

A Unified Approach to the Accusative with *to*-Infinitive Construction, the Double Object Construction, and the Dative Construction *

Tsuyoshi SUGAWARA **

Abstract: It has usually been assumed that the V-NP-*to*-VP construction headed by the verb *order* and the V-NP1-NP2 construction headed by the verb *give* are independent and unrelated constructions, and as for the verb *give*, the V-NP1-NP2 construction and the V-NP2-*to*-NP1 construction are not transformationally related to each other. Contra this common assumption, we will make three proposals about the syntactic structure and argument structure of *order* and *give* so that the above-mentioned three constructions are syntactically related to each other.

Key words: V-NP-*to*-VP construction, V-NP1-NP2 construction, V-NP2-*to*-NP1 construction, invisible HAVE excorporation

1. Introduction

In a traditional analysis, the verb *order* in the V-NP-*to*-VP construction (traditionally called the ‘accusative with *to*-infinitive construction’) as in (1a), is a triadic verb, and its indirect object is analyzed as an element of the matrix clause that controls PRO in the infinitival complement as in (1b):

- (1) a. The officer ordered the men to fire the guns.
 b. [IP The officer [I' I [VP t_{NP} [V' V (ordered) [VP the men [v' t_V [IP PRO to fire the guns]]]]]]]

Independently, the V-NP1-NP2 construction (traditionally called the ‘double object construction’) as in (2a), is normally analyzed as involving a layered VP structure in which the lower VP contains Goal and Theme arguments and the higher VP contains the Agent argument as in (2b):

- (2) a. John gave Mary a picture.
 b. [IP John [I' I [VP t_{NP} [V' V (gave) [VP Mary [v' t_V a picture]]]]]]]

The verb *give* can also occur in the V-NP-PP construction (traditionally called the ‘dative construction’) as in (3a). Except for a few researchers including [1] and [2], the commonly accepted assumption about (3a) is that it is not transformationally related to (2a). Instead, (3a) has the derivation as shown in (3b):

(Accepted December 20 2013)

*This paper is a revised and extended version of the paper presented (with Yoshiki Ogawa) at the workshop entitled “The Fourth International Forum on Language, Brain, and Cognition: Cognition, Brain, and Typology: Toward a Synthesis,” held at Tohoku University on September 2004. All remaining errors are my own.

** Ube National College of Technology Department of General Education (English Section)

- (3) a. John gave a picture to Mary.
 b. $[_{IP} \text{John } [_{I'} \text{I } [_{VP} \text{t}_{NP} [_{V'} \text{V (gave)} [_{VP} \text{a picture } [_{V'} \text{t}_V [_{PP} \text{to Mary}]]]]]]]]$

In short, the general assumption is that the accusative with *to*-infinitive construction, the double object construction, and the dative construction are mutually unrelated constructions.

In contrast, we will make three proposals about the syntactic structure and the argument structure of *order* and *give* so that the above-mentioned three constructions are syntactically related to each other. First, focusing on the verb *order*, we propose that its indirect object, such as *the men* in (4a), should be reanalyzed as the subject of the ECM complement whose verbal head is the invisible HAVE ((4b)):

- (4) a. The officer ordered the men to fire the guns. (=1a)
 b. $[_{IP} \text{The officer } [_{I'} \text{I } [_{VP} \text{t}_{NP} [_{V'} \text{V } [_{VP} \text{V (ordered)} [_{XP} \text{X } (\Phi) [_{VP} \text{the men HAVE to fire the guns}]]]]]]]]]$

This proposal entails that *order* is a dyadic verb with the argument structure of <Agent, Event> rather than a triadic verb with the argument structure of <Agent, Goal, Event >.

