

Geography Dialect Of Muna Language

Maulid Taembo^{1*}, Rahman², Wa Ode Halfian³, Zahrani⁴
Language and Literature Department of Halu Oleo University, Jl. H.E.A. Mokodompit,
Anduonohu, Kendari^{1,2,3,4}

{Maulid.taembo@rocketmail.com}

Abstract, This study discusses the geography dialect of Muna language in Southeast Sulawesi. It was conducted because of both the lack of study about geography dialect and Muna language has interesting dialects to be investigated, in which it is used frequently in three regencies of Southeast Sulawesi. This study discusses (1) the phonemes of Muna language; (2) describing and analyzing phonological and lexical variation of Muna; and (3) describing and analyzing the group of Muna based on phonological and lexical isogloss bundles and lexical dialectometry. Since the limited time, the study was done in only several point observations or areas in Muna and Center Buton Regencies, namely Tongkuno and Mawasangka. The data is obtained from interview or participant speaking and scrutinize methods. The instrument comes from 200 lists of Swadesh and 750 lists of Isodore Dyen. In analyzing the data, it uses apportion and equal methods, and then isogloss bundles and dialectometry methods. The results showed there are five fowels and nineteen consonants in muna language. Both dialects in Tongkuno and Mawasangka do not show significant different or lexical variation because they show the muchclosed relationship. The variation just appears on phonological aspects such as phoneme /r/ on Tongkuno is realized to phoneme /h/ on Mawasangka. It thus phonological bundles can show the groups of Tongkuno and Mawasangka as dialects of Muna. Besides, lexical dialectometry shows that the relationship of Tongkuno and Mawasangka in 17% which is categorized in different dialects of Muna language.

Keywords: geography dialect; Muna; dialectometry

1 Introduction

Language is a form of characterization that is actualized by living creatures. In the context of human being life, language as a means of communication represents cultural diversity within societies. Thus, cultural diversity is reflected through language used in human communication.

The Indonesian archipelago which is formed from thousands of islands from Sabang to Merauke has various ethnic groups. Each of these ethnic groups shares a different type and variety of culture. The culture of each tribe is manifested in various aspects of people's life. Besides, perbedaan karena letak geografis juga mendominasi. Distinction in geographical location of the ethnic groups and the diversity in their culture cause differences in the types and varieties of languages they use. The differences in languages in each of the ethnic groups

are not only shown at the context of sounds (phonology), but also in the form (morphology) and structure of words and sentences (syntax). This indicates that the differences referred to are not only differences at the dialectological level.

One of the local languages is Muna language which is used in Muna social cultural society in their daily conversation involving Muna island (Muna Regency) and a part of Buton island in the north, belong to three district in Buton Regency are Gu, Lakudo, and Mawasangka subdistricts. There are three reasons for conducting the research. First, studies that thoroughly examine the Muna language from the perspective of the geographical location of the community have not been carried out, especially using a qualitative research approach. Second, previous studies have shown inconsistent results regarding the classification of Muna language from one another. However, since the limited of time this study is also very limited which just focus on Tongkuno and Mawasangka. Other reason is the different results of Mawasangka isolects. One states as different language of Muna, while other states as same language of Muna. Kaseng, et al. (1987) state Muna and Mawasangka as two different language, while Pusat Bahasa (2008) and SIL (2006) state that Mawasangka is a dialect of Muna language. Those studies were done only quantitative way.

Based on the considerations above, this study investigated the geography dialects of Muna language in qualitative and quantitative approaches. Theoretically, the result of the study can develop the linguistic theory in Indonesia, mainly for dialect geography study. Practically, the result of the study can explain the relationship of variations of lects or isolects in Muna language, and it can contribute to the increasing sense of belonging and solidarity among people in Muna and Buton.

2 Theoretical Framework

The geography dialect in Indonesia preceded by Teeuw (1951) with the publication of "*Atlas Dialek Pulau Lombok* (Dialect Atlas van Lombok)", and its analysis was published in 1958. Teeuw introduces French current method and uses 250 words of question lists. The study was then developed by Bawa (1983) with his study examining Balinese language from a Dialect Geography Study. Bawa (1983) focused on aspects of phonology and lexical, and used theories of structural and traditional dialectology. Actually, there are many other geography dialect studies that have many contributions in this study, like dissertation studies of Dhanawaty (2002), Putra (2007), Fautngil (2008), and Suryati (2011).

