Subjecthood in Banjarnese

Alien Kurnia Warya Selia[1], Achmad Dicky Romadhan[2]
University of Borneo Tarakan[12], Indonesia
alinkurnia15@borneo.ac.id, dickyromadhan@borneo.ac.id

Abstract:
This research discusses the subject testing tools in the Banjar language. Subjecthood is one of the study materials within the scope of syntax. This research examines subject forms in the Banjar language using typological studies. Linguistic typology is one of the linguistic study theories and models founded on natural data and language structure systems. This research is descriptive qualitative research. This research data are clauses and sentences obtained in the direct speech of Banjar speakers. Respondents are Banjar individuals at least 18 years of age. They have a variety of genders, levels of education, native languages (L1), and places of residence. The study of the subjectivity of the Banjar language entails collecting data via multiple methods (observation and interview). The analysis method used in this research is the distributional method, followed by the advanced method. The result of this research states that the subjugation of the Banjar language follows the typology theory of subject testing. There are five types of subject testing tools applied in this research: canonical structure, relativization, control, adverbial insertion and reflexive. The use of typology theory can reveal the subject test tools.

Keywords: Banjarnese, subjecthood, typology

1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia has approximately 718 dialects. Eastern Indonesia is home to more than 90% of these regional languages. Only some of Indonesia's 718 regional languages have been exhaustively studied. In contrast, numerous of these regional languages lack official grammar texts. The Ministry of Education and Culture notes that of the 718 languages spoken in Indonesia, approximately 707 are currently used, while 143 regional languages are included in UNESCO

data. Akan tetapi, berdasarkan data UNESCO pada tahun 2022, terdapat 11 bahasa daerah yang telah punah di Indonesia. Selain itu, terdapat 25 bahasa daerah di Indonesia yang masuk kategori kritis. Mayoritas bahasa yang punah di Indonesia ialah bahasa yang ada di Papua dan Maluku.

On the other hand, regional languages with official grammar have received little attention from language researchers. This drastically reduces the quantity of regional language corpus data. From 1975 to 2007, a total of 335 grammar publications were published in Javanese, followed by Sundanese (24), Balinese (14), Lampung (9), and Aceh (7), according to Arka (2003). Priority should be given to the corpus-based documentation of endangered languages. A corpus is fundamental data. Unlike dictionaries and grammars, whose data is typically edited, encyclopaedia data is not typically edited. The corpus can serve as both an instrument for compiling dictionaries and an analytical tool for compiling grammars. In reality, language documentation is the initial stage in revitalizing languages. The viability of revitalization continues to rely on the speaking community itself. However, as language policy determiners, the central and local administrations are also responsible for maintaining and preserving the languages in their respective regions.

One of the languages that also needs attention from linguists is Banjar. Although Banjar is one of the languages that is still actively used today and Banjar speakers are one of the languages with the most speakers in Indonesia. This does not guarantee that Banjar language has received attention from language researchers. This is proven by the difficulty of finding Banjar language studies, especially in the field of language typology.

Banjar is one of the provinces of South Kalimantan's official languages. In South Kalimantan, the Banjar language, an oral literary language, is separated into two main dialects: Banjar Kuala and Banjar Hulu. Before Indonesian became the official language, the Banjar people used Arabic-scripted Banjar Malay for public speaking, writing, and composition. The Banjar language is spoken in South Kalimantan Province, East Kalimantan Province, and North Kalimantan Province.

The widespread influence of the Banjar language in the Kalimantan region does not imply that it has become a highly researched language. Research into the problem of grammatical relations, i.e., the determination of subjects, objects, and others, is one of the aspects of the Banjar language that has yet to be extensively discussed. The issue of grammatical relations, particularly the subject, is one of the most crucial aspects of linguistics. The subject is the primary syntactic function that must be present in a sentence, so its presence is crucial.

Subject problems in a language are generally related to the position of the subject (Fathonah & Romadhan, 2021; Romadhan, 2022; Romadhan et al., 2023). This is because not all subject positions in a language are at the beginning of a clause or a sentence. Examples are Arabic, Welsh and Tongan typologically. Based on typology, the three types of languages do not require the subject to always be in front. The problem of subject position and how to determine the subject is what becomes an important point in this research. The researcher wants to focus on how to determine whether a constituent in Banjar language deserves to be called a subject or another core argument.

