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Abstract

This presentation aims to give an example of a radical morphosyntactic change which is often found when a language undergoes endangerment as a result of language contact. There are many endangered languages which are spoken by small populations in Indonesia. Bantik is one of such Austronesian languages spoken in North Sulawesi and is regarded to belong to the Sangiric subgroup. It has less than 3000 fluent speakers all of whom are in their fifties and older, and is endangered. Second language speakers of Bantik, who are in their thirties and forties, show a language structure which is distinct from the traditional one in many respects. I will mainly focus in this paper on generation differences in morpho-syntax.

1 Introduction: The Socio-linguistic Situation of the Bantik Language

1.1 The Bantik language

- Bantik is an Austronesian language, which belong to Sangiric subgroup within the Philippine group which in turn belongs to the Western Malayo-Polynesian family. It is severely endangered.
- Bantik is reported to have around 10,000 speakers (cf. Noorduyn 1991), but is assumed to be spoken by less than 3000 fluent speakers.
- Bantik has five vowels, /i, e, a, o, u/, and fourteen consonants /p, t, d, k, g, ?, s, h, m, n, ñ, r, j/. It has rich morphological system, and has an active voice and two undergoer voices.

1.2 The sociolinguistic situation of the Bantik language

- Bantik is spoken in the vicinity of Manado, the provincial town of North Sulawesi Province. Many people of different ethnic origin live in Bantik villages.
- Indonesian, the national language of Indonesia has two distinct styles; Standard Indonesian (Bahasa Baku) which is formal and used for writing, and Colloquial Indonesian. Colloquial Indonesian varies to the great extent from place to place, and in North Sulawesi, the Manado dialect of Colloquial Indonesian (Bahasa Manado) has immense vitality and is used as many people’s everyday language as well as the common language. The Manado dialect show many features that are not shared with Standard Indonesian and other dialects of Colloquial Indonesian. Almost all the speakers of Bantik can also speak the Manado dialect.

---

1 For detailed description of Bantik, please refer to Bawole 1993 and Utsumi 2005.
2 For more information on the Manado dialect, please refer to Prentice 1994.
First language of older Bantik people (born before 1950) is Bantik, while that of young Bantik people (born after 1970) is the Manado dialect.

Standard Indonesian is the High variety of both groups. The Low varieties of the older generation is Bantik and the Manado dialect. Bantik is limited register and is used among people of ‘primary relation’ (cf. Dorian 1981). The Manado dialect is the Low variety of the younger generation. Their use of Bantik is very limited. They use it only when they speak to the older Bantik speakers.

Young Bantik people speak the Bantik language as a second language, and as a result, their knowledge of the language has undergone many changes. Their Bantik show discrepancies from the traditional Bantik language shared by older speakers.

It is assumed that two factors cause these changes in young peoples’ Bantik.

–Langage contact with Standard Indonesian and the Manado dialect.
–Imperfect Learning (cf. Cook 1995). Young people have limited access to the Bantik language.

The data used in the description below are collected through a fieldwork research in Buha village, North Sulawesi, from 1996 to 2008. There are two linguistic consultants who belong to the young generation: Mr. Vasco Tuwaidan born in 1972, Mr. Stenly Mamengko born in 1974. Mr. Heis Mamengko, born in 1950 and Mr. Terok Mamengko, born in 1948, are my consultants who speak Bantik as the first language. Many other speakers of diverse age groups in Buha village have been consulted too.

The variety of Bantik which are shared by older generation (born before 1950) will henceforth be called Traditional Bantik, or TB, and that shared by younger generation (born after 1970) Young Bantik, or YB. (The idea for these naming came from Schmidt 1985).

2 Semantic Changes in the Lexicon

Overgeneralization of the meaning is often found in the YB lexicon.

YB speakers take proper nouns for common nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>TB meaning</th>
<th>YB meaning</th>
<th>TB word for YB meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paniki</td>
<td>a name of a specific river</td>
<td>river</td>
<td>ake mihihi ‘flowing water’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wagata</td>
<td>strong west wind</td>
<td>strong (for wind)</td>
<td>ma-bahua?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sayoha</td>
<td>kangkung (a kind of vegetable)</td>
<td>uncooked vegetable</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influence of Standard Indonesian and the Manado dialect is apparent.

