How is The Grammatical Relation of Batak Toba Wedding Ceremony

Usman Sidabutar [1]
Mulyadi [2]

 Universitas HKBP Nommensen, Medan[1]
Program Studi S3 Ilmu Linguistik/Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia[2]
[1] usman.sidabutar@uhn.ac.id
[2] mulyadi@usu.ac.id

Abstract

This article discusses grammatical relations in Toba Batak language. Toba Batak language has formal markings, both predicates and arguments that show the relationship between clause elements, and the coding of words in the language. arguments are integrated syntactically. This research uses descriptive qualitative research. Qualitative is used to investigate an issue in order to gain a clear understanding of a particular phenomenon. The main data of this research are sentences. Sentence data in this study were obtained through traditional Toba Batak documents, namely 'marhata sinamot' which is commonly used Grammatical relations have an important role and function to identify the correctness of the syntactic process because they are considered to connect arguments with clauses. The grammatical relationship and the semantic role of the Toba Batak language are S = A/P and S = P/A. That is, the Toba Batak language treats S as A and S as P. A language is said to be of ergative type if the patient (P) of a transitive verb is treated with or coreferential with the subject (S) in an intransitive clause and different from the agent (A) of the verb transitive.

Keywords : *Accusative, Batak Toba Language, Ergativity, Grammatical Relation, Utterances*

Introduction

The development of technology and works demand in the global platform brings up to many arguments. The scope between the language maintenance and language threatening due to the need of language command in the rapid new era. The impact of foreign language and language performance as if profoundly provoke a lessening of mother language capacity naturally as traditional language prior to the distinction of varieties language construction

Gazed upon the current situation, the language performance is vividly concerned to the traditional language. Hence, there were some observations regarding the construction used as the traditional language in North Sumatera as Batak Toba Language.

The Batak Toba Language is the majority cultural language located in North Sumatera. The ethnical language inherited as a cultural norm, value and called anthropolinguistics. The piloting of language construction in Batak Toba calls for the

challenging research to find the facts of how is the grammatical relations of Batak Toba language currently used by the Batak Toba people (Naibaho & Putri, 2016). Batak Toba language possess formal markers either predicate or argument by which the relations between the element of clauses and the coding of words on the language are identified.

The grammatical relations tends to make character of morphosyntactic which connect the argument to clauses, the subjectivity or objectivity as for instance.(Blake, 2002; Farrell, 2005; Tjia, 2015). Grammatical relation is necessary binding the function of syntax and semantics or the role of syntax and semantic features through the integrated argument beyond the clauses. For example, the integration of subject and object or agent and patient. Conceptualizing grammatical relation concerning the subject, object, direct object and indirect object and as well the other realization in oblique demonstrates the benefactive and locative of the clauses (Raupova, 2020). Furthermore, the hierarchy of whose roles on the clauses might be described to address the category either the accusative or ergative characterization. This grammatical relation take the role to show the construction form of Agent and Patient relating the marker (Anderson, 2018; Bril, 2022; Clemens et al., 2015). The facts of this identification is due to the integration of argument syntactically. In addition, the construction of grammatical relation man can be specifically categorized to entail the argument within the clause. (Primus, 2015; Sanfilippo, 1991; Schlüter, 2005).

Similarly, as stated by (Primus, 2015; Sinaga & Mulyadi, 2023), traditionally, grammatical relations are arguments that have a relationship with verbs. Arguments can be categorized to entail a relationship with a verb since the verb acts as the core of the syntactic process (Oghoghophia Famous, 2021). Hence, in this case it is categorized as a syntactic process. The relation that is considered to demonstrate an important part in traditional ideas as the grammatical relations are obviously identified by syntactic properties, and that is to become markers to connect arguments with clauses (Bril, 2022; Suzuki, 2022). Grammatical relations are the basic components of subject, direct object, and indirect object to mark the pattern role of several clauses and phrase which occur on the sentence. It defines that the syntactic relationship between a verb and the noun phrases occur in the clause (Mutiara, 2016).

