

GRAMMATICAL MARKEDNESS OF NON-VERBAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN MINANGKABAUNESE: A GRAMMATICAL TYPOLOGICAL STUDYⁱ

Jufrizal¹, Lely Refnita²

FBS Universitas Negeri Padang¹, FKIP Universitas Bung Hatta²

juf_ely@yahoo.com¹, lrefnita67@yahoo.com²

Abstract

The markedness theory has been becoming an important tool to directly link formal (structural) linguistic data and properties across languages. Markedness is one of the criteria which is used to determine the asymmetry of grammatical constructions in languages being learnt. So far, typological analyses on the non-verbal grammatical constructions in Minangkabauneseⁱⁱ have not been particularly based on the markedness theory yet. Therefore, the markedness analysis on the grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese is linguistically meaningful. This article specifically analyzes and discusses the markedness values of the non-verbal constructions in Minangkabaunese based on markedness theories developed and used in Linguistic Typology. Two questions as the basis for data analysis and discussion are: (i) what are the unmarked and marked non-verbal constructions of Minangkabaunese based on formal and functional markedness analysis? and (ii) how are the unmarked and marked constructions of Minangkabaunese functionally used in communication in its speech community? The data presented in this article are the basic-clause constructions which were collected through the execution of a field research in West-Sumatera and supported by a library study. The result of data analysis reveals that the non-verbal grammatical constructions without copula are the formal and functional unmarked constructions in Minangkabaunese. Meanwhile, the constructions with copula are those of formally and functionally marked.

Key words: non-verbal construction, markedness, marked, unmarked, Minangkabaunese

Abstrak

Teori kebermarkahan telah menjadi alat penting untuk menghubungkan secara langsung data linguistik formal (struktural) dan sifat-perilakunya secara lintas-bahasa. Kebermarkahan adalah salah satu kriteria yang digunakan untuk menentukan ketidaksimetrisan konstruksi gramatikal dalam bahasa yang dikaji. Sejauh ini, analisis tipologis atas konstruksi gramatikal non-verbal dalam bahasa Minangkabau belum ada secara khusus didasarkan pada teori kebermarkahan. Oleh karena itu, analisis kebermarkahan atas konstruksi gramatikal bahasa Minangkabau berarti penting secara linguistik. Artikel ini secara khusus mengkaji dan membahas nilai kebermarkahan konstruksi non-verbal dalam bahasa Minangkabau berdasarkan teori kebermarkahan yang dikembangkan dan digunakan dalam Tipologi Linguistik. Dua pertanyaan sebagai dasar analisis data dan pembahasan adalah: (i) apa saja konstruksi non-verbal bahasa Minangkabau tak-bermarkah dan bermarkah berdasarkan analisis kebermarkahan formal dan fungsional? dan (ii) bagaimanakah konstruksi tak-bermarkah dan bermarkah bahasa Minangkabau tersebut digunakan secara fungsional dalam komunikasi masyarakat penuturnya? Data yang disajikan pada artikel ini adalah konstruksi klausa dasar yang dikumpulkan melalui pelaksanaan penelitian lapangan di Sumatera Barat dan didukung

oleh studi kepustakaan. Hasil analisis data menunjukkan bahwa konstruksi non-verbal tanpa kopula adalah konstruksi tak-bermarkah secara formal dan fungsional dalam bahasa Minangkabau. Sementara itu, konstruksi dengan kopula adalah konstruksi bermarkah secara formal dan fungsional.

Kata kunci: konstruksi non-verbal, kebermarkahan, bermarkah, tak-bermarkah, Minangkabau

INTRODUCTION

In many cases, markedness has become a central concept in the studies of linguistics at linguistic schools along the 20th and 21st centuries. Historically, it can be traced back to the early developments of phonological theories held by some structuralists. According to Gaeta (2017), however, the markedness has acquired so many different meanings and uses during the course of the 20th century as its current usage is still debatable and in some applications are not clearly defined. It is also the fact that the markedness analyses have been developed for other levels of language systems in some versions. Thus, questions are often addressed to the application of markedness theory in syntax and semantics, as well.

Although the markedness theory had originally developed and used for phonological studies, it has been simultaneously adopted and adapted by linguists in both structural and generative trends in rather different ways of its application. In general, the concept of markedness, however, still refers to the works firstly developed in the Prague School of linguistic theory. Croft (1993:64) states that the notion of marked and unmarked values of a category was firstly developed for phonological systems by Trubetzkoy (in 1931 and in 1969) and then it was firstly applied and used to morphosyntactic categories and semantics by Jakobson (in 1932 and in 1984). In its development and uses, markedness in generative grammar is considerably different from markedness developed and used in Structural Linguistics and Linguistic Typology.

