



WORD ORDER IN BOGOR DIALECT SUNDANESE: A STUDY OF SYNTACTIC TYPOLOGY

Nehemia Anugrah Parasian¹, M. Mulyadi²
Universitas Sumatera Utara^{1,2}

nehemiasimorangkir20@gmail.com

Received: (October 2025)

Accepted: (November 2025)

Published : (December 2025)

Abstract

This study aims to examine in depth the word order in Sundanese in Bogor dialect, focusing on sentence structure patterns commonly used by native speakers in various communication contexts. The method used in this research is descriptive qualitative. The translation results will be analysed to see the typology of the Bogor dialect Sundanese language in word order. The results of data analysis will be presented in the form of conclusions to answer what and how the typology of Sundanese language of Bogor dialect in word order. From the results of data and analysis, it is found that the Bogor dialect Sundanese language follows the most dominant S + V + O pattern, especially in ordinary declarative sentences. Negative sentences have the pattern S + NEG + V + O. Command sentences have the pattern V + O. Interrogative sentences have the pattern Question word + Rel + V + O. Passive sentences have the pattern O - Asp - Passive V - Agent. Aspectual declarative sentences have the pattern S - Asp - V - O.

Keywords: Bogor dialect, Sundanese language, syntactic typology, word order

INTRODUCTION

Languages in the world have different characteristics, shapes, patterns, and the science that studies them is called typology (Croft, 2003). According to Moravcsik (2012) language typology is the study of two phenomena, namely typologically and universally shared language characteristics. In this study, languages are classified based on the pattern or type of syntactic structure used in sentence formation. One of the fundamental aspects of language typology is word order (Brahmana et al., 2023; Song, 2010; Yadav et al., 2020). Word order is the arrangement of words in a sentence that determines the grammatical relationship and semantic meaning between elements. In various languages of the world, word order shows the diversity and uniqueness of each linguistic system.

Sundanese is one of the regional languages in Indonesia that has linguistic richness and a distinctive grammatical structure. In morphological typology, Sundanese belongs to the agglutinative type because it is a language that has many affixes (Sudaryat, 2013). According to Comrie (2014), the characteristics of agglutinative languages are as follows: (1) a word consists of more than one morpheme; (2) word or morpheme boundaries are always clear; (3) each morpheme always has a variety of forms; and (4) sound identification is easy to understand. These characteristics are evident in the morphological structure of Sundanese which allows the addition of various types of affixes - such as prefixes, suffixes, infixes, and confixes - to form grammatical and derivative meanings. This affixation process not only enriches the word form, but also reflects the grammatical relationship between elements in the sentence, such as aspect, mode, or agent markers. With a systematic and relatively transparent agglutinative structure, word formation in Sundanese becomes easier to study and analyze linguistically. This makes Sundanese one of the representative examples of agglutinative languages in the Austronesian family.

Word order syntactic typology has a long history. Starting with (Greenberg JH, 1966), many have contributed to the idea. Croft, (2003; Comrie (1983); Hawkins (1980), and others have contributed to word order typology. In the syntactic typology developed by Greenberg (in Comrie, 2014), word order in the basic sentence construction of a language can be a measure to predict several things in the grammar of the language. Greenberg looks at the

effect of word order on the formation of adposition types (prepositions or postpositions) and nominal phrases involving adjective and genitive forms.

Furthermore, word order typology, which some experts call constituent order typology, is one of the fundamental forms of study in linguistic typology, especially in grammatical typology (Artawa, 2020; Jufriзал, 2018). The syntactic constituent order of a language, will examine how different languages can use different orders (Altamimi & Alsager, 2023; Nasution & Mulyadi, 2022; Ramalingam et al., 2020). The typological order of word order is used to convey the same or similar meaning. In this case, Sundanese generally follows the Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order pattern, which means the subject usually precedes the verb, and the verb precedes the object. This pattern shows that Sundanese has similarities in basic sentence structure with many other languages, including Indonesian and English. Typology is important in the study of linguistics because it helps identify the grammatical characteristics of a language as well as its relationship with other language systems in the same or different families (Deal, 2015).

