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I. INTRODUCTION

The analysis of the family of languages in the world includes a vast scope. It is unlikely to get an estimate of how many languages are still spoken or dead to this day. According to rough estimates of some linguists, there are about 2000 to 3000 types of languages worldwide, and out of that number, there are about a family of languages that are widely spread around the world (Amat Juhari, 1967; Collins: 1996).


1) Austrian languages family, which consists of:
   a. Austronesian language
   b. Austro-Asian language surrounds several areas such as Proto-Malaka, Khasi-Nikobar, Mon-Khmer, Munda, and Cham.
   c. The Tibeto-Chinese language, which encompasses three main groups;
      • Thai-Chinese, which consists of Chinese, Thai (Siamese), and Anam.
      • Tibeto-Burmese, which consists of Tibetan, Assam, and Burma.
      • Northern Siberian, known as Jenissai Ostyak.

2) The Nostratic Language family which includes;
   a. Indo-European language is a famous and largest language family and its widespread covering India and Europe. This language
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family comprises languages such as Sanskrit and its descendants, such as Hindustani, Hindi, Bengali, Iranian-Ancient, Kurdish, Hethite, Armenian, Albanian, Latin, ancient Greek, Celtic and Germanic.

b. Hamito-Semitic language covers parts of North Africa and Asia Minor such as Arabic, Jewish, and Ethiopian in the Semitic family; Qibti, Berber, Gushitic, and Chad in the Himitic family.

c. Ural-Altaic language includes Finno, Ugric, Samoyed, Altaic languages including Turkish, Mongolian, Manshu, Nippon, and Caucasian.

3) Central and South African Language Families, which consists of languages such as;

a. Khoisan, the language of the Busman and Hottentot peoples of South-West Africa.

b. Bantu, covering most of South and Central Africa such as Niger-Congo, Swahili and so on.

c. Sudan

4) The American language family consists of more than 1000 isolated languages and are complex to classify. Among them are North American Indian, Uto-Aztec, Eskimo-Ale’ut, Algonquian, Muskogean, and so forth.

5) Remote language families in Asia and Australia. These languages consist of specific groups such as;

a. Hyperborea or Palaeo-Asiatic

b. Dravida, which is found in South India

c. Andaman is found in the Andaman Islands.

d. Indigenous people mainly speak Australia on the Australian continent.

e. Halmahera-Tidore

f. Papua

AUSTRONESIAN LANGUAGE GROUP

Since the 18th century, various Western scholars such as Wilhelm von Humboldt (1836), van der Tuuk (1897), John Hendrik C. Kern (1871, 1889) Otto Dempwolf (1934, 1937), Wilhelm Schmidt (1903, 1906), Brandes (1884), W. Marsden (1783, 1812), Renward Brandstetter (1916) Charles Adrian Van Ophuijsen (1882-1914) and others investigated the languages that were spread across the Malay Archipelago by comparing the languages. Through their research, it was known that the languages in the Malay Archipelago are a cognate language known as Indonesia (Nusantara). When the language groups were compared to the language groups in the Polynesian and Melanesian islands, it revealed the similarities, and thus, these language groups were classified into one language family called Austronesian (Bellwood: 1997, Blust: 1999, Comrie, 2001).

Austronesian name was first proposed by P. W. Schmidt (1926), a leading member of the Austronesian, substituting the term Malayo-Polynesian employed by Wilhelm von Humboldt, namely, a linguist who had studied the kinship between the Malay language with languages in Polynesia districts. The word Austronesia comes from the Latin word *Austro* which means south and *nesos*, which means island. Thus, Austronesia illustrates the meaning of the Southern Islands (Asmah, 1985: 35). At the same time, Brandstetter (1916) adopted the term *Indonesich* for the same purpose. Nevertheless, Malayo-Polynesian and Indonesian names are unpopular, incomplete and limited in scope. Malayo-Polynesian only complements the Malay and Polynesian contexts and does not cover the island of Madagascar, Melanesia and Micronesia.

