

Relative Clauses in Minangkabau, Indonesian, English Languages (Typology Study)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v2i2.235>

| Akmal¹ | Mulyadi² |

^{1,2}Linguistics Science,
Universitas Sumatera Utara,
Medan, Indonesia

¹akmal.shafa@gmail.com

²mulyadi@usu.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Minangkabau and Indonesian languages are an Austronesian. In this study, it was focused on the typology study of three different languages, namely: Minangkabau, Indonesian, and English relative clauses. It aimed to find out the differences and the similarities of relative clauses among the three languages. This paper also outlines the Accessibility Hierarchy approach to the facts that describe building on relative clause construction. The data was taken from some conversations with Minangkabau friends and feedback from the writer as a native speaker of the language in the analysis as well as taking the findings of recent typological and theoretical studies of Austronesian languages into consideration. From the analysis, it is found that Minangkabau and Indonesian languages are same construction and the English is different between Minangkabau and Indonesian languages. In the English, it is also possible to have object focus which called object fronting.

KEYWORDS

Relative Clauses; Typology; construction

INTRODUCTION

Language is an autonomous cognitive ability or a separate module with nonverbal cognitive abilities (Hoang, 2020). In the linguistics, the typology was the classification of the world's languages to find out the sameness and the differences in the structures. Then Mallinson and B.J. Blake (1981:264) in Ambarita, R and Mulyadi stated that in the traditional English books, the clauses are relatively the same as adjunctival clauses, for that reason relative clauses are related to qualifiers or modifiers of constituents consisting of nouns (Ambarita & Mulyadi, 2020). In the real fact, many ethnic languages almost endangered in many areas when they communicate each other in their community. So as the Indonesian citizen, the ethnic needs to save by doing the research the languages in Indonesia especially.

According to Kroeger that a clause is sometimes called as a simple sentence. So a clause is the smallest grammatical unit which was able to express a complete proposition (Kroeger, 2005). Then in this case, there are some clauses which are found in forming a sentence, one of them is the relative clause. The relative clause is a clause which can modify and explain a noun phrase, besides that it functions to show something which is determined to the noun phrase (Jufri et al., 2009; Utami et al., 2013). It means that a clause is the smallest element of grammar which is used to form a sentence. So one clause is one sentence and more than the clauses can be a sentence. It means that in one sentence, it can be one clause and it can be more than one clause. One sentence consists more than one clause and it includes in the relative clause. According to Kridalaksana (1993:110) stated that a clause is a group of words in the grammar unit which consists of at least subject and predicate and it has a potency to be a sentence. Both experts' opinions are supported each other in giving the definition of the clause so clearly so that it is easy to understand many people especially the students. Then a

sentence is mainly a group of words linking together and expressing an idea, event or description. The boundaries of a sentence are easily identified that a sentence is begun a capital letters and ended by full-stop (Indrawati, 2017).

A relative clause (it is shortened 'rc') is a subordinate clause which delimits the reference of the noun phrase (it is shortened *np*) by specifying the role of the referent of that noun phrase in the situation described by the relative clause (rc) (Andrews, 2007). From two different definitions, the relative clauses have at least two clauses namely one main clause and subordinate clause which are related to the relative words (Ariyati et al., 2020; Jufrizal et al., 2009; Utami et al., 2013).

So relative clause is a clause which consists of the dependent and subordinate clause that in the transformational grammar, especially in the generative structure, commonly called an embedded clause because a clause attached or pinned on one of higher constructional elements. A sentence or a clause pinned the position of subordinate clause was called the matrix clause, the independent clause, or a main clause (Ambarita & Mulyadi, 2019). Furthermore, the English Relative Clauses with the formal type is based on (1) the use of special pronouns, it is called relative pronouns *who, which, whom, what, where, and when*, (2) the subordinator *that*, and (3) the use of a 'gap' or empty structure which means that there are the missing constituents in a relative clause structure (Utami et al., 2013).