Second, we show a number of similarities between the verb *order* in the V-NP-*to*-VP construction and the verb *give* in the V-NP1-NP2 construction, and propose that (5a) has the structure of (5b):

- (5) a. John gave Mary a picture. (=2a)
 b. $[_{IP} \text{John } [_{I'} \text{I } [_{VP} \text{t}_{NP} [_{V'} \text{V } [_{VP} \text{V (gave)} [_{XP} \text{X } (\Phi) [_{VP} \text{Mary HAVE a picture}]]]]]]]]$

Given (4b) and (5b), the only difference between the verb *order* in the V-NP-*to*-VP construction and the verb *give* in the V-NP1-NP2 construction is that in the former, the invisible HAVE selects a *to*-infinitive clause, whereas in the latter, it selects a noun phrase.

By the way, [2] proposes that HAVE is a complex of copula BE and the Dative-Case-marking adposition as illustrated in (6). This proposal is justified by the fact that, in a couple of languages, the sentence corresponding to ‘X have Y’ in English is expressed by means of the copula *be* and the preposition *to* or the Dative Case marker. Some examples are given in (7b-d):

- (6) HAVE = copula BE + adposition TO ([2]; cf. [3])

- (7) a. John has a car.
 b. kan **ind** il walad ktab. <Palestinian Arabic: VSO language>
 COP-TNS **to** the boy book ([3]: 585)
 “The boy has the book.”
 c. Le livre est **à** Jean. <French: SVO language>
 the book is **to** Jean ([2]: 195)
 “Jean has the book.”
 d. Taro-**ni** kuruma-ga ar-u. <Japanese: SOV language>
 Taro-**Dat** car-Nom be-Nonpast
 “Taro has a car.”

Building upon the decompositional analysis of the possessive *have* and our proposal about *give* in (5b), we make the third proposal that (8a) has the surface structure as shown in (8b). The point here is that the dative construction is derived from the double object construction by the syntactic excorporation of TO from HAVE and its movement to X:

- (8) a. John gave a picture to Mary. (=3a)
 b. [IP John [_{VP} give + v [_{ASpP} a picture [_{ASp'} Asp [_{VP} t_V [_{XP} X (to) [_{VP} Mary BE t_{a picture}]]]]]]]]

2. Order as an ECM Verb

Note first that, as for the three verbs *believe*, *order*, and *persuade*, they all occur in the V-NP-to-VP construction as in (9a-c):

- (9) a. Barnett believed the doctor to have examined Tilman. ([4]: 4)
 b. Barnett ordered the doctor to examine Tilman.
 c. Barnett persuaded the doctor to examine Tilman. (ibid.)

In the traditional literature, *order* and *persuade* have normally been analyzed as object control verbs, as opposed to *believe*, which is an ECM verb (e.g., [5]). Consider the contrast between (10a) on one hand and (10b,c) on the other:

- (10) a. John believed [_{IP} the doctor to have examined Mary].
 b. John ordered the doctor_i [_{IP} PRO_i to examine Mary].
 c. John persuaded the doctor_i [_{IP} PRO_i to examine Mary].

The criterion for picking out object control verbs is that, when we apply passivization in their complement clause, it is not interpreted as synonymous with the original sentence in the active voice. Take (11a-c) for example.

- (11) a. John believed the doctor to have examined Mary.
 a'. John believed Mary to have been examined by the doctor. (= (11a))
 b. John persuaded the doctor to examine Mary.
 b'. John persuaded Mary to be examined by the doctor. (≠ (11b))
 c. John ordered the doctor to examine Mary.
 c'. John ordered Mary to be examined by the doctor. (≠ (11c)) ([6]: 238)

(11a) with the verb *believe* is synonymous with its passivized version in (11a'). By contrast, (11b) with the verb *persuade* is not synonymous with (11b'). And (11c) with the verb *order* is NOT synonymous with (11c'). Hence, the verb *order* has been classified into the same class as the verb *persuade*.

