Nor Jnl Ling 37.3, 367–391 © Nordic Association of Linguists 2014 doi:10.1017/S0332586514000262

Lødrup, Helge. 2014. Long passives in Norwegian: Evidence for complex predicates. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 37(3), 367–391.

Long passives in Norwegian: Evidence for complex predicates

Helge Lødrup

The purpose of this article is to show that Norwegian has complex predicates, in which two verbs are reanalyzed as one predicate in a monoclausal structure, comparable to complex predicates that have been proposed for other languages. The central evidence comes from the construction called the long passive, in which the subject of the first verb is typically the patient of the second verb. Norwegian long passives often have passive morphology on both verbs, and I consider this a case of verbal feature agreement. The article also discusses evidence for complex predicates from active sentences.

Keywords complex predicates, long passives, Norwegian syntax, reanalysis, restructuring, verbal feature agreement

University of Oslo, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, Pb 1102, Blindern, N-0317 Oslo, Norway. helge.lodrup@iln.uio.no

1. INTRODUCTION

Complex predicates and reanalysis (or restructuring) have been important research topics for decades, see e.g. Butt (1995), Alsina (1996), Wurmbrand (2001, 2004, 2013), Cinque (2006), and references there. The terms have been used in somewhat different ways in the literature. I will use the term reanalysis for the process that combines two verbs into one predicate – a complex predicate which takes a single set of syntactic functions in a monoclausal structure.[1] Cases of reanalysis have been reported for many languages, but the Scandinavian languages have been largely absent from the international discussion. Exceptions are Wiklund (2001, 2007) and Sells (2004), who give accounts of verbal feature agreement involving reanalysis in Swedish (see also Julien & Lødrup 2013 on Norwegian). However, Wiklund (2007:87) claims that Swedish does not have the transparency phenomena that have been used to argue for reanalysis in other languages, such as long passives. The same claim is made in passing in Lundquist (2009:120, 127). (Both Wiklund and Lundquist have footnotes about possible exceptions.) This article shows that there are long passives in a closely related Scandinavian language, namely Norwegian, represented by Urban East Norwegian. Verbal feature agreement will also be shown to have a role to play.

Section 2 discusses sentences with two passive verbs such as *Dette forsøkes å gjøres* 'this try.PRES.PASS to do.INF.PASS', and argues that they must be considered

CrossMark

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

long passives with voice agreement. Their properties are investigated, including the choice of first verbs and the choice of passive forms. Section 3 shows how long passives and verbal feature agreement can be accounted for within the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG). Section 4 proposes that presentational focus sentences and pseudocoordinations also provide evidence for complex predicates in some cases.

2. LONG PASSIVES AND VOICE AGREEMENT

2.1 The long passive

A type of passive in Norwegian that has hardly been discussed in the literature is exemplified in (1)–(3). (Most example sentences in this article are from web texts.)

(1) Ifølge Bergo må klimaproblemene forsøkes å løses . . .
according.to Bergo must climate.problems.DEF try.INF.PASS to solve.INF.PASS
'According to Bergo, one must try to solve the climate problems . . . '

(2) at vaskemaskinen må huskes å slås på
that washing.machine.DEF must remember.INF.PASS to turn.INF.PASS on
'that you should remember to turn the washing machine on'

(3) viktige stridsspørsmål blir unnlatt å presiseres
important issues are neglected to clarify.INF.PASS
'They neglect clarifying important issues.'

In these sentences, a passive verb is followed by a passive infinitive. The subject of the clause is typically the patient of the second verb. It is important that these sentences do not show subject-to-subject raising, as will be argued below. They will be referred to as voice agreeing long passives, to anticipate the analysis to be given.

The first argument of these sentences is a subject, and not a topicalized object in an impersonal construction. Norwegian requires realized subjects in finite clauses. In examples (1) and (2), it is clear that the first argument is in the canonical subject position (specifier of TP), and not in the topic position (specifier of CP). Example (1) has an adjunct PP in the specifier of CP. Example (2) is a subordinate clause, in which the specifier of CP is standardly assumed to be empty.

Voice agreeing long passives have the same options concerning subject choice as other passives. For example, pseudopassives are possible, shown in example (4).

(4) det som er viktig unnlates å snakkes om
that which is important neglect.PRES.PASS to talk.INF.PASS about
'One neglects talking about what is important.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Especially interesting are sentences with an expletive subject. Norwegian has a general option for impersonal passives with an expletive subject, which also applies to long passives. These sentences can have an object, as in example (5), or no object, as in example (6).

(5) det skal tillates å gjøres opptak av overlevende
there shall allow.INF.PASS to do.INF.PASS recordings of survivors
'It will be allowed to produce recordings of survivors.'

(6) Det må våges å tenkes annerledes
it must dare.INF.PASS to think.INF.PASS differently
'One must dare to think differently.'

Voice agreeing long passives can be found with a number of verbs.[2] Searches were made in the Norwegian NoWaC corpus, which consists of 700 million words from web texts (NoWaC: Norwegian Web as Corpus, http://www.hf.uio.no/iln/om/organisasjon/tekstlab/prosjekter/nowac/index.html, accessed here via the Glossa page http://hf-tekstlab.uio.no/glossa2/front). To make the searches feasible, some shortcuts were taken, and I cannot claim that these searches were exhaustive. The search strings were as listed below, where *å* is the infinitival marker, and *bli* and *være* are the two passive auxiliaries, 'become' and 'be', respectively.

verb with *-s*-suffix + *å* + verb with *-s*-suffix
verb with *-s*-suffix + *å* + lemma *bli*/*være* + participle
lemma *bli*/*være* + participle + *å* + verb with *-s*-suffix
lemma *bli*/*være* + participle + *å* + lemma *bli*/*være* + participle

Some combinations gave no hits, see Section 2.4. Irrelevant hits were disregarded. Some verbs that gave very many ambiguous hits were put aside, see endnote 4 below. Needless to say, the analysis of a number of the sentences found could be disputed.

The number of voice agreeing long passives found was 102 (excluding the ones that were put aside). There were 21 different first verbs in these sentences, listed in (7).

(7) *begynne* 'begin', *forsøke* 'try', *fortsette* 'continue', *fraråde* 'advise against', *klare* 'manage', *lære* 'learn', *makte* 'manage', *nekte* 'deny', *plikte* 'have a duty to', *prøve* 'try', *pålegge* 'instruct', *slutte* 'stop', *starte* 'start', *tillate* 'allow', *tørre* 'dare', *tåle* 'stand, tolerate', *unngå* 'avoid', *unnlate* 'neglect', *velge* 'choose', *ynde* 'like', *ønske* 'wish'

Exploratory web searches gave (reasonably) acceptable voice agreeing long passives with a number of other verbs as well, including those in (8).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(8) *forby* 'forbid', *foretrekke* 'prefer', *fortjene* 'deserve', *gidde* 'bother', *glemme* 'forget', *greie* 'manage', *huske* 'remember', *klare* 'manage', *orke* 'be capable of', *overveie* 'consider', *prioritere* 'give priority', *tilråde* 'advice', *våge* 'dare'

Voice agreeing long passives can have an air of informal or even substandard language, and they are sometimes frowned upon by informants. However, examples abound in web texts, and they can be found in typical written genres, even in documents from the government. All example sentences in this article are (reasonably) acceptable to me as a native speaker of Norwegian, unless otherwise indicated. (This does not imply that I accept all the examples found in the NoWaC corpus; for example, I do not accept *begynnes* 'begin.INF.PASS' as a first verb.)

