Categorial ambiguity in *mau, suka* and other Indonesian predicates

1 Introduction[1,2]

This paper discusses the Indonesian predicates *mau* 'want' and *suka* 'like.' These morphemes can occur as the sole predicate of a clause, or can also be immediately followed by a verb. Although some recent literature assumes that *mau* and *suka* belong to the category of verbs, I revisit a previously observed property of *mau/suka,* which is that these can occur as auxiliary-like morphemes. I show that *mau/suka* can occur in syntactic environments that allow auxiliaries but not verbs, and furthermore that two interpretations arise when *mau/suka* is followed by a verb. This is taken as evidence that *mau* and *suka* are lexically ambiguous between the categories V and Aux; when these morphemes occur as the main verb in a clause they occupy the structural position of V, but when they occur as Aux, they occur in a different position in the extended verbal structure.

The first aim of this paper is to describe the systematic availability of two interpretations for lexically ambiguous elements such as *mau* and *suka*, which supports the proposal that these can occur as either verb or auxiliary. I also develop diagnostics for determining that a verb may also occur as an auxiliary in Indonesian. One implication of this discussion is that *mau* and *suka* participate in a phenomenon called crossed control. While crossed control has been observed in Indonesian and Malay (varieties of the same language), it is unexpected from a cross-linguistic standpoint, and presents challenges to current theoretical frameworks. The lexical ambiguity proposed here, which is language-specific, brings a new perspective to potential analyses of crossed control sentences, and potentially expands the set of Indonesian verbs that are lexically ambiguous like *mau* and *suka.*

2 Previous observations

That *mau* 'want and *suka* 'like' occur as verbs is uncontroversial; these morphemes can appear as the sole predicate of a clause. In these cases, I refer to *mau/suka* as a main verb or main V.

(1)   Aku   mau   sepatu   sepakbola   itu.[3]
        1SG   want   shoe   football   that
        'I want those football shoes.'
(2)   Kamu   suka   durian?
        2SG   like   durian
        'Do you like durian?'

A central claim of this paper is that *mau* and *suka* can also occur as auxiliaries: this has long been reported in Indonesian dictionaries, which identify *mau* and *suka* as having auxiliary

[3] Abbreviations used in this paper: ABIL=abilitative; INVOL=involitive; other abbreviations adhere to Leipzig glossing conventions.

senses. The most comprehensive dictionary, KBBI (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia 2016), lists *mau* as either noun or *adverbia,* a category which includes elements that modify other categories (i.e. adverbs, modals, tense and aspect markers, but not adjectives).[4] KBBI also lists *suka* as either verb or *adverbia*. However, often-cited grammars such as Sneddon 1996; Sneddon et al. 2012 treat *mau* and *suka* as verbs only, and do not include them in lists of modals or tense/aspect markers. Several authors briefly note some non-verbal properties: Arka (2011) suggests *mau* could be treated as a desiderative modal, but does not note any properties related to tense or aspect; Musgrave (2001) also notes that *mau* and *suka* both occur as auxiliary-like elements that can express aspectual meaning only.

While it is not a new observation, then, to note that *mau* and *suka* may belong to a category other than V, lexical and categorial ambiguity has not been previously discussed in detail. The distinction between V and Aux is relevant in sentences such as (3) and (4), where *mau* and *suka* are immediately followed by a verb.

(3)   Dia   mau   men-cium   tangan   saya.
       3SG   MAU   ACTV-kiss   hand   1SG
       a.   'He wanted to kiss my hand.' (main V)
       b.   'He was about to kiss my hand.' (auxiliary)
(4)   orang   yang   suka   me-nonton   film   di   rumah
       person   REL   SUKA   ACTV-watch   film   at   house
       a.   'people who like to watch movies at home' (main V)
       b.   'people who often watch movies at home' (auxiliary)

Two readings are possible for these sentences. The first corresponds to the verbal meaning of *mau* 'want' (3a) or *suka* 'like' (4a). In the second reading however, *mau/suka* contributes semantics associated with tense or aspect. *Mau* can occur as a future morpheme, specifically with a near-future orientation, 'about to, will soon' (3b). *Suka* can indicate frequency or habitual action, 'often, usually' (4b). These auxiliary meanings are consistent with the *adverbia* senses reported in the dictionary KBBI. I refer to these readings as auxiliary or auxiliary-like, in contrast to the main V interpretation.

The availability of two readings for *mau* and *suka* is systematic when a verb immediately follows it. Where *mau/suka* occurs as the sole predicate (1-2), the only possible interpretation is the verbal one. Where immediately followed by a verb (3-4), *mau/suka* may either occur as V, in which case the sentence is biclausal (or has two verbs); or may occur as Aux followed by main V; in this case the sentence is monoclausal. It follows that when the context of the sentence is semantically or pragmatically incongruous with the verbal sense of *mau/suka*, then the auxiliary reading remains the only available interpretation.

