

2.

DEAR SIR,—Allow me to make one or two remarks on Mr. Houghton's paper on Professor Sayce in the *January Journal*.

If Burmese affinities with other languages are to be properly followed out, it is absolutely necessary to disregard spelling except in words derived from Sanscrit or Pāli.

True Burmese words have never been spelt according to a fixed rule, but on the phonetic principle.

I have no doubt whatever that the noun plural affix *dō* is a form of the word *tō*, *to increase*. I infer this because we know for certain that the other affix *myā* is a verb meaning *to be many*.

As regards the verbal plural affix, which Mr. Houghton says is *kra*, I must first deny that it is *kra*, for, though so written, it is pronounced *kya*.

Mr. Houghton goes on to say that "there is no known root in Burmese with which this particle is connected."

Let us use the same process of reasoning as I did with the noun affix. The other verbal plural affix is *kôn*, a verb, meaning *to be consumed*; and as a qualifying affix "*entirely, wholly*"; as a noun, *the whole*; as an adjective, *all*. *Kya* is a verb meaning *to drop*, but it has also a secondary meaning *to be spent*, and in this sense is often used in conjunction with *kôn*; thus *kôn-kya*, *to be wanting*.

Kôn and *kya* are therefore similar roots, and the true spelling, I take it, of the plural affix should be *kya*, and not *kra*.

The Burmese constantly interchange the Pāli *y* and *r*, and Latter, who wrote his grammar in Aracan, and uses *r* according to the Aracanese fashion, invariably gives *kya* for the plural affix.—Yours truly,

R. F. ST. ANDREW ST. JOHN, M.R.A.S.

Oxford, Feb. 19, 1893.

To the Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society.