

Comparison of Vocabulary Relationship between the Lewoheba Variant and the Lamaholot Language and Kedang Language

Simon Sabon Ola

Linguistics Professor. Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, Indonesia

Yosep Bisara Kroon

Associate Professor in Linguistics, Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This research is focused on the Lewoheba Variant (LV) found in Lewoheba village, Balurebong village, Lebatukan district, in Lembata Regency – Indonesia, which is thought to have the status of a language. To determine the position, a comparison of the relative vocabulary was carried out between LV and Lamaholot Language (LL), and Kedang Language (KL). Based on Swadesh Vocabulary data (200 Vocabularies), it was found that there were only 45 LV lexicons could be compared with LL and KL. The results of the lexicostatistical analysis showed that the average percentage of kinship between LV, LL, and KL was 10.85%. In other words, it is stated that the percentage difference of LV proves that it is a different language from LL and KL. The status of LV as a language, namely Lewoheba Language (LHL) was determined when LHL had 1 (one) speaker, even though the population of Lewoheba village has 27 families. It is found that the status of LHL is known when it is in the critical language category.

KEYWORDS: kin lexicon, language status, critical language.

1. INTRODUCTION

Lamaholot and Kedang are the indigenous languages spoken on Lembata Island. According to the kinship test using the Relative Vocabulary List, there are significant differences between the Lamaholot and Kedang languages. Even the genealogy of kinship illustrates the origin differences between the two languages.

In terms of life and language use on Lembata Island, there is a Lewoheba variant whose lexicon/vocabulary differs from that of its Lamaholot and Kedang relatives, according to an initial survey. In this study, it is referred to as a variant because it has not been established linguistically as a distinct language from Lamaholot and Kedang or as a dialect of those two languages.

The components of comparative language are phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and lexicon. This research focuses on comparing lexicon-related characteristics. Theoretically, similarities and differences in the vocabulary of close relatives can be used to identify a language, dialect, or variation. This parameter is used to make objective language and language count

95	ISSN 2690-9626 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC" under Volume: 3 Issue: 5 in May-2022 https://grnjournals.us/index.php/AJSHR
	Copyright (c) 2022 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

determination claims. The basis for sociolinguistic or cultural language classification is not an objective determination. The subjective basis of determination causes the number of languages to be greater than the actual number of languages, or vice versa.

The Lewoheba variant lacks language, at least according to previous research. The Language Development and Development Agency did not include the Lewoheba variant in its language mapping. Nevertheless, according to the speaker, there is no confusion between speakers of the Lamaholot and Kedang languages and speakers of the Lewoheba variant, so they refer to it as a language. If this is the case, why was the Lewoheba variant with language status not included in the previous language map? Similarly, if the Lewoheba variant is simply a dialect of the surrounding language, in this case Kedang or Lamaholot, then why are there misunderstandings between the speakers of each language?

This research seeks to demonstrate that the Lewoheba variant is a distinct language from Kedang and Lamaholot, or a dialect, as the variant is defined in this study. To demonstrate this, a vocabulary comparison method, which is a form of historical comparative linguistics, is employed. Although this study is related to the history of language, it does not discuss the year of separation as glotochronological analysis does.

In the preliminary survey, only one speaker of the variant or dialectological term was found to be isolectal. Concern for the extinction of this isolect which can be proven to be a language is reflected in the research. If this study finds linguistic evidence that the Lewoheba variant is a language in addition to the Lamaholot and Kedang languages, then another language in NTT is extinct following the Baleil language in Alor, whose last speaker passed away in early 2021. The intriguing research question for this study can be stated as follows. (a) How many Lewoheba variant lexicons do speakers still possess? b) Is the Lewoheba variant a language, based on the similarity of its lexicon?

