However, those interviewed in Kayu Agung Asli and Kayu Agung identified ethnically with each other. This could be explained by their long history of interaction, and the fact that they have been geographically cut off from other Lampungic groups by interposing Malay groups. The Kayu Agung only identified ethnically with Kayu Agung Asli. Some Kayu Agung Asli interviewed also identified ethnically with Komering.

Those in Ranau identified with Lampung Pesisir, but not with Abung or Menggala, and not with any groups down the Komering River.

The Daya didn’t connect with anyone downriver from them, either; only with the Ranau and Lampung Pesisir.

In Lampung Province, there is general ethnic solidarity across the two main dialect and adat (‘tradition’) divisions. They all consider themselves Lampungese, and, therefore, related; except that an apparent degree of exclusivity causes those in MEL and SKD to only identify with Sukadana. JBG’s choice to identify with Way Kanan and Kota Bumi, but not with Kalianda, could be explained in terms of shared adat with those more western groups and JBG’s claim that they originally came from the Way Kanan area.

Those interviewed in PUB were strong to assert that the Komering people are ethnically related to the Lampungese.

In this case, the most distinct lines are drawn around Kayu Agung. There are vague ties between Kayu Agung Asli and Komering; but the Kayu Agung people do not connect with anyone outside their subdistrict. One piece of information that we failed to ask concerned any ethnic connection between the peoples along the Komering River and the Nyo groups in Lampung. It should be noted that answers to a questionnaire like this vary sometimes even within one group, depending upon the knowledge and opinions of those present.

4.1.3. Interpretation of results

Although responses to sociolinguistic questionnaires varied considerably from place to place, some general responses can assist us in confirming the subgrouping of the Lampungic cluster presented thus far. First, data relating to language choice in inter-variety contact situations (cf. Table 3) point to the general existence of an internally related chain in the western part of Lampung Province, extending down the Komering River in South Sumatra Province. Likewise, evidence for a subgrouping of varieties in eastern Lampung Province is also present.

Maps 2 through 5—based upon informants’ responses regarding which speech varieties are similar and understandable to them—show us that the eastern Lampungic varieties do not consider the South Sumatra Province varieties nor most of the western Lampung Province varieties to be similar. The case is the same in the other direction, with the exception of two groups of the western Lampungic chain that are located nearest the geographic center of the chain, i.e., Sukau and Peminggir. Menggala also named two of the southern groups in the western Lampungic area as having a similar dialect (but cf. §4.2.2 below). With a couple exceptions, the notion of the two Kayu Agung groups perceiving themselves and being perceived as distinct (except by Daya and one Komering group) is also supported by the responses elicited for these questions (cf. Map 3). Finally, it is significant to note that the groups in the center of the western Lampungic area—Sukau and Peminggir—named both the Komering River varieties as well as the southern Lampung Province varieties as being similar. The Komering River varieties and the southern Lampung Province sites, on the other hand, did not consider each other’s speech to be all that similar.
Ethnic identity responses were mixed from one place to another and even within one village, but some general patterns can also be seen here. Informants in most of the Komering varieties identified ethnically within their clans only, but a few included Kayu Agung Asli (not Kayu Agung), Daya and Lampung Pesisir. This supports the existence of a chain of speech varieties in the western Lampungic area, as mentioned above, together with the exclusion of the eastern Lampungic varieties from that chain. Regarding Kayu Agung, those in Kayu Agung Asli and Kayu Agung identified ethnically with each other, but only the Kayu Agung Asli identified with the Komering. This still leaves us with a more loose relationship between Kayu Agung and the rest of the western Lampungic chain. Some informants pointed out that the Kayu Agung people are thought by many to have migrated some time ago from somewhere in the Lampung Nyo area, which is also attested by Mitani (1980).

4.2. Rapid Appraisal Recorded Text Test

4.2.1. Procedure

The Recorded Text Test (RTT) is based on the assumption that a person's ability to retell a story heard in another speech variety corresponds to his or her ability to comprehend that speech variety. The original methodology for the RTT is described in Casad (1974). In practice, this tool can differentiate between very low levels of comprehension in the second language (L2) and moderate/high levels of comprehension. It cannot reliably distinguish between and within moderate and high levels of comprehension of the second language. O'Leary (1994) describes various aspects of the limitations of use of the RTT in language research and language program planning.

