Word order typology of Minangkabaunese: How should it be assigned?

Jufrizal Jufrizal

English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang
Padang, Indonesia
e-mail: juf_ely@yahoo.com; juf_ely@fbs.unp.ic.id;
Orcid id: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2186-1873

Abstract— Assigning basic word order typology of one particular language is one of understanding the nature of language at workplace based on typological tests: frequency, markedness, and pragmatically neutral contexts of basic clause constructions. The three ways of testing, however, do not explicitly assert the use of synchronic and diachronic data yet. By these tests, most studies on word order typology of Minangkabaunese, so far, have not optimally included the use of synchronic and diachronic data. The diachronic data are needed in some parts of assigning the word order typology, in fact. This paper discusses how the basic word order of Minangkabaunese in the level of clause should be typologically assigned. Two questions are raised as the bases of data analysis and discussion, namely: (i) are synchronic-diachronic data and evidences needed in assigning and determining the basic word order typology at syntactic level of Minangkabaunese?; and (ii) how should the basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese be assigned? The data analysis indicates that the SVO and VOS are the patterns of basic word order typology of Minangkbaunese; this local language belongs to both SVO and VOS languages. Synchronically and formally, Minangkabaunese tends to be an SVO language, but diachronically it naturally acts as a VOS language. Further data analysis and discussion toward the data collected support the claim that one language may have more than one basic word order typology in which synchronic and diachronic data are meaningful in assigning the typological phenomena. It is argued that synchronic and diachronic data should be appropriately accommodated in assigning word order typology of particular languages as shown by Minangkabaunese presented in this paper. This claim contributes to further studies of basic word order typology cross-linguistically.

Keywords— word order, synchronic and diachronic typology, basic clause, Minangkabaunese

I. INTRODUCTION

The grammatical constructions in one certain language – in the levels of sound, word, phrase, clause, and/or sentences – have the basic-underlying forms which are possibly varied by its speakers in various communicative events and uses. They are all the facts that the grammatical constructions of human languages have basic and universal layers and their stylistic forms, as well. Ideally, the basic grammatical constructions in which a language reflects its basic word orders in sentential constructions, for instance, have the basic-grammatical function, as well. The typological studies on word-order typology are hopefully the studies dealing with grammatical constructions in the level of a phrase and/or a clause linguistically assigned as the basic phrases or clauses. In the sense of basic word-order typology of clause at syntactic level, it is natural that the speakers of English, for instance, assume and prefer that the normal way of constructing a basic sentence or clause is to place the subject (S) at initial position, then followed by the verb (V), and then the direct object (DO) (if there is one in the clause). The sentence such as *Mary saw John* that follows this order (SVO), is a well formed and the unmarked construction. Meanwhile the variations such as *John Mary saw* or *saw Mary John* are the additional-stylistic constructions or the marked ones (see [1], 2004:234; [2], 1993; [3], 2010 for further explanation).

Based on cross-linguistic and typological studies concerning with grammatical typology on word order typology tell that the "normal pattern" of word-order in a basic sentence of human languages may be considerably various and different from language to language. Accordingly, typologists considerably summarize that there are six possible logically orders of words (constituents) order of clauses found in human languages. It is claimed as well that all of them linguistically serve as the basic constituent order for almost all languages in the world. The six-possible basic word-order typologies of human languages as cross-linguistically summarized by typologists are as the following ones (data and language adopted from [4]:81 – 82; [1]:234 – 236).

(1) S – O – V   : *Taro ga inu o mita*   (Japanese)
                     Taro Sub dog Obj saw
                     'Taro saw the dog'

(2) S – V – O : *Umugore arasoma igitabo*   (Kinyarwanda, in Rwanda)
       woman 3S-read book
       'The woman is reading a book'

(3) V – S – O : *Bara Elohim et ha- shamayim* (Biblical Hebrew)
       created God Obj ART- heaven
       'God created the heavens'

(4) V – O – S : *Manasa lamba amin-'ny savony ny lehilahy* (Malagasy)
       washes clothes with- the soap the man
       'The man washes clothes with the soap'

(5) O – V – S : *Toto yahosiye kamara*   (Hixkaryana, in Brazil)
       man it-grabbed-him jaguar
       'The jaguar grabbed the man'

(6) O – S – V : *pako xua u'u*   (Urubu, in Brazil)
       banana John he-ate
       'John ate banana'

The examples of basic-grammatical constructions of certain languages as in (1) – (6) above are regarded and typologically assumed as the typical and basic ones in each related language. In other cases, however, the native speakers of those languages may vary the constituent (word) order of clause to linguistically capsulate the intended meanings contextually communicated in certain communicative events. In linguistic studies, it is also the fact that to assign and/or to determine the basic word order typology of clause construction of one language is not relatively easy. It needs sufficient-related data, appropriate grammatical-typological analysis toward the data and the ability to have scientific-linguistic interpretation. In relation to this, it has been confirmed by [5] (1989) that the order of constituents of a clause is one of the most important word order typological parameters. This parameter characterizes the relative order of subject, verb, and object (SVO) in a basic clause and to consult to the six logically possible types of patterns as in (1) – (6) above. Thus, to study and to determine the order constituents of the basic clause construction in one language linguistically need a great amount and various-related data and the ability to have typological analyses and inferences

So far, the grammatical-typological studies on Minangkabaunese (see [6]; [7]; [8]; [9]; [10]; [11]) still remain further analyses on its word order typology because this local language, which is originally spoken in the main land of West-Sumatera, exhibits more than one grammatical construction which frequently appear in practical uses. As the result, the following grammatical claims have been already argued:

(i) the frequent patterns of grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese clauses are SVO, 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 natural 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 topicalization construction; the clause construction with OSV word-order is not the basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese, in fact.

Based on the summary above, the grammatical constructions with the patterns SVO, VOS, and OSV may be assigned as the basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese if the frequency of appearance is only used. In relation to (iv), OSV is not a basic clause constructiuon, but it is a topicalization in this local language. Thus, the grammatical construction with OSV word order may be deleted from the candidate of basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese. Then, *how does Minangkabaunese have both SVO and VOS as the basic word-order typology?* In order to answer this question, it seems that further typological analyses by involving both synchronic and diachronic data and evidences are highly needed. It is caused by the case that most of grammatical constructions found in old manuscripts and some casual speeches are constructed as VOS clauses. Looking at the previous studies on word order typology of Minangkabaunese, however, the diachronic data and evidences have not been optimally involved. To involve diachronic data and evidences in assigning and deciding basic word order typology may lead to more valid and reliable results of data analysis and typological claims, then.

Thus, in addition to the use of synchronic data, the use of diachronic data and evidences are also relevant to do in order to have further grammatical-typological analysis to determine and/or to assign what the nature of word-order typology of Minangkabaunese is; whether Minangkabaunese is an SVO or a VOS language or even both.