This study seeks to determine the status of the Lewoheba dialect and whether it is a language or dialect. Identifying the Lewoheba lexicon that is still mastered by speakers and determining the status of the Lewoheba variant based on similarities and differences in its lexicon with the Lamaholot and Kedang languages are used to determine the status of a language.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This investigation focuses on determining whether the Lewoheba variant is a language or a dialect in comparison to the Lamaholot and Kedang languages. The primary design of this study is descriptive-quantitative. This design adheres to the method of identifying and calculating the percentage of lexicon similarity between the Lewoheba variant and the Lamaholot language and the Lewoheba variant and the Kedang language.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Two concepts are referred to in this research, namely: (1) lexicon similarity; and (2) basic vocabulary. These two concepts are relevant for comparative language research that is oriented towards determining the status of a language, the level of closeness of the relationship between languages or the close relationship between language and its dialects.

Lexicon Similarities

The similarity of the lexicon or referred to as a cognate set of words in historical comparative linguistics terms. The similarity of the lexicon to determine the status of a language is quantitative (with respect to number). The greater the lexicon similarity between a variant and the language being compared, the variant cannot achieve status as a language. Conversely, the smaller the lexicon similarity, the variant is a different language from the languages being compared.

96	ISSN 2690-9626 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC" under Volume: 3 Issue: 5 in May-2022 https://grnjournals.us/index.php/AJSHR
	Copyright (c) 2022 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

The similarity of the lexicon includes the same lexicon and similar lexico. For example, the lexicon ama and ina in the Lamaholot language are the same as ama 'father' and ina 'mother' in the Sabu language. While an example of a lexicon similar to wai 'air' in the Lamaholot language, in the Wejewa language in West Sumba it is called wei. The difference between one phoneme /a/ and /e/ can be explained phonologically based on the law of sound, namely the weakening of sound [a] to [e]. the two sounds have a similar articulation. Such similar lexicons are discussed regarding the characteristics of change.

Main Vocabulary

The main vocabulary is words that are universal/universal (Keraf, 1991:123). Basic vocabulary is universal because it is found in all languages in the world. For example, words related to the human body; All languages in the world recognize the lexicon relating to the human body.

These words are not a product of any particular culture as Keraf Keraf (1991:126) says, "A good list is a list compiled by Morris Swadesh of 200 words. The list has the advantage of being researched because it consists of non-cultural words, and the retention of the root word has been tested in languages with a written script.

The main vocabulary is used to identify the lexicon similarities between the languages being compared to determine the close relationship. In addition, basic vocabulary can also be used to identify similarities and differences between variants and languages in the same ecology or geographically close to determine the status of the language or dialect of the variant in question.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Lewoheba Community Description

This research is actually focused on testing the status of the Lewoheba variant/isolect by comparing it with the Lamaholot and Kedang languages, which are geographically close to the distribution of speakers of the Lewoheba variant. Therefore, a brief description of the community (speech) is needed, especially its origins and the language used. At the time of collecting research data, the Lewoheba variant was no longer used by the remaining 1 (one) speaker. According to informants, there were 3 speakers of the Lewoheba variant until the 90s. In the 90s, one speaker died. And in the 2000s one more speaker died. This fact is not only the narrative of the descendants and The words of people from the hamlet Balurebong Village also implies their belief that there is a language used by the people in Lewoheba that is different from the Lembata dialect of lamaholot. Their language is called Lewoheba language, which researchers call a Lewoheba variant, or Lewoheba isolect in dialectological studies.

The name Lewoheba, according to the sources, has the meaning of 'marginalized or marginalized'. If this name is assigned to a community that has social ties as a village, then this condition greatly affects the socio-psychological community. The sociopsychological influence is seen in the reality of the social roles of the Lewoheba people with people in other communities (villages). Social phenomena are born in the form of hegemony and subordination.

The Lewoheba people come from an ancestor named Boti Abo. They consist of several tribes, namely: the Baoninang, Tobi, Lei, and Bara tribes. They are gathered in one traditional house which was previously believed to be a place for storing luggage called Otha which was brought by Boti Abo from Uye Lewun. It is estimated that the Lewoheba people are not Uye Lewun people, but people from outside Lembata who stopped briefly at Uye Lewun, then migrated to a new place which is now known as the Lewoheba village.

