

## Subordinative Construction of Tamiang Malay Language: Syntactic Typology Study

Dwi Kurnia Surya Ningrum<sup>1\*</sup> & Siti Suryani<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Linguistics Department, Faculty of Cultural Studies, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [dwikurnia.sn@usu.ac.id](mailto:dwikurnia.sn@usu.ac.id)

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p><b>Article history:</b> Received 15 October 2023 Revised 30 November 2023 Accepted 14 December 2023 Available online 31 December 2023</p> <p>ISSN: <a href="https://doi.org/10.32734/ijlsm.v2i1.15329">2986-3848</a></p>	<p>This study aims to identify the syntactic typology of Tamiang Malay, focusing specifically on the co-referential patterns of grammatical relations to its arguments, including S, A and P in subordinative construction. This research is qualitative research. This study used a descriptive research design to investigate the syntactic typology of Tamiang Malay language. Data collection was conducted through a fieldwork in Tamiang Malay-speaking communities in Batu Lapan Sub-Village, Rantau Sub-District, Rantau Pauh Village, Aceh Tamiang District, Aceh Province, Indonesia. Tamiang Malay exhibits a unique syntactic structure that combines different types of clauses, including intransitive and transitive clause. The findings demonstrate the existence of several co-referential patterns, such as S = S, S = P, S = A, A = S, P = S, A = A, A = P, and P = A, within the combined clauses. The results of the research also show that Tamiang Malay exhibits a combination of accusative and ergative alignment patterns in its syntactic typology. In Tamiang Malay, the alignment pattern is primarily accusative, where the subject of an intransitive clause is marked the same way as the agent of a transitive clause, while the patient of a transitive clause is marked differently. However, Tamiang Malay also displays instances of ergative alignment that mark the subject of an intransitive clause the same way as the patient of a transitive clause, while the agent of a transitive clause is marked differently.</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Subordinative Construction, Syntactic Typology, Syntactic Argument, Tamiang Malay Language</p>
<p><b>How to cite:</b> Ningrum, D.K.S., &amp; Suryani, S. (2023). Subordinative Construction of Tamiang Malay Language: Syntactic Typology Study. <i>International Journal Linguistics of Sumatra and Malay (IJLSM)</i>, 2(1), 28-36.</p>	



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International.  
<http://doi.org/10.32734/ijlsm.v2i1.15329>

### 1. Introduction

Tamiang Malay language is a local language spoken in the Aceh Tamiang region, Aceh Province, Indonesia. It belongs to the Malay-Polynesian language family, which is part of the larger Austronesian language family. Tamiang Malay language differs from standard Malay in terms of grammar and pronunciation. One of the difference is in the pronunciation of vowels, which has its own distinct characteristics in Tamiang Malay language.

Historically, Tamiang Malay Language is one of several Malay dialects that have developed in the North Sumatra and Aceh regions. Tamiang Malay itself consists of three dialects: Iler dialect, Middle dialect, and Hulu dialect (Muntasir, 2003:94 in Prayogo, 2015). However, despite the division into three dialects, speakers of Tamiang Malay can understand each other, although there may be differences in the understanding of certain terms. Different cultural and historical influences in each region have also had an impact on the development of Tamiang Malay language. They also influences on the development of Tamiang Malay language that shaped its unique features, including its typological characteristics.

Comrie (1981: 2) defines syntactic typology as the study of the variation in the grammatical structures of the world's languages. While Dixon (2010:1) defines syntactic typology as the systematic comparison of the syntax of different languages, with a view to identifying the ways in which they differ and the extent to which they can be classified into types. (See also Dryer, 2013; Croft, 2003:4; Haspelmath, 2001:13).

Linguists such as Dixon (2010), Comrie (1981), and Dryer (2013) share a similar objective in their work on syntactic typology. They seek to describe the diversity of syntactic structures found in languages, and to identify the universals and tendencies that underlie this diversity. They also aim to develop typologies that can help to explain the variation in syntactic structures across languages.

Syntactic typology is classified in various ways by different linguists. Dixon (2010: 72-82) classifies syntactic typology based on the order of subject, object, and verb in sentences. He identifies six main order types: SOV (subject-object-verb), SVO (subject-verb-object), VSO (verb-subject-object), VOS (verb-object-subject), OVS (object-verb-subject), and OSV (object-subject-verb).

