Typology of Syntactic in Karo Language

[1]Karisma Erikson Tarigan,   [2]Mulyadi

[1,2] Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
Email: [1]erick_tarigan2006@yahoo.com, [2]mulyadi@usu.ac.id

Abstract: *Based on classification word order of syntactic typology of Karo Language, VSO/PSO type was dominantly appears because Karo Language generally was passive which Predicate was in the beginning of the sentence and the subject was noun. Then it was followed by SVO/SPO. The classification was based on Mode: (1) Declarative was consisted of two parts, they were positive declarative and negative declarative, in which the dominant pattern was VS/PS type. (2) Interrogative. Basic sentence type could be change into interrogative sentence yes/no. Classification based on clause: (1) Simple sentence which dominantly appeared was the sentence with V-S-O or P-S-O type. (2) Compound complex sentence which dominantly found was subordinate clause with 'adi' marker 'if' when the marker attribute was adverb, and if it was in the beginning of the sentence so it would. Generally, the basic pattern of   be elaborated adverbial subordinate clause by using adjective was K-V/P dan K-V/P-S. (3) Compound sentence was related with two clauses which had two patterns. Basic pattern of compound sentence of Karo language was S-V. (4) Indensity compound sentence, S was related to coordinate marker 'ras'.*

Key Words: *Karo Language, Syntactic Typology, Word and Sentence Order.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

The study of differences and similarities among human languages has developed over time and the distinct varieties of spoken and written languages can be seen from the morphological properties of languages and their syntactic properties. The development of syntactic typology owes a lot to the American linguist Joseph Greenberg, whose interest in typology and language universals led him to propose the theory of 'implicational' universals based on syntactic properties. Typologists believe that there are certain core properties that languages have in common which can be formulated as generalizations about language in the form of language universals or probabilistic statements about the distribution of language classification. Typology is a language grouping based on its grammatical and grammatical characteristics (Mallinson and Blake 1981:1-3). Mallinson further argues that languages can be grouped according to the limitations of their characteristic structural characteristics. The study of language typology seeks to establish broad groupings based on a number of interrelated grammatical features.

Typology of language, as a branch of comparative linguistics of language, develops special methods which result in the classification of languages according to their types. Classification of language based on typology is based on lexical criteria and structural criteria. The lexical criteria, which are the basis of the geneological typology, highlight the similarities in sound (phonological correspondence) contained in a word that has the same meaning as words in various other languages. Other criteria that form the basis of language typology are structural and systematic criteria. These criteria highlight the phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics of various languages. This structural and systemic criterion has three characteristics, namely arbitrary, complete and unique. The latest development of language typology uses structural and systemic criteria on all the basis of language classifications. From the description above, the writers are interested in analyzing the Typology of Syntactic of the Karo language in how is the classification of the syntactic structure of the Karo language and their forms?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW:

2.1 Linguistic Typology

Typology technically refers to language groups based on the characteristics of word and sentence structures (Mallinson and Blake, 1981:3; Artawa, 2000:19). (Comrie, 1983; Konisi et al, 2019) state that the purpose of linguistic typology is to group language based on its structure characteristic and acts. The main objective of typology study is to answer the question: what does the language like? Specifically, the objectives of typology study are (a) to group language based on its structure characteristic, (b) to investigate the language differences, and (c) to learn/investigate variations of human language. Typology represents an "approach" to cross-linguistic comparison which is the identification is based on its formal language and it is called functionalism typology. This functional

typological approach assumes a uniformitarian view of languages: the rules that govern language structure have not changed significantly in recorded time (Croft, 1990).

Baldi (2011:49) argues that the primary goal of typology is the identification of clusters of structural features that co-occur in languages. Once clusters of co-occuring features are identified, the functional interrelationships for their occurrences can be investigated. Comrie (1988) also explains that typology linguistics is a study of language classification of domain. Brown and Miller (1994:64) also state that the category Pred offers a unique environment for the classification of copular verbs. It also enables us to identify which NPs' are predicate, information we need, in English, to ensure that predicate NPs agree in number with the subjects of the sentence, and in other languages to make the correct statement about the agreement of adjectives.