For our Rapid Appraisal survey of the Lampungic cluster, the original RTT was modified significantly (cf. Stalder 1996) in order to make the test more efficient for our purposes; we were simply trying to gain a preliminary understanding of whether speakers of the main, reported dialect groups could in fact comprehend the other main dialects or not. Thus, the collection of texts was done on a less rigorous scale, and a group setting was used instead of testing individuals. In brief, the Rapid Appraisal RTT (RA-RTT) requires a group of subjects to listen to a recorded story in another speech variety and retell it segment by segment, paraphrasing it in their mother tongue or into a language of wider communication (LWC).

Three stories were recorded. One story was told in the Menggala dialect (Nyo, or eastern Lampungic). Two stories were told by speakers from Talang Padang (Api, or western Lampungic in Lampung Province), though from slightly different sub-varieties. One of these Api stories was in a high register, the other in mid to low register (everyday speech).

These stories were then tested in nine Api villages and in three Nyo villages, using the results of previous research and personal interviews to determine which varieties were of the Api group and which were of the Nyo group. Respondents heard the stories in the vernacular and retold the stories in Indonesian. This method of RA-RTT test taking shows the respondents' general ability to understanding the text given.

4.2.2. Presentation of results

The RA-RTT is not designed to be a quantitative test. We have determined in many instances that the variation seen in the results and the appearance of unpredictably high scores in certain areas was most likely the result of two main factors. First, most of the
informants for this test were men who were in positions of leadership, almost all of whom had fairly frequent contact now or in the past with speakers of the speech variety in question. The second major uncontrolled factor affecting these test results was the less-than-desirable quality of the RTT from the Talang Padang (Api) area. Based upon many informants’ comments, we believe that the poor quality of the recording (significant background noise and fast speech) affected their comprehension of the text.

Table 6 presents a summary of the results of the RA-RTT in terms of a qualitative evaluation of observed and reported comprehension of the texts. The symbol Ø corresponds to low comprehension of the recorded text. Areas with high comprehension of the respective text are denoted with the symbol √. The symbol ≈ shows the areas where the comprehension was somewhere in between.

Table 6. Summary of RA-RTT results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test site</th>
<th>RA-RTT version</th>
<th>Talang Padang (TPD1)</th>
<th>Menggala (MGL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SKU1 (Sukau)</td>
<td>Got the main points; missed many details</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said they understood all of it</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Got many main points of the story; missed some details</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claimed a wide range of comprehension depending on person</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRU (Krui)</td>
<td>Got some main points but missed others</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said they understood all of it</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missed a great deal of the main points</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some said they understood it all, some women said they didn't understand any of it</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL (Liwa)</td>
<td>Got the main points but missed many details</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said they understood all of it, but that there were some slang words they didn’t know</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Got the main points of the story; missed some important details</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said they could understand about 75 percent of the story</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKN (Way Kanan)</td>
<td>Got the main points and all the details</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said they understood all of it</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Got the main points and most details, but several informants had more difficulty than others</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said they understood the whole story but that it was significantly different speech; older people wouldn’t be able to understand very much</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKY (Sungkai)</td>
<td>Got most of the main points; many people seemed confused with certain sections</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said they understood most of the story</td>
<td>≈</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Got the main points of the story and most details</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said they understood everything except one word</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUB (Pubian)</td>
<td>Got the main points but missed some details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTAG (Kota Agung)</td>
<td>Got most of the main points of the story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD1 (Talang Padang)</td>
<td>Home town test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAL (Kalianda)</td>
<td>Got all the main points but missed some details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBG (Jabung)</td>
<td>Got the main points but missed many details, after two or three hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL (Melinting)</td>
<td>Got the main points only after hearing it four or five times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKD (Sukadana)</td>
<td>Got the main points but very few details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG1 (Abung)</td>
<td>Got the main points, but with difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGL (Menggala)</td>
<td>Got the main points, but very few details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3. Interpretation of results

The results displayed in Table 6 demonstrate wide variation in the groups' abilities to comprehend the texts. Some general and useful statements can be made, however. The
most striking piece of evidence for comprehension and lack of comprehension may be seen in the results for the Nyo groups plus Jabung. They were able to understand the Menggala (Nyo) text very well, but they all had great difficulty with the Api text. This points to a high degree of uniformity in the level of comprehension of at least that one Api variety, and it points to the fact that at least Menggala is understood well throughout the whole Nyo area, plus Jabung.

