

**SINHALESE NOUN MORPHOLOGY AND CONCORD
A STUDY IN GENDER, NUMBER AND PERSON**

by

M. W. SUGATHAPALA DE SILVA* B.A (Cey) M.A (Lond), Ph.D
formerly of the University of Peradeniya

[Sinhalese—the language spoken by over ten million people in the island of Sri Lanka—displays a marked diglossia wherein the low variety is spoken by all strata of society with minimal variation, and the high variety is used in all forms of writing. A noteworthy feature of this diglossic situation is that the high variety is easily understood by all speakers of the language even if they have not received any formal schooling in its grammar. Aspects of Sinhalese diglossia have been discussed at length by students of South Asian linguistics.

Dr. M. W. Sugathapala de Silva was a Sri Lankan and a native speaker of Sinhalese. He began his academic career as a lecturer in Sinhalese at the University of Ceylon. In 1964 he joined the Department of Language at the University of York where he was Reader in Linguistics at the time of his death in May 1980. He pioneered modern linguistic research into Sinhalese, and an aspect of the language that attracted his particular attention was its diglossic situation. This article was found among his unpublished papers. In it he postulates the hypothesis that both the high and low varieties of Sinhalese possess the same grammatical system, and that the differences obtainable between them relate to exponential criteria. Based on this hypothesis a contrastive study is made of gender, number and person in the nominal form of the spoken language with that of the written in terms of morphology and concord. Dr. de Silva also addresses himself to the question of hybrid formations in Sinhalese - a corollary of its diglossic situation.

This article has been edited for publication by Professor G. D. Wijaya-wardhana, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka.]

*This article is being published posthumously.

Sinhalese—a member of the modern Indo-Aryan group of languages—is a language that presents a vivid diglossic situation. The colloquial variety of Sinhalese is used by all native speakers with little dialectal variation and the literary variety is employed in all forms of writing, and to some extent in formal speech too. All native speakers of Sinhalese are capable of using the colloquial variety grammatically and comprehending the literary variety irrespective of its grammatical peculiarities. Because of this situation it is feasible to surmise that the two varieties contain the same grammatical system: *the differences are then stutable as exponential variations. As alternatives, it is possible to treat the literary variety as having an additional set of grammatical categories imposed, as it were, upon the grammatical system of the language as such or to consider the literary variety as having a different grammar altogether.* These alternatives, however, raise at least two theoretical difficulties. Firstly, the acceptance of the literary language as having different grammatical categories is tantamount to the rejection of the notion that the two varieties belong to the 'same language'. Secondly, and as a corollary to this, such rejection of the 'same language' notion renders the inter-comprehensibility factor at the grammatical level rather difficult to accommodate. This intercomprehensibility factor is one of the cues for treating the Sinhalese situation as diglossic rather than bilingual. I have, accordingly, adopted the first hypothesis; namely, that both literary and colloquial varieties have the same grammatical system, while each differs from the other in exponential criteria.

The grammatical details presented here are not exhaustive for either variety but chosen to focus attention upon the contrasts that obtain between the two varieties. Within the framework of the theory the categories obtainable are, nonetheless, regarded as categories of the Sinhalese language as a whole, and may be divided as follows into two groups from a contrastive point of view.

- (a) Categories which have syntactic exponents in terms of concord in the literary variety, but not in the colloquial variety. These are gender, number and person. In the colloquial variety, as will be shown, gender, number and person have exponents mainly in the morphology of the noun. Number and person have some marginal syntactic status, but not by any means comparable to the concordial relationships obtaining in the literary variety. In the literary variety all three categories have an elaborate system of exponents of a concordial type whereby it maintains the complexities of noun morphology in a manner similar to that in colloquial, but, in addition, renders the morphology of the verb a great deal more complex than that in the colloquial.

(b) Categories which distinguish between the two varieties not in the syntactic relevance of exponents as above but in the morphological shape of the exponents only. These are the categories of the verb and the case.

In the present essay I propose to examine the distinctions obtaining between the two varieties in the categories of group (a).

The categories of gender and number in the colloquial variety are purely morphological and have no concordial implications. Morphologically, singular and plural forms can be derived from, say, a common 'root' by affixation and morphophonological processes involved in affixation; likewise many masculine, feminine (and, though less frequently, neuter) forms can to a considerable extent be treated as derived from common roots modified by phonological and morphological stem formatives. In colloquial Sinhalese, gender and number are categories of the noun and the pronoun, while in the literary variety exponents of these categories obtain in the verb as well, yielding the concordial patterns in question. Thus, as far as the colloquial variety is concerned, the exponents of these categories are class characteristics rather than syntactic characteristics in that they are stable for members of certain classes only, at single syntactic slots in the sentence structure: each number as well as gender has one exponent per noun or pronoun, and this exponent operates as a morphological property of that noun or pronoun. (The marginal syntactic status of number will be illustrated under 'number').

I give below the morphological formulae for the formation of gender forms in colloquial Sinhalese followed by a statement of the contrasts between the two varieties. Gender is a three-term system of masculine, feminine and neuter. This discussion will be followed by a statement of contrasts operating within the categories of number and person. Number is a two-term system of singular and plural: within singular number, definiteness and indefiniteness are distinguished morphologically. Person is a three-term system of first, second and third; the third person forms are further subdivided into four groups in colloquial and two in literary: these sub-groups categorise the criterion of proximity.

Gender

In terms of gender, colloquial Sinhalese nominal roots may be divided into three groups as follows:

1. Nominal roots from which three stems may be derived for the three genders, masculine, feminine and neuter;

2. Nominal roots from which two stems may be derived for masculine and feminine ;
3. Nominal roots which yield single noun stems only.