Croft (1993) argues that the markedness theories applied in Linguistic Typology has been becoming an important tool for typologists in order to directly link the formal (structural) linguistic data and grammatical properties across languages in the world. According to him, the essential notion of markedness in typological studies deals with the fact of asymmetrical or unequal grammatical properties of otherwise linguistic elements, such as inflections, words in word classes, and even for syntactic constructions in the level syntax cross-linguistically. Therefore, it is both interesting and challenging to see how the markedness theory works well in linguistic analyses across languages.

Markedness analyses have been applied to differentiate the underlying constructions from those of derived or “additional” ones. According to Dixon (2010:235), the notion of markedness can be useful in many linguistic description and explanation, so long as the markedness analysis is defined and applied carefully, and not overdone as some linguists do. Furthermore, Croft (1993:65) states that markedness patterns can be used to account for phonological, morphological, and syntactic irregularities found in grammatical constructions of human languages in the world. He adds that one does not need succumb to the temptation to “regularize” the irregular grammatical patterns because it is assumed that the irregularities themselves are manifestations of regular typological patterns in other ways.

Croft (1993) explains as well that the typological marking theory consists of two parts, *the kinds of evidence for markedness patterns* and *the actual markedness patterns*. In this point, the kinds of evidence for markedness deal exclusively with the evidence for markedness presenting a new classification of Greenberg's and researchers' markedness criteria in particular. Most of the markedness criteria have stood the test of time and data of related levels of typological studies. Then, the actual markedness patterns, which is also the called classical marking theory, allows for only one sort of patterns, namely an absolute relationship between the two values of a binary-valued category, such as singular and plural in which the one value (singular) is unmarked, and the other value (plural) is simply categorized as the marked one.

Croft (in Shibatani & Bynon (eds.), 1999) argues as well that typological markedness is a property of grammatical category such that it displays one or more of a cluster of formal-grammatical asymmetries cross-linguistically. The most important type of markedness criteria for typology fall under the behavioural markedness types which can be simply divided into three sub-types, namely: *the inflectional behavioural criterion*, *the distributional behavioural criterion*, and *cross-linguistic distribution*. The first one, ***the inflectional behavioural criterion***, is the unmarked member of a category which will have at least as many cross-cutting grammatical distinctions as a marked member. In this sense, the English singular pronouns *he/she/it*, for example, have a cross-cutting gender distinction that the marked plural pronoun *they* does not have. The second one, ***the distributional behavioural criterion***, is the unmarked member which is found in a wider range of environments than the marked member. In this sub-type, the active construction is found in wider range of syntactic environments than that of the passive one; the passive is more syntactically restricted in linguistic sense, and therefore it is certainly more marked than the active. The third sub-type, ***the cross-linguistic distribution***, means that the unmarked member will occur in particular language types that the marked member does not occur in. Dominant word order (typology) is an example of the cross-linguistic distributional criterion. In relation to the ideas, Croft (in Shibatani and Bynon (eds.), 1999) further adds that the last criterion for markedness is frequency. The unmarked members will be more frequent (or in high frequency) than the marked members, both in practical uses (textual frequency) and in across-languages uses (cross-linguistic frequency).

For the basis of analysis, Dixon (2010, pp. 236–237) explains that the markedness in grammar applies most appropriately to closed systems, and there are two distinct varieties of it. These, in fact, sometimes obviously correlate and sometimes do not. Each variety may be applied to systems of any size (with two members, or with more than two members). Accordingly, the two types of markedness values are probably involved into two types, ***formal markedness*** and ***functional markedness***. The concept of formal markedness is that if a term in a system has *zero* realization, then it is formally unmarked. For example, singular within the [singular, plural] member system applying to count nouns in English. Singular has *zero* markedness realization in its form. Then, the functional markedness relates to the situation of use—the marked term(s) may be used each in a restricted, specifiable situation, meanwhile the unmarked term being employed in all other circumstances. In English, for instance, singular number is functionally as well as formally unmarked. ‘Plural’ must refer to a set of two or more referents, whereas ‘singular’ may refer to just one referent, but may also be used in a general sense when no number specification is intentionally made; for example (adopted from Dixon, 2010): *The dog is the most companionable animal I know.*

Even though some applications of markedness theory in morphosyntactic level are debatable, but it must be argued that the careful applications lead linguist to have meaningful description and explanation on grammatical properties, particularly on those of asymmetries and irregularities found in human languages. Therefore, the studies on markedness values of grammatical constructions in certain language, such as in Minangkabaunese, are linguistically needed and necessary. Linguists and typologists have been studying the phenomena of markedness in different languages and scopes of studies, so far. In other words, the studies on markedness values, based on relevant markedness theories, have been previously applied in various scopes of linguistic studies in many languages. It is also the case that the grammatical-typological studies on grammatical constructions and features of Minangkabaunese have not applied the markedness theory yet.

