Fernão Mendes Pinto. *The Travels of Mendes Pinto*, edited and translated by Rebecca D. Catz. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. Pp. xlvi, 663. Introduction, notes, glossaries, gazetteer, maps, plates, bibliography, index.

Publ: Michael Vickery, *The Travels of Mendes Pinto*, edited and translated by Rebecca D. Catz, in *Asian Studies Review* (Australia),Volume 14, Number 3 (April 1991), pp. 251-253.

The Travels of Mendes Pinto has been little used by historians of Southeast Asia because so many of the toponyms and local titles cited by Pinto were unfathomable, seemingly fantastic; but it is on Southeast Asia that Pinto's historical value stands or falls, for he probably never visited the interior of China (p. xxxv). This is not a matter of great concern to Rebecca D. Catz, the latest translator, who seems little interested in Asian history, and who considers the value of Pinto's work to be in its contribution to European studies (xv-xxviii, xxxix-xlii).

Although Ms. Catz has offered explanations for most of Pinto's exotic terminology, her methods have not gone beyond Hobson-Jobson adhocery, the results are too often wrong, and nothing may be taken on faith.

The first key to interpreting Pinto's Southeast Asian vocabulary is to recognize that his *lingua franca* was Mon, not surprising for someone arriving in Pegu during the period of Mon ascendancy in the 16th century, and many of the unusual names and titles may be explained via that language. There are also terms from other languages, sometimes used inappropriately, as the European rendering (*barcalo*) of the Khmer-based Ayutthayan ministerial title *braḥ glaṅ*/prah khlang/ (not *boromo-kromo*, page 636) applied to officials in China (214, 216), and the Malay *sembahyang* (Pinto's *zumbaia*) in his description of a ceremony in the northern Thai-Lao area (369).

That Ms. Catz did not recognize the Mon element is seen in her explanation of the Mon word for king, Pinto's *xemim* (*smim/smiṅ*) [394], as a "Burmese honorific" (623), and in her assimilation of the Mon royal title *bainhß* (*bañā*) [258] to the Burmese *bayin* (also *bureng*), which is also distinct from *binnya*, an alternative transcription of *bañā* (602).[1] Ms. Catz strays even farther in treating *caubainhß* (*cau bañā*), in which Thai *cau* 'prince' is combined with Mon *bañā*, as meaning 'Lord of Wisdom' (598, 637).

Further evidence for Mon is *Calaminham*, which Pinto (p. 337) said meant "'lord of the world, for in their language *cala* means 'lord'...", as indeed it does in

[1]. Page numbers in square brackets refer to the entries for those terms in H.L. Shorto, *A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions from the Sixth to the Sixteenth Centuries*, London, Oxford University Press, 1971.

Mon [172] (see also ch. 158, n.2). The older form, *tala*, also appears in *talapoi*, 'our lord' (a monk) (317), and in *talagrepo* (149), which Ms. Catz recognized as a Buddhist monk, but was unable to explain. In fact it is probably *tala* plus Mon *grep* 'forest' [86], as is clear from Pinto's rendition of a letter from the 'Burmese' king (i.e. Bayinnaung who used Mon), in which we find reference to "the saintliest *menigrepo* in the forest" (437). *Talagrepo* is thus 'forest monk', and *menigrepo* is possibly *muni* of the forest. At least, the explanations on p.573 are certainly wrong.

Another term for monk, *guimo* (368, 612), listed after *bicos* (*bhikku*), *menigrepos*, and *talagrepos*, probably reflects the Mon *gum'ir, gam'i* [79].[2]

'*Quiay*', used by Pinto for all idols and temples, most of which appear in his accounts of Burma and Siam, is Mon *kyāk*, (modern /caik/), 'sacred being or thing' [59]. The names of most of the *kyāk*, however, remain impenetrable. Only *Quiay Mitreu* (411) may be identified with some certainty as Maitreya, the future Buddha. 'Quiay' also occurs a few times in Chinese personal names, where it must represent something else, but in all cases Catz's reference to Malay *kiai* (544) is to be rejected. Neither may *quiay* be construed as Thai *chao/cau* (612).

The rendition of *kyāk* as *quiay* by Pinto shows he did not perceive the unreleased final stop, a type of sound occurring throughout Southeast Asian languages. This clue permits the correct interpretation of *jau*, which is not "From the Malay *jauh*" (644), impossible in any of the contexts (74, 186), but is the Thai and Khmer *yauj* (Sanskrit *yojana*), with unreleased final palatal, a measure of distance equivalent to 16 km just as Pinto says in one instance (74, 644, 3 leagues=9.6 miles). Pinto's spelling with *j* accurately transcribes the slight voiced fricative onset of *y* as it occurs in some Southeast Asian languages.

An error due to carelessness is the identification of *Savady* with Sandoway on the coast of Arakan (564, 602, 613). The name appears frequently in the Ayutthayan chronicle accounts of conflicts with Burma in the 16th century, and historians have recognized it as Tharawaddy, a district in central Burma between Rangoon and Prome (modern Burmese *th*, pronounced as in English, is historically /s/). Even a casual glance at a map should have hinted to Ms. Catz that a place described by Pinto as northeast (in fact northwest) of Pegu (378) must be within central Burma. The error is compounded in ch. 149, n. 12 where *Savadis* are "people of Sandoway...called...Hongsavadi by the Siamese, and Hanthawaddy by the Peguans"; but Hongsavadi/Hanthawaddy was Pegu.

More linguistic confusion is in, "Siamese *Xieng* is *Thieng* in Burmese, since the initial letters *x* and *s* are pronounced like *t*"; and thus Pinto's *Timplo* should be a

---

[2]. The open final vowel of Pinto's term seems to reflect the modern spoken Mon reflex of *gum'ir*, *həmɔe*, evidence of a transitional period in the language in the 16th century.

"Burmese corruption of *Xieng Luang*...'big city'", in this context Luang Prabang (606). The errors here are multiple. *X* represents a phoneme which is pronounced /s/ in northern Thai, Lao, and Shan, but /ch/ in Bangkok, and is written with Thai *cho chang* (ช). In Burmese the modern phoneme /th/ corresponds to general Thai, Shan, Lao, etc. /s/ (written *so söa* (ส), not to the /s, ch/ phoneme transcribed, for northern Thai, by *x*. Burmese writers regularly transcribed Chiang/Xiang Mai as Zimmé, as Ms. Catz notes on p. 602, using the Burmese graph corresponding to Thai *cho chang*, and their name for the kingdom of Laos centered in Luang Prabang was 'Linzin', that is Lan Xang/Chang. The statement on p. 607, that "*Tinlau* or *Tinleu*...in the Burmese transcription would represent Xieng Lau or Xieng Leu" (Lao), is utter fantasy, although it might represent /din Lao/, 'Lao land' in Thai.

The entire story in which these details appear, and in particular the name 'Calaminham', possibly representing *kala + mbuiwña, muiwña* (Mohnyin [302]), should be dissociated from Laos and treated as an episode which Pinto wrote from hearsay rather than personal experience.

Perhaps in the end Pinto will be seen to contribute little that is new to the history of Southeast Asia, but before that decision is made a 'Guide to Pinto for Southeast Asianists', with detailed linguistic attention to his terminology, is still required. At least Ms. Catz, with her careful translation, copious notes, and lists of exotic terminology, has provided a text on which it may be attempted.