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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’ Mulaku (Gnaviyani [Ñaviani] Atoll) who was living in Māle at that time.

In the same year I applied for a special fellowship (Habilitanden-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 Campapūlūmāgē, Hitadū, Aḍḍū (Seenu [Sin] 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 Aḍḍū dialect within a comparatively short time and to collect approximately 2500 lexemes. HASSAN SAEED also organised a recording session with a professional storyteller, Mr. ALI MANIKUFAANU (Ali Manikufānu, also from Hitadū), whose vivid style of storytelling deeply impressed me. Furthermore, HASSAN SAEED accompanied me for a ten days’ research trip to Fua’ 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’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 (Bodurage), Mr. ABDULLAH AFEEF (Luxury), Mrs. Golden Gētu KADDĀDI and Mr. Diggāmāge MUHAMMAD MANIKUFAANU (Manikufānu) 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 Addū and in Fua’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 (Ma’dulu) 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 Maldives 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.

Oberursel, 2 March 2002          Sonja Fritz
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Addū dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td>Anno Domini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H.</td>
<td>Anno Hijrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amg.</td>
<td>Ardhamāgadhī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anim.</td>
<td>animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap.</td>
<td>Apabhraṃsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appr.</td>
<td>approximately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass.</td>
<td>Assamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attr.</td>
<td>attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux.</td>
<td>auxiliary verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>before Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beng.</td>
<td>Bengali (Baṅgla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>BuddhistHybridSanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bot.</td>
<td>botanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>card.</td>
<td>cardinal number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus.</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>confer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch.</td>
<td>chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class.</td>
<td>classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cop.</td>
<td>copula(tive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cp.</td>
<td>compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decl.</td>
<td>declension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>def.</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dim</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distr.</td>
<td>distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhiv.</td>
<td>Dhivehi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doub.</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.a.</td>
<td>and elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-H.</td>
<td>East Huvadhū dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>editor / edited / edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eds.</td>
<td>editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elem.</td>
<td>element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emph.</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esp.</td>
<td>especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Fua’ Mulaku dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f(em).</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff.</td>
<td>following pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foc.</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut.</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ger.</td>
<td>gerund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germ.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guj.</td>
<td>Gujarati (Gujarāti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Huvadhū dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi.</td>
<td>Hindi (Hindi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id.</td>
<td>the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huv.</td>
<td>Huvadhū dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A</td>
<td>Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Indian / Indic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef.</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interr.</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr.</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i pfv.</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAINA</td>
<td>Jaina Māhārāstrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Māle standard language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>Marathi (Marāṭhī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m(asc).</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBh.</td>
<td>Mahābhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIA</td>
<td>Middle Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod.</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms.</td>
<td>manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntr.</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>negated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nep.</td>
<td>Nepali (Nepāli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIA</td>
<td>New Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntr.</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj.</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>oblique case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs.</td>
<td>obsolete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>Old Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or.</td>
<td>Oriya (Oriyā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ord.</td>
<td>ordinal number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>Puli (Pālī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panj.</td>
<td>Panjabi (Pañjābī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partc.</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers.</td>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfv.</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto-Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.n.</td>
<td>proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss.</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postpos.</td>
<td>postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pot.</td>
<td>potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pred.</td>
<td>predicate, predicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>present (tense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pret.</td>
<td>preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prev.</td>
<td>preverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron.</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron. adj.</td>
<td>pronominal adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps.</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quot.</td>
<td>quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Rāmāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recip.</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red.</td>
<td>reduplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refl.</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repr.</td>
<td>reprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resp.</td>
<td>respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev.</td>
<td>revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subst.</td>
<td>substantive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suff.</td>
<td>suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š.</td>
<td>Šauraseni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top.</td>
<td>toponym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans.</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk.</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ved.</td>
<td>Vedic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vb.n.</td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viz.</td>
<td>namely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>volume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.
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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 “Sigiri Graffiti” which was published in 1956 is of special interest. Besides the text of the inscriptions of the rock of Sigiriya 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 *Dīpavamsa* (“Island Chronicle”) and the *Mahāvamsa* (“Great Chronicle”). The latter covers the time from 544 B.C. until 362 A.D.; it was continued under the name of *Cūlavamsa* (“Lesser Chronicle”) which was carried on until 1781. While the language of the *Dīpavamsa* is still inspired by the clerical tradition and, therefore, is characterised by a ponderous style, the *Mahāvamsa* 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 *Mahāvamsa* 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. 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 *Mahāvamsa* that the island was inhabited by an aboriginal tribe of an unknown race who can presumably be identified with the ancestors of...
the present-day Vedda people. 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 yakkhini 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, as well as a few important historical facts, were listed in a short chronicle written in Dhivehi, the so-called Rādavali, which means “chronicle of the kings”. At present, three manuscripts of the Rādavali 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

---


6 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 Addû, 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 (Huvadû, Fua‘ Mulaku and Addû) carried on their own commercial activities with Sri Lanka until recently; however, these special relations were cut off in 1959 by the government in Mâle, 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 reinstalled 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.7

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.8 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.9

9 “... 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 (Sailân) Saran- oder Sereen-dîb benannten mit dem üblichen Eintritt von r für l; d.i. skr. Sînhala-dvîpa, prakr. Sîhala-dîva, ‘Löwen- oder Heldeninsel’, ... Die D(iva)e des Ammian bezeichnen dagegen die zahlreichen Atolle der Malediven, welche sich westlich von Malabar bis zum Aquator hinabziehen und von pers. Schiffsluten häufig besucht wurden.” (“The form Seren-divae reflects the Persian name of the island Taprobane (Sailân) which was called by the Persians Saran- or Sereen-dîb, showing the normal substitution of l by r; i.e. Skt. sînhala-dvîpa, Pkt. sîhala-dîva ‘island of lions or heros’, ... Ammian’s Divae, however, refer to the numerous atolls of the Maldives which are located in the west of Malabar, extending up to the equator; they were often visited by Persian ships.”)
0.3.3. Some further information that might refer to the Maldives 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 Sihabahu, prince-regent Vijaya, was of evil conduct and became a robber; therefore, he was cast 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- ← dvīpā- “island” + suffix -ka).

Obviously, the Arabic name of the Maldives 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. The first extensive description of the Maldives was given by the traveller Ibn Battūṭa (1304-1377) who calls the islands dībat al-mahal. 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.

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 it 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
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 – 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”). 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 *Brāhmaṇī* 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.

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

---

13 Thor H. EYERDAHL’s expeditions and excavations, as attested particularly in his book “The Maldive 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.

14 Dem.pron. e “that”; *vēla* “time”; *akuru* “script”.

15 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 lômân 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. 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, Mâle. One of these inscriptions was provisionally published by Bell again (1940). Besides the inscriptive attestations, there are numerous manuscripts in Dives akuru written on paper (jutkolu “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 Râdavali 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 Mâle as well as in Mîdu and in Hitadû (Addâ-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 Têna, the right-to-left script which is still in use today. Têna 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 Têna is a mixture of a syllabary belonging to the southern Brâhmi 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 Mâle. Several documents from the 18th c. are already written in Têna (some of them have been published in Maldivian journals by members of the “National Centre” in Mâle; cf. above). Almost all of the numerous funeral and memorial stone inscriptions in Têna which date from the 18th up to the 20th c. (in Mâle, Fua’ Mulaku and in Gan, Hitadu and Mîdu, Addû-Atoll) have not yet been edited. The most extended older text written in Têna is a complete manuscript of the Râdavali which was published in Mâle in 1979. The oldest literary texts, in the proper sense of the word, that are available to us date from the end of the 19th c.

16 Cf. the bibliography.
18 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\(^{19}\) 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. Masic’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.\(^{20}\) 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.\(^{21}\) 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

\(^{19}\) Cf. the list given in Fritz (1993), 15 ff. For further bibliographical information cf. the bibliography.

\(^{20}\) Cf. Geiger (1973), 345.

\(^{21}\) 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 (HLSD 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 Maldive 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 Maldive 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
Battūta 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. 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 Māhilā-
dipaka, 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 surround-
ing 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 his-
tory” 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

22 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.
assumption that Indo-Aryans might already have been present on the Maldive 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. 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 yāṭi “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. 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.

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 docu-
mented 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

24 For details cf. 1.7.
25 Cf. 1.7.
26 Cf. GEIGER (1919), 100: “In one word, Māldivian 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\textsuperscript{27} 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 theeffectivity 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 evolutorial 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 \textit{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,

\textsuperscript{27} 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 \textit{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’ Mulaku and Ađđū.28 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 Ađđū islands which form the southern tip of the whole Maldivian archipelago, is characterised by the highest degree of archaicty. 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.

28 The modern official names are: Gāf-Alif / Gāf-Dāl Atoll, .Navīyani (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). Some of the phonological divergences between the northern and the southern area can be regarded as archaic.

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 inambiguously 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

---

29 Cp., e.g., the phonematic difference between /n/ and /n/ as preserved in the southern dialects as against the uniform /n/ appearing in North Dhivehi; cf. 1.3.7.
30 Cp. M. /ld/ vs. A.F. /ld/ 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.31

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 Addū 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 Addū 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 Addū 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’ Mulaku which essentially corresponds with that of Addū 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’ Mulaku is less transparent from the formal point of view. With respect to morphology, the dialect of Huvaddū is a more typical representant of southern Dhivehi. With regard to the phonology, however, there are some special developments that are characteristic for Huvaddū alone.32

31 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.

32 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 Huvaddū is relatively restricted and, as a consequence, my Huvaddū database is much smaller than the other data collections. Therefore, the dialect of Huvaddū 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’ 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. 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. 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.

1.1.2. Old Dhivehi as handed down in its earliest written documents, the lõmõfanus, 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. rātu “island, land” (attested since L1 [f/2,1]; today M. [ra] (raʃ)) or eku “one” (attested since L3 4/1,5; today M. [eʃ] (ek)). The question whether the same rule applied to southern Dhivehi in ancient times as well, or whether we have to assume a dialectal differentiation

33 For a treatise of some general features of the historical phonology of Dhivehi, cf. FRITZ / GIPPERT (2000), 139-152.
34 Cf., e.g., MASICA (1991), 189. – For concrete Dhivehi examples cf. 1.2.1.
35 For examples cf. 1.2.1.3.
36 For the different types of documents cf. introduction, 0.5.1 and furthermore vol.ii. of the present book.
similiar to that of nowadays, 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 \( lnl, lsl, lkl, ltl \) and \( l\tilde{s} \leftarrow tl \) can be found in final position. While \( lnl \) in final position is articulated as a velar \( [g] \) in all dialects (e.g. \( \text{mihun} [\text{mihu}] \) “people”\(^{38} \)), 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 \( /-kl/ \) which phonetically occurs as glottal stop \( [?] \) in the whole Dhivehi speaking area. In the southern dialects, final \( /-tl/ \) has been changed phonetically to \( [?] \) as well,\(^{39} \) while in the standard language \( /-tl/ \) is realised as glide \( [y] \) forming a diphthong with the preceding vowel; for this development cp., e.g., the \textit{casus rectus} M. \([\text{foi}]\) in comparison with A.F. \([\text{fo’}]\) \(/\text{foil}/ \) “book”.\(^{40} \) In the dialect of Aḍḍū as well as the standard language, final \( /-sl/ \) is pronounced as \( [?] \) too, while we have to state a completely different development for Fua’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. \( \text{ra’so} \) “island, land” vs. M.A. \([\text{ra’}]\) \(/\text{raśl}/ \) (\( ← /\text{raṭul} /\), attested since L1 \([f/2,1]\)).\(^{41} \) While final \( /-sl/ \) remained unchanged in the standard language and in Aḍḍū, the dialect of Fua’Mulaku shows an allophonic change of \( /-sl/ \) to \( [h] \) in the same position, followed by a weakly articulated vowel which echoes the vowel of the preceding syllable; cp., e.g., F. \( \text{maha} \) with M.A. \( \text{maś} \) “fish”.\(^{42} \) The Fua’Mulaku dialect is peculiar with respect to final \( /ll/ \) 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 \( [?] \) has no phonemic value of its own. It only serves as an allophonic variant of the final consonants M.A.F. \( /-kl/ \), A.F. \( /-tl/ \) and M.A. \( /-sl/ \). 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 automatical articulation of a glottal stop \( [?] \) following inevitably every vowel in word-final position, which is a widespread phenomenon throughout the South Asian languages; cp., e.g., the adjective M. \( \text{boḍu} \), F. \( \text{boṇdo} \), A. \( \text{boṇda} \) “big”, which is pronounced \( [\text{boḍu’}], [\text{boṇdo’}] \) and \( [\text{boṇda’}] \), 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 \( -n \) \( [g] \), but it remained \( m \) within the paradigm when it was not final. A tendency of changing \( -m \rightarrow -n \) can be noticed already in the earliest documents. Alongside \textit{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 \( \text{kan} \), which can be found as early as L5 (5/2,2) as well; cf. also \( \text{bimu} \)

\(^{37} \) Cf. 2.3.1.3.4.1 below.

\(^{38} \) Cf. also 2.3.1.3.1.

\(^{39} \) For examples and for the spelling of the two latter phonemes cf. 2.3.1.3.1.

\(^{40} \) For more details and examples cf. 1.2.2.4.

\(^{41} \) For a detailed study on the dative ending F. \( -aśa \) cf. 2.3.1.1.3.

\(^{42} \) For some further examples cf. 2.3.1.3.1.
The sound system

“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 bingaŋdu “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;43 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 kam-gati (L2 6,2; L6 2,4; F5,39.43; cf. also the plural kamugatin-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).44 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.45 Cp., e.g., the contemporary name of the southernmost atoll, Aḍḍu, which has to be derived through an intermediate form aṭ-duvu (L4 a/2,4), syncopated from *aṭa/atu-duvu, lit. “eight-island-(atoll)”; cf. also the name of the island Toḍḍu which is attested as toṭduvu (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 batteriā “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. Geig (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-;46 Sinh. nil “blue, green, dark” vs. Pa. nīla-, OIA nīla-;47 Sinh. duma, stem dum- “smoke, steem” vs. Pa., Pkt.

43 For Dhiv. dū ← duvu “island” cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4.
44 /gat/, gati part.pret. of gannant, 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.
45 For details cf. 1.3.9.
dhūma-, OIA dhūmá.\(^{48}\) 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\(^{49}\)), F. nil “blue” (vs. M.A. nū ← *niu ← nil\(^{50}\), M.A.F. dun, i.e. [\textipa{duŋ}] /\textipa{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. vél¯a “limit, boundary, time” (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 702, no. 12115); M. u˘nd¯oli, A.F. i˘nd¯oli “typical Maldivian wing hanging from the ceiling inside the house” with OIA hindola- “wing, swing cradle” vs. Sinh. idolu-va “palanquin, sedan”, Hi. hindol(¯a)\(^{51}\); M.A.F. j¯oli “a baglike seat or wing outside the house” with OIA *jhola- “bag” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 299, no. 5415); M. d¯oni, A.F. d¯o ˙ni “boat, ship (of the common Maldivian type)” with Pkt. d¯on¯ı- “boat”, ← OIA dro ˙n¯ı- “wooden trough” (MBh.), vs. Pa., Pkt. dona- ← dróna- (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. `ad¯ıtta “Sunday” (OIA ādityá- “son of Aditi, name of seven deities, esp. of the sun”: T URNER 1966, I, 52, no. 1153), or loanwords that obviously have been borrowed more recently such as M.A.F. `ı˙stu “roof tile” (probably from Hi. `ı˙t “id.”,\(^{52}\) cf. Pkt. i˙t˙tag¯a-, i˙t˙t¯a-, OIA í˙s˙tak¯a-; T URNER 1966, I, 72, no. 1600); M.A.F. `āda “habit, norm, rule” (← Arab. ādat “id.”), or M. ̄o ˙daru “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. ̄u\(^{53}\) “rope, thread, cord” ← *(h)u(v)u vs. Sinh. hu, stem hu/hū- “id.” ← Pkt. sīya-, Skt. sūta- “id.”,\(^{54}\) or M.A.F. āru ← *(h)u(v)uru “pig” vs. Sinh. (h)jurā, stem (h)āru- “id.” ← Pkt. sūra- ← OIA

\(^{48}\) Cf. GEIGER (1941), 78, no. 1161; TURNER (1966) I, 392, no. 6849.

\(^{49}\) Gan is the name of the southernmost island of the Addū-Atoll as well as the name of an island in Haddummati- (= Lām-) Atoll. – For the change of final -m → -n cf. 1.1.4.

\(^{50}\) For the change of -l → -u cf. 1.2.1.6.

\(^{51}\) Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 815, no. 14094 and GEIGER (1941), 21, no. 322.

\(^{52}\) 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. īt. The retroflex /ʃ/ shows that the word has been borrowed only recently, because otherwise /ʃ/ would have changed to /ʃ/ 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 kātaya “(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.

\(^{53}\) Cf. also the case forms A. gen. īte, dat. ītaˈ lā-asli, abl. īn lā-unl.

\(^{54}\) Cf. GEIGER (1941), 193, no. 2915; cf. also TURNER (1966) II, 781, no. 13561 s.v. OIA sátra- “id.”.
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sūkarā- “boar”. 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’ 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 morphonological 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. In Fua’ Mulaku, however, it has spread throughout whole paradigms, resulting in the emergence of some nouns with initial long vowel.57 Cf. the nom. A. ali “ash” beginning with short a- as against the gen. A. āle ← *ali-e with secondary lengthening of the initial vowel; in the Fua’ Mulaku equivalent of the word, this vowel spread, by analogy, not only to the nom. āli but to the whole paradigm (dat. ālahā, abl./instr. ālen); cf. furthermore F. īhi “lobster” vs. M.A. īhi. — The secondary lengthening of the root vowel is also attested in many i-stems with word-initial consonant, cf. A. nom.sg.def. mēhā lmehi-āl “the fly”, fēšā lfeši-āl “the box”, gen. fēše lfeši-el as well as F. nom.sg. mēhi “fly”, fēši “box”, fīši “small island, sandbank” (vs. A. nom. fīši) etc.

1.2.1.3. Long vowels that appear in medial as well as final position in modern Dhivehi 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 rása- “sap or juice of plants; taste, flavour”); 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. kiéhi ← *kiés-i; for more details cf. 2.3.2.8.1.3); M. bīru, A.F. bīrī “dead”, Sinh. bīri / bihiri ← Pkt. bahira- ← OIA badhirā- “id.”; M.A. bēs, F. bēhe “medicine, medicament, drug” (← *bees ← *behaia ← *besaja) corresponding to the Sinh. plural stem behet (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 bhāisajya-). The final long vowels and diphthongs of most of the nouns that constitute the group of “root nouns” in Dhivehi 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. fāi, A.F. fā “foot, leg” ← Pkt. pā(y)a- ← OIA pāda- etc.

56 Cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2 and the primary paradigm in 2.3.2.11.3.2.
57 Cf. for details 2.3.2.8.1.4 ff.
58 There are a few exceptions which for the most part can be explained as borrowed or foreign words; cf. 2.3.1.4.
59 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.
60 Cf. GEIGER (1941), 123, no. 1832 and TURNER (1966) II, 515, no. 9130.
61 Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 549, no. 9623.
62 For some examples cf. 2.3.1.5.
1.2.1.4. A few examples of the dialects of Addu and Fua Mulaku show the tendency towards vowel contraction even today. Cp., e.g., A. niaduru vs. M.F. niaduru “pomelo”; F. mère vs. A. miara, M. miaru “shark”,63 or F. lêni, A. lênãi vs. M. lianã “write”.64 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 kuraka’ and hadaka’ which most probably have to be derived from *kuran-ak-aš and hadan-ak-aš, 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. bèbè (vs. M.F. bèbè) “elder brother” from * bèbe-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 -l65 which is characteristic for northern Dhivehi. In the remaining forms of the words concerned, /l/ was preserved wherever it was in medial position.66 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 Addu 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,67 the dialect of Fua Mulaku has conserved final -l even phonetically, as the following examples illustrate: l'mall “flower, blossom” → M. mā, A. mau, but F. mal; /gall “stone, rock” → M. gā, A. gau, but F. gal; l'all “new” → M. ā, A. au, but F. al; /ball “hole” → M. bā, A. bau, but F. bal; /bol “head” → M.A. bō, but F. bol; /koll “inner side of the cheek” → M.A. kō, but F. kol; /loll “eye” → M.A. lō, but F. lol; /mal “root” → M.A. mā, but F. mul; /nil “blue” → M.A. nā ← *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. hauł “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

63 Cf. Sinh. mōra-luvara ← Pkt. magara-, mayara- “shark”. The word goes back to OIA mákara-“crocodile”; for the change of meaning cf. also Pa. makara- “sea-monster” (TURNER 1966, II, 554, no. 9692).
64 Cf. Sinh. liyanavā “id.” (GEIGER 1941, 151, no. 2255).
65 It was only after the apocope of -u (cf. 1.1.3), when closed syllables reappeared in Dhivehi, that /l/ could become a final consonant; e.g. mal ← *malu “flower”, bol ← *bolu “head” etc.
66 For examples cf. 1.2.2.3.
67 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 Serbokroatisch, wo silbenschliessendes -l zu -o wird und wo altes sonantisches / 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 slawischen Sprachen, in: Linguistica Slovaca 1/2, 1939/40, 64-76.)
vocalised -l alone, as the vocalism of the corresponding Fua’ Mulaku forms haul and vaul show (not hall, val). Here, the diphthong is based on a contraction (← *savulu / *vavulu; cf. Sinh. sävul-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’ 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. bāši “eggplant”. /bāʃ/ here reflects the nasal consonant of OIA bhaṅtakī- (TURNER 1966, II, 533, no. 9369). The reason for the lengthening of the root vowel (cp. M.A. baši, Sinh. baṭu 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. bhaṅtā). — A similar example is F. kāši “thorn” vs. M.A. kaši, Sinh. kaṭu-va “id.” which corresponds to bāši in its whole paradigm; it has to be derived from OIA kāntaka- “id.” (cp. Pkt. kaṇṭaa–; TURNER 1966, I, 133, no. 2668).

In the following examples, the nasal vowel is conditioned by a root-final nasal consonant: fāni “worm, caterpillar” vs. A. faṇi, M. faṇi; Sinh. panu-vā (← OIA prāṇaka- “living being, animal, worm”); 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 nidāni where -n is preserved) or the e-stem F. rekē vs. M.A. rekē “avoiding, escaping” ← *rekena (long form rekenā “id.”).

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” (← kudi-ā, sg.def., cf. 2.3.2.8.1.4.3); F. mūdi “ring, jewellery” (Sinh. mudu- “finger-ring”; Pkt. muddā-, OIA mudrá- “seal, signet-ring”;71 or F. bāzu “eagle, falcon” (← Pers. bāz “falcon, (gos-) hawk”). In the case of F. faḥq “five” (M.A. fas), F. hā, ḥā “yes” (M.A. hā), F. yā “no” (besides M. nān, A.F. nun), F. faḥq “if” (cf. A. fehē) and F. mādahq 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. — 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 -ī; cf. the variant forms temī and temī (abs. of temenī “get wet”).

68 Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 501, no. 8929; GEIGER (1941), 93, no. 1383.
69 For the terminology cf. 3.9.
70 For the implied formation rules cf. 3.9.1.
71 Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 588, no. 10203 and GEIGER (1941), 136, no. 2033.
72 It remains possible that the nasal vowel of F. faḥq “five” represents a direct reflex of that in OIA pāṇca (cf. 2.5.1.1).
73 For details cf. 3.10.2.
The nasal vowel phonemes of Fua’ 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., mihun “people” pronounced as [mihɨn]. 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,74 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”75 this is true for examples like M.A.F. māmui “honey”,76 M.A.F. vai “wind”,77 M.A.F. gai “body”,78 or M.A.F. oį “sea current”,79 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 a 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. kaiši vs. M. kāši80 “ripe coconut” (for cooking) and A.F. naiši vs. M. nāši81 “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 kauţi “coconut” and noţi “coconut shell” show.

1.2.2.3. The diphthong au as occurring in words of the type A. maų “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

---

74 Cf., e.g., the short notice in MASICA (1991), 116.
75 Cf. 2.3.1.5.
76 māmui is most probably a compound consisting of (M.) mā “flower, blossom” and an independent word
77 mui ~ Sinh. mī (stem) “honey” (← Pkt. mahu-, Skt. mádhu-; cf. GEIGER 1941, 135, no. 2012.).
78 For the etymology cf. 2.3.1.5.
79 For the etymology cf. 2.3.1.5.
80 For the etymology cf. 2.3.1.5.
81 The etymology of this word is unknown.
82 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. nāši is identified with a Sinh. word nātu “shell” whose connection with Sinh. nātu-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* /vell/ “every kind of creeper” and M. *teo*, A.F. *teu* /tell/ “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*’ /lat/ “hand, arm”, M. *nakai* vs. A.F. *naka*’ /nakat/ “lunar constellation”, M. *fai* vs. A.F. *fa*’ /fatt/ “leaf”, M. *fot* vs. A.F. *fo*’ /fot/ “book”, M. *goi*, A.F. *go*’ /got/ “way, manner”. This process also affects Arabic loanwords ending in -at; cp., e.g., M. *nasǝhai* “advise” ← Arab. *nasihat* “id.”. In medial position -t- remains unchanged in all these cases, e.g. gen.sg. M. *fotuge*, A. fot, dat. M.A. *fota*’ /fotaʃ/.

1.2.2.5. In the standard language there is an increasing tendency to pronounce the diphthong /ai/ as a monophthongised lengthened vowel [ǝ]. As mentioned in HLSD, 11, this [ǝ] is further developing into [e̞] in the northernmost atolls so that we find, e.g., [sê] and [fêvǝn] instead of M. [sǝi] (A.F. *sai*) “tea” and M. [fǝvǝn] (A.F. *faivǝn*) “shoe, sandal”. These cases must be distinguished from the development of original word-final ai-diphthongs into M. -ǝ as in the locative suffix M. -gai (cf. 2.3.2.13) or in the formative of the “absolutive I”, M. -fai (cf. 3.11.4.1 and 3.11.4.4), which are realised almost always as [gǝ] and [fǝ] 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 provable⁸² that the process went through an intermediate *ä as in Sinhalese where we find ā still today. Cp., e.g., M.A.F. *den* “then” (Sinh. dān “now”; Pa. (i)dānī, Skt. idānīm); M.A. *mehi*, F. *mēhi* “fly” (Sinh. māsi- /mēhi- “id.”, Pkt. macchi-, OIA māksi- f. “fly, bee”⁸⁴); M. *veo*, A.F. *veu* /vevl/ “watertank, artificial pool” (Sinh. væv- “id.”; Pkt. væv-, OIA væpī- “id.”);⁸⁵ M. *veo*, A.F. *veu* /vell/ “every kind of creeper” (Sinh. væl- “id.”; Pa., Pkt., Skt. vallī- “id.”); M.A.F. *fen* “water” (Sinh. pān “id.”; Pa. pānīya-, OIA pānīya- “id.”); M. *rē*, A.F. *rei* “night” (Sinh. rā-, Pkt. rā- ← *rāṭī- vs. Pa. ratti-; OIA rāṭī-

---

⁸² Neither *Dives akuru* nor Tǝna provide a grapheme for the sound [ä].

⁸³ Cf. GEIGER (1941), 74, no. 1085.

⁸⁴ Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 554, no. 9696.

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

⁸⁶ Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 666, no. 11429.

“id.”88); M. medu, A.F. mede “mid(dle), centre” (Sinh. māda “id.”; Pa., Pkt. majha-, OIA mādhya- “id.”89).

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., ma´si “loam, clay” vs. Sinh. mā́ti-(Pkt. maṅtiya-, Pa., Skt. mānita- “inspissated juice of sugarcane and other plants”, Pkt. phā-nita- “treacle, molasses”91).

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. beli- “look (at)” and fa´sa- “start, begin (to do something)” with their corresponding preterite stems M.A.F. jehi- and fe´sī-. 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.92

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. faśanī trans. “to start, begin (something)” vs. feśeni intr. “to begin”, jahānī trans. “to beat” vs. jehenī intr. “to fall, hit”, the causative vattanī 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 ibim/ “earth, soil, ground” = Sinh. bim ← Pkt. bhūmī-, Pa. bhūmī-, OIA bhūmi-.93 As a rule, u-umlaut is more widespread in the southern-most 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. muśi vs. A.F. miśi “fist” and the Sinh. stem miti- “id.” ← Pa. muṭhi-, OIA muṣṭi- “id.”;94 M. kuḷi vs. A.F. kīḷi “pond with fresh water”, and M. dānī vs. A.F. dīṇi “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

---

88 Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 619, no. 10702; cf. also 2.3.1.5.
89 Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 563, no. 9804.
90 Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 594, no. 10286.
91 Cf. TURNER (1966) II, 510, no. 9070; GEIGER (1941), 103, no. 1523. – For the binary opposition of /n/ and /ṅ/ in southern Dhivehi cf. 1.3.7.1.
92 Cf. the table of a-verbs in 3.1.4.1; for the derivation of the preterite participle cf. 3.9.2.1.
93 Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 545, no. 9557.
preserved the back vowel \( u \) in the present stem \( duva^- \), while the preterite stem was changed by umlaut into \( divu^- \) (\( \leftarrow *divi^- \)).

1.2.3.3. Concerning the umlauting of \( o \) into \( e \), Dhivehi does not show many examples either. Cp. M. \( le \) “blood” vs. A.F. \( lei \) with a diphthong and Sinh. \( le \)\(^{96} \) (Pkt. \( lohiya^- \) “red”, OIA \( lôhita^- \) “read, reddish substance, blood”). — In the case of M. \( dôni \), A.F. \( dôni \) “boat, ship” vs. Sinh. \( dêna \) “boat, canoe” the umlauting seems to have been omitted; but the Maldivian word rather represents a prakritism.\(^ {97} \) — 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. \( ti\-la \) – A.F. \( tela \) “shallow (water); blade”; M. \( hîla \) – A.F. \( hela \) “rock”; M. \( hima \) – A.F. \( hema \) “thin, fragile”; M. \( mila \) – A.F. \( mela \) “dirt”; M. \( ri\-ha \) – 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. \( dera\-na \) “ring made from rope”; M. \( huras \) – A.F. \( heras \) “across, horizontal”; M. \( furâlu \) – A.F. \( fera\-da \) “roof”.

1.2.4.3. A triadic correspondence of root vowels which occurs regularly is that of M. \( \bar{a} \) – F. \( ai \) – A. \( ei \). It is represented in the pronominal adjective M. \( h\-h\)ai, A. \( hei \) “all” and, as a second component, also in the demonstrative adverb M. \( eh\-h\)ai, A. \( ehei \) “so” and in the interrogative pronoun M. \( kih\-h\)ai, F. \( ki\-h\)ai, A. \( kihei \) “how” (cf. 2.6.7.4.3). Some further examples are M. \( vel\-h\)ai, F. \( velai \), A. \( velei \) “green water turtle”; M. \( kel\-h\)ai, F. \( kelai \), A. \( kelei \) “sandal wood”; M. \( gur\-h\)ai, F. \( gurai \), A. \( gurei \) “parrot”; M. \( fur\-h\)ai, F. \( furai \), A. \( fur\-e \) “full” and probably the ending of the “absolutive I”, M. \( -f\-\)ai, F. \( -f\-e \) \( \leftarrow *-fai \), A. \( -fei \).\(^ {98} \) 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. \( el\-e \)\(^ {99} \) Cp., e.g., M. \( atolu \) – A.F. \( atele \) “atoll”; M. \( toli \) – A. \( tel\-i \), F. \( têli \) “bean”; M. \( go\-ndi \) – A. \( ge\-ndi \), F. \( gë\-ndi \) “chair”; M. \( o\-dî \) – A.F. \( ved\-i \) “type of (Maldivian) ship”; M. \( dol\-i \) –

\(^ {95} \) For the etymology of this verb cf. GEIGER (1941), 79, no. 1175 and TURNER (1966) I, 284, no. 5168 s.v. \( jàvate \) “hastens”.

\(^ {96} \) For the uncontracted variant \( lehe \) “blood” cf. GEIGER (1938), 86. For the etymology cf. TURNER (1966) II, 650, no. 11165.

\(^ {97} \) For details cf. 1.2.1 above.

\(^ {98} \) Cf. 1.2.2.5 above.

\(^ {99} \) The long vowel \( ê \) of some nominal \( i \)-stems is caused by paradigmatic circumstances; cf. 2.3.2.8.1.4.2.
A.F. dedi “front part of the chin”; M. kolu – A.F. kede “piece; end”; M. o’ lošl ← *ošu – A. eša, F. eše “seed, nut, kernel”; M. fonu – A.F. fena “foam, surf”; M. honihira – A.F. henahiri “Saturday”; M. honu – A. heña, F. heñe “thunderbolt”; M. ošōnmāni – A. vēsionnei, F. vēsionnāi “lie (down)”. 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 Male has witnessed a systematic change of /el/ into /ol/, where /el/ was followed by a single retroflex consonant. Thus, e.g., atelu “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 kelu “end” (L3 6/1,2,3,4) vs. modern M. kolu. This word occurs in the name of the atoll Kolumadulu, which is already attested in the form of the locative kelumadule 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 morphonological 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 saṃgha ... TERA for therā, DAMA for dhamma ...” (GEIGER 1938, 40). According to MASICA (1991), 205, this development resulted from Tamil influence, the Tamil consonant system having no aspirates at all. Cf. also C ALDWELL (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

100 For the correspondence M. /l/ – A.F. /d/ cf. 1.3.7.2.
101 For detailed information on this verb cf. 3.9.2.2.3.
102 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.103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>consonants</th>
<th>labial</th>
<th>labiodental</th>
<th>dental</th>
<th>alveolar</th>
<th>retroflex</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>laryngeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless stops</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced stops</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenasalised stops</td>
<td>ŭmb</td>
<td>ŭnd</td>
<td>ŭd</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŭng</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless affricates</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced affricates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n₁₀⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>ſ₁₀⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vibrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laterals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless spirants</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ſ</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced spirants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glides</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tāna</th>
<th>ḡ</th>
<th>ṣ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ḳ</th>
<th>ḍ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ň</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transcribed</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāna</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ň</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcribed</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāna</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ň</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcribed</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ň</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103 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.).

104 As an independent phoneme, /ń/ exists only in the southernmost dialects of Dhivehi; cf. 1.3.10.

105 /ń/ is phonemic in loanwords only; cf. 1.3.7.


107 The character for retroflex ň 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tāna</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
<th>ṭ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. The articulation of the four phonemes in question, /ṁb/, /ṁnd/, /ṁnd/ and /ṁng/, 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 aksaras. 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. [kuruṁba] written as ⟨kuruba⟩ “young drinking coconut”, M. [uṅdagū] ⟨udagū⟩ “difficult”; M. [iṅguru] ⟨iguru⟩ “ginger”; M. [gaṅdu] ⟨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 sukkuṇ, the marker of unvocalised consonants.” 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. [gaṅdu] “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 †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-ṅbu-ru i-ṅdu-na. – Further evidence for the phonemc 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-110 but by “lengthen-

---

108 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).”

109 Cf. the table in 1.3.3.

110 For details cf. 3.2.1.1.
ing” ŋ into n, which results in phonemic oppositions of the type -ńd- vs. -nd- etc.\textsuperscript{111} Cp., e.g., the transitive verb \textipa{ańndani}\textsuperscript{112} “to burn” and its verbal noun \textipa{eńdun} with the causative \textipa{andani} “to (let) burn” and its verbal noun, \textipa{endun}. Another example is the intransitive verb \textipa{eńgeni} “to know, understand”; its verbal noun \textipa{eńgun} forms a minimal pair with the verbal noun \textipa{engan} belonging to the causative \textipa{angan} “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, \textipa{angan} “to (let) burn” and its verbal noun, \textipa{and} un. Another example is the intransitive verb \textipa{eńgeni} “to know, understand”; its verbal noun \textipa{eńgun} forms a minimal pair with the verbal noun, \textipa{eńgun} belonging to the causative \textipa{angan} “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, \textipa{ańngan} “to let know” has to be derived through the intermediate forms *ańngan ← *ańg-va-ni ← *ańg-va-ni from an obsolete a-stem verb *ańgan with the transitive-active meaning “to understand, recognise (something)” as corresponding to the inactive \textipa{eńgeni} “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.) kańburu “(black)smith” which, through an intermediate form like Pkt., Pa. kammāra-, goes back to OIA karmāra- “id.”\textsuperscript{113} Such cases seem to be exceptional, though; cp. the counterexamples Sinh. (= A.) ańba, M. ańbu, F. ańbo “mango” with Pkt., Pa. ambā- (but OIA āmra- “mango”, fruit and tree)\textsuperscript{114}. Sinh. ańbu “wife, mother”, M.A. ańbi, F. ańbu “wife” with Pkt., Pa. ambā- ← OIA ambā- “mother”;\textsuperscript{115} Sinh. (= M.) ińguru, A.F. ińgiri “ginger” with Pa. singivera-, OIA śrṅgaverā- “id.”;\textsuperscript{116} Sinh. hańda/sańda, M. hańdu, A. hańda, F. hańdo “moon” with Pa. candā-, OIA candrā- “moon, moonlight”\textsuperscript{117} 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. ińdańgū vs. A.F. uńdagū “difficult”; M. kuruńbāva vs. A.F. kuruńba “young drinking coconut”; F. ūṇdaga vs. A. ūṇda “big green locust”. Usually the southern vernaculars show a stronger tendency towards the plain stops. An exception to this rule is M. bońdu vs. A. bońda, F. bońdo “big, large”.

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

Sinhalese has a few variants of this kind as well; cf. siceńdu vs. sīńdu “ocean, river” (← OIA sīndhu- “river, Indus; ocean”\textsuperscript{118}) or magańl-a vs. mańgul-a “happiness, good fortune, festival” (← OIA mańgala- “auspicious sign, happiness”\textsuperscript{119}).

\textsuperscript{111} This must not be confused with the paradigmatic change of -ńd/-nn- occurring in the n-stem class of verbs; cf. 3.2.2.

\textsuperscript{112} For the etymology of this verb cf. 3.9.2.2.2.

\textsuperscript{113} Cf. Geiger (1941), 37, no. 547 and Turner (1966) I, 147, no. 2898.

\textsuperscript{114} Cf. Geiger (1941), 9, no. 133; Turner (1966) I, 57, no. 1268.

\textsuperscript{115} Cf. Geiger (1941), 188, no. 2849 and Turner (1966) I, 25, no. 574.

\textsuperscript{116} Cf. Geiger (1941), 20, no. 306; Turner (1966) II, 730, no. 12588.

\textsuperscript{117} Cf. Geiger (1941), 179, no. 2699; Turner (1966) II, 774, no. 13415.

\textsuperscript{118} 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. same, L2 4,1 and L3 2/2,3, and the compound dia-sin “water line”, L3 4/1,2 etc., spelt dyasin in L4 c/2,6), co-occurring with /ima/ in the earliest lômâfanus (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/hina/sima, Pa. Pkt. Skt. simâ- “id.”). 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 Ḥusain, which besides the original orthography (ḥus(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 (s)usein in an Evēla akuru lômâfanu (L2, 36,3).


In medial position, the change /s/ → /h/ has infected inherited words without any exception in all Maldivian dialects; cp., e.g., *divesti → A.M.F. divehi “islander”; *mesi → M.A. mehi, F. mēhi “fly”; *jasan¯i → M.A.F. jahan¯i “beat” (trans.) etc. Mediial /s/ was conserved only when it was geminated for morphonological reasons.125

Word-final -s has remained unchanged in northern Dhivehi and in Addû while it developed into /h/ in Fua’ 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/ “ground, soil”), F. bihi /bis/ “egg” (M.A. bis), F. goho /gos/ “going, having gone” (absolutive of dan¯i “to go”; M.A. gos) etc.126

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. alan¯asi “Ananas”,127 M.A.F. m¯usun “monsoon, season”,128 M.A.F. gam¯is “shirt”,129 etc. The

120 Cf. Geiger (1941), 22, no. 341; Turner (1966) II, 775, no. 13435.
124 Cf. also 1.2.1.6.
125 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.
126 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 Huvadû cf. 1.3.6.3.
127 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.
The consonants

deviation of M.A.F. siṭṭi “letter” seems to be more complicated. If the word had emerged from OIA *ciṣṭa- “message”130 directly or through an intermediate (not attested) MIA form, we would expect neither initial s- nor medial -t-.131 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 siṭṭi is Hi. ciṭṭhi “letter”;132 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. saṇṭu ← MIA canda- “moon”).

1.3.6. In the more recent past, Dhivehi has been affected by two remarkable sound changes: \( /p \rightarrow f / \) and \( /t \rightarrow s \).133 It is not possible, however, to establish the exact date of these changes, because \( \langle f \rangle \) and \( \langle s \rangle \) 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 number134; IDMD 2.4) and apuremence “our” (pers./poss.pron., 1.pl.gen.135; RB 1,11) as against their Tāna equivalents jasvana (ITMHM 4.3; ITAM 1,6) and afuremence (RC 3,13). For Dives akuru \( \langle ṭ \rangle \) vs. Tāna (\( \langle ṡ \rangle \)) , cp. jotu (absolutive of kurānī “to make, do”;136 attested 209 times, beginning with L1 d/1,2), ṭaṭu “island, land” (attested 84 times, beginning with L1 [f/2,1] as well) as against koṣā (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 \( p \rightarrow f \) and \( t \rightarrow s \) (in initial and medial position). PYRARD, who sojourned in the Maldives from 1602 to 1607, noted \( \langle p \rangle \) in his wordlist in all cases concerned, while CHRISTOPHER, who came to the Maldives in 1834, already wrote \( \langle ṭ \rangle \) without any exception. Examples from PYRARD’s list are \( \langle ali-paṇ \rangle \) (M. ali-fān) “fire”, \( \langle penne \rangle \) (M. fen) “water”, \( \langle Buraspaṭey \rangle \) (M. burāṣfāti) “Thursday”, \( \langle piohy \rangle \) (M. fiōhi) “knife”, \( \langle niaptaṭy \rangle \) (M. niapati) “finger nail” and the name of the island \( \langle Mas-pilla-spoury \rangle \) (cf. M. fasū “small islet, sand bank”); in contrast to these spellings, CHRISTOPHER’s list shows \( \langle ali-fang \rangle \), \( \langle feng \rangle \), \( \langle Burasfati \rangle \), \( \langle fiōhi \rangle \), \( \langle niapati \rangle \). 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.

\[128\] Cf. Arab. mausim “season, time of festivities and harvest” (WEHR 1958, 950); cf. also YULE-BURNELL (1902), 577.
\[129\] ← Arab. qamīṣ (cf. WEHR 1958, 504).
\[130\] Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 262, no. 4832.
\[131\] For details on the development of -t- → -st-, cf. 1.3.6.1.
\[132\] 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.
\[133\] For detailed information on the geminates -pp- and -tt- cf. 1.3.9.6.
\[134\] For the ordinal numbers cf. 2.5.2.
\[135\] For details cf. 2.6.2.3.1.2.
\[136\] For details on this irregular absolutive formation cf. 3.10.4.
1.3.6.1. For an exact dating of the change of $t \rightarrow ʃ$, 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 $\ell/\ell$ was not realised as $[t]$ any longer in medial position. The spellings $\langle$caré$\rangle$ “ripe coconut” (M. kāšī), $\langle$tori$\rangle$ “peel, shell, bark” (M. toṣī), $\langle$ystarin$\rangle$ “hair” (M. istori), $\langle$are$\rangle$ “eight” (M. aṣe’ laš-kel, indef. form) as well as the name of the island $\langle$Maspillaspoury$\rangle$ indicate that medial -r- 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 $\langle$kárhi$\rangle$ “ripe coconut”, $\langle$rorhi$\rangle$ “flat bread” (M. roṣī), $\langle$bárhi$\rangle$ “eggplant” (M. baṣī), or $\langle$forhi$\rangle$ “box” (M. foṣi), while in the case of $\langle$tori$\rangle$ “bark”, $\langle$istori$\rangle$ “hair” or $\langle$tori$\rangle$ “plate, dish” (M. tuṣī) he used plain (t) as PYRARD did. GEIGER, who styled this spirant “a sound peculiar to Máldivian, difficult to describe” (1919, 115 / 1986, 116; 1901-1902, III, 127), transcribed it with (r), while BELL used (t). The pronunciation of medial $\ell/\ell$ (← $\ell$/) as a palatal spirant similar to ř can still be heard in Fua’ Mulaku and also from the speakers of the “palace language” in Māle, who alternate between [t] and [ɹ] without phonological reasons. It is only on the basis of an intermediate pronunciation [huri] that the peculiar development of the participal form M. huri (← huṭi, cp. A. hiṣī, F. hiṣī [long form] and H. huṭi, cf. below) can be explained.

1.3.6.2. In the vernacular of Huvadū, the retroflex $\ell/\ell$ is preserved in its original quality without any exception, as the following examples illustrate: H. kauṭi “ripe coconut” (M. kāšī, A.F. kaišī), H. galahutte gen./loc. “(on) the island Galafushi” (i.e. “stone-sandbank”, ← gala-hutye ← gala-juṭi-e, cf. A.F. gen./loc. fiše), H. huṭi part.pret. “being, remaining; standing” (A. hiṣī, F. hiṣī, M. huri, cf. M. hunnanī “to stand, remain, be”; 3.9.2.2.1). The same holds true for the inherited ending of the dative, -aṭa, 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. doraṭa dat. “(to) the door” vs. M.A. dora’/l-asl, F. doraha; H. mattaṭ “upward(s)” vs. A. maṭṭa’, M. macca’/l-asl, F. mattaha (dat. of the i-stem mati “top; above”).

1.3.6.3. The fricative $\ell/\ell$ which had emerged from $p/l$ in the whole Dhivehi speaking area, finally developed into $\ell/\ell$ 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”), or M. kulaṇḍuru hūḥi, F. keraindul hihi vs. A. keraṇḍuru fuθi “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. fuθa “navel” vs. West-H. hūla (cf. M.A.F. fuθu). 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 $s \rightarrow h$ which can be observed in Dhivehi in general has reached a higher level in Huvadū than anywhere else in this language.

137 For more information on this sociolect cf. the introduction, 0.9.2.
138 On the particular problem of the dative ending in Fua’ Mulaku cf. 2.3.1.1.3.
139 For details cf. 2.6.2.3.1.2.
1.3.7. **The phonemes /l/ and /n/:**

In contrast to Sinhalese where the retroflex lateral /l/ coincided with /l/ in pronunciation which led to a permanent confusion in orthography, Dhivehi has preserved the phonemic difference between the laterals. The retroflex /n/, which has also phonetically coincided with its dental counterpart /n/ in Sinhalese, has lost its phonemic status in Standard Dhivehi, 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” with dental /n/ in the standard language, while the Addu and Fua’ Mulaku dialects show a distinctive retroflex /n/ in A. *fani*, F. *fæni* “worm”. An example of a minimal pair that is only distinguished by the two phonemes /l/ and /l/ is M.A.F. *ali* “light” (noun and adj.) vs. M.A. *əli*, F. *əli* “ash, grey”.

Some further examples of words containing /l/ and /n/ are M.A.F. *kuku* “hen”; M. *ato* “atoll”, A.F. *ate* “bean”; M. *to* “bean”; A. *te* “bean”; M.A. *ku* “(fresh water) pond, tank, lake”; M. *finolu*, A. *finola*, F. *finolo* “sandbank (island)”; M.A.F. *næli* “Maldavian weight unit of about 1 kilogram” etc. — For the correspondence of M. *nu* – A.F. *ɖo* cf. M. *dɔni* vs. A.F. *dɔn* “common Maldivian boat type”; M. *hũnu* vs. A.F. *hũnu* “warm, hot”; M. *ukunu* vs. A.F. *ukuṇu* “flea, louse”; M. *kunu* vs. A.F. *kuni* “dirt, dirty, rotten”; M. *dɔni* vs. A.F. *dɔn* “bird”; M. *dekuṇu* vs. A.F. *dekuṇu* “sandbank (island)” etc.

1.3.7.2. There are some isolated examples of a **correspondence of M. /l/ and A.F.  /d/ in Dhivehi.** Besides the words M. *furálu* / A. *feráda* “roof” and M. *rúli* / A. *ridi* “anger, temper”, which are doubtful from an etymological point of view, we have to note M. *valu* / A. *vāda*, F. *vado* “well” which is related to Sinh. *vala* “hole, pit”. This word originates from...
OIA *avatá*—“hole in the ground” which through Pkt. *avada* developed directly into southern Dhivehi A. *vada*, F. *vado*. The development of *d* into *l* which we observe both in northern Dhivehi and in Sinhalese, must be secondary as against this.

The verb M. *ulení* “to live, be, behave” with its equivalents A. *vēndení* and F. *vēndin*, must be considered within the same framework. While in the modern standard language and in Addū, the inflection of this verb shares the pattern of the *e*-stems, the Fua 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. *ulen* vs. A. *vēnden* and F. *vēndin*, or the 1.ps.sg.pret. M. *ulunin* vs. A. *vēndenin*, F. *vēndunin*. 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 *l* and *nd*, there are also some older variants of the verb which speak in favour of an etymological relation. For the older standard language, two variant forms of the part.pres. of this verb are attested, viz. *velena* (L4 e/1,1) and *vulena* (L4 c/2,4; L2 22,3 etc.). It seems obvious that *vu-* represents a later development here, just as -*o-* in *atolu* is opposed to -*e-* in older *atelu*. 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 *l*-*d*-correspondence is provided by the dialectal variants of the part.pret. of *kurānī* “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. *kedē*. In all probability, the *e* vowel of the southernmost dialects represents an earlier phonological stage here, too, just as -*o-* in *atolu* is opposed to -*e-* in older *atelu*. 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).