According to historical records, Hadrian Reland (19706) first examined the similarities of languages in the Austronesian language family. He provided evidence about the similarity of words in Javanese, Malay and Malagasy. With these similarities, he believed that the languages were derived from the same language. Reland’s opinion was followed by Anderson (1990), who declared that there was a similarity of number in Polynesian language with the number in Nusantara language (Hesperanesia) (Amat Juhari, 1967: 10).

After that, Austronesian language researchers came and described the position of the relationship between languages such as Schmidt, von Humboldt, van der Tuuk, Brandes, and others.

**Austronesian language grouping**

From a historical point of belief, archaeologists concluded that the Austronesian tribes’ language originated in the mountains of Yunnan in South China. This opinion followed the position of the
A language within the Austric languages that had branched out into two principal language families, specifically Austronesian and Austro-Asian (Bellwood: 1985, 1987; Li: 2004, 2006).

According to Schmidt, in Asmah (1985), all languages discovered in mainland Asia possessed similarities, and these languages were said to come from the same group from the Austric phylum. Later, from the Austric phylum, it split into two parts, the Austronesian group and the Asian Austro group, which took place over a long period. Therefore, Schmidt made a breakdown of the language family as follows;

- Formosan languages - such as Favorlang and Singkam languages.
- Filipino languages - such as Tagalog, Bisaya, Benag, Igorad, Pangasinan, Maguindanao, and so on.
- Sulawesi and its surroundings - which consists of various language groups such as Gorontalo, Tomini, Toraja, Loinang, Banggai, Bungku-Laki (Mori), South Sulawesi (Makassar and Bugis) and Muna-Butung. Ambon and its surroundings - covering languages in eastern Sulawesi such as groups Sula-Bachon, South Halmahera and Ambon.
- Kalimantan and its surroundings - which consists of the Dayak language and its tribes such as the Murut group, Kenyah-Bahau-Kayan and Busang group, Ot-Danum group and Iban group in Sarawak and Brunei.
- Java Island and its surroundings - which consists of three main languages, Madura, Javanese and Sundanese.
- Sumatra, Malaya and its surroundings - Languages and dialects of Malaya inescapably linked to language in the north-eastern coast of Sumatra, that is the Malay language. Malay area outside of Malaya includes Riau archipelago. Palembang, Kampar, Jambi, and Medan. Malay-Sriwijaya showed the old one of the Austronesian languages’ remnants, by the inscription carved on stone named Talang tuwo, dated 680 AD. While in the northern part there are Aceh, Gayo language groups, Batak language groups such as Karo, Toba, Simalungun, Angkola-Mandailing, Nias and Mentawai languages, Minangkabau and Lampung.
i. Madagascar and its surroundings - including Malegasi and Hova languages.

j. Cham language - which is a relatively isolated language in a tribe in Cambodia.

Indonesian languages’ branch expanded widely because a similar race develops it to the Malays. It occurred due to the spreading nature of the Malay race is themselves. They were identified as prone to sail and migrate. The features of sailors and migrants of Malay race resulted in two critical developments in the core Indonesian language in pre-historic times, namely first, the spread of Malay parent language to such wide area, and the second, the breaking of the parent Indonesian language into other languages (Osman, 1961: 3).

III. STUDY APPROACH

Since the 17th century, many studies were performed by researchers from diverse fields of knowledge, by presenting various hypotheses and opinions on the origin and family between Austronesian languages (Slametmuljana, 1975; Abdul Rashid and Amat Juhari, 2006; Asmah, 1985; Collins, 1996). Among them were J.R. Foster, Van der Tuuk, Brandes, Wilhelm Marsden, von Humboldt, J.R. Logan, A.H Keane, Hendrick Kern, Brandstetter, J. Crawfurd, Otto Dempwolff, Heine Gelden, and others.

Studying a language necessarily entails a historical and comparative approach to related languages, which is referred to as Historical Language Knowledge and Comparative Language Knowledge. According to HA Gleason (Gleason, 1961: 11), Historical Language Knowledge is the discourse of language changes over time or time, while Comparative Language Knowledge is about the relationship between languages of similar origin. Next, Gleason explained that the method Comparative Language Knowledge allows linguists to explain that two or more languages are interconnected and related.

