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Students of Burmese in the English speaking world have been blessed with a new Burmese-English dictionary: The Universal Burmese-English-Pali Dictionary by U Hoke Sein (for details see References below). The preface reveals that we nearly missed it. The author's intention was to write a Burmese-Pali dictionary, a sequel to his Pali-Burmese dictionary, but the Anī-saṅkāṅ Hsaya-daw (long may he flourish) seems to have provided the stimulus that led U Hoke Sein (HS) to insert an English gloss between the Burmese entry and the Pali equivalent (p.1066). The result is the present Burmese-English-Pali dictionary. Its author is a distinguished lawyer, and the dictionary took him 30 years to compile (p.1066). For its last seven years he worked at it full time (p.1066).

Sources
HS lists his sources clearly in the preface. The nucleus of his work was a reverse dictionary made by turning his own four volume Pali-Burmese dictionary back to front. He enlarged it using material from Judson, porāṇa collections, works on literature, officially authorized wordlists from various academic subject areas, U Wun's incomplete Burmese-Burmese dictionary, spelling books, and published government regulations.

Size
A rough and ready method of estimating yields a total of around 68,000 entries, which puts HS's dictionary among the most ambitious Burmese dictionaries ever attempted, let alone completed (for a list of the largest see my review of Bernot).

However, this figure is partially misleading. A large number of entries would be considered redundant by many people's standards. See for example the set of entries (p. 4)

- kacā:mrū:tū:še* disports
- kacā:mrū:tū:khraṅ': a disport [sic]
- kacā:mrū:tū:lu:i:so
  'lakroṅ':kroṅ'. for the sake of sport

Or again (p.715)
- rhaṅṅī:e* becomes long
- rhaṅṅī:i:le* becomes long
- rhaṅṅī:i:saṅṅī' lengthened
- rhaṅṅī:i:wai:saṅṅī' too long
- rhaṅṅī'i:saṅṅī' long

In both cases (and numerous others throughout the volume), given an explanation of the first word in the set, the meaning of subsequent entries is readily deducible and
they would for that reason be excluded from many dictionaries. They are collocations rather than compounds. Presumably their inclusion in this dictionary is an inevitable outcome of its former incarnation as a Pali-English dictionary: no doubt it was useful to have separate translations for the Pali nouns and verbs and compounds. This must also be the explanation for the inclusion of such unlikely entries as

\[
\text{nhača}'\text{p}ə\text{s}ə\text{lakr}ə\text{h}: \text{rhisã}\text{m}i\text{n} \quad \text{twice conditioned}
\]
\[
\text{nhača}'\text{thon}\text{'i} \text{thw}ə \text{\l}\text{atui}n\text{'i} \text{arhãn}n\text{'i} \text{rhisã}\text{m}i\text{n} \quad \text{measuring 2 & 1/3 cubits}
\]
\[
\text{ńwekhye}'\text{cãšũ}n\text{e} \text{m}â\text{n}n\text{h} \quad \text{the wife of a usurer}
\]

This feature means that for use in comparison with other dictionaries the figure for the number of entries should be reduced by an unknown but significant factor.

**Coverage**

Coverage seems to be strong in many areas. Dipping into the volume at random one sees many terms from justice, administration and government, as one would expect, and numerous names of flora and fauna in addition to core vocabulary words.

Notable absences are the names of ethnic groups such as Kachin, Kadu, Shan, etc. Even Tarup 'Chinese' gets no entry on its own, though Kula 'Indian' is included. Grammatical suffixes are also often omitted. There are no entries for example for -ka 'from, subject, past time, if', -kataññi:ka 'ever since', -lhyañ 'per' though lhyañ 'if' is there, -mñas 'at, subject'. Omissions in these areas are probably matters of deliberate policy.

Other omissions are less susceptible to explanation. HS states that he made use of U Wun's dictionary, but he omits for example entries for

- katañ ('part of a horse')
- katañ ('a domino')
- kati peː ('promise')
- katok'sap ('a plant')

and many others which find a place in U Wun's work. It is not easy to see why these words should have been omitted.

HS's coverage of recent officialese, vogue words and ideological terms is erratic. Some are included and some are not. For example, he includes the following:

\[
\text{kwačk}'\text{r}ə\text{c}ə\text{c}e\text{ch}ə\text{kh}ən\text{h}: \quad \text{spot check}
\]
\[
\text{kwač}'\text{ch}ə\text{h}ə\text{lup}'\text{n}ən\text{h}: \quad \text{field work}
\]
\[
\text{añi}nɪ\text{mängi}n\text{h}\text{a} \quad \text{system of correlation}
\]
\[
\text{cän}n\text{h}: \text{ruh}ə\text{r}: \quad \text{organization}
\]
\[
\text{ñiñi}wən\text{cr}ə\text{re}mən\text{h}: \quad \text{director}
\]
\[
\text{tuin}n\text{'r}:\text{r}ən\text{'o}n\text{'i} \quad \text{native}
\]
\[
\text{luθuθuθ}ən\text{cãm}lə\text{ph}wai. \quad \text{mass and class organizations}
\]
\[
\text{apra}n'\text{j}ən\text{h}: \quad \text{open market}
\]

