The International Journal of Social Sciences World
TIJOSSW is Available Online at:
https://www.growingscholar.org/journal/index.php/TIJOSSW
Vol. 5 No.1, January- June 2023, pages: 66~75
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7601540
ISSN **2690-5167**
Growingscholar Publisher

Constituent Order of Clauses in Bima Language and Its Typological Indication

Arafiq[1], Ketut Artawa[2], I Wayan Pastika[3], Made Sri Satyawati[4]

Article history:
Received December, 08, 2022; Accepted: February 02, 2023; Displayed Online: February 03, 2023; Published: June 30, 2023

Keywords

Constituent order;

Pronominal clitics;

Typological indication;

Accusative;

Ergative;

Abstract

This article aims at describing the constituent order and its indications to linguistic typology. The Bima Language is used as the object to describe the constituent order and to give the language its typological indications. The data in this article were taken by elicitation with the speakers until the elicitation is fed up. The analysis begins with assessing the clauses of the Bima Language syntactically involving several constructions in order to get the main patterns of constituent orders and its alternations. After that, the analysis continues to the explanation of the marking system of the cross-reference in the language in order to get how the language give marks on the predications and or on the arguments. Finally, the analysis comes to draw the typological indication of the combination of the patterns may have that of whether the Bima Language is to have an indication of accusative or ergative. Based on the analysis, it was found that the patterns of constituent orders of the Bima Langauge is the combination of S-V-O, O-V-S and V-O-S which indicates accusative. In addition, the pronominal clitics are always marked in S and A not in O.

[1] *University of Mataram, Mataram, Indonesia. ID Scopus: https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57211781137%20*
Email: arafiq@unram.ac.id
[2] *Professor of Linguistics at Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. ID Scopus:*
https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57191382985; Email: tutartawa@gmail.com
[3] *Professor of Linguistics at Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. ID Scopus:*
https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57191869693 ; Email: wayanpastika@unud.ac.id
[4] *Professor of Linguistics at Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia. ID Scopus:*
https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57212192698 ; Email: srisatyawati@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The Bima Language has become an interesting language to study (Cf. Adawiyah, 2021). Being a language, which is geographically located in between three different language groups Bali Sasak Sumbawa (BSS) in the west (Mbete, 2000), languages of south Celebes in the north, and the languages of Flores and Sumba in the East, it is important to explore to which groups it might be included in. This linguistic situation challenges some linguists to give such a comprehensive and well-descriptive research on the language. The Bima Language has been grouped into a subgroup of Centro Polynesian Language of Bima-Sumba-Flores (Blust, 2008). However, it is argued that Blust grouping is based on geographical relatedness of languages rather their than linguistic features shared (Donohue & Grimes, 2008). These contrastive arguments have encouraged linguists to do a more well-planned and comprehensive study involving more languages it surrounds.

There have been many studies on the Bima Language until the recent time and have contributed to a bunch documentation of the language in all aspects. However, those studies tend to be sporadic and lead to a separated and even a different description at some points of grammatical concepts in the language. In morphology of the Bima Language, most bound morphemes belong to affixes (Rachman, 1984), while the same forms are referred to as particles (Wouk & Arafiq, 2016). The study on syntax of the Bima Language revealed that the Bima Language operates S-V-O word order (Arafiq, 2005) which in later study (Wouk, 2010) found that the Bima Language is flexible in operating the word order of clause and that V-S-O was the most common type used in discourse. These findings were enough fair because the data were taken only from discoursal context where the language is used in casual situations. Another study was conducted by Satyawati, Purnawati, & Kardana (2019) about how verbs in the Bima Language engage the arguments in clauses. This study has given some light on the grammatical description of the Bima Language.

The constituent order in the Bima Language is interesting to investigate due to its flexibility in its usage. Moreover, the fact the Bima Language has pronoun clitics which are bound to predicates is also suspicious to have effect on the flexibility of the constituent orders (Arafiq, 2020) which in turn may result in the case system organization of the language. It is believed that the system of pronoun clitics or bound pronouns may conflict with the system of case organization. For instance, in Kalkatungu, while the core case system is organized on a nominative-ergative system, the bound pronouns system operates on S = A / P basis as shown in the followings.

(1) *Nyini a -ni ingka?*
you NOM(S) PURP-2SG.SUBJ go
'Are you going?'

