

A DIALECTOLOGY STUDY OF LAMPUNG-KOMERING RELATIONSHIP IN PRINGSEWU REGENCY OF LAMPUNG PROVINCE

Suprayogi

Faculty of Arts and Education, Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia
suprayogi@teknokrat.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at revealing the relationship between Lampung isolect and Komerling isolect spoken in Pringsewu Regency of Lampung, whether both of them belong to same language or not. This study was conducted in a Lampung Pesisir community village, Lampung Pubian community village and a Komerling community village by analyzing wordlist which consists of 200 words of Swadesh, 52 words of body parts and 98 words of activities. The relationship of the both lect or the “language distance” was measured by using Seguy’s dialectometry with percentage range proposed by Lauder. The result of this study showed that Lampung Pesisir isolect and Komerling isolect had 29,6% of differences in their lexicon. Meanwhile, between Lampung Pubian isolect and Komerling isolect, the lexical differences reached 31,7%, which means that both of them are in idiolect differences. This close relationship between both languages was also reflected in sound correspondences and sound change variatons. The sound [a] in Lampung Pubian isolect corresponds to the sound [ɔ] in Komerling isolect and Lampung Pubian. The sound [ə] in Pesisir subdialect and Pubian subdialect of Lampung language correspond to sound [a] in Komerling Language. The evidence of this close relationship was also shown by lexical variations based on assimilation and sincope. This study concluded that both languages are linguistically same despte their cultural claim as different language.

Keywords: dialectology, Komerling, Lampung, lexical, sound correspondence.

INTRODUCTION

Pringsewu District of Lampung province is a home for many ethnic groups which means they may speak in different language. The map of Lampung province from Hadikusuma (1990) showed that the area now called as Pringsewu has been inhabited by transmigrants, but it was not clearly stated where they came from. The current study on language in Pringsewu mentioned that based on the perceptual dialectology, there were five major languages spoken in Pringsewu i.e. Javanese, Sundanese, Semendo, Lampung and Komerling (Suprayogi, 2017:95). However, there is a conlifcting idea coming from the society there whether Lampung and Komerling are different language. Some of them admit that the language belongs to variety of Lampung language, or it can be said that both of them are actually same. Some others, in fact, percieved that Komerling stands as a language different from Lampung. Later in this study, the term ‘isolect’ was used for the neutral term between language and dialect.

The dispute on clustering Komerling isolect is believed to not only happen in the level of its speaker in Pringsewu regency or in its origin i.e. Southern Sumatera region, but also of some researchers. Greenhill, Drummond, Gray (2010) and Foley (1983) classified Komerling as a distinct language from Lampung. However, some other researchers put Komerling as a part of Lampung language, although there is also polarized idea into which dialect it should be put. Keraf (1996: 2010) stated that Komerling is a part of Lampung Nyow (Abung) dialect, meanwhile Hadikusuma (1990: 118) and Walker (1975) had the opposite idea from Keraf stating that Komerling is a part of Lampung

Api dialect. These different model of clustering occurred because of many factors, but one of them is the difference in its methodology. For example, classification made by Greenhill, Drummond, Gray (2010) is by building phylogenetic tree, Walker (1975) employed lexicostatistics, meanwhile some others didn't provide enough information from it.

From the aforementioned previous studies on the relationship between Lampung and Komerling, this study attempted to give contribution towards the issue by investigating whether they are same language seeing from the perspective of dialectometry calculation. Furthermore, this study tried to describe the pattern of the similarities found in both isolects so that, for the practical level, the finding might be useful for educational purposes.

METHOD

The research site in this study is Pringsewu regency of Lampung province. In this area, Lampung people still speak their language fluently, so are the groups of Komerling people. People of Lampung in Pringsewu also mostly live in groups, especially in the southern part and northern part of the regency. The people call themselves as 'Lampung Pesisir'. There is also a village where the people name them as 'Lampung Pubian'. This study focused on Sinarwaya village (Lampung Pesisir) and Margakaya village (Lampung Pubian). Sinarwaya village is inhabited mostly by Lampung people whose ancestors came from Kotaagung of Tanggamus regency, meanwhile the ancestor of Margakaya's people were from Pesawaran regency of Lampung.