Previous grammatical-typological studies on grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese so far (see for instance Jufrizal, 2004; Jufrizal, 2012; Jufrizal, et al., 2012; Jufrizal, et al., 2019) have come to the conclusion that the local language possibly uses copula for non-verbal constructions, but the copula is not a compulsory one. In this case, Minangkabaunese belongs to non-copula language cross-linguistically. Such conclusion was not furthermore questioned in order to explore and to know why it is so. For this aim, it is assumed that the application of markedness theory toward the non-verbal constructions of Minangkabaunese is linguistically helpful.

Some relevant studies using markedness theory can be briefly reviewed here. Davison (1984), for instance, studied the syntactic markedness and the definition of sentence topic. She explored the relation between the linguistic properties of sentence topics and their use as discourse links in sentence processing. The study proposes a set of criteria for distinguishing relatively weak or strong topic NP's based on syntactic, semantic/pragmatic properties. The study resulted that syntactically defined topics include subjects and those in 'marked' NP positions, where the surface features define grammatical function in an ambiguous or indirect way. Based on her study, Davison states that the implications of the proposal mainly proposed in the study are drawn for several languages and for various models of language processing. It may be said that the markedness study is theoretically meaningful and practically helpful.

Then, Fox (1987) was a linguist who studied the interaction between discourse structure and morphosyntactic markedness. In this previous study, Fox states that the marked member of some morphosyntactic oppositions tend to be associated with the beginning of discourse units. It is also further argued by Fox that the principle is supported by the data of word order inversion in Tagalog and by the data on anaphora in English. Another important point of Fox's study is that discourse should be viewed as composed of hierarchically arranged functional units, rather than as a string of clauses. This strengthens the hypotheses concerning the relationship between discourse and grammar formulated in her study.

Chaudron and Parker (2008) studied an interesting and challenging topic concerning with discourse markedness and structural markedness: the acquisition of English NP. This study investigated second language acquisition of English NP in discourse, examining the effect of discourse markedness, and structural markedness on the development of NP use. This study found that based on expectedness within discourse, the least marked discourse context is reference to a current topic. Then, the most marked context is presumably the introduction of a new referent of a topic. In the study, based on formal complexity, zero anaphora is the least marked structural form. The left-dislocated and existential NPs have the most marked value.

The results of study support predictions that L2 learners seem to distinguish between discourse contexts, acquiring more targeting forms in the least marked context first, and that they respectively acquire the least marked structural forms than the more marked ones.

In a more complex analysis, Culicover and Nowak (2002) studied the markedness, antisymmetry, and complexity of constructions in the level of macro-linguistics. They studied the interaction between language change, language acquisition, markedness, and computational complexity of mappings between grammatical representations. The study demonstrated through a computational simulation of language change that markedness can produce ‘gaps’ in the distribution of combinations of linguistic features. They argue, based on the study, that one contributor to markedness in this sense is the degree of the transparency of the mapping between superficial syntactic structure and conceptual structure. Culicover’s and Nowak’s study is interesting since they develop a rough measure of complexity that takes into account the extent to which the syntactic structure involves stretching and twisting of the relations that hold in conceptual structure.

In relation to Critical Discourse Analysis, Danler (2006) wrote morpho-syntactic markedness in Italian from the perspective of CDA. Based on Valence Theory, Danler looked at the construction and function of focus in Italian. The study found that the focused constituents dealt with are eventually the morpho-syntactically marked realizations of arguments and modifiers; the former simply realized as actants and the latter as circumstantial. This study may give ideas that markedness theory is also applicable for CDA. Then, Bale, Gagnon, and Khanjian (2011) investigated two possible connections between the diagnostic for morphological and semantic markedness focusing on the case of plural morphology. The study explored two possible connections between the diagnostics for morphological and semantic markedness. One possibility, a positive correlation, predicts that if a grammatical feature is diagnosed as being morphologically marked, then it should also be semantically marked. The second possibility, a negative correlation, predicts that if a grammatical feature is diagnosed as being morphologically marked, then it should be semantically unmarked. In their study, it was found that the negative correlation is not only theoretically consistent with the semantic literature, but it is also more consistent with the empirical landscape. Consequently, the morphological diagnostics lend support to the view that plural features are simply interpreted as augmenting functions, in nature. This study proves that markedness theory is also applicable to morphological and semantic properties.