However, grammatical relations are traditionally required and applied for labeling the construction form of phrases and clauses of the overall structures (Frantz, 1979). The most common labels are S as subject and O as direct object and indirect object. In this case the grammatical relation connects the syntactic relationship between the verb and the noun phrase that appears in a clause. (Suparmin, 2018)Grammatical relations have a high degree of relationship in the grouping of arguments needed to analyze the grammatical phenomena of individual languages (cf. Dixon 1979, 1994; Dryer 1986, 1997; Croft 2001). Can be specified with Semantico-syntactic grammatical relations:

a subject	SUBJ	{S, A}
b. Direct Object	PO	{P, R}
c. Indirect Object	SO	{T}
d. Adverb of time/ Obligation	OBL	

Grammatical relations can be distinguished through the role of semantics which can make a presence between arguments and predicates and not between arguments and clauses. As for instance, *raja mangantuk tantara/ the King hits the soldier* VS *raja diantuk tantara/ the King was hit by the Soldier.* From the both cases, NP Shambo is the subject of the clause. But in the active version, the reference to Shambo is the agent of 'killing', while in the passive version, Shambo is the patient of 'killing. Unlike the flow that has several transformations such as dative-passive transformations. ' This can distinguish a grammatical relation from a semantic role in terms of the dative

Reviewing these examples, linguists use this grammatical assessment as a reference for investigating sentence structure, both in terms of phonology, morphology, semantics, and syntax which are currently developing, especially in regional languages. The study of grammatical relations contributes to the uniqueness of grammatical relations and semantic roles(Pascasarjana & Udayana, 2016). The theory above really has a valence that is closely related to previous theories which discuss categories of language structure through grammatical relations. However, this theory has a difference with what is conveyed by (Ackerman & Diego, 2015; Blake, 2002; Farrell, 2005) theory which is more dominant to connect grammatical relations with semantics. However, (Alfa Edison Telaumbanua et al., 2022; Ostler et al., 2002) in (Nagaya, 2008) includes grammatical relations with morphological and pragmatic. In my opinion, this theory has a new uniqueness for researching the study of structural clauses in regional and international languages.

The Toba Batak language is a genealogically known language from North Tapanuli, which is spoken by a fairly large and wide-spread community. In both languages, this will show the construction situations of grammatical relations that are commonly used and also convey the semantic meaning contained therein. The special nature of the construction of grammatical relations can cause important problems for the traditional view. In the use of the Toba Batak language there are often differences in use in Indonesian such as in the Toba Batak language. (Sitompul & Mulyadi, 2020) state that Batak Toba Language is categorized as ergativity because the function of S occurred as argument of intransitive verbs depicts the marked the semantic role from the verb. The treatment of subject (S) is similarly used with the argument of object (O) as /par-/ + /V-an/. In addition, Batak Toba Language is also an accusative since the diathesis construction has the active marking (Damanik & Mulyadi, 2020; Putri & Yusdi, 2020)

In the semantic criteria, it is vividly defined the position of subject of *doing* play the role dominantly as the agent (Info, 2019; Khanina & Shluinsky, 2019). However, syntactically the role of *patient* can be marked as the subject position when the *patient* is promoted to be a subject and agent (actor) (Cieślicka, 2006). In Batak Toba language, it experiences the same construction of grammatical relations. To form the passivity of the sentence above will certainly experience the construction of different grammatical

relations and semantic relations. Therefore, it is necessary to review the grammatical relations of the two regional languages because they are considered to have close grammatical structures and semantic meanings.

Method

This research was used by descriptive qualitative research. Qualitative is used to investigate an issue in order to gain a clear understanding of a particular phenomenon. The main data of this research are sentences. Sentence data in this study were obtained through traditional Toba Batak documents, namely 'marhata sinamot' which is commonly used.
Data analysis using the equivalent reference method. This method is used to show the construction of grammatical relations with semantic relations (Farrell, 2005)

[1a] ro[P] do nasida[S] mamboan[P]   boras   sipirnitondi.[O]   *(Bahasa batak toba)*

[Datangnya(P) mereka(S) membawa(P) beras (O)]
[Come (P) they (S) to bring(P) rice (O)]
[Mereka(S) datang(P) membawa(P) beras(O)] (*Ind)*
[They come to bring rice] (Eng)

In the intransitive form, sentences like

[1b] mangula do hami dohot ibana.
[Work(P)   we (S) with him (O)]
[We work with him] (Eng)
[Kami mencangkul dengan dia] (*Ind)*
 S1   P   Prep O

By using data equivalence as a technique for data reference, categorizing expressions from grammatical relation structures in Toba Batak language. Data was collected through in-depth interviews with informants from and direct observation to the North Tapanuli area.