Table 2: Differences in semantic interpretation influenced by language contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>TB meaning</th>
<th>YB meaning</th>
<th>Similar Indonesian word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peha?</td>
<td>roe (fish egg)</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>perak, ‘silver’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-ruasa?</td>
<td>easy</td>
<td>spacious</td>
<td>luas, ‘spacious’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-sendo?</td>
<td>straw</td>
<td>spoon</td>
<td>sendok, ‘spoon’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3The phoneme /t/ (trill) in Indonesian often corresponds to Bantik /h/ (timur (IND) vs timuhu (BAN) ‘east’, kertas (IND) vs kabatasu?). This is why YB peha? is assigned the meaning of perak in Indonesian.
Many other Bantik lexical items are lost in YB, most of which are replaced by the Manado dialect.

There are many cases where the interpretation of the same word do not coincide between the two age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>TB meaning</th>
<th>YB meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sumau?</td>
<td>to perform a war dance</td>
<td>to be angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topoq</td>
<td>rice without the germ</td>
<td>wheet flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dedehan</td>
<td>column of a hut</td>
<td>column (for everything)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papanta?</td>
<td>post, stake</td>
<td>fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-rotei</td>
<td>weak, feeble</td>
<td>soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-hiaraq</td>
<td>be piled up</td>
<td>be up and down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-ridaq</td>
<td>to bury a body, to cover</td>
<td>to dig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tian</td>
<td>belly</td>
<td>belly, stomach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Morphological Confusion

Bantik language has a rich affixation system. Both Traditional Bantik and Young Bantik seem to share the same rules for the affixation, but the number of words resulting from the application of the word forming rule are different between the two varieties.

3.1 Word classes and affixes in Bantik

The elements in Bantik language can be devided into words and particles. The word classes in Bantik are nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. Verbs and adjectives differ in that verbs have two tenses, non-past and past, while adjectives do not change their forms according to the time of the state that they describe.

- Nouns are categorized into two groups: base-only nouns and derivational nouns that undergo reduplication and affixation.
- Adjectives are categorized into three groups: base-only adjectives, those with the prefix ma-, and derivational adjectives.
- Verbs (with a few exception) should be affixed in order to appear in a sentence. One of voice indicating affixes is necessarily attached.
  - The infix -um-/im-, the prefix ma-/na- or the prefix maN-/naN 4 for active voice.
  - The suffix -AN and the prefix ni- for undergoer voices.
  - Voice-indicating affixes show tense in addition to the voice of the verb. The affixes -um-, ma-, and maN- indicate non-past tense while -im-, na-, naN-, and ni- show past tense.
- Derivational affixes can also attach to the verb base in addition to the voice-indicating affixes. For example, the causative prefix paki-, the applicative prefix paN-, or the abilitative prefix ka-.

3.2 Peculiar word formation in Young Bantik

YB speakers, who do not have complete knowledge of the language, sometimes create nonexistent combinations of an affix and a base.

---

4/N/ in maN-/naN- indicates insertion of a nasal which is homo-organic with the first consonant of the base, or a replacement of the first consonant of a base by a homo-organic nasal. In the case where a base begins with a vowel, /ŋ/ is inserted.
3.2.1 Morphological Confusion Concerning Noun Formation

There are several ways to form derivational nouns from adjective or verb bases. YB speakers tend to overgeneralize the formation rule and create words which do not exist. In addition, their interpretation of the derived words always follow the semantic rule of the majority. Those with diosyncratic meanings are not correctly understood. Here is one of such examples.

- ‘C1 + /a/ + Base’ (reduplication of the first consonant of a verb base followed by /a/ and the base) makes derivational nouns from verb bases. It can be said to be productive, but only applies to less than twenty percent of the verb bases. Most of the derived nouns denote ‘the manner of motion denoted by the base’. On the other hand, some of them have unpredictable meaning. YB speakers tend to apply this formation to many verb bases creating nonexistent words. Their interpretations of the derived nouns are always ‘the manner’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>TB meaning</th>
<th>YB meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ta-tara?</td>
<td>the way of flying</td>
<td>the way of flying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-seqko?</td>
<td>the way of sailing</td>
<td>the way of sailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha-huake</td>
<td>heat, fire</td>
<td>the way of liquefying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-kodo?</td>
<td>eyelid</td>
<td>the way of blinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta-tuhu?</td>
<td>stick or string (for piercing)</td>
<td>the way of following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta-tahundu?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>the way of remembering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da-dahu?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>the way of making noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ga-giridi?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>the way of loving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Applying a wrong voice-indicating affix to verb bases