In the analysis I am making a distinction between root, stem and base; their order of derivation is root > stem > base, so that group 1 is root > stem₁, stem₂, stem₃, > base₁, base₂, base₃; group 2 is root > stem₁, stem₂, > base₁, base₂, base₃; group 3 is root > stem > base. > Root is, thus an abstraction common to all related nominal forms while each stem belongs to a particular gender. The derivation is thus an abstraction common to all related nominal forms while each stem belongs to a particular gender. The derivation of stems from roots is largely a morphological process. Bases are derived from stems by a process of affixation: the further affixes for number and case are determined by the nature of the base. The base in this way provides the overall citation form of each noun. The base formatives added to the stems are { a } in masculine, { i } in feminine and { ə } or { yə } in neuter. Nouns belonging to group 3 above, which have single stems and therefore single bases, are labelled masculine, feminine or neuter according to the base formative each takes, so that all nouns in that group with the base formative { a } are masculine, those with { i } are feminine and those with { ə } or { yə } are neuter. To this third group, and to a smaller extent to the second group, however, belongs a number of nouns which take a base formation { a } but inflect like feminine nouns. For convenience, I have included these among the feminine nouns.

The generalized formulae for these derivations (in group 1 and 2 above) are as follows. R represents the root; y represents a phonological characteristic of frontness observed in all articulations corresponding to R (in this case the consonants are further forward in articulations and the vowels are the front ones of each grade); \bar{y} represents the absence of the features attributed to y; + indicates the base formative added to the stem; { } signals that further affixes are added to the roots to derive stems; () implies that the second half of the root is modified in deriving the particular stem. In these formulae, then R with y or \bar{y} and with or without { } and () constitutes the stem, and the stem with the + elements constitute the base.

Group	Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
1	(i) $y_R + a$	$y_R + i$	$\bar{y}_R + ə$
	(ii) $y_R + a$	$\bar{y}_R + i$	$\bar{y}_R + ə$

Group 2 Masc. $\bar{y}_R + a$ Fem. $\bar{y}_R + i$ Neut.

- (i) $\bar{y}_R + a$ $\bar{y}_R + i$
 (ii) $\bar{y}_R + a$ $\bar{y}_R \{ \} + i$
 (iii) $\bar{y}_R + a$ $\bar{y}_R + i$
 (iv) $\bar{y}_R + a$ $\bar{y}_R \{ \} + i$
 (v) $\bar{y}_R + a$ $\bar{y}_R + i$

Examples :

- (i) *poditt*+a 'little one' *poditt*+i 'little girl' *poditt*+e 'little thing'
 (ii) *maall*+a 'old man' *moll*+i 'old woman' *maall*+e 'old rag'
 2 (i) *ball*+a 'dog' *ball*+i 'bitch'
 (ii) *kok*+a 'crane' *kekinn*+i 'female crane'
 (iii) *kaput*+a 'crow' *kaput*+i 'female crow'
 (iv) *muy*+a 'deer' *muyatt*+i 'doe'
 (v) *upaasəkə*+a 'devotee' *uppāasikaa*+i/ə 'female devotee'

The following morphophonological rules are observed in mapping phonetic forms to these base derivation processes :

- (a) In -a final masc. stems + base formative {a}, ..., ə+a has the phonetic correspondence [e]. Thus *upaasəkə*+a > [upaasəkə+a]
 In -aa final masc. stems + {a}, aa+a has the phonetic correspondences [aaya] or [aava]. Thus *heevaa*+a [heevaaya] 'soldier', *jiilaa*+a [iA]laava, 'a kind of fish'.

- (b) The predominant feminine base formative is {i}. In 2(i) where the stem is \bar{y} -prosodic and the base formative is {i} all articulations corresponding to the base are front in quality. Here, then, the prosody of frontness characterizes the whole base. Where the articulations are mid grade (including midgrade vowels [e, ə, o]), however, a further prosody is optionally stated, namely, the prosody of gradation. In this process, $\bar{y}_R + i$ bases whose R contains mid grade characteristics results in a gradation to the mid range: this gradation covers all syllables, stems as well as the base formative. Hence, *koll*+a 'lad' : f. *y*koll+i > kell+i : mid kell+i > [kelle]. The [ə] in [kellə] which corresponds to the formative [i] is the result of this prosody of gradation. The prosody of gradation is optional in the majority of instances. Thus,

- m. *hor*+aə 'thief' : f. [herii], [herə]
 m. *kot*+aa 'dwarf' : f. [ketii], [ketə]

(c) The feminine base formative {ə} (which is different from [e] of {i} discussed in (b) occurs in 2(v) as an alternative to {i}. Thus, *upaasikaat̄i* as well as *upaasikaat̄ə*, where *-aa* final stems are involved, — *aa+i* has the phonetic correspondence [aavi/aav]. Thus [upaasikaavi, upaasikaavə], 'female devotee' [gaaikaavi, gaaikaavə] 'female singer', etc.

(d) The base formatives {a} and {i} have the phonetic correspondences [a, aa] and [i, ii]. The choice of the short or long vocalic depends upon the mātrā structure of the word.