However, [7] and [8] argue that the lack of synonymy does not entail that the relevant verb is an object control verb. They claim that the verb *order* takes a kind of ECM complement whose semantic structure involves imperative modality in it, and that (12a) is not synonymous with (12a') for the same reasons as (12b) is

not synonymous with (12b’):

- (12) a. John ordered [the doctor to examine Mary].
 a’. John ordered [Mary to be examined by the doctor]. (≠(12a))
 b. The doctor must examine Mary.
 b’. Mary must be examined by the doctor. (≠(12b))

In this section, we will argue for their conclusion by providing syntactic evidence that the verb *order* takes an ECM complement. First, look at the examples in (13) to (15). The infinitival complementation in (13) is paraphrased by the finite complementation in (14) and (15). In the finite complementation, there exists a sharp contrast between *order* and *persuade*:

- (13) a. I believe the scientist to be a genius. ([9]:78)
 b. The officer ordered the men to fire the guns. ([11]: 234)
 c. The officer persuaded the men to fire the guns. ([10]: 57)
 (14) a. I believe that the scientist is a genius. ([9]:78)
 b. The officer ordered that the men (should) fire the guns. ([11]: 234)
 c. *The officer persuaded that the men (should) fire the guns. ([10]: 57)
 (15) a. *I believe the scientist that he is a genius. ([9]:78)
 b. *The officer ordered the men that they (should) fire the guns. ([11]: 234)
 c. The officer persuaded the men that they (should) fire the guns. ([10]: 57)

(14b,c) and (15b,c) indicate that the indirect object of *persuade* must occur in the matrix clause, whereas that of *order* cannot occur in the matrix clause. This contrast shows that unlike *persuade*, *order* does not have a theta-role to assign to its indirect object.

Second, consider the contrast between (16a,b) on one hand and (16c) on the other:

- (16) a. I believe Mary to have lied and John believes it too.
 (it = Mary to have lied) ([12]:468)
 b. The major ordered the troops to fire the guns and the captain ordered it too.
 (it = the troops to fire the guns)
 c. *I tried to persuade John to make a last attempt and Mary tried to persuade it too.
 (it = John to make a last attempt) (ibid.)

In (16c), the sentential anaphor *it* cannot refer to the underlined sequence, but in (16a,b), it can do so. This contrast follows from the assumption that the pronoun *it* can refer to a noun phrase or a clausal constituent, but not to a verb phrase. If *persuade* is an object control verb, the indirect object *John* is in the matrix clause, and the underlined sequence including *John* must be the matrix VP. But the pronoun cannot refer to a VP. Hence, (16c) is ruled out. On the other hand, if *order* is an ECM verb, *the troops* in (16b) is part of the embedded clause. Then, the pronoun *it* can refer to a clausal constituent. Hence, (16b) is well-formed.

Finally, let us examine the following examples:

- (17) a. Mary believes *there* to be a spy among us. ([13]: 151)
 b. The prime minister ordered *there* to be an investigation into the explosion. ([8]: 312)
 c. *She persuaded *there* to be wombats orbiting Jupiter. ([14]:1)

As illustrated in the contrast between (17a) and (17c), ECM verbs accept existential *there* as postverbal NPs, while object control verbs do not. (17b) clearly shows that *order* takes an ECM complement.

3. The Internal Structure of the ECM Complement of *Order* and *Give*

3.1. The Differences between *Order* and *Believe*

In the last section, we have demonstrated that the verb *order* is a kind of ECM verb. In this section, we will discuss the internal structure of the ECM complement of *order* and *give*.

Speaking of ECM verbs, the verb *believe* is well-established. However, we can point out a number of differences between *order* and *believe*. First, as its complement, *believe* takes a proposition, whereas *order* takes an unrealized event, as shown by the contrast between (18a) and (18b):

- (18) a. Mary believes Bill to read books, which is true.
 (which = Bill to read books) ([15]: 27)
 b. *Mary ordered Bill to resign from the position, which was true.
 (which = Bill to resign from the position) ([9]: 82)

Second, for the Japanese counterpart of *believe*, the subject of its infinitival complement is marked for Accusative Case. But for the Japanese counterpart of *order*, the subject of its infinitival complement is marked for Dative Case:

- (19) a. Taro-wa Ziro-o yuuzai da to sinzi-tei-ru.
 Taro-Top Ziro-Acc guilty be Comp believe-Prog-Nonpast
 b. Taro-wa Ziro-ni / *-o sugu kuru yooni meizi-ta.
 Taro-Top Ziro-Dat/Acc immediately come Comp order-Past

Third, in English, the verb *believe* cannot be nominalized when it takes an ECM complement, no matter what Case is assigned to the object, as shown in (20a). On the other hand, the verb *order* can be nominalized if the indirect object is marked for Dative Case, as in (20b,c):

- (20) a. *Mary's belief of / to Bill to read books
 b. Sue's order to Harry to get out of the room ([15]: 134)
 c. Their orders to / *of the troops to fire. ([16]: 73)

One might argue that (20b) can be analyzed as a kind of object control construction in which the PP *to Harry* is in the matrix clause and controls PRO in the embedded clause. However, such an analysis needs to

admit a double argument structure for the nominal *order*, which is not available for the verbal *order*. The ill-formedness of (21a) indicates that the nominal *order* does not have a theta-role to assign to its indirect object, when it takes a finite complement clause:

- (21) a. *Sue's order to Harry that she (should) get out of the room
 b. Sue's order that Harry (should) get out of the room

In view of the ill-formedness of (21a), we need to assume that the nominal *order* has distinct argument structures, when it takes an infinitival complement and when it takes a finite complement. But this is unreasonable, if not impossible. A more simple and natural interpretation of (20b) is that *order* always takes an ECM complement, whether it is verbal or nominal, and that the sequence *to Harry to get out of the room* in (20b) forms a clausal constituent.

For these reasons, we cannot identify the internal structure of the infinitival complement of *order* with that of *believe*.

3.2. The Relation between *Order* and *Give*

However, we can see that the behavior of *order* is quite similar to that of the ditransitive verb *give*. First, the verb *ataeru*, which is the Japanese counterpart of *give*, also requires two objects, but the indirect object is marked for Dative Case rather than Accusative Case:

- (22) Taro-wa Ziro-ni/*-o hon-o atae-ta.
 Taro-Top Ziro-Dat/Acc book-Acc give-Past

Second, when the verb *give* is nominalized, the indirect object must be marked for Dative Case, and the option of Genitive Case is excluded as shown in (23):

- (23) a. *John's gift **of** Mary of a book
 b. John's gift of a book **to** Mary (cf. [17])

Third, just as *give*, *order* can also take the double object construction, and (24a) has the same meaning as the sentence 'The doctor ordered me absolute quiet.' And just as *order*, *give* can also take the accusative with *to*-infinitive construction as in (24b):

- (24) a. The doctor ordered me absolute quiet.
 b. He gave me to believe that he would help us.

These three common properties between the two verbs make it possible to propose that they share a certain syntactic structure.

3.3. The Invisible HAVE in the ECM Complement

As for the verb *give*, it has been occasionally suggested since [18] that it takes a small clause whose head is the invisible verb HAVE as in (25):

(25) I gave / lent [Mary HAVE a book]

In the last decade, Harley, den Dikken, and some other researchers have defended the essence of this proposal. One important aspect of the proposal in (25) is that it implies that the verb *give* in the double object construction is a kind of ECM verb.

Now, recall that we have a number of similarities between the verb *order* in the accusative with *to*-infinitive construction and the verb *give* in the double object construction. On the basis of this fact, we propose that (26a) has the structure as shown in (26b):

- (26) a. Sue ordered Harry to get out of the room.
b. Sue ordered [Harry HAVE to get out of the room].

The invisible HAVE in (26b) is different from that in (25) in that its complement is not a noun phrase but a *to*-infinitive clause. However, it is important to note that this is parallel to the behavior of the lexical verb *have*. The lexical *have* can also take both a noun phrase and a *to*-infinitive clause.

A direct consequence of the proposal in (26b) is that we can account for the fact that (26a) can be paraphrased as in (27) with the deontic modal auxiliary *must*:

(27) Sue gave orders so that Harry must get out of the room.

