

Revisiting Crossed Control in Indonesian

Helen Jeoung
jeoung@sas.upenn.edu
ISMIL-22 at UCLA, May 11-12, 2018

1 Introduction

Crossed control (CC) in Indonesian is illustrated below (also called funny or backward control):^{1,2}

- (1) Siti mau di-cium oleh ibu.
Siti want PV-kiss by mother
a. ‘Siti wants to be kissed by Mother.’ TYPICAL READING
b. ! ‘Mother wants to kiss Siti.’ CROSSED READING
- (2) Anggota gang itu coba di-tangkap oleh polisi.
member gang that try PV-catch by police
a. ‘The gang members tried to be caught by police.’ TYPICAL READING
b. ! ‘The police tried to catch the gang members.’ CROSSED READING

Crossed control sentences are reported to have two readings:

- a TYPICAL: Subject = Experiencer of matrix V + Theme of passive V
Oblique argument = Agent of passive V
- a CROSSED: Subject = Theme of passive V
Oblique argument = ! Experiencer of matrix V + Agent of passive V

Components of crossed control sentences:

Siti		mau		di-cium		(oleh ibu)
Subject DP	+	CC predicate	+	passive V	+	PP

Previous work on crossed control is mainly in Malay/Indonesian:

- Varied analyses for Indonesian and/or Malay: Kaswanti Purwo 1984, Sneddon 1996, Gil 2002, Nomoto 2008, 2011, Nomoto and Wahab 2012, Potsdam and Polinsky 2008, Sato and Kitada 2012, Arka 2014
- Polinsky and Potsdam 2008: CC data with ‘want’ in Javanese, Tagalog, Malagasy, Tukang Besi, Tongan, Samoan (Austronesian)
- This talk: I will focus on Indonesian data; judgments are from consultants who speak varieties of Indonesian prevalent in East Java and Jakarta

¹Thank you to my Indonesian consultants: Dina Maria, Iline Megale, Isya Mahfud, Maimuna and Nadhilah H. Semendawai. This research was partly funded by a Teece Dissertation Fellowship from the Univ. of Pennsylvania.

²Abbreviations: AV=active voice, Cop=copula, OV=object voice, PV=passive voice, Redup=reduplication, Rel=relative morpheme

2 So what’s new? – revisiting crossed readings

I revisit crossed control in Indonesian by

- (i) investigating semantic (and structural) ambiguity in CC predicates;
- (ii) re-examining the significance of crossed readings;
- (iii) developing diagnostics to tease apart verbal vs. modal/auxiliary uses of CC predicates

PROPOSAL

- Ambiguity: CC predicates can either occur as verb OR modal/auxiliary
- The semantics of the modal/auxiliary is compatible with two apparent “readings”
- The “crossed” reading is illusory; an Oblique argument does not become Experiencer of matrix V

3 A closer look at Indonesian CC

- **Crossed reading = Semantic equivalence with active clause.** If a CC sentence allows the “crossed” reading, it means that the sentence is judged semantically equivalent (\approx) to an active sentence with CC predicate, in which the Agent argument occurs as Subject:

- (3) Pemain Arema mau/suka di-tonton [_{PP} oleh **supporter-nya**].
player Arema want/like PV-watch by supporters-Poss
 \approx **Supporter-nya** mau/suka men-onton pemain Arema. (Equivalence in Indonesian)
 \approx **Supporter** yang mau/suka men-onton pemain Arema.
! ‘The supporters want/like to watch Arema players.’ (Equivalence in English)

→ This equivalence is taken to mean that Oblique argument controls the matrix V, and/or receives an Experiencer θ -role from matrix V

→ But how reliable is this equivalence?

- **CC predicates in Indonesian.** The set of CC predicates is not well defined, and can vary between speakers of the same variety of Indonesian. My consultants accepted two distinct readings for the following set of predicates:³

mau ‘want’

coba ‘try’

suka ‘like’

berhasil ‘succeed’

gagal ‘fail’

Nomoto (2008, 2011): CC predicates have to do with modality

- **MeN- prefix does not allow crossed reading.** For CC predicates can take voice affixes, e.g. *men-coba* ‘try,’ *meny-uka-i* ‘like,’ crossed readings are only available without the active prefix *meN-*.