(e) Some *a-* final neuter stems take the base formative {ə} and some {yə}. — *a+ə* has the phonetic correspondence [ə]: *paare+e* > [paare] 'road'. — *a+yə* has the phonetic correspondence [e] or [ee] depending upon the matra structure: *kaamerə+yə* > [kaamere] 'room'. Where *-e* final neuter stems are followed by {ə}, *e+a* has the phonetic correspondence [ee]: *ge+e* > [gee] 'house'. In *-aa* final stems — *aa+ə* has the phonetic correspondence [aavə] or [aayə]: *saalaa+ə* > [saalaavə] 'hall', *kabaa+ə* > [kabaaya] 'jacket'.

Gender in colloquial Sinhalese compared with gender in the literary variety :

Morphologically, the processes involved in stem derivation are common to both varieties. There is a difference in the base derivation, however. The masculine base formative {a} has in colloquial the articulatory correspondences [a] and [aa] dependent upon the mātrā structure of the word, but, the articulation corresponding to {a} in literary is always [aa] owing to the influence of the script. Thus, colloquial has [balla], [kokaa] while literary has [ballaa], [kokaa]. The feminine base formative in literary Sinhalese requires a final *ə* obligatorily, so that corresponding to the colloquial base formative {i}, literary has [io], or, less frequently, {ə}. Thus,

	Colloquial	Literary
<i>singitti</i>	'little girl'	<i>singittia</i>
<i>mæelli</i>	'old woman'	<i>mæhelliə, mæhællə</i>
<i>bælli</i>	'bitch'	<i>bælliə, (pedantically) bællə</i>
<i>ætinni</i>	'female elephant'	<i>ætinniə, ætinnə</i>
<i>upaasikaavi</i>	'female devotee'	
<i>upaasikaavə</i>	'female devotee'	<i>upaasikaavə</i>

In this way, the prosody of gradation is not stable for the literary variety. The two varieties differ in the neuter base formation as follows. — *e+yə* which corresponds in colloquial to [e, eə], has the literary correspondence [eə]. Thus *ge+yə* > coll. [gee], lit. [geə]. — *a+yə* which has the colloquial correspondence [e, ee] corresponds in literary Sinhalese to [eə]. Thus, *kaamerə+yə* > coll. [kaamere], lit. [kaamereə].

Syntactic differences between literary and colloquial Sinhalese with respect to gender lie in the absence of concord in colloquial while literary Sinhalese shows a subject-verb agreement distinguishing the feminine gender from masculine and neuter. It will be seen later that the literary verbal forms involved here belong to the third person agreement with respect to gender is limited to this person.

	<i>Colloquial</i>	<i>Literary</i>	
m.	<i>balla burānava</i>	'The dog barks'	<i>ballaa buranneeya</i>
n.	<i>kooṭuā vāṭenava</i>	'The stick falls'	<i>kootuā vātenneeya</i>
f.	<i>bælli burānava</i>	'The bitch barks'	<i>bællie buranniiya</i>
f.	<i>kellā vāṭenava</i>	'The girl falls'	<i>kellā vātenniiya</i>
m.	<i>mantri tumaa dinua</i>	'The M.P. won'	<i>mantrii tumaa dinueeya</i>
n.	<i>kooṭuā vāṭuma</i>	'The stick fell'	<i>kooṭuā vāetuneeya</i>
f.	<i>mantri tumii dinua</i>	'The M.P.(f.) won'	<i>mantrii tumiā dinuaaya</i>
f.	<i>kellā vāṭuma</i>	'The girl fell'	<i>kellā vāetunaaya</i>

In this manner, the literary variety contains some syntactic exponents of gender which are redundant with reference to the colloquial variety which is the grid. People less educated in Sinhalese in their attempts to maintain the requirements of the literary goal produce hybridisms resulting from this redundancy factor as the following citations from personal letters would show. Each hybridism quoted will be preceded by its colloquial and the nearest literary equivalents.

1. Coll. *poḍi putaa ḍen ḍanā gaanā va*
Lit. *poḍi putaa ḍen ḍanā gaanneeya*
Hybrid. *poḍi putaa ḍen ḍanā gaanā vaaya*
'(My) little son is now crawling'.
2. Coll. *putaa giā maase aava*
Lit. *putaa giā maasēyee aaveeya*
Hybrid. *putaa giā maasee aavaaya*
'(My) son came last month'.
3. Coll. *taatta satutu una*
Lit. *piāa satutu uneeya*
Hybrid. *taataa satutu unaaya*
'The father was pleased'
4. Coll. *amēti tumaa dannela eua*
Lit. *amēti tumaa danvaa eueeya*
Hybrid. *amēti tumaa danvaa euaaya*
'The minister has informed.....'
5. Coll. *nānda hetā enā va*
Lit. *nānda hetā enniya*
Hybrid. *nānda hetā enneeya*
'The gunt is coming tomorrow'

[10] It will have been noticed that the literary verb forms end in a long vowel followed by *-yə*. In hybrid sentence 1, the vowel length before *-yə* is maintained by lengthening the final vowel of the colloquial form. To this verb form the usual literary ending *-yə* is added. The verb forms in hybrid sentences 2, 3 and 4 may be explained in the same way, or, as cases of using feminine verb forms where masculine verb forms are required by the literary usage: in the past tense, *aavaayə* is the feminine of *aaveeyə*, *unaayə* is the feminine of *unneeyə*, and *cuuayə* is the feminine of *eueeyə*. (cf. *dimueeyə* and *dinuaayə* above.) Sentence 5 illustrates the use of a masculine verb form in place of the feminine form. (cf. *buranneeyə* and *buranniiyə* above). This indiscriminate use of forms is a characteristic of hybridism resulting in situations where the goal differs from the grid in exponential redundancy.