This article, which is based on and developed from a part of the result of linguistic research conducted in 2020-2021, particularly discusses how synchronic-diachronic data and evidences are used to assign and to determined the basic word-order typology of Minangkabaunese. As it has been mentioned above, there is no a specific typological analysis on word order typology of Minangkabaunese involving the use of sufficient synchronic and diachronic data and evidences, yet. There are two questions raised as the bases of typological analysis and discussion in this paper. The questions are: *(i) are synchronic-diachronic data and evidences needed in assigning and determining the basic word order typology at syntactic level of Minangkabaunese?; and (ii) how should the basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese be assigned?* In line with the case that language follows the evolutionary process, it is certain that synchronic and diachronic data are related in grammatical constructions. Therefore, the typological analysis and discussion exposed in this paper are believed to have significant data and further ideas in the studies of Minangkabaunese word-order typology and for relevant studies of grammatical typology of other languages. Practically, the analysis and discussion on basic word order typology may be assumed as a part of phenomena dealing with "language in the workplace", in fact. It is also believed that detailed description and qualified explanation of how to assign word order typology of Minangkabaunese become a part of understanding language in the workplace and the nature of language possessed by human beings.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. The Studies on Word Order Typology of Minangkabaunese

The studies on Minangkabaunese word order typology have been initiated by Jufrizal in 2004 by using related theories of grammatical typology (see [6]). Based on the research, it was claimed that the basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese is SVO with two variations, VOS and OSV. In the first typological study, there was no further typological argumentation why Minangkabaunese has the variations and whether VOS and OSV are the patterns of basic grammatical structure or not. Then, another typological study on the basic grammatical construction and word order typology of Minangkabaunese was conducted by Jufrizal et.al. (see [8]). In that study, they again confirmed that Minangkabaunese has three patterns of word order in grammatical constructions: SVO, VOS, and OSV. However, the word order typology in the study was mostly based on the frequency of grammatical constructions appearing in practical events of communication. There is no additional typological test, as proposed by typologists, toward the grammatical constructions in order to appropriately assign the patterns of word order of clause constructions as the basic word order typology. The conclusions resulted from the two previous studies still remain unanswered questions dealing with typological testing. Therefore, the studies on word order typology of Minangkabaunese need further and constructive analyses by using relevant theories and theoretical framework of grammatical typology.

Further analysis and explanation of word order typology of Minangkabaunese is found in [12]. In the study, assigning the basic grammatical construction of Minangkabaunese had been done based on typological theories concerning with cross-linguistic properties of basic clause construction. The basic grammatical constructions were used to critically look at the values of grammatical markedness of Minangkabaunese at morphosyntactic level. Even though the study had analyzed and discussed the word order of Minangkabaunese, but it did not particularly focus on the phenomena of word order typology of this local language. Similar to the previous ones, Jufrizal and Amri in [12] still used frequency test and synchronic data in assigning basic clause construction and word order typology; no diachronic data and further typological analysis on the patterns of clause word order in Minangkabaunese were accommodated and optimally involved. Ideally, the diachronic and typological tests are highly needed in order to have reliable analysis and valid conclusion of word order typology of Minangkabaunese.

As a further development and discussion of the results of researches conducted in 2016, 2017 and in 2019, Jufrizal and Refnita (see [13]) wrote a paper entitled "From V-O-S to S-V-O Language?: A Diachronic Study on Word Order Typology of Minangkabaunese" presented at The 7th International Conference on English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature (ELITE) on 7th – 9th of September 2019. The revised form of the paper with the same title was published as an article in "*Proceeding of the International Conference on English Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature*" (ELITE 2019) (see [14]). This article specifically looks at the diachronic side of clause constructions that are assigned as the basic clause constructions. The data of the article collected from old manuscripts, folklores, and old-style indicate that the clause constructions with the pattern of word order in VOS are found in high frequency; the VOS word order of clauses is dominantly used and appeared. In other side, the formal-written style of Minangkabaunese and the language style used by young-educated people at present mostly appear in SVO word order. Therefore, the main idea stated as the claim of the article is that Minangkabaunese was a VOS language, but today it is in the natural process to be an SVO language. It is argued based on the data analysis that Minangkabaunese is in evolutionary process to be a SVO language.

The claim argued in [13] and [14] as described above is reasonable since the paper only focused on the case of evolution or the changes of grammatical properties occurred in the word order typology of Minangkabaunese. As mentioned and stated by typologists (see among the others [2], [15], [16], [17]), word order typology in

languages may shift and change in various degree as the consequence of language evolution along with the history of human beings cultural development. One serious criticism to address to Jufrizal's and Refnita's work is that the typological test used to assign word order typology of Minangkabaunese was only the frequency test. The frequency test is sometimes bias due to the fact that not all of frequent patterns grammatical construction can be assigned as the basic grammatical construction. Ideally, for more valid and reliable claim in determining and assigning the word order typology of one particular language, the typological test: *frequency, markedness*, and *pragmatically neutral contexts* (see [4]) should be appropriately applied in the data analysis.

As the continuation and further development of the previous studies on Minangkabaunese word order typology, Jufrizal did a research focusing on the typological testing and acceptability hierarchy of word order typology of the local language (see further [10]). In the recent study, the word order typology of Minangkabaunese was specifically studied through the three ways of typological testing as proposed by grammatical typologists. The three ways of typological test used are frequency, markedness, and pragmatically neutral contexts test (see [4], [3]). Based on the typological tests toward the basic clause constructions, it has been claimed that two types of Minangkabaunese clauses with SVO and VOS pattern can be assigned as the basic clause from which the word order typology can be assigned. Meanwhile, the clause construction with the pattern OSV word order cannot be asserted as a basic clause construction; it is a topicalization construction in fact. In other words, Minangkabaunese is a SVO and/or VOS language in word order typology. Thus, OSV is not a variation of the basic word order typology of Mnangkabaunese.

In the study, Jufrizal (see [10]) used and paid attention to related data found in old-written manuscripts and spoken data commonly found in daily life communication of certain communicative events in speech community. The frequency test was firstly applied before markedness and pragmatically neutral contexts followed. In accordance with this, the study had partially used synchronic and diachronic data in order to determine the nature of basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese. Another important point asserted in the research report is that it is believed that Minangkabaunese was a VOS language, but it tends to be an SVO language at present. It was also assumed that Minangkabaunese has been changing from VOS to SVO language. However, the study did not assert explicitly in a comparative analysis and discussion how Minangkabaunese has two patterns, SVO and VOS, and how the phenomena of word order typology of this local language should be assigned. Therefore, further analysis and discussion in a comparative way based on synchronic-diachronic evidences need to do in order that the nature of basic word order typology of the local language can be explored and exposed. In relation to this, this present paper is linguistically needed to have the further and valid typological explanation concerning with Minangkabaunese word order typology.

B. Review of Related Ideas and Studies on Synchronic-Diachronic Word Order Typology

Historically, the studies on basic word order typology of human languages cross-linguistically is one of the main-fundamental studies in grammatical typology. To determine the basic word order typology at syntactic level, linguists should firstly determine what the basic clause construction is in a given language. The basic word order typology is simply understood as the arrangement or 'natural' pattern of word (constituent) order in a basic clause in the 'given' language. Based on Siewirska's, Song [2001:49] (and see also [19]; [20]; [4]; [20]), explains that the basic word order at a clausal level is determined based on the 'natural' patterns of a basic clause construction which is stylistically neutral, independent, indicative clause with "full-complete" noun phrase (NP) participants, where the subject is definite, agentive and human, the object is a definite semantic patient, and the verb represents an action, not a state or an event as a whole. Therefore, to decide and/or to assign basic word order typology of one particular language, it should be firstly decided what the basic clause construction exactly looks like. Then, the items of typological test to determine the basic word order of one language are appropriately applied.

According to Whaley [4] (and see also [19]; [5]; [20]; [18]), although all human languages may naturally vary the order of words (constituents) in their clause constructions, but it is certain that not all of them are considered as the basic ones. In order to have valid and reliable results, certain typological "tests" need to address to the constructions to determine what the basic word order typology of a given language looks like. Three typological tests proposed by typologists to determine and assign the basic word order typology are *frequency, markedness*, and *pragmatically neutral contexts* test. In relation to *frequency test*, following Hawkins', [4] argues that a good place to begin an analysis of basic constituent order is by having and choosing a text or texts, then simply counting the number of occurrences of each constituent (word) order type (pattern). It is possible as well to choose transcripts of oral language by using certain ways or linguistic techniques in order to determine basic clause constructions of a language being studied. It should be understood that in some cases, however, frequent grammatical constructions appearing in communication do not always mean that they are all the basic clause constructions from which the basic word order typology can be typologically derived. In accordance with this idea, [4:101] proposes several linguistic considerations when making text counts. Firstly, not all parts of a text or the beginning of each major episode in a text frequently describe a setting and introduce characters exposed in the text. By this understanding, it is necessary to keep in mind that when making text counts it is on right idea to be aware of the discourse (textual) mechanisms that are employed to create a

coherent text in the first place. Secondly, most frequent order may be different in different genres of text, in reality. Then, it should be seriously noted as well that written text is rather different from that of spoken language which is written (known as a spoken text). In relation to the frequency test, it should be kept in mind that the frequent patterns still need other typological test in order that the grammatical constructions fulfill the criteria of a basic grammatical construction.

