



THE VERB IN SINHALA, WITH SOME PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON DRAVIDIANIZATION



James W. Gair
Cornell University

As probably the longest separated and most isolated of the South Asian Indo-Aryan languages,¹ Sinhala (Sinhalese) is of particular interest for the study of the South Asian linguistic area. The earliest Sinhala inscriptions of the late Third Century B. C. already show clear differences from the mainland Indo-Aryan languages, making it clear that the language had existed on the island for some time before that. Very little is known concerning contact with any non-Indo-Aryan and non-Dravidian languages that might have existed on the island earlier, but there has been steady contact with Dravidian languages, particularly Tamil-Malayalam, since before the beginning of the Christian era. The editors of the PTS Pali dictionary, in fact, argue that the influence of Dravidian on Sinhala was sufficiently strong and early to lead to some apparently Dravidian features finding their way indirectly into Pali through Sinhala in texts of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries A. D. (Rhys-Davids and Stede, 1921-25, p. vi). Furthermore, Sinhala kingdoms were in constant contact with South Indian kingdoms, whether in wars, alliances, or marriage relationships, from pre-Christian times to the last line of Kandyan kings, which itself originated in South India. Although the history of the texture of Sinhalese-Famil (and perhaps Malayalam) relationships remains to be written, what we know of the circumstances would make it astounding if there were not heavy Dravidian influence on Sinhala, and in fact the survival of Sinhala as a clearly Indo-Aryan language might be looked on as a minor miracle of linguistic and cultural history.

1. The qualification "South Asian" is necessitated by Romany, which is, of course, more isolated from the area.

No one who has worked on Sinhala, Tamil, and on some Northern Indo-Aryan language such as Hindi can fail to get some global feeling of similarities shared between the first two in contrast to the latter. There is a danger, however, in drawing too ready conclusions about massive Dravidianization of Sinhala, since it is easy to overlook similarities and differences in the opposite direction and ignore the less exciting question of the extent to which Sinhala has remained distinctively Indo-Aryan. What we need, of course, is not only a careful, point-by-point typological comparison of the present-day languages, but a study of apparent influences as they operated from period to period. Fortunately, the material for such a study is rich, thanks to the relatively continuous documentation of Sinhala since the earliest inscriptions, but that massive task remains to be done or even fairly commenced. The present paper is not an attempt to make such a start, or even to draw firm conclusions about particular points of similarity and their possible origins. Rather, it will be largely restricted to Sinhala itself and specifically to the verb within that language. Its primary goal is modest: to present a brief descriptive summary of major inflectional and syntactic characteristics of the Sinhala verb, followed by a few preliminary observations on some gross similarities to Tamil. It is hoped that such a summary, by gathering those characteristics in brief compass may be of some use to those interested in larger questions of language typology and the South Asian linguistic area.

As is well known, Sinhala presents an almost classic case of diglossia, with sharply distinct written and spoken varieties (De Silva 1967, Gair 1968, Gair and Karunatilaka 1974, among others). In any detailed study of Sinhala-Tamil relations this varietal distinction, along with the parallel distinction operating within Tamil, would have to be taken into account, since influence would have operated on both levels, and probably with varying intensity at different periods. The present paper is limited to Colloquial Sinhala, since the differences between the varieties are great enough to warrant separate treatment. It will also ignore dialectal variants, attempting to represent largely the speech of the educated around Colombo. Although a detailed dialect survey has not been done, material available so far indicates that despite the clear existence of regional differences, taking dialectal variants into account would affect the points made here only in trivial way, and that the grammatical categories and constructions dealt with would remain essentially the same, despite some differences in the forms of morphemes and in lexical items.

No attempt can be made here to deal with the morphophonemic marking of verbal categories, but a general overview is necessary.

