1. Introduction.

In this paper I want to look at one of the classic topics in comparative Scandinavian linguistics: the causative construction with let (1), and relate it to two other variations between Danish and Swedish: verb particle constructions (2) and transitive adjective constructions (3).

(1) a. Da. *Peter lod støvsuge tæppet
   Sw. Peter lat dammsuga mattan
   "Peter let vacuum-clean carpet-the"

   b. Da. Peter lod tæppet støvsuge
   Sw. *Peter lat mattan dammsuga
   "Peter let carpet-the vacuum-clean"

(2) a. Da. *Peter smed ud tæppet
   Sw. Peter kastade bort mattan
   "Peter threw away carpet-the"

   b. Da. Peter smed tæppet ud
   Sw. *Peter kastade mattan bort
   "Peter threw carpet-the away"

(3) a. Da. *Peter var overlegen Martin
   Sw. Peter var överlägsen Martin
   "Peter was superior Martin"

   b. Da. Peter var Martin overlegen
   Sw. Peter var Martin överlägsen
   "Peter was Martin superior"

I will be using the framework of the "Theory of Government and Binding" (Chomsky (1981),(1986a,b)), but the various terms and analyses will be explained as they are introduced.¹

1.1 Attempting to Relate Several Differences.

I will try to account for all three variations as different consequences of just one underlying difference between Danish and Swedish. I assume, with Chomsky (1986b), Platzack (this volume) and others, that various surface differences may reasonably be expected to result from fewer underlying differences, and that it is highly desirable thus to be able to unite separate surface phenomena under one generalisation.

The general idea behind this is that in order to explain the ease and speed with which a child acquires his first language, one might suppose that not all knowledge of the language in question has to be acquired, but that the child possesses part of this knowledge already at birth. The innate part of language knowledge will obviously be the same for all human beings, and thereby this theory also gives an explanation of language universals.

The fewer differences there are between languages, the less data the child will have to encounter in order to be able to choose between alternative possibilities, and the fewer data that have to be encountered to acquire any given language, the better is our account for the speed and ease of first language acquisition.

In order to test the theory outlined above, linguists should therefore try to account for as many surface differences by positing as few underlying ones as possible. Languages like Danish and Swedish seem to be particularly promising as a testing ground for this theory, because already at the surface the differences are few, leading us to expect that the underlying differences are very few indeed. In this particular case, my analysis will predict that a child will only have to be acquainted with one of the three sets of data to be able to derive the relevant facts of the two other sets.

1.2 Abstract Case and Thematic Roles.

The analysis will crucially rely on the notion of abstract case. The three constructions may be subsumed under the following schemata:

(4) a. ... [vp V X NP] * in Da., OK in Sw.
   b. ... [vp V NP X] * in Sw., OK in Da.

I will assume that (4a) is the basic configuration, and that in Danish the NP is forced to move in order to get case, whereas in Swedish the NP cannot move as it would get case twice. Before going into the details of this analysis in the three sections on the individual constructions, I will describe more closely the concepts of thematic roles and of abstract case,
which between them have taken over what used to come under case, with respect to semantic properties (thematic roles) as well as syntactic/morphological properties (abstract case).

Thematic roles are assigned to NPs (except expletive NPs), and account for the interpretation of the NP in question in relation to the whole proposition, e.g. in John reads a book, John is the AGENT or the reader, and a book is the THEME. Thematic role assignments are noted above the examples with arrows and "th" (cf. (5) below).

Abstract case is called abstract, because although in some languages (e.g. Icelandic, German) it may be visible, it does not have to be visible. Even in languages with no morphological case marking (leaving aside genitive) outside the pronominal system, like Danish and Swedish, it is assumed that every NP that is phonetically realised needs abstract case. Furthermore no NP may have more than one case.

There is a distinction between structural and inherent case. Structural case is assigned under certain structural conditions (e.g. the case assigner must be adjacent to and govern the case receiver). Inherent case is what certain NPs (e.g. the second object in a double object construction) are supposed to have, as discussed in Chomsky (1981), in order to explain both why they can occur in non-case assigned position (they already have inherent case), and why they cannot occur in case assigned positions (they would then have more than one case). Inherent case is further discussed in section 7, throughout the other sections only structural case will be referred to. Structural case is assigned under the following circumstances (among others): A finite verb assigns case to its subject. A preposition assigns case to its complement. A verb (whether it is finite or not) assigns case to its object, but only if it assigns a thematic role to its subject (this is called Burzio's generalisation, after Burzio (1986) (see also footnotes 2 and 8)). So-called partitive case may only be assigned to indefinite NPs and does not fall under Burzio's generalisation (following Belletti (1986)). Case assignments are noted below the examples with arrows and "c" (cf. (5) below).

