Olshewsky, T.M. (1969). *Problems in the philosophy of language.* New York: Holt,   Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Sadock, J. M. (2003). Mismatches   in autonomous modular versus derivational grammars. In M. Butt &T. H. King (Ed.), *Proceedings   of the BFGOO Conference Workshops.* CSLI Publications.

Schönefeld, D.(2001). *Where Lexicon and Syntax meet.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Shapiro, L. P. (1997). Tutorial: An introduction to syntax. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 40,* 254-272.

Sorace, A. (1985). Metalinguistic Knowledge and language use in acquisition-poor environments. *Applied Linguistics, 6*(3), 239-254.

Travis, L. (1984). *Parameters and effects of word order variation.* PhD dissertation, MIT

Tyson, L. (1999). *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide.* New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc.

Vollmer, H.J. 1983. The structure of foreign language competence. In A. Hughes & D. Porter (Eds.). *Current developments in language testing.* London: Academic Press.

Wexler, K. & Manzini, M. (1987). Parameters and learnability in Binding Theory. In T. Roeper & E. Williams .(Eds). *Parameter Setting.* D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Willis, D. (1990). *The lexical syllabus.* London: Collins.

Karimi, S. (1997). From deep structure to logical form and the Minimalist program. *Majalle-ye Zabanshenasi, 11*(2), pp. 5-51.

Keyser, S. J. & Postal, P.M. (1976). *Beginning English grammar*. Harper and Row Publishers.

Krashen, S. (1981). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 51-79). California State Department.

Liles, B. L. (1972). *Linguistics and the English language: A transformational approach*. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company Inc.

Longacre, R. E. (2002). Some implications of Zellig Harris's discourse analysis. *The Legacy of Zellig Harris: Language and information into the 21st century*, Volume. 1: *Philosophy of science, syntax, and semantics*, ed. by Bruce Nevin, John Benjamins, pp.117-135.

MacWhinney, B. (Ed.).(1998). *The emergence of language*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Maratsos, M., & Chalkley, M. A. (1980). The internal language of children's syntax: The ontogenesis and representation of syntactic categories. In K. Nelson (Ed.), *Children's Language, Vol. 2*. New York: Gardner Press.

Odlin, T. (1994). *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oller, J. W. (1979). Language tests at school: *A pragmatic approach*. London :Longman.

Cook, V. (1998). Relating SLA research to language teaching materials. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1,* pp. 1-2, 9-27.

Cook, V. & Newson, M. (1996). *Chomsky's Universal Grammar.* Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Dryer, M. S. (2003). *Descriptive theories, explanatory theories, and basic linguistic theory.* Ms., University of Buffalo.

Glauner, J. (2000, October 25). The Evolution of English Grammar. Retrieved June 22, 2005, from captain.park.edu/jglauner/EN-ED325%20F2F/GramText.htm.

Goldsmith, J. (2001). Unsupervised Learning of the Morphology of a Natural language. *Computational Linguistics, No. 27,* Vol. 2, pp. 153- 59.

Goldsmith, J. (2005). Review of the Legacy of Zellig Harris: *Language and information into the 21th century. Volume 1: Philosophy of science, syntax and semantics.* Edited by Bruce Nevin.

Green, A. (1998). *Studies in language testing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halle, Morris.(2004). LSA lecture

Harley, H.(1995). *Subjects, Events and Licensing.* Ph.D. thesis, MIT.

Harris, Z. (1951). *Structural linguistics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Huck, G. J. & Goldsmith. J. A. (1995). *Ideology and Linguistic Theory: Noam Chomsky and the Deep Structure Debates.* London: Routledge.

However, it should not be taken for granted that many are still enchanted by the ideas put forth by structuralism including descriptive linguists who in the recent years have displayed a tremendous penchant for allowing their mode of description to be affected by insights from typological studies. So in this way descriptive theories can also manifest explanatory power (ibid.).

References

Abney, S. (1987). *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Bar-Hillel, Y.(1970). *Aspects of Language.* Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bolinger, D. L.(1975). *Aspects of language.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich.

Bresnan, J. (1996). *Lexical functional syntax.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Cattell, N.R. (1969). *The new English grammar: a descriptive introduction.* Cambridge , Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1980). *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Chomsky, N. (1986). *The knowledge of language, its nature, origin, and use.* Praeger.

Chomsky, N. & Lasnik, H. (1977). Filters and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* ,p. 8

same token, he rebukes the data on which the Chomskyan I-view is based (Bresnan, 2004).

The focus of the present study, the lexicon-syntax interface, operates along the same lines: no strict theory of the structure of the lexicon can afford to get along without at least some theory of lexicon, in the same way as no serious theory of syntax can afford to overlook the lexicon (Schoenefeld, 2001). This is simply because in most linguistic theories the lexicon serves the function of providing all the necessary materials out of which syntactic and semantic structure is formed. As one begins to investigate the goals, devices, and claims of the competing theories, it turns out that there are various ways in which there could be articulated a division of labor between the lexicon and the syntax (ibid.).

