

A new type of backward relation: Indonesian Crossed Control

Mike Berger (University of Leipzig)

Certain Indonesian verbs taking a passive complement give rise to an ambiguity between a normal (NC) and a 'crossed' control (CC) reading (Sneddon 1996 *et seq.*). In NC, the controller is the matrix DP; in CC, it is the (oblique) DP in the complement. The complement's thematic relation is the same in NC and CC - what changes is the 'controller' of the matrix CC predicate:

- (1) *Siti mau / coba / berhasil [di-cium oleh Ali]*
Siti want / try / succeed PASS-kiss by Ali
a) 'Siti wants / tries / succeeds to be kissed by Ali' NC: *CCP(Siti, kiss(Ali, Siti))*
b) 'Ali wants / tries / succeeds to kiss Siti' CC: *CCP(Ali, kiss(Ali, Siti))*

Proposal: NC clauses are standard control or subjunctive clauses - I will not focus on these. By contrast, CC clauses involve backward Restructuring: Patients move long-distance into matrix Spec,TP, and an underspecified matrix v_{RP} inherits the $-$ features of the embedded vP . **Indonesian voice:** Indonesian has an Agent Voice marked by *meN-* (2), a passive marked by *di-* (3), and a zero-marked Patient Voice (4) (Sneddon 2010). The passive demotes the Agent to adjunct (3), while the Patient Voice retains the Agent (4). Voskuil (2000) *et al.* show that (i) Indonesian T has an EPP, and that (ii) the Patient in the Patient voice is a true subject in Spec,TP.

- (2) *Ali mem-baca buku* (3) *Buku itu di-baca (oleh Ali)*
Ali AV-read book book that PASS-read by Ali
'Ali is reading a book' 'The book was read (by Ali)'

- (4) *Buku itu *(aku) / *(kau) Ø-baca*
book that I / you PV-read
'I / you read the book' / 'The book was read by me / you'

CC in the Patient voice: CC also arises with the Patient Voice (Nomoto 2008, Polinsky & Potsdam 2008; (5)). We can thus generalize that CC complements share the property of promoting the Patient to subject.

- (5) *Kucing mau / coba / berhasil [aku Ø-pegang]*
cat want / try / succeed I PV-touch
'The cat wants / tries / succeeds to be touched by me' NC: *CCP(cat, touch(I, cat))*
'I want / try / succeed to touch the cat' CC: *CCP(I, touch(I, cat))*

In CC, the matrix DP has moved: The (optional) Agent voice prefix *meN-* is banned on DP movement paths (Saddy 1992 *et seq.*). As soon as any verb which may bear *meN-* bears it, CC vanishes, indicating that in CC, the matrix DP has undergone Long Object Movement into matrix Spec,TP (Nomoto 2008). Conversely in NC, all DPs remain clause-internal, since *meN-* is allowed on the matrix CCP (6,7) and the lower Agent-Voice verb ((6); Indonesian has *pro-drop*).

- (6) *Kucing_i men-coba [aku me-megang]* (7) *Siti_i men-coba [di-cium oleh Ali]*
cat AV-try I AV-touch Siti AV-try PASS-kiss by Ali
'The cat tries to be touched by me' NC 'Siti tries to be kissed by Ali' NC
'*I try to touch the cat' CC '*Ali tries to kiss Siti' CC

The Agent in the Patient Voice: Unlike the Agent Voice, verbs in the Patient Voice require a non-phrasal, left-adjacent Agent (Sneddon 2010; (8)) which cannot extract ((9); Cole & Hermon 1998). I therefore assume the zero Patient voice head v_{PV} requires the Agent in Spec,vP to incorporate into v_{PV} (Levin 2015); this explains the Patient's movement to Spec,TP despite the structurally closer Agent.

- (8) *Buku itu kami (*semua) Ø-baca* (9) **Siapa_i buku itu t_i Ø-baca?*
 book that we all PV-read who book that PV-read
 'We (all) read the book' 'Who read the book?'