YB speakers sometimes apply a wrong voice-indicating affix to verb bases, or realize /N/ in maN-/naN- wrongly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>TB form</th>
<th>YB form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to ascend</td>
<td>ma-saka</td>
<td>s-un-aka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to help</td>
<td>ma-turui</td>
<td>manurui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to distribute</td>
<td>ma-tiaha?</td>
<td>ma-niaha?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to carry on the back</td>
<td>mam-baruki</td>
<td>ma-maruki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Reinterpretation of the Voice System

4.1 The voice system of the Bantik language

Bantik verbs can be divided into following three groups depending on the number of voice(s) they can take. There are three voices, Active Voice, Undergoer Voice 1, and Undergoer Voice 2. Each verb is lexically determined how many voice(s) it can take.

- Intransitive verbs: they take only one argument (a subject), and can only take the active voice.
- Mono-transitive verbs: they take two arguments (a subject and an object), they can take the active voice and one undergoer voice.
- Ditransitive verbs: they take three arguments (a subject and two objects), they can take the active voice and two undergoer voices.
Table 6: The paradigm of simple verbs (verbs without derivational affixes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Active Voice</th>
<th>Undergoer Voice1</th>
<th>Undergoer Voice2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-past</td>
<td>UM-Base</td>
<td>sake-an</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>s-um-akei</td>
<td>sake-an</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-/na: ex.</td>
<td>tiki (sleep)</td>
<td>MA-Base</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td>MA-Base</td>
<td>sake-an</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>NA-Base</td>
<td>sake-an</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maN-/naN- mono-transitive verb: ex.</td>
<td>buno (kill)</td>
<td>MAN-Base</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td>MAN-Base</td>
<td>buno-n</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>NA-Base</td>
<td>NI-Base</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maN-/naN- ditransitive verb: bihei (give)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAN-Base</td>
<td>Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td>MAN-Base</td>
<td>bihei</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>NA-Base</td>
<td>NI-Base</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maN-/naN- ditransitive verb: bihei (give)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA-Base</td>
<td>NI-Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td>NA-Base</td>
<td>ni-bihei</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Difference in subcategorization of verbs

Younger speakers have lost the distinction between the two undergoer voices, and tend to confuse them. They know that there are three morphologically different voice forms, and that there are three subcategories of verbs, that is, intransitive, mono-transitive and ditransitive, but lack the knowledge for deciding which verb belongs to which subcategory. As a result, they often exhibit a morpho-syntactically peculiar usage of verbs. This confusion is assumed to be caused by language contact with Indonesian, which has only a two-way voice alternation.

Table 7: Verbs regarded as ditransitive by YB speakers but transitive by TB speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>UV1</th>
<th>#UV2</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>toqko?</td>
<td>ma-noqko?</td>
<td>toqko-an</td>
<td>*toqko?</td>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiaha?</td>
<td>ma-niha?</td>
<td>tiaha-en</td>
<td>*tiaha?</td>
<td>share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sahioko?</td>
<td>ma-nioko?</td>
<td>sahiok-an</td>
<td>*sahioko?</td>
<td>rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sohobo?</td>
<td>ma-nohobo?</td>
<td>sohob-an</td>
<td>*sohobo?</td>
<td>light fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saudu?</td>
<td>ma-naudu?</td>
<td>saud-an</td>
<td>*saudu?</td>
<td>hang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Verbs regarded as transitive by YB speakers but ditransitive by OB speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>UV1</th>
<th>UV2</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oqkoho?</td>
<td>ma-oqkoho?</td>
<td>oqkoho-n</td>
<td>oqkoho?</td>
<td>hand in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suqi</td>
<td>ma-suji</td>
<td>suji-an</td>
<td>suji</td>
<td>feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turaau</td>
<td>ma-turaau</td>
<td>turaau-an</td>
<td>turaau</td>
<td>leave something</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some YB speakers confuse the past tense form of verbs with voice-indicating prefixes ma-/na- and maN-/naN-. Mono-transitive verbs as shown below take the suffix -AN when they are in non-past.
tense but do not take it when in past tense. Some young speakers, however, consistently add the suffix even in past tense.

