

The Different Analytical Approaches of Two Sinhalese Grammarians: *A Comparative Analysis on Cumarathunga Munidasa and Ra. Tennakoon*

Chinthaka Ranasinghe

Department of Sinhala, University of Kelaniya

Abstract

This paper aims to identify and analyze the differences between the approaches of Cumaratunga Munidasa (1867-1944) and Ra.Tennakoon (1899-1965) in analysing Sinhalese grammar. For this, two texts on Sinhalese grammar namely, vyākaraṇa vivaraṇaya (Exposition of Grammar) by Cumarathunga Munidasa and Hoṇḍa Sinhala (Good Sinhalese) by Ra. Tennakon. The first one was published in 1938 and the second one in 1964. The time difference between these two is about 26 years. The texts have observed the various grammatical categories in Sinhalese and tried to examine them with their own approaches. Many of the categories are similar in both but the approaches are different for them. The grammarians were considered prominent members of one organization (Heḷa Havula) and commonly accepted in one ideology regarding language study. The paper reveals the differences between them in grammar study in a comparative manner. The usages of language in the texts, how to identify the

grammatical categories in theoretical perspectives, and how to examine their application are the major objectives included in this paper.

Keywords: *Cumaratunga Munidasa, Ra.Tennakoon, exposition of grammar, Honda Sinhala (good Sinhalese), Hela Havula.*

Introduction

This paper addresses some selected periods of the last phase of colonial Ceylon and the early post-colonial period of Sri Lanka. The work described belongs to the subject area of Sinhalese language study. This study is centered around the two major figures who represented those periods and the subject area, namely Cumaratunga Munidasa, and Ra. Tennakoon. Both Cumaratunga and Tennakoon played significant roles in the Sinhalese language and literature in the periods of reference of this study. This paper investigates their selected grammatical treatises in the form of a comparative examination and attempts to reveal their significance and identities with respect to Sinhalese grammar. Although both Cumaratunga and Tennakoon belonged to the same literary and grammatical school, i.e. *hela havula*, the present paper demonstrates how their significantly different identities have been manifested in their literary and grammatical works.

Background

As Ranjani Obeyesekere has pointed out “Language, literature, religion, and nation, have throughout Sri Lanka's history been inextricably linked in the Sinhala mind” (Obeyesekere, 1984, p.71). It says that language study has been embedded into the national heritage and considered as a part of national heritage. There has been a long tradition of monastic education established by Buddhist monks. After arriving western invaders into Ceylon, the education system has been changed and they introduced new subjects through Missionary institutions (Peter, 1978). Further, some Missionaries attempted to study indigenous languages to succeed in their political and religious activities among the people in Ceylon. It was a separate identity for studying the Sinhala language in comparing previous monastic studies and the new methodologies introduced by them for language studies. As Balagalle pointed out, it commenced with the Portuguese period and there was a meaningful study process launched by missionary educationists. All of these foreign rulers started learning indigenous languages for their administrative purposes. Various foreign scholars continued this process and the indigenous scholars represented local high-class society with excellent English education and cultural training with British tradition (Balagalle, 1999). James De Alwis (1823–1878) was one such prominent scholar

and he translated Sidat Saṅgarāva, (was written in the 13th century and is a classical Sinhalese work that secured a place in literary history as a major work of grammatical study in this country.) *into English with the* well-extended introduction on the history of Sinhalese literature. The step is considered a pioneer for modern Sinhalese literature and after that, many scholars entered the field of Sinhalese language and literature (Wickramasinghe, 1964, pp. 11-132).

Having introduced Colebrook -Cameron reforms for Ceylon there have been many radical changes in administrative policies and the changes made new economic and cultural structures in the country (Mendis, 1956). The scholarly culture also was changed under the background and three groups were formed as a result of the reforms. First of them was the English-educated group without a positive idea for indigenous languages and cultures and they were direct followers of Missionary education (Gooneratne, 1963, pp.19-39). The second one was the Sinhala-educated scholars who were nourished by the monastic tradition as followers of the nation and religion hating everything about the British administration and their education policies. The third one was well-English-educated people but fond of indigenous languages and cultural heritage with a critical perspective (Wickramasuriya, 1985) and they were attempting to do something for indigenes' heritage with their honest approach.

This group was very small and numerically less than others (Wickramasuriya, 1985). The intellectual groups contributed to the language study and literature study in the 19th century. The Royal Asiatic Society was established on 7 February 1845 in Ceylon and both foreign and indigenous scholars were entering the research works via the society. The journals and the newspapers accomplished the public sphere in English and as soon as possible their influence attracted Sinhalese society and they also made their own publications and readers (Dharmadasa, 2007, pp.54-110). After having established the University of Ceylon in 1921 many of the university people endeavoured to investigate the national heritage with their own perspectives and those effects blossomed with a new public sphere (Sarathchandra, 1950, Dharmadasa, 1995, pp.130-144).

In the latter part of the century, monastic tradition blossomed with second and third groups but most of the people in them were strongly involved in Sinhalese-Buddhistic ideology and considered academic activities as a part of the national heritage. As Blackburn pointed out “Hikkaduve Sumangala has participated in an intellectual project with local and international network” (Blackburn, 2010, xi). Including him, and other prominent scholars such as Ven. Rathmalanee Dharmarama (1852-1918), Mud.W.F.Gunawardhana (1861-1935) accomplished the great work of editing *sidat saṅgarāva*

and the result was an addition of a few excellent editions of Sidat Saṅgarāva. Those scholars of language studies; provided extensive expositions for sidat saṅgarāva lately. This type of exposition made on various Sinhalese classics became a leading slogan of the cultural renaissance that commenced during the 19th and 20th centuries. This idea was connected with national heritage, and patriotism so, the *Vidyodaya* (1873) and *Vidyalankara*(1875) traditions considered this process as a national duty (Silva, 2019, 12, 13 14).

The educational process of Vidyodaya and Vidyalankara were instrumental in bringing about vital changes in the system of language studies which included both laity and clergy society. The motivation given by this was considerable to create more independent intellectuals. The intellectual discourse in two monastic institutions was rapidly spreading all over the island. The students came from every corner of the country to obtain oriental knowledge from the monastics and many sub-institutions that were adjoined into them were made in distant areas of the country (Wickramasinghe, 1962, p.27).