The study on morphological markedness in an OT-grammar: zeros and syncretism was conducted by Pertsova (2013). Pertsova’s study extends a model of grammar in which lexical spell out and phonological computation occur in the same component with a family of morphological markedness constraints. This model predicts tradeoffs and interactions between morphological markedness and phonological constraints.

Another study, the role of morphological markedness in the processing of number and gender agreement in Spanish (Banon & Rothman, 2016), was an interesting and challenging study dealing markedness and its relation to other aspects of language, number, and gender in Spanish. Banon and Rothman examine how the asymmetries impact agreement resolution in Spanish. The results of analysis show that both number and gender violations elicited a central-posterior, a component associated with syntactic repair, and a late anterior negativity, argued to reflect working memory costs. It is suggested, based on the results, that the parser is sensitive to markedness asymmetries in the course of online processing.

Currently, Wei (2019) investigated the syntactic markedness as a stylistic feature in the *Great Gatsby*. The study particularly investigates the linguistic code choices of Francis Fitzgerald for one of his masterpieces, *The Great Gatsby*. The study aimed to find whether Fitzgerald marks the crucial narrative passages by using particular syntactic structures which are demonstratively different from the typical narrative passages in the novel as a whole. Based on data analysis, Wei concludes that the syntactic markedness stands out as a stylistic feature in the *Great Gatsby*. Such a stylistic feature can only become salient beyond surface-level considerations of phrase structure and grammatical categories in any stylistic analysis of literary works.

The brief review presented above, at least, tells three essential points to be noted. First, the markedness theory attracts linguists' and typologists' attention as one basis of linguistic analyses. Typologists, in particular, adopt and adapt the theory in such a way which results typological analyses for unequal and/or asymmetrical items found in human languages. Second, the adopted and adapted theory of markedness contributes to specific and essential models of linguistic analyses, including in the typological analyses. Third, the markedness theory and its innovation are applicable to mono and multi levels of language layers. They are all interesting and challenging to be applied to mixed analyses of micro and macro linguistics. Therefore, the analyses of markedness values on particular languages are highly meaningful in linguistic studies, then.

The previous typological studies on grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese tell that the non-verbal and verbal clause constructions in this local language possibly fall into the underlying or the derived (or "additional") ones. However, there were no typological analyses on the grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese specifically used the markedness theory yet. In order to have further and specific typological descriptions, the grammatical markedness analysis on the grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese is essentially needed. This article, which is derived from a part of result of a research conducted in 2019, specifically analyzes and discusses the grammatical markedness of non-verbal constructions in Minangkabaunese, both for formal and functional markedness values. Accordingly, markedness values are analyzed toward two types of non-verbal construction of Minangkabaunese, the non-verbal construction with and without copula. The data analysis and discussion are operationally based on the relevant markedness theories developed and used in Linguistic Typology.

Two questions are the bases for data analysis and discussion, namely: (i) what are the unmarked and marked non-verbal constructions of Minangkabaunese based on formal and functional markedness analysis? and (ii) how are the unmarked and marked non-verbal constructions of Minangkabaunese functionally used in communication in its speech community? The markedness analysis on the grammatical constructions, specifically on the non-verbal constructions of Minangkabaunese, based on formal and functional one, may come to further and detail description of the grammatical typology of Minangkabaunese, the main local language originally spoken in West-Sumatera. The grammatical markedness in this article refers to the formal and functional markedness values brought or "encapsulated" by particular grammatical constructions.

METHODOLOGY

This study was a descriptive-qualitative research in linguistics conducted in 2019; it was operationally executed as a field research and supported by a library study. As a field research,

this study took place in fourteen main towns of the main land of West-Sumatera where the native speakers of Minangkabaunese habitually and socially live. The data were in the forms of clause-syntactical constructions which were categorized as the formal-grammatical constructions; they are linguistically assumed as the standard ones.