1.3.8. Like Sinhalese, Dhivehi does not tolerate consonant clusters in any position. Thus, all words that show consonant clusters in initial or final position must be of foreign origin; cp., e.g., M. *gasd* “intention” ← Arab. *gasd* “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. *‘ūht*), 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; fairhaded, lightskinned” + *kel* “longish fruit”; M.A. *domveli*, F. *domvêli* “fine, white coral sand” ← *don* “bright, light” (s.a.) + M.A. *veli*, F. *vêli* “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

150 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.
151 Cf. also 3.9.2.2.4.
152 For more details cf. 3.9.1.1.3.
153 A detailed account of this participle is given in 3.9.2.2.5. For Sinh. *kaḷa* “done” cf. GEIGER (1938), 57.
154 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; *tarjumā “translation” ← Arab. *tarğa mat; *vagutu “time” ← Arab. *waqut; *iskuru “screw” ← Engl. *screw; *furatama “at first” ← *pratama (L2 33,2) ← Skt. *prathamā-; M. *burāṣfati (this spelling is already attested in ITAG 3,2 and ITFM 2,6), F. *berāṣfati, A. *berāsetti (with -sf- → -ss-) “Thursday” ← *bri/ahaspati ← Skt. *bhṛhaspāti- “name of a deity / the planet Jupiter” (cf. also Sinh. *bhṛhaspatindā / brahaspatindā, Skt. *bhṛhaspatisiva- / bhṛhaspativāra- “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.155 Most of the geminates that occur in contemporary Dhivehi can be explained by secondary assimilations of different consonants,156 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 sandhi157 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 ⟨cC⟩, while ⟨CC⟩158 is used less often (e.g. evvana “(the) first”,159 now written ⟨e’vana⟩ 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 ratvesyaku already in F11,28, in the 18th century. Dhiv. *raṭvēhi- corresponds to Sinh. ratavāsi(yā) “inhabitant or native of a country”, which according to GEIGER has to be traced back through an intermedi-
ate form like Pa. *rathra-vāsi(n)- to Skt. *rāṣṭra-vāsin- (from OIA rāṣṭra- “kingdom, country” + vāsin- “inhabiting”\(^{160}\)). While the geminate -tt- in *rāṭtehi is the result of a progressive assimilation of -tv-, the form *ravvehi, which is no longer associated with *rāṭtehi 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 *rāṭvehi 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. *ra´t/ra´s “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 *ra´tvehi. While *ra´t 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 *avatveriā “neighbour” (lit. “village-person”; M. ava´/avaś/ ← /avatl “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. hirvaru /hit-varul “courage, encouragement” (hi’/hit “heart, mind, feeling”; varu “force, size, greatness”); M. k`we /k`i-vel “why” (cf. 2.6.7.2.5), M. eves lek-vesl, 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 morphological 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 morphological 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 Addū; the gen./loc.sg. in Addū and Fua’ Mulaku; the abl./instr. in Fua’ Mulaku. The effect of these morphological rules may be illustrated with two nouns of this type which are in use nowadays:

\(^{160}\) 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. ece', F. ette' but A. etta’, has to be derived from *eti-ek/*eti-ak through the intermediate stage *etyek/etyak.\(^{161}\) Other current forms are: M. dat.sg. ecca’ /leti-āś; F. gen.sg. ette leeti-el, dat.sg. ettaha leeti-āś, abl. etten leeti-ēn; A. nom.sg.def. etta leti-āl; gen.sg.def. ettā leti-āl, dat.sg.def. etta’ leti-āś, abl.sg.def. ettāin leti-ā-in; the distributional plural form M. ecceti, A.F. eteti leeti-etiti “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. mace’a, A. matta’, F. mattaha /mati-āś “to the top; up (to), upwards” (cp. the early attested form matyata in L2 5,1); gen./loc. A.F. matte /mati-ēl “on the surface, at/on the top, overhead”.

1.3.9.2.2. In the standard language, the affrication of final -ti is due to a certain kind of sandhi,\(^{162}\) when adjectives in predicative position precede the quotation marker -ē l-evel.\(^{163}\) Cf. M. rīti “beautiful” as against mi kotari rīceē /rīti-evel “this room is beautiful” or M. hiti “bitter” as against sai hiceē /hiti-evel “(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 morphonological 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 ← *kudjā ← *kudi-ā the indefinite form is affected as well by the affrication; cp. M. kujje’ ← *kujjek ← *kudi-ek “a child”.\(^{164}\) — 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 kalamījja 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 ⟨kalaminjja⟩ (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. raṭje (cf. divehi raṭje as the official name of the Maldives) and A.F. rāddde, represents a sanskritism. While the form rāddyə (Skt. rājya- “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 rāddee (F5,13; F6,10; F7,13,20; F8,18; F13,2; F10,12,15; F11,9,17; IDME 3,25 and 27), rāṭde (F3,8,11), rāndye (F9,4; RB 1,3), rānjē (RC 8,7), rājjē (with Arab. ⟨⟩ 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.

\(^{161}\) 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.

\(^{162}\) For the sandhi rules cf. 1.6.

\(^{163}\) Cf. 2.4.

\(^{164}\) 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. jja’m ← *diam, 2./3.ps.sg. and 3.ps.pl. jje ← *dja ← 1.3.9.12.1 and 3.2.1.1.165 The historical development is clearly shown by the early attestations of M. vejje “became”, 3.ps.sg. pret.IV of vanī “become”, viz. vaddya (F10,18), vaddye (F5.21.24; IDMHHM 4,21), vaddye (F10,10), vejja (spelled ‘venja’; RC 29.11) and ‘vejje’ (RC 5.3 and 30.13); the earliest attestations of the contemporary form vejje (spelled ‘vejje’) 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 palatalization of -n- preceding a stem-final -i in combination with the indefinite suffix is restricted to northern Dhivehi. Cf. the indefinite forms dōnī ← *dōnye ← *dōnie ← *dōni-ek166 “a boat” (M. dōni “boat, ship”) or dānī ← *dānye ← *dāni-ek “a bird” (M. dānī “bird”).167 The same holds true for the ending of the dative (dōnīa, dānīa’ /-aʃ/).

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. divehi “Maldavian” vs. the nom.sg.indef. M.F. divesse’/divesi-ekl, A. divessa’/divesi-akl (← *divu-vesi “islander”168). While the nouns ending in -hi (← -si) have survived as a comparatively homogeneous group in Adžu, they were subject to morphonological simplifications in Fua’ Mulaku and even more so in the standard language.169 Cf. M.A. mehi, F. mēhi “fly” ← *mesi (cp. the Sinh. stem māsī/-mahi- ← Skt. māskā- “fly, bee”170), where in Adžu -s- is preserved within the geminate -ss- almost throughout the paradigm while we find a compensatory change of -s- to -h- in Fua’ Mulaku: cf. A. nom.def. mesā’/mesi-əl, nom. indef. messa’/mesi-akl (besides mēhā / mēha’), gen. messe’/mesi-el, dat. messa’/mesi-aʃl vs. F. nom.indef. (only) mēhe’/mesi-ekl, gen. mēhe’/mesi-el, dat. mēha’/mesi-aʃl.

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-və-ni (cf. 1.3.9.12.1 and 3.2.1.1).

165 For more details cf. 3.11.4.5.1.
166 For the loss of /n/ in the standard language cf. 1.3.7.
167 The statement of HLSD (1988), 15 according to which “a morphophonemic feature of Divine is that morphemes containing the dental nasal ‘n’ in the final syllable ... replace this nasal by ‘iₐ’ 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 n cf. 1.3.10.
168 On “divu “island” cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4 (s.v. uren ← varen); for *vesi “inhabitant” cf. 1.3.9.1.
169 For details and examples cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.2 and 2.3.2.11.3.3 (Adžu), 2.3.2.8.1.4.4 and 2.3.2.12.5.2 (Fua’ Mulaku) and 2.3.2.9.1.3.1 (Māle).
170 Cf. Geiger (1941), 133, no. 1975 s.v. māssā and Turner (1966) II, 554, no. 9696 s.v. maksā-.
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; it second part is M. mē, A.F. mei “liver”.171 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 -pu ˙lu (→ -fu ˙lu) 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. a ˙lu ← *at-pu ˙lu “hand of a person of high social status” and dappulu ← *dat-pu ˙lu “tooth of a person of high social status”. Most probably, the island name dappoli (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. hifāni ← *sipanī “to hold, catch (something)” with its causative hipanī ← *hīpvani ← *hīpa-va-nī “to let hold, let catch; stick” (cf. also the substantive M.A.F. hīppī “sticker”, reflecting the part,pret. “sticked” of the causative hipanī); cp. also kafāni ← *kapanī “to cut (something)” with the simple causative (meanwhile being obsolete) *kapanī ← *ka-va-nī “to let cut” and the double causative (cf. 3.2.1.1.1) M. kapavāni “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 raṭṭēhi ← *rat-vesi “friend, compatriot” and avaṭṭerīā ← *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. koṭāni ← *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 *koṭīni ← *kota-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. putī in L1 mx/2,1, L2 9,2 etc.; cf. M. fuśi, A. jiši, F. jiši “small island”) and koṭṭāi ← *koṭī-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. koši “cage”).

171 The etymology of mē l 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‘ ← *raś-fuš “landscape, rural district” (for ra‘ /raš “land, island”) cf. 1.3.9.1; putu as the previous form of /fus/- “back, surface, top side” is attested, e.g., as a locative asu pute “on horse back” in L1 (d/1,4); cf. also Geiger172 who connects /ju ru/ “side” (his spelling ḥ means /š ← /f/) with Sinh. piṭa ← OIA prṣṭhā- “back, hind part”; M. fussu‘ ← *fuś-fuš “grain, cereals” (distributive plural “corn by corn”, cf. 2.3.2.5); M. fu’ /fus/- “flour” corresponds to Sinh. piṭi “crushed, ground; flour”173; A. daffa “sole of the foot” ← *daš(u)-fā, actually “underside of the foot” (cf. the earlier form /datu/ in L2 22,2; L5 5/1,2; F3,6; F10,19 etc. and datu in RC 5,12 “underside, bottom”; datun 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-174; A. effahara lek faharasaši “one time, once (upon a time)” (e’ lek/ num. “one”; /fahar-as/- dat. of A. faharaśāra, 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. niukāri ińit-kuril “forehead” (cf. M. ni’ ińil “forehead”); M. ebbas “agreement” (leki “one” + /bas/- “word, language”); M.A.F. emme lek-me/ “all, entire, whole”175. It cannot be excluded that M.A.F. udāndī /luk-daṇḍi “sugar cane” reflects a loan compound from Sinhalese (cf. Sinh. uk, uk-danda, also ik, ugu, i ngu “sugar cane” ← OIA ikṣu- “id.”176).

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. aditta “Sunday” (sanskritism; cf. 1.2.1.1); M.A.F. buddi “mind, intellect, spirit” (sanskritism; cf. Skt., Pa. buddhi-, Pkt. buddhi- “intelligence, discernment”177; M. budda “old man” (mot savant; cf. Pa., Pkt. buddha- “old”)178; M.A.F. tayyar-ū/-a/-o “ready” (← Pers. tayyār “ready”); M. mudarris “teacher” (← Arabic “id.”); M.A.F. billūri “(of) glass” (← Arab. billaṛī, billaurī “crystal, of glass”); M. muazzif “employee, official” (Arab. muważza/ “id.”; cf. WEHR 1958, 960); etc.


### 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. *berāsetti* 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. -tt- in M. *kattala*, A. *kattela* “sweet potato, batata” as well as A. -gg- vs. F. -jj- in A. *eggom* (nom.def. eggomā), F. *ejjun* “single blossom of the coconut tree”.183 From a phonological point of view, these correspondences cannot be explained yet.

### 1.3.9.10
When a consonant stem ending in /-tt/ 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. *ațila lat-tițal* vs. A.F. *at-tela lat-telal* “palm” (*latl* “hand, arm” + M. *tīla*, A.F. *tela* “shallow (water); blade”); M. *ađađiđi* vs. A.F. *đađiđi* “arm” (*lati* “hand, arm” + *đađiđi* “stick”); M. *đađiđi* vs. A.F. *đađolji* “chin; jaw(bone)” (*lđol* “teeth” + *đol* “cheekbone”); A. *dakkaśi* /dat-kaśil “alveols” (*kaśi* “bone”); M. *raigā* vs. A. *ragga*, F. *raggal* /rat-gall “red coral” (lit. “red stone”, *ratl* adj. “red” + *gall* “stone”); M. *ramaś* vs. A. *rammas*, F. *rammaha* /rat-mas/ “soldier fish” (actually “red fish”, *ratl* “red” + /masl/ “fish”).

### 1.3.9.11
While in the standard language -rr- in *sirra* “secret” (← Arab. *sirr* “secret, mystery”) is articulated as a geminated alveolar vibrant, the ablative form A. /sirrun/ shows a regular dissimilation into [sidrun]. 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. *fattanē* ← *fatvanē* ← *fata-vanē* “to sink” (trans.),184 actually “to let swim, cause to swim”, from the basic verb *fatanē* “to swim”; M.F. *duvanē*, A. *divvanē* “to drive, ride, sail”, lit. “to let run, cause to run”, from M.F. *duvanē*, A. *divvanē* “to run”; M.A.F. *jassanē* ← *jasvanē* “to land, turn (on)” from M.A.F. *jahanē* ← *jasanē* “to beat, kick, blow”. M.A.F. *dakkanē* “to show”, lit. “to let see” is derived from the transitive verb

---

182 Cf. CARTER 1936, 61.
183 This word is unknown in the standard language. For the single blossom the common word meaning “flower, blossom”, *mā lmalī* is used here instead.
184 *fattanē* does not exist in Addū; for the causative meaning “to sink” the suppletive verb *heruvanē* is used.
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*dakani* “to look” which is obsolete in the modern standard language (but cp. the intr. verb M. dekeni “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. dakunei, F. dakan). M. rissan “to ache”, lit. “to let ache” (e.g. bolugā /-gai/ rissan “to have a headache”, lit. “to cause pain in the head”) is derived from the trans. *risan* (cf. M.A.F. riheini ← *risen* intr. “to ache”). From a formal point of view, M.A.F. huttani trans. “to stop, finish” together with its intransitive derivative, huttani “to stop”, are causatives of the irregular n-stem verb M. hunnan, A. hinnei, F. hinn “to stand; remain, be” (cf. the part.pret. Old Dhiv. huti, A. hiši, F. hiši, and Sinh. hitinavā 185). The transitive verb M.A.F. kakkan “to cook” formally is a causative of the non-attested basic *kakan*, cf. the intr. verb keken “to boil” (of liquids).

1.3.9.12.2. The whole morphological pattern of n-stem verbs such as M. bannan “to tie”, innan “to sit, marry, be married”, dannan “to know, understand”, hunnan “to stand, stay, remain, be”, vannan “to enter” etc. 186 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. koppani /koʃjanil “to push” is composed of ko’ /koʃl “doing, making” (abs. of kurani “to do, make”) and a (nowadays obsolete) verb *pani with unknown meaning, which seems also to be the second part of M.A.F. lappani (la’pani) “to close” (as to the verbal constituent la’ which cannot yet be explained, cf. M. laggan (la’gan) “to float, drift ashore; toss” = A. lavvan; the infixation of the negation particle ni in the negated 3.ps.sg.pres. A. la’ni vei “(it) is not tossed” proves that la’ must be an independent word which is used as a constituent of a compound verb here). One more compound verb containing the absolutive /koʃli/ is M. kollan “koʃlanil. The exact meaning of this verb is “to put down (by doing)”; it only occurs in M. dū kollan “to leave” (lit. “to put down slackening” = “to leave by slackening [the boat]”). — The first part of M. ekkurani lek-kuran “to add, mix” consists of the numeral e’ /lek/; thus, the basic meaning of the verb can be translated with “to make (in) one”. — M. hikkan “to let dry” (only in M. dia-hikkan “to bail water from a leaky boat”) obviously is a denominative verb; cf. M.A.F. hiki “dry”. — M.A.F. vikkran “to sell” goes back to the present stem Skt. vi-kri ˙n (Pa. vikki ˙n, Pkt. vikka-) “to sell” 187 via *vikina-, *vikna-, the geminate reflecting the older sequence of -kn-.

1.3.10. Loan phonemes

While in HLSD (1988, 14), ŋ is described as a phoneme of its own, 188 DE SILVA (1969, 204) analyses ŋ 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 diňne ← *dûnye ← *dûniek ← *dûni-ek “a bird”, the secondary geminated ŋ of which is hardly phonemic. 189 There are some isolated words with initial ŋ- in Dhivehi, however,

185 For the etymology of hunnan cf. 3.9.2.2.1.
186 A complete list of the n-stem verbs is given in 3.4.2.3.
187 Cf. TURNER 1966, II, 678, no. 11640.
188 “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 (fiaviani).”
189 For details about the geminate ŋ cf. 1.3.9.4.
the ñ of which cannot be analysed as a sequence of \( n \) and \( y \) by means of morphonological 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,\(^{190}\) M.A. ñäk “aimless, foolish talk”; ñëku “mentally retarded”; ñakas “a sexual practice”; ñam ñam (ñamu ñamu) “a tropical fruit”, bot. “Cynometra caulifloræ” (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, \( nî \) (cf. modern A.F. \( nî \) vs. M. \( nîu \)) 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 \( \check{h} \). In most cases it is pronounced in its original phonetic value as \( [x] \). Cp., e.g., M.A.F. tärîx “date, chronicle, history” ← Arab. târî “id.”; A.F. xâdîma “servant” ← Arab. hâdím “male servant”, hâdîma “female servant”; M. alî buxairî, A. alî boxairî “Bukhârâ plum” ← Pers. ālu-boxârâ “(dried) prune” etc.

1.3.10.2. There is one more loan phoneme, which can often be heard in its original phonetic quality, viz. \( ż \). Cf. M.A.F. tâzâ “fresh” ← Pers. tâza “id.”, M. bâzâru, A. bâzâra “(oriental) bazaar, market” ← Arab./Pers. bâzâr etc. In contrast to that, we find the original voiced fricative \( ẓ \) substituted by \( -d- \) in earlier loanwords; cp., e.g., namâdu “prayer” (attested since L1 \( d/2,1 \)) ← Pers. namâž).\(^{191}\)

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. hâgîgî “real” ← Arab. haqîqî “id.”, M. faqîru, A.F. fakîrî “poor” ← Arab. faqîr “id.”; M.A.F. bagîcâ “garden” ← Pers. bâgîcâ “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 Tâna:

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Tâna & T & O & S & Ş & Ş\textacute{} & Q & Q & Q & Q & Q \\
\hline
Arabic & \( h \) & \( a \) & \( o \) & \( l \) & \( k \) & \( p \) & \( r \) & \( s \) & \( t \) & \( ñ \) & \( ñ \) \\
transcribed & \( h \), \( x \) & \( h \) & \( \check{h} \) & \( d \) & \( s \) & \( İ \) & \( ĝ \) & \( q \) & & & \\
\hline
Tâna & Q & Q & Q & Q & Q & Q & Q & Q & Q & Q \\
\hline
Arabic & T & O & S & Ş & Ş\textacute{} & Q & Q & Q & Q & Q \\
transcribed & \( z \) & \( d \) & \( ĝ \) & \( w \) & \( r \) & \( İ \) & \( ğ \) & \( ž \) & \( ž \) & \( ž \) \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\(^{190}\) The examples noted here are taken from the monolingual dictionary of Dhivehi (NCLHR 1985-91, 15, 1); \( \ddot{H} \)ASSAN SA’Äd confirmed that they are used in Addu as well.

\(^{191}\) For this type of substitutions cf. GIPPERT (forthcoming).
Examples of Arabic words transcribed into Tāna:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Tāna</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Tāna</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>urAbuG</td>
<td>L£G§H¯</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>ur@he</td>
<td>LÆG˙</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stone</td>
<td>urajaH</td>
<td>LÆG®G≈</td>
<td>ambergris</td>
<td>urab@na&gt;</td>
<td>LÆG§M¿Gˆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alms</td>
<td>utAqadaS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>£G˙G¨G-</td>
<td>wine</td>
<td>ur@maX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filter</td>
<td>umAdiW</td>
<td>?LwZG¨GB</td>
<td>beat</td>
<td>uY@saw</td>
<td>LÿM#Gz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain</td>
<td>unAb@^uP</td>
<td>Lx£NG†Hf</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>ur@biZ</td>
<td>?LÆM†Gg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midday</td>
<td>uruhuF</td>
<td>LÆH¡H˜</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>uqIraY</td>
<td>L›M&gt;GÆG%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td>uday</td>
<td>L¨G&gt;</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>uY@saw</td>
<td>LÿM#Gz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>month</td>
<td>ur@haV</td>
<td>LÆM¡G$</td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>u&gt;AkuC</td>
<td>Y£G¸He</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.


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. As a matter of fact, there is no word in Dhivehi which consists of only one long vowel.


192 For more details cf. 1.2.1.6.

1.4.4. Word structures like CVVCVCV as well as longer sequences of syllables occur in compound words only. Cp., e.g., M.A. vāredunī, F. vārehedunī “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 [']. Thus, there are oppositions like M. ĕyä – A. ĕiau “shadow”, M. fiya – A.F. fi “1) petal, 2) wing” or M. tarie, tariyē – A.F. tarie / tari-ekl “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 ['] 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 aksaras containing y-. We have to consider in this connection that there was no word-initial y- in Dhivehi, inherited /y/ having developed into /l/ 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. bōnda, F. bōndo “big, large”; M.A.F. tīki “drop”; M.A.F. bākari “goat”; M. ātolu, A.F. ātele “atoll”. — M.A.F. nāli “weight unit, ca. 1 kg”; M.A.F. mūsun “monsoon, season”; M.A.F. bēsverīa “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 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. dīvēhi “islander, insular”, i.e. “Maldivian”, indef.sg. M.F. dīvēsse’, A. dīvēssā’ “a Maldivian (man or woman)”; A. fiēhi, M.F. fiōhi “knife”, indef.sg. A. fiōssa’, M.F. fiōsse’ “a knife”; A. kiēhi “saw”, indef.sg. kiēssa’ “a saw” (no exact M.F. equivalent).

---

193 Cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2.2.
194 Cf. F. nom.sg. kēhā, indef. kēhē’ and M. nom. kēs.
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. bāppā “father”, A.F. māmmā “mother” (M. bāppa, māmma).

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. bakamānu, A.F. bakamānu “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‘ 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’ labān195 → [rud-labān] (T6, 26.31) “bending the coconut trees down”
F. /lenek rukahal/ → ene’ rukaha → [ened-rukaha] (T4, 44) “to another coconut tree”.

1.6.2. The realisation of geminates196 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-etere/ → de ru’ dētere → [de rud-dētere] (T4, 44a) “between two coconut trees”.

1.6.3. In the Addū dialect, final -’ ← l-š, -k, -tl, occurring in the position before initial vowel or h, is changed to -t; cf. the following examples:

A. /leage rašaš ebege/ → [eege rašaš ebege] (T16, 35) “he went to his (own) island” (ebege 3.sg.pret. of (M.) danī “to go”)
A. /fiřāndanā gos eñdaš arai/ → [fiřāndanā gos eñdaš 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 arani “to climb”)

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

195 labān ← labagen, abs.III “bending / having bent” of labantī “to bend (down)”; for the contraction of the abs. III frequently occurring in the F. dialect, cf. 3.11.4.3,
196 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:

- \( yo̊tu(-d¯oni) \) “yacht(-boat)” ← Engl. yacht, yag¯ın “certain(ty)” ← Arab. yaq¯ın “id.”; yaum¯ıy¯a “records, chronicle” ← Arab. yaumiyāt “chronicle of everyday life”. For the regular correspondence of Dhiv. \( d- \) and Sinh. \( y- \), DE SILVA listed the following correspondences (1970b, 157-8):
  - M. dan¯ı / Sinh. yanav¯a “to go”; cf. Pa. yāti, but Pkt. jāi “id.” ← OIA y´¯ati “goes, proceeds, moves, walks, travels”.\(^{197}\)
  - 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. jatā-.\(^{199}\)
  - M.A.F. da(ɡãdul/-a/-o) “iron (bar)” / Sinh. ya “iron”; cf. Pa. aya(s)-, Pkt. a(y)a-, OIA áyas- “metal, iron”.\(^{200}\)
  - 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”.\(^{201}\)
  - One more undisputable example which has to be treated in this context is Dhiv. daśu (RC 5,12) ← datu (attested since L2) “underneath”\(^{202}\) as against Sinh. yata adv., postpos. “below, beneath” (← OIA adhástāt).\(^{203}\)

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 \( /l/ \) 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.

---

\(^{197}\) Supplementary remarks as well as corrections as to DE SILVA’s treatise are not particularly noted.

\(^{198}\) Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 604, no. 10452.

\(^{199}\) Cf. GEIGER (1941), 140, no. 2087; TURNER (1966) II, 604, no. 10456.

\(^{200}\) Cf. GEIGER (1941), 140, no. 2081; TURNER (1966) I, 26, no. 590.

\(^{201}\) Cf. GEIGER (1941), 141, no. 2095; TURNER (1966) II, 605, no. 10467.

\(^{202}\) In modern Dhivehi this word has only a locative meaning; cf. loc. M. daśugā, A.F. daš “below, beneath”, abl. M.A.F. daśun “from below”, dat. M.A. daśa’, F. dašaha “down”; Old Dhiv. daśu is a common noun still.

\(^{203}\) 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. sañda/hañda “moon” ← MIA cand-, OIA candrā- “id.”

An inherited initial /j-/ became /d-/ in Sinhalese, as, e.g., in divi “life” ← Pkt. jīv(y)ā- ← OIA jīvitā- “living, life”. 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-. Old medial /-cc-/ became Sinh. /-s/- while an inherited medial /-jj-/ developed into Sinh. /-d/; cf. Sinh. māda “central, middle, centre” ← Pa., Pkt. majjha- ← OIA mádhya- “id.” 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- operated 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/. 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. rāja) 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 in 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). 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〉). 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.

---

204 Cf. GEIGER (1941), 188, no. 2849 and TURNER (1966) I, 252, no. 4661.
205 Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 289, no. 5252.
206 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/ had coincided into the affricate /-jj/), cp. the Sinh. stem behet- “medicine”, a plural form from which the nom.sg. beheta is derived, with the variant 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.
207 However, there seem to be almost no examples attesting this sound change, cf. GEIGER (1938), 49.
209 For more details cf. 1.3.5.
210 Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 618, no. 10679.
211 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\(^{212}\) 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.

\(^{212}\) “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’ Mulaku dialect is of special interest, because here, both systems intermingled with each other. In Fua’ 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.213

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.214 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’ 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 homogene-ous in comparison with the “diffuse” pronouns of Sinhalese.215

---

213 Cf. Geiger (1900), 57 and 63.
214 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.
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\textsuperscript{216}. 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. běnuteri “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 bahuvrihi compounds, cp., e.g., M.A.F. aligada “bright”, lit. “(being) rich (in) light”.\textsuperscript{217}

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 /kaml/, “fact”,\textsuperscript{218} is added to semantically corresponding adjectives and substantives. Cf. M. rīti adj. “beautiful” vs. rītikan “beauty”, M.A.F. ufāveri adj. “glad, happy” vs. ufāverikan “happiness”, A. boṇḍa “big,

\textsuperscript{216} Cf. Geiger (1938), 116 f.
\textsuperscript{217} For more details and examples cf. 2.4.4.
\textsuperscript{218} Dhiv. kan /kaml/, Sinh. kama ← Pa., Pkt. kamma(n)- ← OIA kárman- “act, work”; cf. Turner (1966), I, 147, no. 2892. – In the local grammar, kan is also used as the term for “verb”.
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large” vs. boñdākan “bigness, largeness”, A. fakīrī adj. “poor” (← Arab. faqīr “poor (one)”) vs. fakīrīkan “poverty”; cf. also veri as an originally independent nominal stem meaning “person; leader”219 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 Mulaku version of the fairy tale Mākana “The Crane”, we find ralo-maˈna instead of F. ralo “wave”, mas-maˈna instead of F. maha /masl “fish”, daro-maˈna instead of F. daro “firewood” etc. (further examples in 5.3.3). Possibly -maˈna reflects Dhiv. maˈni “pearl”. This word, albeit being attested already in L1 (f/1,1), is obsolete in the modern language. Most probably the same etymon220 occurs also in M. maniku ← maniku 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. -fuˈlu ← -puˈlu (cf. 1.3.9.6.1) is added to nouns denoting inalienable objects, while -koˈlu 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., iñgili-fuˈlu “finger” or appuˈlu /atpuˈlu “hand” (of a noble person) as against gamīs-koˈlu “shirt” or galam-koˈlu “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.221 Comparing the Sinhalese data with the system we find in Dhivehi, we are forced to

219 For more details cf. 2.3.2.4.1, 2.3.2.4.2.
220 Claus Peter Zoller (personal information) proposes to derive the suffix from OIA manāk “a little” (Pkt. manā etc., cf. Turner 1966, II, 564, no. 9824).
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) 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 and -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.” 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. Cf. also PARANAVITANA’S statement (ib., cxiii): “Ge may therefore be equated with Skt. gehe ‘in the house’, i.e. ‘in the house’.”

222 Basically the distribution of the variant endings in the dialect of Addu 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.

223 In this connection cp. the genitive forms rasunasya (L2 1,5), rasunsya (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 rasum-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).

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.225 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.225 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 -e226 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’ 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. -el-eti, -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-eti “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, madule appears together with the participles ot (otu) (pres./pret.: L2 10,4) and ovuna (pret.pres.: L2 18,4) “being (there), lying”227 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 mūnu “(the) four sides (mūnu, 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 kulaata “to the family/lineage of the village” (attested two times in both L1 g/1,4 and L2 4,5).228

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 -e in the genitive and locative singular; cp., e.g., mal-e “of/in the flower”, gam-e “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

---

225 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.

226 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).

227 For the suppletive distribution of the verbs onnanī “lie, be (there)” and tibēnī “be (there)”, depending on the number of the subjects involved, cf. the detailed information given in 3.14.1.

228 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 unumlauted 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 -ä (cp., e.g., bimä “on the ground”, gamä “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’ 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/-a´s in the standard language as well as in Addū. In Fua’ Mulaku, however, it has the variants -aha, -hā, -aša besides -a/-ašl, depending on the type of the nominal stem and some additional phonological and phonetic criteria. Without any difficulties the ending M.A.F. -a/-ašl and the variant F. -aša 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)ta which through the intermediate stages of Pkt. attham and atthāya (cf. Pa. attham and atthāya) can be derived from Skt. ártham or árthāya, i.e., the acc./dat. of ártha- “aim, cause”. It is difficult to decide, however, whether the two variants F. -aha and -hā represent pure allomorphs of the ending /-ašl, because a phonetic development of inherited t through Š 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. -ahal-hā with a genitive ending -asal/-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 in -assa of Pali and Prakrit. Beginning with the 1st century A.D., these genitives occur in combination with a following -aṭa (-MIA *-attham) or -ataya (-MIA *-atthāya) /-atyā (-MIA *-atthāyē). GEIGER and PARANAVITANA demonstrate this development by means of the dative of saṅgha- “multitude, assembly; community of bhikkhus” (←Skt. saṁgha-, cf. GEIGER 1941, 171, no. 2565), which is attested in inscriptions with and without sandhi in the form saṅgha-ataya/-ye (←*saṅgha-ataya/-ye). GEIGER postulates that Sinh. *saṅgata or *saṅgaṭṭa (←*saṅghaṭṭa, *atthāya) must have been possible forms as well. In the plural, -ata is joined to the gen.pl. in -ana (←-anām). GEIGER illustrates this

---

229 More extensive information as to this will be given in 2.3.2.12.2.
230 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.
231 The genitives in question have the function of denoting an indirect object.
with the formation *savva-sattanata “to all beings”, which occurs in a 4th century inscription and which he derives from *savva-sattanātami. 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 -at (e.g. gamat “to the village”) and -ahat (e.g. maharadhat “to the great king”) as well as pl. forms in -anat (e.g. maha-sahayat “to the great community”; minisnat “to the people”). From the 11/12th century on, -ata, with a secondary final -a, comes into use again (e.g., mituranata “to the friends”). In the 12th century, too, the syncopated formant -a is attested for the first time with a plural meaning (mehe-karuvantat “to the workers”). The other variants continue to be used, as well, together with a pseudo-suffix -hata as in saga-hata which must be explained by a metanalysis of the type sagahata “to the community of bhikkhus” (cf. above). The given development is summed up by Paranavitana as follows: “Having developed so early and merging itself in the gen. ending, -ata and -hata may be considered as dat. case-endings; but when -ata, -hata, or -a 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 -hata given above notwithstanding. This can be illustrated by two Skt. examples of compounds (with a verbal noun as their first member) taken from the Rāmāyana, viz. rakṣa-nārthāya “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 harsanārthāya “for the purpose of frightening” (R. 1.48.7; harsana- “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. minisnat and Old Dhiv. mīsunata (L2 5,1), mīhunat (L6 1,4), mīhunatv 234 (F10,21) “to the people” that can be traced back to underlying genitives without any doubt.

In the case of the dative endings -ahat/-hā and -aśat/-a’, occurring side by side in Fua Mulaku, we may presume with a certain probability that the former variants are based directly on an old genitive ending identical to Sinh. -ahat-asa, while the latter ones in all likelihood developed in the same way as the dative endings M.A. -a’/-aś and Sinh. -(a)ta. Considering the fact that the vernacular of Fua’ 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’ /-aśl as an adverb “excellently” belonging to the adj. barābāru “excellent”.

---


233 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.

234 About the frequent spelling of final /-t/ by ⟨-n⟩ cf. 3.6.3.2.3.
2.3.1.4. The inherited ending of the ablative/instrumental is -in or -un in the standard language and in Addū, while Fua’ 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 Aḍḍū 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 lmas-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. tarín, A. tarin, or the a-stem M.A. aṅga “mouth” with M.A. aṅgaın). -in is also used with those nouns in Aḍḍū that are enlarged by the definite suffix -ā; cp., e.g., mahāin lmas-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’ 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’ Mulaku is the abl./instr. of the indefinite form; cp., e.g., F. kedak-un “of a piece” (F.A. kede = M. kolu “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. 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.

2.3.1.4.1. 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 Aḍḍū (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: (fenā) mašān “from (water and) clay” (RC 1,6236); bolīn “from the shells” (L1 g/2.3; bolī “shell”, obviously meaning a medium of currency here); radīn “in the manner (of)” (L2 21.1 etc.; *rādi “manner, fashion, way”). (2) A frequently attested example of an ablative in -in of an a-stem is hiğrain “since the Hijra”. hiğra, an Arabic loanword, is normally written in Arabic characters, while the

235 Native speakers of the Dhivehi standard language reject the form mihāin “from the person” quoted in MANIKU / DISAYANAKA (1990, 36).
237 Arab. hiğrat “emigration”; the “Hijra” of the Prophet, Muḥammad, 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”238 (cf. gemen nikume (nikme)239 “coming out of the village” in L1 n/1,1, L3 3/2,1, and L2 6,2, or māgemen “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 disen240 (from dis-) “from the direction of” (L1 md/2,6 etc.; L3 4/1,2 etc.; L4 has the later variant dīhen: 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 bađun (ḥadun) “from / out of the womb” (L1 d/1,1, ITMHM 4,6, RC 13,3 etc.; bađu “belly, stomach”), mahun imaš-unl “(starting) from (the) month” (RA 2,6 = RB 1,13 = RC 9,3 / 10,3), ḥađun (ḥadun) “from the moon/month” (ITAM 1,4; ḥađu “moon”), rekan “from / in (an) one night” (ITAH 2,4; abl.indef. of rē “night, evening”), kauverikaman “by / under the reign” (RC 1,5; kauverikan “reign, rule”); mi uren241 “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., dabuduvun (L3 10/2,3,5) and dabuduvun (L3 3/2,5 and 4/1,5) “from Daṇḥbudū” (name of a Maldivian island)242 or isdaven (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. atun, F. aten, Sinh. (medieval) atin can be derived from Skt. hāstena “by / with the hand”243. 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”244. 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. kukṣī- “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.

238 For the peculiar umlaut of the stem gam- “village” cf. fn. 228 above.

239 For the Mod.Dhiv. absolutive nikume of the verb nakunnant “to go / come out, leave” cf. 3.10.3.6.

240 Corresponding Sinh. are the ablatives desen and desin “from the direction of” of desa, stem des- “land, region, direction” ← OIA deśā- (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 dīš- “direction” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 363, 6339).

241 For uren cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4.

242 For du “island” and the variant forms of this word cf. 2.6.2.3.1.4. — The Maldivian island name Daṇḥbudū (today Daṇḥbidi) means “rose-apple tree island” and corresponds to Skt. jambudvīpa-, Pa. jambudvīpa-, Sinh. daṇḥbudīva, all meaning “India”; its basis is Skt., Pa. jambu-, Sinh. daṇḥba “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 daṇḥbu is obsolete in modern Dhivehi. Today the loanword M.A.F. jaḥbu is used for “rose-apple”.

243 For the modern equivalents of OIA hāstā- cf. TURNER (1966), II, 811, no. 14024.

244 GEIGER (1938), 104 illustrates this by some “examples from medieval inscrs. (8th-12th c.): atin from the hand (P. ḍ̣aṭha), gūmin from the village (gūma), bīmin from the ground (bīma), ambaranin with the ornament (ābharana); but kulen from the family (kula), diyen by the water (daka), paraṇuren by the lineal descent (paraṇparā).” For further examples cf. WIJAYARATNE (1956), 156 ff.
Case system and stem types

aksinā through Pkt. acchinā; but -in has been taken from words like this and used in those like bara (barin).\textsuperscript{245} 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. farätun, F. farätén “from the side (of), by” or F. aten “from / by the hand” (for the frozen abl./instr. forms farätun/-en and aten cf. 2.3.2.11.4 and 2.3.2.12.4); cp., e.g., A. sg. mihage / pl. mihunge farätun, F. sg. mihage / pl. mihunge farätén/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); duvesīn kren “from/by the islanders”, i.e. “from/by the Maldivians” (L2 25,2); darīn 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 kämiyan 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:

\begin{verbatim}
M. e hisābun aharen katibu kuren ituru suvāluteke’ kurāne bēnune’ o’ kamaka’ 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. hisāb); aharen pers.pron. I.ps.sg., here subject of the part.fut. kurāne; katibu obl.sg. “mayor” + kuren postpos. “from the side of” = abl.; ituru “further, more” (cf. 2.4.5.2) + suvālute-ek ‘any further questions’, indef.pl. of suvālu ‘question’ (← Arab. su‘āl ‘question’); kurāne “going to make, do” part.fut. (kurānī “to do, make”), attributed to ibēnum-ekl, nom.indef. “a wish”; lotl part.pret. of omnī “be there, lie”, attributed to the indef.dat. ikam-ak-āśī “to a fact” of the nom. kan ikaml; nu negation particle; fenunul part.pret.(intr.) “(having) appeared, seemed” (fenenī “appear, seem”) + eve q.partc.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{245} For OIA āksi- “eye” cf. TURNER (1966) I, 2, no. 43; cf. also GEIGER (1941), 19, no. 286 on Sinh. āsa/āha, stem ās-lāhi- “eye”. For Sinh. bara “weight, load” cf. GEIGER (1941), 119, no. 1774.
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”\(^{246}\); *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).

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cases</th>
<th>Māle</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-ge</td>
<td>-ge</td>
<td>-ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inan.</td>
<td>-e, -i</td>
<td>-e/-ei, -i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>-gā/-ga/i</td>
<td>-e, -i</td>
<td>-e/-ei, -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-a’/-aś/</td>
<td>-a’/-aś/</td>
<td>-aha, -hā; -aśa, -a’/-aś/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl./</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anim.</td>
<td>obl./gen. + kuren, farātun</td>
<td>gen. + farātun</td>
<td>gen. + farātun/aten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inan.</td>
<td>-in, -un</td>
<td>-in, -un</td>
<td>-en, indef.suff. + -un</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite of some variants which are characterised by certain morphonological 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 Addū (as against -un occurring with the consonant stems); note that in contrast to the other dialects, Fua’ 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. toli, A. teli, F. tēli* “bean” with their ablative forms M. *tārin* (← *tari-in*), A. *tārin* (but F. *tārin-en*) and *M. tōlin* (← *toli-in*), A. *tēlin* (but F. *tēlen* ← *tēli-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. *teli, F. tēli, M. toli* “bean”; M.A. *mēhi*, F. *mēhi* “fly”; M.A.F. *divēhi* “Maldivian, islander”; M.A. *ihi*, F. *ihi* “lobster”; M.A. *baši*, F. *bāši* “eggplant”; A. *geṇdi*, F. *geṇdi*, M. *goṇdi*.

\(^{246}\) 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 morphonological rules and, as a consequence, causes a secondary lengthening of the preceding syllable.

### 2.3.1.2.2. The a-stems

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’ 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. -ā ← -a-aš, F. -āša ← -a-aša; abl. A.M. -a-in, F. -a-en; cp. the following examples (primary stems only):

- M.A.F. kaфа “cotton” (abl. M.A. kaфа-in, F. kaфа-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’ Mulaku appears as an a-stem, unlike Addū bema which is a consonant stem (abl. A. bema-un). Cf. also fēna “foam, surf” which is a (secondary) a-stem in Fua’ Mulaku, as opposed to the consonant stems A. fēna, M. fonu (abl. F. fēna-en, but A. fēn-un and M. fon-un).

### 2.3.1.3. The consonant stems

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\(^\text{247}\); 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).

\(^{247}\) 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 Ađđū; 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. \( /nl/, /sl/, /kl/, /tl/ \) and \( /ls/ \) (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 throughout the Maldives when occurring in final position (cp., e.g., M.A.F. nom. \( \text{m̄usun} \) [\( \text{musu} \)] “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, [?] (cp., e.g., M.A.F. nom. \( \text{bo}/\text{bok} \) “frog”; A.F. nom. \( \text{f}ō\)/\( \text{fuak} \) “betel nut”). In Fua’ Mulaku and in Ađđū, final \(-l/-t\) is represented allophonically by [?] as well, while in Māle the glide [-y] is pronounced instead (cp., e.g., A.F. nom. \( \text{fu}/\text{fuak} \) “book”; A.F. nom. \( \text{fa}/\text{faak} \), M. nom. \( \text{f}o\)/\( \text{foak} \) “leaf”). In the older documents of Dhivehi, however, \(-l/-t\) are still attested as such in word-final position; cp., e.g., the nominatives \( \text{bu}/\text{bulat} \) “betel” (L1 g/2,2 etc., L2 5,3 and 25,4) and \( \text{pu}/\text{puvak} \) “areca nut” (L1 my/1,1; L4 e/2,1), or the spelling \( \text{pu}/\text{puvak mulok} \) for the name of the island \( \text{Fua’ Mulaku} \), lit. “areca-nut ground” (L4 e/2,1; possibly also in L1 md/1,2, where only \( -\text{ku muloku} \) is preserved). In contrast to that, the spelling \( \text{fu}/\text{fuva}s\) \( \text{mulaku} \) occurring in a later text (\( \text{Tāna-} \) 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 [?].

In Ađđū and Māle, [?] also serves as an allophone of final \(-s\) (cp., e.g., M.A. nom. \( \text{ra}/\text{raš}l \) as against F. nom. \( \text{ra}/\text{raš} \) “island, land” with a vocalic extension, cf. below). On the other hand, final \(-s/-l\) is preserved in Māle and in Ađđū 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’ Mulaku \( /s/-/l/ \) 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. \( \text{a}/\text{ahe} \) “horse”; M. nom. \( \text{mir}/\text{mirihi} \) “chili”; M.A. nom. \( \text{bē}/\text{behe} \) “medicine”, M. nom. \( \text{g}/\text{gas} \), A. nom. \( \text{ges} \) vs. F. nom. \( \text{ge}/\text{gehe} \) “tree” etc.).

2.3.1.3.2. In auslaut position, stem-final \( /l/-/l/ \) is preserved exclusively in Fua’ Mulaku. In the other vernaculars, it appears only medially within the paradigm. Cp., e.g., the nominative forms F. \( \text{hau}/\text{hau} \), M. \( \text{hā} \) “cock”; F. \( \text{bol}/\text{bō} \) “head”; F. \( \text{gal}/\text{gō} \) “stone”; F. \( \text{tel}/\text{teu} \), M. \( \text{te}/\text{te} \) “oil” etc.).
2.3.1.3.3. No other consonants occur in word-final position, at least in inherited words.\(^{248}\)

As a rule, even foreign words ending in a consonant are enlarged by secondary vowels; cp., e.g., the recent English loanwords M. böțu “boat”, sigarețu “cigaret”, țicaru “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,\(^{249}\) 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correspondence</th>
<th>AĐĐű</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Mālē</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If nothing else is indicated, the following examples are listed in the order Mālē – Fua’ Mulaku – AĐĐű.


\(^{248}\) For more extensive information about the phonological rules implied, cf. 1.1.3.

\(^{249}\) An exception to this are the short vowels which are attached to stems in -s in Fua’ 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”\(^{250}\); haturu “enemy” (obs.)\(^{251}\); M.A. keolu, F. keolu “chief of the dhoni-crew”; M.A.F. mituru “friend” (obs.)\(^{252}\); uxtu “sister” (← Arab. uḥt).

(3) fāru – fāru – 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. nārench / nārenq / nāring “(bitter) orange”, nārenq “mandarine”; Urdu nārggi “orange”). The contracted form A. hennu ← *he̱ndana “morning”, whose original final vowel must have been -u (like in M.F. he̱ndana), 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. ate “atoll”; M. kolu, F.A. ke “piece, end”; M. ēdu, F.A. ēde “bed”; M. medu, F.A. mede “middle”.
(5) miru – mēre – miara “shark”; honu – hene – hena “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. haviru, F.A. haviri, A. abl. havirin “evening”; M. honiru, F. heñhiru, A. heñhiru, abl. heñhirin “Saturday”; M. iñyuru, F.A. iñyiru, A. abl. iñyirin “ginger”; M. kulu, F.A. kili, A. abl. kiliin “saliva”; M. menduru, F.A. mendiru, 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”.\(^{253}\)

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.\(^{254}\) 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

\(^{250}\) Cf. Sinh. āduru “teacher”; Jaina-Pkt. (AMg.JM.) āvariya-, other Prakrits (Ś. etc.) āaria- (Ch. WErBA, personal communication; cf. Pischel 520 etc.); Pa. ācāriya, OIA ācāryā-; cf. Geiger, (1941) 17, no. 268.

\(^{251}\) Dhiv. haturu, Sinh. satura / haturu represent a mot savant which has to be derived from the OIA u-stem sātru- “enemy”. The word cannot be considered as an inherited direct successor of 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).

\(^{252}\) 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. mirā-; Geiger, (1941), 133, no. 1986).

\(^{253}\) From a phonological point of view, some adjectives have to be treated within this group as well; cf. M. biru, A.F. biri “deaf”; M. dīgu, A.F. digi “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.

\(^{254}\) About the influence of retroflex consonants on the surrounding vowels in the southern dialects cf. 3.9.2.2.3 (for ośonnant), 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. falō “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 falō 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 -āl- of Dhiv. fałō speaks in favour of another intermediate form; maybe Dhiv. falō is a loanword (cp., e.g., Konkani phaḷa).255 M.A.F. jādū “magic, sorcery” reflects Persian ḡādū “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”,256 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”257

---

255 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 Maldives islands, where only a few plants are cultivated.


257 GEIGER (1902), 920, no. 156 regards Dhiv. gai as a correspondent of the Sinh. nominal stem gat- “limb, body” which he derives from OIA gāra- 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 gāra- “limb, member of body” (RV); “body”. Both derivations are problematic as they stand. Via MIA gatta-, OIA gāra- would have led to an intermediate Dhiv. *gai. As a phonological input form, however, this *gai (as posited by TURNER) would have yielded M. *gây ← gae, gēl and A.F. *gai; cp. in this connection the word /fali/ “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] → [fæ, fu]. M.A.F. gai can nevertheless represent OIA gāra- if we assume that its MIA predecessor was *gāt-; not *gatta-; in this case we should compare A.F. rei, M. rē “night” from OIA rātri- 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.
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 Aḍḍū 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 Fu’a 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 Aḍḍū.

2.3.2.1. One of the most characteristic particularities of the dialect of Aḍḍū 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

258 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).
259 Cf. the Sinh. stem væ “wind”, Pkt. væ(y)a-, Pa. vāta-, Skt. váta- (GEIGER 1941, 161, no. 2394).
261 The Sinh. correspondents of the Maldivian word are the variants soya, hoya, só and ṭ “small river, rivulet” which by order represent the particular stages of phonological development (← Pkt. sō(y)a-, Pa. sota(s)-, Skt. srotas-; cf. GEIGER 1902, 932, no. 342 and 1941, 33, no. 486; cf. further TURNER 1966, II, 803, nos. 13889 and 13891).
262 Cf. the corresponding Sinh. stem rā-, nom. rāya “night”, Pkt. rār-, *rātī- as opposed to Pa. rātī-, Skt. rātrī- (cf. GEIGER 1941, 146, no. 2167).
263 Probably the word meaning “tea” reached Dhivehi in its Arab. form sāy (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. In contrast to that, the derivation of the indefinite suffix is less problematic. Obviously, A. /-ak and /-ek/ developed from the stem of the cardinal number “one”, /ek/, in the same way as the Sinhalese indefinite suffix /-ek/ which represents the corresponding numeral. In Addu the distribution of the suffixes /-a/ (def.) and /-a/ (indef.) vs. /-y/-e (def.) and /-y/-e (indef.) depends on a simple rule: The suffixes /-e/ and /-e/ which are preceded by a glide y in order to avoid hiatus, are joined exclusively to i-stems. In contrast to that, the suffixes /-a/ and /-a/ 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 /-a/ and /-a/; cp., e.g., the i-stem A. “box” (nom.pl.), gen. “limb” (cf. above), dat. “limb”, nom.sg.def. “limb”, nom.sg.indef. “limb"; cf. G EIGER (1941), 30, no. 445.

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/ as a whole or a shortened variant /-a/ 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 */-a/ 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/; cp., e.g., the i-stem A. “limb”, abl./instr.indef. (Sinh. “limb” ← Pa. “limb”, “limb, body”; cf. GEIGER 1941, 3, no. 34 and TURNER 1966, I, 6, no. 114); boga-ak (L5 S/1,1, beside boga-ek in F3,14; F5,22 etc.) “a benefit” (Dhiv. obviously is a sanskritism, because an inherited intervocalic /-g- would not be preserved (Pa. “enjoyment, use, possession, hire, wages”, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 549, no. 9625); ma-aku bafa-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: vellakara-ak (L4 g/1,1, besides vellakara th/1,7) “an officer”, gadyana-ak (L2 5,4) “a bag” (Skt. “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 /-a/-a/-a/-a/-a/-a 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-ak (F4,1) “a manner, kind”, which are attested only with the suffix /-ek/, show that at least already at the time when the fatkolu 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 Addu also shows secondary plural formations by means of two suffixes which,

---

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

265 Cf. Skt. éka-; note that both Dhivehi and Sinhalese presuppose a MIA variant ékka-. 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. -ānām, Pkt. -ānā(m)) which developed into Sinh. -an regularly, -in and -un being later variants. 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”. 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’ Mulaku, plural formation is less heteromorphic than in Aḍḍū. Unlike Aḍḍū usage, in Fua’ 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’ 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’ 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’ 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’ Mulaku as in Aḍḍū. In both dialects, the indefinite suffix has the variants -e’ / -ekl and -ā’ / -akl, but the distribution

266 Cf. GEIGER (1900), 57 and (1938), 99-100.
267 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’ Mulaku as it does in Addū. While -a’ is comparatively rare in Fua’ Mulaku, -e’ 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’ Mulaku,268 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”).269

2.3.2.2.2. In Fua’ Mulaku, there is no other way of forming the plural than by adding the suffixes -un(/-in), -men and -te’ /-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 dissappeared in the modern dialect of Fua’ 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’ 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’ 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’ /-tek/ is the most frequent and, considering its meaning, also the most neutral of all plural suffixes that are used in Fua’ Mulaku. -te’ is a phonetical variant of the North Maldivian suffix -ta’ /-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

268 Cf. the examples given in 2.3.2.8.1.
269 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 l (obl.) -aku, fem. (dir.) -ak l (obl.) -aka, neutr. (dir.) -ak, -ek l (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 Aḍḍū, 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 Aḍḍū 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’ 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’ 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’/-ekl 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’ duvahaku /ek duvas-akul “one day”. CAIN (1992, 21) calls this suffix “the nonspecified suffix -aku”. In HLSD (1988, 36), it is documented by some examples such as mihaku (of mihā “man”), kujjak (of kujjā “child”), veriaku (of verīā “person”), gahaku (of gas “tree”), or miskitaku (of miski’/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.270

2.3.2.3.1.1. -aku very frequently occurs in connection with a formant -i 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 -i element can be added only to the oblique form of the indefinite suffix which then has the form -akī (from *-aku-i). Cp., e.g., aharenge nam-akī nevi kudatuttu “my name is Nevi Kudatuttu” (aharenge poss.pron. “my”, nevi /inam/ “name”, -ak-i indef.suff.obl. + focus-marker).271 It is important to note that there is no corresponding enlarged suffix form 1-ekī which would be derived from the nominative.

