



Markedness in Word-Order Typology of Minangkabaunese

Jufrizal¹, Lely Refnita², M. Affandi Arianto³

^{1,3}Universitas Negeri Padang

²Universitas Bung Hatta

Corresponding e-mail: juf_ely@fbs.unp.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The typological analyses on word-order typology of Minangkabaunese have been becoming topics of typological studies in some aspects, but those which are based on the markedness theory are still limited. Therefore, the analysis on markedness values of word-order typology of Minangkabaunese is linguistically meaningful. This article, as the development and further discussion of a part of the results of a research conducted in 2020/2021, analyzes and discusses the markedness values of word-order typology of Minangkabaunese. There are two questions to be answered in this paper: (i) *what are the word-word order typology of Minangkabaunese?*; and (ii) *what is the markedness value of each word-order typology of Minangkabaunese?* The data analysis and discussion are based on the related theories of word-order typology and markedness developed and used in Grammatical Typology. The data presented in this paper are the clause constructions which were collected by means of a descriptive-qualitative research and practically executed as of a field research in West-Sumatera and supported by a library study. The result of data analysis reveals that there are three productive patterns of grammatical constructions in Minangkabaunese identified as SVO, VOS, and OSV. However, there are only two patterns of the three grammatical-clause constructions that can be assigned as the basic word-order typology in this local language, namely: SVO and VOS. Therefore, the basic clause constructions with SVO and VOS word-order are unmarked meanwhile those with OSV word-order are marked ones. Furthermore, the markedness value of SVO is higher than that of VOS. In hierarchy, the markedness value of the three productive grammatical constructions in Minangkabaunese can be formulated as: SVO < VOS < OSV. This grammatical-typological analysis contributes to the more specific description of grammatical properties of Minangkabaunese as one of main local languages in Indonesia.

Keywords: *grammatical-typology, markedness, marked, unmarked, Minangkabaunese*

First Receive:

08 November 2022

Revised:

01 December 2022

Accepted:

02 January 2023

Final Proof Received:

18 February 2023

Published:

1 March 2023

How to cite (in APA style):

Jufrizal., Refnita, L., & Arianto, M. A.(2023). Markedness in Word-Order Typology of Minangkabaunese. *ELITE Journal*, 5(1), 17-32.

INTRODUCTION

The study of word-order typology is one of primary-traditional studies dealing with grammatical constructions in the level of phrase or clause which are linguistically assigned as the basic ones. Since a long time, typologists are highly motivated to know and to explore the natural ways of arranging smaller linguistic units into bigger ones cross-linguistically. Dealing with the word-order at clause level, the speakers of English, for instance, commonly assume that the normal way of constructing a sentence is to place the

subject of the sentence first, then the verb, and then the direct object (if there is one). In English, therefore, the sentence *Mary saw John*, which follows this order, indicates *a well formed* and *an unmarked construction*, meanwhile the variations like *John Mary saw* and *saw Mary John* are not basic; they are additional constructions or the *marked ones* (see Finegan, 2004:234; Croft, 1993; Dixon, 2010). It means that even though the native speakers of English, in this case, may vary the ways of arranging the words into clause constructions, but intuitively they do agree that one construction is more natural than others. This is the basic rule used by typologists to determine the basic word order typology of one particular language and to assign its markedness value(s).

In relation to cross-linguistic data and studies on word order typology, the normal word-order in a basic sentence or clause of human languages may differ considerably from one language to other language. Typologists, in this case, summarize that there are six possible logically orders of words (constituents) of clauses in human languages, and all of them have been claimed to serve as the basic constituent order for at least one language in the world. The followings are the six patterns of possible basic word-order typology of human languages in the world argued by typologists (see Whaley, 1997:81 – 82; Finegan, 2004:234 – 236).

S – O – V	: <i>Taro ga inu o mita</i> Taro Sub dog Obj saw 'Taro saw the dog'	(Japanese)
S – V – O	: <i>Umugore arasoma igitabo</i> woman 3S-read book 'The woman is reading a book'	(Kinyarwanda, Rwanda)
V – S – O	: <i>Bara Elohim et ha- shamayim</i> created God Obj ART-heaven 'God created the heavens'	(Biblical Hebrew)
V – O – S	: <i>Manasa lamba amin-'ny savony ny lehilahy</i> washes clothes with- the soap the man 'The man washes clothes with the soap'	(Malagasy)
O – V – S	: <i>Toto yabosiye kamara</i> man it-grabbed-him jaguar 'The jaguar grabbed the man'	(Hixkaryana, Brazil)
O – S – V	: <i>pako xua u'u</i> banana John he-ate 'John ate banana'	(Urubu, Brazil)

The examples of languages and their basic-grammatical constructions presented above are linguistically assumed as the typical and basic ones. In other side, there should be possibility in each language to vary the constituents (words) of clause to package the intended meanings contextually communicated by the speakers in communication. This is also the case to know that to determine and to assign the basic word order typology at the syntactical level of one language is not relatively easy. It needs typological-grammatical analyses toward a lot of related data and involving sense of language, as well. In grammatical-typological view, in other side, Comrie (1989) confirms that the order of

constituents of the clause is one of the most important word order typological parameters. In its original form, this parameter characterizes the relative order of subject, verb, and object, giving rise to six logically possible types above. Therefore, to study and to determine the order constituents of the basic clause construction in one language are linguistically needed to assign the word order typology of the language.