2. Let-causatives.

As already stated above, one of the differences between Danish and Swedish is the one given in (5):

(5) Da. th → th
    *Peter lod [vp støvsuge tæppet] c⁣ c

Sw. th → th
    Peter lät [vp dammsuga mattan] c⁣ c
    "Peter let [vacuum-clean carpet-the]"

My analysis is that only in Swedish does carpet get case from vacuum-clean, whereas in Danish there is no such case forthcoming. In both cases Peter is the AGENT of let, and carpet is the THEME of vacuum-clean.

(6) shows, according to this analysis, that it is possible, in fact necessary, for the NP to move in Danish, as it must be assigned a case. If an NP does not receive case in its original position, it will have to move to a place where it may be assigned one. One such place is next to the main verb let:

(6) Da. th → th
    Peter lod [vp tæppet [vp støvsuge t1]] c⁣ c

Sw. th → th
    *Peter lät [vp mattan [vp dammsuga t1]] c⁣ c
    "Peter let [carpet-the [vacuum-clean t1]]"

When an NP moves it leaves behind a coindexed trace. The indexing may be considered as a "forwarding address", so that e.g. the thematic role assigned by vacuum-clean to its object position may reach carpet. Now the sentence is OK in Danish, carpet receives case from let and thematic role from vacuum-clean via its trace. In Swedish however, (6) is ruled out, as carpet now receives two cases: one directly from let, and one through its trace from vacuum-clean.

The assumption that the same construction has different case assigning properties in the two languages is also compatible with the embedding under let of passive and of ergative verbs.

The standard analysis of passive (Chomsky (1981)) is that the object is prevented from getting case, and therefore it needs to move somewhere else to get case. There is only one such place possible in an example like (7), viz. the subject position (which therefore has to be empty from the start).

(7) En. [The carpet]1 was cleaned t1
    c⁣ c

As can be seen in (7), the reason why the passive ending prevents case from reaching the object position is that the
ending needs case itself (as suggested by Roberts (1987)).

Consider now a passive verb embedded in a let-construction. This is only possible in Swedish, which fits in with the analysis above, as the passive ending needs case from the embedded verb, and so far we have assumed that only in Swedish does the embedded verb assign case, in Danish this is somehow prevented. Thus (8) is parallel to (5):

(8) Da. th→ th
   *Peter lod [vp tæppetj [vp støvsuges t i ]] c→ c
   Sw. Peter lät [vp mattenj [vp dammsugas t i ]] c→ c
   "Peter let carpet-the vacuum-cleaned-be"

Ergative verbs (also called unaccusative verbs) are verbs which are assumed to have only objects and no subjects, and therefore, following Burzio's generalisation, they do not assign case to their objects (as they do not have a subject, they do not assign a thematic role to their subject). As it receives no case in object position, the object then has to move to the empty subject position in order to get case. There are various ways to tell ergative verbs apart from intransitive verbs (which are verbs with subjects but no objects), cf. Burzio (1986), suffice it to assume here that ergatives use være ("be") as auxiliary verb in Danish, whereas intransitives use have ("have") (further discussion in Vikner (1986)).

In both languages we get the following as the only possibility for embedding an ergative verb:

(9) Da. th→ th
   Peter lod [vp blomsternei [vp visne t i ]] c→ c
   Sw. Peter lät blommorna vissna
   "Peter let flowers-the wither"

This is possible even in Swedish, as opposed to (6), as here there is no way for the trace to receive case, as wither never assigns case.2

3. Verb Particles.

The particle construction has the same pattern as the let-causative: in Swedish the particle assigns case and the NP therefore follows it, (10), in Danish the particle does not assign case, and the NP has to move so it can receive case directly from the verb, (11). If the NP moved in Swedish, it would receive two cases, one directly and one via its trace. Compare (10) with (5), and (11) with (6):

(10) Sw. th→ th
    Peter kastade [prtP bort mattan] c→ c
    Da. *Peter smed [ud tæppet]
    "P. threw away carpet-the"

(11) Da. th→ th
    Peter smed [prtP tæppetj [prtP ud t i ]] c→ c
    Sw. *Peter kastade [mattan [bort t]]
    "Peter threw carpet-the away"

4. Transitive Adjectives.

Following Platzack (1982) I will assume the adjectives discussed below to be transitive, in the sense that they involve two NPs. Assuming the underlying structure to be like (12), this will be prevented as a surface structure in both languages for two reasons: there is no subject, and as adjectives do not normally assign case, neither Peter nor Martin get case.