270 For the syntactical use of the suffix cf. 5.2.1.
271 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 akī which often, though not exclusively, emphasises the subject noun or the noun phrase.” According to DE SILVA, the imaginary “emphatic particle” Dhiv. akī has to be regarded as a functional equivalent of OIA khālu, Pa. khālu “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 akī 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 akī as a subject-indicating device. Another commentarial work written in Sinhalese during the ninth century, the Dhampiya atuvā gātāpadaya, quotes some sentences from the Helatuvā containing this particle. e.g., rahado vadānakī āvātahi nami ‘the word rahado is the name for a well’.” Concerning this latter work, DE SILVA came to the following conclusion: “That the Dhampiyā atuvā gātāpadaya, 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. akī has not been attested in that form in any Prakrit either. The presence of akī 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 -akī 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; 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 Maldavian 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. mihāku-ī from mihā “man”), while it gets lost in Ađū as well as in Māle (A. mihāk-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):274

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>declension</th>
<th>casus rectus</th>
<th>casus obliquus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I m.</td>
<td>-ek</td>
<td>-aku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I f.</td>
<td>-ak</td>
<td>-aka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II n.</td>
<td>-ak, -ek</td>
<td>-ak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


273 Cf. the introduction, 0.7.2 above.

274 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.275

2.3.2.4. In comparison with the semantically neutral plural suffix -ta', 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 Mâle, however, it is not added to a (formerly) definite form as in Fua’ 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.276 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. atoju-veriā, A. atele-veriā, F. atele-veri “atoll-chief”.277 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); kārdda-veri “officer, official” (L4 t/2,5: indef. -veriak); tauliyamāla-veri “chief-inspector, supervisor” (part of an abstract -veri-kan: F3,15; F5,36; etc.); pemu-veri (with unknown meaning; F13,7); plural forms are kārdd-veri “officials” (L5 5/2,5; with all probability also in L4 b/2,7 kārudaveriin); tauliya-veri “inspectors” (F8,27); vāru-veri “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’/rāśl “capital”, veri-kan l-kaml “government”, veri-farālī l-farātī “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 lokapā-la 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 annmā-varu “mothers”. For this suffix cf. GEIGER (1938, 103): “There can be no doubt that -varu is pl. of

275 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.
276 HLSD (1988, 36) mentions the indefinite forms verie’ and veriaku, both translated as “person”.
277 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.
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st(em) vara ..., and that this vara corresponds to Pk., P(ali), Sk. vara which is so frequently used at the end of a compound.” A relation between Dhiv. veri and O/ Mia vara- “(the) best” 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 that were asked: “ruh ruh – trees, bas bas – buses, ... goLi – square, goLi goLi jeh [sic] 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-kaml “facts”, avaś-avaś “villages”, got-got (got “manner”), ru’-ru’ /ruk-ruk/ “coconut trees” and raś-raś “islands”. The latter formation is attested for Fua’ Mulaku in the form [rad-raśo] /raś-raśl (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-Fatkołu (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, aristocrate”)281. 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. kaukaluna’s) “all the sirs, gentlemen” and ras-ras-beikalun-āi (RC 8,11) “all the royal gentlemen”. Another distributional form seems to be represented in atol-atolu “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’ ‘fruits’ (from fal-falō); mis-mihun ‘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’ and -un. A “frozen” distributional form can also be found in the plural formation of the adverbial interrogative pronoun A. kontantāki lkon-tan-tan-ak-il, 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 leti-etil “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).

---

278 Cf. also Turner (1966), II, 659, no. 11308.
279 For the names of the main informants cf. the preface of this grammar.
280 jeh obviously represents a misprint; the correct form would be jehi “beaten”, part.pret. of jahant “to beat” (probably in the sense of “lined, draped with stripes”).
281 For more extensive information on this word cf. 2.6.2.4.3.1.
282 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’ 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’ /bob/ “frogs”, bok-ā “the frog”, bok-ak/ “a frog”; fo’ /fot/ “books”, fot-ā “the book”; fot-ak “a book”; hau /haul/ “cocks”, haul-ā “the cock”; hau-l-ā “a cock”; makunu “bugs”, makun-ā “the bug”, makun-ak “a bug”; mīdeu /mīdel/ “mice, rats”, mīdel-ā “the mouse”, mīdel-ak “a mouse”; mas “fish” (pl.), “fish (as a generic term or food)”; ma-ū “the fish”, ma-ak “a fish”; mau /māl/ “flowers”, mal-ā “the flower”, mal-ak “a flower”; ralā “waves”, ral-ā “the wave”, ral-ak “a wave”; na-nā “fishing lines”, nan-ā “the fishing line”, nan-a “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’ 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’/kūdak “a child”, the stem vowel -i
gets lost, the root vowel u being compensatorily lengthened to ṭi. In contrast to that, the
definite form *kudi-ā, despite the expected loss of the root vowel, did not develop into ‘kūdā
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 2.3.2.7.1.2.2.283

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’
Mulaku there are many examples showing this effect throughout the paradigm, the correspon-
ding i-stems in Addū 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/ tari-ek “a star”; boli “shells”, bolie “the shell”, bolie “a shell”; madi “beetles”, madiie “the beetle”, madie “a beetle”; telie “the bean”,
telie “a bean”; issaš “hair (pl.)”, issašie “the hair”, issašie “a hair”; melañfate “butter-
flies”, melañfatie “the butterfly”, melañfatie “a butterfly”; mudi “rings; jewels, jewellery”,
mudie “the ring”, mudie “a ring”; toši “peels, bark (of fruits, vegetables, trees)”, tošie “the
peel”, tošie “a (piece of) peel”; keranđuru fufi “beehives”, keranđuru fufie “the beehive”,
kerañduru fufie “a beehive”; etc.

2.3.2.7.1.2.2. A special group within the i-stems is characterised by a paradigmatic inter-
change 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’. Cp., e.g., mehi
“flies”, messā (besides secondary mēhā) “the fly” and messa’ (besides secondary mēhā) “a
fly”; fiēhi “knives (for food)”; fiēssā “the knife”, fiēssa “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’
“a saw”, sussa’ “an empty coconut”. The nominative lāhi “1/4 kg” has only a singular
meaning, contrasting with the indefinite form lassa’. 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.) thi “(spiny) lobsters” with nom.sg.def. ihie, nom.sg.indef. ihie’
but gen.pl. isse, dat.pl. issa’ lissaši; nom. (pl. and sg.) fehurehi “whale shark(s)” with
gen.sg.def. fehurehie, nom.sg.indef. fehurehie’ but gen.pl. fehuresse, dat.pl. fehuressa’; in the

283 For the parallels occurring in Fua’ 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.) māvahī “large wave in the open sea” has gen.sg.def. māvahie’ but gen.pl. māvasses, dat.pl. māvassasse’.

Considering the interchange of -h- and -ss-, the words divehi “Maldivian, islander” and rātṛtehi “friend, compatriot” have to be classed in this group as well, as the indefinite forms divessa’ and rātṛtessa’ suggest. Within their case formation, however, there are no traces of the morphonological interchange, both nouns showing the peculiar features of words denoting persons (cf. 2.3.2.11.4.1).

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’/bāṣašl, nom.sg.def. bāṣa’/bāṣakl; nom.sg./pl. tās “dish(es), plate(s), glass(es)”, gen. tāše, dat. tāṣa’/tāṣašl, nom.sg.def. tāṣa’/tāṣakl; nom.sg./pl. fiṣi “little island(s)”, gen. fiše, dat. fiṣa’/fiṣašl, nom.sg.def. fiṣa’/fiṣakl; nom.sg./pl. vaṣi “basket(s), bin(s)”, gen. vāše, dat. vāṣa’/vāṣašl, nom.sg.def. vāṣa’/vāṣakl; nom.sg./pl. geṇdi “chair(s)”, gen. geṇde, dat. geṇda’/geṇdašl, nom.sg.def. geṇda’/geṇdakl; etc.

2.3.2.7.2. As mentioned above (2.3.2.7.1.2.4), there are many nouns in Addū 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
Number, definiteness and indefiniteness: Āddū

2.3.2.7.3. Besides the isolated nouns with a defective paradigm as discussed above, there exist several semantical groups in Āddū 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/loll “eye(s)”, nom.sg.indef. lolla; nom.sg./pl. a’ latl “hand(s), arm(s)”, nom.sg.indef. ata’; nom.sg./pl. faietel “feet, foot”, nom.sg.indef. faieta’; nom.sg./pl. bō/loll “head(s)”, nom.sg.indef. bola; nom.sg./pl. nēfa’/nēfalt “nose(s)”, nom.sg.indef. nēfata’ etc.

Two nouns denoting parts of the body do not fit into this scheme, viz. nom.sg./pl. da’/datl “teeth, tooth” and ihigili “fingers, toes” which has only plural meaning. From these stems we find both indefinite (data’ and iḥigila’) and definite forms (nom.sg. datā, iḥigilā). 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 Āddū, 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 dōni, 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-’ ← /bokkor-ā-aśl, 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. dōn-e, dat. dōn-a’/ l-aśl, abl. dōn-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’/bat “cooked rice”, teu/tell “oil”, fani “treacle”, fena “foam, surf”, väre “rain”, bin/ibiml “earth, land, ground”, dara “firewood”, dun/lduml “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’/fodakl, def. *fodā “a / the drop”, and *tika’/tikakl, def. *tikā “a / the tiny drop” (smaller than *foda’) which are used in this way. Cp., e.g., *fen “water”, *fen foda’ “a drop of water”, *fen tika’ “a (tiny) drop of water”. In the same way, *eśa’/eṣakl, 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 eśa’, “a (single) peanut”. The indefinite singular form -gañda’/gañdakl, 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 *pāngañda’ “a (loaf of) bread, a piece of bread”.

2.3.2.7.4. Secondary plural formation in Addū

As described in 2.3.2.1.2, in the dialect of Addū 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 Addū. 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 *kudi- being obsolete. The oblique stem *anhen is still in use, but only in the function of an attributive quasi-adjectival 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 obliquus: cp., e.g., *firi mīhā “husband”, nom.pl. *firin; *vaḍi mīhā “carpenter”, nom.pl. *vadin; *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. *aṅbi “wife”, nom.pl. *aṅbin; 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. mitrā-; cp. also the “frozen” definite form miturā), nom.pl. *miturun; nom.sg. *haturu “enemy” (Ved. sátru-), 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 bafa 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 /kall/ “sir” with a regular change of final -l into -u, cf. 2.6.2.4.3.1); muni-kafa-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, nom.pl. -verin) which denotes professional or official positions when appearing as the second part of nominal compounds. In Addū, the compounds in question are very often used in their definite form when a singular is meant; cp., e.g., nom.sg. rahumatteriā ← rahumat-veri-ā “friend” (rahumat ← Arab. rahmat “compassion, mercy”) vs. nom.pl. rahumatterin; 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. duʿā “prayer”); kāmburu-veriā “blacksmith” (M. kānbura “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-veriā “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 Addū 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 -un/-in, -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 Addū, 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. mammāmen; 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. *kokka-ā), pl. kokkōmen.

2.3.2.7.4.2.2. On the other hand, -men can be used in Addū 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.284 Cp., e.g., bo’/bokl “frogs” vs. bokā-men “the(se) frogs (all) together”; “a certain amount of frogs” (nom.sg.def. bokā); beleu /belell “cats” vs. belelā-men “the cats” (nom.sg.def. belelā); boňda “lizards” vs. boňdā-men “the lizards” (nom.sg.def. boňdā); 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. ihie-men “the lobsters” (nom.sg.def. ihie) etc.

2.3.2.8. Fua’ Mulaku

In comparison with Addū, the formation of number, definiteness and indefiniteness in Fua’ 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 Addū (cf. 2.3.2.1), but nowadays in many cases the distribution of the suffixes -a’/akl and -e’/ekl does not depend on phonological rules (any longer) in Fua’ Mulaku. The suffix -e’, which was confined to the i-stems originally, more and more has taken the place of the suffix -a’. Probably this development is due to an increasing influence of the standard language where the suffix -a’ has been lost completely.285 In Fua’ Mulaku, however, this suffix variant still occurs in some isolated word forms like eša’ “a kernel, seed” (nom.sg. eše), foda’ (besides fode’) “a drop” (nom.sg. fodo), liňboya’ “a lime” (nom.sg. liňboi), tēla’ “a shoal, shallow (place in the sea)” (nom.sg. tēla), lika’ “a manner, kind” (stem /likl/, mitura’ “a friend” (obsolete; nom.sg. mitura). When preceding the conjunction -ā (← -ā) “with”, the suffix -a’ 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’; mīdel-akk-ā “with a rat” vs. the indef.nom.sg. mīdal-e’ / mīdel-e’ etc.

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

284 For the formation of the definite singular cf. 2.3.2.1; for further examples cf. 2.3.2.7.1.
285 For the suffix -aku of the modern standard language cf. 2.3.2.3.1.
short vowel in the ending of the nom.sg.\textsuperscript{286} being eliminated. For the declension of the consonant stems in Fua’ 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., \textit{faivān} “shoe, sandal” \rightarrow \textit{faivāne}; \textit{fa’/fař “leaf” \rightarrow faret’}; \textit{ihal “blossom of the coconut tree” \rightarrow ihale’}; \textit{hi’/hiř “heart” \rightarrow hite’}; \textit{kan/kam “fact; verb” \rightarrow kame’}; \textit{kaňdul “mangrove” \rightarrow kaňdule’}; \textit{kēl “banana tree” \rightarrow kēle’}. The original s-stems, today ending in -HV in Fua’ Mulaku (cf. 1.3.5.), also belong to this group; cf. \textit{aha (← as) “horse” \rightarrow ahe’}; \textit{maha (← mas) “fish” \rightarrow mahe’}; \textit{behe (← bes) “medicine” \rightarrow behe’}; \textit{ehe (← es) “jewel” \rightarrow ehe’}; \textit{gehe (← ges) “tree” \rightarrow gehe’}.

2.3.2.8.1.1.2. For consonant stems that are enlarged with final -\textit{u} in the nom.sg. cp., e.g., \textit{bāću “eagle, falcon” \rightarrow bāće’}; \textit{belalu “cat” \rightarrow be\textit{lale’}}; \textit{fauru “wall” \rightarrow faure’}; \textit{heńdun “morning” \rightarrow heńdune’}; \textit{itu “tile” \rightarrow ite’}; \textit{jańbu “rose apple” \rightarrow jańbe’}; \textit{kaduru “date (palm)” \rightarrow kadure’}; \textit{kahuńbu “tortoise” \rightarrow kahuńbe’}; \textit{karuńu “tear” \rightarrow karuńe’}; \textit{mīdalu “mouse, rat” \rightarrow mīdale’}; \textit{mūnu “face” \rightarrow mūne’} etc.

2.3.2.8.1.1.3. For consonant stems that are enlarged with final -\textit{o} in the nom.sg. cp., e.g., \textit{ado “noise, sound, voice” \rightarrow ade’}; \textit{aharo “year” \rightarrow ahare’}; \textit{balo “dog” \rightarrow bale’}; \textit{doro “door” \rightarrow dore’}; \textit{gańdo “vessel, jar” \rightarrow gańde’}; \textit{hanido “moon” \rightarrow hanide’}; \textit{himāro “donkey” \rightarrow himāre’}; \textit{hińlo “fox, jackal” \rightarrow hińle’}; \textit{karo “neck, throat” \rightarrow kare’}; \textit{kosāro “store-house” \rightarrow kosāre’}; \textit{massaro “month” \rightarrow massare’}; \textit{nāro “fishing line” \rightarrow nane’}; \textit{nāro “vein, nerve, blood-vessel” \rightarrow nāre’}; \textit{ono “bamboo” \rightarrow one’}; \textit{raśo “island, land” \rightarrow raśe’} etc.

2.3.2.8.1.1.4. Consonant stems that are enlarged by -\textit{e} are very rare.\textsuperscript{289} As the quantity of the final vowel is not affected by the suffixation of -\textit{e}, we may assume that the original final -\textit{e} of the nom.sg. gets lost in these cases, the suffix -\textit{e} which characterises the definite form being added directly to the stem-final consonant. Cp., e.g., \textit{bere “drum” \rightarrow bere’}; \textit{eńde “bed” \rightarrow eńde’}; \textit{mère “shark” \rightarrow mēre’}.

2.3.2.8.1.2. In \textit{a}-stems, the stem vowel preceding the suffix -\textit{e} is preserved, the resulting hiatus being tolerated; cp., e.g., F. nom.sg. (but A. pl., cf. above) \textit{kaša “spike, thorn” \rightarrow F. kasha-e’} (vs. A. kaša’); F. nom.sg. (A. pl.) \textit{mađa “harpoon” \rightarrow F. mađa-e’} (vs. A. mađa’). Other examples are F. \textit{attela “palm” \rightarrow attela-e’}; \textit{faletela “foot” \rightarrow faletela-e’}; \textit{buma “eye-brow” \rightarrow buma-e’}; \textit{dida “flag” \rightarrow dida-e’}; \textit{esfia “eye-lash” \rightarrow esfia-e’}; \textit{faga “bitter gourd” \rightarrow faga-e’}; \textit{ifa “branch \rightarrow twig” \rightarrow ifa-e’}; \textit{ila “fibre of the coconut” \rightarrow ila-e’}; \textit{nera “grey hair” \rightarrow nera-e’}; \textit{ohibada “vertebra” \rightarrow ohibada-e’}. For the declension of the \textit{a}-stems in Fua’ Mulaku cf. the table given in 2.3.2.12.5.3.

\textsuperscript{286} For the enlargement of consonant stems by means of short vowels cf. 2.3.1.3.

\textsuperscript{287} For the corresponding forms of the other dialects cf. 2.3.1.3.4.1, 3.4.2, 2. and 3.

\textsuperscript{288} For the corresponding forms of the other dialects cf. 2.3.1.3.4.1, 1.

\textsuperscript{289} 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; boñđā “lizard” → boñđā-e; kihā “saw” → kihā-e etc.

In boñđā and kihā, -ā is preserved throughout the paradigm (gen. boñđāi, kihāi; dat. boñđāsa, kihāsa; abl. boñđāen, kihāen) which thus corresponds exactly with the productive declension pattern of the definite singular in Addū (cf. 2.3.2.11.1.1). F. kihā 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. kīehī ← *kiyesī290 obviously shows an analogical influence of the i-stem A. fiehi “knife” (M. fiohi; 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’ 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’ Mulaku, while the same morphological process has been realised only gradually in Addū (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’ 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’ is suffixed, the stem vowel -i is preserved. Cp., e.g., F. alamāri “cupboard” → indef. alamārie; alanāsi “pineapple” → indef. alanāsie; bakari “goat” → indef. bakarie; boli “shell” → indef. bolie; gadi “hour, watch, clock” → indef. gadie; koli “cloud” → indef. kolie; mađi “beetle” → indef. mađie; tari “star” → indef. tarie etc. While in Fua’ Mulaku the root vowel of all disyllabic nouns belonging to this group remains unchanged throughout the paradigm, the corresponding Addū 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. bāsi “brinjal” (gen. bāse, dat. bāsaha, abl. bāsen) → indef.nom.sg. bāse’; tēli “bean” → indef. tēle’; dāri “child” → indef. dāre’; esnāli “inflammation of the upper eye-lid” → indef. esnāle’; fāli “oar”

→ indef. fâle‘; fâni “worm” → indef. fâne‘; fêši “box” → indef. feše‘; fiši “little island” → indef. fiše‘; kâši “bone, thorn” → indef. kâše‘; mûdi “ring, jewellery” → indef. mûde‘; tâši “dish, plate, glass” → indef. tâše‘ etc. The dialect of Fua’ 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’ 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. kûddä, obviously a “frozen” definite form of the original stem kudi which is obsolete in modern Fua’ 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 kûde and in the plural (nom.pl. kûdun, gen.pl. kûdunga, dat.pl. kûdunna, abl.pl. kûdun aten), while in the singular forms the short vowel preceding the geminate -dd- remains unchanged (cf. gen.sg. kûddäge, dat.sg. kûddäša, abl.sg. kûddä 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 kûde’ 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. aṁbu and the indef. form aṁbe‘. As a former i-stem, this word shows a lengthened root vowel throughout the plural as well (nom.pl. aṁbun, gen.pl. aṁbunge, dat.pl. aṁbunna, abl.pl. aṁbun aten). The original singular paradigm does not exist any longer, however, all singular forms being extended with mîhä “man” (gen.sg. aṁbu mîhâge etc.; the same development can be observed in Aḍḍū, cf. the gen.sg. aṁbi mîhâge). 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 kûda‘ and aṁba‘ (cp. the nom.sg. A. kudi, aṁbi and the nom.pl. A. kudin, aṁbin).

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’ Mulaku. Here, some of the words in question have been affected by analogical adaptations. Cp., e.g., ihi “lobster” and mēhi “fly”, the whole paradigm of which shows the intervocalic -h- in combination with a lengthened root vowel; the indefinite forms are ihe‘ “a lobster” and mēhe‘ “a fly”. These examples must be classified as belonging to the type described in 2.3.2.8.1.4.2.

Even in Fua’ Mulaku, however, there are some words that have preserved the old phonological change of -h- and -ss-; cp., e.g., raṭṭehi “friend” → indef. raṭṭesse‘; divehi “Maldivian” → indef. divesse‘; fiohi “knife” → indef. fiosse‘; mulehi “abscess” → indef. mulesse‘. 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’ 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 Addū, has become obsolete in Fua’ 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. belal(u) “cat”, pl. belal 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 Addū (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’ 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. mihun; kaddū “child” → pl. kaddun; dāri “child” → pl. dārun; ainhū “wife” → pl. ainhun; mituru “friend” (obs.) → pl. miturun; raṭṭehi “friend, compatriot” → pl. raṭṭessun; divehi “Maldvian” → pl. divessun; vaḍi “carpenter” → pl. vaḍiun (sic); etc.

As in Addū (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1), the word meaning “king” shows a suppletive plural formation in Fua’ 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’ 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 kābaufun “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 Addū (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’ Mulaku, however, the nom.pl. has the form -vērun. Cp., e.g., ateleveri “atoll-chief” → nom.pl. atelevērun; fahaveri “sister-in-law” → pl. fahavērun; masveriā “fisherman” → pl. masvērun; rahumatteriā (← rahumat-veri-ā, cf. ib.) “friend” → pl. rahumatṭērun; etc.

2.3.2.8.2.2.2. As in Addū (cf. 2.3.2.7.4.1.2), -verin is used in Fua’ 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., aśoverin “eight people” (F. aśo “eight”), faḥaverin “five people” (faḥq “five”). The use of the older form -verin instead of the more recent variant -vērun 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’ Mulaku and Addū. In both dialects, it is added exclusively to the definite singular in -ā, which as a rule is obsolete in modern Fua’ 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’ Mulaku, a feature which has not been observed in Adđū. Cp., e.g., F. nom.sg. fahaveri “sister-in-law” with the regular nom.pl. fahavërun opposing itself to the plural form fahaveri-ä-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 Adđū is a semantical one. While in Adđū 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’ Mulaku. Cp., e.g., F. nom.sg. fahaveri “sister-in-law” with the regular nom.pl. fahavërun opposing itself to the plural form fahaveri-ä-men, which, although semantically identical, is derived from the old definite nom.sg.

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’ Mulaku. In the first group, the nom.sg. is identical with the pure stem; this is true, e.g., for băzu “eagle, falcon”, bo’ ibokl “frog” → pl. bokämen “(many) frogs”; bakari “goat” → pl. bakariämen “(many) goats”; belalu “cat” → pl. belalämen “(many) cats”; fehuressei “whale shark” → pl. fehuressey(y)ä-men “(many) whale sharks”; ihi “lobster” → pl. ihämän “(many) lobsters”; kakidî “crab” → pl. kakidämen “(many) crabs”; méhî “fly” → pl. méhämän “(many) flies”; midal(u) “mouse, rat” → pl. midalämen; vaul “flying fox” → pl. vaulämän; rehi “sprot” → pl. rehiämän; balo “dog” → pl. balämän; etc.

2.3.2.8.2.4. The plural formation by means of the semantically neutral suffix -te/ltk is very common in the dialect of Fua’ 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' 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’/bok-tek “frogs”, bakari-te “goats”, belalu-te “cats”, fehuressei-te “whale sharks”, ihi-te “lobsters”, kakidî-te “crabs”, kahuñbu-te “tortoises”, méhî-te “flies”, balo-te “dogs”, rehi-te “sprats”, vaul-te “flying foxes” etc.

In Fua’ Mulaku, the suffix -te’ is also used for the plural formation of words denoting parts of the body, while in Adđū the plural meaning of these nouns is expressed by the pure
nominal stem (cf. 2.3.2.7.3.1). Cp., e.g., F. a’ /atl/ “hand, arm” → pl. at-te; faitela “foot” → pl. faitela-te; hi’/hitl/ “heart” → pl. hit-te; iṅgili “finger, toe” → iṅgili-te; kakul “knee” → pl. kakul-te; kāsi “bone” → pl. kāsi-te; lō “eye” → pl. lō-te; issaši “hair” → pl. issaši-te; fia “wing” → fia-te etc.

The following examples represent different semantical spheres of inanimate nouns and botanical expressions: fā’ /atl/ “leaf” → pl. fat-te; gehe /gesl/ “tree” → pl. ges-te; ihal “blossom of the coconut tree” → pl. ihal-te; kaiši “coconut” → pl. kaiši-te; kēl “banana tree” → pl. kēl-te; kaduru “date (palm)” → pl. kaduru-te; karā “water melon” → pl. karā-te; jaṁbu “rose-apple” → pl. jaṁbu-te; bere “drum” → pl. bere-te; faro “reef” → pl. faro-te; hene “thunderbolt” → pl. hene-te; ındōli “Maldivian wing” → pl. ındōli-te; jōli “Maldivian chair” → pl. jōli-te; kan /kam/ (indef.sg. kame) “fact, verb” → pl. kan-te; kan /kam/ (indef.sg. kane) “corner” → pl. kan-te etc.

2.3.2.8.2.5. As mentioned above (2.3.2.8.2.4), there are many nouns in Fua’ 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 bakarāmen / bakarite’ “goats” (← bakari) and vaulāmen / vaule “flying foxes” (← vaul) (for further examples cf. 2.3.2.8.2.3 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. In a few cases there are even three plural formations existing side by side without any semantical differences. Cp. nom.sg. belal(u) “cat” with its plural forms belal (pure nominal stem), belal-ā-men and belal-te “cats”, or fahaveri “sister-in-law” with its plural formations fahavēr-un, fahaveri-ā-men and fahaveri-te. Although both the latter form and kāfāte “grandfathers” obviously represent exceptions, the use of -te in connection with the two kinship terms shows that -te 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’, the only plural form of eduru “teacher” attested in Fua’ Mulaku, which is now obsolete throughout the Dhivehi speaking area, and which seems to have been remodelled after M. eduruntā’ vs. A. edurun. In contrast to Fua’ Mulaku where formations with this type of double marking are treated as normal plural forms, 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’ 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;292 the words in ques-

292 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. hālā); M. māda “mouse, rat” (stem mādal-; def.sg. A. mādalā); M. bulā “cat” (stem bulal-; def.sg. A. belelā). There are also many loanwords ending in a long -ā; cp., e.g., mēvā “fruits” (Class. Mod.Pers. mēva “fruits”; cf. STEINGASS 1929, 1365), bagičā “garden” (Class.Mod.Pers. bāgccā, 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); kujja “child” (← *kudyā ← kudi-ā, oblique form kudi); 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 bēfūlā (3rd level, 2./3.ps.sg.) 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 darifu-lu ← dari “child” + -fu-lu 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 Aḍḍū (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’/-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 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’; nom.sg. jōdu “cup; pair” → indef.sg. jōd-e’; nom.sg. magu “street, road” → indef.sg. mag-e’; nom.sg. bāzu “eagle, falcon” → indef.sg. bāz-e’; nom.sg. mēzu “table” → indef.sg. mēz-e’; nom.sg. rālu “wave” → indef.sg. rāl-e’; nom.sg. mas “fish” → indef.sg. mah-e’; nom.sg. mihā “man” (obsolete stem mīs) → indef.sg. mih-e’; nom.sg. buḷā “cat” → indef.sg. buḷal-e’ (stem buḷal); nom.sg. mīḍa “mouse, rat” → indef.sg. mīḍal-e’ (stem mīḍal-); nom.sg. rū “wrinkle” → indef.sg. rul-e’ (stem rul-); nom.sg. ru’/rukl “coconut tree” → indef.sg. ruk-e’; nom.sg. donkeo “banana” → indef.sg. donkel-e’ (stem donkel-) etc.

1929, 148), bamiā “ocra, lady’s fingers” (Mod.Pers. bāmīya, cf. STEINGASS 1929, 152; Arab. bāmiā/bāmiat, cf. WEHR 1958, 35), haftā “week” (Class.Mod.Pers. haftā, 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.

293 Cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2, 2.3.2.8.1.4.3 and further 1.3.9.3.
294 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; nom.sg. maskiba “one side of a fish” → indef.sg. maskiba-e; nom.sg. mamma (mamma) “mother” → indef.sg. mamma-e; nom.sg. bappa “father” → indef.sg. bappa-e; nom.sg. furēta “demon” → indef.sg. furēta-e; nom.sg. sūra “picture” (← Arab. sūra’) → indef.sg. sūra-e; nom.sg. līla “shallow(s), shoal” → indef.sg. līla-e; nom.sg. aṅga “mouth” → indef.sg. aṅga-e; etc.

2.3.2.9.1.3. For i-stems cp., e.g., nom.sg. bakari “goat” → indef.sg. bakari-e; nom.sg. tari “star” → indef.sg. tari-e; nom.sg. vali “knife” → indef.sg. vali-e; nom.sg. kotari “room” → indef.sg. kotari-e; nom.sg. taši “dish, plate” → indef.sg. taši-e; nom.sg. boli “shell” → indef.sg. boli-e; nom.sg. kaši “bone” → indef.sg. kaši-e; nom.sg. foši “box” → indef.sg. foši-e; nom.sg. fuši “little island” → indef.sg. fuši-e; nom.sg. tolí “bean” → indef.sg. tolí-e; nom.sg. dari “child” → indef.sg. dari-e 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; nom.sg. gevehi “housewife” → indef.sg. gevesse; nom.sg. lāhi “1/4 kilogram” (traditional unit of measure) → indef.sg. lāsse 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. dōnī’e (← *dōneye ← *dōni-ek); nom.sg. dūni “bird” → indef.sg. dūnī’e (← *dūneye ← *dūni-ek); nom.sg. kujjā “child” (“frozen” definite form of *kudi-ā, stem kudi, cf. 2.3.2.9 above) → indef.sg. kujje (← *kudye ← *kudi-ek); nom.sg. eti “thing” → indef.sg. ecce (← *eye ← *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 (kujā) “child” → pl. kudin; nom.sg. dari “child” → pl. darin; nom.sg. ambi (abi) “wife” → pl. aṃbin; nom.sg. sir “husband” → pl. firin; nom.pl. main bafain “parents” (plurale tantum); nom.sg. masveriā “fisherman” → pl. masverin (mas “fish”); nom.sg. baiveriā “partner” → pl. baiverin (bai “part, half”); nom.sg. ahuluveriā “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
2.3.2.9.2.2. In Māle the plural suffix -šah¬ıd 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 kal¬e¬men), 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 en¬men /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, “you” (cf. 2.6.2.4.3.1), and in the pronominal adjective en¬men /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 Adh¬ū and, even more so, to that of Fua’ 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 -ta/-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 -ta 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. bak¬a¬ri “goat” → pl. bak¬a¬rita”; nom.sg. ta¬ri “star” → pl. ta¬rita”; nom.sg. val¬i “knife” → pl. val¬ita”; nom.sg. kot¬a¬ri “room” → pl. kot¬a¬rita”; nom.sg. ta¬ši “dish, plate” → pl. ta¬šita”; nom.sg. it¬g¬ili “finger, toe” → pl. it¬g¬ili¬ta”; nom.sg. fu¬ši “little island” → pl. fu¬ši¬ta”; nom.sg. du¬ni “bow” → pl. du¬n¬ita”; nom.sg. ber¬u “drum” → pl. ber¬uta”; nom.sg. dor¬u “door” → pl. dor¬u¬ta”; nom.sg. mag¬u “street, road” → pl. mag¬u¬ta”; nom.sg. h¬ö¬n¬u “gecko” → pl. h¬ö¬n¬uta”; nom.sg. bis “egg” → pl. bi¬sta”; nom.sg. mas “fish” → pl. mas¬ta”; nom.sg. ga¬s “tree” → pl. ga¬sta”; nom.sg. es “precious stone” → pl. es¬ta”; nom.sg. fan “leaf of the coconut tree” → pl. fan¬ta”; nom.sg. ru¬/ruk¬ “coconut tree” → pl. ru¬ta¬/r¬uk¬-tak¬/; nom.sg. foi /footl “book” → pl. fo¬ita¬/fo¬t¬ak¬/; nom.sg. bile’/bil¬e¬l “betel (tree and leaf)” → pl. bilett¬a”; nom.sg. ra’/rašl “island, land” → pl. ra¬t¬a¬/ra¬š¬t¬ak¬/ etc.

In a few cases, -in/-un and -ta’ occur side by side as a double suffix. Thus, the only correct plural form of the nom.sg. ed¬u¬ru “teacher” is ed¬u¬run¬a’. In the plural form mi¬hu¬n¬a’, however, a special meaning is still perceivable. In correspondence with the original meaning of the suffix -ta’, mi¬hu¬n¬a’ means “(so) many people / men” while the primary plural mi¬hu¬n has to be translated simply by “people / men”.

← Engl. waiter → pl. vē¬tar¬āun; sek¬e¬tt¬ē¬ri or sek¬e¬tt¬ar¬ē ← Engl. secretary → pl. sek¬e¬tt¬r¬īn / sek¬e¬tt¬ar¬īn; me¬hu¬m¬ā¬nu ← Pers., Urdu me¬hu¬m¬ā¬n “guest” → pl. me¬hu¬m¬ā¬n¬u¬n; šah¬id¬u ← Arab. (also Pers., Urdu) šah¬id “martyr” → pl. šah¬i¬d¬u¬n etc.
2.3.2.9.2.4. As in A˚d˚u, the nouns denoting “boats” or “ships” go beyond the scope of the normal plural formation in M˚ale as well (cf. 2.3.2.7.3.2 and 2.3.2.6). While in A˚d˚u 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 M˚ale.295 Cp., e.g., nom.sg. döni → pl. döni-faharu; nom.sg. odi → pl. odi-faharu; nom.sg. batteli 〈ba’telî〉 → pl. batteli-faharu; nom.sg. bokkurå 〈bo’kurå〉 → pl. bokkurå-faharu; nom.sg. bõtu → pl. bõtu-faharu; nom.sg. nå → pl. nå-faharu.

Probably -faharu is connected with the homophone faharu “times” (cp., e.g., de faharu “two times”). In two later fatkolus 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”296 cf. F13.12, where faharu has the same syntagmatic status as döni and odi: ... odi-ak-at döny-ak-at pahar-ak-at ... “to an odi, a döni, one after another” (-ak indef. suffix, -at dat. ending); cf. also F11.37: odyakan pahurakan “to an odi, to a single one”.297 Both syntactically and semantically, the given examples illustrate how faharu could develop into a plural suffix. BELL (1922-35, 79/1926, 267) already noted odi-faharu and döni-faharu (sic) as plural forms in the modern sense.

Sometimes also -ta’ is used as a plural suffix of words denoting ships; this, however, seems to be true for deep-sea vessels only, cp. döni-ta’ or odi-ta’.

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 A˚d˚u 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 A˚d˚u 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.

295 Cf. DBG, 16 where -faharu is noted as a plural formant for words denoting “ship, boat etc.”, too.
296 Thus the basic meaning according to oral information by HASSAN SA’ID as of March, 7 1999.
297 For the spelling of final -t by -n cf. 3.6.3.2.3.
2.3.2.11. Addū

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.298 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mūdel- “mouse, rat”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>mūdelā</td>
<td>mūdeu /mūdel/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mūdelāi</td>
<td>mūdele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>mūdelā’/mūdel-ā-aš/</td>
<td>mūdele’/mūdel-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>mūdelāın</td>
<td>mūdeleun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.11.1.2. A. type Ia: cons.-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ges- “tree”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>gehā /ges-ā/</td>
<td>ges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>gehāi /ges-ā-i/</td>
<td>gehe /ges-e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>gehā’/ges-ā-aš/</td>
<td>geha’/ges-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>gehāın /ges-ā-in/</td>
<td>gehun /ges-un/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.11.1.3. A. type Ib: cons.-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mas- “fish”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>mahā /mas-ā/</td>
<td>mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mahāi /mas-ā-i/</td>
<td>mahi /mas-i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>mahā’/mas-ā-aš/</td>
<td>maha’/mas-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>mahāın /mas-ā-in/</td>
<td>mahun /mas-un/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

298 This rule seems not to be reversible without exceptions, however, because in Addū 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.) kañda “ocean, open sea” → gen. kañde; nom.(pl.) jañbu “rose apple” → gen. jañbe; 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jaṁburōz- “star-apple”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>jaṁburōză</td>
<td>jaṁburōzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>jaṁburōzăi</td>
<td>jaṁburōze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>jaṁburōză’</td>
<td>jaṁburōza’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>jaṁburōzăın</td>
<td>jaṁburōızun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.11.1.4.2. A. type Ib: cons.-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mad- “nut, kernel”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>madă</td>
<td>mada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>madăi</td>
<td>madi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>madă’</td>
<td>mada’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>madăın</td>
<td>madun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kuruba- “young coconut”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>kurubă /kuruba-ă/</td>
<td>kuruba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>kurubăi /kuruba-ă-i/</td>
<td>kurubai /kuruba-ı/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>kurubă’ /kuruba-ă-aš/</td>
<td>kurubă’ /kuruba-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>kurubăın /kuruba-ă-in/</td>
<td>kurubain /kuruba-in/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>geri</strong> “cattle”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>gerie /geri-ā/</td>
<td>geri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>geriei /geri-ā-i/</td>
<td>gerie /geri-e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>geriea’ /geri-ā-aš/</td>
<td>geria’ /geri-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>geriein /geri-ā-in/</td>
<td>gerin /geri-in/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.11.3.2. A. type IIIa: i-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>tari</strong>- “star”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>tarie /tari-ā/</td>
<td>tari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>tariei /tari-ā-i/</td>
<td>tære /tari-e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>tariea’ /tari-ā-aš/</td>
<td>tāra’ /tari-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>tariein /tari-ā-in/</td>
<td>tarin /tari-in/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.11.3.3. A. type IIIb: i-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>mehi</strong>- “fly”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (primary paradigm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>messā /mesi-ā/; mehā (secondary)</td>
<td>mehi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mehiei /mesi-ā-i/</td>
<td>messe /mesi-e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>mehiea’ /mesi-ā-aš/</td>
<td>messa’ /mesi-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>mehiein /mesi-ā-in/</td>
<td>mehin /mesi-in/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>mīs</strong>- “man”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (secondary) -un/-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>mīhā /mīs-ā/</td>
<td>mīhun /mīs-un/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mīhāge /mīs-ā-ge/</td>
<td>mīhunge /mīs-un-ge/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>mīhā’ /mīs-ā-aš/</td>
<td>mīhunna’ /mīs-un-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>mīhāge farātun</td>
<td>mīhunge farātun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.2.11.4.2. A. type IVb (denoting persons):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kokko- “younger brother/sister”</th>
<th>sg. (def. form)</th>
<th>pl. (secondary) -men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>kokkō /kokko-ū</td>
<td>kokkōmen /kokko-ā-men/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>kokkōge /kokko-ā-ge</td>
<td>kokkōmenge /kokko-ā-men-ge/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>kokkōa’ /kokko-ā-ašl</td>
<td>kokkōmennena’ /kokko-ā-men-ašl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>kokkōge farātun</td>
<td>kokkōmenge farātun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.12. Fua’ Mulaku

Regarding their basic structure, the declension types of the Fua’ Mulaku dialect correspond with those of Adđū to a high extent. The particular declension classes occurring in Fua’ Mulaku cannot be outlined with the same transparency as in the neighbour dialect of Adđū, 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’ 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 Adđū paradigms serving as a general parameter. Without comparing the declension patterns of Adđū 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’ 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 Adđū,299 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 Adđū, 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’ Mulaku (cf. F. maha, A. mas “fish”, gen. mah-i etc.). As the following examples show, the genitive ending is hardly predictable in Fua’ Mulaku, cp. for (1) A. baša, F. balo “dog” → gen. A. bal-i, F. bal-e; A. himāra, F. himāro “donkey” → gen. A. himār-i, F. himār-e; A. nana, F. nano “fishing line” → gen. A. nano-i, F. nano-e. While in Adđū 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’ Mulaku to which this rule cannot be applied, as the given examples show.

For the divergence of A. gen. -e, F. gen. -i (2), cp. A. nom.pl. beleu /belell “cats” (sg.def. beletā “the cat”) → gen.pl. belel-e vs. F. nom.pl. belal (sg. belal(u)) → gen.pl. belal-i; A. nom.pl. midēu Imiddēl “mice, rats” (sg. middēlā) → gen.pl. middēl-e vs. F. nom.pl. midal (sg. midal(u)) → gen.pl. midal-i (for the peculiar number formation characterising these two nouns in Fua’ 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’ Mulaku variant which may have caused the -i of the primary genitive.

According to the sound laws, the final -e of the genitive A. belel-e (nom. A. beleu) 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. beleu has to be regarded as a secondary vowel as the inter-Maldivian correspondences F. belalu and M. balū ibalūlī and extra-Maldivian cognates show; cp. Sinh. sg.def. balalā (stem balal), but also older forms of this word such as Pa. bilāra-, bilāla-, Skt. bidāla- “cat” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 120, no. 1791 and TURNER 1966, II, 521, no. 9237). In Addū, 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. 306 In the A. midēu “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. midāmiddālī, Sinh. sg.def. mīyā, stem mī; Pa. mūsikā-, OIA m. mūs-, mūsikā-; 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. huvañḍa, F. huvahdo “fragrance, perfume” → gen. A. huvaṅḍi, F. huvañḍ-ei; A. kośāra, F. kośāro “store-house” → gen. A. kośār-i, F. kośār-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 (← -ata), which is typical for Fua’ 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. bappāsā; mihā “man, person” → dat. mihāsā; kokkō “younger brother/sister” (← *kokkōa, → dat. kokkōsā) or are loanwords (cp., e.g. haftā “week” → dat. haftāsā; fullā “deer” → dat. fullāsā); 2) as a rule, in the case of a-stems, with a concomitant lengthening of the stem-final -a into -ā (cp., e.g., fiā “wing” → dat. fiāsā, dea “water, liquid” → dat. deāsā); 3) in the case of all consonant stems in -VhV (← F. *-VsV ← Dhiv. -Vs) (cp., e.g. gehe ← ges “tree” → dat. gehāsā; maha ← mas “fish” → dat. mahāsā; faha ← fas “soil” → dat. fahasā); 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; belalu “cat” → dat. belalūsā; midalu “mouse, rat” → dat. midalūsā.

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’ Mulaku can be explained as allomorphs of an underlying -ata (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

306 Cp., e.g., A. aṭele “atoll” vs. M. aṭolu ← aṭelu; 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. boliha; joli “Maldivian chair” → dat. joliha; maviha “large wave in the open sea” → dat. maviha). A subtype within this group is characterised by a reduction of the ending -aha to -hə, without a change of the root. There are also some words showing both forms, such as jangali “jungle” (→ dat. jangaliha and jangalihə) or aši “low table” (→ dat. ašiha and ašihə). Many words possess only the reduced form of the ending; cp., e.g., ali “light” → dat. alihə; bakari “goat” → dat. bakarihə; dəni “dhoni-boat” → dat. dənihə). 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., dəli “ink” → dat. delaha; bəši “brinjal” → dat. bəšaha; dini “bird” → dat. dənaha. 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; fiohi “knife” → dat. fiohaha etc.

2.3.2.12.3. While in the dialects of Aḍḍū and Māle, the vocalism of the ablative ending depends on the stem in question, there is only a uniform ending -en in Fua’ Mulaku. For consonant stems, cp., e.g., a’lati “hand, arm” → abl. at-en; aharo “year” → abl. ahar-en; mənu “face” → abl. mən-en; for i-stems, cp., e.g., aši “low table” → abl. aši-en; akiri “coral stone” → abl. akiren (← akiri-en); dəli “ink” → abl. dəlen (← dəli-en); for a-stems, cp., e.g., attela “palm” → abl. attela-en, fia “wing” → abl. fia-en; buma “eyebrow” → abl. buma-en.

2.3.2.12.4. In Fua’ 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 aτen (lit. “by / from the hand (of)”, abl./instr. of a’lat “hand”) or by means of the genitive combined with the postposition farätən (“frozen” abl. “from the side of”; cf. 2.3.2.11.4). Cp., e.g., dərí aτen “from (the side of) the child”, dərunt aτen “from the children”; kafage farätən “from the grandfather”, kabaʃunge farätuŋ “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’ 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg.</th>
<th>“fish”</th>
<th>“face”</th>
<th>“date (palm)”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>mah-a</td>
<td>münü-u</td>
<td>kadur-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mah-i</td>
<td>münü-e</td>
<td>kadur-ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>mah-aśa</td>
<td>münü-aha</td>
<td>kadur-aha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>mah-en</td>
<td>münü-en</td>
<td>kadur-en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morphology
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2.3.2.12.5.2. *i*-stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg.</th>
<th>“shell”</th>
<th>“goat”</th>
<th>“brinjal”</th>
<th>“knife”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>boli</td>
<td>bakari</td>
<td>bāši</td>
<td>fiohi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>boli-e</td>
<td>bakari-e</td>
<td>bāš-e</td>
<td>fiohi-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>boli-aha</td>
<td>bakari-hā</td>
<td>bāš-aha</td>
<td>fiohi-aha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>boli-en</td>
<td>bakari-en</td>
<td>bāš-en</td>
<td>fiohi-en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.12.5.3. *a*-stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg.</th>
<th>“shallows”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>tela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>tela-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>telāsā /tela-aša/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>tela-en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.12.5.4. Declension pattern of nouns designating persons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“mother”</th>
<th>“child”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>mammā (def.)</td>
<td>mammā-men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mammā-ge</td>
<td>mammā-men-ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>mammāšā /mammā-aša/</td>
<td>mammāmenna’ /mammā-men-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>mammāge farāten</td>
<td>mammāmenga farāten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.12.5.5. In the case of a few consonant stems designating animals (*belal(u) “cat”, *midal(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’ 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’ /-tekl*. The word *nannigatti*302 (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.

301 For this formation cf. 2.3.2.8.2.2.
302 This noun obviously represents a taboo-word, *nam-ni-gati* “the one not having received a name”.

301 For this formation cf. 2.3.2.8.2.2.
302 This noun obviously represents a taboo-word, *nam-ni-gati* “the one not having received a name”.
## 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/-aʃ, abl. -in/-un) being exact correspondences of those of the Addū-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 -gai. Without a doubt this suffix must be identified with the gen./loc. of the substantive gai “body”. Thus, M. gahu-gai originally means “at/in the body of the tree”.

