WORD ORDER IN ANGKOLA LANGUAGE:
A STUDY OF SYNTACTIC TYPOLOGY

Jamaluddin Nasution[1], Mulyadi[2]
[1]Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia
E-mail: djamal.nst@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to discover what and how the typology of *Angkola* Language (AL) is in word order as well as to determine its grammatical alliance. The application of qualitative methods was carried out descriptively to this study, it means that the data analyzed and the results are in the form of a phenomenon description. The stages in this research are data collection, data analysis, and presentation of data analysis results/conclusions. The conclusion of this study is the word order, namely: (1) declarative sentences in AL are in the pattern of: a) Verb + Subject + Object for intransitive; b) Verb + Object + Subject for transitive; (2) The negation sentences have 2 patterns: a) Negation + Subject + Verb + Object; b) Subject + Negation + Verb + Object; (3) Interrogative sentences have 3 patterns: a) Subject + Verb + Object; b) Verb + Subject + Object; and c) Passive-Verb + Subject + Object; and (4) Imperative sentences have 2 patterns: a) Verb + Object (subject disappears); and b) Verb + Subject + Object (similar to a declarative sentence). In AL, the argument Agent (A) behaves the same as the argument Subject (S) and is different from the argument Patient (P); therefore, this language pattern is classified as an accusative type. It is expected that there will be a syntactic typology researches in AL which examine the syntactic typology comprehensively as an effort to preserve and maintain local/ethnic languages.

Keywords: *Angkola language (AL); subject-verb-object; Typology; word order.*

1. Introduction

Typology can be defined as types, division, classification, model, and concept of a language. Language, in which it is a formed system to convey meanings in communication (Khairah & Ridwan, 2014), has its own type of structure, and language studies can be carried out on any language structure, by considering the most dominant characteristics of that language, and this is what is called a typological study. Language typology is generally intended to classify languages through structural behavior based on the language peculiarities. The typology of languages in the world is different one another. Typology, however, can be carried out in any language structure, by considering the dominant characters of the language (Siminto, 2013).

There are about 6,500 languages all over the world, from ethnic/local languages to national languages of a country. In the study of typology, the languages in the world can be grouped according to the basic order of subjects, objects, and verbs. Mallinson and Black

(1981) (in Basaria, 2018) state that a typology or word order typology concludes that there are six sentence patterns, and only Latin and Russian language which have all 6 patterns below (Basaria, 2018):
1) SOV, for example: Farmer tree cuts down (Turkish language);
2) SVO, for example: Farmer cuts down tree (Indonesian language);
3) VSO, for example: Cuts down farmer tree (Welsh language);
4) VOS, for example: Cuts down tree farmer (Malagasy language);
5) OVS, for example: Tree cuts down farmer (Hixkaryana language); and
6) OSV, for example: Tree farmer cuts down (Apurina language)

Relating on languages, Indonesia is a country which has many ethnic languages and it is rich in literature as well. Languages and literature are the nation's wealth, and its wealth on the one hand is a pride; on the other hand, a problem, especially when we are thinking about how to protect, explore the benefits, and maintain its diversity (Sugiyono, 2013a). According to the Basic Data on Language and Literature of Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture, Indonesia has around 718 local languages and Indonesian language itself is the official national language. Despite being understood and spoken by more than 90% of Indonesian people, Indonesian language is not the mother tongue for most speakers. Most Indonesian people use one of the 718 languages stated above as their mother tongue language or first language. Within the scope of Indonesia, the mother tongue is identified with the local language (Hutapea, 2020).

The local language as the mother tongue plays an important role in daily life of Indonesian people. Its sustainability is also very important to be maintained. This is because it has become a mandate from the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, in article 32 paragraph 2 states, "The state respects and maintains local languages as national cultural treasures". Various efforts and attempts have been done by Indonesian government through the Ministry of National Education to maintain local languages as a wealth of Indonesia in order that they exist and are preserved. Indonesian people are also expected to maintain and preserve their respective local languages.

