

PROBLEMS OF RECONSTRUCTION IN THE AUSTRONESIAN LANGUAGES

(Revised text of a paper read to the Linguistic Society of New Zealand on 29th June, 1960)

M.E. Reizenstein

In a paper reviewing work done on "The Comparative Linguistics of Austronesian Languages", summarised in Te Reo 2 (1959) 6-15, it was indicated that the Austronesian languages east of the Brandes Line may ultimately prove to be relatively closer to the parent tongue than the West Indonesian languages. This paper is intended to justify this suggestion.

The Brandes Line (Brandes 1884, Kruyt 1914) is the linguistic boundary running from Flores northwards to the Celebes Sea and separating the West Indonesian (WIN) languages (Malay, Old Javanese, Tagalog in the Philippines, Toba-Batak in Sumatra, Ngadju-Dayak in Borneo and Hova in Madagascar) from the East Indonesian (EIN) along with the Melanesian (MN), Micronesian (MCN) and Polynesian (PN). The WIN languages named are not of course the only members of that group, but are the ones taken as basic by Dempwolff in his reconstruction of Proto-Austronesian (PAN).

Two different attitudes have generally been taken towards this linguistic boundary. Jonker, for example, denied its existence, although he admitted that certain EIN languages went with MN rather than with WIN. On the other hand, the non-IN population of Oceania and the existence of "Papuan" languages in the EIN area as well as in the MN area has led to the conclusion that east of the Brandes Line we are dealing with a mixture of IN with a former "Papuan" element, the final stage of the admixture being found in MN (Kanski and Kasprusch 1934).

The view taken here is that the undeniably different features characterising the Oceanic languages are Austronesian, but archaic, and that the Brandes Line is to be regarded as demarcating an older, Oceanic, Austronesian from a younger WIN branch of Austronesian. Any reconstruction of PAN based on WIN includes Oceanic features only in so far as they can be brought into line with that reconstruction: it is then a simple matter to explain typical Oceanic features as either corrupted WIN or non-Austronesian, as has, of course, been done.

Subsequent reconstruction of a pre-Austronesian stratum or strata is not rejected by the attitude adopted here, but it is imperative to consider the Austronesian aspect first. Schmitz (1960: 13) has rightly stressed the urgency of research into non-MN elements present in MN, but before we can do this we must know what we mean by MN from the point of view of PAN. Only then is it possible to see if the non-Austronesian, non-"Papuan" Grundkultur B established by Schmitz on ethnological and mythological grounds has any linguistic correlations.

Our method of approach is to see how far Dempwolff's WIN-based PAN, tested on very few MN and PN languages, meets the problems typical of the Oceanic group of Austronesian languages. In the process we shall see that it is thanks to the efforts of C.E. Fox and A.G. Haudricourt that advances can be made in reconstructing proto-Oceanic features.

* * * * *

One of the many notable divergences of Oceanic from Dempwolff's PAN is the nature of the initial consonant, particularly in MN, which has a series of labiovelars, both prenasalised and oral. They appear as initial clusters, e.g. kpwatu "head", or medially e.g. zambwat, zangwet "dry", and are found in the SE Solomons, New Hebrides and Banks Is., and New Caledonia. There are regular sound correspondences in each of these regions, not only between labials and velars (pw:kw), but also between dentals and velars (t:k) and between dentals and sibilants (t:s). For examples, cf. Haudricourt 1951.

There are three different explanations of these clusters and of the correspondences noted.

(1) They are taken as belonging to a non-Austronesian substratum.

(2) The labiovelar clusters belonged to the mother-tongue, and while they remain in a few languages are mainly represented by either labials or velars in the languages of today. This is the view taken by Haudricourt (1948: 159-162), who indicated that the conservation of early stages of this development in New Caledonia might be traced back to neolithic times. (The round-axe culture which preceded the IN quadrangular adze culture has not, apart from a few examples in N. Borneo, been traced west of the Brandes Line, but it could well be attributed to such an early Melano-Austronesian population. Cf. van Heekeren 1957: 122, map.)

