

Reflexive sentences with *la* ‘let’ in Norwegian — active or passive?

Helge Lødrup

Abstract. This article discusses Norwegian sentences such as *Helge lar seg ikke stoppe* ‘Helge lets REFL not stop’. The second verb raises a difficult question: It does not have passive morphology, but it seems to share properties with passive verbs. This problem has been discussed for corresponding constructions in e.g. German and French. I focus on the Norwegian data, and argue that it is necessary to consider this kind of sentence to be passive. I also discuss how to implement this view within an LFG conception of complex predicates.

1 Introduction

What is a passive verb? The question might seem trivial, and it is not often asked. However, Dyvik (1980) did ask, both for Old Norse and for general grammatical theory. He stressed the structuralist principle of solidarity between content and expression. To assume a passive, there must be a certain content — the well known change in the relation between thematic roles and syntactic functions — combined with an identifiable expression (Dyvik 1980, p. 91). In practice, this means that there must be some kind of morphological marking. This requirement has also been stressed by others, e.g. Haspelmath (1990).

A possible problem for this requirement is represented by some causative and causative-like constructions, with verbs such as German *lassen* ‘let’ or French *faire* ‘make’. A German example is (1), from Comrie (1976, p. 271). The second verb has the active form. Even so, it seems to share properties with passive verbs: it has an agent phrase, and its logical object could be argued to be in a subject position.

- (1) *Er liess den Brief von seinem Sohn abtippen.*
he let the-ACC letter by his-DAT son type
‘He made his son type the letter.’

This question has been discussed many times for various languages (see e.g. Comrie 1976, pp. 271–75; Haspelmath 1990, pp. 46–49; Pitteroff 2014). The facts are complicated, and they are not identical from language to language. Comrie may have been

right when he wrote that the question of voice depends upon detailed study of the individual languages (Comrie 1976, pp. 272).

The question of voice also arises in sentences that have a reflexive pronoun with the first verb, such as the Norwegian (2) with the verb *la* ‘let’.

- (2) *Helge lar seg ikke stoppe av hindringer.*
 Helge lets REFL not stop by obstacles
 ‘Helge cannot be stopped by obstacles.’

Similar sentences have been discussed for Germanic and Romance languages (see e.g. Pitteroff 2014 for German; Labelle 2013 for French). In this article, I will discuss whether Norwegian sentences such as (2) should be considered passive, a question which has not been raised in the Scandinavian literature (Taraldsen 1983; Taraldsen 1991; Vikner 1987). Section 2 shows how *la* ‘let’ in reflexive sentences is different from other uses of this verb. Section 3 discusses properties of these sentences that could provide arguments for or against a passive analysis. Sections 4 and 5 argue that the point of departure for an analysis must be the theory of complex predicates, and give an account based upon Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG). Section 6 discusses cases where the second verb has passive morphology.

2 The verb *la* ‘let’

The Norwegian verb *la* ‘let’ (henceforth LA) can take a verbal complement in sentences such as (3)–(6).¹

- (3) *Vi lot vaktene løslate fangene.*
 we let guards-DEF release prisoners-DEF
 ‘We let the guards release the prisoners.’
- (4) *Vi lot løslate fangene.*
 we let release prisoners-DEF
 ‘We let the prisoners be released.’
- (5) *Vi lot fangene løslate.*
 we let prisoners-DEF release
 ‘We let the prisoners be released.’
- (6) *Fanger lar seg gjerne løslate.*
 prisoners let REFL gladly release
 ‘Prisoners are happy to be released.’

¹ Examples (4)–(5) are from Taraldsen (1983, p. 201).

In (3), the logical subject of the second verb is raised to be the object of LA. In (4) and (5), the second verb has a realized logical object, but no realized logical subject. These sentences will be referred to as 'prisoner sentences'. The standard claim in the literature is that Norwegian has two options for word order in prisoner sentences, with the logical object following or preceding the embedded verb. This claim can be found from Falk and Torp (1900, p. 200) to Taraldsen (1983, p. 201) and Taraldsen (1991). Norwegian has been compared to Danish, which has the first word order only, and Swedish, which has the second only (e.g. Taraldsen 1991). However, in current colloquial Norwegian, prisoner sentences are archaic, especially the type in (5), (see e.g. Faarlund et al. 1997, p. 1009). Even if examples can be found in texts, it would be only a mild idealization to say that prisoner sentences no longer exist as a productive option.