(5)   Aku   butuh   sandaran   ketika   aku   mau   ter-jatuh.
       1SG   need   support   when   1SG   MAU   INVOL-fall
       a.   # 'I needed support when I wanted to fall down.' (main V)
       b.   'I needed support when I was about to fall down.' (auxiliary)
(6)   Anak-anak   suka   men-angis.

---

[4] Puzzlingly, *mau* is not identified as a verb in KBBI*,* even in example sentences where it appears as the only predicate.

child~PL   SUKA ACTV-cry
a.   # 'Children like to cry.' (main V)
b.   'Children often cry.' (auxiliary)

To my knowledge, the two readings arising from (3-4) have not yet been documented in the literature. For example, in Vamarasi's (1999) analysis of preverbal elements, a single gloss is given for *mau,* the verbal meaning 'want.' (*Suka* and other predicates discussed in this paper are not included in Vamarasi's discussion). Musgrave (2001) also notes that both *mau* and *suka* are verbs that also appear as auxiliaries, but does not discuss whether two readings arise from the same clause.
    The presence of two interpretations is not affected by the voice of the embedded verb. The examples above show active and involitive verbs (bearing the prefixes *meN-* and *ter-*, respectively). Dual readings also arise when the embedded verb is a canonical passive (bearing the *di-* prefix).

(7)   Pemain Arema   suka di-tonton   oleh   supporter-nya.
       player Arema like PASS-watch by   supporter-POSS
       a. 'Arema players like to be watched by their supporters.' (main V)
       b. 'Arema players are often watched by their supporters.' (auxiliary)

Sentences such as (7), in which *mau/suka* is followed by a passive verb, have received attention in the literature, due to an unexpected interpretation called "crossed control." In Section 4 I return to this issue, to discuss the implications of categorial ambiguity for crossed control sentences. It is worth noting here, however, that several authors writing about crossed control have briefly observed that crossed control predicates such as *mau* have properties shared by modals and auxiliaries (Fukuda 2007; Nomoto 2008; Polinsky and Potsdam 2008).

3 Diagnostics

The aim of this section is to develop diagnostics for teasing apart the categories V and Aux, in order to demonstrate that *mau* and *suka* can occur as auxiliary.
    In basic Indonesian clauses, tense and aspect markers can occur between the grammatical subject and the verb, yielding the word order S-(Aux)-V-O (Dardjowidjojo 1978;Sneddon et al. 2012). This means that the linear position of an auxiliary can sometimes be indistinguishable from that of *mau* and *suka* in (3-4).

(8)   Saya akan men-jelas-kan   cara   mem-buat   website sederhana.
       1SG   FUT   ACTV-clear-APPL means   ACTV-make   website simple
       'I will explain how to make a simple website.'
(9)   Mereka   sudah/telah   ber-cerai.
       3PL   PRF   INTR-divorce
       'They (already) divorced.'

Tense is optionally marked in Indonesian; if the auxiliary is omitted from (8-9), the clause is compatible with past, present and future contexts. Modals also occupy the position between grammatical subject and verb:

(10) Saya dapat/bisa men-jelas-kan cara mem-buat website sederhana.
　　　1SG can ACTV-clear-APPL means ACTV-make website simple
　　　'I can explain how to make a simple website.'
(11) Mereka boleh/mesti/harus ber-cerai.
　　　3PL may/should/must INTR-divorce
　　　'They may/should/must divorce.'

Tense/aspect markers such as *akan, sudah, telah* and modals such as *dapat, bisa, boleh, mesti, harus* do not occur as verbs: they do not contribute verbal semantics, select their own arguments, or occur as the sole predicate in a clause. These must be accompanied by a main V (or non-verbal predicate). I will include tense, aspect and modals under the umbrella of auxiliaries. I assume that morphemes in this category do not occur in the structural position of V, and that (10) and (11) are monoclausal structures with a single verb (*menjelaskan* 'explain' and *bercerai* 'divorce').

　　　The negation morphemes *tidak* (and informal variants such as *nggak, ga*) and *belum* 'not yet' typically occur before auxiliaries, but they can occur between the auxiliary and verb as well.

(12) Mereka tidak akan ber-cerai.
　　　3PL NEG FUT INTR-divorce
　　　'They will not divorce.'
(13) Mereka akan tidak ber-cerai.
　　　3PL FUT NEG INTR-divorce
　　　'They will not divorce.'
(14) Mereka tidak boleh/mesti/harus ber-cerai.
　　　3PL NEG may/should/must INTR-divorce
　　　'They may/should/must not divorce.'
(15) Mereka boleh/mesti/harus tidak ber-cerai.
　　　3PL may/should/must NEG INTR-divorce
　　　'They may/should/must not divorce.'

For diagnostic purposes then, the relative position of negation morphemes does not provide a clear distinction between the position of verbs and auxiliaries.

　　　A number of verbs can take a verbal or clausal complement in Indonesian; this is illustrated below with *lupa* 'forget,' *kelihatan* 'seem,' *mulai* 'begin,' *perlu* 'need,' *setuju* 'agree.'

