Madurese Control

William D. Davies
Department of Linguistics, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
e-mail: william-davies@uiowa.edu

Abstract: This paper provides an overview of some characteristics of a Madurese grammatical construction in which the subject or object of the main verb supplies the reference for a nonovert participant in the complement, what is generally referred to under the rubric as 'control' in generative syntactic theory. The data indicate that control in Madurese shows some similarities to control in English and other languages, but that there are important differences as well.

Key words: Madurese, comparative grammar, generative syntax, control.

This paper examines 'control' structures in Madurese. These are illustrated by the sentences in (1-3).

(1) Siti terro entar-a ka Jakarta.
S want go-IRR to J (IRR: Irrealis)
'Siti wants to go to Jakarta.'

(2) Ali nyajal mateppa' sapedha motor-ra bi' obing.
A AV.try AV.fix motorcyle-DEF with screwdriver (AV: Actor Voice)
'Ali tried to fix his motorcycle with a screwdriver.'

(3) Atin molae noles sorat.
A start AV.write letter
'Atin started to write a letter.'

These are referred to as control structures because the overt subject of the main clause–*Siti* in (1), *Ali* in (2), and *Atin* in (3)–controls the reference of the covert or null subject of the verb of the complement. That is, in (1) *Siti* is understood to be both the one who wants and the one who goes, as opposed to (4), in which *Siti* is the one who wants, but *Bambang* is the one who goes, the subject of the complement verb.

(4) Siti terro Bambang entar-a ka Jakarta.
S want B go-IRR to J
'Siti wants Bambang to go to Jakarta.'

Control structures are of special interest because an important issue of continued investigation and theorizing over the past 40 or so years in generative linguistics is the proper analysis of raising versus control, illustrated in (5) and (6), respectively for English.[1]

(5) Hasan seemed to understand the principle.
(6) Hasan tried to understand the principle.

The sentence in (5) exemplifies raising-to-subject and that in (6) illustrates subject control. Note that the surface strings in (5) and (6) are identical: main clause with an infinitival complement, which can be represented as NP-V-to-VP. The sole surface difference is the choice of the main verb, *seem* versus *try*. In the raising construction in (5), the subject *Hasan* is semantically linked only to the complement verb *understand*. The construction is referred to as raising because in the dominant analysis *Hasan* starts as the subject of the complement verb and 'raises' into its position in the main clause. Conversely, in (6) the subject *Hasan* is semantically linked to both the main verb *try* and the complement verb. For this reason, the subject in (6) is said to 'control' the reference of the subject of the complement verb. The most widespread account of control, which is exemplified by the treatment in Chomsky (1981), is one in which the complement is a full clause and a null subject (represented as PRO) shares its reference (represented by the coindexation) with the main controller, so that (6) is represented as (7).[2]

(7) Hasan_i tried [PRO_i to understand the principle].

One of the characteristics of these constructions is the fact that the complement clause is an infinitive clause; and it is the finiteness versus non-finiteness distinction that characterizes control from non-control complement structures in English. And a verb such as *decide* can occur in both structures.

[1]For an overview of the analyses of these constructions through the history of generative linguistics, see Davies and Dubinsky 2004.
[2]In (7) and elsewhere, the square brackets indicate the boundaries of a complement clause.

(8) Siti decided [to go to Jakarta].
(9) Siti decided [that she would go to Jakarta].

However, this distinction is not robust in all languages of the world. Madurese and other closely related languages such as Balinese, Indonesian, Javanese, and Sundanese have no apparent finite versus non-finite distinction in the verbal system. Rather than an elaborate system of tense and person marking found in some highly inflected languages (e.g., Greek, Hindi, Turkish, and others) or a relatively impoverish system (e.g., English, Japanese), there is no overt tense and agreement marking in a language such as Madurese. Instead, verbs occur in an uninflected form and time and aspectual distinctions are signalled by temporal and aspectual adverbs (such as *gi'* 'still', *ba'ari* 'yesterday') or are easily inferred from the discourse context.

