

XVI.

THE NAGARAKRETAGAMA LIST OF COUNTRIES ON
THE INDO-CHINESE MAINLAND

(*circa* 1380 A.D.).

BY COLONEL G. E. GERINI, M.R.A.S.

“*NĀGARAKRETĀGAMA*” is the title of a Javanese poem composed by a native bard named Prapañca, in honour of his sovereign Hayam Wuruk (1350–1389), the greatest ruler of Mājapāhit. It has recently been edited with his customary scholarship by Dr. Brandes,¹ and its contents were shortly afterwards analyzed by Dr. Kern.² Its date, in so far as can be made out from internal evidence, must be put down to about 1380. At this period the Mājapāhit empire³ had reached the zenith of its power, and embraced, besides most of the archipelago, several, though little better than nominal, dependencies on the southern part of the Malay Peninsula. Furthermore, friendly and trading relations had been established with a number of States on the Indo-Chinese mainland. In the course of his pæan of praise for his great sovereign, the poet gives a long enumeration of all such countries. This is where the interest of the production chiefly lies, for though it be merely a question of a list of bare toponyms, yet the simple fact of some of them being mentioned at such a date gives rise to issues, as we shall see directly, of high importance for the elucidation of the historical geography, as well as of

¹ J. Brandes, “*Nāgara Krētāgama*” (Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, deel liv, Batavia, 1902).

² “En Oud-Javaansch geschiedkundig gedicht uit het bloeitijdperk van Madjapahit,” in *Indische Gids*, March, 1903, pp. 341–360.

³ Mājapāhit was founded some time between 1278 and 1292, probably nearer the latter date.

several obscure points in the early history of the countries concerned.

I propose to deal here only with the toponyms relating to the Indo-Chinese mainland. Some of these are quite obvious, but some others are not so easily recognizable; while a few require a certain amount of investigation ere their identity can be satisfactorily established.

In so far as I am aware, none of the second and third class toponyms just alluded to have been identified, though I have noticed one or two attempts in that direction which, I regret to say, have proved abortive. Not having access either to Dr. Brandes' edition of the poem or to Dr. Kern's analytical summary, I can only deal with such place-names as I have met with in other publications referring to them;¹ hence it is somewhat doubtful whether the subjoined list is anything like a complete one. It is to the following effect:—

I. FRIENDLY STATES.	II. DEPENDENCIES (on Malay Peninsula).
1. Syangka.	10. Tringgano.
2. Ayodhyāpura.	11. Pahang.
3. Dharmanagara.	12. Kalanten.
4. Marutma.	13. Lengka-suka.
5. Rājapura.	14. Tumasik.
6. Singhanagara.	
7. Campā.	
8. Kamboja.	
9. Yavana.	

Nos. 7, 8, 10, 11, are perfectly obvious and need no comment.

Yavana (No. 9) refers to Annam and Tonkin, whose people have long been known to the Chāms, Khmērs, and Siānese, as *Yūon* or *Yūan*.² The same designation is applied to the

¹ Dr. Brandes' speech in the *compte rendu* of the "Premier Congrès International des Études d'Extrême Orient, Hanoi, 1902," Hanoi, 1903. Also, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, t. iv, pp. 344, 345, 475.

² This name makes its appearance in Chām inscriptions in A.D. 1159, but occurs nearly two centuries earlier on the Khmēr inscription of P'hūm Mien (province of Thbōng Khmum, eastern Kamboja), which, under a date corresponding to A.D. 987, mentions *Yvan* (Yūen or Yavan) settlers, trading, among other things, in slaves. It might, in this instance, be a question of Arabs or Moorish merchants

Western Lāu (principality of C'hieng Māi), who appear in their own chronicles as the *Yūan* or *Yona* (the Pāli form of *Yavana*), and their country as *Yona-ratṭha* or *Yonaka-dēsa*;¹ but, of course, it cannot be a question of them here.

Dharma-nagara (No. 3) is *Śrī Dharma-rāja Nagara*, the *Nagor Śrī Dharmarāj* of Siānese official documents, *vulgo Lakhōn*; and the *Ligor* of Malays. It appears under the name of *Śrī Dharmarāja* in the oldest extant Siānese inscription, discovered at Sukhōthai and dating from about 1300 A.D., as a dependency of the kingdom which then had its capital there. I have besides found earlier mentions of the same city in the form *Śrī Dharmānagara* or *Śiri Dhammanagara*, in several old chronicles discovered by me in Northern Siām.² Hence the statement of Pallegoix, copied in many subsequent publications,³ to the effect that Ligor was founded by the kings of Ayudhyā "about 450 years ago"⁴ (in 1854, which yields 1400 *circa*), is utterly devoid of historic foundation.

(cf. Mahāvamsa, ch. 76, v. 268, date about 1180), though this is made somewhat doubtful from the fact that Annam, in A.D. 968, had regained independence, which event naturally led to a revival of trade with foreign countries. We are told, in fact, that not long afterwards, in 1140, she opened her ports to ships of all nations.

¹ This designation dates back from at least the thirteenth century, and applies then more particularly to the territory of C'hieng Sēn further to the north.

² "Cāmadevī-varṇsa," by Bodhiramsi-Mahāthēra, composed about the end of the fifteenth century, ch. xii, under date corresponding to A.D. 924: "Tadā ēko Sujito nāma rājā *Śiridhammanagarē* karetvā," etc. The "Jinakāla Mālinī," composed in Pāli at C'hieng Māi in 1516, by Ratanapaññañāna Thēra, alludes to the same circumstances. The older form of the city's name thus appears to be *Śrī Dharmānagara*.

³ Among which the too often unreliable Balfour's "Cyclopædia of India," 3rd ed., vol. ii, p. 711; Professor Keane's "Geography of the Malay Peninsula," etc., 2nd ed., London, 1892, p. 17; and so forth.

⁴ "Description du Royaume Thai ou Siam," Paris, 1854, t. i, pp. 26, 27. If I am led to go into such particulars in order to refute an obviously absurd statement, it is because error dies hard, as experience has taught me in my turn. I have, for instance, years ago pointed out, among other matters, that the term *Syām* (Siām) has existed as the name of a country and people for at least nineteen centuries, and that Chām inscriptions of the first half of the eleventh century testify to the presence in Indo-China of such a country and people at that date. Yet I have seen in recent publications by writers whom one would expect to know better, the absurd and worn-out statement repeated, that the term *Siam* was invented by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century!

Ayodhyāpura (No. 2). It would be unnecessary to waste words upon this toponym, obviously equivalent to *Ayudhyā*, the capital of Siām from A.D. 1350 to 1767, but for the theory recently set up by M. Aymonier that Ayudhyā was not founded until 1460 or so.¹ This mention of Ayudhyā in the “Nāgarakretāgama” shortly after the middle of the fourteenth century, is by itself alone enough to disprove that theory. Refraining, therefore, from any further notice of it here,² I deem it useful to point out that the relations existing at the period between Siām and Java according to the author of the “Nāgarakretāgama,” are confirmed from Chinese sources. The annals of the Ming dynasty do state, in fact, that in 1397 China invited Siām to use her influence with 爪哇, *Chao-wa* (Java, i.e. specifically Mājapāhit), to induce the latter to keep her vassal *San-fo-ch’i* (Śrī Bhoja = Palembang) quiet, as this State had become a real *enfant terrible*, and had carried its offences against China so far as to murder the imperial envoys.³

Rājapura (No. 5) is undoubtedly *Rāja-purī*, *volgo* Rāj-burī, in south-eastern Siām, already mentioned in the Sukhōthai inscription of about 1300, referred to above, as then a dependency of that capital. At the period we are concerned with it was, of course, subject to Ayudhyā, and probably still formed, as of old, a petty State ruled by vassal princes.