This research also has relevance to several previous studies. The relevance of many previous studies with this research is on the study of the subject. This is evidenced by the many studies related to subjects and grammatical relations that have been conducted previously. One of the

studies related to this research is a study conducted by Harahap (2019) in his research entitled "Subjecthood in the Angkola Batak language". The research conducted by Harahap (2019) discusses the subject test conducted on the Angkola Batak language. The research conducted by Harahap (2019) uses typological theory in the application of Angkola Batak subjugation. The research results found in the Angkola Batak language subjugation are that the Angkola Batak language has a word order, S-V-O and V-O-S analysis with the word order of the typological approach and genitive transformation. The S- V- O word order can be derived from the V- O- S word order in the Angkola Batak language. These two theories are relevant to test the validity of the truth of subjugation in the Angkola Batak language.

The difference between this research and Harahap's research (2019) is that this research only discusses subject testing tools using typological theory, while Harahap's research (2019) discusses subject testing using typological theory and genetic transformation. Another difference between this research and Harahap's (2019) research is the use of language objects. Harahap's (2019) research used the Angkola Batak language, while this research used the Banjar language as the research object.

In addition, this research also has relevance to Romadhan and Sari's (2021) research entitled "Subject of Punan Tebunyau Language". The research by Romadhan and Sari (2021) discusses the types of subject tools in the Dayak Punan Tebunyau language. The research conducted by Romadhan and Sari (2021) found that the subject test in the Dayak Punan Tebunyau language can be done with five types of test tools, namely canonical structure, control, relativization, adverbial insertion and reflexive. Research conducted by Romadhan and Sari (2021) uses typology theory. The difference between this research and Romadhan and Sari's research (2021) is the language object used in the research object. The research conducted by Romadhan Sari (2021) uses the Dayak Punan Tebunyau language, while this research uses the Banjar language as the research object.

Basaria (2018), entitled "Grammatical Relation of Subjects in Pakpak Dairi Language: A Typological Study," is the last research relevant to this research. The research conducted by Basaria (2018) discusses grammatical relations in the Pakpak Dairi language. The research conducted by Basaria (2018) found that subject, object and oblique relations in the Pakpak Dairi language. Subjects in Pakpak Dairi can act as agents and patients. The research conducted by Basaria (2018) used typology theory in the process of analyzing the grammatical relations of Pakpak Dairi language subjects.

The difference between the research conducted by Basaria (2018) and this research is in the study and language objects analyzed. The research conducted by Basaria (2018) examines subject, object and oblique relations, while this research analyzes the subject test in a language. The next difference between these two studies is that the research conducted by Basaria (2018) uses the Pakpak Dairi language as the object, while this study uses the Banjar language.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Subjecthood

Subjecthood is one of the study materials within the scope of syntax. There are many opinions that have been conveyed by linguists related to the definition of the subject. These opinions include Keenan and Comrie (1983), Culicover (2017) and Foley and Van Valin (1986). The opinions expressed by these linguists can describe that the explanation of the subject is quite an

interesting study material but can also be said to have a fairly high level of complexity. One of the things that causes subjecthood to have complexity is caused by the typology of a language and grammatical behavior. Different language typologies of each language and various grammatical behaviors of the language trigger various definitions and stipulations about the subject so that it presents various problems that can be studied (Romadhan et al., 2023).

In discussing the problem of subjectivity, many things can be used as reference material about subjectivity in various languages in the world. Subjecthood is basically one of the terms used to explain the subject device in a language in the world. The subject is generally tested using several tests that have been widely used by linguists. These tests have been widely presented in subject typology as described by Keenan and Comrie (1983) and Foley and Van Valin (1986).

Based on a set of tools used in testing subjects. The subject itself is viewed as the main part of a clause. This is emphasized in the statements of Kridalaksana (2017) and Comrie (2017) which state that the subject is part of a clause/sentence that has the form of a noun or nominal phrase that marks what is said by the speaker. The concept of subject is also often misinterpreted as semantic and pragmatic functions. In addition to Kridalaksana's (2017) opinion, other opinions about the subject are also conveyed by Palmer (2016) and Harris (2016) who state that the subject is a syntactic aspect. The subject in each clause or sentence has a very important function to make the clause or sentence perfect.

The next opinion related to the subject is presented by Verhaar (2017) and Shibatani (2016). Verhaar (2017) and Shibatani (2016) state that the subject is what is described by the verb that fills the predicate position or what experiences the event defined by the verb in its function as a predicate. Sugono (1995) states that there are four concepts regarding the subject in syntactic studies, namely (1) grammatical concept, (2) word category concept, (3) semantic concept, and (4) pragmatic conception or organization of information presentation. Subject is a grammatical concept that refers to the function of the subject in terms of syntactic structure. Subject as a word category concept refers to the function of the subject in terms of word category. Subject as a semantic concept refers to the function of the subject in terms of semantic role, and subject as a pragmatic concept refers to the function of the subject in terms of information presentation organization.