In the study of syntactic typology, the determination of language's alignment type is based on how it marks the grammatical relations between arguments: subject (the argument that performs the action), the agent (the entity that initiates the action), and the patient (the entity that undergoes the action) in a sentence. Dixon (1994) distinguishes the type of language into two: accusative and ergative alignment. Accusative alignment systems are characterized by marking the subject of an intransitive sentence the same way as the agent of a transitive sentence, while the patient of a transitive sentence is marked differently. In contrast, ergative alignment systems mark the subject of an intransitive sentence the same way as the patient of a transitive sentence, while the agent of a transitive sentence is marked differently.

Comrie (1988) and Artawa (2004) propose that languages can be classified into three groups: ergative and accusative languages, passive languages, and active and antipassive languages. An ergative language is characterized by treating the patient (P) of a transitive verb in the same or co-referential manner as the subject (S) in an intransitive clause, but differently from the agent (A) of a transitive verb. Ergative languages typically do not mark P and S. On the other hand, accusative languages have a system where A is the same as S and treated differently from P. Meanwhile, an active language exhibits a pattern where there is a group of S behaving like P and another group of S behaving like A within the same language.

The subordinative construction involves the relationship between non-equivalent clauses. One clause functions as an independent clause, while the other clause serves as a dependent clause. In other words, the presence of one clause is dependent on another clause. A subordinative sentence construction can consist of one main clause and one subordinative clause.

This study examines the syntactic typology in subordinative construction of Tamiang Malay and identifies its alignment patterns based on Comrie's and Artawa's classifications. The classification of languages into ergative, accusative, and active types allows us to analyze how Tamiang Malay assigns grammatical relations to its arguments, including S, A and P. By investigating the alignment patterns and analyzing the behavior of these arguments in different sentence constructions, this study aims to gain a deeper understanding of the syntactic typology of Tamiang Malay.

Some linguists argue that Tamiang Malay displays accusative alignment, as the subject of an intransitive clause and the object of a transitive clause are both marked with a different case (the nominative), while the patient of a transitive clause is marked with a different case (the accusative). Example:

*Roni tabok ayam mati.*  
 Roni-ERG chicken ABS-beat die.  
 Roni beat the chicken to death.

Others argue that Tamiang Malay exhibits ergative alignment, as the subject of an intransitive clause and the object of a transitive clause are marked with the same case (the absolutive), while the agent of a transitive clause is marked with a different case (the ergative). Example:

*Adi datang pangka na.*  
 Adi come village NOM  
 Adi came to the village.

Beside the characteristics above, Tamiang Malay language also has a complex system of pronouns that is distinctive from other Malay dialects. It distinguishes between inclusive and exclusive first-person plural pronouns, meaning that the speaker can differentiate between "we" that includes the listener and "we" that excludes the listener. It also has a unique second-person plural pronoun that is different from the second-person singular pronoun.

This article presents a research study that aims to identify the syntactic typology of Tamiang Malay. The motivation behind this study stems from the need to gain a deeper understanding of the distinctive syntactic features exhibited by Tamiang Malay and to contribute to the existing body of knowledge in the field of language typology. While previous studies have examined various aspects of Tamiang Malay, including its

phonology, morphology, and syntax, there is a research gap in terms of specifically investigating its syntactic typology.

Existing studies, such as Toha (2013), have primarily focused on dialectology and have provided insights into the dialects of Tamiang Malay in Aceh Tamiang District, employing synchronic dialectological analysis. Additionally, research conducted by Prayogo (2015) delved into the morphological processes of Tamiang Malay, such as affixation, reduplication, and composition. Another study by Hafrianto and Mulyadi (2018) examined the structure of interrogative sentences in the Tamiang Malay dialect, utilizing the X-Bar Theory.

There have been other studies that address the typology of languages, such as the research conducted by Mulyadi (2017), which focuses on the syntactic typology of Indonesian based on coordination constructions. The findings of this study suggest that Indonesian can be classified as a language with syntactic ergativity and accusativity. Another relevant study is conducted by Kale et al. (2022), which examines the typology of Sabu language. Furthermore, Yosef (2017) conducted research on the syntactic typology of Lamaholot language. The analysis of data indicates that the basic structure of simple Lamaholot clauses is SVO (FN FV FN) and OSV (FN FN FV) as a derived structure.

