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Preface

This book represents a revised and enlarged translation 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 (Maldvian) 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 [Naviyan] 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.

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 Campapāltāmāgē, Hitadū, Addū (Seenu [Sīr] Atoll) who is highly respected as the most reliable authority on the southernmost dialect. For six weeks he was at my disposal for several hours every day. Thanks to his excellent knowledge of English and his indefatigable help I was able to get a profound knowledge of the grammatical categories of the Addū dialect within a comparatively short time and to collect approximately 2500 lexemes. HASSAN SAEED also organised a recording session with a professional storyteller, Mr. ALI MANIKUFAANU (Ali Manikuufānu, 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

1 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 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 (Boodhurage), Mr. ABDULLAH AFEEF (Luxury), Mrs. Goldan Gētu KADDADDI 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 Alīf] Atoll) and Mr. MUHAMMAD HASSAN (Morning Paris, Fares, Gaafu Dhaalu [Gāf Dar] 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 (Madulu) 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. 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. DERANITYAGALA (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

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

For a proof-reading of the German version, I owe many thanks also to Prof. Dr. Chris Peter Zetter (South Asia Institute, University of Heidelberg) and to Prof. Dr. Christine Werda (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. Herbert Petermann 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. Tom Geehart, 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 these years, this book could not have been written in its present form. This also holds true for his help with technical problems, concerning particularly the software difficulties. Furthermore, my husband made his collection of Old Shivy inscriptions and manuscripts (collected in 1993) available to me which not only enlarged my knowledge of Old Shivy 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 write the whole book into English and eliminating me in those moments when I was about to lose my strength and self-confidence.

Oberschleißheim, 16 August 2001

Senta Fritz
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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 (former) 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 since in 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 Ceder (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 Dravidian 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 Ceder used for his etymological, morphological and syntactical investigations was taken from the rich Sinhalese literature which he divided into four main periods: Sinhalese Pechiket (from the 2nd c. B.C. to the 1st c. A.D.; ancient Raddum inscriptions), Proto-Sinhalese (from the 450th c. to the 3rd c. B.C.; later Raddum inscriptions); Medieval Sinhalese (from the 5th c. to the middle of the 15th c.; inscriptions and the most ancient documents of manuscript literature); the period from the middle of the 15th c. up to the present, called "Modern Sinhalese" by Ceder, which actually has to be subdivided into Classical Sinhalese (from the 15th 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”)\(^2\) 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.\(^3\) 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 *Yāngas* where he had married a royal princess, to a region called *Lāta*; there he founded his residence *Sīhapura*. While *Yānga* obviously refers to Bengal, the name *Lāta*, in connection with the hypothesis about the home-land, can be understood in two senses.\(^4\) *Sīhabāhu* (“lion-arm”) is described as being the son of a lion and a princess; after he killed his father, he was called *Sīhala*. *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

---


\(^4\) Cf. the discussion and the bibliography about the different hypotheses given in DE SILVA (1979), 16 ff.
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 Male. Apart from that, the periods of rulership of the sultans and sultanatas, 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 Male, 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; their only obligations consisted of an annual tribute which was paid from 1645 on. From 1754 until 1759, the Maldives voluntarily delivered themselves under the protection of the French who were asked for help against the permanent assaults of Malabar pirates. In 1796, together with Ceylon, the Maldives became a British colony; the only result of this

---


2 In the 14th c. there were three de facto sultanatas; in the middle of the 18th c. a nominal sultana was on the Maldivian throne.
oldest son of the legendary Sinhalese king Sinhabahu, prince regent Vijaya, was of evil conduct and hence was banished; 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 Maldivepura (Pali lit. "woman-island"; maldiha- "woman" + pura- = prapañca "island" + suffix -a). Obviously, the Arabic name of the Maldivian islands, which was used in the Middle Ages by several Arab and travellers and geographers, was derived from the Pali form Maldivepura as well. The first writer who mentioned the Maldives is Negi (1179-1239) who under the name of abu-lhalif refers in 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 Batuta (1304-1377) who called the islands jahan al-malabat.

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 UDA dhaih- through PALLA dhaih- "island" is without definite context.

0.4. If it is true that the toponym Maldivespura refers to the Maldives, the report on the simultaneous departure of three ships from the home country and their respective landing on different islands, as given in the Mahavamsa, 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 this legend is true in the Mahavamsa 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 Sinhalese 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 lexicography is of special interest. With the help of the sound methods of historical linguistic comparison and the supplemented by extralinguistic data, it is possible to gain 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...
saying 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, downplaying a strong interest in the pre-Islamic period as 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—the most cases in a very unprofessional way—bear vivid testimony to this epoch of Maldivian history. As to the possibility of serious archaeological 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 Maldives archipelago remains practically unknown.

0.5. As was mentioned above, the time following the conversion to Islam, at least with respect to the regional seas 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 Sanskrit.

0.5. The early Dhivehi texts are written in a script named Biyaaru ("Maldivian script"). The oldest type of writing is called Loita ("script of that time"). It is quite obvious that this syllabary must be related to the Modern Sanskrit script. As the latter, it must be classified as a sub-type of a southern Brahmi script. Among the oldest texts we find some inscriptions in Loita; among them, three staves belonging to the National Museum in Male (approximately from the 12th / 13th c., still undeciphered, as well as some decrees on copper-plates (Bootheef), dated by the early Islamic rulers, the earliest ones dating from the late 12th c. If it now, eight copper-plate documents have come to light, each of them consisting of several (up to 50) pages; some of them are in a very bad condition, though, and practically unrecognizable. The latest plate must be dated in the 15th c. Two of the paragraphs, which are in a fair state, have recently been edited by representatives of the "National Centre for Language and Historical Research" in Male in cooperation with members of the Department of Sinhala of the University of Colombo; in many respects, however, the quality of these writings does not satisfy scientific requirements.15

1. From, 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 the Laccadive by a few professional calligraphers, it has been completely lost in the Maldives. There is good reason to believe that the palm leaves were used as a writing material in the Maldives in older times as well, the extremely humid and hot climate there

15. L. H. Hasmukhia, Historical and Ethnographical Description of the Maldives, 2nd ed. (London 1906), states that the scientific requirements to a large extent lead to the conclusions about the period and the Burmese period of the Maldives are partly Indian. A special character of this subject is just being prepared by the author of the book.
must have destroyed them in their entirety. Even the copper-plates show many traces of corrosion.

The first inscriptions were discovered as late as 1932 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 comprehensive and complete survey on history, geography and etymology of the Maldivian Islands which has ever been written and which, therefore, has not lost its importance until the present time. Furthermore, Bell collected the written documents in Dhivehi as far as they were available, and he even tried to analyze them with the help of Maldivians. Bell himself had no knowledge of the Maldivian script and language.

6.5.2. Two comparatively extensive inscriptions in Dhivehi (above) date from the middle of the 14th c. They are written on a wooden beam and a board and are now stored in the National Museum in Male. One of these inscriptions was provisionally published by 1877, again (1880) besides the inscriptions mentioned above, there are numerous manuscripts in Dhivehi written on paper (Fukōli, "leaf-plates"), i.e. "manuscript scripts" which date from the 16th to the 18th c. Two of these texts were edited for the first time by Bell as well. One of the three Bodhiví manuscripts (cf. above) is also written in Dhivehi. Furthermore, there are approximately 20 epitaphs and memorial inscriptions in Dhivehi written on stone, most of them have not yet been edited (16th-18th c.). They are to be found in Male as well as in Malé and in Huraa (Addu-Atoll).

6.5.3. The written documents of the 13th period, to a larger extent consisting of decrees and administrative letters as well, are written in Tāna, the right-to-left script which is still in use today. Tāna obviously represents a mixed product of modified Dhivehi characters and Arabic elements. A curious phenomenon is the use of the Arabic origin for the first two characters of the Maldivian alphabet. Typologically Tāna is a mixture of a syllabary belonging to the southern Bodhiví type and the alphabetic script which strictly follows phonological criteria. It is not really known at what time this script emerged, it was used alongside Dhivehi for a longer period, until the latter was finally given up at the end of the 18th c. It is an interesting fact that in the source of the Maldives the old script was preserved much longer than in Male. Several documents from the 14th c. are already written in Tāna (some of them have been published in Maldivian journals by members of the "National Centre" in Male, cf. above). Almost all of the numerous funeral and memorial stone inscriptions in Tāna which date from the 16th to the 18th c. (in Male, Hulhulé, and in Gan, Thud and Maleh) have not yet been edited. The most extended older text written in Tāna is a complete manuscript of the Ruknas which was published in Male in 1999. The oldest, modern texts, in the proper sense of the word, that are available to us date from the end of the 19th c.

2. See above P. 17 (1937), 18-20.
3. Cf. in the material volume of this work.
0.6. The small amount of linguistic studies (in a wider sense) that have been devoted to Dhivehi so far shows that there has been but little interest in this language. In most cases, Dhivehi is not even mentioned in general Indo-European literature. Exceptions are R.C. TUNNELL's "Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages" (1865, I, II), the new edition of G.A. Zeuner's "Jazyki jaduvi Abii" (1930) and C.C. MARSCA's survey "The Indo-Aryan Languages" (1941); the information about Dhivehi as given there does not extend 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 only 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. GRIGGER at the beginning of the 20th century (1901-1902 and 1919), is very fragmentary. GRIGGER himself never had the opportunity to visit the Maldives; his contact with the language remained sporadic. When he was in Ceylon in winter 1895-96, he had three short meetings with the Maldivian aristocrat and merchant Abul Fath Effendi who was the prime minister of the Maldives. Such and, at the same time, consul of the Ottoman Empire and who returned to Colombo at that time. 2 The outcome of these meetings was a small vocabulary and some paradigms and sentences, which GRIGGER 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. As we should expect, the result of these hasty contacts were vague and not free from mistakes. Because of this brilliant knowledge of the Sinhalese language, however, GRIGGER 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 1968 by Milla. In the German original, the chapter on morphology comprises are 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, GRIGGER (1912) published a small etymological vocabulary of 175 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 Pierre de Laval who journeyed to the Maldives in the 17th c. (PERROT/GRAY 1878), as well as the vocabulary compiled by the British officers J. Wilson and W. Christopher in the 19th c., 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 theylluran vocabulary of the modern standard language (partly with mistakes) are of a restricted usability as well (MULL 1985, SAEHAGE 1985; DISANAYAKA/MARASU 1990). Quite recently, a multilingual dictionary covering 16 volumes appeared in Male (NCH, HR 1985-92); ca. 125 hand-written pages per vol.; it contains so many examples of inaccuracy, however, that its complete...
members of the "National Centre for Historical and Linguistic Research", Male) already began thinking about a new edition before this project was finished.

3.6.2 Three articles by the Sinhala 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 Sinhala and Maldivian authors who compiled an unpublished study finished in 1988 (M illustrations 1988) which comprises a small collection of phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical correspondences between Dhivehi and Sinhalese. The final conclusion about the genetic relation of the two languages, which are based on poor material and contain many mistakes, do not meet scientific criteria.

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

3.6.4 The philological studies of the Maldivian scholar MAASAN AMMAH. MANIKU deserve special attention. Most of his publications are dedicated to the cultural and linguistic heritage of the Maldivians (MANIKU, 1985; 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 H. CAHN (1990; 1992) and two articles by the author of this present book (1994: 1989-1990 and 1993).

3.6.5 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 views which have to be discussed here.

3.6.6 Although GEDDA's studies about Dhivehi represent the foundation stage 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 prehistoric period of the Indo-Aryan migration to the Maldives Islands. GEDDA's basic assumption can be proved to be wrong. Relying completely on the premise that Dhivehi must be a dialectal offspring of Sinhalese, he concluded that the splitting time was not earlier than the 10th c. a.D. However, it remains a real question 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 Maldives Islands, if only imagination were the motive for such an emigration could have been a war or an expedition. However, whatever the reason of such a sudden and powerful colonisation of the Maldives might have been - the Sinhalese chronicles would certainly have mentioned it. But in fact there is not even a short note which could support GEDDA's assumption. Ifn
Battula who in the 14th c. spent one year and a half in the Maldives working as a radiologist, noted everything which seemed to him to be important. If the Maldivian had been settled relatively recently, he would certainly have heard about that. And, last but not least, we should expect that the Maldivian chronicles, which give some 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.

6.3.3. The Sinhalese philologist De Silva (1970) published the hypothesis that the Maldivians were colonized at the same time as Sri Lanka by Indo-Aryan tribes who come 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, not withstanding. In this connection, the episode about the ship used by the weather god Indragetu, as reported in the Mahavamsa, deserves a certain interest: it is not difficult to imagine that some of the ships that went on the way to Sri Lanka missed their original destination because of adverse winds or storms and thus landed on the Maldives. Comparable incidents are well known from the most recent past. Besides the stated cases of ships or boats from far away, driven off course, an enormous number of ships were destroyed by reefs surrounding the islands, which are hard to locate for navigators; many of these wrecks are still to be found around the Maldives. Over the last two thousand 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-Aryans settlers might have reached the Maldives by accident is not completely unfounded.

6.3.4. Jakob Geiger's famous sentence according to which "our language is also our history" (24) 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 theories 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 inherent categories as well as special developments in the field of syntax. However, neither thesis is convincing in its present state; the one being rather small coherent 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...

24 Here, the question whether the original homeland was located in the north, as in the modern, or of the Sinhalese was left open by De Silva. In a later publication (1979), De Silva considers the "Western hypothesis" as more probable.

Introduction

assumption that Indo-Aryans might already have been present on the Maldives islands for a certain period, perhaps even a long time before the 16th c. A.D. Neben: GEGG, the Maldivian were aware of the complex 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 Male, and if they had been able to compare more than only some isolated elements of this particular idiom with Sinhalese, GEGG's model would be less rigid and his SILVA's arguments more effective.

9.5.4. Despite some other errors and misleading conclusions, SILVA's, when regarding the historical-chronological development of Dhivehi and Sinhalese, discovered two essentials, features that speak in favor of a very early dialectal separation of the two languages. The first feature concerned the development of the OLA glide /e/ which in initial position is preserved as /e/ in Sinhalese while it is represented by /a/ in the same position in Dhivehi without exception (e.g., Sinh. jàmāwa vs. Dth. /a/ don't "to go" - OLA gen. "age"). 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 drastic as the one just mentioned, it consists in the different development of Dhivhehi and Sinhalese of the OLA and MIA affixes. All the other divergences seem of lesser great: between the phonemic systems of the two languages can be assigned to the modern Indo-Aryan epoch only: some of these, however, are already stressed in the oldest Maldivian texts (20-30 c. of. Shavak). Considering phonological features only, the amount of material which I had the opportunity to copy leaves us no doubt that GEGG'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 16th 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 characterize some verbal categories might have developed within one or two centuries only, as GEGG's temporal framework considering the assumed "splitting off" of Dhivehi would imply.

9.5.2. 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 decimal system which was still in use at the beginning of the 20th c. This system, which was characterized by special lexical items based on calculating operations with decimal numbers, determined all weights and measures as well. In contrast to that, there are no indications of a particular, decimal system in Sinhalese in any period of its well explored history. However, apart from the obviously dominating decimal system, decimal features have always existed in Dhivehi, alterations being found already in the old texts. In all dialects, the decimal numerical system 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

\footnote{Lefevre 1937}
\footnote{Ch. 1}
\footnote{GEGG 1895-1902, 102. "The word, Maldivian may have separated from Sinhalese at a time when the latter had already begun to adopt some, perhaps the form which it has at present. And this, as I think, I have shown was about the year 500 A.D."}
archaic Maldivian decimal numbers obviously represent "pictorialisms" which are not attested in Sinhalese; they are of particular interest here.