Results
Word Construction of Batak Toba Language
The language structure of the Toba Batak P-S-O has a word structure order that dominates the formal language which should be used in everyday language and the language of traditional parties. However, in Indonesian, this sequence does not have the same sequence when used as an informal or formal language. In the Toba Batak language, the predicate has a role as a verb which is always placed in front of the sentence as shown below:

[1] Mauliate ma[P] *di Raja*[S]

   [Thanks[P] for the King[S]]

   [Thanks for the King] (Eng)

   [Terimakasihlah untuk Raja] *(Ind)*

[2] Mauliate ma [P] *Raja ni parboruonnami*[S]

   [Thanks [P]King for woman we[S]]

   [Thanks for the King of bride family] (Eng)

   [Terimakasihlah Raja pihak perempuan kami] *(Ind)*

[3] Mauliate [P]*ma Raja napatupahon sipanganon niboan muna*[S]

   [Thanks King[P] who prepare food taken you[S]]

   [We thank for the King who prepares the food taken by you] (Eng)

   [Terimakasihlah Raja yang mempersiapkan makanan yang kalian   bawa] *(Ind)*

The data above explains that the position of the verb in the Toba Batak language precedes nouns such as Raja and other word units are loaded. Therefore, the importance of a more specific explanation to prove the word order. Tumanggor (2006). The function of these words are necessary to explore the diathesis on the placement of morphological roles and functions in verbs of clauses and active sentences, namely man-(maniop)/hold, man-hon (mandapothon)/meet, man-I (manjalangi)/shake hand, masi-hon (masidapothon)/meeting, pa-hon (pasangaphon)/ praise, mampar-hon(mamparitohon)brotherhood ,danmangha-hon(manghalungunhon)/living in heart. Likewise found in the arrangement of passive sentences such as di- (dipaboa), tar-,(tarbege), dan ni-(niboto).

From a number of diathesis above, we can find examples of clauses which has a marking upon the structure that occurs in the Toba Batak language, such as;

[4] <u>Alani</u> i   roma   Raja ni Paranak   pasahathon sinamot i

   Kon   P   S   Ket (S, P,O)

   [Therefore (Conj) come (P) King (S)   submit the money (Adv- S, P,O)]

   [Therefore, the King comes submit the money] (Eng)

   [Karena itu datanglah   raja dari pihak laki-laki menyerahkan mahar itu] *(Ind)*

The structural arrangement of the sentence patterns above contains the *Conj-P-S-Adv* pattern which can be categorized as having in syntax as *S-P-O*. From the clause above, it is found that the role of the conjunction is to separate the main clause from the subordinate clause. Therefore, it can be equipped with word constructions that can complete sentences such as;

[5] Alani(Konj) i roma (P) Raja ni Paranak (S)   laho pasahathon sinamot I (Adv)

   [Therefore (Conj) come (P)   King (S)   to   submit the money (Adv- S, P,O)]

   [Therefore, the King comes to submit the money] (Eng)

    [Karena itu datanglah   raja dari pihak laki-laki   untuk menyerahkan mahar itu] *(Ind)*

In addition to the explanation from *roma/come* and *laho/to* base on the example clause above, more detailed evidence is also found through the role of conjunctions, so that the arrangement of the clauses above can display markers in the main clause and

child clauses. This proof can also be seen through examples of the development of the above clauses such as;

[6] *Alani I (Conj) roma (P) Raja ni Paranak(S) baen songonna pasahathon(P) sinamot i(O*
[Therefore (Conj) come (P)   King (S) as a way submit (P) the money (O)]
[Therefore, the King comes as a way to submit the money] (Eng)
[Karena itu(konj) datanglah(P)   raja dari pihak laki-laki(S)   sebagaimana Menyerahkan(P)
mahar itu (O)] (*Ind*)

The sentence contains two clauses that have a P-S structure accompanied by a conjunction with a marker structure that functions as a child clause and is continued with a verb that has a P – O pattern. As a marker structure that functions as the main clause. From the proof of this example, the arrangement of the Toba Batak language pattern is still P-S-O