Lewoleba Variant Overview

The status of this Lewoheba variant is given based on several reasons, as follows.

- a. It has not been linguistically proven that the language used by the people in Lewoheba Village (before the expansion of Balurebong Village) is different from the Lamaholot language on the island of Lembata.
- b. The last generation of Lewoheba people (who are now over 70 years old only have stories from their teenage years that their parents used a different language from the neighboring village, and different from the language they use today (meaning the Lamaholot language, especially the Lewoeleng dialect).

This worrying fact was not really felt by researchers when in 1998 they received information that some people in Lewoheba, Lembata used a different language from the Lamaholot and Kedang languages. At that time there were less than 10 speakers left, all of whom belonged to the older generation who were involved in traditional rituals (Mr. Cristo's statement..., interview on October 4, 2021). If researchers had known the fact that the number of speakers had been there since 1998, this opportunity would not have been missed because 23 years ago, the Lewoheba variant was actually a language (according to the informant) that was threatened with extinction.

As an observer of the life of local languages, the researcher does not want this omission to continue. Although it has now been included in the critical "language" category, the status of the Lewoheba variant must be ascertained immediately, although the results of this study only arrive at confirming the status of the variant as a language with very limited lexicon data in the repertoire of speakers whose number has reached a very critical level.

Lexicon Data on the Lamaholot, Kedang, and Lewoheba Variants

The lexicon data in the form of Swadesh Vocabulary of 200 words is not entirely mastered by speakers of the Lewoheba variant. The data of the Lamaholot (DielakLembata) and Kedang (KL) language lexicon data are adjusted for the number of Lewoheba (LV) variants. This presentation model has never been applied in various studies on language comparisons conducted by previous researchers. This is because the characteristics of the living conditions of the variant under study are truly unique. However, this research must find the meaning behind the limited data due to policy omissions and delays in responding from researchers.

The LV, BLDL and KL lexicon data can be presented in a different way than the commonly used lexicostatistical method. At least there is a modification strategy so as to produce a data presentation like the following.

- a. Lexicon showing the similarities and similarities between LV and BLDL

No	Gloss	LV	BLDL
1	skin	<i>uli</i>	<i>kuliy</i>
2	nose	<i>nirung</i>	<i>irung</i>
3	chicken	<i>manu</i>	<i>manu*)</i>
4	water	<i>we</i>	<i>wai*)</i>
5	in	<i>we</i>	<i>se*)</i>
6	one	<i>to'</i>	<i>tou</i>
7	four	<i>pate</i>	<i>pat</i>
8	stomach	<i>bohti</i>	<i>boti*)</i>

*) The same as KL

b. Lexicon showing similarities and similarities between LV and KL

No	Gloss	LV	KL
1	shoulder	<i>wale</i>	<i>wali</i>
2	hunt	<i>derudare</i>	<i>derung</i>
3	water	<i>we</i>	<i>Wei*)</i>
4	salt	<i>tao</i>	<i>teu</i>
5	small	<i>utung</i>	<i>utung</i>
6	in	<i>we</i>	<i>Be*)</i>
7	chicken	<i>manu</i>	<i>Manu*)</i>
8	stomach	<i>bohti</i>	<i>Botin*)</i>

*) The same as BLDL

c. LV Lexicon Different from BLDL and KL

No	Gloss	LV
1	foot	<i>nonore</i>
2	dirty	<i>mide</i>
3	back	<i>munu</i>
4	intestines	<i>weuhe</i>
5	afraid	<i>ko</i>
6	blood	<i>dagedare</i>
7	head	<i>ete</i>
8	neck	<i>tomatodo</i>
9	tie	<i>gui</i>
10	steal	<i>matausarawege</i>
11	dead	<i>tiwa</i>
12	life	<i>mara</i>
13	plant	<i>penola</i>
14	bird	<i>todopre</i>
15	sand	<i>bethe</i>
16	sea	<i>wura</i>
17	Lake	<i>opha</i>
18	Forest	<i>duli</i>
19	rain	<i>turututu</i>
20	thunder	<i>milaebtaa</i>
21	cold	<i>leroe</i>
22	wind	<i>dudubelebabera</i>
23	sick	<i>beibarosopati</i>
24	old	<i>gopidohe</i>
25	Fine, right	<i>klume</i>
26	wicked	<i>meida</i>
27	hide	<i>ba'bi</i>
28	this	<i>bo'o</i>
29	far	<i>ingiole</i>
30	we	<i>gise</i>
31	what	<i>natepunu</i>
32	who	<i>ne'e</i>