CC clause size: Due to tense / aspect restrictions and the unavailability of a complementizer in the lower clause, CC complements must lack CP and TP (Polinsky & Potsdam 2008). **Summary:** CC arises with complements in the passive or Patient voice. In CC, the matrix DP moves from the lower clause into matrix Spec,TP; in NC, the matrix DP is merged in matrix Spec, $v_{AV}P$. While the lower verb bears voice marking, the CCP does not. Clauses are ambiguous between NC and CC only when certain conditions obtain, mainly the absence of *meN*- and a lower COMP. **Analysis:** Long Object Movement and truncated clauses are hallmarks of Restructuring (Wurmbrand 2001). For CC, I adopt a 'backward' version of Wurmbrand's (2016) Restructuring: a Restructuring voice head v_R , which doesn't license an Agent or assign ACC, is born with unvalued voice and φ -features; these are valued by a matrix v via feature-sharing (10a). In Wurmbrand's typology of Long Object Movement Restructuring in Austronesian languages, there is no case where the Agent, if present, is in the matrix clause, and where the matrix verb is not voice-marked - CC is just such a case. I thus propose that a null matrix v_R bearing only unvalued φ is valued by a lower $v_{PV}P$ / $v_{Pass}P$ (10b). Matrix v_R must lack voice, since the CC predicate is not voice-marked. This seems related to the fact that most CCPs can *never* be voice-marked, or passivize (the prefix *ber-* derives intransitive verbs from non-verbs, not mark voice - e.g. *berhasil* 'succeed' from *hasil* 'result'; cf. (1)).

- (10) a) $v_{[F:val1]} \dots v_{R[F:_]} \Rightarrow v_{[F:val1]} \dots v_{R[F:val1]}$ Forward Restructuring
 b) $v_{R[F:_]} \dots v_{[F:val1]} \Rightarrow v_{R[F:val1]} \dots v_{[F:val1]}$ Backward Restructuring

v_{PV} (\emptyset -) is born as $[v:PV, \varphi:_]$, v_{Pass} (*di-*) as $[v:PASS, \varphi:x]$, and $v_R(\emptyset-)$ as $[\varphi:_]$ (I assume v_{PV} and v_{Pass} are not phases - assuming they are poses no problem). In the Patient voice (11), after v_{PV} has merged with VP, the Agent merges, values v_{PV} 's φ -features, then incorporates into v_{PV} . The CC predicate and v_R are merged, and v_R has its φ -features valued by v_{PV} . Because v_{PV} and v_{Pass} cannot assign ACC (Cole et al. 2008), the Patient must move to Spec,TP to receive NOM and satisfy T's EPP. The derivation of the passive (12) proceeds similarly, except that the implicit Agent may optionally be specified.

- (11) $[_{v_{PV}P} I_{[\varphi:1SG]} [v_{PV} [v:PV, \varphi:_] [VP touch cat]]] \Rightarrow [_{v_{PV}P} I + v_{PV} [v:PV, \varphi:1SG] [VP touch cat]]$
 $\Rightarrow [_{v_R P} v_R [\varphi:_] [VP try [_{v_{PV}P} I + v_{PV} [v:PV, \varphi:1SG] [VP touch cat]]]]$
 $\Rightarrow [CP [TP cat_1 [_{v_R P} v_R [\varphi:1SG] [VP try [_{v_{PV}P} I + v_{PV} [v:PV, \varphi:1SG] [VP touch t_1]...]]]]]$

- (12) $[CP [TP Siti_1 [_{v_R P} v_R [\varphi:x] [VP try [_{v_{Pass}P} v_{Pass} [v:PASS, \varphi:x] [VP kiss t_1]]]]] ([PP by Ali])...]$

Conclusion: The analysis derives two crucial properties of CC: **(i)** the subject of the matrix CCP is merged in the lower clause - its φ -features are inherited by an anaphoric matrix v_R ; **(ii)** the matrix DP originates as an object to the lower verb, but moves to matrix Spec,TP. Others have used optional Raising (P&P 2008) or optional Agree (Nomoto 2008), and Sato's (2012) cross-clausal X^0 -movement wrongly predicts that negating only the lower clause is bad. Here, there is no optionality, and since there is no X^0 -movement, negating only the lower clause should be fine - which is correct. Note that CC is better characterized as Object-to-Subject Raising, not Control. I discuss properties of CC predicates, and relate Backward Restructuring to Backward Control and Backward Raising, concluding that Backward Restructuring is forced mainly by the morphology. Importantly, Indonesian CC seems to constitute a novel pattern of Long Object Movement Restructuring. If time permits, I discuss a potential correlation between word order and Restructuring patterns. **Sel. refs.:** Nomoto (2008): *A unified analysis of funny control*; Polinsky & Potsdam (2008): *The syntax and semantics of wanting in Indonesian*; Sato (2012): *The crossed control construction and the syntactic role of passive morphology in Standard Indonesian*; Wurmbrand (2016): *Complex predicate formation via voice incorporation*