Unlike Lampung, Komerling is an ethnic group in Sumatera Selatan province (<https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>). The word 'Komerling' is also related to the name river that becomes the heart of civilization of people in Ogan Komerling Ulu (OKU) regency and Ogan Komerling Ilir (OKI) regency. In search of better future, many people from the areas migrated to Lampung, and some of them finally arrived in an area later called 'Fajarbaru' village and asked Dutch East Indies government for making living there. They were from Minanga village in Komerling Ulu Semendawai Suku III in 1930. The history of Komerling origin in this area was taken from rough documentation from the Fajarbaru village administration in 2016.

This study employed qualitative method. To get lexical data, some informants were selected from each village. The criteria of the informants are old, speak the isolect clearly and fluently, and attended senior high school at maximum for their education degree. These informants were asked to say targeted words in their isolect. There are 350 words which are used as the instrument in this study, covering 200 words of Swadesh list, 52 words of body parts and 98 words of verbs. Every word in their language was transcribed using phonetic transcription based on the guideline of *Kuesioner Kosakata Dasar dan Kata Budaya Dasar* from Ministry of National Education Republic of Indonesia (2013).

For data analysis, there are three things conducted. The first is dialectometry calculation. Dialectometry is geolinguistics variable quantification pioneered by Seguy by counting *disagreement* of compared items in two region to make dissimilarity matrix, converting it into percentage or index score to reflect *linguistic distance* between two observation points (Chamber and Trudgill, 2007). The following is the formula of Seguy's dialectometry as cited by Lauder (2007: 96).

$$\frac{s \times 100}{n} = d \%$$

s is the number of difference of disagreement, n is the number of words compared and d is the linguistic distance in percentage. In this study, the range of dialectometry proposed by Lauder (1990, in Ayatrohaedi 2002) was employed. If the score for d is above 70%, means that two

areas are different in language, 51-70% means different in dialect, 41-50% means different in subdialect, 31-40 means different in speech, and below 30% means two areas are not different in language. In this step, lexical differences between Sinarwaya village and Komerling village as well as Margakaya village and Komerling village will be calculated. The result is used to determine in which level of differences that they are clustered. The second is classifying the similar utterances and drawing the patterns. This includes finding sound correspondences and variation based on language change.

ANALYSIS

The following table indicated the dialectometry score in two different *n*. The first is with *n* = 350 (all words), and the second is with *n* = 200 (Swadesh words).

	D of All words (350) Komerling (Fajarbaru village)	D of Swadesh words (200) Komerling (Fajarbaru village)
Lampung Pubian (Margakaya village)	31,7 %	24,5 %
Lampung Pesisir (Sinarwaya village)	29,6 %	23,0 %

Table 1. Dialectometry result

From the table, it is shown that the the result of dialectometry with *n* of all words between Komerling lect and Lampung Pubian lect is 31,7 %. Based on the range, Komerling lect and Lampung Pubian lect was just different in speech. By using *n* of Swadesh words, the result of dialectometry between the two lects is 24,5 %, which means there is no different between them. In addition, the result of dialectometry both in *n* of all words and *n* in Swadesh words is in the same range. Both of them were under 30%, which means that they are no different. Thus, from dialectometry result, Komerling lect and Lampung lect in Pringsewu regency are actually in the same language with no such a big difference.

This study support the findings of some previous studies that clustered Komerling into the same language as Lampung. The following tables shows some information about the previous researches in Komerling lect.