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 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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“mouse, rat”</th>
<th>sg. I</th>
<th>sg. II</th>
<th>pl. (primary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>mīdalu</td>
<td>mīdalu</td>
<td>mīdal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mīdali</td>
<td>mīdalu gai</td>
<td>mīdali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>mīdaluša</td>
<td>mīdalu gāša</td>
<td>mīdalaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>mīdalen</td>
<td>mīdalu gaen</td>
<td>mīdalen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“cat”</th>
<th>sg. I</th>
<th>sg. II</th>
<th>pl. (primary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>bešalu</td>
<td>bešalu</td>
<td>belal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>belali</td>
<td>belalu gai</td>
<td>belali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>bešaluša</td>
<td>bešalu gāša</td>
<td>bešalaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>bešalen</td>
<td>bešalu gaen</td>
<td>bešalen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“snake”</th>
<th>sg. I</th>
<th>sg. II</th>
<th>pl. (primary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>nannigattu</td>
<td>nannigati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>nannigattu gai</td>
<td>nannigatte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>nannigattu gāša</td>
<td>nannigattaha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>nannigattu gaen</td>
<td>nannigaten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

303 The connection of the locative suffix -gai 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg.</th>
<th>cons. stem “tree”</th>
<th>i-stem “room”</th>
<th>a-stem “mouth”</th>
<th>root noun “house”</th>
<th>frozen def.form “man”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>gas</td>
<td>kotari</td>
<td>aṅga</td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>mīhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>gahu-ge</td>
<td>kotari-ge</td>
<td>aṅgā-ge (aṅgaige)</td>
<td>gē-ge</td>
<td>mīhā-ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>gahu-’l-āśl</td>
<td>kotari-’l-āśl</td>
<td>aṅgā’/aṅga-āśl</td>
<td>ge-’l-āśl</td>
<td>mīhā’/mīhā-āśl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>gah-un</td>
<td>kothān/kotari-in/</td>
<td>aṅga-in</td>
<td>ge-in</td>
<td>mīhā-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>gahu-gā ’l-gāil</td>
<td>kothān-gā ’l-gāil</td>
<td>aṅgā-gā (aṅgaigai)</td>
<td>gē-gā ’l-gāil</td>
<td>mīhā-gā ’l-gāil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(obl.)</td>
<td>(gahu)</td>
<td>(kotari)</td>
<td>(aṅgā (aṅgaigai))</td>
<td>(gē)</td>
<td>(mīhā)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-āśl/ and the ablative/instrumental, /-ak-unl/, while the nominative variant of the suffix, /-e/-ekl/, occurs only in combination with the secondary case forms of the genitive, /-ek-ge/ and the locative, /-ek-gail/. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“tree”</th>
<th>indef. sg.</th>
<th>indef. pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>gahe’/gas-ekl/</td>
<td>gastake’/gas-tak-ekl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>gahaku /gas-aku/</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>gahegge/’l-ekl/</td>
<td>gastakegge/’l-ekl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>gahak-’l-āśl</td>
<td>gastakegge/’l-āśl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>gahak-un</td>
<td>gastakegge/’l-ekl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>gaheggā/’l-ek-gāil</td>
<td>gastakegge/’l-ek-gāil/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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”, mihā “man” (stem mís), dari
“child” and bappa “father”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plural</th>
<th>“tree”</th>
<th>“people”</th>
<th>“children”</th>
<th>“fathers”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>gas-ta’/gas-tak/</td>
<td>mihun /mís-un/</td>
<td>darin /dari-in/</td>
<td>bappa-men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>gas-taku-ge</td>
<td>mihun-ge</td>
<td>darin-ge</td>
<td>bappa-men-ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>gas-tak-a’ /-aʃ/</td>
<td>mihunna’/mísun-aʃ/</td>
<td>darinna’/darin-aʃ/</td>
<td>bappa-menna’ /-men-aʃ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>gas-tak-un</td>
<td>mihun-ge farätun</td>
<td>darin-ge farätun</td>
<td>bappa-men-ge farätun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>gas-taku-gā /-gai/</td>
<td>mihun-gā /-gai/</td>
<td>darin-gā /-gai/</td>
<td>bappa-men-gā /-gai/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 [e],
written ⟨eve⟩. Cp., e.g., M. mī koṭari riccē (riti + e304) “this room is beautiful” as against
rīti koṭari-e/ -eʃ/ “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.
biṛu, A.F. biṛi “deaf”; M. digu, A.F. digi “tall” (of human beings); M.A. avas, F. avaha
“rapid, fast”; M. boḍu, A. boṇḍa, F. boṇdo “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. hutaru “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 substanti-
tive. Cp., e.g., the following examples which illustrate the use of ran “gold, of gold, golden”
and riḥi “silver, of silver, silver(y)” as a substantive: ... mī ranun o’ molōgaṇḍā “... this was
a golden axe”, lit. “of gold” (abl./instr.; T3, 35); as an attributive adjective: ... ran molō-
gaṇḍāi riḥi molōgaṇḍāi ... “with the golden axe and with the silver axe” (T3, 48; molō-
gaṇḍāi def. form + particle -aï “and”). For other examples of nouns of this type cp.
M. hūnu, A.F. hunu “heat; hot, warm”; M. hulaṅgu, A. hulaṅga, F. hulaṅgo “West, west
wind; western”; M.A.F. mugu “lentil, gram; green”; M. majā “amusing, exciting; fun”;

304 /rti-evel → *rtye → riccē; cf. 1.3.9.2.1.
M. baru, A. baru, F. baro “heavy; load”; M.F. bali (A. nikameti) “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. haqīgī (haqīqī “real” ← Arab. haqīqī “real, true, original”; M. faqīru (faqīru), A.F. faqīri “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. gülē “fitting, appropriate, suitable” (part.pres. of gulenī “to be combined (with)”), with its “frozen” negated form nu gülē now meaning “irrelevant”, or M. dirē “being alive, living” (part.pres. of direni “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 hunnānī “to be, stand, stay, remain”) or M. kamu nu dē “hopeless”, lit. “fact not giving” (kamu obl. “fact”, nu “not”, dē part.pres. of deni “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. adu-gada, A. ada-gada, F. ado-gada “loud, noisy”, lit. “rich in noise” (M. adu, A. ada, F. ado “noise, voice”); M. vara-gada, A. vara-gada, F. varo-gada “strong, powerful” (M. vara, 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 madu/mada/mado miturā “the taciturn friend” (lit. “the friend (having) a silent mouth”), belong to these formations as well (M.A.F. aṅga “mouth”; for M. madu 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. nasibu-veri “happy” (M. nasibu ← Arab. nasib “share (in the profits), happiness, chance, fate”); M. taguvā-veri “religious, devout, pious” (M. taguvā (taqvā) ← 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”); harakāterī ḥaraka-verbs “active” (← Arab. pl. harakāt, sg. haraka “motion, action” among other meanings); amānāterī lamānāt-veri “trustworthy, responsible” (← Arab. pl. amāna “goods in trust”; sg. amāna “trustworthiness, fidelity, confidence”); M. zīnatterī zīnāt-veri “magnificent, splendid” (← Arab. zīnāt “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., 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. anīa-veri “cruel” (M. anīā “cruelty”); M.A.F. ṣág-veri “kind”; M.A.F. ufā-veri “happy, lucky” (A. also ufā “id.”); M. tedu-veri, A.F. te-de-veri “honest” (A. also te-de “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 lōbiverīa/-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 (lek-ekl indef.), from which also the locative forms M. ekugā leku-gail, 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
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“safe” (cp. the complex verbs rakka u kurâ “to save (money)” and rakka u vun “to bear, give birth (to)”). A few adjectives with -teri can be substantivised; cp., e.g., ehî-teri l-teri-âl “volunteer”, derived from ehî-teri “helpful” (ehî “help”). For the enlargement of the i-stem -teri by means of the suffix -â, the same rules apply as for l-veri-âl (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. lôbi-veti “dear” (lôbi “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. rî(v)eti “beautiful, pretty”; in the modern standard language, this word occurs only in its contracted form, rîti. Geiger already realised from the variants riveti and rîeti that the word contains an old copula form (1902, 933, no. 356); he analysed the word as consisting of the stem represented by Pa. rûpa- (← OIA rûpâ- “form, beauty”) and eti, the Maldivian equivalent of Sinh. âti “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 rû- “form, image, comeliness, beauty”, cf. Geiger 1941, 148, no. 2205), the corresponding Dhivehi form *rû- / rî- 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. rîti-kan, NCLHR 1985-91, 3, 50). The derivation of riveti / rîti from *rûpavantî- 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., lôbi-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 *rû- 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. mado, 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 mado/mada/mado fehi “light-green” and gada fehi “dark-green”. Further adjectives expressing colours are M. kalu, A. kala, F. kalo “black, dark”; M. ra, A.F. ra’ratl “red”; M.A.F. hudu “white”; M.A. nî, F. nil “blue”; M.A. rîndî, F. rîndul “yellow, orange”; M.A.F. mugu “(pea-)green”; M.F. muši, A. meši “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’, F. varaha (dat. /var-as/) “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’ gina, F. varaha gina “very much”; and M. nuhanu “considerably, quite (a)”. Cp., e.g., A. vara’ riveti “very beautiful”, F. mā boňdo “very big”, A. vara’ 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 kuđa “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’ “very” together with a duplicated adjective in A. ... vara’ fakiri fakiri de mafiriakāmen ... “... a very very poor couple ...” (T3, 1; vara’ /varaś “very”; fakiri adj. “poor”; de card.num. “two”; ma-firi-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. itiru, A.F. itiri “more, another, increase”, the latter also occurring in the dative without a change of meaning (M. itiru’, A. itira’, F. itiraha /-as/), 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 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. “bala-fele ma aŋgai tibi au da’ afage raṭṭehi mīhā aŋgai 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 balaun “look”; ma aŋgai poss.pron. ma + gen.loc. of aŋga “mouth”: “in my mouth”; tibi part.pret. of tibeni “to be”, attr. of au da’ datu “new teeth”, nom.pl.; afage poss.pron. “my”; raṭṭehi obl. + mīhā obl. “friend-man”; aŋgai loc. “in the mouth”; tibi part.pret. of tibeni “to be”, attr. of datav datasu 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-aš vure mi rē bar ē, e re-aš 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-aš [re’] dat. of rē “night”, here: “to the (last) night”; vure(n) “in comparison to”, lit. “rather”, correlated with the preceding dat. re-aš; mi rē dem.pron. + obl. “(in) this night”; bar = /baru/ “heavy”; ē quotparticle; e re-aš 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 filemādīcev vanī ek kaśi itirau hiśei. “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 gāi obl. “body”); “in
the body of the bēkā-fish”306; fileimādi-e-asl/ dat.sg.def. of fileimādi “flounder”; part.pres. M. vanī “becoming, being” + focus-marker -ī instead of the A.-form ventī, cp. the preceding sentence; e’ lekī “one”, attr. of kašī “bone; thorn”; itirau itir-asl/ dat. “more”; hišeī abs. “being” of hinnei, M. hunnanī “to stand, be, stay, remain”).

2.4.5.3. The pronominal adjectives emme “all, whole, entire” (cf. 2.6.7.4.1) and muli “whole” (cf. 2.6.7.4.4) are used for expressing superlative concepts, cp., e.g., M. emme rītī “most beautiful, the most beautiful (of all)”, or mulin raṅgālu “best, the best (of all)” (mulin 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 rašī hiši emme fakīrī taulūman ne’ mihā 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”; fakīrī adj. “poor”; taulūman ne’ “without education”, lit. “education not being there”; taulūman “education, teaching”, M. ta’(u)limu ← Arab. ta’līm “id.”; ne’/net part.pret. of the verbal noun netun “not being (there)”; mihā 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 tafatuge terein timā hita’ emme rieti mi vi adḍā baha. “Best of all the different dialects of this language I like the Addū-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 Addū.” (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) fasdolās, A. fasdolos “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 fasdolos 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 nāli, contained about 0,96 litres; nowadays, however, one nāli 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

306 A. bēkā (sg.def. of a stem be’/bēkI, M. bēṅgu) is the only fish in the Maldives that is able to live in saltwater 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 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 enclave 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' l-ekl (derived from the cardinal number “one” itself; cf. 2.3.2.1). Cp., e.g., M.A.F. e' lekl attr. vs. eke' lek-ekl subst. “one”, or M.A.F. tin attr. vs. M.A.F. tine' tine-ekl 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

307 Cf. the Introduction, 0.5.1.
Dhivehi substantivisations with the suffix -e/- 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 ahara “five years” (T9, 9), M. de tin luñbó “two (or) three limes” (T10, 6), A. hatara ahara “four years” (T16, 23), F. de fäli “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.308

“One”: attr. M.A.F. e/-lek; subst. M.A.F. eke/-lek-ekl. 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. ékka- which with an optional quantitative metathesis represents a regular development from earlier MIA forms. 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 ahara “five years” (T9, 9), M. de tin luñbó “two (or) three limes” (T10, 6), A. hatara ahara “four years” (T16, 23), F. de fäli “two oars” (T4, 28).

Two”: attr. M.A.F. de; subst. M.A.F. dë/-de-ekl. Dhiv. de and Sinh. deka, stem de-, go back to Pkt. dve, *de (cf. GEIGER 1941, 80, no. 1182 and 1902, 915, no. 76); cp. Pa. dve, dve and OIA (fem.) dvé (cf. also TURNER 1966, I, 379, no. 6648).309


“Eight”: attr. M.A. a’, F. aso lašl; subst. M.A.F. aše/-laš-ekl. The numeral is spelled (aša) by GEIGER (1902, 911, no. 18) in accordance with the contemporary pronunciation.310 Dhiv. lašl (← at ← at-a) and Sinh. aṭa can be traced back to Pkt. ~ Pa. aṭha ← OIA aṣṭā (cf. GEIGER 1941, 4, no. 48; TURNER 1966, I, 41, no. 941).

---

308 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.
309 For the distribution of the descendent forms of Pkt. dō ← Skt. d’vāyu and Pkt. dve ← Skt. d’vē in the modern languages and, particularly, a variant “with initial b- in Prakrit bē, Apabhramśa bi, which goes back to dv- (via *dv-)” and is also dominant in all compounds with ‘two’ (Hi. bārah ‘twelve’, bāis ‘twenty-two’, etc.), cf. BERGER (1992), 246.
310 For the phonetical background of this spelling, cf. 1.3.6.


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. *panara*, 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. *vihi* 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. *ekolos* “11” and Dhiv./Sinh. *dolos* “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. *fasshi* “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, viii311) 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 detail312. 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 Hindustānī decimal numeration is that in common use.” Bell, who deserves well for his work on

311 During a short stay in the Maldives Reynolds, the author of a short bibliography on the Maldives (1993), collected material for a Dhivehi word-list which he put at Turner’s disposal.

312 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, 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 ekādana). This as well as Pkt. ekkārasa, egārasa can be traced back to OIA ekādana “eleven”. The same holds true for the IIA numeral stem *ekolos “eleven” which belongs to the duodecimal system (in Dhivehi only; cf. 2.5.1.8). ekolos 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 ekolos 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/bāhra, Pa. bārasa (1941, 118, no. 1773; 1919, 70; cp. also the hybrid Pa. form dvādasa ← OIA dvādasa “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; 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 dolos “twelve” (stem form used attributively; the substantive form is dolaha, cf. GEIGER 1941, 82, no. 1210). For the corresponding numeral Dhiv. dolos, 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. lērasa/lēralu ← lēral) instead of the expected form tēra which seems to be attested in the Dives akuru inscription IDMHM 5.3, corresponding to Old Sinhalese tēra; cp. also Hi. terah, Nep. Ass. Beng. Or. Guj. tēra, Mar. tērā with regular short -ē-. According to BERGER (1992, 251), these variants “go back, not to Sanskrit trayōdasā, but to Middle Indo-Aryan terasa (Pa., Prakrit), terahā (Prakrit) ...” tredasa, with an earlier stage *trayadamśa (or, according to Turner, *trayēdasā), BERGER’S supposition (ib.) according to which “the l-form, Pa. telasa ← *telasa ← *trērasa, which arose by assimilation ... does not survive anywhere in the Indian languages” is perhaps contradicted by a variant telesa (stem teles) with retroflex -l- appearing in literary Sinhalese which, however, is obsolete in the modern (colloquial) language.

313 Cf. the bibliography for details.
315 The variants in -ā (without a final -h) belong to the colloquial language, cp., e.g., MCGREGOR (1972), 61.
316 The e of tera (IDMHM 5.3) is not decisive as Dives akuru had no means of expressing long ē.
317 In Modern Sinhalese, only daha-tuna (stem daha-tun) is used for “13” (lit. “ten-three”, cf. GEIGER 1938, 118; MATZEL 1983, 39).

“Fourteen”: M. sāda, A.F. sauda. Geiger (1919, 71) identified the variants sauda and sāda318 with Pa. catuddasa. Unlike this and the Pa. variant caddasa, the Maldivian examples as well as Hi. caudah, Beng. codda etc. are much closer to Pkt. caudasa, caiddasa/caudaha (besides coddasa/codghaha); all forms can be derived from OIA cāturdaśa “14”, cf. Turner 1966, I, 250, no. 4605). The Sinh. numeral tudasa (stem tudus) which was used in the older literary language,319 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.320 — 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 Rāṉadavi (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.321 — 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 panna “15” of Old Sinhalese which has to be derived (like Old Guj. pana, Beng. panera / ponera) and also variants with a secondarily inserted -d- between n and r such as Hi. pandra, Ass. pondara etc.) from a Prakrit form like pannarasa, pannaraḥa; cf. also Pa. pannarasa (besides paṅcadasa) (cf. Geiger 1938, 120; Turner 1966 I, 432, no. 7662; Berger 1992, 252). We cannot definitely decide, however, whether Dhiv. fanara and Sinh. pana are cognates in the proper sense because of the different results of the OIA cluster -ḥc- they show. Sinh. pana rasa reflects a MIA form with -ṇ- (cf. above), while the Dhiv. word seems to go back to a Pkt. variant with -n-. Cf., e.g., Pkt. pannārasa and pannarasas (cf. Berger ib.). As a correspondent of Sinh. pana, we would expect *fanara with retroflex -n- in the southern dialects.

As a numeral, pana 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 paholaha/paholos, stem paholos “15” is used nowadays322 which, following Geiger (1900, 65 and 1941, 101, no. 1496), can be identified with Pa. paṅcadasa (for the retroflex -l- in paholos cf. “sixteen”).

“Sixteen”: M.A.F. sūla, as well as its literary Sinhalese correspondent solosasolasa (stem solos) which is obsolete in the modern language, can be derived directly from a preform like Pkt., Pa. solasa ← OIA sódaśa ← *sāḍasa (cf. Geiger 1941, 187, no. 2832; Turner 1966, II, 743, no. 12812). On the basis of solas, Geiger

318 Cf. Geiger (1919, 71): “Instead of sauda (which is historically correct), I heard the expression sāda.” Geiger’s informant Ebrahim Didī 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. ħau ḥaull (= hauull) “cock” is to A. hau hauull, F. hauull “id.” (cf. 1.2.1.6).

320 In Modern Sinhalese, only dha-hatara (lit. “ten-four”) is used for “14” (cf. Geiger 1938, 118 and Matzel 1983, 39).

322 “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).

321 For another case of an initial s- which remains unexplained cp. Dhiv. sīt “letter” (cf. 1.3.5).

322 Cp. also the neologisms referred to in the sections about “13” and “14”, and “16” to “19”.

319 Cf. also the neologisms referred to in the sections about “13” and “14”, and “16” to “19”.

318 Cf. Geiger (1919, 71): “Instead of sauda (which is historically correct), I heard the expression sāda.” Geiger’s informant Ebrahim Didī 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. ħaḷ ħaull (= ḥaull) “cock” is to A. hau hauull, F. hauull “id.” (cf. 1.2.1.6).

322 “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).

321 For another case of an initial s- which remains unexplained cp. Dhiv. sīt “letter” (cf. 1.3.5).

322 Cp. also the neologisms referred to in the sections about “13” and “14”, and “16” to “19”.

318 Cf. Geiger (1919, 71): “Instead of sauda (which is historically correct), I heard the expression sāda.” Geiger’s informant Ebrahim Didī 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. ħaḷ ħaull (= ḥaull) “cock” is to A. hau hauull, F. hauull “id.” (cf. 1.2.1.6).

322 “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).

321 For another case of an initial s- which remains unexplained cp. Dhiv. sīt “letter” (cf. 1.3.5).

322 Cp. also the neologisms referred to in the sections about “13” and “14”, and “16” to “19”.

318 Cf. Geiger (1919, 71): “Instead of sauda (which is historically correct), I heard the expression sāda.” Geiger’s informant Ebrahim Didū 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. ḥaḷ ḥaull (= ḥaull) “cock” is to A. hau hauull, F. hauull “id.” (cf. 1.2.1.6).

322 “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).

321 For another case of an initial s- which remains unexplained cp. Dhiv. sīt “letter” (cf. 1.3.5).

322 Cp. also the neologisms referred to in the sections about “13” and “14”, and “16” to “19”.
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convincingly explains the retroflex -l- sounds occurring in Sinh. ekoḷas “11” (cf. above), doḷos “12” (cf. 2.5.1.8), pahaḷos “15” (cf. above), sataḷos “17” (cf. below), aṭalos “18” (cf. below) by assuming an analogical transfer: “The cerebralisation of the intervocalic d (→ d → l) is taken from soḷos 16 where it is phonetically justified.” (1938, 120). In Modern Sinhalese, soḷos has been replaced by dhaṭa-sayā “16”, lit. “ten-six” (cf. Geiger 1938, 118 and Matzel 1983, 39). The supposition that Dhiv. sōḷa could be a loanword from Hindi is disproved by the mere fact that the retroflex /l/ has a 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. *Isōḷā 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. sōḷa as a borrowing from Mar. solā or Gaj. 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. sōḷa consists in assuming a prakritisim (← *Isōḷā ← *Isōḷahā ← Isōḷasah).323

“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, satadasa (← OIA saptādāsa “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. satraḥ 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 northwestern 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 *sattara 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 saptādāsa as well (cf. “sixteen” above; Geiger 1938, 120).324

“Eighteen”: M.A.F. aṣārā which in inscriptions is attested also in its older form atārā (IDMMM 3.4; IDHMH 4.11) does not correspond directly to Old Sinh. atāra and atarasā, the latter forms showing the regularly shortened medial -a- against Dhiv. -ā-. Cf. also literary Sinh. atalos/atadosa25 with short -a- (for the retroflex -l- cf. “sixteen” above). All these forms go back to OIA aṣṭādāsa “18”; intermediate stages are represented by forms such as Pa. attādāsa, Pkt. attadāsa, Pa., Pkt. attārasa, Pkt. attārara (cf. Turner 1966, I, 41, 946; Geiger 1941, 4, nos. 52 and 53). Dhiv. aṣārā 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. atāra → aṣārā reflects a prakrisim (cp. Pkt. attarasā / attārasa). In the (less probable) case of an early borrowing from Hi. athārara, as suggested by Maldivian popular etymology (cf. above), the result in Dhivehi would as well be aṣārā (t → s 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 Prakrit foundation of Sinhalese and Maldivian a form must have existed which corresponded to the Sanskrit āṇa-viniśaṭi (with omission of the eka)”. It must be admitted, though, that in this case, the retroflex -n- appearing in A. ona-viḥi and F. unaviḥi remains as unexplained as that of Pkt. igunavīsam, igunavīsaṇam and aṇaṇavīsam (← ekāṇvinniśati; cf. below26). *āṇaviniśati-, which is not recorded in MIA, must also be the source of Hi. aṇ(n)ijis and Beng. unis (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.

323 Cf. 1.3.5 above and the other numbers beginning with s-.
324 In the modern language, this is replaced by dhaṭa-hata (cf. Matzel 1983, 39 and Geiger 1938, 118).
325 In Modern Sinhalese, only dhaṭa-ata (lit. “ten-eight”) is used for “18” (cf. Matzel 1983, 39 and Geiger 1938, 118).
The numeral ekunvisi (subst. ekunvissa) must be identified with Pa. ekūnavīsa(ti)-. OIA ekonaviṁśati- “19” (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 120, no. 2499; GEIGER 1938, 121). The literal meaning of ekonaviṁśati- and its elliptic variant, *tūnnaviṁśati- is “twenty lacking one”. — In Modern Sinhalese, “19”, lit. “ten-nine”, is expressed only by the two variants dāha-nama(-ya) and dāha-nava(-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: hāhāhi dusaita 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-(ona-/una-) 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’, onatiṁ ‘29’, onasatta ‘69’ [sic!]327 ← Ind.”). While vihi “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 onatiṁs “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-dīha, 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. vihi, Sinh. visi (subst. vissa), Hi. bīṣ, Guj. and Mar. viṣ etc. must be traced back to OIA viṁśati- “20” via nasal-less variants like Pa. viṣati, Pkt. viṣāt, viṣā (cp. also Pkt. viṁśādi, Pa. and Pkt. viṣādi; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 677, no. 11616; GEIGER 1941, 167, no. 2505 and 1938, 121; BERGER 1992, 253). In Old Dhivehi, we find both vihi (IDMEM 4,11; ITMHM 1,3 and ITAH 4,7; vihi in L5 4/2,6) and vis (IDMHM 6,6). The latter form with long -ī, as well as the compound numerals containing -vī (cf. 2.5.1.3 below) are irregular; the variant viṣ can only be explained as a prakritism. The spelling viṁśati, attested in some lomāfanus (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 vis (cf. 2.5.1.2 above) is used to denote the meaning of “twenty-...”. With no doubt, all the numbers built on -vis must be regarded as prakritisms.

“21”: M.A.F. ekā-viṣ, lit. “1-20” cannot be equated with Class.Sinh. ek-viṣsa (stem ek-viṣi; cp. also the modern form visi-eka, stem (adj.) visi-ek; cf. GEIGER 1938, 118-9) which may be derived directly from OIA ekaviṁśati- via a Prakrit form like ekkaviṣa, ekkaviṣam. A form *ekkhi eviṣi which, according to the sound laws, would represent an exact equivalent of Class.Sinh. ekviṣi-, does not exist in Dhivehi. TURNER was right in looking for an extra-HIA origin of ekāviṣ, but Hi. ikkāi, which he proposed, cannot be regarded as a direct source (cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119, no. 2476 and 1985, 15, no. 2476). Instead, ekāviṣ, which has the appearance of an artificial form, is more likely to represent a prakritism. Most probably, it presupposes a form *ekavīsa, a conservative MIA variant with -k, similar to Pa. ekaviṣa but with a secondary lengthening of -ā which we find in some late MIA variants (cp. egavīsa, egavīsa, eōsa); NORMAN (1992, 214) explains the lengthened -ā by analogy with egarasa “11”. This contrasts with BERGER’s assumption according to which the lengthening of -ā (in modern forms like Hi. ikkāi, Nep. ekāis and in the MIA variants mentioned above) must be explained by analogy with “the next numeral, ‘twenty-two’ (Hi. bā, etc.)”; cf. BERGER 1992, 254 and s.v. “22” below.

“22”: M.A.F. bā-viṣ, 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 dvāviṁśati- represents a prakritism (cp. the Pkt. variants bāvisam etc. and Pa. bāvisati-; 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.
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for Insular Indo-Aryan (cf. 2.5.1.2). According to the sound laws, OIA *dvāvinśati- would have led to Dhiv. *davīhi via a MIA form with initial dv- such as Pa. dāvīsati-, dvāvīsa. Cp. also Class.Sinh. de-vissa (as against the modern form viṣi-deka, stem viṣi-de; cf. Geiger 1938, 119) which has no equivalent form in Dhivehi (*devīhi).338

“23”: M.A.F. tē-vīs, lit. “3-20”, must also be considered as a prakritism. Older attested variants are teviṣu (Dives akuru; F3.8) and tēvīs (Tāna; ITAG 6.3). Cp. Class.Sinhs. tevīs, stem te-viṣi, which must be derived through an intermediate form like Pkt. teviṣam, Pa. teviṣa (etc.) from OIA trāvyōvinśati- (cf. Turner 1966, I, 342, no. 6004 and 1985, 49, no. 6004). The correspondent Dhivehi form would be *teviṣi.

“24”: M.A.F. sau-vīs, lit. “4-20”, is already attested in some of the earliest written documents (sauvīsa in the lomāfanus 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. catuvvīsa from OIA cāturvinśati- (cf. Turner 1966, I, 250, no. 4623). -vīs with long i 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 cases 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 Hl. caubīs, Beng. cabbīs. Cp. also Class.Sinhs. satar(a)-vissa, stem “visi-.

“25”: M.A.F. fansa-vīs must be derived from OIA pācchavinśati-; cp. Pa. paṇcavīsa besides paṇṇavīsati, paṇṇavīsa, Pkt. paṇavīsam, paṇavīsati 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 pācchavinśati- being represented in Class.Sinhs. pas-vīsa (stem pas-viṣi) “25” as well as Dhivehi fassīhi (← Old Dhiv. pas-viṣi) 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 (saḥīs) in the Tāna inscription ITAG 1.9, goes back to OIA sādvīnśati-; cp. the MIA equivalents Pa. chabbīsati- and Pkt. chāvīsam (Turner 1966, II, 742, no. 12796). As in the preceding cases, Dhiv. sabbīś 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. chābbīs or Guj. chavvīs (cf. Berger 1992, 255). In Dhivehi, OIA sādvīnśati- would have developed into *hāvīhi via *savīsi, corresponding with Class.Sinhs. savīsa (stem savisi-).

“27”: M.A.F. haṭā-vīs is attested in one of the earliest records of Dhivehi in the spelling satāvīsu (lomāfanu L2 33.4). The derivation of this word from OIA saptāvinśati- is unproblematical. The Dhivehi form, a prakritism like the preceding numerals, must represent a MIA equivalent such as Pa. sattāvīsati or Pkt. sattāvīsa (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 saptāvinśati- would have led to Dhiv. *hātīhi ← *atvīsi ← *satvīsi.

“28”: M.A.F. asāvīs, 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. athāvīsam, Pa. athāvīsati- to OIA asāvīnśati- (cf. Turner 1966, I, 42, no. 950). The regular Dhivehi form would be *aṭṭhīhi ← *aṭvīsi ← *aṭavīsi.

“29”: can be expressed by two etymologically different numerals, in the same way as “19”. The prakritism M. ona-tīrīs, A. ona-tīrīs F. una-tīrīs, lit. meaning “thirty lacking (one)”, reflects OIA ṭatārinśat- “29” (cf. Turner 1966, I, 114, no. 2408; for tīrīs “30” cf. 2.5.1.4 below), thus contrasting with Class.Sinhs. ekun-tisa (stem ekun-tiṣ) “29”, an inherited IIA form which corresponds to the more “complete” variant OIA ekonatrimśat- (cf. Turner 1966, I, 120, no. 2496; for other variant forms cf. Berger 1992, 256). In Dives akuru inscriptions, we find onatīris (IDMHM 7.4), onatīris (IDAH 1.8) and the ordinal number onatīrśavana (IDMEM 4.8, spelt with (ṇ)). 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 haṭāvīs “27” and asāvīs “28”, similar to navārā “19” which

338 Most probably, Sinh. devesi- must be derived from a feminine form OIA *deviṁśati- via MIA *dve-/deviśati-. A formation by analogy with Sinh. teviśi- (cf. below) cannot be excluded either; cp. “Marāthi bevis (beside bāvīs), the e [of which] is anticipated from tēris “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. nava “nine” and the analytical formation nuva-ṭiha “19”. It is not impossible that the vocalism of the first syllable of navāvis 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-vis and aṣā-vis. 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., vināśati “20” appearing in some līmāfanus (L3 1/1.1; L5 1/1.2, 4/1.2) as well as ekaviśati “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 ș-visa (stems visi-nama and ș-nava), lit. meaning “20+9” (cf. Geiger 1938, 119; Matzel 1983, 39), which presumably substitute a reverse formation *nava-vissana, 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. tirās 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/ṭiha which are derivable directly from Ap. tis, tisam, Pa. tīsam(tri)- (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. tirās is related with OIA triṃśat- “30” (cp., e.g., Niya triśa). In Modern IA we find “beside the normal continuations such as Hi. [etc.] tis ... forms with preserved tr- as in ... Gujrāṭi triš, ... Bengali tris, Assamese trix, Oriya triša, 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 tirās can be taken seriously, is still open to doubt (1985, 49, no. 6015). In this case, tirās 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 tirās represents a learned prakritism in Dhivehi.

“40”: M.A.F. sālis is already attested in its modern form in the Dives akuru inscription IDMBM 1.5329. Its Sinhalese equivalents are the stem variants satalis/hatalis, sutalis/hatalis, and sālis/sālis (subst. -a) which through Pkt. cattālīsaṃ, cātissams, Pa. cattālīsand/cattālīsam/cattārisams can be derived from OIA catvāpriṃśat- (cf. Geiger 1941, 188, no. 2844; Rhyss-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 *sālis with short -i-, which we see in all Sinhalese variants mentioned above. Thus, Dhiv. sālis, too, must be interpreted as a prakritism, reflecting a form like cātissam.

“50”: M.F. fansās, A. fansas go back to OIA pañcāsās- (with the regular change of c to s); the numeral fansas meaning “48” in the Maldivian duodecimal system (cf. 2.5.1.8 below), which is obsolete in the modern language, must derived 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, fansas 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 fansas and fansās cannot have been the same, despite of their common etymology. Dhiv. fansas exactly corresponds to Sinh. pañnas “50” (subst. pañnasāpanaha) which through forms like Pkt. pannāsam, Pa. pannāsa, paññāsam goes back to OIA pañcāsās- (cf. Geiger 1941, 95, no. 1402 and Turner 1966, I, 433, no. 7682). The medial cluster -ns- of fansās reflecting OIA -nc-, 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 fansas “50” must have acquired the new interpretation of “48”.

“60” is expressed by two numerals of different etymological origin. M. fas-dolos, A.F. fas-dolos “5×12” is the only duodecimal numeral of Dhivehi that has been completely integrated into the decimal system. According

329 sālīsa (with -l-) in L2 37.5 refers to the prophet Sālih; cp. the spelling sāleḥ 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. ḍhāṭti which through Pkt. ṣaṭṭhi, Pa. ṣaṭṭhi- 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. ḍhāṭti cannot be exactly identified with Sinh. sāṭṭha/sāṭṭha “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. ā’, F. ašo laš “8” ← Pkt. atha.

“70”: M. haidiha, A.F. ḍadheha ḍhat-deha “7×10” represents a comparatively recent type of formation (together with ḍaddiha “80” and nuvadiha “90”); cf. also Geiger (1919, 71). In contrast to this neologism, M. haiṭeri, A.F. haiṭari “70” reflect MIA forms such as Pkt. sattarim, Pa. sattari- which can be derived from OIA saptati-. Cp. also the corresponding numeral stem of Sinhalese, hāṭṭā/sāṭṭā (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. ḍaddiha, A.F. ḍaddeha ḍat-deha “8×10” cf. “70” above. The numeral is attested in the spelling (ditha) in the Tāna inscription ITAG 3.6. — As against this, there is a more archaic variant in Dhivehi, viz. M.A.F. ḍhi which can be traced back to OIA aṣṭi- “80” through intermediate stages like Pkt. aṣṭāsam, Pa. asṭī- (cf. Turner 1966, I, 40, no. 911 and 1985, 6, no. 911); cp. the correspondent Sinh. form aṣṭā, subst. aṣṭāva (Geiger 1941, 14, no. 222). The initial ḍ- of Dhiv. ḍhi still needs an explanation.

“90”: M. nuva-ṭiha “9×10” is already documented two times in Tāna inscriptions of the 18th century (ITMMH 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-ṭeṇha; 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 navati-; cp. Pkt. nau, naui, 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. anā, subst. anāva “90” the initial a of which “seems to be due to the analogy of aṣṭāva 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”).


2.5.1.5.2. 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.
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). 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 \textit{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”:

- \textit{ettirīs} “31” (OIA \textit{ekatriṃśat}-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119 and 1985, 15, no. 2469);
- \textit{sauratirīs} “34” (OIA \textit{cāṭustriṃśat}-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 252, no. 4651); the ordinal number “34th” is attested as \textit{sau-tirīs-vana} in Old Dhiv. (ITAH 6,2; cp. \textit{sauvīs} “24”, 2.5.1.3);
- \textit{sattirīs} “36”, attested in the spelling \textit{〈 satirīs 〉} in RC 9,3 (OIA \textit{˙sā ˙ttriṃśat}-, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12786; cp. Guj. \textit{chattrīs});
- \textit{satutirīs} “37” (OIA \textit{saptatriṃśat}-, cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13145);
- \textit{aśutirīs} “38” (OIA \textit{aṣṭatriṃśat}-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 41, no. 945; cp. Guj. \textit{aṭṭrīś});
- \textit{saurayālīs} “44” (OIA \textit{cāṭucatvārinśat}-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 251 and 1985, 33, no. 4628; cp. Or. \textit{cāurīś});
- \textit{fansayālīs} “45” (OIA \textit{pañcacatvārinśat}-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432 and 1985, 62, no. 7659; cp. -\textit{ns-} in Old Sinh. \textit{pansalīs} and -\textit{nc-} in Or. \textit{paṅcaḷīsa} as against Pkt. \textit{paṅayālīsa});
- \textit{sayālīs} “46” (OIA \textit{saṭcatvārinśat}-, Pkt. \textit{chāyālīsam}; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12784; cp. Or. \textit{chāyālīsa});
- \textit{satālīs} “47” (OIA \textit{saptācatvārinśat}-, Pkt. \textit{sattālīsam}; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 760 and 1985, 104, no. 13142);
- the ordinal number \textit{satālīs-vana} “47th” is already attested in the Dives akuru fatko\textit{lū} F8,16.
- \textit{aṣālīs} “48” (OIA \textit{aṣṭacatvārinśat}-, Pa. \textit{aṭṭhatalīsa}, Aṭṭhatalīsa; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 41, no. 944);
- \textit{bāvanna} “52” (OIA \textit{dvāpācārīsam}-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 380 and 1985, 55, no. 6661; cp. Pkt. \textit{bāvannam(ī), bāvannam});

\footnote{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 trāyapāñcāśati-, Pkt. tēvannam, tēvannain; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 342 and 1985, 49, no. 5995);
sauravanna “54” (OIA catuḥpāñcāśati-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 251, no. 4638);
fansavanna “55” (OIA pāñcaphāñcāśati-, Pa. pāñcaphāñcāśati, Pkt. pāñcāśati; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7666);
sauvan “56” (OIA sātpāñcāśati-, Pkt. chappannam; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12787);
sauvan “57” (OIA saptapāñcāśati-, Pkt. sattavannam; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13149);
asuvanna “58” (OIA aśṭāpāñcāśati-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, no. 949; cp. Pkt. atṭhavanna);

ekāhāti “61” (OIA ekāśasti-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119 and 1985, 15, no. 2478; cp. also Sindhi ekahāthī; for the lengthening of -ā- cp. Dhiv. “51” above331);
bāhāti “62” (OIA dvāśasti-, Pkt. bāṣṭham, bāṣṭhi; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 381 and 1985, 55, no. 6673);
tēhāti “63” (Skt. trayāśasti-, Pk. tēṣṭham, Pkt. tēṣṭhi; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 342 and 1985, 49, no. 5996);
for an older attestation cf. the ordinal number tēhāṭi-vana, written (tēhaṭī-vana) in a Tāṇa inscription (ITMHM 5.2).
sauraḥāti “64” (OIA catuḥśasti-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 249, no. 4590);
fansahaṭṭi “65” (OIA pāñcascasti-, Pkt. pāñcascastham; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7674);
sahāti “66” (OIA satascasti-, Pkt. chasastham (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12790 and NORMAN 1992, 218); cp. also Or. chasasthi, Sindhi chāhāthī332);
satuaḥāti “67” (OIA saptasasti-, Pkt. satascasthi- etc.; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13158 and NORMAN 1992, 218; cp., e.g., Sindhi sathasthi, cf. BERGER 1992, 266);
asuhaṭṭi “68” (OIA aṣṭasasti-, Pkt. aṭṭhasastham etc.; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, no. 953; cp. also Panj. athahat);

ekāhātiye “71” for the more archaic formations with ṭhattari such as ekabhāṭṭari etc. in the dialect of Addū cf. 2.5.1.1 above); OIA ekasaptasati-., cf. TURNER 1966, I, 119 and 1985, 15, no. 2479; Pkt. ekasattari-., cf. NORMAN 1992, 218; for Hi. ik-hattar, Beng. ekattar etc. cf. BERGER 1992, 267);
bāhāṭiye “72” (OIA dvāśasti-., Pkt. bāvattarim; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 381 and 1985, 55, no. 6674; for Pkt. bāhāṭari- babhāṭari- and Hi. etc. bhāṭtar, Mar. bāhāṭtar etc cf. BERGER 1992, 267); cp. the attestation of the ordinal number bhāṭtarivana333 in the Dives akuru inscription IDMHM 2.4,
tēhāṭiye “73” (Skt. traversaptasati-., cf. TURNER 1966, I, 49 and 1985, 49, no. 5997; Pa. tēṣṭati-., cf. NORMAN 1992 219; cp. also Hi. and Nep. tīharat);
sauraḥāṭiye “74” (OIA catuḥsasthi-., 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);
fansahaṭṭiye “75” (OIA pāncasasthi-., Pkt. pāñcacaṭṭari- besides pāñcakattarim; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 432, no. 7675 and NORMAN 1992, 219; cp. further Gaj. pañjahattari);
sahaṭṭiye “76” (OIA sastasasti-., Pkt. chāṭṭarim, Ap. chāṭṭhari; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 742, no. 12790 and NORMAN 1992, 219);
satuaḥāṭiye “77” (OIA saptasasti-., Pkt. sattahattarim; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 761, no. 13159 and NORMAN 1992, 219);
asuhaṭṭiye “78” (OIA aṣṭasasti-., Pkt. aṭṭhahattarim, aṭṭhahattari- besides aṭṭhatarim; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 42, 954 and NORMAN 1992, 219);

331 Cf. also BERGER (1992), 265, who explains the secondary -ā- of Panj. akāhat “61” by analogy with Panj. bāhāt “62”.
332 For the secondary lengthening of the a in the first syllable cf. BERGER (1992), 266.
333 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”.

ekāhātiye “81” (OIA ekāśi-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 120 and 1985, 16, no. 2491; Pkt. ekkāśī and ekkāśī, cf. NORMAN 1992, 219; for Beng. Or. etc. ekāśi cf. BERGER 1992, 219);
bayāhī “82” (OIA dvyaśi-, cf. TURNER 1966, I, 382 and 1985, 55, no. 6699; for Hi. bayāśī, Nep. bayāśi, Or. bayāsi etc. cf. BERGER 1992, 270);
2.5.1.5.2. Formations of the type “9 + decade”:


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. ona-vihi, F. āṇa-vihi “19”; M. ona-tirīs, A. ona-tirīs F. āṇa-tirīs “29”; M. ona-sālīs, A. ona-sālīs, F. āṇa-sālīs “39”; M. ona-fansās, A. ona-fansas, F. āṇa-fansās “49”; M. ona-haṭṭi, A. ona-haṭṭi, F. āṇa-haṭṭi “59”; M. ona-haṭṭeri, A. ona-hattari, F. āṇa-hattari “69”; M. ona-āhi, A. ona-āhi (sic), F. āṇa-āhi “79”; M. ona-satta (obs.), A. ona-satta, F. āṇa-satta “99” (for satta “100” cf. 2.5.1.6 below). The numeral denoting “89” shows the effect of haplology; cp. M. ona-nava ← *ona-nava, A. ona-vei ← *ona-vei, F. uṇa-nava ← *uṇa-nava.

334 Cf. BERGER (1992), 273: “The other languages have analogical new formations on the model of the other compounds with ’six’; cf. Hi. chirānawe (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” + eka- “1”). For the older language, this numeral is attested in the spelling satēka 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’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 hyper-prakritisation here. — In contrast to that, the numeral M.A.F. hia, together with Sinh. siya “100” (subst. sīyaya), a variant almost obsolete in the modern language, clearly represents the regular outcome of OIA śatā-, Pa. sata-, Pkt. sada-, saya- etc. 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. dusatta “200” which obviously represents a sanskritism (cp. Skt. dvīśata-).

2.5.1.7. “1000”; M.A.F. hās can be traced back to OIA sahasra- “1000” through an intermediate form *sēssē; cf. Pa., Pkt. sahsasa-, 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. sahāsa- (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 fatkolu (F2,3); in this case, however, the reading is not absolutely certain, the manuscript being damaged.

The stepping by thousands is performed in regular composition with hās “1000”; cp. M.F. e’, A. eu lek/l 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. fissatēka aṣaṭirīs “538”; A. nuvasatēka aṣānavei “998”; M. tirīs ha hās a’ /aś/ satēka fasdoḷas “36,860”; M. haidiha hās “70,000”.

335 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 Male 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 Adhā and Fua’ 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. dolos is the basis of the duodecimal system. The earliest attested forms are dolos and dolosu both appearing in the lomāfanu L1 (g/2,3 and my/1,6), and the reduplicated forms dolosu-tolos and dolosu-tołosu 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 l-s_d-l). The interpretation of dolos-tolos as “twelve thirteen” as proposed by Maniku/Wijayarathna (1986, 5) must be rejected because “13” was never attested in the form “tolos” 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. dolos (Sinh. subst. dolaha) from OIA (RV) dvādāsa as against Skt. dvādāsa as proposed by Geiger (1941, 82, no. 1210); cp. also Pa. dvādāsa, Pkt. dvālāsa 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 ekolos which can be traced back to OIA ekkādaśa; ekolos is to the regular e(k)gāra (cf. 2.5.1.2) as dolos 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. dolos eke “12+1”, “14” by dolos de “12+2”, “15” by dolos tine “12+3” etc., up to “22” which has the form of dolos dihae “12-10”. The last number preceding the following step by twelve can be formed by a kind of subtraction, cf., e.g., “23” which is expressed by F. ekuni-fasshi “24 less one” (lit. “24 lacking one”; for ekuni cp. OIA ekona- “less by one” ← eka- + inā-, 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; cf. 2.5.1.2 for the formation of “nineteen” and 2.5.1.5.3.

“24”: M.A.F. fasshi (noted as “24 faslesi” with a question mark by Geiger 1919, 72) is already attested in the lomāfanu L2 (5,4), in the archaic form pasvisi which exactly corresponds to Sinh. pasvisi “25” (cp. Pa. pañcaviṣati-). OIA pañcaviṃśati- “25” (cf. Turner 1966, I, 432, no. 7672). In the given context in the lomāfanu, 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/Wijayarathna (1986, 5) translate Dhiv. pasvisi with “25”. Because of the other duodecimal numbers appearing in the same context (especially dolos-tolos, cf. above), the meaning of “24” seems to be more probable, however. In more recent times, Dhiv. pasvisi → fasshi (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. fasshi eke “24+1”; “26”: fasshi de “24+2” etc. Geiger (1919, 72) notes “fasshi-haye (=2×12+6)” for “30”. “35”, however, is expressed by “subtraction” as “36 minus one”: ekuni-tin-dolos.

“36” tin-dolos is “3×12”; “37” tin-dolos eke is “3×12+1” etc. Cf. Geiger (1919, 73) who noted tin dolos hatare “3×12+4” for “40”. “47” ekuni-fanas literally means “one less than 48”.

336 Cp., however, the formation of fas-dolos ekolos “71” discussed s.v. “60” below.
“48”: M.A.F. fanas, 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. fanas ← *panas corresponds to Sinh. panas “50”; cf. TURNER 1985, 62, no. 7682, who identifies fanas (besides fansás “50”, the regular cardinal number of Modern Dhivehi) with OIA pañcasát- “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 fanas de’ “48+2”.

“60”: fas-dolos “5×12” is attested for the period of Old Dhivehi in the spelling (fasdolos) appearing in the Tānā inscriptions ITAG (2,2), ITAH (3,6) and ITAM (1,3). fas-dolos 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-dolos eke’, A.F. fas-dolos eke’ “5×12+1”, “62”: M. fas-dolos de’, A.F. fas-dolos de’ “5×12+2” etc., up to “69”: M. fas-dolos nuvæ, A.F. fas-dolos nuvæ, are still used as well. The highest derivative based on fas-dolos is A.F. fas-dolos ekolos “71”, lit. meaning “5×12+1”, which appears in a Tānā inscription from Gan (Addū Atoll: ITAG 2,2).

“72”: F. fäheti. This duodecimal number which has so far been attested for the vernacular of Fua’ 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 Addū and in North Dhivehi was not (much) different from F. fäheti. — For further examples of reinterpreted duodecimal numbers cp. 24 (← 25), 48 (← 50) and 96 (← 100).

“84”: A.F. haddolos 〈that-dolosl has the meaning of “7×12”.

“96” exists in the dialectal variants F. hia dolos 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 ḫāhā ḫātēka “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), satālis-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 prathamā-; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 488, no. 8648 and GEIGER 1919, 74), has been replaced by the neologism M.A.F. evvana lek-vanala 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 pañamu “first” has been used without interruption until nowadays in Sinhalese; this word goes back to OIA pratham- as well but presupposes an intermediate form with a retroflex stop such as Pa. pathama- (cf. GEIGER 1941, 101, no.
Furthermore, we find the secondary formation *palamu-veni* “first” in colloquial Sinhalese which occurs side by side with its “allegro-variant”, *palaveni*. Among the ordinal numbers of Sinhalese, there is no form derived from *ek*—“one” (i.e., ’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., *palamu-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. *faheṭi*, F. *faheṭi ← 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. *mīhā*) 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. *faχverin* “unit of five persons”, A.F. *havverin* (*ha*’/haʔ “seven”) “unit of seven persons”, A. *avverin* “unit of eight persons” (A. *a’, F. aʃo laʃl “eight”), etc. In Addū 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’ 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 *-vərun* in Fua’ 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 kula e’/ek/ bai “1/2”, lit. “one part made two parts” (bai “part”, *kula* “made, done” part.pret. of *kuranī* “to make, do”), *tin bai kula e’ bai “1/3”, hataru bai kula e’ bai “1/4”, etc.
In Sinhalese, too, fractions are expressed periphrastically by nouns meaning “part, share, portion”, viz. bāgaya and paṁguva. Cp., e.g., aten paṁguva “1/8”, lit. “(one) part of eight” (at-en abl./instr. of ata “eight”); aten tun-paṁguva “3/8”, lit. “three part(s) of eight”; hataren paṁguva “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”, 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.337

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”; cp. also M. gunanī, A. gananī “to count” and Sinh. ganinavā “to count, reckon, enumerate” which have to be derived from Skt. ganayati, Pa. gane- “to count” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 52, no. 760 and 1902, 921, no. 173).338

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 *guna of IIA Prakrit or of an early stage of Old Dhivehi would have developed into *gunu, -u being a secondary final vowel which, at least in the northern dialects, would have been conserved in the same quality until present.339 Old Dhiv. ṭgunu or, at a later time, M. ṭgunu, is not attested, however. Hence, we must presume that A. guṇa / M. guṇa, 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.340 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

337 The formations with -guna 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-pata “double, twice”, tun-pata “threethfold” or de-varak “two times”, te-varak “three times”; for further formations cf., e.g., JAYA-WARDENA-MOSER (1996), 2 f.

338 Cf. TURNER (1985), 29 who, on the one hand, puts M. gunanī together with OIA gunāyati (1) “advises” (1966, I, no. 4191), while the nominal element M. guna, on the other hand, is identified with gunāyati (2) “multiplies” (1966, I, no. 4191a); cf. further TURNER (1966), I, 213, 3993 s.v. gunāyati “counts” and 224, 4190 s.v. gunā- “... 2. species, quality, good quality”. The etymology of the OIA noun gunā-, 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-guna- “twofold”, catu-guna- “fourfold”, pāṭi-guna- “fivefold”; tribhīr gunāī “threefold”.

339 For the final vowels of the consonant stems cf. 2.3.1.3.4.2; for the development of OIA gunā- in diverse NIA languages cf. TURNER (1966), I, 224, no. 4190 and BERGER (1992), 281 f.

340 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 Addā uses indefinite collective numbers (cf. 2.5.3.1 above) in their dative form: cp., e.g., A. fāhettaka’ /fāhəti-ak-āsə/ “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’ /ha-ekk-āsə/ “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’ /doləs-ak-āsə/ “approximately twelve”. 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’ (“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” 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.

341 There is no particular suffix -haka’ as presumed by DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990, 104).

342 “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\(^{343}\) 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\(^{344}\) 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.\(^{345}\)

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 Aḍḍū pronouns here (pers.pron. I.ps.sg., interrogative pronouns, dem.pron. mi/me).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal pronouns</th>
<th>interrogative pronouns</th>
<th>demonstrative pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avar, obl. ma “I”</td>
<td>keyye “who?”</td>
<td>mi (attr.) “this (here)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing</td>
<td>konta’ “what?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality</td>
<td>kon “what kind of, what a?”</td>
<td>mi kahalei “such a”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>kehei vara’ “how much?”, kitaka’ “how many?”</td>
<td>mi vara’ “so much”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation (poss.)</td>
<td>afagē, ma “my”</td>
<td>kankāge “whose?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi (attr.)</td>
<td>miagē “of this”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mood</td>
<td>kehei, kehenaka’ “how, in which way?”</td>
<td>mehen “thus, in this way”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space</td>
<td>kontāki “where, at which place?”</td>
<td>mi tān, “here, at this place”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>konkalaki “when, at what time?”</td>
<td>mi kō “now, at this time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causality / finality</td>
<td>kian vegen “why, what for?”</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{343}\) Cf. the tables given in ISAČENKO (1962), 474 and 512.

\(^{344}\) The pronoun timā cannot be assigned a reflexive function in Modern Dhivehi, cf. 2.6.4.