Syntactically, the typology of word order according to Greenberg in (DeLancey & Comrie, 1983) universally there are three elements in the formation of clauses in the languages of the world, namely subject, predicate, and object abbreviated as SVO. Later, it was refined by other experts, namely Lehmann and Vennemann and Hawkins. In terms of typology, the universality of clause formation can be described into six types, namely: SVO, SOV, VSO, VOS, OSV, and OVS. Later, it was refined by other experts, namely Lehmann and Vennemann as well as Hawkins. In terms of typology, the universality of clause formation can be described into six types, namely: SVO, SOV, VSO, VOS, OSV, and OVS. Of these six types, Sundanese in general, including the Bogor dialect, tends to follow the SVO (Subject-Verb-Object) pattern, where the subject precedes the predicate, and the object comes after the verb. For example, in the sentence “Abdi maca buku” (I read a book), it can be seen that the order of subject (*abdi*), verb (*maca*), and object (*book*) follows the SVO structure consistently.

Research on language typology has been conducted, such as research on Indonesian: A Study of Syntactic Typology by (Yani et al., 2019) typology study of Ciacia language (CL) in various linguistic aspects has not been conducted yet. It is the first study that focus on syntactic typology. Research on Indonesian Coordinative Sentences: A Syntactic Typology Approach by Mulyadi, who concluded that Indonesian coordinative sentences 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 coordinative sentences is “split” (Mulyadi, 2007). In the study and exploration of syntax, as in semantics, and grammatical pragmatics is to characterize the nature of syntactic structures, which include clause structures, adpositional phrases, and noun phrases. Then the clause structure consists of a core and a nucleus called the core layer, while the supporting layer is called peripheral (Anwar, 2019; Van Valin, 2005). Therefore, the study of syntactic typology generally characterizes the syntactic structure of a language as well as its grammatical alliances.

Greenberg developed a universal word order theory that divides the world's languages into three types, namely S-V-O, S-O-V, and V-S-O. (Hawkins, 1980) continued this theory by examining 350 languages in the world from different language families. In his research, Greenberg produced 15 language types while Hawkins produced 24 language types. Their research concluded that languages with verb order (V) preceding object (O) will have prepositions and noun phrases (FN) formed with the central element (core noun) preceding attributes (noun+adjective and noun+genitive). Meanwhile, languages with the order of O preceding V tend to have propositions and attributes preceding the central element in the formation of FN (adjective + nomina and genitif + nomina).

This research continues, (Rizki & Pujianti, 2017) stating that this word order syntactic typology actually looks at the position of nouns with certain functions in relation to verbs. However that word order rules in the basic sentence of a language affect three things. First, the formation of compound sentences. The rules for forming compound sentences tend to follow the rules for forming basic sentences. Second, if a language has an O-V sequence then the language tends to have an attribute sequence followed by the central element in the construction of its nominative phrase. As for languages with V-O order, they tend to have a central element followed by attributes. Third, the morphological system. O-V languages have dominant suffixes, while V-O languages have dominant prefixes.

However, in practice, especially in the Bogor Sundanese dialect, there is a certain flexibility in word order that can be influenced by speech context, meaning emphasis, and pragmatic nuances. Some forms of informal conversation allow for variations, such as the placement of an adverbial element at the beginning of a sentence, or the omission of a subject that is already implied in the communicative situation. Therefore, although Sundanese typologically

belongs to the SVO category, sentence structures that deviate from this basic pattern can be found, especially in daily oral speech.