The ways to maintain and preserve local languages are to put them into lessons at school, to translate local language into Indonesian language as national language, and to make some local language competitions, such as storytelling, speech, singing, and other culture exhibitions. But somehow, the results of Indonesian translations into local languages do not match to the natural structure of the target language (local language). The teenagers and young people who have the Indonesian language as the first language will communicate in local languages as the translation process from national to local languages. This happens since speakers do not understand the typology of the local language which were much uttered by some children in Angkola language. These errors can occur in the phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and even in pragmatic of the local language itself.

This research discusses Angkola local language in terms of its syntactic typology. Angkola language (later called AL) becomes the lingua franca for people of several districts in North Sumatra, such as; South Tapanuli, Padangsidimpuan City, Padanglawas, and North Padanglawas. An effort to revitalize regional languages is needed through education for children to maintain and preserve the authenticity of the local language from an early age. One of the efforts is through teaching in formal schools such as elementary/basic schools by learning how to use local languages (Nasution, 2021).

From the description above, it can be concluded that there is great expectation that local languages will be preserved by those concerning, Indonesian Government and the community. This is also in line with the mandate of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in article 32 paragraph 2. On the other hand, there is a local language phenomenon that occurs, especially in AL when the written translation and spoken language often appear in the pattern of 'S + P + O'. This is seen and heard by the writers when listening to the sentences spoken by children who use Indonesian Language and local language in the Padangsidimpuan city area. The sentences spoken are Indonesian language translations, for example:

(1) 'Aku   pergi   ke   sekolah'
    'Au   kehe   tu   sikola'
    1Sg   go   Prep   school

If we refer to some previous research on the Batak Toba language and Karonese language which had been done, AL also probably uses the same syntactic pattern because AL is cognate with the Batak Toba or Karonese language. And sentence 1 above can be stated as a direct translation from Indonesian language. This is also seen by writers in a research article data which was published in reputed journal with an example sentence:

(2) 'Mereka   meninggalkan aku   karena   terlambat'
    'Alai   maninggalkon   au   arana   tarlambat'
    3Plu   leave   1Sg   Conj   late

Sentence 2 above is translated from Indonesian language literally without considering whether the typology of the target language is similar or not to the source language. These phenomena are also seen in books, newspapers, and some articles when Indonesian language is translated to AL or vice versa. Therefore, research needs to be done in order to provide an explanation of what the natural syntactic typology of AL is, and this research can be used as a scientific reference when AL is used by speakers or those who study it.

The types of syntactic typology that are commonly discussed are: typology based on word order (SOV, SVO, VSO, VOS, OVS, OSV), typology based on mode (declarative, interrogative, imperative), typology based on clause (single sentence, compound sentence), typology based on active-passive sentences, or zero construction as proposed by Jufrizal, 2018 in his research (Jufrizal, 2018). Due to the wide scope and language of the syntactic typology, the writers in this study only focus on typology based on word order (SOV, SVO, VSO, VOS, OVS, OSV) and this study aims to see what and how AL typology is its order (word order) and determine their grammatical alliances.

2. Literature Review

Linguistic Typology is a linguistic study trying to classify languages based on the properties of the language itself (Rizki & Pujiati, 2017). The study of linguistic typology in the early period was famous as word order typology conducted by Greenberg (1966). This study examined the grammatical features and characteristics of languages all over the world, and grouped them according to certain parameters, which is known in the world of linguistics as the study of linguistic typology (Comrie, 1989). The purpose of the language typology is to determine the cross-language patterns and the relationship between these patterns. Thus, the methodologies and results of typological research are basically compatible with any

grammatical theory (Jufrizal, 2018). Eventually, language typology is generally intended to classify languages through structural behavior based on the peculiarities of the language (Umiyati, 2015).

Some of studies in language typology have been carried out, such as a study on Indonesian Language: A Study of Syntactic Typology by Artawa in 1998 and research entitled Balinese Language: A Study of Syntactic Typology which concluded that the Balinese language exhibits syntactic ergative behavior (Artawa, 1998). Research on Coordinating Sentences of Indonesian Language: An Approach to Syntactic Typology by Mulyadi which concludes that coordinating sentences of Indonesian language are formed by four types, namely (1) intransitive-intransitive, (2) intransitive-transitive, (3) transitive-intransitive, and (4) transitive-transitive. Typologically, the behavior of syntactic arguments in coordinating sentences is "split" (Mulyadi, 2007). In the study and exploration of syntax, as well as in semantics, and grammatical pragmatics is to characterize the nature of syntactic structures, which include clause structures, adpositional phrases, and noun phrases. Then clause structure consists of *nucleus* and *core* named by core layer, while supported layer called *periphery* (Van Valin Jr, 2005); (Anwar, 2019). Therefore, the study of syntactic typology generally characterizes the syntactic structure of the language as well as its grammatical alliance.