Based on the previous studies on Tamiang Malay and syntactic typology in various languages, such as Indonesian, Sabu and Lamaholot, there is still a significant research gap in the understanding of syntactic typology of Tamiang Malay. Specifically, this study will examine the grammatical relations between arguments in Tamiang Malay, including the classification of its alignment system as either ergative or accusative based on the marking of the subject, agent, and patient.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive research design to investigate the syntactic typology of Tamiang Malay language. It aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the grammatical relations between arguments (subject, agent, and patient) in subordinative construction in Tamiang Malay. The research design involves data collection and qualitative analysis to identify the marking patterns of grammatical relations.

### 2.2. Instruments and Procedures

Data collection was conducted through a fieldwork in Tamiang Malay-speaking communities in Batu Lapan Sub-Village, Rantau Sub-District, Rantau Pauh Village, Aceh Tamiang District, Aceh Province, Indonesia. A total of 3 informants were purposively selected, representing different age groups and backgrounds. The selection aimed to capture a diverse range of language usage and ensure data richness.

The data were collected using various techniques, firstly the method of naturalistic observation (Sudaryanto, 2015) was employed, where the researcher observed and recorded natural language use in everyday communicative settings. This allowed for the collection of authentic language data. Structured interviews (Huber and Milles, 2003) were also conducted to elicit specific linguistic features and patterns of Tamiang Malay. The interviews included prompts and questions designed to target the grammatical relations of subject, agent, and patient.

### 2.3. Data Analysis Procedures

Qualitative analysis was employed to analyze the collected data. The analysis focused on identifying the marking patterns of grammatical relations that form the typology of Tamiang Malay. The following steps were followed in data analysis:

1. Transcription: The recorder speech and interview data were transcribed and documented in a written format, ensuring accurate representation of the spoken language.
2. Coding: The transcribed data were systematically coded based on the grammatical relations of subject, agent, and patients. The coding allowed for the identification and categorization of relevant linguistic features.
3. Pattern Identification: The coded data were analyzed to identify patterns of grammatical relations in Tamiang Malay subordinative constructions.
4. Interpretation and Discussion: The identified patterns were interpreted and discussed in the context of syntactic typology. The findings were compared to existing linguistic theories and typological studies proposed by previous researchers.

## 3. Findings

From the data collected by researcher, subordinative construction in Tamiang Malay consists of combined clauses, including intransitive and transitive clauses. The combination of these clauses forms complex

sentences with several possibilities: 1) combination of intransitive and intransitive clauses, 2) combination of intransitive and transitive clauses, 3) combination of transitive and intransitive clauses, and 4) combination of transitive and transitive clauses. From these combined clauses, several co-referential patterns can be identified or discovered, including: (1) sentence pattern where  $S = S$ , (2) sentence pattern where  $S = P$ , (3) sentence pattern where  $S = A$ , (4) sentence pattern where  $A = S$ , (5) sentence pattern where  $P = S$ , (6) sentence pattern where  $A = A$ , (7) sentence pattern where  $A = P$ , and (8) sentence pattern where  $P = A$ , along with alternative patterns.

Mulyadi (2007) provides an explanation regarding how the interpretation of the relationship between S, A, and P is based on the types of clause alliance that form coordinate sentences in Indonesian. The study examines the co-referential relationships among these three arguments, as summarized in Table 1, to shed light on the typological interpretations of coordinate sentences in Indonesian. The research on subordinative constructions in Tamiang Malay also refers to the relationship of clause alliance types as discussed by Mulyadi (2007).

**Table 1.** Clause Alliance Type in Coordinative Sentences of Indonesian

Type	Clause I	Clause II	Coreference Relationship
I	Intransitive	Intransitive	$S1 = S2$
II	Intransitive	Transitive	$S1 = P2$ $S1 = A2$
III	Transitive	Intransitive	$P1 = S2$ $A1 = S2$
IV	Transitive	Transitive	$P1 = P2$ $A1 = A2$ $P1 = A2$ $A1 = P2$ $P1 = P2$ dan $A1 = A2$ $P1 = A2$ dan $A1 = P2$

#### 4. Discussion

In Tamiang Malay, subordinate clauses are constructed using conjunctions that can take various forms, such as, “*Kagheno*” (because), “*sebab*” (since), “*kalo*” (if), “*walope*” (although), “*biogh*” (so that), and so on. The presence of the core clause syntax has a relationship or correlation with the subordinative clause based entirely on the verb’s meaning and the presence of conjunctions. Consider the following examples of subordinate clauses in Tamiang Malay, which are presented as combinations of two clauses.

