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GRAMMATICAL HIERARCHIES 
AND THE INTERACTION OF TYPOLOGICAL PATTERNS 
OF THE GORONTALO LANGUAGE 
(A Typological Approach) 
(Prof. Dr. Moses Usman, Hasanuddin University)

Abstract 

The study touches on several aspects of morphosyntax of the Gorontalo language based on the typological semantic-syntactic roles approach aiming at providing a concise description of the constituent order at clause level and the grammatical relation as well as semantics. The procedure in analyzing the data was by identifying and classifying the data according to the constituent order which determines the basic word order and its variant with regard to syntax, and by formulating the basic word order rules and the grammatical relations of the subject-agent-patient, and comparing them with the Greenberg's language universals. The finding indicates that the basic word order is SVO correlated with preposition and noun-adjective, (SVO<prep N-Adj). Subjects in general are filled by arguments (+human, +animate) in active intransitive and transitive clause. Proper nouns are characterized by the particle 'te'/ti' and personal pronouns by independent pronouns. The subject semantically plays the role of an agent. The direct objects are filled by noun phrases (-animate). If they are filled by (+human), they are characterized by the preposition olo (ole/oll) in front of the noun and characterized by particular independent pronouns. The object is semantically the patient. In bi-transitive clauses, the direct objects are filled by noun phrases which are semantically themes; indirect objects are filled by particular independent pronouns which are the same as the pronouns for the direct objects in transitive clauses; semantically the indirect objects are the goals. The type of the Gorontalo language is nominative-accusative language since the S and the A have the same marker, but in bi-transitive clauses the type of the language is the secondary object since the patient and the goal have the same marker.

Key words: Grammatical hierarchies, typological patterns, typological approach

Abstrak

Telaah ini berkaitan dengan beberapa aspek morfo-sintaksis bahasa Gorontalo berdasarkan pendekatan peran semantic-sintaktik tipologis yang bertujuan untuk mendapatkan pemeran yang tepat tentang urutan konstituen pada tingkat klausa dan hubungan grammatikal serta hubungan semantis. Prosedur analisis data adalah dengan mengidentifikasi dan mengklasifikasi data sesuai dengan urutan konstituen yang menentukan urutan dasar dan

Kata kunci: Hierarki grammatical, pola tipologis, pendekatan tipologis

I. Introduction
1.1. The Language

The Gorontalo language is spoken in the town of Gorontalo and its environs on the northernmost peninsula of the Sulawesi island, Indonesia, where the coasts of this long and narrow peninsula run in a generally west-east direction. The town of Gorontalo is located on the south coast. The Gorontalo language is the principal and best known dialect in a larger language area, which also includes other closely related languages or dialects, such as the Bonda dialect, which is spoken in the Suwawa district to the east of the town of Gorontalo. The languages adjacent to the Gorontalo language area are those of Bo- laang Mongondow to the east, and Buol, i.e. Buwolo, to the west.

1.2 Constituent Order of Typology

Historical and The Theoretical Background

Descriptive linguists have long observed that individual languages structure their clauses in characteristic ways; some languages tend to place the verb at the end of a clause; others at the beginning; still others place it somewhere in the middle. Finally, many languages seem to place the verb just about anywhere. Among the nominal constituents of a clause, an important distinction has traditionally been drawn between subject and object (S and O). From this point of view there are logically possible orders of constituents in a clause that contains a subject (S), an object (O) and a verb (V). These are VSO, SVO, SOV, VOS, OVS, and OSV.
be the partial according to which, of these orders is typical, or 'basic'. Though the assumption that subject and object are indeed universal categories relevant to the ordering of nominal elements in a clause has been seriously questioned, this typology is often a useful starting point for conceptualizing the syntactic structure and investigating of various orders in any language.

Greenberg (1963) observed that several syntactic characteristics tend to correlate with certain of these constituent orders mentioned above. For example, if a language normally places the object after the verb (VO) in main clauses, then it tends to exhibit all the structural properties in the V = O column. It is important to recognize that Greenberg simply observed certain correlations. He did not attempt to provide a reason (i.e. to 'motivate') these correlations or even to test them for statistical significance. In this sense, Greenberg did not attempt to predict constituent ordering as yet unstudied languages. Nevertheless, Greenberg's work stimulated the field of typological linguistics and has continued to be very influential.