The second typological test, so called *markedness*, is theoretically applied and practically used in order to be sure if a clause construction is basic one or not. Whaley [4:102], in relation to this point, simply explains that the basic constituent order of a language typically occurs in utterances that have the least formal marking. In the typological concept of markedness, it is argued that a marked construction is the one which needs 'extra' or 'added' linguistic features to produce or to understand it. An unmarked construction, in other side, is the one which has 'natural' linguistic features and pragmatically neutral contexts; it may be also stated that a basic grammatical construction is the one which is unmarked. Then, the third test (or way) to determine a basic word order typology is *pragmatically neutral contexts*. For this purpose and the way of typological testing, Whaley [4:104] argues that further consideration in making hypotheses about the basic constituent (word) order of a language is by applying and critically searching the pragmatic function(s) of the clause being investigated. Sentences in which a speaker (or a writer) is highlighting a particular constituent are considered as not good examples for basic constituent (word) patterns. Therefore, these three tests of typological studies on word order typology are intentionally and respectively applied in determining the basic word typology of one particular language being investigated.

Based on related linguistic studies, it has not been questioned anymore that, as a matter of fact, human languages are not static, but dynamic; they naturally grow, develop, shift, and change all time in systematic and natural ways as the reflections of human's development and culture in the world. According to Anderson (in [21]), in the synchronic perspective, on the historical level, the 'language' that changes is a 'practice of speaking', but in the diachronic perspective, the 'language' is a 'tradition of speaking'. In real life, the historical dimension of both practices and traditions is certainly obvious and undeniable. It is a fat that 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. For more valid and reliable description of grammatical properties, it is reasonable to state that the study of language typology, therefore, needs to involve the historical-diachronic aspects (data and evidences) of languages as well in order to have valuable-linguistic data and information dealing with the nature of the language being studied.

In addition to the ideas above, Song ([18]:298) mentions as well that the possibility of extending linguistic typology to historical linguistics had been explored or entertained as evident in the earlier works of grammatical typology practically executed by typologists such as Greenberg (in 1957) and Jacobson (in 1958). Song also adds that the synchronic data and evidences typologically derived universal should not be violated in linguistic reconstruction and languages should belong to one of the occurring types within specific typologies or groups formulated by the experts. Language universals are naturally deemed to function as constraints on language types and groups. This in turn has significant implications for linguistic reconstruction just as do implicational universals at theoretical views. Languages can only naturally change from one occurring type into other occurring types in natural-systematic ways; language can never change either from or into a non-occurring types. In this sense, it can be stated as well what is possible in human languages will not arise out of what is naturally possible in human languages. This idea 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. Following Song's ([18]), this dynamic view of synchronic typology can be terminologically referred to as the *dynamicization* of typology and it may be linguistically assumed as one way of typological studies, including the grammatical typology concerning with the studies on word order typology.

The need to appropriately combine and involve both synchronic and diachronic studies in grammatical typology is also supported by Comrie ([5]). According to him, almost all similarities between two or more languages are probably caused by four main reasons. Firstly, the similarities found could be due to the accidental chances. Secondly, those similarities could stem from the facts that the languages are genetically related and have inherited the common property from their common ancestor or their proto-language. Thirdly, the languages could be in areal-regional contact in certain areas or geographical zones. One language could have borrowed the properties from the other, or they could have borrowed from the other-close language(s), either directly or through mediation of yet other languages in contact. Lastly, the properties could be a form of language universal, either absolute or just a tendency. Even though these four factors are still debatable and need clarification in the studies of *Historical-Comparative Linguistics*, they are probably reasonable and logically acceptable in many aspects. In other words, it is alright to say that diachronic studies on particular aspects of grammatical features of languages in the framework and practical works of *Linguistic Typology* are certainly relevant to do as the awareness and as a particular "view point" on historical aspects of language and language changes, in nature.

The studies on Linguistic Typology, especially those of grammatical typology under diachronic perspectives, have been conducted in many areas or scopes of grammatical aspects by linguists and typologists. Those studies due to the fact that the phenomena of language shift and change occur in all levels and layers of human languages and in the grammatical typology. In relation, it has been confirmed that languages may evolve from isolative languages to a inflectional or to an agglutinative one, then a nominative-accusative language to an ergative-absolutive one, or vice versa (see [22]; [5]; [15]). In more specific focus of ideas, Gell-Mann and Ruhlen [16] in an article entitled "*The Origin and Evolution of Word Order*" state that all attested human languages may derive from a single earlier language. Based on a historical-comparative study as presented in the article, they draw main conclusions, namely: (i) *the word order in the ancestral language was SOV.* ; (ii) E*xcept for the cases of diffusion, the direction of syntactic change, when it occurs, has been for the most part SOV > SVO, and beyond that, SVO > VSO/VOS with a subsequent reversion to SVO occurring occasionally. It is also claimed that reversion to SOV occurs only through the processes of diffusion*; (iii) *Diffusion, although important, is not the dominant process in the evolution of word order in nature*; and (iv) The two extremely rare word orders (namely OVS and OSV) are derived directly from SOV. This study implies that word order typology of human languages, a part of grammatical features existed in the languages, naturally follow the evolutionary processes along the time. Thus, the studies on word order typology need to involve the synchronic and diachronic data and evidences for qualified and reliable conclusions of typological studies.

In relation to the evolutionary processes and the changes of word order typology diachronically (see [16]), it is argued that a language may have more than one basic word order typology and one particular language may have the natural processes in kind of word order changing (see [4]; [20]; [11]). The studies on basic clause constructions cross-linguistically indicate that one language may allow arranging words (or constituents) in more than one pattern to build another pattern of basic clause construction. Therefore, in addition to typological tests as mentioned above, appropriately involving and considering synchronic and diachronic data (evidences) are needed in the studies of word order typology in order to have valid and reliable claims, then.

Greenberg who studied the implicational correlation of word-order (in 1957) and Jacobson who studied the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European stop system (in 1958) can be taken as the examples of diachronic-historical and comparative studies in Linguistic Typology ([18]). Then, another example of similar work is the work of Yiu ([23]) about the typology of word-order in Chinese dialects. The study focused on revisiting the classification of *Min** in a form of comparative analysis. This is one of recent studies which used diachronic perspectives in a comparative framework that can be also consulted to have other form of studies concerning with diachronic perspectives of word-order typology. Thepkanjana and Uehara ([24]) did another form of study dealing with word-order typology. They studied the effects of constituent orders on functional patterns of the verbs for '*give*' (word meaning 'give'). It was a kind of contrastive-comparative study of Thai and Mandarin Chinese. The study applied comparative perspective and the analysis focused on the extension patterns of the verbs for lexicon with the meaning '*give*'. This study may give information on diachronic-comparative analysis of word-order typology of language for certain function of the language studied.