Therefore, many linguists developed studies and hypotheses on languages within the Austronesian language environment. In the early stages, language research in the context of comparisons between Austronesian and mainland Asian languages was largely done on vocabulary alone. Nevertheless, the studies from other perspectives were given less attention except after Prof. Hendrik. C. Kern started to study the Austronesian language in terms of grammar and word comparison, especially between Fiji and the Nusantara (Amat Juhari, 1967).

According to research by Slametmuljana (1975), the first person to observe the cohesion between Austronesian languages was Hadrian Reland (1706) and followed by Anderson, then supported by L. Hervas. A Dutch scholar, A. Reland (1676-1718) suggested that Austronesia’s languages belong to one group of languages. While John Reinhold Foster in his ‘Voyage Round the World’ mentioned that a similar form of words between Polynesia and the Malay language was derived from the two mentioned parties’ older language. The older language was called the Malay language. According to him, ancient Polynesia was used by the Indie Islands people or the northern islands near the Asian continent. Besides, William Marsden (1783-1812), more emphatically, said that there was solid reciprocity between the languages within the range between Madagascar to the Marquesas Islands.

IV. PROBLEMS OF RECONSTRUCTION AND CLASSIFICATION IN THE AUSTRONESIAN LANGUAGE FAMILY

According to Crystal (1980: 297), the process of language reconstruction is a method used in Historical Linguistics and Philology Comparison of two or more languages performed in the analysis of sound systems and forms of a language that no longer exists, such as proto-languages. For Kridalaksana (1983: 144), reconstruction is a process of obtaining a common ancestor from a group of related languages by comparing standard features or by determining the changes experienced by a language throughout the ages. Thus, language reconstruction aims to reshape the structure and the system of a language that is lost through the features of the language of its related languages that still exist today.

Types of Reconstruction

Anthony Arlotto (1971: 70) divided the reconstruction into two parts, particularly Phonological Reconstruction and Internal Reconstruction. Phonological reconstruction involves analyzing the sounds of a parent language to study the similarities in the origin of a language
with other languages. Internal reconstruction includes the comparison of languages to find out the origin of a particular language. Asmah Haji Omar (1985: 347) explained that internal reconstruction is a method in historical-comparative linguistics that aims to study the history of a particular language through its dialects. This method is called the Indirect Method, due to contemporary materials to find out about its history.

**Austronesian Language Reconstruction And Classification**

The work of reconstructing and classifying the Austronesian language family is closely associated with the history and origins of the nation and language, and it is not a simple task. The origin of the Austronesian race and language is not straightforward to recognize because according to the study, the Austronesian population was said to come from other areas such as mainland Asia or the like.

Therefore, it is tough to identify the original components in the Austronesian family. It is because every cultural element that existed in Austronesia were not clearly known. It was often considered to be its own original culture. Thus, words like aku (me), hidup (life) dan mati (die)

whose origins were not originally known were included in the group of native Austronesian words. While the words whose origins were known were not classified among the original Austronesian words. For example, the word saya (me), which was clearly derived from the Sanskrit word or wafat (death) was derived from the Arabic language (Slametmuljana, 1975: 28).

Therefore, it is quite complex to reconstruct an element as a result of historical interpretation. The determination of whether the words studied was included in the words of Ancient Austronesian, or foreign words were closely related to the search for the immigrant nation’s original land.

Similarly, to provide an interpretation of the Austronesian language and nation’s original land, one should collect enough historical material and evidence and then research and study its truth. In this case, based on the classification done, it was found that many researchers believed that many ancient Austronesian words that exist until now were considered as original words originating from mainland Asia. When viewed in terms of its form, it was found that there were various languages scattered throughout Austronesia, especially in the Indonesian islands. Hence, it clearly exposed multiple connections or similarities and was not found in other languages.

As already explained, there were many scholars from various races and disciplines who gave opinions on the origin of the Austronesian language and race, especially Nusantara. As an attempt to classify and reconstruct the language, some opinions were only in the form of suggestions or hypotheses that were inaccurate and firm or more positive. These opinions were closely related to the question of language groups in Nusantara. Research on these languages was often done on word types, word formation such as affixes, or looking at the language’s sentence structure. The results of Von Humboldt’s research (in Slametmuljana, 1975) discovered that the ancient Javanese language received many Sanskrit words. Moreover, the study revealed a kinship between Malay and Polynesian languages.

