

Notes on Malay History.

BY C. O. BLAGDEN.

I. Introductory.

About a dozen years ago a comparison of the details of Malay history as given in the *Sĕjarah Mĕlayu* (or "Malay Annals") with the information contained in the Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca (extracted and translated from various old Chinese sources by Mr. W. P. Groeneveldt) and with the section in the Commentaries of Albuquerque relating to the history of Malacca led me to the conclusion that the usual chronology, which dated the fall of Singapore and the foundation of Malacca in the year 1252 A.D. or thereabouts, was hopelessly untenable. The evidence available seemed to make it pretty clear that these events must be put somewhat more than a century later, probably somewhere about the year 1377 A.D., in fact. A short paper embodying this conclusion and some of the arguments leading to it was read by me before the XIth Oriental Congress at Paris in 1897, and subsequently appeared in the printed transactions of that congress.

The arguments, in outline, were these. First, the received chronology gave absurdly long reigns to the Malacca Rajas: for instance four generations of them, from Sultan Muhammad Shah to Sultan Alauddin Shah inclusive, are made to cover a space of 201 years; which is extremely improbable and next door to impossible. Similarly the life of the great Bĕndahara Paduka Raja, a leading minister of state in Malacca in the 15th. century and one of the most striking figures in the *Sĕjarah Mĕlayu*, would (if we accept the ordinary chronology) cover about 130 years, during more than 100 of which he must have held the office of Bĕndahara! This is manifestly absurd. Secondly, the Chinese records, which in some cases are contemporary with the events they relate, give a list of the names

of the later Malacca Rajas. These names (with the dates attached to them) make it clear that their reigns fell within the 15th. century and did not extend to the abnormal lengths that the ordinary chronology makes out. Thirdly, there is no mention of Malacca anywhere, in any authority that has hitherto come to light, prior to the early years of the 15th century. (1) This negative evidence, for what it is worth, supports the view that Malacca was not founded (or at any rate did not rise to the position of an important commercial emporium) much before the beginning of that century. On the other hand we find mention of the State of Pasei (better Pasè) in Sumatra at an earlier date. An abstract of its history is inserted in the *Séjarah Melayu* as a sort of episode just before the account of the fall of Singapore. According to this account, with which the *Hikayat Raja-raja Pasei* in the main agrees, the first Muhammadan ruler of Pasei was a person who on his conversion to Islam took the name of Malik-al-Salih. His successor was his son Malik-al-Dzahir. Now the last named was reigning and was already a fairly old man when he was visited by the celebrated Arab globe-trotter Ibn Batutah in 1345 or 1346 A.D. The inference is that Muhammadanism became the established religion in Pasei somewhere about the year 1300 A.D. The Commentaries of Albuquerque record a native tradition that Iskandar Shah, one of the early Rajas of Malacca, was converted from Hinduism to Islam on the occasion of his marriage with a daughter of a Raja of Pasei. Whether that be so or not, the general trend of tradition goes to show that Pasei was regarded as being an older state than Malacca. All this evidence combined negatives the ordinarily received view that Malacca became Muhammadan in the reign of a Raja whose accession according to the commonly accepted chronology took place in 1276 A.D. or thereabouts. Fourthly, the *Hikayat Raja-raja Pasei*, which however is a work of uncertain and probably rather late date, speaks of a Javanese expedition of conquest successfully directed against Pasei, Jambi and Palembang, and shortly afterwards speaks of the

(1) A possible exception, which I had not at that time seen, is dealt with in the present paper. It does not affect the argument.

conquest by the Javanese of the dominions of the Raja of Ujong Tanah. This latter country is of course the southern extremity of the Malay Peninsula, known since the 16th century as Johore, and the dominions of its Raja included a number of island groups, such as the Riau-Lingga Archipelago, the Natunas, Anambas, etc., which are duly enumerated in the Hikayat Raja-raja Pasei. Now we know from Groeneveldt's Chinese sources that Palembang was taken by the Javanese in the year 1377 A.D. The inference is that the conquest of Ujong Tanah and its insular possessions (which must have included the island of Singapore) took place shortly after 1377 A.D. The foundation of Malacca must then be put at some intermediate date between 1377 and 1400 A.D.; and the establishment of Muhammadanism in that State cannot have taken place very many years before the close of the 14th. century. When first visited by Chinese envoys in the first decade of the 15th. century, it was a Muhammadan State.

II. Allusions to Malays in the "Pararaton."

I propose here to draw attention to a few additional data which confirm the conclusions already stated and throw a little more light on a very obscure period of Malay history. At the time of reading my paper I had not had access to the Javanese historical work styled the "Pararaton" (i.e. Book of Kings), which has been edited and translated (with the addition of copious and valuable notes) by the late much lamented Dr. J. L. A. Brandes, a most eminent authority on the history of the Eastern Archipelago. This appeared in 1896 in Deel XLIX of the *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*. It is a work of uncertain date and authorship, but is probably in part based on more or less contemporary records of the events it relates, and is certainly older than 1600 A.D. It is of no great length; but it is one of the few professedly historical works in this part of the world that can really lay claim to some historical value. (Most Javanese and Malay histories are a blend throughout of fact and myth; but in the Pararaton only the beginning bears the stamp of being merely legendary). It contains

a large number of dates and covers the period 1222-1481 A.D. (in the original 1144-1403 Çaka). This period includes the time when the great Javanese State of Majapahit was founded and flourished; and the Pararaton gives many interesting details about the history of Java during this epoch.