While prisoner sentences are archaic, sentences such as (6), with a reflexive following LA are perfectly normal (Taraldsen 1983, p. 225; Faarlund et al. 1997, p. 1009). This type of sentence will be referred to as reflexive LA sentences.

The relation between the uses of LA in (3)–(6) raises some questions. Examples (5) and (6) might look rather similar from a syntactic point of view. An important difference between the sentence types is that the noun phrase following LA realizes the logical object of the second verb, while the reflexive does not. The logical object of the second verb in sentences such as (6) is often realized as the subject of LA (see Taraldsen 1983, p. 233 and Vikner 1987, pp. 271–72 on Norwegian and Danish). Examples (7)–(8) from Taraldsen (1983, p. 233) illustrate how the syntactic and semantic properties of the subject of LA are constrained by the second verb. The clausal subject in (7)–(8) only gives meaning when the second verb is of a type that can take a clausal object, as in (7).

- (7) *At jorden er flat lar seg neppe hevde idag.*
 that earth-DEF is flat lets REFL hardly claim today
 'That the earth is flat can hardly be claimed today.'

- (8) *#At jorden er flat lar seg neppe hjelpe over gaten.*
 that earth-DEF is flat lets REFL hardly help across street-DEF
 'That the earth is flat can hardly be helped across the street.'

The meanings of prisoner sentences are rather different from those of reflexive LA sentences. In the prisoner sentences, the subject is a causer. In reflexive LA sentences, on the other hand, the meaning is not causative. In many cases, the predicate denotes something that happens to the subject, as in (9), or a disposition that the subject has, as in (10).

- (9) *Ola lot seg behandle.*
 Ola let REFL treat
 'Ola was treated.'

- (10) *Sykdommen lar seg ikke behandle.*
 disease-DEF lets REFL not treat
 ‘The disease is untreatable.’

In reflexive LA sentences, a human subject can be implied to have some control over the event, at least by not opposing it. This fact might seem to stand in the way of a passive analysis, but this is not the case. Furthermore, the subject can be implied to have some control in the regular periphrastic passive (see e.g. Engdahl 2006, pp. 32–34). For example, the periphrastic passive has an imperative, as in (11) (adapted from Engdahl 2006, p. 33), as opposed to the morphological passive. Keenan and Dryer (2007, p. 340) say that “distinct passives in a language are likely to differ semantically with respect to aspect and/or degree of subject affectedness ...”

- (11) *Ikke bli ranet i Chicago!*
 not become robbed in Chicago
 ‘Don’t get robbed in Chicago!’

In the literature on German, a traditional idea is that the second verb is passive both in reflexive LA sentences and in prisoner sentences with a preposed logical object (see e.g. Reis 1973; Pitteroff 2014). For Norwegian, Åfarli and Eide (2003, pp. 220–22) claim that prisoner sentences are passive (see also Platzack 1986 on Swedish). I will not discuss prisoner sentences any further, for two reasons. First, the idea of prisoner sentences being passive only gives meaning if the logical object of the second verb is its structural subject. It is not clear, however, that it is not its structural object (see e.g. Gunkel 1999 on German). Second, it is very difficult to argue for or against analyses of prisoner sentences in Norwegian, given their marginal status.

I will first give an overview of facts that seem to indicate that passive voice is in some way involved in reflexive LA sentences in Norwegian. Relevant phenomena concern subject choice, the behavior of the external argument of the second verb, and exceptions to the passive. These kind of phenomena have been discussed for German and other languages (see e.g. Pitteroff 2014 and references there). The Norwegian facts are not identical, but the differences between the languages will not be focused on here.