##### 4.1. Intransitive-Intransitive

Subordination sentences can be formed by two intransitive clauses where both of their argument S are coreferential. As it is known, the argument that appears in an intransitive clause is only the Subject (S). Therefore, when combining two intransitive clauses, it will result in two identical Subject arguments. Consequently, the co-referentiality of the arguments can be described as  $S = S$ . This means that Subject of the first intransitive clause is the same as, or co-referential with, the Subject of the second clause. In this case, there is only one possibility for co-referentiality. Let’s consider the following example of a subordinative clause in Tamiang Malay:

- (1) *Lebok diogh daghi ketanging kagheno diogh sembrono.*  
Fall 3SL from the bike because 3SL reckless.

‘He fell off the bike because he was reckless.’

- (2) *Nak datang anaknye kalo dah peghre diogh.*  
FUT come son 3SL POSS when already vacation 3SL.

‘His son will come when he has a vacation.’

In example (1), the co-referentiality between the S “*diogh*” (he) in the main clause and the subordinative clause indicates that the subject remains the same throughout both clauses. The action of falling (“*lebok*”) is

attributed to the subject “*diogh*” in both clauses, emphasizing the continuity of the subject’s involvement in the event.

In example (2), the co-referentiality between the subject “*anaknye*” (his son) in the main clause and the subject “*diogh*” (he) in the subordinative clause establishes a connection between the two clauses. The subject in the subordinative clause is associated with the action “*peghre*” (has a vacation), which is relevant to the future action of the future action of the son “*nak datang*” (will come). This co-referential relationship strengthens the connection between the S of the main clause and the S of subordinative clause.

In Tamiang Malay, when two referential S arguments are combined into a subordinate sentence, the S argument in the second clause can be omitted. For example, S2 in sentences (3) and (4) can be omitted because it is referential to S1, as follows.

- (3) *Ngelecek anak-anak nu sampek [ ] lebok.*  
Run around children ART until [ ] fell down.

‘The children ran around until they fell down.’

- (4) *Tetap lalu diogh walope mantang [ ] saket.*  
Still go 3SL although still [ ] is sick.

‘He still went although he was still sick.’

In these examples, S2 in both sentences (3) and (4) can be omitted because it is co-referential with S1, which is NP “*anak-anak nu*” (the children) in (3) and NP “*diogh*” (he) in (4). This interpretation is possible because there are no other S arguments present in those sentences. The only syntactic argument that can fill the slot left by S2 is the preceding S1. Therefore, due to the co-referentiality between S1 and S2, S2 can be omitted, and the syntactic slot is filled by preceding S1.

#### 4.2. Intransitive-Transitive

As known, the argument that appears in an intransitive clause is only the Subject (S). In a transitive clause, two core arguments are introduced, namely the Agent (A) and the Patient (P), therefore, when combining an intransitive clause with a transitive clause, several possibilities of coreferential patterns arise, namely: the S in the intransitive clause is treated the same as the A and P in the transitive clause. Thus, the possible coreferential relations that can be obtained are: S = A, S = P. This means that the Subject of the first intransitive clause is the same as or co-referential with the Agent or the Patient of the second clause.

- (5) *Maknye (S) belanjo kek pajak [ ] (A) naek ketangin.*  
Mother 3SL POSS goes shopping to market ride bicycle.

‘Her mother goes shopping to the market riding a bicycle.’

- (6) *Kecewo diogh (S) kaghenno diogh (A) te’ek maen bolo.*  
Disappointed 3SL because 3SL could not play football

‘He was disappointed because he couldn’t play football.’

- (7) *Cadok belajogh Dini (S) mangkonye [ ] (P) dapek nile bughuk.*  
not study Dini so [ ] got grades bad

‘Dini didn’t study so she got bad grades.’

- (8) *Sedeh si Dandy (S) kaghenno mak marahi diogh (P).*  
Sad ART Dandy because mom scolded 3SL

‘Dandy was sad because mom scolded him.’

In the examples provided, it can be observed the coreferential relations between the Subject (S) and the Agent (A) or Patient (P) in Tamiang Malay’s subordinative constructions.

Example (5) demonstrates the co-referentiality between the S “*maknye*” (her mother) in the main clause with the omitted Agent (A) in the subordinative clause. The omission of the Agent in the subordinative clause,

marked by [ ], is possible because there are no other syntactic arguments present that can fill that slot. Therefore, the co-referential relationship between the S in the main clause and the A in the subordinative clause signifies that her mother is the one riding the bicycle while going shopping.