Its allusions to Malay history are unfortunately (as is natural) much scantier. I will give them here briefly.

The first one occurs in the account of the reign of Cri Kêrtanagara, the last king of Tumapël, who reigned (according to the Pararaton) from Çaka 1194 to 1197 (1272-1275 A.D.) This king, we are told, "sent his troops against Malayu." The immediate result of this unwise expedition, which left Tumapël almost defenceless ("there were very few men left at Tumapël, most of them having been sent to Malayu"), was the fall of his kingdom in the same year at the hands of another Javanese Raja, one Jaya Katong, of Daba. "The expedition against Malayu and the fall of Tumapël occurred in the same year, 1197 Çaka," i. e. 1275 A.D. Assuming this date to be correct, the expedition must have been on a considerable scale and not a mere raid, for the troops, we are told, did not return till many years later, apparently in 1293 A.D. They brought back with them, as part of their booty, it may be presumed, two Malay princesses: one of these, by name Dara Pêtak was, subsequently married to Raden Wijaya, the first king of Majapahit, who bore the royal style of Cri Kêrtarajasa; the other, called Dara Jingga, became the wife of a high chief and the mother of the prince Tuhan Janaka, styled Cri Marmadewa, with the title of Ratu ring Malayu, and afterwards also styled Aji Mantrolot.

There is nothing to show us which Malay state in particular was the victim of this onslaught. But as from the close of the 7th century at least (and perhaps earlier) and for many centuries later the term "Malayu" was especially applied to the homeland of the Malays, i. e. Central Sumatra north-west of Palembang, it is probable that the Javanese expedition was directed against this region. In any case some

part of Sumatra is almost certainly intended. During the interval between the despatch and the return of this expedition stirring events had occurred in Java. Majapahit had been founded and the wellknown invasion of the island by the forces of Kublai Khan, the Mongol Emperor of China (called in the Pararaton "Ratu Tatar") had taken place. It is described in the Pararaton, but its details do not concern us here.

I ought perhaps to add that while it seems to follow from the account in the Pararaton that King Kértanagara was killed by his enemies of Daha at the time when Tumapel fell, the facts are really otherwise. We know from an inscription dated Caka 1272' (1350 A.D.), reproduced with transliteration, translation and commentary by Professor Kern in the *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* (Deel LVIII), that he did not actually die till the year Caka 1214' (1292 A.D.), shortly before the arrival of the 'Mongol expedition' (which reached Java in 1293 A.D.). This seems to throw some doubt on the correctness of the date on which the expedition is supposed to have been despatched to "Malayu." But the point is not really very material.

The next mention in the Pararaton of Malay countries occurs in or after the account of the reign of a certain queen of Majapahit styled, (from her place of residence) Bhreng Kahuripan, whose reign began in 1331 A.D. In the year 1346 A.D. the celebrated Gajah Mada, whose name is familiar to the readers of Malay chronicles (which wrongly introduce him into their somewhat legendary accounts of the 15th. century) became *apatih amangkubhumi*, that is to say prime minister, of Majapahit. On a certain undated occasion' (but certainly after 1334 and presumably after 1346 A.D.) we are told that "Gajah Mada, the *apatih amangkubhumi*" made a vow that he would eat no *palapa*' (whatever that may be) "until Nusantara shall have been subdued, until Gurun, Seran, Tañjung Pura, Haru, Pahang, Dampo, Bali, Sunda, Palembang and Tumasik shall have been subdued; then will I eat *palapa*," said he.

Of these names, Nusantara is believed to denote the Archipelago generally, Gurun is Goram, Seran is Ceram, both in the Moluccas, Dompö is a state in the island of Sumbawa, Bali is the island lying immediately to the east of Java, Sunda is the western end of Java itself, and Palembang is of course the well-known place of that name in south-eastern Sumatra. Haru, which is often mentioned in the *Sĕjarah Mĕlayu*, was a state on the east coast of Sumatra, Tañjung Pura is evidently Borneo or some particular spot in Borneo, where a place bearing that name did in fact exist. (I follow here the identifications given by Brandes). The names that particularly interest us are Pahang and Tumasik: the former requires no comment, the latter is certainly Singapore. In the *Sĕjarah Mĕlayu* the old name of Singapore is given as *تاسك* which the Malays

nowadays pronounce Tĕmasak. It is evident, however, that there has been a break in the tradition here: they ought to call the place Tĕmasek, as it is printed in the Romanised (1898) edition of the *Sĕjarah Mĕlayu*, for that would be the proper Malay equivalent for the Javanese form Tumasik, and we shall meet with the latter form again in another Javanese work in the same connection. Brandes derives the name from *tasek*, "sea", and imagines an identification with Samudra' (near Pasei) but refers to the possibility of Singapore being meant. The *Encyclopædie van Nederlandsch-Indië* (s. v. Tochten, vol. IV, pp. 383-4), following Professor Kern, correctly identifies it with Singapore.

Evidently, (and this is important as confirming the amended chronology of the Peninsula), Singapore was still in existence as a state unsubdued by Majapahit at the time when Gajah Mada made his vow, somewhere about the year 1346 A.D. probably. It could not therefore have been finally destroyed by the forces of Majapahit in 1252 A.D. (in which year, it may be remarked, Majapahit had not yet been founded).