- (1) *Bibina dagang tiung*
Aunt=3SG sell headscarf
'Bibinya dagang kerudung'
'Her aunt sells headscarf'
- (2) *Maman teu datang lantaran sare*
Maman TOP come because sleep
'Maman tidak datang karena tidur'
'Maman didn't come because he was asleep'

This study aims to examine in depth the word order in Sundanese in the Bogor dialect, focusing on sentence structure patterns commonly used by native speakers in various communication contexts. This research seeks to identify the general form of subject, predicate, object and adverb arrangement in the dialect, and explore variations that may appear in daily language practice. In addition, this research also intends to compare the word order in the Bogor dialect with the standard Sundanese language, so that it can be seen to what extent differences or deviations in structure occur. Not only from the structural side, this research also examines linguistic and pragmatic factors that influence the flexibility of word order in the dialect, such as the social context, the relationship between speakers, and the purpose of communication.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative descriptive data analysis method. 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 is carried out descriptively, meaning that the data analysed and the results of the analysis are in the form of a description of the phenomenon, but not in the form of numbers. Descriptive research is research that describes current problem solving based on data (Narbuko & Achmadi, 2017). The purpose of this method is to describe and analyze the word order pattern of Sundanese in the Bogor dialect based on naturally occurring linguistic data.

The data of this study consist of spoken and written sentences produced by native speakers of the Bogor dialect of Sundanese. The spoken data were collected through natural conversations and semi-structured interviews with six native speakers (aged 25–60) who have lived in Bogor for more than ten years. Written data were also obtained from social media posts and local publications written in the Bogor dialect. The inclusion of both oral and written sources was intended to ensure a more comprehensive representation of the dialect's syntactic structure. The data were collected using recording, note-taking, and translation techniques. Recorded conversations were transcribed verbatim and translated into Indonesian and English for comparison. The researcher also employed elicitation by asking native speakers to produce sentences with specific syntactic structures (e.g., declarative, interrogative, negative, imperative, and passive forms). All data were then categorized based on sentence types and syntactic patterns (SVO, SOV, etc.).

The data analysis was carried out using a distributional and comparative analysis method. Each sentence was segmented into its syntactic constituents (subject, predicate, object, aspect, negation, and adverbial). The patterns were then compared to Greenberg's (1966) typological framework and subsequent models by Croft (2003) and Comrie (2014) to determine the dominant word order and its variants. The analysis was conducted through Miles et al., (2014) model, the following steps:

1. Data condensation: selecting representative sentences from the corpus;
2. Data display: classifying sentence patterns in tabular form; and
3. Conclusion drawing/verification: identifying typological tendencies of the Bogor dialect.

The translation results will be analyzed to see the typology of Bogor dialect Sundanese in word order when compared to Indonesian. The results of data analysis will be presented in the form of conclusions to answer what and how the typology of the Sundanese language of the Bogor dialect in word order. To ensure the validity of the findings, the study applied triangulation techniques by comparing oral and written data, cross-checking with multiple speakers, and consulting a native language expert. In addition, member checking was conducted by confirming interpretations with participants to ensure accuracy of meaning and syntactic representation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Sundanese in general has a sentence structure that generally follows the Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) pattern and especially for people living in the Bogor area who have their own dialect, although in practice it can show flexibility depending on the discourse context, the focus of the utterance, and the level of language formality. By analysing the various sentence forms found in the data, it is hoped that it can be seen how word order variations appear and what factors influence them. Consider the data below.

(3) *Urang indit ka Bandung*
1PL go to Bandung
'Kita pergi ke Bandung'

(4) *Abdi dongkap ka dieu*
1SG arrive to here
'Saya datang ke sini'

(5) *Ceu Icih tisoledat*
Mrs. Icih NEG-Slip
'Bu Icih terpeleset'

Sundanese has an explicit pronominal form that occurs in data 3, 4, and 5. Although in informal or spoken contexts, sometimes the subject can be dropped (pro-drop). However, in this sentence the subjects *urang*, *abdi*, and *ceuh icih* are stated explicitly, strengthening the SVO structure. The verb that comes after the subject in this sentence does not carry a time inflection (tense). Time information is usually conveyed through context or additional information, not through verb form. Analysis of the sentences in data 3, 4, and 5 shows that Sundanese has a stable basic SVO sentence structure that is consistent with other typological features of SVO languages. Verbs do not undergo time inflection, direct objects appear without prepositions, and grammatical relations are determined by word order, not morphology. This places Sundanese in a structural family with other languages in the Austronesian region and modern Indo-European.