Table 9: Confusion concerning Undergoer Voice form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>base</th>
<th>AV non-past</th>
<th>UV past</th>
<th>YB Form</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bei</td>
<td>ma-bei</td>
<td>ni-bei</td>
<td>*ni-bei-an</td>
<td>pick up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tunu</td>
<td>ma-tunu</td>
<td>ni-tunu</td>
<td>*ni-tunu-an</td>
<td>grill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rutaŋ</td>
<td>ma-rutaŋ</td>
<td>ni-rutaŋ</td>
<td>*ni-ruta-men</td>
<td>shoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bunu</td>
<td>ma-munu</td>
<td>ni-buno</td>
<td>*ni-buno-n</td>
<td>kill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Overgeneralization of the derivational verb-forming rules

The other characteristics of YB is that it overgeneralize the derivational rules of those affixes and applies them to inapplicable bases.

4.3.1 Adversative verbs

The form ‘ka- + Adjective Base + -AN’ conveys adversative meaning, and words with this form are verbs (because they have two tense forms). Although adjective bases with unfavorable meanings have a tendency to take this form, not all of them can take it. YB speakers tend to make nonexistent words with this form by overgeneralizing the formation rule. A possible factor for this is that there is a form ‘ka- + Adjective Base’, which is the nominalization form derived from adjective bases. YB speakers might confuse these two forms and functions.

Table 10: Adversatives: existent and nonexistent words presented by YB speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>base</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>Adversative verb</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pidisi?</td>
<td>ma-pidisi?</td>
<td>painful</td>
<td>ka-pidis-an</td>
<td>suffer from a pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suredo</td>
<td>ma-suredo</td>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>ka-suredo-n</td>
<td>suffer from dirtiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roqoʔ?</td>
<td>ma-roqoʔ?</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>ka-roqoʔ-an</td>
<td>suffer from being fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hagaŋ</td>
<td>ma-hagaŋ</td>
<td>spicy</td>
<td>ka-hagaŋ-en</td>
<td>suffer from spiciness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pudu</td>
<td>ma-pudu</td>
<td>bitter</td>
<td>ka-pudu-an</td>
<td>experience bitterness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sahioko?</td>
<td>ma-sahioko</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>*ka-sahiok-an</td>
<td>*speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bahaʔ?</td>
<td>ma-bahaʔ?</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>*ka-bahaʔ-en</td>
<td>*suffer from heaviness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misiʔ?</td>
<td>ma-misiʔ?</td>
<td>sweet</td>
<td>*ka-misiʔ?-an</td>
<td>*suffer from sweetness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dodoʔ?</td>
<td>ma-dodoʔ?</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td>*ka-dodoʔ?-an</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) bari ni ka-suredo-n ada ʔasana anaʔ-anaʔ? house NI-2sg KA-dirty-AN if many children
   ‘Your house will get dirty if you have many children’

(2) i-pasko ni-ka-hagaŋ-en
I-Vasco NI-KA-spicy-AN
   ‘Vasco was suffered from spiciness’

(3) a *ka-sahiok-an nu-oʔoʔ ene ma-pia
   KA-fast-AN NU-car that MA-good
   ‘*The speed of that car is nice’
b ka-sahioko nu-oto? ene ma-pia
KA-fast NU-car that MA-good
‘The speed of that car is nice’