Briefly, from a verb root, or a stem consisting of a root plus derivational affixes such as the {p} and {C} morphemes discussed below, two tense themes are formed: a past and a non-past. For regular verbs it is simplest to derive the past from the non-past through a set of vowel changes within the theme usually accompanied by a change of thematic vowel or consonant gemination. In addition, there is a third, participial theme (which is the same as the non-past theme for some verbs). The three major regular classes of verbs have non-past thematic vowels -ə, -i, and -e, and examples of thematic formation for each of them follow:

<i>Non-Past Theme</i>	<i>Past Theme</i>	<i>Participial Theme</i>
hadə- 'make'	hædu-	hadə-
adi- 'pull'	ædd-	ædə-
wæte- 'fall'	wætun-	wæti-

The inflected forms of the verb, except for some verbal nouns, are built on these three themes and are accordingly tense or participial forms. The paradigms below for the three verbs cited above will indicate the range of inflected forms. (For some of them, there are dialectal variants not given here--forms marked with ? are doubtful.)

Tense Forms (built on tense themes)

Basic :

non-past	hadənəwa 'make'	adinəwa 'pull'	wætenəwa 'fall'
past	hædua	ædda	wætuna

Emphatic :

non-past	hadanne	adinne	wætenne
past	hædue	ædde	wætune

Conditional :

non-past	hadətət	aditət	wætetət
past	hæduət	æddət	wætunət

Concessive :

non-past	hadətət	aditət	wætetət
past	hæduət	æddət	wætunət

Adjectival :

non-past	hadənə	adinə	wætenə
past	hæduə	æddə	wætunə

The following are formed from the non-past tense theme, but have no past counterparts :

Hortative :	hadəmu	adimu	wætəmu
Volitive optative	hadannan	adinannan	wætənnan

Involitive

optative :	hadaawi, haday	adiiwi, adii	wæteewi, wætey
Contemporaneous:	hadaddi	adiddi	wæteddi
Infinitive :	hadannə	adiinnə	wætənnə
Present			
Participle :	hadətə	aditə	wætətə

The following are formed from the past theme but have no non-past counter-parts :

Prior temporal:	hæduaamə	æddaamə	wætunaamə
Permissive :	hæduaawe	æddaawe	wætunaawe

Participial Forms (built on the participial theme)

Participial base

form :	hadaa	ædə	wætii
--------	-------	-----	-------

Perfect

Participle :	hadəla	ædəla	wætila
Reduplicated :	hadə hadə	ædə ædə	wəti wəti
Adjectival :	hadəpu	ædəpu	wæticcə
Perfective :	hadəpi	ædəpi	wæticci

Imperatives : (Categories are from De Silva 1960)

Ordinary :	sg.	hadəpan	ædəpan	wætian
	pl.	hadəpalla	ædəpalla	wætialla
Non-Honorific :	sg.	hadəpiə	ædəpiə	? wætjə
	pl.	hadəpiəu	ædəpiəu	wætjəu

In addition, there are verbal nouns in *-iimə* and *-illə* which are regularly formed but not based on any of the three themes given :

hædiimə	ædiimə	wætiiimə
hædillə	ædillə	wætillə

One striking point apparent from the paradigm above is the lack of person-number and gender agreement. There are, however, forms restricted to occurrence with subjects of specific person and/or number. For example, imperatives, not surprisingly, are restricted to second person and the hortative to first person plural. Similarly, the volitive optative is restricted to occurrence with first person, singular or plural, whereas the involitive optative rarely occurs with first person.² Even if one counts this as agreement, however, it is minimal at best.

2. There is a problem of terminology and analysis here. The involitive optative does occur with first person in such sentences as *mamə wæteewi* 'I fall-invol. opt. = I might fall', but it can be argued that *mamə* in this case is not a grammatical subject, an analysis is bolstered by its possible appearance, in some dialects at least, in the accusative (Gair 1970, pp. 78-79). If so, the volitive and involitive optative would be first person and non-first person where there are grammatical subjects (expressed or implied) in active sentences. This could be considered agreement, but still of a minimal sort.