2.2 The analysis of voice agreeing long passives

Voice agreeing long passives must be distinguished from other constructions in Norwegian that involve two passive verbs, such as 'complex passives' and (other) subject-to-subject raising sentences. It will first be shown that they are different from sentences such as (9), in which a subject-to-subject raising verb with passive morphology is followed by an ordinary passive verb (Sells 2004, Julien & Lødrup 2013).

(9) Dette behøves ikke å gjøres.
this need.PRES.PASS not to do.INF.PASS
'This does not have to be done.'

The first verb in (9) is not a real passive. It can be replaced by an active form without any change in meaning, as in example (10), and it can only have passive morphology when the second verb is passive, shown in example (11). (There is more about these sentences in Sections 2.4 and 3.2 below.[3])

(10) Dette behøver ikke å gjøres.
this needs not to do.INF.PASS
'This does not have to be done.'

(11) Du behøver/*behøves ikke å arbeide.
you need/need.PRES.PASS not to work
'You don't have to work.'

With voice agreeing long passives, on the other hand, the first verb is a real passive which cannot be replaced by an active form, as shown in example (12). It is the second passive form that is not real; it can to some extent be replaced by an active, as shown in example (13) (see also examples (24)–(26) below).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(12) Slike ting forsøkes/*forsøker ofte å gjøres.
such things try.PRES.PASS/try.PRES often to do.INF.PASS
'One often tries to do such things.'

(13) Slike ting forsøkes ofte å gjøres/gjøre.
such things try.PRES.PASS often to do.INF.PASS/do.INF
'One often tries to do such things.'

Voice agreeing long passives are also different from what is called 'complex passives' in Scandinavian grammar (see e.g. Christensen 1991, Ørsnes 2006). An example of a complex passive is (14).

(14) Forsøket aktes utført i Bergen.
experiment.DEF intend.PRES.PASS carried.out in Bergen
'They intend to carry out the experiment in Bergen.'

The complex passive construction has a passive participle (with no auxiliary) as its second verb, while voice agreeing long passives have an infinitive – either an infinitive main verb with passive morphology, as in most examples above, or an infinitive passive auxiliary with a passive participle as in example (15).

(15) Deponiet foreslås å bli lagt til et område som ...
depot.DEF suggest.PRES.PASS to become placed to an area that
'They suggest that the depot be placed in an area that ...'

The complex passive construction takes a very small group of first verbs, while voice agreeing long passives appear with a somewhat larger group (see (7) and (8) above). There is a certain overlap between the groups, e.g. the verb *forsøke* 'try'. First verbs in the complex passive construction include *akte* 'intend', as in (14) above, but not e.g. *huske* 'remember', as shown in (16). Recall that this verb appears in an agreeing long passive in (2) above.

(16) *Forsøket huskes utført i Bergen.
experiment.DEF remember.PRES.PASS carried.out in Bergen
Intended: 'They remember having carried out the experiment in Bergen.'

An interesting difference between these passive constructions concerns verbs that take a PP with an infinitival complement, such as *advare* 'warn'. These verbs cannot be the first verb of a complex passive, see examples (17) and (18).

(17) De advarte mot å forfremme Jon.
they warned against to promote Jon
'They warned against promoting Jon.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(18) *Jon ble advart mot forfremmet. (Hellan 2001:5)
Jon was warned against promoted
Intended: 'They warned against promoting Jon.'

This restriction has been discussed thoroughly in the literature (Christensen 1986; Engh 1994:111–113; Hellan 2001; Ørsnes 2006). Ørsnes (2006) shows that it follows from a subject-to-subject raising analysis of the the complex passive – the extra structural layer created by the PP would make the raising path too 'long'. With voice agreeing long passives, on the other hand, there is no such restriction, as shown in (19) and (20).

(19) Det advares mot å gis i for store mengder.
it warn.PRES.PASS against to give.INF.PASS in too large quantities
'They warn against giving it [i.e. liver as dog food] in too large quantities.'

(20) Suksessen ... satses på å gjentas.
success.DEF concentrate.PRES.PASS on to repeat.INF.PASS
'They concentrate on repeating the success.'

It is an important point that voice agreeing long passives are different from regular subject-to-subject raising sentences. What is here called voice agreeing long passives would be of no special interest if they could be derived in the following way:

(i) passivization of the second verb
(ii) passivization of the first verb
(iii) raising of the derived subject of the second verb to the subject position of the first verb

Example (21) is a subject-to-subject raising sentence with the passive raising verb *hevdes* 'claim.INF.PASS.

(21) Prioritering innenfor budsjettet hevdes å gjøres lokalt.
prioritizing within budget.DEF claim.PRES.PASS to do.INF.PASS locally
'They claim that prioritizing within the budget is done locally.'

It is clear, however, that the voice agreeing long passive cannot be derived by subject-to-subject raising. Many of the verbs that allow the long passive do not allow subject-to-subject raising in the passive. For example, *forsøkes* 'try.INF.PASS' differs from a typical passive subject-to-subject raising verb such as *hevdes* 'claim.INF.PASS' in not allowing an expletive subject or an idiom chunk subject, as shown in (22) and (23).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(22) Det hevdes/*forsøkes å være ulver i skogen.
there claim.PRES.PASS/try.PRES.PASS to be wolves in forest.DEF
'There are claimed/tried to be wolves in the forest.'

(23) Helvetet hevdes/*forsøkes å bryte løs på mandag.
hell.DEF claim.PRES.PASS/try.PRES.PASS to break loose on Monday
'Hell is claimed/tried to break loose on Monday.'

Some of the verbs that allow the voice agreeing long passive, e.g. *huskes* 'remember.INF.PASS', can be found with subject-to-subject raising in bookish style. This means that some sentences are ambiguous between voice agreeing long passives and subject-to-subject raising sentences.[4]

Another argument against a subject-to-subject raising analysis of voice agreeing long passives is provided by sentences with a preposition preceding the infinitival complement, such as (19) and (20) above. These sentences would not be expected to be grammatical if the construction were a subject-to-subject raising construction.

