

**Achtung!**

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Buchs  
„The Dhivehi Language. A Descriptive and Historical Grammar of Maldivian and Its Dialects“  
von Sonja Fritz (2002).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe zu entnehmen, die als  
*Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, 191*  
erschienen ist  
(Würzburg: Ergon Verlag 2002 /  
Heidelberg: Südasien-Institut).

**Attention!**

This is a special internet edition of the book  
“ The Dhivehi Language. A Descriptive and Historical Grammar of Maldivian and Its Dialects ”  
by Sonja Fritz (2002).  
It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the original edition which appeared as  
*Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, 191*  
(Würzburg: Ergon Verlag 2002 /  
Heidelberg: Südasien-Institut).

**Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:**  
Sonja Fritz, Frankfurt 2012

# The Dhivehi Language

A Descriptive and Historical Grammar

of Maldivian and Its Dialects

by

Sonja Fritz

Heidelberg

2002

For Jost

in love



## Preface

This book represents a revised and enlarged English version of my habilitation thesis “Deskriptive Grammatik des Maledivischen (Dhivehi) und seiner Dialekte unter Berücksichtigung der sprachhistorischen Entwicklung” which I delivered in Heidelberg, 1997.

I started my work on Dhivehi (Maldivian) in 1988 when I had the opportunity to make some tape recordings with native speakers during a private stay in the Maldives. Shortly after, when I became aware of the fact that there were almost no preliminary studies of a scientific character on the Maldivian language and literature and, particularly, no systematic linguistic studies at all, I started to collect material for an extensive grammatical description of the Dhivehi language. In 1992, I went to the Maldives again in order to continue my work with informants and to make official contact with the corresponding institutions in Māle, whom I asked to help me in planning my future field research. During my 1992 stay, my main informant was Mr. AHMED ABDULLA\* from Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku (Gnaviyani [*Ūnaviani*] Atoll) who was living in Māle at that time.

In the same year I applied for a special fellowship (Habilitationen-Stipendium) with the German National Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG), because without financial supply I could neither have managed the field work in the Maldives nor the following intensive studies which took all my time for four years. I am very grateful to DFG for supporting my work with a generous three years' fellowship and for special support covering the expenses of a three months' field trip to the Maldives (July-October 1993), together with a shorter stay in Colombo (Sri Lanka) where I was concerned with archive studies. Furthermore, I should like to thank DFG for financing the printing of this book.

During my work, I became particularly interested in the southern Dhivehi dialects which are very different from the standard language. They were never used as a written language and they never served as an object of linguistic interest before. In this sphere, I am deeply indebted to Mr. HASSAN SAEED *Campapūlmāgē*, Hitadū, Addū (Seenu [*Sīm*] Atoll) who is highly respected as the most reliable authority on the southernmost dialect. For six weeks he was at my disposal for several hours every day. Thanks to his excellent knowledge of English and his indefatigable help I was able to get a profound knowledge of the grammatical categories of the Addū dialect within a comparatively short time and to collect approximately 2500 lexemes. HASSAN SAEED also organised a recording session with a professional story teller, Mr. ALI MANIKUFAANU (*Ali Maṇikuḥānu*, also from Hitadū), whose vivid style of storytelling deeply impressed me. Furthermore, HASSAN SAEED accompanied me for a ten days' research trip to Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku Atoll in order to help me with the communication problems I expected visiting this atoll for the first time. Since my 1993 field research, he has always been ready to answer the questions I sent to him, and when I returned to the Maldives

\* In the preface, (Arabic) personal names are not given in the scientific indological transliteration (as normally used in this book) but in a Latin transcription which is officially used in the Maldives themselves. In accordance with Maldivian tradition, I have additionally mentioned the “house names” (*ge* ‘house’) used as a kind of family names, as far as they have become known to me. The two official names, consisting of a first name and a father's name, a first name and a surname, or even two first names, are very often ambiguous because of the high frequency of a restricted number of names and combinations of names that are met with. Some elder people use only their house names beside their first names, sometimes even affixing the latter ones.

in March 1999 and in January 2002 in order to clear up some further problems, he helped me again. I would like to express my gratitude to him not only for his direct contribution to my research work – without which I could not have written this grammar in its present form – but also for introducing me to the peculiarities of daily and cultural life of the southern Maldives.

Concerning the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, I am particularly grateful to my informants Mr. ADNAN IBRAHIM, Mr. MUHAMMAD SAEED and Ms. AMINATH MUHAMMAD SAEED (*Havitta*), Mr. HASSAN SAEED (*Sosan Villa*), Mrs. AMINATH SHEHENAZ and Mrs. FATIMATH IBRAHIM DIDI (*Boḍurage*), Mr. ABDULLAH AFEED (*Luxury*), Mrs. *Goldan Gētu* KADDĀDI and Mr. *Diggāmāge* MUHAMMAD MANIKUFAANU (*Maṇikufānu*) for the fairy tales they told and for their contributions to my systematic collection of lexical and morphological data which were recorded on tape as well. For some tape recordings of the dialect of Huvadū which I could undertake in Aḍḍū and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, I am indebted to Mr. MUHAMMAD SHAKEEL (*Looking Glass*, Tinadū, Gaafu Alifu [*Gāf Alif*] Atoll) and Mr. MUHAMMAD HASSAN (*Morning Paris*, Fares, Gaafu Dhaalu [*Gāf Dāl*] Atoll).

My studies on the standard language of Māle were deeply stimulated by an intensive three weeks' cooperation with Mrs. HABIBA HUSSAIN HABIB, the director of the National Library in Māle, who is also a writer. I am much obliged to her for introducing me into the "palace language" which was the colloquial and written medium of the nobility at the time of the sultans, an almost obsolete idiom she is one of the last native speakers of, and I am very grateful for the numerous tape recordings she allowed me to take. I also owe many thanks to Mr. MUHAMMAD WAHEED (*Maḍulu*) and Mr. ABDULLAH SAADIQ who, as professional writers, helped me with abundant information on the language of modern Dhivehi prose and who provided some tape recordings as well. I owe special thanks to the scholar Mr. HASSAN AHMED MANIKU (Māle) who is one of the best authorities on history and culture of the (Northern) Maldives and who helped me with much scientific information. Furthermore, I should like to thank Mrs NASEEMA MOHAMED (Māle) for detailed information on the colonial periods of Maldivian history. Last but not least, I have to thank Mr. MOHAMED WAHEED MANDHU (at that time Deputy Director of the National Centre for Linguistic and Historical Research) and Mr. ABDUL SAMEEU HASSAN (at that time Assistant Director of the National Centre) who in 1993 helped me to get access to the southern atolls and to receive special permits for research on inscriptions in the National Museum of Māle and some graveyards.

It would go beyond the scope of this preface to personally express my gratitude to all those Maldivian people who helped me during my stays on the islands. Instead, I would like to express thanks to the Maldivians for their warm welcome and their helpfulness I experienced so many times!

For the scientific support I received in Colombo (Sri Lanka) in October 1993, I have to thank Prof. G.D. WIJAYAWARDHANA and Prof. J.B. DISANAYAKA (both from the Dept. of Sinhala, Faculty of Arts, University of Colombo), Dr. W. Thelma T.P. GUNAWARDANE (Director of the National Museum), Mr. Kalasuri Wilfred M. GUNASEKARA (Library of the Royal Asiatic Society), Dr. Siran U. DERANIYAGALA (Director of the Archeological Survey Dept.) as well as the Director of the National Archive.

I am also very grateful to Mr. Sisira JAYASURIYA (at that time Māle/Colombo), who was my main informant for colloquial Sinhalese and who helped me with Sinhalese literature for many years.

I owe a special thank to Prof. Donald RAYFIELD (Queen Mary College, University of London) who under difficult circumstances procured a copy of H.C.P. BELL's book "The Maldive Islands. Monograph on the History, Archeology, and Epigraphy" (Colombo 1940) for me. Furthermore I am deeply indebted to him for proof-reading the complete English text of the present book.

I am also very grateful to Prof.Dr. Monika BOEHM-TETTELBACH (Dept. of Modern Indian Studies, South Asia Institute, University of Heidelberg) who supported my studies on Dhivehi from the beginning and who was kind enough to present the German version of the present book as a habilitation thesis to the Faculty of Oriental and Classical Studies of the University of Heidelberg. Furthermore I would like to thank Prof. BOEHM-TETTELBACH very much for proof-reading the German text.

For a proof-reading of the German version, I owe many thanks also to PD Dr. Claus Peter ZOLLER (South Asia Institute, University of Heidelberg) and to Prof.Dr. Chlodwig WERBA (Dept. of Indology, University of Vienna).

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Faculty of Oriental and Classical Studies of Heidelberg University for having accepted the German text of the present book as a habilitation thesis. I am particularly grateful to the late Prof.Dr. Hubert PETERSMANN who was the Dean of the faculty at that time.

The person I have to thank most of all, however, is my husband, Prof.Dr. Jost GIPPERT, a linguist himself (Chair of Comparative Linguistics, Frankfurt University), who was my constant companion during all my research stays in the Maldives. Without the inspiring suggestions he made and the ongoing discussions we had over all the years, this book could not have been written in its present form. This also holds true for his help with technical problems, concerning particularly hard- and software difficulties. Furthermore, my husband made his collection of Old Dhivehi inscriptions and manuscripts (collected in 1993) available to me which not only enlarged my knowledge of Old Dhivehi but enabled me to describe the historical development of different categories of this language. Furthermore, I would like to thank my husband for proof-reading both the German original and the English translation of this book several times and for preparing the layout and the indexes. I also have to thank my husband for encouraging me to translate the whole book into English and stimulating me in those moments when I was about to lose my strength and self-confidence.



# Table of contents

Introduction	1
Phonology	17
The sound system	17
The vowels	19
Long vowels	20
nasal vowels	23
diphthongs	24
Umlaut phenomena	26
vocalic alternations	27
The consonants	29
consonant clusters	37
Geminates	38
Loan phonemes	45
Syllable and word structure	47
Word accent	48
Sandhi	49
On the historical relationship of Dhivehi and Sinhalese	50
Morphology	53
The nominal categories	53
The noun	56
Case system and stem types	56
genitive	57
locative	58
dative	59
ablative/instrumental	61
i-stems	64
a-stems	65
consonant stems	66
root nouns	69
Number, definiteness and indefiniteness	70
Addū	78
Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	84
Māle	91
Declension types	94
Addū	95
Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	99
Māle	103
The adjective	105
Adjectival comparison	108
Numerals	110

Cardinal numbers . . . . .	111
The duodecimal system . . . . .	125
Ordinal numbers . . . . .	126
Other categories of numerals . . . . .	127
The pronominal system . . . . .	129
Personal pronouns . . . . .	131
The personal pronouns of the first person . . . . .	132
The personal pronouns of the second person . . . . .	136
The personal pronouns of the third person . . . . .	140
Possessive pronouns . . . . .	147
Reflexive pronouns . . . . .	148
Demonstrative pronouns . . . . .	149
Demonstrative adverbs . . . . .	153
Modal adverbs . . . . .	154
Reciprocal pronouns . . . . .	155
Interrogative pronouns . . . . .	155
indefinite pronouns . . . . .	162
The verbal system . . . . .	167
The finite present . . . . .	171
Formation of the causative . . . . .	173
“Double” causatives . . . . .	173
The finite preterite . . . . .	177
The finite future . . . . .	179
Addū . . . . .	181
Fua’ Mulaku . . . . .	182
Māle . . . . .	185
The imperative . . . . .	186
The infinitive in jussive function . . . . .	188
Imperatives with the suffix <i>-ti</i> . . . . .	189
Periphrastic imperative formations . . . . .	190
The infinitive . . . . .	195
The infinitive of the <i>a</i> -stems . . . . .	196
The infinitive of the <i>e</i> -stems . . . . .	199
The infinitive of the <i>n</i> -stems . . . . .	199
The verbal noun . . . . .	199
The gerund . . . . .	200
The participles . . . . .	202
The participle of the present . . . . .	203
The participle of the preterite . . . . .	205
The participle of the future . . . . .	213
The absolutive (converb) . . . . .	214
Irregular absolutives . . . . .	218
Reduplicated absolutives . . . . .	219
Compound verbs and auxiliary verbs expressing “aktionsart” concepts . . . . .	220
Combinations with auxiliary verbs in Sinhalese . . . . .	227
Compound verbs and auxiliary verbs in Dhivehi . . . . .	229
The potential . . . . .	235

Māle	236
Aḏḏū	237
Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	239
Suppletive potential formation	240
Past forms of the potential	240
The potential of “root verbs”	241
Suppletive and combined potential forms	242
Conditional formations	243
Aḏḏū	243
Māle	244
Suppletive verbal paradigms	246
Suppletivism according to number	246
Suppletivism in the formation of tense forms	247
Interrogative forms (“yes/no” questions)	248
Aḏḏū	248
Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	251
Māle	252
Uninflected words	253
Syntactical sketch	255
Sentence structure	255
subordinate clauses	258
conjunctions	258
Participial subordinate clauses	260
absolutives	261
Verbal nouns	261
Quotation particles and interrogative particles	262
Negated sentences	264
Indexes**	263
Grammatical terms	263
Texts	268
Languages	269
Geographical names	269
Personal names	269
Historical and sociological terms	270

\*\* Additional indexes (of text passages and word forms) have been attached to vol. II (p. 225 ff.).

## Abbreviations\*

A. . . . .	Addū dialect	foc. . . .	focus	Panj. . .	Panjabi (Pañjābī)
A.D. . . .	Anno Domini	Fr. . . . .	French	part. . . .	participle
A.H. . . .	Anno Hijrae	fut. . . . .	future	partc. . . .	particle
abl. . . .	ablative	gen. . . . .	genitive	Pers. . . .	Persian
abs. . . .	absolutive	ger. . . . .	gerund	pers. . . . .	personal
acc. . . .	accusative	Germ. . .	German	pfv. . . . .	perfective
adj. . . .	adjective	Guj. . . .	Gujarati (Gujarātī)	PIE . . . .	Proto-Indo-European
adv. . . .	adverb	H. . . . .	Huvadū dialect	Pkt. . . . .	Prakrit
aff. . . . .	affirmative	Hi. . . . .	Hindi (Hindī)	pl(ur). . .	plural
AMg. . . .	Ardhamāgadhi	hon. . . . .	honorific	p.n. . . . .	proper name
anim. . .	animate	IA . . . . .	Indo-Aryan	pol. . . . .	polite
Ap. . . . .	Apabhraṃśā	id. . . . .	the same	Pol. . . . .	Polish
appr. . .	approximately	IIA . . . .	Insular Indo-Aryan	poss. . . .	possessive
Arab. . .	Arabic	impv. . .	imperative	postpos.	postposition
Ass. . . .	Assamese	inact. . .	inactive	pot. . . . .	potential
attr. . . .	attribute	inan. . . .	inanimate	pred. . . .	predicate, predicative
aux. . . .	auxiliary verb	Ind. . . .	Indian / Indic	pres. . . .	present (tense)
B.C. . . .	before Christ	indef. . .	indefinite	pret. . . .	preterite
Beng. . .	Bengali (Baṅglā)	inf. . . . .	infinitive	prev. . . .	preverb
BHS . . .	BuddhistHybridSanskrit	instr. . .	instrumental	pron. . . .	pronoun
bot. . . .	botanical	interr. . .	interrogative	pron.adj.	pronominal adjective
card. . .	cardinal number	intr. . . .	intransitive	ps. . . . .	person
caus. . .	causative	ipfv. . . .	imperfective	quot. . . .	quotation
cf. . . . .	confer	JM. . . . .	Jaina Māhārāstrī	R. . . . .	Rāmāyana
ch. . . . .	chapter	l.f. . . . .	long form (participle)	recip. . . .	reciprocal
class. . .	classical	Lat. . . .	Latin	red . . . . .	reduplicated
conj. . . .	conjunction	lit. . . . .	literally	refl. . . . .	reflexive
cop. . . .	copula(tive)	loc. . . . .	locative	repr. . . .	reprint
cp. . . . .	compare	M. . . . .	Māle standard language	resp. . . .	respectively
dat. . . .	dative	Mar. . . .	Marathi (Marāthī)	rev. . . . .	revised
decl. . . .	declension	m(asc). .	masculine	Russ. . . .	Russian
def. . . .	definite	MBh. . .	Mahābhārata	RV . . . . .	Ṛgveda
dem. . . .	demonstrative	MIA . . .	Middle Indo-Aryan	sg. . . . .	singular
dim . . . .	diminutive	mod. . . .	modern	Si. . . . .	Sindhi (Sindhī)
distr. . .	distributive	ms. . . . .	manuscript	Sinh. . . .	Sinhalese
Dhiv. . . .	Dhivehi	n. . . . .	noun	Skt. . . . .	Sanskrit
doub. . .	double	neg. . . .	negated	subj. . . .	subject
e.a. . . . .	and elsewhere	Nep. . . .	Nepali (Nepālī)	subst. . . .	substantive
East-H. .	East Huvadū dialect	NIA . . .	New Indo-Aryan	suff. . . . .	suffix
ed. . . . .	editor / edited / edition	nom. . . .	nominative	Ś. . . . .	Śaurasenī
eds. . . .	editors	ntr. . . . .	neuter	top. . . . .	toponym
e.g. . . .	for example	num. . . .	numeral	trans. . . .	transitive
elem. . .	element	obj. . . .	object	Turk. . . .	Turkic
emph. . .	emphatic	obl. . . .	oblique case	Ved. . . . .	Vedic
Engl. . .	English	obs. . . .	obsolete	vb.n. . . .	verbal noun
esp. . . .	especially	OIA . . .	Old Indo-Aryan	viz. . . . .	namely
F. . . . .	Fua' Mulaku dialect	Or. . . . .	Oriya (Oriyā)	voc. . . . .	vocational
f(em). . .	feminine	ord. . . .	ordinal number	vol. . . . .	volume
ff. . . . .	following pages	Pa. . . . .	Pali (Pāli)	West-H.	West Huvadū dialect

\* For L1 etc., F1 etc., RA and other abbreviations referring to the Old and Modern Dhivehi texts that were used in the present book, cf. the Survey of historical documents contained in vol. II, p. 215 ff.

## Bibliography\*

- BECHERT (1959): Heinz B., Bemerkungen zur Aussprache des Singhalesischen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 14, 55-62.
- BELL (1883): Harry Charles Purvis B., The Máldive Islands. An Account of the Physical Features, Climate, History, Inhabitants, Productions, and Trade. Colombo.
- (1922-35): id., Excerpta Maldiviana 1-14. *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. XXIX, 75 (1922), 99-104 [no. 1]; 76 (1923), 194-214 [no. 2]; 77 (1924), 283-303 [no. 3]; vol. XXX, 78 (1925), 132-142 [no. 4]; 79 (1926), 257-270 [no. 5]; 80 (1927), 436-447 [no. 6]; vol. XXXI, 81 (1928), 180-194 [no. 7]; 82 (1929), 400-414 [no. 8]; 83 (1930), 539-578 [no. 9]; vol. XXXII, 84 (1931), 76-124 [no. 10]; 85 (1932), 226-242 [no. 11]; 86 (1933), 372-387 [no. 12]; vol. XXXIII, 87 (1934), 47-90 [no. 13]; 88 (1935), 169-191 [no. 14].
- (1940): id., The Máldive Islands. Monograph on the History, Archeology, and Epigraphy. Colombo.
- BERGER (1953): Hermann B., Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre. München.
- (1992): id., Modern Indo-Aryan. In: Jadranka GVOZDANOVIĆ (ed.), Indo-European Numerals. Berlin - New York, 243-287.
- BÜHLER (1934): Karl B., Sprachtheorie. Jena.
- CAIN (1992): Bruce D. C., A Grammatical Sketch of Dhivehi. (Pre-publication draft).
- (1995): id., Maldivian Prototypical Passives and Related Constructions. *Anthropological Linguistics* 37/4, 524-540.
- CALDWELL (1875): Robert C., A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages. London. (Repr. Madras 1961).
- CARTER (1936): Charles C., An English-Sinhalese Dictionary. 2nd, rev. ed. Colombo. (Repr. Colombo 1965).
- CHATTERJEE (1988): Ranjit Ch., Aspect and Meaning in Slavic and Indic. Amsterdam.
- CLOUGH (1892): B. C., A Sinhalese-English Dictionary. Colombo.
- D.B.G.: Divehi bahuge gavāidu (ed. National Centre for Linguistic and Historical Research, Male). Male [not dated].
- DE SILVA (1969): M.W.S. de S., The Phonological Efficiency of the Maldivian Writing System. *Anthropological linguistics* 11, 199-208.
- (1970a): id., Some Affinities between Sinhalese and Maldivian. *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1970, 20-27.
- (1970b): id., Some Observations on the History of Maldivian. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1970, 137-162.
- (1979): id., Sinhalese and other Island Languages in South Asia. Tübingen.
- DISANAYAKA / MANIKU (1990): J.B. D. / Hassan Ahmed M., Say it in Maldivian (Dhivehi). Colombo.
- DSL (1935-): A Dictionary of the Sinhalese Language, ed. by W. GEIGER / D.B. JAYATILAKA (1935-41, continued by the University of Ceylon, now ed. by the Ministry of Cultural Affairs). Colombo.
- ELIZARENKOVA (1974): Tat'jana Jakovlevna E., Issledovanija po diaxroničeskoj fonologii indoarijskix jazykov. Moskva.
- FRITZ (1989-90): Sonja F., Dhivehi. Eine bisher weitgehend unbekannt gebliebene neuindoarische Sprache. *Klagenfurter Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 15-16, 117-129.
- (1993): id., Wilhelm Geigers Beitrag zur Erforschung des Dhivehi, der Staatssprache der Malediven. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 54, 15-32.
- FRITZ / GIPPERT (2000): Sonja F. / Jost G., Towards a Historical Phonology of Maldivian. In: Michaela OFITSCH / Christian ZINKO (eds.), 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz, Graz, 139-152.

\* This table lists only those titles that are quoted in abbreviated form in the present book.

- GAIR (1970): James W. G., *Colloquial Sinhalese Clause Structures*. The Hague – Paris.
- GEIGER (1900): Wilhelm G., *Litteratur und Sprache der Singhalesen*. Strassburg.
- (1901-02): id., *Mäldivische Studien*. I: *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse*, München [1901], 614-684. II: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 55, 1901, 371-387. III: *Sitzungsberichte ...* 1902, 107-132.
- (1902): id., *Etymological Vocabulary of the Mäldivian Language*. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1902, 909-938.
- (1916): id., *Päli. Literatur und Sprache*. Strassburg.
- (1919): id., *Mäldivian Linguistic Studies* (transl. by J.C. WILLIS / ed. by H.C.P. BELL). In: *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 27, Extra Number. Colombo. (Repr. Male 1986).
- (1938): id., *A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language*. Colombo.
- (1941): id., *An Etymological Glossary of the Sinhalese Language*. Colombo.
- (1941a): id., *Studien zur Geschichte und Sprache Ceylons*. In: GEIGER (1973), 523-557.
- (1942): id., *Beiträge zur singhalesischen Sprachgeschichte*. In: GEIGER (1973), 560-636.
- (1973): id., *Kleine Schriften zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde* (ed. Heinz BECHERT). Wiesbaden.
- GIPPERT (1997): Jost G., *Paläographische Untersuchungen mit dem Computer*. *Studia Iranica, Mesopotamica et Anatolica* 2, 1996 [1997], 77-100.
- (forthcoming): id., *Early New Persian as a Medium of Spreading Islam*. To appear in: L. PAUL (ed.), *Proceedings of the conference "Early New Persian"*, Göttingen.
- GUNASEKARA (1891): Abraham Mendis G., *A Comprehensive Grammar of the Sinhalese Language*. Colombo. (Repr. Colombo 1962).
- GRIERSON (1903-27): George A. G., *Linguistic Survey of India*. 11 vols. Calcutta.
- HACKER (1958): Paul H., *Zur Funktion einiger Hilfsverben im modernen Hindi*. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse* 4/1958, 189-270.
- HINÜBER (1986): Oskar v. H., *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Wien.
- HLSD (1988): *Historical and Linguistic Survey of Divehi* (ed. National Centre for Linguistic and Historical Research, Male and Department of Sinhala, University of Colombo). Colombo (typescript).
- HOOK (1974): Peter E. H., *The Compound Verb in Hindi*. Michigan.
- ISAČENKO (1962): Aleksandr Vasiljevič I., *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart*. Halle (Saale).
- JAYAWARDENA-MOSER (1996): Premalatha J.-M., *Aufbauwortschatz Singhalesisch-Deutsch*. Wiesbaden.
- (1993): id., *Grundwortschatz Singhalesisch-Deutsch*. Wiesbaden.
- KELLOG (1875): S.H. K., *A Grammar of the Hindi Language*. London. (Repr. London 1955).
- LIENHARD (1961): Siegfried L., *Tempusgebrauch und Aktionsartenbildung in der modernen Hindī*. Uppsala.
- MALTEN (1983): Th. M., *Malediven und Lakkadiven. Materialien zur Bibliographie der Atolle im Indischen Ozean*. Wiesbaden.
- MANIKU (1988-89): Hassan Ahmed M., *Vanavaru*. 1: Dhevi (1988). 2: Nakaïy (1989). 3: Dhekunu arumaadhu (1989). 4: Filaaveli (1989). Male.
- MANIKU / WIJAYAWARDHANA (1986): Hassan Ahmed M. / G.D. W. (eds.), *Isdhoo Loamaafaanu*. Colombo.
- MASICA (1991): Colin P. M., *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge.
- MATZEL (1983): Klaus M., *Einführung in die singhalesische Sprache*. 2. verb. Aufl., Wiesbaden.
- MAYRHOFER (1951): Manfred M., *Handbuch des Päli*. 2 Bde. Heidelberg.
- (1965): id., *Sanskrit-Grammatik mit sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen*. 2. Aufl., Berlin.
- (1981): id., *Laryngalreflexe im Indo-Iranischen*; in *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 34, 427-438.
- (1986-): id., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg.
- MCGREGOR (1972): R.S. M., *Outline of Hindi Grammar*. Oxford.
- MHM (1984): *Māle Hukuru Miskit* (ed. Divehi bahāi tārixaṣ xidmat kurā qaumī marukazu [National Center for Linguistic and Historical Research]). Māle.

- MITE (1996): Glossary: English-Dhivehi, Dhivehi-English (ed. Male Institute for Teacher Education). Male.
- MM: Mālēge miskittak [The Mosques of Māle] (ed. Dept. of Information and Broadcasting). Male [not dated].
- NAJEEB (2001): Alī Najīb (ed.), Danbidū lōmāfānu. Māle: Divehi bahāi tārixās xidumat kurā qaumī marukazu [National Center for Linguistic and Historical Research]. (Divehīnge tariku, 12).
- NCLHR (1985-91): Divehi basfot. Vols. 1-16 (ed. National Centre for Linguistic and Historical Research). Male [lithographed].
- NESPITAL (1981): Helmut N., Das Futursystem im Hindi und Urdu. Ein Beitrag zur semantischen Analyse der Kategorien Tempus, Aspekt und Modus und ihrer Grammeme. Wiesbaden.
- NORMAN (1992): H.R. N., Middle Indo-Aryan. In: Jadranka GVOZDANOVIĆ (ed.), Indo-European Numerals. Berlin - New York, 199-241.
- RHYS DAVIDS (1921-25): T.W. R.D. and William Stede, The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary. Oxford. (Repr. Oxford 1992).
- PARANAVITANA (1956): S. P., Sigiri Graffiti. 2 vols. Oxford e.a.
- PISCHEL (1981): Richard P., A Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages (transl. Subhadra JHĀ). 2nd rev. ed., Delhi.
- POŘÍZKA (1967-1970): Vincenc P., On the perfective verbal aspect in Hindi; in: *Archiv Orientální* 35/1 (1967), 64-88; 35/2 (1967), 208-231; 36 (1968), 233-251; 37/1 (1969), 19-47; 37/2, 345-364.  
— (1970): id., On some verbal expressions in Hindi, in: *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica* 5 (1970), 69-86.
- PYRARD / GRAY (1878): A. G., The Maldive Islands: with a Vocabulary taken from François PYRARD DE LAVAL. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1878, 173-209.
- RENOU (1961): Louis R., Grammaire Sanscrite. 2 vols. Paris.
- REYNOLDS (1993): Christopher H.B. R., Maldives. Oxford e.a.
- SHISHIDO (1983): M. Sh., English-Dhivehi Dictionary. Male [typoscript].
- SŚ (1937-1992): Siṃhala śabdakōṣaya [Sinhalese Dictionary]. 27 vols. (ed. Ministry of Cultural Affairs). Colombo.
- STEINGASS (1929): F. S., Persian-English Dictionary. London. (Repr. London 1977).
- TURNER (1966): Ralph L. T., A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. Vols. I,II. London e.a.  
— (1969): id., A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. Indexes. London e.a.  
— (1971): Ralph L. T. / D.R. T., A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. Phonetic Analysis. London e.a.  
— (1985): Ralph L. T., A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. Addenda and Corrigenda (ed. J.C. WRIGHT). London e.a.
- VYXUXOLEV (1964): V.V. V., Singal'skij jazyk. Moskva.
- WEHR (1958): Hans W., Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart. Wiesbaden.
- WERBA (1997): Chlodwig H. W., Verba Indoarica. Die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache. Wien.
- WHITNEY (1885): William D. W., The Roots, Verb-Forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. Leipzig. (Repr. New Haven/Connecticut, 1945).
- WIJAYARATNE (1956): D.J. W., History of the Sinhalese Noun. Colombo.
- WILSON / CHRISTOPHER (1841): Vocabulary of the Maldivian Language, compiled by Lieut. W. Chr., I.N. Communicated to the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society by J. W. In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 6, 42-76.
- YULE / BURNELL (1902): Henry Y. / A.C. B., Hobson-Jobson. A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive. New edition by William CROOKE. (Repr. Delhi 1989).
- ZOGRAF (1976): G.A. Z., Morfologičeskij stroj novyx indoarijskix jazykov. Moskva.
- ZOGRAF (1990): G.A. Z., Jazyki južnoj Azii. Moskva.
- ZUHAIR (1991): M. Z., Practical Dhivehi. Male.



## Introduction

0.1. Dhivehi, the official language of the Republic of Maldives, represents the southernmost Indo-Aryan language and even the southernmost Indo-European language, if we consider the historical distribution of the (earlier) Indo-European languages rather than the comparatively recent expansion of some colonial languages, such as English, French, Spanish or Portuguese. Together with the closely related Sinhalese, the Indo-Aryan language spoken by the major part of Sri Lanka's population, Dhivehi establishes a special subgroup within the Modern Indo-Aryan languages which will hereafter be called "Insular Indo-Aryan" (IIA). This term, which is based on purely geographical facts, is legitimate insofar as the area where the two languages are spoken is confined to the respective insular states.

Because of a high degree of isolation from the Indo-Aryan linguistic area in the Subcontinent, the two insular languages are distinguished by many particular developments affecting different linguistic spheres. In order to understand all these peculiarities it is necessary to consider historical facts and developments, the cultural influences and the history of the languages. The preconditions that characterise the study of the two languages in question are essentially different from each other. While Sinhalese shows the longest continuous literary and historical tradition of all Modern Indo-Aryan languages, Dhivehi has only a very scanty written tradition. This is the reason why long periods in the history of the Maldives have remained almost unknown even today. Inevitably, these facts are also reflected in the history of scientific research into both languages. Without considering Sinhalese a well-founded investigation of Dhivehi is practically impossible. Therefore, this introduction begins with a short outline of the most important stages of the historical studies concerning the two languages.

0.2. The foundation stone of the historical linguistic analysis of Sinhalese as well as of Dhivehi was laid by WILHELM GEIGER (1856-1943) whose comprehensive studies of Pali and Sinhalese are still to be taken seriously. In his 1937 article "The linguistic character of Sinhalese", he definitively rejected all attempts to consider Sinhalese as one of the members of the Dravidic family of languages. Although the Danish linguist RASMUS RASK had classified Sinhalese as a language of the Sanskrit stock as early as 1821, he could not prevent others from trying to prove a relationship between Sinhalese and Tamil.

The material GEIGER used for his etymological, morphological and syntactical investigations was taken from the rich Sinhalese literature which he divided into four main periods: Sinhalese Prakrit (from the 2nd c. B.C. to the 3rd/4th c. A.D.; ancient *Brāhmī* inscriptions); Proto-Sinhalese (from the 4/5th c. to the 8th c.; later *Brāhmī* inscriptions); Medieval Sinhalese (from the 8th c. to the middle of the 13th c.; inscriptions and the most ancient documents of manuscript literature); the period from the middle of the 13th c. up to the present, called "Modern Sinhalese" by GEIGER, which actually has to be subdivided into Classical Sinhalese (from the 13th c. to the 17th c.), and Modern Sinhalese proper (from then on). The latter period comprises the contemporary literary and colloquial language.

To a large extent, Sinhalese inscriptions have been collected and edited within the series *Epigraphia Zeylanica* (Archeological Survey of Ceylon) since 1904. In this connection, S. PARANAVITANA's two volume edition of the "Sīgiri Graffiti" which was published in 1956 is of special interest. Besides the text of the inscriptions of the rock of Sīgiriya it also contains a comprehensive descriptive grammar of Medieval Sinhalese and, furthermore, the most detailed paleographical description of Sinhalese that has ever been published.

0.2.1. However, the most important information on the earliest history of the Sinhalese people is not attested in the Sinhalese language but within two chronicles written in Pali: the *Dīpavaṃsa* ("Island Chronicle")<sup>2</sup> and the *Mahāvāṃsa* ("Great Chronicle"). The latter covers the time from 544 B.C. until 362 A.D.; it was continued under the name of *Cūlavāṃsa* ("Lesser Chronicle") which was carried on until 1781.<sup>3</sup> While the language of the *Dīpavaṃsa* is still inspired by the clerical tradition and, therefore, is characterised by a ponderous style, the *Mahāvāṃsa* which combines Buddhist tradition with a rich folklore can be called a work of poetic artisanship. The author, *Mahānāma*, lived at the end of the 5th c. / beginning of the 6th c.

It is often difficult to distinguish historical facts from pure myths and legends in both of these chronicles. GEIGER whose investigations into the chronicles yielded numerous publications (cf. above), succeeded in filtering much information about historical events and material culture from these texts. The details would exceed the scope of the present study and only a few items are to be mentioned here. Thus, e.g., it is nowadays taken for granted that the first Indo-Aryan colonisation of Sri Lanka took place at about the 5th/4th c. B.C. by tribes coming from the north of the subcontinent; however, the question whether their "proto-homeland" was located in the northwest or in the northeast of India, has not yet been proved satisfactorily. Most of the toponyms mentioned in the chronicle can be interpreted in favour of both sides. Thus, ch. VI of the *Mahāvāṃsa* which relates the colonisation of the island, informs us that *Sīhabāhu*, the father of the legendary first Sinhalese king *Vijaya*, migrated from the land of the *Vaṅgas* where he had married a royal princess, to a region called *Lāṭa*; there he founded his residence *Sīhapura*. While *Vaṅga* obviously refers to Bengal, the name *Lāṭa*, in connection with the hypothesis about the home-land, can be understood in two senses.<sup>4</sup> *Sīhabāhu* ("lion-arm") is described as being the son of a lion and a princess; after he killed his father, he was called *Sīhaḷa*. *Vijaya*'s successors accepted this name as their ethnonym.

Furthermore we can learn from the *Mahāvāṃsa* that the island was inhabited by an aboriginal tribe of an unknown race who can presumably be identified with the ancestors of

<sup>2</sup> HERMANN OLDENBERG, *The Dīpavaṃsa. An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record* (ed. + transl.). New Delhi-Madras 1992 (1st ed. Berlin 1879).

<sup>3</sup> WILHELM GEIGER (transl.), *The Mahāvāṃsa or Great Chronicle of Ceylon*. Pali Text Society, London 1980 (1st ed. 1912). – The same (ed.), *Cūlavāṃsa* being the more recent part of the *Mahāvāṃsa*. Vols. I, II. Pali Text Soc., London 1980 (1st ed. 1925). – The same (transl.) *Cūlavāṃsa Part I*. Pali Text Soc., London 1973 (1st ed. 1929). – ANANDA W.P. GURUGE, *Mahāvāṃsa. The Great Chronicle of Sri Lanka*. Chapters 1-37 (transl. and commentary). Colombo 1989. – Cf. further W. GEIGER's articles collected under the title of "III. Ceylonesische Chroniken" as part of his "Kleine Schriften zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde" (ed. HEINZ BECHERT), Wiesbaden 1973, 233-313. – WILHELM GEIGER, *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times* (ed. HEINZ BECHERT), repr. Stuttgart 1986.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the discussion and the bibliography about the different hypotheses given in DE SILVA (1979), 16 ff.

the present-day Vedda people.<sup>5</sup> The Veddas who are neither a Dravidic nor an Indo-Aryan tribe, still live, to a small extent, as hunters and gatherers. The chronicle informs us about intensive contacts between the first Sinhalese settlers and the aborigines up to the point of marriage (*Vijaya* himself took a *yakkhiṇī* as his wife), as well as about close relations with Dravidic tribes from South India.

Soon after the immigration of the Sinhalese to Sri Lanka manifold contacts with different regions of India started to develop. To a certain degree, these relations must have influenced the Sinhalese language. In particular it is likely that the contacts with Tamil which lasted for many centuries left considerable traces; however, so far these interferences have scarcely been investigated.

0.2.2. The language of the immigrants was a MIA dialect which essentially developed in the same way as the MIA vernaculars of the mainland. At the end of the MIA period, Sinhalese Prakrit had reached a typical *Apabhramśa* state which is called “Proto-Sinhalese”. The linguistic categories of Sinhalese achieved their modern form at the beginning of the 8th c., i.e. on the threshold of the stage which GEIGER called “medieval”.

0.3. The abundant early attestations of Sinhalese history have no comparable counterpart on the Maldivian side. The official historiography starts with the year 1153 A.D. which is considered to be the beginning of the conversion of the Maldives to Islam. From this time on a national chronicle was written in Arabic, the so-called *Tārīḥ* (“history”), the original manuscript of which was destroyed in 1752 during a firestorm in Māle. Apart from that, the periods of rulership of the sultans and sultanas,<sup>6</sup> as well as a few important historical facts, were listed in a short chronicle written in Dhivehi, the so-called *Rādavaḷi*, which means “chronicle of the kings”. At present, three manuscripts of the *Rādavaḷi* have been found in Māle, but it can be taken for certain that originally there were more variants of the text.

0.3.1. With islamisation, the Maldives became an independent sultanate. They officially kept this status even during the colonial age under the Portuguese, the Dutch and the British. While the Portuguese period (1558-73) was characterised by an enormous brutality, the relations with the Dutch were based on an initiative which was taken by the Maldives themselves; being considered as a protectorate rather than a colony, their only obligations consisted of an annual present which was sent to the Dutch government from 1645 on. From ca. 1753 until ca. 1754/5, the Maldives voluntarily delivered themselves under the protection of the French who were asked for help against the permanent assaults of Malabar pirates. In

<sup>5</sup> In the chronicle this people is called *yakkha-*. The Pali word goes back to OIA *yakṣá-* “supernatural being”; Cf. also Sinh. *yakā* “demon, devil” (TURNER 1966, II, 601, no. 10395). According to GEIGER, in the chronicle the word is used for wild tribes living in the mountains. – Cf. furthermore: C.G. SELIGMANN and B.Z. SELIGMANN, *The Veddas*, Cambridge 1911; M.W.S. DE SILVA, *Vedda Language of Ceylon. Texts and Lexicon*, München 1972; K.N.O. DHARMADASA and S.W.R. DE A. SAMARASINGHE, *The Vanishing Aborigines. Sri Lanka's Veddas in Transition*, New Delhi 1990.

<sup>6</sup> In the 14th c. there were three de facto sultanas; in the middle of the 18th c. a nominal sultana was on the Maldivian throne.

1796, the Maldives became a British protectorate; the only result of this consisted in the fact that the addressee of the annual present changed. Only later, the British built a military base on the island of Gan in Aḍḍū, the southernmost atoll of the Maldives. On the basis of a special contract of lease they were allowed to keep this base until 1976, although the Maldives had been officially independent since 1965.

Although the Maldives never were an Arab colony, Arabic influence in the spheres of culture and language is very strong. The relations with the Sinhalese which had been very close in former times were loosened more and more by the Maldivians, obviously as a consequence of islamisation. Only the three southernmost atolls (Huvadū, Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku and Aḍḍū) carried on their own commercial activities with Sri Lanka until recently; however, these special relations were cut off in 1959 by the government in Māle, after the southern atolls had tried to declare their independence as a separate republic. After a first attempt in 1953 to establish a republic, and an intermediate period of a reinstated sultanate, a second Republic of Maldives was founded in 1968, based on the laws of Islamic Sharia.

0.3.2. Regarding the time before islamisation, the Maldivians can in a certain sense be called a “people without history”, because there are no autochthonous sources. In order to reveal information about the more distant past of the Maldives, it is therefore necessary to refer to external reports which are, however, not numerous.<sup>7</sup>

It is highly probable that the Maldives were already known to the Phoenicians. The ancient geographer, Claudius Ptolemaeus, who lived in the 2nd c. A.D., used Phoenician nautical charts when he compiled his tables which contain 8000 locations known at that time, along with their longitudinal and latitudinal degrees. In his work, he mentions 1378 islands near by the island of Taprobane (Sri Lanka) which most probably are to be identified with the Maldives and the Lakkadives.<sup>8</sup> In his report on the year 302, Ammianus Marcellinus informs his emperor, Julian, about “*Divae et Serendivae, nationes Indicae ...*” which are located in the Indian Ocean; without any doubt, he is referring to the Maldives and Sri Lanka.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Cf. already FRITZ (1989-1990), 120-21.

<sup>8</sup> Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia I-III. Ed. C.F.A. Nobbe. Leipzig 1843-45; repr. Hildesheim 1966. Lib. VII, Cap. 4, 11., 175.

<sup>9</sup> “... *inde nationibus Indicis certatim cum donis optimates mittentibus ante tempus ab usque Diuis et Serendiuis, ...*” (“... from there the Indian nations, being in competition which each other, prematurely sent aristocrates with presents from the *Divis* and *Serendivis, ...*”) quoted from: Ammianus Marcellinus, Römische Geschichte (Latin and German, commentary by W. SEYFARTH. Part 3, book 22-25, 3rd ed., Darmstadt 1986; 1st ed. Berlin 1970), 20-21. – Cf. also TOMASCHEK in Paulys Realenzyklopädie der Class. Altertumswissenschaften, 9 (1903), 1231: “Die Form *Seren-divae* entstammt der Vermittlung durch Perser, welche die Insel Taprobane (*Sailān*) *Saran-* oder *Seren-dīb* benannten mit dem üblichen Eintritt von *r* für *l*; d.i. skr. *Sinhala-dvīpa*, prakt. *Sihala-dīva*, ‘Löwen- oder Heldeninsel’, ... Die *D(ivae)* des Ammian bezeichnen dagegen die zahlreichen Atolle der Malediven, welche sich westlich von Malabār bis zum Äquator hinabziehen und von pers. Schiffsleuten häufig besucht wurden.” (“The form *Seren-divae* reflects the Persian name of the island *Taprobane* (*Sailān*) which was called by the Persians *Saran-* or *Seren-dīb*, showing the normal substitution of *l* by *r*; i.e. Skt. *siṅhala-dvīpa*, Pkt. *sihala-dīva* ‘island of lions or heros’, ... Ammian’s *Divae*, however, refer to the numerous atolls of the Maldives which are located in the west of *Malabār*, extending up to the equator; they were often visited by Persian ships.”)

0.3.3. Some further information that might refer to the Maldive Islands is contained in chap. VI of the *Mahāvamsa* which relates about the first migration of Indo-Aryans to Ceylon. The eldest son of the legendary Sinhalese king *Sīhabāhu*, prince-regent *Vijaya*, was of evil conduct and became a robber; therefore, he was casted out by his father. *Vijaya* and his male followers, as well as their wives and children, were provided with three ships. These ships put to sea and landed on different islands. The island where the women landed was called *Mahilādīpaka* (Pali lit. “woman-island”; *mahilā-* “woman” + *dīpa-* ← *dvīpá-* “island” + suffix *-ka*).

Obviously, the Arabic name of the Maldive islands which was used in the Middle Ages by several Arabic travellers and geographers, was derived from the Pali form *Mahilādīpaka* as well. The first author who mentioned the Maldives is Yāqūt (1179-1229) who under the name of *al-dībaḡāt* refers to about one thousand islands, some of them inhabited, close by each other in the middle of the Indian Ocean.<sup>10</sup> The first extensive description of the Maldives was given by the traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (1304-1377) who calls the islands *dībat al-maḡal*.<sup>11</sup>

It cannot be decided with certainty whether the toponym of the Maldives has to be understood as “island(s) of the women” in the sense of the Pali chronicle. Probably the first part of the word represents a linguistic phenomenon which is called a “popular etymology”; nevertheless, the derivation of the second part from OIA *dvīpa-* through MIA *dīpa-* “island” is with no doubt correct.<sup>12</sup>

0.4. If it is true that the toponym *Mahilādīpaka* refers to the Maldives, the report on a simultaneous departure of three ships from the home country and their respective landing on different islands, as given in the *Mahāvamsa*, deserves a special interest. On the one hand, the question arises at what time the first migration of Indo-Aryans to the Maldives took place. On the other hand, we may wonder whether the first immigrants came directly from mainland India or via Sri Lanka. If the legend as told in the *Mahāvamsa* is not purely invented, it could be taken as an indication that the first Indo-Aryan colonists who travelled to the Maldives arrived there at the same time as those who, coming from India, settled in Sri Lanka. Furthermore, this would imply that Dhivehi and Sinhalese are “sister languages” which developed from a common Prakrit ancestor.

As to the questions concerning the immigration, there is no written tradition at all on the Maldivian side so that we have to rely upon other information. In the given case, the explanatory quality of historical-comparative linguistics is of special interest. With the help of the exact methods of a historical linguistic comparison which, in a few auspicious cases, can be completed by extralinguistic data, it is possible to gain at least a very fragmentary insight into the early periods of Maldivian history which cannot be gained in any other way. An intensive

<sup>10</sup> YĀQŪT BIN ʿABDALLAH AR-RŪMĪ: Muʿğam al-buldān, 2nd vol., Bairūt 1979, 495.

<sup>11</sup> Voyages d’ibn Baṭṭūṭa. Texte arabe, accompagné d’une traduction par C. DEFREMERY et B.R. SANGUINET-TI, Paris 1979 (1st ed. 1845).

<sup>12</sup> For the derivation of the word *divehi* meaning “Maldivian”, lit. “island-inhabitant, islander” cf. 1.3.9.5 and 2.6.2.3.1.4. The spelling *dhivehi* with initial ⟨dh⟩ as used in the official transcription in the Maldives does not reflect an aspirated consonant (for the general loss of aspirates cf. 1.3.1) but marks the dental stop /d/ as against the retroflex /d/ spelled ⟨ḍ⟩. Within this spelling system, the dental stops are generally marked by an additional ⟨h⟩.

cooperation between philologists and archeologists will be indispensable for this task, but until a short time ago, there were neither the necessary financial means nor a real interest in saving the remnants of the pre-Islamic era on the Maldivian side. In the most recent past, however, the common and the official opinion has changed; nowadays, a strong interest in the non-Islamic period is arising.

Before they were converted to Islam, the Maldivians were Buddhists. Under the ground of many islands there are ruins of Buddhist temples which are still awaiting excavation. A few monuments that have already been uncovered – in most cases in a very unprofessional way<sup>13</sup> – bear vivid testimony to this epoch of Maldivian history. As to the possibility of serious archeological investigations, no more time must be wasted because of the permanent erosion of the monuments which is caused by the equatorial climate. Until now, no written documents of the Buddhist period of the Maldives have been discovered. Thus, for lack of evidence, the pre-Islamic history of the Maldivian archipelago remains practically unknown.

0.5. As was mentioned above, the time following the conversion to Islam, at least with respect to the reignal years and the names of the sultans, is documented without interruption. There are also some older documents written in Dhivehi, but the limited number of the texts which have been preserved cannot compete in any way with the rich tradition of Sinhalese.

0.5.1. The early Dhivehi texts are written in a script named *Dives akuru* (“Maldivian script”), the oldest type of which is called *Evēla akuru* (lit. “script of that time”<sup>14</sup>). It is quite obvious that this syllabary must be related to the medieval Sinhalese script; like the latter, it must be classified as a subtype of a southern *Brāhmī* cursive. Among the oldest texts we find some inscriptions in *Evēla akuru* on three statues belonging to the National Museum in Māle (approximately from the 12th / 13th c., still unedited), as well as some decrees on copper-plates (*lōmāfanu*) issued by the early Islamic rulers, the earliest ones dating from the late 12th c. Until now, eight copper-plate documents have come to light, each of them consisting of several (up to 50) plates; some of them are in a very bad condition, though, and practically undecipherable. The latest plates must be dated in the 14th c. Two of the *lōmāfanus*, which are in a better state, have recently been edited by representatives of the “National Centre for Linguistic and Historical Research” in Māle in cooperation with members of the Department of Sinhala of the University of Colombo; in many respects, however, the quality of these editions does not satisfy scientific requirements.<sup>15</sup>

In form, the copper-plates are an imitation of palm leaves, which were the typical writing material of the whole region until recently. While the art of writing on palm leaves is still practised in Sri Lanka by a few professional calligraphers, it has been completely lost in the

<sup>13</sup> Thor HEYERDAHL’s expeditions and excavations, as attested particularly in his book “The Maldivian Mystery” (London 1986), do not meet any scientific requirements. To a large extent, his conclusions about the prehistory and the Buddhist period of the Maldives are pure illusion. – A special article on this subject is just being prepared by the author of this book.

<sup>14</sup> Dem.pron. *e* “that”; *vēla* “time”; *akuru* “script”.

<sup>15</sup> This is especially true for matters in historical linguistics. For further information cf. the material volume of this book, p. 215 f.

Maldives. There is good reason to believe that real palm leaves were used as a writing material in the Maldives in older times as well; the extremely humid and hot climate there must have destroyed them in their entirety. Even the copper-plates show many traces of erosion.

The first *lōmāfanu* plates were discovered as late as 1922 during an expedition which was supervised by the British Archaeological Commissioner for Ceylon, H.C.P. BELL, who is also the author of the most instructive and complete survey on history, geography and ethnology of the Maldive Islands which has ever been written and which, therefore, has not lost its importance until the present time.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, BELL collected the written documents of Dhivehi as far as they were available, and he even tried to analyse them with the active help of Maldivians. BELL himself had no knowledge of the Maldivian script and language.

0.5.2. Two comparatively extensive inscriptions in *Dives akuru* date from the middle of the 17th c. They are written on a wooden beam and a board and are now stored in the National Museum, Māle. One of these inscriptions was provisionally published by BELL again (1940). Besides the inscriptional attestations, there are numerous manuscripts in *Dives akuru* written on paper (*fatkoļu* “leaf(piece)”, i.e. “manuscript sheet”) which date from the 16th up to the 18th c. Two of these texts were edited for the first time by BELL as well. One of the three *Rādavaḷi* manuscripts (cf. above) is also written in *Dives akuru*. Furthermore, there are approximately 20 epitaphs and memorial inscriptions in *Dives akuru* written on stone; most of them have not yet been edited (16th-18th c.). They are to be found in Māle as well as in Mīdū and in Hitadū (Aḍḍū-Atoll).

0.5.3. The written documents of the later period, to a larger extent consisting of decrees and official letters as well, are written in *Tāna*, the right-to-left script which is still in use today. *Tāna* obviously represents a mixed product of modified *Dives akuru* characters and Arabic elements. A curious phenomenon is the use of the Arabic digits for the first nine characters of the Maldivian alphabet. Typologically *Tāna* is a mixture of a syllabary belonging to the southern *Brāhmī* type and an alphabetic script which strictly follows phonological criteria. It is not really known at what time this script emerged. It was used alongside *Dives akuru* for a longer period, until the latter was finally given up at the end of the 19th c. It is an interesting fact that in the south of the Maldives the old script was preserved much longer than in Māle.<sup>17</sup> Several documents from the 18th c. are already written in *Tāna* (some of them have been published in Maldivian journals by members of the “National Centre” in Māle; cf. above). Almost all of the numerous funeral and memorial stone inscriptions in *Tāna* which date from the 18th up to the 20th c. (in Māle, Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku and in Gan, Hitadu and Mīdu, Aḍḍū-Atoll) have not yet been edited. The most extended older text written in *Tāna* is a complete manuscript of the *Rādavaḷi* which was published in Māle in 1979.<sup>18</sup> The oldest literary texts, in the proper sense of the word, that are available to us date from the end of the 19th c.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the bibliography.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. already FRITZ (1993), 19-20.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. also in the material volume of this book.

0.6. The small amount of linguistic studies (in a wider sense) that have been devoted to Dhivehi so far<sup>19</sup> shows that there has been but little interest in this language. In most cases, Dhivehi is not even mentioned in general indological literature. Exceptions are R.L. TURNER's "Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages" (1966, I/II), the new edition of G.A. ZOGRAF's "Jazyki južnoj Azii" (1990) and C.P. MASICA's survey "The Indo-Aryan Languages" (1991); the information about Dhivehi as given there does not exceed a few fragmentary notes, however. The amount of special literature having Dhivehi as its subject is very restricted as well. Only a few publications exist, some of them having a very popular character; their only value consists in the material they comprise. In most cases, studies of a more scientific character are not really informative either, and there are practically no works of reference.

0.6.1. Thus, the very first – and still the only existing – sketch of a Maldivian grammar which was published by W. GEIGER at the beginning of the 20th century (1901-1902 and 1919), is very fragmentary. GEIGER himself never had the opportunity to visit the Maldives; his contact with the language remained sporadic. When he was in Colombo in winter 1895-96, he had three short meetings with the Maldivian aristocrat and merchant A. Ebrahim Dīdī Effendi who was the prime minister of the Maldivian Sultan and, at the same time, consul of the Ottoman Empire and who sojourned in Colombo at that time.<sup>20</sup> The outcome of these meetings was a small vocabulary and some paradigms and sentences, which GEIGER noted. Some time later, he was able to enlarge this very restricted material on the basis of an indirect correspondence with a native speaker of Arabic who had a certain knowledge of Dhivehi.<sup>21</sup> As we should expect, the results of these hasty contacts were meagre and not free from mistakes. Because of his brilliant knowledge of the Sinhalese language, however, GEIGER was able to publish at least a rudimentary grammatical sketch which has remained the only printed grammar of Dhivehi until now; its English version was reprinted in unchanged form in 1986 in Māle. In the German original, the chapter on morphology comprises no more than 20 pages (35 pages in the English translation; the difference is mainly due to the printing fonts used, not by an enlargement of information).

0.6.2. Besides this, GEIGER (1902) published a small etymological vocabulary of 435 words which has also remained the only publication of its kind so far. There exists no dictionary yet which could be used for reliable reference. The word list of the French seafarer Pyrard de Laval who sojourned in the Maldives in the 17th c. (PYRARD/GRAY 1878), as well as the vocabulary compiled by the British officers J. Wilson and W. Christopher in the 19th c. (WILSON/CHRISTOPHER 1841) have a certain value for the solution of some problems concerning the historical phonology of Dhivehi, but beyond that their importance is marginal. Some modern glossaries which contain very incomplete collections of the colloquial vocabulary of the modern standard language (partly with mistakes) are of a restricted usability as well (MITE 1986; SHISHIDO 1983; DISANAYAKA/MANIKU 1990). Quite recently, a monolingual dictionary covering 16 volumes appeared in Māle (NCLHR 1985-91; ca. 125 handwritten pages per vol.). As it contains many instances of inaccuracy, its compilers (members of the

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the list given in FRITZ (1993), 15 ff. For further bibliographical information cf. the bibliography.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1973), 345.

<sup>21</sup> For details cf. FRITZ (1993), 23.

“National Centre for Historical and Linguistic Research”, Māle) already begun working on a new edition before the project was finished; a first enhanced version has been made available in electronic form in 2000.

0.6.3. Three articles by the Sinhalese philologist M.W.S. DE SILVA (1969, 1970a, 1970b) must be considered as the first efforts to investigate Dhivehi on the basis of modern linguistic methods. DE SILVA for the first time tried to elucidate and to explain the relationship between Dhivehi and Sinhalese. The same goal was aimed at by a team of Sinhalese and Maldivian authors who compiled an (unpublished) study finished in 1988 (HLSO 1988) which comprises a small collection of phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical correspondences between Dhivehi and Sinhalese; the final conclusions about the genetic relation of the two languages, which are based on poor material and contain many mistakes, do not meet scientific criteria.

0.6.4. The increasing interest of the Maldivians in their own language, history and culture which can be observed nowadays manifests itself in the periodical *Fattūra* which contains articles about Maldivian history and literature, including literary products of contemporary Maldivian original writers as well as translated texts. In *Fattūra* we also find some articles about lexical and morphological questions concerning the Dhivehi language.

0.6.5. The philological studies of the Maldivian scholar HASSAN AHMED MANIKU deserve special interest. Most of his publications are dedicated to the cultural and linguistic heritage of the Maldives (MANIKU, 1988-1989). In more recent times, Dhivehi was the subject of an article on the expression of the passive voice and a provisional “Pre-Publication Draft” of a planned “Grammatical Sketch of Dhivehi” by B. CAIN (1995 / 1992) and two articles by the author of the present book (FRITZ 1989-1990 and 1993).

0.7. The question concerning the approximate time of the first Indo-Aryan migration to the Maldives, which is regarded as a substantial problem by many Maldivians, has yielded two contradictory theses which have to be discussed here.

0.7.1. Although GEIGER’s studies about Dhivehi represent the foundation stone of any scientific linguistic investigation into this language, the material he collected did not suffice to judge the “degree of relationship” of Dhivehi and Sinhalese. As to the presumptive period of the Indo-Aryan migration to the Maldivian Islands, GEIGER’s basic assumption can be proved to be wrong. Relying himself on the prejudice that Dhivehi must be a dialectal offspring of Sinhalese, he concluded that the splitting time was not earlier than the 10th c. A.D. This, however, would imply a real exodus from Sri Lanka to the Maldives to have taken place in the middle ages. But there is no convincing reason why thousands of Sinhalese people should have given up their fertile home country in order to exchange it for the comparatively sterile Maldivian Islands; the only imaginable motive for such an emigration could have been a war or an epidemic. However, whatever the reason of such a sudden and powerful colonisation of the Maldives might have been — the Sinhalese chronicle would certainly have mentioned it. But in fact there is not even a short note which could support GEIGER’s assumption. Ibn

Baṭṭūta who in the 14th c. spent one year and a half in the Maldives working as a *cadi*, noted everything which seemed to be important to him; if the Maldives had been settled relatively recently, he would certainly have heard about that. And, last but not least, we should expect that the Maldivian chronicle, albeit giving more exact dates only from the year 1153 A.D., would have reported about such a sudden immigration at least in legendary form. Furthermore, the few Maldivian legends that refer to the pre-Islamic period do not contain any indications which speak in favour of a recent mass immigration. None of these extralinguistic arguments supports GEIGER's thesis, which, however, cannot be disproved by them either. Until there are serious archeological investigations that testify to an earlier settlement by Indo-Aryans, we have to look for other pieces of scientific evidence.

0.7.2. The Sinhalese philologist DE SILVA (1970b) published the hypothesis that the Maldives were colonised at the same time as Sri Lanka, by Indo-Aryan tribes who came from South India.<sup>22</sup> According to DE SILVA, a first Indo-Aryan immigration, perhaps of a larger extent, could have taken place as early as the 5th or 4th c. B.C., the possibility of smaller migration waves during the following centuries, probably also from Sri Lanka, notwithstanding. In this connection, the episode about the ship used by the women which lands on the island *Mahilā-dīpaka*, as reported in the *Mahāvamsa*, deserves a certain interest. It is not difficult to imagine that some of the ships that were on the way to Sri Lanka missed their original destination because of adverse winds or currents and thus landed on the Maldives. Comparable incidents are well known from the more recent past. Besides the attested cases of ships or boats from far away, driven off course, an enormous number of ships were destroyed by reefs surrounding the islands, which are hard to locate for navigators; many of these wrecks are still to be found around the Maldives. Over the last two-three centuries, several cases of crews who have had to stay in the Maldives after their vessels were broken are attested. Thus, the assumption that the first Indo-Aryan settlers might have reached the Maldives by accident, is not completely unfounded.

0.8. Jakob GRIMM's famous sentence according to which "our language is also our history"<sup>23</sup> holds true for many nations and tribes. As to the special case of the Maldivians, the history of the language even represents the only possible basis for investigations into their prehistory. Both GEIGER and DE SILVA built their respective migration theses on linguistic data. GEIGER paid special attention to the common features of Sinhalese and Dhivehi, as far as they were known to him, while DE SILVA, without neglecting the importance of, looked particularly for features that distinguish the two languages. He tried to find divergences concerning the inherited categories as well as special developments in the field of areal typology. However, neither thesis is convincing in its present state; there being but a very small quantity of Dhivehi material at our disposal, neither GEIGER's nor DE SILVA's thesis can be proved or disproved with certainty. Some facts, however, seem to speak in favour of the

<sup>22</sup> Here, the question whether their original homeland was located in the northwest or in the northeast of the Subcontinent was left open by DE SILVA. In a later publication (1979) he considers the "Western hypothesis" as more probable.

<sup>23</sup> "Unsere Sprache ist auch unsere Geschichte." Kleinere Schriften, I, 1864, 290.

assumption that Indo-Aryans might already have been present on the Maldivian islands for a certain period, perhaps even a long time before the 10th c. A.D. Neither GEIGER nor DE SILVA were aware of the complicated dialectal situation that is to be found in the Maldives. If they had had the opportunity to investigate more than the standard language, which represents the dialect of Māle, and if they had been able to compare more than only some isolated elements of this particular idiom with Sinhalese, GEIGER's model would be less rigid and DE SILVA's arguments more effective.

0.8.1. Despite some other errors and misleading conclusions, DE SILVA, when regarding the historical-phonological development of Dhivehi and Sinhalese, discovered two essential features that speak in favour of a very early dialectal separation of the two languages.<sup>24</sup> The first feature concerned is the development of the OIA glide /y/ which in initial position is preserved as /y-/ in Sinhalese while it is represented by /d-/ in the same position in Dhivehi without exception (cp., e.g., Sinh. *yanavā* vs. Dhiv. (M.) *danī* "to go" ← OIA *yāti* "goes"). This sound law would be less decisive if the dialectal differentiation could not be traced back to the MIA period. The second important phonological divergence is not as archaic as the one just mentioned. It consists in the different development in Dhivehi and Sinhalese of the OIA and MIA affricates.<sup>25</sup> All the other divergences (some of them great) between the phoneme systems of the two insular languages can be assigned to the modern Indo-Aryan epoch only; some of these, however, are already attested in the oldest Maldivian texts (12th c., cf. above). Considering phonological features only, the amount of material which I had the opportunity to study leaves us no doubt that GEIGER's thesis is wrong. His assumption that the first Indo-Aryan settlers of the Maldives came from Sri Lanka and arrived no earlier than the 10th c., can no longer be maintained. In morphology, as well, there are many significant differences between Old Dhivehi and the Sinhalese language of the late medieval period, i.e. the early form of Classical Sinhalese. It is quite improbable that the fundamental morphological differences which characterise some verbal categories might have developed within one or two centuries only, as GEIGER's temporal framework considering the assumed "splitting off" of Dhivehi would imply.<sup>26</sup>

0.8.2. A striking typological difference between Dhivehi and Sinhalese is met with in the structure of the numeral system. Until the most recent past, Dhivehi disposed of a complete duodecimal system which was still in use at the beginning of the 20th c. This system which was characterised by special lexical items based on calculating operations with duodecimal numbers, determined all weights and measures, as well. In contrast to that, there are no attestations of a particular duodecimal system in Sinhalese in any period of its well documented history. However, apart from the obviously dominating duodecimal system, decimal numbers have always existed in Dhivehi, attestations being found already in the old texts. In all dialects, the duodecimal numbers have been replaced by the decimal numbers the system of which shows many innovations as to the formation of the numerals. Some of the more

<sup>24</sup> For details cf. 1.7.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. 1.7.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1919), 100: "In one word, Máldivian must have separated from Sinhalese at a time when the latter had already, in respect of sound, assumed the form which it has at present. And this, as I think I have proven, was about the year 900 A.D."

archaic Maldivian decimal numbers obviously represent prakritisms<sup>27</sup> which are not attested in Sinhalese; they are of particular interest here.

0.8.3. Regarding the lexical items that were borrowed from Sinhalese into Dhivehi, the Sinhalese language with its unbroken written tradition can be used as chronological parameter. Even though thorough investigations of Sinhalese loanwords in Dhivehi have not yet been undertaken, it is to be expected that the respective diachronical layers of Sinhalese loanwords in Dhivehi reflect different stages in the phonological development of Sinhalese; furthermore, depending on the time when the Sinhalese words were borrowed into Dhivehi, they will also reflect some of the particular sound changes that are exclusively characteristic for Dhivehi. Thus, it is possible that a systematical historical investigation into the Sinhalese loanwords will not only inform us about the intensity and the effectivity of (bilingual) contacts in the course of time, but will perhaps even allow us to draw our conclusions concerning the chronology of the migrations from Sri Lanka to the Maldives.

0.8.4. Despite the more extensive research work that has been devoted to Dhivehi in recent times, and its results which also elucidate parts of the history of the language, it is still too early to decide with certainty whether Dhivehi and Sinhalese developed at about the same time from a common Prakrit ancestor which would allow to call them “sister languages” in the literal sense of the word, as proposed by DE SILVA. We cannot disprove the opposite assumption that Dhivehi might represent a “daughter language” of Sinhalese which split off from it in prehistorical time; it is clear, however, that this time must have been much earlier than GEIGER supposed.

0.9. The relationship between Dhivehi and Sinhalese is not only the most important objective when the history of the language is concerned, but also an indispensable means for judging the evolutionary background of certain dialectal phenomena occurring in Dhivehi. Within this framework it is necessary to regard the diglossia which characterises all levels of contemporary Sinhalese. The modern written language is interwoven with many influences from the earlier stages of the literary language, from poetry as well as from classical prose; furthermore, a permanent infiltration of loanwords (often in the function of *mots savants*) from Sanskrit, Pali and Classical Sinhalese can still be observed nowadays. Apart from that, from the point of view of morphology, syntax and stylistics as well, the modern written language is heterogeneous. This can be explained by the parallel use of different diachronical strata which causes the great variety of concomitant stylistic levels we find in the written language. In contrast to this, the colloquial language is characterised by manifold simplifications both in morphology and syntax as well as comparatively reduced stylistic means of expression. The highly developed diglossia we observe in Sinhalese is typical only for languages with a long and popular literary tradition. Thus, a language like Dhivehi with its relatively meagre literary resources is likely to exhibit a completely different picture. Concerning its vocabulary,

<sup>27</sup> Within the given context the term “prakritism” is to be understood in the sense of a “loanword from a MIA language”. In Old Dhivehi prakritisms, in correspondence with sanskritisms, were used as *mots savants* (in the written language).

its grammatical categories and its stylistic possibilities, however, Dhivehi is not a “poor” language at all, given its abundant dialectal variation on the one hand and its rich tradition of oral folklore on the other hand. It is written poetry of any kind, however, which has developed only recently as a new literary category and which has remained confined to the standard language.

0.9.1. The speakers of Dhivehi are scattered all over a vast area, the geographical circumstances preventing them from being in very close contact with each other. This situation has resulted in a remarkable dialectal differentiation. The archipelago which consists of ca. 1200 islands, ca. 200 of them inhabited, covers a distance of 885 km from north to south. If we take Minicoy (Maliku) into account, an island now belonging to India which is situated at the northern end of the Maldivian archipelago where Dhivehi is spoken as well, the Maldives extend to a length of about 1000 km. The numerous subdialects are divided into two main groups: a northern and a southern one. The latter is restricted to the three southernmost atolls with the traditional names Huvadū, Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku and Aḍḍū.<sup>28</sup> There are some considerable differences between the particular subdialects of the south. The dialectal divergences between North and South Dhivehi are of such a quality that northern Maldivians can hardly understand the southern dialects. The opposite is much easier since the Māle standard language has become widespread. The northern dialect group which extends from the Haddummati (Lām) Atoll in the south up to Minicoy, is very homogeneous. The dialect of Māle is a typical representative of this group.

0.9.1.1. It has been observable during the last years that the active knowledge of the unwritten dialects is getting lost in favour of an increasing competence of the standard language. The fact that the standard language is used in education and administration all over the atolls is not the only reason for this development; the role played by the mass media, television and radio which broadcast from Māle all over the islands, is gaining more and more importance.

0.9.1.2. In many respects, the dialects of Dhivehi represent different diachronical stages in the development of the language. Especially in the field of morphology, the amount of archaic features steadily increases from north to south. Within the three southernmost atolls, the dialect of the Aḍḍū islands which form the southern tip of the whole Maldivian archipelago, is characterised by the highest degree of archaicity. Thus, the different classes of verb conjugation and nominal inflection are best preserved there, morphological simplifications and, as a consequence, irregularities increasing from atoll to atoll towards the north. From a strictly morphological point of view, the southern dialects which are still very rich in forms correspond more to Classical Sinhalese than to northern Dhivehi which has lost many forms and even complete morphological categories. On the other hand, the northern Maldivian dialects, including the colloquial standard language, can be compared with colloquial Sinhalese, the morphology of which has also undergone considerable reductions.

<sup>28</sup> The modern official names are: *Gāf-Alif / Gāf-Dāl* Atoll, *Ānaviyani (Gnaviyani)* Atoll and *Sīn* Atoll.

0.9.1.3. As is to be expected, the dialects also show many differences in their vocabularies. In many cases different etyma are used for the same concept. But there are also divergences concerning whole systems. A very prominent example are the personal pronouns where, to a large extent, the northern and the southern dialects show different etyma.

0.9.1.4. In phonological development the interdialectal differences are less significant. As a rule, the vowel system of the standard language is more conservative than that of the southern dialects, while the latter show some archaic features in their consonant system which are not to be found in North Dhivehi (any longer).<sup>29</sup> Some of the phonological divergences between the northern and the southern area can be regarded as archaic.<sup>30</sup>

0.9.1.5. Comparative syntax does not reveal any systematical differences between the dialects. The most decisive point of Maldivian syntax consists in the question whether a sentence contains a finite verb or not. The basic clause structure depends on this predisposition. In comparison with the significance of this main rule, the other syntactical rules play a subordinate role only.

0.9.2. A special development of Dhivehi which is very peculiar from a typological point of view, is confined to the standard language. While the expression of the social status, on the one hand, and politeness, appreciation, despise, intimacy and respect for older people, on the other hand, is not unknown to the languages of the Subcontinent in general, the hierarchical system we find in the traditional language of Māle is unique within the languages of South Asia for different reasons. The pure existence of three formally differentiated social degrees alone would not be surprising as such within the areal context. But, in contrast to the other Modern IA languages, the Maldivian language perfectly reflects the threefold system of social status which originally consisted of commoners (1st honorific degree), nobles (2nd degree) and the king and queen, nowadays replaced by the president and leaders of institutions (3rd degree). In standard Maldivian the expression of hierarchy is strictly organised and completely formalised, the social status being represented by the three honorific degrees as indicated. The language of Māle is the only modern IA dialect where all personal pronouns, including the first person, are systematically distinguished according to the status of the respective person. Thus, all forms are unambiguously marked, which includes that the relation of the particular forms to the respective social level is straight-forward and unchangeable. It is neither possible to change the stylistic level in order to express more intimacy or distance, nor are there any special forms that refer to a hierarchy of age. The primary criterion of this system consists in differentiating status and nothing else. All kind of communication depends on the social rank, acquired by birth, of the speaker, the addressee and third persons referred to. Politeness is important but has no influence on the choice of the respective pronoun.

The expression of status is not restricted to the pronominal system, however. Thus, nouns are integrated into the hierarchical order by help of two special suffixes. Even the use of particles depends on the common status criteria. One of the most remarkable features consists

<sup>29</sup> Cp., e.g., the phonematic difference between /n/ and /ɳ/ as preserved in the southern dialects as against the uniform /n/ appearing in North Dhivehi; cf. 1.3.7.

<sup>30</sup> Cp. M. /l/ vs. A.F. /d/ as described in 1.3.7.2.

in a very strict, hierarchically organised verbal system. Three verbal levels are expressed mainly by causative formations, partly also by lexical means.

The systematic use of the honorific levels has always been a special feature of the capital and its sphere of influence, where the differentiation of the three status classes was an omnipresent phenomenon. Nowadays the significance of the threefold social splitting is loosing importance even here, though, which corresponds with a decreasing competence for the honorific system of the language. The sociolect of the sultan's palace ("palace language") which represents the most elevated level from the stylistical point of view, is almost forgotten now, because the courtly lifestyle has disappeared. In the southern Maldives where the society has always been more homogeneous, there are even no traces whatsoever of a comparable linguistic differentiation.<sup>31</sup>

0.10. The primary goal of the present grammar consists in a detailed comparative description of the morphology of the main dialects of Dhivehi. Furthermore, without a solid knowledge of the morphological relations it would be impossible to give a correct phonological description, because there are many morphonological processes that play an important role in Modern Dhivehi.

From the morphological point of view, the dialect of Aḍḍū is the most conservative one. It is of a special interest because of the high degree of regularity and transparency of its forms. A good knowledge of the morphological system of the Aḍḍū dialect helps to judge and to explain many of the (secondary) developments of the other dialects which seem to be irregular; this is especially true for modern northern Dhivehi which shows a comparatively reduced morphology. Furthermore, without the morphological background of the Aḍḍū dialect, it would be difficult to establish the syntactical function of the oblique case in the standard language, because this inherited case form has almost completely been lost there, while in the southern dialects it is preserved not only as a syntactical factor but, to a certain extent (especially in the pronominal system), also as a morphological unit. The dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku which essentially corresponds with that of Aḍḍū in the manifestation of the formal categories, at the same time shows many morphological peculiarities that are characteristic for northern Dhivehi. As a result of these overlaps, the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku is less transparent from the formal point of view. With respect to morphology, the dialect of Huvadū is a more typical representant of southern Dhivehi. With regard to the phonology, however, there are some special developments that are characteristic for Huvadū alone.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>31</sup> The Maldivian honorific system will be the subject of a separate study which at present is under preparation. In it, the phenomenon will be treated within an enlarged areal context.

<sup>32</sup> Depending on the (mainly temporal) circumstances of my research stay in 1993, I had to concentrate primarily on the two southernmost dialects as well as on the standard language. The material I could collect from Huvadū is relatively restricted and, as a consequence, my Huvadū database is much smaller than the other data collections. Therefore, the dialect of Huvadū plays only a small role within the framework of this book.



# Phonology

## 1. The sound system

Except for some special developments, the sound system of Dhivehi can be regarded as typical for a South Indian language. Among the characteristics common to Modern Indo-Aryan languages, the Maldivian phonemic inventory shows an opposition of long and short vowels, of dental and retroflex consonants as well as of single and geminate consonants, furthermore diphthongs and nasalised vowels (the latter having a phonemic value only in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, cf. below). There are three peculiar features that Dhivehi shares with Sinhalese, viz. the complete loss of the aspirated consonants, the emergence of prenasalised stops and, finally, considerable vowel changes as a consequence of *umlaut*-processes.

1.1. To illustrate these basic principles, a concise survey of the most important historical sound changes that are responsible for the phonological peculiarities of modern Dhivehi in comparison with its Sinhalese sister language is required.<sup>33</sup> The essential changes occurred gradually, following an hierarchical order within the framework of a continuous process which affected and transformed considerable parts of the sound system.

1.1.1. With the other modern Indo-Aryan languages Dhivehi shares the fundamental sound changes that mark the beginning of this epoch, the earliest characteristics of which can be traced back already to late Middle Indo-Aryan times. For instance, it shows no long vowels in inherited words which could be derived directly from corresponding Old Indo-Aryan long vowels.<sup>34</sup> In general, the long vowels of the modern language have emerged as a secondary result of the contraction of two originally short vowels after the loss of intervocalic consonants during the Middle Indian period.<sup>35</sup>

1.1.2. Old Dhivehi as handed down in its earliest written documents,<sup>36</sup> the *lōmāfanus*, had only open syllables. From the fact that there were no closed syllables, it follows that the prenasalised stops have to be considered as monophonemic (cf. 1.3.4); this coincides with the fact that they were never written as sequences of *nasals* + *stops*. The writing rule also implies that there were no consonant clusters in Old Dhivehi (cf. 1.3.8). In the language of those days, the contemporary (nominal and verbal) consonant stems (cf. 2.3.1.3) still ended in *-u*; e.g. *raṭu* “island, land” (attested since L1 [f/2,1]; today M. [raʔ] ⟨*raṣ*⟩) or *eku* “one” (attested since L3 4/1,5; today M. [eʔ] ⟨*ek*⟩), *koṭu* abs. “having done, made” (attested since L1 [d/1,2]; today M. [koʔ] ⟨*koṣ*⟩). The question whether the same rule applied to southern Dhivehi in ancient times as well, or whether we have to assume a dialectal differentiation

<sup>33</sup> For a treatise of some general features of the historical phonology of Dhivehi, cf. FRITZ / GIPPERT (2000), 139-152.

<sup>34</sup> Cf., e.g., MASICA (1991), 189. – For concrete Dhivehi examples cf. 1.2.1.

<sup>35</sup> For examples cf. 1.2.1.3.

<sup>36</sup> For the different types of documents cf. introduction, 0.5.1 and furthermore vol.ii. of the present book.

similar to that of nowadays,<sup>37</sup> cannot be answered with certainty, because all linguistic documents were written in the standard language.

1.1.3. The history of Dhivehi – as far as it is attested by written documents – shows that final *-u* in the position after voiceless consonants, nasals and *l* tended to be apocopated more and more in the course of the centuries, while it was conserved after retroflex and voiced consonants. As a result of this development, in modern Dhivehi only the consonants */n/*, */s/*, */k/*, */t/* and */s ← t/* can be found in final position. While */n/* in final position is articulated as a velar *[ŋ]* in all dialects (e.g. *mihun* *[mihuŋ]* “people”<sup>38</sup>), the other four consonants mentioned are subject to considerable phonetic changes which for the most part vary from dialect to dialect. The only phoneme that is realised homogeneously is */-k/* which phonetically occurs as glottal stop *[ʔ]* in the whole Dhivehi speaking area. In the southern dialects, final */-t/* has been changed phonetically to *[ʔ]* as well,<sup>39</sup> while in the standard language */-t/* is realised as glide *[y]* forming a diphthong with the preceding vowel; for this development cp., e.g., the *casus rectus* M. *[foi]* in comparison with A.F. *[foʔ]* */fot/* “book”.<sup>40</sup> In the dialect of Addū as well as the standard language, final */-s/* is pronounced as *[ʔ]* too, while we have to state a completely different development for Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku where the phoneme */s/* is never met with in word-final position. Obviously, there was no tendency in this dialect to omit the following vowel which, however, underwent some qualitative changes; cf. F. *rašo* “island, land” vs. M.A. *[raʔ]* */raś/* (*← /raʃu/*, attested since L1 *[f/2,1]*).<sup>41</sup> While final */-s/* remained unchanged in the standard language and in Addū, the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku shows an allophonic change of */-s/* to *[h]* in the same position, followed by a weakly articulated vowel which echoes the vowel of the preceding syllable; cp., e.g., F. *maha* with M.A. *mas* “fish”.<sup>42</sup> The Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku dialect is peculiar with respect to final */l/* as well, for it is the only dialect where this consonant has been preserved to this day in its original phonetic quality (cf. 1.2.1.6).

It follows from these observations that *[ʔ]* has no phonemic value of its own. It only serves as an allophonic variant of the final consonants M.A.F. */-k/*, A.F. */-t/* and M.A. */-s/*. It is important to draw attention to the fact that this phonological function of the glottal stop has to be regarded separately from a pure phonetic phenomenon typical not only for Dhivehi and Sinhalese, viz. the automatic articulation of a glottal stop *[ʔ]* following inevitably every vowel in word-final position, which is a widespread phenomenon throughout the South Asian languages; cp., e.g., the adjective M. *boḍu*, F. *boṅḍo*, A. *boṅḍa* “big”, which is pronounced *[boḍuʔ]*, *[boṅḍoʔ]* and *[boṅḍaʔ]*, resp. This kind of glottal stop has neither phonological nor morphological significance.

1.1.4. The nasal *m*, which by apocope of the final *-u* came into absolute final position, was changed into *-n* *[ŋ]*, but it remained *m* within the paradigm when it was not final. A tendency of changing *-m* → *-n* can be noticed already in the earliest documents. Alongside *kamu* “fact, deed” which is attested in this form from L1 (d/2,3) up to the *Tāna*-period, the same word was written in parallel *kan*, which can be found as early as L5 (5/2,2) as well; cf. also *bimu*

<sup>37</sup> Cf. 2.3.1.3.4.1 below.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. also 2.3.1.3.1.

<sup>39</sup> For examples and for the spelling of the two latter phonemes cf. 2.3.1.3.1.

<sup>40</sup> For more details and examples cf. 1.2.2.4.

<sup>41</sup> For a detailed study on the dative ending F. *-aśa* cf. 2.3.1.1.3.

<sup>42</sup> For some further examples cf. 2.3.1.3.1.

“earth, soil, ground, land” (F3,14; F6,11) with its variant *bin* which is attested in *fatkolus* in the compounds *binbai* “share, portion of land” (F6,11; F8,23) and *bingañḍu* “id.” (F4,3). There can be no doubt that the spelling with final *-u* does not reflect the actual pronunciation, at least in later times; these forms must be explained as results of historical spelling instead.

1.1.5. Besides the apocope of final *-u* we have to deal with a syncope of medial *-u-* and *-a-* which took place under the same phonological conditions. There is much evidence for this process being as old as the ancient documents. Cp. the name of the island *Isdū* which often occurs as *isu-duvu* since L1 (s/1,4), as against the variant form *is-duvu* appearing in L2 (7, 2) and L3 (12/1,3) which already shows syncope;<sup>43</sup> the sibilant *s* in *isdū* was preserved because it belongs to the very few consonants in Dhivehi that are not omitted in final position (cf. 1.1.3 above). Cf. also the ancient word for “officer”, lit. “the one having received a task (to do)” which is attested in many documents as *kamu-gati* (L2 6,2; L6 2,4; F5,39,43; cf. also the plural *kamugatīn-āi* “and officers” in L5 5/1,4 as well as the indef. plural forms *kamugattakun* in L1 n/1,1 and *kamugatyakun* in L2 37,5), as against syncopated *kam-gati* (L4 f/1,7 and g/1,1; indef. plural *kamgatyakun* “officers” in L3 3/2,1).<sup>44</sup> On the other hand, all consonants which after the loss of the originally word-final vowels could not appear in final position themselves yielded geminates in syncope environments.<sup>45</sup> Cp., e.g., the contemporary name of the southernmost atoll, *Aḍḍū*, which has to be derived through an intermediate form *aṭ-duvu* (L4 a/2,4), syncopated from *\*aṭa/aṭu-duvu*, lit. “eight-island-(atoll)”; cf. also the name of the island *Todḍū* which is attested as *totḍuvu* (L2 11,2,3; L3 10/2,3) from *\*toṭu-duvu*, approximately “ford-island”. Another consonant that could not enter final position is *t* as in *batterā* “rice man, rice farmer” which is attested in its genitive form written *bat-veriage* (L2 28,3). Finally, the same kind of syncope is also responsible for the geminates that characterise the regular formation of causatives (cf. 1.3.9.12).

## 1.2. The vowels

1.2.1. The vowel system of modern Dhivehi is strictly symmetrical. It consists of five vocalic qualities which show a phonemic differentiation of quantity: *a – ā, i – ī, u – ū, e – ē, o – ō*. As was mentioned above, there are no inherited words with long vowels that could be derived directly from the corresponding long vowels of Old Indo-Aryan. GEIGER (1938, 14-15) shows that the same process is valid for Sinhalese as well where the inherited long vowels merged with the short ones not later than the Proto-Sinhalese period, i.e., the 5th c. A.D.; cp., e.g., Sinh. *gama*, stem *gam-* “village” vs. Pa., Pkt. *gāma-*, OIA *grāma-*<sup>46</sup>; Sinh. *nil* “blue, green, dark” vs. Pa. *nīla-*, OIA *nīla-*<sup>47</sup>; Sinh. *duma*, stem *dum-* “smoke, steem” vs. Pa., Pkt.

<sup>43</sup> For Dhiv. *dū* ← *duvu* “island” cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4.

<sup>44</sup> */gat/, gatī* part.pret. of *gannāi*, originally meaning “to get”, but nowadays meaning only “to buy”; for more detailed information on this verb cf. 3.11.4.3. – For *kam(u)* cf. 1.1.5.

<sup>45</sup> For details cf. 1.3.9.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 53, no. 777 and TURNER (1966) I, 234, no. 4368.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 89, no. 1310 and TURNER (1966) I, 426, no. 7563.

*dhūma-*, OIA *dhūmā-*<sup>48</sup> etc. Cp. the equivalent words of Dhivehi, *gamu* “village” (L1 s/2,4 etc.; L2 6,3; L3 3/2,2 and 11/1,2; L4 e/2,2 etc.; in Modern Dhivehi only preserved in the island name *Gan*<sup>49</sup>), F. *nil* “blue” (vs. M.A. *nū* ← \**niu* ← *ni*<sup>50</sup>), M.A.F. *dun*, i.e. [*duŋ*] /*dum*/ “smoke, steam”.

There are several words in the basic vocabulary of Dhivehi which show medial long vowels in accordance with long vowels of their correspondents in OIA and MIA. These must without doubt be classified as sanskritisms or prakritisms, resp. Cp. A.F. *vēla* “time” with OIA *vēlā-* “limit, boundary, time” (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 702, no. 12115); M. *uñdōli*, A.F. *iñdōli* “typical Maldivian wing hanging from the ceiling inside the house” with OIA *hindola-* “wing, swing cradle” vs. Sinh. *idolu-va* “palanquin, sedan”, Hi. *hindol(ā)*;<sup>51</sup> M.A.F. *jōli* “a baglike seat or wing outside the house” with OIA \**jhola-* “bag” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 299, no. 5415); M. *dōni*, A.F. *dōni* “boat, ship (of the common Maldivian type)” with Pkt. *dōñi-* “boat”, ← OIA *droñi-* “wooden trough” (MBh.), vs. Pa., Pkt. *doṇa-* ← *drōṇa-* (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 379, no. 6641).

1.2.1.1. **Long vowels** in initial position are extremely rare in Dhivehi. No verb begins with a long vowel, and almost all nouns that show a primary initial long vowel can be explained as sanskritisms such as M.A.F. *āditta* “Sunday” (OIA *ādityā-* “son of Aditi, name of seven deities, esp. of the sun”: TURNER 1966, I, 52, no. 1153), or loanwords that obviously have been borrowed more recently such as M.A.F. *ītu* “roof tile” (probably from Hi. *ī* “id.”,<sup>52</sup> cf. Pkt. *īṭtagā-*, *īṭā-*, OIA *īṣṭakā-*; TURNER 1966, I, 72, no. 1600); M.A.F. *āda* “habit, norm, rule” (← Arab. *ādāt* “id.”), or M. *ōḍaru* “order” (← Engl. *order*) etc.

Only a few Dhivehi words that belong to the inherited vocabulary have a long initial vowel, which in most cases can be explained by contractions. This is true, e.g. for the long *ē-* of the personal pronouns of the 3.ps.sg., *ēti* “it” and *ēnā* “he, she”, of the standard language which obviously developed by a merger of the demonstrative *e* “that” with a noun (*ēti* ← *e+eti* “that thing”, cf. 2.6.2.5.1.1; *ēnā* ← *e+V(?)nā*, cf. 2.6.2.5.3). — Other examples can be explained by assuming the loss of a consonant between vowels: cf. A. *ū*<sup>53</sup> “rope, thread, cord” ← \*(*h*)*u(v)u* vs. Sinh. *huya*, stem *hu/hū-* “id.” ← Pkt. *sūya-*, Skt. *sūta-* “id.”,<sup>54</sup> or M.A.F. *ūru* ← \*(*h*)*u(v)uru* “pig” vs. Sinh. (*h*)*ūrā*, stem (*h*)*ūru-* “id.” ← Pkt. *sūara-* ← OIA

<sup>48</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 78, no. 1161; TURNER (1966) I, 392, no. 6849.

<sup>49</sup> *Gan* is the name of the southernmost island of the Aḍḍū-Atoll as well as the name of an island in Haddummati- (= *Lām-*) Atoll. — For the change of final *-m* → *-n* cf. 1.1.4.

<sup>50</sup> For the change of *-l* → *-u* cf. 1.2.1.6.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 815, no. 14094 and GEIGER (1941), 21, no. 322.

<sup>52</sup> Although it might seem dubious that Dhivehi could have received direct loans from Hindi or Urdu, it is highly probable that the source of Dhiv. *ītu* has to be seen in Hi. *ī*. The retroflex */t/* shows that the word has been borrowed only recently, because otherwise */t/* would have changed to */s/* in all dialects except Huvadū. As in many other cases, the word seems to have been imported together with the *reale* it denotes. Roof tiles and normal tiles were unknown in traditional Maldivian architecture and have come into a limited use very recently only; they were imported from India and Sri Lanka. The traditional building material was produced from plants (mostly from the coconut tree) and from coral stone. — Cp. also the common Sinh. word for “tile”, *uḷu* (e.g. *uḷu kūtaya* “(roof) tile”) which cannot be the source of Dhiv. *ītu*; the etymology of *uḷu* is not clear, however, cf. TURNER (1966), I, 77, no. 1681 and GEIGER (1941), 29, no. 443.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. also the case forms A. gen. *ūe*, dat. *ūā* / *ū-aś*/, abl. *ūn* / *ū-un*/.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 193, no. 2915; cf. also TURNER (1966) II, 781, no. 13561 s.v. OIA *sūtra-* “id.”.

*sūkarā-* “boar”.<sup>55</sup> For the initial long vowel of the presumably inherited numeral M.A.F. *āhi* “80” (cf. 2.5.1.4) there is no convincing explanation so far.

1.2.1.2. A special group among the words with initial long vowel is constituted by certain nominal *i*-stems in Aḍḍū and, to a much higher degree, in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. There, the paradigmatic loss of the stem-final *-i* led to a transformation of the phonetic scope of the nouns in question. In most cases the characteristic trait of this process is the lengthening and subsequent accentuation of the root vowel. In the dialect of Aḍḍū, this morphological process can be noted only sporadically, being restricted, besides a few exceptions, to single oblique case forms and to the definite and indefinite form only.<sup>56</sup> In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, however, it has spread throughout whole paradigms, resulting in the emergence of some nouns with initial long vowel.<sup>57</sup> Cf. the nom. A. *āli* “ash” beginning with short *a-* as against the gen. A. *āle* ← *\*āli-e* with secondary lengthening of the initial vowel; in the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku equivalent of the word, this vowel spread, by analogy, not only to the nom. *āli* but to the whole paradigm (dat. *āḷaha*, abl./instr. *ālen*); cf. furthermore F. *īhi* “lobster” vs. M.A. *ihī*. — The secondary lengthening of the root vowel is also attested in many *i*-stems with word-initial consonant, cf. A. nom.sg.def. *mēhā* /*mehi-ā*/ “the fly”, *fēsā* /*fēsi-ā*/ “the box”, gen. *fēše* /*fēsi-e*/ as well as F. nom.sg. *mēhi* “fly”, *fēsī* “box”, *fīsī* “small island, sandbank” (vs. A. nom. *fīsī*) etc.

1.2.1.3. Long vowels that appear in medial as well as final position in modern Dhivehi<sup>58</sup> have mostly come about as a secondary result of contraction of two (identical or different) short vowels. These vocalic contractions must have occurred after intervocalic consonants of the MIA period had been lost. Cp., e.g., M.F. *rā*, A. (*dō*)*rā* “fermented juice of the liquid taken from the palm-blossom, palm-wine, toddy” (Sinh. *rā* ← *raha* ← Pkt. *rasa-*, OIA *rāsa-* “sap or juice of plants; taste, flavour”<sup>59</sup>); M. *kīs* “saw”, F. *kīhā* ← nom.def. *\*kīs-ā* through MIA *kakaca-* from Skt. *krakaca-* “id.” (cf. the still uncontracted correspondent in the secondary *i*-stem A. *kiēhi* ← *\*kiēs-i*; for more details cf. 2.3.2.8.1.3); M. *bīru*, A.F. *bīri* “deaf”, Sinh. *bīri* / *bihiri* ← Pkt. *bahira-* ← OIA *badhirā-* “id.”<sup>60</sup>; M.A. *bēs*, F. *bēhe* “medicine, medicament, drug” (← *\*bees* ← *\*behaja* ← *\*besaja*) corresponding to the Sinh. plural stem *behēt* (with the final consonant being unvoiced) with *beheta* as a regular nom.sg. (besides nom.sg. *beheda*, of the original stem *behed-* ← *\*besaja* ← Pkt. *bhesajja-* “id.” ← OIA *bhāṣajya-*.<sup>61</sup> The final long vowels and diphthongs of most of the nouns that constitute the group of “root nouns” in Dhivehi<sup>62</sup> can also be traced back to vowel contraction which must already have taken place in an early period in this case: cp., e.g., A.F. *gē* (M. *ge*) “house” ← MIA *geha-* ← OIA *gehā-*; M. *fai*, A.F. *fā* “foot, leg” ← Pkt. *pā(y)a-* ← OIA *pāda-* etc.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 29, no. 444 and TURNER (1966) II, 780, no. 13544.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2 and the primary paradigm in 2.3.2.11.3.2.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. for details 2.3.2.8.1.4 ff.

<sup>58</sup> There are a few exceptions which for the most part can be explained as borrowed or foreign words; cf. 2.3.1.4.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1902), 932, no. 351 and (1941), 145, no. 2160; TURNER (1966) II, 616, no. 10650. Cf. also YULE/BURNELL (1902), 927 s.v. *toddy*.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 123, no. 1832 and TURNER (1966) II, 515, no. 9130.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 549, no. 9623.

<sup>62</sup> For some examples cf. 2.3.1.5.

1.2.1.4. A few examples of the dialects of Aḍḍū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku show the tendency towards vowel contraction even today. Cp., e.g., A. *nēduru* vs. M.F. *niaduru* “pomelo”; F. *mēre* vs. A. *miara*, M. *miaru* “shark”,<sup>63</sup> or F. *lēnī*, A. *lēnāi* vs. M. *lianī* “write”.<sup>64</sup> The medial long vowel of indefinite infinitives which are used in negated sentences (cf. 5.5.4), have obviously developed in the recent past by contraction of two short vowels as well, after the *-n-* of the infinitive ending had been lost. Cp., e.g., the infinitives M. *kuran* “to do” and *hadan* “to make, build, create” with their indefinite forms *kurāka*<sup>3</sup> and *hadāka*<sup>3</sup> which most probably have to be derived from *\*kuran-ak-aś* and *hadan-ak-aś*, resp.

1.2.1.5. In the case of some isolated words the final long vowel can be explained by assuming a merger of an originally short final vowel with the definite suffix, *-ā*; cp., e.g., A.F. *kokkō* (vs. M. *kokko*) “younger brother / sister” from *\*kokko-ā*; A. *bēbē* (vs. M.F. *bēbe*) “elder brother” from *\*bēbe-ā* (cf. 2.3.1.4).

1.2.1.6. In the standard language, the final long vowel appearing in the direct case of some nouns is conditioned by the loss of final *-l*<sup>65</sup> which is characteristic for northern Dhivehi. In the remaining forms of the words concerned, *//* was preserved wherever it was in medial position.<sup>66</sup> In the standard language, the loss of final *-l* did not lead directly to a long vowel, however. Rather, we are dealing with a continuous process here, as the development of M. *-el* into *-eo* (but not *-ē*) shows. The abovementioned tendency is still more evident in the dialect of Aḍḍū where *-l* cannot occur in final position either. Here, final *-l* was vocalised both after *a* and *e*, leading to diphthongisation (*-al* → *-au* and *-el* → *-eo*). In the position after *u* and *o*, however, the merger of *-l* yields the corresponding long vowel (*-ul* → *-ū* and *-ol* → *-ō*), while the change from *-il* to *-ū* presupposes an intermediate *\*-iu*. As opposed to this,<sup>67</sup> the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku has conserved final *-l* even phonetically, as the following examples illustrate: */mal/* “flower, blossom” → M. *mā*, A. *mau*, but F. *mal*; */gal/* “stone, rock” → M. *gā*, A. *gau*, but F. *gal*; */al/* “new” → M. *ā*, A. *au*, but F. *al*; */bal/* “hole” → M. *bā*, A. *bau*, but F. *bal*; */bol/* “head” → M.A. *bō*, but F. *bol*; */kol/* “inner side of the cheek” → M.A. *kō*, but F. *kol*; */lol/* “eye” → M.A. *lō*, but F. *lol*; */mul/* “root” → M.A. *mū*, but F. *mul*; */nil/* “blue” → M.A. *nū* ← *\*niu*, but F. *nil*; */vel/* “every kind of creeper” → M. *veo*, A. *veu*, but F. *vel*; */tel/* “oil” → M. *teo*, A. *teu*, but F. *tel* etc.

In the words M. *hā*, A. *hau*, F. *haul* “cock” and M. *vā*, A. *vau*, F. *vaul* “flying fox”, however, the final long vowel of the standard forms cannot be the result of a secondarily

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Sinh. *mōra-/muvara-* ← Pkt. *magara-*, *mayara-* “shark”. The word goes back to OIA *mākara-* “crocodile”; for the change of meaning cf. also Pa. *makara-* “sea-monster” (TURNER 1966, II, 554, no. 9692).

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Sinh. *liyanavā* “id.” (GEIGER 1941, 151, no. 2255).

<sup>65</sup> It was only after the apocope of *-u* (cf. 1.1.3), when closed syllables reappeared in Dhivehi, that *//* could become a final consonant; e.g. *mal* ← *\*malu* “flower”, *bol* ← *\*bolu* “head” etc.

<sup>66</sup> For examples cf. 1.2.2.3.

<sup>67</sup> This phonetic change is not restricted to Modern IA languages; a comparable vocalisation of final *-l* is to be found in other languages as well, such as in South Slavic: “Vokalische Sprachen weisen die Tendenz auf, Konsonanten zu vokalisieren. Am augenfälligsten geschieht dies im Serbokr(oatischen), wo silbenschiessendes *-l* zu *-o* wird und wo altes sonantisches *l* zu *u* wurde. Ebenso werden auch im Slovenischen, z.B. in der Aussprache von Ljubljana, die Endungen ‘Vokal plus *l*’ und *-ev* zu reinem vokalischem *u*.” (A.V. ISAČENKO, Versuch einer Typologie der slavischen Sprachen, in: *Linguistica Slovaca* 1/2, 1939/40, 64-76.)

vocalised *-l* alone, as the vocalism of the corresponding Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku forms *haul* and *vaul* show (not <sup>h</sup>*hal*, *val*). Here, the diphthong is based on a contraction (← \**savulu* / \**vavulu*; cf. Sinh. *sāvul-ā* “jungle cock, *gallus lafayetti*” which (with unexplained *umlaut*) has to be derived from OIA *capala-* “trembling, fickle” through Pkt. *cavala-*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 253, no. 4672 and, for Sinh. *vavul-ā* “flying fox”, II, 675, no. 11584).

1.2.1.7. The vernacular of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku is the only Maldivian dialect that has phonemic **nasal vowels**. These vowels occur only in a very restricted area of the originally eight different local idioms which nowadays have merged together more and more. At present only some elderly persons speaking the subdialect in question still have the necessary competence for the inherited nasal vowels which – because of the increasing influence of the standard language – has been lost by younger people in the recent past.

An example of an inherited long nasalised vowel is provided by F. *bāṣi* “eggplant”. /*ṣ̄*/ here reflects the nasal consonant of OIA *bhaṣṭākī-* (TURNER 1966, II, 533, no. 9369). The reason for the lengthening of the root vowel (cp. M.A. *baṣi*, Sinh. *baṣu* with short *a*) has to be seen in the morphonological rule of *i*-stems which was mentioned above (cf. 1.2.1.2 and 2.3.2.8.1.4.2; cp. also Beng. *bhaṣā*). — A similar example is F. *kāṣi* “thorn” vs. M.A. *kaṣi*, Sinh. *kaṣu-va* “id.” which corresponds to *bāṣi* in its whole paradigm; it has to be derived from OIA *kāṣṭaka-* “id.” (cp. Pkt. *kaṣṭaa-*; TURNER 1966, I, 133, no. 2668).

In the following examples, the nasal vowel is conditioned by a root-final nasal consonant: *fāṇi* “worm, caterpillar” vs. A. *fāṇi*, M. *fāṇi*; Sinh. *paṇu-vā* (← OIA *prāṇaka-* “living being, animal, worm”<sup>68</sup>); F. *bāṇi* “bark” with nasal *ā* vs. A. *baṇi* (the word has no equivalent outside the southernmost dialects). — The same condition applies to the final nasal vowel appearing in the present participle of numerous verbs which can be traced back to an original *-n-*. Examples are the *a*-stem F. *nidā* “sleeping” vs. A.M. *nidā* ← \**nidana* (but cf. the lengthened form<sup>69</sup> *nidanī* where *-n* is preserved) or the *e*-stem F. *rekē* vs. M.A. *rekē* “avoiding, escaping” ← \**rekena* (long form *rekenī* “id.”)<sup>70</sup>.

There are many examples of nasal vowels whose occurrence is not easy to explain, neither on phonological nor on phonetic grounds. This is true, e.g., for F. *kuddā* “child” (← *kudī-ā*, sg.def., cf. 2.3.2.8.1.4.3); F. *mūdi* “ring, jewellery” (Sinh. *muḍu-* “finger-ring”; Pkt. *muddā-*, OIA *mudrā-* “seal, signet-ring”<sup>71</sup>); or F. *bāzu* “eagle, falcon” (← Pers. *bāz* “falcon, (gos-) hawk”). In the case of F. *fahā* “five” (M.A. *fas*), F. *hā*, *hū* “yes” (M.A. *hā*), F. *uḥu* “no” (besides M. *nūn*, A.F. *nun*), F. *fahē* “if” (cf. A. *fehē*) and F. *mādahā* adv. “tomorrow” (cf. M. *mādamā*, A. *māduma*), we realise that the nasal vowel is preceded by *h* which might be responsible for a secondary nasalisation.<sup>72</sup> — There are also verbal forms with nasal vowels that cannot be explained from a linguistic point of view, for example the ending of the absolutive of the *e*-stems which alternates between *-ī* and *-ī̄*; cf. the variant forms *temī* and *temī̄* (abs. of *temenī* “get wet”).<sup>73</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 501, no. 8929; GEIGER (1941), 93, no. 1383.

<sup>69</sup> For the terminology cf. 3.9.

<sup>70</sup> For the implied formation rules cf. 3.9.1.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 588, no. 10203 and GEIGER (1941), 136, no. 2033.

<sup>72</sup> It remains possible that the nasal vowel of F. *fahā* “five” represents a direct reflex of that in OIA *pāñca* (cf. 2.5.1.1).

<sup>73</sup> For details cf. 3.10.2.

The nasal vowel phonemes of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku must be clearly distinguished from the common Maldivian trend to pronounce short or long vowels in a nasalised way when they precede the nasal consonant *n*; cp., e.g., *mīhun* “people” pronounced as [mīhū̃n]. Besides this, some speakers show a general tendency to a slightly nasalised pronunciation of vowels, irrespective of their phonological surrounding. Both these articulations represent purely **phonetic** phenomena, they have no bearing on the **phonological** system of the language.

1.2.2. In contrast to Sinhalese,<sup>74</sup> Modern Dhivehi possesses true **diphthongs** which because of their apparently ambiguous character need a detailed examination. Basically, we have to distinguish phonemic diphthongs from numerous kinds of diphthongisations that represent the phonetic realisation (i.e. the pronunciation) of certain phonological structures but cannot be interpreted as diphthongs according to phonological rules.

1.2.2.1. The occurrence of phonemic diphthongs is restricted. There are only a few words which show an identical diphthong throughout the whole Dhivehi speaking area, with the diphthong remaining unchanged throughout the paradigm. Leaving aside obvious loanwords such as M.A.F. *sai* “tea”<sup>75</sup> this is true for examples like M.A.F. *māmui* “honey”<sup>76</sup>, M.A.F. *vai* “wind”,<sup>77</sup> M.A.F. *gai* “body”,<sup>78</sup> or M.A.F. *oi* “sea current”,<sup>79</sup> the diphthongs of which are the result of a vowel contraction of former disyllabic units.

1.2.2.2. As a rule, phonemic *au*- and *ai*-diphthongs occur only in the southern dialects, however. In northern Dhivehi, the corresponding vowel is long monophthongic *ā* in both cases. Typical examples are F. *haul*, A. *hau* “cock” and F. *vaul*, A. *vau* “flying fox” (M. equivalents *hā* and *vā*, cf. 1.2.1.6), the diphthong of which is based on a contraction of *\*-avu-*, but also A.F. *kaiśi* vs. M. *kāśi*<sup>80</sup> “ripe coconut” (for cooking) and A.F. *naiśi* vs. M. *nāśi*<sup>81</sup> “coconut shell”. The diphthongs of these remain unchanged throughout the whole paradigm (cf. gen. A.F. *haule*, *vaule*; *kaiše*, *naiše*). From an etymological point of view, however, the two latter examples cannot be judged in the same way as the divergent root vowels of the corresponding Huvadū-forms *kauṭi* “coconut” and *noṭi* “coconut shell” show.

1.2.2.3. The diphthong *au* as occurring in words of the type A. *mau* “flower, blossom” or *gau* “stone, rock” (vs. F. *mal*, *gal* and M. *mā*, *gā*; cf. 1.2.1.6) is of another origin than the homophone diphthong in the examples mentioned above. In the actual cases, *au* appears as the result of a vocalisation of a word-final *-l*; consequently it is nothing but a phonetic variant of *-al* in final position. It is important to note that *-al* is stable in the paradigm of the words

<sup>74</sup> Cf., e.g., the short notice in MASICA (1991), 116.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. 2.3.1.5.

<sup>76</sup> *māmui* is most probably a compound consisting of (M.) *mā* “flower, blossom” and an independent word *\*mui* ~ Sinh. *mī* (stem) “honey” (← Pkt. *mahu-*, Skt. *mādhu-*; cf. GEIGER 1941, 135, no. 2012.).

<sup>77</sup> For the etymology cf. 2.3.1.5.

<sup>78</sup> For the etymology cf. 2.3.1.5.

<sup>79</sup> For the etymology cf. 2.3.1.5.

<sup>80</sup> The etymology of this word is unknown.

<sup>81</sup> The etymology of this word is not easy to establish; cf. TURNER (1966), I, 406, no. 7075 s.v. *nārikēla* “coconut palm and fruit”. – In HLSD (1988), 31, M. *nāśi* is identified with a Sinh. word *naṭu* “shell” whose connection with Sinh. *naṭu-va* “stalk of a leaf or fruit, petiole, pedicel” (cf. CLOUGH 1892, 275; SŚ 12, 1985, 5881) remains unclear.

in question (cf. gen. A.F. *mali*, *gali*). Examples like M. *veo*, A.F. *veu* /*vel*/ “every kind of creeper” and M. *teo*, A.F. *teu* /*tel*/ “oil” can be considered in the same way (cf. also 1.2.1.6).

1.2.2.4. In the standard language, word-final (phonemic) sequences of vowel + /t/ are treated in the same manner: they are realised as (phonetic) *i*-diphthongs. In contrast to this, final /-t/ is articulated as a glottal stop [ʔ] throughout the southern dialects. Cp., e.g., M. *dai* vs. A.F. *da* /*dat*/ “tooth”, M. *ai* vs. A.F. *a* /*at*/ “hand, arm”, M. *nakai* vs. A.F. *naka* /*nakat*/ “lunar constellation”, M. *fai* vs. A.F. *fa* /*fat*/ “leaf”, M. *foi* vs. A.F. *fo* /*foʔ*/ “book”, M. *goi*, A.F. *go* /*got*/ “way, manner”. This process also affects Arabic loanwords ending in -at; cp., e.g., M. *nasēhai* “advise” ← Arab. *naṣīḥat* “id.”. In medial position -t- remains unchanged in all these cases, e.g. gen.sg. M. *fotuge*, A. *fote*, dat. M.A. *fota* /*fotaś*/.

1.2.2.5. In the standard language there is an increasing tendency to pronounce the diphthong /*ai*/ as a monophthongised lengthened vowel [ā]. As mentioned in HLSD, 11, this [ā] is further developing into [ē] in the northernmost atolls so that we find, e.g., [sē] and [fēvān] instead of M. [sā] (A.F. *sai*) “tea” and M. [fāvān] (A.F. *faivān*) “shoe, sandal”. These cases must be distinguished from the development of original word-final *ai*-diphthongs into M. -ā as in the locative suffix M. -*gai* (cf. 2.3.2.13) or in the formative of the “absolute I”, M. -*fai* (cf. 3.11.4.1 and 3.11.4.4), which are realised almost always as [gā] and [fā] today (cf. 1.2.4.3.).

### 1.2.3. Umlaut phenomena

In the prehistory of Dhivehi, the back vowels *a*, *o* and *u* of the first root syllable were changed into the front vowels *e* ← \**ä*, *e* and *i*, when one of the following syllables contained the front vowel *i* or the glide *y*. These “umlaut” processes followed the same principles in Dhivehi as they did in Sinhalese (cf. GEIGER 1938, 13 ff.), although they were less effective in the Maldivian language. On the other hand, an interdialectal comparison of Dhivehi shows that in the southernmost vernaculars there are more examples with umlaut than in the standard language.

1.2.3.1. The umlauting of *a* into *e* is the most frequent one. It is highly probable though not provable<sup>82</sup> that the process went through an intermediate \**ä* as in Sinhalese where we find *ä* still today. Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *den* “then” (Sinh. *dān* “now”; Pa. (*i*)*dāni*, Skt. *idānīm*<sup>83</sup>); M.A. *mehi*, F. *mēhi* “fly” (Sinh. *māsi-/māhi-* “id.”, Pkt. *macchiā-*, OIA *mākṣikā-* f. “fly, bee”<sup>84</sup>); M. *veo*, A.F. *veu* /*vev*/ “watertank, artificial pool” (Sinh. *vāv-* “id.”; Pkt. *vāvī-*, OIA *vāpī-* “id.”<sup>85</sup>); M. *veo*, A.F. *veu* /*vel*/ “every kind of creeper” (Sinh. *vāl-* “id.”; Pa., Pkt., Skt. *vallī-* “id.”<sup>86</sup>); M.A.F. *fen* “water” (Sinh. *pān* “id.”; Pa. *pānīya-*, OIA *pānīya-* “id.”<sup>87</sup>); M. *rē*, A.F. *rei* “night” (Sinh. *rā-*, Pkt. *rāi-* ← \**rātī-* vs. Pa. *rattī-*; OIA *rātrī-*

<sup>82</sup> Neither *Dives akuru* nor *Tāna* provide a grapheme for the sound [ā].

<sup>83</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 74, no. 1085.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 554, no. 9696.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 672, no. 11529; GEIGER (1941), 162, no. 2415.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 666, no. 11429.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 456, no. 8082.

“id.”<sup>88</sup>); M. *medu*, A.F. *mede* “mid(dle), centre” (Sinh. *māda* “id.”; Pa., Pkt. *majjha*-, OIA *mādhya*- “id.”<sup>89</sup>).

In contrast to Sinhalese, Dhivehi shows a comparatively large number of words containing a root vowel *a* which was not changed by umlaut under the given condition. Cp., e.g., *maṣi* “loam, clay” vs. Sinh. *māṭi*- (Pkt. *maṭṭiyā*-, Pa. *mattikā*-, Skt. *mṛttikā*- “earth, clay”<sup>90</sup>) or M.A.F. *fani* “(coconut) treacle” vs. Sinh. *pāni/pāni* “treacle, molasses, honey” (Pa., Skt. *phānita*- “inspissated juice of sugarcane and other plants”, Pkt. *phāṇiya*- “treacle, molasses”<sup>91</sup>).

1.2.3.1.1. From a morphonological point of view the *a/e*-umlaut plays an important role in verbal paradigms as well, viz. with *a*-stem verbs that have *a* as their root vowel. On the one hand, the *a* of the present stem opposes itself to *e* in the preterite stem; cp. present stems like M.A.F. *bala*- “look (at)”, *jaha*- “beat” and *faṣa*- “start, begin (to do something)” with their corresponding preterite stems M.A.F. *beli*-, *jehi*- and *feṣi*-. The preterite participle of the *a*-stem verbs, identical in its form with the preterite stem, is formed with the suffix *-i* which through intermediate *\*-ī* goes back to OIA *-ita*; this suffix vowel *i* causes umlaut regularly.<sup>92</sup>

The second morphonological function of the umlaut becomes apparent in the derivation of intransitive, inactive *e*-stem verbs from transitive and/or active *a*-stems with *a* as their root vowel. Here, both the *a* of the root and the stem marker are changed by umlaut; cf. *faṣanī* trans. “to start, begin (something)” vs. *feṣenī* intr. “to begin”, *jahanī* trans. “to beat” vs. *jehenī* intr. “to fall, hit”, the causative *vaṭṭanī* trans. “to let fall (something or somebody)” vs. *vettenī* intr. “to fall, be dropped”, *fatanī* “to swim (actively, willingly)” vs. the inactive *fetenī* “to sink, drown (by floating)” etc.

1.2.3.2. There are only a few words that show umlaut-change of *u* to *i* throughout the Dhivehi speaking area. In comparison with Sinhalese, Dhivehi provides much fewer examples for this kind of umlaut. One of them is M.A.F. *bin* /*bim*/ “earth, soil, ground” = Sinh. *bim* ← Pkt. *bhūmī*-, Pa. *bhūmi*-, OIA *bhūmi*-.<sup>93</sup> As a rule, *u*-umlaut is more widespread in the southernmost vernaculars, the corresponding words in northern Dhivehi having preserved *u* as their root vowel, which must be regarded as a conservative trait. Cp., e.g., M. *muṣi* vs. A.F. *miṣi* “fist” and the Sinh. stem *miṭi*- “id.” ← Pa. *muṭṭhi*-, OIA *muṣṭi*- “id.”;<sup>94</sup> M. *kuḷi* vs. A.F. *kīli* “pond with fresh water”, and M. *dūni* vs. A.F. *dīni* “bird”.

1.2.3.2.1. There is but one available verb showing this type of *u*-umlaut, viz. M. *duvanī* as opposed to A.F. *divanī* “to run” (with *i* in all forms). Here, too, the *u* of the root has remained unchanged in the standard language. The same holds true for Sinhalese which has

<sup>88</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 619, no. 10702; cf. also 2.3.1.5.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 563, no. 9804.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 594, no. 10286.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 510, no. 9070; GEIGER (1941), 103, no. 1523. – For the binary opposition of /n/ and /n/ in southern Dhivehi cf. 1.3.7.1.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. the table of *a*-verbs in 3.1.4.1; for the derivation of the preterite participle cf. 3.9.2.1.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 545, no. 9557.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 589, no. 10221 and GEIGER (1941), 133, no. 1977.

preserved the back vowel *u* in the present stem *duva-*, while the preterite stem was changed by umlaut into *divu-* (← *\*divī-*).<sup>95</sup>

1.2.3.3. Concerning the umlauting of *o* into *e*, Dhivehi does not show many examples either. Cp. M. *lē* “blood” vs. A.F. *lei* with a diphthong and Sinh. *lē*<sup>96</sup> (Pkt. *lohiya-* “red”, OIA *lōhita-* “read, reddish substance, blood”). — In the case of M. *dōni*, A.F. *dōni* “boat, ship” vs. Sinh. *deṇa* “boat, canoe” the umlauting seems to have been omitted; but the Maldivian word rather represents a prakritism.<sup>97</sup> — Obviously there is not even one verb showing an umlaut-change of *o* into *e* (cf. 3.9.2.1).

1.2.4. A comparison of the Maldivian vernaculars reveals some more **vocalic alternations** which can only partially be regarded as regular. This holds true for the following variations:

1.2.4.1. Where *i* is a root vowel in the standard language, it often corresponds with *e* in the southern dialects if followed by *a* in the next syllable. Cp., e.g., M. *tila* – A.F. *tela* “shallow (water); blade”; M. *hila* – A.F. *hela* “rock”; M. *hima* – A.F. *hema* “thin, fragile”; M. *mila* – A.F. *mela* “dirt”; M. *riha* – A.F. *reha* “curry”; M. *dia* – A.F. *dea* “water, liquid” etc.

1.2.4.2. In some cases southern Dhiv. *e* corresponds to M. *u* as a root vowel. Here, too, we observe that it is followed by *a*: M. *nura* – A.F. *nera* “grey hair”; M. *durana* – A.F. *deraṇa* “ring made from rope”; M. *huras* – A.F. *heras* “across, horizontal”; M. *furālu* – A.F. *ferāda* “roof”.

1.2.4.3. A triadic correspondence of root vowels which occurs regularly is that of **M. *ā* – F. *ai* – A. *ei***. It is represented in the pronominal adjective M. *hā*, F. *hai*, A. *hei* “all” and, as a second component, also in the demonstrative adverb M. *ehā*, F. *ehai*, A. *ehei* “so” and in the interrogative pronoun M. *kihā*, F. *kihai*, A. *kihei* “how” (cf. 2.6.7.4.3). Some further examples are M. *velā*, F. *velai*, A. *velei* “green water turtle”; M. *kelā*, F. *kelai*, A. *kelei* “sandal wood”; M. *gurā*, F. *gurai*, A. *gurei* “parrot”; M. *furā*, F. *furai*, A. *furei* “full” and probably the ending of the “absolute I”, M. *-fā*, F. *-fē* ← *\*-fai*, A. *-fei*.<sup>98</sup> In the given threefold correspondence, the diphthongs that occur in the southernmost dialects must represent an older pronunciation.

1.2.4.4. There are numerous examples that illustrate the correspondence of **M. *o* – A. *e*, F. *e***<sup>99</sup> Cp., e.g., M. *atolu* – A.F. *atele* “atoll”; M. *toḷi* – A. *teḷi*, F. *tēḷi* “bean”; M. *goṅḍi* – A. *geṅḍi*, F. *gēṅḍi* “chair”; M. *oḍi* – A.F. *veḍi* “type of (Maldivian) ship”; M. *doḷi* –

<sup>95</sup> For the etymology of this verb cf. GEIGER (1941), 79, no. 1175 and TURNER (1966) I, 284, no. 5168 s.v. *jávate* “hastens”.

<sup>96</sup> For the uncontracted variant *lehe* “blood” cf. GEIGER (1938), 86. For the etymology cf. TURNER (1966) II, 650, no. 11165.

<sup>97</sup> For details cf. 1.2.1 above.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. 1.2.2.5 above.

<sup>99</sup> The long vowel *ē* of some nominal *i*-stems is caused by paradigmatic circumstances; cf. 2.3.2.8.1.4.2.

A.F. *dedi*<sup>100</sup> “front part of the chin”; M. *koḷu* – A.F. *keḍe* “piece; end”; M. *oʷ loʷ* ← \**oṭu* – A. *eśa*, F. *eše* “seed, nut, kernel”; M. *fonu* – A.F. *feṇa* “foam, surf”; M. *honihiṛu* – A.F. *henahiri* “Saturday”; M. *honu* – A. *heṇa*, F. *hene* “thunderbolt”; M. *ośōnnanī* – A. *veśionnei*, F. *veśionnāi* “lie (down)”.<sup>101</sup> All these examples share a phonological peculiarity in that A. *e* and F. *e/ē* are followed by a retroflex (or former retroflex) consonant. As the early documents of Dhivehi show, the *e*-vocalism of the southern vernaculars represents an older stage of development as opposed to the *o* of the standard language. Since the 14th century the language of Māle has witnessed a systematic change of /*e/* into /*o/*, where /*e/* was followed by a single retroflex consonant. Thus, e.g., *ateḷu* “atoll” is documented with *e* during the whole *lōmāfanu*-period since L1 (n/1,1), while in later times it was almost exclusively written in the form *atolu* (e.g. F1,2.4; F4,3; F5,15.16.39; F13,5; F10,9.16; IDMMM 3,6). Another example is *keḷu* “end” (L3 6/1,2.3.4) vs. modern M. *koḷu*. This word occurs in the name of the atoll *Koḷumaḍulu*, which is already attested in the form of the locative *keḷumaḍule* in L1 (s/1,1-2). On the other hand, the final *-e* of A.F. *atele* and other examples has to be considered as a secondary development. While final *-u* was preserved in northern Maldivian, it was obviously adapted (across the retroflex consonant) to the *e* of the penultimate syllable in the southern dialects.

1.2.4.5. For the correspondence of **M. u** and **A.F. e** in non-final position cf. 1.3.7.2. For details on the regular dialectal differences concerning the final vowels in the direct case of consonant stems (M. *-u*, F. *-o*, A. *-a* etc.) cf. the table and the examples given in 2.3.1.3.4.1.

### 1.3. The consonants

The consonant system Dhivehi inherited from Old and Middle Indo-Aryan corresponds in most points with that of Sinhalese. For the phonological development of the consonant phonemes, it will therefore be sufficient to refer to GEIGER’s comprehensive historical description of the Sinhalese consonants (1938, 39 ff.). The present treatise will focus in the combinatorial processes and special developments of the Maldivian consonant system which are important for a general outline of Dhivehi phonology as well as morphological relations. In this context, developments that are common exclusively to the “Insular Indo-Aryan” languages as well as phonological tendencies that are confined to Dhivehi deserve a particular interest.

1.3.1. The change of the inherited **aspirates** into their non-aspirated counterparts can be regarded as a regular process already of the time of Sinhalese Prakrit (from 2nd century B.C. until 4/5th century A.D.): “BIKU stands for *bhikku*, SAGA for *saṅgha* ... TERA for *thera*, DAMA for *dhamma* ...” (GEIGER 1938, 40<sup>102</sup>). According to MASICA (1991), 205, this development resulted from Tamil influence, the Tamil consonant system having no aspirates at all. Cf. also CALDWELL (1875), 130: “Tamil makes no use whatever of aspirates, and has not borrowed any of the aspirated consonants of Sanskrit, nor even the isolated aspirate *h*.” GEIGER (ib.) presumes

<sup>100</sup> For the correspondence M. /*l/* – A.F. /*d/* cf. 1.3.7.2.

<sup>101</sup> For detailed information on this verb cf. 3.9.2.2.3.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. modern Sinhalese *bik* 1. “community of bhikkhus”; 2. “mendicant, bhikkhu” (GEIGER 1941, 121, no. 1808), *saṅga* “multitude, assembly; the community of bhikkhus” (ib. 171, no. 2565), *tera* “aged monk, senior monk” (ib. 67, no. 973), *dama* “law, doctrine; the Buddhist sacred scriptures” (ib. 70, no. 1026).

that "... even Sinhalese Prakrit did not possess any aspirated consonant." If the loss of the aspirates actually took place in such an early period, it remains doubtful, however, whether the linguistic contact between Sinhalese and Tamil could have lasted long enough before in order to provoke such an extensive change. It is possible that already in early Sinhalese Prakrit there was a tendency towards deaspiration which then was reinforced by the influence of the Tamil sound system.

1.3.2. The table below gives a general view of the **consonant phonemes** of contemporary Dhivehi. Loan phonemes which constitute an integral part of the Maldivian consonant system have been included as well.<sup>103</sup>

consonants	labial	labiodental	dental	alveolar	retroflex	palatal	velar	laryngeal
voiceless stops	<i>p</i>		<i>t</i>		<i>ʈ</i>		<i>k</i>	
voiced stops	<i>b</i>		<i>d</i>		<i>ɖ</i>		<i>g</i>	
prenasalised stops	<i>m̃b</i>		<i>ñd</i>		<i>ɳd</i>		<i>ŋg</i>	
voiceless affricates						<i>c</i>		
voiced affricates						<i>j</i>		
nasals	<i>m</i>		<i>n</i>		<i>ɳ</i> <sup>104</sup>	<i>ɲ</i> <sup>105</sup>		
vibrants				<i>r</i>				
laterals				<i>l</i>	<i>ɭ</i>			
voiceless spirants		<i>f</i>		<i>s</i>		<i>ʃ</i>		<i>h</i>
voiced spirants				<i>z</i>				
glides	<i>v</i>					<i>y</i>		

1.3.3. Except for the prenasalised stops (cf. below), the consonant inventory of Dhivehi is exactly reflected by the modern *Tāna* script;<sup>106</sup> cf. the following table which represents the traditional "alphabetic" order:

Tāna	ހ	ށ	ނ	ރ	ބ	ޅ	ކ	ވ	
transcribed	<i>h</i>	<i>ś</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>ɭ</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>v</i>	
Tāna	ޕ	މ	ފ	ދ	ޖ	ޗ	ޅ	ޞ	
transcribed	<i>v</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	
Tāna	ސ	ޅ	ޖ	ޗ	ޕ	ޖ	ޗ	ޞ	ޞ
transcribed	<i>s</i>	<i>ɖ</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>ʈ</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>ɳ</i> <sup>107</sup>

<sup>103</sup> Phonemes that occur only in Arabic loanwords are written by educated people in accordance with the original spelling. Their pronunciation, however, may be quite distinct from the original sound. The corresponding graphemes will be shown in a special table (cf. 1.3.10.4.).

<sup>104</sup> As an independent phoneme, /ɳ/ exists only in the southernmost dialects of Dhivehi; cf. 1.3.10.

<sup>105</sup> /ɲ/ is phonemic in loanwords only; cf. 1.3.7.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. DE SILVA (1969), 205 ff.

<sup>107</sup> The character for retroflex *ɳ* has become obsolete in standard Dhivehi; it occurs in older *Tāna* texts. Nowadays it is used by a few writers (poets) who speak a southern dialect as their mother tongue.

The vocalisation marks which were taken from the Arabic script are superscribed or subscribed to the basic consonant characters:

Tāna	ت	ت̄	تِ	تِي	تُ	تُ	تَ	تِ	تِ	تِ	تِ
transcribed	ta	tā	tī	tī	tu	tū	te	tē	to	tō	t

1.3.4. Within the phonological framework of the Indo-Aryan languages and the Indic languages in general, the **prenasalised stops** represent a very particular phenomenon of the two Insular languages, Dhivehi and Sinhalese, only.<sup>108</sup> The articulation of the four phonemes in question, /*m̥b*/, /*n̥d*/, /*ṅg*/, is marked by a considerable shortness in contrast to the pronunciation of the corresponding consonant clusters, *-mb-*, *-nd-* etc. In the modern Sinhalese script the prenasalised stops are represented by special *akṣaras*. Within Sinhalese, the nasal component of the prenasalised plosives has been noted since medieval times, while it was still unmarked in the older *Brāhmī* inscriptions (cf. GEIGER 1938, 68). We find a quite different situation in written Dhivehi. *Dives akuru* never developed any means of writing the prenasalised stops, and *Tāna* has no particular characters for that purpose either. In modern times, however, three different ways to solve the problem have been applied. The most popular one follows the tradition by leaving the nasalisation unmarked and writing only the plosive element; cp., e.g., M. [*kurum̥ba*] written as ⟨*kuruba*⟩ “young drinking coconut”, M. [*uṅḍagū*] ⟨*udagū*⟩ “difficult”; M. [*iṅḡuru*] ⟨*iguru*⟩ “ginger”; M. [*gaṅḍu*] ⟨*gaḍu*⟩ “piece, thing”. – For a certain period, the nasal component was expressed by the so-called “empty *nūn*” (*hus nūn*), i.e. an ⟨*n*⟩ letter remaining without any vocalisation marks or *sukkun*, the marker of unvocalised consonants.<sup>109</sup> – Only exceptionally, the prenasalised stops are written as a sequence of full nasal + plosive, but this way of writing is normally regarded as a mistake. However, even now there are no absolute orthographical rules for the correct writing of the prenasalised stops.

Two arguments speak in favour of a monophonematic character of the prenasalised stops, at least in the contemporary language. Support for a monophonematic interpretation of the prenasalised stops is given by the early documents as well. The oldest written specimens of Dhivehi, the *lōmāfanu* inscriptions, show that the language had only open syllables in older times, consonant clusters being systematically excluded. A good example is M. [*gaṅḍu*] “piece, thing”, written ⟨*gaḍu*⟩ “piece (of land)” in L2 (9,4 etc.), L3 (4/1,2 and 6/1,5), L4 (e/2,1) etc. which means that it has to be analysed as *ga-ṅḍu*, an analysis <sup>†</sup>*gaṅ-du* being impossible because of the given syllable structure. Another example is the syntagm ⟨*kuburu iduna*⟩ (L2 28,4) “living in the bushes” which, according to modern usage, must represent a syllable sequent *ku-ṁbu-ru i-ṅḍu-na*. – Further evidence for the phonemic status of the prenasalised stops can be gained from minimal pairs. Some modern Dhivehi verb roots ending on a prenasalised plosive do not form the causative with the suffix *-va-*<sup>110</sup> but by “lengthen-

<sup>108</sup> Cf. MASICA (1991), 105: “... the *prenasalised stops* of Sinhalese ... are apparently confined to that language in NIA (although I should add that I have been unable to find any good account of Maldivian phonology).”

<sup>109</sup> Cf. the table in 1.3.3.

<sup>110</sup> For details cf. 3.2.1.1.

ing” *ñ* into *n*, which results in phonemic oppositions of the type *-ñd-* vs. *-nd-* etc.<sup>111</sup> Cp., e.g., the transitive verb *añdanī*<sup>112</sup> “to burn” and its verbal noun *eñdun* with the causative *andanī* “to (let) burn” and its verbal noun, *endun*. Another example is the intransitive verb *eñgenī* “to know, understand”; its verbal noun *eñgun* forms a minimal pair with the verbal noun *engun* belonging to the causative *anganī* “to inform, let know”. If we consider GEIGER’s derivation of parallel cases in Sinhalese (1938, 71), we may well conclude, however, that the causative formation of the Maldivian verbs in question can be traced back to an underlying suffix *-va-* as well: thus, *anganī* “to let know” has to be derived through the intermediate forms *\*añgñganī* ← *\*añg-va-nī* ← *\*añga-va-nī* from an obsolete *a*-stem verb *\*añganī* with the transitive-active meaning “to understand, recognise (something)” as corresponding to the inactive *eñgenī* “to know, understand”.

GEIGER (1938, 67-71) who interprets the Sinhalese prenasalised stops as a sequence of “half nasals” + consonants, provides some etymologies in order to show that the prenasalised plosives always reflect an old nasal which, on the other hand, was not necessarily combined with a plosive. An example for this assumption is Sinh. (= M.A.F.) *kañburu* “(black)smith” which, through an intermediate form like Pkt., Pa. *kammāra-*, goes back to OIA *karmāra-* “id.”<sup>113</sup> Such cases seem to be exceptional, though; cp. the counterexamples Sinh. (= A.) *añba*, M. *añbu*, F. *añbo* “mango” with Pkt., Pa. *amba-* (but OIA *amrā-* “mango”, fruit and tree);<sup>114</sup> Sinh. *añbu* “wife, mother”, M.A. *añbi*, F. *añbu* “wife” with Pkt., Pa. *ambā-* ← OIA *ambā-* “mother”;<sup>115</sup> Sinh. (= M.) *iñguru*, A.F. *iñgiri* “ginger” with Pa. *siṅgivera-*, OIA *śṛṅgavera-* “id.”;<sup>116</sup> Sinh. *hañda/sañda*, M. *hañdu*, A. *hañda*, F. *hañdo* “moon” with Pa. *canda-*, OIA *candrā-* “moon, moonlight”<sup>117</sup> etc.

Dhivehi shows some examples of dialectal variation in the distribution of prenasalised stops in contrast to normal plosives in the same words. In some of these cases it is hard to decide whether an inherited nasal was lost within a certain dialectal area or whether we are dealing with the result of a spontaneous prenasalisation here. Sometimes, both variants appear side by side even within the same dialect. Cp. M. *uñdagū* vs. A.F. *udagū* “difficult”; M. *kurum̃ba* vs. A.F. *kuruba* “young drinking coconut”; F. *feñdaga* vs. A. *feḍaga* “big green locust”. Usually the southern vernaculars show a stronger tendency towards the plain stops. An exception to this rule is M. *boḍu* vs. A. *boñḍa*, F. *boñḍo* “big, large”.

Contemporary Dhivehi has many words which show spontaneous prenasalisation. Foreign words such as *siñgireṭu* (← Engl. *cigarette*) with prenasalised *g* (as against the variant *sigareṭu*) are good examples for the strength of this tendency.

Sinhalese has a few variants of this kind as well; cf. *sidu* vs. *siñdu* “ocean, river” (← OIA *sīndhu-* “river, Indus; ocean”<sup>118</sup>) or *maḡul-a* vs. *mañḡul-a* “happiness, good fortune, festival” (← OIA *maṅgala-* “auspicious sign, happiness”<sup>119</sup>).

<sup>111</sup> This must not be confused with the paradigmatic change of *-ñd/-nn-* occurring in the *n*-stem class of verbs; cf. 3.2.2.

<sup>112</sup> For the etymology of this verb cf. 3.9.2.2.2.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 37, no. 547 and TURNER (1966) I, 147, no. 2898.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 9, no. 133; TURNER (1966) I, 57, no. 1268.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 9, no. 131 and TURNER (1966) I, 25, no. 574.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 20, no. 306; TURNER (1966) II, 730, no. 12588.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 188, no. 2849 and TURNER (1966) I, 252, no. 4661.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 179, no. 2699; TURNER (1966) II, 774, no. 13415.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 126, no. 1875; TURNER (1966) II, 555, no. 9706.

1.3.5. Another sound change that is typical for Dhivehi as well as colloquial Sinhalese, is the transition of /s/ to /h/ in initial and medial position. While Dhivehi has completely lost initial *s-* in its inherited vocabulary, Sinhalese shows a large amount of double forms with *s-* and *h-*, the variants with *s-* being used almost exclusively in the written language and in higher stylistic levels. In the oldest written sources of Dhivehi we often find *s* when it is to be expected from an etymological point of view; cp., e.g., \**simu* “border” (in the loc. *sime*, L2 4,1 and L3 2/2,3, and the compound *dia-sin* “water line”, L3 4/1,2 etc., spelt *dyašin* in L4 c/2,6), co-occurring with *imu* in the earliest *lōmāfanus* (L1 mx/2,5, L3 4/1,2 etc.) and appearing as *hin* (in *dyahin* “water line”, F4,3) and *in* (F4,2 etc.) in later times (cp. Sinh. *ima/hima/sima*, Pa. Pkt. Skt. *sīmā-* “id.”).<sup>120</sup> In the same documents, there are many words with “unetymological” initial *s-*. These must be explained as examples of historical or hypercorrect spelling which implies that in the period in question, written ⟨s⟩ was already pronounced as [h]. Cp., e.g., the Arabic name *Husain*, which besides the original orthography ⟨*hus(s)ayn*⟩ (often in inscriptions, e.g. in IDMHM 2,15; ITAG 1,7; very often in RC, e.g. 26,4) is attested as ⟨*šusein*⟩ in an *Evēla akuru lōmāfanu* (L2, 36,3).