Given this fundamental grammatical difference, a question that arises is whether the notion of control in the grammar of English and like languages is relevant to a language in which finiteness does not seem to play a significant role. However, in recent work, Landau (2000, 2004) has shown that finiteness is not determinate, as control into finite clauses is possible in Bulgarian, Greek and other Balkan languages. In light of this, there is no particular reason to suspect that control is not also a part of the grammar of a language such as Madurese. In fact, in other recent work, Culicover and Jackendoff (Culicover & Jackendoff, 2001; Jackendoff & Culicover, 2003) have argued for a semantic basis of control rather than a syntactic one.

With this background in mind, the remainder of this paper informally investigates some of the characteristics of control in Madurese.

METHODOLOGY

The data reported on in this study were collected from native speakers of Madurese who live in the Bangkalan area. Some of the data were extracted from narratives told by these speakers. However, inasmuch as finding all the crucial data necessary to describe and analyze particular grammatical constructions rarely occur with sufficient frequency in naturally occurring samples, direct elicitation of data is also a crucial component to data collection. Two forms of elicitation were used. In one, the native speaker consultant was asked how to say a particular sentence (given in Indonesian) in Madurese. Based on these responses and the

examples gleaned from the narratives, the investigator created Madurese sentences and had the native speaker consultants judged whether they were acceptable Madurese utterances. In this way, the investigator was able to ascertain the full range of possible expression and to determine what the limits of the grammar were.

THREE CLASSES OF PREDICATES?

The Madurese sentences in (1-3), repeated here, illustrate three different patterns.

(1) Siti terro entar-a ka Jakarta.
S want go-IRR to J
'Siti wants to go to Jakarta.'

(2) Ali nyajal mateppa' sapedha motor-ra bi' obing.
A AV.try AV.fix motorcyle-DEF with screwdriver (DEF: Definite)
'Ali tried to fix his motorcycle with a screwdriver.'

(3) Atin molae noles sorat.
A start AV.write letter
'Atin started to write a letter.'

In some ways these constructions are the same, and in some ways they differ. For instance, in (1), the complement verb takes the irrealis morpheme *a*, which indicates that the states of affairs described by the predicate (here *entar* 'go') has not occurred. The main verb *terro* 'want' requires that the verb of the complement clause be in this form; this follows naturally as the complement describes something that is desired and thus has not occurred at the time described in the sentence. This irrealis morpheme is lacking from the verbs of the complements in (2) and (3). Another predicate that takes a complement clause with an irrealis-marked verb is *endha'* '(be) willing', as in

(10) Siti endha' noles-a sorat.
S willing AV.write-IRR letter
'Siti is willing to write a letter.'

Again, someone's willingness to do something entails that the action has not been done at the time that the person expresses this willingness. There thus appears to be a class of control predicates typified by *terro* and

endha' which take complements with a verb marked for irrealis.

As we will see below, despite the fact that *terro* has this requirement on the complement verb and the others do not, there are ways in which the three sentences are alike and ways in which the sentence with the main verb *terro* is like the sentence with the main verb *jajal* 'try' that make them different from the sentence with the verb *molae* 'start'.

Some properties shared by all three sentence types

The constructions illustrated by the sentences in (1-3) are what are referred to as 'obligatory control'. What this means is that in these constructions the understood (PRO) subject of the complement clause obligatorily gets its interpretation from some element in the main clause. One of the properties usually associated with obligatory control that these structures share is the fact that the reference of the understood subject must include the entire main clause controller, not a subpart of it. Thus, in (11), it is Siti's friend who tried to read the letter, not Siti.

(11) Kanca-na Siti nyajal maca sorad-da Ita.
friend-DEF S AV.try AV.read letter-DEF I
'Siti's friend tried to read Ita's letter.' (Siti's friend reads, not Siti)

Another property of obligatory control can only be illustrated when there are both a subject and object in the main clause. Under normal circumstances the object is the controller when the main clause verb occurs in the active voice, as with the verb *mayaken* 'convince' (12).

(12) Ali mayaken bapa' melle motor-ra taretan-na.
A AV.convince father AV-buy car-DEF older.sibling-DEF
'Ali convinced father to buy his older brother's car.'

