2. PÂLI SUTTAS PRINTED IN CEYLON.

Sir,—In view of the value of the Pâli Sutta-literature, of which a fresh and interesting specimen appeared under Mr. Chalmers’s editorship in the last number of the Journal, it may be of value to enumerate the Suttas that have been recently (i.e. since the publication of my Catalogue of Sanskrit and Pâli Books) printed in Ceylon:


" " commentary (Manorathapāraṇī). " 1893.

" " Dānuppatti-sutta. " 1893.

" " Kālakārāma-s. " 1893.

" " Kālāma-s. " 1893.


Majjhima-nikāya Aṅgulimālā-s. 1891.

" Balopaṇḍita-s. 1893.

" Cūla-puṇṇamāya-s. 1893.

Also a ‘Vyāghra-padya’-sūtra (differing from Aṅguttara iv. 194), and an Āsivisopama-sutta, not yet identified.

All the above separate Suttas have Sinhalese interpretations (padagata sanna).

It is most unfortunate that the editors (Dr. Trenckner and Dr. Morris) of two of the chief collections of Suttas, the Majjhima and Aṅguttara, should have been removed by death with their work unfinished. It is to be hoped that these important texts will not be left long incomplete.

C. Bendall.

3. THE NEW BURMESE DICTIONARY.

Dear Prof. Rhys Davids,—May I be allowed a few words on Stevenson’s most useful new Burmese Dictionary.

We do not call the new English Dictionaries revised Johnsons, and it cannot be conceded that the American Baptist Missionaries have any claim to copyright in Judson. This is really a new work. The old dictionary consisted of 786 pages; the present consists of 1188 pages.
of a larger size. A great feature, moreover, is the introduction of explanatory Burmese sentences. Should not the next edition be called Stevenson’s Burmese Dictionary based on Judson?

The pronunciation of many of the words is given in English characters, but as there is no scheme of transliteration, European students will derive small help from this.

What will disappoint most scholars is an absence of all attempt to give derivations and correct popular errors.

At p. v. of the preface Mr. Stevenson says: “The compiler had hoped, in the course of the compilation of this work, to have been able to throw some light on the etymology of the Burmese language. In this he has been greatly disappointed. So far as the compiler’s experience goes the Burmese appear to have no idea of, or take any interest in, the etymology of their own language. . . . In fact, it has often appeared to the compiler that the Burmese affect to despise their own language and unduly exalt Pali.” This is very true, and I have found, on asking learned men to explain some of their own terms, that they always offered fanciful derivations from that language. It is a great pity, however, that Mr. Stevenson has not made an attempt in this direction, for it would not be difficult to anyone on the spot. For instance, the derivations of names of the months, which are pure Burmese, would have been very interesting.

As regards spelling, too, Mr. Stevenson might have made an effort to correct modes which are clearly inaccurate, though generally used. Judson, in his preface, says: “Indeed, there is no writer in Burmese who has uniformly followed any mode of orthography.”

Two instances strike me very forcibly. The word ကြားရှေး (Sir or Madam) is, he admits, derived from ကြားရှေး သောကာ ဖျား, the r being pronounced as y; it ought, therefore, to be written ကြားရှေး according to its derivation.
The other is  Myin-mo(r) (Mount Meru). Judson gave the old spelling  , and this, I take it, is the true representation of  Mahâmeru. The word  means lofty, from  to see, whereas  is a horse, a totally different root.

A little more research would have helped to correct various errors.  , câmari, is said to be a fabulous beast or bird with a splendid tail, whereas it is, according to Childers, the Yak.  , Karawit, is thought to be the Garuda, but it is probably the Karaviko, or Indian cuckoo.  , zaw, denoting excellence, is said to be derived from  zaugyi, a Bengali form of Sans. yogi; but there is an old Burmese root  tsaw, found in  tsawká, to be haughty,  tsawbwa, a Shan prince,  tsawké, a Karen chief, which is a more probable solution.

Mr. Stevenson has done excellent work, and will, I trust, when the present edition is exhausted, bring out another and also a grammar.

R. F. St. Andrew St. John.

4. THE BRHADEVATA—CORRECTION.

Sir,—In the first of the two legends from the Brhaddevata edited by me in the January number of this year’s Journal, I misunderstood the point of verses 15 to 18 (p. 15), and accordingly mistranslated them. The passage is not an enumeration of what Agni received from the gods as his share of the sacrifice in return for his services. It states that he dismembered himself, and that his various parts