The results in the Api areas were less homogenous. Comprehension of the Menggala text was good in some areas, and poor in others, not corresponding in any apparent way to geography. Information gathered in interviews, however, points to the likelihood that this high comprehension results from acquired intelligibility, as the Menggala people are well-known throughout the province and have established entire villages in other parts of the Lampungic region.

Most notable of the comprehension abilities within the Api area is that the various Api speakers overall did not perform as well at comprehending one of the Api speech varieties as the Nyo people did at comprehending the Nyo variety Menggala.

In the Api case, this could be simply due to lack of close contact between many of the ethnic groups and the fact that they are separated by significant geographical distance. In the Nyo case, this could be due to much greater contact between the groups, or at least between Menggala people and other groups. On the other hand, it could be the result of the relatively higher number of shared linguistic and lexical features briefly described below.

5. Linguistic survey tools used

As mentioned above, not only sociolinguistic elements were taken into consideration in this language survey. An historical comparative analysis and lexicostatistical analysis were also done on word lists collected during the survey. These two aspects of our analysis of the Lampungic cluster are only mentioned in broad outline below. A complete treatment of the data leading to the conclusions presented here may be found in Anderbeck, Hanawalt and Katubi (2005) and in Hanawalt, Tarp and Husain (forthcoming). An initial reconstruction of Proto-Lampungic is postulated in Anderbeck (this volume).

Although word lists were available for some sites from other researchers, the quality of these word lists and purpose for their collection varied. Thus we found it necessary to re-collect word lists in some locations in order to fill in missing data for our analysis.

5.1. Historical comparative phonological analysis

A historical comparative analysis allows for the grouping of speech varieties based on shared phonological innovations; the mutual absence of a particular innovation, however, does not constitute grounds for grouping two speech varieties together. We do not attempt to construct a lower-order subgrouping of Lampungic varieties but rather demonstrate the most likely similarities that emerge from our analysis. The findings in this section are an outgrowth of comparative studies done by White (n.d.) and Anderbeck (this volume).

---

1 Because of time constraints, an in depth comparison of morphology and syntax is typically not included in a Rapid Appraisal survey.
First, we posit a western Lampungic subgroup which exhibits the innovation of ultimate \(^*ə > o\)—those groups along the Komering River in South Sumatra, the western mountains and western coast of Lampung Province and the southern and western inland sections of Lampung Province (including Jabung), possibly also including Menggala and Sukadana from the Lampung Nyo area. Thus only the Abung and Melinting varieties are excluded from this subgroup.

Fortunately, the uncertainty regarding whether Abung and Melinting fit into this first subgroup can be sufficiently answered by looking at a combination of other innovations. A second subgrouping of the four varieties in the Lampung Nyo area can be made based upon several innovations. First, the case of nasal deletion in nasal consonant clusters at syllable boundaries supports this subgroup, plus Jabung (though more evidence is needed in the case of Melinting). Second, the nearly absolute deletion of Proto-Lampungic word-initial \(^*h\) is another phonological change that is found only in these four eastern Lampungic varieties, plus Jabung again. A fourth phonological innovation that corresponds very clearly to the four Nyo varieties plus Jabung is the change of word-final \(^*ə > o\). Finally, word final \(^*o\) (from earlier \(^*a\)) together with \(^*i\) and \(^*u\) were diphthongized. This change to final diphthongs is not the case in Jabung, however.

Within this subgroup, the evidence in Menggala related to the innovation of slightly higher realizations of the diphthongs discussed above helps us to possibly separate out Menggala as a subgroup of its own.

The phonological changes presented above point to the existence of a subgroup consisting of the four varieties of the Nyo group, together with Jabung.