A Sinhala verb may contain one of the two derivational morphemes which can be designated {P} and {C}. Verbs containing them may be called P and C verbs, and those containing neither, A verbs. Commonly, verbs fall into sets of three containing an A, a P and a C verb and sharing a common root. For example:

A	P	C
kapə- 'cut'	kəpə- 'get cut'	kappə-/kappəwə- 'cause to cut'
hadə- 'make'	hæde- 'get mad'	hadəwə- 'cause to make'
bani- 'scold'	bæne 'scold involun- tarily'	bannə- 'cause to scold'
marə- 'kill'	mære- 'die, be killed'	marəwə- 'cause to kill'

There are, however, defective sets having one or two members, as well as some sets with a fourth member containing both {P} and {C}. (De Silva 1960, pp. 96-103; Gair 1970, pp. 34-35; Gair 1971, pp. 239 ff). There are also alternate forms of some C verbs as in the first example above, but all of this may be accommodated quite easily within the general pattern as shown.

The occurrence of these morphemes has syntactic implications that constitute one of the more complex areas of Sinhala syntax, and we can present only a very brief indication of the nature of that interplay here (more detail is given in De Silva 1960, Gair 1970 and Gair 1971).

{C} is clearly a causative morpheme, and has the effects, familiar from other Indo-Aryan languages, of transitivizing intransitive A verbs (or P verbs in some sets lacking A verbs), and causativizing (i.e. with a superordinate or instigative agent) transitive ones. Not only transitive A verbs, but C verbs resulting from the transitivizing use of C may enter into causative structures. However, in Sinhala there are not two forms of the causative related to these functions as, for example, in the common Hindi pattern. Rather, a transitive C verb causativizes without further change of form,³ as in the following

3. The statement here is generally true, but actually somewhat oversimplified. {C} has two main forms: -wə- and gemination. To a geminated C verb as in *kappə-* 'cause to cut' from *kapə-* 'cut', -wə- may be added, as in *kappəwə-*. For most speakers, however, these "double causatives" appear to be free variants with the single ones. There is some indication that some speakers may employ the double causative only when some sort of (syntactic) double causativization is involved, but even in these cases the other may substitute. In any event, this pertains to a small number of verbs, and the details are far from clear.

(*lawaa* is one post-position used to mark the subordinate agent in causatives):

lamea nægiṭinəwa 'child awakens (A) = the child is awakening'

mali lameawə nægiṭṭənəwa 'younger-brother child-accusative
awaken (C) = younger brother is awakening the child'

mamə mali lawaa lameawə nægiṭṭənəwa 'I younger-brother
lawaa child-accusative awaken (C) = I get younger brother
to awaken the child'

Verbs with {P} have been called "passive verbs", but {P} is actually closer in function to what Masica has called an "anti-causative" (Masica 1971, particularly pp. 77-78). They occur in a wide range of syntactic constructions involving great complexity in transformational relationships, lexical entries, or both. This has been described elsewhere, even if still insufficiently (notably De Silva 1960, pp. 96-103; Gair 1970, esp. pp. 72-89; and Gair 1971) *passim*) and cannot be adequately treated here. The general nature of these constructions may be gained from the following examples (arranged according to the categories of Gair 1970 and 1971):

Involitive :

maṭə kiuna 'I-dative got-spoken (P) = I spoke without thinking'

maṭə pansələ peənəwa 'I-dative temple see (P) = I see the temple'

Inactive :

miniha wə bimə wəṭuna 'man-accusative ground fell (P) = he fell down'

huləṅgəṭə gaha wəṭuna 'wind-dative tree fell (P) = the tree fell from the wind'

Passive: (*atin* indicates agency, often involitive, in this type)

ee miniha atin lameawə wəṭeewi 'man by child-accusative
get-dropped (P) = the child might be dropped by that man'

banDa atin pol siiak witərə kəDenəwa 'Banda by coconuts
hundred-a about get-picked (P) = about a hundred coconuts can
be picked by Banda'

The one constant semantic (or syntactico-semantic) characteristic that seems to apply to these P verb structures is the absence of a conscious, volitionally acting agent (see Gair 1971), and the term involitive, used by some scholars, like *nirutsaaha kriyaa*, one of the traditional terms, seems best to capture this characteristic. Two other relevant points should be mentioned before leaving this topic. First, although A verbs are characteristically active in that they may have

grammatical subjects referring to a (volitive) agent, a few of them occur in structures more commonly associated with P verbs, and the reverse is also true, since some P verbs appear in active sentences. Secondly, the "activity" distinction associated with P verbs versus A and C verbs has counterparts in non-verbal syntax as well, specifically sentence structures with adjectives or nouns as predicators⁴ (Gair 1971).