33	all	<i>peha</i>
34	how	<i>epemange</i>
35	no	<i>newoho</i>
36	count	<i>bebe</i>
37	two	<i>tire</i>

Data analysis

4.1 Basic Vocabulary Comparison

In lexicostatistical analysis, efforts to determine language status are obtained by comparing the number of the same lexicon. In the first data collection, only 30 lexicon was obtained. The second take only obtained a dozen lexicon. Thus, the total number of Lewoheba variant lexicon collected is 45 lexicon, or 22.5%.

Based on the principle of lexicostatistical analysis, gloss that has no equivalent in the language being compared is ignored in the calculation of the relative vocabulary. Nevertheless, in principle, the 77.5% lexicon number in the LV is an extraordinary condition that needs to be handled carefully in relation to the application of the principle. lexicostatistical analysis. The recorded lexicon as many as 45 lexicon, or 22.5% of the total basic vocabulary of the Swadesh version has given an early indication of the LV status of BLDL and KL.

The possible analysis applied in this study uses the if-then formula, as follows.

a. If the empty lexicon in the LV, BLDL and KL lexicon comparison list is ignored, then the calculation of the basic vocabulary to obtain the kinship vocabulary is as follows:

$$\frac{8}{45} \times 100\% = 17,7\%$$

This means that there is a lexicon similarity between LV with BLDL and KL of 17.7%; or a difference of 82.3%.

b. If the empty lexicon is taken into account so that the total comparison is 200 Swadesh vocabularies, then the relative vocabulary numbers are as follows:

$$\frac{8}{200} \times 100\% = 4\%$$

This means that there is a lexicon similarity between LV with BLDL and KL only 4%; or a difference of 96%. The average percentage of kinship between calculations a and b is:

$$\frac{17,7\% + 4\%}{2} = \frac{21,7\%}{2} = 10,85\%$$

This means that the difference between LV with BLDL and KL is 89.15%. This figure means significantly that the difference between LV with BLDL and KL is a language difference.

4.2 Genealogy

The use of the term genealogical kinship in this study is no longer relevant after the data shows that the Lewoheba variant lexicon in the repertoire of speakers is very limited. The number of 45 lexicon as mentioned in the previous explanation can only produce a tendency of the relationship between LV with BLDL and KL that cannot be described in a kinship tree. This condition also causes the analysis of this study not to reach the determination of the year of separation using the glotochronology technique.

Lexicostatistical analysis shows that LV is a different language from BLDL and KL. Because the lexicon data is very limited, the results of the above analysis are only a trend. Non-linguistic data can be an accurate verification instrument about the position of LV as a language in the kinship line. Thus, various characteristics of phoneme changes and reflections on proto phonemes are not discussed in the results of this study.

4.3 Discussion

Lewoheba Language Status

In this research design, the term Lewoheba variant (LV) is used. However, based on the results of the analysis, the status of the variant as a language was determined, namely the Lewoheba language (LHL). The average lexicon similarity which is only 10.85% in comparison with BLDL and KL is a relative measure in determining language status with respect to LV.

The sociolinguistic interpretation of the relationship between languages and the relationship between language and dialect is in line with the determination of language status on LV. Dialects are more flexible and more adaptable to dialects of the same language around them. Dialect ecology does not exclude each other's lexicon. Meanwhile, language tends to be rigid in the ecology of language so that there is resistance that seems to get rid of the lexicon of other languages. In this condition of rigidity, language is prone to deresistance, meaning that it is unable to get rid of it and turns into an excluded language.