During the span of a few decades between 1940-1960, there was an intellectual awakening on the island. Various socio-political and cultural factors provided a conducive environment for the origin of some intellectual groups. The long discourse started by those groups was inclusive of subjects such as priority for national language and literature, protection of human rights,

and gaining of independence and political power from the British. However after independence, these main objectives were not fulfilled, and society became frustrated. This situation led to a revolutionary awakening in the Sinhalese-educated rural middle class and they established a political movement against the then-existing ruling class (Mendis, 1995, pp.160-166). In this way, the Sinhalese language study process developed amidst so many different factors that led to creating scholars with different approaches towards Sinhalese language and grammar studies. Cumaratunga Munidasa and Ra. Tennakoon are two such scholars who contributed to the development of Sinhalese language studies in the academic field. Both of them were staunch members of the school of Heḷa Havula of which Cumaratunga was the founder in 1941 and Tennakoon was his follower. But despite this popular stance, I attempted to describe their identities in terms of the approaches they adopted to analyze the Sinhalese language studies.

Materials and Methods

Cumarathunga Munidasa (1887-1944)

Cumarathunga Munidasa was born on 25th July 1887, at *Dikwalle in Mathara* district, in the south of Sri Lanka. After completing his primary education at a village Sinhalese school and entered St. Thomas' College at *Mathara*. In 1907, he

entered Teacher-Training Collage in Colombo and completed a two-year training course. He was appointed as a principal of Kadugannawa School in 1909 and he was working there till 1917. After that, he was appointed as a school inspector and he worked till 1922 in the position. In 1927, he was appointed as the principal of Nittambuwa Teacher-Training College. These were the most outstanding years of his life because of Ra. Tennakoon and Cumarathunga met each other at *Nittambuwa*. After a short time spent in Nitambuwa, he moved to *Balapitiya* Teacher-Training Collage (Coperehewa, 2000). According to the writings of Do. De. Mohotti, (Mohotti, 2001) it seems that Cumarathunga was attempting to create a new teaching and learning practice in *Balapituiya* but, he left *Balapitiya* in a short time and there was no clear information available about this period. He edited *Lakmini Pahana* from 1934 to 1936, the newspaper was considered the most important and prestigious newspaper in the early part of the century (Dissanayake, 2009, p.60) and founded the *Hela Haula* on 11th January 1941 and passed away on 02nd March 1944.

Ra. Tennakoon (1899-1965)

Ra. Tennakoon was born in south *Aluthkuuru Korele*⁴ (Division of *Aluthkuuru*) at *Raygamapathuwa* in the Western province on the 19th of December 1899. Tennakoon entered *Raddoluwa*

⁴ This division is located in the western province; of *Minuwangoda*, a city 30 KM from Colombo.

School in Negombo division. He was the brightest student in the school and in addition, school education exposed him to temple education at *Raddoluwa* temple and also he attended the English class. Tennakon has been exposed to both oriental and occidental languages at his primary stage. At the Nittambuwa Teacher-Training College, he met Cumaratunga Munidasa. According to the records, at the first meeting of them, they started an ideological debate between them. At that time Tennakoon had a keen interest in language, Geography, and History. Cumaratunga had emphasized to him the significance of 'correct language' and why they must apply correct usage to every subject. According to the records available, Tennakoon expressed in his book: "When I met Cumarathunga, I was reading many books. After meeting him I could re-read them with a new vision (Kudathihi, 1996, p.11).

Those say that both Cumaratunga and Tennakoon had been close contacts in representing one theoretical school and ideology regarding Sinhala. However, in this article, I will reveal the differences between them regarding Sinhalese grammar study.

In this way, the Sinhalese language study process developed amidst so many different factors that led to creating scholars with different approaches towards Sinhalese language and grammar studies. Cumaratunga Munidasa and Tennakoon are two such scholars who contributed valuable service to the

development of Sinhalese language studies in the academic field.

Subsequently, as critics pointed out, Cumaratunga also endeavoured to engage in language studies, and as a result of this, he was able to author two books, with an approach of linguistics, namely *kriyā vivaraṇaya* (Examination of the verbs) and *Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya*. What he illustrated here as the linguistic approach was engaging in form-based analysis of language instead of meaning-based analysis (Wikramasuriya, 1970). Cumaratunga proposed a new case analysis instead of the old one so far used in Sinhalese language studies. This new introduction was much appreciated even in the seminal works of linguistics. Cumaratunga's theoretical struggle against already established Oriental discourse encouraged him to create this new usage of Case or *Vibakthi*. The traditionally practiced ninefold method of the case was replaced by his new six-fold case system. But most of the time Cumaratunga engaged in language studies centralizing meaning but he thoroughly based his attention on the classical Sinhalese language stratum.

1. Comparison of grammar conception and how they are represented.
2. How the analysis is made on the same language conception is compared. Under this caption, attention is called for the

analysis of conceptions on the type of syntax and relevant knowledge.

3. How the attention is focused on the concept of literary language and colloquial language is considered here.
4. How the attention is focused on meaning and form is called for discussion.
5. The evolution of language, especially in parallel to social change is to be discussed with the language changes that occurred.

Comparison of the Methods Used in Grammatical Concepts

Chapter eight of vyākaraṇa vivaraṇaya is named a combination of nouns. Yet another parallel content -can be found in chapter seven of “hoṇḍa simhala”. The combination of nouns illustrated in this chapter is parallel to the above chapter of Vyākaraṇa Vivaraṇaya . This chapter begins with this sentence

උක්ත ප්‍රකාශය සඳහා එක් නාම පදයක් අන්‍ය පදයක් හා බැඳීම නාම පද සම්බන්ධයි (මුනිදාස, 1963, p.135).

“Connecting of nouns to express meaning can be named as a combination of nouns”(Munidasa, 1963, p.117).

Tennakon begins his chapter as follows:

යම් කිසි අර්ථයක් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීම හුදු නාම පද යෙකින් බැරි වෙයි ඒ පිණිස අනෙක් පද හා නාම පදය බැඳෙනු නිසි වෙයි, සම්පූර්ණ අර්ථයක් ප්‍රකාශ කරනු පිණිස නම් එය ක්‍රියා පදයක් සමගින් බැඳෙනු ම නිසි වෙයි. සෙසු පද සමග ද නාම පදයේ බැඳීම සිදු වෙතත් එ විට එයින් ප්‍රකාශ කැරෙන අර්ථය සම්පූර්ණ නො වේ. (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p. 135).