The sentence in data (3) follows the basic S-V-O pattern. The subject "urang" (we) is followed by the verb "indit" (go), and then the object "ka Bandung". This is a common form of declarative sentence and represents the basic structure of Sundanese, which is generally SVO, with the addition of an adverb (place) after the verb. There is no aspect marker or negation in this sentence, so the form is neutral. This shows that in neutral constructions, Sundanese consistently places the subject at the beginning of the sentence, followed by the verb, and then an adverb such as place or time. This pattern is very similar to Indonesian, but it's important to note that verbs in Sundanese don't change form based on the subject (no person inflection).

The sentence in data (5) is patterned S-V, with the subject "Ceu Icih" and the intransitive verb "tisoledat" (slipped). There is no additional object or adverb. This shows that Sundanese allows simple sentences with intransitive verbs, without the need for an object, and the subject order remains at the beginning. This sentence also shows that the S-V structure is maintained even though there is no complement. This phenomenon strengthens the evidence that subject order in the initial position is the main feature of declarative sentences in Sundanese, and can stand alone with verbs that do not demand objects.

(6) *Saha nu maca buku eta?*
Who REL read book that
'Siapa yang baca buku itu?'
'Who read the book?'

(7) *Abdi henteu dahar daging*
1SG NEG eat meat
'Saya tidak makan daging'
'I don't eat meat'

(8) *Tutupan panto eta!*
close-IMP door that
'Tutup pintu itu!'
'Close the door!'

The sentence in data (6) is an open question sentence. The interrogative word “saha” (who) occupies the initial position, followed by the relative phrase “nu maca” (who reads), and the object “buku eta”. This pattern can be thought of as Wh-Rel-V-O. The use of “nu” here is typical of Sundanese relative construction. This structure shows that in an interrogative sentence, the word order has shifted with the interrogative word at the beginning as the focus/topic form. The use of “nu” indicates that in subject questions, Sundanese utilizes a relative clause structure to explain the actor. This is a unique and distinctive feature in Sundanese interrogative constructions, which are syntactically more complex than just subject and verb inversions as in English.

The sentence in data (7) is a negative sentence with the pattern S-Neg-V-O. “Abdi” (me) is the subject, ‘henteu’ (not) is the negation, ‘dahar’ (eat) is the verb, and ‘meat’ is the object. The placement of “henteu” before the verb is a common pattern in Sundanese negation. This confirms that the negation marker in Sundanese precedes the verb, in contrast to some other languages that place it at the end. This shows that the negation marker in Sundanese has a fixed position between the subject and the verb. This structure is quite consistent and parallel to negation in Indonesian, which also places “not” before the verb.

The sentence in data (8) is an imperative sentence (command), with a V-O structure. The verb “tutupan” (close, imperative form) precedes the object “panto eta” (the door). In command sentences, the subject is usually implicit/ignored, as it is clearly directed to the listener. This shows that Sundanese follows the same pattern as many languages when it comes to imperatives: the subject is omitted, the verb is immediately preceded. This shows that in imperative sentences, Sundanese omits the subject pragmatically, as do many other languages. The emphasis is on the action (verb), which is directly directed to the hearer.