Example (6) shows the co-referentiality between the S “*diogh*” (he) in the main clause and the Agent “*diogh*” (he) in the subordinative clause. The S in the main clause is co-referential with the A in the subordinative clause. This implies that the S of the main clause is the same as the A of the subordinative clause.

In the example (7), the Subject “Dini” is mentioned in the main clause as the one who didn’t study. The subordinative clause introduces the Patient that omitted marked by [ ]. Although the Patient is not explicitly mentioned in the subordinative clause, it can be inferred that the Patient refers back to the Subject of the main clause, Dini. Therefore, there is co-referential relationship between the S of the main clause and the P of the subordinative clause.

In the example (8), the Subject “Dandy” is mentioned in the main clause as the one who experiences sadness. The subordinative clause states the cause of his sadness, with the Patient “*diogh*” (him) being scolded by the Agent “*mak*” (mom). Here, it can be observed a co-referential relationship between the Subject of the main clause (Dandy) and the Patient of the subordinative clause (him), indicating that Dandy is the one being scolded.

In both examples, the co-referentiality between the S of the main clause and the P of the subordinative clause helps establish a connection and indicate that the S is directly involved or affected by the action described in the subordinative clause.

#### 4.3. Transitive-Intransitive

As known, the arguments that appear in a transitive clause are the Agent (A) and the Patient (P), or possibly the Object (O). On the other hand, in an intransitive clause, the Subject (S) is the only core argument that appears. Therefore, when combining a transitive clause with an intransitive clause, several possibilities of alignment between the two clauses arise, namely  $A = S$ , and  $P = S$ .

- (9) *Riko (A) tetap maen bolo biogh pe diogh (S) lekoh.*  
Riko kept playing football even though 3SL tired.

‘Riko kept playing football even though he was tired.’

- (10) *Walope hatinye (P) udoh disakiti Jono (A), Reni (S) tetap sabar.*  
Even though heart 3SL POSS has been hurt Jono, Reni remains patient

‘Even though her heart has been hurt by Jono, Rini remains patient.’

- (11) *Beni (A) nonton TV kalo [ ] (S) udoh belajogh.*  
Beni watch TV if has studied.  
‘Beni watched TV after studying.’

In the examples provided, it can be observed the co-referentiality between the Subject (S) of the intransitive clause and either the Agent (A) or the Patient (P) of the transitive clause. Example (9) illustrates the co-referentiality between the S “*diogh*” (he) in the intransitive clause and the A “Riko” in the transitive clause. Both “*diogh*” and “Riko” refer to the same entity, indicating  $A = S$ . The sentence implies that Riko continued playing football despite feeling tired.

Example (10) demonstrates the co-referentiality between the S “Reni” in the main clause and the P “*hatinye*” (her heart) in the subordinate clause. The co-referential relationship suggests that  $P = S$ . The sentence conveys that Reni remains patient even though her heart has been hurt.

Example (11) shows the co-referentiality between the S “Beni” in the main clause and the omitted S in the subordinate clause. In this case, the S in the subordinate clause is not explicitly stated but is understood to be the same as the S in the main clause. This implies  $S = S$ , where the S of the main clause (Beni) is co-referential with the S of the subordinate clause.

#### 4.4. Transitive-Transitive

As known, the arguments that appear in a transitive clause are the Agent (A) and the Patient (P). Therefore, when combining two transitive clauses, there can be co-referentiality between the two arguments, leading to several possibilities:  $A = A$ , which means the Agent of the first transitive clause is the same as or co-referential with the Agent of the second clause;  $P = P$ , which means the Patient of the first transitive clause is the same as or co-referential with the Patient of the second clause.  $A = P$ , indicating that the Agent of the first clause is the

same as or co-referential with the Patient of the second clause; and P = A, meaning that the Patient of the first clause is the same as or co-referential with the Agent of the second clause.

(12) *Engko (A) boleh balek buku ne kalo [ ] (A) udoh siap baconye.*  
 2SL may return book ART when [ ] have finished reading it.  
 ‘You may return this book when you have finished reading it.’

(13) *Mak (A) masak nasi selepeh [ ] (A) nyuci baju.*  
 Mom cook rice after [ ] wash cloth.

‘Mom cooks rice after washing clothes.’