Furthermore, H.C Kern (in Slametmuljana, 1975) discovered that many words were in Malay Polynesia languages in mainland south Asia such as Cambodia, Siam, and Assam. Thus, he decided that the Malay Polynesia ancestors’ original land was Champa, Kocing China, Cambodia, and surrounding land along the coast. Kern’s research proved that there was a language coexistence between Austronesia and Campa, Chinese Kocing and Cambodia. Kern cited the word selatan (south), which indicated direction, i.e. opposite the north, which was available in various language areas of Sumatra and was limited in the range of languages that were still close to the Malay language to find out the extent to which the broader common with other languages. It can be reconstructed based on the user areas, as described below. (Slametmuljana, 1975: 32).

The word selatan came from the Malay Peninsula area and is still used today in the Malay language. Besides, it is also used in Aceh, Jakarta, Riau, Lampung, Indrapura, Bengkulu, Banjar, Dayak, Ngaju, Bacan, and Banda. While in Polynesian languages, the word tonga is used for the selatan
(south) meaning and is called tonga (Maori), toa (Tahiti), kino (Hawaii), toga (Tonga), tuatoka (Marquesas), toga (Mangarewa), and toga (Paumotu).

In the languages of Nusa Tenggara, most of them use the word tarangan for the southern meaning, such as tarangan (Nusa Laut, Waru and Saparua), forangan (Seram), tarana (Elpa Putih), tranan (Fordata) and trangan (Jamdena).

Words in Nusa Tenggara were considered to be related to the word toga in Polynesian. Therefore, the word selatan (south) only existed as the original relationship between the Malays in the Malay Peninsula who settled in Indonesia and a small part of the tribes living in the area Austronesian (Slametmuljana, 1975: 21).

P.W. Schmidt (in Slametmuljana, 1975) also argued that the language of the Campa, Rade, Jarai and Sedang showed that the structure and vocabulary were included in the language family of Mon-Khmer, whereby in this language, there were many loanwords from Malay to include the pronoun and count noun. For example, we examined the form of pronouns to reconstruct and determine the relationship between the languages. For example, my personal pronoun covered a wide area of usage in the Austronesian Islands. The word is not an ancient Austronesian word but came from the Shan language, which is kau (you). The word is also found in the Campa language which is said to have originated in Shan and is used in language groups from Southern Tiongkok to Assam. Similarly, the personal pronoun kamu (you) both in Malay and Indonesian language was derived from the Shan that is mau. While the third-person pronoun in Palaung language, an called n or an in various Austronesian languages, but not in Malay or Campa. The Malay language takes, which was derived from the language Khasi War and in Indonesian language, it became ia (Slametmuljana, 1975: 32).

In another investigation, the reconstruction elements of Polynesian languages can also be observed based on comparing four languages that were investigated, namely Maori, Hawaiian, Samoan, and Fijian (Arlotto, 1971: 92).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Samoan</th>
<th>Fijian</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pou</td>
<td>pou</td>
<td>pou</td>
<td>bou</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapu</td>
<td>kapu</td>
<td>tapu</td>
<td>tabu</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tani</td>
<td>kani</td>
<td>tani</td>
<td>tani</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takere</td>
<td>ka?ele</td>
<td>ta?ele</td>
<td>takele</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison of the languages above clearly explains some movement and connection in some vowel sounds and consonants. Aspects of vocal sound relevance can be shown in the following relationships;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Samoan</th>
<th>Fijian</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the relationship in the consonant sounds can be shown in the following relationship;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Samoan</th>
<th>Fijian</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Etymological Approach**

Another exciting aspect of researching the origin and spread of words in this ancient Austronesian language is to be seen from the etymological point of view. The concept of etymology can recognize a bond or network in a word that is between sound and its meaning naturally. This method is called etymology of sound symbolism or sound symbolism etymology (Hashim, 1991: 62). In this method, every word’s meaning is supported by every sound or syllable in the word. For example, the two-syllable word in the Malay language which sounds jur was derived from Austronesian languages (proto), for example;