Previous researchers	Different language	Same language
Greenhill, Drummond, Gray (2010)	√	
Folley (1983)	√	
Keraf (1996: 210)		√ O
Hadikusuma (1990: 118)		√ A
Walker (1975)		√ A
<i>Ethnologue</i> (2016)		√ A
This study		√

Table 2. Research findings of Komerling lect

In its website, *Ethnologue* (2016) clustered Komerling as part of Lampung, but it stated that Komerling has 70% of lexical similarities with Kalianda dialect of Lampung Api and 74% lexical similarities with Sungkai dialect of Lampung Api. It means that the result of dialectometry calculation is around 26-30%. The result of dialectometry in this study is in line with the result of dialectometry calculation that both of the results show that Komerling and Lampung are actually same language. This study however can not reveal, and therefore suggested the future research direction, in which dialect is this Komerling lect. This study only compared Komerling lect and two Lampung Api lects because Pringsewu is not the area where spekaers of Lampung O dialect live.

Comparing Lampung lect and Komerling lect, there are four patterns found in the tested lexicons. The first pattern is Komerling lect is lexically different from both Lampung lects. The second pattern is Komerling lect has lexical similarities with Lampung Pesisir lect only. The third pattern is Komerling lect has lexical similarities with Lampung Pubian lect only. And the fourth pattern is Komerling lect has lexical similarities with both lects, either it is phonologically different or not. The examples are illustrated in the following table.

No	Glos	Komerling	Pubian	Pesisir	Note
1	<i>TO FLOW</i>	[ŋahaŋu?]	[mahili]	[mahili]	Pattern 1
2	<i>WHEN</i>	[idan]	[kapan]	[kapan]	
3	<i>ANIMAL</i>	[binataŋ]	[nawa]	[binataŋ]	Pattern 2
4	<i>TO BURN</i>	[suwah]	[pəpul]	[suwah]	
5	<i>FOREHEAD</i>	[kəda?]	[kəda?]	[taga?]	Pattern 3
6	<i>DRY</i>	[ŋələh]	[ŋələh]	[kəxɪŋ]	
7	<i>TO DIVIDE</i>	[bəlah]	[bəlah]	[bəlah]	Pattern 4
8	<i>TAIL</i>	[gundaŋ]	[gun:əŋ]	[gundaŋ]	

Table 3. Patterns of Lexical Similarities

Lexical similarities also show certain repeated patterns, as seen in pattern 3 and 4. This study illustrates the pattern in two points of discussion i.e. sound correspondences and model of language changes. Sound correspondence in this context means a set of two different sounds which consistently appear between two languages. There were five correspondence sets between Lampung and Komerling found, four vowel correspondences and one consonant correspondence.

No	Komerling	Pubian	Pesisir	Gloss
	[ɔ]	[a]	[ɔ]	
1	[luŋkəp]	[luŋkap]	[luŋkəp]	<i>FACE DOWN</i>
2	[nanəm]	[nanam]	[nanəm]	<i>TO PLANT</i>
3	[tajəm]	[tajam]	[tajəm]	<i>SHARP</i>
4	[haləm]	[halam]	[haləm]	<i>BLACK</i>
5	[sələm]	[sələm]	[sələm]	<i>TO DIVE</i>
6	[bəkəm]	[bəkam]	[bəkəm]	<i>TO HOLD</i>

Table 4. Sound correspondence 1

The table shows that the vowel sound [a] in Lampung Pubian lect corresponds to vowel sounds [ɔ] in Komerling lect. As can be seen in glos *PLANT*, Lampung Pubian has [nanam], meanwhile Komerling has [nanəm]. This sound correspondence is found in 6 glosses i.e. *FACE DOWN*, *TO PLANT*, *SHARP*, *BLACK*, *TO DIVE*, and *TO HOLD*. From the table, it can also be said that Komerling lect is exactly same as Lampung Pesisir Lect. Another vowel sound correspondence was also found in this study. The vowel sound [ə] in Lampung Pubian lect and Lampung Pesisir lect corresponds to vowel sound [ɔ] in Komerling lect. This sound correspondence is found in 16 glosses.