(3) The clusters result from the combination of prefixes with the initial consonant of the word to which the prefix is added. Such combinations had already been described for IN by Brandstetter (Blagden 1916: 159). Dempwolff (1934: 30-33) treats the problem purely phonetically and arrives at the concepts of "Nasaler Ersatz" and "Nasaler Zuwachs". Fox (1948) points out a whole series of possible changes of initial consonants through prefixation, with the MN clusters as the outcome; and further, that the grammatical characteristics of the prefixes in IN are not valid for MN. Where Brandstetter distinguished the article and the verbal prefix nga- in IN, Fox showed that in Oceania this and other prefixes are simply formatives which do not alter the meaning of the word to which they are prefixed (1948: 236).

We may take the formative nga- as an example. It is used with nouns and verbs, and may remain in full: e.g., Maori nga-hora "spread". Before a consonant of similar articulation, only the consonant of the prefix remains: e.g., Nggela ng-gau "branch"

(PAN *kayu "tree"). If the initial consonant is not of similar articulation, it is replaced by the consonant of the prefix: e.g., Nggela ngara "blood" (PAN *(d)RaRa "blood"); Arosi ngoa, Maori ngota, "broken" (PAN *beTak "to break, split"). Before b- or p-, the consonant of the prefix either becomes k or g, or disappears: e.g., Mota kpw-, Lau gw-, Arosi bw-, pw-; cf. *baTuk "skull" below, and Fox 1948: 242 ff.

The problem of formative prefixation is an intricate one, awaiting further research and thought. When the phonetic changes, the prefixes themselves, and the initial consonants of the words are clearly determined, many a word thought to be non-Austronesian may be recognised as belonging to the common stock, particularly in MN. This early method of prefixation, apparently so alive then, and absent in WIN, apparently disappeared later. Obviously, ignorance of its operation and concentration on WIN were complementary features in Dempwolff's method.

One may ask, however, whether this prefixation was absent in early WIN, whether in fact, on this point, the characteristic of WIN may not have been loss of the prefix, with the resulting change of voiced velar initial (e.g., *gayu) to unvoiced (WIN *kayu). In EIN, treatment of the personal pronoun subjects as verb prefixes led to initial consonant changes in the verbs: Stresemann (1927: 117-125) has studied this for the Seran-Ambon group, and similar processes are found in languages of the Sunda Archipelago (Flores, Solor) and the Tanimbar group.

We may now consider in detail some of Dempwolff's reconstructions from the point of view of the initial consonant.

PAN *baTuk "skull".

WIN: batok, bato, batu (meanings discussed below).

PN : patu.

MN : (meaning everywhere "head"): Bismarck Archipelago: pat, baku, vaku, paungu, patungu, batu (Lanyon-Orgill 1942: 106); N. Solomons, Choiseul: botu (Lanyon-Orgill 1944: 81); SE Solomons, Bugotu: pau, Arosi: bwau, Lau: qwou, Alite: gwalu, Sa'a: pwaeu, pweu; Banks Is., Central New Hebrides: kpwat, kpwatu, kmbwatu; S. New Hebrides: bau, botu, Fate bwau; New Caledonia: nggwa, ngga, mbwa (Haudricourt 1951; Leenhardt 1946: no. 1); (cf. Codrington 1885: no. 42, pp. 45, 76).

Dempwolff includes Sa'a pwaeu, pweu as derivatives of PAN *baTuk, as they fulfil the phonetic correspondences except for the initial pw-. The reflex of PAN *b- in Sa'a is h-, or more rarely p-. The actual pw- here is regarded as arising from a "Papuan" substratum influence (Dempwolff 1937: 160, § 141c). Haudricourt's analysis, however, shows clearly the need to take variations of this kind back to an earlier stage: we should therefore reconstruct *nggbaTuk. If, however, we then bring into the discussion Fox's formative prefix nga, we must interpret this PAN form as *ng-baTuk.