Recent grammatical-typological studies on Minangkabaunese, a local language which is originally spoken in the main land of West-Sumatera, (see Jufrizal, 2004; Jufrizal, 2012; Jufrizal et.al, 2016, 2017; Artawa and Jufrizal, 2018; Jufrizal, 2020; Artawa and Jufrizal, 2021; Jufrizal, 2022) include the analyses on its word order typology but still remain critical questions to have further analyses because the local language has more than one grammatical construction that can be assigned as a basic one based on frequency. Based on the previous studies, it has been already claimed that Minangkabunese has the following grammatical properties dealing with word-order typology of clause constructions.

- (i) the frequent pattern of grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese clauses appearing in verbal communication practices is SVO with the variation VOS and OSV;
- (ii) the SVO word-order is the highest frequency and the highest degree of acceptability in formal language and commonly used by young-educated speakers;
- (iii) the VOS word-order is also naturally acceptable in old-stylistic constructions and frequently used by native speakers in informal speech events; and
- (iv) the OSV word order, however, is grammatically proved as the construction of topicalization; the clause construction with OSV word-order is not the basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese.

Such summary of Minangkabaunese word order typology as mentioned above leads to further analyses on *how Minangkabaunese has SVO and VOS word-order at syntactic level and the degree of markedness value of those word-orders*. The answer to these simple questions, in fact, needs more related data and further analyses based on typological test of word-order and markedness analysis. Both typological test and markedness analysis are needed to determine and to assign the nature of word-order typology of Minangkabaunese. For many cases of studies, markedness has become a central concept in the studies of linguistics at linguistic schools along the 20th and 21st centuries. Markedness analysis can historically be traced back to the early developments of phonological theories held by some structuralists. However, according to Gaeta (2017), the markedness has acquired so many different meanings and uses during the course of the 20th century as its current usage is still debatable and in some applications are not clearly defined. In fact, the markedness analyses have been developed for other levels of language systems in some versions.

Originally, the markedness analysis had been developed and used for classical-phonological studies, but then, it has been simultaneously adopted and adapted by linguists in both structural and generative trends in rather different ways of its application. In general view, the concept of markedness still refers to the works firstly developed in the Prague School of linguistic theory. According to Croft (1993:64), the notion of *marked* and *unmarked* values of a category was firstly developed for phonological systems by Trubetzkoy (in 1931 and in 1969) and then it was firstly applied and used to morphosyntactic categories

and semantics by Jacobson (in 1932 and in 1984). Croft (1993) adds that the markedness theories applied in Linguistic Typology has been becoming an important tool for typologists in order to directly link the formal (structural) linguistic data and grammatical properties across languages in the world. The essential notion of markedness in typological studies deals with the fact of asymmetrical or unequal grammatical properties of otherwise linguistic elements such as inflections, words in word classes and even for syntactic constructions in the level syntax. Therefore, it is interested and challenged to see how the markedness analysis works well in further analysis of word-order typology across languages,

Markedness analysis has been mostly applied to differentiate the underlying constructions from those of derived or “additional” ones. Dixon (2010:235) believes that the notion of markedness can be useful in many linguistic description and explanation, so long as the markedness analysis is defined and applied carefully, and not overdone as some linguists do. Furthermore, Croft (1993:65) argues that markedness patterns can be used to account for phonological, morphological, and syntactic irregularities found in grammatical constructions of human languages in the world. According to him, one needs not succumb to the temptation to “regularize” the irregular grammatical patterns because it is assumed that the irregularities themselves are manifestations of regular typological patterns in other ways.

Croft (in Shibatani and Bynon (eds.), 1999) adds that typological markedness is a property of grammatical category such that it displays one or more of a cluster of formal-grammatical asymmetries cross-linguistically. The most important type of markedness criteria for typology fall under the behavioural markedness types which can be simply divided into three sub-types, namely: *the inflectional behavioural criterion*, *the distributional behavioural criterion*, and *cross-linguistic distribution*. Dominant word order (typology) is an example of the cross-linguistic distributional criterion. In relation to the ideas, Croft (in Shibatani and Bynon (eds.), 1999) further adds that the last criterion for markedness is frequency. The unmarked members will be more frequent (or in high frequency) than the marked members, both in practical uses (textual frequency) and in across-languages uses (cross-linguistic frequency).