Singhanagara (No. 6) cannot be Singapore (see No. 14); nor, I should think, a town on the Campā coast appearing as *Simhapura* in the Sanskrit inscriptions of that country at the beginning of the thirteenth century. I am therefore inclined to identify it with *Simha-purī*, spelt at times *Singa-purī* (for

¹ *Journal Asiatique*, 1903, pp. 228 et seqq.; and “Le Cambodge,” t. iii, Paris, 1904, pp. 659 and 724-733.

² I have, a few days since writing the above, confuted it in full, by simply availing myself of such documents as are in print, and therefore accessible to everyone (though ignored by M. Aymonier), at a meeting of the Siam Society, Bangkok, on the 1st March, 1905. (See *Bangkok Times* of March 2nd for a summary, and forthcoming number of the *Journal of the Siam Society* for a fuller account.)

³ Cf. Groeneveldt, in “Miscellaneous Papers relating to Indo-China,” 2nd series, vol. i, London, 1887, pp. 194, 195.

Śrīnga-purī),¹ known to us from a Siāmesese law of the period (the *Kaṭa Mandirapāla*) as being one of the provinces, or vassal principalities, given in appanage to sons of the Ayudhyā sovereigns. The site of old Simha-purī is still marked by ruins in about lat. 15° 3' N. and long. 100° 17' E., near the western bank of a branch of the river Mē-Nam now almost silted up.

Syangka (No. 1) is one of the most puzzling toponyms of the list under examination. After due consideration of the five or six names of important places on the Indo-Chinese peninsula at the period, that might lay claim to identification with it, I have come to the conclusion that the most eligible is *Saṅkhaburī* (*Sarga-purī*),² a sister town of the preceding one (No. 6), and like it given in appanage to princes of the Ayudhyā royal family. On or soon after 1403 the then reigning sovereign bestowed it, as the annals inform us, upon his second son Chāu Yī, who in about 1415–16 fell in single combat on elephants with his elder brother, the prince of Sup'han (*Suvarṇa-purī*). The ruins of Saṅkhaburī are still extant at about fourteen miles further up-stream from her sister town of Simha-purī (No. 6).

Philip Baldaeus mentions, about the middle of the seventeenth century, a seaport of *Sencaza*, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula;³ but as his work is chiefly an 'armchair'

¹ So (*Singapurī*) in the *Kaṭa Mandirapāla*, and in the law on the status of provincial governors of *circa* 1454: see *Laws of Siām*, vol. ii, p. 93, and vol. i, p. 203 (Siāmesese ed.).

² It is met at times in old records with the spelling *Swankhaburī* (*Svarga-purī*), which is incorrect.

³ See Anderson's "English Intercourse with Siam," p. 41, according to which Baldaeus says: "betwixt *Tanassery* [Tenasserim] and *Occeda* (Quedah), towards *Malacca*, are the harbours of *Tanangar*, *Sencaza*, and *Perach*, opposite to Achem." In order to clear Baldaeus of blame, it would be necessary to demonstrate that *Perach* is a misprint, or *lapsus calami*, for *Perlis*, in which case *Sencaza* would have to be looked for between Perlis and Trang. There is a little stream named *Kacha* (Khlōng Kacha) debouching on that tract of coast through the Lawang estuary (70° 9' N. lat.). This may have of old borne the name *Sungei Kacha*, of which *Sungei-kacha*, *Sencaza*, would be possible contractions. In default, there is nothing left but the Kesang River below Malacca and immediately above the Muār, which appears in old European accounts as the *Gaza*, *Jyga*, *Krotsant*, and *Krisarant* (Dutch), *Cação* (Portuguese), etc. Nieuhoff was wrong in thinking it to be the Muār, and Dennys in not rectifying that blunder in his "Descriptive Dictionary of British Malaya," London, 1894, p. 208. But whichever of the two here proposed be the correct location of *Sencaza*, this evidently cannot be the *Syangka* of the Nāgarakretāgama.

compilation from the writings of his predecessors, where no such name occurs, the term in question is very probably a slip for either Langkāwī, Sungei Gaza (Kesang River), or the like. At all events, as he enumerates it between *Tanangar* (Trang) and *Perach* (Pērak), which latter he wrongly places before Kedah in coming from the north, it must on this account alone be discarded, for most of the southern part of the Malay Peninsula (Kedah included) was, as we shall see directly, claimed as a dependency by the Mājapāhit rulers.

The only place on the Malay Peninsula which might aspire to identification with **Syangka** is *Songkhilā* or *Sungkhilā* (Singora); but I cannot help excluding it on account of the too marked difference in spelling between the two names. *Swankhalōk* (Svarga-loka), *Svāñkha-burī* (Svānga-purī), and *Nakhōn Swan* (Nagara Svarga, Svarga-nagara), in Central Siām, though bearing similar names, must be discarded as forming at the period part of the last nucleus of the Sukhōthai State then in course of absorption by the new power that had sprung up at Ayudhyā. Owing to the war that raged between the two rival States during the second half of the fourteenth century, the cities above referred to were, as a matter of course, cut off from direct communication with countries beyond the sea; hence all possibility of an intercourse with Java at the time being must be excluded, while for an earlier period it can with the greatest difficulty be admitted, since it was only through its expansion by the conquest of the neighbouring islands that Mājapāhit came into contact with the nations on the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, and that event appears not to have taken place until A.D. 1377 or thereabouts.

Marutma (No. 4). The original is apparently corrupt here; for it should read either *Muttama* or *Martama* (Muḥ-t'mōh) = Martaban; or *Mrt*, *Marit*, *Mrittika* = Mergui. The chances appear to be in favour of Martaban, though since 1354 a rebel province of the Pegu kingdom that had just had its first nucleus there; for when Martaban was finally reduced by the warlike Peguan king Siharāja in 1388,

its governor, Braḥ Tabah, fled by sea with his two brothers, the governors of Maulmain and Nagar P'hên, to the Malay Straits,¹ mayhap those very ones who acknowledged the suzerainty of Mājapāhit. It seems, therefore, that we should read *Martma* or *Martuma*, *Martama*, instead of *Marutma*.

In concluding these brief remarks on the States with which Mājapāhit had established friendly relations, we cannot help drawing attention to the significant fact that no less than five are mentioned in Siām, of which three (to wit: Syangka, Rājapura, and Singhanagara) were in the immediate neighbourhood of Ayudhyā (*Ayodhyāpura*).² We must infer that a fairly active intercourse doubtless existed at the time between Siām and Java, although we should remember that the author of the Nāgarakretāgama has by no means refrained from availing himself of the license granted by common consent to poets in order to insert a good many toponyms through mere hearsay. It is surprising, in fact, that side by side with the names of the above States those of Sup'han and Lawô (*Lava-purī*), which ranked then as second and third in importance respectively, immediately after the suzerain one of Ayudhyā, should not appear. However, it is perhaps wise to withhold criticism on this point until the full topographic list of the Nāgarakretāgama lies before us.

The same reservation cannot, on the other hand, be made with regard to the dependencies claimed on the Malay Peninsula for his empire by the imaginative Prapañca; for all that territory then belonged unquestionably to Siām, and

¹ So the annals of Pegu, Siām. transl., p. 203.