Number

Number is a two-term system of singular and plural. Plural forms are not always predictable from the singular forms, and, insofar as any predictability exists, the following inflectional patterns obtain in the colloquial variety. The formations discussed here pertain to the citation forms in each number: given the citation form, the case terminations are predictable. The citation forms equate with what will be referred to under 'case' as 'direct case' forms.

Masculine gender :

Sg. base affix {a} Pl. {u} {o} { }

Where the plural affix is {u}, the stems end in single consonants; this consonant is germinated in plural. (The germination of *h* is *ss* as a universal rule). Where {o} or { } is selected the stem does not undergo any change. Stems with two final consonants and those with final *r* select {o}, but the choice between {o} and { } is not predictable for stems ending in single consonants (other than *r*). As a rule, the plural affix replaces the base affix. Thus,

{u} :	<i>kok⁺a</i> > [kōkaa]	'crane'	:	<i>kok⁺u</i> > [kokku]
	<i>minih⁺a</i> > [miniha]	'man'	:	<i>minih⁺u</i> > [minissu]
	<i>baləl⁺a</i> > [baləla]	'cat'	:	<i>baləl⁺u</i> > [balallu]
[o] :	<i>ball⁺a</i> > [balla]	'dog'	:	<i>ball⁺o</i> > [ballo]
	<i>vandur⁺a</i> > [vandura]	'monkey'	:	<i>vandur⁺o</i> > [vanduro]
	<i>kaput⁺a</i> > [kaputa]	'crow'	:	<i>kaput⁺o</i> > [kapuṭo]
	<i>ali⁺a</i> > [aliə]	'elephant'	:	<i>ali⁺o</i> > [alio]
[#] :	<i>ali⁺a</i> > [aliə]	'elephant'	:	<i>ali⁺</i> > [ali]
	<i>maalu⁺a</i> > [maalu]	'fish'	:	<i>maalu⁺</i> > [maalu]
	<i>harək⁺a</i> > [kareka]	'ox'	:	<i>harək⁺</i> > [harak]

Feminine Gender :

Sg. base affix {i} or {e} Pl. {o} (rarely {u})

Where the base affix {i} has the alternant {i}, {o} has the alternant [io]; where the base affix is {ə} or the alternant of {i} is {ə}, {o} has the alternant [o] replacing [ə]. [u] is attested in a very small number of examples. Thus, {o}:

- (i) *bəll+i* > [blli] 'bitch' : *bəll+o* > [blio]
upaasikaa+i > [upaasikaavi] 'devotee' : *upaasikaa+i+o* > [upaasikaavio]
(ii) *kəll+i* > [kella] 'girl' : *kəll+o* > [kello]
upaasikaa ə > [upaasikaave] 'devotee' : *upaasikaa+o* > [upaasikavo]
{u} : *gəən+i* > [gəəni] 'woman' : *gəən+u* > [gəənu]

Colloquial Sinhalese has another set of plural formatives common to both masculine and feminine nouns referring to humans. They are the affixes {vəru}, {la} and {golla} added either to the stem or to the base: which one is selected is not predictable. Thus,

- əməti+a* 'minister' : *əməti+vəru* > [əmetivəru]
əməti+golla > [əmetigolla]
upaasikaa+i 'devotee' : *upaasikaa+i+la* > [upaasikaavila]
upaasikaa+i+vəru > [upaasikaavivəru]
upaasikaa+vəru > [upaasikaavəru]
gəən+i 'woman' : *gəən+i+la* > [gəənila]

Neuter gender :

Sg. base affix {ə} or {yə} Pl. {ə} [val]u

Where the plural affix is {ə} the plural affix *val* is selected. Also in the rare group which includes *gee* 'house' the plural is formed by adding {val}. Bases which take the formative [yə] form the plural with { } or {val}. Elsewhere { } is selected with certain morphophonological rules. Where the stem ends in a consonant, { } replaces the base affix. Stems ending in two consonants have the alternant [C i/u] before { }; the selection of [i] or [u] is prosodically conditioned; where the articulations are predominantly front, [i] is selected and elsewhere [u] is selected. [i] and [u] are therefore not treated as two separate vowels but as a -C + syllabic alternant of -CC stems, realised in consonance with the prosodic nature of the word. Thus,

- {val} : *paarə+a* > [paarə] 'road' : *paarə+val* > [paarəval]
ge+a > [gee] 'house' : *ge+val* > [geval]
(#): (i) *mall+a* > [malla] 'bag' : *mall+#* > [malu]
kokk+a > [kokkə] 'hook' : *kokk+#* > [koku]
att+a > [attə] 'branch' : *att+#* > [atu]
kekk+a > [kekkə] 'hook' : *kekk+#* > [keki]
pitt+a > [pitta] 'rod' : *pitt+#* > [piti]
pətt+a > [pəttə] 'side' : *pətt+#* > [pətti]

- (ii) *mal⁺a* > [malə] 'flower' : *mal⁺#* > [mal]
at⁺a > [atə] 'arm' : *at⁺#* > [at]
miiti⁺a > [miitiə] 'hammer' : *miiti⁺#* > [miiti]
puṭu⁺a > [puṭuə] 'chair' : *puṭu⁺#* > [puṭu]
vææ⁺a > [vææə] 'adze' : *vææ⁺#* > [vææ]
mini⁺a > [miniə] 'corpse' : *mini⁺* > [minii]

(Notice the irregular vocalic lengthening in [minii].)