The lexicon similarity between LV and BLDL (including Serang Gorang) which only 4 lexicon out of 45 remaining LV lexicon is evidence that LV is different from BLDL. Likewise, the similarity of the lexicon between LV and KL which also contains 4 lexicon is also proof that LV is not a dialect of KL. Thus, LV is a different language from BLDL and KL.

Very limited linguistic data becomes an obstacle in determining LHL historically or diachronically. At least this study has not been able to confirm the authenticity of the LHL. The languages that are compared to determine the status of LV as LHL, namely LL and KL are included in the Austronesian language family . (https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahasa_Lamaholot-Kedang).

Lewoleba Language Living Conditions

LHL has been categorized as a dead language or an extinct language. This language has run out of speakers. One remaining speaker is a condition that makes it impossible to identify LHL language data. His repertoire is limited to only 45 lexicon. While the repertoire at the morphological level, phrases, clauses, and sentences are already in a nil state.

The shift in the function and role of LHL in daily communication in the realm of the family and the realm of neighbors has lasted for two generations. As the results of interviews with resource persons, since the last two generations LHL has only been used for ritual speech in traditional houses. Meanwhile, traditional ceremonies outside the traditional house are dominated by the use of the Lamaholot language, the Serang Gorang dialect.

101	ISSN 2690-9626 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC" under Volume: 3 Issue: 5 in May-2022 https://grnjournals.us/index.php/AJSHR
	Copyright (c) 2022 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

The reality of using language in the Lewoheba community shows that LHL is spoken by only one speaker who initially acts as a customary holder; the person who has the authority to convey the story to the ancestor of the Lewoheba people named Boti Abo. The ancestor, who is believed to have inhabited the traditional house, is believed to have resided in the traditional house, which is the place where Boti Abo started storing his belongings when he first arrived in Lewoheba. If that is the reality, then since the ritual speech delivered in the traditional house is not a spell but an ordinary language, namely LHL whose function is enhanced as a language for sacred communication.

The LHL speaker who is also a traditional holder is no longer the main actor in traditional rituals at the traditional house of Lewoheba village. This also contributes to the shrinking of the linguistic repertoire of the remaining one speaker. The fishing technique by presenting a ritual context to obtain linguistic data through ritual speech is not effective enough to explore the LHL lexicon data.

Social factors seem to have contributed to the shift to the LHL's extinction. There are symptoms of subordination of the Lewoheba community from other village communities in Balurebong Village who are speakers of the Serang Gorang dialect LL. The people of Lewoheba have long been subordinated; since they labeled their village name Lewoheba meaning the marginalized or marginalized village. Maybe that's not the label intended by the Lewoheba people, but rather the village located at the very edge of a residential unit. Due to the immigrant factor with a limited social role, a side meaning of Lewoheba is raised, namely as a marginalized village (and people).

As marginalized people, they have minimal social roles, both traditional social roles and modern social roles. This lack of social roles has an impact on the choice of language in interacting with outside groups. Groups with minimal social roles like the Lewoheba people in the past, although they do not underestimate their own language, there is always a tendency to be proud of the language of the outsiders. The language is not the main choice in daily communication because the speakers themselves do not consider it a prestigious or prestigious language. This condition is a process that begins with language competition, language shift, and leads to language extinction.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The main conclusion of this research is that LV has the status of a language, which is called Lewoheba language (LHL). This conclusion is based on the similarities and differences in the lexicon between LV with BLDL and KL. The similarity of the lexicon is only 10.85% which results in the conclusion that LV is not a dialect of Lamaholot or KL.

In addition to the main conclusions mentioned above, based on data analysis, both lexicon data and interview data, the following are also concluded.