4.3.2 Applicative verbs

• The prefix paN- forms applicative verbs when attached to the transitive verb bases. The productivity is limited though; only around twenty percent of such bases can take paN-. Applicative verbs are ditransitive and take all the three voices.
• The Active Voice form of applicative verbs is ‘ma-/na- + paN- + Base’.
• The Undergoer Voices of applicative verbs are: ‘paN- + Base + -AN’ for Undergoer Voice 1 and ‘paN- + Base’ for Undergoer Voice 2.
  – The Undergoer Voice 1 form ‘paN- + Base + -AN’ is identical with locative verb form which has no Active Voice form.
  – The Undergoer Voice 2 form ‘paN- + Base’ is identical with instrumental verb form which has no Active Voice form.
• YB speakers tend to create applicative verbs from every transitive verb base. As a result, they insist nonexistent applicative Active Voice forms to be present.
• Three factors for this is suggested below.
  – YB speakers have tendency to overgeneralize derivational rules. Examples of this abound as we have seen above. Once they are asked to make derivational forms, they tend to elicit combinations of affixes and bases without taking lexical information into account.
  – YB speakers have lost lexical information concerning verb (and verb base) subcategorization. Examples above suggest that they cannot discern intransitive verbs from mono-transitive verbs, and they often confuse mono-transitive verbs with ditransitive verbs.
  – A large proportion of morpho-syntactic knowledge is lost in YB. Although YB speakers know there are three voice forms, a three-way voice alternation system is seldom activated in their mind, possibly because High variety language they are willing to learn (Standard Indonesian) has a two-way voice alternation. (The Manado dialect has no morphologically apparent voice alternation system.) When they are aware that derivational verbs with a specific affix can take three voice forms, they automatically apply every voice form to any verb base. As a result, they create nonexistent forms and ungrammatical sentences.
• To summerize, YB speakers have a morpho-syntactic system distinct from that of TB speakers. They look for possible morphological forms, and then, without consulting lexical information which is sometimes idiosyncratic, apply every form to adequate and inadequate bases. If there are forms which can be interpreted as three voice forms, they automatically create a paradigm for ditransitive verbs and fill the slot with nonexistent forms.
### Table 11: Arguments of applicative verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Voice</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>verb</th>
<th>object 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantic role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past</td>
<td>i-/øNP</td>
<td>maN-Base</td>
<td>si-/su-/øNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>i-/øNP</td>
<td>naN-Base</td>
<td>si-/su-/øNP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of applicative verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergoer Voice 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantic role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergoer Voice 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantic role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) a) i-heis ma-pa-mareq nu-batu ie su-uai ene
    I-Heis MA-PAN-take by throwing NU-stone this SU-mango that
    ‘Heis will take mango by throwing this stone’ (Active Voice)

b) uai pa-mareq-an ni-heis nu-batu ie
    mango PAN-take by throwing-AN NI-Heis NU-stone this
    ‘That mango will be taken by Heis by throwing this stone’ (Undergoer Voice 1)

c) batu ie pa-mareq ni-heis su-uai ene
    stone this PAN-take by throwing NI-Heis SU-mango that
    ‘This stone will be used by Heis to take that mango’ (Undergoer Voice 2)

(5) a) *i-stenli ma-pa-ghehe? nu-pahigi su-kahatasa
    I-Stenly MA-PAN2-tear NU-knife SU-paper
    ‘*Stenly will tear a piece of paper with a knife’ (nonexistent applicative Active Voice form insisted by YB speakers)

b) su-maga ie pag-ghehe2-an ni-stenli kahatasa?
    paper this PAN-tear-AN NI-Stenly paper
    ‘On this table, Stenly will tear a piece of paper’ (Locative verb)

c) *kahatasa? pag-ghehe?-an ni-stenli nu-pisou
    paper PAN-tear-AN NI-Stenly NU-knife
    ‘*A piece of paper will be torn by Stenly with a knife’ (Ungrammatical sentence insisted by YB speakers)

d) pisou pag-ghehe? ni-stenli kahatasa
    knife PAN-tear NI-Stenly paper
    ‘A knife will be used by Stenly to tear a piece of paper’ (Instrumental verb)

(4) a) i-heis ma-pa-mareq nu-batu ie su-uai ene
    I-Heis MA-PAN-take by throwing NU-stone this SU-mango that
    ‘Heis will take mango by throwing this stone’ (Active Voice)

b) uai pa-mareq-an ni-heis nu-batu ie
    mango PAN-take by throwing-AN NI-Heis NU-stone this
    ‘That mango will be taken by Heis by throwing this stone’ (Undergoer Voice 1)

c) batu ie pa-mareq ni-heis su-uai ene
    stone this PAN-take by throwing NI-Heis SU-mango that
    ‘This stone will be used by Heis to take that mango’ (Undergoer Voice 2)

(5) a) *i-stenli ma-pa-ghehe? nu-pahigi su-kahatasa
    I-Stenly MA-PAN2-tear NU-knife SU-paper
    ‘*Stenly will tear a piece of paper with a knife’ (nonexistent applicative Active Voice form insisted by YB speakers)

b) su-maga ie pag-ghehe2-an ni-stenli kahatasa?
    paper this PAN-tear-AN NI-Stenly paper
    ‘On this table, Stenly will tear a piece of paper’ (Locative verb)

c) *kahatasa? pag-ghehe?-an ni-stenli nu-pisou
    paper PAN-tear-AN NI-Stenly NU-knife
    ‘*A piece of paper will be torn by Stenly with a knife’ (Ungrammatical sentence insisted by YB speakers)