No	Pubian	Pesisir	Komerling	Gloss
	[ə]	[ə]	[ɔ]	
1	[məŋan]	[məŋan]	[məŋan]	<i>TO EAT</i>
2	[gəmu?]	[gəmu?]	[gəmu?]	<i>FAT (ADJ)</i>
3	[kəxəh]	[kəxəh]	[kəxəh]	<i>TO BITE</i>
4	[təŋis]	[dəŋis]	[dəŋi]	<i>TO HEAR</i>
5	[bəlah]	[bəlah]	[bəlah]	<i>TO SPLIT</i>
6	[pələ?]	[pələ?]	[pələ?]	<i>TO CUT</i>
7	[bəla?]	[bəla?]	[bəla?]	<i>TO LICK</i>

8	[təliŋ]	[təliŋ]	[təliŋ]	<i>PENIS</i>
---	---------	---------	---------	--------------

Table 5. Sound correspondence 2

According to the table, the sound correspondence mostly occurred in two-syllable words and in the first syllable. For example, in the gloss *TO CUT*, both Lampung Pubian lect and Lampung Pesisir lect used [pəloʔ], meanwhile Komering lect has [pəloʔ]. Another example is the gloss *TO LICK* which is expressed with [bəlaʔ] Lampung Pubian lect and Lampung Pesisir lect and [bəlaʔ] in Komering lect.

Another correspondences were found in this study, but only in few glosses. Therefore, it required further investigation. The first sound [i] in Lampung Pubian lect corresponded to sound [ɔ] in Komering lect. This occurred in two glosses only, which are *TO ASK SOMEONE* ([kayin] and [kayɔn]) and *LONG* ([tijaŋ] and [tɔjaŋ]). The second is sound [x] in Lampung Pubian lect and Lampung Pesisir lect corresponded to sound [ɣ] in Komering lect. Both sounds are fricative. This correspondence only occurred in two glosses. For example, to express *WIDE*, Lampung Pubian lect and Lampung Pesisir lect had [bəxaʔ], meanwhile Lampung [bəɣaʔ]. However, this [ɣ] sound is conflicting because in other gloss, Komering lect also used [x], like [xua] in the gloss *TWO*. There might only be the idiolect of the informants.

No	Komering, Pesisir	Pubian	Glos
1	[gundaŋ]	[gun:aŋ]	<i>TAIL</i>
2	[tuŋgaŋ]	[tuŋ:aŋ]	<i>PIKUL</i>
3	[minjaʔ]	[miŋ:aʔ]	<i>TO WAKE UP</i>
4	[mandi]	[man:i]	<i>TO BATH</i>
5	[handaʔ]	[han:aʔ]	<i>WHITE</i>
6	[panday]	[pan:ay]	<i>TO KNOW</i>
7	[hambux]	[ham:ɔʔ]	<i>TO FLY</i>

Table 6. Assimilation

Besides sound correspondence, there were also variations based on language change analogy. The first one is assimilation, the sound changes where two phonemes in proto languages change to be one phoneme in current language (Keraf, 1996: 85). In this study, assimilation is actually not in phoneme as it doesn't change the meaning. The assimilation occurred between Komering lect and Lampung Pubian lect and was found in 7 glosses. The assimilation occurred in the sound in middle of the word where the certain sound is influenced by nasal sound around. For example, the gloss *WHITE* in Lampung Komering lect and Lampung Pesisir lect is [handaʔ], meanwhile in Lampung Pubian is [han:aʔ]. From this example, [n] and [d] are both produced in lamino alveolar. However, it is produced in different manner. Sound [n] is nasal sound meanwhile sound [d] is plosive sound. When assimilation occurred, [d] merged into [n] sound.