- a. LHL is categorized as a very critical language. It can even be categorized as an extinct language before its status is established.
- b. LHL linguistic data is very limited in the linguistic repertoire of its speakers. Even the most basic lexicon, such as limbs, numbers, and activities have disappeared from the repertoire of speakers.
- c. Social factors related to group subordination are the trigger for the extinction of LHL.

5.2 Suggestions

The National Language Politics in Indonesia has not yet reached the aspects of language maintenance, especially local languages in a systematic, planned, and sustainable manner. This condition is seen in the incomprehensive mapping effort, in addition to the fate of critical languages

102	ISSN 2690-9626 (online), Published by "Global Research Network LLC" under Volume: 3 Issue: 5 in May-2022 https://grnjournals.us/index.php/AJSHR
	Copyright (c) 2022 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

which only raises concerns verbally. The fate of LHL is a consequence of the policy of maintaining language which is partial and momentary. In connection with the condition experienced by LHL which is very critical, it can even be categorized as an extinct language before the determination of its status, a number of recommendations are proposed, such as the following.

- a. Mapping languages in Indonesia, especially in the province of East Nusa Tenggara, needs to be done as soon as possible to anticipate language extinction.
- b. Language mapping to obtain accurate information on the number of languages needs to be done by using a location determination technique down to the smallest level of a community group, such as a hamlet/village.
- c. Linguistic data must be the main instrument to determine the dialect or language status of a variant or isolect.
- d. Especially for LHL, historical traces of the Lewoheba people and various traditional rituals can be an instrument to obtain more complete LHL linguistic data.

The recommendations mentioned above are addressed to researchers and agencies or institutions, such as the Language Office and Language Agency, as well as local governments according to the mandate of the Act.

References:

1. Brannen, Julia.2005. *Memadu Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Fakultas Tarbiyah IAIN Antasari Samarinda Bekerja Sama dengan Pustaka Pelajar.
2. Ibrahim, Abdul Syukur.1987. “Leksikostatistik, Sebuah Teknik dalam Linguistik Historis Komparatif”. Dalam Nurhadi, ed. *Kapita Selekta Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya, Jilid 1*. Malang: FPBS IKIP Malang.
3. Jeffers, Robert J. & Lehist 1979. *Prinsip dan Metode Linguistik Historis*. Diterjemahkan oleh Abdul Syukur Ibrahim dan Machrus Syamsudin. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional.
4. Keraf, Gorys. 1991. *Linguistik Bandingan Historis*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
5. Mbete, Aron Meko, 2004. *Metode Linguistik Historis*. Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.
6. Mbete, Aron Meko, 2000. “Sekilas tentang Linguistik Diakronis”. Bahan Matrikulasi, Tidak Dipublikasikan. Denpasar: Program Magister dan Doktor Linguistik PPs Universitas Udayana.
7. Muhammad. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
8. Ningsih, Tri Wahyu Retno dan Endang Purwaningsih. 2013. Sistem Fonologi Bahasa Lamalera”, dalam Proceeding PESAT Volme 5, Oktober, halaman 75—83.
9. Ola, Simon Sabon dan Fredy Maunareng. 2014. *Lingistik Historis Komparatif*.
10. Putrayasa, I Gusti Ngurah Ketut 1998. “Hubungan Kekerabatan Bahasa Tetun-Rote-Dawan: Kajian Linguistik Historis Komparatif”. Tesis Magister, Tidak Dipublikasikan. Denpasar: Program Magister Linguistik PPs Universitas Udayana.
11. Sawardo, Paulus, dkk. 1989. *Fonologi, Morfologi, dan Sintaksis Bahasa Kedang*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
12. Saidi, Shaleh. 1989. *Linguistik Bandingan Nusantara*. Flores: Nusa Indah.
13. Samarin, William J. 1988. *Ilmu Bahasa Lapangan*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.

14. Sanda, Fransiskus 1998. "Rekonstruksi Protobahasa Mambae-Tokodede-Kemak (PMTK) di Daerah Provinsi Timor-Timur". Denpasar: Program Magister Linguistik PPs Universitas Udayana.
15. Trask, R.L. 2000. *The Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.