² In locating these States in India, I am of course aware of the existence of several similarly named cities in India, e.g. *Ayodhyā* = Oude, still alluded to as *Ayujjha* in about A.D. 1052 in Mahāvamsa, ch. 56; *Sihapura* of both Dipavamsa and Mahāvamsa; *Rājapuri* = Rajauri of the Rājatarāṅgīnī (viii, 617, A.D. 1118); *Raipur* in the Central Provinces, and so forth. But it will be evident to everyone that, owing partly to the great distance and partly to the non-existence of some of such cities at the period we are concerned with, they are entirely out of question. Invasions of Malays (called *Javaku* in the Sinhalese chronicles) occurred, it is true, on the coasts of Ceylon and Southern India in 1251 (cf. Mahāvamsa, ch. 84) and earlier; but these freebooters came, I think, from Sumatra, and as the range of their exploits did not extend beyond the Coromandel coast, it is unlikely that relations could be established by them with the States further to the north.

continued to do so until the advent of the Portuguese at Malacca. Although adventurers from India, and still more frequently from Sumatra or from the neighbouring archipelago, succeeded in founding settlements on various points of its coasts, their interference was always resented by Siām, who invariably either drove them out or compelled them to acknowledge her supremacy. From as early as 1279–80 we hear of the famous Sukhōthai king Rúang (the second of that nickname) starting himself at the head of an expedition to repel one of such invasions of his southern provinces on the Malay Peninsula.¹ Shortly after that the adventurers who settled on the island of Singapore, founding there the settlement of that name, and on the shores of the Old Strait, causing the whole southernmost portion of the Malay Peninsula, known as the *Malaya* or *Malāyu* country (Tānah Malāyu), to rebel, were duly dealt with; and towards 1295 the State of *Ma-li-yü-érh*, 麻里子兒 (Malāyur), as the historians of the Yüan dynasty term it, had to renew the acknowledgment of its allegiance to Sukhōthai.² But the encroachments from Sumatra's side, upon the southern coasts of the Malay Peninsula, continued from time to time; and it doubtless was in order to punish some raid perpetrated by the newly-founded petty State of Pāsei, that in or about 1320 the king of Siām despatched a naval expedition to seize its ruler Māliku'l-Zaher and bring him to Siām, where he was kept a prisoner for twenty years.³ This is the same jolly old fellow who, after having been duly released

¹ Annals of Pegu, Siām. transl. ("Rājādhirāj"), p. 10.

² It goes without saying that this is the State of *Ma-li-yü-érh*, which Sinologists have placed on the territory of Palembang, east coast of Sumatra; as well as the hitherto vainly sought for *Maliur* or *Malavir* of Marco Polo. I cannot go here into the long discussion that the subject would entail, especially as I have fully made it elsewhere in a work now being passed through the press. Suffice to point out, as some of my witnesses, the river *Malāyu* (*Sungei Malāyu*), still so called, and the village *Bentan* (probably connected with Marco Polo's *Pentam*), both lying there (ignored by all my learned predecessors), on the northern shore of the Old Singapore Strait.

³ "Sejarah Malāyu," Leyden's transl., p. 73; and Marre's "Histoire des Rois de Pasey," Paris, 1874, pp. 48–50, which, however, takes a far more rosy view of the matter.

from Siām, was Ibn Baṭūṭa's host both in 1345 and 1346.¹ Such does not appear, however, to have been the only instance in which Siām made the northern coast of Sumatra feel her strong hand, for even as late as 1406, when Ayudhyā had long been the Siāmesse capital, *Su-mên-ta-la* (Samudra) still had grievances to air against her before the Chinese Court.

But to return to the Malay Peninsula. The "Kaṭa Mandirapāla" informs us that on the southern part of it, *Ūjong Tānah* (afterwards named Johor), *Malākā* (Malacca), and *Malāyū*, among others, were States tributary to Ayudhyā during the latter half of the fourteenth century. Here we again meet with our old acquaintance *Malāyu*, alias *Malāyur*, *Maliur*, or *Malavir*, on the northern shore of the Old Singapore Strait, which, duly brought to book by Sukhōthai in 1295, had continued to be kept obedient, and when the balance of power became transferred to Ayudhyā, acknowledged, or was compelled to acknowledge, its new masters. It merged, later on, into the kingdom of Johore, therefore also known to the early Portuguese writers as the kingdom of *Malaiio*.

The statements of the "Kaṭa Mandirapāla" are confirmed as regards Malacca, I may point out, by all Chinese accounts of the period, which declare that the country, even before the foundation of the emporium just referred to, belonged to Siām, to which its chiefs "had to pay a tribute of 40 taels of gold, and if they failed to do this they were attacked for it."² The 40 taels of gold referred to here were, of course, offered in the shape of the usual 'golden trees' of tribute, as is yet the custom to this day for the States on the Malay Peninsula still owing their allegiance to the Siāmesse Crown.

Further, as regards Pahang we find, again from Chinese sources, that towards 1406 some Champā ships having drifted there, the Siāmesse had detained and molested them, evidently

¹ Defrémery & Sanguinetti's "Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah," t. iv, Paris, 1858, pp. 230 and 306.

² Groeneveldt, in "Miscellaneous Papers relating to Indo-China," 2nd series, vol. i, pp. 243, 245, 248, etc., etc.

because of their being part of a mission then despatched by Champā to *Hsü-wén-ta-na* (Samudra).¹

It would be outside the scope of the present paper to carry on the inquiry to a later period. The above *résumé* will suffice to give a clear idea of the political situation on the southern part of the Malay Peninsula at the time we are concerned with, and to throw a few sidelights from some sources hitherto not put under contribution, on a subject of considerable importance.

If it is possible, nay, fairly probable, that from the end of the seventh to the end of the twelfth century the southern half or so of the Malay Peninsula, with the neighbouring islands, were part of the empire having then its centre at Śrī-Bhoja or Palembang on the eastern coast of Sumatra, as evidenced by the writings of I-tsing and Chao Ju-kua respectively, the same cannot hold good, as we have seen, for the centuries following. Hence, it would not be sufficient even to admit that the alleged conquest of those territories by Mājapāhit in A.D. 1377 or thereabouts was merely an ephemeral one. It is necessary to ascribe to that exploit a far more restricted range, limited simply to a few islets and sundry tracts on the southernmost borders of the Malay Peninsula. If some chiefs of the petty States in that neighbourhood considered it a good policy for themselves to coquet with Mājapāhit, as with China and other powers then to the fore in the Archipelago, making a semblance of acknowledging its suzerainty, that was merely one of the preparatory rehearsals to the game of playing off one State against another in which they became so admirably proficient in after times. But of real subjection to the insular empire there had been none.

The Pāsei chronicle, it should be pointed out, in its list of countries on or about the Malay Peninsula conquered by Mājapāhit at the period in question, merely enumerates *Ūjong Tānah*, *Pulo Tinggi*, *Pemangilan*, and *Tyūman*,² which

¹ Cf. *China Review*, vol. xxiii, p. 256; and *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for January, 1900, p. 135, where 1436 is doubtless a misprint for 1406.

² Cf. Marre, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

correspond to the later kingdom of Johore with its adjacent islands of Tinggi, Pemangil, and Tyūman. This statement quite suffices to exclude *a priori* **Tringgano** (No. 10), **Pahang** (No. 11), and **Kalanten** (= Kalantan, No. 12) from the number of the conquests ascribed to Mājapāhit in the Nāgarakretāgama, while confirming our preceding arguments that the sway of that empire was scarcely enforced, except ephemerally, beyond the very southern borders of the Malay Peninsula and neighbouring islands (including at most the above-named, with the addition of those of Singapore and of the Rhio-Lingga archipelago).

Having thus cleared the ground, we may now proceed to examine the two last toponyms in our list, still awaiting identification.