The relative clause (or RC hereafter) - with the beginning of *word order* and *the case marking* - took a very prominent position in the linguistic typology. Keenan and Comrie's (1977) cross-linguistic study, which deals with none other than grammatical constraints on relativization or relative clause formation, is regarded as 'one of the most influential works in the language universals literature'. The relative clause construction, as is generally understood, it belongs to two components, they are the head noun and the restricting clause. The semantic function of the head noun is to make a set of entities, which were able to be called the domain of relativization, as Keenan and Comrie (1977: 63) explained that, whereas that the limitation of the clause is to make the identification of a domain subset - a one-member subset in the case of (1) below - by pressing the conditional semantic on the domain of the relativization referred to the head noun, the role of the head noun is expressed in the restricting clause. Then There are three main ways of dealing with the head of the relative clauses: 1). **Obliteration / gapping**: the head is not elaborated at all of the clause, it can be seen this clause, *the boy (whom) they met*. In the relative clause the non-expressing head is in object function and it is called a subordinator. 2). **Relative pronouns (it is shortened rp)**: these relative pronouns (rps) gave the indication that the clause is a relative clause (rc) and in addition provide information about the syntactical function of the head of the rc, as example: *the girl whose bag I bought*. The *whose* word indicated that the head is a possessive word. 3). **Pronoun retention (pr)**: it is often in combination with a subordinator as example: *the girl that I got this bag from her* (Rosita, 2015).

Indonesian is a national language in Indonesia which functions as national communication when the people of other ethnics communicate each other because there are so many ethnics languages in Indonesia and one of them is the Minangkabau language. The Minangkabau language and other languages have the same role and position in Indonesia because the languages have been protected by UUD 1945. Minangkabau language also has the structural rules and roles in using by the society in the West Sumatera area (Ariyati et al., 2020; Jufrizal et al., 2009, 2015; Lindawati, 2015; Rasyad et al., 1986).

Then in commonly, the relative clauses in Indonesian language refer to the rules of English or other western languages, so that their rules or roles have similarities which are sometimes interesting phenomena. For example, in English, there are at least 3 main features of the Relative Clause, namely (1) it has to be an antecedent (Ant), the noun phrase of the

core clause must be the same as the nominal phrase relative clause; (2) it has to be a relator / assembler of the core clause with the element of the Relative Clause (r c) positioned before the Relative Clause; and (3) the relator has to take the position one of the syntactical functions in the Relative Clause (Ambarita & Mulyadi, 2020). Alotaibi (2016: 58) in Sari and friends stated that relative clauses are marked with a *yang* relative word. This type of clause functions to change the noun attached as the main clause (Sari et al., 2017).

Then Rosita (2015) stated that The basic *word order* in the clause consists of a *Subject, Verb, and Object (SVO)*, with the head previous modifier in the phrase. While the lexicon and the phonology of this language is really same to Standard Indonesian. Relative clause (r c) is as an adding information about a noun is by incorporating a clause within the noun phrase. This clause is signed by “*nan*” word in the Minangkabau language. The head of the noun phrase corresponds to some components within the relative clause (Rosita, 2015). The researcher was interested in this study because the typology was focused on the comparative of languages in the same topics of structure. The problems of this study: what are embedded relative clauses in Minangkabau, Indonesian, and English languages? How are the embedded relative clauses in three different languages?

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study, the researcher used the qualitative research design by using the documentary library and comparative analysis of the study. the qualitative research focuses on gathering and interpretation of non-numerical data (elaboration/description). It is also to describe and explain more details the differences of Minangkabau, Indonesian, and the English language in the syntax phenomenon (Adedoyin, 2020). The qualitative research was to get the insights into these constructions of the reality, i.e., to tease out the nature of the world as it was experienced, structured and interpreted by the people in the course of their everyday lived. The information of qualitative, the researcher collected the data to get the necessary thing was largely, although not always, obtained by the means of the descriptives in which the people being studied to communicate the way they understood the world (Cropley, 2019).

In this study, the researcher took the data from the documantary library. The dokumens which were taken from the books, teaching module, and the scientific article or papers about the relative clauses in Minangkabau language, the Indonesian language, and the English language as the data of this research. The sources of documents were also taken from the internet because the situation was impossible to get the books manually. Besides that, the reseacrher also asked the informan of Minangkabau people who really understand about the relative clause topic.