The studies on word-order typology of local languages in Nusantara, especially those of Malay family, by means of diachronic studies have not been becoming a serious interest of typological studies in Indonesia yet. Basaria ([25]), for instance, studied the grammatical relations and semantic roles of *Bahasa Pakpak-Dairi* in her dissertation. One part of her dissertation discusses the phenomena of word-order typology of the local language, but the analysis and discussion was still in synchronic analysis. Then, Tambusai ([26]) conducted a research for his dissertation on morphological typology and argument structure of *Malay Riau*. Similar to Basaria ([25]), Tambusai in one part of his research report, talks about word-order typology of *Malay Riau*. However, the discussion only focuses on synchronic data; no diachronic data and evidences are involved. In addition, Siwi ([27]) also studied the syntax of *Siladang Language* in the framework of grammatical typology. Similar to Basaria and Tambusai, however, Siwi did not use the diachronic ways to determine the nature of word-order typology of *Siladang*. In some parts of the previous studies, it can be seen that the diachronic-comparative analyses were still as suggestions for further studies. Therefore, a study on Minangkabaunese word-order typology by involving synchronic and diachronic evidences (data) is linguistically necessary in order to further explore and to describe the nature of word-order typology of the local language as a part of '*language at work place*'.

The basic word-order typology of one language, as proposed by linguists, is mostly determined by the highest percentage of "acceptability" of grammatical constructions. It is sure that this is the resulted from intensive typological studies based various relevant data. Even though (constituent) word order typology has been proved as a powerful and basic line of researches in answering the question "*what is a language?*", there are still more other basic issues that need to study. Related to this idea, Whaley ([4]) states that based on several typological researches, in languages with fairly (and/or rather) rigid constituent order, for instance, certain variations of SVO pattern are clearly employed for specific functions in constructing a discourse (or a text) in verbal communication in many aspects. In many languages, however, two (or more) patterns of constituent (word) orders may occur in rather high frequency in practical uses of language. They do not seem to have any unique or

specific discourse function in certain speech events in many communicative events. Some linguists even argue that in assigning and/or grouping languages into certain patterns of basic word-order. But in some facts, a category to be used should exist for languages that do not have a basic constituent order at all.

In other related ideas, Whaley ([4]) adds as well that the primary split in language types is rooted in whether the (constituent) word-order is primarily sensitive to and highly influenced by pragmatic considerations or pragmatic functions (it may be said as *flexible-order*) or syntactic considerations (or *fixed order*) with certain patterns and variations. Therefore, the typologists do not highly 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 assigned as basic grammatical structure. Even in many languages in which multiple or free orders (patterns) for constituent are natural, it is still necessary and often possible to determine a basic word order by using several diagnostic and typological tests by involving synchronic and diachronic data (evidences) as concisely described above.

III. METHOD

In line with problem raised, purpose of study, data collected, and data analysis, this study was a form of linguistic research constructed as a descriptive-qualitative research conducted in 2020-2021. In practice, it was operationally executed in the form of a field research with the research area in West-Sumatera and it was respectively supported by a library study. As a field research, the sample areas were chosen fourteen main towns/regions of the main-land of West-Sumatera where the native speakers of Minangkabaunese habitually and socio-culturally live. The data collected in this study were the clause constructions of Minangkabaunese which are regarded as the formal-grammatical ones and they are all intuitively and linguistically categorized as the standard grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese. Practically, the data in the forms of spoken and written data with certain criteria were simultaneously collected by means of participant observation, depth-interview, administrating questionnaires, and quoting/selecting data from old manuscripts and other related texts written in Minangkabaunese.

The instruments used in this study were in the forms of field-notes, observation sheets, audio-recorders, interview guideline, and questionnaire sheets. All instruments of research were constructed and developed by researcher by using related guideline of developing research instruments as proposed by experts. The sources of spoken data were 28 informants and 280 respondents who were intentionally selected from native speakers with certain identities and criteria commonly used in linguistic studies. The written-synchronic data were taken from certain articles and parts of newspapers, magazines, and books written in Minangkabaunese. Old manuscripts/texts in the forms of folklores, old-stylistic speeches, and old rules and announcements were the sources of the diachronic data, in this study. Since the researcher is also a native speaker of Minangkabaunese, he was also possible to act as the source of data, but the intuitive data were systematically and always cross-checked and consulted to the selected informants in order that the validity and reliability of the data were fulfilled. The data gathered were firstly classified into clausal-syntactical categories in order to decide whether they were appropriate and ready to analyze in order to decide or to assign what the basic clause constructions in this local language look like, what the patterns of basic word order typology are, and what the typologists should do in assigning the word order typology of Minangkabaunese is. As for practical works, the data were linguistically analyzed based on the related theories of synchronic-diachronic word order typology and typological tests as described in previous section. The results of data analysis and discussion are presented and argumentatively described in formal and informal ways commonly used in linguistics, especially those used in grammatical typology.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. *The Word Order Patterns of Frequent Clause Constructions in Minangkabaunese*

Based on the results of data analyses exposed and stated in the previous research reports of typological studies on Minangkabaunese (see among the others [6]; [29]; [30]; [31]; [32]), it was found that there are three types of grammatical constructions based on word order patterns frequently appear in various practical uses of Minangkabaunese in communicative events. The three types (patterns) of clauses are those with the (surface) patterns *SVO, VOS*, and *OSV*. These three types of clause constructions are linguistically extracted from various genres and units of discourses/texts based grammatical analyses and micro-linguistic view-points. It may be stated that the three types of clause are the formal-grammatical constructions of standard Minangkabaunese, in nature. The followings are the data of grammatical constructions indicating Minangkabaunese clause with SVO word order.

    (7) *Aia gadang mam- bao luluak dari ulu.*
         water big   ACT- bring mud   from upper course
         'The flood brought mud from upper course'

(8) *Awan itam mam- buek bumi galok sajak pagi   tadi*.
   cloud black ACT-make earth dark   since morning just now
   'The black cloud made the earth dark since this morning'

(9) Amak- nyo   ma- makai baju adat   ari tu.
   mother-Poss3SG ACT-use   traditional gown day that
   'Her mother used traditional gown at that day'

(10) *Urang kampuang ka   mam-bukak sawah   baru bulan muko*.
   people kampong   FUT ACT-open   rice-field baru month next
   'Villagers will open new rice-field next month'

In the data (7) – (10) above, the pattern of word order in each clause construction is SVO in which *aia gadang* 'flood' (in (7)), *awan itam* 'black cloud' (in (8)), *amak-nyo* 'her mother' (in (9)), and *urang kampuang* 'villagers' (in (10)) are (S)ubjects. Meanwhile, *mam-bao* 'to bring' (7), *mam-buek* 'to make' (8), *ma-makai* 'to use' (9), and *mam-bukak* 'to open' (10) are V(verb)s, and *luluak* 'mud' (7), *bumi* 'earth' (8), *baju adat* 'traditional gown' (9), and *sawah baru* 'new rice-filed (10) are O(bject)s. This type of clause construction is normally found in formal-academic speech events of Minangkabaunese; it is mostly used by educated-young speakers; it encodes indicative, non-figurative, and neutral meanings as well. Typologically, the SVO type of grammatical construction belongs to a nominative-accusative construction with active markers morphologically attached to the verbs. The clause constructions with SVO, as in (7) – (10), have been already claimed as the most frequent and one of basic clause constructions found in both written and spoken Minangkabaunese.

The second type of Minangkabaunese clause construction, which is frequently used and found in verbal communication and in old manuscripts, is the clause with VOS word order. The followings are the examples of such type of clause constructions.

