

### Revisiting crossed control in Indonesian

In crossed control, a phenomenon which has been reported for Malay and Indonesian, an embedded passive clause is reported to have the two interpretations in (1) and (2). The (a)-readings are expected, while the (b)-readings are surprising: an oblique argument is interpreted as the matrix Experiencer, while the subject is interpreted as the Theme of the embedded verb.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) Siti mau di-cium (oleh) ibu.<br>Siti want PV-kiss by mother | 2) Anggota gang itu coba di-tangkap (oleh) polisi.<br>member gang that try PV-catch by police |
| a. 'Siti wants to be kissed by Mother.'                        | a. 'The gang members wanted to be caught by police.'  |
| b. ! 'Mother wanted to kiss Siti.'                             | b. ! 'The police tried to catch the gang members.'  |

(1b) and (2b) have been called crossed control (Polinsky and Potsdam 2008, Sato and Kitada 2012) since the grammatical roles of an oblique argument and subject argument are "crossed."

**LEXICAL AMBIGUITY IN INDONESIAN.** While a larger set of crossed control predicates are reported for Malay (e.g. approx. 20 in Nomoto 2008), I find that in Indonesian, a smaller set of predicates have dual interpretations, including *mau* 'want,' *suka* 'like,' *coba* 'try,' *berhasil* 'succeed,' *gagal* 'fail.' A fact that has been overlooked in previous analyses, however, is that these predicates can occur as main verb, or as modal/auxiliary or adverb, as in (3) and (4):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 3) Anak-anak suka menangis.<br>child-Redup cry | 4) Aku mau rapat di sekolah.<br>1sg meet at school     |
| Verb: # 'Children <b>like</b> to cry.'         | Verb: ✓ 'I <b>want</b> to attend a meeting at school.' |
| Adverb: ✓ 'Children <b>often</b> cry.'         | Modal: ✓ 'I <b>will</b> attend a meeting at school'    |

**ILLUSORY CROSSED CONTROL READINGS.** For Indonesian, I argue that only the (a) readings are correct in (1) and (2), while the (b) readings are false. For example, since *mau* occurs as the future morpheme 'will,' the (b) reading is correctly rendered as 'Siti *will* be kissed by Mother.' For this reading, confusion arises when asking consultants which argument is associated with *mau* ('will'): Is it the case that *Siti mau*, or is it the case that *Ibu mau*? Since the embedded clause is passive (and Mother is the Agent), I suggest that it is pragmatically more feasible that *Mother will X* rather than *Siti will be-Xed*, and that this is the source of the confusion. Instead of relying on English glosses, I use a finer-grained set of syntactic and semantic diagnostics to show that the oblique argument cannot be the Experiencer of the matrix predicate.

**TYPICAL READINGS.** Next I provide an analysis of the (a) readings in (1) and (2): these are not derived by raising and do not show evidence of *PRO* in the embedded clause. Rather, the initial verb functions as a restructuring predicate, embedding a reduced size clause (VoiceP), and allowing long movement of the object from the embedded clause (cf. Wurmbrand 2004).

**SUMMARY.** In Indonesian, so-called crossed control does not involve control at all, nor does an oblique argument have an unexpected thematic role. This account has the advantage of not requiring unusual mechanisms of  $\theta$ -role assignment or feature inheritance (e.g. as previous proposed in Polinsky and Potsdam 2008, Nomoto 2008, Sato and Kitada 2012). I leave open the question of whether the same analysis holds for Malay.

**REFERENCES.** Nomoto. 2008. A unified analysis of funny control. Presentation given at *12-ISMIL*. Polinsky and Potsdam. 2008. The syntax and semantics of wanting in Indonesian. *Lingua* vol. 118. Sato and Kitada. 2012. Successive feature inheritance, theta-features and the crossed control construction in Standard Indonesian. Wurmbrand. 2004. Two types of restructuring: lexical vs. functional. *Lingua* vol. 114.