0.2.5 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 diachronological 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 systematic historical investigation of Sinhalese loanwords will not only inform us about the intensity and the effectiveness of language contacts in the course of time, but will perhaps even allow us to draw conclusions concerning the chronology of the migrations from Sri Lanka to the Maldives.

0.3.4 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 conclude with certainty whether Dhivehi and Sinhalese developed independently from a common Prakrit ancestor which would allow to call them "sister languages" in the literal sense of the word, as proposed by Dr. Silva. We cannot disprove the opposite assumption that Dhivehi might represent a "daughter language" of Sinhalese which split off from it in prehistoric times; it is clear, however, that this time must have been much earlier than 5000 B.C. supposed.

0.9. The relationship between Dhivehi and Sinhalese is not only the most important objective when the history of the language is concerned, but also an indispensable means for judging the evolutionary background of certain diachronic phenomena occurring in Dhivehi. Within this framework it is necessary to regard the diglossia which characterizes at least contemporary Sinhalese. The modern written language is interwoven with many influences from the earlier stages of the literary language; from society as well as from classical prose. Furthermore, a permanent influence of loanwords taken in the Internet or more recently from Sinhalese, 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 diachronic strata which causes the great variety of contemporaneous stylistic levels we find in the written language. In contrast, in this, the colloquial language is characterized 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 meager literary resources is likely to exhibit a completely different picture. Concerning its vocabulary,
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. 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.

3.9.1. 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 ca. 1200 islands, ca. 200 of them inhabited, covers a distance of 385 km from north to south. If we take Malesey (Maliiv) into account, an island now belonging to India which is situated at the north end of the Maldives archipelago where Dhivehi is spoken as well, the Maldives extend to a length of about 1200 km. The numerous subdialects are divided into two main groups: a northern and a southern one. The latter is restricted to the three southernmost islands with the traditional names Fuvah, Funga, Maleh and Addu.2 There are some considerable differences between the particular subdialects of the north. The dialectal differences between North and South Dhivehi are of such a nature that eastern Maldivians can hardly understand the southern dialects. The opposite is much rarer since the Male standard language has been widespread. The northern dialect group which extends from the Addamalef (Iam) Atoll in the north up to Malesey, is very homogeneous. The dialect of Male is a typical representative of this group.

3.9.2. It has been observable during the last years that the native knowledge of the unwritten Dhivehi 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 archipelago is not the only reason for this development: the role played by the mass media, television and radio which broadcasts from Male all over the islands, is gaining more and more importance.

3.9.3. In many respects, the dialects of Dhivehi represent different developmental stages in the development of the language. Especially in the field of morphology, the amount of inflectional features steadily increases from north to south. Within the three southernmost atolls, the dialects of the Aaddh Atolls which form the southern tip of the whole Maldivian archipelago, is characterised by the highest degree of archaism. Thus, the different classes of verb conjugation and nominal inflection are best preserved there, morphologically simple formations and, as a consequence, irregularities increasing from north to south 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 Maldives dialects, including the coloquial structure of language, can be compared with colloquial Sinhalese - a morphology of which has also undergone considerable reduction.

2 The Maldivian language is also known as Addi, Male, Maleew, Maleiv (Mohawk), Maleew (Monoid), Maleew (Maliiv), Maleew (Maleq), and Maleew (Malei).
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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 forms.

0.9.1.4. In phonological development the interdialectal differences are less significant. As a rule, the vowel system of the northern 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 are to be regarded as archaic.

0.9.1.5. Comparative syntax does not reveal any systematic 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 predication. In conjunction 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, despite, conciliation 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 Male 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 axial 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 hereditary 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 hereditary degrees as indicated.

The language of Male is the only modern IA dialect where all personal pronouns, including the first person, are systematically distinguished according to the status of the respective person. Thus, all forms are unambiguously marked, which includes also the relation of the particular form to the respective social level in a straightforward and unchangeable way. It is neither possible to change the stylistic level in order to express more intimacy at distance, nor are there any special forms that refer to a hierarchy of age. The primary criterion of the 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 exemplified in the pronounal system, however, thus names 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...
in a very strict, hierarchically organized verbal system. These 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 explicit phenomenon. Nowadays the significance of the threefold social splitting is losing importance even here, though, which corresponds with a decreasing competence for the honorific system of the language. The subordate 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 south-east Maldives where the society has always been more homogeneous, there are even no traces whatsoever of a comparable linguistic differentiation.1

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 morphological processes that play an important role in Vadeem Dhivehi.

From the morphological point of view, the dialect of A’addh 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 A’addh 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 terracem Dhivehi in which shows a comparatively reduced morphology. Furthermore, without the morphological background of the A’addh 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 here, while in the southern dialects it is preserved not only as a syntactical factor but in a certain extent (especially in the pronominal system), also as a morphological unit. The dialect of Huvadhoo which essentially corresponds with that of A’addh in the manifestation of the formal categories, in the same time shows many morphological peculiarities that are characteristic for southern Dhivehi. As a result of these overlaps, the dialect of Huvadhoo is less transparent from the formal point of view. With respect to morphology, the dialect of Huvadhoo is a more typical representative of southern Dhivehi. With regard to the phonology, however, there are some special developments that are characteristic for Huvadhoo alone.3

---
1 The Maldivian honorific system is the subject of a separate study which is presently in preparation. Subsequently, the phonemes will be stated within an enlarged alveolar context.
2 Depending on the (usually temporal) circumstances of my research stay in 1994 I had to concentrate primarily on the two latter mentioned dialects as well as on the standard language. The material I could collect from Huvadhoo is relatively restricted and as a consequence, my Huvadhoo database is much smaller than that of the other dialects. Therefore, the system of Huvadhoo 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 ordinary, like that of other Indian languages. Among the characteristics common to Modern Indo-Aryan languages, the Medhivak phonemic inventory shows an opposition of long and short vowels, of dental and retroflex consonants as well as of single and geminated consonants, further more diphthongs and nasalised vowels file after having a phonemic value only in the dialect of Muri Malda, at below. There are three peculiar features that Dhivehi shares with Sanskrit, viz. the complete loss of the aspirated consonants, the emergence of personalised stops and, finally, considerable vowel changes as a consequence of vowel 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 Sirthole 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 even 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 combination of the originally short vowels after the loss of inter-vocalic consonants during the Middle Indian period.

1.1.2. Old Dhivehi is handed down in us earliest written documents: the letters, inscriptions, and only open syllables. From the fact that there were no closed syllables, it follows that the personalised stops have to be considered as monophthongic (r, s, s) at the time they were never written as sequences of sound + stop. The writing rule also implies that there were no consonant clusters in Old Dhivehi (cf. 1.58). In the language of these days, the contemporary (normal and vowel) consonant stems (cf. 2.3.1.3) appeared in -m or -m, e.g. man "animal, land" retained since 1.3 (1211); today M. [ma] (nii); or some "-m" retained since 1.3 (1213); today M. [m] (nii); and the "ntw" retained since 1.3 (1214); today M. [n] (nii). The question whether the same rule applied to southern Dhivehi in all cases as well, or whether we have to assume a dialectal differentiation.

---

14. 3.
6. Cf. e.g. McEwan (1954), 126. - For more Dhivehi examples cf. 1.2.1.4.
7. For examples cf. 1.2.1.3
8. For the critical types of documents of transcription, 115.3 and furthermore vol. 1 of the present book.
similar to that of nowadays, cannot be answered with certainty, because the linguistic documents were written in the standard language.

1.1.3. The history of Dhoweli as far as it is attested by written documents—shows that final -u in the position after voiceless consonants, nasal 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 Dhoweli only the consonants nd, lb, lb, lb, and lb — can be found in final position. While lb in final position is articulated as a vowel [i], in all dialects e.g. modern [mbag] "people", the other four consonants mentioned are subject to considerable phonetic changes which are the most part vary from dialect to dialect. The only phenomenon that is realised homogeneously is lb which phonetically occurs as glottal stop [?] in the whole Dhoweli-speaking area. In the southern dialects, final lb has been changed phonetically to [i] as well, while in the standard language lb is realised as glide [y] forming a diphthong with the preceding vowel, for this development, e.g., the noun mass. M. [yf?i] in comparison with A.F. [f?i] "book", in the dialect of Dhoweli as well as in the standard language, final lb is pronounced as [i] too, while we have to state a completely different development for Funj Misiku where the phoneme lb 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 of F. mass "stand, land" vs. M.A. [f?i] lb? (— baad, altered since L1 [f?i, i]). While final lb remained unchanged in the standard language and in Dhoweli, the dialect of Funj Misiku shows an allophonic change of lb into [i] in the same position, followed by a weakly articulated vowel which echoes the vowel of the preceding syllable, e.g., lb: mass with M.A. was "fish". The Funj Misiku dialect is peculiar with respect to lb 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 lb has no phonetic value of its own, but only serves as an allophonic variant of the final consonant M.A. lb, A.F. lb and C.A. lb. It is important to draw attention to the fact that lb's phonological function of the glottal stop has to be regarded separately from a pure phonetic phenomenon, typical not only for Dhoweli and Siraalee, but also the automatic substitution of a glottal stop lb following immediately every vowel, in word-final position, which is a widespread phenomenon throughout the South Asian languages, e.g., the adjective M. badee, F. badee. A badee "big", a pronoun mdeel, [badeel] and [badeel], resp. This kind of glottal stop has metathesis, met-palatalisation, and met-palatization significance.

1.1.4. The nasal -m, which by apcope of the time in came into usual final position, was changed into -n [i], but it remained within the periphery when it was not final. A tendency of changing -m into -n can be noticed already in the earliest documents. Alongside kame "then, deceit" which is attested in this form from L1 (62.1) up to the Funj one of the same word was written in parallel form, which can be found as early as L1 (62.15) as well, cf. also below.

1 Cf. 2.1.1.3. below.
2 Cf. 2.1.1.4.
3 For examples and for the spelling of the two latter phonemes cf. 2.1.1.2.
4 For more results and examples cf. 2.1.4.
5 For a detailed table on the latest writing F. -de6 cf. 2.5.
6 For more further examples cf. 2.1.3.1.
"and... still, ground, land" (F3.14; F5.11) with its variant bin which is attested in *sattaru in the compounds binaad "share, portion of land" (F5.11; I3.23) and bingaad "ě." (F4.3). There can be no doubt that the spelling with final -a 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 scope of final -a we have to deal with a syncope of medial -a- and -a which took place under the same phonological conditions. There is much evidence for this process being as old as the ancient edicts. Cp. the name of the island Hula which often occurs as *kunu-deva since L.4 (2.4), as against the variant form *kuna-deva appearing in L.2 (7.2) and L.3 (12.1,3) which already shows syncope, 46 the syllable *in idiwa was preserved because it belongs to the very few consonants in Dhivehi that are not omitted in final position (cf. p.1 above). Or, also the ancient word for "officer", lit. "the one having received a task (to do)" which is attested in many documents as koun-gaai (L.2 8.2; L6 3.4; F5.9.43; cf. also the plural koun-gaatiit "and officer") in L5 57.4 as well as the indef. plural forms koun-gatteh in 1.1 n.1 and koun-gattek in L2 37.3, as against syncopated kouu-gaai (L4 12.1) and gr. I; indef. plural koung-taatiit "officers" in L3 3.2,4. 46 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 syncopatic environment. 49 Cp. e.g., the contemporary name of the southernmost island Hulâ, which has to be derived through an intermediate form *kunu-deva (L.4 2.4), syncopated from *kunad-latSha, lit. "eight island-totally". Cp. also the name of the island Fortak which is attested as fortak (L2 1.1,2.3; L2 10.2.3) from for-nu-deva, approximately "fort-island". Another consonant that could not enter final position is r as in beraad "rice man; rice farmer", which is attested in its genitive form bernu-eraga (L.2 28.3). Finally, the same kind of syncope is also responsible for the geminates that characterise the regressive formation of participles (cf. c. 1.2.9.12).

1.2. The vowels

1.2.1. The vowel system of ancient Dhivehi is almost symmetrical. It consists of five vocalic qualities which show a phonetic differentiation of quantity: a – ō, i – ē, u – ū, e – ū. 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. Glare (1928, 14-12) shows that the same process is valid for Sinhalese as well where the inherited long vowels merged with the short ones far later than the Proto-Sinhalese period, i.e. the 5th c. A.D.; cp. e.g., Sth. gruma, gruma gaRR "r. tiger" vs. Pa, Ph. guma, OIA gruma, 5th. Sth. miR "blue, green, dark" vs. Pa, nula, OIA nura, 46 Sth. sanna, sanna gam "smoke, steam" vs. Pa, Ph. su.
There are several words in the basic vocabulary of Divi which show initial long vowels in initial position that belong to the inherited vocabulary have a long initial vowel, which in cases, can be explained by contractions. This is true e.g. for the long of the personal pronouns of the 3s.pl.sg. of *it* and *ith* "he, she", of the standard language which obviously developed by a merger of the demonstrative *that* with a noun *mu* + *ath* "that thing", cf. 2.6.2.5 1.1: *eti* (cf. *en*), cf. 2.6.2.5.3. Other examples can be explained by assuming the loss of a consonant between vowels: e.g. A. *a* "rare, thin, soft, light" (cf. Arab. *aita* "soft," or M. *a* "color" (cf. Eng. *order") etc.

Although it may seem dubious that the Divi could have received direct loan from HIndi or Urdu, it is highly probable that the source of Divi *de* has been taken to the Dravidian languages, as well as the names of its island in the Indian Ocean have been borrowed. The above facts show that the word has been borrowed solely recently, otherwise it would have changed to *de* in all dialects except Divi. As in many other cases, the word seems to have been impressed together with the rest of the culture. Roof tiles and monuments such as columns in the Dravidian architecture and have come into India in recent centuries or very recently. The traditional building material was produced from plants (mango) from the coconut tree, and burnt in a kiln. — Cf. also the common Hindi word *dhe*, (e.g. *dhe* "wood, wood, wood") which cannot be the source of Divi but the similarity of *de* is not certain. However, cf. Turner (1965, I, 77, no. 566) and Giriker (1941, 2), no. 222.

Cf. also the case from Tahiti, *a* "god, the", *ed* "bald," *kia* "kind, man."
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To the initial long vowel of the presentable inherited nominal M.A.I.: and "go" (cf. 2.1.4) there is no convincing explanation so far.

2.1.2. A special group among the words with initial long vowel is constituted by certain nominal stems in Aigd and, to a much higher degree, in FND. Mulaku. There, the paradigmatic bias of the stem-final -i led to a transformation of the phonetic shape of the nouns in question. In these cases the characteristic row of this process is the lengthening and subsequent accentuation of the root vowel. In the dialect of Aigd, this morphological process can be noted only sporadically, being restricted, besides a few exceptions, in single oblique case forms and to the definite and indefinite forms only. In FND. Mulaku, however, it has spread throughout whole paradigms, resulting in the emergence of some nouns with initial long vowel: 32. Cf. the nom. A. ax "k'eb" beginning with short a, as against the gen. A. ax' → "k'ee" with secondary lengthening of the initial vowel: the FND. Mulaku equivalent of the word. This vowel spread by analogy, not only to the nom. ax" but to the whole paradigm (cf. *aixa, axa, axa, etc.). Cf. furthermore P. N. "k'ebab" vs. M.A. nax. — The secondary lengthening of the root vowel is also arrested in many stems with word-initial consonant, cf. nom.sg.女主 "hoi" (lit. "fly"), festi-festi "the box", gen. feste ifesti-es as well as festa male "fly", feste "box", fest "small island, sandbank" (vs. A nom. festi etc.