(16) Dia lupa mem-bawa kaos kaki.
　　　3SG forget ACTV-bring socks
　　　'He forgot to bring socks.'
(17) Bu Yul kelihatan meng-hindari pertanyaan itu.
　　　Ms Yul seem ACTV-avoid question that
　　　'Ms Yul seemed to avoid the question.'
(18) Kemudian saya mulai ber-cerita tentang orang tua saya.
　　　then 1SG begin INTR-story about parent 1SG
　　　'Then I began to tell about my parents.'
(19) Mengapa kita perlu bel-ajar matematika?

why   1PL.INCL   need   INTR-study   mathematics
'Why do we need to study mathematics?'
(20)   Dia   tidak   setuju   mem-bayar   biaya   rumah sakit.
       3SG   NEG   agree   ACTV-pay   fee   hospital
       'She did not agree to pay the hospital fees.'

The surface string of these examples mirrors sentences that have two readings (3-4). However, these predicates are uncontroversially category V, as they can occur as the sole predicate of a clause and also select arguments. Importantly, two readings do not arise when these verbs are followed by a second verb.

   In the diagnostics that follow, I demonstrate that morphemes that only occur as category V, such as *lupa, kelihatan, mulai, perlu, setuju* cannot occur in positions reserved for auxiliaries. I do not explore here the distinction between control and raising in (16-20), nor analyses related to restructuring (i.e. clause union, or variability in the size of a clausal complement). While these sentences offer interesting possibilities for analysis, such discussion is outside the scope of this paper. I am primarily concerned with establishing that the first verb in (16-20) cannot occur elsewhere as category Aux. I assume, then, that whether the relevant structures are analyzed as control, raising or restructuring, the predicates in (16-20) are category V.

   The first diagnostic that teases apart verbs from auxiliaries comes from Object voice clauses, a test that is also employed in Vamarasi 1999 and Musgrave 2001.[5] Object voice is well-documented in Indonesian and other languages of the area (Chung 1976, Guilfoyle et al 1992, Arka and Manning 1998, Sneddon 2006, Cole et al. 2008, Yanti 2010, McKinnon et al. 2011, Sneddon et al. 2012, Legate 2014, Jeoung 2017).[6] The word order in an Object voice clause is fixed. The Theme occurs as preverbal grammatical subject, like a canonical passive. However, unlike the optional Agent in a passive, the Agent in Object voice is required, and occurs immediately before the verb (see Guilfoyle et al. 1992 and Legate 2014 for arguments supporting an analysis in which the Agent is generated as the external argument of the verb, and remains in its thematic position in Object voice). This results in the surface word order S-(Aux)-Agent-V.

(21)   Promosi   akan   saya-dapat.[7]
       promotion FUT   1SG-get
       'I will get a promotion.'

(22)   Banyak   film   romantis   sudah   ku-tonton.

---

many   film romantic PRF   1SG-watch
'I have watched many romantic films.'

(23)   Kopi   Nescafe tidak pernah ku-minum.
        coffee luwak   NEG   ever   1SG-drink
        'I have never drunk Nescafe coffee.'

(24)   jawaban   yang   mesti/harus/bisa   kau-dapat
        answer   REL   should/must/can   2SG-get
        'the reply that you should/must/can get'

Note that in Object voice, the verb must appear in 'bare' form, without a voice prefix.[8] The Agent is also restricted to personal pronouns in Object voice.[9]

      Only negation, modals, temporal morphemes and aspectual markers may occur in the position between subject and Agent in Object voice. In contrast, main verbs cannot occur in this position, as illustrated in (25-28). We have already seen that these verbs can take a verbal or clausal complement, yet these are not licit in the position of auxiliary.

(25)   * Promosi   perlu   saya-dapat.
        promotion need   1SG-get
        ('I need to get a promotion.')

(26)   * Banyak   film   romantis   setuju   ku-tonton.
        many   film   romantic   agree   1SG-watch
        ('I agreed to watch many romantic films.')

(27)   * Kopi   Nescafe   lupa/mulai   ku-minum.
        Coffee   Nescafe   forget/begin   1SG-drink
        ('I forgot to/began to drink Nescafe coffee.')

(28)   * jawaban   yang   kelihatan   kau-dapat.
        answer   REL   seem   2SG-get
        ('the reply that you seemed to/need to get.')

      Object voice therefore provides a syntactic environment that disallows verbs, but allows auxiliaries. Testing *mau* and *suka* in an Object voice clause shows that these can occur between the grammatical subject and the bare verb, as auxiliaries do:

(29)   Promosi   mau   saya-dapat.

---

[8] The voice prefixes *meN-* and *ber-* are optional in informal speech. This contrasts with Object voice, which requires a bare verb. NP extraction over an active verb also requires a bare verb without voice prefix in Indonesian (Cole et al. 2008).
[9] While there is variation in Object voice across different varieties of Indonesian (e.g. see Sneddon 2006), my consultants limit the set of acceptable Agents to personal pronouns and several kinship terms.

promotion MAU 1SG-get
'I am about to get a promotion.'