2.2 Types of Syntactic Typology

Crystal (2008:471) defines syntax as a principle of how words are combined to form a sentence in a specific language. Besides, Khan (2020) argues that word order typology is based on the classification of languages according to their syntactic pattern of verb and object in simple sentences. Furthermore, the combination of three syntactic elements, namely subject, verb, and object. Theoretically, there are six language classification possibilities based on orders as the following.

Table 1. The Classification of Word Order in Syntactic Typology

Subject-initial sentences	Verb-initial sentences	Object-initial sentences
SOV	VSO	OSV
SVO	VOS	OVS

According to Aitchison (2008), language classification usually found in the classification with the subject in the initial sentence and followed by the verb in the initial sentence which is functioning as an action verb. Strazny (2013:1066) defines that syntactic typology is one of the major branches of linguistic typology, aiming to classify language structure based on its shared syntactic properties, which are not necessarily the result of geographical contact. The criteria according to can be typologized syntactically are:

- Word order. It is an ideal method to predict the complete structure of language on the basis of typological language. For example, an SVO language is likely to have prepositions rather than postpositions (such as *up the plant* rather than *the plant up*), and auxiliaries before main verbs (such as *He may drink* rather than *He drink may*). Such a language is also likely to have relative clauses (beginning with who/which, etc.) after the noun they refer to, such *as The girl who destroyed the room escaped* rather than *The who destroyed the room girl escaped.*
- Agreement. Agreement refers to grammatical person is found between verb and subject as in *She is a waiter*/*She is a waitress*. This may also show itself in structures where a word refers back to something mentioned previously, as in *I know Dean quite well, **he** was my friend for long*. Plag, et al (2011) defines that subject-verb agreement is a syntactic process which requires subject and verb share the same person and number features.
- Negation. Negation is a syntactic (or more technically, "morphosyntactic") process in which a lexical item denies or inverts the meaning of another lexical item. Negation can be found in various types of clauses, such as declarative, interrogative, and exclamative.
- Ergativity. In some languages, the form of the object in a transitive clause is the same as that of the subject of an intransitive clause. Such languages are called 'Ergative' languages, as opposed to languages like English, which are typologically entitled 'nominative-accusative' languages. In studying the ergative languages, the linguist has to check if the subject of a transitive clause has a different form; i.e. in some languages, in intransitive clauses some subjects are treated like transitive subjects, and others like transitive objects.

2.3 Greenberg Syntactic Typology

The work of Greenberg (1963) is generally viewed as marking the beginning of word order typology as a discipline of modern linguistics. Some of the major claims of modern word order typology had been formulated centuries ago (Lehmann 1995:1150), for instance, the claim that word order is fixed when case endings are lost or that the determining element regularly either precedes or follows the determined element (Weil, 1844; Behaghel, 1932).

This study is based on the Greenberg's rule (1957:76-77) which sees the effect of word order on the formation of ad-position types (prepositions or postpositions) and nominal phrases involving both adjective and genitive forms. Greenberg's typology is actually not a new typology. He just develops what has been proposed by Lepsius and Schmidt and other experts who accept the opinions of the two experts. Greenberg tries to develop a new systemic by taking into

account the three elements (type and system) together, which he calls the basic order which concerns: relative order between subject, verb, and object, adposition, and attributive adjective position to noun). In his article entitled "some universals of grammar with a particular reference to the order of meaningful elements" (in Universals of Language, 1966), Greenberg proposed a typology which he called the basic order typology. This basic order typology is determined by three criteria, namely: (1). Relative order between subject-verb-object in a news sentence, which is denoted by S (subject), V (verb), O (object); (2). The existence of an adposition, namely a preposition versus a position in a language, which is denoted by pr/po (preposition/ postposition); (3). The position of the attributive adjective to the noun. If the adjective precedes the noun then this sequence is denoted by A, and if the noun precedes the adjective this sequence is denoted by N.