d) pisou pag-ghehe? ni-stenli kahatasa
    knife PAN-tear NI-Stenly paper
    ‘A knife will be used by Stenly to tear a piece of paper’ (Instrumental verb)
Table 12: Examples of applicative verbs in TB lexicon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>base</th>
<th>simple verb</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>applicative verb</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bohe?</td>
<td>ma-mohoe?</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>ma-pa-bohe?</td>
<td>write with st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraq</td>
<td>ma-maraq</td>
<td>take st</td>
<td>ma-pa-maraq</td>
<td>take st with st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mada</td>
<td>ma-mada</td>
<td>dry</td>
<td>ma-pa-mada</td>
<td>dry at st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turubu</td>
<td>ma-murubu</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>ma-pa-nurubu</td>
<td>close with st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saqkoi</td>
<td>ma-naqkoi</td>
<td>plow</td>
<td>ma-pa-naqkoi</td>
<td>plow with st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solobo?</td>
<td>ma-nohobo?</td>
<td>flame</td>
<td>ma-pa-nohobo?</td>
<td>flame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dahuq</td>
<td>ma-dahuq</td>
<td>sew</td>
<td>ma-pan-dahuq</td>
<td>sew on st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Examples of applicative verbs elicited by YB speakers but are not acknowledged by TB speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>base</th>
<th>simple verb</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>applicative form</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ki?aq</td>
<td>ma-qi?aq</td>
<td>lift</td>
<td>*ma-pa-qi?aq</td>
<td>let sb lift st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tekoso?</td>
<td>ma-nekoso?</td>
<td>steal</td>
<td>*ma-pa-nekoso?</td>
<td>steal st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gogaha?</td>
<td>maq-gogaha?</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>*ma-pa-gogaha?</td>
<td>break st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirimu?</td>
<td>ma-qririmu?</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>*ma-pa-qririmu?</td>
<td>make st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kara?</td>
<td>ma-qrara?</td>
<td>scoop out</td>
<td>*ma-pa-qrara?</td>
<td>scoop out st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tukusu?</td>
<td>ma-nukusu?</td>
<td>wrap</td>
<td>*ma-pa-nukusu?</td>
<td>wrap st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Summary

It is widely reported that endangered language show morphological reduction (Dorian 1981, Campbell and Muntzel 1989, Schmidt 1985a). For example, in Dyirbal, ergative allomorphs are subsumed into lesser number of allomorphs as the speaker’s competency reduces. Some incompetent speakers have only one form, and less competent ones finally lose the case marking itself (Schmidt 1985a).

In Bantik, however, the reduction of the number of allomorphs is not observed. Instead, ‘overgeneralization of morphological rules’ is widely observed in Young Bantik. YB speakers retain knowledge of morphological rules for deriving words, but they do not know lexical restriction for the word formation.

It seems that YB speakers are losing vocabulary of Bantik quite fast. Since all of them are fluent in the Manado dialect, when they cannot find the right word which convey the intended meaning in Bantik, they easily replace it with the Manado dialect.

YB speakers supplement the loss of vocabulary by being conscious of the morphological and morpho-syntactic rules in Bantik, and by combining the bases and the affixes following the rules, they create words which are not traditionally used nor admitted by Traditional Bantik speakers. When they come to assign meanings to a nonexistent word, they simply combine the meaning of an affix and a base.

The overgeneralization of the rules by YB speakers extend to the inflectional rules. They inflect words by applying the morpho-syntactic rules by analogy regardless of the lexical restriction. As a result, they create strange words for TB speakers and make ungrammatical sentences for TB speakers using their own words.

YB speakers are more conscious of the morphological and morpho-syntactic rules than TB speakers, since it is one of the few ways to compensate loss of lexicon. By applying morphological rules to as many bases as possible, they can increase the vocabulary. Morpho-syntactic rules help them to create sentences without consulting to lexical information.

Although YB speakers are quite competent in creating words by affixation, they are often not sure of their meaning. This fact indicates that they do not actually use the words they elicit in daily speech. TB speakers, on the other hand, when asked to elicit words with derivational affixes, consult lexical information and decide whether a resulting form exist or not. Naturally, they are confident of and
consistent with the meaning of the words once they acknowledged their existence.

It is suggested that overgeneralization of the rules is found in morphology and morpho-syntax when a language is on the way of extinction. Under the circumstances, reinterpretation of morpho-syntactic system also emerges.
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