Most unfortunately there is at this point a lacuna in the text of the *Pararaton* and nothing whatever is told us of the important events which took place in pursuance of Gajah

Mada's declared policy of conquest, except that in 1357 A.D. he picked a quarrel with the Sundanese which ended in a bloody battle wherein they were defeated and slaughtered, and that in the same year an expedition from Majapahit conquered Dampo. "Thereupon," we are told, "Gajah Mada again made use of *palapa*."

Are we entitled to infer that the whole of this great minister's programme of aggressive imperialism had been carried out at that date? Alas, no: for we know from Chinese sources that Palembang was not conquered till 1377 A.D., nine years after Gajah Mada's death' (which the Pararaton puts in Caka 1290, i. e. 1368 A.D.). It would seem that he was not particular in adhering to the very letter of his vow (assuming it to be correctly reported) but was content to put up with an instalment of his ambitious plan. Unfortunately the Pararaton thus leaves us in the dark as to the precise date when Singapore was taken and destroyed; but it makes it plain that the event must have happened in the 14th and not, as the old chronology has it, in the 13th century. I have already mentioned the fact that the Hikayat Raja-raja Pasei puts the conquest of "the dominions of the king of Ujong Tanah" shortly after that of Palembang. But it does not specifically mention Singapore, though its list of the islands conquered on this occasion includes Timbalan, Siantan' (in the original, Siatan), Jëmaja, Bunguran, Sérasan, Subi, Pulau Laut, Tioman, Pulau Tinggi, Pëmanggilan, Karimata, Bëlitong, Bangka, Lingga, Riau, Bintan and Bulang.

III. The Evidence of the "Nāgarakrētāgama."

Probably we shall never know the exact date of the fall of Singapore. But the evidence available may at any time be strengthened by some accidental discovery of a hitherto unknown record. Such a discovery occurred a few years ago when the Nāgarakrētāgama unexpectedly turned up. This is a panegyric poem composed' (according to the Encyclopædie van Nederlandsch-Indië) in the year 1365 A.D. by a Javanese court poet, a Buddhist bearing the name of Prapanīcha, in hon-

our of the then reigning sovereign of Majapahit. The king in question was Hayam Wuruk, known by the royal style of king Rajasanagara and also as Sang Hyang Wékasing Sukha, not to mention all his other titles. This monarch, who was a son of the queen already mentioned, appears to have ascended the throne at the age of 16 in the year 1350 A.D., his mother (who till then had acted as regent) having handed over the government to him in that year; and he reigned till his death in the year 1389 A.D. It was during his reign that the power of Majapahit really culminated and its political expansion reached its widest extent.

The poem, written in the Javanese language of that period, is an important historical document. The unique manuscript containing it was discovered by the late Dr. Brandes among the books of the last Balinese ruler of Lombok, when that island was taken under the immediate control of the Dutch colonial government. Dr. Brandes published it in Deel LIV of the *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* in 1902. Unfortunately he only gave the poem in the original Balinese script, without transliteration, translation notes or commentary, a circumstance which leaves it a sealed book except to an extremely limited number of specialists; for it is given to few (even amongst Dutch scholars) to understand 14th. century Javanese and read the Balinese character readily. Under the circumstances one must be thankful that Professor Kern has given some information on the subject for the benefit of the general reader, who is not a Kawi scholar. In the *Indische Gids* for 1903 (I, pp. 341-360) he gave a general account of the contents of the poem, with particular reference to some of its geographical data, and in Deel LVIII (1905) and Deel LXI (1908) of the *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* he returned to the subject and dealt more particularly with some of the genealogical and chronological details contained in the poem. Colonel G. E. Gerini further dealt with some of the geographical data of the *Nāgarakētūgama*, especially those connected with Siam and the Malay Peninsula, in a paper published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (July 1905), to which I wrote a

reply contesting his claim of an ancient Siamese occupation of the whole Peninsula (J. R. A. S., January 1906). In the *Encyclopædie van Nederlandsch-Indië* (s. v. *Tochten*, vol. IV, p. 384) the geographical data relating to the Archipelago and the Peninsula are again examined and some identifications suggested.

There is still scope for a few more remarks on these matters: the subject is one of local interest to the readers of this Journal, and some of the identifications that have been suggested require to be amended. The *Nāgarakṛtāgama* mentions a considerable number of places in the Eastern Archipelago and the Malay Peninsula as being subject to the empire of Majapahit. Beginning in Canto 13 with Sumatra, it specifies Jambi, Palembang, Tēga, Dharmāçraya, Kandis, Kanwas, Manangkabo, Siyak Rēkan, Kampar, Pane, Kampe, Haru, Mandahiling, Tumihang, Parlak, Barta, Lwas, Samudra, Lamuri, Batan, Lampung and Barus. "These and some others lie in the land of Malayu," says the poem, as abstracted by Professor Kern. It then proceeds to deal with the dependencies on the island of Tañjungnagara, which is clearly the same as the Tañjung Pura of the Pararaton and is certainly Borneo, as the names of the several places on it sufficiently prove. They are: Kapuas, Katingan, Sampit, Kuta Lingga, Kuta Waringin, Sambas, Lawai, Kadangdangan, Landa, Samēdang, Tirēm, Sedu, Buruneng' (probably for Bērunei-Brunei), Kalasaludung, Solot, Pasir, Baritu, Sawaku, Tabalung, Tuñjungkute, Malano, and the capital town Tañjungpuri.