For practical analysis, it is useful to follow what Dixon (2010:236 – 237) explains about markedness. According to him, the markedness in grammar applies most appropriately to closed systems, and there are two distinct varieties of it. These, in fact, sometimes obviously correlate and sometimes do not. Each variety may be applied to systems of any size (with two members, or with more than two members). In accordance with this, the two types of markedness values are probably involved into two types, **formal markedness** and **functional markedness**. The concept of *formal markedness* is that if a term in a system has *zero* realization, then it is formally unmarked. For example, singular within the [*singular, plural*] member system applying to count nouns in English. Singular has *zero* markedness realization in its form. Then, the *functional markedness* relates to the situation of use – the marked term(s) may be used each in a restricted, specifiable situation, meanwhile the unmarked term being employed in all other circumstances. In English, for instance, singular number is functionally as well as formally unmarked. ‘Plural’ must refer to a set of two or more referents, whereas ‘singular’ may refer to just one referent, but may also be used in a general sense when no number specification is intentionally made; for example (adopted from Dixon (2010): *The dog is the most companionable animal I know*.

In other side, Whaley (1997) (and see also Mallinson and Blake, 1981; Comrie, 1989; Dryer in Shopen (ed.), 2007; Song, 2001; Song (ed.), 2012; Song, 2018) states that even though (almost) all languages may vary the order of words (constituents) in clause constructions, but of course not all of them are considered as the basic ones. Certain typological “tests” are needed in order to determine or to assign the basic word order typology of the given language. The typological tests of determining and assigning the basic word order typology are *frequency*, *markedness*, and *pragmatically neutral contexts* test. In the case of *frequency test*, following Hawkins’, Whaley (1997:100) states that a good place to begin an analysis of basic constituent order is by choosing a text or texts and simply counting the number of occurrences of each constituent order type. In relation to this, it is also possible to choose transcripts of oral language by means of certain linguistic techniques in order to have basic clause constructions of the language being studied. But, in some cases frequent grammatical constructions appear do not mean they are the basic clause constructions from which basic word order typology is typologically derived. Whaley (1997:101) then clarifies several considerations to keep in mind when making text counts. First, not all parts of a text or the beginning of each major episode in a text frequently describe a setting and introduce characters. Therefore, when making text counts it is necessary to be aware of the discourse mechanisms that are employed to create a coherent text in the first place. Second, most frequent order may be different in different genres of text. Then, it should be noted that written text is linguistically rather different from spoken language which is written (spoken text).

The second typological test, *markedness*, is used to be sure whether a clause construction is basic or not. Whaley (1997:102) explains that the basic constituent order of a language typically occurs in utterances that have the least formal marking. Marked construction is that which need ‘extra’ or ‘added’ linguistic features to produce or to understand, meanwhile the unmarked construction is the one which has ‘natural’ linguistic features and pragmatically neutral contexts test, are to apply. The third way to determine basic word order typology is *pragmatically neutral contexts*. Whaley (1997: 104) mentions as well that a further consideration in making hypotheses about the basic constituent order of a language is the pragmatic function(s) of the clause being investigated. Sentences in which a speaker (or a writer) is highlighting a particular constituent are not good examples for basic constituent (word) patterns. Therefore, these three tests are intentionally applied in determining basic word typology of one particular language.

This article, which is further developed from a part of the results of a linguistic research conducted in 2020/2021, specifically discusses markedness values of word-order typology of Minangkabaunese at syntactic level. Two questions are to answer as the bases of typological analysis and discussion in this paper: (i) *what is the basic word order typology of clause constructions in Minangkabaunese?*; and (ii) *what the markedness value of word-order typology of Minangkabaunese?* It is believed that the typological analysis and discussion exposed in this article supply significant data and linguistic information dealing with the studies of word-order typology and for relevant studies of grammatical typology, as well.

METHOD

This study was a linguistic research constructed as a descriptive-qualitative research conducted in 2020/2021. It was operationally executed as a field research and supported by a library study. As a field research, the sample areas were fourteen main towns/regions of the main-land of West-Sumatera in which most native speakers of Minangkabaunese habitually and socio-culturally live. The data were in the forms of the clause constructions of Minangkabaunese which are assumed as the formal-grammatical ones and they are intuitively and linguistically assigned as the standard grammatical constructions. In the research execution, the data were simultaneously collected by the application of participant observation, depth-interview, administering questionnaires, and quoting/selecting data from written-related manuscripts and texts written in Minangkabaunese.