Practically, the data were simultaneously collected through participant observation, depth-interview, administrating questionnaires, and quoting and/or selecting related data from written manuscripts and texts which are written in Minangkabaunese. The instruments of research were field-notes, observation sheets, recorders, interview guideline, and questionnaire sheets. The sources of data were the native speakers of Minangkabaunese who were intentionally selected as informants and respondents and the manuscripts/texts written in Minangkabaunese. As the researchers are also the native speakers of Minangkabaunese, they were also possible to act as the sources of data, but the intuitive data were systematically cross-checked and consulted to the selected informants in order to have the valid-reliable data.

The data obtained then were classified into clausal-syntactical categories, especially into non-verbal constructions, in order to decide whether the data were appropriate and ready to analyze. The data were linguistically analyzed based on the relevant theories and principles of markedness developed and used in grammatical typology. The results of data analysis and discussion are argumentatively described in formal and informal ways commonly used in linguistics.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this article, the grammatical markedness refers to the formal and functional markedness values conveyed or “encapsulated” by particular grammatical constructions, in this case those of non-verbal constructions. The non-verbal construction is one of the basic-clause constructions in Minangkabaunese. In relation to the previous research reports and based on the data collected in this study, the basic clause of non-verbal construction in Minangkabaunese can be in the type of: (i) adjectival clause, (ii) nominal (including pronominal) clause, (iii) numeral clause, and (iv) prepositional phrase clause. Therefore, this paper analyzes and discusses the grammatical markedness of these types of non-verbal constructions based on formal and functional markedness analyses.

The ideas of markedness analysis stated by Croft (1993) and Dixon (2010) say that markedness in grammar applies most appropriately to closed systems, and there are, at least, two distinct varieties of it are mainly referred to in this study. In accordance with the grammatical properties of non-verbal clause constructions of Minangkabaunese, there are two closed-systems or two distinct varieties found, namely: (i) *the non-verbal clause constructions without copula* and (ii) *the non-verbal clause constructions with copula*. Thus, in this article, the closed system and the distinct varieties of grammatical constructions refer to the two distinct varieties. Accordingly, the data analysis and discussion of grammatical markedness of non-verbal constructions in Minangkabaunese in the sense of formal and functional markedness are addressed to the two types of the non-verbal clause constructions.

The data of non-verbal constructions of Minangkabaunese reveal that they can appear with or without copula. Cross-linguistically, copula in some languages commonly appears in non-verbal constructions. However, in some languages, the use of copula is compulsory and in some others, it is optionally used in non-verbal construction. The term copula frequently appears in the discussion of verbal and non-verbal constructions at syntactic level. In simple

definition, a copula is any morpheme (affix, particle, or verb) that joins or “couples” two nominal elements in a predicate of non-verbal constructions. The verb *to be* in English is the common example of copula itself. In English, the non-verbal construction in the level of syntax must have copula (see Payne, 2002). English in this case belongs to languages with copula in its non-verbal constructions. In Minangkabaunese, in contrast, copula is not a compulsory syntactic element. No copula is necessarily used in non-verbal constructions in this local language. Thus, an argument of non-verbal construction is not necessarily joined by the linguistic element so called copula. The followings are the examples of *the non-verbal clause constructions without copula* in this local language.

- (1) *Amak cameh bana sajak kajadian tu.*
mother worried very since event ART
'Mother is very worried since the event.'
- (2) *Baliau takuik taruih manaruih.*
PRO3SG afraid continuously
'She is afraid continuously.'
- (3) *Pisau tu tajam bana.*
knife ART sharp right
'The knife is too sharp.'
- (4) *Anak mudo tu guru SD di kampuang kami.*
man young ART teacher primary school in kampong POS2PL
'The young man is a primary school teacher in our kampong.'
- (5) *Inyo urang gilo.*
PRO3TG man crazy
'He is a crazy man.'
- (6) *Itu sabun mandi.*
that soap bath
'That is bath soap.'
- (7) *Pikiran-nyo saribu satu.*
thought-POS3SG thousand one
'His thought is one thousand and one.'
- (8) *Pandapek-nyo baratuih.*
ideas-POS3SG hundreds
'His ideas are hundreds.'
- (9) *Anak-nyo tunggal babeleang.*
child-POS3SG one pure
'Her child is only one.'
- (10) *Rang gaek-nyo di rantau sajak sudah parang.*
parents-POS3SG in out-country since after war
'His parents are in out-country since the war-over.'

- (11) *Polisi ka gudang tu beko.*
 policemen to storage ART after now
 ‘Policemen are to the storage after now.’
- (12) *Buku baru dalam tas hitam tu.*
 book new in bag black ART
 ‘The new book is in the black bag.’