Much subsequent work on constituent order typing has focused on discovering motivations for the correlation observed by Greenberg, e.g. Lehmann (1973), Vennemann (1974), Hawkins (1983). In order to 'motivate' a correlation between the two syntactic characteristics (e.g. SOV, order and postposition), the research paradigm has been first to show that the correlation could not be otherwise, e.g. logically, exclude the possibility that the correlation could have been other than the observed facts. In this sense, these subsequent studies attempted to make predictions of constituent orders. That's, they hoped that given certain key constituent orders, e.g. main declarative clause, order and order of genitive and head in the noun phrase (Hawkins, 1983), for any language they would be able to accurately guess (predict) what the other constituent orders would be.

The three major problems with the original typology are: (1) the difficulty in identifying the basic constituent order for many languages of the world; (2) the fact that Greenberg's typology simply assumed that languages order their nominal elements according to the grammatical relations of subject and object; and (3) Greenberg did not even attempt to come up with a significantly large and random sample languages.

The first two problems are probably to a general Euro-centric bias among linguists. That is, since the European languages that many linguists speak order their main clause elements according to status as subject and object, and since these categories are readily identifiable in most of these languages, it has been assumed, not just by Greenberg, that all languages must operate in the same way. However, subsequent research, much of which has been done by speakers of non-Indo-European languages, has revealed that in many languages grammatical relations just are not as clearly identifiable as they are in Indo-European. Furthermore, even when they are identifiable, it is often doubtful whether any significant correlations can be drawn between constituent orders and grammatical relations while...
nouns themselves are relatively easy to identify universally, there are many different properties (sometimes ‘status’ or ‘roles’) that noun phrases have when they enter into syntactic constructions. The roles of subject and object are central in most Indo-European languages, but there is no a priori reason to expect that other characteristics, perhaps agent/patient, finite/indefinite, given/new, animate/inanimate, big/small, or abstract/concrete would not affect the positions of nouns in clauses. Hence, it should be a matter of empirical observations, not a priori assumption, whether and to what extent constituent orders in a language can be stated in terms of S and O.

In spite of these problems with the Greenberg typology, it is still helpful to a root of a grammar sketch to have some sense of the basic constituents order type the language represents. However, in this discussion we will replace the traditional two-way distinction between subject and object (see, Usman, M. 1995) with a three way distinction among Comrie (1981, 1989) has called ‘semantic-syntactic roles’. These are the most agent argument of a transitive clause, only argument of an intransitive clause and other argument of a transitive clause.

Subject

A  most agent-like argument of a transitive clause

S  only argument of an intransitive clause

Absolutive

P  least agent-like argument of a transitive clause

Within this framework, the subject category consists of the set of A together with S, while the absolutive category consists of the set of S together with P. For purposes of constituent order typology, then languages can be characterized in terms of A,S,P and V rather than simply S,O and V. This new terminology both provides for languages that lack the intransitive subject like a transitive object in terms of constituent ordering and provides a bridge into more detailed treatment of grammatical relations.

1.3 Distribution of Constituent Order Types around the World

From studies that assume that subject and object are relevant for basic constituent order, it appears that APV/SV and AVP/SV are the most common constituent order types they occur in virtually every area of the world in about equal properties. Japanese is a non prototypical APV/SV language. English is a fairly constituent AVP/SV language, allowing alternatives such as PAV (‘beans I like’) and VS (‘there comes the bus’). However, these alternatives are clearly pragmatically marked, occurring rarely and only in very-well defined discourse environments. Together APV/SV and
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AVP/SV languages constitute approximately 70 percent of the world languages. The third most common order type is VAP/VS. This type is well represented in Austronesian languages (Philippines, Pacific islands, Madagascar, and the interior of Saharan and Semitic languages of eastern and northern Africa. It is also quite common in the Americas. Verb-initial languages tend to allow more flexibility of constituent orders than the verb-final or verb-medial languages. For this reason, if discourse in a given language contains many verb-initial clauses, it may be difficult to determine what the basic constituent order is (Payne, 1987:75).

