



LINGUISTIK TERAPAN

VOL. 8 NO. 2 NOVEMBER 2011

JURNAL LINGUISTIK TERAPAN PASCASARJANA UNIMED



Jurnal Linguistik Terapan	Vol. 8 No.2	72-164	Medan November 2011	ISSN 0215 - 5139
------------------------------	-------------	--------	------------------------	---------------------

PENERBIT
PROGRAM STUDI LINGUISTIK TERAPAN BAHASA INGGERIS
PROGRAM PASCASARJANA UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN



LINGUISTIK TERAPAN

JURNAL LINGUISTIK TERAPAN BAHASA INGGRIS
TERBIT SEJAK MEI 2004 DUA KALI SETAHUN (MEI DAN NOPEMBER)

PENASEHAT
REKTOR UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN

PIMPINAN UMUM
DIREKTUR PASCASARJANA UNIMED

PIMPINAN REDAKSI
BUSMIN GURNING

WAKIL PIMPINAN REDAKSI
LINCE SIHOMBING

SEKRETARIS REDAKSI
ANNI PULUNGAN

PENYUNTING AHLI
BUSMIN GURNING (UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN)
LINCE SIHOMBING (UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN)
I MADE SWASTA (UNIVERSITAS UDAYANA)
ASRUDIN BARONI TAU (YOGYA)
JOKO NURKAMTO (UNIVERSITAS SEBELAS MARET SOLO)
HARYANTO (UNIVERSITAS MAKASSAR)
AMRIN SARAGIH (UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN)
KINAYATI DJ (UNIVERSITAS NEGERI JAKARTA)

REDAKTUR PELAKSANA
SRI MINDA MURNI
SANIAGO DAKHI

SEKRETARIAT/DISTRIBUTOR
VIVI

DESAIN COVER/LAY OUT
FARID MARUF HARAHAP

PRORAM STUDI LINGUISTIK TERAPAN BAHASA INGGRIS
SEKOLAH PASCASARJANA UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MEDAN

Jl. Willieam Iskandar, Psr. V-Kotak Pos No. 1589 Medan 20221
Telpon (61) 6636730 ax (061) 6636730

LEXICAL CHANGES OF SOUTHERN DIALECT OF LI NIHA

By
Santiago Dakhi¹

ABSTRACT

This qualitative research addresses the lexical changes investigating the change types, describing the change patterns, and explaining the change reasons of Southern dialect lexicon of Li Niha. The empirical materials were thoroughly and well-gathered from the document and interview and the data analysis with Miles and Huberman Interactive Model has yielded the following conclusions. Firstly, the lexical changes of Southern dialect of Li Niha comprised lexical loss, semantic change, and lexical creation. Secondly, the patterns of lexical change of Li Niha has been manifested on three types: (1) lexical loss: (a) potential and (b) total lexical loss; (2) semantic change: (a) Noun to Noun, (b) Noun to Adjective, (c) Noun to Verb, (d) Adjective to Adjective, (e) Adverb to Verb, (f) Verb to Noun, (g) Verb to Verb, and (h) Verb to Adjective; (3) lexical creation: (a) internal lexical creation and (b) external lexical creation. Thirdly, the reasons of lexical changes of Southern dialect of Li Niha were: (1) lexical loss: cultural, linguistic and prestige factors; (2) semantic change: analogy, metaphor, mutual concept, implication, and euphemism factors; (3) lexical creation: naturalization, technological development, foreign influence, mutual linguistic feature, translation and adoption of the conceptual feature. In educational setting, the various changes of Southern dialect lexicon of Li Niha implicitly implicate that language standardization, i.e. selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance, is not totally employed, consequently it bears an enormously complicated problem impeding the success of teaching and learning Li Niha to the next generation.

Key words: Lexicon, Change, *Li Niha*

Introduction

Language, generally, is characterized as a great part in human lives (Bloomfield, 1993:3). It is regarded as the means of communication by which the idea, opinion as well as feeling are expressed in different ways and modes according to the social context surrounded. The dynamics and changeability are the nature and inevitability of every living language (Trask, 1994:2 and Gurnig, 2008:19). This is in line with what Varshney (1995:275) remarks that

¹ Santiago Dakhi, S.Pd, M.Hum adalah dosen B. Inggris di STKIP Nias Selatan

language moves down time in a current of its own making. It has a drift and is never perfectly static. Every word, grammatical element, locution, sound as well as its meaning is a slowly changing configuration from time to time.

Language change are complex and shared by other dynamic systems in the natural world (Niyogi and Berwick, 1995:1). The way of languages change offers insights into the nature of language itself. Ke, Gong, and Wang (2008:937) point out that language change can be viewed as a diffusion process of some new linguistic elements (*linguistic innovations*) in a language community. Language change explains the very substantial and complex change in the language features. On the other words, language change is a study of how historically linguistic features, namely phonetic, phonemic, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic change which extremely rooted from the combined effect (Yang, 2001:231) of internal and external factors. External factor is defined as the environmental conditions where the language is used by its speakers (Moyna, 2009:131-132). The external factor might be subdivided into social, cultural, educational, religious, and historical factors. Internal factor of language change is the change which is strongly influenced by psychological, linguistic, and intergenerational (or genetic endowment) factors.