2.1.3. Long vowels that appear in medial as well as final position in modern Dhivehi may have mostly come about as a secondary result of contraction of two identical or different short vowels. These vowel contractions must have occurred after intervocalic consonants of the MIA period and been lost. Cep. e.g., M.E. ma. A. ṭūçe "flower"; juice of the liquid taken from the palm blossom, palm wine, toddy" (Sinh. ṭūça = ṭūça = Pkt. če; OIA *čuoça = juice of palms tree, favourer"; M. čūsa "saw", in čūsa ← nom. čūsa, etc. through MIA *čūça - from Skt. čūṣa- "to eat," cf. the still uncontracted correspondent in the secondary stem A. čūsa ← čūsa; for more details cf. 2.3.2.8.1.5); M. čūsa, A.F. čūsa "merrily, merrily, all around the year"; M. čūsa, A.F. čūsa "medicate, medicament, drug" (Sinh. čūza ← čūza) corresponding to the Sinh dual form čūza (with the final consonant being reinforced) with čūza as a regular noun, besides nom. čūza, or the original form čūza ← čūza ← Pkt. čūza "čūza" = OIA *čūza. 33 The first 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: e.g., A.F. čū (M. čū) "nose" = MIA čū- = OIA čū-; M. čū, A.F. čū "man, eg." = Pkt. čūjē = OIA *čūjē etc.

33 Cf. 2.3.1.1.1 and the primary paradigm in 2.3.2.11.2.
35 There are few exceptions which for the main part can be explained as borrow or foreign loan, cf. 2.3.1.4.
38 For some examples cf. 2.2.1.2.
1.2.4. A few examples of the dialects of Adjeu and Firi-Muliku show the tendency towards vowel contraction even today. Cp., e.g., A. nédura vs. M.F. niedura "pome"; M. mérë vs. M. mira "shark"; or F. lótë, A. lëmë vs. M. lòë "write". The medial long vowel of indefinite infinitives which are used in negated sentences (cf. §5.1-2) have obviously developed in the recent past by contraction of two short vowels as well, after the use of the infitive ending had been lost. Cp., e.g., the infinitives M. kara "to do" and kara do "to make, build, create" with their indefinite forms kara-gi and kara-ke, which most probably have to be derived from kara-eh and kara-ë, resp.

1.2.4.5. In the case of some isolated cases the final long vowel can be explained by assuming a merger of an originally short final vowel with the definite article, e.g., A.F. kaka (vs. M. kaká) "younger brother / sister" from kaká-ë, A. bëbë (vs. M.F. bëbë) "elder brother" from bëbë-ë (cf. §2.1.4).

3.1.6. In the standard language, the final long vowel appearing in the direct case of some nouns is conditioned by the loss of final e6 and which is characteristic for northern Djuvehi. In the remaining forms of the word concerned, it was preserved whenever it was in medial position. In the standard language, the loss of final e 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 -a (but not -ë) shows. The so-called final e in the dialect of Adjeu which points towards a final vowel is generally not felt. In the position after ë and e, however, the merger of -e yields the corresponding long vowel ë-i → ë-i and -ë → -ë, while the change from ë to -a presupposes an intermediate ë-i. As opposed to this, the dialect of Firi-Muliku has conserved final -e even phonetically, as the following examples illustrate:

* tømbi "flower, blossom" — M. tum, A. um; but F. tømb; tømbi "stone, rock" — M. go, A. go; but F. gol; tømbi "new" — M. ë, A. ë; but F. ël; tømbi "rest" — M. ë, A. ë; but F. ël; tømbi "side of the cheek" — M. ë, A. ë; but F. ël; tømbi "eye" — M. ë, A. ë; but F. ël; tømbi "root" — M. ë, A. ë; but F. ël; tømbi "blue" — M. ë, A. ë; but F. ël; tømbi "very wide of scope" — M. ë, A. ë; but F. ël; tum "fall" — M. tum, A. um; but F. tum; tum "lie", tum "fall" — M. tum, A. um; but F. tum; tum "lie" — M. tum, A. um; but F. tum.

In the words M. ë, A. ë, F. ël "tock" and M. ë, A. ë, F. ël "lying fox", however, the final long vowel of the standard forms cannot be the result of a secondarily
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vocalised -i alone, as the vocalism of the corresponding Pah Mušāku forms and show (not "hal, suh"). Here, the rightshong is based on a contraction (= 'amāla /'amāla; cf. Sinh. madda / madda, "jingle cock, golden feather" which, with unexplained reason has to be derived from OIA capilla "breathing, fiddle" through Per. caivala; cf. TURNER 1966, I, 253, no. 4072 and, for Sinh. madda "flying fox", II, 675, no. 1584).

1.2.1.7 The vernacular of Pah Mušāku 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 dialects 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 when /h/ is replaced by 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 P. bāṭ "eggplant". (cf.) here reflects the original contrast of OIA bhāndāka (TURNER 1966, I, 533, no. 9269). The reason for the lengthening of the root vowel (cf. M.A. bāṭ, Sinh. bāṭa with short a) has to be seen in the morphological zero of i stems which was mentioned above (cf. 1.2.1.7 and 3.3.2.8.1.4.7. cf. also Beng. bātĩ). A similar example is P. bāṭi "them" vs. M.A. kāṭi, Sinh. kāṭa or "it" which corresponds to bāṭi in its whole paradigm; it has to be derived from OIA kāṭa "it" (cf. Pah. kāṭa; TURNER 1966, I, 133, no. 2068).

In the following examples, the nasal vowel is conditioned by a root-final nasal consonant: māṭi "worm, caterpillar" vs. A. fāṭ, M. fōta; Sinh. pāṭi (cf. OIA praḥkata "living being, animal, worm"); P. bōtā "back" with nasal i vs. A. bōna (the word has no equivalent aside the southeastern dialects). The same condition applies to the final nasal vowel appearing in the present paradigm of numerous verbs which can be traced back to an original -i. Examples are: rāṭa a stem I, māṭi "sleeping" vs. A.M. rāṭa, M.A. rāṭi "those (but cf. the lengthened form: māṭa where -i is preserved) or the a stem: P. rāṭā vs. M.A. rāṭa "avoiding, escaping" < *rāṭe (long form: rāṭon, "id.").

There are many examples of nasal vowels whose occurrence is not easy to explain, rather on phonological or on phonetic grounds. This is true, e.g., for P. küddi "child" (cf. Kudda; sgr. "), cf. 3.3.2.8.1.4.7.); P. bāṭi "jewellery" (Sinh. madda "jewellery"; Pah. madda, OIA madda = "seal, signet ring"; cf. P. bāṭi "eagle, fishhook" (cf. Pah. biṭ "bloom, egg, hook"). In the case of P. fāhi "food" (M.A. fāsi, A. fāsi, yā "yes" (M.A. yā), P. yā "no" (Yahšu M. iyi, A.F. iyi). P. yāhi "it" (cf. A. fāsi) and I. nūdha "now, day" (cf. M. nūdha, A. nūdha), we realise that the nasal vowel is preceded by ę 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 absolute of the a stems which alternates between -a and -i, e.g. the verbal forms ęam and ęa (e.g. ęam "to want").

**For the terminology cf. 2.9.
**For the phoneticisation rules cf. 2.8.1.
**For the phoneticisation rules cf. 2.8.1.


It remains possible that the nasal vowel of P. fāhi "food" represents a direct ex. of that in OIA päṭo.
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The initial vowel phonemes of the Mvukal are clearly distinguished from the consonant Mvukal with respect to pronunciation short or long vowels in a simple way when they precede the final consonant or a glide, (e.g., mukal “people” pronounced m-ukal). Besides this, these sounds show a general tendency to a slightly nasalized pronunciation of vowels, irrespective of their phonetic environment. Real, these characteristics represent purely phonetic phenomena, they have no bearing on the phonological system of the language.

1.2.2. In contrast to Sinhalese, the Modern Bihari possesses true diphthongs which because of their apparently ambiguous character need a detailed examination. Basically, we have to distinguish phonemic diphthongs from those which are simple diphthongizations that represent the phonetic realization (i.e., the pronunciation) of certain phonological sanctions but cannot be interpreted as 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 speaking area, with the diphthong remaining unchanged throughout the paradigm. Let us look at some homographs such as M.A.F. pāh “sea”52 (this is true for examples like M.A.F. pāh “honey”53, M.A.F. pāh “wine”54, M.A.F. gāth “body”,55 or M.A.F. pāh “sea”,56 the diphthongs of which are the result of a vowel contraction of former diphthongs).

1.2.2.2. As a rule, phonemic eardand aiphthongs occur only in the southern dialects, however. In northern Bihari, the corresponding vowel is long monophthonga in both cases. Typical examples are B. pāh “brick” and B. pāh “peach” (M. equivalents pāh and M. pāh “pāh “peach”), the diphthong of which is based on a contraction of “pearl” but also A.F. kāh vs. M. kāh59 “ripe coconut” (for coconuts) and A.F. nāsī vs. M. nāsī60 “coconut shell.” The diphthongs of these remain unchanged throughout the whole paradigm (cf. gen. A.F. nāsī, nom. kāh, aiphth. kāh, nāsī). 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 Bihari forms kāh “coconut” and nāsī “coconut shell” show.

1.2.2.3. The diphthong as occurring in words of the type A. kāh “flower, blossom” or A. nāsī “shell, radii” (vs. B. kāh, gāth and M. kāh, gāth; cf. 1.2.1.6) is not native: origin that the home of the diphthong in the examples mentioned above. In the second case, this appears as the result of a voicing of a word-final /k/ (see below) but a phonetic variant of /e/ in final position it is important to note that /e/ is stable in the paradigm of the words.

---

52 Cf. e.g., the short notice in Mvtukal (1921), 176.
53 Cf. 51.5.
54 More is probably a compound consisting of : M. pāh “flower, blossom” and an independent word pāh “seed, corn.”
55 See the monograph by H. W. H. Portman, Bih. monographs, 7 (1961), 34-42.
56 The etymology of this word is unknown.
57 The etymology of this word is unknown.
1.2.2.4. In the standard language, word-final (phonemic) sequences of vowel + h are treated in the same manner; they are realized as (phonetic) diptongues. In contrast to this, final / h / is assimilated as a glottal stop /ʔ/ throughout the southern dialects. C. e.g., M. skir vs. A.F. skir “month”, M. ma vs. A.F. o h “hand, arm”, M. naka vs. A.F. naka “constellation”. M. fao vs. A.F. fo “leaf”, M. foi vs. A.F. fo “book”. M. go vs. A.F. go “way, manna”. This process also affects Arabic loanwords ending in -ait, e.g., M. mekhalt “advise” ← Arabic mishkat “teach”. In media position / h / remains unchanged in all cases. e.g., M. fnang “A, faro, dar”. M.A. fnait “hit”.

1.2.2.5. In the standard language there is an increasing tendency to pronounce the diptongue /ait/ as a monophthongized lengthened vowel /a/. As mentioned in E.H.N.D., this /a/ is further developing into /e/ in the northernmost dialects so that we find, e.g., /skir/ and /skir/, instead of M. /skir/ (A.F. skir “tear” and M. /fira/ (A.F. fira “shoe, sandal”). These cases must be distinguished from the development of original word-final diptongues into M. aw as in the locative suffix M. aw (cf. 2.5.1.5) or in the formative of the possessive *//, M. foi (cf. 3.1.4.1 and 3.1.4.4), which are realized almost always as /a/ and /o/ today (cf. 1.2.4.3).

1.5. Umball phenomena

In the prehistory of Dhivehi, the back vowels e, o and u of the first slot syllable were changed into the front vowels a, e and i, when one of the following syllables contained the front vowels e or i: glide: These “umball” processes followed the same principles in Dhivehi as they did in Sinhalese (cf. GESCHER 1936, 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, vernacular there are more examples with umball than in the standard language.

1.2.2.7. The umballting of a /u/ is the most frequent one. It is highly probable though not provable* that the process went through an intermediate *a as in Sinhalese where we find *ah today (e.g., M.A. dhun “then” (Sinh. dhun “now”; Pa. dhun, Skt. dhunah), M.A. noo, L. moli “fry” (Sinh. moli-lahadul “id.”), Pkt. moli-tha, O.A. mlapə- ʃ  “fly”, “fly”); M. mā, A.F. mu lub “water tank, artificial pool” (Sinh. mā “id.”), M. mā, O.A. mā “id.”). M. noo, A.F. no lub “every kind of creeper” (Sinh. nō “id.”); M. mō, Pkt., Skt. mō “id.”; M.A. mō “water” (Sinh. pō “id.”); Pkt. pō, O.A. pō “id.”); M. rō, A.F. rō “right” (Sinh. pō, Pkt. naL → rō vs. Pkt. naL; O.A. ᵃ rō-
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"id."\(^{56}\); M. mātā, A.P. medio "middle", ventū "(Sinh. mātā "ud."); Pa., Bkt. māthā-, O.A. māthāya. "id."\(^{56}\).

In contrast to Sinhalese, Dhivell shows a comparatively large number of words containing a root vowel a which was not changed by umlaut under the given condition. Cq., e.g., most "pam, elay" vs. oun, uyi (Bkt. maityā); Pa. maitā-, Skt. maityā- "ant, elay"\(^{56}\) or M.A.F. āndi "(vegetable) treacle" vs. Sinh. pāndilā "treacle, molasses, honey" (Pa., Skt. pāndilā- "inspired juice of sugarcane and other plants"), Pa. phiyom- "treacle, molasses"\(^{56}\).

1.2.3.1.1. From a morphological point of view the mālumlant plays an important role in what paradigms such as, viz. with a-stem verbs that have a as their root vowel. Or the other hand, the a of the present stem opposes itself to i in the preterite stem; e.g., present stem like M.A.F. bāhā, "look (at)"; john, "eat" and jāna-, "start, begin (to do something)" with their corresponding preterite stems M.A.F. bāhi-, jehi- and jējii. The preterite participle of the a-stem, however, in its form with the preterite stem, is formed with the suffix -i which through intermediate i goes back to OIA -iti, this suffix vowel i causes umlaut regularly.

The second morphological function of the umlaut becomes apparent in the derivation of intensive, intransitive a-stem verbs from transitive and/or active a-stem verbs with a as their root vowel. Here, both the a of the root and the stem marker are changed by umlaut; cf. jējant trans. "to start, begin (something)" vs. jējant intr. "to begin", jējant trans. "to heat" vs. jējant intr. "to heat", the intensive variant trans. "to let fall (something or somebody)" vs. -int intr. "to fall be dropped", jējant "to swim (actively, willingly)" vs. the intensive jējant "to sink, drown (by swallowing)" etc.