Most example sentences in the following are from the World Wide Web, found either by googling or by searching the NoWaC-corpus (Norwegian Web as Corpus). Some of them have been edited lightly.

3 A comparison to regular passives

In reflexive LA sentences such as (6), the logical object of the second verb is realized as the subject of LA. There are also other options for choosing a subject in these sentences. These options will now be discussed and compared to those of regular passives.

Impersonals. All regular Norwegian passives have an impersonal version with an expletive subject (see e.g. Åfarli 1992, p. 20). Reflexive LA sentences can also be impersonal. Two examples are (12) with a presentational focus construction (see Taraldsen 1983, p. 231), and (13) with an unergative verb.

- (12) *Det lar seg skaffe dokumentasjon.*
 EXPL lets REFL provide documentation
 'Documentation can be provided.'

- (13) *så lenge det lar seg trene på kunstgresset*
 as long EXPL lets REFL practice on astroturf-DEF
 'as long as we can practice on the astroturf'

Non-thematic subjects. An important fact is that the subject of LA can correspond to an argument that does not get a thematic role from the second verb. In (14)–(15), the derived subject corresponds to the object of the unergative second verb. This argument is also the subject of a resultative predicate. It does not get a thematic role from the second verb, only from the resultative (*bort* 'away' and *flat* 'flat').

- (14) *overflødig fett som ikke lar seg trene bort*
 excess fat that not lets REFL exercise away
 'excess fat that cannot be removed by exercising'

- (15) *Ingen skulle la seg trække flate.*
 nobody should let REFL step flat
 'Nobody should let anyone squeeze themselves.'

Sentences such as (14)–(15) give important arguments for a passive analysis. With middles and unaccusatives, a derived subject must be an argument that gets a thematic role from the verb (Keyser and Roeper 1984, p. 409; Levin and Hovav 1995, pp. 42–48). With passives, on the other hand, there is no such requirement (compare *Fettet ble trent bort* 'The fat was exercised away').

Benefactives. Another difference from middles and unaccusatives (Baker 1993) is that the derived subject is not limited to the theme argument. When the second verb is ditransitive, its benefactive argument is usually realized as the subject of LA, as in (16).

- (16) *Mussolini lot seg overrekke et sverd.*
 Mussolini let REFL present a sword
 'Mussolini was presented with a sword.'

In regular Norwegian passives of ditransitives, the subject can correspond to either the theme or the benefactive argument (even if the latter option seems to be more common). In reflexive LA sentences, however, theme subjects are marginal, cf. (17).

- (17) ??*Dette sverdet lot seg ikke overrekke Mussolini.*
 this sword let REFL not present Mussolini
 ‘This sword could not be presented to Mussolini.’

This is a difference between regular passives and reflexive LA sentences. However, Herslund (1986) and Vikner (1987, pp. 274–277) show that double objects in causatives and causative-like sentences behave in ways that are not understood. For example, when a sentence such as (12) is acceptable, it is not easy to see why the corresponding sentence with two objects in (18) is not.

- (18) **Det lar seg skaffe ham dokumentasjon.*
 EXPL lets REFL provide him documentation
 ‘Documentation can be provided for him.’ [intended meaning]

Pseudopassives. An option that is very limited in the world’s languages is the pseudopassive, in which the passive subject corresponds to the object of a preposition. No language seems to have a corresponding option with unaccusatives or middles, as has sometimes been pointed out (e.g. Drummond and Kush 2015, p. 458). Norwegian is a language that has pseudopassives, and reflexive LA sentences seem to allow this option to the same extent. Examples are (19) and (20).

- (19) *et arbeidsliv der arbeideren lar seg bestemme over*
 an economic.life there worker-DEF lets REFL decide over
 ‘an economic life where the worker is controlled’
- (20) *reir som ikke lar seg hakke hull på av hakkespetten*
 nests which not let REFL peck holes in by woodpecker
 ‘nests which the woodpecker cannot drill holes in’

We see, then, that the options for choosing a subject in reflexive LA sentences are strikingly similar to those in regular passives, with a slight complication for ditransitive verbs. We will now compare two other properties of the passive, namely its exceptions and the behavior of its demoted argument.

