

East and West; to this great city of Singapura all flocked as to a general market." (Dec. II. 6, 1.) This suits the description in our text well; but as Singapura was in sight of any ship passing through the straits, mistake could hardly occur as to its position, even if it had not been visited.

I omit *Malacca* entirely from consideration, because the evidence appears to me conclusive against the existence of Malacca at this time.

The Malay Chronology, as published by Valentyn, ascribes the foundation of that city to a king called Iskandar Shah, placing it in A.D. 1252, fixes the reign of Mahomed Shah, the third King of Malacca and first Mussulman King, as extending from 1276 to 1333 (not stating *when* his conversion took place), and gives 8 kings in all between the foundation of the city and its capture by the Portuguese in 1511, a space, according to those data, of 259 years. As Sri Iskandar Shah, the founder, had reigned 3 years in Singapura *before* founding Malacca, and Mahomed Shah, the loser, reigned 2 years in Johore *after* the loss of his capital, we have 264 years to divide among 8 kings, giving 33 years to each reign. This certainly indicates that the period requires considerable curtailment.

Again, both De Barros and the Commentaries of Albuquerque ascribe the foundation of Malacca to a Javanese fugitive from Palembang called Paramisura, and Albuquerque makes Iskandar Shah (*Xaquem darxa*) the son of Paramisura, and the first convert to Mahomedanism. *Four* other kings reign in succession after him, the last of the four being Mahomed Shah, expelled in 1511.

[Godinho de Eredia says expressly (Cap. i. *Do Citio Malaca*, p. 4) that Malacca was founded by *Permicuri*, *primeiro monarcha de Malayos*, in the year 1411, in the Pontificate of John XXIV., and in the reign of Don Juan II. of Castille and Dom Juan I. of Portugal.]

The historian De Couto, whilst giving the same number of reigns from the conversion to the capture, places the former event about 1384. And the Commentaries of Albuquerque allow no more than some ninety years from the foundation of Malacca to his capture of the city.

There is another approximate check to the chronology afforded by a Chinese record in the XIVth volume of Amyot's collection. This informs us that Malacca first acknowledged itself as tributary to the Empire in 1405, the king being *Sili-ju-eul-sula* (?). In 1411 the King of Malacca himself, now called *Peilimisula* (Paramisura), came in person to the court of China to render homage. And in 1414 the Queen-Mother of Malacca came to court, bringing her son's tribute.

Now this notable fact of the visit of a King of Malacca to the court of China, and his acknowledgment of the Emperor's supremacy, is also recorded in the Commentaries of Albuquerque. This work, it is true, attributes the visit, not to Paramisura, the founder of Malacca, but to his son and successor Iskandar Shah. This may be a question of a *title* only, perhaps borne by both; but we seem entitled to conclude with confidence that Malacca was founded by a prince whose son was reigning, and visited the court of China in 1411. And the real chronology will be about midway between the estimates of De Couto and of Albuquerque. Hence Malacca did not exist for a century, more or less, after Polo's voyage.

[Mr. C. O. Blagden, in a paper on the Mediæval Chronology of Malacca (*Actes du XI^e Cong. Int. Orient. Paris*, 1897), writes (p. 249) that "if Malacca had been in the middle of the 14th century anything like the great emporium of trade which it certainly was in the 15th, Ibn Batuta would scarcely have failed to speak of it." The foundation of Malacca by Sri Iskandar Shah in 1252, according to the *Sejarah Malayu* "must be put at least 125 years later, and the establishment of the Muhammadan religion there would then precede by only a few years the end of the 14th century, instead of taking place about the end of the 13th, as is generally supposed" (p. 251). (Cf. *G. Schlegel, Geog. Notes*, XV.)—H. C.]

Mr. Logan supposes that the form *Malayu-r* may indicate that the Malay language of the 13th century "had not yet replaced the strong naso-guttural terminals by pure vowels." We find the same form in a contemporary Chinese