In (12), the object *bapa'* 'father' controls the reference of the complement subject, just as is true in English. Importantly, the sentence is interpreted as father buying the car on his own; (12) cannot be interpreted as both Ali and father buying the car. Again, this is true of the English translation as well. This demonstrates that the understood subject of the complement clause cannot take what is referred to as a split antecedent, that is, an antecedent (or controller) made up of two distinct entities. Note that this is not true in non-control structures. In (13), the pronominal element *aba'na* can have a number of different interpretations: it can refer to Bambang

alone, Ita alone, Bambang and Ita together, some person or persons in the domain of discourse, or some combination of these. Most relevant here though is the fact that *aba'na* can refer to Bambang and Ita together, meaning it can take a split antecedent.

(13) Bambang$_i$ a-bala dha' Ita$_j$ ja' aba'na$_{i+j}$ kodu mole.
B AV-say to I that they should go.home
'Bambang said to Ita that they should go home.'

The fact that a split antecedent is possible in (13) (again as it is in English), sets the control construction in (12) apart. And the construction in (12) acts according to the predictions of an obligatory control analysis.

One other property of these constructions that is relevant to considerations of control and which make these structure seem similar to control in English is the fact that it is impossible to have a subordinating conjunction introduce the complement clause. As we see in the sentence in (14) and that in (15), complement clauses in non-control sentences can be introduced by the subordinator *ja'* 'that'.

(14) Bambang yaken ja' ana'-na lulus ujian-na.
B sure that child-DEF pass exam-DEF
'Bambang is sure that his child passed his exam.'

In the control structures, neither *ja'* nor any other subordinator may introduce the complement.[3]

(15) Ali nyajal (*ja'/*sopaja) mateppa' sapedha motor-ra..
A AV.try that/so that AV.fix motorcycle-DEF
'Ali tried to fix his motorcycle.'

The same is true when the main clause verb is comes from either of the other two sentence types, that is, when *terro* or *molae* (or like verbs) is the main verb.

Thus, there are aspects of the Madurese structures that make plausible a control analysis akin to that proposed for English and other languages– an obligatory control analysis. As we see in the following section, however, there are some important differences as well.

[3]The * in the example indicates that if the sentence includes the element following the sentence is ungrammatical.

Some 'unusual' properties of certain Madurese control structures

One aspect of obligatory control in English and many other languages is the fact that the controller must be either the subject or the direct object of the main verb. With an object control verb such as *convince*, the controller can be the object, as in (12) or may be the subject of a passive clause, as in (16).

(16) Father was convinced by Ali to buy his older brother's car.

Howe ver, despite the fact that the verb *try* can be passive in English (as in *The new method was tried by Sam*), it is impermissible for *try* to be passive in the control structure, (17). The explanation for this is the fact that prepositional objects cannot be controllers, as is indeed the case for all English obligatory control structures.

(17) *To understand the principle was tried by Hasan.

Madurese departs from this pattern. As in English, it is possible for the controller of an object control verb to occur as the subject, as in (18).

(18) Bapa' e-payaken Ali melle motor-ra taretan-na.
father OV-convince A AV.buy car-DEF older.sibling-DEF
'Ali convinced father to buy his older brother's car.'

However, Madurese parts company with the English pattern in allowing the controller of a subject control predicate occur in postverbal position of an object voice (passive) construction.

(19) Mateppa' sapedha motor-ra se e-jajal Ali.
AV.fix motorcyle-DEF REL OV-try A (OV: Object Voice)
'Ali tried to fix his motorcycle.'

In (19), *Ali* is the agent but no longer the subject of the main clause, and yet the sentence is grammatical. Thus, the facts of Madurese diverge from what is expected given the facts of English and other languages.

One of the hallmarks of obligatory control in the world's languages is that only subjects of subordinate clauses can be controlled. This figures into every theoretical account of control and, in fact, is a characteristic that many theoretical approaches strive to explain, building the theory so that this fact follows from the account. So, for instance, despite the fact that the subject of the main clause might be coreferent with the embedded agent and thus control it, it is only when the agent is the subject that the structure is well-formed. Thus, (20a) is a grammatical English sentence, but (20b) is not.

(20) a. Hasan tried to fix his motorcycle.
b.*Hasan tried his motorcycle to be fixed (by).