“By a noun alone it is difficult to express meaning and for that purpose, it should be connected with other words. To give a complete meaning a noun must join with a verb. Though the noun joins with other words, then the meaning derived from it is not complete (Tennakon, 2008, pp.135).

මා සිත තුළ බියක්

යන තැන නාම පද සතරක් සැසඳී ඇති. එයින් එකක් සර්ව නාමයෙකි. එ හෙත් එ සතරින් සම්පූර්ණ අර්ථයක් ප්‍රකාශ නො වේ. (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p.135)

“A fear in my mind”. Here four nouns are combined. One of the nouns is a proper noun but from these four words, a clear meaning does not arise (Tennakon, 2008, p.135).

බල්ලා දුවයි.

එහි බල්ලා යන නාම පදය බැඳී හෙවත් සම්බන්ධ වී ඇත්තේ දුවයි යන ක්‍රියා පදය සමගයි. එයින් සම්පූර්ණ අර්ථයක් ප්‍රකාශ කරනු හැකි වෙයි (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p.135).

A Dog runs.

Here the noun dog is connected with the verb run and this sentence states a clear meaning (Tennakon, 2008, p.135).

Cumaratunga also provides some examples to establish his statement:

1. පුතා යේ.
 2. හේ පුත්‍ර දකී.
 3. තෝ පුත්‍ර හා යව.
 4. මා දකුණු අත සැලේ.
 1. පුතා යන නාම පදය යේ යන ආඛ්‍යාත පදය හා ද
 2. හේ යන නාම පදය දකී යන ආඛ්‍යාත පදය හා ද
 3. තෝ යන නාම පදය යව යන ආඛ්‍යාත පදය හා ද
- (මුනිදාස, 1963, p. 167).

1. Son may go.
2. He sees son.
3. Thou goes with son.
4. My right hand is shaky.

The noun "Son" goes with the verb (go)

The noun He goes with the verb see

The noun Thou goes with the verb goes (Munidasa, 1963, p.167).

According to my opinion, after comparing these two starting points, one can observe certain factors. One such factor is Tennakon's brevity in describing his ideas concerning Cumaratunga. He used a single sentence to discuss his conception of the combination of nouns. Cumaratunga's statement is descriptive and as well as his examples are numbered while Tennakon uses comparatively a lengthy but small paragraph and does not number his examples. His descriptions go into a broader readership because of his easy understanding of them. The conception Cumaratunga explains as “අර්ථ ප්‍රකාශය” (expression of the meaning), Tennakon explains in his usage as “යම්කිසි අර්ථයක් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීම” (Expression of certain meaning). Cumaratunga's usage is far more logical and scientific and it shows certain logistics we find in English grammar books. In comparison with Cumaratunga, Tennakon has paid more attention to a descriptive method. It emphasizes that he aimed at the Sinhalese readership. Cumaratunga has used Sanskrit words profusely but by contrast, Tennakon has used more Sinhalese words. For example, Cumaratunga to write a sentence used four Sanskrit words connected with the “Expression of the word” 1. අර්ථ 2 ප්‍රකාශය 3 අන්‍ය 4 සම්බන්ධ, but Tennakon used only a few Sanskrit words for his sentences. Cumaratunga used more examples, but Tennakon is excessive of descriptions but he is scanty of examples. Tennakon's target readership is different than from Cumaratunga's target readership. The examples

used by Cumaratunga are mostly from the classical Sinhalese language stratum and literary language while Tennakon s attention is in contrast, on the colloquial language. The three examples he cites, provide enough proof for this. The sentence “මා සිත තුළ බියක්” is closely similar to the common usage of “අර්ථ ප්‍රකාශ සම්පූර්ණ”. But examples such as “පුතා යෙ”.

හේ පුත්‍ර දකි’

“are more similar to the old literary language. The next two examples “තෝ පුත්‍ර හා යව’

මා දකුණු අත සැලේ’.

“are consistent with the written language and even that consistency is closer to the stratum of colloquial language.

Under no 2, Cumaratunga states as follows

සම්බන්ධ වන අන්‍ය පදය සලකන කල නාම පද සම්බන්ධය ත්‍රිවිධ යි.

1 නාමාඛ්‍යාත සම්බන්ධය

2 නාම නිපාත සම්බන්ධය

3 නාම නාම සම්බන්ධය

(මුනිදාස, 1963, p. 167).

“When considering the other word that connects with the combination of nouns is three-fold ;

1. Connectivity of noun-verb
2. Noun-interjection
3. noun-noun

Cumaratunga's attempt here was to use more grammatical technical terms and analyze his theme for his readers who are equipped with some basic knowledge. In contrast, Tennakon by simplifying his main theme tries to convince his idea to readers with lesser knowledge of grammar. More subtly, Tennakon uses grammatical technical terms for this purpose.

“අපේ බල්ලා බුරයි අපේ යන සර්ව නාම පදය බල්ලා යන නාම පදය සමග ද එය බුරයි යන ක්‍රියා පදය සමග ද සම්බන්ධ වී අර්ථය ප්‍රකාශ කරයි (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p.135).

Our dog barks. This sentence has two nouns and one verb bound together." The pronounce “connects with the noun" and it connects with the verb “barking" “to produce a meaning".

What Tennakoon states here is very simple. Because of the lucidity of this style, this sentence is conceivable to a reader as a speech delivered in close proximity. But Cumaratung's voice is so tough with pedantic scholarliness.

How attention is focused on meaning and form is to be considered here.