\(^{345}\) “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 Aḍḍū 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 Aḍḍū-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. 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 Aḍḍū and Fua’ 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 *alugaṅdu* 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 *fatkuḷu* 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. DISANAYAKA/ MANIKU (1990, 37) note the pronoun *ma* for the 1.ps.sg. besides *aharen* and *alugaṅdu* 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 *alugaṅdu*, nor does it belong to a particular level of the threefold honorific system, which is otherwise “omnipresent” in the pronominal categories of standard Dhivehi. 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-

---

346 For this fundamental rule which has no exceptions cf. 5.2.
347 For GEIGER’s informant cf. the Introduction, 0.6.1 above.
348 Information by MUHAMMAD WAHEED (Madulu), 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 lín magaś la'galé (T1, 50) "let it float afloat to the place (lit. ‘road’) where I am sitting" (in part.pret. of innant “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. apē, aphenī, gen. aphāka, loc. aphesu appearing in the Asoka 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 ātmān-. “breath, soul; self”. TURNER (1966, I, 43, no. 986 and 51, no. 1135), while confirming that the Prakrit variants (“ātā, ātā, ādā, āyā nom., ... appā nom.”) come from ātmān-, 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 ātmān-, he relates api and the Asoka forms with the oblique prononinal stem of the 1.ps.pl. OIA asmā(d)-. On the problems involved now cf. HINÜBER (1986, 159) who states: “The acc.pl. apē of (Eastern) Asoka developed from Sanskrit asmān through *asvām: *as-vam, *as-paṃ → *appham which was later transformed after maye [Eastern Asoka ‘we’].”

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 Muhammad; afurenge kau in Tāna, RA 2,3; RC 4,8 and 9,1). The earlier form of the modern 1.ps.pl. M. ahare-men/aharumen “we", which represents an "allegro-form" (with a change /a/ to /o/, cf. 2.3.2.1.2. of the pers.pron. stem of the 1.ps.pl. OIA asmān). The problems involved now cf. HINÜBER (1986, 159) who states: “The acc.pl. apē of (Eastern) Asoka developed from Sanskrit asmān through *asvām: *as-vam, *as-paṃ → *appham which was later transformed after maye [Eastern Asoka ‘we’].”

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 t1/1,6). In several texts we find mi uren “these people" (F1,21; F2,15; F10,11; F12,9) and e uren “those people” (dat. e urenaṭu 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 miṭhun “those people”. The older form of uren is vuren,


350 For the plural suffix -men cf. 2.3.2.1.2.

351 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.

352 For the plural suffix -un, cf. 2.3.2.1.2.

353 The development of initial va- to u- represents a sound law within the history of Dhivehi, cp., e.g., the participle uḷunu ← uḷunu “(having) lived, been” substituting older vuḷunu (cf. 3.9.2.3).
“these people” appearing in the lômáfanus (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)\(^{354}\); the dative forms mi vuren-atu “to these people” (L2 36,3), mi uren-atu “id.”, e uren-atu “to those people” (F3,24 and 6, resp.). In the locational dative form mi vuren-ge-ta “to these people” (L2 24,2), the genitive ending -ge still has preserved its original meaning “house”\(^{355}\); thus, the exact translation is “to the house of these people”.\(^{356}\) The form mi uren-nā “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 Huvadī, 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 viṁrā- “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 viṁṛa-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 vi- to Dhivehi vi-. The Sinh. representation of OIA viṁrā-, 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 vi- going back directly to OIA vi- in initial position. In some examples there is a clear correspondence of initial Sinh. vi- (from MIA vi-ī-) and Dhiv. vi- or vi (with a secondary long vowel); cp., e.g., the following words the MIA ancestors of which have vi-: Dhiv. vihi “twenty”, Sinh. vissa, stem visi-: Pa. visati-, OIA vimśati- (cf. TURNER 1966, II, 677, no. 11616); Dhiv. vi “unhusked rice”, Sinh. viya, stem vi-; Pa., Pkt. vihi-, OIA vihi- (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 vidyā- (TURNER 1966, II, 683, no. 11742). An argument in favour of the derivation of vuren from viṁrā- may, however, be found in the etymology of the old Dhivehi word for “island”, even though its OIA ancestor, dvipā- “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-, dipaka-, Pkt. diva-; cf. TURNER 1966, I 382, no. 6691), representing the regular outcome of OIA dī-, 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, dāpata and dāva (cf. CARTER 1936, 261). The Dhivehi word divu “island” which serves as the first part of the ethnonym divēhi (← *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 diva, partly occurring side by side with divu in the same texts (e.g. L3 7/4), has been lost as an independent word as well, but is preserved as -dā in the second part of toponyms (cp., e.g., Midhā, Maradī, Hitadī, Fēdā, Mukandadī etc.; cp. also the name of the southernmost atoll, Addū, which represents a compound of Old Dhiv. at- (← *ata) “eight”\(^{357}\) and -dā\(^{358}\) lit. meaning “eight islands (atoll)”).

\(^{354}\) For the quasi-reflexive pronoun timā, cf. 2.6.4.2.

\(^{355}\) For the meaning and the derivation of the genitive ending, cf. 2.3.1.1.1.

\(^{356}\) 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.

\(^{357}\) 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. ra‘, F. rao raśl “island”; M. faší, A. fíši, F. fíši “little island”; M. finolu, A. finola, F. finolo “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 v- 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 lómáfanus L1 1/1.4 and L2 36,1); cp. Sinh. pirimi “id.” and puris “man”; Pa. purisa-, OIA púruša- “person, man.” 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‘ 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. It remains uncertain whether lafirial can reflect an old nom.pl. preserved as an isolated form.

2.6.2.3.3. In the standard language, alugañdu 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, alugañdum-en “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 alu-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

358 For the development of -t+d- → -dd- cf. 1.3.9 above.
359 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.
360 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, alu-gaṅdu 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 alu is obsolete as an independent noun in the modern language; is has been replaced by the loanword M. xādimu, A.F. xādim “servant” (← Arab. ḫādim “id.”). The noun alu, whose etymology is still unknown, often occurs as such in the documents of Old Dhivehi, however, where it was used as a pluralis tantum meaning “submissives, vassals, (the whole) domestic staff” as well as a singular form meaning “servant, slave”. Thus, alu appears as a neutral singular or plural form in the lōmāfanus (nom.sg.: L2 22,3 etc.; L3 12/2,2.3; nom.pl. alun “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. alā “the servant, the vassal” is met with in several fatkolu (F3,18; F4,5; F5,49; F6,26 etc.; gen.sg.def. alāge: F7,25; F9,5; F13,10.13.15; cf. also de alun “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 alutakun “all vassals together” (F5,36). Cp. also the derivative alukamu / alukan “domestic staff; servitude, slavery; service”361 (alikamu [!] in L3 2/1,5; alukan e.g. in F3,17; F5,46; F8,31; cp. also the indef. form alukamak “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”362 can be added to any noun with a concrete meaning; as a second part of a compound, it looses its own meaning, functioning as a derivational suffix which is approximately equivalent to the Engl. abstract suffix -ship.363

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 Aḍḍū and in Fua’ 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

---

361 In Modern Dhivehi, alukan means “divine service, worship, prayer”.
362 In Modern Dhivehi, kan is also used as a grammatical term meaning “verb”. For the etymology cp. Sinh. kama, stem kama: “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.
363 For the development kam(u) → kan (implying the change -m → -n, cf. 1.1.4) cp. the attestation in F8,31 where alukan precedes a word with initial k-: budat alukan kula kafīrān-ai... “… and the infidels who did service to the Buddha”; budat dat. “to the Buddha”, kula part.pret. “done” (cf. 3.9.2.2.5), kafir-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. tāe or Pa. t(v)ayā (cp. OIA instr. tvā). The Aḍḍu plural forms, nom. tafrīrītafrīrīlm and obl. tafrīrin “you”, which are based on the oblique stem ta, are obviously formed by analogy with afrīre lafrīrīl and afrīrin “we” (cf. 2.6.2.3.2). Just like its presumptive model afrīrin, ta-frirīn 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’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’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’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 mihū (← *mihū ← mihun), obl. ti mihun 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 mihun “people” (stem mīs- “man, human being”). Its exact meaning is “these people” (nearby 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 Muhammad, 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. tīa 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 Muhammad 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 Rādavalī, 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
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presupposed by the derivatives kalemen, nom.pl., “the lords” (F6,17), and kalēgefānunge, gen.pl., approximately “of the high-ranking Lord” (plurālis maiestatis, denoting the Prophet Muhammad; RC 10,2; ITMHM 7,6). The older phonological variant of the latter formation, kalēgepānū, is preserved in a Dives akuru tomb inscription in Mīdū, Addū (IDAM 1,27) and in the Rādāvalī again (RB 1,11). Cp. also the corresponding formations kaloge-pānū (nom.sg.; F10,6 and IDMHM 6,9) and kaloge[pānun (plurālis maiestatis, F11,7) which are based on kalo. The etymology of the second part of these compounds, -pān-/fānū, 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 -a/-ā 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., hasan364 kalo, F1,20); it cannot be excluded that this function, among others, is responsible for the distribution of -e and -a. 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 SA (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 muhammad “Lord Muhammad” (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; kalaminjā ← *kalaminjā, 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 -midī/mijja the meaning and etymology of which is still unclear. In contrast to this, the forms kalās (L6 1,2 and 2,3; RA 21,2) with its definite form kalaminjā in which obviously represents a honorific stem, kalēgefānunge (nom.pl.) “the lords” (F6,17), meaning “all the lords (to whom it may concern)” as in the gen.sg. the plural is additionally marked by the suffix -un.

In the gen.pl. (kau-kabal-un-ge)365 (IDMHM 1,8), meaning “of the gentlemen and ladies”, we have a dvandva-compound kau-kahbal- “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 ikānhal, the etymology of which is still unclear, can be determined as “lady, Mrs.”. Cp. (kabau) (for [kānhau]) (mariam bibī) “Mrs. Mariam Bibī” occurring in a fakolu (F2,4); in a passage written in Arabic, kañbahu (kabau) refers to the Prophet Muhammad’s mother in the Rādāvalī (RC 4,13; kabau wahhabu binti aminatu). A nom.pl. in -un is attested in mi de kañbalun (kabalu) “these two women” (RC 6,1,3; F2,5,6). In the same fakolu (F2,9), we also find the gen.pl. kañbalunge (kabalunge) “of the women”. A definite gen.sg. is represented in kañbalāge (kabalāge) “of the woman” occurring in a lōmāfanu (L2 15,5). Presumably kañbalo (kabalo) (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 (← *kañbulo-ā?). Likewise it is not clear how we should analyse the form kañbō (kabō) “woman” which is attested in the Tāna Rādāvalī (RC 26,5). If it is not a mere “allegro-form” of kañbulo, we could also suppose some sort of “monophthongisation” of kañbahu here, representing a phonetic variant which depends on the position within a syntagm. Further documented forms are the genitives (sg.) kañbule (kabule) (ITAG 6,6) and kañbulo (kabulo) (F12,6; IDMBM 1,15). The word kañbulo also occurs in the modern colloquial language of Māle, but it does not mean “lady” any longer. kañbulo 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

364 Sic (in Dives akuru). The normal spelling of the name would be hasan in Arabic script.
365 The spelling is (kalās), the ō being corrected from ō. The final -a is uncertain.
366 For this type of formation cf. 2.3.2.5.
367 Phonetically this form contains a prenasalised ḍhīb [kaukañbalunge]; 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 *ka ámbulo* 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.  

2.6.2.4.4. In the modern language of Málé, the pronoun of the 2.ps. for the second degree of the social hierarchy, i.e., aristocracy, is *tia bèkalè “you (thou)” in the singular and *tia bèkalun “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 bèkalè* is “this one near you, the honourable lord” or “the honourable lord there, near you”. In a literary sense, *tia bèkalè* can thus be regarded as an indirect vocational form which, however, is used to directly addressing the addressee in question.  

The second part of this pronoun, bè-kalè, is a compound consisting of the title bè “bey; prince, sovereign, sir”, which is widespread in Islamic countries, and the element kalè “lord” that has been dealt with above. In Old Dhivehi, bè 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 /bèː/). This word, which presumably entered Dhivehi through Arabic (Arab. bè, written ⟨beyk⟩, cf. WEHR 1958, 76), lastly reflects the Turkic etymon *beg/bey “ruler, sovereign, prince”.*370 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), bèkalun-a’s “to the noble lords” (dat.pl., RB 1.8 written ⟨bekalunap⟩ preceding initial p-), bekalun-ā (RB 1.7) and beikalun-ā (RC 8.11) “the noble lords and” (“ā “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, bè is used by the younger members of the (extended) family as a form of addressing elder men.  

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 bèfulā or tia manikutānu*. Adequate translations for these exclusive forms of addressing would be “your (royal) majesty” or “excellence”. As in the case of *tia bèkalè* (cf. above), the first part of *tia bèfulā* consists of the enlarged form of the demonstrative pronoun ti. bèfulā is a compound again, containing the loanwords bè “prince, ruler, sovereign” and the honorific element -fulu (cf. 2.2.3) which has the particular

368 Cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 116; cp. also the use of bè (cf. 2.6.2.4.4).  
369 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.  
371 We cannot decide so far whether there is a connection between bè “lord” and the kinship term M.F. bèbe, A. bèbè “elder brother” (cf. 1.2.1.5). It is still unknown whether this etymon represents an original Dhivehi word or a loanword.  
372 Cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 116. Cp. also the use of ka ámbulo (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., înegili-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 -ä, which distinguishes the singular tía běfu-ä from its plural counterpart, tía běfulun 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 běfulu-/ä and běfulun are not attested.

2.6.2.4.6. The addressing form manikufänu, which represents an inheritable aristocratic title, is characteristic for a particularly high style. In its original function as a title, manikufänu 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 Êvela and Dives akuru (i.e. lômàfanus and fatkòlus as well as the Dives akuru manuscript of the Râdavaí), the title manikufänu seems not to be attested yet. The earliest attestations can be found in Tâña inscriptions of a relatively late period, but there are also some examples occurring in Dives akuru inscriptions; cp., e.g., the forms manikupänu nom.sg. (IDMEM 3,31), manikupänata dat.sg. (IDHM 7,18; spelt with (n)?), manikufänu nom.sg. (ITMHM 2,8 etc.; ITAH 3,6 and 4,9), manikufänu/manikufänu nom.sg. (ITMP 1,4; ITMHHM 1,5; ITAG 1,8 and 2,5), manikufänage gen.sg. (ITAG 1,6), manikufänage gen.pl. pro sg. (ITMHHM 1,4; ITAG 2,4). The nom.sg. maniku is attested only twice (ITMP 1,3; ITAG 3,6). Most probably, the title reflects a word meaning “jewel, precious stone, ornament”; cp. OIA ma-“jewel”, “ornament”, Pa., Pkt. mañi- (TURNER 1966, II, 557, no. 9731) as well as Sinh. mína/mäna, (stem mi-“gem, precious stone” (GEIGER 1941, 133, no. 1981) and mänika (stem mänik) “gem, jewel, precious stone” (← Skt. mañika-; cf. GEIGER 1941, 131, no. 1955). For Old Dhivehi, the form mani is attested in L1 (l/1,1, obviously in the sense of “pearl”); this must be explained as a sanskritim, the word being unknown in Modern Dhivehi. Thus, the original meaning of the title manikufänu must have been something like “esteemed jewel” (cf. also 2.2.2; for the element -pänu/-fänu 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., ZOGRÄF 1976, 155 and MASICA 1991, 251). According to GEIGER (1941, 31, 472 and 1938, 124-5), the corresponding Sinhalese pronominal stem e/ë “that; he” must be deduced from the old pronominal stem ay- which is represented in the OIA nom.sg. ayám “this” as well as the nom.sg. esá “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 esá (stem etá-) as the original form (I 122, 2530 s.v. ĕsá).

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
373 For this construction cf. 2.6.5.3.1.1 and, furthermore, 5.2.
374 For the phonological reasons of these developments cf. 1.3.9.2.1.
375 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. ē; 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 (leu). 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 mi; cp. the nom. A. mide “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’ Mulaku, the 3.ps.pl. “they” has the nominative form e mihū (← #mīhū ← mihun) and the oblique case e mihun, while the corresponding plural forms of Ādū 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-vere le-verial, obl. e-verin (with shortened variant even) “they” can be translated with “those persons, those people”. For the final l-al 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 Ādū and Fua’ Mulaku:

### 2.6.2.6.1. Māle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pers.pron.</th>
<th>1st degree</th>
<th>2nd degree</th>
<th>3rd degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>“I”</td>
<td>alugañdu</td>
<td>alugañdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>“you”</td>
<td>kalē</td>
<td>tia bēkalā, tia bēkalē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>“he / she”</td>
<td>ēnā</td>
<td>e bēkalā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(anim.)</td>
<td>“it”</td>
<td>e, eā, ēti</td>
<td>e, eā, ēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td>“we”</td>
<td>alugañdumen</td>
<td>alugañdumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>“you”</td>
<td>kalēmen</td>
<td>tia bēkalun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>“they”</td>
<td>e mihun, e bai mihun</td>
<td>e bēkalun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(anim.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inan.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6.2.6.2. Ādū:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pers.pron.</th>
<th>casus rectus</th>
<th>casus obliquus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>“I”</td>
<td>ava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>“you”</td>
<td>tō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>“he / she”</td>
<td>ede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(anim.)</td>
<td>“it”</td>
<td>e, eā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inan.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td>“we”</td>
<td>aferie /afiria/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>“you”</td>
<td>tafiri /tafiri/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>“they”</td>
<td>everie /everia/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(anim.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>etaketi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inan.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.2.6.3. Fua’ Mulaku:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pers.pron.</th>
<th>casus rectus</th>
<th>casus obliquus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>“I”</td>
<td><em>ava</em></td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>“you”</td>
<td><em>tō</em></td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>(anim.) “he /she”</td>
<td><em>ede</em></td>
<td><em>ea, eu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td>“we”</td>
<td><em>afū</em></td>
<td><em>afun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>(anim.) “you”</td>
<td><em>tāmen</em></td>
<td><em>ti mīhū</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1./2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td><em>ava</em></td>
<td><em>ava</em></td>
<td><em>alugañdu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
<td><em>alugañdu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td><em>afagē, magē</em></td>
<td><em>mage</em></td>
<td><em>alugañduge</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>*ma’/maś/</td>
<td><em>maśa</em></td>
<td>*alugañda’/-aś/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td><em>magē farātun, ma eku hun</em></td>
<td><em>mage farātēn</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2.7.2. Pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. anim. “you”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td><em>tō</em></td>
<td><em>tō</em></td>
<td><em>tia bēkalā</em> / <em>tia bēkalē</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
<td><em>tia bēkalē</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td><em>tagē</em></td>
<td><em>tage</em></td>
<td><em>tia bēkalēge</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>*tā’/tā-āś/</td>
<td><em>taśa</em></td>
<td>*tia bēkelā’/kale-āś/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td><em>tagē farātun; ta eku hun</em></td>
<td><em>tage farāten</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.2.7.3. Pers. pron. 3.ps.sg. anim. “he/she”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aḍḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>ede</td>
<td>ede</td>
<td>ēnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>eu, ea</td>
<td>ēnā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>eagē</td>
<td>euge, eage</td>
<td>ēnāge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>ea’/lea-āʃ/</td>
<td>euṣa, eaṣa</td>
<td>ēnāa’/ēnā-āʃ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>eagē farātun</td>
<td>euge/eage farāten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2.7.4. Pers. pron. 3.ps.sg. inan. “it”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aḍḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>e, ea (sg.def.)</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e, eā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>eāi</td>
<td>eai</td>
<td>ēge /eai-ège/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>eā’/eā-āʃ/</td>
<td>eaṣa</td>
<td>ea’/eai-āʃ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>eaɪn/eaɪ-in/</td>
<td></td>
<td>ein /eai-in/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>(= gen.)</td>
<td>(= gen.)</td>
<td>ēgā /ea-gaɪ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2.7.5. Pers. pron. 1.ps.pl. “we”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aḍḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1./2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>a新基建 /a新基建ya/</td>
<td>afū</td>
<td>alusgaⁿdumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>a新基建</td>
<td>afun</td>
<td>alusgaⁿdumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>a新基建ė</td>
<td>a фине</td>
<td>alusgaⁿdumenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>a新基建na’/ a финна’/a-asi/</td>
<td>a финна’/a-asi/</td>
<td>alusgaⁿdumena’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>a新基建ė farātun / a新基建 enulun</td>
<td>a фине faraṭen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.2.7.6. Pers.pron. 2.ps.pl. “you”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ađđū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>tafirie /tafiria/</td>
<td>tāmen, ti mīhū</td>
<td>kalēmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>tafirin</td>
<td>ti mīhūn</td>
<td>kalēmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>tafiringē</td>
<td>tāmenge, ti mīhunge</td>
<td>kalēmenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>tafiringē /-aśl, tafinna’</td>
<td>tāmenna’, ti mīhunna’</td>
<td>kalēmenna’ /-aśl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>tafiringē farātun, tafirin ekuhun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2.7.7. Pers.pron. 3.ps.pl. anim. “they”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ađđū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>everie /leveria/</td>
<td>e mīhū</td>
<td>e mīhun, e bai mīhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>everin, even</td>
<td>e mīhun</td>
<td>e / e bai mīhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>everingē</td>
<td>e mīhunge</td>
<td>e / e bai mīhunge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>everinna’, evenna’</td>
<td>e mīhunna’</td>
<td>e / e bai mīhunna’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>everingē farātun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2.7.8. Pers.pron. 3.ps.pl. “they” (inan.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ađđū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>e taketi</td>
<td>e etteti /eti-etil/</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>e takettiği</td>
<td>e ettettiği</td>
<td>e takettiği</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>e taketta’ /-aśl</td>
<td>e ettetta’ /-aśl</td>
<td>e takecca’ / etaketi-aśl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>e takettin</td>
<td>e ettettin</td>
<td>e taketin /-i-in/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>(= gen.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>e takettiği /-gai/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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,376 possession is expressed by the genitive of the personal pronouns. Only in the first person, *timå* “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-*ı aharen-*ge* ge.” (T8, 71) “This is my house.” (lit. “What that house is, is my house.”; *tia* dem.pron.; *ge* “house”, -ak-*ı* indef. suffix + focus-marker -ı).

A. “*te-ak-*ı *timå-*gå *molōgaña* na*n-åu.*” (T3, 37) “This is not my axe.” (lit. “What that is, is not the self’s axe.” *te* dem.pron.; *timå-*gå gen. of *timå*, used in possessive function; *molōgaña* “axe”, unenlarged nominal stem in singular function; *nun* “is not”; -åu quotation marker).

The following table illustrates all possessive forms that are based on the genitive of the personal pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>poss.pron.</th>
<th>Addå</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Måle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg. “my”</td>
<td>afagå</td>
<td>mage</td>
<td>alugañåuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg. “your”</td>
<td>tagå</td>
<td>tage</td>
<td>kalåge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg. “his/her”</td>
<td>eagå</td>
<td>eage, euge</td>
<td>ènåge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl. “our”</td>
<td>aﬁringå</td>
<td>aﬁunge</td>
<td>alugañåmånge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl. “your”</td>
<td>taﬁringå</td>
<td>tàmenge, ti mîhungå</td>
<td>kalåmånge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl. “their”</td>
<td>everingå</td>
<td>e mîhungå</td>
<td>e / e båi mîhungå</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Måle 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 *fûlu digu hañdíge våhaka* (“Story of the demon with the long navel”) where it occurs in an exclamation quoted as direct speech: M. “*addò 〈a’dò〉, ma fûlo!*” (T13, 28) “Ouch, my navel!” The oblique case *ma* meaning “my” is not the only exceptional form within this sentence. The form *fûlo*, 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”, *fûlu*.377 Another way to explain the long -ò of *fûlo* would be to assume a merger of *fûlu* and the quotation marker ē ← 〈eve〉 here (cf. 5.4).

---

376 Cf., e.g., GEIGER (1942), 6 / (1973), 588; MATZEL (1983), 22.

377 The etymology of *fûlu* 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 Adđú and Fua’ Mulaku:

A. “mi ta molōganda tau?” ... “tě ma molōganda nunāu.” (T3, 59-60) “Is this (here, nearby me) your axe?” — “No, that (there, nearby you) is not my axe.” (mi = mi-i, dem.pron. mi + focus-marker -i; tě = te-i, dem.pron. te + focus-marker -i; ma “my”, tu “your”, obl. case forms of the pers.pron. of the 1st and 2nd ps.sg., resp.; molōganda “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 Adđú and Fua’ 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 Molōganda “The axe”, in the dialect of Adđú (T3, 12):


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:


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*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“self”</th>
<th>Aḍdū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom./obl.sg.</td>
<td><em>timā</em></td>
<td><em>timā</em></td>
<td><em>timā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.sg.</td>
<td><em>timāge</em></td>
<td><em>timāge</em></td>
<td><em>timāge, timange</em>, timenge*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.sg.</td>
<td><em>timā /timā-aš/</em></td>
<td><em>timāša /timā-aš/</em></td>
<td><em>timā /timā-aš/</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.sg.</td>
<td><em>timāge farātun / timā ekuhun</em></td>
<td><em>timāge ferāten</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom./obl.pl.</td>
<td><em>timāmen</em></td>
<td><em>timāmen</em></td>
<td><em>timāmen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.pl.</td>
<td><em>timāmengē</em></td>
<td><em>timāmengē</em></td>
<td><em>timāmengē, timennēge</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.pl.</td>
<td><em>timāmenna</em></td>
<td><em>timāmenna</em></td>
<td><em>timāmenna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.pl.</td>
<td><em>timāmengē farātun; timāmen ekuhun</em></td>
<td><em>timāmengē ferāten</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) These forms are dialectal variants according to oral information by ḤASSAN ȘA’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 deniablemable after the Latin demonstratives *hic*, *iste* and *ille*.

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*-*, ṝ-/oya-*, ê- and *ara-* as follows: “*mē* ‘this, these’: proximity to speaker, or to both speaker and hearer. *oya* ‘that, those (by you)’: proximity to hearer. *ara* ‘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.”

---

378 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 BRÜG-MANN (Die Demonstrativpronomen der indogermanischen Sprachen. Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Bd. 22, 1904).

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. *imā-*; 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dem.pron.attr.</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fuā′ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“hic”</td>
<td><em>mi</em> / <em>(me)</em></td>
<td><em>mi</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“iste”</td>
<td><em>te</em></td>
<td><em>ti</em></td>
<td><em>ti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ille”</td>
<td><em>e</em></td>
<td><em>e</em></td>
<td><em>e</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Addū 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 beni mei* ... (T1, 10) “Having spoken this way ...” (*me* “this”, attr. of *hen* obl. “mood, way”; *beni* part.pret. “(having) said, spoken” (M. *bunanī* “to say, speak”); *mei* nom.loc. in conjunctival function “(at the time) when”.

F. *kihinne tai ta tī rukaha gē?* (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-ī* part.pret. “gone” (M. *danī* “to go”) + focus marker; lit. “which way was it you went to that coconut-tree (there, near you)?”).

M. *e de bēfuūn musīmahā duru vī* (T8, 140) “Those two gentlemen went mackerel fishing.” (*e* attr. “those”; *de* “two”; *bēfuūn* obl.pl. “gentlemen, nobles”; *musīmahā* for /musīmas-āl/ “with the mackerels”; *daru vī-ī* part.pret. of *daru vant* “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, belalaku mī hedī likī goho, mī 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”; belalaku obl.indef. “a cat”; mī 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); mī dem.pron. used as substantive, nom., inan. “this (one)”; kāfī 3.ps.sg.pret.I (M. kānī “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, 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 mōlogaṇḍa tau? ... tē ma mōlogaṇḍa 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 mōlogaṇḍa “your axe”; tau quest.particle; tē = te-ī “what that (there, nearby you) is, is ...”; ma mōlogaṇḍa “my axe”; nun-āu negation particle + quotation particle).

F. ... mī ran fēšak ai. “... what this was, is a golden box.” (T1, 54a; mī = mi-ī “what this (here, nearby him) was, was ...”; ran obl. “gold”; fēšak ← stem fēši- + indef.suff. -ak “a box”; -ai quotation particle).

M. mi-ī ves mamma-ek-ge sūra eve. (mi-ī ves mamma’e’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. sūra ‘id.”381; eve quot.party.

Sentences like the following one can be understood within the framework of a similar syntactic context:

A. boṇdānā ahafti: fiṇdanu, fiṇdanu, e kon aḍa? “The B.-bird asked: ‘F.-bird, F.-bird, what a noise is that?’” (T1, 20-20a: boṇdānā nom.def.; ahafti pret.I, 3.ps.sg. (M. ahafti “to ask”); fiṇdanu obl. “F.-bird”; kon interv.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 -t 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.

380 For the details of this construction cf. 5.2.

381 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 -i 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-i, while ēnā-i does not exist. Cp. the following example:

M. ēnā akī ēge nevin. (T8, 165) “(It is true), he was her captain.” lit. “(It is true) that what he was, 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-i) as used in the following sentence:

A. ehen vi mei, eākī e raśī hiśi emme fakīrī taulīman ne’ mīhā kamugai vege. (T16, 3) “Therefore, he (probably) became the poorest and least educated man in this island.” lit. “Having become that way (ehen vi mei), it became the fact (kamugai 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”; mei “when” (nom.loc.); e raśī “(in/on) that island”: e dem.pron., attr. of raśī, gen./loc. of ra’/raśī “island, land”; hiśi part.pret. “having been” (M. hunnani “to be, stand, remain”), attr. of mīhā nom.sg. “man”; emme pron.adj. “all, of all”; fakīrī adj. “poor”; taulīman ne’ “without education”, lit. “education not being there”; taulīman “education, instruction” (M. ta’u’/limu ← Arab. ta’līm “instruction, teaching”; ne’ /neti 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’ 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’ Mulaku, the animate substantivised forms of the demonstral 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’ Mulaku fairy tale alīkedēa dērikēdeī “The piece of ash and the piece of coal” (T6):

F. ... mi kuddā bōdō vege ai. miu aḥāfī ai ... “This boy grew up. He asked ...” (T6, 61-62; kuddā “child”, here: “boy”; bōdō adj. “big, great”; vege pret.IV, 3.ps.sg. (M. vanī “to become”); ai quot.particle; mi-u “this one, he” (m.); aḥāfī pret.I, 3.ps.sg. (M. ahanī “ask”).

F. ... reha kakkāgen, mia 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. hadāni “to do, make, act”; lik-ī nominal stem lik- “way” + focus-marker -i).

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’ Mulaku text material, there is only one example attested, viz. dat. tiuša “to

382 For the nuance of vagueness expressed by -ak-i, 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 Aḍḍū, 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 benafi_ ... “This one said ...” (T3, 45; _mi-de_ subst. dem.pron. nom. “this one”; _benafi_ pret.I, 3.ps.sg., _A. benani_ (M. _bunani_) “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. _annani_); _ehi-ā_ part.pret. (M.) _ahanī_ “to ask” + focus-marker _-ā_ - _au_ 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’ Mulaku (cf. 2.6.5.3.2), substantivisations of the demonstrative stem _te_ “iste” are rare in Aḍḍū. The only attested form occurring in the collected texts is _te-ak-ī_ (indefinite form + focus-marker _-ī_):

A. _teakī timāgē molōgaṇē noun-āu_. lit. “What this one nearby you is, is not my axe.” (_timā-ge_ pron. in the gen. as poss.pron. “my (own); _molōgaṇē_ “axe”; _noun-āu_ negation + _quot.particle_; from the fairy tale _molōgaṇē_ “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)”, _tinā_ “this person (there, nearby you)” 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 Aḍḍū 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

383 Cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 42.
Demonstrative adverbs

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. ... *belalaku mi hedi liği* ... (T4, 4) “what a cat did now, was the following” (for the exact morphological analysis cf. 2.6.5.3.1).

A. ... *mi mussantı vegen mi vēhdeni* (T3, 66) “... this is (the) way we are living now, having become rich now.” (*mussantı* adj. “rich”; *vegen* abs.III of A. *vēn* “to become” (M. *vanī*); *vēhdeni* part.pres. “living” (M. *ulenī*) + 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 oṭi khenaka* 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”; *oṭi* part.pret./pres. + focus-marker, (M.) *onnani* “to lie, be there”; *khenaka* “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. 〈*tāka´s* / *tan-ak-a´s* / “to which place, where”).

The following sentence admits both a temporal and a local interpretation of the pronoun *ti*:

F. *kontākaha tai ti ent?* (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-a´s* dat.sg.indef. of *tan* “place”; *tai* question particle).

In the following sentence, *e* has the local meaning “there”:

A. *e hišī hei käyē ede käfī* “He ate everything eatable which was there.” (*hišī* part.pret. “(having) been”, (M.) *hunnani* “to be, stand, remain, stay”; *hišī* hei “everything”, cf. 2.6.7.4.3; *kayē* “eatable, something to eat”; *ede* “he”, nom. 3.ps.sg. pers.pron.; *kafi* 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 formations 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*, F. *mi gotaha* “thus, (in) this way” (*got-a´s* dative in adverbial use of M. *goi*, A.F. *go/lgot/i* “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 “each other; one another” consists of lek-akul, the obl. case of the numeral “one”, and lanek-ak-āsā, the dat.sg.indef. of the pronoun ane’ lan-ekl “another” (cp. Sinh. an “other, foreign”, anikā / aniki “the other one”; Pkt. anña-, Pa. anña-, 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. lek-akul and the dat.sg. of F. ene’ (= M. ane’), len-ek-aku-śāl. A. ehakā enehaka “each other” most probably shows a double dissimilation. The definite nom.sg. enehaka must be explained as *ekak-ā, while the dat.sg. enehaka “to an other” must be derived from *en-ek-ak-āš.384

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 “each other”, lit. “the one thing to an other thing” (with an unusual, probably dissimilative sound change of [e → a] occurring twice), lek-eti an-ek-eti-āś; A. ekti enekettā “each other” most probably shows a double dissimilation. The definite nom.sg. ehtā “the other one” must be explained as *ekak-ā, while the dat.sg. ehtā “to an other” must be derived from *en-ek-ak-āš.384

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 anekacijaš bunā ńdu ivē eve ... (T12, 15) “... he hears one [of the pigeons] saying to another: ...” (bunā “saying” part.pres. of bunāni “to say, speak”; ńdu “sound, noise”; livēl 3.ps.sg.pres. of ivēni “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,385 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-1; 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

384 Another example of the presumed dissimilation is A. lehekē ← lek-ek-i “a way was (the following ...)” (from T1, 31; lek “way, manner” + indef.suff. -ek + focus marker -i), as against the synonymous A. lekakē (from T3, 26; lek + indef.suff.obl. -ak + focus marker -i).

385 Cf., e.g., ZOGRAT (1976), 164 and MASICA (1991), 253.
identified with OIA kāh 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 (e.g., kom-mišaku in L1 (mn/1,4) where kon appears as an attr. of the obl. case of lmīs/ “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. keey, 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 Aḍḍū 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’, F. könnteke’ and M. kon ecce’ – 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’ which is the only interrogative pronoun in Modern Aḍḍū expressing “what” in a general sense, originally had the meaning of “what so much” (/kon tak/), with a quantitative nuance. Hence, F. könnteke’ “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’ “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’ and F. *kon ettek-e’ for the modern language in this case (cf. 1.3.9.2.1). In the framework of this derivation, the actual forms A. konta’ and F. könnteke’ could perhaps be explained as representing very unusual allegro-forms.
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. kınê “what” consists of a form of the interrogative stem which is enlarged by the interrogative particle -hê/-hei (cf. 3.15.3). GEIGER’s spelling ⟨kînê⟩ “what” with n386 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.387 The form kî “what” which also occurs in the modern standard language in questions concerning a concrete verbal action,388 seems to speak in favour of the latter possibility. We then have to ask from which original consonant the final glottal stop of kî can be derived. At a first glance, it seems to be very doubtful that kî could be connected with the interrogative kîk, which is one of two forms that are mentioned by TURNER without being attested anywhere else (“Md. kiek, kîk ‘what?’”: 1985, 21, no. 3164 s.v. OIA kîm, 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. kîkê “what” which is used in the colloquial language as a check in the case of non-understanding; cf. DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990, 74) who translate kîkê with “what? (of the said word)” (cp., e.g., kîkê ta? “What did you say?”, lit. “what” + interr. particle ta. – ēnā bûnî kîkê ta? “What did he say?” ēnā “he”, bûnî-î part.pret. “said” + focus-marker). Concerning the etymology of kîkê, there are two imaginable explanations. At the first glance, it seems to be quite possible that kîkê represents the normal interrogative stem enlarged with an interrogative particle just as in the case of kınê. As there is no particle -kê attested in Dhivehi, however, this derivation cannot be upheld. Therefore it is more likely to assume a combination of an interrogative pronoun kîk (as mentioned by TURNER, cf. above), existing as the independent word kî “what” in the modern language, and the question particle hê/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. Followingl, kîkê could be derived from *kîk-hê without a morphologi- cal, 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. koṁbûkin / kon-bûkinî which can be regarded as a compound of the pronoun kon and the Arabic loanword bûkin used in Aḍḍû as an indefinite pronoun meaning “some, any” (cf. 2.6.7.3; for Arab. bâqin “remaining;
remains, remainders, rest” cf. WEHR 1958, 61). Thus, kon bākin literally means “which (ones) / who of the rest?” Presumably, the final -in of Arab. bāgin 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. koṁbākin, the corresponding form of the nom.pl. in Fua’ Mulaku, koṁbaikēa, seems to be opaque from the phonological and morphological point of view. The original formation can still be regarded in the oblique stem koṁbaiten-, however. Possibly, the Arabic word bāgin came into the dialect of Fua’ 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’ and F. könteke’ “what” is an analytic formation too. The forms in question, A. kon etteti teka’ /kon eti-eti tek-ak/ and F. kon etteti tekeke’ /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’ indef.suff., F. eke’ numeral “one”.

2.6.7.1.3. The following tables illustrate the main interrogative pronouns and their declension in the singular and plural:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>who?</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. “who”</td>
<td>key(y)e</td>
<td>kēye</td>
<td>kāku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“who”</td>
<td>koṁbākin /kon-bākin/</td>
<td>koṁbaikēa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. “whose”</td>
<td>kankāge</td>
<td>kākage</td>
<td>kākuge, kāge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“whose”</td>
<td>koṁbākinge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. “to whom”</td>
<td>kankā’ /-aš/</td>
<td>kākaśa, kāka ataha</td>
<td>kāka’ /-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to whom”</td>
<td>koṁbākinna’ /-aš/</td>
<td>koṁbaikenna’ /-aš/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl. “from whom / by whom”</td>
<td>kankāge farātun</td>
<td>kākage farāten</td>
<td>kākun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“from whom / by whom”</td>
<td>koṁbākinge farātun</td>
<td>koṁbaikenge farāten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>what?</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. “what”</td>
<td>konta’ /kontak/</td>
<td>könteke’ /kontekel/</td>
<td>kon ecce’ /eti-ekl., köce; kīkē, kīnē, kī’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“what”</td>
<td>kon etteti teka’ /tekak/</td>
<td>kon etteti tekeke’ /tekekek/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen./loc. “of what” / “in which, on/at which”</td>
<td>kontaki</td>
<td>könteki</td>
<td>kon eṛīge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“of what” / “in which, on/at which”</td>
<td>kon etteti tekaki</td>
<td>kon etteti tekeki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. “what for/to”</td>
<td>kontaka’</td>
<td>köntakaha</td>
<td>kon ecca’ /eti-aš/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“what for/to”</td>
<td>kon etteti tekaka’ /-aš/</td>
<td>kon etteti tekakahə</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. “by what means, by which”</td>
<td>kontakun</td>
<td>köntakun</td>
<td>kon etīn /eti-in/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“by what means, by which”</td>
<td>kon etteti tekakun</td>
<td>kon etteti tekakun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.\(^389\) 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. *ṭhāna-*, OIA *sthāna-\(^390\)*). 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?”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“where”</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obl. “where”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kontāku /kon-tan-ak-i/</td>
<td>kontaneki /kon-tan-ek-i/</td>
<td>kontāku /kon-tan-ak/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. “where”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>kontantāki</td>
<td>kontantaneki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/kon-tan-ak-i/</td>
<td>/kon-tan-ak-i/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. “where to”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>kontāka’</td>
<td>kontanaka / kontanakaha</td>
<td>kontāka’ /kon-tan-ak-s/i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/kon-tan-ak-s/i</td>
<td>/kontanekaha</td>
<td>/kon-tan-ak-s/i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>kontantāka’</td>
<td>kontantanaka / kontanekaha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/kon-tan-ak-s/i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl. “from where”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>kontākun</td>
<td>kontanakun / kontanekun</td>
<td>kontākun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>kontantākun</td>
<td>kontanakun / kontanekun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

\(^389\) For the interrogative pronominal adverbs of Sinhalese which are formed in the same way, cf. MATZEL (1983), 100 ff.

\(^390\) 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 ḫē/hei (cf. 2.6.7.1.2).

2.6.7.2.3. Like the adverbal 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 Adđū and Fua’ Mulaku, it is the stem kal- “time, moment” which is used here (A. nom. ḫō; cp. Sinh. kal- “time”, ki-kala “when, at what time”; Pa. kālā- “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. sūriya- 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 Adđū und Fua’ Mulaku. The forms in question are illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“when”</th>
<th>Adđū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obl. “when”</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>koniraku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. “when”</td>
<td>konkalaki</td>
<td>konkalaki</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. “until when”</td>
<td>konkalaka’/-a’s/</td>
<td>konkalakaha</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl. “when” (from now on), “since when”</td>
<td>konkalakun</td>
<td>konkalakun</td>
<td>konirakun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. kihai, 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”\(^{391}\) which is still used as an indepen-

---

\(^{391}\) Most likely, Dhiv. hen must be derived from OIA sēnā- “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 sēnāpati-; 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 kajjā, A.F. firihen kuddā “boy” (lit. “male child”); M.A.F. firihen mīhā “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’ 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’ [ki-hin-ek] (indef.; -e’ indef.suff.) “in which way? how?”, F. kihina’ [ki-hin-ak] “id.” (-a’ indef.suff.), F. kihinake (obl.indef. ← *ki-hin-ek’ eke’ “one”392) and F. kihinne (possibly ← dat. *ki-hin-aha ← *aša’?). In contrast to the dialect-internal variants occurring in Fua’ Mulaku, A. kehenaka’ [ke-hen-ak-aš] (dat. indef.) “in which way” is completely straightforward from the morphological and phonological point of view.

The question forms A. kehei vara’? F. kihai varakaha’, M. kihā vare’, kihā varaka’? “how much?” are used when asking for abstract quantities, e.g. the price of something. M. vara, A. vara, F. varo means “strength, power; quantity, amount” when used independently (with A. vara’ /var-ak/, M. vare’ /var-ek/ as its indef. form and F. varakaha, M. varaka’ /var-ak-aš/ as its indef. (dative); the etymology of this word is still unknown.

The dialectal variants M. kita’ /ki-tak/, F. kite393 /ki-tekl/, M. kitake’ /ki-tak-ekl/, A. kitaka’ /ki-tak-akl/ (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’? (duvas-ak-aš dat.indef. of duvas “day”) and F. kite’ duvaha? (iki-tek duvasl) / kitaka’ duvaha? (iki-tak-akl) can be given as “how many days?”, while the corresponding Malē variants kihā ire’? and kihā irakun? can be translated as “How much (a) time?” (iir-ekl nom.indef. of iiru “time”) and “From what time (on)?” (irak-un abl.indef. of iiru), resp.

The question “how long?”, “how tall?” (concerning a linear measure) is expressed by kehei digi? in Addū (A. digi adj. “long, tall”) and by kihā dige’? in the standard language (ldig-ekl indef. form of the adj. digu).


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.) vanē “to become”. M. kīvve (kī’/ve) “why?”, “what for?”, lit. “what becoming”, is composed by

“male human being”); M.A.F. firihen geri “bull” (lit. “male cattle”). The original meaning of fire-hen, however, must have been “group of men” (lit. “men-group, men-army”). Cp. the corresponding adjective M.A.F. ahnen “female” (e.g. in anhen miha’ “woman”, anhen geri “cow”) which has to be derived from *anbhi-lanbu-hen “group of women” (M.A. anbhi, F. anbhu “woman, wife”; cf. Sinh. anbhe, stem anbhu “wife, mother” ← OIA ambhā. “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. In the sense of “in the way of men/woman”; finally, a further semantic abstraction led to “way, manner”.

392 Cp. the plural form F. kon etetti tek-eke’ “what a so-much (of) things”, discussed in 2.6.7.1.2.
393 Thus according to HLSD 165.
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kī “what” (cf. 2.6.7.1.2) and the primary absolutive ve (cf. 3.10.4). The exact meaning of M. kihine vegeṇ is “having become in which way?” (for kihine’ cf. 2.6.7.2.4; for ve-gen, abs.III of vanī, cf. 3.11.4.3). A. kian [kien] vegeṇ and F. kuma’ vegeṇ “why?”, “what for” are built by means of this absolutive form as well. The interrogative A. kian, which is also used without vegeṇ 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 Addū. 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 Addū. 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’ 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’ as occurring in kuma’ vegeṇ 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’ reflects the old dative /kumaśl/, 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. Isachenko 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.”

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.

394 “Es ist wohl klar, daß Pronomina wie jemand, etwas, irgendein, irgendetwie, irgendetwo 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. genau zu bestimmen” (1962, 497).
As the following examples show, the indefinite pronoun M. komme /kon-mel (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 miñe /kon-me mīs-ekl (/ekl 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 miñe, often occurring in an allegro-form as kommes miñe, with the meaning “somebody, someone” vs. komme miñe ves meaning “anybody (who so ever)”; A. kommiAs miña’ (lkon-mi-as/, -as = M. ves, cf. above; /mīs-ekl indef.) “someone”; F. kommiAs mīhaku (obl.indef.) or miñe’ (lmiñs-ekl nom.indef.) “someone”.

The formations M. komme (ves) ecce, A. kommiAs etta/ Kommi-As eti-akl, F. kommiAs etta have the meaning of “something, anything”. Cp. also the variants M. kommehece’ (lkon-mi-eti-ekl, the intervocalic -h- either serving to avoid the hiatus or being the result of a dissimilation of -k-), further kommehece’ ves, A. kommi etta, F. kommi ette “everything, what so ever”, “anything”. Cp. also M. huri hā ecce’/leti-ekl lit. meaning “everything”.

Indefinite pronouns with a local meaning are, e.g., M. komme tāne’ “everywhere”, lit. “what (a) place so ever” (/tan-ekl nom.indef. “a place”396, M. huri hā tāku “everywhere” (/tan-akul obl.indef., lit. “at any place”). Cp. also M. komme ves tāku or kommes tāku “anywhere” (/tan-akul obl.indef.; kommes ← komme ves) vs. komme tāne’ ves “anywhere (where so ever)” (/tan-ekl nom.indef.). In temporal function, we find the indefinite pronominal formations M. komme duvahaku and huri hā duvahaku, A. kommi duvahaki, F. kommi duvahaku “every day, at any day” (M.F. /dus-akul obl.indef.; A. /dus-as-ak-il loc.indef.). An example of a modal indefinite pronoun is M. komme otakun ves “(in) any way” (got-akun abl.indef. “in a way/manner”).

In contrast to the examples treated above, there is one indefinite pronoun which is not based on /kon-mel 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 Adđū dialect, the loanword A. bākin “some (people)” (← Arab. bāgin “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 hādā’ tibi vēlei ... “... when some (people) were about to seek firewood ...” (T2, 24; eb = e’/ekl num. “one”, attr. of bākin, lit. meaning “a unit of some people”; dara nom. “firewood”; hādā’/ inf., M. hōdāน “to look for, seek”; tibi part.pret. “being”, M. tiher “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-

395 For the particle -as cf. 2.6.7.4.2 s.v. A. emmennas “all”.
396 For the etymology of tān “place” cf. 2.6.7.2.1.
161Pronominal adjectives

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”.\(^\text{397}\)\(^\text{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/\textsc{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’ naiså daśun ... "... from below the coconut lying at the very bottom ..." (T1, 34a; vati loc. of va’vat “bottom”; o’ot part.pret. of M. onnan “to lie, be, be located”; naiså obl.sg.def. “of the coconut”; daśun 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:\(^\text{398}\)

F. ti bahuge tafătuge terein timă hita emme rieti mi vī addă 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 Addū language.” (T7, 9a; ti dem.pron. “this (near by you)”; bahu-ge gen.sg. “of the language”; tafătū-ge gen.sg. “of the diversity”, tafătū “diverse; diversity”; terein abl. “from within”; timă pron.obl. in possessive function “(my) own”; hita’/hitas/dat.sg. of hū/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. van “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 lek-menl “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 Addū, the extended form emmennas /lek-men-asl 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’ l-asl vs. emmennaš-as; cp. also A. kommias etta’ “something, anything”

\(^\text{397}\) For the function of emme in the formation of an analytic superlative cf. 2.4.5.3.

\(^\text{398}\) The legend is given here in the dialect of Fua’ Mulaku (informant MUHAMMAD SAlD). 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. *hiśī hai*, A. *hiśī 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 ļeti-ekl* “every-thing”. Except for the dialectal variants of the part.pret. of (M.) *hunnā* “to be, stand, remain”, the part.pret. M.A.F. *tibī* of (M.) *tibē* “to be” is used in rare cases as well. The general rule that the forms of *hunnā* are confined to singular subjects while those of *tibē* 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. *ehei* “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 *mulū* “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. *mulīn* “from the whole, of all” is used for the analytic expression of a superlative form; cp., e.g., *mulīn raṅgulī* “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 Hassan Sa’id (oral information), M.F.A. *gīna* “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 Addū. In Modern Dhivehi, *gīna* has become the most frequent word meaning “much, many”. Turner identifies the Dhivehi word, together with Sinh. *gana* “thick, dense” e.a., with OIA *ghanā- “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. *gīnain* “of many / much” is that of a partitive; cp. A. *gīna-in ni-kāheti! “Don’t eat too much!” (ni neg. particle; for the fut. form kāheti cf. 3.4.1). In *gīna gīna-in “(very) often, more often”, lit. “much of many [times]”, the meaning of the partitive ablative *gīna-in* is increased by quasi-reduplication.

M. *baivarū*, F. *baivaro*, A. *baivara* denotes “a lot (of), many”; cp. M. *baivarū 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 †bahutara- “more, many” (OIA bahú- “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’, F. -te’) in the modern language (with the exception of the Aḍḍū 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 gina in above). M. madu and its variants must not be confused with the adjective M. madu, F. mado, A. mada “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/mañña “slight, scantly, 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 mādu “quiet, slow” can be distinguished both semantically and phonologically. The difference between the retroflex stop /ɖ/ 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. madu and mādu could not have developed from a common source. The phonological difference between /ɖ/ 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. kuda vs. A.F. kudu “small, little” with a difference of the intervocalic M. -d- and A.F. -d- which cannot be explained from an inner-Maldavian 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. kuddi, F. kuddā, M. kujjā; nom.pl. M.A. kudin, F. kudden; cf. 2.3.2.7.1.2). GEIGER (1902, 926, nos. 258 and 259) identifies Dhiv. kudi “little, small” and kuddin, 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. kuda “little, small” and Sinh. kudā “small, little” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 45, no. 666) are derived from Pkt. khudda, both MIA forms representing the same Skt. etymon ksudrī-. As GEIGER correctly states (1938, 55), an intervocalic -d- of Modern Sinhalese always presupposes a MIA -dd- or -ddh- which can have several sources in its turn. For Sinh. d ← dd ← ddh cf. GEIGER (1938), 58.