There are several concepts used in this study. They are (1) language variation; (2) dialect, subdialect, and isolect; (3) isogloss; (4) underlying and surfaces forms; (5) distinctive feature; and (6) language map. Language variation includes language element variation and difference levels in language. A language may consist of several dialects. Likewise, dialects may consist of several subdialects. Dialect has more differences than subdialect. In dialectometry method, dialect and subdialect have different percentage. Isogloss is line which is used in map to unify or separate certain elements of language. Underlying form is base form to deliver the surface forms. Distinctive feature is the smallest unit in language. The language map is used to visualize the variations of language in different places.

The study uses theories of traditional dialectology. Traditional dialectology is used to analyze the lexical aspects of language. In the view of traditional dialectology all language variations have the same basic characteristics. Languages in the world have relationship one another. Thus, the present research will reveal the similarities of these languages. In addition, the study is done not only through a diachronic study but also using a synchronous study.

Diachronic study is the study of language over a long period of time, while synchronous study is the study of language over a certain period of time (Chaer, 2003: 347). Further, Suwadji and Samid (1991: 4) explains that clear description of language system can be found in synchronic study.

3 Method

The research data were collected through interview method and distributional method (Mahsun, 1995: 94-101). The interview method was realized through a face speaking technique. Researchers came to each research location and interviewed informants with a list of provided questions. Distributional method was actually a complementary method which was carried out by note-taking and recording techniques.

The research data were analyzed using synchronous and diachronic approaches. The methods used in this step are apportioned and Interlingua equal methods by using similarity comparative and difference comparative techniques (Mahsun, 2007: 118). The variations of phonology and lexicon were supported by the results of isogloss bundles. For grouping the Muna language, lexical dialectometry method was applied.

The instrument used to collect the research data was a questionnaire containing a list of 200 words of Swadesh. 200 Swadesh words were used to calculate the percentage of the Muna cognate of variations at two observation points, Tongkuno and Mawasangka. In this study, similarity in meaning and form is used as the criterion that one word is the same as the word in the Swadesh list and not a loan word.

4 Discussion

Based on the data found in the field, Muna language in both Tongkuno and Gu-Mwasangka dialects has vowel phonemes. They are phonemes of /i/, /u/, /e/, /o/, and /a/, as in the following examples. 1) /a/-/o/: /idā/ 'father' and /idō/ 'green'; 2) /a/-/e/: /ana/ 'a child' and /ane/ 'if'; 3) /e/-/a/: /mate/ 'die' and /mata/ 'eye'; 4) /u/-/a/: /tolu/ 'three' and /tola/ 'call'. Those vowel phonemes can be in the initial, medial, and final positions. Besides, the language has 19 consonant phonemes, such as /b/, /β/, /p/, /d/, /β/, /t/, /g/, /ŋ/, /k/, /m/, /n/, /ŋ/, /f/, /s/, /h/, /l/, /r/, /w/, and /y/, as in the examples: 1) /t/-/l/: /otu/ 'louse' and /olu/ 'cloud', 2) /f/-/h/: /ifi/ 'fire' and /ihi/ 'meat', 3) /l/-/p/: /lani/ 'sky' and /pani/ 'wing', 4) /w/-/t/: /we/ 'to' and /te/ 'in', 5) /r/-/n/: /rea/ 'blood' and /nea/ 'name', 6) /l/-/d/: /five/ 'lima' and /dima/ 'hand', 7) /r/-/s/: /ria/ 'noisy' and /sia/ 'beat', 8) /b/-/β/: /baru/ 'happy' and /baru/ 'fertilizer', 9) /d/-/d/: /dolo/ 'snout' and /dolo/ 'ridge', 10) /f/-/p/: /findo/ 'banana leaves' and /pindo/ 'healthy', 11) /g/-/ŋ/: /crazy/ 'liar' and /ŋila/ 'small moles', 12) /n/-/t/: /nara/ 'bored' and /tara/ 'spur', 13) /h/-/ŋ/: /horo/ 'fly' and /ŋoro/ 'throw', 14) /m/-/w/: /manu/ 'chicken' and /wanu/ 'wake up'.