An important argument that voice agreeing long passives are not subject-to-subject raising sentences is given by sentences such as (24)–(26). These examples have been selected to parallel the voice agreeing long passives (1)–(3) above. They have the same first verbs and the same main characteristics, but their second verb has the active form.

(24) en slik situasjon bør forsøkes å gjøre noe med
a such situation ought.to try.INF.PASS to do something with
'One should try to do something about this kind of situation.'

(25) Har mye som må huskes å gjøre.
have much that must remember.INF.PASS to do
'(I) have many things that I have to remember doing.'

(26) ingen juleting ble unnlatt å spøke med
no Christmas.issues were neglected to joke with
'They did not neglect to joke with any Christmas issue.'

The acceptability of sentences such as (24)–(26) varies; they often sound better when the second verb is a passive. A search for the verbs in (7) and (8) above as passive first verbs in the NoWaC corpus resulted in 29 sentences with an active second verb, with 14 different first verbs.[5]

Passives such as those in (24)–(26) cannot have a subject-to-subject raising analysis, because their subject is the patient of an embedded active verb. To my knowledge, they have not been discussed in the Norwegian or Scandinavian literature. However, they are well known from a number of languages under the name of long passives (see e.g. Wurmbrand 2001, Cinque 2006, and references there). Examples (27) and (28) are long passives from German and Spanish (from Wurmbrand 2001:19 and Cinque 2006:65, respectively).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(27) dass der Traktor zu reparieren versucht wurde
that *the.NOM* *tractor* *to* *repair* *tried* *was*
'that they tried to repair the tractor'

(28) Estas paredes están siendo terminadas de pintar.
these *walls* *are* *being* *finished* *to* *paint*
'They are finishing to paint these walls.'

The similarity with examples (24)–(26) above is striking. Both (24)–(26) and (27)–(28) have a passive first verb and an active second verb, and the surface subject of the first verb is the patient of the second verb.

Examples (24)–(26) can be safely assumed to be long passives. The question is, then, what the relation is between the long passives (24)–(26) and what I have called voice agreeing long passives such as (1)–(3). The answer is – as anticipated by my terminology – that the voice agreeing long passives are long passives in which the voice feature of the second verb agrees with the one of the first verb.[6] One argument for this analysis is the fact that a voice agreeing long passive can replace the second passive verb with an active verb form, while this is not possible with the first passive verb. (This was shown above, see examples (12) and (13).)

Verbal features are usually not in focus when agreement is discussed. However, verbal feature agreement has been established independently for Swedish in Wiklund (2001, 2007), and voice agreement is discussed in Sells (2004) and Julien & Lødrup (2013). (There is more about feature agreement in Sections 2.7 and 3.1 below.)

In Sections 2.1 and 2.2 I have argued that Norwegian has long passives. It was shown that the sentences in question have grammatical properties that cannot be accounted for by a subject-to-subject raising analysis. Long passives are well known from other languages, but they have not been noted before in Norwegian. A difference between long passives in Norwegian and e.g. German and Spanish is that the second verb is often passive in Norwegian; this is considered a case of agreement.

2.3 Further arguments for the long passive analysis

A general argument for the long passive analysis concerns the time reference of the verbs involved. The long passive – or reanalysis in general – is assumed not to be possible when the second verb has independent tense, i.e. when it refers to a time that is independent of the time of the first verb (Wurmbrand 2001:79–99). Several of the Norwegian verbs that take the long passive allow, more or less easily, an embedded verb to have independent tense; an example is *foretrekke* 'prefer' (see Wurmbrand 2001:80–85 for similar German data). However, reanalysis is only possible when the second verb does not have independent tense. Thus, a sentence such as (29), with the second verb in the perfect, has no corresponding long passive, as can be seen in (30).[7]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(29) Jeg foretrekker å ha lest dokumentene før møtet.
I prefer to have read documents.DEF before meeting.DEF
'I prefer having read the documents before the meeting.'

(30) *Dokumentene foretrekkes å være lest før møtet.
documents.DEF prefer.PRES.PASS to be read before meeting.DEF
Intended: 'I prefer having read the documents before the meeting.'

When complex predicates are assumed to be monoclausal, a prediction is that an adjunct modifies the whole complex predicate, and never just one of the verbs involved. Even if this prediction involves some delicate judgements, it seems to be basically correct, as indicated by the contrast in (31)–(32).

(31) Vi må overveie å (alltid) involvere dem.
we must consider to always involve them
'We must consider to always involve them.'

(32) De må overveies å (??alltid) involveres.
they must consider.INF.PASS to always involve.INF.PASS
'We must consider to always involve them.'

When there is no reanalysis, an embedded infinitive can easily take a sentence adverb following the infinitival marker, while this sounds very strange in a long passive. A parallel pair of examples with an ordinary adjunct is found in (33)–(34).

(33) De foretrekker å avslutte dette (i morgen).
they prefer to finish this in morning
'They prefer to finish this tomorrow.'

(34) Dette foretrekkes å avsluttes (??i morgen).
this prefer.PRES.PASS to finish.INF.PASS in morning
'They prefer to finish this tomorrow.'

2.4 Passive forms in the long passive

Norwegian has two ways of realizing the passive, the suffix *-s* (the morphological passive) and auxiliary plus participle (the periphrastic passive). The morphological passive has no preterit form (with marginal exceptions) and no participle form. The passive auxiliaries are *bli* 'become' and *være* 'be'. The periphrastic passive with *være* 'be' is usually understood as a perfect. It can be found with the first verb in long passives, but not with the second verb. The reason must be that with the second verb, it would give a time reference that is independent of the time of the first verb, which is not compatible with reanalysis (see Section 2.3 above). The periphrastic passive with *bli* 'become' competes with the morphological passive in the infinitive and the present. The relation between these passive realizations is generally not well

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

understood (but see Engdahl 2006, Laanemets 2013, Lundquist 2013), and the long passives only add further challenges.

Both passive realizations are in principle possible with the first as well as the second verb. Examples with one or two periphrastic passives are (3) above, repeated here for convenience as (35), and (36)–(37).[8]

(35) viktige stridsspørsmål blir unnlatt å presiseres
important issues are neglected to clarify.INF.PASS
'They neglect clarifying important issues.'

(36) Deponiet foreslås å bli lagt til et område som ...
depot.DEF suggest.PRES.PASS to become placed to an area that
'They suggest that the depot be placed in an area that ...'

(37) Verket ble forsøkt å bli stoppet.
publication.DEF was tried to be stopped
'They tried to stop the publication.'

Nevertheless, the frequencies of the morphological and periphrastic passives are different. For the 102 voice agreeing long passives in the NoWaC corpus, the distribution is the following:

morphological passive + morphological passive: 73
morphological passive + periphrastic passive: 9
periphrastic passive + periphrastic passive: 1
periphrastic passive + morphological passive: 19

We see that using the morphological passive with both verbs is the most frequent option. This is also the option that generally 'sounds best'. Embedded periphrastic passives are only used with some 10% (10/102) of all voice agreeing long passives in the corpus.