No	Komering	Pubian	Glos
1	[kuykuy]	[kəkuy]	<i>TO SCRATCH</i>
2	[bixbix]	[bɛbɛx]	<i>LIPS</i>
3	[naŋkayun]	[nəkayun]	<i>TO SCREAM</i>
4	[ŋaximahko]	[ŋəmahko]	<i>TO BRESTFEED</i>
5	[xaŋa-xaŋa]	[xəxaŋa]	<i>FINGERS</i>

Table 7. Syncope

Syncope was also found in this study, which is the loss of sound in the middle part of the word (Keraf, 1996: 91). This variation occurred in 5 glosses and occurred in Komering lect and Pubian lect. For example, gloss *FINGERS* in Komering lect is [xaŋa-xaŋa] then in Pubian lect is [xəxaŋa]. In this context, sound [ŋ] and [a] were deleted and the vowel sound [a] in the first syllable change into [ə]. In

glos LIPS, syncope occurred when sound [x] in the first syllable of [bixbix] was deleted. After that, the sound [i] in the first and two syllable changed into vowel sound [ɛ] so it became [bɛbɛx]. From those findings, mostly there are more than one sound lost occurred and there was also vowel change. Therefore it was not full syncope.

CONCLUSION

Komering lect and Lampung lect in Pringsewu regency had close relationship as seen in the result of dialectometry calculation and patterns of lexical variation in both lects. Apart from linguistic claim or cultural claim toward Komering people, this close relationship shows that it is important to explore the richness of elements in each lect, especially for scientific and practical purposes. Assuming that Komering lect becomes the part of Lampung lect, it is vital that the description about this lect be introduced in local content subject that is now existing in Lampung education curriculum. Furthermore, lexical variation patterns can be the insight for local language teaching so that the language learners can directly compare two lects that have close relationship.

Future direction of this study lies on two things. The first is the lect that is compared. This study only employed two lects, which are Lampung Pubian and Lampung Pesisir, in which Lampung Pesisir here is still hard to define, whether it belongs to Krui subdialect or Waylima subdialect. Involving more lects such as Lampung Nyow Dialect and another Lampung Api dialect are highly suggested. The second is the glosses used, more glosses in different lexical fields may influence the result of dialectometry calculation and lexical variation patterns found.

REFERENCES:

- Ayatrohaedi. (2012). *Pedoman Penelitian Dialektologi*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional
- Chambers, JK dan Peter Trudgill. (2004). *Dialectology Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, W.A. (1983). Language atlas of Sumatra. In S.A. Wurm and S. Hattori (eds.). *Language atlas of the Pacific area. Part II. Japan Area, Taiwan (Formosa), Philippines, Mainland and Insular SouthEast Asia*. Pacific Linguistics Series C67. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Greenhill SJ, Drummond AJ, & Gray RD. (2010). *How Accurate and Robust Are the Phylogenetic Estimates of Austronesian Language Relationships?* PLoS ONE 5(3): e9573.
- Hadikusuma, H. Hilman. (1990). *Masyarakat dan Adat-Budaya Lampung*. Bandung: CV Mandar Maju.
- Keraf, Gorys. 1996. *Linguistik Bandingan Historis*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia.
- Lauder, Multamia RMT. (2007). *Sekilas Mengenai Pemetaan Bahasa*. Jakarta Timur: Akbar Media Aksara.
- Suprayogi. (2017). *Variasi Bahasa dan Sentuh Bahasa di Kabupaten Pringsewu*. Unpublished: Thesis Universitas Indonesia
- Walker, Dale F. 1975. A lexical study of Lampung dialects. In J.W.M. Verhaar (ed.). *Miscellaneous studies in Indonesian and languages in Indonesia*, pp. 1120. (NUSA Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and Other Languages in Indonesia, 1). Jakarta: Lembaga Bahasa, Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya.

<https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/komering>

Biodata:

Suprayogi

Faculty of Arts and Education, Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia

suprayogi@teknokrat.ac.id , suprayogisalim@gmail.com

Master Degree in Linguistics, Universitas Indonesia, graduated in 2017, Bachelor Degree of English Literature, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, graduated in 2012.

sociolinguistics, dialectology, linguistic anthropology, language teaching.