Tongkuno and Gu-Mawasangka dialects of Muna has unique phonological variations or correspondence, namely phoneme /r/ in Tongkuno and /h/ in Gu-Mawasangka such as *randa* and *handa* 'stomach', *rea* and *hea* 'blood'; phoneme /h/ in Muna and /s/ in Gu-Mawasangka such as *anahi* and *anai* 'child', *tehi* and *tei* 'sea'; and phoneme /ŋ/ in Muna and /s/ in Mawasangka such as *gae* and *ae* 'cry', *gato* and *ato* 'roof. Besides, Tongkuno and Gu-Mawasangka dialects have lexical variations as in the following examples. In Tongkuno, the

gloss “walk” realized to *kaŋkaha* while in Gu-Mawasangka realized to *mparigi*. Other examples are glosses as presented in the following table

Table 1. Lexical Variation of Tongkuno and Gu-Mawasangka

Nu	Tongkuno	Gu-Mawasangka	Gloss
1	no-raku	no-kokita	dirty
2	Tolobuġu	Kundo	back
3	de-gau	de-founda	cook
4	de-komi	de-sosoe	suck
5	poŋke	Tiŋala	Ear
6	no-lua	no-gende	overflow
7	do-hulo	do-foisi	go hunting
8	no-duko	no-papa	dull
9	de-tisa	de-loa	plant
10	no-mawa	no-siwiwi	flow
11	Karumbu	lalo kampo	forest

Further, based on data 200 of Swadesh list, Tongkuno and Gu-Mawasangka have 34 different words or 166 categorized as same lexicons. So, based on the result of dialectometry, Tongkuno and Mawasangka is in 17% which is categorized in different dialects of same language, namely Muna language.

5 Conclusion

Muna language has five vowels and nineteen consonants. Both dialects in Tongkuno and Mawasangka do not show significant different or lexical variation because they show very closed relationship. The variation just appears on phonological aspects such as phoneme /r/ on Tongkuno is realized to phoneme /h/ on Mawasangka. It thus phonological bundles can show the groups of Tongkuno and Mawasangka as dialects of Muna. Besides, lexical dialectometry shows that the relationship of Tongkuno and Mawasangka in 17% which is categorized in different dialects of Muna language.

This study is very simple and the first step of geography dialect of Muna language. It is very limited because just involves two areas as point observation and 200 of Swadesh list. So, it needs next researches which involve more areas and more data.

References

- [1] Bawa, I Wayan. 1983. “Bahasa Bali di daerah Provinsi Bali: Sebuah Analisis Geografi Dialek”. Disertasi S-3. Universitas Indonesia Jakarta.
- [2] Chaer, Abdul. 2003. *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- [3] Dhanawaty, Ni Made. 2002. “Variasi Dialektal Bahasa Bali di Daerah Transmigrasi Lampung Tengah” (Disertasi). Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- [4] Fautngil, Christ. 2008. “Varietas-Varietas Bahasa di Lembah Grime Jayapura: Kajian Dialektologi Regional” (Disertasi). Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Udayana.
- [5] Kaseng, Syahrudin, Alimudin D.P, Andi Mahmuddin, dan Rasdiana P. 1991. *Pemetaan Bahasa-Bahasa di Sulawesi Tenggara*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Depdiknas.

- [6] Mahsun. 1995. *Dialektologi Diakronis: Sebuah Pengantar*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press. 2007. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan Strategi, Metode, dan Tekniknya*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [7] Pusat Bahasa. 2008. *Bahasa dan Peta Bahasa di Indonesia*. Dendy Sugono, Mahsun, Inyo Yos Fernandez, Kisyani Laksono, Multamia Lauder, dan Nadra (Ed). Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa. Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- [8] Putra, Anak Agung P. 2007. "Segmentasi Dialektal Bahasa Sumba di Pulau Sumba: Suatu Kajian Dialektologi". Disertasi: Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Udayana.
- [9] SIL. 2006. *Bahasa-Bahasa di Indonesia*. Jakarta: SIL International.
- [10] Suryati, Ni Made. 2012. "Variasi Fonologis dan Leksikal Bahasa Lio di Flores, Nusa Tenggara Timur: Kajian Dialektologi Geografi" (Disertasi). Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Udayana.
- [11] Suwadji, Dirgo Sabariyanto, dan Samid Sudira. 1991. *Perbandingan Sistem Morfologi Verba Bahasa Jawa dengan Sistem Morfologi Verba Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [12] Teeuw, Andries. 1951. *Atlas Dialek Pulau Lombok*. Jakarta: Biro Reproduksi Jawatan Topografi.