The change of language is manifested at all linguistic levels, including lexicon. Lexical change is viewed as a process in which the word, concept or meaning are totally or partly replaced by another lexical item which is realized in the lexical loss, semantic change and lexical creation (Varshney, 1995:283) and thoroughly realized in every single sort of lexical classes: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, pronoun, preposition, conjunction, and interjection. The Loss of lexical item is a phenomenon in which a particular use of word disappears, which yields (1) homonymic clash-words which have the same phonemic structure but different meaning, (2) phonetic attrition-word which becomes so altered due to the sound change, (3) and shortening-an empirically linguistic phenomenon in an attempt to initialize or shorten any linguistic item. Semantic change definition impinges upon the highly convincing concept, that is, a process in which the lexical meaning synchronically and diachronically changes (Ullmann, 1959 in Varshney, 1995:284) as an influence of increasingly modern influence (or innovation), rather than the grammatical functions of a form (Bloomfield, 1933:425). And lexical creation focuses on the process by which a lexical item appears among the language users. According to Varshney (1995:289), the methods of creating new lexical item can

be assigned to two main classes: (1) items created from sources within the language (internal borrowing) and (2) items created from outside sources (external borrowing).

Gao (2008) and Ali and Mohideen (2010) have ever scientifically scrutinized the changes of lexicon. Gao's research was highly pertinent to the provision of evidences of language change in Computer-Mediated Communication, while Ali and Mohideen sufficiently illuminated the contemporary lexical change for professional competence in English language education. Nevertheless, Laiya (2009) proves the evidence of lexical changes in *Li Niha* or Nias language, a barrier island (Himmelmann 2005:111) and endangered (Wurm, 2003:22) language in Indonesia, by stating that Southern Nias dialect consists of 3,500 totally different vocabularies from other dialects of *Li Niha*.

The fundamentally indispensable result and evidence above led this research to its ultimate aims at investigating the change types, describing the change patterns, and explaining the change reasons of Southern dialect lexicon of *Li Niha*.

Research Method

The qualitative research was employed to scrutinize the lexical changes in Southern dialect of *Li Niha* from 1980s to 2010. Southern dialect is one of *Li Niha* dialects (Zagōtō, 1975 and Brown, 1994:56), namely *si fabada'ō* or Northern dialect, *si fabagandrō* or Central dialect and *si fabahō'ō* or Southern dialect. The Southern dialect of *Li Niha* is used by the people in Teluk Dalam, Fanayama, Toma, Maenamōlō, Pulau-Pulau Batu and Hibala sub districts. The objective explanative was the suitably fixed design of this research. The subjects were the highly skillful and knowledgeable native speakers and the document written in Southern dialect of *Li Niha*, such as (a) personal document, e.g. personal letters, (b) official document, e.g. internal documents and external communication, and other forms of written language produced by the subjects, e.g. books, articles, songs, dictionary and so on. The document was considerably important to obtain the types and patterns of lexical changes of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* which was extremely indispensable to concisely answer the research questions number one and two. And the native speakers' interview was indicated as a means of the provision of all empirical materials in corporation to the reasons of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* which was vitally essential to deliberately answer the last research question of this study. The Interactive Model Technique of Miles and Huberman (1984) was employed to analyze the data consisting of three

concurrent flows of activities: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification.

Research Results and Discussion

Three indispensable findings in accordance with the objectives of this study are visualized in an easily understood configuration (or matrix) below.

Table 1: Types, patterns and Reasons of Lexical Changes in Southern Dialect of Li Nihua

No	Types of Lexical Change	Patterns of Lexical Change	Reasons of
1	Lexical Loss	1.1 Potential lexical loss 1.2 Total lexical loss	1.1.1 Cultural 1.1.2 Linguistic 1.2.1 Cultural 1.2.2 Linguistic 1.2.3 Prestige
2	Semantic Change	2.1 Noun to Noun 2.2 Noun to Adjective 2.3 Noun to Verb 2.4 Adjective to Adjective 2.5 Adverb to Verb 2.6 Verb to Noun 2.7 Verb to Verb 2.8 Verb to Adjective	2.1.1 Analogy 2.2.1 Metaphorical 2.3.1 Metaphorical 2.4.1 Mutual concept 2.5.1 Implication 2.6.1 Euphemism 2.7.1 Mutual concept 2.8.1 Euphemism 2.8.2 Implication
3	Lexical creation	3.1 Internal lexical creation 3.2 External lexical creation 3.2.1 Modified lexical borrowing 3.2.2 Total	3.1.1 Mutual linguistic feature 3.1.2 Mutual linguistic concept 3.2.1.1 Naturalization 3.2.1.2 Technological development 3.2.1.3 Foreign influence 3.2.2.1 Mutual

lexical borrowing	linguistic feature
	3.2.2.2 Mutual linguistic concept
3.2.3 Loan translation	3.2.3.1 Translation of the conceptual features
	3.2.3.1 Adoption of the conceptual features

As customarily defined that lexical change is a process by which lexical loss, semantic change, and lexical creation take place. The first finding of this research is that the lexical change in Southern dialect of *Li Niha* encompassed those brands of change, an entirely applied theory of Varshney (1995: 283). He asserts that lexical change of a language contains the loss of lexical items, the change of meaning and the creation of new lexical items.

The number of lexical change in Southern dialect of *Li Niha* is 516 (five hundred sixteen) lexicons, where lexical loss is 186 (one hundred eighty six) or 36.40% (thirty four point four zero percent); semantic change is 72 (seventy two) or 14.09% (fourteen point zero nine percent); and lexical creation 253 (two hundred fifty three) or 49.51% (forty nine point five one percent). Obviously lexical creation has significant number which might be due to the fact that *Li Niha* is strongly interfered by the national language of Indonesia and the study of English, a compulsory subject at schools, by which the students or people of Southern Nias have a great possibility to practice such languages and the highly positive attitude towards them emerges. Apart from this, it is resulted from the un-standardized language of *Li Niha* which crawls on the uncontrolled loan words system so that the number of lexical creation in Southern dialect of *Li Niha* significantly increases.