Though the present study derives one to a bias towards a lexicon-dominated interface between lexicon and syntax where information from lexical items takes precedence over syntactic principles in construction of linguistic structure, one should struggle for making a brave effort and for being unafraid to build bridges between a purely distribution-based theory and that of generative grammarians, as we think it will be more fair and correct to say that the difference between the opposing views in this respect is one of stress and degree than of kind. So there is a continuous argument, on the part of some fairly realistic linguists such as Dryer (2003) concerning a need for both descriptive and explanatory theories. On the grounds of the false contrast many linguists observe between description and theory, and because of the intense prestige associated with the concept of *theory*, many often disregard any efforts made by distribution-based basic linguistic theory as "merely" descriptive.

Harris follows Sapir's classic observations about speaker intuitions which is absolutely Chomskyan perspective on the relationship between semantics and syntax during the 1960s (Huck & Goldsmith, 1996: that meaning is no business of syntax, but that a thorough grammatical analysis will have probably much to offer to neighboring disciplines concerned with meaning and logic.

Correspondingly, Robert Longacre (2002) remarks on Harris's reluctance to link to a distribution-based analysis of corpora information regarding the meaning of it. In our credo, Harris moves along the same lines as did Carnap and Bloomfield in, as Bar-Hillel (1970) suggests, striving to go on without fuzzy semantics- and to reconstruct their fields on a purely structural basis. A most known modern statement of a distribution-based idea of grammatical analysis is from Maratsos and Chalkley (1980) who closely follow Bloomfield (1933) and Harris (1951). They suggest that children could sort words into grammatical categories by noting their co-occurrences with other morphemes and their privileges of occurrences in sentences. Thus, -*ed* follows verb and *the* precedes noun. They assert that children carry out such analyses even in the absence of fostering semantic evidence.

Antagonistic psychologists though deprived of the tools to develop what is or is not a suitable noun preceder, can easily assert that "nouns" simply are not the most frequent article-followers but that *adjectives* and *adverbs* are. That is why the computational linguists today struggle to develop as similar as the traditional linguistic labeling regarding the categorization of words into patterns. Goldsmith (2005) alike many others criticizes Harris's E-view as being too meager disregarding many linguistic facts. However, by the

because he believed that this is the only basis on which one could establish a comprehensive linguistic theory.

Harris' work from the very early to the end was on the basis of the view that linguistics was a science of external facts (such as corpora) rather than a science of internalized knowledge as Chomsky asserted. As Morris Halle (2004) notes, it was the increasing awareness of the committitive view to a rationalist hypothesis, different from Harris's empiricist view, which led to the intellectual alienation between Harris and Chomsky despite their close coalition up until 1960. One could come up with important subfields of linguistics that stay involved with an empiricist view of linguistics ranging from corpora linguistics and the most contemporary computational linguistics in a close association with connectionists' view of linguistics (see e.g. MacWhinney, 1998).

Goldsmith (2001) is also of the credo that an up-to-date version of Harrisian conceptions acts as a firm foundation for the working linguists with regard to the current rationalist view. The image emerging out of Harris's view, according to him, is one that regards a radical disintegration of linguistics from psychology and biology. A radical move that will be a curse to quite a few leading theoreticians in linguistics from Ronald Langacker and George Lakoff to Ray Jackendoff and, of course, Noam Chomsky all of whom advocate an affiliation of linguistic structures with human cognitive structures. To the reverse, Harris's determined view was to adhere to an autonomous science of linguistics not involved with the methodological and conclusive concerns of any other discipline for he regarded predictions as being outside the techniques and scope of descriptive linguistics and that linguistics offers no way of them.

become, to a lesser degree, educationally grammar-oriented, i.e. rely on the grammatical points and rules as the knowledge of language. Given the demographic differences among the individuals, this fact seems to be true especially with those whose knowledge of English language, when coming up to the university, happens not to exceed beyond the high school education, leading to an obviously wrong attitude towards the nature of the English language to be learnt.

Conclusion

Here it is deemed crucial to understand the philosophical standpoints laying behind the idea of the integration or disintegration of meaning and form with an eye to the closely affiliated conception of the integration between lexicon and syntax.

Therefore, in the first place, it is important to understand the challenge that is implicit in developing the Harrisian versus Chomskyan perspective.