According to *Fundamental Principle of Placement (*FPP) theory, the main syntactic construction consists of V and O, meanwhile S is ignored in many languages since S is not the subject at all for the language (Song, 2018). If the Agent argument (A) behaves the same as the Subject argument (S) and it is different from the Patient argument (P), then the language is classified as an accusative type. But if the Subject (S) is treated the same as the Patient (P), and a different treatment is given to the Agent (A), then this language is classified as an accusative type. The basic understanding of the grammatical alliance is a system or tendency of grammatical alliances within or between clauses in one language typologically; whether the alliance is Subject = Agent, S ≠ P (Accusative Syntax), or S = P, S ≠ A (Syntactic Ergative), (Dixon & Dixon, 1994); (Jufrizal, 2018). Therefore, this study will also determine the grammatical alliance of AL.

Research on local languages has ever been conducted by Jufrizal about Minang language. He concluded that the standard variety or written variety of the Minang language is more likely to have a syntactically accusative typology. On the other hand, the ordinary pattern, less formal communication, or spoken variety of the Minang language tends to have an ergative typology (Jufrizal, 2018). From the classification of word order, the study entitled Typology of Karo by Ernawati Br Surbakti concluded that the "Syntactic Typology of Karonese Language" which was studied based on the classification of the dominant word order appearance was the VSO/PSO type because Karonese Language is generally a passive sentence with Predicate at the beginning of the sentence and the Subject is a noun (Surbakti, 2012). Other local language research is Batak Toba language by Sarma Panggabean, and she concluded that the basic order of Verb is in the front position, but it is followed by Subject. Batak Toba language has one common pattern namely V-O-S. Verb construction precedes the Object and Subject, consequently, the acceptance of the predicate position is in the beginning of utterances (clause/sentence) (Panggabean, 2013). Another study related to ordering was conducted by Purwanto Siwi on the typology of word order commonly used in clauses in the Siladang language (Mandailing Natal Regency, North Sumatra Province) is S-V-O and this is similar to Indonesian Language. In special circumstances (and certain sentence constructions, for example topical constructions), it can

be O-S-V (Siwi, 2018). Siwi's research is in line with the results of I Wayan Budiarta's research on basic clauses/sentences order of Kemak language based on the structure of declarative sentences, interrogative sentences, imperative sentences, and negative sentences is SVO (Budiarta, 2013).

3. Research Method

This research uses data analysis method by descriptive qualitative. Qualitative research is a procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written and spoken data in a language. In this study, the application of qualitative methods was carried out descriptively, it means that the analyzed data and the results of the analysis are in the form of a description of the phenomenon, but it is not in the form of numbers. Descriptive research is research that describes current problem solving based on data (Narbuko & Achmadi, 2018).

Therefore, a descriptive study will present data, analyze, and interpret, and can be comparative and correlative as well. The three stages in this research are data collection, data analysis, and presentation of the results of data analysis/ giving conclusions (Miles, 2014). Due to phenomenon of language, this research has *phenomenographic* approach as well. This approach can be interpreted as a method to determine the understanding of each individual in understanding and conceptualizing which aims to identify qualitatively different ways (or variations in the way) people experience, conceptualize, perceive, and understand various phenomena (Stamouli & Huggard, 2007). Thus, this research needs data from respondents' answer obtained from G-Form.