(2) *Nyin -ti a -ni nuwa?*
You -ERG(A) PURP -2SG.SUBJ see
'Do you want to see him/her/it?'

(3) *Nyini a -kin nuwa*
you.NOM(P) PURP -2SG.OBJ see
'S/he wants to see you.'

(Blake, 2004, p. 20)

There have been many studies about constituent orders across languages. Understanding constituent orders in the study of syntax is always done prior to further analysis because the pattern of the constituent order a language operate may help in the analysis of the syntactical typology. Below

are presented the studies about constituent order of the languages as the comparison to the same study in the Bima Language.

The first constituent order of clauses to discuss is the Siladang Language. According to Siwi, (2021) the Siladang Language operates the S-V-O (A-V-P) pattern. All syntactical tests done to the basic structure of the Siladang reveals patient always follows the verbs. However, in certain circumstances, like topicalization, the order may alternate into O-S-V (P-A-V). Based on the pivot test on the complex sentences, the language shows A = S ≠ P system. It means that the Siladang Language fits the accusative typology.

The second constituent order is Indonesian which has been done by Purnawati, Krisnawati, and Artawa (2020) as well as Laksana et al, (2021). Like the Siladang, the order of clause of Indonesian is S-V-O (A-V-P). The syntactical functions of constituents in Indonesian in complex clauses resembles the accusative which treating S in the same way with A but differently with P (S=A, ≠ P). It is further explained that when S co-occurs with A, A can be omitted without any syntactical modification and when A co-occurs with S, S can be omitted too. However, when S co-occurs with O, the deletion of O must be done prior to the syntactical modification, such as passivation.

The third example of the constituent order is of Balinese. The constituent order of Balinese is quite complex because it has two ways of expressing the imperative constructions, namely zero construction (morphologically unmarked verb) and the N-construction (morphologically marked verb) Artawa, (1994). The constituent order of the imperative of zero construction in Balinese is P-V which may reverse to V-P. Syntactically, based on the pivot test done, Balinese fits the S/P pivot system which is the indication of ergativity.

The fourth example is Korean which is known to operate the S-O-V constituent order (Park & Yi, 2021). Being a language that is rich of case marking, Korean has two ditransitive constructions that vary in the case marking on the recipient argument. The first is the canonical ditransitive construction and the second is double accusative construction. The double accusative construction in Korean cannot fit the S-O-V constituent order although it is not completely avoided in sentence completion.
The above evidences suggest that there is a correlation between the word order typology with the syntactical typology of a language between accusative or ergative. If a language operates S-V-O, the language tends to be treated as an accusative system treating S=O, ≠ P. However, if it operates S-P-V or S-V-P, it tends to be treated as an ergative system.

2. Materials and Methods

This is a descriptive qualitative study which aims at describing linguistic phenomena used and occurred in a particular community; the Bimanese speakers who live in the eastern part of Sumbawa Island Indonesia (Craswell, 2014). This research was conducted in Rade, a village where the Bima Language speakers of Seresuba dialect is spoken (Mahsun, 2006). Data in this study are the simple clauses in the Bima Language which were taken from field work of elicitation using the elicitation guide for field work proposed by (Artawa, 2004). The elicitation involved three speakers of the Bima Language which criteria following Samarin, (1988). The elicitation was done until the data needed is fed up. The data were then transcribed and analyzed qualitatively to explain about pattern of constituent order in the Bima Language and the marking system it may involve. Reflexive-introspective was also applied considering that one of the authors is the speaker of the Bima Language (Sudaryanto, 1998) and (Chomsky, 1977). After that, the constituent order in the Bima Language is described and analyzed based on Comrie, (1989). Lastly, the interpretation of syntactic typological is made to put whether the Bima Language has an indication of accusative or ergative (Dixon, 1994).

3. Results and Discussions

This subsection describes the patterns of constituent order in the Bima Language to get the possible combinations of constituents and how marking system is made to generate the combinations. After that, the description continues to describe the typological indication that the Bima Language may belong to.

Constituent order of clause in the Bima Language

The study about constituent order of clause was first introduced by Greenberg in his seminal article on word order typology (Comrie, 1989). This study refers to as the study of type-based approach to distinguish it from token-based typology (Levshina, 2019). The term word order was quite doubtful since this area of typology did not concern wholly to the order of words in clause rather it was something to do with the order of constituents. Moreover, when talking about the basic order of subject – verb – object, it is no more relevant to use the term as the constituents of clause can consist not only a single word but more words. In this case, Comrie (1981) and Artawa (2004) stated that the order of subject (S), verb (V), and object (O) in imperatives, declaratives, and interrogatives is important to observe (Swandana et al., 2022).

