

From V-O-S to S-V-O Language?: A Diachronic Study on Word-order Typology of Minangkabaunese

Jufrizal¹, Lely Refnita²

¹English Department of FBS, Universitas Negeri Padang, Jl. Prof. Dr. Hamka, Padang, Indonesia

²English Department of FIB, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jl. Ir. Sutami No. 36, Surakarta, Indonesia

Keywords: grammatical construction, Minangkabaunese, word-order typology, markedness.

Abstract: Recent studies on grammatical typology of Minangkabaunese claim that: (i) the basic grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese have the S-V-O word-order with the variation V-O-S and O-S-V; (ii) the S-V-O word-order is the highest degree of acceptability for formal language and commonly used by young-educated speakers; (iii) the V-O-S word-order is acceptable in old-stylistic constructions and frequently used by native speakers in informal speech events; and (iii) the O-S-V word order, however, is assigned as the topicalization construction; it is not the basic clause construction, then. A question then rises up: how do the variations of the word-order come up? The answer for this basic question needs further typological analyses. Among the others, the diachronic studies are relevant to do in order that the progress and/or change of word-order typology can be argumentatively explored. This paper particularly discusses a preliminary-diachronic study on word-order typology of Minangkabaunese. The main questions answered in this paper is that “how does Minangkabaunese have S-V-O, V-S-O, and O-S-V word-order typology?” This study was a descriptive-qualitative one which was operationally conducted as a field research and in a library study. The data in the forms of clausal and syntactical (grammatical) constructions were collected through participant observation, semi-structural interview, distributing questionnaire, and having note-taking. The analysis results reveal that the S-V-O word-order is more basic in modern-formal Minangkabaunese, meanwhile the V-O-S word-order are natively preferred in old-stylistic constructions and in casual-informal speech events. It may be diachronically assumed that Minangkabaunese is in the evolutionary progress from V-O-S to S-V-O language; it was originally V-O-S language in nature, then it gradually becomes S-V-O in modern style.

1 INTRODUCTION

Languages are various in terms of forms, meanings, functions, and values although they have particular universal-shared characteristics to say as human languages. The studies on the diversity of languages and on the patterns of variation within this universe are the great interest of linguistic typologists (typologists for short). The studies on structural patterns naturally performed by the surface forms of human languages are both interesting and challenging in order to classify and to group thousands of existing languages cross-linguistically into certain classification of domains. Typologists argue that despite the differences among the languages in the world, there must be certain properties whereby the languages of the world are all recognized as falling into human language category; there must be an underlying unity to human languages in nature. In

addition to synchronic studies of language phenomena, typologists have been trying to enlarge the scope of typological studies into diachronic ones as the part of linguistic awareness and studies on the phenomena of language changes along with the history of human race.

As the socio-cultural phenomena, human languages are not static; they “live” and are all dynamic as human beings are. Languages appear, develop, and change all time in systematic and natural ways as the reflections of human development in the world. Anderson (in Thomsen (ed.), 2006:65) clarifies that in the synchronic perspective, on the historical level, the ‘language’ that changes is a ‘practice of speaking’, meanwhile in the diachronic perspective, and the ‘language’ is a ‘tradition of speaking’. The historical dimension of both practices and traditions is obvious and undeniable. Clearly, every living language serves as a tool of

communication in the present, and at the same time it is of course a product of history. The speakers of one particular language have both expectations of contemporary usage and memories of past usage. Thus, the studies of language typology need to be addressed to the historical-comparative aspects of languages as well in order to have valuable data and information concerning with the nature of language itself. This type of studies accommodates the idea of diachronic-comparative linguistics which is common in Historical-Comparative Linguistics.

In relation to the ideas above, Song (2001:298) mentions that the possibility of extending linguistic typology to historical linguistics had been explored or entertained as evident in the earlier works practically executed by Greenberg (1957) and Jacobson (1958). He adds that the synchronic typologically derived universal should not be violated in linguistic reconstruction. Ideally speaking, languages should belong to one of the occurring types within specific typologies or groups. Language universals are deemed to function as constraints on language types. This in turn has significant implications for linguistic reconstruction just as do implicational universals. Languages can only naturally change from one occurring type into another occurring types; language can never change either from or into a non-occurring types. Thus, what is possible in human languages will not arise out of what is possible in human languages. This suggests that the constraints that synchronic typology places on language types can also be linguistically interpreted as 'constraints on typological change among occurring types within specific typologies. This dynamic view of synchronic typology can be terminologically referred to as the *dynamization* of typology.