In terms of data sources, there are three sources of data used in cross-language research, namely: 1) grammar books of the language; 2) data derived from examples used by other writers who are acknowledged to be correct; and 3) informants who are the native speakers of the language studied (Mallinson & Blake, 1981). Therefore, the data was collected from a data source i.e., AL native speaker. She is Mrs. Sy. (age 60 years) who domiciles in Padangsidimpuan city. Mrs. Sy. was chosen because the language she uses daily is AL, and she lives in an area where Indonesian language is minimally spoken in order that the translation to the AL can be more natural. Then this data becomes primary data because it is a source of data directly obtained by researchers. Primary data sources were obtained through interviews with research subjects and by direct observation or observation in the field (Sugiyono, 2013b). Primary data is data in the form of verbal or spoken words, gestures or behavior carried out by trusted subjects, in this case the research subjects (informants) relating to the variables studied (Arikunto, 2013).

The same sentence will be given then to several native and non-native speakers who use AL actively using the G-Form which then becomes secondary data. Methods of collecting secondary data can be done in various ways such as survey results. This secondary data is primary data that has been further processed and presented either by primary data collectors or by other parties, for example in the form of tables or diagrams (Umar, 2013). Secondary data consists of answers from 184 respondents (age under 20 years: 20.1%, 21-30 years: 14.0%, 31-40 years: 29.3%, over 40 years: 36.4%) in which 55.4% of respondents live in AL areas, and 44.6% live outside the AL area. This data was obtained from 9 – 16 March 2022. Moreover, the writers also use their intuitive data as a native speaker of AL.

The results of the translations will be analyzed to see the typology of AL in its word order when compared to the Indonesian language. The results of the data analysis will be

presented in the form of conclusions to answer what and how the AL typology is in its word order.

4. Results and Discussion

The sentences spoken by Mrs. Sy. in Angkola language were recorded and transcribed by the writers in order that they were used as primary data. Then the data is translated into Indonesian language with the pattern 'S + P', and then compiled into questions answered by the respondents in the form of G-Form and this data is then referred to as secondary data. The data collected makes it easier for the writers to analyze and draw conclusions. From the main data source, several simple declarative sentences were obtained, such as the following data:

(3) Kehe   hami   tu   Medan.
    Go-(V)   2Plu-(S)   Prep   Medan.

This sentence is formed V + S pattern for intransitive sentences which do not require an object, but the sentence pattern in Indonesian language is usually formed by S + V. The AL sequence is consistent with the predicate precedes the subject, such as data 4 in Indonesian language "When we were bathing in the river, I saw a snake in the bushes" to be:

(4) Hatiha   maridi   hami   di   batang aek,
    Conj   bath-(V)   3Plu-(S)   Prep   river,
    adong   ulok   huida   di   duhut-duhut i.
    there's-(V) snake-(S)   see   Prep   bushes.

From the respondents' translation, for data 3, the results of the translation with the V + S order were 62.5% and the S + V pattern was 37.5%. For data 4, the V + S pattern is 74.5% and the S + V pattern is 25.5%. Data 4 is a complex sentence and if it is translated with S + V pattern, it will sound weird to AL speakers themselves. However, if the sentence is formed with a transitive pattern that requires an object, it will look like the data below:

(5) Manonton   TV   hami.
    Watch-(V)   Obj   2Plu-(S).

(6) Manggoreng   gulaen   umak.
    Fried-(V)   fish (Obj) mother-(S).

From the data 5 and 6 above, it shows that the word order of a transitive sentence is V + O + S and this form is a common and acceptable sentence in AL. For the negative sentence/form, the data obtained in sentences such as "He is not good at swimming." becomes;

(7) Inda malo ia   marlange.
    Neg can   3Sg-(S) swim-(V).

For this data, 82.1% answered that the word order of AL sentence is V + S, it means that predicate in AL normally and usually precedes the subject. The complex negation sentence such as "Three people came to our house, but we don't know who they are." results a combination of word order 'V + S and S + V' as follows;

(8) Ro   tolu halak   tu   bagas   nami,
    Come-(V)   three people-(S)   Pre   house   2Plu,

tai	inda		hami	tandai	ise	halai.
but	Neg		2Plu	know-(V)	who	3Plu.

From data 6, it is found that the V + S order is not generally accepted in all forms of AL sentences. Negative sentence can be formed with S + V or V + S. For data 7 "My mother was not vaccinated against Covid-19 because she had diabetes" is an example that the AL pattern uses a subject/predicate at the beginning of a sentence;

(9) Nadivaksin   Covid-19   umakku
     Neg-vaccine-(V-Pas)   Covid-19   mother-1Sg
     harana   marpanyakit diabetes   umak.
     Conj   had diabetes-(N)   mother-(S).