To complete this sketch of major characteristics of the verb, we may survey briefly the syntactic uses of the inflected forms given earlier. For this, it is convenient to divide them into independent forms, characteristically occurring as the main verb in independent clauses, and dependent forms, occurring in dependent (i. e. embedded) clauses and whose inflectional affixes thus mark subordinate status. One form, the perfect participle, occurs freely in both types of clauses.⁵ From an areal and typological point of view the embedded forms are of special interest, and we will thus include in the discussion some periphrastic forms showing functional similarities with some of the dependent inflected forms.

Independent Forms :

The basic forms appear to be, semantically at least, the most neutral or unmarked forms; that is, they serve essentially as non-past and past indicative forms :

mamə pettjak hadənəwa/hædua 'I box-a make/made = I make
(am making, will make)/made a box'

The emphatic forms are particularly interesting, since they appear to be a peculiarly Sinhala phenomena among languages of the area.⁶ They have two main functions. As main verbs they indicate

4. Here, of course, one might wish to read "surface predicators", assuming no distinction at a deeper level depending on his theoretical proclivities, but this involves theoretical questions that it is not necessary to raise here.
5. De Silva 1960 (pp. 104-105) thus calls the perfect participle (his "-la form") a "Common Form" as opposed to his finite and participial forms, essentially equivalent to our independent and dependent forms, respectively.
6. It is true that the "pronominalized verb" of Tamil and other South Dravidian languages shows some similarity of function to the Sinhala emphatic verb, as pointed out by Ramanujan (as quoted by Masica 1971, p. 30n). In fact, it seems plausible that it served as a model for it, in its "focus shifting" function. However, not only does the Sinhala form seem far more common in this use, but the associated emphatic structures are part of a complex sub-system of forms and relationships involving non-verbal forms as well (see Gair 1970, esp. pp. 133 ff. for more detail). Thus, even if Dravidian influence played a role in the origin of these structures, Sinhala has developed it in a unique and interesting way. This will be a matter for separate treatment elsewhere.

that the focus is elsewhere than on the verb or verb phrase,⁷ and they are likely to be accompanied by a shift from the unmarked (SOV) word order to a focus-last order. The most common English translation equivalent is a cleft or pseudo-cleft sentence. The following may be compared with their non-emphatic counterpart given earlier :

mamə hadanne/hædue peṭṭiak 'I make-emph./made-emph. box-a
= It is/was a box that I made'

peṭṭiak hadanne/hædue mamə 'Box-a make-emph./made-emph.
I = It is/was I who made a box'

The other main use of the emphatic form is before the negative auxiliary *nææ* :⁸

mamə peṭṭiak hadanne/hædue nææ 'I box-a make-emph./
made-emph. *nææ* = I am not making/did not make a box'

The hortative and imperative forms occur with the senses one would expect; the imperative marking singular and plural and showing several grades depending on status of speaker and addressee (see De Silva 1960, p. 106). The infinitive is also used as a polite imperative without distinction of number. No special attention need be given those forms here.

The volitive and involitive optative have future reference, and are in complementary or near complementary distribution in their occurrence with first and non-first person subjects, as noted earlier. They could thus be considered first and non-first person future forms, but they have very strong modal senses.⁹ The volitive optative implies volition or determination :