Lengka-suka (No. 13). I have not the slightest doubt that this is *Langka-suka*, the name of the earliest royal residence and capital of Kedah according to the chronicle of that State, the "Marong Mahāvamsa," translated by Captain (afterwards Colonel) Low in the *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, vol. iii. Its site was, to the writer's belief, near the present village of Kūboh Bālei, some four or five miles eastwards of Kedah Peak. The territory was then an island termed *Pūlo Srāi*, which was just on the point of becoming attached to the mainland. The term survives in a more correct form in the name of Kedah Peak, known to this day as *Gūnong Jerai*. But this is merely the Malay, as *Srāi* is the Siānese, corruption of *Chrai* (Črai), the Mōñ-Khmēr word for the banyan-tree.¹

It will readily be seen that our identification of *Lengka-suka* with the original capital of Kedah is of some importance for the determination of the hitherto unknown date of the foundation of that State. For, according to the chronicle above referred to, it was only under the reign of Rāja Bodhisat, the son of the founder, that the name of the country (*Chrai*, *Jerai*, or *Srāi*) was changed into *Kiddah*,

¹ Now pronounced *chrēi* by the Khmērs, and *srōa*, or *soa*, by the Mōñs. Kedah is down to the present day called *Srāi* (*Muang Srāi*); officially, *Sai-burī* (*Srāi-purī*) by the Siānese.

now more usually spelled كَدَا, *Kedah* = 'currel,' or elephant stockade (Hind. *Khedā*), presumably upon the introduction into the country of Islāmism from India. This event, however, is said in the annals of Achīn not to have taken place until A.D. 1501.

Again, always according to the same chronicle, it was Rāja Śrī Mahāvamsa, the youngest son and successor of Rāja Bodhisat, who left the old capital Langkasuka and built a new one further south at Srokam.

Now, the "Nāgarakretāgama" proves the existence of Langkasuka as capital of the State in about A.D. 1380; while a Chinese map of about 1399–1400, reproduced by Phillips from the "Wu-pei-pi-shu," marks Kedah, or at any rate its river (the Sungei Merbuk or Merbau), in the form of 吉達港, *Chi-ta Chiang* (*Kit-ta Kiang*).¹ It seems, then, legitimate to infer that the change of the name of the State into *Kiddah* or *Kedah* must have taken place immediately after 1380; whereas the transference of the capital from Langkasuka to Srokam may be put down roughly at 1400, and the foundation of the State at the very earliest to 1300. This, naturally, always provided, and the more so as regards the last inference, that the Kedah chronicle is correct, and has integrally recorded the series of its early rulers. As we shall see, such a view is not entirely beyond objection.

In fact, M. Pelliot, a young and promising Sinologist, in a learned and bulky, though not very conclusive monograph, recently published on the subject of a number of place-names mentioned by Chinese writers in Further India,² connects the *Lengka-suka* of the "Nāgarakretāgama" with the 凌牙斯, *Ling-ya-ssü*, of Chau Ju-kua (*circa* 1200–1240), the correct form of which, he says, is 凌牙斯加, *Ling-ya-ssü-ka*. On the authority of Professors Hirth³ and Schlegel,⁴ who both read it *Ling-ya-sz*, I had some time ago felt inclined to identify it with either Tanjung *Rangga*, the north point of

¹ See *Journal of the China Branch R.A.S.*, vol. xxi, map, and p. 38, No. 7.

² *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, t. iv, pp. 328, 345, etc.

³ *Journal R.A.S.*, 1896, p. 478.

⁴ *T'oung-Pao*, 1901, p. 129.

entrance to the Indragiri River, east coast of Sumatra, the *Langsa* or *Langksa* (Langkasa?) River further up that coast, or *Langat*, on the south-western shore of the Malay Peninsula above Port Dickson. But M. Pelliot, while not attempting to locate it, assures us that *Ling-ya-sz* appears twice in Chao Ju-kua's work under the more complete form *Ling-ya-ssü-ka*, whence its very probable identity with the *Lengka-suka* of the "Nāgarakretāgama" and, it should be added after our location of the latter, with Kedah.

Chao Ju-kua enumerates *Ling-ya-sz* or *Ling-ya-ssü-ka* among the vassal States of *San-fo-ch'i* (Palembang), in *circa* 1200, but this may refer to an older period; and names as its neighbours *Fo-lo-an*, 佛囉安, and *Tan-ma-ling*, 單馬令, with which, he adds, there was communication both by land and sea. He furthermore gives us the sailing distances from *Tan-ma-ling* to *Chên-lah* (Kamboja), and from *Fo-lo-an* to *San-fo-ch'i* (Palembang), as follows:—

1. *Chên-lah* to *Tan-ma-ling*, 10 days;
2. *Tan-ma-ling* to *Ling-ya-sz* or *Ling-ya-ssü-ka*, 6 days.
(distance by land not stated);
3. *Ling-ya-sz* or *Ling-ya-ssü-ka* to *Fo-lo-an*, 4 days.
(distance by land not stated);
4. *Fo-lo-an* to *San-fo-ch'i*, 4 days.

Then he mentions as neighbours of *Fo-lo-an* the three States of:—

1. *Têng-ya-nêng*, 登牙儂;
2. *Pêng-fêng*, 蓬豐;
3. *Chia-chi-lan-tan* or *Ka-ki-lan-tan*, 加吉蘭丹.¹

I have before this come to two possible solutions of this intricate geographical puzzle, answering to the double alternative which arises according to whether we place the intercommunicating States of *Tan-ma-ling*, *Ling-ya-sz* (or *Ling-ya-ssü-ka*), and *Fo-lo-an* (with its three neighbours on the same strip of territory, or separated by the sea, as

¹ *T'oung-Pao*, 1901, pp. 125-134; and 1898 (vol. ix), pp. 402-406.

the case may be) on Sumatra or on the Malay Peninsula. For the sake of brevity I shall merely confine myself here to the results I have reached on the basis of the second alternative, and on the new hypothesis that *Ling-ya-sz* is not *Langat* but *Ling-ya-ssü-ka* = Langkasuka, i.e. the original capital of Kedah. They may be tabulated as follows:—

1. *Tan-ma-ling* = Temiling or Tembeling, the name of a cape and a hill near the mouth of the Kwāntan River, Pahang, on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. Probably it is the old designation borne by the present Kwāntān district, and should not be confounded with Tembeling or Tembelang, the name of an inland district on one of the tributaries of the Pahang River. M. Pelliot has just fallen into this error (p. 328, n. 6).
2. *Ling-ya-ssü-ka* = Langkasuka = original capital of Kedah near Kedah Peak (Gūnong Jerai), on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula.
3. *Fo-lo-an* = Beranang on the Langat River, west coast of Malay Peninsula. Though this district lies rather inland, it may have of old stretched down to the coast towards the mouth of the Langat River. At all events, it is a remarkable fact that the Chinese settled there, and now write its name 芙蓉莪, *Fu-lu-ngan*.

The distances suit tolerably well in so far as those given in Chinese itineraries go, and there is overland communication between the three districts. Remembering furthermore the leisurely manner in which Chinese authors have compiled their accounts of foreign countries, it is not necessary to assume that the three neighbours of *Fo-lo-an* must be situated on the Malay Peninsula, should this State eventually prove to have stood there. M. Pelliot says *Ka-ki-lan-tan* is a faulty spelling for *Ki-lan-tan* = Kelantan, and we may admit that. But when we come to *Téng-ya-néng* and *Péng-féng*, which he would fain have us believe are, respectively, Trenggānu and Pahang, we feel somewhat sceptical. For

Téng-ya-néng looks more like Trieng-gading, on the north coast of Sumatra, a little to the west of Samalangan, and *Péng-féng* may represent some other place-name in that neighbourhood, where is also a Berūan or Barūan, which may claim historical descent from *Fo-lo-an*. So likewise may the ruins of Kota Benūwang on the Rokan River, and Belawan (river and cape), near Deli, on the east coast of Sumatra.¹ It will thus be seen that, owing to the abundance of toponyms similar to the above, both on Sumatra and the southern half of the Malay Peninsula, the question becomes a very intricate one; and although the solution we have proposed above seems, and not very improbably is, correct enough, it may yet have to undergo substantial modifications ere it can be accepted as definite. Should we adopt it in its present form, we must put back the date for the foundation of *Langkasuka* to at least the end of the twelfth century, and interpolate another half-dozen reigns of unknown petty rulers between that date and the advent of Rāja Bodhisat, under whom the country changed its old name into *Kiddah* or *Kedah*.