In getting the data, the researcher has done as following below: a). The researcher opened the internet and searched on the website of Minangkabau language and Indonesian study. b). After that the researcher searched about the relative clauses in Minangkabau language, Indonesian, and English languages. c). After all the books or article were opened, the researcher had to choose the documents which were really related to the structure of relative clauses in three different languages. d). The last, the researcher had to compare to see what relative clauses word was in the Minangkabau, the Indonesian, and the English languages.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The relative clauses are a word “*nan*” in the Minangkabau language, a word *yang* in the Indonesian language, and some words such as *who, which, whom, and whose* in the English language. It can be seen the relative clauses in the Minangkabau language, the Indonesian language, and English language in the table 1.

Table 1. Relative clauses structure

Languages	Minangkabau	Indonesian	English
Relative Clauses	<i>nan</i>	<i>Yang</i>	<i>who, which, whom, whose, where, when.</i>

Relative clauses are often called adjective clause because the functions of clauses are as a noun and the main clause. English relative clause have a complex structure by some relativized kinds. Relative clauses in English are classified into two types: formal and relational. As Huddleston (2002:1033) stated, formal RC is marked by the use of: (1) relative pronouns *who, which, whom, whose, where, when*, and another *wh* questions; (2) subordinator *that*; and (3) gap structure. Those relativizers can be used in the position of relativizing (1) subject, (2) object, (3) object of preposition, (4) possessive, and (5) adverb. These are examples of such positions (Novianto & Suhandano, 2019).

The relative clauses were focused on the subject, the object, the gap of preposition, the possessive.

It is as A Subject

1. Minangkabau :Urang tu duduak
 Indonesian : Orang itu duduk
 3rd det verb
 English : Person that is sitting
 That person is sitting
2. Minangkabau : Urang tu bakarajo jo ambo
 Indonesian : Orang itu bekerja dengan saya
 3rd det predicate prep.
 English : Person that works with me
 That person works with me
3. Minangkabau : Urang tu *nan* duduak, bakarajo jo ambo
 Indonesian : Orang itu *yang* duduk, bekerja dengan saya
 3rd(singular) rel verb(sitting), verb(work) prep. The object
 English : The person (*who*) is sitting, works with me.

The clause in (1), it is able to be *embedded* within the N P *subject* of the clause in example number 2 (two) and it can be the clauses of the examples number 3 (three). The relative clause is derived from the clause in examples number 1 (one) by step (i), (ii) and (iii) above and occurs as a subject of clause in the examles number 3 (three). The subject of the example number 3 (three) ends with the optional '*tu*'. Although '*tu*' identifies the subject of the clause in the examples number two (2), this is also achieved by the relative clause. In the clause in (3), it is called *embedded clause in the pre-nominal*. In this case '*tu*' is more likely to be omitted from the embedding phrase. In Minangkabau '*nan*' must occur before a relative clause although in English corresponding '*who*' or '*which*' can be sometimes omitted.

4. Minangkabau : gadis *nan* ambo berikan buku, rancak
 Indonesia : gadis *yang* saya berikan buku, cantik
 Girl *who-Dative I* gave book, pretty.
 English : girl to *whom* I gave the book, is pretty
 The girl *whom* I gave the book, is pretty
5. Minangkabau : Sarawa *nan* dibali padusi tu ketek bana.
 Indonesian : Celana *yang* dibeli gadis itu, kecil sangat
 Plural *rel di-verb* the girl, det. Adj.
 English : Troaders (*that* were) bought the girl, were small very.

- The trousers (*that* were) bought the girl, were very small
6. Minangkabau : Oto nan dilantak bis koto tu rusak.
 Indonesian : Mobil yang ditabrak bis kota itu, rusak
 English : The car (which was) hit the city bus, is broken.

In the case of clause in (4), the relative – *dative* where the relative pronoun who functions as object so the relative changed to be *whom*.