Some further examples for *s* → *h* in initial position are M. *hañdu*, A. *hañda*, F. *hañdo* “moon” vs. Sinh. *hañda/sañda* “id.” (Pa. *canda-*, OIA *candrā-* “id.”);<sup>121</sup> M. *hialu*, F. *hialo*, A. *hivaḷa* “fox, jackal” vs. Sinh. *hivalā/sivalā* “id.” (Pkt. *siyāla-*, Pa. *sigāla-*, OIA *śrgālā-*);<sup>122</sup> M. *huvāñdu*, A. *huvāñda*, F. *huvāñdo* “fragrance, perfume” vs. Sinh. *suvañda* “id.” (Pkt. *suandha-*, Pa., OIA *sugandha-* “id.”);<sup>123</sup> M. *hā*, A. *hau*, F. *haul* “cock” vs. Sinh. *sāvul-ā* “jungle cock”, *gallus lafayetti* (Pkt. *cavala-*, OIA *capala-* “trembling, fickle”).<sup>124</sup>

In medial position, the change *s* → *h* has infected inherited words without any exception in all Maldivian dialects; cp., e.g., \**dīvesi* → A.M.F. *dīvehi* “islander”; \**mesi* → M.A. *mehi*, F. *mēhi* “fly”; \**jasanī* → M.A.F. *jahanī* “beat” (trans.) etc. Medial *s* was conserved only when it was geminated for morphological reasons.<sup>125</sup>

Word-final *-s* has remained unchanged in northern Dhivehi and in Aḍḍū while it developed into *h* in Fua<sup>7</sup> Mulaku where it is followed by a secondary short (echo) vowel which is not phonemic. This echo vowel is identical with the vowel of the last syllable; cp., e.g., F. *maha/mas/* “fish” (M.A. *mas*), F. *gehe/ges/* “tree” (A. *ges*, M. *gas*), F. *uhu/us/* “tall, high” (M.A. *us*), F. *faha/fas/* (M.A. *fas* “ground, soil”), F. *bihi/bis/* “egg” (M.A. *bis*), F. *goho/gos/* “going, having gone” (absolute of *danī* “to go”; M.A. *gos*) etc.<sup>126</sup>

In contrast to the inherited vocabulary, *s* has been preserved in loanwords and foreign words not only on the phonemic, but also on the phonetic level. Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *alanāsi* “Ananas”,<sup>127</sup> M.A.F. *mūsun* “monsoon, season”,<sup>128</sup> M.A.F. *gamīs* “shirt”,<sup>129</sup> etc. The

<sup>120</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 22, no. 341; TURNER (1966) II, 775, no. 13435.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 188, no. 2849 and TURNER (1966) I, 252, no. 4661.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 193, no. 2906 and TURNER (1966) II, 729, no. 12578.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 776, no. 13454.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. also 1.2.1.6.

<sup>125</sup> For details cf. 1.3.9.5 and 1.3.9.5.1; for the morphological peculiarities cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.2.

<sup>126</sup> For more examples cf. 2.3.1.3.1; on general tendencies and developments of final consonants, cf. 1.1.3; for the change of /s/ → /h/ in Huvadū cf. 1.3.6.3.

<sup>127</sup> For the worldwide dissemination of the fruit as well as the word denoting it, cf. YULE-BURNELL (1902), 25 ff. s.v. *ananas*; Dhivehi most probably received it via Portuguese.

derivation of M.A.F. *siṭī* “letter” seems to be more complicated. If the word had emerged from OIA \**ciṣṭa*- “message”<sup>130</sup> directly or through an intermediate (not attested) MIA form, we would expect neither initial *s*- nor medial *-t*-<sup>131</sup> for contemporary Dhivehi. Even if the Dhivehi word represented a prakritism (in the sense of a *mot savant*), *-t*- could not have been conserved as such. Therefore, the most probable source of *siṭī* is Hi. *ciṭṭhī* “letter”;<sup>132</sup> in this case, the change of initial *c*- → *s*- has nothing to do with the similar sound change in the early history of Dhivehi (cp., e.g., Old Dhiv. *sañdu* ← MIA *canda*- “moon”).

1.3.6. In the more recent past, Dhivehi has been affected by two remarkable sound changes: */p* → */f* and */t* → */s*.<sup>133</sup> It is not possible, however, to establish the exact date of these changes, because ⟨*f*⟩ and ⟨*s*⟩ were never written with separate characters before the *Tāna* period. Thus it remains uncertain, since when the *Dives akuru* characters for *p* and *t* can be taken to represent [*f*] and [*s*], resp. Cp., e.g., the *Dives akuru* forms *pasvana* “fifth” (ordinal number<sup>134</sup>; IDMD 2,4) and *apuremenge* “our” (pers./poss.pron., 1.pl.gen.<sup>135</sup>; RB 1,11) as against their *Tāna* equivalents *fasvana* (ITMHM 4,3; ITAM 1,6) and *afuremenge* (RC 3,13). For *Dives akuru* ⟨*t*⟩ vs. *Tāna* ⟨*s*⟩, cp. *koṭu* (absolute of *kuranī* “to make, do”,<sup>136</sup> attested 209 times, beginning with L1 d/1,2), *raṭu* “island, land” (attested 84 times, beginning with L1 [f/2,1] as well) as against *koṣu* (ITMKM 1,13) and *raṣu* (RC 32,12) written in *Tāna*. While Maldivian documents do not provide exact information about the time of the spirantisation of */t/* and */p/* themselves, external evidence can be gained from PYRARD’s and CHRISTOPHER’s wordlists which witness both to the changes of *p* → *f* and *t* → *s* (in initial and medial position). PYRARD, who sojourned in the Maldives from 1602 to 1607, noted ⟨*p*⟩ in his wordlist in all cases concerned, while CHRISTOPHER, who came to the Maldives in 1834, already wrote ⟨*f*⟩ without any exception. Examples from PYRARD’s list are ⟨*alīpan*⟩ (M. *alifān*) “fire”, ⟨*penne*⟩ (M. *fen*) “water”, ⟨*Bouraspaty*⟩ (M. *burāsfati*) “Thursday”, ⟨*piohy*⟩ (M. *fióhi*) “knife”, ⟨*niapaty*⟩ (M. *niafati*) “finger nail” and the name of the island ⟨*Maspillaspoury*⟩ (cf. M. *fuṣi* “small islet, sand bank”); in contrast to these spellings, CHRISTOPHER’s list shows ⟨*alifang*⟩, ⟨*feng*⟩, ⟨*Burasfati*⟩, ⟨*fióhi*⟩, ⟨*niafati*⟩. We may conclude that the change of *p* into *f* must have taken place not earlier than the early 17th century and not later than the early 19th century.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Arab. *mausim* “season, time of festivities and harvest” (WEHR 1958, 950); cf. also YULE-BURNELL (1902), 577.

<sup>129</sup> ← Arab. *qamīṣ* (cf. WEHR 1958, 704).

<sup>130</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 262, no. 4832.

<sup>131</sup> For details on the development of *-t* → *-s*, cf. 1.3.6.1.

<sup>132</sup> Direct loans from Hindi or Urdu are quite common in modern Dhivehi. The Maldives always had both trading contacts and cultural relations with many parts of the subcontinent, the contacts to Pakistan being particularly close. There are many educated people in Maldives who dispose of a good knowledge of Urdu or Hindi. Last but not least, there is a tradition of visiting India and other countries of the subcontinent regularly because of serious health problems.

<sup>133</sup> For detailed information on the geminates *-pp-* and *-tt-* cf. 1.3.9.6.

<sup>134</sup> For the ordinal numbers cf. 2.5.2.

<sup>135</sup> For details cf. 2.6.2.3.1.2.

<sup>136</sup> For details on this irregular absolute formation cf. 3.10.4.

1.3.6.1. For an exact dating of the change of  $t \rightarrow \acute{s}$ , however, the two wordlists do not give any reliable indication. The only fact that can be stated with certainty is that already in PYRARD's time, the non-geminated phoneme /t/ was not realised as [t] any longer in medial position. The spellings ⟨*caré*⟩ “ripe coconut” (M. *kāśi*), ⟨*tori*⟩ “peel, shell, bark” (M. *tośi*), ⟨*ystarin*⟩ “hair” (M. *istaśi*), ⟨*aret*⟩ “eight” (M. *aśe*<sup>3</sup> /*aś-ek*/, indef. form) as well as the name of the island ⟨*Maspillaspoury*⟩ indicate that medial -t- was already pronounced as a palatal fricative *r* sound, the articulation being somewhere in between Czech *ř* and Turkish -*r*. CHRISTOPHER indicated a similar spirant by spellings like ⟨*kárhi*⟩ “ripe coconut”, ⟨*rorhi*⟩ “flat bread” (M. *rośi*), ⟨*bárhi*⟩ “eggplant” (M. *baśi*), or ⟨*forhi*⟩ “box” (M. *fośi*), while in the case of ⟨*tori*⟩ “bark”, ⟨*istari*⟩ “hair” or ⟨*tari*⟩ “plate, dish” (M. *taśi*) he used plain ⟨*t*⟩ as PYRARD did. GEIGER, who styled this spirant “a sound peculiar to Máldívián, difficult to describe” (1919, 115 / 1986, 116; 1901-1902, III, 127), transcribed it with ⟨*ř*⟩, while BELL used ⟨*r*⟩. The pronunciation of medial /s/ (← /t/) as a palatal spirant similar to *ř* can still be heard in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku and also from the speakers of the “palace language” in Māle,<sup>137</sup> who alternate between [ř] and [s] without phonological reasons. It is only on the basis of an intermediate pronunciation [huři] that the peculiar development of the participial form M. *huri* (← *huři*, cp. A. *hiśi*, F. *hiśi* [long form] and H. *huři*, cf. below) can be explained.

1.3.6.2. In the vernacular of Huvadū, the retroflex /t/ is preserved in its original quality without any exception, as the following examples illustrate: H. *kauři* “ripe coconut” (M. *kāśi*, A.F. *kaiśi*), H. *galahuře* gen./loc. “(on) the island Galafuśi” (i.e. “stone-sandbank”, ← *galahuře* ← *gala-fuři-e*, cf. A.F. gen./loc. *fīše*), H. *huři* part.pret. “being, remaining; standing” (A. *hiśi*, F. *hiśi*, M. *huri*, cf. M. *hunnani* “to stand, remain, be”; 3.9.2.2.1). The same holds true for the inherited ending of the dative, -*ača*, which is preserved in its original form ending in a vowel as well as an apocopated variant ending in -*t* in Huvadū. Cp., e.g., H. *dorača* dat. “(to) the door” vs. M.A. *dora*<sup>3</sup> /-*aś*/, F. *doraha*<sup>138</sup>; H. *mattā* “upward(s)” vs. A. *mačča*<sup>3</sup>, M. *macca*<sup>3</sup> /-*aś*/, F. *mattaha* (dat. of the *i*-stem *mati* “top; above”).

1.3.6.3. The fricative /f/ which had emerged from /p/ in the whole Dhivehi speaking area, finally developed into /h/ in Huvadū. While a similar sound change has remained exceptional in the other dialects (cp., e.g., M. *aharen* ← *afuren* ← \**apuren*, pers.pron.1.ps., originally meaning pl. “we”, nowadays sg. “I”,<sup>139</sup> or M. *kulañduru huhi*, F. *kerañdul hūhi* vs. A. *kerañduru fuři* “bee hive”), it spread out in Huvadū, where it has affected a wide area. According to HLSD, 154, the subdialect of the eastern parts of the Huvadū-Atoll seems to be more conservative in this respect; cp., e.g., East-H. *fūla* “navel” vs. West-H. *hūla* (cf. M.A.F. *fūlu*). The material that has been collected so far does not suffice to draw final conclusions yet. There is no doubt, however, that no other dialect of Dhivehi shows such a strong tendency towards despirantisation in its phonemic system as does Huvadū. This agrees with the fact that the development of *s* → *h* which can be observed in Dhivehi in general has reached a higher level in Huvadū than anywhere else in this language.

<sup>137</sup> For more information on this sociolect cf. the introduction, 0.9.2.

<sup>138</sup> On the particular problem of the dative ending in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku cf. 2.3.1.1.3.

<sup>139</sup> For details cf. 2.6.2.3.1.2.

### 1.3.7. The phonemes /l/ and /ɳ/:

In contrast to Sinhalese where the retroflex lateral /l/ coincided with /l/ in pronunciation which led to a permanent confusion in orthography,<sup>140</sup> Dhivehi has preserved the phonemic difference between the laterals. The retroflex /ɳ/, which has also phonetically coincided with its dental counterpart /n/ in Sinhalese,<sup>141</sup> has lost its phonemic status in Standard Dhivehi,<sup>142</sup> while the southern dialects still provide many examples of the retroflex nasal and, furthermore, even some minimal pairs contrasting this with dental /n/.

1.3.7.1. Thus, e.g., M. *fani* “worm, caterpillar” is homophone of M.A.F. *fani* “(coconut) treacle”<sup>143</sup> with dental /n/ in the standard language, while the Addū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku dialects show a distinctive retroflex /ɳ/ in A. *fāni*, F. *fāni* “worm”<sup>144</sup>. An example of a minimal pair that is only distinguished by the two phonemes /l/ and /ɳ/ is M.A.F. *ali* “light” (noun and adj.) vs. M.A. *ali*, F. *āli* “ash, grey”.<sup>145</sup>

Some further examples of words containing /l/ and /ɳ/ are M.A.F. *kukuḷu* “hen”; M. *atolu*, A.F. *atele* “atoll”; M. *toḷi*, A. *teḷi*, F. *tēḷi* “bean”;<sup>146</sup> M. *kuḷi*, A.F. *kiḷi* “(fresh water) pond, tank, lake”; M. *finolu*, A. *finoḷa*, F. *finoḷo* “sandbank (island)”; M.A.F. *nāli* “Maldivian weight unit of about 1 kilogram”<sup>147</sup> etc. — For the correspondence of M. *n* – A.F. *ṅ* cf. M. *dōni* vs. A.F. *dōṅi* “common Maldivian boat type”; M. *hūnu* vs. A.F. *huṅnu* “warm, hot”; M. *ukunu* vs. A.F. *ukuṅnu* “flea, louse”; M. *kuni* vs. A.F. *kuṅi* “dirt, dirty, rotten”; M. *dūni* vs. A.F. *dūṅi* “bird”; M. *dekuṅnu* vs. A.F. *dekuṅnu* “south” etc.

1.3.7.2. There are some isolated examples of a **correspondence of M. *ḷ* and A.F. *ḍ*** in Dhivehi. Besides the words M. *furāḷu* / A. *ferāḍa* “roof”<sup>148</sup> and M. *ruli* / A. *riḍi* “anger, temper”, which are doubtful from an etymological point of view, we have to note M. *vaḷu* / A. *vaḍa*, F. *vaḍo* “well” which is related to Sinh. *vaḷa* “hole, pit”. This word originates from

<sup>140</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 56: “In some words there is an uncertainty concerning the spelling *l* or *l* and the dictionaries ... quote alternative forms.” – MATZEL (1983), 17: “Zwischen *l* und *ḷ* besteht ein Unterschied der sprachgeschichtlichen Herkunft, der sich in den Schreibungen *l* und *ḷ* erhalten hat. Die Aussprache beider Laute ist jedoch die gleiche.”

<sup>141</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 62 on the phonetic loss of Sinh. /ɳ/, often occurring in the written language even nowadays: “But owing to the fact that there is no difference now in pronunciation between *ṅ* and *n* a great confusion has arisen in the Sinh. orthography ... and many words and forms are spelt with *n* by some people and with *ṅ* by others.”

<sup>142</sup> The retroflex pronunciation of /n/ as [ɳ] in medial position after /ā/ and before a following vowel which is typical for Standard Dhivehi, is exclusively bound to this phonotactic position and therefore has no phonemic basis; cp., e.g., M. /*dānan*/ “I shall go” (1.ps.sg.fut. of *danī* “to go”), which is pronounced as [dānāɳ] regularly.

<sup>143</sup> Cp. Sinh. *pāni/pāni* “treacle, honey, molasses”; for the etymology cf. 1.2.3.1.

<sup>144</sup> Cp. Sinh. *paṅu-va* “id.” (GEIGER 1941, 93, no. 1383).

<sup>145</sup> For the secondary lengthening of the root vowel which is caused by a morphological rule, cf. 2.3.2.8.1.4.2.

<sup>146</sup> For the secondary lengthening of the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku variant cf. 2.3.2.8.1.4.2.

<sup>147</sup> For details on the traditional weights cf. BELL (1883), 118 f.

<sup>148</sup> The etymological connection of this word with OIA, Pa. *paṭala-*, Pkt. *paḍala-* “roof” is rather problematic (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 433, no. 7694). In the Dhivehi forms, both the consonants and the long Dhiv. *ā* could not be explained on this basis.

OIA *avaṭá-* “hole in the ground” which through Pkt. *avaḍa*-<sup>149</sup> developed directly into southern Dhivehi A. *vaḍa*, F. *vaḍo*. The development of *ḍ* into *ḷ* which we observe both in northern Dhivehi and in Sinhalese, must be secondary as against this.

The verb M. *uḷenī* “to live, be, behave” with its equivalents A. *vēñḍenī* and F. *vēñṇaī* must be considered within the same framework. While in the modern standard language and in Aḍḍū, the inflection of this verb shares the pattern of the *e*-stems, the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku variant shows the paradigm of the *n*-stems. The correlation of the dialectal variants becomes evident by means of the finite forms; cp., e.g., the 1.ps.sg.pres. M. *uḷen* vs. A. *vēñḍen* and F. *vēñḍin*, or the 1.ps.sg.pret. M. *uḷunin* vs. A. *vēñḍenen*, F. *vēñḍunin*.<sup>150</sup> We cannot take it for granted that the northern and southern variants represent the same etymon, but we have to consider that besides the correspondence of the retroflex sounds *ḷ* and *ñḍ*, there are also some older variants of the verb which speak in favour of an etymological relation.<sup>151</sup> For the older standard language, two variant forms of the part.pres. of this verb are attested, viz. *veḷena* (L4 e/1,1) and *vuleṇa* (L4 c/2,4; L2 22,3 etc.).<sup>152</sup> It seems obvious that *vu-* represents a later development here, just as *-o-* in *atolu* is opposed to *-e-* in older *ateḷu*. Thus we can assume that it was the retroflex consonant which influenced and changed the quality of the preceding vowel here in the same way as *e* became *o* in the position before a retroflex consonant (cf. 1.2.4.4).

Another example of the *ḷ-ḍ*-correspondence is provided by the dialectal variants of the part.pret. of *kurani* “to make, do”. The form M. *kuḷa* “made, done”, which is attested frequently since L1 (mn/2,2) but is no longer used nowadays, opposes itself to F. *keḷa* and to A. *kede*. In all probability, the *e* vowel of the southernmost dialects represents an earlier phonological stage here, too, just as the retroflex plosive *-ḍ-* in A. *kede* seems to be more archaic than the retroflex lateral *-ḷ-* of the other forms.<sup>153</sup>

1.3.8. Like Sinhalese, Dhivehi does not tolerate **consonant clusters** in any position.<sup>154</sup> Thus, all words that show consonant clusters in initial or final position must be of foreign origin; cp., e.g., M. *gasd* “intention” ← Arab. *qaṣd* “aim, purpose, intention”, or the sanskritism *pratama* “the first” which is attested in L2 33,2 (← Skt. *prathamá-* (cf. 2.5.2). In contrast to that, consonant groups in medial position can be based on two different developments. Either the words in question are of foreign origin as well (like *haftā* “week” ← Class.Mod.Pers. *hafta*, *ilmu* “knowledge” ← Arab. *ilm*, *uxtu* “sister” ← Arab. *uḥt*), or – in all other cases – the cluster extends over a morpheme boundary of compound words (like M. *donkeo*, A. *donkeu*, F. *donkēl* “banana” ← *don* “light, white; fairhaired, lightskinned” + */kel/* “longish fruit”; M.A. *domveli*, F. *domvēli* “fine, white coral sand” ← *don* “bright, light” (s.a.) + M.A. *veli*, F. *vēli* “sand”).

In normal pronunciation, consonant clusters occurring in sanskritisms or other foreign words are decomposed by means of anaptyctic vowels, regardless of their position within the

<sup>149</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) I, 34, no. 774 and GEIGER (1941), 160, no. 2393.

<sup>150</sup> The prenasalised stop in the southern variants of the *n*-stems is regular; cf. also the tables given in 3.2.2.1 and 3.3.2.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. also 3.9.2.2.4.

<sup>152</sup> For more details cf. 3.9.1.1.3.

<sup>153</sup> A detailed account of this participle is given in 3.9.2.2.5. For Sinh. *kaḷa* “done” cf. GEIGER (1938), 57.

<sup>154</sup> Cf., e.g., MASICA 1991, 125-7.

word. Frequent words show these vowels even in their written form; cp., e.g., *fikuru* “thought, thinking, idea” ← Arab. *fikr*; *tarujamā* “translation” ← Arab. *tarǧamat*; *vagutu* “time” ← Arab. *waqt*; *iskuru* “screw” ← Engl. *screw*; *furatama* “at first” ← *pratama* (L2 33,2) ← Skt. *prathamā*–; M. *burāsfati* (this spelling is already attested in ITAG 3,2 and ITFM 2,6), F. *berāsfati*, A. *berāseti* (with *-sf-* → *-ss-*) “Thursday” ← *\*bri/ahaspati* ← Skt. *br̥haspāti* “name of a deity / the planet Jupiter” (cf. also Sinh. *br̥haspatindā* / *brahaspatindā*, Skt. *br̥haspatidiva-* / *br̥haspativāra-* “Thursday”; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 527, nos. 9303 and 9304).

### 1.3.9. Geminates

DE SILVA has shown in his table (1969, 203) that in modern Dhivehi all consonants with the exception of the prenasalised stops, the palatal spirant *ś* and the glottal spirant *h* can occur as geminates. In contrast to DE SILVA’s statement according to which the retroflex lateral *l*, too, appears only as a single consonant, there are a few examples showing geminated *-ll-* in Dhivehi. It seems, however, that all the words in question are of foreign origin. None of the numerous geminates in Dhivehi can be derived directly from a corresponding geminate in MIA, because during the transition period between MIA and NIA all MIA geminates were reduced to single consonants.<sup>155</sup> Most of the geminates that occur in contemporary Dhivehi can be explained by secondary assimilations of different consonants,<sup>156</sup> the assimilatory processes being progressive or regressive. There are clear indications that progressive assimilations began earlier than those directed backwards; nowadays, however, Dhivehi exhibits much more examples that are due to regressive assimilations. As a matter of fact, regressive assimilations are regularly met with until now as a result of word formation processes or – in rare cases – by phenomena of sandhi<sup>157</sup> combining two words. The regressive assimilation of consonant clusters which leads to the formation of geminates has been reflected by the writing system of the standard language in recent times only. The most common spelling of geminates is ⟨*ʔC*⟩, while ⟨*CC*⟩<sup>158</sup> is used less often (e.g. *evvana* “(the) first”,<sup>159</sup> now written ⟨*eʔvana*⟩ as against original ⟨*ekvana*⟩ in ITAG 3,1 and ITAM 1,4). In some cases, the various stages of the historical development of geminates is attested in detail in the written sources, as we will see below.

1.3.9.1. *-Cv-* becomes *-CC-* or *-vv-*. The occurrence of progressive assimilations as well as regressive ones at morpheme boundaries is attested by parallel variants such as *raṭṭehi* “friend, compatriot” and *ravvehi* “native, local, indigenous, resident”. *raṭṭehi*, being obsolete in the modern standard language, is still known in the southern dialects, where it has an antiquated touch, as well. The word is attested in its indefinite form *raṭvesyaku* already in F11,28, in the 18th century. Dhiv. *\*raṭvehi-* corresponds to Sinh. *raṭavāsi(yā)* “inhabitant or native of a country”, which according to GEIGER has to be traced back through an intermedi-

<sup>155</sup> Cf., e.g., GEIGER 1938, 39 or MASICA 1991, 187.

<sup>156</sup> On the historical development of the geminates cf. 1.1.5.

<sup>157</sup> For details on the sandhi rules cf. 1.6.

<sup>158</sup> The spelling of one and the same word can vary even nowadays, because there are no orthographical rules.

<sup>159</sup> For details cf. 2.5.2.

ate form like Pa. *raṭṭha-vāsi(n)-* to Skt. *rāṣṭra-vāsin-* (from OIA *rāṣṭrá-* “kingdom, country” + *vāsin-* “inhabiting”).<sup>160</sup> While the geminate *-tt-* in *raṭṭehi* is the result of a progressive assimilation of *-tv-*, the form *ravvehi*, which is no longer associated with *raṭṭehi* by the native speakers of Dhivehi, obviously has to be traced back to a regressive assimilation of *-tv-* into *-vv-*. Considering *ravvehi*, there are two different ways of formation which have to be taken into account. On the one hand, *ravvehi* could be derived directly from *\*raṭvehi* as well. Although it seems rather unlikely, we cannot exclude the possibility that the two assimilation processes in question occurred at the same time (*-tv-* → *-tt-* and → *-vv-*), within one and the same dialect. On the other hand, we have to take into consideration that the form *ravvehi* could represent a (relatively) recent formation, namely a compound consisting of Dhiv. *raʷ /raś/* ← *raṭu* “land, island” and *vehi* ← *\*vesi* “inhabitant, resident; inhabiting” (= Sinh. *vāsiyā* “inhabitant”; cf. also *divehi* ← *\*divu-vesi* “islander, inhabitant of the islands, i.e. the Maldives”, 1.3.9.5) which could have developed independently from the inherited compound *\*raṭvehi*. While *raṭu* is well documented in Old Dhivehi (since L1), there are no attestations of *\*vehi* as a single word at all. This is why we cannot expect to find out at what time *\*vehi* became obsolete in the spoken language. By all means, even if *ravvehi* were of comparatively recent origin, *\*vehi* still must have been in use at the time of its formation. — One more example of a progressive assimilation of *-tv-* → *-tt-* is *avaṭṭeriā* ← *\*avaṭ-veri-ā* “neighbour” (lit. “village-person”; M. *avaʷ /avaś/* ← */avaṭ/* “village” + def. form *veri-ā* “the person”; cf. 2.3.2.4.1). — Further examples showing regressive assimilation of *-Cv-* → *-vv-* are, e.g., M. *hivvaru /hit-varu/* “courage, encouragement” (*hiʷ /hit/* “heart, mind, feeling”; *varu* “force, size, greatness”); M. *kīvve /kīʷ-ve/* “why” (cf. 2.6.7.2.5), M. *evves /ek-ves/*, A. *evvies*, F. *evvias* “even” (cf. 2.6.7.5).

1.3.9.2. In northern Dhivehi final *-ti* and *-di* were affricated when they were followed by *-e* or *-a*. Through intermediate *-ty-* and *-dy-*, they developed into the geminated affricates *-cc-* and *-jj-*. In contrast, the southern dialects show a progressive assimilation in these cases, which leads to the geminated plosives A.F. *-tt-* and *-dd-*. While the formation of the voiceless geminate *-cc-*, which is attested already for the Old Dhivehi period, has survived in the standard language as a living phonological process until nowadays, the voiced affricate *-jj-*, which derived from *-dy-*, was restricted to some isolated examples. The same holds true for the southernmost vernaculars, where *-ti* before *-e* and *-a* is phonetically realised as *-tt-* while the corresponding development of the voiced geminate, *-dd-*, is met with in a few words only which can be considered as frozen forms.

1.3.9.2.1. From the synchronic point of view, the occurrence of the geminates M. *-cc-* and A.F. *-tt-* is a morphonological feature in the formation of the indefinite form and the dative of the very rare *i*-stems with *-t* as their final root consonant. In addition to this, the morphonological change in question has a paradigmatic function in deriving the following forms in the southernmost dialects: the definite form and all the case forms based on it in Aḍḍū; the gen./loc.sg. in Aḍḍū and Fuaʷ Mulaku; the abl./instr. in Fuaʷ Mulaku. The effect of these morphonological rules may be illustrated with two nouns of this type which are in use nowadays:

<sup>160</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 144, nos. 2138 and 2137; 162, no. 2417. Cf. also TURNER (1966) II, 620, no. 10721 and 676, no. 11605.

The indefinite form of the *i*-stem M.A.F. *eti* “thing”, M. *ecce*<sup>161</sup>, F. *ette*<sup>161</sup> but A. *etta*<sup>161</sup>, has to be derived from *\*eti-ek/\*eti-ak* through the intermediate stage *\*etyek/etyak*.<sup>161</sup> Other current forms are: M. dat.sg. *ecca*<sup>161</sup> /*eti-aś*/; F. gen.sg. *ette* /*eti-e*/, dat.sg. *ettaha* /*eti-aś*/, abl. *etten* /*eti-en*/; A. nom.sg.def. *ettā* /*eti-ā*/; gen.sg.def. *ettāi* /*eti-ā*-i/, dat.sg.def. *ettā*<sup>161</sup> /*eti-ā-aś*/, abl.sg.def. *ettāin* /*eti-ā-in*/; the distributional plural form M. *ecceti*, A.F. *etteti* /*eti-eti*/ “thing by thing, all things” (cf. 2.3.2.5). Cp. the earliest attestations, *etyāk* (nom.indef.: sic L5 5/2,6), *etyaku* (obl.indef.; F5,26), *etyakaṭu* (dat.indef.; F3,1), *etye* (probably instead of *\*etyek* as nom.indef.; F3,1), *etyeti* (distributional plural form; F3,7; F2,14; F5,41; F8,29,30). — The case forms of M.A.F. *mati* “top, surface”, which are mainly used as local adverbs correspond to those of the preceding noun, cp., e.g., dat. M. *macca*<sup>162</sup>, A. *matta*<sup>162</sup>, F. *mattaha* /*mati-aś*/ “to the top; up (to), upwards” (cp. the early attested form *matyaṭa* in L2 5,1); gen./loc. A.F. *matte* /*mati-e*/ “on the surface, at/on the top; above, overhead”.

1.3.9.2.2. In the standard language, the affrication of final *-ti* is due to a certain kind of sandhi,<sup>162</sup> when adjectives in predicative position precede the quotation marker *-ē* /*-eve*/.<sup>163</sup> Cf. M. *rīti* “beautiful” as against *mi koṭari rīccē* /*rīti-eve*/ “this room is beautiful” or M. *hiti* “bitter” as against *sai hiccē* /*hiti-eve*/ “(the) tea is bitter”.

1.3.9.3. As was stated above, there are only a few examples of the development of *-di* → *-jj-* in the standard language and of *-di* → *-dd-* in the southern vernaculars. In contrast to the change of *-ti* into *-cc-/-tt-*, which is regularly connected with a paradigmatic function, the parallel sound change of the voiced stop is restricted to isolated unchangeable forms. Thus, in southern Dhivehi, the *i*-stems *kudi-* “child” and *kalamidi-* “prince” show this morphological process only in their definite nom.sg. and the depending case forms; cf. the nom.sg.def. A. *kuddā* (F. *kuddā*) ← *\*kudi-ā* “the child”. In the standard language, besides *kujjā* ← *\*kudyā* ← *\*kudi-ā* the indefinite form is affected as well by the affrication; cp. M. *kujje*<sup>164</sup> ← *\*kudyek* ← *\*kudi-ek* “a child”.<sup>164</sup> — The nom.sg. *kalamidi* “prince”, which is well attested in the history of the language (L6 1,2 and 2,3; RA 21,1; *kalamedi* in F5,38 and RC 14,5), has *kalamijjā* as its definite form which has to be derived through *\*kalamidyā* from *\*kalamidi-ā*; all of the (frequent) attestations of this word show ⟨*-nj-*⟩ which was the usual spelling of [–*jj-*], hence the written form is regularly ⟨*kalaminjā*⟩ (e.g. RC 12,10; RC 22,11 etc.). — The modern Dhivehi word for “state, empire”, originally “kingdom”, which appears in the dialectal variants M. *rājje* (cf. *divehi rājje* as the official name of the Maldives) and A.F. *rādde*, represents a sanskritism. While the form *rādyā* (Skt. *rājyā-* “kingship, kingdom”, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 619, no. 10694), which is attested already in L1 (g/2,5), L2 (6,1) and L3 (2/1,2 and 3/1,5) with the spelling ⟨*-dy-*⟩ for *-jy-*, represents the nominative, the numerous variants ending in *-e* which appear in different spellings such as *rāddyē* (F5,13; F6,10; F7,13,20; F8,18; F13,2; F10,12,15; F11,9,17; IDME 3,25 and 27), *rātde* (F3,8,11), *rāndye* (F9,4; RB 1,3), *rānjē* (RC 8,7), *rājje* (with Arab. ⟨ج⟩ RA 1,4) have to be explained as a locative form “in the kingdom, in the state”. In Modern Dhivehi the frozen form of the locative has been re-interpreted as a nominative.

<sup>161</sup> For the distribution of the two suffixal variants cf. 2.3.2.1 (A.), 2.3.2.2 (F.), 2.3.2.3.1 and 2.3.2.3.1 (M.), resp.

<sup>162</sup> For the sandhi rules cf. 1.6.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. 2.4.

<sup>164</sup> For further details on the morphology and on the use of these forms in the modern language, cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2, 2.3.2.8.1.4.3 and 2.3.2.9.1.3.2.

In standard Dhivehi, the formation of the “preterite IV” which contains *danī* “to go” as an auxiliary verb must be explained within this framework; cp. 1.ps.sg. *-jjain* ← *\*-diain*, 2./3.ps.sg. and 3.ps.pl. *-jje* ← *-dye* ← *\*-dia*, 1./2.ps.pl. *-jjaimu* ← *\*-diaimu*.<sup>165</sup> The historical development is clearly shown by the early attestations of M. *vejje* “became”, 3.ps.sg. pret.IV of *vanī* “become”, viz. *veddya* (F10,18), *veddye* (F5,21.24; IDMHM 4,21), *vedye* (F10,10), *vejja* (spelled ⟨*venja*⟩; RC 29,11) and ⟨*ve<sup>2</sup>ja*⟩ (RC 5,3 and 30,13); the earliest attestations of the contemporary form *vejje* (spelled ⟨*ve<sup>2</sup>je*⟩) can be found on a tombstone of the graveyard of the Māle Hukuru Mosque (ITMHM 1,7; the dating is uncertain) and in RC (2,6).

1.3.9.4. The gemination and palatalisation of *-n-* preceding a stem-final *-i* in combination with the indefinite suffix is restricted to northern Dhivehi. Cf. the indefinite forms *dōññe<sup>o</sup>* ← *\*dōnye<sup>o</sup>* ← *\*dōniek* ← *\*dōni-ek*<sup>166</sup> “a boat” (M. *dōni* “boat, ship”) or *dūññe<sup>o</sup>* ← *\*dūnye<sup>o</sup>* ← *\*dūniek* ← *\*dūni-ek* “a bird” (M. *dūni* “bird”).<sup>167</sup> The same holds true for the ending of the dative (*dōñña<sup>o</sup>*, *dūñña<sup>o</sup>* /-aś/).

1.3.9.5. The paradigmatic interchange of *-h-* (← *-s-*) and *-ss-* occurring in some *i*-stems can be found in the whole Dhivehi speaking area, the phonological development of *-si+V* → *-siV* → *-syV* → *-ssV* being equivalent with A.F. *-ti-* → *-tt-* and *-di-* → *-dd-* (cf. 1.3.9.2). Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *divēhi* “Maldivian” vs. the nom.sg.indef. M.F. *divesse<sup>o</sup>* /*divesi-ek*/, A. *divessa<sup>o</sup>* /*divesi-ak*/ (← *\*divu-vesi* “islander”<sup>168</sup>). While the nouns ending in *-hi* (← *-si*) have survived as a comparatively homogeneous group in Aḍḍū, they were subject to morphological simplifications in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku and even more so in the standard language.<sup>169</sup> Cf. M.A. *mēhi*, F. *mēhi* “fly” ← *\*mesi* (cp. the Sinh. stem *māsi-/māhi-* ← Skt. *mākṣikā-* “fly, bee”<sup>170</sup>), where in Aḍḍū *-s-* is preserved within the geminate *-ss-* almost throughout the paradigm while we find a compensatory change of *-s-* to *-h-* in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku: cf. A. nom.def. *messā* /*mesi-ā*/, nom. indef. *messa<sup>o</sup>* /*mesi-ak*/ (besides *mēhā* / *mēha<sup>o</sup>*), gen. *messe* /*mesi-el*/, dat. *messa<sup>o</sup>* /*mesi-aś*/ vs. F. nom.indef. (only) *mēhe<sup>o</sup>* /*mesi-ek*/, gen. *mēhe* /*mesi-el*/, dat. *mēha<sup>o</sup>* /*mesi-aś*/.

1.3.9.5.1. The formation of causatives from verbs with *-s* as their original final root consonant is affected by the same morphonological interchange of *-h-/ss-*; cf. *jahanī* ← *\*jasanī* “beat, strike, kick; blow (wind), ring (bell)” with its causative *jassanī* ← *\*jasvanī* ← *\*jasa-va-nī* (cf. 1.3.9.12.1 and 3.2.1.1).

<sup>165</sup> For more details cf. 3.11.4.5.1.

<sup>166</sup> For the loss of /n/ in the standard language cf. 1.3.7.

<sup>167</sup> The statement of H LSD (1988), 15 according to which “a morphophonemic feature of Divehi is that morphemes containing the dental nasal ‘n’ in the final syllable ... replace this nasal by ‘ññ’ when they are followed by certain suffixes”, is not exact enough, because this is not a question of “certain suffixes”. Besides the indefinite suffix, the phonetic process is also triggered by the ending of the dative, i.e. all nominal suffixes with initial vowel are concerned. – On the status of the palatal nasal ñ cf. 1.3.10.

<sup>168</sup> On *\*divu* “island” cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4 (s.v. *uren* ← *vuren*); for *\*vesi* “inhabitant” cf. 1.3.9.1.

<sup>169</sup> For details and examples cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.2 and 2.3.2.11.3.3 (Aḍḍū), 2.3.2.8.1.4.4 and 2.3.2.12.5.2 (Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku) and 2.3.2.9.1.3.1 (Māle).

<sup>170</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 133, no. 1975 s.v. *mässā* and TURNER (1966) II, 554, no. 9696 s.v. *makṣā-*.

1.3.9.6. The geminates *-pp-* and *-tt-* are of particular interest because the inherited Old Maldivian stops /p/ and /t/ are preserved in their original quality only within these geminated consonants (cf. 1.3.6). There are only a few examples as to this, which will be treated below.

1.3.9.6.1. The geminate *-pp-* occurring in the kinship term M. *bappa*, A.F. *bappā*, A. *appā* “father” cannot be analysed any further because the word obviously originated in children’s language. – M. *fuppāmē*, A.F. *fuppāmei* “lungs” contains Dhiv. *fuppā-*, which does not exist as an independent word; its second part is M. *mē*, A.F. *mei* “liver”.<sup>171</sup> Dhiv. *fuppā-* can be identified with Sinh. *papu-* “lungs” which, according to TURNER (1966, II, 511, no. 9090) has to be derived from OIA *phupphusa-* “lungs”. In Sinhalese, we also meet with a word *pupphusa* “lungs” which, like Dhiv. *fuppā-* (with the regular change of *p-* → *f-*), must be explained as a sanskritism. — A few consonant stems with final /t/ which were combined with the honorific suffix *-pulu* (→ *-fulu*) in the standard language were obviously fixed in this combination before /p/ developed into /f/. The geminate *-pp-* occurring in these words is the result of an regressive assimilation of *-Cp-*; cf. *appulu* ← *\*at-pulu* “hand of a person of high social status” and *dappulu* ← *\*dat-pulu* “tooth of a person of high social status”. Most probably, the island name *duppoḷī* (L2 15,1) shows the same development as well. — In a similar way the stem final *-p* of some verbs was preserved in their causative forms (cf. 3.2.1.1) because of a progressive assimilation leading to geminated *-pp-*. Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *hifanī* ← *\*sipanī* “to hold, catch (something)” with its causative *hippanī* ← *\*hipvanī* ← *\*hipa-va-nī* “to let hold, let catch; stick” (cf. also the substantive M.A.F. *hippi* “sticker”, reflecting the part.pret. “sticked” of the causative *hippanī*); cp. also *kafanī* ← *\*kapanī* “to cut (something)” with the simple causative (meanwhile being obsolete) *\*kappanī* ← *\*kapa-va-nī* “to let cut” and the double causative (cf. 3.2.1.1.1) M. *kappavanī* “to have something cut (by someone of a lower social class)”.

1.3.9.6.2. The geminate *tt* in many cases has its origin in a progressive assimilation of *-tv-*, as in the compound nouns *rattehi* ← *\*rat-vesi* “friend, compatriot” and *avatteriā* ← *\*avat-veri-ā* “neighbour” (cf. 1.3.9.1). This is also true for causative formations with *-tt-* being based on primary verbs with original *-t-* (for *ś* ← *t* cf. 1.3.6.1). Cf. M.A.F. *koṣanī* ← *\*koṭanī* “to chop, cut (e.g., wood)” with the double causative M. *kottavanī* “to let someone (belonging to a lower social class) chop”; the primary causative *\*kottanī* ← *\*koṭa-va-nī* does not exist any longer (cf. 1.3.9.12.1 and 3.2.1.1).

1.3.9.6.2.1. The sound change *-tt-* ← *-ty-* is attested, e.g., in *puṭṭāi* ← *\*puṭi-āi* “and the island” (L1 s/1,1, L2 8,4 etc.; nom. *puṭi* in L1 mx/2,1, L2 9,2 etc.; cf. M. *fusi*, A. *fīsi*, F. *fīsi* “small island”) and *koṭṭāi* ← *\*koṭi-āi* “and the enclosure” (L2 15,5 etc.; L3 6/2,2; L4 d/2,5), *koṭṭakāi* ← *\*koṭi-ak-āi* “and an enclosure” (L2 26,4), *koṭṭ-evyana* ← *\*koṭi-eviana* “being named ‘enclosure’” (L2 15,5); cf. the *i*-stem *koṭi* “enclosure, garden, fenced-in area” (cf. modern M.A.F. *koṣi* “cage”).

<sup>171</sup> The etymology of *mē* / *mei* is not clear.

1.3.9.6.3. The geminate *-ff-* must be of later origin, because it cannot have developed before the transition of /p/ into /f/. All examples concerned can be explained by assuming regressive assimilations; cf. M. *raffu*<sup>172</sup> ← \**raś-fuś* “landscape, rural district” (for *ra*<sup>2</sup> /*raś*/ “land, island” cf. 1.3.9.1; *putu* as the previous form of /*fuś*/ “back, surface, top side” is attested, e.g., as a locative *asu pute* “on horse back” in L1 (d/1,4); cf. also GEIGER<sup>172</sup> who connects ⟨*fu*⟩ “side” (his spelling ⟨*ř*⟩ means /*s* ← *t*/) with Sinh. *piṭa* ← OIA *prṣṭhā-* “back, hind part”; M. *fuffu*<sup>173</sup> ← \**fuś-fuś* “grain, cereals” (distributive plural “corn by corn”, cf. 2.3.2.5); M. *fu*<sup>173</sup> /*fuś*/ “flour” corresponds to Sinh. *piṭi* “id.”, ← OIA *piṣṭā-* “crushed, ground; flour”<sup>173</sup>; A. *daffa* “sole of the foot” ← \**daś(u)-fā*, actually “underside of the foot” (cf. the earlier form *daṭu* in L2 22,2; L5 5/1,2; F3,6; F10,19 etc. and *daśu* in RC 5,12 “underside, bottom”; *daṭun* abl. “from the underside, from below” in F6,20; F7,32.38; F9,16; F11,22 etc.; F13,18; IDMHM 1,12; IDMEM 3,26); M. *fai*, A.F. *fā* “foot” belongs to Sinh. *pā-* “foot”, ← OIA *pāda*<sup>174</sup>; A. *effahara*<sup>174</sup> /*ek faharaś*/ “one time, once (upon a time)” (*e*<sup>2</sup> /*ek*/ num. “one”; /*fahara-ś*/ dat. of A. *fahara/fāra*, M. *faharu* “time”) etc.

1.3.9.7. Different geminates emerged in recent times as a result of assimilation on the morpheme boundary of compounds; cp., e.g., M.A.F. *nikkuri* /*nit-kuri*/ “forehead” (cf. M. *nī* /*nīt*/ “forehead”); M. *ebbas* “agreement” (/*ek*/ “one” + /*bas*/ “word, language”); M.A.F. *emme* /*ek-me*/ “all, entire, whole”<sup>175</sup>. It cannot be excluded that M.A.F. *uddaṇḍi* /*uk-daṇḍi*/ “sugar cane” reflects a loan compound from Sinhalese (cf. Sinh. *uk, uk-daṇḍa*, also *ik, ugu, iṅgu* “sugar cane” ← OIA *ikṣū-* “id.”<sup>176</sup>).

1.3.9.8. As a rule, geminates that occur in foreign words are not changed in modern Dhivehi. Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *āditta* “Sunday” (sanskritism; cf. 1.2.1.1); M.A.F. *buddi* “mind, intellect, spirit” (sanskritism; cf. Skt., Pa. *buddhi-*, Pkt. *buddhī-* “intelligence, discernment”<sup>177</sup>; M. *budda* “old man” (*mot savant*; cf. Pa., Pkt. *buddha-* “old”)<sup>178</sup>; M.A.F. *tayyāru/-a/-o* “ready” (← Pers. *tayyār* “ready”); M. *mudarris* “teacher” (← Arabic “id.”); M.A.F. *billūri* “(of) glass” (← Arab. *ballūrī, billaurī* “crystal, of glass”); M. *muazzif* “employee, official” (Arab. *muwazzaf* “id.”; cf. WEHR 1958, 960); etc.

1.3.9.9. Nevertheless, many geminates remain that cannot (yet) be explained historically. Cf. M.A.F. *batteli* “Maldivian type of sailing boat”<sup>179</sup>; M. *datta*, A.F. *dattā* “elder sister; older woman”; M. *bokkurā*, A.F. *bokkorā* “small rowing boat”; M. *kokko*, A.F. *kokkō* “younger brother or sister”; M.F. *labba* “yes”<sup>180</sup>; M. *amilla*, A. *amella*, F. *āmillā* “self, private”; M. *kullavā* “mangrove”; A. *baddela* “green grasshopper”; M. *diggā*, A. *diggē* “hibiscus”; M. *mamma*, A.F. *mammā* (A. also *ammā*) “mother”; M.A.F. *assēri* “beach”; M.F. *mussaṇḍi*,

<sup>172</sup> (1902), 920, no. 153 and (1941), 104, no. 1539.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) I, 465, no. 8218 and GEIGER (1941), 104, no. 1540.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 95, no. 1417.

<sup>175</sup> For detailed information about the pronominal adj. *emme* cf. 2.6.7.4.1.

<sup>176</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 24, no. 364 and TURNER (1966) I, 70, no. 1550.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. TURNER 1966, II, 525, no. 9277.

<sup>178</sup> Cf. TURNER 1966, II, 524, no. 9271.

<sup>179</sup> About the Maldivian boat terms cf. 2.3.2.7.3.2.

<sup>180</sup> In contrast to that cp. A. *hā* “yes”.

A. *mussanti* “rich”; M.A.F. *iyye* “yesterday” (cf. Sinh. *īyē* “yesterday”, Pkt. *hio*, *hijjo*, Pa. *hiyyo*, Skt. *hyāh* “id.”<sup>181</sup>); M. *falli* “Christian church / Buddhist temple” (*paḷli* already in L1 [d/2,3 and t/1,3], cf. Sinh. *pallīva*, stem *pallī-* “church” with alveolar *-ll*<sup>182</sup>).

1.3.9.9.1. Concerning the regular correspondence of certain consonant clusters and geminates, we have to note a few specific developments that occur only in a restricted dialectal area. Cp., e.g., M. *burāsfati* “Thursday” (ITAG 3,2, ITFM 2,6), F. *berāsfati* vs. A. *berāsseti* with a transition of *-sf-* to *-ss-* (cf. 1.3.8) or M. *istaśi* “hair” vs. A.F. *issaśi* with a change of *-st-* → *-ss-*. – There is also the very surprising correspondence of M. *-tt-* vs. A. *-ṭṭ-* in M. *kattala*, A. *kattela* “sweet potato, batata” as well as A. *-gg-* vs. F. *-jj-* in A. *eggom* /*leggom*/ (nom.def. *eggomā*), F. *ejjun* “single blossom of the coconut tree”.<sup>183</sup> From a phonological point of view, these correspondences cannot be explained yet.

1.3.9.10. When a consonant stem ending in */-t/* comes into the position before a word with initial consonant, the resulting phonetic process occurring on the morpheme boundary is not the same in northern and southern Dhivehi. While in the standard language the development leads to a diphthong (*Vt+C-* → *ViC-*), in the southern dialects a corresponding geminate emerges by regressive assimilation (*Vt+C-* → *VCC-*). Cp., e.g., M. *aitila* /*at-tila*/ vs. A.F. *at-tela* /*at-tela*/ “palm” (/*at/* “hand, arm” + M. *tila*, A.F. *tela* “shallow (water); blade”); M. *aiḍaṇḍi* vs. A.F. *addaṇḍi* “arm” (/*at/* “hand, arm” + *daṇḍi* “stick”); M. *daiḍoli* vs. A.F. *daddoli* “chin; jaw(bone)” (/*dat/* “teeth” + *doli* “cheekbone”); A. *dakkaśi* /*dat-kaśi*/ “alveols” (*kaśi* “bone”); M. *raigā* vs. A. *raggau*, F. *raggal* /*rat-gal*/ “red coral” (lit. “red stone”, /*rat/* adj. “red” + /*gal/* “stone”); M. *raimas* vs. A. *rammas*, F. *rammaha* /*rat-mas*/ “soldier fish” (actually “red fish”, /*rat/* “red” + /*mas/* “fish”).

1.3.9.11. While in the standard language *-rr-* in *sirru* “secret” (← Arab. *sirr* “secret, mystery”) is articulated as a geminated alveolar vibrant, the ablative form A. /*sirrun*/ shows a regular dissimilation into [s*idrun*]. For a similar development in external sandhi cf. 1.6.

### 1.3.9.12. Geminates in the verbal system

Generally speaking, the gemination of the last consonant of the verbal root has an important morphonologic function in the formation of **causatives**. In many cases the historical development of causatives can thus be traced back both from the formal and from the semantic point of view (for further details cf. 3.2.1.1). Cp. the following examples:

1.3.9.12.1. M.F. *fattanī* ← *\*fatvanī* ← *\*fata-va-nī* “to sink” (trans.),<sup>184</sup> actually “to let swim, cause to swim”, from the basic verb *fatanī* “to swim”; M.F. *duvvanī*, A. *divvanī* “to drive, ride, sail”, lit. “to let run, cause to run”, from M.F. *duvanī*, A. *divanī* “to run”; M.A.F. *jassanī* ← *\*jasvanī* “to land, turn (on)” from M.A.F. *jahanī* ← *\*jasanī* “to beat, kick, blow”. M.A.F. *dakkanī* “to show”, lit. “to let see” is derived from the transitive verb

<sup>181</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 24, no. 363 and TURNER (1966) II, 815, no. 14108.

<sup>182</sup> Cf. CARTER 1936, 61.

<sup>183</sup> This word is unknown in the standard language. For the single blossom the common word meaning “flower, blossom”, *mā* /*mal*/, is used here instead.

<sup>184</sup> *fattanī* does not exist in Addū; for the causative meaning “to sink” the suppletive verb *heruvanī* is used.

\**dakanī* “to look” which is obsolete in the modern standard language (but cp. the intr. verb M. *dekenī* “to see” which is derived from the same stem and, furthermore, the *n*-stem pres. A.F. *dak-* “to see” (intr.), with the pres.part. (“long form”) A. *dakumei*, F. *dakonāi*). M. *rissanī* “to ache”, lit. “to let ache” (e.g. *bolugā /-gai/ rissanī* “to have a headache”, lit. “to cause pain in the head”) is derived from the trans. \**risanī* (cf. M.A.F. *rihenī* ← \**risenī* intr. “to ache”). From a formal point of view, M.A.F. *huṭṭanī* trans. “to stop, finish” together with its intransitive derivative, *huṭṭenī* “to stop”, are causatives of the irregular *n*-stem verb M. *hunnanī*, A. *hinnei*, F. *hinnāi* “to stand; remain, be” (cf. the part.pret. Old Dhiv. *huṭi*, A. *hiṣi*, F. *hiṣi*, and Sinh. *hiṭṭinavā*<sup>185</sup>). The transitive verb M.A.F. *kakkanī* “to cook” formally is a causative of the non-attested basic \**kakanī*; cf. the intr. verb *kekenī* “to boil” (of liquids).

1.3.9.12.2. The whole morphological pattern of ***n*-stem verbs** such as M. *bannanī* “to tie”, *innanī* “to sit, marry, be married”, *dannanī* “to know, understand”, *hunnanī* “to stand, stay, remain, be”, *vannanī* “to enter” etc.<sup>186</sup> is characterised by the geminate *-nn-*; cf. also 3.2.2, 3.6.5 and 3.9.1.2.

1.3.9.12.3. In the following verbs, the geminates are of different provenance. M. *koppānī* /*koṣfanī*/ “to push” is composed of *ko*<sup>3</sup> /*koṣ*/ “doing, making” (abs. of *kuranī* “to do, make”) and a (nowadays obsolete) verb \**panī* with unknown meaning, which seems also to be the second part of M.A.F. *lappānī* /*la<sup>3</sup>panī*/ “to close” (as to the verbal constituent *la<sup>3</sup>* which cannot yet be explained, cf. M. *laggānī* /*la<sup>3</sup>ganī*/ “to float, drift ashore; toss” = A. *lavvanī*; the infixation of the negation particle *nī* in the negated 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *la<sup>3</sup> nī vei* “(it) is not tossed” proves that *la<sup>3</sup>* must be an independent word which is used as a constituent of a compound verb here). One more compound verb containing the absolutive /*koṣ*/ is M. *kollanī* /*koṣlanī*/ . The exact meaning of this verb is “to put down (by doing)”; it only occurs in M. *dū kollanī* “to leave” (lit. “to put down slackening” = “to leave by slackening [the boat]”). — The first part of M. *ekkurānī* /*ek-kuranī*/ “to add, mix” consists of the numeral *e<sup>3</sup>* /*ek*/; thus, the basic meaning of the verb can be translated with “to make (in) one”. — M. *hikkānī* “to let dry” (only in M. *dia-hikkānī* “to bail water from a leaky boat”) obviously is a denominative verb; cf. M.A.F. *hiki* “dry”. — M.A.F. *vikkānī* “to sell” goes back to the present stem Skt. *vi-krinā-* (Pa. *vikkīṇā-*, Pkt. *vikkīṇa-*) “to sell”<sup>187</sup> via \**vikina-*, \**vikna-*, the geminate reflecting the older sequence of *-kn-*.

### 1.3.10. Loan phonemes

While in HLSD (1988, 14), *ñ* is described as a phoneme of its own,<sup>188</sup> DE SILVA (1969, 204) analyses *ñ* as a cluster consisting of the phonetic components [ny] which, of course, has no phonemic status as such. Obviously DE SILVA’s analysis starts out from such cases as *dūññe<sup>3</sup>* ← \**dūnye<sup>3</sup>* ← \**dūniek* ← \**dūñi-ek* “a bird”, the secondary geminated *ññ* of which is hardly phonemic.<sup>189</sup> There are some isolated words with initial *ñ-* in Dhivehi, however,

<sup>185</sup> For the etymology of *hunnanī* cf. 3.9.2.2.1.

<sup>186</sup> A complete list of the *n*-stem verbs is given in 3.4.2.3.

<sup>187</sup> Cf. TURNER 1966, II, 678, no. 11640.

<sup>188</sup> “On the one hand, our corpus of data does not contain any minimal pairs in which this sound contrasts with the dental ‘n’ ... In our analysis, the palatal nasal will be treated as a distinct phoneme on the grounds that it occurs frequently as a geminate cluster and the Divehins recognise it as distinct unit in their system of writing (ñāviani).”

<sup>189</sup> For details about the geminate *ññ* cf. 1.3.9.4.

the *ñ* of which cannot be analysed as a sequence of *n* and *y* by means of morphological criteria. As most of these words must be explained as (presumably) old loanwords, it seems to be adequate to see a loan phoneme here, i.e., a sound with a “low phonemic level” within the Maldivian phonological system. There are only a few words with undisputable initial /*ñ*/ in Dhivehi,<sup>190</sup> M.A. *ñāki* “aimless, foolish talk”; *ñēku* “mentally retarded”; *ñakas* “a sexual practice”; *ñam ñam* (<*ñamu ñamu*) “a tropical fruit”, bot. “*Cynometra cauliflora*” (rare on the Maldives); the corresponding tree, which was imported from Sri Lanka, is called M.A. *ñam ñam gas/ges*, bot. “*Fabacea leguminosa*”. It cannot be excluded that the first three of these words contain the negation particle in its original form, *ni* (cf. modern A.F. *ni* vs. M. *nu*) which might have been reduced to *ny* in the position before a vowel.

1.3.10.1. A very frequent phoneme, which occurs exclusively in loanwords from Arabic and Persian, is /*h*/l. In most cases it is pronounced in its original phonetic value as [x]. Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *tārīx* “date, chronicle, history” ← Arab. *tārīḥ* “id.”; A.F. *xādima* “servant” ← Arab. *ḥādīm* “male servant”, *ḥādima* “female servant”; M. *alī buxairī*, A. *alī boxārī* “Bukhārā plum” ← Pers. *ālu-boxārā* “(dried) prune” etc.

1.3.10.2. There is one more loan phoneme, which can often be heard in its original phonetic quality, viz. /*z*/l. Cf. M.A.F. *tāzā* “fresh” ← Pers. *tāza* “id.”, M. *bāzāru*, A. *bāzāra* “(oriental) bazaar, market” ← Arab./Pers. *bāzār* etc. In contrast to that, we find the original voiced fricative /*z*/ substituted by [-*d*-] in earlier loanwords; cp., e.g., *namādu* “prayer” (attested since L1 d/2,1) ← Pers. *namāz*).<sup>191</sup>

1.3.10.3. All other foreign phonemes (as listed in the table below) are substituted by autochthonous phonemes until nowadays; cp., e.g., M. *hagīgī* “real” ← Arab. *ḥaqīqī* “id.”, M. *fagīru*, A.F. *fakīri* “poor” ← Arab. *faqīr* “id.”; M.A.F. *bagīcā* “garden” ← Pers. *bāgčā* “id.” etc. Only a few people with a good knowledge of Arabic try to pronounce the sounds in question according to their original value.

1.3.10.4. The following table shows Arabic characters and their transliteration into Tāna:

Tāna	ﺥ	ﺡ	ﻉ	ﺽ	ﺺ	ﺚ	ﻍ	ﻕ
Arabic	ﺥ	ﺡ	ﻉ	ﺽ	ﺺ	ﺚ	ﻍ	ﻕ
transcribed	<i>h,x</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>ʕ</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>q</i>
Tāna	ﺶ	ﺫ	ﻍ	ﻭ	ﺭ	ﻁ	ﻁ	ﺯ
Arabic	ﺶ	ﺫ	ﻍ	ﻭ	ﺭ	ﻁ	ﻁ	ﺯ
transcribed	<i>ʃ</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>w</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>z</i>

<sup>190</sup> The examples noted here are taken from the monolingual dictionary of Dhivehi (NCLHR 1985-91, 15, 1); HASSAN SA'ID confirmed that they are used in Addū as well.

<sup>191</sup> For this type of substitutions cf. GIPPERT (forthcoming).

Examples of Arabic words transcribed into Tāna:

English	Tāna	Arabic	English	Tāna	Arabic
dust	ṭṭṭṭ	غَبَارٌ	heart	ṭṭṭṭ	قَلْبٌ
stone	ṭṭṭṭ	حَجَرٌ	ambergriis	ṭṭṭṭ	عَبْنِيْنٌ
alms	ṭṭṭṭ	صَدَقَاتٌ	wine	ṭṭṭṭ	خَمْرٌ
filter	ṭṭṭṭ	نِدَامٌ؟	beat	ṭṭṭṭ	ضَرْبٌ
captain	ṭṭṭṭ	رَبَانٌ	book	ṭṭṭṭ	زَيْنٌ؟
midday	ṭṭṭṭ	ظَهْرٌ	road	ṭṭṭṭ	طَرِيْقٌ
hand	ṭṭṭṭ	يَدٌ	middle	ṭṭṭṭ	وَسْطٌ
month	ṭṭṭṭ	شَهْرٌ	sun	ṭṭṭṭ	ذِكَاؤٌ

#### 1.4. Syllable and word structure

As the earliest written documents of Dhivehi show, there were only open syllables in Old Dhivehi (cf. 1.1.2 ff.). It was only because of the systematic occurrence of the processes of apocope and syncope (cf. 1.1.3 and 1.1.5 above) that in the course of time new types of closed syllables emerged.

The following survey illustrates the most important patterns of word and syllable structure of modern Dhivehi. Geminates are treated like sequences of two different consonants.

1.4.1. Monosyllabic structures: **CV** (consonant-vowel): M.A.F. *de* “two”; **VC**: A.F. *aʿ* /at/ (M. *ai*) “hand, arm”, M. *oʿ* /oʃ/ (A. *eša*, F. *eše*) “seed, kernel”; M.A.F. *en* /em/ “bait fish”; **CVC**: M.A.F. *kan* /kam/ “fact”; M.A.F. *hun* “fever”; M.A.F. *tīr* “arrow”.

Monosyllabic words which consist of a single long vowel in the standard language, such as *ā* “new”, do not represent open syllables from a phonological point of view. Instead we have to deal with the phonetic realisation of a closed syllable here, as the correspondent forms A. *au* and F. *al* show.<sup>192</sup> As a matter of fact, there is no word in Dhivehi which consists of only one long vowel.

1.4.2. Disyllabic structures: **VCV**: M.A. *ihī*, F. *īhī* “lobster”; M.A.F. *uḍu* “sky”; **CVCV**: M.A.F. *hudu* “white”; M.A. *baśī*, F. *bāśī* “eggplant”; **VCVC**: M.A. *atun*, F. *aten* (abl.) “from, by the hand”; **CVCVC**: M. *bēnun*, A.F. *bēnun* “wish, will”; **VCCV**: M.A.F. *emme* /ek-mel/ “all, whole”; **CVCCV**: M. *datta*, A.F. *dattā* “elder sister/woman”; M. *bappa*, A.F. *bappā* “father” **VCCVC**: M.A.F. *emmen* /ek-men/ “all (persons)” (pl.).

<sup>192</sup> For more details cf. 1.2.1.6.

1.4.3. Trisyllabic structures: **VCVCV**: M.A.F. *iṅgili* “finger, toe”; **CVCVCV**: M.A.F. *huturu* “ugly”; M. *himāru*, A. *himāra*, F. *himāro* “donkey”; **CVCVCVC**: M.A.F. *miturun* (nom.pl.) “friends”; **CVCCVCV**: M.A.F. *batteli* “a kind of Maldivian sailing boat”; M. *bokkurā*, A.F. *bokkorā* “a small boat type”.

1.4.4. Word structures like **CVCVCVCV** as well as longer sequences of syllables occur in compound words only. Cp., e.g., M.A. *vāreduni*, F. *vāreheduni* “rain bow”.

1.4.5. The phenomenon of **hiatus** is met with very frequently in the southern varieties of Dhivehi. In contrast to that there seems to be a strong tendency in the standard language to avoid sequences of two vowels and, furthermore, to avoid hiatus by insertion of the glide *y* or the glottal stop [ʔ]. Thus, there are oppositions like M. ⟨*hiyā*⟩ – A. *hiau* “shadow”, M. ⟨*fīya*⟩ – A.F. *fīa* “1) petal, 2) wing” or M. ⟨*tari'e*ʔ, *tariye*ʔ⟩ – A.F. *tari'e* /*tari-ek*/ “a star” which seem to be dialectal variants. In pronunciation, however, there is no clear difference between the dialects here. The widely held view of native speakers of the standard language that an intervocalic *-y-* or [ʔ] is audible in such cases, is obviously caused by the spelling. Palaeographic research shows that the assignment of the phonetic value *y* to a given letter is a comparatively recent development in the history of Dhivehi writing. In *Dives akuru* there were only two series of characters designing the initial vowels of words or syllables which could be used at random. It is possible that one of these series has to be traced back to a row of *akṣaras* containing *y-*. We have to consider in this connection that there was no word-initial *y-* in Dhivehi, inherited /*y*/ having developed into /*d*/ in early times (cf. 1.7.1).

1.5. **Word accent** as a rule falls on one of the first two syllables in Dhivehi. At the same time, the following tendencies can be made out:

1.5.1. When both syllables are short, or the first syllable is long and the second short, the first syllable is stressed; cp., e.g., M.A.F. *mēhi* “fly”; M. *bōdu*, A. *bōṅda*, F. *bōṅdo* “big, large”; M.A.F. *tīki* “drop”; M.A.F. *bākari* “goat”; M. *ātoḷu*, A.F. *āteḷe* “atoll”. — M.A.F. *nāli* “weight unit, ca. 1 kg”; M.A.F. *mūsun* “monsoon, season”; M.A.F. *bēsveriā* “medical doctor; traditional naturopath”; M.A.F. *sāfu* “clean, clear”; M.F. *bōkiba*, A. *bōkoba* “pancake”.

Because of their special accentuation, three nouns with a paradigmatic interchange of *-h-* and *-ss-* in the position before a stem-final *-i*<sup>193</sup> have to be treated as a particular group within the *i*-stems. Although their first two syllables are short, the stress falls on the second syllable, i.e., on the vowel followed by *h* / *ss*. Cf. M.A.F. *divēhi* “islander, insular”, i.e. “Maldivian”, indef.sg. M.F. *divēsse*ʔ, A. *divēssa*ʔ “a Maldivian (man or woman)”; A. *fīēhi*, M.F. *fīōhi* “knife”, indef.sg. A. *fīēssa*ʔ, M.F. *fīōsse*ʔ “a knife”; A. *kiēhi* “saw”, indef.sg. *kiēssa*ʔ “a saw” (no exact M.F. equivalent<sup>194</sup>).

<sup>193</sup> Cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.2.

<sup>194</sup> Cf. F. nom.sg. *kīhā*, indef. *kīhāe*ʔ and M. nom. *kīs*.

1.5.2. When the first syllable is short and the second long, it is the second syllable which is stressed; cp., e.g., M.A.F. *timā* “self”; M. *ufāveri*, A. *ufā* “happy”; M. *furālu*, A. *ferāda* “roof”; A. *fehē*, F. *fahē* “if”; M.A.F. *falō* “papaya”. — This rule is not effective, however, when the long syllable is preceded by a geminate; cf. A.F. *báppā* “father”, A.F. *mámmā* “mother” (M. *báppa*, *mámma*).

1.5.3. When the first two syllables are long, the first syllable is stressed; cp., e.g., M.A.F. *mīhā* “(the) man”; M.A.F. *kāfūru* “camphor”.

1.5.4. When in words with three or more syllables the first two syllables are short and the third is long, it is the latter one which is stressed; e.g. M.A.F. *alanāsi* “pine apple”; M. *bakamūnu*, A.F. *bakamūnu* “owl”; A. *belelā* (def.) “the cat”.

To sum up these observations, the **basic rule** of Maldivian word accentuation can be stated as follows: The first long syllable in a word is stressed. This comprises syllables that are closed by geminates or consonant clusters.

1.6. **Sandhi** phenomena do not play an important role in Dhivehi. There are only a few rules that can be considered as unquestionable.

1.6.1. On the basis of orally recorded stories from older native speakers of the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku dialect we may state the rule that word-final glottal stops (← *-k* or *-t*) are realised as *-d* before initial *l-* or *r-*. Cf. the following two examples:

F. */ruk labāgen/* → *ru<sup>3</sup> labān<sup>195</sup>* → [*rud-labān*] (T6, 26.31) “bending the coconut trees down”

F. */enek rukahal/* → *ene<sup>3</sup> rukaha* → [*ened-rukaha*] (T4, 44) “to another coconut tree”.

1.6.2. The realisation of geminates<sup>196</sup> instead of sequences consisting of glottal stop + consonant at the word boundary must be considered as a sandhi phenomenon as well; cf. e.g.:

F. */de ruk de-eterel/* → *de ru<sup>3</sup> dētere* → [*de rud-dētere*] (T4, 44a) “between two coconut trees”.

1.6.3. In the Aḍḍū dialect, final *-ʔ* ← */-s, -k, -t/*, occurring in the position before initial vowel or *h*, is changed to *-u*; cf. the following examples:

A. */eage raśaś ebege/* → [*eage raśau ebege*] (T16, 35) “he went to his (own) island” (*ebege* 3.sg.pret. of (M.) *danī* “to go”)

A. */fiñdanā gos eñdaś arai/* → [*fiñdanā gos eñdau arai*] (T1, 11) “the F.-bird, having gone (there) and having climbed up to the bed ...” (*gos* abs. of (M.) *danī* “to go”, *arai* abs. of *aranī* “to climb”)

1.6.4. For the affrication of final *-ti* in predicative adjectives preceding the quotation marker *-ē /-eve/* in the standard language, cf. 1.3.9.2.2.

<sup>195</sup> *labān* ← *labagen*, abs.III “bending / having bent” of *labanī* “to bend (down)”; for the contraction of the abs. III frequently occurring in the F. dialect, cf. 3.11.4.3,

<sup>196</sup> About the phonological rules concerning the formation of geminates cf. 1.3.9.

### 1.7. On the historical relationship of Dhivehi and Sinhalese

DE SILVA (1970b, 157 ff.) put forward several arguments that might speak in favour of an early dialectal differentiation of Dhivehi and Sinhalese. In the course of the present investigation, DE SILVA's observations as to the comparative-historical phonology of the Insular Indo-Aryan languages deserve of being discussed in detail.

1.7.1. Although DE SILVA had only a very restricted corpus of Maldivian language material at his disposal, he noticed that the initial Sinhalese glide *y-* as inherited from Old and Middle IA *y-*, corresponds to the voiced dental stop *d-* in Dhivehi. He realised that *d-* must have developed through the palatale affricate *\*j* from the original glide, *y*. At the same time DE SILVA recognised that the few Maldivian words which show initial *y-* must be of foreign origin; cp. the following examples: *yoṭu(-dōni)* “yacht(-boat)” ← Engl. *yacht*, *yagīn* “certain(ly)” ← Arab. *yaqīn* “id.”; *yaumīyā* “records, chronicle” ← Arab. *yaumīyāt* “chronicle of everyday life”. For the regular correspondence of Dhiv. *d-* and Sinh. *y-*, DE SILVA listed the following correspondences (1970b, 157-8).<sup>197</sup>

M. *danī* / Sinh. *yanavā* “to go”; cf. Pa. *yāti*, but Pkt. *jāi* “id.” ← OIA *yāti* “goes, proceeds, moves, walks, travels”.<sup>198</sup> The nouns M. *daturu* and Sinh. *yaturu-* “journey”, which belong to the same root etymologically, are *mots savants*, as the consonants in medial position show; cf. OIA *yātrā-* “journey”, Pa. *yātrā-* (a sanskritism itself) “id.”, but Pkt. *jattā-*.<sup>199</sup>

M.A.F. *da(gaṇḍu/-a/-o)* “iron (bar)” / Sinh. *ya* “iron”; cf. Pa. *aya(s)-*, Pkt. *a(y)a-*, OIA *āyas-* “metal, iron”.<sup>200</sup>

M.A.F. *dan /dam/* “unit of time covering three hours” – Sinh. *yama* “(night) watch”; cf. Pkt. *jāma-* vs. Pa. *yāma-*, Skt. *yāma-* “night watch of three hours”.<sup>201</sup>

One more undisputable example which has to be treated in this context is Dhiv. *daśu* (RC 5,12) ← *daṭu* (attested since L2) “underneath”<sup>202</sup> as against Sinh. *yaṭa* adv., postpos. “below, beneath” (← OIA *adhāstā*).<sup>203</sup>

1.7.2. DE SILVA accordingly divides the Indo-Aryan languages into a “*y-group*” and a “*j-group*”, depending on the fact whether OIA initial */y/* was preserved or changed into */d/* through intermediate */j/*. He comes to the result that Sinhalese is a “*y-language*” in its main stock while Dhivehi belongs to the *j-languages*. Without any doubt DE SILVA was right in considering this twofold phonological development as a dialectal differentiation which originated in the Prakrit period. It is also right that it can be taken as an indication for a comparatively early separation of Sinhalese and Dhivehi.

<sup>197</sup> Supplementary remarks as well as corrections as to DE SILVA's treatise are not particularly noted.

<sup>198</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 604, no. 10452.

<sup>199</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 140, no. 2087; TURNER (1966) II, 604, no. 10456.

<sup>200</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 140, no. 2081; TURNER (1966) I, 26, no. 590.

<sup>201</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 141, no. 2095; TURNER (1966) II, 605, no. 10467.

<sup>202</sup> In modern Dhivehi this word has only a locative meaning; cf. loc. M. *daśugā*, A.F. *daśi* “below, beneath”, abl. M.A.F. *daśun* “from below”, dat. M.A. *daśa*?, F. *daśaha* “down”; Old Dhiv. *daśu* is a common noun still.

<sup>203</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 140, no. 2085.

1.7.3. One more regular difference between Sinhalese and Dhivehi that was already treated by DE SILVA consists in the development of the palatal affricates of the Old and Middle Indo-Aryan period. In Sinhalese the initial /c-/ of inherited words developed into /s-/ which regularly changed into *h-* later; cf. Sinh. *sañḍa/hañḍa* “moon” ← MIA *canda-*, OIA *candrá-* “id.”<sup>204</sup> An inherited initial /j-/ became /d-/ in Sinhalese, as, e.g., in *divi* “life” ← Pkt. *jīvi(y)a-* ← OIA *jīvitá-* “living, life”.<sup>205</sup> Old and Middle IA /c-/ and /j-/ in medial position led to Sinh. /-d-/, which in word-final position further developed into unvoiced *-t*; thus, e.g., Skt. *krakaca-* “saw” at first developed, through an intermediate form like Pa. *kakaca-*, to Sinh. *\*kiyad-*, then (by devoicing of the stem-final *d*) to the modern stem *kiyat-*.<sup>206</sup> Old medial *-cc-* became Sinh. /s/,<sup>207</sup> while an inherited medial *-jj-* developed into Sinh. /d/; cf. Sinh. *māda* “central, middle, centre” ← Pa., Pkt. *majjha-* ← OIA *mādhyā-* “id.”<sup>208</sup> The latter sound change can also be found in Dhivehi; cp., e.g., M. *medu*, A.F. *mede* “id.”.

Besides the sound change of *-jj-* → *-d-* treated above, DE SILVA realised that the heterogeneous substitution of the inherited palatal affricates in Sinhalese opposes itself to a very homogeneous development in Dhivehi. As a matter of fact, all the corresponding phonemes, which still existed in MIA, merged into a single phoneme in Dhivehi, viz. /s/ which in initial and medial position subsequently changed into *h*.<sup>209</sup> When the Maldivian language material is judged comprehensively, DE SILVA’s perceptions of these historical sound changes must be regarded as right in their main points; there are several particular problems, however, that cannot be solved without contradictory results even now. Thus, e.g., OIA *rājan-* “king” (cp. Pa. nom. *rājā*)<sup>210</sup> exists in Dhivehi not only in the form *ras* (attested since L4 [b/2,3 etc.]) which represents the expected development of *-j-* → *-s-*, but also as the stem *radun* which seems to reflect the original *-n-*stem reinterpreted as a *pluralis maiestatis* (attested since L5 [2/2,2: *mahāradun*], cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1). Besides these two variants which occur side by side until nowadays, the singular forms *rāda* (L4 g/1,6; F1,3 etc.; ⟨*rāja*⟩ L2 3,1) and *radu* (F10,18 etc.) are attested as well. The corresponding Sinhalese form is *rada* as expected (cf. the older variants *rad/rat* and the inscriptional form ⟨*raja*⟩<sup>211</sup>). It must be assumed that all Maldivian variants of this word which contain *d* have to be considered as *mots savants*. In these cases, *-d-* must have substituted the Skt. phoneme *-j-* which did not exist as such in the sound system of Old Dhivehi.

<sup>204</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 188, no. 2849 and TURNER (1966) I, 252, no. 4661.

<sup>205</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 289, no. 5252.

<sup>206</sup> With good reasons, TURNER (1966, I, 185, no. 3570) points out that GEIGER (1941, 43, no. 635) did not recognise that the Sinh. nom.sg. *kiyata* “saw” (stem *kiyat-*) has to be traced back to an original stem *\*kiyad-* (with *-d-* ← *-j-* ← *-c-*); the stem-final *-t* can be explained by the assumption that the pure stem was used as a plural which led to a devoicing of *-d*, the final result being *kiyat*. The modern form of the nom.sg. (cf. above) was thus derived from this allophonic variant. For a parallel development (from the late MIA period, after early MIA *-c-* ← *-c-* and *-jj-* ← *-jy-* had coincided into the affricate *-j-*), cp. the Sinh. stem *behet-* “medicine”, a plural form from which the nom.sg. *beheta* is derived, with the variant *beheda* from an original stem *behed-* which through *\*beseja* emerged from Pa., Pkt. *bhesajja-* “id.” (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 549, no. 9623). Cf. also DE SILVA (1970b), 158 f., and 2.3.2.8.1.3 below.

<sup>207</sup> However, there seem to be almost no examples attesting this sound change, cf. GEIGER (1938), 49.

<sup>208</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 131, no. 1958 and TURNER (1966) II, 563, no. 9804.

<sup>209</sup> For more details cf. 1.3.5.

<sup>210</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 618, no. 10679.

<sup>211</sup> In the earliest inscriptions of Sinhalese, long and short vowels are usually not distinguished from each other; cf., e.g., GEIGER (1938), 14.

## Morphology

### 2. The nominal categories

The nominal system of Dhivehi comprises nouns, pronouns, adjectives and numerals as parts of speech. Despite of their partially remarkable morphological differences, all Maldivian dialects show the same grammatical categories, viz. case, number, definiteness and indefiniteness.

2.1. In Maldivian the noun has lost grammatical **gender** as a category of its own. This makes a great difference in comparison with modern Sinhalese, where the inherited grammatical distinction of animate masculine and feminine substantives has been preserved until nowadays, natural sexus and grammatical gender always corresponding with each other. Furthermore, the opposition of animate vs. inanimate nouns is expressed in manifold ways in the morphological categories of Sinhalese. The combination of both systems led to a threefold distinction of grammatical gender, animate masculine and feminine nouns being opposed to inanimate neuters. In the nominal system of Dhivehi, however, the morphological expression of the dichotomy of animateness and inanimateness plays a comparatively insignificant role.

2.1.1. Without any doubt GEIGER's observation that the inherited **case system** was sharply diminished already in Prakrit times in the prehistory of Sinhalese<sup>212</sup> is valid for Dhivehi as well. Basically the inherited case forms of Old Indo-Aryan were reduced to distinctive forms of a direct case (*casus rectus*) and an oblique case (*casus obliquus*), the latter one serving as a basis for the formation of secondary case forms which developed in the period of Modern Indo-Aryan only. While the declension of northern Dhivehi, just like the one of Sinhalese, is rather agglutinative, the southern dialects show a much greater variety of inflectional declension patterns. In comparison with the paradigms of MIA, most of these case forms are secondary, however. In particular, the case system of South Dhivehi consists of a direct and an oblique case, a genitive-locative (the two forms being formally identical), a dative and an ablative, the latter serving as an instrumental case as well. In contrast to that, the case inventory of North Dhivehi comprises a special agglutinative locative which is different from the genitive. There is no formal accusative in Dhivehi; the object is morphologically expressed by the direct or the oblique case. Usually the direct case occurs in nominative function as the subject case of finite predicative verbs. When the predicate is infinite, however, the oblique case can serve as a subject case.

2.1.2. In modern Dhivehi the classification of nominal stems derives from the different **declension types**. Thus, the nouns can be divided into consonant stems, *a*-stems and *i*-stems, stems ending in other vowels being rare. On the other hand, consonant stems and *i*-stems have many subtypes. However, neither the stem classes nor the declension paradigms of modern Dhivehi can be derived directly from corresponding Old and Middle Indo-Aryan types, most of the formations in question being the result of secondary developments.

<sup>212</sup> "In der präkritischen Grundlage des Sgh. war der Unterschied der alten Declination bereits aufgehoben" (GEIGER 1900, 56).

2.1.3. The **number system**, which is characterised by the distinction of singular and plural, is interrelated inseparably with the categorical dichotomy of definiteness and indefiniteness. The correlation of these two categories led to a very complex system which is preserved unaltered only in the dialect of Addū. It is characterised by the fact that the pure nominal stem as a rule functions as a plural form. This is the primary basis of the plural paradigms from which the definite and the indefinite singular forms are derived by additional markings. As to the formation of number, words designing human beings (persons) usually show a peculiar behaviour. In these cases the singular must be considered as primary, the plural being marked by special suffixes. The number system of North Dhivehi differs widely from this system. Here, the plural is regularly formed by a uniform suffix, the original meaning of which is “so much / many” as the earlier written documents of Dhivehi show. Furthermore, these texts reveal that in the language of Māle some hundred years ago the correlation of number and definiteness was practically identical to that preserved in Addū to this day. Comparing the linguistic areas in question, the treatment of number in the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku dialect is of special interest, because here, both systems intermingled with each other. In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku all peculiarities of the categories of number and definiteness can be found on the spot to a certain extent; this special constellation caused the emergence of a great variety of morphological and morphonological irregularities. A functional overlap of the categories of number on the one hand and of definiteness and indefiniteness on the other hand, which is quite similar to that of Addū, also exists in Sinhalese.<sup>213</sup>

2.1.4. In function, the **pronouns** of Dhivehi can be divided into personal, demonstrative, possessive, reciprocal, interrogative, reflexive and indefinite pronouns and pronominal adjectives. In Dhivehi as in Sinhalese, the relative pronoun was lost already at an early period; instead of relative clauses, both languages use participial constructions regularly.<sup>214</sup> Furthermore, there are no particular negative pronouns in Dhivehi; “nobody, no one, nothing” and the like have to be expressed periphrastically. In congruence with the noun, the pronominal system of Dhivehi distinguishes the categories of case, number, and, to some extent, also definiteness and indefiniteness. Corresponding to what has been said about the nouns, there is no formal expression of grammatical gender in the pronouns of the standard language and the Addū dialect. In contrast to that, the pronominal system of the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku vernacular shows a few traces of gender differentiation. Some of the pronouns can be used as attributes as well as independently. Partly the pronominal categories show considerable dialectal divergences; thus, e.g., even some personal pronouns of the northern and southern vernaculars represent different etyma. In Māle, where the social status of the speaker in comparison with that of the addressee is expressed in the first person, different pronouns are used to denote the different hierarchical levels. In southern Dhivehi, we do not find any traces of such a sociolinguistic differentiation. Here, however, the old formal distinction of the direct and the oblique case, which was lost in northern Dhivehi, has been preserved in the pronominal system. Despite the many differences, the Maldivian pronominal system is rather homogeneous in comparison with the “diffuse” pronouns of Sinhalese.<sup>215</sup>

<sup>213</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 57 and 63.

<sup>214</sup> For the invariable form *yam*, which can be traced back to the old relative pronoun, and for the expression of relative clauses in Sinhalese in general cf. GEIGER (1941), 7 and 69 / (1973), 564 and 626.

<sup>215</sup> For Sinhalese pronouns cf. GEIGER (1938), 123 ff. and (1900), 66 ff.; cf. also MATZEL (1983), 30 f.

2.1.5. Neither in attributive nor in predicative position, the **adjective** does not show any morphological variation of its own in both Maldivian and Sinhalese<sup>216</sup>. In particular, there are no suffixal formations of comparatives. Degrees of comparison are expressed by quantifiers such as “big”, “great”, “more”, “rather” or “very”. Furthermore, adjectival comparison can be expressed by purely syntactical means. When used independently, however, adjectives have the same inflectional variety as nouns.

2.1.6. The **numeral system** of Modern Dhivehi is the result of a manifold restructuring. Its most striking feature is a particular mode of counting based on a purely duodecimal system, which attracts special attention from a typological point of view. This system which in earlier times was used all over the Maldives, is almost lost nowadays. It is surprising that a similar system, built on duodecimal units, is not attested for Sinhalese at any time of its long history (cf. DE SILVA 1970b, 149). In Modern Dhivehi, as well, a decimal system prevails, in which relic forms of the old autochthonous numeral system are mixed with many sanskritisms and prakritisms. From the cardinal numbers (like nouns), an indefinite form can be derived by suffixation. Ordinal numbers are derived from cardinal numbers by means of a suffix, too.

2.1.7. In Dhivehi the term “**adverb**” is not related to a specific part of speech; it has to be understood as a functional general term instead. Adverbs derived from nominal parts of speech, such as, e.g., nouns or adjectives, but also pronouns, will be treated in the context of their underlying formations.

2.2. There are almost no **word formation** procedures in Dhivehi. As a rule, adjectives and nouns are not distinct from each other by special morphological marks. There are at least four suffixal elements of different productivity, however, by means of which adjectives can be derived from nouns or from already existing adjectives without further morphological marks. The frequency and the distribution of the particular suffixes within the different dialectal areas is subject to a considerable variety. Thus, the suffix *-teri* is obviously restricted to North Dhivehi (cp., e.g., M. *bēnunteri* “useful”), and the same holds true for the rare suffix *-(v)eti* which almost exclusively occurs in the standard language (e.g. M. *lōbiveti* “dear”). In contrast to that, the adjective suffix *-veri*, which goes back to a former independent noun, occurs all over the dialects (e.g. M.A.F. *buddiveri* “wise”). By means of the adjective *gada* “rich, strong”, which still occurs as an independent word as well, compound adjectives are derived from nouns. These secondary adjective formations represent a reverse type of *bahuvrīhi* compounds, cp., e.g., M.A.F. *aligada* “bright”, lit. “(being) rich (in) light”.<sup>217</sup>

2.2.1. For the formation of nouns, there is only one kind of productive derivation in Dhivehi. In order to create nouns with abstract meaning, the word *kan* /*kam*/, “fact”,<sup>218</sup> is added to semantically corresponding adjectives and substantives. Cf. M. *rīti* adj. “beautiful” vs. *rītikān* “beauty”, M.A.F. *ufāveri* adj. “glad, happy” vs. *ufāverikan* “happiness”, A. *boṅḍa* “big,

<sup>216</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 116 f.

<sup>217</sup> For more details and examples cf. 2.4.4.

<sup>218</sup> Dhiv. *kan* /*kam*/, Sinh. *kama* ← Pa., Pkt. *kamma(n)*- ← OIA *kārman*- “act, work”; cf. TURNER (1966), I, 147, no. 2892, – In the local grammar, *kan* is also used as the term for “verb”.

large” vs. *boñḍākan* “bigness, largeness”, A. *fakīri* adj. “poor” (← Arab. *faqīr* “poor (one)”) vs. *fakīrikan* “poverty”; cf. also *veri* as an originally independent nominal stem meaning “person; leader”<sup>219</sup> vs. *verikan* “government”.

2.2.2. There are practically no diminutive formations in Dhivehi. In all the investigated texts there is only one attestation of a suffix with diminutive function, which is joined to a nominal stem. In the Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku version of the fairy tale *Mākana* “The Crane”, we find *raḷo-maṇa* instead of F. *raḷo* “wave”, *mas-maṇa* instead of F. *maha /mas/* “fish”, *daro-maṇa* instead of F. *daro* “firewood” etc. (further examples in 5.3.3). Possibly *-maṇa* reflects Dhiv. *maṇi* “pearl”. This word, albeit being attested already in L1 (f/1,1), is obsolete in the modern language. Most probably the same etymon<sup>220</sup> occurs also in M. *maniku* ← *maṇiku* which was originally used as an aristocratic title (for an etymological discussion cf. 2.6.2.4.6).

2.2.3. There are two honorific suffixes in Dhivehi, the usage of which is confined to the standard language as well. *-fulu* ← *-pulu* (cf. 1.3.9.6.1) is added to nouns denoting inalienable objects, while *-koḷu* is joined to nouns denoting alienable objects; in both cases the function of the suffixes is to morphologically express the high social level of the owner of the objects in question. Cp., e.g., *iṅgili-fulu* “finger” or *appulu /atpulu/* “hand” (of a noble person) as against *gamīs-koḷu* “shirt” or *galam-koḷu* “pen” (of a noble person). As a consequence of the increasing democratisation of the Maldivian society, however, the two suffixes are becoming more and more obsolete in the modern language.

## 2.3. The noun

### 2.3.1. Case system and stem types

In Dhivehi the formation of the nominal stem types is closely connected to the rules of case formation. Within the system of nominal declension, there is a considerable divergence between the southern and northern dialects. While there are no remarkable differences in the function of the case forms all over the Dhivehi speaking area, their formation is very heterogeneous. Alongside some relics of the inherited inflectional system, an agglutinative declension developed in northern Dhivehi, while the southernmost dialects have preserved more archaic inflectional patterns until nowadays. The actual paradigms cannot be derived directly from the well known declension types of Old and Middle Indo-Aryan, however. According to GEIGER, they had already disappeared to a high degree by the time of Sinhalese Prakrit.<sup>221</sup> Comparing the Sinhalese data with the system we find in Dhivehi, we are forced to

<sup>219</sup> For more details cf. 2.3.2.4.1, 2.3.2.4.2.

<sup>220</sup> Claus Peter ZOLLER (personal information) proposes to derive the suffix from OIA *manāk* “a little” (Pkt. *maṇā* etc., cf. TURNER 1966, II, 564, no. 9824).

<sup>221</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900, 56): “In der präkritischen Grundlage des Sgh. war der Unterschied der alten Declinationen bereits aufgehoben; der Process, den wir im P(āli) beobachten, ist nunmehr vollzogen. ... Die Flexion besteht ... nur noch aus spärlichen Resten. Sie beschränkt sich in der masc. und fem. Declination auf die Bildung eines Casus rectus und eines C. obliquus der beiden Numeri. Die neutr. Declination hat die alten Pluralformen vollständig eingebüßt, im Sing. dagegen ausser dem Nominativ-Accusativ auch den Instrumental und den Locativ

assume that the inflectional state of the presumable Maldivian Prakrit must have been quite similar. The case system of modern Dhivehi and Sinhalese is based on the difference between a direct (or nominative) case (*casus rectus*) and an oblique case (*casus obliquus*), the latter being identical with the pure nominal stem. While the function of the direct case is restricted to the use as a nominative, the oblique case is the basis of all the other case forms. In Dhivehi this holds true for genitive, dative, and ablative in general. Besides this, the northern dialectal area has a particular locative case, too, while in the southernmost vernaculars the locative morphologically coincides with the genitive.

2.3.1.1. In the following paragraphs, we will give a comprehensive survey of the **case suffixes** in particular and – whenever possible – of their etymology. While the **nominative** and the **oblique case** have no homogeneous suffix in Dhivehi, all the other cases are characterised by unambiguous formal markers.

2.3.1.1.1. In the southern dialects, two different kinds of **genitive** formations can be distinguished. The morpheme variants which are used in the formation of the genitive of nouns and pronouns designating “non-persons” in general (A. *-e*, *-i*; F. *-el-ei*, *-i*<sup>222</sup>), cannot yet be etymologised with certainty. It is quite probable, however, that they correspond with the genitive endings *-ā* and *-hi* which PARANAVITANA (1956, I, cxi) attests for medieval Sinhalese (8th to 10th century A.D.). Following PARANAVITANA, these endings (besides the genitive endings Sinh. *-ā*, *-hu*, *-u* und *-yahu*, occurring in the same inscriptions, which obviously have no equivalents in Dhivehi) have to be derived from “*-sya* in Old Indian which, in Middle Indian, is *-ssa*”.<sup>223</sup> They are opposed to the genitive suffix *-ge*, which in the South Maldivian area is used exclusively with nouns and pronouns designating “persons” in a wider sense, while it has become the only formal marker of the genitive in North Maldivian. This suffix must be derived from the locative of *ge* “house” without any doubt. According to GEIGER, the corresponding genitive ending of Sinhalese, *-gē*, has been contracted from *geyi* “in the house”; thus, *goviyā-gē daruvō* has the meaning of “the children (in the house) of the farmer”. In this connection, the original genitive meaning of the oblique case preceding *-gē* is still recognisable, at least when appearing in archaic forms.<sup>224</sup> Cf. also PARANAVITANA’s statement (ib., cxiii): “*Ge* may therefore be equated with Skt. *gehe* ‘in the house’, i.e. ‘in the

erhalten.”

<sup>222</sup> Basically the distribution of the variant endings in the dialect of Addū depends on the different stem types. In consonant stems, special phonological rules depend on the particularities of the phonological structure of the nouns in question; cf. 2.3.2.11.1 for details. For the dialect of Fua’ Mulaku which presents an even more complicated picture, cf. 2.3.2.12.1.

<sup>223</sup> In this connection cp. the genitive forms *rasunasya* (L2 1,5), *rasunasya* (L2 1,4 and 2,1; L3 1/1,2 etc.) and *rasunusia* (L2 1,2) “the king’s”, which are attested in some written documents of Old Dhivehi and which have to be judged as sanskritisms (*mots savants*). In contrast to that the same documents also show the “real Maldivian” genitive *rasun-ge* “the king’s, of the king” which represents today’s normal genitive formation of nouns designating persons (L1 ms/1,2; L2 34,5 and L3 15/1,5).

<sup>224</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1942), 32 / (1973), 589: “*-gē*, das dem Sprachgefühl als Endung gilt, ist kontrahiert aus *geyi*, in dem Hause; *goviyā-gē daruvō* bedeutet ‘die Kinder (im Hause) des Landmannes.’ Die urspr. genitivische Bed. des vor *-gē* stehenden K.obl. ist wohl erkennbar und tritt auch in den archaischen Formen zutage.” — Cf. further GEIGER (1941), 57, no. 841 s.v. *geya* “house”; GEIGER (1900), 62 and (1938), 110 as well as TURNER (1966) I, 227, no. 4240 s.v. *grhá-* “house”; cf. also WIJAYARATNE (1956), 143-4.

place'. The change in meaning from the loc. to the gen. is a natural one: what is one's house is one's own, so the postposition *ge* came to denote ownership." PARANAVITANA proves that in early medieval Sinhalese *-gē* occurs only as a genitive suffix in connection with personal names, not yet competing with the inherited synthetic formation of the genitive.<sup>225</sup> This observation agrees with what we find in the early written documents of Dhivehi which show that in the earlier stages of the standard language genitive endings in *-e*<sup>226</sup> were usual. Furthermore they prove that the suffix *-ge*, originally added only to nouns designating persons or to personal names, slowly developed into a general marker of the genitive. In the modern standard language, genitives in *-e* are completely unknown.

2.3.1.1.2. In the vernaculars of Addū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku the **locative** of all nouns designating inanimate objects or non-persons is formally identical with the genitive. Hence, the morphemes that denote the locative are A. *-e*, *-i* and F. *-e/-ei*, *-i*. In many cases we can decide only by the context, whether the forms in question have to be interpreted as genitives or as locatives (e.g. A. *fen-e*, F. *fen-ei* "of the water" or "in the water"). In older Dhivehi, most forms in *-e* represent locatives, while an unambiguous genitival use of the same morpheme with inanimate nouns is comparatively rare. Some of the forms attested in L2, which are taken by MANIKU/WIJAYAWARDHANA (1986, viii-ix) to represent the possessive function of the locative, have to be interpreted as locative forms without any doubt in the given context, while other examples remain ambiguous. In two of the passages in question, *maḍule* appears together with the participles *ot* <*otu*> (pres./pret.: L2 10,4) and *ovuna* (pret.pres.: L2 18,4) "being (there), lying"<sup>227</sup> and has to be translated as "(being) in the district" (in contrast to MANIKU/WIJAYAWARDHANA, who translate "of the atoll" [in the sense of an administrative district]). The form *sime* which is rendered as "of the boundaries" (ib.) can be interpreted as a genitive or as a locative as well; cf. the phrase *sime sataru mūṇu* "(the) four sides (*mūṇu*, lit. 'face') on the border" or "(the) four sides of the border", occurring in L2 (4,1-2) and L3 (2/2,3). *geme*, translated as "of the village" (ib.), rather seems to have the function of a genitive in some passages; cp., e.g., *geme kulaḷa* "to the family/lineage of the village" (attested two times in both L1 g/1,4 and L2 4,5).<sup>228</sup>

2.3.1.1.2.1. For the formal identity of the genitive and the locative, we find an exact parallel in modern Sinhalese: nouns meaning inanimate objects or plants have the ending *-ē* in the genitive and locative singular; cp., e.g., *mal-ē* "of/in the flower", *gam-ē* "of/in the village" (cf. MATZEL 1983, 22). Following GEIGER (1938, 105), the Sinh. suffix *-ē*, serving as a genitive and locative marker, has to be traced back to *-ehi* and, further, to

<sup>225</sup> In modern Sinhalese *-gē* has the function of a genitive ending with all animate nouns (plants excluded); cf., e.g., MATZEL 1983, 22 and 67.

<sup>226</sup> It has not yet been proved by means of the written documents that *-a-* occurring in the last syllable of a substantive could give rise to a gen./loc. ending in *-i* in the older language of Māle, as it is the case in the dialect of Addū (cf. 2.3.2.11.1).

<sup>227</sup> For the suppletive distribution of the verbs *onnanī* "lie, be (there)" and *tibenī* "be (there)", depending on the number of the subjects involved, cf. the detailed information given in 3.14.1.

<sup>228</sup> The gen./loc. *gem-e* of the stem *gam-* "village" shows a type of umlaut which is very unusual in Dhivehi. The regular form would be *gam-e*. Such a form is indeed attested in L1 (mx/1,5; instr./abl. *gamen* in md/1,2-3 and 6), but it is not yet certain whether *gam-* has the meaning of "village" in these passages. The unlauted stem *gem-* is well attested in other case forms too (cp., e.g., the instr./abl. *gemen* in 2.3.1.1.4.1), but it is the only example of this kind of umlaut within a nominal paradigm that has become known until now.

a common basic form (“loc. of *-as-* stems”), which already in the earliest period could have represented both case forms. For lack of convincing evidence, GEIGER’s supposition cannot be proved, however, the possibility of a syncretism of separate formal elements characterising the genitive and the locative remaining valid. GEIGER maintains that the locative suffix *-ā* (cp., e.g., *bimā* “on the ground”, *gamā* “in the village”; for the gen.suff. *-ā* cf. above), which frequently occurs during the 9th century, is the “result of a contraction” of earlier *-ē*. This assumption cannot be proved by examples or parallel developments, either.

2.3.1.1.2.2. At a relatively late time an analytic locative formation came into use in the standard language of Māle which completely replaced the inherited forms in *-e*. The modern locative suffix *-gā /-gai/* which can be added to inanimate as well as animate nouns, represents the inherited oblique case of the noun *gai* “body”. The original meaning of “on, in, at (something or somebody)” was “on/in/at the body (of something or somebody)” accordingly (for more details cf. 2.3.2.13). In the standard language, this formation has already become rigid and is no longer perceived in its original sense. But in the dialect of Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku there exists a special declension type constituted by a few nouns designating animals only, which yields immediate insight into the development of the word *gai* into a case marking suffix (cf. 2.3.2.12.5.5).

2.3.1.1.3. The **dative** ending is *-a<sup>o</sup> /-aś/* in the standard language as well as in Addū. In Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku, however, it has the variants *-aha*, *-hā*, *-aśa* besides *-a<sup>o</sup> /-aś/*, depending on the type of the nominal stem and some additional phonological and phonetic criteria<sup>229</sup>. Without any difficulties the ending M.A.F. *-a<sup>o</sup> /-aś/* and the variant F. *-aśa* can be traced back to the dative ending *-aṭ(a)* which is frequently attested in the older written documents of Maldivian. This is obviously identical with the Sinhalese dative ending *-(a)ṭa* which through the intermediate stages of Pkt. *aṭṭham* and *aṭṭhāya* (cf. Pa. *attham* and *atthāya*) can be derived from Skt. *ārtham* or *ārthāya*, i.e., the acc./dat. of *ārtha-* “aim, cause”.<sup>230</sup> It is difficult to decide, however, whether the two variants F. *-aha* and *-hā* represent pure allomorphs of the ending */-aś/*, because a phonetic development of inherited *ṭ* through *ś* into F. *h* (in all positions) would be an exception, as can be shown by many comparable examples (cf. 1.3.6.). Instead, there are some indications which suggest an identification of F. *-aha/-hā* with a genitive ending *-asa/-aha*, which is attested for the most archaic stage of Sinhalese in the function of a dative as well.

2.3.1.1.3.1. GEIGER (1938, 108-9) and (obviously following him) PARANAVITANA (1956, I, cxi) even assume that all Sinhalese dative formations are based on old genitives. GEIGER tries to document the development beginning with the Prakrit period. In the oldest inscriptions, genitives in *-asa* and *-aha* were used as datives, just like the genitives<sup>231</sup> in *-assa* of Pali and Prakrit. Beginning with the 1st century A.D., these genitives occur in combination with a following *-aṭa* (← MIA *\*aṭṭham*) or *-aṭaya* (← MIA *\*aṭṭhāya*) / *-aṭaye* (← MIA *\*aṭṭhāyē*). GEIGER and PARANAVITANA demonstrate this development by means of the dative of *saṅga* “multitude, assembly; community of bhikkhus” (← Skt. *saṅgha-*; cf. GEIGER 1941, 171, no. 2565), which is attested in inscriptions with and without sandhi in the form *⟨sagahaṭa⟩* (← MIA *\*saṅghassaṭṭham*) besides *⟨sagaha aṭaya/-ye⟩* (← *\*saṅghassa aṭṭhāya/-yē*). GEIGER postulates that Sinh. *\*sagaṭa* or *\*sagaṭāya* (← *\*saṅghaṭṭham*, *°aṭṭhāya*) must have been possible forms as well. In the plural, *-aṭa* is joined to the gen.pl. in *-ana* (← *-ānām*). GEIGER illustrates this

<sup>229</sup> More extensive information as to this will be given in 2.3.2.12.2.

<sup>230</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 29, no. 638 and further GEIGER (1941), 59, no. 865; (1900); 62; (1938) 108 f.; for the part the dative plays in the formation of the infinitive cf. 3.6.1.1 ff.

<sup>231</sup> The genitives in question have the function of denoting an indirect object.

with the formation *sava satanaṭa* “to all beings”, which occurs in a 4th century inscription and which he derives from \**savva-sattānaṭṭham*<sup>232</sup>. The co-occurrence of different formations of this type can be observed up to the medieval period of Sinhalese, where we meet with datives in *-aṭ* (e.g. *gamaṭ* “to the village”) and *-ahaṭ* (e.g. *maharad’haṭ* “to the great king”) as well as pl. forms in *-anaṭ* (e.g. *maha-saṅṅnaṭ* “to the great community”; *minisnaṭ* “to the people”). From the 11/12th century on, *-aṭa*, with a secondary final *-a*, comes into use again (cp., e.g., *mituranaṭa* “to the friends”). In the 12th century, too, the syncopated formant *-ṭa* is attested for the first time with a plural meaning (*mehe-karuvaṭa* “to the workers”). The other variants continue to be used, as well, together with a pseudo-suffix *-haṭa* as in *saga-haṭa* which must be explained by a metanalysis of the type *sagahaṭa* “to the community of bhikkhus” (cf. above).<sup>233</sup> The given development is summed up by PARANAVITANA as follows: “Having developed so early and merging itself in the gen. ending, *-ṭa* and *-haṭa* may be considered as dat. case-endings; but when *-aṭa*, *-haṭa*, or *-ṭa* is abstracted from a dat. form in Sinhalese, what remains is a gen.” — Both GEIGER and PARANAVITANA seem to postulate that every Sinhalese dative form must necessarily be based on a genitive. We cannot exclude, however, that the compound forms with the dative *ārthāya* “for the sake (of)” (cf. above), occurring so frequently in OIA, might have served as a starting point of the formation in question, the derivation of *-haṭa* given above notwithstanding. This can be illustrated by two Skt. examples of compounds (with a verbal noun as their first member) taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, viz. *rakṣa-ṇārthāya* “for the sake / purpose of protection / shelter” (R. 3,8,7; *rakṣana-* “guarding”, of *rakṣati* “guards”; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 610, no. 10547 and WERBA 1997, 468) and *harṣaṇārthāya* “for the purpose of frightening” (R. 1,48,7; *harṣana-* “(state of) excitement, agitation, emotion, stimulation”, of the root *hṛṣ-* “to bristle; get / become / be glad, excited; shudder”; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 818, WHITNEY 1885, 208 and WERBA 1997, 387).

2.3.1.1.3.2. In particular cases, it will hardly be possible to find out the correct derivation of a given dative form if this is not attested continuously. Even in Sinhalese with its outstanding written tradition, this condition is fulfilled only in special cases. It goes without saying that the situation in Old Dhivehi, with its fragmentary documents, is much more hopeless, the few attested dative forms offering no chance for an exact analysis. We find, e.g., only a handful of plural dative forms such as Sinh. *minisnaṭ* and Old Dhiv. *mīsunāṭa* (L2 5,1), *mīhunaṭu* (L6 1,4), *mīhunan*<sup>234</sup> (F10,21) “to the people” that can be traced back to underlying genitives without any doubt.

In the case of the dative endings *-aha/-hā* and *-aśa/-a<sup>o</sup>*, occurring side by side in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku, we may presume with a certain probability that the former variants are based directly on an old genitive ending identical to Sinh. *-aha/-asa*, while the latter ones in all likelihood developed in the same way as the dative endings M.A. *-a<sup>o</sup> /-aś/* and Sinh. *-(a)ṭa*. Considering the fact that the vernacular of Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku represents a melting-pot of manifold peculiarities and influences, such a double-tracked development would not be astonishing at all.

2.3.1.1.3.3. In Dhivehi the dative has not only the function of marking indirect objects but also of expressing local and temporal directions, responding to the questions “where (to)?” and “when, (towards) what time?”. Besides this, the dative of some nouns and adjectives which are suited from the semantic point of view can be used for the expression of adverbial meanings (manner) without further formal additions or changes; cp., e.g., M. *barābara<sup>o</sup> /-aś/* as an adverb “excellently” belonging to the adj. *barābaru* “excellent”.

<sup>232</sup> Sinh. *sav/hav* “all” ← Pkt. *savva-*, OIA *sārva-*; cf. GEIGER (1941), 190, no. 2875. — Sinh. *satā* (stem *sat-*) “living being, irrational animal” ← Pa., Pkt. *satta-*, OIA *sattvá-*; cf. GEIGER (1941), 172, no. 2578 and TURNER (1966) II, 759, no. 13111.

<sup>233</sup> For this case and for further evidence cf. GEIGER and PARANAVITANA (ib.). GEIGER also gives details on the use of the suffix variants in Sinhalese.

<sup>234</sup> About the frequent spelling of final *-ṭ/* by *<-n>* cf. 3.6.3.2.3.

2.3.1.1.4. The inherited ending of the **ablative/instrumental** is *-in* or *-un* in the standard language and in Addū, while Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku uses the homogeneous form *-en* (with only one exception, cf. below). In Modern Dhivehi the rules governing the distribution of the given variants are easy to define. In Addū and in the standard language, all consonant stems (cf. 2.3.1.3) as well as the stems enlarged by the indefinite suffix (cf. 2.3.2.1) build an abl./instr. with *-un*; cp., e.g., the cons. stem *mas* “fish” with M.A. *mahun* /*mas-un*/; abl./instr.indef. M.A. *mahakun*. As against this, *-in* is the abl./instr.-ending of all *i*- and *a*-stems (cf. 2.3.1.2.1 and 2.3.1.2.2, resp.), as well as a few stems ending in other vowels (cf. 2.3.1.4) and root nouns (cf. 2.3.1.5); cp., e.g., the *i*-stem M.A. *tari* “star” with M. *tarīn*, A. *tarīn*, or the *a*-stem M.A. *aṅga* “mouth” with M.A. *aṅgain*). *-in* is also used with those nouns in Addū that are enlarged by the definite suffix *-ā*; cp., e.g., *mahāin* /*mas-ā-in*/ “from / by (means of) the (definite) fish”, as well as the frozen definite form in *-ā* of northern Dhivehi (cf. 2.3.2.9). In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, however, all variant endings (if they ever existed in this vernacular) coincided into *-en*. In the case of stems ending in a vowel and frozen definite forms, *-en* is joined to the vowel in question without merging phonetically with it; cp., e.g., *mahen* “by/from the fish”; *tarien* “by/from the star”; *aṅgaen* “by/from the mouth”. The only case where the variant *-un* is conserved in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku is the abl./instr. of the indefinite form; cp., e.g., F. *keḍak-un* “of a piece” (F.A. *keḍe* = M. *koḷu* “piece, end”) or the interrogative pronoun F. *kōntak-un* “by what means, through / by / with which” (cf. 2.6.7.1.3).

In all varieties of Dhivehi, the synthetic formation of the abl./instr. is confined to inanimate nouns and pronouns (in the sense of “non-persons”) today, and there are no exceptions to this rule<sup>235</sup>. It seems that in all dialects the use of the ablative/instrumental in *-in/-un/-en* is further restricted to the singular and the primary plural (cf. 2.3.2.1); at least, there is no evidence so far of analytic plural formations being enlarged by *-in*, *-un* or *-en*.

2.3.1.1.4.1. Considering medieval Dhivehi, MANIKU/WIJAYAWARDHANA (1986, ix) state that “only singular forms of the ablative are recorded”; they do not take into account, however, that the formal appearance of the plural in the older language was considerably different from that of the modern standard language. The early documents show that the generic plural meaning of the pure nominal stems, which can still be found in the dialect of Addū (cf. 2.3.2.1), was a feature of the northern Dhivehi speaking area in former times, too, while the analytic plural formation was of comparatively little importance at that time (cf. 2.3.2.3). The statement that the only attestations of the ablative are singular forms, is true from the point of view of the morphology of the modern standard language; but it does not consider the fact that enormous semantical changes have affected some of the forms in question. Furthermore, MANIKU/WIJAYAWARDHANA failed to notice that the ablative in Old Dhivehi ended not only in *-en* and *-un*, but also in *-in*. Cp. the following early attestations of ablatives / instrumentals:

Abl./instr. in *-in*: (1) *i*-stems: (*fenāi*) *maṣīn* “from (water and) clay” (RC 1,6<sup>236</sup>); *bolīn* “from the shells” (L1 g/2,3; *bolī* “shell”, obviously meaning a medium of currency here); *ruḍīn* “in the manner (of)” (L2 21,1 etc.; \**ruḍī* “manner, fashion, way”). (2) A frequently attested example of an ablative in *-in* of an *a*-stem is *hiḡrain* “since the Hijra”. *hiḡra*, an Arabic loanword,<sup>237</sup> is normally written in Arabic characters, while the

<sup>235</sup> Native speakers of the Dhivehi standard language reject the form *mīhāin* “from the person” quoted in MANIKU / DISAYANAKA (1990, 36).

<sup>236</sup> The passage in question gives a description of the creation of the first man. — *fen* “water” ≈ Sinh. *pān* ← Skt. *pāṇīya-*, cf. GEIGER (1941), 103, no. 1528; *maṣī* “clay” ≈ Sinh. *māṭi-* “clay” ← Skt. *mṛttikā-* “clay, earth”, cf. GEIGER (1941), 131, no. 1952.

<sup>237</sup> Arab. *hiḡrat* “emigration”; the “Hijra” of the Prophet, Muḡammad, is normally used as the stating point of the Islamic era in older Maldivian texts.

Dhivehi ending is mostly added in *Dives akuru* (cp., e.g., F3,7 or IDMHM 3,1) or in *Tāna* (e.g., ITMHM 3,1); in a few cases only the ending is written in Arabic too (unambiguously vocalised, e.g., in F8,16; RC 30,8; IDAM 1,19; cf. also F5,11; F7,12 etc., RC 9,2 and diverse inscriptions). Cp. also *makkāin* “from Mekka” (← Arab. *makka*), written in *Dives akuru* or *Tāna* throughout (F2,2; F3,4; F10,7; F11,7; RA 2,4).

The abl./instr. ending *-en* appears, e.g., with the consonant stem *gam-* in the form *gemen* “from the village”<sup>238</sup> (cf. *gemen nikume* ⟨nikme⟩<sup>239</sup> “coming out of the village” in L1 n/1,1, L3 3/2,1, and L2 6,2, or *mā-gemen* “from the great / large village” = “from the capital” in L1 n/1,3 etc., L2 27,3 etc.; L3 15/1,4 etc.); cp. also *disen*<sup>240</sup> (from *dis-*) “from the direction of” (L1 md/2,6 etc.; L3 4/1,2 etc.; L4 has the later variant *dihen*: c/2,3 etc.), *mi veren* (from *veru* “land, terrain, ground”) “from this terrain” (L4 b/1,1; *veren* also in L3 10/1,4).

The variant ending *-un* occurs, e.g., in *bañḍun* ⟨baḍun⟩ “from / out of the womb” (L1 d/1,1, ITMHM 4,6, RC 13,3 etc.; *bañḍu* “belly, stomach”), *mahun /mas-un/* “(starting) from (the) month” (RA 2,6 ≈ RB 1,13 ≈ RC 9,3 / 10,3), *hañḍun* ⟨hadun⟩ “from the moon/month” (ITAM 1,4; *hañḍu* “moon”), *reakun* “from / (in) one night” (ITAH 2,4; abl.indef. of *rē* “night, evening”), *kauverikamun* “by / under the reign” (RC 1,5; *kauverikan* “reign, rule”); *mi uren*<sup>241</sup> *atun* “from the hand of these people” (ITMP 2,4). It seems that the distribution of the suffix variants *-en* and *-un* is not governed by specific rules as some double forms show; cp., e.g., *dabuduven* (L3 10/2,3,5) and *dabuduvun* (L3 3/2,5 and 4/1,5) “from *Dañbudū*” (name of a Maldivian island<sup>242</sup>) or *isduven* (L4 c/2,3) / *is(u)duvun* (L2 6,3,4; 8,1) “from *Isdū*” (name of the island L2 refers to).

2.3.1.1.4.2. Following GEIGER (1938, 104), the corresponding Sinhalese suffix variants *-en* and *-in* go back to *-ena*, the instr. ending of the OIA *a*-declension. Thus, M.A. *aten*, Sinh. (medieval) *atin* can be derived from Skt. *hástena* “by / with the hand”<sup>243</sup>. For medieval Sinhalese, GEIGER claimed that “there can be no doubt that originally *-in* had its place after a heavy and also after two light syllables, *-en* after a single light syllable”<sup>244</sup>. This rule does not apply to Dhivehi, however, as far as we can tell by its historical development. It has to be stated, though, that the distribution of the suffix variants as described above cannot be found in modern Sinhalese, either. Beginning with the 10th century, GEIGER registers double forms like *desen* and *desin* “from the direction (of)” or *kusen* and *kusin* “from the womb” (≈ Dhiv. *kihun*, e.g. in L8 1,5, cf. Skt. *kukṣí-* “womb”).

2.3.1.1.4.3. PARANAVITANA (1956, I, cx) was certainly right in seeing the starting point of the Sinh. formations with *-in* in the *i*-stems: “*Āsin* would be the normal development of Skt.

<sup>238</sup> For the peculiar umlaut of the stem *gam-* “village” cf. fn. 228 above.

<sup>239</sup> For the Mod.Dhiv. absolutive *nukume* of the verb *nukunnānī* “to go / come out, leave” cf. 3.10.3.6.

<sup>240</sup> Corresponding Sinh. forms are the ablatives *desen* and *desin* “from the direction of” of *desa*, stem *des-* “land, region, direction” ← OIA *deśá-* (cf. GEIGER 1938, 104 and 1941, 81, no. 1198; TURNER 1966, I, 374, no. 6547); in contrast to that, Dhiv. *dis-* seems to reflect the OIA root noun *dís-* “direction” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 363, 6339).

<sup>241</sup> For *uren* cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4.

<sup>242</sup> For *dū* “island” and the variant forms of this word cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4. — The Maldivian island name *Dañbudū* (today *Dañbidū*) means “rose-apple tree island” and corresponds to Skt. *jambudvīpa-*, Pa. *jambudīpa-*, Sinh. *dañbadiva*, all meaning “India”; its basis is Skt., Pa. *jambu-*, Sinh. *dañba* “rose-apple tree” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 283, nos. 5134 and 5131, as well as GEIGER 1941, nos. 1022 and 1021, resp.). The Maldivian island in question is located in Haddummati Atoll (nowadays administration district Lām Atoll). — The inherited word *dañbu* is obsolete in modern Dhivehi. Today the loanword M.A.F. *jañbu* is used for “rose-apple”.

<sup>243</sup> For the modern equivalents of OIA *hástena* cf. TURNER (1966), II, 811, no. 14024.

<sup>244</sup> GEIGER (1938), 104 illustrates this by some “examples from medieval inscs. (8th-12th c.): *atin* from the hand (P. *hattha*), *gāmin* from the village (*gāma*), *bimin* from the ground (*bhūmi*), *ambaranin* with the ornament (*ābharana*); but *kulen* from the family (*kula*), *diyen* by the water (*daka*), *parapuren* by the lineal descent (*paramparā*).” For further examples cf. WIJAYARATNE (1956), 156 ff.

*akṣiṇā* through Pkt. *acchinā*; but *-in* has been taken from words like this and used in those like *bara* (*barin*).<sup>245</sup> The other variants of the ablative ending noticed by PARANAVITANA (1956, I, cxi) for medieval Sinhalese, have no equivalents in Dhivehi (Sinh. *-än, -äna, -äni, -ini, -ina, -ena, -eni, -ni, -nen*). On the other hand, there is no evidence for an ablative variant in *-un* in Sinhalese at any time. In modern Sinhalese the variant endings have been generally reduced to *-in* and *-en*, with the addition of *-gen* as a new suffix characterising the ablative meaning (← \**gēn* ← \**gehen* = Pa. *gehena* “from the house”; cf. GEIGER 1900, 62 and further 2.3.1.1.1 above).

2.3.1.1.4.4. Besides the synthetic formation, we find also analytic expressions of ablative and instrumental meanings in both Dhivehi and Sinhalese. In all Maldivian dialects, the ablative of nouns denoting persons, and pronouns referring to persons can be expressed exclusively by means of a combination of the genitive in *-ge* and A. *farātun*, F. *farāten* “from the side (of), by” or F. *aten* “from / by the hand” (for the frozen abl./instr. forms *farātun/-en* and *aten* cf. 2.3.2.11.4 and 2.3.2.12.4); cp., e.g., A. sg. *mihāge* / pl. *mihunge farātun*, F. sg. *mihāge* / pl. *mihunge farāten/aten* sg. “from/by the man”, pl. “from/by the people/men”.

2.3.1.1.4.5. In the modern standard language and in the older written documents there are no ablative/instrumental forms that are based on the genitive. In Old Dhivehi the instr./abl. of nouns denoting persons is built with *kuren* (sometimes written ⟨*kren*⟩) which follows the oblique case of the noun as a postposition. Cp., e.g., the plural nouns *mi uren kuren* “from/by these people” (ITMP 1,3); *duvesin kren* “from/by the islanders”, i.e. “from/by the Maldivians” (L2 25,2); *darin kren* “from/by the children” (L2 32,3). As already noticed by GEIGER (1901-1902, II, 375), *kuren* corresponds in form and function to medieval Sinh. *keren*; cf. the expression *kāmiyan keren* “from/by the workers”, attested in the 10th century (*kāmiyan* obl.pl.; cf. GEIGER 1938, 110). Until now the etymology of *keren* cannot be established with certainty. GEIGER (1941, 48, no. 704) hesitatingly follows PARANAVITANA who proposes to regard *keren* (in analogy with *aten* “from/by the hand”, cf. above) as an abl./instr. sg. of *kara* “hand” with umlaut (cf. GEIGER 1941, 38, no. 560).

2.3.1.1.4.6. In modern standard Dhivehi, the postposition *kuren*, following the oblique case of nouns meaning persons, must be translated as “from the side of, from the part of, from”. Cp. the following example:

M. *e hisābun aharen katību kuren ituru suvālutake<sup>3</sup> kurāne bēnume<sup>7</sup> o<sup>3</sup> kamaka<sup>2</sup> nun fenun eve*. (T8, 168) “From then on, I saw no need”, lit. “from that moment on it did not seem desirable to me,” “to ask any further questions from the side of the mayor about the present fact.” (*e* dem.pron. “that”; *hisāb-un* abl. of *hisāb* “mathematics, arithmetics; moment” (← Arab. *ḥisāb*); *aharen* pers.pron. 1.ps.sg., here subject of the part.fut. *kurāne*; *katību* obl.sg. “mayor” + *kuren* postpos. “from the side of” ≈ abl.; *ituru* “further, more” (cf. 2.4.5.2) + */suvālu-tak-ek/* “any further questions”, indef.pl. of *suvālu* “question” (← Arab. *suāl* “question”); *kurāne* “going to make, do” part.fut. (*kuranī* “to do, make”), attributed to */bēnum-ek/*, nom.indef. “a wish”; */ot/* part.pret. of *onnanī* “be there, lie”, attributed to the indef.dat. */kam-ak-aš/* “to a fact” of the nom. *kan /kam/*; *nu* negation particle; */fenunu/* part.pret.(intr.) “(having) appeared, seemed” (*fenenī* “appear, seem”) + *eve* q.partic.

<sup>245</sup> For OIA *ākṣi-* “eye” cf. TURNER (1966) I, 2, no. 43; cf. also GEIGER (1941), 19, no. 286 on Sinh. *āsa/āha*, stem *ās-/āhi-* “eye”. For Sinh. *bara* “weight, load” cf. GEIGER (1941), 119, no. 1774.

2.3.1.1.4.7. Like the dative, the ablative/instrumental can be used to express adverbial meanings. As an example for Old Dhivehi cp. *mi tak aharun* “(during) so many years” (*mi tak* “this/so many/much”<sup>246</sup>; *aharu* “year”); for the modern language cf. M. *e hisābun* “from that moment (on), from then on, since then” (cf. above, 2.3.1.1.4.6).

2.3.1.1.5. The following table presents a concise survey of the **case suffixes** used in Modern Dhivehi. The attributes “animate” and “inanimate” have to be understood in the sense of “person” and “non-person”, resp.

cases		Māle	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku
gen.	anim.	-ge	-ge	-ge
	inan.		-e, -i	-e/-ei, -i
loc.		-gā /-gai/	-e, -i	-e/-ei, -i
dat.		-a <sup>3</sup> /-aś/	-a <sup>3</sup> /-aś/	-aha, -hā; -aśa, -a <sup>3</sup> /-aś/
abl./	anim.	obl./gen. + <i>kuren, farātun</i>	gen. + <i>farātun</i>	gen. + <i>farāten/aten</i>
instr.	inan.	-in, -un	-in, -un	-en, indef.suff. + -un

2.3.1.2. The **nominal stems** of Modern Dhivehi can be divided into two main groups, viz. stems ending in a vowel and stems ending in a consonant. Within vocalic stems, stems in *-i* and *-a* form the largest groups by far, while stems ending in other vowels are restricted to a few words.

2.3.1.2.1. Despite of some variants which are characterised by certain morphological patterns within the declension paradigm of the southern dialects, the ***i*-stems** represent a very homogeneous group in Dhivehi. Regarding some secondary morphological and phonological developments, we can state that all of the real *i*-stems share two distinctive formal features: first, the stem of the nouns in question ends in *-i* without exception in all dialects; second, the ablative ending is always *-in* in Māle and in Aḍḍū (as against *-un* occurring with the consonant stems); note that in contrast to the other dialects, Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku uses *-en* as the ablative suffix for all stem types (cf. 2.3.1.1.4 above). Cp., e.g., the nominal stems M.A.F. *tari* “star” and M. *toḷi*, A. *teḷi*, F. *tēḷi* “bean” with their ablative forms M. *tarīn* (← *\*tari-in*), A. *tarin* (but F. *tari-en*) and M. *toḷīn* (← *\*toḷi-in*), A. *teḷin* (but F. *tēḷen* ← *\*tēḷi-en*). Whenever one of these two characteristics is missing, the noun in question is not an *i*-stem but a consonant stem which must have undergone a special development in a particular dialectal area (cf. the table given in 2.3.1.3.4.1 below).

As was stated above, the non-enlarged form of the direct case of the *i*-stems is characterised by a final *-i* without any exceptions in all dialects; cp., e.g., M.A.F. *tari* “star”; A. *teḷi*, F. *tēḷi*, M. *toḷi* “bean”; M.A. *mehi*, F. *mēhi* “fly”; M.A.F. *divehi* “Maldivian, islander”; M.A. *ihī*, F. *ihī* “lobster”; M.A. *baśi*, F. *bāśi* “eggplant”; A. *geṅḍi*, F. *gēṅḍi*, M. *goṅḍi*

<sup>246</sup> For the later development of the pronominal adjective *tak* into a plural suffix cf. 2.3.2.3.

“chair” etc. The *i*-stems can further be subdivided into different declension classes, depending on whether the stem vowel remains unchanged within the paradigm or whether it disappears because of certain morphological rules and, as a consequence, causes a secondary lengthening of the preceding syllable.

2.3.1.2.2. The ***a*-stems** form a large, widely homogeneous group in Dhivehi. They are characterised by a stem vowel *-a* which can be distinguished throughout the whole paradigm. While in northern Dhivehi all nouns with a nominative in *-a* belong to the *a*-stems, in Addū and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku this stem class is not determined by the nominative alone. In these dialects, a nominative ending in *-a* can represent an *a*-stem or a consonant stem. To ascertain the stem class, it is necessary to know the genitive, dative or ablative forms of its primary paradigm, i.e. the paradigm which is marked neither for definiteness nor indefiniteness. The respective case forms of *a*-stems are gen. A.F. *-a-i*, M. *-a-ige*; dat. A.M.  $\bar{a}^{\prime} \leftarrow -a-a\acute{s}$ , F.  $\bar{a}\acute{s}a \leftarrow -a-a\acute{s}a$ ; abl. A.M. *-a-in*, F. *-a-en*; cp. the following examples (primary stems only): M.A.F. *fia* “wing; petal” (abl. M.A. *fia-in*, F. *fia-en*); A.F. *kuruba*, M. *kurumba* “young (drinking) coconut” (abl. A. *kuruba-in*, F. *kuruba-en*, M. *kurumba-in*); A. *farabada*, F. *farobada*, M. *farubada* “mountain” (abl. A. *farabada-in*, F. *farobada-en*, M. *farubada-in*); A.F. *hela*, M. *hila* “rock” (abl. A. *hela-in*, F. *hela-en*, M. *hila-in*); A.F. *mela*, M. *mila* “dirt” (abl. A. *mela-in*, F. *mela-en*, M. *mila-in*); M.A.F. *aṅga* “mouth” (abl. M.A. *aṅga-in*, F. *aṅga-en*); A.F. *attela*, M. *attila* [aitila] “palm (of the hand)” (abl. A. *attela-in*, F. *attela-en*, M. *attila-in*); A.F. *faitela*, M. *faitila* “foot” (abl. A. *faitela-in*, F. *faitela-en*, M. *faitila-in*); M.A.F. *dida* “flag” (abl. M.A. *dida-in*, F. *dida-en*); M.A.F. *fāga* “bitter gourd” (abl. M.A. *fāga-in*, F. *fāga-en*); A.F. *ohi-bada*, M. *mai-bada* “vertebra” (abl. A. *ohibada-in*, F. *ohibada-en*, M. *maibada-in*); A.F. *reha*, M. *riha* “curry” (abl. A. *reha-in*, F. *reha-en*, M. *riha-in*); M.A.F. *āditta* “Sunday” (abl. M.A. *āditta-in*, F. *āditta-en*); M.A.F. *hōma* “Monday” (abl. M.A. *hōma-in*, F. *hōma-en*); M.A.F. *aṅgāra* “Tuesday” (abl. M.A. *aṅgāra-in*, F. *aṅgāra-en*); M.A.F. *buda* “Wednesday” (abl. M.A. *buda-in*, F. *buda-en*); M.A.F. *kafa* “cotton” (abl. M.A. *kafa-in*, F. *kafa-en*); M.A.F. *kara* “land” (abl. M.A. *kara-in*, F. *kara-en*); A.F. *dea*, M. *dia* “water, liquid” (abl. A. *dea-in*, F. *dea-en*, M. *dia-in*); M.A.F. *vina* “grass” (abl. M.A. *vina-in*, F. *vina-en*) etc. In some cases, we meet with words which because of their declension have to be judged as *a*-stems in one dialect but must be classified as consonant stems in another dialectal area. Cp., e.g., the noun M.F. *buma* “eyebrow” (abl. M. *buma-in*, F. *buma-en*) which in Māle and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku appears as an *a*-stem, unlike Addū *bema* which is a consonant stem (abl. A. *bem-un*). Cf. also *feṇa* “foam, surf” which is a (secondary) *a*-stem in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, as opposed to the consonant stems A. *feṇa*, M. *fonu* (abl. F. *feṇa-en*, but A. *feṇ-un* and M. *fon-un*).

2.3.1.3. In comparison with the *i*- and *a*-stems, the **consonant stems** form a very heterogeneous group, the divergences mostly depending on the stem-final consonant. Here we have to take into account that only a restricted subset of consonants can appear in word-final position, all others requiring a “supporting” vowel<sup>247</sup>; the quality of these secondary vowels varies from dialect to dialect. As we stated above, there are also some consonant stems whose direct case form ends in *-i* (for particular cases which are found all over the Maldives, cf. 2.3.1.2.1)

<sup>247</sup> For the particular auslaut correspondences cf. the table given in 2.3.1.3.4.1 below.

or in *-a* (only in the southernmost dialects, above all in Aḍḍū; cf. 2.3.1.2.2). It follows that in the case of most consonant stems, it is impossible to deduce the stem class from an isolated nominative alone. Hence, the correct classification of a noun with respect to a particular stem class depends on the knowledge of certain items of the declension paradigm, and, if available, of the corresponding stem forms of the other dialects.

2.3.1.3.1. As a result of peculiar sound laws concerning the auslaut of words in Modern Dhivehi, only a small number of consonant phonemes can occur in word-final position, viz. /n/, /s/, /k/, /t/ and /s/ (← /t/) (cf. 1.1.3 above). Furthermore, their phonetic realisation is quite different from that in medial position, so that a remarkable variation has developed in the paradigms of stems ending in these consonants; there are also many dialectal differences. The most consistent realisation is that of the dental nasal /n/, which is pronounced as a velar [ŋ] throughout the Maldives when occurring in final position (cp., e.g., M.A.F. nom. *mūsun* [*musuŋ*] “monsoon, season”).

All the other consonants mentioned above are subject to significant phonetic changes when occurring in final position. Thus, final */-k/* is in all dialects realised as a glottal stop, [ʔ] (cp., e.g., M.A.F. nom. *bo*<sup>o</sup> /*bok*/ “frog”; A.F. nom. *fua*<sup>o</sup>, M. nom. *fō*<sup>o</sup> /*fuak*/ “betel nut”). In Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku and in Aḍḍū, final */-t/* is represented allophonically by [ʔ] as well, while in Māle the glide [-y] is pronounced instead (cp., e.g., A.F. nom. *fo*<sup>o</sup>, M. *foi* /*fot*/ “book”; A.F. nom. *fa*<sup>o</sup>, M. nom. *fai* /*fat*/ “leaf”). In the older documents of Dhivehi, however, /k/ and /t/ are still attested as such in word-final position; cp., e.g., the nominatives *bulat* “betel” (L1 g/2,2 etc., L2 5,3 and 25,4) and *puvak* “areca nut” (L1 my/1,1; L4 e/2,1), or the spelling *puvak mulok* for the name of the island *Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku*, lit. “areca-nut ground” (L4 e/2,1; possibly also in L1 md/1,2, where only *-ku muloku* is preserved). In contrast to that, the spelling *fivaš mulaku* occurring in a later text (*Tāna*-inscription on a gravestone nearby the Hukuru-Miskit in Māle: ITMHM 2,7), already indicates the phonetic change of final */-k/* (and other stops) to [ʔ].

In Aḍḍū and Māle, [ʔ] also serves as an allophone of final */-s/* (cp., e.g., M.A. nom. *ra*<sup>o</sup> /*raš*/ as against F. nom. *rašo* “island, land” with a vocalic extension, cf. below). On the other hand, final */-s/* is preserved in Māle and in Aḍḍū in the nominative, but within the paradigm forms of stems in *-s*, there is a regular interchange with [h]; in contrast to that, in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku /s/ has developed into [h] in final position as well, a secondary short vowel which is identical with the vowel of the preceding syllable being attached (cp., e.g., M.A. nom. *as* vs. F. nom. *aha* “horse”; M. nom. *mirus*, A. nom. *miris* vs. F. nom. *mirihi* “chili”; M.A. nom. *bēs* vs. F. nom. *behe* “medicine”, M. nom. *gas*, A. nom. *ges* vs. F. nom. *gehe* “tree” etc.).

2.3.1.3.2. In auslaut position, stem-final // is preserved exclusively in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku. In the other vernaculars, it appears only medially within the paradigm. Cp., e.g., the nominative forms F. *haul* vs. A. *hau*, M. *hā* “cock”; F. *bol* vs. M.A. *bō* “head”; F. *gal* vs. A. *gau*, M. *gā* “stone”; F. *tel* vs. A. *teu*, M. *teo* “oil” etc.).

2.3.1.3.3. No other consonants occur in word-final position, at least in inherited words.<sup>248</sup> As a rule, even foreign words ending in a consonant are enlarged by secondary vowels; cp., e.g., the recent English loanwords M. *bōṭu* “boat”, *sigareṭu* “cigaret”, *ṭīcaru* “teacher”.

2.3.1.3.4. The attachment of short vowels after a given consonant stem in the formation of the nominative (direct case) can be shown to be a comparatively archaic feature of Dhivehi,<sup>249</sup> given that the same phenomenon is met with in Modern Sinhalese in the corresponding nouns. The interdialectal differences in the quality of these vowels must be regarded as secondary.

2.3.1.3.4.1. The table given below shows the regular correspondences of additional vowels in the neutral, non-enlarged form of the *casus rectus* of consonant stems. The first two correspondences are by far the most frequent ones, while the correspondences (3) to (7) are restricted to a few words only.

correspondence	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
(1)	-a	-o	-u
(2)	-u	-u	-u
(3)	-a	-u	-u
(4)	-e	-e	-u
(5)	-a	-e	-u
(6)	-u	-u	-i
(7)	-i	-i	-u

If nothing else is indicated, the following examples are listed in the order *Māle* – *Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku* – *Aḍḍū*.