Exceptions to the passive. Some verbs cannot passivize. If reflexive LA sentences are passive, these verbs would be expected not to occur as second verbs. This seems to be what we find. Example (21) has an unaccusative verb, while (22)–(23) have verbs whose meanings make them impossible to passivize “in the majority of languages” (Siewierska 1984, p. 189), including Norwegian.

- (21) **Det lar seg forsvinne i skogen.*
 EXPL lets REFL disappear in woods-DEF
 'One can disappear in the woods.' [intended meaning]
- (22) **Penger lar seg aldri mangle på universitetet.*
 money lets REFL not lack at university-DEF
 'One is never short of money at the university.' [intended meaning]
- (23) **Elvis lar seg vanskelig ligne.*
 Elvis lets REFL hardly resemble
 'One can hardly resemble Elvis.' [intended meaning]

There are also language-specific exceptions to the passive. Norwegian does not allow verbs ending in *-s* to passivize, such as *synes* 'think'. The verbs *skylde* 'owe' and *slippe* 'avoid' are idiosyncratic exceptions (Lødrup 2000). It is striking that even these restrictions on the passive seem to be reflected in reflexive LA sentences, as shown in (24)–(26). Verbs with related meanings such as e.g. *tenke* 'think', *avse* 'spare' and *unngå* 'avoid' can be used both in the regular passive and in reflexive LA sentences.

- (24) **At filmen var god lar seg vanskelig synes.*
 that movie-DEF was good lets REFL hardly think
 'One can hardly think that the movie was good.' [intended meaning]
- (25) **Hvor mange penger lar seg skylde av et EU-land?*
 how many money lets REFL owe by an EU-country
 'How much money can an EU country owe? [intended meaning]'
- (26) **Rengjøringen lar seg aldri slippe.*
 cleaning-DEF lets REFL never avoid
 'One can never avoid the cleaning.' [intended meaning]

It is difficult to find clear counterexamples to the generalization that verbs that cannot be passivized do not occur in reflexive LA sentences. A possible case is (27), with the verb *interessere* 'interest'. In my intuition, this verb has no regular passive. The morphological passive can be found in texts, however.

- (27) *Jeg håper jo at noen vil la seg interessere.*
 I hope you.know that somebody will let REFL interest
 'I hope that somebody will be interested, you know.'

The demoted argument. Passives have an implicit external argument, which can be realized as an agent phrase. In some cases, the implicit external argument can be a controller of PRO. Reflexive LA sentences allow an agent phrase, as has often been observed; an example is (28). In some cases, the implicit argument can control PRO, as in (29).

- (28) *Helge lar seg ikke stoppe av hindringer.*
 Helge lets REFL not stop by obstacles
 ‘Helge cannot be stopped by obstacles.’
- (29) *Pengene lar seg innvinne uten å gå til oppsigelser.*
 money-DEF let REFL reclaim without to go to layoffs
 ‘The money can be reclaimed without going to layoffs.’

However, the parallel to regular passives is less than perfect, because LA does not have an external argument, and the implicit agent can only be associated with the second verb.

4 The role of the complex predicate

We have seen that reflexive LA sentences share important properties with regular passives (like the corresponding German construction, see e.g. Pitteroff (2014)). This would be difficult to account for if we simply say that they are active.

Before discussing the question of voice in reflexive LA sentences further, it is necessary to establish another aspect of their analysis. There seems to be consensus that reflexive LA sentences (like the prisoner sentences) are complex predicate constructions (see Taraldsen (1983), Taraldsen (1991), Vikner (1987) and Pitteroff (2014) on Norwegian, Danish and German). The two verbs in reflexive LA sentences behave as one predicate together. This predicate takes one single set of syntactic functions, and behaves as one unit for grammatical rules that operate on argument structure, such as the presentational focus rule (see sentence (12) above).