But the following are not to be found:

- kedã
- kañ' sat'kun'
- kan'lwátkun'
- lup'ãn: peːː
- cetanññhãn'

- cadre
- state controlled goods
- uncontrolled goods
- contribute voluntary labour
- well wisher
Likewise the words current in international news reports. HS has these:

- phwañ.phrui:chait nuinët'han' developing country
- ñwepe:ñweyirhañ'tam': balance of payments
- thip'sicwe:ñwepwai summit conference
- prok'kyë:cac'sič: guerilla

but not these:

- dukkha sāññ: refugee
- lakram:phak'wilda terrorism
- lip'khaitalë:lën:sakhlanei impasse
- lañëlësakhlanei:han' major power

Terms from science and technology are similarly served. We find these:

- tachësāññ: diastase
- taniññhrim'pwat'sič: static friction [unfortunately printed as 'statistical friction']
- ganjan'twak'cak': calculator
- lapuipeccāññ: spare parts
- reisumāññ:helüp'han': hydroelectric works

but not:

- duñpqamkwañ:duñpqamant antimissile missile
- muiñipañnpoñ: gas filled balloon
- sākñsalwāñ:pyamkutui.yāñ: space shuttle
- lapumrūññ:poñ:phui nuclear reactor

I also found that a number of HS's scientific terms did not correspond precisely with those given in the authoritative Panñiṣrap' wohñramyāñ:..

**Accuracy**

Most entries are given a simple one-word English gloss. At first sight this looks bare and unhelpful: what of all the other meanings? The answer is that many of them are covered by HS's glosses for the compounds of the simple word. For example chuit (entered as chuiñsaññ) gets its one-word gloss 'bad'; but the compounds give a less terse idea of the semantic range of chuit. We find compounds with glosses like:

- pernicious
- foully impure
- base
- malign
- depraved
- scurrilous
- profligate
- vile
- evil

One cannot of course guarantee that the meanings of the compounds are all valid for the simple verb, but they do help to round out the bare one-word gloss.

This method of presentation certainly saves space, but it is not a convenient one for the user. Under kok, for example, which is a word with two or three homonyms, there are over 120 compounds to wade through.

Given this restriction — i.e. that one-word (or two-word) glosses do not tell the
whole story - the meanings given seemed to me to be quite satisfactory on the whole. I say this with some reserve because there were a few examples that weakened my confidence. For example, for kakhya 'kakhyat' HS has 'flippantly' where Judson has 'in a manner bungling and laughable'; and the Mra'ma 'abhidham' !akya!khyup' (henceforth MA) has 'wrong' (with an example about errors in text inscribed on stone) and 'superficial'. Further, consider the following divergences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS gloss</th>
<th>MA gloss (translated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kat\karam'</td>
<td>obscurely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaywat\kayui</td>
<td>unevenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalin\kalak'</td>
<td>unsteadily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My suspicion is that MA is right and HS is wrong in most of these cases, possibly all.

In other examples I think HS's one-word gloss is misleading. For kapok\karok' for example he has 'thoughtless'. This would be acceptable if taken in the sense of 'taking what comes to hand, going where the whim leads, having no system or objective'; but that is unlikely to be the first meaning of 'thoughtless' that comes to mind. A similar example is kalekakhye, for which HS's gloss 'at one's own will' would only be reasonable if one knew that it meant 'living a life according to one's own will', i.e. wandering about, without a regular home, occupation or relationships. More generous glossing would have saved some misunderstanding in such cases.

Arrangement of entries

The system of alphabetical order currently preferred in Burma is what one might call the 'spelling book' (sat\puñkyam') system, as used in MA. In this system closed syllables are listed separately from open syllables, and ordered first by final consonant and only then by vowel. This approach has been followed by the compilers of the Burmese-Russian, Burmese-Chinese, and Burmese-French dictionaries; but HS remains unmoved by current fashion and uses a system close to that of the Pali dictionaries, as one would expect of a Pali scholar of his standing. This makes his system similar to Judson's, and it will therefore be easy to operate for those familiar with the Judson dictionary.

My personal preference is for the Judson type system. The spelling book system seems to me to have several irritating defects; but there will no doubt be many who find HS's arrangement a drawback.

The Pali Component

Each entry contains a Pali equivalent for the Burmese entryword in addition to the English gloss. In nearly all cases there is a Sanskrit form as well, in square brackets, and a note of the gender in round brackets; e.g.

\text{lhwa a saw kakaca [krakaca] (puñ)}

I cannot tell how accurate the Pali equivalents are. I can only express astonishment and admiration for the way in which HS has found, or created - apparently without undue effort - Pali equivalents for such terms as:

- short circuit, United Kingdom, enzyme
- electrode, freshman (at university), Covenanted Assistant Commissioner
- tungsten, broadcasting station

also numerous varieties of fauna and flora, and many more items that can play no part in the Pīṭaka or its commentaries.