(12) Da. th→ th
    *e var [AP överlegen Martin Peter]
    "was superior Martin Peter"

In Swedish Peter moves to the subject position, and this suffices for the adjective to be able to assign case to Martin:

(13) Sw. th→ th
    Peteri var [AP överlägsen Martin tj]
    "Peter was superior Martin"

In Danish this would not suffice, as the adjective would not be able to assign case to Martin. Therefore Martin has to move too, to the immediate right of the verb. I assume here that be may assign case, depending on other conditions of the grammar (further discussion in Vikner (1986))4:

(14) Da. th→ th
    Peteri var [AP Martinj [AP överlegen tj tj i ]]
    "Peter was Martin superior"
If adjectives may assign case (in certain constructions, in Swedish), then why is (15) impossible in both languages:

(15) Da. *Der var [AP syg Peter] c
Sw. *Det var [AP sjuk Peter]  ("There/It was ill Peter")

The answer is to be found in the interaction between Burzio's generalisation and the idea of the adjective ar.d the verb being reanalysed as one constituent, [verb + adjective]. In (13) Martin receives case from the adjective because this adjective obeys Burzio's generalisation, it has formed what we might call a complex verb which assigns a thematic role to its subject, and therefore it can assign case to its "object" (cf. footnote 8). In (15) however, whether or not the adjective and the verb are reanalysed as one constituent, there is no thematic role assigned to the subject (the dummy element "there/it"), and therefore there is no case forthcoming to the structural object position. The result in both languages is that the NP has to move to get case5, e.g. to the subject position:

(16) Da. Peteri var [AP syg t]
Sw. Peter var [sjuk t]  ("Peter was ill")

much like the way Peter moved to the subject position in (13) and (14).

5. Analysis: Reanalysis.

Consider again the schemata of (4), repeated as (17):

(17) a. ... [vp V X NP] * in Da., OK in Sw.
b. ... [vp V NP X] * in Sw., OK in Da.

where sections 2-4 have given further details on the following instantiations:

(18) section topic V is X is
2 let-causatives let any verb
3 verb particles any verb any particle
4 transitive adj. be any trans. adj.

The central assumption of this paper is that V and X are reanalysed as one constituent in some sense, and that this constituent comes under Burzio's generalisation in Swedish, but not in Danish.

From some points of view the reanalysed constituent [V + X] is not a regular constituent, e.g. V and X may reanalyse as one constituent even when they are not next to one another, cf. (6), (11), and thus this may correspond to what Baker (1985) calls "abstract incorporation".

Reanalysis is assumed to take place even in Danish for reasons connected with the let-construction, as X here is a verb that has lost the thematic role that it would normally assign to its subject. This is something that does not normally happen (cf. John(AGENT) read the paper(THME) vs. *There(-th) read the paper(THME)). That no thematic role of the kind normally assigned to a subject is possible in the let-construction can be seen by comparing the two verbs hope and arrange. The former needs to be able to assign its subject thematic role to its subject position, the latter has no such requirements. As passive subjects do not have a subject thematic role (cf. (7)), hope may not be passivised:

(19) a. Da. *Det blev håbet at ...
b. Da. Det blev arrangeret at ...

"It was hoped/arranged that ..."

When embedding these two verbs under let, we get parallel results:

(20) a. Da. *Peter lod håbe at ...
b. Da. Peter lod arrangere at ...

"Peter let hope/arrange that ..."

which can be explained if we assume that in let-constructions where there is no subject of the embedded verb present, the embedded verb has no subject thematic role at all. (Argument from Grewendorf (1983)). It is actually possible for the verb embedded under let to have a subject, but in that case the embedded constituent is not a VP but an S:

(21) Da. th
Sw. Peter låt [Martin [damm- trình tæppet]]

"Peter let Martin vacuum-clean carpet-the"

The analysis may now be summarised as follows (with reference to (17) and (18)):
A further argument for the reanalysis analysis is that the case assigned by X is the case that V is able to assign, rather than the case that X would otherwise have assigned (see footnotes 2 and 3).