M. Pelliot suggests that we may have an allusion to this name in the 吉陀, *Ki-t'o*, country mentioned by Chao Ju-kua early in the thirteenth century, among the eighteen States tributary to *P'iau* (Lower Burmā); but this, it may now be seen, is next to impossible.² He does not, however,

¹ As regards *Tan-ma-ling*, there is a river Tambilang on the east coast of Sumatra in 2° S. lat. From the position described for *Fo-lo-an* in relation to neighbouring countries (*T'oung-Pao*, ix, p. 404), it would appear that Berūan, on the north coast of Sumatra, is the most likely place, and the sailing distance from it to *San-fo-ch'i* may be merely meant to the northern borders of this State.

² Equally impossible is the rapprochement made by both M. Pelliot and M. Huber, in the same number of the *Bulletin* (pp. 407 and 475), of *Ling-ya-ssü-ka* with *Lang-ya-hsiu*, 狼牙修. In the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for January, 1901, pp. 157, 158, I have conclusively shown that the latter stood on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula and on the territory of the present C'hump'hōn (about 10° 30' N. lat.), where the name survives to this day in the two islets of *Langkachtu*, nearly in front of C'hump'hōn Bay. These, I have now no doubt, are the very 'mountains' (山) of *Jang-ya-hsiu* sighted in A.D. 607 by the Chinese embassy to *Ch'ih-t'u* (= Sukda, Sukhada, later on

stop short here, for the 偈陀, *Chie-t'o* (*K'it-t'o* = Kadū?), State referred to in analogous circumstances by the same author, causes his thoughts to again fly to Kedah (p. 352). So does I-tsing's seaport of 羯茶, *Chie-ch'a* (*K'it-ch'a* or *Ka-ch'a*); and why not? the port of 哥羅, *Ko-lo*, of T'ang history; the *Kalah* of the early Arab navigators; and so forth. In all this, however, M. Pelliot but follows his predecessors, to whom we owe the almost hopelessly muddled state of the historical geography of Further India in the 'light' of Chinese and Arab sources. With no other name beginning with K or Q printed on the Malay Peninsula in their Hand Atlases except Kedah or Quedah, what could be done but identify with this place every toponym beginning with the same initials met with in the time-worn texts? Thus Kedah grew to become, under the fostering hatching of the K, *alias* Q, theory, a sort of hub of the universe—of the Far East at any rate. As a matter of fact, there is absolutely no shadow of proof that this name ever came into existence before the end of the fourteenth century; and the evidence we have adduced conclusively shows, on the other hand, that, prior to that period, the country as well as its capital were known by quite different names. Nowadays the name *Kedah* is spelled 吉打, *Ki-ta*, *Kit-ta*, by the Chinese living in the Straits.¹

Tumasik (No. 14). This toponym, which has, according to M. Pelliot (p. 345, n. 4), puzzled three well-known Oriental scholars, presents no difficulty whatever. It is, with but trifling variation, the old name of Singapore Island, *Tamasak*, as testified to by the "Şejarah Malāyu."² Several years ago I identified it with those of the *Tamus*, or *Tamarus*, *Promontorium* of Strabo and Pomponius Mela;

Sukhodaya, in Central Siām); while C'hump'hōn harbour and district is I-tsing's 頁迦戎, *Lang-ka-hsü*, as well as the 狼牙脩, *Lang-ya-hsiu* of Liang history. It is amusing to see Sinologists go on suggesting imaginary locations for place-names which have already been identified with absolute certainty and shown to correspond to *actually existing* places.

¹ *Journal Str. Br. R.A.S.*, No. 42, p. 200.

² Cf. Leyden's "Malay Annals," London, 1821, pp. 42-44.

with the *Be-Tūmah*, بتومه (*Bī-Tuma*, i.e. *Tuma River*), seaport of the Arab navigators in the ninth century, and with the 淡馬錫, *Tan-ma-hsi* or *T'am-ma-sek Hill*, marked on the Chinese map of *circa* 1399–1400 published by Phillips, and already referred to above.”¹ This hill, I may add, is *Būkit Timah*, بوكيت تيمه (= ‘*Tin Hill*’), the most conspicuous elevation (530 feet, and 667 to tops of trees) on Singapore Island, as is, apart from other indications, shown from the fact of the character 錫, *hsi*, which means ‘tin,’ being employed in the above quoted transcript. There seems thus to be no doubt that the original name of the island, which I assume to have been derived from the *Mōñ t'mōh* (= ‘rock’), owing to the Singapore River being formerly noted for a large rock standing at its entrance, which might have caused it to be called *Bī-T'mōh*, i.e. ‘River of the Rock’ (whence *Be-Tūmah*²), must have

¹ See *Journal R. Asiatic Society* for July, 1897, table x, at foot and on the right-hand side. There I suggested the *Tong-si-tiok* of the Chinese as a probable equivalent, relying on Groeneveldt, who (op. cit., pp. 258–9) identified it with Singapore Island. But when I began to feel out the way for myself, I at once recognized *Tamasak* in the *Tan-ma-hsi* above referred to, and corrected the mistake in a new monograph still in the press. M. Pelliot, who, I am glad to notice, proceeds far more cautiously and with more critical acumen than his predecessors in his new inquiries on these subjects, recently suggested, in his turn (op. cit., p. 345, n. 4), the probable identity of the *Tumasik* of the “*Nāgarakretāgama*” with the *Tan-ma-hsi* of the Chinese map published by Phillips, from which latter he argued its location to be about the site of the present Johore. He may now see, however, that it is more precisely Singapore Island, the hill represented on that map being unquestionably *Būkit Timah*. The Old Singapore Strait is not shown there, as scarcely any longer used by Chinese junks at that time. It appears that the Chinese discovered the new passage on or about the end of the fifteenth century, and therefore at least two centuries before the Hispano-Portuguese. The new channel is, in fact, duly marked in the map in question, the date assigned to which by Phillips I see no reason to dispute.