The idea to have both synchronic and diachronic studies in Linguistic Typology and Language Universals is also proposed by Comrie (1989). According to him, the similarities between two or more languages are possibly caused by four reasons. Firstly, they could be due to the chance. Secondly, they could stem from the fact that the languages are genetically related and have inherited the common property from their common ancestor. Thirdly, the languages could be in areal contact; in this sense, one language could have borrowed the property from the other, or they could have borrowed from the other-close language, either directly or through mediation of yet other languages. Lastly, the property could be a language universal, either absolute or a tendency. Even though these four factors are still debatable and need clarification in Historical-Comparative Linguistics, they are sufficiently reasonable and

logically acceptable. It can be stated that the diachronic studies on particular aspects of grammatical features of languages in the framework of Linguistic Typology are certainly relevant to do as the awareness and as a particular "view point" of historical aspects of language and language change.

The studies on Linguistic Typology under diachronic perspectives have been conducted in many areas of grammar by linguists, especially by typologists. Greenberg (1957) who studied the implicational correlation of word-order and Jacobson (1958) who studied the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European stop system can be assigned as the examples of diachronic-historical studies in Linguistic Typology (see Song, 2001). Then, Yiu (2014) studied the typology of word-order in Chinese dialects. The study focused on revisiting the classification of *Min** in the comparative analysis. This is one of the recent studies which used diachronic perspectives in comparative framework that can be consulted to have other form of studies of diachronic perspectives of word-order typology. Thepkanjana & Uehara (2015) is another form of studies dealing with word-order typology. They studied effects of constituent orders on functional patterns of the verbs for 'give'. It was a kind of contrastive study of Thai and Mandarin Chinese. The study used comparative perspective and the analysis focused on the extension patterns of the verbs for lexicon with the meaning 'give'. This study again gives information on diachronic-comparative analysis of word-order typology of language for certain function of language.

The studies on word-order typology of local languages in Indonesia, especially those which belong to Malay family, by means of diachronic studies have not been becoming the serious interest yet. Basaria (2011), for instance, studied the grammatical relations and semantic roles of *Bahasa Pakpak-Dairi* in her dissertation. One part of the dissertation discusses the word-order typology of the local language, but the discussion was still in synchronic analysis. Then, Tambusai (2016) conducted a research on morphological typology and argument structure of *Malay Riau*. He, in one part of his dissertation, talks about word-order typology of *Malay Riau*. In addition, Siwi (2018) studied the syntax of Siladang Language in the framework of grammatical typology. However, Tambusai and Siwi did not use the diachronic ways to determine the word-order typology of the local languages they studied. In the previous typological researches toward Minangkabau (see further Jufriзал, 2004; Jufriзал et.al., 2013, 2014; Jufriзал et.al., 2016, 2017), the

word-order typology of Minangkabaunese became parts of analysis and discussion. The basic clause constructions, underlying and derived forms of grammatical constructions were the bases for assigning and determining the word-order typology of Minangkabaunese. However, the analyses and discussion were still mostly in synchronic ones. In some parts of the previous studies, the diachronic-comparative analyses were still the suggestion for further studies. Therefore, the diachronic study on Minangkabaunese word-order typology is essentially necessary in order to explore and to describe the phenomena of word-order patterns of basic clause construction in the local language.

It has been already claimed based on the recent studies on grammatical typology of Minangkabaunese that the local language has the following grammatical properties dealing with word-order typology:

- (i) the basic grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese have the S-V-O word-order with the variation V-O-S and O-S-V;
- (ii) the S-V-O word-order is the highest degree of acceptability for formal language and commonly used by young-educated speakers;
- (iii) the V-O-S word-order is acceptable in old-stylistic constructions and frequently used by native speakers in informal speech events; and
- (iv) the O-S-V word order, however, is assigned as the constructions of topicalization; thus, this pattern of word-order typology is not determined as the basic clause construction.

Related to the variations of word-order typology of Minangkabaunese, a basic question then rises up: how do the variations of the word-order come up? As mentioned above, the data analysis of the previous studies were still on synchronic ways. Therefore, the answer for this question needs further typological analyses on the forms and variations of word-order in the local language. In addition to synchronic analysis, the diachronic studies are relevant to do in order that the progress and/or change of word-order typology can be argumentatively explored. This paper, which is further developed from a part of the result of linguistic research conducted in 2019, specifically discusses a preliminary-diachronic study on word-order typology of Minangkabaunese. The main questions answered as the basis of typological analysis and discussion in this paper is that how does Minangkabaunese have S-V-O, V-S-O, and O-S-V

word-order typology? The typological analysis and discussion exposed in this paper are assumed to have significant ideas and contributions to the studies on Minangkabaunese word-order typology and for relevant studies of human languages, as well.

Cross-linguistic studies in grammatical typology claim that there are six patterns of word-orders (or constituent orders) of basic clause construction in natural languages. It is theoretically supposed that all of the word-order patterns serve as the basic constituent order for at least one particular human language found in the world. The followings data are adopted from Whaley (1997) showing the possible patterns of word-order typology based on basic clause constructions of human languages.

S – O – V (Japanese):

Taro ga inu o mita
Taro Sub dog Obj saw
'Taro saw the dog'

S – V – O (Kinyarwanda of Rwanda):

Umugore arasoma igitabo
woman 3S-read book
'The woman is reading a book'

V – S – O (Biblical Hebrew):

Bara Elohim et ha-shamayim
created God Obj ART-heaven
'God created the heavens'

V – O – S (Malagasy):

Manasa lamba amin'ny savony ny lehilahy
washes clothes with- the soap the man
'The man washes clothes with the soap'

O – V – S (Hixkaryana of Brazil):

Toto yahosiye kamara
man it-grabbed-him jaguar
'The jaguar grabbed the man'

O – S – V (Urubu of Brazil):

pako xua u'u
banana John he-ate
'John ate banana'

The basic word-order typology in one language is firstly determined by the highest percentage of "acceptability" of grammatical constructions. Of course, this is the result of intensive typological studies based great amount of relevant data. Even though constituent word-order typology has proved to be a powerful and basic line of researches in answering the question "what is a language?", there

are still some other basic issues that have been raised and argued. A question such as: “does one language have rigid word-order typology?” can be regarded as one basic-important question to explore the “degree” of acceptability and flexibility possessed by grammatical constructions found in one given language (see among the other Whaley, 1997). Whaley also states that almost all languages have more than one way to order S(ubject), V(erb), and O(bject) as the basic clause constructions. In languages with fairly (and/or rather) rigid constituent order, for instance, certain variations of S-V-O patterns are clearly employed for specific functions in constructing a discourse (or a text) in verbal communication. In English, for instance, when O-S-V (as “beans, I like”) appears, it is probably clear that this constituent-order should not be accepted as basic order to the language because it is only used in very specific-restricted contexts of language uses. For many languages, however, two (or more) constituent (word) orders may occur in rather high frequency in practical uses and they do not seem to have any unique or specific discourse function in certain speech events. In accordance with the ideas, how linguists decide the basic word order in one language becomes a “critical question” to be answered, then. Some linguists have argued that in classifying and assigning languages according to basic their word-order, a category to be used should exist for languages that do not have a basic constituent order at all. In this case, however, that one language is in the progress of shift or change from one pattern of word-order to another pattern can be an alternative-linguistic analysis for problem solving. This is a type of diachronic-comparative studies applied to linguistic typology as it is presented in this present paper.

Related to the ‘split’ order of constituents in basic clause constructions of human languages, what Whaley (1997:97 – 98) states can be the basis for argumentation and analysis. Accordingly, the primary split in language types is rooted in whether the constituent or word-order is primarily sensitive to and highly influenced by pragmatic considerations (it may be said as flexible-order) or syntactic considerations (or fixed order). Therefore, the linguist, especially typologist, does not need to impose a rigid constituent (word)-order classification on a language that does not manifest any obvious and certain rules for the linear arrangement of clausal-grammatical units as the formal grammatical constructions. Even in many languages in which multiple or free orders for constituent arise, it is still necessary and often possible to determine a basic order by using several diagnostic in the studies of

grammatical typology. Therefore, the label “flexible order” must be reserved for cases in which two or more patterns appear where it is not always possible to make a principled determination of what is the basic one among the others.

Referring to the ideas delivered by typologists (see Whaley, 1997; Comrie, 1989), the basic word-order in sentential level can be assigned based on syntactic construction and/or its pragmatic consideration. In one language with “high” pragmatic constraint in the level of clause (grammatical) constructions, the “values” of acceptability of the grammatical constructions cannot be only based on the syntactical structures and rules. The consideration and focus of attention should be given and be related to the pragmatic functions involved in the constructions. Naturally, it is mostly found in the languages with “high” pragmatic constraints in which the basic word-order typology can be more than one pattern. In local languages, which belong to Malay language family, pragmatic functions and values tend to be dominant in certain types grammatical constructions. As the result, the variation and the “degree” of acceptability of the each grammatical construction may be more flexible and in scales. In addition, it is also natural and possible that the word order typology of one language tends to change and the consequences of evolutionary processed happened to languages (see further Moravcsik, 2013:201 – 206; and also Comrie, 1989; Dixon, 1994; Song, 2001). In accordance with the ideas, the diachronic-comparative analysis, as it is used in this paper, is highly helpful.

2 METHODS

This study was originally a descriptive-qualitative research in linguistics which was operationally conducted in 2019. More specifically, this research was a field research whis was mainly supported by a library study. Mainly, this research was observationally executed in the main land of West-Sumatera in which the native speakers of Minangkabaunese originally live and socio-culturally develop. As the supporting method, the library study was in the form of documents studies and manuscripts quotation. The data were the various forms of clause-syntactical constructions categorized and determined as the formal-grammatical constructions. Practically, the data collection was practically operated as the participant observation, depth-interview, note taking, administrating questionnaires, and quoting data from written manuscripts. The instruments of the research

were field-notes, observation sheets, interview guide, recording equipments, questionnaire sheets, and writing equipments. The native speakers of Minangkabaunese who were intentionally selected as informants and respondents and the manuscripts written in Minangkabaunese in the forms of written folk-stories, newspapers, and magazines were the sources of data. Then, because the researchers are all the native speakers of Minangkabaunese, they also functioned as the sources of data. The intuitive data, however, were always systematically cross-checked and seriously consulted to the selected informants in order to get data validity and reliability. The data obtained then were orthographically transcribed and then grammatically classified into clausal-syntactical categories to decide whether the data were appropriate, sufficient, and ready to analyze. The data were systematically analyzed by using the relevant theories of word order typology frequently applied in grammatical typology, and supported by the framework of diachronic perspectives and principles. The results of analysis are argumentatively described in formal and in informal ways commonly used in linguistics.

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

There have been some studies on the phenomena of word-order typology of the Minangkabaunese language (beginning from Jufrizal, 2004; and continued by Jufrizal et.al., 2006; Jufrizal et.al., 2013, 2014; Jufrizal et.al., 2016, 2017). The previous synchronic analyses applied in the previous studies claim that there are three patterns of constituent orders of formal-grammatical constructions at syntactical level of Minangkabaunese. Three patterns of word-order of clause construction in the local language are: (i) S-V-O; (ii) V-O-S; and (iii) O-S-V. The followings are the examples of formal-grammatical constructions which indicates that Minangkabaunese belongs to S-V-O languages.

- (1) *Inyo ma- ulang carito lamo sudah itu.*
PRO3SG ACT-repeat history old after that
'He repeated old news after that'
- (2) *Kami alah ma- makai caro lamo tu di siko.*
PRO1PL PERF ACT-use ways old ART in here
'We had used the old ways here'
- (3) *Urang tu ka mam-bali tanah dakek musajik.*
Man ART FUT ACT-buy earth near mosque
'The man will buy the earth near the mosque'

- (4) *Acok bana paja tu man- cari ilik-ilik*
Frequently small boy ART ACT-look for tricks
di nagari ko.
in country this
'The small boy frequently looked for tricks in
this country'

Each clause above is morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* to indicate the active voice of the nominative-accusative constructions. The clause constructions as seen in (1) – (4) are the first type of basic grammatical constructions which have S-V-O word-order. This pattern of word-order is the highest degree of acceptability mentioned by native speakers and based on written data, where *inyo*, *kami*, *urang tu*, and *paja tu* are the S(subjects); *ma-ulang*, *ma-makai*, *mam-bali*, and *man-cari* are the V(erbs); while *carito lamo*, *caro lamo*, *tanah*, and *ilik-ilik* are O(bjects) in each relevant clause.

This is the word order of clauses which have been claimed as the the basic clause of Minangkabaunese. In this type of clause construction, the grammatical meanings and other formal-natural senses of meanings are formally packaged and easily understood by the native speakers. Most young speakers and educated people of Minangkabaunese agree and decide that the S-V-O constructions as seen (1) – (4) above are highly common and in the highest frequency of uses based on respondents of the research. Those types of clauses are the unmarked constructions in nature seen from markedness theory. Typological testing toward such constructions indicates that the nominative-accusative constructions with S-V-O word-order can be assigned as the basic-clause construction. That is one primary reason to state that Minangkabaunese is one of accusative language at syntactic level. Then, it can be stated as well that the grammatical meanings conveyed in the clause construction with S-V-O word order is less indicative, neutral, and high-formal (see also Jufrizal et.al., 2016; Jufrizal, 2018). This type of grammatical constructions mostly appears and commonly used in formal situation of speech events, in educational-normative expressions, and in having neutral positions for delivering certain information and/or messages. Therefore, the S-V-O word-order is mostly preferred by young speakers and educated people of Minangkabaunese in daily life communication.

In addition to S-V-O word-order, Minangkabaunese also has the type of grammatical constructions with the pattern of word-order as VOS. The following data are the examples of clause construction in Minangkabaunese which can be also

assigned as a basic-clause construction due to its high frequency in uses as the casual speech.

- (5) *Man- jua tanah waang baliak taun lalu yo.*
ACT-sell land PRO2SG again year last PART
'You sold the land again last year, right'
- (6) *Ba- tuka oto ang sajak kajadian itu yo.*
ERG-change car POS2SG since event ART PART
'You changed your car since the event'
- (7) *Man- angkek tuah urang tu agaknyo.*
ACT-promote prestige man ART probably
'That man probably promotes his prestige'
- (8) *Ma- niru corak nan adoh kito eloknyo.*
ACT imitate pattern REL existing PRO2PL better
'We ought to imitate the existing pattern'
- (9) *Ma- ukia angan-angan sajo kito ruponyo.*
ACT-draw imagination only PRO2PL probably
'We only probably draw the high imagination'

The V-O-S clause constructions as in (5) – (9) above are also grammatically accepted and commonly used by Minangkabaunese in daily communication as the casual speech and in traditional-stylistic uses. Compared to clauses with S-V-O word order, the clauses with V-O-S word-order are dominantly found in folk-stories and in oral expressions of cultural-stylistic style. The data (7), (8), and (9) are the examples of cultural-stylistic uses in traditional contexts. The native speakers of Minangkabaunese intuitively understand that the meanings brought by such clauses have stylistic senses in nature. In some typological studies toward local languages of Malay family and in Austronesia, it is claimed that the V-O-S is the basic word-order typology. Malagasy (see Whaley, 1997; Dryer in Shopen (ed.), 2007), bahasa Pakpak-Dairi (Basaria, 2016); bahasa Siladang (Siwi, 2018) are the examples of Malay-Austronesia languages with V-O-S word-order typology.

As the clauses with V-O-S word-order are frequently used in the sense of stylistic and casual uses in daily communication as the casual speech, this type of clauses can be grammatically assigned as another form of the basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese. Thus, there are two basic clause constructions in Minangkabaunese, namely those with S-V-O and V-O-S word order. Is it right to claim that Minangkabaunese belongs to language with two basic clause constructions as they can be formulated as S-V-O and V-O-S? How does Minangkabaunese have S-V-O and V-O-S word-order of basic clause? Synchronic analyses on the two types of word-order

typology of Minangkabaunese may answer the first question as yes based on two main reasons. Firstly, the two patterns of word-order are found and used by the native speakers in balance frequency although the respondents' answers to questionnaires distributed in this study (and also in previous ones) told that the frequency of S-V-O is higher than V-O-S. Secondly, the nominative-accusative constructions with S-V-O word-order bring about higher formal meanings than V-O-S and the S-V-O constructions are mostly preferred by younger-educated speakers of this language. Based on the facts, it may be also reasonable to state that S-V-O is more basic than V-O-S in modern Minangkabaunese (see also Jufrizal, 2018a; Jufrizal, 2018b).

The answer based on synchronic analyses as stated above can be typologically agreed because some languages with high pragmatic constraints are possible to have more than one basic clause construction (see further Comrie, 1989; Whaley, 1997; Song, 2001). The answer for second question, how does Minangkabaunese have S-V-O and V-O-S word-order of basic clause? (and this is the main question to be answered in this present paper, in fact) cannot only be stated as it is synchronically described above. The diachronic-comparative study and analysis are assumed to be further needed and helpful in this case. Let's simply compare and see the historical background of the dominant uses of clauses with S-V-O and V-O-S in Minangkabaunese. Based on the data and related linguistic information gained in the last research, including the previous ones, the S-V-O constructions in Minangkabaunese are dominantly found and frequently used in formal ways of communication in current era by younger-educated speakers. In addition, such constructions convey neutral-formal meanings as they are naturally used in formal speech events both in oral and written uses. In other side, the grammatical constructions in V-O-S word-order are easily found in old-manuscripts and in stylistic-cultural speech events of communication even though today it may appear in casual-daily communication events. It means that the V-O-S clauses are common in stylistic-casual speech of daily communication; the senses of stylistic and cultural meanings are conveyed by this type of clause constructions. The data and related information collected indicate as well that the V-O-S constructions are preferred by old speakers in having humanistic advices. In addition, it is assumed that they were highly common in practical uses of old Minangkabaunese and in cultural-stylistic speech.

The following data were quoted from old-stylistic manuscripts (classic folk stories, kingdom laws,

classic drama transcriptions) indicating that V-O-S were highly common in old-classical and stylistic Minangkabaunese.

- (10) *Ma- nitah rajo kutiko itu.*
ACT-declare king time that
'The king declared at that time'
- (11) *Ma- nadah jamba puti tu kini.*
ACT-serve meal nice-girl ART now
'The nice girl is now serving the meal'
- (12) *Ma- urai kusuik kito nan elok.*
ACT-solve problem PRO2PL REL good
'We better solve the problems'
- (13) *Di- karang janji untuk basamo.*
PAS-construct promise for all
'The promises were constructed for all (people)'
- (14) *Ba- baliak pulang Malin dauu.*
ERG-back home name firstly
'Malin immediately went home back'

Based on the diachronic-comparative analysis above, there are three main remarks argued, namely:

- (i) It can be claimed that the "original" word-order typology of Minangkabaunese was V-O-S. It can be correlated to the cases of Malagasy, Pakpak-Dairi, Batak Toba, and Siladang languages, the languages with V-O-S word-order typology.
- (ii) That Minangkabaunese has S-V-O word-order typology is the result and logical consequence of language evolution motivated by language contact, the shift and change of socio-cultural values in its speech community, and globalization era.
- (iii) Modern Minangkabaunese is in the progress of the shift (and tends to change) from a V-O-S language in word-order typology to S-V-O language.

In relation to these diachronic-comparative remarks, it is reasonable to say that language evolution, language contact, and socio-cultural changes of its speakers lead Minangkabaunese has two patterns of word-order typology; V-O-S is supposed as the classical-original word-order and S-V-O as the developing-modern one. Therefore, there two reasonable patterns of word-order typology of modern Minangkabaunese, namely: S-V-O and V-O-S. The S-V-O word-order can be assigned as the basic word-order typology under the influence of modern-immigrant languages, while the V-O-S originally comes from the old-classical word-order of

Austronesian and Malay family languages. Diachronically, the result of study presented in this paper tells that Minangkabaunese can be assumed as a language which is in the progress of shifting (and tends to change) from V-O-S to S-V-O language, the main characteristic of word order typology of high degree of nominative-accusative languages, such as English.

Another pattern of constituent order of grammatical clause constructions in Minangkabaunese is O-S-V, as in the following data (see also the related data in Jufrizal, 2018).