These lexical changes proportionally disseminate on some lexical classes: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, and conjunction. However, noun is dominant lexical class as it has 80.43%. And other lexical classes are minor; verb is 10.08%, adjective is 8.33%, adverb is 0.97%, and conjunction is 0.19% from the data obtained. The dominant number of noun above has been theoretically proved by Thomason (2007:44) and Lindstrom (2007:233) who stated that the vocabulary is significantly affected than other language features. This finding is as a consequence of the reality that human beings dominantly interact and use the physically perceived thing. Another indispensably interesting attention for the content words, not

functional words, emerges on the rendition. They are dominant in use, which are substantially rooted from their linguistic role, that is, contributing the major content to a message (Delahunty and Garvey, 2010:147).

Those lexical changes has been manifested on some fields (e.g. object, notion, adjective & color, food & drink, equipment, game, dress & ornament, condition of the world, animal, plant, body & its part, house & its part, disease, and ceremony & ritual) a classification proposed by Herusantoso (1997:5-8). The number of lexicon in each domain varies. Lexicon change found in 'object' is dominant and most of its lexicons are nouns. This reality is probably caused by the huge number of object around the human beings which is easily viewed and used.

1. Lexical Loss of Southern Dialect of Li Niha

Principally, the pattern of a language change is theorized by Varshney, 1995:275. He says: "Language has a tendency to change from complexity towards simplicity, from length towards precision, from difficulty towards ease, from disorder towards order". Such this prevailing principle partly exists on the lexical changes of Southern dialect of *Li Niha*. Two sorts of lexical loss have been patterned in Southern dialect lexicon of *Li Niha*: potential loss and total loss. Potential loss is a sort of changes of lexicon in which the lexicon has a highly potential loss due to the absence of the object and concept among the language users or presence of another lexical item which represents the conceptual features of linguistic item being potentially changed. On the other hand, total lexical loss is meant as a process by which the lexical item is totally unrecognizable, or no longer understandable, since the lexical item for naming object and concept is definitely unrecognized. The following is the further explanation of the two sorts of change pattern crawling on the lexical loss of Southern dialect of *Li Niha*.

1.1 Potential Lexical Loss of Southern Dialect of Li Niha

Potential lexical loss, in this research finding, is viewed as a sort of changes of lexicon in which the lexicon has a profoundly potential loss due to the absence of the object and concept among the language users or the presence of another lexical item which represents the conceptual features of linguistic item being potentially changed. The prevailing assumption and characteristics of any word, potential to

change, serves as the strongly underpinning reason of "potential to lose". Some words convincingly exemplify below.

Table 2: Potential Lexical Loss of Southern Dialect of Li Niha

No Li Niha Word	Meaning
1 <i>olō</i>	'plantation in the mountain from which the irrigation is not available and needed'
2 <i>rigi</i>	'two-and-a-half rupiah, national currency of Malaysia and Brunei'
3 <i>lawiwi'ao</i>	'type of snail'
4 <i>ondrianō</i>	'hot'

The word *olō*, a plantation in the mountain in which the irrigation is not available or needed, is one of potential loss lexicons of Southern dialect of Li Niha because it is not practiced anymore, or not a part of culture. Similarly *rigi* 'two-and-a-half rupiah, national currency of Malaysia and Brunei' and *lawiwi'ao* 'type of snail' which are potential to lose resulted from their absence in Southern people's characteristic of life. A different loss reason is *ondrianō* 'hot'. It belongs to adjective lexical class and has another term to change its practical use *aukhu* 'hot'. It is a result of the particular rendition of *aukhu* 'hot' to all descriptions of 'hot'. In fact, it has an exception in describing the dry season. Such this account is categorized as linguistic factor.

Hence the highly cultural, also termed as social factor by Moyna (2009:131-132) or social factor by Varshney (1995:275), and linguistic factors serve as a means to bridge the permanent or total loss of lexicon. The process of potential lexical loss can be caused by the absence of object and concept among the language users, or by the absence of linguistic item to name the object and concept. Obviously two indispensable implications emerge and serve as the concluding remarks of this part. Firstly, potential loss is still understandable and extent among the language users. Secondly, potential lexical loss is resulted from the absence of one between the two factors: cultural and linguistic.

1.2 Total Lexical Loss of Southern Dialect of Li Niha

Total lexical loss, another apparent exemplification of the pattern of lexical loss in Southern dialect of *Li Niha*, is defined as a process by which the lexical item is totally unpracticed, or no longer understandable, since the lexical item for naming an object and describing a concept are extremely unrecognizable. Some highly convincing examples are coded below.

Table 3: Total Lexical Loss of Southern Dialect of *Li Niha*

No	<i>Li Niha</i> Word	Meaning
1	<i>maoma</i>	'portion or gift like pork given to someone who is not invited to go to the ceremony or party held in other villages'
2	<i>daladala</i>	'serious'
3	<i>hefuyua</i>	'type of slug'
4	<i>ohou</i>	'slowly flowing water'

The word *maoma*, a portion or gift like pork given to someone who is not invited to the ceremony or party held in other villages, is one of total loss lexicons of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* since its concept is no longer extant. Similarly *ohou* 'slowly flowing water' and *hefuyua* 'type of slug' which are total loss resulted from their absence in Southern people's characteristic of life. However, *daladala* 'serious' has its own way of change, that is, as a consequence of the borrowing word of *seriu* 'serious' for practical and prestigious usage.