There are two reasons for writing "loses" in (22a) in quotes. One is that in the cases where X corresponds to a verb particle or a transitive adjective, X never had any subject thematic role to assign. The other is that, even when X is a verb embedded under let, it is not always obvious that it is actually lost:

If the subject thematic role was lost, it should not be possible to refer to it in any way, e.g. neither by an adverbial, (23-24), nor with a so-called agent by-phrase, (25-26).

In (22) we see that it is possible to have the adverbial referring to the subject of the verb embedded under let, i.e. eat, in a construction where the constituent embedded under let is an entire S rather than a VP (i.e. a construction where reanalysis does not apply, cf. (21)):

(23) Da. Peter lod [g Martin spise frølårene med fingrene]
Sw. Peter lat [g Martin äta grodlåren med fingrarna]
"Peter let Martin eat frog's-legs-the with fingers-the"

(24) shows that with just a VP embedded under let (i.e. the case where (22) applies), this subject-related adverbial becomes much less acceptable (if not completely unacceptable), indicating that the subject thematic role of eat is lost:

(24) Da. ??Peter lod [vp frølårene spise med fingrene]
Sw. ??Peter lat [vp äta grodlåren med fingrarna]
"Peter let frog's-legs-the eat with fingers-the"

If we look at the agent by-phrases, we find that there are special cases where the subject thematic role does not seem to have been lost. One is where the agent is pragmatically relevant and perceptible from the resulting state (Information is relevant if it increases the hearer's knowledge of the world in a given situation. See Sperber & Wilson (1986:122, 260 n26))6. Thus (25a) is much better than (25b):

(25) a. Da. Han lod kapellet udsmykke af Matisse
   "He let chapel-the decorate by Matisse"
   b. Da. ??Han lod frølårene spise af Peter
   "He let frog's-legs-the eat by Peter"

Another case is the Swedish passive, where the agent by-phrase is completely acceptable (26a), as opposed to the active subject-less variant (26b):

(26) a. Sw. Martin låt huset byggas av Peter
   "Martin let house-the built-be by Peter"
   b. Sw. ??Martin låt byggas huset av Peter
   "Martin let build house-the by Peter"

6. Reflexives in the let-construction.

In the remainder of this paper, particular versions of the let-construction will be considered, to show that the analysis given in section 5 will be able to give a satisfactory account even for these more complex cases. First we will look at the occurrences of non-thematic ("semantically/thematically empty") reflexives in the let-construction.

On the surface an example like (27) is completely parallel to e.g. (6):

(27) Da. Peter lod sig overtale
   "Peter let REFL persuade"

i.e. one might expect Peter to get a subject thematic role from let and sig to get the object thematic role from persuade.

There are however good reasons for not accepting this analysis, and for assuming instead that Peter has the object thematic role of persuade and sig does not have any thematic role at all. One argument is connected with the following examples:

(28) a. Da. Peter lod sig overtale
   b. Da. ??Peter lod sig spise
   c. Da. ??Peter lod sig læse
   "Peter let REFL persuade/eat/read"

(29) a. Da. ??Kødlet lod sig overtale
   b. Da. Kødlet lod sig spise
   c. Da. ??Kødlet lod sig læse
   "Meat-the let REFL persuade/eat/read"
There is a clear correlation between the subject and the thematic role assigned by the embedded verb to its object: the judgments in e.g. (29) are related to the fact that meat is a lot better with the object thematic role from eat than from persuade or read (you can eat meat, but not really persuade it or read it), but this could perhaps be explained by the subject and the reflexive being coreferential. More importantly, the subjects in (29) and (30) (as opposed to the subject in (28)) are not of the kind that would normally be able to receive a subject thematic role from let, compare (31b) to (29b):

(31) a. Da. Peter lod Martin overtale sig
"Peter let Martin persuade REFL"

Therefore I conclude that the subject thematic role of let has disappeared (it has been absorbed by the reflexive7), and that the surface subjects of (27-30) have the thematic role assigned by the embedded verb to its object. The underlying structure of (27) is therefore assumed to be the following (valid for both Sw. and Da.):