LA in reflexive sentences is a light verb. We have seen that it has no external argument. The only position in its argument structure is an open position for the argument structure of the second verb. This means that the second verb contributes all the thematic roles that are realized as syntactic functions. When this open position is filled in, we have the argument structure of the complex predicate as a whole. For *la seg stoppe* ‘let REFL stop’ in a sentence such as (28), the representation will be as in (30) in Lexical Mapping Theory.

- (30) *la seg* < *stoppe* < agent theme > >
 -o -r
 OBL SUBJ

Passives of complex predicates – called “long passives” – raise challenges for our understanding of the passive. Examples of long passives are the German (31) (from Wurmbrand 2001, p. 19), and the Norwegian (32).

(31) *dass der Traktor zu reparieren versucht wurde*
 that the-NOM tractor to repair tried was
 ‘that they tried to repair the tractor’

(32) *Har mye som må huskes å gjøre.*
 have much that must remember-PASS to do
 ‘(I) have many things that I must remember to do.’

Long passives such as (31) and (32) introduce a mismatch between syntax and morphology. A complex predicate can passivize as a whole, but passive morphology is realized on the first verb only. This situation creates a potential problem for the requirement that there must be morphological marking of the passive. Consider sentence (32) above. The first verb *huskes* ‘remember-PASS’ is uncontroversially passive, but what about the second verb *gjøre* ‘do’? It seems to be difficult to say that this verb is active. Its internal argument is realized as a subject, and its external argument is not realized. What is special is of course that its external argument is identified with the external argument of the first verb in the formation of the complex predicate; this is indicated by the indices on the agents in (33).

(33) *huske å gjøre* ‘remember to do’ < agent_i < agent_i patient > >

The verb in question is the second part of a complex predicate. The complex predicate is passivized as a whole, and there is only one passivization involved. This passivization is morphologically realized on the first verb only in (31) and (32).

Long passives have the same options of subject choice as other passives (Lødrup 2014). For example, the pseudopassive is possible, as in (34). The choice of the second verb involves the same exceptions as morphologically passive verbs; an example is (35).

(34) *En slik situasjon bør forsøkes å gjøre noe med.*
 a such situation ought.to try-PASS to do something with
 ‘One should try to do something about this kind of situation.’

(35) **Elvis bør ikke forsøkes å ligne.*
 Elvis should not try-PASS to resemble
 ‘One should not try to resemble Elvis.’ [intended]

In Norwegian and some other languages, the second verb of a long passive can have passive morphology, as in (36) (see Lødrup 2014; Haff and Lødrup 2016; Wurmbrand and Shimamura 2017). However, this does not affect the argument. Passive morphology on the second verb has been seen as a kind of verbal feature agreement, licensed by feature sharing in functional structure (see Niño 1997; Sells 2004; Lødrup 2014).

- (36) *Dette må forsøkes å gjøres.*
 this must try-PASS to do-PASS
 ‘We must try to do this.’

It seems to be difficult to avoid the conclusion that the second verb in a long passive must be considered a passive verb, independently of its own morphology. Its voice is expressed unambiguously, if indirectly, on the first verb in the long passive construction.

5 The status of *la seg*

We concluded with the grammatical tradition that reflexive LA sentences must be passive in some way. The question is then how this should be implemented. This task is in one sense too difficult – these sentences have been discussed a number of times, and there seems to be no simple solution. In another sense, the task is too easy. The reflexive LA construction is special by any account. In Norwegian, it has no clear synchronic relation to other uses of the verb LA, or to other verbs. This means that any account of its properties has to involve at least some idiosyncratic information.

Reflexive LA shares an important property with regular passive verbs: it has no external argument that requires realization as a subject. A difference is that the implicit agent of the complex predicate comes from the second verb, as mentioned in Section 3.

If reflexive LA sentences are passive, the question is what it is that is passive about them. The literature has focused on the second verb. For example, Pitteroff (2014, p. 107) and (2015, p. 45) assume that it is the embedded VP that is passive. A premise of his analysis is a Minimalist conception of complex predicates in which the first verb selects a VP which is ‘small’ in the sense that it lacks functional projections (Wurmbrand 2001; Cinque 2006).