- (1) *aḍu* – *aḍo* – *aḍa* “sound, noise, voice”; *aharu* – *aharo* – *ahara* “year”; *baḷu* – *baḷo* – *baḷa* “dog”; *doru* – *doro* – *dora* “door”; *fiavaḷu* – *fiāḷo* – *fiavaḷa* “foot, step”; *foḍu* – *fodo* (A. *foda* is not used as a stem form, only the nom.sg. def. *fodā* and indef. *foda*<sup>3</sup> occur) “drop”; *gañḍu* – *gañḍo* – *gañḍa* “vessel”; *hañḍu* – *hañḍo* – *hañḍa* “moon”; *himāru* – *himāro* – *himāra* “donkey”; *hialu* – *hialo* – *hivala* “fox, jackal”; *karu* – *karo* – *kara* “neck, throat”; *koñḍu* – *koñḍo* – *koñḍa* “shoulder”; *koṣāru* – *koṣāro* – *koṣāra* “storehouse”; *kotalu* – *kotalo* – *kotala* “bag”; *massaru* – *massaro* – *massara* “month”; *madu* – *mado* – *mada* M.F. “kernel of the coconut”, A. “(kernel) of a nut”; *nanu* – *naṇo* – *naṇa* “fishing line”; *nāru* – *nāro* – *nāra* “vein, nerve, blood-vessel”; *onu* – *oṇo* – *oṇa* “bamboo”; *vaḷu* – *vaḍo* – *vaḍa* “well”.
- (2) M. *bakamūnu*, F.A. *bakamūṇu* “owl”; M. *dekunu*, F.A. *dekuṇu* “south”; M. *fāidigumakunu*, F.A. *fāidigimakuḍu* “spider”; M.F.A. *fīḷu* “navel”; *hakuru* “sugar”; *hukuru* “Friday”; M. *hūnu*, F.A. *huṇu* “heat; hot, warm”; M.F.A. *īṭu* “tile”; *javvu* “atmosphere”; *kāḷūru* “camphor”; *kaduru* “date(palm)”; *mugu* “lentil, gram; green”; *muñḍu* “sarong”; M. *mūnu*, F.A. *mūṇu* “face”; M.F. *nīaduru*, A. *nēduru* “pomelo, shaddock”; M.F.A. *uḍu* “sky”; *uñgu* “lap”; *uturu* “north”; *ūru* “pig”; *vagutu* “time”; M. *jaṃburōlu*, F.A. *jaṃburōzu* “star apple”; M.F.A. *jaṃbu* “rose apple”; M. *kahaṃbu* (*kahabu*), F.A. *kahuṃbu* “tortoise”; M. *kāḷu*, F.A. *kauḷu* “crow”. — *-u* as a common final stem vowel is also present in a few

<sup>248</sup> For more extensive information about the phonological rules implied, cf. 1.1.3.

<sup>249</sup> An exception to this are the short vowels which are attached to stems in *-s* in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku: these have to be judged as secondary. Cf. 1.3.5 and further below.

words from the numerous group of nouns denoting persons that are characterised by morphological peculiarities (cf., e.g., 2.3.2.1.2). Cf. M.A.F. *eduru* “teacher”<sup>250</sup>; *haturu* “enemy” (obs.)<sup>251</sup>; M.A. *keoḷu*, F. *keuḷu* “chief of the dhoni-crew”; M.A.F. *mituru* “friend” (obs.)<sup>252</sup>; *uxtu* “sister” (← Arab. *uht*).

- (3) *fāru – fauru – favara* “wall”; M.F. *fēru*, A. *fēra* “guava”. The three following words have to be seen as exceptions within this class, because they are inflected as *a*-stems in Addū (two of them are loanwords): *bāzu – bāzu – (bāza)* “eagle, falcon” (← Pers., Urdu *bāz* “falcon”); M.F. *nāringu* (A. *nāringa*) “orange” (cf. Pers. *nāreṅṅ / nāreṅ / nāring* “(bitter) orange”, *nārangī* “mandarine”; Urdu *nāraqī* “orange”). The contracted form A. *henna* ← \**heñduna* “morning”, whose original final vowel must have been *-u* (like in M.F. *heñdunu*), has to be regarded as a secondary *a*-stem as well.

The following correspondences are documented by a few examples only:

- (4) M. *atolu*, F.A. *ateḷe* “atoll”; M. *koḷu*, F.A. *keḷe* “piece, end”; M. *eñdu*, F.A. *eñde* “bed”; M. *medu*, F.A. *mede* “middle”.
- (5) *miaru – mēre – miara* “shark”; *honu – heṇe – heṇa* “thunderbolt”. A. *bera* “drum” is a secondary *a*-stem as well while M. *beru*, F. *bere* belong to the consonant stems (cp. correspondence (3) above).
- (6) In the two examples belonging to this type an original final *-u*, preserved in its original quality in the southernmost dialects, changed into *-i* in Māle; cf. F.A. *kehuru* against M. *keheri* “fur” and F.A. *guguru* against M. *guguri* “thunder”.
- (7) The correspondence of the nominative endings M. *-u* and F.A. *-i* seems to suggest an intermediate position between consonant stems and *i*-stems. There can be no doubt, however, that the words in question have to be considered as consonant stems, at least within the standard language. Most of the Addū examples have been adapted to the *i*-stems as their ablative ends in *-in*; cf. M. *havīru*, F.A. *havīri*, A. abl. *havīrin* “evening”; M. *honihiru*, F. *heñihiri*, A. *heñahiri*, abl. *heñahirin* “Saturday”; M. *iṅguru*, F.A. *iṅgiri*, A. abl. *iṅgirin* “ginger”; M. *kuḷu*, F.A. *kīli*, A. abl. *kīlin* “saliva”; M. *menduru*, F.A. *mendiri*, A. abl. *mendirin* “noon”. In contrast to that, some Addū examples have preserved the old variant of the ablative: M. *iru*, F.A. *iri*, M.A. abl. *irun* “sun”; M. *kiru*, F.A. *kiri*, M.A. abl. *kirun* “milk”.<sup>253</sup>

2.3.1.3.4.2. The phonological rules that have caused the change of the final sound can easily be identified in the case of correspondence (4), A.F. *-e* vs. M. *-u*, where the quality of the final vowel was obviously adapted to that of the penult in the A. and F. words, the triggering element of the process being the retroflex consonant.<sup>254</sup> In other cases, however, the vocalic change has just to be noted, without a phonological reason being perceivable; cp., e.g., the numerous examples of the correspondence of A. *-a* and F. *-o* as against the more archaic *-u* we find in Māle (correspondence 1), or the correspondence of A.F. *-i* as against the original

<sup>250</sup> Cf. Sinh. *āduru* “teacher”; Jaina-Pkt. (AMg.JM.) *āyariya-*, other Prakrits (Ś. etc.) *āaria-* (Ch. WERBA, personal communication; cf. PISCHEL 520 etc.); Pa. *ācariya*, OIA *ācāryā-*; cf. GEIGER, (1941) 17, no. 268.

<sup>251</sup> Dhiv. *haturu*, Sinh. *saturu / haturu* represent a *mot savant* which has to be derived from the OIA *u*-stem *śātru-* “enemy”. The word cannot be considered as an inherited direct successor of the the original *u*-stem, because the OIA cluster *-tr-* must have changed as early as MIA, yielding a prototype such as Pa. *sattu-* “enemy” (P.E.D., 673). Cf. the antonym *mituru* which shows the same secondary development of *-tr-* (cf. fn. 252).

<sup>252</sup> Like *haturu* “enemy” (cf. fn. 251 above), *mituru* represents a *mot savant*; cf. the correspondent Sinh. word *mituru*, which opposes itself to the synonymous Sinh. form *mit* which developed directly from MIA (Pa., Pkt. *mitta-*, Skt. *mitrā-*; GEIGER (1941), 133, no. 1986).

<sup>253</sup> From a phonological point of view, some adjectives have to be treated within this group as well; cf. M. *bīru*, A.F. *bīri* “deaf”; M. *diḡu*, A.F. *diḡi* “long”; M. *tūnu*, A.F. *tīni* “hot (spicy)”. They are declined only when being used as nouns. For adjectives in general, cf. 2.4.1.

<sup>254</sup> About the influence of retroflex consonants on the surrounding vowels in the southern dialects cf. 3.9.2.2.3 (for *ośōnnanī*), 3.9.2.3 and, further, 1.2.4.4.

-*u* preserved in Māle again (correspondence 7). If we compare the final vowels occurring in the direct case of the consonant stems both interdialectally and with their equivalents attested in Old Dhivehi, we cannot but conclude that as far as this development is concerned, the language of Māle is more conservative than the southern dialects.

2.3.1.4. Vocalic stems ending in other vowels than *-i* and *-a* are confined to a few words in Dhivehi. Stems with a long-vocalic ending suggest that the word in question is of foreign origin, except for a few cases which can be explained as frozen definite forms of the nom.sg.; cp., e.g., M.F. *bēbe*, A. *bēbē* (presumably from the def. form *\*bēbe-ā*) “elder brother”; M. *kokko*, A.F. *kokkō* (presumably from the def. form *\*kokko-ā*) “younger brother / sister”. In the case of M.A.F. *faḷō* “papaya”, it remains uncertain, however, whether its final *-ō* can be interpreted as a reflex of the definite suffix. Although it seems to be sure that *faḷō* has to be derived from OIA *phāla-*, Pa., Pkt. *phala-* “fruit, seed of a fruit, grain”, the exact derivation of the Dhivehi word cannot be ascertained. While Sinh. *pala* “fruit” can go back directly to an equivalent MIA form, the retroflex *-l-* of Dhiv. *faḷō* speaks in favour of another intermediate form; maybe Dhiv. *faḷō* is a loanword (cp., e.g., Konkani *phaḷa*).<sup>255</sup> M.A.F. *jādū* “magic, sorcery” reflects Persian *ǧādū* “id.,” either directly or via its Urdu equivalent. The etymology of M.A.F. *karā* “water melon” is unknown.

2.3.1.5. Words that can be classified as **root nouns** are very rare in Dhivehi. This category is represented by nouns the root of which is restricted to the minimal structure of {consonant-vowel} in their stem form as well as their paradigm; the vowel in question can be short or long, but also a diphthong. Most of the root nouns belong to the inherited vocabulary. Cp., e.g., nom.sg. M. *ge*, A.F. *gē* “house”,<sup>256</sup> gen. A. *gē*, M. *gēge*, dat. M.A. *gea*, abl. A. *gen*, M. *gein*; the nom.sg. A.F. *gē* seems to be a frozen definite form (cf. above) ← *\*ge-ā*. This example demonstrates that in Māle the original declension has been replaced by the agglutinative paradigm also in the case of root nouns; hence the declensional forms of the following examples will be given only for the Aḍḍū dialect. Cp., e.g., nom.sg. M.A.F. *gai* “body”<sup>257</sup>

<sup>255</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 508, no. 9051 and GEIGER (1941), 96, no. 1429. The semantic restriction from a general meaning “fruit” to “papaya” might have occurred because the papaya is one of the most important fruits on the Maldivian islands, where only a few plants are cultivated.

<sup>256</sup> Cf. Sinh. *gē*, Pkt., Pa. *geha-* ← OIA *gehā-/grhā-*; cf. BERGER (1953), 40, no. 72; GEIGER (1941), 57, no. 841 and TURNER (1966) I, 227, no. 4240.

<sup>257</sup> GEIGER (1902), 920, no. 156 regards Dhiv. *gai* as a correspondent of the Sinh. nominal stem *gat-* “limb, body” which he derives from OIA *gātra-* via MIA *gatta-* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 52, no. 762). In contrast, TURNER (1966) II, 822, no. 14445 associates the Dhivehi word (for which he notes an obviously non-existent variant “*gat*” besides *gai*), with Sinh. *gāya* “strength of body” which he also derives from *gātra-* “limb, member of body” (RV); “body”. Both derivations are problematic as they stand. Via MIA *gatta-*, OIA *gātra-* would have led to an intermediate Dhiv. *\*gat*. As a phonological input form, however, this *\*gat* (as posited by TURNER) would have yielded M. *\*[gay → gae, gā]* and A.F. *\*[ga]*; cp. in this connection the word *lfaṭ/* “leaf” (= Sinh. *pata*, stem *pat-* ← Pkt., Pa. *patta-*, OIA *pātra-*, cf. GEIGER (1941), 93, no. 1385 and (1902), 918, no. 122), which shows a similar development: M. *[fai] → [fae, fā]*. M.A.F. *gai* can nevertheless represent OIA *gātra-* if we assume that its MIA predecessor was *\*gāta-*, not *\*gatta-*; in this case we should compare A.F. *rei*, M. *rē* “night” from OIA *rātrī-* which could yield MIA *\*rātī-* alongside Pa. *ratti-* according to the MIA “law of two moras”. For the alternative results produced by this law cf. GEIGER (1916, 42-3) and, further, n. 262 below; cf. also 1.2.3.1.

(A. gen. *gai* /*gayil*/, dat. *gā*<sup>258</sup> /*gayas*/, abl. *gain* /*gayin*/); A.F. *fā*, M. *fai* “foot, leg”<sup>258</sup> (A. gen. *fāi*, dat. *fā*<sup>2</sup>, abl. *fāin*); nom.sg. M.A.F. *vai* “wind”<sup>259</sup> (A. gen. *vaye*, dat. *vā*<sup>2</sup> /*vayaś*/, abl. *vain* /*vayin*/); A.F. *gū*, M. *gui* “excrement”<sup>260</sup> (A. gen. *gue*, dat. *gua*<sup>2</sup>, abl. *guun*); M.A.F. *oi*<sup>261</sup> (besides A. *oivara*, M. *oivaru*) “current” (A. gen.sg.def. *oyei*, other def. case forms missing; A. gen. *oye*, abl. *oyin*; dat. only *oi-vara*); A.F. *rei*, M. *rē* “night”<sup>262</sup> (no case forms). From its root structure and its declension, the loanword M.A.F. *sai* “tea”<sup>263</sup> (A. gen. *saye*, dat. *saya*<sup>2</sup>, abl. *sayin*) must be regarded as a root noun as well.

### 2.3.2. Number, definiteness and indefiniteness

In Dhivehi, the category of number comprises singular and plural. From the formal point of view, the morphological expression of plurality is one of the most heterogeneous elements of Maldivian grammar and, by consequence, of great typological interest. Considering the interdialectal divergences and overlaps of the plural formations, it seems reasonable to describe the particular formations separately for each dialect.

The vernacular of Addū is the only dialect of Dhivehi that has preserved without restrictions the archaic system in which the formal expression of singularity is linked to that of definiteness and indefiniteness. Regarding the treatment of number, the dialect of Fua<sup>2</sup> Mulaku, although belonging to southern Dhivehi as well, represents a kind of transitional idiom between the southern and northern dialects. In the modern standard language, the semantic distribution of the concepts of singular and plural and the morphological realisation of number deriving from them, is, to some extent, diametrically opposed to the situation we find in Addū.

2.3.2.1. One of the most characteristic particularities of the dialect of **Addū** consists in the fact that the pure nominal stem is frequently used as a generic plural form, if this is not contradicted by the semantics involved. Being unmarked from the morphological point of view, this plural form can be regarded as the primary form of the given noun; this is why the paradigm based on it will hereafter be called the “primary” one. When the plural form is the generic one, singularity must be expressed by additional special suffixes added to the stem. Generally speaking, there are two different singular forms that can be derived from a nominal stem, viz. a definite and an indefinite one, the former being characterised by the definite suffix *-ā* or its variant *-(y)e* (← */-yā/*). The etymological origin of this suffix is not clear, as

<sup>258</sup> In Sinhalese the corresponding nominal stem is *pā*, nom. *paya* “foot”; cf. Pkt. *pā(y)a-*, Pa. *pāda-*, Skt. *pāda-* “foot” (GEIGER 1941, 95, 1417).

<sup>259</sup> Cf. the Sinh. stem *vā* “wind”, Pkt. *vā(y)a-*, Pa. *vāta-*, Skt. *vāta-* (GEIGER 1941, 161, no. 2394).

<sup>260</sup> Cf. Sinh. *gū*, OIA *gūtha-* (GEIGER 1902, 921, no. 172; TURNER 1966, II, 827, no. 14449).

<sup>261</sup> The Sinh. correspondents of the Maldivian word are the variants *soya*, *hoya*, *oya*, *sō* and *ō* “small river, rivulet” which by order represent the particular stages of phonological development (← Pkt. *sō(y)a-*, Pa. *sota(s)-*, Skt. *srōtas-*; cf. GEIGER 1902, 932, no. 342 and 1941, 33, no. 486; cf. further TURNER 1966, II, 803, nos. 13889 and 13891).

<sup>262</sup> Cf. the corresponding Sinh. stem *rā-*, nom. *rāya* “night”, Pkt. *rā-*, \**rāi-* as opposed to Pa. *rattī/i-*, Skt. *rātrī/i-* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 146, no. 2167).

<sup>263</sup> Probably the word meaning “tea” reached Dhivehi in its Arab. form *šāy* (as contrasting with Pers. *čāy* etc.), together with the product itself; for further informations cf., e.g., YULE-BURNELL 1902, 905 ff.

GEIGER stated when he described the same phenomenon for Sinhalese<sup>264</sup>. In contrast to that, the derivation of the indefinite suffix is less problematic. Obviously, A.  $-a^{\prime}$  /-ak/ and  $-e^{\prime}$  /-ek/ developed from the stem of the cardinal number “one”,  $e^{\prime}$  /ek/, in the same way as the Sinhalese indefinite suffix  $-ek$  /-k which represents the corresponding numeral.<sup>265</sup> In Aḍḍū the distribution of the suffixes  $-ā$  (def.) and  $-a^{\prime}$  (indef.) vs.  $-(y)e$  (def.) and  $-(y)e^{\prime}$  (indef.) depends on a simple rule: The suffixes  $-e$  and  $-e^{\prime}$  which are preceded by a glide  $y$  in order to avoid hiatus, are joined exclusively to  $i$ -stems. In contrast to that, the suffixes  $-ā$  and  $-a^{\prime}$  occur with all other vocalic stems and with all consonant stems. Besides this, those  $i$ -stems which are characterised by a secondary vowel lengthening in the penult, together with a loss of the stem-final  $-i$  in the genitive and dative as well as the definite and indefinite nominative, can also take the suffixes  $-ā$  and  $-a^{\prime}$ ; cp., e.g., the  $i$ -stem A. *fēśi* “box” (nom.pl.), gen. *fēśe* (← \**fēśi-e*), dat. *fēśaʹ* /*fēśaśiʹ* (← \**fēśi-aś*), nom.sg.def. *fēśā* (← \**fēśi-ā*), nom.sg.indef. *fēśaʹ* /*fēśakʹ* (← \**fēśi-ak*); for further examples cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.3.

2.3.2.1.1. As to the origin of the indefinite form of the  $a$ -stems, it is not clear from the synchronic point of view whether this represents the suffix  $-a^{\prime}$  /-ak/ as a whole or a shortened variant /-k/ as in Sinhalese (cf. above). In the former case we would have to assume that it was influenced by the consonant stems, because otherwise we would expect a form \* $-ā^{\prime}$  \*/-āk/ which is not even once attested in Modern Dhivehi. In the older documents of the language, however, there are some indefinite forms of  $a$ -stems (among them some sanskritisms, possibly also prakritisms in  $-a$ ), which end in  $-a-ak$ ; cp., e.g., *anga-ak-un* (RC 1,12) “from one limb / from one of the limbs”, abl./instr.indef. (Sinh. *aṅga* “limb” ← Pa. *aṅga-*, Skt. *āṅga-* “limb, body”; cf. GEIGER 1941, 3, no. 34 and TURNER 1966, I, 6, no. 114); *boga-ak* (L5 5/1,1, beside *boga-ek* in F3,14; F5,22 etc.) “a benefit” (Dhiv. *boga-* obviously is a sanskritism, because an inherited intervocalic  $-g-$  would not be preserved (Pa. *bhoga-*, Skt. *bhōga-* “enjoyment, use, possession, hire, wages”, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 549, no. 9625); *ma-aku baḷa-ak-ai* (RC 1,5-6) “a mother and a father” (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1.1). The meaning of the following examples can be established only approximately: *vellaḷakāra-ak* (L4 g/1,1, besides *vellaḷakāra* f/1,7) “an officer”, *gadyāṇa-ak* (L2 5,4) “a bag” (Skt. *gadyāṇa-*), *hinna-ak* (F8,25 and IDMMM 2,6) “a piece of land which is cleared, rooted out” (cf. *sinya* in L2 6,5 etc.), *kiba-ak-an* (F6,19) “in a manner” (dat.; for the spelling of the dative ending /-aś ← -aḷ/ in the form <-an> cf. 3.6.3.2.3). We must not conclude from the forms given above that the indefinite suffix of the  $a$ -stems has to be traced back to  $-ak$  in general, however. Variants like *boga-ak* and *boga-ek* (cf. above) or the indef.  $a$ -stem *pada-ek* (F4,1) “a manner, kind”, which are attested only with the suffix  $-ek$ , show that at least already at the time when the *fatkoḷu* document F4 was written (17th century),  $a$ -stems could be combined also with the suffix variant  $-ek$ .

2.3.2.1.2. Besides the expression of a generic plural meaning by the pure nominal stem, the dialect of Aḍḍū also shows secondary plural formations by means of two suffixes which,

<sup>264</sup> “Der Casus rectus (Nominativ) der Masculina hat im Sing. jetzt die Endung  $-ā$ , deren Entstehung schwer zu erklären ist. Es fragt sich namentlich, in was für einem Verhältnisse sie steht zu dem Ausgange  $-e$ , welchen der N(ominativ) Sg. in den ältesten Inschriften zeigt.” (GEIGER 1900, 56).

<sup>265</sup> Cf. Skt. *ēka-*; note that both Dhivehi and Sinhalese presuppose a MIA variant *ēkka-*. For more extensive information cf. GEIGER (1941), 30, no. 445.

however, are used only in a very restricted semantic sphere. In the case of nouns denoting kinship terms, special social relationships and official functions, the fundamental rule, which says that the pure stem has to be understood as a regular plural form, is not effective. Some of the nouns in question use the pure stem as a nominative singular, while in the case of other nouns the definite form of the direct case can be found in this role, though deprived of its original definite meaning. The nominative plural of these nouns is formed with the suffixes *-in / -un* and *-men* which do not overlap in their range of use. The suffix *-in / -un* has an exact parallel in the Sinhalese ending *-an / -in / -un* which is used for the formation of the oblique case in the plural. Following GEIGER it reflects Old Sinh. *-ana* (Skt. *-ānām*, Pa. *-ānam*, Pkt. *-āna(m)*) which developed into Sinh. *-an* regularly, *-in* and *-un* being later variants.<sup>266</sup> The second plural suffix of Dhivehi, *-men*, goes back to an adverbial element; cf. the Sinhalese adverb *men* “like, similarly, exactly as” which can be derived from Pa., Skt. *samena* “together”<sup>267</sup>. The Dhivehi suffix *-men*, which is exclusively added to the definite singular form, is not only joined to kinship terms but also to nouns denoting animals; in combination with the latter ones, however, *-men* has the special meaning of “a certain amount (of animals)” or “an assessable number of (animals)”. In order to express the unspecified plural meaning “(many) animals”, the pure nominal stem is used in most cases. In Aḍḍū, *-men* does not serve as a plural formant for pronouns as it does in Māle. The only exception is the isolated form A. *miāmen* “both” which obviously reflects the pronominal stem *mi* “this” in its definite form, *miā*. The first evidence for *-men* in combination with a pronominal meaning is *kalemen* “you”, pers.pron. 2.ps.pl., attested in F6,14, a document from 1123 A.H. / 1711 A.D.

2.3.2.2. In **Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku**, plural formation is less heteromorphic than in Aḍḍū. Unlike Aḍḍū usage, in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku the unmarked form of a noun cannot automatically be considered as a plural form. It always represents a singular from which an explicit plural can be formed in different ways. This means that normally the singular is identical with the nominal stem, with some exceptional formations recalling the situation in Aḍḍū. The fact that in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku the nominative singular has to be regarded as the primary form must be the main reason why the formation of a definite singular ceased to be productive in this dialect. While in Aḍḍū the definite suffix represents the only means of marking a singular form which is at the same time morphologically distinct from the indefinite singular, the neutral plural or an ambivalent meaning of number, the grammatical process of number formation has been simplified in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku to a considerable extent. Here, the pure nominal stem represents the basic singular form, but also expresses definiteness (in contrast to indefinite forms which have to be marked). Hence, it is no longer necessary in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku to distinguish morphologically the basic singular and a special definite form. On the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the definite suffix *-ā* might not have been productive in the older language, though in a less extensive form than in Aḍḍū; obviously the suffix *-ā* was only connected to nouns denoting living beings. This is clear from those nouns which have kept the suffix in their ending as a “frozen” morpheme until nowadays, without a trace of its original meaning. In contrast to that, the indefinite form still has the same function in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku as in Aḍḍū. In both dialects, the indefinite suffix has the variants *-e<sup>3</sup> / -ek/* and *-a<sup>3</sup> / -ak/*, but the distribution

<sup>266</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 57 and (1938), 99-100.

<sup>267</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 69 and (1941), 138, no. 2060; TURNER (1966) II, 762, no. 13173 s.v. *samā-*.

of these variants does not follow the same strict phonological rules in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku as it does in Addū: While *-a<sup>3</sup>* is comparatively rare in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, *-e<sup>3</sup>* is here attached not only to *i*-stems but to all other nominal stems as well.

2.3.2.2.1. As for the use of the two suffix variants, there seems to be no connection between the category of animateness and inanimateness in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku,<sup>268</sup> such as we find in Sinhalese, where the distribution of the indefinite suffixes is governed by strict rules. In modern (colloquial) Sinhalese *-ek* is added only to animate nouns, while *-ak* combines with inanimate nouns; (cp., e.g., Sinh. nom.sg. *minihā* “the man” vs. nom.sg.indef. *minihek* “a man”, or nom.sg. *nama* “the name” vs. nom.sg.indef. *namak* “a name”).<sup>269</sup>

2.3.2.2.2. In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, there is no other way of forming the plural than by adding the suffixes *-un* (*-in*), *-men* and *-te<sup>3</sup>* */-tek/* to the nominative singular form. Concerning the distribution of the variants *-un* and *-in*, we may state the same observations as for the indefinite suffix. The original (probably purely) phonological rule is not effective any more; while *-in* has almost completely disappeared in the modern dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, *-un* being also combined with *i*-stems. As to the semantics of the variants, there are no differences to what applies to Addū (cf. above, 2.3.2.1.2).

The morphological basis of the suffix *-men* is the same as in Addū. Normally, it is attached to the definite singular, although the original meaning and function of this form are lost in the modern vernacular of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. As we stated above, the definite singular formant *-ā* occurs only with nouns denoting living beings here; agreeing with this, the plural suffix *-men*, morphologically depending on this element *-ā*, appears only in combination with animate nouns. In contrast to the semantically restricted function that the suffix *-men* has in Addū (cf. above, 2.3.2.1.2), it is used as an ordinary plural suffix in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku in that it can be added to all nouns denoting animals as well as to some terms designating persons, without expressing anything else than the purely grammatical meaning of plurality.

The suffix *-te<sup>3</sup>* */-tek/* is the most frequent and, considering its meaning, also the most neutral of all plural suffixes that are used in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. *-te<sup>3</sup>* is a phonetical variant of the North Maldivian suffix *-ta<sup>3</sup>* */-tak/* which – except in the dialect of Addū – has become the most common Dhivehi plural suffix of today. The modern grammatical function of the suffix, whose original meaning was “so many/much”, is the result of a relatively recent development.

2.3.2.3. During the period of the oldest written Maldivian documents, the expression of number was not much different in the language of **Māle** from the system we still find in the Addū dialect. As textual tradition shows, the radical differences delimiting the northern

<sup>268</sup> Cf. the examples given in 2.3.2.8.1.

<sup>269</sup> For further examples from Colloquial Sinhalese cf., e.g., MATZEL (1983), 22; cf. also 2.3.2.3.1.2. In earlier Sinhalese, however, “a differentiation was made between the three genders and between the oblique case” (GEIGER, 1938, 113 f.; masc. (dir.) *-ek* / (obl.) *-aku*, fem. (dir.) *-ak* / (obl.) *-aka*, neutr. (dir.) *-ak*, *-ek* / (obl.) *-ak*); for evidence from medieval inscriptions cf. WIJAYARATNE (1956), 180 ff. To a certain extent, this formal differentiation is still reflected in the written form of Modern Sinhalese; cf., e.g., MATZEL, 1983, 78 or JAYAWARDENA-MOSER, 1993, 21.

Dhivehi area from the southern dialects, especially from Addū, in the field of nominal morphology, has developed only in the last centuries. In the medieval language of Māle, the pure nominal stem was still an unmarked form which in some cases could have plural meaning. Furthermore, at that time also the formation of a definite singular was still in use. On the other hand, there are also the first attestations of plural forms with the suffix *-tak* in the early texts.

Most probably the plural formation of northern Dhivehi developed in the following way: the more the principle of suffixation gained importance as a plural formant, the more it was led to a re-interpretation of the pure nominal stem as a singular form. From the semantic point of view, the suffix *-men* was not abstract enough to be able to serve as a general plural suffix; in contrast to that, the pronominal adjective *tak* was obviously neutral enough in its meaning to adopt the function of the generic plural which has been conserved in Addū until nowadays. *tak*, an originally independent word, developed into a plural suffix which was attached to the nominal stem by means of agglutination.

From a morphological point of view, the system of plural formation is not as rich in northern Dhivehi as it is in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, where the formal characteristics of the northern area have coincided with those of the southern ones, thus establishing a very complicated system with many synchronic irregularities. The formation of the indefinite form, however, is similar in the modern standard language and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. The same holds true for the occurrence of the definite singular which is confined to some isolated “frozen” forms in both varieties of Dhivehi.

2.3.2.3.1. For the formal expression of indefiniteness in a strict sense, only the suffix *-e<sup>3</sup> /-ek/* is used in Māle. Besides this, however, a suffix variant *-ak* is preserved in several oblique case forms. The suffix *-aku*, as an unenlarged form of the oblique case, is mainly added to nouns expressing undetermined or uncertain local or temporal meanings; cp., e.g., M. *e<sup>3</sup> duvahaku /ek duvas-aku/* “one day”. CAIN (1992, 21) calls this suffix “the nonspecified suffix *-aku*”. In HLSD (1988, 36), it is documented by some examples such as *mīhaku* (of *mīhā* “man”), *kujjaku* (of *kujjā* “child”), *veriaku* (of *veriā* “person”), *gahaku* (of *gas* “tree”), or *miskitaku* (of *miski<sup>3</sup> /miskit/* “mosque”); there is no indication, though, of the role *-aku* plays within the case system (cf. 2.3.2.13.2). From the morphological point of view, the suffix *-aku* is an exception, because it is obviously the only formal element of the *casus obliquus* which has been preserved as such in the nominal system.<sup>270</sup>

2.3.2.3.1.1. *-aku* very frequently occurs in connection with a formant *-ī* which will be called a “focus-marker” hereafter. Its (purely syntactical) function consists in indicating the rhematisation of the following part of the sentence. The *-ī* element can be added only to the oblique form of the indefinite suffix which then has the form *-akī* (from *\*-aku-ī*). Cp., e.g., *aharengē nam-akī nevi kudatuttu* “my name is Nevi Kudatuttu” (*aharengē* poss.pron. “my”, *nam /nam/* “name”, *-ak-ī* indef.suff.obl. + focus-marker).<sup>271</sup> It is important to note that there is no corresponding enlarged suffix form *†-ekī* which would be derived from the nominative.

<sup>270</sup> For the syntactical use of the suffix cf. 5.2.1.

<sup>271</sup> More details about the syntactical construction and more examples are given in 5.2.2.

DE SILVA (1970b, 155), who seems not to have noted that *-akī* is an enlarged form of the indefinite suffix, took it for "... the emphatic particle *akii* which often, though not exclusively, emphasises the subject noun or the noun phrase." According to DE SILVA, the imaginary "emphatic particle" Dhiv. *akii* has to be regarded as a functional equivalent of OIA *khālu*, Pa. *khalu* "certainly" (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 202, no. 3846) with its corresponding form *vuu kali* in classical Sinhalese. Furthermore, DE SILVA thought to have found an extra-Maldivian cognate of the element *akii* in Sinhalese Prakrit: "It has been recorded, however, that a Prakritic commentarial work called the *Helatuvā*, written in Ceylon about three centuries before Christ, makes some use of an emphatic particle *akii* as a subject-indicating device. Another commentarial work written in Sinhalese during the ninth century, the *Dhampiyā aṭuvā gāṭapadaya*, quotes some sentences from the *Helatuvā* containing this particle. e.g., *rahado vadānakī āvāṭahi nami* 'the word rahado is the name for a well'." Concerning this latter work,<sup>272</sup> DE SILVA came to the following conclusion: "That the *Dhampiyā aṭuvā gāṭapadaya*, which does not use this particle at all, quotes sentences with it, only to supply further explanatory notes, is to testimony to the fact that it was no longer in use in the ninth century. This form has not been attested since. *akii* has not been attested in that form in any Prakrit either. The presence of *akii* in Maldivian seems to suggest that it might well be a residue of a pre-ninth century stratum of language, and if so, that stratum must have been closely related, if not contemporaneous with, the language of the *Helatuvā*." The fact that DE SILVA obviously failed to analyse the enlarged suffix form *-ak-ī* morphologically and regarded it as an independent particle and, furthermore, as a prakritism, may have a simple reason. With the help of the article in question, DE SILVA, having only a limited knowledge of Dhivehi himself, wanted to support his own thesis of a very early Indo-Aryan colonisation of the Maldives<sup>273</sup>; at least he wanted to give counterevidence to GEIGER's thesis (1902, 909) according to which the Maldives were settled by Sinhalese people at a time not earlier than in the 11th or 12th century, Dhivehi consequently being a late dialectal offspring of the Sinhalese language only. Basically DE SILVA's assumption, that in the case of a very early separation of Maldivian and Sinhalese we should expect to find prakritisms in Dhivehi which could serve as evidence, is right. *-akī*, however, cannot be explained as a prakritism and, therefore, cannot be used as a proof of DE SILVA's theory.

2.3.2.3.1.2. Concerning the southernmost dialects, the formal difference between the direct and the oblique case consists only in the final *-u* of the latter one, i.e., *-ak* vs. *-aku*. When the focus-marker *-ī* is added to *-aku*, the final *-u* is preserved in Fua' Mulaku (cf. F. *mīhāku-ī* from *mīhā* "man"), while it gets lost in Addū as well as in Māle (A. *mīhāk-ī*).

Sinhalese, too, shows a formal differentiation of the direct and the oblique case in the indefinite form, the distribution being closely connected with the grammatical distinction of gender. The following table is a graphical representation of the Sinhalese system on the basis of GEIGER's data (1938, 114).<sup>274</sup>

declension	casus rectus	casus obliquus
I m.	<i>-ek</i>	<i>-aku</i>
I f.	<i>-ak</i>	<i>-aka</i>
II n.	<i>-ak, -ek</i>	<i>-ak</i>

In modern colloquial Sinhalese, the old difference in the distribution of the suffix variants, which was purely grammatical in the beginning, has developed into a differentiation based on semantic criteria only. Thus, in the

<sup>272</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 4: "Für das älteste Prosawerk in singhalesischer Sprache gilt Dampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapada Sannaya. Es ist dies ein Glossar zu dem Commentar des Dhammapada, welches von Louis de Zoysa i.J. 1875 aufgefunden wurde, und von dem man annimmt, dass es um die Mitte des 10. Jahrh. geschrieben wurde."

<sup>273</sup> Cf. the introduction, 0.7.2 above.

<sup>274</sup> For a similar table cf. WIJAYARATNE (1956), 180.

spoken language the indefinite suffix *-ek* is only added to nouns denoting living beings, while *-ak* occurs with inanimate nouns.<sup>275</sup>

2.3.2.4. In comparison with the semantically neutral plural suffix *-ta*<sup>3</sup>, which is attached to nouns of any stem class and meaning in the Dhivehi standard language, the other plural suffixes play only a secondary role. The suffix *-men* has lost its productivity but is still used in connection with kinship terms as in the southern dialects. In Māle, however, it is not added to a (formerly) definite form as in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, but directly to the pure stem. The suffix doublets *-un/-in*, which in the northern area are used with the same group of words as in the southern dialects (kinship terms, nouns denoting occupations and titles), have been extended to foreign words denoting living beings.

2.3.2.4.1. The stem *veri* “leader, chief, head; person”, with its definite form M.A.F. *veriā* and its plural M.A. *verin*, F. *vērun*, must also be treated in connection with the plural formations in *-in/-un*. In modern Dhivehi, *veri* almost never appears as an independent word; what we do find is fix combinations such as M. *beleni veriā* “guardian”, occurring as an isolated formation which consists of the attribute *beleni*, inact. part.pres. of *balanī* “to look”, and the “frozen” definite form *veriā*.<sup>276</sup> Besides this, *-veri* regularly occurs as the second part of some nominal compounds in which case it indicates special occupations or particular roles in social life; cp., e.g., M. *atoļu-veriā*, A. *atele-veriā*, F. *atele-veri* “atoll-chief”.<sup>277</sup> In the early documents of Dhivehi, the role of *veri* as the second part of compounds is already well attested; cp. *ma’kai-veri* “head of Mekka” (relating to the Prophet’s grandfather; RC 4,11); *bat-veri* “rice-lord” (L2 28,3: gen. *-veriage*); *kārdā-veri* “officer, official” (L4 f/2,5: indef. *-veriak*); *tauliyamūla-veri* “chief-inspector, supervisor” (part of an abstract *-veri-kan*: F3,15; F5,36; etc.); *pemus-veri* (with unknown meaning; F13,7); plural forms are *kārdā-verīn* “officials” (L5 5/2,5; with all probability also in L4 b/2,7 *kārudaveriīn*); *tauliyā-verīn* “inspectors” (F8,27); *vāru-verīn* “tax collectors” (L5 5/2,4). *veri* can also be attached to other parts of speech; cp. A. *de-verin*, *tin-verin* “two/three people; a unit of two/three people” etc. Here the plural *verin* is used to substantivise the cardinal number in the sense of a collective number (cf. also 2.5.3.1).

2.3.2.4.2. In the following three compounds, *veri* serves as the first part: *veri-ra*<sup>3</sup> /-raś/ “capital”, *veri-kan* /-kam/ “government”, *veri-farāi* /-farāt/ “owner”. One more function is to be found in the use of *-veri* as a suffixal element in the formation of adjectives, e.g. M. *lobu-veri* “dear”, *buddi-veri* “wise” etc. (cf. 2.4.4.2). The etymological derivation of *veri* is not without problems, all the more since there seems to be no direct equivalent in Sinhalese. TURNER (1985, 14, no. 2218a) derives Dhiv. “*veri* ‘leader, possessor’” from \**uparika-* “upper”, which seems to be reasonable from the phonological and semantical point of view. Another possibility should at least be mentioned, however. In the earliest written documents of Dhivehi we find the forms *lokapāla-varun* “ministers” (L1 t/2,1), *upāsaka-varun* “laymen” (L3 15/2,1) and *kadi-varun* “cadi-people” (L3 12/2,4 etc.). The suffix *-varun*, which occurs nowhere else in Dhivehi, obviously finds a parallel in the Sinhalese plural suffix *-varu*, obl. *-varun* which, besides the pure plural function, also has a honorific meaning; it expresses respect as in *ammā-varu* “mothers”. For this suffix cf. GEIGER (1938, 103): “There can be no doubt that *-varu* is pl. of

<sup>275</sup> For the use of feminine forms with *-ak* in modern Sinhalese cf. JAYAWARDENA-MOSER (1993), 21 and MATZEL (1983), 22 and 78; cf. also fn. 269 above.

<sup>276</sup> HLSD (1988, 36) mentions the indefinite forms *verie*<sup>3</sup> and *veriaku*, both translated as “person”.

<sup>277</sup> Further examples are given in 2.3.2.7.4.1.2, 2.3.2.8.2.2.1, 2.3.2.8.2.5 and 2.3.2.9.2.1.

st(em) *vara* ..., and that this *vara* corresponds to Pk., P(al)i, Sk. *vara* which is so frequently used at the end of a compound." A relation between Dhiv. *veri* and O/MIA *vara*- "(the) best"<sup>278</sup> cannot be completely denied; in this case, however, *veri* would have to be traced back to an extended form *\*vara/ika-*, because otherwise the umlaut would remain unexplained. All in all, the derivation proposed by TURNER seems to be more probable.

2.3.2.5. According to HLSD (1988), 39, Modern Dhivehi uses the reduplication of nominal stems for the formation of plurals at least "to a limited extent". This statement cannot be confirmed by linguistic facts, however. The examples listed in HLSD which will be quoted below in the original transcription as given there, were not accepted as correct Dhivehi forms by any one of the informants<sup>279</sup> that were asked: "ruh ruh – trees, bas bas – buses, ... goLi – square, goLi goLi jeh [sic]<sup>280</sup> gamiis 'the shirt with squares'; rogu – stripes, lines, rogu rogu demi munDa 'the sarong with lines'". Nevertheless, some of these examples coincide with a few examples appearing in a small Maldivian school grammar (DBG, 16), viz. *bas-bas* "busses", *kan-kan* /kam-kam/ "facts", *avaś-avaś* "villages", *got-got* (*got* "manner"), *ru<sup>2</sup>-ru<sup>2</sup>* /ruk-ruk/ "coconut trees" and *raś-raś* "islands". The latter formation is attested for Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku in the form [rad-raśo] /raś-raś/ (F. *raśo* "island, land"); its meaning is approximately "from island to island". Without doubt, the given examples do not represent plural formations in the literal sense but distributional forms. Such forms are also known from the older written documents where they do not occur frequently either, however. In the following example from the *Gan-* or *Filā-Fatkoḷu* (F3,6), both the governing noun and a participle depending on it appear in a reduplicated form: *fahun vī-vī ras-ras-kalun* has to be translated as "each one of the kings who followed afterwards" ≈ "all the kings, whosoever, who followed" (*fahun* "after"; *vī* "having become", part.pret. of *vanī* "to become"; *ras* "king", *kal-un* pl. of the def.nom. *kalā* "sir, noble, aristocrat")<sup>281</sup>. The same document shows one more distributional form enlarged by *kalun*, namely *bei-bei-kalun* (F3,6-7), approximately meaning "high-ranking people, gentlemen" (lit. "sir-sir-noblemen"). Two further distributional plural formations are *kaukalun* /kal-kal-un/ (RA 1,9: dat. *kaukalunaś*) "all the sirs, gentlemen" and *ras-ras-beikalun-āi*<sup>282</sup> (RC 8,11) "all the royal gentlemen". Another distributional form seems to be represented in *atoḷ-atoḷu* "atoll by atoll" (F5,39).

In this connection cf. also GEIGER (1919, 64): "Sometimes, in the formation of the plural, the substantive is doubled: *faffalō-ta<sup>3</sup>* 'fruits' (from *fal-falō*); *mis-mīhun* 'human beings'." It should be noted, however, that in both these cases the reduplicated nouns are enlarged by means of the typical plural suffixes *-ta<sup>3</sup>* and *-un*. A "frozen" distributional form can also be found in the plural formation of the adverbial interrogative pronoun A. *kontantāki* /kon-tan-tan-ak-i/, F. *kon-tan-tan-ek-i* "where?", "at which places" (*tan* "place"; cf. 2.6.7.2.1). The pl. M. *ecceti*, A.F. *etteti* /eti-eti/ "things" (sg. *eti*) represents a distributional formation as well; it is used for the plural formation of pronouns (cf., e.g., 1.3.9.2.1 and 2.6.7.1.3).

<sup>278</sup> Cf. also TURNER (1966), II, 659, no. 11308.

<sup>279</sup> For the names of the main informants cf. the preface of this grammar.

<sup>280</sup> *jeh* obviously represents a misprint; the correct form would be *jehi* "beaten", part.pret. of *jahanī* "to beat" (probably in the sense of "lined, draped with stripes").

<sup>281</sup> For more extensive information on this word cf. 2.6.2.4.3.1.

<sup>282</sup> For details about *bei-* cf. 2.6.2.4.4.

2.3.2.6. Words denoting “boats” or “ships” have a special position within the nominal morphology of Dhivehi. Thus, in the dialect of Addū, all the nouns in question are invariable concerning the categories of number, definiteness and indefiniteness; in normal usage, all these grammatical concepts are expressed only by means of the nominal stem (cf. 2.3.2.7.3.2). In contrast to that, in northern Dhivehi the indefinite form and, to a limited extent, also the normal plural in *-ta* can be formed from the corresponding nouns. Furthermore, there exists a special plural formation in the standard language which is confined exclusively to nouns belonging to the semantic field of “ships”, viz. the suffixation of the element *-faharu* (cf. 2.3.2.9.2.4). It is hardly astonishing, though, that the words denoting ships show notable particularities in their formal development, given that all things that are connected with navigation play a special role in Maldivian life; in particular, the presence of ships is a guarantee of survival.

The following examples, which are meant to illustrate the categories treated above, will be given separately for each of the dialects in question. In order to show the historical morphological changes in a more explicit way, the sequence in the description of the dialects will be Addū – Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku – Māle.

### 2.3.2.7. Addū

2.3.2.7.1. In the following paragraphs, the words which serve as examples for the formation of definite and indefinite forms are specified according to their stem classes. As described above, both the definite and the indefinite forms are derived from the pure nominal stem which in all cases given below has a plural meaning.

2.3.2.7.1.1. Consonant stems: *bo*<sup>3</sup> /*bok*/ “frogs”, *bok-ā* “the frog”, *bok-a*<sup>3</sup> /*bok-ak*/ “a frog”; *fo*<sup>3</sup> /*fot*/ “books”, *fot-ā* “the book”; *fot-a*<sup>3</sup> “a book”; *hau* /*haul*/ “cocks”, *haul-ā* “the cock”, *haul-a*<sup>3</sup> “a cock”; *makunu* “bugs”, *makun-ā* “the bug”, *makun-a*<sup>3</sup> “a bug”; *mīdeu* /*mīdel*/ “mice, rats”, *mīdel-ā* “the mouse”, *mīdel-a*<sup>3</sup> “a mouse”; *mas* “fish” (pl.), “fish (as a generic term or food)”, *mah-ā* “the fish”, *mah-a*<sup>3</sup> “a fish”; *mau* /*mal*/ “flowers”, *mal-ā* “the flower”, *mal-a*<sup>3</sup> “a flower”; *raḷa* “waves”, *raḷ-ā* “the wave”, *raḷ-a*<sup>3</sup> “a wave”; *naṇa* “fishing lines”, *naṇ-ā* “the fishing line”, *naṇ-a*<sup>3</sup> “a fishing line”. For the declension of the consonant stems cf. 2.3.2.11.1.

2.3.2.7.1.2. As to *i*-stems, some particular morphonological developments within the paradigm resulted in the existence of different subgroups in modern Addū. All these groups represent different stages of a process which, however, in the dialect of Addū has not been accomplished even in a single case, but which in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku consequently affected the whole paradigm of many nouns. The differences between the particular groups depend on the fact whether the stem-final *-i* which precedes the suffixes marking case forms, definiteness and indefiniteness remains unchanged within the paradigm and, furthermore, whether the root of the noun remains unchanged as well. If the stem-marking *-i* gets lost, the structure of the nominal root changes; then, in most cases, the root vowel is lengthened and falls under stress.

There are a few exceptions which do not show a lengthening of the root vowel but a gemination of the consonant preceding the stem-final sound. Cp. the nominal stem (with singular meaning) *kudi* “child” the *-i* of which is preserved in its plural formation: nom.pl. *kudin*, gen.pl. *kudinge* etc. In the indefinite form *kūda*<sup>283</sup> /*kūdak*/ “a child”, the stem vowel *-i* gets lost, the root vowel *u* being compensatorily lengthened to *ū*. In contrast to that, the definite form \**kudi-ā*, despite the expected loss of the root vowel, did not develop into *ḱūdā* but into *kuddā*. In this connection, cf. also the *i*-stems which show a paradigmatic interchange of *-h-* and *-ss-* in the primary genitive and dative forms as described in 2.3.2.7.1.2.2.<sup>283</sup>

Depending on whether any forms of the paradigm lose the stem-marking *-i*, and how many of them do so, the nouns in question can be divided into different groups. While in Fua<sup>2</sup> Mulaku there are many examples showing this effect throughout the paradigm, the corresponding *i*-stems in Aḍḍū present only individual stages of this complex development, which sometimes cannot be clearly separated from each other.

2.3.2.7.1.2.1. The following nouns derive the definite and indefinite forms without a change of the root or the stem-final sound; but all of them show a lengthening of the root vowel in the primary genitive and dative (for the complete declension paradigm cf. 2.3.2.11.3.2): *tari* “stars”, *tarie* “the star”, *tarie*<sup>2</sup> /*tari-ek*/ “a star”; *boli* “shells”, *bolie* “the shell”, *bolie*<sup>2</sup> “a shell”; *maḍi* “beetles”, *maḍie* “the beetle”, *maḍie*<sup>2</sup> “a beetle”; *teḷi* “beans”, *teḷie* “the bean”, *teḷie*<sup>2</sup> “a bean”; *issaṣi* “hair (pl.)”, *issaṣie* “the hair”, *issaṣie*<sup>2</sup> “a hair”; *mēlaṃfati* “butterflies”, *mēlaṃfatie* “the butterfly”, *mēlaṃfatie*<sup>2</sup> “a butterfly”; *mudi* “rings; jewels, jewellery”, *mudie* “the ring”, *mudie*<sup>2</sup> “a ring”; *toṣi* “peels, bark (of fruits, vegetables, trees)”, *toṣie* “the peel”, *toṣie*<sup>2</sup> “a (piece of) peel”; *keṛaṇḍuru fufi* “beehives”, *keṛaṇḍuru fufie* “the beehive”, *keṛaṇḍuru fufie*<sup>2</sup> “a beehive”; etc.

2.3.2.7.1.2.2. A special group within the *i*-stems is characterised by a paradigmatic interchange of *-h-* and *-ss-* in the position before the final *-i* of the nominative form (cf. 1.3.9.5). The nouns in question belong to the same type of declension as the examples mentioned in 2.3.2.7.1.2.1, but they do not show a secondary lengthening of the vowel preceding the geminate *-ss-* in the primary genitive and dative (for the complete paradigm cf. 2.3.2.11.3.3). In some cases the definite nom.sg. ends in *-ā* and the indefinite nom.sg. in *-a*<sup>2</sup>. Cp., e.g., *mehi* “flies”, *messā* (besides secondary *mēhā*) “the fly” and *messa*<sup>2</sup> (besides secondary *mēha*<sup>2</sup>) “a fly”; *fiēhi* “knives (for food)”; *fiēssā* “the knife”, *fiēssa*<sup>2</sup> “a knife”. Concerning the category of number, some words of this group are defective. In the case of *kiēhi* “saw(s)” and *suhi* “empty coconut(s)”, the primary nominative expresses both numbers; a definite form for the morphological expression of the singular is missing, while the indefinite form exists: *kiēssa*<sup>2</sup> “a saw”, *sussa*<sup>2</sup> “an empty coconut”. The nominative *lāhi* “1/4 kg” has only a singular meaning, contrasting with the indefinite form *lassa*<sup>2</sup>. Three words which belong to this declension type show the paradigmatic interchange of *-ss-* and *-h-* only in parts of their paradigms, in that they preserve the final sound of the nominative both in the definite and the indefinite form: cp. nom.(pl.) *ihī* “(spiny) lobsters” with nom.sg.def. *ihie*, nom.sg.indef. *ihie*<sup>2</sup> but gen.pl. *isse*, dat.pl. *issa*<sup>2</sup> /*issaṣ*/; nom. (pl. and sg.) *fehurehi* “whale shark(s)” with gen.sg.def. *fehurehie*, nom.sg.indef. *fehurehie*<sup>2</sup> but gen.pl. *fehuresse*, dat.pl. *fehuressa*<sup>2</sup>; in the

<sup>283</sup> For the parallels occurring in Fua<sup>2</sup> Mulaku cf. 2.3.2.8.1.4.3, for Māle parallels cf. 2.3.2.9.1.3.2.

same way nom. (pl. and sg.) *māvahi* “large wave in the open sea” has gen.sg.def. *māvahiei* and nom.sg.indef. *māvahie*<sup>o</sup> but gen.pl. *māvasse*, dat.pl. *māvassa*<sup>o</sup>.

Considering the interchange of *-h-* and *-ss-*, the words *divehi* “Maldivian, islander” and *raṭṭehi* “friend, compatriot” have to be classed in this group as well, as the indefinite forms *divessa*<sup>o</sup> and *raṭṭessa*<sup>o</sup> suggest. Within their case formation, however, there are no traces of the morphological interchange, both nouns showing the peculiar features of words denoting persons (cf. 2.3.2.11.4.1).

2.3.2.7.1.2.3. In the case of some *i*-stems which also belong to the declension type mentioned in 2.3.2.7.1.2.1, the lengthening of the root vowel in the primary dative and genitive co-occurs with a lengthening in the definite and/or indefinite forms; cp., e.g., nom.pl. *feṣi* “boxes”, gen.pl. *fēṣe*, dat.pl. *fēṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*fēṣaśi*/, nom.sg.def. *fēṣā*, nom.sg.indef. *fēṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*fēṣak*/; nom.pl. *foli* “(flat) bread, pancake (as a generic term); loaves of bread”, gen.pl. *fōle*, dat.pl. *fōla*<sup>o</sup> /*fōlaśi*/, nom.sg.def. *fōlā*, nom.sg.indef. *fōla*<sup>o</sup> /*fōlak*/; nom.pl. *añḍun huli* “ulcers of the lower eyelid”, gen.pl. *a<sup>o</sup> hūle*, dat.pl. *a<sup>o</sup> hūla*<sup>o</sup>, nom.sg.def. *a<sup>o</sup> hūlā*, nom.sg.indef. *a<sup>o</sup> hūla*<sup>o</sup>.

2.3.2.7.1.2.4. In many examples the stemform serves as a nominative of both plural and singular, while a definite form is missing; cp., e.g., nom.sg./pl. *baṣi* “eggplant(s), brinjal(s)”, gen. *bāṣe*, dat. *bāṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*bāṣaśi*/, nom.sg.indef. *bāṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*bāṣak*/; nom.sg./pl. *taṣi* “dish(es), plate(s), glass(es)”, gen. *tāṣe*, dat. *tāṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*tāṣaśi*/, nom.sg.indef. *tāṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*tāṣak*/; nom.sg./pl. *fiṣi* “little island(s)”, gen. *fīṣe*, dat. *fīṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*fīṣaśi*/, nom.sg.indef. *fīṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*fīṣak*/; nom.sg./pl. *vaṣi* “basket(s), bin(s)”, gen. *vāṣe*, dat. *vāṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*vāṣaśi*/, nom.sg.indef. *vāṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*vāṣak*/; nom.sg./pl. *geñḍi* “chair(s)”, gen. *geñḍe*, dat. *geñḍa*<sup>o</sup> /*geñḍaśi*/, nom.sg.indef. *geñḍa*<sup>o</sup> /*geñḍak*/; etc.

2.3.2.7.1.2.5. In some isolated cases, the lengthening of the root occurs only in the indefinite form and in the primary genitive and dative, but not in the definite form; cf. nom.pl. *kaṣi* “(fish)bones, thorns”, gen.pl. *kāṣe*, dat.pl. *kāṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*kāṣaśi*/, nom.sg.indef. *kāṣa*<sup>o</sup> /*kāṣak*/, but nom.sg.def. *kaṣie*. A reverse example is the nom.sg./pl. *fali* “oar”, with a lengthening of the root vowel in the definite nom.sg. *fālā* but not in the indefinite nom.sg. *falie*<sup>o</sup> /*falie-ek*/). This word obviously represents a transitional morphological stage, as can be seen not only from the difference in the formal realisation of the definite and indefinite form but also from the existence of a definite singular form alongside a pure nominal stem with the meaning of a singular. The next example has a transitional character as well: of the nom.pl. *gaḍi* “hours (as a unit of time and date), watches, clocks”, we find both the more archaic definite nom.sg. *gaḍie* and a secondary form *gāḍā* (and gen.pl. *gāḍe*, dat.pl. *gāḍa*<sup>o</sup> /*gāḍaśi*/).

2.3.2.7.2. As mentioned above (2.3.2.7.1.2.4), there are many nouns in Aḍḍū the stem of which has the double function of denoting both a (generic) plural and a singular. In most of these cases, which are spread about all declension classes, the form of the definite nominative singular is obsolete while the indefinite nominative singular exists. Some of the substantives in question have only a primary declension paradigm (cf. 2.3.2.1 above) with both plural and singular meaning, while others have developed separate paradigms for plural and singular, although their nominative is ambivalent considering number. Thus, e.g., the nominal stems *fehurehi* “whale shark” and *māvahi* “large wave in the open sea” represent the forms of a nom.pl. and a nom.sg. at the same time, but nevertheless they show particular declension

paradigms for the two numbers each. In contrast to that, there are some nouns which use the whole primary paradigm for both singular and plural; cp., e.g., *gē* “house”, *ra*<sup>3</sup>/*ras*<sup>3</sup> “island, land”, *fīṣi* “little island”, *geṇḍi* “chair”, *vaḷi* “knife” etc.

2.3.2.7.3. Besides the isolated nouns with a defective paradigm as discussed above, there exist several semantical groups in Aḍḍū which are characterised by the absence of one or more of the morphological categories in question.

2.3.2.7.3.1. Thus, in the case of most nouns denoting single or paired parts of the body, the complete primary declension paradigm expresses both numbers; an indefinite nom.sg. can be derived, but there is no definite form. Cf. nom.sg./pl. *lō* /*lol*/ “eye(s)”, nom.sg.indef. *lola*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg./pl. *a*<sup>3</sup> /*at*/ “hand(s), arm(s)”, nom.sg.indef. *ata*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg./pl. *faitela* “feet, foot”, nom.sg.indef. *faitela*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg./pl. *bō* /*bol*/ “head(s)”, nom.sg.indef. *bola*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg./pl. *nēfa*<sup>3</sup> /*nēfat*/ “nose(s)”, nom.sg.indef. *nēfata*<sup>2</sup> etc.

Two nouns denoting parts of the body do not fit into this scheme, viz. nom.sg./pl. *da*<sup>3</sup> /*dat*/ “teeth, tooth” and *iṅgili* “fingers, toes” which has only plural meaning. From these stems we find both indefinite (*data*<sup>2</sup> and *iṅgila*<sup>2</sup>) and definite forms (nom.sg. *datā*, *iṅgilā*). Most probably, the existence of a definite singular form of these stems is based on the fact that both nouns designate parts of the body which are not single or paired but represent something like a set; hence, the terms in question can be understood as *pluralia tantum*.

2.3.2.7.3.2. Special attention must be drawn to the fact that in Aḍḍū, all words denoting “boats” or “ships” are completely indifferent towards the categories of number, definiteness and indefiniteness from a formal point of view. Thus, the basic forms of the *i*-stems *dōṇi*, *vedi*, *batteli* and *bokkorā* (traditional types of Maldivian boats and ships) serve as a nominative of both singular and plural; besides that, they are also used when a definite or indefinite singular form would be required, the actual grammatical meaning depending on the context. On the other hand, the nominative *bokkorā* (M. *bokkurā*) most probably reflects a “frozen” definite form (if it is not a loanword ending in a long vowel); this supposition is not only founded on the existence of the long-vocalic ending *-ā*, but also on the case forms: assuming an original consonant stem *\*bokkorV*, the case formations could be analysed as gen. *bokkor-ā-i*, dat. *bokkor-ā-i* ← /*bokkor-ā-aś*/, abl. *bokkor-ā-in*. All other words denoting boats have a primary paradigm which expresses both numbers, without any markings of definiteness or indefiniteness; cp., e.g., gen. *dōṇ-e*, dat. *dōṇ-a*<sup>3</sup> /*-aś*/, abl. *dōṇ-in*).

2.3.2.7.3.3. It is not surprising that nouns denoting substances of any kind are not differentiated as to the categories of number, definiteness and indefiniteness. All the substantives in question have only a primary declension paradigm. Cp., e.g., *fen* “water”, *ba*<sup>3</sup> /*bat*/ “cooked rice”, *teu* /*tel*/ “oil”, *fani* “treacle”, *fena* “foam, surf”, *vāre* “rain”, *bin* /*bim*/ “earth, land, ground”, *dara* “firewood”, *dun* /*dum*/ “smoke”.

At least for some of the words which belong to this group, there is a way of expressing some kind of “singularisation”. This is provided by special nouns with a basic meaning of “a little, a bit, a piece (of)” which can be combined with the oblique case of terms harmonising with them from the semantical point of view. This results in the expression of the “smallest

possible unit” of the substance in question on the basis of words denoting a “counting unit”. In combination with words denoting liquids, it is mainly *foda*<sup>3</sup> /*fodak*/, def. *fodā* “a / the drop”, and *tika*<sup>3</sup> /*tikak*/, def. *tikā* “a / the tiny drop” (smaller than *foda*<sup>3</sup>) which are used in this way. Cp., e.g., *fen* “water”, *fen foda*<sup>3</sup> “a drop of water”, *fen tika*<sup>3</sup> “a (tiny) drop of water”. In the same way, *eśā*<sup>3</sup> /*eśak*/, def. *eśā* “a / the seed, kernel (of nut)” is added to nouns denoting a mass consisting of kernels etc. such as rice, cereals, or nuts; cf. *badan* “peanuts” with its definite singular *badan eśā* “the peanut” and its indefinite singular *badan eśā*<sup>3</sup>, “a (single) peanut”. The indefinite singular form *-gañḍa*<sup>3</sup> /*gañḍak*/, originally an independent word meaning “thing, piece”, does not have this status any more but has been reduced to a suffix expressing the “singularisation” of nouns denoting solid substances; cp., e.g., *pān* “bread” with *pāngañḍa*<sup>3</sup> “a (loaf of) bread, a piece of bread”.

#### 2.3.2.7.4. Secondary plural formation in Aḍḍū

As described in 2.3.2.1.2, in the dialect of Aḍḍū the plural formation on the basis of suffixes is confined to a few groups of animate substantives which can easily be defined from the semantical point of view. The suffix variants *-in/-un*, which are added to the pure stem, occur only with nouns designating persons, i.e. kinship terms and terms of social relationship and occupation. Within this framework, *-in/-un* are used in a wider range than the suffix *-men* which occurs only with kinship terms denoting close relatives. Besides this, however, *-men* is also used in the formation of a secondary, semantically restricted plural of nouns designating animals in Aḍḍū. While the pure stem expresses the general plural meaning in these cases, the plural forms with *-men* have the connotation of “a certain amount of animals, the number of which can be estimated within one moment”. As a rule, *-men* can only be added to the form of the definite nominative singular.

2.3.2.7.4.1. Among the most frequent examples of the plural formation with *-in/-un*, we find nom.sg. *mīhā* “(the) man, human being”, nom.pl. *mīhun*; nom.sg. *kuddā* “(the) child”, nom.pl. *kudin*; nom.sg. *anhenā* “(the) woman”, nom.pl. *anhenun*. In all these cases the nom.sg. represents “frozen” definite forms, the original stem forms *mīs-* and *kudī-* being obsolete. The oblique stem *anhen* is still in use, but only in the function of an attributive quasi-adjective meaning “female” (e.g. *anhen geri* “cows”). Some nouns can be singularised by means of the definite nom.sg. *mīhā* “man” being added to their obliquous: cp., e.g., *firi mīhā* “husband”, nom.pl. *firin*; *vaḍi mīhā* “carpenter”, nom.pl. *vaḍin*; *anhen mīhā* “woman” (besides *anhenā*, cf. above), nom.pl. *anhenun*. Some nouns use the pure stem as a nom.sg. form; cp., e.g., nom.sg. *dari* “child”, nom.pl. *darin*; nom.sg. *lian* “brother-in-law”, nom.pl. *lianun*; nom.sg. *añbi* “wife”, nom.pl. *añbin*; nom.sg. *divehi* “Maldivian”, nom.pl. *divehin*; nom.sg. *raṭṭehi* “friend”, nom.pl. *raṭṭehin*. At least three nouns which form the plural with the ending *-un* have become obsolete nowadays; these are nom.sg. *mituru* “friend” (Skt. *mītrá-*; cp. also the “frozen” definite form *miturā*), nom.pl. *miturun*; nom.sg. *haturu* “enemy” (Ved. *śátru-*), nom.pl. *haturun*; nom.sg. *eduru* “teacher” (Ved. *ācāryā-*), nom.pl. *edurun*. One more word belonging to this group is the title “king, sultan”, nom.sg. *rasgefānu*, which has the two suppletive plural forms *radun* and *raskalun*.

2.3.2.7.4.1.1. Within kinship terminology, there is a remarkable group of words denoting subgroups within the family. These special terms occur only in the plural formed with the

suffix *-in*. Cp., e.g., *de bofa-in* “father and son”, lit. “two (together with the) father” (*de* “two”; *bofa* ← *bafa* “father”, now used in the def. form *bafā* only); *tin bofa-in* “father and two sons”, lit. “three together with the father” (*tin* “three”); *ma-in bafa-in* “parents” (lit. “mothers [and] fathers”); *kau bofa-in* “forefathers, ancestors from the paternal side” (*kau* represents /*kal*/ “sir” with a regular change of final *-l* into *-u*, cf. 2.6.2.4.3.1); *muni-kāfa-in* “ancestors from the paternal side”, consisting of *muni* (obviously an obsolete stem; in this connection cp. the def. form *munnā* “grandmother from the paternal side” which must be traced back to *\*munyā* ← *\*muni-ā*) and *kāfa* “grandfather from the paternal side” (today only used in its definite form, *kāfā*); *muni-māfa-in* “ancestors from the maternal side” (the stem *māfa-* “grandfather from the maternal side” is obsolete as well; only the definite form *māfā* is still in use).

2.3.2.7.4.1.2. As mentioned above (cf. 2.3.2.4.1, 2.3.2.4.2), there is a stem *-veri* (nom.sg.def. A. *-veriā*, nom.sg.indef. *-verie*<sup>2</sup>, nom.pl. *-verin*) which denotes professional or official positions when appearing as the second part of nominal compounds. In Aḍḍū, the compounds in question are very often used only in their definite form when a singular is meant; cp., e.g., nom.sg. *rahmatteriā* ← *rahmat-veri-ā* “friend” (*rahmat* ← Arab. *raḥmat* “compassion, mercy”) vs. nom.pl. *rahmatterin*; *bēs-veriā* “medical doctor” (*bēs* “medicine”); *mas-veriā* “fisherman” (*mas* “fish”); *atele-veriā* “atoll-chief” (*atele* “atoll”); *duā-veriā* “man leading the prayer; preacher” (*duā* ← Arab. *du‘ā* “prayer”); *kaṃburu-veriā* “blacksmith” (M. *kaṃburu* “id.”); *fēran-veriā* “weaver”; *tede-veriā* “honest man” (substantivisation of the adjective *tede(veri)* “honest”). In one case *-veri* is used for the formation of a kinship term. This is *faha-veri* “sister-in-law” which represents the nom.sg. form as a pure stem while the gen.sg. *fahaveriā-ge* is derived from a definite form no longer occurring as a nominative as such.

In combination with cardinal numbers, *-verin* is used for the formation of collective numerals; cp. A. *de-verin* “two people; a group of two people”, *tin-verin* “three people; a group of three people”, *hatara-verin* “four people; a group of four people”, etc. (cf. also 2.5.3.1). Beyond that, *-verin* also appears in the plural formation of the pronoun *eā*, *e* “he/she/it; that”, serving as a substantivisation formant; cf. nom.pl. *e-verie* and obl.pl. *e-verin* “they; those” (cf. 2.6.2.5.5).

#### 2.3.2.7.4.2. Examples of plurals with *-men*:

As mentioned above (cf. 2.3.2.1.2), in the dialect of Aḍḍū the plural suffix *-men* is found with two semantically defined groups of nouns only, both of them having a closely delimited character.

2.3.2.7.4.2.1. Like the suffix *-in/-un*, *-men* is used for the plural formation of particular nouns denoting kinship relations and, furthermore, some isolated nouns referring to other members of the social community. Obviously, there are no cases of overlapping in the use of the two suffixes in Aḍḍū, except for the very special compound terms which denote particular units within the family (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1.1). In all these cases, *-men* is suffixed to the form of the definite singular. Cf. *bappā* / *bafā* / *appā* “father” with pl. *bappāmen* / *bafāmen* / *appāmen*; *mammā* / *ammā* “mother” with pl. *mammāmen* / *ammāmen*; *māfā* “grandfather from the maternal side” with pl. *māfāmen*; *māmā* “grandmother from the maternal side” with pl. *māmāmen*; *kāfā* “grandfather from the paternal side” with pl. *kāfāmen*; *munnā* “grandmother from the paternal side”, pl. *munnāmen*; *dattā* “elder sister; older women”, pl. *dattāmen*; *bēbē*

“elder brother” (probably ← def.nom.sg. \**bēbe-ā*), pl. *bēbēmen*; *kokkō* “younger brother / sister; younger man (m./f.)” (probably ← def.nom.sg. \**kokko-ā*), pl. *kokkōmen*.

2.3.2.7.4.2.2. On the other hand, *-men* can be used in Aḏḏū in the formation of a secondary plural of nouns denoting animals, but only under special circumstances: either the number to be denoted is small enough so that it can be estimated at a glance, or it is a selected part or a sector of a herd, swarm, or shoal which is referred to. In all other cases the pure nominal stem is used as plural form. With names of animals as well, *-men* is suffixed to the definite nominative singular so that the plural it constitutes will best be called “definite” too.<sup>284</sup> Cp., e.g., *bo*<sup>3</sup> /*bok*/ “frogs” vs. *bokā-men* “the(se) frogs (all) together”; “a certain amount of frogs” (nom.sg.def. *bokā*); *beḷeu* /*belel*/ “cats” vs. *beḷelā-men* “the cats” (nom.sg.def. *beḷelā*); *boṅḏa* “lizards” vs. *boṅḏā-men* “the lizards” (nom.sg.def. *boṅḏā*); *mas* “fish” (pl.) vs. *mahā-men* “the fish” (nom.sg.def. *mahā*); *mīdeu* /*mīdel*/ “rats, mice” vs. *mīdelā-men* “the rats or mice” (nom.sg.def. *mīdelā*); *boli* “shells” vs. *bolie-men* “the shells” (nom.sg.def. *bolie*); *ihi* “lobsters” vs. *ihiē-men* “the lobsters” (nom.sg.def. *ihiē*) etc.

### 2.3.2.8. Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku

In comparison with Aḏḏū, the formation of number, definiteness and indefiniteness in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku shows many simplifications. Thus, e.g., the formation of a definite singular is not productive at all in this dialect. This agrees with the fact that the pure nominal stem, except for some special cases, can no longer be regarded as a plural form in the modern language (cf. 2.3.2.2).

2.3.2.8.1. The formation of the **indefinite form** still follows the same principle as in Aḏḏū (cf. 2.3.2.1), but nowadays in many cases the distribution of the suffixes *-a*<sup>3</sup> /*-ak*/ and *-e*<sup>3</sup> /*-ek*/ does not depend on phonological rules (any longer) in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. The suffix *-e*<sup>3</sup>, which was confined to the *i*-stems originally, more and more has taken the place of the suffix *-a*<sup>3</sup>. Probably this development is due to an increasing influence of the standard language where the suffix *-a*<sup>3</sup> has been lost completely.<sup>285</sup> In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, however, this suffix variant still occurs in some isolated word forms like *eśa*<sup>3</sup> “a kernel, seed” (nom.sg. *eśe*), *foda*<sup>3</sup> (besides *fode*<sup>3</sup>) “a drop” (nom.sg. *fodo*), *liṃboya*<sup>3</sup> “a lime” (nom.sg. *liṃboi*), *tela*<sup>3</sup> “a shoal, shallow (place in the sea)” (nom.sg. *tela*), *lika*<sup>3</sup> “a manner, kind” (stem /*lik*/), *mitura*<sup>3</sup> “a friend” (obsolete; nom.sg. *mituru*). When preceding the conjunction *-ā* (← *-āi*) “with”, the suffix *-a*<sup>3</sup> has preserved its productivity even without exception. When *-ā* is added to the indefinite form of a noun, the original final *-k* of the suffix is regularly geminated; cp., e.g., *haul-akk-ā* “with a cock” vs. the indef.nom.sg. *haul-e*<sup>3</sup>; *mīdel-akk-ā* “with a rat” vs. the indef.nom.sg. *mīdal-e*<sup>3</sup> / *mīdel-e*<sup>3</sup> etc.

2.3.2.8.1.1. In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the indefinite form of **consonant stems** is in most cases derived with the suffix *-e*<sup>3</sup> (about *-a*<sup>3</sup> cf. above) which follows the stem-final consonant, the secondary

<sup>284</sup> For the formation of the definite singular cf. 2.3.2.1; for further examples cf. 2.3.2.7.1.

<sup>285</sup> For the suffix *-aku* of the modern standard language cf. 2.3.2.3.1.

short vowels in the ending of the nom.sg.<sup>286</sup> being eliminated. For the declension of the consonant stems in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku cf. the paradigms given in 2.3.2.12.5.1.

2.3.2.8.1.1.1. For consonant stems without enlarging vowels in the nom.sg. cp., e.g., *faivān* “shoe, sandal” → *faivāne*<sup>2</sup>; *fā*<sup>3</sup> /*fat*/ “leaf” → *fate*<sup>2</sup>; *ihal* “blossom of the coconut tree” → *ihale*<sup>2</sup>; *hī*<sup>3</sup> /*hit*/ “heart” → *hite*<sup>2</sup>; *kan* /*kam*/ “fact; verb” → *kame*<sup>2</sup>; *kañdul* “mangrove” → *kañdule*<sup>2</sup>; *kēl* “banana tree” → *kēle*<sup>2</sup>. The original *s*-stems, today ending in *-hV* in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku (cf. 1.3.5.), also belong to this group; cf. *aha* (← *as*) “horse” → *ahe*<sup>2</sup>; *maha* (← *mas*) “fish” → *mahe*<sup>2</sup>; *behe* (← *bes*) “medicine” → *behe*<sup>2</sup>; *ehe* (← *es*) “jewel” → *ehe*<sup>2</sup>; *gehe* (← *ges*) “tree” → *gehe*<sup>2</sup>.

2.3.2.8.1.1.2. For consonant stems that are enlarged with final *-u* in the nom.sg. cp., e.g.,<sup>287</sup> *bāzu* “eagle, falcon” → *bāze*<sup>2</sup>; *beḷalu* “cat” → *beḷale*<sup>2</sup>; *fauru* “wall” → *fauze*<sup>2</sup>; *heñdunu* “morning” → *heñdune*<sup>2</sup>; *īu* “tile” → *īe*<sup>2</sup>; *jaṃbu* “rose apple” → *jaṃbe*<sup>2</sup>; *kaduru* “date (palm)” → *kadure*<sup>2</sup>; *kahuṃbu* “tortoise” → *kahuṃbe*<sup>2</sup>; *karuṇu* “tear” → *karuṇe*<sup>2</sup>; *mīdalu* “mouse, rat” → *mīdale*<sup>2</sup>; *mūṇu* “face” → *mūṇe*<sup>2</sup> etc.

2.3.2.8.1.1.3. For consonant stems that are enlarged with final *-o* in the nom.sg. cp., e.g.,<sup>288</sup> *aḍo* “noise, sound, voice” → *aḍe*<sup>2</sup>; *aharo* “year” → *ahare*<sup>2</sup>; *baḷo* “dog” → *baḷe*<sup>2</sup>; *doro* “door” → *dore*<sup>2</sup>; *gañḍo* “vessel, jar” → *gañḍe*<sup>2</sup>; *hañḍo* “moon” → *hañḍe*<sup>2</sup>; *himāro* “donkey” → *himāre*<sup>2</sup>; *hiāḷo* “fox, jackal” → *hiāḷe*<sup>2</sup>; *karo* “neck, throat” → *kare*<sup>2</sup>; *košāro* “store-house” → *košāre*<sup>2</sup>; *massaro* “month” → *massare*<sup>2</sup>; *nāno* “fishing line” → *nāne*<sup>2</sup>; *nāro* “vein, nerve, blood-vessel” → *nāre*<sup>2</sup>; *oṇo* “bamboo” → *oṇe*<sup>2</sup>; *raśo* “island, land” → *raśe*<sup>2</sup> etc.

2.3.2.8.1.1.4. Consonant stems that are enlarged by *-e* are very rare.<sup>289</sup> As the quantity of the final vowel is not affected by the suffixation of *-e*<sup>2</sup>, we may assume that the original final *-e* of the nom.sg. gets lost in these cases, the suffix *-e*<sup>2</sup> which characterises the definite form being added directly to the stem-final consonant. Cp., e.g., *bere* “drum” → *bere*<sup>2</sup>; *eñde* “bed” → *eñde*<sup>2</sup>; *mēre* “shark” → *mēre*<sup>2</sup>.

2.3.2.8.1.2. In *a*-stems, the stem vowel preceding the suffix *-e*<sup>2</sup> is preserved, the resulting hiatus being tolerated; cp., e.g., F. nom.sg. (but A. pl., cf. above) *kaśa* “spike, thorn” → F. *kaśa-e*<sup>2</sup> (vs. A. *kaśā*<sup>2</sup>); F. nom.sg. (A. pl.) *maḍa* “harpoon” → F. *maḍa-e*<sup>2</sup> (vs. A. *maḍā*<sup>2</sup>). Other examples are F. *attela* “palm” → *attela-e*<sup>2</sup>; *faitela* “foot” → *faitela-e*<sup>2</sup>; *buma* “eye-brow” → *buma-e*<sup>2</sup>; *dida* “flag” → *dida-e*<sup>2</sup>; *esfia* “eye-lash” → *esfia-e*<sup>2</sup>; *fāga* “bitter gourd” → *fāga-e*<sup>2</sup>; *ifa* “branch → twig” → *ifa-e*<sup>2</sup>; *ila* “fibre of the coconut” → *ila-e*<sup>2</sup>; *nera* “grey hair” → *nera-e*<sup>2</sup>; *ohibada* “vertebra” → *ohibada-e*<sup>2</sup>. For the declension of the *a*-stems in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku cf. the table given in 2.3.2.12.5.3.

<sup>286</sup> For the enlargement of consonant stems by means of short vowels cf. 2.3.1.3.

<sup>287</sup> For the corresponding forms of the other dialects cf. 2.3.1.3.4.1, 3.4.2, 2. and 3.

<sup>288</sup> For the corresponding forms of the other dialects cf. 2.3.1.3.4.1, 1.

<sup>289</sup> Cf. also 2.3.1.3.4.1, 4. and 5.

2.3.2.8.1.3. In the case of nom.sg. forms ending in a long vowel, this vowel is preserved in the indefinite form, independently of the etymology of the words in question (cf. also 2.3.1.4). Cp. the following examples which most probably represent “frozen” definite forms in their basic shape (cf. also 2.3.1.4): *kokkō* “younger brother / sister” → *kokkō-e*<sup>2</sup>; *boñḍā* “lizard” → *boñḍā-e*<sup>2</sup>; *kīhā* “saw” → *kīhā-e*<sup>2</sup> etc.

In *boñḍā* and *kīhā*, *-ā* is preserved throughout the paradigm (gen. *boñḍāi*, *kīhāi*; dat. *boñḍāsa*, *kīhāsa*; abl. *boñḍāen*, *kīhāen*) which thus corresponds exactly with the productive declension pattern of the definite singular in Addū (cf. 2.3.2.11.1.1). F. *kīhā* represents the “frozen” definite form of the nominative *kīs* of the standard language which must have developed directly from \**kiyes* ← \**kiyas* (through an intermediate form like Pa. *kakaca-* ← Skt. *krakaca-* “saw”; cf. 1.7.3). The corresponding nom.pl. and sg. A. *kiēhi* ← \**kiyesī*<sup>290</sup> obviously shows an analogical influence of the *i*-stem A. *fiēhi* “knife” (M. *fiōhi*; cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.2).

2.3.2.8.1.4. According to the formation of the indefinite forms, the *i*-stems can be divided into two main groups in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku, the classification being based on morphological criteria: either the indefinite suffix is added to the complete stem or it is added to a shortened variant of it which lacks the final *-i*. In the latter case the formation of the indefinite form co-occurs with a lengthening of the root vowel which normally effects the whole paradigm in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku, while the same morphological process has been realised only gradually in Aḍḍū (cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2). Depending on whether the nouns in question pertain to one of the two main paradigm types or whether they represent intermediate stages, different morphological subtypes are constituted which, from a synchronic point of view, exhibit a very complicated system (for the particular declension types cf. 2.3.2.12.5.2). The only way to clarify the system of the *i*-stems in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku consists in a diachronic comparison which must take into account all main dialects of Dhivehi. But even if the historical development is clear, it is not possible to predict the correct indefinite form of an actual *i*-stem without a doubt. Thus, the following description of the main types is meant to yield a general synchronic view of the existing forms rather than to give standardised rules for deriving the correct indefinite form of every *i*-stem.

2.3.2.8.1.4.1. In the most stable type of the *i*-stems, the indefinite nom.sg. is formed without any changes of the root: when *-e*<sup>2</sup> is suffixed, the stem vowel *-i* is preserved. Cp., e.g., F. *alamāri* “cupboard” → indef. *alamārie*<sup>2</sup>; *alanāsi* “pineapple” → indef. *alanāsie*<sup>2</sup>; *bakāri* “goat” → indef. *bakārie*<sup>2</sup>; *bolī* “shell” → indef. *bolie*<sup>2</sup>; *gaḍi* “hour, watch, clock” → indef. *gaḍie*<sup>2</sup>; *koḷi* “cloud” → indef. *koḷie*<sup>2</sup>; *maḍi* “beetle” → indef. *maḍie*<sup>2</sup>; *tari* “star” → indef. *tārie*<sup>2</sup> etc. While in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku the root vowel of all disyllabic nouns belonging to this group remains unchanged throughout the paradigm, the corresponding Aḍḍū words show a secondary lengthening of the root vowel (cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.1).

2.3.2.8.1.4.2. In another group of nouns, the lengthening of the root vowel affects all forms of the paradigm, the stem-final *-i* having disappeared; hence, the indefinite suffix is added directly to the final consonant of the root in these cases. Cp., e.g., nom.sg. *bāṣi* “brinjal” (gen. *bāṣe*, dat. *bāṣaha*, abl. *bāṣen*) → indef.nom.sg. *bāṣe*<sup>2</sup>; *tēli* “bean” → indef. *tēle*<sup>2</sup>; *dāri* “child” → indef. *dāre*<sup>2</sup>; *esnāli* “inflammation of the upper eye-lid” → indef. *esnāle*<sup>2</sup>; *fāli* “oar”

<sup>290</sup> Cp. A. nom.sg.indef. *kiessa*<sup>2</sup>, gen. *kiesse*, dat. *kiessa*<sup>2</sup>, abl. *kiehin*.

→ indef. *fāle*<sup>2</sup>; *fāni* “worm” → indef. *fāṇe*<sup>2</sup>; *fēsi* “box” → indef. *fēse*<sup>2</sup>; *fīsi* “little island” → indef. *fīse*<sup>2</sup>; *kāsi* “bone, thorn” → indef. *kāse*<sup>2</sup>; *mūdi* “ring, jewellery” → indef. *mūde*<sup>2</sup>; *tāsi* “dish, plate, glass” → indef. *tāse*<sup>2</sup> etc. The dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku is the only vernacular of Dhivehi which has systematised this morphonological process; a similar trend can be observed in Aḍḍū, but only in an initial stage (cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.4 and 2.3.2.7.1.2.5).

2.3.2.8.1.4.3. Even in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku there are a few isolated examples, however, in which the lengthening of the root vowel affects but parts of the paradigm. This is true for two *i*-stems at least. One of them is the word meaning “child” with the nom.sg. *kuddā*, obviously a “frozen” definite form of the original stem *kudi* which is obsolete in modern Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku (for the corresponding form in Aḍḍū cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2, 2.3.2.7.4.1). In this word, a lengthened root vowel is found only in the indefinite form *kūde*<sup>2</sup> and in the plural (nom.pl. *kūḍun*, gen.pl. *kūḍunge*, dat.pl. *kūḍunna*<sup>2</sup>, abl.pl. *kūḍun aten*), while in the singular forms the short vowel preceding the geminate *-dd-* remains unchanged (cf. gen.sg. *kuddāge*, dat.sg. *kuddāsa*, abl.sg. *kuddā aten*). It is true that in inherited Maldivian words there are generally no long vowels preceding a geminated consonant so that the vocalism of the singular paradigm cannot serve as a definitive argument; nevertheless, this word can be taken as an indication of the fact that the indefinite form was the starting point of the lengthening of the root vowel, for *kūde*<sup>2</sup> must have been derived directly from the original stem *kudi* before this one became obsolete. The other example which has to be mentioned in this connection is the word meaning “wife” with the nom.sg. *aṃbu* and the indef. form *aṃbe*<sup>2</sup>. As a former *i*-stem, this word shows a lengthened root vowel throughout the plural as well (nom.pl. *aṃbun*, gen.pl. *aṃbunge*, dat.pl. *aṃbunna*<sup>2</sup>, abl.pl. *aṃbun aten*). The original singular paradigm does not exist any longer, however, all singular forms being extended with *mīhā* “man” (gen.sg. *aṃbu mīhāge* etc.; the same development can be observed in Aḍḍū, cf. the gen.sg. *aṃbi mīhāge*). The supposition that the lengthening of the root vowel must have originated in the indefinite form is further supported by the corresponding words in Aḍḍū where the lengthening of the vowel has remained restricted to the indefinite forms *kūda*<sup>2</sup> and *aṃba*<sup>2</sup> (cp. the nom.sg. A. *kudi*, *aṃbi* and the nom.pl. A. *kudin*, *aṃbin*).

2.3.2.8.1.4.4. The *i*-stems with a paradigmatic change of *-h-* and *-ss-*, which constitute a considerable subgroup in Aḍḍū (cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.2), are restricted to a few examples in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. Here, some of the words in question have been affected by analogical adaptations. Cp., e.g., *īhi* “lobster” and *mēhi* “fly”, the whole paradigm of which shows the intervocalic *-h-* in combination with a lengthened root vowel; the indefinite forms are *īhe*<sup>2</sup> “a lobster” and *mēhe*<sup>2</sup> “a fly”. These examples must be classified as belonging to the type described in 2.3.2.8.1.4.2.

Even in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, however, there are some words that have preserved the old phonological change of *-h-* and *-ss-*; cp., e.g., *raṭṭehi* “friend” → indef. *raṭṭesse*<sup>2</sup>; *divehi* “Maldivian” → indef. *diveesse*<sup>2</sup>; *fiohi* “knife” → indef. *fiosse*<sup>2</sup>; *mulehi* “abscess” → indef. *mulesse*<sup>2</sup>. Possibly, the decisive factor to be seen here is the number of syllables of the word in question, which seems to determine whether the older phonological stage is still preserved or the paradigm has been simplified by the morphonological changes mentioned above. It is a striking fact indeed that all words that have conserved the change of *-h-* and *-ss-* are obviously trisyllabic, while those having generalised the intervocalic *-h-* are disyllabic in their basic structure.

### 2.3.2.8.2. Plural formation in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku

2.3.2.8.2.1. The use of the pure nominal stem as an ordinary plural form, which is very likely to have been common to the whole Dhivehi speaking area in former times and which is still typical for the dialect of Aḍḍū, has become obsolete in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku in favour of secondary formations. Nowadays, there are only a few stem forms that can still be used as plurals; cp., e.g., sg. *beḷal(u)* “cat”, pl. *beḷal* and sg. *mīdal(u)* “mouse, rat”, pl. *mīdal*. The nouns in question have secondary plural formations as well, however (cf. 2.3.2.8.2.3.2 and 2.3.2.8.2.4). For the special declension of these words cf. 2.3.2.12.5.5.

2.3.2.8.2.2. In principle, the plural suffixes *-un* and *-in* are used in the same way as in Aḍḍū (cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2, 2.3.2.7.4.1), but the phonological distribution of the two suffix variants has lost its productivity in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku (cf. 2.3.2.2.2). The suffix *-in*, which originally was confined exclusively to the *i*-stems, is almost obsolete now; the only example that has conserved *-in* is the plural *firin* of *firi* “husband”. All the other nouns belonging to the group in question use *-un* for the plural formation, independently of their stem class. Cp., e.g., *mihā* “man” → pl. *mīhun*; *kuddā* “child” → pl. *kūḍun*; *dāri* “child” → pl. *dārun*; *aṃbu* “wife” → pl. *aṃḅun*; *mituru* “friend” (obs.) → pl. *miturun*; *raṭṭehi* “friend, compatriot” → pl. *raṭṭessun*; *divehi* “Maldivian” → pl. *divessun*; *vaḍi* “carpenter” → pl. *vaḍiun* (sic); etc.

As in Aḍḍū (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1), the word meaning “king” shows a suppletive plural formation in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku as well; cf. F. nom.sg. *radun* “king”, nom.pl. *raskalun*. Originally *radun* was a plural form itself, probably used in the sense of a *pluralis maiestatis*.

In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, there are some terms designating special units within the family or among the ancestors. These words occur only as *pluralia tantum*; cf. *maun* “mother and child”, *maun bafaun* “parents” and *kābafaun* “ancestors” (for the formation cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1.1).

2.3.2.8.2.2.1. The stem *-veri* and its “frozen” definite form *-veriā* are used in the same way and occur with the same nouns as in Aḍḍū (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1.2; for the derivation of the word cf. 2.3.2.4.1, 2.3.2.4.2). In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, however, the nom.pl. has the form *-vērūn*. Cp., e.g., *ateḷeveri* “atoll-chief” → nom.pl. *ateḷevērūn*; *fahaveri* “sister-in-law” → pl. *fahavērūn*; *masveriā* “fisherman” → pl. *masvērūn*; *rahumatterīā* (← *rahumat-veri-ā*, cf. ib.) “friend” → pl. *rahumattērūn*; etc.

2.3.2.8.2.2.2. As in Aḍḍū (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1.2), *-verin* is used in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku as a suffix to build an animate plural of cardinal numbers which serves as a kind of collective numeral (cf. also 2.5.3.1); cp., e.g., *aṣoverin* “eight people” (F. *aṣo* “eight”), *fahqverin* “five people” (*fahq* “five”). The use of the older form *-verin* instead of the more recent variant *-vērūn* underlines the archaic character of these formations.

2.3.2.8.2.3. Considering the morphological role of the plural suffix *-men*, there are no differences between Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku and Aḍḍū. In both dialects, it is added exclusively to the definite singular in *-ā*, which as a rule is obsolete in modern Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, occurring only in “frozen” forms (cf. 2.3.2.2.2 and 2.3.2.7.4.2). As to the semantical connotation of the suffix, both dialects agree in most points.

2.3.2.8.2.3.1. A noteworthy difference consists in the fact that there are a few overlaps of the suffixes *-men* and *-un* in the plural formation of kinship terms in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, a feature which has not been observed in Addū. Cp., e.g., F. nom.sg. *fahaveri* “sister-in-law” with the regular nom.pl. *fahavērun* opposing itself to the plural form *fahaveri-ā-men*, which, although being semantically identical, is derived from the old definite nom.sg.

2.3.2.8.2.3.2. Another divergence relating to Addū is a semantical one. While in Addū the suffix *-men* has the restricted meaning of “a certain amount (of animals)”, it serves as a neutral plural formant without any secondary meaning in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. Cp., e.g., *bo*<sup>3</sup> /*bok*/ “frog” → pl. *bokāmen* “(many) frogs”; *bakari* “goat” → pl. *bakariāmen* “(many) goats”; *belalu* “cat” → pl. *belalāmen* “(many) cats”; *fehuressei* “whale shark” → pl. *fehuressey(y)ā-men* “(many) whale sharks”; *īhi* “lobster” → pl. *īhāmen* “(many) lobsters”; *kakiḍi* “crab” → pl. *kakiḍāmen* “(many) crabs”; *mēhi* “fly” → pl. *mēhāmen* “(many) flies”; *mīdal(u)* “mouse, rat” → pl. *mīdalāmen*; *vaul* “flying fox” → pl. *vaulāmen*; *rehi* “sprot” → pl. *rehiāmen*; *baḷo* “dog” → pl. *baḷāmen*; etc.

2.3.2.8.2.3.3. From the morphological point of view, nouns forming their plural by means of the suffix *-men* can be divided into two groups in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. In the first group, the nom.sg. is identical with the pure stem; this is true, e.g., for *bāzu* “eagle, falcon”, *bo*<sup>3</sup> /*bok*/ “frog”, *bakari* “goat”. In the formation of the plural, the ending *-ā* of the obsolete definite singular reappears in these cases; cf. *bāz-ā-men*, *bok-ā-men*, *bakari-ā-men*. In the second group, it is the stem form itself which is obsolete. In these words the “frozen” definite form generally functions as an unmarked nom.sg.; cp., e.g., *bappā* “father” → pl. *bappā-men*; *kāfā* “grandfather from the paternal side” → pl. *kāfā-men*; *boṅḍā* “lizard” → pl. *boṅḍā-men* (the original nominatives *bappa*, *kāfa* and *boṅḍa* no longer exist in modern Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku). With all probability, the two kinship terms *kokko* “younger brother / sister” and *bēbe* “elder brother” with their plural forms *kokkōmen* and *bēbēmen* belong to this group as well (cp. A. *kokkō* ← def.nom.sg. \**kokko-ā*, *bēbē* ← def.nom.sg. \**bēbe-ā*; cf. also 2.3.2.7.4.2.1). As a rule, words pertaining to this group cannot have a plural in *-un* (cf. 2.3.2.8.2.2 above) or *-te*<sup>3</sup> (cf. 2.3.2.8.2.4 below) because these suffixes are added immediately to the stem, but never to the definite form.

2.3.2.8.2.4. The plural formation by means of the semantically neutral suffix *-te*<sup>3</sup> /*-tek*<sup>3</sup> (291) is very common in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. The suffix is added to the nom.sg. of animate as well as inanimate nouns; in particular cases it can also be added to nouns denoting persons (cf. 2.3.2.8.2.2.1, 2.3.2.8.2.5 below).

In many cases, *-te*<sup>3</sup> can be used instead of *-men*, e.g. with most nouns denoting animals (cf. 2.3.2.8.2.3.2 above). Cp. the plural forms *botte*<sup>3</sup> /*bok-tek*/ “frogs”, *bakari-te*<sup>3</sup> “goats”, *belal-te*<sup>3</sup> “cats”, *fehuressei-te*<sup>3</sup> “whale sharks”, *īhi-te*<sup>3</sup> “lobsters”, *kakiḍi-te*<sup>3</sup> “crabs”, *kahuṃbu-te*<sup>3</sup> “tortoises”, *mēhi-te*<sup>3</sup> “flies”, *baḷo-te*<sup>3</sup> “dogs”, *rehi-te*<sup>3</sup> “sprats”, *vaul-te*<sup>3</sup> “flying foxes” etc.

In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the suffix *-te*<sup>3</sup> is also used for the plural formation of words denoting parts of the body, while in Addū the plural meaning of these nouns is expressed by the pure

<sup>291</sup> For the etymological background of this suffix cf. 2.3.2.2.2.

nominal stem (cf. 2.3.2.7.3.1). Cp., e.g., F. *a* /at/ “hand, arm” → pl. *at-te*<sup>2</sup>; *faitela* “foot” → pl. *faitela-te*<sup>2</sup>; *hi* /hit/ “heart” → pl. *hit-te*<sup>2</sup>; *iṅgili* “finger, toe” → *iṅgili-te*<sup>2</sup>; *kakul* “knee” → pl. *kakul-te*<sup>2</sup>; *kāsi* “bone” → pl. *kāsi-te*<sup>2</sup>; *lol* “eye” → pl. *lō-te*<sup>2</sup>; *issaṣi* “hair” → pl. *issaṣi-te*<sup>2</sup>; *fia* “wing” → *fia-te*<sup>2</sup> etc.

The following examples represent different semantical spheres of inanimate nouns and botanical expressions: *fa* /fat/ “leaf” → pl. *fat-te*<sup>2</sup>; *gehe* /ges/ “tree” → pl. *ges-te*<sup>2</sup>; *ihal* “blossom of the coconut tree” → pl. *ihal-te*<sup>2</sup>; *kaiṣi* “coconut” → pl. *kaiṣi-te*<sup>2</sup>; *kēl* “banana tree” → pl. *kēl-te*<sup>2</sup>; *kaduru* “date (palm)” → pl. *kaduru-te*<sup>2</sup>; *karā* “water melon” → pl. *karā-te*<sup>2</sup>; *jaṃbu* “rose-apple” → pl. *jaṃbu-te*<sup>2</sup>; *bere* “drum” → pl. *bere-te*<sup>2</sup>; *faro* “reef” → pl. *faro-te*<sup>2</sup>; *heṇe* “thunderbolt” → pl. *heṇe-te*<sup>2</sup>; *iṅḍōli* “Maldivian wing” → pl. *iṅḍōli-te*<sup>2</sup>; *jōli* “Maldivian chair” → pl. *jōli-te*<sup>2</sup>; *kan* /kam/ (indef.sg. *kame*<sup>2</sup>) “fact, verb” → pl. *kan-te*<sup>2</sup>; *kan* /kan/ (indef.sg. *kane*<sup>2</sup>) “corner” → pl. *kan-te*<sup>2</sup> etc.

2.3.2.8.2.5. As mentioned above (2.3.2.8.2.4), there are many nouns in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, in particular words denoting animals, whose plural can be built with both suffixes in question without a difference of meaning; this is true, e.g., for *bakariāmen* / *bakarite*<sup>2</sup> “goats” (← *bakari*) and *vaulāmen* / *vaulte*<sup>2</sup> “flying foxes” (← *vaul*) (for further examples cf. 2.3.2.8.2.3.2 and 2.3.2.8.2.4). One more noun showing a twofold plural formation is the kinship term *kāfā* “grandfather from the paternal side”; besides the original plural *kāfāmen* (cf. 2.3.2.8.2.3.3) we find also *kāfāte*<sup>2</sup>. In a few cases there are even three plural formations existing side by side without any semantical differences. Cp. nom.sg. *beḷal(u)* “cat” with its plural forms *beḷal* (pure nominal stem), *beḷal-ā-men* and *beḷal-te*<sup>2</sup> “cats”, or *fahaveri* “sister-in-law” with its plural formations *fahavēr-un*, *fahaveri-ā-men* and *fahaveri-te*<sup>2</sup>. Although both the latter form and *kāfāte*<sup>2</sup> “grandfathers” obviously represent exceptions, the use of *-te*<sup>2</sup> in connection with the two kinship terms shows that *-te*<sup>2</sup> is becoming more and more productive in its function as a plural suffix. Probably this development is due to the increasing influence of the standard language. This is suggested by *edurunte*<sup>2</sup>, the only plural form of *eduru* “teacher” attested in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, which is now obsolete throughout the Dhivehi speaking area, and which seems to have been remodelled after M. *edurunta*<sup>2</sup> vs. A. *edurun*. In contrast to Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku where formations with this type of double marking are treated as normal plural forms, their counterparts still have a special meaning in the standard language (cf. 2.3.2.9.2.3).

### 2.3.2.9. Māle

In northern Dhivehi, the nominal stem is used as a normal singular form from which the indefinite singular and plural are derived by help of the particular suffixes (cf. 2.3.2.3). As in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the occurrence of the definite form is confined to “frozen”, “relic” formations consisting, as a rule, of a definite singular characterised by a final *-ā*,<sup>292</sup> the words in ques-

<sup>292</sup> Not every final *-ā* of a nom.sg. goes back to an older definite form, however. In many cases, a final *-ā* developed from short *a* preceding an original word-final *-l* which got regularly lost in this position. Cp., e.g., M. *mā* “flower” (stem *mal-*; def.sg. A. *malā*), M. *gā* “stone, rock” (stem *gal-*; def.sg. A. *galā*); M. *hā* “cock” (stem *hāl-*; def.sg. A. *haulā*); M. *mīdā* “mouse, rat” (stem *mīdal-*; def.sg. A. *mīdelā*); M. *buḷā* “cat” (stem *buḷal-*; def.sg. A. *beḷelā*). There are also many loanwords ending in a long *-ā*; cp., e.g., *mēvā* “fruits” (Class. Mod.Pers. *mīva* “fruits”; cf. STEINGASS 1929, 1365), *bagīcā* “garden” (Class.Mod.Pers. *bāgīca*, cf. STEINGASS

tion have been lexicalised in the modern standard language where they are used as normal nominative singular forms.

Cp., e.g., M. *mihā* “man” (obsolete stem *mīs*); *kujjā* “child” (← \**kudyā* ← *kudi-ā*,<sup>293</sup> obsolete stem *kudī*); *mākanā* “crane” (obsolete stem *mākana*); *-veriā* (stem *-veri*, cf. 2.3.2.4.1) occurring as the second part of compounds like *masveriā* “fisherman” or *atoluveriā* “atoll-chief”. In the case of *anhenā* “woman” and *firihenā* “man”, the definite suffix can be regarded as a marker of substantivisation, the underlying stems *anhen* “female” and *firihen* “male” being treated as adjectives. Without doubt, the honorific personal pronouns *bēkalā* (2nd level, 2./3.ps.sg.) and *bēfulā* (3rd level, 2./3.ps.sg.)<sup>294</sup> represent definite forms as well. It remains uncertain, however, whether the vocational form *darifulā* “Child!” can be traced back to a “frozen” definite form as well (stem *darifulu* ← *dari* “child” + *-fulu* honorific suffix, designating inalienable objects; cf. 2.2.3.).

From the grammatical point of view, the pure stem represents the unmarked singular form in the standard language, while the indefinite form, as in the southern dialects, must be regarded as marked. In certain contexts, however, when there is no special need for a morphological expression of number, the nominal stem can also have a vague plural meaning. Such isolated cases can be understood as relics of the system we still observe in modern Addū (cf. 2.3.2.1); this must, therefore, be considered as more archaic. But these exceptional forms do not contradict the general rule that in the modern standard language suffixation is the only productive method of plural formation.

2.3.2.9.1. In the modern standard language, the **indefinite form**, as the counterpart of the unmarked noun stem which is treated as a definite form, is derived by means of the suffix *-e*<sup>3</sup> /-ek/ which is added to the pure nominal stem; the rules applied do not differ from those of southern Dhivehi (cf. 2.3.2.7.1 ff. and 2.3.2.8.1 ff.). As against this, the formation of the indefinite form of the *i*-stems does not cause the complicated special developments we have observed in the southern dialects, in particular in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku (cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2 and 2.3.2.8.1.4). For the suffix *-aku* “some, any” which in Māle occurs only in the inherited oblique form, cf. 2.3.2.3.1.

2.3.2.9.1.1. For the formation of indefinite forms of consonant stems (some of them enlarged by a short vowel, cf. 2.3.1.3) cp., e.g., nom.sg. *fodu* “drop” → indef.sg. *fod-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *jōḍu* “cup; pair” → indef.sg. *jōḍ-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *magu* “street, road” → indef.sg. *mag-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *bāzu* “eagle, falcon” → indef.sg. *bāz-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *mēzu* “table” → indef.sg. *mēz-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *rālu* “wave” → indef.sg. *rāl-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *mas* “fish” → indef.sg. *mah-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *mihā* “man” (obsolete stem *mīs*) → indef.sg. *mih-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *bulā* “cat” → indef.sg. *bulal-e*<sup>3</sup> (stem *bulal*); nom.sg. *mīdā* “mouse, rat” → indef.sg. *mīdal-e*<sup>3</sup> (stem *mīdal-*); nom.sg. *rū* “wrinkle” → indef.sg. *rul-e*<sup>3</sup> (stem *rul-*); nom.sg. *ru*<sup>3</sup> /ruk/ “coconut tree” → indef.sg. *ruk-e*<sup>3</sup>; nom.sg. *donkeo* “banana” → indef.sg. *donkel-e*<sup>3</sup> (stem *donkel-*) etc.

1929, 148), *bamiā* “ocra, lady’s fingers” (Mod.Pers. *bāmiya*, cf. STEINGASS 1929, 152; Arab. *bāmiā/bāmiat*, cf. WEHR 1958, 35), *haftā* “week” (Class.Mod.Pers. *hafta*, cf. STEINGASS 1929, 1504). In the modern language, we have to consider the etymology or the forms of the non-nominative cases to be able to decide whether a given word represents a “frozen” definite nominative or whether the final *-ā* must be explained otherwise.

<sup>293</sup> Cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2, 2.3.2.8.1.4.3 and further 1.3.9.3.

<sup>294</sup> For details cf. 2.6.2.4.4 f.

2.3.2.9.1.2. For indefinite forms of *a*-stems cp., e.g., nom.sg. *vāhaka* “story” → indef.sg. *vāhaka-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *maskiba* “one side of a fish” → indef.sg. *maskiba-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *mamma* ⟨*manma*⟩ “mother” → indef.sg. *mamma-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *bappa* “father” → indef.sg. *bappa-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *furēta* “demon” → indef.sg. *furēta-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *sūra* “picture” (← Arab. *ṣūra*‘) → indef.sg. *sūra-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *tila* “shallow(s), shoal” → indef.sg. *tila-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *aṅga* “mouth” → indef.sg. *aṅga-e*<sup>2</sup>; etc.

2.3.2.9.1.3. For *i*-stems cp., e.g., nom.sg. *bakari* “goat” → indef.sg. *bakari-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *tari* “star” → indef.sg. *tari-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *vaḷi* “knife” → indef.sg. *vaḷi-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *koṭari* “room” → indef.sg. *koṭari-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *taṣi* “dish, plate” → indef.sg. *taṣi-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *boli* “shell” → indef.sg. *boli-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *kaṣi* “bone” → indef.sg. *kaṣi-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *foṣi* “box” → indef.sg. *foṣi-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *fuṣi* “little island” → indef.sg. *fuṣi-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *toḷi* “bean” → indef.sg. *toḷi-e*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *dari* “child” → indef.sg. *dari-e*<sup>2</sup> etc.

2.3.2.9.1.3.1. From a synchronical point of view, the formation of the indefinite form seems to be irregular in a small group of *i*-stems; but an interdialectal historical comparison reveals the phonological background of the apparent irregularities. Cp., e.g., M. nom.sg. *divehi* “Maldivian, islander” → indef.sg. *divesse*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *gevehi* “house-wife” → indef.sg. *gevesse*<sup>2</sup>; nom.sg. *lāhi* “1/4 kilogram” (traditional unit of measure) → indef.sg. *lāsse*<sup>2</sup> etc. As was shown above, the paradigmatic change of *-h-* and *-ss-* which in these *i*-stems occurs in all dialects, is the result of a regular phonological process (cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.2, 2.3.2.8.1.4.4 and 1.3.5).

2.3.2.9.1.3.2. In some *i*-stems, the addition of the indefinite suffix results in affrication and gemination of the consonant preceding the stem vowel. This, too, is a regular phonological development. Cf. M. nom.sg. *dōni* “boat, ship” → indef.sg. *dōññe*<sup>2</sup> (← *\*dōnye*<sup>2</sup> ← *\*dōñi-ek*); nom.sg. *dūni* “bird” → indef.sg. *dūññe*<sup>2</sup> (← *\*dūnye*<sup>2</sup> ← *\*dūñi-ek*); nom.sg. *kujjā* “child” (“frozen” definite form of *\*kudi-ā*, stem *kudi*, cf. 2.3.2.9 above) → indef.sg. *kujje*<sup>2</sup> (← *\*kudye*<sup>2</sup> ← *\*kudi-ek*); nom.sg. *eti* “thing” → indef.sg. *ecce*<sup>2</sup> (← *\*etye*<sup>2</sup> ← *\*eti-ek*; the oldest attestation of this form is written *etyāk* [sic] in L5 5/2,6; cf. also 1.3.9.2.1.) — For the declension of the particular stem types cf. 2.3.2.13.1.

### 2.3.2.9.2. Plural formation in Māle

2.3.2.9.2.1. In northern Dhivehi, the plural suffix *-in/-un* is added to the same class of inherited animate nouns as in the southern dialects (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1 and 2.3.2.8.2.2 above). Cp., e.g., M. nom.sg. *mīhā* “man” → pl. *mīhun*; nom.sg. *kujjā* ⟨*ku’jā*⟩ “child” → pl. *kudin*; nom.sg. *dari* “child” → pl. *darin*; nom.sg. *aṃbi* ⟨*abi*⟩ “wife” → pl. *aṃbin*; nom.sg. *firi* “husband” → pl. *firin*; nom.pl. *main bafain* “parents” (plurale tantum); nom.sg. *masverīā* “fisherman” → pl. *masverin* (*mas* “fish”); nom.sg. *baiverīā* “partner” → pl. *baiverin* (*bai* “part, half”); nom.sg. *ahuluverīā* “inhabitant” → pl. *ahuluverin* (*ahulu* ← Arab. *ahl* “family”) etc.

In the modern colloquial language of Māle, the suffix *-in/-un*, originally confined to a small, semantically restricted group of nouns, has been extended in its use in that it now serves as the normal plural suffix of several foreign words denoting persons. Cp., e.g., *vēṭaru*

← Engl. *waiter* → pl. *vēṭarun*; *sekeṭṭrī* or *sekeṭṭarī* ← Engl. *secretary* → pl. *sekeṭṭrīn* / *sekeṭṭarīn*; *mehumānu* ← Pers., Urdu *mehmān* “guest” → pl. *mehumānun*; *šahīdu* ← Arab. (also Pers., Urdu) *šahīd* “martyr” → pl. *šahīdun* etc.

2.3.2.9.2.2. In Māle the plural suffix *-men* occurs only with a few kinship terms. Cp., e.g., *bappa* ⟨*baʔpa*⟩ “father” → pl. *bappamen*; *mamma* ⟨*manma*⟩ “mother” → pl. *mammamen*; *bēbe* “elder brother” → pl. *bēbemen*; *kokko* ⟨*koʔko*⟩ “younger brother / sister” → pl. *kokkomen*. As we can see from these examples, the rule of the southern dialects according to which *-men* can be combined only with the form of the definite nom.sg. is not applicable to the Māle standard language; here, the plural suffix is added to the nominal stem instead which is obsolete in southern Dhivehi but which has the function of a regular nom.sg. in the standard language. There are no indications whatsoever in the older documents that this suffix was ever used outside the sphere of kinship terminology and a few other nouns or pronouns denoting persons. Altogether, there are only two older attestations of the plural formation by means of *-men*, viz. in *kalemen* (F6,17, for *kalēmen*), originally meaning “sirs, ladies and gentlemen; high-ranking people” but nowadays used only as a pers.pron. of the 2.ps.pl. “you” (cf. 2.6.2.4.3.1), and in the pronominal adjective *emmen* /*ek-men*/ (L2 2,5 and 34,1) “all together” (cf. 2.6.7.4.1, 2.6.7.4.2). The use of the suffix with nouns denoting animals, which is common to the dialect of Addū and, even more so, to that of Fuaʔ Mulaku (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.2 and 2.3.2.8.2.3.2), seems to be unknown in North Dhivehi. Even though the suffix *-men* plays a less important role in the plural formation of the standard language, it is surprising that it has been completely ignored as a plural suffix in all treatises on Dhivehi so far.

2.3.2.9.2.3. The suffix *-taʔ* /*-tak*/ has become the most frequent plural formant of northern Dhivehi. It can be used with any animate and inanimate noun and, furthermore, be added to any nominal stem; thus we may regard it as the most neutral plural suffix. For the derivation of *-taʔ* which originated in an originally independent word meaning “so many / much”, cf. 2.3.2.2.2 and 2.3.2.3; cp. also the declension pattern given in 2.3.2.13.3. For the use of the suffix cp. the following examples which illustrate different semantical spheres and inflectional classes: nom.sg. *bakari* “goat” → pl. *bakaritaʔ*; nom.sg. *tari* “star” → pl. *taritaʔ*; nom.sg. *vali* “knife” → pl. *valitaʔ*; nom.sg. *koṭari* “room” → pl. *koṭaritaʔ*; nom.sg. *taṣi* “dish, plate” → pl. *taṣitaʔ*; nom.sg. *iṅgili* “finger, toe” → pl. *iṅgilitaʔ*; nom.sg. *fuṣi* “little island” → pl. *fuṣitaʔ*; nom.sg. *dumi* “bow” → pl. *dunitaʔ*; nom.sg. *beru* “drum” → pl. *berutaʔ*; nom.sg. *doru* “door” → pl. *dorutaʔ*; nom.sg. *magu* “street, road” → pl. *magutaʔ*; nom.sg. *hōnu* “gecko” → pl. *hōnutaʔ*; nom.sg. *bis* “egg” → pl. *bistaʔ*; nom.sg. *mas* “fish” → pl. *mastaʔ*; nom.sg. *gas* “tree” → pl. *gastaʔ*; nom.sg. *es* “precious stone” → pl. *estaʔ*; nom.sg. *fan* “leaf of the coconut tree” → pl. *fantaʔ*; nom.sg. *ruʔ* /*ruk*/ “coconut tree” → pl. *ruttaʔ* /*ruk-tak*/; nom.sg. *foi* /*foṭ*/ “book” → pl. *foitaʔ* /*foṭ-tak*/; nom.sg. *bileʔ* /*bilet*/ “betel (tree and leaf)” → pl. *bilettaʔ*; nom.sg. *raʔ* /*raṣ*/ “island, land” → pl. *raṭtaʔ* /*raṣ-tak*/ etc.

In a few cases, *-in/-un* and *-taʔ* occur side by side as a double suffix. Thus, the only correct plural form of the nom.sg. *eduru* “teacher” is *eduruntaʔ*. In the plural form *mīhuntaʔ*, however, a special meaning is still perceivable. In correspondence with the original meaning of the suffix *-taʔ*, *mīhuntaʔ* means “(so) many people / men” while the primary plural *mīhun* has to be translated simply by “people / men”.

2.3.2.9.2.4. As in Addū, the nouns denoting “boats” or “ships” go beyond the scope of the normal plural formation in Māle as well (cf. 2.3.2.7.3.2 and 2.3.2.6). While in Addū the nouns in question are defective concerning the formation of the definite and indefinite singular and of the plural form, a special formant *-faharu* is used for their plural formation in Māle.<sup>295</sup> Cp., e.g., nom.sg. *dōni* → pl. *dōni-faharu*; nom.sg. *oḍi* → pl. *oḍi-faharu*; nom.sg. *batteli* ⟨*baʔteli*⟩ → pl. *batteli-faharu*; nom.sg. *bokkurā* ⟨*boʔkurā*⟩ → pl. *bokkurā-faharu*; nom.sg. *bōṭu* → pl. *bōṭu-faharu*; nom.sg. *nā* → pl. *nā-faharu*.

Probably *-faharu* is connected with the homophone *faharu* “times” (cp., e.g., *de faharu* “two times”). In two later *fatkoḷus* the word in question is attested in the indefinite form of the dative. In the given contexts it can still be interpreted as meaning “single, one after another”,<sup>296</sup> cf. F13,12, where *faharu* has the same syntagmatic status as *dōni* and *oḍi*: ... *oḍi-ak-aṭ dōny-ak-aṭ pahar-ak-aṭ* ... “to an *oḍi*, a *dōni*, one after another” (*-ak* indef. suffix, *-aṭ* dat. ending); cf. also F11,37: *oḍyakan pahurakan* “to an *oḍi*, to a single one”.<sup>297</sup> Both syntactically and semantically, the given examples illustrate how *faharu* could develop into a plural suffix. BELL (1922-35, 79/1926, 267) already noted *oḍi-faharu* and *dōni-faharu* (sic) as plural forms in the modern sense.

Sometimes also *-taʔ* is used as a plural suffix of words denoting ships; this, however, seems to be true for deep-sea vessels only, cp. *dōni-taʔ* or *oḍi-taʔ*.

### 2.3.2.10. Declension types

An appropriate classification of the declension types of Dhivehi can only be given in direct connection with the stem classes, if the synchronical status as well as the most important diachronical developments are to be taken account of. As mentioned above, the nominal morphology of the Addū dialect is particularly conservative but also very transparent from the formal point of view; thus, the declension types of this vernacular are predestined to serve as a general parameter for the whole Dhivehi speaking area. Therefore, the declension tables of Addū will be given in the first place here.

In contrast to the personal pronouns which in the southernmost dialects still show the inherited morphological differentiation between the direct (nominative) and the oblique cases, the nouns are characterised by an almost complete coincidence of these case forms whose basic functional difference can be summarised by the following rule: If the predicate is a finite verb, the subject of the sentence will be in the nominative; but if the predicate is expressed by an infinite verb, the subject can only appear in the form of the oblique case (cf. also 2.1.1.). In the modern language, this difference can only be expressed by syntactical means. From a synchronical point of view, it is therefore necessary to differentiate an inherited (morphological) and a functional (syntactical) oblique case, the first being identical with the nominal stem and serving as a basic form from which all other cases except for the nominative are derived. The functional *casus obliquus*, on the other hand, can also occur as a “frozen” definite form. A purely formal differentiation between nominative and oblique cases of nouns being impossible, the latter will be neglected in the following tables.

<sup>295</sup> Cf. DBG, 16 where *-faharu* is noted as a plural formant for words denoting “ship, boat etc.”, too.

<sup>296</sup> Thus the basic meaning according to oral information by ḤASSAN SAʔID as of March, 7 1999.

<sup>297</sup> For the spelling of final *-ṭ* by ⟨*-n*⟩ cf. 3.6.3.2.3.

### 2.3.2.11. Aḏḏū

In the following paragraphs, only nouns with a complete paradigm of both the singular (definite / indefinite) and plural will serve as examples of the particular declension types.

2.3.2.11.1. On the basis of the ending of the primary (i.e. plural) genitive which represents the primary paradigm, the **consonant stems** can be subdivided into two main types. The nouns of type I and Ia have a gen.pl. ending in *-e*, while those of type Ib end in *-i*. The historical reasons for this divergency are still unknown; but from the synchronical data we can see that the ending in *-i* is confined to nouns showing *-a-* as the vowel of the last syllable of their stem.<sup>298</sup> The difference between type I and subtype Ia can be described as follows: in the case of type I the ending *-in* of the abl.sg. does not merge with the final *-ā* of the definite stem, while subtype Ia shows a contraction into *-ān*.

#### 2.3.2.11.1.1. A. type I: cons.-stem

<i>mīdel-</i> “mouse, rat”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>mīdelā</i>	<i>mīdeu /mīdel/</i>
gen.	<i>mīdelāi</i>	<i>mīdele</i>
dat.	<i>mīdelā<sup>2</sup> /mīdel-ā-aś/</i>	<i>mīdela<sup>2</sup> /mīdel-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>mīdelāin</i>	<i>mīdelun</i>

#### 2.3.2.11.1.2. A. type Ia: cons.-stem

<i>ges-</i> “tree”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>gehā /ges-ā/</i>	<i>ges</i>
gen.	<i>gehāi /ges-ā-i/</i>	<i>gehe /ges-e/</i>
dat.	<i>gehā<sup>2</sup> /ges-ā-aś/</i>	<i>geha<sup>2</sup> /ges-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>gehān /ges-ā-in/</i>	<i>gehun /ges-un/</i>

#### 2.3.2.11.1.3. A. type Ib: cons.-stem

<i>mas-</i> “fish”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>mahā /mas-ā/</i>	<i>mas</i>
gen.	<i>mahāi /mas-ā-i/</i>	<i>mahi /mas-i/</i>
dat.	<i>mahā<sup>2</sup> /mas-ā-aś/</i>	<i>maha<sup>2</sup> /mas-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>mahāin /mas-ā-in/</i>	<i>mahun /mas-un/</i>

<sup>298</sup> This rule seems not to be reversible without exceptions, however, because in Aḏḏū there are also a few examples of consonant stems with the vowel *-a-* in the last syllable of the stem and the genitive of the primary paradigm ending in *-e*: cp., e.g., nom.(sg.) *kañḏa* “ocean, open sea” → gen. *kañḏe*; nom.(pl.) *jaṃbu* “rose apple” → gen. *jaṃbe*; nom.(sg./pl.) *vada* “well” → gen. *vade*.

2.3.2.11.1.4. Consonant stems with a secondary final short vowel, are subject to the phonological rules as described in 2.3.2.11.1, independently from the quality of the secondary vowel occurring in the nom.sg. Cp. the following examples:

2.3.2.11.1.4.1. A. type I: cons.-stem

<i>jaṁburōz-</i> “star-apple”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>jaṁburōzā</i>	<i>jaṁburōzu</i>
gen.	<i>jaṁburōzāi</i>	<i>jaṁburōze</i>
dat.	<i>jaṁburōzāʻ</i>	<i>jaṁburōzaʻ</i>
abl.	<i>jaṁburōzāin</i>	<i>jaṁburōzun</i>

2.3.2.11.1.4.2. A. type Ib: cons.-stem

<i>mad-</i> “nut, kernel”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>madā</i>	<i>mada</i>
gen.	<i>madāi</i>	<i>maḍi</i>
dat.	<i>madāʻ</i>	<i>madaʻ</i>
abl.	<i>madāin</i>	<i>madun</i>

2.3.2.11.2. The characteristic feature of ***a*-stems** consists in the fact that the stem-final *-a* does not change throughout the case forms of the primary declension. The (secondary) singular paradigm of this type is based on a definite form in *-ā* as well.

2.3.2.11.2.1. A. type II: *a*-stem

<i>kuruba-</i> “young coconut”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>kurubā</i> /kurubā-ā/	<i>kuruba</i>
gen.	<i>kurubāi</i> /kurubā-ā-i/	<i>kurubai</i> /kuruba-i/
dat.	<i>kurubāʻ</i> /kurubā-ā-aś/	<i>kurubāʻ</i> /kuruba-aś/
abl.	<i>kurubāin</i> /kurubā-ā-in/	<i>kurubain</i> /kuruba-in/

2.3.2.11.3. Of ***i*-stems**, there are three variants. Type III, the morphologically basic type, consists of a few nouns only; it is characterised by a stable root vowel which does not change throughout the paradigm. In contrast to that, the nouns of type IIIa show a lengthening of the root vowel in the genitive and the dative of the primary (plural) paradigm, in conjunction with a loss of the stem vowel *-i*. IIIb is a subtype of IIIa; here the stem vowel *-i* is preceded by an original /s/ which is preserved as a geminate in the genitive and dative of the primary paradigm (mostly also in the def. and indef. nom.sg.); the root vowel preceding this geminate can never be lengthened. The other case forms show a regular interchange of intervocalic /s/ and /h/ according to the common sound laws.

2.3.2.11.3.1. A. type III: *i*-stem

<i>geri</i> “cattle”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>gerie</i> /geri-ā/	<i>geri</i>
gen.	<i>geriei</i> /geri-ā-i/	<i>gerie</i> /geri-e/
dat.	<i>geriea</i> <sup>3</sup> /geri-ā-aś/	<i>geria</i> <sup>3</sup> /geri-aś/
abl.	<i>geriein</i> /geri-ā-in/	<i>gerin</i> /geri-in/

2.3.2.11.3.2. A. type IIIa: *i*-stem

<i>tari</i> “star”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>tarie</i> /tari-ā/	<i>tari</i>
gen.	<i>tariei</i> /tari-ā-i/	<i>tāre</i> /tari-e/
dat.	<i>tariea</i> <sup>3</sup> /tari-ā-aś/	<i>tāra</i> <sup>3</sup> /tari-aś/
abl.	<i>tariein</i> /tari-ā-in/	<i>tarin</i> /tari-in/

2.3.2.11.3.3. A. type IIIb: *i*-stem

<i>mehi</i> “fly”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (primary paradigm)
nom.	<i>messā</i> /mesi-ā/; <i>mēhā</i> (secondary)	<i>mehi</i>
gen.	<i>mehiei</i> /mesi-ā-i/	<i>messe</i> /mesi-e/
dat.	<i>mehiea</i> <sup>3</sup> /mesi-ā-aś/	<i>messa</i> <sup>3</sup> /mesi-aś/
abl.	<i>mehiein</i> /mesi-ā-in/	<i>mehin</i> /mesi-in/

2.3.2.11.4. From a formal point of view, the stem class of the word in question is insignificant for the declension of nouns denoting persons. The declension pattern of type IV is distinguished from all the other paradigms by the appearance of a pronominal genitive ending *-ge* and by an analytic formation of the ablative which consists of the genitive form combined with *farātun* “by (means, help of), from the side of”, serving as a postposition here. Depending on their plural formation, the nouns in question can be further divided into subtypes IVa (suffix *-un/-in*) and IVb (suffix *-men*).

## 2.3.2.11.4.1. A. type IVa (denoting persons):

<i>mīs</i> “man”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (secondary) <i>-un/-in</i>
nom.	<i>mihā</i> /mīs-ā/	<i>mihun</i> /mīs-un/
gen.	<i>mihāge</i> /mīs-ā-ge/	<i>mihunge</i> /mīs-un-ge/
dat.	<i>mihā</i> <sup>3</sup> /mīs-ā-aś/	<i>mihunna</i> <sup>3</sup> /mīs-un-aś/
abl.	<i>mihāge farātun</i>	<i>mihunge farātun</i>

## 2.3.2.11.4.2. A. type IVb (denoting persons):

<i>kokko</i> - “younger brother/sister”	sg. (def. form)	pl. (secondary) <i>-men</i>
nom.	<i>kokkō</i> /kokko-ā/	<i>kokkōmen</i> /kokko-ā-men/
gen.	<i>kokkōge</i> /kokko-ā-ge/	<i>kokkōmenge</i> /kokko-ā-men-ge/
dat.	<i>kokkōa</i> <sup>299</sup> /kokko-ā-aš/	<i>kokkōmenna</i> <sup>299</sup> /kokko-ā-men-aš/
abl.	<i>kokkōge farātun</i>	<i>kokkōmenge farātun</i>

2.3.2.12. Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku

Regarding their basic structure, the declension types of the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku dialect correspond with those of Aḍḍū to a high extent. The particular declension classes occurring in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku cannot be outlined with the same transparency as in the neighbour dialect of Aḍḍū, however. This fact can be explained by interferences of different kinds; thus, on the one hand, we observe special developments in the field of phonetics, phonology and morphology in the different vernaculars of the eight original villages of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku which are merging more and more, and, on the other hand, there is an increasing influence of the standard language. Consequently, the tables given below cannot be more than a guideline for understanding the main types, the corresponding Aḍḍū paradigms serving as a general parameter. Without comparing the declension patterns of Aḍḍū which are still “intact” from a diachronic point of view, it would be hard to systematise and to describe the numerous irregularities of the case endings and the frequent morphonological changes of the nominal roots occurring in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku.

2.3.2.12.1. In the declension of **consonant stems**, the ending of the gen.sg. varies between *-i*, *-e* and *-ei*, the two latter variants obviously emerging on the level of phonetic realisation. In some cases, the genitive endings are exact equivalents of those of declension types I, Ia and Ib in Aḍḍū,<sup>299</sup> but there are also correspondences of (1) F. gen. *-e* vs. A. gen. *-i*, (2) F. gen. *-i* vs. A. gen. *-e*, and (3) F. gen. *-ei* vs. A. gen. *-e*, *-i*, which can only to a limited degree be traced back to phonological regularities. The rule described in 2.3.2.11.1 for Aḍḍū, according to which for consonant stems the quality of the vowel of the last stem syllable decides whether the genitive ends in *-e* or *-i*, is only to a certain extent applicable to the corresponding nouns in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku (cf. F. *maha*, A. *mas* “fish”, gen. *mah-i* etc.). As the following examples show, the genitive ending is hardly predictable in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, cp. for (1) A. *baḷa*, F. *baḷo* “dog” → gen. A. *baḷ-i*, F. *baḷ-e*; A. *himāra*, F. *himāro* “donkey” → gen. A. *himār-i*, F. *himār-e*; A. *naṇa*, F. *naṇo* “fishing line” → gen. A. *naṇ-i*, F. *naṇ-e*. While in Aḍḍū a (short or long) *-ā-* in the last syllable of the stem is responsible for a genitive ending in *-i*, there are many cases in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku to which this rule cannot be applied, as the given examples show.

<sup>299</sup> Cf. 2.3.2.11.1; cp., e.g., A.F. *mūṇu* “face”, gen. *mūṇ-e*; A.F. *bin* /*bim*/ “earth, land”, gen. *bim-e*; A.F. *dun* /*dum*/ “smoke”, gen. *dum-e*; A. *mas*, F. *maha* “fish”, A.F. gen. *mah-i*; A.F. *kan* /*kam*/ “fact; verb”, gen. *kam-i*; A. *hañdo*, F. *hañdo* “moon”, A.F. gen. *hañd-i*; A. *mau*, F. *mal* “flower”, A.F. gen. *mal-i*; A.F. *fua*<sup>3</sup> /*fuak*/ “areca nut”, gen. *fuak-i*.

For the divergence of A. gen. *-e*, F. gen. *-i* (**2**), cp. A. nom.pl. *beļu* /*beļel*/ “cats” (sg.def. *beļelā* “the cat”) → gen.pl. *beļel-e* vs. F. nom.pl. *beļal* (sg. *beļal(u)*) → gen.pl. *beļal-i*; A. nom.pl. *mīdeu* /*mīdel*/ “mice, rats” (sg.def. *mīdelā*) → gen.pl. *mīdel-e* vs. F. nom.pl. *mīdal* (sg. *mīdal(u)*) → gen.pl. *mīdal-i* (for the peculiar number formation characterising these two nouns in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, cf. 2.3.2.12.5.5). Note that in both these cases, the vowel of the last stem-syllable is an *a* in the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku variant which may have caused the *-i* of the primary genitive.

According to the sound laws, the final *-e* of the genitive A. *beļel-e* (nom. A. *beļu*) can be explained by the last stem-syllable not containing an *a* vowel. In this case we must consider that the *e* occurring in the last stem-syllable of A. *beļu* has to be regarded as a secondary vowel as the inter-Maldivian correspondences F. *beļalu* and M. *buḷā* /*buḷal*/ and extra-Maldivian cognates show; cp. Sinh. sg.def. *baḷalā* (stem *baḷal*), but also older forms of this word such as Pa. *biḷāra-*, *biḷāla-*, Skt. *biḍāla-* “cat” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 120, no. 1791 and TURNER 1966, II, 521, no. 9237). In Aḍḍū, the original *a* seems to have developed into *e* across the retroflex *l*, probably under the influence of the preceding *e*. There are many examples of a similar adaptation among the consonant stems enlarged with final *-u*.<sup>300</sup> In the case of A. *mīdeu* “mouse, rat” which has no retroflex consonant that might have caused such a change of the vowel, the *e* of the last stem syllable can possibly be explained by assuming an analogical influence of the word denoting “cat” (cp. M. *mīdā* /*mīdal*/, Sinh. sg.def. *mīyā*, stem *mī*; Pa. *mūsika-*, OIA m. *mūs-*, *mūsīkā-*; cf. GEIGER 1941, 135, no. 2015 and TURNER 1966, II, 592, no. 10258).

For the divergence of the type F. gen. *-ei*, A. gen. *-e/-i* (**3**), there are numerous examples; cp. A.F. *kaduru* “date (palm)” → gen. A. *kadur-e*, F. *kadur-ei*; A. *dora*, F. *doro* “door” → gen. A. *dor-e*, F. *dor-ei*; A. *huvāṇḍa*, F. *huvāṇḍo* “fragrance, perfume” → gen. A. *huvāṇḍ-i*, F. *huvāṇḍ-ei*; A. *koṣāra*, F. *koṣāro* “store-house” → gen. A. *koṣār-i*, F. *koṣār-ei*). As in the case of the genitive variants discussed above, the occurrence of the genitive ending F. *-ei* is not predictable. Probably these differences can be explained by local phonetic variation.

2.3.2.12.2. The dative ending *-aśa* (← *-aṭa*), which is typical for Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, occurs only in connection with the following features: **1**) in the case of all stems in *-ā* that go back to definite forms (cp., e.g., *bappā* “father” → dat. *bappāśa*; *mīhā* “man, person” → dat. *mīhāśa*; *kokkō* “younger brother/sister” (← *\*kokkoā*, → dat. *kokkōśa*) or are loanwords (cp., e.g. *haftā* “week” → dat. *haftāśa*; *fullā* “deer” → dat. *fullāśa*); **2**) as a rule, in the case of *a*-stems, with a concomitant lengthening of the stem-final *-a* into *-ā* (cp., e.g., *fia* “wing” → dat. *fīāśa*, *dea* “water, liquid” → dat. *deāśa*); **3**) in the case of all consonant stems in *-VhV* (← F. *\*-VsV* ← Dhiv. *-Vs*) (cp., e.g., *gehe* ← *ges* “tree” → dat. *gehaśa*; *maha* ← *mas* “fish” → dat. *mahaśa*; *faha* ← *fas* “soil” → dat. *fahaśa*); **4**) in the case of some consonant stems which either show an archaic declension pattern or which are obsolete now; the words in question preserve the final *-u* characterising the oblique case together with the dative ending, so that they look like *u*-stems. Cp., e.g., *mituru* “friend” (obs.) → dat. *mituruśa*; *beļalu* “cat” → dat. *beļaluśa*; *midalu* “mouse, rat” → dat. *midaluśa*.

In all other cases, the dative ending is *-aha*; this is true for all consonant stems (with the exception of the original “*s*-stems”, cf. type 3) above) and all *i*-stems. It cannot be decided with certainty whether *-aha* is etymologically distinct from *-aśa* or whether all the variants of the dative ending that occur in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku can be explained as allomorphs of an underlying *-aṭa* (cf. 2.3.1.1.3.2). — As to the *i*-stems, particular changes of the dative ending led to the existence of two subgroups which can be characterised as follows: **1**) The nominal root

<sup>300</sup> Cp., e.g., A. *atele* “atoll” vs. M. *atoḷu* ← *ateḷu*; for this sound change cf. 1.2.4.4.

remains unchanged throughout the whole paradigm (cf. also 2.3.2.7.1.2.1), the dative ending always being *-aha* (cp., e.g., *boli* “shell” → dat. *boliaha*; *jōli* “Maldivian chair” → dat. *jōliaha*; *māvahi* “large wave in the open sea” → dat. *māvahiaha*). A subtype within this group is characterised by a reduction of the ending *-aha* to *-hā*, without a change of the root. There are also some words showing both forms, such as *jangali* “jungle” (→ dat. *jangaliaha* and *jangalihā*) or *asī* “low table” (→ dat. *asīaha* and *asihā*). Many words possess only the reduced form of the ending; cp., e.g., *ali* “light” → dat. *alihā*; *bakari* “goat” → dat. *bakarihā*; *dōni* “dhoni-boat” → dat. *dōnihā*). 2) The root vowel of disyllabic *i*-stems is either lengthened throughout the whole paradigm or (in rare cases) only in particular forms of the paradigm, the stem vowel *-i* being lost (cf. also 2.3.2.8.1.4.2). In these cases, the dative ending *-aha* remains unchanged; cp., e.g., *dēli* “ink” → dat. *dēlahā*; *bāsi* “brinjal” → dat. *bāsaaha*; *dīni* “bird” → dat. *dīnaha*. The same holds true for trisyllabic *i*-stems which normally do not show a lengthening of the root vowel but are characterised by a loss of the stem vowel *-i*; cp., e.g., *akiri* “coral stone” → dat. *akiraha*; *atiri* “beach on the inner side of the atoll” → dat. *atiraha*; *fīohi* “knife” → dat. *fīossaha* etc.

