Indonesian complement clause types

One dimension along which clausal complement structures are frequently characterized is that of finiteness. However, for a language such as Indonesian, the lack of both overt agreement and tense morphology makes categorization of this kind difficult if not impossible. As the same time, it is evident that predicates taking clausal complements (or what appear to be clausal complements) occur in different structures which can, in part, be characterized by the nature of the complement clause and its grammatical characteristics. In this paper, we will examine some of these characteristics and examine what they indicate about the types and range of embedding structures involved, arguing that certain feature point to structural differences while others may simply reduce to semantic co-occurrence restrictions.

Among the more obvious distinctions is the admissibility of the complementizers *bahwa* and *untuk*, which in the past have sometimes been linked to a difference between finite (*bahwa*) and nonfinite (*untuk*) complements. Thus a predicate such as *katakan* 'say' can take a *bahwa*-complement but not an *untuk*-complement (1), while raising predicates such as *percaya* 'believe' (2) and control predicates such as *coba* 'try' (3) and *paksa* 'force' (4) can take *untuk*- but not *bahwa*-complements. However, there are also predicates that appear to take clausal complements that disallow any complementizer at all, such as *mulai* 'start' (5), *terus* 'continue', and other aspectual predicates and desideratives such as *mau* and *ingin*.

The types of auxiliary elements licit in the complement clause provide another factor of variability. Raising predicates like *percaya* 'believe' pattern with predicates that can take *bahwa*-complements in allowing the full range of temporal/modal-type elements such as *akan* 'will', *harus* 'must', *boleh* 'may', *sudah* 'already', and others, which distinguishes them from control predicates. Object control predicates such as *paksa* 'force' can have complements with *harus* but not the others. Aspectual and desiderative predicates virtually disallow all of these in their complements. We will explore what the distribution of these elements, which have been hypothesized to reside in various functional projections in syntactic structure, can tell us about the complexity of the architecture in the complement clauses.

Like raising predicates, subject control predicates and aspectual and desiderative predicates allow the complement object to surface as the subject of the matrix clause (6-8). However, only control, aspectual and desiderative predicates allow other embedded dependents (PP arguments and *wh*-adjuncts) to occur sentence-initially, which indicates structural differentiation from raising predicates. This is illustrated in (9-10), where raising predicates and control predicates have different ranges of interpretations with embedded and fronted *wh*-adjuncts. The limits of these constructions will be examined and the implications of the facts for principled analytical distinctions explored.

In sum, while the finiteness/non-finiteness dimension does not seem to play the role that it does in other languages, these other grammatical characteristics argue for structural distinction.

Data

1.   Hasan mengatakan   bahwa/*untuk Ali mem-bakar buku terlarang itu.
      H   AV.say-KAN that/*to   A   AV-burn   book banned   that
      'Hasan said that Ali burned that banned book.'
2.   Ali di-percaya oleh Hasan untuk/*bahwa mem-bakar buku terlarang itu.
      A OV-believe by H   to/*that   AV-burn   book banned   that
      'Ali was believed by Hasan to burn that banned book.'
3.   Ali men-coba untuk/*bahwa mem-bakar buku terlarang itu.
      A AV-try   to/*that   AV-burn   book banned   that
      'Ali tried to burn that banned book.'
4.   Ali di-paksa oleh Hasan untuk/*bahwa mem-bakar buku terlarang itu.
      A OV-force by H   to/*that   AV-burn   book banned that
      'Ali was forced by Hasan to burn that banned book.'
5.   Ali mulai *untuk/*bahwa mem-bakar buku terlarang itu.
      A begin *to/*that   AV-burn   book banned   that
      'Ali began to burn that banned book.'
6.   Buku terlarang itu di-percaya   di-bakar oleh Ali.
      book banned   that OV-believe OV-burn by   A
      'That banned book was believed to have been burned by Ali.'
7.   Buku terlarang itu di-coba di-bakar oleh Ali.
      book banned   that OV-try OV-burn by   A
      'Ali tried to burn that banned book.'
8.   Buku terlarang itu mulai di-bakar oleh Ali.
      book banned   that begin OV-burn by   A
      'Ali began to burn that banned book.'
9 a. Ali di-percaya   oleh Hasan mem-bakar buku terlarang itu kapan?
      A OV-believe by H   AV-burn   book banned   that when
      'When was Ali believed by Hasan to have burned that banned book?'
       (When here is requesting temporal information about the event of burning.)
  b. Kapan Ali di-percaya oleh Hasan mem-bakar buku terlarang itu?
      when A OV-believe by H   AV-burn   book banned   that
      'When was Ali believed by Hasan to have burned that banned book?'
      (When here is requesting temporal information about the event of believing, not
      burning.)
10 a. Ali men-coba mem-bakar buku terlarang itu kapan?
      A AV-try   AV-burn   book banned   that when
      'When did Ali try to burn that banned book?'
   b. Kapan Ali men-coba mem-bakar buku terlarang itu?
      when A AV-try   AV-burn   book banned that
      'When did Ali try to burn that banned book?'
      (Both 10a and 10b are requesting temporal information about the same thing.)