     Umak   inda divaksin   Covid-19
     Mother-(S)   Neg-vaccine-(V-Pas)   Covid-19
     harana   umakku   marpanyakit diabetes.
     Conj   mother-1Sg   had diabetes-(N).

For data 7, there are 50% of respondents' answers with a V + S pattern and 50% with a V + S pattern. The main reason is because there is an emphasis on negative sentences if the pattern is V + S, but if the S + V pattern is a declarative sentence or a common statement. AL speakers use the S + V and V + S patterns and both are commonly used without any specific differences. The use V + S pattern is frequently obtained from statements of primary data. But around 74.5% of respondents from G-Form use the S + V pattern for sentences as seen below;

(10)   Jam piga   manelepon   boumu?
         Int   call-(V)   aunt-2Sg

(11)   Jam piga   boumu   manelepon?
         Int   aunt-2Sg   call-(V)

Another pattern found in AL is during active interrogative sentences such as "Can you help me tonight?" and the phrase "When do you pay your debt?" formed into passive sentences as many as 75% of respondents answered with a V + S pattern as shown in the data below;

(12)   Bisado itolong   ho   au   borngin on?
         Int   help-(V Pas)   2Plu   1Sg   tonight

(13)   Andigan do   dibayari   ho   utangmi?
         Int   Part   pay-(V Pas)   2Plu   debt-2Plu

Meanwhile, the imperative sentences in AL have a V + S pattern and they are similar to the word order of Indonesian language and English which use a verb at the beginning of sentence. On the other hand, the pattern of imperative sentences in AL can be seen in the following data 12 and 13:

(14)   Buat   jo   laptop na   diginjang   meja i!
         Take-(V)   Part   laptop which Prep   table that!

(15) Kehe   ho   sannari!
      Go-(V)   2Sg   now!

Respondents' answers to the sentence formation in data 12 are about 88.6% with a VO pattern and omitted subjects because they were spoken directly. And for data 13 there is 97.3% formed with the VSO pattern. For grammatical alliance in AL, subject and agent play the same role, it can be seen in the following data;

(16) Kehe **hami**   tu   Medan
      Verb **Subject**   Prep   Medan

(17) Manonton   TV   **hami**
      Verb   Patient   **Agent**

The grammatical alliance in AL is typologically patterned S = A and S ≠ P, and this is called the 'accusative'. This is because the Agent argument (A) behaves the same as the Subject argument (S) and is different from the Patient argument (P), so that this language pattern is classified as an 'accusative' type. Hence, the word order in AL as the results and discussion above is drawn in the table explanation below:

Sentence Types	Word order (findings)	Explanations
Declarative	V + S + O	For all intransitive sentence
	V + O + S	For all transitive sentence
Negative	Negation + S + V + O	Emphasizing for negative
	S + Negation + V + O	Common statement
Interrogative	Question Words + S + V + O	2 forms commonly used together
	Question Words + V + S + O	
	Question Words + V-Passive + S + O	Passive form used more frequently than active form
Imperative	V + O	Directly spoken and subject disappeared
	V + S + O	Similar to declarative sentence

Table 1. Word Order in Angkola Language

5. Conclusion

Based on the description of results and discussion above, the writers finally conclude that the word order in AL varies according to the types of sentences are as follows:

1. Declarative sentences in AL are patterned: Verb + Subject + Object in intransitive sentences and patterned: Verb + Object + Subject in transitive sentences.
2. The type of negative in AL has 2 patterns: 1) Negation + Subject + Verb + Object; 2) Subject + Negation + Verb + Object.
3. The type of interrogative sentence has 3 patterns: 1) Subject + Verb + Object; 2) Verb + Subject + Object; and 3) Passive Verb + Subject + Object.
4. The type of imperative sentence in AL has 2 patterns: 1) Verb + Object (subject disappeared); and 2) Verb + Subject + Object (similar to a declarative sentence).
5. In AL, the Agent argument (A) behaves the same as the Subject argument (S) but different from the Patient argument (P), therefore, this language pattern is classified as an 'accusative' type.