The opinion about subject is also conveyed by Wouk and Artawa (2000) who state that the subject is syntactic so that its testing must be preceded syntactically as well and not semantically. Cross-linguistically, SUBJ properties vary between one language and another. However, there are similarities in SUBJ properties, such as transitive verb arguments that behave the same as intransitive arguments. Subject is a grammatical relation so the determination of the subject itself should be based on grammatical behavior.

On the other hand, subjecthood is basically part of grammatical relations. The basic concepts of grammatical relations as proposed by (Comrie & Keenan, 1983), (Shopen, 2018) and (Blake, 2016) are referenced in this study. Grammatical relations generally discuss the elements of the subject category, direct object, and indirect object. These elements are syntactic in nature. In addition, grammatical relations also have oblique relations. So it can be concluded that grammatical relations contain SUBJ, OT, OTL and oblique relations.

Subject is the most important grammatical function occupied by a noun or noun phrase (FN) in a sentence. In intransitive clauses, the subject is the only core argument contained in the

structure. Meanwhile, in transitive clauses, the noun phrase is the argument that occupies the highest position in the hierarchy of functions (Blake, 2016).

Subject is a syntactic concept so that its proof must be done syntactically as well and not semantically (Wouk & Artawa, 2000). The universally used subject test tools have been described by (Comrie & Keenan, 1983), namely: canonical ordering of constituents, relativization, and control construction. The test tools revealed by (Comrie & Keenan, 1983) and have been used by (Budiarta, 2013) to determine the subjecthood of Kemak language.

Subject in terms of argument structure is one of the core functions alongside object (**OBJ**). Core arguments (=terms) are arguments traditionally referred to as subjects and objects (Manning, 2016). Foley and Van Valin (1986) characterize grammatical subjects or pivots as follows: (1) canonical position; (2) relativizable; (3) controllable; (4) reflexive and (5) adverbial insertion.

Based on several expert opinions related to the definition of the subject, the subject can be defined as the main component in a clause and is the component described by the predicate. This research will use the subject test tool as presented by Keenan and Comrie (1983) and Foley and Van Valin (1986). Based on the opinions of Keenan and Comrie (1983) and Foley and Van Valin (1986), this is the basis of the research on subjectivity or testing a set of tools applied to the subject of the Banjar language.

2.2 Linguistic Typology

Linguistic typology (linguistic typology) is one of the linguistic study theories and models founded on natural data and language structure systems. Thus, the principles of descriptive linguistic research and the form of research that "wins the data" become the fundamental flux of linguistic typology research. In this regard, the study of linguistic typology necessitates the creation of as-is language descriptions and the scientific explanation and interpretation of common data and information in one or multiple languages. In addition, the study of linguistic typology also takes the form of cross-language comparative studies to arrive at language typologies based on large quantities of data from diverse grammatical and grammatical systems of languages worldwide (Ketut & Jufrizal, 2018).

The technical term typology that has entered linguistics refers to the grouping of languages based on their word order and sentence structure characteristics. When compared across languages, languages can be grouped outwardly based on the boundaries of their structural characteristics. A well-known early typological study in linguistics is determining groups (groupings) of languages broadly based on several interconnected features (Mallinson & Blake, 1981). Examination of the systems and patterns of relationships between human natural languages broadly shows that there are systems and patterns of word order and sentence structure that are the same or, at least, are similar so that they can be grouped.

Among the early forms of linguistic typology study is word order typology, as done by Greenberg in 1963 (Mallinson & Blake, 1981). The results of Greenberg's typology study have shown that languages can be grouped according to the basic order of subject, object, and verb (S, O, V), with the usual order of words, such as S – V – O, V – O – S, O – V – S, and other possibilities. This initial study triggered researchers and linguistic typologists to pay more attention to the possibility of language typologies based on other grammatical characteristics across languages. Studies that examine the grammatical features and characteristics of the world's languages and then make groupings based on the similarities or similarities of these grammatical features are known in

linguistics as the study of linguistic typology (linguistic typology), which produces language typology (language typology) (Ketut & Jufrizal, 2018).

The terms linguistic and language typology are often used interchangeably, particularly by novices. This is because several reference books need to clarify the distinction explicitly. Although the terms have distinct meanings, they are closely related. On the one hand, linguistic typology refers to the theories or theoretical frameworks used in linguistics to study typology. Linguistic typology is a classification theory and research model used to categorize languages, language typology. In contrast, language typology refers to groups of languages with similar characteristics and grammatical behaviour.