Having the explanation of potential and total lexical loss above, it therefore yielded an understanding that the profound factors of culture, linguistic and prestige bridge the lexical loss of language. The lexical loss might be potential and total. Their substantial distinctions lie on the existence of the lexicons among the language users. Potential lexical loss is still understandable and extent among the language users, whereas total lexical loss consists in extremely unrecognizable features.

Lexical loss of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* is caused by the cultural, linguistic and prestige reasons. These findings are different from the theory of Varshney (1995: 283). In his book, it is stated that lexical loss is rooted from internal and external factors. The internal reasons are homonym-words which have the same phonemic structure, but different meanings, phonetic attrition-the variations of meanings

due to the sound change, and shortening. On the other hand, external factors are historical or social. Nevertheless, the social factor of lexical change pointed out by Varshney above is still the same as cultural factor due to the wide definition of social factor itself, which might be cultural, historical, economic, etc.

2. Semantic Change of Southern Dialect of Li Niha

The analysis of the data reveals eight patterns of semantic change in Southern dialect of Li Niha. Look at the frequency distribution of the data below.

Table 4: Number of Occurrence of Semantic Change Pattern

No	Pattern of Change	Example	Number of Occurrence	Percentage
1	Noun to Noun	<i>fanoko</i>	34	47%
2	Noun to Adjective	<i>tefaõ</i>	22	31%
3	Noun to Verb	<i>suti</i>	7	10%
4	Adjective to Adjective	<i>gariti</i>	3	4%
5	Adverb to Verb	<i>ba gawu</i>	2	3%
6	Verb to Noun	<i>fahombo</i>	2	3%
7	Verb to Verb	<i>õhõ</i>	1	1%
8	Verb to Adjective	<i>molombase</i>	1	1%

The displayed data above leads our attention to the numbers 1 Noun to Noun and 2 Noun to Adjective as the patterns which have the dominant number of occurrence. Noun to Adjective pattern occurred 22 (twenty two) times of occurrence or 31% (thirty one percent) and Noun to Noun pattern has 34 (thirty four times of occurrence) or 47% (forty seven percent) from the data obtained. On the other hand, the patterns of Verb to Adjective (1 time), Adjective to Adjective (3 times), Adverb to Verb (2 times), Verb to Noun (1 time), and Noun to Verb (7 times) are not significant.

Those patterns are pertinent to the conversion-a functional shift from one category to another (Brinton & Trugott, 2005:36). However, the term conversion is still too general and without any further explicitly stated exemplification. Through this finding, it comes to the expression that the numerous worthwhile exploration of semantic change patterns has been figured out in detail.

These patterns are strongly rooted from the process of analogy, metaphor, mutual concept, and implication. Additionally euphemism played an important role in changing the meaning of the lexicons

gathered. This is precisely congruent with what recently found by Ali and Mohideen (2010:102-106) that euphemism usage directly pours on the change of language. This finding is a little bit contrastive with the type of semantic change theorized by Varshney (1995:288-289). As he suggested that the semantic change is patterned into restricted-the meaning of the word is narrowed and made specific from general, extended-the meaning of the word is developed and adopted to another concept, and transferred-the meaning of the word is shifted. This is not completely applicable with the research finding; only the restricted meaning existed. A result of the extremely geographic influence of *Li Niha* which is regarded as an endangered language (Wurm, 2003:22) or a barrier island language (Himmelmann, 2005:111). This condition, of course, is quite different from English as a lingua franca. Their distinctive features implicitly impinge upon their speakers' characteristics of life from which the various numbers of lexicons of the same object emerge. For instance, the words related to the 'coconut' considerably appear in *Li Niha* not in English which is dominated by the presence of the word 'bread'.

Obviously, three ranges of semantic change patterns, e.g. major, adequate and minor, are displayed on the table. Major patterns are Noun to Noun and Noun to Adjective; adequate pattern is Noun to Verb; and minor patterns are Adjective to Adjective, Adverb to Verb, Verb to Noun, Verb to Verb, and Verb to Adjective. The various numbers of occurrences of each sort of pattern, of course, is fundamentally rooted from its extent of characteristics. For instance, Noun to Noun and Noun to Adjective as the major patterns found is influenced by their practical use as device for analogy and metaphor: "a word [which] is used for something resembling that which it usually refers to" (Halliday, 1994:340). Treating them as distinct, the convincingly concise and detailed explanation is as follows.

2.1 Noun to Noun

Noun to Noun pattern, the most significant pattern in semantic change in Southern dialect lexicon of *Li Niha*, has 34 (thirty four times) of occurrence or 47% (forty seven percent) from the data obtained. This pattern is entirely unique since the meaning changes to the same lexical class. Some apparent examples are shown below.

Table 5: Noun to Noun Pattern of Semantic Change

No	Lexicons	Basic Meaning	Changes of Meaning
1	<i>fanoko</i> (n)	hammer (n)	punishment (n)
2	<i>mandrera</i> (n)	flag (n)	code, symbol, or gesture knowing whether they

			(magicians) are from the same master (n)
3	<i>guti</i> (n)	scissors (n)	trouble maker (n)
4	<i>gaji</i> (n)	odd of numbers (n)	extremely dangerous
			magic (n)

Note: (n) is noun

The word *fanoko* is a noun which means hammer. It is a typical and analogy of punishment, which is also categorized as noun. Similarly in the words *mandrera* 'flag', *guti* 'scissors' and *gaji* 'odd of numbers' change to the same lexical class, that is, noun. Hence, the sustained change meaning from noun to noun-a change from and to the mutual lexical class-is definitely influenced by the analogy as an evidence of the increasingly extended meaning of Southern dialect of Li Niha.