In the data above, (1)–(3) are the examples of the adjectival clauses, in which *amak* ‘mother’, *baliau* ‘she’, and *pisau* ‘knife’ are subjects, meanwhile *cameh bana* ‘very worried’, *takuik taruih* ‘afraid continuously’, and *tajam bana* ‘too sharp’ are the adjective predicates of the clauses. No copula is needed to “joint” the subject and adjective predicate in such clauses. In (4)–(6), the predicates of the clause are noun phrases (NP). As in (1)–(3), there is no copula either to “joint” the subject *anak mudo tu* ‘the young man’, *inyo* ‘he’, and *itu* ‘that’ and its related nominal predicate *guru SD* ‘primary school teacher’, *urang gilo* ‘crazy man’, and *sabun mandi* ‘bath soap’. The data (7)–(9) show the numeral clauses, in which *saribu satu* ‘thousand and one’, *baratuih* ‘hundreds’, and *tungga babeleang* ‘only one’ are the numeral predicates. It is still that no copula is used in each clause. Then, in (10)–(12), the prepositional phrases *di rantau* ‘in out-country’, *ka gudang tu* ‘to the storage’, and *dalam tas* ‘in the bag’ are the predicates of clauses. In this type of non-verbal construction, no copula is used either.

In all non-verbal constructions above, the argument subjects (S) are directly followed by their complements (Comp) or the non-verbal predicates; no copula are compulsory needed in such grammatical constructions. In relation to this, it may be argued that Minangkabau language belongs to language without *copula* in its non-verbal clause constructions. It is different from English, for instance, where copula in the form of *to be* (am, is, are) are compulsory in its non-verbal constructions.

Even though it is true that no copula is compulsory in non-verbal constructions in Minangkabau language, the use of copula *iolah* or *adolah* ‘be’ does not make an ungrammatical non-verbal construction in fact. The use of the copula is grammatically allowed. Therefore, the non-verbal clauses (1)–(12) remain grammatical if *copula* (*iolah* or *adolah* ‘be’) is appropriately inserted and used between S and Comp as shown in (13)–(24) below.

- (13) *Amak iolah cameh bana sajak kajaian tu.*
 mother COP worried very since event ART
 ‘Mother is very worried since the event.’
- (14) *Baliau adolah takuik taruih manaruih.*
 PRO3SG COP afraid continuously
 ‘She is afraid continuously.’
- (15) *Pisau tu adolah tajam bana.*
 knife ART COP sharp very
 ‘The knife is too sharp.’
- (16) *Anak mudo tu adolah guru SD di kampuang kami.*
 man young ART COP teacher primary school in kampung POS2P
 ‘The young man is a primary school teacher in our kampung.’

- (17) *Inyo adolah urang gilo.*
 PRO3TG COP man crazy
 ‘He is a crazy man.’
- (18) *Itu adolah sabun mandi.*
 that COP soap bath
 ‘That is bath soap.’
- (19) *Pikiran-nyo adolah saribu satu.*
 thought-POS3SG COP thousand one
 ‘His thought is one thousand and one.’
- (20) *Pandapek-nyo iolah baratuih.*
 ideas-POS3SG COP hundreds
 ‘His ideas are hundreds.’
- (21) *Anak-nyo adolah tunggal babeleang.*
 child-POS3SG COP one pure
 ‘Her child is only one.’
- (22) *Rang gaek-nyo adolah di rantau sajak sudah parang.*
 parents- POS3SG COP in out-country since after war
 ‘His parents are in out-country since the war-over.’
- (23) *Polisi iolah ka gudang tu beko.*
 policemen COP to storage ART after now
 ‘Policemens are to the storage after now.’
- (24) *Buku baru adolah dalam tas hitam tu.*
 book new COP in bag black ART
 ‘The new book is in the black bag.’

The data presented above furthermore indicate that the use of copula is optional in Minangkabaunese. As it is the fact, the non-verbal constructions with and without copula are all grammatically accepted. The questions then rise: *Do both non-verbal constructions with and without copula have the same degree of grammatical acceptability? Do they have different values of markedness?* To answer these questions, markedness analysis as the focus of this article is essentially needed.

Based on the data presented above, there are two closed-systems or two distinct varieties of non-verbal clause constructions in Minangkabaunese, namely: (i) *the non-verbal clause construction without copula* and (ii) *the non-verbal clause construction with copula*. The type of grammatical construction can be assigned as two closed-systems since these two constructions are grammatically accepted and the acceptance may depend on certain values of grammatical-semantic properties.

