

Acknowledgments

This monograph first began as a project to update Dempwolff's *Vergleichende Lautlehre* (1934–38), the cornerstone of the historical study of Austronesian languages. I was building on the work of my mentor I. Dyen, who had considerably revised Dempwolff's original phonology. I thus began with a considerable body of data and a tradition of analysis that was useful, but the research of two scholars published in the late seventies and early eighties provided ample data that could not be explained by Dempwolff's reconstructed phonology, even as revised by Dyen. These studies made it clear that it would be necessary to rethink each and every reconstruction and question the basic assumptions of the nature and location of the proto-language in order to accommodate the wealth of additional data they provided. First was the work of R. Blust 1980b, 1983, 1986, and 1989, who added geometrically to the the stock of reconstructed forms that had been published up to that time, and second, that of S. Tuschida 1976, who made accessible the crucial attestations from the Formosan languages. My first debt in the preparation of this monograph is to these four scholars, whose work formed the basis for my glossary and attestations. In addition to these, this study incorporates or takes into account a vast number of pieces of research, smaller and larger, as well as dictionaries, whose authors I can only acknowledge by a listing in the bibliography. I should however mention a few studies that were crucial in providing data that enabled me to make the reconstructions. For the Formosan languages, I relied heavily not only on Tsuchida 1976 but on the studies of the histories of the individual languages published under the auspices of the Academia Sinica, Taiwan, ROC, undertaken by Paul Li and other scholars from that institution. My data on Bugis and Salayar were substantiated and enhanced by the extensive materials for the languages of South Sulawesi presented by R. Mills 1975. For Oceanic Languages, the monumental work by M. Ross 1988 provided a wealth of data and the framework for understanding the subgrouping crucial to interpreting the complicated developments, especially in the Western Oceanic languages. In addition, for the Eastern Oceanic languages, there are two pieces of research that were particularly influential in the analysis presented in this study. They stand out among a multitude of fine dictionaries, grammars, and secondary studies on these languages. First is the work of P. Geraghty, whose in-depth study of the Fijian languages (1983) had an important part in shaping my thinking about the developments in the Eastern Oceanic languages. Second is the treasure-trove of attestations found in Pollex, which also had a substantial input into my analysis of the Eastern Oceanic data.

In addition to acknowledging the importance of these published materials, I also owe a debt of gratitude to the personal efforts of colleagues and institutions, without which I could not have produced this study. First I have had years and years of support from Cornell University, both the Southeast Asia Program and the Department of Linguistics, which not only provided me the opportunity of offering seminars in the subject matter of this study and giving me access to some absolutely first-rate students, but also provided me with summer stipends and research grants that enabled me to obtain clerical and editorial assistance and pay informants. In addition I profited greatly from three research fellowships abroad which afforded me facilities, stipends, and access to colleagues and informants: first, the International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden, the Netherlands, where I spent three months

in the fall of 1998, at the invitation of Professor Hein Steinhauer. Then in the summer of 2004 I received a fellowship from the Academia Sinica, Linguistics Department, under the sponsorship of Paul J. K. Li, which provided me the opportunity to visit several sites where Formosan languages are still spoken and paid all research and expenses. Because of the basic importance of these languages for historical studies of the Austronesian group, this fellowship was particularly important for enhancing the accuracy and quantity of my Formosan data. Finally, I had a six-week fellowship in from the Center for General Linguistics (ZAS), Berlin, at the invitation of Patrick Steinhauer in the winter of 2007, which afforded me the opportunity of writing portions of this manuscript and interacting with colleagues in Germany.