2.3.2.12.3. While in the dialects of Addū and Māle, the vocalism of the ablative ending depends on the stem in question, there is only a uniform ending *-en* in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. For consonant stems, cp., e.g., *a’ /at/* “hand, arm” → abl. *at-en*; *aharo* “year” → abl. *ahar-en*; *mūṇu* “face” → abl. *mūṇ-en*; for *i*-stems, cp., e.g., *asī* “low table” → abl. *asī-en*; *akiri* “coral stone” → abl. *akiren* (← *akiri-en*); *dēli* “ink” → abl. *dēlen* (← *dēli-en*); for *a*-stems, cp., e.g., *attela* “palm” → abl. *attela-en*, *fīa* “wing” → abl. *fīa-en*; *buma* “eyebrow” → abl. *buma-en*.

2.3.2.12.4. In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, there are also some cases of analytic case formation. As a rule, nouns denoting persons form their ablatives either by means of the stem form in combination with the postposition *aten* (lit. “by / from the hand (of)”, abl./instr. of *a’ /at/* “hand”) or by means of the genitive combined with the postposition *farāten* (“frozen” abl. “from the side of”, cf. 2.3.2.11.4). Cp., e.g., *dāri aten* “from (the side of) the child”, *dārun aten* “from the children”; *kāfāge farāten* “from the grandfather”, *kābafaunge farātun* “from the ancestors” (for the genitive ending *-ge* cf. 2.3.2.11.4). In very rare cases, the stem of nouns denoting animals is combined with the word *gai* “body” which, albeit being fully inflectible, has no other function than that of a formal element (cp. the examples given in 2.3.2.12.5.5 below).

2.3.2.12.5. The tables below will show only those declension paradigms that can be considered as prototypes in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. For the phonetical and phonological variants of the genitive and dative forms cf. 2.3.2.12.1 and 2.3.2.12.2 above.

#### 2.3.2.12.5.1. Consonant stems

sg.	“fish”	“face”	“date (palm)”
nom.	<i>mah-a</i>	<i>mūṇ-u</i>	<i>kadur-u</i>
gen.	<i>mah-i</i>	<i>mūṇ-e</i>	<i>kadur-ei</i>
dat.	<i>mah-aśa</i>	<i>mūṇ-aha</i>	<i>kadur-aha</i>
abl.	<i>mah-en</i>	<i>mūṇ-en</i>	<i>kadur-en</i>

2.3.2.12.5.2. *i*-stems

sg.	“shell”	“goat”	“brinjal”	“knife”
nom.	<i>boli</i>	<i>bakari</i>	<i>bq̄śi</i>	<i>fiohi</i>
gen.	<i>boli-e</i>	<i>bakari-e</i>	<i>bq̄ś-e</i>	<i>fioss-e</i>
dat.	<i>boli-aha</i>	<i>bakari-hā</i>	<i>bq̄ś-aha</i>	<i>fioss-aha</i>
abl.	<i>boli-en</i>	<i>bakari-en</i>	<i>bq̄ś-en</i>	<i>fioss-en</i>

2.3.2.12.5.3. *a*-stems

sg.	“shallows”
nom.	<i>tela</i>
gen.	<i>tela-i</i>
dat.	<i>telāśa /tela-aśa/</i>
abl.	<i>tela-en</i>

## 2.3.2.12.5.4. Declension pattern of nouns designating persons:

	“mother”		“child”	
	singular	plural	singular	plural
nom.	<i>mammā</i> (def.)	<i>mammā-men</i>	<i>dāri</i> ( <i>i</i> -stem)	<i>dārun</i> <sup>301</sup>
gen.	<i>mammā-ge</i>	<i>mammāmen-ge</i>	<i>dāri-ge</i>	<i>dārun-ge</i>
dat.	<i>mammāśa /mammā-aśa/</i>	<i>mammāmenna<sup>3</sup> /mammā-men-aś/</i>	<i>dār-aha</i>	<i>dārunna<sup>3</sup> /dārun-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>mammāge farāten</i>	<i>mammāmenge farāten</i>	<i>dāri aten</i>	<i>dārun aten</i>

2.3.2.12.5.5. In the case of a few consonant stems designating animals (*beḷal(u)* “cat”, *mīdal(u)* “mouse, rat”, *nannigattu* “snake”) which have to be regarded as exceptions, the original plural meaning of the primary declension has been conserved in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku until present; in these cases, a singularised paradigm cannot be built from the definite form, however. Instead of that, the nominative ending in *-u* in most cases (but not always) has the meaning of a singular, while the corresponding form without *u* (being the original oblique case) in most cases represents the plural. Besides that, there is an analytic declension type (sg. II) consisting of the oblique case and the noun *gai* “body” which has only singular meaning. The regular plural is formed by means of the suffixes *-men* and *-te<sup>2</sup> /-tek/*. The word *nannigati*<sup>302</sup> (pl.) “snake” has no primary singular (sg. I) at all, a singularised paradigm with the nom. *nannigattu* can only be built analytically. The following table may serve as an illustration of the complicated situation.

<sup>301</sup> For this formation cf. 2.3.2.8.2.2.

<sup>302</sup> This noun obviously represents a taboo-word, *\*nam-ni-gati* “the one not having received a name”.

“mouse, rat”	sg. I	sg. II	pl. (primary)
nom.	<i>mīḍalu</i>	<i>mīḍalu</i>	<i>mīḍal</i>
gen.	<i>mīḍali</i>	<i>mīḍalu gai</i>	<i>mīḍali</i>
dat.	<i>mīḍaluśa</i>	<i>mīḍalu gāśa</i>	<i>mīḍalaha</i>
abl.	<i>mīḍalen</i>	<i>mīḍalu gaen</i>	<i>mīḍalen</i>
“cat”	sg. I	sg. II	pl. (primary)
nom.	<i>beḷalu</i>	<i>beḷalu</i>	<i>beḷal</i>
gen.	<i>beḷali</i>	<i>beḷalu gai</i>	<i>beḷali</i>
dat.	<i>beḷaluśa</i>	<i>beḷalu gāśa</i>	<i>beḷalaha</i>
abl.	<i>beḷalen</i>	<i>beḷalu gaen</i>	<i>beḷalen</i>
“snake”	sg. I	sg. II	pl. (primary)
nom.		<i>nannigattu</i>	<i>nannigati</i>
gen.		<i>nannigattu gai</i>	<i>nannigatte</i>
dat.		<i>nannigattu gāśa</i>	<i>nannigattaha</i>
abl.		<i>nannigattu gaen</i>	<i>nannigaten</i>

### 2.3.2.13. Māle

In contrast to the numerous dialectal differences we find in the declension patterns of the southern dialects, the nominal inflection of northern Dhivehi is rather uniform, the paradigms of the standard language being representative for the whole dialectal area. As against the synthetic-inflectional declension paradigms of the southern dialects, north Dhivehi has more agglutinative features. Only the formation of the dative and ablative follows the traditional patterns, the case-marking suffixes (dat. *-a<sup>o</sup> /-aś/*, abl. *-in/-un*) being exact correspondences of those of the Aḍḍū-dialect. The genitive suffix *-ge* which in the southernmost dialects occurs only with nouns denoting persons, has been generalised in the standard language, now representing the only suffix with the meaning of a genitive. While in the southern dialects locative functions are expressed by the genitive (or a common gen./loc.) or (in the case of indefinite nouns) the oblique case, the language of Māle possesses a special locative which is characterised by the suffix *-gā /-gai/*. Without a doubt this suffix must be identified with the gen./loc. of the substantive *gai* “body”. Thus, M. *gahu-gā* originally means “at/in the body of the tree”.<sup>303</sup> The combination of the oblique case of a basic noun with *gai* “in, at the body”, here appearing in the function of a locative, corresponds to the formation of a secondary analytic singular paradigm occurring in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku (cf. 2.3.2.12.5.5); in Māle, this has been restricted to the form of the locative.

Except for the nominative (or direct) case, all case forms are derived from a stem which with all probability originally had the function of a *casus obliquus*. In stems ending in a vowel, this is characterised by a lengthening of the stem-final short vowel reappearing in

<sup>303</sup> The connection of the locative suffix *-gā* with Sinh. *gāvā* “near” which has been suggested by HLSD, 44, must be excluded because of phonological reasons, cf. GEIGER (1919), 67.

formation of the genitive and locative cases. In *a*-stems, the lengthened vowel is surprisingly spelled with ⟨-ai-⟩; cp., e.g., ⟨aṅgaige⟩, ⟨aṅgaigai⟩ “of/in the mouth”. Possibly this spelling can be explained by assuming an underlying synthetic form of the genitive as the one we find in southern Dhivehi (aṅgai), to which the suffix *-ge*, now serving as the only genitive ending, might have been added in a redundant way. Such a double formation of the genitive would be imaginable for a transitional stage between the original synthetic inflection and the modern agglutinative pattern; thus, the spelling ⟨aṅgai-⟩ could have conserved a “stage of formal uncertainty”. From the point of view of historical linguistics, however, this association would not be correct because the agglutinative genitive in *-ge* seems always to have been derived directly from the stem (or the *casus obliquus*) as consonant stems show (cp., e.g., *gahu-ge* “of the tree”). Maybe the spelling ⟨-ai-⟩ for *a* lengthened before the locative suffix can be explained by an adaptation to the spelling of the genitive as there cannot be any doubt that in the given case the suffix *-gā* originally was added to the oblique case as well.

2.3.2.13.1. The following table will give an illustration of the widely uniform character of the singular declension types of the different stem classes:

sg.	cons. stem “tree”	<i>i</i> -stem “room”	<i>a</i> -stem “mouth”	root noun “house”	frozen def.form “man”
nom.	<i>gas</i>	<i>koṭari</i>	<i>aṅga</i>	<i>ge</i>	<i>mihā</i>
gen.	<i>gahu-ge</i>	<i>koṭarī-ge</i>	<i>aṅgā-ge</i> ⟨aṅgaige⟩	<i>gē-ge</i>	<i>mihā-ge</i>
dat.	<i>gah-a<sup>ʔ</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>koṭari-a<sup>ʔ</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>aṅgā<sup>ʔ</sup> /aṅga-aś/</i>	<i>ge-a<sup>ʔ</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>mihā<sup>ʔ</sup> /mihā-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>gah-un</i>	<i>koṭarīn /koṭari-in/</i>	<i>aṅga-in</i>	<i>ge-in</i>	<i>mihā-in</i>
loc.	<i>gahu-gā /-gai/</i>	<i>koṭarī-gā /-gai/</i>	<i>aṅgā-gā</i> ⟨aṅgaigai⟩	<i>gē-gā /-gai/</i>	<i>mihā-gā /-gai/</i>
(obl.)	( <i>gahu</i> )	( <i>koṭarī</i> )	( <i>aṅgā</i> ⟨aṅgai⟩)	( <i>gē</i> )	( <i>mihā</i> )

2.3.2.13.2. The following table illustrates the declension of the consonant stem *gas* “tree” in the indefinite singular and the plural. The suffix *-aku* characterising the indefinite *casus obliquus* (cf. 2.3.2.3.1) is combined with the inherited case-endings of the dative, */-ak-aś/* and the ablative/instrumental, */-ak-un/*, while the nominative variant of the suffix, *-e<sup>ʔ</sup> /-ek/*, occurs only in combination with the secondary case forms of the genitive, */-ek-ge/* and the locative, */-ek-gai/*. The arrangement of the suffixes marking indefiniteness and plural follows a strictly hierarchical order; this can clearly be seen in the formation of the indefinite plural which consists of the nominal stem + plural suffix + indefinite suffix + case suffix. The example given below can be taken as a prototype of the other stems as well.

“tree”	indef. sg.	indef. pl.
nom.	<i>gahē<sup>ʔ</sup> /gas-ek/</i>	<i>gastakē<sup>ʔ</sup> /gas-tak-ek/</i>
obl.	<i>gahaku /gas-aku/</i>	—
gen.	<i>gahegge /-ek-ge/</i>	<i>gastakegge /-ek-ge/</i>
dat.	<i>gahak-a<sup>ʔ</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>gastakak-a<sup>ʔ</sup> /-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>gahak-un</i>	<i>gastakak-un</i>
loc.	<i>gaheggā /-ek-gai/</i>	<i>gastakeggā /-ek-gai/</i>

2.3.2.13.3. The following table shows the plural declension of nouns which uses the suffixes *-ta'* /-tak/, *-in/-un* and *-men*. For the use of the two latter plural suffixes cf. 2.3.2.9.2.1 and 2.3.2.9.2.2. The words serving as examples are *gas* “tree”, *mīhā* “man” (stem *mīs*), *dari* “child” and *bappa* “father”.

plural	“tree”	“people”	“children”	“fathers”
nom.	<i>gas-ta'</i> /gas-tak/	<i>mīhun</i> /mīs-un/	<i>darin</i> /dari-in/	<i>bappa-men</i>
gen.	<i>gas-taku-ge</i>	<i>mīhun-ge</i>	<i>darin-ge</i>	<i>bappa-men-ge</i>
dat.	<i>gas-tak-a'</i> /-aś/	<i>mīhunna'</i> /mīs-un-aś/	<i>darinna'</i> /darin-aś/	<i>bappa-menna'</i> /-men-aś/
abl.	<i>gas-tak-un</i>	<i>mīhun-ge farātun</i>	<i>darin-ge farātun</i>	<i>bappā-men-ge farātun</i>
loc.	<i>gas-taku-gā</i> /-gai/	<i>mīhun-gā</i> /-gai/	<i>darin-gā</i> /-gai/	<i>bappa-men-gā</i> /-gai/

## 2.4. The adjective

Dhivehi is one of the few Modern IA languages (besides Sinhalese, Bengali, Assamese, Oriya; cf. ZOGRAF 1976, 137 or MASICA 1991, 251) in which the adjective does not change its form at all. Thus, the categories of case and number as well as the degrees of comparison cannot be expressed by the adjective itself. From the morphological point of view, it makes no difference whether an adjective has the function of an attribute or a predicate. The only changes that may occur are certain sandhi-effects concerning adjectives in predicative position when they are followed by a word with an initial vowel, such as the quotation marker [*ē*], written ⟨*eve*⟩. Cp., e.g., M. *mī kotari rīccē* (*rīti* + *ē*<sup>304</sup>) “this room is beautiful” as against *rīti kotari-e'* /-ek/ “a beautiful room”.

2.4.1. In Dhivehi most of the adjectives are not morphologically distinct from substantive stems; cp., e.g., M. *ā*, A. *au*, F. *al* “new”; M. *bā*, A. *bau*, F. *bal* “old, ancient, antique”; M. *bīru*, A.F. *bīri* “deaf”; M. *digu*, A.F. *digi* “tall” (of human beings); M.A. *avas*, F. *avaha* “rapid, fast”; M. *boḍu*, A. *boṇḍa*, F. *boṇḍo* “big, large”; M. *raṅgaḷu*, A. *raṅgaḷa*, F. *raṅgaḷo* “beautiful, pretty; good, right”; M.A.F. *don* “fair (haired and skinned)”; M.A.F. *duru* “far”; M.A.F. *huturu* “ugly”; M. *hima*, A.F. *hema* “thin” (e.g. of pencils); M.A. *hiki*, F. *hīki* “dry; thin, meagre”, etc.

As a rule, every nominal stem (i.e. the oblique case of a noun) can be used as an adjective if this is not excluded by the meaning. Because of their specific semantics, qualifying and quantifying terms are especially apt to such a double use. Hence, in many cases it is clear from the context only whether a given noun has to be regarded as an adjective or a substantive. Cp., e.g., the following examples which illustrate the use of *ran* “gold, of gold, golden” and *rihi* “silver, of silver, silver(y)” as a substantive: ... *mī ranun o' molōgañḍa'* “... this was a golden axe”, lit. “of gold” (abl./instr.; T3, 35); as an attributive adjective: ... *ran molōgañḍāi rihi molōgañḍāi* ... “with the golden axe and with the silver axe” (T3, 48; *molōgañḍā-ai* def. form + particle *-āi* “and”). For other examples of nouns of this type cp. M. *hūnu*, A.F. *huṇu* “heat; hot, warm”; M. *hūlaṅgu*, A. *hūlaṅga*, F. *hūlaṅgo* “West, west wind; western”; M.A.F. *mugu* “lentil, gram; green”; M. *majā* “amusing, exciting; fun”;

<sup>304</sup> /*rīti-eve*/ → \**rītyē* → *rīccē*; cf. 1.3.9.2.1.

M. *baru*, A. *bara*, F. *baro* “heavy; load”; M.F. *bali* (A. *nikamei*) “weak, sick”, M.F.A. “illness, disease” etc.

2.4.2. Loan adjectives, which to a large extent come directly from Arabic, are used without formal changes. If necessary, they are adapted to the phonetical system of Dhivehi; in many cases, however, such adaptations do not effect the spelling because the original writing is generally imitated. Cp., e.g., M. *hagīgī* ⟨*haqīqī*⟩ “real” ← Arab. *ḥaqīqī* “real, true, original”; M. *faḡīru* ⟨*faqīru*⟩, A.F. *fakīri* “poor” ← Arab. *faqīr* “poor (one)”; M.A.F. *tāzā* “fresh” ← Pers. *tāza* (in modern pronunciation *tāze*) “fresh, young, new”.

2.4.3. Depending on the meaning of the verbs in question, the participles of the present and the preterite can be used as adjectives as well. In the modern language, there are many participial adjectives that are used independently of the original verbs, which in some cases are obsolete nowadays; cp., e.g., the participle M. *gulē* “fitting, appropriate, suitable” (part.pres. of *gulēnī* “to be combined (with)”), with its “frozen” negated form *nu gulē* now meaning “irrelevant”, or M. *dirē* “being alive, living” (part.pres. of *direnī* “to come into life”). Some of the participial formations have become idiomatic in the modern language, in syntagms consisting of a nominal and a verbal part. Cp., e.g., M. *agu huri* “expensive, precious”, lit. “price being (there)” (*agu* “value, price”; *huri* part.pret. of *hunnanī* “to be, stand, stay, remain”) or M. *kamu nu dē* “hopeless”, lit. “fact not giving” (*kamu* obl. “fact”, *nu* “not”, *dē* part.pres. of *denī* “to give”).

2.4.4. There are only a few adjectives in Dhivehi that are characterised by formal features which distinguish them morphologically from nouns. At least two suffixal elements that are used to derive adjectives from nouns must be noted in this context: first, the originally independent nominal stem *veri* occurring in this function most frequently in Māle and, second, the adjective *gada* which is common to all dialects of Dhivehi and is still used as an independent adjective meaning “strong, rich”. The *i*-stem *-teri*, which occurs only in the function of an adjective suffix, is obviously confined to northern Dhivehi. The comparatively rare suffix *-(v)eti* is also more frequent in the standard language than in southern Dhivehi.

2.4.4.1. There are many compound adjectives that are derived from nouns by means of *gada* “strong, rich” (cf. above). From their formation, these adjectives represent an inverse type of *bahuvrīhi*, the adjective *gada* “strong, rich” serving as the second part. Cp., e.g., M. *aḡu-gada*, A. *aḡa-gada*, F. *aḡo-gada* “loud, noisy”, lit. “rich in noise” (M. *aḡu*, A. *aḡa*, F. *aḡo* “noise, voice”); M. *varu-gada*, A. *vara-gada*, F. *varo-gada* “strong, powerful” (M. *varu*, A. *vara*, F. *varo* “strength, power”); M.A.F. *ali-gada* “bright” (*ali* “light”); M.A.F. *vas-gada* “smelly” (M.A. *vas*, F. *vaha* “smell”); M. *avi-gada* “sunny” (M. *avi* “sunshine”); M.A.F. *vai-gada* “windy” (M.A.F. *vai* “wind”); M. *bāru-gada* “effective” (M. *bāru* “force, power, tight”). The names of a couple of friends appearing in some fairy tales, viz. M.A.F. *aṅga gada miturā* “the eloquent friend” (lit. “the friend (having) a rich mouth”) and M.A.F. *aṅga maḡu/maḡa/maḡo miturā* “the taciturn friend” (lit. “the friend (having) a silent mouth”), belong to these formations as well (M.A.F. *aṅga* “mouth”; for M. *maḡu* etc. “soft, slow” cf. 2.6.7.4.6; on the *mot savant mituru* “friend”, being obsolete in the modern language, cf. 2.3.1.3.4.1). It cannot be excluded that there are some more (still unknown) formations of the inverse *bahuvrīhi*-type with other adjectives in Dhivehi.

2.4.4.2. Many adjectives use the nominal *i*-stem *veri* as a derivational suffix which originally must have had the meaning of “leader” or “person” (cf. 2.3.2.4.2). While this particular meaning of *veri* is still perceivable in composition with nouns, it is no longer transparent in adjective formation. The main function of *-veri* consists in the derivation of adjectives from nouns, a large number of which represents foreign words of Arabic origin. Thus, the suffix *-veri* can be used to form Maldivian adjectives from any Arabic loanword, if there are no obstacles from the semantic point of view. Cp., e.g., M. *adabu-veri* “polite” (M. *adabu* ← Arab. *adab* “good manners, good behaviour”); M. *nasību-veri* “happy” (M. *nasību* ← Arab. *naṣīb* “share (in the profits), happiness, chance, fate”); M. *taguvā-veri* “religious, devout, pious” (M. *taguvā* ⟨*taquvā*⟩ ← Arab. *taqwā* “fear of God, piety, devoutness”); M. *šukuru-veri* “grateful” (M. *šukuru* ← Arab. *šukr* “gratitude”); M.A.F. *hasada-veri* “envious, jealous” (M.A.F. *hasada* ← Arab. *ḥasad* “envy”); *harakāṭteri* /*harakāt-veri*/ “active” (← Arab. pl. *ḥarakāt*, sg. *ḥaraka* “motion, action” among other meanings); *amānāṭteri* /*amānāt-veri*/ “trustworthy, responsible” (← Arab. pl. *amānāt* “goods in trust”; sg. *amāna* “trustworthiness, fidelity, confidence”); M. *zīnatteri* /*zīnat-veri*/ “magnificent, splendid” (← Arab. *zīnat* “adornment, decoration”).

Besides nouns of different, sometimes unknown origin, the first part of the compound, which contains the meaning, can also consist of adjectives. Cp. e.g., M.A.F. *buddi-veri* “wise” (M.A.F. *buddi* “mind”, possibly a *mot savant*, cp. Skt., Pa., Pkt. *buddhi*- “intelligence, discernment, mind”; TURNER 1966, II, 525, no. 9277); M. *dogu-veri* “false, dishonest, lying” (M. *dogu* “lie, false”; cp. OIA *drógha*- “injurious; injury, treachery”; TURNER 1966, I, 379, no. 6640); M. *aniā-veri* “cruel” (M. *aniā* “cruelty”<sup>305</sup>); M.A.F. *ōgā-veri* “kind”; M.A.F. *ufā-veri* “happy, lucky” (A. also *ufā* “id.”); M. *tedu-veri*, A.F. *tede-veri* “honest” (A. also *tede* “id.”; cp. the compound verb M. *tedu-vanī* “to get up, stand”, lit. “become upright”). M. *enani-veri* “lonely” is derived from the adjective M. *enani* “alone”. It seems that M. *lobu-veri* “dear, affectionate” must be kept separate from the noun M. *lōbi* “love” which can also be used as an adjective in the sense of “lovely”. Whether *lobu-* and *lōbi* are etymologically connected with each other and of what kind their morphological relation may be is still unknown. It seems that \**lōbi-veri* does not exist (any longer), but it obviously was the basis of substantivisations such as *lōbiveriā* /*-veri-ā*/ “lover” and *lōbiverikan* “love affair, proof of love”, as well as the adjective *lōbiveti* which is a synonym of *lobuveri* (cp. NCLHR 1985-91, 13, 21-2). M. *hitāma-veri* “unhappy, sad” is derived from the noun M. *hitāma* “sadness, misery” the etymology of which is unknown. The first part of M. *eku-veri* “kind, friendly” is identical with M. *eku*, an adverb reflecting the numeral “one” with the meaning “together (with), whole, entire”. M. *eku* obviously represents the “frozen” oblique case of the numeral “one”, *eke*’ (/ek-ek/ indef.), from which also the locative forms M. *ekugā* /*eku-gai*/, A.F. *ekī* are derived with the same meaning (lit. “in one”).

2.4.4.3. Only a few adjectives are built with *-teri*, the use of which is confined to the standard language, as their second part. Cp., e.g., *ufeddun-teri* “creative, productive” (*ufeddun* is the verbal noun of *ufaddanī* “to create, make”); *bēnun-teri* “useful” (*bēnun* “need, want, wish”); *kiaman-teri* “obedient” (cp. the complex verb *kiaman vanī* “obey”); *rakkau-teri* or *rakkā-teri*

<sup>305</sup> C. ZOLLER (priv. inf.) proposes an etymological connection with OIA *avanāyā-* “putting down”, Sinh. *onā* “act of throwing and pouring down” (TURNER 1966, I, 35, no. 790).

“safe” (cp. the complex verbs *rakkau kuranī* “to save (money)” and *rakkau vun* “to bear, give birth (to)”). A few adjectives with *-teri* can be substantivised; cp., e.g., *ehīteriā* /-teri-ā/ “volunteer”, derived from *ehī-teri* “helpful” (*ehī* “help”). For the enlargement of the *i*-stem *-teri* by means of the suffix *-ā*, the same rules apply as for /-veri-ā/ (cf. 2.4.4.2 above and 2.3.2.4.1).

2.4.4.4. In the modern language, the adjective suffix *-(v)eti* is mostly met with in the northern area. Cp., e.g., M. *lōbi-veti* “dear” (*lōbi* “love(ly)”); M. *lobu-veti* “dear, affectionate” (*lobu* “dear”; cf. 2.4.4.2 above); M. *ladu-veti* “shy” (M. *ladu* “id.”; A. *lada*, F. *lado* “id.”); M. *dahi-veti* “selfish, greedy” (M.A.F. *dahi* “id.”). The only adjective with *-(v)eti* which is attested for southern Dhivehi is A. *riveti*, F. *ri(v)eti* “beautiful, pretty”; in the modern standard language, this word occurs only in its contracted form, *rīti*. GEIGER already realised from the variants *riveti* and *rīeti* that the word contains an old copula form (1902, 933, no. 356); he analysed the word as consisting of the stem represented by Pa. *rūpa-* (← OIA *rūpá-* “form, beauty”) and *eti*, the Maldivian equivalent of Sinh. *āti* “it is” (Skt. *asti*; cf. 3.11.2.4). While the OIA (and MIA) word meaning “beauty, form” has an immediate continuant in Sinh. *ruva* (stem *rū-* “form, image, comeliness, beauty”, cf. GEIGER 1941, 148, no. 2205), the corresponding Dhivehi form *\*riv-* / *rī-* is not preserved as an independent word in the modern language. In Dhivehi the noun meaning “beauty” is in its turn derived from the adjective (M. *rīti-kan*, NCLHR 1985-91, 3, 50). The derivation of *riveti* / *rīti* from *\*rūpavantī-* as proposed by TURNER (1985, 87, no. 10804a) must be excluded for phonological reasons, even though many other adjectives in *-(v)eti* exist in Dhivehi which were unknown to TURNER. In modern Dhivehi, *-(v)eti* has become a suffix which can approximately be translated as “comprising, containing, embodying”; cp., e.g., *lōbi-veti* “containing love”. The glide *-v-* which in all the adjectives in question precedes the formant *-eti*, must have been abstracted from nouns ending in *-u* or *-v* [w]; a possible source of this might be the reconstructed form *\*riv-* mentioned above, or a word like M. *ladu* “shy” before it was transferred to nouns ending in other sounds.

2.4.4.5. Particularly in the standard language, attributive and predicative adjectives denoting colours can be enlarged with M.A.F. *kula* “colour; coloured” without a change of their meaning; cp., e.g., M. *vilu* (*kula*) “turquoise(-coloured)”. A lighter tint of a colour is expressed by M. *madu*, A. *mada*, F. *mado* “a little”, while a darker shade is denoted by the adjective M.A.F. *gada* “strong, rich” (cf. 2.4.4.1 above) preceding the designation of the colour proper. Thus, e.g., M.A.F. *fehi* “green” can be associated with levels such as *madu/mada/mado fehi* “light-green” and *gada fehi* “dark-green”. Further adjectives expressing colours are M. *kaḷu*, A. *kaḷa*, F. *kalo* “black, dark”; M. *rai*, A.F. *ra* /*rat*/ “red”; M.A.F. *hudu* “white”; M.A. *nū*, F. *nil* “blue”; M.A. *rīñdū*, F. *rīñdul* “yellow, orange”; M.A.F. *mugu* “(pea-)green”; M.F. *muśi*, A. *meśi* “brown”.

### 2.4.5. Adjectival comparison

As in most Modern IA languages (MASICA 1991, 251), there is no productive morphological model of building comparational forms in Dhivehi. This means that the degrees of comparison are not marked by special suffixes as in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan. Instead, comparison

is expressed by means of syntax, sometimes with the additional use of quantifying terms meaning “big”, “large”, “great”, “much”, “many”, “very” or “a few” which precede the adjective in question.

2.4.5.1. Several adverbs are used for the expression of an **elative**; they comprise, among others, M.A. *vara*<sup>3</sup>, F. *varaha* (dat. /*var-aś*/) “very”; M.A.F. *mā* “very”, originally meaning “great” (cf. Sinh. *mā-/maha-* ← MIA and OIA *mahā-* “great”, nowadays only occurring as a part of names or titles; GEIGER 1941, 130, no. 1944); M.A. *vara*<sup>3</sup> *gina*, F. *varaha gina* “very much”; and M. *nuhanu* “considerably, quite (a)”. Cp., e.g., A. *vara*<sup>3</sup> *riveti* “very beautiful”, F. *mā boṅḍo* “very big”, A. *vara*<sup>3</sup> *gina varabali* “very very tired”, M. *nuhanu mīru* “quite tasty”, etc. The same adverbs are also used to express an excessive amount of something in the sense of an **excessive** grade: e.g. M. *mi koṭari mā kuḍa* “this room is too small”. Adjectives can also be used in a duplicated form to express a higher degree of quality or quantity. Cp. the elative meaning expressed by *vara*<sup>3</sup> “very” together with a duplicated adjective in A. ... *vara*<sup>3</sup> *fakīri fakīri de mafīriakāmen* ... “... a very very poor couple ...” (T3, 1; *vara*<sup>3</sup> /*varaś*/ “very”; *fakīri* adj. “poor”; *de* card.num. “two”; *ma-fīri-ak-ā-men* “couple”, lit. “woman-(with)-a-man-together”: obl. + obl. + indef.suff. + def.suff. *-ā* preceding the pl.suff. *-men*, cf. 2.3.2.1.2).

2.4.5.2. In Dhivehi, the concept of a **comparative** can only be expressed by a special syntactical construction which uses the postponed adverbial terms M. *vure* or *vuren* “rather” (in the sense of “more”) and M. *ituru*, A.F. *itiri* “more, another, increase”, the latter also occurring in the dative without a change of meaning (M. *ituru*<sup>3</sup>, A. *itira*<sup>3</sup>, F. *itiraha* /-*aś*/), or with the adverbs which serve as elative markers (cf. 2.4.5.1 above). In comparative sentences, the noun being compared (i.e., the comparational standard) appears in the dative as the following examples show:

- A. “*balafele ma aṅgai tibi au da’ afagē raṭṭehi mīhā aṅgai tibi datav vanī mā riveti au!*” “Please see that the new teeth in my mouth are nicer than the teeth in the mouth of my friend!” lit. “Please look that the new teeth being in my mouth are **nicer (in comparison) to the teeth** being in the mouth of my friend!” (T11, 15; *bala-fele* polite form of the impv. of *balanī* “look”; *ma aṅgai* poss.pron. *ma* + gen./loc. of *aṅga* “mouth”: “in my mouth”; *tibi* part.pret. of *tibenī* “to be”, attr. of *au da’ /dat/* “new teeth”, nom.pl.; *afagē* poss.pron. “my”; *raṭṭehi* obl. + *mīhā* obl. “friend-man”; *aṅgai* loc. “in the mouth”; *tibi* part.pret. of *tibenī* “to be”, attr. of *datav /dataś/* dat.pl. “(compared) to the teeth”. The long form of the part.pres. *vanī* “becoming, being” has to be explained by interference from the standard language, the correct Addū-form being *venī*, cp. the unenlarged part.pres. A. *vē*; *mā riveti* here: “more beautiful”).
- M. ⟨“*re’as vuren mi rē bar ē, e re’as vure mi rē bar ē.*”⟩ “This night it (the jar) is heavier than last night.” lit. “In this night (it is) heavy in comparison to the (last) night, in this night (it is) heavy in comparison to that night.” (T12, 13; *re-as* [*rea*] dat. of *rē* “night”, here: “to the (last) night”; *vure(n)* “in comparison to”, lit. “rather”, correlated with the preceding dat. *re-as*; *mi rē* dem.pron. + obl. “(in) this night”; *bar* = /*baru*/ “heavy”; *ē* quot.particle; *e re-as* dem.pron + nom.dat. “to that night”).

In this connection cp. also the following sentence in the dialect of Addū, where a noun plays the role of the comparational standard (the fairy tale in question is about two un conspicuous fish, quarreling about the question which one of them has more bones):

- A. *bēkā gai fileimaḍieav vanī ek kaśi itirau hiṣei*. “In the body of the *bēkā*-fish there is one more bone than (in that) of the flounder.” lit. “What the body of the *bēkā*-fish is (as) against (that of) the flounder, is to consist of one bone more.” (T15, 10; *bēk-ā* obl.def. “the *bēkā*-fish” with postponed *gai* obl. “body”: “in

the body of the *bēkā*-fish<sup>306</sup>; /*fileimaḍi-e-aś*/ dat.sg.def. of *fileimaḍi* “flounder”; part.pres. M. *vanī* “becoming, being” + focus-marker *-ī* instead of the A.-form *venī*, cp. the preceding sentence; *e*° /*ek*/ “one”, attr. of *kaśi* “bone; thorn”; *itirau* /*itir-aś*/ dat. “more”; *hiśei* abs. “being” of *hinnei*, M. *hunnani* “to stand, be, stay, remain”).

2.4.5.3. The pronominal adjectives *emme* “all, whole, entire” (cf. 2.6.7.4.1) and *muḷi* “whole” (cf. 2.6.7.4.4) are used for expressing **superlative** concepts, cp., e.g., M. *emme rīti* “most beautiful, the most beautiful (of all)”, or *muḷin rañgaḷu* “best, the best (of all)” (*muḷin* abl., lit. “from the whole”). Cp. the following two sentences in which *emme*, always preceding the adjective, serves as a superlative-formant:

- A. *ehen vi mei, eakī e raśi hiśi emme fakīri taulīman ne° mīhā kamugai vege* (T16, 3). “Thus it happened that he became the poorest and least educated man of all (people) on that island.” (*emme* pron.adv. “all, of all”; *fakīri* adj. “poor”; *taulīman ne°* “without education”, lit. “education not being there”; *taulīman* “education, teaching”, M. *ta(u)līmu* ← Arab. *ta’līm* “id.”; *ne°* /*net*/ part.pret. of the verbal noun *netun* “not being (there)”; *mīhā* nom.sg. “man”; for the analysis of the remaining forms cf. 2.6.5.3.1.2).
- M. (with interferences from Fua° Mulaku): *ti bahuge tafātuge terein timā hita° emme rietī mi vī aḍḍū baha*. “Best of all the different dialects of this language I like the Aḍḍū-dialect”, lit. “Within the diversity of this language the one which has now become beautiful (i.e. the most beautiful) of all to my heart, is the language of Aḍḍū.” (T7, 9a; for the exact analysis of the particular forms cf. 2.4.5.3, 2.6.7.4.1).

## 2.5. Numerals

The Maldivian numeral system is characterised by a very particular typological development: apart from the decimal system which alone is used in the modern language, Old Dhivehi disposed of a complete duodecimal system. In the modern language, however, there are only a few remnants reminding of the old system such as, e.g., M. (modern) *fasdoḷas*, A. *fasdoḷos* “60”, lit. “5 times 12”. As a matter of fact, “60” was the only duodecimal number that was totally integrated into the decimal system adopted by the standard language by the turn of the 19th to the 20th century. GEIGER (1901-1902, II, 379; 1919, 73) already explained the particular double role of *fasdoḷos* by stating that the number “60” represents the overlapping point of the two systems. Originally, all traditional Maldivian units of measure were based on the number “twelve” as well (cf. BELL 1883, 118-9); they were only gradually adapted to the decimal system. Thus, e.g., the basic dry measure, a *nāḷi*, contained about 0,96 litres; nowadays, however, one *nāḷi* equals one kilogram exactly.

In the southern regions of the Maldives, the old numerals and measures were longer preserved than in the northern parts. In southern Dhivehi, they must still have been used by the beginning of the 20th century, alongside the already prevailing decimal system; nowadays, however, one can hardly find even elderly people in the southernmost atolls who remember the duodecimal numerals.

The fact that Old Dhivehi shows such a perfectly developed duodecimal system is still more impressive as there are obviously no attestations of a corresponding mode of counting in Sinhalese at any time of its well documented history; cf. DE SILVA (1970b, 148-9) who states: “The interesting fact about the Maldivian numeral system is not the lexical similarities

<sup>306</sup> A. *bēkā* (sg.def. of a stem *bē*° /*bēk*/, M. *bēṅgu*) is the only fish in the Maldives that is able to live in salt-water as well as freshwater.

to one language or another but the presence, in the speech of the older generation especially, of a counting device which is not known to have been used in Sinhalese at any stage.”

On the one hand, it can be taken for sure that the duodecimal system was the prevailing counting method in the Maldives for a long period but on the other hand, it is nevertheless not probable that the decimal system developed within a short time or was even imported of late. Some archaisms in the decimal numbers as well as the attestations of items of the decimal system in the early Maldivian texts force us to assume that both systems coexisted at least for some centuries, the decimal numbers probably being less important.

There are some significant correspondences between the Maldivian and Old Sinhalese numerals which suggest two different models concerning their origin. Thus, it is imaginable that during the period of close commercial, religious and cultural relations between the Sinhalese and the Maldivians not only the oldest script<sup>307</sup> but also the decimal system including the numerals representing it was brought to the Maldives, where, at least for a while, it was characterised by a limited use, maybe within a particular scope. According to a second model, there might have been at least one dialectal exclave on the Maldives where the decimal system could have been handed down without an interruption since the Prakrit period. There is some evidence, however, that at least a considerable part of the decimal numbers cannot be derived from the Insular Indo-Aryan Prakrit basis. Some unquestionable sound-laws show that these decimal numbers can only be explained as loanwords from an extra-Insular-Indo-Aryan Prakrit of uncertain origin which influenced both the Maldivian and the Sinhalese numeral systems. Besides that, there are many traces of foreign Prakrits and even hyperprakritisms in the Dhivehi decimal system which are not known in Sinhalese.

At a later time, when the duodecimal system was becoming obsolete step by step, the decimal system might have been strengthened by exterior influences, mainly those of medieval Sinhalese; finally, in the recent past, the decimal numbers definitely overruled their duodecimal counterparts.

### 2.5.1. Cardinal numbers

The numerals from one to ten have different forms for attributive and substantival usage. In attributive function, it is the pure stem which is used, while the substantive form of the cardinal numbers is marked by the indefinite suffix *-e* /*-ek*/ (derived from the cardinal number “one” itself; cf. 2.3.2.1). Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *e* /*ek*/ attr. vs. *eke* /*ek-ek*/ subst. “one”, or M.A.F. *tin* attr. vs. M.A.F. *tine* /*tin-ek*/ subst. “three”. GEIGER (1919, 70) succeeded in analysing the substantive forms of the Maldivian numerals by comparison with their Sinhalese correspondences: “The forms probably correspond to the substantive forms in *-ak* in Sinhalese, like *dekak*, *tunak*, ... The original forms are therefore *\*ekak*, *\*dek*, *\*tinek*.” In the modern Sinhalese language, these substantivised forms have the function of inanimate collective numerals (cf., e.g., MATZEL 1983, 40). Thus, Sinh. *ekak* means “one, one thing”, *dekak* means “(a unit of) two things”, *tunak* “(a unit of) three things”, etc., contrasting with formations such as *tun-denā* “(the) three persons, a unit of three persons” (*denā* def. “the person”; for more information about these formations cf. GEIGER 1938, 121-2). In comparison to this, the Maldivian numerals in *-e* do not have a collective meaning; they only serve as counting forms. While in Sinhalese, forms in *-ak* can also be built from higher numbers, the

<sup>307</sup> Cf. the Introduction, 0.5.1.

Dhivehi substantivisations with the suffix *-e*<sup>3</sup> do not exceed the number “ten” in Dhivehi. From “eleven” upwards, there are only the unenlarged stem-forms which are used both as attributes and as nouns.

While in Sinhalese the positioning of the cardinal numbers before or after the governing noun depends on several criteria (cf. GEIGER 1942, 4 / 1973, 561; MATZEL 1983, 41), the situation is comparatively simple in Dhivehi. As already mentioned by GEIGER (1919, 73), the attributive numeral always precedes the governing noun in this language. Cp., e.g., *M. fas aharu* “five years” (T9, 9), *M. de tin lum̃bō* “two (or) three limes” (T10, 6), *A. hatara ahara* “four years” (T16, 23), *F. de fāli* “two oars” (T4, 28).

2.5.1.1. To give a complete and detailed survey, the cardinal numbers from “one” to “ten” will be listed below both in their (attributive) stem-form and in their enlarged substantive form which is used for counting.<sup>308</sup>

“**One**”: attr. M.A.F. *e*<sup>3</sup> /*ek*/; subst. M.A.F. *eke*<sup>3</sup> /*ek-ek*/. Following GEIGER (1941, 30, no. 445), the corresponding Sinh. form *eka*, stem *ek-*, cannot be traced back directly to OIA *éka-* and Pa. *eka-* but presupposes Pkt. *ēkka-* which with an optional quantitative metathesis represents a regular development from earlier MIA forms with simple *-k-*; *ēkka-* must be regarded as the basic form not only for Dhivehi and Sinhalese but also for the other NIA languages (cf. also TURNER 1966, I, 119, no. 2462, GEIGER 1902, 916, no. 97 and BERGER 1992, 245).

“**Two**”: attr. M.A.F. *de*; subst. M.A.F. *dē*<sup>3</sup> /*de-ek*/. Dhiv. *de* and Sinh. *deka*, stem *de-*, go back to Pkt. *duve*, \**de* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 80, no. 1182 and 1902, 915, no. 76); cp. Pa. *dve*, *duve* and OIA (fem.) *d<sub>u</sub>vé* (cf. also TURNER 1966, I, 379, no. 6648).<sup>309</sup>

“**Three**”: attr. M.A.F. *tin*; subst. M.A.F. *tine*<sup>3</sup> /*tin-ek*/. GEIGER derives Sinh. *tuna*, stem *tun-* and Dhiv. *tin* from Pkt. *tiñi* ~ Pa. *tīñi*, Skt. (ntr.) *trīñi* (GEIGER 1941, 65, no. 949 and 1920, 935, no. 384; cf. also TURNER 1966, I, 342, no. 5994).

“**Four**”: attr. M. *hataru*, A. *hatara*, F. *hataro*; subst. M.A.F. *hatare*<sup>3</sup> /*hatar-ek*/. The Dhivehi forms as well as Sinh. *hatara/satara*, *hataru* etc. must be derived from Pkt. ~ Pa. *cattāro* ← OIA *catvārah* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 188, no. 2843 and 1902, 922, no. 185; TURNER 1966, I, 252, no. 4655).

“**Five**”: attr. M.A. *fas*, F. *fahq*; subst. M.A.F. *fahe*<sup>3</sup> /*fas-ek*/. Dhiv. *fas* and Sinh. *paha/pasa*, stem *pas-* go back to Pkt. ~ Pa. *pañca*, OIA *pāñca* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 100, no. 1485 and 1902, 918, no. 120; TURNER 1966, I, 431, no. 7655). Possibly, the OIA nasal has left its traces in the final vowel of F. *fahq*.

“**Six**”: attr. M.A.F. *ha*; subst. M.A.F. *hae*<sup>3</sup> /*ha-ek*/. Like Sinh. *haya/saya*, stem *ha-/sa-*, Dhiv. *ha* can be derived from Pkt. ~ Pa. *cha* ← OIA *ṣaṭ* (GEIGER 1941, 189, no. 2862 and 1902, 921, no. 175; TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12803).

“**Seven**”: attr. M. *hai*, A.F. *ha*<sup>3</sup> /*hat*/; subst. M.A.F. *hate*<sup>3</sup> /*hat-ek*/. Dhiv. /*hat*/, like Sinh. *hata/sata*, stem *hat-/sat-*, goes back to Pkt. ~ Pa. *satta* ← OIA *saptá* (GEIGER 1941, 188, no. 2842 and 1902, 922, no. 184; TURNER 1966, II, 760, no. 13139).

“**Eight**”: attr. M.A. *a*<sup>3</sup>, F. *aśo* /*aś*/; subst. M.A.F. *aše*<sup>3</sup> /*aś-ek*/. The numeral is spelled ⟨āṣa⟩ by GEIGER (1902, 911, no. 18) in accordance with the contemporary pronunciation.<sup>310</sup> Dhiv. /*aś*/ (← *aṭ* ← *aṭa*) and Sinh. *aṭa* can be traced back to Pkt. ~ Pa. *aṭṭha* ← OIA *aṣṭā* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 4, no. 48; TURNER 1966, I, 41, no. 941).

<sup>308</sup> For additional information on the etymology of the numerals cf. GEIGER (1938), 119 ff. and (1900), 65; for the etymological background of the cardinals in Modern Indo-Aryan in general cf. BERGER (1992), 245 ff.

<sup>309</sup> For the distribution of the descendant forms of Pkt. *dō* ← Skt. *d<sub>u</sub>vāu* and Pkt. *duve* ← Skt. *d<sub>u</sub>ve* in the modern languages and, particularly, a variant “with initial *b-* in Prakrit *bē*, Apabhraṃśa *bi*, which goes back to *dv-* (via \**db-*) and is also dominant in all compounds with ‘two’ (Hi. *bārah* ‘twelve’, *bāīs* ‘twenty-two’, etc.)”, cf. BERGER (1992), 246.

<sup>310</sup> For the phonetical background of this spelling, cf. 1.3.6.

“**Nine**”: attr. M.A.F. *nuva*; subst. M.F. *nuvae* /*nuva-ek*/, A. *nuva* /*nuvak*/. Dhiv. *nuva*, together with Sinh. *navaya*, stem *nava-* (besides the variant *namaya*, stem *nama-*), comes from Pkt. ~ Pa. *nava*, OIA *náva* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 83, no. 1230 and 1902, 932, no. 339; TURNER 1966, I, 401, no. 6984).

“**Ten**”: attr. M. *diha*, A.F. *deha*; subst. M. *dihae*, F. *dehae* /*-ek*/, A. *deha* /*dehak*/. *diha/deha*, like Sinh. *daha/dasa*, goes back to Pkt. *daha*, *dasa*, Pa. *dasa* ← OIA *dása* (GEIGER 1941, 73, no. 1065 and 1902, 915, no. 79; TURNER 1966, I, 356, no. 6227).

2.5.1.2. In Modern Dhivehi, the cardinal numbers starting with “eleven” have only one form for attributive and substantival use (cf. 2.5.1 above). When GEIGER (1919, 71) stated about the numbers from “11” to “20” that “the numerals are of interest from the fact that some of them are more closely related to the Pali than the corresponding forms in Sinhalese”, he presumably wanted to refer to the archaicity of the forms in question. He was not aware that most of the numbers from “11” to “20” and also most of the higher numbers in Modern Dhivehi represent prakritisms or hybrid formations.

The following etymological discussion of the individual numerals will show that the decimal numbers “11”, “12”, “13”, “14”, “16”, “17”, “18” and “19” of Dhivehi which reflect Prakrit variants have no direct cognates in Sinhalese. Even in the case of “15” (Dhiv. *fanara* as against Old Sinh. *paṇara*, cf. below) we cannot definitely decide whether the two forms represent a one-to-one correspondence.

These facts cannot be regarded as arguments against a common Prakrit source of the two languages, however; cp., e.g., the numerals from “one” to “ten” (cf. 2.5.1.1 above) which with no doubt represent cognates, or Dhiv. *vih*i and Sinh. *visi* “20” which are etymologically identical. Furthermore, it is an unquestionable fact that the duodecimal system was predominant in Dhivehi for a long time, the decimal numbers playing a secondary role only. Thus, it is not surprising that there are unambiguous cognates between some duodecimal numbers of Dhivehi and their etymological correspondences in Sinhalese; cp., e.g., Dhiv./Sinh. *ekoḷos* “11” and Dhiv./Sinh. *doḷos* “12” (cf. below and 2.5.1.8). In the latter language, which presumably never had a duodecimal system, some of the etyma in question have preserved their original meaning as inherited from OIA; cp. Dhiv. *fasih*i “24” as against Sinh. *pasvisi* “25” or Dhiv. *fanas* “48” as against Sinh. *panas* “50” (cf. 2.5.1.8 below).

TURNER who quotes C.H.B. REYNOLDS for the scanty material on Dhivehi available to him (1985, vii<sup>311</sup>) proposed an extra-Insular-Indo-Aryan origin for the numerals “11”, “12”, “14”, “16” and “17” (and most of the higher numbers, cf. below) as well, but the source which he had in mind was Modern Mainland Indo-Aryan. TURNER’s etymological proposals concerning the Dhivehi numbers in question are much too vague, however, for being verifiable in detail<sup>312</sup>. The assumption that the numerals from “11” to “19” generally represent loanwords from Hindi is widespread in the Maldives as well. With all probability it reflects an opinion first expressed by BELL (1883, 121): “Beyond 10 a modified form of the Hindústání decimal numeration is that in common use.” BELL, who deserves well for his work on

<sup>311</sup> During a short stay in the Maldives REYNOLDS, the author of a short bibliography on the Maldivian Islands (1993), collected material for a Dhivehi word-list which he put at TURNER’s disposal.

<sup>312</sup> Cf., e.g., TURNER (1985), 15, 2485 on “11”: “Md. *egāra* (← Ind.? cf. H(indi) *igārah*)”; Add. 55, 6658 on “12”: “Md. *bāra* ← Ind.”; Add. 33, 4605 on “14”: “Md. *sauda*, *sāda* ← Ind.”; Add. 102, 12812 on “16”: “Md. *sōla* ← M(arathi) or G(ujarati)”; Add. 104, 13146 on “17”: “Md. *satāra* ← Ind.”.

the history, geography and ethnography of the Maldives,<sup>313</sup> also provided a huge collection of older material of the Dhivehi language. Being neither a philologist nor a linguist, however, he was not able to judge the relationship between the Hindi and Dhivehi numerals which often seem to be very similar to each other. In most cases it is easy to prove that TURNER's vague etymological proposals concerning the Dhivehi numerals (mostly consisting of indications like "← Ind." only) have no linguistic basis. Most of the numerals in question are attested in the written documents of Old Dhivehi; hence it can easily be demonstrated that it is not possible to explain these numerals as loans from Modern Hindi, all the more since there are some typical phonological developments that have to be accounted for (cp., e.g., "14", "16" and "17").

**"Eleven":** M. *eṅgāra* (*egāra*), A.F. *egāra*. GEIGER (1919, 70 and 1916, 103) identifies *egāra* with Pa. *ekārasa* (besides *ekādasā*). This as well as Pkt. *ekkārasa*, *egārasa* can be traced back to OIA *ekādaśa* "eleven". The same holds true for the IIA numeral stem *\*ekoḷos* "eleven" which belongs to the duodecimal system (in Dhivehi only; cf. 2.5.1.8).<sup>314</sup> *ekoḷos* is attested in a *Tāna* inscription of the 18th century (ITAG 2,2); it is obsolete in Modern Dhivehi but still in use in Sinhalese. While *ekoḷos* represents the inherited IIA word for "eleven", M. *eṅgāra* (*egāra*), A.F. *egāra* can only be explained as a loanword from a non-IIA language of uncertain origin and unknown time (but cf. particularly Beng. and Or. *egāra*).

**"Twelve":** M.A.F. *bāra* only indirectly corresponds to Old Sinh. *bara* which GEIGER derives from Pkt. *bārasa/bāraha*, Pa. *bārasa* (1941, 118, no. 1773; 1919, 70; cp. also the hybrid Pa. form *dvādasa* ← OIA *dvādaśa* "twelve"; TURNER 1966, I, 380, no. 6658). The initial *b-* must be taken as a clear evidence that both Dhiv. *bāra* and Sinh. *bara* cannot be traced back to an autochthonous IIA Pkt. form, because the development of *b-* ← OIA *dv-* (via *db-*), being regular for "all Indian languages and a great part of the northwestern languages" (BERGER 1992, 251; cp. Beng., Or., Ass. *bāra*, Hi. *bārah/bārā*<sup>315</sup>; cf. also fn. 309 above), never occurs in Sinhalese or Dhivehi which show initial *d-* instead. Sinh. *bara* shows the regular shortening of MIA *-ā-* → *-a-* which allows to assume that this numeral represents an early loanword from one of the mainland IA Prakrits. The long root vowel of Dhiv. *bāra*, however, speaks in favour of a more recent prakritism or even of a loanword from a Modern IA language. In Sinhalese, *bara* was completely replaced by the inherited *doḷos* "twelve" (stem form used attributively; the substantive form is *dolaha*, cf. GEIGER 1941, 82, no. 1210). For the corresponding numeral Dhiv. *doḷos*, which is obsolete in the modern language, and the other duodecimal numbers cf. 2.5.1.8 below.

**"Thirteen":** The long root vowel of M.A.F. *tēra* "13" (for an earlier attestation of this form cp. *tēra* in the *Tāna* inscription ITMP 2,3) indicates a Prakrit loanword (cp. Pkt. */tērasa/* → */tēraha/* → */tēra/*) instead of the expected form *tera* which seems to be attested in the *Dives akuru* inscription IDMHM 5,3,<sup>316</sup> corresponding to Old Sinhalese *tera*; cp. also Hi. *terah*, Nep. Ass. Beng. Or. Guj. *tera*, Mar. *terā* with regular short *-e-*. According to BERGER (1992, 251), these variants "go back, not to Sanskrit *trayodaśa*, but to Middle Indo-Aryan *terasa* (Pa., Prakrit), *teraha* (Prakrit) ..., *\*tredaśa*, with an earlier stage *\*trayadaśa* (or, according to Turner, *\*trayēdaśa*)". BERGER's supposition (ib.) according to which "the *l*-form, Pa. *telasa* ← *\*trelasa* ← *\*trerasa*, which arose by assimilation ... does not survive anywhere in the Indian languages" is perhaps contradicted by a variant *teḷesa* (stem *teḷes*) with retroflex *-l-* appearing in literary Sinhalese which, however, is obsolete in the modern (colloquial) language.<sup>317</sup> GEIGER (1938, 120) explains this form as follows: "The numeral *teḷes* 13 seems also to be derived from MInd. *\*tēdasa* = Skt. *trayodaśa*". BERGER (ib.), however, derives *tedasa* */tēdasa/* (attested in *Aśoka* inscriptions) through *\*tredasa* */trēdaśa/* from *\*trayadaśa* as well. It cannot be decided with certainty whether the retroflex *-l-* in Sinh. *teḷes* has to be explained by analogy (as described below, s.v. "sixteen") or whether it can be derived directly from a MIA variant containing *-l-*, like Pa. *teḷasa* "13" (cf. RHYS DAVIDS

<sup>313</sup> Cf. the bibliography for details.

<sup>314</sup> For the retroflex *-l-* cf. "sixteen" below. — Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 120, no. 2485; GEIGER (1941), 30, no. 455.

<sup>315</sup> The variants in *-ā* (without a final *-h*) belong to the colloquial language, cp., e.g., MCGREGOR (1972), 61.

<sup>316</sup> The *e* of *tera* (IDMHM 5,3) is not decisive as *Dives akuru* had no means of expressing long *ē*.

<sup>317</sup> In Modern Sinhalese, only *daha-tuna* (stem *daha-tun*) is used for "13" (lit. "ten-three", cf. GEIGER 1938, 118; MATZEL 1983, 39).

1921-25, 297 s.v. *tayo*. — Cf. also GEIGER (1941), 67, no. 980; (1919), 71; TURNER (1966) I, 342, no. 6001: OIA *tráyodaśa*).

**“Fourteen”**: M. *sāda*, A.F. *sauda*. GEIGER (1919, 71) identified the variants *sauda* and *sāda*<sup>318</sup> with Pa. *cauddasa*. Unlike this and the Pa. variant *cuddasa*, the Maldivian examples as well as Hi. *caudah*, Beng. *codda* etc. are much closer to Pkt. *cauddasa*, *caüddasa/caüddaha* (besides *coddasa/coddaha*); all forms can be derived from OIA *cāturdaśa* “14”, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 250, no. 4605). The Sinh. numeral *tudusa* (stem *tudus*) which was used in the older literary language,<sup>319</sup> lastly reflects *cāturdaśa* as well; according to GEIGER, however, *tudusa* is the result of a different development in the MIA period, reflecting a case where the first syllable had already been lost before the loss of intervocalic voiceless stops occurred.<sup>320</sup> — The variant *sauda*, which is the older form, is attested in several *Dives akuru* and *Tāna* inscriptions (IDMH 2,11, IDMEM 1,22, IDMD 1,3, and ITAH 1,5) and in the *Rādaṅgaḷi* (RC). — At a glance, the initial *s-* in *sauda* seems to represent a general phonological development of Insular Indo-Aryan, according to which every inherited *c-* of OIA and MIA changed to *s-*. Whenever the affricate *c-* occurs in initial position in Dhivehi, the word in question can with no doubt be categorised as a recent loanword (cf. 1.7.3.). If the Dhivehi numeral had been borrowed from Modern Hi. *caudah* (as popular etymology takes it, cf. 2.5.1.2 above) or if it reflected a later prakritism (cf. Pkt. *cauddasa*), the initial *c-* would have been preserved in its original quality, because the change of *c-* to *s-* was restricted to an early period in the history of the Maldivian language. M. *sāda* and A.F. *sauda* cannot represent an inherited word, however, for the old initial *s-* would have developed into *h-* (cf. 1.3.5). In analogy with M. *hataru* etc. “four” (cf. 2.5.1.1 above), we would expect *\*hauḍa* which, however, never existed in Dhivehi. Thus, the initial *s-* of *sāda* / *sauda* remains problematic.<sup>321</sup> — TURNER (cf. fn. 312) supposed that the Dhivehi variants represent an “Indic” loanword without specifying the period or the language. To sum up the facts, *sauda* can neither be regarded as an autochthonous IIA word, nor can it represent an immediate prakritism or a loanword from a recent period.

**“Fifteen”**: M.A.F. *fanara* corresponds to the numeral *paṇara* “15” of Old Sinhalese which has to be derived (like Old Guj. *panara*, Beng. *panera* / *ponera* and also variants with a secondarily inserted *-d-* between *n* and *r* such as Hi. *pandrah*, Ass. *pondara* etc.) from a Prakrit form like *pañnarasa*, *pañnaraha*; cf. also Pa. *paññarasa* (besides *pañcadasa*) ← OIA *pāñcadaśa* (cf. GEIGER 1938, 120; TURNER 1966 I, 432, no. 7662; BERGER 1992, 252). We cannot definitely decide, however, whether Dhiv. *fanara* and Sinh. *paṇara* are cognates in the proper sense because of the different results of the OIA cluster *-ñc-* they show. Sinh. *paṇara* reflects a MIA form with *-ṇ-* (cf. above), while the Dhiv. word seems to go back to a Pkt. variant with *-nn-*; cp., e.g., Pkt. *pannārasa* and *pannarasa* (cf. BERGER ib.). As a correspondent of Sinh. *paṇara*, we would expect *\*faṇara* with retroflex *-ṇ-* in the southern dialects.

As a numeral, *paṇara* is obsolete in Modern Sinhalese but the word is still in use as the name of the 15th day of the lunar month (cf. GEIGER 1941, 93, no. 1380). With the meaning of “15”, only the Old Sinh. numeral *pahaḷoha/pahaḷosa*, stem *pahaḷos* “15” is used nowadays<sup>322</sup> which, following GEIGER (1900, 65 and 1941, 101, no. 1496), can be identified with Pa. *pañcadasa* (for the retroflex *-ḷ-* in *pahaḷos* cf. “sixteen”).

**“Sixteen”**: M.A.F. *sōḷa*, as well as its literary Sinhalese correspondent *soḷosa/soḷasa* (stem *soḷos*) which is obsolete in the modern language, can be derived directly from a preform like Pkt., Pa. *soḷasa* ← OIA *śoḍaśa* ← *\*śāḍaśa* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 187, no. 2832; TURNER 1966, II, 743, no. 12812). On the basis of *soḷos*, GEIGER

<sup>318</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1919, 71): “Instead of *sauda* (which is historically correct), I heard the expression *sāda*.” GEIGER’s informant *Ebrahim Dīdī* was from Māle; therefore it is not surprising that he used *sāda*, the correct form of the modern standard language, which from the historical point of view represents a more recent stage than *sauda*. The diphthong in *sauda* corresponds to the phonological norm of southern Dhivehi, while the long *-ā-* of the Māle variant can probably be explained by an analogical development. Thus, M. *sāda* is to A.F. *sauda* as, e.g., M. *hā* / *hāl*! (← */haul/*) “cock” is to A. *hau* / *haul*!, F. *haul* “id.” (cf. 1.2.1.6).

<sup>319</sup> In Modern Sinhalese, only *daha-hataru* (lit. “ten-four”) is used for “14” (cf. GEIGER 1938, 118 and MATZEL 1983, 39).

<sup>320</sup> “Es leitet sich von einer Grundform ab, welche die erste Silbe bereits verloren hatte, ehe das Gesetz vom Abfall intervocalischer Tenues in Kraft trat.” (GEIGER 1900, 65; cf. also 1941, 65, no. 948).

<sup>321</sup> For another case of an initial *s-* which remains unexplained cp. Dhiv. *siṭi* “letter” (cf. 1.3.5).

<sup>322</sup> Cp. also the neologisms referred to in the sections about “13” and “14”, and “16” to “19”.

convincingly explains the retroflex *-l-* sounds occurring in Sinh. *ekoḷos* “11” (cf. above), *doḷos* “12” (cf. 2.5.1.8), *pahaḷos* “15” (cf. above), *sataḷos* “17” (cf. below), *ataḷos* “18” (cf. below) by assuming an analogical transfer: “The cerebralisation of the intervocalic *d* ( $\rightarrow d \rightarrow ḷ$ ) is taken from *soḷos* 16 where it is phonetically justified.” (1938, 120). In Modern Sinhalese, *soḷos* has been replaced by *daha-saya* “16”, lit. “ten-six” (cf. GEIGER 1938, 118 and MATZEL 1983, 39). The supposition that Dhiv. *sōla* could be a loanword from Hindi is disproved by the mere fact that the retroflex *ḷ* has the status of a phoneme in Dhivehi; this means that it cannot appear arbitrarily neither in the inherited vocabulary nor in loanwords. Hence, we would expect Dhiv. *\*/solā/* if it were a borrowing from Hi. *solah/solā* “16”. In this connection cp. also the Prakrit variants *solasa* and *solaha* with *-l-* (cf. TURNER, ib.). TURNER’s proposal to explain Dhiv. *sōla* as a borrowing from Mar. *solā* or Guj. *sol* (1985, 102, 12812) has to be rejected because of the differences in vowel quantity. The only way to explain the long root vowel as well as the initial *s-* of Dhiv. *sōla* consists in assuming a prakritism ( $\leftarrow */sōlā/ \leftarrow */sōḷaha/ \leftarrow /sōḷasa/$ ).<sup>323</sup>

“**Seventeen**”: M.A.F. *satāra*, which is attested in this form already in an early period of written Dhivehi (F2,4, document of 1627 A.D.), cannot be directly derived from a preform like Pkt., Pa. *sattarasa*, *sattadasa* ( $\leftarrow$  OIA *saptādaśa* “17”; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13146). The initial *s-* (cf. “fourteen” and “sixteen” above) on the one hand and the long root vowel on the other hand show with no doubt that *satāra* cannot be an inherited IIA word. – As against the common popular etymology (cf. above), Hi. *satrah* cannot be the origin of Dhiv. *satāra* because of the long vowel, *-ā-*, either. Whenever initial or medial consonant clusters occurring in foreign words are split in Dhivehi, the resulting anaptyctic vowels can never be long or lengthened (cf. 1.3.8.). The only way to explain the long *-ā-* is to assume a loanword. Although there are similar forms in the north-western group of the Modern IA languages (cp., e.g., Panj. *satārā*), it is very improbable that Dhiv. *satāra* could have been borrowed from there. The Dhivehi form might, however, be explained in a similar way as its equivalent in Panjabi (and other languages); cf. BERGER (1992, 253), according to whom “... the long connecting vowel is taken over from ‘eighteen’” (cf. below). Assuming a Pkt. loanword *\*sattara*, we should expect *\*satara* as its outcome in Dhivehi. The lengthened medial *-ā-* of the actual form *satāra* could then be explained as the result of an analogical transfer. – Cp. also the literary Sinh. form *sataḷos* “17” which goes back to OIA *saptādaśa* as well (cf. “sixteen” above; GEIGER 1938, 120).<sup>324</sup>

“**Eighteen**”: M.A.F. *aśāra* which in inscriptions is attested also in its older form *aṭāra* (IDMMM 3,4; IDMHM 4,11) does not correspond directly to Old Sinh. *aṭāra* and *aṭarasa*, the latter forms showing the regularly shortened medial *-a-* as against Dhiv. *-ā-*. Cf. also literary Sinh. *aṭaḷosa/aṭaḷoha*<sup>325</sup> with short *-a-* (for the retroflex *-l-* cf. “sixteen” above). All these forms go back to OIA *aṣṭādaśa* “18”; intermediate stages are represented by forms such as Pa. *aṭṭhādasa*, Pkt. *aṭṭhadasa*, Pa., Pkt. *aṭṭhārasa*, Pkt. *aṭṭhāraha* (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 41, 946; GEIGER 1941, 4, nos. 52 and 53). Dhiv. *aśāra* cannot be derived directly from an IIA basis, however. With no doubt it has to be explained as a loanword. In analogy with the other numbers (from “11” to “17”), it is most probable that Dhiv. *aṭāra*  $\rightarrow$  *aśāra* reflects a prakritism (cp. Pkt. *aṭṭhārasa* / *aṭṭhārasa*). In the (less probable) case of an early borrowing from Hi. *aṭhārah*, as suggested by Maldivian popular etymology (cf. above), the result in Dhivehi would as well be *aśārā* ( $t \rightarrow ś$  with regular loss of the aspiration; for the sound change involved cf. 3.6.3.2.1.2 and 1.3.6).

“**Nineteen**”: is denoted by two different etyma in Modern Dhivehi. The standard Dhivehi form of the numeral, M. *ona-vihi*, was already known to GEIGER who wrote (1919, 71): “The form for 19 is worthy of note. It shows that in the Prākṛit foundation of Sinhalese and Māldivian a form must have existed which corresponded to the Sanskrit *ūna-vimśati* (with omission of the *eka*)”. It must be admitted, though, that in this case, the retroflex *-ṇ-* appearing in A. *oṇa-vihi* and F. *uṇa-vihi* remains as unexplained as that of Pkt. *iguṇavisam*, *iguṇvīsam* and *aiṇavisam* ( $\leftarrow$  *ekūnavimśati-*; cf. below<sup>326</sup>). *\*ūnavimśati-*, which is not recorded in MIA, must also be the source of Hi. *un(n)īs* and Beng. *unīs* (cf. BERGER 1992, 253), while in Sinhalese there is no attestation of a correspondent form (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 114, no. 2411). The literary, now obsolete Sinh.

<sup>323</sup> Cf. 1.3.5 above and the other numbers beginning with *s-*.

<sup>324</sup> In the modern language, this is replaced by *daha-hata* (cf. MATZEL 1983, 39 and GEIGER 1938, 118).

<sup>325</sup> In Modern Sinhalese, only *daha-aṭa* (lit. “ten-eight”) is used for “18” (cf. MATZEL 1983, 39 and GEIGER 1938, 118).

<sup>326</sup> Cp. also the Mar. variants *ekunvīs*, *ekuṇīs*, *ekonīs* (cf. BERGER 1992, 253).

numeral *ekunvīsi* (subst. *ekunvīssa*) must be identified with Pa. *ekūnavīsa(ti)-*, OIA *ekonaviṃśati-* “19” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 120, no. 2499; GEIGER 1938, 121). The literal meaning of *ekonaviṃśati-* and its elliptic variant, *\*ūnaviṃśati-* is “twenty lacking one”. — In Modern Sinhalese, “19”, lit. “ten-nine”, is expressed only by the two variants *daha-nama(-ya)* and *daha-ṇava(-ya)*, the forms with *-ya* being used as substantives (cf. MATZEL 1983, 39). — The second numeral in Dhivehi with the meaning of “19”, M.A.F. *navāra*, seems to be a recent analogical formation, matching the pattern of *aśāra* “18” and *satāra* “17”. A similar form can neither be attested for Sinhalese nor for any of the texts of Old Dhivehi, while the inherited numeral M. *onavihi* occurs as a part of an ordinal number in one of the early *Tāna* inscriptions: *hāhāi duiṣatta onavihi-vana aharu* “in the thousand and two hundred nineteenth year” (ITMHM 2,2). — It is very improbable that the Dhivehi numerals formed with *ona-* (*oṇa-/uṇa-*) might have been borrowed in this form from a Modern Indo-Aryan mainland language (cf. TURNER 1985, 16, no. 2494: “Md. *ona-* ‘less by one’ (in *onavihi* ‘19’, *onativīs* ‘29’, *onasatta* ‘69’ [sic!]<sup>327</sup> ← Ind.”). While *vīhi* “20” as the second part of the numeral “19” represents a regular development according to the sound laws of Dhivehi (cf. below), the case of *onativīs* “29” and *onasatta* “99” is more complicated (cf. 2.5.1.3 and 2.5.1.6, s.v. *satta* “100”). — A third numeral for “19” documented in older Dhivehi records is *nuva-diha*, lit. “9-10” (ITMHM 4,3 and 7,2; the ordinal number *nuvadiha-vana* “29th” in ITFM 2,3); this form is obsolete in the modern language.

“**Twenty**”: M.A.F. *vīhi*, Sinh. *visi* (subst. *vīssa*), Hi. *bīs*, Guj. and Mar. *vīs* etc. must be traced back to OIA *viṃśati-* “20” via nasal-less variants like Pa. *vīsati*, Pkt. *visāi*, *vīsā* (cp. also Pkt. *viṃśadi*, Pa. and Pkt. *vīsam*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 677, no. 11616; GEIGER 1941, 167, no. 2505 and 1938, 121; BERGER 1992, 253). In Old Dhivehi, we find both *vīhi* (IDMEM 4,11; ITMHM 1,3 and ITAH 4,7; *vīhī* in L5 4/2,6) and *vīs* (IDMHH 6,6). The latter form with long *-ī*, as well as the compound numerals containing *-vīs* (cf. 2.5.1.3 below) are irregular; the variant *vīs* can only be explained as a prakritism. The spelling *viṃśati*, attested in some *lōmāfanus* (L3 1/1,1; L5 1/1,2 and 4/1,2), represents a pure sanskritism.

2.5.1.3. The formation of the Dhivehi cardinal numbers from “21” to “28” follows the principle of “monadic unit plus decade”, in just the same way as the Sinhalese language did in its classical period (cf. GEIGER 1938, 119). In contrast to this, Modern Sinhalese shows a reverse pattern of “decade plus monadic unit”. In Dhivehi, only the long-vocalic variant *vīs* (cf. 2.5.1.2 above) is used to denote the meaning of “twenty-...”. With no doubt, all the numbers built on *-vīs* must be regarded as prakritisms.

“**21**”: M.A.F. *ekā-vīs*, lit. “1-20” cannot be equated with Class.Sinh. *ek-vīssa* (stem *ek-visi*; cp. also the modern form *visi-eka*, stem (adj.) *visi-ek*; cf. GEIGER 1938, 118-9) which may be derived directly from OIA *ēkaviṃśati-* via a Prakrit form like *ekkaṃvīsai*, *ekkaṃvīsam*. A form *\*ekkihi* *‘ek-visi*’ which, according to the sound laws, would represent an exact equivalent of Class.Sinh. *ekvisi-*, does not exist in Dhivehi. TURNER was right in looking for an extra-IIA origin of *ekāvīs*, but Hi. *ikkāīs*, which he proposed, cannot be regarded as a direct source (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119, no. 2476 and 1985, 15, no. 2476). Instead, *ekāvīs*, which has the appearance of an artificial form, is more likely to represent a prakritism. Most probably, it presupposes a form *\*ekāvīsa*, a conservative MIA variant with *-k-*, similar to Pa. *ekavīsa* but with a secondary lengthening of *-ā-* which we find in some late MIA variants (cp. *egāvīsā*, *eyāvīsa*, *eāisa*); NORMAN (1992, 214) explains the lengthened *-ā-* by analogy with *egārasa* “11”. This contrasts with BERGER’s assumption according to which the lengthening of *-ā-* (in modern forms like Hi. *ikkāīs*, Nep. *ekāīs* and in the MIA variants mentioned above) must be explained by analogy with “the next numeral, ‘twenty-two’ (Hi. *bāīs*, etc.)”; cf. BERGER 1992, 254 and s.v. “22” below.

“**22**”: M.A.F. *bā-vīs*, lit. “2-20”, is already attested in *Dives akuru* inscriptions, both in its cardinal form (IDMDM 1,6) and as an ordinal number *bāvīs-vana* “22nd” (IDAH 1,3; ITAH 3,1). In principle, TURNER’s assumption (1985, 55, no. 6672) that *bāvīs* has its origin in an Indic language (not specified by him) is right. The form *bāvīs* which must be derived from OIA *dvāvīṃśati-* represents a prakritism (cp. the Pkt. variants *bāvīsam* etc. and Pa. *bāvīsati-*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 381, no. 6672 and NORMAN 1992, 214). Theoretically, *bāvīs* might have been taken over from any Prakrit language with the development of OIA *dv-* → MIA *b-* which is untypical

<sup>327</sup> Obviously TURNER confused M. *ona-satta* (A. *oṇa-satta*, F. *uṇa-satta*) “99” with M. *ona-hāteri*, A. *oṇa-hattari*, F. *uṇa-hattari* “69”.

for Insular Indo-Aryan (cf. 2.5.1.2). According to the sound laws, OIA *dvāvimśati-* would have led to Dhiv. *\*davihi* via a MIA form with initial *dv-* such as Pa. *dvāvīsati-*, *dvāvīsa*. Cp. also Class.Sinh. *de-vissa* (as against the modern form *visi-deka*, stem *visi-de*; cf. GEIGER 1938, 119) which has no equivalent form in Dhivehi (*\*devihi*).<sup>328</sup>

“23”: M.A.F. *tē-vīs*, lit. “3-20”, must also be considered as a prakritism. Older attested variants are *tevīsu* (*Dives akuru*; F3,8) and *tēvīs* (*Tāna*; ITAG 6,3). Cp. Class.Sinh. *te-vissa*, stem *te-visi*, which must be derived through an intermediate form like Pkt. *tevīsaṃ*, Pa. *tevīsa* (etc.) from OIA *trāyovimśati-* (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 342, no. 6004 and 1985, 49, no. 6004). The correspondent Dhivehi form would be *\*tevihi*.

“24”: M.A.F. *sau-vīs*, lit. “4-20”, is already attested in some of the earliest written documents (*sauvīsu* in the *lōmāfanu* L1 d/1,2 and L8 1,2; *sauvīs* in the *Tāna* inscription ITAH 3,2). There are good reasons why *sauvīs* cannot represent an inherited IIA word which would have developed directly through intermediate stages like Pkt. *cauvvīsa*, Pa. *caturvīsa* from OIA *caturvimśati-* (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 250, no. 4623). *-vīs* with long *ī* speaks in favour of a prakritism (cf. above). But we can exclude a recent prakritism because in this case the initial *c-* would have been preserved. For the change of OIA and MIA *c-* to *s-* which is characteristic for early Dhivehi but which did not result in an initial *h-* which would be regular in Modern Dhivehi, cf. 2.5.1.2 s.v. “fourteen”. The diphthong *-au-*, occurring in all three dialects in this word cannot be inherited as such either. — TURNER’s derivation of “*sauvīs* ← Ind.” (1985, 33, no. 4623) cannot be upheld if we consider correspondent Modern IA forms such as Hi. *caubīs*, Beng. *cabbiś*. Cf. also Class.Sinh. *satar(a)-vissa*, stem *visi-*.

“25”: M.A.F. *fansa-vīs* must be derived from OIA *pāñcaviṃśati-*; cp. Pa. *pañcavīsa* besides *pañṇavīsati*, *pañṇuvīsa*, Pkt. *pañāvīsaṃ*, *pañāvīsai* etc. (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7672; NORMAN 1992, 215). Because of its *-n-*, *fansa-vīs* easily reveals itself as being a prakritism, the regular outcome of OIA *pāñcaviṃśati-* being represented in Class.Sinh. *pas-vīssa* (stem *pas-visi*) “25” as well as Dhivehi *fassihī* (← Old Dhiv. *pas-visi*) which shows a reinterpretation of the original meaning “25” into the duodecimal number “24” within the prevailing duodecimal system (cf. 2.5.1.8). For *-vīs* cf. above.

“26”: M.A.F. *sabbīs*, attested in the spelling (*sa’bīs*) in the *Tāna* inscription ITAG 1,9, goes back to OIA *śādvimśati-*; cp. the MIA equivalents Pa. *chabbīsati-* and Pkt. *chavvīsam* (TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12796). As in the preceding cases, Dhiv. *sabbīs* must be regarded as a prakritism, not as a loanword from a Modern Indo-Aryan mainland language (cf. TURNER 1985, 103, no. 12796: “Md. *sabbīs* ← Ind.”); cp., e.g., Hi. *chabbīs*, Beng. *chābbīś* or Guj. *chavvis* (cf. BERGER 1992, 255). In Dhivehi, OIA *śādvimśati-* would have developed into *\*havihi* via *\*savisi*, corresponding with Class.Sinh. *savīssa* (stem *savisi-*).

“27”: M.A.F. *hatā-vīs* is attested in one of the earliest records of Dhivehi in the spelling *ṣatāvīsu* (*lōmāfanu* L2 33,4). The derivation of this word from OIA *ṣaptāvimśati-* is unproblematical. The Dhivehi form, a prakritism like the preceding numerals, must represent a MIA equivalent such as Pa. *sattāvīsati* or Pkt. *sattāvīsaṃ* (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13157). Thus, TURNER’s explanation of the Dhivehi numeral as a borrowing from Guj. *sattāvīs* (1985, 104, no. 13157) cannot be supported. According to the sound laws of Insular Indo-Aryan, OIA *ṣaptāvimśati-* would have led to Dhiv. *\*hattihi* ← *\*satvisi* ← *\*satavisi*.

“28”: M.A.F. *aśāvīs*, a prakritism which is first documented in this form in an 18th-century *Tāna* inscription (ITAG 2,6), can be traced back through MIA forms like Pkt. *aṭṭhāvīsam*, Pa. *aṭṭhāvīsati-* to OIA *aṣṭāvimśati-* (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, no. 950). The regular Dhivehi form would be *\*aṭṭihi* ← *\*aṭvisi* ← *\*aṭavisi*.

“29”: can be expressed by two etymologically different numerals, in the same way as “19”. The prakritism M. *ona-tirīs*, A. *oṇa-tirīs* F. *uṇa-tirīs*, lit. meaning “thirty lacking (one)”, reflects OIA *ūnatrīṃśat-* “29” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 114, no. 2408; for *tirīs* “30” cf. 2.5.1.4 below), thus contrasting with Class.Sinh. *ekun-tīsa* (stem *ekun-tīs*) “29”, an inherited IIA form which corresponds to the more “complete” variant OIA *ekona-trīṃśat-* (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 120, no. 2496; for other variant forms cf. BERGER 1992, 256). In *Dives akuru* inscriptions, we find *onatiris* (IDMHM 7,4), *onatirīs* (IDAH 1,8) and the ordinal number *oṇatirīsvana* (IDMEM 4,8, spelt with *(ṇi)*). For the formation cf. 2.5.1.2, 2.5.1.5.3, s.v. “nineteen”. — Of M.A.F. *navā-vīs* “29” (lit. “9-20”), no older attestations have been found so far. At first sight, this seems to be a plain neologism built after the pattern of the preceding numerals *hatāvīs* “27” and *aśāvīs* “28”, similar to *navāra* “19” which

<sup>328</sup> Most probably, Sinh. *devisi-* must be derived from a feminine form OIA *\*d<sub>v</sub>vevimśati-* via MIA *\*dve-/devisati-*. A formation by analogy with Sinh. *tevisi-* (cf. below) cannot be excluded either; cp. “Marāṭhī *bevīs* (beside *bāvīs*), the *e* [of which] is anticipated from *teīs* ‘twenty-three’” (cf. BERGER 1992, 254).

obviously represents an analogical formation after the model of *aśāra* “18” etc. (cf. “nineteen”). In case of analogy, however, we should expect \**nuvā-vis* instead; cp. *nuva* “nine” and the analytical formation *nuva-diha* “19”. It is not impossible that the vocalism of the first syllable of *navāvīs* might have been caused by a secondary assimilation following *navāra* “19”. It is more plausible, however, that *navā-* represents a sanskritism here (cp. Skt. *nāva* “nine”). But in this case, too, the long vowel of the second syllable must have been caused by an analogical adaptation to *hatā-vīs* and *aśā-vīs*. It is true that there are not many sanskritisms among the numerals in Dhivehi. At the period of the early written documents, however, some Sanskrit numerals were still available as *mots savants*; cp., e.g., *viṅṣati* “20” appearing in some *lōmāfanus* (L3 1/1,1; L5 1/1,2, 4/1,2) as well as *ekaviṅṣati* “21” (L2 1,2). — At least, we must consider the variants of the numeral “29” in Modern Sinhalese in this respect, viz. *visi-namaya* and °*navaya* (stems *visi-nama* and °*nava*), lit. meaning “20+9” (cf. GEIGER 1938, 119; MATZEL 1983, 39), which presumably substitute a reverse formation \**nama-vissa/nava-vissa*, lit. “9-20”, of Classical Sinhalese (cf. “22”). If it ever existed, this form must have been a neologism, too, because in the older documents of Sinhalese only the inherited form *ekuntisa* is attested.

2.5.1.4. The names of the decades from 30 to 90 are also best explained as prakritisms (or in a few cases perhaps as sanskritisms).

“30”: M.A.F. *tirīs* which already occurs in some documents of Old Dhivehi (*Dives akuru* inscription IDMEM 1,19; RC 10,3), obviously represents a different development as against Sinh. *tis*, subst. *tisa/tiha* which are derivable directly from Ap. *tīsa*, *tīsam*, Pa. *tiṃsa(ti)*- (cf. GEIGER 1941, 65, no. 944 and 1919, 71; NORMAN 1992, 213). It is still too early to definitely decide by which intermediate forms of the MIA period Modern Dhiv. *tirīs* is related with OIA *triṅśāt-* “30” (cp., e.g., Niya *triśa*). In Modern IA we find “beside the normal continuations such as Hi. [etc.] *tīs* ... forms with preserved *tr-* as in ... Gujarātī *trīś*, ... Bengali *tris*, Assamese *trix*, Orīyā *triśa*, which can be explained by Sanskrit influence in the eastern languages ... and by association with ‘three’ ... in the western languages” (BERGER 1992, 256; cf. also TURNER 1966, I, 343, no. 6015). Whether TURNER’s reference to an (unspecified) Indic language as the presumptive source of *tirīs* can be taken seriously, is still open to doubt (1985, 49, no. 6015). In this case, *tirīs* could be explained as borrowing with an anaptyctic vowel in the first syllable (perhaps as an “indirect” sanskritism). Considering the other designations of decades, it seems more probable, however, that the form *tirīs* represents a learned prakritism in Dhivehi.

“40”: M.A.F. *sālīs* is already attested in its modern form in the *Dives akuru* inscription IDMBM 1,5<sup>329</sup>. Its Sinhalese equivalents are the stem variants *satalis/hatalis*, *sataḷis/hataḷis*, and *sālīs/sālīs* (subst. *-a*) which through Pkt. *cattāḷisaṃ*, *cālīsaṃ*, Pa. *cattāḷisaṃ/cattāḷisaṃ/cattārīsaṃ* can be derived from OIA *catvāriṅśāt-* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 188, no. 2844; RHYS-DAVIDS 1921-25, 261; TURNER 1966, I, 252, no. 4656 and BERGER 1992, 258). According to the sound laws of Dhivehi, a regular development within IIA would have led to \**sālīs* with short *-i-*, which we see in all Sinhalese variants mentioned above. Thus, Dhiv. *sālīs*, too, must be interpreted as a prakritism, reflecting a form like Pkt. *cālīsaṃ*.

“50”: M.F. *fansās*, A. *fansas* go back to OIA *pañcāśāt-* (with the regular change of *c* to *s*); the numeral *fanās* meaning “48” in the Maldivian duodecimal system (cf. 2.5.1.8 below), which is obsolete in the modern language, must derive from the same source. On the coexistence of these two forms cf. BELL (1883, 121): “Some confusion, however, arises from the co-existence of the two systems [i.e. the decimal and the duodecimal system; S.F.]; thus, *fanās* or *fansās* may be either 48 or 50.” GEIGER (1919, 71) obviously failed to verify the two variant forms which he knew from BELL (ib.). — The phonological development of *fanās* and *fansās* cannot have been the same, despite of their common etymon. Dhiv. *fanās* exactly corresponds to Sinh. *panas* “50” (subst. *panasa/panaha*) which through forms like Pkt. *paññāsaṃ*, Pa. *paññāsa*, *paññāsaṃ* goes back to OIA *pañcāśāt-* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 95, no. 1402 and TURNER 1966, I, 433, no. 7682). The medial cluster *-ns-* of *fansās* reflecting OIA *-ñc-*, however, forces us to assume a sanskritism or a learned prakritism. At the (early) time when the duodecimal system was developing in Dhivehi, the (inherited) form underlying the attested numeral *fanās* “50” must have acquired the new interpretation of “48”.

“60” is expressed by two numerals of different etymological origin. M. *fas-doḷas*, A.F. *fas-doḷos* “5×12” is the only duodecimal numeral of Dhivehi that has been completely integrated into the decimal system. According

<sup>329</sup> *sālīsu* (with *-l-*) in L2 37,5 refers to the prophet *Sālīh*; cp. the spelling *sāleh* in L1 mn/2,3.

to GEIGER (1919, 73), the main reason for this can be seen in the fact that the number “60” represents the point of overlap of both counting methods (cf. also 2.5.1.8). — The second numeral denoting “60” is M.A.F. *haṭṭi* which through Pkt. *saṭṭhī*, Pa. *saṭṭhi-* goes back to OIA *ṣaṭṭi-* “60” (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 743, no. 12804 and 1985, 102, no. 12804). From the phonological point of view, Dhiv. *haṭṭi* cannot be exactly identified with Sinh. *sāṭa/hāṭa* “60” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 191, no. 2886) because of the geminate *-ṭṭ-* which indicates a secondary origin, presumably as a re-prakritisation; in contrast to that cp. the regular development manifesting itself in M.A. *aś*, F. *aśo* /*aś*/ “8” ← Pkt. *aṭṭha*.

“70”: M. *haidiha*, A.F. *haddeha* /*hat-deha*/ “7×10” represents a comparatively recent type of formation (together with *aḍḍiha* “80” and *nuvadiha* “90”); cf. also GEIGER (1919, 71). In contrast to this neologism, M. *hāiteri*, A.F. *hattari* “70” reflect MIA forms such as Pkt. *sattariṃ*, Pa. *sattari-* which can be derived from OIA *saptatī-*. Cp. also the corresponding numeral stem of Sinhalese, *hātū/sātū* (GEIGER 1941, 191, no. 2888 and 1938, 118; TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13143 and 1985, 104, no. 13143).

“80”: For the formation of M. *aḍḍiha*, A.F. *aḍḍeha* /*aṭ-deha*/ “8×10” cf. “70” above. The numeral is attested in the spelling ⟨*aḍḍiha*⟩ in the *Tāna* inscription ITAG 3,6. — As against this, there is a more archaic variant in Dhivehi, viz. M.A.F. *āhi* which can be traced back to OIA *aṣītī-* “80” through intermediate stages like Pkt. *asī/asim*, Pa. *asīti-* (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 40, no. 911 and 1985, 6, no. 911); cp. the correspondent Sinh. form *asū*, subst. *asūva* (GEIGER 1941, 14, no. 222). The initial *ā-* of Dhiv. *āhi* still needs an explanation.

“90” M. *nuva-diha* “9×10” is already documented two times in *Tāna* inscriptions of the 18th century (ITMHH 4,3 and 7,2) as a cardinal number and, furthermore, in the corresponding ordinal form *nuvadiha-vana* in ITFM (2,3). Its modern dialectal variant is A.F. *nuva-deha*; for the formation cf. “70” above. — For this numeral, too, Dhivehi disposes of a more archaic equivalent in M.F. *navai*, A. *navei* which can be traced back to OIA *navatī-*; cp. Pkt. *nauī*, *nauī*, *nauim* etc. (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 402, no. 6995 and 1985, 58, no. 6995; NORMAN 1992, 214). As against this, a different development must be assumed for Sinh. *anū*, subst. *anūva* “90” the initial *a* of which “seems to be due to the analogy of *asūva* eighty” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 8, no. 113).

2.5.1.5. The **monadic entities** from 31 to 39, from 41 to 49 etc. can be formed both by anteposition and by postposition of the monadic units with respect to the decades in question (i.e. in the form of 30-1 and 1-30, resp.). The postpositional formation of the monadic units occurs regularly in adjectival as well as substantival forms, which are distinguished in the same way as their underlying elements (cf. 2.5.1.1). From the point of view of historical linguistics, these formations must have come into use in the relative recent past only. In contrast to that it is very difficult to estimate the relative age of the formations that are composed in the opposite way (“monadic units + decades”).

2.5.1.5.1. A few examples may suffice to illustrate the regular formation of the type “**decade + monadic unit**”. “31”: M.A.F. adj. *tirīs e*<sup>o</sup> /*ek*/, subst. *tirīs eke*<sup>o</sup> /*ek-ek*/; “32”: adj. *tirīs de*, subst. *tirīs dē*<sup>o</sup> /*de-ek*/; “39”: adj. *tirīs nuva*, subst. *tirīs nuvae*<sup>o</sup> /*nuva-ek*/; “42”: adj. *saḷīs de*, subst. *saḷīs dē*<sup>o</sup>; “63”: adj. M. *fasdoḷas tin*, A.F. *fasdoḷos tin*, subst. M. *fasdoḷas tine*<sup>o</sup>, A.F. *fasdoḷos tine*<sup>o</sup> /*tin-ek*/ etc.

2.5.1.5.2. The monadic units which are built according to the model “**monadic unit + decade**” do not show homogeneous formations. The morphological diversity of the numerals in question can be explained by the fact that they presuppose at least three types of historical development which cannot easily be determined. There are only a few inherited formations, most of the numerals in question representing so-called “*mots savants*”, i.e. learned sanskritisms or prakritisms, which were borrowed at different times. Additionally, there must also be some analogical formations dating from different periods. Besides these main types, there is a considerable number of numerals which can only be explained as hybrid formations. It

would go beyond the scope of the present work to etymologise each of the numerals in question; thus, the following list will only provide their meaning and their equivalents in OIA. Only in particular cases, when a direct derivation from an attested MIA form seems to be possible or there are similar variants in other Modern Indo-Aryan languages, will these forms be given too (without automatically considering them as direct ancestors of the Dhivehi forms, however).<sup>330</sup> As dialectal variation is reduced to a minimum in this part of the Dhivehi numeral system, the list will contain only the forms of the standard language (cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU 1990, 99 ff.). The numerals “39”, “49” etc. which are built on the pattern *nava-* + “decade” and which have no ancestral forms in OIA will be collected in a particular chapter. For the names of the decades cf. 2.5.1.4.

#### 2.5.1.5.2.1. Formations of the type “monadic unit + decade”:

- ettirīs* “31” (OIA *ēkatrimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119 and 1985, 15, no. 2469);  
*battirīs* “32” (OIA *dvātrimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 380 and 1985, 55, no. 6657; cp. Guj. *batrīs*);  
*tettirīs* “33” (OIA *trāyastriṃśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 342 and 1985, 49, no. 6000; cp. Beng. *tetrīs* and Guj. *tetrīs*);  
*sauratirīs* “34” (OIA *cāstrimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 252, no. 4651); the ordinal number “34th” is attested as *sau-tirīs-vana* in Old Dhiv. (ITAH 6,2; cp. *sauvīs* “24”, 2.5.1.3);  
*fansatirīs* “35” (OIA *pāñcatrimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7661);  
*sattirīs* “36”, attested in the spelling (*satirīs*) in RC 9,3 (OIA *ṣāṭtrimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12786; cp. Guj. *chatrīs*);  
*satutirīs* “37” (OIA *saptatrimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13145);  
*aśutirīs* “38” (OIA *aṣṭātrimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 41, no. 945; cp. Guj. *āṭrīs*);
- ekālīs* “41” (OIA *ēkacatvārimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119 and 1985, 15, no. 2464; cp. Pa. *ekatālisa*);  
*bayālīs* “42” (OIA *dvācatvārimśat-*, Pkt. *bāyālisaṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 380 and 1985, 55, no. 6656; cp. Hi. *bayālīs*);  
*teyālīs* “43” (OIA *trayaścatvārimśat-*, Pkt. *tēyālisaṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 342 and 1985, 49, no. 5998; cp. Or. *teyālisa*);  
*saurayālīs* “44” (OIA *cātuścatvārimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 251 and 1985, 33, no. 4628; cp. Or. *caūrālisa*);  
*fansayālīs* “45” (OIA *pāñcacatvārimśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432 and 1985, 62, no. 7659; cp. *-ns-* in Old Sinh. *pansālīs* and *-ñc-* in Or. *pañcālisa* as against Pkt. *pañayālīsā*, *pañnayālisa*);  
*sayālīs* “46” (OIA *ṣaṭcatvārimśat-*, Pkt. *chāyālisaṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12784; cp. Or. *chayālisa*);  
*satālīs* “47” (OIA *saptācatvārimśat-*, Pkt. *sattālisaṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 760 and 1985, 104, no. 13142); the ordinal number *satālīs-vana* “47th” is already attested in the *Dives akuru fatkoḷu* F8,16.  
*aśālīs* “48” (OIA *aṣṭācatvārimśat-*, Pa. *aṭṭhatālisa*, Ap. *aṭhatālisa*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 41, no. 944);
- ekāvanna* “51” (OIA *ēkapañcāśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119 and 1985, 15, no. 2472; cp. Pkt. *ekkāvannaṃ*, *ekkāvanna*, *ekāvanna*, *ekāvanna*; NORMAN 1992, 217 explains the *-ā-* by analogy with *ekkārāsa* “11”);  
*bāvanna* “52” (OIA *dvāpañcāśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 380 and 1985, 55, no. 6661; cp. Pkt. *bāvanna(m)*, *bāvannaṃ*);

<sup>330</sup> In the case of the numerals discussed below, TURNER’s indication “← Ind.”, often appearing in the Addenda and Corrigenda of his work (1985), cannot be taken seriously in general, albeit there are some phonetical convergences between Dhivehi and diverse other Indic languages; cf. also 2.5.1.2. This does not mean, however, that TURNER’s assumption of borrowings or influences from non-Insular IA languages can be ruled out with certainty for all items concerned. – For the equivalent forms of MIA cf. NORMAN (1992), 215-221, for those of the Modern IA languages cf. BERGER (1992), 256-274.

*tēvanna* “53” (OIA *trāyahaṇcāśat-*, Pkt. *tēvaṇṇam*, *tēvannaṇi*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 342 and 1985, 49, no. 5995);

*sauravanna* “54” (OIA *catuḥpañcāśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 251, no. 4638);

*fānsavanna* “55” (OIA *pañcapanāśat-*, Pa. *pañcapaññāsa*, Pkt. *pañcavannam*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7666);

*savanna* “56” (OIA *ṣaṭpañcāśat-*, Pkt. *chappannam*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12787);

*sativanna* “57” (OIA *saptañcāśat-*, Pkt. *sattavannaṇi*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13149);

*aśuvanna* “58” (OIA *aṣṭapañcāśat-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, no. 949; cp. Pkt. *aṭṭhavaṇṇa*);

*ekāhaṭṭi* “61” (OIA *ēkaśaṣṭi-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119 and 1985, 15, no. 2478; cp. also Sindhī *ekahaṭṭhi*; for the lengthening of *-ā-* cp. Dhiv. “51” above<sup>331</sup>);

*bāhaṭṭi* “62” (OIA *dvāśaṣṭi-*, Pkt. *bāsaṭṭhiṃ*, *bāsaṭṭhi*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 381 and 1985, 55, no. 6673);

*tēhaṭṭi* “63” (Skt. *trayaḥśaṣṭi-*, Pa. *tēsattḥi-*, Pkt. *tēsattḥiṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 342 and 1985, 49, no. 5996); for an older attestation cf. the ordinal number *tēhaṭṭi-vana*, written (*tēhaṭṭivana*) in a *Tāna* inscription (ITMHM 5,2).

*saurahaṭṭi* “64” (OIA *catuḥśaṣṭi-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 249, no. 4590);

*fānsahaṭṭi* “65” (OIA *pañcaśaṣṭi-*, Pkt. *pañcasattḥiṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7674);

*sahaṭṭi* “66” (OIA *ṣaṣṭi-*, Pa. *chasaṭṭhi-*, Pkt. *chasaṭṭhiṃ* (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12790 and NORMAN 1992, 218); cp. also Or. *chaasathī*, Sindhī *chāhaṭṭhi*<sup>332</sup>);

*satuhaṭṭi* “67” (OIA *saptaśaṣṭi-*, Pkt. *sattasaṭṭhi-* etc.; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13158 and NORMAN 1992, 218; cp., e.g., Sindhī *satahaṭṭhi*, cf. BERGER 1992, 266);

*aśuhaṭṭi* “68” (OIA *aṣṭaśaṣṭi-*, Pa. *aṭṭhasattḥi-*, Pkt. *aṭṭhasattḥiṃ* etc.; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, no. 953; cp. also Panj. *aṭṭhaṭṭ*);

*ekāhaṭṭeri* “71” (for the more archaic formations with <sup>o</sup>*hattari* such as *ekāhattari* etc. in the dialect of Adḍū cf. 2.5.1.4 above); OIA *ēkasaptati-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119 and 1985, 15, no. 2479; Pkt. *ēkasattari-*, cf. NORMAN 1992, 218; for Hi. *ik-hattar*, Beng. *ekāttar* etc. cf. BERGER 1992, 267);

*bāhaṭṭeri* “72” (OIA *dvāśaptati-*, Pkt. *bāvattariṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 381 and 1985, 55, no. 6674; for Pkt. *bāhattari-* / *bahattari-* and Hi. etc. *bahattar*, Mar. *bāhattar* cf. BERGER 1992, 267); cp. the attestation of the ordinal number *bāhattarivanā*<sup>333</sup> in the *Dives akuru* inscription IDMHM 2,4.

*tēhaṭṭeri* “73” (Skt. *trayaḥsaptati-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 49 and 1985, 49, no. 5997; Pa. *tēsattati-*, cf. NORMAN 1992 219; cp. also Hi. and Nep. *tihattar*);

*saurahaṭṭeri* “74” (OIA *catuḥsaptati-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 249, no. 4591; Pkt. *cauhattari-*, cf. NORMAN 1992, 219; cp. also Hi. and Nep. *cauhattar*; for Mar. *caurehattar* cp. BERGER 1992, 268);

*fānsahaṭṭeri* “75” (OIA *pañcasaptati-*, Pa. *pañcasattati-*, Pkt. *pañcahattari-* besides *pañcattariṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7675 and NORMAN 1992, 219; cp. further Guj. *pañjahattari*);

*sahaṭṭeri* “76” (OIA *ṣaṣṭaptati-*, Pkt. *chāvattariṃ*, Ap. *chāhattari*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12791 and NORMAN 1992, 219);

*satuhaṭṭeri* “77” (OIA *saptasaptati-*, Pkt. *sattahattariṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13159 and NORMAN 1992, 219);

*aśuhaṭṭeri* “78” (OIA *aṣṭasaptati-*, Pkt. *aṭṭhahattariṃ*, *aṭṭhahattari-* besides *aṭṭhattariṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, no. 954 and NORMAN 1992, 219);

*ekāhi* “81” (OIA *ekāśīti-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 120 and 1985, 16, no. 2491; Pkt. *ekkāsī* and *ekkāsī*, cf. NORMAN 1992, 219; for Beng., Or. etc. *ekāsi* cf. BERGER 1992, 219);

*bayāhi* “82” (OIA *dvyaśīti-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 382 and 1985, 55, no. 6699; for Hi. *bayāsi*, Nep. *bayāsi*, Or. *bayāsi* etc. cf. BERGER 1992, 270);

<sup>331</sup> Cf. also BERGER (1992), 265, who explains the secondary *-ā-* of Panj. *akāhat* “61” by analogy with Panj. *bāhat* “62”.

<sup>332</sup> For the secondary lengthening of the *a* in the first syllable cf. BERGER (1992), 266.

<sup>333</sup> The form is not easily readable, therefore its analysis is uncertain. It cannot be completely excluded that the final *-ai* represents a gen./loc. or the postponed element *-ai* meaning “and”.

*tēāhi* “83” (OIA *tryasīti*-, Pkt. *tēyāsī*- etc.; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 346 and 1985, 50, no. 6086; NORMAN 1992, 220; cp. Or. *teyāsi*);  
*saurayāhi* “84” (OIA *caturasīti*-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 249, no. 4597; for Hi. *caurāsī*, Mar. *cauryāsī* etc. cf. BERGER 1992, 270);  
*fansayāhi* “85” (OIA *pañcāsīti*-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 433, no. 7683; cp. Guj. *paṇyāsī*, Mar. *paṇyāsī*, cf. BERGER 1992, 271);  
*sayāhi* “86” (OIA *ṣaḍasīti*-, Pa. *chalāsīti*-, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12793 and NORMAN 1992, 220; for Hi. *chiyāsī*, Beng. *chiyāsi* etc. cf. BERGER 1992, 271);  
*satāhi* “87” (OIA *saptāsīti*-, Pkt. *sattāsīṃ*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761 and 1985, 104, no. 13160; cp., e.g., Hi. etc. *satāsī*, Guj. *satyāsī*; cf. BERGER 1992, 271);  
*aśāhi* “88” (OIA *aṣṭāsīti*-, Pkt. *aṭṭhāsīṃ* etc., Ap. *aṭṭāsī*; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, no. 951 and NORMAN 1992, 220; cp. Beng. *āṭāsī* and Hi. *aṭ(t)hāsī*);

*ekānavai* “91” (Skt. *ekanavati*-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119, no. 2471; cp. Pkt. *ekkaṇauim*, *ekkaṇauī*, cf. NORMAN 1992, 220; cp. also, e.g., Beng. *ekānai*, Hi. *ekānwe*, cf. BERGER 1992, 272);  
*bayānavai* “92” (Skt. *dvīnavati*-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 381 and 1985, 55, no. 6683; cp. also \**dvīyānavati*- → Panj. *biāṇṇṇe*, cf. BERGER 1992, 272);  
*tēānavai* “93” (Skt. *trayonavati*-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 342 and 1985, 49, no. 6003);  
*saurayānavai* “94” (Skt. *caturnavati*-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 250, no. 4614; cp., e.g., Mar. *cauryāṇṇav* and Beng. *curānabbai*, cf. BERGER 1992, 273);  
*fansayānavai* “95” (OIA *pāñcanavati*-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432 and 1985, 62, no. 7665);  
*sayānavai* “96” (OIA *ṣaṇṇavati*-, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12800; cp., e.g., Hi. *chīyānawe*, Or. *chayānabe*<sup>334</sup>);  
*satānavai* “97” (OIA *saptanavati*-, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761 and 1985, 104, no. 13148; cp., e.g., Pkt. *sattānauim* “with -ā- by analogy with *aṭṭhā-*”, cf. NORMAN 1992, 221);  
*aśānavai* “98” (OIA *aṣṭānavati*-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, no. 948; cp., e.g., Pkt. *aṭṭhānauim*, cf. NORMAN 1992, 221).

#### 2.5.1.5.2.2. Formations of the type “9 + decade”:

*nava-tirīs* “39”, *nava-sālīs* “49”, M. *nava-fansās*, A. *nava-fansas* “59”, *nava-haṭṭi* “69”, M. *nava-haiteri*, A. *nava-hattari* “79”, *navāhi* /*nava-āhi*/ “89”, M. *navā-navai*, A. *navā-navei*; for *nava-* instead of the expected form *nuva-* “9” cf. “29”, treated in 2.5.1.3 above.

2.5.1.5.3. Besides the formations described above, the numbers 39, 49, 59 etc. can also be expressed by subtraction from the following decade, e.g. by formations of the type “1 less than 40, 50” etc. (for this archaic type cf. “19” treated in 2.5.1.2 and “29” treated in 2.5.1.3). Cp., e.g., M. *ona-vihi*, A. *oṇa-vihi*, F. *uṇa-vihi* “19”; M. *ona-tirīs*, A. *oṇa-tirīs* F. *uṇa-tirīs* “29”; M. *ona-sālīs*, A. *oṇa-sālīs*, F. *uṇa-sālīs* “39”; M. *ona-fansās*, A. *oṇa-fansas*, F. *uṇa-fansās* “49”; M. *ona-haṭṭi*, A. *oṇa-haṭṭi*, F. *uṇa-haṭṭi* “59”; M. *ona-haiteri*, A. *oṇa-hattari*, F. *uṇa-hattari* “69”; M. *ona-āhi*, A. *oṇo-āhi* (sic), F. *uṇa-āhi* “79”; M. *ona-satta* (obs.), A. *oṇa-satta*, F. *uṇa-satta* “99” (for *satta* “100” cf. 2.5.1.6 below). The numeral denoting “89” shows the effect of haplology; cp. M. *onavai* ← \**ona-navai*, A. *oṇavei* ← \**oṇa-navei*, F. *uṇavai* ← \**uṇa-navai*.

<sup>334</sup> Cf. BERGER (1992), 273: “The other languages have analogical new formations on the model of the other compounds with ‘six’; cf. Hi. *chīyānawe* (*i* from ‘sixty six’, -*ya-* from ‘eighty-six’) ...”

2.5.1.6. In the modern language, “100” is denoted by M.A.F. *satēka*, a sanskritism which obviously exists only in Dhivehi in this form (Skt. *śatā-* “100” + *ēka-* “1”). For the older language, this numeral is attested in the spelling *sateka* in the *Dives akuru* documents F4,2, IDMDM 1,3 and RB 1,12. — Another word for “100” which is obsolete but not completely forgotten in Modern Dhivehi, is M.A.F. *satta*, a form already documented in the *lōmāfanus* (L3 2/2,1: ⟨*satt<sup>h</sup>a*⟩ and L2 12,1: ⟨*śata*⟩). The derivation of *satta* is problematic because the presumptive ancestral forms of this word, OIA *śatā-* and Pa. *sata-*, cannot explain the existence of a geminated *-tt-* in Dhivehi (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 711, no. 12278). Thus it remains uncertain whether we have to assume a different (emphatic?) basic form or a hyperprakritisation here. — In contrast to that, the numeral M.A.F. *hia*, together with Sinh. *siya* “100” (subst. *siyaya*), a variant almost obsolete in the modern language, clearly represents the regular outcome of OIA *śatā-*, Pa. *sata-*, Pkt. *sada-*, *saya-* etc.<sup>335</sup> As BELL (1883, 121) and GEIGER (1901-1902, II, 378) recognised, Dhiv. *hia* is semantically ambiguous. Although it was reinterpreted as meaning “96” during the period of the duodecimal system (“8×12”; the highest number which is known within this system, cf. 2.5.1.8), the original meaning “100” did not totally fall into oblivion. Thus, when fish are counted, old people in Aḍḍū still use *hia* for “100”. Nevertheless, the same people also remember the use of *hia* as an archaic numeral meaning “96”.

In Dhivehi the stepping by **hundreds** is expressed by regular composition with *satēka*; cp. M.A.F. *tin-satēka* “300”, “3(×)100”; M. *hataru-* / A. *hatara-* / F. *hataro-satēka* “400”; M.A.F. *fas-satēka* “500”; M.A.F. *ha-satēka* “600”; M. *hai-satēka*, A.F. *has-satēka* /*hat-*/ “700” (for “7” cf. 2.5.1.1 above); M.A.F. *as-satēka* /*aṭ-*/ “800” (for “8” cf. 2.5.1.1 above); M.A.F. *nuva-satēka* “900”. The only exception to the rule is A.F.M. *duisatta* “200” which obviously represents a sanskritism (cp. Skt. *dviśata-*).

2.5.1.7. “1000”: M.A.F. *hās* can be traced back to OIA *sahāsra-* “1000” through an intermediate form *\*sə<sup>ʔ</sup>assə*; cf. Pa., Pkt. *sahassa-*, further Pkt. *sahasa-*, *sahāsa-* (TURNER 1966, II, 768, no. 13307). The Sinh. equivalent is *dahas/dās* (subst. *dahasa/dāsa*) which substitutes the expected form, *\*sahas/sās* ← Sinh.Pkt. *sahasa-* (cf. NORMAN 1992, 222). GEIGER (1900, 65 and 1941, 73, no. 1067) prefers to explain the initial *d-* of the Sinh. word by assuming an analogical influence of *dasa/daha* “10”, arguing against the alternative derivation form MIA *dasa-sata-* “10×100”. An equivalent of this is indeed attested for Old Dhivehi in the form *diha-satta-satirīs* “1036” appearing in a 17th century *Dives akuru fatkoḷu* (F2,3); in this case, however, the reading is not absolutely certain, the manuscript being damaged.

The stepping by thousands is performed by regular composition with *hās* “1000”; cp. M.F. *e<sup>ʔ</sup>*, A. *eu /ek/ hās* “1000”, M.A.F. *de hās* “2000”, *tin hās* “3000” etc.

The interaction of the formations described above can easily be illustrated with the following examples of higher numbers: A. *satēka bāhattari* “172”, A. *fassatēka aśatirīs* “538”; A. *nuvasatēka aśānavei* “998”; M. *tirīs ha hās a<sup>ʔ</sup> /aṣ/ satēka fasdoḷas* “36,860”; M. *haidiha hās* “70,000”.

<sup>335</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 179, no. 2708 and (1902), 923, no. 193, further TURNER 1966, II, 711, no. 12278 and NORMAN 1992, 221.

### 2.5.1.8. The duodecimal system

In the written documents of Old Dhivehi there are only a few numerals that can be regarded as parts of a duodecimal system; the numerals in question will be quoted below. As already stated by GEIGER (1919, 73), the duodecimal method of counting “began to die out” in the language of Māle at the beginning of the 20th century. Most probably, the duodecimal numbers had the status of mere relic forms even then. In the southern Maldives, the old numeral system must have been preserved for a longer time (cf. 2.5 above); but here too, it has become very difficult to find informants who still remember the duodecimal numbers. It was only with the help of some of the oldest speakers each of the dialects of Addū and Fua<sup>7</sup> Mulaku that a complete list of the particular items of the duodecimal system could be prepared. Most of the forms quoted below would have remained obscure without their help.

“12”: M.A.F. *doḷos* is the basis of the duodecimal system. The earliest attested forms are *doḷos* and *doḷosu* both appearing in the *lōmāfanu* L1 (g/2,3 and my/1,6), and the reduplicated forms *doḷosu-toḷos* and *doḷosu-toḷosu* in L2 (5,2 and 4) which probably have to be regarded as distributive plurals meaning “twelve each” (-s\_t- being the result of an assimilation of /-s\_d-/). The interpretation of *doḷos-toḷos* as “twelve thirteen” as proposed by MANIKU/WJAYAWARDHANA (1986, 5) must be rejected because “13” was never attested in the form *\*toḷos*; furthermore, this interpretation is not supported by the given context. — TURNER (1966, I, 380, no. 6658) and BERGER (1992, 251) are right in deriving Dhiv. and Sinh. *doḷos* (Sinh. subst. *doḷaha*) from OIA (RV) *duvādaśa* as against Skt. *dvādaśa* as proposed by GEIGER (1941, 82, no. 1210); cp. also Pa. *dvādaśa*, Pkt. *duvālasa* etc. For the Modern Dhivehi numeral *bāra* and Sinh. *bara* “12” which represent the Sanskrit variant, cf. 2.5.1.2; for the retroflex -l- cf. 2.5.1.2 above (s.v. “sixteen”).

Within the duodecimal system, “11” is denoted by *ekoḷos* which can be traced back to OIA *ékādaśa*; *ekoḷos* is to the regular *e(ñ)gāra* (cf. 2.5.1.2) as *doḷos* to *bāra*.

The duodecimal expressions of the numbers in between the steps by twelve are based on the numerals denoting the particular steps to which the monadic units are added. Thus, “13” is expressed by M.A.F. *doḷos eke* “12+1”, “14” by *doḷos dē* “12+2”, “15” by *doḷos tine* “12+3” etc., up to “22” which has the form of *doḷos dihae* “12-10”. The last number preceding the following step by twelve can be formed by a kind of subtraction;<sup>336</sup> cp., e.g., “23” which is expressed by F. *ekuni-fassihi* “24 less one” (lit. “24 lacking one”; for *ekuni* cp. OIA *ekona* “less by one” ← *éka-* + *ūná-*, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 120, no. 2494). This implies that the formation of the last units of decades in the form of “(one) less than 10, 20, 30 etc.”, which was inherited from the OIA decimal system, must have been transferred to the duodecimal system; cp. 2.5.1.2 for the formation of “nineteen” and 2.5.1.5.3.

“24”: M.A.F. *fassihi* (noted as “24 *fassehi*” with a question mark by GEIGER 1919, 72) is already attested in the *lōmāfanu* L2 (5,4), in the archaic form *pasvisi* which exactly corresponds to Sinh. *pasvisi* “25” (cp. Pa. *pañcaviśa(t)i-*, OIA *pañcaviṃśati-* “25”; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7672). In the given context in the *lōmāfanu*, however, it cannot be decided with certainty whether Old Dhiv. *pasvisi* meant “25” or “24”. It is presumably under the influence of the corresponding Sinh. numeral that MANIKU/WJAYAWARDHANA (1986, 5) translate Dhiv. *pasvisi* with “25”. Because of the other duodecimal numbers appearing in the same context (especially *doḷos-toḷos*, cf. above), the meaning of “24” seems to be more probable, however. In more recent times, Dhiv. *pasvisi* → *fassihi* (meaning “24”) has been clearly confined to the duodecimal system (cf. also TURNER 1985, 62, no. 7672; cf. 2.5.1.3 for “25”). The reinterpretation implied is not an isolated phenomenon in the history of Dhivehi if we consider the origin of the duodecimal numbers *fanas* “48” and *hia* “96” (cf. below).

The numbers from 25 to 34 (inclusively) are regularly built by “addition”; cp., e.g., “25”: M.A.F. *fassihi eke* “24+1”; “26”: *fassihi dē* “24+2” etc. GEIGER (1919, 72) notes “*fassehi-haye* (=2×12+6)” for “30”. “35”, however, is expressed by “subtraction” as “36 minus one”: *ekuni-tin-doḷos*.

“36” *tin-doḷos* is “3×12”; “37” *tin-doḷos eke* is “3×12+1” etc. Cf. GEIGER (1919, 73) who noted *tin doḷos hatare* “3×12+4” for “40”. “47” *ekuni-fanas* literally means “one less than 48”.

<sup>336</sup> Cp., however, the formation of *fas-doḷos ekoḷos* “71” discussed s.v. “60” below.

**“48”**: M.A.F. *fanās*, like *fassihi* “24”, presupposes the reinterpretation of an original decimal number which must have happened at the time of the emergence of the duodecimal system. Dhiv. *fanās* ← \**panās* corresponds to Sinh. *panās* “50”; cf. TURNER 1985, 62, no. 7682, who identifies *fanās* (besides *fansās* “50”, the regular cardinal number of Modern Dhivehi) with OIA *pañcāsāt-* “50”. For further details concerning the derivation of the concurrent etymological variants cf. 2.5.1.4 s.v. “50” above. The Old Dhiv. numeral *panasu* which is attested in L2 (26,4) is translated as meaning “50” by MANIKU/WIJAYAWARDHANA (1986, 26) who do not consider a duodecimal interpretation; this, however, imposes itself in the given context. Within the framework of the duodecimal system, **“50”** would have been expressed by *fanās dē* “48+2”.

**“60”**: *fas-doļos* “5×12” is attested for the period of Old Dhivehi in the spelling ⟨*fasdoļos*⟩ appearing in the *Tāna* inscriptions ITAG (2,2), ITAH (3,6) and ITAM (1,3). *fas-doļos* is the only duodecimal number which has been integrated into the decimal system and is therefore still in use in the modern language (cf. also 2.5.1.4 s.v. “60”). Correspondingly, the monadic numbers based on “60” such as **“61”**: M. *fas-dolas eke*, A.F. *fas-doļos eke* “5×12+1”, **“62”**: M. *fas-doļas dē*, A.F. *fas-doļos dē* “5×12+2” etc., up to **“69”**: M. *fas-dolas nuvae*, A.F. *fas-doļos nuvae*, are still used as well. The highest derivative based on *fas-doļos* is A.F. *fas-doļos ekoļos* **“71”**, lit. meaning “5×12+11”, which appears in a *Tāna* inscription from Gan (Aḍḍū Atoll: ITAG 2,2).

**“72”**: F. *fāheti*. This duodecimal number which has so far been attested for the vernacular of Fuaʼ Mulaku only, possibly represents a reinterpreted form of OIA *pañcasaptati-* “75” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7675). We may assume that the corresponding word for “72” in Aḍḍū and in North Dhivehi was not (much) different from F. *fāheti*. — For further examples of reinterpreted duodecimal numbers cp. 24 (← 25), 48 (← 50) and 96 (← 100).

**“84”**: A.F. *haddoļos* /*hat-doļos*/ has the meaning of “7×12”.

**“96”** exists in the dialectal variants F. *hia doļos* and A.M. *hia*. It represents the highest number that can be found within the duodecimal system; cf. GEIGER (1919, 73) who states: “It is concluded with *hia* (=100) which comes close to 96 (=8×12).” *hia* reflects the inherited word for “100” which, in the same way as “50” was reinterpreted as a duodecimal number (cf. 2.5.1.6). — It may be interesting to note that another word meaning “one hundred”, viz. *eksatēka* (cf. 2.5.1.6), can be interpreted as “96” according to the duodecimal system as well. In a *Dives akuru* inscription on a tombstone (IDMHM 7,1-2), we find the Arabic annual date 1196 (A.H.) alongside the Maldivian date which is given as ⟨*hāhai eksatēka*⟩ “1000 and 96”. If we assume that a one-to-one correspondence was intended, the monument being an epitaph, we must admit that the Maldivian form is incomplete, either “100” or “96” missing. Thus it cannot be decided with certainty whether *satēka* – like *hia* – could be used for “96” or whether this is an isolated example of mere confusion caused by the influence of *hia*.

## 2.5.2. Ordinal numbers

In Dhivehi, ordinal numbers are formed by means of the suffix *-vana* which is added to the stem of the cardinal numbers; cp., e.g., M.A.F. *de-vana* “second”, *tin-vana* “third”, *vihi-vana* “twentieth”, *satēka-vana* “hundredth” etc. For ordinal numbers attested in Old Dhivehi cp., e.g., *sa-vana* “6th” (L4 a/1,7), *satālīs-vana* “47th” (F8,16), *sau-tirīs-vana* “34th” (ITAH 6,2), *nuvadiha-vana* “90th” (ITFM 2,3). The suffix *-vana* corresponds to *-veni* in Modern Sinhalese which has replaced the Old Sinh. forms *-vana* and *-vanna* (cf. GEIGER 1938, 122 and 1900, 65). In Dhivehi there are no exceptions as to the formation with *-vana*. Hence, also the inherited ordinal number *furatama* “first”, which as a sanskritism is irregular from the point of view of the modern language (← OIA *prathamá-*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 488, no. 8648 and GEIGER 1919, 74), has been replaced by the neologism M.A.F. *evvana* /*ek-vana*/ which is derived from the cardinal number *e* “one”. *furatama* still exists in the contemporary language, but only in the function of an adverb meaning “at first, at the beginning”. Unlike that, the inherited ordinal numeral *paļamu* “first” has been used without interruption until nowadays in Sinhalese; this word goes back to OIA *prathamá-* as well but presupposes an intermediate form with a retroflex stop such as Pa. *paṭhama-* (cf. GEIGER 1941, 101, no.

1500). Furthermore, we find the secondary formation *paḷamu-veni* “first” in colloquial Sinhalese which occurs side by side with its “allegro-variant”, *paḷaveni*. Among the ordinal numbers of Sinhalese, there is no form derived from *ek-* “one” (i.e., <sup>†</sup>*ek-veni*; cf. MATZEL 1983, 41).

While the Sinhalese formations with *-veni* can only be used as adjectives (they must be further enlarged to be usable as substantives; cp., e.g., *paḷamu-veni-yā* “the first”, *tun-veni-yā* “the third”), the Maldivian ordinal numbers ending in *-vana* can be substantivised without any morphological change.

### 2.5.3. Other categories of numerals

2.5.3.1. There are special analytic forms of **collective numerals** in Dhivehi which are used for the morphological expression of the correlation “animate vs. inanimate”, here meaning an opposition of “person” and “non-person” in particular. The inanimate collective numerals are generated by adding the noun *eti* “thing” to the numeral stem; this process is uniform throughout the whole Dhivehi speaking area. Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *dēti* ← *de* “two” + *eti* “a unit of two things, a pair, both”; M.A.F. *tin-eti* “a unit of three things”; A. *faheti*, F. *fāheti* ← *fas* “five” + *eti* “a unit of five things” etc. When the collective numeral refers to nouns denoting persons, the numeral stem is combined with *mihun* “people, men” (pl. of the nominal stem *mīs-* “man”; sg. *mihā*) in the standard language. Although collective numerals that are enlarged with *mihun* may also occur in the southern dialects, the formation with *-verin* (the plural of an obsolete noun *veri* which originally had the meaning of “leader, person”, cf. 2.3.2.4.2) is much more common there. In general, the combination of a cardinal number with *-verin* is understood as one word, *-verin* being taken as a suffix denoting “person”. In the case of formations with *mihun*, however, only the context can tell whether the formation in question must be interpreted as a real collective number or whether it only denotes a certain “number of people” without a collective meaning. Thus, A.F. *de-verin* has the meaning of a “unit of two persons; both persons”, while M.A.F. *de mihun*, depending on the context, can be translated as “unit of two persons” or, in a more neutral sense, as “two persons (not necessarily connected with each other)”. For the “southern” type of formation further cp. A. *fasverin*, F. *fahqverin* “unit of five persons”, A.F. *havverin* (*ha<sup>2</sup> /hat/* “seven”) “unit of seven persons”, A. *avverin* “unit of eight persons” (A. *a<sup>2</sup>*, F. *aśo /aś/* “eight”), etc. In Aḍḍū this type of formation is still productive; collective numerals ending in *-verin* can be derived from any numeral stem, even if it denotes a very high number or the numeral in question is a loanword. In the modern dialect of Fua<sup>2</sup> Mulaku, however, the collective formation by means of *-verin* can no longer be extended to every number. The main reason for this can be seen in the fact that *-verin*, originally the regular plural of an *i*-stem *veri*, has become obsolete in this form as the second part of nouns denoting persons, *-verin* having been replaced by *-vērūn* in Fua<sup>2</sup> Mulaku (cf. 2.3.2.8.2.2.2).

2.5.3.2. **Fractional numbers** are formed analytically with the noun *bai* meaning “part” in Dhivehi. Cp., e.g., M. *de bai kuḷa e<sup>2</sup> /ek/ bai* “1/2”, lit. “one part made two parts” (*bai* “part”, *kuḷa* “made, done” part.pret. of *kuranī* “to make, do”), *tin bai kuḷa e<sup>2</sup> bai* “1/3”, *hataru bai kuḷa e<sup>2</sup> bai* “1/4”, etc.

In Sinhalese, too, fractions are expressed periphrastically by nouns meaning “part, share, portion”, viz. *bāgaya* and *paṃguva*. Cp., e.g., *aṭen paṃguva* “1/8”, lit. “(one) part of eight” (*aṭ-en* abl./instr. of *aṭa* “eight”); *aṭen tun-paṃguva* “3/8”, lit. “three part(s) of eight”; *hataren paṃguva* “1/4”, lit. “(one) part of four” (cf. GEIGER 1938, 123, and, in greater detail, GUNASEKARA 1891, 147-8).

**2.5.3.3. Multiplicative numerals** are formed with the noun M. *guna*, A. *guṇa* “times” which is suffixed to the cardinal stem; cp., e.g., M. *de-guna*, A. *de-guṇa* “two times, twice, twofold, double”, M. *tin-guna*, A. *tin-guṇa* “three times”, etc. Corresponding formations also exist in Sinhalese; cp., e.g., *de-guṇa* “twice” or *te-guṇa* “three times”, but also the sanskritisms *dvi-guṇa* “twice” and *tri-guṇa* “three times” which are used in the literary language.<sup>337</sup>

M. *guna*, A. *guṇa* is also used as the nominal part of the complex verb M. *guna kuraṇī*, A. *guṇa keraṇī* “to multiply, increase, augment”, lit. “to make number, amount”; cp. also M. *gunanī*, A. *gaṇanī* “to count” and Sinh. *gaṇinavā* “to count, reckon, enumerate” which have to be derived from Skt. *gaṇaya-*, Pa. *gaṇe-* “to count” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 52, no. 760 and 1902, 921, no. 173).<sup>338</sup>

The Maldivian numerals with *-guṇa/-guna* cannot be directly inherited from the corresponding formations of Old or Middle Indo-Aryan because the original final *-a* would not have been preserved in Modern Dhivehi. A presumptive preform *\*guṇa* of IIA Prakrit or of an early stage of Old Dhivehi would have developed into *\*guṇu*, *-u* being a secondary final vowel which, at least in the northern dialects, would have been conserved in the same quality until present.<sup>339</sup> Old Dhiv. *†guṇu* or, at a later time, M. *†gunu*, is not attested, however. Hence, we must presume that A. *guṇa* / M. *guna*, both as a suffixal element and as a noun meaning “amount, number”, represent a sanskritism or a borrowing from another Modern Indo-Aryan language; in the latter case, Sinhalese is one of the most probable sources.<sup>340</sup> If Dhiv. *guṇa/guna* represents the Sanskrit form proper, it must have been borrowed at a comparatively recent period so that it could not be affected by the usual change of the word-final vowel any longer.

#### 2.5.3.4. Approximate numerical data

Depending on the degree of uncertainty to be expressed, there are different morphological devices of denoting approximate figures. If the uncertainty concerning the exact number is not particularly important, the numbers in question can simply be arranged as a string; cp., e.g., M.A. *de-tin* “two (or) three” corresponding to Sinh. *de-tun* “id.”. For the expression of a

<sup>337</sup> The formations with *-guṇa* represent only one of numerous methods of expressing numeral adjectives and numeral adverbs in Sinhalese as equivalents of Engl. “times, -fold” etc. Cp., e.g., *de-paṭa* “double, twice”, *tun-paṭa* “threefold” or *de-varak* “two times”, *te-varak* “three times”; for further formations cf., e.g., JAYAWARDENA-MOSER (1996), 2 f.

<sup>338</sup> Cf. TURNER (1985), 29 who, on the one hand, puts M. *gunanī* together with OIA *guṇāyati* (1) “advises” (1966, I, no. 4191), while the nominal element M. *guna*, on the other hand, is identified with *guṇāyati* (2) “multiplies” (1966, I, no. 4191a); cf. further TURNER (1966), I, 213, 3993 s.v. *gaṇāyati* “counts” and 224, 4190 s.v. *guṇā-* “... 2. species, quality, good quality”. The etymology of the OIA noun *guṇā-*, which has numerous (partly contradictory) meanings, is still unclear (cf. MAYRHOFER 1986-, I, 489-490); cp. the OIA multiplicative numerals with *°guna-* “-fach, -plex” being quoted ib.: *dvi-guṇa-* “twofold”, *catur-guṇa-* “fourfold”, *pañca-guṇa-* “fivefold”; *tribhīr guṇāḥ* “threefold”.

<sup>339</sup> For the final vowels of the consonant stems cf. 2.3.1.3.4.2; for the development of OIA *guṇā-* in diverse NIA languages cf. TURNER (1966), I, 224, no. 4190 and BERGER (1992), 281 f.

<sup>340</sup> Cp. also Modern Hi. *gun* vs. *gunā* in *du-gunā* “twofold”, *ti-gunā* “threefold”, *das-gunā* “tenfold”, etc.; cf. KELLOG 1875, 158.

higher degree of uncertainty, the dialect of Addū uses indefinite collective numbers (cf. 2.5.3.1 above) in their dative form: cp., e.g., A. *fāhettaka*<sup>7</sup> /*fāheti-ak-aś*/ “approximately five (pieces of ...)”. This formation can only be used for the numbers between “two” and “ten”, however. In the standard language, a presumptive value of “approximately six” is expressed by the dative of the substantive form of the numeral; cp., e.g., M. *haekka*<sup>7</sup> /*ha-ekk-aś*/ “approximately six”, lit. “(up) to (a) six”. An indefinite dative can be built for the same purpose from higher numbers as well; cp., e.g., M. *dolahaka*<sup>7</sup> /*dolas-ak-aś*/ “approximately twelve”.<sup>341</sup> Following DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990, 104), this formation type cannot be used for numbers greater than 60, however. If the number in question has a higher value, it must be combined with *varaka*<sup>7</sup> (“very” indef. dat.), here functioning as a postpositional adverb (cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU, ib.).

## 2.6. The pronominal system

From the formal point of view, pronouns do not represent a homogeneous morphological class, neither in Dhivehi or Sinhalese nor in most other Indo-Aryan or Indo-European languages. Hence, before trying to classify them, it will be necessary to define the general framework which determines the morphological and semantical limits of the category “pronoun”. The main criterion for a clear distinction between the nominal and the pronominal categories is the simple fact that nouns designate elements of extra-linguistic reality by naming them, while the function of the pronouns consists in referring to these elements without specifically naming them.

2.6.1. In the Insular Indo-Aryan languages, a definition and classification of the pronouns on the basis of purely morphological criteria would not be effective because of their formal heterogeneity. In this regard, A.V. ISAČENKO’s general statement (1962, 470) according to which “the main feature characterising the pronouns as an independent word-class and distinguishing them from all other parts of speech, is not their form, but their particular ‘meaning’, their *specific semantics*”<sup>342</sup> is valid for these languages, too.

2.6.1.1. Depending on their syntactic characteristics, the pronouns can be divided into three main groups. The first group consists of “**absolute pronouns**” which have a high degree of substantival function, occurring as subjects or objects of sentences. The second group is represented by “**determinative pronouns**” which have an adjectival function; these pronouns can be used as attributes as well as predicates. The third group consists of “**adverbial pronouns**” which, according to their name, are characterised by several adverbial functions.

<sup>341</sup> There is no particular suffix *-haka*<sup>7</sup> as presumed by DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990, 104).

<sup>342</sup> “Das, was die Pronomina als selbständige Wortklasse kennzeichnet und sie von allen anderen Wortarten unterscheidet, ist nicht ihre Form, sondern ihre eigenartige ‘Bedeutung’, ihre *spezifische Semantik*.” Because of their general character, ISAČENKO’s (1962, 469-520) theoretical considerations about the fundamental characteristics of pronouns, which were based on Russian material, can also be used as “coordinates” for the still undescribed pronominal system of Dhivehi. ISAČENKO’s extended presentation and discussion of the theoretical context can hardly be regarded as the scope of this chapter, however. ISAČENKO himself relied on formulations made by KARL BRUGMANN (Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen. Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Bd. 22, 1904) and KARL BÜHLER (Sprachtheorie. Jena 1934).

2.6.1.2. The particular pronominal classes such as personal pronouns, interrogative pronouns, demonstrative pronouns etc. are established by attributing these three pronominal groups to different deictic levels. ISAČENKO<sup>343</sup> assumes two levels arranged as a coordinate system, with the syntactically motivated tripartition of the pronouns representing the vertical axis and the level of the “modified references” (i.e., e.g., references to actual speech acts in the course of which the personal pronouns of the first two persons are used, or references to the ignorance of a speaker in an interrogative situation which requires an interrogative pronoun) appearing as the horizontal axis. The intersection nodes of the two coordinates represent the potential pronominal meanings, the realisation of which may be different from language to language. Thus, for example, there are no relative pronouns, no negative pronouns and no reflexive pronouns proper<sup>344</sup> in Modern Dhivehi. According to their specific meaning, some of the pronominal stems (absolute, determinative and adverbial pronouns) form complete semantical rows along the vertical axis of the coordinate system.<sup>345</sup>

2.6.1.3. The following table shows a simplified variant of ISAČENKO’s (1962, 512) model to illustrate the interaction of the two axes as mentioned above. In its adaptation to Dhivehi, the pronominal formations are exemplified by means of Addū pronouns here (pers.pron. 1.ps.sg., interrogative pronouns, dem.pron. *mi/me*).

			personal pronouns	interrogative pronouns	demonstrative pronouns
absolute pronouns	substance	person	<i>ava</i> , obl. <i>ma</i> ‘I’	<i>keyye</i> ‘who?’	<i>mi</i> (attr.) ‘this (here)’
		thing	—	<i>kota</i> ‘what?’	
determinative pronouns	feature	quality	—	<i>kon</i> ‘what kind of, what a?’	<i>mi kahalei</i> ‘such a’
		quantity	—	<i>kehei vara</i> ‘how much?’, <i>kitaka</i> ‘how many?’	<i>mi vara</i> ‘so much’
		relation (poss.)	<i>afagē</i> , <i>ma</i> ‘my’	<i>kankāge</i> ‘whose?’	<i>miagē</i> ‘of this’
adverbial pronouns	adverbial factor	mood	—	<i>kehei, kehenaka</i> ‘how, in which way?’	<i>mehen</i> ‘thus, in this way’
		space	—	<i>kontāki</i> ‘where, at which place?’	<i>mi tān</i> , ‘here, at this place’
		time	—	<i>konkalaki</i> ‘when, at what time?’	<i>mi kō</i> ‘now, at this time’
		causality / finality	—	<i>kian vege</i> ‘why, what for?’	—

<sup>343</sup> Cf. the tables given in ISAČENKO (1962), 474 and 512.

<sup>344</sup> The pronoun *timā* cannot be assigned a reflexive function in Modern Dhivehi, cf. 2.6.4.

<sup>345</sup> “Achse der allgemeinen logischen Kategorien” according to ISAČENKO.

2.6.1.4. From the functional point of view, the inventory of the pronominal categories is quite homogeneous in Dhivehi. Concerning the realisation of the particular pronominal meanings, however, there are considerable divergences not only between North and South Dhivehi. As to the etymology of the particular pronouns, divergences occur also within the two main dialect groups; in some cases, specific etymological heterogeneities are even met with in neighbouring atolls.