The instruments and tools of research were field-notes, observation sheets, recorders, interview guideline, and questionnaire sheets. The sources of spoken data were 28 informants and 280 respondents intentionally selected from native speakers with certain identities and criteria appropriately used in linguistic studies. The written data were taken from newspapers, magazines, and books written in Minangkabaunese. In case that the researchers are also the native speakers of Minangkabaunese, they were also possible to act as the sources of data, but the intuitive data were systematically cross-checked and consulted to the selected informants in order that the validity and reliability of data were linguistically obtained. The data gathered were classified into clausal-syntactical categories in order to decide whether the data were appropriate and ready to analyze. The data were linguistically analyzed based on the related theories of markedness and word order typology as described in previous section. The results of data analysis and discussion are argumentatively described in formal and informal ways commonly used in linguistics.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Word-Order Typology of Minangkabaunese

In the previous typological studies on Minangkabaunese (see Jufrizal, 2004; Jufrizal et.al., 2006; Jufrizal et.al., 2012; Jufrizal et.al., 2013, 2014; Jufrizal et.al., 2016, 2017; Jufrizal, 2022), it was found that there are three types (surface form) of grammatical constructions frequently appear in language use based on the patterns of constituent (word) order. The three types of grammatical constructions at clausal level are those with the patterns of word order as SVO, VOS, and OSV. See the following data!

- (1) *Gampo kareh ma- oyak kota Padang baliak.*
earth-quake hard ACT-destroy city Padang again
'Hard earth-quake destroyed Padang city again'
- (2) *Angin kencang ba- rambuih sajak malam tadi.*
wind fast ACT-blow since night last
'The storm blew since last night'
- (3) *Amak lah pai ka ladang sudah subuah cako.*
mother ASP go to garden after subuh just now
'Mother has gone to garden after subuh pray just now'
- (4) *Urang kampung ka mam-buek jalan baru sasudah rayo ko.*
people kampong FUT ACT-make road new after holiday this
'Villagers will make new road after this holiday'

In the examples above, each clause construction has SVO word-order in which *gampo kareh* (in (1)), *angin kancang* (in (2)), *amak* (in (3)), and *urang kampuang* (in (4)) are S(ubject). Meanwhile, *ma-oyak*, *ba-rambuih*, *pai*, and *mam-buek* are V(erb), and *kota Padang* (in (1)) and *jalan baru* (in (4)) are O(bject). This type of clause construction is commonly found in formal-academic speech events, mostly used by educated-young speakers, and it encodes indicative, non-figurative, and neutral meanings. This type of grammatical construction belongs to a nominative-accusative construction with active markers on the verbs morphologically.

The second type of clause constructions frequently found in Minangkabaunese is the clauses with VOS word order. Please pay attention to the following data!

- (5) *Mam- bali tanah urang cino tu di kampuang kito mah.*
 ACT- buy land man Chinese ART in kampong POS2PL PART
 ‘The Chinese bought the land in our kampong’
- (6) *Ba- rambuih angin kancang sajak malam tadi.*
 ACT-blow wind fast since night last
 ‘The storm has been blowing since last night’
- (7) *Mam- baka sarok uni sabalun magrib.*
 ACT-burn rubbish elder sister before sun-set
 ‘Elder brother burned rubbish before sun-set’
- (8) *Ma- ningga-an kampuang inyo jo ibo ati.*
 ACT-leave- APL kampong PRO3SG with sad heart
 ‘He left his kampong sadly’
- (9) *Ma- ubah janji urang tu mungkin.*
 ACT-change agreement man ART probably
 ‘The man probably changed the agreement’

The clause constructions with VOS word-order as in (5) – (9) are also common and frequently used in Minangkabaunese. The phrase *mam-bali* ‘to buy’, *ba-rambuih* ‘to blow’, *mam-baka* ‘to burn’, *ma-ningga-an* ‘to leave’, *ma-ubah* ‘to change’ (in (5) – (9)) are V at initial position. Then, *tanah* ‘land’ (in (5)), *sarok* ‘rubbish’ (in (7)), *kampuang* ‘kampong’ (in (8)) and *janji* ‘agreement’ (in (9)) are V of each related clause. Meanwhile, *urang cino* ‘chinese’, *angin* ‘wind’, *uni* ‘elder sister’, *inyo* ‘he/she’, *urang tu* ‘the man’ in each clause are S. Such type of grammatical construction is also reasonable to assign as a basic clause construction in the local language.

The third type of Minangkabaunese clause construction which is also productive and frequently used in verbal communication is the clause with OSV word order. The following data are the examples of such pattern of word (constituent) order.

- (10) *Aia lah kami minum; nasi lah kami makan.*
 water ASP PRO1PL drink; rice ASP PRO1PL eat
 ‘We have just drunk the water; we have just eaten the rice’
- (11) *Aturan kito patuh- i basamo.*
 regulation PRO1PL follow-APL together
 ‘We follow the regulation together’

- (12) *Utang lamo alah inyo baia.*
 debt old ASP PRO3SG pay
 'He has paid the old debt'
- (13) *Ganti rugi tanah ko alun kami tarimo lai.*
 compensation land ART ASP PRO1PL receive yet
 'We have not received the land compensation yet'
- (14) *Jalan babelok lai ambo tampuah.*
 road turn ASP PRO1SG follow
 'I have really followed the turned road'

Based on the frequency test, the clauses with word order pattern SVO, VOS, and OVS are productive and frequently used both in oral and in written communication. The frequency and productivity of the three forms of clause constructions as in (1) – (14), however, cannot be directly used to determine that they are all the basic clause constructions. In addition to (1) – (4), the followings are other examples of the clause construction with SVO word order.