[7] *Ala   ditangihon   Raja parboru Panggoraan i*
     P   S   Ket (S-P-O)
[because, is listened[P] King of bride [S]the calls [Adv (S,P,O]
[Because the King of bride listen to the calls] (Eng)
[karena, didengar pihak laki-laki   panggilan itu] (*Ind*)

[8] *Angkup ni i digorahon   Raja ni Paranak*
                    P   S
parboru i
Ket (S-P-O)
[then shouted[P] the King of bride[S] the woman (Adv: S,P,O)]
[Then, the King of bride shouts for the woman] (Eng)
[Kemudian pihak perempuan itu dipanggil Raja pihak laki-laki] (*Ind*)

The structuring of the above clauses has two different conjunctions that can be played to connect the two clauses so that they can be appropriated into effective sentences in the Toba Batak language. The verbs 'dinggihon and 'digorahon' are words that have synonyms semantically and have the same syntactically equivalent word as passive verb diathesis. From this clause, there is a sequence of P-S-O patterned structures. Likewise in the next clause which has the same role but is arranged in a different diathesis such as;

[9]*marpangidoan ma[P]   Raja paranak [S]   tu*
parboru i[O]
[asking(P) the King of bride(S) to the woman(O)]
[The King of bride asks for the woman] (Eng)
[Raja pihak laki-laki meminta kepada pihak perempuan itu] (*Ind*)

The structural arrangement of the clauses experiences a different diathesis from the previous clauses. The morphological process that occurs in the word *marpangidoan/asking* occurs as the prefix *mar* and the suffix an become a diathesis for the root word *pangido* [*ask*]. In the Toba Batak language, the affixation of *marpangidoan/asking* is an intransitive verb that is placed before the sentence and precedes *Raja Laki-laki* as the noun. From this clause, it was found that the P-S-O pattern

became a sentence that applies normally to the pronunciation of the Toba Batak language in traditional events and in everyday language. Apart from the form of the clause arrangement that occurred before, it can be found data on the Toba Batak language that supports the Toba Batak language structure such as;

[10] marrokkapma[P] *nasida*[S] *songon bagot*[Ket]
    [are engaged[P]   they[S] as palm tree [Ket]
    [they are engaged as palm tree] (Eng)
     [Mereka berjodoh bagaikan pohon anau] (*Ind*)
[11]   paboahonon[P]nami [S]ma godang ni sinamot [O]
     [convey[P] we[S]the amount of money [O]]
    [we convey the amount of money] (Eng)
     [Kami menyampaikan banyaknya mahar itu] (*Ind*)
     Words' construction of Batak Toba based on the previous research are generally using the patterns of 'P-S-O'

However, in the Toba Batak language arrangement found from the cultural book of Batak Toba *Marhata Sinamot (Wedding Discussion)* used in Batak custom also found a different pattern from what was previously studied. The word structure is different from the clause data which is found to have an S-P pattern such as;

[12]Tangkas[ket] hita[S]massipabotoan [P] jala[konj] marsiattusan[P]
   [clearly[adv] us[S] each know [P] and each understand[P]]
   [each of us know and understand clearly] (Eng)
   [Jelaslah kita saling mengetahui dan saling mengerti] (*Ind*)
From the clause above, the arrangement of the clause structure has changed from the arrangement of the previous clause which was patterned P-S-O. Looking at the structural arrangement of clause (12), it is clear that the clause is patterned as S-P which is preceded by a statement. This word pattern will certainly make a consideration of the changes found in the clause. With this arrangement, it is possible that with an exception statement, namely *tangkas(jelas)*, then the speaker enthusiastically emphasizes *hami (we)* after the word is preceded by an adverb. For the evidence of this arrangement, it is necessary to prove clause data that occurs in the Toba Batak language such as;

Semantic Role in Grammatical Relation

Placement of the subject in the clause provides a very significant interpretation to consider the appropriateness of the clause pattern that occurs in a language that has norms. Subject and predicate patterns provide certain functions when placed in a language. In language, the role of the concept of subject and predicate is not completely normative, however, the structure process of pattern existence does not only tie to the syntactic process but also plays a role in the cymatic process.. (Kosmas, 2017)