1.2.3.3.2. There are only a few words that show umlaut-change of a to i throughout the Dhivell speaking area. In comparison with Sinhalese, Dhivell provides much fewer examples for this kind of umlaut. One of them is M.A.F. bīh bīhāi "earth, soil, ground" = Sinh. bīhā = Bkt. māthā-, O.A. maśāi.\(^{56}\) As a rule, umlaut is more widespread in the southernmost, vettuvanless, i.e. corresponding words in northern Dhivedi having preserved a as their root vowel, which must be regarded as a conservative trait. Cq., e.g., M. mātā vs. A.P. mūti "cat" and the Sinh. mātā mātā "cat" = Bkt. māthā-, O.A. mūtī-\(^{56}\) M. mūtā vs. A.P. mūti "cat with fresh water", and M. māthā vs. A.P. mūti "hite".

1.2.3.3.3. There is not one available verb showing this type of umlaut, viz. M. mātā is opposed to A.P. mūti "to run" (with i in all forms). Here, too, the a of the root has remained unchanged in the standard language. The sameholds true for Sinhalese which has

\(^{56}\) Cfr. TURNER (1960): H. 669, no. 17202, cf. also 7.3.1.4
\(^{57}\) Cfr. TURNER (1962), II, 522, es. 964.
\(^{21}\) Cfr. TURNER (1960), II, 544, l. 10985
Cfr. TURNER (1965): II, 54, no. 9672, GLEBER (1944). 192, no. 10425. - For the binary opposition of -i and -iti in southern Dhivedi, cfr. 2.3.11.
\(^{22}\) Cfr. the table of verbs in 2.3.1.1, for the derivation of the participle of 1.2.3.1.1
\(^{21}\) Cfr. TURNER (1960), II, 545, no. 9593.
preserved the back vowel a in the present stem dhuwa-, while the præterite stem was changed by adding into dhun- (cf. dhin-).

1.2.5.4. Concerning the umlauting of " into " in the Abglid does not show many examples either. Cmp. M. baha "blood" vs. A.F. baha with a diphthong and Sinh. baha6 (Pit. tothiy- "red", OIA Baha "red, reed's", substance, wood). In the case of M. donji, A.F. donji "act, ship" vs. Sinh. donja "boat, cause" the umlauting seems to have been omitted, but the Maldivian word rather represents a "vulgarism." Obviously there is not even one verb showing an umlaut-change of " into " (cf. 3.8.2.4).

1.2.4. A comparison of the Maldivian vernacular reveals some more vocalic alternations which can only partially be regarded as regular. This lends itself to the following variations

1.2.4.1. Where e is a root vowel in the standard language, it often corresponds with o in the southern dialects, if followed by a in the next syllable. Cmp. e.g., M. nila - A.F. tela "shallow (water); blade"; M. loka - A.F. loka "rock"; M. lima - A.F. lama "thin"; M. olla - A.F. olla "time"; M. taha - A.F. taha "curry"; M. ata - A.F. ada "water, quiet" etc.

1.2.4.2. In some cases standard Dhivehi corresponds to M. e as a root vowel. Here, too, we observe that e is followed by o: M. amra - A.F. ara "grey hair"; M. durama - A.F. durra "ring made from rope"; M. arras - A.F. arras "across, horizontally; M. karima - A.F. karima "cool".

1.2.4.3. A triadic correspondence of root vowels which occurs regularly is that of M. o - A. al - F. al. 1. in is represented in the pronouns' adjective M. ils, t. ils, A. il "all" and, as a second component, also in the interrogative pronoun M. ilna, t. ilna, A. il "so" and in the interrogative pronoun M. ilne, t. ilna, A. il "how" (cf. 2.6.7.4.3). Some further examples are: M. rela, F. relo, A. relo "green water cattle"; M. rela, F. relo, A. relo "sandal wood"; M. gara, F. gara, A. gara "parrot"; M. sofi, F. sofi, A. sofi "she" and probably the ending of the "absolute l", M. fo, F. fo, A. fo: "fei, A. fei". In the given triad, correspondence, the diphthongs that occur in the southernmost dialects must be treated as partial pronunciations

1.2.4.4. There are numerous examples that illustrate the correspondence of M. o - A. e, F. e. "P." Cmp. e.g., M. atala - A.F. atala "all"; M. ola - A. olo, F. olo "beet"; M. gollo - A. golli, F. golli "gollii"; M. olli - A.F. olli "type of (Maldivian) ship"; M. olli.
A.F. *slêt* "front part of the clam"; M. *kêle* A.F. *kêle* "peel, end"; M. *a'i biś* ← *kêle* - A. cêś. P. *ciś̄i* "seed, out, kernel"; M. *fotm* A.F. *fôm* "form, out"; M. *hôchîbî* A.F. *hôchîbî* "Saturday"; M. *bôm* A. *bêm* A. *bêm* "thunderbolt; M. *ôamamâqu* - A. *ôamamâq*; P. *ôamamâq* "thundering". All these examples show a phonological peculiarity in that A. e and P. a were followed by a retroflex (or former retroflex) consonant. As the early documents of Dhivehi show, the e-vocalism of the southern vernacular represents an older stage of development as opposed to the a of the standard language. Since the 15th century the language of Male has witnessed a systematic change of *i* into *e* wherever *i* was followed by a single retroflex consonant. Thus, e.g., *mëna "call" is documented with *e* during the whole Kampan period in L. (s.1,1), while in later times it was almost exclusively written in the form *mëna* (e.g. F.1,4; F.1,6; F.2,12,16,19; F.13,5; F.19,9; [DAMM 1,6]). Another example is *kêh* "end" (L.6 8/1,1 3.4) vs. modern M. *kêh*. This word occurs in the name of the Atoll, *Kahwardhak*, which is already attested in the form of the locative *kahwardhak* in L.1 (6/2,12,16,19). On the other hand, the final *a* of A.F. *mućh* and other examples has to be considered as a secondary development. While final *a* was preserved in northern Maledivian, it was obviously adopted (across the retroflex consonant) to the e of the penultimiate syllable in the southern dialects.

1.2.4.5. For the correspondence of M. *a* and A.F. *e* in nasal-final position cf. 1.3.7.2. For details on the regular contextual difference concerning the final vowels in the other case of consonant stems (M. -ā, E. -a, 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 CRIBER's comprehensive historical description of its Sinhalese consonants (1935, 39 ff.). The present treatment will focus on the combinational processes and special developments of the Maldivian consonant system which are important for a general outline of Dhivehi phonology as well as morphological relations. In this context, developments that are common exclusively to the "Indo-Indo-Aryan" languages as well as phonological tendencies that are confined to Dhivehi, deserve a particular interest.

1.3.1 The change of the unrounded aspirates into their non-aspirated counterparts can be regarded as a regular process already at the time of Nārläka Dabhi (from late 3rd century B.C. until 4th century A.D.) as well as in *këh* M. See *këh* SAGA for *mućh* TARA for *dëh* DAMA for *dëh* CRIBER (1935, 30 ff.; 1937, 65 ff.) According to MASC (1995, 125), this development resulted from Tamil influence, the Tamil consonant system having no aspirates at all. Cf. also CARDULL (1912), 125: "The Dhim dances in the presence of aspirates, and has not narrowed any of the entered consonant or sound, nor even the isolated aspirate A." CRIBER (ibid.) mentions

1) For the correspondence M. *ô* A.F. *ô* etc. 1937.
2) For more information on the verb of 1937.
3) *Këh* modern Sinhalese *këh*, "community of inhabitants"; 2 "mangal, bhikka" CRIBER (ibid. 32, 121 no. 1808), saggio "multiethnic assembly; the community of bhikkas" (ibid. 17, no. 1251); see also "right, virtue, nation, man, law" (ibid. no. 9/3), dhana "law, doctrine; the Buddhist sacred scriptures" (ibid. no. 10/0).
1.3.2. The table below gives a general view of the consonant phonemes of contemporary Dhowli. Local phonemes which constitute an integral part of the Maldivian consonant system have been included as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>dental</th>
<th>alveolar</th>
<th>retroflex</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>labiodental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ɾ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ɾ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenasal stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ɾ郁闷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless nasals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced nasals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless spirants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced spirants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless affricates</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.3. Except for the prenasalised stops (cf. below), the consonant inventory of Dhowli is exactly reflected in the modern Taus script. As in the following table which represents the traditional "alphabetic" order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>dental</th>
<th>alveolar</th>
<th>retroflex</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>labiodental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ɾ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ɾ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenasal stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ɾ郁闷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless nasals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced nasals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless spirants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced spirants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless affricates</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phonemes that are retained in Maldivian regardless of their occurrence with the same spelling, are also present in Taus; however, many of them are not found in the original sound. The corresponding differences will be marked in a special symbol (e.g., ɾ郁闷).

Note: The name of the phoneme is indicated only in the non-Persian dialects of Dhowli (cf. 1.3.1).

The name of the phoneme in consonants only, cf. 1.3.3.

The name of the phoneme in the name of the phoneme only, cf. 1.3.7.

The name of the phoneme in the name of the phoneme only, cf. 1.3.9.

The name of the phoneme in the name of the phoneme only, cf. 1.3.11.
The vocalisation marks which were taken from the Arabic script are superscripted or subscribed to the basic consonant characters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.4. Within the phonological framework of the Indo-Aryan languages and the Indo-Iranian languages in general, the prenasalised stops represent a very particular phenomenon of the two Sinhalese languages, Sinhali and Sinhala, only. The articulation of the four phonemes in question, *kədɪ, kədɪ, kədɪg* and *kədɪg*, is marked by a considerable shortness in contrast to the pronunciation of the corresponding consonant clusters, *kədɪ, kədɪ, kədɪg* etc. In the modern Sinhalese script, the prenasalised stops are represented by special akshars. Within Sinhalese, the nasal component of the prenasalised plosives has been noted since medieval times, while it was still unmarked in the older Brahmi inscriptions (cf. Gunaratne 1938: 93). We find a quite different situation in written Elamli. Even when never developed any means of writing the prenasalised stops, and there was no particular character for that purpose either. In modern times, however, these different ways to solve the problem have been adapted. The most popular one follows the tradition by leaving the vocalisation unmarked and writing only the consonant element, e.g., *kədɪ, kədɪg* written as (kədɪ) "young drinking coconut", *kədɪ* (tədɪ) "difficult": *kədɪ* (tədɪ) "ginger": *kədɪ* (tədɪ) "piece, thing". For a certain period, the nasal component was expressed by the so-called "empty sign" (tədɪ), i.e., an (ə) letter remaining without any vocalisation marks or syllabification, the marker of unnasalised consonants. Only exceptionally, the prenasalised stops are written as a sequence of the 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 monophthongic character of the prenasalised stops, at least in the contemporary language. Support for a monophthongic interpretation of the prenasalised stops is given by the early documents as well. The oldest written specimens of Elamli, the Tamilian inscriptions, show that the language had only open syllables in earlier times, consonant clusters being systematically excluded. A good example is *kədɪ* (tədɪ) "piece, thing", written (tədɪ) "piece of land" in 1.3 (U.4 ed.), 1.3 (V.12 and V.15), 1.4 (V.14) etc., which means that it was to be analysed as *kədɪ*, an analysis *kədɪg* being impossible because of the given syllable structure. Another example is the syntactic (tədɪ) (1.2.8.4) "lives in the bushes" which, according to modern usage, must represent a syllable sequence *kədɪg* or *kədɪg* - further evidence for the phonetic status of the prenasalised stops can be gained from minimal pairs. Some modern Elamli words ending on a prenasalised plosive do not form the consistent with the suffix -ət, but by "segmentation".

---

60 C.f. Mascos (1991), 102: "The prenasalised stop of Sinhalese ... are apparently limited to that language in MIA (although I should add that I have been unable to find any good account of Brahmic phonology)."

61 C.f. the FEs in 1.3.2.

62 For details cf. 1.2.11.
The causative

ing’ a late n, which results in phonemic oppositions of the type -δι- vs. -λι- etc. 11 Cp. e.g., the transitive verb *ἀποδιδω* “to take” and its verbal noun *ἀποδόν* with the causative *ἀποδόσ* “to give” and its verbal noun *ἀποδός*. Another example is the intensive verb *εἰμί* “to know, understand”; its verbal noun *εἰγός* forms a minimal pair with the verbal noun *εἴγος* belonging to the causative *εἰγω* “to inform, let know”. If we consider Geschière’s derivation of parallel cases in Sinhalese (1938, 71), we may well conclude, however, that the causative formation of the Multilingual verbs in question can be traced back to an underlying suffix -ειγ- as well, thus, *εἰγος* “to know” has to be derived through the intermediate forms *εἰγογος* → *εἰγογος* → *εἰγογος* from an obsolete -ειγ- verb *ειγογος* with the transitive active meaning “to understand, recognize (something)” as corresponding to the intransitive *εἰγο* “to know, understand”.


Dravidi 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 initial 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. *rājagā “A.F. rājagā “righ”; M. *kāmu “A.F. kāmu “young drinking cucumber”; F. *kāmu “A.F. kāmu “big, great, local”. Usually the Southern variants show a stronger tendency towards the plain stops. An exception to this rule is M. *hōtī “A. *hōtī, P. *hōtā “big, large”.

Contemporary Dravidi has many words which show spontaneous prenasalisation, reception and even as *āsaṃgha (*A. *āsaṃgha “having, father”; OIA *āsaṃgha “having, father” in OIA *āsaṃgha “having, father”);
1.5.5. Another sound change that is typical for Dhivehi as well as colloquial Sinhalese, is the interaction of $s$ to $th$ in initial and medial position. While Dhivehi has completely lost initial $s$ in its indigenous vocabulary, Sinhalese shows a large amount of double forms with $s$ and $th$, the variants $v.$ $s$—$th$ 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, e.g., "muna "muster" (in the loc. case, *2.4, 1 and 1.5 252), and the compound $dsala "water line"; L3 412, etc., small $dyana in 1.7 62,6), occurring with $s$ in the earliest inscriptions (L1 62, 6.1 472, etc.) and appearing as $th$ in dyana "water line", L4 53, 5 and in 5.4 (L2, etc.) in later texts (e.g. Sinh nevathisalana, etc.). In the same documents, there are many words with "unetymological" initial $s$. These must be explained as examples of historic stilization, which implies that in the period in question, written (s) was already pronounced as Y. Cp., e.g., the Arabic name Beesin, which besides the original orthography (first two) occur in inscriptions, e.g., in IDMMH, 2.15; ITAG 1.7; very often in RC, e.g., 7.6 (is attested as $sosin$) in an Eher akkara $Sawam$ (L2, 36.3).

Some further examples for $s$ to $th$ in initial position are $M$. Hansa, A. hande, S. $hande "masti" vs. Sinh. haddasalana "nd" (Pa. candra; GT. candra "nd"); $M$. Kethu, F. Ketho, A. beedal "beet", jukaal "juckal" vs. Sinh. kivastigala "ld" (Pa. sigala; GT. sigala "ld"); S. lanhoo, A. lano, F. laa, "Lance, percola" vs. Sinh. accalaka "ld" (Pa. salka; GT. salka "ld"); $M$. noa, A. noo, F. noo "cock" vs. Sinh. niyana "junge cock", gathis laajana (Pa. caaika, GT. caaika "mutchling, sickle")..

In medial position the change $s$ to $th$ has infected inherited words without any exception in all Maldivesian varieties, e.g., "diwai = A.M.A. $diwada "skender"; $bees = M.A. $meh, F. mrel "My", $bees = M.A.F. jahan "beat" (stems) etc. Medial $s$ was conserved only when it was importance for morphological reasons.