The distribution of meanings is also important. "Head" is valid for Melanesia, and on up through the Gilberts (atu) to Formosa (vau), cf. Codrington 1885: 76. In IN and PN only associated meanings are found: "neck", "forehead", "half coconut shell" (IN), and "fatty swelling or tumour" "hard thickening of skin" (Western PN); (for these meanings, v. Dempwolff 1939: s.v. baTuk); cf. also Niue patu "chief". The apparently later AN word for "head", ulu, hulu, which extends as far as Eastern Polynesia, is also frequent along the MN north coast of New Guinea. We may therefore consider PAN *baTuk as a predominantly Oceanic and MN word, phonetically, semantically and geographically. The north-south semantic area of "head", from Formosa to New Caledonia, is particularly curious.

PAN *qatey "liver".

Dempwolff's Sa'a entry here: "s/ae" for sae, implying that the initial s- is an accretion, is nowhere explained by him. In fact, his whole PAN reconstruction accounts only for Sa'a si. and su, as in PAN *sinaR "light": Sa'a sine; yet there are many Sa'a words containing s plus a vowel other than i.

If we turn to EIN and MN, we find other initial consonants. In EIN we have Muna (Celebes): ghate (Adriani 1914: 249); Selaru (Tanimbar): kati (Drabbe 1932); N. Halamahera: gatel, gate, katere (Van der Veen 1915: 117); Sikka (Central Flores): wateng. For MN, we have New Guinea (N. coast: Sariba, Mukawa, Kiriwina, etc.): kata, kate (Capell 1943: 109, no. 14; Ray 1907: 493, 83); Northern New Caledonia: kaxi, kei, xhi, kiye (Leenhardt 1946: no. 83; Haudricourt 1951). As Haudricourt (1954: 216-217) points out, Palau in W. Micronesia has a velar spirant in xad "liver", and in Formosa (e.g. Paiwan) the s- appears as in Sa'a, or dz, tz, which correspond to PAN *s-. This leads Haudricourt to consider that the s- and its corresponding velars k-, g-, x-, are older than the WIN initial sounds for this word, and therefore Dempwolff's *q- is inadequate. To allow for the shifts from k to x to s, he favours reconstructing *qsathey.

The question of a change in the initial phoneme through prefixation must however be considered. Apart from the series of initials already discussed, there is also a labial ae, seen in Sikka: wateng; Mota: vare, varai; and probably Efate: uateam "kidneys". Here one could perhaps invoke wa, the MN classificatory prefix for things of roundish shape (Codrington 1885: 146). Returning to the velar series, it is interesting to note that for the Halamahera words for "liver", Van der Veen (1915: 117) suggests ka- as a "vorm-element", interesting in particular because these languages are not Austronesian. It is cases like this which lead to speculation as to the persistence of an older and wider linguistic context, predating Austronesian, Austro-Asian, Thai-Kadai and Tibeto-Burman. Relics of such a context could be seen in the Nâgâ-Bodo and Kuki-Chin languages of Assam as well as in Tibetan itself: Central Chin: pa-tí; Lhota Nâgâ: n-teⁿ; Mikir: in-t'in; Ao Nâgâ: te-me-sen; Tibetan: mcin-(pa) (Wolfenden 1929: 194, 152, 168).

We may now consider some semantic questions, and it is useful to begin with another Sa'a word analysed by Dempwolff, sa "sago-palm", PAN *qatep "thatched roof" (hence "s/ao/"). Surely here the original sense is that of the palm itself, rather than its leaves, used for thatching?

The semantic distribution of PAN *lima "hand", "five", is also instructive. The meaning "five" is common Austronesian, but the meaning "hand" is found only in languages east of the Brandes Line. Most of these languages thus have the one word for both meanings, and this clearly represents the older stage. For "hand", WIN used PAN *tangan, which has no general Austronesian meaning. In the Oceanic group it designates a variety of receptacles: Sa'a: anga "basket"; Tongan, Samoan: tanga "sack". It would seem that the original idea must have been the concept of a receptacle or container, from which the meanings "basket", "sack", "hand", can readily be derived. This is certainly more acceptable than working from an original meaning "hand".

There are also words belonging entirely to, and extensively distributed over, the languages east of the Brandes Line. Among the many we may mention mbembe (PN pepe) "butterfly"; mwata, ngata "snake"; mwane "male". The fact that some of the "eastern" words are also found in certain "Papuan" languages of New Guinea (e.g. mate, mat, mot, moa, etc. "snake") is in general against any notion of ascribing to them a "Papuan" origin, since "Papuan" words have neither continuous distribution nor stable phonetic shape (v. Friederici 1913: no. 128 and p. 127).