In a small number of loan words the neuter bases are formed by *-ekə* rather than *-ə* to the loan stem. The following are examples of the use of this special base formative: *bas⁺ekə* > [bassekə] 'bus', *kaar⁺ekə* > [kaarekə] 'car', *paiṅt⁺ekə* > [paiṅtṭekə] 'pint', *tiisis⁺ekə* > [tiisissekə] 'thesis'. Incidentally, *-ekə* equates with the word *ekə* 'numeral one (neuter)'. The plural formative used with these stems is [#], so that [bas] 'buses', [kaar] 'cars', [paiṅt] 'pints', [tiisis] 'theses'.

As has already been mentioned, singular forms are inflected for definiteness and indefiniteness. The base affix has the implication of definiteness while indefinite nouns are formed by adding the following affixes:

Masc. {ek} which replaces the base affix

- minih⁺a* : *minih⁺ek* > [minihək] 'a man'
ball⁺a : *ball⁺ek* > [ballek] 'a dog'

In these nouns with vowel-final stems where the base affix {a} has the alternants [ya, va], the indefinite affix {ek} has [yek, vek] correspondingly:

- heevaa⁺a* > [heevaaya] : *heevaa⁺ek* > [hevaayek] 'a soldier'
jiilaa⁺a > [jiilaava] : *jiilaa⁺ek* > [jiilaavek] 'a jiile fish'

Fem. {ek} which replaces the base affix {ə} as well as the {ə} alternant of {i}, but is added to the [i] alternant of {i}.

- bəll⁺i* : *bəll⁺i⁺ek* > [bəlliek] 'a bitch'
kaput⁺i : *kaput⁺i⁺ek* > [kaputiek] 'a female crow'
kell⁺i > [kellə] : *kell⁺ek* > [kellek] 'a girl'
upaasikaa⁺a : *upaasikaa⁺ek* > [upaasikaavek] 'a female devotee'

where the base affix {ə} has the alternant [və], {ek} has the alternant [vek]: hence [upaasikaavek].

In the feminine gender, the affix {ak} is used by some speakers as an alternative to {ek}. {ak}, however, is far less frequent. As a result of the affix {ak} such forms as [bəlliak], [kellak], [upaasikaavak] etc. are heard in speech.

Neuter {ak}, which replaces the base affix.

<i>mall+ə</i>	: <i>mall+ak</i> > [mallak]	'a bag'
<i>pot+ə</i>	: <i>pot+ak</i> > [potak]	'a book'
<i>ge+ə</i>	: <i>ge+ak</i> > [geak]	'a house'
<i>saalaa+ə</i>	: <i>saalaa+ak</i> > [saalaavak]	'a hall'
<i>kabaa+ə</i>	: <i>kaabaa+ak</i> > [kabaayak]	'a jacket'

Notice that where the base affix {ə} has the alternants [yə] and [və], {ak} has the alternants [yak] and [vak] correspondingly.

Number in colloquial Sinhalese compared with number in the literary variety :

Morphologically, the masculine base forms (or the singular definite forms) are identical in the two varieties except in the corresponding phonetic exponency; the literary forms always end in [aa], while colloquial selects [a] or [aa] depending upon the mātrā structure of the word. All feminine base forms in literary Sinhalese take the formative {ə} or {iə} whereas colloquial has {i} predominantly. Neuter base forms show a distinction in phonetic exponents insofar as, ...ə+yə = coll., -[eə]. -[e] and lit. -[eə]; ...e+ə = coll., -[eə] and lit. -[eə]. Thus, coll. [kaaməree], lit. [kaaməreə]; coll. [gee], lit. [geə].

The neuter (loan) forms with the base formative {ekə} are peculiar to the colloquial variety. In borrowing such nouns the literary variety either employs the base formative {əyə} or {uə} or translates the form into its Sanskrit 'root meaning' equivalent.

Examples of the former are [basəyə] 'bus': coll. [bassekə]; [təlipoonəyə] 'telephone': coll. [təlipoonnekə] or [təlipoonnekə]; [painṭuə] 'pint': coll. [painṭekə].

In the plural number, the affix {o} has the phonetic correspondence [o] or [oo] in colloquial, depending upon the mātrā structure of the word, and [oo] in literary consistently. The plural affix {gollə} is extremely rarely used in the literary variety, {la} in literary has the phonetic correspondence [laa]. Literary language has a special plural affix {hu} which is never used in colloquial. This affix is used in both masculine and feminine genders. Just as {la}, {gollə} etc. in colloquial are used as alternatives to the various other affixes, even so {hu} in literary is an alternative formative, which is added to the stem or the base form. Where the stem ends in -i or -u, or is canonically (C) VC-, {hu} is generally added to the stem; elsewhere it is added to the base form.

-i stems :	<i>ali + hu</i> > [alihū]	'elephants'
-u stems :	<i>daru + hu</i> > [daruhū]	'children'
(C)VC stems :	<i>ət + hu</i> > [əthū]	'elephants'
	<i>kok + huk</i> [okhu]	'cranes'

Elsewhere,

vandur+*a*+*hu* > [vandurehu] 'monkeys'
upaasikaa + *a* + *hu* > [upaasikaavahu] 'female devotees'

With reference to the indefinite formatives the two varieties differ from each other in the following manner. (Thick lines indicate that the same affix is in more than one gender. Broken lines indicate an infrequent use).

Colloquial		Literary	
Masc.	{ek}	Masc.	{ek}
Fem.	{ak}	Fem.	{ak}
Neut.	{ak}	Neut.	{ak}

In this way, the literary variety consistently maintains {ak} in feminine and {ek} in masculine. In my observation, those who use {ak} in feminine colloquially belong to a small group of purists; the writing of [ek] in literary neuter is observed by the same group.

