Chapter Five

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions

One of the grammatical aspects of language is speech sounds, and speech sounds are the nature of language itself, and, therefore, learning a language is learning the sound systems of that language. To this end, the Toba Batak language is not exempted.

The phonology of language is concerned with the study of sounds and sound patterns. The sound pattern of a given language refers to the set of sounds that happens on and on in the language, the permissible combinations or arrangements of these sounds in words, and the process of adding, deleting, or changing sounds. These processes affect most languages, but it should not be overlooked that languages are unique and that no two languages are exactly the same and these facts apply well to Toba Batak as they can apply as a whole to the language and the comparative degree of adjectives as well.

The basis for the assumption provided before is based on the standard written and spoken Toba Batak by referring to the two standard sources for the language, namely, the Toba Batak Bible and Hymnals. Another authoritative
source is worth mentioning, which is van der Tuuk's *A Grammar of Toba Batak* written over a century ago (1861).

After the data for this study have been collected and classified phonologically and later they are compared to the spoken, everyday use, it was discovered that it is either alternative choices or analogy or, free variation (this work p.34) that predominates the use of the generic prefix *um-* in the idiolect of some people and therefore becomes their dialect, in which the *m* is later modified phonologically by the initial phoneme of the base Toba Batak adjectives irrespective of whether it is a vowel or a consonant, such as:

- balga \(\rightarrow\) ubbalga ‘bigger’
- denggan \(\rightarrow\) uddenggan ‘better’
- godang \(\rightarrow\) uggodang ‘more’
- hatop \(\rightarrow\) ukkatop ‘faster’
- jonok \(\rightarrow\) ujjonok ‘neater’
- koras \(\rightarrow\) ukkoras ‘more rough’
- leleng \(\rightarrow\) ulelelen ‘longer’
- malo \(\rightarrow\) ummalo ‘smarter’
- neang \(\rightarrow\) unnaang ‘lighter’
- posa \(\rightarrow\) upposa ‘more sickly’
- roa \(\rightarrow\) urroa ‘uglier’
- solhot \(\rightarrow\) ussolhot ‘more intimate’
timbo → uttibbo ‘taller’

The writer would rather opt to call these convoluted uses as a case of hypercorrection and analogy that have affected a speaker to use the generic prefix um- in which the m is influenced by the initial sound of the base Toba Batak adjectives no matter which phonemes, vowels or consonants. But after a careful observation on Toba Batak adjectives beginning with b, m, and p, they all should be prefixed with um- in which the m is affected by the b, m, and p to become ub-, umm-, and up- respectively, and with umm- including all base adjectives beginning with the vowels a-, e-, i-, o-, and u- such as the examples previously presented; whereas adjectives beginning with g-, h-, j-, k-, l-, n-, r-, s-, and t-, they should be infixed with -um- in writing and undergo some morphemic changes, such as the stress movement. In that sense the comparative adjectives denggan, godang, hatop, jonok, koras, leleng, neang, roa, solhot, and timbo should take the forms dumenggan, gumodang, humatop, jumanok, kumoras, lumeleng, numeang, rumoa, sumolhot, and tumimbo respectively and the overgeneralized prefix uŋ → ud-, uŋj-, uh-, uŋ-, uk-, ul-, un-, ur-, us-, and ut- in the speech some dialect speakers. A Toba Batak clan (marga) Situmorang derived from si-, an article and torang, ‘bright, clear’ is infixed with -um- to form Situmorang, it has never been confused with Siuttorang, a solid proof of the infixation process.
5.2 Suggestions

Members of a given society would choose their leader from among those figures who really represents their aspirations and ideals. This is one of the reasons why a representative spokesperson becomes the symbol of the people's aspirations, values and ideals because his speech/spoken language surpasses the manner and quality other figures do not possess or cannot prove outright on the spot.

The so-called standard variety has always become goal of every speaker of a language in his attempt to study the language depending on what sense is contained in the term standard. After restudying the whole research data, the writer came to suggest that the uses of the prefix um- and infix -um- fall right into a segment of the phonological rules of Toba Batak affixation as well as to morphophonemic changes, which all Toba Batak speakers ought to attend to.

Just because a speaker might not be fully aware of his use of his own language (as most native speakers of a language are not) and because they take the language for granted much like they do breathing and walking, mistakes or even errors in speaking their language tend to multiply especially when another older speaker does the same throughout his daily interactions with other people and becomes imitated by the younger generation.
If a native speaker of Toba Batak were no longer interested in improving and maintaining his own language, who else would, especially when the latter is a foreign to the system?

What are we to say when an alien, such as Dr. van der Tuuk had not done anything to the Toba Batak language? Would we leave it dead and forgotten?