2.6.7.4.7. The pronominal adjective M. ane’/lan-ekl, F. ene’/len-ekl, A. ena’/len-akl “another” consists of the stem an- (or its South Maldavian variant, en-) and the indefinite suffix M.F. -e’/ekl, A. -a’/akl. The corresponding pronominal stem of Sinhalese is an “other, foreign” which goes back to OIA anyá- “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. eag̃ da’ naganāl̃ ai, ehen kahalei au da’ seta’ jahafi “Having removed his teeth, she inserted [him] such a set of new teeth [as it was her (lit. ‘that’)] way” (T11, 5; ea-g̃ poss.pron. “his”; da’ ldat obj. “teeth” (cf. 2.3.2.7.3.1); naga-l̃ ai abs.II of (M.) nagañ “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 se̊ta’c obj.: “a set of teeth”; jaha-ﬁ pret.I 3.ps.sg. of (M.) jahani “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. 〈aharenge mul̃ hayat-a’s mi a kon kahala badale b̃ava 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; aharenge pers.pron. gen. = poss.pron. 1.ps.sg. “my”; mul̃ pron.adj. “whole” (cf. above), attr. of /hayat-a’s = [hayata]’ dat. “into (the) life” ← Arab. hayat “life”; mi a “that this has come”; mi dem.pron. “this”, a-i part.pret. of (M.) annani “to come” + focus-marker -i; /badal-ekl nom.indef. “a change” ← Arab. badal “substitute, replacement”, badala “to change”; b̃ava 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-a’ka’s ...〉 “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-a’s / [geaka] dat.indef. of ge “house”).

M. tia kahala kantakugai “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 /kami “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 miha’ku ñun “nobody is there”, lit. “not even one man is there” (lek-ves/ “even”, a compound of the num. ek- “one”, ves “also, even, otherwise”; miha’ku obl.indef. of /mi̊s- “man, human being”); M. evves miha’ ne’ “not even a man was there” (lmet part.pret. of netun (verbal noun) “not existing”); A.F. miha’ ne’ “not a man was there” (lmi̊s-akl nom.indef.). Correspondingly, the negative pronoun “nothing” is expressed as follows: M. evves ecce’ ne’ or evves ecce’ ne’ “not even a thing is there” (leti-ekl nom.indef.); A. etta’ ne’, F. ette’ ne’ “not a thing is there” (A. leti-ekl, F. leti-ekl nom.indef.). M. evves tanaka’ ñun has the meaning of “nowhere”, lit. “not being to any place” (ltan-ak-a’sl 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 Aḍḍū once again turns out to be the most conservative one; it follows that for an analysis of the Dhivehi verb the Aḍḍū 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’ Mulaku forms than the corresponding Aḍḍū 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”. 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 absolutive and the gerund, however, are not derived directly from either one of the basic stems.

---

399 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 aspecual 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 balanî “to look (at), watch, observe”, of the n-stem verb vannanî “to enter, come/go in”, and of the e-stem verb temenî “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”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addû</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Mâle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a-stem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present stem</td>
<td>bala-</td>
<td>bala-</td>
<td>bala-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 1st sg.</td>
<td>balan</td>
<td>balan</td>
<td>balan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. participle</td>
<td>balā; balanī</td>
<td>bala/ā; balanī</td>
<td>balā; balanī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative 2nd sg.</td>
<td>bala</td>
<td>bala</td>
<td>balā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>balā</td>
<td>balanna</td>
<td>balan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future 1st sg.</td>
<td>balāśun</td>
<td>balannen(in)</td>
<td>balānan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. participle</td>
<td>balāne; balānei</td>
<td>balannen; balannenī</td>
<td>balāne; balānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolutive</td>
<td>bala(i)</td>
<td>balā</td>
<td>balā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>balamun</td>
<td>balamun</td>
<td>balamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite stem</td>
<td>beli-</td>
<td>beli-</td>
<td>beli-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pret. 1st sg.</td>
<td>belin</td>
<td>belin</td>
<td>belin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pret. participle</td>
<td>beli; beli</td>
<td>beli</td>
<td>beli; beli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal noun</td>
<td>belun</td>
<td>belun</td>
<td>belun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.4.2. n-stem (M.) vannanī “to enter, come/go in”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addû</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Mâle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n-stem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present stem</td>
<td>van-/vad-</td>
<td>van-/vañd-</td>
<td>van-/vad-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 1st sg.</td>
<td>vanun/vadun</td>
<td>vañdin</td>
<td>vannan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. participle</td>
<td>vanne; vannei</td>
<td>vannā; vannāi</td>
<td>vanna; vannanī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative 2nd sg.</td>
<td>vanu/vadu</td>
<td>vañdi</td>
<td>vaden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>vanna’</td>
<td>vannaha</td>
<td>vanna’/vannan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future 1st sg.</td>
<td>vannasun</td>
<td>vannāhinin</td>
<td>vannānan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. participle</td>
<td>vannane; vannanei</td>
<td>vannāhinin; vannāhinī</td>
<td>vannāne; vannānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolutive</td>
<td>vedi/vede-</td>
<td>vede</td>
<td>vade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>vedemun</td>
<td>vañdimun</td>
<td>vannamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite stem</td>
<td>van-</td>
<td>van-</td>
<td>van-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pret. 1st sg.</td>
<td>vanin</td>
<td>vanin</td>
<td>vanin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pret. participle</td>
<td>van; vanī</td>
<td>van; vanī</td>
<td>van; vanī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal noun</td>
<td>vanun</td>
<td>vanun</td>
<td>vanun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.1.4.3. e-stem (M.A.F.) temenī “to get wet”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-stem</td>
<td>teme-</td>
<td>teme-</td>
<td>teme-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present stem</td>
<td>temen</td>
<td>temen</td>
<td>temen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 1st sg.</td>
<td>temen</td>
<td>temen</td>
<td>temen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. participle</td>
<td>temē; temenī</td>
<td>temē; temenī</td>
<td>temē; temenī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative 2nd sg.</td>
<td>tem (temī gan)</td>
<td>temē</td>
<td>temē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>temē; temenī</td>
<td>temenāna</td>
<td>temen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. 1st sg.</td>
<td>temēsūn</td>
<td>temēnņ</td>
<td>temēnān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. participle</td>
<td>temēne; temēnei</td>
<td>temēnen; temēnenī</td>
<td>temēne; temēnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolutive</td>
<td>temi</td>
<td>temi / temī</td>
<td>temi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>tememun</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>tememun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite stem</td>
<td>temene-</td>
<td>temun-</td>
<td>temun-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fin. pret. 1st sg.</td>
<td>temenēn</td>
<td>temunin</td>
<td>temunin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pret. participle</td>
<td>temene; temenei</td>
<td>temun; temēnī</td>
<td>temunu; temēnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal noun</td>
<td>temun</td>
<td>temun</td>
<td>temun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.\(^{400}\) To what extent in Dhivehi – in accordance with the development in Sinhalese as demonstrated by Geiger\(^{401}\) – the inherited personal endings were adapted to the forms of the auxiliary “to be” (from the OIA root √\textit{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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
<th>Sinhalese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.sg.</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-n, -ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>-i / -y</td>
<td>-ie / -yye</td>
<td>[-:] (← *-y?)</td>
<td>-hi / -yi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.sg.</td>
<td>-i / -y</td>
<td>[-:] (← *-y?), -i</td>
<td>[-:] (← *-y?)</td>
<td>-y / -yi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl.</td>
<td>-mā</td>
<td>-mā</td>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>-mu, -mha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>-tā</td>
<td>-va</td>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>-vu / -hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
<td>-tā</td>
<td>-tta</td>
<td>[-:] (← *-y?)</td>
<td>-t, -ti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{400}\) Cf. Geiger (1938), 142 and (1900), 75 ff.

\(^{401}\) For the Sinhalese data cf. Geiger (1900), 76.
The dialect of Fua’ 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. 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. kuraṇī “to do, make” may serve as an example of the multiple syncretism of the plural forms; thus, besides the 1.ps.pl. kuraṇamu, also kuraṇ 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 kuraṇamu, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>finite present (a-stems)</th>
<th>Aḍḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.sg.</td>
<td>balan</td>
<td>balan</td>
<td>balan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>balai</td>
<td>balayye</td>
<td>balā*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.sg.</td>
<td>balai</td>
<td>balā</td>
<td>balā*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl.</td>
<td>balamā</td>
<td>balamā</td>
<td>balamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>balatā</td>
<td>balāva</td>
<td>balāva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
<td>balatā</td>
<td>balatta</td>
<td>balā*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) 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., bunani “to speak”: bunē (but A. benai); duvanā “to run”: dūvē (A. divai); minni “to measure”: minē (A. minai); halāni “to stir”: halē; duruvanā – 2nd hon. degree of annaṇi “to come” / ḍanēi “to go”: duruvē; kuraṇi “to do, make”: kurē.

402 For the homophone interrogative suffix -vā cf. 3.15.1.3.
403 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. In MIA, -aya- mostly developed into -e-, and similarly -(ā)paya- changed into -(ā)pe- in Pali and into -(ā)ve- in Prakrit. 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.

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, 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, 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, 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...
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.\footnote{Cf. \textit{Gunasekara} (1891), 174 ff.} Cp., e.g., the 1st degree verb \textit{fihanā} “to roast, cook, bake” with its honorific 2nd/3rd degree equivalent \textit{fissavanā} which is a double causative, the primary form \textit{*fissanā} \textit{←} \textit{*fisa-va-nī} “to cause to cook” being obsolete today. A parallel case is \textit{happavanā} which is the honorific 2nd/3rd degree equivalent of \textit{hafanā} “to chew”; the primary causative \textit{*happanā} \textit{←} \textit{*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., \textit{gulanā} “to contact, connect” with its primary causative \textit{guluvanā} 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 \textit{guluvanā} meaning “to join, attach”, which functions as a verb of the 1st degree; furthermore, a double causative, \textit{guluvvanā}, is derived from \textit{guluvanā}, 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.\footnote{For the system of social structures in Māle cf. the introduction, 0.9.2.} Thus, \textsc{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 \textit{v}, the causative character is obscured, a second syllable -\textit{va} can be inserted so that a \textbf{double causative} is resulted”.

3.2.1.1.2. \textsc{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 \textit{-enu} are themselves derivatives. The causative must always be formed out of base-verbs in \textit{-anu}”. In accordance with this rule, we would expect that in Dhivehi, too, the formation of causatives might be confined to \textit{a}-stems and \textit{n}-stems, the latter constituting a subgroup of the former. There are numerous verbs such as the \textit{e}-stems \textit{jessenā} and \textit{jessevenā}, however, which seem not to fit into the system because they show the typical formal structure of causatives, albeit \textit{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 \textit{a}-stem \textit{jahanā} meaning “to beat, kick; blow (of the wind)”. From this primary verb the simple causative \textit{jassanā} “to land, turn; switch on” is derived. The secondary causative formation \textit{jassavanā} exists only in Māle, where it occurs as a honorific verb of \textit{jahanā} as well as \textit{jassanā}, denoting the 2nd and 3rd degree. The inactive verb \textit{jehenā} “to fall (down upon)” is derived directly from \textit{jahanā}; the umlaut of the root vowel is typical for inactive \textit{e}-stems that are derived from \textit{a}-stems. \textit{jessenā} “to come in touch (with), touch” is the corresponding inactive form of the simple causative \textit{jassanā}. In this case as well, the morphological criteria determining the formation of an inactive from a primary active verb are visible: the \textit{a}-stem is changed into an \textit{e}-stem, together with a simultaneous umlauting of the root-vowel. In the same way, \textit{jessevenā} is
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 vadāy gannavanī, lit. approximately “to cause to take by strutting”. The basic verb underlying the petrified absolutive vadāy has been lost in Dhivehi; vadāy 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 danmi “I know” as against the variant danimi attested in a later period, or the old infinitive vadnā “enter” as against its more recent counterpart vadīnu. 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; 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 Addū and by an i vowel in Fua’ Mulaku. In Māle, however, we find not a secondary vowel but a gemination of the stem consonant, -n-.

412 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”.
413 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)\(^{414}\); in the conjugation of the present tense, the paradigmatic change of stem-final \(n\) and \(d\) or \(\tilde{n}d\) in Addå and of geminated \(mn\) and \(d\) in Måle; this corresponds with the prenasalised stop \(\tilde{n}d\) occurring in Fua’ Mulaku in all persons. Cf. the following table which illustrates the finite present forms of (M.) \(vannan\)‘i “to enter”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>finite present</th>
<th>Addå</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Måle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.sg.</td>
<td>vanun / vadun</td>
<td>vaŋdin</td>
<td>vannan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>vadi</td>
<td>vaŋdiyye</td>
<td>vade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.sg.</td>
<td>vadi</td>
<td>vâŋdi</td>
<td>vade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl.</td>
<td>vadumâ</td>
<td>vaŋdimâ</td>
<td>vannamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>vadutâ</td>
<td>vaŋdivva</td>
<td>vannamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
<td>vadutâ</td>
<td>vaŋditta</td>
<td>vade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 \(vannan\)‘i “to enter” (cf. above) which does not go back to a nasal present of OIA\(^{415}\) 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 \(vannan\)‘i, these verbs are \(a\ddan\)‘i “to burn” (trans.); \(bannan\)‘i “to tie”; \(binnan\)‘i (in Måle also \(b\ddan\)‘i) “to pluck”; \(innan\)‘i “to sit; to marry, be married”; \(i\ddinnan\)‘i (A., F. \(i\ddin\)‘-) “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).

---

\(^{414}\) Cf. 3.6.5, 3.10.3.

\(^{415}\) The origin must be seen in OIA \(vratjati\) “goes, wanders”. Pa. \(vajati\), the forms of which obviously merged with those of the nasal stem verb OIA \(vrynkti\) “twists”; cf. P.E.D., 593 s.v. \(vajati\), WHITNEY (1885), 163 s.v. \(vrf\) and 213, and WERBA (1997), 263 s.v. \(vrf\). Cf. also TURNER (1966, II, 707, no. 12225 s.v. \(vrajeti\)) who postulates a nasal present *\(vrañjati\) as the basis of Pkt. \(vañjai\) “goes”. Sinh. \(vaññaru\), Lahådå \(vañj\)ån and Panj. \(vañj\)ån “to go, depart, die”. Obviously, Dhiv. \(vannan\)‘i 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 realize 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”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>finite present</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua‘ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.sg.</td>
<td>temen</td>
<td>temen</td>
<td>temen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>temei</td>
<td>temeyye</td>
<td>temē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.sg.</td>
<td>temei</td>
<td>temē</td>
<td>temē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl.</td>
<td>tememā</td>
<td>tememā</td>
<td>tememu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>temetā</td>
<td>temēva</td>
<td>tememut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
<td>temetā</td>
<td>temetta</td>
<td>temē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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\(^{416}\) which in the first conjugation is marked by a suffix `-u ← -ā`, in the second by a suffix `-i ← -ī`. According to GEIGER, `-ī` as well as `-ā` go back to `-ita`.\(^{417}\) 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 *belī* in all dialects (= Sinh. *bālu*, cf. GEIGER 1938, 135; for the umlaut cf. 3.9.2.1 below), while the correspon-

\(^{416}\) For this *communis opinio* cf. MATZEL (1983), 118; for details cf. GEIGER (1938), 146.

\(^{417}\) Cf. GEIGER (1938), 135; cf. also 1.2.3.1.1, 3.9.2.1.
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Ding participle of the n-stem vannani “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 -unu (cf. 3.3, 3.9.2). In Dhivehi, this suffix underwent a dialectal differentiation which in the case of temeni “to get wet” led to the forms M. temunu, F. temun, and A. temene (Sinh. temunu; 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 A dobr; the old ending of the 2.ps.pl., -va, is obviously confined to the a- and e-conjugation and will be met with only rarely.418 While in Fua 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal endings</th>
<th>A dobr</th>
<th>Fua Mulaku</th>
<th>Mâle</th>
<th>Sinhalese (short form)419</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.sg.</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>Ð</td>
<td>-yye</td>
<td>Ð</td>
<td>Ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.sg.</td>
<td>Ð</td>
<td>-ðye</td>
<td>Ð</td>
<td>Ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl.</td>
<td>-mâ</td>
<td>-mû</td>
<td>-mâ</td>
<td>-mû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>-e /-a/, -vâ</td>
<td>-vâ</td>
<td>-vâ</td>
<td>-vâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
<td>-e /-a/</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) concurrent with a lengthening of the stem final vowel;
2) concurrent with a gemination of the stem final -n;
3) ending -a based on l-eal, cp. temenâ ← *temenea;
4) unetymological -r: 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 balani, vannani and temeni:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fin. preterite a-stems</th>
<th>Addû</th>
<th>Fua Mulaku</th>
<th>Mâle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.sg.</td>
<td>belin</td>
<td>belin</td>
<td>belin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>beli</td>
<td>beli</td>
<td>beli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.sg.</td>
<td>beli</td>
<td>beli</td>
<td>beli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl.</td>
<td>belimâ</td>
<td>belimâ</td>
<td>belimâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>belie /belia/, belivâ</td>
<td>beliva</td>
<td>belimu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
<td>belie /belia/</td>
<td>beliâ</td>
<td>beli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

418 For the ending -vâ further cf. 3.2.
419 Thus Geiger (1938), 146.
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’ 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:
A rough analysis yields the following table of personal endings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal endings</th>
<th>Aḍḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-st.</td>
<td>n-st.</td>
<td>e-st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.sg.</td>
<td>-un /-n/</td>
<td>-en(in)</td>
<td>-in-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ē, -eyye</td>
<td>-in-n-e ← yye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl.</td>
<td>-umā /-mā/</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>-in-mā ← -emā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>-ie /-ia/</td>
<td>-ēva</td>
<td>-in-vā ← -ēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
<td>-ie /-ia/</td>
<td>-enā</td>
<td>-in-na ← -enā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1. At a glance, the morphological analysis seems to be simple in Aḍḍū. 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 Aḍḍū is easy to understand, A. balāṣ-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 balâhe, 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. beliêhe, vediêhe and temiêhe which are used for all persons, being composed of the inactive absolutive and the formant -êhe) 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 balâhe etc., which are built with the same auxiliary verb, has a nominative construction (cp. A. tō / ede balâhe “you will / he will look”), balanî being a transitive, active verb.

Thus, it is likely that the ending -êhe represents a petrified optative form of the copula. To which verbal element -êhe was added in the case of balâhe 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 -s ← -t would have developed into -h-; such a development is otherwise unknown in Addû, however, and the other future forms show s 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 / tafrin baläheti; this construction literally means “it is visible for you (sg./pl.); it is to be looked (for/at) by you”. Here, -eti corresponds exactly with the petrified Sinhalese copula form äti “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 balâhe, vannahe and temēhe are based on the present participle. In this case the forms in question would have to be analysed as *balâ-êhe, *vanna-êhe and *temê-êhe. 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 Mulaku as well (cf. 3.4.2.3). Hence it follows that the future paradigm of the Addû-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 /-ial, 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’ 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 Addû (cf. above). Cp. the future paradigms of the a-stem balanî in Fua’ Mulaku and its Sinhalese equivalent, balana- (cf. GEIGER 1938, 148):

420 Cf. the German translation which is more similar: “es ist für dich/euch zu sehen”.
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: balannem means, I am (or was) one who looks, I am (or was) looking.” 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). 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 Mulaku. It cannot be proved, however, that the formation of the future tense in Fua’ 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’ Mulaku as in Adḍū, 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’ Mulaku:

---


422 Cf. Geiger (1938), 134 and (1900), 73.
If this assumption is right, the original meaning of F. balannen would be “I am going to look.” 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”. Cp. the following analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st ps.sg.</th>
<th>en</th>
<th>1st ps.pl.</th>
<th>emā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>eyye</td>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>ēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ps.sg.</td>
<td>ē ← ē ← *en</td>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
<td>etta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Male.

3.4.2.3. 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’ 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 [œ], which is still pronounced as a nasal vowel by the older people in Fua’ Mulaku but realised as a plain long [œ] 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

---

423 This derivation does not imply that the same verb might be reflected in the homophonic present endings of e-stem verbs.
424 In the southern dialects, the present participle of this verb, corresponding with the “Male 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 [˘] and [˛], resp., as depending on the particular informants; the lemmatic entries are given in their “Mâle form” followed by the most characteristic forms of the 1.ps.sg. future, the present participle and the infinitive as recorded in Fua’ Mulaku:

- a˘ndan˘ı “to burn”;
- bannan˘ı “to tie”;
- innan˘ı “to sit; to marry, be married”;
- iš˘nnan˘ı “to sit”;
- dannan˘ı “to know”;
- donnan˘ı “to wash”;
- gen gu ˙leen˘ı “to care for (somebody)”;
- hunnan˘ı “to stand, stay, remain; be”;
- konnan˘ı “to dig”;
- deken˘ı “to see”;
- vannan˘ı “to enter”;
- u ˙leen˘ı “to live; behave”;
- bi˘ndan˘ı / binnan˘ı “to pluck, break”;

3.4.2.3.1. Whatever the diachronic basis of 3.ps.sg.fut. forms such as vann˘ahin 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., vann˘ahin-in, vann˘ahin-y(y)e, vann˘ahin-∅ etc.

3.4.3. In the standard language of Mâle, 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 ideolect.

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 ulenī “to live, be (there)” which is still used as an auxiliary today (cf. 3.11.4.7). The two forms in question are liyāt-ulēmā (RB 1,10, with its spelling variant liyās-ulēmā in RC 9,1 and 10,1) and liās-ulēmā-ve (RA 2,2). liyāt/s 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 ulenī which in Māle became obsolete already at an early time; in Modern Aḍḍū, however, the corresponding forms are completely regular even today.426 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 [ ]). 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. kuravvānam “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 Aḍḍū (except for the 2nd and 3rd ps.sg.fut., cf. 3.4.1).

3.5. The imperative

Like Sinhalese,427 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-

---

426 In Aḍḍū, however, the verb in question is not ulenī but vēṉdenī; cf. also 3.2.3.
427 Cf. GEIGER (1938), 149 ff.; (1900), 78 f.; (1942), 48 ff. / (1973), 605 ff.
The imperative 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>imperative: a-stems</th>
<th>Aḍḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
<th>Sinhalese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.sg.</td>
<td>bala</td>
<td>bala</td>
<td>balā</td>
<td>bala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>balau</td>
<td>balau</td>
<td>balā</td>
<td>balav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl. (cohortative)</td>
<td>balamā</td>
<td>balamā</td>
<td>balamā</td>
<td>balamha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.428 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.”429 The form of the cohortative is identical with the first person plural of the present tense.430 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.431 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.

428 Cf. GEIGER (1938), 149 and (1900), 78.
429 GEIGER (1938), 149-150; cf. also (1900), 78 and (1916), 108 f.
430 Cf. GEIGER (1938), 150.
431 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>imperative: n-stems</th>
<th>2nd ps.sg.</th>
<th>2nd ps.pl.</th>
<th>1st ps.pl. (cohortative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aḍḍū</td>
<td>vanu / vadu</td>
<td>vadī</td>
<td>vadē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fua’ Mulaku</td>
<td>vaḥdi</td>
<td>vadēiu</td>
<td>vannama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>imperative: e-stems</th>
<th>2nd ps.sg.</th>
<th>2nd ps.pl.</th>
<th>1st ps.pl. (cohortative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aḍḍū</td>
<td>teme</td>
<td>temē</td>
<td>tememā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fua’ Mulaku</td>
<td>(temē gan)</td>
<td>(temē gaṇdu)</td>
<td>tememā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. hiṅgani “to walk”, is sometimes added as a facultative auxiliary element to cohortative forms; cp., e.g., M. nukunnuma (hiṅgā) “Let’s go out!”; M. isīnnama (hiṅgā) “Let’s sit down!”; A. sitī lēma (hiṅga) “Let’s write letters!” On the other hand, damā which is the imperative of damani “to pull”,432 can be added to the cohortative of hiṅgani; cp. M. hiṅgama damā “Let’s go (for a walk)!”.433

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 / kiyannaṭa / 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).433

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

---

432 Etymologically, damani corresponds to Sinh. damanavā; cf. GEIGER (1902), 914, no. 61; cf. also 3.11.2.2.
433 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 ohuta kiyanṭa (kiyanṭa), teile ihm die Sache mit!” The given sentence is elliptic 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 Addu as well as in Fua Mulaku, the infinitive is syntactically connected with the absolutive form A. kei, F. ke (M. kian “to say, speak”), as the following two parallel examples taken from dialectal variants of the same fairy tale (T1, 8) show:

A. boñdanə benaf, boñda āše vesionna 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. benə bəni-ai, boñdo aśi matte vesiōnaha 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 annanı “to go”, *e, which is obsolete in the modern colloquial language of the capital but still occurs in southern Dhivehi.434 Without a further remark, GEIGER (1919, 89 and 97) mentioned a few forms of this type which express a jussive meaning, viz. nu marāshake “Do not kill!” (maranı “to kill”) and annāše (sic, for annāše) “Come!” (annanı “to come”).435

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 kujja devvase! (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 -tī

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 -tī future imperative suffix.” DE SILVA sees the main function of the suffix -tī 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 nukaṇdāti! “Do not cut!” has the meaning of “Do not do what you plan to do (on some future occa-

434 For the analysis of these formations and for some more examples cf. 3.6.3.2.2, 3.11.4.6.
435 The other forms GEIGER (ib.) noted are probably not correct; for more extensive information cf. 3.6.3.2.2.
sion)” while nukañdā!, translated by him with “Do not cut!” as well, expresses the demand to stop an action that has already begun.

3.5.3.1. **D E 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. 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).”

3.5.3.2. **D E 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 futuritive 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. äti “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!”, govāit / 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:

---

436 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.

437 “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.

438 The sentences and their translation are taken from ZUHAIR (1991). The respective page numbers are noted at the end of each example.
Imperatives with the suffix -ti


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. 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 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. 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:

(1) e sitī vaige magun fonuvālā dī! (57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e</th>
<th>sitī</th>
<th>vaige</th>
<th>magun</th>
<th>fonuvālā</th>
<th>dī!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>of air</td>
<td>by way</td>
<td>sending</td>
<td>give!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.pron.</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>gen.sg.</td>
<td>abl.sg.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attr.</td>
<td>nom./obl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>impv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Send that letter by air mail!”

439 For the formation and function of the absolutive cf. 3.10.
440 In North Dhivehi, the absolutive dī is homophonous with the imperative; cf. 3.10.4.
441 Cf. also CAIN (1992), 104, who, from a purely synchronic view, interprets -bala (sic) as a simple “imperative suffix”.
442 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.
**Morphology**

1. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mi</th>
<th>siţgē</th>
<th>baru</th>
<th>vazan</th>
<th>ko’</th>
<th>dī</th>
<th>balā!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>of letter</td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>making</td>
<td>giving</td>
<td>look!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.pron.</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>+ verb</td>
<td>aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
<td>impv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attr.</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>impv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Find out the weight of this letter!"

2. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mi</th>
<th>ahanna’</th>
<th>kīālā</th>
<th>dī</th>
<th>balā!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>to me</td>
<td>reading aloud</td>
<td>giving</td>
<td>look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.pron.</td>
<td>pers.pron. 3rd degree</td>
<td>verb+aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj.</td>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>abs.II</td>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>impv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Read this for me!"

3. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ahanna’</th>
<th>goňdie’</th>
<th>genes</th>
<th>dī!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to me</td>
<td>chair a</td>
<td>bringing</td>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers.pron. 3rd degree</td>
<td>noun-num.</td>
<td>verb+aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>obj.indef.</td>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>impv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Bring me a chair!"

4. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aharenna’</th>
<th>fenfode’</th>
<th>genes</th>
<th>dī!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to me</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>bringing</td>
<td>look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers.pron. 3rd degree</td>
<td>drop a</td>
<td>verb+aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>abs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj.</td>
<td>obj. indef.</td>
<td>impv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Bring me some (lit. ‘a drop of’) water!"

5. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>koţarita’</th>
<th>dakkālā</th>
<th>dī</th>
<th>balā!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the rooms</td>
<td>showing</td>
<td>giving</td>
<td>look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun-pl.</td>
<td>verb+aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj.</td>
<td>abs.II</td>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>impv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Show (me) the rooms!"

6. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>huttaľā</th>
<th>dī!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stopping</td>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs.II</td>
<td>impv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Stop, please!"

7. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e</th>
<th>dakkālā</th>
<th>devvā!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>showing</td>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.pron.</td>
<td>verb aux.</td>
<td>aux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obj.</td>
<td>abs.II</td>
<td>2nd degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Show that, please!"

---

443 vazan kurāni “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,\(^{444}\) 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”\(^{445}\) 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.\(^{446}\) 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.), dipan / dīpallā “give!” (sg./pl.), kiyāpan / kiyāpallā “speak!” (sg./pl.); diyan / diyallā “give!” (sg./pl.)\(^{447}\)

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 *di* is often completed by an element *-fīanan* the original meaning of which has been forgotten in the modern language. Actually, *-fīanan* 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. *dakkāfīanan* “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 *fīani* (the same holds true for the other personal forms of the type *dakkāfīanan*). For syntactic reasons, the form *-fīanan*, 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 *-fīnu* 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*.\(^{448}\) Neither in the modern literary language nor in Old Dhivehi is *fīani* attested as an independent verb. In the

---

\(^{444}\) Cf. Geiger (1900), 78 and (1938), 150; cf. also Matzel (1983), 103.

\(^{445}\) “... einen Abschluß oder eine Vollständigkeit der Handlung ...”; cf. Geiger (1900), 83.

\(^{446}\) “... 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.

\(^{447}\) 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.

\(^{448}\) 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.449

3.5.4.2.3. The following sentences illustrate the use of polite imperative forms with -fan- in the standard language.450

(1)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{e} & \text{hen} & \text{hotale’} & \text{bune} & \text{dī} & \text{fanan} & \text{ta?}
\end{array}
\]

that way hotel a saying giving will you finish ?

dem.pron. noun noun verb aux. verb quest.-particle, 1st degree

abs. abs. 2.ps.sg.fut.

“Would you please recommend another hotel?”

(2)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{adi} & \text{e’} & \text{faharu} & \text{balālā} & \text{dī} & \text{fanan} & \text{ta?}
\end{array}
\]

again one time looking giving will you finish ?

conj. num. noun verb-aux. aux. verb quest.-particle, 1st degree

abs.II abs. 2.ps.sg.fut.

“Would you please look once more?”

(3)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{mi} & \text{hama} & \text{mihāru} & \text{fonuvalā} & \text{dī} & \text{fanu} & \text{to?}
\end{array}
\]

this just at this time sending giving will you finish ?

dem.pron. adv. adv. verb-aux. aux. verb quest.-particle, 2nd degree

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.

449 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 lifianti (RA 2,8; RC 9,6) written in Tāna. Obviously, din- and lit- represent the preterite participles of denī “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).

450 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 *fianĩ, too, which in Addũ, 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 denĩ “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 diēši, the question form of the potential (cf. 3.15.1.3.5) of the auxiliary denĩ; the meaning of diēši 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 Addũ, the basic meaning being the same throughout:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st degree</td>
<td>dōni bala!</td>
<td>“Look after the boat!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd degree</td>
<td>dōni balafele!</td>
<td>“Please look after the boat!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd degree</td>
<td>dōni balai derefele!</td>
<td>“Would you please look after the boat?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th degree</td>
<td>dōni balai diēši!</td>
<td>“Would you please be kind enough to look after the boat?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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. *bhalanamu; (2) balanu which has to be derived from the same form enlarged by -ka, *bhalanakamu; (3) balanta, the regular dative case of balan, with its more archaic variant balanata, the origin of which is seen by GEIGER in MIA *bhalanattham; and (4) the infinitive balanattha which represents a dative form of balanu according to GEIGER again who derives the infinitive ending -anna(a) (attested since the 9th/10th century A.D.) via an uncontracted preform -anuvata (attested in the older literature as well) from MIA *-anakattham (← OIA -anaka- + ártham “aim”, cf. 2.3.1.1.3).

451 GEIGER (1938), 162 f.; cf. also (1900), 75.
452 For the dative ending -ta going back to *attham, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aḍḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>balā’</td>
<td>balanna</td>
<td>balan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.3.1. Aḍḍū

In the dialect of Aḍḍū, the formation of the infinitive is unproblematical and transparent. Without any doubt, the a-stem infinitives go back to a form in *-anata corresponding with the more archaic form of the Sinhalese infinitive balanāta (mentioned as (3) in 3.6.1.1), which is based on a MIA quasi-dative containing *-attham ← 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’ ← balās(a) ← *balāṭ(a) ← *balanāta (bala- “to look”, kerā ← kerās(a) ← *k(V)rāṭ(a) ← *k(V)ranāta (k(V)ra- “to do, make”. The immediate predecessors of balā’ and kerā’, 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 Aḍḍū (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 -āni (perhaps written -en), more frequently -ān, -ēn. These forms doubtless correspond to the S. -anu, -enu, and, like them, go back to the verbal forms in -anā 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. karaṇa ‘in order to make’; as well as bahān ... = S. bedanta ‘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 *bhalanam (cf. infinitive (1) in 3.6.1.1), with Sinh. balanu ← *bhalanakam (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 ← *balāś ← *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, 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 -āς; in both cases, the form in question is liāς “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 liyāś-ulemā and liāś-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 -še which occur as infinitives and imperatives (cf. 3.5.2.2.2). HLSD treats -še as a special “suffix” in the formation of these two categories.⁴⁵³ 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’ni e!

⁴⁵³ HLSD (1988), 68-70. Cf. also Cain (1992), 104: “Imperatives that take the -še 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, ge² bai! “Go home!””. Thus, M. balåše can be analysed as a combination of the infinitive balåš- 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:

kahåse (vs. kám) “to eat”, déšë (vs. dën) “to give”, bôšë (vs. böm) “to drink”, duvåšë (vs. duvan) “to run”, kuråšë (vs. kuran) “to do”, liyåšë (vs. liyan) “to write”, vehëše (vs. vëhen) “to rain”, libëše (vs. liben) “to receive”. Cp. also the sentence aharen kåše 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 maråše “do not kill!” and annåše (sic, for annåše) “come!” (cf. 3.5.2.2.2). The other examples are nagåhåše “take up, lift”, nu talåhåše (sic, with l instead of l) “do not strike”, deheše “give” and dåhåše; most likely, the sequences -aha- and -ehe- contained in these forms must be interpreted as representing a long-vocalic -å- and -e-, resp. The expected forms would be nagåše (M. nagåni “to take, lift, remove”); nu talåše (M. talåni “to hit, hammer, strike, fight, beat”); déšë (M. deni “to give, offer”); dåså (M. danii “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 Addù 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 /l/ in final position is meant; the other spelling variants are (t, -t, -n) and (k). The unsteadiness in the spelling shows that /l/ 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 (s), it remains unclear when and under which conditions the phonetic realisation of the previous phoneme /l/ changed into that of a sibilant [s] in the language of Måle. Only in the period of the Tåna script, [s] could be represented graphically in an unambiguous form. The rendering of an original final /l/ by the graphemes (n) and (k) leads to the supposition that already at that time the phonetic realisation of /l/ 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 /l/ in Modern Fua³ Mulaku which in medial position varies between a very weakly articulated [s] and a sound similar to Czech [ř], as well as the transition of -Vt into -VhV in word-final position occurring in the same dialect.⁴⁵⁴ 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 -t(a?) will be quoted as well:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{datat(a?) (L.2 22.1; 12th century, oldest form); datat (datatu) (L.6 2.1; approximately 14th-16th centuries);} \\
\text{datan (F.8,20.33; 18th century) “down, to the underside” (mod.Dhv. Idåsåli: A. daåå; F. daåaha, M. daåå).} \\
\text{gekat, dorakat (F.13,11); gekan, dorakan (F.11,37) “to a house, to a door”.} \\
\text{haddummattyyan (F.5,13; 16th century) “to Haddummati”.} \\
\text{kulaimat (F.1,8; 16th century), kulañmatu (F.4,4.5; 17th century), kulaiman (F.6,14; 18th century) of the verbal noun kulain (mod. M. kurun, verbal noun of kurani) “to do, make”.}
\end{align*}
\]

⁴⁵⁴ For more details cf. 1.3.5.
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hedduman (ITMP 1,4) “for the making” (verbal noun of the causative of hadanī “to make, create”);
madīnayātu (F3,4), madīnāar (F2,3; F7,11; F11,7), madīnayāt (F5,11), madīnāan (sic F10,8); madīnāan (RA 2,5), madīnāas (RC 8,2) “to Madīnā”.

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 -ōta, viz. kuranaōta (kranaōta) (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’ 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)ta was its basic form, the retroflex ʃ must have been assimilated to the preceding nasal. But if the basic form was *balanattasa in correspondence with the 4th type of Sinhalese, we would have to assume a transitional phonetic stage such as [balannaša / -ša / -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.455 The question whether we may suggest a shortening of -a’ 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>temē’</td>
<td>temenna</td>
<td>temen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.5. The infinitive of the n-stems

With n-stem verbs, the following formations of infinitives are met with in Dhivehi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanna’</td>
<td>vannaha</td>
<td>vanna’; vannan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 *aṭṭhaṃ (acc.sg. ←

OIA ártham, cf. 2.3.1.1.3)\(^{456}\) 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’, which is homophonous in the modern dialects of Addū and Māle, obviously developed from *vad(V)nat (cp. M. (vaduna-)); the corresponding infinitive in Fua’ 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,\(^{457}\) 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,\(^{458}\) 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 bäl(u)ma, bälīma and bālilla. The formation of the Dhivehi verbal noun is illustrated for the three stem types by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbal noun</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-stem</td>
<td>belun</td>
<td>belun</td>
<td>belun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-stem</td>
<td>vanun</td>
<td>vanun</td>
<td>vanun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-stem</td>
<td>temun</td>
<td>temun</td>
<td>temun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.\(^{459}\) 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,\(^{460}\) the form in question which is characterised by the

\(^{456}\) Cf. Geiger (1900), 62, in particular fn. 2.

\(^{457}\) Cf., e.g., Geiger (1900), 75 and Matzel (1983), 105.

\(^{458}\) Matzel (1983, 105) draws an interesting typological comparison between Sinhalese and German: “die Verbalnomen auf -īma entsprechen unseren substantivierten Infinitiven (das Schneiden, Fließen, Tanzen, Töten, Sehen usw.), die auf -uma ... unseren Verbalnomen actionis (der Schnitt, Fluß, Tanz, Tod, Blick usw.) und die auf -illa in einigen Fällen unseren Verbalnomen auf -ung ...”.

\(^{459}\) “Sie werden flectirt als neutrale Substantiva” (Geiger 1900, 74).

\(^{460}\) Geiger (1938), 158 ff. and (1900), 73 f.; (1919), 79 ff.
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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 “absolutive I” or “absolutive 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. 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. 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.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gerund</th>
<th>Addı</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-stem</td>
<td>balamun</td>
<td>balamun</td>
<td>balamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-stem</td>
<td>vedemun</td>
<td>vañdimun</td>
<td>vannamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-stem</td>
<td>tememun</td>
<td>– (*tememun)</td>
<td>tememun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.2.1. The following sentences may suffice to illustrate the use of the gerund:

A. dōnī balamun ma fen bonī.

boats looking I water drinking
noun verb pers.pron. noun verb
obj. ger. obliquo obj. part.pres.lf.

“(While) looking for the boats I am drinking water.”

461 “… der Instrumental eines Verbalnomens auf -ma” (GEIGER 1900, 74).

462 “Die Form entspricht aber nicht, wie man vermuten könnte, dem alten Part.Präss. auf -māna.” (GEIGER 1900, 74).


464 The examples for the standard language are taken from HLSD (1988), 74.
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.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. kuku' kå’ demun demun gos varabali vege.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| kuku’| kå’| demun| demun| gos| varabali| vege  
| to the chickens| to eat| giving| giving| having gone| tired| got  
| noun| 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.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M. ēnā liamun liamun gos varubali vejje.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ēnā| liamun| liamun| gos| varabali| vejje  
| he| writing| writing| having gone| tired| got  
| pers.pron.| 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 -i 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 Fu’a’ Mulaku, the phonetic variants that occur in this dialect have been listed throughout.

| participle a-stem | Addhū | Fu’a Mulaku | Māle  
|-------------------|--------|-------------|--------  
| present | balā; balanī | balā/-ā; balanī | balā; balanī  
| future | balāne; balānei | balanā/-en; balanneni | balāne; balānī  
| preterite | beli; belī | belī | beli; belī  

"(While) eating rice, he is drinking water."
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:465 “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 -¯ana.” 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’ 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 balanā 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 temenē “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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>participle n-stem</th>
<th>Adḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>vanne; vannei</td>
<td>vannā; vannāi</td>
<td>vana; vannāni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>vannaŋe; vannaŋe</td>
<td>vannāhin; vannāhinī</td>
<td>vannāne; vannānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite</td>
<td>van; vanī</td>
<td>vānī</td>
<td>van; vanī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>participle e-stem</th>
<th>Adḍū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>temē; temenī</td>
<td>temē; temenī</td>
<td>temē; temenī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>temēñe; temenēi</td>
<td>temennen; temennenī</td>
<td>temēne; temenī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite</td>
<td>temenē; temene</td>
<td>temun; temūnī</td>
<td>temunu; temunī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

465 “Das Particip 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(ī)li auf -¯ana ausgeht” (GEIGER 1900, 73; cf. also 1938, 134).
466 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 govanī “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:

evya “calling, naming” (L3 5/1.3; cf. eviana above).
kura “doing” (F2.7; F3.12; F9.11; IDMMM 3.4; cf. kruana 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. dantī “to go”).
arā “climbing up, entering (the mosque)” (F11.25; → M. aranī “to climb up”).
aru “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”).
ki “(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”.

vu Lena “living, being” (L2 22.3 etc.), gene vu Lena (L4 c/2.4) besides gen velen (L4 e/1,1), but also vule in L1 d/2.3) and gen vule (L4 c/1.7 and f/1.1; read [vule]) “being taken”: → M. ulē, of ulenī “to live, be”.

gudena “joining, meeting” (L2 34.1); → M. gudē, of gudenī “to join”.

tibena “being” (L7 2.5); → M. ibē, of tibenī “to be”.

vena “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. ve, F. ve. 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 Addū 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, -nā developing into -ne; subsequently, the short form was adapted to this by analogy (-na → -ne), resulting in A. vanne as the primary form instead of *vanne.

The corresponding present participles of Fuaḍ Mulaku and Māle show no unexpected vocalism in their ending; cp., e.g., F. vannā, vannaṭ and M. vanna, vannanī. 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 \textit{*vannana}. If this is true, the final nasalised vowel -\textbar -a is not a reflex of -\textit{an} here but a formation following the model of \textit{bal\textbar -a}.

As against this, the short form of the present participle of the M\‘ale standard language, \textit{vanna}, conforms to the morphological rules. On the other hand, the long form of this participle, \textit{vannan\‘i}, 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 -\textit{na} is added. In the oldest Dhivehi texts, there are several examples attesting this process unambiguously, among them \textit{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 \textit{vad-}, an anaptyctic vowel -\textbar -u- and the suffix -\textit{na}. Cp. also \textit{vadun\‘a} which occurs twice in combination with \textit{kotu}, the absolutive of \textit{kuran\‘i} “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:

\textit{ganna} “receiving, getting” (L2 2,5 and 27,5; L3 15/2,2; L4 b/2,7 and f/2,3); cp. also \textit{ganna\‘i} (negated by \textit{nu}, in combination with \textit{kotu} “doing” used as a periphrastic causative “causing not to get” in L5 5/2,6 and F13,18); cp. M. \textit{gannya} “to buy”, but Sinh. \textit{gannav\‘a} “to take”.

\textit{hig\‘a} “going (there)” (F4,2); cp. M. \textit{hi\‘ig\‘ani} “to walk; happen”.

\textit{iduna} “sitting”, also “living, residing” (L2 11,2 etc.; L3 3/2,4 etc.); cp. M. \textit{innani} “to sit”.

\textit{basuna} “setting, descending (of the sun)” (L4 f/1,5; F4,2); cp. Sinh. \textit{bahinav\‘a} “to sit, descend” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 120, no. 1790).

\textit{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 \textit{vadai} which is used in the analytical formation of verbs of motion as a formant characterising the two higher honorific degrees.\footnote{Cf. 0.9.2. — Cp. Sinh. \textit{vadunav\‘a} “to increase, augment; to take up” (GEIGER (1941), 154, no. 2297). In Dhivehi, the preterite form \textit{vodi} is attested besides the older variant \textit{vedi}; M. \textit{vodi} is to \textit{vedi} as M. \textit{ato\‘lu} is to A. \textit{ate\‘le}, cf. 1.2.4.4.}

\textit{nikunnai}, attested in combination with \textit{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 \textit{*nikunna}, cp. M. \textit{nukunnani} “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.\footnote{In the present book, the terms “preterite” and “past” are used synonymously.} 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
preterite. In all dialects of Dhivehi, this form can be taken as a basic 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 *-i 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-ı → *bāli → beli “(having) looked”, *tal-ı → *tāli → telí “(having) beaten, hammered”, *nat-ı → *nāti → neši “(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 -¯ı and -¯u 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 ¯u/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. 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 *ā. This corresponds with the development in Sinhalese where ā 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; they do not show a change of the quality of this vowel in their preterite. Cp., e.g., Sinh. koṭanavā “to mash, cut, bruise” with its part.pret. keṭu vs. Dhiv. kośanī “to chop, cut; reap, whittle” with its part.pret. kośi; Sinh. duvanavā “to run”: part.pret. divu vs. Dhiv. M. duvanī “id.”: part.pret. divi. 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’ Mulaku show a
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 hunnani “to stand”). Cp. the following list of examples:

dekenî “to see”: In Addû and Fua’ Mulaku, the past participle of this verb is duši. There is no older attestation of the corresponding M. form du’ /duši/ (← /du(ɯ)/ ?), but cf. the Sinhalese participle dātu (of dakinava “to see”). Both the Maldivian and the Sinhalese form go back to an old participle with the suffix -ā; cp. Pa. duṭha-, Skt. dṛṣṭa- “seen”.473
hunnani “to be, stand, remain, stay”: A. hiṣi; F. hiṣi (long form). The modern form M. hurî must be of recent origin; it is for the first time attested in the Tāna version of the Rādavali. The earlier form hiṣi is attested 35 times, beginning with later lōmāfanus (L6 2,5; L7 2,5; F1,9 etc.; F10,11 etc.). It corresponds to Sinh. hiṣi (of hiṣinava “to stand; be”)474 which must be related with Pa. hiṭo- and Skt. sthitā- (of tisthati “to stand”, root sthā-) although its phonetic shape remains unclear.475 — 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 hunna-hutî (F1,10 etc.) containing the present participle of the same verb which obviously underlines the present meaning (lit. “being – having been”).476
konnañi (A. kamei, F. kañnañ) “to dig”: A. keñi; F. kēñi (long form). The short form M. konunuma is obviously formed by analogy after the e-stems. — The corresponding Sinhalese verb is kaninava “to dig, excavate” which is also attested in a spelling with retroflex n, (kaninavā); it belongs to the 2nd conjugation and must be identified with Pkt. khañai, Pa. khanati, and Skt. khanati (1st present class; root khan-), part. pret. khañta-.477 — Obviously the past participle is not preserved in Sinhalese, but it can be reconstructed as *kāñī / *kāñ on the basis of the preterite kāñņa.
kuññeñi (A. kolonei, F. keñnañ) “to play”: A. koli; F. kēli (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. kuñnumu has to be regarded as a regular form. As to the Addû and Fua’ Mulaku forms, cp. the Sinh. i-stem keñinavā with its past participle keli. — The etymology of this verb is still unclear.478
heññeñi (A. sahunee, F. sahunāñ) “to husk”: A. sehī; F. sēñi (long form). Like kuññeñi, M. heññeñi (part. pret. heñnen) follows the model of the e-stems. It remains uncertain whether there is a corresponding verb in Sinhalese; the etymology of heññeñi is unknown as well.
The compound verb M. gen galenī “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’ and F. dagonaha. The past participles are A. degi and F. dēgi (long form). — So far, both the Sinhalese correspondents and the etymology of this verb are unknown.

474 Cf. Matzél (1983), 55; Geiger (1941), 192, no. 2897.
475 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. hunnann “to stand, be” from sad: “to sit” and puts it together with M. innann “to sit, be”.
476 As a semantic parallel cp. German gelegen meaning “liegend, seidend” in local contexts.
477 Cf. Geiger (1941), 36, no. 535; Turner (1966) I, 200, no. 3811; Whitney (1885), 32.
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.

$\textit{aidan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ (F. anna\ddot{i}, A. annei) “to burn”; part.pret. M.A.F. an. — Neither the transitive verb $\textit{aidan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ “to burn” nor its causative form andan\ddot{i} “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, $\textit{aidan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ cannot be considered as an inherited nasal present. The OIA preterite participle, built with the suffix -ta, is sámiddha- “ignited”.\textsuperscript{479}

$\textit{a˘ndan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ (F. anna\ddot{i}, A. annei) “to wear (a sarong)”: part.pret. an. In the modern language this verb is homophonous and morphologically identical with $\textit{aidan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ “to burn”, without being etymologically connected with it. In contrast to the latter, $\textit{a˘ndan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ “to wear” has an etymological cognate in Sinhalese, viz. a˘ndinav\ddot{a} with its older variant ha˘ndinav\ddot{a} “to don, attire, wear”, part.pret. (h)a˘ndi. GEIGER\textsuperscript{480} identifies (h)a˘ndinav\ddot{a} with OIA sámjyati “to tie, fasten” (sam- + root dā- “to bind”\textsuperscript{481}), while TURNER also takes into consideration a connection with sañjayati “attaches to” (root sañj- “to hang”).\textsuperscript{482}

$\textit{bannan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ (A. bannei, F. banna\ddot{i}) “to tie, bind”: part.pret. ban. GEIGER derives the Sinhalese past participle bada “bound, tied” from a form with the suffix -ta; cp. Pa., buddha, Skt. baddha- ← *badh-ta\textsuperscript{483}. — $\textit{bannan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ and Sinh. ba˘ndinav\ddot{a} can lastly be traced back to an OIA nasal present (badhn´¯ati, 9th present class) but presuppose a reshaping of its stem for the MIA period (cp. Buddhist Hybrid Skt., Pkt. bandha-).

$\textit{bi˘ndan}\ddot{\text{i}} / binnan\ddot{\text{i}}$ (A. binnei, F. binnai) “to pluck, break”: part.pret. bin. This participle corresponds to Sinh. bun “broken; split; expanded (as flowers)” belonging to the i-stem verb bi˘ndinav\ddot{a}; cp. Pa., Pkt. bhinna, Skt. bhinn\ddot{a} ← *bhid-na\textsuperscript{484}. The verb is based on an old nasal present (7th class); cp. Ved. bhinn\ddot{a}ti (root bhid- “split”), later thematised into bhindati (MIA, Buddhist Hybrid Skt.).