It has been mentioned that number in colloquial Sinhalese has some marginal syntactic implications. Some concordial relationships operate in the imperative mood. In the imperative mood, verb forms like *duapan*, 'you (sg) run' with the inflection *-pan* are used with second person singular subjects and forms like *duapalla* 'you (pl) run' with the inflection *-palla* are used with second person plural subjects. Concordial relationships in the literary variety however show a far greater degree of complexity. In literary Sinhalese subject-verb agreement is always observed with respect to number. Masculine or feminine singular nouns agree with singular verb forms and masculine and feminine plural nouns agree with plural verb forms. In the case of the neuter gender, both singular and plural nouns agree with singular verbs. These characteristics of the literary variety are contrasted below with the equivalent colloquial forms using the verb *temenava* 'to get wet' in the examples. It will be noticed that three, or in plural four, variants are given for the verb in the literary variety.

Colloquial		Literary	
m.sg.	<i>miniha temenava</i>	'The man is getting wet'	<i>minihaa</i> (1) <i>temei</i> (2) <i>temee</i> (3) <i>temenneeya</i>
	<i>minihek temenava</i>	'A man is getting wet'	<i>minihek</i> (1) <i>temei</i> (2) <i>temee</i> (3) <i>temenneeya</i>
m.pl.	<i>minissu temenava</i>	'Men are getting wet'	<i>minissu</i> (1) <i>temet</i> (2) <i>temeti</i> (3) <i>temennooya</i> (4) <i>temennaaha</i>

f. sg.	<i>gæani temeneva</i>	'The woman is getting wet'	<i>gæhaniæa</i>	(1) <i>temei</i>
				(2) <i>temee</i>
				(3) <i>temenniye</i>
	<i>gæaniæk temeneva</i>	'A woman is getting wet'	<i>gæhaniæk</i>	(1) <i>temei</i>
				(2) <i>temee</i>
				(3) <i>temenniye</i>
f. pl.	<i>gæanu temeneva</i>	'Women are getting wet'	<i>gæhanu</i>	(1) <i>temet</i>
				(2) <i>temeti</i>
				(3) <i>temennooya</i>
				(4) <i>temennaaha</i>
n. sg.	<i>potæ temenava</i>	'The book is getting wet'	<i>potæ</i>	(1) <i>temei</i>
				(2) <i>temee</i>
				(3) <i>temenneeya</i>
	<i>potæk temeneva</i>	'A book is getting wet'	<i>potæk</i>	(1) <i>temei</i>
				(2) <i>temee</i>
				(3) <i>temenneeya</i>
n. pl.	<i>potæ temenava</i>	'Books are getting wet'	<i>potæ</i>	(1) <i>temei</i>
				(2) <i>temee</i>
				(3) <i>temenneeya</i>

Notice the distinction made in literary Sinhalese between masculine and feminine on the one hand and neuter on the other with reference to concord. In neuter, morphologically plural subjects agree with morphologically singular verbs. (This is the basis on which certain writers on Sinhalese grammar have maintained a two-term gender distinction as animate and inanimate. I have used the three-term distinction in order to accommodate the morphological characteristics of gender discussed above). In masculine and feminine, the singular-plural distinction is maintained in the noun as well as the verb. Notice that the literary language makes no distinction between masculine and feminine in the singular verb forms (1) and (2): Thus, *temei*, *temee* are m.f. sg. Verb form (3), however, has gender implications: *temenneeya* m.sg., *temenniye*, f.sg.

Plural verb forms are identical in both genders: *temet*, *temeti*, *temennooya*, *temennaaha*, m.f. pl. The verbal forms agreeing with neuter nouns equate with masc. s.g. forms: *temei*, *temee*, *temenneeya*, m.sg.; n.

The number of verb variants operating in the literary variety are fewer in other tenses and moods, but the general nature of number concord is the same throughout.

In ornate literature, there is a tendency to 'personify' neuter nouns in the plural number by using the masculine plural affixes [oo] and [hu]. [oo] is used with Sanskrit loans, e.g. *vṛkṣa* 'tree': *vṛkṣayoo* [vrukseeoo] 'trees'. With other nouns, the distinction made between [oo] and [hu] is purely stylistic: *aṅgilloo* [aṅgilloo], *aṅgillahu* [aṅgilləhu] 'fingers'. This personification is rare and used as an alternative to the usual plural formation in the neuter gender. Where a noun is personified in this way, it takes all the morphological attributes of masculine plural nouns as well as entering into plural concordial relationships with the verbs just as masculine plural nouns do. Thus, n.pl. *gas vatei/vatee/ vatenneeya* 'Trees fall' personified pl. *gashu vatei/vāteṭi vāṅlennooya/vāteennaaha* 'Trees fall'

In this way the exponents of the category of number in literary Sinhalese consist very largely of redundancy phenomena with reference to the grid variety which is colloquial. I give below a few examples of hybridisms arising out of this disparity. Colloquial and literary equivalents are given for each hybridism.

1. coll. *gas vāṅṅava* 'Trees fall'
- lit. *gas vatei*
- hyb. *gashu vāṅṅ*

The plural concord is observed inspite of the neuter non-personified subject.

2. coll. *haamūduruo baṇā kiāṇava* 'The monk preaches'
- lit. *bhīksuā deesānaa kārāi*
- hyb. *bhīksuā deesāna kārāṭi*

The plural form of the verb is used with a singular subject.