Based on the results of reasoning on the first criterion, six sentence patterns can potentially be obtained, namely: SVO, SOV, VSO, VOS, OSV, and OVS. Latin and Russian, for example, can use these six patterns. Other languages have more limited order patterns, some have only one dominant pattern, and some have two dominant patterns, and so on. Indonesian, for example, only has one dominant pattern, namely SVO, English has two dominant patterns, namely: SVO and VSO for informative sentences and question sentence. Latin uses these six patterns; this can be seen in the example of the sentence Father loves his son which can be translated into:

SVO: Father was bitten by the phyliumsuum

SOV: Pater phyliumsuum was bitten

VSO: Bitten by the pater phyliumsuum

VOS: Bitten by the phyliumsuum pater

OSV: Phyliumsuum pater bitten

OVS: Phyliumsuum was bitten by a pater

In Indonesian, the word father occupies the subject function because of its position or place precedes the predicate: on the other hand, the son becomes the object of the sentence precisely because it comes after the predicate. When the places of father and son are exchanged, the functions of the two words also change. In Latin, the function of the subject and predicate is not determined by the position or place in the sentence, but is determined by the subject who takes the nominative case, and the concordance between the subject and the predicate is in the form of a person (I, II, III singular or plural) according to the subject. Thus, a word with a certain case will still occupy a certain function, even if it is placed anywhere. The word pattern which contains the nominative case occupies the subject function while the phylum (from *filius*) which contains the accusative case occupies the object. Of the six basic sequence pattern opportunities as stated above, there are three dominant basic sequence patterns, namely SVO, SOV, and VSO. To make it easier to remember, Greenberg mentions the pattern in succession according to the position of element V, namely:

Type I: VSO (V occupies the position at the beginning of the sentence)

Type II: SVO (V takes second place)

Type III: SOV (V occupies the third position).

Of the three criteria above, namely: the basic order pattern (VSO / SVO / SOV), the presence of an adposition (Pr/Po), and the adjective position of the language class opportunity (= 3 x 2 x 2).

2.4 The Principles of Syntactic Typology

The characterization of basic word order by Hawkins (1983:13) is representative of criteria assumed by many linguists: he uses a set of different criteria, all of which tend to correlate with each other, though none of them are necessary properties. The basic principles of syntactic typology can be accounted for in terms of three general principles:

1. More topical material tends to come nearer to the beginning of the clause (to the left) than non-topical material.
2. Heavy material tends to come nearer to the end of the clause (to the right) than light material.
3. Constituents tend to fix their position according to their grammatical or semantic relation in the clause (noun, verb, prepositional phrase, etc.) (Mallison and Blake, 1981:151).

Vennemann & Harlow (1977) turned to the syntactic head concept for the clarification of the specifier specified relation, which substitutes the operator-operand relation of earlier work. The specifier is identified with the non-head element, the specified element with the head. The principle under discussion states that all specifiers tend either to precede or follow the element they specify. (Jackendoff, 1977; Gazdar et al, 1985; Zwicky 1985; and Corbett et al, 1993) have contributed towards the clarification of the head concept within modern syntactic theories. The criteria are:

1. The head determines the category of the phrase (i. e. head and phrasal node share the major categorial features).
2. The head is the determining category in terms of case government or other valency-related phenomena in which one element determines the presence, syntactic or semantic function of another element.

3. The head expresses the syntactic function of the phrase by inflection (i. e. head and phrasal node share the functional inflectional features).

3. METHOD:

The method used in this research was a qualitative method. Qualitative method was an easy method when faced with multiple realities. This method presented the nature of the relationship between informants and researchers directly (Moleong, 2004). The approach used to the subject of this study was the typology approach of language because the object of research was Karo speakers. Meanwhile, the technique used in the research was interviews by recording and taking notes directly. This technique was aimed at obtaining data in a naturalist manner, without any conditioning at all from the researcher.