Meaning and form denote traditional grammar and modern linguistics. Traditional grammar analyzed language on the basis of meaning. In modern linguistics, this is done by taking form as a base and the basic definition for the subject clearly says “Linguistics is the scientific way of studying language” (Crystal, 1974, p.27). According to this, definitions on different genres of grammar are made by form which is the base all the definitions are based on. My intention here is not to go into long descriptions because such descriptions have already been made by grammarians. The following is a brief description given by M.W.Sugathapala de Silva on the difference between modern linguistics and traditional grammar :

වාග්විද්‍යාව භාෂාව හඳුනා විද්‍යාවක් නොව භාෂාවේ ඇති සැටිය විග්‍රහ කරන්නකි. වඩා හරි කියමන කුමක් ද යන්න වාග්වේදියාගේ පර්යේෂණය නො වේ. භාෂා සංශෝධකයා වාග්වේදියකු විය යුතු නොවේ. කියමනක් හරි ද වැරදි ද යන්න මැන ගත යුත්තේ ඒ කියමන භාෂාවේ භාවිත වන තරම මත පිහිටා සිට ගෙනය. යම් කිසි කියමනක් ඒ භාෂාව කථා කරන ජනතාවගෙන් වැඩි හරිය පාවිච්චි කරනවා නම් එය වැරදි කියමනකැයි කෙසේ කියමු ද? භාෂාව ප්‍රදේශයෙන් ප්‍රදේශයට වෙනස් වෙයි. ලියන බස හා කථා කරන බස යන ප්‍රභේදය ද ලේඛන සම්ප්‍රදායක් ඇති සියලු ම භාෂාවලම පාහේ දක්නට ලැබේ. මේ ප්‍රභේද ගණන් ගෙන ඒවා ඇති සැටියෙන් විග්‍රහ කිරීම වාග්වේදියාගේ කාර්යය ද යුතුකම ද වන්නේය. “මම යනවා” “මා යනවා” යන වාක්‍ය දෙකෙන් වඩා හරි කෝක ද යන්න තීරණය කර ගැනීමට වාග්විද්‍යාව අනුව නම්

කිසි ම සාධකයක් නො ලැබේ. මේ වාක්‍ය දෙකෙන් වඩා ප්‍රචලිත ව භාවිත වන වාක්‍ය වඩා ප්‍රචලිත වාක්‍යය යි නිගමනය කිරීමත් එහි ඇති විශරණය පැහැදිලි කිරීමත් වාග්වේදියා ගේ කාර්යය යි (ද සිල්වා, 1973, pp.05-06).

“Linguistics does not mean to make a language, but it means to analyze its characteristics. To find out the correct sentence or statement is not the duty of a linguist. The Language revisionist should not be a linguist. An utterance is to be identified as correct or wrong depending on how far it is used in a language. It is used by many people how could one say that it is a wrong utterance? Language differs from area to area. All the languages having writing traditions are supposed to be maintaining written language and spoken language systems. It is the duty and responsibility of a linguist to count and record these language systems and analyze them according to their true nature. According to linguistics, there is no way of proving whether “*mama yanawa*” or “*ma yanawa*” is correct. A linguist's duty is to decide which one of these two is popular and explain its grammatical structure.

In traditional grammar, the basic point is to highlight correct usage and analyze language according to its meaning. According to linguists “the purpose of language study in traditional grammar is to show for the people what is correct usage they have to follow and what is wrong usage they should not follow and study of rules about this language practices

which come under the purview of grammar study. What they mean by this indicates the responsibility of grammarians and not of them. J. B. Disanayaka in his discussion on the difference between traditional grammar and modern linguistics explains the language as “Something with plenty of patterners” (*Rata Samudayak*) in his early writing (Disanayake, 1969, p.xii).

Even though language practice is the main subject common to both, traditional grammar and modern linguistics, grammarian and linguist do not employ themselves in the analysis of them with the same objective. The responsibility of grammarians is to show the movies the correct way of speech and writing while the linguistics responsibility is to analyze the nature of language as it is in a real situation. Various factors, such as how the language has been formulated, how it operates, how it changes from time to time, how it spreads and exists in localities and the relationship between language and society are focused on his attention. According to these points, it seems that the grammarian uses the meaning-based concepts of correct usage as his prime factor for studying language whereas the linguist uses the form-based in contrast to analyze language.

Now I am going to inquire about the study approaches adopted by Cumaratunga and Tennakoon and how they have applied them to language study. By analyzing how each grammar

conception called for their attention let us examine these study approaches.

At the beginning let us compare the two initial paragraphs that appear in the first chapter of “vyākaraṇa vivaraṇaya” and “hoṇḍa simhala”

ශිෂ්ට සමාජය සාමාජික නීතියෙන් රැකේ. එ මෙන් ම, ශිෂ්ට භාෂාව ව්‍යාකරණ නම් වූ භාෂා නීතියෙන් රැකේ. අශිෂ්ට මනුෂ්‍යයෝ සමාජ නීති බිඳිති. ශිෂ්‍යයෝ එය ගුරු කමට නො ගනිත්. වැළි, අශිෂ්ටයනුදු ශිෂ්ට කරන්නට වැරදිකින් (මුනිදාස, 1963, p.1).

“Civilised society is protected by the law; likewise, language is protected by the laws pertaining to language. Uncivilized people violate social laws. The civilized do not practice these laws. They try again and again to civilize the uncivilized. The uneducated people violate the law and the educated do not practice these laws but they try to make uneducated people educated.”

In this way, Cumaratunga has begun his Viyakarana Vivaranaya.

“Tennakoon sets forth with his “Honda Sinhala” as follows:

කතා බස් කිරීමට හුරුපුරුදු වූ, කතාවෙන් බසින් වැඩ ගන්නා මෙ ලොවේ වසන අප දන්නා එක ම සතා මිනිසායි. සිය සතුන් අතුරින් ප්‍රබලම සතා ද මිනිසා යි. එ මිනිසා ගේ ඉතා ම බලසම්පන්න, ඉතා

ම ශක්තිමත්, වැඩ අවැඩ දෙකට ම යෙදිය හැකි, තියුණු ම, දරුණු ම අවිය හෙවත් ආයුධය නම් ඔහු ගේ භාෂාව යි.

භාෂාවක් එකිනෙකින් වෙනස් වූ ශබ්ද ගණනාවෙකින් යුක්ත වෙයි. ඒ ශබ්ද කීපයක් එක් විමෙන් යම් යම් දේ අගවන වදන් හෙවත් වචන පිළියෙල වී ඇති (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p1).

“Man is the only animal who uses language for his speech and he is the strongest animal among the other animals. For his good or bad deeds man uses his most vicious weapon; namely language. A language contains a number of different sounds. The words signifying certain things are arranged by combining these sounds”.

When the above paragraphs are compared with each other the first one seems to say that language laws are similar to social laws. Conceptions of the civilized and uncivilized are connected with the value of language practice. It seems that Cumaratunga's approach can be applied not only to language but also to social laws. This approach is connected with the laws covering the whole society while language laws and social laws are to be established on an equal basis. Cumaratunga shows that one of the things of social and cultural revival is to provide education for the uneducated, further, it should add complete training on language usage, to the education process. Tennakon, in contrast to Cumaratunga's approach, identifies the universal relationship between language and humanity.