The periphrastic passive can be found with the first verb, but primarily when there is no alternative. As mentioned above, the periphrastic passive competes with the morphological passive when the auxiliary *bli* 'become' is in the infinitive or the present tense. This turns out to be the case with only two of the 20 sentences with a first periphrastic passive in my dataset. The same holds for long passives with an active second verb: Of 29 such examples, 14 had a morphological passive and 15 a periphrastic passive. Again, only two of the periphrastic passives could have been replaced by a morphological passive.

This relative predominance of the morphological passive in long passives raises several questions. In simple passives, the periphrastic passive is the less formal form in Norwegian, in the sense that it is the predominant form in conversation. Written texts show a higher relative frequency of the morphological passive (Laanemets (2013:92) found 48.2% morphological passives in newspapers, and 20.4% in conversation).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This general picture seems to conflict with the fact that the long passive can give the impression of being informal, and even substandard.

Especially striking is the use of the morphological passive in infinitival clauses. In general, the morphological passive is less frequent and to some extent marked when the infinitival marker is present (see Müller & Ørsnes 2013:298–299 on Danish).[9] However, the morphological passive is the preferred form when there is voice agreement in long passives. Julien & Lødrup (2013) observe that the morphological passive is also the preferred form when a subject-to-subject raising verb agrees in voice with an embedded passive verb, as in (9) above, repeated as (38).

(38) Dette behøves ikke å gjøres.
this need.PRES.PASS not to do.INF.PASS
'This does not have to be done.'

Why should the morphological passive be the preferred form when there is voice agreement? Julien & Lødrup (2013) point out that the passive suffix – invariably *-s* – is a 'small' element, which might make voice agreement sound more natural. An idea from Lundquist (2013) gives the basis for a different explanation of the preference of the morphological passive with the second verb: In Norwegian, the morphological passive has a short paradigm. When some marginal preterits are put aside, it is traditionally said that the morphological passive only has infinitive and present forms. What is striking, however, is that these forms are always – without exception – identical. Drawing on this fact, Lundquist (2013) interprets the morphological passive as tenseless. This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that the morphological passive is used in 'timeless' sentences, such as rules and generic sentences. Lundquist uses this analysis to account for the fact that the periphrastic passive is the preferred form with epistemic modals (e.g. *Brevet skal bli sendt* 'letter.DEF shall be sent') – since complements of epistemic modals carry their own tense, the tenseless morphological passive is less optimal. If this kind of reasoning can be extended to agreeing passive forms, the preference for the morphological passive can be explained by the general constraint on reanalysis that was discussed above (Section 2.3): The second verb cannot have independent tense. The untensed morphological passive is therefore a natural choice with the second verb. This explanation could also be applied to sentences such as (38) above, which are also assumed to be reanalysis sentences (Sells 2004, Julien & Lødrup 2013).

2.5 Long passives and voice agreement in other languages

The present work is based on Norwegian data. However, a quick glance at other languages reveals that Norwegian is not the only language with a voice agreeing long passive. Unsystematic searches on the Swedish and Danish web indicate that (varieties of) Swedish and Danish have an option for long passives, comparable to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Norwegian one. Examples with voice agreement are (39) and (40), without voice agreement (41) and (42).

(39) Detta ska försökas göras idag. (Swedish)
this shall try.INF.PASS do.INF.PASS today
'They will try to do this today.'

(40) Det skal bare huskes at gøres med måde. (Danish)
it shall just remember.INF.PASS to do.INF.PASS with moderation
'One should just remember to do it in moderation.'

(41) Banan skall successivt försökas göra säkrare. (Swedish)
*course.*DEF *shall successively try.INF.PASS do safer*
'They will try to make the [golf] course safer by and by.'

(42) en pointe . . . som bør huskes, at tage med i beregningerne (Danish)
a point that ought.to remember.INF.PASS to take with in calculations.DEF
'a point that one should remember to take into account'

Swedish and Danish linguists have informally reported that they are aware of such sentences. Some of the Swedes have told me that they also accept some of these examples, but only with voice agreement. (The few Danes I have asked were more reluctant.)

English and French may also be argued to have voice agreeing long passives, even if they are seldom mentioned in the literature. Whitman (2013) shows that this construction can be found in English from the 18th century to today, although it is disliked by normative grammarians. He gives several text examples such as (43).

(43) others were attempted to be killed

Some French examples of voice agreeing long passives are provided by Grevisse & Goosse (2008:986). Other examples can easily be found on the French web, such as (44). I am not aware of any discussion of the French situation.

(44) le problème a été tenté d'être résolu
the problem has been tried to.be solved
'They have tried to solve the problem.'

Long passives in Turkish are described by Kornfilt (1996, 1999). Turkish allows long passives with passive second verbs, but only with a very small number of first verbs. An example is (45).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(45) üniversite-ler (polis tarafından) kuşat-ıl-mak iste-n-di
university-PLUR police by surround-PASS-INF want-PASS-PAST
'The universities were wanted to be surrounded by the police.'
(Kornfilt 1996:123)

Especially interesting is the fact that Turkish, like Norwegian, allows impersonal long passives, such as (46).

(46) üniversite-ler-e gir-il-mek iste-n-di
university-PLUR-DAT enter-PASS-INF want-PASS-PAST
'It was wanted (for) the universities to be entered.'
(Kornfilt 1996:134)

Voice agreeing long passives can also be found in some Austronesian languages; see Wurmbrand (2013) for discussion and references.

3. A LEXICAL-FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR ANALYSIS

3.1 Reanalysis

In the previous section we have established that Norwegian has long passives of the same kind that has been reported for a number of other languages, with an option of voice agreement. The question is now how to account for the long passives. Long passives are usually assumed to involve reanalysis (also called restructuring).[10] An argument that Norwegian long passives must be related to reanalysis concerns the types of verbs found in long passives. Using the same classification as Wurmbrand (2001), one may identify the following central types:

- aspectual verbs, e.g. *fortsette* 'continue'
- irrealis verbs, e.g. *forsøke* 'try', *tillate* 'allow', *tilråde* 'recommend'
- strong implicative verbs, e.g. *unnlate* 'neglect', *glemme* 'forget', *våge* 'dare'

There is a clear parallel to the types of verbs that have been assumed to take reanalysis in other languages (see the overview in Wurmbrand 2001:342–345).[11]

Reanalysis has been understood in different ways in the literature. For analyses within Minimalism, see e.g. Wurmbrand (2001, 2004, 2013), Cinque (2006) and Wiklund (2007). In this section, I give an analysis within the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG), as in e.g. Butt (1995), Alsina (1996), Andrews & Manning (1999) and Sells (2004).