(11) *Mam-baco aturan baru urang-urang tu   di kantua pemuda*.
   ACT- read rules   new   people   ART in office youth
   'The people read the new rules in youth office'

(12) *Ma- nambah masalah waang   kini ko.*
   ACT-add   problem PRO2SG-man now this
   'You are adding problems right now'

(13) *Mam-bali rokok   juo waang   yo*.
   ACT-buy cigarettes still PRO2SG PART
   'You still bought cigarettes, right'

(14) *Man- caliak urang sakik kami   pagi   tu.*
   ACT-visit   man sick   PRO2PL morning ART
   'We visited the sick man this morning'

(15) *Ma- ukia angan-angan inyo   tiok ari*.
   ACT-draw imagination PRO3SG every day
   'He draws the imagination every day'

The grammatical constructions as in (11) – (15) are the clauses with the pattern of VOS word order in Minangkabaunese. The word forms *mam-baco* 'to read', *ma-nambah* 'to add', *mam-bali* 'to buy', *man-caliak* 'to visit', *ma-ukia* 'to draw' (in (11) – (15)) are all the verbs (V) at initial position. Then, *aturan baru* 'new rules', *masalah* 'problem', *rokok* 'cigarettes', urang sakik 'sick man', and *angan-angan* 'imagination' are objects (O) of each related clause. Meanwhile, *urang-urang tu* 'the people', *waang* 'you', *waang* 'you', *kami* 'we', *inyo* 'he' in each clause are subjects (S). This type of grammatical construction is naturally used and easily understood by native speakers of Minangkabaunese in many communicative events, especially in colloquial and traditional speeches. Based on its frequency in use, such type of construction is also reasonable to decide as a basic clause construction in the local language natively used in the main land of West-Sumatera.

Then, the third type of Minangkabaunese clause construction which is also productive and frequently used in verbal communication in many events of communication is the clause with OSV word order. Please pay serious attention to the following data as the examples of OSV clauses in Minangkabaunese.

(16) *Palajaran baru guru aja- an   ka kami   malam tu.*
   lesson   new teacher teach-CAU to PRO2PL night   that
   'The teacher taught new lesson to us at that night'

(17) *Pangalaman itu   inyo   bao   dari rantau.*
experience   ART PRO3SG bring from oversea
'He brought the experience from oversea'

(18) *Makanan tu   kami   buang   sajo ka banda.*
food   ART   PRO2PL throw away just to small river
'We just threw out the food to the small river'

(19) *Ganti rugi   tanah ko   alun juo kami   tarimo.*
 compensation land   ART ASP still PRO1PL receive
 'We have not received the land compensation yet'

(20) *Kasalahan-nyo   ambo   tutuik rapek.*
false-   POS3SG PRO1SG close   tightly
'I have tightly closed his false'

The OSV constructions, as in (16) – (20) above are also productive and frequently used in communicative interactions in the speech community of Minangkabaunese. In (16), for instance, *palajaran baru 'new lesson'* is O, *guru* 'teacher' is S, and *aja-an '*teach (causative)*'* is verb (V) in the clause. Then, pangalaman itu 'the experience' in (17); makanan tu 'the food' in (18); ganti rugi 'conpensation' in (19); and kasalahan-nyo in (20) are the objects (O). The next words: inyo 'he' (17), kami 'we' (18), kami 'we' (19), and ambo ' I ' (20) are the subjects (S) in the related main clause. Then, bao 'bring' (17), buang 'throw away' (18), tarimo 'receive' (19), and tutuik 'close' (20) are the subjects (S) respectively in each clause. Due to the fact that this type of clause construction (OSV) is common and frequently appears in oral communication as well, Jufrizal ([6]) previously states that such kind of construction belongs to the basic clause constructions in Minangkabaunese. This claim, however, is questioned and it should be seriously re-checked whether it a basic-underlying clause or not.

B. Basic Clause Construction of Minangkabaunese and Typological Testing of Basic Word Order

Based on the related data and relevant information collected in this study, it may be simply stated that there are three types of Minangkabaunese clauses based on the (surface) patterns of word order, namely SVO, VOS, and OSV clauses. A question then come up: *Are they all possibly assigned and/or determined as the basic clause constructions from which the basic word typology is derived from?* To answer this question, it is necessary to see again and to consider the perception and judgment delivered by native speakers dealing with the degree of acceptability of each type of clause construction and set back to the characteristics of basic clause construction cross-linguistically. To have information dealing with native speakers' judgment, in this study, there were 280 respondents from 14 towns in West-Sumatera gave responses to the questionnaire administrated. The following is the table telling the degree of acceptability and naturalness of the three clause constructions based on respondents' level of education and age.

Table: Percentage of acceptability of constituent order of clause construction of Minangkabaunese

Consti-tuent (word) order	Native Speakers' Responses											
	COMMON				LESS COMMON				UNCOMMON			
	Sum	%	Age	Educat-ion	Sum	%	Age	Educat-ion.	Sum	%	Age	Educat-ion
SVO	221	79%	19 – 70 th	ES – UN	69	25%	50 – 70 th	ES - JHS	10	4%	60 – 70 th	ES
OSV	166	59%	30 – 70 th	ES – SHS	90	32%	19 – 50 th	JHS - UN	24	9%	19-30th	SHS-UN
VOS	152	54%	60-70th	ES – JHS	87	31%	30-50th	SHS-UN	41	15%	19-30th	UN

Note: ES = Elementary School; JHS = Junior High School; UN = University

The different "degree" of acceptability of clause constructions with different word order (as seen the table above) should be used as one of consideration in to determine whether they are basic clause constructions, from which a basic word order typology is derived, or not. Based on the linguistic data and related information summarized in the table above, most respondents (79%) from different age and education levels reveal that the clause constructions with SVO word order are common. It means that such type of clause constructions is frequently used by native speakers in daily life conversation or in writing texts. Based on the frequency test, it may be claimed that the clause constructions as in (7) – (10) (clauses with SVO pattern) are the basic clause constructions; a clause with SVO word order is a basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese. Then, it may be typologically determined that SVO is the word order typology of Minangkabaunese.

An interesting thing to be noted is that the clause constructions with OSV and VOS word orders are intuitively perceived by Minangkabaunese as the acceptable constructions in nearly the same percentage (59% and 54%). In accordance with that the respondents' age and level of education should be considered in assigning word order typology, as well. Based on the data, it seems that most old respondents with low-middle level of education state that the clause constructions with OSV and VOS word order are natural and common. In other side, only few young respondents with middle-high level of education state that such constructions are less common. To have valid and reliable claim, it is a necessity to have grammatical test to determine whether the clause with OSV or VOS word order is a basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese or not.

Theoretically, the frequency test needs to add with the two additional typological tests, *markedness* and *pragmatically neutral contexts test*, in order to have valid and reliable results of analysis. Thus, the three typological tests should be simultaneously and appropriately applied to determine and/or to assign a basic clause construction from which the basic word order typology of a language declared. For the reason, it needs to look into the details of typological information dealing with the three surface-forms of clause constructions based on the word order patterns in Minangkabaunese. Even though in some cases the native speakers' cognition and perception are helpful, but the three typological tests are still the bases of typological test proposed and argued by typologists cross-linguistically.

In relation to the application of *frequency test*, as summarized in the table above, the clauses with word order pattern SVO, VOS, and OVS are productive and frequently used in both oral and in written communication. The frequency and productivity of the three forms of clause constructions as in (7) – (20), in fact, cannot be directly used to decide that they are all can be assigned as the basic clause constructions in Minangkabaunese. Let's then see in closer grammatical testing toward the three types of clause constructions. In addition to (7) – (10), the followings are other examples of the clause construction with SVO word order pattern.