- (15) *Inyo ma- nulis buku baru tu sajak duo bulan lalu.*
 PRO3SG ACT-write book new ART since two months ago
 'He has been writing the new book since two months ago'
- (16) *Walikota mam-bangun ruang hijau jo taman bermain.*
 mayor ACT-build space green and garden play
 'Mayor built the green space and playing garden'
- (17) *Kami ma- tunggu bantuan bareh sajak pagi bana.*
 PRO2PL ACT-wait donation rice since morning early
 'We have waited the rice donation since early morning'

Data (15) – (17), similar to (1) – (4), are those of independent clauses of active voice in which the core arguments are completely available. The NP *inyo* 'he', *walikota* 'mayor', and *kami* 'we' are subjects as well as agents in each related clause. Then, *buku baru tu* 'the new book', *ruang hijau jo taman bermain* 'the green space and playing garden', and *bantuan bareh* 'rice donation' are the object in each related clause. Verbal predicate in each clause is *tulis* 'to write', *bangun* 'to build', and *tunggu* 'to wait' morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* indicating active voice; the word order pattern in this type of clause is SVO. In this type of grammatical constructions, the grammatical-semantic meanings conveyed are the most neutral and basic ones. This is the clause construction which fulfills the criteria of a basic-underlying clause construction cross-linguistically. In formal-written language and for young-educated speakers of Minangkabau, this is the type of clauses in high frequent use and productive. In addition, such claim is also supported by the typological analysis that Minangkabau belongs to neutral language at syntactical level with the specification that modern Minangkabau tends to be a nominative-accusative language. Thus, the clause with SVO word order can be assigned as one basic clause construction of Minangkabau.

Then, the SVO construction needs to have the second typological test, *markedness*, in order to further prove that SVO is true as the basic word order typology. A marked

construction is the one that has and needs additional linguistic features in use and meaning. Meanwhile, an unmarked construction is the “standard” grammatical construction which does not need additional linguistic features in use and meaning. The SVO clause construction in Minangkabaunese is the basic-grammatical construction due to the facts that it has the highest frequency of use and it is the nominative-accusative construction in active voice morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* in the verb form of its predicate which is compulsory needed in order to make grammatical constructions.

Furthermore, the clause constructions with SVO word order morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* in verb are the grammatical constructions in neutral pragmatically contexts. Meanings and uses of this type of clause construction do not need additional linguistic features and contextual properties. This is the basic clause construction in this local language. The semantic properties capsulated by the SVO clause construction are standard and neutral which lead speakers and listeners are in normative mutual understanding. In accordance with this, it is reasonable to claim that SVO is the basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese.

In accordance with frequency and productivity in use (frequency test), one more clause construction in Minangkabaunese which may be considered as a basic clause construction is that with VOS word order. The constructions as in (18) – (20) are grammatically accepted, then.

- (18) *Ma- nulis buku baru tu inyo sejak dua bulan lalu.*
 ACT-write book new ART PRO3SG since two months ago
 ‘He has been writing the new book since two months ago’
- (19) *Mam-bangun ruang ijaui jo taman bamain walikota.*
 ACT-build space green and garden play mayor
 ‘Mayor built the green space and playing garden’
- (20) *Ma- nunggu bantuan bareh kami sejak pagi bana.*
 ACT-wait donation rice PRO2PL since morning early
 ‘We have waited the rice donation since early morning’

The VOS clause constructions as in (18) – (20) are cognitively and practically accepted by native speakers of Minangkabaunese as natural and common ones. No extra-additional linguistic features and contextual properties are needed in using and understanding the meanings conveyed by such construction. In other words, the VOS clause construction is the *unmarked construction* and *pragmatically neutral context* in nature. It may be claimed in relation to the case that the clause construction with VOS word order is one more basic clause construction and thus the VOS may be assigned as another basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese.

If only based on frequency and productivity in use, the clause constructions with OSV word order (as in (10) – (14) above) may also be considered as one of basic clause construction as well. However, such type of grammatical construction cannot be grammatically identified as the basic clause constructions; they are typologically identified as the topicalization construction, in fact. The topicalization constructions are grammatically derived from the underlying constructions by means of topicalization process in which pragmatic functions are involved (Lamrecht, 1996; Kroeger, 2008; Jufrizal, 2012; Artawa and Jufrizal, 2018; Artawa and Jufrizal 2021). In order to prove that

the OSV clause is a type of topicalization construction, let's follow the following explanation based on data (10) – (14).