Imperatives

Imperatives have an underlaying agent that does a particular action which are very common across languages (Artawa, 2004). Imperative Imperatives can consist of verb (V) constituent only, verb (V) with object (O) constituent, or verb (V) with two objects constituents (DO & IO). However, this paper only focuses on the structure that takes the verb (V) and the objects (O) since the order of constituents is concerned. In Indonesian, a verb constituent may be monomorphemic or polymorphemic as seen in the following constructions.

(4) *Cuci -lah gelas itu*
Wash -AF glass DET
'Wash the glass, please'

(5) *Telan obat itu*
Swallow medicine DET
'Swallow the medicine'

(6) *Simpan -lah uan g itu*
Save -AF money DET
'Save the money'

(7) *Lepas -kan sapi itu*
Relase -AF cow DET
'Let the cow goes'

(Noviatri, 2011, p. 33)

In Indonesian, the constituent verb (V) can be taken by basic verbs *cuci* 'wash' in (4), *telan* 'swallow' as in (5) or basic verb and *simpan* 'keep' in (6) followed by affix {–*lah*} and verb *lepas* 'release' followed by suffix {–*kan*} in (7) which emphasize the imperative. Meanwhile *gelas itu* 'that glass', *obat itu* 'that medicine', *uang itu* 'that money', dan *sapi itu* 'that cow', are considered as the NP subjects (S) not the objects (O). Fahmiyanto (2016) argued that those NPs cannot be substituted with anaphoric *nya.* The anaphoric test towards the NPs is not relevant to be applied in the transitive imperative

because the subjects (S) of transitive imperative are logically understood as the second persons though they are not explicitly stated.

Unlikely, imperatives in English do not allow to use complex (polymorphemic) verbs. Imperatives are essentially subject-less sentence with a bare verb stem or bear no tense and modals which semantically can express command, suggestion, invitation, and instruction (Fox, 2014). Observe the following English imperatives.

(8) Shut the door

(9) Try asking Peter

(10) Come to our party

(11) Carefully remove the lid

(Fox, 2014, p. 434)

Constituent verb (V) 'shut', 'try', 'come', and 'remove' are simple (monomorphemic) words and followed by constituent objects (O) 'the door', 'Peter', 'our party', and 'the lid'. So constituent subject (S) are omitted.

Like Indonesian, transitive imperatives in the Bima Language can use both simple and complex words and the object NP comes after it. as shown in the following examples.

(12) a. *Ndawi -wea -pu uma -na*
Make -APL -PTL house -3POS
'Make a house for it'

b. *Uma -na ndawi -wea -pu*
house -3POS make -APL -PTL
'Make a house for it'

(13) a. *Henga -pu ranta*
Open -PTL foodbox
'Open the foodbok, please'

b. *Ranta ede hengga -pu*
Foodbox DET open -PTL
'Open the foodbox, please'

The object NP (O) of transitive imperative in the Bima Language above come after the verb (V) as in (13a) and (14a). Meanwhile, in (13b) the NP object precedes the verb (V). However, object NP (O) cannot precede the verb (V) as in (14b) because it is not a full NP as in (13c). Both order of constituent of imperatives in the Bima Language are not all the basic constructions although the both use the same unmarked verbs. The V – O order is considered as the basic construction considering that all constituents are the same prominent as in (9a) dan (10a), while the O – V order is its alternation making object (O) as the more prominent than verb (V).

The structure of imperative in the Bima Language may also include an overt subject if the command is more direct. However, the overt subject must proceed the verb as in (14a) and (15a) but not the object NP as in (14b) and (15b) below.

(14) a. *Nggomi ndawi -wea -pu uma -na*
2SG make -APL -PTL house -3POS
'You make a house for it'

b. **Nggomi uma -na ndawi -wea -pu*
2SG house-3POS make -APL -PTL
'You make a house for it'

(15) a. *Nggomi henga -pu ranta*
2 SG open -PTL foodbox
'You Open the foodbok, please'

b.**Nggomi ranta ede hengga -pu*
2 SG foodbox DET open -PTL
'You Open that foodbox'

Declaratives

The order declaratives in the Bima Language put subject (S) before the verb (V). Both verbal and nonverbal clauses can be used to exemplify the declaratives.

