Buddhist religious traditions, their sacred art often takes a mandala form. The basic form of most Hindu and Buddhist mandalas is a square with four gates containing a circle with a center point. Each gate is in the shape of a T.... In common use, mandala has become a generic term for any plan, chart or geometric pattern that represents the cosmos metaphysically or symbolically, a microcosm of the Universe from the human perspective. Wikipedia: Mandala.
6. Sultan Mahmud of Johor was assassinated in 1699 for his seeming cruelty through the collusion of his Bendahara and Laksamana.
7. Malay Annal or *Sejarah Melayu* is the MSS record of the period of the Melaka Sultanate, transmitted to the present through copyist work of the 17 century.

References

- A. Samad Ahmad, (ed.). (1979). *Sejarah Melayu*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Asmah Hj Omar, (1993). *Susur Galur Bahasa Melayu*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Leyden, John, trans., *Malay Annals*, repr. 20, Kuala Lumpur: MBRAS.
- Bellwood, Peter, (1985). *Prehistory of Indo-Malaysian Archipelago*, N. S. W.: Academic Press Australia.
- Sahlins, M. D., "Poor Man, Rich Man, Big-Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia", *Journal of Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 5, No. 3. (Apr., 1963) pp. 285-303, Cambridge University Press.