This means that language typology results from linguistic data assessment based on linguistic typology theory. Linguistic typology has an understanding as a theory or theoretical framework of a form of study in linguistics which places typology as its emphasis, grouping studies (typology) in linguistics (Ketut & Jufrizal, 2018). Comrie (1989)also states that the purpose of typological linguistics is to classify languages based on the structural properties of the language. Its main purpose is to answer the question: What is language x like? There are two main assumptions of typological linguistics: (a) all languages can be compared based on their structure, and (b) there are differences between the existing languages.

Song (2020) explains that besides the differences between extant languages, they must share specific behavioral characteristics to be considered human languages. All human languages must share specific fundamental units. In this regard, a group of linguists is specifically interested in discovering this fundamental unity by analyzing the numerous structural variations of languages on Earth. Linguists with this designation are linguistic typologists (linguistic typologists) or typologists (typologists). Their discovery of cross-linguistic variation is referred to as language typology, or for brief, typology. The primary objective of the study of linguistic typology is to discover similarities or similarities in the grammatical behavior of different languages by comparing extant patterns of language structure.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This research employed a qualitative methodology. Creswell (2010) defines a qualitative approach as "a strategy for investigating and comprehending individual or group meanings derived from social or human problems." According to Mahsun (2005), the outcome of qualitative research design is a narrative report that explains the participants' social reality. According to the preceding explanation, qualitative research is a research design involving the exploration of informant perspectives and the analysis of data to comprehend human and social behaviour in specific situations.

3.2 Participants

Respondents are Banjar individuals at least 18 years of age. They have a variety of genders, levels of education, native languages (L1), and places of residence. Similarly, the utterances used as data for this study were collected directly from the participants.

3.3 Instruments

According to Zaim (2014), the most prevalent data collection techniques in qualitative research are observation, interview, and document analysis. The study of the subjectivity of the Banjar language entails collecting data via multiple methods (observation and interview).

The primary method for collecting data in qualitative research is observation. The observation method employs recording techniques for pronouncing terms from a word list. Interviewing is another method. According to Zaim (2014), Interviews are used to collect data about people's opinions, beliefs, and feelings about situations on their terms. Interviews can provide information that cannot be gained through observation alone. Additionally, interviews can be used to validate observations. According to Creswell's (2010) assertion, qualitative research entails unstructured and typically open-ended inquiries.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis is the initial stage following the collection of all data. Data analysis is the phase of qualitative research that is both the most complex and vital. According to Mahsun (2005), data analysis in qualitative research entails understanding the phenomenon being studied, synthesising information and explaining relationships, theorising about how and why relationships emerge as they do, and connecting new knowledge to what is already known.

The distributional method was used for analysis in this study. Sudaryanto (2017) explains that the agih method is then followed by the direct element technique as the primary technique for employing the agih method. After the direct element technique, the permutation technique is the next-level technique utilised. In conclusion, the author interprets and explains the findings regarding subjecthood in the Banjar language.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Canonical Order of Constituents

The subject test tools used in this study are those described by (Comrie & Keenan, 1983), namely: canonical order of constituents, relativization, and control construction. Canonical order deals with the prevalent position of subject presence in a language. Relativization discusses the relativization process used as one of the subject testing tools, and control constructions relate to the controls applied as subject testing tools.

The first subject test tool presented by (Comrie & Keenan, 1983) is the canonical order. Canonical order itself is the position of SUBJ that is generally present in a sentence. The canonical structure of the Banjar language has an S-V-O pattern. The canonical structure illustrates that SUBJ in Banjar is present in the preverbal position or before the predicate. The following example illustrates the presence of SUBJ before the predicate in an intransitive verb sentence.

1. *Mama guring*
   Mom sleeps
   'mom sleeps'

2. *Inya bukah ka lapangan*
   3S run Prep Field
   'He run to the field'

The clauses above show that the canonical structure of Banjar intransitive clauses introduces the SUBJ function in the position preceding the intransitive verb or pre-verbal. In clause (1), the constituent *mama* occupies the subject function before the intransitive verb *guring*. In clause (2), the subject function is occupied by the constituent *Inya* present before the intransitive verb *bukah,* and the constituent *ka* field occupies the adverbial function because the presence of the verb *bukah* does not require the presence of an object. In clause (2) also has an adverb function filled by the constituent *ka lapangan.*

The canonical subject structure can also be applied to transitive verb clauses. Transitive clauses in Banjar consist of transitive clauses and bitransitive clauses. An transitive clause is a clause whose predicate contains one verb that requires the presence of one object, while a bitransitive clause is a clause whose predicate contains one verb that requires the presence of two objects in its construction. The following is an example of a transitive clause in Banjar.