- (15) *Ujuang jalan kami cari; kato sapatah kami bari.*
end road PRO1PL seek; word one PRO1PL give
'We (try) to seek the end of road; we (need) to give a message'
- (16) *Aturan nan ado kito ikut- i.*
regulation REL available PRO1PL follow-APL
'We always follow the available regulation'
- (17) *Janji lamo inyo suruak-an.*
commitment old PRO3SG hide- APL
'He hides the old commitment'
- (18) *Ari rayo kito nanti juo.*
holiday PRO2PL wait for also
'We are also waiting for the holiday'

The grammatical-typological analyses and test toward the O-S-V constructions (as 15 – 18) above, however, cannot be assigned as the basic clause constructions; they are actually the topicalization constructions. In accordance with the fact, it has been already clarified in recent working papers (see Jufrizal, 2018a; Jufrizal, 2018b) that O-S-V is not one variation of basic word-order typology in Minangkabaunese. Such grammatical constructions are the clauses with high influence of pragmatic functions at syntactic level.

4 CONCLUSIONS

That Minangkabaunese has two patterns of word-order typology cannot be assigned and argued only based on synchronic study. The synchronic analyses on word-order typology of Minangkabaunese remain further questions to be further answered. How Minangkabaunese has both V-O-S and S-V-O word-order typology is one of essential questions which need diachronic studies. Based on the diachronic analysis, it seems that Minangkabaunese was

originally a V-O-S language, and due to the factors of historical development, language evolution, language contact, and the changes of socio-cultural values of its speech community, it shifts to be a S-V-O language in modern style. Therefore, the modern Minangkabauese tends to have S-V-O word-order typology, but for certain purposes of cultural-stylistic communication and casual-humanistic interaction, the native speakers still tend to have and use the V-O-S clause constructions. It may be also claimed that the S-V-O (the nominative-accusative construction) is the basic word-order of Minangkabauese which is simply influenced by modern-immigrant languages, especially English as a “high” nominative-accusative language with S-V-O word-order typology. This preliminary-diachronic study on the word order typology of Minangkabauese welcomes scientific questions and criticisms in order that all irrelevant and problematic ways of analyses, constructing the items of claims, and drawing conclusion can be well revised, then.

REFERENCES

- Basaria, I. 2011. ‘Relasi dan peran gramatikal bahasa Pakpak-Dairi: Kajian tipologi’ (unpublished dissertation). Medan: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Comrie, B. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jufrizal. 2004. “Struktur argumen dan aliansi gramatikal bahasa Minangkabau” (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Denpasar: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana.
- Jufrizal., Zaim, M., & Ardi, H. 2013, 2014. “Bahasa dan budaya Minangkabau: Dari tipologi gramatikal ke budaya berbahasa penuturnya” (unpublished research reports). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Jufrizal., Amri. Z., Ardi, H. 2016, 2017. “Kemasan makna gramatikal dan makna sosial-budaya bahasa Minangkabau: Penyelidikan atas tatamakna dan fungsi komunikatifnya” (unpublished research reports). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Jufrizal. 2018a. ‘Word-order typology of Minangkabauese: variation and degree of its acceptability’ (a paper presented at International Seminar of KOLITA-17; 10-12 April, 2018). Jakarta: PKBB Unika Atma Jaya.
- Jufrizal. 2018b. ‘Grammatical meanings of clauses with different word-orders in Minangkabauese’ (a paper presented at KIMLI-2018). Manokwari: MLI and Universitas Papua.
- Moravcsik, E. A. 2013. *Introducing language typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shopen, T. 2007. *Language typology and syntactic description: Volume I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siwi, P. 2018. ‘Sintaksis bahasa Siladang: kajian tipologi gramatikal’ (unpublished dissertation). Medan: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Sumatera Utara
- Song, J. J. 2001. *Linguistic typology: morphology and syntax*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tambusai, A. 2016. ‘Tipologi morfologis and struktur argumen bahasa Melayu Riau’ (unpublished dissertation). Medan: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Thepkanjana, K., & Uehara, S. 2015. ‘Effects of constituent orders on functional extension patterns of the verbs for ‘give’: A contrastive study of Thai and Mandarin Chinese’ in *Language and Linguistics*. lin.sagepub.com
- Thomsen, O. N. (ed.). 2006. *Competing models of linguistic change: Evolution and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Whaley, L. J. 1997. *Introduction to typology: The unity and diversity of language*. London: Sage Publication.
- Yiu, C. Yuk-man. 2014. ‘Typology of word order in Chinese dialects: Revisiting the classification of Min*’ in *language and linguistics*. lin.sagepub.com.