$\textit{innan}\ddot{\text{i}}$ (A. innei, F. innai) “to sit, marry, be married”: part.pret. in. The corresponding Sinh. participle is un “seated” (of (h)i˘ndinav\ddot{a}, innava) which can be traced back to a participial formation with the suffix -na; cp. Pa., Pkt. sanna, Skt. sann\ddot{a} ← *sad-na- (root sad-)\textsuperscript{485}.

\textsuperscript{479} 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”.

\textsuperscript{480} Cf. GEIGER (1941), 7, no. 100.

\textsuperscript{481} Cf. WHITNEY (1885), 72 and WERBA (1997), 294 s.v. dā- “binden, fesseln”.

\textsuperscript{482} Cf. TURNER (1966), II, 757, no. 13085 and 748, no. 12906; cf. furthermore 758, no. 13098. Cf. also WHITNEY (1885), 182.

\textsuperscript{483} Cf. GEIGER (1938), 137 and (1941), 117, no. 1755; further MAYRHOFER (1965), 83 f. and 96; WHITNEY (1885), 105.

\textsuperscript{484} 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.

\textsuperscript{485} Cf. GEIGER (1938), 137, (1941), 21, 324 / 26, 393, and (1916), 148; cf. also MAYRHOFER (1951) I, 173 and (1965), 66.
The participle of the preterite

iṣīnnaṇī “to sit” (F. iṣīṇnaṇī, A. iṣīrṇei); part. pret. M. iṣin, A.F. iṛin. — GEIGER suggested a connection of this participle with Sinh. ḫiṁin, but the most probable derivation presupposes a compound verb. In this case, the first part is most likely to consist of the absolute of the verb hunnaṇṭi (cf. 3.9.2.2.1 above) in its older form hिṁe (preserved until today in southern Dhivehi as against the more recent variant M. ḫure), from *hite. The finite part of the verb may then be taken from innanṭi “to sit” (cf. above). Thus, the total meaning can be translated with “being sitting”. — As to the formation, cp. osōmnāṇī (3.9.2.2.3).

vannāṇṭi (A. vaṇṇeṇi, F. vaṇṇaññi) “to enter”: The past participle M.A.F. van has a homophonous equivalent in Sinhalese about which GEIGER wrote: “Appears to be ppt. of v. vadīnavā, 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 vrajiṭa- (root vrj- “to proceed”). 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. denṭi “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. denṭi can hardly be an inherited n-stem if it reflects OIA dāḍāṭi “gives”, which is a reduplicative root present (root dāṭ-).488 din is well attested in the early documents of Dhivehi where it sometimes still appears in the spelling (dīna) (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 dām; cp. Pa., Pkt. dinna vs. Skt. dattā- ← *tta- (with suffix -ta)489.

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.490 In the long form, however, the inherited stop is preserved in the position before -t. The following verbs exhibit this feature:

gannāṇḍi (A. ganneṇi, F. gannāṇi) “to buy”: līgat M. gai, A.F. ga; cp. the long forms M.A. gatī, F. gātī. The Sinhalese equivalent is gat as well; GEIGER derives this form from an OIA past participle variant *ghṛpta- “taken”, contrasting with the attested form gr(h)hiṭā- of the nasal present (9th class) gr(h)hniṭī.492 Although the etymological development is not clear in every detail, gannāṇḍi seems to be one of the inherited n-stems of Dhivehi.

nukunnaṇṭi (A. nukunneṇi, F. nukunṇaññi) “to come/go out, leave”: /nukutī → M. nukai, A.F. nuka; long form M.A. nukuti, F. nukāṭi. 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 nिस्रंतa-, of nisṛmāṇaṇi “goes out” (set root kram-, belonging to the 1st present class of the Indian grammar).493

onnāṇḍi (A.F. →) “to lie, be there”; /lotl → M. oṭi, A.F. oṭi; long form M.A. oṭṭi, F. oṭṭī. The etymological equivalent in Sinhalese is hōvinava, hōnavā “to lie down, repose, sleep” which can be traced back to the

---

486 Cf. GEIGER (1902), 924, no. 215.
487 For the etymology of the verb cf. fn. 415.
490 For the phonetic development of word final plosives cf. 1.1.3.
491 Cf. GEIGER (1941), 52, no. 761 and further TURNER (1966) I, 244, no. 4509.
492 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.
493 Cf. MAYRHOFER (1986-), I, 409 f.; TURNER (1966) I, 423, no. 7492 and GEIGER (1941), 87, no. 1274. — The Sinh. verb nikmēṇavnā “to come forth, issue”, which belongs to the e-stems, goes back to nīṣ + kram- as well (GEIGER 1941, ib., no. 1275). Cp. also the causative nikmēvanaṇā “to send forth”.

OIA root *svap- “to sleep”. The past participle (*h)ot continues a participle with the suffix -*ta, cp. Skt. *supti-, Pa. *sutta.494

*ovanni (A. *vinni, F. *vinna) ‘to lie (down)’; M. *losöl → ośöi, A.F. *lesöl → *wešio; long form M. *osöi, A. *wešio, F. *višo. This verb is a compound with onnani (cf. above) as its second part. In A.F. *viši-, the first part preserves the regular absolutive of an e-stem not existing any longer as an independent verb in Dhivehi, viz. *višenī ← older *vetenī. The Sinhalese equivalent of this is vitenavā “to fall (down), drop”. According to Geiger (1941, 161, no. 2400), this is a “passive (with peculiar meaning) of vatavana” meaning “to turn round” which goes back directly to the OIA root vrt- “to turn”495. The phonological equivalent of the Sinh. causative vatavana is preserved in Modern Dhivehi in the semantically restricted verb M. vošanī “to rub in, embrocate (with circling movements)”. Presumably Dhiv. *vutenī had the same meaning as Sinh. vitenavā and was replaced by vetenī which is the only verb in the modern language meaning “to fall”. Morphologically vetenī is the inactive equivalent of the causative vatana “to cause to fall, let fall”. Thus, the compound vesi-at- literally means “lying (having) fallen (down)” or “lying by falling” — The phonological structure of M. *ovannī can be easily explained on this basis. While the conservation of /el/ in the position before a single retroflex consonant is typical for southern Dhivehi, this vowel regularly developed into /ol/ in the northern dialects as early as the 14th century A.D. (cf. 1.2.4.4); cp. M. atolu vs. A. atele “atoll” or M. odī vs. A. veši “larger Maldivian boat” which shows the same additional loss of /v- in the position before -a as oš- ← voš- ← voṭ- ← veš-. In contrast to that, the initial ve- of M. vutenī has not changed because the following retroflex is a geminate. — The compositional structure of *ovannī has a parallel in išinnī (cf. 3.9.2.2.2 above).

In the case of donnani “to wash” (cp. Pa. dhovati, Skt. dhāvati “washes”; root dhāv-496), North and South Dhivehi show a different formation of the past participle; cf. A.F. *ldotl → *do, long form A. dotli, F. *dolli as against the short form M. *douunu, long form *douni, which formally presupposes an inactive verb.497 — The Sinhalese equivalent of this verb is dōvana, 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 devavā) if it was built regularly. The ancestor of this form can be seen in the OIA participle dhautā- which is built with the suffix -*ta; the phonological development implied is Sinh. *dōvī → *dēvī → *devu498. The form /dotl/ we find in southern Dhivehi is even more problematic because a final l-ll in Dhivehi or in Sinhalese cannot go back to a simple medial /-ll 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., onnani, gannani (cf. above) with a final l-ll in their past participles; in these cases, l-ll 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. ulei with its southern equivalents. F. vėma, A. vėdeni “to live, be”. In Fua’ Mulaku, the verb has the forms of an n-stem, with the only exception of the past participle vėduin, long form vėduin which is built after the model of the e-stems. In Ađdu as well as the standard language, all forms follow the pattern of the e-stems; hence, the forms of the past participle are vėdeni, long form vėdeni in Ađdu and ulunu, long form ulunī 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. ulei and A. vėdeni can be derived from the same etymology; 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).

494 Cf. Turner (1966) II, 803, no. 13902; Geiger (1941), 195, no. 2946 and 32, no. 481.
495 Cf. Geiger (1941), 154, no. 2293; Whitney (1885), 164; Werba (1997), 237.
497 Cp. kulen treated in 3.9.2.2.1.
498 For the rules of this formation cf., e.g., Matzel (1983), 54.
499 For the change of -i → -u in the past participles cf. Geiger (1938), 135.
A completely irregular verb is M. dannaní, A. dennei, F. dennaï “to know”. In the southern dialects, the conjugation of the present of this verb is in accordance with the n-stems; in Pua’ Mulaku this is also true for the pattern of the finite future, but not the infinitive. — Etymologically, dannaní is a real n-stem going back to an old nasal present, viz. Skt. janáti which belongs to the 9th present class (root jñā- “to know”).505 — In Addú and Pua’ Mulaku, the past participle of this verb is built periphrastically by combining its absolutive with the past participle of hunnaní (cf. 3.9.2.2.1), here functioning as an auxiliary verb (A. dene hi’, F. dene híst, long form); in Māle, the verb has no past participle at all. — In Sinhalese, the past participle of dannaní “to know” is dat which Geiger explains as a formation by analogy: “The prpt. dat is formed after the model of gat : gannavā.”506

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. annaní “to come”, A.F. ení “to go, come” has the following short and long forms: M. aí / aí; F. éé / éé, A. aí / aí. 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. ēi), Skt. āgata- (root aay/-ā; 2nd present class).502

Because of a semantic overlap as well as for formal reasons, the verb M. daní cannot be treated separately from annaní. In the standard language where daní 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 ent which conveys the meaning of both “to come” and “to go” today. The past participle has the forms M. dia / diat, A. ge / ēi, F. gè / gēi. 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-. 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. daní and Sinh. yanavā can be derived from the OIA root yā-504 (yāiti “goes, approaches, comes to”, 2nd present class505).

The past participle of boní “to drink” has the forms M. bui / buī, A. bi / bī, F. bi (long form); cp. the Sinhalese equivalent bi, of bonavā.506 Its basic form is the OIA past participle pītā- belonging to the present pība- “to drink” (root pā-).507

508 Cf., e.g., Whitney (1885), 56 and further Werba (1997), 403.
509 Cf. Geiger (1941), 70, no. 1018 (for gannaní 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 Sindhí jātō (cf. Grierson 1903-1927, VIII, 1, 50), Lahndā jātā (ib., 264), Hindī jātā (besides jānnā; 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).
511 Cf. Geiger (1938), 137 and (1941), 56, no. 814.
514 Cf. Matzel (1983), 56; Geiger (1941), 125, no. 1863.
The past participle of *kanāti* "to eat" has the forms M.F. *kē / kēr* and A. *ke / kei* which exactly correspond with Sinh. *kā* (of *kanavā*).508 Its ancestral form is the OIA participle *khādiyā-* (cp. *khādatt* "chews, bites, eats", root *khād*509); the umlaut appearing in Sinhalese and Dhivehi was caused by the suffix *-ita*.

From a synchronic point of view, the past participle of M. *kurāti*, A.F. *kerāti* "to make, do" presents a complex of irregularities; cp. the forms M. *kurī / kurī* contrasting with *kuḷa / kuḷāt*, an archaic form occurring only in Old Dhivehi texts (e.g., L1 nn/1,6) and, as a stylistic variant, in poetic diction, F. *kela / kēla* and A. *kedē / kedeī*. From a diachronic perspective, the manifold forms can be explained satisfactorily. In Sinhalese the past participle is *kuḷa* with a dialectal variant *kela* today510; according to the sound laws, both these variants correspond with M. *kula*, F. *kela* and A. *kede*. The basic form of this formation must be seen in the OIA participle *krtā-* "done" (root *kr-,* pres. stem *kṛnō-*/*karō-*).511 The forms appearing in Sinhalese, North Dhivehi and Fua' Mulaku imply the following phonological development: after a root containing *-r*, the dental plosive *ll* of the participial suffix first changed to a retroflex *l* which later, according to the sound laws, developed through voiced *ll* into *lL*. Some MIA idioms show parallels which, however, cannot be regarded as direct "genetic" ancestors of the modern IIA forms in question; cp. Pa. *kata / katha* and AMg. *kaṭa* (besides *kaya*).512 In contrast to that, the voiced retroflex *lL* is preserved in Addū in this case as well as in all comparable examples.513 — 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.

*vanāti* "to become; be" (A.F. *venī*) has the past participle M.A. *vī / vī*, F. *vī*. Its Sinhalese equivalent is *vā* (of *venavā* "to become") which goes back to a *ta-*participle, cf. Skt. *bhūtā-,* Pa. *bhūta-*, Pkt. *bhū(y)ā-*. (OIA root *bhū-* "to be", pres. *bhāva-*).514

The verb *netūni* "not being there" is a secondary formation which, particularly in the standard language, is characterised by a very contradictory paradigm. In Addū, the past participle is *ne / 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 *netī* which is the Dhivehi equivalent of Sinhalese *nātī,* *nātī*. 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 *nā* "not" and the finite present form *āsti* "is"); cp. also Pa. *nāthī*, Pkt. *nāthi*.515

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 ← -unu* occurring only with inactive verbs. Sinhalese disposes of a homophonous suffix *-unu* 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

---

508 Cf. MATZEL (1983), 56; GEIGER (1941), 36, no. 532.
509 Cf. TURNER (1966), I, 203, no. 3865; WHITNEY (1885), 32.
510 Cf. BECHERT (1959), 62, note 3.
512 Cf. GEIGER (1938), 57.
513 For more details cf. 1.3.7.2.
514 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.
515 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 temunu.” The prototype of this participial formation was identified by Geiger with forms like Pa. parihiṇa “wasted” which corresponds with Sinh. pirihunu, although “in this case the traditional spelling with the cerebral (n) would be unintelligible. The correct derivative of parihiṇa is pirihun, which really exists in the language.” The spelling of the nasal (dental ⟨n⟩ vs. retroflex ⟨ṅ⟩) 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.516 The spelling with the retroflex ⟨ṅ⟩ 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 ⟨ṅ⟩ the suffix still has today as an independent phoneme in the Addū dialect.517

The past participle of the e-stems in Modern Dhivehi shows regular dialectal variation. The participial forms of temenī “to get wet”, A. temene, F. temun and M. temunu, can be traced back to a common basis *temunu which is identical to the Sinhalese form in its traditional spelling with retroflex ⟨ṅ⟩. The change of final -u → -e in the position after a retroflex ⟨ṅ⟩ 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 ⟨ṅ⟩ in Addū; cp., e.g., A. dekuṅu “south”, hunu “heat; hot”, karuṅu “tear”, kuni “dirt; rotten”, makuṅu “bed bug”, mekuṅu “grey (or blue tail) mullet” (crenimugil crenilabis) or ukunu “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 nimene “finished”, thus contrasting with the dialectal variants F. nimun, M. nimunu and the older form nimunu 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. negunu “raised” (L2 9,3 and 22,1), vuluṅu (L1 mn/2,5; L4 d/2,1) and ulunu “lived, been” (F3,16), or vunu (L1 d/2,2,4; L2 2,1) and vevunu (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,518 is likely to represent a new formation dating from a relatively recent period. In standard Dhivehi and in Fua ‘Mulaku, the short form of the participle is formally identical with the 3.ps.sg. of the finite future.519 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

517 For the loss of the phonemic status of the retroflex ⟨ṅ⟩ in North Dhivehi cf. 1.3.7.
518 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).
519 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’ 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 Addū 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. kurāne (of kuranī “to make, do”; F5,17,18), vāne (of vanī “to become”; F11,20), hunnāne (of hunnanī “to stand, remain, stay, be”; ITMKM 1,6), haddavāne (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 Addū we may at least formulate a simple synchronic rule for the formation of the future participle according to which the infinitive ending /-c/, which reflects the dative ending /-ã/ itself, is replaced by -ne / -nei (long form); cp., e.g., balāne(i), vannane(i), temēne(i), kerāne(i), himnāne(i), vēne(i); the corresponding infinitives are balā “to look”, vanna “to enter”, temē “to get wet”, kerā “to make, do”, hinna “to stand, remain, stay, be”, vē “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 -n (*balāt-ne → *balātne → balāne). 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” while MATZEL preferred the term “absolutive II (absolutive of the preterite)” 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 absolute (in Dhivehi as well as in Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit) is not tied to a specific
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 absolutes 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 -i/i are based on them as well. Once again, Sinhalese fits perfectly with the historical development of the Prākrit languages.”

As to Modern Sinhalese, GEIGER gives a synchronic rule for the formation of the absolutes: 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>absolutive</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-stems</td>
<td>balai</td>
<td>balā</td>
<td>balā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 absolutes (cf. 3.10.5), the final -i of the first member can be apocopated in the dialect of Addū; cp. balai 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. Pkt. it ends in -aya: KADAYA having detached, ... KARAVAYA having caused to be constructed, ... KANA-

522 “Sicher aber ist, daß allen Bildungen die Gerundialformen [i.e. absolutive, 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 -i/i stammen ebenfalls von ihnen her. Das Sgh. fügt sich also wieder vollkommen in die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Prākrits ein” (GEIGER 1900, 74).
VAYA having caused to be dug ... I believe that -aya is spelt for -āya and that forms like P. ādāya, utthāya 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 Adhū until present while the absolutive in -ā of Fua’ 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>absolutive e-stems</th>
<th>Adhū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>temi</td>
<td>temi</td>
<td>temē / temē</td>
<td>temi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10.2.1. In the standard language, the final -i is sometimes lengthened in the absolutive; in Fua’ Mulaku, the lengthening of -i → -ī is even regular for all e-stems. Cp., e.g., nimenē “to finish (intr.), come to an end”: A.M. nimi, F. nimē; veṭṭenē “to fall”: A.M. veṭṭi, F. veṭṭi.

3.10.2.2. In Sinhalese, the corresponding absolutive of the 3rd conjugation has a final -ī as well; cp. the forms tibī (of tibēnavā / tīyenavā “to be (there), exist”), pipī (of pipēnavā “to come into flower, open (as a flower)”):

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 manyfold 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>absolutive n-stems</th>
<th>Adhū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vedi, vede-</td>
<td>vedi</td>
<td>veñeđe</td>
<td>vade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

523 For further forms of this type cf., e.g., Matzel (1983), 48.
The absolutive (converb) 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’ 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’ 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.”524 In the Modern Sinhalese language, the corresponding absolutes show a final -a, but in the medieval inscriptions and in the older literature, the normal ending was still -ā. 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., bändā525 “having bound” (8th c.), dākā “having seen” (12th c.) vs. bānda and dīka (both 12th c.). The archaic Sinhalese ending -ā exactly agrees with the -e we find in Modern Dhivehi.

The verbs listed below build the absolutive according to the morphonological rule given above. The examples show that there are, at least for parts, considerable differences between the forms of North and South Dhivehi.


vannānī “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 vedefei, vadelāni, vedegen (cf. 3.11.4.4 below). The 3.ps.sg.pres. F. vāndī is regular as is the abs. vende. — The Māle equivalents of both the absolutive and the finite form have no umlaut (3.ps.sg.pres. vade – 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. ganni, F. gānī 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. gane 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’ Mulaku and -ē in the standard language. This type is represented by the following verbs:

524 Geiger (1938), 160; cf. also (1900), 74. For the terminology cf. 3.10
525 Sic; cf. Geiger (1941), 117, no. 1755.
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:


3.10.3.5. Another type is constituted by the following three verbs:

donnanī "to wash": 3.ps.sg.pres. A. dūī, F. dōe, M. dōvē. In Aññū, the primary absolutive has the form dūī while a variant dō- appears in compound formations such as dōfēi etc. In Fua’ Mulaku too, the simple absolutive is dūī but the compound absolutives still show an uncontracted form; cp. dōvē-fē etc. This latter form (dove) is the regular absolutive while the 3.ps.sg.pres. is dōvē in the standard language.

onnanī "to lie, be (there)”: In Aññū, 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.

osonnanī "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. vesīoi (cf. also vesīofei, vesiovēfei), F. vesīove, M. ošōve – 3.ps.sg.pres. A. vesīoi, F. vesīove, M. ošōve.

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 Aññū:


nukunnanī “to leave, come/go out”: A. 3.ps.sg.pres. nukumei – abs. nukume. — 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 absolute 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 vanavā “to go”. GEIGER derives gos via MIA *gacca from the old absolutive form -gatya (Skt. gam- “to go”; cf. below); the development of -cc- into -s- agrees with the sound laws of both Insular IA languages. Although GEIGER offers no explanation for the o-vocalism in Sinh. gos, he suggests a parallel with the o-vocalism of the absolutive koṭa (← Sinh. karanu; cf. below s.v. karanī).

526 Cf. de silva (1970b), 158 and 159. Cf. also 1.7.3.
M. annanı, A.F. enı “to come” has the absolutive forms M. ais, A. ās, F. āho which correspond to Sinh. avut, āvit. Via an intermediate *ə-gacca, GEIGER traces the latter forms back to the Skt. absolute ā-gatyā (ā + gam- “to come near, approach”\(^{527}\)); 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, āvit.” Both intermediate forms, avuj as well as avud, are attested in medieval Sinhalese.\(^{528}\) 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.\(^{529}\)

kuranı “to make, do” has the absolutive forms M.A. koč/ko´s, F. kō. The Old Dhivehi documents show variant spellings such as koṭu or kṭ which exactly correspond with Sinh. koṭa (but not with its synonym kara which represents a different formation). In Sinhalese Prakrit, the form katu is attested since the 2nd c. A.D., koṭa appearing as a later variant. In medieval Sinhalese, there is a chronological succession of the forms koṭ (9/10th c.), koṭä (12th c.) and, lastly, koṭa. The basis of all these formations must be seen in Skt. kṛtvā.

vanı “to become” has the absolutive 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 vf 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 bonı “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. denı “to give” treated below).

kanı “to eat” has the absolutive forms M. kai, A. kāi (but kā-gen etc., cf. below), F. kā. In Fua’ Mulaku, the form of the 3.ps.sg. present is identical with the absolutive; but cf. A. kai, M. kē. — The Sinhalese equivalent of the absolute is kā, which, according GEIGER (1938, 159), is a regular formation of the 1st conjugation.

In the standard language, the absolute of denı “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’ Mulaku. Possibly, this formation, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reduplicated absolute</th>
<th>Addū</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-stem</td>
<td>bala(i)</td>
<td>balā balā</td>
<td>balā balā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>balai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-stem</td>
<td>vedi</td>
<td>veṅde veṅde</td>
<td>vade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vedi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-stem</td>
<td>temi</td>
<td>temṅ temṅ</td>
<td>temi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As GEIGER stated (1938, 159), reduplicated absolutes are also frequently used in Sinhalese: “The Gerund II [i.e. absolutive; S.F.] is often doubled: bala-balā, kapa-kapā, dāka-dāka,

\(^{527}\) Cf. MAYHOFER (1965), 99.

\(^{528}\) GEIGER (1938), 159; cf. also DE SILVA (1970b), 158.

\(^{529}\) 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 absolutes of the a-conjugation in Aḍḍū (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.530 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 features531

530 For the theoretical background cf. ISАČЕNКО 1962, 347-355.
531 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. 532

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 KURYLOWICZ’s observations and ideas are of a particular interest. 533 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 **aspeuctual nuances** without being aspect languages in the strict sense of the word.

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. 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 KURYLOWICZ (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.

It is evident that in the sense of a structuralistic definition as given by ISAČENKO (cf. above), Hindi and other modern IA languages 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, 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

---

534 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.”

535 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.

536 Within the framework of Indological studies, most of the literature in question deals only with Hindi or Urdu; cf. MASICA (1991), 262-279.

537 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., bāḷā “looking, having looked”) as a “perfective gerund” to the gerund in -min (e.g., bāḷamin “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 perfectivation 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.\footnote{This would mean that from a verb which expresses an “aktionsart” meaning, no secondary imperfective 
or perfective aspect partner can be derived.} There are three parameters which qualify the category of aktions-
art 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.\footnote{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.} 

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.
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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.540

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 ones541, 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-verbes 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

540 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. ISACENKO (1962), 388 ff.

Compound verbs and auxiliary verbs expressing “aktionsart” concepts

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. 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”. 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 and Helmut NESPITAL’s 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”. 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.

542 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 obagrjat’ ipfv. – obagrit’ pfv., obagryvat’ representing a secondary imperfective.

543 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.


545 NESPITAL (1981), particularly 61 f.

546 Cf. also HOOK (1974); CHATTERJEE (1988); MASICA (1991), 327 ff.
Morphology

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, MCGLERGAR (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);
- purnā “to fall, be found” and uthnā “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);
- dālnā “to throw down” (stresses the violent, decisive or drastic course of an action or, that it is done in a casual way);
- baithnā “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);
- nikālān “to emerge” (expresses the suddenness or unexpectness of an action);
- puhumān “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”).

As against MCGLERGAR, 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 absolutives 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

---

547 All the direct quotations are taken from MCGLERGAR (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.”

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.

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.

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 dānā-gannu ‘to get to know, recognise’; dakinu ‘to see’, but dāka-gannu ‘to find out (something) for oneself ...” Cp. also hōdanavā “to wash” vs. hōdā-gannavā “to wash oneself”; baṅdinavā “to bind, tie” vs. baṅda-gannavā “to tie (something) around oneself” etc.

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.

In auxiliary function, piyanavā stresses the completion or the perfect realisation of an action in the sense of a resultative aktionsart. Cp. di-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-piyamu “to cause (somebody) to do (something) completely”. — The past participle of piyanavā, which does not occur independently, has the form pū 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-liyā-pu “written”, from liyanavā “to write”; hita-pu “been”, of hitinavā “to be”; ā-pu “(having) come”, of enavā “to come”; būpu “drunken”, of bonavā “to drink”. — The old imperative forms of piyanavā, sg. pan, piya, pl. pallā,
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, lanav¯a “to put, set, place” is but rarely used as a main verb. As an auxiliary, it is almost synonymous with piyanav¯a. The past participle l¯u/l u, in the literary language l¯ı, is used like p¯a / pu / pī (cf. above); it occurs very frequently. In combination with the absolutive of a main verb, the absolutive l¯a is regularly used for the formation of the colloquial absolutives in -l¯a, co-occurring with a shortening of the long final vowels of primary absolutives of the 1st and the 3rd conjugation. Cps., e.g., balal¯a ← bal¯a-l¯a (of balanav¯a “to look (for)”, conjugation I), or pipil¯a ← pipī-l¯a (of pipenav¯a “to bloom”, conjugation III); dākal¯a (absolutive dāka, of dakinav¯a “to see”, conjugation II) remains without a change. — In combination with a few verbs, lanav¯a gives rise to causative-like meaning; cp., e.g., got¯a-lanu “to let plait, weave”, from gotanu “to plait, weave” (cf. Geiger 1900, 83).

In auxiliary function, damanav¯a / d¯anav¯a “to put, place, fix; subdue, tame, overpower” is generally used in the same sense as piyanav¯a and lanav¯a. In combination with the absolutive of transitive verbs, it yields the nuances of resultativity and completion of an action; cp., e.g., kap¯a-damanav¯a “to cut (completely) through”, bānda-damanav¯a “to tie / bind up”, etc.

3.11.2.3. yanav¯a “to go” and enav¯a “to come” are only rarely used as auxiliary verbs in Sinhalese. Geiger (1938, 161) attests a similar nuance for yanav¯a as for piyanav¯a etc.; cp., e.g., virī-yanu “melted (completely)” (of virenav¯a “to melt”). According to Matzel (1983, 81), the combination of yanav¯a 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 gannav¯a “to take” which functions as the main verb; the verbs in question are gena-yanav¯a, also appearing in the phonetic variant geniya-nav¯a, with the meaning “to take away”, lit. “to go having taken”, and gena-enav¯a, contracted to gen¯enav¯a and furthermore shortened by haplology to g¯enav¯a, meaning “to bring”, lit. “to come having taken”.555

3.11.2.4. In combination with the absolutive of a main verb, Sinh. äti “is (there)”, which represents a petrified relic form of the old copula (cp. Pa. attthi, Skt. asthi), 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 gihill¯a äti “Probably he has gone home”556 (gihill¯a being a compound of the colloquial absolutive form gihin and the absolutive l¯a; cf. 3.10.4 and 3.11.2.2). According to Geiger (1938, 161), both meanings are represented together in the sentence uhiba aran-äti “you have (or may have) taken” (with aram being a colloquial absolutive form of arragannav¯a “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 īūdina-nav¯a / innav¯a “to sit; be (there), be present, exist”, siṭina-nav¯a / hiṭina-nav¯a “to stand; be, remain, stay” (both verbs referring only to

555 Cf. Geiger 1938, 162 and 1900, 84; cf. also Matzel 1983, 49. Hindi has exact parallels in le j¯an¯a, lit. “to go having taken”, and le ¯an¯a, lit. “to come having taken”.
living beings) and tiyenavā / 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’, 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. Cp., e.g., kapam 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 -lā, -lu, -lī (aux. verb lanavā; cf. 3.11.2.2) and -pā / -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, gena-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 lappani 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

557 Geiger (1900), 83: “tibenu ‘sein’ drückt den Abschluß einer Handlung aus.”
558 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 “absolutive 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 absolutive of the main verb. A representative example of the a-stems, from which preterite I can be regularly derived, is the Addū-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”), ūde-fin (innanī “to sit; marry, be married”). — Furthermore, preterite I can also be derived from some e-stems; cp. M. ule-fin (ulenī “to be, live”), A. edī-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 “absolutive 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 Addū with 1.ps.sg. bala-lin, 2./3.ps.sg. bala-li; 1.ps.pl. bala-limā, 2./3.ps.pl. bala-lio [balalie] where the preterite forms of lanī are added to the absolutive 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”, ūde-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 Addū. In 1) ava dōni bala-fin / ava dōni bala-lin, both variants of the secondary preterite express a kind of resultative aktionsart as against the normal past tense ava dōni belin “I looked after the dhonis”. While ava dōni bala-fin means “I have looked after the dhonis just right now (and I know everything about their actual condition)”, ava dōni bala-lin means “I looked after the dhonis (doing what I had to do)”. — The other example is 2) fīna-fin “I have just dived” contrasting with fīna-lin “I had to dive, so I did it” (cp. M. finanī “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. *gannanî* 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 absolute III, are very productive. In many cases the compound verbs which are built by means of *gannanî* show complete paradigms. There are essentially two different semantic nuances that are added to the meaning of the main verb by *gannanî* used as an auxiliary. In combination with intransitive verbs, *gannanî* 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 *teduvanî* “to get up”); F. *temî gatin* “I got (myself) wet” (1.ps.sg. pret. III of *teménî* “to get wet”); F. *temî 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 *nukunnanî* “to come/go out”).

In the preterite and in absolutive constructions, *gannanî* 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. *muhammad bē en damaga* “Muhammad Bē managed to catch bait fish (all at once)” (T2, 9; *dama-ga* / *gat* 3.ps.sg. pret. III of *damanî* “to pull (out)”; *en* “bait fish” (as a primary plural).

“Absolutives III” of *a*-stems, with -*gen* following the absolutive ending (M.F. -*a*, A. -*a* ← -*ai*), often appear in contracted form, -*a*-gen (A. -*a*-gen, cf. 3.10.1.1) being shortened to -*an*. This phonetic phenomenon which frequently occurs with the *a*-stems in general but also with the “root verbs” (cf. 3.1.1) *lanî* “to put, place” (lāgen → lān) and *kanî* “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 oṭi ai vago jahān* (← *jahāgen*). “Having said (this), he acted like a thief” (T1, 21a; *kē-fē* abs.I of *kēnî*, M. *kianî* “to speak, say”; *mi* adv. “now”; *oṭi* part.pret. of M. *onnanî* “to lie, be” + focus-marker -ō; “the way he was now, was ...”; *ai* quotation particle; *vago* nom. “thief”; *jahān* ← *jahā-gen* abs.III of *jahānî* “to beat”; *vago jahānî* “to act as/like a thief”.)

3.11.4.4. The following table shows some typical secondary absolutives which are built by addition of *fianî, lanî* and *gannanî*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>absolutive derivations</th>
<th>Addů</th>
<th>Fua’ Mulaku</th>
<th>Māle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-stem</td>
<td>balafei</td>
<td>balāfē</td>
<td>balāfā / balāfai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-stem</td>
<td>vedefei</td>
<td>veṅdefē</td>
<td>vadefā / vadefai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-stem</td>
<td>temifei</td>
<td>temīfē</td>
<td>temīfā / temīfai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-stem</td>
<td>balalāi</td>
<td>balālāi</td>
<td>balālāi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-stem</td>
<td>vedelāi</td>
<td>veṅdelāi</td>
<td>vedelāi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-stem</td>
<td>'temilāi</td>
<td>temilāi</td>
<td>temilāi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-stem</td>
<td>balagen</td>
<td>balāgen</td>
<td>balāgen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-stem</td>
<td>vedegen</td>
<td>veṅdegen</td>
<td>vadegen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-stem</td>
<td>temigen</td>
<td>temigen</td>
<td>temigen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11.4.5. In the standard language of Mâle, there is one more auxiliary that is used in the formation of a compound preterite, viz. *dan* “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 Addû und Fua’ 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 *nimen* “to finish, come to an end”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st ps.sg.</th>
<th>2nd ps.sg.</th>
<th>3rd ps.sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nimijjain</td>
<td>nimijje</td>
<td>nimijje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ps.pl.</td>
<td>2nd ps.pl.</td>
<td>3rd ps.pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nimijjaimu</td>
<td>nimijjaimu</td>
<td>nimijje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11.4.5.1. In all these forms, *-jj-* has developed from *-di-*: 1.ps.sg. *nimi-jiain* ← *nimi-diain*, 2nd/3rd ps.sg. and 3rd ps.pl. *nimi-jje* ← *nimi-dia* via an intermediate form *-dye*, 1./2.ps.pl. *nimi-jiaimu* ← *nimi-diaimu*559. 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’ nimige* or M. *ahanna’ nimijje* (ma’/ahanna’ 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 Addû. As a further example of the dative-agent cp. A. *ma’ temige*, F. *maša temiže*, M. *ahanna’ temijje* “it has become wet for me”, i.e. “I have got wet” (from *temen* “to get wet”). In the standard language, we again find the corresponding construction with the agent in the nominative, i.e., *aharen temiijain* 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 *hunnan* “to stand, be”), or M. 1.ps.sg. *iňdejjain*, 2./3.ps.sg. *iňdejje* etc. (of *innan* “to sit, marry, be married”). Like *išiṇan* “to sit”, *onnan* “to lie, be there”, and *ošōnan* “to lie (down)”, *hunnan* and *innan* build forms of preterites I and II as well.560 As against this, the *n*-verbs *nukunnan* “to come/go out” (M. *nukumejje* etc., F. *nukumege*, A. *nukumige*) and *vannan* “to enter” (cf. A. *vedege*) obviously have only forms of preterite III (with nominative construction) besides preterite IV; cp. A. *ma’ nukumi-ge* “I went out (having definitely left)” as against preterite III *ava nukumi-gatin* “I finally managed to go out”.

559 For further considerations on the history of this formation cf. 3.12.5.4.2.
560 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 \(\text{fin}^\text{nani} \) “to dive” or \(\text{n}^\text{idani} \) “to sleep” which, like the \(n\)-stems, form a preterite I or II by means of \(\ast\text{fian}^\text{n} \) and \(\text{lan}^\text{n} \) 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. \(\text{ar}^\text{age} \), A. \(\text{arige} \) (M. \(\text{aran}^\text{n} \) “to climb (up), get (up)”) or A. \(\text{divage} \) “(he) ran” (M. \(\text{duvani} \) “to run”).

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. \(\text{aharen hu}^\text{tit}^\text{fin} \) [\(\text{hu}^\text{tit}^\text{fin} \)] “I have stopped (somebody/-thing)”, 1.ps.sg. pret.I of \(\text{hu}^\text{tit}^\text{n} \) “to stop (trans.)”, vs. M. \(\text{aharen hu}^\text{titijj} \) “I have stopped (myself)”, 1.ps.sg. pret.IV of \(\text{hu}^\text{tit} \) “to stop (intr.)”; A. \(\text{ava fi}^\text{halin} \) “I have baked (something, because I had to do it)”, 1.ps.sg. pret.II of \(\text{fi}^\text{han}^\text{n} \) “to fry, bake (trans.)”, vs. A. \(\text{ma}^\text{c}^\text{fi}^\text{hige} \) “I have baked (something; now it is finished)”, 3.ps.sg. pret.IV of \(\text{fi}^\text{hen}^\text{n} \) “to fry, bake (intr.)” with dative agent \(\text{ma}\) (pers.pron.1.ps.sg.).

3.11.4.5.5. The verb \(\text{gendan}^\text{n} \) “to take (something) out / away” consists of \(\text{gen} \), an archaic absolutive form of the main verb \(\text{gannan}^\text{n} \), and \(\text{dan}^\text{n} \) “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, \(\text{gendan}^\text{n} \) shows a full paradigm, while in the southern dialects the corresponding forms exist only to the same extent as \(\text{dan}^\text{n} \) is used as an independent verb.\(^{562}\) \(\text{gendan}^\text{n} \), which corresponds exactly with Sinh. \(\text{gena}-\text{yanav}^\text{a} \),\(^{563}\) represents a very archaic compound as the shape of the absolutive shows. The regular absolutive of \(\text{gannan}^\text{n} \) is A.F. \(\text{gine} \), M. \(\text{gane} \) (cf. 3.10.3.2 s.v. \(\text{gannan}^\text{n} \) “to buy”). In the modern language, the occurrence of \(\text{gen} \) is confined to a few verbal compounds which can all be regarded as semantic units; besides \(\text{gendan}^\text{n} \), this is true for \(\text{gennan}^\text{n} \) “to bring, fetch, go for” (cf. 3.11.4.6) and \(\text{gen gu}^\text{len}^\text{n} \) “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 \(\text{gene} \) (L1 d/2,3 etc.; L2 34,2 etc.; L3 4/2,2 etc., L4 a/2,2; L5 4/2,3), \(\text{gen} \) (L1 t/2,1 and L2 2,5 preceding \(\text{ais} \) “coming”, cf. 3.11.4.6 below; L4 e/1,3 etc.), and the pret.I \(\text{genfi} \) (RC 7,12). \(\text{gene gosu} \) (L1 d/1,4) represents the oldest attested form of the absolutive of \(\text{gendan}^\text{n} \); the modern form M. \(\text{gengos} \) 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, \(\text{annan}^\text{n} \) “to come” agrees with \(\text{dan}^\text{n} \). In the modern language, \(\text{gennan}^\text{n} \) “to bring, fetch” is considered to be an independent verb; it is no longer analysed as a combination of the petrified absolutive \(\text{gen} \) and \(\text{annan}^\text{n} \), meaning “to come taking / having

---

\(^{561}\) It is not clear whether \(\text{hi}^\text{ngan}^\text{n} \) “to walk” can form a preterite IV besides preterite I.

\(^{562}\) For details cf. 3.14.2.

\(^{563}\) GEIGER (1902), 921, no. 161: \(\text{gend}^\text{n} \); cf. also 3.11.2.3.
taken”. The oldest attestation of this compound is the absolutive gen-aïs “coming having taken / taking”, which is to be found in the copper-plate inscriptions L1 (t/2,1) and L2 (2,5). gennaï has an exact parallel in the Sinhalese compound gena-enavā.\footnote{Cf. Geiger (1902), 921, no. 162: gennan; further cf. 3.11.2.3.} Apart from that, annaï occurs in auxiliary function only in isolated cases which can be regarded as idiomatic; cp., e.g., aïnhurâ annaï “to return (something)”, lit. “to come returning” (M. aïnhurâni “to twist, turn, steer”) with the corresponding inactive eïnhuri annaï “to return; come returning” (M. eïnhurenî “turn”).

In its most frequent use as an auxiliary, annaï is not combined with the absolutive of a main verb, however. This is true for the dialect of Fua’Mulaku where the present forms of annaï, 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. uïlenî, 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 nukannâni “to come / go out” and vannâni “to enter”, there is a secondary finite present consisting of the absolutive of of these verbs and the conjugated present forms of uïlenî; thus, we have nukume / vade uïlen, uê, uê; ubelumu, uê, uê “(I am) coming out / entering” etc.

In the older language, there are two attestations of uïlenî occurring in auxiliary function together with an infinitive. The formation in question is similar to a periphrastic future: liâś-uïlemâ “we are to write”, i.e. “we shall write” (cf. 3.4.3.2). The corresponding verb of southern Dhivehi (A. vëndenî, F. vënnait) does not show a comparable use (cf. also 3.9.2.2.4).

3.11.4.8. denî “to give” and balanî “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 denî with ko’, absolutive of kurani “to do, make”, appearing in conditional clauses (cf. 3.13.2.3.1).

3.11.4.9. When used as an auxiliary with i’sînnanî “to sit” as a main verb, innanî has the special meaning of “be seated for a longer time”. This combination is especially typical for the standard language of Mâle; cp. M. pres.part. i’sînde inna(nî), past part. i’sînde in(i), absolutive i’sînde înde. Not only in Mâle but in all Dhivehi dialects, we find an idiomatic phrase that is built by means of innanî, viz. balî ve innanî “to be pregnant”, lit. “to sit having become sick” or “having fallen sick” (with ve, absolutive of vanî “to become”); cp. A. balî ve îndige “she became pregnant” (T3, 3; îndî-ge pret. IV, 3.ps.sg.).

3.11.4.10. In Geiger’s fragmentary chapter on the Maldivian verb\footnote{Cf. Geiger (1901-1902), III, 109-112 / (1919), 94-97.} he noted some compound verbs as well; this is true, e.g., for hadaïfin in timan iyye hadaïfin “I made yesterday”, but also for the remaining forms of the paradigm of preterite I of M. hadanî “to make”. As to kani “to eat” and balanî “to look”, Geiger gives paradigms that are mixtures of the
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 belimu, 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”, 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 preferrable 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 Male as well as the dialects of Aḍḍū and Fua’ Mulaku, the latter function is fulfilled by the same auxiliary which is used for the formation of the future as well. In Male and in Fua’ Mulaku, this is true for the auxiliary verbs (M.) danī “to go” and (F.) enī (M. annanī) “to come; go”. In Aḍḍū, 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 Male 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:

---

566 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.”
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 intransitvity 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 absolute 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”, huṭṭi-dāne from huṭṭanī “to stop”, etc.

Potentials of e-stems based on the absolutive of the causative (“regular” formation):

huṭṭevi-dāne from huṭṭenī “to stop” (intr.), temevi-dāne from temenī “to get wet”, ulevi-dāne from ulenī “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: eṅgi-dāne from eṅgenī “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 biṅdanī / binanī “to break (especially flowers); pluck, pick” with its potential form biṅdi-dāne. Potentials of other n-stems are based on the inactive absolutive of the causative; cp. the following examples:

baṅdevi-dāne from bannanī “to bind, tie (in the sphere of shipbuilding)”; dovevi-dāne from donnanī “to wash”; iṅdevi-dāne from innanī “to sit, marry, be married”; isṅdevi-dāne from isṅnanī “to sit”; hurevi-dāne from hunnanī “to stand, be”; konevi-dāne from konnanī “to dig”; nukumevi-dāne from nukunnanī “to go / come out”; osṅovevi-dāne from osṅonnanī “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 donnanī 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, *bannā* can no longer be separated semantically from *dōnī* (or any other term denoting traditional boats or ships). *ahanna* / *ahannā* / *dōnī* *bañēvidānē* then means “I can / am able to build ships”, and the elliptic sentence *ahanna* *bañēvidānē* 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 *bannā* with only one nominal word field which gave rise to the potential of *bannā* being built like that of an intransitive verb. — In most cases, *donnā* is used as a transitive verb; cp., e.g., *ādavegēn* *ēnā* *gāmis* *dōve* *nu* *ūlē* “He never washes (his) shirt” (*ādavegēn* adv. “usually”; *ēnā* nom., pers.pron. 3.ps.sg. m./f.; *gāmis* dir. obj.; *dōve* absolutive of *donnā*; *nu* negation particle; *ūlē* 3.ps.sg.pres., used as an aux.verb; cf. 3.11.4.7). But *donnā* can also be used in an intransitive-reflexive meaning; cp., e.g., *ēnā* *abādu* *dōvē* *tā*? “Does he always wash (himself)?” (*abādu* “always”; *dōvē* 3.ps.sg.pres.; *tā* 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-dānē* and *bovi-dānē*, 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 *kurānī* “to do, make” which, albeit exclusively appearing as a transitive, derives its potential from the absolutive of the causative; this is *kurevi-dānē* “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 *dānē* 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 kurevēnē* lit. “(it) will not be caused to be done”, i.e. “(it) cannot be done”, “it is not possible to do (it)” (cp. positive *kurevidānē*); *nu vadevēnē* “it is not possible to enter” (cp. *vadevidānē*); *nu huṭṭēvēnē* “it is not possible to stop” (intr.) (cp. *huṭṭēvidānē*), etc. — No causative forms are *nu essēnē* “it will not be tied up”, “one cannot tie up” (cp. *essiddānē*); *nu huṭṭēnē* “it will not stop”, “one cannot stop (it)” (cp. *huṭṭiddānē*); *nu biṅḍēnē* “it will not be plucked”, “one cannot pluck (it)” (cp. *biṅḍiddānē*), 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* *ṣigareṭu* *biṃ huṭṭēnē* 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 -ehe is also used for the negated potential; cp., e.g., ma’ dōni (ni) beli-ehe “I can(not) look after the dhonis.”

A peculiarity of the Adđū dialect is the existence of a special interrogative form of the potential in the present tense. This form is characterised by the formant -eši which, as a rule, is used instead of -ehe in interrogative sentences; eši 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 -ehe. Cp., e.g., ma’ dōni beli-eši “Can I look after the dhonis?”; ma’ měže kaveri irindi-eši “Can I sit down to table?”; ta’ masakka vēši (← *ve(i)-eši; M. vani “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 Adđū are derived from the absolutive of the inactive causative do not give a systematical picture. Cp., e.g., bēvi-ehe ← bānanī “to fish”, dēvi-ehe ← dānī “to bite”, gēvi-ehe ← gānanī “to rasp (coconut)”, ğinevi-ehe ← gennanī “to bring, fetch”, vēvi-ehe ← vanī “to become”.

3.12.3.2.2. As in the standard language, there are also some potential formations in Adđū that are derived from the absolutive of primary inactive verbs. Cp. for a-stems: beli-ehe ← bānanī “to fish”, dēvi-ehe ← dānī “to bite”, ği-ehe ← ğānanī “to rasp (coconut)”, ğīnevi-ehe ← ğennanī “to bring, fetch”, vēvi-ehe ← vanī “to become”.

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., feši-ehe representing the potential form of both fašanī “to begin” (trans.) and fešenī “to begin” (intr.); ĥedi-ehe pertaining both to hadanī “to make, build” and ĥedenī “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 Adđū 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., vedī-ehe ← (M.) vannanī “to enter”, beṇi-ehe ← (M.) bīnanī “to bind, tie” 567, nukumī-ehe ← (M.) nukananī “to go / come out”, kēni-ehe ← (M.) konnanī “to dig”, vēni-ehe ← (M.) uļenī “to live, be”, ĕši-ehe ← (M.) hūnanī “to stand, be there”, bīndi-ehe ← (M.) bīnanī “to pluck”, etc.

3.12.3.2.4. The potential of root verbs (cf. 3.1.1) in Adđū is based on the primary inactive absolutive as well. Cp., e.g., kēči-ehe ← kani “to eat”; bēhe ← bonī “to drink”; ğēhe ← (M. dani “to go”); dēhe ← denī “to give”; liēhe ← lanī “to wear, put” 568.

567 This verb belongs to the ship (building) terminology; cf. 3.12.3.1.1 above.

568 For (M.) vanī “to become” cf. 3.12.3.2.1, 3.12.4.
3.12.3.3. In Fua’ Mulaku the potential is built by means of the verb eni “come” (M. annanì) 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’ 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 Aḍḍū, there is no formal differentiation between a positive and a negated potential in the dialect of Fua’ Mulaku.

3.12.3.3.1. Potential forms of a-stems: oδiennen ← F. oλani “to call” (M. govanì), huiennen ← huanì “to look for” (M. hōdanì), keندiennen ← kaндanì “to cut (trees)”. The potential eriennen of arani “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 ihìnnen ← F. ihanì “to smile, lough” (M. henì) or nìdienne ← nidanì “to sleep”.

3.12.3.3.2. The potential forms of e-stems can be based on the primary absolutive (cp., e.g., temjennen ← temenj “to get wet”) as well as the absolutive of the causative (cp., e.g. rekeviennen ← rekeni “to avoid, escape”, vettêviennen ← vetti “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’ Mulaku, obviously without regard of the transitivity or intransitivity of the given verb.

The absolutive of the inactive causative is used with the following verbs: innai (M. innanì) “to sit, marry, be married” → iîdeviennen; gannai (M. gannanì) “to buy” → gineviennen; nukunnai (M. nukunnanì) “to come / go out” → nukumeviennen; vannai (M. vannanì) “to enter” → verîdeviennen; vêppnaì (M. ufenì) “to live” → vêjîdeviennen; hinnai (M. hunnanì) “to stand, be” → hiîviennen.

The primary inactive absolutive is used with annaì (M. aîdanì) 1. “to burn”; 2. “to wear (a sarong)” → eîdînen; bannai (M. bannanì) “to bind, tie (parts of) ships” → beîdînen; irînnai (M. iînnanì) “to sit” → irîdînen; binnai (M. biîdanì) “to pluck, break (flowers)” → biîdînen; d agonai (M. gen gûlenî) “to care for” → degînen; donnai (M. donnanì) “to wash” → doînen; sahanai (M. hehenì) “to peel” → seîhînen; kanñai (M. konnanì) “to dig” → keniennen; kelenai (M. kulenì) “to play” → kelînen; (M. onnanì)569 “to lie, be” → ovînen; vesjonnaì (M. osoûnanì) “to lie (down)” → vesiôviennen.

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’ Mulaku. The following forms are based on the absolutive of the inactive: (M.) denì “to give” → dinienne; lani “to wear, put” → liennen / liinnen; bonì “to drink” → biinnen; kanì “to eat” → înennen. The intransitive verb venî (M. vanì) “to become; be” derives its potential from the absolutive of the inactive causative, yielding veveînnen.