As there are two closed-systems or two distinct varieties of non-verbal clauses of Minangkabaunese, *the non-verbal clause construction without copula* and *the non-verbal clause construction with copula*, it is necessary to “measure” and/or to explore which one of the two constructions is natural (unmarked construction) and which one is less natural or more restricted in use (marked construction). For the purpose, a scientific-linguistic analysis and discussion is

needed. In relation to this, it is believed that markedness analysis in order to know the markedness values of the two close-systems are needed. It is probably suitable to use the markedness analysis to decide which one of the two is unmarked or marked construction.

The first type of non-verbal clause of Minangkabaunese, the non-verbal clause constructions without copula (data (1)–(12)) have at least three main grammatical properties. Firstly, it is the most natural and neutral construction without any additional contextual-pragmatic features in meaning constructed and brought. In relation to this, the clause construction without copula is the basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese. The constructions as (1)–(12) are common, grammatically accepted, and easily understood by native speakers in any case of communicative events. It is the construction with the most natural and the most common grammatical-semantic properties in Minangkabaunese. It supports the claim previously stated above that Minangkabaunese belongs to language which does not necessarily use copula in non-verbal construction or a language without copula.

Secondly, the non-verbal construction without copula are used in much-broader senses, in unlimited contexts of communication, and in high frequency of uses rather than the construction with copula. These are also supported by the typological analysis on the grammatical constructions in which the presence of copula in non-verbal clauses of Minangkabaunese is not grammatically obligatory. In other words, the non-verbal construction without copula is more frequently and dominantly used in unlimited speech events of language use in the Minangkabaunese speech community.

Thirdly, the non-verbal construction without copula in this local language does not need the specific-particular context in use. The native speakers of Minangkabaunese use and understand the natural-basic meaning brought by such clause construction in natural ways. This type of non-verbal clause is used as the standard and ‘neutral’ one and it does not bring about specific and limited context of communicative meanings.

In other side, the non-verbal construction with copula, as shown in (13)–(24), has contrast grammatical-semantic properties. Even though such constructions remain grammatical and they are used in particular speech events, there are specific “senses” and “properties” conveyed which make it less common and less natural. As opposed to its counterpart, it can be argued as well that the non-verbal construction with copula in Minangkabaunese has three main linguistic properties. Firstly, such type of grammatical construction sounds unnatural because the presence of copula in a non-verbal construction is not grammatically obligatory. Consequently, it has something to do with additional grammatical-semantic meanings in communicative uses. Most native speakers of Minangkabaunese think and feel “additional things” when they use and listen to such type of clause constructions.

Secondly, the meaning and “sense” brought by such construction sounds highly formal and stylistic. “The high status” of formality and stylistics brought by non-verbal construction with copula is proved by the case that it is just used with low frequency in high-formal speech, in literary language, in law-rule verses, and in language for high-cultural statements of proverbs. It is just frequently found in old-manuscripts, statues, and in old folklores.

The last one is that the appearance and uses of the non-verbal clauses with copula of Minangkabaunese are relatively limited in more specific contexts and in high restricted uses compared to the use of non-verbal clauses without copula. The case that the non-verbal construction with copula in Minangkabaunese is not used in broader contexts and natural speech

events makes such construction does not mainly function as the construction appear in frequent time. It means that it has “something” to do with limited and specific properties, then.

Consulted to the principles of markedness values as one of main points of markedness theory application toward the two distinct-closed systems developed and used in Linguistic Typology, it can be stated that the non-verbal construction without copula has low or less markedness values. The three grammatical-semantic properties and uses lead us to assign that the non-verbal construction without copula having unlimited contexts of uses and it brings about natural meaning and communicative use. In other words, it can be stated that the non-verbal construction without copula as shown by the data (1)–(12) is the unmarked construction.

In relation to formal and functional markedness, it may be added on this occasion that such type of non-verbal construction is both formally and functionally unmarked. It is formally unmarked construction because of the absence of copula *iolah* or *adolah* ‘be’ as the natural form of the construction. Then, it may be assigned as functionally unmarked because it is the construction which may be used in broader senses and contexts of communication. In addition, the unmarked construction is communicatively used in non-restricted situation and condition in linguistic and communicative uses.

Meanwhile, considering the grammatical-semantic properties and contextual uses in communication events as presented and explained above, the non-verbal clause construction with copula in Minangkabaunese has high values of markedness; it is the marked constructions. Further analysis on such type of non-verbal construction based on markedness theory, it can be stated that this type of non-verbal construction is both formally and functionally marked, as well. It is formally marked because the presence of copula *iolah* and/or *adolah* ‘be’ makes additional grammatical form to the natural (derived) construction in this local language. In addition, it is functionally marked because such construction has very limited and high restricted contexts of uses; it cannot communicatively used in broader areas of communicative events.