² In Khm̄r a rock is also called *t'mō* or *thmō*; but we cannot explain the name by the Khm̄r language except by admitting a form *Bā-T'mō*, meaning ‘excellent rock,’ ‘sacred rock,’ which may have been the name applied to the great mass of unhewn coarse red silicious sandstone above alluded to. I do not positively assert that *Bī-Thmōh* was the name of Singapore River, or, for that matter, of the Kallang or Roehor streams flowing close by. It is a mere conjecture, though, as may be seen, not altogether unfounded. I do not, in fact, say that *Bī-Thmōh* cannot have been used as the name of the Old Strait; for *bi* in *Mōñ* is a rather elastic term, it being used to denote, besides a large river, an arm of the sea, and the sea itself (termed *bi-c'hnōk* = great river). The Khm̄r name for ‘tin’ is *sannō*; also *pahang*, whence the name of *Pahang* may have been derived (do those who talk about *Fanggang* tribes in those parts know this?), though the reverse may, after all, be the case. But I do not think that

been Sanskritized by the early Indian navigators into *Tamara* (= 'Tin'). For, while we may easily enough account for the forms *Tuma*, *Tama*, *Tamu*, *Timah*, as corruptions of the former, we cannot explain a good many others except by admitting an original base *Tamara*. We have, in fact, besides the *Tamarus Promontorium* alluded to above,¹ *Tumerau*

samnō is the prototype of either *Tuma* or *Tamara*. Many toponyms on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, and even on North Sumatra, are unmistakably Mōñ-derived; hence my conjectural etymology for *Be-Tūmah* = *Bī-T'mōh*. This is further supported by the fact that the ancient pronunciation of *Bī* seems to have been *Bē*, for Ptolemy spells with *Bη* all the toponyms on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula of which the Mōñ *Bī* forms the initial syllable; even to-day the sound of *ī* in *Bī* somewhat inclines towards a closed *ē*. It is not improbable that the old *Bη* or *Bē* still survives in the Straits and neighbouring islands under the somewhat modified form *Wē* (meaning 'water,' and perhaps 'rivulet'), which occurs in several toponyms, e.g. *Pulo Way*, etc.

¹ Or *Tamarum*, see Strabo, lib. xi, 7. It is the *Promontorium Samara* of the plainsphere of the fourteenth century in Hereford Cathedral, which bears at this point the explanation: "India quæ finem facit." Santarem has noticed ("Essai sur l'histoire de la Cosmographie," etc., t. ii, p. 343) that the change in nomenclature from *Tamos*, *Tamus*, or *Tamarum* into *Samara* took place on mediæval maps in the fifth century.

In this connection it is interesting to observe that, according to the Chinese annals of the Liang dynasty, during the first quarter of the third century A.D. *Fu-nan* (Kamboja) conquered a number of places on and about the southern part of the Malay Peninsula. Among such were:

(1) 歌營, *Ko-ying*, which I take to be *Krian* in Pêrak, nowadays denoted by the Chinese in the Straits as 高煙, *Kau-yen* or *Ko-yin* (see *Journal Str. Br. R.A.S.*, No. 42, p. 187); and

(2) 典孫, 典遜, or 頓遜, *Tien-sun* or *Tun-sun*, a State situated at over 3,000 *li* (circa 500-600 miles) from the southern borders of *Fu-nan*, and which therefore Sinologists have identified with Tenasserim! If not in name connected with *Tamsak* or *Tumasik*, this State, the territory of which is said to be only 1,000 *li* (say, 180-200 miles) in extent, and to project in a curviform direction into the sea, cannot have been far from it on the Malay peninsula. The chief city is said to have stood at 10 *li* (about two miles) from the sea, and to have been a great emporium—a gathering-place, in fact, for traders from east and west, just as Singapore is described afterwards by De Barros. The name recalls the Malay term *Dūsun*, meaning an 'orchard,' but also a 'village,' or the 'country' as distinguished from the town, and is common to several places on the Malay Peninsula, besides being applied to certain tribes in North Borneo calling themselves *Kadasan*.

Now, in view of the conquests of *Fu-nan* in the south of the Malay Peninsula, it is not altogether impossible that the name *Tamara* (= 'tin') of Singapore Island was changed into *Samnō*, the corresponding Khmēr word, whence the *Samara* of European cartographers was afterwards derived (in the fifth century or earlier). Of course, this is a mere suggestion; the change, if it ever occurred, did not last a long time locally, for the Arab navigators of the ninth century again employ the form *Tuma*. But among our geographers the variant *Samara* would naturally persist longer; and to this circumstance is perhaps due the fact

as a name to this day of the Old Strait (sometimes corrupted into *Tebrau*), and of a stream debouching in the same from the mainland on the north. There is furthermore a Negritic tribe named *Tumior*, dwelling at present far up the peninsula about the Pahang and Kelantan borders, which may have originally occupied Singapore Island, and been driven many centuries ago, as more recently the Kallang and Selitar tribes, thence to the mainland. Is it possible that the Tumiors got their name from Singapore Island, or else have we to assume that this was named after them, always supposing a connection to have existed between the two? I should think the former alternative the more probable, in view of the fact that most tribes on the Malay Peninsula derived their present designations from the names of the places, generally streams, on which they were originally settled. At all events, it seems to me more easy to admit the derivation of the terms *Tuma*, *Tama*, *Timah*, *Tumerao*, etc., from an original base *T'môh*, or something to that

that Marco Polo, when speaking of the petty State of *Samudra* on the north coast of Sumatra, spells the name *Samara*.

The Sanskrit inscription on the *Bân Thât* (Dhātu) stele near Bassac (Campāsak, Upper Kamboja), erected by the warlike king *Sūryavarman II* (A.D. 1112-1152 *circa*), and published by Professor Kern (*Annales de l'Extrême Orient*, t. iii, pp. 65-76), mentions an expedition undertaken by that famous potentate to the "Land of Elephants and Copper," *Dvipatāmra-dēśa*, by which "he eclipsed the glory of victorious Rāghava (Rāma)":—

"*So' yam prayāya Dvipatāmra-de[śam]
Raghuñ jayantam laghayanākāra*" (v. 35).

Professor Kern thinks the island of Ceylon is meant, which is not altogether unlikely in view of the allusion to Rāma's exploit in the above lines, and also of the fact that a few years afterwards (*circa* 1170-80) the Ceylon king Parakkama Bāhu sent a princess as a gift (or tribute?) to the ruler of Kamboja, the son or other successor of *Sūryavarman II* (cf. "Mahāvamsa," ch. 76, v. 35).

I would point out, nevertheless, that it is not impossible that Singapore Island be meant, in which case *Tāmra* should be taken as a *lapsus*, whether intentional or not, for *Tamara*. Singapore Island is much nearer to Kamboja than Ceylon, and has doubtless been at some time or other under Kambojan sway; whereas, in respect to Ceylon, no such expedition is recorded in local chronicles, and no such name as *Dvipatāmra*, the nearest one to it being *Tāmra-parṇi* or *Tamba-parṇi*, unless we take the term *Nāgadvipa*, applied to one portion of that island, to mean 'Elephant Isle' (or District; Ptolemy mentions, by the way, feeding-grounds for elephants on its territory).

I am, notwithstanding this, under the impression that the *Dvipatāmra-dēśa* of the inscription above cited may, after all, mean *Lān-c'hāng* ('Elephant plains'), i.e. Eastern Lāos, which, besides being the traditional land of elephants, is also that of copper.

effect, through its Sanskritized form *Tamara*, than to accept both this latter and *Timah* as the original designations applied to the island, for no tin ore has ever been known to exist either on it or on the mainland in its neighbourhood. The variant *Tebrau*, although somewhat resembling *Trapu* and *Tipu*, the Sanskrit and Pāli names for tin that have drifted into Siānese under the form *Dibuk*, can more easily be traced, it will be seen, to *Tumerau* and *Tamara*. And when one compares for a moment the spelling توماه (*Tūmah*), employed by Abū Zaid in his relation, with the Malay تيمه (*Timah*) occurring in the name of Būkit Timah, he can readily understand how easily the transformation may have taken place, whether in writing upon the introduction of Islāmism into the island, or, what is yet more probable, in speech long before that.