2.2 Noun to Adjective

The second pattern of semantic change Southern dialect lexicon is Noun to Adjective. It has 22 (twenty two) times of occurrence or 31% (thirty one percent) from the whole data obtained. Note the following table.

No	Lexicons	Basic Meaning	Changes of Meaning
1	<i>tefaõ</i> (n)	iron (n)	strong (adj)
2	<i>lašakule</i> (n)	stratum, layer, lining, row (n)	unbelievable (adj)
3	<i>celacela</i> (n)	cloth with the lowest quality (n)	unimportant (adj)
4	<i>faku</i> (n)	hoe (n)	selfish, arrogant (adj)

Table 6: Noun to Adjective Pattern of Semantic Change

Note: (n) is noun

(adj) is adjective

The way of those changes is the definitely applicable realization of a particular conceptual feature to another lexical item. A case in *tefaõ* 'iron' which contains a conceptual feature strong. Consequently, a great possibility implication impinges upon the empirical truth, that is, the change of lexical meaning by Noun to Adjective pattern serves as a device in metaphorically stating a certain meaning by using one or more characteristics of the noun being used. This sort of change is tentative depending on the social context. Social

context, defined as mental models of social situations of communication, is in many ways interfaces between discourse and society (Dijk, 2009:29). It encompasses addressee, addresser, topic, temporal and special. A crisp and concise exemplification is precisely portrayed on the use of word 'operation' by a thief, which means to go to steal. Unlike, a doctor who probably defines this sort of simple lexicon as a process of cutting open a part of the body to remove a diseased and injured part.

2.3 Noun to Verb

The third sort of semantic change of Southern dialect lexicon of *Li Niha* is Noun to Verb. It has 7 (seven) lexicons or ten percent from the data obtained. This number is not significant, but still adequate. However, it is still considerably unique comparing with other patterns of changes. The substantial distinction lies on the transferred lexical class of noun to verb.

Table 7: Noun to Verb Pattern of Semantic Change

No	Lexicons	Basic Meaning	Changes of Meaning
1	<i>suti</i> (n)	injection (n)	persuade to do bad thing (v)
2	<i>bola</i> (n)	ball (n)	make a fool of someone (v)
3	<i>karu</i> (n)	sack (n)	take all (v)

Note: (n) is noun
(v) is verb

Suti 'injection' which is classified as a noun, a linguistically acceptable category, becomes a verb 'persuade to do bad thing'. Similarly *bola* 'ball' moves to make a fool of someone (v) and *karu* 'snack' changes to take all (v). This phenomenon provides an approval that the change of semantic change is potentially influenced by the characteristics of the lexical items being used, which is mutually applicable to other concept through the process of metaphor, the use of language to refer to something other than what it was originally applied to, or what it 'literally' means in order to suggest some resemblance or make a connection the two things (Knowles & Moon, 2006:2). This concept is in line with the Noun to Adjective pattern above.

2.4 Adjective to Adjective

Another pattern of semantic change of Southern dialect lexicon of *Li Niha* is termed as Adjective to Adjective. This concept is the same as the change pattern of Noun to Noun due to its changes to the same lexical class, i.e. noun to noun or adjective to adjective.

Table 8: Adjective to Adjective Pattern of Semantic Change

No	Lexicons	Basic Meaning	Changes of Meaning
1	<i>gariti</i> (adj)	curly (adj)	unbelievable (adj)
2	<i>legaitō</i> (adj)	sweaty (adj)	tired (adj)

Note: (adj) is adjective

The word *gariti* means curly, an adjective. It changes to 'unbelievable' which is also an adjective. In this case, the change of this meaning is not resulted from the process of analogy; but it is viewed as a process in which the concept of the lexical item is mutually applicable and transferable to another one.

2.5 Adverb to Verb

This sort of semantic change pattern is numerous exiting because the change starts from the lexical class of noun to verb. Look the words below.

Table 9: Adverb to Verb Pattern of Semantic Change

No	Lexicons	Basic Meaning	Changes of Meaning
1	<i>ba ene</i> (adv)	at the beach (adv)	(to) find out fish at the beach (v)
2	<i>ba gawu</i> (adv)	at the beach (adv)	(to) find out fish at the beach (v)

Note: (adv) is adverb

(v) is verb

From the table above, it indicates that the lexical class of adverb changes to verb. Generally, these are the expressions of the fisherman. By saying so, their purpose to go to fish is implicitly stated. Hence implication is also treated as an influential factor of semantic change.

2.6 Verb to Noun

The sixth pattern of semantic change of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* is Verb to Noun. This process of change starts from the verb to noun. One case in Southern dialect of *Li Niha* is exemplified as follows.

Table 10: Verb to Noun Pattern of Semantic Change

No	Lexicons	Basic Meaning	Changes of Meaning
1	<i>fahombo</i> (v)	jumping (v)	accident by falling down from the coconut tree (n)

Note: (n) is noun

(v) is verb

The word *fahombo* literally means 'jumping', a verb. However, in Southern people's characteristics of life, this lexicon is usually coded metaphorically to express that someone get an accident, especially when he falls down from the coconut tree. For instance, *Ilau fahombo ama Niti* metaphorically means 'The father's Niti has fallen down from the coconut tree'. Literally, in fact, means 'The father's Niti is jumping'. Thus, this sort of semantic change is regarded as the process of euphemism.