In LFG, the distinction between constituent structure and functional structure is important for an account of reanalysis. The constituent structure – the syntactic tree – does not reflect reanalysis directly. The crucial level of representation

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is functional structure, where syntactic functions and grammatical features are represented. At this level, the two verbs in a reanalysis construction together constitute one predicate which takes a single set of syntactic functions. A long passive such as (47) has the simplified functional structure in (48).

(47) Dette forsøkes å gjøres.
this *try*.INF.PASS *to* *do*.INF.PASS
'They try to do this.'

(48)
PRED 'try-do'
SUBJ 'this'
PASSIVE +
TENSE PRESENT

A verb such as *forsøke* 'try' has one lexical entry for its use as a reanalysis verb. It is then an incomplete verb with an argument structure in which the internal argument is not a thematic role, but an open position, as in (49) (Alsina 1996:201–203). When the functional structure is built, a process of predicate composition combines the reanalysis verb and the verb below it, creating a complex predicate. The argument structure of the complex predicate is the result of combining the argument structures of the two verbs, as in (50). The lines indicate that the external argument of the second verb is identified with the external argument of the first verb.[12] (Some technical questions involved are not in focus here, see e.g. Andrews & Manning 1999 and Sells 2004 for discussion.)

(49) forsøke 'try' < agent < . . . > >

(50) forsøke å gjøre 'try to do' < agent < agent patient > >

This account predicts that reanalysis should in principle be possible with more than two verbs, when every (non-lowest) verb allows reanalysis. This prediction seems to be borne out, for example, by the grammaticality of the constructed (51).

(51) Det skjemaet må forsøkes å huskes å brukes.
that *form*.DEF *must* *try*.INF.PASS *to* *remember*.INF.PASS *to* *use*.INF.PASS
'One must try to remember to use that form.'

A potential problem for a reanalysis approach is represented by long passives with a preposition in front of the infinitival complement (see Section 2.2 above). The

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

preposition is selected by the verb, and its semantic content is insignificant. Examples (52)–(53) are repetitions of (19)–(20) above.

(52) Det advares mot å gis i for store mengder.
it warn.PRES.PASS against to give.INF.PASS in too big quantities
'They warn against giving it [i.e. liver as dog food] in too big quantities.'

(53) Suksessen . . . satses på å gjentas.
success.DEF concentrate.PRES.PASS on to repeat.INF.PASS
'They concentrate on repeating the success.'

This preposition must be considered a part of the complex predicate. Independently of long passives, it is a common assumption in the literature that a verb and a preposition can be reanalyzed as one predicate. A central motivation is the pseudopassive (e.g. Bresnan 1982, see Postal 2004:258–264 for critical discussion). In Scandinavian grammar, this idea has not been popular, and there are arguments against reanalysis in pseudopassives (Lødrup 1991). Even so, it seems to be necessary to assume that reanalysis in sentences such as (52)–(53) makes the preposition a part of the complex predicate.[13]

It has been claimed that reanalysis verbs do not take an internal argument (the infinitive aside), see e.g. Cinque (2006:22). Wurmbrand (2004:997–998) shows that an internal argument is possible with some reanalysis verbs in German, but this does not seem to be the case in Norwegian. Some of the verbs that allow reanalysis can take three semantic arguments, e.g. *forby* 'forbid' and *tillate* 'allow'. In their regular use, they allow their benefactive argument to be realized as an object in front of an infinitival complement. This option does not exist when they are used as reanalysis verbs.[14] A web example such as (54) becomes completely unacceptable with an object inserted.

(54) det skal tillates [*John] å gjøres opptak av overlevende
there shall allow.INF.PASS John to do.INF.PASS recordings of survivors
'It will be allowed to produce recordings of survivors.'

3.2 Feature agreement

The LFG theory of reanalysis makes a simple account of feature agreement possible. An important general insight, which can be found in Niño (1997), Wiklund (2001, 2007) and Sells (2004), is that verbal feature agreement occurs in sentences with reanalysis. This follows without extra rules or stipulations within LFG, as shown in Niño (1997) and Sells (2004). Sells (2004) discusses sentences such as (9) above, repeated here as (55), in which a subject-to-subject raising verb agrees with its dependent verb in voice (see also Julien & Lødrup 2013).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(55) Dette behøves ikke å gjøres.
this *need.PRES.PASS* *not* *to* *do.INF.PASS*
'This does not have to be done.'

In a monoclausal functional structure, two instances of a grammatical feature will unify, e.g. PASSIVE. This means that there can be two of them with the same value, or just one. Example (47) above and its simplified functional structure (48) are reproduced as (56) and (57).

(56) Dette forsøkes å gjøres.
this *try.PRES.PASS* *to* *do.INF.PASS*
'They try to do this.'

(57)
PRED 'try-do'
SUBJ 'this'
PASSIVE +
TENSE PRESENT

Both passive verbs contribute [PASSIVE +], and these features unify. An active infinitive is assumed to be an unmarked form without features. This means that it does not contribute [PASSIVE –], so a sentence similar to (56) without voice agreement would also get the functional structure (57).

Voice agreement in sentences with one or two periphrastic passives (such as (35)–(37) above) follows when the passive auxiliary is a functional head without a semantic predicate. With this analysis, the auxiliary does not define a separate level in functional structure, it only contributes grammatical features at the top level (see Butt, Niño & Segond 1996, Frank & Zaenen 2004). A morphological passive and a periphrastic passive then have the same functional structure (but it is of course possible to use a feature to distinguish them if necessary). Both the passive suffix and the passive auxiliary contribute a passive feature, which unifies with another passive feature when there is agreement. This means that a sentence with voice agreement similar to (56), but with one or two periphrastic passives, would also have the (simplified) functional structure (57).[15]

This account of voice agreement works without any special rules or stipulations in LFG (see Lødrup forthcoming for more thorough discussion). Nevertheless, there are problems with overgeneration. The account given predicts that feature agreement should be possible with all verbal features in all reanalysis sentences. For some varieties of Norwegian, this could be a good approximation of the real situation (see Section 4.1 below). However, there is both linguistic and sociolinguistic variation, and the account given would overgenerate for most speakers. An even more unfortunate prediction of the account given is that a long passive can realize passivity with the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

second verb only. Overgeneration can be avoided with optimality restrictions (Sells 2004:217), but this will not be discussed further here.

4. MORE EVIDENCE FOR COMPLEX PREDICATES

When the passives under discussion here show reanalysis, the expectation is that the first verbs in question also allow reanalysis in the active. There is evidence that this is the case.

4.1 Verbal feature agreement in the active

Many of the verbs that occur with voice agreement also show verbal feature agreement in the active. Wiklund (2007) shows that active reanalysis verbs allow verbal feature agreement in Swedish. This is also true of Norwegian, but neither the grammatical nor the dialectal and sociolinguistic facts are known in any detail.

Feature agreement in the active means that the second verb takes on the inflectional form of the first verb instead of the expected infinitival form. The forms that participate in this process are the imperative, the perfect participle, and the finite present and preterit forms.[16] Examples are (58)–(60).