## 2.6.2. Personal pronouns

In Dhivehi the system of personal pronouns is characterised by the distinction of three persons in both singular and plural. The first two persons exclusively refer to persons or personified beings, while the third person comprises animate beings and objects as well.

The use of demonstrative pronouns as personal pronouns of the 3rd person can be regarded as typical for the Indo-European and also for the Indo-Aryan languages. The demonstrative pronouns in question originally represent a different deictic category than the personal pronouns (cf. 2.6.5.2 below). In Dhivehi, it is primarily the dem.pron. *e* “that” which has the function of a personal pronoun of the 3rd person; in its non-enlarged form, however, it can only be used for inanimate objects (“it”). For the expression of an animate 3.ps.sg. (“he, she”), *e* must be “substantivised” with certain suffixes, while in the 3.ps.pl. (“they”), a plural noun meaning “people, men, persons” is added to it. As the following tables show, the nominalisation is realised by different specialised suffixes or nouns meaning “people” in the Dhivehi dialects.

2.6.2.1. In the standard language, the system of the personal pronouns is characterised by a particular typological development which is completely unknown in southern Dhivehi. In analogy to the three honorific levels of the verbal system (cf. 3.2.1.1.1.), the personal pronouns, too, are differentiated according to three formal levels which express the social position and, to a certain extent, esteem and disregard. The first degree or rank is the lowest one; the corresponding pronouns serve for addressing among (untitled) commoners and are also used by high-ranked people in addressing commoners. The pronouns of the second degree are reserved for the nobility; they are used by aristocrats when speaking with each other but also by members of the first and third class when addressing nobles. The pronouns of the third degree, which represent the highest level of the society, were originally reserved exclusively for the king or the queen; nowadays they are correspondingly used for the president of the Maldives, but also for people in leading positions (heads of departments, directors, professors etc.). When representatives of the second or the third social level refer to themselves, they will always use the pronominal variants of the lowest degree, however.

In the southern Maldives, we observe certain levels in the social hierarchy, too, but they can by no means be regarded as traces of a caste-like society system recalling that of Māle. This means that the system of the personal pronouns is confined to only **one** formal level. There is, however, a peculiar development concerning the use of the personal pronouns in Addū which has to be mentioned here. During the last years, the younger generation has more and more lost its competence in using the personal pronouns in an adequate way which often results in confusion and mistakes in the use of the grammatical persons. Especially in the singular, this uncertainty is often compensated by using a proper name instead of the personal

pronoun in question, even when referring to oneself; thus, the pronouns meaning “I”, “you”, “he” and “she”, having become taboo to some extent, are avoided. Some of the younger Addū-speakers even characterise them as “ugly” or “embarrassing”. To the older people who still have a full competence in using the pronouns, this taboo appears strange, however. Probably this recent development results from a conflict caused by the fact that nowadays the speakers of these dialects have to learn the standard language with its honorific levels which are completely unusual to them from the point of view of their mother tongue.

2.6.2.2. As the tables given in 2.6.2.6.2 will show, the personal pronouns of the southernmost dialects clearly distinguish a *casus rectus* (nominative) and a *casus obliquus*, which are still differentiated by particular forms. When the predicate verb is finite, the subject of the sentence appears in the direct case; but when the predicate verb is infinite, its subject appears in the oblique case.<sup>346</sup> In northern Dhivehi, this morphosyntactic differentiation exists as well, but the forms of the direct and the oblique case coincide there. This fundamental morphological change must have happened at a very early time as can be followed from the written documents of Old Dhivehi. Even in the oldest texts there are no traces of a morphological opposition of the cases *rectus* and *obliquus* in this sense.

In the following paragraphs, the personal pronouns will be treated one by one. It must be noted right from the beginning that it is not yet possible to present an etymological derivation for all of them.

### 2.6.2.3. The personal pronouns of the first person

In the dialects of Addū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the personal pronoun of the 1.ps.sg. (“I”) has the form *ava* in the nominative and *ma* in the oblique case. Its equivalents in the standard language are *alugañdu* for the first and the second honorific level and *aharen* for the third degree. The obl. A.F. *ma* is identical with the Sinh. obl. *mā* which GEIGER (1938, 124) derives from an old instr./abl. of the 1st person pronoun; cp. Pkt. *mae*, Pa. *mayā* (for the OIA obl. stem *ma-* cf. TURNER 1966, II, 554, no. 9691).

As was mentioned above (cf. 2.6.2.2), the opposition between the direct and the oblique case must have died out in the language of Māle a long time ago. Even in the oldest texts that have become known until today, the old oblique form *ma* occurs only one time (in the 16th century *fatkoļu* F1,1.5), but in attributive position and in possessive function. Nevertheless, *ma* is mentioned by GEIGER (1919, 75) as a pers.pron. of the 1.ps.sg.<sup>347</sup> DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990, 37) note the pronoun *ma* for the 1.ps.sg. besides *aharen* and *alugañdu* as well. As a matter of fact, *ma* does exist as a very familiar, unofficial form meaning “I”, but it serves neither as an oblique case of *aharen* or *alugañdu*, nor does it belong to a particular level of the threefold honorific system, which is otherwise “omnipresent” in the pronominal categories of standard Dhivehi.<sup>348</sup> Thus, *ma* represents something like an “alien element” within the well-organised system of the personal pronoun in Māle. It is probable that its very restricted use as well as its existence in the language of Māle can be explained by interfer-

<sup>346</sup> For this fundamental rule which has no exceptions cf. 5.2.

<sup>347</sup> For GEIGER’s informant cf. the Introduction, 0.6.1 above.

<sup>348</sup> Information by MUHAMMAD WAHEED (Maḍulu), Māle, 24-03-1999.

ence of the southern dialects. As against this, it seems less probable, yet imaginable that *ma* is a relic form from an older period which has been nearly deprived of its original function as an oblique case form but has been secondarily “strengthened” by a later influence from the south. In the normal colloquial and official language as well as in modern literature, *ma* is mostly used in possessive function; as an oblique case it occurs, e.g., in a fairy tale in the sentence *ma im /in/ magas la'galē* (T1, 50) “let it float ashore to the place (lit. ‘road’) where I am sitting” (*in* part.pret. of *innanī* “to sit”).

2.6.2.3.1. Most probably, the modern nominative forms A.F. *ava* and M. *aharen* are etymologically connected with the form of the 1.ps.pl. “we” we find in the Sinh. nom. *api*, obl. *apa*; cf. the older Sinh. forms *āp* und *āp*.

2.6.2.3.1.1. GEIGER (1941, 8, no. 115) identifies this pronoun with the forms of the 1.ps.pl. acc. *aphe*, *apheni*, gen. *aphāka*, loc. *aphesu* appearing in the *Aśoka* inscriptions. *api* and its variants are derived from the reflexive pronoun Pkt. *appa-* which, according to PISCHEL (1981), 226, alternates with *atta-*. PISCHEL deduces both forms from OIA *ātmán-* “breath, soul; self”. TURNER (1966, I, 43, no. 986 and 51, no. 1135), while confirming that the Prakrit variants (“*attā, ātā, ādā, āyā* nom., ... *appā* nom.”) come from *ātmán-*, rejects the proposal to trace the Sinh. pronoun *api* etc. back to the same form. While noting Sinh. *ata* “self, individuality” as a direct successor of *ātmán-*, he relates *api* and the *Aśoka* forms with the oblique pronominal stem of the 1.ps.pl. OIA *asmā(d)-*. On the problems involved now cf. HINÜBER (1986, 159) who states: “The acc.pl. *aphe* of (Eastern) *Aśoka* developed from Sanskrit *asmān* through *\*asvaṃ: \*as-vaṃ, \*as-paṃ* → *\*apphaṃ* which was later transformed after *maye* [Eastern *Aśoka* ‘we’].”<sup>349</sup>

2.6.2.3.1.2. M. *aharen* “I”, also existing in the variant *ahuren* which is less used today, originally was a plural form meaning “we”; accordingly, GEIGER (1919, 75) still noted *aharen* besides *aharamen* (sic) as a pronoun of the 1.ps.pl. With all probability, *aharen* represents an “allegro-form” (with a change of /f/ to /h/; cf. below) of an older *afuren* ← *apuren*, well attested in genitive forms which in most of the passages in question have a possessive function. Cp., e.g., *apurenge kau* “our Lord” (F3,3.7; the person in question being the Prophet Muḥammad; *afurenge kau* in *Tāna*, RA 2,3; RC 4,8 and 9,1). The earlier form of the modern 1.ps.pl. M. *aharen/aharumen* “we”, which is enlarged with the plural suffix *-men*,<sup>350</sup> is attested as well; cp. *afuremenge kau* “our Lord” appearing in the *Rādavaḷi* (RC 4,1), which has the older spelling, *apuremenge kau*, in its *Dives akuru* version (RB 1,11).<sup>351</sup> The possessive genitive we find in *afunge kau* “our Lord” (RC 10,1) represents the same form as the one being used in the 1.ps.pl. obl. *afun* “we” (nom. *afū*) in Fua` Mulaku today. Whether *afun* presupposes a pluralisation by means of the suffix *-un*<sup>352</sup> or whether this is a mere “allegro-variant” of *afuren*, cannot be decided with certainty yet.

Most probably, the form *apuren* goes back to a combination of the oblique case of the pers.pron. 1.ps.pl., *\*apa*, here used in possessive function, with the plural element *uren*. As an independent word meaning “people”, this element is already attested in the earliest documents of Dhivehi (e.g., L1 t/1.6). In several texts we find *mi uren* “these people” (F1,21; F2,15; F10,11; F12,9) and *e uren* “those people” (dat. *e urenatu* F3,6) used like a personal pronoun of the 3.ps.pl., in analogy to the nominal plural formations functioning as pronouns in the modern language; cp., e.g., M. *e mīhun* “those people”. The older form of *uren* is *vuren*,<sup>353</sup> cp. *mi vuren*

<sup>349</sup> Cf. HINÜBER (1986), 159: “Aus skt. *asmān* entwickelt sich *Aśoka* (östlich) acc.pl. *aphe* über *\*asvaṃ: \*as-vam, \*as-paṃ* → *\*apphaṃ*, das nach *maye* [*Aśoka* östl. ‘wir’] umgestaltet wird.”

<sup>350</sup> For the plural suffix *-men* cf. 2.3.2.1.2.

<sup>351</sup> From the different spelling of *Tāna* as against *Dives akuru* texts alone we cannot tell the actual date of the phonetical change of [p] to [f]; for this problem cf. 1.3.6.

<sup>352</sup> For the plural suffix *-un*, cf. 2.3.2.1.2.

<sup>353</sup> The development of initial *vu-* to *u-* represents a sound law within the history of Dhivehi, cp., e.g., the participle *uḷunu* ← *uḷunu* “(having) lived, been” substituting older *vūḷunu* (cf. 3.9.2.3).

“these people” appearing in the *lōmāfanus* (L1 t/1,6; L2 38,3). The same word is further attested in the genitive forms *mi vuren-ge* “of these people” (L1 mn/2,5), *mi uren-ge* “id.” (F11,31), *timā uren-ge raśu* “the island of the own people” (F5,17; F10,17; F11,20)<sup>354</sup>; the dative forms *mi vuren-aṭa* “to these people” (L2 36,3), *mi uren-aṭu* “id.”, *e uren-aṭu* “to those people” (F3,24 and 6, resp.). In the locational dative form *mi vuren-ge-ṭa* “to these people” (L2 24,2), the genitive ending *-ge* still has preserved its original meaning “house”<sup>355</sup>; thus, the exact translation is “to the house of these people”.<sup>356</sup> The form *mi uren-āi* “with these people” appears in the Palace-inscription (preserved in the National Museum, Māle). Thus, the original meaning of *apuren* must have been “our people”; in the function of a personal pronoun, it can be interpreted as an inclusive plural “we”. At a later time, which cannot be exactly determined, *afuren* developed to *ahuren/aharen*, still meaning “we”. The phonological change of /f/ to /h/ implied here is not an isolated process. In a considerable part of Huvadū, this sound change is a regular phenomenon, while in the other southern dialects and, still more, in northern Dhivehi, it can be found only in rare cases (cf. 1.3.6.3).

2.6.2.3.1.3. The question arises whether A.F. *ava*, the direct case form of the personal pronoun of the 1.ps.sg., can be regarded as belonging to the same etymon as *afuren / aharen*. Through an intermediate stage *\*afa*, this form can be derived from *\*apa* “we” as well. In this case, too, the plural form “we” must have been reinterpreted as a singular, “I” (cf. above).

2.6.2.3.1.4. Possibly *uren* ← *vuren* reflects OIA *vīrā-* “man, hero, son; male of an animal” (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 697, no. 12056) which occurs several times as a part of the traditional Sanskrit names of the Maldivian kings that are attested in the early Dhivehi documents; cp., e.g., the name of the king *vīra-singa* “man-lion” (F3,8; F4,1; F10,14; IDMMM 1,1; IDMHM 1,2). So far there are, however, no clear examples of a change of initial OIA *vī-* to Dhivehi *vu-*. The Sinh. representation of OIA *vīrā-*, *viru* “hero” (TURNER ib.), does not speak in favour of such an assumption either. On the other hand, there seems to be no other case of initial Modern IIA *vī-* going back directly to OIA *vī-* in initial position. In some examples there is a clear correspondence of initial Sinh. *vi-* (from MIA *vī-/vi-*) and Dhiv. *vi-* or *vī-* (with a secondary long vowel); cp., e.g., the following words the MIA ancestors of which have *vī-*: Dhiv. *vihi* “twenty”, Sinh. *vissa*, stem *visi-*: Pa. *vīsati-*, OIA *viṃśatī-* (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 677, no. 11616); Dhiv. *vī* “unhusked rice”, Sinh. *viya*, stem *vī-*: Pa., Pkt. *vīhi-*, OIA *vīthī-* (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 708, no. 12233). An unquestionable example of the development OIA and MIA *vi-* → Sinh., Dhiv. *vi-* is M. *vidu-varu*, A.F. *vidi* “lightening”, Sinh. *vidu*, Pa. *vijju-*, OIA *vidyūt-* (TURNER 1966, II, 683, no. 11742). An argument in favour of the derivation of *vuren* from *vīrā-* may, however, be found in the etymology of the old Dhivehi word for “island”, even though its OIA ancestor, *dvīpā-* “island”, has a consonant cluster in initial position. The following argumentation is mainly based on the development of the vowel; concerning the phonological development of the initial cluster, the simplified consonantism of MIA *dī-* (cf. Pa. *dīpa-*, *dīpaka-*, Pkt. *dīva-*; cf. TURNER 1966, I 382, no. 6691), representing the regular outcome of OIA *dvī-*, will serve as the starting point of the discussion. Besides the sanskritism *dvīpaya* which is used in the literary language, there are several variants of the same etymon in Sinhalese, reflecting different periods in the history of the language, perhaps also dialectal variation and later Prakrit influences; cp. *diva*, stem *divu* (GEIGER 1941, 77, no. 1129); *divayina*, *dūpata* and *dūva* (cf. CARTER 1936, 261). The Dhivehi word *divu* “island” which serves as the first part of the ethnonym *divehi* (← *\*divu-vesi* “island-inhabitant”; cf. 1.3.9.5.), is still attested as an independent word in some of the oldest texts (L3 7/2,3 etc.). In the modern language, however, *divu* has been completely lost. The more recent variant *duvu*, partly occurring side by side with *divu* in the same texts (e.g. L3 7/2,4), has been lost as an independent word as well, but is preserved as *-dū* in the second part of toponyms (cp., e.g., *Midū*, *Maradū*, *Hitadū*, *Fēdū*, *Makumudū* etc.); cp. also the name of the southernmost atoll, *Aḍḍū*, which represents a compound of Old Dhiv. *aṭ-* (← *\*ata*) “eight”<sup>357</sup> and *-dū*,<sup>358</sup> lit. meaning “eight islands (atoll)”.

<sup>354</sup> For the quasi-reflexive pronoun *timā*, cf. 2.6.4.2.

<sup>355</sup> For the meaning and the derivation of the genitive ending, cf. 2.3.1.1.1.

<sup>356</sup> A typological parallel of this can be found in the development of French *chez* “near(by), close to, by, next to, at” from the Lat. abl. *casā* “in, from the house”; cf. W. MEYER-LÜBKE, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3. vollst. neub. Aufl., Heidelberg 1939, 165, no. 1728.

<sup>357</sup> Cf. 2.5.1.1 above s.v. “eight”.

In Modern Dhivehi, the inherited word for “island” has been replaced by other etyma as a common noun (cp. M.A. *raʹ*, F. *rašo* /*raš/* “island”; M. *fuši*, A. *fīši*, F. *fīši* “little island”; M. *finoḷu*, A. *finoḷa*, F. *finoḷo* “island consisting of only one sandbank” etc.). But even if the example mentioned above could be taken to prove the assumption of a development of MIA *vī-* to Dhiv. *vu-*, one more problem arises. The final *-en* of (*v*)*uren* is not integrated into the system of the Dhivehi plural endings (cf. *-in/-un* in 2.3.2.1.2) which is an important argument to look for another analysis of this *plurale tantum*.

2.6.2.3.2. In Addū the 1.ps.pl. of the personal pronoun has the forms nom. *afirie* and obl. *afirin*. From the etymological point of view, these forms seem to be ambiguous: on the one hand, they could consist of the personal pronoun of the 1.ps.pl. in its older form, *\*apa*, or in its later spirantised form, *\*afa*, merged with the common Dhivehi word *firi* “man, male” (← *piri*, attested, e.g., in the *lōmāfanus* L1 f/1,4 and L2 36,1); cp. Sinh. *pirimi* “id.” and *puris* “man”; Pa. *purisa-*, OIA *pūruṣa-* “person, man”<sup>359</sup>. The meaning would in this case be something like “our people” (cp. *aharen* treated above). The problem would arise, however, that *\*apa-pirin* would regularly have led to *\*appirin*; according to the sound laws, the geminated *-pp-* would have been preserved in medial position (cf. 1.3.9.6.1). If we postulated a compound of the later (spirantised) forms *\*afa-firin* instead, the problem caused by the geminate would be the same, because no double spirant *-ff-* exists in Dhivehi; in this case, too, we should expect *-pp-*. The single spirant *-f-* could also be the result of a later reinterpretation by popular etymology, however, caused by the plural *firin* “men” as used in Addū. Another derivation could start from the oblique form of *\*apa/afa* instead, which in this case would have been combined with the *plurale tantum* (*v*)*uren* “people” (cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4 above). The two constituents of the compound would have merged into the form *afuren* which is well attested in the older written documents. Perhaps, the actual form of the pronoun in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, nom. *afū*, obl. *afun* (cf. 2.6.2.3.1.2 above), goes back to the same form. The plural in *-en*, which is not analysable from the modern point of view, could have been reinterpreted as a plural in *-in*, which regularly occurs with nouns denoting persons. From *\*afur-in*, however, it would be only a small step to the form *afirin*, which would thus be influenced by a popular etymology as well. The nominative form *afirie* “we” must be interpreted phonologically as /*afiria/*, thus obviously representing the nominative of a noun with final *-a* in plural function.<sup>360</sup> It remains uncertain whether /*afiria/* can reflect an old nom.pl. preserved as an isolated form.

2.6.2.3.3. In the standard language, *aḷugañdu* serves as personal pronoun of the 1.ps.sg. in the two lower social levels; beyond that, it is used by the representatives of the third, i.e. highest degree, when referring to themselves in a humble way. The corresponding plural, *aḷugañdumen* “we”, is formed with the suffix *-men* which also appears in the variant form of the highest degree, *aharemen* (cf. 2.6.2.3.1.2 above). The original meaning of *aḷu-gañdu*, “servant, slave”, has been lost in the modern language. The word is a nominal compound which literally means “servant-piece”. The particular meaning of the element *gañdu* (“thing, piece” as a common noun; in northern Dhivehi also “vessel”) is not perceivable in this type of

<sup>358</sup> For the development of *-t+d-* → *-dd-* cf. 1.3.9 above.

<sup>359</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 107, no. 1590 and 112, no. 1671 as well as 1902, 919, no. 136; TURNER (1966) I, 469, no. 8289 and II, 832, no. 14696.

<sup>360</sup> For the morphological expression of the plural in Addū cf. 2.3.2.1.

compound any longer. As outlined in 2.3.2.7.3.3, the originally independent noun has the function of a singularisation suffix in the modern language; thus, *aḷu-gaṅḍu* can be understood as meaning “one (belonging to the group) of the servants / vassals”. Referring to oneself as a “servant”, “slave” or “vassal” is a formal way of expressing one’s own submissive or humble position within the society.

The Old Dhiv. word *aḷu* is obsolete as an independent noun in the modern language; it has been replaced by the loanword M. *xādimu*, A.F. *xādima* “servant” (← Arab. *ḥādīm* “id.”). The noun *aḷu*, whose etymology is still unknown, often occurs as such in the documents of Old Dhivehi, however, where it was used as a *plurale tantum* meaning “submissives, vassals, (the whole) domestic staff” as well as a singular form meaning “servant, slave”. Thus, *aḷu* appears as a neutral singular or plural form in the *lōmāfanus* (nom.sg.: L2 22,3 etc.; L3 12/2,2.3; nom.pl. *aḷun* “servants, vassals”, enlarged with the suffix *-un*: L1 d/2,4; L2 28,2 and 32,5; L3 13/2,5), while the definite nom.sg. *aḷā* “the servant, the vassal” is met with in several *fatkoḷus* (F3,18; F4,5; F5,49; F6,26 etc.; gen.sg.def. *aḷāge*: F7,25; F9,5; F13,10.13.15; cf. also *de aḷun* “two servants” in F3,12). A plural form with a double marking by the suffixes *-tak* and *-un* (cf. 2.3.2.9.2.3) and further combined with *emme* “all” is attested in *emme aḷutakun* “all vassals together” (F5,36). Cp. also the derivative *aḷukamu* / *aḷukan* “domestic staff; servitude, slavery; service”<sup>361</sup> (*aḷikamu* [!] in L3 2/1,5; *aḷukan* e.g. in F3,17; F5,46; F8,31; cp. also the indef. form *aḷukamak* “a service” in L2 3,4), which shows a type of word-formation for abstract nouns which is still productive in the modern language. The independent word *kan* /*kam*/ “act, deed, fact”<sup>362</sup> can be added to any noun with a concrete meaning; as a second part of a compound, it loses its own meaning, functioning as a derivational suffix which is approximately equivalent to the Engl. abstract suffix *-ship*.<sup>363</sup>

2.6.2.3.4. Besides the forms that have been mentioned so far, in all dialects of Dhivehi the pronoun M.A.F. *timā* can be used as a personal pronoun of the 1.ps. sg. and pl. (*timā-men*) as well. It occurs mainly in direct speech. For the question of a reflexive pronoun existing in Dhivehi cf. 2.6.4.2.

## 2.6.2.4. The personal pronouns of the second person

2.6.2.4.1. In Addū and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the inherited pronoun of the 2.ps.sg. has been preserved. The direct case A.F. *tō* and the oblique case A.F. *ta* exactly correspond with Sinh. *tō* and *tā* “you (thou)”, resp. According to GEIGER (1938, 124; cf. also TURNER 1966, I, 336, no. 5889 s.v. *tuvām*, *tvām* “thou”), the nominative Sinh. *tō* must be derived from a MIA

<sup>361</sup> In Modern Dhivehi, *aḷukan* means “divine service, worship, prayer”.

<sup>362</sup> In Modern Dhivehi, *kan* is also used as a grammatical term meaning “verb”. For the etymology cp. Sinh. *kama*, stem *kam-* “occupation, act, deed, necessity”, Pa. *kamma(n)-*, OIA *kārman-* “act, work”; cf. GEIGER (1941), 37, no. 549; TURNER (1966) I, 147, no. 2892. Cf. also 2.2.1 above.

<sup>363</sup> For the development *kam(u)* → *kan* (implying the change *-m* → *-n*, cf. 1.1.4) cp. the attestation in F8,31 where *aḷukan* precedes a word with initial *k-*: *budaḷ aḷukan kuḷa kafīrun-ai...* “... and the infidels who did service to the Buddha”; *budaḷ* dat. “to the Buddha”, *kuḷa* part.pret. “done” (cf. 3.9.2.2.5), *kafīr-un* nom.pl. “infidels, unbelievers”, *-ai* “and”).

genitive of the pronoun (cp. Pkt. *tava*, *tuha*, Pa. *tava*; OIA *táva*), while the origin of the oblique case Sinh. *tā* can be seen in an old instrumental such as Pkt. *taē* or Pa. *t(v)ayā* (cp. OIA instr. *tvā*). The Addū plural forms, nom. *tafirie* /*tafiria*/ and obl. *tafirin* “you”, which are based on the oblique stem *ta*, are obviously formed by analogy with *afirie* /*afiria*/ and *afirin* “we” (cf. 2.6.2.3.2). Just like its presumptive model *afirin*, *ta-firin* could be based on a secondary interpretation by popular etymology as well; this means that it might have been understood as meaning “your men/persons”, *ta* being an oblique case in possessive function. In contrast to that, the 2.ps.pl. of the pers.pron. in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, nom. *tāmen* “you”, obviously represents a regular plural formation with the suffix *-men*. The long *ā* in *tā-men* can be explained in two ways on the basis of the underlying stem *ta*. The first explanation, which is more probable, considers the fact that the plural suffix *-men* as a rule can be added only to the definite form of nouns, even though this formation is no longer productive in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku (cf. 2.3.2.2.2). In this case, the form would have to be analysed as *\*ta-ā-men*. The second explanation takes into consideration that in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, besides the form *ta*, there must have existed a long-vocalic variant *\*tā* from which the plural would have been derived directly. This derivation would be supported by the corresponding form of the oblique case in Sinhalese which is *tā* as well (cf. GEIGER 1938, 123).

2.6.2.4.2. The F. plural nom. *ti mīhū* (← *\*mīhū* ← *mīhun*), obl. *ti mīhun* which is also used as a 2nd person pronoun “you” is a combination of the demonstrative pronoun *ti* in its attributive form with the plural *mīhun* “people” (stem *mīs-* “man, human being”). Its exact meaning is “these people” (nearly the addressee; cf. 2.6.2.4.4).

2.6.2.4.3. The 2.ps.sg. pronoun *kalē*, which is used in the modern language of Māle for the expression of “you (thou)” on the first (lowest) honorific level, is of nominal origin. It can be traced back to a noun meaning “sir, lord” which is well attested in the early texts; normally it refers to the Prophet Muḥammad, to the sultan or to another high-ranking personality. In its function as a pronoun, *kalē* which originally was used only for males, today refers to female persons as well. The fact that *kalē* represents the lowest and most neutral hierarchic degree, is evidence of a considerable semantic change which illustrates the possibility of a pronominal shift between the social levels. According to GEIGER (1919, 75), *kalē* is the “more respectful” form of address in comparison with *tia*. This implies that at the beginning of the 20th century, *tia* must still have served as the pronoun of the lowest rank in the language of Māle. In the modern standard language, however, it has been replaced in this function by *kalē*. In general, the occurrence of *tia* as a personal pronoun is restricted to the combination with some secondary pronominal elements today which serve as honorific markers of the two higher degrees (for *tia* further cf. 2.6.2.4.4 s.v. *tia bēkalē*).

2.6.2.4.3.1. The etymological origin of *kalē* is still unknown. The nominative of the underlying noun is attested in different final variants which cannot be explained only by dialectal variation. Besides the stem variants *kal-* (in prevocalic position) and *kau* (in final position, e.g. in F3,3; F5,10; F8,12; F10,6; F11,7; IDAM 1,18; RA 1,3 etc.; cp. also the abstract formation *kaukan* “rulership” appearing, e.g., in F3,1,2; RC 28,12) and the definite nom.sg. *kalā* “the Lord” (relating to the Prophet Muḥammad or the sultan; F7,10; RA 1,7 etc.; RC 5,3 etc.), we find the extended forms *kalo* (in *Dives akuru* documents: F1,20.26; F6,15-16; RB 1,6) and *kalō* (in the *Tāna Rādaṅgaḷi*, RC 3,2 etc.). As against this, *kale* and *kalē* have not been attested in the old documents as isolated forms so far. The existence of these variants must be presumed without a doubt, however, because they are

presupposed by the derivatives *kalemen*, nom.pl. “the lords” (F6,17), and *kalēgefānunge*, gen.pl., approximately “of the high-ranking Lord” (*pluralis maiestatis*, denoting the Prophet Muḥammad; RC 10,2; ITMHH 7,6). The older phonological variant of the latter formation, *kalēgepānu*, is preserved in a *Dives akuru* tomb inscription in Midū, Addū (IDAM 1,27) and in the *Rādavali* again (RB 1,11). Cp. also the corresponding formations *kalogepānu* (nom.sg.; F10,6 and IDMHH 6,9) and *kalogepānun* (*pluralis maiestatis*, F11,7) which are based on *kalo*. The etymology of the second part of these compounds, *-pānu/-fānu*, which obviously represents a honorific attribute meaning something like “honourable”, is still unknown.

2.6.2.4.3.2. The variants ending in *-e/-ē* and *-o/-ō* seem to represent different forms of address. It cannot be decided with certainty whether the long final vowels have to be explained as emphatic or whether they might be “frozen” definite forms (*kalē* ← *\*kale-ā* and *kalō* ← *\*kalo-ā*, cf. 2.3.1.4). It is surprising that *kalo/ō*, when used in attributive function, is often postponed to the word it determines (cp., e.g., *hasan*<sup>364</sup> *kalo*, F1,20); it cannot be excluded that this circumstance, among others, is responsible for the distribution of *-e* and *-o*. Furthermore, there is a noun *kalo* in the dialect of Addū which is used as a term of endearment when addressing beloved persons, esp. children. According to ḤASSAN SAʿĪD (personal communication), A. *kalo* cannot be regarded as a pronoun, however.

2.6.2.4.3.3. The following examples may illustrate the different forms of the stem *kal-* “lord” appearing in Old Dhivehi texts: *apurenge kau*, nom.sg., is a frequent formula meaning “our Lord” (since F3,3). In *kau muḥammad* “Lord Muḥammad” (the Prophet; e.g. RA 1,3, RB 1,11 etc.), the attributive *kau* must be interpreted as an oblique case form just as in the compound *kau-kan* “rulership”, where *kau* appears as the first part (RC 3,2 etc.; for *-kan* cf. 2.6.2.3.3). The compound *kalamidi* (nom.sg., L6 1,2 and 2,3; RA 21,2) with its definite form *kalaminjā* (RC 23,13 and 37,1; /*kalamijā* ← *\*kalamidyā* ← *\*kalamidi-ā*/, cf. 2.3.2.9.1.3.2), which was used as a title meaning “prince” and “princess”, is another example of the attributive function of *kal-*; in its enlarged variant form, *kala-*, it here determines the noun *-midi/-mijā* the meaning and etymology of which is still unclear. In contrast to this, the forms *kalās*/ *kalā-as*/ (dat.sg.def., RC 34,9<sup>365</sup>) and *kalo-aṭ* (dat.sg., RB 1,14) as well as the gen.sg. *kalo-ge* (F2,8; F3,3; IDMHH 6,8 etc.) are less problematic. *kau-kal-un* (RA 1,9: dat. *-as*) represents a distributional plural formed by reduplication of the stem,<sup>366</sup> meaning “all the lords (to whom it may concern)”; in the given case, the plural is additionally marked by the suffix *-un*.

In the gen.pl. *⟨kau-kabal-un-ge⟩*<sup>367</sup> (IDMHH 1,8), meaning “of the gentlemen and ladies”, we have a dvandva-compound *kau-kaṁbal-* “gentleman and lady” which is marked with the plural ending *-un* as well. Because of the numerous attestations within unambiguous contexts, the meaning of the consonant stem /*kaṁbal*/, the etymology of which is still unclear, can be determined as “lady, Mrs.”. Cp. *⟨kabau⟩* (for [*kaṁbau*]) *⟨mariam bibī⟩* “Mrs. Mariam Bibī” occurring in a *fatkoḷu* (F2,4); in a passage written in Arabic, *kaṁbau* *⟨kabau⟩* refers to the Prophet Muḥammad’s mother in the *Rādavali* (RC 4,13: *⟨kabau wahhabu binti āminatu⟩*). A nom.pl. in *-un* is attested in *mi de kaṁbalun* *⟨kabalun⟩* “these two women” (RC 6,1,3; F2,5,6). In the same *fatkoḷu* (F2,9), we also find the gen.pl. *kaṁbalunge* *⟨kabalunge⟩* “of the women”. A definite gen.sg. is represented in *kaṁbalāge* *⟨kabalāge⟩* “of the woman” occurring in a *lōmāfanu* (L2 15,5). Presumably *kaṁbulō* *⟨kabalō⟩* (RC 19,12) has to be understood as a form of address approximately meaning “honourable lady”; as with *kalō* (cf. above), it remains unclear whether we have to assume an underlying definite form here (← *\*kaṁbulo-ā*?). Likewise it is not clear how we should analyse the form *kaṁbō* *⟨kabō⟩* “woman” which is attested in the *Tāna Rādavali* again (RC 26,5). If it is not a mere “allegro-form” of *kaṁbulō*, we could also suppose some sort of “monophthongisation” of *kaṁbau* here, representing a phonetic variant which depends on the position within a syntagm. Further documented forms are the genitives (sg.) *kaṁbulēge* *⟨kabalēge⟩* (ITAG 6,6) and *kaṁbuloge* *⟨kabaloge⟩* (F12,6; IDMBM 1,15). The word *kaṁbulo* also occurs in the modern colloquial language of Māle, but it does not mean “lady” any longer. *kaṁbulo* is still used as a form of address, but on another stylistic level than in the documents of Old Dhivehi. Nowadays the use of the word is confined

<sup>364</sup> Sic (in *Dives akuru*). The normal spelling of the name would be *ḥasan* in Arabic script.

<sup>365</sup> The spelling is *⟨kalāša⟩*, the *ā* being corrected from *ō*. The final *-a* is uncertain.

<sup>366</sup> For this type of formation cf. 2.3.2.5.

<sup>367</sup> Phonetically this form contains a prenasalised /*m̥b*/ [*kaukaṁbalunge*]; for the prenasalised stops cf. 1.3.4.

to the inner circle of the family where it functions as a “generation specific” nick-name. This means that *kañbulo* can be used by a man when addressing his daughter or his niece in a very familiar way, but he could never use this word for a woman older than himself.<sup>368</sup>

2.6.2.4.4. In the modern language of Māle, the pronoun of the 2.ps. for the second degree of the social hierarchy, i.e., aristocracy, is *tia bēkalē* “you (thou)” in the singular and *tia bēkalun* “you” in the plural. The element *tia* is obviously derived from *ti* “that” (nearby the addressee: “*iste-deixis*”, cf. 2.6.5.2), with a suffix *-a* which is used for the substantivisation of demonstrative pronouns in other cases as well (cp. *ea*, 2.6.2.5.3 below). The particular meaning of *tia bēkalē* is “this one near you, the honourable lord” or “the honourable lord there, near you”. In a literary sense, *tia bēkalē* can thus be regarded as an indirect vocational form which, however, is used to directly addressing the addressee in question.<sup>369</sup> The second part of this pronoun, *bē-kalē*, is a compound consisting of the title *bē* “bey; prince, sovereign, sir”, which is widespread in Islamic countries, and the element *kalē* “lord” that has been dealt with above. In Old Dhivehi, *bē* is attested in the spelling ⟨*bei*⟩ as an independent word meaning “lord” (L4 g/1,6; F3,6; F6,12); when used as the first part of compounds, it is sometimes written ⟨*be*⟩ (for /*bē*/). This word, which presumably entered Dhivehi through Arabic (Arab. *bē*, written ⟨*beyk*⟩, cf. WEHR 1958, 76), lastly reflects the Turkic etymon *beg/bey* “ruler, sovereign, prince”.<sup>370</sup> The compound is attested in older records as well; cp. the plural forms *beikalun* “noble lords, gentlemen” (nom.pl.; F3,2), *emme beikalun* “all the noble lords” (nom.pl.; F12,6), *beikalun-aś* “to the noble lords” (dat.pl., RB 1,8 written ⟨*beikalunap*⟩ preceding initial *p*-), *beikalun-āi* (RB 1,7) and *beikalun-āi* (RC 8,11) “the noble lords and” (*-āi* lit. “with”), *bei-bei-kalun* “the noble lords (whosoever)” (F3,6-7; reduplicated distributional plural, cf. 2.3.2.5), and the indef. singular *beikalaku* “a (particular) noble lord” (obl.indef., F3,2; F12,3). — In the modern standard language, *bē*<sup>371</sup> is used by the younger members of the (extended) family as a form of addressing elder men.<sup>372</sup>

2.6.2.4.5. The 2.ps.sg. of the personal pronoun of the third degree which originally was reserved for the king is expressed by *tia bēfulā* or *tia manikufānu*. Adequate translations for these exclusive forms of addressing would be “your (royal) majesty” or “excellence”. As in the case of *tia bēkalē* (cf. above), the first part of *tia bēfulā* consists of the enlarged form of the demonstrative pronoun *ti*. *bēfulā* is a compound again, containing the loanwords *bē* “prince, ruler, sovereign” and the honorific element *-fulu* (cf. 2.2.3) which has the particular

<sup>368</sup> Cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 116; cp. also the use of *bē* (cf. 2.6.2.4.4).

<sup>369</sup> Typological parallels can easily be found in other languages; quite frequently, high-ranking people cannot be addressed directly. Cp., e.g., German “*Möchte(n) der Herr sich nicht setzen?*”, lit. “Wouldn’t the lord like to take a seat?”. In Polish, as a matter of principle, no personal pronoun can be used when addressing in a polite way; instead, the nouns *pan* “lord, sir, Mr.” and *pani* “lady, Mrs.” appear in the role of honorific pronouns. Thus, the literal meaning of the question *Jak się pan ma?* “How are you?” is “How is the lord?” In Italian, as in German, the 3.ps. is used as the polite form of address.

<sup>370</sup> Cf. M. RÄSÄNEN, Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Turksprachen, Helsinki 1969, 67 s.v. *bäg*.

<sup>371</sup> We cannot decide so far whether there is a connection between *bē* “lord” and the kinship term M.F. *bēbe*, A. *bēbē* “elder brother” (cf. 1.2.1.5). It is still unknown whether this etymon represents an original Dhivehi word or a loanword.

<sup>372</sup> Cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 116. Cp. also the use of *kañbulo* (cf. 2.6.2.4.3.3).

function of marking inalienable objects, such as parts of the body or children, of high-ranking persons (cp., e.g., *iṅgīli-fulu* “finger of a high-ranking person”, or *dari-fulu*, originally meaning “child of an aristocratic family”; today, *dari-fulu* can also be used by non-aristocrats, in order to express their high esteem for their own child). Most probably, the final *-ā*, which distinguishes the singular *tia bēful-ā* from its plural counterpart, *tia bēfulun* meaning “you”, “ye” (on the highest level), “your highnesses” as well as “your highness / majesty” in the sense of a *pluralis maiestatis*, represents the definite suffix. In the older texts that have been available so far, the forms *bēfulu/-ā* and *bēfulun* are not attested.

2.6.2.4.6. The addressing form *manikufānu*, which represents an inheritable aristocratic title, is characteristic for a particularly high style. In its original function as a title, *manikufānu* is postponed to first names and patronyms. The unenlarged form *maniku* can be used in the same way but has no pronominal function. In the oldest documents of Dhivehi written in *Evēla* and *Dives akuru* (i.e. *lōmāfanus* and *fatkoḷus* as well as the *Dives akuru* manuscript of the *Rādavaḷi*), the title *manikufānu* seems not to be attested yet. The earliest attestations can be found in *Tāna* inscriptions of a relatively late period, but there are also some examples occurring in *Dives akuru* inscriptions; cp., e.g., the forms *manikupānu* nom.sg. (IDMEM 3,31), *manikupānaṭa* dat.sg. (IDMHM 7,18; spelt with ⟨ṅ⟩?), *manikufānu* nom.sg. (ITMHH 2,8 etc.; ITAH 3,6 and 4,9), *maṅikufānu/maṅikufānu* nom.sg. (ITMP 1,4; ITMHH 1,5; ITAG 1,8 and 2,5), *maṅikufānuge* gen.sg. (ITAG 1,6), *maṅikufānunge* gen.pl. pro sg. (ITMHH 1,4; ITAG 2,4). The nom.sg. *maṅiku* is attested only twice (ITMP 1,3; ITAG 3,6). Most probably, the title reflects a word meaning “jewel, precious stone, ornament”; cp. OIA *maṅi-* “jewel”, “ornament”, Pa., Pkt. *maṅi-* (TURNER 1966, II, 557, no. 9731) as well as Sinh. *maṅa/māna*, (stem *maṅi*) “gem, precious stone” (GEIGER 1941, 133, no. 1981) and *mānika* (stem *māṅik*) “gem, jewel, precious stone” (← Skt. *māṅikya-*; cf. GEIGER 1941, 131, no. 1955). For Old Dhivehi, the form *maṅi* is attested in L1 (f/1,1, obviously in the sense of “pearl”); this must be explained as a sanskritism, the word being unknown in Modern Dhivehi. Thus, the original meaning of the title *maṅikufānu* must have been something like “esteemed jewel” (cf. also 2.2.2; for the element *-pānu/-fānu* cf. 2.6.2.4.3.1).

### 2.6.2.5. The personal pronouns of the third person

In Dhivehi, the forms which are used for the expression of “he, she, it” and pl. “they” are no personal pronouns by origin. They are all based on the demonstrative pronoun *e* “that” which refers to persons or objects that are located in a certain distance or completely out of sight from the point of view of the speaker as well as the addressee (“*ille-deixis*”, cf. 2.6.5.2). The use of deictic pronouns as personal pronouns of the third person is very common in Indo-Aryan (cf., e.g., ZOGRAF 1976, 155 and MASICA 1991, 251). According to GEIGER (1941, 31, 472 and 1938, 124-5), the corresponding Sinhalese pronominal stem *e/ē* “that; he” must be deduced from the old pronominal stem *ay-* which is represented in the OIA nom.sg. *ayām* “this” as well as the nom.sg. *eṣā* “id.”. TURNER (1966, I, 26, no. 587) notes that in post-OIA times these two stem variants were contaminated; concerning the etymology of the Sinhalese pronominal stem *e*, however, he decides in favour of *eṣā* (stem *etá-*) as the original form (I 122, 2530 s.v. *eṣā*).

2.6.2.5.1. In Dhivehi, the use of the unextended demonstrative stem *e* in substantive function is restricted to the inanimate 3.ps.sg., “it”. Most frequently, this usage occurs within a syntactical construction which is typical for Dhivehi, the pronoun serving as a means of

reference indicating the immediately following rhematic part of speech.<sup>373</sup> In these cases, it must be connected with the focus-marker *-ī* as in the following two examples:

- M. *e-ī boḍu fikuru*. “This indeed is deep thought.” (T8, 115) lit. “What that is, is great thought.” (*boḍu* “great, big”, *fikuru* ← Arab. *fikr* “thinking, thought, reasoning, idea, meaning”).
- A. *fiñdanā beṇi: e-ī magun ge mīhak-ā fua’ keḍa’ din aḍa*. (T1, 21) “The f.-bird said: ‘This is the sound produced with a piece of betel nut by a man walking outside.’” lit. “...: ‘What that is, is (the) sound, given by a man going in the street and a piece of betel nut.’” (*fiñdanā* nom.def. “the f.-bird”; *beṇi* 3.ps.sg.pret. “he said” (M. *bunanī* “to say”); *magun* abl. of A. *maga* “street, road”; *ge* part.pret. “having gone” (M. *dani* “to go”); *mīhak-ā* obl.indef. “a man” + conj. “and”; *fua’ /fuak/* obl. “betel nut”; *keḍa’ /kedak/* obl.indef. “a piece”; *din* part.pret. “given” (*denī* “to give”); *aḍa* nom. “sound, noise”).

2.6.2.5.1.1. In Māle as well as the southern dialects, the definite singular *eā* ⟨*eyā*⟩, which consists of the pronominal stem *e-* enlarged with the definite suffix *-ā*, is often used for “it”. In the standard language, “it” can also be expressed by the form *ēti* which obviously represents a merged form of the pronoun *e* and the *i*-stem noun *eti* “thing” (*e* + *eti* → *ēti*). Hence, the original meaning of *ēti* must be “that thing”. The noun *eti* reflects the old verbal form Skt. *asti*, Pa. *atthi* “(it) is”; cp. also the Sinhalese form *āti/āta* “there is/are” which is indeclinable as well (cf. GEIGER 1941, 17, 256; further cf. 3.9.2.2.5 for *netunī*).

2.6.2.5.1.2. As to the expression of the inanimate 3.ps.pl. “they”, there exist two formations which are almost identical in northern and southern Dhivehi. These are the nom.pl. M. *e taketi*, A. *ettaketi* and M. *e ecceti* /*e eti-eti*/,<sup>374</sup> A. *e etteti* “they, those” (for the complete paradigm cf. 2.6.2.7.8).

2.6.2.5.1.2.1. The form M. *e tak-eti* has to be analysed as a petrified phrase meaning “those, so many things”. Within this phrase, both *ta’ /tak/*, which later developed into a plural suffix, and *eti*, a former verbal form (cf. 2.6.2.5.1.1 above), can still be understood in their original meaning; cp. the early attested forms *taketi* (2 times IDMMM 4,6); *mi taketi* “these, so many things” (F4,4); gen. *taketige* (ITMKM 1,10). The modern nom.pl. A. *ettaketi* obviously represents a borrowing from the standard language; it seems that *ettaketi* was reinterpreted by popular etymology as a distributional plural *ettak-eti* “a thing-thing” consisting of the indef.sg. *etta’ /ettak/* ← *\*eti-ak* and the unmarked sg. *eti*.<sup>375</sup> The genitive form proves with no doubt that *ettaketi* cannot be an authentic Aḍḍū-formation; it seems that *ettaketige* is the only example in Aḍḍū of the genitive suffix *-ge*, which is normally confined to nouns denoting persons and to pronouns referring to living beings, being added to a pronominal element that explicitly refers to inanimate objects. In contrast to that cp. the gen.sg. A. *eāi* which is regularly derived from *e* “that”.

2.6.2.5.1.2.2. The dialectal variants A. *e etteti* / M. *e ecceti* “they, those” represent real distributional plural forms. The original meaning of the reduplicated form *\*e eti-eti* is “that thing-thing”, “those things”.

<sup>373</sup> For this construction cf. 2.6.5.3.1.1 and, furthermore, 5.2.

<sup>374</sup> For the phonological reasons of these developments cf. 1.3.9.2.1.

<sup>375</sup> For the reduplicated distributional plural forms cf. 2.3.2.5.

2.6.2.5.1.2.3. It must be noted that the substantive use of the inanimate pronouns meaning “it” and “they” is comparatively restricted in Dhivehi. Most often pronominal references are avoided, the noun in question being used twice or repeatedly without affecting the sense of style.

2.6.2.5.2. In general, reference to persons can only be expressed by enlarged forms of the pronoun, with respectable differences between the northern and the southern dialects. Unlike the animate pronouns of Sinhalese which are still differentiated by gender (cf. nom.sg. m. *eyā*, f. *ā*; GEIGER 1938, 125), Dhivehi has no gender distinction at all, not even in pronouns.

According to HLSD (1988, 165), F. *evu* (thus spelled for *eu*) is used for “he” while *eya* (for *ea*) means “she”. This statement cannot be confirmed by the facts of the living language, however. Considering the (not very many) examples with *eu* that can be approved, the use of the two forms seems to be unsystematical and arbitrary. There is only one circumstance speaking in favour of the assumption that a former gender-specific difference between *ea* and *eu* might have been lost in modern Fua’ Mulaku. From all the passages available in Fua’ Mulaku texts, we may conclude that the forms *miu* “this one” (m.) and *mia* “this one” (f.) which are derived from the demonstrative pronoun F. *mi* “this” (cf. 2.6.5.2, 2.6.5.3.2), are kept distinct by their gender. In the dialects of Aḍḍū and Māle, however, there are not even any traces of such a differentiation.

2.6.2.5.3. When used as a personal pronoun of an inanimate 3.ps.sg. (“it”), the demonstrative element *e* remains formally unchanged. In the function of a personal pronoun of an animate 3.ps.sg., however, it must be enlarged with special substantivising morphemes. In the dialects of Aḍḍū and Fua’ Mulaku, the direct case of the 3.ps.sg. is *ede* “he/she”, while the corresponding oblique case has the forms A. *ea* [*ee*] and F. *ea* (*/eu*). A.F. *ea* has a clear parallel in the Sinh. nom./obl. *eyā* “he”; for the (Sinh.) ending *-ā*, GEIGER (1938, 125) concisely notes that in the given case as well as in the case of the other demonstrative pronouns, its function consists in the substantivisation of the pronominal elements. As to the etymology of the final *-a*, it remains unexplained both for Sinhalese and southern Dhivehi. The same is true for the etymological derivation of the formal element *-de* which is not only present in the nom. A.F. *ede* “that one; he/she” but also in the corresponding form of the pronominal stem *mī*; cp. the nom. A. *mīde* “this one” (anim.). Most probably, the demonstrative *e* is also concealed in the personal pronoun M. *ēnā* denoting “he” or “she” on the lowest social level. It remains unclear, however, what an element *e* is combined with in this case.

2.6.2.5.4. In the language of Māle, the personal pronouns of the 3.ps.sg. of the second and the third degree correspond to those of the 2.ps.sg. to a large extent as far as their formation is concerned. The main difference between the 2.ps. pronominal forms *tia bēkalē* and *tia bēfulā* and their 3rd person equivalents *e bēkalā* and *e bēfulā* consists in the deictic orientation. While the pronoun *tia* originally refers to a person near by the addressee (Lat. *iste*), *e* refers to someone further away or even out of sight of the speaker as well as of the addressee (Lat. *ille*). Thus, the literal meaning of the second degree pronoun *e bēkalā* would be “that gentleman/lady (not present during the speech act in question)” (cf. 2.6.2.4.4) while that of the third degree *e bēfulā* is “that excellence (not present)”. The 3.ps.pl. of the second and third degrees is formed by the plural suffix *-un* which is added to the stem instead of the (former) definite suffix *-ā*, thus yielding 2nd degree *e bēkalun* and 3rd degree *e bēfulun* “they”.

2.6.2.5.5. Concerning the first, i.e., the lowest social degree, the plural of the 3rd person pronoun is formed analytically as well. Thus, the plural of M. *ēnā* “he, she” is expressed either by *e mihun* “those people” or by *e bai mihun* “that part (of the) people” (stem *mīs-* “man, person”; *bai* “part, half”). Semantically, the latter formation suggests a partitive meaning. In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the 3.ps.pl. “they” has the nominative form *e mihū* (← \**mihū* ← *mihun*) and the oblique case *e mihun*, while the corresponding plural forms of Aḏḏū are built by means of the noun *veri*, originally meaning “person” (cf. 2.3.2.4.1). Hence, the personal pronoun of the 3.ps.pl. A. nom. *e-verie* /*e-verial*/, obl. *e-verin* (with shortened variant *even*) “they” can be translated with “those persons, those people”. For the final /-a/ of the nominative cf. 2.6.2.3.2.

2.6.2.6. The following tables give an overview of the complete forms of the personal pronouns appearing in the standard language and in the dialects of Aḏḏū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku:

2.6.2.6.1. Māle:

	pers.pron.	1st degree	2nd degree	3rd degree
1st sg.	“I”	<i>aḷugañḏu</i>	<i>aḷugañḏu</i>	<i>aharen</i>
2nd sg.	“you”	<i>kalē</i>	<i>tia bēkalā,</i> <i>tia bēkalē</i>	<i>tia bēfulā,</i> <i>tia manikuḡānu</i>
3rd sg.	(anim.) “he / she”	<i>ēnā</i>	<i>e bēkalā</i>	<i>e bēfulā</i>
	(inan.) “it”	<i>e, eā, ēti</i>	<i>e, eā, ēti</i>	<i>e, eā, ēti</i>
1st pl.	“we”	<i>aḷugañḏumen</i>	<i>aḷugañḏumen</i>	<i>aharemen</i>
2nd pl.	“you”	<i>kalēmen</i>	<i>tia bēkalun</i>	<i>tia bēfulun</i>
3rd pl.	(anim.) “they”	<i>e mihun, e bai mihun</i>	<i>e bēkalun</i>	<i>e bēfulun</i>
	(inan.)	<i>e taketi, e ecceti</i>		

2.6.2.6.2. Aḏḏū:

	pers.pron.	casus rectus	casus obliquus
1st sg.	“I”	<i>ava</i>	<i>ma</i>
2nd sg.	“you”	<i>tō</i>	<i>ta</i>
3rd sg.	(anim.) “he / she”	<i>ede</i>	<i>ea</i>
	(inan.) “it”	<i>e, eā</i>	<i>ea</i>
1st pl.	“we”	<i>aḡirie /aḡiria/</i>	<i>aḡirin</i>
2nd pl.	“you”	<i>taḡirie /taḡiria/</i>	<i>taḡirin</i>
3rd pl.	(anim.) “they”	<i>everie /everia/</i>	<i>everin, even</i>
	(inan.)	<i>ettaketi</i>	<i>e etteti</i>

2.6.2.6.3. Fua<sup>2</sup> Mulaku:

	pers.pron.	casus rectus	casus obliquus
1st sg.	“I”	<i>ava</i>	<i>ma</i>
2nd sg.	“you”	<i>tō</i>	<i>ta</i>
3rd sg.	(anim.) “he /she”	<i>ede</i>	<i>ea, eu</i>
	(inan.) “it”	<i>e</i>	<i>ea</i>
1st pl.	“we”	<i>afū</i>	<i>afun</i>
2nd pl.	“you”	<i>tāmen; ti mīhū</i>	<i>ti mīhun</i>
3rd pl.	(anim.) “they”	<i>e mīhū</i>	<i>e mīhun</i>
	(inan.)	<i>e etteti ?</i>	

2.6.2.7. The following tables illustrate the complete paradigms of the declinable personal pronouns:

## 2.6.2.7.1. Pers.pron. 1.ps.sg. “I”:

	Addū	Fua <sup>2</sup> Mulaku	Māle	
			1./2.	3.
nom.	<i>ava</i>	<i>ava</i>	<i>aḷugañḍu</i>	<i>aharen</i>
obl.	<i>ma</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>aḷugañḍu</i>	<i>aharen</i>
gen.	<i>afagē, magē</i>	<i>mage</i>	<i>aḷugañḍuge</i>	<i>aharenge</i>
dat.	<i>ma<sup>2</sup> /maś/</i>	<i>maśa</i>	<i>aḷugañḍa<sup>2</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>aharenna<sup>2</sup> /-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>magē farātun, ma ekuhun</i>	<i>mage farāten</i>		

## 2.6.2.7.2. Pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. anim. “you”

	Addū	Fua <sup>2</sup> Mulaku	Māle		
			1.	2.	3.
nom.	<i>tō</i>	<i>tō</i>	<i>kalē / kalā</i>	<i>tia bēkalā / tia bēkalē</i>	<i>tia bēfulā, tia manikufānu</i>
obl.	<i>ta</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>kalē</i>	<i>tia bēkalē</i>	<i>tia bēfulu, tia manikufānu</i>
gen.	<i>tagē</i>	<i>tage</i>	<i>kalēge</i>	<i>tia bēkalēge</i>	<i>tia bēfuluge, tia manikufānuge</i>
dat.	<i>ta<sup>2</sup> /ta-aś/</i>	<i>taśa</i>	<i>kale<sup>2</sup>a<sup>2</sup> /kale-aś/</i>	<i>tia bēkale<sup>2</sup>a<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>tia bēfula<sup>2</sup>, tia manikufāna<sup>2</sup></i>
abl.	<i>tagē farātun; ta ekuhun</i>	<i>tage farāten</i>			

## 2.6.2.7.3. Pers.pron. 3.ps.sg. anim. “he/she”

	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle		
			1.	2.	3.
nom.	<i>ede</i>	<i>ede</i>	<i>ēnā</i>	<i>e bēkalā</i>	<i>e bēfuḷā</i>
obl.	<i>ea</i>	<i>eu, ea</i>	<i>ēnā</i>	<i>e bēkalē</i>	<i>e bēfuḷu</i>
gen.	<i>eagē</i>	<i>euge, eage</i>	<i>ēnāge</i>	<i>e bēkalēge</i>	<i>e bēfuḷuge</i>
dat.	<i>ea<sup>2</sup> /ea-aś/</i>	<i>euśa, eaśa</i>	<i>ēnāa<sup>2</sup> /ēnā-aś/</i>	<i>e bēkalea<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>e bēfuḷa<sup>2</sup></i>
abl.	<i>eagē farātun</i>	<i>euge/eage farāten</i>			

## 2.6.2.7.4. Pers.pron. 3.ps.sg. inan. “it”

	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle	
nom.	<i>e, eā (sg.def.)</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e, eā</i>	<i>ēti ← e eti</i>
obl.	<i>ea</i>	<i>ea</i>		
gen.	<i>eāi</i>	<i>eai</i>	<i>ēge /ea-ge/</i>	<i>ēti-ge</i>
dat.	<i>eā<sup>2</sup> /eā-aś/</i>	<i>eaśa</i>	<i>ea<sup>2</sup> /ea-aś/</i>	<i>ēcca<sup>2</sup> /ēti-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>eāin /eā-in/</i>		<i>ein /ea-in/</i>	<i>ētīn /ēti-in/</i>
loc.	(= gen.)	(= gen.)	<i>ēgā /ea-gai/</i>	<i>ētī-gā /-ga/</i>

## 2.6.2.7.5. Pers.pron. 1.ps.pl. “we”

	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle	
			1./2.	3.
nom.	<i>afirie /afiriya/</i>	<i>afū</i>	<i>aḷugañḍumen</i>	<i>aharemen, mamen</i>
obl.	<i>afirin</i>	<i>afun</i>	<i>aḷugañḍumen</i>	<i>aharemen, mamen</i>
gen.	<i>afiringē</i>	<i>afunge</i>	<i>aḷugañḍumenge</i>	<i>aharemenge, mamenge</i>
dat.	<i>afirinna<sup>2</sup> / afinna<sup>2</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>afunna<sup>2</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>aḷugañḍumena<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>aharemena<sup>2</sup>, mamena<sup>2</sup></i>
abl.	<i>afiringē farātun / afirin ekuhun</i>	<i>afunge farāten</i>		

## 2.6.2.7.6. Pers.pron. 2.ps.pl. “you”

	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle		
			1.	2.	3.
nom.	<i>tafirie /tafīria/</i>	<i>tāmen, ti mīhū</i>	<i>kalēmen</i>	<i>tia bēkalun</i>	<i>tia bēfuḷun</i>
obl.	<i>tafirin</i>	<i>ti mīhun</i>	<i>kalēmen</i>	<i>tia bēkalun</i>	<i>tia bēfuḷun</i>
gen.	<i>tafiringē</i>	<i>tāmenge, ti mīhunge</i>	<i>kalēmenge</i>	<i>tia bēkalunge</i>	<i>tia bēfuḷunge</i>
dat.	<i>tafirinna<sup>3</sup> /-aś/ tafinna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>tāmenna<sup>3</sup>, ti mīhunna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>kalēmenna<sup>3</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>tia bēkalunna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>tia bēfuḷuna<sup>3</sup></i>
abl.	<i>tafiringē farātun, tafirin ekuhun</i>				

## 2.6.2.7.7. Pers.pron. 3.ps.pl. anim. “they”

	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle		
			1.	2.	3.
nom.	<i>everie /everia/</i>	<i>e mīhū</i>	<i>e mīhun, e bai mīhun</i>	<i>e bēkalun</i>	<i>e bēfuḷun</i>
obl.	<i>everin, even</i>	<i>e mīhun</i>	<i>e / e bai mīhun</i>	<i>e bēkalun</i>	<i>e bēfuḷun</i>
gen.	<i>everingē</i>	<i>e mīhunge</i>	<i>e / e bai mīhunge</i>	<i>e bēkalunge</i>	<i>e bēfuḷunge</i>
dat.	<i>everinna<sup>3</sup>, evenna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>e mīhunna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>e / e bai mīhunna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>e bēkalunna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>e bēfuḷunna<sup>3</sup></i>
abl.	<i>everingē farātun</i>				

## 2.6.2.7.8. Pers.pron. 3.ps.pl. “they” (inan.)

	Aḍḍū		Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle	
	nom.	<i>e taketi</i>		<i>e etteti /eti-eti/</i>	?
gen.	<i>e taketiḡē</i>	<i>e ettetiḡē</i>		<i>e taketiḡe</i>	<i>e eccetiḡe</i>
dat.	<i>e taketta<sup>3</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>e ettetta<sup>3</sup> /-aś/</i>		<i>e takecca<sup>3</sup> /etaketi-aś/</i>	<i>e eccetta<sup>3</sup> /eti-aś/</i>
abl.	<i>e takettin</i>	<i>e ettettin</i>		<i>e taketiḡin /-i-in/</i>	<i>e eccetiḡin /-i-in/</i>
loc.	(= gen.)			<i>e taketiḡā /-gai/</i>	<i>e eccetiḡā /-gai/</i>

### 2.6.3. Possessive pronouns

From the morphological point of view, the possessive pronouns do not represent an independent category in Dhivehi. As in Sinhalese,<sup>376</sup> possession is expressed by the genitive of the personal pronouns. Only in the first person, *timā* “self” can be used in possessive function as well (cf. 2.6.4.2), but only in reported speech. Cp. the following two examples:

- M. “*tia ge-ak-ī aharen-ge ge.*” (T8, 71) “This is my house.” (lit. “What that house is, is **my** house.”; *tia* dem.pron.; *ge* “house”, *-ak-ī* indef. suffix + focus-marker *-ī*).
- A. “*te-ak-ī timā-gē moḷōgañḍa nun-āu.*” (T3, 37) “This is not **my** axe.” (lit. “What that is, is not the self’s axe.” *te* dem.pron.; *timā-gē* gen. of *timā*, used in possessive function; *moḷōgañḍa* “axe”, unenlarged nominal stem in singular function; *nun* “is not”; *-au* quotation marker).

The following table illustrates all possessive forms that are based on the genitive of the personal pronoun.

poss.pron.	Addū	Fua <sup>7</sup> Mulaku	Māle		
			1st degree	2nd degree	3rd degree
1st sg. “my”	<i>afagē</i>	<i>mage</i>	<i>aḷugañḍuge</i>		<i>aharenge</i>
	<i>timāgē</i>	<i>timāge</i>	<i>timāge</i>		
2nd sg. “your”	<i>tagē</i>	<i>tage</i>	<i>kalēge</i>	<i>tia bēkalēge</i>	<i>tia bēfuluge</i>
3rd sg. “his/her”	<i>eagē</i>	<i>eage, euge</i>	<i>ēnāge</i>	<i>e bēkalēge</i>	<i>e bēfuluge</i>
1st pl. “our”	<i>afiringē</i>	<i>afunge</i>	<i>aḷugañḍumenge</i>		<i>aharemenge</i>
	<i>timāmengē</i>	<i>timāmenge</i>	<i>timāmenge</i>		
2nd pl. “your”	<i>tafiringē</i>	<i>tāmenge, ti mihunge</i>	<i>kalēmenge</i>	<i>tia bēkalunge</i>	<i>tia bēfulunge</i>
3rd pl. “their”	<i>everingē</i>	<i>e mihunge</i>	<i>e / e bai mihunge</i>	<i>e bēkalunge</i>	<i>e bēfulunge</i>

2.6.3.1. In the southernmost Maldivian dialects, it is more often the pure oblique case of the personal pronoun than its genitive which is used in possessive function. This is one more feature southern Dhivehi shares with Sinhalese but not with the Māle standard language. The oblique case of the personal pronouns being lost as a category of its own in northern Dhivehi, its occurrence as a possessive element is restricted to exceptional cases. The only example of the *casus obliquus* of a personal pronoun in possessive function that can be mentioned in this connection is taken from the fairy tale *fūlu digu hañḍige vāhaka* (“Story of the demon with the long navel”) where it occurs in an exclamation quoted as direct speech: M. “*addō* ⟨*a<sup>3</sup>dō*⟩, *ma fūlō!*” (T13, 28) “Ouch, my navel!” The oblique case *ma* meaning “my” is not the only exceptional form within this sentence. The form *fūlō*, which is attested only here, is not quite clear, either; possibly it represents an (archaic) emphatic (i.e., exclamatory) form of the common Dhivehi word for “navel”, *fūlu*.<sup>377</sup> Another way to explain the long *-ō* of *fūlō* would be to assume a merger of *fūlu* and the quotation marker *ē* ← ⟨*eve*⟩ here (cf. 5.4).

<sup>376</sup> Cf., e.g., GEIGER (1942), 6 / (1973), 588; MATZEL (1983), 22.

<sup>377</sup> The etymology of *fūlu* is unknown.

2.6.3.2. The following two examples illustrate the use of the oblique case of personal pronouns as an attributive possessive element in the dialects of Aḍḍū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku:

- A. “*mī ta moḷōgaṇḍa tau?*” ... “*tē ma moḷōgaṇḍa nunāu.*” (T3, 59-60) “Is this (here, nearby me) your axe?” — “No, that (there, nearby you) is not my axe.” (*mī* = *mi-i*, dem.pron. *mi* + focus-marker *-i*; *tē* = *te-i*, dem.pron. *te* + focus-marker *-i*; *ma* “my”, *ta* “your”, obl. case forms of the pers.pron. of the 1st and 2nd ps.sg., resp.; *moḷōgaṇḍa* “axe”; *tau* question marker; *nun-āu* negation “is not” + quotation marker).
- F. “*ta bere nu nun, ma bere nu nun, ...*” (T2, 64a) “It is not my drum, it is not your drum, ...” (*bere* “drum”; the combination of *nu* (negation particle) and *nun* “not being” represents a quite uncommon double negation; besides that, *nu* represents the northern Dhivehi variant of the negation particle, the regular equivalent in Aḍḍū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku being *ni*).

#### 2.6.4. Reflexive pronouns

For the Dhivehi language of his time, GEIGER (1919, 76) noted briefly: “The Reflective Pronoun, also, is employed, clearly in more modest modes of expression, in place of the First Person.” As far as this concerns the word *timā*, this statement is still true for Modern Dhivehi; throughout the dialects, *timā* can be used as a personal pronoun meaning “I”, but only in reported speech. Cp. the following text passage which is taken from the fairy tale *Moḷōgaṇḍa* “The axe”, in the dialect of Aḍḍū (T3, 12):

- A. *mi kuddā kēfi*: “*ammāu! timā ēṇei dara hōdāsāu.*” “This child said: ‘Mother! I’ll go to look for (some) fire-wood.’” (lit. “That where I shall go, is to look for fire-wood.”; *mi* dem.pron. “this”; *kuddā* sg.def. “child”; *kē-fi* pret.I, 3.ps.sg. “said” ← A. *kēnī*, M. *kianī* “to say”); *ammāu* sg.def. *ammā* “mother”, here combined with the quotation marker *-āu* in vocational function; *timā* obl. of the pron. “I (myself)”; *ēṇei* for *ēṇe-i*, part.fut. of *enī* (M. *annanī*) “to come” + focus-marker; *dara* obj., pure nominal stem in the function of a generic plural “fire-wood”; *hōdās-āu* inf. + quotation marker “(in order) to look for”).

Though being frequent, the use of *timā* as a personal pronoun in reported speech is not obligatory. This is illustrated by the following sentence, which is taken from the same fairy tale:

- A. “*ammāu! ma enī dara kośāsāu.*” (T3, 17) “Mother, I want to look for some fire-wood.”; lit. “Mother! Where I am going, is to cut fire-wood.” *ma* obl. case of the pers.pron. “I”, here used instead of *timā* with *en-i*, part.pres. “going” (enlarged by the focus-marker).

2.6.4.1. By etymology, *timā* is related with the Sinhalese reflexive pronoun which in its older, inscriptional form is attested as *tumā* while the modern language has *tamā* (cf. GEIGER 1938, 130). Through an intermediate form like Pa. *tuma-* “oneself, himself”, this must be derived from OIA *tmān-* (obl. stem of *ātmā*) “vital breath, one’s own person” (TURNER 1966, I, 341, no. 5983). It remains doubtful, however, whether this formation can be designated as a “reflexive” pronoun in the proper sense of the word, given that it seems never be used for the object of a verbal predicate which is co-referential with the subject of the sentence. As a matter of fact, Dhivehi possesses no formal elements at all for this function which is usually fulfilled by reflexive pronouns in European languages.

2.6.4.2. The following table will give a general view of the dialectal variants of Dhiv. *timā*:

“self”	Adḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
nom./obl.sg.	<i>timā</i>	<i>timā</i>	<i>timā</i>
gen.sg.	<i>timāgē</i>	<i>timāge</i>	<i>timāge, timange<sup>°</sup>, timenge<sup>°</sup></i>
dat.sg.	<i>timā<sup>3</sup> /timā-aś/</i>	<i>timāśa /timā-aśa/</i>	<i>timā<sup>3</sup> /timā-aś/</i>
abl.sg.	<i>timāgē farātun / timā ekuhun</i>	<i>timāgē ferāten</i>	
nom./obl.pl.	<i>timāmen</i>	<i>timāmen</i>	<i>timāmen</i>
gen.pl.	<i>timāmengē</i>	<i>timāmenge</i>	<i>timāmenge, timennāge<sup>°</sup></i>
dat.pl.	<i>timāmenna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>timāmenna<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>timāmenna<sup>3</sup></i>
abl.pl.	<i>timāmengē farātun; timāmen ekuhun</i>	<i>timāmengē ferāten</i>	

\*) These forms are dialectal variants according to oral information by ḤASSAN SA‘ĪD, March 1999.

### 2.6.5. Demonstrative pronouns

In Dhivehi, there exist three rows of demonstrative pronouns which correspond to the classical subdivision of deictic meanings as denominable after the Latin demonstratives *hic*, *iste* and *ille*.<sup>378</sup> M.F.A. *mi* is the common pronoun of the *hic*-deixis. It refers to somebody or something in close proximity to the speaker and can be translated with “this one here nearby myself”. The pronominal stem M.F. *ti*, A. *te* corresponds to the *iste*-deixis, referring to somebody or something in close proximity to the hearer. The basic meaning of this demonstrative is “the one there nearby you”. The meaning of *ti / te* cannot be rendered adequately in English though; depending from the context, it must be translated by “this” or “that”. M.F.A. *e* “that” serves as a pronoun of the *ille*-deixis, referring to a person or an object which is out of sight of the speaker as well as of the addressee.

2.6.5.1. The threefold deixis of Dhivehi contrasts with a fourfold one in Modern Sinhalese. GAIR (1970, 31) describes the meaning of the Sinhalese demonstrative stems *mē-*, *ō-/oya-*, *ē-* and *ara-* as follows: “*mee* ‘this, these’: proximity to speaker, or to both speaker and hearer. *oyā* ‘that, those (by you)’; proximity to hearer. *arā* ‘that, those (over there)’: distal [sic!] from both speaker and hearer; if an object, in sight. *ee* ‘that, those (in question)’: anaphora; reference to some preceding segment or topic in the discourse.”<sup>379</sup>

<sup>378</sup> For the development of the classical theory on *deixis* cf. BÜHLER (1934, 79 ff.) who also gave an extensive presentation of the contemporary and previous discourse on this theme, in particular by Karl BRUGMANN (Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen. Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Bd. 22, 1904).

<sup>379</sup> Cf. also MATZEL (1983), 23: “*mē-* bezeichnet *das näher zum Sprechenden Befindliche*, *ō-/oya-* bezeichnet *das näher zum Angesprochenen Befindliche*, *ē-* bezeichnet *das Abwesende, nicht sichtbare, Gedachte*, *ara-* bezeichnet *das räumlich und zeitlich Entfernte*.” Cf. also MASICA (1991), 251.

2.6.5.1.1. According to GEIGER (1919, 76), Dhiv. *mi* “this” corresponds with Sinh. *mē* which he derives from the pronominal stem *ē* enlarged with the prefixed pronominal stem *ma-* (GEIGER 1938, 126), in its turn deduced from Pkt., Pa. *ima-*, Skt. *imá-*; TURNER (1966, I, 26 and 1985, 4, no. 587) agrees with this. For the derivation of the pronominal stem Sinh. *ē* / Dhiv. *e* “that” cf. 2.6.2.5. The etymology of the demonstrative M.F. *ti*, A. *te*, in its deictic function corresponding with Sinh. *ō/oya-* (cf. above), is still unknown.

2.6.5.1.2. As was mentioned above, there are no particular personal pronouns for the third person in Dhivehi (cf. 2.6.2.5). This morphological gap is filled by the demonstrative pronouns which also function as anaphoric and cataphoric pronouns. Thus, the pronouns of the *that*-deixis normally serve as anaphorics, while the pronoun of the *this*-deixis is mainly used in a cataphoric sense.

2.6.5.2. The table below gives a comprehensive survey of the demonstrative stems that exist in Dhivehi:

dem.pron.attr.	Āḍḍū	Fua’ Mulaku	Māle
“hic”	<i>mi</i> / ( <i>me</i> )	<i>mi</i>	<i>mi</i>
“iste”	<i>te</i>	<i>tī</i>	<i>tī</i>
“ille”	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>

For the declension of the substantivised demonstratives cf. the tables given in 2.6.2.7.3 and 2.6.2.7.4 which show the enlarged forms of the demonstrative *e* used as personal pronouns of the 3.ps.sg. The declension of the enlarged pronominal forms that are based on *mi* follows the same pattern.

2.6.5.2.1. A. *me*, which is indicated as a variant in the list above, can be explained by an assimilation of the root vowel, the form being exclusively used as an attribute of *hen* “mood, way”. *me-hen* which in Modern Āḍḍū is regarded as an inseparable morphological unit, means “(in) this way”. In contrast to this, there is no assimilation of *mi* when combined with other words containing *e*; cp., e.g., A. *mi gehā* sg.def. “this tree”, *mi gē* sg.def. “this house”.

2.6.5.2.2. The attributive use of the demonstrative pronouns can be illustrated by the following examples representing the different dialects.

- A. *mi kuddā kēfi*: ... (T3, 12) “This child said: ...” (*mi* “this”, attr. of *kuddā* nom.def. “child”; *kēfi* 3.ps.sg.pret. “said” (M. *kianī* “to say, speak; to tell, read”).
- A. *me-hen beṇi mei* ... (T1, 10) “Having spoken this way ...” (*me* “this”, attr. of *hen* obl. “mood, way”; *beṇi* part.pret. “(having) said, spoken” (M. *bunanī* “to say, speak”); *mei* nom.loc. in conjunctive function “(at the time) when”).
- F. *kihinne tai ta tī rukaha gēi?* (T4, 39) “How did you go to that coconut-tree (near you)?” (*kihinne* “how, which way”; *tai* quest.part.; *ta* obl. pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. “you”; *tī* dem.pron. “this (one) near you”, attr. of *rukaha*, dat.sg. of *ru* /*ruk*/ “coconut-tree”; *gē-i* part.pret. “gone” (M. *dani* “to go”) + focus marker; lit. “which way was it you went to that coconut-tree (there, near you)?”).
- M. *e de bēḥuḥun mušimahā duru vī*. (T8, 140) “Those two gentlemen went mackerel fishing.” (*e* attr. “those”; *de* “two”; *bēḥuḥun* obl.pl. “gentlemen, nobles”; *mušimahā* for /*mušimas-āi*/ “with the mackerels”; *duru vī-i* part.pret. of *duru vanī* “to go”, lit. “be far (away)”, 2nd level + focus marker *-ī*: “where they went (to), is ...”

2.6.5.3. In Sinhalese, the stem form of the demonstrative pronouns can be used in attributive function only. When used independently, they must be enlarged by special suffixes which at the same time express a threefold differentiation of gender, viz. m. *-ā*, f. *-ī*, n. (only inanimate) *-a*; cp., e.g., Sinh. *eyā* “that one (male person)”, *ā* ← *\*eyī* “that one (female person)” and *eya* “that one (object)” (cf. GEIGER 1938, 125; cf. also 2.6.2.5.3 above). In both these features, Dhivehi is different from Sinhalese.

2.6.5.3.1. First, in all Maldivian dialects demonstrative pronouns referring to “non-persons”, i.e. animals in general as well as plants and inanimate things, can be used in their unenlarged form both as attributes and independently. Cp. the following example:

- F. ... *ebagēm mā, beḷalaku mi hedī likī goho, mi kāfī*. (T4, 4) “... after she [Mēliāge Dia] had left, a cat, coming (there), ate **this** [a bread fruit].”; lit. “... when she had left, the way a cat acted now, was as follows: coming (here), it ate this.” (*ebagēm* = *ebageun* verbal noun in the obl. case, “the leaving” (M. *danī* “to go”); *mā* nom.loc., “when”; *beḷalaku* obl.indef. “a cat”; *mi* dem.pron. in adverbial function “now”; *hedī* part.pret. “done, acted” (M. *hadanī* “to act, do, make, create”); *lik-ī* nom. + focus-marker “what the way was, was (as follows)”; *goho* abs. of “to go” (M. *danī*); *mi* dem.pron. used as substantive, nom., inan. “this (one)”; *kāfī* 3.ps.sg.pret.I (M. *kanī* “to eat”).

2.6.5.3.1.1. The demonstrative stems in their unenlarged form can also be used in the syntactic construction with the focus-marker *-ī* emphasising the rhema, which is one of the most typical features of Dhivehi (cp. the sentence treated above). If this marker, which indicates the rhematisation of the following part of the sentence,<sup>380</sup> is added to a demonstrative pronoun, it is usually absorbed by the final vowel of the latter which is lengthened. Cp. the following examples:

- A. *mī ta moḷōgañḍa tau? ... tē ma moḷōgañḍa nunāu*. “Is this your axe?” ... “No, this is not my axe.” (T3, 59-60); *mī* = *mi-ī* “what this (here, nearby myself) is, is ...”; *ta moḷōgañḍa* “your axe”; *tau* quest.particle; *tē* = *te-ī* “what that (there, nearby you) is, is ...”; *ma moḷōgañḍa* “my axe”; *nun-āu* negation particle + quotation particle).
- F. ... *mī ran fēśak ai*. “... what this was, is a golden box.” (T1, 54a; *mī* = *mi-ī* “what this (here, nearby him) was, was ...”; *ran* obl. “gold”; *fēśak* ← stem *fēśi-* + indef.suff. *-ak* “a box”; *-ai* quotation particle).
- M. *mi-ī ves mamma-ek-ge sūra eve*. (*mi-ī ves manma’ē’ge sūra ’eve*) “What this [in her eyes] was, was also the figure of a mother.” (T9, 37; *mi-ī* “what this is, was ...”; *ves* “also, even, too”; *mamma* “mother”, *-ek* def.suff., *-ge* gen.suff.; *sūra* “form, figure, picture, mood” etc. ← Arab. *šūra* “id.”<sup>381</sup>; *eve* quot.particle).

Sentences like the following one can be understood within the framework of a similar syntactic context:

- A. *boñdanā ahafī: fiñdanu, fiñdanu, e kon aḍa?* “The B.-bird asked: ‘F.-bird, F.-bird, what a noise is that?’” (T1, 20-20a; *boñdanā* nom.def.; *ahafī* pret.I, 3.ps.sg. (M. *ahanī* “to ask”); *fiñdanu* obl. “F.-bird”; *kon* interr.pron. “which, what a”; *aḍa* nom. (stem form) “noise, sound”). The reason why in this sentence (frequently occurring in the given fairy tale) the focus-marker *-ī* is not added to the pronoun *e*, must obviously be seen in the fact that the rhematic element is sufficiently marked by the interrogative pronoun *kon* which follows immediately after *e*.

<sup>380</sup> For the details of this construction cf. 5.2.

<sup>381</sup> For some further meanings of this word cf., e.g., WEHR (1958), 480.

2.6.5.3.1.2. When persons are referred to, the substantivised pronominal form cannot take the focus-marker *-ī* itself. In such cases, the latter element is either added to the pure demonstrative stem or to the indefinite (oblique) form which is derived with the suffix *-ak*. In the case of M. *ēnā* “that one (m./f.); he/she”, the resulting form is *ēnā-ak-ī*, while <sup>†</sup>*ēnā-ī* does not exist. Cp. the following example:

M. *ēnā<sup>382</sup>akī ēge nevin*. (T8, 165) “(It is true), he was her captain.” lit. “(It is true) that **what he was**,<sup>382</sup> is her [i.e. the ship’s] captain.” (*ēge* gen.sg. of *e* “it” (inan.) in the function of a poss.pron. “its”, here: “her”; *nevin* nom.sg. “captain”).

In southern Dhivehi, however, the corresponding form is derived from the oblique case; cp. A. *eāk-ī* (← *ea-ak-ī*) as used in the following sentence:

A. *ehen vi meī, eākī e raśi hiśi emme fakīri taulīman ne<sup>3</sup> mīhā kamuḡai vege*. (T16, 3) “Therefore, he (probably) became the poorest and least educated man in this island.” lit. “Having become that way (*ehen vi meī*), it became the fact (*kamuḡai vege*) that he was the one (*eāk-ī*), who was the poorest and least educated man of all in that island.” (*e-hen* adv. “(in) that way”; *vi* part.pret. of (M.) *vanī* “become”; *meī* “when” (nom.loc.); *e raśi* “(in/on) that island”: *e* dem.pron., attr. of *raśi*, gen./loc. of *ra<sup>3</sup>/raśi* “island, land”; *hiśi* part.pret. “having been” (M. *hunnānī* “to be, stand, remain”), attr. of *mīhā* nom.sg. “man”; *emme* pron.adj. “all, of all”; *fakīri* adj. “poor”; *taulīman ne<sup>3</sup>* “without education”, lit. “education not being there”; *taulīman* “education, instruction” (M. *ta<sup>3</sup>(u)līmu* ← Arab. *ta<sup>3</sup>līm* “instruction, teaching”; *ne<sup>3</sup>/net/* part.pret. of the verbal noun *netun* “not to be there”; *kamu-gai* nom. “fact, state”, lit. “fact-body”: *kamu* obl. + *gai* “body”; *vege* “became” 3.ps.sg. pret.IV of (M.) *vanī* “to become”).

2.6.5.3.2. The second formal difference that distinguishes Dhivehi from Sinhalese is the grammatical expression of gender. In the dialect of Aḍḍū as well as North Dhivehi, the substantivised forms of the demonstrative pronouns do not show any differentiation in gender. Only in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, there are some isolated forms that could possibly be regarded as relics of an originally systematic differentiation of masculine and feminine pronominal forms. In the comparatively numerous texts that have been collected in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the animate substantivised forms of the pronominal stem expressing the *hic*-deixis (i.e., *mi* “this”), shows variant endings which seem to specify gender. Thus, *mi-u* “this one” always refers to a male person while *mi-a* only refers to females. Cp. the following examples from the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku fairy tale *ālikedeā dērikedeā* “The piece of ash and the piece of coal” (T6):

F. ... *mi kuddā boṅḍo vege ai. miū ahāfī ai* ... “This boy grew up. He asked ...” (T6, 61-62; *kuddā* “child”, here: “boy”; *boṅḍo* adj. “big, great”; *vege* pret.IV, 3.ps.sg. (M. *vanī* “to become”); *ai* quot.particle; *mi-u* “this one, he” (m.); *ahāfī* pret.I, 3.ps.sg. (M. *ahanī* “ask”).

F. ... *reha kakkāgen, miā mi hadā likī* ... “... having prepared (cooked) the curry, this one [*Mēliage Dia*, she] acts as follows ...” (T6, 19; *reha* “curry (dish)”; *kakkāgen* abs.III (M. *kakkanī* “to cook, prepare”; *mi-a* “this one” (f.), also “she”; *mi hadā likī* “the way she acts is the following”: *mi* here used as a temporal adverb “now” (cf. 2.6.5.6 below); *hadā* part.pres. (M. *hadanī* “to do, make, act”; *lik-ī* nominal stem *lik-* “way” + focus-marker *-ī*).

The corresponding forms of the *ille*-deixis, F. *e-u* and *e-a*, do not show such a clear differentiation of gender, however. In particular, the younger generation uses them without any grammatical or semantical difference (cf. also 2.6.2.5.2). The same holds true for the substantivised forms *ti-a* and *ti-u* (demonstrative stem *ti* “iste”) which were nominated by the informants as rarely occurring oblique case forms of the personal pronoun of the 2.ps.sg.; in the actual Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku text material, there is only one example attested, viz. dat. *tiūśa* “to

<sup>382</sup> For the nuance of vagueness expressed by *-ak-ī*, cf. 5.2.2.2.

you”. It is more probable that *tia* and *tiu* represent relic forms than to assume an influence of the standard language in the modern period. By the way, in the contemporary language of Māle the occurrence of the demonstrative *tia* is confined to the 2nd honorific level; M. *tia* is not common any longer as an unspecified pronoun of the 2.ps.sg. “you” with a neutral meaning (cf. 2.6.2.4.3).

2.6.5.4. In Addū, the ending of the substantivised demonstrative pronoun depends on syntactical criteria only. If the pronoun in question serves as the subject of a finite verb, it appears in the form of the nominative. If the predicate is represented by an infinite verb, the pronominal subject appears in the oblique case. Cp. the following two examples containing the pronominal stem *mi*. In the first sentence, the demonstrative pronoun is in the nominative:

- A. *mide beṇafi* ... “This one said ...” (T3, 45; *mi-de* subst. dem.pron. nom. “this one”; *beṇafi* pret.I, 3.ps.sg., A. *beṇanī* (M. *bunanī*) “to say”).

In the second sentence, the demonstrative pronoun appears in the oblique case, serving as the subject of an infinite verb:

- A. *ās mia ehi-āu*: ... “When he came, he asked as follows: ...” (T3, 55; wtl. “coming, what this one asked, was: ...” *ās* abs. of *eni* “to come; to go” (M. *annanī*); *ehi-ī* part.pret. (M.) *ahanī* “to ask” + focus-marker *-ī*; *-āu* quot.particle).

The substantivised forms of the pronominal stem *e* “that” are used in the same way (A. nom. *e-de*, obl. *e-a*). As in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku (cf. 2.6.5.3.2), substantivisations of the demonstrative stem *te* “iste” are rare in Addū. The only attested form occurring in the collected texts is *te-ak-ī* (indefinite form + focus-marker *-ī*):

- A. *teakī timāgē moḷogañda nun-āu*., lit. “What this one nearby you is, is not my axe.” (*timā-ge* pron. in the gen. as poss.pron. “my (own)”; *moḷogañda* “axe”; *nun-āu* negation + quot.particle; from the fairy tale *moḷogañda* “The axe”, T3, 37).

2.6.5.5. In northern Dhivehi, the substantivised demonstrative stems show particular forms for persons and “non-persons”. There is no differentiation of gender and also no morphological differentiation of nominative and oblique case forms. In the modern standard language, the deictic pronouns referring to persons, viz. *mīnā* “this person (here, nearby myself)”, *tīnā* “this person (there, nearby you)”<sup>383</sup> and *ēnā* “that person” (used as a pers.pron. of the 3.ps.sg. “he / she”, cf. 2.6.2.5.3), contrast with only one form that refers to non-human beings and objects, resp., viz. *eā* “that, it”; with all probability, this form represents a petrified definite singular just like the corresponding Addū form (cf. 2.6.2.7.4). The form element *-nā* remains unclear, both from the etymological and the semantical point of view (cf. also 2.6.2.5.3), all the more since there is no evidence in the written material as to when the enlarged pronominal forms with *-nā* came into use.

### 2.6.5.6. Demonstrative adverbs

The demonstrative stems M.F.A. *mi* “hic”, M.F. *ti*, A. *te* “iste” and M.F.A. *e* “ille” are frequently used as local and temporal adverbs without any further enlargement, retaining their

<sup>383</sup> Cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 42.

particular deictic function. Thus, *mi* means “here” when used as a local adverb and “now, just now” in the function of a temporal adverb, while *ti/te* means “there, nearby you” as a local adverb and “then, afterwards” in temporal use. Sometimes it is not possible to distinguish the temporal and the local component clearly from each other. In such cases the primary deictic meaning seems to be more important than further local or temporal connotations. The following examples will give an impression of the most characteristic uses of the demonstrative adverbs. In the first two examples, *mi* occurs as a temporal adverb:

- F. ... *beḷalaku mi hedī likī* ... (T4, 4) “what a cat did **now**, was the following” (for the exact morphological analysis cf. 2.6.5.3.1).
- A. ... *mi mussanti vegen mi vēñdenī*. (T3, 66) “... this is (the) way we are living **now**, having become rich now.” (*mussanti* adj. “rich”; *vegen* abs.III of A. *venī* “to become” (M. *vanī*); *vēñdenī* part.pres. “living” (M. *uḷenī*) + focus-marker “that (the way) we are living”).

In the following examples, the adverb A. *te* / M. *ti* has a local meaning prevailing:

- A. *bala juhāu, ta te oṭī kehenaka hadagen tau?* (T17, 11) “Look, Juhā, what is it you are doing **there**?” lit. “Look, Juhā, what are you doing down **there**?” (The king asks Juhā, what he is doing in the middle of the road, i.e., “there”. — *bala* impv.sg. of (M.) *balanī* “to look”; *juhā-au* nom. (voc.) + quot.particle; *ta* pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. obl. “you”; *oṭī* part.pret./pres. + focus-marker, (M.) *onnanī* “to lie, be there”; *kehenaka* “how, in which way”; *hadagen* abs.III, (M.) *hadanī* “to make, act, create”; *tau* quest.particle)
- M. ... *damvaru mihen ti danī kon tāka?* (T8, 78) “... what are you strolling about **there** in the middle of the night?” lit. “where is it you are going in this way (over) **there** at three hours past midnight?” (*damvaru* <*danvaru*> “three hours past midnight”; *mi-hen* dem.pron.attr. + nom.obl. “in this way”; *danī* part.pres. “going” + focus-marker; *kon tāk-a* interr.pron. *kon* + dat.sg.indef. <*tākaś*> /*tān-ak-aś*/ “to which place, where”).

The following sentence admits both a temporal and a local interpretation of the pronoun *ti*:

- F. *kontākaha tai ti enī?* (T5, 6.11.16.20) can be translated as “Where are you going (over) there?” as well as with “Where are you going (right) now?” (lit. “To which place is it you are going (over) there / right now?”) In the given fairy tale, a girl asks this question to several kinds of food (an onion, a chili, a lime fruit etc.) which she happens to meet on her way (*kontākaha* “to which place, where to”, *kon* interr.pron. “what a, which”, *tākaha* /*tan-ak-aś*/ dat.sg.indef. of *tan* “place”; *tai* question particle).

In the following sentence, *e* has the local meaning “there”:

- A. *e hiśi hei kāyē ede kāfi*. “He ate everything eatable which was **there**.” (*hiśi* part.pret. “(having) been”, (M.) *humanī* “to be, stand, remain, stay”; *hiśi hei* “everything”, cf. 2.6.7.4.3; *kāyē* “eatable, something to eat”; *ede* “he”, nom. 3.ps.sg. pers.pron.; *kāfi* 3.ps.sg. pret.I).

### 2.6.5.7. Modal adverbs

Adverbial formations with a modal meaning most frequently consist of one of the demonstrative stems and a noun or pronoun. Cp., e.g., M. *e-hā*, F. *e-hai* and A. *e-hei* “thus, so”, all representing a combination of the demonstrative *e* and the pronominal adjective M. *hā*, F. *hai*, A. *hei* “all, everything” (with an unknown etymology; cf. 2.6.7.4.3). Cp. the following adverbial compounds the nominal elements of which are still used independently in the modern language: M.F. *mi-hen*, A. *me-hen* “thus, (in) this way”, M.A.F. *e-hen* “thus, (in) that way” (*hen* nom.obl. “manner, way”) or M.A. *mi gota*<sup>2</sup>, F. *mi gotaha* “thus, (in) this way” (/*got-aś*/ dative in adverbial use of M. *goi*, A.F. *go*<sup>3</sup> /*got*/ “sort, kind, way, manner”).

### 2.6.6. Reciprocal pronouns

According to their particular meaning, the reciprocal pronouns consist of two parts. In Dhivehi there are animate (referring to persons) and inanimate forms (referring to things), most of which can be analysed easily. Animate pronouns do not show a differentiation of gender.

M. *ekaku anekaka*<sup>384</sup> “each other; one another” consists of /*ek-aku*/, the obl. case of the numeral “one”, and /*anek-ak-aś*/, the dat.sg.indef. of the pronoun *ane*<sup>3</sup> /*an-ek*/ “another” (cp. Sinh. *an* “other, foreign”, *anikā* / *anikī* “the other one”; Pkt. *aṇṇa-*, Pa. *añña-*, OIA *anyā-* “other”, cf. GEIGER 1941, 8, no. 104 and TURNER 1966, I, 19, no. 399). The corresponding formations of the southern dialects can be explained in the same way: F. *ekaku enekakuśa* “each other; one another” is composed of the obl. /*ek-aku*/ and the dat.sg. of F. *ene*<sup>3</sup> (≈ M. *ane*<sup>3</sup>), /*en-ek-aku-śa*/, A. *ehakā enehaka*<sup>3</sup> “each other” most probably shows a double dissimilation. The definite nom.sg. *ehakā* must be explained as \**ekak-ā*, while the dat.sg. *enehaka*<sup>3</sup> “to an other” must be derived from \**en-ek-ak-aś*.<sup>384</sup>

With things or living beings that do not have the status of personalities (e.g., animals in a herd, flock or shoal), the reciprocal relationship is expressed by M. *ekati anekacca*<sup>3</sup> “each other”, lit. “the one thing to an other thing” (with an unusual, probably dissimilative sound change of [e → a] occurring twice), /*ek-eti an-ek-eti-aś*/; A. *eketi enekettā*<sup>3</sup> /*ek-eti en-ek-ettā-aś*/ (*ettā* def.). In the following example, the reciprocal pronoun refers to two pigeons which, in the given fairy tale, do not appear as animate personalities but only as indifferent members of a flock: M. ... *ekati aneka<sup>3</sup>caś bunā adu ive eve* ... (T12, 15) “... he hears one [of the pigeons] saying to another: ...” (*bunā* “saying” part.pres. of *bunanī* “to say, speak”; *adu* “sound, noise”; /*ivē*/ 3.ps.sg.pres. of *ivenī* “to hear, come to one’s ears”; *eve* quot.particle).

### 2.6.7. Interrogative pronouns

The interrogatives are the only pronouns in Dhivehi that form a complete row along the axis of the absolute, determinative and adverbial pronominal categories (cf. the table given in 2.6.1.3). While the main function of these pronouns consists in expressing the ignorance or unawareness of the asking person concerning certain things, persons or situations, some interrogatives (e.g. “how”, “what”) can also be used in exclamative function in order to utter spontaneous emotions such as astonishment or frightening. As in the other Modern IA languages,<sup>385</sup> the inherited interrogative pronouns can be derived from forms reflecting the OIA stem *kā-* in Dhivehi, too (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 127, s.v. *ka*<sup>-1</sup>; MAYRHOFER 1986-, 284; for Sinhalese cf. GEIGER 1938, 128 ff.). In Modern Dhivehi, most of the interrogative pronouns are compound forms the first component of which always consists of a variant of the old pronominal stem while the second part is of nominal origin. The stem variants M.F. *ki-*, A. *ke-* and M.A.F. *kon* “what a, which”, which are used when asking for a peculiar quality and which have the same form throughout Dhivehi, always appear as the first part of the pronouns. According to TURNER (1985, 17, no. 2575), Dhiv. *kon* “which?” can be

<sup>384</sup> Another example of the presumed dissimilation is A. *lehekī* ← *lek-ek-ī* “a way was (the following ...)” (from T1, 31; *lek* “way, manner” + indef.suff. *-ek* + focus marker *-ī*), as against the synonymous A. *lekakī* (from T3, 26; *lek* + indef.suff.obl. *-ak* + focus marker *-ī*).

<sup>385</sup> Cf., e.g., ZOGRAF (1976), 164 and MASICA (1991), 253.

identified with OIA *kāḥ pūnar* “who?”, lit. “who again?” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 127, no. 2575), but this derivation is quite improbable because of semantical reasons. A few attestations dating from the Old Dhivehi period show that *kon* had its modern form even then (cp., e.g., *kom-mīsaku* in L1 (mn/1,4) where *kon* appears as an attr. of the obl. case of /*mīs*/ “man, person”, with the meaning “anybody” in a negated sentence); such attestations do not provide additional information as to the etymology. Because of the specific character of the texts (legal documents, decrees etc.) which do not contain dialogues, the early written material of Dhivehi usually contains but a few interrogatives. Thus, not even one historical attestation of the pronominal stem *ki-* has been found so far.

In the following paragraphs, the particular interrogative pronouns of Dhivehi will be subdivided and described according their function and meaning.

2.6.7.1. In Dhivehi, the distribution of the **absolute interrogative pronouns “who”** and **“what”** matches the semantical categories of animateness and inanimateness only to a certain extent. The pronoun “who” is used for persons in a wider sense. Thus, if animals are regarded as individual characters, they are treated as persons; in particular this applies to the numerous animals acting as (human) personalities in fairy tales or fables as well as to certain domestic animals. The pronouns meaning “what” are generally used for things, plants and all animals that do not play an individual role, furthermore for asking about events, activities etc.

A. *key(y)e* and F. *kēye*, nom.sg. “who”, cannot (yet) be analysed as to their etymology, while the nom.sg. M. *kāku* “who” obviously reflects the indefinite oblique case of the interrogative stem (*\*kV-aku* “what a”) which also serves as the basis of the particular case forms of the pronoun in the standard language and in Fua’ Mulaku. In contrast to that, the oblique case forms met with in Addū are built from a stem variant *kankā-* (cf. 2.6.7.1.3).

2.6.7.1.1. The singular forms expressing the pronominal meaning “what” – A. *konta*<sup>o</sup>, F. *kōnteke*<sup>o</sup> and M. *kon ecce*<sup>o</sup> – are compound forms which are based on the interrogative *kon* “what (a), which” (cf. above). Within the given context, A. /*tak*/ and F. /*tek*/ cannot be regarded as a plural suffix. It seems more likely that these elements could have preserved the original pronominal meaning of “so much” here (cf. 2.3.2.2.2, 2.6.5.7, 2.6.7.4.5). Consequently, we must assume that *konta*<sup>o</sup> which is the only interrogative pronoun in Modern Addū expressing “what” in a general sense, originally had the meaning of “what so much” (/kon *tak*/), with a quantitative nuance. Hence, F. *kōnteke*<sup>o</sup> “what” which contains a supplementary indefinite suffix /-*ek*/ could be interpreted as “what a (..) of so many” (/kon-*tek-ek*/). In contrast to all these forms, M. *kon ecce*<sup>o</sup> “what” can be analysed from the point of view of the modern language, the underlying syntagm /*kon eti-ek*/ simply meaning “what a thing” (*eti* “thing”).

We cannot exclude with certainty, however, that the formations that occur in the southern dialects could be explained on the basis of M. /*kon eti-ek*/ as well. In this case, the ancestral forms would have been A. *\*kon eti-ak* and F. *\*kon eti-ek-ek* which at first would have developed to A. *\*kon etyak* and F. *\*kon etyek-ek*, resp. According to the usual sound laws, however, we should rather expect A. *\*kon etta*<sup>o</sup> and F. *\*kon ettek-e*<sup>o</sup> for the modern language in this case (cf. 1.3.9.2.1). In the framework of this derivation, the actual forms A. *konta*<sup>o</sup> and F. *kōnteke*<sup>o</sup> could perhaps be explained as representing very unusual allegro-forms.

As against A. *konta*<sup>3</sup> and F. *kōnteke*<sup>3</sup>, the interrogative pronoun M. *kōce* “what” represents an allegro-variant of *kon ecce*<sup>3</sup>, *kōce* being the result of a normal contraction.

2.6.7.1.2. One more compound interrogative pronoun meaning “what a?” which is based on *kon*, is A. *kon kahalei*, M.F. *kon kahala* (the Māle variant is already mentioned by GEIGER 1919, 77). The pronominal adjective M.F. *kahala* / A. *kahalei*, which is unclear from the etymological point of view, means “such”.

M. *kīnē* “what” consists of a form of the interrogative stem which is enlarged by the interrogative particle *-hē/-hei* (cf. 3.15.3). GEIGER’s spelling  $\langle kīnhē \rangle$  “what” with *n*<sup>386</sup> indicates the articulation of a velar nasal in the given position which seems to have been usual at the turn of the 20th century. We cannot decide from the phonological point of view whether this nasal was a primary one or whether it developed from a former stop.<sup>387</sup> The form *kī* “what” which also occurs in the modern standard language in questions concerning a concrete verbal action,<sup>388</sup> seems to speak in favour of the latter possibility. We then have to ask from which original consonant the final glottal stop of *kī* can be derived. At a first glance, it seems to be very doubtful that *kī* could be connected with the interrogative *kīk*, which is one of two forms that are mentioned by TURNER without being attested anywhere else (“Md. *kiek*, *kīk* ‘what?’”: 1985, 21, no. 3164 s.v. OIA *kīm*, cf. 1966, I, 161, no. 3164). In the old documents of Dhivehi, there are no attestations either that might support TURNER’s forms. It cannot be excluded, however, that *kiek* could be the result of a corrupt spelling of the interrogative form M. *kīkē* “what” which is used in the colloquial language as a check in the case of non-understanding; cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990, 74) who translate *kīkē* with “what? (of the said word)” (cp., e.g., *kīkē ta?* “What did you say?”, lit. “what” + interr. particle *ta*. – *ēnā bunī kīkē ta?* “What did he say?” *ēnā* “he”, *bunī*-ī part.pret. “said” + focus-marker). Concerning the etymology of *kīkē*, there are two imaginable explanations. At the first glance, it seems to be quite possible that *kīkē* represents the normal interrogative stem enlarged with an interrogative particle just as in the case of *kīnē*. As there is no particle *-kē* attested in Dhivehi, however, this derivation cannot be upheld. Therefore it is more likely to assume a combination of an interrogative pronoun *kīk* (as mentioned by TURNER, cf. above), existing as the independent word *kī* “what” in the modern language, and the question particle *hē/hei* (cf. above). The fact that this particle is used for inquiry when something is not understandable or audible, may be taken as a striking argument speaking in favour of the proposed explanation. Followingly, *kīkē* could be derived from *\*kīk-hē* without a morphological, phonological or semantical problem.

In the southern area of Dhivehi, there exist several plural forms of the interrogatives denoting “who” and “what” such as, e.g., the nom.pl. form A. *koṃbākin* /*kon-bākin*/ which can be regarded as a compound of the pronoun *kon* and the Arabic loanword *bākin* used in Addū as an indefinite pronoun meaning “some, any” (cf. 2.6.7.3; for Arab. *bāqin* “remaining;

<sup>386</sup> GEIGER (1919), 77. For the exact notation, cf. GEIGER’s original German text in (1901-2), II, 380, however.

<sup>387</sup> Cp. the phonetic development of the infinitive ending in the language of Māle, the final *-n* of which developed through *-ś* from *-t* (cf. 3.6.3.2.1.2).

<sup>388</sup> Cf. also CAIN (1992), 142: “*kī* is the question word referring to an activity as opposed to an object.... *kī* always precedes the verb.” Cp., e.g., *ēnā kī kuranī?* “What is he/she doing?” (*ēnā* pers.pron. 3.ps.sg., *kuranī* part.pret. + focus marker).

remains, remainders, rest” cf. WEHR 1958, 61). Thus, *kon bākin* literally means “which (ones) / who of the rest?”. Presumably, the final *-in* of Arab. *bāqin* was here reinterpreted as being the plural ending *-in(-un)* which is used for nouns denoting persons (cf. 2.3.2.1.2). In contrast to A. *koṃbākin*, the corresponding form of the nom.pl. in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, *koṃbaikēa*, seems to be opaque from the phonological and morphological point of view. The original formation can still be regarded in the oblique stem *koṃbaiken-*, however. Possibly, the Arabic word *bāqin* came into the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku at a time when the plural ending *-in* had already become obsolete and been replaced by the variant *-un* (cf. 2.3.2.2.2).

The plural of A. *konta<sup>3</sup>* and F. *kōnteke<sup>3</sup>* “what” is an analytic formation too. The forms in question, A. *kon etteti teka<sup>3</sup> /kon eti-eti tek-ak/* and F. *kon etteti tekeke<sup>3</sup> /kon eti-eti tek-ekek/*, can be translated with “what a so-much of things”. Their individual components must be analysed as follows: A.F. *kon* “what a”, *etteti* distributive plural of *eti* “thing” (cf. 2.3.2.5), */tek/* pron.adj. “so much/many”; A. *-a<sup>3</sup>* indef.suff., F. *eke<sup>3</sup>* numeral “one”.

2.6.7.1.3. The following tables illustrate the main interrogative pronouns and their declension in the singular and plural:

who?		Aḏḏū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
nom. “who”	sg.	<i>key(y)e</i>	<i>kēye</i>	<i>kāku</i>
	pl.	<i>koṃbākin /kon-bākin/</i>	<i>koṃbaikēa</i>	
gen. “whose”	sg.	<i>kankāge</i>	<i>kākage</i>	<i>kākuge, kāge</i>
	pl.	<i>koṃbākinge</i>	<i>koṃbaikenge</i>	
dat. “to whom”	sg.	<i>kankā<sup>3</sup> /-aš/</i>	<i>kākaša, kāka ataha</i>	<i>kāka<sup>3</sup> /-aš/</i>
	pl.	<i>koṃbākinna<sup>3</sup> /-aš/</i>	<i>koṃbaikenna<sup>3</sup> /-š/</i>	
abl. “from whom / by whom”	sg.	<i>kankāge farātun</i>	<i>kākage farāten</i>	<i>kākun</i>
	pl.	<i>koṃbākinge farātun</i>	<i>koṃbaikenge farāten</i>	

what?		Aḏḏū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
nom. “what”	sg.	<i>konta<sup>3</sup> /kontak/</i>	<i>kōnteke<sup>3</sup> /kontekek/</i>	<i>kon ecce<sup>3</sup> /eti-ek/, kōce; kīkē, kīnē, kī<sup>3</sup></i>
	pl.	<i>kon etteti teka<sup>3</sup> /tekak/</i>	<i>kon etteti tekeke<sup>3</sup> /tekekek/</i>	
gen./loc. “of what” / “in which, on/at which”	sg.	<i>kontaki</i>	<i>kōnteki</i>	<i>kon etīge</i>
	pl.	<i>kon etteti tekaki</i>	<i>kon etteti tekeki</i>	
dat. “what for/to”	sg.	<i>kontaka<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>kōntakaha</i>	<i>kon eccā<sup>3</sup> /eti-aš/</i>
	pl.	<i>kon etteti tekaka<sup>3</sup> /-aš/</i>	<i>kon etteti tekakaha</i>	
Abl. “by what means, by which”	sg.	<i>kontakun</i>	<i>kōntakun</i>	<i>kon etīn /eti-in/</i>
	pl.	<i>kon etteti tekakun</i>	<i>kon etteti tekakun</i>	

2.6.7.2. The **adverbial interrogative pronouns** are compounds consisting of the basic interrogative stems M.F.A. *kon* and M.F. *ki-* / A. *ke-* and a nominal constituent which in most cases is a noun, while adjectival formations are rare.<sup>389</sup> Besides the normal singular forms, some of these interrogatives have plural forms as well, just like the absolute interrogative pronouns (cf. 2.6.7.1). Depending on the concrete meaning of the given question, the interrogative pronouns adopt different case endings whose functions are strictly defined. In some cases, there are considerable differences both in form and in function between the northern and the southern dialects of Dhivehi. The adverbial interrogatives are generally used in local, temporal, modal and causal questions.

2.6.7.2.1. For **local** questions, a combination consisting of the pronoun *kon* “what a, which” and the indefinite form of the noun *tan* (sometimes *tān*) “place” is used in the whole Dhivehi speaking area (cp. the Sinh. stem *tan*, Pa. *thāna-*, OIA *sthāna-*<sup>390</sup>). While in the standard language the question “where?” is expressed by the indefinite *casus obliquus*, the southern dialects use the indefinite locative in this function. As with the absolute pronouns “who” and “what” (cf. 2.6.7.1.3), the local interrogative has a whole set of plural forms in South Dhivehi; cp., e.g., the loc. A. *kontantāki* / F. *kontantaneki*, expressing the meaning of “where?”, i.e. “on which places?”, which is based on a distributional plural formation (*tan-tan*, cf. 2.3.2.5). As to the contraction of M.A. *-tā- ← -tana-* (e.g., in M. *kontāku ← kontanaku*, obl. case), cp. the corresponding development to be observed in the ending of the part.pres. of *a*-stem verbs (*-ā ← -ana-*; cf. 3.9.1.1.1).

The following table shows the particular case forms of the composed pronoun *\*kon-tan-ak-* “what a place?”:

“where”	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
obl. “where” sg.	—	—	<i>kontāku</i> /kon-tan-aku/
loc. “where” sg.	<i>kontāki</i> /kon-tan-ak-i/	<i>kontaneki</i> /kon-tan-ek-i/	—
pl.	<i>kontantāki</i> /kon-tan-tan-ak-i/	<i>kontantaneki</i> /kon-tan-tan-ek-i/	
dat. “where to” sg.	<i>kontāka<sup>2</sup></i> /kon-tan-ak-aś/	<i>kontākaha</i> / <i>kontanakaha</i> / <i>kontanekaha</i>	<i>kontāka<sup>2</sup></i> /kon-tan-ak-aś/
pl.	<i>kontantāka<sup>2</sup></i> /kon-tan-tan-ak-aś/	<i>kontantanakaha</i> / <i>kontantanekaha</i>	
abl. “from where” sg.	<i>kontākun</i>	<i>kontanakun</i> / <i>kontanekun</i>	<i>kontākun</i>
pl.	<i>kontantākun</i>	<i>kontantanakun</i> / <i>kontantanekun</i>	

2.6.7.2.2. For questions referring to objects which are in immediate proximity to the speaker, one can also use the interrogative A.F.M. *kobā* “where (here)?” which has no further case

<sup>389</sup> For the interrogative pronominal adverbs of Sinhalese which are formed in the same way, cf. MATZEL (1983), 100 ff.

<sup>390</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 793, no. 13753; GEIGER (1941), 61, no. 885.

forms. GEIGER (1919, 77) mentioned the enlarged form *kobāhē* “where” only which contains the interrogative particle *hē/hei* (cf. 2.6.7.1.2).

2.6.7.2.3. Like the adverbial pronoun meaning “where” (cf. 2.6.7.2.1 above), the **temporal** interrogative “when” is a compound consisting of *kon* “what a” and a nominal element. In Aḍḍū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, it is the stem *kal-* “time, moment” which is used here (A. nom. *kō*; cp. Sinh. *kal-* “time”, *ki-kala* “when, at what time”; Pa. *kāla-* “time, morning”, OIA *kālā-* “time, fixed point of time”; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 157, no. 3084; GEIGER 1941, 39, no. 569.), while in North Dhivehi the noun *iru* “sun, east; time” is found in the same function (cf. GEIGER 1902, 924, no. 214; cp. also the Sinh. stem variants (*h*)*iri/u/a-*, Pa. *suriya-* besides *sūra-*, OIA *sūrya-* besides *sūra-* “sun”; TURNER 1966, II, 782, no. 13574; GEIGER 1941, 22, no. 344). Another parallel with the interrogative pronoun “where” (cf. above) consists in the fact that the temporal interrogatives show differences between the northern and the southern Maldivian dialects in the syntactic use of the particular case forms. Thus, the *casus obliquus* M. *koniraku* is used in basically the same way as the locative and dative forms are used in Aḍḍū und Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. The forms in question are illustrated in the following table:

“when”	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
obl. “when”	—	—	<i>koniraku</i>
loc. “when”	<i>konkalaki</i>	<i>konkalaki</i>	—
dat. “until when”	<i>konkalaka<sup>3</sup> /-aś/</i>	<i>konkalakaha</i>	—
abl. “when” (from now on), “since when”	<i>konkalakun</i>	<i>konkalakun</i>	<i>konirakun</i>

2.6.7.2.4. “How?”, which represents the least specified **modal** question from the semantical point of view, can be expressed by two different formations in Dhivehi. The first one is M. *kihā*, F. *kihāi*, A. *kihei* which is not only used as an interrogative but also as an exclamative “how!”. Most probably, this pronominal form is a combination of the interrogative stem M.F. *ki-*, A. *ke-* (cf. 2.6.7) and the pronominal adjective M. *hā*, F. *hai*, A. *hei* “all, everything”. The second interrogative pronoun meaning “how” is based on the stem *ki-/ke-* as well, but implies the noun A.F.M. *hen* “manner, way”<sup>391</sup> which is still used as an indepen-

<sup>391</sup> Most likely, Dhiv. *hen* must be derived from OIA *śēnā-* “army”; cp. Sinh. *sen* “multitude, army” (GEIGER 1941, 185, no. 2806; TURNER 1966, II, 783, no. 13587). The original meaning of the word is still preserved in Old Dhivehi texts where we find it in the compound *henevi* “leader of an army” (RC 9,9 and 10,8; cp. Sinh. *senevi(-rada)* “chief commander of an army, general”, OIA *śēnāpati-*; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 783, no. 13589 and GEIGER 1941, 185, no. 2810). Accordingly, the toponym *henveru*, i.e. the name of the north-eastern part of Māle, must be understood as “army camp”. The word *veru*, often occurring in the earliest Dhivehi texts (L2 10,1; L3 2/2,1; L4 c/1,2 etc.) where it has the meaning of “Buddhist monastery (ground)”, exactly corresponds with Sinh. *vehera* “Buddhist monastery, monks’ residence” and has to be identified with OIA *vihāra-* denoting (among other things) “pleasure ground” and “monastery (ground)” (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 695, no. 12033). Hence, Dhiv. *hen-veru* can be translated as “training camp of the army” (lit. “army(’s) training camp”). With all probability, the semantic change leading from “army” to “way, manner” had its origin in compounds such as *firi-hen* which in the modern language is used as an adjective meaning “male” (vs. the noun *firi* “man”); cp. M. *firihen kujjā*, A.F. *firihen kuddā* “boy” (lit. “male child”); M.A.F. *firihen mihā* “man” (lit.

dent word in all dialects of Dhivehi, mostly occurring in the oblique case meaning “in the way of; like”. Concerning the vocalism of the Māle und Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku variants of the interrogative pronoun containing *hen*, the root vowel *-e-* must have been assimilated to *-i-* in the position after the interrogative stem *ki-*. Cp. M. *kihine*<sup>3</sup> /*ki-hin-ek*/ (indef.; *-e*<sup>3</sup> indef.suff.). “in which way? how?”, F. *kihina*<sup>3</sup> /*ki-hin-ak*/ “id.” (*-a*<sup>3</sup> indef.suff.), F. *kihinake* (obl.indef.? ← \**ki-hin-eke*<sup>3</sup>? *eke*<sup>3</sup> “one”<sup>392</sup>) and F. *kihinne* (possibly ← dat. \**ki-hin-aha* ← \**-aśa*?). In contrast to the dialect-internal variants occurring in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, A. *kehenaka*<sup>3</sup> /*ke-hen-ak-aś*/ (dat. indef.) “in which way” is completely straightforward from the morphological and phonological point of view.

The question forms A. *kehei vara*<sup>3</sup>? F. *kihā varakaha*?, M. *kihā vare*<sup>3</sup>, *kihā varaka*<sup>3</sup>? “how much?” are used when asking for abstract quantities, e.g. the price of something. M. *varu*, A. *vara*, F. *varo* means “strength, power; quantity, amount” when used independently (with A. *vara*<sup>3</sup> /*var-ak*/, M. *vare*<sup>3</sup> /*var-ek*/ as its indef. form and F. *varakaha*, M. *varaka*<sup>3</sup> /*var-ak-aś*/ as its indef. dative); the etymology of this word is still unknown.

The dialectal variants M. *kita*<sup>3</sup> /*ki-tak*/, F. *kite*<sup>393</sup> /*ki-tek*/; M. *kitake*<sup>3</sup> /*ki-tak-ek*/, A. *kitaka*<sup>3</sup> /*ki-tak-ak*/ (indef. form), all meaning “how many”, are used in questions concerning a distinguishable number of men, animals, plants and things of any kind. All these question forms are compounds consisting of the interrogative stem *ki-* and the element *tak/tek* “so many” which originally was a pronominal form, too (cf. 2.6.7.1.1). TURNER’s proposal (1985, 21, no. 3167) to derive “Md. *kitak*” from \**kiyatta*- “how great” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 161, no. 3167) can hardly be upheld.

All other compound interrogatives containing a modal pronoun and a local or temporal component are based on the question forms meaning “how, in which way, how many/much”. It may suffice here to discuss just a few of the most frequently occurring formations.

The temporal question “how long?” is expressed by different formations in the dialects of Dhivehi. Thus, the exact meaning of A. *kehei duvahaka*<sup>3</sup>? (*duvas-ak-aś*/ dat.indef. of *duvas* “day”) and F. *kite duvaha*? (*ki-tek duvas*/) / *kitaka duvaha*? (*ki-tak-ak*/) can be given as “how many days?”, while the corresponding Malé variants *kihā ire*<sup>3</sup>? and *kihā irakun*<sup>3</sup>? can be translated as “How much (a) time?” (*ir-ek*/ nom.indef. of *iru* “time”) and “From what time (on)?” (*irak-un* abl.indef. of *iru*), resp.

The question “how long?”, “how tall?” (concerning a linear measure) is expressed by *kehei digi*<sup>3</sup>? in Aḍḍū (A. *digi* adj. “long, tall”) and by *kihā dige*<sup>3</sup>? in the standard language (*dig-ek*/ indef. form of the adj. *digu*).

“How far?” is *kehei duru*<sup>3</sup>? or *kehei duraki*<sup>3</sup>? in Aḍḍū and *kihā dure*<sup>3</sup>? in the standard language (M.A.F. *duru* adj. “far, remote”; A. /*dur-ak-i*/ (gen./)loc.indef.; M. /*dur-ek*/ indef. form).

2.6.7.2.5. All **causal-final interrogative pronouns** meaning “why?”, “what for?” in Dhivehi are combinations of an interrogative pronoun and an absolutive form of the verb (M.) *vanī* “to become”. M. *kīvve* ⟨*kīve*⟩ “why?”, “what for?”, lit. “what becoming”, is composed by

“male human being”); M.A.F. *firihihi geri* “bull” (lit. “male cattle”). The original meaning of *firi-hen*, however, must have been “group of men” (lit. “men-group, men-army”). Cp. the corresponding adjective M.A.F. *anhen* “female” (e.g. in *anhen mihā* “woman”, *anhen geri* “cow”) which has to be derived from \**añbi-añbu-hen* “group of women” (M.A. *añbi*, F. *añbu* “woman, wife”; cf. Sinh. *añba*, stem *añbu* “wife, mother” ← OIA *ambā*- “mother”; cf. GEIGER 1941, 9, no. 31 and TURNER 1966, I, 25, no. 574). The modern meaning of *hen* presupposes a reinterpretation of such compounds, approximately in the sense of “in the way of men/woman”; finally, a further semantic abstraction led to “way, manner”.

<sup>392</sup> Cp. the plural form F. *kon eteti tek-eke*<sup>3</sup> “what a so-much (of) things”, discussed in 2.6.7.1.2.

<sup>393</sup> Thus according to HLSD 165.

*kī* “what” (cf. 2.6.7.1.2) and the primary absolutive *ve* (cf. 3.10.4). The exact meaning of M. *kihine*<sup>3</sup> *vegen* is “having become in which way?” (for *kihine*<sup>3</sup> cf. 2.6.7.2.4; for *ve-gen*, abs.III of *vanī*, cf. 3.11.4.3). A. *kian* [*kien*] *vegen* and F. *kuma*<sup>3</sup> *vegen* “why?”, “what for” are built by means of this absolutive form as well. The interrogative A. *kian*, which is also used without *vegen* in the same meaning, remains unclear from the morphological point of view because it does not contain any of the usual case endings (dative or ablative/instrumental). A dative with final *-n* as occurring in the infinitive ending of the standard language (cf. 3.6.3.2.1.2) is not attested in the dialect of Aḍḍū. *kian* cannot be interpreted as an ablative either because this would presuppose a consonant stem inflected after the pattern of *ges-* “tree” (cf. 2.3.2.11.1.2) whose definite ablative form is *gehān* (from \**gehā-in*). If *kian* went back to a form \**kiān*, the long vowel *-ā-* in the last syllable would not have allowed a phonetical realisation of the word as [*kien*] as it is usual in modern Aḍḍū. From its syntactical function, *kian* could also represent an oblique case, but the morphological background of the interrogative would remain unclear in this case as well. F. *kuma*<sup>3</sup> is perhaps connected with the interrogative stem *kuma-* which is well attested in the Old Sinhalese language. The dative forms of this Sinh. stem, *kuma-ta* and *kuma-t* occur frequently with the meaning “why”. The indefinite form *kumak* is also to be found in the function of an interrogative pronoun meaning “what” (cf. GEIGER 1938, 129). F. *kuma*<sup>3</sup> as occurring in *kuma*<sup>3</sup> *vegen* is ambiguous from the morphological point of view. If it represents an indefinite form /*kumak*/, the syntagma could be analysed as “having become what (a) ...”. If *kuma*<sup>3</sup> reflects the old dative /*kumaś*/, the original meaning would be “having become what / having developed into what”.

2.6.7.3. Except for a few exceptions, the **indefinite pronouns** of Dhivehi are based on the interrogative stem *kon* (cf. 2.6.7). In contrast to the interrogative pronouns the main function of which consists in the elimination of ignorance, the purpose of an indefinite pronoun is not necessarily the expression of ignorance. ISAČENKO defines the character of the indefinite pronouns as follows: “It is obvious that pronouns like *someone*, *something*, *somebody*, *somehow*, *somewhere* etc. are regarded as ‘indefinite’ pronouns for the very reason that they generally express the impossibility (or the incapability or the lack of will) to define the person, the object, the quality, the manner, the place etc. in question more exactly.”<sup>394</sup>

The list given below represents the most frequent indefinite pronouns of Dhivehi. Some examples show that it is sometimes almost impossible to make a clear distinction between indefinite pronouns and pronominal adjectives. The conventional formal and semantic criteria are obviously not sufficient to distinguish these two categories from each other. Without a doubt, one of the main reasons for this phenomenon consists in the fact that the pronominal adjectives do not form a consistent system (cf. 2.6.7.4 below). Thus, for example, indefinite pronouns like “each” can also be subsumed under the pronominal adjectives which, to a certain extent, can be regarded as a primary category whose limits, although not being exactly definable, serve the pragmatic purpose of a grammatical subdivision.

<sup>394</sup> “Es ist wohl klar, daß Pronomina wie *jemand*, *etwas*, *irgendein*, *irgendwie*, *irgendwo* usw. eben deshalb als ‘unbestimmte’ Pronomina angesehen werden, weil sie ganz allgemein die Unmöglichkeit (oder die Unfähigkeit oder den mangelnden Willen) ausdrücken, die in Frage stehende Person, den Gegenstand, die Qualität, die Art und Weise, den Ort usw. genauer zu bestimmen” (1962, 497).

As the following examples show, the indefinite pronoun M. *komme* /*kon-me*/ (for *-me* cf. *emme* in 2.6.7.4.1), A.F. *kommi* “every, each” serves as the basis for the (analytic) formation of almost all the other indefinite pronouns. Only in the standard language we find *huri hā* “all, everything, each” (only for non-persons; for the formation cf. 2.6.7.4.2 s.v. M. *hā*) which occurs in the same function but less frequently.

For examples of the use of *komme* cp. M. *komme mīhe*<sup>395</sup> /*kon-me mīs-ek*/ (*/-ek/* indef.suff.) “everyone, everybody”, lit. “what man so ever”; M. *komme ves* (*ves* “also, even, else, too”, cf. 2.6.7.5) “someone, somebody, each, everyone”; M. *komme ves mīhe*<sup>395</sup>, often occurring in an allegro-form as *kommēs mīhe*<sup>395</sup>, with the meaning “somebody, someone” vs. *komme mīhe*<sup>395</sup> *ves* meaning “anybody (who so ever)”; A. *kommīas mīha*<sup>395</sup> (/*kon-mi-as*/, *-as* = M. *ves*, cf. above;<sup>395</sup> /*mīs-ak*/ indef.) “someone”; F. *kommias mīhaku* (obl.indef.) or *mīhe*<sup>395</sup> (/*mīs-ek*/ nom.indef.) “someone”.

The formations M. *komme (ves) ecce*<sup>395</sup>, A. *kommīas etta*<sup>395</sup> /*kommi-as eti-ak*/, F. *kommias etta*<sup>395</sup> have the meaning of “something, anything”. Cp. also the variants M. *kommehecce*<sup>395</sup> (/*kon-me eti-ek*/, the intervocalic *-h-* either serving to avoid the hiatus or being the result of a dissimilation of *-k-*), further *kommehecce*<sup>395</sup> *ves*, A. *kommi etta*<sup>395</sup>, F. *kommi ette*<sup>395</sup> “everything, what so ever”, “anything”. Cp. also M. *huri hā ecce*<sup>395</sup> /*eti-ek*/ lit. meaning “everything”.

Indefinite pronouns with a local meaning are, e.g., M. *komme tāne*<sup>395</sup> “everywhere”, lit. “what (a) place so ever” (/*tan-ek*/ nom.indef. “a place”<sup>396</sup>; M. *huri hā tāku* “everywhere” (/*tan-aku*/ obl.indef., lit. “at any place”). Cp. also M. *komme ves tāku* or *kommēs tāku* “anywhere” (/*tan-aku*/ obl.indef.; *kommēs* ← *komme ves*) vs. *komme tāne*<sup>395</sup> *ves* “anywhere (where so ever)” (/*tan-ek*/ nom.indef.). In temporal function, we find the indefinite pronominal formations M. *komme duvahaku* and *huri hā duvahaku*, A. *kommi duvahaki*, F. *kommī duvahaku* “every day, at any day” (M.F. /*duvas-aku*/ obl.indef.; A. /*duvas-ak-i*/ loc.indef.). An example of a modal indefinite pronoun is M. *komme otakun ves* “(in) any way” (*got-ak-un* obl.indef. “in a way/manner”).

In contrast to the examples treated above, there is one indefinite pronoun which is not based on /*kon-me*/ or *huri-hā*, viz. M.A. *eki*, F. *iki* “each separately”, which occurs only in attributive function, together with a distributional plural form (cf. 2.3.2.5); cp., e.g., A. *eki gē-gē* “each house separately”; A.M. *eki mīs-mīhun*, F. *iki mīs-mīhun* “each one (lit. ‘man’) separately”; A. *eki ges-gehun*, F. *iki ges-gehun* “each tree separately”.

In the Aḏḏū dialect, the loanword A. *bākin* “some (people)” (← Arab. *bāqin* “remaining; remains, remainders, rest”, cf. 2.6.7.1.2) can be used like an indefinite pronoun as well. *bākin* occurs only in substantive function as in the following example:

A. ... *eb bākin dara hōdā tibi vēlei* ... “... when some (people) were about to seek firewood ...” (T2, 24; *eb* = *e* /*ek*/ num. “one”, attr. of *bākin*, lit. meaning “a unit of some people”; *dara* nom. “firewood”; /*hōdās*/ inf., M. *hōdanī* “to look for, seek”; *tibi* part.pret. “being”, M. *tibenī* “to be”; *vēlei* “when”, lit. loc. of *vēla* “time”).

2.6.7.4. Traditionally the term “**pronominal adjective**” denotes pronouns with a more general meaning like “all, another, whole, many/much, a few, such”. Like real adjectives, they are found not only in attributive function but (most of them) also in the role of substan-

<sup>395</sup> For the particle *-as* cf. 2.6.7.4.2 s.v. A. *emmenas* “all”.

<sup>396</sup> For the etymology of *tān* “place” cf. 2.6.7.2.1.

tives. In contrast to the pronominal categories described above, the pronominal adjectives cannot be characterised by means of common semantical or morphological features. Therefore, it is not always easy to make a clear distinction between the pronominal adjectives and other pronominal categories; this is particularly true for some of the indefinite pronouns (cf. 2.6.7.3 above). Obviously, the only common feature of the pronominal adjectives consists in the fact that their function resembles that of the adjectives. The number of the pronouns in question (the most important ones being listed below) is comparatively small in Dhivehi.

2.6.7.4.1. In attributive use M.A.F. *emme* has the meaning of “all, entire, whole”; cp. F. *emme maun* “all, mother and child(ren)”, “the whole (group consisting of) mother and child(ren)”, i.e., “the whole family” (T6, 72; cf. 2.3.2.8.2.2). Furthermore, *emme* occurs in adverbial function in the sense of “(of) all, most of all; only”.<sup>397</sup> GEIGER (1902, 917, no. 103) regards *emme* as a combination of the numeral *e* /ek/ “one” with an emphatic particle *-me*, corresponding with Sinh. “-**ma**, encl. part. emphasising the preceding word” (GEIGER 1941, 125, no. 1868). Probably the same element *-me* is represented in the indefinite pronoun *komme* /kon-mel/ “every, each” as well (cf. 2.6.7.3). Furthermore it is possible that it is identical with the particle *me* which is translated as “itself” by DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990, 90); cp. *mi-adu me* “today itself, just today”. In the documents of Old Dhivehi, a particle *me* is often attested in the meaning of “just, as well”. For the use of *emme* cp. the following examples:

- A. ... *emme vati o<sup>o</sup> naišā dašun* ... “... from below the coconut lying at the very bottom ...” (T1, 34a; *vati* loc. of *va<sup>o</sup> /vat/* “bottom”; *o<sup>o</sup> /ot/* part.pret. of M. *onnanī* “to lie, be, be located”; *naišā* obl.sg.def. “of the coconut”; *dašun* abl. “from the underside / bottom /below”).

The following sentence is from a legend about a king who has to judge in a Maldivian dialect competition.<sup>398</sup>

- F. *ti bahuge tafātuge terein timā hita<sup>o</sup> emme rieti mi vī ađđū baha*. “Within the diversity of this language the one (language) which I like best (lit. ‘having now become [the most] beautiful of all to my mind’), is the Ađđū language.” (T7, 9a; *ti* dem.pron. “this (near by you)”; *bahu-ge* gen.sg. “of the language”; *tafātu-ge* gen.sg. “of the diversity”, *tafātu* “diverse; diversity”; *terein* abl. “from within”; *timā* pron.obl. in possessive function “(my) own”; *hita<sup>o</sup> /hitaš/* dat.sg. of *hi<sup>o</sup> /hit/* “mind, heart”; F. *rieti, riveti* = M. *rīti* “beautiful”; F. *emme rieti* here quasi-superlative meaning “most beautiful of all”; *mi* dem.pron. as adv. “here, now”; *vī* part.pret. of M. *vanī* “to become” + focus-marker; F. *baha*, M. *bas* nom.sg. “language”).

Other examples of superlative formations with *emme* are, e.g., *emme gina* “most (of all)” (*gina* “many, much”, cf. below), *emme madu* “less (of all)” (*madu* “few”, cf. below).

2.6.7.4.2. The pronominal adjective M.A.F. *emmen* /ek-men/ “all” (referring to living beings) is based on the numeral “one” as well, but is enlarged with the plural ending *-men* (cf. 2.3.2.1.2). In Ađđū, the extended form *emmennas* /ek-men-as/ can be used with the same meaning. Depending on the context, the suffixed particle *-as* (= M. *ves*, cf. 2.6.7.3, s.v. *komme mihe*) expresses the vague meanings of “even, too, ever, always, then”. It remains unchanged throughout the whole paradigm (cp. the gen. *emmenge* vs. *emmenge-as* and the dat. *emmenna<sup>o</sup> /-aš/* vs. *emmennaš-as*; cp. also A. *kommīas etta<sup>o</sup>* “something, anything”

<sup>397</sup> For the function of *emme* in the formation of an analytic superlative cf. 2.4.5.3.

<sup>398</sup> The legend is given here in the dialect of Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku (informant MUHAMMAD SA’ID). This is why the third honorific level, which would be reserved exclusively for the king, is not used. Cf. the introduction, 0.9.2.

treated in 2.6.7.3). If *emmen* is a plural form of “one”, we might rather expect an – at least original – meaning of “some”; but there are no attestations in oral or written Dhivehi speaking in favour of this supposition. For the normal usage of *emmen*, cp., e.g., F. *mi mīhun emmen ekī* “they (lit. ‘these people’, pers.pron.3.ps.pl.) all together”. Even in its earliest attestations in L2 (2,5 and 34,1) *emmen* must be translated as “all together”.

2.6.7.4.3. In the modern language, the pronoun M. *hā*, F. *hai*, A. *hei* “all, everything” (n.) occurs only in an inseparable combination with the participles meaning “(having) been”. Thus, the literal meaning of M. *huri hā*, F. *hīstī hai*, A. *hiši hei* is “everything having been” or “everything which was”, but in Modern Dhivehi *huri hā* and its dialectal variants are no longer understood as compound forms; this is why the formation is usually written as one word ⟨*hurihā*⟩ in the standard language. M. *huri hā* is also used as an indefinite pronoun “every, each” (cf. 2.6.7.3) which can be further substantivised by means of *eti* “thing”; cp. *huri hā ecce’ /eti-ek/* “every-thing”. Except for the dialectal variants of the part.pret. of (M.) *hunnanī* “to be, stand, remain”, the part.pret. M.A.F. *tibi* of (M.) *tibenī* “to be” is used in rare cases as well. The general rule that the forms of *hunnanī* are confined to singular subjects while those of *tibenī* are restricted to plural subjects (cf. 3.14.1) seems not to be effective in the given combination with *hā* etc.

There are two adverbial formations that can be explained as compounds of a demonstrative and an interrogative pronoun, resp., with M. *hā*, F. *hai*, A. *hei* (cf. 2.6.5.7, 2.6.7.4.5), viz. M. *ehā*, F. *ehai*, A. *ehi* “thus” and M. *kihā*, F. *kihai*, A. *kihei* “how” (interrogative and exclamative, cf. 2.6.7.2.4).

2.6.7.4.4. M. *mulī* “whole, entire” corresponds with the Sinhalese pronominal adjective *muḷu* “all, entire” which is regularly derived from OIA *sāmūḍha-/sāmūlha-* “brought together” (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 764, no. 13238 and GEIGER 1941, 138, no. 2053). In combination with adjectives, the ablative M. *mulin* “from the whole, of all” is used for the analytic expression of a superlative form; cp., e.g., *mulin rañgalu* “the best (one); best of all, excellent” (lit. “good of all, the good one of all”; cf. 2.4.5.3, 2.6.7.4.1). Furthermore, the ablative form is used as an adverb meaning “completely, entirely, totally”.