(32) Da. 
\[ \text{e lod sig [vp overtale Peter]} \]
"e let REFL persuade Peter"

This gives rise to (33) in Danish:

(33) Da. 
\[ \text{Peteri lod sig [vp overtale t} _i \text{]} \]
"Peter let REFL persuade"

Following the arguments above (and in footnote 7), it is assumed that sig needs to absorb a subject thematic role, and following the analysis in section 5, it is only in Swedish that the reanalysis is carried out to the extent that the subject thematic role of let also counts for the embedded verb. Consequently it is only in Swedish that one would predict it to be possible for sig to be next to the embedded verb as well as to let itself (34). In Danish, the reanalysis is more restricted, the subject thematic role of let does not count as such for the embedded verb, and therefore (36) is not possible in Danish, only (33) is.
The idea that sig needs to absorb a subject thematic role is also crucial in explaining why (37) is impossible in Swedish:

(37) Sw.

*Peter låt sig övertala sig ti

c -c

"Peter let REFL persuade REFL"

This is not impossible for reasons of case, as it is possible for the embedded verb to assign case even when separated from let by sig (cf. that the passive ending gets case in (34)). However, it is not possible for both sigs to absorb a subject thematic role, as there is only one, the one of let, which presumably is absorbed by the first sig, leaving the second sig without a subject thematic role to absorb, ruling the sentence out. (The other subject thematic role, the one of persuade, is absorbed by other mechanisms in this construction, cf. (22a)).

7. Double Objects in the Let-construction.

In this section I will consider what takes place when the verb embedded under let is a verb that allows for two objects9, and I will also consider the interaction between let, double object verbs, and sig.

I will assume that in a double object construction, only the object next to the verb receives structural case, whereas the other object receives inherent case somehow (inherent as it may have case just by virtue of being the second object)10:

(38) Da. th  th  th

Peter anbefalede Martin hotellet
c -c -c ic

"Peter recommended Martin hotel-the"

The structural case is the one that is absorbed by the passive ending, explaining why only the object receiving structural case may be the subject in a passive construction:

(39) a. Da.

Martin blev anbefalet ti hotellet
c -c -c ic

"Martin was recommended hotel-the"

b. Da.

*Hotellet blev anbefalet Martin tj

c -c ic

"Hotel-the was recommended Martin"

In (39a) the trace of Martin does not receive any case, as this is prevented by the passive ending, and thus every NP has just one case. In (39b) hotel receives two cases, a structural one directly and the inherent one via its trace. As one of the two cases thus clashing is an inherent case, this may not be enough to explain the ungrammaticality of this example (e.g. Belletti (1986) does not assume that this kind of case clash should be ruled out). What does rule out (39b) is that Martin does not get any case at all, the case going to this position having been taken over by the passive ending. So what is wrong with (39b) is not so much that one NP has more than one case, but that another NP has less than one case11.

Let us now consider this construction when it is embedded under let. The underlying structure is assumed to be as in (40), but this cannot be a well-formed surface structure as Martin does not receive any case, for the by now familiar reasons (cf. sections 2 and 5):

(40) Da. th  th  th

*Peter lod [yp anbefale Martin hotellet]
c -c ic

"Peter let recommend Martin hotel-the"

It is however possible to save (40) along lines parallel to (39a), i.e. the NP which ought to receive structural case moves somewhere else to receive it. Not surprisingly, Martin may thus move so that it can receive case from let12:

(41) Da. th  th  th

Peter lod [yp Martini [yp anbefale t1 hotellet]]
c -c ic

"Peter let Martin recommend hotel-the"

If we try to move hotel to the position next to let, instead of Martin, not only does hotel get two cases, but Martin is also left caseless:

(42) Da. th  th  th

*Peter lod [yp hotelletj [yp anbefale Martin t1]]
c -c ic

"Peter let hotel-the recommend Martin"

It is however possible to move both NPs, provided Martin is in the position next to let (43), and not hotel (44), as Martin needs to be in this position to get case, whereas hotel does not need case, as it has inherent case via its trace13:
Let us now consider what happens when a non-thematic sig occurs next to let, taking over from section 6 the assumptions that this reflexive absorbs the subject thematic role of let and also receives the case that let assigns to its right. I assume the underlying structure of such a construction to be:

(45) Da.  
\[ \text{Peter lod sig [vp Martin hotelletj [vp anbefale t\textsubscript{i} t\textsubscript{j}]]} \]  
\[ c \leftarrow \longrightarrow th \]  
\[ \text{"Peter let REFL recommend Martin hotel-the"} \]

As a surface structure, this is ungrammatical for two reasons: there is no subject, and Martin and sig receive no case. As with (32) and (33), this can be saved by moving Martin so that it gets case and so that the sentence has a subject:

(46) Da.  
\[ \text{Martini lod sig [vp t\textsubscript{i} hotelletj [vp anbefale t\textsubscript{i} t\textsubscript{j}]]} \]  
\[ c \leftarrow \longrightarrow th \]  
\[ \text{"Martin let REFL hotel-the"} \]

If hotel moves rather than Martin, then although the sentence will have a subject, it will still be ungrammatical, as Martin will receive no case:

(47) Da.  
\[ \text{Hotelletj lod sig [vp t\textsubscript{j} [vp anbefale Martin t\textsubscript{j}]]} \]  
\[ c \leftarrow \longrightarrow th \]  
\[ \text{"Hotel-the let REFL Martin recommend"} \]

As with (43) and (44), it is possible to have both of the NPs in question move, as long as one of them moves into the subject position. As Martin needs case and as the only case available is in the subject position, it is necessary that Martin moves to this position (48), and not hotel (49):

(48) Da.  
\[ \text{Martini lod sig [vp t\textsubscript{i} hotelletj [vp anbefale t\textsubscript{i} t\textsubscript{j}]]} \]  
\[ c \leftarrow \longrightarrow th \]  
\[ \text{"Martin let REFL hotel-the recommend"} \]

(49) Da.  
\[ \text{Hotelletj lod sig [vp t\textsubscript{j} Martin [vp anbefale t\textsubscript{i} t\textsubscript{j}]]} \]  
\[ c \leftarrow \longrightarrow th \]  
\[ \text{"Hotel-the let REFL Martin recommend"} \]

Reasons of space prevent me from going into the details of similar constructions in Swedish. Suffice it to say that (40) would be possible in Swedish, and that provided the embedded verbs are changed into passive, (41), (43), and (46), (48) are also possible, as would be expected.

8. Conclusion.

I have tried to show that all the variations between Danish and Swedish discussed in sections 2-4 can be seen as consequences of one fundamental difference: In Swedish it is possible for let and the embedded verb, for a verb and its particle, and for be and an adjective to be reanalysed, i.e. to behave as one verb. Although Danish also shows some degree of reanalysis, none of the three pairs of elements behave as one verb.

In Swedish, these three pairs each behave as one verb, both with respect to case assignment (this is why NPs may remain in their original final position) and with respect to thematic roles (explaining why the non-thematic reflexive sig, which needs to absorb a subject thematic role, may also occur in this final position). In Danish these three pairs do not behave as one verb, forcing the complement NPs to move in order to receive case, and prohibiting the non-thematic reflexive occurring after the verb embedded under let.

Under the further assumption of inherent case, the distributional facts arising from the interaction between the let-construction, the non-thematic reflexive, and the double object construction, may also be accounted for under this analysis, as shown in sections 6 and 7.

Notes.

1. An earlier version of this talk was presented to the 3rd Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax, Turku, Finland, June 1986. I am grateful to the following for their comments: Kjell-Ake Gunnarson, Liliane Haegeman, Michael Herslund, Arild Hestvik, Christer Platzack, Luigi Rizzi, Ian Roberts, Neil V. Smith, Rex Sprouse, Carl Vikner. Special thanks to my Swedish informant, Lena Westlund.
2. Given the analysis to be suggested in section 5, it is actually not expected that either will not be able to assign case in Swedish. According to Burzio (1986), the reason why ergatives can not assign case is that they assign no subject thematic role, but in my analysis the subject thematic feature of the embedded verbs in Swedish (not in Danish).