The data (10) – (14) above are grammatically derived from (21) – (25) as their basic clause constructions.

- (21) *Kami alah ma- minum aia; kami alah ma- makan nasi.*
 PRO1PL ASP ACT-drink water; PRO1PL ASP ACT-eat rice
 'We have just drunk the water; we have just eaten the rice'
- (22) *Kito ma- matub- i aturan basamo.*
 PRO1PL ACT-follow-APL regulation together
 'We follow the regulation together'
- (23) *Inyo alah mam-baia utang lamo.*
 PRO3SG ASP ACT-pay debt old
 'He has just paid the old debt'
- (24) *Kami alun ma- narimo ganti rugi tanah ko lai.*
 PRO1PL ASP ACT-receive compensation land this yet
 'We have not received this land compensation yet'
- (25) *Ambo ma- nampuah jalan babelok.*
 PRO1SG ACT-follow road turned
 'I followed the turned road'

There are two independent clauses in data (21) which are separated by semi colon and each clause has SVO word order. Through topicalization process, the non-topic arguments *aia* 'water' and *nasi* 'rice' in each clause are promoted to a topic argument by means of dislocating them to initial position. In the grammatical-pragmatic process, the active prefix marker *ma-* must be deleted to have grammatical topicalization construction as: *aia* (O) *alah kami* (S) *minum* (V); *nasi* (O) *alah kami* (S) *makan* (V) and the pattern of word order becomes OSV (see data (14)). In topicalization construction of Minangkabaunese, no more prefix as morphological marker is needed; verb must be in base form (*zero verb form*). The present of morphological marker in verb form makes the derived construction is ungrammatical. The same explanation can be addressed to (22) – (25). Thus, the clause constructions as in (26) – (30) below are ungrammatical in Minangkabaunese.

- (26) **Aia alah kami ma-minum; nasi alah kami ma-makan.*
- (27) **Aturan kito ma-matubi basamo.*
- (28) **Utang lamo inyo alah mam-baia.*
- (29) **Ganti rugi tanah alun kami ma-narimo lai.*
- (30) **Jalan babelok ambo ma-nampuah.*

The productive clause construction with OSV word order is not a basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese, but it is a derived construction so called topicalization construction. As a result, the OSV is not one of word order typology of Minangkabaunese because it is not the pattern of word order of a basic clause construction in this local language. The tree ways of typological testing, *frequency*, *markedness*, and *pragmatically neutral*

contexts test, lead to the main finding that Minangkabaunese has two basic word orders typology namely SVO and VOS at syntactic level. Meanwhile, the OSV word order which is much influenced by pragmatic functions cannot be grammatically assigned as one of word order typology in Minangkabaunese.

Markedness Values of Word-Order Typology of Minangkabaunese

As stated by Croft (1993) and Dixon (2010), markedness in grammar applies most appropriately to closed systems, and there are, at least, two distinct varieties of it are mainly referred to in this study. In accordance with basic word-order typology in Minangkabaunese, there are two closed-systems or two distinct varieties found, namely: (i) *SVO*; and (ii) *VOS*. Accordingly, the data analysis and discussion of markedness value of word-order typology of Minangkabaunese in the sense of formal and functional markedness of are addressed to the two types of basic word-order typology.

As explained above, the clause constructions as in (1) – (4) and in (15) – (17), based on frequency test, are basic clause constructions in Minangkabaunese. Thus, SVO is a basic word order typology of this local language. In order to see the markedness value in such basic grammatical construction, markedness analysis is needed. The markedness theory adopted and developed in linguistic typology (see Comrie, 1989; Croft, 1993; Whaley, 1997; Croft in Shibatani and Bynon (eds.), 1999) asserts that a basic clause construction is the grammatical construction that has least formal markedness. A marked construction is the one that has and needs additional linguistic features in use and meaning. Meanwhile, an unmarked construction is the “standard” grammatical construction which does not need additional linguistic features in use and meaning. The *markedness values* (see also Dixon, 2010) can be categorized into formal markedness and functional markedness.

The SVO clause construction in Minangkabaunese is the basic-grammatical construction due to the facts that it has the highest frequency of use and it is the nominative-accusative construction in active voice morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* in the verb form of its predicate which is compulsory needed in order to make grammatical constructions. The order of words (grammatical constituents) cannot be rearranged as SOV or OSV as in (31) – (32) (except for VOS as in (33) as topicalization construction). Therefore, the following constructions are ungrammatical.

(31) **Inyo (S) buku baru tu (O) ma- nuli (V) sajak duo bulan lalu.*

(32) **Ruang ija jo taman bamain (O) walikota (S) mam-bangun (V).*

(33) *Ma- nunggu (V) bantuan bareh (O) kami (S) sajak pagi bana.*

The SVO clause construction without prefix *maN-* is also grammatical as in the following ones.