(16) a. *Ana nahu ntika sara'a*
Child 1SG pretty all
'My daughters are all pretty'

b. *Ntika sara'a ana nahu*
Prety all child 1SG
'My daughters are all prety'

(17) a. *Sia$_j$ bi'a -na$_j$ Hape lenga –na*
3SG break **-** 3SG/CLT Handphone friend **-**3POS
'She broke her friend's handphone'

b. *Hape lenga -na Sia$_j$ bi'a - na$_j$*
Handphone friend **-**3POS 3SG break **-** 3SG/CLT
'She broke her friend's handphone'

c. *bi'a -na$_j$ Hape lenga -na Sia$_j$*
break **-** 3SG/CLT Handphone friend **-**3POS 3SG
'She broke her friend's handphone'

In declaratives, the order of the Bima Language seems very flexible. However, the basic order put constituent subject (S) at the beginning followed by constituent verb (V) and object NP (O) as in (16.a) and (17.a). For the sake of pragmatic, the order may alternate to O – V as in (16.b) and (17.b) or V – O as in (17.c) depends on which constituent is prominent. The third singular clitic /*-na*/ in (17) is cross-referencing to the subject or the agent *sia* 'third singular subject' not to the object or the patient.

The cross-references in the Bima Language fit very good to the verbal clause (15a & 15b) rather than nonverbal ones (16a &16b) above. This fact is very universal since the cross-reference is a matter of marking system between NP and the verbs. In the Bima Language, the NP to which the cross-reference agree with can be omitted. The fact that only a subject NP which agree with the clitics, but not the object NP, the subject NP of clauses in the Bima Language in (17a) and (17)b above can be omitted as in the clauses (18a & 18b) below.

(18) a. *bi'a -na Hape lenga -na*
break **-** 3SG/CLT Handphone friend **-**3POS
'She broke her friend's handphone'

b. *Hape lenga -na bi'a - na*

Handphone friend -3POS break - 3SG/CLT
'She broke her friend's handphone'

The 3rd singular subject NP *Sia* 'she' can be omitted wherever its position in a clause if it cross-references with clitic *-na*. However, this omission is made for the favor of a subject NP, not for a clitic.

Interrogatives

The order of constituent in interrogatives is tested by substituting only the core argument of the clauses. The position of periphery in a clause in the Bima Language is very flexible so that it does not determine the grammaticality of a clause wherever the position it may take.

(19) a. *Au ma ngemo aka?*
What REL fly DET
'What is flying'

b. *Ma ngemo aka au?*
REL fly DET what
'What is flying'

c. *Ma ngemo aka au?*
REL fly DET what
'What is flying'

(20) a. *Au weli -mu nggomi?*
What buy -2SG/CLT 2SG
'What did you buy?'

b. *Weli -mu au nggomi?*
buy -2SG/CLT what 2SG
'What have you bought?

c. *Nggomi au weli-mu?*
2SG/CLT what buy -2SG
'What have you bought?'

Based on the above examples, the question word *au* 'what' in intransitive sentence (19a) precedes the verb in relative *ngemo* 'fly' so as to form S – V order. Meanwhile in (19b) the questions word *au* 'what' comes after the verb *ngemo* 'fly' and takes V – O order. In transitive sentence, the question word *au* 'what' precedes the verb *welimu* '(kamu)beli' and followed by object NP *nggomi* '2SG' and form the S-V-O as in (20a).

Like the cross-reference between the 3rd singular subject *sia* 'she' with its clitic, the 2nd singular subject *nggomi* 'you' exhibits the same syntactical relation no matter what types of clause it may occur. In other words, the omission of the subject *nggomi* 'you' is possible both in interrogatives as in (21) and in declarative as in (22) below.

(21) a. *Au weli -mu ?*
What buy -2SG/CLT
'What did you buy?'

b. *Weli -mu au ?*
buy -2SG/CLT what
'What have you bought?