The technique of data analysis was in the form of descriptive qualitative. The data were analyzed in the following steps: (1) Identifying syntax; (2) Classifying it based on the type of syntactic construction characteristics; (3) Identify the meaning contained in each syntactic construction based on its characteristics; (4) Identify the structural characteristics possessed by the syntax of the Karo language to determine the number and roles of participants expressed by the syntax of the Karo language; (5) Interpreting the Karo language typology based on syntax by applying the Karo language syntactic sorting.

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS:

From the results of the analysis and discussion of the classification, it was found that the types of syntactic typology in the Karo language include:

A. *Typology Based on Word Order*

The dominant classification based on word order is VSO/PSO type because Karo language was generally a passive sentence where P was at the beginning of the sentence and the subject was a noun.

1. *Type SVO/SPO*
a. *Ennda kujujurken isapku* (SVO/SPO)
   'I am handling you my cigarette'
b. *Jenge kap bene na adat.*(SVO/SPO)
   'This is where the loss of culture'
c. *Emkap nina bahan isapntah pe belo.*(SVO/SPO)
   'He said, it is made for suction or betel'

2. *Type VSO/PSO*
a. *Enggom bene sie kerina.*(VSO/PSO)
   'It's all gone'
b. *Tersinget-singet rulih niding enda*. (VSO/PSO)
   'Remember the success of this trial'
c. *Reh nina temanku ndai* (VSO/PSO)
   'Come, my friends' said'

3. *OSV/OSP type*
a. Waja melala, a yellow elephant supplies a friend. (OSV/OSP)
   "There are many names for a yellow elephant, a friend"

This type of OSV/OSP was found in one sentence in the interviews conducted, and the author added the two sentences below. After being tested on the informants, the informant understood this sentence, but this sentence was tested in the appropriate context. If this sentence did not fit the context, then this sentence was rarely found.
b. Gulen mbue ate gia sugar rollers work (OSV/OSP)
   "Vegetables are a lot of party vegetable wholesalers'
c. Eat melala Mama ula mbiar man (OSV/OSP)
   'There's a lot of rice, Uncle, don't be afraid to eat.

What it means: a son-in-law who told his uncle to add rice without hesitation (the context of the situation at the time of eating together).

From the two additional examples above, the writer always heard the sentence when a son-in-law, both male and female, talked to the in-laws, often used the sentence using the basic pattern or VSO/PSO type because the speaker did not speak directly but through an intermediary. Or the speaker spoke politely out of reluctance or respect.

B. Typology Based on Mode

From the results of the analysis of the syntactic type sentence in the Karo language based on mode were as follows:

1. Declarative

Declarative sentence was to tell something to others so that the expected response was in the form of attention from the speech partner. Sometimes the response or form of attention answer *'yes'* from the speech partner. In addition, in declarative sentence, there was no question words like *'what, who, where, why',* and words of invitation like '*come on, come on, say please',* and say no. Declarative sentence was ended with a period (.) while in oral form was ended in a descending tone.

From the description of the analysis of declarative sentences, declarative sentences were consisted of two parts, namely positive declarative and negative declarative, where the dominant pattern that appeared was the VS/PS pattern/type and was followed by SP/SV. Negative declaratives generally had a PS/VS pattern.

2. Interrogative

An interrogative sentence was a sentence that functioned to expect a reaction or an answer from someone. This sentence was formal characterized by the presence of question words such as what, who, when, how, and why.

Basic sentence types could be changed to "yes/no" question sentences. In the form of a "yes/no" question the predicate was always before the subject.

Example: *Labo nen wari niding enda?* (V-S/P-S)

           'Don't have to see the day of the holiday?

In its most basic form, Karo interrogative sentences for yes/no questions were structurally similar to declarative sentences and only differ in their intonational contours. In general, "yes/no" questions were characterized by an increased final intonation, whereas in declarative sentences, the intonation contour decreases. In an interrogative sentence, it was common to find an interrogative particle which was located right after the predicate. These interrogative particles made subtle but important differences to the expectations of the speaker.