In our proposal, this is simply because *have to* has the same meaning as *must*.

Therefore, we assume that both *give* and *order* select an ECM complement, whose internal structures are shown in (28a) and (28b), respectively. Here, the invisible HAVE is selected by another category, which is tentatively called X:

- (28) a. [IP John [I I [VP t_{NP} [V' V [VP V (gave) [XP X (Φ) [VP Mary HAVE a picture]]]]]]]]
b. [IP Sue [I I [VP t_{NP} [V' V [VP V (ordered) [XP X (Φ) [VP Harry HAVE to get out of the room]]]]]]]]

Recall here that, when *order* and *give* are nominalized, their indirect object is assigned Dative Case by the preposition *to*. Note also that, in the dative construction with the verb *give*, the indirect object is marked for Dative Case. In the next section, we propose that the preposition *to* in all three cases stem from the invisible HAVE.

3.4. Excorporation of TO from HAVE

We are assuming that HAVE is the complex of BE plus TO. Using this assumption, we propose in this section that the overt realization of *to* indicates that the invisible preposition TO is excorporated from the invisible HAVE and moved to the selecting head X.

3.4.1. Optional Excorporation in the Complement of *Give*

If no more restriction is imposed, the excorporation of TO from HAVE should be optional. We propose that the dative alternation as in (29a,b) is the result of the optional application of the excorporation:

- (29) a. John gave Mary a book.
b. John gave a book to Mary.

More specifically, we propose the following derivations for (29a,b), respectively:

- (30) a. $[_{IP} \text{John } [_{VP} v \ [_{AspP} \text{Asp } [_{VP} V (\text{give}) \ [_{XP} X (\Phi) \ [_{IP} \text{Mary HAVE a book }]]]]]]]]$
b. $[_{IP} \text{John } [_{VP} v \text{ give}+v \ [_{AspP} \text{a book } [_{Asp} \text{Asp } [_{VP} t_v \ [_{XP} X (\text{to}) \ [_{IP} \text{Mary BE } t_{a \text{ book}}]]]]]]]]]]$

In (30a), there is no excorporation, and the invisible HAVE keeps the ability to check the Case of the direct object *a book*. However, the indirect object *Mary* cannot have its Case feature checked in the embedded clause. Hence, it moves at LF to the matrix clause to have its Accusative Case checked.

On the other hand, in (30b), TO is excorporated from HAVE, and the invisible HAVE is changed to the invisible BE. Since X is occupied by *to*, the indirect object *Mary* has its Case checked by the preposition. However, just like the lexical *be*, the invisible BE cannot check the Case of *a book*. Hence, *a book* must move to the matrix clause. If this movement takes place in overt syntax along with the movement of the verb *give*, we obtain the word order in (29b).

3.4.2. Obligatory Excorporation of TO from HAVE in Nominalization

Now, let us consider the nominal counterpart of (29a,b), as in (31a,b):

- (31) a. *John's gift of Mary of a book
b. John's gift of a book to Mary

The derivations of (31a,b) will be represented as in (32a,b), respectively. We will not explicate the technical details of (32a,b), but note just that in the ill-formed (31a), the head X is phonetically empty:

- (32) a. $*[_{DP} \text{John } [_{NzP} \text{give} + Nz (=gift) \ [_{AspP} \text{Asp } [_{VP} t_v \ [_{XP} X (\Phi) \ [_{VP} (\text{of}) \text{Mary HAVE } (\text{of}) \text{a book }]]]]]]]]$
b. $[_{DP} \text{John } [_{NzP} \text{give} + Nz (=gift) \ [_{AspP} \text{of a book } [_{Asp} \text{Asp } [_{VP} t_v \ [_{XP} X (\text{to}) \ [_{VP} \text{Mary BE } t_{a \text{ book}}]]]]]]]]]]$

This fact is reminiscent of the fact that the complementizer *that* is obligatory in the complement of a derived nominal as in (33b):

- (33) a. John believed (that) Bill was guilty.
b. John's belief *(that) Bill was guilty

Since this asymmetry between verbs and nouns is observed quite generally, we may state it as a cross-linguistic generalization as in (34):

(34) The highest head of the clausal complement of a noun cannot be phonetically empty.