(22) a. *Bi'a - mu Hape lenga -na*
break - 2SG/CLT Handphone friend -3POS
'You broke her friend's handphone'

b. *Hape lenga -na bi'a - mu*
Handphone friend -3POS break - 2SG-CLT
'You broke her friend's handphone'

The accusativity of the Bima Language

Dixon (1994) purposed several ways in distinguishing the syntactic functions of core arguments (S, A, and O). Some languages make use of constituent order (e.g., English), some uses cases, particles, or adpositions, some employ pronominal cross-referencing on the verbs, and some employ a combination of these strategies (e.g., the Bima language). The Bima Language uses the combination of cross-referencing and constituent order to distinguish the core arguments in simple clauses. In relation to the constituent order of the basic, the Bima Language exhibits the combinations of S-V-O, O-V-S, and V-O-S patterns. Furthermore, in causative constructions, the combinations also operate the same combination of patterns as shown in the examples below.

(23) a. *Ana nahu nangi -na*
child 1SG cry -3SG/CLT
'My child cried?'

b. *La Hasa ka- nangi -na ana nahu*
Art hasan CAU- cry -3SG child 1SG
'Hasan made my child crying?

c. **La Hasa ana nahu ka- nangi -na*
Art Hasan child 1SG CAU- cry -3S/CLT
'Hasan made my child cried'

Based on the above example, the argument subject (S) in the non-causative (23a) *ana nahu* 'my child' takes the initial position in the clause and followed by the verb *nangi-na* 'cried' so that it forms the S -V pattern. This argument is demoted to the object (O) position in the causative construction (23b) when the causer *La Hasa* 'Hasan' takes the subject position in in the initial position of the clause and forms the S-V-O pattern. The grammatical relation in the causatives can serve as clear evidence of how fix the pattern S-V-O of the Bima Language having that S-O-V pattern is not allowed as shown in (23c). This can have the indication of the accusative.

The evidences from the cross-references of the Bima Language also gives an indication of the accusative. The pronominal clitics in the Bima Language always mark the argument S and A in the same way but mark the argument O differently (unmarked). Below are further evidences for all kinds of pronominal clitics.

(24) a. *La Hami$_i$ weli -na$_i$ baju ru'u ina -na*
Art Hamid buy -3SG/CLT shirt OBL mother -3POS
'Hamid bought a shirt for his mother'

b. *Nahu$_j$ weli -ku$_j$ baju ru'u ina -na*
1SG buy -1SG shirt OBL mother -3POS
'I bought a shirt for his mother'

c. *Nggomi weli -mu baju ru'u ina -na*
2SG buy -2SG/CLT shirt OBL mother -3POS

'You bought a shirt for his mother'

d. *Nami weli -mu baju ru'u ina -na*
1PL-Ex buy -1PL-Ex/CLT shirt OBL mother -3POS
'We bought a shirt for his mother'

e. *Ndai weli -ta baju ru'u ina -na*
1PL-Ink buy -3SG/CLT shirt OBL mother -3POS
'We bought a shirt for his mother'

The cross-reference in the Bima Language is made between the subject NPs and the verbs but not with the object NPs. The pronominal clitic *-na* is cross-referent to the third singular subject *La Hami* 'Hamid' as in (24a), the pronominal clitic *-ku* is cross-reference to the fist singular subject *nahu* 'I' as in (24b), the pronominal clitic *-mu* is cross-referent to the second subject *nggomi* 'you' as in (24c) and to the first plural exclusive subject *nami* 'we' as in (24d), and *-ta* is cross-referent to the first inclusive subject *ndai* 'we' as in (24e).

4. Conclusion

Based on the analysis and syntactical tests done above, the Bima Language operates the S-V-O (P) pattern which can alternate to O-V-S and V-O-S. The S-V-O pattern. This pattern is considered as the basic pattern since it is the only pattern occurs in the causative constructions of the Bima Language. The evidence from cross-reference of the language shows that the pronominal clitics are marked in S and A function with a different marking (zero) to an object (O) NP. The combination of constituent order and the marking system that the Bima Language operates, would be an indication of an accusative. Comprehensive typological research needs to be conducted in the Bima Language in order to give a complete typological description as done towards other local languages in Indonesia, such as the Siladang (Siwi, 2021) and the Balinese (Artawa, 1994).

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to all informants who contribute in the process of data collection. Special thanks to the three key informants who help us assessing and validating the data during the elicitation process until the data are saturated. We are also grateful to speakers of the Bima Language who have willingly allowed us to observe and record during their talks. Lastly, we would be remiss in not mentioning the village head and staff to welcome us and allow us to interact with the local people freely.