(30) Film romantis itu mau/suka ku-tonton.
      film romantic that MAU/SUKA 1SG-watch
      'I am about to watch/I often watch that romantic film.'

(31) Kopi Nescafe mau/suka ku-minum.
      coffee Nescafe MAU/SUKA 1SG-drink
      'I am about to drink Nescafe coffee.' / 'I often drink Nescafe coffee.'

(32) jawaban yang mau kau-dapat
      answer REL MAU 2SG-get
      'the reply that you will soon get'

In order to employ this diagnostic to determine if a particular predicate may occur in the position of auxiliary, the clause must be in Object voice. Note that the subject can be extracted, as in the relative in (32), but an overt Agent is required, and must be a personal pronoun or other nominal that speakers accept as Object voice Agent. An inanimate Theme occurring as the surface subject also makes it impossible for the subject to be interpreted as Experiencer of *mau/suka*, that is, the one who 'wants' or 'likes.' The inanimate subject also rules out the possibility that the sentence is interpreted as biclausal. For example

(33) Ayah mau ku-obat-i.
      father MAU 1SG-medicine-APPL
      'I am about to treat Father (with medicine).'

This has the form of an Object voice clause, but the animate subject leaves open the possibility that it is a biclausal structure, interpreted as 'Father wants me to treat (him).' In this case *Ayah* 'father' is the Experiencer of the main verb *mau/suka*, and *ku* 'I' is subject of an embedded clause: the complementizer may be null, clitic pronouns are possible in subject position, and voice prefixes may also be dropped from active verbs in Indonesian. To avoid this possibility, then, the choice of an inanimate matrix subject is important in (29-32).

We have seen previously that *mau* and *suka* allow for two readings when followed by a verb. To confirm that only the auxiliary reading arises in the Object voice clauses (29-32), the verbal meanings of *mau* 'want' and *suka* 'like' can be ruled out with semantically incongruous contexts.[10]

---

[10] One reviewer notes that it is surprising for 'want' to occur as a near-future morpheme, and 'like' to mark frequency or habitual aspect. Since the proposal advanced here is that these occur as different lexical items, no synchronic relationship is claimed between the verb and auxiliary. Let me note, however, that in some English sentences, *want* and *like* can be semantically bleached, with pragmatics that approach 'about to' and 'often.'
   (i)   He is obnoxious; he wants to be punched.
   (ii)   We like to travel light, with only one small bag each.

(34) * Kopi Nescafe mau/suka ku-minum tadi   pagi.
        coffee Nescafe MAU/SUKA 1SG-drink before morning
        ('I am about to drink Nescafe coffee this morning.' / 'I often drink Nescafe coffee this
        morning.')

(35)   Aku mau/suka minum   kopi   Nescafe tadi   pagi.
        1SG want/like drink   coffee Nescafe before morning
        'I wanted to drink/I liked drinking Nescafe coffee this morning.'

(36) * Promosi   suka   saya-dapat.
        promotion SUKA   1SG-get
        ('I often get a promotion.')

(37)   Saya suka dapat promosi.
        1SG like get   promotion
        'I like to get a promotion.'

The inanimate surface subject cannot be an Experiencer argument of *mau/suka,* which eliminates
a verbal reading arising from a biclausal structure (see discussion of 33 above). In (34) the
auxiliary readings of *mau* 'about to' and *suka* 'often' are incompatible with 'this morning.'
Although (36) is well-formed with auxiliary *mau* 'about to' (29), the auxiliary reading of *suka*
'often' renders the meaning semantically anomalous, 'I often/usually get a promotion.' Note that
the verbal meanings present no semantic incongruity per se, as illustrated in the active clauses in
(35) and (37). It follows that (34) and (36) are ruled out because the semantic context is
incompatible with auxiliary readings of *mau* and *suka.*
        Another useful test for ruling out a verbal reading, while allowing the auxiliary reading,
is a continuation. I repeat (3-4) here as (38-39):

(38)   Dia mau   men-cium tangan saya.
        3SG MAU   ACTV-kiss hand   1SG
        a.   'He wanted to kiss my hand.' (main V)
        b.   'He was about to kiss my hand.' (auxiliary)

(39)   orang yang suka me-nonton   film di rumah
        person REL SUKA ACTV-watch film at house
        a.   'people who like to watch movies at home' (main V)
        b.   'people who often watch movies at home' (auxiliary)

A continuation that conflicts with the semantics of 'want' and 'like' should result in semantic
incongruity with the verb. This is illustrated with other verbs that have similar root meaning.

(40) # Dia pingin men-cium tangan saya, walaupun tidak ingin.
        3SG want   ACTV-kiss hand   1SG   although NEG   want
        'He wanted to kiss my hand, although (he) didn't want to.'

(41) # Anak-anak gemar me-nonton   TV, walaupun tidak menikmati.

children   like   ACTV-watch TV   although NEG enjoy
'The children like watching TV, although (they) don't enjoy it.'

By contrast, the continuation presents no conflict with *mau* or *suka,* since the auxiliary interpretation is available.