Example: *Beltu-beltu kai kin e?* (S-V/S-P)

            'How is it now?'

'Kin', a particle that indicates that the speaker expects his question to tend to answer positively. Almost all of the question sentences "yes / no" had a VS/PS arrangement in the content question sentence, the question word used generally was appeared in a position as close as possible at the beginning of the sentence, while the intransitive sentences containing the question word which were subject to prominence almost all had a structure SV/SV.

3. Imperative

Imperative sentence was a sentence that formed to expect a response in the form of action. In the form of writing, imperative sentences or imperative sentences usually was ended with a sign *exclamation (!).* Meanwhile, in spoken form, intonation was marked with a low tone at the end of the speech.

The imperative in the Karo language, especially the context of the recorded sentence, was addressed to the second person who was already understood from the context, usually not expressed in the sentence. Example:

a. *Uat kalender nen wari, piga berngi bulan!*

'Take the calendar, see the day, how many nights of the month'

b. *'Tama ku para tuhur*!

'Lies to the tuhur (the multistory above the stove)'

Impereative in Karo language was also marked with the word *'enda'* which signified the imperative of petition or request.

Example: *Ennda kujujurken isapku nini*!

       'I am handing you my cigarette'

The imperative in this recording also had a suffix *'-lah'* marker to express an urge or hope for a desire.

Example: *Cabur bintang bas langit caburen lah pencarinku*!
　　　'As a star in the sky, the more my fortune is'

C. Typology Based on Clause
(1) Single Sentence
　　From the Karo recordings, the dominant single sentence that appeared was the single sentence of the V-S-O or P-S-O type.

1. *Tersinget-singet   rulih niding enda*. (PSO)
　　　P　　　　　S　　O
　　'Keep in mind this successful'

2. *Labo nen   wari niding enda?* (PSO)
　　P　　S　　　O
　　'Don't have to see this next day?'

3. *Waja melala atendu perbalok gajah kuning nge teman.*(OSP)
　　　O　　　　S　　　　　　　　　P
　　'A lot of bait, the name is also the yellow elephant friend.'

　　From the description of the single sentence above, the dominant sentence pattern that were appeared was V-S / P-S or that was followed by S-V / S-P.

(2)   Compound Sentence
a.   Multilevel Compound Sentence
　　From the Karo sentence, it is found above the compound sentence, the dominant one was the clause with the *'adi'* marker *'if'* was the adverbial marking feature, and if it was placed at the beginning of the sentence then it would become a clause that expanded the adverb.

1. *Adi lit kalender   nen adi lalit lang.*
　　　<u>K</u>　　P　　<u>K</u>
　　S-P　　　　S-P
　　'If there is a calendar, see, if there is not any calendar, no need'

2. *Adi niding enda   la man bahanen upah niding?*
　　　<u>K</u>　　　P　　O
　　S-P
　　'If this is not for netting wages?'

　　Of the two multilevel compound sentences above *'adi'* was a sign of the adverb of the conditions, the basic pattern of compound sentences for the expansion of the description using the word *'adi'* was generally the basic pattern of K-P and K-P-S.

3. *Si kitikna pe labo dalih gelah mbelang tapakna*
　　　<u>S</u>　　　　　<u>P</u>
　　S-P　　　　P-S-O
　　'Even the smallest is fine as long as the foot width'

4. *Si kertang-kertangna pe labo dalih gelah mbue tabeh-tabehna*
　　　<u>S</u>　　　　　<u>P</u>
　　S-P　　　　P-S-O
　　'Even the thinnest is fine as long as there is a lot of fat'

　　From the two examples above, it could be seen that, this clause had a basic clause structure unless the subject position of the prefix in this clause was replaced by the relative identifier *'si'* which connected the subject of the replaced clause with the main word of the co-referent noun phrase explained by the clause.

b.   Compound Sentence Equivalent
　　From the example sentences below, the compound sentence was equivalent to connecting two clauses that had two

patterns. The basic pattern of compound sentences with the Karo equivalent was S-P.