Wore-final $s$ remained unchanged in contrast: Dhivehi and in Adiga while is developed into $h$ in Pa. Maldives where it is followed by a secondary syllable (goth) vowel which is not phonetic. This goth vowel is identical with the vowel of the last syllable, e.g., F. goth $maa "fish" M.A. maar, F. goth $maa "two" M.A. maar, F. goth $maa "all, high" (M.A. moor). F. goth $maar (M.A. maar "ground, soil"), S. bhool $maar "egg" (M.A. bish), F. goth $maar "going, away gone" (derivative of $maar"to go") M.A. maar, etc.".

In contrast to the inherited vocabulary, $h$ has been reserved in loanwords and foreign words not only on the phonetic, but also on the phonological level, e.g., M.A.F. aamada "Acacia", M.A. meriit "tomato, season", M.A.P. yamaa "drunk", etc. The
derivation of M.A.E. gin "letter" seems to be more complicated. If the word had emerged from the "message" directly or through an intermediate (not attested) MIA form, we would expect, rather, initial s- not m-.⁴⁴ for contemporary Dhivehi. Even if the Dhivehi word represented a phonetic (in the sense of a new sound), s- could not have been observed as such. Therefore, the most probable source of m- is M. kin "letter";⁴⁵ in this case, no change of initial s- to m- has to do with the similar sound change in the early history of Dhivehi (e.g., O.K. Dh. sausa <- MIA sama- "moon").

s- in the more recent past, Dhivehi has been affected by two remarkable sound changes: \( s' \rightarrow f \) and \( s' \rightarrow d \).¹¹ It is not possible, however, to establish the exact date of these changes, because \( s' \) and \( s' \) were never written with separate characters before the Thana period. Thus, it remains uncertain, since when the Dives akuru characters for \( p' \) and \( j' \) can be taken to represent \( s' \) and \( s' \), resp., e.g., the Dives akuru forms psiosku (scil. "water"), ⁴² IPMD 2 *s* and saperunru (past.poss. pron. pl. pgo~a).⁴³ for Dives akuru \( s' \) vs. Thana \( s' \), e.g., kom (absolute of limma "to make, do") ⁴⁵ to a. 299,13, beginning with 1.1 21.2, late "island, land" (attested 84 times, beginning with 1.1 [21.2] as well as against kom (GITMK 1.13) and raia (RC 23.12) written in Thana. While Maldivian documents do not provide exact information about the time of the specialization of \( f' \) and \( d' \) themselves, external evidence can be drawn from Pyramids and CHIQTUDEH; there are words that witness both in the changes of p- \( s' \) and \( s' \rightarrow d \) (in initial and medial position). PYRAHAIR, who arrived in the Maldives from 1607 to 1609, used \( p' \) in his wordlist in all cases concerned, while CHIQTUDEH, who came to the Maldives in 1834, already wrote \( s' \) without any exception. Examples from PYRAHAIR's list are (aigau) (M. aless: "fire", (aigau) (M. am: "water", (aigau) (M. boraqan: "Thursday", (aigau) (M. jolii: "White", (aigau) (M. naiqaj: "finger nail" and the name of the island (bess-pithi-ground) (cf. M. jolii "small island, small back"). In contrast to these spellings, CHIQTUDEH's list shows (aigau), (aigau), (aigau), (aigau), (aigau), (aigau). We may conclude that the change of p into f has not taken place not earlier than the early 17th century and not later than the early 19th century.

⁴⁵ For details on the development of s-, s', d' in A. 1.5 5-1.
⁴⁶ Direct loans from Hindi to Dives and vice versa in modern Dhivehi. The Maldives are a way of south and southeast contacts and cultural solutions with many parts of the subcontinent, the contacts in Dives being absolutely close. There are many educated people in Maldives who dispose of a good knowledge of Urdu or Hindi. Let it be not least that there is a tradition of visiting India and other countries of this subcontinent regularly because of various health problems.
⁴⁷ For detailed information on the spellings: (aigau), (aigau), (aigau) 2.9.6.
⁴⁸ For the aigau number of 2.51.
⁴⁹ For details of 2.51 1.2.
" For detailed on the irregular absolute formation of 3.10.4.
1.5.6.1. For an exact dating of the change of \( r \rightarrow \delta \), however, the two words do not give any reliable indication. The only fact that can be stated with certainty is that already in Pyunado’s time the non-geminated phoneme \( ɾ̝ \) was not realized as \( r \) in any large in medial position. The spellings (\( ɾ̝ \) “ripe coconut” (M. kāți), (\( ɾ̝ \) “peel, shell, back” (M. tāti), (\( ɾ̝ \)) “air” (M. tāți), (\( ɾ̝ \)) “eight” (M. aṅī tāt-ak), incert. form) as well as the name of the island (\( Maqūlā.eqəp̪ɔʁ \)) indicate that medial \( \delta \) was already pronounced as a palatal fricative \( r \) sound. The articulation being somewhere in between Czech \( ě \) and Turkish \( \hbar \). Christoffler indicated a similar spirant by spellings like (\( ɾ̝ \) “ripe coconut” (\( ɾ̝ \) “fat head” (M. ma [&](\( \delta \) “eggsplaat” (M. būt “box” (M. būt)), while in the case of (\( ɾ̝ \) “back”, (\( ɾ̝ \)) “air” or (\( ɾ̝ \)) “plate, dish” (M. tāt) he used plain \( r \) as Pynado did. Geerl. who studied this spirant, “a sound peculiar to Mlthirvan, difficult to describe” (1919: 114 f. 1935, 16, 190-1902, 111, 127), transcribed it with \( r \), while Bell used \( r \). The pronunciation of \( r̝ \) “(\v{c}ér) ɾ̝ ” as a dental spirant similar to \( r \) can still be heard in Ma’ulaku and also from the speakers of the “Dalab language” in Male, who alternate between \( r \) and \( ɾ \) without phonological reasons. It is only on the basis of an intermediate pronunciation \( ɾ̝ \) that the peculiar development of the participial form M. bāt (\( ɾ̝ \), e.g. A. kāt, F. bāt long form) and I. bāt, cf. below, can be explained.

1.5.6.2. In the vernacular of Huvadō, \( ɾ̝ \) retroflex \( ɾ \) is preserved in its original quality without any exception. In the following examples illustrate: H. koŋi “ripe coconut” (M. kātī, A.P. kātī), F. galangī g.e. “toni (the island Galafis)” (i.e. “strom sandbank”), galangī “[galing] firi e,” e.g. A.P. generic firi). H. bāt past. pret. “being, remaining; standing” (A. bātī, F. bāt, M. bāt, cf. M. bū “in state, remain, hold”); 01:2.2.1). The same holds true for the inherited ending of the active, e.g., which is preserved in \( r \) original form ending in a vowel as well as as an apocopated verbal ending \( -r \) in Huvadō, C. e.g. H. dō Franç “(\( \xi \)) the door” vs. M. A. dōr “door”, F. dørak; “I. matti “urwaad(s)” vs. A. matta; M. māntu “tell, F. matala (dat. of the enem matt “top; above”).

1.5.6.3. The creative \( ɾ̝ \) which had emerged from \( ɾpl \) in the whole Dhivehi speaking area, finally developed into \( m \) in Huvadō. While a similar sound change has remained exceptional in the other dialects (e.g., M. aburen “assure” \( aŋezen \) pers pron 1sg., originally meaning pl. “we”, nowadays e.g. “I.”, or M. kantar “hathi, I. kerandau “hathi” vs. A. kərəndu “see here”), it spread out in Huvadō, where it has affected a wide area. According to ILSD, 154, the subdialect on the eastern parts of the Huvadō-Aadu seems to be more conservative in this respect e.g. e.g. East H. fōti “navel” vs. West H. fōti (cf. M.A.D. fiti). The material thus 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 despirantization in its phonematic system as does Huvadō. This agrees with the fact that the development of \( r \rightarrow \delta \) which can be observed in Dhivehi in general has reached a higher level in Huvadō than anywhere else in this language.

138 For more information on this subdialect cf. the introduction, 6.1.4.
139 On the particular problem of the relative ending in Ma’ulaku cf. 23:1.1.3.
140 For details cf. 26:2.3.2.1.
The phonemes /l/ and /n/:  

In contrast to Sinhalese where the retroflex lateral /l/ coincided with /n/ in pronunciation which led to a permanent confusion in orthography, 36 Dhivelli has preserved the phonemic difference between the laterals. The retroflex /l/, which has also phonetically coincided with its dental counterpart /n/ in Sinhalese, 37 has lost its phonemic status in Standard Dhivelli, 38 while the southern dialects still provide many examples of the retroflex nasal and, furthermore, even some minimal pairs contrasting this with dental /n/.

3.1. Thus, e.g., M. j:mā “worm”, etymology is homophone of M.A.F. j:mā “(coconut) scute”, 39 with dental /n/ in the standard language, while the Addu and Jum Mihini dialects show a distinctive retroflex /l/ in A. j:nā, B. j:nā “worm”.40 An example of a minimal pair that is only distinguished by the two phonemes /l/ and /n/ is M.A.F. nī “light” (noun and adj.) vs. M.A. nī, P. nī “rate, grey”.41


3.1.2. There are some isolated examples of a correspondence of M. /l/ and A.E. /f/ in Dhivelli. Besides the words M. j:ri:lā / A. j:ri:lā “cow” 42 and M. rulā / A. rulā “anger, temper”, which are distinct from an etymological point of view, we have to note M. wā:la / A. wā:la, P. wā:la “well” which is related to Sinh. wa:la “bol.e, pr.” This word originates from

---

37 "Zwischen Lund i besagt ein Unterschied der phonetisch-lautlichen Bedeutung der drei in den Schlichitengrau und Isorrala. Die Ausgangsgründe haben, laut schlichitengrau, stehen die gleichen.
38 C. Gregor, 1988, 33. "in the phonetic system of Sinh. /l/ often occurring in the written language even nowadays. But being to the fact that there is no difference now in pronunciation between /l/ and /n/ a great number of words in Sinh. orthography... and many words and terms a e.g. "by" and "why" by others."
39 The retroflex pronunciation of /l/ as /l/ in medial position e.g. 36 and before a following vowel, which is typical for Sinh. Dhivelli is exclusively found in this phonetic position and is regarded as an phonetic "nasal" e.g. M. j:ri:lā "don't get it" (pro. int. of sinhə “wa:la”), which is pronounced as "don’t get it" (pro. int. of donā “wa:la”), which is pronounced as "don’t get it" (pro. int. of donā “wa:la”).
40 C. Gregor, 1992, 35. "In the phonetic system of Sinh. Dhivelli is exclusively found in this phonetic position and is regarded as an phonetic "nasal" e.g. M. j:ri:lā "don’t get it” (pro. int. of sinhə “wa:la”), which is pronounced as "don’t get it" (pro. int. of donā “wa:la”), which is pronounced as "don’t get it" (pro. int. of donā “wa:la”).
41 C. Gregor, 1992, 35. "In the phonetic system of Sinh. Dhivelli is exclusively found in this phonetic position and is regarded as an phonetic "nasal" e.g. M. j:ri:lā “don’t get it” (pro. int. of sinhə “wa:la”), which is pronounced as "don’t get it” (pro. int. of donā “wa:la”), which is pronounced as "don’t get it” (pro. int. of donā “wa:la”).
42 For the secondary lengthening of the Fut. Middle variant cf. 2.3.12. 12
43 For details on the traditional weights cf. BELL (1833), 114 f.
44 The etymological connection of this word with O.A. P., pade, P. pade, "arm" is rather problematic. 39 1966, 1-52, no. 2994. In the Dhivelli form, both the consonants and the long Dhiv. /l/ could be explained by these bases.
OIA əndə “side on the ground” which through ISk. ananda- developed directly into southern Dhivra A. əndə, F. əndə. The development of d into t which we observe both in northern Dhivra and in Sinhalese, must be secondary, as against this.

The verb M. əndə “to live, be, believe” with its equivalents A. əndə and F. vəndə must be considered within the same framework. While in the modern standard language and in Acld, the inflection of this verb shares the pattern of the a-stems, the Frā Mutaka variant shows the paradigm of the a-stem. The correlation of the dialectal variants becomes evident by means of the time forms; e.g., the 1ps.sg.pres. M. əndə vs. A. vəndəna and F. vəndina, or the 1ps.sg.past. M. ənduvs vs. A. vəndənuma. F. vəndinuma.\[^{18}\] We cannot take it for granted that the northern and southern variants represent the same etymology, but we have to consider that besides the correspondence of the reflexive sounds ṭ and nd, there are also some older variants of the verb which speak in favor of an etymological relation.\[^{12}\] For the older standard language, two variant forms of the past pres. of this verb are attested, viz. vəndəna (L4 əndə, 12) and vəndəna (D4. vəndə, L2 22,3 etc.).\[^{12}\] It seems obvious that vəndəna represents a later development here, just as in nd discusses was opposed to in.\[^{12}\] Thus we can assume that it was the reflexive consonant which influenced and changed the quality of the preceding vowel here in the same way as it became d in the position before a reflexive consonant (cf. l.2.4.4).

Another example of the l-d-correspondence is provided by the dialectal variants of the past pres. of kəwəm “to move, do”. The form M. əndə “side, move” which is attested frequently since L1 (var. 1.2) but is no longer used nowadays, opposes itself to F. kədə and to A. kəde. In all probability, the d vowel of the southernmost dialects represents an earlier phonological stage here, too, just as the reflexive pleonastic ū in A. kəde seems to be more archaic than the reflexive initial d- of the other forms.\[^{12}\]

1.3.3. Like Sinhalese, Dhivra does not tolerate consonant clusters in any position.\[^{13}\] Thus, all words that show consonant clusters in initial or final position must be of foreign origin; e.g., M. kəndə “mention” = Ar. qand “aim, purpose, intention”, or the sanskritism pradān “the first” which is attested in L2 33,2 (≠ Skt. pradāna-; cf. 2.5.2). In contrast to Frā, consonant groups in medially position can be based on two different developments. Either the words in question are of foreign origin as well (like kəndə “weeds” = Gk. Med. Pers. kənda, bhūta “knowledge” = Ar. dhimmun “sister” = Ar. dhīl). or — in all other cases — the cluster extends over a simple mora boundary or connected words like M. dənke, A. dənke. F. dənke “country” = dhən “light, white; b/haired, light-skinned” + ləl “light fruit”; M. vəndə “fission”, T. vəndə “fat, white coral sand” = dhən “light” (v.2.) + M. vənt, F. vēnt “sand”).