The historical comparative evidence that penultimate \(^*ə > o\) helps us group Kayu Agung, Kayu Agung Asli and the Komering River varieties together.

A separate innovation which may allow Kayu Agung to effectively stand by itself separate from all other varieties is the innovation in all varieties except Kayu Agung of debuccalization. Subgroupings are not made based upon retentions (or the absence of an innovation), but in this case the fact that Kayu Agung alone has retained final voiceless consonants is nevertheless very interesting.

One further subgrouping can potentially be made, though the evidence for this is not as strong. The western mountain and coastal varieties Krui, Ranau and Sukau all exhibit the fortition of final \(^*h\) and the less systematic deletion of initial \(^*h\). This is deemed not as strong of a basis for labeling them as a separate subgroup, but it is at least a clue calling for further investigation into that possibility.

5.2. Lexicostatistical analysis

Our lexicostatistical analysis allows us to make some statements about the synchronic situation among the Lampungic dialects. First, we see that it is possible to state that lexically, there are two general subgroups within the Lampungic cluster which internally share higher degrees of lexical similarity between varieties. One of those is an eastern subgroup. This corresponds to what is referred to locally as the Lampung Nyo speech varieties—Menggala, Kotabumi, Sukadana and Melinting.

The second subgroup will be referred to as the western subgroup, although it stretches from north to south in the shape of an arc, as described above. This includes all the other varieties not included under the eastern subgroup—from Kalianda and Jabung in the south to Kayu Agung and Kayu Agung Asli in the north.
In general, we find a loose chain of dialects running from Kalianda in the south, through central and western Lampung and down the Komering River. It is beyond the scope of lexicostatistics, however, to make any lower-level dialect divisions within this chain.

One very interesting case, though, is that of Jabung, which does not display this same high degree of lexical similarity with its immediate neighbors in the western subgroup. Instead, it shares the highest degrees of similarity with speech varieties located much further north in that subgroup—corresponding nicely with local reports that the Jabung people had migrated from that interior western area some time ago.

Overall, our lexicostatistical analysis agrees with Walker (1975), except that it appears his site 'Jabung' corresponds to our site 'Nibung/MEL' (Melingting dialect) a few kilometers away from Jabung, whereas our 'Jabung/JBG' and ‘Jabung dialect’ correspond to a significantly divergent group of three villages centered in the town Jabung.

6. Synthesis of results

Three sets of evidence suggest that the Nyo, or eastern Lampungic subgroup, is much more homogenous than the remaining groups are with each other. First, the historical comparative analysis yields a number of innovations that link the Nyo varieties together. Next, the lexicostatistical analysis also links them more closely together lexically than many areas are to each other in the remainder of the speech varieties. Finally, the Nyo RA-RTT text comprehension for the Nyo speakers was much higher and more consistent than the Api speakers' comprehension of the Api text. This subgroup is further attested by the language similarity maps presented above, where the majority of Nyo sites named other Nyo sites as being very similar in speech, but excluded for the most part the remainder of the speech varieties.

The Nyo varieties aside, the homogeneity and interrelatedness of the remainder of the Lampungic varieties is much more at issue. Above we stated that it is far more desirable to use a number of tools to determine the language and dialect situation in a given area, as opposed to using one tool only. A number of examples from this western side of the Lampungic cluster will suitably illustrate and support this claim.

While lexicostatistics may provide some idea that these western groups somehow ‘belong together', nothing firm can be concluded from lexicostatistics about whether this constitutes one language or not. (Again, in this paper the definition of language found in Gordon 2005 is being used.)

Next, the historical comparative method permits us to nicely group together the Nyo varieties along a number of shared innovations; however, this does not hold true at all for the remaining varieties. We are left with only one solid subgrouping (Kayu Agung and Kayu Agung Asli with the Komering River varieties) and a small number of other, more tenuous possibilities.

If we were simply to stop there, using either one or both of the linguistic methods of analysis, we would not only fall far short of answering all the points in our adopted definition of what is a language but would also end up completely ignoring a wealth of information provided by the native speakers’ own perception of their languages.