(34) *Inyo Ø- tulih buku baru tu sajak duo bulan lalu.*

(35) *Walikota Ø-bangun ruang ija jo taman bamain.*

(36) *Kami Ø-tunggu bantuan bareh sajak pagi bana.*

However, the constructions as in (34) – (36) do not imply the “rigid standard” ones because it may be rearranged become SOV or OSV by means of certain pragmatic-contextual features. It means that the constructions (34) – (36) are less standard than (15) – (17); the constructions as in (15) – (17) are formally and functionally unmarked, meanwhile those as in (21) – (23) are functionally unmarked. In relation to markedness test, in fact, the SVO word order-typology as seen in (1) – (4) and (15) – (17) are formally and functionally *unmarked* in Minangkabaunese. In addition, the unmarked value of SVO word-order is

determined as well by the neutral pragmatically contexts. Meanings and uses of this type of clause construction do not need additional linguistic features and contextual properties. The semantic properties capsulated by the SVO clause construction are standard and neutral which lead speakers and listeners are in normative mutual understanding.

Then, one more clause construction in Minangkabaunese which may be assigned as a basic clause construction is one with VOS word order. The comparison with the basic clause constructions of some other local languages belonging to Malay family, it may be assumed that the VOS clause constructions are genetically derived from old-original word-order of languages in Malay language family. Such constructions are mostly found in daily life of communication in informal situation, frequently used by old speakers with low-middle education level, and they are common in stylistic language and in folk-tales or classic history.

The VOS clause constructions as in (18) – (20) are cognitively and practically accepted by native speakers of Minangkabaunese as natural and common ones. No extra-additional linguistic features and contextual properties are needed in using and understanding the meanings conveyed by such construction. In other words, the VOS clause construction is the *unmarked construction* and *pragmatically neutral context* in Minangkabaunese; it is functionally unmarked word-order. Compared to SVO, however, VOS word-order conveys less marked value. It means that the markedness value of VOS word-order is higher than that of SVO.

Even though the frequency and productivity in use of OSV word order (as in (10) – (14) above) are higher, but it is not one of basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese: it is typologically identified as the topicalization construction. The topicalization constructions are grammatically derived from the underlying constructions by means of topicalization process in which pragmatic functions are involved (Lamrecht, 1996; Kroeger, 2008; Jufrizal, 2012; Artawa and Jufrizal, 2018; Artawa and Jufrizal 2021). Accordingly, a clause in topicalization construction in Minangkabaunese is identified by four grammatical characteristics, namely: (i) a non-topic argument of a basic clause construction promoted to a topic argument; (ii) a new topic argument is placed at initial position of the derived clause; (iii) the prefix as morphological marker of verb is deleted; and (iv) the word order pattern of the derived clause is OSV. Furthermore, it is not neutral for pragmatic contexts in meaning configurations. Therefore, all grammatical constructions with OSV word-order in Minangkabaunese are formally and functionally marked constructions; they employ high marked values.

The result of data analysis reveals that there are three productive patterns of grammatical constructions in Minangkabaunese with word-order SVO, VOS, and OSV. However, there are only two patterns of the three grammatical-clause constructions that can be determined as the basic clause constructions that may lead to be assigned as the basic word-order typology, namely: SVO and VOS. The grammatical construction with OSV word-order in Minangkabaunese is not the basic grammatical construction; the pattern of word-order formulated as OSV is not the word-order typology in this language. In relation to the cases, the basic clause constructions with SVO and VOS word-order are *formally and functionally unmarked*; they are unmarked constructions as they have low markedness values. Meanwhile, those with OSV word-order are *formally marked ones* as they have high markedness values. Furthermore, the markedness value of SVO and VOS does not relatively equal; the markedness value of VOS is higher than that of SVO. In hierarchy,

the SVO is the unmarked word-order, the VOS is the less unmarked one, and the OSV is the marked construction in Minangkabaunese. The markedness value hierarchy of word-order typology of this local language may be illustrated as: **SVO < VOS < OSV** (< is read 'smaller than'). It is then read: *the markedness value of SVO is lesser than that of VOS, and VOS has lesser markedness value than that of OSV*. This grammatical-typological analysis may contribute to the more specific description of grammatical properties, especially in the nature of word-order typology, of Minangkabaunese as one of main local languages in Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

The results based on data analysis and discussion declared in this article may give significant contribution to the theories of grammatical typology, especially in the studies of word order typology in order to say that one language may have more than one basic word-order typology as it is found in Minangkabaunese. Even though Minangkabaunese has SVO and VOS as its basic word-order typology, but markedness analysis tells that the two patterns do not have equal values linguistic properties. Although SVO and VOS are both unmarked, but VOS has higher markedness value than that of SVO. Comparing the two patterns, SVO is unmarked and VOS is less unmarked; SVO is more basic than VOS in modern Minangkabaunese. Further question concerning with word order typology of Minangkabaunese, such as how Minangkabaunese has both SVO and VOS needs further analysis and discussion. It is also useful to have applied researches dealing with word order typology and translation, word order typology and creative teaching-learning processes of language, and so on. Therefore, further studies and analyses on the grammatical-typological properties and the application of word order typology in Minangkabaunese and in other languages are highly recommended both for theoretical and practical goals.

