The apparent lack of a complementizer-trace effect in Indonesian supaya complements
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1. Introduction

Complementizer-trace (C-t) effects
(1) Complementizer-trace (C-t) effects
A preverbal subject cannot be extracted from an embedded clause headed by an overt complementizer.
(2) a. *Who did you think [that ___ met Budi yesterday]?
b. Who did you think [Ø ___ met Budi yesterday]?

C-t effects are considered part of UG and have been reported in a number of unrelated languages (Pesetsky 2017).

The issue
Supaya clauses in Standard Indonesian can contain a subject gap, thus suggesting the absence of a C-t effect.
(3) a. Siapa-kah yang kamu usulkan [supaya ___ ketemu Budi besok]?
   who-Q REL 2SG suggest so.that meet Budi tomorrow
b. Siapa-kah yang kamu usulkan [ Ø ___ ketemu Budi besok]?
   who-Q REL 2SG suggest meet Budi tomorrow
   ‘To whom did you suggest meeting Budi tomorrow?’

The claims
- The gap is indeed a trace.
- Indonesian supaya complement clauses present a counterexample to the universality of C-t effects.

Organization
§2. Complement vs. adjunct supaya clauses
§3. Analysis of supaya complement clauses: Successive cyclic interclausal movement
§4. Alternative accounts: Intraclausal/no movement + coreference, raising
§5. Conclusion

---

1 This type of sentence has an inverted pseudo-cleft structure with a headless relative clause. However, we treat it as if the interrogative rather than a null operator moved.

(i) [Predicate WH-kah] [Subject Op yang t ...]
2. Different kinds of supaya clauses: Complement vs. adjunct

Not all supaya clauses are adjuncts. Complement and adjunct supaya clauses are distinct.

Fronting

(4) Complement: No
   a. Saya meng-usulkan [supaya mesin itu di-perbaiki oleh tukang].
      1SG ACT-suggest so.that machine that PASS-fix by mechanic
      ‘I proposed that the machine be fixed by a mechanic’
   b. *[Supaya mesin itu diperbaiki oleh tukang], saya mengusulkan.
      so.that machine that PASS-fix by mechanic 1SG ACT-suggest

(5) Adjunct: Yes
   a. Tono meng-[k]erjakan PR-nya [supaya dia bisa lulus].
      Tono ACT-do homework-3 so.that 3SG can pass.
      ‘Tono did his homework so that he can pass’
   b. [Supaya dia bisa lulus], Tono meng-[k]erjakan PR-nya.
      so.that 3SG can pass Tono AV-do homework-3
      ‘So that he can pass, Tono did his homework’

Extraction

(6) Ini adalah persidangan yang di-usulkan [supaya __ di-bubarkan].
    this COP trial REL PASS-suggest so.that PASS-dissolve
   (i) Complement: Yes (despite C-t) → reasonable interpretation
       ‘This is the trial whose dissolution was suggested.’
   (ii) Adjunct: No (adjunct island) → anticipated semantic oddity blocked
        #‘This is the trial that was suggested, so that it be dissolved.’

3. The proposal

Assumption: CT splitting

(7) CT splitting (Martinović 2015; Erlewine 2016)
    C and T start as one head. They split when a feature cannot be checked or when no
    position is available for the CT’s goal to move into.
   a. No split → no clear A/A’-distinction
      [CTP CT[uTop, uD] [VoiceP DP[Top, D] … ]]
   b. Split → clear A/A’-distinction
      [CTP CT[uTop, uD] [VoiceP DP[D] PP[Top] … ]]
      ↓
      [CP C[uTop] [TP[uD] [VoiceP DP[D] PP[Top] … ]]]
The claim: Successive cyclic movement

(8) a. The embedded subject successive-cyclically moves.
   b. A-movement (raising): Driven by an EPP (D) feature.
   c. A’-movement: Also driven by an information structural feature such as [Top(ic)] and [Foc(us)].

(9) \[CTP Mesin itu_{[Top, D]} [VoiceP t di-usulkan [CTP t supaya [VoiceP t di-perbaiki oleh tukang]]]].
    machine that PASS-suggest so that PASS-fix by mechanic
    ‘The machine was suggested to be repaired by a mechanic.’

(10) \[CTP Siapa[kah yang [VoiceP t kamu usulkan [CTP t supaya [VoiceP t ketemu Budi who-Q REL 2SG suggest so that meet Budi besok]]]]? tomorrow
    ‘To whom did you suggest meeting Budi tomorrow?’