(9) *Abdi geus maca buku eta*
1SG PFV read book that
‘Saya sudah membaca buku itu’
‘I have read the book’

(10) *Buku eta geus dimaca ku abdi*
Book that PFV PASS-read by 1SG
‘Buku itu sudah dibaca oleh saya’
‘I have already read the book’

The sentence in data (9) adds the aspect element with “geus” (already). The pattern becomes S-Asp-V-O. This shows that Sundanese has an explicit aspect marker, and its placement is before the verb. This is in line with the tendency in Austronesian languages to mark aspect or time before the predicate. Sundanese uses a pre-verbal aspect marker, which precedes the verb to indicate that the action has already taken place. This placement shows that the aspect element has a fixed slot in the sentence structure, which is between the subject and the verb.

The sentence in data (10) uses a passive structure, with the object “book eta” placed at the beginning, making it the topic of the sentence. The pattern is O - Asp - Passive - Agent. “Geus” (already) is the aspect marker, ‘dimaca’ (read) is the passive verb, and ‘ku abdi’ (by me) is the agent. This shows that in passive sentences, Sundanese moves the object to the initial position (topic/focus), and the agent is recognized through the preposition “ku”. In the passive sentence, the structure changes to O - Asp - Passive V - Agent, showing that Sundanese topicalizes the object. Agents (actual actors) are recognized through the preposition “ku”, similar to “by” in Indonesian. This also shows the flexibility of Sundanese structures in foregrounding important information (topic/focus) at the beginning of a sentence.

The grammatical alliance of Bogor dialect Sundanese is typologically patterned S=A and S=P, and this is called accusative. This is because the agent argument behaves the same as the subject argument (A) and different from the patient argument, so this language pattern is classified as an accusative type. Therefore, the word order in the language that has been presented above can be seen in the table below:

The results of the study are presented in the form of graphs, tables, or descriptive, then the analysis and interpretation of these results is needed before being discussed. The table is written in the middle or at the end of each text description of the results / acquisition of research. If the table width is not enough to be written in half a page, it can be written in full page. The table title is written from the left centered, all words begin with uppercase letters, except conjunctions. If more than one line is written in a single space (at least 12). For example, can be seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Word Order Patterns of Bogor Dialect Sundanese

No.	Sentences	Syntactic Pattern	Sentences Type
1	<i>Urang indit ka Bandung</i> 'We go to Bandung'	S + V + O	Declarative
2	<i>Abdi dongkap ka dieu</i> 'I come to here'	S + V + O	Declarative
3	<i>Ceu Icih tisoledat</i> 'Mrs. Icih slipped'	S + V	Declarative
4	<i>Saha nu maca buku eta?</i> 'Who read the book?'	Wh + Rel + V + O	Interrogative
5	<i>Abdi henteu dahar daging</i> 'I don't eat meat'	S + Neg + V + O	Negative
6	<i>Tutupan panto eta!</i> 'Closer the door!'	V + O	Imperative
7	<i>Abdi geus maca buku eta</i> 'I have read the book'	S + Asp + V + O	Aspectual declarative
8	<i>Buku eta geus dimaca ku abdi</i> I have already read the book	O + Asp + Vpasif + Agen	Passive

Based on the results of the data analysis presented in Table 1, it can be concluded that the Bogor dialect of Sundanese shows a dominance of the word order pattern S + V + O, as is commonly found in other SVO languages such as Indonesian and English. However, this study also reveals systematic variations in word order based on sentence type (interrogative, negative, imperative, aspect, and passive), which demonstrates the richness and flexibility of syntax in this dialect.

This finding is consistent with the syntactic typology theory proposed by Greenberg JH (1966) and expanded upon by Croft (2003) and Comrie (2014), which states that in SVO languages, the subject tends to appear at the beginning of the sentence, followed by the verb, then the object. The Sundanese language, Bogor dialect, consistently applies this pattern in neutral declarative sentences, as seen in the data "*Urang indit ka Bandung*" and "*Abdi dongkap ka dieu*." This reinforces the classification of Sundanese as part of the Austronesian language family, which generally follows the SVO pattern.

However, when compared to Yani et al. (2019) research on verbal clause construction in the Ciacia language, it was found that Ciacia shows greater variation in word order, even with an SOV tendency in certain structures. In contrast, in the Bogor dialect, variation maintains the main SVO pattern, although in transformational forms such as passive and interrogative sentences, there is a shift in the position of sentence elements.