7. Focus can be structurally defined in Sinhala, by the occurrence or potential occurrence of certain markers (Gair 1970, pp 49 ff). Semantically, it is similar to focus in the sense of Chomsky 1971, or particularly Schachter 1973, and raises a number of interesting questions similar to those raised in those papers.
8. It is interesting that Sinhala has the verb plus the negative auxiliary cited by Southworth as a Dravidian feature shared by Marathi (Southworth 1971, p. 264) and that it is essentially the functional equivalent of Tamil verb plus *illai*. However, the Sinhala emphatic form does not otherwise have a range of distribution paralleling that of the Tamil infinitive which precedes *illai*. Unless this discrepancy is explained, one should be hesitant to say that there is a Tamil model involved here. This, too, will be a matter for separate treatment elsewhere.
9. Also, involitive optatives do occur with first person reference, even though the nominal involved can be considered not to be an active subject, depending on one's analysis of the sentences in which this occurs. See footnote 2 above.

mamə pahəṭə ennan 'I five-dative come-vol. opt. ~ I'll come at five'. The involitive optative signifies the possibility of something occurring, i. e. 'might' or 'it could happen that':¹⁰

eaa pahəṭə witərə eewi 'he five-dat. about come-invol. opt. = he might come at about five'

The perfect participle, in addition to its subordinate function to be dealt with later, very commonly occurs as a main verb:

miniha meekə hadəla 'man this-one make-perf. part. = he has made this'

The sense is completed action (commonly with an implication of less direct observation of the action itself on the part of the speaker than is the case with the past basic form). The perfect participle also occurs before *tiənəwa* 'be'¹¹ to form a perfect:

mamə ee pəttəṭə gihiila tiənəwa 'I that area-dative go-perf.past be-basic = I have gone to that area'

The sense may be completed action with third person subjects, but it is usually, in all persons, that one has had the experience of doing something, i. e. "I have been to Sri Lanka".

The perfective form also signifies completed action, commonly with an implication that the action was undesired by the speaker (the name "ohellative", if somewhat jocular, conveys this implication somewhat better):

miniha eekə kapəpi 'he that-one cut-perf. = he's gone and cut it'

The permissive is also confined to third person, and may convey exasperation or unconcern:¹²

miniha kaepuwaawe 'man cut-permiss. = let him cut it (I don't care)'

Dependent Forms:

Sinhala embedded verbal structures are of particular interest from an areal standpoint. Here we will deal briefly first with

10. This is further treated in Gair 1971, pp. 253-354 as representative of an important and pervasive semantic distinction in Sinhala.
11. Only in this auxiliary function is *tiənəwa* used with animate subjects. Otherwise, it is restricted to inanimate and *innəwa* 'be' must be used with animate.
12. There is also a permissive form in *-dden*, which appears to be a dialectal variant. According to Garusinghe (1962) this is used in first and third persons and both numbers. De Silva (1960) gives this form with another variant in *-ddaawe* and indicates a plural in *-ddella*, and lists them as third person. Informants differ on their knowledge and use of these forms, but dialectal differences, as yet undetermined, are clearly involved.

adjectival clauses and then with adverbial. We should first note that there are no clause-initial (or inter-clause) conjunctions in Sinhala, although there are clause initial discourse-linking adverbs such as *namut* 'but'. All grammatical subordination is clause-final, either by verbal affix or some lexical item.

Sinhala has no relative clause in the strict sense involving a relative pronoun, nor has it correlative constructions such as Hindi *jo...vo*. Rather, the equivalent of relativization is accomplished by a preposed adjectival clause, employing the past, non-past, or participial adjectival forms. The latter two appear to be semantic equivalents :

miniha hadəna peṭṭiə 'man make-adj box = the box the man is making'

peṭṭiə hadəna miniha 'box make-adj man = the man who is making the box'

miniha hæduə/hadəpu peṭṭiə 'man make-adj/make-particip. -adj box = the box the man made'

peṭṭiə hæduə/hadəpu miniha 'box make-past-adj/make-participial man = the man who made the box'

lamea iskooletə yanə bas-ekə 'child school-dative go-adj bus = the bus on which the child goes to school'

mamə giə tənə 'I go-past-adj place = the place that I went'