In turning to our interpretations of results for the non-Nyo varieties, we see some conflicting conclusions. On the one hand, the non-Nyo speakers in Lampung Province see themselves as all speaking something called Api, which they consider by and large to be a single language (bahasa); and for the most part they claim that the local varieties are
mutually intelligible. When faced with a real-life example of such a variety in the form of a brief, recorded story, however, many of these same individuals who claimed to be able to understand all the other Api varieties really could understand only a part or very little of the example given.

Such a discrepancy points out two important issues related to language identification and other aspects of sociolinguistic survey. First, how do we know that the respondent has the same thing in mind when we ask him or her questions about a particular speech variety? It is possible that he or she is thinking of something completely other than what the researcher has in mind; or that the respondent has never had any real exposure to the variety in question, but answers based on a desire to please the researcher or to avoid losing face.

Second, we must be aware that answers given about how many distinct languages there are in a cluster may be the product of generations of passive knowledge rather than active experience. Such knowledge may not always reflect reality; the answer may be found to be quite different if the person is asked about the same speech variety a week after living in that other variety’s homeland for the first time.

For this reason a battery of tools or tests is needed, preferably including something like the RA-RTT, which places a real example in front of the respondent, allowing him or her to give a response that corresponds to his new, though somewhat artificial, firsthand experience with the speech variety in question.

Unfortunately, the RA-RTT has not yet been employed for the South Sumatra Province part of the survey. Thus, a significant piece of information about intelligibility between the speech varieties there and elsewhere is still missing. Looking at the evidence in hand, however, does help us come to a better understanding of these groups’ relationship to the whole. Our historical comparative analysis leads us to group together all the varieties labeled Komering, plus the two Kayu Agung varieties. Further, our language similarity maps help us see that the groups at the ‘ends’ of these non-Nyo areas (the Komering River groups and the southern Lampung Province groups) do not consider themselves to be all that similar in language—though they are aware of some ethnic ties. By contrast, the non-Nyo groups in the geographic center (such as Peminggir and Sukau) consider the groups to both the north and south of them to be similar. Such evidence points to the existence of a sort of dialect chain among the non-Nyo varieties. Based on the evidence presented here, this chain seems to have two sections that overlap in the middle, namely a southern section (southern, central and western Lampung Province) and a northern section (central and western Lampung Province and the South Sumatra Province varieties).

Our ethnic identity questions together with interviews with native speakers must be compared with the facts presented above. As far as language identity is concerned, both the Daya and Kayu Agung groups assert a more separate ethnolinguistic identity which must not be ignored.

7. Conclusions

7.1. Comparison with previous research

The general consensus of most researchers is that the entire Lampungic cluster can be divided into two large subgroups—Lampung Api (Pesisir) and Lampung Nyo.
The Lampung Api subgroup contains many speech varieties or more local clusters of speech varieties, which for the purposes of this paper have been termed local speech varieties. Most past research, including Walker (1975) and Mitani (1980), agree that the Komering varieties are linguistically a part of the Lampung Api subgroup. A few other researchers, such as Foley (1983), treat Komering as a separate language parallel to Lampung. Our research confirms the existence of two or three main subgroups within the Lampungic cluster.

Within the Lampung Api subgroup, most researchers recognize bundles of speech varieties of different sorts, usually referring to these regional clusters as ‘dialects’. The most clearly distinct of these dialects seem to be Komering, Sungkai and Pubian. Other groups seem to be less clear in terms of a locally accepted name and delineation of the extent of their dialect, with most of these being centered around a particular town or region (e.g., Krui and Kalianda). Other researchers obtained names related to clan (marga) backgrounds (e.g., Bengkuluh, Meninting).

Within the Lampung Nyo group, two groups noted as dialects are Abung and Tulangbawang (Menggala). Our research also confirms the existence of two such dialect groups, both in linguistic as well as in sociolinguistic terms.

Our findings differ considerably with those of Aliana et al. (1986) as to the areas inhabited by some speech varieties. For instance, Aliana et al. (1986:48) claim that the Jabung ‘subdialect’ is spoken in eleven subdistricts, while village leaders in Jabung claim that their speech variety is only spoken in three villages. We postulate that this and similar discrepancies may be due to a difference in how dialect names were elicited.

