Crossed control as Voice restructuring

Ileana Paul, Lisa Travis, Jozina Vander Klok, Susanne Wurmbrand

Western, McGill, Oslo, Vienna

In Indonesian [I] certain predicates can embed a passive-like clause, giving rise to ambiguity. On one reading (1) has a typical control interpretation, where the matrix subject controls the reference of the embedded subject (the theme of *di-ringkus* 'be caught'), (1a). On another reading, the <u>embedded</u> passive agent *polisi* 'police' controls the reference of the external argument of the <u>matrix</u> predicate *berhasil* 'succeed', (1b). The latter reading is referred to as CROSSED CONTROL [CC] and is typologically unusual (Kaswanti Purwo 1984, Gil 2002, inter alia).

(1) Tujuh anggota komplotan berhasil   [di-ringkus   polisi]   Indonesian
    seven member gang   succeed   PASS-catch   police
    a. 'Seven members of the gang succeeded in being caught by the police.'
    b. 'The police succeeded in catching seven members of the gang.' (Sneddon 1996)

Several analyses have been proposed in the literature (e.g. Polinsky & Potsdam 2008, Arka 2014, Berger 2019, Kroeger & Frazier 2019), and although they differ in frameworks and details, the common property, which we follow, is that CC involves a form of restructuring and long object movement. What is unusual about CC is that the passive agent is in the embedded clause. We therefore analyze CC as "reverse" Voice restructuring [VR] (Berger 2019, Wurmbrand & Shimamura 2017 (W&S)) and extend this analysis to closely related languages (Balinese [B], Sundanese [S], and Madurese [M]), accounting for the different realizations of voice morphology (see Natarina 2018, Kurniawan 2013, Davies 2014, respectively).

Placing CC in the broader context of VR, the possible Voice combinations between the two clauses are given in Table 1. I and B have both passive (*di-* in (1)) and Patient Voice (PV) (ø marked); S and M only have PV. In PV, the patient is realized as the subject and the agent as a clitic on the verb (obligatory in Indonesian, optional in other languages).

Table 1: Possible voice combinations, position of agent

V1	V2	AGT HIGH	AGT LOW (CC)
A. ø	PV	n/a	I, B, S, M
B. ø	passive	n/a	I, B
C. passive	passive	Chamorro	I
D. PV	PV	Isbukun Bunun	S, M
E. passive	default	German, Japanese	n/a
F. PV	default	Mayrinax Atayal	n/a
G. passive	PV	??	*

To account for these patterns, we adopt bidirectional VR (Berger 2019, W&S), where in CC, the complement clause is a fully specified VoiceP, while the matrix VoiceP is underspecified for voice and phi-features (we notate the latter as Voice$_R$ __). Moreover, languages either realize Voice matching or default Voice, leading to the typology in (2). We propose that CC is always Voice matching: the Voice and phi-features (agent features in PV or implicit agent of passive) originate in the embedded clause and are transferred to the matrix Voice. In the talk, we derive this restriction from the system in W&S.

(2)

Voice$_{PASS/PV}$ [Voice$_R$ __ OBJ]	Voice restructuring: default, matching
Voice$_R$ __ [Voice$_{PASS/PV}$ OBJ]	Reverse Voice restructuring: matching **only**

Case A is the baseline example of CC: PV is morphologically null, so the matrix V appears bare. We claim that cases B and C are the same in CC: passive Voice is transferred to the matrix V. Matrix predicates that lack a passive form are as a result realized as bare (case B). Case D is not possible in I, as it would involve two overt agents, which blocks VR in general. But it is possible in M and S, where the agent is only realized on the embedded predicate. Cases E and F are only possible in downward VR languages. Finally, we predict the absence of G: the Voice features clash and neither passive nor PV are default options in these languages. Indonesian and

related languages thus add an important component to our understanding of VR: shared Voice features may vary in their position and realization, but they are restricted in principled ways.

References

Arka, I W. 2014. Double and backward control in Indonesian: An LFG analysis. *Proceedings of the LFG14 Conference*, 26–46. Stanford: CSLI.

Berger, M. 2019. Indonesian crossed control: Expanding the typology of restructuring. *Proceedings of WCCFL 36*, 61–70. Somerville: Cascadilla.

Davies, W. 2014. Describing Madurese crossed control. *Argument realisations and related constructions in Austronesian languages, Papers from 12-ICAL, Volume 2*, eds. I Wayan Arka and N.L.K. Indrawati, 369–383. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics.

Gil, D. 2002. The prefixes *di-* and *N-* in Malay/Indonesian dialects. In *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*, 241-283. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Kaswanti Purwo, B. 1984. *Deiksis dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Kroeger, P. & K. Frazier. 2019. Crossed-control in Malay/Indonesian as long-distance passivization. *Proceedings of AFLA 26*, 159-174. University of Western Ontario.

Kurniawan, E. 2013. *Sundanese complementation*. PhD, University of Iowa.

Natarina, A. 2018. *Complementation in Balinese: Typological, syntactic, and cognitive perspectives*. PhD, University of Iowa.

Polinsky, M. & E. Potsdam. 2008. The syntax and semantics of wanting in Indonesian. *Lingua* 118:1617-1639.

Sneddon, J. 1996. *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.

Wurmbrand, S. & K. Shimamura. 2017. The features of the voice domain: actives, passives, and restructuring. In *The verbal domain*, 179-204. Oxford: Oxford University Press.