The writers expect that there will be a syntactic typology research in AL based on sentence mode, clause level, and the difference between active/passive sentences to see the AL syntactic typology comprehensively. This expectation is a manifestation of efforts to preserve and maintain local languages in order that they result the origin pattern in their grammatical rules. This expectation is in line with the mandate of the 1945 Constitution Article 32 paragraph 2 to preserve local languages in Indonesia.

References

Anwar, M. (2019). Konstruksi kosubordinasi dalam bahasa Indonesia (perspektif linguistic fungsional). *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, *8*(1), 1–17.

Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Artawa, K. (1998). Bahasa Bali: Sebuah Kajian Tipologi Sintaksis. *Jurnal Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia: Jakarta*.

Basaria, I. (2018). Relasi Gramatikal Subjek Bahasa Pakpak Dairi: Kajian Tipologi. *Talenta Conference Series: Local Wisdom, Social, and Arts (LWSA)*, *1*(1), 49–58.

Budiarta, I. W. (2013). *Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Kemak. Disertasi).* Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and morphology*. University of Chicago press.

Dixon, R. M. W. & Dixon, R. M. W. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge University Press.

Hutapea, E. (2020). Indonesia Punya 718 Bahasa Ibu, Jangan Sampai Punah. *Kompas. Com. Diambil Dari*.

Jufrizal, J. (2018). Fenomena Tipologi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau: Akusatif, Ergatif, Atau Campur? *Leksika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pengajarannya*, *3*(1).

Khairah, M. & Ridwan, S. H. (2014). *Sintaksis: Memahami satuan kalimat perspektif fungsi*. Jakarat: Bumi Aksara.

Mallinson, G. & Blake, B. J. (1981). *Language Typology: Cross-linguistic studies in syntax*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Miles, M. B. H. A. M. & S. J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis, A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). New York: Sage Publications.

Mulyadi. (2007). Kalimat Koordinasi Bahasa Indonesia Sebuah Ancangan Tipologi Sintaktis. *USU-IR Repository*, *3*(2). https://repository.usu.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/16717/log-okt2007-3%287%29.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y

Narbuko, C. & Achmadi, A. (2018). *Metodologi Penelitian.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Nasution, J. (2021). Revitalisasi Bahasa Angkola-Mandailing Melalui Penerjemahan Buku Tematik. *Jurnal Pustaka Mitra (Pusat Akses Kajian Mengabdi Terhadap Masyarakat)*, *1*(2), 129–134.

Panggabean, S. (2013). Konstruksi Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Batak Toba. *http://repositori.usu.ac.id/handle/123456789/39037*.

Rizki, A. & Pujiati, P. (2017). TATA URUT KATA DALAM BAHASA ARAB (TIPOLOGI SINTAKSIS). *ITTIHAD*, *1*(2).

Siminto, S. (2013). *Pengantar Linguistik*. Jakarta: Cipta Prima Nusantara.

Siwi, P. (2018). Sintaksis Bahasa Siladang: Kajian Tipologi Gramatikal. http://repositori.usu.ac.id/handle/123456789/10602

Song, J. J. (2018). *Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stamouli, I. & Huggard, M. (2007). Phenomenography as a tool for understanding our

students. *International Symposium for Engineering Education*, 181–186.

Surbakti. (2013a). *Pelindungan Bahasa Daerah dalam Kerangka Kebijakan Nasional Kebahasaan*. Https://Badanbahasa.Kemdikbud.Go.Id/Lamanbahasa/Content/Pelindungan-Bahasa-Daerah-Dalam-Kerangka-Kebijakan-Nasional-Kebahasaan.

Sugiyono, D. (2013b). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Surbakti, E. B. (2012). Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Karo. *Jurnal Telangkai Bahasa Dan Sastra, Januari*, 55–73.

Umar, H. (2013). *Metode Penelitian untuk Skripsi dan Tesis Bisnis*. Jakarta: Rajawali.

Umiyati, M. (2015). Prioritas Aspek-Aspek Tipologi Linguistik Pada Pemetaan Masalah-Masalah Kebahasaan. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, *1*(2), 279–297.

Van Valin Jr, R. D. (2005). *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.