> (21) *Inyo   ma- nambah masalah baru sajo sajak tigo bulan   lalu*.
>   PRO3SG ACT-add   problem new only since three months ago
>   'He only has been adding new problems since three months ago'

> (22) *Walikota ma- ubah   aturan lamo sajak sapakan lalu*.
>   mayor   ACT-change rules old   since week   last
>   'Mayor changed the old rules since last week'

> (23) *Inyo   mam- bukak rasio   keluarga malam tu.*
>   PRO3SG ACT- wait   secrete family   night   that
>   'He opened the family secretes that night'

Data (21) – (23), similar to (7) – (10) in word order pattern, are those of independent clauses in active voice in which the core arguments are completely available. The NP *inyo* 'he', *walikota* 'mayor', and *inyo* 'he' are the subjects as well as the agents in each related clause. Then, *masalah baru* 'new problems', *aturan lamo* 'old rules' and *rasio kaluarga* 'family secretes' are the objects in those clauses. Verbal predicate in each clause is *manambah* 'to add', *maubah* 'to change', and *mambukak* 'to open' is morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* indicating the active voice. It can be seen that the word order pattern in this type of clause is SVO. In this type of grammatical constructions in Minangkabaunese, the grammatical-semantic meanings conveyed are those of the most neutral and basic ones. The data and related linguistic information tell that this type of clause constructions full fill the criteria of a basic-underlying clause construction cross-linguistically. It is also the fact that the formal-written language and for most young-educated native speakers of Minangkabaunese, this is the type of clauses with high frequent use and in high productivity, as well (see table above). This claim is also supported by the grammatical-typological analysis telling that Minangkabaunese is a neutral language at syntactical level with another specification that modern Minangkabaunese tends to be an accusative language. Thus, the clauses with SVO word order can be assigned as and decided as the basic clause construction of Minangkabaunese. It is also in line with the case that many (nominative-) accusative languages have SVO word order.

The frequency test applied to clause construction as (7) – (10) and (21) – (23) with SVO word order tells that they are the basic clause constructions in Minangkabaunese; they appear and use in high frequency in many communication events. As so, the SVO can be decided as one of basic word order typology in this local language. Nevertheless, such type of clause construction needs to have the second typological test, so called markedness test, in order to prove further that SVO is true as the basic word order typology in this language. The markedness theory adopted and developed in linguistic typology (see [5]; [2]; [4]; [28]) 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 in understanding its meaning. Meanwhile, an unmarked construction is stated as the "standard" grammatical construction which does not need additional linguistic features both in use and meaning. The *markedness values* (see also [3]), in addition, can be differentiated as *formal markedness* and *functional markedness*.

It has been previously mentioned, the clause construction with SVO pattern of word order in Minangkabaunese is the basic-grammatical construction due to the fact that it has the highest frequency of use and it is identified as the nominative-accusative construction in active voice morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* in the verb form of its predicate. The morphological marker *maN-* is grammatically compulsory in this type of grammatical constructions. The pattern of word order cannot be rearranged as SOV or OSV (except for VOS as in (26) below), which will be explained in the next part. Therefore, the constructions as in (24) and (25) are ungrammatical ones.

(24) *Inyo* (S) *masalah baru* (O) *mam-buek* (V) *kini ko.*

(25) * *Lampu jalan jo taman baru* (O) *walikota* (S) *mam-buek* (V).

(26) *Ma- nambah* (V) *utang lamo* (O) *ambo* (S) *sajak ari tu.*

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

(27) *Inyo Ø- buek masalah baru kini ko.*

(28) *Urang kampuang Ø-buek lampu jalan jo ruang ijau.*

(29) *Ambo Ø-tambah utang lamo sajak ari tu.*

However, the constructions as in (27) – (29) do not imply the "real standard" ones because each construction may be rearranged becomes SOV or OSV by means of certain-additional pragmatic-contextual features in uses. It means that the constructions (27) – (29) are less standard than (21) – (23); the constructions as in (21) – (23) are formally and functionally unmarked, meanwhile those as in (27) – (29) are functionally unmarked, in nature. In relation to markedness test, the SVO clause constructions morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* in verb form of predicate are decided as the unmarked constructions in Minangkabaunese; they are the basic clause constructions and the unmarked ones, as well.

Further typological test, so called neutral pragmatic context, to the clause constructions with SVO word order morphologically marked by prefix *maN-* in verb tells that they are in neutral pragmatically contexts; no extra-linguistic contexts are involved in such grammatical constructions . Meanings communicated and communicative uses of this type of clause construction do not need additional linguistic features and non-contextual properties. This is, actually, the basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese. The semantic properties encapsulated by the SVO clause constructions are the standard and neutral contexts which lead speakers and listeners (or communicative participants) are in normative-mutual understanding. In accordance with the cases, it is right and reasonable to claim that SVO is one of the basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese.

In accordance with frequency of appearance in uses and productivity, as well, one more clause construction in Minangkabaunese which is also possible to consider as a basic clause construction is the clause with VOS word order. The comparison with the basic clause constructions of some local languages belonging to Malay language family (see for instance [25]), it may be assumed and possibly predicted that the VOS is the original basic word order of many local languages of Malay family. It may further be stated that such clause constructions are genetically derived from old-original and basic word-order of languages in Malay language family. In addition, such constructions are mostly found in daily life of communication and in informal communicative events. In daily life uses of language, such type of clause constructions is frequently used by old speakers with low-middle education level, and they seem common in stylistic-cultural language and in folk-tales

or classic history. The constructions as in (21) – (23) are grammatically accepted if they are constructed as the related clauses with VOS word order as in the following data, (30) – (32).

(30) *Ma- nambah masalah baru sajo inyo   sajak tigo bulan   lalu.*
ACT-add   problem new only PRO3SG since three months ago
'He has been making new problems since three months ago'

(31) *Ma- ubah   aturan lamo walikota lamo sajak sapakan lalu.*
ACT-change rules old   mayor   since a week ago
'Mayor has changed the old rules since a week ago'

(32) *Mam- bukak rasio   keluarga inyo   malam tu.*
ACT- open   secrete family   PRO3SG night   that
'He opened the family secretes at that night'

The clause constructions with VOS pattern of word order as in (18) – (20) are cognitively perceived and practically understood by native speakers of Minangkabaunese as natural, frequent, and common ones. No extra-additional linguistic features and contextual properties are necessary added in using and understanding the meanings conveyed by such type of clause construction. In other words, the VOS clause construction can be assigned and regarded as the *unmarked construction* and *pragmatically neutral context* in Minangkabaunese. In relation to the case, it may be claimed that the clause construction with VOS word (constituent) order is another form of the basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese. Consequently, it may be argued that VOS may be assigned and determined as the basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese, as well.

If the focus of analysis in only based on frequency test and productivity, the clause constructions with OSV word order (as in (16) – (20) above) is also probably considered as one of the basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese. Based on grammatical-typological analysis, however, the grammatical constructions with OSV word order cannot be determined as the basic clause constructions; they are typologically identified as the topicalization construction, in fact. The topicalization constructions, according to typologists, are grammatically derived from the underlying constructions by means of topicalization process in which pragmatic functions are certainly involved in such type of constructions ([33]; [34]; [7]; [9]; [11]). To simply prove that the OSV clause is a type of topicalization construction in Minangkabaunese, the data (16) – (20) can be concerned again and explained as the following ones.

Pay serious attention the data (16) – (20) below again !

(16) Palajaran baru guru   aja-   an   ka kami   malam tu.
lesson   new teacher teach-CAU to PRO2PL night   that
'The teacher taught new lesson to us at that night'

(17) Pangalaman itu   inyo   bao   dari rantau.
experience   ART PRO3SG bring from oversea
'He brought the experience from oversea'

(18) Makanan tu   kami   buang   sajo ka banda.
food   ART   PRO2PL throw away just to small river
'We just threw out the food to the small river'

(19) Ganti rugi   tanah ko   alun juo kami   tarimo.
compensation land   ART ASP still PRO1PL receive
'We have not received the land compensation yet'

(20) Kasalahan-nyo   ambo   tutuik rapek.
false-   POS3SG PRO1SG close   tightly
'I have tightly closed his false'

The data (16) – (20) are grammatically derived from the data (33) – (37) their basic clause constructions.