It is important to note that the range of nominal forms that may be modified by such clauses approximates that of those which can be modified by relative clauses in English. That is, there are not restrictions concerning the modified noun in terms of its subject or object status in the embedded clause (or perhaps more accurately that of its deleted equi-NP), such as those that apply to Hindi participial modifiers of the *jaataa huaa* or *gayaa huaa* type, and which are linked to the transitivity and inflection of the verbal form.¹³

We may now turn to adverbial clauses. There is one conjunction *nan* 'if' that may follow a clause in independent form :

mamə yanəwa nan taatta hambəwenəwa 'I go if father meet = if I go, I will meet father'

13. This seems to be the simplest way to state this for present purposes to indicate the distinction between these Sinhala clauses and participial modifiers of the Hindi, and apparently more characteristically Indo-Aryan, types. In fact, there are complex restrictions that apply, as for example, that most case-marked nouns can be relativized, but that nouns followed by postpositions, or by cases in certain specific functions, cannot; but these are clearly of a different order from those obtaining in the Hindi case. For areal purposes this is very important, since the Sinhala adjectival clauses are in virtually all respects like those in Tamil.

Otherwise adverbial embedding is accomplished in one of two ways :

(1) the use of one of the dependent forms of the verb, such as the conditional, concessive, contemporaneous, prior temporal or reduplicated forms. These may be called conjunct forms. The perfect participle is both a conjunct and an independent form.

(2) the use of one of a number of forms (usually of nominal or verbal origin) following one of the adjectival forms of the verb or an infinitive.

The following examples illustrate the use of the conjunct forms and will roughly convey the senses involved :

Conditional : *mamə peṭṭiak hæduot salli hambəwenəwa*, 'I box-a make-past-cond. money receive = if I make a box, I will get money'

Concessive : *mamə peṭṭiak hæduat salli hambəwenne næə* 'box-a make-past-concess. money receive not = even if I make a box I will not get money'

Contemporaneous : *mamə peṭṭiak hadaddi, miniha kataakerua* 'I box-a make-contemp. man talk-past = the fellow talked while I made a box'

Prior Temporal : *mamə peṭṭiak hæduaamə gedərə giyaa* 'I box-a make-prior-temp. home go-past = I went home after I made a box'

Reduplicated : *mamə peṭṭiə hadə kataa kerua* 'I box make-redup. talk-past = I made the box and talked (simultaneously)

Perfect Participle : *mamə peṭṭiak hadəla gedərə giyaa* 'I box-a make-past home go-part. = I made a box and went home'

As the last example shows, Sinhala has the conjunctive participle construction on which so much stress has been placed by Emeneau and others dealing with the Indian linguistic area (see Masica 1971, pp. 128 ff. for a survey).

Sinhala has a number of lexical items which may follow a verb in an adjectival form to form an adverbial clause. Like the conjunct affixes, they have special senses in addition to their function as markers of subordination, and there are limitations as to which verbal adjectival forms some of them may follow. Some of them, with their meanings (and the adjectival forms with which they occur indicated in parentheses) are: *nisaa* or *hinda* 'because (all)', *koṭa* 'when' (non-past),

kan 'until' (non-past), *hætie* (past or participial), *hamə* 'prior action' (past or participial). The following examples should suffice to illustrate the manner in which these forms occur :

taatta aawə nisaa mamə gieə nəə, 'father come-past-adj because
I go-past-emph not = because father came, I did not go'

mamə enə kan gedərə mə innə 'I come-until home emph
stay-infin = stay at home until I come'

mamə peṭṭiak hæduə hamə gedərə giaa 'I box-a make-past-adj
home go-past = after I made a box, I went home'

The form *hamə* above is particularly interesting because it is not only an equivalent of the prior temporal form in *-aamə* but clearly its etymological source as well. It thus furnishes a neat example of the way in which a periphrastic structure has become an inflectional form. All of the other conjunct forms appear to have similar histories, although not as obviously as this.