(58) Så vennligst slutt å kveruler.
so kindly stop.IMPER to quarrel.IMPER
'So please stop quarreling.'

(59) Har som regel klart å vært venner med ekser.
have as rule manage.PART to be.PART friends with exes
'(I) have usually managed to be friends with exes.'

(60) de forsøker å analyserer hva som skjer
they try.PRES to analyze.PRES what that happens
'They try to analyze what happens.'

There is an important reservation to be noted concerning participle agreement: Using a perfect participle instead of an expected infinitive is not a unitary phenomenon in Norwegian (or Swedish). There is also a different case (with a different distribution) related to counterfactuality (see Julien 2003, Wiklund 2007 and Eide 2011 for discussion). This is not agreement and is therefore not relevant here.

Verbal feature agreement in active reanalysis sentences seems to be one and the same phenomenon from a grammatical point of view. However, the dialectal and sociolinguistic distribution of the different types of agreement is not the same. Wiklund (2007:64–65) writes that present and preterit agreement is more restricted in Swedish than imperative and participle agreement, concerning both which verbs and which speakers allow it. This also seems to be the case in Norwegian.[17]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4.2 Presentational focus sentences

Presentational focus sentences might provide independent evidence for reanalysis. Norwegian has a general option for presentational focus sentences (see e.g. Lødrup 1999). Many one-place verbs – including unergatives – can take an expletive subject and realize their thematic argument as an object, as in (61).

(61) Det smyger seg inn en lyd.
there sneaks REFL in a sound
'A sound sneaks in.'

This option also applies to some complex predicates (mentioned in Holmberg 2002:122). Web searches give examples such as (62) and (63), in which the thematic argument is in the object position of the second verb.

(62) om det våger å smyge seg inn en lyd eller lysstrimmel i rommet . . .
if there dares to sneak REFL in a sound or light.stream in room.DEF
'If a sound or a stream of light dares to sneak into the room . . . '

(63) jeg ble ekstremt overasket over at det klarte å komme ut
I was extremely surprised over that there managed to come out
vann av den
water of it
'I was extremely surprised that it [a water jet] managed to produce water.'

The first verbs in (62) and (63) do not allow subject-to-subject raising, as shown by the fact that they cannot take an idiom chunk subject.

(64) *Helvetet våger/klarer å bryte løs på mandag.
hell.DEF dares/manages to break loose on Monday
'Hell dares/manages to break loose on Monday.'

Sentences such as (62) and (63) are not easy to find in texts, and it is not the case that all complex predicates take the presentational focus construction. This must be related to general semantic and pragmatic constraints on this construction, which are not well understood (see e.g. Sveen 1996:4.3). Even so, active presentational focus sentences seem to provide independent evidence for monoclausal reanalysis.

4.3 Pseudocoordinations

The syntax of pseudocoordinations might give further evidence for complex predicates. This construction looks like a coordination of two verb phrases, see (65) below, but its syntactic behavior is different. The first verb belongs to a small group of verbs that includes posture verbs (see e.g. Lødrup 2002, 2014).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(65) John sitter og leser en bok.
John sits and reads a book
'John is sitting and reading a book.'

The second verb in a pseudocoordination must have the same inflectional form as the first verb. In the literature, pseudocoordinations are usually considered to be reanalysis sentences (e.g. Wiklund 2007). Lødrup (2002, 2014) argues that most pseudocoordinations, including those with posture verbs, are usually biclausal subordination sentences in which the first verb takes a verbal complement. However, pseudocoordinations with posture verbs providing evidence for monoclausal reanalysis may occasionally be found. Two syntactic phenomena indicate reanalysis: the passive and the presentational focus construction.

In some pseudocoordinations both verbs may be passive. In the slightly edited web example (66), the passive subject is the patient of the second verb; it has no thematic relation to the first verb. Such sentences must be considered long passives.

(66) Kebab må sittes og nytes.
kebab must sit.INF.PASS and enjoy.INF.PASS
'One should enjoy kebab sitting down.'

Sentences such as (66) are not frequent, and they are marginal to many speakers, including myself. But there is also another indication that reanalysis is possible in pseudocoordinations, as a posture verb in a pseudocoordination may allow the presentational focus construction, as in (67).

(67) Det lå noe og fløt i vannet.
there lay something and floated in water.DEF
'Something was floating in the water.'

These sentences usually have the characteristics of a biclausal construction (Lødrup 2002, 2014): The argument of the first verb is realized in its object position, controlling the subject position of the second verb. However, pseudocoordinations such as (68) below can be found in which the thematic argument is in the object position of the second verb. This is an indication of reanalysis; the parallel to the presentational focus sentences (62) and (63) above is clear.

(68) det lå og fløt noe i vannet
there lay and floated something in water.DEF
'Something was floating in the water.'

Pseudocoordinations thus give further evidence for monoclausal reanalysis in Norwegian.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5. CONCLUSION

Reanalysis and complex predicates have traditionally played a marginal role in the literature on Norwegian and Scandinavian grammar. This article has argued that Norwegian has monoclausal complex predicate constructions, like many other languages. The central evidence is the option of long passives, which has not been noticed before. The grammatical properties of the relevant sentences have been discussed, and it has been argued that they cannot be accounted for by a subject-to-subject raising analysis. A difference between Norwegian and e.g. German and Spanish long passives is that Norwegian long passives often have a passive second verb. This has been analyzed as a case of voice agreement, which has a clear parallel in the option of verbal feature agreement in active sentences. I have also shown that the morphological passive is the most common passive realization in long passives. Furthermore, I have provided a discussion of the treatment of the long passive and voice agreement in LFG. According to Wurmbrand (2013:1), the long passive is 'a showcase of complex predicate formation'. In this article, the evidence from the long passives has been corroborated by other phenomena, as presentational focus sentences and pseudocoordinations have also been argued to give evidence for complex predicates.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Versions of this work were presented at the 25th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics (Reykjavík, 2013) and the 18th Lexical-Functional Grammar Conference (Debrecen, 2013). For input and discussion, I would like to thank Marit Julien, Jim Wood, Björn Lundquist, Ida Larsson, Elisabet Engdahl, Anders Holmberg, Marianne Hobæk Haff, Mary Dalrymple, Helge Dyvik, and Neal Whitman. Thanks are also due to the *NJL* reviewers and editor for their thorough work.