[13] Ahu[S] *pe dohononku[P] do hata[O] saotik[ket]*
   [I (S)   also   say(P)   statement (O) a few (adv)]
   [I also say a few statement] (Eng)

[Aku pun juga menyampaikan sepatah kata] *(Ind)*
[14] Jala[Konj] ahu[S] pe mangido[P] tu hamu lae
[and I[S] also ask [P]to you brother-in-law]
[and I also ask to brother-in-law] (Eng)
[dan aku pun meminta pada mu ipar] (Ind)

From the clause above, the structural arrangement of clause (14) has an *S-P -O* pattern, explaining that the structural arrangement is different from the rules that apply to the structural arrangement of the Toba Batak language. Likewise, in the clause (15) shows the *S-P* pattern. The placement of this clause structure undergoes a syntactic process by following the pattern of the Indonesian language. However, in the position of this clause structure, a semantic process is found through the subject's emphasis on the predicate. The 'ahu' position describing the placement of the predicate category will not be carried out when the subject is preceded.

Syntactic Typology of Batak Toba Language

The occurrence of verb construction appeared on the clauses which is categorized as the manner of assessing the syntactic typology (Jufizal, 2020; Jufrizal, 2018). The diathesis of Batak Toba language occurs on the clause grammatical defines its main argument and clearly justifies the evidence of patterns in accordance to the basic words. Based on this analysis, the occurrence of class constructions utilized in Batak Toba identify the justification of the transitivity and intransitivity of *marhata sinamot/dowry discussion*

Accusative

To prevent the constraints of construction appeared on the ethnicity language, accusative take a part of syntactically based on the clauses on Batak Toba Language as overtly expressed as;

[15][marsipakkulingan manang marsiattoan dang pola dia I (transitif)
        A
, asal ma ingot hamu poda I (intransitive)]
            P
[talking or having relation is no matter *(transitif),*
            A
importantly remember you the   advice(intransitive)
            P

[It is not matter to have relation or talking since you remember the advice] (Eng)

[berbicaraan atau bersapaan tidak apa-apa itu, asal lah kalian ingat nasehat itu] *(Ind)*

S=A/P marked as the Accusative Type

The identification shows that the phenomenon [15] of the clauses in the classification of the construction depicts the difference grammatical from Bahasa Indonesia and English. The analysis of the data *dang pola dia 'no matter'* on in Bahasa Indonesia '*tidak apa-apa/no matter*' shows that the various kinds of clauses are classified as the *accusative* type. Basically, determining the marking of language in Batak Toba is not merely

leading mono uses, but it depends on the regional varieties of language used by the local people. It eventually encounters such problems at the time justifying the prototype of the class marking based on the clauses' construction. However, these clauses indeed dominate the character or advice rather than narrative text. The section [15] consists of transitivity as *marsipakkulingan manang marsiattoan dang pola dia I/ talking or having relation is no matter is* marked as the *Agent (A).* The word " *marsipakkulingan 'talking'* and *'marsiattoan/having relation'* are recognized as noun and they are regarded as *subject (S)* based on the language pattern. Observing this clause, there should be located in the front of clause as '*hamu marsipakkulingan manang marsiattoan dang pola dia'* or "*kalian berbicara atau berhubungan tidak apa-apa"* or '*You make a talking or relation is not a problem".* Having found this clause, there is an omission of '*hamu-kalian-you'* from the clause which is emphasizing the verb into subject or *Agent.*

Ergativity

In ergativity, there will be a justification of the marker which occur as the main of grammatical of language. The occurrence of mechanism appears in two domains of category which is marked as the accusative. The category of *object* and *subject* profound the one category in case of marking called the *absolutive.* The category of *ergative* emphasizes the position of *agent (A).* Hence, the language is called ergative since the *patient (P)* of the transitive is coherently marking the *subject (S)* in the intransitive clause instead of *agent (A)* in transitive clause. Ergative clause manifests the *patient (P)* to identify *subject (S).* this mechanism shows the head-marking constraints the distinction of the phenomena itself. Batak Toba language constructions express the phenomics of the ergative realization as shown in [16.a]