- (4) Anggota gang itu **men-coba** di-tangkap oleh polisi.
member gang that AV-try PV-catch by police
a. ‘The gang members tried to be caught by police.’
b. ! ‘The police tried to catch the gang members.’

³Polinsky and Potsdam (2008) discuss CC with both *mau* and *ingin* ‘want, wish’ but my consultants do not accept the crossed reading with *ingin*. Nomoto (2008) lists approximately 20 predicates for Malay/Indonesian, including those listed above.

In contrast, *ber-* and *ter-* allow a crossed reading:

- (5) Anggota gang itu **ber-hasil**/gagal di-tangkap oleh polisi.
member gang that MV-succeed/fail PV-catch by police
a. ‘The gang members succeeded/failed to be caught by police.’
b. ! ‘The police succeeded/failed to catch the gang members.’

• **Inanimate subjects** have been reported to force a crossed reading:

- (6) TV suka di-tonton oleh anak-anak.
TV like PV-watch by child-Redup
a. # ‘The TV likes to be watched by children.’
b. ! ‘Children like to watch TV.’ (≈ Anak-anak yang suka menonton.)

However, the typical reading is judged possible:

≈ **TV** yang suka di-tonton.

‘It is the TV that likes to be watched.’

- (7) Junk food adalah makanan yang paling suka di-beli banyak orang.
junk food Cop food Rel most like PV-buy many person
≈ **Junk food** suka dibeli banyak orang
‘Junk food likes to be bought by many people.’

• **Crossed reading with indefinite/generic Agent in PP.**

- (8) hal-hal yang suka di-pamerkan orang
things Rel like PV-show.off person
! ‘things that people like to show off’ (≈ hal-hal yang orang suka pameran)

• **Crossed reading without PP.** Control by a silent argument?

- (9) Siti mau di-cium.
Siti want PV-kiss
! ‘Someone wants to kiss Siti.’ (≈ Ada orang yang mau mencium Siti.)

• **Crossed readings with negation.**

- (10) Siti tidak mau di-cium oleh Ibu.
Siti Neg want PV-kiss by Mother
! ‘Mother does not want to kiss Siti.’

• **Two readings also available in Object voice** (or *pasif semu*, bare active, Passive type II, Objective voice, pro-V clause). Just as in CC, note that the Agent argument, which must immediately precede a bare verb, appears to control the predicate to its left (backward control):

- (11) Ayah coba ku-obati.
father try 1SG-treat

- a. ‘Father tried to be medically treated by me.’
 - b. ! ‘I tried to medically treat Father.’ (Arka 2014, ex 23)
- (12) Beliau tidak mau saya wawancarai.
3SG.Pol Neg want 1SG interview
- a. ‘He doesn’t want to be interviewed by me.’
 - b. ! ‘I don’t want to interview him.’ (Sneddon 1996:271)

→ Between the subject (Theme) and the Agent in an Object voice clause, only **modals** and **aspectual auxiliaries** may occur: *bisa, harus, mesti, sudah, telah, akan* etc. (Arka and Manning 1998, Arka 2002, 2003, Cole et al. 2008, Yanti 2010 among others.)

4 Ambiguity in CC predicates

I propose that CC predicates are ambiguous: these may occur as verb or auxiliary/modal:⁴

- **Verb.** Structural position = head V; transitive forms take either a nominal or verbal complement

- (13) Aku mau nasi goreng.
1SG want fried rice
‘I want fried rice.’
- (14) Anak-anak suka es krim.
child-Redup like ice cream
‘Children like ice cream.’

- **Auxiliary/modal.** Structural position higher than V, in AuxP; takes a verbal complement

- (15) Aku mau rapat di sekolah.
1SG will meet at school
‘I will attend/I am about to attend a meeting at school.’
- (16) Anak-anak suka men-angis.
child-Redup often AV-cry
‘Children often cry.’