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

\[^{13}\] The preceding stage in the northern variant of the d-variant is regular, cf. also the table given in 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.
\[^{14}\] Cf. also 3.4.2.24.
\[^{15}\] For more details cf. 3.1.1.2.
\[^{16}\] A detailed account of this parenthesis is given in 3.4.2.22. For Sinh. kəndə “dust” of G. T. FRooP (1938), V. 14.
\[^{17}\] Cf., e.g., M. T. S. (1951: 22-7)

1.3.9. Germinates

Dr. SILVA has shown in his table (1980, 203) that in modern Dhivehi all consonants with the exception of the palatalised stops, the palatal spirant ž and the glottal stop h are germinated as geminates. In contrast to the SILVA's statement according to which the subvocal lateral ɾ, too, appears only as a single consonant, there are a few examples showing gaminated ɾ 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 formation period between MIA and NIA all MIA geminates were reduced to single consonants.¹ Most of the geminates that occur in contemporary Dhivehi can be explained by secondary assimilations of different consonants,² the assimilatory processes being progressive or regressive. There are clear indications that progressive assimilations began earlier than those directed backwards; nowadays, however, Dhivehi exhibits 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 one cases — by phenomena of sandhi,³ 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 frequent spelling of geminates is (C), while (CC)⁴ is used less often (e.g., *remūna* "(the) first",⁵ now written (rēmuva) as against original (remuva) in *TFA* 3.1 and *TIA* 1.3). 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 Cf., e.g., *GUGER* 1929, W. v. MAIER 1931. 182.
² On the historical development of the geminates cf. 1.1.15
³ For details on the sandhi rules cf. 1.6.
⁴ The spelling of the man. the same word can very even nowadays, because there are no orthographical

12 For details cf. 2.6.2.
Phonology

The first, like Pt. rathwa-rathwa, to Skt. ragnr-ragnr (from OIA ranhra- "kingdom, country" + -an- "inhabiting"), while the germinative -a in ragnr: is the result of a progressive assimilation of -a, the form ragnr, which is no longer associated with ragnr by the native speakers of Dhaieli, obviously has to be traced back to a progressive assimilation of a into a.

Considering ragnr, there are two different ways of formation which have to be taken into account. On the one hand, ragnr could be derived directly from ragnr as well. Although it seems rather unlikely, we cannot exclude the possibility that the two assimilation processes in question occurred at the same time (-ev- > -ev- and -aev-, within one and the same dialect). On the other hand, we have to take into consideration that the form ragnr could represent a (relatively) recent formation, namely a compound consisting of Div. ev = RV, se "land, island" and evi = "island, inhabitant, inhabitant" (= Sikh, Matyani "inhabitant"); cf. also divi < Div. strewe "island, inhabitant of the island's, i.e., the Matyes", 15.9.9.5. which could have developed independently from the uninflected compound ragnr. While RV is well documented in Old Dhaieli (since 1.11), there are no attestations of Dhaieli as a single word at all. This is why we cannot expect to turn out at what time Dhaieli became obsolete in the spoken language. By all means, even if ragnr were of comparatively recent origin, we still must have been in use at the time of its formation. — One more example of a progressive assimilation of a > a has been cited in "hegnder" (from "village-person"). M. evan/ev < ev "village" (cf. 2.3.2.4.1) — further examples showing regressive assimilation of -ev > -ev- are, e.g., M. evirown evirown ("agreement, encouragement") ("heart, mind, feeling"); evi "force, size, greatness"); M. evi-dire "why" (cf. 2.8.7.2.5), M. evi-dire-vest, A. evi-vest, 5. evi as "event" (cf. 2.6.7.5).

15.9.2.1. In northern Dhaieli final -ei and -ai were affixed when they were followed by -a or -u. Through intermediate -e- and -e-, they developed into the germinated affixes -a- and -a-. In contrast, in southern dialects show a regressive assimilation in these cases, which leads to the germinated prefixes A.F. -a- and -a-. While the formation of the voiceless germinative -a-, which is attested already for the Old Dhaieli period, as avoided to the standard language as a living phonological process until nowadays, the voiced affixes -a- and -a- have been used in some isolated examples. The same holds true for the southermost varieties, where -a before -a and -a is phonetically realized as -a-, while the corresponding development of the voiceless germinative -a- is not seen in a few words only which can be considered as frozen forms.

15.9.2.1. From the synchronic point of view, the occurrence of the germinative M. -e- and A.F. -a- is a morphological feature in the formation of the inanimate forms and the native of the very few stems with -a- 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 southermost dialects: the definite form and all the case forms based on it in Adh.; the germinative, e.g., as Adh. and Par. Malhari, the adjectives, in Par. Malhari. The effect of these morphological rules may be illustrated with two constructions of this type which are in use nowadays:

3.2.3.2. In the standard language, the affixation of final -ti is due to a certain kind of sandhi, when infinitives in predicate position precede the infinitive marker -i. Cf. M. 40.1, "beautiful" against on koṣṭha nireṭ thitt-i-evat 'this room is beautiful' or M. 40.1, "bitter" as aga eva nireṭ thitt-i-evat 'the tea is bitter'.

3.9.3. As was stated above, there are only a few examples of the development of *di = *jī in the standard language and *diti = *dī in the southern vernaculars. In contrast to the change of *dī into *dī in -ō, 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 bases kari "child" and naimaeti "prince" show this morphonomological process only in their definite forms, and the depending case forms; e.g. the nom.sg., karī (F. kardī) "the child". In the standard language, besides kari (F. kardī) "the child" the indefinite form is affected as well by the affixation; e.g. M. "kari" as kari jī "a child", kāri nī "the child". — The nom.sg. kalāmi "prince", which is well attested in the history of the language (1.6.1,2 and 2.3; RA 2,1), kālaṇi in PS.38 and 7C.14,1), as kalāmi, as its definite form, which has to be derived through *kalāmi from kallāmi (e.g. of the (frequent) attestations of this word show *jī) which was the noun spelling of *jī, hence the written form is regularly (kalāmi) (e.g. RC 17,10; RC 22,1; etc.). The modern Dhivehi word for "state, empire", originally "kingdom", which appears in the dialectic variants M. rājja (cf. Sinh. rājja) as the official name of the Maldives; and A.F. rādha, represents a sandhi. While the form rājja (Sinh. rājja) "kingdom, kingdom", cf. TURK, 8466, 1. 6.1, no. 10864), which is attested already in 1. (16.1,5), 2.6 (6.1) and 1.2 (21.2 and 30.1) with the spelling (dy-) for -jī-, represents the nominative, the numerous variants ending in *jī which appear in different spellings such as rājdy (F.5.13; F.6.11; 17.13 20; FS.15; F13.2; F1C.12.15; I.11.9.17; JNE 3.25 and 27). rādha (F.3.2.1), rādy (F.3.2.1), rājja (F.3.2.1), rājja (with Atta. (1) KA 1.6), have to be explained as locative forms in the "kingdom, in the state". In Modern Dhivehi the locative form of the locative has been re-interpreted as a nominative.

Footnotes:
1. For the distribution of the two suffixal variants of 2.3.2.1 (RA), 2.3.2.3 (6.1), 2.3.2.x.1 and 2.3.2.3.1 (M).
2. For the sandhi rules cf. 1.6.
3. CF. 2.4.
4. For further details on the morphology and on the use of these forms in the modern language cf. 2.3.3.7.2, 2.3.2.3.1, 2.1.1.3 and 2.3.2.3.1.3.2.
In standard Dhivehi, the formation of the "pre-serif IV" which contains dāhī "to go" as an auxiliary verb must be explained within this framework; cp. I. ps.p. dāhīna < dāhī-11, 2.3.3.p.s. gahī-11, I.2.3.p.s. dāhīnā < dāhī-11. The historical development is clearly shown by the early attestations of M. dāhī "back," A.P. ps.p. pres.IV of dāhī "become," viz. ādāhī (Fl 10,18), vedāhī (5.23.3.44; SMDHM 4.2.2), gahī (Fl 10,19), vagāhī (spelled venjī, RC 29.11) and (venjī) RC 5.3 and 30.13; the earliest attestations of the contemporaneous form vejā (spelled ṭeṇjē) (RC 1.7) can be found on a tombstone of the site of the Māne Hukum Mosque (TIMHM 1.7); the dating is uncertain and in RC (2.6).

1.2.9.4. The gemination and palatalization of -s& preceding a vowel-final in combination with the indefinite suffix is restricted to northern Dhivehi. (Cf. the indefinite forms māhī < mādi < dāhī "boat," shī < dūrī "dirt." (M. dūrī "birth").) The same holds true for the ending of the definite māhīna, dūrīnī (c.6).

1.2.9.5. The paradigmatic interchange of -di (< -s) and -s & occurring in some i-stems can be followed in the whole Dhivehi speaking area, the phonological development of si-IV < sīV < sīV < sīV is the same equivalent with A.P. i-IV < āi-IV < āi-IV (cf. 1.3.9.2). Cp., e.g., M.A. dhīvī < Māsīnī < vi, M.H. dīvī- < dīvī- < dīvī- (< dīvī-) (cf. 1.3.9.6). While the roots ending in -ii (< -i) have survived as a comparatively homogeneous group in Ādī, they were subject to morphological simplifications in Īnū, Mālūka and even more so in the standard language. Cf. M.A. mihi, M. méhi "fly" < māsī (cp. I. Śī. root stem māsī-māhī < Skt. māvākī- "fly, etc." [165]), where in Ādī -i is preserved within the geminate s-s- throughout the paradigm while we find a compensatory change of -i to -a in Īnū. Mālūka: cf. A. nom.def. mehē lāsī ti, nom.indef. mehē lāsī (the adjectives māhī kī méhi), gen. mehē lāsī-1, dat. mehē lāsī-1 ti vs. G. nom.indef. (only) māhī lāsī-1, gen. méhī lāsī-1, dat. méhī lāsī-1.

1.3.9.6.1. The formation of causatives from verbs with -s& as their original final root consonant is affected by the same morphological interchange of -di-IV < gahī-11 < jahāngī "boat, strike, kick, blow (with), ring (bell)" with its causative jahāngī < jahānā-11 (cf. 1.3.9.12.1 and 3.2.1.1).

---

1 For more data (cf. 3.1.4.5).
2 For the loss of -ā in the standard language of 1.3.9.
3 The statement of Fl 131 (1983), p. acceding to which "in morphological features of Dhivehi is that rumphones containing the dāhī vowel -i in the final syllable... are replaced by the simple -i when they are followed by certain suffixes,
4 This process, however, because it is not a question of certain suffixes. Besides the mechanism under the thematic process is also triggered by the ending of the dative, i.e., all nominal suffixes with final vowel are concerned. The status of the verbal morph is, of 1.3.9.
5 Cf. from "vehī" cf. 2.6.2.1.4 but then → reflects the "mālūkī" cf. 1.3.9.1.
6 For other and examples of 1.3.9.12.2 and 2.6.2.1.2.1 (Ādīnī), 2.6.2.1.4 and 2.6.2.1.2.2 (F. Mālūka) and 2.6.2.1.3.1 and 4 (F. Mālūka).
7 Cf. GRIGER 11.411, 135, no. 11955 in, mehē and TORDER (1986) I 554, no. 9865 s.v. mehē.
3.9.6. The geminates -pp- and -pp- are of particular interest because the inherited OIA geminates -pp- and -pp- are preserved in their origins, quality only within these geminates contexts (cf. 1.3.6). There are only a few examples as in this, which will be treated below.

1.3.9.6.1. The geminate -pp- occurring in the kinship term M. ḫanā, A.F. ḫanā, ḫanā cannot be analyzed any further because the word originally originated in children's language. — M. ḫarnādi, A.F. ḫarnādi "long" contains Dīv. ḫarnā, which does not exist as an independent word; it second part is M. ḫā, A.F. ḫā "face." 13 Dīv. ḫarnā can be identified with Sīr., ḫarā "long" which, according to Turner (1956, II. 51), no. 3009d as to be derived from OIA pharrānu- "rings." In Sino-Hindu, we also meet with a word sāmrānu "long" which, like Dīv. ḫarnā (with the regular change of p → f), must be explained as a geminate. — A few consonant stems with final ḫā which were combined with the honorific suffix -ppāh (→ ḫppāh) in the standard language were obviously fixed in this combination before ḫppā developed into ḫā. The geminate -pp- occurring in these words is the result of an assimilative geminization of ḫā; cf. ṭappās ḫppāh "head of a person of high social status" and ḫppāh ḫppāh "head of a person of high social status." Most probably, the island name ḫappāh (12.5.1) shows the same development as well. — In a similar way the geminal -pp- of some verbs was preserved in their causative forms (cf. 3.2.1.1) because of a progressive assimilation leading to geminated -pp-. ḫā, e.g., M.A.F. ḫatiṭān is ḫaṭān "to hold, catch (something)" with its causative ḫaṭān ḫaṭān ḫaṭān the let hold, let catch, let it catch (cf. also the substantive M.A.F. ḫaṭa "catcher", reflecting the imperative "catch the" of the causative ḫaṭān); ḫā, also ḫaṭan = ḫatān "to cut (something)" with the simple causative (meanwhile being obsolete) ḫaṭān ḫaṭān ḫaṭān the let cut and the double causative (cf. 3.2.1.11) M. ḫaṭappān ḫaṭappān "to have something cut (by someone of lower social class)."

3.9.6.2. The geminate ḫā in many cases has no origin in a progressive assimilation of -pp-, as in the compound nouns ṭappā "friend, companion" and ṭappāta "companion" (cf. 1.3.9.1). This is also true for causative formations with -pp- being based on primary verbs with original -pp- (or ḫā is cf. 1.3.9.1). Cf. M.A.F. ḫatān ḫaṭān "to catch, cut (e.g., wood)" with the double causative M. ḫatān ḫaṭān "to let someone (catch) a lower social class cut," the primary causative ḫatān ḫaṭān does not exist any longer (cf. 1.3.9.2.1 and 3.2.1.11).

3.3.9.6.1. The sound change -pp- is attested, e.g., M. ḫatān ḫaṭān "and the island" (L1 51.1, L2 5.4 etc.; nom. ḫatān in L1 52.2, L2 5.3 etc.; cf. M. ḫatān, A. ḫatān, F. ḫatān "small island") and ḫaxā ḫaxā "and the enclosures" (L2 15.5 etc.; 13 53.2, 14 52.3, ḫaxā ḫaxā ḫaxā ḫaxā "and the enclosures" 12.26.5), ḫatān ḫatān "being named enclosure" 12.15.5, the M. ḫatān ḫatān "garden, walled in area" (cf. modern M.A.F. ḫatān "garden").

111. This etymology of ḫatān is not clear.
1.3.9.6.2. The genitive -a must be of later origin, because it cannot have developed before the transliteration of -ari into -a. All examples concerned can be explained by assuming regressive assimilations; cf. M. kaffa—'rainy, rainy landscape, rural district' (for M. kaffa 'land, island' cf. 1.3.9.1; pata as the previous form of -sakti 'back, surface, top side' is attested, e.g., as a locative ati pata 'on horse back' in L1 6141; 12, cf. also GISHER 12 who compares (Sinh.) 'saca' (this spelling (seven) means -s in -s) with Sinh. pata ← OIA -pata- 'back, hind part'; M. affa—'just six, grain, cattle' (distributive plural) 'corn by corn', cf. 2.3.2.5); M. fa{'sakti 'front' corresponds to Sinh. pati 'id.' ← OIA -pata- 'crushed, ground; inner'; A. daffa 'side of the foot'; Daffa-(f-, actually 'under side of the foot' (cf. the earlier form da door in L1 81.2; 12, 222; 2; 5; 112; 136; 10.19 etc. and derma in RC 5.12 'under side, bottom'); dafu a. s. of 'from the under side, from below' in 16.28; 27.28; 27.3; 11.22 etc.; F3.18; 10.1.1.2; 10.1.3.6), M. fa. A. fa 'foot' belongs to Sinh. pata 'foot', ← OIA *pa-da-; A. affhara infa 'father' (one time, once upon a time) (in *fafi nun 'one', infahun a. d. of A. affhara, M. fafa 'father') etc.