- jur - means ‘long and wide.’
- lajur - ‘Extends along.’
- mujur - ‘extending abstractly, i.e. good luck continues.’
- jujur - ‘honest behaviour.’
- kujur - ‘Lying upright longitudinally.’
- lanjur - ‘Overdo or continuous.’
- lunjur - ‘Sit with feet straight forward.’
Regarding this approach, A.C Vreede once examined the relationship's distinctive features in his study of morphemes in Javanese (Over de Wortelwoorden in de Javaanschetsala). Vreede has explained that certain parts of root words have meaning concerning other morphemes in many cognate words. According to him, words with the same final syllable, tend to show a meaning that is quite close or almost the same, for example, in words rooted in the root word (morpheme) wur as below that carries a scattered notion (Mees, 1967: 66).

luwur - scattering  
lawur - scattered  
wuwur - sprinkling  
mauwar - scattered; messy  
kawur - giving up, fibrous  
bawur - running away  
blawur - messy  
kebawur - Mixing with the crowd  
kesawur/ - spreading  
ketawur -

**Characteristics of Proto-Austronesian Language Phonology**

Phonology is the field that studies the sound systems of language. Phonological studies are essential to produce research results on the phonemes of a language that enables language researchers to compose and create a writing system to express the language (Arbak, 1983: 78). Studying the phonological features of a language inevitably involves the study of the phoneme system of a language. Phonemes are distinctive language sounds (distinguishing meanings). The number of phonemes between one language and another in the Austronesian family is not the same. For example, the number of Javanese phonemes from the Indonesian group is more than the number of phonemes in the Polynesian language.

It is challenging to interpret the sound and writing system, such as the Proto-Austronesian language, especially in studying the sound sequences used in the Austronesian language family due to its imperfect writing system and lack of definitive evidence. According to Dempwolff (1956: 3-4), the sound system in the Austronesian language of Proto consists of the following consonants and vowels;

- **Lip consonants**: p, b, v, m
- **Tooth consonants**: t, d, l, n
- **Cerebral consonants**: d, l
- **Palatal consonants**: t, d, j, n (coronal) k, g (dorsal)
- **Verlar consonant**: k, g, r, n
- **Vowel sounds**: a, i, u, e (pepet).

For consonants, these phonemes are associated with nasal sounds at the end of words, i.e., mp, mb, nt, nd, n, n’t, n’d, n’k, n’g, k, g as well as pre-nasal sounds v: vp, vb and vt.

**Consonant Sound System**

It is fascinating to realise that when discussing the consonant sound system in the Proto-Austronesian language, it is related to the RLD and RGH Sound Law proposed by Van der Tuuk (1897). According to him, the consonant sound / r/ in Proto-Austronesian (Sulong) can change its sound in other languages that come from the same language family; that is, some change to / g/ and / j/ and some change to / l/ and / d/. In the study further explains Brandes, an example of Sound Law of RLD, (/rl/ in the Proto-Austronesian) is the utterance / pari/ (Java) / padi/ and / palai/ (Tagalog). For Brandstetter, RGH Sound Law is marked / r2/ and RLD Sound Law is marked / rl/. Examples of / rl/ in Proto-Austronesian language are / ribu/ and / r2/ is / atus/ (ratus).

The sound / r2/ in Proto-Austronesia can vary in different languages from the same family for example for the Austronesian word / u at/ (Amat Juhari, 1967: 108);

- Malay /r/: urat  
- Tagalog /g/: uhat  
- Dayak /h/: uyat  
- Lampung /y/: ulat

With regard to this / r/ sound also in Austronesian language, Otto Dempwolff reconstructed the sound law made by Brandstetter and listed two forms of sound namely / r/ velar (in the throat cavity) and / r/ alveolar (on the front gums). The pronunciation / r/ velar is similar to the sound / / in Arabic or /, for example in the words / bibi/ , / dapi/ , / ta uh/ , / atus/ and / abut /.