These three common types AVP/SV, AVP/SV, and VAP/VS account for about 85 percent of the world’s languages. The other 15 percent, determination of basic constituent order in terms of grammatical relations is likely to be difficult or impossible. What the major constituent orders have in common is that the A precedes the P in transitive clauses. In the three other logically possible types the P precedes the A. The tendency for A to precede in basic, pragmatically neutral clauses, is so overwhelming that it is extremely unlikely that it could have arisen by chance. This fact has led many researchers to reflect on possible cognitive motivations for the categories of A and P. That is, many have asked ‘what is about nominals categorized as A and P causes languages to practically always order A before P in basic clauses?’ As mentioned above, if a language employs verb-initial clauses quite frequently (approximately 25 percent or more) in discourse, it will probably be quite difficult to determine a ‘basic’ order. This will be because of either or both of the following tendencies: (1) verb-initial languages often avoid the use of full noun phrases, preferring to rely on pronouns and/or clitics, and (2) verb-initial languages often are less sensitive to grammatical relations than are other languages. That is, their basic clause structure can often be insightfully describe as a verb followed by one or more noun phrases. The order the noun phrases following the verb tends to be determined by pragmatic or semantic factors that are only indirectly characterized in terms of grammatical relations. This is true for many western Austronesian languages. It is also true of many verb-initial languages of the Americas, e.g. Mayan and other Meso-American languages.

1.4 The Problems

Based on the discussion above, the problems of this study is ‘what the basic constituent order of the Guatemalan language is, related to the relative order of subject, agent, and patient (S A P)’. The notion of grammatical relations in terms of grammatical expressions of semantic roles.

2. Methods

2.1 The Data

The data sources was oral expression supported by written materials ‘Otanaha’. In the collection of data, the researcher applied both observation and interview methods backed up by interviewing, recording, and note-taking techniques. In analyzing the data, the distributional method is used with its immediate constituent technique.
2.2 The Procedure

To determine the ‘basic’ constituent order of the Gorontalo language, the researcher follows the procedure how to consider the ‘basic’ constituent order of a language to be exhibited at least in pragmatically neutral clauses (Payne, 1997: 77). However, identifying one clause as ‘pragmatically neutral’ may be problematic. It is especially difficult to find pragmatically neutral clauses that contain one or more full noun phrases. A general way to approach this problem is, first to eliminate clause types that are known to exhibit variant constituent orders in the language. These would include: 1) dependent clauses, 2) paragraph-initial clauses, 3) clause that introduce participants, 4) question, 5) negative clauses, and 6) clearly contrastive clauses.

3. The Result

The System for Growing S.A.P in the Gorontalo Language

In order to define grammatical relations, it is convenient to identify three basic semantic-syntactic roles, termed S, A, and P (Comrie 1978). Similar terms are used by Croft (1970), Payne (1997). These terms presupposed two prototypical clause types in the Gorontalo language.

(1) Single argument

a. (S)(V) 
Te Ali lo-naqo (P)
part A perf. past-go
‘Ali has gone’

b. (A)(V) 
(P) 
Te Ali lo-mate oli Ani / olio/batade
Part A past-hit to Ani/p3
sing-fem/goat
‘Ali hit Ani/her/the goat’

c. (A)(V)(T)(G) 
Te Ali lo-ngoifi doi oli Ani/olio
Part A past-give money to Ani/olio
‘Ali gave money to Ani/her’

The S is defined as the only nominal argument of a single one clause. Sometimes this type of clause refers to as an intransitive clause. (see Payne: 1997: 320). The A is defined as the most agent-like argument of a multi-argument clause. Sometimes this type of clause refers to as a transitive or bi-transitive clause. If there is no argument that is a very good agent, the A is the argument that is treated morpho-syntactically in the same manner as prototypical agents are treated. Usually there will be one argument in every verbal clause that exhibits this property, though there may not be. P is the ‘most patient-like’ argument of a multi-argument clause i.e. transitive clause. Again, if none of the arguments is very much like a patient, then the argument is treated like a prototypical patient is considered to be the P. T is the theme argument of a bi-transitive clause. It has similar function as P in transitive clause. G is the goal argument of a bi-transitive clause.
In traditional grammar terms, intransitive clauses have only a single argument, the ‘subject’. Transitive clauses have two arguments, the ‘subject’ (as A) and the ‘direct object’ (P); the bi-
transitive clauses have three arguments, the subjects (A), the direct object (T), and the
indirect object (G) (Croft 1990:102). The grammatical relation of ‘subject’ can be defined as
P together with A, while direct object or ‘simply’ object can be defined as P together with T,
and as ‘indirect object’ can be defined as G alone.