A most interesting word is mena, mea, me, etc. "tongue". Capell (1943: 112, no. 184) constructed *maya and, relying on manuscript notes of S.H. Ray, stated that the word does not occur further west than Celebes (1943: 127). It is also found in a number of "Papuan" languages along the north and south coasts of New Guinea. This could be the result of EIN influence, but the word has an archaic look in EIN, cf. Taburuasa (between Seran and Onin, S. New Guinea): kweri "tongue", and in N. New Guinea, cf. Sissano: weliak (Ray in Wollaston 1912: 337; Churchill 1916: 20). The existence of mena "tongue" in different dialects of Tasmania (Schmidt 1952: 298) is intriguing, as it could imply a non-Austronesian origin for the word. The PAN *iRaq, *iRang "to be red" must be taken into account, giving Malay merah (from *ma/ira); Sa'a mela (from *ma/ila) "glow"; Futuna mea (from *ma/ia) "to be red, blond". Dempwolff could not include Sa'a mea "tongue" here, and his WIN test languages would not allow of *igag. But the semantic and phonetic relationship of these words for "tongue" and "red" is so close that it points to a common origin, with the two meanings arising from regional differentiations. The meaning "tongue" is extensively found in MN and EIN, but not in PN. Any connection with the Tasmanian must of course be very old.

* * * * *

Certain grammatical features belong exclusively to different language groups of Oceania: the so-called "reversed" position of the genitive ("reversed" from the IN standpoint!); suffixation of the possessive pronoun exclusively to names of parts of the

body, to relationship terms and to personal nouns, with prefixation for all others. Because they have no direct bearing on the reconstruction of PAN itself, discussion of these problems and the interpretation of them as archaic Austronesian rather than non-Austronesian must be omitted here.

One interesting peculiarity, the trial number in the personal pronouns of PN, has just been treated by Haudricourt. He concludes: "Il semble donc que la séparation entre les langues polynésiennes et celles de Mélanésie s'est faite à une époque où existait encore le triel; que la séparation entre le polynésien occidental et oriental a eu lieu après que la forme du triel eut remplacé celle du pluriel" (Haudricourt 1959:135). This feature is obviously considered to be Austronesian, not of some other origin.

* * * * *

Much has been said at various times about the great reduction in phonemes evident in languages of the Oceanic group, particularly PN. We may quote a MN example: Sa'a ii "a noise in the ear", in relation to Javanese, Malay tinting "to clink". The general truth of this has been used as a background to what could almost be called the "law of the loss of the final consonant" throughout PN, to a great extent in MN and EIN, and partly in MCN. Because WIN has this final consonant, it is reconstructed, and its loss assumed in these other languages. Thus on the basis of WIN tanom, tanam, tanim, etc., as compared with MN, PN, tano, tanu, Dempwolff reconstructed *tanem "to bury" (intrans.). The procedure seems logical enough. We then consider MN tanumi, anomi, PN tanumi, "to bury" (trans.). Here the traditional explanation is that the final consonant of the PAN word reappears when a suffix is involved, here the transitive suffix -i. Dempwolff therefore enters under *tanem: IN: tanom, etc., MN: Sa'a: ano, anom/i; PN: Tonga: tano, tanom/i. Now this WIN-based analysis is in fact just a hypothesis which is not justified by an Oceanic-based analysis.

What we really meet with in MN and PN is this: a verb corresponding to the formula CVCV, expressing the act itself without determination: "bury, the burying as such". Our nearest equivalent is an intransitive verb. To this is added a suffix of the form CV, which ~~expresses~~ direction towards an object: tano-mi "to bury (something)"; tangi-si "to cry for (something)"; susu-ki "to sting, pierce (something)". Our nearest equivalent is a transitive verb. The analysis here is structural and functional, not purely descriptive and phonetic. The Oceanic linguist cannot but regard the WIN word as the curiosity which requires explanation, for there the suffix has lost its value, and the distinction between "intransitive" and "transitive" has gone.

Dempwolff in fact elevated his final consonant theory - 70% of his PAN stock of vocabulary has the form CVCVC - into a dogma, inserting his laryngeal weak off-glide wherever no final consonant could be reconstructed, e.g. *mata'. Dyen (1953: 19) has exposed this weakness: "Such an hypothesis is actually only a working hypothesis, because it simply fills a gap in the comparative evidence and is not a comparative formula. Such working principles can easily be discarded." He therefore admits the existence of vocalic endings in IN, but is otherwise concerned with reconstructing the laryngeals and carries the matter no further.

In actual fact, Fox had already sketched out the theory of the non-existence of the final PAN consonant, without knowledge of Dempwolff's views, and in reaction to Brandstetter's assumption that Austronesian had few suffixes. Fox comes to the conclusion that "IN is the aberrant member, its former ability to suffix largely lost, and former suffixes appearing only as single consonants, petrified and, except in Malagasy, unrecognized for what they are" (Fox 1947: 66). Malagasy was brought into the WIN scheme by Dempwolff, but not without difficulty (Dempwolff 1938: 71ff.).

The difference in approach could not be more extreme:

Dempwolff	Fox
IN: <u>tangis</u>	
MN, PN: <u>tangi</u> ; <u>tangis/i</u>	MN, PN: <u>tangi</u> ; <u>tangi-si</u>
whence PAN: <u>*tangis</u>	IN: <u>tangi/s</u>
	(whence PAN: <u>*tangi</u>)

Before elaborating Fox's theory, we may recall that agglutinative word formation is universally accepted as the core of Austronesian grammar and vocabulary. The typical Austronesian word-base CVCV is made up of a root CV + a root CV, with the possibility that neither root ever existed as such in PAN. These CVCV word-bases are common in Oceanic languages but rare in WIN.

Many formative suffixes exist in MN, but few of them are specialised for distinct grammatical functions. Transitive suffixes have already been mentioned; there are others which are used to form verbal or abstract nouns:

Sa'a ma-uri "to live"; whence ma-uri-nge "physical life" and ma-uri-he "life of the soul" (Ivens 1929). Sa'a h is a reflex of PAN *p; uri-he therefore corresponds to Dempwolff's PAN *quDip. The suffix is clearly still fully functioning in Sa'a, and apparently lost in WIN. In fact, we can find it in WIN, in Malay hidupi "bring (something) to life"; in Sanguir idope, la-idope "livelihood" (Steller 1959). Malay hidup, hidupi are metathetic forms of hudip, hudipi, and correspond therefore to Sa'a me-uri, me-uri-he. We can therefore conclude that the Sa'a suffix -he corresponds to Malay -pi, and that MN has preserved the word-base *quDi which incorrect analysis and phonetic change had obscured in WIN.

Fox mentions IN lumut "moss", and comments: "In Mota -ta is used as a suffix forming nouns from verbs or adjectives; lumu meaning "soft"; lumu-ta "a particularly soft thing, i.e. moss" (Fox 1947: 65). Dempwolff had reconstructed *lumut, *limut. In the Philippine area (Kankanay, Lepanto-Igorot, Central North Luzon), we find lumug "soft, tender, well-cooked", lumus "rotten, petrified", lumut "moss" (Vanoverbergh 1933): suffixation is not evident, yet there is differentiation of meaning marked only by the change in final consonant. The word-base lumu can be clearly seen in EIN, e.g. Paulohi (Seran) rumu-te "moss" (Stresemann 1918). Particularly interesting are the Malagasy examples lomotra "moss, seaweed", lamorina "moss-covered" (Abinal-Malzac 1955). The

statement by Cousins (1894) that -tra is a suffix is clearly right, and in lomo-ri-na we have the same passive participle formation as in PN, e.g., Maori whaka-atu-ri-na or -ri-a "to be shown". Neither Malagasy nor Maori have final r as a reflex of PAN *-t, as would be required by Dempwolff's analysis.