2.6.7.4.5. For the expression of “much, many”, there are several means in Dhivehi.

According to ḤASSAN SA’ĪD (oral information), M.F.A. *gina* “much, many” was originally confined to North Dhivehi. Only in the very recent past it has spread into the southernmost dialects and come into use also in Aḍḍū. In Modern Dhivehi, *gina* has become the most frequent word meaning “much, many”. TURNER identifies the Dhivehi word, together with Sinh. *gana* “thick, dense” e.a., with OIA *ghaná-* “compact, firm, dense” (TURNER 1966, I, 238, no. 4424 and 1985, 31, no. 4424; cf. also GEIGER 1941, 52, no. 770). — The main function of the abl. *ginain* “of many / much” is that of a partitive; cp. A. *gina-in ni-kāheti!* “Don’t eat too much!” (*ni* neg. particle; for the fut. form *kāheti* cf. 3.4.1). In *gina gina-in* “(very) often, more often”, lit. “much of many [times]”, the meaning of the partitive ablative *gina-in* is increased by quasi-reduplication.

M. *baivaru*, F. *baivaro*, A. *baivara* denotes “a lot (of), many”; cp. M. *baivaru mīhun* “a lot of people, a crowd” (*mīh-un* pl. of the stem /*mīs-*/ “man, human being”). TURNER (1985,

73, no. 9188a) proposes to derive the Dhivehi word from <sup>†</sup>*bahutara*- “more, many” (OIA *bahū*- “much, many”, TURNER 1966, II, 518, no. 9187) which is hardly tenable though.

The old pronominal adjective *tak* which is frequently attested with the meaning “so much/many” in the historical sources of Dhivehi, has developed into a plural morpheme (M. *-ta*<sup>3</sup>, F. *-te*<sup>3</sup>) in the modern language (with the exception of the Addū dialect; cf. 2.3.2.2.2). Today only some special forms give an idea of the original meaning of the suffix (cf., e.g., 2.6.7.1.1).

2.6.7.4.6. The pronominal adjective M. *madu*, F. *mado*, A. *mada* has the meaning of “a little, a bit”; its common ablative form is M.F.A. *madun*. This word can be used for the expression of a (negative) gradation (decreasing a quality or quantity); cp., e.g., M. *madu madun* “(very) rare, rarely”, lit. “a few of a few [times]” (cp. *gina ginain* above). M. *madu* and its variants must not be confused with the adjective M. *maḍu*, F. *mado*, A. *maḍa* “quiet, soft, slow”, as GEIGER did (1902, 928, no. 287) who treated the two words under the one lemma *madu* (written with a dental stop) “calm, smooth; less, few” which he, together with the Sinhalese adjective *mada/maḍa* “slight, scanty, little, few”, identified with Pa., Pkt., Skt. *manda*- (cf. also TURNER 1966, II, 560, no. 9754). GEIGER obviously failed to realise that *madu* “a few” and *maḍu* “quiet, slow” can be distinguished both semantically and phonologically. The difference between the retroflex stop /ḍ/ and the dental stop /d/ is phonematic in Dhivehi just as it is in Sinhalese; overlaps or spontaneous phonetic confusions can be excluded for both languages, at least from a synchronic point of view. This does not definitely mean, however, that Dhiv. *maḍu* and *madu* could not have developed from a common source. The phonological difference between /ḍ/ and /d/ might be explained by a spontaneous sound change in the early history of Dhivehi but also by dialectal developments of the same OIA etymon in the MIA period.

In this connection cp. also the dichotomy of M. *kuḍa* vs. A.F. *kudu* “small, little” with a difference of the intervocalic M. *-ḍ-* and A.F. *-d-* which cannot be explained from an inner-Maldivian point of view either. The *i*-stem /*kudi*-/ “child”, which exists in all Dhivehi dialects, belongs to the same root (nom.sg. A. *kudi*, def. *kuddā*, F. *kuddā*, M. *kujjā*; nom.pl. M.A. *kudin*, F. *kūḍun*; cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2). GEIGER (1902, 926, nos. 258 and 259) identifies Dhiv. *kudi* “little, small” and *kudin* (sic), which he erroneously interpretes as a sg. “child”, with Sinh. *kudu* “small, short, dwarfish” (“corresponds to P[ali] *khudda*”, cf. 1941, 46, no. 670) while Dhiv. *kuḍa* “little, small” and Sinh. *kuḍā* “small, little” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 45, no. 666) are derived from Pkt. *khudda*, both MIA forms representing the same Skt. etymon *ḥṣudrā*-. As GEIGER correctly states (1938, 55), an intervocalic *-ḍ-* of Modern Sinhalese always presupposes a MIA *-ḍḍ-* or *-ḍḍh-* which can have several sources in its turn. For Sinh. *ḍ* ← *ḍḍ* ← *ḍḍ*, *ḍḍh* cf. GEIGER (1938), 58.

2.6.7.4.7. The pronominal adjective M. *ane*<sup>3</sup> /*an-ek*/, F. *ene*<sup>3</sup> /*en-ek*/, A. *ena*<sup>3</sup> /*en-ak*/ “another” consists of the stem *an-* (or its South Maldivian variant, *en-*) and the indefinite suffix M.F. *-e*<sup>3</sup> /*-ek*/, A. *-a*<sup>3</sup> /*-ak*/ . The corresponding pronominal stem of Sinhalese is *an* “other, foreign” which goes back to OIA *anyā*- “other” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 8, no. 104 and TURNER 1966, I, 19, no. 399). Cp. also Sinh. *anik* “another” which GEIGER (1938, 131) regards as a combination of *an* with the indefinite suffix *-ek* as well.

2.6.7.4.8. The etymology of the pronominal adjective M. *kahala*, A. *kahalei* “such” is unclear. For an example of its use, cp. the following sentence:

- A. *eaḡē da' nagaḡāi, ehen kahalei au da' seṡa' jahafi* “Having removed his teeth, she inserted [him] such a set of new teeth [as it was her (lit. ‘that’)] way” (T11, 5; *ea-gē* poss.pron. “his”; *da' /dat/* obj. “teeth” (cf. 2.3.2.7.3.1); *naga-lāi* abs.II of (M.) *naganī* “to lift up, raise”, here: “to take off, remove”; *e-hen* “(in) that way” (cf. 2.6.5.7), here: “in her (special) way”; A. *au* attr. adj. “new”; */dat seṡ-ak/ da' obl., seṡa'* nom.indef., obj.: “a set of teeth”; *jaha-fi* pret.I 3.ps.sg. of (M.) *jahanī* “to beat”, here: “to insert”).

Depending on the context, the compound pronoun M. *kon kahala*, A. *kon kahalei*, which contains the interrogative stem *kon* “what a, which” (cf. 2.6.7), has either an exclamative or an interrogative nuance. Cp. the following example:

- M. ⟨*ahareṡe muḡi ḡayātaṡ mi aī kon kahala badale' bāva eve.*⟩ “Why such a change in my whole life?” lit. “What a change that means that this has come into my whole life!” (T8, 40; *ahareṡe* pers.pron. gen. = poss.pron. 1.ps.sg. “my”; *muḡi* pron.adj. “whole” (cf. above), attr. of */ḡayāt-aṡ/ = [ḡayāta]* dat. “into (the) life” ← Arab. *ḡayāt* “life”; *mi aī* “that this has come”: *mi* dem.pron. “this”, *a-ī* part.pret. of (M.) *annanī* “to come” + focus-marker *-ī*; */badal-ek/* nom.indef. “a change” ← Arab. *badal* “substitute, replacement”, *badala* “to change”; *bāva* particle expressing a rhetorical question; *eve* quotation particle).

In combination with the demonstrative stems *mi*, *ti*, etc., however, the pronominal adjective M. *kahala* etc. gains a clear demonstrative nuance. Cp. the following examples:

- M. ⟨*mi kahala ge'akaṡ ...*⟩ “to a house like this (here)”, “to such a house” (T10, 93; *mi* dem.pron. “this” → *mi kahala* dem.pron. “this sort, such”; */ge-ak-aṡ/ [geaka]* dat.indef. of *ge* “house”).  
 M. *tia kahala kantakugā* “in such cases”, “in cases like this” (*tia* dem.pron. “this/that (there, nearby you)” → *tia kahala* “this sort, such”, cf. 2.6.5; *kantakugai* loc.pl. of *kan /kam/* “case”).

2.6.7.5. In Dhivehi there are no **negative pronouns** in the literal sense. Pronominal meanings like “nobody, nothing, nowhere, never” etc. can only be expressed by periphrastic constructions. Thus, “nobody” is expressed in the following ways: M. *evves mīhaku nūn* “nobody is there”, lit. “not even one man is there” (*/ek-ves/* “even”, a compound of the num. *ek-* “one”, *ves* “also, even, otherwise”; *mīh-aku* obl.indef. of */mīs-/* “man, human being”); M. *evves mīhe' nūn* “not even a man is there” (*/mīs-ek/* nom.indef.); M. *evves mīhaku ne'* “not even one man was there” (*/net/* part.pret. of *netun* (verbal noun) “not existing”); A.F. *mīha' ne'* “not a man was there” (*/mīs-ak/* nom.indef.). Correspondingly, the negative pronoun “nothing” is expressed as follows: M. *evves ecce' nūn* or *evves ecce' ne'* “not even a thing is there” (*/eti-ek/* nom.indef.); A. *etta' ne'*, F. *ette' ne'* “not a thing is there” (A. */eti-ak/*, F. */eti-ek/* nom.indef.). M. *evves tanaka' nūn* has the meaning of “nowhere”, lit. “not being to any place” (*/tan-ak-aṡ/* dat.indef.).

### 3. The verbal system

3.1. While the system of the verbal categories is homogeneous throughout the whole area of Dhivehi, the realisation of the particular forms shows considerable interdialectal divergences in many cases. Regarding the comparative morphology of the Dhivehi verb, the dialect of Addū once again turns out to be the most conservative one; it follows that for an analysis of the Dhivehi verb the Addū forms are of a special importance. Because of some very particular developments in the sphere of phonology and phonetics which are typical for Fua' Mulaku, the verbal paradigm of this vernacular seems to be less transparent in many respects. Even though they may reveal a high degree of archaicity, it is often much more difficult to

classify Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku forms than the corresponding Addū forms. The sociolinguistic stratification, which is generally characteristic for the language of Māle, has still stronger a bearing on the verbal system than it has on the nominal structures, in particular where the use of the *verbum finitum* is concerned. At the same time, the literary language which is mainly based on the sociolect of the aristocracy is not as different from the southern dialects with their rich morphology as the modern colloquial language of Māle is. There is a general tendency in northern Dhivehi to prefer uninflectable nominal forms of the verb and to reduce the finite forms at the same time. This process results in the phenomenon that many speakers of northern Dhivehi show a gradual loss of their competence in parts of the inherited verbal morphology and try to avoid special conjugational forms. Thus, for example, the finite present forms of numerous verbs have become unusual in positive propositions in the colloquial vernacular of Māle.

3.1.1. The most general basis for a morphological classification of the Dhivehi verb is to be found in the category of voice which can be characterised by the dichotomy of the terms “active” and “inactive”.<sup>399</sup> The fact whether a verb is active or inactive is the main factor determining stem formation and conjugation type on the basis of morphonological rules. All active verbs can be subsumed under the main category of “*a*-stems” while the inactive verbs constitute the class of “*e*-stems”. From the synchronical point of view, the *n*-stems which form a small, compact group that is not productive any more, have to be regarded as a subclass of the *a*-stems because of their inflection. The numerous causatives which, as a matter of principle, can be derived from any verb not belonging to the class of *e*-stems, pertain to the *a*-stems as well. Depending on the particular verbal meaning, some causatives also appear as secondary formations of intransitives or inactives. Some of these derivations are lexicalised, not differing in form from the productive formations. — Besides the two large groups of verbs with a regular inflection, there are but a few verbs that are irregular from a synchronical point of view; those which have a monosyllabic stem ending in a vowel (e.g., *ka*- “to eat”) will be treated as “root verbs” hereafter.

It must be pointed out in this connection that the terms “active” and “inactive” must be understood primarily as morphological principles. In the modern language, it is not always possible to classify a verb as “active” or “inactive” only by its meaning, because in several cases morphological or semantical reinterpretations resulted in the fact that the morphological shape of a verb need no longer agree with its meaning.

3.1.2. In Dhivehi, every verb has a present stem and a preterite stem. Together they constitute the basis of the whole paradigm which reflects this basic distinction both in finite and infinite formations. The following categories are derived from the present stem: finite present, present participle, imperative, infinitive, finite future, future participle. The forms of the finite preterite, of the past participle and of the verbal noun are derived from the preterite stem. The absolute and the gerund, however, are not derived directly from either one of the basic stems.

<sup>399</sup> The term “inactive” is here preferred as against “passive” because many verbs belonging to this category do not have a passive meaning in the sense of common understanding. Furthermore, “inactive” seems to be more appropriate as a counterpart of “active” than “involitive” which, although referring to the same class of verbs, is less neutral in its meaning.

3.1.2.1. The category of tense, including a present, a preterite and a future formation, characterises both finite verbs and participles. Within the category of mood, we have to differentiate an indicative, an imperative and a formally heterogeneous, analytic conditional. There is no subjunctive in Dhivehi. The finite verb is characterised by a three person system distinguishing singular and plural.

3.1.2.2. The Dhivehi verb has no differentiation of aspect; there is no grammatical category for the morphological expression of aspectual differences in the sense of a binary opposition as we find it in “classical” aspect languages, particularly in Russian.

3.1.3. Dhivehi has a large number of infinite forms. Each of the participles of the present, the preterite and the future has a short and a long form the difference of which is based on their syntactic use. When the participles occur in substantive function they are inflected like nouns. In accordance with the other nominal forms, they do not distinguish gender.

3.1.3.1. The other infinite verbal formations are not directly related to the category of tense. This is true for the infinitive, the verbal noun and the converb which functions as an “absolutive” form. The latter category includes four further enlarged stems which can be derived from the basic absolutive; these secondary stems, being formed by means of auxiliary verbs, have an additional semantical nuance expressing concrete *aktionsart*-type meanings. Furthermore, these four stems serve as a derivational basis of four secondary finite preterite forms, together with the corresponding preterite participles and four further absolutives which are characterised by just the same *aktionsart* (“preterite, preterite participle and absolutive I-IV”).

3.1.3.2. The formation of a so-called “double absolutive” which is derived by simply reduplicating the converb, is a very productive process in Dhivehi; the double absolutive is used for the expression of a durative-intensive course of action or state.

3.1.3.3. In Modern Dhivehi, the “potential” must be regarded as an infinite category which, by its formation but not by its function, can be connected with the absolutive. The potential is a compound form consisting of the absolutive of the inactive causative and the 3.ps.sg.fut. of the auxiliary verb meaning “to become”; in accordance with these formal preconditions, the subject of a “potential” sentence appears in the dative case.

3.1.3.4. Another infinite verbal category is the gerund proper which represents a verbal noun in the ablative/instrumental case, derived from the present stem.

3.1.4. In order to illustrate the basic formal categories and their derivation from the present and the preterite stems, resp., the following tables contain an exemplary survey of the *a*-stem verb *balanī* “to look (at), watch, observe”, of the *n*-stem verb *vannanī* “to enter, come/go in”, and of the *e*-stem verb *temenī* “to get wet”. As a rule, the verbs are quoted in the long form of the present participle here which serves as a general lemmatic form in Dhivehi. Participial forms are given both in short and long forms in the tables.

3.1.4.1. *a*-stem (M.A.F.) *balanī* “to look (at), watch, observe”

<i>a</i> -stem	Aḏḏū	Fuaʹ Mulaku	Māle
present stem	<i>bala-</i>	<i>bala-</i>	<i>bala-</i>
pres. 1st sg.	<i>balan</i>	<i>balan</i>	<i>balan</i>
pres. participle	<i>balā; balanī</i>	<i>bala/ā; balanī</i>	<i>balā; balanī</i>
imperative 2nd sg.	<i>bala</i>	<i>bala</i>	<i>balā</i>
infinitive	<i>balāʹ</i>	<i>balanna</i>	<i>balan</i>
future 1st sg.	<i>balāšun</i>	<i>balannen(in)</i>	<i>balānan</i>
fut. participle	<i>balāṇe; balāṇei</i>	<i>balannen; balammenī</i>	<i>balāne; balānī</i>
absolute	<i>bala(i)</i>	<i>balā</i>	<i>balā</i>
gerund	<i>balamun</i>	<i>balamun</i>	<i>balamun</i>
preterite stem	<i>beli-</i>	<i>beli-</i>	<i>beli-</i>
pret. 1st sg.	<i>belin</i>	<i>belin</i>	<i>belin</i>
pret. participle	<i>beli; belī</i>	<i>belī</i>	<i>beli; belī</i>
verbal noun	<i>belun</i>	<i>belun</i>	<i>belun</i>

3.1.4.2. *n*-stem (M.) *vannanī* “to enter, come/go in”

<i>n</i> -stem	Aḏḏū	Fuaʹ Mulaku	Māle
present stem	<i>van- / vad-</i>	<i>van- / vañd-</i>	<i>van- / vad-</i>
pres. 1st sg.	<i>vanun / vadun</i>	<i>vañḏin</i>	<i>vannan</i>
pres. participle	<i>vanne; vannei</i>	<i>vannā; vannaī</i>	<i>vanna; vannanī</i>
imperative 2nd sg.	<i>vanu / vadu</i>	<i>vañḏi</i>	<i>vadē</i>
infinitive	<i>vannaʹ</i>	<i>vannaha</i>	<i>vannaʹ / vannan</i>
future 1st sg.	<i>vannašun</i>	<i>vannāḥinin</i>	<i>vannānan</i>
fut. participle	<i>vannaṇe; vannaṇei</i>	<i>vannāḥin; vannāḥinī</i>	<i>vannāne; vannānī</i>
absolute	<i>vedi / vede-</i>	<i>veñde</i>	<i>vade</i>
gerund	<i>vedemun</i>	<i>vañḏimun</i>	<i>vannamun</i>
preterite stem	<i>van-</i>	<i>van-</i>	<i>van-</i>
pret. 1st sg.	<i>vanin</i>	<i>vanin</i>	<i>vanin</i>
pret. participle	<i>van; vanī</i>	<i>van; vañī</i>	<i>van; vanī</i>
verbal noun	<i>vanun</i>	<i>vanun</i>	<i>vanun</i>

3.1.4.3. *e*-stem (M.A.F.) *temenī* “to get wet”

<i>e</i> -stem	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>o</sup> Mulaku	Māle
present stem	<i>teme-</i>	<i>teme-</i>	<i>teme-</i>
pres. 1st sg.	<i>temen</i>	<i>temen</i>	<i>temen</i>
pres. participle	<i>temē; temenī</i>	<i>temē; temenī</i>	<i>temē; temenī</i>
imperative 2nd sg.	<i>teme</i>	( <i>temī gan</i> )	<i>temē</i>
infinitive	<i>temē<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>temenna</i>	<i>temen</i>
fut. 1st sg.	<i>temēšun</i>	<i>temennē</i>	<i>temēnan</i>
fut. participle	<i>temēne; temēnei</i>	<i>temennen; temennenī</i>	<i>temēne; temēnī</i>
absolutive	<i>temi</i>	<i>temī / temī</i>	<i>temi</i>
gerund	<i>tememun</i>	—	<i>tememun</i>
preterite stem	<i>temeṇe-</i>	<i>temun-</i>	<i>temun-</i>
fin. pret. 1st sg.	<i>temeṇen</i>	<i>temunin</i>	<i>temunin</i>
pret. participle	<i>temeṇe; temeṇei</i>	<i>temun; temūnī</i>	<i>temunu; temunī</i>
verbal noun	<i>temun</i>	<i>temun</i>	<i>temun</i>

## 3.2. The finite present

The finite present is built from the present stem by addition of the personal endings which are identical for all classes of verbs. The formation agrees exactly with that known from literary Sinhalese as the comparative table following below will show. The archaic character of the Sinhalese personal endings becomes obvious by comparing them with the corresponding forms of MIA, especially with those of Pali.<sup>400</sup> To what extent in Dhivehi – in accordance with the development in Sinhalese as demonstrated by GEIGER<sup>401</sup> – the inherited personal endings were adapted to the forms of the auxiliary “to be” (from the OIA root  $\sqrt{as}$ ) and what the original Maldivian copula forms were like at all can only be reconstructed fragmentarily. In Sinhalese, the personal endings in question generally occur in all tenses (with only a few restrictions) and with all conjugation types. In Dhivehi, however, the endings of the present differ very much from those being used for the other tenses, at least for parts. There are also some differences depending on the conjugation types and, furthermore, some considerable dialectal divergences.

personal endings	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>o</sup> Mulaku	Māle	Sinhalese
1st ps.sg.	<i>-n</i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-m, -mi</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>-i / -y</i>	<i>-ie / -yye</i>	[ <i>-:</i> ] (← <i>*-y?</i> )	<i>-hi / -yi</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>-i / -y</i>	[ <i>-:</i> ] (← <i>*-y?</i> ), <i>-i</i>	[ <i>-:</i> ] (← <i>*-y?</i> )	<i>-y / -yi</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>-mā</i>	<i>-mā</i>	<i>-mu</i>	<i>-mu, -mha</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>-tā</i>	<i>-va</i>	<i>-mu</i>	<i>-vu / -hu</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>-tā</i>	<i>-tta</i>	[ <i>-:</i> ] (← <i>*-y?</i> )	<i>-t, -ti</i>

<sup>400</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 142 and (1900), 75 ff.

<sup>401</sup> For the Sinhalese data cf. GEIGER (1900), 76.

The dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku is the only one that has entirely preserved a complete set of distinct personal endings. Here, in analogy with the archaic Sinhalese literary language, every person is characterised by its particular personal suffix. In Aḍḍū, however, the forms of the 2nd and 3rd ps.sg. and, correspondingly, those of the 2nd and 3rd ps.pl., coincided. The original suffix of the 2.ps.pl., *-vā*, is almost obsolete nowadays.<sup>402</sup> In the standard language of Māle, the syncretism of the forms in question is still more advanced, there being a clear formal identity of the 2nd and the 3rd ps.sg. as well as of the 3rd ps.pl. on the one hand and a common form of the 1st and 2nd ps.pl. on the other hand. M. *kuranī* “to do, make” may serve as an example of the multiple syncretism of the plural forms; thus, besides the 1.ps.pl. *kuramu*, also *kuran* can be used. It is not clear, whether this form can be explained by analogy with the singular or whether the *-n* developed according to the sound laws because of the apocope of the word-final *-u*. Alongside the expected *kuramu*, there is a form *kurē* for the 2.ps.pl. which presumably originated in an analogical adaptation of the 2.ps.sg. form. The reduction of the inherited complete set of different forms coincides with an increasing uncertainty on the part of many speakers. Especially in the colloquial language of Māle, the inflected forms of the present tense are becoming obsolete more and more. Their regular usage is now almost confined to the negated paradigm of the present, while in positive sentences the long form of the present participle has practically replaced the finite forms.

3.2.1. In the finite present of the *a*-stems, the personal endings are joint to the stem-final vowel *-a*. The *a*-stems of Dhivehi agree with the “first conjugation” of Sinhalese which is characterised by a short /a/ functioning as a stem vowel as well. The *a*-stems, representing the largest crop of verbs in both Sinhalese and Dhivehi, have in most cases developed directly from OIA verbs with thematic present classes.<sup>403</sup>

finite present ( <i>a</i> -stems)	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>balan</i>	<i>balan</i>	<i>balan</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>balai</i>	<i>balayye</i>	<i>balā*</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>balai</i>	<i>balā</i>	<i>balā*</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>balamā</i>	<i>balamā</i>	<i>balamu</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>balatā</i>	<i>balāva</i>	<i>balamu</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>balatā</i>	<i>balatta</i>	<i>balā*</i>

\*) In Māle some verbs belonging to the *a*-stems show a final *-ē* in the 3.ps.sg. (and the 2.ps.sg. and the 3.ps.pl.) which still remains unexplained; cp., e.g., *bunanī* “to speak”: *bunē* (but A. *beṇai*); *duvanī* “to run”: *duvē* (A. *divai*); *minanī* “to measure”: *minē* (A. *minai*); *halanī* “to stir”: *halē*; *duruvanī* – 2nd hon. degree of *annanī* “to come” / *danī* “to go”: *duruvē*; *kuranī* “to do, make”: *kurē*.

<sup>402</sup> For the homophone interrogative suffix *-vā* cf. 3.15.1.3.

<sup>403</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 138.

### 3.2.1.1. Formation of the causative

The causatives constitute a special subgroup within the *a*-stems with which they share their inflection. They represent a very productive formation type which is inherited through MIA from OIA where the causative suffix *-aya-* was added to the verbal root. An enlarged variant of the suffix, *-paya-*, which was originally restricted to verbal roots ending in *-ā* (cp., e.g., *sthāpayati* 3.ps.sg.pres. “causes to stand”), in the course of time expanded to other roots. A further abstracted variant of the same suffix was *-āpaya-*; in late Sanskrit this variant extended to roots ending in a consonant.<sup>404</sup> In MIA, *-aya-* mostly developed into *-e-*, and similarly *-(ā)paya-* changed into *-(ā)pe-* in Pali and into *-(ā)ve-* in Prakrit.<sup>405</sup> These latter suffix variants, which became more and more frequent in MIA and, at least, came to replace the original formation with *-e-* in MIA, are directly continued in the causative suffix *-va-* of both Sinhalese and Maldivian<sup>406</sup>.

In the regular causative formation of these two languages, the suffix *-va-* is inserted between the present stem and the ending. If the last stem syllable is open, its *-a*-vowel is syncopated, thus bringing about a phonetical change of the stem which results in two different possibilities of forming the causative. In most cases, a short *u* appears after the syncopation as an anaptyctic vowel between the consonant, now in stem-final position, and the causative suffix: cp., e.g., (M.) *faśanī* “to begin, start” vs. *faśuvanī* “to let begin, cause to begin”. A less frequent development consists in the assimilation of the initial *v-* of the causative suffix to the consonant in stem-final position. An example for this process is provided by the causative *jassanī* ← *\*jasvanī* ← *\*jasa-va-nī*,<sup>407</sup> which is derived from *jahanī* “to strike, beat”.

Obviously, there are only very few cases of causatives that exist in both phonetical variants. One such example is the pair of *faśuvanī* and *\*faṭṭanī* “to let begin, cause to begin”, with the restriction that only the first variant is used as a regular causative in all dialects of Dhivehi (cf. above). The variant *\*faṭṭanī* which, according to the sound laws, has preserved the old retroflex in its geminated form,<sup>408</sup> does not occur any longer as an independent verb, but it still exists in Addū as the first part of the compound verb *faṭṭa-gannanī* “to start” (intr.), with *faṭṭa-* representing an absolutive form. In Addū, this combination is today regarded as synonymous with *faśa-gatun*,<sup>409</sup> which is a compound verb as well.

The inflection of the causatives is generally that of the primary *a*-stems.

#### 3.2.1.1.1. “Double” causatives and their special function as verbal honorificators

In Dhivehi there are numerous examples of causatives that are marked twice. The verbs in question show the causative suffix two times in turn, first in its assimilated variant and then in its unchanged form; cp. *jassavanī* which represents a secondary (repeated) causative formation of the existing causative *jassanī*. Many of the “reduplicated” or “double” causatives occur only in the language of Māle, where they have a very special function in that they

<sup>404</sup> Cf. RENO (1961), 468.

<sup>405</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1916), 139 ff. and PISCHEL (1981), 442 ff.

<sup>406</sup> For the Sinhalese causative cf. GEIGER (1938), 154 ff. and (1900), 81 f.

<sup>407</sup> This causative, having developed into an independent lemma in Modern Dhivehi, has the meaning of “to land, to turn” today.

<sup>408</sup> Cf. 1.3.9.12.1.

<sup>409</sup> For compound verbs that are built with *gannanī*, cf. 3.11.4.3.

serve as the most productive grammatical medium for the expression of the second and the third honorific degree, corresponding with the two aristocratic levels of the threefold social hierarchy which was particularly characteristic for the language of the capital.<sup>410</sup> Cp., e.g., the 1st degree verb *fīhanī* “to roast, cook, bake” with its honorific 2nd/3rd degree equivalent *fīssavanī* which is a double causative, the primary form *\*fīssanī* ← *\*fīsa-va-nī* “to cause to cook” being obsolete today. A parallel case is *happavanī* which is the honorific 2nd/3rd degree equivalent of *hafanī* “to chew”; the primary causative *\*happanī* ← *\*hapa-va-nī* does not exist any longer either.

In some special cases, the morphological framework of the causative formation is used for a semantic differentiation; cp., e.g., *gulanī* “to contact, connect” with its primary causative *gūlvvanī* which serves as a normal verb of the honorific 2nd and 3rd degree. Besides this honorific verb, however, there exists also a formally identical causative *gūlvvanī* meaning “to join, attach”, which functions as a verb of the 1st degree; furthermore, a double causative, *gūlvvanī*, is derived from *gūlvvanī*, which is used in honorific function for the 2nd and 3rd degree.

Sinhalese has no comparable use of secondary causatives motivated by social stratification; in general, the Sinhalese verb is no medium for the expression of honorific levels.<sup>411</sup> Thus, GEIGER was right in stating that the existence of double causatives in Sinhalese has only morphological reasons (1938, 156): “In those causatives, in which by assimilation of the *v*, the causative character is obscured, a second syllable *-va-* can be inserted so that a **double causative** is resulted”.

3.2.1.1.2. GEIGER further states that in Sinhalese, causatives can only be derived from the first two conjugation classes (1938, 156): “A causative of Conj. III does not exist at all, since the verbs in *-enu* are themselves derivatives. The causative must always be formed out of base-verbs in *-anu*”. In accordance with this rule, we would expect that in Dhivehi, too, the formation of causatives might be confined to *a*-stems and *n*-stems, the latter constituting a subgroup of the former. There are numerous verbs such as the *e*-stems *jessenī* and *jessevenī*, however, which seem not to fit into the system because they show the typical formal structure of causatives, albeit *e* is their stem-vowel. Only a step-by-step analysis of the successive verbal derivations and their historical interrelationship can give a clear picture of the whole process.

The basic form of the example mentioned above is the transitive *a*-stem *jahanī* meaning “to beat, kick; blow (of the wind)”. From this primary verb the simple causative *jassanī* “to land, turn; switch on” is derived. The secondary causative formation *jassavanī* exists only in Māle, where it occurs as a honorific verb of *jahanī* as well as *jassanī*, denoting the 2nd and 3rd degree. The inactive verb *jehenī* “to fall (down upon)” is derived directly from *jahanī*; the umlaut of the root vowel is typical for inactive *e*-stems that are derived from *a*-stems. *jessenī* “to come in touch (with), touch” is the corresponding inactive form of the simple causative *jassanī*. In this case as well, the morphological criteria determining the formation of an inactive from a primary active verb are visible: the *a*-stem is changed into an *e*-stem, together with a simultaneous umlauting of the root-vowel. In the same way, *jessevenī* is

<sup>410</sup> For the system of social structures in Māle cf. the introduction, 0.9.2.

<sup>411</sup> Cf. GUNASEKARA (1891), 174 ff.

derived from *jassavanī*. By its function, however, it represents the 2nd or 3rd degree equivalent of *jehenī*; hence, its literal meaning as a honorific verb can be given as “It happens to the gentleman/lady or to the king/queen that he/she causes him-/herself to fall”.

It is not always possible to establish a complete list of causative and inactive derivatives as in the example just mentioned. There are many verbs where one or more links in the derivational chain are missing. On the one hand, it seems to be very plausible that not every form that might have existed has been preserved. On the other hand, however, it is also likely that forms which would conform with morphological rules were not realised because of semantical reasons.

3.2.1.1.3. Several verbs build their higher honorific degrees in a suppletive way. An example of this is the verb “to come”. M. *annanī* refers to the 1st degree. The 2nd degree is represented by the suppletive causative *duruvanī*, lit. “to let run, cause to run” (from M. *duvanī* “to run”). The 3rd degree, too, is formed by a suppletive verb, viz. the compound formation *vaḍay gannavanī*, lit. approximately “to cause to take by strutting”. The basic verb underlying the petrified absolutive *vaḍay* has been lost in Dhivehi;<sup>412</sup> *vaḍay* occurs in honorific function with other verbs as well, however.

3.2.2. The *n*-stems, representing a very archaic, closed subgroup within the framework of the Dhivehi verb, generally correspond with the 2nd conjugation type of Modern Sinhalese which is characterised by a final *-i* in the present stem. For the case of Sinhalese, GEIGER proves that this stem vowel *-i* is the result of a relatively recent development (1938, 138): “We can only say that the stem vowel *i* has the character of a svarabhakti-vowel and is of later origin. For, it never produces umlaut of the preceding syllable, and in the medieval language forms without *i* are numerous.” Examples mentioned by GEIGER are, e.g., the archaic present form *danni* “I know” as against the variant *danimi* attested in a later period, or the old infinitive *vadnā* “enter” as against its more recent counterpart *vadinu*. GEIGER’s hypothetical assumption that this conjugation type might have its basis in the second verbal class of Sanskrit is highly improbable, however, because of the statistics of the latter, as GEIGER himself concedes;<sup>413</sup> what is more, it cannot be upheld because of phonological reasons (for further considerations cf. 3.2.2.3).

Dhivehi shows a parallel development of the *n*-stems; here, however, the anaptyctic vowel corresponding to Sinh. *i* differs systematically from dialect to dialect. As the table in 3.2.2.1 shows, the stem-final consonant *n* is followed by an *u* vowel in Aḍḍū and by an *i* vowel in Fua<sup>7</sup> Mulaku. In Māle, however, we find not a secondary vowel but a gemination of the stem consonant, *-n-*.

<sup>412</sup> The etymologically corresponding Sinh. verb still exists: *vaḍanavā* “to increase, augment; to take up (and carry a child in the arms)”; cf. GEIGER (1941), 154, no. 2297; cf. also TURNER (1966) II, 663, no. 11376 s.v. *vārdhate* “grows, increases” and 664, no. 11382 s.v. *vārdhāyati* “makes grow or increase”, “rears”.

<sup>413</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 138: “The prototype of conj. II seems to be the 2nd class of Sk.: type: han-mi, han-ti, but it is hardly intelligible how this type which is very rare in Middle-Indian could occur in Sinh. to such an extent.”

3.2.2.1. From a synchronical point of view, all verbs that are characterised by the following formal features must be treated as *n*-stems in Dhivehi: 1) the co-occurrence of the infinitive endings A. *-a'*, F. *-aha*, M. *-a'* (besides *-an*)<sup>414</sup>; in the conjugation of the present tense, the paradigmatic change of stem-final *n* and *d* or *ñd* in Addū and of geminated *nn* and *d* in Māle; this corresponds with the prenasalised stop *ñd* occurring in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku in all persons. Cf. the following table which illustrates the finite present forms of (M.) *vannanī* “to enter”:

finite present	Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>vanun / vadun</i>	<i>vañdin</i>	<i>vannan</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>vadi</i>	<i>vañḍiyye</i>	<i>vade</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>vadi</i>	<i>vāñḍi</i>	<i>vade</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>vadumā</i>	<i>vañḍimā</i>	<i>vannamu</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>vadutā</i>	<i>vañḍivva</i>	<i>vannamu</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>vadutā</i>	<i>vañḍitta</i>	<i>vade</i>

A similar change of consonants in stem-final position can be found in the imperative (cf. 3.5.1.3), the absolutive (cf. 3.6.5, 3.10.3) and the gerund (cf. 3.8.2).

3.2.2.2. From a historical point of view, we must distinguish between primary and secondary *n*-stems. While the primary *n*-stems go back directly to OIA nasal presents, the secondary formations obviously represent not inherited *n*-stems but original *a*-stems which completely or only to a certain extent were adapted to the paradigm of the *n*-stems. An example for a secondary *n*-stem is *vannanī* “to enter” (cf. above) which does not go back to a nasal present of OIA<sup>415</sup> but which in all dialects of Modern Dhivehi appears as an exemplary *n*-stem in all its forms.

3.2.2.3. There are but a few verbs with a pure *n*-stem paradigm. Besides *vannanī*, these verbs are *añḍanī* “to burn” (trans.); *bannanī* “to tie”; *binnanī* (in Māle also *biñḍanī*) “to pluck”; *innanī* “to sit; to marry, be married”; *iññanī* (A., F. *irñ-*) “to sit”. The particular forms of the other verbs belonging to this inflection type may differ very much from the *n*-conjugation proper; nevertheless, all these verbs are characterised by the typical infinitive ending of the *n*-stems. In each case, we must decide separately whether a verb which belongs to the *n*-class was formally adapted to the *a*-stems or whether the verb in question might be an “unetymological” *n*-stem. The modern conjugation pattern of *n*-verbs does not suffice to prove that it really developed from an OIA nasal present. Besides a methodically correct reconstruction, only the evidence of the OIA material itself can serve as a final proof (cf. 3.9.2.2).

<sup>414</sup> Cf. 3.6.5, 3.10.3.

<sup>415</sup> The origin must be seen in OIA *vrājati* “goes, wanders”, Pa. *vajati*, the forms of which obviously merged with those of the nasal stem verb OIA *vrñākti* “twists”; cf. P.E.D., 593 s.v. *vajati*, WHITNEY (1885), 163 s.v. *vrj* and 213, and WERBA (1997), 263 s.v. *vrj*. Cf. also TURNER (1966, II, 707, no. 12225 s.v. *vrājati*) who postulates a nasal present *\*vrañjati* as the basis of Pkt. *vañjai* “goes”, Sinh. *vañḍu*, Lahndā *vañjan* and Panj. *vaññā* “to go, depart, die”. Obviously, Dhiv. *vannanī* must be derived from the same source.

We must state here by the way that the authors of HLSD, in their subdivision of the conjugation patterns of Sinhalese and Dhivehi, obviously failed to realise the existence of the Maldivian *n*-stems as a special type of conjugation; cp. their statement: “All [Sinhalese, S.F.] verbal bases containing two or more syllables and ending in ‘i’ fall into this [third, S.F.] conjugation. Dhivehi does not have this conjugation....” (HLSD, 56).

3.2.3. The *e*-stem class exclusively consists of inactive verbs. To a certain extent these verbs are intransitive derivatives of transitive *a*-stems, expressing a passive, medial or reflexive meaning. There are many inactive verbs, however, which have no active or transitive equivalent; in these cases, the *e*-stem has to be considered as primary. Cp., e.g., *ivenī* “to hear”, *libenī* “to receive, get”, or *edenī* “to want, wish, demand”.

The *e*-stems of Dhivehi exactly correspond with the third conjugation class of Sinhalese; cp. GEIGER’s statement (1938, 141): “The verbs of conj. III are generally intransitive formations corresponding to transitive verbs of conj. I or II. They sometimes assume reflexive or passive meaning. ... Intransitive verbs of conj. III are frequently formed after the *e*-type, but have no corresponding transitive verb in conj. I or II.” The stem vowel *-e-* which in Dhivehi, as well as Sinhalese, is generally associated with an intransitive, inactive verbal meaning, can be derived from MIA *-iya-* and OIA *-yá-*, i.e. the suffix of “passive” presents (cf. GEIGER 1938, 138).

The following table illustrates the present paradigm of the *e*-stem *temenī* “to get wet”:

finite present	Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>temen</i>	<i>temen</i>	<i>temen</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>temei</i>	<i>temeyye</i>	<i>temē</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>temei</i>	<i>temē</i>	<i>temē</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>tememā</i>	<i>tememā</i>	<i>tememu</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>temetā</i>	<i>temēva</i>	<i>tememu</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>temetā</i>	<i>temetta</i>	<i>temē</i>

### 3.3. The finite preterite

The finite preterite is built by adding the personal endings to the preterite stem which is formally identical with the preterite participle from which it developed (cf. 3.9.2 below). The finite forms of the Maldivian *a*- and *n*-stems exhibit the same formation as the so-called “shorter form of the preterite” in literary Sinhalese, the latter being based on the past participle<sup>416</sup> which in the first conjugation is marked by a suffix *-u* ← *-ū*, in the second by a suffix *-i* ← *-ī*. According to GEIGER, *-ī* as well as *-ū* go back to *-ita*.<sup>417</sup> As medieval Sinhalese texts show, the diversification of the two suffixes is the result of a gradual process. In contrast to that, Dhivehi shows a clear differentiation only between *a*- and *n*-stems; thus, e.g., the preterite (or past) participle of the *a*-stem verb *balanī* “to look” is *beļī* in all dialects (≈ Sinh. *bālu*, cf. GEIGER 1938, 135; for the umlaut cf. 3.9.2.1 below), while the correspon-

<sup>416</sup> For this *communis opinio* cf. MATZEL (1983), 118; for details cf. GEIGER (1938), 146.

<sup>417</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 135; cf. also 1.2.3.1.1, 3.9.2.1.

ding participle of the *n*-stem *vannanī* “to enter” has the form *van* throughout (≈ Sinh. *van*; cf. GEIGER 1941, 156).

Both in Sinhalese and in Dhivehi, the verbs of the *e*-conjugation build their past participle with a particular suffix the original form of which was *-uṇu* (cf. 3.3, 3.9.2). In Dhivehi, this suffix underwent a dialectal differentiation which in the case of *temenī* “to get wet” led to the forms M. *temunu*, F. *temun*, and A. *temene* (Sinh. *temuṇu*; cf. GEIGER 1938, 136).

3.3.1. In Dhivehi, the personal endings of the preterite are identical with those of the present tense to a certain extent only. Unlike the equivalent forms of the present tense, the 2nd and the 3rd person plural of the preterite have different endings in Modern Aḍḍū; the old ending of the 2.ps.pl., *-vā*, is obviously confined to the *a*- and *e*-conjugation and will be met with only rarely.<sup>418</sup> While in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the 3.ps.pl. is still different from the corresponding present form, the paradigm of the standard language shows the same reduced inventory as in the present tense. The following table gives a comparative survey of the personal endings of the preterite:

personal endings	Aḍḍū			Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku			Māle			Sinhalese (short form) <sup>419</sup>
	<i>a</i> -st.	<i>n</i> -st.	<i>e</i> -st.	<i>a</i> -st.	<i>n</i> -st.	<i>e</i> -st.	<i>a</i> -st.	<i>n</i> -st.	<i>e</i> -st.	
1st ps.sg.	<i>-n</i>	<i>-in</i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-in</i>	<i>-in<sup>1)</sup></i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-in<sup>4)</sup></i>	<i>-in<sup>4)</sup></i>	<i>-m</i> ; <i>-mi</i>
2nd ps.sg.	-∅			<i>-yye<sup>1)</sup></i>	<i>-īyye</i>	<i>/-yye/</i>	-∅	-∅	-∅	<i>-hi</i>
3rd ps.sg.	-∅			-∅			-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅
1st ps.pl.	<i>-mā</i>			<i>-mā<sup>1)</sup></i>	<i>-mā</i>	<i>-mā</i>	<i>-mu<sup>1)</sup></i>	<i>-īmu</i>	<i>-īmu<sup>4)</sup></i>	<i>-mu</i> ; <i>-mō</i> , <i>-mha</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>-e /-a/, -vā</i>	<i>-ā</i>	<i>-ā, -vā</i>	<i>-va<sup>1)</sup></i>	<i>-va</i>	<i>-va</i>	<i>-mu<sup>1)</sup></i>	<i>-īmu</i>	<i>-īmu<sup>4)</sup></i>	<i>-hu</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>-e /-a/</i>	<i>-ā</i>	<i>-ā<sup>3)</sup></i>	<i>-a<sup>1)</sup></i>	<i>-a<sup>2)</sup></i>	<i>/-ya/?</i>	-∅	-∅	-∅	<i>-ha</i>

1) concurrent with a lengthening of the stem final vowel;

2) concurrent with a gemination of the stem final *-n*;

3) ending *-ā* based on */-ea/*, cp. *temeṇā* ← \**temeṇea*;

4) unetymological *-ī*: obviously, the ending was abstracted from the *n*-stems and transferred to the *e*-stems.

3.3.2. The following tables show the preterite conjugation of the verbs *balanī*, *vannanī* and *temenī*:

fin. preterite <i>a</i> -stems	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>belin</i>	<i>belin</i>	<i>belin</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>beli</i>	<i>belīyye</i>	<i>beli</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>beli</i>	<i>beli</i>	<i>beli</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>belimā</i>	<i>belīmā</i>	<i>belīmu</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>belie /belia/, belivā</i>	<i>belīva</i>	<i>belīmu</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>belie /belia/</i>	<i>belīa</i>	<i>beli</i>

<sup>418</sup> For the ending *-vā* further cf. 3.2.

<sup>419</sup> Thus GEIGER (1938), 146.

fin. preterite <i>n</i> -stems	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>vanin</i>	<i>vanin</i>	<i>vanin</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>van</i>	<i>vanīyye</i>	<i>van</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>van</i>	<i>van</i>	<i>van</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>vammā</i>	<i>vammā</i>	<i>vanīmu</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>vanā</i>	<i>vanva</i>	<i>vanīmu</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>vanā</i>	<i>vanna</i>	<i>van</i>

fin. preterite <i>e</i> -stems	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>temeṇen</i>	<i>temunin</i>	<i>temunin</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>temeṇe</i>	<i>temunne</i>	<i>temunu</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>temeṇe</i>	<i>temū</i>	<i>temunu</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>temeṇemā</i>	<i>temummā</i>	<i>temunīmu</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>temeṇā / temeṇevā</i>	<i>temūva</i>	<i>temunīmu</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>temeṇā</i>	<i>temunna</i>	<i>temunu</i>

### 3.4. The finite future

The formation of the finite future tense is not homogeneous in Dhivehi. Only in the dialect of Aḍḍū it is morphologically transparent both from the synchronic and the diachronic point of view. At a glance, the formation of the future forms seems to be clear in the standard language of Māle as well, at least on a synchronic level; concerning the historical development and the dialectological evidence, however, the future forms reveal themselves as the result of a process of diversification. The most complex and complicated situation can be found in the vernacular of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku where the morphological mechanism of the future formation is obviously heterogeneous within the particular verbal classes, the derivation of some formal components still being unclear.

The future formation of the different conjugation types can be illustrated cross-dialectally by the following tables:

finite future <i>a</i> -stems	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>balāšun</i>	<i>balannen(in)</i>	<i>balānan</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>balāhe</i>	<i>balannē / balanneyye</i>	<i>balāne</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>balāhe</i>	<i>balannen</i>	<i>balāne</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>balāšumā</i>	<i>balannā</i>	<i>balānan / balānū</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>balāšie / balāšia/</i>	<i>balannēva</i>	<i>balāne / balānū</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>balāšie / balāšia/</i>	<i>balannenā</i>	<i>balāne</i>

finite future <i>n</i> -stems	Adḏū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>vannašun</i>	<i>vannāhinin</i>	<i>vannānan</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>vannahe</i>	<i>vannāhinne</i>	<i>vannāne</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>vannahe</i>	<i>vannāhin</i>	<i>vannāne</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>vannašumā</i>	<i>vannāhimmā</i>	<i>vannānan</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>vannašie /vannašia/</i>	<i>vannāhimva</i>	<i>vannāne</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>vannašie /vannašia/</i>	<i>vannāhinna</i>	<i>vannāne</i>

finite future <i>e</i> -stems	Adḏū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
1st ps.sg.	<i>temēšun</i>	<i>temennē</i>	<i>temēnan</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>temēhe</i>	<i>temennē / temenneye</i>	<i>temēne</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>temēhe</i>	<i>temennen</i>	<i>temēne</i>
1st ps.pl.	<i>temēšumā</i>	<i>temennā</i>	<i>temēnan</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>temēšie /temēšia/</i>	<i>temennēva</i>	<i>temēne</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>temēšie /temēšia/</i>	<i>temennenā</i>	<i>temēne</i>

A rough analysis yields the following table of personal endings:

personal endings	Adḏū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku			Māle		
		<i>a</i> -st.	<i>n</i> -st.	<i>e</i> -st.	<i>a</i> -st.	<i>n</i> -st.	<i>e</i> -st.
1st ps.sg.	<i>-un /-n/</i>	<i>-en(in)</i>	<i>-in-in</i>	<i>-ē</i>	<i>-an</i>		
2nd ps.sg.	<i>-e</i>	<i>-ē, -eyye</i>	<i>-in-n-e ← -yye</i>	<i>-ē, -eyye?</i>	<i>-e</i>		
3rd ps.sg.	<i>-e</i>	<i>-en</i>	<i>-in-∅</i>	<i>-en?</i>	<i>-e</i>		
1st ps.pl.	<i>-umā /-mā/</i>	<i>-ā</i>	<i>-in-mā ← -emā</i>	<i>-ā?</i>	<i>-an, -ū</i>	<i>-an</i>	<i>-an</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>-ie /-ia/</i>	<i>-ēva</i>	<i>-in-vā ← -ēva</i>	<i>-ēva?</i>	<i>-e, -ū</i>	<i>-e</i>	<i>-e</i>
3rd ps.pl.	<i>-ie /-ia/</i>	<i>-enā</i>	<i>-in-na ← -enā</i>	<i>-enā?</i>	<i>-e</i>		

3.4.1. At a glance, the morphological analysis seems to be simple in **Adḏū**. There, the future tense of all stem types is obviously derived from the infinitive (cf. 3.6.3.1) to which a set of special future endings is added (cf. the table given above); with all probability, these endings reflect forms of a previous copula whose stem can no longer be reconstructed. The original meaning of the underlying infinitive construction in Adḏū is easy to understand, A. *balās-u-n* being equivalent with English “I am to look”. The question whether the endings go back to indicative present forms of the copula as this interpretation suggests, however, is not supported unambiguously by the facts of the language. An important counter-argument results from the comparison with another verbal category, the potential, which obviously contains a formally identical morphological element but which can hardly have originated from the indicative.

The basis of the future formation can be found in the forms of the 2nd and 3rd ps.sg.fut. of all three conjugation types, which are identical with each other; here, the copula occurring in the function of a personal ending is likely to reflect not the indicative but another mood, provided the ending of *balāhe*, *vannahe* and *temēhe* really is the same as in the case of the potential (cf. 3.12.3.2). It is not important in this respect that the latter category is infinite (cp. the forms A. *beliēhe*, *vediēhe* and *temiēhe* which are used for all persons, being composed of the inactive absolutive and the formant *-ēhe*) and that the agent of verbs in the potential appears in the dative case, for potential forms can, in principle, be derived only from inactive stems. Hence, it is no contradiction that the future forms *balāhe* etc., which are built with the same auxiliary verb, has a nominative construction (cp. A. *tō / ede balāhe* “you will / he will look”), *balanī* being a transitive, active verb.

Thus, it is likely that the ending *-ēhe* represents a petrified optative form of the copula. To which verbal element *-ēhe* was added in the case of *balāhe* etc. remains unclear, however. A derivation of *balah-* from the infinitive would be less probable for phonological reasons. It would presuppose that in the given position the infinitive ending *-ś* ← *-t* would have developed into *-h-*; such a development is otherwise unknown in Aḍḍū, however, and the other future forms show *ś* unaltered. On the other hand, we cannot exclude the influence of another future formation which only occurs in the second person of both numbers, where it is combined with the oblique case as in *ta / tafirin balāheti*; this construction literally means “it is visible for you (sg./pl.); it is to be looked (for/at) by you”.<sup>420</sup> Here, *-eti* corresponds exactly with the petrified Sinhalese copula form *āti* “it is” (← Skt. *asti*; cf. GEIGER 1941, 17, no. 256). In this formation, it seems even more likely that *balah-* reflects the infinitive; but the phonological problem that was mentioned above remains the same.

After all, we cannot exclude that the forms *balāhe*, *vannahe* and *temēhe* are based on the present participle. In this case the forms in question would have to be analysed as *\*balā-ēhe*, *\*vanna-ēhe* and *\*temē-ēhe*. From a phonological point of view, this solution would even be preferable. Furthermore, there seem to exist morphological parallels in Sinhalese (cf. 3.4.2.1) and, for the *n*-stems, in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku as well (cf. 3.4.2.3). Hence it follows that the future paradigm of the Aḍḍū-dialect probably represents a suppletive mixture of two morphologically different formations in that the 1st person singular and all persons of the plural must be derived from the infinitive while the 2nd and the 3rd person of the singular are more likely to have developed from the present participle.

The ending *-ie /-ia/*, which is identical in the 2nd and 3rd person plural, possibly represents an analogous formation based on the homophonic ending of the same persons in the finite preterite. In this case, it presupposes that the vowel *-i-* which originally was a marker of the preterite stem has been reinterpreted as a part of the ending (*beli-e* → *bel-ie*).

3.4.2. Regarding the formation of the finite future in **Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku**, there are considerable formal divergences that distinguish the three conjugation types from each other. It is impossible to find out with certainty whether we have to assume a future formation which is similar to that of literary Sinhalese, or whether it is more plausible to take the infinitive as a basis of the formation as we had proposed for Aḍḍū (cf. above). Cp. the future paradigms of the *a*-stem *balanī* in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku and its Sinhalese equivalent, *balana-* (cf. GEIGER 1938, 148):

<sup>420</sup> Cf. the German translation which is more similar: “es ist für dich/euch zu sehen”.

Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku:			
1st ps.sg.	<i>balannen(in)</i>	1st ps.pl.	<i>balannā</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>balannē / balanneyye</i>	2nd ps.pl.	<i>balannēva</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>balannen</i>	3rd ps.pl.	<i>balannenā</i>
Sinhalese:			
1st ps.sg.	<i>balannem</i>	1st ps.pl.	<i>balannemu</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>balannehi</i>	2nd ps.pl.	<i>balannāhu</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>balannē</i>	3rd ps.pl.	<i>balannō, balannāha</i>

3.4.2.1. The Sinhalese future is explained by GEIGER as a secondary formation that came about by analogy with the full form of the preterite (1938, 148): “The formation of the Future Tense corresponds to that of the preterite. The personal affixes are annexed to the inflected form of the pprs. [present participle] ... It is obvious that the future meaning of the forms ... is not primary. Originally they were to express not an action but a state of longer duration in present or in preterite time: *balannemi* means, I am (or was) one who looks, I am (or was) looking.”<sup>421</sup> In other words, GEIGER sees the basis of the formation in present participles such as *balana* “looking” or rather their substantivised, inflected variant (*balannā*, with *-nnā* ← *-niyā* or *-nuvā*, i.e. the stem of the participle enlarged by a suffix *\*-ka*).<sup>422</sup> In analogy with the 1st person of the preterite, *bāluv-em*, the future form was then built as *balann-em*.

3.4.2.2. In the **a-stems**, there is a striking phonetic similarity indeed between the singular forms of Sinhalese and those of the Dhivehi dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. It cannot be proved, however, that the formation of the future tense in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku is based on the present participle as in Sinhalese. In this case, we would have to assume that the participle was enlarged in the way GEIGER proposed for Sinhalese and, furthermore, the personal endings reflect old copula forms. This formation is not without morphological and phonological contradictions, however, which do not arise at all when we consider a derivation based on the infinitive.

3.4.2.2.1. Taking the infinitive as the basic form in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku as in Aḍḍū, the personal endings could be identified with the present forms of (M.) *annanī* which in the southern dialects has the meaning of “to go”. Cp. the paradigm of the present of this verb in modern Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku:

<sup>421</sup> For more details cf. GEIGER (1900), 78: “Die Bildung entspricht durchaus der des Prät(eritums). Wie dieses aus einer Verbindung des Part.Prät. mit dem Hilfsverbum hervorgeht, so ist das Fut(ur) eine Verbindung des ... Part.Präs. mit dem Hilfsverbum, bzw. den Personalendungen. Die 3. Sg. und Pl. entbehren wieder der Copula und sind reine Nominalformen. Auch für diese Fut.-bildung bieten die MIAV. Analogien. Zunächst bedeutet also *kapannemi* ‘ich bin welcher schneidet’ und hat von Haus aus noch keine futurale Bedeutung. In der That findet sich denn auch das sog. Fut. in der Eḷu-Litteratur als Durativ, selbst als erzählendes Tempus gebraucht.”

<sup>422</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 134 and (1900), 73.

1st ps.sg.	<i>en</i>	1st ps.pl.	<i>emā</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>eyye</i>	2nd ps.pl.	<i>ēva</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>ē ← ē̄ ← *en</i>	3rd ps.pl.	<i>etta</i>

If this assumption is right, the original meaning of F. *balannen* would be “I am going to look”.<sup>423</sup> It is a well-known typological phenomenon that verbs denoting “to go” can occur in the function of auxiliaries within future constructions (cp., e.g., French *je vais voir*).

3.4.2.2.2. On the basis of the derivation outlined above, the particular future forms of both *a*-stem and *e*-stem verbs can be explained for all persons except the 3.ps.pl., the vowel *e*-preceding the endings proper being identifiable with the present stem of the verb “to go”.<sup>424</sup> Cp. the following analysis:

1st ps.sg.	<i>balanna + en → balannen</i>	1st ps.pl.	<i>balanna + emā → *balannemā → balannā</i> (contracted)
2nd ps.sg.	<i>balanna + eyye → balanneye</i>	2nd ps.pl.	<i>balanna + ēva → balannēva</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>balanna + *en → balannen</i>	3rd ps.pl.	(cf. below)

According to this model, we would expect *\*balannetta* for the 3.ps.pl. In contrast to this, the existing form *balannenā* could have emerged by analogy after the 3.ps.sg. This would not be surprising, given that there is a common Maldivian trend for finite verbs to use the 3.ps.sg. instead of the 3.ps.pl. which has already resulted in a paradigmatic change in Māle.

3.4.2.2.3. We cannot exclude with certainty that an original construction which was based on an enlarged form of the present participle as in the Sinhalese formation mentioned above could have been reinterpreted as a combination of the normal infinitive with present forms of the verb “to go”. In Dhivehi, however, the existence of such an enlarged participle cannot be proved for any dialect, nor is it attested in the older stages of the language. Regarding the *a*- and *e*-stems, which are morphologically connected with each other, this is one more argument that speaks in favour of the derivation from an underlying infinitive construction.

3.4.2.3. The derivational process which yielded the future forms of the *n*-stems in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku is not yet clear in every detail. But it is more likely that the formation of the future tense of this very special and archaic conjugation type is based on the present participle than on the infinitive. The vowel [ē̄], which is still pronounced as a nasal vowel by the older people in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku but realised as a plain long [ā] by most part of the younger generation, corresponds exactly with the final vowel of the present participle in its short form. In contrast to that, neither the nasalised nor the long-vocalic pronunciation could be explained on the

<sup>423</sup> This derivation does not imply that the same verb might be reflected in the homophonic present endings of *e*-stem verbs.

<sup>424</sup> In the southern dialects, the present participle of this verb, corresponding with the “Māle form” *annanī*, has the long form *enī*. For the use of *annanī* in auxiliary function cf. 3.6.3.2.2, 3.11.4.6.

basis of the infinitive form, however phonetically tempting the following *-h-* might be, since in the given verbs the infinitive ending is always *-aha* (with a short *a*).

In the following list of *n*-stem verbs, the transcription shows the original pronunciation with [ā] and [ā], resp., as depending on the particular informants; the lemmatic entries are given in their “Māle form” followed by the most characteristic forms of the 1.ps.sg. future, the present participle and the infinitive as recorded in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku:<sup>425</sup>

*añdanī* 1. “to burn”; 2. “to wear (a sarong)”: F. 1.ps.sg.fut. *annāhinin*; pres.part. *annā*; inf. *annaha*.  
*bannanī* “to tie”: *bannāhinin*; *bannā*; *bannaha*.  
*innanī* “to sit; to marry, be married”: *innāhinin*; *innā*; *innaha*.  
*iñnanī* “to sit”: *iñnāhinin*; *iñnā*; *iñnaha*.  
*dannanī* “to know”: *dennāhinin*; *dennā*; (no infinitive).  
*dontanī* “to wash”: *donnāhinin*; *donnā*; *donnaha*.  
*gen gulenī* “to care for (somebody)”: *tagonāhinin*; *tagonā*; *tagonaha*.  
*gannanī* “to buy”: *gannāhinin*; *gannā*; *gannaha*.  
*hehenī* “to husk”: *sahunāhinin*; *sahunā*; *sahunaha*.  
*hunnanī* “to stand, stay, remain; be”: *hinnāhinin*; *hinnā*; *hinnaha*.  
*konnanī* “to dig”: *kaññāhinin*; *kaññā*; *kaññaha*.  
*dekenī* “to see”: *dakunāhinin*; *dakonā*; *dakonaha*.  
*kuḷenī* “to play”: *kelenāhinin*; *kelenā*; *keḷenaha*.  
*nukunnanī* “to come out”: *nukunnāhinin*; *nukunnā*; *nukunnaha*.  
*onnanī* “to lie, be there”: *onnāhinin*; (part.pres. = part.pret.) *o’/ot’*; *onnaha*.  
*oññonanī* “to lie (down)”: *veññonāhinin*; *veññonā*; *veññonaha*.  
*vannanī* “to enter”: *vannāhinin*; *vannā*; *vannaha*.  
*uḷenī* “to live; behave”: *vēññāhinin*; *vēññā*; *vēññaha*.  
*biñdanī* / *binnanī* “to pluck, break”: *binnāhinin*; *binna*; *binnaha*.

3.4.2.3.1. Whatever the diachronic basis of 3.ps.sg.fut. forms such as *vannāhin* may be, they must be analysed as forms with a “zero-ending” today. This implies that *-hin-* cannot represent a part of the ending. Comparing the forms in question from this point of view with the finite forms of the preterite and the present tense, we arrive at the conclusion that the (copula-based) personal endings of the latter categories are just the same as the endings of the future paradigm.

3.4.2.3.2. The complicated historical implications notwithstanding, we can describe the formation of the finite future forms of the *n*-stems by a simple rule: the common personal endings are added to the short form of the future participle, with the typical assimilations occurring at the morpheme boundary. Cp., e.g., *vannāhin-in*, *vannāhin-y(y)e*, *vannāhin-Ø* etc.

3.4.3. In the standard language of **Māle**, the formation of the future is very homogeneous. As in the other tenses, the set of endings underwent a maximal reduction resulting in actually two different forms, one for the 1.ps.sg. and pl. (*-an*), and another for the 2nd and 3rd ps.sg. and pl. (*-e*); these endings are agglutinated to the stem of the future participle. The only exception from this rule concerns the *a*-stems for which a special ending of the 1st and 2nd ps.pl. (*-ū*) has been preserved in the sociolect of the palace language and in the literary language, which has an archaic touch even for the native speakers of this idelect.

<sup>425</sup> For the etymology of these verbs cf. 3.9.2.2.

3.4.3.1. According to CAIN (1992, 76), “the future is formed by lengthening the final vowel of the verb root and adding *-nan ...* and *-ne ...*”. Although this rule does not correspond with the historical development, it may well be taken as a guideline for building the correct forms synchronically.

3.4.3.2. With no doubt, the future participle of northern Dhivehi is based on the infinitive which emerged from the analytical dative of the MIA verbal noun. In the early written documents of Dhivehi, there are two finite future forms attested which can be taken as an unambiguous proof supporting the data of the modern language. These forms, which belong to the verb *lianī* “to write”, deserve a particular interest because they occur in a combination with the verb *uḷenī* “to live, be (there)” which is still used as an auxiliary today (cf. 3.11.4.7). The two forms in question are *liyāt-uḷemā* (RB 1,10, with its spelling variant *liyās-uḷemā* in RC 9,1 and 10,1) and *liās-uḷemā-ve* (RA 2,2). *liyāt/ś* is the most ancient attestation of the infinitive of *lianī* we dispose of (cf. 3.6.3.2.1.2). *ul-emā* represents an archaic variant of the 1.ps.pl.pres. of the *e*-stem verb *uḷenī* which in Māle became obsolete already at an early time; in Modern Addū, however, the corresponding forms are completely regular even today.<sup>426</sup> The final *-ve* occurring in the second example is a sandhi variant of the quotation particle *eve* which is still used in the modern standard language (cf. 5.4).

3.4.3.2.1. The origin of the finite future of the modern standard language must as well be seen in the infinitive (in an allophonic variant with final *-ān* or *-ēn*) which developed from the original dative in *-ās* ← *-āt* (cf. 3.6.3.2.1.2). This analysis presupposes that the *-n* occurring in the future is a reflex of the old dative ending *-t* in prevocalic position which in final position developed into a glottal stop [ʔ]. The first and, at the same time, only attestation of a finite future form of the modern type in Old Dhivehi texts is represented in a (causative) verb of the 2nd/3rd honorific degree, viz. *kuravvānem* “I shall build” (lit. “I shall cause to build”; F3,11).

3.4.3.2.2. The future formation on the basis of the infinitive to which the personal endings are added exhibits a high degree of typologic and genetic conformity between the standard language and the dialect of Addū (except for the 2nd and 3rd ps.sg.fut., cf. 3.4.1).

### 3.5. The imperative

Like Sinhalese,<sup>427</sup> Dhivehi shows several formations that are used to express jussive and hortative meanings. Besides the imperative proper, which is comparatively homogeneous in its form throughout the Maldives, there are also some peculiar secondary formations which differ from dialect to dialect. While the inherited imperative still is a productive category in all dialects of Dhivehi, its counterpart in Modern Sinhalese occurs only in the literary language. This restriction must be considered as one of the main reasons why in Sinhalese other verbal forms, in particular the infinitive or the lemmatic form ending in *-navā* (the so-

<sup>426</sup> In Addū, however, the verb in question is not *uḷenī* but *vēñdenī*; cf. also 3.2.3.

<sup>427</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 149 ff.; (1900), 78 f.; (1942), 48 ff. / (1973), 605 ff.

called “basic verbal form”), are most frequently used when a jussive meaning is to be expressed today. Functional changes of this kind can also be found in Dhivehi but the role they play within the system of jussive constructions is comparatively marginal.

3.5.1. The inherited imperative of Dhivehi corresponds to a high degree with that of literary Sinhalese; cp. the following table which shows the imperative forms of the *a*-stems:

imperative: <i>a</i> -stems	Addū	Fua' Mulaku	Māle	Sinhalese
2nd ps.sg.	<i>bala</i>	<i>bala</i>	<i>balā</i>	<i>bala</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>balau</i>	<i>balau</i>	<i>balā</i>	<i>balav</i>
1st ps.pl. (cohortative)	<i>balamā</i>	<i>balamā</i>	<i>balamā</i>	<i>balamha</i>

3.5.1.1. As GEIGER demonstrated, the form of the 2.ps.sg. imperative in Sinhalese, which must be derived from the MIA imperative, shows a formal identity with the pure present stem in all conjugation types.<sup>428</sup> Besides this, Sinhalese has a concurrent form of the 2.ps.sg. imperative which is enlarged by an ending *-va*, in the older literature also by a variant *-ga* which GEIGER left unexplained. This formation (for which cp. Sinh. *balava* = *bala* “look!”) seems to have no parallel in Dhivehi. Considering the final *-v* of the 2nd person plural in Sinhalese, GEIGER stated: “In Pl. 2 a form in *-va* occurs in older books ... It is hardly dubious that the suffix *-va*, *-v* corresponds to the old *-tha* and that there is only a difference of spelling between it and the suff. *-hu*, *-vu* of pres. pl. 2.”<sup>429</sup> The form of the cohortative is identical with the first person plural of the present tense.<sup>430</sup> All these rules concerning Sinhalese are also true for the corresponding forms of the conservative Dhivehi dialects spoken in the Southern Maldives.

3.5.1.2. In Māle, some details have changed as against this because of the extensive formal simplifications of the personal endings. Thus, the cohortative is preserved in its old form, but there is no more formal correspondence with the 1.ps.pl. of the present (cf. 3.2). The quantity of the final *-a* of the cohortative fluctuates; the occasional lengthening of the vowel seems to imply emphatic usage. Within the imperative pattern, the form of the 2.ps.pl. was adapted to that of the 2.ps.sg., the latter being formally identical with the 2nd and 3rd ps. of the present-indicative (cf. ib.). It cannot be decided whether this change which has affected all verbs of Modern Standard Dhivehi today, was brought about by a functional extension of the 2.ps.sg. pres.<sup>431</sup> or whether there are some other reasons responsible for it as well. Concerning this question the written documents of Old Dhivehi are not informative at all because they do not contain any imperative forms.

<sup>428</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 149 and (1900), 78.

<sup>429</sup> GEIGER (1938), 149-150; cf. also (1900), 78 and (1916), 108 f.

<sup>430</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 150.

<sup>431</sup> Cp. German “*Du machst das!*” expressing an imperative meaning.

3.5.1.3. The formation of the imperative of the other conjugations follows the same principles as that of the *a*-stems as the following tables show:

imperative: <i>n</i> -stems	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
2nd ps.sg.	<i>vanu / vadu</i>	<i>vaṅḍi</i>	<i>vadē</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>vadu</i>	<i>vaṅḍiu</i>	<i>vadē</i>
1st ps.pl. (cohortative)	<i>vadumā</i>	<i>vaṅḍima</i>	<i>vannama</i>

imperative: <i>e</i> -stems	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
2nd ps.sg.	<i>teme</i>	<i>(temī gan)</i>	<i>temē</i>
2nd ps.pl.	<i>temeu</i>	<i>(temī gaṅḍu)</i>	<i>temē</i>
1st ps.pl. (cohortative)	<i>tememā</i>	<i>tememā ?</i>	<i>tememā</i>

3.5.1.4. A prohibitive (negated imperative) is produced by means of the element M. *nu-* / A.F. *ni-* which is prefixed to the forms in question; cf. also 5.5.2.1.

3.5.1.5. *hiṅgā*, the 2nd person imperative form of M. *hiṅganī* “to walk”, is sometimes added as a facultative auxiliary element to cohortative forms; cp., e.g., M. *nukunnama (hiṅgā)* “Let’s go out!”; M. *iṣinnama (hiṅgā)* “Let’s sit down!”; A. *siṭī lēma (hiṅga)* “Let’s write letters!” On the other hand, *damā* which is the imperative of *damanī* “to pull”,<sup>432</sup> can be added to the cohortative of *hiṅganī*; cp. M. *hiṅgama damā* “Let’s go (for a walk)!”.

### 3.5.2. The infinitive in jussive function

3.5.2.1. In Sinhalese, as a matter of principle, all forms of the infinitive (cf. 3.6.1.) can be used in jussive function. GEIGER (1938, 150) demonstrates this rule with the sentence “Tell him this circumstance!”, *mē bava ohu-ṭa kiyan / kiyanu / kiyanna / kiyaṅṭa / kiyannaṭa!*, lit. “this circumstance (direct case) [is] to be told to him (dative)”. In this constellation it makes no syntactical and, obviously, no semantical difference whether the infinitive appears in the dative case or not. The dative of the infinitive (type *kiyannaṭa*) is still used in Modern Sinhalese as a form expressing a polite demand (cf., e.g., MATZEL 1983, 26).<sup>433</sup>

3.5.2.2. In Dhivehi, the infinitive can be used in jussive function as well. However, the peculiar developments characterising the situation in Dhivehi do not match exactly what we

<sup>432</sup> Etymologically, *damanī* corresponds to Sinh. *damanavā*; cf. GEIGER (1902), 914, no. 61; cf. also 3.11.2.2.

<sup>433</sup> Concerning this, cf. also GEIGER’s statement on the same example in (1942), 31 / (1973), 588, in this case only containing the dative of the infinitive: “Eine Ellipse ist anzunehmen, wenn in der V(olks)sprache der dativische Infinitiv als Imperativ gebraucht wird. Es ist ‘ich bitte,’ zu ergänzen. ... *mē bava ohuṭa kiyaṅṭa (kiyannaṭa)*, teile ihm die Sache mit!” The given sentence is elliptical only with respect to the copula which does not exist in the modern language.

find in Sinhalese. Furthermore, there are considerable differences between the two main Maldivian dialect groups.

3.5.2.2.1. For southern Dhivehi, only a few infinitive forms are attested in a clear jussive function, all of them occurring in indirect speech. In all these cases, in Aḍḍū as well as in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the infinitive is syntactically connected with the absolutive form A. *kei*, F. *kē* (M. *kianī* “to say, speak”), as the following two parallel examples taken from dialectal variants of the same fairy tale (T1, 8) show:

- A. *boñḍanā beṇaḥī, boñḍa āše veṣionna<sup>3</sup> kei*. “The b.-bird said, he should lie down on the big table”, lit. “The b.-bird said, telling (him) to lie down on the big table.”  
 F. *beṇā beṇi-ai, boñḍo aṣi matte veṣiōnnaha kē*. “Saying [this], he said, telling (him) to lie down on the big table.”

3.5.2.2.2. In **Māle**, the infinitive can be found in jussive function, too, but only within a special formation which presumably represents an original combination of a dative infinitive and an old imperative of *annanī* “to go”, \**e*, which is obsolete in the modern colloquial language of the capital but still occurs in southern Dhivehi.<sup>434</sup> Without a further remark, GEIGER (1919, 89 and 97) mentioned a few forms of this type which express a jussive meaning, viz. *nu marāše* “Do not kill!” (*maranī* “to kill”) and *annāṣē* (sic, for *annāṣe*) “Come!” (*annanī* “to come”).<sup>435</sup>

From a synchronic point of view, the authors of HLSD (1988, 69) and, obviously following them, CAIN (1992) interpret the final *-še* as a separate infinitive suffix; cf. HLSD (1988, 68): “In classical Divehi, the suffix ‘še’ has also been used, particularly in poetic writing.” The example given there must be understood as a demand asking God for a son: “... *firihen kujjā devvaše!* (sic, for *devvāše*) ‘.. please give me a male child!’” The verbal form *devvāše* signals a high honorific level, being morphologically marked as a double causative formation (cf. 3.2.1.1.1.).

For the meaning of these imperative forms in the modern language cf. CAIN (1992, 104): “In terms of usage, this form is common in instructions in school books, etc. But, in spoken speech it is regarded as impolite and very forceful. Sometimes *-še* forms are used when command is repeated.”

### 3.5.3. Imperatives with the suffix *-ti*

The standard language of Māle has a particular imperative form expressing an order which has to be accomplished in the future, a so-called “posterior imperative”; cf. CAIN (1992, 106): “... Dhivehi features a way in verb inflections of commanding someone to do something in the more distant future, the *-ti* future imperative suffix.” DE SILVA sees the main function of the suffix *-ti* in prohibitive utterances (1970b, 152-3): “In negative imperative sentences, Maldivian makes a distinction between the prohibition of actions already begun and the prohibition of actions not yet begun.” According to DE SILVA, the form *nukañḍātī!* “Do not cut!” has the meaning of “Do not do what you plan to do (on some future occa-

<sup>434</sup> For the analysis of these formations and for some more examples cf. 3.6.3.2.2, 3.11.4.6.

<sup>435</sup> The other forms GEIGER (ib.) noted are probably not correct; for more extensive information cf. 3.6.3.2.2.

sion)” while *nukañḍā!*, translated by him with “Do not cut!” as well, expresses the demand to stop an action that has already begun.

3.5.3.1. DE SILVA explains the difference between the two forms as an aspectual one, the suffix *-ti* operating as a marker of the imperfective aspect. “This is comparable to the perfective and imperfective distinction in the imperfective mood in languages like Russian, but not identical from the point of view of the total meaning.” The semantic side of DE SILVA’s argumentation may be convincing but the comparison with the verbal aspect of Russian is completely unfounded.<sup>436</sup> The actual difference rather consists in a formal distinction between an “inhibitive” and a “preventive” mood as in the case of the injunctive present and the injunctive aorist in the Vedic period of OIA. According to Karl HOFFMANN, “the difference between an inhibitive and a preventive sentence consists in the question (which in most cases is objectively provable) whether a prohibited action has already begun (inhibitive) or whether it has to be expected for the future (preventive).”<sup>437</sup>

3.5.3.2. DE SILVA also provided an etymological explanation of the suffix which he considered to be a Dravidic borrowing: “The imperfective affix *-ti* is lexically similar to the futurity affix *-ti* known in Dravidian, and may be explained as a Dravidian borrowing” (ib., 153). This assumption has to be rejected, however, given that the borrowing of flectional elements is typologically highly improbable. On the other hand, there is no offhand derivation from an Indo-Aryan basis for this suffix either; in particular, we can neither exclude nor prove that the suffix *-ti* might be related to the noun M. *eti* “thing” which most likely reflects a petrified form of the copula, approximately meaning “(that what) is” (cp. Sinh. *āti* “it is”, Pa. *atthi*, Skt. *asti*; cf. 3.11.2.4.).

3.5.3.3. The formation of the *ti*-imperative remains as unclear as the derivation of the ending itself. It is certain, however, that *-ti* cannot be suffixed directly to the basic form of the imperative as form doublets like *balāti* / *balā* “look!”, *govāti* / *govā* “call!” etc. might suggest. Pairs such as *kurāti* vs. *kurē* “do!”, *bunāti* vs. *bunē* “speak!”, *kāti* vs. *kē* “eat!”, *dāti* vs. *dē* “go!” etc. prove that the given formation is not necessarily based on the imperative proper. The rule given by CAIN according to which “this suffix is added to the verb root with the final vowel of the verb root lengthened” may be taken as a synchronic statement but it does not take the historical background of the formation into account.

3.5.3.4. The formation with *-ti* is confined to North Dhivehi. There are no traces of comparable imperative formations in the southern dialects. Its use may be illustrated by the following examples:<sup>438</sup>

<sup>436</sup> In Russian, a general or very strict prohibition is expressed by the negated form of the imperfective imperative while the negated perfective imperative is used for the expression of anxious warnings or cautious acts of prohibitions. Cf., e.g., E. TAUSCHER – E.G. KIRSCHBAUM, *Grammatik der russischen Sprache*. 10. Aufl., Düsseldorf 1974, 306 f.

<sup>437</sup> “Der Unterschied zwischen Inhibitivsatz und Präventivsatz beruht auf der meist objektiv feststellbaren Gelegenheit, daß die verbotene Handlung sich bereits im Verlauf befindet (Inhibitiv) oder daß sie erst für die Zukunft erwartet wird (Präventiv).” Cf. Karl HOFFMANN, *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg 1967, 44.

<sup>438</sup> The sentences and their translation are taken from ZUHAIR (1991). The respective page numbers are noted at the end of each example.

M. *bēs kāti!* (69) “Take (lit. ‘eat’) the medicine!” — *avas kurāti!* (48) “Be (lit. ‘do’) quick!” — *heñdunu uñdagū nu-kurāti!* (58) “Don’t disturb in the morning!” (*uñdagū kuranī* “to disturb”).

### 3.5.4. Periphrastic imperative formations

Apart from the imperative forms described above, there are several periphrastic formations in Dhivehi that express jussive meanings. The formations in question differ from region to region, some of them also representing different degrees of politeness or urgency.

#### 3.5.4.1. Form and function of periphrastic imperatives in Māle

The northern dialect area of Dhivehi shows a well-developed system of imperative formations that are based on a combination of finite verbs and special absolutive forms.<sup>439</sup> As usual, the first part of these formations consists of the main verb occurring in the form of an absolutive; the auxiliary verb appears as the finite member of the combination.

3.5.4.1.1. In the standard language, there are basically two verbs that are regularly used for building complex imperatives, viz. *balanī* “to look” (imperative *balā*) and *denī* “to give” (imperative *dī*). Astonishingly enough, neither of these verbs occurs otherwise in auxiliary function. As the following examples show, *dī* and *balā* can occur separately as imperatives but also combined with each other; in the latter case, the absolutive *dī*<sup>440</sup> is, as a rule, followed by the imperative *balā*. The imperatives that are built with *balā* indicate urgency; they are used towards people belonging to the same or to a lower social degree in comparison with the speaker.<sup>441</sup> A less strict order is expressed by *dī*. As example (8) below illustrates, *devvā* can be used as an imperative of *devvanī* (2nd / 3rd degree of *denī*) in the same sense, differing from *dī* only in the degree of politeness. Sentences with *devvā* thus express polite demands and requests, regardless of the social position of the addressee.

3.5.4.1.2. For the use of the periphrastic imperatives, cp. the following examples:<sup>442</sup>

(1) *e siñi vaige magun fonuvālā dī!* (57)

<i>e</i>	<i>siñi</i>	<i>vaige</i>	<i>magun</i>	<i>fonuvālā</i>	<i>dī!</i>
that	letter	of air	by way	sending	give!
dem.pron.	noun	noun	noun	verb+aux.	aux.
attr.	nom./obl.	gen.sg.	abl.sg.	abs.II	impv.

“Send that letter by air mail!”

<sup>439</sup> For the formation and function of the absolutive cf. 3.10.

<sup>440</sup> In North Dhivehi, the absolutive *dī* is homophonous with the imperative; cf. 3.10.4.

<sup>441</sup> Cf. also CAIN (1992), 104, who, from a purely synchronic view, interprets *-bala* (sic) as a simple “imperative suffix”.

<sup>442</sup> All the examples noted here are taken from ZUHAIR (1991), the respective page numbers being mentioned at the end of the sentences. ZUHAIR’s transcription has been adapted to that of the present grammar. Misprints have been corrected without further notice.

(2) *mi siṭṭige baru vazan ko' dī balā!* (57)

<i>mi</i>	<i>siṭṭige</i>	<i>baru</i>	<i>vazan</i>	<i>ko'</i>	<i>dī</i>	<i>balā!</i>
this	of letter	weight	weight	making	giving	look!
dem.pron.	noun	noun	noun	+ verb <sup>443</sup>	aux.	aux.
attr.	genitive	obl.	obl.	abs.	abs.	impv.

“Find out the weight of this letter!”

(3) *mi ahanna' kiālā dī balā!* (68)

<i>mi</i>	<i>ahanna'</i>	<i>kiālā</i>	<i>dī</i>	<i>balā!</i>
this	to me	reading aloud	giving	look
dem.pron.	pers.pron. 3rd degree	verb+aux.	aux.	aux.
obj.	dat.	abs.II	abs.	impv.

“Read this for me!”

(4) *ahanna' goṇḍie' genes dī!* (64)

<i>ahanna'</i>	<i>goṇḍie'</i>	<i>genes</i>	<i>dī!</i>
to me	chair a	bringing	give
pers.pron. 3rd degree	noun-num.	verb+aux.	aux.
dat.	obj.indef.	abs.	impv.

“Bring me a chair!”

(5) *aharennā' fenfode' genes dī balā!* (58)

<i>aharennā'</i>	<i>fen</i>	<i>fode'</i>	<i>genes</i>	<i>dī</i>	<i>balā!</i>
to me	water	drop a	bringing	giving	look
pers.pron. 3rd degree	noun	noun	verb+aux.	aux.	aux.
dat.	obl.	obj. indef.	abs.	abs.	impv.

“Bring me some (lit. ‘a drop of’) water!”

(6) *koṭarita' dakkālā dī balā!* (51)

<i>koṭarita'</i>	<i>dakkālā</i>	<i>dī</i>	<i>balā!</i>
the rooms	showing	giving	look
noun-pl.	verb+aux.	aux.	aux.
obj.	abs.II	abs.	impv.

“Show (me) the rooms!”

(7) *huṭṭālā dī!* (50)

<i>huṭṭālā</i>	<i>dī!</i>
stopping	give
verb+aux.	aux.
abs.II	impv.

“Stop, please!”

(8) *e dakkālā devvā!* (55)

<i>e</i>	<i>dakkālā</i>	<i>devvā!</i>
that	showing	give
dem.pron.	verb aux.	aux. 2nd degree
obj.	abs.II	impv.

“Show that, please!”

<sup>443</sup> *vazan kuranī* “to weigh”, lit. “to make weight”, is a complex verb the first part of which consists of the Arab. noun *wazn* “weight”.

3.5.4.2. Another auxiliary verb that occurs in a periphrastic imperative formation in Dhivehi can only be explained by considering its Sinhalese equivalent.

3.5.4.2.1. In Sinhalese, the formation of imperatives by means of auxiliary verbs is a very common feature indeed, although the majority of the verbs that are used in this function is not the same as in Dhivehi. Thus, *balanavā* “to look” and *denavā* “to give” are not used as auxiliary verbs. As GEIGER argued,<sup>444</sup> the periphrastic imperatives of Sinhalese are mainly built with the following auxiliary verbal forms: sg. *-pan* / pl. *-pallā*, sg. *-yan* / pl. *-yallā*, sg. *-piya(va)* / pl. *-piyav*. The latter form is the regular imperative of *piyanu*, a verb with the basic meaning “to put” which in auxiliary function adds the semantical nuance of the definitive “conclusion or completeness of an action”<sup>445</sup> to the main verb. In *-yan* GEIGER (1900, 78) sees the imperative of *yanu* “go”. Although the derivation of *-pan* from *-piyan* as proposed by GEIGER (1938, 150) yields certain phonological problems, it remains very probable. The same author’s argument that the variant *-panna*, which occurs alongside the form *-pan*, suggests that we are dealing with infinitives with an “imperative” (jussive) meaning here, is highly convincing.<sup>446</sup> For the use of *-piya* etc. as imperative auxiliaries cp. the following examples:

S. *balāpiya* / *balāpiyav* “look!” (sg./pl.), *dīpiya* / *dīpiyav* “give!” (sg./pl.), *kiyāpiya* / *kiyāpiyav* “speak!” (sg./pl.); *balāpan* / *balāpallā* “look!” (sg./pl.), *dīpan* / *dīpallā* “give!” (sg./pl.), *kiyāpan* / *kiyāpallā* “speak!” (sg./pl.); *diyan* / *diyallā* “give!” (sg./pl.)<sup>447</sup>

3.5.4.2.2. Regarding the choice of auxiliary verbs that are used for the formation of periphrastic imperatives, Sinhalese and Standard Dhivehi differ from each other in many respects. There is a common feature, however, in the complex imperative constructions in North Dhivehi which obviously correspond with the Sinh. formations using the auxiliary *-pan*. In polite demands, the sequence of a main verb in absolutive form and the auxiliary absolutive *dī* is often completed by an element *-fānan* the original meaning of which has been forgotten in the modern language. Actually, *-fānan* must be regarded as a petrified finite future form which, besides the basic meaning of “completing an action”, has the function of a formal “mark of politeness”. The 1.ps.sg. *dakkāfānan* “I shall show” which in the literary style is used synonymously with the primary future form *dakkānan*, represents a relic form of a (previously) regular periphrastic future formation built by means of *\*fianī* (the same holds true for the other personal forms of the type *dakkāfānan*). For syntactic reasons, the form *-fānan*, when occurring in a jussive context, has to be considered as a 2.ps.sg. future, although this does not agree with its morphological shape (cf. 3.4.3.1.). The form *-fānu* probably represents an archaic form of the 2.ps.pl.; in the given example (cf. (3) below), the elevated style is also expressed by the question particle of the 2nd degree, *-to*.<sup>448</sup> Neither in the modern literary language nor in Old Dhivehi is *\*fianī* attested as an independent verb. In the

<sup>444</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 78 and (1938), 150; cf. also MATZEL (1983), 103.

<sup>445</sup> “... einen Abschluß oder eine Vollständigkeit der Handlung ...”; cf. GEIGER (1900), 83.

<sup>446</sup> “.. da neben *-pan* auch *-panna* vorkommt, könnte es sich um Infinitive mit imperativischer Bedeutung handeln.” Cf. GEIGER (1942), 49 / (1973), 606 and also GUNASEKARA (1891), 201.

<sup>447</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1942), 49 / (1973), 606 and (1938), 150 as well as MATZEL (1983), 103. GEIGER derives the plural forms *-pallā* and *-yallā* from *-pan-lā* and *-yan-lā*; for the formation cf. GEIGER (1900), 78.

<sup>448</sup> Cf. 3.4.3, and, for more extensive information, 3.15.3.

function of an auxiliary, however, it still plays an important role in the whole Dhivehi speaking area.<sup>449</sup>

3.5.4.2.3. The following sentences illustrate the use of polite imperative forms with *-fan-* in the standard language:<sup>450</sup>

(1) *e hen hoṭale<sup>o</sup> bune dī fānan ta?* (51)

<i>e</i>	<i>hen</i>	<i>hoṭale<sup>o</sup></i>	<i>bune</i>	<i>dī</i>	<i>fānan</i>	<i>ta?</i>
that	way	hotel a	saying	giving	will you finish	?
dem.pron.	noun	noun	verb	aux.	verb	quest.-particle, 1st degree
attr.	obl.	obj.indef.	abs.	abs.	2.ps.sg.fut.	

“Would you please recommend another hotel?”

(2) *adi e<sup>o</sup> faharu – balālā dī fānan ta?* (57)

<i>adi</i>	<i>e<sup>o</sup></i>	<i>faharu</i>	<i>balālā</i>	<i>dī</i>	<i>fānan</i>	<i>ta?</i>
again	one	time	looking	giving	will you finish	?
conj.	num.	noun	verb-aux.	aux.	verb	quest.-particle, 1st degree
	attr.	obl.	abs.II	abs.	2.ps.sg.fut.	

“Would you please look once more?”

(3) *mi hama mihāru fonuvālā dī fānu to?* (58)

<i>mi</i>	<i>hama</i>	<i>mihāru</i>	<i>fonuvālā</i>	<i>dī</i>	<i>fānu</i>	<i>to?</i>
this	just	at this time	sending	giving	will you finish	?
dem.pron.	adv.	adv.	verb-aux	aux.	verb	quest.-particle, 2nd degree
obj.			abs.II	abs.	2.ps.pl.fut.	

“Would you please send this just now?”

### 3.5.4.3. Polite forms of the imperative in Aḍḍū

In the dialect of Aḍḍū, there are several formal possibilities to express an order or a demand in a more polite way as well. Apart from the normal imperative, there exist three more hierarchic degrees of politeness, all of them consisting of a main verb in the form of an absolutive and the finite form of an auxiliary verb. All in all, this yields a fourfold system expressing nuances from a strict command up to a very polite request. These nuances of politeness are completely independent from the social status of the addressee, they have nothing in common with the honorific degrees characterising the language of Māle.

3.5.4.3.1. The use of auxiliaries in building polite imperatives exhibits a strict system without any variation. It seems that this system of imperative forms exists only in Aḍḍū.

<sup>449</sup> Cf. furthermore 3.11.4.1. — The verb in question is probably attested as part of the forms *dinpanti* (L5 5/2,3) and *lipanti* (IDMHM 4,22), both of them written in *Dives akuru*, and *lifanti* (RA 2,8; RC 9,6) written in *Tāna*. Obviously, *din-* and *lī-* represent the preterite participles of *deni* “give” and *lianī* “write”, resp.; the ending *-ti* still being unclear, the two verbal forms cannot be fully analysed. Possibly, *-ti* can be connected with the homophone imperative suffix (cf. 3.5.3).

<sup>450</sup> The sentences are taken from ZUHAIR (1991) again (cf. above).

A 2nd degree of politeness is characterised in the 2.ps.sg. and pl. by the suffixes *-fele* and *-feleu*, resp., which are added to a shortened variant of the absolutive of the main verb. Presumably, these forms are originally imperatives of the auxiliary verb *\*fianī*, too, which in Aḍḍū, as in the other atolls, is only preserved as a formant of the “absolutive I” (cf. 3.11.4.1) and of the “preterite I” (cf. 3.11.4.1). The formation of the imperative forms cannot yet be explained in detail, however.

The imperative of a 3rd degree of politeness consists of the absolutive of a main verb in its full form, combined with the absolutive of the auxiliary *denī* “to give”, *dere*, and again *-fele* / *-feleu*.

The imperative of a 4th degree of politeness is built on the unshortened absolutive of a main verb in combination with *dīṣī*, the question form of the potential (cf. 3.15.1.3.5) of the auxiliary *denī*; the meaning of *dīṣī* is approximately “could/would you please ...”.

3.5.4.3.2. The following examples may suffice to demonstrate the distinction of the four different levels of politeness in Aḍḍū, the basic meaning being the same throughout:

1st degree: <i>dōṇi bala!</i>	“Look after the boat!”
2nd degree: <i>dōṇi balafele!</i>	“Please look after the boat!”
3rd degree: <i>dōṇi balai derefele!</i>	“Would you please look after the boat?”
4th degree: <i>dōṇi balai dīṣī!</i>	“Would you please be kind enough to look after the boat?”

### 3.6. The infinitive

3.6.1. In his “Grammar of the Sinhalese Language”, GEIGER gives an extended description of the Sinhalese infinitive forms used in the different periods of the literary language.<sup>451</sup> He derives all of these forms from the OIA/MIA verbal noun with the suffix *-ana-* or *-anaka-* (the latter form enlarged with the suffix *-ka-*). Concerning conjugations I and III (*a-* and *e-*stems), GEIGER distinguishes four different formation types which are partly connected with each other; conjugation II (*i-*stems) is characterised by a special formation, however.

3.6.1.1. An example from the *a*-conjugation may illustrate the four infinitive types of Sinhalese. As shown by GEIGER (1938, 162), the verb *balanavā* “to look” distinguishes all four infinitives described above: (1) *balan*, going back to the MIA acc.sg. *\*bhalanam*; (2) *balanu* which has to be derived from the same form enlarged by *-ka-*, *\*bhalanakam*; (3) *balanṭa*, the regular dative case of *balan*, with its more archaic variant *balanṭa*, the origin of which is seen by GEIGER in MIA *\*bhalanattam*;<sup>452</sup> and (4) the infinitive *balannaṭa* which represents a dative form of *balanu* according to GEIGER again who derives the infinitive ending *-annaṭ(a)* (attested since the 9th/10th century A.D.) via an uncontracted preform *-anuvāṭa* (attested in the older literature as well) from MIA *\*-anakattam* (← OIA *-anaka-* + *ārtham* “aim”, cf. 2.3.1.1.3).

<sup>451</sup> GEIGER (1938), 162 f.; cf. also (1900), 75.

<sup>452</sup> For the dative ending *-ta* going back to *\*attam*, cf. GEIGER (1900), 62.

3.6.1.2. Following GEIGER, there is an even more archaic infinitive formation in Sinhalese which uses the suffix *-nā*. This formation is frequently attested in inscriptions datable between the 10th and 12th centuries A.D., but it survived only as a relic form of some verbs belonging to the 2nd conjugation; cp., e.g., *vadnā* “to enter”. GEIGER supposes “that the inf. in *-nā* is derived from the dat. c. in *-āya* of the verbal noun. Forms such as *dassanāya*, *karanāya* etc. are used as infinitives also in Pali. This *-āya* must become *-aya*, *-ay*, *-ā*” (1938, 163).

3.6.2. Given this colourful picture, the question arises to what extent the infinitive forms of Dhivehi are connected with those of Sinhalese. As already claimed by GEIGER (1919, 79), there is no doubt at all that the origin of the infinitive formations in Dhivehi must be the same as in Sinhalese. Thus, the central problem consists in the question whether the infinitives of the Maldivian dialects go back to only one prototype or whether they represent heterogeneous formations, corresponding with the different infinitive types of Sinhalese. In this respect, we are mostly concerned with the peculiarities of the *a*- and *e*-stem verbs.

### 3.6.3. The infinitive of the *a*-stems

The following table illustrates the regular formation of infinitives of *a*-stem verbs in the dialects of Dhivehi:

Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
<i>balā<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>balanna</i>	<i>balan</i>

#### 3.6.3.1. Addū

In the dialect of Addū, the formation of the infinitive is unproblematical and transparent. Without any doubt, the *a*-stem infinitives go back to a form in *\*-anaṭa* corresponding with the more archaic form of the Sinhalese infinitive *balanaṭa* (mentioned as (3) in 3.6.1.1), which is based on a MIA quasi-dative containing *\*-aṭṭham* ← OIA *ārtham* (acc.sg. “aim”, cf. 2.3.1.1.3). The phonological development resulting in the actual forms can be traced back as follows: A. *balā<sup>3</sup>* ← *balās(a)* ← *\*balāṭ(a)* ← *\*balanaṭa* (*bala-* “to look”, *kerā<sup>3</sup>* ← *kerās(a)* ← *\*k(V)rāṭ(a)* ← *\*k(V)ranaṭa* (*k(V)ra-* “to do, make”). The immediate predecessors of *balā<sup>3</sup>* and *kerā<sup>3</sup>*, viz. *balās(a)* and *kerās(a)*, are still preserved in another context in that they regularly occur in the function of interrogative forms of the infinitive (cf. 3.15.1.3.6). Besides that, the same forms serve as the basis of the future formation in Addū (cf. 3.4.1).

#### 3.6.3.2. Māle

On the basis of only a few examples of infinitives in the standard language that were known to him, GEIGER stated (1919, 79): “In Maldivian, ..., the infinitive ends in *-ani* (perhaps written *-eni*), more frequently *-āni*, *-ēni*. These forms doubtless correspond to the S. *-anu*, *-enu*, and, like them, go back to the verbal forms in *-ana* of Pāli. Short end vowels, which are still preserved in the Sinhalese ..., appear, according to the law of sound, to fall off in Maldivian.” Obviously, GEIGER identified the formant in question with that of the Sinhalese infinitive type in *-anu* mentioned as (2) in 3.6.1.1 above. In the same paragraph, however, he noted that

“examples of the use of the infinitive in our texts are *kurān* ... = S. *karāṇta* ‘in order to make’; as well as *bahān* ... = S. *bedāṇta* ‘to divide’ ...” It seems that GEIGER suggested a double origin of the infinitive without stating this explicitly. The spelling of the infinitive ending with a long vowel can probably be explained by assuming a lengthened stem vowel in the infinitives of the *a*- and *e*-stems at that time. In the modern pronunciation such a lengthening is not usual. It remains unclear whether the long-vocalic variant of the infinitive ending as noted by GEIGER is the phonematic reflex of a morphological difference or whether this is the result of a sporadic, perhaps emphatic lengthening.

3.6.3.2.1. It seems that the infinitive in *-an* of the modern standard language represents an amalgam of two originally distinct forms. Thus, the infinitive *balan* “to look” can basically be derived in two different ways which do not exclude but complete each other.

3.6.3.2.1.1. With all probability, “*balan* 1” developed immediately from the verbal noun in *-ana*. As there are no intermediate stages attested in Old Dhivehi, we cannot decide whether “*balan* 1” corresponds with Sinh. *balan* ← MIA *\*bhalanaṃ* (cf. infinitive (1) in 3.6.1.1), with Sinh. *balanu* ← *\*bhalanakaṃ* (infinitive (2) in 3.6.1.1), or perhaps with both formations.

3.6.3.2.1.2. Historical reasons and interdialectal comparisons lead to the conclusion that there exists a homophonous form “*balan* 2” which has to be derived as *balan* ← *balān* ← *\*balās* ← *\*balāt* ← *\*balāta* ← *\*balanata*. It is obvious that the basis of this form is the quasi-dative of a MIA verbal noun. The corresponding infinitive in Sinhalese is *balan(a)ta* (cf. infinitive (3) in 3.6.1.1). If it is true that this second *balan* of North Dhivehi has developed from an older *balān*, it must have been phonetically adapted to the other infinitive type mentioned before. “*balan* 2” would thus represent a direct parallel of the Addū infinitive *balā*<sup>7</sup>, although these two forms seem not to be easily identifiable with each other from a purely synchronic point of view.

3.6.3.2.1.3. The written documents of Old Dhivehi show two attestations of the infinitive here treated as “*balan* 2”, in its earlier form ending in *-ās*; in both cases, the form in question is *liās* “to write” (as against modern M. *lian*). The final consonant remained unchanged in these cases because it is combined with an auxiliary verb with an initial vowel (thus yielding a finite future, cf. 3.4.3.2); the combinations in question are *liyāt/ś-ulemā* and *liās-ulemā-ve* “we shall write”.

3.6.3.2.2. Within a special syntactic construction, the final (dative) ending *-ś* of the infinitive has been preserved up to the present day. This is true for the comparatively rarely attested forms in *-śe* which occur as infinitives and imperatives (cf. 3.5.2.2.2). HLSD treats *-śe* as a special “suffix” in the formation of these two categories.<sup>453</sup> From a historical point of view, however, this is rather the old infinitive ending preserved before a following vowel which in the given case is best explained as a petrified imperative form of the verb M. *annanī* “to come” / A. *enī* “to go, come”, given that an equivalent of this form can be found in the southern dialects. In Addū, *e* is still preserved in prohibitive environments; cp., e.g., *gē<sup>7</sup> ni e!*

<sup>453</sup> HLSD (1988), 68-70. Cf. also CAIN (1992), 104: “Imperatives that take the *-śe* lengthen the final vowel of the verb root and add the suffix.”

“Don’t go home!”, contrasting with the prefixed form of the same verb appearing in the positive order, *gē’ bai!* “Go home!”. Thus, *M. balāše* can be analysed as a combination of the infinitive *balās-* and an imperative form *\*e* with the literal meaning of “Go (in order) to look!”. Within the *a-* and *e-*stems, this type of formation is still productive.

Apart from the infinitives in *-an/-en*, HLSD (1988, 69) lists the following forms in *-še*: *kāše* (vs. *kān*) “to eat”, *dēše* (vs. *dēn*) “to give”, *bōše* (vs. *bōn*) “to drink”, *duvāše* (vs. *duvan*) “to run”, *kurāše* (vs. *kuran*) “to do”, *liyāše* (vs. *liyan*) “to write”, *vehēše* (vs. *vehen*) “to rain”, *libēše* (vs. *liben*) “to receive”. Cp. also the sentence *aharen kāše bunifime* “I told (someone) to eat” (ib., 70).

GEIGER (1919, 89 and 97) noted six imperative forms of this type only two of which show the expected spelling, viz. *nu marāše* “do not kill!” and *annāšē* (sic, for *annāše*) “come!” (cf. 3.5.2.2.2). The other examples are *nagahaše* “take up, lift”, *nu talahaše* (sic, with *l* instead of *l̥*) “do not strike”, *deheše* “give” and *dahaše*; most likely, the sequences *-aha-* and *-ehe-* contained in these forms must be interpreted as representing a long-vocalic *-ā-* and *-e-*, resp. The expected forms would be *nagāše* (M. *naganī* “to take, lift, remove”); *nu talāše* (M. *talānī* “to hit, hammer, strike, fight, beat”); *dēše* (M. *denī* “to give, offer”); *dāše* (M. *dani* “to go”).

3.6.3.2.3. The historical facts too speak in favour of a common origin of the infinitive in *-an* of the standard language and the infinitive of the Aḏḏū dialect. The most important argument is provided by some dative forms which are attested in the documents of Old Dhivehi.

The grapheme ⟨*n*⟩ is only one of the spelling variants occurring in the earlier *Dives akuru* texts when the phoneme /*t̥*/ in final position is meant; the other spelling variants are ⟨*-t*⟩, ⟨*-t*⟩, ⟨*-n*⟩ and ⟨*-k*⟩. The unsteadiness in the spelling shows that /*t̥*/ must still have been in the writers’ mind in its inherited quality as a retroflex stop, while its articulation was already transitional. The exact pronunciation of that time can only be guessed. As *Dives akuru* had no particular grapheme for rendering the sound ⟨*ś*⟩, it remains unclear when and under which conditions the phonetic realisation of the previous phoneme /*t̥*/ changed into that of a sibilant [ʃ] in the language of Māle. Only in the period of the *Tāna* script, [ʃ] could be represented graphically in an unambiguous form. The rendering of an original final /*t̥*/ by the graphemes ⟨*n*⟩ and ⟨*k*⟩ leads to the supposition that already at that time the phonetic realisation of /*t̥*/ in final position must have been similar to the glottal stop prevailing in this position in the modern language. In this connection, we may compare the pronunciation of the former /*t̥*/ in Modern Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku which in medial position varies between a very weakly articulated [ʃ] and a sound similar to Czech [ř], as well as the transition of *-Vt̥* into *-VhV* in word-final position occurring in the same dialect.<sup>454</sup> The written documents from different centuries that could be examined so far show several dative forms with a final ⟨*n*⟩; the chronological evidence of these forms remains uncertain though, given that a historical spelling can never be completely excluded. In the following list of attested dative forms, the older spelling with *-t̥(a)* will be quoted as well:

- daṭaṭ(a?)* (L2 22,1; 12th century, oldest form); *daṭaṭ* ⟨*daṭaṭu*⟩ (L6 2,1; approximately 14th-16th centuries); *daṭan* (F8,20,33; 18th century) – “down, to the bottomside” (mod.Dhiveh. /*daśaśi*/: A. *daśa*<sup>3</sup>, F. *daśaha*, M. *daśa*<sup>3</sup>).
- geakaṭ*, *dorakaṭ* (F13,11); *geakan*, *dorakan* (F11,37) “to a house, to a door”.
- haddummattyān* (F5,13; 16th century) “to Haddummati”.
- kuḷaimaṭ* (F1,8; 16th century), *kuḷaimaṭu* (F4,4,5; 17th century), *kuḷaiman* (F6,14; 18th century) of the verbal noun *kuḷain* (mod. M. *kurun*, verbal noun of *kuranī*) “to do, make”.

<sup>454</sup> For more details cf. 1.3.5.

*hedduman* (ITMP 1,4) “for the making” (verbal noun of the causative of *hadani* “to make, create”); *madīna(y)atu* (F3,4), *madīnāṭ* (F2,3; F7,11; F11,7), *madīnayṭ* (F5,11), *madīnāān* (sic F10,8); *madīnāan* (RA 2,5), *madīnaas* (RC 8,2) “to Madīna”.

Of all the dative forms that are attested for Old Dhivehi by now, there is only one infinitive which is still written with a final ⟨-ṭa⟩, viz. *kuranṭa* ⟨*kranṭa*⟩ (L3 2/1,5) “(in order) to do”. Within the whole framework of Maldivian linguistic data, this single form is one more indication that the second infinitive ending in *-an* of northern Dhivehi goes back to the dative of the old verbal noun, just as in the case of its Addū equivalent.

3.6.3.3. The infinitive of the *a*-conjugation of **Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku** is much harder to fit into the scheme given by the Sinhalese forms. It is very probable, however, that infinitives such as *balanna*, *keranna* etc. have their origin in a dative form too; otherwise the geminate *-nn-* would remain unexplained. Hence, the ancestor of *balanna* presumably corresponds to the 3rd or the 4th infinitive type of Sinhalese (cf. 3.6.1.1 above). If *\*balan(a)ṭa* was its basic form, the retroflex *ṭ* must have been assimilated to the preceding nasal. But if the basic form was *\*balannaṭa* in correspondence with the 4th type of Sinhalese, we would have to assume a transitional phonetic stage such as [*\*balannaśa* / -*řa* / -*ha*]. It follows that the *a*-stems once presumably had the same infinitive ending we nowadays find only with *n*-stems. This derivation still leaves one problem in that in word-final position, we would expect a reflex of the old dative ending in form of a phonematic glottal stop or a lengthening of the preceding *-a*.<sup>455</sup> The question whether we may suggest a shortening of *-a<sup>3</sup>* or *-ā* into *-a* in word-final position must remain unsolved.

### 3.6.4. The infinitive of the *e*-stems

In its formation, the infinitive of the *e*-stems corresponds with that of the *a*-stems; the only formal difference consists in the quality of the stem vowel. Cp. the following table:

Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
<i>temē<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>temenna</i>	<i>temen</i>

### 3.6.5. The infinitive of the *n*-stems

With *n*-stem verbs, the following formations of infinitives are met with in Dhivehi:

Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
<i>vannā<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>vannaha</i>	<i>vanna<sup>3</sup>; vannan</i>

With no doubt, the infinitives of the *n*-stems in Modern Dhivehi can be traced back to the same basic forms as those of the *a*-stems. Thus, the starting point must have been the MIA verbal noun in *-ana-* (with or without a suffix *-ka-*) to which the word *\*aṭṭham* (acc.sg. ←

<sup>455</sup> Cp. F. nom. *hūhi* “empty coconut”, (*kerañdul*) *hūhi* “bee hive” – dat. *hūhā*; nom. *īhi* “lobster” – dat. *tāhā*; nom. *rihi* “silver” – dat. *rihā*; *mēhi* “fly” – dat. *mēha<sup>3</sup>* (← dative ending */-as/*).

OIA *ártham*, cf. 2.3.1.1.3)<sup>456</sup> was added. Infinitives such as the Sinhalese relic form *vadnā* which are likely to go back directly to MIA dative forms cannot be attested in any of the Maldivian dialects (cf. 3.6.1.2). The infinitive *vanna*<sup>2</sup>, which is homophonous in the modern dialects of Aḍḍū and Māle, obviously developed from *\*vad(V)naṭ* (cp. M. ⟨*vaduna-*⟩); the corresponding infinitive in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, *vannaha*, must be derived from a preform *\*vadVnaṭa*.

### 3.7. The verbal noun

3.7.1. In contrast to the diverse verbal nouns of Sinhalese, which differ both formally and semantically,<sup>457</sup> Dhivehi disposes of but one equivalent. In all dialects and conjugation types, this is built in the same way, viz. by adding a suffix *-un* to the preterite stem; in accordance with the sound laws, this suffix must have developed from *\*-um*, thus being identical with the Sinhalese suffix *-uma*. In the function of a *nomen actionis*,<sup>458</sup> the Sinhalese verbal noun in *-uma* competes with different other formations which have no equivalents in Dhivehi. Thus, Dhivehi *belun* contrasts with the Sinhalese forms *bāl(u)ma*, *bālīma* and *bālilla*. The formation of the Dhivehi verbal noun is illustrated for the three stem types by the following table:

verbal noun	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
<i>a</i> -stem	<i>belun</i>	<i>belun</i>	<i>belun</i>
<i>e</i> -stem	<i>vanun</i>	<i>vanun</i>	<i>vanun</i>
<i>n</i> -stem	<i>temun</i>	<i>temun</i>	<i>temun</i>

3.7.2. The origin of the Dhivehi formation in *-un* ← *\*-um(a)* is unclear. GEIGER offers no explanation of the Sinhalese suffixes *-uma* and *-īma* either. He just states that the verbal nouns, different from the “gerund” (cf. below), are inflected like neutral substantives.<sup>459</sup> The same holds true for the Maldivian verbal noun, with the restriction that there is no differentiation of gender in Dhivehi.

### 3.8. The gerund

The term “gerund” is not used equally in the linguistic literature concerning Sinhalese and Dhivehi. In GEIGER’s treatises,<sup>460</sup> the form in question which is characterised by the

<sup>456</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 62, in particular fn. 2.

<sup>457</sup> Cf., e.g., GEIGER (1900), 75 and MATZEL (1983), 105.

<sup>458</sup> MATZEL (1983, 105) draws an interesting typological comparison between Sinhalese and German: “die Verbalnomina auf *-īma* entsprechen unseren substantivierten Infinitiven (*das Schneiden, Fließen, Tanzen, Töten, Sehen* usw.), die auf *-uma* ... unseren Verbalnomina actionis (*der Schnitt, Fluß, Tanz, Tod, Blick* usw.) und die auf *-illa* in einigen Fällen unseren Verbalnomina auf *-ung* ...”.

<sup>459</sup> “Sie werden flecirt als neutrale Substantiva” (GEIGER 1900, 74).

<sup>460</sup> GEIGER (1938), 158 ff. and (1900), 73 f.; (1919), 79 ff.

formants *-min* in Sinhalese and *-mun* in Dhivehi is called “gerund I” or “gerund of the present”, while the same author unites the absolutes under the title “gerund II”. In contrast to that, MATZEL calls the form in *-min* an “absolute I” or “absolute of the present” (1983, 72). In HLSD (1988, 73-4 and 98-9), the same category will be found under the term “concurrent” which is explained as follows: “... this verb ... expresses an action that takes place concurrently with the action expressed by the finite verb of the sentence.” In the present work, the term “gerund” will be reserved for these formations.

3.8.1. According to GEIGER, the gerund is based on the instrumental case of a verbal noun in *\*-ma*<sup>461</sup>. Another possible etymology that might be worth considering was rejected by GEIGER, presumably for phonological reasons, viz. the derivation from the OIA medial participle in *-māna*.<sup>462</sup> Recent studies speak in favour of the latter etymological connection, both for the Sinhalese gerund in *-min* and its Dhivehi counterpart in *-mun*, after a suffix variant *-mīna-* has been detected in MIA.<sup>463</sup>

3.8.2. In Dhivehi at least, the gerund characterises an action that runs parallel, i.e. at the same time as the main action. This feature clearly distinguishes this category from absolutes in the literal sense which do not express a fix temporal relationship with respect to the main action (cf. 3.10). The following table shows the formation of the gerund in Dhivehi which is based on the present stem:

gerund	Adḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
<i>a</i> -stem	<i>balamun</i>	<i>balamun</i>	<i>balamun</i>
<i>n</i> -stem	<i>vedemun</i>	<i>vañḍimun</i>	<i>vannamun</i>
<i>e</i> -stem	<i>tememun</i>	— ( <i>*tememun</i> )	<i>tememun</i>

3.8.2.1. The following sentences<sup>464</sup> may suffice to illustrate the use of the gerund:

A. *dōṇi balamun ma fen bonī.*

<i>dōṇi</i>	<i>balamun</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>fen</i>	<i>bonī</i>
boats	looking	I	water	drinking
noun	verb	pers.pron.	noun	verb
obj.	ger.	obliquus	obj.	part.pres.l.f.

“(While) looking for the boats I am drinking water.”

<sup>461</sup> “... der Instrumental eines Verbalnomens auf *-ma*” (GEIGER 1900, 74).

<sup>462</sup> “Die Form entspricht aber nicht, wie man vermuten könnte, dem alten Part.Präs. auf *-māna*.” (GEIGER 1900, 74).

<sup>463</sup> Cf. HINÜBER (1986, 197): “In den östlichen Aśoka-Inschriften und in der Amg [Ardhamāgadhī] findet sich ein Partizip des Präsens auf *-mīna*: *palakamāmīna* [...]; Amg *āgamāmīna* [...], ...; im P [Pali] kommt es nicht vor” (additional remarks by S.F.). Both this *-mīna* and OIA *-māna* can be derived from a Proto-Indo-European *\*-mh<sub>2</sub>no-*; cf. MAYRHOFER (1981), 135.

<sup>464</sup> The examples for the standard language are taken from HLSD (1988), 74.

M. *ēnā bai kamun fen bonī.*

<i>ēnā</i>	<i>bai</i>	<i>kamun</i>	<i>fen</i>	<i>bonī</i>
he	rice	eating	water	drinking
pers.pron.	noun	verb	noun	verb
obl.	obj.	ger.	obj.	part.pres.1.f.

“(While) eating rice, he is drinking water.”

3.8.2.2. To express that a secondary action accompanying the main action is performed in a very intensive way, at least for a certain while, the gerund often is used twice, the meaning being the same as in the case of the reduplicated absolutive (cf. 3.10.5). In contrast to Dhivehi, the reduplication of the gerund is not usual in Sinhalese. Cp. the following examples:

A. *kukuḷa<sup>3</sup> kā<sup>3</sup> demun demun gos varabali vege.*

<i>kukuḷa<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>kā<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>demun</i>	<i>demun</i>	<i>gos</i>	<i>varabali</i>	<i>vege</i>
to the chickens	to eat	giving	giving	having gone	tired	got
noun	verb	verb	verb	verb	adjective	verb
dative	inf.	ger.	ger.	abs.	pred.	pret.IV, 3.ps.sg.

“By giving and giving food to the chickens (I) got tired”.

M. *ēnā liamun liamun gos varubali vejje.*

<i>ēnā</i>	<i>liamun</i>	<i>liamun</i>	<i>gos</i>	<i>varubali</i>	<i>vejje</i>
he	writing	writing	having gone	tired	got
pers.pron.	verb	verb	verb	adjective	verb
nom.	ger.	ger.	abs.	pred.	pret.IV, 3.ps.sg.

“By writing and writing he got tired.”

### 3.9. The participles

From a synchronic point of view, two participial forms must be distinguished in each tense of Modern Dhivehi, viz. a short form and a long form which are clearly kept distinct by their syntactic use. The long vowel *-ī* appearing in the long form is a morphological element characterising the rhematisation of the following part of speech; within this construction which is typical for Dhivehi, the long form must be regarded as predicative. In contrast to that, the short form is only used in attributive function. The following tables will illustrate the short and long forms of the regular participles; in the case of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the phonetic variants that occur in this dialect have been listed throughout.

participle <i>a</i> -stem	Aḍḍū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
present	<i>balā; balanī</i>	<i>balā̄/-ā; balanī</i>	<i>balā; balanī</i>
future	<i>balāne; balānei</i>	<i>balannē/-en; balannenī</i>	<i>balāne; balānī</i>
preterite	<i>beli; belī</i>	<i>belī</i>	<i>beli; belī</i>

participle <i>n</i> -stem	Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
present	<i>vanne; vannei</i>	<i>vannā; vannaī</i>	<i>vanna; vannaī</i>
future	<i>vannaṇe; vannaṇei</i>	<i>vannāhin; vannāhinī</i>	<i>vannāne; vannānī</i>
preterite	<i>van; vanī</i>	<i>van; vānī</i>	<i>van; vanī</i>

participle <i>e</i> -stem	Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
present	<i>temē; temenī</i>	<i>temē; temenī</i>	<i>temē; temenī</i>
future	<i>temēṇe; temēṇei</i>	<i>temennen; temennenī</i>	<i>temēne; temēnī</i>
preterite	<i>temeṇe; temeṇei</i>	<i>temun; temūnī</i>	<i>temunu; temunī</i>

### 3.9.1. The participle of the present

The formation of the present participle of the *a*- and *e*-stems, but also the *n*-stems in Dhivehi clearly corresponds with that of Sinhalese where the formation is the same for all stem types. GEIGER describes the process as follows:<sup>465</sup> “The participle of the present has the ending *-na* which is added to the present stem ... The prototype of these formations is the medial present participle which in Pali ends in *-āna*.” Examples given by him are, among others, *balana* “looking” (conjugation I = *a*-stem), *badina* “frying” (conjugation II = *n*-stem) and *penena* “appearing” (conjugation III = *e*-stem).

3.9.1.1. The Sinhalese participle *balana* corresponds with the homophonous form *\*balana* of Old Dhivehi. The lengthening of the final *-ā* of the short form *balā* and the emergence of a nasal vowel in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku can be explained as reflexes of the original *n* being lost in the position between two identical vowels. As against this, the same intervocalic *n* has been preserved in the long form *balanī* because of the different quality of the vowels. An influence of analogy can be seen in the formation of the present participle of the *e*-stems. If in the case of the exemplary verb *temenī* “to get wet” the original participle form must be reconstructed as *\*temena*, this must first have been assimilated to *\*temene* before yielding *temē / temē*.

3.9.1.1.1. The derivational process as described above is documented by some present participles which are attested in Old Dhivehi. Cp., e.g., the following archaic forms of ***a*-stems** with *-ana* preserved:

*eviana, evyana*<sup>466</sup> “naming, calling; (being) named, called” (L1 f/2,4,5, mx/2,4; L2 8,3 etc.; L3 5/2,4 etc.).

*evana* “id.” (L8 1,1; F3,3; F7,9; F8,13; F10,6; F11,7).

*dakvana* “showing” (L1 t/2,5; L2 21,2): → M. *dakkā*, of *dakkanī* “to show”.

<sup>465</sup> “Das Participle des Präs. hat die Endung *-na*, welche an den Präsensstamm angefügt wird ... Der Typus für diese Bildungen ist das mediale Part.Präs., das im P(āli) auf *-āna* ausgeht” (GEIGER 1900, 73; cf. also 1938, 134).

<sup>466</sup> In the printed editions of L2 and L3, *vyana / viyana* was erroneously transcribed as an independent word, the initial *e*- being treated as a part of the preceding word. — The only relic form of this verb in the modern language of Māle is the absolutive *eve* “saying”; in the function of a “quotation particle” it marks the end of direct speech. For the derivation of the verb cf. 5.4.

- krana* “making, doing” (L2 3,4 etc.); *kurana* “id.” (F5,15; F6,3; F11,16; IDMHM 2,9; IDMEM 3,14; RC 4,7): → M. *kurā*, of *kurānī* “to make, do”.
- kuravana* “causing to do” (causative, here 2nd honorific degree; F3,10): → M. *kuravā*, of *kuravanī* (causative of *kurānī*, cf. above).
- kuravvana* (double causative, 2nd/3rd honorific degree; IDMMM 1,3): → M. *kuravvā*, of *kuravvanī*; 1st degree *kurānī* “to do” (cf. above).
- govana* “calling” (F3,16): → M. *govā*, of *govānī* “to call”.
- darana* “holding” (F4,2 etc.; IDMMM 4,6): → M. *darā*, of *darānī* “to owe”.
- vasana* “inhabiting, settling (down), being there” (L2 4,3); in Modern Dhivehi the basic verb \**vasanī* is lost, but cf. Sinh. *vasanavā* “to inhabit, reside”.

3.9.1.1.2. The following examples represent the earliest attestations of present participles of *a*-stems which already exhibit the contraction of *-ana* into *-ā*:

- evyā* “calling, naming” (L3 5/1,3; cf. *eviana* above).
- kurā* “doing” (F2,7; F3,12; F9,11; IDMMM 3,4; cf. *krana* above).
- kuravvā* “causing to do” (double causative; ITMP 1,3 and 2,3; cf. *kuravvana* above).
- dā* “going” (F1,2; F5,14; F7,20.21; F13,3,4; → M. *danī* “to go”).
- arā* “climbing up, entering (the mosque)” (F11,25; → M. *aranī* “to climb up”).
- aruā* “causing to climb up / enter” (F4,2; causative of M. *aranī*, cf. above).
- gahā* “pushing against, bordering” (F4,2; → M. *jahanī* “to push, to strike”).
- vā* “becoming” (L6 2,5; F1,25; F4,3; RC 16,2; → M. *vanī* “to become”).
- kiā* “(being) named, called” (L1 f/1,5 and f/2,2; F6,11; F10,16; F11,22 etc.), *kyā* (F1,17; F3,11; F4,3,4; F13,17 etc.; → M. *kianī* “to name”).

3.9.1.1.3. The oldest attestations of present participles of *e*-stems with *-ena* preserved are:

- dena* “being given” (L1 my/1,4,5; L2 5,2 etc.; L3 3/1,3): → M. *dē*, of *denī* “to give”. It is not clear whether *dene* (L1 d/2,6 etc.; L4 c/1,3 etc.) represents a (later) variant of *dena*; if it does, this would be the only attested form showing an assimilated *-ne*.
- negena* “being raised” (L1 g/2,6 etc.; L2 6,1 etc.; L3 3/1,5 etc.; L4 d/1,5): → M. *negē*, of *negenī*, inactive counterpart of *naganī* “to lift, take (up), raise”.
- vuḷena* “living, being” (L2 22,3 etc.), *gene vuḷena* (L4 c/2,4) besides *gen vuḷena* (L4 e/1,1), but also *vuḷe* in L1 d/2,3) and *gen vuḷe* (L4 c/1,7 and f/1,1; read /vuḷē/) “being taken”: → M. *uḷē*, of *uḷenī* “to live, be”.
- guḷena* “joining, meeting” (L2 34,1): → M. *guḷē*, of *guḷenī* “to join”.
- tibena* “being” (L7 2,5): → M. *tibē*, of *tibenī* “to be”.
- venā* “becoming”, attested only once (in F11,5). The more frequent form of the pres.part. of *vanī* “to become” is ⟨*vana*⟩ (cf. above). Today, the form *venā* is continued only in the southern dialects, cf. A. *vē*, F. *vē*. In the standard language the pres.part. has the short form *vā*.

3.9.1.2. There is no reason to assume that the present participle of the *n*-stems might have taken a different development than that of the other stems, even though the Aḍḍū forms, ending in *-ne*, do not seem to fit into the general scheme at first glance; cp. A. *vanne* “entering” with its long form variant *vannei* ← \**vanneī*. The surprising *e*-vocalism of the ending can perhaps be explained by umlauting. In this case, the final *-ī* of the long form would have caused the change of *a* into *e*, *-nai* developing into *-neī*; subsequently, the short form was adapted to this by analogy (*-na* → *-ne*), resulting in A. *vanne* as the primary form instead of \**vanna*.

The corresponding present participles of Fua<sup>7</sup> Mulaku and Māle show no unexpected vocalism in their ending; cp., e.g., F. *vannā*, *vannaī* and M. *vanna*, *vannaī*. Without doubt, the short form F. *vannā* must be explained by an analogical adaptation to the short forms of

the *a*-stems, given that its ancestral form can hardly have been something like *\*vannana*. If this is true, the final nasalised vowel *-ā* is not a reflex of *-an* here but a formation following the model of *balā*.

As against this, the short form of the present participle of the Māle standard language, *vanna*, conforms to the morphological rules. On the other hand, the long form of this participle, *vannanī*, is apparently built after the model of the corresponding form of the *a*-stems.

3.9.1.2.1. These assumptions presuppose that the formation of the present participle of the *n*-stems is based on the present stem to which the suffix *-na* is added. In the oldest Dhivehi texts, there are several examples attesting this process unambiguously, among them *vaduna* “entering” (L2 17,5 etc.; L3 12/1,1; F2,18; F5,41.47; F8,30.32); the form consists of the present stem *vad-*, an anaptyctic vowel *-u-* and the suffix *-na*. Cp. also *vadunā* which occurs twice in combination with *koṭu*, the absolutive of *kuranī* “to make, do” (F3,16.17); it is not completely clear whether this constellation has to be understood as a periphrastic causative “causing to enter”.

3.9.1.2.2. Other early attested forms of present participles of *n*-stems are:

*ganna* “receiving, getting” (L2 2,5 and 27,5; L3 15/2,2; L4 b/2,7 and f/2,3); cp. also *gannā* (negated by *nu*, in combination with *koṭu* “doing” used as a periphrastic causative “causing not to get” in L5 5/2,6 and F13,18); cp. M. *gannā* “to buy”, but Sinh. *gannavā* “to take”.

*higā* “going (there)” (F4,2); cp. M. *hiṅganī* “to walk; happen”.

*iduna* “sitting”, also “living, residing” (L2 11,2 etc.; L3 3/2,4 etc.); cp. M. *innanī* “to sit”.

*basuna* “setting, descending (of the sun)” (L4 f/1,5; F4,2); cp. Sinh. *bahinavā* “to set, descend” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 120, no. 1790).

*vaduna* (L4 a/1,7; L5 4/2,2; F3,12; F4,1; ITMKM 1,7); in Modern Dhivehi, this verb is preserved only in the standard language, in the form of the absolutive *vaḍai* which is used in the analytical formation of verbs of motion as a formant characterising the two higher honorific degrees.<sup>467</sup>

*nikunnai*, attested in combination with *vi* “having become” in the sense of a passive of the periphrastic causative, “having been caused to go out” (F3,14); the short form of this present participle must be reconstructed as *\*nikunna*, cp. M. *nukunnā* “to go out”.

### 3.9.2. The participle of the preterite

As in Sinhalese, the past participles of Dhivehi have to be divided into two main groups representing two different formation types. The larger group consists of the regular participles which, as a rule, build the basis for the formation of the finite past tense forms.<sup>468</sup> The second group, which is less numerous, consists of a set of archaic participial forms which can be derived directly from the corresponding irregular forms of MIA or OIA. In Sinhalese, only a small number of these participles is used in the formation of the finite preterite. For Dhivehi, however, we must assume a compensatory process resulting in the fact that, as a matter of principle, each of these past participles can occur as a preterite stem, even if it is irregular from the synchronical point of view. On this basis, we arrive at the synchronical rule that the short form of the participle is always identical with the third person singular of the

<sup>467</sup> Cf. 0.9.2. — Cp. Sinh. *vaḍanavā* “to increase, augment; to take up” (GEIGER (1941), 154, no. 2297). In Dhivehi, the preterite form *voḍi* is attested besides the older variant *veḍi*; M. *voḍi* is to *veḍi* as M. *atoḷu* is to A. *atele*, cf. 1.2.4.4.

<sup>468</sup> In the present book, the terms “preterite” and “past” are used synonymously.

preterite.<sup>469</sup> In all dialects of Dhivehi, this form can be taken as a basic form from which all the other personal forms can be derived by adding the respective personal endings.

3.9.2.1. In Dhivehi, the past participle of **a-stems** is built with the suffix *-i* which through an intermediate *\*-ī* goes back to OIA *-ita*. In the course of history, the front vowel *i* caused an umlaut of back vowels in the preceding syllable; in the given case, this is true for the vowel *a* which developed into *e*, cp. Dhiv. *\*bal-i* → *\*bāli* → *beli* “(having) looked”, *\*tal-i* → *\*tāli* → *teḷi* “(having) beaten, hammered”, *\*nat-i* → *\*nāti* → *neṣi* “(having) danced” etc. (cf. 1.2.3.1.1). In Dhivehi there are no traces of a special development of the inherited suffix *-ita* as in Sinhalese where a secondary splitting of the suffix led to the long vowels *-ī* and *-ū* which were later shortened into *-i* and *-u*. That the latter variant is secondary is proved by umlaut of *a* occurring in the syllables preceding the suffix in all verbs in question, even when the suffix vowel is *ū* / *u*. As Sinhalese textual history shows, the use of the two suffix variants was still undifferentiated in the Middle Ages; in the course of time, the *u*-variant became typical for verbs of the first conjugation while *-i* was preferred for verbs of the second conjugation.<sup>470</sup> Cp., e.g., the Modern Sinhalese past participles *bālu* “looked”, *tālu* “beaten” and *nātu* “danced” whose umlaut can only be explained by an original *-i*-vowel of the suffix.

The formation of the past participle with the suffix *-ī* / *-i* in Sinhalese is characterised by an umlaut of all back vowels of the verbal root, leading to a change of *o* to *e* and of *u* to *i*. In Dhivehi, however, the umlaut process effected only the vowel *a* which changed into *e*; most likely, *e* was preceded by an intermediate stage *\*ä*. This corresponds with the development in Sinhalese where *ä* has persisted as independent phoneme in the modern language. In Dhivehi there are but a few verbs that have a back vowel other than *a* in their root, at least in the standard language;<sup>471</sup> they do not show a change of the quality of this vowel in their preterite. Cp., e.g., Sinh. *kotanavā* “to mash, cut, bruise” with its part.pret. *keṭu* vs. Dhiv. *koṣanī* “to chop, cut; reap, whittle” with its part.pret. *koṣi*; Sinh. *duvanavā* “to run”: part.pret. *divu* vs. Dhiv. M. *duvanī* “id.”: part.pret. *divi*.<sup>472</sup> Thus we may conclude that in the formation of the Dhivehi past participle, as a rule only the vowel *a* is affected by umlaut.

3.9.2.2. The formation of the past participle of the **n-stems** does not follow a general rule. Only a few verbs of this class build the participle with the suffix *-i* ← *-ita*; most others have preserved other participial forms which have to be discussed in detail. In most cases, the verbs in question are the same verbs in Dhivehi and Sinhalese; cf. GEIGER (1938, 136) who, referring not only to the past participles of *n*-stems but also to those belonging to irregular verbs that cannot be classified by synchronical rules, stated: “A considerable number of old participles in *-ta* or *-na* are preserved as historical forms in Sinhalese. They are conventionally but erroneously called irregular forms.”

Except for some isolated verbs, it will be sufficient here to specify the short form of the participles. It must be stated, though, that some verbs in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku show a

<sup>469</sup> The only exception from this rule is the preterite of M. *kuranī*, cf. 3.9.2.2.5.

<sup>470</sup> Cf. 3.3. For details on the past participle in Sinhalese cf. GEIGER (1900), 73 and (1938), 135 f.; cf. also MATZEL (1983), 53 ff.

<sup>471</sup> It is still unclear whether (and in which way) this fact may be connected with the OIA ablaut.

<sup>472</sup> The southern variant of this verb shows umlaut in the whole paradigm: A.F. *divanī* : *divi*; cf. 1.2.3.2.1.

syncretistic development in that their long form definitely took over the syntactic function of the short form which morphologically no longer exists.

3.9.2.2.1. The past participle of several *n*-stem verbs ends in *-i* in southern Dhivehi. In the standard language, the past participles of the corresponding verbs exhibit other endings with the only exception of *huri* (of *hunnānī* “to stand”). Cp. the following list of examples:

*dekenī* “to see”: In Aḍḍū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the past participle of this verb is *diṣi*. There is no older attestation of the corresponding M. form *du*<sup>3</sup> /*duś*/ (← /*du(u)*/ ?), but cf. the Sinhalese participle *duṭu* (of *dakinavā* “to see”). Both the Maldivian and the Sinhalese form go back to an old participle with the suffix *-ta*; cp. Pa. *diṭṭha-*, Skt. *dr̥ṣṭá-* “seen”.<sup>473</sup>

*hunnānī* “to be, stand, remain, stay”: A. *hiśi*; F. *hīśī* (long form). The modern form M. *huri* must be of recent origin; it is for the first time attested in the *Tāna* version of the *Rādavaḷi*. The earlier form *huṭi* is attested 35 times, beginning with later *lōmāfanus* (L6 2,5; L7 2,5; F1,9 etc.; F10,11 etc.). It corresponds to Sinh. *hiṭi* (of *hiṭinavā* “to stand; be”)<sup>474</sup> which must be related with Pa. *ṭhito-* and Skt. *sthītá-* (of *tiṣṭhātī* “to stand”, root *sthā-*) although its phonetic shape remains unclear.<sup>475</sup> — In Dhivehi this preterite participle often expresses a contemporary state as if it were a present participle “being”; concerning this, cp. the early attested combination *huṇna-huṭi* (F1,10 etc.) containing the present participle of the same verb which obviously underlines the present meaning (lit. “being – having been”).<sup>476</sup>

*konnānī* (A. *kaṇṇei*, F. *kaṇṇāi*) “to dig”: A. *keṇi*; F. *kēṇī* (long form). The short form M. *konunu* is obviously formed by analogy after the *e*-stems. — The corresponding Sinhalese verb is *kaṇinavā* “to dig, excavate” which is also attested in a spelling with retroflex *ṇ*, ⟨*kaṇinavā*⟩; it belongs to the 2nd conjugation and must be identified with Pkt. *khaṇai*, Pa. *khanati*, and Skt. *khanati* (1st present class; root *khan-*), part.pret. *khātá-*.<sup>477</sup> — Obviously the past participle is not preserved in Sinhalese, but it can be reconstructed as *\*kānī* / *\*kāṇī* on the basis of the preterite *kānnā*.

*kulenī* (A. *koḷonei*, F. *keḷenāi*) “to play”: A. *koḷi*; F. *kēḷī* (long form). Unlike the preceding example, this verb has been completely adapted to the *e*-stems in the Māle standard language; hence, the participle M. *kuḷunu* has to be regarded as a regular form. As to the Aḍḍū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku forms, cp. the Sinh. *i*-stem *keḷinavā* with its past participle *keḷi*. — The etymology of this verb is still unclear.<sup>478</sup>

*hehenī* (A. *sahunēi*, F. *sahunāi*) “to husk”: A. *sehi*; F. *sēhī* (long form). Like *kulenī*, M. *hehenī* (part.pret. *hehumu*) follows the model of the *e*-stems. It remains uncertain whether there is a corresponding verb in Sinhalese; the etymology of *hehenī* is unknown as well.

The compound verb M. *gen guḷenī* “to care for” (lit. “to join by taking”), which belongs to the *e*-stems as well, need not be dealt with in the given framework. Its semantic counterparts in the southernmost dialects must be mentioned, however, because they formally belong to the *n*-stems; cp. the infinitive forms A. *daguna*<sup>3</sup> and F. *daḡonaha*. The past participles are A. *degi* and F. *dēgī* (long form). — So far, both the Sinhalese correspondents and the etymology of this verb are unknown.

<sup>473</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 137 and (1941), 68, no. 993; TURNER (1966) I, 371, no. 6507 and 372, no. 6518; MAYRHOFER (1986-), I, 704 ff. s.v. *DARŚ*. Cf. further RHYS-DAVIDS 1921-1925, 316 s.v. *dassati*.