(33) *Guru   ma- aja- an   palajaran baru ka kami   malam tu.*
Teacher ACT-teach-APL lesson new   to PRO1PL night   that
'The teacher taught us new lesson at that night'

(34) *Inyo   mam-bao   pangalaman itu   dari rantau.*
     PRO3SG ACT-bring experience   ART from oversea
      'He brought the experiences from oversea'

(35) *Kami   mam-buang sajo makanan tu ka banda.*
     PRO2PL ACT-throw out meal ART   to small river
      'We just threw out the meal to small river'

(36) *Kami   alun juo ma- narimo ganti rugi   tanah ko   lai.*
     PRO1PL ASP   ACT-receive compensation land   this yet
      'We have not received the land compensation yet'

(37) *Ambo   ma-   nutuik rapek kasalahan-nyo.*
     PRO1SG ACT-close   tightly false-   POS3SG
      'I tightly closed his false'

In (33), it is a with SVO word order. Through topicalization process, the non-topic arguments *palajaran baru* 'new lesson' is promoted to a topic argument by means of dislocating them to the initial position of the clause. In the grammatical-pragmatic process, the active prefix marker *ma-* must be deleted in order to have grammatical topicalization construction as (16): *Palajaran baru(O) guru (S) aja- an (V) ka kami malam tu* and the pattern of word order becomes OSV. In the topicalization construction, no more prefix as morphological marker is needed; verb must be in base form (*zero verb form*). The present or use of morphological marker in verb form makes the derived construction is ungrammatical. The same explanation can be addressed to (17) – (20) with their own pair in (34)- (37)). Thus, the clause constructions as in (38) – (42) below are ungrammatical in Minangkabaunese.

(38) **Palajaran baru guru <u>ma-aja-an</u> ka kami malam tu.*
(39) **Pangalaman tu inyo <u>mam-bao</u> dari rantau.*
(40) **Makanan tu kami <u>mam-buang</u> sajo ka banda.*
(41) **Ganti rugi tanah alunjuo kami <u>ma-narimo</u> lai.*
(42) **Kasalahannyo ambo <u>ma-nutuik rapek</u>.*

In this case, 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.
As it is the case, the productive clause construction with OSV word order cannot be assigned as a basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese; it is actually a derived construction so called the topicalization construction. In accordance with this, the OSV is not one of basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese because it is not the pattern of word (constituent) order of a basic clause construction, in fact. The high acceptability and productivity of such OSV constructions in speech events is assumed as the fact that most speakers in many communicative events want to have polite verbal expressions, and one of them is by constructing topicalization constructions. Pragmatically, such type of constructions is one strategy of language politeness.

The tree ways of typological testing for assigning and determining basic word order typology, *frequency, markedness,* and *pragmatically neutral contexts test*, lead to the findings that Minangkabaunese has two basic word orders typology, so called SVO and VOS at syntactic level. Meanwhile, the clause with OSV word order which is much influenced by pragmatic functions and context cannot be grammatically assigned as one of basic word order typology in Minangkabaunese. The OSV clause construction in Minangkabaunese only fulfills *the frequency test* but it does not pass two more tests, *the markedness and pragmatically neutral contexts test*. In the sense of *markedness*, topicalization construction is not a basic clause construction (*unmarked construction*) but it is a derived one or *marked construction*. The topicalization constructions are not neutral for pragmatic contexts in meaning configurations and communicative uses.

C. Word Order Typology of Minangkabaunese: How should it be assigned?

Based on three ways of typological testing, as described above, SVO and VOS are the two patterns of word order of independent clauses which are regarded as the basic clause constructions from which the basic word order typology of Minangkabunese is typologically derived or extracted. It is true and in line with typologists' argument that some languages may have only one basic word order typology and some others may have more than one basic word order typology (see [5]; [4]; [20]; [3]; [17]). In relation to this, Minangkabaunese belongs to

a language with two basic word order typology as described above. What are additional proofs supporting the case that that Minangkabaunese has more than one basic word order typology (SVO and VOS)? A close look at the various and available data collected in this research, it may be argued that the linguistic-functional features and the historical changes occurred along with language evolution and language contact support and prove this claim (see [5]; [22]; [16]). In this study, therefore, further analysis of how Minangkabaunese has SVO and VOS word order typology and how it should be assigned focuses on historical aspects particularly taken based on synchronic and diachronic evidences.

In relation to previous-related studies, it may be argued that modern Minangkabunese, the language style used by most educated-younger speakers and as formal-written language mostly have, tends to be a nominative-accusative language (an accusative language) at syntactic level and places grammatical subject (S) at initial position (before verb); pre verbal constituent of clause construction is S in this local language. Most synchronic data of clauses found in formal uses and in written forms of Minangkabaunese constructed in SVO patterns. It may be assumed that once Minangkabaunese contacts to other hegemonic languages whose word order typology is SVO, such as English, modern Minangkabaunese has been evolutionary influenced and formally tends to be SVO language. More than 70 percent of clauses identified as modern-formal Minangkabaunese grammatically constructed in SVO word order. Due to the facts, it may be claimed that modern Minangkabaunese, based on synchronic data and linguistic evidences, is an SVO language in word order typology.

In relation to word order VOS, the clauses with such pattern of word order are also frequently found modern Minangkabaunese, even though they are in less frequency than SVO has. Based on the data collected and the historical line (diachronic view points), the VOS is grammatically accepted as one of basic word order of Minangkabaunese. There are three diachronic reasons and evidences that can be argued in this paper to support this claim. Firstly, the VOS word order of clause construction is assumed as the original-genetic word order of classic-Malay language family to which Minangkabaunese belongs to. Genetically, Minangkabaunese is a local language of the West-Malay language sub-group as most local languages spoken in the main land of Sumatera. The West-Malay language sub-group belongs to Malay language family as a language family of Austronesian. As reported by previous researchers, Malagasi, Tagalog, Tongan (Austronesian languages) and Bataknese of Toba and Pak-Pak Dairi (languages of Malay family in country-side of Sumatera) are the VOS languages in nature (see [4]; [35]; [25]). Related to its genetic ancestor, it is reasonable to state that Minangkabaunese is a VOS language as many other languages of Malay family are. Then, due to time and processes of language contact with hegemonic SVO languages, such as English, modern Minangkabaunese tends to be an SVO language, as well.

Secondly, data (clauses and other related evidences) obtained from old-manuscripts and written texts such as folklores, cultural-stylistic speeches, and proverbs are mostly constructed in VOS word order. The data selected and presented as VOS clauses in previous part were mostly taken and quoted from old-manuscripts, folklores, proverbs, and cultural-stylistic speeches of Minangkabaunese. Related to sources of data of this category, it may be argued that Minangkabaunese was originally a VOS language in nature, and in its evolutionary changes and development affected by dynamic language contacts, the SVO word order becomes dominant in formal and written style of this local language today. This diachronic condition is highly possible as human languages are dynamic motivated by linguistic and non-linguistic factors in certain portions.

Thirdly, the VOS clause constructions are frequent found in many daily communication events such as in casual speech, in delivering oral advices, and in informal communication among native speakers of Minangkabaunese. Native speakers mostly choose VOS constructions in order to avoid agent focus meanings in such speech events. They prefer to construct clauses in VOS word order as the sense of having old-style of language. Thus, the native speakers of Minangkabaunese naturally and cognitively maintain the "sense" of VOS word order as the original-genetic construction of clauses in their language. When both patterns of word order, SVO and VOS, are used by native speakers, they do not need to have extra-additional linguistic features in producing and in understanding them. Then, they are the unmarked constructions, in nature.

Based on data and discussion as a whole, it may be claimed that synchronic data tell that Minangkabaunese is an SVO language, even though some synchronic data indicate that VOS clause constructions are acceptable, as well. Based on diachronic data and evidences, in other side, Minangkabaunese is VOS language, even some of such clause constructions are still unmarked in modern Minangkabaunese. Therefore, the synchronic-diachronic data and evidences reveal and assert that Miangkabaunese can be typologically claimed as both an SVO and a VOS language. For better claim, however, it should be noted that old Minangkabaunese was diachronically assumed as a VOS language, but it tends to be an SVO language today as the consequence of language evolution and language contact in modern life.