569 The equivalent of this present participle is missing in Fua’ 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 dekeṇ(A. dakunei, F. dakonạ) “to see” which in no dialect shows a regular potential formation; in Māle the forms beliḍane (of balaṇ “to see”) or feniḍane (of fennaṇ “to be seen, appear”) are used, while the potential of the causative dakkani “to let see; show” occurs as a suppletive form in A. dekkiịehe and F. dekḳiennen. — In Addū the verb dannaṇ(A. dennei, F. dennạ) “to know, understand” has no potential form at all while in Fua’ Mulaku the missing form is substituted by e˘ng̣iennen (of angaṇ “to inform” or e˘ngeṇ “to be informed, to understand”). — kurani “to make, do” has a regular potential form in North Dhivehi only, viz. kureviḍane or kureṿene. In A. ḍḍu the verb dannaṇ (A. dennei, F. dennạ) “to know, understand” has no potential form at all while in Fua’ Mulaku, however, the potential of keraṇ “to make, do” has a regular potential form in North Dhivehi only, viz. kureviḍane or kureṿene. In A. ḍḍu and in Fua’ Mulaku, however, the potential of keraṇ is substituted by the diverse potential forms of the auxiliary verb (M.) vaṇ “to become”. Thus, in Fua’ Mulaku the potential forms veṿı̣ennen and ṿennen are used as substitutional forms, maśa veṿı̣ennen meaning “I am able to do something” vs. maśa ṿennen “I have the possibility to do something”. The Addū dialect has an equivalent of the latter formation in ma’ ṿehe “I can do (something)”. Obviously, F. ṿennen and A. ṿehe are original future forms of vaṇ, the Fua’ Mulaku form consisting of the primary absolutive of vaṇ, ṿe to which, as usual, the form of the 3rd person singular of “to come / go”, ennen, is added. ṿennen is not used as a potential form of vaṇ itself though (cf. 3.12.3.4). A. ṿehe is based on the absolutive of vaṇ (vei, appearing as ve- in combined forms) as well, with -̣ehe 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.) annaṇ “to come, go”, the potential forms F. gienṇen, A. gịehe belonging to the verb (M.) daṇ “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 serves unaltered as the basic form of the potential of the preterite; cp., e.g., M. ahannạ l-ašl 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. belene ← balaṇ “to look”; M. liunu, F. liun, A. liene ← (M.) liani “to write”; M. nidunu, F. nidun, A. nidẹne ← nidaṇ “to sleep”; M. jehunu, F. jehun, A. jehẹne ← jahaṇ “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., jeheni “to fall” the preterite potential forms of which are identical with those of the primary active verb jahaṇi “to beat, kick” (cf. above). — For potential forms of semantically independent or primary inactive e-verbs cp., e.g., M. e˘ngunun, F. e˘gur, A. e˘ngene ← e˘ngeṇi “to know, understand” (cp. angaṇi “to inform”); M. edunu, F. edun, A. edene ← edeni “to wish”; M. temunu, F. temun, A. temene ← temeṇi “to get wet”.

570 For the synchronic formation of this form and its derivation cf. 3.9.2.3.
3.12.5.2. In Adhū, 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’ 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 *vu-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 *venavī* “to become, be”, viz. *vu-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:

*a˘ndanī* 1. “to burn (intr.)”: A. *e˘ndene*, F. *e˘ndun*, M. *endunu* / *e˘nd+vunu* 571.
*a˘ndanī* 2. “to wear (a sarong)”: A. *e˘nde ˙ne*, F. *e˘ndun*, M. *endunu* / *e˘nd+vunu* 571.
*bannanī* “to bind, tie (in ship building)”: A. *be˘nde ˙ne*, F. *be˘ndun*, M. *ba˘ndun* / *ba˘nd+vunu*.
*binnanī* / *bi˘ndanī* “to pluck”: A. *bi˘nde ˙ne*, F. *bi˘ndun* / *bi˘nd+vunu* (?), M. *bi˘ndunu* / *bi˘nd+vunu*.
*(M. gen gu ˙len¯ı) “to care for”: A. *dege ˙ne*, F. *degun*.
*donnanī* “to wash”: A. *dove ˙ne*, F. *dovun*, M. *dovunu* / *dove+vunu*.
*innanī* “to sit, be married, marry”: (A. *ir¯ı˘nde ˙ne*), F. *i˘nde-vun* / *i˘nde-vun(u)*.
*i´s¯ınnanī* “to sit (down)”: A. *ir¯ı˘nde ˙ne*, F. *ir¯ı˘ndun*, M. *i´s¯ı˘nde-vun(u)*.
*gannanī* “to buy”: A. *gine ˙ne*, F. *gine-vun*, M. *gane-vunu*.
*(M. hehen¯ı) “to husk”: A. *sehe ˙ne*, F. *sehun*.
*hunnanī* “to stand, be, remain, stay”: A. *hi´se ˙ne*, F. *hi´se-vun*, M. *hure-vun(u)* in *hurevijj-¯as* 572.
*konnanī* “to dig”: A. *ke ˙ne ˙ne*, F. *ke ˙nun*, M. *kone-vunu*.
*ku ˙len¯ı* “to play”: A. *ko ˙le ˙ne*, F. *ke ˙leun*, M. *ku ˙le-vunu*.
*nukunnanī* “to come / go out”: A. *nukume ˙ne*, F. *nukume-vun*, M. *nukume-vunu*.
*onnanī* “to lie, be (there)”: A. *ove ˙ne*, F. *ovun*, M. *ove-vunu*.
*o´s¯onnanī* “to lie (down)”: A. *ve´siove ˙ne* (negated *ve´si ni ove ˙ne*), F. *ve´siovun* (negated *ve´si ni ovun*), M. *o´s¯ove-vunu*.
*vannanī* “to enter”: A. *vede ˙ne*, F. *ve˘ndun*, M. *vade-vunu*.
*(M. u ˙len¯ı) “to live, behave, be”: A. *v¯e˘n ˙de ˙ne*, F. *v¯ ˛e˘n ˙de-vun* 573.

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. *die ˙ne*, F. *dinun*, M. *devunu*.
kanī “to eat”: A. *kiene*, F. *kiun*, M. *kone-vunu*.
bonī “to drink”: A. *bie ˙ne*, F. *biun*, M. *bovunu* (← *boe-vunu*?).
lanī “to wear, put”: *liene*, F. *liun*, M. *lie-vunu*.
vanī “to become”: A. *veve ˙ne*, F. *vevu*n, M. *vevu*n (cf. 3.9.2.3).
danī “to go”: A. *gie ˙ne*, F. *gian*, M. *gie-vunu*.

571 Hereafter, this type of combination will be marked by a hyphen only.
572 The form *hurevijj(e)* (3.ps.sg. pret.IV) in *hurevijj-¯as* (<-ais) is used synonymously (cf. 3.12.5.4). For the particle *-is* contained in these formations, cf. 3.12.5.4.1.
573 ← *vēṇī-converted*; 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. giene, F. giun and M. gievunu represent suppletive potential forms of M. annani “to come”, A.F. eni “to come, go” which have their origin in the paradigm of danı “to go” (cf. 3.12.4).

In the southern dialects, the potential of the preterite of kuranı “to make, do” is substituted by the 3.ps.sg. pret. of vanı “to become”; cp. A. ma’ masakka’ (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’ masakka’ kurevunuš “I could do the work” and ahanna’ masakka’te nu kurevunuš “I could not do the work”, resp. (with /ahanna/š pers.pron. 1.ps. dat. “to me”). kurevunuš 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 *vušnu, given that the inherited absolutive of kuranı is koštı “to make, do” (cf. 3.10.4). It is not impossible, however, that a secondary “regular” absolutive *kure was built after the 3.ps.sg. present kur; 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 koštıa (of Sinh. karanav đa “to make, do”) which is derived directly from a MIA predecessor (←← OIA krtvá), 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 kurevunuš 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’lahannaštı huţevunuš “I could stop” (huţevunuš from huţe- ← abs. huţı of huţenı “to stop” (intr.) + -vunu ← vunu + is).
- ahanna’lahannaštı temevunuš “I could get wet” (temevunuš from teme- ← abs. temı of temenı “to get wet” + -vunu + is).
- iyye ahanna’lahannaštı mitāğa lmitanugai/hurevunuš; “I could be there” (lit. ‘on this place’) yesterday”, i.e. “I had the right to be there” (iyye “yesterday”; lmitanugai consisting of mi dem.pron. “this” + tanu obl. “place” + -gai loc.suffix; hurevunuš 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’temunıš (= temunu, part.pret. of temenı “to get wet”, + is) “I could get wet”; ahanna’ huţanunıš (= huţunı, of huţanı trans. “to stop” and huţenı 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 kurevijješ/lkurevijjais/ and hurevijješ/hurevijjais/ which in positive sentences have the same meaning as kurevunuš or hurevunuš 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 kuranı, this preterite has the form kurevijje “it could be done” (lit. “it passed being caused to be done”); the corresponding form of hunnanı is hurevijje “it could remain / be” (lit. “it

574 Native speakers of the “Palace language” (cf. 0.9.2) accept the formation kurevijješ 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 danì “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 lômâfanus (L3 3/2.1 and
L2 6.2), furthermore the forms veddyâ-ve (F10.18: -ve is the quotation particle, cf. 5.4) and veddyé (F5.21.24)
as the earliest attestations of the “preterite IV” of vanì “to become”. In 1089 A.H. = 1678 A.D., veje is already
attested in its modern form (in a gravestone inscription on the cemetery of the Mâle Hukuru Miskit).

Thus, the examples kurevijje and hurevijje developed through the intermediate forms
*kureviøja and *hureviøja 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 hunnanì, the 1.ps.sg. is hurejja-in while for the
1st and the 2nd ps.pl. we have tibejja-imu; the other persons are formally identical to the
3.ps.sg. Cp. the finite preterite forms of danì 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 “condi-
tional 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 irreal 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 irreal. In the formation of conditional clauses, the dialects of Dhivehi use
different conjunctions with a conditional meaning; cp. A. fehé, fehennà, etennà; F. fahç,
fahenà; M. nama, (i)yà “if”.

The interrelationship of morphological elements and syntactical structures which sometimes
is quite complicated will be illustrated by some examples from the dialect of Addû 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. Addû

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

---

575 For the suppletive distribution of hunnanì (sg.) and tibeni (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 *fianī, cf. 3.11.4.1). The verb of the respective main clause appears in the finite future:

\[ \text{ma dōni balā-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“If I (ma obl.) look after the dhonis, he/she will be very happy.”

\[ \text{ma kukulā’ kā dē-fehē, e vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“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:

\[ \text{ma dōni balā-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“If I had looked after the dhonis, he would be very happy.”

\[ \text{ma kukulā’ kā derefi-fehē, e vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“If I had given food to the hen, she would be very happy.”

\[ \text{ma masakka’ koffi-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“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.

\[ \text{dōni ō-fehē, ma’ dōni belēhe.} \]

“If the dhonis had come, I could have looked after the dhonis.”

\[ \text{dōni ō-etennā, ma’ dōni belēhe.} \]

“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 vanī “to become; be”, and kama’, the indefinite nominative of the stem kan/kam-l “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:

\[ (1a) \text{ma dōni beli kama’ vē-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“If I looked after the dhonis, he would be very happy.”

\[ (1b) \text{ma dōni beli kama’ vē-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“If I had looked after the dhonis, he would be very happy.”

\[ (2a) \text{ma masakka’ kedefe kama’ vē-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“If I did a job, he would be very happy.”

\[ (2b) \text{ma masakka’ kedefe kama’ vē-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“If I had done (i.e. ‘finished’) a job, he would be very happy.”

\[ (3a) \text{ma sitia’ te’ kama’ /letmak/ vē-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“If I wrote a letter, he would be very happy.”

\[ (3b) \text{ma sitia’ te’ kama’ vē-fehē, ea vara’ ufā vēhe.} \]

“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 Mâle 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. nâmâ, P. nâmâ, Sk. nâmam ...” — 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 *yanavâ nam, ma-ta katâ-karânta!* “If you go to town this afternoon, tell (it) to me too!” (*Ada havasa* “today afternoon”; *nuvara* obl. “town”; *yanavâ* unchangeable basic verbal form of the present-future “to go”; *ma-“to me”, *-t* “also, too, as well”; *(katâ “speech”, *karânta* infinitive in imperative use “do!”). Depending on the extralinguistic situation, the following example can be understood as a real or as a potential condition: lamayâ *yanavâ nam, Mama-t yanavâ* “If the boy goes off, I’ll go too” or “If the boy went off, I would go too” (*lamayâ* 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. *Oyâ iyê râ nuvara giyâ nam, perahâra balanta tîhunâ* “If you had gone to Kandy last night, you could have seen the procession” (*Oyâ “you (sg.)”; iyê râ “yesterday night”; *nuvara*, as a short form of *mahu nuvara* “great town”, here used as a name for Kandy; *giyâ* infinitive preterite of *yanavâ* “to go”; *perahâra* “procession”; *balanta* infinitive of *balanavâ* “to see”; *tîhunâ* infinitive preterite of *tîbenavâ* “to be (there)”). (3) In combination with an absolutive, *nam* expresses a real condition. Cp. the sentence *Ohu nuvara gihillâ nam, ma-ta katâ-karânta!* “If he went to Kandy, tell me!” (*Ohu “he”; *gihillâ* ← *gihin-lâ* composite absolutive of *yanavâ* “to go”).

3.13.2.2. The derivation of the conjunction M. *(i)yâ*, 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”.

*aaharen masakke* *kuri nama, enâ ufâ vâne (kuri primary part.pret. of kurânti “to do, make”).*  

576 For the Sinhalese examples given here and for further examples cf. MATZEL 1983, 83 and 149 f.
aharen masakke' koffi nama, ēnā ufā vāne (koffi ← /kos-f/ part.pret. I of kurant “to do, make”).
aharen masakke' koddīfī nama, ēnā ufā vāne (/kos-dī-fīl, abs. /kos/ of kurant, combined with with dī-ři, part.pret. I of denī “to give” as an auxiliary).[[577]]
aharen masakke' koddīfī-ā, ēnā ufā vāne. (/kos-dī-fī-yāl, same as above, with conj. yā “if”).
aharen masakke' koddin-i̱a, ēnā ufā vāne. (/kos-dīn-yā/ part.pret.I of denī “to give” as an auxiliary, cf. above).

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'ris vantakamuge lōbi “A Teacher’s love” by ′ABDULLĀH ṢĀDIQ, T10, 62):

M. geaš gosfai vagute /libi/ nama mirē ha gadi bai ehākaš hā iru aharenge geaš 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-aš/ dat. “to the house”; gos-fai abs.I of danī “to go”; /vagut-ek/ indef. nom. “a time”; /libi/ part.pret. IV “(having) received”, of liben; mi dem.pron., rē “night, evening”; ha card.num. “six”, gadi “hour”, bai “half”; ehākaš “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 give”, 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 nuleññá, miha danvaru mihen ti danī kon tākās? (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”; nuleññā, i.e. inu ule-ññāl,578 represents the negated part.pres. of uleñ “to live” in its original short form in -n, contrasting with the modern variant ule, 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; kontākās 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. (kos-dī, abs. /kos/ of kurant “to make, do”, combined with dī, abs. of denī “to give”, as an auxiliary) “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 tiben meaning “to be

577 For the use of denī as an auxiliary verb cf. 3.11.4.8.
578 For the geminate [ññ] resulting from n + i (+V), cf. 1.3.9.4.
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no singular forms can be derived throughout the Dhivehi dialects, while the verbs innañī “to sit, be married, marry”, iśìnñañī “to sit”, hunñañī “to be, stand, remain”, onnañī “to lie, be there” and ośōnñañī “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 tibenñī. Thus, the finite and infinite plural forms of tibenñī 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 hunñañī “to stand, be, remain” where we find a 1.ps.sg. pret. M. hurin, F. hiśin, A. hiśin “I stood” etc. vs. the 1.ps.pl. pret. M. tibīmu, F. tibīma / tibīna, A. tibīmā “we stood” etc.580

While tibenñī has no singular forms at all, the other verbs concerned show a non-uniform behaviour in their plural formation. hunñañī “to stand” has no plural forms of its own in any Dhivehi dialect; this means that the corresponding forms of tibenñī represent the only plural forms available of this verb. For onnañī “to lie” the same holds true in the dialects of Addū and Fua’a 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 tibenñī are used as well. ośōnñañī exhibits a complete paradigm in Addū and Māle while the dialect of Fua’a Mulaku has no other plural than that of tibenñī. While iśìnñañī has a plural paradigm of its own in Māle and in Fua’Mulaku, its Addū 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 innañī 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 tibenñī again.

With the exception of tibenñī, 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 Addū and in Fua’a Mulaku, all forms of the verb (M.) danñī “to go” which would belong to the present stem have been completely lost; as a rule they are substituted by the corresponding forms of enñī “to come” (M. annañī). This is the reason why the present stem of enñī and all forms which are derived from it share the two meanings; cp. the sentence A. ma ādavegen kāu (← kā’ ← /kāśl/) enñī gē’ (← gea’ ← /geaśl/) which can mean “usually I go home for eating” as well as “usually I come home for eating” (ma perspron. 1.ps.sg.obl. “T”; ādavegen “always, usually”; /kāśl/ infinitive of kāñī “to eat”; enñī part.pres. + focus-marker -i “that where I come / go to”; /geaśl/ dat. of gē “house”). Thus, the exact translation of enñī depends on the context or extralinguistic information.

579 Cp. the Sinh. equivalent tibenavã / tiyenavã “to be (there) (of inanimate things)” representing the intransitive variant of tabanavã / tibanavã “to put, place” ← OIA sṭhā- “to stand” (causative sṭhāpayati); cf. GEIGER (1941), 61, no. 890.

580 Cp. also the tables illustrating the interrogative forms of Addū 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 ann ani as well as those of dan i. The preverb ebe- which denotes a motion “away from the spectator” can only be combined with the preterite of dan i. Cp. the following three examples from the dialect of A d d u 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 ← lgeaʃ/) in prevocalic position (cf. 1.6.3) “to (the) house, home”; ai part.pret. ā of en i, M. ann ani “to come” + -i). The sentences ava gē tebe-ain and ava gē tebe-gen, both containing the preverb tebe-, are synonymous in modern A d d u 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 en i / ann ani) nor A. -gen (1.ps.sg.pret. of dan i) can be used without a preverb. With ebe-, only the preterite forms of dan i 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’ Mulaku there are special question particles which mark a sentence as being a yes/no question. In A d d u, 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 A d d u 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 A d d u, 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. A d d u

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 -i in the ending of the 1.ps.sg. of all conjugations; with certain n-stems, this -i 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 -i, 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 -i; 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 in that they

581 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 -ı (cf. below). Similarly, the interrogative form of the infinitive has preserved the final -sa ← -ta which reflects the oldative ending; the emphatic lengthening of the final vowel lastly led to all interrogative infinitives ending in -sä (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, -eši, 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.

The following examples illustrate the use of the long form of the present participle enlarged by -ā in Addū:

(1) ta masakka' keraniá? “Are you working (right now)?” (ta pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. obl.; masakka’/masakkat/ obj., “work”; kerani-ā part.pres. + focus-marker -ı of M. kuranı “to make, do”; -ā interrogative element).

(2) ta sišį̈ ̃ lęnyā ̃ nun “Are you not writing a letter (right now)?” (sišį̈/sišį̈-akl indef. obj.; lęnye ← llęnye-ı, part.pres.of M. liani “to write” + focus-marker, nun “no, not”).

The following sentence contains an absolutive that is enlarged with the suffix -ā:

ea [ee] a kō ta ińi mēze kaverie [kaverį̈] iriŋdegenā “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 eni, M. annańi “to come”; kō conj. “at the time when”; ińi part.pret. “having been sitting” + focus-marker -ı; mēze gen. of męzu “table”; kaverie (gen./)loc. “near (by)”; iriŋdegen abs.III of M. išinanı̃ “sit” + interrogative element -ā).

In another example, -ā is suffixed to a noun in the oblique case: ma mi hiší bagicāi 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”; hiší part.pret. of hinnei, M. hunnańi “to stand, be” + focus-marker -ı; bagicāi gen. of bagicā “garden”; etere obl. “inside of, in” + interrogative element -ā).

In the following tables those interrogative forms of the Addū dialect that are derived from verbal forms are listed systematically, the morphonological differences as against their declarative equivalents being marked by bold type (M. balanı “to look”; lianı “to write”; išinanı / innani “to sit”; hunnańi / tibenni “to stand, be”; temenı “to get wet”; fenenni “to appear”; annańi “to come”; deni “to give”).
3.15.1.3.1. Regular stems: present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>present</th>
<th>a-stems</th>
<th>n-stems</th>
<th>e-stems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>balamă</td>
<td>lêmă</td>
<td>irîndumă</td>
<td>hișumă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>balai</td>
<td>lêi</td>
<td>irîndă</td>
<td>hiși</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>balai</td>
<td>lêi</td>
<td>irîndă</td>
<td>hiși</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td>balamă</td>
<td>lêmă</td>
<td>irîndumă</td>
<td>tibemă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>balată</td>
<td>lêța</td>
<td>irîndată</td>
<td>tibetă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>balată</td>
<td>lêța</td>
<td>irîndată</td>
<td>tibetă</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example:
(1) *ava ädavegen sițî ni lêmă?* “Do I not always write letters?” (*ava* pers.pron. 1.ps.sg. nom.; *ädavegen* “always, usually”; *sițî* obj. pl. “letters”; *ni* “not”).

3.15.1.3.2. Regular stems: preterite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>preterite</th>
<th>a-stems</th>
<th>n-stems</th>
<th>e-stems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>belimă</td>
<td>lemmă ← *letimă</td>
<td>immă ← *înmă</td>
<td>hișimă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>beli</td>
<td>leti</td>
<td>ină</td>
<td>hiși</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>beli</td>
<td>leti</td>
<td>ină</td>
<td>hiși</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td>belimă</td>
<td>lemmă ← *letimă</td>
<td>(tibimă)</td>
<td>temeșemă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>belivă</td>
<td>levvă ← *letivă</td>
<td>(tibivă)</td>
<td>temeșevă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>beliă</td>
<td>letă</td>
<td>(tibiă)</td>
<td>temeșă</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:
(1) *ava iyye siția țî lemmă?* “Didn’t I write a letter yesterday?” (*iyye* adv. “yesterday”).
(2) *everie iyye dînil beli* “Did they look after the dhonis yesterday?” (*everie* 1-ial pers.pron. 3.ps.pl. nom. “they”; *dînil* here generic pl. “boats”).

3.15.1.3.3. Regular verbs: future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>future</th>
<th>a-stems</th>
<th>n-stems</th>
<th>e-stems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>balâșumă</td>
<td>lênesumă</td>
<td>irînnașumă</td>
<td>hinnașumă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>balâșă</td>
<td>lênesă</td>
<td>irînnașă</td>
<td>hinneșă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>balâșă</td>
<td>lênesă</td>
<td>irînnașă</td>
<td>hinneșă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td>balâșumă</td>
<td>lênesumă</td>
<td>irînnașumă</td>
<td>tibesumă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>balâșia</td>
<td>lênesia</td>
<td>irînnași</td>
<td>tibesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>balâșia</td>
<td>lênesia</td>
<td>irînnași</td>
<td>tibesia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example:
(1) *ava măduma siția lênesumă?* “Shall I write a letter tomorrow?”
3.15.1.3.4. Root verbs: present / preterite / future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>present</th>
<th>preterite</th>
<th>future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>emi</td>
<td>tebe-āmī</td>
<td>bēšumā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demi</td>
<td>*tebe-aimī</td>
<td>be-ēsumā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>tebe-āi</td>
<td>bēši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dei</td>
<td>dinī</td>
<td>dēši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg.</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>tebe-āi</td>
<td>bēši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dei</td>
<td>dinī</td>
<td>dēši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl.</td>
<td>ema</td>
<td>tebe-āmā</td>
<td>bēšumā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dema</td>
<td>dimā</td>
<td>dēšumā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>eva</td>
<td>tebe-āvā</td>
<td>bēšuvā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deta</td>
<td>tebe-ātā</td>
<td>dēşıva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>etā</td>
<td>tebe-ātā</td>
<td>bēşıā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deta</td>
<td>dinā</td>
<td>dēşıā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:
(2) tafirie mādamu’ kukuša’ kā’ dēşuvā? “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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a-stems</th>
<th>n-stems</th>
<th>e-stems</th>
<th>root verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>belēšā</td>
<td>irinđiēšā</td>
<td>temiēšī</td>
<td>giēšā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diēšā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:
(1) ma’ nidašē tān libiēšē? “Can I have a place for sleeping?” (T1, 7; lmašl pers.pron. 1.ps.sg. dat. “to me”; nidašē part.fut. of nidant “to sleep”; tān nom. “place”).
(2) ma’ gē’ giēšē? “Can I go home?” (/geas/ dat. of gē “to (the) house”).

3.15.1.3.6. Infinitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a-stems</th>
<th>n-stems</th>
<th>e-stems</th>
<th>root verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>balāšā</td>
<td>irinnašā</td>
<td>temēšā</td>
<td>ēšā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dēšā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example:
(3) ea ākō ma inī dönī 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”; hajj-aha dat. “hajj (Islamic pilgrimage)”; ni “not”; ennen 2.ps.sg. future of enī “to come; go”, = M. annanī).
(2) *taša ni fenéŋ tain, tima kari o’ tashiba (gaňdo)?* “Do you not see (it), the rosary being on my neck?” (T4, 16; *taša* pers.pron. 2.ps.sg. dat. “to you”; *fenéŋ* 3.ps.sg.pres. “it is visible”, of F. *fenéŋ* “to be visible”; *kari* (gen./loc. of F. *karo* “neck”; *tashiba* obl. “rosary”; *gaňdo* nom. “piece”).

(3) *amméve, ammáša tima nun fahé, kudaku ni libunu tain?* “Mother, when I was not yet there, did you (lit. ‘mother’) not receive a child?” (T6, 62; *ammé* nom. (voc.) “Mother!” + quot. particle (M¯ale-form!) *eve*; *ammáša* dat. “to the mother”; *nun* “not being”; *fahé* ≈ *A. fehè* (cf. 3.13) conj. “when, if”, here: “when”; *kudaku* obl.indef. “child”; *libunu* part.pret. of *libéŋ* “to receive, get”; lit. “... was a child not received to the mother?”).

3.15.3. M¯ale

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. *tain*, 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, *heı/hé* and *bá*, express additional semantic nuances. *heı/hé* 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 *heı* is etymologically identical with the adj. *heyo* “good, enough”. The particle *bá* which is also used in repeated questions expresses surprise about what has been said or asked. Concerning the honorific levels, *heı* and *bá* 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) *aľuguňona’ mi masakkakt kurevidán tō?*
(2) *ahanna’ mi masakkakt [masakkaut] kurevidán *ta*?
(3) *ahanna’ mi masakkakt kurevidán *heı*?
(4) *ahanna’ mi masakkakt kurevidán *bá*?

(*lahanna*) pers.pron. 3.ps.sg. dat. “to me”; *mi dem.pron. “this”; *masakkaut* nom. “work, job”; *kurevidán* pot.pres./fut. of *kuranî* “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 dúsīn tay*?” “... Have you seen my child?” (T9, 29; *aharen-ge* pers.pron. gen. = poss.pron. 1.ps.sg., 2./3. hon. degree, attributive “my”; *darifulu*, consisting of *dari* obl. “child” +
Interrogative forms: Māle

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 -fuöl (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? maruvi heyy eve? “Was it hashish? (Is she) dead?”, lit. “Has she died?” (T9, 61-62; maru vi 3.ps.sg.pret., with an emphatic lengthening of vi, the finite part of maru vaní “to die”; eve quotation particle). — In the following example, the particle tô together with a verb in the 2nd hon. degree indicates an elevated social position of the addressee:

(7) vakaru ballavai [ballavāi] gannavamu tô? “Would you like to buy some firewood?” (T10, 15; vakaru “(fire)wood”; ballavai gannavamu 2.ps.pl.pres. of ballavai gannavaní, 2nd/3rd hon. degree of gannaní “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. vėlei, F. vėlaöl when, while” or M. ekugā leku-gail, A.F. eköl “(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, only a few words remain that must be treated here.

4.1. Depending on the context, the postponed particle A. -aí, M.F. -a means either “and” or “with”. In the southern dialects, -a(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. fiñdanāi boñdanāi de verin ... ge edá’ ledášl nimmalie l-ial “Both the f.-bird and the b.-bird (the f.-bird as well as the b.-bird) ... finished building (their respective) houses” (fiñdanā-āi boñdanā-āíl sg.def. + -aí); F. fiñdanu-āi boñdanu-ā de verin ebage-ai “both the f.-bird and the b.-bird went off” (T1, 1). In the modern standard language, however, -a “and” is used in rare cases only; cp. the following sentence where the particle is suffixed only to the first noun: M. eba ulē fiñdan-fulak-ā boñdanupe’ -ekl “Once there lived a f.-bird and a b.-bird” (T1, 1). As the form fiñdanul-ak-ā shows, the conjunction -a combines not with the nominative case of the indefinite suffix (as contained in boñdanupe’) but with the oblique case form which is no

582 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 SAAED KOSHY (in Finiashi 3, 26), the word “heroin” is used instead.

583 For the derivation of these conjunctions from M. iru obl. “time” and A. vėlei / F. vėlai loc. “at the time (when)”, cf. 5.3.1. Cp. also the other conjunctions mentioned there.

584 For the derivation of these conjunctions from M. iru obl. “time” and A. vėlei / F. vėlai loc. “at the time (when)”, cf. 5.3.1. Cp. also the other conjunctions mentioned there.

585 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. In South Dhivehi -ā(i) can be used for combining any part of speech; cp., e.g., F. ... hauluā, kukulūā, midaluā tin-eti ekī deāsā fummālī 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 ė velai, laigātī, emme feramāśa haulakkā/haulak-ā. “While going along, the one she met with first of all was a cock” (T4, 12) ... den ė velai, laigattī, midelakkā/midelak-ā’... then, while going along, what they met with was a rat” (T4, 19), ... kukułakkā/kukułak-ā “... with a hen” (T4, 26).587

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 AḏĎu and Fu’a 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. fahe’/ek jahan den “until it strikes five” i.e. “until five o’clock”588.

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 preponed negation particles M. nu, A.F. ni cf. 5.5.2. The independent negation particle corresponding to Engl. “no!” is M.A. nūn, F.  ülk (less often nun); “yes” is expressed by M.A. hā, F. hā, hā.589

586 For the development of the indefinite suffix in Māle cf. 2.3.2.3.1.
587 The gemination of /k/ in the position before -ā is one of the cases of spontaneous gemination which is characteristic for Fu’a Mulaku. This is a phonetic, not a phonemic process which is not connected with the “historical” geminates described in 1.3.9.
588 Example taken from DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 91.
589 M. labbā/llabbai 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. ₪hilm¯ım m¯arukešaš d¯án gein nukumejje eve “Hilm¯ım walked to the market from his house”, lit. “Hilm¯ım 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. ₪hilm¯ım p.n. nom.; gein abl.sg. “from (the) house”; d¯án inf. of daní “to go”).
M. šar¯ıfu kuriš huŋgaman dia eve “Šar¯ıf continued on walking”, lit. “Šar¯ıf went (on) walking further” (T9, 12; pred. dia 3.ps.sg.pret. of daní “to go” + quotation particle eve; subj. šar¯ıfu p.n. nom.).
A. den, e’ kala’ lek kalaśi kal¯ege k¯ora’ /-as/ fummali “Then, all at once, the lord jumped into the pond” (T3, 33; pred. fummali 3.ps.sg.pret.II of fummaní “to jump”; subj. kal¯ege nom. “lord, sir”).
A. vēla gañdakun, molōgañdak-di arage “After a while, (he) came up with an axe” (T3, 34; pred. arage 3.ps.sg.pret.IV of araní “to climb / go / come up”; the subject is not expressed explicitly).
F. ed duvaheki, ed duvaheki, M¯eliage Dia g¯ei ˘nd¯ole i˘ndu v¯elai domba ˛umk¯ele “One day, when M¯eliage Dia was sitting on the swing bed of (her) house, a light-coloured breadfruit fell down” (T4, 1; pred. vetṭige 3.ps.sg.pret.IV of vetṭení “to fall (down)”; subj. M¯eliage Dia nom., lit. “Mélia’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 -í which “announces” the following rhema; this -í 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
With but one exception which consists in the oblique form of the indefinite suffix (-aku, e.g. in mihaku “a person”), 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, -ı, the rhematic structure being translated with relative constructions.

F. boňdanu keňdı hai vakar-ai “The b.-bird cut only timber”, lit. “(What) the b.-bird cut, was (is) all timber.” (T1, 2; pred. keňdı part.pret. l.f. of kaňdani “to cut”; subj. boňdanu obl. “the b.-bird”).

A. mi gehā hišić kıraki kaverie “This tree was (standing) near by a pond”, lit. “(That where) this tree was (standing), was near by a pond” (T3, 24; pred. hišić part.pret. l.f. of (M.) hunnani “to stand, be, remain”; subj. mi gehā obl.def. “this tree”).

M. alugañdu vaki vī skälge grē 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+ı, part.pret. l.f. of vaki vanı “to separate, abandon”; subj. alugañdu obl. humble “I”, 1st hon. degree).

M. madumadun e ivēni mihaku rō ad-ève “I heard a man’s faint, weak cry”, lit. “What was perceivable very weakly was the moaning noise of a man.” (T8, 99; pred. ivēni part.pres. l.f. “hearing”, inact., here “to be heard, perceivable”; mih-aku obl.sg.indef. “a man”; rō part.pres. short form “moaning”; adu “noise”).

In the following sentence, the subject remains formally unexpressed:

M. annanı ellemun anna gotaka´s eve “(She) came zigzagging (along the street)”, lit. “(The way she) came, was in a way of going zigzagging” (T9, 20); pred. annanı 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 -ı 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. mihā-ı, cf. below), this would be unusual in the standard language. Instead of -ı, only the particle -akı is here used for focussing nouns. In the southern dialects, -akı expresses an additional nuance of uncertainty, in contrast to the unenlarged -ı 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 -ı 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, mi ← mi-ı can be translated approximately with “this here is ...”, eı, 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 -akı 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 -ı and -akı:

5.2.2.1. Deictic pronouns with -ı:

M. mi-ı ves mamma-ek-ge sīra eve “She was a mother too”, lit. “(What this one) was [in her eyes], was also the figure of a mother” (T9, 37).

590 Cf. 2.6.2.2 ff. — For the use of the casus obliquus cf. already Fritz (1993), 31.
591 Cp. the obl.indef. mihaku in T8, 101; cf. further 2.3.2.3.1.
A. mī lmi-īl ta mōlōgañda tau? ... tē Ḳe-īl ma mōlōgañda nunāu. “Is this your axe?” ... — “No, this is not my axe”, lit. “What this (here, near by myself) is, (is) your axe?” — “What that (there, near by yourself) is, (is) not my axe” (T3, 59-60).

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; this implies that the hearer to a certain extent depends on presumptions:

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. ēhen vi mei, ēkī lea-akīl e raśi hiśi enme fakīrī taulīman ne’ mīhā kamugai 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, 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 Aḍḍū (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 ēge-aśl 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’ ēden-ak-aśl 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.”

592 For a detailed analysis of these examples cf. 2.6.5.3.1.1.

593 “Zeigfeld” in the sense of BÜHLER (1934), 149 ff.

594 For an exact analysis of the two examples and for morphological details, cf. 2.6.5.3.1.2.

595 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 -tı will be preferred:

A. ... geu êne mihā-tı såđima “The man who will come (êne 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-ı can be added to nouns in North Dhivehi; the same holds true for substantives in pronominal use such as alugańdu “I”. Cp. the following sentence representing the answer of a boy who was asked by his former teacher, Hilmi:

M. alugańdaki, hilmige darivare’ l-ekl “I was your student”, lit. “(Who) I am is, a pupil of Hilmi.”
(T10, 34). — Another example from the same short story is
M. main bafain nagāfai dunie matıgai tibê emme gāt mihunnakí 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’ l-ekl ta kianí (kiyani)?’ “‘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. 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 infinitive 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. ĕ vēlai “while she is going” (e.g. in T4, 8; ĕ 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

596 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.\footnote{Cp. Sinh. \textit{kala} “when, while” reflecting the stem \textit{kal} “time” (cf. GEIGER 1941, 39. no. 569 and MATZEL 1983, 151). Because of its F. equivalent, \textit{kal}, it is not very probable that A. \textit{kô} would correspond to the Sinh. conjunction \textit{kota}, which is identical with the homophonous absolutive of \textit{karanavi} “to make, do”; its equivalent is A. \textit{ko’}, F. \textit{kôsôf}. We cannot exclude, however, that both the absolutive \textit{kôsôf} and the noun \textit{kall} coexisted for a while, at least in Addû, and then merged into one form. The fact that the modern Addû form is \textit{kô} and not *\textit{kau} as we should expect because of F. \textit{kal}, supports this assumption (cf. 1.2.1.6). On the other hand, a spontaneous phonetic change of \textit{au} $\rightarrow$ \textit{o} remains possible, although this would not represent a normal development in Addû.} Examples are A. \textit{beli kô} “when (he) looked” (T1, 33; \textit{beli} part.pret.); F. \textit{balâli kal} “when (she) looked (around)” (T4, 7; \textit{balâli} part.pret.II). In the standard language, the noun \textit{iru} “time” is used in the same function as a conjunction meaning “when, while”; cp., e.g., \textit{eñburili iru} “when I turned around” (\textit{eñburili} part.pret.II)\footnote{For the complete sentence cf. 5.4.3.}. As to the conjunction A. \textit{mei}, F. \textit{mâ} $\leftrightarrow$ *\textit{mai}\footnote{For the use of this conjunction cf. 5.3.6; for the phonetic correspondence of (M. \textit{â}) $\leftrightarrow$ F. \textit{ai} $\leftrightarrow$ A. \textit{ei} which presumably is represented here cf. 1.2.4.3.} “when”, it is possible that this too reflects a noun in the locative case.

5.3.1.1. The conjunction A.F. \textit{hedi/-ë}, M. \textit{hedi} “because” must be derived from the homophonous absolutive of the inactive verb \textit{hedeni} “to be done”; cp. A. \textit{ta ¯a hedi} “because you have come” (\textit{ta} obl. “you (thou)”; \textit{¯a} part.pret.). In the same way, M.A.F. \textit{vegen}, the absolutive III of \textit{vanî} “to become”, is frequently used as a conjunction meaning “because (of)” or “in order to”; cp., e.g., F. \textit{etta}’/\textit{akl/} \textit{huanna} \textit{vegen} \textit{ebage} “she went off \textit{in order to} look for something”. The noun \textit{kan} \textit{/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. \textit{deneti} “not knowing”:

F. \textit{kaÔlo raÔlomaÔnÔn kan} \textit{deneti} “not knowing that it is your wave”;
A. \textit{ta raÔlaÔ/} /\textit{akl/} \textit{kan} \textit{deneti} “not knowing whether (it is) your wave or my wave” (both examples taken from T2, 12).

5.3.1.2. After participles, the particle \textit{tô} 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. \textit{reha kakkÔgen mia mi hadÔ˛a likÔ} “while cooking a curry, she looked \textit{whether} the children were (already) coming ...”, lit. “what she did, was, to look ...” (T6, 19; \textit{en/Ô} part.pres. “coming”)
M. ... \textit{kaiÔtu dabas gennÔn} \textit{tô} \textit{suvÔalu koÔsli eve} “The island chief asked \textit{whether} to fetch (my) bag (or not)” (T8, 152; \textit{genna(n)} part.pres. “fetching, bringing”).

5.3.1.3. When the interrogative particle A. \textit{tau} / F. \textit{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 AÔdÔdÔu and Fua’ Mulaku which can be understood both as a question \textbf{and} as a statement:

A. \textit{taÔ/} /\textit{taÔs} /\textit{deÔnei mahaÔ/} /\textit{akl/} \textit{tau}, \textit{emaÔ/} /\textit{akl/} \textit{tau} and
F. \textit{kaloÔsia dennÔnÔn masmanÔn tau}, \textit{emmanÔn ti} (both from T2, 21).
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. læña, pret. le’ /illet and fut. lænæne (M. liani “to write”):

- **A.** mi siṭ læña mihā-t xādima “The man (who is) writing this letter is (a) servant”.
- **A.** mi siṭ le’ /illet mihā-t xādima “The man who wrote (lit. ‘having written’) this letter is (a) servant.”
- **A.** mi siṭ lænæne mihā-t xādima “The man who will write this letter is (a) servant.”

The following sentence taken from T7 (6a.7a.8a) 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.** aṣaki matte hiṣi vāṣaki etere o’ ešakudu rukaki maṣafei o’ kaišaki naiša’.
- **F.** aṣieki matte hiṣi vašeki etere o’ ešekudu rukeki maṣafē o’ kaišeki naiše’.
- **H.** attaƙu matte hutii vattaku etere ote otākade rukaku mataifai ote kaatuaku noṭteke.
- **M.** attegeg mattägi huri vaṭtege terēgā o okkuda rukegge maṣafāi o kättege nātte’.

“(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.) onnanĩ “to lie, be (there)”, A. hiṣi etc. part.pret. of (M.) hunnani “to stand, be, remain”).

The Fua’ Mulaku version of the fairy tale Mākana “The crane” (T2, 60-60a) exhibits an example of an extreme sequence of participial clauses with additional absolutes depending on them; the translation of the participial chain which represents the crane’s direct speech must start from the end:

- **F.** āho beni ai: timan kalō galaka’ /-ak lī gui mana dīfā’ ga’ lgat raloma dīfā’ gat emmaña dīfā’ ga’ masmana dīfā’ ga’ daromana dīfā’ ga’ fanima dīfā’ ga’ utērimana kobh heye?
  “Coming (āho abs.) he said (beni 3.ps.sg.pret. + quotation particle): Where is the yarn reel (utērimana) which I received (ga’ part.pret.) by giving (dīfā abs.I) the pancake (kusmana) which I received by giving the treacle (fanima) which I received by giving the firewood (daromana) which I received by giving the fish (masmana) which I received by giving the bait fish (emmaña) which I received by giving the wave (raloma) which I received by giving the dropping (gui mana) which I myself (lit. the lord (him)self) laid to a rock.”

600 The examples given in 5.2.2.4 show similar participial constructions (A. eni / M. annanni “to come”).
601 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 HASSAN SA’ID.
602 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. derefē “giving / having given” (cf. 3.11.4.4 and 3.10.4). For the diminutive suffix -maña 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.\(^{603}\) Apart from the primary absolutives, there are also secondary absolute formations; these "compound verbs",\(^{604}\) consisting of combinations of absolutes and auxiliary verbs very frequently occur in the colloquial language. In contrast to the syntactical restrictions concerning participles, the position of absolutes in a sentence is free. Cp. the following examples:

* M. **e˘ndun teduvegen hus gayă lgai-a˘il hure bêraš nukumejjâtm-eve** “I got up and went outside. I had no shirt on”, lit. “Having got up from the bed” (teduvegen abs.III of tedu-vanî “to get up”), standing there with the naked (upper part of the) body (hure abs. of hunnanî “to stand, be, remain”), I went outside (nukumejjâm 1.ps.sg.pret.IV\(^{605}\) of nukunnanî “to go / come out”) (T8, 8).

* A. **ka˘ndagen âs de verie de gê edafie** “After they came (back) from cutting (wood), the two (people) built two houses”, lit. “Having cut (ka˘ndagen abs.III of ka˘n ˘danî ’to cut ’), coming / having come (âs abs. of (M.) annanî ’to come ’), the two (people) built two houses (edafie-l-ial 3.ps.pl.pret.)” (T1, 3).

In the following sentence, the sequence of absolutes represents the rhematic element:

* F. **haulu udihﬁf¯e goho eggamaha /ek-gamaha jeh¯ı** “The cock reached the land by flying”, lit. “(The way how) the cock (haulu obl.) hit (jehi+¯ı part.pret. + focus-marker of jahanî, lit. ‘to strike, beat’) (to) the land, was (by) flying (and) going (udihﬁf abs.I of (M.) uduhenî ’to fly’; goho abs. of (M.) danî ’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.\(^{605}\) Besides that, gerunds are not different in use or meaning from the absolute, as the following example shows:

* A. **den gövamun dememun fërû kalêqe ekahà’ l-a˘sl goş, kaşiqe naguvagen kinàra assêria’ l-a˘sl goş, înde mi këni ...** “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 (gövamun ger. of A. gövanî = M. roni ’to cry, howl’), struggling (dememun ger. of demeni ’to pull oneself, struggle’), having gone (goş abs. of (M.) danî ’to go’) close to the weaver(’s person), having caused (him) to pull out the thorn (nagu-va-gen abs.III of the caus. naguvanî ’to cause to raise, lift up’), having gone to the inner beach-edge (goş abs.), sitting (down) (înde abs. of (M.) innanî ’sit’), what he said, is (the following words) ...” (këni part.pret. + focus-marker -ı of (M.) kianî ’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. **ênà liamun liamun goş varubali vejje** “Having been writing for a long time he became tired”, lit. “Writing writing going he got tired”. (liamî “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.

---

\(^{603}\) Cf. also 3.10.

\(^{604}\) Cf. 3.11.4.

\(^{605}\) For this formation cf. 3.11.4.5.

\(^{606}\) 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 /benuni mā beni ai “when he / she said (so), (that one) answered (lit. ‘said’)” (beni 3.ps.sg.pret.; cf. M. bunun of bunānī “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 beni ai, timāsā dennēnī rālomānāk-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-f part.fut. + focus-marker; rālo-maṇ-a + 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, aulāu in Addū and aiāi in Fua’ 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 Addū and tai in Fua’ 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. 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” + īti such as, e.g., īti vikhyāta, often appearing in the Mahābhārata. Similarly, the absolutive A. kē, F. kei “saying” is used like a quotation particle in Addū and in Fua’ Mulaku, both representing an
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absolutive of M. kianĩ “to say, speak” which reflects the same OIA root, khyā.609 In the
given connection, kē l kei often has the exhortative meaning of “to tell somebody to do some-
thing”. 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”. Furth-
more, 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’ l-asl fakīrī fakīrī de mafiriākāmen 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. kuku lfilāge āi “The hen hid away, they say” (T4, 36).
M. baldī liru hurī ran ēve “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 ērī āi gaśāi ba’tavā kakānēne “(What) arose to the mind of this child, was, – they say
[external] – that she should prepare a pan of gaśāi-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 molōgađakā? ... te au ma molōgađakā “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).”610 (T3, 44-45).
F. kon tākaha tāi ti eni? “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 kēfī: ammāu! timā ēnei dara hōdāśaū611 “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 benaf: nun-āu, tē teīl ma molōgađa 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,

609 Cf. GEIGER (1902), 926, no. 247 and (1941), 43, no. 636.
610 For the deictic elements involved cf. 2.6.5.2.
611 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 ma ˙du h¯unu*, “The warmth of a cool midnight”, by MUHAMMAD WAH¯ID (MA ˙DULU); T8, 53-57):

M. *ku ˙da-ko´s jehilun vefai fahata´se˘mberilaif¯ım eve* “Anxiously, I glanced behind me”, lit. “I turned around, having become a little bit nervous, saying.”.

M. *evves m¯ıhaku net eve* “Nobody was there, saying.”

M. *kurimacca´sm ¯unu a ˘mbur¯a-nu-l¯au ˙len¯ık o ´s nubai kunivahegge /kuni-vas-ek-gel 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 gota´s ehiburili iru, vara´s kair¯ıgai m¯ıhaku hu ˙t ˙tigen ahann¯a dim¯a-a´s balan hu ˙t ˙t- eve /hu ˙t ˙ti eve* “Turning around, I faced a man starring 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. *hurih¯a ista´sita c -tak ko ˙la´s 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. *n˘¯un* 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. *ingir¯esi dannan ta? — n¯un.*612 “Do you know English?” — “No”. In this sense, the dialect of Fua’ Mulaku prefers *uyu* to *nun* in most cases.

5.5.1.1. Another important function of M.A.F. *n˘¯un* is that of a verb negating the rhematic part of a sentence; cp., e.g., M. *mi-¯ı fote c/-ekl “this is a book”, lit. “(what) this is, is a book”, in contrast to *mi-¯ı fote c/n¯un “this is not a book”, lit. “(what) this is, is not a book”. Within this context, *n¯un* equals a negated copula meaning “is not”. The following example shows *n˘¯un* in both functions:

A. *mi lmi-il tau koyy¯age molagāndaki? — nun-āu. tē he-il ma molōganda 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. *ni* “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

612 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 Addu dialect: As a positive sentence with the part.pres. eni in the long form functioning as a predicate verb, A. ma ādavegen kāu /kā̄š̄/ eni ge /ge-āsī “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’ /-āsī kā’ /kā̄š̄ ni en. “Normally I do not go home for eating.”

5.5.3. The negated variant of a verbum substantivum meaning “to be there, exist” is based on Dhiv. netīl (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.614 In most cases, nei/ne’ is used in like manner as nī (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 hununī “to be, stand, remain”, onnanī “to lie, be there”, innanī “to sit, be there” and tībenī “to exist, be there”; cp., e.g., M. mēze’ /-ekl eba huri “there is a table” as against mēze nei “there is not a table, there is no table”.615

In the sentence A. gē kō, boñdanā geaki nei /neti/616 “When he went (there), the b.-bird was not at home” (T1, 55), the syntactic position of nei can be compared to that of nī in the examples mentioned in 5.5.1.1; cp. also A. ... taulīman nei 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 nēti maha ni bēvvigen tībi 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 (tībi ‘being’), fish (maha) not being catchable (ni bēvvigen ‘not being catchable’, abs.III), bait fish (en) not being (there) (nēti abs.)”.

A. ... en netigen, mas ni bēvvigen ... “... 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
syntactical sketch

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 d¯oni vara' l-ašl bodu “This boat is very big” vs. mi d¯oni vara' bodet l-ekl nūn “This boat is not very big”, lit. “a very big (one)”;  
M. fansure’ l-ekl bēnum ta617 “Do you want a pencil?”; lit. “(Is) a pencil (the object of) desire?” vs. fansure’ bēnume’ l-ekl nūn ta? “Wouldn’t (you) like a pencil?”, lit. “(Is) a pencil not (an object of) desire?”

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’ l-ašl masakkai l-at kurāka’ ikurākašl nu jehunu619 “Yesterday I could not work”, lit. “Yesterday it did not turn out possible (jehunu potential pret. of jeheni ‘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-aš, with regular loss of the interrogative -n-.  

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, -aš is changed to -kaš. ... Although -aš corresponds to Sinh. -at, -kaš has no equivalent in Sinhalese either in form or in use. -kaš [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 Addū fairy tales Moḷōgaṇḍa “The axe” and Fiūdanāī boṇdanāī “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 ljehuml, of jahanī “to beat, strike”, which appears in the indefinite form:

A. arai, mi hedi lekākī, kaṁda’ l-ašl jehum-ak-āi ni lāi moḷōgaṇḍa kōra’ l-ašl vāṭal( 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 ni + abs. lāi) with a stroke (jehum-ak-āi obl.sg.indef. + particle ‘with’) in order to cut (inf. lāi)”.

A. ge kō, boṭdanā geaki ne netl (T1, 55) “When 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. mākanāya boṇi ai, guake denne kāke kēm-ekel nežge nu-eṅgel, ra例行 deṇ-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 eṅge) (to me) whether (kam-ek nom.sg.indef., lit. ‘a fact’) to give a dropping (guake, obl.indef.) or (‘and’) to give a wave (ra例行 obl.sg.indef.).”

617 The noun M. bēnum, A.F. bēnum “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.
618 Both examples are taken from DISANAYAKA/MANIKU (1990), 83 and 84, resp.
619 Sentence provided by HABĪBA HUSSAIN HABĪB, personal communication.
620 For this development cf. 1.2.1.4.
621 For the conjunction kō cf. 5.3.1.
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