The Madurese data that we have examined thus far conform to this 'subjects only' restriction. But as we will see shortly, this need not necessarily be the case. However, this need not be the case. It is possible at least for some speakers for the controlled position to be the postverbal position when the embedded verb occurs in the object voice. This is demonstrated for a case of subject control in (21) and object control in (22).[4]

(21) Ali nyajal [sapedha motor-ra e-pateppa' PRO].
A AV.try motorcycle-DEF OV-fix
Ali tried to fix his motorcycle.'

(22) Ebu' a-lantor Siti [sorad-da Ita e-baca PRO].
mother AV.allow S letter-DEF I OV-read
'Mother allowed Siti to read Ita's letter.'

In (21), the subject controller *Ali* provides the reference of the agent of the subordinate clause, even though *sapedha motorra* is the subject of the clause. In (22), the object controller *Siti* provides the reference of the agent in the embedded clause, despite the fact that *soradda Ita* is the complement subject. In this respect, Madurese differs from many languages of the world. However, Kroeger (1993) reports that Tagalog demonstrates the same set of facts as Madurese. Inasmuch as both Madurese and Tagalog belong to the Austronesian family of languages and demonstrate other similarities (see Davies, in press), this similarity should not be too surprising.

The notion subject can play a role in these Madurese structures though. Although it is the standard case for the agent to be the controlled element in the complement clause, an object of a complement verb can be controlled if it is made the subject in the object voice construction. In (23), *maleng gila rowa* 'that crazy thief' is the object of the catching by the police, and thus the complement object is being controlled even though there is an agent in the clause.[5]

[4]I have included a PRO solely to illustrate the position in which one would expect to find the agent were it an overt element.
[5]Again PRO is included here simply to indicate the position that is controlled.

(23) Maleng gila rowa nyajal [PRO e-tangkep bi' polisi].
thief crazy that AV.try OV-catch with police
'The crazy thief try to get caught by the police.'

Speakers report that (23) is more acceptable with the modifier *gila* 'crazy' than without it, as no sensible thief would attempt to be caught by the police. The part of sentences in (24) show the relevance of the grammatical relation subject in these instances. In the grammatical sentence in (24a), *Siti* is the notional object of the complement clause but is also the subject. In the ungrammatical (24b) in which *dokter rowa* is the subject, *Siti* would be the object. The fact that *Siti* is not the subject therefore accounts for the ungrammaticality of the sentence.

(24) a. Siti e-olleagi ebu' [PRO e-pareksa dokter rowa].
S OV-allow mother OV-examine doctor that
'Mother allowed Siti to be examined by the doctor.'

b. *Siti e-olleagi ebu' [dokter rowa mareksa PRO].
S OV-allow mother doctor that AV.examine
(Mother allowed Siti to be examined by the doctor.)

A final unusual characteristic of these Madurese structures is the fact that for some speakers with some main clause verbs it is possible for the complement not to have a null subject but to have a pronominal subject. Most speakers accept some sentences with pronouns in subject position, but they differ somewhat with respect to which main clause verbs this is possible with. So, the sentences in (25-26) are deemed acceptable Madurese sentences. (The variability in acceptability is indicated by the % symbol.)

(25) %Ali$_i$ nyajal [*aba'eng$_i$* mateppa' sapedha motor-ra bi' obing].
A AV.try he AV.fix motorcyle-DEF with screwdriver
'Ali tried to fix his motorcycle with a screwdriver.'

(26) %Na'-kana'$_i$ e-soro bapa' [*aba'eng$_i$* nyaba' maenan-na]
children OV-order father they AV.put toy-DEF
ka dhalem kothak.
to inside box
'Father ordered the children to put their toys in the box.'

Speakers who accepted these sentences also accepted the sentences without the pronoun. The possibility of an overt pronoun in the controlled

position casts some doubt that the analyses of obligatory control proposed for English and other languages are applicable to the Madurese case. However, a much more thorough examination and collection of data with a variety of speakers is necessary before conclusions can be safely drawn.

The differing behavior of aspectual predicates

Sentences with main verbs such as *terro* or *jajal* pattern in a similar manner other than the complement verb take the irrealis suffix. Aspectual predicates such as *molae* 'start', *ambu* 'stop', *terrossagi* 'continue', and others differ in some important ways. First, unlike verbs of the *terro*-class or *jajal*-class, verbs of the *molae*-class can occur in sentence initial position, as in (27) and (28).