<sup>474</sup> Cf. MATZEL (1983), 55; GEIGER (1941), 192, no. 2897.

<sup>475</sup> According to the Indic classification, the verb is a representative of the 1st present class; from a modern perspective, however, the verb is a reduplicated root present which was secondarily thematised. Cf. MAYRHOFER (1965), 66; (1951), I, 170; WHITNEY (1885), 194. — TURNER (1966, I, 775, no. 13432) erroneously derives the infinitive M. *hunnān* “to stand, be” from *sad-* “to sit” and puts it together with M. *innan* “to sit, be”.

<sup>476</sup> As a semantic parallel cp. German *gelegen* meaning “liegend, seiend” in local contexts.

<sup>477</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 36, no. 535; TURNER (1966) I, 200, no. 3811; WHITNEY (1885), 32.

<sup>478</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 49, no. 718 and TURNER (1966) I, 207, no. 3918 s.v. *\*khēḍ-* “to play” and 186, no. 3592 s.v. *kr̥ḍati*.

3.9.2.2.2. Considering the formation of the preterite participle, the rest of the *n*-stems can be divided into two groups. The first group is formed by those verbs which represent the most typical *n*-stems because they completely or almost completely fulfil the morphological criteria outlined above; in particular, these are the only verbs showing the characteristic *n*-stem paradigm of the present (cf. 3.2.2.1). We must admit, however, that these are purely synchronic criteria; they do not adduce any evidence for the particular present class the given verbs had in earlier periods. Thus, the conjugation pattern of an *n*-stem in Modern Dhivehi does not prove by itself that the verb in question must go back to an OIA nasal present.

The verbs concerned do not show any special suffix that would be used in building the past participle, which always ends in the stem-marking final *-n*; hence, these participles are characterised by a “zero-morpheme” from a synchronic point of view. All together, there are seven verbs totally fitting into this scheme; they will be discussed in detail here below. The equivalents of their past participles contain the suffixes *-ta-* or *-na-* in OIA and MIA which, however, cannot be automatically considered as being continued in the modern forms.

*añdanī* (F. *annaī*, A. *anneī*) “to burn”: part.pret. M.A.F. *an*. — Neither the transitive verb *añdanī* “to burn” nor its causative form *andanī* “to (let) burn” seem to have an etymological correspondent in Sinhalese. Most likely, the verb must be identified with OIA (RV) *sáminddhe* (3.ps.sg.pres.med.) “sets fire to, takes fire”; if this is true, *añdanī* cannot be considered as an inherited nasal present. The OIA preterite participle, built with the suffix *-ta*, is *sámiddha-* “ignited”.<sup>479</sup>

*añdanī* (F. *annaī*, A. *anneī*) “to wear (a sarong)”: part.pret. *an*. In the modern language this verb is homophonous and morphologically identical with *añdanī* “to burn”, without being etymologically connected with it. In contrast to the latter, *añdanī* “to wear” has an etymological cognate in Sinhalese, viz. *añdinavā* with its older variant *hañdinavā* “to don, attire, wear”, part.pret. (*h*)*aññī*. GEIGER<sup>480</sup> identifies (*h*)*añdinavā* with OIA *sámdyati* “to tie, fasten” (*sam-* + root *dā-* “to bind”<sup>481</sup>), while TURNER also takes into consideration a connection with *sañjayati* “attaches to” (root *sañj-* “to hang”).<sup>482</sup>

*bannanī* (A. *bannei*, F. *bannaī*) “to tie, bind”: part.pret. *ban*. GEIGER derives the Sinhalese past participle *bada* “bound, tied” from a form with the suffix *-ta*; cp. Pa. *baddha*, Skt. *baddhá-* ← *\*badh-ta*<sup>483</sup>. — *bannanī* and Sinh. *bañdinavā* can lastly be traced back to an OIA nasal present (*badhnāti*, 9th present class) but presuppose a reshaping of its stem for the MIA period (cp. Buddhist Hybrid Skt., Pkt. *bandha-*).

*biñdanī* / *binnanī* (A. *binnei*, F. *binnaī*) “to pluck, break”: part.pret. *bin*. This participle corresponds to Sinh. *bun* “broken, splitted; expanded (as flowers)” belonging to the *i*-stem verb *biñdinavā*; cp. Pa., Pkt. *bhinna*, Skt. *bhinná-* ← *\*bhid-na*<sup>484</sup>. The verb is based on an old nasal present (7th class); cp. Ved. *bhināti* (root *bhid-* “split”), later thematised into *bhindati* (MIA, Buddhist Hybrid Skt.).

*innanī* (A. *innei*, F. *innaī*) “to sit, marry, be married”: part.pret. *in*. The corresponding Sinh. participle is *un* “seated” (of (*h*)*añdinavā*, *innavā*) which can be traced back to a participial formation with the suffix *-na*; cp. Pa., Pkt. *sanna*, Skt. *sanná-* ← *\*sad-na-* (root *sad-*)<sup>485</sup>.

<sup>479</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 764, no. 13225; for *indh-* “to kindle” cf. ib., I, 71 and further MAYRHOFER (1986-), I, 267 s.v. *EDH* “entflammen, anzünden”.

<sup>480</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 7, no. 100.

<sup>481</sup> Cf. WHITNEY (1885), 72 and WERBA (1997), 294 s.v. *dā-* “binden, fesseln”.

<sup>482</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 757, no. 13085 and 748, no. 12906; cf. furthermore 758, no. 13098. Cf. also WHITNEY (1885), 182.

<sup>483</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 137 and (1941), 117, no. 1755; further MAYRHOFER (1965), 83 f. and 96; WHITNEY (1885), 105.

<sup>484</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 137 and (1941), 122, no. 1814 and 123, no. 1838; MAYRHOFER (1951) I, 173; WHITNEY (1885), 111; TURNER (1966) II, 541, no. 9496.

<sup>485</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 137, (1941), 21, 324 / 26, 393, and (1916), 148; cf. also MAYRHOFER (1951) I, 173 and (1965), 66.

*iṣṇanī* “to sit” (F. *irīṇnāi*, A. *irīṇnei*): part.pret. M. *iṣṇ*, A.F. *irīṇ*. — GEIGER suggested a connection of this participle with Sinh. *hiṭṭinu*,<sup>486</sup> but the most probable derivation presupposes a compound verb. In this case, the first part is most likely to consist of the absolutive of the verb *hunnanī* (cf. 3.9.2.2.1 above) in its older form *hiṣe* (preserved until today in southern Dhivehi as against the more recent variant M. *hure*), from *\*hiṭe*. The finite part of the verb may then be taken from *innanī* “to sit” (cf. above). Thus, the total meaning can be translated with “being sitting”. — As to the formation, cp. *oṣṇnanī* (3.9.2.2.3).

*vannanī* (A. *vannei*, F. *vannāi*) “to enter”: The past participle M.A.F. *van* has a homophonous equivalent in Sinhalese about which GEIGER wrote: “Appears to be pppt. of v. *vadinavā*, but I cannot explain the form” (1941, 156, nos. 2326 and 2319). The common Sinhalese and Maldivian form *van* cannot be explained on the basis of the OIA past participle *vrajita-* (root *vṛj-* “to proceed”<sup>487</sup>). Possibly *van* represents a formation by analogy after one of those verbs that show the *-n* of the present stem as the final consonant of the past participle (cf. above).

There is at least one further verb which builds the participle of the preterite in the way described here, viz. M.A.F. *denī* “to give” with its participle *din*; here, too, the final *-n* is part of the stem to which no further suffix is added. All the other forms of this verb do not show any common features with the conjugation of the *n*-stems, however. *denī* can hardly be an inherited *n*-stem if it reflects OIA *dādāti* “gives”, which is a reduplicative root present (root *dā-*).<sup>488</sup> *din* is well attested in the early documents of Dhivehi where it sometimes still appears in the spelling *(dinu)* (L1 s/1,6 etc.; L2 6,4 etc.; L3 3/2,3 etc.; L4 b/2,7 etc.; L6 2,1; F4,3). — The corresponding participle of Sinhalese is *dun*; cp. Pa., Pkt. *dinna* vs. Skt. *dattā* ← *\*tta-* (with suffix *-ta*)<sup>489</sup>.

3.9.2.2.3. The past participle of the second group of Dhivehi *n*-stems is not formed with the suffix *-i* but with a final *-t* which, as a rule, is phonetically realised as a glottal stop in the southern dialects.<sup>490</sup> In the long form, however, the inherited stop is preserved in the position before *-ī*. The following verbs exhibit this feature:

*gannanī* (A. *gannei*, F. *gannāi*) “to buy”: /*gat*/ M. *gai*, A.F. *ga*<sup>2</sup>; cp. the long forms M.A. *gati*, F. *gāī*. The Sinhalese equivalent is *gat* as well; GEIGER derives this form from an OIA past participle variant *\*ghṛpta-* “taken”,<sup>491</sup> contrasting with the attested form *gr(b)hṛtā-* of the nasal present (9th class) *gr(b)hṛtāi*.<sup>492</sup> Although the etymological development is not clear in every detail, *gannanī* seems to be one of the inherited *n*-stems of Dhivehi.

*nukunnanī* (A. *nukunnei*, F. *nukunnāi*) “to come/go out, leave”: /*nukut*/ → M. *nukui*, A.F. *nuku*<sup>2</sup>; long form M.A. *nukutī*, F. *nukūī*. In Sinhalese, the corresponding participle *nikut* “gone away, departed, dead” still exists as an isolated form while the verb itself has not been preserved. The participle is based on its OIA equivalent *niṣkrānta-*, of *niṣkrāmati* “goes out” (*set* root *kram*<sup>3</sup>-, belonging to the 1st present class of the Indian grammar).<sup>493</sup>

*onnanī* (A.F. —) “to lie, be there”: /*ot*/ → M. *oi*, A.F. *o*<sup>2</sup>; long form M.A. *otī*, F. *ōī*. The etymological equivalent in Sinhalese is *hovinava*, *hōnavā* “to lie down, repose, sleep” which can be traced back to the

<sup>486</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1902), 924, no. 215.

<sup>487</sup> For the etymology of the verb cf. fn. 415.

<sup>488</sup> Cf. WHITNEY (1985), 71 and WERBA (1997), 292.

<sup>489</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1916), 148; HINÜBER (1986), 197; MAYRHOFER (1986-) I, 713 ff.

<sup>490</sup> For the phonetic development of word final plosives cf. 1.1.3.

<sup>491</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 52, no. 761 and further TURNER (1966) I, 244, no. 4509.

<sup>492</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 53, no. 773; TURNER (1966) I, 227, no. 4236. Cf. also MAYRHOFER (1965), 83 and, more recently, (1986-) I, 505 s.v. *GRABH*.

<sup>493</sup> Cf. MAYRHOFER (1986-), I, 409 f.; TURNER (1966) I, 423, no. 7492 and GEIGER (1941), 87, no. 1274. — The Sinh. verb *nikmenavā* “to come forth, issue”, which belongs to the *e*-stems, goes back to *niṣ* + *kram*<sup>3</sup>- as well (GEIGER 1941, ib., no. 1275). Cp. also the causative *nikmavanavā* “to send forth”.

OIA root *svap-* “to sleep”. The past participle (*h*)*ot* continues a participle with the suffix *-ta*, cp. Skt. *suptá-*, Pa. *sutta*.<sup>494</sup>

*oṣōnnanī* (A. *veṣionnei*, F. *veṣionnāi*) “to lie (down)”: M. /*oṣōt*/ → *oṣōi*, A.F. /*veṣiot*/ → *veṣio*<sup>3</sup>; long form M. *oṣōtī*, A. *veṣiōtī*, F. *veṣiōtī*. This verb is a compound with *onnanī* (cf. above) as its second part. In A.F. *veṣi-*, the first part preserves the regular absolutive of an *e*-stem not existing any longer as an independent verb in Dhivehi, viz. *\*veṣenī* ← older *\*vetenī*. The Sinhalese equivalent of this is *vātenavā* “to fall (down), drop”. According to GEIGER (1941, 161, no. 2400), this is a “passive (with peculiar meaning) of *vaṭanavā*” meaning “to turn round” which goes back directly to the OIA root *vrt-* “to turn”<sup>495</sup>. The phonological equivalent of the Sinh. causative *vaṭanavā* is preserved in Modern Dhivehi in the semantically restricted verb M. *vaṣanī* “to rub in, embrocate (with circling movements)”. Presumably Dhiv. *\*veṣenī* had the same meaning as Sinh. *vātenavā* and was replaced by *vettenī* which is the only verb in the modern language meaning “to fall”. Morphologically *vettenī* is the inactive equivalent of the causative *vaṭtanī* “to cause to fall, let fall”. Thus, the compound *veṣi-ot-* literally means “lying (having) fallen (down)” or “lying by falling”. — The phonological structure of M. *oṣōnnanī* can be easily explained on this basis. While the conservation of /*e*/ in the position before a single retroflex consonant is typical for southern Dhivehi, this vowel regularly developed into /*o*/ in the northern dialects as early as the 14th century A.D. (cf. 1.2.4.4); cp. M. *atoḷu* vs. A. *ateḷe* “atoll” or M. *oḍi* vs. A. *veḍi* “larger Maldivian boat” which shows the same additional loss of *v-* in the position before *-o-* as *oś-* ← *voś-* ← *voṭ-* ← *veś-*. In contrast to that, the initial *ve-* of M. *vettenī* has not changed because the following retroflex is a geminate. — The compositional structure of *oṣōnnanī* has a parallel in *iṣīnnanī* (cf. 3.9.2.2.2 above).

In the case of *dōnnanī* “to wash” (cp. Pa. *dhovati*, Skt. *dhāvati* “washes”; root *dhāv-*<sup>496</sup>), North and South Dhivehi show a different formation of the past participle; cf. A.F. /*dot*/ → *do*<sup>3</sup>, long form A. *dotī*, F. *dōtī* as against the short form M. *dovunu*, long form *dovunī*, which formally presupposes an inactive verb.<sup>497</sup> — The Sinhalese equivalent of this verb is *dōvanavā*, an *a*-stem which is obsolete in the modern language. The past participle which has obviously been lost in Sinhalese must be reconstructed as *\*devu* (cp. the preterite *devuvā*) if it was built regularly.<sup>498</sup> The ancestor of this form can be seen in the OIA participle *dhautá-* which is built with the suffix *-ta*; the phonological development implied is Sinh. *\*dōvī* → *\*dēvī* → *\*devu*<sup>499</sup>. The form /*dot*/ we find in southern Dhivehi is even more problematic because a final /*-t*/ in Dhivehi or in Sinhalese cannot go back to a simple medial /*-t-*/ of OIA. It seems most probable that the form in question must be explained by an analogous adaptation on the model of other verbs such as, e.g., *onnanī*, *gannanī* (cf. above) with a final /*-t*/ in their past participles; in these cases, /*-t*/ reflects a combination of the OIA suffix *-ta* with at least one preceding consonant.

3.9.2.2.4. There are two more verbs which, to judge by their paradigm, must partly be considered as *n*-stems. Their forms show many irregularities within the pattern and, furthermore, many interdialectal differences. In the formation of the past participle they are irregular too.

One of these verbs is M. *uḷenī* with its southern equivalents, F. *vēṇṇaī*, A. *vēṇḍenī* “to live, be”. In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the verb has the forms of an *n*-stem, with the only exception of the past participle *vēṇḍum*, long form *vēṇḍūṇī* which is built after the model of the *e*-stems. In Aḍḍū as well as the standard language, all forms follow the pattern of the *e*-stems; hence, the forms of the past participle are *vēṇḍene*, long form *vēṇḍenei* in Aḍḍū and *uḷunu*, long form *uḷunī* in Māle. — All the dialectal variants of this verb are etymologically unclear, all the more since no Sinhalese cognate has been detected so far. It even remains uncertain whether M. *uḷenī* and A. *vēṇḍenī* can be derived from the same etymon; from the point of view of historical phonology, however, there are some details which seem to speak in favour of a common origin (cf. 1.3.7.2).

<sup>494</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 803, no. 13902; GEIGER (1941), 195, no. 2946 and 32, no. 481.

<sup>495</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 154, no. 2293; WHITNEY (1885), 164; WERBA (1997), 237.

<sup>496</sup> Cf. WHITNEY (1885), 83; GEIGER (1941), 81, no. 1206; TURNER (1966) I, 394, no. 6886 s.v. *\*dhauvati* and particularly MAYRHOFER (1986-) I, 782-3.

<sup>497</sup> Cp. *kuḷenī* treated in 3.9.2.2.1.

<sup>498</sup> For the rules of this formation cf., e.g., MATZEL (1983), 54.

<sup>499</sup> For the change of *-i* → *-u* in the past participles cf. GEIGER (1938), 135.

A completely irregular verb is M. *dannanī*, A. *dennei*, F. *dennāi* “to know”. In the southern dialects, the conjugation of the present of this verb is in accordance with the *n*-stems; in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku this is also true for the pattern of the finite future, but not the infinitive. — Etymologically, *dannanī* is a real *n*-stem going back to an old nasal present, viz. Skt. *jānāti* which belongs to the 9th present class (root *jñā-* “to know”).<sup>500</sup> — In Addū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the past participle of this verb is built periphrastically by combining its absolutive with the past participle of *humnanī* (cf. 3.9.2.2.1), here functioning as an auxiliary verb (A. *dene hi*<sup>3</sup>, F. *dene hīsī*, long form); in Māle, the verb has no past participle at all. — In Sinhalese, the past participle of *dannavā* “to know” is *dat* which GEIGER explains as a formation by analogy: “The pprt. *dat* is formed after the model of *gat* : *gannavā*.”<sup>501</sup>

3.9.2.2.5. Apart from the *n*-stems treated above, there are some more verbs which are irregular from a synchronical point of view because their past participles go back directly to participial forms of MIA and OIA.

The past participle of M. *annanī* “to come”, A.F. *enī* “to go, come” has the following short and long forms: M. *ai* / *aī*; F. *ā* / *āī*; A. *ā* / *ai*. The corresponding form in Sinhalese is *ā* (of *enavā* “to come”) which goes back to a past participle formed with the suffix *-ta*; cp. Pkt. *āaa-* (3.ps.sg. *ēī*), Skt. *āgata-* (root *ay-/i-*; 2nd present class).<sup>502</sup>

Because of a semantic overlap as well as for formal reasons, the verb M. *danī* cannot be treated separately from *annanī*. In the standard language where *danī* is the only verb meaning “to go”, it shows a complete paradigm. In South Dhivehi, however, all forms which are derived from the present stem have been supplementarily replaced by the corresponding forms of *enī* which conveys the meaning of both “to come” and “to go” today. The past participle has the forms M. *dia* / *diaī*, A. *ge* / *gei*, F. *gē* / *gēī*. Its Sinhalese equivalent *giya* (of *yanavā* “to go”) is derived by GEIGER from an old participle in *-ta-*, cp. Pkt. *gaa-*, Pa. *gata-*, Skt. *gatā-*.<sup>503</sup> With no doubt, A. *ge* and F. *gē* have the same origin. The initial *d-* of M. *dia* can perhaps be explained by assuming a sporadic adaptation to the initial consonant of the present stem in an early period of Dhivehi. In the oldest written documents, there are no forms in question showing initial *g-* but two attestations with *d-*, viz. in *diame* (loc.sg. of the verbal noun; L3 3/2,1 and L2 6,2). — The present stems of Dhiv. *danī* and Sinh. *yanavā* can be derived from the OIA root *yā-*<sup>504</sup> (*yāti* “goes, approaches, comes to”, 2nd present class<sup>505</sup>).

The past participle of *bonī* “to drink” has the forms M. *bui* / *buī*, A. *bi* / *bī*, F. *bī* (long form); cp. the Sinhalese equivalent *bī*, of *bonavā*.<sup>506</sup> Its basic form is the OIA past participle *pīā-* belonging to the present *pība-* “to drink” (root *pā-*).<sup>507</sup>

<sup>500</sup> Cf., e.g., WHITNEY (1885), 56 and further WERBA (1997), 403.

<sup>501</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 70, no. 1018 (for *gannanī* cp. also 3.9.2.2.3). A comparison with the corresponding participial forms of other Modern IA languages, especially of the northwestern group, raises the question whether Sinh. *dat* really does represent an analogous adaptation. Irregular past participles like Sindhī *jjātō* (cf. GRIERSON 1903-1927, VIII, 1, 50), Lahndā *jātā* (ib., 264), Hindkī *jjātā* (besides *jjāniā*; ib., 344) etc. perhaps support the assumption that Sinh. *dat* has its origin in the same form as the Northwest IA participles mentioned above. We still do not know whether there are any further coincidences of this type between Northwest IA and Insular IA. Supposing that there might exist some more synchronic irregularities which are common to both groups and which by an exact historical analysis could be traced back to a common origin, this would speak in favour of a Northwest Indian origin of the common ancestors of Sinhalese and Maldivians (cf. DE SILVA 1979, 14 ff. for the “Eastern” and “Western” hypotheses).

<sup>502</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 136; (1941), 15, no. 237 and 31, no. 463. Cf. also WHITNEY (1885), 7; TURNER (1966) I, 70; 121, no. 2515 and 123, no. 2534; MAYRHOFER (1986-) I, 102.

<sup>503</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 137 and (1941), 56, no. 814.

<sup>504</sup> Cf. DE SILVA (1970b), 157-58; cf. also 1.7.1.

<sup>505</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 604, no. 10452; WHITNEY (1885), 131.

<sup>506</sup> Cf. MATZEL (1983), 56; GEIGER (1941), 125, no. 1863.

<sup>507</sup> Cf. WHITNEY (1885), 95 f.; MAYRHOFER (1986-), I, 113 f.; TURNER (1966), I, 464, no. 8209 and (1985), 66, no. 8209.

The past participle of *kanī* “to eat” has the forms M.F. *kē* / *kēī* and A. *ke* / *kei* which exactly correspond with Sinh. *kā* (of *kanavā*).<sup>508</sup> Its ancestral form is the OIA participle *khādītā-* (cp. *khādati* “chews, bites, eats”, root *khād-*<sup>509</sup>); the umlaut appearing in Sinhalese and Dhivehi was caused by the suffix *-ita*.

From a synchronic point of view, the past participle of M. *kuranī*, A.F. *keranī* “to make, do” presents a complex of irregularities; cp. the forms M. *kuri* / *kurī* contrasting with *kuḷa* / *kuḷāī*, an archaic form occurring only in Old Dhivehi texts (e.g., L1 mn/1,6) and, as a stylistic variant, in poetic diction, F. *keḷa* / *keḷāī* and A. *keḍe* / *keḍēī*. From a diachronic perspective, the manifold forms can be explained satisfactorily. In Sinhalese the past participle is *kaḷa* with a dialectal variant *keḷa* today<sup>510</sup>; according to the sound laws, both these variants correspond with M. *kuḷa*, F. *keḷa* and A. *keḍe*. The basic form of this formation must be seen in the OIA participle *krītā-* “done” (root *kr-*, pres. stem *kr̥ṃó-/karó-*<sup>511</sup>). The forms appearing in Sinhalese, North Dhivehi and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku imply the following phonological development: after a root containing *-r-*, the dental plosive */t/* of the participial suffix first changed to a retroflex */ṭ/* which later, according to the sound laws, developed through voiced */d/* into */ḷ/*. Some MIA idioms show parallels which, however, cannot be regarded as direct “genetic” ancestors of the modern IIA forms in question; cp. Pa. *kata* / *kaṭa* and AMg. *kaḍa* (besides *kaya*).<sup>512</sup> In contrast to that, the voiced retroflex */ḷ/* is preserved in Aḍḍū in this case as well as in all comparable examples.<sup>513</sup> — The modern variant *kuri* cannot be derived from the OIA *ta*-participle; it represents a secondary formation modelled after the present stem. The formation of the finite preterite is based on this new form as well. There is no past tense derived from *kuḷa* in the modern standard language.

*vanī* “to become; be” (A.F. *venī*) has the past participle M.A. *vi* / *vī*, F. *vī*. Its Sinhalese equivalent is *vū* (of *venavā* “to become”) which goes back to a *ta*-participle, cf. Skt. *bhūtā-*, Pa. *bhūta-*, Pkt. *bhū(ya-* (OIA root *bhū-* “to be”, pres. *bháva-*).<sup>514</sup>

The verb *netunī* “not being there” is a secondary formation which, particularly in the standard language, is characterised by a very contradictory paradigm. In Aḍḍū, the past participle is *ne<sup>o</sup>* / *netī*. In North Dhivehi, *netī* serves as a participle of the present as well as of the preterite, occurring alongside M. *netunu* which appears as past participle and as a finite form of the 3.ps. sg./pl. pret. and which is modelled after the *e*-stems (cf. below). Presumably, it was the latter form from which the modern verbal noun *netun* and the “pseudo-lemmatic” form *netunī* were derived. — The basis of the whole verbal paradigm must be seen in the form */net/* which is the Dhivehi equivalent of Sinhalese *nāti*, *nāt*. This was identified by GEIGER as an adverbial phrase meaning “not existing, no, not”; its origin is OIA *nāsti* “is not”, consisting of the particle *ná* “not” and the finite present form *ásti* “is”; cp. also Pa. *natthi*, Pkt. *ṇatthi*.<sup>515</sup>

3.9.2.3. The past participle of the ***e*-stems** is not derived by means of the formants which are characteristic for the *a*- and *n*-stems but by a special suffix *-unu* ← *-uṇu* occurring only with inactive verbs. Sinhalese disposes of a homophonous suffix *-uṇu* which characterises the past participle of the 3rd conjugation; according to GEIGER (1938, 136), “it is a type of later origin than the participles in *-i*, *-u*, and its sphere has immensely grown in the modern language. ... Frequently the older forms in *-i*, *-u* exist side by side with the more modern

<sup>508</sup> Cf. MATZEL (1983), 56; GEIGER (1941), 36, no. 532.

<sup>509</sup> Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 203, no. 3865; WHITNEY (1885), 32.

<sup>510</sup> Cf. BECHERT (1959), 62, note 3.

<sup>511</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 38, no. 558; TURNER (1966) I, 142, no. 2814; WHITNEY (1885), 21; MAYRHOFER (1986-) I, 307 ff.

<sup>512</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 57.

<sup>513</sup> For more details cf. 1.3.7.2.

<sup>514</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 136; (1941), 167, no. 2512 and 168, no. 2518; WHITNEY (1885), 113; TURNER (1966) II, 536, no. 9416 and 545, no. 9552; MAYRHOFER (1986-) II, 255 ff.

<sup>515</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1941), 85, no. 1256; cf. ib. 17, no. 256 s.v. *āti*, *āta* “there is, there are”. — TURNER (1966) I, 407, no. 7091.

forms in *-unu*: ... *temi wet (timita)* and *temuṇu*.” The prototype of this participial formation was identified by GEIGER with forms like Pa. *parihīna* “wasted” which corresponds with Sinh. *pirihunu*, although “in this case the traditional spelling with the cerebral (*ṇ*) would be unintelligible. The correct derivative of *parihīna* is *pirihun*, which really exists in the language.” The spelling of the nasal (dental *<n>* vs. retroflex *<ṇ>*) cannot be regarded as a final proof of the etymologically correct form, however, because in Sinhalese the two phonemes had coincided phonetically into [n] by the 16th century when they were often confused as GEIGER himself stated in another context.<sup>516</sup> The spelling with the retroflex *<ṇ>* is proved to be historically correct by the existence of the homophonous suffix *-unu* which is attested in the documents of Old Dhivehi and by the retroflex /*ṇ*/ the suffix still has today as an independent phoneme in the Addū dialect.<sup>517</sup>

The past participle of the *e*-stems in Modern Dhivehi shows regular dialectal variation. The participial forms of *temenī* “to get wet”, A. *temeṇe*, F. *temun* and M. *temunu*, can be traced back to a common basis *\*temuṇu* which is identical to the Sinhalese form in its traditional spelling with retroflex *<ṇ>*. The change of final *-u* → *-e* in the position after a retroflex *ṇ* in the Addū variant agrees with the sound laws (cf. 1.2.4.4) whereas the change of the suffix-initial *u* into *e* can be explained by an analogical adaptation to the present stem, *teme-*, because there is no reason for a spontaneous sound change here. There are good examples to show that an *u* is not automatically changed into *e* in the position before *ṇ* in Addū; cp., e.g., A. *dekuṇu* “south”, *huṇu* “heat; hot”, *karuṇi* “tear”, *kuṇi* “dirt; rotten”, *makuṇu* “bed bug”, *mekuṇu* “grey (or blue tail) mullet” (*crenimugil crenilabis*) or *ukuṇu* “flea, louse”. The analogical adaptation of the preterite stem to the present stem as assumed here is not isolated in Addū but rather usual; cp., e.g., the past participle of (M.) *nimenī* “to get finished, come to an end” which in Addū is *nimeṇe* “finished”, thus contrasting with the dialectal variants F. *nimun*, M. *nimunu* and the older form *nimuṇu* which is attested in a document of the 17th century (F3,2). For some further examples of past participles with *-unu* that are attested in Old Dhivehi texts, cp. *neguṇu* “raised” (L2 9,3 and 22,1), *vuluṇu* (L1 mn/2,5; L4 d/2,1) and *uluṇu* “lived, been” (F3,16), or *vunu* (L1 d/2,2.4; L2 2,1) and *vevuṇu* (L2 38,2) “become” (for the latter formation cf. also 3.12.5.3). It is impossible to find out when the two special developments occurred in the history of Addū speech because there are no written documents of this dialect available to us.

### 3.9.3. The participle of the future

The future participle of Dhivehi, which obviously has no equivalent in Sinhalese,<sup>518</sup> is likely to represent a new formation dating from a relatively recent period. In standard Dhivehi and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the short form of the participle is formally identical with the 3.ps.sg. of the finite future.<sup>519</sup> This statement can also be taken as a synchronic rule for the formation of the future participle in these dialects. In Modern Addū, however, there is no comparable

<sup>516</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1938), 62 ff.

<sup>517</sup> For the loss of the phonemic status of the retroflex *ṇ* in North Dhivehi cf. 1.3.7.

<sup>518</sup> At least there is no indication of such a category in GEIGER’s and GUNASEKARA’s grammars of Sinhalese (GEIGER 1900 and 1938; GUNASEKARA 1891).

<sup>519</sup> For the derivation of these forms, cf. 2.3.1.3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3.

morphological coincidence at all (if it ever existed); here, the 3rd person has formally coincided with the 2nd person (cf. 3.4.1).

3.9.3.1. Considering all available data, we arrive at the conclusion that in North Dhivehi and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the finite future tense developed from the future participle in the same way as the preterite and the present participles were the basis of the corresponding finite forms. As against this, the future participle of the Aḍḍū dialect cannot be derived satisfactorily, albeit it seems to be identical with the corresponding form of the standard language; the impression of homophony need not be based on morphological identity though. As there is obviously no Sinhalese equivalent and as there are no attestations in the earliest texts of Dhivehi, a serious historical investigation into this subject is not possible at present.

3.9.3.2. The earliest attestations of the future participle date from the 16th century A.D. At that time they already had their modern form so that they do not give any information about their morphological and phonological prehistory. So far, only four examples are attested, viz. *kurāṇe* (of *kurani* “to make, do”; F5,17,18), *vāṇe* (of *vani* “to become”; F11,20), *hunnāṇē* (of *hunnani* “to stand, remain, stay, be”; ITMKM 1,6), *haddavāṇē* (of *haddavanī* causative, 2nd/3rd honorific degree, “to (cause to) make, build”; RC 3,12). All these participles are used as attributes.

3.9.3.3. For Aḍḍū we may at least formulate a simple synchronic rule for the formation of the future participle according to which the infinitive ending /-ʔ/, which reflects the dative ending /-ś/ ← /-t/ itself, is replaced by *-ne* / *-nei* (long form); cp., e.g., *balāṇe(i)*, *vannaṇe(i)*, *temēṇe(i)*, *kerāṇe(i)*, *hinnāṇe(i)*, *vēṇe(i)*; the corresponding infinitives are *balā* “to look”, *vanna*<sup>3</sup> “to enter”, *temē*<sup>3</sup> “to get wet”, *kerā*<sup>3</sup> “to make, do”, *hinna*<sup>3</sup> “to stand, remain, stay, be”, *vē*<sup>3</sup> “to become”. This rule suggests that the future participle was built from the infinitive in its oldest form ending in a retroflex *-t* by adding a suffix *-ne*; the resulting sequence *\*-tne* was then simplified by a loss of the stop *t* which left its retroflex articulation in the following *-ṇ* (*\*balāt-ne* → *\*balāṭṇe* → *balāṇe*). It remains unclear, however, what the origin of the suffix *\*-ne* was.

### 3.10. The absolutive (converb)

In the present treatise, the term “absolutive” is used for the category which GEIGER called the “gerund of the preterite” or “gerund II”<sup>520</sup> while MATZEL preferred the term “absolutive II (absolutive of the preterite)”.<sup>521</sup> As against this, the term “gerund” is here reserved for the form which was called “gerund I” by GEIGER and “absolutive I” by MATZEL (cf. 3.8. above). A consistent distinction of the terms is necessary because the latter formation (“gerund”) is diachronically not connected with the category of the absolutive proper. Furthermore, GEIGER’s (and MATZEL’s) terminology which refers to the preterite can be misleading because the absolutive (in Dhivehi as well as in Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit) is not tied to a specific

<sup>520</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 74, (1938), 159 and (1919), 79.

<sup>521</sup> “Für diese grammatische Kategorie ist die in der Grammatik der indischen Sprachen eingebürgerte Bezeichnung Absolutivum gegenüber Gerundium zu bevorzugen, da ihre Funktion nichts mit den Gerundien europäischer Sprachen zu tun hat” (MATZEL 1983, 47).

category of tense; depending on the context, it can be used for the expression of anterior as well as contemporary actions.

Although it is not possible to track the historical development of the absolutive in Dhivehi in detail, many questions can be solved by comparing the Sinhalese material. From a synchronic-morphological point of view, the regular as well as the irregular absolutives of Dhivehi and Sinhalese can generally be deduced from a common basis. This implies that the historical derivation of the absolutive in Dhivehi cannot differ in many respects from the development GEIGER assumed for Sinhalese: “It is certain that all formations in question are based on [OIA] gerunds [i.e. absolutive forms, S.F.] in *-ya*. This, however, is very important. We see in Pkt. that these forms are of a more recent origin in comparison with those ending in *-ttā*, *-ittā* (= Skt. *-tvā*, *-itvā*), and the gerunds in *-iṭ* are based on them as well. Once again, Sinhalese fits perfectly with the historical development of the Prākṛit languages.”<sup>522</sup>

As to Modern Sinhalese, GEIGER gives a synchronic rule for the formation of the absolutives: they are built from the present stem by adding the final vowels which characterise the particular conjugation types. This rule is not applicable as such to Dhivehi, however, since there are too many interdialectal differences and, furthermore, also formal variations within a given dialect. The only exception is constituted by the *e*-stems with their regular morphology, which is equivalent to that of the 3rd conjugation of Sinhalese.

3.10.1. The regular formation of the absolutive of the ***a*-stem verbs** in Dhivehi can be illustrated by the following example:

absolutive	Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
<i>a</i> -stems	<i>balai</i>	<i>balā</i>	<i>balā</i>

3.10.1.1. As a rule, the absolutive is formally identical to the 3.ps.sg. of the present (cf. 3.2.1). The only exception is represented by those verbs of the standard language which end in *-ē* in the 3.ps.sg. In these cases, the absolutive has a final short *-e*; cp. *bunē* “he says” with the absolutive *bune* “saying”. — In the formation of reduplicated absolutives (cf. 3.10.5), the final *-i* of the first member can be apocopated in the dialect of Addū; cp. *bala balai* “by looking and looking” existing alongside “regular” *balai balai*. In the same dialect, a shortening of the diphthong occurs whenever the absolutive is combined with an auxiliary verb; cp., e.g., *balagen*, *balafei*, *balalāi* (cf. 3.11.4 below).

3.10.1.2. The historical development of the regular absolutive forms of Dhivehi is likely to be the same as that described for Sinhalese by GEIGER (1938, 160): “The frequent use of the gerund [= absolutive, S.F.] allows us to trace the development, at least, of the forms in *-ā* (conj. I) from the Prakritic Sinhalese up to the modern times. In Sinh. Pk. it ends in *-aya*: KADĀYA having detached, ... KARĀVAYA having caused to be constructed, ... KANA-

<sup>522</sup> “Sicher aber ist, daß allen Bildungen die Gerundialformen [i.e. absolutives, S.F.] auf *-ya* zugrunde liegen. Dies ist aber von großer Wichtigkeit. Wir beobachten im Pkt., daß diese Formen gegenüber denen auf *-ttā*, *-ittā* (= skt. *-tvā*, *-itvā*) die jüngeren sind, und die Gerundien auf *-iṭ* stammen ebenfalls von ihnen her. Das Sgh. fügt sich also wieder vollkommen in die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Prākṛits ein” (GEIGER 1900, 74).

VAYA having caused to be dug ... I believe that *-aya* is spelt for *-āya* and that forms like P. *ādāya*, *uṭṭhāya* are the prototype of the Sinhalese gerund [abs.]. In Pali such formations are not confined to the *ā*-roots. ... In the medieval period *-āya* became *-ay*: *karay* having done, *nimavay* having finished, ... *balay* having looked ... This *-ay* alternates with *-ā* in the 10th c.: *balā*, *nimavā* ... and *-ā* becomes the regular ending from the 12th c.: *asā* having heard ...”

Thus, the absolutive ending *-ai* which in Sinhalese disappeared as early as the medieval period, has remained unchanged in Addū until present while the absolutive in *-ā* of Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku and Māle corresponds exactly with its modern Sinhalese counterpart. As against this, it must be stated that there are no Sinhalese equivalents of the exceptional absolutives in *-e* we find among the *a*-stems in Māle.

3.10.2. The formation of the absolutive of the ***e*-stems** is as homogeneous in all Dhivehi dialects as that of the *a*-stems. The synchronical rule can be easily formulated: the final *-e* of the present stem is replaced by *-i* (*/-ī*) as the following example shows:

absolutive <i>e</i> -stems	Addū	Fua <sup>o</sup> Mulaku	Māle
	<i>temi</i>	<i>temī / temī</i>	<i>temi</i>

3.10.2.1. In the standard language, the final *-i* is sometimes lengthened in the absolutive; in Fua<sup>o</sup> Mulaku, the lengthening of *-i* → *-ī* is even regular for all *e*-stems. Cp., e.g., *nimenī* “to finish (intr.), come to an end”: A.M. *nimi*, F. *nimī*; *veṭṭenī* “to fall”: A.M. *veṭṭi*, F. *veṭṭī*.

3.10.2.2. In Sinhalese, the corresponding absolutive of the 3rd conjugation has a final *-ī* as well; cp. the forms *tibī* (of *tibenavā / tiyenavā* “to be (there), exist”), *pipī* (of *pipenavā* “to come into flower, open (as a flower)”).<sup>523</sup> According to GEIGER (1938, 161) again, this absolutive form has developed only recently. In inscriptions of the medieval period and in the older literature, there are still many absolutives of *e*-verbs which end in *-ā* and *-a*, thus following the model of the 2nd conjugation.

3.10.3. For the absolutive of the ***n*-stems**, it is impossible to provide a general rule of its synchronical formation because it is too manifold in its forms. This is why the following table cannot be valid for all cases, although the ending *-e* is statistically the most frequent one among the absolutive formations of this verbal type.

absolutive <i>n</i> -stems	Addū	Fua <sup>o</sup> Mulaku	Māle
	<i>vedi, vede-</i>	<i>veṅde</i>	<i>vade</i>

3.10.3.1. On the basis of certain formal correspondences which characterise the 3.ps.sg. present as well as the absolutive, a set of particular subtypes can be established which will be

<sup>523</sup> For further forms of this type cf., e.g., MATZEL (1983), 48.

listed below. Considering these correspondences it is possible in most cases to derive the correct form of the absolutive from the finite 3.ps.sg. present. The main basis for this comparison is represented by the Addū forms; to a large extent, the corresponding forms of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku agree with those of the Addū dialect. In the standard language, however, the absolutive forms often show other developments or compensatory innovations.

3.10.3.2. A considerable group of *n*-stem verbs in Addū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, but not in the standard language, enables us to set up the following rule: If the root vowel of a verb is *a* and the ending of the 3.ps.sg. present is *-i*, the absolutive is characterised by an umlaut of the root vowel, changing *a* into *e*, and by an ending appearing as *-e* as well.

The historical reason which caused the umlaut of these forms can be seen in the fact that the suffix is based on the same formant as that represented in the *a*-stems; cf. GEIGER who noted the same constellation for Sinhalese: "... the MInd. gerunds in *-ya*, *-iya* are the prototype of the 2nd gerund in Sinh."<sup>524</sup> In the Modern Sinhalese language, the corresponding absolutives show a final *-a*, but in the medieval inscriptions and in the older literature, the normal ending was still *-ä*. The latter ending was productive in the early Middle Ages and began to be replaced by *-a* only since the 12th century. Cp., e.g., *bändä*<sup>525</sup> "having bound" (8th c.), *däkä* "having seen" (12th c.) vs. *bäñda* and *däka* (both 12th c.). The archaic Sinhalese ending *-ä* exactly agrees with the *-e* we find in Modern Dhivehi.

The verbs listed below build the absolutive according to the morphological rule given above. The examples show that there are, at least for parts, considerable differences between the forms of North and South Dhivehi.

*añdanī* "to burn": 2. "to wear (a sarong)": 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *añdi*, F. *añdi* – abs. A.F. *eñde*, but M. abs. = 3.ps.sg.pres. *añdā* (of 1. "to burn").

*bannanī* "to tie": 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *bañdi*, F. *bāñdi* — abs. A.F. *beñde*. The corresponding form in Māle has no umlaut: abs. *bañde* — 3.ps.sg.pres. *bañdē*.

*konnani* "to dig": 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *kañi*, F. *kāñi* – abs. A.F. *keñe*. — M. 3.ps.sg.pres. *konē* – abs. *kone*.

*hehenī* "to husk": 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *sāhi*, F. *sāhi* – abs. A.F. *sehe*; M. *hehi*.

*dekenī* "to see": 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *daki*, F. *dāki* – abs. A.F. *deke*. — M. 3.ps.sg.pres. *dekē* – abs. *deki*.

A. *dagunei*, F. *daḡonāi* "to care for": 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *daḡi*, F. *dāḡi* – abs. A.F. *dege*. (M. *gen guḡenī*).

*vannanī* "to enter": In Addū, both the 3.ps.sg.pres. (*vadi*) and the absolutive end in *-i* today but only the latter form shows umlaut (*vedi*). It is clear that this must be considered as an innovation, given that the expected absolutive form *vede* still occurs in the compounds *vedefeī*, *vedelāi*, *vedegen* (cf. 3.11.4.4 below). The 3.ps.sg.pres. F. *vāñdi* is regular as is the abs. *veñde*. — The Māle equivalents of both the absolutive and the finite form have no umlaut (3.ps.sg.pres. *vadē* – abs. *vade*).

With respect to its present conjugation and its absolutive, *gannanī* "to buy", which represents an inherited nasal present (cf. 3.9.2.2.3), seems to belong to this group as an exception; cp. the 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *gani*, F. *gāni* and the abs. *gine*. In this case, however, the front root vowel *i* cannot be traced back to an *a*-umlaut and remains unclear. The equivalent forms of the M. standard language, the 3.ps.sg.pres. *ganē* and the abs. *gane*, do not show umlaut either. — An archaic variant of this absolutive is *gen* (← Old Dhiv. *gena* = Sinh. *gena*), which in Modern Dhivehi occurs in compound verb forms only (cf. 3.11.4.5.5).

3.10.3.3. There is another subtype of *n*-stem verbs with an absolutive ending in *-e*; in this group, the ending of the 3.ps.sg. present is *-i* in Addū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku and *-ē* in the standard language. This type is represented by the following verbs:

<sup>524</sup> GEIGER (1938), 160; cf. also (1900), 74. For the terminology cf. 3.10

<sup>525</sup> Sic; cf. GEIGER (1941), 117, no. 1755.

*dannanī* “to know”: 3.ps.sg.pres. A.F. *deni* – abs. *dene*. — M. 3.ps.sg.pres. *danē* – abs. *dene*.  
*kuḷenī* “to play”: 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *koḷi* – abs. *koḷe*; 3.ps.sg.pres. F. *kēli* – abs. *keḷe*. — M. 3.ps.sg.pres. *kuḷē* – abs. *kuḷe*.  
*binnanī* “to pluck”: 3.ps.sg.pres. A.F. *biṅḍi* – abs. A.F. *biṅḍe*. — M. 3.ps.sg.pres. *biṅḍē* – abs. *biṅḍe*.  
*iṣṭṭnanī* “to sit”: 3.ps.sg.pres. A.F. *irīṅḍi* – abs. A.F. *irīṅḍe*. — M. 3.ps.sg.pres. *iṣṭṭṅē* – abs. *iṣṭṭe*.

3.10.3.4. A third subgroup of *n*-stems with an absolutive ending in *-e* consists of two verbs whose 3.ps.sg. present ends in A. *-ei*, F. *-e*, M. *-ē*:

*innanī* “to sit; marry, be married”: 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *iṅḍei*, F. *iṅḍe* – abs. F. *iṅḍe*; A. *\*iṅḍe* is not attested because in today’s language only the suppletive form *irīṅḍe* is used (cf. 3.10.3.3 above s.v. *iṣṭṭnanī*). — M. 3.ps.sg.pres. *iṅḍē* – abs. *iṅḍe*.  
*hunnanī* “to stand; be; remain, stay”: 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *hiṣei*, F. *hiṣe* – abs. A.F. *hiṣe*. — M. 3.ps.sg.pres. *hurē* – abs. *hure*.

3.10.3.5. Another type is constituted by the following three verbs:

*donnanī* “to wash”: 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *dōi*, F. *doe*, M. *dovē*. In Aḍḍū, the primary absolutive has the form *dōi* while a variant *dō-* appears in compound formations such as *dōfei* etc. In Fua’ Mulaku too, the simple absolutive is *dōi* but the compound absolutives still show an uncontracted form; cp. *dove-fē* etc. This latter form (*dove*) is the regular absolutive while the 3.ps.sg.pres. is *dovē* in the standard language.  
*onnanī* “to lie, be (there)”: In Aḍḍū, the prefixed, contracted form of the 3.ps.sg.pres. *teb-ō* contrasts with the uncontracted absolutive *ove*. The equivalent forms of Fua’ Mulaku and the standard language are identical to the latter: abs. *ove* – M.F. 3.ps.sg.pres. *ovē*.  
*oṣṭṭnanī* “to lie (down)”: this compound verb contains *onnanī* as its second member (cf. 3.9.2.2.3); its absolutive forms are almost identical with those of the latter verb: abs. A. *veṣiōi* (cf. also *veṣiōfei*, *veṣiovefei*), F. *veṣiove*, M. *oṣṭṭve* – 3.ps.sg.pres. A. *veṣiōi*, F. *veṣiove*, M. *oṣṭṭve*.

3.10.3.6. In the case of two verbs, the co-occurrence of a 3.ps.sg. present ending in *-ei* and of an absolutive ending in *-i* is confined to the dialect of Aḍḍū:

(*uḷenī*) “to live, be”: A. 3.ps.sg.pres. *vēṅḍei* – abs. *vēṅḍi*; F. 3.ps.sg.pres. *vēṅḍi* – abs. *vēṅḍi*. — (M. 3.ps.sg. pres. *uḷē* – abs. *uḷe*; cf. 3.9.2.2.4 above).  
*nukunnanī* “to leave, come/go out”: A. 3.ps.sg.pres. *nukumei* – abs. *nukumi*. — Fua’ Mulaku and Māle have identical forms: 3.ps.sg.pres. *nukumē* – abs. *nukume*.

### 3.10.4. Irregular absolutives

Apart from the absolutives mentioned so far, which can be classified according to the three verbal classes, there also exist some isolated absolutive formations which belong to so-called irregular verbs. Some of these absolutives, which cannot be explained from the synchronic point of view, have exact equivalents in Sinhalese. As far as the forms in question are attested in historical Sinhalese, GEIGER was able to trace them back to OIA predecessors (cf. GEIGER 1938, 159 f. and 1900, 74).

M. *danī* “to go” has an absolutive form M.A. *gos*, F. *goho* which agrees with Sinh. *gos* (cp. also the variant *gosin*, colloquial *gohin*, *gihin*) belonging to the verb *yanavā* “to go”. GEIGER derives *gos* via MIA *\*gacca* from the old absolutive form *-gatyā* (Skt. *gam-* “to go”; cf. below); the development of *-cc-* into *-s-* agrees with the sound laws of both Insular IA languages.<sup>526</sup> Although GEIGER offers no explanation for the *o*-vocalism in Sinh. *gos*, he suggests a parallel with the *o*-vocalism of the absolutive *koḷa* (← Sinh. *karanu*; cf. below s.v. *kurani*).

<sup>526</sup> Cf. DE SILVA (1970b), 158 and 159. Cf. also 1.7.3.

M. *annanī*, A.F. *enī* “to come” has the absolute forms M. *ais*, A. *ās*, F. *āho* which correspond to Sinh. *avut*, *ävīt*. Via an intermediate \**ā-gacca*, GEIGER traces the latter forms back to the Skt. absolute *ā-gatya* (*ā* + *gam-* “to come near, approach”<sup>527</sup>); on the final *-t* which contrasts with the final *-s* in *gos*, he states: “Here [i.e. in *gos*, S.F.] *cc* has become *s*, but it seems to be represented by *d* (through *j*) in *avut*, *ävīt*.” Both intermediate forms, *avuj* as well as *avud*, are attested in medieval Sinhalese.<sup>528</sup> In contrast to that, the final consonant of the Dhivehi equivalents is unproblematical because it shows that there was a regular change of *-cc-* (→ *-j*) into *-s*, just as in *gos*.<sup>529</sup>

*kuranī* “to make, do” has the absolute forms M.A. *ko* /*koś*/, F. *kō*. The Old Dhivehi documents show variant spellings such as *koṭu* or *koṭ* which exactly correspond with Sinh. *koṭa* (but not with its synonym *kara* which represents a different formation). In Sinhalese Prakrit, the form *kaṭu* is attested since the 2nd c. A.D., *koṭu* appearing as a later variant. In medieval Sinhalese, there is a chronological succession of the forms *koṭ* (9/10th c.), *koṭā* (12th c.) and, lastly, *koṭa*. The basis of all these formations must be seen in Skt. *kṛtvā*.

*vanī* “to become” has the absolute forms M. *ve*, A. *vei* (but *ve-gen* etc., cf. below), F. *vē*, which, like the absolutes of the *a*-stems and most of the *n*-stems, is correlated to the form of the 3.ps.sg.pres. (M. *vē*, A. *vei*, but F. *ve*) from a synchronical point of view. — In medieval Sinhalese, (9/10th c.), the corresponding absolute is attested in the form *vā*, but in the modern language only the variants *va* and *vī* are used (cf., e.g., MATZEL 1983, 49). According to GEIGER (1938, 160), the forms *vā* and *va* “belong to conj(ugation) II”; *vā*, however, is the only variant that can be identified with M. *ve* etc.

The absolute of *bonī* “to drink” is M. *boe*, A. *bōi* (but *bō-gen* etc., cf. below), F. *bō*. This absolute too is nearly identical with the 3.ps.sg. pres.; cf. M. *boe* (besides *boi*), F. *bō* and A. *boi*. The Sinh. equivalent *bī* is explained by GEIGER (1938, 160) as analogous to *dī* (cp. *denī* “to give” treated below).

*kani* “to eat” has the absolute forms M. *kai*, A. *kāi* (but *kā-gen* etc., cf. below), F. *kā*. In Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, the form of the 3.ps.sg. present is identical with the absolute; but cf. A. *kai*, M. *kē*. — The Sinhalese equivalent of the absolute is *kā*, which, according to GEIGER (1938, 159), is a regular formation of the 1st conjugation.

In the standard language, the absolute of *denī* “to give” (cf. 3.9.2.2.2) is *dī* which is completely identical with its Sinh. counterpart, *dī*. In contrast to that, the absolute has the unexpected form *dere* in Addū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. Possibly, this form, which has remained unexplained so far, represents an original compound.

### 3.10.5. Reduplicated absolutes

Both gerunds and absolutes can be reduplicated for the expression of a prolonged or intensive action or process (cf. 3.8.2.2); cp. the following typical formations:

reduplicated absolute	Addū	Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	Māle
<i>a</i> -stem	<i>bala(i) balai</i>	<i>balā balā</i>	<i>balā balā</i>
<i>n</i> -stem	<i>vedi vedi</i>	<i>veñde veñde</i>	<i>vade vade</i>
<i>e</i> -stem	<i>temi temi</i>	<i>temī temī</i>	<i>temi temi</i>

As GEIGER stated (1938, 159), reduplicated absolutes are also frequently used in Sinhalese: “The Gerund II [i.e. absolute; S.F.] is often doubled: *bala-balā*, *kapa-kapā*, *dāka-dāka*,

<sup>527</sup> Cf. MAYHOFER (1965), 99.

<sup>528</sup> GEIGER (1938), 159; cf. also DE SILVA (1970b), 158.

<sup>529</sup> Cf. DE SILVA (1970b), 159; cf. also 1.7.3.

*peni-penī* etc. Such formations have approximately the same meaning as the present gerund ‘while looking, while cutting, while seeing, while appearing’.” In Sinhalese, the final long vowel of the first absolutive is regularly shortened (conjugation I: *-ā* → *-a*, conjugation III: *-ī* → *-i*) in these formations. In contrast to that, the shortening of the vowel is facultative in Dhivehi; it mostly concerns the monophthongisation of the diphthong *-ai* into *-a* in absolutives of the *a*-conjugation in Adḍū (cf. also 3.10.1.1).

In HLSD (1988, 74) the reduplicated absolutive is called “recurrent suffix” with the second absolutive being regarded as a suffix, an opinion which can hardly be upheld if the historical facts are considered.

### 3.11. Compound verbs and auxiliary verbs expressing “aktionsart” concepts

GEIGER’s term “composite verbs” denotes a grammatical category which is typical not only for Sinhalese and Dhivehi but for all modern IA languages in general. According to GEIGER (1900, 83), the “composite verbs” were already characteristic of the MIA vernaculars; he states that “the gerund [absolutive, S.F.] is frequently used to form composite verbs. An auxiliary verb of somewhat general meaning is annexed to it and this gives the verb a peculiar shade of meaning” (1938, 161). The same type of formation appears under different names in the Indological literature; it will be called “compound verbs” in the present treatise. To clarify the “peculiar shade of meaning” GEIGER referred to, it is necessary to provide a consistent discussion of the terms “(verbal) aspect” and “aktionsart” in this context.

#### 3.11.1. Some general remarks on “aspect” and “aktionsart”

From a strictly structuralistic point of view, “aspect” is defined as a binary category which involves the whole verbal system. In real aspect languages such as the Slavic languages and Russian in particular, there is no verbal form which does not participate in the binary opposition of the imperfective and the perfective aspect.<sup>530</sup> This does not mean, however, that every verb must have an aspect partner; there are always some verbal meanings which occur only in the imperfective or in the perfective aspect because of purely semantical reasons. Such verbs are called “perfectiva tantum” and “imperfectiva tantum”, resp. Normally neither the perfective nor the imperfective aspect is represented by a complete verbal paradigm; instead, the paradigm is constituted by a suppletive addition of the perfective and imperfective forms. The perfective aspect, as the marked member of this opposition, is defined by the existence of one or more particular qualities, while the imperfective aspect can simply be defined by the absence of the same qualities. The verbs are marked grammatically as perfective or imperfective by the presence or absence of special morphological features<sup>531</sup>

<sup>530</sup> For the theoretical background cf. ISAČENKO 1962, 347-355.

<sup>531</sup> In Modern Russian as well as the other Slavic languages, aspect formation is formally heterogeneous. Basically three techniques can be distinguished: 1) suffixation: imperfective forms are derived from perfective verbs by special suffixes (cp., e.g., Russ. *otkryt’* pfv. – *otkryvat’* ipfv. “to open”; this method is very productive); 2) lexical suppletivism: in rare cases two etymologically unrelated verbs function as a correlative aspectual pair (cp., e.g., Russ. *govorit’* ipfv. – *skazat’* pfv. “to speak, say”); 3) prefixation: every imperfective primary verb (*verbum simplex*) which is prefixed becomes perfective. In contrast to suffixation and suppletivism, prefixation is not generally accepted as a regular aspect-building method, however. Different from suffixes which never change the meaning of the verb to which they are connected, prefixes generally keep their own meaning. This implies that besides the change of aspect, there is also a semantic difference distinguishing primary

which, on a formal level, inambiguously express the actual aspect, i.e., the view of the speaker towards the action or process in question. It has meanwhile been accepted as a *communis opinio* that the **main characteristic of the perfective aspect** consists in the completeness or totality of a verbal action or process which is virtually witnessed by the speaker from a position outside of this process. So to speak, the speaker assumes a perspective view on the whole process from its beginning to its end. In contrast to that, the imperfective aspect is defined by the absence of this total view from outside. It follows that an imperfective verb expresses the position of an actant right in the middle of a process from where he or she sees neither the beginning nor the end nor the course of events in their totality.

Apart from the speaker's perspective, there is no semantic difference between the two aspects of a verb; thus, the aspectual pair consisting of a perfective and an imperfective partner is characterised by semantic identity which leads to the conclusion that both aspects, as a grammatical doublet, represent only one lexeme. Within the framework of this aspect model which is mainly based on Russian, the category of tense is of no significance.<sup>532</sup>

It is true that some other theories on aspect exist which are not developed exclusively on the basis of the Slavic system but take into account Semitic and Turkic as well as some West-European and Oriental Indo-European languages. These models usually include tense as an important coordinate as well. In this connection, Jerzy KURYŁOWICZ's observations and ideas are of a particular interest.<sup>533</sup> From a formal point of view, they are less strict but also less consistent. Within the framework of a more open but, at the same time, less consistent aspect system, many languages which do not have aspect as a systematic category in the sense of the strict morphological and semantical criteria outlined above, can be regarded as “aspect languages” too. This implies that the pure meaning of the perfective and imperfective aspect can be expressed to a certain extent also in languages which do not dispose of a complementary morphological aspect system. In such languages, aspect is not a primary category that could be kept formally distinct from the temporal system; instead, the only way to express certain nuances of the aspect dichotomy consists in using categories that are (basically) temporal. Thus, the languages in question are characterised by an inseparable coexistence of aspectual and temporal meanings and functions. E.g., English and Hindi belong to this type of languages which possess but a reduced set of features to express **aspectual nuances** without being aspect languages in the strict sense of the word.

3.11.1.1. S. LIENHARD (1961, 21) whose studies on tense and aktionsart in Modern Hindi represent an extension of KURYŁOWICZ's theses (cf. above) in many respects, considers Hindi

imperfective verbs and prefixed perfective verbs; a constellation which is contradictory to the main definition of aspectual pairs. Basically, prefixation always causes the formation of different types of aktionsart (cf. below).

<sup>532</sup> Cf. particularly Ferdinand DE SAUSSURE, *Cours de linguistique générale* (1916), 162. – Cf. ISAČENKO (1962), 347-352, with further bibliographical indications.

<sup>533</sup> Jerzy KURYŁOWICZ, *Aspect et temps dans l'histoire du Persan*, in: RO XVI, 531 ff., 1953; repr. in *Esquisses linguistiques*, 1960), and *Le système verbal de l'Indoeuropéen* (as a “Note liminaire” in J.K.'s *L'apophonie en Indo-Européen*, 1956). – Cf. furthermore Erwin KOSCHMIEDER, *Studien zum slavischen Verbalaspekt I-II*, in: KZ 55, 1928, 280 ff.; KZ 56, 1929, 78 ff.; id., *Zeitbezug und Sprache*, 1929; id., *Zu den Grundfragen der Aspekte*, in: IF 53, 1935, 280 ff.; Wolfgang SCHLACHTER, *Der Verbalaspekt als grammatische Kategorie*, in: MSS 13, 1959, 22 ff. – Bernard COMRIE, *Aspect*, Cambridge 1976 tries to treat the category of aspect as a linguistic universal.

to be a real aspect language characterised by a binary opposition which is formally expressed by means of the participial system, with the present participle as the “constitutive element” of the imperfective aspect and the past participle as the “constitutive element” of the perfective aspect.<sup>534</sup> According to LIENHARD, the temporal system must be understood as a secondary phenomenon which generally results from a “localisation” of forms originally expressing aspect onto certain temporal levels; in the case of Hindi, the participles occur in this function. In LIENHARD’s opinion, this universal change of the originally aspectual meaning into a more temporal one did not yield homogeneous results in the particular languages, but he claims the category of aspect to be still present in all languages, either occurring as a grammatically unambiguous form or as “aspectual qualities” preserved in different degrees within the framework of the temporal system. LIENHARD considers the Latin system of the *consecutio temporum* as the most perfect example of a “temporalisation” of the aspects. He compares the “purely aspectual” meaning of the temporal forms of Modern Hindi with what we find in Modern English and in the Romance languages where, according to KURYŁOWICZ (cf. above), aspect is rather a syntactical than a morphological category (cf. LIENHARD, 1961, 21-27).

It must be stated here, however, that the “aspectual” function of the participles in Hindi is the result of a secondary development. It is not connected with the aspectual opposition of aorist and imperfect met with in the Old Indo-European languages.<sup>535</sup>

It is evident that in the sense of a structuralistic definition as given by ISAČENKO (cf. above), Hindi and other modern IA languages<sup>536</sup> which have a comparable verbal system are no “aspect languages”. Despite the aspectual nuances which are mainly expressed by participles (cf. above), it is not the **whole** verbal system which is governed by a strictly organised binary aspectual opposition here; cp., e.g., the infinitive which is not involved in any way by the category of aspect. Hindi can be called an “aspect language” in the same right as English, however. At the same time it must be underlined that “aspect” in this connection is not the same as the homonymous category in Slavic; nevertheless, it would be too simple to reduce this very complex linguistic problem to a purely terminological question. As there is no aspectual differentiation in the Insular IA languages,<sup>537</sup> it is unnecessary to go into further details of this discussion within the present book.

3.11.1.2. As in the other modern IA languages, the category of “aktionsart” plays an important role in Sinhalese and Dhivehi. In order to avoid a terminological and factual mix-up of the two distinct categories of aspect and aktionsart, it will be necessary to give an exact description of the functional and semantic character of the latter category which is best named

<sup>534</sup> Cf. also MCGREGOR (1972), 17: “-tā, -ā and their concord variants ... form imperfective and perfective participles respectively. These characterise verbal actions aspectually as not completed, or as completed.”

<sup>535</sup> For the imperfective meaning of the injunctive present in contrast with the perfective meaning of the injunctive aorist in prohibitive function which is characteristic for the Vedic period of OIA, cf. 3.5.3.1.

<sup>536</sup> Within the framework of Indological studies, most of the literature in question deals only with Hindi or Urdu; cf. MASICA (1991), 262-279.

<sup>537</sup> In his grammar of Sinhalese, VYXUXOLEV (1964, 51 ff.) erroneously calls the present participle an “imperfective participle”, and the past participle, a “perfective participle”. However, the Sinhalese participles have no aspectual nuances at all. Furthermore, VYXUXOLEV opposes the absolutive (e.g., *balā* “looking, having looked”) as a “perfective gerund” to the gerund in *-min* (e.g., *balamin* “looking”) which he calls “imperfective gerund”. This “aspectualisation” of the Sinhalese verbal categories is without any foundation.

by its German term, “aktionsart” literally meaning “kind or way of action”. It was A.V. ISAČENKO again who, on the basis of the Russian system, exactly defined the peculiar characteristics of aktionsart and who revealed the complicated interrelations between aspect and aktionsart without any contradictions (1962, 386). He came to realise that the prefixation of an imperfective verb in Russian not only results in the perfectivisation of the verb in question but, as a consequence of the specific meaning of the prefix, always gives rise to a semantic re-specification. According to ISAČENKO, an aktionsart can only be derived from already existing verbs.<sup>538</sup> There are three parameters which qualify the category of aktionsart in Russian inambiguously, both from the morphological and the semantic point of view: 1) The particular meaning of a given verb is modified by an additional semantic nuance; 2) this modification is grammatically expressed by a specialised prefix or suffix; 3) the verbs which express a particular aktionsart are aspectually defective, i.e. they can only be perfective or imperfective.<sup>539</sup> The demand for aspectual defectivity of verbs that are determined with respect to their aktionsart is still a subject of discussion within the framework of Slavic studies; as it does not play any role for modern Indic languages, it can be ignored here.

Furthermore, it is important to make a distinction between the morphological category of “aktionsart” and the so-called “verbal character”. ISAČENKO (1962, 397) uses the latter term for verbs that are characterised by common semantic features but are not formally marked as having a peculiar “aktionsart”; this is true, e.g., for “frequentative verbs”, i.e. verbs denoting an action which can be regarded as a continuous sequence of many separate steps (cp., e.g., Engl. *to hammer*).

3.11.1.2.1. Although it is obvious that the Russian scheme of aktionsart formation cannot be transferred directly to the verbal system of the modern IA languages, the function of the prefixes in Russian has to be discussed in a more comprehensive way. The theoretical perceptions which are based on the rich and morphologically consistent system of aktionsart in Russian can indeed serve as a model for understanding and analysing the character of aktionsart in Modern IA. Furthermore, only a good knowledge of the theoretical background can help to avoid a misinterpretation of aktionsart as being an aspectual phenomenon, which has all too often occurred in linguistic literature.

In the Slavic languages, the formation of aktionsart is a very productive morphological process expressing semantic nuances which are added to the basic meaning of a verb. In most cases, these nuances refer either to a particular phase or temporal segment of the whole verbal action or process (e.g., to the beginning, to the end or to a temporal delimitation within the occurrence), or to gradations of quantity and intensity within the course of action.

There are numerous types and subtypes of aktionsart in Russian. Cp., e.g., the “ingressive aktionsart” which concentrates the attention to the initial point of an action (cp. Russ.

<sup>538</sup> Cf. also Jurij S. MASLOV (Sistema osnovnyx ponjatij i terminov slavjanskoj aspektologii, in: Voprosy obščego jazykoznanija, Leningrad 1965) who in his studies on the Slavic aspect did not differentiate clearly enough between aspect and aktionsart. In his rather diffuse theory, all Russian verbs represent some kind of “aktionsart”, no matter whether they are morphologically marked. He distinguishes three types of “aktionsart”: a “characterised” type which is marked by particular morphemes, a “non-characterised” type which is not especially marked, and an “inconsequently characterised” type which can be marked or not.

<sup>539</sup> This would mean that from a verb which expresses an “aktionsart” meaning, no secondary imperfective or perfective aspect partner can be derived.

*govorit'* ipfv. "to speak" and *za-govorit'* (pfv.) "to start speaking"), or the "delimitative aktionsart" which draws the attention to a certain phase within the course of action (cp. *rabotat'* ipfv. "to work" and *po-rabotat'* "to work for a certain time, for a while"). There are different kinds of "resultative aktionsart" which concentrate on the final phase plus the result of an action; this is true, e.g., for the "perdurative-resultative aktionsart" which expresses the finishing moment of an intensive procedure that takes a certain time (cp. *pro-rabotat'* pfv. "to work through (without a break) for a certain time and come to a result"). All the examples given here emphasise a certain segment of the process. The aktionsart in question brings a special phase of the action into the visual field of the speaker; this is expressed grammatically by the perfectivisation of the verb.<sup>540</sup>

In Russian, the diverse prefixes modify the basic meaning of the imperfective primary verbs they combine with to a different extent. The more the meaning of a verb is changed by the particular prefix, the more the aktionsart which results from the prefix becomes transparent. Thus, the aktionsart formations can be distinguished not only semantically but also by their particular derivational relation with the underlying verb.

3.11.1.2.2. From this it follows that there are two main aktionsart types, viz. **lexical** and **modifying** ones<sup>541</sup>, both occurring in numerous subtypes. In the case of a lexical aktionsart, the prefix adds a new semantic element to the original verbal meaning, while in the case of a modifying aktionsart the prefix is semantically closely related to the verb. Thus, a more concrete or more abstract meaning of a given prefix predestines it to create either lexical or modifying aktionsart meanings, but the decisive factor which determines the actually resulting type of aktionsart consists in the combination with the respective verbal meaning. Different kinds of lexical aktionsart are represented, e.g., in Russ. *za-govorit'*, *po-rabotat'* and *pro-rabotat'* (cf. above). Typical examples of the modifying type are, e.g., *na-pisat'* (vs. *pisat'* ipfv.) "to write", *na-risovat'* (vs. *risovat'* ipfv.) "to paint, draw", or *na-mazat'* (vs. *mazat'* ipfv.) "to spread, grease", all of them expressing a resultative aktionsart. The prefix *na-* has the basic meaning "on (the surface of something / somebody)"; the verbs adapting it have the underlying meaning of "to mark (out) the surface of an object; to put marks on the surface of an object". The special meaning of the prefix is already inherent in the semantical content of these verbs; this is why the prefix does not add a new semantic nuance to their original meaning. Prefixes occurring in this constellation are usually called "empty prefixes" ("pré-verbès vides"), but there is no prefix which is specialised to be "empty" – the presupposition always consists in a highest possible semantic overlap with the respective imperfective verb. The more the particular meaning of a prefix corresponds with the verbal meaning to which it is added, the more the prefix is semantically neutralised and the deeper it merges with the main semantic characteristics of the verb in question. Only in such cases, a prefix can occur

<sup>540</sup> Thus, in this connection perfectivisation is nothing more than a concomitant phenomenon, accompanying the aktionsart formation in those cases where the primary verb is imperfective and the aktionsart meaning is expressed by a particular prefix. The prefixation of a perfective verb does not change the aspect as the case of the ("quantitative") "attenuative aktionsart" shows which expresses a deduction of the intensity of an action and which can be built only from perfective verbs (cp. Russ. *nažat'* pfv. "to press" vs. *pri-nažat'* pfv. "to press a little bit, not intensively"; *zabyt'* pfv. "to forget" vs. *pod-zabyt'* pfv. "to forget temporarily"). – For more details and other types of aktionsart cf. ISAČENKO (1962), 388 ff.

<sup>541</sup> Cf. especially O. MÜLLER, Zur Stellung der Verben mit préverbès vides im russischen Aspektsystem, in: *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* IX, 1964, 213-220.

in the purely grammatical function of a “*préverbe vide*”. Because of this semantical neutrality with respect to the primary imperfective verb, a modifying resultative aktionsart of this kind can take over the function of constituting a perfective aspect partner. There is a strong tendency to avoid such provisional aspect pairs, however; in many cases we find a secondary imperfective verb instead which is derived by suffixation from the prefixed perfective verb.<sup>542</sup> In Russian, this represents a very productive development. It follows that the perfectivisation by means of “*préverbes vides*” must be considered as a provisional solution in the evolution of the historically rather young binary category of aspect in Modern Russian. Within this morphological development, the part of the modifying aktionsart type is that of a temporary “donor”.<sup>543</sup> The analysis of the diachronic interrelationship of aspect and aktionsart shows that prefixation in general – and the formation by means of “*préverbes vides*” in particular – cannot be regarded as an aspect-building method although this is still a widely held doctrine.

3.11.1.2.3. Vincenc POŘÍZKA’s<sup>544</sup> and Helmut NESPITAL’s<sup>545</sup> understanding of “aspect” in Hindi and Urdu must be dealt with within this context too. NESPITAL, who in the main points of his argumentation follows POŘÍZKA (as against KURYŁOWICZ, LIENHARD e.a., cf. above) explicitly denies the original present participle (“Partizip I”) to be the imperfective partner and the past participle (“Partizip II”) to be the perfective partner of an aspectual opposition. Influenced by MASLOV’s inefficient theory on aspect and aktionsart (cf. fn. 538 above), NESPITAL is convinced of the existence of an aspect system in Hindi and Urdu which is equivalent to the Slavic system. In his opinion, the “*préverbes vides*” represent the central point of Slavic aspect formation. Following POŘÍZKA, he calls a “sequence of two verbs the first one of which appears in the form of the normal absolutive while the second one is as an inflected form” a “modified verbal expression”; if this verbal sequence satisfies certain semantic requirements, the modifying verb is grammaticalised like a “*préverbe vide*”. Although NESPITAL is right in considering the “modifying verbal expression” as a phenomenon which corresponds to the combination of an imperfective verb with a *préverbe vide* in Slavic, his conclusions are wrong because he confuses “aktionsart” and “aspect” concepts.

Another term used for those verbs in auxiliary function for which POŘÍZKA created the expression “modifying verbs”, is “vector verbs”.<sup>546</sup> The combination consisting of an absolutive form of a main verb and a vector verb is called “compound verb” or “composite verb” (cf. 3.11 above). Essentially, the compound verbs of Indo-Aryan languages represent different kinds of aktionsart. Although this category is semantically less manifold and, from the formal point of view, less consistent in Modern Indo-Aryan than in the Slavic languages, there is a wide range of aktionsart meanings that can be expressed by compound verbs, viz.

<sup>542</sup> Cp., e.g., Russ. *bagrit’* ipfv. “to turn something (purple) red” with its resultative aktionsart derivative *o-bagrit’* which is well attested in the early 19th century as a perfective aspect partner of *bagrit’*; in Modern Russian, however, the aspect pair is *obagrijat’* ipfv. – *obagrit’* pfv., *obagrijat’* representing a secondary imperfective.

<sup>543</sup> For a detailed synchronical and historical description of this development and for a comprehensive bibliography on this subject, cf. Sonja FRITZ, Zur Problematik der “*préverbes vides*” im Russischen, in: *Klagenfurter Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 6, 1980, 139-159.

<sup>544</sup> POŘÍZKA (1967-1970 and 1970); cf. also HACKER (1958).

<sup>545</sup> NESPITAL (1981), particularly 61 f.

<sup>546</sup> Cf. also HOOK (1974); CHATTERJEE (1988); MASICA (1991), 327 ff.

completion, resultativity, suddenness, intensity, progressivity or duration of a verbal action or process. In the Slavic languages, it is not possible to combine all prefixes with all verbs; the same holds true for the combination of main verbs and modifying auxiliary verbs in the Modern IA languages. The selection of the modifying verbs that can be used always depends on the meaning of a given main verb. Each auxiliary verb which can appear as a modifier must have a concrete meaning which overlaps with that of the main verb. Depending on the degree of the semantic overlap or “harmony” between the main verb and the auxiliary verb, the original meaning of the latter usually becomes more or less pale; sometimes it gets even lost completely. Combinations of main verbs and auxiliary verbs which are frequently used can be treated as independent lexical units.

3.11.1.2.4. Most linguistic investigations into compound verbs of Modern IA languages are concerned with Hindi or Urdu. The number of auxiliary verbs with a modifying function assumed in these treatises varies from author to author. In his grammar of Modern Standard Hindi, MCGREGOR (1972, 99-105) lists the following 13 verbs which regularly occur in this function:

*jānā* “to go” (stresses the completion of an action or process);

*lenā* “to take” (reflexive-medial meaning);

*denā* “to give” (often used in contrast with *lenā*, suggesting that the action particularly concerns a person other than the actant);

*paṛnā* “to fall, be found” and *uṭhnā* “to rise” (are often used with verbs denoting “to fall” and “to rise” themselves; in stressing “a change of circumstance, particularly a sudden one”, these verbs come near to the ingressive aktionsart of Slavic (cf. 3.11.1.2.1 above);

*ḍālnā* “to throw down” (stresses the violent, decisive or drastic course of an action or, that it is done in a casual way);

*baiṭhnā* “to sit” (suggests, e.g., something anticlimactic or deteriorative, or the feeling that an action is done foolishly, thoughtlessly or maliciously);

*ānā* “to come” (complementary to *jānā*, cf. above; suggests completion; as common with verbs of motion, *ānā* emphasises “the carrying through of actions directed towards a place, literal or figurative, from which they are considered”);

*calnā* “to move, go” (sometimes stresses the progressive element in an action);

*nikalnā* “to emerge” (expresses the suddenness or unexpectedness of an action);

*pahuñcnā* “to reach, arrive at” (has a resultative meaning in the sense of Slavic; cf. 3.11.1.2.2 above);

*pānā* “to get, find” (“stresses not so much the ability to perform an action as the possibility of performing it”);

*rakhnā* “to put, place, keep, hold” (“underlines the fact that the action results in the achievement of a state of some duration”).<sup>547</sup>

As against MCGREGOR, HOOK who in his exhaustive study on compound verbs only deals with popular Hindi, even assumes the enormous number of 35 vector verbs of this type (1974, 19). R. CHATTERJEE enumerates 18 vector verbs for Bengali (1988, 76-7).

3.11.1.2.5. In contrast to this, the Insular IA languages possess but a small number of auxiliary or vector verbs which combine with main verbs in the form of absolutes or gerunds. But in spite of the small variety of auxiliaries, the role compound verbs play in modern Sinhalese and Dhivehi is not less important than in Hindi, and their use is extremely

<sup>547</sup> All the direct quotations are taken from MCGREGOR (1972), 99-105; for more details about the different kinds of aktionsart meaning which is expressed by the given modifying verbs cf. ib.

frequent; cp. MATZEL’s observations on Sinhalese which are true for Dhivehi as well: “Such combinations are of a great importance for the Sinhalese language. The different kinds of combinations which can express reflexivity, the beginning, course, repetition and conclusion of an action, have compensated the loss of forms which had a modifying function in the verb[al system of] the older language.”<sup>548</sup>

As in the other Indo-Aryan languages, the combination of auxiliaries and main verbs is not a matter of free choice but of semantic harmony in Sinhalese and Dhivehi. Many compound verbs are used like lexical units as GEIGER already stated speaking about Sinhalese.<sup>549</sup>

### 3.11.2. Combinations with auxiliary verbs in Sinhalese

In Sinhalese, five types of verbs can be used in auxiliary function. All these verbs are combined with the absolutive, in particular cases also with the gerund of a main verb.<sup>550</sup>

3.11.2.1. *gannavā* “to take, buy” gives the main verb a kind of medial-reflexive meaning: “it expresses that the action refers to the actant, that it is useful for him ... Thus, *dannu* means ‘to know’, but *dāna-gannu* ‘to get to know, recognise’; *dakinu* ‘to see’, but *dāka-gannu* ‘to find out (something) for oneself ...’”<sup>551</sup> Cp. also *hōdanavā* “to wash” vs. *hōdā-gannavā* “to wash oneself”; *bañdinavā* “to bind, tie” vs. *bāñda-gannavā* “to tie (something) around oneself” etc.<sup>552</sup>

3.11.2.2. Besides some special meanings, all verbs in auxiliary function which basically mean “to put” emphasise the finishing phase or the completion of an action in the sense of a “resultative aktionsart”. This is true for the following three verbs:

*piyanavā* “to close, shut”; the meanings “to put, set” and “to leave” are obsolete in Modern Sinhalese.<sup>553</sup>

In auxiliary function, *piyanavā* stresses the completion or the perfect realisation of an action in the sense of a resultative aktionsart. Cp. *dī-piyanavā* which is derived from *denavā* “to give”, or *dāka-piyanavā* from *dakinavā* “to see”. In the older language, *piyanavā* was often used in combination with causatives, cp. *karavā-piyanu* “to cause (somebody) to do (something) completely”. — The past participle of *piyanavā*, which does not occur independently, has the form *pī* in the written language, while the colloquial form is *pū* / *pu*. In combination with the absolutive of a main verb, it is frequently used to build a secondary past participle; especially the forms ending in *-pu* are considered as the most important type of past participles in the colloquial language. Cp., e.g., *liyā-/liya-pu* “written”, from *liyanavā* “to write”; *hiṭa-pu* “been”, of *hiṭinavā* “to be”; *ā-pu* “(having) come”, of *enavā* “to come”; *bīpu* “drunken”, of *bonavā* “to drink”.<sup>554</sup> — The old imperative forms of *piyanavā*, sg. *pan*, *piya*, pl. *pallā*,

<sup>548</sup> MATZEL (1983), 81: “Derartigen Zusammensetzungen kommt in der singhalesischen Sprache eine große Bedeutung zu. Durch die verschiedenen Arten von Zusammensetzungen, die Reflexivität, Beginn, Verlauf, Wiederholung und Abschluß der Handlung bezeichnen können, ist der Verlust von Formen, die in der älteren Sprache der Modifikation des Verbs dienen, ausgeglichen worden.”

<sup>549</sup> “Viele Verbindungen werden freilich stereotyp und in ihrem Ursprung kaum mehr gefühlt” (GEIGER 1941a, 28 / 1973, 549).

<sup>550</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 83 f.; (1941a), 28 / (1973), 549; (1938), 161 f. Cf. also MATZEL (1983), 82 f.

<sup>551</sup> “... es wird ausgedrückt, daß die Handlung sich auf den Agens bezieht, ihm Nutzen bringt ... So heißt *dannu*: wissen, aber *dāna-gannu*: sich ein Wissen aneignen, erkennen; *dakinu*: sehen, aber *dāka-gannu*: etwas für sich ausfindig machen ...” GEIGER (1941a), 28 / (1973), 549.

<sup>552</sup> For further examples cf. MATZEL (1983), 81.

<sup>553</sup> Cf., e.g., JAYAWARDENA-MOSER (1993), 138.

<sup>554</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1900), 83 and (1938), 161; 137. Many examples can be found in MATZEL (1983), 91.

*piyav*, only occur in combination with the absolutive of a main verb too; they are used to build very intensive, strict imperative forms (cf. 3.5.4.2.1).

In the modern Sinhalese language, *lanavā* “to put, set, place” is but rarely used as a main verb. As an auxiliary, it is almost synonymous with *piyanavā*. The past participle *lū / lu*, in the literary language *lī*, is used like *pū / pu / pī* (cf. above); it occurs very frequently. In combination with the absolutive of a main verb, the absolutive *lā* is regularly used for the formation of the colloquial absolutives in *-lā*, co-occurring with a shortening of the long final vowels of primary absolutives of the 1st and the 3rd conjugation. Cp., e.g., *balalā* ← *balā-lā* (of *balanavā* “to look (for)”, conjugation I), or *pipilā* ← *pipī-lā* (of *pipenavā* “to bloom”, conjugation III); *dākalā* (absolutive *dāka*, of *dakinavā* “to see”, conjugation II) remains without a change. — In combination with a few verbs, *lanavā* gives rise to causative-like meaning; cp., e.g., *gotā-lanu* “to let plait, weave”, from *gotanu* “to plait, weave” (cf. GEIGER 1900, 83).

In auxiliary function, *damanavā / dānavā* “to put, place, fix; subdue, tame, overpower” is generally used in the same sense as *piyanavā* and *lanavā*. In combination with the absolutive of transitive verbs, it yields the nuances of resultativity and completion of an action; cp., e.g., *kapā-damanavā* “to cut (completely) through”, *bāñḍa-damanavā* “to tie / bind up”, etc.

3.11.2.3. *yanavā* “to go” and *enavā* “to come” are only rarely used as auxiliary verbs in Sinhalese. GEIGER (1938, 161) attests a similar nuance for *yanavā* as for *piyanavā* etc.; cp., e.g., *virī-yanu* “melted (completely)” (of *virenavā* “to melt”). According to MATZEL (1983, 81), the combination of *yanavā* with the absolutive of a main verb expresses “the complete execution of an action which extended over a certain period”, i.e. a kind of resultative-durative aktionsart. In a purely periphrastic use, this nuance cannot be distinguished any longer, however. In this connection, special attention should be drawn to two compound verbs which are frequently used in the modern language. In both these cases, it is *gannavā* “to take” which functions as the main verb; the verbs in question are *gena-yanavā*, also appearing in the phonetic variant *geniyanavā*, with the meaning “to take away”, lit. “to go having taken”, and *gena-enavā*, contracted to *genēnavā* and furthermore shortened by haplology to *gēnavā*, meaning “to bring”, lit. “to come having taken”.<sup>555</sup>

3.11.2.4. In combination with the absolutive of a main verb, Sinh. *āti* “is (there)”, which represents a petrified relic form of the old copula (cp. Pa. *atthi*, Skt. *asti*), has a twofold function: On the one hand, it can add the nuance of completion, on the other hand it can also express the speaker’s assumption that an action has probably taken place; cp., e.g., *ohu gedara gihillā āti* “Probably he has gone home”<sup>556</sup> (*gihillā* being a compound of the colloquial absolutive form *gihin* and the absolutive *lā*; cf. 3.10.4 and 3.11.2.2). According to GEIGER (1938, 161), both meanings are represented together in the sentence *uñba aran-āti* “you have (or may have) taken” (with *aram* being a colloquial absolutive form of *aragannavā* “to take (for oneself)”; cf. MATZEL 1983, 49).

3.11.2.5. From a morphological point of view, three verbs establish a special set in the formation of compound verbs in that they do not combine with the absolutive but with the gerund or the reduplicated absolutive in auxiliary function. They add a pronounced nuance of duration to the main verb. The verbs in question are *iñḍinavā / innavā* “to sit; be (there), be present, exist”, *siṅṅinavā / hiṅṅinavā* “to stand; be, remain, stay” (both verbs referring only to

<sup>555</sup> Cf. GEIGER 1938, 162 and 1900, 84; cf. also MATZEL 1983, 49. Hindi has exact parallels in *le jānā*, lit. “to go having taken”, and *le ānā*, lit. “to come having taken”.

<sup>556</sup> Cf. MATZEL (1983), 85.

living beings) and *tiyēnavā* / *tibenavā* “to be, exist, be located” (of inanimate things). In the case of *tibenavā*, GEIGER reconsidered the character of the aktionsart it expresses in the course of time; in 1900, he still wrote that “*tibenu* ‘be’ expresses the completion of an action”,<sup>557</sup> but about forty years later he regarded the same verb as an auxiliary adding a durative meaning to the main verb (GEIGER 1938, 161). Both GEIGER and MATZEL compare the periphrastic function of the three auxiliary verbs with that of the English progressive form.<sup>558</sup> Cp., e.g., *kapamin iñdim* “I am cutting”; *kapamin (kapa-kapā) unim* “I have been cutting”.

3.11.3. Paradigmatic combinations which consist of the absolutive of a main verb and a twofold auxiliary verb are usual in Sinhalese; their use is not as systematised as it is in Dhivehi, however (cf. below). The most important formations in Sinhalese are colloquial absolutives ending in *-lā*, past participles ending in *-lū* / *-lu*, *-lī* (aux. verb *lanavā*; cf. 3.11.2.2) and *-pū* / *-pu*, *-pī* (aux. verb *piyanavā*; cf. 3.11.2.2). Cp., e.g., *gena-gihillā* “having taken away”, the colloquial compound absolutive of *gena-yanavā* “to take away”, lit. “to go having taken”, (*gena* absolutive of the main verb *gannavā* “to take”; *gihillā*, a reduplicated absolutive consisting of *gihin* from *yanavā* “to go” and *-lā* from *lanavā* “to put, set, place”), but also the colloquial (infinite) preterite of the same verb, *genā-giyapu* (absolutive *gena* + infinite pret. *giyā* + infinite pret. *-pu*; cf. MATZEL 1983, 49 and 92.)

### 3.11.4. Compound verbs and auxiliary verbs in Dhivehi

In Dhivehi, the combination of the absolutive of a main verb and an auxiliary verb is used for the systematic formation of compound participles and finite forms of the preterite and the future as well as compound absolutive forms. The finite and the infinite preterite forms and the absolutive formations occur very frequently while the corresponding future forms are used but rarely. Composite present formations are built by a few auxiliary verbs only. Some auxiliary verbs play an outstanding role as morphological elements constituting periphrastic formations, while others are only used within unchangeable idiomatic phrases.

Those verbs which regularly occur in modifying function together with absolutives will be discussed below. Most of the auxiliary verbs will be found in all dialects and used in the same way throughout the Dhivehi speaking area; exceptional cases will be noted.

3.11.4.1. Dhivehi must once have possessed a verb *\*fianī* which presumably meant “to put, set, place; close, shut” in accordance with Sinh. *piyanavā* (cf. 3.11.2.2). In the standard language, *\*fianī* has become obsolete as a main verb today; even in the earliest written documents it is not attested independently. The same holds true for the southern dialects, the verb meaning “to shut, close” being *lappanī* everywhere in Modern Dhivehi.

In the modern language, *\*fianī* is a very productive auxiliary verb with a mainly morphological function; it does have a semantical component too, however, which can be paraphrased with “just having got (something) completely finished”. This nuance, which can easily be

<sup>557</sup> GEIGER (1900), 83: “*tibenu* ‘sein’ drückt den Abschluß einer Handlung aus.”

<sup>558</sup> GEIGER (1938), 161; MATZEL (1983), 72.

regarded as a resultative aktionsart, cannot be associated with all verbs; nevertheless *\*fianī* is one of the most frequent auxiliaries, being used for the periphrastic formation of a special set of categories which will hereafter be called “absolute I”, “past participle I” and “(finite) preterite I”. The formation of a “future I” with the respective forms of *\*fianī* remains exceptional though; cp. the first person singular *dakkā-fānan* which in a more elevated style of the standard language has the same meaning as the normal future form *dakkānan* “I shall show” (M. *dakkanī* “to show”). The unalterable forms *-fānan* and *-fānu* which in the language of Māle are used for the formation of a polite imperative, must have originated as future forms of *\*fianī* as well (cf. 3.5.4.2.2). The endings of the finite preterite I are identical with the finite forms of the primary preterite paradigm of *\*fianī* which is preserved only within this constellation where they are added to the absolute of the main verb. A representative example of the *a*-stems, from which preterite I can be regularly derived, is the Aḍḍū-paradigm of *balanī* “to look” with the forms 1.ps.sg. *bala-fin*, 2nd/3rd ps.sg. *bala-fi*; 1.ps.pl. *bala-fimā*, 2nd/3rd ps.pl. *bala-fia* [*balafie*]. — The short form of the past participle I, *bala-fi*, is identical with the 3.ps.sg. of the finite preterite I. — Formations of a preterite I generally occurs with the *n*-stems as well; cp. M. *hure-fin* (*hunnanī* “to stand, be”), *iñde-fin* (*innanī* “to sit; marry, be married”). — Furthermore, preterite I can also be derived from some *e*-stems; cp. M. *uḷe-fin* (*uḷenī* “to be, live”), A. *edi-fin* (M. *edenī* “to wish”).

3.11.4.2. From a formal point of view and from its meaning, Dhiv. *lanī* “to wear, put” corresponds with Sinh. *lanavā* in auxiliary function (cf. 3.11.2.2). Just like *\*fianī*, *lanī* is used for the systematic formation of periphrastic forms which will be called “absolute II”, “past participle II” and “preterite II” below. In auxiliary function *lanī* occurs as frequently as *\*fianī*; it gives the main verb a nuance of “completion of the action”, together with a connotation of urgency. The combinations with *lanī* are formed by the same morphological rules as those with *\*fianī*; cp. the preterite II of *balanī* “to look” in the dialect of Aḍḍū with 1.ps.sg. *bala-lin*, 2./3.ps.sg. *bala-li*; 1.ps.pl. *bala-limā*, 2./3.ps.pl. *bala-lia* [*balalie*] where the preterite forms of *lanī* are added to the absolute without any further change. The short form of past participle II is *bala-li*. With the *n*-stems, preterite II is as common as with the *a*-stems (cp., e.g., M. *hure-lin* from *hunnanī* “to stand, be”, *iñde-lin* from *innanī* “to sit; marry, be married”), while *e*-stems use it only to a small extent (cp., e.g., M. *teme-lin* from *temenī* “to get wet”). — The formation of a “future II” is rare although *lanī* is apt to add a certain semantic nuance to the pure future meaning; cp., e.g., M. *nimmā-lānan* “I shall finish (something) as usual” as against the primary future form *nimmānan* “I shall finish (something)”.

3.11.4.2.1. The semantic difference distinguishing the two most productive auxiliary verbs of Dhivehi, *\*fianī* and *lanī*, can be demonstrated by two examples from Aḍḍū. In 1) *ava dōṇi bala-fin* / *ava dōṇi bala-lin*, both variants of the secondary preterite express a kind of resultative aktionsart as against the normal past tense *ava dōṇi belin* “I looked after the dhonis”. While *ava dōṇi bala-fin* means “I have looked after the dhonis just right now (and I know everything about their actual condition)”, *ava dōṇi bala-lin* means “I looked after the dhonis (doing what I had to do)”. — The other example is 2) *fūna-fin* “I have just dived” contrasting with *fūna-lin* “I had to dive, so I did it” (cp. M. *fīnanī* “to dive”). It is obvious from both examples that the preterite I with *-fi* comes close in meaning to the English present perfect.

3.11.4.3. *gannanī* which as a main verb means only “to buy” in Modern Dhivehi, is used as an auxiliary in the periphrastic formation of an “absolutive III”, a “past participle III” and a finite “preterite III”. All these forms, especially absolutive III, are very productive. In many cases the compound verbs which are built by means of *gannanī* show complete paradigms. There are essentially two different semantic nuances that are added to the meaning of the main verb by *gannanī* used as an auxiliary. In combination with intransitive verbs, *gannanī* produces a reflexive-medial meaning just as its Sinh. counterpart *gannavā* does (cf. 3.11.2.1); cp. the examples A. *teduvi-ga’ /gat/* “he/she got up (by him-/herself)” (3.ps.sg. pret. III of *teduvanī* “to get up”); F. *temī gatin* “I got (myself) wet” (1.ps.sg. pret. III of *temenī* “to get wet”); F. *temī gan!* “get (yourself) wet!” (2.ps.sg. imperative III); A. *ava nukumi-gatin* “I came/went out (by myself)” (1.ps.sg. pret. III of *nukunnani* “to come/go out”).

In the preterite and in absolutive constructions, *gannanī* in combination with certain verbal meanings yields the semantic nuance of “to manage to do something, achieve” which can clearly be regarded as a “resultative aktionsart”. Cp., e.g., A. *muhummā bē en damaga’* “Muhammā Bē managed to catch bait fish (all at once)” (T2, 9; *dama-ga’ /gat/* 3.ps.sg. pret. III of *damanī* “to pull (out)”; *en* “bait fish” (as a primary plural).

“Absolutives III” of *a*-stems, with *-gen* following the absolutive ending (M.F. *-ā*, A. *-a* ← *-ai*), often appear in contracted form, *-ā-gen* (A. *-a-gen*, cf. 3.10.1.1) being shortened to *-ān*. This phonetic phenomenon which frequently occurs with the *a*-stems in general but also with the “root verbs” (cf. 3.1.1) *lanī* “to put, place” (*lāgen* → *lān*) and *kanī* “to eat” (*kāgen* → *kān*), seems to be unattested in the literary language; it is particularly characteristic of the dialect of Fua’ Mulaku. Cp. the following example:

F. *kēfē, mi oṭī ai vago jahān* (← *jahāgen*). “Having said (this), he acted like a thief” (T1, 21a; *kē-fē* abs.I of *kēnī*, M. *kianī* “to speak, say”; *mi* adv. “now”; *oṭī* part.pret. of M. *onnanī* “to lie, be” + focus-marker *-ī*: “the way he was now, was ...”; *ai* quotation particle; *vago* nom. “thief”; *jahān* ← *jahā-gen* abs.III of *jahanī* “to beat”; *vago jahanī* “to act as/like a thief”).

3.11.4.4. The following table shows some typical secondary absolutives which are built by addition of *\*fianī*, *lanī* and *gannanī*:

absolutive derivations		Aḍḍū	Fua’ Mulaku	Māle
I	<i>a</i> -stem	<i>balafei</i>	<i>balāfē</i>	<i>balāfā / balāfai</i>
	<i>n</i> -stem	<i>vedefei</i>	<i>veṅdefē</i>	<i>vadefā / vadefai</i>
	<i>e</i> -stem	<i>temifei</i>	<i>temīfē</i>	<i>temifā / temifai</i>
II	<i>a</i> -stem	<i>balalāi</i>	<i>balālāi</i>	<i>balālāi</i>
	<i>n</i> -stem	<i>vedelāi</i>	<i>veṅdelāi</i>	<i>vadelāi</i>
	<i>e</i> -stem	<i>†temilāi</i>	<i>temilāi</i>	<i>temilāi</i>
III	<i>a</i> -stem	<i>balagen</i>	<i>balāgen</i>	<i>balāgen</i>
	<i>n</i> -stem	<i>vedegen</i>	<i>veṅdegen</i>	<i>vadegen</i>
	<i>e</i> -stem	<i>temigen</i>	<i>temīgen</i>	<i>temigen</i>

3.11.4.5. In the standard language of Māle, there is one more auxiliary that is used in the formation of a compound preterite, viz. *danī* “to go”. In accordance with its basic meaning, this verb can be combined with most intransitives, constituting a complete paradigm of finite preterite forms. In contrast to that, the systematic formation of this preterite variant is confined to the 3.ps.sg. in Aḏḏū und Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. This “preterite IV” is often used for the expression of a “definitive completion of an intransitive action”; thus it serves as a formant of a terminative-resultative aktionsart.

As a rule, a preterite IV can be derived from all *e*-stem verbs. The characteristic paradigm of the standard language can be illustrated with *nimenī* “to finish, come to an end”:

1st ps.sg.	<i>nimijjain</i>	1st ps.pl.	<i>nimijjaimu</i>
2nd ps.sg.	<i>nimijje</i>	2nd ps.pl.	<i>nimijjaimu</i>
3rd ps.sg.	<i>nimijje</i>	3rd ps.pl.	<i>nimijje</i>

3.11.4.5.1. In all these forms, *-jj-* has developed from *-di-*: 1.ps.sg. *nimi-jjain* ← \**nimi-dia**in*, 2nd/3rd ps.sg. and 3rd ps.pl. *nimi-jje* ← \**nimi-dia* via an intermediate form *-dye*, 1./2.ps.pl. *nimi-jjaimu* ← \**nimi-diaimu*<sup>559</sup>. In the southernmost dialects, the only form we find is the 3.ps.sg. (A. *nimige*, F. *nimīge*). A typical feature of this formation is the dative construction it brings about in sentences like A. *ma<sup>3</sup> nimige* or M. *ahanna<sup>3</sup> nimijje* (*ma<sup>3</sup> / ahanna<sup>3</sup>* pers. pron. 1.ps.sg. dat. “to me”); the semantic nuance thus achieved can be rendered by “it has come to an end for me”, i.e., “I have managed to come to an end”. In contrast to this, the nominative construction we find in M. *aharen nimijjain* “I have come to an end” (*aharen* pers.pron. 1.ps.sg. nom.) has no direct equivalent in Aḏḏū. As a further example of the dative-agent cp. A. *ma<sup>3</sup> temige*, F. *maša temīge*, M. *ahanna<sup>3</sup> temijje* “it has become wet for me”, i.e. “I have got wet” (from *temenī* “to get wet”). In the standard language, we again find the corresponding construction with the agent in the nominative, i.e., *aharen temijjain* meaning “I have got wet (by myself)”. It has to be kept in mind that to a smaller extent, *e*-verbs also show forms of preterites I and II which have a nominative construction throughout; cp., e.g., M. *aharen teme-lin* “I got wet” (pret. II).

3.11.4.5.2. Apart from other secondary preterite formations, preterite IV regularly occurs with intransitive *n*-verbs as well. Cp., e.g., M. 1.ps.sg. *hurejjain*, 2./3.ps.sg. *hurejje* etc. (of *hunnani* “to stand, be”), or M. 1.ps.sg. *iñdejjain*, 2./3.ps.sg. *iñdejje* etc. (of *innani* “to sit, marry, be married”). Like *išinnani* “to sit”, *onnanī* “to lie, be there”, and *ošōnnani* “to lie (down)”, *hunnani* and *innani* build forms of preterites I and II as well.<sup>560</sup> As against this, the *n*-verbs *nukunnani* “to come/go out” (M. *nukumejje* etc., F. *nukumege*, A. *nukumige*) and *vannani* “to enter” (cf. A. *vedege*) obviously have only forms of preterite III (with nominative construction) besides preterite IV; cp. A. *ma<sup>3</sup> nukumi-ge* “I went out (having definitely left)” as against preterite III *ava nukumi-gatin* “I finally managed to go out”.

<sup>559</sup> For further considerations on the history of this formation cf. 3.12.5.4.2.

<sup>560</sup> For the suppletive paradigms of these verbs cf. 3.14.

3.11.4.5.3. For verbs belonging to the *a*-stem class, the formation of preterite IV seems to be unusual (for morphological reasons?) even if their meaning is undoubtedly intransitive. Cp., e.g., the verbs *finanī* “to dive” or *nīdanī* “to sleep” which, like the *n*-stems, form a preterite I or II by means of *\*fianī* and *lanī* but which obviously have no preterite IV. The only attested examples of preterites IV which have to be considered within this framework are built from *a*-verbs expressing some kind of spatial motion; cp., e.g., F. *arāge*, A. *arage* “(he) came up, climbed up” occurring besides the usual inactive form F. *erīge*, A. *erige* (M. *aranī* “to climb (up), get (up)”) or A. *divage* “(he) ran” (M. *duvanī* “to run”).<sup>561</sup>

3.11.4.5.4. It seems that preterite IV cannot be derived from verbs with an unambiguously transitive meaning. In many cases where an active *a*-verb opposes itself to an inactive *e*-verb belonging to the same root, we find a complementary distribution of preterite I and II on the one hand and preterite IV on the other hand; cp., e.g., M. *aharen hutṭaifin* [*hutṭāfin*] “I have stopped (somebody/-thing)”, 1.ps.sg. pret.I of *hutṭanī* “to stop (trans.)”, vs. M. *aharen hutṭijjain* “I have stopped (myself)”, 1.ps.sg. pret.IV of *hutṭenī* “to stop (intr.)”; A. *ava fihalin* “I have baked (something, because I had to do it)”, 1.ps.sg. pret.II of *fihanī* “to fry, bake (trans.)”, vs. A. *ma’ fihige* “I have baked (something; now it is finished)”, 3.ps.sg. pret.IV of *fihenī* “to fry, bake (intr.)” with dative agent *ma’* (pers.pron.1.ps.sg.).

3.11.4.5.5. The verb *gendanī* “to take (something) out / away” consists of *gen*, an archaic absolutive form of the main verb *gannanī*, and *danī* “to go” used in auxiliary function. From a semantic point of view, the two components with the original meaning “to go taking / having taken” merged to such a degree that they must be regarded as one verbal unit in Modern Dhivehi. In the standard language, *gendanī* shows a full paradigm, while in the southern dialects the corresponding forms exist only to the same extent as *danī* is used as an independent verb.<sup>562</sup> *gendanī*, which corresponds exactly with Sinh. *gena-yanavā*,<sup>563</sup> represents a very archaic compound as the shape of the absolutive shows. The regular absolutive of *gannanī* is A.F. *gine*, M. *gane* (cf. 3.10.3.2 s.v. *gannanī* “to buy”). In the modern language, the occurrence of *gen* is confined to a few verbal compounds which can all be regarded as semantic units; besides *gendanī*, this is true for *gennanī* “to bring, fetch, go for” (cf. 3.11.4.6) and *gen gulenī* “to look after, care for (somebody / something)”, the latter occurring only in the standard language. The earliest attestations of this absolutive appear already in the copper-plate documents where we find *gene* (L1 d/2,3 etc.; L2 34,2 etc.; L3 4/2,2 etc., L4 a/2,2; L5 4/2,3), *gen* (L1 t/2,1 and L2 2,5 preceding *ais* “coming”, cf. 3.11.4.6 below; L4 e/1,3 etc.), and the pret.I *genfi* (RC 7,12). *gene gosu* (L1 d/1,4) represents the oldest attested form of the absolutive of *gendanī*; the modern form M. *gengos* is first attested in 1759 A.D., in the so-called “Palace Inscription” written in *Tāna* (ITMP 1,3).

3.11.4.6. As an auxiliary verb, *annanī* “to come” agrees with *danī*. In the modern language, *gennanī* “to bring, fetch” is considered to be an independent verb; it is no longer analysed as a combination of the petrified absolutive *gen* and *annanī*, meaning “to come taking / having

<sup>561</sup> It is not clear whether *hiṅganī* “to walk” can form a preterite IV besides preterite I.

<sup>562</sup> For details cf. 3.14.2.

<sup>563</sup> GEIGER (1902), 921, no. 161: *gendān*; cf. also 3.11.2.3.

taken". The oldest attestation of this compound is the absolutive *gen-ais* "coming having taken / taking", which is to be found in the copper-plate inscriptions L1 (t/2,1) and L2 (2,5). *gennanī* has an exact parallel in the Sinhalese compound *gena-enavā*.<sup>564</sup> Apart from that, *annanī* occurs in auxiliary function only in isolated cases which can be regarded as idiomatic; cp., e.g., *aṃburā annanī* "to return (something)", lit. "to come returning" (M. *aṃburanī* "to twist, turn, steer") with the corresponding inactive *eṃburi annanī* "to return; come returning" (M. *eṃburenī* "turn").

In its most frequent use as an auxiliary, *annanī* is not combined with the absolutive of a main verb, however. This is true for the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku where the present forms of *annanī*, together with the infinitive of a main verb, are used for the formation of the future paradigm of *a*-stems (cf. 3.4.2.2.1, 3.4.2.2.2).

3.11.4.7. In connection with special verbs M. *uḷenī*, with the original meaning "to live; behave", can be used as an auxiliary verb meaning "to be". The function of such combinations is similar to that of the English continuous present. Thus, besides the normal present paradigm of the verbs *nukunnānī* "to come / go out" and *vannānī* "to enter", there is a secondary finite present consisting of the absolutive of these verbs and the conjugated present forms of *uḷenī*; thus, we have *nukume / vade uḷen, uḷē, uḷē; uḷemu, uḷē, uḷē* "(I am) coming out / entering" etc.

In the older language, there are two attestations of *uḷenī* occurring in auxiliary function together with an infinitive. The formation in question is similar to a periphrastic future: *liās-uḷemā* "we are to write", i.e. "we shall write" (cf. 3.4.3.2). The corresponding verb of southern Dhivehi (A. *vēñdenī*, F. *vēñṇanī*) does not show a comparable use (cf. also 3.9.2.2.4).

3.11.4.8. *denī* "to give" and *balanī* "to look" also occur in auxiliary function, but only in North Dhivehi where they are used, e.g., in the formation of a periphrastic imperative (cf. 3.5.4.1.1); cp. also the combination of *denī* with *ko*<sup>2</sup>, absolutive of *kuranī* "to do, make", appearing in conditional clauses (cf. 3.13.2.3.1).

3.11.4.9. When used as an auxiliary with *iṣṇnanī* "to sit" as a main verb, *innanī* has the special meaning of "be seated for a longer time". This combination is especially typical for the standard language of Māle; cp. M. pres.part. *iṣṇde inna(nī)*, past part. *iṣṇde in(ī)*, absolutive *iṣṇde iṇde*. Not only in Māle but in all Dhivehi dialects, we find an idiomatic phrase that is built by means of *innanī*, viz. *balī ve innanī* "to be pregnant", lit. "to sit having become sick" or "having fallen sick" (with *ve*, absolutive of *vanī* "to become"); cp. A. *balī ve iṇḍige* "she became pregnant" (T3, 3; *iṇḍi-ge* pret. IV, 3.ps.sg.).

3.11.4.10. In GEIGER's fragmentary chapter on the Maldivian verb<sup>565</sup> he noted some compound verbs as well; this is true, e.g., for *hadaiḥin* in *timan iyye hadaiḥin* "I made yesterday", but also for the remaining forms of the paradigm of preterite I of M. *hadanī* "to make". As to *kanī* "to eat" and *balanī* "to look", GEIGER gives paradigms that are mixtures of the

<sup>564</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1902), 921, no. 162: *gennan*; further cf. 3.11.2.3.

<sup>565</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1901-1902), III, 109-112 / (1919), 94-97.

primary preterite and preterite I; for *dekenī* “to see”, he notes preterite I as well but without the 1.ps.sg. which is substituted by *belīmu*, the older form of the 1.ps.sg. of the primary preterite. Another mixed paradigm is listed among the examples which illustrate the future forms, consisting of the regular future and future I of *hadanī*: *timan mādan hadāfānan* “I shall make tomorrow” etc. GEIGER obviously did not realise that these are compound verb forms: at least he did not discuss their peculiar shape. However, he recognised the composite forms containing *lanī*: under the special heading of “compound verb paradigm”,<sup>566</sup> he notes the paradigm of the compound verb *vattailān* “to cause to fall, fell, drop”, quasi “infinitive II”, but once again he mixes finite and infinite forms.

### 3.12. The potential

In Dhivehi, we find one more verbal category that is derived from the absolutive, viz. the “potential”. It is used for the formal expression of modal meanings like “can”, “be able to”, “be possible”. Because of its semantic restriction to only one modal nuance, the term “potential” seems to be preferable as against a more general term like “subjunctive”. In the existing literature on Dhivehi, this category has been neglected throughout.

The potential has two variants, viz. one formally distinct form for the preterite and one indifferent form that can be attributed to the present as well as the future.

3.12.1. The basis for the formation of the present/future potential is the inactive absolutive which combines with a petrified auxiliary verb. In the standard language of Māle as well as the dialects of Addū and Fua’ Mulaku, the latter function is fulfilled by the same auxiliary which is used for the formation of the future as well. In Māle and in Fua’ Mulaku, this is true for the auxiliary verbs (M.) *danī* “to go” and (F.) *enī* (M. *annanī*) “to come; go”. In Addū, however, the constituent in question is most probably a modal form of the old copula. The formation rules imply that the potential is an exclusively inactive category, independent from the original voice of the verb. It does not play any role whether the verbs in question are primary inactive verbs such as e.g. *temenī* “to get wet”, or whether they represent secondary inactive (passive) verbs such as *belenī* (from *balanī* “to look”). The agent of potential constructions always appears in the dative. Because of the inactive character of the category, the auxiliary verb of the present potential has the form of the 3rd person singular throughout.

3.12.2. The potential of the preterite, which has the function of an *irrealis*, is primarily expressed by the past participle of the inactive (passive) verb. Besides that, the elevated language of Māle also uses some combined forms.

3.12.3. A contrastive comparison of the potential formations of the standard language and the southern dialects shows that the formal inventory of northern Dhivehi is essentially more elaborate than that of the south. The following table exhibits the potential formations of the present / future:

<sup>566</sup> In the German original (1901-1902, III, 111), GEIGER writes: “Ich füge hier noch das Paradigma des zusammengesetzten Verbums *vattailān* ‘fallen machen, fällen, hinwerfen’ bei.”

potential	Addū	Fua <sup>o</sup> Mulaku	Māle	
	(positive/negated)	(positive / negated)	positive	negated
<i>a</i> -stem	(ni) <i>beliēhe</i>	(ni) <i>beliennen</i>	<i>belidāne</i>	<i>nu belēne</i>
<i>n</i> -stem	(ni) <i>vediēhe</i>	(ni) <i>veñdeviennen</i>	<i>vadevidāne</i>	<i>nu vadevēne</i>
<i>e</i> -stem	(ni) <i>temiēhe</i>	(ni) <i>temjennen</i>	<i>temividāne</i>	<i>nu temevēne</i>

3.12.3.1. In the standard language of **Māle**, the formation of the potential has preserved its transparency despite its synthetical character; this means that it can easily be analysed. In the present tense, the formant *-dāne* is added to the inactive absolutive; *dāne* is simply the finite 3rd person future form of *danī* “to go”. The absolutive contained in the formation differs; it depends on the transitivity or intransitivity of the verb from which the potential is derived. This means that in the case of the *a*-stems and, partly, also the *n*-stems the simple absolutive of the corresponding inactive is used when transitive verbs are concerned. In the case of most of the *e*-stems and of intransitive *n*-stems, however, the potential is derived from the absolutive of the causative of the corresponding inactive. Exceptions from this rule can be found in all stem classes (cf. below). The fact that some of the verbs in question seem not to fit into this model can only partly be explained by semantic reasons. Cp. the following examples:

*a*-stems: *beli-dāne* from *balanī* “to look (at)”, *essi-dāne* from *assanī* “to tie (up), fasten”, *hutji-dāne* from *huttanī* “to stop” (trans.), etc.

Potentials of *e*-stems based on the absolutive of the causative (“regular” formation): *huttevi-dāne* from *huttanī* “to stop” (intr.), *temevi-dāne* from *temenī* “to get wet”, *uļevi-dāne* from *uļenī* “to live, be”, etc. To this group may be added the intransitive root verb (cf. 3.1.1) *vanī* “to become” the potential of which has the form *vevidāne*.

Potentials of *e*-stems based on a primary inactive absolutive: *eñgi-dāne* from *eñgenī* “to know, understand”, *heri-dāne* from *herenī* “to pierce”, *libi-dāne* from *libenī* “to receive, get”.

3.12.3.1.1. The only *n*-stem which uses a primary inactive absolutive in the formation of the potential is the transitive verb *biñdanī* / *binnanī* “to break (especially flowers); pluck, pick” with its potential form *biñdi-dāne*. Potentials of other *n*-stems are based on the inactive absolutive of the causative; cp. the following examples:

*bañdevi-dāne* from *bannanī* “to bind, tie (in the sphere of shipbuilding)”; *dovevi-dāne* from *dontanī* “to wash”; *iñdevi-dāne* from *innanī* “to sit, marry, be married”; *išñdevi-dāne* from *išñnanī* “to sit”; *hurevi-dāne* from *hunnanī* “to stand, be”; *konevi-dāne* from *konnānī* “to dig”; *nukumevi-dāne* from *nukunnanī* “to go / come out”; *ośōvevi-dāne* from *ośōnnanī* “to lie (down)”; *ovevi-dāne* from *onnanī* “to lie, be”; *vadevi-dāne* from *vannanī* “to enter”.

Except for the first two examples, all cases belonging to this group can be classified unambiguously as intransitive verbs. *bannanī* and *dontanī* are basically transitive but in special contexts, the transitivity tends to become insignificant.

In the case of *bannanī*, the transitive meaning is completely restricted to the sphere of shipbuilding. *dōni bannanī* “to build a ship”, i.e. “to bind together (in the traditional way)”, has to be considered as a “complex verb” the respective nominal and verbal components of which can be regarded as a verbal unit; in North

Dhivehi, *bannanī* can no longer be separated semantically from *dōni* (or any other term denoting traditional boats or ships). *ahanna' /ahanna's/ dōni bañdevidāne* then means “I can / am able to build ships”, and the elliptical sentence *ahanna' bañdevidāne* has exactly the same meaning. In any other connection, the verbal concept of “to bind, tie” is expressed by *assanī*. Possibly it is this narrow union of *bannanī* with only one nominal word field which gave rise to the potential of *bannanī* being built like that of an intransitive verb. — In most cases, *donnanī* is used as a transitive verb; cp., e.g., *ādavegen ēnā gamīs dove nu ulē* “He never washes (his) shirt” (*ādavegen* adv. “usually”; *ēnā* nom., pers.pron. 3.ps.sg. m./f.; *gamīs* dir. obj.; *dove* absolutive of *donnanī*; *nu* negation particle; *ulē* 3.ps.sg.pres., used as an aux.verb; cf. 3.11.4.7). But *donnanī* can also be used in an intransitive-reflexive meaning; cp., e.g., *ēnā abadu dovē ta?* “Does he always wash (himself)?” (*abadu* “always”; *dovē* 3.ps.sg.pres.; *ta* question particle).

3.12.3.1.2. The potential forms of the “irregular” root verbs (cf. 3.1.1) *kanī* “to eat” and *bonī* “to drink”, *kevi-dāne* and *bovi-dāne*, are derived from the absolutive of the causative as well, although these verbs seem never to be used intransitively. Even in the unspecified meaning of “to eat” and “to drink”, Dhivehi uses the transitive combinations *bai kanī*, lit. “to eat rice”, and *fen bonī*, lit. “to drink water”. The same holds true for the “irregular” *a*-stem verb *kurani* “to do, make” which, albeit exclusively appearing as a transitive, derives its potential from the absolutive of the causative; this is *kurevi-dāne* “it can be done”, lit. “being caused to be done it will pass”.

3.12.3.1.3. In northern Dhivehi, a different form of the potential is normally used in negated sentences. This form can be identified with the plain 3rd person singular of the future of the corresponding inactive verb. In the same way as the potential built with *dāne* is derived from the absolutive of the causative, the negated form of the potential is mostly derived from the causative as well; cp., e.g., *nu kurevēne* lit. “(it) will not be caused to be done”, i.e. “(it) cannot be done”, “it is not possible to do (it)” (cp. positive *kurevidāne*); *nu vadevēne* “it is not possible to enter” (cp. *vadevidāne*); *nu huṭṭevēne* “it is not possible to stop” (intr.) (cp. *huṭṭevidāne*), etc. — No causative forms are *nu essēne* “it will not be tied up”, “one cannot tie up” (cp. *essidāne*); *nu huṭṭēne* “it will not stop”, “one cannot stop (it)” (cp. *huṭṭidāne*); *nu biñdēne* “it will not be plucked”, “one cannot pluck (it)” (cp. *biñdidāne*), etc. In a few cases, this potential formation can also be used in positive sentences. In these cases, the (positive) possibility is even underlined; cp. *ahanna' sigareṭu biun huṭṭēne* lit. “smoking will be stopped for me”, i.e. “I am able to stop smoking”.

3.12.3.2. In the dialect of **Aḍḍū**, the formant of the potential is *-ēhe* for the present-future; most probably this is the same element as that which in Aḍḍū is used for the formation of the finite future forms of the 2nd and 3.ps.sg. (cf. 3.4.1). Presumably *-ēhe* represents a petrified modal form – maybe an optative – of the copula which does not exist any longer as such in Dhivehi; the original meaning must have been something like “it will be, it may be”. Normally *-ēhe* is added to the inactive form of the absolutive; this rule has an exception though, which can be explained on semantic grounds. For *aranī* “to go up, climb up” we find not only the expected regular form *eri-ēhe* “it is possible to climb up, one can climb up”, lit. “climbing up it will be” but also a second potential form which is based on the active absolutive, viz. *arai-ēhe* meaning “climbing up it will be (possible)” as well. The main difference between the two formations consists in the fact that *eri-ēhe* expresses an action which will (possibly) be done unwillingly while *arai-ēhe* means that an action will (possibly) be done willingly, following a plan. — In Aḍḍū it makes no formal difference for the potential

whether the verb from which it is derived is transitive or intransitive. Furthermore, the form in *-ēhe* is also used for the negated potential; cp., e.g., *ma' dōṇi (ni) beliēhe* “I can(not) look after the dhonis.”

A peculiarity of the Aḍḍū dialect is the existence of a special interrogative form of the potential in the present tense. This form is characterised by the formant *-ēṣī* which, as a rule, is used instead of *-ēhe* in interrogative sentences; *-ēṣī* which combines with the inactive absolutive as well, is identical with the ending of the 3.ps.sg. future of the normal interrogative form (cf. 3.15.1.1.). It probably reflects a 3.ps.sg. of the obsolete modal verb which is also represented in the element *-ēhe*. Cp., e.g., *ma' dōṇi beli-ēṣī?* “Can I look after the dhonis?”; *ma' mēze kavēri irīndi-ēṣī* “Can I sit down to table?”; *ta' masakka' vēṣī* (← \**ve(i)-ēṣī*; M. *vanī* “to become”) “Can you do the work?” (lit. “will the work become to you?”; cf. 3.12.3.2.1, 3.12.4 below).

3.12.3.2.1. The very few potential forms which in Aḍḍū are derived from the absolutive of the inactive causative do not give a systematical picture. Cp., e.g., *bēviēhe* ← *bānanī* “to fish”, *dēviēhe* ← *dānī* “to bite”, *gēviēhe* ← *gānanī* “to rasp (coconut)”, *gineviēhe* ← *gennanī* “to bring, fetch”, *veviēhe* ← *vanī* “to become”.

3.12.3.2.2. As in the standard language, there are also some potential formations in Aḍḍū that are derived from the absolutive of primary inactive verbs. Cp. for *a*-stems: *beliēhe* ← *balanī* “to look”, *līēhe* ← (M.) *lianī* (A. *lēnēi*) “to write”, *beṇiēhe* ← (M.) *bunanī* (A. *beṇanī*) “to speak, say”, *demiēhe* ← *damanī* “to pull”, *hōdiēhe* ← *hōdanī* “to look for”, *nidiēhe* ← *nidanī* “to sleep”, etc.; for *e*-stems: *temiēhe* ← *temenī* “to get wet”, *ediēhe* ← *edenī* “to wish”, *libiēhe* ← *libenī* “to receive”, etc.

The potential of those *e*-stems which represent the regular inactive equivalents of given *a*-stems is identical with the potential of the latter; cp., e.g., *feṣiēhe* representing the potential form of both *faṣanī* “to begin” (trans.) and *feṣenī* “to begin” (intr.); *hedīēhe* pertaining both to *hadanī* “to make, build” and *hedenī* “to grow; pretend”, etc. — This is an essential difference as against the standard language where the potential of intransitive verbs is derived from the absolutive of the inactive causative so that formal coincidences are excluded (cf. 3.12.3.1 and 3.12.3.1).

3.12.3.2.3. In Aḍḍū the derivation of the potential is completely regular even with *n*-stems, *-ēhe* being added to the primary inactive absolutive, independently from the transitivity or intransitivity of the given verb; cp., e.g., *vediēhe* ← (M.) *vannanī* “to enter”, *beṇḍiēhe* ← (M.) *bannanī* “to bind, tie”,<sup>567</sup> *nukumiēhe* ← (M.) *nukunnanī* “to go / come out”, *keṇiēhe* ← (M.) *konnānī* “to dig”, *vēṇḍiēhe* ← (M.) *uḷenī* “to live, be”, *hiṣiēhe* ← (M.) *hunnānī* “to stand, be there”, *biṇḍiēhe* ← (M.) *binnānī* “to pluck”, etc.

3.12.3.2.4. The potential of root verbs (cf. 3.1.1) in Aḍḍū is based on the primary inactive absolutive as well. Cp., e.g., *kīēhe* / *kiēhe* ← *kanī* “to eat”; *bīēhe* ← *bonī* “to drink”; *gīēhe* ← (M. *danī* “to go”); *dīēhe* ← *denī* “to give”; *līēhe* ← *lanī* “to wear, put”.<sup>568</sup>

<sup>567</sup> This verb belongs to the ship (building) terminology; cf. 3.12.3.1.1 above.

<sup>568</sup> For (M.) *vanī* “to become” cf. 3.12.3.2.1, 3.12.4.

3.12.3.3. In **Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku** the potential is built by means of the verb *enī* “come” (M. *annanī*) which also functions as auxiliary verb in the formation of the finite future of the *a*- and *e*-stems (cf. 3.4.2.2.1, 3.4.2.2.2). For the formation of the potential of the present/future, the 3.ps.sg. of the future tense of this verb, *ennen*, is added to the inactive absolutive of the primary verb or the causative. Different from the language of Māle where the potential of intransitive verbs is in most cases derived from the absolutive of the inactive causative while transitive potentials are normally based on the primary inactive absolutive (cf. 3.12.3.1), there are no clear tendencies concerning the distribution of the two types of formation in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. Thus, it is practically impossible to establish an explicit rule for the derivation of the potential in this dialect; instead all forms that could be recorded are listed below. As in Addū, there is no formal differentiation between a positive and a negated potential in the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku.

3.12.3.3.1. Potential forms of *a*-stems: *ōliennen* ← F. *ōlanī* “to call” (M. *govanī*), *huīennen* ← *huanī* “to look for” (M. *hōdanī*), *keñḍiennen* ← *kañḍanī* “to cut (trees)”. The potential *erīennen* of *aranī* “to go / climb up” can be used both transitively and intransitively (cf. 3.12.3.1). It seems that the *a*-stems derive their potential only from the primary inactive absolutive; this holds true also for the few intransitive verbs belonging to this stem class such as *ihīennen* ← F. *ihanī* “to smile, lough” (M. *henī*) or *nidiennen* ← *nidanī* “to sleep”.

3.12.3.3.2. The potential forms of *e*-stems can be based on the primary absolutive (cp., e.g., *temīennen* ← *temenī* “to get wet”) as well as the absolutive of the causative (cp., e.g. *reke-vīennen* ← *rekenī* “to avoid, escape”, *vetḥeviennen* ← *vetḥenī* “to fall”). There are no obvious semantical reasons for the distribution of these two formation types.

3.12.3.3.3. With *n*-stems too, both types of potential formations are found in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, obviously without regard of the transitivity or intransitivity of the given verb.

The absolutive of the inactive causative is used by the following verbs: *innā* (M. *innanī*) “to sit, marry, be married” → *iñdevīennen*; *gannaī* (M. *gannanī*) “to buy” → *ginevīennen*; *nukunnaī* (M. *nukunnanī*) “to come / go out” → *nukumevīennen*; *vannaī* (M. *vannanī*) “to enter” → *veñdevīennen*; *vēññā* (M. *ulenī*) “to live” → *vēñḍevīennen*; *hinnā* (M. *hunnanī*) “to stand, be” → *hiševīennen*.

The primary inactive absolutive is used with *annaī* (M. *añdanī*) 1. “to burn”; 2. “to wear (a sarong)” → *eñḍiennen*; *bannaī* (M. *bannanī*) “to bind, tie (parts of) ships” → *beñḍiennen*; *irīnnaī* (M. *išīnnaī*) “to sit” → *irīñḍiennen*; *binnaī* (M. *biñdanī*) “to pluck, break (flowers)” → *biñḍiennen*; *agonaī* (M. *gen gulenī*) “to care for” → *degīennen*; *domnaī* (M. *domnanī*) “to wash” → *doīennen*; *sahunā* (M. *hehenī*) “to peel” → *sehīennen*; *kannaī* (M. *komnanī*) “to dig” → *keñiennen*; *kelenaī* (M. *kulenī*) “to play” → *keļiennen*; (M. *onnanī*)<sup>569</sup> “to lie, be” → *oviennen*; *vešionnaī* (M. *ošōnnaī*) “to lie (down)” → *vešioviennen*.

3.12.3.3.4. From a synchronic point of view, the potential of the root verbs (cf. 3.1.1) is represented by irregular formations throughout in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. The following forms are based on the absolutive of the inactive: (M.) *denī* “to give” → *dinīennen*; *lanī* “to wear, put” → *liennen* / *liennen*; *bonī* “to drink” → *bīennen*; *kanī* “to eat” → *kīennen*. The intransitive verb *venī* (M. *vanī*) “to become, be” derives its potential from the absolutive of the inactive causative, yielding *vevīennen*.

<sup>569</sup> The equivalent of this present participle is missing in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku where it is substituted by the past participle.

### 3.12.4. Suppletive potential formation

In all dialects of Dhivehi, there are some isolated verbs which have no potential formations of their own but express the meaning of the potential by corresponding forms of other – mostly synonymous – verbs. One of these verbs is *dekenī* (A. *dakunei*, F. *dakonāi*) “to see” which in no dialect shows a regular potential formation; in Māle the forms *belidāne* (of *balanī* “to see”) or *fenidāne* (of *fennanī* “to be seen, appear”) are used, while the potential of the causative *dakkanī* “to let see; show” occurs as a suppletive form in A. *dekkīēhe* and F. *dekkīennen*. — In Addū the verb *dannanī* (A. *dennei*, F. *dennāi*) “to know, understand” has no potential form at all while in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku the missing form is substituted by *eṅgīennen* (of *anganī* “to inform” or *eṅgenī* “to be informed, to understand”). — *kuranī* “to make, do” has a regular potential form in North Dhivehi only, viz. *kurevidāne* or *kurevēne*. In Addū and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, however, the potential of *keranī* is substituted by the diverse potential forms of the auxiliary verb (M.) *vanī* “to become”. Thus, in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku the potential forms *vevīennen* and *vēnnen* are used as substitutional forms, *maša vevīennen* meaning “I am able to do something” vs. *maša vēnnen* “I have the possibility to do something”. The Addū dialect has an equivalent of the latter formation in *ma’ vēhe* “I can do (something)”. Obviously, F. *vēnnen* and A. *vēhe* are original future forms of *vanī*, the Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku form consisting of the primary absolutive of *vanī*, *vē* to which, as usual, the form of the 3rd person singular of “to come / go”, *ennen*, is added. *vēnnen* is not used as a potential form of *vanī* itself though (cf. 3.12.3.3.4). A. *vēhe* is based on the absolutive of *vanī* (*vei*, appearing as *ve-* in combined forms) as well, with *-ēhe* added which obviously represents a relic modal form of the obsolete copula (cf. 3.12.3.2). — Another suppletive formation is found in the southern dialects in the case of (M.) *annanī* “to come, go”, the potential forms F. *giennen*, A. *giēhe* belonging to the verb (M.) *dani* “to go” which in South Dhivehi is defective from a formal point of view.

### 3.12.5. Past forms of the potential

In all Maldivian dialects, the form of the inactive (passive) past participle<sup>570</sup> serves unaltered as the basic form of the potential of the preterite; cp., e.g., M. *ahanna’ /-aš/ belunu* “I could see”, lit. “it was seen to (i.e. ‘by’) me”. Beyond this, there are combined formations in the standard language which, however, are semantically identical with the basic form. Cp. the following examples of the past potential of **a-stems**: M. *belunu*, F. *belun*, A. *beleṇe* ← *balanī* “to look”; M. *liunu*, F. *liun*, A. *lieṇe* ← (M.) *lianī* “to write”; M. *nidunu*, F. *nidun*, A. *nideṇe* ← *nidanī* “to sleep”; M. *jehunu*, F. *jehun*, A. *jehēṇe* ← *jahanī* “to beat, kick”, etc.

3.12.5.1. From their formation, the potential forms of the **e-stems** cannot be kept distinct from those of the **a-stems**; this is especially true for diverse *e-stem* verbs which represent original passive forms of the corresponding *a-verbs* but lost the direct semantical connection with their active counterparts. In the modern language, the meaning and function of these verbs is rather inactive than passive; cp., e.g., *jehenī* “to fall” the preterite potential forms of which are identical with those of the primary active verb *jahanī* “to beat, kick” (cf. above). — For potential forms of semantically independent or primary inactive *e-verbs* cp., e.g., M. *eṅgunu*, F. *eṅgun*, A. *eṅgeṇe* ← *eṅgenī* “to know, understand” (cp. *anganī* “to inform”); M. *edunu*, F. *edun*, A. *edeṇe* ← *edenī* “to wish”; M. *temunu*, F. *temun*, A. *temeṇe* ← *temenī* “to get wet”.

<sup>570</sup> For the synchronic formation of this form and its derivation cf. 3.9.2.3.

3.12.5.2. In Aḍḍū, the potential forms of ***n*-stems** are formally identical to “passive” past participles as well, even though the corresponding inactive (*e*-stem) verbs do not exist. In Māle and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, however, we find secondary forms in many cases (especially with intransitive *n*-stem verbs) which can best of all be explained as being combinations of the absolutive of the given verb and *vunu* which represents the inactive past participle of *vanī* “to become”. In Modern Dhivehi the past participle of *vanī* has the form *vi* throughout; the form *vunu* does not exist any longer but is attested as such in Old Dhivehi (L1 d/2,2.4; L2 2,1). In contrast to that, Sinhalese has preserved both the equivalent forms of the past participle of *venavā* “to become, be”, viz. *vunu* and *vū* (cf., e.g., MATZEL 1983, 57).

The following list of preterite potential forms of *n*-stems will suffice to illustrate their derivation:

- añdanī* 1. “to burn (intr.)”: A. *eñdeṇe*, F. *eñḍun*, M. *endunu* / *eñde-vunu* (abs. + *-vunu*)<sup>571</sup>.  
*añdanī* 2. “to wear (a sarong)”: A. *eñdeṇe*, F. *eñḍun* (M. /).  
*bannanī* “to bind, tie (in ship building)”: A. *beñdeṇe*, F. *beñḍun*, M. *bañde-vunu*.  
*binnanī* / *biñdanī* “to pluck”: A. *biñdeṇe*, F. *biñḍun* / *biñde-vun*<sup>(2)</sup>, M. *biñḍunu* / *biñde-vunu*.  
(M. *gen guḷenī*) “to care for”: A. *degeṇe*, F. *degun*.  
*donnanī* “to wash”: A. *doveṇe*, F. *dovun*, M. *dovunu* / *dove-vunu*.  
*innanī* “to sit, be married, marry”: (A. *irñdeṇe*), F. *iñde-vun*, M. *iñde-vun(u)*.  
*iññnanī* “to sit (down)”: A. *irñdeṇe*, F. *irñḍun*, M. *iññde-vun(u)*.  
*gannanī* “to buy”: A. *gineṇe*, F. *gine-vun*, M. *gane-vunu*.  
(M. *hehenī*) “to husk”: A. *seheṇe*, F. *sehun*.  
*hunnanī* “to stand, be, remain, stay”: A. *hiṣeṇe*, F. *hiṣe-vun*, M. *hure-vun(u)* in *hure-vun-iṣ*<sup>572</sup>.  
*konnanī* “to dig”: A. *keṇeṇe*, F. *keṇun*, M. *kone-vunu*.  
*kuḷenī* “to play”: A. *koḷeṇe*, F. *keḷeun*, M. *kuḷe-vunu*.  
*nukunnanī* “to come / go out”: A. *nukumeṇe*, F. *nukume-vun*, M. *nukume-vunu*.  
*onnanī* “to lie, be (there)”: A. *oveṇe*, F. *ovun*, M. *ove-vunu*.  
*oṣōnnanī* “to lie (down)”: A. *veṣioveṇe* (negated *veṣi ni oveṇe*), F. *veṣiovun* (negated *veṣi ni ovun*),  
M. *oṣōve-vunu*.  
*vannanī* “to enter”: A. *vedeṇe*, F. *veñḍun*, M. *vade-vunu*.  
(M. *uḷenī*) “to live, behave, be”: A. *vēñdeṇe*, F. *vēñde-vun*<sup>573</sup>.

### 3.12.5.3. The potential of “root verbs”

Obviously, the past potential of root verbs (cf. 3.1.1) is based on the past participle of the inactive (passive) as well; only M. *bovunu* seems to be an exception which can presumably be explained as a formation consisting of the absolutive *boe* + *-vunu* (cf. 3.12.5.2). Cp. the following list of examples:

- denī* “to give”: A. *dieṇe*, F. *dinun*, M. *devunu*.  
*kanī* “to eat”: A. *kiṇeṇe*, F. *kiun*, M. *kevunu*.  
*bonī* “to drink”: A. *bieṇe*, F. *biun*, M. *bovunu* (← *boe-vunu*?).  
*lanī* “to wear, put”: *liene*, F. *liun*, M. *lie-vunu*.  
*vanī* “to become”: A. *veveṇe*, F. *vevun*, M. *vevunu* (cf. 3.9.2.3).  
*danī* “to go”: A. *giṇeṇe*, F. *giun*; M. *gie-vunu*.

<sup>571</sup> Hereafter, this type of combination will be marked by a hyphen only.

<sup>572</sup> The form *hurevijj(e)* (3.ps.sg. pret.IV) in *hurevijj-ās* (-*ais*) is used synonymously (cf. 3.12.5.4). For the particle *-is* contained in these formations, cf. 3.12.5.4.1.

<sup>573</sup> ← *vēñḍi-vun*(?); this formation is problematic because of the usual absolutive ending in *-ī*.

### 3.12.5.4. Suppletive and combined potential forms of the preterite

Like the corresponding present formations, A. *giṇe*, F. *giun* and M. *gievunu* represent suppletive potential forms of M. *annanī* “to come”, A.F. *enī* “to come, go” which have their origin in the paradigm of *danī* “to go” (cf. 3.12.4).