Cf. English: This doorknob *likes* to break. *like* \approx has propensity for

- The verbal use of the CC predicate is compatible with *meN-* (for verbs that take this prefix); auxiliaries and modals cannot be prefixed with *meN-* (Sneddon et al. 2012).

⁴Cf. Fukuda (2007) for discussion of lexical ambiguity vs. structural difference for modals and auxiliaries.

This ambiguity corresponds to semantic differences, listed in Table 1:

	verb	modal/auxiliary
<i>mau</i>	‘want’	‘about to, will’ FUTURE
<i>coba</i>	‘try’	‘can, could’; ‘let’s see’ (Sneddon 1996:330) POSSIBILITY, ABILITY
<i>suka</i>	‘like’	‘often’ FREQUENCY
<i>berhasil</i>	‘succeed’ (intransitive)	‘has (resulted in)’ COMPLETIVE
<i>gagal</i>	‘fail’ (intransitive)	‘has not, (has failed to)’ INCOMPLETIVE

Table 1: Crossed control predicates in Indonesian

- Modals = sentential Operators that have to do with NECESSITY, POSSIBILITY and ABILITY.
- Aspectual auxiliaries = encode how an event or state unfolds.
 - Modals and auxiliaries are semantically compatible with **both** embedded active clauses and embedded passive clauses.
- 3 readings for crossed control sentences:
 1. Verbal use of the forms in Table 1 → TYPICAL READING
 2. Modal/auxiliary: TYPICAL READING with embedded active;
 3. Modal/auxiliary: CROSSED READING with embedded passive
- Another look at CC sentences, with the 3 readings (N.B. the (c) readings are the so-called “crossed control” readings)
 - (17) Siti mau di-cium oleh ibu.
Siti want PV-kiss by mother
 - a. ‘Siti *wants* to be kissed by Mother.’
 - b. ‘Siti is *about to* be kissed by Mother.’
 - c. ! ‘Mother is *about to* kiss Siti.’
 - (18) Anggota gang itu coba di-tangkap oleh polisi.
member gang that try PV-catch by police
 - a. ‘The gang members *tried* to be caught by police.’
 - b. ‘The gang members *could/may* be caught by police.’
 - c. ! ‘The police *could/may* catch the gang members.’
 - (19) Pemain Arema suka di-tonton [*PP* oleh **supporter-nya**].
player Arema want/like PV-watch by supporters-Poss
 - a. ‘The Arema players *like* to be watched by their supporters.’
 - b. ‘The Arema players are *often* watched by their supporters.’
 - c. ! ‘Their supporters *often* watch the Arema players.’

- (20) Anggota gang itu **ber-hasil** di-tangkap oleh polisi.
 member gang that MV-succeed PV-catch by police
 a. ‘The gang members *succeeded* to be caught by police.’
 b. ‘The gang members *have been* caught by police.’
 c. ! ‘The police *have* caught the gang members.’
- (21) Anggota gang itu **gagal** di-tangkap oleh polisi.
 member gang that fail PV-catch by police
 a. ‘The gang members *failed* to be caught by police.’
 b. ‘The gang members *have not been* caught by police.’
 c. ! ‘The police *have not* caught the gang members.’
- (22) Inanimate subjects - note that the typical reading is out because an inanimate subject is incompatible with the verb *suka*, but the reading in (b) remains:
 Junk food adalah makanan yang paling suka di-beli banyak orang.
 junk food Cop food Rel most like PV-buy many person
 a. ~~‘Junk food is the food that *most likes* to be bought by people.’~~
 b. ‘Junk food is the food that is *most often* bought by people.’
 c. ! ‘Junk food is the food that people *most often* buy.’

- CC sentences always involve an embedded passive with Agent PP → Agent is naturally interpreted as having agency or intent → Results in illusory crossed control

5 Diagnostics

Structural diagnostic. Auxiliaries and modals can occur before the Agent in an Object voice clause.

- The set of CC predicates that allows the crossed reading corresponds to the set that occurs in Object voice; non-CC predicates are disallowed in the same position.