2.7 Verb to Verb

The seventh pattern of semantic change is Verb to Verb. This change is the same as Noun to Noun and Adjective to Adjective pattern by which the same lexical class moves to another one.

Table 11: Verb to Verb Pattern of Semantic Change

No	Lexicons	Basic Meaning	Changes of Meaning
1	<i>ōhō</i> (v)	fasten (v)	secure (v)

Note: v

The word *ōhō* means '(to) fasten'. This meaning moves to 'secure'. However, they are still the same lexical class. Thus this sort of semantic change can be viewed as the process by which the meaning of a certain lexical item is coded in another same lexical item. This evidence is as a consequence of its mutually applicable concept.

2.8 Verb to Adjective

The last but not the least, Verb to Adjective pattern of semantic change is the same as Verb to Noun. It has only 1 (one) lexicon or 1% (one percent) from the data obtained.

Table 12: Verb to Adjective Pattern of Semantic Change

No	Lexicons	Basic Meaning	Changes of Meaning
1	<i>molombase</i> (v)	(to) take a rest (v)	dead (adj), die

Note: (adj) is adjective
(v) is verb

The word *molombase*, which is classified as a verb, congruently means (to) take a rest. However, this sometimes changes to 'dead', an adjective. Thus, by all accounts it is resulted from the

process of euphemism, a sort of indirection to soften the ill effects of a negative utterance (Israel, 2006 in Horn & Ward, 2006:708)

The detailed picture of the sorts of semantic change pattern of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* reveals two highlighted concepts. Firstly, the pattern of semantic change, in relation to 'from which to which' change; can be thoroughly categorized into two main types, i.e. intra lexical semantic change and inter lexical semantic change. Intra lexical semantic change is meant as a semantic change of the same lexical class, for instance, Noun to Noun, Verb to Verb, or Adjective to Adjective; whereas inter lexical semantic change is regarded as the change of semantic change in which a certain lexical item moves to another different one, for example, Verb to Noun, Noun to Verb, or Adverb to Verb. On the other words, any sort of semantic change pattern above just impinges upon the extended lexical meaning. It indicates that the meaning of any lexicon of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* increasingly applicable to another domain of linguistic item and never narrowed or made specific from general.

Secondly, the influential factors of semantic change are analogy, metaphorical, mutual concept, implication, and euphemism. The analogy is completely applied when the language users is using a conceptual feature of a linguistic item to another one. Metaphor is viewed as a word which is used for something resembling that which it usually refers to. Mutual concept is the sameness of conceptual features of the linguistic items. The implication is the process by which an extremely unpleasant matter is indirectly stated. This result is substantially distinguishable with what Varshney (1995:284) notices that the reasons of semantic changes are linguistic, historical, environmental, psychological, foreign influences, and the need for a new name. Other different theories are Lindstrom (2007:233) who said that the semantic change is extremely affected by mixings and borrowings of another language, and Denham and Lobeck (2005:2) who remark that the reasons of language change are assimilation-the result of making a certain sequence of sound easier to say, language regularization and analogy-the act of adopting a concept of words to another different setting and phenomenon.

3. Lexical Creation of Southern Dialect of *Li Niha*

Lexical creation in Southern dialect of *Li Niha* has been manifested on two types: internal lexical creation and external lexical creation, an entirely realized theory of Varshney (1995:289-292). However, this research finding is more comprehensive due to the division of the external lexical creation into modified lexical

borrowing-the process of borrowing of the lexical item from other languages through naturalization, total lexical borrowing-the pattern by which the borrowing lexicons are naturalized based on the characteristics of language borrower, and loan translation-a phenomenon from which the external lexical creation occurs through the borrowing of concept of the linguistic item being borrowed.

3.1 Internal Lexical Creation of Southern Dialect of *Li Niha*

Internal lexical creation in Southern dialect of *Li Niha* is made from the borrowing word of another *Li Niha* dialect. 16 words were found as the approval of internal lexical creations from Northern dialect. The 16 words are noun, verb, adverb, and adjective. Some apparent exemplifications are provided in the following.

Table 13: Internal Lexical Creation

No	Created Lexicons	Source of Lexicons	Meaning
1	<i>si'ōli</i> (n)	<i>si'ōli</i> (Nd)	iron (n)
2	<i>jalo</i> (n)	<i>jalo</i> (Nd)	floor (n)
3	<i>fōnu</i> (adj)	<i>fōnu</i> (Nd)	angry (adj)

Note: (n) is noun

(Nd) is Northern dialect of *Li Niha*

(adj) is adjective

The word *si'ōli* (n), *jalo* (n), and *fōnu* (adj) are derived from Northern dialect of *Li Niha*. Those created lexicons are not modified, but adopted like they are. It is as a direct indication of mutual linguistic feature and concept from which the further naturalization process is not employed.

3.2 External Lexical Creations of Southern Dialect of *Li Niha*

The other sources of lexical creations of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* are words which come from (1) Indonesian, (2) English, (3) *Bahasa Batak*, and (4) Japanese. This sort of way of creation as the researcher calls as an 'external lexical creation' since its source is thoroughly derived from outside of *Li Niha*. Some evidences can be seen on the table below.