The poet next proceeds (in the second strophe of Canto 14) to enumerate a list of places, which like those in the two preceding lists, though not in strict geographical order, have evidently been grouped together because they belong to one definite region. This region, to which no general name appears to be attached, is the Malay Peninsula. The four lines in which they occur appear to me to read as follows in the printed text:—

ikang sakahawan Pahang pramuka tang Hujung Medini
re Lēngkasuka len ri Sai mwangi Kalantěn i Tringgano
Naçor Paka Muwar Dungun ri Tumasik ri Sang Hyang

Hujung Kĕlang Kĕda Jĕre ri Kañjapiniran sanuça pupul.

I cannot claim to be a Kawi scholar and it is quite possible that in my attempted transliteration I may have divided some of the Javanese words wrongly: the original runs most of them together without a break. But I am only concerned with the proper names which the passage contains, and as in the interpretation of some of these I venture to differ from previous commentators, it was necessary to quote the whole passage. The poet then goes on to detail the dependencies lying to the east-ward of Java, beginning with Bali and including a number of places in the Lesser Sunda Islands, the Moluccas and Celebes and even as far as New Guinea; in fact, covering practically the whole Archipelago except the Philippines. It is not necessary for my purpose to enumerate these places here. But the whole list gives a very good summary of the Archipelago as known to the Javanese in the 14th century of our era; and though in a good many cases the claim of supremacy may have been of a somewhat shadowy kind, yet the list is evidence of the predominant position held by the kingdom of Majapahit at this period.

To return now to the place-names more particularly connected with the Malay Peninsula: Pahang, Kalantĕn, Tringano, Kĕlang' (nowadays less accurately written Klang) and Kĕda' (i. e. Kĕdah) are obvious and require no explanatory comment. It must not be assumed that they stand for the names of states: they probably represent the rivers, with tiny settlements at the mouth of each, that were the nuclei round which the respective states have developed. Hujung Medini is rendered by Professor Kern as "Hudjung, Tanah;" but I think the comma must be a misprint and agree with the Encyclopædie in interpreting it as the southern end of the Peninsula, the already mentioned Ujong Tanah, nowadays called Johore. "Medini" appears to mean the same thing as *tanah*. Lĕngkasuka has been rightly identified by Col. Gerinei with the Langkasuka mentioned in the Hikayat Marong Mahawangsa as an old capital of the state of Kĕdah. It lay near Ĝunong Jĕrai (Kĕdah Peak), a considerable way south of the Kĕdah

River, and that is no doubt the reason why the two are separately mentioned. The Encyclopædie conjecturally identifies Lēngkasuka with Sēlangor, which is certainly a mistake. Sai is one of the Patani states and lies to the north-west of Kēlantān. At this point my reading differs from Professor Kern's. He reads the words *Sai mwanj* together as one proper name, which he transliterates "Semong." But I know of no such place-name and take *mwanj* to be a particle, as in the passage in Canto 13 which reads *Samudra mwanj i Lamuri Batan Lampung mwanj i Barus*. Where the text has, apparently, "Nacor," Professor Kern writes "Nagor." Perhaps "Naçor" was a misprint. If it is right I do not know what it stands for. Nagor has been identified by the Encyclopædie with Ligor and I have no alternative explanation to suggest. But there is a difficulty here: for a place called Dharmānāgarī mentioned in Canto 15 of the poem has also (by Col. Gerini) been identified with Ligor. Moreover Ligor was at this period certainly tributary to Siam and could not with any show of reason be claimed by Majapahit.

The next two names, which I take to be Paka and Muwar, are read as one expression "Pakamuwar" by Professor Kern. The Encyclopædie suggests that they represent "pēkan Muar," that is to say a mart in the district of Muar or on the Muar river. I incline to think that they stand for two distinct places, viz. (a) Muar, which now forms part of Johore, (i.e. the mouth of the Muar river, not its upper course) and (b) a river on the East coast lying between Kēnaman and Dungun in the state of Trēngganu. Newbold (vol. ii, p. 60 of his well known work on the Peninsula "British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca") spells it Pakaa; Skinner in his "Geography of the Malay Peninsula" (p. 29) calls it Paka; my friend Mr. W. W. Skeat informs me that the Society's maps spell it Pake. The identification is conjectural, of course, and I put it forward with some diffidence. But it seems on the whole rather more probable than the "pēkan" interpretation. The next name, Dungun, which is also a river-name, has just been incidentally accounted for and requires no further explanation. Tumasik,

identified in this connexion with the Island of Singapore by Professor Kern, Colonel Gerini and the *Encyclopædie*, may safely be said to be determined beyond all doubt or question: an additional piece of evidence regarding it will be mentioned later. Jère may, as the *Encyclopædie* suggests, be Jëring in the Patani states. But it might equally well stand for Gunung Jërai; only this district is already referred to by the mention of Lëngkasuka.

Kaŋjapiuiran has received no satisfactory explanation as yet. Clearly, if it is a Malay place-name and not altogether corrupt, the expression must be a compound one, not a single word.