1. *Soalna sangket ia je enggoh, saja ola nen.*

      S   P
    P-S-K   K-P

    'The problem is that he's stuck there already, but don't look often'

2. *Berarti niding enda ras njala enggo seri kap warina e?*

      S   P
    S-P   S-P

    'So that means this session and the njala are the same day?'

3. *Cabur bintang bas langit,   caburen lah pencarinku*

      S   P
    P-S-K   P-S-O

    'As a star in the sky, the more my fortune is'

    From the below sentence, there was a compound sentence equivalent to the S meeting which was connected with the coordinative marker *'ras'* which meaning was *'and'*.

4. *Niding enda ras njala   enggo seri kap   warina e?*

      S   P   O
    S-S

    'This Niding and Njala are the same day?'

D. Typology Based on Active-Passive Sentences

a.   Active Sentence

    From the Karo language recordings, the dominant active sentence appeared was the active sentence with an S-P or S-P pattern, for example, like the active sentence above. In the active sentence of the Karo language there were at least two core constituents, usually with the composition S, and P, other core constituents S, P, and O. Other constituents arose among these core constituents. For example information that expresses the frequency or way of doing, additional information between the subject and the predicate.

1. *Uat   kalender*
     P   S

2. *nen   wari!*
     P   S

    'Take a calendar view days'

3. *buat kari galuh setabar ena*
       P   S

    'Take the banana later'

    Finding the example below, it could be seen that the active sentence type also had an S-P-O-O pattern, namely two sentences that had the same pattern but different types of objects. Active voice S-V-O comorbid O-patient and active voice S-V-O comorbid O-sufferer. This sentence pattern was occured because this sentence was an imperative sentence in the form of a highly expected request and usually the word '*kujujurken'* was for the creator or *'kalimbubu' dibata ni idah (visible God)* in Karo's customs.

4. *Enda kududurken bandu isapku*
    S   P   O   O

    'I present/offer for you my cigarette'

b. Passive Sentence

    The recorded sentences in Karo were divided into ordinary passive and unsubjected passive forms, both of which could appear in accidental passive or dynamic passive form. Karo passive voice contained at least two kinds of constituents, generally sequentially, namely P-S or V-S. Generally, the subject of the passive sentence was characterized by a noun phrase and had a semantic role as a sufferer. Whereas predicates were generally in the form of phrases that

contained an obligatory central element played by a passive verb plus an optional complementary actor played by certain types of noun phrases that had a semantic role as the actor. Examples:

1. *Tersinget-singet* *rulih* *niding enda*.
       P   S   O

   'Keep in mind this successful'

2. *La mbue*   *bas ia*   *tabas*.
      K   S   P

   'Not much at her mantra'

3. *Enggom bene* *sie* *kerina*.
      P   S   O

   'This is all gone'

Generally, the Karo language VSO or PSO type in the recording of the *'niding'* process was passive but not absolute, both in interrogative and declarative sentences. The subject of the above sentence was generally a noun.

5. CONCLUSION :

From the description of the analysis and discussion as well as the research findings, it could be concluded that the "Syntactic Typology of Karo Language" which was studied based on the classification of word order, the dominant type appeared was the VSO / PSO type because Karo language was generally a passive sentence where P was at the beginning of the sentence and the subject was a noun followed by SVO / SPO.

Classification based on mode: (1) Declarative. It was consisted of two parts, namely positive declarative and negative declarative, where the dominant pattern that appeared was the VS / PS pattern / type. (2) Interrogative. Basic sentence types could be changed into "yes / no" question sentences. In the form of a "yes / no" question, the predicate was always before the subject. In its most basic form, Karo interrogative sentences for yes / no questions were structurally similar to declarative sentences and only differ in their intonational contours. In general, "yes / no" questions were characterized by an increased final intonation, whereas in declarative sentences, the intonation contour decreases. In an interrogative sentence, it was common to find an interrogative particle which was located right after the predicate. These interrogative particles made subtle but important differences to the expectations of the speaker. Almost all of the interrogative "yes / no" interrogative sentences had a VS / PS arrangement in the content question sentence, the interrogative words used generally were appeared at the closest possible position at the beginning of the sentence, while the intransitive sentences containing the question word that experience the prominence almost all had an SV / SV. (3) Imperative. Imperative in Karo language, especially the context of the recorded sentence, was addressed to the second person who was already understood from the context, usually not expressed in a sentence. Imperative in Karo language was also marked with the word *'enda'* which signified the imperative of petition or request. The imperative in this recording also had a suffix *'–lah'* marker to express an urge or hope for a desire.