3. *Kakak maanggung kursi*
    Brother lift chair
    'Brother lift chair'

The example above indicates that the canonical subject structure in Banjar can be applied to transitive verb clauses. In clause (3), the subject is filled with the constituent *kakak,* which comes before the transitive verb *maanggung,* while the object in the clause is the constituent *chair.* The clause above is called a transitive verb clause because the predicate *maanggung* is a verb category that requires an object, so it is called a transitive verb. The example above is a transitive verb clause because it requires an object. Predicates with verb categories that require more than two objects are called bi-transitive verbs. The examples of transitive predicate clauses are as follows.

4. *Ulun mambariakan ading ulun baju*
    1S give sister Poss shirt
    'I give my sister shirt'

5. *Abah manukarakan ading mainan*
    Father buy sister toy
    'Father bought sister a toy'

The two examples above show that the canonical position of the subject is still at the beginning of the clause. In clause (4), the subject of the clause is filled by the constituent *ulun,* followed by the verb *mambariakan* as a bitransitive verb. The verb *mambariakan* requires the presence of an object occupied by the constituents *ading* and *baju* as objects. In clause (4), the direct object function is occupied by the constituent *baju*, while the constituent *ading* occupies the indirect object function. In clause (5), the subject of the clause is occupied by the element *Abah* followed by the verb *manukarakan* as a bitransitive verb that requires two objects, namely *ading* and *mainan*. In clause (5), it can be seen that the *mainan* constituent occupies the direct object function while the *ading* constituent occupies the indirect object function.

In addition to predicates that can be filled with verbs, the Banjar language can also be filled with predicates other than verbs. Intransitive clauses with predicates other than verbs can be seen in the examples below.

6. *Muha kakak ulun bungas*
   Face Poss Sister Beautiful
   'My Sister's face is beautiful'

7. *Ninik di dalam kamar*
   Grand ma Prep room
   'Grandma in the room'

8. *Acil ulun petani*
   Aunt Poss farmer
   'My aunt is farmer'

These clauses show that the canonical structure of Banjar's non-verb predicate clauses presents the SUBJ function in the position before the predicate with a word class other than verbs or non-verbs. In clause (6), the constituent *muha kakak ulun* occupies the subject function, which comes before the predicate with the adjectival word class *bungas*. In clause (7), the subject function is occupied by the constituent *ninik* coming before the predicate with the adverbial class *di dalam kamar*. In clause (8), the subject function is occupied by the constituent *acil ulun* coming before the predicate with the noun class *farmer*. From the clause examples above, it can be concluded that Banjar's canonical structure or position is before the predicate with the category of verb, noun, adjective or adverb. In Banjar, the subject positions are all on the left at the beginning of the clause.

Based on the analysis above, the subject test tool in the form of the canonical structure of the subject in Banjar is at the beginning of the clause or sentence. This indicates that the subject in Banjar is a noun or noun phrase present at the beginning of a clause or sentence and is a preverb. This is also in line with the thoughts of Keenan and Comrie (1983) regarding the cross-linguistic canonical structure of subjects.

4.2 Relativization

The second test tool used to test subjecthood in Banjar is relativization. Relativity is one of the strategies used to test subjectivity in a language. This strategy or method tests whether an argument is a subject. It shows that not all languages can relativize their grammatical alliances. English, for example, is one of the languages that can experience the relativization process in all its grammatical relations. Unlike English, some languages can only relativize subjects (Comrie & Keenan, 1983).

To get an idea of the patterns and strategies of subject relativization or subjecthood in Banjar, examples of clauses that undergo the relativization process in Banjar will be given as follows.

9. *Kai guring di tilam*
   Grandfather sleep Prep mattress
   'Grandfather sleeping on the mattress'

10. *Kai nang guring di tilam*
    Grandfather REL sleep Prep mattress
    'Grandfather who sleeps on the mattress'

11. *Kai guring nang di tilam*
    Grandfather sleep REL Prep mattress
    'Grandfather sleeps who on the mattress'

The clauses above show the patterns and strategies of subject relativization and subjecthood in Banjar. Clause (9) shows that the constituent kai is the element that occupies the subject position. The intransitive verb in the clause is occupied by the constituent *guring*, followed by an adverbial function filled by the constituent *di tilam*. In clause (10), there is a relativizing element filled with the element *nang* to prove that relativization can be applied to the subject function of *kai*. Clause (11) is proof that relativization in Banjar can only be applied to the subject function because relativization applied to functions other than the subject is not acceptable in Banjar.