As an object

The relative clause was able to consist of any constituents which occurred in an independent clause except the subject, which was to identify to the head of the *embedding* noun phrase. Since the head noun really stood in the same connection to the *verb* as the *subject* of the clause that connection of clause had to be shown by the *verb*. The relative clauses of the object pattern type in the English did not change the voice of the verb especially in the Minangkabau language did. That was, the antecedent referred to by the relative pronoun can be an object that focused on the Minangkabau language, the Indonesian language, and the English language. Compare the following Minangkabau, Indonesian, English languages. It can be seen the examples as follows:

7. Minangkabau : Urang tuo nan Rina tamui di sekolah tu adolah kakeknyo
 Indonesian : Orang tua yang Rina temui di sekolah itu adalah kakeknya
 English : The old man (*whom*) Rina met at the school, is grandfather (her)
 : The old man (*whom*) Rina met at the school, is her grandfather
8. Minangkabau : Para Demonstran nan ambo tonton di TV tu manakuikan.
 Indonesian : Para Demonstran itu yang saya tonton di TV itu, menakutkan.
 English : Demonstrans whom I watched on TV, was scary
 The demonstrans whom I watched on TV, was scary

The both statements of relative clauses are so often either in speakings or in writings which are talked to the speakers in the society. Sometimes the Minangkabau and Indonesian languages are not same to the English language in translate because of the structure in the languages. Kadarisman (2002:3) also gave the explanation that it is the carrying over of a syntactic structure in English into Indonesian and also Minangkabau. Then the clauses in (7) and (8), they can be *pre-nominal* because the relative pronoun of *whom* can be omitted and the pronoun-retentions are occurred in the clauses where as the relative *who* change to be *whom*.

The object-focus on the construction in Minangkabau that were different from cleft in the English, e.g “*That is the girl that we have met*”, or “*That is the car, we are looking for*”. In Minangkabau, the cleft sentences were equal to object-focus + *lah* construction, e.g “*gadiah itulah nan pernah kami tamui*”, dan “*Oto itulah nan sedang kami cari*” cleft sentences are equal to object-focus + *-lah* construction, e.g *Gadis itulah yang pernah kami temui*, and *Mobil itulah yang sedang kami cari*”.

The rule that the verb has to be passive, follows a noun which stands as object to it is able to cause difficulty for English speaker as in English the verb is able to be and usually active in this context.

9. Minangkabau : Rumah nan dibuek ajo Madi, gadang
 Indonesian : Rumah yang dibuat bang Madi, besar
 DO rel di-build brother Madi, big
 English : House which built brother Madi, is big
 The house which was built brother Madi, is big.
10. Minangkabau : angkot nan amak naiki indak baranti di Kuraitaji.
 Indonesian : angkot yang ibu naiki tidak berhenti di Kuraitaji.

English : DO rel 1st took-i, didn't stop in Kuraitaji.
 : City bus which mother took, didn't stop in Kuraitaji.
 The city bus which mother took, didn't stop in Kuraitaji

Here in English we can see that subject relative formulates in active but in Minangkabau and Indonesia it should be in passive or bare passive prefixless. Minangkabau and Indonesia languages are same forms.

Verbal suffixes

The verbal suffixes did not change in the relative clauses. Thus the head of noun was able to have any participant roles that the subject of an independent passive clause belongs. In the first example below the head noun stood as the *recipient* and in the second it was as the *beneficiary*.

11. Minangkabau : Saketek urang *nan* bakirimi surek alun manjawek
 Indonesian : Sedikit orang *yang* dikirimi surat belum menjawab
 A few 3rd rel ba-send-i DO have yet not answered
 English : a few 3rd *who* were sent letter, have yet not answered
 A few persons *who* were sent a letter, have not replied it yet.
12. Minangkabau : Urang mudo *nan* bacarian karajo sangek basyukuar
 Indonesian : Orang muda *yang* mencari kerja, sangat bersyukur
 3rd rel ba-search-an DO , is very grateful
 English : man young *who* was searching work, is very grateful.
 The young man *who* was searching the work, is very grateful.

The relativized subject was more than the object or low position by fact that Minangkabau and Indonesian languages possess a system of verbal inflection which allows patient to appear in subject position with a change on the verbal voice.