3. coll. *mantirīi deevī kēleṭā giaa* 'Queen Mandri went to the forest'
- lit. *madrii deevīa vateṭe giaaye*
- hyb. *madrii deevīa valēṭā giaahā*

The plural form of this verb is used with a singular subject.

4. coll. *ganvaturēṭā paul raasiak* 'A large number of families is afflicted by the floods'
- lit. *anaatā vela*
- hyb. *ganvaturēṭā paul raasiak anaathā vei*

A plural verb form is used with a singular indefinite subject.

It must be added that inspite of a large amount of classroom injunctions, the agreement of the verb with respect to number with such subject words as *kenek*, *samāharek*, *aek*, *atamēk*, 'some people'; *kisirek* 'some one'; *kāvarek* 'who' etc. in the literary language is in a state of flux, some writers

using the singular agreement and some plural while others use both indiscriminately. The injunctions are that owing to notional plurality, the agreement with *kenek*, *samāharek*, *aek*, *ætāmek* and *kisivek* should be plural, while the agreement with *kavārek* should be singular. The nature of hybridisms arising out of this type of phenomenon creates a wide gulf between the injunction and the actual usage of those who do not possess an absolute mastery of the prescriptive literary form.

Person

As the category of person necessarily involves the personal pronoun, I propose to discuss briefly the pronominal system in Sinhalese before illustrating the syntactic distinctions between the two varieties with regard to person. The first person pronouns in both varieties are *mamā* 'I' and *api* 'we'. Colloquial Sinhalese also has a form *man* 'I' which is related to *mamā*. Literary Sinhalese has alternants of *mame* and *aapi* when they are inflected for case. The colloquial variety has a large number of second person pronouns which may be classified into three grades as respectful, general, and inferior. As these gradation names suggest, respectful forms are used with reference to superiors, general forms with reference to intimates and equals and inferior forms in addressing persons of much lower status or much younger persons. *tamunnaanse*, *obe tumaa* (f. *obe tumii*) are common superior forms; *ohee*, *oyaa*, *tamuse* are common general forms; *umbā* and rarely *too* are inferior forms. Except in the case of *too* which has a plural *topi*, the plurals of these pronouns are formed by adding *-la*: thus, *tamunnaansela*, *ohela*, *umbāla*, etc. Of these pronouns only *obā tumii*, *oya*, *umbā* (and *too*) (and their plurals) are used with reference to females. Except for *obatumaa*, *obatumii*, *obā tumaalaa*, *obā tumiilaa* these pronouns are not used in the literary variety. Literary Sinhalese uses *obā* as a common second person pronoun (like English 'you') irrespective of gender and number. However, the form *obālaa* is occasionally used as an alternative plural form. In using *obā* literary Sinhalese avoids the problem of gradation. Implications of gradation are drastically reduced in colloquial Sinhalese as well by the fact that it (as well as the literary variety) has a tendency to leave the second person pronoun unstated: in this practice Sinhalese conforms to the Indian tradition pertaining to the use of pronominal forms.

In the third person there are four pronominal 'roots' which may be labelled as third person 1, third person 2, third person 3 and third person 4; the numerals indicate a distinction in proximity. From each root a demonstrative pronoun as well as a set of personal pronouns indicating gender and number are derived in the colloquial variety. The literary variety, as well be seen, has fewer forms and shows some significant restrictions with regard to the roots, 2, 3 and 4. In order to focus attention on these distinctions I shall tabulate below the

demonstrative pronouns along with the personal pronouns. In this tabulation, forms marked 2 and 3 are inferior forms. Where it is needed to indicate respect, the colloquial variety uses the demonstrative pronoun followed by a suitable noun (like Eng. 'This gentleman'), but in literary Sinhalese the personal pronoun is acceptable in such situations.

Root	Demonstrative Pronoun		Personal Pronoun		
	Coll.	Lit.	Coll.	Lit.	
1. <i>me-</i> 'this'			m.sg. 1. <i>mea</i>	} <i>mohu</i>	
			2. <i>meeka</i>		
			3. <i>muæ</i>		
		<i>mee</i>	m.pl. 1. <i>meala</i>	} <i>mouhu</i>	
			2. <i>meekala</i>		
			3. <i>mun</i>		
			f.sg. 1. <i>mea</i>	} <i>mæya</i>	
			2. <i>meeki</i>		
			3. <i>mææ</i>		
		Colloquia		f.pl. 1. <i>meala</i>	} <i>mouhu</i>
				2. <i>meekila</i>	
				3. <i>mææla, mun</i>	
			n.sg. <i>meekæ</i>	<i>mæ</i>	
			n.pl. <i>meeva</i>	<i>meevaa</i>	

Root	Demonstrative Pronoun		Personal Pronoun
	Coll. & Lit.	Coll.	
2. o- 'that near you'	<i>oya</i>	m.sg. 1. <i>oya</i> 2. <i>ooka</i> m.pl. 1. <i>oyala</i> 2. <i>ookala</i> f.sg. 1. <i>oya</i> 2. <i>ooki</i> f.pl. 1. <i>oyala</i> 2. <i>ookila</i> n.sg. <i>ookə</i> n.pl. <i>oova</i>	m.sg. <i>ohu, hetema</i> m.pl. <i>ouhu</i> f.sg. <i>əyə</i> f.pl. <i>ouhu</i>
3. are- 'that over there'	<i>arə</i>	m.sg. 1. <i>area</i> 2. <i>areka</i> 3. <i>arun</i> m.pl. 1. <i>areala</i> 2. <i>arekala</i> 3. <i>arun</i> f.sg. 1. <i>area</i> 2. <i>areki</i> 3. <i>arun</i> f.pl. 1. <i>arəala</i> 2. <i>arekila</i> 3. <i>arəala</i> 4. <i>arue</i> n.sg. <i>arəkə</i> n.pl. <i>arəva</i>	n.sg. <i>eə</i> n.pl. <i>eevaa</i>
4. e- 'that in question'	<i>ee</i>	m.sg. 1. <i>ea</i> 2. <i>eeka</i> 3. <i>uu</i> m.pl. 1. <i>eala</i> 2. <i>eekala</i> 3. <i>u</i> f.sg. 1. <i>ea</i> 2. <i>eeki</i> 3. <i>æ</i> f.pl. 1. <i>eala</i> 2. <i>eekila</i> 3. <i>æala</i> , 4. <i>un</i> n.sg. <i>eeə</i> n.pl. <i>eeva</i>	