There are also forms like *issella* 'before' which follow the infinitive, with similar effects :

taata yanə issella mamə peṭṭiak hadannan 'father go-inf before
I box-a make-vol opt = I will make a box before father goes'

Verbal nominals deserve a brief mention. The *-iimə* and *-illa* ones form gerundive nominals with the subject of the under-lying clause appearing in the genitive :

minihaḡə pot liviimə hondə nəə 'man-genitive books write-
nominal good not = his writing of books is no good'

There is another type of nominalization in which the verbal adjective is followed by *ekə*, etymologically the inanimate numeral 'one'.¹⁴ This nominalizes an entire clause, with no other change in form :

miniha pot liənə ekə hondə nəə 'man books write-adj *ekə* good
not = that he writes books is not good'

As stated at the beginning, this paper does not attempt any detailed Sinhala-Tamil comparisons or their historical explanation, but a few general observations, coupled with some cautionary remarks, are in order.

14. A verbal noun plus *ekə* in this nominalizing function contrasts with the same sequence in which *ekə* alone has a nominal function like English 'the one' and is modified by a verbal adjective, i. e. relativized. Thus *yanə ekə* can be 'going' or 'the one which goes', but only in the second construction can other numerals be substituted: *yanə deka* 'the two that go'. *ekə* is also employed in adapting loan words, particularly from English: *bas-ekə* 'the bus', *kaar-ekə* 'the car', etc.

Despite the manifest influence of Dravidian, particularly Tamil, on Sinhala, further specification of that influence poses some very knotty historical problems, and a considerable amount of caution is called for. Noting resemblances is important, but insufficient; each observation must ultimately be accompanied by a plausible historical explanation if we wish to demonstrate conclusively cross-language influence of any direct kind. The form of the causative affords one example of the difficulties involved in drawing conclusions from resemblances alone. Masica indicates that Sinhala employs not only *-wə-* (his *-WA-*) as the distinctive sign of the causative, but also "consonant strengthening" (i. e. gemination) and mentions in passing that the latter is "a Dravidian device" (Masica 1971, p. 77). This interesting observation could suggest direct influence, but the history of Sinhala offers an alternative explanation making such an inference unnecessary, and in fact implausible. The Sinhala causative *-wə-* (or orthographically *-va-*) is the direct reflex of Sanskrit *(ā)paya* (Geiger 1938, p. 154). Historically, the geminated causatives have the same source, through the changes $CVwə > Cwə > CC$ i. e. *kapəwə kapwə kappə-*, and alternates with *Cw* and *CC* are attested, particularly in Literary Sinhala: *nawətwə-* or *nawəttə-* 'cause to stop'. These changes, dating from about the Eighth to Tenth Centuries, are part of a set attributable to regular sound change involving *y* as well as *w*. These by no means affect the causative alone, but also other aspects of verb morphology as well as noun morphology, where no question of Dravidian influence of this kind would arise (Karunatilake 1969, pp. 105 ff.). Thus any Dravidian influence would have had to operate through those regular sound changes, rather than on the morphophonemics of the verb, and there seems no reason to invoke it. Since Sinhala historical phonology has been relatively well treated, we are on firm ground in dealing with such examples, but we have no equally comprehensive treatment of historical morphology and syntax. Thus any historical inferences from similarities in those areas, though well worth making, should be considered provisional at best.

A Special problem with Sinhala lies in determining the period at which particular influences could have operated. Presumably, its pre-Sri Lanka ancestor was subject to prior influence on the mainland, leading to membership in the general South Asian linguistic area, but it is no simple task to separate the results of such influence from subsequent effects of influences operating independently but in a parallel fashion on Sinhala and its cognate languages. For this we need further detailed studies of the area as a whole, such as Masica's, along with period-by-period analyses of both Sinhala and Tamil.