[16] ungkapni lasma roha ni <u>raja parboru</u> i
   Conj/ therefore   P
  Alani <u>tabona</u>
      S
  [therefore, being happy the bride family because of being delicious] (Eng)
  [oleh karena itu senanglah hati raja pihak perempuan itu karena enaknya] *(Ind)*

S = P/ A marked as the Ergative Type

*[17] [<u>Alai dung pate roha ni Parumaen(S) na so olo be ibana mulak,</u> (*klausa intransitif)
   but after broken heart daughter in law for not she comes back (intransitive)
  *,<u>gabe dioloi Rajai pangidoanna.</u> (*klausa transitif)]
  , so accepted the King request her (transitive)
  [but after the daughter in law feels broken heart for, she is does not comes back, so   the King
   accepts he request] (Eng)
   [tetapi setelah menantu perempuan merasa patah hati untuk tidak mau pulang, maka Raja
   menerima permintaannya] *(Ind)*

Gazed upon the phenomenon on the clause being occurred on the [16] shown that the *<u>raja parboru</u>* '*the bride famili/keluarga pihak perempuan'* marks the identity as the *patient (P) which* follows the pattern of *ergativity.* However, as noted in the above phenomenon, the clause [17] manifests the type of ergative which show the *subject (S) parumaen 'daughter in law'* marked as the same as *patient (P).* moreover, the marking

function of *Subject* treats either the transitive clause as *"dioloi/accepted".* The interpretation of the ergativity on the clauses due to the controlling of the second clause identifies the first clause.

Discussion

The structure of the language is said to be an active language fulfilling grammatical alliances which indicate the feasibility of the language to be loaded. The use of grammatical languages that exist in the world has the possibility of logically experiencing an arrangement. The order of languages can be classified in what was conveyed by Payne (2002: 140), that the grouping S, A and P that occurs in all languages in the world includes the possibility (i) S = A ≠ P; S =P, ≠ A; (iii) S ≠ A, ≠ P; (iv) A = P, ≠ S; and (v) S = A, = P. word placement structures that have rules and regulations that apply from the smallest unit to the largest units such as phrases, clauses and sentences so that the language deserves to have the correct language norms. Songs (2008). In this sequence there are six sequences that are appropriate to be placed as sentence patterns such as S-P-O, S-O-P, P-S-O, P-O-S, O-S-P, and O-P-S.

Placement of the subject in the clause provides a very significant interpretation to consider the appropriateness of the clause pattern that occurs in a language that has norms. Subject and predicate patterns provide certain functions when placed in a language. In language, the role of the subject and predicate concepts is not completely normative, however, the structural process of pattern existence does not only tie to the syntactic process but also plays a role in the cymatics process (Kosmas, 2017).

Conclusion

The grammar structure of the Toba Batak has a P-S-O pattern in the syntactic process. This arrangement is a normative pattern in the Toba Batak language both in everyday speech and in traditional events such as 'marhata sinamot'/ *wedding discussion*. The use of the pattern arrangement also did not change from what had been studied before. However, the Toba Batak language structure is also found in *'marhata sinamot'/ wedding discussion*, namely the S-P-O pattern, which is also commonly used in Indonesian. The events of the arrangement are concluded because of the emphasis on the subject of the verb so that the subject precedes the predicate.

This positional role gives semantic meaning in the Toba Batak language. It can also be concluded that the grammatical relationship and the semantic role of the Toba Batak language are S = A/P and S = P/A. That is, the Toba Batak language treats S as A and S as P. A language is said to be of ergative type if the patient (P) of a transitive verb is treated with or coreferential with the subject (S) in an intransitive clause and different from the agent (A) of the verb transitive. Ergative languages treating P the same as S. Usually the same is pointless.

Acknowledgment

References

Anderson, J. M. (2018). On the Nature of Grammatical Relations. In *On Case Grammar* (pp. 188–280). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429460869-3

Blake, B. (2002). Relational Grammar. In *Relational Grammar*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203221761

Bril, I. (2022). Lexical restrictions on grammatical relations in voice constructions (Northern Amis). *STUF - Language Typology and Universals*, *75*(1), 21–71. https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2022-1048

Clemens, L. E., Coon, J., Mateo Pedro, P., Morgan, A. M., Polinsky, M., Tandet, G., & Wagers, M. (2015). Ergativity and the complexity of extraction: a view from Mayan. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, *33*(2), 417–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-014-9260-x

Damanik, S. F., & Mulyadi, M. (2020). Ergativity Case-Marking in Batak Toba Language. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, *3*(1), 80–87. https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v3i1.755

Farrell, P. (2005). Grammatical Relations (Oxford Surveys in Syntax and Morphology). *Oxford Surveys in Syntax And Morphology*, 245.