Support 1: Null expletive

- The preverbal position can be null for passive verbs taking a clausal complement.²
- The embedded subject is licensed in the embedded clause.
- The sentence is not about the embedded subject.

(11) \[CTP ___ Telah di-usulkan [CTP supaya mesin itu_{[D]} di-perbaiki oleh tukang]].
    PFV PASS-suggest so that machine that PASS-fix by mechanic
    ‘It was suggested that the machine be repaired by a mechanic.’

Support 2: No meN- on the matrix verb

The ungrammaticality of meN- indicates DP movement happening across it (Saddy 1991; Soh 1998; Cole and Hermon 1998).

(12) A-movement (bare passive)
   a. Buku itu sudah Ali baca t.
      book that already Ali read
      ‘Ali has already read the book./The book has already been read by Ali.’
      book that already Ali ACT-read

² Unlike in English, clausal subject is generally unacceptable in Indonesian.

(i) *[Supaya mesin itu di-perbaiki] di-usulkan oleh mereka.
    so that machine that PASS-fix PASS-suggest by 3PL
    ‘[That the machine needed fixing] was suggested by them.’
A-movement (crossed control reading; Nomoto’s (2011) analysis)

a. Tono coba t-di-ciumi ibu.
   Tono try PASS-kiss mother
   ‘Mother tried to kiss Tono.’

   Tono ACT-try PASS-kiss mother
   Intended reading: ‘Mother tried to kiss Tono.’

A’-movement (adapted from Saddy 1991: 186)

a. Siapa yang t men-cintai Sally?
   who REL ACT-love Sally
   ‘Who loves Sally?’

b. *Siapa yang Sally men-cintai t?
   who REL Sally ACT-love
   ‘Who Sally loves?’

c. Siapa yang Sally cintai t?
   who REL Sally love
   ‘Who Sally loves?’

A-movement (Nomoto’s 2011 analysis)

a. Mesin itu telah di-usulkan [supaya di-perbaiki oleh tukang].
   machine that PFV PASS-suggest so.that PASS-fix by mechanic

b. Mesin itu telah mereka usulkan [supaya di-perbaiki oleh tukang].
   machine that PFV 3PL suggest so.that PASS-fix by mechanic

c. *Mesin itu telah mereka meng-usulkan [supaya di-perbaiki oleh tukang].
   machine that PFV 3PL ACT-suggest so.that PASS-fix by mechanic
   ‘{It was/They} suggested that the machine be repaired by a mechanic.’

4. Alternative accounts

Alternative 1: Matrix A-movement (passivization) + coreference

a. Obligatory control
   [TP Mesin itu di-usulkan t [CP, supaya PRO, di-perbaiki oleh tukang]].
   machine that PASS-suggest so.that PASS-fix by mechanic

b. Prolepsis
   [TP Mesin itu di-usulkan t [CP, supaya pro/ia, di-perbaiki oleh tukang]].
   machine that PASS-suggest so.that it PASS-fix by mechanic

---

3 This sentence as well as (13a) are acceptable in the normal control reading (‘Tono wants to be kissed by Mother.’).
4 We extend Fortin’s (2006) analysis of adjunct clauses to complement clauses. Fortin claims that CP adjuncts with and without an overt subject involve different kinds of TPs.
   ● T with Case-assigning ability → overt subject
   ● T with no Case-assigning ability → PRO + obligatory control
Empirical problem

The verb *usulkan* does not select the passive “subject” DP.  

(17) *Mereka meng-usulkan \([_{DP} \text{ mesin itu}] \ [_{CP} \text{ supaya PRO/pro/ia di-perbaiki oleh tukang}]\).  

3PL ACT-suggest machine that so.that it PASS-fix by mechanic

Alternative 2: Base-generated topic + obligatory control (= our analysis in the abstract)

(18) \([_{TopP} \text{ Mesin itu di-usulkan } \ [_{CP} \text{ supaya } \ [_{TP} \text{ PRO/ia di-perbaiki oleh tukang}]])\].  

machine that PASS-suggest so.that it PASS-fix by mechanic

Theoretical problem

In obligatory control, the controller must be in an A-position.  

Alternative 3: Base-generated topic + prolepsis

(19) \([_{TopP} \text{ Mesin itu di-usulkan } \ [_{CP} \text{ supaya } \ [_{TP} \text{ PRO/ia di-perbaiki oleh tukang}]])\].  

machine that PASS-suggest so.that it PASS-fix by mechanic

Empirical problem

The antecedent of *pro/ia* is restricted to the DP in the matrix clause.