In the Sichule language, lumo means "soaked in water, therefore soft (of wood)" (Kaehler 1959), and belongs to PAN *lemk "to be soft". It seems clear the word bases such as *lemu, *lumu, *limu, "soft", whether in Malay, Mota or Sichule, were first applied to the world of objects by the use of suffixes giving them a noun character: "something soft", "the thing being soft". Objects were thus named by one of their essential characteristics. Hence the use of such bases for "moss". Later, in some areas, the suffix loses its formative identity, the consonant of the suffix becomes the final phoneme of the word, and only the difference of this final phoneme distinguishes the words, as in the Philippine examples above. The meanings may have become far removed: IN lumut "moss" (*lumu); Hova lemu-ka "upper lip", "sunk in" (*lemu); Hova luna-ka "fertility of the earth" and Ngadju Dayak lune-k "flesh of fruit" (*luna "being soft").

Brandstetter (1916: § 219) mentions a "suffixed article" -ne, which he encountered "in many IN languages and particularly in those that are near neighbours and are relatively closely connected with Roti" (SW Timor, EIN). This -ne also helps in clarifying the question of the PAN final consonant:

Paulohi: mu-tua "to be old"
mu-tua-ne "old man"

Malay: tuan "master" not

Hence PAN *tuga "be old", not *tugah; and *tuwa "master", *tuwan (Dempwolff considers *tugah and *tuwan to be related forms).

Paulohi: leku "collect, draw water"
leku-ne "bamboo vessel"

Javanese lengkong "bay, inlet"

Hence PAN *le(ng)ku "be concave", not *le(ng)kung.

Paulohi: ria-ne, lia-ne "cave"
Savu (near Roti): roe-ne "cave"

Javanese leng "small hole"

Hence PAN *liha "hole, pit", not *lihang.

The early process of suffixing the possessive to the word-base with relationship terms and names of parts of the body, extended in parts of EIN to food, clothes and other objects involved in bodily contact, may account for the -n of *ikan "fish". This word is rather unevenly distributed in WIN, but is common in EIN, MN and PN. In EIN, we may quote Seran ia-ne and Bouton (S. Celebes) ika-ni, and along the MN north-east coast of New Guinea we find iGa-na (G a voiced velar fricative), ia-na (Capell 1943: no. 97). In MN, -na, and in Seran -ni are the suffixes indicating 3rd person singular possession. Further confirmation is provided with PAN words for which Dyen accepts a final vowel. Thus for *mata "eye" we find Sikka (Central Flores): matang "eye", and in old religious

texts in East Flores: matan (Arndt 1951: 8, 10, etc.).

The final consonant of WIN words is thus seen to find its true explanation in terms of Austronesian suffixes which continue to be used in Oceanic.

* * * * *

The impression may have been gained from what has preceded that the underlying view is that the reconstruction of PAN should be based on the Oceanic languages alone. This, of course, is not the case. But the predominance of WIN in Dempwolff's work has to some extent falsified the approach to PAN, and we can gain a true understanding of the lessons of WIN only by reference to Oceanic, and of the nature of PAN only by reference to both. As an immediate step, we could begin quoting PAN words in which the final consonant given by WIN is in fact a survival of a suffix, not in Dempwolff's WIN-based form (e.g. *lumut), nor in the form of the word base alone (e.g. *lumu), but in the form of word-base plus derivatives, e.g.: *lumu (MN lumu), *lumu-ta (WIN lumut; MN lumuta), and so on, accounting for the various other derivatives attested; or *tangi (MN, PN tangi), *tangi-si (WIN tangis; MN, PN, tangisi). In other words, at the moment Austronesian comparative linguistics needs deepening and broadening through full consideration of features present in Oceanic.