Furthermore, the structure of interrogative sentences in the Bogor dialect, such as in "*Saha nu maca buku eta?*" (Who read that book?), shows the pattern Wh + Rel + V + O, which indicates the use of relative constructions (nu) as interrogative devices. This differs from the interrogative structure in Indonesian, which tends to be more direct without relative forms (e.g., "Who read that book?"). This pattern shows a local characteristic in the formation of questions, as also shown in Nasution & Mulyadi (2022) research on the Angkola language, which notes that local languages often adapt questioning strategies based on relative clause structures. This shows that the Sundanese language of the Bogor dialect has its own syntactic complexity in forming interrogative sentences.

In negative sentences such as "*Abdi henteu dahar daging*" it is found that the negative particle "*henteu*" is consistently placed before the verb, forming the pattern S + NEG + V + O. This is consistent with the findings of Rizki & Pujianti (2017) on Arabic, which also places the negation particle before the verb, thereby indicating that in many agglutinative languages, the position of negation occupies a fixed slot within the clause structure. This consistency underscores the stability of the syntactic structure of the Bogor dialect in expressing negation.

In imperative sentences such as "*Tutupan panto eta!*", the V + O structure implies the omission of the subject (pro-drop), which is already implied pragmatically. This is in Mulyadi (2007) findings in his research on syntactic coordination in Indonesian, where sentence structures in the imperative form tend to omit the subject for the sake of communicative effectiveness. Thus, the Bogor dialect also adheres to the principle of economy of expression, which is common in everyday speech.

One of the main contributions of this study lies in its observation of passive aspects and structures. In the sentence "*Abdi geus maca buku eta*" the pattern S + Asp + V + O is found, while in "*Buku eta geus dimaca ku abdi*" there is a change to the pattern O + Asp + Vpassive + Agent. This reflects similarities with the patterns discussed in the studies by (Artawa, 2020) and (Van Valin, 2005), which state that in agglutinative languages, aspectual information is typically marked lexically (e.g., with particles such as "*geus*"), rather than through verbal inflection. The placement of aspect before the verb marks a fixed structure and shows cross-linguistic consistency within the Austronesian family.

Meanwhile, passive sentence structures in the Bogor dialect, with the object placed at the beginning and the agent at the end with the preposition “*ku*” typologically show a tendency toward object topicalization. This aligns with the theories of Deal (2015) and Hawkins, (1980), who explain that in passive sentences, the placement of the object at the beginning serves to highlight specific information within the discourse, rather than merely fulfilling a syntactic function. The Sundanese dialect of Bogor demonstrates pragmatic maturity in forming such structures, reinforcing the claim that word order flexibility is often driven by communicative needs rather than grammatical rule violations.

From all these comparisons, it is clear that this study makes a significant contribution to the study of local syntactic typology. The Bogor dialect not only retains the basic SVO structure commonly found in Austronesian languages, but also exhibits structural variations and pragmatic strategies that enrich our understanding of local grammar. This study expands the scope of previous studies by systematically documenting how sentence forms are constructed in actual practice by native speakers of the Bogor dialect, and bridges formal typological studies with the actual context of usage.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that the Sundanese language, specifically the Bogor dialect, predominantly follows the S + V + O word order pattern, aligning with the characteristics of other Austronesian and SVO-structured languages. Nevertheless, the data reveal that the Bogor dialect also exhibits structural flexibility influenced by sentence type, pragmatic context, and communicative emphasis. Interrogative, negative, aspectual, and passive sentences show systematic variations that enrich the syntactic diversity of the dialect.

The main advantage of this study lies in its detailed and data-driven documentation of actual sentence use among native speakers of the Bogor dialect. It not only confirms theoretical assumptions in syntactic typology but also provides empirical evidence of how local languages adapt to pragmatic and contextual demands in natural discourse. This adds valuable insight to the typological studies of regional Indonesian languages and contributes to the broader understanding of Austronesian linguistic systems.