For / r/ alveolar sounds closer to / l/ and / d/ sounds
especially in the following examples (Mees, 1967: 31);

\[
\begin{align*}
/\text{hatul}/ & \quad (\text{atur}) \\
/\text{tutul}/ & \quad (\text{tutur}) \\
/\text{culat}/ & \quad (\text{surat}) \\
/\text{ukul}/ & \quad (\text{ukur})
\end{align*}
\]

The spread of consonant sounds in the Proto-Austronesian languages also often changes the relatively limited range around the native sounds of the language. For instance, we observe that blast soft palate / k / which is original in most languages in the Austronesian family is protected, but its presence in words often become a glottal stop /? /, especially in the Malay language. While in Toba-Batak language, the consonant / k / is changed to / h / (Mees, 1967: 44).

Austronesia: /k/ aku laki-laki kali
Malay: /k/ aku laki-laki kali
Toba Batak: /h/ ahu lahi-lahi hali

The earliest study of the phonological system of Austronesian languages was conducted by E.M. Uhlenbeck (1949) in his thesis entitled De Structuur van het Javaanse Morfeem. He analysed the structure of sound arrangement based on 18,000 root words in Javanese (Mees, 1967: 81-82). Based on the study, Uhlenbeck outlined six features that were not found in the Javanese phonological system, namely;

a. more than one vowel in one syllable.
b. more than one consonant at the end of a word.
c. more than two consonants at the beginning of a word.
d. more than three consonants in a row in the middle of a root word.
e. more than two consecutive vowels.
f. more than four syllables in the root word.

Instead, the study found that there are four main features found in it, namely;

a. Most, i.e. 85 per cent of the root words are two-syllable.
b. 55 per cent of the root words show a rotating arrangement of consonants - regular vowels.
c. Consonants at the beginning of a word are more than vowels.
d. Consonant sounds at the end of a word are also more than vowels.

Vocal Sound System

Otto Dempwolff (1956: 4) has listed only four vowel letters in the Austronesian vowel sound system, namely the vowels / a /, / i /, / u / and / e / (pepet) and there is no vowel / e / (taling) and / o / . The vowel / a / in the Proto-Austronesian languages does not change much except due to the influence of nearby phonemes (Mees, 1967: 39), for example;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austronesian Language</th>
<th>Malay Language</th>
<th>Tontemboan Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/avak/</td>
<td>/awak/</td>
<td>/owak/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vowel sound / a / changes when followed by the semi-vowel sound / w / . Most of the vowel / a / in final syllable also stay, for instance, in the Malay Riau language and Malaya, it is pronounced as / / otherwise in the Java language called / c /.

As explained, the vowel sound / o / does not exist in the Proto-Austronesian phonological system. These / o / sounds only exist through several ways such as due to the process of melting the sounds / ae / and / au / in Javanese or the realisation of the sound / u / (Mees, 1967: 40), for example;

Proto-Austronesian

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ba’u} & \quad \text{boho} \quad \text{(Tagalog)} \\
\text{batu} & \quad \text{bato} \quad \text{(Tagalog)} \\
\text{dapug} & \quad \text{dapog} \quad \text{(Tagalog)} \\
\text{tulung} & \quad \text{tulong} \quad \text{(Tagalog)} \\
\text{takut} & \quad \text{takot} \quad \text{(Tagalog)}
\end{align*}
\]

As for the vowel sounds / e / and / / in Austronesian language, most of them are in the Indonesian language family (Nusantara). According to the Brandes study list, it turns out that / e / pepet is widely available in Ancient Javanese, Balinese, Tombulu, Sawu and Batak. In most Austronesian languages, the vowel / e / pepet can realise other vowel sounds, for example / e / turns into / a / in Makassar, Minangkabau and Bugis, / e / in Ngaju-Dayak, / i / in Tagalog, / o / in Toba and Bisaya, and / eu / in Aceh. The following example shows the change of the sound / e / pepet for the word / depa / (Proto-Austronesia) (Mees, 1967: 41);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word /depa/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>depa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>depa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balinese</td>
<td>depa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for the vowel sound /u/, although it is retained as the original sound in Austronesian languages, in many cases the sound /u/ is changed to /o/ in the pronunciation of some languages especially in the final syllable, for example in Tagalog. In a variety of other languages in the Austronesian family, vowel /u/ can be transformed into /o/ irregularly. It usually occurs in languages Ngaju-Dayak, Javanese, Malay, Toba-Batak etc. (Mees, 1967: 41). It can be observed through the example below;

Austronesia Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>aku pergi (I go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>khnyom cap (I catch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>on co (I pour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaung</td>
<td>o men (I see)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campa</td>
<td>kau blei (I buy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passive Sentence Form.