Classification based on clauses: (1) The dominant single sentence that was appeared was a single sentence of type V-S-O or P-S-O. (2) The dominant multilevel compound sentence was the clause with the '*adi'* marker *'if'* was the adverbial marking feature, and if it was placed at the beginning of the sentence it would become a clause in the adverb extension. The basic pattern of compound sentences for the expansion of the description using the word '*adi'* was generally the basic pattern of K-P and K-P-S. The compound sentence markers were stratified, clauses were distinctively distinguished from the use of the '*yang'*. Internally, this clause had a basic clause structure unless the subject position of the prefix in this clause was replaced by the relative identifier '*si'* which was connected the subject of the replaced clause with the main word of the coreferent noun phrase explained by the clause. (3) Equivalent compound sentences connected two clauses that had two patterns. The basic pattern of compound sentences with the Karo equivalent was S-P. (4) Equivalent compound sentences associated with the coordinative markers *'ras'* which was meaning *'and'*.

REFERENCES:

1. Artawa, K. (2000). *Alternasi diatesis pada beberapa bahasa nusantara: Dalam kajian serba linguistic.* Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya dan PT BPK Gunung Mulia.
2. Atchison, J. (2008). *Linguistics*. London: Hodder Headline.
3. Baldi, P. (2011). *Linguistic change and reconstruction morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
4. Behaghel, O. (1932). *Deutsche syntax: Eine geschichtliche darstellung.* Heidelberg: Winter.
5. Brown & Miller. (1994). *Syntax: A linguistic introduction to sentence structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Comrie, B. (1983). *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Limite.

7. Corbett, G., Fraser, N., & McGlashan, S. (1993). *Heads in grammatical theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Croft, W. (1990). *Typology and universals.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
10. Gazdar, Gerald, Klein, E., & Pullum, G. (1985). *Generalized phrase structure grammar.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
11. Greenberg, J. (1957). Order of affixing: A study in general linguistics, in J. Greenberg, *Essays in linguistics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
12. Greenberg, J. H. (1963). Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In: Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.) *Universals of language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
13. Hawkins, J. A. (1983). *Word order universals.* New York: Academic Press.
14. Jackendoff, R. (1977). *X-bar-syntax: A study of phrase structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
15. Khan, M. K. (2020). *Pashto Phonology: An Evaluation of the Relationship between Syllable Structure and Word Order.* United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
16. Konisi, L. Y, Artawa, L. A., Satyawati, & Udayana, I. Y. (2019). Verbal clause construction of ciacia language: *Syntactic Typology Study*, 13(11), 242-254.
17. Lehmann, W. (1972). Contemporary linguistics and indo-european studies. *Publications of the Modern Language Association, 87(*967993*).*
18. Mallinson, G., & Blake, B. (1981). *Language typology.* Amsterdam: North-Holland.
19. Moleong. (2004). *Metode kualitatif.* Bandung: Rosdakarya.
20. Plag, I., Braun, M., Lappe, S., & Schramm, M. (2011). *Introduction to english linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
21. Strazny, P. (2013). *Encyclopedia of linguistics.* New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
22. Vennemann, Theo, & Harlow, R. (1977). Categorial grammar and consistent basic VX serialization". *Theoretical Linguistics, 4* (227254).
23. Weil, H. (1844). *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes compare′es aux langues modernes.* Paris: Univ. Diss.
24. Zwicky, A. (1985). Heads. *Journal of Linguistics, 21*(129).