1.3.9.7. Different genitivates emerged in modern times as a result of assimilation on the complete boundary of compounds, e.g., M.A.F. a-fakku init-tela 'village' (cf. M. ni 'nun' 'forest, forest'), M. athu 'agreement' (yekki 'mark' + -athu 'word, language'); M.A.F. emma hesi-ada 'all, every, whole'). It cannot be excluded that M.A.F. udahia udahaili 'sugar cane' reflects a loan compound from Sinhala (e.g. Sinh. na, ni-linda, also s. ligm, ligg 'sugar cane' ← OIA *skhu- 'ed'.

1.3.9.8. As a rule, genitivates that occur in foreign words are not changed in modern Dhivehi. C.f. e.g., M.A.F. onna 'Sunday' (Sanskritism; cf. 1.2.1.1); M.A.F. baddi 'mind, intellect, spirit' (transliteration; cf. Sk. Pa. baddhu, Sk. baddhi 'intelligence, discernment'; M. badda 'old man' 'true statement; cf. Pa. Pkt. baddha- 'old'); M.A.F. tayyara-ada 'ready' ← Pers. tayyar 'ready'); M. muhtarri 'teacher' (cf. Arabic 'id'); M.A.F. biffari 'at (of) glass' (cf. Ar. b'dafar, b'dim 'crystal, of glass'); M. unziri 'employee, official' (Arab. iynziraf 'id.'); cf. WBP 1958, 960 etc.

1.3.9.9. Nevertheless, many genitivates remain that cannot (yet) be explained historically. C.f. M.A.F. bari (Maldive type of sailing boat'; M. datta, A.F. datta 'elder sister; older woman'; M. bokkud, A.F. bokkum 'small, young boat'; M. bokko, A.F. bokk'o 'younger brother or son'; M. lobbo 'yes'; M. abulla, A. bollud i. dimu' 'he is, private'; M. lasu 'mangrove'; M. udhila 'green, greenish'; M. udhila 'green, greenish'; M. matima, A.F. matimatu (A. also annu 'nicher', M.A.F. uddari 'beach'; M. uddari).
1.3.9.1. Concerning the regular correspondences of certain consonantal clusters and geminates, we have to note a few specific developments that occur only in a restricted dialectal area. For e.g., M. onyacin “Thursday” (JTAG 3.2, 11PM 2.6); F. berástet vs. A. berásted “wait” vs. A.H. stáfi with a change of -st to -st; there is also a very surprsing correspondence of M. n. vs. A.  a in M. kathra, A. khattra “sweet potato, beet” as well as A.  a in A. eggá, reggá (noun def. A. eggá “coconut”). F. offers “single” (from the coconut tree). From a chronological point of view, these correspondences cannot be explained yet.

1.3.9.1.0. When a consonantal stem ending in -st comes into the position before a word with initial consonant, the resulting phonetic process occurring on the moraic boundary is not the same in northern and southern Dhuveli. While in the standard language the development takes a diphthong (VC+C -> V+C), in the southern dialects a corresponding geminate emerges by regressive assimilation (VC+C -> VCC). For e.g., M. allíla lat-táli vs. A.H. at-táli “palmyra” (lit. “bark, r.”) + M. tíla, A.H. tálí “shallow (water); blace”); M. addádi vs. A. oddádi “addádi” (lit. “hand, addádi” + oddá “stick”); M. addádi vs. A.H. addádi “addádi” (lit. “tooth” + addá “tooth”). A. dábádi “dábadádi” (lit. “almonds”); M. ragá vs. A. ragáam, F. ragá “red olive” (lit. “red stone”); M. ráma “red”; M. ráma “red”; M. ráma “red”; F. ammá “red”; M. ráma “red”; F. mómá “red”; M. ráma “red”; F. mómá “red”. (F. mómá “red.”) 1.3.9.1.1. While in the standard language -sv in Bźra “secret” (-Adó, sv “secret, mystery”) is articulated as a geminated velar fricative, the ablative form A. hárón shows a regular assimilation into [bźrə]. For a similar development in external sandhi cf. 1.6.

1.3.9.1.2. Geminates in the verbal system

Generally speaking, the gemination of the last consonant of the verbal root has an important morphological function in the formation of causatives. In many cases the historical development of causatives can thus be traced back both from the normal and from the semantic point of view (for fuller details cf. 3.2.1). C.f. the following examples:

1.3.11 (1941), 24, no. 283 and (1966) B. 815, no. 14168.
2. C. CARTER 1935, 61. This word is unknown in the standard language. For the single example, the common word meaning “to sink” (cf. other examples), the suppletive verb hárón is used.
1.3.9.12.2. The whole morphological pattern of e-stem verbs such as M. karmani "to die", ksa in "to sit, marry, be married", dahnani "to know, understand", harmani "to stand, stay, remain, be", samani "to enter" etc. 132 is characterized by the geminate -ni-; 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. kaqani /kaqani/ "to put" is composed of ka- /ka/- "doing, making" (abs. of karmani "to do, make") and a nowadays obsolete verb *qani* with unknown meaning, which seems also to be the second part of M.A.F. kaqani (kaqani) "to close" (as to the verbal constituent ka- which cannot yet be explained, cf. M. kaqani /kaqani/ "to float, drift astir; toss = A. karmani the injection of the negatory particle of in the negated lips gapes. A. ka- mi ni (ki) is not tossed" proves that it must be an independent word which is used as a constituent of a compound verb here). One more compound verb containing the absolutive ka- is M. kaqani /kaqani/ "to close". The exact meaning of this verb is "to put down, do it"; it only occurs in M. dag kaqani "to leave" (lit. "to put down leaving" = "to leave by shaking it outside") -- the first part of M. ekqani /ekqani/ "to add, mix" consists of the numeral e- /e-\(\) thus, the basic meaning of the verb can be translated with "to make (in) e-". M. akami /akami/ "to cry" (only in M. akami /akami/ "to crawl, be a baby") obviously is a derived active verb; cf. M.A.F. hë /hë/ "cry". M.A.F. akami /akami/ "to sell" goes back to the present stem Sk., vikramati (Pā. vikramati, Pā. vikramati) "to sell" via *vikrama\-*, *vikram-*, the geminate reflecting the older sequence of -ni-.

1.3.10. Loan phonemes

While in H.A.D. (1988: 14), it is described as a phoneme of its own, 133 in S.V. (1969: 204) analyses it as a cluster consisting of the phonetic components [ny] which, of course, has no phonetic shape of its own. Obviously in S.V.'s analysis starts out from such cases as dūndē → *dūpnye*  → *dūnnek* (without *dūnnek* "be bad") the secondary geminates of which is ideally phonemic. 134 There are some isolated words with initial it- in Dhivehi, however.

132 For the morphology of karmani cf. 3.5.2.2.
133 A complete list of e-stem verbs is given in 3.4.2.
134 For details about the geminate it- cf. 1.3.9.4.
The phonemes of which cannot be analysed as a sequence of a and y by means of morphological criteria. As most of these words must be explained as (presumably) old loanwords, it seems to be adequate to see a loan phoneme here, i.e., a sound with a "low phoneme level" within the Maldivian phonological system. There are only a few words with indisputable Arabic or Persian origin, e.g., M.A. ḥarāb "harmless, foolish talk"; ḥāla "mentally retarded"; ḥakīs "a sexual practice"; ḥanūna (from hānūna) "a tropical fruit", etc. "Demotica candidula" (due to the Maldivian; the corresponding root, which was imported from Sinhalese, is called M.A. hāka, hāya, hāyā, hāri, "Maldivian kangaroo". It cannot be excluded that the first three of these words contain the negative particle "ni" (its original form, i.e., modern A.L. ni vs. M. ni) which might have been reduced to ny in the position before a vowel.

1.1.10.1. A very frequent phoneme, which occurs exclusively in loanwords from Arabic and Persian, is [i]. In most cases it is pronounced in its original phonetic value [i]. Cf. e.g., M.A.F. ṭāha "date, chronicle, history" ← Arab. ṭāhā "d."

1.1.10.2. There is one more loan phoneme, which can often be heard in its original phonetic quality, viz., [i]. Cf. M.A.F. ḥarāb "harmless" ← Pers. āhā "d.", M. baṣra "bazaar" ← Arab. Pers. baṣur etc. In contrast to that, we find the original vowel /i/ substituted by [i] in earlier loanwords; e.g., e.g., nūsah "papyrus" (ancestor since L1 J2i) ← Pers. nūsah etc.

1.1.10.3. All other foreign phonemes (as listed in the table below) are substituted by nasalized phonemes until nowadays; e.g., M. baṣra "bazaar" ← Arab. Pers. baṣur etc. Only a few people with a good knowledge of Arabic try to pronounce the sounds as written according to their original value.

1.1.10.4. The following table shows Arabic characters and their transliteration into Tene:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Tene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گ</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[The examples noted here are taken from the morphological dictionary of Sinhalese (NCUR 435 91, 15, 15). If Sinhalese is continued for; they are used in Arabic as well.]

* For this type of substitutions of Greek (for discussion).
### Examples of Arabic words transcribed into Tana:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Tana</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>دَصَنَت</td>
<td>دَصَنَت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>نَامِ</td>
<td>نَامِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm</td>
<td>أَرْمَمَ</td>
<td>أَرْمَمَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inna</td>
<td>عَمَلَ</td>
<td>عَمَلَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk</td>
<td>مَلِك</td>
<td>مَلِك</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wine</td>
<td>وَنِي</td>
<td>وَنِي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beer</td>
<td>بَرْي</td>
<td>بَرْي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look</td>
<td>لِكُنْ</td>
<td>لِكُنْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road</td>
<td>دُرا</td>
<td>دُرا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needle</td>
<td>نَدْنِي</td>
<td>نَدْنِي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat</td>
<td>كَشَ</td>
<td>كَشَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4. Syllable and word structure

As the earliest written document of Dhivehi shows, there were only open syllables in Old Dhivehi (c.f. 1.1.2 ff.). It was only because of the systematic occurrence of the processes of syncope and syncope (c.f. 1.2.3 and 1.2.5 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. Clusters are treated like sequences of two different consonants.

#### 1.4.1. Monosyllabic structures:
- CV (consonant vowel): M.A.F. "ka' "roll"; V.C. "a" tae (M. "i" "head. arm", M. "a" "seed. kenol"; M.A.F. en "salt fish"; C.V.C. M.A. "basal" "beet"; M.A.F. "ban" "fever"; M.A.F. "jewel".

Monosyllabic words which consist of a single long vowel in the standard language, such as a "word", do not represent open syllables from a phonological point of view. Instead, we have to deal with the phonetic realization of "closed syllable here, as the correspondent forms A. "and E. "show a. In either of fact, there is no word in Dhivehi, which consists of only one long vowel.

#### 1.4.2. Disyllabic structures:
- CV: M.A. "i". F. "i" "belver"; M.A.F. "agh" "sky"; CV.CV: M.A.F. "bad" "white"; M.A. "be". F. "be" "eggplant"; V.C.V.C. M.A. "am". F. "att" (ahl.) "tass. by the hand"; C.V.C.V. M. "bahi. A. "be" "wist. will"; V.C.V.C: M.A.F. "one" "all. work"; C.V.C.V. M. "eita. A. F. "eita. eitor. atonnamam"; M. "bo". A. "bo". "fetter" V.C.V.C: M.A.F. "eina. fik. mon" "all (persons)" (pl.).
1.4. Word structures like CVCVCVCV as well as longer sequences of syllables occur in compound words only. Cf., e.g., M.A. ṯanənə, T. ṯanənə ‘kata 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. (haya) — Ḍ. bīyā “smile”, M. (pipel) A. pīn ‘(a) pet, (a) wing’ or M. (tarī) — A. ṭarī ‘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/ is audible in such cases is obviously caused by the spelling. Palaeographic research shows that the assignment of the glottal value to a given letter is a comparatively recent development in the history of Dhivehi writing. In Dhivehi there were only two series of characters designating 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 rows of okaras containing /y/. We have to consider in this context that there was no word-initial /y/ in Dhivehi, inherited by having developed into /i/ 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:


Because of their special accentual status, these words with a paradigmatic interchange of tān and or in the position before a syllabic nā have to be treated as a particular group within the okara. Although their first two syllables are short, their stress falls on the second syllable, i.e., on the vowel followed by a /n/. Cf. M.A.F. āndhī ‘black’, B. āndhī ‘black’. T. ‘Maldivian’, mildef, M.T. mildef, A. mildef ‘a Maldivian (man or woman)’. A. ṭī, M.F. ṭī ‘knife’, māl ‘knife’. M.F. bahī ‘knife’, milong. A. bahī ‘knife’, māl ‘knife’ (as well M.F. equivalent).}

1 Cf. 1.7.4.2.2.
1 Cf. F. nom sā ḍad, indef velan and M. nom kev.
1.5.3. When the last syllable is short and the second long, it is the second syllable which is stressed; e.g., M.A.F. stdafx "self"; M. qārahā, A. ɣaŋ "happy"; M. ūndhā, A. ūndhā "roof"; A. ūndhā. F. ñé "it"; M.A.F. ʃambah "papaya". This rule is not effective, however, when the long syllable is preceded by a geminate; e.g., A.F. boppā "father", A.F. mowullwa "mother" (M. boppā, momma).

1.5.4. When the first two syllables are long, the last syllable is stressed; e.g., M.A.F. nāndī "the man", M.A.F. boppa "camphon".

1.5.5. When in words with three or more syllables the first two syllables are short and the third is long, i.e., the latter one which is stressed; e.g., M.A.F. ʃëndna "plum apple"; M. ñakandiana, A.F. ñammyi "cail"; A. ñeyði (def.) "the ear".

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 applies to syllables that are not followed 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 old or native speakers of the Fen' Mulaku dialect we may state the rule that word-final glottal stops (ʔ) are realised as -d before initial l-, r-, c-, the following two examples:

\[ \text{thakabab} \rightarrow \text{thakabab} \quad \text{[and issue] (Th, 205A) "springing the current moves down"} \]
\[ \text{thakabab} \rightarrow \text{thakabab} \quad \text{[and issue] (Th, 205A) "to another encountered"} \]

1.6.2. The restoration of geminates instead of sequences consisting of a glottal stop and consonant at the word boundary must be considered as a sandhi phenomenon as well; e.g.,

\[ \text{Vokalisch re-} \rightarrow \text{del the arrow} \quad \text{[not and down] (Th, 406) "the words two cycles past"} \]

1.6.3. In the Addoli dialect, final ɾ → l-, k-, d-, occurring in the position before initial vowel or h, is changed to -d, e.g.,

\[ \text{A. ñaŋa salaŋ aŋhā} \rightarrow \text{laŋa zanaŋ aŋhā} \quad \text{(Th, 333) "the teen to his from island" (ðpre ſegram. of M. jadna "to go")} \]
\[ \text{A. ñaŋa salaŋ aŋhā} \rightarrow \text{laŋa zanaŋ aŋhā} \quad \text{(Th, 333) "the teen to his from island" (ðpre ſegram. of M. jadna "to go")} \]

1.6.4. For the articulation of final -d in predicative adjectives preceding the quotation marker -d arel in the standard language, cf. 1.5.9.2.2.