There remains only Sang (Hyang) Hujung. This is rather an interesting name. Professor Kern writes it "Sang Hyang Hudjun," but the original distinctly has a guttural nasal as the final of the last word. The *Encyclopædie* conjecturally identifies it with Ujong Salang, i.e. Junk Ceylon. For this there is no shadow of evidence or probability. We must look for it elsewhere. I lay no stress at all on the fact of the name occurring between those of Tumasik and Këlang: the *Nāgarakrētāgama* is a poem, not a geography book' (the more's the pity, for our purpose), and the exigencies of metre may have influenced the writer more than any considerations of topography. But the very form of the name appears to me to speak for itself. It is evidently the سنڠ هوجڠ of the *Sëjarah*

Mëlayu, which we must transliterate San-yang' (or Saniang or Sëniang, not Sëning) Hujung (or Ujong). Shellabear's Romanised edition of 1898' (pp. 43 and 81) has Sening Ujung. Leyden in his translation' ("Malay Annals" 1821), being no doubt guided by native tradition, has on p. 88 Sangang Ujong and on p. 191 Senyang Ujong. In short it is the district now known as Sungai (or Sungei) Ujong, locally often called Së-mujong (on the same principle that the title Yang di-përtuan becomes in the Menangkabau dialect Yampituan and Yamtuan). This name Sungai Ujong has long been a puzzle to etymologists. If it meant anything, it could only mean "the river of the cape (or corner) or else "the Ujong river," whatever

that might be. But there exists no river of that name: the name is not a river-name at all but the name of a small stretch of coast-line, and though there is an important cape there it has no river alongside of it. One popular etymology is reported by Mr. D. F. A. Hervey in No. 13 of this Journal, p. 241. But it is as impossible as most popular etymologies usually are and is moreover mixed up with an equally improbable explanation of the name of the state of Rĕmbau. It is really not worth repeating here, for the 14th century Javanese name explains everything. The modern name Sungai Ujong is evidently a corruption (through the 17th century San-yang Hujung) of the old Sang Hyang Hujung, which means much the same as our "Holyhead."

The reference is to the promontory usually called Cape Rachado, from the Portuguese name, which the Malays nowadays style Tanjong Tuan. It is a celebrated *kramat* or shrine and has of course its local legend. (1) Nowadays I fancy it is supposed to be the tomb of some orthodox Muhammadan saint or worthy. But in fact it is an old animistic holy place going back to very ancient times and owing its origin to a simple natural phenomenon. The reason for the special sanctification of the spot is incidentally given by Begbie ("The Malayan Peninsula," p. 422) and Newbold (op. cit., vol. ii, p. 38). It is merely that at this cape two strong and opposing currents meet and cause a dangerous eddy or race in which boats are liable to be upset. Hence it has naturally come about that, to use Newbold's phrase, "the Dattu Tanjong Tuan, the elder of Cape Rachado, is a saint of no ordinary celebrity among the sea-faring class of natives."

That exhausts the names connected with the Peninsula contained in the passage I have extracted from the Nāgarakretā-gama. I gather from Professor Kern's abstract that the last two words imply that besides the places specified there were several groups of islands which the poet has not thought it

(1) The legend has been put on record by Mr. D. F. A. Hervey in "Man" (1904), pp. 266; but at the moment of writing I am unable to refer to it for the purpose of seeing whether it throws any additional light on the origin of the name Sungai Ujong.

necessary to name. Unfortunately these old names tell us very little about the condition of the Peninsula at the period when the *Nāgarakrētāgama* was written. But they tell us something. We need not follow the loyal and courtly Prapañcha in claiming that Majapahit exercised a real supremacy over all these places; Palembang was not conquered by the Javanese until a dozen years later and yet it is included amongst the dependencies of Majapahit in the poem. It is equally improbable that such outlying places as Kélang and Sai were genuinely subject to Majapahit. But the list of Peninsular names suffices at any rate to negative the view recently put forward by Mr. R. J. Wilkinson in "Papers on Malay Subjects" (History, Part I, p. 8) that the Malay colonisation of the Peninsula dates only from the year 1400 A. D. Evidently there were already in the middle of the 14th century a number of settlements scattered along the coast-line, both on the east and on the west side of the Peninsula. (It is noticeable that unlike the names relating to Sumatra none of the Peninsular names given in the *Nāgarakrētāgama* have any reference to the interior of the country: they are settlements on the coast or barely a few miles inland). Some of these settlements even then bore the same names as they do at the present day and one or two of these names are distinctly Malay. Langkasuka is no doubt of Indian origin, Nagor (if that be the right reading) is Indian modified by Indo-Chinese pronunciation, Kélang Kédah and Jère may possibly be of Mon-Khmer origin, Sai is perhaps Siamese, and most of the others I would not try to explain. But Kélang seems to be Malayan in form, and Dungun is the Malay name for a common sea-shore tree (according to Mr. H. N. Ridley in No. 30 of this Journal, pp. 87 & 44). Of course Sang Hyang Hujung is Malayan also, but it is just the sort of name that mariners give to a notable landmark and by itself it would not be evidence of actual Malay settlement but merely of Malay navigation and trade. Taking these names, however, as a whole, I think they support the inference that before 1365 A. D. the Malays had already colonised both coasts of the Peninsula. It is also pretty clear that at that date Singapore was still in existence and that Malacca had not yet been founded: for a list that enumerates Kélang, Sun-

gai Ujong, Singapore and (probably) Muar would hardly have omitted Malacca, which lies between these places, if it had existed at that time. This string of names therefore once more confirms the amended chronology that I have suggested.

Without laying any particular stress on the fact. I think it is worth while drawing attention to the considerable gaps left by the Nāgarakrētāgama in its enumeration. The Encyclopædie points out the omission of Sēnggora and Patani. It is equally noticeable that there is a complete blank between Kēdah and Kēlang: not a single place on the coast of Perak is mentioned. The same is true of the coast-line intervening between the Pahang river and Point Rumēnia. It may be surmised that there were at that early date no settlements of any note along those two strips of coast.