Based on the data analysis above, it can be concluded that applying the subjectivity test in the form of relativization in Banjar is always characterized by the form *nang* as a relative marker in Banjar clauses. This has similarities with the concept of the test tool for subjectivity in the form of relativization presented by Keenan and Comrie (1983).

4.3 Control

Control is the third testing device used in Banjar to evaluate subject or subjecthood. The following are examples of clauses in Banjar that have control in them.

12. *Kami disuruh malala nyiur samalam*
    3P tell make coconut oil yesterday'
    'We were told make coconut oil yesterday'

13. *Kami disuruh [_____ malala nyiur samalam]*
    3P tell make coconut oil yesterday'
    'We were told make coconut oil yesterday'

14. *Kami disuruh [_____ nyiur malala samalam]*
    3P tell coconut oil make yesterday'
    'We were told coconut oil make yesterday'

The clausal examples above show how the subject control strategy of the Banjar language works. Clause (12) shows a simple clause where our constituent occupies the subject function. The constituents told and *malala* occupy the predicate function, followed by the object function of *nyiur* and the time description *samalam*.

The control strategy in the clause above is applied to the subject function. It shows that the subject of embedded verbs can be controlled, like in clause (13). However, control over arguments other than SUBJ needs to be grammatical in Banjar. This is shown in the example of clause (14). Clause (12) shows that our argument can be controlled. It shows that the subject of the embedded verb can be controlled. However, control of arguments other than SUBJ is not grammatical in Banjar language in the example of clause (14).

Based on the analysis above, it can be concluded that applying the control test in Banjar always results in a co-reference between the subject of the main clause and the subject of the controlled embedded verb. This follows Keenan and Comrie's (1983) opinion about the subject-control test tool that has been tested cross-linguistically.

4.4 Adverbial Insertion

In addition to using the subject parameters presented by (Comrie & Keenan, 1983), the subject test tools that can be used in testing Banjar language subjects are adverbial insertion and reflexivity. All three subject test tools can be applied to Banjar language subjects.

Adverbial insertion is one of the standard subject test tools applied to subjects in various languages. However, adverbial insertion cannot be applied to all language types. One of the language types that can use the adverbial insertion test is Kemak. Like the Kemak language, the adverbial insertion subject test tool can be applied to the Banjar language. The application of adverbial insertion in Banjar clauses is as follows.

15. *Inya samalam tulak maunjun*
    3S yesterday go fishing
    'He went fishing yesterday

16. *Inya isuk bakunyung di sungai*
    3S tomorrow swim Prep river
    'He swims in the river tomorrow'

Clause (15) shows the position of *samalam* as an adverbial placed between the subject and predicate, which is a verb. The insertion of an adverbial in the form of the constituent *samalam* between the constituents inya as the subject and *tulak maunjun* as the predicate is still acceptable in the clause. Similarly, clause (16) shows that the adverbial position is placed between the subject and predicate in the form of verbs, namely the constituents *inya* and *bakunyung*. The insertion of an adverbial between the subject and predicate is still acceptable in Banjar. The constituent *inya* occupies the subject of the clause (16), and the constituent *bakunyung* occupies the predicate. It is inserted with a time-marking adverbial form in the form of the constituent *isuk*, which is then completed with a place-marking adverbial form *in the river*.

Based on the clause examples above, it can be concluded that adverbial insertion in Banjar is after the subject and before the predicate with a verb category. In Banjar, the subject positions are all on the left at the beginning of the clause before the adverbial insertion. This aligns with Keenan and Comrie's (1983) statement regarding a cross-linguistic test tool for subjecthood with adverbial insertions. A similar test tool has also been used in Kemak by Budiarta (2013).

4.5 Reflexive Test

The following test tool, as one of the subject testing tools in the Banjar language, is the reflexive test. An agent is an element that functions as a reflexive controller. English is one of the languages that place the agent or doer as the controller of the noun phrase. Besides English, Balinese is also one language that places the agent as a reflexive controller (Wouk & Artawa, 2000). Artawa (2020) also adds that the agent being the controller of reflexive is a general truth. An example of reflexive application in Banjar language clauses is as follows.