Given (34), we can provide the same explanation for the obligatoriness of the excorporation of TO in (32b) and the obligatoriness of *that* in (33b). The obligatoriness of *to* in (35) is similarly explained.

- (35) a. *Sue's order of Harry to get out of the room
 b. Sue's order to Harry to get out of the room

On the other hand, the optionality of excorporation of TO in (29) can be assimilated with the optionality of *that* in (33a).

4. Further Evidence for the ECM Complementation of *Give*

In this section, we will provide two more pieces of evidence for the proposed internal structure of the ECM complement of *give*.

4.1. Subject-Oriented Anaphors in Japanese

The Japanese anaphor *zibun* must take a grammatical subject as its antecedent ([19]). Thus, in (36), *zibun* can be bound by the subject *Taro*, but not by the indirect object *Hanako*:

- (36) Taro_i-ga Hanako_j-ni zibun_{i/*j}-no yuuzin-ga byouki da to it-ta.
 Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat self-Gen friend-Nom sick is Comp say-Past
 "Taro said to Hanako that a friend of himself / *herself was sick."

Now, compare (36) with (37). Somewhat surprisingly, with *ataeru*, the Japanese counterpart of the verb *give*, *zibun* can be bound by its indirect object *Hanako*, as well as by the subject *Taro*:

- (37) Taro_i-ga Hanako_j-ni zibun_{i/*j}-no heya-o atae-ta.
 Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat self-Gen room-Acc give-Past
 "Taro gave Hanako the room of himself / herself."

Since *zibun* is a subject-oriented anaphor, the possibility of anaphoric dependency between *Hanako* and *Zibun* in (37) is not expected in the traditional analysis of the double object construction as outlined in (2b).

On the other hand, in our analysis, the so-called "indirect object" of the verb *give* is the grammatical subject of the invisible HAVE. Therefore, we can assimilate the well-formedness of (37) in the relevant reading with the well-formedness of (38):

- (38) Hanako_i-ni-wa zibun_i-no heya-ga aru.
 Hanako-Dat-Top self-Gen room-Nom be-Nonpast
 "Hanako has her own room."

4.2. NPI Licensing by Negative Verbs in English

In this section, we will show that the ECM complement of *give* is XP that dominates VP rather than the bare VP headed by the invisible HAVE.

The argument is related to a peculiar property of the Negative Polarity Item, or NPI, in English. Look at the contrast between (39a) and (39b). This indicates that the NPI in English must be c-commanded by the negative element:

- (39) a. John did not read any book.
b. *Any student did not come.

When the NPI occurs in the complement of the negative verb *deny*, it appears to be subject to another restriction, since we have the contrast between (40a) and (40b):

- (40) a. *John denied anything.
b. John denied that he had won anything.

In both (40a) and (40b), the verb *deny* c-commands the NPI *anything*. Nevertheless, (40a) is ill-formed. To account for this asymmetry, [20] proposes that the NPI in (40b) is licensed not by the negative verb itself as in (41a), but by the negatively specified head of the complement CP as in (41b):

- (41) a. deny (NEG) [_{CP} that he had won anything]
b. deny [_{CP} that (NEG) [_{IP} he had won anything]

By the way, the verb *deny* can not only be a transitive verb that selects a DP complement as in (42a), but it can also be a ditransitive verb as shown in (42b):

- (42) a. John denied the earlier claim.
b. They denied John the victory.

As far as NPI licensing is concerned, the ditransitive *deny* behaves like (40b) rather than (40a). Thus in (43a), the NPI is the first object of *deny*; in (43b), it is the second object of *deny*; and both are well-formed:

- (43) a. I hesitate to deny anyone the opportunity to play hooky.
b. A combination of good defense and bad luck denied them any further score.