IV. Further Details from the Wu-Pei-Pi-Shu Charts.

A brief reference must be made to some additional almost contemporary evidence which serves to confirm that of the Nāgarakrētāgama in some points and to supplement it in others. For reasons which will presently be obvious I cannot pretend to do justice to this independent source, and I regret that I can only use it as a sort of appendix to what has already been said, instead of dealing with it as adequately as it deserves. The evidence in question is that of the Chinese charts appended to a Chinese work called the Wu-pei-pi-shu, by one She, Yung-t'oo. This work, it appears from two papers in Vol. XX., pp. 209-226 and Vol. XXI., pp. 30-42 of the Journal of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, is a relatively modern compilation but embodies much material taken straight out of considerably older books. Mr. G. Phillips, the author of the two papers just referred to, considers that the charts appended to it are older than the commencement of the fifteenth century. They are alleged to be the charts used by the Chinese captains who navigated the vessels conveying the celebrated Chinese envoy Chēng Ho (commonly called Sam-po) and his suite to the various southern and western countries which he visited. (This envoy, I may parenthetically observe, is recorded to have visit-

ed Malacca in 1409 A. D. The list of many other places which he visited in the course of his official career is given in an extract from the History of the Ming Dynasty by Mr. W. P. Groeneveldt in his valuable "Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca," reprinted in "Miscellaneous Papers relating to Indo-China and the Indian Archipelago," 2nd Series, Vol. I., p. 170. He went as far afield as Magadoxu in East Africa).

Mr. G. Phillips has published facsimiles of these charts in the form of a long continuous strip, divided for convenience into two parts. The part relating to the regions to the eastward of Tenasserim appears in Vol. XXI., of the S. China Branch R.A.S. and is the one that concerns us here. It contains a great deal of geographical information in a much distorted shape. There is no approach to accuracy in its plotting of the outlines of the different countries set down in it. Thus the coast of the Malay Peninsula is laid down as an irregular line, following one almost uniform direction from right to left of the chart, all the way between Sënggora and Tenasserim. In fact it is plainly the record of an actual coasting voyage or voyages. Islands are marked in various places along the coast; and both on these and on many points of the coastline itself appear Chinese characters. Many of these characters represent in transcription the native names of places. Others appear to be Chinese descriptive names. A good many of these various place names have been identified by Mr. Phillips. But he appears to have omitted a certain number of others. His transliteration of the Chinese characters follows a dialect which is evidently not the one in which they were intended to be read and does not tend to facilitate identification. Probably too a good deal of additional light could be thrown on these names by some one possessed of local knowledge. I therefore venture to invite the attention of Chinese scholars in the Straits to these charts and suggest that they should bring their combined local knowledge and Chinese scholarship to bear upon them.

In the meantime Mr. Phillips' labours enable me to quote a certain number of place names recorded in this chart. Pro-

ceeding from right to left and starting at Sēnggora 孫姑那
Sun-ku-na, we pass four groups of unexplained Chinese
 characters and then arrive at the Kēlantān river 吉蘭丹港
Keih-lan-tan-kiang. Next on the coastline comes Trēngganu
 丁加下路 *Ting-kia-hia-lu*, then the Pahang river
 彭坑港 *P'eng-keng-kiang*, then a place called
 答那溪嶼⁽¹⁾ *Ta-na-ki-seu* which Mr. Phillips has
 not identified, and then 淡馬錫 *Tan-ma-seih*, which, as

Colonel Gerini has rightly pointed out, is our old acquaintance
 Tumasik or Tēmasek, otherwise Singapore. Curiously enough
 this is represented as being on the mainland, which shows that
 at this date the Chinese shipping already passed through the
 New Straits to the south of the island of Singapore, not
 through the Old Straits to the north of it.

Thus far we have been coasting along the east coast of the
 Peninsula. Dotted alongside of it in the chart, from a little
 to the right (i.e. north) of Kēlantān onwards, are figured a
 number of named islands, some of which have been identified
 by Mr. Phillips, others not. Nearly opposite *Ta-na-ki-seu* the
 course laid down on the chart runs past an island marked

白礁 *Pei-chiao*, leaving it on the left or port side. This
 island Mr. Phillips identifies with Pedra Branca. The course
 then runs amongst a number of islands, leaving three to the
 right' (starboard, north) and four islands and a shoal, all named,

(1)^s 嶼 = "island"

to the left (port, south) side. ⁽¹⁾ *Tan-ma-seih* is marked on the coast just opposite the second of the starboard islands. After passing the shoal to port, the course runs between Karimun

吉利門 *Keih-li-men*, which it likewise leaves to port,

and Pulau Pisang **毗宋嶼** *Pi-sung-seu*, leaving the latter to starboard. This seems to me to clinch the Tumasik = Tēmasik = Tan-ma-seih = Singapore equation absolutely. ⁽²⁾

Of course the chart is not evidence that Singapore was still an inhabited settlement at the time when it was compiled. Maps and charts often contain names that are merely traditional: they are usually compilations embodying the notes and records of several generations of travellers and navigators. Besides, names often adhere to sites long after they have ceased to be inhabited. We shall see in a moment that this is probably the case in the present instance, for the next thing on the chart after Pulau Pisang (and wrongly put quite close to

⁽¹⁾ The starboard islands, so far as I can make out, are marked

- (a) **官嶼** (b) **琵琶嶼** ^(c) **長腰嶼** the port islands
(d) **馬革山** (e) **琵琶撓嶼** (f) **牛屎碼** (g) **涼傘嶼**

(f) and (g) lie just opposite (below) (c). The shoal (h) **沙糖淺** lies just to the west (west) of (g) and a bit further, on the south-west apparently, comes Karimun.