(27) Ambu Ali makane sape-na bapa'.
stop A AV.feed cow-DEF father
'Ali stopped feeding father's cow.'

(28) Hasel Atin nemmo domped-da.
succeed A AV.find wallet-DEF
'Atin succeeded in finding her wallet.'

Of course, it is also possible for the subject to precede the verb, as in (29) and (30).

(29) Ali ambu makane sape-na bapa'.
A stop AV.feed cow-DEF father
'Ali stopped feeding father's cow.'

(30) Atin hasel nemmo domped-da.
A succeed AV.find wallet-DEF
'Atin succeeded in finding her wallet.'

Unlike the *terro*- and *jajal*-types of structures, with aspectual predicates the object of the complement can be the subject of the main verb if the complement verb is in the object voice. Thus, in (30) and (31), the complement objects, *sapena bapa'* 'father's cow' and *dompedda* 'her wallet', respectively, occur as the subjects of the main clauses. In each case, the complement verb is in the object voice.

(31) Sape-na bapa' ambu e-pakane Ali.
cow-DEF father stop OV-feed A
'Ali stopped feeding father's cow.'

(32) Domped-da hasel e-temmo Atin.
wallet-DEF succeed OV-find A
'Atin succeeded in finding her wallet.'

Finally, unlike the *terro-* and *jajal*-types of structures, no speakers accept control of the non-subject agent in the aspectual construction. In (33) and (34), the agent of the object voice complement verb is missing, but it cannot be construed as controlled by the subject of the main clause, as both are ungrammatical.[6]

(33) *Ali ambu sape-na bapa' e-pakane PRO.
A stop cow-DEF father OV-feed
(Ali stopped feeding father's cow.)

(34) *Atin hasel domped-da e-temmo PRO.
A succeed wallet-DEF OV-find
(Atin succeeded in finding her wallet.)

In (33), although hypothetically one might be able to understand the agent of *epakane* 'feed' to by *Ali* (as we saw above in (21) with the verb *jajal* 'try'), this is not possible with the main verb *ambu*; nor is it possible with the main verb *hasel*.

CONCLUSION

The rather cursory look at the Madurese data above reveals that the constructions exemplified by the sentences in (1-3) bear some similarity to control constructions that have been described for English and a variety of other languages of the world. This is particularly true of the semantics of these structures, where predicates with similar meanings in English show similar semantic properties to those in Madurese. This might then provide some support for the semantic approach to control advocated by Culicover and Jackendoff. However, there are clearly syntactic differences between the Madurese and English constructions. This may be tied to the lack of a role for finiteness in Madurese. The subject position of a non-finite clause in English allows an overt subject only under limited circumstances, and likely is important to the restriction that only subject position can be controlled. This was certainly true in the Government Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981). The fact that finiteness is irrelevant in Madurese may account for the unusual properties of allowing non-subjects to be controlled and allowing an overt pronoun in the controlled position.

[6]As in (21) and (22), PRO is included here simply to indicate what the missing position is.

Finally, it might also be the case that the control as it has been described for English and other languages is simply not a relevant notion in Madurese grammar or it might be that languages such as Madurese may help establish what the core properties are for control in all languages, paring off the kinds of syntactic differences that have been identified. However, before an answer can be appropriately formulated, a close and exhaustive study of these structures in Madurese and other Indonesian-type languages must be undertaken. The results could well be illuminated for syntactic theory.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Culicover, P., & Jackendoff, R. 2001. Control is not movement. *Linguistic Inquiry, 32,* 493-512.

Davies, W.D. In press. The richness of Madurese voice. In I Wayan Arka & M. Ross (Eds.), *Aspects of Austronesian Voice Systems* (pp. 193-216). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Davies, W.D., & Dubinsky, S. 2004. *The grammar of raising and control: a course in syntactic argumentation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Jackendoff, R., & Culicover, P. 2003. The semantic basis of control. *Language, 79,* 517-556.

Kroeger, P. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI.

Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of control: structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Landau, I. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, *22*, 811-877.