NOTES

1. Some researchers, e.g. Wiklund (2007:89–91), assume a version of reanalysis which does not necessarily result in a complex predicate in a monoclausal structure; the subordinate clause is then reduced in some way (see also Wurmbrand 2001:10–15).
2. Engh (1994:105) gives a couple of text examples of voice agreeing long passives. He claims that these examples are unacceptable, and that this is also true of the construction in general. It is striking that his examples do not have the infinitival marker; this contributes strongly to their unacceptability.
3. The list in (7) above of first verbs that were found in voice agreeing long passives includes some aspectual verbs, such as *begynne* 'begin' and *fortsette* 'continue'. I assume the classical analysis of aspectual verbs in Perlmutter (1970), in which an aspectual verb with an infinitival complement can be a one-place subject-to-subject raising verb or a two-place control verb. Because a subject-to-subject raising verb cannot passivize, a passive

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

aspectual verb such as *fortsettes* 'continue.INF.PASS' is assumed to be the passive of the two-place verb in (i).

(i) Dette fortsettes å gjøres.
this *continue.PRES.PASS* *to* *do.INF.PASS*
'This continues to be done.'

However, Julien & Lødrup (2013) give a different analysis of sentences such as (i). They assume that an aspectual verb with an infinitival complement is always a one-place subject-to-subject raising verb (see e.g. Fukuda 2008). The verb *fortsettes* 'continue.INF.PASS' in (i) is then assumed not to be a real passive, and the sentence is given an analysis parallel to that of example (9).

4. Some verbs that seem to allow a voice agreeing long passive have been disregarded in this article because they are often used with subject-to-subject raising in bookish style, including *anbefale* 'recommend', *bestemme* 'decide', *beslutte* 'decide' and *planlegge* 'plan'. Consider examples (i)–(iii), with *planlegges* 'plan.INF.PASS'.

(i) Restaureringen planlegges å være ferdig våren 20.
restoration.DEF *plan.PRES.PASS* *to* *be* *finished* *spring* *20*
'They plan to finish the restoration in the spring of 20.'

(ii) Hvilke interface planlegges å bruke?
which *interface* *plan.PRES.PASS* *to* *use*
'Which interfaces do they plan to use?'

(iii) luksusskipet . .. planlegges ikke å flyttes før september.
luxury-ship.DEF *plan.PRES.PASS* *not* *to* *move.INF.PASS* *before* *September*
'They do not plan to move the luxury ship before September.'

Sentence (i) is obviously a subject-to-subject raising sentence. Sentence (ii) must be a long passive because the second verb is active (compare examples (24)–(26) in the text). Sentence (iii) is then ambiguous between these analyses.

5. There were also a number of sentences with the participles *tillatt* 'allowed' and *forbudt* 'forbidden', as (i) and (ii), which might be analyzed as adjectival passives in '*tough*-movement' sentences.

(i) Alle slags grønnsaker og frukt er tillatt å spise.
all *kinds* *vegetables* *and* *fruit* *are* *allowed* *to* *eat*
'You are permitted to eat vegetables and fruit of all kinds.'

(ii) Følgende utstyr er forbudt å bruke ombord.
following *equipment* *is* *forbidden* *to* *use* *on.board*
'The following equipment is forbidden to use on board.'

6. The term long passive could be taken to mean that the surface subject has moved a 'long' way – from the object position of the second verb. With this interpretation, impersonal passives such as (5) and (6) above are not really long passives. They are long in a different sense, however: the distribution of passive morphology involves both verbs. Sentences with an active infinitive are different in this respect. A sentence such as (i), with an expletive subject and an active infinitive, might be thought of as the impersonal counterpart of long passives without voice agreement, such as (24)–(26).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(i) Det må våges å tenke annerledes.
it must dare.INF.PASS to think differently
'One must dare to think differently.'

(constructed, based on (6) in the main text)

However, it seems to have no grammatical properties that are not compatible with an analysis as a regular impersonal passive.

7. The complex passive is different from the long passive in that the former is completely acceptable also when the verbs have different time reference, as shown in (i),

(i) Bilen bes flyttet før midnatt.
car.DEF ask.PRES.PASS moved before midnight
'We request that the car be moved before midnight.'

8. There is more about the morphological realization of the second verb in Section 2.4. Sentences with passive marking only on the second verb, such as (i) below, are occasionally attested – this might be taken to mean that the first verb is used as a subject-to-subject raising verb.

(i) Aktivitetene må prøve å gjøres så billige som mulig.
activities.DEF must try to make.INF.PASS as cheap as possible
'One must try to make the activities as cheap as possible.'

9. Julien & Lødrup (2013) observe that in the NoWaC corpus, the sequence 'infinitival marker + *bli* 'become' + participle' is four times as frequent as the sequence 'infinitival marker + morphological passive' (the numbers are 78,238 and 19,302, respectively).
10. Reanalysis has not been much discussed in Scandinavian grammar. It has been involved to account for the complex passive in Holmberg (2002), and for two causative verbs, *la* 'let' (e.g. Taraldsen 1991), and *få* 'get' (Lødrup 1996). In addition, some cases of verbal feature agreement have been accounted for in terms of reanalysis in Wiklund (2001, 2007), Sells (2004) and Julien & Lødrup (2013).
11. The long passive seems to be possible with a larger set of verbs in Norwegian than in languages such as German or Spanish (see Wurmbrand 2001:327–332; Reis & Sternefeld 2004:484–486; Cinque 2006:65–79). However, intuitions vary, and it would be difficult to delimit the set of acceptable long passives exactly.
12. In a sentence with a complex predicate such as *forsøkes å gjøres* 'try.INF.PASS to do.INF.PASS', the 'doers' must be identical to the 'tryers'. With a small number of reanalysis verbs, however, the external role of the second verb is not identified with the external role of the first verb. For example, in the combination *tillates å gjøres* 'allow.INF.PASS to do.INF.PASS', the identity of the 'doers' is unspecified although they cannot be the same as the 'allowers'. The combination *foreslås å gjøres* 'suggest.INF.PASS to do.INF.PASS' is ambiguous with respect to whether the 'suggesters' and the 'doers' are identical or not. It could be noted that the literature on complex predicates does not exclude these types of verbs as first verbs; this is clear from the overview of first verbs assumed in the literature (see Wurmbrand 2001:342–345).
13. A more general option for reanalysis of a verb and a preposition would create several problems (see Lødrup 1991), and it would undermine the restriction against complex passives with a preposition preceding the second verb, such as (18) in the main text. On

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the other hand, there is at least one independent argument for verb–preposition reanalysis: In a sentence such as (i), the verb and the preposition together seem to take an object that can be the subject of the secondary predicate.

(i) Vi tenker på John som ny formann.
we think of John as new chairman
'We think of John as a new chairman.'

14. This is another possible difference from the complex passive, which allows a benefactive object (this is according to the relevant literature – my own intuition is that this is marginal).

(i) Jon ble lovet oss forfremmet. (Hellan 2001:5)
Jon was promised us promoted
'They promised us to promote Jon.'

15. Sells (2004:218) claims that voice agreement is not possible with the periphrastic passive in Swedish. However, he discusses a different type of voice agreement, exemplified in (9)/(38)/(55).
16. It might seem strange that the periphrastic passive takes part in verbal feature agreement, while periphrastic active forms, such as the perfect or the future, do not. Searching web texts, it is possible to find scattered examples of this kind of agreement, such as (i), but they might be considered deviant.