One impressive set of similarities does emerge from the summary above. Although Sinhala verbs in independent clauses do not seem to resemble in any obvious way those of Tamil any more than they do those of northern Indo-Aryan languages, subordinate verbal structures as a whole are of a strikingly Tamil character. The exclusive use of preposed adjectival clauses as the equivalent of relativization stands out here, as do the conjunct affixes such as the conditional and concessive (i. e. Sinhala *giot*, Tamil *poonal* 'if one goes'; Sinhala *giat*, Tamil *poonaalum* 'even if one goes'¹⁵ as well as the use of particles or other forms following verbal adjectives so as to form adverbial clauses (Sinhala *yanə koṭə*, Tamil *pookiṛa polutu* or colloquial *poora appa* 'when one goes'). Whatever the problems in accounting for specific similarities, the cumulative effect is nothing short of overwhelming, particularly considering the lack in Sinhala of the alternate structures found in northern Indo-Aryan, such as correlatives and clause-initial conjunctions. On the other hand, Indo-Aryan is not without parallels and possible sources, such as participial modifiers and such constructions as Hindi *jaate samay* 'when one is coming' or *jaane ke baad* 'after coming'.

One might venture the hypothesis that what occurred in Sinhala was a shifting toward Dravidian patterns of embedding by the reformation of those Indo-Aryan structures most closely resembling those of Dravidian with similar functions so as to approximate the latter, and that this was accompanied by the (gradual ?) disuse of alternatives not bearing those resemblances. Fortunately, the relatively extensive documentation of Sinhala throughout its history should make it possible to treat this as an empirical question, by observing changes through successive periods, but this task remains to be done. Why the effect seems to have been so much more marked in dependent than in independent verbal structures is also an extremely interesting question which could cast some further light upon the way in which such influences operate, not only in this instance, but elsewhere.

15. Even here there is a suggestive similarity accompanied by a challenging discrepancy. The Sinhala concessive appears to include the form *-t* (literally *da*) in its derivation. Elsewhere, this form signifies 'also' and is essentially a functional equivalent of Tamil *-um*. However, it is not added to the conditional, as in Tamil, to form the concessive, but to a participial or (originally) nominal form. (Furthermore Geiger (1938, pp. 152-154) traces the conditional to the same *-t* but here an alternate explanation is possible.) Thus the parallelism breaks down in a way that makes it difficult to account for just how a Tamil model could have operated directly.

Bibliography

- Chomsky, Noam. 1971. "Deep Structure, Surface Structure and Semantic interpretation". In *Semantics*. Eds. Danny D. Steinberg and Leon A. Jakobovits. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 183-216.
- De Silva, M. W. S. 1960. "Verbal Categories in Spoken Sinhalese". *University of Ceylon Review*, 18, 1 and 2 (January-April), pp. 96-112.
- . 1967. "Effects of Purism on the Evolution of the Written Language: Case History of the Situation in Sinhalese". *Linguistics*, 36.
- Gair, James W. 1971. "Action involvement Categories in Colloquial Sinhalese". In *Themes in Culture (Essays in Honor of Morris E. Opler)*. Eds. Mario D. Zamora, J. Michael Mahar and Henry Orenstein. Quezon City, The Philippines: Kayumanggi Publishers, pp. 238-256.
- . 1970. *Colloquial Sinhalese Clause Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- . 1968. "Sinhalese Diglossia". *Anthropological Linguistics*, 10, 8 (November), pp. 1-15.
- and W. S. Karunatilaka. 1974. *Literary Sinhala*. South Asia Program, Cornell University.
- Garusinghe, Dayaratna. 1962. *Sinhalese, The Spoken Idiom*. Menuchen: Max Huber Verlag.
- Geiger, Wilhelm. 1938. *A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language*. Colombo, Ceylon: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Karunatilaka (Karunatilaka), W. S. 1969. *Historical Phonology of Sinhalese from Old Indo-Aryan to the 14th Century A. D.* Cornell University Dissertation.
- Masica, Colin P. 1971. *A Study of the Distribution of Certain Syntactic and Semantic Features in Relation to the Definability of an Indian Linguistic Area*. University of Chicago Dissertation.
- Rhys-Davis, T. W. and William Stede. 1921. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. London: Luzac, 1921-1925 (5th printing 1966).
- Schachter, Paul. 1973. "Focus and Relativization". *Language*, 49, 1 (March) pp. 19-46.
- Southworth, Franklin C. 1971. "Detecting Prior Creolization: An Analysis of the Historical Origins of Marathi". In *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. Ed. Dell Hymes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 255-273.