17. *Inya mandabau diri sorang*
    3S hit himself
    'He hit himself

18. *Ulun manyipak diri sorang*
    1S kick myself
    'I kick myself'

Based on the examples of clauses above, Banjar clauses can be tested for subjecthood using the reflexive strategy. Clause (17) shows that the constituent *inya* occupies the subject function, and the constituent *mandabau* present fills the predicate function. The reflexive form of clause (17) is expressed as *diri sorang* controlled by the subject. Clause (18) shows that the constituent *ulun* occupies the subject function, and the constituent *manyipak* occupies the predicate function. The reflexivity of clause (18) is expressed as *diri sorang*, just like clause (17).

The agent in the reflexive clause examples above has the nature of the subject grammatical relation because the agent in the reflexive clause that fills the subject position is the only preverbal argument contained in the reflexive clause that plays a role in controlling the reflexive form.

Based on the data above, the conclusion is that the agent present is a constituent that acts as a subject because the reflexive process only presents one agent with a function as a subject. This aligns with Keenan and Comrie's (1983) statement regarding the cross-linguistic test of reflexive subjectivity.

5. DISCUSSION

Subjecthood is one part of the analysis of syntactic functions. This is evident from the way to analyze and describe the forms of the subject, and the subject test tool is entirely a syntactic analysis complemented by a review of linguistic typology. The study of subjectivity still needs to be carried out on languages in Indonesia, even though the benefits of this subject analysis are the basis for determining syntactic functions in a language.

The determination of subject or Subjecthood in Banjar uses five methods presented by Comrie & Keenan (1983): canonical ordering of constituents, relativization, and control construction. In addition, adverbial insertion and reflexive tests are also included in the Banjar subject test to strengthen the subject's position in Banjar so that the subject's position in Banjar becomes very clear in a clause or sentence.

The first tool of the subject test is the canonical order in Banjar which is at the beginning of the clause or sentence. This indicates that the subject in Banjar is a noun or noun phrase that comes at the beginning of a clause or sentence and is a preverb. This is also in line with the thoughts of Keenan and Comrie (1983) regarding the canonical structure of subjects across languages. The second subject test tool is that the form nang always characterizes relativization in Banjar as a relative marker in Banjar clauses. This has similarities with the concept of the subjectivity test tool in the form of relativization presented by Keenan and Comrie (1983).

Banjar's third subject test tool controls always produce a coreference between the subject of the main clause and the subject of the controlled embedded verb. This follows Keenan and Comrie's (1983) opinion about the subject-control test tool, which has been tested cross-linguistically. The fourth subject test tool is the insertion of adverbs in the Banjar language after the subject and before the predicate with the verb category. In Banjar, the subject positions are all on the left at the beginning of the clause before the adverbial insertion. This aligns with Keenan and Comrie's (1983) statement regarding the cross-linguistic test of adverbial insertion. The fifth subject test tool is a reflexive process that only presents one agent that functions as a subject. This is in line with Keenan and Comrie's (1983) statement regarding the cross-linguistic test of subjecthood.

Based on the research results found in this study, there are differences between this study and several studies conducted by Aritonang (2018) and Budiarta (2016). Aritonang (2018) conducted research entitled "Subject Property of Tetum Language". The research discusses several test tools on the subject in the Tetum language. The difference between the subject test tool in this research and the research conducted by Aritonang (2018) is that the test tool applied in Aritonang's (2018) research is the subject in the Tetum language can focus the subject with the existence of 'ne' focus affixes 'yang'. In addition, the difference in the test tool Aritonang (2018) used is that the Tetum language subject can be raised from direct and indirect object to subject through a raising mechanism. This research does not use the two test tools used by Aritonang (2018), which is the fundamental difference between this research and the research conducted by Aritonang (2018).

In addition, this study also has differences from the research conducted by Budiarta (2016). The research conducted by Budiarta (2016). entitled "Subject characteristics of The Kemak language in Belu Regency, East Nusa Tenggara" The research conducted by Budiarta (2016) explains the subject test properties used and differences with the subject test tools used in this study. The research conducted by Budiarta (2016). uses the assertion test in applying the Kemak language subject test tool and using quantifier float as one of the subject test tools. The research conducted by Budiarta (2016). uses typology theory. This is also one of the similarities between this research and Budiarta's (2016) research.

6. CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, several things have been successfully revealed in this study that the Banjar language subject test tool has five types: canonical structure, relativization, control, adverbial insertion and reflection. The five types of subject test tools have all been in accordance with the linguistic typology used in testing subjects universally.

This research also proves that universal subject testing sometimes works in some languages. Banjar language uses five types of subject test tools universally in language and based on linguistic typology. Language universal subject tools can be used according to the type of language that is the object of research, so before determining the subject tool in testing a subject, it is necessary to know the type of language that is the object of the language.