Mr. Phillips conjecturally identifies (c), which he transliterates *Chang-yaou-sen*, with Singapore island; but I think it represents some small island lying to the south of Singapore island. Perhaps it is Pulau Panjang: the Chinese name means "Long Waist Island."

⁽²⁾ Cf. Pelliot, in *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient*, 1904, Tome IV., p. 345 and Gerini, *J. R. A. S.*, July 1905, Part III., pp. 500-1. The first named paper is a long and learned dissertation in which a very large number of problems of historical geography relating to South-Eastern Asia are exhaustively discussed. It teems with references to all manner of sources, Asiatic and European, and should be referred to by all who are interested in these questions.

it) is an estuary in the coastline, on the further (right geographical) bank of which is a mountain or headland marked

身箭山 *Sia-ch'ien-shan*, presumably Tanjong Sagenting,

Batu Pahat, as Mr. Phillips suggests. The course after leaving Pulau Pisang passes some half a dozen unnamed islands on the starboard side and then puts in at an inlet or river-mouth

on the left geographical bank of which is the entry **滿刺加**

which Mr. Phillips transcribes *Muan-la-kia*, adding that the Amoy pronunciation of the characters is *Moa-la-ka*. There is no sort of doubt that Malacca is intended: the same characters are uniformly used in the various Chinese sources translated by Groeneveldt. Probably if the other names in the chart were read with their Hokkien sounds it would make the whole thing more intelligible. On the right geographical

bank of the same inlet is the entry **官廠** which Mr.

Phillips has not explained.

I may add that the sailing directions inscribed on the chart rectify the rough-drawing of the chart itself. They run in the opposite direction to that which I have been following, and go from Samudra via Malacca to China. I extract the following from Mr. Phillips' version of them: "Going from Malacca for five watches the vessel sights Sejin Ting and Batu Pahat river, three watches from which Pesang island is reached, and in five watches more Carimon is reached, five watches more S.E. by E. brings the vessel off Long Waist island (Singapore?) and into the Linga Straits, (1) through which for five watches on a course E. by a very little N. the White Rôck, Pedra Branca, is reached." The course then proceeds in five more watches N.E. by N. to the eastward of Pulau Aor, and thence to Pulau "Condor" and so on past Cape St. James to China. It is plain that these sailing directions confirm the identifications already given.

(1) This term is here improperly transferred from the Lingga Straits to the Straits of Singapore.

Continuing to follow the coast of the Peninsula as laid down in the chart, I find next after the inlet where Malacca is marked, a place called **假五嶼** *Kia-ivn-seu*, which Mr. Phillips identifies as "Fisher's islet (?)". The Chinese name appears to mean "False Five Islands" but the characters are on the mainland itself. Remembering that "Five Islands" is an old Chinese name for Malacca, it may be conjectured that this entry refers to the neighbourhood of Port Dickson and Cape Rachado. Next, after coasting a considerable distance, is reached **綿花嶼** *Mien-hua-seu*, as it appears to read in Mr. Phillips' dialect (though he has not transliterated it), just near which in the sea is marked **繇花淺** *Mien-hua-chien*, which Mr. Phillips identifies as South Shoals. The names appear to be purely Chinese descriptions, not attempts to reproduce genuine native names. The second name appears in the midst of four or five small unnamed islands lying off the mouth of an inlet marked **吉令港** *Keih-ling-kiang*, "Kling river." I should like to read "Kélang river" if the Chinese characters allow of such a pronunciation, as to which question I express no opinion. Next, somewhat inland, is marked **吉那大山** *Keih-na-ta-shan*, unidentified. Then, but some distance further, we pass an island marked **九州** *Kiu-chou*, "Sambilangs," evidently the group of islands off the Perak coast known as Pulau Sambilan, the Nine Islands: the Chinese name means the same thing as the Malay one. Next, but somewhat further out to sea, are put two islands close together, the second and larger of which is marked **陳公嶼** which name Mr. Phillips does not explain. These lie nearly opposite a wide river-mouth. A very little further on, but quite close to the mainland, lies

檳榔嶼

Ping-lang-seu, which (if these charts are really over 500 years old) is, I suppose, the first recorded mention of Pulau Pinang, commonly called Penang. On the same assumption, that they are the charts used for Chêng Ho's voyages, the above noticed mention of Malacca is also the first on record; for apart from these charts Malacca is first described in the account written by Ma Huan in 1416 A.D., this Ma Huan being a Chinese Muhammadan who had accompanied Chêng Ho as interpreter on his travels. Chêng Ho's first voyage was undertaken in 1405 A.D. and as it may be assumed that his ship-captains made use of the most up-to-date charts they could obtain, the mention of Malacca need not surprise us, for that town had then probably been in existence for 20 or 25 years. But of course we cannot be sure that the charts, even supposing them to be really old, have not been somewhat modified and brought up to date since Chêng Ho's time. My point is that whatever may be their actual date in their present shape, they undoubtedly embody some very ancient data, as the case of Tan-ma-seih sufficiently proves. Whether the entry referring to Penang goes back 500 years or not I leave as an open question, though I see no reason why it should not: the island is a very conspicuous object to mariners navigating along that coast.