CONCLUSION

Grammatical typological studies on grammatical constructions lead to finding and conclusion that Minangkabaunese typologically belongs to languages with no copula in non-verbal clause. However, Minangkabaunese still grammatically and semantically allows the use of copula in non-verbal clause constructions, even though the use of copula is not obligatory, in nature. However, why and how is it had not been answered before the markedness analysis came. In this study, it was found that the non-verbal construction without copula is the unmarked construction. It may be stated that it is formal and functional unmarked construction in Minangkabaunese. The non-verbal construction without copula is used in natural and neutral ways and in broad events of communication. Meanwhile, the construction with copula has high value of markedness; it is assigned as the formal and functional marked construction. The analysis of markedness values of closed system of grammatical constructions of Minangkabaunese allows us to have the answer for question how and why language has asymmetrical and/or unequal construction. The analysis presented in this paper may inspire other and further analyses of markedness values toward this language and/or other languages.

NOTE

The authors would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for very helpful comments on the earlier draft of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Bale, A., Gagnon, M., and Khanjian H. (2011). On the Relationship between Morphological and Semantic Markedness: The Case of Plural Morphology. *Morphology*, 21(2), 197–221. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/6/30/2019>.
- Banon, A.J. and Rothman, J. (2016). The Role of Morphological Markedness in the Processing of Number and Gender Agreement in Spanish: an event-related potential investigation. *Language, Cognition, and Neuroscience*, 31(10). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2016.1218032>.
- Chaudron, Craig and Parker, Kate. (2008). Discourse Markedness and Structural Makedness: The Acquisition of English Noun Phrase. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100008731>.
- Croft, William. (1993). *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culicover, P.W., dan Nowak, A. (2002). Markedness, Antisymmetrical and Complexity of Constructions. *Linguistic Variation Year Book*, 2(1). John Benjamins Publishing Company, DOI <https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.2.o3cul>.
- Danler, Paul. (2006). Morpho-syntactic Markedness in Italian from the Perspective of CDA. *Quaderns de Filologia*, Vol 11 Print ISSN 1135-416X, electronic ISSN 2444-1449. Universitat de Valencia.
- Davison, Alice. (1984). Syntactic Markedness and the Definition of Sentence Topic. *Language: Linguistic Society of America*, 60(4), 797–846.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (2010). *Basic Linguistic Theory*. Volume 1 Methodology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, B.A. (1987). Morpho-syntactic Markedness and Discourse Structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11(3), 359–375. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(87\)90137-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90137-8).
- Gaeta, L. (2017). Markedness. *Oxford Bibliographies*. DOI: 10.1093/QBO/9780199772910-0153.
- Jufrizal. (2004). Struktur Argumen dan Aliansi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Denpasar: Program Pascasarjana Univeritas Udayana.
- Jufrizal. (2012). *Tatabahasa Bahasa Minangkabau: Deskripsi dan Telaah Tipologi Linguistik*. Padang: UNP Press.
- Jufrizal., Amri, Zul., and Jufri. (2012). Keakusatifan dan Keergatifan Bahasa Minangkabau: Telaah Tipologi Linguistik dan Linguistik Kebudayaan (unpublished research report). Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Jufrizal and Amri, Zul. (2019). Kebermarkahan Morfosintaksis Bahasa Minangkabau: Telaah Tipologi Linguistik (unpublished research report). Padang: Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris FBS Universitas Negeri Padang.

- Payne, Thomas E. (2002). *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pertsova, Katya. (2013). Morphological Markedness in an OT-Grammar: Zeros and Syncretism. *Annual Meetings on Phonology*. <https://doi.org/10.3765/amp>.
- Shibatani, M. dan Bynon, T. (editor). (1999). *Approaches to Language Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wei, Longxing. (2019). Syntactic Markedness as a Stylistic Feature in the Great Gatsby. *Studies in Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1). Scholink INC. Print ISSN 2573-6434, Online ISSN 2573-6426.

ⁱ This is the revised form of the paper presented at *Kongres Internasional Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia (KIMLI)-2021* (The International Congress of the Society of Indonesian Linguistics)-2021 held by The Society of Indonesian Linguistics and Universitas Hasanuddin, Makassar, 18-20 August 2021.

ⁱⁱ A main local language originally spoken by Minangkabau in West Sumatra, Indonesia.