However, the study has certain limitations. The data are primarily drawn from descriptive analysis and qualitative interpretation, which may not fully capture the sociolinguistic dynamics or phonological variations that also influence syntax. In addition, the research is focused on the Bogor dialect only, which may not represent other Sundanese sub-dialects with distinct grammatical nuances.

The possible applications of this study extend to comparative linguistic research, language teaching, and preservation of regional languages. By identifying stable syntactic patterns and their pragmatic variations, this research can serve as a reference for typological comparison among Austronesian languages, as well as for curriculum design in local language education. Future research should expand the data scope to include other Sundanese dialects and employ quantitative or corpus-based methods to validate the typological tendencies found in this study.

REFERENCES

- Altamimi, H. S., & Alsager, H. N. (2023). Argument Structure and Word Order in Saudi Sign Language. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1401.21>
- Anwar, M. (2019). Konstruksi Kosubordinasi dalam Bahasa Indonesia (Perspektif Linguistik Fungsional). *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v8i1.947>
- Artawa, K. (2020). Pemarkahan Diatesis Bahasa Indonesia: Kajian Tipologi Linguistik. *Mozaik Humaniora*, 20(1), 26–38.
- Brahmana, R. A., Mulyadi, & Widayati, D. (2023). Mandarin Word Order: Syntactic Typology. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.610>
- Comrie, B. (1983). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Comrie, B. (2014). Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Data-Bases and Explanations. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals*, 46(1–4). <https://doi.org/10.1524/stuf.1993.46.14.3>
- Croft, W. (2003). *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deal, A. R. (2015). Ergativity. In Artemis Alexiadou and Tibor Kiss (eds.), *Syntax – Theory and Analysis*. An International Handbook, (1). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Greenberg J.H. (1966). Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. In J.H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of Language* (pp. 40-70). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hawkins, J. (1980). On Implicational and Distributional Universals of Word Order. *Journal of Linguistics*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700006551>
- Jufriзал, J. (2018). Fenomena Tipologi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau: Akusatif, Ergatif, Atau Campur? *Leksika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pengajarannya*, 3(1).
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook*. California: Sage Publication.
- Moravcsik, E. A. (2012). *Introducing Language Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mulyadi. (2007). Kalimat Koordinasi Bahasa Indonesia: Sebuah Ancangan Tipologi Sintaksis. *LOGAT: Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 3(2), 90–98.
- Narbuko, C., & Achmadi, A. (2017). *Metodologi Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Nasution, J., & Mulyadi, M. (2022). Word Order In Angkola Language: A Study Of Syntactic Typology. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v6i1.5184>
- Ramalingam, S., Krishnan, I. A., Suppiah, P. C., & Maruthai, E. (2020). Word Order in Job Interviews: The Malaysian Perspective. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v16i3.11080>
- Rizki, A., & Pujianti. (2017). Tata Urut Kata Dalam Bahasa Arab (Tipologi Sintaksis). *Ittihad*, 1(2).
- Song, J. J. (2010). *Word Order Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sudaryat, Y. (2013). Fungsi Gramatikal Dan Semantis Sufiks -Eun Dalam Bahasa Sunda. *LOKABASA*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.17509/jlb.v4i1.3132>
- Van Valin, R. D. (2005). *Exploring the Syntax–Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yadav, H., Vaidya, A., Shukla, V., & Husain, S. (2020). Word Order Typology Interacts With Linguistic Complexity: A Cross-Linguistic Corpus Study. *Cognitive Science*, 44(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12822>
- Yani, L., Artawa, K., Sri Satyawati, M., & Udayana, I. N. (2019). Verbal Clause Construction of Ciacia Language: Syntactic Typology Study. *E-Journal of Linguistics*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2019.v13.i02.p05>