\[
\text{(3) a. (S) (V)}
\begin{align*}
\text{Dia} & \quad \text{pergi} \\
3p.sg & \quad \text{go} \\
\text{he/she went}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{b. (A) (V) (P)}
\begin{align*}
\text{me-mukul-nya} & \\
3p.sg \quad \text{Nom. Ac-hit-3p.sg acc} \\
\text{he/she hit him/her}
\end{align*}
\]

So, in the Gorontalo language, the free forms of personal pronouns (waqu ‘1sg.’/ waatia ‘1sg-
used only for the subjects (S) of a single verb argument (intransitive verb) or the agent of a
multi-argument verb (transitive and bitransitive), and the personal pronouns olaqu/olaatia
‘1sg’, olaami ‘1pl’, olanto/olemu/ ‘2sg’, olimongoli ‘2pl’, olio ‘3sg’, olimongolio ‘3pl’ are
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used only for the P of a two-argument verb (transitive) or for the G of a three-argument verb (bitransitive P and G). It is quite different from Indonesian and English. Compare it!

The Gorontalo language manifests a nominative/accusative system in marking free form pronouns. The Gorontalo language also manifests a nominative/accusative system for organizing grammatical relations in person marking on verbs.

\[(5) \text{a. } (V\ -A)\quad (P)\quad (V\ -A)\]
\[
\text{Naqo-u tio} \quad \text{tio naqo-u}
\]
\[
\text{Go-1sg erg 3sg} \quad \text{3sg go-1sg erg}
\]

\[b\ (V\ -A)\quad (P)\quad (V\ -A)\]
\[
\text{pate-u tio} \quad \text{tio pate-u}
\]
\[
\text{hit-1sg erg 3sg} \quad \text{3sg hit-1sg erg}
\]

The free pronouns forms as subject or agent can be morphologically clitics marking on verbs and functions as agent. The clitics are -u-/laatia ‘1sg’, -lam/lamiaatia/-nto ‘1pl’, -mu/-nto ‘2sg’, -limongoli ‘2pl’, -lio ‘3sg’, and -limongolio ‘3pl’.

In constituent order type, the Gorontalo language constituent with its nominative/accusative orientation, treats S and A alike in both subject of intransitive verbs and object of transitive verbs most neutrally occur in preverbal position. So, I can say that constituent order type of the Gorontalo language is AVP (70 percent), although there are other possible constituent order such as VPA or VAP.

From the examples above we see that S and A are unmarked noun phrases that precede the verb, while P and G are unmarked noun phrases that immediately follow the verb. G is expressed as a prepositional phrase i.e. a noun phrase whose grammatical relation to the verb is marked by a preposition. (This is encoded in the traditional grammar terminology: S + A is the subject and P + T is the direct object. G is the indirect object). I quote again the example above:

\[1.\ e\ (A)\ (V))\ (T)\ (G)\]
\[
\text{Te Ali lo-ngohi doi oli Ani/olio}
\]
\[
\text{Part A past-give money to Ani/olio}
\]
\[
‘\text{Ali gave money to Any/her’}
\]

\[
\text{G}
\]

\[
\text{A P T G}
\]
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In the Gorontalo language G (the transitive, indirect object) is expressed in the same way as P (the transitive direct object). The position of the G argument varies in the Gorontalo language. Neutrally the position (T) follows the T argument (see Usman, 1990:1). The combination of \( P + G \) refers in the primary object and T as the secondary object (Croll, 1990:103). So, the grammatical relation hierarchy in the Gorontalo language can be written as \( S + A < P + T < G \).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


**DISCUSSION**

If we first restrict our attention to the Gorontalo language with traditional subjects (S + A) and objects (P + T), then we find that agreement fits the grammatical relation hierarchy. If the verb agrees with the direct object, then it agrees with the subject (see the Indonesian example). Turning to word order, the Gorontalo language follows the grammatical hierarchy. The fact that subjects generally precede objects is embodied in Greenberg’s first universal: In declarative sentences with nominal subject and object, the dominant order is almost always one in which the subject precedes the object. *Greenberg, 1966:77*.

*There is also animacy hierarchy.* The animacy hierarchy actually involves several distinct but related grammatical dimension. If we turn to case marking, we find that the major manifestation of animacy pattern is found in the marking of personal pronouns. A human pronoun is a human common noun direct object or indirect object. In the Gorontalo language, a human direct or indirect object uses preposition in \( P + G \) arguments. A non-human common noun direct object or indirect object uses a preposition phrase if the only the \( P \) follows the \( P \) in di-transitive clause.
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