(20) Talking about Tono, who is always complaining about his machine’s bad conditions.

a. *\([_{TopP} \text{ Mesin-nya di-usulkan } \ [_{CP} \text{ supaya } \ [_{TP} \text{ PRO/ia ketemu tukang}]])\].  

machine-3 PASS-suggest so.that it meet mechanic  
For: ‘As for his machine, it was suggested that he meet a mechanic.’

b. #\([_{TopP} \text{ Mesin-nya di-usulkan } \ [_{CP} \text{ supaya } \ [_{TP} \text{ PRO/ia ketemu tukang}]])\].  

machine-3 PASS-suggest so.that it meet mechanic  
‘It was suggested that his machine meet a mechanic.’

Alternative 4: Raising

(21) \([_{TP} \text{ Mesin itu di-usulkan } \ [_{CP} \text{ supaya } \ [_{TP} \text{ di-perbaiki oleh tukang}]])\].  

machine that PASS-suggest so.that PASS-fix by mechanic

---

5 The verb usulkan is able to take a DP complement, but the DP must denote eventualities.

(i) Mereka meng-usulkan \([_{TP} \text{ pembaikan mesin itu}]\).  

3PL ACT-suggest fixing machine that  
‘They suggested repairing the machine.’

6 This problem will disappear under the CT-splitting hypothesis, where no clear A/A’-distinction exists in Indonesian. If one also adopts a movement analysis of obligatory control (Hornstein 1999), this alternative will be nothing but our proposed analysis.
(22)  
   a.  *They say [\text{DP} the machine] [\text{CP} that \text{PRO/it} was repaired by a mechanic].
   b.  The machine is said to have been repaired by a mechanic.
   cf.  *The machine is said that \text{PRO/t} was repaired by a mechanic.  \text{(that}-trace effect)

Theoretical problem

- The presence of \textit{supaya} indicates that the embedded clause is not a TP but CP.
- The putative movement would incur a locality violation (e.g. Chomsky’s (2001) Phase Impenetrability Condition).

(23)  
   a.  (21)
      ___ diusulkan [\text{CP supaya [\text{TP mesin itu} diperbaiki oleh tukang]]}.
      ↑______________________________
   b.  (22b)
      ___ is said [\text{TP the machine} to have been repaired by a mechanic].
      ↑______________________________

5. Conclusion

An interclausal successive-cyclic movement analysis appears most plausible for Indonesian \textit{supaya} complement clauses.

(9)  
   [\text{CTP Mesin itu[Top, D]} [\text{VoiceP t} di-usulkan [\text{CTP t supaya [\text{VoiceP t} di-perbaiki oleh tukang]]}].
   machine that PASS-suggest so.that PASS-fix by mechanic
   ‘The machine was suggested to be repaired by a mechanic.’

(10)  
   [\text{CTP Siapa[Foc, D]} \text{-kah yang [\text{VoiceP t kamu usulkan [\text{CTP t supaya [\text{VoiceP t} ketemu Budi who-Q REL 2SG suggest so.that meet Budi besok]]}]?}
   tomorrow
   ‘To whom did you suggest meeting Budi tomorrow?’

- The proposed structure involves a C-\text{t} configuration.
- Our analysis provides a counterexample to the hypothesis that C-\text{t} effects are part of UG.
- To the extent our analysis is successful, it lends support to the view that Austronesian languages lack a clear A/A’-distinction (Aldridge 2017).

Future work

1. Find other verbs taking \textit{supaya} complement clauses.
2. Explain why Indonesian lacks C-\text{t} effects.
   Conjecture
   C-\text{t} effects only concern languages with a clear A/A’-distinction? Only in a split CT structure, does \text{t} occur in the same phase/spell-out domain as C.
(24) a. Split CT structure  
\[
[CP\ WH\ C]\ t\ T\ [\text{VoiceP}\ t\ \ldots]
\]
\[
\uparrow\ \text{(i) }\ast\ \uparrow\ \text{(ii) ok}
\]
b. Non-split CT structure  
\[
[CTP\ WH\ CT]\ [\text{VoiceP}\ t\ \ldots]
\]
\[
\uparrow\ \text{(ii) ok}
\]

3. Think more carefully about Indonesian clause structure under the CT-splitting framework.
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