Frantz, D. G. (1979). Grammatical relations in universal grammar. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.31356/silwp.vol23.03

Info, A. (2019). *2598-1803 2581-2130*. *3*(2), 107–117.

Jufizal. (2020). Ergativity and Subject Deletion in Stylistic-Grammatical Constructions of Minangkabaunese. *Jurnal Lazuardi*, *3*(3), 529–540. https://doi.org/10.53441/jl.vol3.iss3.40

Jufrizal, J. (2018). Fenomena Tipologi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau: Akusatif, Ergatif, Atau Campur? *Leksika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pengajarannya*, *3*(1), 14–28.

Khanina, O., & Shluinsky, A. (2019). Intransitive verbs in enets: A contribution to the typology of split intransitivity. *Zeitschrift Fur Sprachwissenschaft*, *38*(1), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1515/zfs-2019-0001

Kosmas, J. (2017). Masalah Relasi Gramatikal Bahasa Rongga: Sebuah Kajian Awal. *Linguistik Indonesia*, *35*(1), 1--10.

Mutiara, N. G. (2016). *the Analysis of Grammatical Relations Subject and Object in Seven Short Stories of Nasreddin " the Wise Man ."* *4*(1), 20–51.

Naibaho, S., & Putri, I. P. (2016). *Pola Komunikasi Prosesi Marhata Sinamot Pada Pernikahan Adat Batak Toba Dalam Membentuk Identitas Budaya Suku Batak Toba Di Bandung Communication Patterns of Marhata Sinamot Procession in Batak Toba Traditional Wedding Ceremony To Form the Cultural Identi*. *Vol. 15*, N.

Oghoghophia Famous, I. (2021). Valency in the Urhobo Language. *Indian Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *2*(2), 38–46. https://doi.org/10.34256/ijll2125

Pascasarjana, P., & Udayana, U. (2016). *Tesis Relasi Gramatikal Bahasa Makasae : Relasi Gramatikal Bahasa Makasae :*

Primus, B. (2015). Grammatical relations. *Syntax - Theory and Analysis*, *1*(July), 218–246. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110377408.218

Putri, R., & Yusdi, M. (2020). NUSANTARA: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial RELASI GRAMATIKAL SUBJEK BAHASA INDONESIA DALAM SURAT KABAR REPUBLIKA. *Tahun*, *7*(1), 149–161. nusantara: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial available online http://jurnal.um-tapsel.ac.id/index.php/nusantara/index

Raupova, L. (2020). Logical and Grammatical Relations in Word Categories: The Factor of Difference and Incarnation. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, *24*(4), 6828–6833. https://doi.org/10.37200/ijpr/v24i4/pr2020494

Sanfilippo, A. (1991). *Grammatical relations, thematic roles and verb semantics. January 1991*. https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/6585

Schlüter, J. (2005). Rhythmic Grammar. In *Linguistics*.

Sinaga, L. D., & Mulyadi, M. (2023). Grammatical Alliance and Pivot System of Batak Simalungun Language: a Syntactic Typology Study. *LiNGUA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *17*(2), 237–246. https://doi.org/10.18860/ling.v17i2.16673

Sitompul, M., & Mulyadi, M. (2020). Relasi Gramatikal Dalam Bahasa Batak Toba Dan Gayo Lut. *Lingua*, *16*(1), 1–7.

Suparmin. (2018). *Relasi gramatikal. 241*, 241–254.

Suzuki, H. (2022). *Grammatical relations in Caucasian languages : Preliminary mapping Grammatical relations in Caucasian languages : Preliminary mapping. January*.

Tjia, J. (2015). Grammatical relations and grammatical categories in Malay. the Indonesian prefix meN- revisited. *Wacana*, *16*(1), 105–132. https://doi.org/10.17510/wjhi.v16i1.368

.