References

Adawiyah, R. (2021). Action Verbs with Notions of Hitting in Bima Language: The Study of Natural Semantics Metalanguage. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC)*, *3*(01), 56-65.

Arafiq. (2005). *Relasi Gramatikal Konstruksi Kausatif dan Aplikatif Bahasa Bima. (Tesis).* Denpasar: Program Magister Linguistik, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Udayana.

Arafiq. (2020). The Syntax of Personal Pronouns in the Bima Language. *International Linguistics Research*, (3)2, 13-19.

Artawa, K. (1994). *Ergativity in Balinede Syntax.* Melbourne: La Trobe University.

Artawa, K. (2004). *Balinese Language: A Typological Description.* Denpasar: CV Bali Media Adikarsa.

Blake, B. J. (2004). *Case.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blust, R. (2008). Is There A Bima-Sumba Subgroup? *Oceanic Linguistics*, 47(1) 23-37, University of Hawaii Press.

Chomsky, N. (1977). *Essay of Form and Interpretation.* Amsterdam: North Holland.

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Language Typology: Syntax and Morphology. Second Edition.* Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Craswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th Edition).* Sage Publication, Inc.

Dixon, R. W. (1994). *Ergativity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donohue, M., & Grimes, C. E. (2008). Yet More on the position of the languages of Eastern Indeonesia and East Timor. *Oceanin Linguistics*, 47(1), 114-158.

Fahmiyanto, F. Y. (2016). *Kalimat Perintah Bahasa Indonesia dalam Bahasa Petunjuk (Skripsi).* Yogyakarta: Program Studi Sastra Indonesia, Fakultas Bahasa Indonesia, Universitas Negri Yogyakarta.

Fox, C. (2014). The Semantic of Imperatives. In *Handbook of Contemporarry Semantic Theory (Second Edition).* United Kingdom: University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park.

Laksana, I. K. D., Yadnya, I. B. P., & Udu, S. (2021). Batata Construction of Cia-Cia Language in Traditional Medicine. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC)*, *3*(2), 108-117.

Levshina, N. (2019). Based Typology and Word Order Entropy: A Study Based on Universal Dependency. *Linguistic Typology*, 533-572, De Gruyter Mouton.

Mahsun. (2006). *Distribusi dan Pemetaan Varian-Varian Bahasa Mbojo.* Yogyakarta: Media Gama.

Mbete, A. M. (2000). *Kekerabatan Bahasa Bali, Sasak, Sumbawa. Laporan Penelitian.* Denpasar: Program Pascasarjana. Universitas Udayana.

Noviatri. (2011). *Kalimat Imperatif Bahasa Minangkabau.* Padang: Minangkabau Press.

Park, S.-H., & Yi, E. (2021). Perception_Production Asummetry for Korean Double Accusative. *Linguistic Research*, 38(1), 27-52.

Purnawati, K. W., Krisnawati, N. P., & Artawa, K. (2020). Alignments of Coreferential Grammatical Functions in Indonesian. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(8), 897-905.

Rachman, A. (1984). *Morfologi Kata Kerja Bahasa Bima.* Jakarta: Badan Pembinaan Bahasa Daerah, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Samarin, W. J. (1988). *Ilmu Bahasa Lapangan (J. S. Badudu Penerjemah).* Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Satyawati, M. S., Purnawati, K. W., & Kardana, I. N. (2019). Verbal Expressions and Argument Engagement in the Clause of Bimanese Language. *Mozaik Humaniora*, 19(2), 181-193.

Siwi, P. (2021). Siladang Symtax: A Study of Grammar Typology. *Annual International Conference on Language and Literatire (AICLL)* (pp. 541-549). KnE Social Science.

Sudaryanto. (1998). *Metode Linguistik.* Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Swandana, I. W., Artawa, I. K., Udayana, I. N., & Purnawati, K. W. (2022). The argument structure and its semantic role of reporting verbs in balinese language. *The International Journal of Social Sciences World (TIJOSSW)*, *4*(2), 187-196.

Wouk, F. (2010). Voice and Transitivity in Bimanese: A Discourse Perspective. *The 6th International East Nusantara Conference on Language and Culture (ENUS 2010)*, (pp. 34-46). Kupang.

Wouk, F., & Arafiq. (2016). The Particle Kai in Bimanese. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 55(2), 319-349.