Passive forms in various regional languages in the Austronesian region have existed for decades. Nevertheless, written evidence of the existence of the oldest passive form in Austronesia can only be traced back to 684 AD. The oldest passive form was found in the Sriwijaya charter, the Talang Tuwo charter in Palembang (Slametmuljana, 1975: 62). There is clear evidence in the Sriwijaya language that there is evidence of active and passive forms. The active form beginning with ma, for example, is built on the word /mangujari/ and the passive form beginning with ni can be seen in the example of the word /niujari/. Similarly, in another example found in the Kota Kapur charter, this prefix is used as a passive form marker, for example formed in the word /niwunuh/ (killed).

Besides, the passive form with this insert marker is considered one of the oldest passive forms in the Austronesian language and has an extensive area of use below (Slametmuljana, 1975: 70). An example can be observed through the following sentences found in the ancient Javanese language;

Tinunggang ire kang kuda (He rides the horse)

This insertion of in in the word ‘tinunggang’ (rides) serves as a passive form marker.

Proto-Malay Language

As an essential branch of the Austronesian family of languages, one must mention the shapes and sounds of the Proto-Malay language. History writing Malay started way back in 680 AD. The evidence indicated that the extent of the spread of the Proto-Malay language as the language of instruction in the Malay Archipelago was reinforced when the stone inscriptions or inscriptions were
found. It uses the Malay language within the Land Andalas like the inscription of Kedukan Hill (683 AD), the inscription of Talang Tuwo (684 AD), the inscription of Kota Kapur (686 AD), and the inscription of Karang Brahi inscription (692 AD). Additionally, there was also evidence of other discoveries in Java in the district of Gandasuli, Kedu, towards the east of Mount Sundara (Abd. Ghani, 1960: 648). According to the inscription on the charters, it shows some of the shapes and sounds of the Proto-Malay language.

Consonant Sounds of Proto-Malay Language.

Based on the study of the Talang Tuwo (684M) and Kedukan Bukit (683M) inscriptions, it is clear that there is no consonant of two explosive lips / b /, instead, it is replaced by a semi-vowel sound / w / (Ismail, 1984: 18), for example in words the following words;

- wulan = bulan (moon)
- wanyak = banyak (a lot)
- wuat = buat (make)

In addition, there are many uses of consonants pronounced with aspirational sounds such as / bh /, / ph /, / dh / and / kh /.

Vocal Sound of Proto-Malay Language.

Regarding the vowel sound, in the inscriptions of Talang Tuwo (684M) and Kedukan Bukit (683M), there is no middle cardinal vowel / a /. Thus, in the Proto-Malay language, the vowel / a / is usually replaced by a vowel / a /, for example, on the following word (Ismail, 1984: 18);

- dangan = dengar (with)

While in the Terengganu inscription stone (1303M), the form of writing is more precise with the following writing;

- danda = dengar (Listen)
- mandalika = mendalika

Additionally, in some writing, vowel / a / eliminated directly in spelling and pronunciation Proto-Malay (Ismail, 1984),

- dngan = dengar (hear)
- dngar = dengar (hear)

An assumption that indicates that such forms existed in Proto-Malay language is due to Sanskrit’s influence and the effect of Pallawa alphabet sound (Ismail, 1984).

IV. CONCLUSION

Ergo, this research presented a concise description of the Austronesian language family with its far-reaching spread. Although determining the homeland of the Austronesian nation and language was not a facile task, with the perseverance of researchers and analysts among previous linguists, whether they have employed comparative linguistic or historical approaches, some hypotheses can be justified its history.

Through this paper, the researcher endeavored to rearrange some theories and hypotheses about the history and dissemination of language families in the Austronesian group. It was accomplished to identify and understand the origin, dissemination, grouping, and forms of language based on comparison and explain reconstruction.
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