7.2. Language mapping

The evidence presented in this paper leads us to three main possibilities for presentation of the Lampungic speech varieties, in light of the three criteria found in our definition of language (cf. §1).

In the first option, the Lampungic cluster could be listed simply as one language—a large, interconnected cluster of dialects with some clear subgroupings. This option would be based primarily on the view that the Lampungic varieties are structured in two dialect subgroups. Though low, there is some level of comprehension between the two clusters. Additionally, there is a clear sense, especially among speakers in Lampung Province, that all Lampungic speakers speak the same language, albeit with significant regional differences. Calling this language ‘Lampung’ would lead to several problems, however. First, this would immediately suggest to the hearer that this language is confined to Lampung Province, which is clearly not the case. Second, we anticipate that there would be local resistance to the use of the term ‘Lampung’ in areas outside Lampung Province to refer to local speech varieties, such as in the Komering River valley. Nevertheless, there is some understanding among Komering and Kayu Agung leaders that they are ethnically related to the Lampung people of Lampung Province. As the Kayu Agung people are located along the Komering River, we submit that it would be sufficient to list them as a dialect under a broader name that encompasses Komering. In this option, we suggest the name LAMPUNG-KOMERING to refer to the entire language cluster.

The language maps displayed in this paper make no claim as to real or imagined ethnic or political boundaries. Maps in this paper were created using ArcGIS software, which was kindly donated by Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI). Permission to reproduce these maps in any print, electronic or other media must be obtained in writing from SIL International.
The second option would be to list the cluster as two main languages—an eastern Lampungic cluster (LAMPUNG NYO) and a western Lampungic chain (LAMPUNG API-KOMERING), with each main speech variety listed as a dialect underneath one of these two entries. In this terminology, CLUSTER refers to a group of dialects that share a very similar degree of intelligibility and other similarities with each other; whereas a CHAIN is defined as a group of dialects that are connected but in a more linear fashion—a given variety is most closely related to its immediate neighbor, but less so to another variety further away. This option would see the clear distinction and low intelligibility between the eastern and western sections of the Lampungic cluster as significant enough to label them as two separate languages (groups of dialects). In this scenario, Kayu Agung would be listed as part of the Lampung Api-Komering language due to its ethnic affinity to the Kayu Agung Asli, which is a variety very closely related to Komering. Jabung would also be grouped with the Lampung Api-Komering group because of historical-comparative similarities and ethnic affinity with the interior western Lampungic chain—places such as Sungkai and Way Kanan. This option would not go so far, though, as taking into consideration many of the inter-variety attitudes and other ethnic identity statements of the informants in some of the groups, as called for in the Ethnologue's third criterion for labeling a group of speech varieties as a language.