7. REFERENCES

Aritonang, B. (2018). Properti Subjek Bahasa Tetum Dialek Foho di Desa Nanaet Dubessi, Kabupaten Belu, Provinsi NTT. *Gramatika: Jurnal Ilmiah Kebahasaan Dan Kesastraan, 6*(2), 100–110.

Arka, I. W. (2003). *Balinese Morphosyntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach.* Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The ....

Basaria, I. (2018). Relasi Gramatikal Subjek Bahasa Pakpak Dairi: Kajian Tipologi. *Talenta Conference Series: Local Wisdom, Social, and Arts (LWSA), 1*(1), 49–58.

Blake, B. (2016). *Relational Grammar.* Routledge.

Budiarta, I. W. (2013). Tipologi Sintaksis Bahasa Kemak. *Disertasi. Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.*

Budiarta, I. W. (2016). Perilaku Subjek dalam Bahasa Kemak Kabupaten Belu Nusa Tenggara

Timur. *LITERA, 15*(1).

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals And Linguistic Typology: Syntax And Morphology.* University of Chicago press.

Comrie, B. (2017). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology.* University of Chicago press.

Comrie, B., & Keenan, E. L. (1983). Noun Phrase Accessibility Revisited. *Language, 55*(3), 649. https://doi.org/10.2307/413321

Creswell, J. W. (2010). Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed. *Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.*

Culicover, P. W. (2017). *Principles and Parameters: An Introduction to Syntactic Theory.* Oxford University Press.

E., D., Foley, W. A., & Van Valin, R. D. (1986). Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 192. https://doi.org/10.2307/327353

Fathonah, S., & Romadhan, A. D. (2021). Active and Passive Voice In Bulungan Language. *Rainbow: Journal of Literature, Linguistics and Culture Studies, 10*(2), 96–105.

Harahap, A. L. (2019). Kesubjekan Dalam Bahasa Batak Angkola: Ancangan Tipologi. *Red: Revolution of English Department Journal, 3*(2).

Harris, A. C., & Campbell, L. (2016). *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective* (Issue 74). Cambridge University Press.

Jae, J. S. (2020). *Tipologi Linguistik: Morfologi dan Sintaksis.* Udayana University Press.

Ketut, A., & Jufrizal. (2018). *Tipologi Linguistik: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya.* Pustaka Larasan.

Kridalaksana, H. (2017). *Kamus Linguistik (Edisi Keempat).* Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Mahsun, M. S. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan Strategi, Metode dan Tekniknya.* PT RajaGrafindo Persada.

Mallinson, G., & Blake, B. J. (1981). Language typology: Cross-Linguistic Studies in Syntax. In *North-Holland Publishing Company.* North-Holland Publishing Company.

Manning, C. D. (2016). *Voice and Grammatical Relations in Indonesian : A New Perspective Voice and Grammatical Relations in Indonesian : A New Perspective University of Sydney The University of Queensland , Brisbane Mirriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (Editors). 4*(June).

Palmer. (2016). *Grammatical Roles and Relations.* Cambridge University Press.

Romadhan, A. D. (2022). Subjek dan Oblik Bahasa Tidung. *Cakrawala Linguista, 5*(2), 70–78.

Romadhan, A. D., Hakim, L., Selia, A. K. W., Ekasani, K. A., Wuarlela, M., Hiariej, C., Janggo, W. O., Kami, P., Raja, F. D., & Susanti, R. (2023). *Pengantar Linguistik Umum.* CV. Intelektual Manifes Media.

Romadhan, A. D., & Sari, R. K. (2021). Subjecthood In Punan Tebunyau Language: Kesubjekan Bahasa Punan Tebunyau. *Jurnal Kata: Penelitian Tentang Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra, 5*(2), 224–234.

Shibatani, M., & Bynon, T. (2016). *Approaches to Language Typology.* Clarendon Press.

Shopen, T. (2018). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Volume 3* (Vol. 3). Cambridge University Press.

Sudaryanto. (2017). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa.* Sanata Dharma University Press.

Sugono, D. (1995). *Pelesapan Subjek Bahasa Indonesia.* Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Verhaar. (2017). *Pengantar Linguistik Umum.* Gadjah Mada University Press.

Wouk, F., & Artawa, I. K. (2000). Ergativity and Balinese Syntax. *Oceanic Linguistics, 39*(1), 212. https://doi.org/10.2307/3623225

Zaim, M. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Pendekatan Struktural.* UNP Press.