Through such a consideration, we may find that the non-"Papuan", non-Austronesian (i.e., non-WIN) basic culture B, for which C.A. Schmitz seeks a linguistic correlation, is after all a very early Melano-Austronesian element. It has at least to be remembered that *hayaq "father" and *bapa "father", giving for the Huon Peninsula jaja, gajan, jeja, etc. "mother's brother" and yava, awa "father" are both PAN; yet Schmitz would regard them as belonging to his non-Austronesian B stratum (Schmitz 1966: 10-12). While bearing in mind that languages, races and cultures "are not distributed in parallel fashion, that their areas of distribution intercross in the most bewildering fashion and that the history of each is apt to follow a distinctive course" (Sapir 1921), it is certain that the linguist must expect to unearth in Melanesia a pre-Austronesian substratum. Justification for such a search can be found even in West Indonesia whose earlier population (Malagasy, Nias, Mentaway, inland Batak tribes, Dayak, Toradja and Igorok), called "Malaysian" by Loeb (1950), seems also to have particular linguistic features somewhat nearer to those of Oceania than are shown by the later-arriving "Deutero-Malays" bringing WIN cultures and languages, who did not infiltrate further east than Borneo and further south than Lombok. The German Sunda Expedition of 1927 confirmed the existence of a proto-Malayan element reaching from Lombok to Western Flores, and still particularly pure in the central mountain regions, e.g. in Sumbawa. From Central and Eastern Flores to the eastern islands, a distinct Melanesian anthropological type sets in (Heberer & Lehmann 1950: 176 ff.). This seems to coincide with a proto-Malayan Indonesian language group and an Oceanic Melanesian language group, both Austronesian. This could be the explanation of the Brandes Line, running through Central Flores.

* * * * *

Needless to say, the problems involved in the subject of this paper have not been treated in all their intricacy: the main aim has been to illustrate the value of working in a direction hitherto rather neglected. Fox and Haudricourt offer working hypotheses of real importance to Oceanic linguistics, but neither, unfortunately, has fully brought into the picture the work already done by Dempwolff. Their viewpoint and methods, however, are the things which count.

In conclusion, it may be well to draw attention to the results of extra-Austronesian comparison in relation to the form of the PAN word. Benedict gives some insight into apparently very early formative processes leading to the PAN word as we can reconstruct it: these processes can be interpreted as prefixation, with the prefixes lost in words of Thai or Kadai stock.

Comparison of Proto-IN and Proto-Thai indicates that Oceanic Austronesian cannot have shared the contact with Thai, or the Austro-Asian languages to the west as the following examples show (Benedict 1942: 591):

IN: <u>manuk</u> "bird"	Thai: <u>nok</u>	Kadai: <u>nuk</u>	Oceanic: <u>manu</u>
<u>danum</u> "water"	<u>nam</u>	<u>nom</u>	PN: <u>lanu</u> "wash"

The transition to monosyllabism can be seen in mata "eye", Lati: mta, Kadai: m-tsu, Laqua, Kadai: te (Benedict 1942: 584).

Acknowledgement: I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Hollyman for drawing my attention to the work of Haudricourt.

Bibliography

- Abinal-Malzac, 1955. Dictionnaire français-malgache, 5e éd. Paris.
- Adriani, N. & Kruijt, A., 1914. De Barre'e-Sprekende Toradja's. 3 Deel.
- Arndt, P., 1937. Grammatik der Solor-Sprache, Ende
- " 1951. Religion auf Ostflores, Adonare und Solor. Wien-Moedling (Studia Instituti Anthropos, vol. 1).
- Benedict, P.K., 1942. Thai, Kadai and Indonesian = American Anthropologist, n.s., 44, no. 4.
- Brandes, J.L.A., 1884. Bijdragen tot de vergelijkende Klangleer der westersche Afdeeling van de malaiisch-polyneesisch Taalfamilie. Utrecht.
- Brandstetter, R., 1916. An Introduction to Indonesian Linguistics. Four Essays translated by C.O. Blagden. London.
- Capell, A., 1943. The Linguistic Position of South-Eastern Papua. Sydney.
- Churchill, W., 1916. Sissano. Washington.
- Codrington, R.H., 1885. The Melanesian Languages. Oxford.
- Cousins, W.E., 1894. A Concise Introduction to the Study of the Malagasy Language. 3rd ed. Tananarive.
- Dahl, O.C., 1951. Malgache et Maanjan. Oslo (Avhandlinger. . . Egede Instituttet No. 3).
- Dempwolff, O., 1934 (vol. 1), 1937 (vol. 2), 1938 (vol. 3). Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. Berlin (Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen Sprachen, Beihefte 15, 17, 19).