---

11 It is true that the III. ending of having been of ñaŋa "in town (town)" for the construction of the subj. III frequently occurring in the Pād abar, cf. 2.11.4.2.
12 Also: for the grammatical rules concerning the formation of geminates cf. 1.5.9.
1.7. On the historical relationship of Dhivehi and Sinhalese

De Silva (1970: 157 ff.) put forward several arguments that might speak in favour of an early dialectal differentiation of Dhivehi and Sinhalese. In the course of our present investigation, we shall examine 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 realized that the initial Sinhalese glides, as inherited from Old and Middle Aryan, correspond to the voiced dental stop in Dhivehi. He realized that at least four—have developed through the palatal affricate /j/ from the original glide /y/. At the same time De Silva recognized that the few Maldivian words which show initial /y/—be of foreign origin, can the following examples: yoa (deni) /yuddhi botha/ = Engl. yod, yodh, yophon “certainty” —Ar. yaqūn “right”; yauffal, records, chronicle —Arab. yaqūna “chronicle of everyday life”. For the regular correspondence of Dhiv. al- and Sinh. /y/, De Silva derives the following correspondences (1970: 157-8): 20

M. dhivi / al. dhivi: Derma “go”, cf. Pa. yā, Sin. pithi “gives”, pres. past, wovels, travel “j”. The term Maldivian Sinh. refers to “journey”, which belongs to the same root etymologically, as was known as the verbal form in several places such as: Old Aryan “journey”, Pa. pithi “and others” “go” 21, but Pali yova. 22


One more and peculiar example which has to be treated in this context is Dhiveh. ‘alif (loc. 3.4.12) = dhys (preserved since 1.1) “milk/wood” as against Sinh. “alif, yam, yam a. ‘palms”, “alm, hom.” (cf. OIA yam a.).23

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

20 Supra: previous lexicists as well as authorities as to De Silva’s line of thought are not particularly mild.
26 In modern Dhivehi /ji/ can also occur in a locative meaning: e. loc. /ji_ada/ “below, beneath”, cf. H. M. Alcohen “below, beneath”, cf. M. A. dhys “behe”, F. dhys “below”, Old Dhiveh. dhys = a common term still.
27 Cf. Cruse (1954), 141, no. 2085
7.5. One more regular difference between Sinhalese and Dhivehi that was already treated by Dr. S. E. A. Silva consists in the development of the palatal affricates of the Old and Middle Indic-Aryan period. In Sinhalese the initial /t/ of inherited words developed into /θ/ which regularly changed into /s/ later; cf. Sinh. suvakandha "moon" — MIA əmən, OIA əmən-"id". An inherited initial /j/ became /t/ in Sinhalese, as, e.g., in old "不舒服" < Pkt. jptu< (cf. OIA bətptu< "living, life". Old and Middle IA /k/ and /k/- in medial position led to Sinh. /k/-, which, in word-final position further developed into /h/-; thus, e.g., Sinh. kada "now" at first developed, through an intermediate form like Pa. kasa- to Sinh. "kada", then (by devoicing of the stem-final /k/) to the modern stem kada-. Old medial /s/ became Sinh. /s/ while an inherited medial /j/ developed into Sinh. /ʃ/. Of Sinh. médhā "central, middle, centre" — Pa. Médhā — OIA mádhā-"id". The latter sound change can also be found in Dhivehi, e.g., M. médhā, A.G. médhā "id.".

Besides the sound changes of /t/ → /s/ treated above, Dr. Silva realized that the homorganic substitution of the palatal affricates in Sinhalese opposed 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. /θ/ which in initial and medial position subsequently changed into /s/. When the Maldivian language material is judged comprehensively, Dr. 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 avoided without contradictory results even now. Thus, e.g., OIA guya- "king" (< Pkt. guyā) exists in Dhivehi only in the form gaju (attested since L5 [232.2] etc.) which represents the expected development of /g/ → /g/ (a) but also the sound /a/ which seems to reflect the original /u/ in the attested form guya (< OIA guyāu). L5 (232.2: malākāntu) cf. 233.2.7.4 (1) (1)). Besides these two variants which occur side by side until nowadays, the singular forms raka (L4 [232.2] etc.; rāka) and raka (<10, 18 etc.) are attested as well. The corresponding Sinhalese form is rāka as expected. Cf. the older variants rākak and the inscriptive form (rāka)31. It must be assumed that all Maldivian variants of this word which contain a have to be considered as more accurate. In these cases, /u/ must have substituted the Sinh. phoneme /j/ which did not exist as such in the sound system of Old Dhivehi.
Morphology

2. The nominal categories

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

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 inherent grammatical distinction of animate masculine and feminine substantives has been preserved until nowadays. Natural sexes and grammatical gender always corresponded 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 three-fold distinction of grammatical gender, animate masculine and feminine nouns being opposed to inanimate nouns. 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 GUDE's observation that the inherited case system was already diminished already in Proto-Indo-European in the prehistory of Sinhalese33 is valid for Dhivehi as well. Basically the inherited case forms of Old Indo-Aryan were reduced to distinctive forms of a direct case (caseum rectum) and an oblique case (caseum oblique), 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 either augmentative, the southern dialects show a much greater variety of inflected case declension patterns. In comparison with the paradigms of MLA, 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 genitive-locative 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, st-stems and s-stems, stems ending in other vowels being rare. On the other hand, consonant stems and st-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.

33 "Im der prakritischen Grundlage des 5. Jh. war der Unterschied der akten Dehnung bereits aufgehoben" (Güde 1909, 56).
2.1.3. The number system, which is characterized 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 Adil. It is characterized by the fact that the pure numeral 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 designating human beings (person) usually show a particular behavior. In these cases the singular must be considered as primary, the plural being marked by special suffixes. The number system of North Dhuveh can be traced widely from this system. Here, the plural is regularly formed by a uniform suffix, the original meaning of which is "so much / many" in the earlier written documents of Dhuvehic. Furthermore, these texts reveal that in the language of Male some hundreds years ago the correlation of number and definiteness was practically identical to that preserved in Adil so to this day. Comparing the linguistic areas in question, the treatment of number in the Fua Maliku dialect is of special interest, because here, both systems intermingle with each other. In Fua Maliku, all peculiarities of the categories of number and definiteness can be found on the spot. To a certain extent, this special correlation caused the emergence of a great variety of morphological and morphophonological 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 Adil, also exists in Sinhalese.\footnote{\textsuperscript{13}}

2.1.4. In Dhuvehic, the pronominal system of Dhuvehic can be divided into personal, demonstrative, possessive, reflexive, interrogative, reflexive and indefinite pronouns, and pronominal adjectives. In Dhuvehic as in Sinhalese, the relative pronoun was lost already at an early period instead of relative clauses, and languages use pronominal constructions regularly.\footnote{\textsuperscript{14}} Furthermore, there are no particular negative pronouns in Dhuvehic; "neither, no one, nothing" and the like have to be expressed periphrastically. In conformity with the noun, the pronominal system of Dhuvehic distinguishes the categories of case, number, and, to some extent, 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 Adil\textsuperscript{15} dialect. In contrast to that, the pronominal system of the Fua Maliku dialect shows a few traces of gender differentiation. Some of the pronouns can be used as attributes as well as independently. Thus the pronominal categories show considerable diachronical divergences; thus, e.g., even some personal pronouns of the northern and southern varieties represent different systems. In Male, 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 social levels. In northern Dhuvehic, we do not find any traces of such a social linguistic differentiation. Here, however, the old formal distinction of the direct and the oblique case, which was lost in northern Dhuvehic, has been preserved in the pronominal system. Despite the many differences, the Maldivian pronominal system is rather homogeneous compared to the "flexible" pronouns of Sinhalese.\footnote{\textsuperscript{16}}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{13}} For the missing form "how" which can be traced back to the relative pronoun, and for the expression of relative clauses in Sinhalese, see general o. G. GRASS (1941), Y and ZW. (1922), 264 ann. 266.
\footnote{\textsuperscript{14}} For Sinhalese pronouns of GRASS (1941), 123 ff. and 1300, 86 ff.; cf. also MALIK (1983), 59 ff.
2.1.5. Neither in attributive nor in predicative position, the adjective does not show any morphological variation of its own in both Maldívian and Sinhalese. 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 Maldíves, 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. bënumteri “useful”), and the same holds true for the rare suffix -(v)eti which almost exclusively occurs in the standard language (e.g. M. lëbiveti “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”.

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”, is added to semantically corresponding adjectives and substantives. Cf. M. riti adj. “beautiful” vs. ritékan “beauty”, M.A.F. ufáveri adj. “glad, happy” vs. ufáverikan “happiness”, A. boñtha “big,
2.2.2. There are practically no diminutive formations in Dhivehi. In all the investigated cases there is only one attestation of a suffix with diminutive function, which is related to a nominal stem. In the Pāl Mulaku version of the fairy tale Māla “The Crane”, we find rājā-majja instead of rāj “wave”, maj-maj instead of F. māla “fish”, dhera-majja instead of F. dher “firewood” etc. (Further examples in 5.2.3). Possibly -majja reflects Dīr. māja “pearl”. This word, which being attested already in 1.1 (L.C.), is obsolete in the modern language. Most probably the same etymon⁶⁰ occurs also in M. marīka — marī, which was originally used as an aristocratic title (for an etymological discussion cf. 2.1.2 c e 6).

2.2.3. There are two diminutive suffixes in Dhivehi, the usage of which is confined to the standard language as well. -fuv → -phu (cf. 1.5 §6.1) is added to nouns denoting immovable objects, while -ka is used to nouns denoting mobile objects; in both cases the function of the suffix is to morphologically express the high social level of the owner of the objects in question. (E.g. digif-kul “finger” or uppalu kīrukl “hand” of a noble person) as against gānu-kul “shirt” or qalān-kul “pen” for a noble person). As a consequence of the increasing democratization 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 Indic-Aryan, however. According to Geiger, they are already obtained at a high degree by the time of Sinhalese Pāli.⁶¹ Comparing the Sinhalese data with the system we find in Dhivehi, we are forced to...

⁶⁰ For more details cf. 2.2.2 a 1. 2.2.2 b 12.
⁶¹ Claus Peter Zoller (personal communication) proposes to derive the suffix from Gāruku “a LDK” (Pali form... cf. Fosk 1964, 1. 194, 1. 632 f).
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-el, -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 -sra”. 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, goviya-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

erhalten.”

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

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

place'. The change in meaning from the loc. to the gen. is a natural one: what is one’s house is one’s own, so the postposition ge came to denote ownership.” PARANAVITANA proves that in early medieval Sinhalese -gē occurs only as a genitive suffix in connection with personal names, not yet competing with the inherited synthetic formation of the genitive. This observation agrees with what we find in the early written documents of Dhivehi which show that in the earlier stages of the standard language genitive endings in -e 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 Fu'a 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-ei, -i. In many cases we can decide only by the context, whether the forms in question have to be interpreted as genitives or as locatives (e.g. A. fen-e, F. fen-ei “of the water” or “in the water”). In older Dhivehi, most forms in -e represent locatives, while an unambiguous genitival use of the same morpheme with inanimate nouns is comparatively rare. Some of the forms attested in L2, which are taken by MANIKU/WIJAYAWARDHANA (1986, viii-ix) to represent the possessive function of the locative, have to be interpreted as locative forms without any doubt in the given context, while other examples remain ambiguous. In two of the passages in question, madūle appears together with the participles ot (otu) (pres./pret.: L2 10,4) and ovuna (pret.pres.: L2 18,4) “being (there), lying” 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 mīnu “(the) four sides (mīnu, 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/2,4 and L2 4,5).

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., māl-e “of the flower”, gam-e “of 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 -ō- 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 unnani “lie, be (there)” and tibeni “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 three times in L1 (md/1,4 and 6; ms/1,5), but it is not yet certain whether gam- has the meaning of “village” in these passages in question. 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 -ā (cp., e.g., bimā "on the ground", gamū "in the village"; for the gen. suff. -ē cf. above), which frequently occurs during the 9th century, is the "result of a contraction" of earlier -e. 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 -ē. The modern locative suffix -gā l-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 -aṭa l-asū in the standard language as well as in Addū. In Fua’ Mulaku, however, it has the variants -aha, -hā, -asā besides -aṭa l-asū, depending on the type of the nominal stem and some additional phonological and phonetic criteria. Without any difficulties the ending M.A.F. -aṭa l-asū and the variant F. -asā can be traced back to the dative ending -aṭa(a) which is frequently attested in the older written documents of Maldivian. This is obviously identical with the Sinhalese dative ending -aṭa which through the intermediate stages of Pkt. athām and athāya (cf. Pa. atthām and athāya) can be derived from Skt. ārtha or ārthāya, i.e., the acc./dat. of ārtha- "aim, cause". It is difficult to decide, however, whether the two variants F. -aha and -hā represent pure allomorphs of the ending l-asū, because a phonetic development of inherited ṭ through s 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 -asāl-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) PARANAVIDANA (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 -ata (← MIA *-athām) or -ataya (← MIA *-athāya) l-ataye (← MIA *-athāyē). GEIGER and PARANAVIDANA demonstrate this development by means of the dative of saṅga "multitude, assembly; community of bhikkhus" (← Skt. saṃgha; cf. GEIGER 1941, 171, no. 2565), which is attested in inscriptions with and without sandhi in the form (saṅghāta) (← MIA *saṅghassatthām) beside (saṅgha ataya/-yē) (← *saṅghassatthāya/-yē), GEIGER postulates that Sinh. *sagāta or *sagātāya (← *saṅghathām, *athāya) must have been possible forms as well. In the plural, -ata is joined to the gen.pl. in -anā (← *-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 sava satanata "to all beings" which occurs in a 4th century inscription and which he derives from *savva-sattanatam.232 The co-occurrence of different formations of this type can be observed up to the medieval period of Sinhalese, where we meet with dative in -at (e.g. gamaat "to the village") and -ahat (e.g. maharat'hat "to the great king") as well as pl. forms in -anat (e.g. naha-sahignat "to the great community"; minisnat "to the people"). From the 11/12th century on, -ata, with a secondary final -a, comes into use again (cp., e.g., mituranata "to the friends"). In the 12th century, too, the syncopated formant -ta is attested for the first time with a plural meaning (mehe-kuruwanta "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 saga-hata "to the community of bhikkhus" (cf. above).233 The given development is summed up by PARANAVITANA as follows: "Having developed so early and merging itself in the gen. ending, -ta and -hata may be considered as dat. case-endings; but when -ata, -hata, or -ta 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 ārīhāya "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 Rāmāyaṇa, viz. rakahārāhāya "for the sake / purpose of protection / shelter" (R. 3.8.7; rakahāna- "guarding", of rakṣati "guards"; cf. TURNER 1966, II, 610, no. 10547 and WEBRA 1997, 468) and harṣaṇārāhāya "for the purpose of frightening" (R. 1.48.7; harṣaṇa- "(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 WEBRA 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. misunata (L2 5.1), mihunata (L6 1.4), mihunata234 (F10,21) "to the people" that can be traced back to underlying genitives without any doubt.

In the case of the dative endings -ahal-hā and -asāl-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. -ahal-asa', while the latter ones in all likelihood developed in the same way as the dative endings M.A. -a' l-as'l and Sinh. -(a)ita. 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' l-as'l as an adverb "excellently" belonging to the adj. barābara "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 l-ṭl by -n cf. 3.6.3.2.2.