Such attitude and affinity statements would be taken into account in a third option, where the Lampungic cluster would be listed as three, four, or five languages. The eastern Lampungic cluster would still be listed as the LAMPUNG NYO language, with its dialects of Abung, Tulangbawang, Sukadana and Melinting. The western Lampungic chain could be broken down into two or three languages—chains of dialects—beginning with the distinction above of one large chain in Lampung Province, but including Ranau and probably Daya, which we could call LAMPUNG API. The Daya seem to relate more to the Lampung Pesisir groups south of them than to the Komering right beside them—though they do apare to have intelligibility in both. Thus Daya would probably be best grouped with the Lampung Api rather than as a part of the Komering dialect chain. A separate dialect chain called KOMERING would comprise the closely related speech varieties along the Komering River—all the Komering varieties, Kayu Agung Asli and Kayu Agung. Kayu Agung Asli should be included in the Komering dialect chain based upon historical-comparative and ethnic affinity ties to the Komering. However, the Kayu Agung people are more difficult to place in the Komering chain on the grounds of a lack of ethnic affinity. Ethnic affinity is a major criterion for grouping varieties together into languages, thus it may be necessary to consider Kayu Agung a separate language possibly originating in the eastern Lampungic cluster, with close ties now to Kayu Agung Asli due to a long period of proximity. In that case, it may be best to keep it as one language but label this chain 'Komering-Kayu Agung'; alternately, we could separate them out as two languages: 'Komering' with a dialect Kayu Agung Asli, and 'Kayu Agung'. In this approach Kayu Agung Asli would specifically need to be mentioned in order to avoid confusion with what is meant by the label 'Kayu Agung'. The final speech variety that is difficult to place is Jabung. It seems clear that Jabung is more comparable to the interior western Lampungic groups linguistically (Way Kanan, Sungkai and Pubian); the sociolinguistic analysis regarding Jabung is divided, however. The RA-RTT comprehension data and sociolinguistic questionnaires point to Jabung's much greater ability to understand Lampung Nyo speech. However, the interviews also reveal that the Jabung people came from Way Kanan in interior western Lampung at some time in the past. Long contact with their present Nyo neighbor has made them more accustomed to Nyo speech than to the western Api speech. As far as classification as a separate language or as a dialect of one of the other groups, it may be best to list Jabung within the Lampung Api
cluster as a more distant variety which has incorporated many features found in the Lampung Nyo cluster. However, on the basis of the Jabung informants’ statements that they speak Lampung Jabung (as opposed to Nyo or Api), it could be argued that they are sufficiently different linguistically from both groups to warrant listing them as a separate language on language identity grounds. A display of this third option with three Lampungic languages may be seen in Map 6. This constitutes our recommendations to the Ethnologue editors for redrawing the map of the Lampungic cluster languages and adjacent languages. Language boundaries shown below for other languages outside the Lampungic cluster are simply taken from the existing Ethnologue mapping data. Discussion of the language boundaries for those languages is beyond the scope of this paper.

This survey also included an investigation of the Haji/Aji people of South Sumatra Province, listed in Gordon (2005:436) as a dialect of Malay. Anderbeck (2005) uses the comparative method to determine the origin of lexical stock and phonological innovations and retentions in Haji, concluding that Haji originated from a Malay parent language but has since borrowed significantly from Lampungic. Anderbeck (2005) thus argues that Haji should be listed as a separate language. The locations of the Haji language are shown in Map 6.

### 7.3. Call for further research

Further research into intelligibility is necessary within the western Lampungic chain. The varieties within South Sumatra Province were not included in the RA-RTT testing, thus no direct testing of their comprehension of each other or of varieties in Lampung Province has yet been carried out. Also, there were some quality problems with the text used in the RA-RTT recording, which may or may not have affected comprehension of the RA-RTT text. It would be desirable to test intelligibility of other speech varieties within the western Lampungic chain, as well. Within the eastern Lampungic cluster research should be done to determine whether there is reciprocal intelligibility of the other speech varieties, as only Menggala was used in the RA-RTT testing.

A better understanding of how the setting, question ordering and methodology of administering sociolinguistic questionnaires affects responses would potentially allow us and other researchers to enhance our ability to obtain good, emic responses from local participants. Minimizing the effect of the instrument while at the same time obtaining useful information must be pursued further.

Language mapping in Sumatra and elsewhere should be considered critically in terms of how best to represent the language inventory. Finding a balance between a useful way to display languages on a map and accurately representing current sociolinguistic realities presents an ongoing challenge. Further study into the possibilities and benefits of various ways of representing the linguistic and sociolinguistic diversity within Sumatra is necessary. Of particular concern is how best to map areas of heavy transmigration and areas where there is a significant mixing of ethnic groups in alternating villages.

As summarized in §2, some investigations into specific aspects of some of the Lampungic varieties have been conducted. Further investigation should be undertaken into aspects of the phonology, grammar, discourse, semantics, sociolinguistics and other domains among the varieties of Lampungic spoken in the two provinces.
Map 6. Proposed changes to *Ethnologue* map of the Lampungic cluster
Abbreviations

BI          BI Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia) RA-RTT Rapid Appraisal Recorded Text Test
BL          BL Lampung (Bahasa Lampung) RTT Recorded Text Test
Kom         Kom Komering PM Palembang Malay
Meng        Menggala (For research site codes, see Table 2)
LWC         LWC Language of Wider Communication
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