At all events, the forms *Tama* and *Tuma* must have survived until the fourteenth century, as evidenced by the *Tamasak* of the “*Şejarah Malāyu*,” the *Tumasik* of the “*Nāgarakretāgama*,” and still more conclusively by the Chinese map above referred to, which bears *Tan-ma-hsi* (*Tamasik*) marked on the very hill of Būkit Timah. The mixed character of this transcript—doubtless a combination of the old designation *Tama* with the new one *Timah* (represented by *hsi* or *sik* = ‘tin’), with the view of reproducing the then current designation *Tamasak* or *Tumasik*—well demonstrates how either of the forms *Tama* and *Timah* was then also in use.¹

I cannot say as regards the variant *Tamasak*—which may have originated not much earlier than the thirteenth century, and must in any case be far later in date than *Tama* and *Tamara* (for the Arab navigators in the ninth century still

¹ The “*Tung-hsi-yang-k’ao*” (publ. 1618) still mentions, as M. Pelliot observes (op. cit., p. 345, n. 4), the Strait of *Tan-ma-hsi*, 淡馬錫門 (*Tan-ma-hsi Mên*), as being passed by junks at that time. If this information is taken from old records, the Old Strait may be the one meant; but if gleaned from contemporary sources or accounts not earlier than the fourteenth century, the new passage would be intended, in which case the existence of the term *Tamasak* or *Tumasik* might be traceable to a yet more recent date than could be argued from the evidence we have examined above.

use the short form *Tūmah*)—whether its last syllable *sak* should be taken in the sense of *saka*, *saka* = ‘land,’ ‘country’ (in Khmēr *srok*), or whether it owes its existence to the fact of *Sekah* or *Sika* tribes from the neighbouring archipelago having settled on the island side by side with the aboriginal *Tumiors*, whom they may have driven off in due course to the mainland. It may have been instead Sakais from that very mainland who came and settled on the island, but this seems less likely. I do not think anyhow that the suffix *sak* is in any way connected with the 息 or 寔 (*Hsi*, *Sik*, or *Sit*) occurring in the present designation 息力, 息叻, or 寔叻 (*Hsi-li*, *Sik-lek*, or *Sit-lat*), applied by the Chinese to Singapore Island, for this appears to be simply a transcript of the Malay term *Selat* = a strait of the sea, the Straits in general.¹

Another question arises from the fact of Singapore Island being still mentioned in about 1380 and 1400, respectively, by the “*Nāgarakretāgama*” and the Chinese map alluded to above, under the old denomination of *Tumasik* or *Tamasak*; while there is no notice in either as to the city of Singapore. The question is: Did not Singapore exist as yet at that period?

If we are to believe the “*Sejarah Malāyu*,” it did, having been founded some ninety-three years before its conquest by the Javanese from *Mājapāhit*, which we know from Chinese sources to have occurred in or about 1377. Despite the fact that the chronicle of *Pāsei* does not include

¹ It is in the *Journal of the Straits Branch R.A.S.*, No. 42, p. 153, that I have noticed for the first time the use of the character 寔 instead of the one 息 that has so far obtained in Chinese publications.

In his study of an itinerary through the Straits recorded by Chia Tan in *circa* A.D. 785–805, M. Pelliot (op. cit., p. 231), following Chavannes, takes the Strait of 質, *Chih* (or *Chöt*, *Chit*), mentioned therein, to be the Strait of Malacca; but it appears to me that either the new Singapore passage or the Old Strait are more likely meant, in which case we would have in 質 a pretty old prototype of the present 息 and 寔; if not, possibly an evidence as to the existence, at such an early period, of the suffix *sik* or *sak* attached to the name of Singapore Island.

Singapore in its list of countries conquered by Mājavāhit, and that the "Nāgarakretāgama" merely mentions, in its far more extensive enumeration of such conquests, Singapore Island under its name of *Tumasik*, which is at the same time, with but little variation, the designation appearing shortly afterwards on the Chinese map already referred to, I think we might admit on the whole the trustworthiness of the time-honoured tradition handed down in the "Şejarah Malāyu" as to the existence on the island of some settlement—perhaps a mere hamlet—bearing the pompous classical name of *Simha-pura*.¹ The ruins of an ancient temple—Buddhist or Brahmanic (mayhap Śāivite)—noticed by Crawford on the hill behind the town on which now stands Fort Channing, argue the early presence on the island of immigrants from a country—whether the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, or Java—that had received Indū civilization; and that temple may have been the *pura* or *puri* that received the name of *Simha* ('lion') and caused the neighbouring village to be called therefrom *Simhapura*.² Such a designation was doubtless adopted either with a view to enhance the prestige of the foundation by naming it after an old city of India, or to perpetuate, as often occurred in many parts of Indo-China, the name of the founder, which may just have been *Simha*.

The account given in the "Şejarah Malāyu" is, of course, far more ornate and glowing, quite in the style that suits native fancy; but when shorn of its embellishments it presents nothing that would appear to conflict with historical truth. It may be summarized as follows.

¹ Or, as some Malay scholars would have it, the Malay name of *Singah-pura*, meaning 'a place of call,' from *سنگاه*, *singah*, 'to visit,' 'to call in.' But this term is certainly not Malay: cf. *singhātaka* = a market-place, in "Questions of King Milinda," Sacred Books of the East, xxxv, pp. 2, 53, and xxxvi, p. 279, n. 1. I should think, moreover, that *Simha-pura* is the really correct form of the toponym. The derivation given in "Hobson-Jobson" (2nd ed., p. 839), from *singah* + *pura-pura*, is inadmissible.

² Remains of an earthen wall and other relics were also discovered, including an inscription in characters resembling those of ancient Java, on a rock since blown to pieces.

Nila Uttama, the son of a chief from Palembang who became afterwards the ruler of Menang-kabau State in Central Sumatra, came to the island of Bintang near the eastern entrance to the Singapore Strait, where a queen was reigning—probably at some village on Bintang Bay, northward of the present Rhio (Riau), on the south-western part of the island. This queen had some time before been visited by his father—when her husband was absent, having gone to Siām and left her to govern in his stead.¹ It was evidently on account of the friendly relations thus established between the queen and the father of Nila Uttama that the latter called in at the island, his visit resulting shortly afterwards in his marriage with the queen's daughter.

From Bintang, Nila Uttama went to Tanjung Bemban, which I have identified with Tanjung Bemban, Bumban, or Bombang, forming the north-eastern end of the neighbouring island of Batang. There, chasing a deer, he reached a rock of great height and size, which he climbed and obtained a view of the opposite shore (i.e. the south-eastern coast of Singapore Island) with its sands white as cotton. Inquiring what land that was, he was informed that those were the sands of the extensive country of *Tamasak*.

Longing to visit them, Nila Uttama crossed thereto on his ship, and went to disport himself on a plain near the mouth of the river *Tamasak* (Singapore River). Here he saw a lion (!) ; hence he named the country *Tamasak-Singhapura* (Simha-pura), and settled there, receiving the title of Śri-Tribhuvana.

If the last statement is correct, it would explain the reason why the foreign records alluded to above merely referred to Singapore, after the foundation of the settlement, as *Tamasak* or *Tumasik*. This was a shortened form of *Tamasak-Singhapura*, while being at the same time the traditional name of the island, which would, as a matter of course,

¹ This I take to be a veiled hint to the fact that the king of Bintang had probably been taken prisoner to Siām, whence he appears never to have returned. At all events, he must have gone to Siām in order to pay homage, or to arrange matters that the interference of that country had made somewhat critical for him.

linger for a long while in the memory of neighbouring nations before these condescended to recognize the novel denomination Simhapura and eventually adopt it as the only name of the island.

As regards the date at which the events summarized above occurred, we can obtain it roughly by deducting the 93 years believed by native chroniclers to have elapsed between the foundation of Singapore city and the conquest of the island by the armies from Mājavāhit. As we positively know this to have taken place in or about 1377, we obtain $1377-93 = 1284$.