(i) to kjendiser som skal ha forsøkt å ha voldtatt henne
two celebrities who shall have tried to have raped her
Intended: 'Two celebrities who allegedly tried to rape her.'

17. In the NoWaC-corpus, there are many examples of verbal feature agreement in the active:
    - Imperative agreement was found with 11 different first verbs, all of which are included in the lists (7) and (8) of verbs that take the long passive.
    - Participle agreement was found with most of the verbs in (7) and (8). In some cases, however, it was difficult to tell if the participle form was due to agreement or to counterfactuality.
    - Present and past agreement was found with more than two thirds of the verbs in (7) and (8).

REFERENCES

Alsina, Alex. 1996. *The Role of Argument Structure in Grammar: Evidence from Romance*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Andrews, Avery D. & Christopher D. Manning. 1999. *Complex Predicates and Information Spreading in LFG*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Bresnan, Joan. 1982. The passive in lexical theory. In Joan Bresnan (ed.), *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, 3–86. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Butt, Miriam. 1995. *The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Butt, Miriam, Maria-Eugenia Niño & Frederique Segond. 1996. Multilingual processing of auxiliaries in LFG. In Dafydd Gibbon (ed.), *Natural Languages Processing and Speech Technology*, 111–122. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. [Reprinted in Sadler & Spencer 2004, 11–22.]

Christensen, Kirsti Koch. 1986. Complex passives, reanalysis, and word formation. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 9(2), 135–162.

Christensen, Kirsti Koch. 1991. Complex passives reanalysed. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 48, 45–75.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Eide, Kristin Melum. 2011. The ghost of the Old Norse subjunctive: The Norwegian subjunctive participle. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 53(2), 1–28.

Engdahl, Elisabet. 2006. Semantic and syntactic patterns in Swedish passives. In Benjamin Lyngfelt & Torgrim Solstad (eds.), *Demoting the Agent*, 21–45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Engh, Jan. 1994. *Verb i passiv fulgt av perfektum partisipp: Bruk og historie*. Oslo: Novus.

Frank, Anette & Annie Zaenen. 2004. Tense in LFG: Syntax and morphology. In Sadler & Spencer (eds.), 23–65.

Fukuda, Shin. 2008. Aspectual verbs and the aspect phrase hypothesis. *San Diego Linguistic Papers* 3. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/9pj2s50f (accessed 11 September 2014).

Grevisse, Maurice & André Goosse. 2008. *Le bon usage: Grammaire française*. Paris: De Boeck.

Hellan, Lars. 2001. Complex passive constructions in Norwegian. Ms., University of Trondheim. http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/books/progressingrammar/hellan.pdf (accessed 11 September 2014).

Holmberg, Anders. 2002. Expletives and agreement in Scandinavian passives. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4(2), 85–128.

Julien, Marit. 2003. Dobbelsupinum og irreal modus. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 21(2), 135–161.

Julien, Marit & Helge Lødrup. 2013. Dobbel passiv og beslektede konstruksjoner i skandinavisk. *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift* 31(2), 221–246.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1996. NP-movement and 'restructuring'. In Robert Freidin (ed.), *Current Issues in Comparative Grammar*, 121–147. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1999. Das Fernpassiv im Türkischen und im Deutschen. In Lars Johanson & Jochen Rehbein (eds.), *Türkisch und Deutsch im Vergleich*, 153–170. Wiesbaden: Harossowitz.

Laanemets, Anu. 2013. *Passiv i moderne dansk, norsk og svensk: Et korpusbaseret studie af tale- og skriftsprog*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tartu.

Lødrup, Helge. 1991. The Norwegian pseudopassive in lexical theory. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 47, 118–129.

Lødrup, Helge. 1996. The theory of complex predicates and the Norwegian verb *få* 'get'. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57, 76–91.

Lødrup, Helge. 1999. Linking and optimality in the Norwegian presentational focus construction. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 22(2), 205–229.

Lødrup, Helge. 2002. The syntactic structures of Norwegian pseudocoordinations. *Studia Linguistica* 56(2),121–143.

Lødrup, Helge. 2014. There is no reanalysis in Norwegian pseudocoordinations (except when there is). In Hans Petter Helland & Christine Meklenborg Salvesen (eds.), *Affaire(s) de*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

grammaire: Mélanges offerts à Marianne Hobæk Haff à l'occasion de ses soixante-cinq ans, 43–65. Oslo: Novus.
Lødrup, Helge. Forthcoming. How can a verb agree with a verb? Reanalysis and pseudocoordination in Norwegian. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *LFG14*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
Lundquist, Björn. 2009. *Nominalizations and Participles in Swedish*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tromsø.
Lundquist, Björn. 2013. The role of tense-copying and syncretism in the licensing of morphological passives in the Nordic languages. http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001902.
Müller, Stefan & Bjarne Ørsnes. 2013. Danish in Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar. Ms., Institut für Deutsche und Niederländische Philologie, Freie Universitat Berlin. http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/~stefan/Pub/danish.html (accessed 11 September 2014).
Niño, Maria-Eugenia. 1997. The multiple expression of inflectional information and grammatical architecture. In Francis Corblin, Danièle Godard & Jean-Marie Marandin (eds.), *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics*, 127–147. Bern: Peter Lang.
Ørsnes, Bjarne. 2006. Creating raising verbs: An LFG-analysis of the complex passive in Danish. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *LFG06*, 386–405. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
Perlmutter, David M. 1970. The two verbs *begin*. In Roderick A. Jacobs & Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, 107–119. Waltham, MA: Ginn & Co.
Postal, Paul M. 2004. *Skeptical Linguistic Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Reis, Marga & Wolfgang Sternefeld. 2004. Review article of Susanne Wurmbrand's *Infinitives Restructuring and Clause Structure*. *Linguistics* 42(2), 469–508.
Sadler, Louisa & Andrew Spencer (eds.). 2004. *Projecting Morphology*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
Sells, Peter. 2004. Syntactic information and its morphological expression. In Sadler & Spencer (eds.), 187–225.
Sveen, Andreas. 1996. *Norwegian Impersonal Actives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of Oslo.
Taraldsen, Tarald. 1991. A directionality parameter for subject–object linking. In Robert Freidin (ed.), *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, 219–268. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Whitman, Neal. 2013. Double passives. Ms., The Ohio State University.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2001. Dressing up for vocabulary insertion: The parasitic supine. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19(1), 199–228.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2007. *The Syntax of Tenselessness*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Wurmbrand, Susi. 2004. Two types of restructuring: Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua* 114, 991–1014.
Wurmbrand, Susi. 2013. Complex predicate formation via voice incorporation. http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001968.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586514000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press