Table 14: External Lexical Creation

No	Created Lexicons	Source of Lexicons	Meaning
1	<i>tofia</i> (n)	<i>topi</i> (Ind)	hat (n)
2	<i>Belendre</i> (n)	blender (Eng)	instrument used for blending the

			spices (n)
3	<i>sunami</i> (n)	<i>tsunami</i> (Jap)	<i>tsunami</i> (n)
4	<i>haruti</i> (n)	<i>haruting</i> (Bat)	catfish (n)

Note:

(n) is noun

(Ind) is Indonesian

(Eng) is English

(Jap) is Japanese

(Bat) is *Bahasa Batak*

A critically formulated concept emerges three conceptually different subdivisions of external lexical creation: modified lexical borrowing, total lexical borrowing, and loan translation. Modified lexical borrowing is meant as the process of borrowing of the lexical item from other languages through naturalization. Total lexical borrowing consists in the pattern by which the borrowing lexicons are naturalized according to the characteristics of language borrower. Another one is loan translation. It is a phenomenon from which the external lexical creation occurs through the borrowing of concept of the linguistic item being borrowed. The further explanation and exemplification can be directly read in the following subtopics.

The lexical creations are substantially influenced by naturalization, technological development, mutual linguistic feature, translation of the conceptual features, and adoption of the conceptual features. This finding is contrastive with theory of Varshney (1995:289-290), which noticed that the reasons of lexical creation are necessity, fashion and need for new name. However, this reasons technological development is similar with fashion, and adoption of the conceptual features is tightly linked with need for new name.

3.2.1 Modified Lexical Borrowing of Southern Dialect of Li Niha

The first pattern of lexical creation of Southern dialect of Li Niha is modified lexical borrowing, a result of naturalization process. Some lexicons exemplify.

Table 15: Modified Lexical Borrowing

No	Created Lexicons	Source of Lexicons	Meaning
1	<i>tofia</i> (n)	<i>topi</i> (Ind)	hat (n)
2	<i>fese</i> (n)	<i>pensil</i> (Ind)	pencil (n)
3	<i>kurusi</i> (n)	<i>kursi</i> (Ind)	chair (n)
4	<i>sandrela</i> (n)	<i>jendela</i> (Ind)	window (n)

Note: (n) is noun
(Ind) is Indonesian

The word *tofia* (n) is the result of naturalization *topi*, where the sound [p] is not extent in Southern dialect of *Li Niha*. Or *kurusi* derived from the Indonesian word *kursi*. The sound [r] is a middle independent consonant. Such this independent consonant does not exist in the characteristic of *Li Niha*. Thus the sound [r] is added with [u] becomes [ru]. Another case is *trator*, which means tractor, as an impact of the use of technological aids.

Having this detailed explanation, thus it can be stated that naturalization and technological development are the influential factors of modified lexical borrowing of Southern dialect of *Li Niha*.

3.2.2 Total Lexical Borrowing of Southern Dialect of *Li Niha*

Total lexical borrowing refers to the pattern by which the borrowing lexicons are not naturalized due to the same characteristics of the two languages. This pattern can be seen on the table below.

Table 16: Total Lexical Borrowing

No	Created Lexicons	Source of Lexicons	Meaning
1	<i>goni</i> (n)	<i>goni</i> (Ind)	jute (n)
2	<i>baru</i> (adj)	<i>baru</i> (Ind)	new (adj)
3	<i>kaca</i> (n)	<i>kaca</i> (Ind)	glass (n)

Note: (n) is noun
(adj) is adjective
(Ind) is Indonesian

The *goni* totally derived from the Indonesian *goni*, which means 'jute'. This lexical item is totally adapted to Southern dialect of *Li Niha* without any modification or naturalization, because this word sounds like language borrower itself. Therefore, it can be concluded that the more mutual linguistic characteristic of two different languages have, the less modification and naturalization of the lexical borrowing will be.

3.2.3 Loan Translation of Southern Dialect of *Li Niha*

Another pattern of lexical creation of Southern dialect change of *Li Niha* is loan translation, a phenomenon from which the external lexical creation occurs through translating and sometimes adopting the conceptual features of the linguistic item being borrowed.

Table 17: Loan Translation of Lexical Creation

No	Created Lexicons	Source of Lexicons	Meaning
	<i>kandrekandre</i>	<i>kantong baju</i> (Ind)	packet of shirt or t-shirt
1	<i>mbaru</i> (n)		(n)
2	<i>fanoko</i> (n)	<i>martil</i> (Ind)	hammer (n)
3	<i>sarawa sanau</i> (n)	<i>celana panjang</i> (Ind)	pants (n)
4	<i>bumanu</i> (n)	<i>bulu tangkis</i> (Ind)	badminton (n)

Note: (n) is noun

(Ind) is Indonesian

Most of the created lexicons figured out above obviously resulted from the translation and adoption of the conceptual features of the linguistic items being borrowed. For instance, the word *kandrekandre mbaru* comes from Indonesian word, i.e. *kanderekandre* means *kantong* and *mbaru* means *baju*; or *fanoko* derived from the conceptual feature of *martil* 'hammer'.