13. Minangkabau: Piliahlah padusi baiak nan ala waang tau bana
 Indonesian : Pilihalah perempuan baik yang telah kamu kenal benar
 Choose-lah IO rel has 2nd know
 English : Choose good girl whom have you know very well
 Choose a good girl whom you have known very well

Keenan and Comrie (2004) stated that Minangkabau and Indonesian have the primary strategies that apply only to subject on the assumption that 'focus' NP is the subject just like others Western Malayu-Polinesian language, Bataknese language as an example which was used in North Sumatera provinces and Indonesia country. It is *postnominal* and *-case*. They gave the examples on Bataknese language, but if we analyze it further by giving Minangkabau and Indonesian sentences, they will share common the universal feature of relative clause sentence.

14. Minangkabau: Mancuci sawawah padusi tu
 Indonesian : Mencuci kain perempuan itu
 Man-wash DO 3rd det
 English : Washes cloth woman that
 That woman is washing the cloth
15. Minangkabau: Padusi *nan* mancuci sarawah tu
 Indonesian : Perempuan *yang* mencuci kain itu.
 3rd rel man-wash DO the
 English : woman *who* is washing cloth that
 The woman *who* is washing that cloth

Oblique

It was usually identical to the noun phrase in a prepositional phrase, one indicating location. The noun which followed the preposition, is deleted and replaced by *-nyo*. The following basic clause contained a prepositional phrase as an adjunct of location:

16. Minangkabau: Di sampiang kadai tu, ado pohon anggur.
 Indonesia : Di sampiang kedai itu, ada pohon anggur.
 Prep. Det
 English : Beside shop that, there is a tree grape.
 Beside that shop, there is a grape tree.

This could be embedded in a noun phrase whose head was kadai '*shop*'. *kadai tu* was deleted from the prepositional phrase and its place were taken by *-nyo*:

17. Minangkabau: Kadai nan di sampiangnyo ado pohon anggur
 Indonesia : Kedai yang di sampingnya ada pohon anggur
 English : Shop which beside it, there is a tree grape.
 The shop which is beside, there is a grape tree.

In such constructions the preposition occurs at the beginning of the relative clause, immediately after '*nan*'. The preposition involved is usually a locative preposition, as in the first example below. In the other examples below it is the recipient preposition untuak '*to*' and the benefactive preposition untuk '*for*':

18. Minangkabau: urang nan untuaknyo ambo mangiriman surat
 Indonesia : Orang yang untuknya saya mengirimkan surat
 English : Person for him I send a letter to
 The person I send a letter to
19. Minangkabau : Anak nan untuaknyo ambo mambali kado
 Indonesian : Anak yang untuknya saya belikan kado
 English : Child for him I bought gift
 The child I bought the gift for

Genetive

The topic of the topic-comment clause is deleted; the noun of the embedding phrase then stands as topic (not subject) to the relative clause. The *-nyo* (in Minangkabau language) – *nya* (in Indonesian language) of the relative clause identified the head of the noun phrase. '*whose*' in the possessive of topic-comment relative clauses, which translate constructions with '*whose*' in English, the subject of the relative clause is the thing possessed by the head noun. The first example below derives from the independent clause.

20. Minangkabau: Kudo tu namanyo Tegap, bajalan dengan tanang bana
 Indonesia : Kuda itu yang namanya Tegap, berjalan dengan tenang benar.
 English : Horse that whose name is Tegap, walked calmly really.
 That horse whose name is Tegap, walked really calmly

Locative Relative Clauses

These differ from other relative clauses in that they are not preceded by '*nan*'. The more traditional construction begins with '*tempat*', translated 'where'

21. Minangkabau: Perusahaan *dima* mereka bakarajo jauh dari siko
 Indonesia : Perusahaan *dimana* mereka bekerja, jauh dari sini.
 English : The company where they worked, is far from here.

The sentence above is so familiar in the spoken of Minangkabau people especially in the middle of society because the word of *dima* is easier to speak than they speak” *perusahaan tampek mereka bakarajo jauh dari siko*”.

