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 An̂-sahkàn 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.1a). 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.1a).

**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, parāṇa 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:mru:túe* disports
- kacā:mru:tū:khrān': a disport [sic]
- kacā:mru:tū:luiso 'lakron':sakron'. for the sake of sport

Or again (p.715)

- rhaṁñei* becomes long
- rhaṁñei'saṁñīi becomes long
- rhaṁñei'lsaññī lengthened
- rhaṁñei'lan:saññī too long
- rhaṁñei'lsaññī 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

\[\text{eac'pasolakon': rhisa\text{'n}}\quad\text{twice conditioned}\]
\[\text{eac'thon': thwa \text{'latu\text{'n}: arha\text{'n}}\ rhisa\text{'n}}\quad\text{measuring 2 & 1/3 cubits}\]
\[\text{nyekhye\text{'cassue': maya}\quad\text{the wife of a usurer}\]

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', -kata\text{'n}:ka 'ever since', -lyan 'per' though lyan 'if' is there, -mha\text{'n} '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 Win's dictionary, but he omits for example entries for

\[\text{kat\text{'n}}\quad\text{(part of a horse)}\]
\[\text{kata\text{'n}}\quad\text{(a domino)}\]
\[\text{kati pe:} \quad\text{promise}\]
\[\text{katok\text{'sap} \quad\text{(a plant)}\]

and many others which find a place in U Win'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:

\[\text{kwak\text{'kra': cac\text{'che:khra\text{'n}}:} \quad\text{spot check}\]
\[\text{kwa\text{'n}: chat\text{'n}: lup\text{'n}:} \quad\text{field work}\]
\[\text{la\text{'n}:ma\text{'n}:} \quad\text{system of correlation}\]
\[\text{ca\text{'n}: ru\text{'n}:re:} \quad\text{organization}\]
\[\text{ga\text{'n}: wa\text{'n}:re: mhu\text{'n}:} \quad\text{director}\]
\[\text{tu\text{'n}: ra\text{'n}:\text{'r}i:} \quad\text{native}\]
\[\text{lu\text{'thui\text{'n}: ca\text{'laphwai}.} \quad\text{mass and class organizations}\]
\[\text{lap\text{'n}:jhe:} \quad\text{open market}\]

But the following are not to be found:

\[\text{keda} \quad\text{cadre}\]
\[\text{ka\text{'n}: sat\text{'kun}' \quad\text{state controlled goods}\]
\[\text{kun\text{'l}: wat\text{'kun}' \quad\text{uncontrolled goods}\]
\[\text{lup\text{'n}: pe:} \quad\text{contribute voluntary labour}\]
\[\text{cetan\text{'n}:arha\text{'n}'} \quad\text{well wisher}\]
Likewise the words current in international news reports. HS has these:

- phwañ.phrui:chai nuiñ'han' (developing country)
- ēwepe:hwey'irhañ':tam' (balance of payments)
- thip'chwenwe:phwai (summit conference)
- prok'kyë: cac'siñ' (guerilla)

But not these:

- dukkaña saññi (refugee)
- lakram:phak'wida (terrorism)
- lip'khañañi:lan':lakhrelanei (impasse)
- lal'êkënduññi:ñan' (major power)

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

- tacheñiñi' (diastase)
- tanñiñërim' phwat'ni (static friction [unfortunately printed as 'statistical friction'])
- gañañ:tawak'cak (calculator)
- lapuipeccañiñiñi (spare parts)
- reñiñuñ:ñiñ:ñiñ: slup'ñan' (hydroelectric works)

But not:

- duñ'pyam'skwahñi:duñ'pyam (antimissile missile)
- muiñ'pyam:poñ (gas filled balloon)
- ëkëñsalwan'pyam'kutui.yañi (space shuttle)
- lapumruññiñ:poñ'phuï (nuclear reactor)

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

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 chuiñ: (entered as chuiñ:saññiñi) gets its one-word gloss 'bad'; but the compounds give a less terse idea of the semantic range of chuiñ. We find compounds with glosses like:

- pernicious
- foully impure
- base
- malign
- depraved

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 kokñ, 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 kakhyo 'kakhwat' HS has 'flippantly' where Judson has 'in a manner bungling and laughable'; and the Mran'ma 'abhidhān' 'akyān'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>katikaram':</td>
<td>obscurely confused, deranged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaywat'kayui</td>
<td>unevenly wrong, superficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalin'kalak'</td>
<td>unsteadily uncouth, rude</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 kalekahye, 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' (saptumkyam':) 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.

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

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

It is a pity that the Burmese words are given no indication of pronunciation. The written word is unfortunately an unreliable guide, most of all in matters of weakening and voicing, e.g. თაშე: pronounced /tâkâ/, not /tän-kâ/.

It would have been helpful to have entries under some of the more widely used variant spellings with a cross reference to the spelling selected as the norm. HS normally gives an entry in only one spelling, so if it is not there in the spelling you know, you have to hunt around trying out other possibilities: e.g. there is no entry for the common spelling ძა: 'knife', and no indication that you will find what you want under ძა: - though (to give credit where it is due) there is an entry under ძჳ: saying 'see ძჳ'.

There are however a few cases in which both members of a pair of alternative spellings are listed and glossed, together with some of their compounds; see e.g. the entries under კათჳ and its compounds (p.5) compared with those under კათჳ (p.7); or კალჳ and compounds compared with კალ and its compounds (p.4f). This is wasteful, and in fact unhelpful, because not all compounds are listed under each spelling. The user finding ღჩჳ 'is entangled' and no compounds would probably assume that the dictionary had no entry for ღჩჳ, ღუბჳ, ღქია etc; how is he to know that all these are listed under the spelling ღი? An entry saying ღჳ see ღი would have avoided this difficulty.

There are occasional mishaps in the English or the printing - e.g. Regualar Trial (p.678), arraignment (ibid.), lookes for (p.770), danse shade (p.998) - but they are commendably rare. Under procarţaprac the gloss is 'the fault of being reprehensible' - presumably an error for 'a reprehensible fault'.

I am also honour bound to record my usual complaint about the fact that HS has missed the opportunity to make a really convenient dicontry (and save himself space) by combining the entries beginning with prefix თ- with the unprefixed forms (see my review mentioned above).

Under prochuisampona the gloss given is 'phonetics'. Actually the standard Burmese term for phonetics - not given in the HS dictionary - is saddabeda, the same word as the Pali. It looks as if in the Pali-Burmese version HS wrongly glossed saddabeda as prochuisampona, so the error persists in the reverse version.

Conclusion

The HS dictionary is undoubtedly more comprehensive and up to date than Judson. On the debit side there are the omissions, like those mentioned under Coverge above; and it is inconvenient, and often misleading, to have only one-word glosses as against Judson's strings of equivalents (sometimes filled out with example sentences), which provide the user with a much more precise idea of the range of meanings of each entryword.

Also on the debit side, though less serious from the practical point of view, is the inclusion of a lot of material that the English-speaking student of Burmese would have no need for. I have in mind here entries of the type 'the wife of a usurer', and the numerous compounds of deducible meaning (see above under Size).
In brief, then, we must congratulate H.S. on making a distinct advance over Judson's dictionary in some ways, but we cannot say that he has superseded Judson: rather, the two dictionaries complement each other. And we still need a single dictionary, to combine all the information in these two, and to supply what they leave out.
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Romanization

The transliteration system used above is close to that adopted by the Library of Congress (see Cataloging Service Bulletin 12, spring 1981, pp. 69-71). The main differences are in the spacing, and in the tone marks (for which I use : and .); and I replace their raised comma and inverted comma with ! and ' respectively.
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