Within an LFG conception of complex predicates, it would not be natural to assume that two verbs that differ in voice could constitute a complex predicate in a monoclausal structure (pace Lødrup 1996). The reason is that complex predicates behave as units with respect to rules that operate on argument structure. It would be more natural to assume that the whole construction is one passive complex predicate.

This assumption has the consequence that we have to think of reflexive LA as a passive verb, whose passive voice also scopes over the second verb in a complex predicate

construction. This might seem an unintuitive and contrived idea. Is there again a passive verb without passive marking? If there is, the problem now concerns one single verb. Besides, one might consider the empty reflexive a grammatical marker for the passive. It is well known from various languages that simple reflexives can be used to mark different kinds of valency reduction, not only anti-causatives, e.g. Norwegian (37), and middles, e.g. German (38), but also passives, e.g. French (39).²

(37) *En dør åpner seg.*
 a door opens REFL
 'A door opens.'

(38) *Das Buch liest sich leicht.*
 the book reads REFL easily
 'The book reads easily.'

(39) *Tout se vend ici.*
 everything REFL sells here
 'Everything is sold here.'

In Norwegian, the reflexive is not used to mark the passive in other cases. If one assumes that it exceptionally functions as a passive marker here, reflexive LA is a passive verb that has no direct counterpart in the active (like English *rumored*, which only exists in the passive).

6 The form of the second verb

The point of departure for this article was the lack of passive morphology with the second verb in reflexive LA sentences. The question is now if passive morphology can be used at all with the second verb. This question raises some problems of analysis. Consider a sentence such as (40). This sentence has a human subject, and can be understood as causative. As a causative, it is a regular subject-to-object-raising sentence. The raised object is then accidentally reflexive, and the sentence is not relevant in this context.

(40) *Bee lar seg bli polstret under.*
 Bee lets REFL become padded underneath
 'Bee lets herself be padded underneath.' [i.e. her pants are padded]

Sentences such as (41)–(42) are different. These sentences have inanimate subjects, and cannot be interpreted as causative or permissive. I assume that these sentences can only have the same structure as the reflexive LA sentences discussed above.

² In the literature on German, *sich lassen* 'REFL let' has been seen as the anti-causative of *lassen* 'let' as used in prisoner sentences (e.g. Pitteroff 2014). The reflexive is then the anti-causative marker. Even if this is an intuitive idea, it would be difficult to make use of in a synchronic account of Norwegian.

- (41) *Dette lar seg ikke gjøres lenger.*
 this lets REFL not do-PASS anymore
 ‘This cannot be done anymore.’
- (42) *En del antibiotika lar seg også produseres syntetisk.*
 a part antibiotics lets REFL also produce-PASS synthetically
 ‘Some antibiotics can be produced synthetically.’

We see, then, that the second verb in reflexive LA sentences can have active or passive morphology. This is the same phenomenon that was shown in examples (32), (34) and (36) above: The second verb of a long passive can have active or passive morphology in Norwegian. Some reflexive LA sentences might be a bit marginal with a passive second verb in Norwegian, but examples can be found in texts. It is interesting that a passive second verb is normal in Swedish. This difference between the languages was pointed out in Hulthén (1944, p. 199-201). Klingvall (2012) gives Swedish examples such as (43).

- (43) *Kakan låter sig bakas med lätthet.*
 cake-DEF lets REFL bake-PASS with ease
 ‘The cake bakes easily.’

With the analysis given here, the passive form of the second verb in sentences such as (41), (42) and (43) must be seen as a kind of verbal feature agreement, like in (36) above. It is a general phenomenon that complex predicate constructions in Norwegian can show agreement for certain verbal features – with some variation between speakers. Aagaard (2016, p. 84) shows that participle agreement is possible in reflexive LA sentences.³ A *www* example is (44).

- (44) *Det hadde ikke latt seg gjort om opptaket var i jpeg.*
 it had not let REFL done if recording-DEF were in jpeg
 ‘It would have been impossible if the recording were in jpeg format.’