CONCLUSION

This paper has provided first description of Minangkabau language and Indonesian that relative clause formations in this language show a peculiar characteristic. It is can be concluded that in the Minangkabau language, only *subject* can be relativized and object can't. Since object can't be relativized, automatically the lower level in the Accessibility Hierarchy can't also be relativized. That is, although object relatives are grammatical, they are very rarely produced by speakers of Minangkabaunese and it will be awkward to be produced; instead speakers of Minangkababu produce subject relatives in which the subjects of passive sentences get relativized. I argued that the ease of passivization in Minangkabau makes it possible for indirect relativation of objects to be realized as subject relatives. Speakers of Indonesia generally, and Minangkabaunese especially, prefer this type of relativization because of its less processing cost than direct relativization

The relative clauses in Minangkabau, Indonesian, and English languages is one of topics in typology study. The researchers hope that there are other researchers who analyze any topics in typology especially in three different languages so that the study can be studied many students who are studying linguistics.

REFERENCES

- Adedoyin, O. B. (2020). Qualitative Research Methods. *Principles of Social Psychiatry: Second Edition*, 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470684214.ch7>
- Ambarita, R., & Mulyadi. (2019). Relative Clause of Indonesian and Java Language. *Scholar International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 8677, 85–89. <https://doi.org/10.21276/sijll.2019.2.5.1>
- Ambarita, R., & Mulyadi. (2020). Indonesian Relative Clauses And Its Similarities. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 3(6), 111–112.
- Andrews, A. D. (2007). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. 2dn Edition. Volume II: Complex Constructions* (T. Shopen (ed.); Second Edi, Vol. 2). Cambridge University Press. <http://marefateadyan.nashriyat.ir/node/150>
- Ariyati, R. P., Yusdi, M., & Lindawati. (2020). Kalimat dan Klausa pada Novel "Lubang dari Separuh Langit. *Jurnal Um-Tapsel*, 5(1), 179–186. <https://doi.org/10.31604/linguistik.v5i1.179-186>
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology. second edition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cropley, A. (2019). Introduction to qualitative research methods. In *A research handbook for patient and public involvement researchers*. <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526136527.00012>
- Ekaristiano, F. B. H., Purnanto, D., & Sumarlam. (2019). Klausa Relatif Bahasa Indonesia : Sebuah Pendekatan Tipologi Sintaksis. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik Dan Sastra (SEMANTIKS)*, 1–3.
- Hoang, P. N. (2020). Teaching Language in Cross-Disciplinary Contexts. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 1(1), 36-43. <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v1i1.27>
- Indrawati, N. L. K. M. (2017). Complementiser and Relativiser in the English Subordinate Clauses. *Lingual*, 8(1), 1–9.
- Jufrizal, Rusdi, & Refnita, L. (2009). Struktur Informasi pada Klausa Bahasa Minangkabau. *Lingua Didaktika*, 2(4), 58–69.
- Jufrizal, Zaim, M., & Ardi, H. (2015). Struktur Gramatikal dan Budaya Berbahasa : Data dan Informasi Bahasa Minangkabau.
- Kroeger, P. R. (2005). Analyzing Grammar An Introduction. In *Journal of Chemical*

- Information and Modeling* (First Edit, Vol. 53, Issue 9). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/9780521816229>
- Lindawati. (2015). *Bahasa Minangkabau*. Minangkabau Press.
minangkabau_press@yahoo.com
- Novianto, W., & Suhandano. (2019). Production of Relative Clauses by English Learners. *3rd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC)*, 3(February), 50–56.
- Rasyad, H., Said, C., Busri, Amir, Z., Yamin, M., & Gani, R. (1986). *Frase Bahasa Minangkabau*. Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Rosita, N. (2015). Relative Clause Formation in Minangkabau Language: An Accessibility Hierarchy Motives. *Africa's Potential for the Ecological Intensification of Agriculture*, 3(9), 1689–1699.
- Sari, A. M., Andayani, & Sumarlam. (2017). Penggunaan Klausa Relatif pada Pembelajaran Bipa di Unit Pelaksana Teknis (Upt) Bahasa Universitas. *Diglossia*, 9(1), 45–64.
- Utami, N. P. C. P., Artawa, K., & Indrawati, N. L. K. M. (2013). Struktur dan peran nomina inti klausa relatif bahasa inggris. 34.