In the southern dialects, the potential of the preterite of *kuranī* “to make, do” is substituted by the 3.ps.sg. pret. of *vanī* “to become”; cp. A. *ma<sup>3</sup> masakka<sup>3</sup> (ni) vi* “I could (not) work”, lit. approximately “a work emerged (did not emerge) for me”. In the standard language the corresponding sentence is *ahanna<sup>3</sup> masakka<sup>3</sup> kurevunīs* “I could do the work” and *ahanna<sup>3</sup> masakkate<sup>3</sup> nu kurevunīs* “I could not do the work”, resp. (with /*ahannaš*/ pers.pron. 1.ps. dat. “to me”). *kurevunīs* obviously consists of *kurevunu* and an element *is*; the latter presumably reflects a particle meaning “also, too”. It is not certain whether *kurevunu* represents a combination of the absolutive and the participial form \**vunu*, given that the inherited absolutive of *kuranī* is *ko<sup>3</sup> /koš/* (cf. 3.10.4). It is not impossible, however, that a secondary “regular” absolutive \**kure* was built after the 3.ps.sg. present *kurē*; thus, the formation *kurevunu* would represent the same pattern as that occurring with *n*-stem verbs (cf. 3.12.5.2 above). The absolutive form M. \**kure* as postulated here is supported by Sinhalese where we find, besides the “irregular” absolutive *koṭa* (of Sinh. *karanavā* “to make, do”) which is derived directly from a MIA predecessor (←← OIA *kṛtvā*), a more recent formation *kara* which is used in the literary language (cf. MATZEL 1983, 48).

3.12.5.4.1. There are many other verbs in the standard language whose potential forms are enlarged in the way proposed for *kurevunīs* above. In all these cases, we find the alternation of *-i* and *-e* where we would expect an absolutive ending in *-i*. Cp. the following examples:

*ahanna<sup>3</sup> /ahannaš/ huṭṭevunīs* “I could stop” (*huṭṭevunīs* from *huṭṭe-* ← abs. *huṭṭi* of *huṭṭenī* “to stop” (intr.) + *-vunu* ← *vunu* + *is*).

*ahanna<sup>3</sup> /ahannaš/ teme<sup>3</sup>evunīs* “I could get wet” (*temevunīs* from *teme-* ← abs. *temi* of *temenī* “to get wet” + *-vunu* + *is*).

*iyye ahanna<sup>3</sup> /ahannaš/ mitāgā /mitanugai/ hurevunīs* “I could be there (lit. ‘on this place’) yesterday”, i.e. “I had the right to be there” (*iyye* “yesterday”; /*mitanugai*/ consisting of *mi* dem.pron. “this” + *tanu* obl. “place” + *-gai* loc.suffix; *hurevunīs* from *hure* abs. + *-vunu* + *is*).

Another extended variant of potential forms is found with some verbs which add the particle *is* directly to the inactive past participle. Cp. the following examples:

*ahanna<sup>3</sup> temunīs* (← *temunu*, part.pret. of *temenī* “to get wet”, + *is*) “I could get wet”;

*ahanna<sup>3</sup> huṭṭunīs* (← *huṭṭunu*, of *huṭṭanī* trans. “to stop” **and** *huṭṭenī* intr. “to stop”) “I could stop (somebody)” or “I could stop (myself)”, etc.

3.12.5.4.2. Furthermore, the particle *is* is likely to be concealed in a more complex variant of the potential. This is to be seen in formations like *kurevijjās /kurevijjais*<sup>574</sup> and *hurevijjās /hurevijjais/* which in positive sentences have the same meaning as *kurevunīs* or *hurevunīs* but cannot be used in negative sentences. These forms are obviously based on the “preterite IV” which is an extension of the absolutive of the inactive causative (cf. 3.11.4.5). In the case of *kuranī*, this preterite has the form *kurevijje* “it could be done” (lit. “it passed being caused to be done”); the corresponding form of *hunnanī* is *hurevijje* “it could remain / be” (lit. “it

<sup>574</sup> Native speakers of the “Palace language” (cf. 0.9.2) accept the formation *kurevijjās* only from a formal point of view; they try to avoid it because of stylistical reasons.

passed having been placed (there)"). As the examples show, the preterite IV has the ending *-jje* in the modern standard language; this has to be derived from *dia*, the 3.ps.sg. pret. "he / she went" (of *danī* "to go") which is based on the homophonous past participle (cf. 3.3, 3.9.2.). In auxiliary function the form *\*dia* was changed phonologically because of its enclitic connection with the main verb, developing first into *-jja* (through an intermediate stage *-dya*), then into *-jje* in word-final position.

The intermediate stages of this phonological process are well attested in Old Dhivehi. *dia* is to be found, e.g., in RC 5,9; cf. also *diame*, the locative of the verbal noun which is attested in two *lōmāfanus* (L3 3/2,1 and L2 6,2), furthermore the forms *veddya-ve* (F10,18; *-ve* is the quotation particle, cf. 5.4) and *veddye* (F5,21.24) as the earliest attestations of the "preterite IV" of *vanī* "to become". In 1089 A.H. = 1678 A.D., *vejje* is already attested in its modern form (in a gravestone inscription on the cemetery of the Māle *Hukuru Miskit*).

Thus, the examples *kurevijje* and *hurevijje* developed through the intermediate forms *\*kurevijja* and *\*hurevijja* from *\*kurevi-d(i)ya* and *\*hurevi-d(i)ya*, resp. While the inherited vowel *-a* became *-e* in word-final position, *-a* was preserved in its original quality in those paradigm forms to which an additional personal ending was attached; in accordance with the conjugation pattern of the modern standard language (cf. 3.3.1), this is true for the 1.ps.sg. and pl. and the 2.ps.pl. Thus, in the case of *hunnanī*, the 1.ps.sg. is *hurejja-in* while for the 1st and the 2nd ps.pl. we have *tibejja-imu*<sup>575</sup>; the other persons are formally identical to the 3.ps.sg. Cp. the finite preterite forms of *danī* used as a main verb, viz. 1.ps.sg./pl., 2.ps.pl. *dia-in*; all other personal forms are identical to the 3.ps.sg. *dia*.

### 3.13. Conditional formations

In Dhivehi, there is no distinct formal category that might be styled a conditional. Conditional clauses are mainly built using participles in combination with some special conjunctions which are placed at the end of the respective syntagms; they will hereafter be called "conditional conjunctions". The agent of this type of conditional clauses appears in the oblique case. The conditional of the present is expressed by the short form of the present participle while that of the preterite uses the short form of the past participle. If the verb of the corresponding main clause appears in a finite future form, the condition can be real or unreal depending on the context. But if the verb of the main clause has the form of the potential of the present, the condition is always unreal. In the formation of conditional clauses, the dialects of Dhivehi use different conjunctions with a conditional meaning; cp. A. *fehē*, *fehēnnā*, *etennā*; F. *fahē*, *fahēnā*; M. *nama*, *(i)yā* "if".

The interrelationship of morphological elements and syntactical structures which sometimes is quite complicated will be illustrated by some examples from the dialect of Aḍḍū and the standard language below. In order to simplify matters, the particular formal elements that are used are summed up under the respective types of conditional formations.

#### 3.13.1. Aḍḍū

3.13.1.1. The following examples illustrate the **conditional of the present** which expresses a real condition. This conditional is formally marked by the participle of the present in

<sup>575</sup> For the suppletive distribution of *hunnanī* (sg.) and *tibenī* (pl.), cf. 3.14.1.

combination with the conjunction *fehē*. The fact that *fehē* can be combined with participles suggests a nominal origin of this conjunction; it is possible that *fehē* reflects an old verbal noun (maybe of \**fīani*, cf. 3.11.4.1). The verb of the respective main clause appears in the finite future:

*ma dōni balā-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I (*ma* obl.) look after the dhonis, he/she will be very happy.”  
*ma kukuḷā' kā' dē-fehē, e vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I give food (lit. ‘to eat’) to the hen, she will be very happy.”

3.13.1.2. The **conditional of the preterite** which always expresses an irreal condition, is characterised by different formation types. In one type, the meaning of an irreal conditional is expressed by the “past participle I” in combination with the conjunction *fehē*, the verb of the main clause appearing in the finite future again:

*ma dōni balafi-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I had looked after the dhonis, he would be very happy.”  
*ma kukuḷā' kā' derefi-fehē, e vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I had given food to the hen, she would be very happy.”  
*ma masakka' koffi-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I had done the work, he would be very happy.”

In a second type, an irreal condition is expressed by the past participle combined with a following conjunction again, the predicate of the main clause appearing in the form of the potential of the present.

*dōni ā-fehē, ma' dōni beliēhe.* “If the dhonis had come, I could have looked after the dhonis.”  
*dōni ā-ettennā, ma' dōni beliēhe.* “If the dhonis had come, I could have looked after the dhonis.”

3.13.1.3. In the dialect of Addū, there is one more variant of a conditional clause the morphological components of which suggest an irreal meaning. The nucleus of this formation is the syntagm *kama' vē-fehē* consisting of *vē* “becoming; being”, the part.pres. of *vani* “to become; be”, and *kama'*, the indefinite nominative of the stem *kan /kam-/* “fact”. Thus, *kama' vē-fehē* can be translated as “if it becomes a fact that ...” In this construction, *kama'* is either combined with a primary past participle or a “past participle II” (cf. 3.11.4.2). While the primary past participle expresses a real condition (in the present), the past participle II expresses an irreal condition (in the past). The participles which are enlarged by *-li* as in the sentences listed below are indicators of a “resultative aktionsart” (cf. 3.11.1.2 and 3.11.4.2); they indicate that the intention to bring the action in question to an end was not realised in the given conditional environment. Cp. the following pairs of sentences:

- (1a) *ma dōni beli kama' vē-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I looked after the dhonis, he would be very happy.” (lit. “If it became a fact that I looked after the dhonis, he would be very happy.”)  
 (1b) *ma dōni balali kama' vē-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I had looked after the dhonis, he would be very happy.” (lit. “If it were a fact that I had looked after the dhonis, he would be very happy.”)  
 (2a) *ma masakka' keḍe kama' vē-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I did a job, he would be very happy.” (“If it became a fact that I do a job, he would be very happy.”)  
 (2b) *ma masakka' kollī kama' vē-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I had done (i.e. ‘finished’) a job, he would be very happy.”  
 (3a) *ma siṭiā' le' kama' /let kamak/ vē-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I wrote a letter, he would be very happy.”  
 (3b) *ma siṭiā' lēli kama' vē-fehē, ea vara' ufā vēhe.* “If I had written a letter, he would be very happy.”

### 3.13.2. Māle

In North Dhivehi, as in Addū, conditional meanings are in most cases expressed by participial forms which are combined with special conjunctions meaning “if”, viz. *nama* and (*i*)yā which

are obviously used without any semantical differences. In certain cases, the standard language of Māle uses absolutes instead of participial forms in the formation of conditional clauses. This is a structural feature which is common to northern Dhivehi and colloquial Sinhalese. The same holds true for the conjunction M. *nama* which has an etymological and functional equivalent in Sinhalese (cf. (3) in 3.13.2.1 below); this is why a short survey of the conditional formations of Modern Sinhalese is given below.

3.13.2.1. Apart from the particular conditional paradigms of the present and the preterite (cf. GEIGER 1938, 152-3), Sinhalese possesses an analytical conditional formation which uses the conjunction *nam* ‘if’. GEIGER identifies this with the Sinhalese word *nama* ‘name’ in its stem form, *nam-* (1941, 83, no. 1229): “As particle *-nam* is used for emphasising the preceding word, or it stands at the end of a conditional sentence. — Pk. *nāma*, P. *nāma*, Sk. *nāman* ...” — In the function of a “conditional conjunction”, *nam* appears in a wide sphere of uses in the modern colloquial language. (1) In combination with the infinite present-future form, it can express a condition which is just going to be completed, as well as an irreal conditional. As an example of a condition which is going to (or can) be realised in near future, cp. *ada havasa nuvara yanavā nam, maṭa-t katā-karaṇṭa!* “If you go to town this afternoon, tell (it) to me too!” (*ada havasa* “today afternoon”; *nuvara* obl. “town”; *yanavā* unchangeable basic verbal form of the present-future “to go”; *maṭa* “to me”; *-t* “also, too, as well”; *katā* “speech”, *karaṇṭa* infinitive in imperative use “do!”). Depending on the extralinguistic situation, the following example can be understood as a real or as a potential condition: *lamayā yanavā nam, mama-t yanavā* “If the boy goes off, I(‘ll) go too” or “If the boy went off, I would go too” (*lamayā* def. nom. “the boy”; *mama-t* “me too”). (2) Together with an infinite preterite form which is derived from the past participle and used for all persons, *nam* serves as a formant of an irreal conditional of the past. Cp. *oyā iyē rā nuvara giyā nam, perahāra balanṭa tibuṇā* “If you had gone to Kandy last night, you could have seen the procession” (*oyā* “you (sg.)”; *iyē rā* “yesterday night”; *nuvara*, as a short form of *maha nuvara* “great town”, here used as a name for Kandy; *giyā* infinite preterite of *yanavā* “to go”; *perahāra* “procession”; *balanṭa* infinitive of *balanavā* “to see”; *tibuṇā* infinite preterite of *tibenavā* “to be (there)”). (3) In combination with an absolute, *nam* expresses a real condition. Cp. the sentence *ohu nuvara gihillā nam, maṭa katā-karaṇṭa!* “If he went to Kandy, tell me!” (*ohu* “he”; *gihillā* ← *gihin-lā* composite absolute of *yanavā* “to go”).<sup>576</sup>

3.13.2.2. The derivation of the conjunction M. (*i*)yā, which is used less often than *nama*, is unknown. It seems to have no etymological equivalents in the southern dialects of Dhivehi or in Sinhalese. DE SILVA suggested that *-yyaa* (sic) might have developed directly from a MIA ancestor (1970b, 156): “This affix bears a close resemblance to Pa. *-yya*, both in form as well as in function”. This view cannot be upheld, however, given that OIA and MIA /y/ was never preserved in its original quality in Dhivehi but developed into /d/ initially and disappeared completely in medial position (cf. 1.7.1). Furthermore, DE SILVA gives no attestations of the presumed correspondent of Pali and its usage.

3.13.2.3. The following examples may illustrate the formation of conditional clauses in the Dhivehi standard language.

3.13.2.3.1. Most often the conditional is built with the different variants of the past participle combined with one of the two conjunctions mentioned. All the examples given below can be translated in the same way: “If I did the job (lit. ‘a job’), he would be happy”.

*aharen masakke’ kuri nama, ēnā uṭā vāne* (*kuri* primary part.pret. of *kuranī* “to do, make”).

<sup>576</sup> For the Sinhalese examples given here and for further examples cf. MATZEL 1983, 83 and 149 f.

*aharen masakke<sup>3</sup> koffī nama, ēnā ufā vāne* (*koffī* ← /*koś-fi*/ part.pret. I of *kuranī* “to do, make”).  
*aharen masakke<sup>3</sup> koddīfi nama, ēnā ufā vāne* (/*koś-dī-fi*/, abs. /*koś*/ of *kuranī*, combined with with *dī-fi*, part.pret.I of *denī* “to give” as an auxiliary<sup>577</sup>).  
*aharen masakke<sup>3</sup> koddīfi-ā, ēnā ufā vāne.* (/*koś-dī-fi-yā*/, same as above, with conj. *yā* “if”).  
*aharen masakke<sup>3</sup> koddīn-iā, ēnā ufā vāne.* (/*koś-din-yā*/, abs. /*koś*/ of *kuranī*, combined with *din*, part.pret. of *denī* “to give” as an auxiliary, cf. above).  
*(masakke<sup>3</sup> /masakk-ek/ indef. “a work, job”; aharen “I” pers.pron. 1.ps.sg. nom.; ēnā 3.ps.sg.pers.pron. nom. “he / she”; ufā “happy”; vāne 3.ps.sg. future of vanī “to become”).*

3.13.2.3.2. The following example, which illustrates the formation of a conditional clause by means of the “past participle IV” and the conjunction *nama*, is taken from the modern literary language (short story *muda<sup>3</sup>ris vantakamuge lōbi* “A Teacher’s love” by ‘ABDULLĀH ṢĀDIQ, T10, 62):

M. *geaś gosfai vagute<sup>3</sup> libīje nama mirē ha gaḍi bai ehākaś hā iru aharenge geaś goslai dī fan!* “If you have time, after you’ve finished work and gone home, come to my house around 6:30 p.m.!” (/ge-aś/ dat. “to the house”; *gos-fā* abs.I of *danī* “to go”; /*vagut-ek*/ indef. nom. “a time”; *libīje* part.pret.IV “(having) received”, of *libenī*; *mi* dem.pron., *rē* “night, evening”; *ha* card.num. “six”, *gaḍi* “hour”, *bai* “half”; /*ehākaś*/ “approximately, about”, dat. of *ehā* “so, that way”; *hā* “all, whole”, *iru* “sun; time”; *aharen-ge* pers.pron. gen. = poss.pron., 2nd/3rd hon. degree “my”; *gos-lā* abs.II of *danī* “to go”, *dīfan* 2.sg.impv.I (polite) of *denī* “to give” (cf. 3.5.4.2.2): *goslā dīfan* “(would you) please go!”).

3.13.2.3.3. The conditional of the following sentence is built with the present participle in combination with the conjunction (*i*)*yā*:

M. *mi raśugai nūleññā, mihā danvaru mihen ti danī kon tākaś?* (T8, 78) “If you do not live here, why are you strolling around this house at three o’clock after midnight?”, lit.: “If you do not live on this island, where is it that you are going to in this way at three o’clock after midnight?” (*mi* dem.pron., *raśu-gai* loc. “on this island”; *nūleññā*, i.e. /*nu ulen-yā*/,<sup>578</sup> represents the negated part.pres. of *ulenī* “to live” in its original short form in *-n*, contrasting with the modern variant *ulē*, and *yā* “if”; *mi-hā* dem.pron. *mi* + pron. *hā* “all, whole”; *danvaru* noun, obl. “three hours after midnight”; *mi-hen* dem.pron. *mi* + *hen* obl. “sort”; *ti* dem.pron. “this”; *danī* part.pres. “going” + focus-marker; *kontākaś* dat. “to which place?”).

3.13.2.3.4. Different from Aḍḍū, there is a type of conditional in Māle which consists of the absolutive co-occurring with the conjunction *nama*. A parallel formation which is used for the expression of a condition that is just going to be realised is found in Sinhalese, however (cf. (3) in 3.13.2.1 above). Cp. the following example:

*koddī nama, ēnā ufā vāne.* (*koś-dī*, abs. /*koś*/ of *kuranī* “to make, do”, combined with *dī*, abs. of *denī* “to give”, as an auxiliary<sup>3</sup>) “Having done (that), he / she will be happy.”  
*ēnā koddī nama, aharen ufā vānan.* “After he will have done (that), I’ll be happy.”

## 3.14. Suppletive verbal paradigms

### 3.14.1. Suppletivism according to number

In Dhivehi all verbs that belong to the semantic sphere of “to lie, sit, stand; be (there)” are characterised by peculiar morphological features. From the verb *tibenī* meaning “to be

<sup>577</sup> For the use of *denī* as an auxiliary verb cf. 3.11.4.8.

<sup>578</sup> For the geminate [ññ] resulting from *n* + *i* (+V), cf. 1.3.9.4.

(there)",<sup>579</sup> no singular forms can be derived throughout the Dhivehi dialects, while the verbs *innanī* "to sit, be married, marry", *išīnnanī* "to sit", *hunnanī* "to be, stand, remain", *onnanī* "to lie, be there" and *ośōnnanī* "to lie (down)" are defective in their plural formation, at least in particular dialectal areas. Where the plural forms of the latter verbs are missing, they are systematically substituted by the corresponding forms of *tibenī*. Thus, the finite and infinite plural forms of *tibenī* constitute a mixed paradigm together with the singular forms of the other verbs belonging to the same semantic field. Cp., e.g., the paradigm of *hunnanī* "to stand, be, remain" where we find a 1.ps.sg. pret. M. *hurin*, F. *hūšin*, A. *hišin* "I stood" etc. vs. the 1.ps.pl. pret. M. *tibīmu*, F. *tibīmā / tibīma*, A. *tibimā* "we stood" etc.<sup>580</sup>

While *tibenī* has no singular forms at all, the other verbs concerned show a non-uniform behaviour in their plural formation. *hunnanī* "to stand" has no plural forms of its own in any Dhivehi dialect; this means that the corresponding forms of *tibenī* represent the only plural forms available of this verb. For *onnanī* "to lie" the same holds true in the dialects of Aḍḍū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku whereas the standard language has a special plural paradigm of this verb which, however, is only used when there is a particular stress on the meaning of "lying (prostrate)"; when it has the unspecified meaning of "being there", the suppletive plural forms of *tibenī* are used as well. *ośōnnanī* exhibits a complete paradigm in Aḍḍū and Māle while the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku has no other plural than that of *tibenī*. While *išīnnanī* has a plural paradigm of its own in Māle and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, its Aḍḍū equivalent prefers the suppletive forms in the plural; exceptions are only met with when the state of "sitting" is underlined (e.g., in contrast to "standing upright"). In Māle, the (original) plural forms of *innanī* can only be used in this sense (alongside the suppletive forms) while in the southernmost dialects this verb has no other plural than that of *tibenī* again.

With the exception of *tibenī*, all verbs with a suppletive distribution according to number are *n*-stems. It is not clear whether this fact is connected with the special development of the morphological suppletivism, apart from the basic meaning of "to be there" they share. Within the Indo-Aryan languages, this typological peculiarity seems to be confined to Dhivehi. The etymological equivalents of Sinhalese, as far as they exist, do not show any parallels.

### 3.14.2. Suppletivism in the formation of tense forms

In Dhivehi, we find another type of suppletion in a verbal paradigm which is restricted to the southern dialects though. In Aḍḍū and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, all forms of the verb (M.) *danī* "to go" which would belong to the present stem have been completely lost; as a rule they are substituted by the corresponding forms of *enī* "to come" (M. *annanī*). This is the reason why the present stem of *enī* and all forms which are derived from it share the two meanings; cp. the sentence A. *ma ādavegen kāu* (← *kā* ← /*kāś*/) *enī gē* (← *gea* ← /*geaś*/) which can mean "usually I go home for eating" as well as "usually I come home for eating" (*ma* pers.pron. 1.ps.sg.obl. "I"; *ādavegen* "always, usually"; /*kāś*/ infinitive of *kanī* "to eat"; *enī* part.pres. + focus-marker *-ī* "that where I come / go to"; /*geaś*/ dat. of *gē* "house"). Thus, the exact translation of *enī* depends on the context or extralinguistic information.

<sup>579</sup> Cp. the Sinh. equivalent *tibenavā / tīyēnavā* "to be (there) (of inanimate things)" representing the intransitive variant of *tabanavā / tibanavā* "to put, place" ← OIA *sthā-* "to stand" (causative *sthāpayati*); cf. GEIGER (1941), 61, no. 890.

<sup>580</sup> Cp. also the tables illustrating the interrogative forms of Aḍḍū in 3.15.1.3.1.

In contrast to that, it is still possible to distinguish the meanings of “to come” and “to go” in the preterite; many speakers are giving up this distinction, however, especially when using finite forms. In order to avoid semantic overlaps, two preverbs are used in the finite past tense which make the verbal form in question unambiguous. The preverb *tebe-* signals a “motion from an external point towards the agent”; it can be combined with the finite past forms of *annanī* as well as those of *danī*. The preverb *ebe-* which denotes a motion “away from the spectator” can only be combined with the preterite of *danī*. Cp. the following three examples from the dialect of Aḏḏū all of which mean “I have come / came home”. The construction without a preverb is restricted to the infinite preterite: A. *ma geu ai...* “that I have come home ...” (*ma* obl. “I”; *geu* (← *gea'* ← */geaš'/*) in prevocalic position (cf. 1.6.3) “to (the) house, home”; *ai* part.pret. *ā* of *enī*, M. *annanī* “to come” + *-ī*). The sentences *ava gē' tebe-ain* and *ava gē' tebe-gen*, both containing the preverb *tebe-*, are synonymous in modern Aḏḏū in the sense of “I've come / came home” (*ava* nom. “I”; *tebe-ain* “I have come / came (here)” vs. *tebe-gen* “I went (there)”). Neither A. *-ain* (1.ps.sg.pret. of *enī* / *annanī*) nor A. *-gen* (1.ps.sg.pret. of *danī*) can be used without a preverb. With *ebe-*, only the preterite forms of *danī* are used as in A. *ava geu ebe-gen* “I went away (from somewhere).”

### 3.15. Interrogative forms (“yes/no” questions)

In Dhivehi, the formation of yes/no questions is a matter of morphology. In the standard language and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku there are special question particles which mark a sentence as being a yes/no question. In Aḏḏū, however, the procedure is quite different; here we find particular interrogative paradigms for almost all verbal categories even though in some parts of the verbal system the question forms do not differ very much from the corresponding declarative forms. Furthermore, questions are usually stressed in Aḏḏū by a typical intonation ascending towards the end of the sentence. There is no special interrogative word order in Dhivehi; thus, the morphological means of expression are especially important. The interrogative paradigms, which are characteristic for Aḏḏū, and the question particles of the other dialects, which mostly occur in combination with the interrogative pronouns, are also used for the formation of questions that need a more complex answer (cf. 2.6.7).

#### 3.15.1. Aḏḏū

In comparison with their declarative counterparts, the endings of the interrogative forms show some enlargements (cf. the tables given below). In the present tense, we find an additional long *-ī* in the ending of the 1.ps.sg. of all conjugations; with certain *n*-stems, this *-ī* is also met with in the other singular persons. The remaining personal endings do not show any visible changes. A greater variety is found in the paradigm of the preterite where all singular forms have a final *-ī*, the 2.ps.pl. in most cases shows the older ending *-vā*, and the 3.ps.pl. always has a long final *-ā*. In the future paradigm too, all persons of the singular have a final *-ī*; the 2nd and the 3rd ps.pl. show a long final *-ā* without any exceptions. The 1.ps.pl. is the only form that is never changed in questions.

3.15.1.1. The interrogative paradigms are likely to represent an earlier stage in the phonological development in comparison with the corresponding declarative forms<sup>581</sup> in that they

<sup>581</sup> Cf. the tables given in 3.2, 3.2.1, 3.2.2.1, 3.2.3, 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.4.

have preserved final vowels of the personal endings which were partly lost in the syntactic environment of declarative sentences; the typical interrogative intonation consisting of a special accentuation of the last syllable may be responsible for this effect. The lengthening of the respective vowels which sometimes even influences the quantity of the preceding syllable, its vowel being lengthened as well, can presumably be explained by secondary emphasis resulting from the interrogative intonation. Because of the preservation of the final vowels the consonants immediately preceding them remained unchanged as well. This is true, e.g., for the ending of the 1.ps.sg. of all conjugation types in all tenses; in its interrogative variant, the original *-m* which, according to the sound laws of Modern Dhivehi, would have developed into *-n* [ŋ] in word-final position, reappears before the final *-ī* (cf. below). Similarly, the interrogative form of the infinitive has preserved the final *-śā* ← *-ṭa* which reflects the old dative ending; the emphatic lengthening of the final vowel lastly led to all interrogative infinitives ending in *-śā* (cf. 3.6.3 and below). Furthermore, the formant of the interrogative form of the 2nd and 3rd ps.sg.fut. as well as the potential, *-ēśī*, shows a *-ś-* which corresponds to the *-h-* of its declarative equivalent (for the phonological problems concerning the latter forms cf. 3.4.1 and 3.12.3.2).

It is not certain, however, whether the lengthening of the plural endings of the finite interrogative forms yielding a long final *-ā* can be explained by an emphatic interrogative intonation only in those cases where the corresponding declarative forms end in a short *-a*; as against this, the lengthened interrogative endings might as well contain another (unknown) formant. The infinite forms to which an *-ā* is suffixed in interrogative sentences could be regarded as an argument speaking in favour of the latter possibility which takes both emphasis and suffixation into account.

3.15.1.2. The following two examples illustrate the use of the long form of the present participle enlarged by *-ā* in Aḏḏū:

- (1) *ta masakka' keranā?* “Are you working (right now)?” (*ta* pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. obl.; *masakka' /masakkat/* obj., “work”; *keranī-ā* part.pres. + focus-marker *-ī* of M. *kuranī* “to make, do”; *-ā* interrogative element).
- (2) *ta siṭiā' lēnāyā nun* “Are you not writing a letter (right now)?” (*siṭiā' /siṭi-ak/* indef. obj.; *lēnei* ← */lēna-ī*, part.pres.of M. *lianī* “to write” + focus-marker; *nun* “no, not”).

The following sentence contains an absolutive that is enlarged with the suffix *-ā*:

*ea [ee] ā kō ta inī mēze kavere [kaverī] irīndegenā* “When he came, were you just sitting at table?”, lit. “At the time when he came, was that what you were (doing), to sit nearby the table?” (*ea* pers.pron. 3.ps.sg. obl.; *ā* part.pret. “(having) come” of *enī*, M. *annanī* “to come”; *kō* conj. “at the time when”; *inī* part.pret. “having been sitting” + focus-marker *-ī*; *mēze* gen. of *mēzu* “table”; *kaverie* (gen./)loc. “near (by)”; *irīndegen* abs.III of M. *iśīnnanī* “sit” + interrogative element *-ā*).

In another example, *-ā* is suffixed to a noun in the oblique case:

*ma mi hiśī baḡicāi etereā?* “Was I in the garden (at that time)?”, lit. “(The place) where I was at that time, was that inside of the garden?” (*ma* pers.pron. 1.ps.sg. obl.; *mi* adv. “just, (right) now”; *hiśī* part.pret. of *hinnei*, M. *hunnani* “to stand, be” + focus-marker *-ī*; *baḡicāi* gen. of *baḡicā* “garden”; *etere* obl. “inside of, in” + interrogative element *-ā*).

3.15.1.3. In the following tables those interrogative forms of the Aḏḏū dialect that are derived from verbal forms are listed systematically, the morphological differences as against their declarative equivalents being marked by bold type (M. *balanī* “to look”; *lianī* “to write”; *iśīnnanī* / *innanī* “to sit”; *hunnani* / *tibenī* “to stand, be”; *temenī* “to get wet”; *fenenī* “to appear”; *annanī* “to come”; *denī* “to give”):

## 3.15.1.3.1. Regular stems: present

present	<i>a</i> -stems		<i>n</i> -stems		<i>e</i> -stems	
1st sg.	<i>balamī</i>	<i>lēmī</i>	<i>irīndumī</i>	<i>hišumī</i>		<i>tememī</i>
2nd sg.	<i>balai</i>	<i>lēi</i>	<i>irīndī</i>	<i>hišei</i>		<i>temei</i>
3rd sg.	<i>balai</i>	<i>lēi</i>	<i>irīndī</i>	<i>hišei</i>		<i>temei</i>
1st pl.	<i>balamā</i>	<i>lēmā</i>	<i>irīndumā</i>		<i>tibemā</i>	<i>tememā</i>
2nd pl.	<i>balatā</i>	<i>lētā</i>	<i>irīndutā</i>		<i>tibetā</i>	<i>temetā</i>
3rd pl.	<i>balatā</i>	<i>lētā</i>	<i>irīndutā</i>		<i>tibetā</i>	<i>temetā</i>

Example:

- (1) *ava ādavegen siṭī ni lēmī?* “Do I not always write letters?” (*ava* pers.pron. 1.ps.sg. nom.; *ādavegen* “always, usually”; *siṭī* obj. pl. “letters”; *ni* “not”).

## 3.15.1.3.2. Regular stems: preterite

preterite	<i>a</i> -stems		<i>n</i> -stems		<i>e</i> -stems	
1st sg.	<i>belimī</i>	<i>lemmī</i> ← * <i>letimī</i>	<i>immī</i> ← * <i>innmī</i>	<i>hišimī</i>	<sup>†</sup> <i>temeṇemī</i>	<i>feneṇemī</i>
2nd sg.	<i>belī</i>	<i>leṭī</i>	<i>inī</i>	<i>hišī</i>	<i>temeṇei</i>	<i>feneṇei</i>
3rd sg.	<i>belī</i>	<i>leṭī</i>	<i>inī</i>	<i>hišī</i>	<i>temeṇei</i>	<i>feneṇei</i>
1st pl.	<i>belimā</i>	<i>lemmā</i> ← * <i>letimā</i>	<i>(tibimā)</i>		<i>temeṇemā</i>	<i>feneṇemā</i>
2nd pl.	<i>belivā</i>	<i>levvā</i> ← * <i>letivā</i>	<i>(tibivā)</i>		<i>temeṇevā</i>	<i>feneṇevā</i>
3rd pl.	<i>beliā</i>	<i>leṭā</i>	<i>(tibiā)</i>		<i>temeṇā</i>	<i>feneṇā</i>

Examples:

- (1) *ava iyye siṭia' ni lemmī?* “Didn’t I write a letter yesterday?” (*iyye* adv. “yesterday”).
- (2) *everie iyye dōṇi beliā* “Did they look after the dhonis yesterday?” (*everie* /-ia/ pers.pron. 3.ps.pl. nom. “they”; *dōṇi* here generic pl. “boats”)

## 3.15.1.3.3. Regular verbs: future

future	<i>a</i> -stems		<i>n</i> -stems		<i>e</i> -stems	
1st sg.	<i>balāsumī</i>	<i>lēnešumī</i>	<i>irīnnašumī</i>	<i>hinnašumī</i>		<i>fenēšumī</i>
2nd sg.	<i>balāšī</i>	<i>lēnešī</i>	<i>irīnnašī</i>	<i>hinnešī</i>		<i>feniēšī</i>
3rd sg.	<i>balāšī</i>	<i>lēnešī</i>	<i>irīnnašī</i>	<i>hinnešī</i>		<i>feniēšī</i>
1st pl.	<i>balāšumā</i>	<i>lēnešumā</i>	<i>irīnnašumā</i>		<i>tibēšumā</i>	<i>feniēšumā</i>
2nd pl.	<i>balāšīā</i>	<i>lēnešīā</i>	<i>irīnnašīā</i>		<i>tibēšīā</i>	<i>feniēšīā</i>
3rd pl.	<i>balāšīā</i>	<i>lēnešīā</i>	<i>irīnnašīā</i>		<i>tibēšīā</i>	<i>feniēšīā</i>

Example:

- (1) *ava māduma siṭia' lēnašumī?* “Shall I write a letter tomorrow?”

## 3.15.1.3.4. Root verbs: present / preterite / future

	present		preterite		future	
1st sg.	<i>emī</i>	<i>demī</i>	<i>tebe-āmī</i> ← * <i>tebe-aimī</i>	<i>dimmī</i> ← * <i>dinimī</i>	<i>bēšumī</i> ← <i>be-ēšumī</i>	<i>dēšumī</i>
2nd sg.	<i>ei</i>	<i>dei</i>	<i>tebe-āi</i>	<i>dinī</i>	<i>bēšī</i>	<i>dēšī</i>
3rd sg.	<i>ei</i>	<i>dei</i>	<i>tebe-āi</i>	<i>dinī</i>	<i>bēšī</i>	<i>dēšī</i>
1st pl.	<i>emā</i>	<i>demā</i>	<i>tebe-āmā</i>	<i>dimā</i>	<i>bēšumā</i>	<i>dēšumā</i>
2nd pl.	<i>evā</i>	<i>detā</i>	<i>tebe-āvā</i> / <i>tebe-ātā</i>	<i>dimvā</i> ← <i>dinvā</i> / <i>dinā</i>	<i>bēšuvā</i>	<i>dēšuvā</i>
3rd pl.	<i>etā</i>	<i>detā</i>	<i>tebe-ātā</i>	<i>dinā</i>	<i>bēšīā</i>	<i>dēšīā</i>

Examples:

- (1) *tō kukula' kā' dei?* “Do you give the chicks (something) to eat?” (*tō* pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. nom. “you”; /*kukulaš/* dat.pl. “to the chicks”; /*kāš/* inf. “to eat”).
- (2) *tafirie māduma' kukula' kā' dēšuvā?* “Will you give the chicks (something) to eat tomorrow?” (*tafirie* /-ia/ pers.pron. 2.ps.pl. nom.; *māduma'* adv. “tomorrow”).

## 3.15.1.3.5. Potential

<i>a</i> -stems	<i>n</i> -stems	<i>e</i> -stems	root verbs	
<i>beliēšī</i>	<i>irīndiēšī</i>	<i>temiēšī</i>	<i>gīēšī</i>	<i>dīēšī</i>

Examples:

- (1) *mā' nidāne tān libiēšī?* “Can I have a place for sleeping?” (T1, 7; /*maš/* pers.pron. 1.ps.sg. dat. “to me”; *nidāne* part.fut. of *nidanī* “to sleep”; *tān* nom. “place”).
- (2) *mā' gē' gīēšī?* “Can I go home?” (/*geaš/* dat. of *gē* “to (the) house”).

## 3.15.1.3.6. Infinitive

<i>a</i> -stems	<i>n</i> -stems	<i>e</i> -stems	root verbs	
<i>balāšā</i>	<i>irīnnašā</i>	<i>temēšā</i>	<i>ēšā</i>	<i>dēšā</i>

Example:

- (3) *ea ākō ma inī dōni balāšā?* “When he came, was I sitting (there) to look after the dhonis?”

## 3.15.2. Fua' Mulaku

In the dialect of Fua' Mulaku, “yes/no” questions are only marked by the particle *tai* which is added to the end of the given sentence or clause without any further morphological or syntactical changes of the verb forms contained. The only function of *tai* is to signal that the sentence must be understood as a question; it has no further meaning. The following examples are sentences of direct speech which are taken from different fairy tales:

- (1) *haulāu, timāi ekī hajjaha ni ennen tai?* “Cock, will you not come on a hajj together with me?” (T4, 13; *haul-āu haul* + quotation particle “Cock!”; *timāi* pron.obl. + conj. -*ai* “with self”; *ekī* “together”; *hajjaha* dat. “hajj (Islamic pilgrimage)”; *ni* “not”; *ennen* 2.ps.sg. future of *eni* “to come, go”, ≈ M. *annanī*).

- (2) *taša ni fenen tai, timā kari o<sup>3</sup> tasbīha (gañḍo)?* “Do you not see (it), the rosary being on my neck?” (T4, 16; *taša* pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. dat. “to you”; *fenen* 3.ps.sg.pres. “it is visible”, of F. *fenenī* “to be visible”; *kari* (gen./)loc. of F. *karo* “neck”; /ot/ “being” part.pret. of (M.) *onmani* “to lie, be”; *tasbīha* obl. “rosary”; *gañḍo* nom. “piece”).
- (3) *ammāve, ammāša timā nun fahē, kūdaku ni libun’ tai?* “Mother, when I was not yet there, did you (lit. ‘mother’) not receive a child?” (T6, 62; *ammā* nom. (voc.) “Mother!” + quot. particle (Māle-form!) *eve*; *ammāša* dat. “to the mother”; *nun* “not being”; *fahē* ≈ A. *fehē* (cf. 3.13) conj. “when, if”, here: “when”; *kūdaku* obl.indef. “child”; *libunu* part.pret. of *libenī* “to receive, get”; lit. “.. was a child not received to the mother?”).

### 3.15.3. Māle

In the standard language, “yes/no” questions can be marked with four different particles, each of them having a particular function. The particles that are most frequently used are *ta* and *tō*; like F. *tai*, they signal neutral questions. *ta* and *tō* are only distinguished by the honorific level they pertain to. While questions marked with *ta* refer to the lowest level, *tō*, in combination with verbs of the 2nd and 3rd degree (cf. 3.2.1.1.1), traditionally refers to nobles and the sultan, in the modern language also to other people in a leading position. Apart from any context of social hierarchy, *tō*-questions can in special cases be used for “normal” people, too, in order to express respect towards the addressee. Besides their grammatical function as a morphological question marker, the two other particles, *hei/hē* and *bā*, express additional semantic nuances. *hei/hē* is used in repeated questions when a given answer was not well conceivable for different reasons; beyond that it is used to confirm presuppositions or well-known facts. Presumably *hei* is etymologically identical with the adj. *heyo* “good, enough”. The particle *bā* which is also used in repeated questions expresses surprise about what has been said or asked. Concerning the honorific levels, *hei* and *bā* are unspecified.

3.15.3.1. Usage and meaning of the different particles can be illustrated by contrasting four versions of just one sentence, all rendering the English question “Can I do this job?” or “Shall I be able to do this job?”:

- (1) *aḷugañḍa’ mi masakka’ kurevidāne tō?*  
 (2) *ahanna’ mi masakka’ [masakkai] kurevidāne ta?*  
 (3) *ahanna’ mi masakka’ kurevidāne hei?*  
 (4) *ahanna’ mi masakka’ kurevidāne bā?*  
 (/ahannaš/ pers.pron. 3.ps.sg. dat. “to me”; *mi* dem.pron. “this”; /masakkat/ nom. “work, job”; *kurevidāne* pot.pres./fut. of *kuranī* “to make, do”)

With respect to their meaning, (1) and (2) are the most neutral versions. Sentence (1) is used by members of the two higher degrees when talking to each other but also when members of a low social status address nobles, the sultan, the president or any person in a leading position (directors etc.). Question (2) can be produced by members of the lower social levels when communicating with each other; it can also be uttered by representants of a higher social status when speaking with members of a lower status. Question (3) means: “Would you (please) repeat, I could not understand quite well, can I do this job?”, while (4) expresses a doubt: “Can I really do this job?”.

3.15.3.2. Some further examples may suffice to illustrate the use of the question particles:

- (5) “... *aharenge darifulu dušin ta?*” “... Have you seen my child?” (T9, 29; *aharen-ge* pers.pron. gen. = poss.pron. 1.ps.sg., 2./3. hon. degree, attributive “my”; *dari-fulu*, consisting of *dari* obl. “child” +

honorificator *-fulu*; *dušin* 2.ps.sg.pret. of *dekenī* “to see”). This question is asked by a mother who is very anxious about her daughter; the addressee is a person in the street. Even without any further context, this sentence makes it evident that the question is directed by someone belonging to the upper class to a person of a lower social status; apart from the interrogative particle *ta*, this is clearly indicated by the pronoun, the verb and the element *-fulu* (cf. 2.2.3). — The two final sentences of the same story illustrate a repeated question marked with the particle *hei*. In this case, the topic is a horrible accident; just at the moment when a young girl is dying in the street, with all eyes upon her, someone of the people asks:

- (6) *hašiš heyy eve? maruvī heyy eve?* “Was it hashish?<sup>582</sup> (Is she) dead?”, lit. “Has she died?” (T9, 61-62; *maru vī* 3.ps.sg.pret., with an emphatic lengthening of *vi*, the finite part of *maru vanī* “to die”; *eve* quotation particle). — In the following example, the particle *tō* together with a verb in the 2nd hon. degree indicates an elevated social position of the addressee:
- (7) *vakaru ballavai [ballavā] gannavamu tō?* “Would you like to buy some firewood?” (T10, 15; *vakaru* “(fire)wood”; *ballavai gannavamu* 2.ps.pl.pres. of *ballavai gannavanī*, 2nd/3rd hon. degree of *gannanī* “to buy”). A young salesboy asks this question in the Māle market; the addressee is a man passing by who is well known and respected as a teacher.

#### 4. Uninflected words

This paragraph will give a survey of Dhivehi word forms which from the point of view of the modern language are uninflected and can therefore be regarded as particles. Conjunctions such as M. *iru*, A. *vēlei*, F. *vēlai*<sup>583</sup> “when, while” or M. *ekugā /eku-gai/*, A.F. *ekī*<sup>584</sup> “(together) with” which represent petrified nominal forms will not be treated within this context. As in most cases adverbial qualifications are nouns or pronouns in the ablative, dative, locative or oblique case,<sup>585</sup> only a few words remain that must be treated here.

4.1. Depending on the context, the postponed particle A. *-āi*, M.F. *-ā* means either “and” or “with”. In the southern dialects, *-ā(i)* can be added separately to all parts of the sentence that are to be combined in the function of a coordinative conjunction; sometimes it can be translated as “both ... and” or “as well as”. Cp. A. *fīndanāi boḥḍanāi de verin ... gē eḍā<sup>7</sup> /eḍās/ nimmalie /-ia/* “Both the f.-bird and the b.-bird (the f.-bird as well as the b.-bird) ... finished building (their respective) houses” (*/fīndanā-āi boḥḍanā-āi/* sg.def. + *-āi*); F. *fīndanu-ā boḥḍanu-ā de verin ebage-ai* “both the f.-bird and the b.-bird went off” (T1, 1). In the modern standard language, however, *-ā* “and” is used in rare cases only; cp. the following sentence where the particle is suffixed only to the first noun: M. *eba uḷē fīndan-fulak-ā boḥḍanfulē<sup>7</sup> /-ek/* “Once there lived a f.-bird and a b.-bird” (T1, 1). As the form *fīndanful-ak-ā* shows, the conjunction *-ā* combines not with the nominative case of the indefinite suffix (as contained in *boḥḍanfulē<sup>7</sup>*) but with the oblique case form which is no

<sup>582</sup> According to (oral) information of the author of the short story in question (Mrs. ḤABĪBA ḤUSSAIN ḤABĪB), *hašiš* denotes a stronger drug in this case (M. *drag*); in the Engl. translation by ABDULLAH SAEED KOSHY (in *Finiashi* 3, 26), the word “heroin” is used instead.

<sup>583</sup> For the derivation of these conjunctions from M. *iru* obl. “time” and A. *vēlei* / F. *vēlai* loc. “at the time (when)”, cf. 5.3.1. Cp. also the other conjunctions mentioned there.

<sup>584</sup> M. *eku-gai* and A.F. *ekī*, lit. “in one”, represent the respective locatives of the numeral *ek(u)* “one”.

<sup>585</sup> Cf., e.g., 2.6.5.6 for demonstrative adverbs and 2.6.5.7 for modal adverbs. For the dative functioning as an “adverbial case” cf. 2.3.1.1.3.3; for the ablative/instrumental cf. 2.3.1.1.4.7. For adverbial interrogative pronouns cf. 2.6.7.2 ff. For adverbial formations that are based on indefinite pronouns cf. 2.6.7.3. For the use and derivation of the conditional conjunctions cf. 3.13.

longer used independently in this form in the standard language.<sup>586</sup> In South Dhivehi *-ā(i)* can be used for combining any part of speech; cp., e.g., F. ... *haulūā, kukuḷūā, mīdaluā tin-eti ekī deāśa fummāli ai*. “the cock as well as the hen and the rat (lit. ‘the cock and the hen and the rat’), all three together jumped into the water” (T4, 31).

In southern Dhivehi the particle *-ā(i)* is often used in the sense of “with”, while it has been more or less replaced in this meaning by *ekugā* in the standard language (cf. above). Cp. some examples taken from a fairy tale again:

F. *duve ē vēlai, lāigātī, emme feratamāsa haulakkā* /haulak-ā/. “While going along, the one she met **with** first of all was a cock” (T4, 12) ... *den ē vēlai, laigātī, mīdelakkā* /mīdelak-ā/ “... then, while going along, what they met **with** was a rat” (T4, 19), ... *kukulakkā* /kukuḷak-ā/ “... **with** a hen” (T4, 26).<sup>587</sup>

4.2. The main meaning of M. *adi* is “and”. When *adi* is used as a double conjunction, it can be translated with “as well as”; depending on the context, it can also have the meaning of “also, too, again, else, yet”. It often functions as an introductory element of a sentence. In Adḍu and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, *adi* sometimes appears in the speech of educated people, but it never occurs in folkloristic texts; this suggests that the use of *adi* in southern Dhivehi must be explained by interference from the standard language. Cp. M. ... *ran rihi adi nū kuḷaige ali* ... “... light of golden, silver and blue colour” (T9, 24).

4.3. The postponed particle M. *ves*, A.F. *as* “also, too, else, even” appears in combination with numerous pronominal formations and conjunctions; cp., e.g., M. *adi-ves* “and also” and *nama-ves* “but, even if” (*nama* conditional conjunction “if”, cf. 3.13.2). For combinations with indefinite pronouns cf. 2.6.7.3, for pronominal adjectives, 2.6.7.4.2.

4.4. For the emphatic particle *-me* “just, right” (e.g. M. *miadu-me* “just today”) and its presumable background cf. 2.6.7.4.1.

4.5. The temporal adverb M.A.F. *den* corresponds with Sinh. *dān* “now” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 74, no. 1085). Introducing a sentence, *den* has the meaning of “then, now”, while postponed after temporal expressions it means “until”; cp., e.g., M. *fahē* /-ek/ *jahan den* “until it strikes five” i.e. “until five o’clock”<sup>588</sup>.

4.6. Being of fundamental syntactic importance, the **quotation and question particles** will be treated separately in 5.4; for their function as conjunctions cf. 5.3.1.3.

4.7. For the preposed **negation particles** M. *nu*, A.F. *ni* cf. 5.5.2. The independent negation particle corresponding to Engl. “no!” is M.A. *nūn*, F. *uhy* (less often *nun*); “yes” is expressed by M.A. *hā*, F. *hā, hū*.<sup>589</sup>

<sup>586</sup> For the development of the indefinite suffix in Māle cf. 2.3.2.3.1.

<sup>587</sup> The gemination of /k/ in the position before *-ā* is one of the cases of spontaneous gemination which is characteristic for Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. This is a phonetic, not a phonemic process which is not connected with the “historical” geminates described in 1.3.9.

<sup>588</sup> Example taken from DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 91.

<sup>589</sup> M. *labbā* /labbai/ and *āde* which are used in the standard language as more polite variants meaning “yes” are likely to be of verbal origin.

## Syntactical sketch

### 5. Sentence structure

In its syntactical structure, Dhivehi fits well into the general framework of the Modern IA languages the most typical feature of which consists in the “**right-to-left construction**” of **the sentence**. As MASICA states (1991, 332) “the central fact of NIA syntax is the final position of the verb”. This holds true for Dhivehi, too, but only as far as **finite verbs** are concerned. This means that the structure of the whole sentence depends on whether it contains a finite verb or not. Without understanding this basic issue of the syntactical correlations of Dhivehi it would be impossible to analyse the morphological structures, especially of the verb and the pronoun. This is why the present chapter also contains, from a syntactic perspective, additional information on morphological phenomena that have already been treated before within the respective paragraphs.

5.1. In Dhivehi, the occurrence of **finite verbs** is strictly confined to sentences which do not show a rhematic foregrounding of any of its parts. In this connection it does not play any role whether the given sentences are primitive or rather complicated by their syntactic structure. The subject of such sentences regularly appears in the nominative case; cp. the following examples:

- M. *hilmī mārukeṭaś dān gein nukumejje eve* “Hilmī walked to the market from his house”, lit. “Hilmī left the house (in order) to go to the market” (T10, 2; pred. *nukumejje* 3.ps.sg.pret.IV of *nukunnani* “to come / go out, leave” + quotation particle *eve*; subj. *hilmī* p.n. nom.; *gein* abl.sg. “from (the) house”; *dān* inf. of *dani* “to go”).
- M. *šarīfu kuriaś hiṅgamun dia eve* “Šarīf continued on walking”, lit. “Šarīf went (on) walking further” (T9, 12; pred. *dia* 3.ps.sg.pret. of *dani* “to go” + quotation particle *eve*; subj. *šarīfu* p.n. nom.).
- A. *den, e<sup>3</sup> kala<sup>3</sup> /ek kalaś/ kalēge kōra<sup>3</sup> /-aś/ fummali* “Then, all at once, the lord jumped into the pond” (T3, 33; pred. *fummali* 3.ps.sg.pret.II of *fummani* “to jump”; subj. *kalēge* nom. “lord, sir”).
- A. *vēla gaṅḍakun, moḷōgaṅḍak-āi arage* “After a while, (he) came up with an axe” (T3, 34; pred. *arage* 3.ps.sg.pret.IV of *aranī* “to climb / go / come up”; the subject is not expressed explicitly).
- F. *ed duvaheki, ed duvaheki, Mēliage Dia gē iṅḍōle iṅḍu vēlai dombaṃkēle<sup>3</sup> /don-baṃ-kēl-ek/ veṭṭige* “One day, when Mēliage Dia was sitting on the swing bed of (her) house, a light-coloured breadfruit fell down” (T4, 1; pred. *veṭṭige* 3.ps.sg.pret.IV of *veṭṭeni* “to fall (down)”; subj. *Mēliage Dia* nom., lit. “Mēlia’s daughter”).

5.2. For the focussing of **rhematic parts of a sentence**, Dhivehi has a very effective and complex procedure which consists of maximally four different formal elements in well-organised syntactical cooperation. Firstly the parts of a sentence are arranged in a way that the rhematic part (usually but not in all cases, cf. 5.2.3 below) is moved to the end of the sentence and thus represents the only part that follows the verbal predicate. In this constellation, the latter does not appear as a finite verb but only in participial form (active or inactive). The participial predicate is further enlarged by an element *-ī* which “announces” the following rhema; this *-ī* is here called a “focus-marker” while the enlarged participial form itself is named “long form” (cf. 3.9 above). Finally, the subject of the construction appears in the oblique case which has special forms only with personal pronouns, and only in southern Dhivehi, however, the oblique and the direct (nominative) case having merged to a large

extent.<sup>590</sup> With but one exception which consists in the oblique form of the indefinite suffix (-*aku*, e.g. in *mīhaku* “a person”),<sup>591</sup> the modern standard language does not show any formal differences between these two case forms today.

5.2.1. Concerning the length and the semantical content of rhematical parts of a sentence focussed in this way, there are no restrictions at all. Cp. the following examples with participial predicates that are enlarged with the focus-marker, *-ī*, the rhematic structure being translated with relative constructions.

- F. *boñdanu keñḍī hai vakar-ai* “The b.-bird cut only timber”, lit. “(What) the b.-bird cut, was (*is*) all timber.” (T1, 2; pred. *keñḍī* part.pret. l.f. of *kañḍanī* “to cut”; subj. *boñdanu* obl. “the b.-bird”).
- A. *mi gehā hiṣī kōraki kaverie* “This tree was (standing) near by a pond”, lit. “(That where) this tree was (standing), was near by a pond” (T3, 24; pred. *hiṣī* part.pret. l.f. of (M.) *hunnānī* “to stand, be, remain”; subj. *mi gehā* obl.def. “this tree”).
- M. *aḷugañḍu vaki vī skūlge grēḍ 4C-in* “I left school when I was in grade 4C (4C-in abl.)”, lit. “(The level) I abandoned (from) was (from) grade 4C of the school” (T10, 36; pred. *vaki vī+ī*, part.pret. l.f. of *vaki vanī* “to separate, abandon”; subj. *aḷugañḍu* obl. humble “I”, 1st hon. degree).
- M. *maḍumaḍun e ivenī mīhaku rō aḍ-eve* “I heard a man’s faint, weak cry”, lit. “What was perceivable very weakly was the moaning noise of a man.” (T8, 99; pred. *ivenī* part.pres. l.f. “hearing”, inact., here “to be heard, perceivable”; *mīh-aku* obl.sg.indef. “a man”; *rō* part.pres. short form “moaning”; *aḍu* “noise”).

In the following sentence, the subject remains formally unexpressed:

- M. *annanī ellemun anna gotakaś eve* “(She) came zigzagging (along the street)”, lit. “(The way she) came, was in a way of going zigzagging” (T9, 20); pred. *annanī* part.pres., l.f. “to come”).

5.2.2. When there is no predicative verb (i.e. in the case of nominal sentences), the focus-marker *-ī* is added to the (nominal) subject of the sentence. In this position the focus-marker functions as a kind of copula. From the formal point of view, these cases reveal some differences between northern and southern Dhivehi. While in the southern dialects the focus-element can be joined directly to the respective noun (cp., e.g., A. *mīhā-ī*, cf. below), this would be unusual in the standard language. Instead of *-ī*, only the particle *-akī* is here used for focussing nouns. In the southern dialects, *-akī* expresses an additional nuance of uncertainty, in contrast to the unenlarged *-ī* which has no other function than announcing the rhematic part of the sentence. In the standard language, a semantic differentiation of this kind cannot be expressed by the focus-element. Here, the particle *-ī* can be added directly only to the demonstrative pronouns *mi* “this (here)”, *ti* “that (there, near by you)” and *e* “that”, in agreement with their deictic meaning. Thus, *mī* ← *mi-ī* can be translated approximately with “this here is ...”, *eī*, similarly, with “that there is ...”. Although something which can be pointed at leaves hardly any room for uncertainty, even demonstrative pronouns can be enlarged by *-akī* within particular contexts. In such cases, the correct translation will not be “this is” but “this seems to be; this probably is ...”. Cp. the following examples of verbless constructions with *-ī* and *-akī*:

5.2.2.1. Deictic pronouns with *-ī*:

- M. *mī-ī ves mamma-ek-ge sāra eve* “She was a mother too”, lit. “(What this one) was [in her eyes], was also the figure of a mother” (T9, 37).

<sup>590</sup> Cf. 2.6.2.2 ff. — For the use of the *casus obliquus* cf. already FRITZ (1993), 31.

<sup>591</sup> Cp. the obl.indef. *mīhaku* in T8, 101; cf. further 2.3.2.3.1.

- A. *mī /mi-ī/ ta moļōgañḍa tau? ... tē /te-ī/ ma moļōgañḍa nunāu.* “Is this your axe?” ... — “No, this is not my axe”, lit. “What this (here, near by myself) is, (is this) your axe?” — “What that (there, near by yourself) is, (is) not my axe” (T3, 59-60).<sup>592</sup>

5.2.2.2. The following two examples show substantivised deictic pronouns combined with *-akī*, in the sense of a reference object which is located outside of the concrete deictic environment<sup>593</sup>; this implies that the hearer to a certain extent depends on presumptions:<sup>594</sup>

- M. *ēnā-akī ēge nevin* “He presumably was the ship’s captain”, lit. “Who that one, i.e. a person not being present, obviously was, is her (i.e. the ship’s) captain” (T8, 165).  
 A. *ehen vi mei, eākī /ea-akī/ e raṣi hiṣi emme fakīri taulīman ne’ mīhā kamuḡai vege* “Thus it happened that he (probably) became the poorest and least educated man on that island”, lit. “Having become that way, it became a fact that what he was, was, the poorest and least educated man of all on that island ...” (T16, 3).

5.2.2.3. The element *-akī* is most probably combined of the oblique stem of the indefinite suffix, *-ak-*, and the focus-element *-ī*. This derivation, which from the morphological point of view is well justified,<sup>595</sup> agrees with the fact that the nouns with *-akī* exhibit a nuance of uncertainty in South Dhivehi which clearly distinguishes them from nouns or demonstrative pronouns with the focus-marker *-ī*. The meaning of uncertainty can then be explained by the fact that the forms with *-akī* are derived from the indefinite stem. The circumstance that the differentiation between definite nouns with *-ī* and indefinite ones marked by *-ak-ī* has been lost in North Dhivehi, is presumably connected with the fact that the morphological expression of definiteness has become obsolete in the modern standard language while it has been preserved until present in the southern dialects, particularly in Addū (cf. 2.3.2.3). The fact that *-akī* is exclusively added to nominal parts of speech but never to verbal items, i.e., participles, can be taken as a further proof that *-ak* represents the indefinite suffix in its oblique form.

5.2.2.4. The difference between nominal constructions with the simple focus-element *-ī* and those marked by *-akī* is not only interesting as a formal relic of South Dhivehi but also because of the semantic differentiation it has preserved. Cp. the following two sentences whose rhematic part is represented by *xādimā* “the servant” (sg.def.):

- A. *iyye geu /ge-aṣ/ ā mīhā-ī xādimā* “**The man who** came home yesterday, is the servant”, lit. “(Who) the man (who) came (*ā* part.pret.) home yesterday is, is, the servant”.  
 A. *denaka’ /den-ak-aṣ/ geu ē mīhā-ī xādimā* “The man who is just coming (*ē* part.pres.) home is the servant.”

In the following sentence, too, the rhematic part which is announced is the servant. In contrast to the two preceding examples, however, this is an event in the future which implies a certain extent of uncertainty; this factor is obviously expressed morphologically by the oblique indefinite suffix *-ak*:

- A. *māduma geu ēne mīh-ak-ī xādimā* “The (lit. ‘a’) man who will come (*ēne* part.fut.) tomorrow is, **I suppose**, the servant.”

<sup>592</sup> For a detailed analysis of these examples cf. 2.6.5.3.1.1.

<sup>593</sup> “Zeigfeld” in the sense of BÜHLER (1934), 149 ff.

<sup>594</sup> For an exact analysis of the two examples and for morphological details, cf. 2.6.5.3.1.2.

<sup>595</sup> Cf. the arguments given in 2.3.2.3.1.1.

If in the same context there is no doubt that the person who is expected to come home is the servant, the construction with plain *-ī* will be preferred:

A. ... *geu ēne mihā-ī xādima* “The man who will come (*ēne* part.fut.) tomorrow is the servant.”

5.2.2.5. In the standard language, there is no semantic differentiation of this kind available. As a rule, only the enlarged focus-element *-ak-ī* can be added to nouns in North Dhivehi; the same holds true for substantives in pronominal use such as *aḷugañḍu* “I”. Cp. the following sentence representing the answer of a boy who was asked by his former teacher, Ĥilmī:

M. *aḷugañḍakī, ĥilmīge darivare’ /-ek/* “I was your student”, lit. “(Who) I am is, a pupil of Ĥilmī.” (T10, 34). — Another example from the same short story is

M. *main baḥain naḡāḥai dunie maṭṭai tībē emme gāt mihunnakī kiavai dē mihun* “Apart from parents, teachers are the most dependable people in the world”, lit. approximately “(Who) the people that are the most dependable in the world, are, exempting parents, is, teaching people.” (T10, 100).

5.2.3. The part of a sentence which is marked by the focus-marker referring to the rhema need not precede the latter in all cases. In particular colloquial situations, especially in exclamations or questions, the focussed part can even appear at the end of a sentence. Cp., e.g., M. “*kon name’ /-ek/ ta kianī <kiyanī>?*” “What is your name?”, lit. “(What they) call you, is what name?” (T10, 32). In this case, the rhema consists of the introductory syntagm which is marked by the interrogative pronoun *kon* “which”.

5.3. As a rule, Maldivian sentences cannot have more than one finite verb (if we exclude cases of direct speech where a finite predicate verb of its own can appear in the embedded sentence; cf. below). Instead of finite forms, the predication of **subordinate clauses**, esp. temporal or adverbial clauses of all kinds requires nominalised categories such as participles, absolutives (converbs), gerunds, or verbal nouns. Conditional clauses (as described in 3.13) are built with participles and special conjunctions as well. Final clauses are usually expressed by infinitive constructions. Frequently one and the same sentence shows combinations of two or even more of the categories mentioned, rendering sequences of subordinate clauses. For the expression of very intensive or durative verbal actions, absolutives and gerunds, also in combination with each other, are often reduplicated.<sup>596</sup> If the type of a given subordinate clause is clear from the context, the use of introductory conjunctions is facultative in many cases.

5.3.1. By their etymology, most of the **conjunctions** in Dhivehi reveal themselves as petrified nominal forms or infinite verbal forms. Thus, A. *vēlei*, F. *vēlai* “when, while” represents the locative of the noun A.F. *vēla* “time” which is obsolete in the modern standard language but is well attested in Old Dhivehi. A. *vēlei*, F. *vēlai* is postponed to participles; cp. F. *ē vēlai* “while she is going” (e.g. in T4, 8; *ē* part.pres.) or A. *kē vēlei* “when he said (so) / by saying (so)” (e.g. in T1, 51; *kē* part.pres.). The same holds true for the conjunction A. *kō*, F. *kal* “when, after” which is confined to South Dhivehi as well. *kō* / *kal* reflects the pure stem of

<sup>596</sup> For details cf. 3.8.2.2 and 3.10.5; cf. further the example given in 5.3.5.

a word meaning “time” which is still used in the southern dialects.<sup>597</sup> Examples are A. *beli kō* “when (he) looked” (T1, 33; *beli* part.pret.); F. *balāli kal* “when (she) looked (around)” (T4, 7; *balāli* part.pret.II). In the standard language, the noun *iru* “time” is used in the same function as a conjunction meaning “when, while”; cp., e.g., *eṃburili iru* “when I turned around” (*eṃburili* part.pret.II)<sup>598</sup>. As to the conjunction A. *mei*, F. *mā* ← *\*mat*<sup>599</sup> “when”, it is possible that this too reflects a noun in the locative case.

5.3.1.1. The conjunction A.F. *hedi/-ī*, M. *hedi* “because” must be derived from the homophonous absolutive of the inactive verb *hedenī* “to be done”; cp. A. *ta ā hedi* “because you have come” (*ta* obl. “you (thou)”; *ā* part.pret.). In the same way, M.A.F. *vegen*, the absolutive III of *vanī* “to become”, is frequently used as a conjunction meaning “because (of)” or “in order to”; cp., e.g., F. *etta<sup>3</sup> /-ak/ huanna vegen ebage* “she went off **in order to look** for something”. The noun *kan* /*kam*/ “fact” occurs in the function of the English conjunctions “that” and “whether”; when it is reduplicated it also means “whether – or”. Cp. the following two examples with the petrified absolutive formation A.F. *dēneti* “not knowing”:

F. *kaḷo raḷomaṇā kan dēneti* “not knowing **that** it is your wave”;

A. *ta raḷa<sup>3</sup> /-ak/ kan, ma raḷa<sup>3</sup> kan dēneti* “not knowing **whether** (it is) your wave **or** my wave” (both examples taken from T2, 12).

5.3.1.2. After participles, the particle *tō* which in the standard language occurs as one of the interrogative particles (cf. 3.15.3), is used as a conjunction meaning “whether” throughout Dhivehi. Cp. the following examples:

F. *reha kakkāgen mia mi hadā liki, kūdun en tō balanna ...* “while cooking a curry, she looked **whether** the children were (already) coming ...”, lit. “what she did, was, to look ...” (T6, 19; *en/ē* part.pres. “coming”)

M. ... *katību dabas gennan tō suvālu koṣli eve* “The island chief asked **whether** to fetch (my) bag (or not)” (T8, 152; *genna(n)* part.pres. “fetching, bringing”).

5.3.1.3. When the interrogative particle A. *tau* / F. *tai* is reduplicated, it has the meaning “or” in a question, while in a declarative sentence it represents a disjunctive “either-or”. Cp. the following sentence in the dialects of Aḍḍū and Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku which can be understood both as a question **and** as a statement:

A. *ta<sup>3</sup> /taś/ dēṇei maha<sup>3</sup> /-ak/ tau, ema<sup>3</sup> /-ak/ tau* and

F. *kalōśa dennēni masmaṇā tai, emmaṇā tai* (both from T2, 21).

<sup>597</sup> Cp. Sinh. *kala* “when, while” reflecting the stem *kal* “time” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 39, no. 569 and MATZEL 1983, 151). Because of its F. equivalent, *kal*, it is not very probable that A. *kō* would correspond to the Sinh. conjunction *koṭa*, which is identical with the homophonous absolutive of *karanavā* “to make, do”; its equivalent is A. *ko<sup>3</sup>*, F. *kō* /*koś*/. We cannot exclude, however, that both the absolutive /*koś*/ and the noun /*kal*/ coexisted for a while, at least in Aḍḍū, and then merged into one form. The fact that the modern Aḍḍū form is *kō* and not *\*kau* as we should expect because of F. *kal*, supports this assumption (cf. 1.2.1.6). On the other hand, a spontaneous phonetic change of *au* → *ō* remains possible, although this would not represent a normal development in Aḍḍū.

<sup>598</sup> For the complete sentence cf. 5.4.3.

<sup>599</sup> For the use of this conjunction cf. 5.3.6; for the phonetic correspondence of (M. *ā*) – F. *ai* – A. *ei* which presumably is represented here cf. 1.2.4.3.

As a question, the sentence means “Is it a (A.) / the (F.) fish **or** a/the bait fish what is to be given to you?”; as a statement it must be translated with “What is to be given to you, is **either** a/the fish **or** a/the bait fish.”

5.3.2. For the conjunctions which are used in **conditional clauses** cf. 3.13.

5.3.3. **Participial subordinate clauses** are mainly used for the expression of concurrence, anteriority or posteriority of a verbal action. The noun which is qualified by a participle is preceded by it in attributive position. If the noun represents the subject of the verbal action expressed by the participle, these constructions can be translated into English directly as participial clauses; in all other cases, relative clauses will have to be substituted. Cp. the following examples from Aḍḍū with the participles pres. *lēna*, pret. *le° /let/* and fut. *lēnaṇe* (M. *lianī* “to write”):

A. *mi siṭ lēna mīhā-ī xādima* “The man (who is) writing this letter is (a) servant”.

A. *mi siṭ le° /let/ mīhā-ī xādima* “The man who wrote (lit. ‘having written’) this letter is (a) servant.”

A. *mi siṭ lēnaṇe mīhā-ī xādima* “The man who will write this letter is (a) servant.”<sup>600</sup>

The following sentence taken from T7 (6a.7a.8a<sup>601</sup>) shows a threefold chain of participial clauses which furthermore contains an integrated absolutive. This very complex sentence is a typical example of the so-called “right-to-left construction of the sentence” (cf. 5 above).

A. *āṣaki matte hiṣi vāṣaki etere o° eṣakudu rukaki maṣafei o° kaiṣaki naiṣa°.*

F. *aṣieki matte hiṣi vaṣieki etere o° eṣekudu rukeki maṣafē o° kaiṣeki naiṣe°.*

H. *aṭṭaku matte huṭi vaṭṭaku etere ote oṭākude rukaku maṭaifai ote kauṭaku noṭteke.*

M. *aṭtegge mattīgā huri vaṭtegge terēgā oi okkuda rukegge maṣāfai oi kāṭtegge nāṭte°.*

“(This is) a shell of a small polished coconut of a coconut tree with small seeds, lying in(side) a basket (which is) standing on the table.” (abs. A. *maṣafei* etc. “being polished”, /ot/ part.pret.(pres.) of (M.) *onnanī* “to lie, be (there)”, A. *hiṣi* etc. part.pret. of (M.) *hunanī* “to stand, be, remain”).

The Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku version of the fairy tale *Mākana* “The crane” (T2, 60-60a) exhibits an example of an extreme sequence of participial clauses with additional absolutives depending on them; the translation of the participial chain which represents the crane’s direct speech must start from the end:

F. *āho beṇi ai: timan kalō galaka° /-ak/ lī guimaṇa dīfā ga° /gat/ raḷomaṇa dīfā gat emmaṇa dīfā ga° masmaṇa dīfā ga° daromaṇa dīfā ga° fanimaṇa dīfā ga° kubusmaṇa dīfā ga° ütērimaṇa kobā heye?*  
 “Coming (*āho* abs.) he said (*beṇi* 3.ps.sg.pret. + quotation particle): Where is the yarn reel (*ütērimaṇa*) which I received (*ga°* part.pret.) by giving (*dīfā* abs.I) the pancake (*kubusmaṇa*) which I received by giving the treacle (*fanimaṇa*) which I received by giving the firewood (*daromaṇa*) which I received by giving the fish (*masmaṇa*) which I received by giving the bait fish (*emmaṇa*) which I received by giving the wave (*raḷomaṇa*) which I received by giving the dropping (*guimaṇa*) which I myself (lit. the lord (him)self) laid to a rock.”<sup>602</sup>

<sup>600</sup> The examples given in 5.2.2.4 show similar participial constructions (A. *enī* / M. *annanī* “to come”).

<sup>601</sup> The tale contrasting the southern dialects of the Maldives with this sentence is about a competition which was undertaken in order to find out the most beautiful dialect. To complete things, the Huvadū variant is mentioned here as well. The Māle version was contributed by ḤASSAN SA’ĪD.

<sup>602</sup> This sentence contains some clear interferences of the standard language; cp. the interrogative particle *heye* ← M. *hei* (cf. 3.15.3) and the abs.I *dīfā* used instead of F. *derefe* “giving / having given” (cf. 3.11.4.4 and 3.10.4). For the diminutive suffix *-maṇa* which is attested only in this version of the *Mākana*-story, cf. 2.2.2.

5.3.4. In relation to the principal sentence, subordinate clauses that are based on **absolutives** are either concurrent or anterior. Different from participles, however, the respective temporal taxis cannot be predicted from the form of the absolute only; without a clarifying context, the temporal correlation of the absolute and the main clause cannot be estimated unambiguously.<sup>603</sup> Apart from the primary absolutives, there are also secondary absolute formations; these “compound verbs”,<sup>604</sup> consisting of combinations of absolutives and auxiliary verbs very frequently occur in the colloquial language. In contrast to the syntactical restrictions concerning participles, the position of absolutives in a sentence is free. Cp. the following examples:

M. *eñdum teduvegen hus gayā /gai-ai/ hure bēraś nukumejjaīm-eve* “I got up and went outside. I had no shirt on”, lit. “Having got up from the bed” (*teduvegen* abs.III of *tedu-vanī* “to get up”), standing there with the naked (upper part of the) body (*hure* abs. of *hunnānī* “to stand, be, remain”), I went outside (*nukumejjaīm* 1.ps.sg.pret.IV<sup>605</sup> of *nukunnānī* “to go / come out”) (T8, 8).

A. *kañḍagen ās de verie de gē eḍafie* “After they came (back) from cutting (wood), the two (people) built two houses”, lit. “Having cut (*kañḍagen* abs.III of *kañḍanī* ‘to cut’), coming / having come (*ās* abs. of (M.) *annānī* ‘to come’), the two (people) built two houses (*eḍafie* /-ia/ 3.ps.pl.pret.)” (T1, 3).

In the following sentence, the sequence of absolutives represents the rhematic element:

F. *hauļu uḍihīfē goho eggamaha /ek-gamaha/ jehī* “The cock reached the land by flying”, lit. “(The way how) the cock (*hauļu* obl.) hit (*jehī+ī* part.pret. + focus-marker of *jahanī*, lit. ‘to strike, beat’) (to) the land, was (by) flying (and) going (*uḍihīfē* abs.I of (M.) *uduhenī* ‘to fly’; *goho* abs. of (M.) *danī* ‘to go’)” (T4, 33).

5.3.5. In contrast to absolutives, **gerunds** imply a fix temporal relation with the main action, the secondary action which is expressed by them always being parallel to that of the primary one.<sup>606</sup> Besides that, gerunds are not different in use or meaning from the absolute, as the following example shows:

A. *den gōvamun dememun fēru kalēge ekaha’ /-aś/ gos, kaśie naguvagen kināra assēria’ /-aś/ gos, iñde mi kēnī ...* “Then, crying (and) struggling (along), he reached the weaver; after having caused (him) to pull out the thorn, he went out to the beach, sat down and said ...”, lit. “Then, crying (*gōvamun* ger. of A. *gōvanī* ≈ M. *ronī* ‘to cry, howl’), struggling (*dememun* ger. of *demenī* ‘to pull oneself, struggle’), having gone (*gos* abs. of (M.) *danī* ‘to go’) close to the weaver(’s person), having caused (him) to pull out the thorn (*nagu-va-gen* abs.III of the caus. *naguvanī* ‘to cause to raise, lift up’), having gone to the inner beach-edge (*gos* abs.), sitting (down) (*iñde* abs. of (M.) *innānī* ‘sit’), what he said, is (the following words) ...” (*kēnī* part.pret. + focus-marker -ī of (M.) *kianī* ‘to say’)” (T1, 49).

Furthermore, the use of reduplicated gerunds, combined with an absolute, for the expression of a durative and intensive action is very typical for Dhivehi; cp. the following example:

M. *ēnā liamun liamun gos varubalī vejje* “Having been writing for a long time he became tired”, lit. “Writing writing going he got tired”. (*lianī* “to write”; cf. 3.8.2.2 above).

5.3.6. **Verbal nouns** in the literal sense (i.e., formations such as *belun* “to see”; cf. 3.7.1) can represent subordinate clauses as well. In such cases they always appear at the beginning of a sentence, expressing a secondary action which happens simultaneously with the main action.

<sup>603</sup> Cf. also 3.10.

<sup>604</sup> Cf. 3.11.4.

<sup>605</sup> For this formation cf. 3.11.4.5.

<sup>606</sup> Cf. also 3.8.2.

In all such cases, the verbal noun is combined with the element F. *mā*, H. *mai* “when” which presumably represents a petrified noun with a locative meaning. In the recorded texts, this construction most frequently appears in the phrase F. *benum lbeṇun/ mā beṇi ai* “when he / she said (so), (that one) answered (lit. ‘said’)” (*beṇi* 3.ps.sg.pret.; cf. M. *bunun* of *bunanī* “to say, speak”); it is often used in stories that are told spontaneously and contain a high percentage of direct speech. Cp. the following example:

F. *benum mā beṇi ai, timāśa dennēnī raḷomaṇāk-ai* (T2, 7) “When that one said so, (the crane) answered: ‘Give me a wave’”; lit. “... what is to be given to me is a wave”. (*dennēn-ī* part.fut. + focus-marker; *raḷo-maṇ-ak* + *ai* “wave” + diminutive suff. *-maṇa* + indef.suff. + quotation particle).

It is a remarkable fact that the combination of verbal nouns and *mā* in the function of an introducing syntactical element seems to be restricted to spontaneous narration only. In those oral tales that are stylistically polished as well as literary texts of the standard language, this construction is practically unknown.

#### 5.4. Quotation particles and interrogative particles

The varieties of Dhivehi have a special particle which because of its syntactic use is best called a “quotation particle” or “quotation marker”. The particle concerned is *eve* [ē] in the standard language, *au/āu* in Aḍḍū and *ai/āi* in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku. Essentially, two different functions of the quotation particle must be distinguished: on the one hand it serves as a **particle of direct speech**, on the other hand it has the function of an **inferential particle**, i.e. a particle which indicates that the speaker knows only by hearsay what he is talking about. The quotation particle is used only in statements, thus contrasting with the question particle which is *tau* in Aḍḍū and *tai* in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku; in the standard language there are even four different interrogative particles (*ta*, *tō*, *hei*, *bā*) the use of which depends on the given interrogative situation and the honorific levels implied.<sup>607</sup> In contrast to the interrogative particles, the occurrence of the quotation particles is confined to literary texts in a wider sense. There are considerable differences in their use between the modern prose of the standard language and short stories, fairy tales and legends of popular poetry.

5.4.1. In oral reports and stories, the quotation particle normally appears at the end of passages of direct speech where it can be translated with “... he/she says/said” or the like, equalling an absolutive “by saying”. At least the form M. *eve* can indeed be regarded as the petrified absolutive of an obsolete verb *\*ev(i)anī* “to call, name” several forms of which are attested in *lōmāfanu* documents (L1, L2, L3). The use of *eve* in the sense of “saying” and the part.pres. *eviana* / *evyana* / *evyā* in the sense of “called” (cf. 3.9.1.1.1) can be direct remnants of prototypical OIA constructions containing *vi-khyā* “to tell” + *iti* such as, e.g., *iti vikhyāta*, often appearing in the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>608</sup> Similarly, the absolutive A. *kē*, F. *kei* “saying” is used like a quotation particle in Aḍḍū and in Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku, both representing an

<sup>607</sup> For the use of the interrogative particles, especially in yes/no questions, cf. 3.15.2 (Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku) and 3.15.3 (Māle). For the special question forms of finite verbs and, to a certain extent, also of infinite verbs in Aḍḍū cf. 3.15.1.

<sup>608</sup> Cp., e.g., M. 1,61,6. For the etymological background cf. MAYRHOFER (1986-), I, 456 s.v. *khyā* and furthermore TURNER (1966), I, 210 s.v. *khyā*; 47, no. 1040 ff.; (1985), 7, no. 1043 and 102, no. 12842. Cf. further 3.9.1.1.1.

absolutive of *M. kiani* “to say, speak” which reflects the same OIA root, *khyā*.<sup>609</sup> In the given connection, *kē* / *kei* often has the exhortative meaning of “to tell somebody to do something”. This use of particles referring to explicit speech acts will be referred to as “internal” hereafter. When the quotation particle appears at the end of an inferential clause or as an insertion between two parts of a sentence in vernacular texts, it signals that the speaker is talking about something which he only knows by hearsay so that he cannot witness to it. Used like this, the quotation particle can be rendered as “... (as) it is told, (as) they say, as people tell, as the saying goes” etc. This use will from now on be called “external”. Furthermore, the particle is often found in vocational function at the end of a clause of exclamation consisting of a personal address or a name only. The following examples, taken from various fairy tales, will illustrate the different functions of the quotational and interrogative particles.

5.4.2. Sentences with a pure narrative or interrogative function where the “external” particle appears at the end of the clause:

- A. *mi tibī vara’ /-aš/ fakīri fakīri de mafiriakāmen āu* “Once there was a very very poor couple, **as people say**”, lit. “(What) there once was, is a very poor, poor couple, telling” (T3, 1).  
 F. *kukuļu filāge ai* “The hen hid away, **they say**” (T4, 36).  
 M. *balāli iru hurī ran eve* “When he looked (inside), there was gold (in it), **they say**”, lit. “When he looked, (what) there was, is gold, they say” (T1, 65).

5.4.2.1. When the rhematic part of a sentence is moved to the end of a clause (cf. 5.2.3 above), the quotation particle immediately precedes it in most cases:

- F. *mi kuddā hitaha erī ai gašāi ba’ tavā kakkānēne* “(What) arose to the mind of this child, was, – **they say** [external] – that she should prepare a pan of *gašāi*-rice.” (T5, 2).

If the order of the sentence parts is inverted (cf. 5.2.3 above), the particles will be placed in between too:

- A. *mi tau ta moļogaņdakī? ... te au ma moļogaņdakī* “Is this your axe?” — “That (one) is my axe”, lit. “What your axe is, (he) **asked** [internal], is it this one near by myself?” ... — “What my axe is, (he) **said** [internal], is that one (near you).”<sup>610</sup> (T3, 44-45).  
 F. *kon tākaha tai ti enī?* “Where are you going (to)?”, lit. “That where you are going to, is, (he) **asked** [internal], to which place?” (T5, 6.11.16).

In the following examples, the quotation particle appears in a position after sentences which consist of only one element:

- A. *mi kuddā kēfi: ammāu! timā ēnei dara hōdāsāu*<sup>611</sup> “The child said: ‘Mother, I am going to look for firewood’”, lit. “This child said: ‘Mother, (he) **said** [internal], (where) I shall go is to look for firewood.’ — (**telling** [internal] or **they say** [external]).” (T3, 12)  
 A. *den, mi kuddā beņafi: nun-āu, tē /teī/ ma moļogaņda nun* “Then the child said: ‘No, this is not my axe’”, lit. “Then this child said: ‘No **saying** [internal], (what) that is near by you, is not my axe.’” (T3, 41).

5.4.3. Modern prose writing, as it is cultivated in Māle today, is no longer based on the oral, vernacular literary tradition. Instead it is mainly influenced by foreign literary genres such as,

<sup>609</sup> Cf. GEIGER (1902), 926, no. 247 and (1941), 43, no. 636.

<sup>610</sup> For the deictic elements involved cf. 2.6.5.2.

<sup>611</sup> For the function of the reflexive pronoun in the role of a personal pronoun within the framework of direct speech, cf. 2.6.4.

e.g., the short story. Within such new literary conceptions, the function of the quotation particle *eve* has changed completely. As a matter of principle, it is now attached to every narrative sentence, even if the whole short story is written in the first person and tells about personal experiences. Thus, the use of the quotation particle has become independent from the question whether the subject that is told about can be testified by the speaker's own experience or not. Obviously it is the written form of story-telling which brings in some distance between the story-teller and his "own" experiences so that he refers to them from the view of another person. In this function, the quotation particle represents a newly-developed stylistic device within the comparatively recent genre of belle-lettres in Dhivehi. In order to illustrate this, a small passage of a short-story written in the first person is given below; its subject is a terrifying encounter with a ghost (*Fini mendamegge maḍu hūnu*, "The warmth of a cool midnight", by MUHAMMAD WAHĪD (MADULU); T8, 53-57):

M. *kuḍa-koś jehilun vefai fahataś eṁberilaifim eve* "Anxiously, I glanced behind me", lit. "I turned around, having become a little bit nervous, **saying**."

M. *evves mīhaku net eve*. "Nobody was there, **saying**."

M. *kurimaccaś mūnu aṁburā-nu-lā uleṅi koś nubai kunivahegge /kuni-vas-ek-ge/ vas nēfatugai jehijje eve* "But I felt a foul stench", lit. "Although I did not turn (my) face in front, the stench of a bad rotten smell hit on (my) nose, **saying**."

M. *kurin in gotaś eṁburili iru, varaś kairigai mīhaku huṭṭigen ahannā dimā-aś balan huṭṭ-eve /huṭṭi eve/* "Turning around, I faced a man staring at me", lit. "When turning around in the way (I had been sitting) before, a man having stopped very close by me stopped (in order) to look into my direction, **saying**."

M. *hurihā istaśita<sup>o</sup> /-tak/ koḷaś jehijje eve* "My hair rose", lit. "All (my) hair hit upwards, **saying**."

## 5.5. Negated sentences

For the expression of negation, Dhivehi has different morphological and syntactical means.

5.5.1. The particle M.A.F. *nūn* has the meaning of the negative clause "it is not"; it corresponds with Engl. "no" as an answer to yes/no questions. Cp., e.g., M. *ingirēsi dannan ta? — nūn*.<sup>612</sup> "Do you know English?" — "No". In this sense, the dialect of Fua<sup>3</sup> Mulaku prefers *uḥu* to *nun* in most cases.

5.5.1.1. Another important function of M.A.F. *nūn* is that of a verb negating the rhematic part of a sentence; cp., e.g., M. *mi-ī fote<sup>o</sup> /-ek/* "this is a book", lit. "(what) this is, is a book", in contrast to *mi-ī fote<sup>o</sup> nūn* "this is **not** a book", lit. "(what) this is, is **not** a book". Within this context, *nūn* equals a negated copula meaning "is not". The following example shows *nūn* in both functions:

A. *mī /mi-ī/ tau koyyāge moḷōgaṅḍakī? — nun-āu. tē /te-ī/ ma moḷōganda nun*. (T3, 40-41) "Is this the boy's axe?" — "No, this is **not** my axe", lit. "(What) this (here) is, is – (I) suppose (cf. 5.2.2.4) – the boy's axe?" — "No. What that (there) is, **is not** my axe."

5.5.2. The particle M. *nu*, A.F. *nī* "not" serves as a negation prefix of finite verbs, sometimes also of infinite verbal forms (cf. 5.5.4 below). When a participle which introduces a rhematic part of speech with the focus-marker *-ī* is to be negated, it must be transformed into the

<sup>612</sup> This and the following example are taken from DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 82 and 83, resp.

corresponding finite form; this causes a change of the whole syntactical construction. In accordance with the rules given in 5.2, the respective transformations must be done gradually by reversing the order of elements, as illustrated in the following example in the Aḍḍū dialect: As a positive sentence with the part.pres. *enī* in the long form functioning as a predicate verb, A. *ma ādavegen kāu /kās/*<sup>613</sup> *enī gē' /ge-aś/* “Normally I go home for eating”, lit. “That where I am normally (*ādavegen*) going to eat (inf. *kā'*), is to (the) house”, has its subject in the oblique case (*ma* pers.pron. 1.ps.sg.), the rhematic part being placed at the end of the sentence. In the negated version of the same sentence, the predicate verb is transformed into the finite 1.ps.sg. pres., *en* “I go” and, furthermore, it is placed to the end of the clause. The subject is accordingly transformed into the nominative *ava*: A. *ava ādavegen gea' /-aś/ kā' /kās/ ni en*. “Normally I do **not** go home for eating.”

5.5.2.1. In order to express negated requests and prohibitions, the negation prefix M. *nu* / A.F. *ni* precedes the imperative; cp., e.g., M. *balā!* 2.ps.sg./pl. “look!” vs. *nu-balā!* “don’t look!” or A.F. 2.ps.sg. *bala!* “look!”, 2.ps.pl. *balau!* “look!” vs. *ni-bala!* and *ni-balau!* “don’t look!”. — For the formal differentiation of inhibitive and preventive forms cf. 3.5.3.

5.5.3. The negated variant of a *verbum substantivum* meaning “to be there, exist” is based on Dhiv. */net/* (M. *nei*, A.F. *ne'*) “is/was not there” which, with its “pseudo-lemmatic form” *netunī* “not being there, not existing”, must be derived from OIA *nāsti*.<sup>614</sup> In most cases, *nei/ne'* is used in like manner as *nūn* (cf. 5.5.1.1 above), but it can also occur in the function of a participle (pret. and pres.) or an absolutive. In the southern dialects the paradigm of *netunī* is well developed, while it has remained fragmentary in the standard language. *netunī* is regarded as the negative equivalent of the verbs *hunnanī* “to be, stand, remain”, *onnanī* “to lie, be there”, *innanī* “to sit, be there” and *tibenī* “to exist, be there”; cp., e.g., M. *mēze' /-ek/ eba huri* “there **is** a table” as against *mēze' nei* “there is not a table, there is no table”.<sup>615</sup>

In the sentence A. *gē kō, boḍḍanā geaki ne' /net/*<sup>616</sup> “When he went (there), the b.-bird was not at home” (T1, 55), the syntactic position of *ne'* can be compared to that of *nūn* in the examples mentioned in 5.5.1.1; cp. also A. ... *taulīman ne' mīhā* ... “the man **without** education”, lit. “the education-**not-being-there** man” (T16, 3; cf. 5.2.2.2). In the following two parts of a sentence (T2, 15), *neti-* appears in absolutive function:

F. ... *baiken en nētī maha ni bēvigen tibi tākaha* ... “...to a place where some people failed to catch fish because they had no bait fish”, lit. “... to a place (*tākaha*) (where) some people (*baiken*) were present (*tibi* ‘being’), fish (*maha*) not being catchable (*ni bēvigen* ‘not being catchable’, abs.III), bait fish (*en*) not being (there) (*nētī* abs.)”.

A. ... *en netigen, mas ni bēvigen* ... “... catching no fish because of bait fish lacking ...”, lit. “.. bait fish **not being** (there) (*netigen* abs.III), fish not being catchable ...”.

5.5.4. Finally, Dhivehi is characterised by a syntactical peculiarity which plays an important role in the negation of impersonal sentences with an infinite predicate verb or with a noun in predicative function. In this case, that part of a sentence which is to be negated appears in an

<sup>613</sup> For this phenomenon of sandhi cf. 1.6.3.

<sup>614</sup> For more information on the secondary verb *netunī*, cf. 3.9.2.2.5.

<sup>615</sup> Examples taken from DISANAYAKA /MANIKU (1990), 85.

<sup>616</sup> For *geaki* cf. also 5.5.4.1.

indefinite form. It makes no difference whether the negation concerns the existence or only a particular quality of something; furthermore, it is indifferent from the formal point of view whether the subject of negation is a noun, an adjective, a pronoun, a verbal noun or an infinitive. Cp. the following examples:

- M. *mi dōni vara' /-aś/ boḍu* “This boat is very big” vs. *mi dōni vara' boḍe' /-ek/ nūn* “This boat is **not** very big”, lit. “a very big (one)”;  
 M. *fansure' /-ek/ bēnun ta?*<sup>617</sup> “Do you want a pencil?”, lit. “(Is) a pencil (the object of) desire?” vs. *fansure' bēnume' /-ek/ nūn ta?* “Wouldn't (you) like a pencil?”, lit. “(Is) a pencil not (an object of) desire?”<sup>618</sup>

In the following sentence, it is the infinitive of *kuranī* “to make, do” which appears in an indefinite (dative) form, immediately preceding the negation particle *nu*:

- M. *iyye ahanna' /-aś/ masakkai' /-at/ kurāka' /kurākaś/ nu jehunu*<sup>619</sup> “Yesterday I could not work”, lit. “Yesterday it did not turn out possible (*jehunu* potential pret. of *jehēnī* ‘to hit’ intr.) for me to do the work”. The indefinite form *kurāka'* of the infinitive *kuran* “to make, do” must be analysed as \**kuran-ak-aś*, with regular loss of the intervocalic *-n*.<sup>620</sup>

This type of construction was already noted by DE SILVA (1970b, 153-4) who did not realise that this is a regular formation with the indefinite suffix appearing in the dative, however. He proposed that these form variants might be borrowings: “In negating sentences with the dative affix, *-aś* is changed to *-kaś*. ... Although *-aś* corresponds to Sinh. *-at*, *-kaś* has no equivalent in Sinhalese either in form or in use. *-kaś* [ka'] is reminiscent of the Tamil dative Suffix *-kku*, and may well be a Tamil borrowing.” On the basis of the material provided here, this view has nothing in its favour and must be rejected.

5.5.4.1. Three further examples (from the Aḍḍū fairy tales *Moḷōgañḍa* “The axe” and *Fiñḍanāi boñḍanāi* “The f.-bird and the b.-bird” and the Huvadū story *Mākana* “The crane”) may suffice to illustrate the use of indefinite forms in connection with the negation. In the first example it is the verbal noun *jehun /jehum/*, of *jahanī* “to beat, strike”, which appears in the indefinite form:

- A. *arai, mi hedi lekakī, kañḍā' /-āś/ jehum-ak-āi nī lāi moḷōgañḍa kōra' /-aś/ vaṭṭali* (T3, 69) “Having climbed up, he dropped the axe into the pond without even striking one blow”, lit. “Having climbed up, (what) he now did, was, he dropped the axe into the pond, not putting (negation particle *nī* + abs. *lāi*) with a stroke (*jehum-ak-āi* obl.sg.indef. + particle ‘with’) in order to cut (inf. */kañḍāś/*)”.  
 A. *gē kō, boñḍanā geaki ne' /net/* (T1, 55) “When<sup>621</sup> he came / went (there), the b.-bird was not at home”, lit. “in a (!) house” (*ge-ak-i* loc.sg.indef.; cf. 5.5.3).

In the following sentence, the indefinite form of the noun *kan* has the function of the conjunction “whether” (cf. 5.3.1.1):

- H. *mākanayā boṇi ai, guake denne kāeke /kam-ekel neñge /nu-eñgel, raḷeke denn-āi*. (T2, 7) “The crane said, (I) do not know whether a dropping is to be given or a wave”, lit. “The crane said, it is not known (*nu eñge*) (to me) whether (*kam-ekel* nom.sg.indef., lit. ‘a fact’) to give a dropping (*guake*, obl.indef.) or (‘and’) to give a wave (*raḷeke* obl.sg.indef.)”

<sup>617</sup> The noun M. *bēnun*, A.F. *bēṇun* “wish, will” is one of the most frequent predicate nouns of the colloquial language; in all dialects of Dhivehi it is used like an infinite, unchangeable verb.

<sup>618</sup> Both examples are taken from DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 83 and 84, resp.

<sup>619</sup> Sentence provided by ḤABĪBA ḤUSSAIN ḤABĪB, personal communication.

<sup>620</sup> For this development cf. 1.2.1.4.

<sup>621</sup> For the conjunction *kō* cf. 5.3.1.

# Indexes

## Grammatical terms

- archaicity . . . . . 13, 14, 26, 66, 68, 86, 89, 110, 164, 181  
areal typology . . . . . 10  
colloquial language . . . . . 12, 90, 130, 135, 154, 165, 169  
decimal system . . . . . 53, 107, 108, 110, 116, 122, 123  
deixis . . . . . 127, 128, 136, 137, 139, 151, 252, 253, 259  
dialectal variation . . . . . 13, 14, 18, 31  
diglossia . . . . . 12  
duodecimal system . . . . . 11, 53, 107, 108, 110, 111, 115,  
116, 121-123  
emphasis . . . . . 73, 121, 135, 144, 148, 161, 183, 193, 245,  
249  
father's names . . . . . V  
first names . . . . . V, 137  
historical phonology . . . . . 11, 17, 49  
honorific degrees → honorific levels  
honorific levels . . . . . 15, 128, 129, 134, 161, 171, 172, 182,  
185, 187, 190, 200, 201, 210, 248, 258  
honorific system . . . . . 15, 129  
house names . . . . . V  
hyperpraktisation . . . . . 108, 121  
kinship terms . . . . . 70, 74, 80, 81, 87, 88, 91, 136  
loans from Arabic . . . . . 25, 36, 45, 103, 104, 136, 154  
loans from Hindi/Urdu . . . . . 20, 33, 110, 113, 115  
loans from Persian . . . . . 45  
loans from Sinhalese . . . . . 12, 125  
loanwords . . . . . 12, 20, 24, 25, 29, 32, 36, 42, 45, 59, 60,  
65, 66, 68, 79, 88, 90, 103, 104, 108, 110-113, 115  
, 124, 133, 136, 154  
morpheme boundary . . . . . 36, 37, 42, 43  
**Morphology:** . . . . . 11-13, 15, 51-250  
  a-stem nouns . . . . . 51, 59, 62, 63, 66, 69, 83, 90, 94,  
97-99, 101  
  a-stem verbs . . . . . 23, 26, 156, 165-167, 169-171, 173-  
181, 183, 184, 191, 192, 193-202, 206, 208, 211-213  
  215, 216, 226, 227, 229, 230, 232-236, 246, 247  
  ablative case . . . . . 51, 55, 59, 61-63, 95, 98, 100, 159,  
162, 249  
  ablative/instrumental . . . . . 38, 59, 61, 62, 101, 102, 159,  
166, 249  
  absolute interrogative pronouns . . . . . 153, 156  
  absolute pronouns . . . . . 126, 127, 152  
  absolute . . . . . 158, 165, 166, 170, 173, 178, 185, 187  
  , 189-191, 197, 198, 201, 205-207, 210-216, 218, 2  
  21-227, 229-238, 241, 242, 245, 254-258, 261  
  absolute I . . . . . 27, 166, 191, 197, 210, 226  
  absolute II . . . . . 166, 210, 226  
  absolute III . . . . . 166, 227  
  absolute IV . . . . . 166  
  accusative case . . . . . 51  
  action nouns . . . . . 196  
  active . . . . . 26, 165, 171, 178, 229, 233, 236, 251  
  adjectival comparison . . . . . 53, 102, 105  
  adjectives . . . . . 53, 58, 66, 74, 81, 89, 102-105, 107, 124,  
156, 160, 162, 262  
  adverbial interrogative pronouns . . . . . 156  
  adverbial pronouns . . . . . 126, 127, 152  
  adverbs . . . . . 53, 62, 106, 161, 162  
  agglutinative . . . . . 51, 54, 67, 72, 100, 101, 181  
  aktionsart . . . . . 166, 216-221, 225  
  alienable . . . . . 54  
  analytic . . . . . 57, 59, 61, 95, 98-100, 160-162, 166, 241  
  animate . . . . . 51, 56, 57, 62, 71, 74, 80, 86, 87, 90, 91,  
124, 128, 139, 149, 152  
  animateness . . . . . 51, 71, 153  
  aorist . . . . . 186, 218  
  approximate numbers . . . . . 125  
  attenuative aktionsart . . . . . 220  
  auxiliary verbs . . . . . 40, 166, 168, 178, 180, 182, 187,  
189-191, 193, 207, 211, 216, 221-231, 235, 242, 257  
  bahuvrīhi compounds . . . . . 53, 103  
  basic verbal form . . . . . 183, 202, 241  
  cardinal numbers . . . . . 53, 69, 74, 86, 108-110, 114  
  case . . . . . 51, 52  
  case suffixes . . . . . 55, 62  
  case system . . . . . 51, 54, 55  
  casus obliquus → oblique case  
  casus rectus → direct case  
  causal-final interrogative pronouns . . . . . 158  
  causative . . . . . 206  
  causative formation . . . . . 15, 19, 30, 31, 40, 41, 43, 170,  
171  
  causative suffix . . . . . 31, 170  
  causatives . . . . . 165, 170-172, 182, 200, 201, 205, 223,  
232-236  
  cohortative . . . . . 183, 184  
  collective numbers . . . . . 74, 81, 86, 108, 124, 126  
  comparative . . . . . 53, 105, 106  
  complex verbs . . . . . 104, 125, 188, 232  
  composite verbs → compound verbs  
  compound adjectives . . . . . 53, 103  
  compound verbs . . . . . 170, 172, 203, 205, 206, 213, 214,  
216, 221-225, 227-231, 257  
  compounds . . . . . 36, 42, 44, 47, 74, 81, 89, 104, 133, 135,  
136, 151, 152, 154, 156, 158, 162  
  concurrent . . . . . 197  
  conditional . . . . . 166, 239, 241, 242  
  conditional clauses . . . . . 242  
  conditional conjunctions . . . . . 239-242, 249, 254  
  conjugation classes → conjugation types  
  conjugation patterns → conjugation types  
  conjugation types . . . . . 165, 168, 172, 176, 178, 180, 183,  
184, 196, 211, 245  
  conjunctions . . . . . 239-242, 249, 250, 254-256  
  consecutio temporum . . . . . 218  
  consonant stem nouns . . . . . 28, 41, 43, 51, 55, 59, 62-67,  
69, 76, 82, 83, 89, 93, 94, 96, 97-99, 101, 125, 135

- continuous present . . . . . 230  
 converb . . . . . 166, 210, 254  
 coordinative conjunctions . . . . . 249  
 copula verb . . 105, 168, 177-179, 181, 184, 186, 224,  
     231, 233, 236, 252, 260  
 counting units . . . . . 80  
 dative case . . . 18, 51, 55, 57, 58, 62, 63, 69, 77, 78,  
     94, 97, 98, 100, 101, 106, 126, 157, 159, 166, 178,  
     182, 184, 185, 191-195, 249  
 dative ending . . . . . 40, 193, 195, 210, 245  
 decades . . . . . 116, 117  
 declarative forms . . . . . 244, 245  
 declension . . . . . 51, 54, 62, 94-96, 98, 99  
 declension classes . . . . . 92, 93, 95, 96, 101  
 defective paradigms . . . . . 79, 92, 236, 243  
 definite . . . . . 253  
 definite form . . . 21, 38, 39, 52, 67-72, 74, 76-84, 87  
     -89, 91-94, 99, 101, 134  
 definite plural . . . . . 82  
 definite singular . 52, 70-72, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 86-88,  
     92  
 definite suffix . . . . 22, 59, 67, 68, 70, 89, 137, 139  
 definiteness . . . . 51, 52, 63, 68, 70, 76, 79, 82  
 deixis . . . . . 146, 149, 150  
 delimitative aktionsart . . . . . 220  
 demonstrative adverbs . . . . . 150, 249  
 demonstrative pronouns . 52, 127, 128, 136, 137, 139,  
     146-151, 162, 252, 253  
 derivational suffixes . . . . . 53, 103, 104  
 derivative verbs . . . . . 171, 172  
 determinative pronouns . . . . . 126, 127, 152  
 diminutives . . . . . 54  
 direct case . . 18, 22, 51, 52, 55, 62, 65, 67, 70, 73, 92,  
     100, 129, 131, 133, 140, 141, 251  
 distributional plural . . . . 75, 122, 135, 136, 138, 156,  
     160  
 double absolutive → reduplicated absolutive  
 double causatives . . . . . 41, 170, 171, 185, 200  
 durative aktionsart . . . . . 225, 254  
 durative-intensive aktionsart . . . . . 166, 254, 257  
 dvandva compounds . . . . . 135  
 e-stem verbs . . . 23, 26, 36, 165, 166, 168, 171, 174-  
     177, 180, 182, 184, 191, 192-197, 199, 200, 203, 205,  
     206, 208, 209, 211, 212, 215, 226-229, 232, 23  
     4-237, 246, 247  
 elative . . . . . 106  
 emphatic particle . . . . . 73, 161  
 ending . . . . . 57  
 excessive grade . . . . . 106  
 feminine . . . . . 51, 74, 149  
 finite . . . 165, 166, 168, 169, 173, 174, 176-178, 180-  
     182, 187, 189, 190, 193, 201, 205, 207-210, 213, 2  
     25-228, 231, 232, 235, 239, 240, 243-245, 251, 254,  
     258  
 finite verbs . . . 51, 92, 129, 150, 165, 166, 169, 174,  
     180, 187, 251, 254, 258, 260  
 focus-element → focus-marker  
 focus-marker . . . . . 72, 73, 138, 148, 149, 251-254  
 fractional numbers . . . . . 124  
 frequentative aktionsart . . . . . 219  
 frozen definite forms . . . 59, 67, 70, 72, 74, 79, 80, 8  
     4-90, 92, 97, 101, 135, 150  
 future . . . 165, 166, 176-182, 185, 186, 189, 192, 193  
     , 198, 199, 207, 209, 210, 225, 226, 230-236, 239,  
     240, 244, 246  
 future I . . . . . 226, 231  
 future II . . . . . 226  
 future participle . . . . . 165, 166, 181, 182, 209, 210  
 future potential . . . . . 231, 233, 235  
 gender . . . . . 51, 52, 73, 139, 148-150, 152, 166, 196  
 generic plural . . . 59, 68-70, 72, 76, 78, 82, 86, 88, 94,  
     133, 246  
 genitive case . . . 51, 55-58, 61, 63, 69, 77, 78, 94-98,  
     100, 101, 144  
 genitive-locative . . . . . 38, 51, 55, 56, 100  
 gerund . . 165, 166, 173, 196-198, 210, 211, 215, 216,  
     218, 222-224, 254, 257  
 gerund I . . . . . 197, 210  
 gerund II . . . . . 197, 210, 215  
 honorific suffixes . . . . . 54, 89  
 i-stem nouns . . . 21, 23, 27, 38-41, 47, 51, 59, 60, 62  
     , 63, 66, 69, 71, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 84-86, 89, 90,  
     94, 95, 97-99, 101, 124, 138, 163  
 i-stem verbs . . . . . 191, 203, 204  
 imperative . . . 165, 166, 173, 182-187, 189-191, 193,  
     194, 223, 224, 226, 230, 261  
 imperfect . . . . . 218  
 imperfectiva tantum . . . . . 216  
 imperfective aspect . . . . . 186, 216-221  
 inactive . . 26, 165, 171, 172, 174, 178, 200, 206, 208,  
     229, 231-238, 251, 255  
 inactive of the causative . . . . 166, 206, 234, 235, 238  
 inalienable . . . . . 54, 89, 137  
 inanimate . . 51, 56, 57, 59, 62, 71, 74, 87, 88, 91, 108,  
     124, 128, 137, 138, 139, 148, 152, 243  
 inanimateness . . . . . 51, 71, 153  
 indefinite . . . . . 53, 59, 149, 253, 262  
 indefinite form . . 21, 52, 68-70, 72-74, 76-80, 82, 84,  
     85, 88-90, 92-94, 101, 158  
 indefinite infinitive . . . . . 22, 262  
 indefinite plural . . . . . 88, 101  
 indefinite pronouns . . . . . 52, 154, 159-161, 249, 250  
 indefinite singular . . . . . 52, 70, 79, 88, 92, 101  
 indefinite suffix . . 40, 59, 62, 69-73, 84, 88, 90, 108,  
     249, 250, 253, 262  
 indefiniteness . . . . 51, 52, 63, 68, 72, 76, 79, 82, 101  
 indicative . . . . . 166, 177, 178, 183  
 infinite . . 165, 166, 178, 225, 231, 241, 243-245, 254,  
     260-262  
 infinite verbs . . . . . 51, 92, 129, 150  
 infinitive . . 22, 57, 154, 159, 165, 166, 177-182, 184,  
     185, 189, 191, 192, 193-196, 203, 207, 210, 218  
     , 230, 245, 247, 254, 262  
 infinitive endings . . . . . 173, 178  
 infinitive II . . . . . 231  
 inflectional . . . . . 51, 54, 55, 100  
 ingressive aktionsart . . . . . 219, 222  
 injunctive . . . . . 186, 218  
 instrumental case . . . . . 51, 61, 197  
 interrogative forms . . . . . 192, 234, 243-245, 258

- interrogative particles → question particles
- interrogative pronouns . . . 52, 127, 148, 152-159, 162  
 , 164, 244, 249
- intransitive . . . 26, 165, 174, 227-229, 232-235, 237,  
 243
- involitive . . . . . 165
- irregular verbs . . . . . 202, 214
- lexical aktionsart . . . . . 220
- local adverbs . . . . . 150
- local interrogatives . . . . . 156
- locational dative . . . . . 131
- locative case . . . 39, 51, 55, 56, 100, 101, 156, 157, 249,  
 255, 258
- long form . . . 23, 166, 169, 198, 200, 201, 203, 205-  
 207, 210, 245, 251
- masculine . . . . . 51, 149
- medial . . . . . 174, 223, 227
- modal adverbs . . . . . 151, 249
- modal interrogatives . . . . . 157
- modal pronouns . . . . . 158
- modifying aktionsart . . . . . 220, 221
- monadic units . . . . . 117
- mood . . . . . 166, 178, 186
- multiplicative numbers . . . . . 125
- n-stem nouns . . . . . 50
- n-stem verbs . . . 36, 44, 165-167, 171-178, 180, 181,  
 184, 195-197, 199, 200, 201-208, 212-215, 226-229,  
 232, 234, 235, 237, 238, 243, 244, 246, 247
- nasal presents . . . . . 173, 204, 205, 207, 213
- negation . . . . . 153, 169, 184, 233-235, 260-262
- negation particles . . . . . 250, 260, 262
- negative pronouns . . . . . 52, 127, 164
- neuter . . . . . 51
- nominal stem classes → nominal stem types
- nominal stem types . . . . . 54, 55, 57, 62, 92, 95
- nominal system . . . . . 51
- nominative case . . . 51, 55, 63-65, 92, 150, 249, 251
- number . . . 51, 52, 56, 68, 70, 71, 76-79, 82, 89, 97,  
 102
- oblique case . . . 15, 21, 51, 52, 55, 57, 61, 70, 72, 73  
 , 79, 92, 97, 99-102, 104, 129, 130, 133-135, 140,  
 141, 144, 145, 149, 150, 153, 156-159, 178, 239, 245,  
 249, 251, 261
- optative . . . . . 178, 233
- ordinal numbers . . . . . 53, 123
- participles . . . 166, 198, 199, 201, 202, 207, 209, 218  
 , 225, 239, 240, 251, 253-257, 260
- particles . . . . . 249, 250
- passive . . . . . 165, 174, 231, 236, 237
- past → preterite
- past participle → preterite participle
- perdurative-resultative aktionsart . . . . . 220
- perfectiva tantum . . . . . 216
- perfective aspect . . . . . 186, 216-219, 221
- perfectivisation . . . . . 220, 221
- periphrastic constructions . . . . . 52, 125, 164
- periphrastic formations . . 187, 189, 201, 207, 225-227,  
 230
- personal endings . . . 168-170, 174, 175, 177-183, 202  
 , 239, 245
- personal names . . . . . 128
- personal pronouns . . 14, 20, 52, 92, 127-130, 133, 134,  
 136, 137, 139-141, 144, 145, 147, 149, 251
- plural . . . 52, 59, 61, 68, 70, 71, 76, 78-80, 82, 87-90  
 , 92, 93, 99, 101, 102
- plural suffixes . . . 52, 62, 69, 72, 74, 75, 80, 81, 86-88,  
 90-92, 138, 153, 163
- plurality tantum . . . . . 79, 86, 90, 132, 133, 145
- possessive pronouns . . . . . 52, 144
- posterior imperative . . . . . 185
- postpositions . . . . . 61, 95, 98, 249
- potential . . . . . 166, 177, 178, 191, 231-239, 247
- present . . . 165, 166, 168, 169, 173-175, 177, 179, 181,  
 183, 186, 197, 198, 199, 204, 207, 208, 213, 214,  
 218, 230, 232, 234, 239, 244, 246, 247
- present conditional . . . . . 239, 241
- present participle . . . 23, 103, 165, 166, 169, 178-181  
 , 199-201, 203, 205, 208, 210, 218, 221, 235, 239,  
 242, 245, 261
- present perfect . . . . . 226
- present potential . . . . . 231, 233-235, 239, 240
- present stem . . . 26, 165, 166, 168, 170, 172, 180, 183,  
 197, 199, 201, 205, 207, 208, 209, 211, 243
- preterite . . . 165, 166, 174-176, 178, 179, 181, 198, 199,  
 201, 202, 208, 210, 225-228, 231, 236, 238, 239,  
 241, 244, 246
- preterite conditional . . . . . 240, 241
- preterite I . . . . . 166, 191, 226, 228-231
- preterite II . . . . . 166, 226, 228, 229
- preterite III . . . . . 166, 227, 228
- preterite IV . . . . . 40, 166, 228, 229, 238, 239
- preterite participle . . . 26, 103, 165, 166, 174, 175, 190,  
 201-210, 218, 221, 223, 225, 231, 235-241, 261
- preterite participle I . . . . . 166, 226, 240
- preterite participle II . . . . . 166, 226
- preterite participle III . . . . . 166, 227
- preterite participle IV . . . . . 166, 242
- preterite potential . . . . . 231, 236-238
- preterite stem . . . 26, 165, 166, 174, 178, 196, 201, 209
- préverbes vides . . . . . 220, 221
- preverbs . . . . . 244
- progressive form . . . . . 225
- pronominal adjectives . . . 52, 62, 91, 107, 154, 157,  
 159, 160, 162-164, 250
- pronominal adverbs . . . . . 156
- pronominal system . . . . . 52, 126
- pronouns . . . 52, 59, 61, 70, 75, 91, 126, 151, 152, 249,  
 251, 262
- question particles . . 154, 157, 189, 244, 247, 248, 250,  
 255, 256, 258
- quotation marker . . . . . 182, 199, 239, 250, 258-260
- quotation particle → quotation marker
- reciprocal pronouns . . . . . 52, 152
- recurrent . . . . . 216
- reduplicated absolutive . . . . . 211, 215, 216, 224, 225
- reduplicated gerund . . . . . 257
- reduplication . . . . . 75, 135, 136, 138, 162, 166, 170, 198
- reflexive . . . . . 174, 223, 227, 233
- reflexive pronouns . . . . . 52, 127, 133, 145
- relative pronouns . . . . . 52, 127

- resultative aktionsart . . . . . 220-223, 226, 227, 240  
 resultative-durative aktionsart . . . . . 224  
 rhematisation . . . . . 252, 253  
 root nouns . . . . . 21, 59, 67, 68, 101  
 root verbs . . . . . 165, 227, 232-235, 237, 247  
 s-stem nouns . . . . . 83, 97  
 short form . . . 166, 180, 181, 198-203, 206, 209, 226,  
     239, 242  
 singular . . . . . 52, 59, 68, 70, 77-79, 88, 89, 93  
 singularisation . . . . . 68, 79, 80, 133  
 subjunctive . . . . . 166, 231  
 substantive . . . . . 53, 160  
 substantivisation . . . 81, 89, 105, 109, 128, 136, 139,  
     150, 253  
 superlative . . . . . 107, 161, 162  
 suppletion . . . 172, 178, 216, 228, 236, 238, 239, 242  
     , 243  
 syncretism . . . . . 169  
 synthetic . . . . . 56, 59, 61, 100, 101  
 temporal adverbs . . . . . 150, 151  
 temporal interrogatives . . . . . 157  
 tense . . . . . 166, 168, 198, 201, 211, 217, 243  
 terminative-resultative aktionsart . . . . . 228  
 thematic present . . . . . 169  
 transitive . . . . . 26, 174, 178, 224, 229, 232-234  
 u-stem nouns . . . . . 97  
 uninflected words . . . . . 249  
 vector verbs . . . . . 221, 222  
 verbal aspect . . . . . 166, 186, 216-219, 221  
 verbal character . . . . . 219  
 verbal noun . . 165, 166, 182, 191, 193, 195-197, 254,  
     257, 262  
 verbal system . . . . . 164  
 vocalic stems . . . . . 62, 67, 69, 100  
 vocational forms . . . . . 89, 135-137, 145  
 voice . . . . . 165  
 word formation . . . . . 53  
 mots savants . . 12, 33, 42, 49, 50, 55, 66, 103, 104, 116,  
     117  
 nick-names . . . . . 136  
 numeral system . . . . . 11, 53, 107  
 patronyms . . . . . 137  
 personal names . . . . . 56  
**Phonology:** . . . . . 1-50  
   affricates . . . . . 11, 38, 50  
   affrication . . . . . 38, 39, 48, 90  
   ai-diphthong . . . . . 24, 25  
   allegro forms . . . . . 124, 130, 135, 153, 154, 160  
   alternation A. -gg- - F. -jj- . . . . . 43  
   alternation M. -i - A.F. -u . . . . . 65, 66  
   alternation M. -tt- - A. -tʰ- . . . . . 43  
   alternation M. -u - A. -a - F. -e . . . . . 65, 66  
   alternation M. -u - A. -a - F. -o . . . . . 65, 66  
   alternation M. -u - A.F. -e . . . . . 65, 66, 209  
   alternation M. -u - A.F. -i . . . . . 65-67  
   alternation M. -d- - A.F. -d- . . . . . 163  
   alternation M. ā - F. ai - A. ei . . . . . 27, 255  
   alternation M. i - A.F. e . . . . . 27  
   alternation M. o - A. e - F. e/ē . . . . . 27, 97  
   alternation M. u - A.F. e . . . . . 27, 28  
   alternation M. ɪ - A.F. d . . . . . 14, 28, 35, 36  
   alternation M. ɪ - A.F. ñd . . . . . 36  
   alternation M.F. -u - A. -a . . . . . 65, 66  
   alternation of final vowels in consonant stems . . 28, 63  
   alternation of prenasalised and plain stops . . . . . 31  
   anaptyctic vowels . . . . . 36, 113, 116, 170, 172, 201  
   apocope . . . . . 18, 19, 22, 34, 46, 169  
   aspirates . . . . . 5, 17, 28  
   assimilation . . . . . 158, 170, 195  
   au-diphthong . . . . . 24, 112, 115  
   change -ai → -ā . . . . . 25  
   change -al → -au . . . . . 22  
   change au → ō . . . . . 255  
   change -avu- → -au- . . . . . 24  
   change c- → s- . . . . . 33, 50, 112, 115  
   change -c- → -s- . . . . . 116  
   change -c-/j- → -d- . . . . . 50  
   change -cc- → -s- . . . . . 50, 214, 215  
   change -Cp- → -pp- . . . . . 41  
   change -Cv- → -CC-/vv- . . . . . 37  
   change -Cv- → -vv- . . . . . 38  
   change -di- → -dd- . . . . . 38-40  
   change -di- → -dy- → -jj- . . . . . 38, 39, 239  
   change -di- → -ji- . . . . . 228  
   change dv- → b- . . . . . 111, 114  
   change d → ɪ . . . . . 36, 194  
   change e → a . . . . . 152  
   change e → o . . . . . 36, 201, 206  
   change -el → -eo . . . . . 22  
   change -el → -eu . . . . . 22  
   change -il → -ū . . . . . 22  
   change j- → d- . . . . . 50  
   change -j- → -s- . . . . . 50  
   change -jj- → -d- . . . . . 50  
   change -k → -<sup>3</sup> . . . . . 18, 64  
   change -k- → -h- by dissimilation . . . . . 152, 160  
   change -kn- → -kk- . . . . . 44  
   change -l → -u . . . . . 20, 22, 64, 81  
   change -m → -n . . . . . 18, 20, 133  
   change -ni- → -ny- → -ññ- . . . . . 40, 242  
   change -ol → -ō . . . . . 22  
   change p → f . . . . . 33, 34, 42, 130  
   change p → f → h . . . . . 34, 130, 131  
   change -rt- → -rʰ- . . . . . 208  
   change s → h . . . . . 32, 34, 60, 64, 83, 97  
   change s- → h- . . . . . 50, 112, 113, 115  
   change -sf- → -ss- . . . . . 37, 43  
   change -si- → -sy- → -ss- . . . . . 40  
   change -st- → -ss- . . . . . 43  
   change -ś → -<sup>3</sup> . . . . . 18, 64  
   change -t → -y . . . . . 18, 64  
   change -t → -<sup>3</sup> . . . . . 18, 64, 205  
   change -ti- → -tt- . . . . . 38-40  
   change -ti- → -ty- → -cc- . . . . . 38, 39  
   change ʈ → ś . . . . . 18, 20, 33, 34, 41, 42, 113, 194  
   change ʈ → ś → h . . . . . 57, 178, 194  
   change u → e . . . . . 209  
   change -ul → -ū . . . . . 22  
   change vī- → vi- . . . . . 131  
   change vī- → vu- . . . . . 131

- change -VtC- → -VCC- . . . . . 43  
 change -VtC- → -ViC- . . . . . 43  
 change vu- → u- . . . . . 130  
 change -y- → -∅- . . . . . 241  
 change y- → d- . . . . . 11, 47, 49, 241  
 change <sup>-3</sup> → -u . . . . . 244, 261  
 change -t- → <sup>-3</sup> . . . . . 182  
 change -tv- → -vv- . . . . . 38  
 change -tv- → -tʃ- . . . . . 38, 41  
 change -ty- → -tʃ- . . . . . 41  
 closed syllables . . . . . 17, 22, 46, 48  
 consonant clusters . . . . . 17, 30, 36, 37, 43, 44, 48, 113,  
 116, 131  
 consonant system . . . . . 14, 28  
 consonants in word-final position . . . . . 18, 64  
 contraction -ana- → -ā- . . . . . 156, 199, 200, 262  
 deaspiration . . . . . 5, 17, 28, 29, 113  
 dental consonants . . . . . 17  
 dental stops . . . . . 5  
 despirantisation . . . . . 34  
 diphthongisation . . . . . 22, 24, 43  
 diphthongs . . . . . 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 27, 67  
 dissimilation . . . . . 152, 160  
 disyllabic word structures . . . . . 46  
 echo vowel . . . . . 18, 32  
 emphatic lengthening of vowels . . . . . 183, 193, 245, 249  
 epenthetic vowels . . . . . 64, 65, 83, 89, 94, 97, 125  
 equivalence M.A.F. -u . . . . . 65  
 fricative r . . . . . 34, 42, 109, 194  
 front vowels . . . . . 25  
 geminates . . . . . 17, 19, 33, 37, 38, 41-44, 46, 48, 77, 85,  
 94, 117, 132, 170, 195, 250  
 gemination . . . . . 32, 40, 43, 77, 82, 90, 172, 173, 250  
 glides . . . . . 11, 25, 47, 49, 64, 105  
 glottal stop . . . . . 18, 25, 47, 48, 64, 194, 195, 205  
 hiatus . . . . . 47, 69, 83, 160  
 i-diphthongs . . . . . 25  
 influence of retroflex consonants on surrounding  
 vowels . . . . . 28, 66, 97, 201, 206  
 interrogative intonation . . . . . 245  
 laterals . . . . . 35  
 lengthening of root vowels in i-stems . . . . . 21, 23, 27, 35,  
 69, 76-78, 84, 85, 94, 98  
 loan phonemes . . . . . 29, 44, 45  
 long nasalised vowels . . . . . 23  
 long vowels . . . . . 17, 19-22, 46, 50, 67, 79, 84, 85, 88,  
 111, 113, 115, 116, 135, 183, 193, 202, 216, 244  
 loss of affricates . . . . . 5  
 loss of aspirates . . . . . 17  
 loss of intervocalic consonants . . . . . 17, 20, 21, 262  
 loss of v- before o . . . . . 206  
 loss of word-final -l . . . . . 88  
 monophthongisation . . . . . 25, 135, 216  
 monosyllabic word structures . . . . . 46, 165  
 nasal consonants . . . . . 18, 23  
 nasal vowels . . . . . 17, 23, 24, 180, 199, 201  
 open syllables . . . . . 17, 30, 46  
 opposition of d and ḍ . . . . . 163  
 opposition of l and ḷ . . . . . 35, 111, 113  
 opposition of n and ṇ . . . . . 26, 29, 35, 40, 209  
 opposition of ṅd and nd etc. . . . . 31  
 palatal affricates . . . . . 50  
 palatalisation . . . . . 40  
 paradigmatic interchange of -d- and -nn- . . . . . 173  
 paradigmatic interchange of -h- and -ss- . . . . . 40, 47, 77,  
 78, 85, 90  
 paradigmatic interchange of -s- and -h- . . . . . 64, 94  
 paradigmatic interchange of -ṅd- and -nn- . . . . . 31, 173  
 prenasalised stops . . . . . 17, 29-31, 36, 37, 135, 173  
 progressive assimilation . . . . . 37, 38, 41  
 realisation of <sup>-3</sup> → -d in sandhi . . . . . 48  
 realisation of <sup>-3</sup> → -u in sandhi . . . . . 48  
 regressive assimilation . . . . . 37, 38, 41-43, 132  
 retroflex consonants . . . . . 5, 17, 18, 28, 35-37, 97  
 retroflex stops . . . . . 194  
 sandhi . . . . . 37, 39, 48, 57, 102, 182, 261  
 secondary nasalisation by -h- . . . . . 23  
 spelling system → writing system  
 spirantisation . . . . . 33, 132  
 spontaneous prenasalisation . . . . . 31  
 substitution of -j- by -d- . . . . . 50  
 substitution of -z- by -d- . . . . . 45  
 substitution of foreign phonemes . . . . . 45  
 syllable structure . . . . . 46  
 syncope . . . . . 19, 46, 170  
 trisyllabic word structures . . . . . 47  
 umlaut . . . . . 17, 23, 25, 26, 200, 202, 208, 213  
 umlaut a/e in a-stem verbs . . . . . 26, 202  
 umlaut a/e in the derivation of intransitives . . . . . 26, 171  
 umlaut in nominal paradigms . . . . . 56, 60  
 umlauting of a → ä . . . . . 25, 202  
 umlauting of a → e . . . . . 25, 26, 56, 60, 75, 171, 202, 213  
 umlauting of o → e . . . . . 27, 202  
 umlauting of u → i . . . . . 26, 202  
 vocalic alternations . . . . . 27, 238  
 vocalisation of -l . . . . . 22-24  
 voiced consonants . . . . . 18  
 voiceless consonants . . . . . 18  
 vowel adaptation u → e . . . . . 28, 97  
 vowel contraction . . . . . 17, 20-24  
 vowel system . . . . . 14, 19  
 word accent . . . . . 47, 48, 245  
 word structure . . . . . 46  
 palace language . . . . . VI, 15, 34, 181, 238  
 pluralis maiestatis . . . . . 50, 86, 135, 137  
 politeness . . . . . 187, 190, 191  
 popular etymology . . . . . 5, 112, 113, 132, 134, 138  
 prakritisms . . . . . 12, 20, 27, 33, 53, 69, 73, 108, 110-117  
 re-prakritisation . . . . . 117  
 Sanskrit names . . . . . 131  
 sanskritisms . . . . . 12, 20, 36, 39, 41, 42, 49, 53, 55, 69, 114,  
 116, 117, 121, 123, 125, 131, 137  
 social levels . . . . . 14, 52, 54, 128, 129, 134, 139, 140, 165,  
 171, 187, 190  
 status levels → social levels  
 stylistic levels . . . . . 12, 14, 32, 135  
 stylistics . . . . . 12  
 surnames . . . . . V

<b>Syntax:</b> . . . . .	12, 14, 251-262
adverbial clauses . . . . .	254
agent . . . . .	178, 228, 229, 231, 239
anaphoric . . . . .	147
attribute . . . . .	52, 53, 102, 105, 108-111, 126, 129, 134, 135, 145, 147, 148, 160, 198, 210, 256
cataphoric . . . . .	147
conditional clauses . . . . .	239-241, 254, 256
dative construction . . . . .	178, 228, 229, 231
declarative sentences . . . . .	245, 255
direct speech . . . . .	133, 144-145, 199, 247, 254, 258
exclamation . . . . .	254, 259
exclamative . . . . .	152, 157, 162, 164
exhortative . . . . .	259
external quotation . . . . .	259
final clauses . . . . .	254
focus . . . . .	251, 252, 254
hortative . . . . .	182
impersonal sentences . . . . .	261
indirect object . . . . .	57, 58
indirect speech . . . . .	185
inferential . . . . .	258, 259
inhibitive . . . . .	186, 261
internal quotation . . . . .	259
interrogative sentences . . . . .	234
irrealis . . . . .	231
jussive . . . . .	182-185, 187, 189
local directions . . . . .	58
local questions . . . . .	156
modal questions . . . . .	157
narrative . . . . .	258-260
negated sentences . . . . .	233, 238, 260
nominal sentences . . . . .	252
nominative construction . . . . .	178, 228
object . . . . .	126, 145
participial clauses . . . . .	256
participial constructions . . . . .	52
partitive . . . . .	140, 162

predicate . . . . .	51, 92, 102, 105, 126, 129, 145, 150, 198, 240, 251, 252, 254, 261
preventive . . . . .	186, 261
prohibitive . . . . .	184, 185, 218, 261
questions . . . . .	244, 245, 247, 254
relative clauses . . . . .	52, 256
reported speech → direct speech	
rhematisation . . . . .	72, 138, 148, 198, 251, 259
subject . . . . .	51, 56, 92, 126, 129, 145, 150, 166, 178, 251, 252, 256, 261
subordinate clauses . . . . .	254, 256, 257
temporal clauses . . . . .	254
temporal directions . . . . .	58
temporal questions . . . . .	158
vocational . . . . .	259
word order . . . . .	244, 251
yes/no questions . . . . .	244, 247, 248, 258, 260
taxis . . . . .	257
verbal levels → honorific levels . . . . .	15
vocabulary . . . . .	14

**Writing system:**

alphabet . . . . .	29
Arabic script . . . . .	7, 30, 135
Brāhmī script . . . . .	6, 7, 30, 108
Dives akuru . . . . .	6, 7, 25, 30, 33, 47, 60, 111, 112, 114-116, 118, 119, 121, 123, 130, 134, 135, 137, 190, 194
empty nūn . . . . .	30
Evēla akuru . . . . .	6, 32, 137
historical spelling . . . . .	19, 32
mixed spelling . . . . .	39, 59
orthography . . . . .	30, 37
Sinhalese script . . . . .	30
spelling of final -t by -n . . . . .	58, 69, 92, 154, 159, 194
Tāna . . . . .	7, 18, 25, 29, 30, 33, 45, 46, 60, 64, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, 119, 123, 130, 134, 135, 137, 190, 194, 203, 229
transcriptional spelling . . . . .	5
vocalisation marks . . . . .	30

**Texts**

Aśoka inscriptions . . . . .	111, 130, 197
belle-lettres . . . . .	260
copper-plate documents → lōmāfanu . . . . .	2
Cūlavamsa . . . . .	7, 153
decrees . . . . .	73
Dhammapada . . . . .	73
Dhampiya atuvā gātapadaya . . . . .	73
Dīpavamsa . . . . .	2
epitaphs . . . . .	7
fatkoḷu documents . . . . .	7, 19, 69, 92, 118, 121, 129, 133, 135, 137
Filā-Fatkoḷu . . . . .	75
fōlklore . . . . .	13
Gan-Fatkoḷu . . . . .	75
Heḷatuvā . . . . .	73
inscriptions . . . . .	6, 7, 30, 50, 60, 64, 111-117, 119, 123, 135, 137, 192, 212, 213, 239

legal documents . . . . .	153
letters . . . . .	7
lōmāfanu . . . . .	6, 7, 17, 28, 30, 32, 114-116, 121, 122, 131-133, 135, 137, 203, 229, 239, 258
Mahābhārata . . . . .	258
Mahāvamsa . . . . .	2, 4, 5, 10
manuscripts . . . . .	7
oral poetry . . . . .	13
palace inscription . . . . .	131, 229
palm leaf documents . . . . .	6
poetry . . . . .	13
Rādavaḷi . . . . .	3, 7, 112, 130, 134, 135, 137, 203
Rāmāyana . . . . .	58
short stories . . . . .	260
Tārīḥ . . . . .	3

Apabhramśa	3	Maldivian Prakrit	55
Arabic	4, 5, 25, 29, 32, 45, 46, 59	Medieval Sinhalese	1-3, 55, 61, 174, 202, 212, 213, 215
Ardhamāgadhī	197	Modern Sinhalese	1, 112, 114, 146
Assamese	102	North Dhivehi	13, 14
Bengali	102, 222	Northwest Indo-Aryan languages	207
Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit	204	Oriya	102
Classical Sinhalese	1, 11-13, 73, 114, 116	Pali	12, 110
Colloquial Sinhalese	13, 32, 71, 73, 111, 124, 241	Persian	45
Czech	194	Portuguese	32
Dravidic	1, 3, 186	Proto-Sinhalese	1, 3, 19
English	217, 218, 225, 226, 230	Romance languages	218
Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku idioms	23, 96	Russian	166, 186, 216, 217, 219, 221
Hindi	20, 33, 217, 218, 221, 222, 224	Sanskrit	12
Hindkī	207	Semitic languages	217
Indo-Aryan languages	221	Sindhī	207
Indo-European languages	218	Sinhalese	102, 107, 110
Insular Indo-Aryan	1, 108, 112, 115, 126, 207, 214, 218, 222	Sinhalese Prakrit	1, 3, 28, 29, 73, 211, 215
Insular Prakrit	5, 12, 108, 113, 125	Slavic languages	216-219, 221, 222
Lahndā	207	South Dhivehi	13
Latin	218	Tamil	1, 3, 28, 29, 262
Literary Sinhalese	168, 178, 182, 191	Turkic languages	217
Mainland Prakrits	108, 111	Urdu	20, 33, 218, 221, 222
		Vedic	186

## Geographical names

Aḍḍū	4, 7, 13, 15, 19, 20, 123, 131	Lāta	2
Bengal	2	Madīna	195
Dambīdū	60	Mahilādīpaka	5, 10
Divae	4	Makka	60
Fēdū	131	Makunudū	131
Fua <sup>3</sup> Mulaku	4, 7, 13, 15, 64	Malabār	4
Gāf-Alif Atoll	13	Māle	7, 11, 13, 14
Gāf-Dāl Atoll	13	Maliku	13
Gan	7, 20, 123	Maradū	131
Gnaviyani Atoll	13	Mīdū	7, 131, 135
Haddummati	13, 20, 60, 194	Minicoy	13
Henveru	157	Ōaviyani Atoll	13
Hitadū	7, 131	Serendivae	4
Huvadū	4, 13, 15	Sīhapura	2
Isdū	19, 60	Sīn Atoll	13
Jambudvīpa	60	Taprobane	4
Koḷumaḍulu	28	Toddū	19
Lakkadives	4	Vāṅga	2
Lām Atoll	13, 20, 60		

## Personal names

Ammianus Marcellinus	4	Pyrard de Laval, F.	8, 33, 34
Bell, H.C.P.	7, 110	Sālih	116
Christopher, W.	8, 33, 34	Sīhabāhu	2, 5
Claudius Ptolemaeus	4	Sīhala	2
Ebrahim Didī	112	Vijaya	2, 3, 5
Geiger, W.	1 et passim	Vīrasinga	131
Ibn Battūta	5, 10	Wilson, J.	8
Juhā	151	Yāqūt	5
Muḥammad	59, 130, 134, 135		

**Historical and sociological terms**

archeology	5, 6, 10	Islamic era	59
British dominion	3, 4	Malabar pirates	3
Buddhism	6	migration	3-5, 9, 10, 12, 73, 207
caste system	128	Phoenicians	4
Dutch dominion	3	Portuguese dominion	3
French dominion	3	pre-Islamic era	6, 10
Hijra	59	prehistory	6, 10, 25, 51
homeland	2, 10	Sharia	4
islamisation	3, 4, 6	Vedda	3