Next after Penang island is a well-marked river-mouth in the coastline, lettered 吉達港 *Keih-ta-kiang*, that is to

say the Kédah river, and a little further on an island marked

龍牙梭橋

Lung-ya-kiao-yi, undoubtedly from its position representing the Langkawi islands though the Chinese name is much distorted from the original. Next comes an

island bearing the five characters 古力由不洞 which

Mr. Phillips does not explain, and here we appear to be pretty well at the limit of the Malay Peninsula proper, for the next place

marked on the coastline bears the characters 獨掛頭山

(also unexplained: perhaps they represent Takua headland, if there is one?) and then, after passing two rivers and several unnamed islands, we reach Tenasserim, which lies outside my present sphere of interest.

V. Prehistoric Speculations and Conjectures.

The evidence here put together gives, I think, an outline picture of what the Malay Peninsula was in the second half of the 14th. century, which though very sketchy is not altogether without interest to us moderns. One would like to peer further back into the dim past of this region and form some sort of idea as to when the process of Malay colonisation began. But unfortunately there is very little evidence to help us. Mr. Wilkinson hypothetically gives Singapore a very short lease of life, (from 1360(?) to 1377 A. D., he suggests). That however is quite impossible: to have made the impression that it did on Malay legend and tradition, it must have lasted much longer and I see no reason why it should not have flourished during the reigns of five generations of kings, as the *Sējarah Melayu* asserts. That would give it an existence of about a century as a Malay settlement, say from about 1280 A. D. to the time of its destruction about 1337 A. D. As a matter of fact there is some evidence that a settlement had existed upon this spot at an even earlier date: but we do not know that it was a Malay one and it may have been a Mon-Khmer colony. Crawford in his *Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Island*, p. 402, records that among the ruins of the old Singapore (which amounted to very little when we acquired the place in 1819 A. D.) were found some Chinese coins the oldest of which bore the name of an emperor who died in 967 A. D. Unfortunately he omits to tell us what the dates of the remaining coins were and how many different specimens of Chinese coinage were represented in the find, although that information would have been very much to the point. Of course it is not safe to assume that there was a settlement at Singapore as

early as the 10th. century simply because a Chinese coin of that period has been found there. But on the facts it does seem probable that there was a trading station there considerably before the middle of the 13th century.

Colonel Gerini, in his article already referred to, has devoted a good deal of ingenious speculation and conjecture to the question of the antiquity of Singapore in pre-Malay times. But I fear that the conclusions he arrives at are merely hypothetical. They depend largely on suggested etymologies of local names which do not carry conviction. If, however, he is right (as I think he probably is) in his theory that there was once an old Mon-Khmer trading station on the island of Singapore, it is certain that it must have been abandoned somewhere about the middle of the 13th century (if not earlier). For at that period the Siamese became finally the masters of the whole Menam valley and a generation or so later Ligor, as well as Tenasserim and Tavoy, became tributary to the Siamese kingdom whose capital was at Sukhothai. *Colonel Gerini claims that about 1280 A. D. the Siamese conquered not merely Ligor but the whole of the Malay Peninsula. One can only say that up to the present there is no sufficient evidence to support such a claim. If they conquered it then, why did they let it go again a few generations later?

Although there seems to be no sufficient reason for believing that the Siamese ever subdued the whole of the Peninsula, there is evidence that at this period they came into conflict with the Malays. In the History of the Yuan dynasty there is an entry stating that in the first year of the period Yuan-Cheng (i.e. 1295) an embassy was sent by Siam to the court of China, on which occasion "as the Siamese had for a long time past been at war with the 麻里子兒 (Malays), both peoples submitted (i.e. to the majesty of China) and an Imperial order was issued to the Siamese saying: 'Do no hurt to the Malays, so that you may keep your promise.'" This entry is quoted in Bowring's Kingdom and People of Siam, Vol. I, p. 71 and has

*Gerini, Historical Retrospect of Junkceylon Island, in Journal of the Siam Society, 1905, p. 131.

been discussed by the late Professor Schlegel in T'oung Pao, Vol. IX, No. 4. *He thinks that it must refer to the Malays of the Peninsula: it does not seem likely that the Siamese could have had prolonged hostilities with Sumatra at this period. I think he is right as to that point and interpret the entry as recording the fact that when the Siamese, after asserting their supremacy over Ligor, pressed further southward into the northern parts of the Peninsula, they came into conflict with the Malays who had already at that time colonised the country. This would throw back the beginnings of regular Malay settlement in the Peninsula well into the middle of the 13th century, if not earlier, and I see no reason why that should not be so. At any rate it is quite certain that Mr. Wilkinson's 1400 A. D. is much too late. Malacca was not, in point of time, the first Malay settlement on the mainland; it rose rapidly to a position of predominance which overshadowed its older neighbours, but it by no means marks the beginnings of Malay immigration into the Peninsula.

Here I must take leave of this subject. It may be convenient if I state briefly the general conclusions which the evidence here adduced appears to me to establish. They are as follows:—

- (1) that the Malay colonisation of the Peninsula was already in progress in the 13th century;
- (2) that Singapore, as a Malay settlement, was founded in that century (or possibly even earlier);
- (3) that Singapore was still in existence throughout the first 60 or 70 years of the 14th century and must have been conquered and destroyed by the Javanese of Majapahit shortly after 1377 A. D.
- (4) that Malacca was not founded till some short time after 1377 A. D.
- (5) that the reigning family of Malacca did not become converted to Mubammadanism until very near the end of the 14th century

*Pelliot, loc. cit. p. 242, gives the same entry as well as a number of others' (p. 324 et seq.) mentioning the Malays. I have followed his version.