In the passive and ergative constructions with expletive subjects, the NPs in object position do not seem to receive normal case (as predicted by Burzio's generalisation, as the NP partly assigns any thematic role). However, as the NPs in object position to receive partitive case, it is possible, it was also the previous (1986): Da. Der blev stövzsugat tre table. ("He let (there) vacuum-clean three carpets") and Da. Der visnede tre blomster. ("He let (there) bloomed three flowers")

It is therefore unexpected that partitive case is not possible in a Da. let-construction: ?Han lod (der) stövzsugat tre table. ("He let (there) vacuum-clean three carpets")

After the analysis of (13-16) above, it is necessary to make some extra assumptions to avoid a problem with regard to Burzio's generalisation. This generalisation distinguishes between two possibilities: either the subject thematic role is assigned (and then the verb may assign case to its object position) or the subject thematic role is not assigned (no case to object position). Taken as such, an option will not allow a distinction between the cases with expletive subjects ((15), (35)) and the cases with subjects with these roles via their traces ((13-14), (33-34)) as the two types have subjects with directly assigned thematic roles (as opposed to e.g. (24)). Thus, it is possible that the subject is assigned case to its object position is impossible in all six of the cases in question, which is only the desired role for (15) (35), not for the others.

To assimilate these four cases to the ones where case assignment to object is allowed I will use the observation made...
above that in (13-14) and (33-34) the subject does receive a thematic role, only not of the kind required. What Burzio's generalisation requires in order to allow case assignment is that the subject receives a particular kind of thematic role, i.e. the thematic role assigned directly to the subject position. With regard to the reanalysed verbs, we must then ask which of the thematic roles assigned by the two components of the reanalysed verb, V and X, is to count as the subject thematic role. Four situations are possible: 1) V and X both assign subject thematic roles. 2) X assigns a subject thematic role, but V does not. Neither of these two situations will arise here, as the reanalysis always deprives X of its subject thematic role. 3) V assigns a subject thematic role, but X does not. In this case V's subject thematic role counts as the subject thematic role of the reanalysed verb. 4) Neither V nor X assign a subject thematic role. In this case I suggest that the reanalysed verb may accept, for the purpose of Burzio's generalisation, that its subject receives the highest ranking of the remaining thematic roles.

This will allow case assignment in (13-14) and (33-34), as here the subject is filled with an NP with the highest thematic role left. This analysis will also give an answer to why the subject of e.g. (14) must always be interpreted as having the thematic role of the person who is superior to someone, and never as the person to whom someone is superior. Assuming that the former of the two thematic roles described is higher in a hierarchy of thematic roles (as described e.g. by Belletti & Rizzi (1986)), the subject would have to have this higher thematic role in order to allow the verb to assign case to the NP with the other thematic role.

9. Similar facts are analysed in Herslund (1986), but with slightly diverging grammaticality judgments, and in a different theoretical framework (Relational Grammar).

10. Inherent case is also different from structural case (incl. partitive) in that, as it is not assigned in a structural position as such, it is "portable", i.e. NPs with inherent case may move around in the sentence, as long as they avoid case assigned positions. Normally structural (and partitive) case assignment requires the NP to be in the position where the case is assigned, cf. that note 4 registered a problem with a NP receiving structural case via a trace. This is also a difference between structural case assignment and assignment of thematic roles, the latter are definitely portable.

11. The string of words in (39b) actually has a grammatical but pragmatically rather marked interpretation, viz. "Martin was recommended to the hotel". The structure of this interpretation would not be as in (39b) but rather as in (39a), i.e. Da. Hoteller blev anbefalet & Martin, which is OK for case reasons, but now has Martin in the position to which the thematic role THEME is assigned and the trace of hotel in the position to which the role GOAL is assigned, as opposed to both (39a) and (39b) where Martin is assigned GOAL and hotel THEME.

12. The string of words in (41) also has another interpretation, insofar as Da. anbefalet ("recommend") is acceptable with only one object, viz. "Peter let Martin recommend the hotel (to someone)" as well as the given "Peter let (someone) recommend the hotel to Martin". The alternative interpretation has a structure similar to (21), i.e. with an S embedded under let.

If the embedded constituent is an S, then hotel receives structural case (Burzio's generalisation applies, and recommend does assign a thematic role to its subject, Martin), as opposed to if the embedded constituent is VP, in which case hotel receives inherent case, as shown in (41). Given that only inherent case is portable (cf. note 10), this then predicts that if hotel moves, it can no longer be interpreted as receiving structural case, and therefore Martin can no longer be interpreted as a subject. This thus accounts for the non-ambiguity of (41), as opposed to (41).

13. Though (43) may not be completely acceptable, it is significantly better than (44).

14. Though (48) may not be completely acceptable, it is significantly better that (49).
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