Examples (36) and (44) might look like cases of suffix copying. However, it is important that verbal feature agreement is a more “abstract” phenomenon. Voice agreement concerns the grammatical feature passive, and does not require the two verbs to mark the passive in the same way (Lødrup 2014). This is shown in (45) and (46), in which

³ Imperative agreement is not uncommon in complex predicates, as in *Forsøk å stupe/stup!* ‘try-IMP to dive-INF/dive-IMP’ (Havnelid 2015). It is striking, then, that imperative agreement is completely unacceptable in reflexive LA sentences: *La deg ikke stoppe/*stopp!* ‘let-IMP REFL not stop-INF/stop-IMP’. This must be related to the fact that the second verb of a reflexive LA sentence is not a real active.

complex predicates with voice agreement each have one morphological passive and one periphrastic passive.⁴

- (45) *Deponiet foreslås å bli lagt til et område som ...*
 depot-DEF suggest-PASS to become placed to an area that
 'They suggest that the depot be placed in an area that ...'
- (46) *Viktige stridsspørsmål blir unnlatt å presiseres.*
 important issues become neglected to clarify-PASS
 'They neglect clarifying important issues.'

7 Conclusion

A passive verb must have an identifiable expression of its passive voice. However, this expression does not necessarily have to be on the verb itself. For the second verb in a complex predicate it is enough that the first verb is marked.

The reflexive LA construction is special on all accounts. It has no clear synchronic relation to similar constructions, or to other uses of the verb LA in Norwegian. I have argued that its properties are best accounted for when we assume that *la seg* and its second verb constitute a passive complex predicate.

8 Acknowledgements

I was lucky to have Helge as a colleague when I worked in Bergen in the 1980s. I am grateful for what I have learned from him, both then and later. A highlight of my early linguist days was his dissertation defense. (It is remarkable how his dissertation anticipated aspects of LFG and HPSG.) I never stop laughing at his classical poems. We have also had some laughs together.

References

- Aagaard, Teodor Ekblad (2016). *Doble partisipper i norsk: Verbal trekkongruens og re-strukturering*. MA thesis. University of Oslo.
- Åfarli, Tor A. (1992). *The Syntax of Norwegian Passive Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Åfarli, Tor A. and Kristin Melum Eide (2003). *Norsk generativ syntaks*. Oslo: Novus.

⁴ A possible objection is that voice agreement in long passives is very common in Norwegian. Why is it then unusual in reflexive LA sentences? It must be considered that different complex predicates can behave in different ways with respect to voice agreement. For example, French has long passives of aspectual verbs (such as *finir* 'finish') with or without voice agreement, while long passives of other verbs (such as e.g. *tenter* 'try', *oublier* 'forget') seem to require voice agreement (Haff and Lødrup (2016), Chantal Lyche pc).

- Baker, Mark (1993). "Why unaccusative verbs cannot dative-shift". In: *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 23*. Ed. by Amy J. Schafer. Department of Linguistics, University of Massachusetts, pp. 33–47.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2006). *Restructuring and Functional Heads: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard (1976). "The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-language similarities and divergences". In: *Syntax and Semantics 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions*. Ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani. New York: Academic Press, pp. 261–312.
- Drummond, Alex and Dave Kush (2015). "'Reanalysis' is raising to object". In: *Syntax* 18.4, pp. 425–463.
- Dyvik, Helge (1980). "Har gammelnorsk passiv". In: *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics 4*. Ed. by Even Hovdhaugen. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, pp. 82–107.
- Engdahl, Elisabet (2006). "Semantic and syntactic patterns in Swedish passives". In: *Demoting the Agent. Passive, Middle and Other Voice Phenomena*. Ed. by Benjamin Lyngfelt and Torgrim Solstad. John Benjamins, pp. 21–45.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie, and Kjell Ivar Vannebo (1997). *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Falk, Hjalmar and Alf Torp (1900). *Dansk-norskens syntax i historisk fremstilling*. Aschehoug.
- Gunkel, Lutz (1999). "Causatives in German". In: *Theoretical Linguistics* 25.2/3, pp. 133–160.
- Haff, Marianne Hobæk and Helge Lødrup (2016). "Où en est le «passif long» en français?" In: *Syntaxe et sémantique* 1, pp. 153–173.
- Haspelmath, Martin (1990). "The grammaticization of passive morphology". In: *Studies in Language* 14.1, pp. 25–72.
- Havnelid, Inga Margrethe (2015). "Prøv å fakk skurken som gjemmer seg på Manhattan": Om dobbel imperativ i norsk. MA thesis. University of Oslo.
- Herslund, Michael (1986). "Causatives, double objects, and the ergativity hypothesis". In: *Scandinavian Syntax: Papers from the Ninth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*. Ed. by Östen Dahl. Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University, pp. 142–153.
- Hulthén, Lage (1944). *Studier i jämförande nunordisk syntax*. Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift 50.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Matthew S. Dryer (2007). "Passive in the world's languages". In: *Language Typology and Syntactic Description 1. Clause Structure*. Ed. by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge University Press, pp. 325–361.
- Keyser, Samuel Jay and Thomas Roeper (1984). "On the middle and ergative constructions in English". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.3, pp. 381–416.
- Klingvall, Eva (2012). "How to approach complex passives". In: *Discourse & Grammar. A Festschrift in Honor of Valéria Molnár*. Ed. by Johan Brandtler, David Håkansson,