Conclusion

The lexical change of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* emerges on every single sort of lexical changes. It is divided into lexical loss, semantic change and lexical creation. The lexical change patterns of Southern dialect of *Li Niha* are totally realized in various ways according to its type. Firstly, lexical loss is proportionally patterned into potential and total lexical loss. Secondly, semantic change patterns are categorized into: (1) Noun to Noun, (2) Noun to Adjective, (3) Noun to Verb, (4) Adjective to Adjective, (5) Adverb to Verb, (6) Verb to Noun, (7) Verb to Verb, and (8) Verb to Adjective. Thirdly, lexical creation flows under the two crisp and concise methods: internal and external lexical creation. External lexical borrowing patterns impinge upon the three distinctive domains: modified lexical borrowing, total lexical borrowing, and loan translation. These ways come to the implicit expression of the un-standardized borrowing system in *Li Niha*. The division of lexical change reasons in Southern dialect of *Li Niha* varies and is considerably linkable with every sort single of lexical change type. Firstly, culture, linguistic and prestige play the important role as the influential causes of lexical loss. Secondly, analogical, metaphorical, mutual concept, implication, and euphemism are viewed as the core source of semantic change. Thirdly, naturalization, technological development, foreign influence, mutual linguistic feature, translation and adoption of the conceptual features

are treated as the numerous sustained factors of lexical creation in Southern dialect of *Li Niha*.

Implications

The conclusion drawn above convincingly yields a number of implications. Firstly, the changes of Southern dialect lexicon of *Li Niha* occur on every single sort of lexical changes: lexical loss, semantic change, and lexical creation. The noun which contains the highest number of lexical change bridges the attention to Indonesian influence, the national and official language, as an easily naturalized language since it consists of the same linguistic characteristics with *Li Niha*, not English which is from the completely different root of language. Secondly, even though South Nias regency is as a tourism area, the number of lexical changes relating to this condition is not significant. Therefore, obviously tourism is not regarded as the influential factor of *Li Niha* change. Thirdly, the deviation of the number of every single sort of lexical changes is definitely implicated by the influence and status of Southern Nias people's characteristics of life, culture, and technological development. Fourthly, in educational setting, the various changes of Southern dialect lexicon of *Li Niha* implicitly implicate that language standardization, i.e. selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance, is not totally employed, consequently it bears an enormously complicated problem impeding the success of teaching and learning *Li Niha* to the next generation.

References

- Ali, H. M. B. M. & Mohideen, S. (2010). Awareness of Contemporary Lexical Change for Professional Competence in English Language Education. In *European Journal of Social Sciences* – Vol. 13, pg. 101-107, No. 1 (2010). Kuala Lumpur: International Islamic University Malaysia Press.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Brinton, L. J. & Traugott, E. C. (2005). *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, L. (1994). *Nominal Mutation in Nias*. In Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference, Sydney.
- Delahunty, G. P., & Garvey, J. J. (2010). *The English Language from Sound to Sense*. Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse.

- Denham, K. & Lobeck, A. (2005). *Teaching Kids about Language Change, Language Endangerment, and Language Death*. Mahwan, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dijk, T. A. V. (2009). *Society and Discourse: How Social Context Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gao, L. (2008). *Language Change in Progress: Evidence from Computer-Mediated Communication*. Proceedings of the 20th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics (NACCL-20). 2008. Volume 1 (pg. 361-377). Edited by Marjorie K.M. Chan and Hana Kang. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University.
- Gurning, B. (2008). *Functional Grammatics: A Hallidayan View in Language Development*. In Jurnal Linguistik Terapan Pascasarjana UNIMED, ISSN 0216-5139, Vol. 5, pg. 19-39. Medan: PPs Linguistik Terapan Bahasa Inggris.
- Israel, M. (2006). The Pragmatics on Polarity. In Horn, L. R. & Ward, G. (Eds.). *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 701-723) Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd Edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- Himmelman, N. P. (2005). The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological Characteristics. In Adelaar, K. A., and Himmelmann, N. P. 2005. *The Austronesian Languages and of South East Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge.
- Ke, J., Gong, T. and Wang, W. S-L. (2008). *Language Change and Social Networks*. Communications in Computational Physics Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 935-949.
- Knowles, M. & Moon, R. (2005). *Introducing Metaphor*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Laiya, B. (Oktober, 2009). Nias Language. *Nias Island*. Retrieved from <http://www.>

niasisland.com/home/writing_disp.php?writing_no_option=003153&category_code_option=PR

Laycock, J. & Wurm, A. (1977). *Language Borrowings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindstrom, L. (2007). *Bismala into Kwamera: Code-Mixing and Language Change on Tanna (Vanuata)*. University of Tulsa Press, E-ISSN 1934-5275.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. California: Sage Publication.

Moyna, M. I. (2009). *Child Acquisition and Language Change: Voseo Evolution in Río de la Plata Spanish (p. 131-142)*. In *Elected Proceedings of the First Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. Someerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Thomason, S. G. (2007). *Language Contact and Deliberate Change*. In *Journal of Language Contact* University of Michigan-THEMA 1 (2007), retrieved on July 25, 2010 from www.jlc-journal.org

Trask, R. L. (1994). *Language Change*. London: Routledge.

Varshney, R. L. (1995). *An Introductory Textbook of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Rampur Bagh: Student Store.

Wurm, S. A. (2003). The Language Situation and Language Endangerment in the Greater Pacific Area. In Janse, M. and Tol, S. (Eds.) 2003. *Language Death and Language Maintenance: Theoretical, Practical and Descriptive Approaches* (pp. 15-47) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publication Company.

Yang, C. D. (2001). *Internal and External Forces in Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zagoto, S. (1975). *Descriptive Analysis of the Phonemes of the South Variety of Nias Language, Indonesia* (Master's Thesis). Dumaguete City: Silliman University.