It has already been mentioned that person in Colloquial Sinhalese is a marginally syntactic one in that the (future tense) *-ma* form of the verb agrees with the first person pronouns while the *-vi* form agrees with the other pronouns e.g.

<i>mamə yanna</i>	'I'll go'
<i>api yanna</i>	'We'll go'
<i>ea yaavi</i>	'He'll go'
<i>temuse yaavi</i>	'You'll go'

The pronoun-verb concord in literary Sinhalese is a much more elaborate one than this: the verb inflects for person in all tenses and moods. This contrast is illustrated below with a select number of examples. The distinction is most marked in the indicative mood:

Indicative mood (Present tense)

	Colloquial		Literary
1P.sg.	<i>mamə yanəva</i>	'I go'	<i>mamə yami/yannemi</i>
pl.	<i>api yanəva</i>	'We go'	<i>api yamu/yannemu</i>
2P.sg.	<i>tamuse yanəva</i>	'You go'	<i>obə yahi/yannehi</i>
pl.	<i>tamusela yanəva</i>	'You go'	<i>obə yahi/yannəhu</i>
3P.sg.	<i>eal yanəva</i>	'He goes'	<i>ohu yai/yanneeye (m)</i>
		'She goes'	<i>oeyə yai/yannīya(f)</i>
pl.	<i>eala yanəva</i>	'They go'	<i>ouhu/yat/yati/yannooya/yannaahə</i>

Indicative Mood (Past Tense)

	Colloquial		Literary
1P.sg.	<i>mamə gia</i>	'I went'	<i>mamə giemi</i>
pl.	<i>api gia</i>	'We went'	<i>api giemu</i>
2P. sg.	<i>tamuse gia</i>	'You went'	<i>obə giehi</i>
pl.	<i>tamusela gia</i>	'You went'	<i>obe giehu</i>
3P. sg.	<i>ea gia</i>	'He went'	<i>ohu gieeye(m)</i>
		'She went'	<i>əye giaaya (f)</i>
pl.	<i>eala gia</i>	'They went'	<i>ouhu giəhə/giooya/giaahə</i>

In the above examples the literary form *obə* is second person in concord. A small group of purists, depending on an old classical rule, advocates that the term *obə* is a third person plural form, so that they write *obə yat/yati* etc. rather than *obə yahi* etc. Certain others use the two concordial patterns indiscriminately. The second person agreement is still the predominant one.

It will have been noticed that as against the single verb form in colloquial in all persons, the literary variety has a number of inflectional differences consisting of 1P.sg. *-mi*, pl. *-mu*; 2P.sg. *-hi*, pl. *hu*, and 3P.sg. *-i*, pl. *-ti/t* in the present tense.

3P. also has the alternative *-nneeyə* (m) *-nniyyə* (f) in sg. and *-nnooyə* and *-nnaahə* in pl. In the past tense, the literary inflections are 1P. sg. *-mi*, pl. *-mu*; 2Psg. *-hi* pl. *-hu*; and 3P.sg. *-eeyə* (m), *aayə* (f), pl. *-əhə*, *-aahe*, *-ooyə*.

Two hybridisms arising out of this complexity in the goal variety are cited below. These are taken from personal letters. The colloquial and literary equivalents are given for each hybridism cited. Both hybridisms contain a first person pronoun in the sentence: it is not claimed that this is the only area susceptible to hybridism although it seems to be the most vulnerable one.

1. Coll. (*maʔə*) *liume læbuna* 'I received the letter'
(Lit. 'The letter was received by me')

Lit. (*maʔə*) *ʃiumə læbuneeyə*

Hyb. (*maʔə*) *ʃiumə læbunemi*

(The presence of the form *maʔə* although not as the subject of the sentence seems to have signalled the use of the first person verb.)

2. Coll. *mamə iyye giaa* 'I went yesterday'

Lit. *mamə iyyee giemi*

Hyb. *mamə iyyee giaaya*

(This hybridism used a literary verb form, but the concord requirement has not been met.)

	Literary	Colloquial
1P. sg.	<i>mi</i>	<i>giə</i>
1P. pl.	<i>mu</i>	<i>giə</i>
2P. sg.	<i>hi</i>	<i>giə</i>
2P. pl.	<i>hu</i>	<i>giə</i>
3P. sg.	<i>i</i>	<i>giə</i>
3P. pl.	<i>ti/t</i>	<i>giə</i>

In the above examples the literary form of the second person in concord. A small group of purists, depending on an old classical rule advocates that the term *giə* is a third person plural form, so that they write *giə* rather than *giə* etc. Certain others use the two concordial patterns indiscriminately. The second person agreement is still the predominant one.