In examples (12) and (13), there is co-referentiality between the Agent (A) in the first clause and the Agent (A) in the second clause. This means that the Agent performing the action in the first clause is the same as or co-referential with the Agent performing the action in the second clause. In example (12), the subject “*Engko*” (You) in the first clause is the Agent who may return the book. The bracketed portion [ ] in the second clause indicates the omission of the Agent, but it is understood to refer back to “*Engko*” from the first clause. Similarly, in example (13), the subject “*Mak*” (Mom) in the first clause is the Agent who cooks rice. The bracketed portion [ ] in the second clause implies the omission of the Agent, but it is interpreted as referring back to “*Mak*” from the first clause. Therefore, A = A, indicating that the Agent in the first clause is the same as the Agent in the second clause.

Co-referentiality between two P arguments can occur in a subordinate sentence formed by the alliance of two transitive clauses. Take note of the following example:

(14) a. *Bapak peghbaiki mobil (P) selepeh Andi khelehnye (P).*  
 Dad repair car after Andi broke it  
 ‘Dad repair the car after Andi broke it.’

b. *\*Bapak peghbaiki mobil selepeh Andi kheleh [ ].*  
 Dad repair car after Andi broke [ ].  
 ‘Dad repair the car after Andi broke it.’

c. *Bapak peghbaiki mobil selepeh [ ] dikheleh Andi.*  
 Dad repair car after [ ] broken Andi  
 ‘Dad repair the car after the car was broken by Andi.’

d. *Mobil dipegbaiki bapak selepeh [ ] dikheleh Andi.*  
 Car repaired Dad after [ ] broken Andi  
 ‘The car was repaired by Dad after the car was broken by Andi.’

In (14a), P in the second clause is coreferential with P in the first clause and both clauses have an active structure. With this clause structure, the omission of P in the second clause is not allowed, as shown in (14b). An attempt to omit P in the second clause in (14b) results in an ungrammatical sentence. To omit P in the second clause, the syntactic operation involves re-evaluating the structure of the second clause, as seen in (14c), or re-evaluating the structure of both the first and second clauses, as seen in (14d). therefore, the omission of P in the second clause is only possible when P in the second clause occupies the Subject position in the derivational structure.

The subordination construction as an alliance of transitive clauses provides as alternative for the A argument in the first clause to co-refer with the P argument in the second clause. Consider the example below:

(15) *Mak (A) tetap ukhuh andong (P) walope bapak (A) udoh dilakhangnye (P).*  
 Mom still take care grandma even though Dad already forbid 3SL

‘Mom still takes care of grandma even though Dad has already forbid her.’

In the given example, the Agent (A) in the main clause is “*Mak*” (Mom), indicating who is performing the action of taking care. The Patient (P) argument in the main clause is “*andong*” (grandma), representing the entity being taken care of. In the subordinate clause, it is observed an interesting phenomenon. The word “*nye*” in the clause functions as a pronoun that refers back to the Agent (A) in the main clause, which is “*Mak*”



(Mom). This is an example of co-referentiality between the Agent in the main clause and the P in subordinate clause. The pronoun “*nye*” represents the same entity as the Agent in the main clause, but it functions as the Patient (P) in the subordinate clause due to the syntactic requirements of the clause.

In addition to the previously explained possibilities, there is also possibility of co-referentiality between the Patient (P) argument in the first clause and the Agent (A) argument in the second clause, forming P = A. This can be observed in the following example:

- (16) *Engko (A) hakhus teghimo diogh (P) gano diogh (A) teghimo engko (P).*  
 2SL            must accept 3SL            as    3SL            accepts 2SL

‘You must accept him as he accepts you.’

- (17) *Bapak (A) mukol Bayu (P) sampek diogh (A) minto maaf.*  
 Dad    hit    Bayu    until    he            asked for forgiveness

‘Dad hit Bayu until he asked for forgiveness.’

In the example (16), there is a co-referential relationship between the P argument in the first clause “*diogh*” and the A argument in the second clause “*diogh*”. This means that the person being accepted in the first clause is the person who is doing the accepting in the second clause. In the example (17), there is a co-referential relationship between the P argument in the first clause “*Bayu*” and the A argument in the second clause “*diogh*” referring to “*Bayu*”. It indicates that Bayu, who initially received the action of being hit by Dad, later becomes the A requesting forgiveness. These examples showcase the flexibility of argument alignment in Tamiang Malay, where the P in one clause can be co-referential with the A in another clause, forming P = A.