In the case as described above, to determine and to assign the nature of word order typology of Minangkabaunese, synchronic and diachronic data should be appropriately accommodated and involved. It may lead us to know how a language evolves and how it genetically born, grows up, and develops all time until the present condition and/or to predict what will happen to the language then. The nature of grammatical properties of human languages does not stand statically in certain points including the cases of word order typology. It may be reasonably argued that assigning word order typology of Minangkabaunese at syntactic level need to include

synchronic and diachronic data and/or evidences in order that the claims stated are grammatically valid and reliable as linguistic studies.

V. CONCLUSION

It is on right "path" and on correct "ideas" to have synchronic and diachronic data in order to have valid linguistic evidences in exploring and in analyzing the grammatical-typological properties of basic-grammatical constructions in one particular language. This way of study may lead linguists to prove and to claim further conclusions dealing with certain grammatical phenomena which are still in questions. The use of both diachronic and synchronic evidences, in assigning word order typology for instance, may work hand in hand for certain cases such as in exploring and in explaining how and why one language has more than one basic word order typology. Basic word order typology Minangkabaunese, as discussed in this article, is hard to explain if the synchronic data are only used. The phenomena of word order typology of Minangkabaunese as a local language in West-Sumatera are more reasonable and valid if related diachronic data and evidences are appropriately involved in typological analyses. How and why Minangkabunese has two equally acceptable basic word orders typology, SVO and VOS, can be explained through the use synchronic and diachronic data. This study, based on synchronic and diachronic data, proves that Minangkabaunese belongs to a language with more than one basic word order typology, namely SVO and VOS.

The result of analysis and conclusion linguistically exposed in this paper may give significant and certain contribution to the related theories of grammatical typology, especially in the theories and practical studies of word order typology in order to support the ideas that one language may have more than one word order typology as in Minangkabunese. Further questions concerning with basic word order typology of Minangkabaunese, such as whether SVO and VOS are really the two basic word orders typology of Minangkabaunese based on three ways of typological test toward different genre of texts, what the hierarchy of acceptability of the word order typology, and others are relevant and essential to ask, then. It is also suggested on this occasion to have applied researches dealing with application of word order typology analysis and translation. It is also possible to study the phenomena of word order typology and creative teaching-learning processes of language, and so on. Therefore, further studies and analyses on the grammatical-typological properties of certain languages and the practical application of word order typology in Minangkabaunese and in other languages are recommended to do with particular specifications and in cross-linguistic studies.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

VII. REFERENCES

[1] E. Finegan. Language: Its Structure and Use. Boston: Thomson Wadsworth. 2004.

[2] W. Croft. Typology and Universals. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1993.

[3] R. M. W. Dixon. Basic Linguistic Theory (Vol. 1: Methodology). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2010.

[4] L. J. Whaley. Introduction to Typology. London: SAGE Publication. 1997.

[5] B. Comrie. Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1989.

[6] Jufrizal. "Struktur Argumen dan Aliansi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau" (unpublished dissertation). Denpasar: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana. 2004.

[7] Jufrizal. Tatabahasa Bahasa Minangkabau. Padang: UNP Press. 2012.

[8] Jufrizal., Z. Amri., H. Ardi. 'Kemasan Makna Gramatikal dan Makna Sosial-Budaya Bahasa Minangkabau: Penyelidikan atas Tatamakna dan Fungsi Komunikatifnya" (unpublished research report). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang. 2016/2017.

[9] K. Artawa., and Jufrizal. Tipologi Linguistik: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya. Denpasar: Penerbit Pustaka Larasan. 2018.

[10] Jufrizal. "Tipologi Tataurut Kata Bahasa Minangkabau: Uji Tipologis dan Hirarkhi Keberterimaannya" (unpublished research report). Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang. 2020/2021.

[11] K. Artawa., and Jufrizal. Tipologi Linguistik: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya (Edisi Revisi). Denpasar: Penerbit Pustaka Larasan. 2021.

[12] Jufrizal and Z. Amri. "Kebermarkahan Morfosintaksisi Bahasa Minangkabau: Telaah Tipologi Linguistik" (unpublished research report). Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang. 2019.

[13] Jufrizal., and L. Refnita. 'From V-O-S to S-V-O Language?: A Diachronic Study on Word-Order Typology of Minangkabaunese' (a paper presented at 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. 2019.

[14] Jufrizal and L. Refnita. 'From V-O-S to S-V-O Language?: A Diachronic Study on Word-Order Typology of Minangkabaunese'. 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. 2020.

[15] R. M. W. Dixon. Ergativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1994.

[16] M. Gell-Mann., and M. Ruhlen. 'The Origin and Evolution of Word Order' in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. Published online 2011, October 10. Doi:10.1073/pnas.1113716108 PMCID: PMC3198322, PMID: 21987807. 2011.

[17] J. J. Song. Linguistic Typology. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2018.

[18] J. J. Song. Linguistic Typology: Morphology and Syntax. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited. 2001.

[19] G. Mallinson,, and B. J. Blake. Language Typology: Cross-Linguistic Studies in Syntax. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company. 1981.

[20] T. Shopen. (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description (Vol. 1) 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2007.

[21] O. N. Thomsen. (ed.). Competing Models of Linguistic Change: Evolution and Beyond. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2006.

[22] L. Campbell. Historical Linguistics: An Introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

[23] C. Y. Yiu. "Typology of Word Order in Chinese Dialects: Revisiting the Classification of Min" in Language and Linguistics 15(4) 539-573, p.p. 539-573. DOI: 10.1177/1606822XX14532052/lin.sagepub.com . 2014.

[24] K. Thepkanjana., and S. Uehera. 'Effects of Constituent Orders on Functional Extension Patterns of the Verb for 'Give': A Constrastive Study of Thai and Mandarin Chinese' in Language and Linguistics 16(1). p.p. 43-68. DOI: 10.1177/1601822X14556603lin.sagepub.com. 2015.

[25] I. Basaria. 'Relasi dan Peran Gramatikal dalam Bahasa Papak Dairi: Kajian Tipologi' (unpublished dissertation). Medan: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Sumatera Utara. 2011.

[26] A. Tambusai. 'Tipologi Morfologis dan Struktur Argumen Bahasa Melayu Riau' (unpublished dissertation). Medan: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Sumatera Utara. 2016.

[27] P. Siwi. 'Sintaksis Bahasa Siladang: Kajian Tipologi Gramatikal' (unpublished dissertation). Medan: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Sumatera Utara. 2018.

[28] M. Shibatani., and T. Bynon. (eds.). Approaches to Language Typology. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1999.

[29] Jufrizal., Rusdi., and Refnaldi. "Pentopikalan dalam Bahasa Minangkabau dan Kaitannya dengan Upaya Pembinaan Sosial-Budaya Masyarakat Minangkabau" (unpublished research report). Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni. 2006.

[30] Jufrizal., M. Zaim., and H. Ardi. "Bahasa dan Budaya Minangkabau: Dari Tipologi Gramatikal ke Budaya Berbahasa Penuturnya" (unpublished research report 1st year). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang. 2013.

[31] Jufrizal., M. Zaim., and H. Ardi. "Bahasa dan Budaya Minangkabau: Dari Tipologi Gramatikal ke Budaya Berbahasa Penuturnya" (unpublished research report 2nd year). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang. 2014.

[32] Jufrizal., Z. Amri., and H. Ardi. 'Kemasan Makna Gramatikal dan Makna Sosial-Budaya Bahasa Minangkabau: Penyelidikan atas Tatamakna dan Fungsi Komunikatifnya" (unpublished research report 1st and 2nd year). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang. 2016, 2017.

[33] K. Lambrecht. Information Structure and Sentence Form. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1996.

[34] P. R. Kroeger. Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008.

[35] A. Caffarel., J. R. Martin., and C. M. I. M. Matthiessen. (eds.). Language Typology: A Functional Perspective. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2004.