The collegiality and helpfulness of colleagues in the field have also had an important role in enabling me to carry out this study. For the first three introductory chapters I am indebted to the following people who read them and provided me with substantial commentary that enabled me to improve the presentation considerably and avoid some potentially embarrassing errors: K.A. Adelaar, L. Sagart, Martin Schell, Daniel Kaufman, and Matthew Amster. In fact, Sagart read almost the entire manuscript. I profited most prominently in my thinking about the first chapter of this study from the spring 2008 seminar that Sagart offered in Cornell University, the many hours of discussions that term, and the wealth of private unpublished data he supplied me with. Although my ignorance of Chinese and Tibeto-Birman linguistics rendered it impossible to incorporate these data directly into this study, the data were sufficient to inform my understanding of any number of reconstructions and in persuading me of the relationship of the Austronesian and the Sino-Tibetan languages and thus to shape the assumptions that underlie the analysis here presented. For the Formosan languages, I first and foremost owe a debt of gratitude to Paul Li for supplying me with all relevant publications produced at the Academia Sinica—off prints of articles, dictionaries, and compilations of texts, but also for arranging two visits, where I had first-hand access to the Formosan languages. I was also given much help by S. Tsuchida, who similarly supplied me with his data published and unpublished, including his extensive collection of data on the Bunun dialects. I also owe a debt of gratitude to M. Nojima, who accompanied me to the Bunun area and helped me understand the data gathered there. I should also mention the linguists who accompanied me in my month in Taiwan in 2005, P. Radetsky, C. Quinn, A. Tsukamoto, who not only interpreted my interaction with the informants but were helpful in gathering a large amount of data in a short time and making sense of it. For the Philippine languages I profited immensely in my discussions over the years with M. Charles and D. Zorc and from the large amount of data they had gathered and generously shared. For Ratahan I am indebted to N. Himmelmann, who spent many weeks together with me in Indonesia and with whom I collaborated in the investigating and preparing a monograph on the language. For the Minahasan languages I am indebted to F.K. Watuseke, who spent many hours discussing data from these languages and informing me on his native Tondano, drawing on a deep well of knowledge gained from a lifelong devotion to Minahasan studies. For my chapter on Bugis (§C6ff.) I profited greatly from a host of trenchant comments by U. Sirk, which not only informed my understanding of many of the attestations but also provided background material that explained the not inconsiderable disjunction between published materials and the material I gathered from informants during twelve weeks in Macassar. For Muna I had valuable feedback from R. van den Berg. For Malagasy, I had the benefit of careful and critical reading by W. Mahdi and K.A. Adelaar, both of whom

provided me with commentary that strengthened my presentation considerably. For Kelabit I profited immensely from discussions with M. Amster, who with his active knowledge of the language, enabled me to solve some of the puzzles the data presented. For Moken I had the immensely good fortune of being able to conduct the field research together with P. Pittayaporn (Joe), who not only interpreted the interactions with the speakers, but also worked together with me in transcribing the data and making sense of them in terms of the published materials we had at our disposal. Joe also read Chapter One and the chapter on Moken (§E3ff.), and provided me with detailed commentary, which invariably was remarkably insightful and to the point. For Buru I had the benefit of a fairly lengthy correspondence with C. Grimes, whose thesis (1991), provided a context for the data provided by the dictionaries. Grimes' comments on my chapter on Buru (§E2ff.) rectified a number of misunderstandings by presenting additional data that led to an alternative solution. For Leti, I had the benefit of intensive contact with A. van Engelenhoven during my tenure as a fellow of IIAS in 1998. Although his two theses on Leti (1996b, 2004) are the key to understanding the complexities that the Leti data present, I would not have been able to present the history of this language in a lucid manner without the benefit of the many hours van Engelenhoven devoted to discussing and explaining the bewildering morphophonemics and their historical background. He was also instrumental in providing me the opportunity to contact the community of Kei speakers resident in the Netherlands and accompanied me to their settlement on several occasions. For Kei I also had help from E. Travis, who provided me with his draft dictionary of Kei, which considerably augmented the materials in the published dictionary and what I had been able to elicit from informants in the Netherlands. These were the people and institutions that remain in my memory as having made particularly important contributions to this study. I do not wish to imply that these scholars necessarily share all my conclusions, nor are they responsible for errors in this study. The errors herein are exclusively mine. There are many others who educated me, informed me on languages, discussed methodology, or commented on my talks or articles, and many others who encouraged me and gave me confidence that this was a project worth pursuing. I am grateful to each and every one of them, even if space limitations make it impossible to list them expressly. I praise God for the institutions and the many human beings that enabled me to undertake this lifelong study.

J.U.W.
August 2010