Now, remembering that the Sukhōthai expeditions against foreign invaders in the south of the Malay Peninsula began in 1279-80; that by 1295 the State of Malāyu, corresponding roughly to the territory of the present Johore, had been reduced; and that the punitive expedition against Pāsei, which probably included also a settlement of outstanding differences with Bintang, took place some time between 1300 and 1320, we see no reason for seriously disputing the above date. It is apparently correct within, at the utmost, forty years, in the event of our deciding to place the foundation of the city after the Siānese expedition against Pāsei. But it is not improbable that the settlement had been founded by the time matters were squared up with Malāyu on the neighbouring mainland, or was established shortly afterwards under the ægis and with the connivance of that State.

Marco Polo, who went through the Old Strait in 1292, does not mention Singapore; neither does Friar Odoric, who travelled the same way in 1317 or thereabouts. Of course, neither had reason to tarry at that harbour, which was somewhat out of the way for ships at that period. But both mention the island called *Pentam* and *Paten*, or *Panthen*, respectively, as being part of the kingdom of *Malaiur* (Malāyu).¹ Although, as I have remarked before, there

¹ Friar Odoric has *Malamasmi* in Ramusio ("Navigationi et Viaggi," vol. ii, 1583, fol. 247 verso), which may be compared to the *Malanir*, *Malavir*, and similar *varia lectiones* in the texts of Marco Polo.

exists to this day a village *Bentam* on the mainland side of Singapore Strait,¹ it is not likely that both travellers mistook the coast of the Malay Peninsula for an island. This island of *Pentam*, *Paten*, or *Pantem* must therefore be the *Be-Tumah* (Island) of the Arab navigators, the *Tamasak* Island of the Malays; and, in short, the Singapore Island of our day. If the commentators of Marco Polo and Friar Odoric have signally failed to discover this, it is not certainly the fault of their texts, which are tolerably clear, and, it is hoped, may now appear the more so, in the light of our explanations, to everyone.²

Singapura, both as a city and the name of a channel through which all the shipping of those parts passed, is, it should be noted, mentioned since the second decade of the

¹ Right opposite the mouth of the Sungei Selitar, on the northern shore of Singapore Island.

² Colonel Yule's genius, which has elucidated so much of Marco Polo's text, seems to have grown dim in the course of his treatment of the Venetian traveller's route in the southern seas (especially for the portion comprised between the south borders of China and the north coast of Sumatra, which I consider the least satisfactory portion of that monumental work). Nor has Cordier, who, in my opinion, misunderstood that part also of Friar Odoric's itinerary, succeeded in throwing any further light on the subject in his recent edition of Yule's "Marco Polo." Both scholars have been misled by De Barros' and Valentijn's mention of a river *Malāyu* in the interior of Palembang, which these writers believed to have been the cradle of the Malay race; as well as by those Sinologists who located I-tsing's *Mo-lo-yu* (lying, according to this author, at *fifteen days' sail* from Palembang) in the valley of that very stream *Malāyu* in the interior of the country, or else in all sorts of other impossible places which have naturally been adopted also as the site for the *Ma-li-yü-êrh* of later Chinese historians.

I have neither space nor leisure to go here into Marco Polo's and Friar Odoric's itineraries in the Southern Seas, and must accordingly defer the treatment of them to another occasion. All I can add for the present is this:—

1. Marco Polo's channel, where "there is but four paces' depth of water," so that great ships, in passing it, "have to lift their rudders" (Yule's "Marco Polo," 3rd ed., vol. ii, p. 280), is unmistakably the OLD SINGAPORE STRAIT. There is no channel so shallow throughout all those parts except among reefs.

2. The island of *Pentam* cannot be either Batang or Bitang, the latter of which is likewise mentioned by Marco Polo under the same name of *Pentam*, but $60 + 30 = 90$ miles before reaching the former. Batang, girt all round by dangerous reefs, is inaccessible except to small boats. So is Bintang, with the exception of its south-western side, where is now Riâu, and where, a little further towards the north, was the settlement, as we have seen, at which the chief of the island resided in the fourteenth century. There was no reason for Marco Polo's junk to take that roundabout way in order to call at such, doubtlessly insignificant place. And the channel (i.e. Rhio Strait) has far more than four paces' depth of water, whereas there are no more than two fathoms at the western entrance to the Old Singapore Strait.

sixteenth century in D'Albuquerque's "Commentarios"; and shortly afterwards in De Barros' "Decadas." *Cingapura* is said to have been a celebrated settlement, to which "flocked together all the navigators of the Seas of India from West and East." If, in 1819, Sir Stamford Raffles and his party, on landing upon the island, found it covered with primeval forest, with the exception of a single village of poor and predatory Malay fishermen, and that only formed in 1811, this is not sufficient reason for denying that the island had seen better days. For the same fate has befallen far more important places in Further India; and in a region where cities have been, until comparatively modern times, mere agglomerations of wooden (mostly bamboo) and thatch-covered shanties, with the exception of some substantial buildings devoted to worship or to princely residence, one cannot expect to find many remains after their disappearance from the scene of the world's history.

To sum up, the inferences that can be drawn from the data discussed above are—

(1) That the ancient name of Singapore Island was very probably *T'môh*, afterwards Sanskritized into *Tamara*.

(2) That both these forms can be traced as far back as the dawn of the Christian Era in the name of the *Tamos* or *Tamarum Promontorium*, corresponding to the *Ponta de Cincapura* of the early Portuguese navigators.¹

(3) That the island or its river—if not the Old Strait between it and the mainland—is recorded as *Bē-Tūmah* in the accounts of the Arab navigators of the ninth century.

(4) That the name of the island (and of its Old Strait) was some time afterwards modified into *Tamasak* or *Tumasik*, in which form it can be traced from the second half of the thirteenth to the end of the sixteenth century; while it survives to this day in *Būkit Timah*, the most conspicuous hill extant on the island near its centre.

¹ See also "*Cingaporla*, che è il capo," as well as a city, in Pigafetta, 1522. (Ramusio, op. cit., vol. i, ed. 1563, f. 369 *recto*).

(5) That the island belonged during the thirteenth and following centuries to the State of *Malāyu* on the opposite mainland at first, and then to its historical continuations Malacca (*circa* 1380–1511) and Johore (1511–1819).

(6) That under the ægis and with the connivance of the chiefs of *Malāyu* and probably also the ultimate sanction of Siām, immigrants from Sumatra founded on the island the settlement of *Sinhapura* at some time between 1280 and 1320; the date 1284 resulting from local traditions being not altogether to be rejected as incorrect.

(7) That the settlement in question, if already existing in Marco Polo's and Friar Odoric's time (1292 and 1317 *circa*), was not mentioned by them, owing no doubt to its as yet trifling importance, and to their having passed through the Old Strait somewhat out of the way of it, where their attention was instead attracted by the capital of the State of *Malāyu* (of which the island was a dependency at that period), at which both travellers called.

(8) That nevertheless the island has been duly noticed and mentioned by both of them under the names, respectively, of *Pentam* and *Paten* (or *Panthen*), which appear to be survivals of the ancient *Bē-Tūmah*.

These are, in brief, the considerations suggested to me by the few toponyms examined above from the “*Nāgarakretā-gama*.” When the full topographic list of that poem lies before me, it may give occasion for further comments. Meanwhile I trust I have made clear in these pages the importance of that work for the historical geography of Further India; and cannot more fitly conclude than by heartily joining in expressing the hope that its editor, Dr. Brandes, may consent to carry out the suggestion already made from various quarters, of giving us a translation of the poem, supplemented by whatever subsidiary information can be drawn from Javanese epigraphy and other records of that island, not so easily accessible to students in other countries.