## 5. Conclusion

Tamiang Malay exhibits a rich syntactic typology through its combination of clauses, encompassing both intransitive and transitive structures. These combined clauses give rise to complex sentences with various possibilities. The combinations include intransitive-intransitive, intransitive-transitive, transitive-intransitive, and transitive-transitive constructions.

Within these combined clauses, a range of co-referential patterns can be identified. These patterns involve the alignment of different arguments, such as subject (S), patient (P), and agent (A). The co-referential patterns observed include S = S, S = P, S = A, A = S, P = S, A = A, A = P, and P = A.

Furthermore, in terms of syntactic typology, Tamiang Malay exhibits a combination of accusative and ergative alignment patterns. In Tamiang Malay, the alignment pattern is primarily accusative, where the subject of an intransitive clause and the agent of a transitive clause are treated similarly. The subject of an intransitive clause is marked the same way as the agent of a transitive clause, while the patient of a transitive clause is marked differently. This aligns with the typical accusative pattern found in many languages. However, Tamiang Malay also displays instances of ergative alignment that mark the subject of an intransitive clause the same way as the patient of a transitive clause, while the agent of a transitive clause is marked differently.

This combination of accusative and ergative alignment pattern in Tamiang Malay provides variation in how arguments are aligned, depending on the syntactic context. The accusative alignment is more prevalent in standard transitive and intransitive clauses, while the ergative alignment appears in certain constructions involving co-referentiality. This syntactic typological feature adds complexity and flexibility to the language’s argument structure and can be seen as a unique characteristic of Tamiang Malay.

However, it is important to note that this analysis is based on a limited corpus and further research needed to solidify these findings. Future studies could expand the analysis to a larger dataset, investigate the historical development of Tamiang Malay syntax, conduct experimental studies, compare Tamiang Malay with other languages, and explore the functional motivations behind the identified co-referential patterns.

## References

- Brown, Lea. 2001. *A Grammar of Nias Selatan*. University of Sydney.  
 Comrie, B. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. University of Chicago Press.



- Comrie, B. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology (2nd ed.)*. University Of Chicago Press.
- Croft, W. 2003. *Typology and Universals (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Demon, Yosef. 2017. *Struktur Klausa dan Interpretasi Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Lamaholot Dialek Lamalera*. (Disertasi Doktor, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, 2017)
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2012. *Basic Linguistic Theory: Vol. 3. Further Grammatical Topics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dryer, M. S. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greenberg, J. H. 1963. "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements". In J.H. Greenberg (ed.). *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Prss. 73-113.
- Hafrianto, J., Mulyadi. 2018. *Kalimat Tanya dalam Bahasa Melayu Dialek Tamiang*. Jurnal LITERA, 17 (2). 186-201. <https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v17i2.20225>
- Haspelmath, M. 2001. *The European linguistic area: Standard Average European*. In M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, & W. Raible (Eds.), *Language typology and language universals (Vol. 2, pp. 1492-1510)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, M., Dryer, M. S., Gil, D., & Comrie, B. (Eds.). 2005. *The world atlas of language structures*. Oxford University Press.
- Huber, M., & Milles, M. 2003. *Language survey work: Methods and techniques*. SIL International.
- Kale, M. B., Rocky P. S., Oce, A. L., Yanrini, A. 2022. *Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Sabu*. Klausa Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Learning, 06 (021), 37-60. DOI: 10.33479/klausa.v6i01.493
- Mulyadi. 2007. *Kalimat Koordinasi Bahasa Indonesia: Sebuah Ancangan Tipologi Sintaksis*.
- Netra, I. M., Pita, P., Mandra, I. W., Subiyanto, P. 2008. *Sistem Koreferensial Klausa Subordinatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Linguistika. 15 (29), 140-153.
- Prayogo. 2015. *Morfologi Bahasa Melayu Tamiang*. Sebuah Skripsi. Medan: Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Song, J. J. 2018. *Linguistic Typology*. Oxford University Press.
- Sudaryanto. 2015. *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa: Pengantar penelitian wahana kebudayaan secara linguistic*. Senata Dharma University Press.
- Surbakti, Ernawati Br. 2012. *Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Karo*. Jurnal Telangkai Bahasa dan Sastra, 6 (1), 55-73.
- Toha, Muhammad. 2013. *Isolek-Isolek di Kabupaten Aceh Tamiang Provinsi Aceh: Kajian Dialektologi*. Jurnal Madah, 4 (1)