- Drabbe, P., 1932. Slaroeësche Taal. Bandoeng (Verh. v. h. Kon. Batav. Genootsch., Deel LXXI, 4. St.).
- Dyen, I., 1953. The Proto-Malayo-Polynesian Laryngeals, Baltimore.
- Fox, C.E., 1947. "Phonetic Laws in Melanesian Languages", in Journal of the Polynesian Society 56: 58-118.
- " 1948. "Prefixes and their Functions in Oceanic Languages", in Journal of the Polynesian Society 57: 227-255.
- Friedericici, G., 1913. Untersuchungen über eine melanesische Wanderstrasse. Berlin.
- Heberer, G. & Lehmann, W., 1950. Die Inland-Malaien von Lombok und Sumbawa. Göttingen.
- Heekeren, H.R. van, 1957. The Stone Age of Indonesia. s'Gravenhage (Verh. . . kon. Inst. voor Land- en Volkenk., Deel XXI).
- Haudricourt, A.G., 1948. "Les langues du nord de la Nouvelle-Caledonie et la grammaire comparée", in Journal de la Société des Océanistes 4: 159-162.
- " 1951. "Variations parallèles en mélanésien", in Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 47: 140-153.
- " 1954. Review of Dyen 1953, in Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 50: 216-217.
- " 1959. "La première personne inclusive du singulier en Polynésie", in Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 54: 130-135.
- Hollyman, K.J., 1960. A Checklist of Oceanic Languages. Auckland.
- Ivens, W.G., 1929. A Dictionary of the Languages of Sa'a (Mala) and Ulawa. Oxford.
- Kaehler, H., 1937. Untersuchungen über die Laut-, Wort- und Satzlehre des Nias = Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen Sprachen 27, Hefte 2-4.
- " 1959. Vergleichendes Wörterverzeichnis der Sichule-Sprache auf der Insel Simalur. Berlin.
- Kanski, P. & Kasprusch, P., 1931. "Die indonesisch-melanesischen Uebergangssprachen auf den kleinen Molukken", in Anthropos 26: 883-891.
- King, C., 1901. A Grammar and Dictionary of the Wedau Language. Sydney.
- Lanyon-Orgill, P.A., 1942. "A Polynesian Settlement in New Britain", in Journal of the Polynesian Society 51: 87-114
- " 1944. "The Languages of the Island of Choiseul", in Journal of the Polynesian Society 53: 75-85
- Leenhardt, M., 1946. Langues et dialectes de l'Austro-Mélanésie. Paris.
- Loeb, E., 1935. Sumatra. Wien.
- Ray, S.H., 1907. Linguistics (Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Straits, vol. 3). Cambridge.
- " 1912. "Notes on Languages in the East of Netherlands New Guinea", appendix to A.F.R. Wollaston, Pygmies and Papuans, London, pp. 322-341.
- " 1926. A Comparative Study of the Melanesian Island Languages. Cambridge.
- Salzner, R., 1960. Sprachenatlas des indopazifischen Raumes. Wiesbaden.
- Sapir, E., 1921. Language. New York.
- Schmidt, P.W., 1900. "Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Valman-Sprache", in Zeitschrift für Ethnologie 32, Hefte 2-3.
- " 1952. Die Tasmanischen Sprachen. Utrecht.
- Schmitz, C.A., 1960. "Verwandschaftsnamen und Kulturschichten im Nordosten von Neu Guinea", in Zeitschrift für Ethnologie 85.

- Steller-Abersold, 1959. Sanguirees-Nederlands Woordenboek.
s'Gravenhage.
- Stresemann, E., 1918. Die Paulohisprache. s'Gravenhage.
- " 1927. Die Lauterscheinungen in den Ambonischen
Sprachen. Berlin.
- Van der Veen, H., 1915. De Noord-Halamahera'se taalgroep tegenover
de Austronesiese talen. Leiden.
- Vanoverbergh, M., 1933. A Dictionary of Lepano Igorot or Kankanay.
Moedling.
- Wolfenden, S.N., 1929. Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morpho-
logy. London.