(42)   Dia   mau   men-cium   tangan, saya walaupun tidak ingin.
        3SG   MAU   ACTV-kiss hand   1SG   although NEG   want
        'He was about to kiss my hand, although he didn't want to.'

(43)   Anak-anak suka   me-nonton   TV, walaupun tidak menikmati.
        children   SUKA   ACTV-watch   TV   although NEG   enjoy
        'The children often watch TV, although they don't enjoy it.'

An interesting observation here is that the meaning of the predicate does not predict its ability to occur as auxiliary: other 'want' and 'like' verbs do not share this property. The categorial ambiguity appears to be an idiosyncratic property of *mau* and *suka.*

4 Crossed control predicates

I have established that *mau* and *suka* do not always occur as V, but are ambiguous between V and Aux when followed by a verb. I now return to the issue of crossed control in Indonesian, which is directly affected by this discussion of categorial ambiguity.

      The phenomenon of crossed control, which has also been called funny control or backward control, was first observed by Kaswanti Purwo (1984), and later described by Sneddon (1996) and others writing about Indonesian grammar. Crossed control sentences are illustrated in (44-45).

(44)   Siti   mau   di-cium   oleh ibu.
        Siti   MAU   PASS-kiss by   mother
        a. 'Siti wants to be kissed by Mother.' (typical reading)
        b. 'Mother wants to kiss Siti.' (crossed reading)
(45)   Pemain Arema suka di-tonton oleh supporter-nya.
        player Arema SUKA PASS-watch by   supporter-POSS
        a. 'Arema players like to be watched by their supporters.' (typical reading)
        b. 'Their supporters like to watch Arema players.' (crossed reading)

In a crossed control (CC) sentence, a CC predicate such as *mau* 'want' or *suka* 'like' is followed by a canonical passive verb (with *di-* prefix). These sentences have been reported to have two distinct interpretations. In the first reading (labeled as the typical reading in 44a, 45a), the preverbal subject is the raised Theme of the embedded passive verb and the Experiencer of the CC predicate. A second, unexpected, reading has been reported in the literature for these sentences (44b, 45b): the oblique argument embedded in the PP is interpreted as both the Agent

of the embedded passive *and* the Experiencer of the matrix CC predicate.[11] This is the "crossed" reading that has garnered attention, not only because it is cross-linguistically unusual, but also because it poses a challenge for contemporary theory: the crossed reading is unexpected from the perspective of both syntactic locality and semantic composition.

Analyses of crossed control must address (at least) two questions: how does a matrix predicate assign a thematic role (Experiencer) to a non-local argument (embedded PP Agent) instead of the matrix subject? What syntactic or semantic mechanism enables the oblique Agent of an embedded passive verb to control (i.e. backward control) the matrix CC predicate? Authors have varied in their approach to these questions (Kaswanti Purwo 1984; Sneddon 1996; Arka 2000; Musgrave 2001; Gil 2002; Fukuda 2007; Nomoto 2008, 2011; Polinsky & Potsdam 2008; Sato 2010; Nomoto & Wahab 2012; Sato & Kitada 2012; Akbar 2013; Davies et al. 2013; Kurniawan 2013; Arka 2014; Davies 2014; Berger 2018; Kroeger & Frazier 2019). To date there does not yet appear to be consensus in the literature.

I bring the proposed categorial ambiguity of *mau* and *suka* to bear on the discussion. My aim here is not to lay out a full analysis of crossed control, but rather to return to the set of data that forms the core of the crossed control phenomenon as reported for Indonesian and Malay. The lexical ambiguity of *mau/suka* has been overlooked from analyses of crossed control, and consequently, this presents a potential confound in the data. It is worth noting that in the literature cited above, *mau* is the most commonly occurring verb in examples (always glossed as 'want'), and serves as an exemplar for CC predicates that is standardly used in literature on the topic (see, in particular, Polinsky and Potsdam 2008). Beside *mau*, *coba* 'try' is the next most frequent CC predicate appearing in the literature; other Indonesian CC predicates that have been reported in the literature include *gagal* 'fail,' *berhasil* 'succeed, manage to,' *berani* 'dare to,' *mulai* 'begin,' among others. In this discussion, my aim is to suggest that crossed control readings should be revisited in order to carefully diagnose whether crossed readings arise from an auxiliary interpretation of the CC predicate. Diagnostics developed in Section 3 provide some initial tools for such a reexamination, which I briefly outline below.

To date, crossed control has been extensively investigated only in Indonesian and Malay, which are varieties of the same language, and other Indonesian languages such as (Davies 2014) and Sundanese (Kurniawan 2013).[12] I am not aware of analyses of crossed control readings outside this family of languages. Crossed control, then, may be a phenomenon specific to

---

[11] The crossed readings are not readily offered or accepted by all Indonesian speakers, as the literature suggests. One of my consultants does not accept any crossed readings (even with *mau/suka*), even though he allows *mau* and *suka* to occur in auxiliary position. In my fieldwork experience, speakers report the typical reading or the auxiliary reading, but the crossed reading must be suggested to an uninitiated consultant. Davies (2014) reports that in Madurese, speakers do not always see the ambiguity, and must first be shown the crossed readings in Indonesian; he also notes that speakers prefer inanimate subjects in examples so that the crossed reading is the only possible interpretation. I also note that in personal conversations with consultants and linguists who are native speakers of Indonesian, some of the crossed readings have been questioned as epiphenomenal, arising from real-world knowledge, i.e. a mother naturally wants to kiss her child (example 44); football fans usually want to watch their team (45).

[12] Polinsky and Potsdam 2008 includes a single example of crossed control with 'want' in several other Austronesian languages: Tagalog, Malagasy, Tukang Besi, Tongan and Samoan. Discussion of these languages, however, has not been pursued.

languages of the area; this suggests that language-specific properties might best account for the unexpected nature of crossed readings. We have already seen that the CC predicates *mau* and *suka* can occur as auxiliaries. In (44) and (45), observe that the two readings reported in the literature are both verbal: in both the typical reading and the crossed reading, *mau* is glossed as 'want' and *suka* as 'like.' The auxiliary readings previously discussed in this paper have largely been overlooked. These auxiliary meanings are given below.

(46)　Siti　mau　di-cium　oleh ibu.
　　　Siti　MAU　PASS-kiss　by　mother
　　　'Siti is about to be kissed by Mother.' (auxiliary)
(47)　Pemain Arema　suka　di-tonton　oleh　supporter-nya.
　　　player　Arema　SUKA　PASS-watch　by　supporter-POSS
　　　'Arema players are often watched by their supporters.' (auxiliary)

The availability of this auxiliary interpretation has important implications for the crossed readings. When *mau* and *suka* occur as auxiliaries in (46-47), these sentences are monoclausal and contain only one verb. For the monoclausal structure in (46-47), the PP is no longer associated with an embedded verb in a downstairs clause, but rather with the single verb in the clause. Furthermore, I suggest that the auxiliary reading 'Siti is about to be kissed by Mother' could plausibly be judged to have another "reading" in which 'Mother' becomes surface subject: 'Mother is about to kiss Siti.'

　　　The latter reading should be disentangled from the crossed control reading, 'Mother wants to kiss Siti.' This is not as straightforward in Indonesian as in English, since both meanings are compatible with *mau*. The practial implication for future fieldwork is to rule out auxiliary readings before reporting crossed control readings such as (44b) and (45b). Since the literature to date has not acknowledged auxiliary readings, this is a potential confound in some of the crossed control data, especially given the frequent occurrence of *mau* in CC examples. On the other hand, an auxiliary reading for the CC predicate is not altogether unwelcome from a theoretical perspective. If the CC predicate occurs as an auxiliary, and the CC reading can be attributed to an auxiliary interpretation, then the monoclausal structure is not unusual. Interpretations such as (46) and (47) are easily analyzed with previously existing syntactic and semantic mechanisms.

　　　Other documented aspects of crossed control are also potentially consistent with the CC predicate occurring as auxiliary. When the typical reading of a CC sentence is pragmatically unlikely, as in (48), then the CC reading is "forced."

(48)　Anggota gang itu　coba di-tangkap　oleh polisi.
　　　member　gang that try　PASS-catch　by　police
　　　a.　# 'The gang members tried to be caught by police.' (Typical reading)
　　　b.　'The police tried to catch gang members.' (Crossed reading)

While this pattern has been taken to indicate the validity of the crossed reading, it does not rule out the auxiliary reading that I have proposed. We have previously seen in (40-43) that when the verbal reading is semantically incompatible with the sentence, the auxiliary reading remains. The question is whether *coba* 'try' also has an auxiliary interpretation. In (49), *coba* occurs with an

inanimate subject, which makes it unlikely that 'this house' is the external argument of 'try.' Instead, *coba* occurs with a modal meaning, 'can.'

(49)　Rumah ini coba men-awar-kan　　alternatif　bagi　keluarga Anda.
　　　　house　this COBA ACTV-offer-APPL alternative　for　　family　　2SG.POL
　　　　'This house can offer an alternative for your family.' (auxiliary)

Although this meaning is not reported in the dictionary KBBI, *coba* is equivalent to the modal *bisa* 'can' in (49). Crucially, for consultants who accepted the crossed reading for *coba,* they also accepted *coba* as an auxiliary in Object voice:[13]

(50)　Film romantis　itu　coba ku-tonton.
　　　　film　romantic　that　COBA 1SG-watch
　　　　'I can watch that romantic film.'

The interpretation in (50) is consistent with the auxiliary reading rather than the verbal reading of *coba*, confirming that *coba* could occur as auxiliary in the CC example in (48). Two other CC predicates that my consultants accepted as having crossed readings were *gagal* 'fail' and *berhasil* 'succeed, manage to'; and these were also available in the auxiliary position in Object voice.

(51)　Promosi　　gagal saya dapat.
　　　　promotion　GAGAL 1SG　get
　　　　'I did not get a promotion.'

(52)　jawaban　yang berhasil　kau-dapat
　　　　answer　　REL　BERHASIL 2SG-get
　　　　'the reply that you did get'

The auxiliary readings appear to be bleached of verbal semantics here. *Gagal* is used to negate the Object voice clause in (51); *berhasil* is interpreted as an aspectual (completive) morpheme in (52).
　　　　Another notable property of some CC predicates is that they may optionally occur with the complementizers *supaya* 'in order that' and *untuk* 'for' (Kaswanti Purwo 1984). When the complementizer is present however, the crossed reading is no longer available.

(53)　Si　Yem ingin di-cium　si　　Dul.

---

[13] It is clear that besides *mau* and *suka,* there is significant variability in judgments regarding which predicates allow the crossed readings. I find that there is variability among different varieties of spoken Indonesian, but also among speakers of the same variety. Each of my Indonesian consultants disagreed with at least one of the CC predicates reported in the literature (for Indonesian); different authors also present conflicting data with regard to the set of predicates that allows crossed readings. For example, Kaswanti Purwo 1984 and Polinsky and Potsdam 2008 identify *ingin* 'want, wish' as a CC predicate, whereas other authors claim that *ingin* does not give rise to CC readings at all, which is also the judgment of my consultants. See Nomoto 2008; 2011 for a longer list of CC predicates in Malay; most of my consultants only accepted five predicates: *mau* 'want,' *suka* 'like,' *coba* 'try,' *gagal* 'fail' and *berhasil* 'succeed.'

ART Yem want PASS-kiss ART Dul
      a.   'Yem wanted to be kissed by Dul.' (typical reading)
      b.   'Dul wanted to kiss Yem.' (crossed reading)
(54)   Si Yem ingin supaya   di-cium si Dul.
      ART Yem want in.order.that PASS-kiss ART Dul
      a.   'Yem wanted to be kissed by Dul.' (typical reading)
      b.   * 'Dul wanted to kiss Yem.' (crossed reading)
(Modified from Kaswanti Purwo 1984:75)

This is also expected under the current proposal of categorial ambiguity. Sentences with complementizers must have a biclausal structure (Vamarasi 1999; Sneddon et al. 2012), so *ingin* must be a matrix verb in (54), since auxiliaries do not take clausal complements. This means that where the crossed reading is ruled out in (54b), the auxiliary interpretation must also be ruled out. In order to determine whether this is due to coincidence, the auxiliary reading and the verbal reading must be carefully disentangled.[14]

      Finally, one last pattern supports a possible auxiliary status for CC predicates. Inanimate subjects are also reported to "force" crossed readings, because an inanimate subject cannot be a thematic Experiencer of *mau/suka* (a 'wanter' or 'liker'). However, this generalization is weakened by sentences in which the oblique argument (the Agent embedded in a PP) is inanimate (55). The argument *kamera keamanan* 'security camera' is a possible Agent for the verb *rekam* 'record' since it may occur as the subject of an active clause with the verb *rekam*, but it should be ruled out as the Experiencer of *suka* because it is inanimate; only the typical reading should be available. The prediction is not borne out however, since two readings are judged to be available in (55).

(55)   Pemain Arema suka di-rekam   oleh kamera keamanan.
       player   Arema like PASS-record by   camera security
       a.   'Arema players like to be recorded by security cameras.' (typical reading)
       b.   'Security cameras like to record Arema players.' (crossed reading)

The availability of two readings is easily explained if the CC predicate *suka* is interpreted as an auxiliary 'often, usually' in (55b), which is compatible with an inanimate argument. An even more striking example is a CC sentence with two inanimate arguments.

(56)   Dalam foto,   ter-lihat mobil yang mau di-tabrak   oleh kereta.
       at   photo ABIL-see car   REL   want PASS-crash by   train
       a.   'In the photo, there is a car that wants to be hit by a train.' (typical reading)
       b.   'In the photo, there is a train that wants to hit a car.' (crossed reading)

Two readings are available in (56), although previous accounts of crossed control predict that *both* readings should be ruled out, since both are inanimate arguments and cannot be the 'wanter' argument associated with *mau*. However, under an auxiliary interpretation of *mau* 'about to,' two

---

[14] As noted previously, my consultants do not accept crossed readings with *ingin*; they also reject *ingin* in the auxiliary position of Object voice clauses.

readings still obtain: 'there is a car that is about to be hit by a train' (56a) and 'there is a train that is about to hit a car' (56b).

5 Conclusion

I have reported the systematic availability of two readings when *mau* and *suka* are followed by a verb in Indonesian, and presented syntactic and semantic diagnostics to confirm that *mau* and *suka* predicates can occur as auxiliaries in Indonesian. The claim advanced in this paper is that *mau* and *suka* can occur as category V or category Aux, and that this lexical ambiguity gives rise to a structural ambiguity when *mau/suka* is followed by a verb. This discussion attempts to fill a gap in the literature, which has assumed verbal meanings for *mau* and *suka*, overlooking auxiliary interpretations.

I also extended the discussion of categorial ambiguity to the phenomenon of crossed control. I have remained neutral regarding an analysis for the typical reading of crossed control sentences; my aim is to question whether CC predicates always occur as category V, a prevalent assumption in the CC literature. If this analysis is on the right track, some CC predicates including *mau* and *suka* can be lexically ambiguous between verb and auxiliary. This does not affect typical readings, which result from the CC predicate occurring as category V. However, the ambiguity has consequences for the crossed readings of CC sentences. I suggest that given the categorial ambiguity described here, crossed readings require reexamination. In particular, the auxiliary reading has been largely overlooked as a potential confound in reporting crossed control readings, as I have briefly demonstrated for *mau* and *coba*. If the phenomenon of crossed control is shown to arise from a monoclausal structure with an auxiliary and one verb, this is welcome from a theoretical viewpoint: standard syntactic and semantic mechanisms account for CC sentences, obviating the need for innovation. On the other hand, if some CC predicates do not occur as auxiliaries, this strengthens analyses of crossed control and clarifies its range of possible interpretations. The diagnostic methods that I have developed here may prove useful for disentangling these interpretations in Indonesian, Malay and other languages reported to have crossed control.

References

Akbar, Farah. 2013. Malay Morphosyntax: The Role of *meN-*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex.

Arka, I Wayan. 2002. Voice systems in the Austronesian languages of Nusantara: Typology, symmetricality and undergoer orientation. http://hdl.handle.net/1885/41058.

Arka, I Wayan. 2011. On modality and finiteness in Indonesian: Complexities of =nya nominalisation. In Workshop on TAM markers and evidentiality in Indonesian Languages, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 73-89.

Arka, I Wayan. 2014. Double and backward control in indonesian: An LFG analysis. In *Proceedings of LFG14*.

Arka, I Wayan, and Christopher Manning. 2008. Voice and grammatical relations in Indonesian: a new perspective. In *Voice and grammatical relations in Austronesian Languages*, eds. P.K. Austin and S. Musgrave, 45-69. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Berger, Mike. 2018. Indonesian crossed control: Expanding the typology of restructuring. Paper

presented at the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, UCLA, April 20-22, 2018.

Chung, Sandra. 1976. On the subject of two passives in Indonesian. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. C. N. Li. Academic Press.

Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon and Yanti. 2008. Voice in Malay/Indonesian. *Lingua* 118:1500–1553.

Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. 1978. *Sentence Patterns of Indonesian*. University of Hawaii Press.

Davies, William D. 2014. Describing Madurese crossed control. In *Argument realisations and related constructions in Austronesian languages*, *Papers from 12-ICAL,* Volume 2, ed. by I Wayan Arka and N.L.K. Indrawati. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics.

Davies, William D., Eri Kurniawan & Ari Natarina. 2013. Toward a unified analysis of crossed control. Paper presented at the 4th International Symposium on the Languages of Java. Universitas Bung Hatta, Padang, Indonesia.

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. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross*,* 241-283. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Guilfoyle, Eithne, Henrietta Hung and Lisa Travis. 1992. Spec of IP and Spec of VP: Two subjects in Austronesian languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10:375-414.

Jeoung, Helen. 2017. On the number of voices in Madurese. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*. 10.1:16-35. DOI: http://hdl.handle.net/10524/52395

Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Edisi Kelima [Comprehensive Indonesian Dictionary, Fifth Edition]. 2016. Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/

Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1984. *Deiksis dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Balai Pustaka.

Kroeger, Paul, & Kristin Frazier. 2019. Crossed-control in Malay/Indonesian as Long Distance Passivization. Paper presented at the 26th meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association, Univ. of Western Ontario, May 24-26, 2019.

Kurniawan, Eri. 2013. Sundanese Complementation. Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.

Musgrave, Simon. 2001. Non-subject Arguments in Indonesian. Doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne.

Nomoto, Hiroki. 2008. A unified analysis of funny control. Paper presented at the 12th International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics.

Nomoto, Hiroki. 2011. Analisis seragam bagi kawalan lucu. In *Isamu Shoho: Tinta Kenangan 'Kumpulan Esei Bahasa dan Linguistik,'* ed. H. Nomoto, Z. Ahmad, and A. Ridhwan, 44–91. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Polinsky, Maria, and Eric Potsdam. 2008. The syntax and semantics of wanting in Indonesian. *Lingua* 118:1617–1639.

Sato, Yosuke. 2010. The crossed-control construction and the syntactic role of passive morphology in Standard Indonesian. Retrieved from https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001177

Sato, Yosuke, & Shin-Ichi Kitada. 2012. Successive feature inheritance, Θ-features and the crossed-control construction in Standard Indonesian. https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001523

Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge.

Sneddon, James Neil. 2006. *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian* (Vol. 581). Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University.

Sneddon, James Neil, Alexander Adelaar, Dwi N. Djenar, and Michael Ewing. 2012. *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge.

Vamarasi, Marit K. 1999. Grammatical Relations in Bahasa Indonesia. Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.