- Stefan Huber, and Eva Klingvall. Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University, pp. 395–410.
- Labelle, Marie (2013). “Anticausativizing a causative verb: The passive *se faire* construction in French”. In: *Non-Canonical Passives*. Ed. by Artemis Alexiadou and Florian Schäfer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 235–260.
- Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav (1995). *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Lødrup, Helge (1996). “The theory of complex predicates and the Norwegian verb få ‘get’”. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57, pp. 76–91.
- (2000). “Exceptions to the Norwegian passive: Unaccusativity, aspect and thematic roles”. In: *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift* 18.1, pp. 37–54.
- (2014). “Long passives in Norwegian: Evidence for complex predicates”. In: *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 37.3, pp. 367–391.
- Niño, María-Eugenia (1997). “The multiple expression of inflectional information and grammatical architecture”. In: *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics*. Ed. by Francis Corblin, Danièle Godard, and Jean-Marie Marandin. Peter Lang, pp. 127–47.
- Pitteroff, Marcel (2014). “Non-canonical *lassen*-middles”. PhD thesis. University of Stuttgart.
- (2015). “Non-canonical middles: a study of personal *let*-middles in German”. In: *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 18.1, pp. 1–64.
- Platzack, Christer (1986). “The structure of infinitive clauses in Danish and Swedish”. In: *Scandinavian Syntax. Workshop at the Ninth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*. Ed. by Östen Dahl and Anders Holmberg. Institute of Linguistics, University of Stockholm, pp. 123–137.
- Reis, Marga (1973). “Is there a rule of subject-to-object raising in German?” In: *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Ed. by Claudia Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark, and Ann Weiser. Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago, pp. 519–529.
- Sells, Peter (2004). “Syntactic information and its morphological expression”. In: *Projecting Morphology*. Ed. by Louisa Sadler and Andrew Spencer. CSLI Publications, pp. 1287–225.
- Siewierska, Anna (1984). *The Passive: A Contrastive Linguistic Analysis*. London: Croom Helm.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald (1983). *Parametric Variation in Phrase Structure: A Case Study*. Dissertation, University of Tromsø.
- (1991). “A directionality parameter for subject-object linking”. In: *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*. Ed. by Robert Freidin. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 219–268.

- Vikner, Sten (1987). "Case assignment differences between Danish and Swedish". In: *Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of Teachers of Scandinavian Studies in Great Britain and Northern Ireland*. Ed. by Robin Allan and Michael P. Barnes. University College London, pp. 262–281.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne (2001). *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne and Koji Shimamura (2017). "The features of the voice domain: Actives, passives, and restructuring." In: *The Verbal Domain*. Ed. by Roberta d'Alessandro, Irene Franco, and Ángel Gallego. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 179–204.