- (23) Ayah coba/mau ku-obati.
 father could/will 1SG-treat
 ‘I could/will treat Father.’
- (24) Promosi gagal ku-dapat.
 promotion INCOMPLETEIVE 1SG-get
 ‘I have not gotten a promotion.’
- (25) jawaban yang berhasil ku-dapat
 reply Rel COMPLETEIVE 1SG-get
 ‘the reply that I have gotten’

Semantic diagnostics.

- Continuations.

- (26) Inanimate subject - Typical reading ruled out
 TV suka di-tonton oleh anak-anak... #(walaupun anak-anak jarang menonton.)
 TV like/often PV-watch by child-Redup although child-Redup rarely AV-watch
 a. ~~‘The TV likes to be watched by children... although they rarely watch.’~~

- b. ‘The TV is often watched by the children... although they rarely watch.’
- c. ‘The children often watch the TV... although they rarely watch.’

- Conjunctions.

- (27) Siti mau di-cium oleh Ibu... dan oleh Tono juga.
 Siti want/will PV-kiss by Mother and by Tono also
- a. ‘Siti wants to be kissed by Mother... and by Tono also.’ ✓
 - b. ‘Siti is about to be kissed by Mother... and by Tono also.’ ✓
 - c. ‘Mother is about to kiss Siti... and Tono is about to also.’ ✓

6 Summary

- Modals and auxiliaries are not controlled – thus cross control is neither an issue of control nor unusual thematic roles.
- “Crossed” readings are somewhat illusory, arising from an ambiguity in the first predicate. The verbal use of the predicate gives rise to a typical reading. The modal/auxiliary use is compatible with either an embedded passive or active clause.
- For further research: ambiguity in CC predicates in Malay, and other Austronesian languages?

References

- Arka, I Wayan. 2002. Voice systems in the Austronesian languages of Nusantara: Typology, symmetry and undergoer orientation. URL <http://hdl.handle.net/1885/41058>.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2003. Balinese Morphosyntax: A Lexical-functional Approach. The Australian National University.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2014. Double and backward control in Indonesian: An LFG analysis. In Proceedings of LFG14.
- Arka, I Wayan, and Christopher Manning. 1998. On the three subjects in Indonesian: Evidence from binding. In On-line Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference, <http://web.stanford.edu/group/cslipublications/cslipublications/LFG/LFG3-1998/lfg98arkamanning.pdf>. CSLI Publications.
- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, and Yanti. 2008. Voice in Malay/Indonesian. Lingua 118:1500–1553.
- Fukuda, Shin. 2007. On the control/raising ambiguity with aspectual verbs: A structural account. In Studies in Complement Control, ed. Barbara Stiebels, 159–195. Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Typologie und Universalienforschung.
- Gil, David. 2002. The prefixes di- and N- in Malay/Indonesian dialects. In The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems, ed. Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 241–283. Pacific Linguistics.
- Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1984. Deiksis dalam Bahasa Indonesia. Balai Pustaka.
- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2008. A unified analysis of funny control. Paper presented at the 12th International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics (ISMIL).
- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2011. Analisis seragam bagi kawalan lucu. In Isamu Shoho: Tinta Kenangan ‘Kumpulan Esei Bahasa dan Linguistik’, ed. Hiroki Nomoto, Zaharani Ahmad, and Anwar Ridhwan, 44–91. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

- Nomoto, Hiroki, and Kartini Abd. Wahab. 2012. Kena passives in Malay, funny control and covert voice alternation. Oceanic Linguistics 51:360–386.
- Polinsky, Maria, and Eric Potsdam. 2008. The syntax and semantics of wanting in Indonesian. Lingua 118:1617–1639.
- Potsdam, Eric, and Maria Polinsky. 2008. A unified analysis of funny control. Paper presented at ISMIL12 Leiden, the Netherlands.
- Sato, Yosuke, and Shin-Ichi Kitada. 2012. Successive feature inheritance, theta-features and the crossed-control construction in Standard Indonesian. URL <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001523>.
- Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar. Routledge.
- Sneddon, James Neil, Alexander Adelaar, Dwi N. Djenar, and Michael Ewing. 2012. Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar. Routledge.
- Yanti. 2010. A Reference Grammar of Jambi Malay. Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware.