

Toward a more inclusive, unified analysis of crossed control

There have been a number of recent analyses of the so-called crossed control construction (CCC) or ‘funny control’ in Indonesian and Malay (Polinsky & Potsdam 2008, Nomoto 2008, 2011, Sato 2012), illustrated with the now widely cited example in (1). The signature characteristics of the example in (1) are (a) the fact that many speakers report the ambiguity noted in the translation and (b) the fact that the NP which is the experiencer of the wanting in (1ii), *ibu*, appears never to be a direct argument of the predicate *mau/ingin* ‘want’. It is this second meaning which is referred to as crossed control. Each of the recent proposals has its merits, but each is focused solely on Indonesian/Malay to the exclusion of other Indonesian-type languages which evince the same structure, such as Balinese (2), Madurese (3) and Sundanese (4). Also each must stipulate some aspect of the analysis, introducing a potentially unwanted (or unwarranted) grammatical device, leaving aside some potentially troublesome data, or running counter to some well-established principle. Furthermore, none is able account for particular facts in these other languages. In this paper, we will lay out the properties of crossed control in Balinese, Madurese, and Sundanese that any adequate analysis must address. We will suggest one possibility that builds on the insights of these existing proposals and a view of the syntactic structure of voice marking following Cole et al. 2008, Ko 2009, Legate 2011 and others.

We will briefly show that the properties of the structures in these languages mirror those identified for Indonesian/Malay, indicating that the complement is not clausal but verbal. Illustrating with Madurese data, monoclausal properties include the fact that quantified agents can bind variable pronouns in subject position (5), PPs can be fronted from the complement (6) and others. All of these properties point to the fact that the complement is not clausal but some form of verbal projection, as has been the consensus of the cited analyses. However, rather than the vP or VP complements of Polinsky & Potsdam, Nomoto, and Sato, we propose that for these languages the appropriate projection is VoiceP.

Within a Minimalist analysis, Cole et al. 2008 propose that Indonesian and closely related languages include a Voice projection that takes as its complement vP, the details of which we present in the paper. We go on to show that there are Madurese, Sundanese and Balinese grammatical properties that are most easily accounted for by positing the Voice node. These include the fact that unlike Indonesian/Malay, in Madurese and Sundanese the PP agent of an apparent ‘passive’ clause can antecede a reflexive in subject position while at the same time accounting for the postverbal position of the agents (7-8). A similar argument can be made for the agent in the Object Voice structure in Balinese (9), which both binds the reflexive in subject position and occurs postverbally. We also provide arguments for the Voice projection from Madurese causatives and the Sundanese plural agreement infix *-ar/-al*.

With the Voice projection in place, we use Sato’s (2012) feature inheritance proposal in which the semantic role of the matrix predicate is passed down to the complement verb to account for all of the crossed control data in Balinese, Madurese and Sundanese. We further show that the analysis extends to the ‘standard control’ structure with the same matrix predicates (a feature which only Nomoto’s analysis shares) as the ‘standard control’ structure in (10) is also demonstrably monoclausal, as shown by the ability of a complement PP to be fronted (11), something which is not possible in Raising and canonical Control structures in these languages.

Data

- (1) Anak itu mau/ingin dicium oleh ibu.
 child that want PASS.kiss by mother
 (Polinsky& Potsdam 2008)
 i. 'The child wants to be kissed by the mother.'
 ii. 'The mother wants to kiss the child.'
- (2) Mobilé ento tagih beli-na tekén Wayan.
 car.DEF that OV.want buy-PV by Wayan
 'Wayan wants to buy that car.'
- (3) Motor sè anyar terro è-belli-yâ (moso) anom.
 car REL new want OV-buy-IRR by uncle
 'Uncle wants to buy a new car.'
- (4) Mobil anyar téh hayang di-pecak-an ku Ujang.
 car new PAR want OV-try-AN by Ujang
 'Ujang wants to try out the new car.'
- (5) Ana'-na terro è-berri'-â pèssè bi' bhân-sabbhân embu'.
 child-DEF want OV-give-IRR money by RED-each mother
 'Each mother wanted to give money to her (own) child.'
- (6) Moso anom, motor sè anyar terro è-belli-yâ.
 by uncle car REL new want OV-buy-IRR
 'Uncle wants to buy a new car.'
- (7) Abâ'na dhibi' è-kennallaghi (moso) Siti, ka Evi
 she self OV-introduce by Siti to Evi
 'Siti introduced herself to Evi.'
- (8) Manéhna sorangan, nu osok di-agul-agul ku si Ohang.
 he self REL often PV-boast-RED by Ohang
 'Ohang often boasts about himself.'
- (9) Raganné, tan kanggoang ida.
 self.3 NEG OV.accept 3
 (Arka 2003)
 'S/he does not accept herself/himself.'
- (10) Ohang hayang meuli imah téh pikeun abah.
 Ohang want AV.buy house PAR for grandmother
 'Ohang wants to buy a house for grandmother.'
- (11) Pikeun abah, Ohang hayang meuli imah téh.
 for grandmother Ohang want AV.buy house PAR
 'For grandmother, Ohang wants to buy a house.'