On this matter, he is closer to modern linguistics. What he emphasizes here is the potentiality within the language for good or bad objectives. The idea he meant by the last sentence of the above passage is closer to the theories of modern linguistics. That is because of Tennakon's emphasis on the position of sounds that create a language. Sugathapala de Silva has shown how modern linguistics provides a considerable place for sounds in creating a language." A language is spoken by using sounds. Sounds are fourfold with short and long vowels, and soft and hard consonants. The analysis of sounds is called phonetics "This is completely different from how traditional language analyses are made by syllable-based methods. When comparing Cumaratunga and Tennakoon, it is obvious that Tennakoon was closer to the modern linguistic discourse than Cumaratunga was and it is proved by the above paragraphs. Tennakoon agrees with the idea that language consists of many sounds and becomes closer to the discourse of modern linguistics. But Cumaratunga in contrast with Tennakoon, considers language as a composition of syllables. "Read the word conceive the sounds arise, then it becomes clear that two sounds. It is necessary to write syllables." Cumaratunga's statement proves that he considered ශබ්ද (sounds) and අකුරු (syllables) as a synonym. However, according to modern linguistics, the word consists of three sounds and two syllables. Even though Tennakoon also regards අකුරු and ශබ්ද as synonyms, when compared with Cumaratunga, he is more

inclined towards modern linguistics than him. It is obvious from the examples he elucidates :

“හඳ is a word, (හ්, අඳ්, අ). It is composed of හ්, අ,ඳ්,අ syllables." This statement is similar to the modern linguistic definitions." The word මිනිසා is composed of six phonetic sounds and the word මල is composed of four phonetic sounds. This is the modern linguistic s idea and it is parallel with a modern linguistic idea and it is parallel with what Tennakon says.

The following examples illustrate that Tennakoon continued his stance in his analyses. එක් එක් වගේ මිනිසුන් ව්‍යාවහාර කරන භාෂාවන්හි උච්චාරණයෙන් උපදවනු ලබන ශබ්ද වෙනස් වේ. ඒ ශබ්ද ඇඳින විමට යොදනු ලබන අකුරු ද එ සෙයින් මැ වෙනස් වේ. ජන්ම භාෂාව හෙවත් උපතින් උරුම වූ භාෂාව තමා ඒ ඒ මිනිසාට නිවැරදි ව උච්චාරණය කළ හැකි වන්නේ (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p5). The sounds of utterances derive from the language used by people of each race are different. The syllables used for denoting these phonetic sounds are also different. The utterance of one race is different from another race. The language one could correctly utter is his mother-tongue. These ideas of Tennakoon are very similar to the ideas of the modern linguist, regarding language studies. Tennakoon's approach towards language study is not limited only to the Sinhalese language, but also to the whole process of language studies of other languages the second lesson of his book called “භෝධිය (Alphabet)" is a good example of this.

“We know that the phonetic sounds and the syllables used for the denoting theme are different. The certain nation takes as their own syllables or letters the other's syllables and alphabet. Therefore, one syllable is uttered in different sounds and different ways. European nations left behind their savage societies and began to civilize themselves by following religious precepts, and then they realized that they had no alphabet; as a solution for this, they adopted an alphabet of Romans, then who were at the highest point of civilization.

Cumaratunga very clearly selected the system called the Sinhalese language. But Tennakoon selected a common discourse of language. That is why Tennakoon's contribution to the field of language is closer to modern linguistics. But Cumaratunga was from the very beginning closer to the traditional system of Sinhala grammar system. Tennakon's scope of language discourse was wider than Cumaratunga's circumscribed approach to Sinhala language only.

By all these facts, I do not intend to propose that Tennakon was representing the modern linguistics discourse but what I mean here is that he is inclined towards a modernist approach regarding Sinhalese grammar study. Tennakoon's idea on the evolution of the Sinhalese language also goes parallel with modern linguistics.

ලක්දිවට පරංගි මිනිසුන් පැමිණි ඉක්බිති ඔවුන් ගේ ආගම වූ රෝමානු කතෝලික දෘෂ්ටිය අප අතරේ ද පතළ වූ යේ යි. සිංහලයෝ බොහෝ දෙනෙක් කතෝලිකයෝ වූහ. කතෝලික ආගම සිංහලයෙන් පළ කරන්නට ද සිදු වූයේයි. එයින් කතෝලික ආගමේ වදන් සිංහලයට වැදුණේ ය. ලන්දේසි දනන් ගේ පැමිණීමෙන් පසු ද ඉංගිරිසියන් ගේ පැමිණීමෙන් පසු ද ක්‍රිස්තියානි ආගම පිළිබඳ නො යෙක් කොටස් මේ දිවයිනේ ද පැතිරී ගියෙන් ඒ ඒ කොටස් පිළිබඳ විශේෂ වදන් ද ක්‍රමයෙන් සිංහලයට වැදුණේ යි (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, pp.84-85).

තමන් ගේ සිත් ගත් භාෂාවට සියල්ල අයත් කරන්නට තැන් කිරීම මෙ රට බොහෝ දෙනා ගේ සිරිත යැ. අලුතැ සංස්කෘතයට බැස ගත්තේ සියලු සිංහල මුල්වලැ කොන් ඒ උත්කෘෂ්ට භාෂායෙහි දකී. පාලි, දෙමළ, හින්දි ආදී භාෂාවන්ට ළ දුන්නෝ ද තම තමන් ගේ ආදරයත් සිංහල මුලුත් එක් තන්හි දකි ත්. සිංහල රටේ සිංහල මුලක් ඇති විය හැකි බවක් පවා ඔහු නො සිතති (මුනිදාස, 1963, p.84).

බවර භාෂාවෙකින් අව ද සිංහලයෙහි යෙදෙන කලැ ඒ සිංහල ප්‍රකෘතියෙකි දත යුත්තේ ඒ ප්‍රකෘතිය භාෂා රීතියට අනුකූල කොටැ යොදන පරි දි යි (මුනිදාස, 1963, p.83).

“With the arrival of Roman Catholic religion, number of words related to the religious practice adapted into Sinhalese language after Dutch and British invasions, the same thing happened. So, special words can be found in the Sinhalese language.”

This factor proves that Tennakon was completely in agreement with the changes that occurred in the evolutionary process of language and society. So he says, calling someone by the word තෝ (thou) is so archaic and not in common usage but it appears in highly advanced literary writings. Instead of "thou" now writers use the word "ඔබ" (you). It is a plural word but is used by people even for a single person. are being used by elders for miners. On other occasions, they are kept out of the vocabulary. Here Tennakoon emphasizes the word ශීථ (civilized) on purpose. This means that he also respects the idea that civilized and uncivilized exist in society as Cumaratunga did.

"Deviating from Cumaratunga's approach, Tennakoon pays his attention to the changes that take place parallel to the moving times. M.W.Sugathapade Silva describes how a word's original "Meaning of a word depends on the situation and environment, to which it is applied". (De silva, 1973, p.97) .We can observe a shadow of Silva's explanation of Tennakon 's idea.

වාගාලාපයේ අරුත රඳා පවතින්නේ වාගාලාපය භාවිත කෙරෙන පරිසරය හා අවස්ථාව මත ය (ද සිල්වා, 1973, p.97).

Chapter 7 of Tennakoon's book is entitled 'පිට භාෂාවන් ගෙන් වදන් පැමිණීම' (intake of foreign words into Sinhalese) and in which he explains his ideas about the modern man and his

social environs Civilized man who lives in a house is called නිවැසියා (dweller in a house) in the Sanskrit language as ගෘහවාසියා. This ගෘහවාසියා is a villager (ගම්වැසියා) .Then he becomes a city dweller or නාගරිකයා. Gradually, he becomes a citizen and then a world citizen. We are now world citizens. Therefore, we consider anything in this, world on common terms. A man from his house-dwelling stage came gradually passing other stages while gathering various customers, and gastronomic habits and became a world citizen and his gathered habits are now common to entire mankind.

මිනිසා - හැදෑණු මිනිසා නේවාසිකයෙකි හෙවත් නිවෙස් වැසියෙකි. සංස්කෘතයට හුරු වෙන්නට කියනවා නම් ගෘහවාසියෙකි. මේ ගෘහවාසියා ගම් වැසියෙකි. පසුවට රට වැසියෙකි. එයින් ඉක්බිති ලෝ වැසියෙකි. අද අපි ලෝ වැසියෝ වෙමු. එ හෙයින් ලොවේ ඇති කවර දැයක් අපි අද පොදුවේ සලකමු (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p.80).

This proves his clear knowledge of what kind of complex global environment we are living in.

As Cumaratunga explained in the introduction to his “*Viyakarana Vivaranaya*”, he states that it is a crime to make a grammar book so bulky with the addition of a chapter written about the history of a nation and the history of a language. What he meant by this were some-extract chapters that the Pirivena -tradition added to Sinhalese classics as the history

of a nation in a lengthy style. He wanted to establish the method of analyzing structural formations of language. As a result of this stance, the social factors applicable to language study were ignored. But Tennakoon paid special attention to this factor. He has clearly illustrated how foreign word influx occurred and the environment for such happening to be present. He further emphasized the universal viewpoint of citizens living in the modern world. But he did not completely deviate from Cumaratunga's attitude in analyzing words. The examples cited in the same chapter prove this idea:

1. Instead of these previous words apply more civilized words" (මේ තාවකාලික බොල් වදන් පිණිස ශිෂ්ට වචන යොදන්න)
2. වට්ටාඩිකම (roguishness)
3. පුවානම්කාරයා (blabber)

It is observed that Tennakoon has also respected the norm of civility as Cumarathunga did in categorizing words by their meanings. But in some aspects, he has gone against Cumaratunga's approach towards language.

2. Comparing how a single grammar concept was analyzed by these two exponents.

When analyzing a single concept of grammar, Cumaratunga and Tennakoon both followed similar and dissimilar approaches. Although both of them showed conceptually similar ideas, Tennakoon was more inclined towards colloquial language. The analysis of modes of gender in the Sinhala language provides an ample example to prove this idea Cumaratunga's introduction mode of gender as saying that නාමයකින් ස්ත්‍රී අර්ථය දෙවන්නා වූ ක්‍රම තුනකි (There are three modes of gender in Sinhalese language). What Tennakoon says about this is different ලිංග භේදය මිශ්‍ර සිංහලයේ නම් අයුරින් යෙදේ (modes of gender in mixed Sinhalese are – varied. In this matter, Tennakoon presented two different points, namely: one point is that he did not give the definite number and the other point -is that he stressed as මිශ්‍ර සිංහලය (mixed Sinhala language) . He explains “නම් අයුරින්” as නොයෙක් ආකාරයෙන්” within brackets. All this proves that Tennakoon had a special way of addressing his readers. Sometimes this may be due to the difference between the periods they represented. If I may go a little further from this fact, that deference can lead to several other facts mentioned below:

1. When Tennakoon wrote his book he was performing duties of various positions in government service and the experiences he gained through them were very helpful. Yet Cumarathunga was not that mature enough in such an environment.

2. All of Tennakoon's writings were in pure -Sinhalese style and the style remained right throughout his lifetime.
3. Cumaratunga's style was rather Sanskritized mixed -Sinhalese and two-fold style for the rest of his life.

As per the above analysis, Cumaratunga and Tenakkon both were great exponents as well as great orators who made untiring efforts to impart knowledge to the Sinhalese readers. But one can trace so many differences between these two giants. One other thing to state here is that Tennakoon was able to maintain his "Pure-Hela" style for his lifetime, whereas Cumaratunga practised it for a shorter period.

Very same examples, which C used to illustrate his interpretation. On modes of gender in the Sinhala language, Tennakoon uses for his feminine Gender analysis.

වී යන ප්‍රත්‍ය යෙදීමෙන් ස්ත්‍රී ලිංගාර්ථ ශබ්ද නිපදවනු ලබන ශබ්ද කීපයක් ද වෙයි

ගිරා	ගිරවී
ගොළ	ගෙළවී
ගුරු	ගිරිවී
එළු	එළුවී

(තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p.103).

From these examples, only one remains in colloquial language. But when creating a new method of composing Sinhalese

words, he was closer to the colloquial language than the other members of the “*Hela Hawula*” group. Some examples Cumaratunga employed are not consistent with colloquial language, they totally agreed with modern linguistics.

The Sinhalese article written by Sugathapala de Silva on the modes of gender in Sinhalese grammar (ව්‍යවහාර සිංහලේ ලිංග භේදය) denotes the same examples of two-syllabled words and their conceptual meaning of them are close to Tennakoon's stance.

The word “එළු” that Cumaratunga never used was Tennakoon's favourite word. Cumaratunga used “හෙළ” as synonyms for සිංහල. He takes more examples from written language but Tennakoon in his “*Honda Sinhala*” has taken from strata of rural dialects daily usage of colloquial Sinhalese language.

“තෝ” යනු ගිය දවස් හි කෙසේ වෙතත් මෙ දවස් හි උසස් සාහිත්‍ය ප්‍රබන්ධයන්හි මිස ශිෂ්ට සමාජයේ භාවිත නො වේ. එ වෙනුවට අද ව්‍යවහාර වන්නේ “ඔබ” යන්නයි. නුඹ, නුඹලා, උඹ යනු ද එක් අවධියෙක ව්‍යවහාරයට පැමිණ පැවතුණත් එ වදන් අදිපතියන් විසින් පහත් යැයි ගණන් ගන්නා ලද දනන් ඇමතීමේ බෙහෙවින් යෙදූයෙන් එ ද අද වැඩිමහල්ලන් විසින් බාලයන් අමතනු ලැබීමේ හැර සෙසු තන්හි ව්‍යවහාර නොවේ (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p.90).

On page no. 90 Tennakoon's *Hoda Sinhala*, he indicates the way of forming various nonuse, in different social and

cultural spheres which are used for addressing other persons. He does not present this as a linguist, but he pays attention to the suitability and non-suitability of those nouns as a cultured personality. When compared with Cumaratunga, he highlighted how far social factors influence construction the way of forming practical usage of the Sinhalese language and he understated this influence and accepted it.

Cumaratunga does not respect provincial dialects and does not take many examples from them. He discards this kind of language usage as impolite. But Tennakoon compares colloquial language and polite and scholarly language when he deals with language analyses. He states on page no 99 as follows: only following the wd.uh theory (theory of augmentation) in the Sanskritized Sinhalese language of grammarians, does not use colloquial Sinhalese strongly....".

ආගම න්‍යාය සංස්කෘත සිංහලයෙහි හෙවත් ව්‍යක්තයන් ගේ ව්‍යවහාරය අනුව සකස් වූ සිංහලයෙහි පමණ ගැමි ව්‍යවර්ථ බලවත් නො වේ. එහෙයින්

‘මැටි’ ශබ්දය

මැටිය මැටියෙන්’ යැයි ද

මැටිට මැටිටෙන් යැයි ද දෙ විදියටම අසන්නට ලැබේ.

(තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p.99).

While discarding this kind of colloquial usage, Cumaratunga does not accept usages as මැටිටෙන- into his method and in his

opinion, these kinds of words come under provincial dialects, But Tennakoon showed that these two methods are practised equally in language. The idea of provincial dialects rural and daily practices of language is brought in by Tennakoon with no negative attitude. In his discussion of compound words (සමාස) Tennakoon says, as follows: අල ද පුටු ද ‘අල පුටු’ යි සමාසයක් කොට දැක්වීම

අල and පුටු two words are made as one compound word ‘අල පුටු’ by grammarians who kept indigenous languages at the mentorial position and it was suitable for that period but not for current usage. It should be now as two words as අල පුටු

The language used for dealing with conversations should not be full of shorter words.

In, Hoda Sinhala, Tennakoon has paid special attention to the contemporaneousness of language and colloquial language. Under the patronage of indigenous languages, it is alright with this type of words but they are not suitable for modern society. This idea shows how far Tennakoon was concerned with the social factors vibrant in contemporary society. He used the special words “කටචතරේ භාෂා” to stress the importance of contemporariness and colloquial usages in analyzing the Sinhalese language (Tennakoon, 2008, p.105).

Tennakoon pays attention to the fact that the Sinhalese language had been in use for a long time.

සිංහලය ඉතා දීර්ඝ කාලයෙ ක සිටැ ව්‍යවහාර වෙමින් පවත්නා භාෂාවෙකි. එහි එක් ම අර්ථය දීමට නො එක් විදියේ පද ඇති වීම එ හෙයින් අරුම නො වේ (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, pp. 177-178).

“The Sinhalese language had been in use for a long time and therefore availability of various words to give the same meaning is no wonder.” (Hoda Sinhala, p.178)

When the Sinhalese language is considered an independent phenomenon, it has a long history of practice and as a result of that, there are a number of synonyms available for a single word. With time a language in continuous practice gains wider expansion, Tennakoon discussed these factors in his book.

Tennakoon while analyzing grammar conceptions, pays attention to other language practices. Such as colloquial usages. This stance agrees with the modern linguistic method. Instead of this Cumaratunga elucidated sorter definitions for language practices.

This he directly states about the non-availability of the future tense in the Sinhala language.

Regarding combining words (ප්‍රත්‍යාර්ථන බෙද) Tennakoon selects examples from rural dialects and shows us the “form “extracted.

‘නුවර + ඉ’ යනු නුවර යි වුව මනා සේ පෙනෙන්න අනමාදේශයෙන් හෙවත් පටු ස්වරයෙන් ගේ නැමීමෙන් නිවරියි ද, දෙ පස ‘ඉ’ බලා

වූ 'චි' හට 'යි' ආ දේශයෙන් ද නියැරී යි සිටී. 'දෙගෙඩි' යනු ද ගැමි වහරේ බෙහෝ විට 'දෙගිඩි' යි සිටී (තෙන්නකෝන්, 2008, p. 243).

(The word 'දෙගෙඩි' appears in colloquial language as 'දෙගිඩි')

Another remarkable difference that appears in the theoretical approach applied to studying language is Cumarathunga's act of borrowing technical terms, and forms, from the English grammar system to introduce his language types. But Tennakoon totally rejects borrowing technical terms from the English language.

For example, we can note down here that Cumaratunga in his "*Viyakarana Vivaranaya*" has named chapter 16 as "Sentences" (වාක්‍ය) and explains sub-sections of the chapter he states about "Clauses" (ද්විවිධ වච) and "Phrases"(ද්විවිධ පාද) (Munidasa, 1963, not mention page numbers).

What he means here is that two conceptions of "ද්විවිධ වච " and "-ද්විවිධ පාද" are similar to clauses and phrases of English grammar. Tennakoon in his book entitled "-අපේ කවි" (Our Poetry) includes the following idea.

ඉංගිරිසි වියරණයෙහි ඇති

Sentence

Subject and predicate

Clause

Phrase

Simple sentence

Composed sentence

Complex sentence

Direct object

Indirect object

ඇසිය ගණන් නම් සිංහල වියරණයට අමු අමු යේ කුලවද්දා ඇති සැටි ඉස්කෝලයේ 'බසා' ඉගැන්වීමට පිළියෙළ කරුනු පොතක් බැලූ විටදී පෙනී යනවා ඇති (තෙන්නකෝන්, 1957, p. xv).

These terms have been adapted to the Sinhalese language without rational investigation and this can be seen even in a schoolbook used for educational purposes. (Tennakon, 1957, p. xv).

Discussion

These two approaches of Cumaratunga and Tennakoon are different from each other. What Cumaratunga is trying to do here is, with the help of English technical words, to define Sinhalese grammar. But Tennakoon has shown that without

any reason or logical foundation, these technical terms have been borrowed. According to his opinion, the Sinhalese grammar teacher in schools is not pure Sinhala grammar but a hybrid Sinhala. He names 'රට නිංගල' (Foreign Sinhalese) for modern school grammar teaching and the Sinhalese has been prepared by blindly following English grammar texts and their terms and not following real Sinhalese texts in Sri Lanka.

At this point, Tennakoon stands directly against Cumaratunga's approach. This process that C has closely used the English grammar system for analyzing Sinhala grammar concepts. But Tennakoon rejected completely this approach and believed in practice as purely "Hela" language a grammar system that innovates itself.

Conclusion

The proposition I attempted to build up in this article was based on a comparison between the approaches of Cumaratunga and Tennakoon for analyzing Sinhala grammar conceptions and their difference. They are theoretically different approaches. These two eminent scholars were ardent members of the same school as Hela Havula but Cumaratunga was Tennakoon's mentor and his theoretical leader. Tennakoon followed his teacher's approach. However, the point attempted to be proved was that these two separate approaches are rather

different in basis vice and conceptual vice within the scope of Sinhala language studies. At the same time, it was clear that Cumaratunga's approach was based on the traditional theory of the Sinhalese language while Tennakoon showed his closeness to the modern theories of linguistics.

References

- Blackburn, A. (2010). *Locations of Buddhism, Colonialism and Modernity in Sri Lanka*, Social Scientists Association, Colombo.
- Coperahewa, Sadagomi. (2000). *The politics of language in colonial Sri Lanka, c. 1900-1948*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Dharmendra, K. N. O. (1995). *The Peradeniya Contribution To Literature, Theatre And The Arts* p.130-138, The University System Of Sri Lanka-Vision And Reality, (ed), K M de Silva and G.H.Peiris.International Centre For Ethnic Studies, Kandy.
- Dissanayake, Wimal. (2009). *Sinhala Novel and the Public Sphere-Three Illustrative Moments*, Visidunu Publication, Boralesgamuwa.
- Do. De. Mohotti. (2001). *Momments of Cumaratunga*, Colombo Godage Publishers.
- Gooneratne, M. Y. (1968). *English Literature in Ceylon 1815-1878, 1968*, Tisara Prakasakayo, Dehiwala.
- Mendis G. C. (1956). *The Colebrooke -Cameran Papers-Documents on British Colonial Policy in Ceylon 1796-1833 Volume 1*, (Selected and Edited) Oxford University Press.

Obeyesekere, Ranjani. (1984). *The Bilingual Intelligentsia, Their Contribution to the Intellectual life of Sri Lanka in the Twentieth Century, P.71-91*, Honoring, E. F. C. Ludowyk-Feliciation Essays, Tisara Prakasakayo Ltd. Dehiwala.

Sarathchandra, E.R. (1950). *The Sinhalese Novel*, M. D. Gunasena -Colombo.

Silva, Chandra R. De. (2018). *The Education of Buddhist Monks in Sri Lanka-A historical review and some suggestions for reform*. The Sri Lankan journal of the humanities 42;1-2,1-28. published online, the University of Peradeniya.

Wikramasuriya, Sarachandra. (1970). Munidasa Cumaratunga's contribution to Sinhalese linguistics, The Ceylon Journal of the Humanities, Vol.1, no,1, January, University of Peradeniya.

බලගල්ලේ විමල, ජී. (1999). සිංහල භාෂා අධ්‍යයන ඉතිහාසය, එස්. ගොඩගේ, කොළඹ.

තෙන්නකෝන්, ඩ. (1957). අපේ කවි, එම්. ඩී. ගුණසේන, කොළඹ.

තෙන්නකෝන්, ඩ. (2008). හොඳ සිංහල, එස්. ගොඩගේ ප්‍රකාශකයෝ, කොළඹ.

ද සිල්වා, සුගතපාල. (1973). විග්‍රහාත්මක වාග් විද්‍යාව, අධ්‍යාපන ප්‍රකාශන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව, කොළඹ.

ද සිල්වා, සුගතපාල. (2016). භාෂා විෂයක ලිපි, එස් ගොඩගේ ප්‍රකාශකයෝ, කොළඹ.

මුණිදාස, කුමාරතුංග. (1963). ව්‍යාකරණ විවරණය, එම්.ඩී. ගුණසේන, කොළඹ.

වික්‍රමසිංහ, කේ. ඩී. පී. (1964). නූතන සිංහල සාහිත්‍ය, එම්.ඩී. ගුණසේන, කොළඹ.

වික්‍රමසිංහ මාර්ටින්. (1962). හික්කඩුවේ නායක මාහිමියෝ හා සිංහල සාහිත්‍ය ආරම්භය 1962 පිටු 27-42 ශ්‍රී සුමංගල (සංස්.) කඩ්ඩිංගල සෝරන, ප්‍රේමරත්න අබේසේකර, විද්‍යෝදය විශ්වවිද්‍යාලය, ශ්‍රී සුමංගල ගුනානුස්මරණ සංගමය.

Biographical Note

Chinthaka Ranasinghe is a Senior Lecturer in Sinhala language and literature at the Sinhala Department of the University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka. He earned his B.A. degree from the University of Colombo and his M.A. from the University of Kelaniya. Additionally, he completed his MPhil degree from the University of Colombo. Chinthaka has published extensively, including both books and journal articles, in the fields of Sinhala language, literature, and literary criticism.