This fact follows from our framework, if we assume that it is the functional category X that is negatively specified. Given this assumption, the structure of (43a) and (43b) will be (44a) and (44b), respectively:

- (44) a. deny [_{XP} X (NEG) [_{VP} anyone [_{V'} HAVE the opportunity to play hooky]]]
b. deny [_{XP} X (NEG) [_{VP} them [_{V'} HAVE any further score]]]

In (44a), the negatively specified X c-commands the subject of HAVE, and in (44b), the same head c-commands

the object of HAVE. In either case, the NPI can satisfy the c-command requirement.

In place of (44), suppose that the double object verb directly selects the invisible HAVE, and that the invisible HAVE is negatively specified as in (45):

(45) deny [_{VP} anyone [_V HAVE (NEG) the opportunity to play hooky]] (in place of (44a))

In this assumption, we expect that (43a) is ill-formed since in (45), the negatively specified HAVE does not c-command the first object of *deny*.

Hence, we can conclude that the ECM complement of *deny* is XP. If *deny* has this property, its positive counterpart *give* should be similarly analyzed. Hence, we can conclude that the ECM complement of *give* is XP.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that the verb *order* in the accusative with *to*-infinitive construction and the verb *give* in the double object construction are both a kind of ECM verb. More specifically, we have argued that the internal structure of their complement clause contains the functional projection XP, whose head selects the invisible HAVE.

References

- [1] Larson, R. "On the Double Object Construction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335-391, (1988).
- [2] den Dikken, *Particle: On the Syntax of Verb-Particle, Triadic, and Causative Constructions*, New York, Oxford University Press, (1995).
- [3] Freeze, R. "Existentials and Other Locatives," *Language* 68, 553-595, (1992).
- [4] Davies, W. D. and S. Dubinsky, *The Grammar of Raising and Control*, Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing, (2004).
- [5] Landau, I. *Control in Generative Grammar: A Research Companion*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, (2013).
- [6] Culicover, P. W. *Syntax*, New York, Academic Press, (1976).
- [7] Nakau, M. *The Principles of the Cognitive Semantics*, Tokyo, Taishukan, (1994).
- [8] Nakamura, M. "The Semantic Structure and Inference Rules of the English Verbs with Infinitive Complement," *Core and Periphery of Language*, ed. by Kuroda, S., and M. Nakamura, Tokyo, Kuroshio Publisher, 287-320, (1999).
- [9] Sugawara, T. "On the Causative Use of Accusative with Infinitive Constructions: From the Viewpoint of the Interaction between Syntax and Semantics," *Central Japan English Studies* 23, 72-83, (2004).
- [10] Sugawara, T. "Two Types of Accusative with Infinitive Constructions: Order-Type vs. Persuade-Type," *KLS 25: Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of Kansai Linguistic Society*, 55-64, (2005).
- [11] Sugawara, T. "An Event Structure Account of English Causatives," *JELS 23: Papers from the Twenty-Third Conference of the English Linguistic Society of Japan*, 230-238, (2006).
- [12] Gee, J. P. "Comments on the Paper by Akmajian," *Formal Syntax*, ed. by P. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian, New York, Academic Press, 461-481, (1977).
- [13] Bresnan, J. W. *Theory of Complementation in English Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT, (1972).
- [14] Langacker, R. W. "Raising and Transparency," *Language* 71, 1-62, (1995).
- [15] Pesetsky, D. "Zero Syntax vol.2," ms. MIT, Cambridge, MA, (1991).
- [16] Grimshaw, J. *Argument Structure*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, (1990).
- [17] Kayne, R. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*, Dordrecht, Foris Publications, (1984).
- [18] Ross, J. R. "To Have Have and To Not Have Have," *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill*, Lisse, Holland, The Peter and Ridder Press, 263-270, (1976).
- [19] Sportiche, D. "Zibun," *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 369-374, (1986).
- [20] Laka, M. I. *Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*, Ph. D. dissertation, MIT, (1990).