REFERENCES

- Artawa, K., and Jufrizal. (2018). *Tipologi Linguistik: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya*. Denpasar: Penerbit Pustaka Larasan.
- Artawa, K., and Jufrizal. (2021). *Tipologi Linguistik: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya (Edisi Revisi)*. Denpasar: Penerbit Pustaka Larasan.
- Comrie, Bernard. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Croft, W. (1993). *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (2010). *Basic Linguistic Theory* (Vol. 1: Methodology). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finegan, Edward. (2004). *Language: Its Structure and Use*. Boston: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Gaeta, L. 2017. 'Markedness' in *Oxford Bibliographies*. DOI: 10.1093/QBO/9780199772910-0153
- Jufrizal. (2004). "Struktur Argumen dan Aliansi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau" (*unpublished dissertation*). Denpasar: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana.
- Jufrizal., Rusdi., and Refnaldi. (2006). "Pentopikalan dalam Bahasa Minangkabau dan Kaitannya dengan Upaya Pembinaan Sosial-Budaya Masyarakat Minangkabau" (*unpublished research report*). Padang: Fakultas Bahasa Sastra dan Seni.

- Jufrizal., Zul Amri., and Jufri. (2012). 'Keakusatifan dan Keergatifan Bahasa Minangkabau: Telaah Tipologi Linguistik dan Budaya Berbahasa' (*unpublished research report*). Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni.
- Jufrizal. (2012). *Tatabahasa Bahasa Minangkabau: Deskripsi dan Telaah Tipologi Linguistik*. Padang: UNP Press.
- Jufrizal., Zaim, M., and Ardi, Havid. (2014). "Bahasa dan Budaya Minangkabau: Dari Tipologi Gramatikal ke Budaya Berbahasa Penuturnya" (*unpublished research report*). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Jufrizal., Zaim, M., and Ardi, Havid. (2015). *Struktur Gramatikal dan Budaya Berbahasa: Data dan Informasi Bahasa Minangkabau*. Padang: FBS UNP Press.
- Jufrizal., Amri, Z., and Ardi, Havid. (2016). 'Kemasan Makna Gramatikal dan Makna Sosial-Budaya Bahasa Minangkabau: Penyelidikan atas Tatamakna dan Fungsi Komunikatifnya' (*unpublished research report*). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Jufrizal., Amri, Z., and Ardi, H. (2017). 'Kemasan Makna Gramatikal dan Makna Sosial-Budaya Bahasa Minangkabau' (*unpublished research report*). Padang: Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris FBS Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Jufrizal and Amri, Zul. (2019). 'Kebermarkahan Morfosintaksis Bahasa Minangkabau: Telaah Tipologi Linguistik' (*unpublished research report*). Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Jufrizal and Refnita, L. (2019). 'From V-O-S to S-V-O Language?: A Diachronic Study on Word-Order Typology of Minangkabau' (a paper presented as The 7th International Conference on English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature (ELITE), 7th – 9th of September, 2019). Malang: School of Post Graduate Program, Maulana Malik Ibrahim, State University of Malang.
- Jufrizal and Refnita, L. (2020). 'From V-O-S to S-V-O Language?: A Diachronic Study on Word-Order Typology of Minangkabau'. *Proceeding of The 7th International Conference on English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature (ELITE), 2019*, pp. 33-40. SCITEPRESS, ISBN: 978-989-758-459-6 Science and Technology Publications, Lda.
- Jufrizal. (2020). 'Tipologi Tataurut Kata Bahasa Minangkabau: Uji Tipologis dan Hirarkhi Keberterimaannya' (*unpublished research report*). Padang: Universitas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Jufrizal. (2022). *Tipologi Tataurut Kata Bahasa Minangkabau*. Padang: Get Press.
- Kroeger, P. R. (2008). *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud. (1996). *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mallinson, G., Blake, B. J. (1981). *Language Typology: Cross-Linguistic Studies in Syntax*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Shibatani, M. and Bynon, T. (eds.). (1999). *Approaches to Language Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shopen, T. (ed.). (2007). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description (Vol.I) 2nd ed.*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Song, J. J. (2001). *Linguistic Typology: Morphology and Syntax*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.

- Song, J. J. (ed.). (2012). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Song, J. J. (2018). *Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whaley, L. J. (1997). *Introduction to Typology*. London: SAGE Publications.