Harris's work must be situated in terms of the conflict between two visions of linguistic science: the mediationalist view which according to Goldsmith (2005) regards the aim of linguistic research as discovering how natural languages associate form and meaning, and the distributionist view, seeing how discrete pieces of language (e.g. word and structure) connect to each other in a way that defines each individual language. Harris in contrast to Chomsky had no idea of how mediationalist conceptions could contribute to linguistics as the former's goal was to show that the only priority in a linguistic analysis could be defined in terms of the distribution of components

justify their decisions, at a higher rate with respect to concurrent reports, by appealing to grammatical rules and conventions they seemed to be consciously aware of, and to have encountered in their rule-based course books for instance in resolving on their choices of verb tense, subject/verb agreement and word order. The fact could be somehow related to the conscious efforts made by the subjects to resolve the disagreements which quite logically led to the frequent references to the conventions they were obviously aware of due to the nature of the educational policies and concerns as to what students of the mostly lower education should be provided with. So the rate of appealing to the rules and analogies seemed higher in proportion with the same rate as to the same feature in the concurrent sessions. The logic behind this fact might have to do with Krashen's (1981) continuum of the acquisition/learning distinction where at the left extreme lies the chomskyan claim of unconscious acquisition of language.

At the same time, the groups resorted to intuition or conviction quite frequently. These findings appear to support Odlin's (1994) claim that appropriate intuitions appear to reflect a developing competence in the target language.

Instances where no justifications where proposed or students simply disbanded with 'I think' ...might be owing to this fact that they were not accustomed to articulating their justifications (Swain & Lapkin, 1995) or may not be that proficient in the second language. Sorace (1985), as an instance, offers the claim that it demands an ability of high order to verbalize rules and conventions. It is however the researchers' credo that any appeal to the analogical conventions is to a great extent due to the simple fact that these students have

Accordingly, the two tables the researchers came up with provide the readers with information concerned with the frequency of the learners' concern as well as the justifications they expressed overtly or implicitly as to their choice of a peculiar feature.

The results attained from the two types of the procedures the subjects went through, correlated highly, to the effect that, the retrospective reports corroborated some of the discussions put forth at the end of fractions accommodating concurrent reports.

Due to the nature of the cloze task and the autonomy with which the subjects verbalized their conscious thoughts, it could not be anticipated that all the features of concern were attended to at the same rate. It would rightly be more sensible to recruit a large number of subjects who will produce copious reports at least ten times as many as the ones present in the study. Despite this, the results obtained contribute largely to the claims effected by a unitary account of GB theories regarding especially the valency properties of the content words, and sentence structure not to mention the rest. These two points of concern lie at the crossroads of interaction between the nuts and bolts central in describing a language, for which there seems to exist no logical answer in a meaning-free word-by-word approach to, let us say, text-reconstruction. Accordingly, the groups ventured beyond the single word and considered the entire sentence and the relationships between ideas in the text. What was perhaps more perplexing to the researchers were the justifications the students supplied to speak up for their grammatical decisions. Such justifications and explanations tended to be offered only when disputes (e.g. repairs) arose or where confirmation requests were made. The findings seem to indicate that the subjects attempted to

demonstration of their arguments versus the approach according to which the structures are formulated in the syntax rather than lexically-oriented.

The claims afforded by both approaches were challenged through the protocol techniques adopted. The peculiar methodology was to use the frequency-driven data as indicators of the extent to which syntactic structure is determined or constrained by lexical choices. Although the data admit a range of interpretations, they unequivocally suggest a lexicon-syntax interface which is more strongly restrained by lexical choices and that syntax is more often accommodated to the demands of some lexical items than vice versa (Schoenefeld, 2001). Here, the effects of frequency were key contributors to the GB claims of the lexical-syntactic interface, though those who are unable or unwilling to put data from protocols ahead of formal argumentation might find the discussions tough going.

The results are further utilized for a lexically-dominated interface, with frequency having a much greater importance than in many standard theories, in which these effects are relegated to "mere performance".

Schoenefeld (2001) undertakes a notoriously laborious task of a similar kind: that of applying psycholinguistic data as a way of putting various linguistic theories to test. According to her at least in North American linguistic circles, there is a long-lasting reluctance to allow one's theory to become too indebted to facts from the corpus as to linguistic behavior. But she hopes that others will follow in the line of experimental investigations that she unblocks.

The exchange begins with A making obvious efforts to reconstruct a sentence. At the same time she expresses her uncertainty as to the grammaticality and meaningfulness of the sentence. B accepts this construction, but obviously finds it difficult to articulate the reason for that. Therefore, he resorts to his intuition that the construction sounds right.

Discussion

Many various aspects of syntax have been investigated in SLA research primarily within the American structuralist tradition. L2 syntax has been looked at within the frameworks of the UG theory in the course of the last 30 years quite variously (Cook & Newson, 1996). The chief implication lying in the bedrock of such studies, including the present study, is that when one acquires the L2 as a natural language, one does not need to learn the central areas of syntax (Cook, 1998).

The proper characterization of the lexicon-syntax interface, closely affiliated with the concerns of the above-cited studies, is a central question of not only structuralist theoreticians, but any theory that seeks to explain even the most basic properties of any linguistic relation. The main question of the concern of the present study, about the interface between lexicon and syntax is if and to what extent there exists an association between the lexical-semantic properties of predicated and the syntactic frames in which they appear. Abstracting away from details, here we deal with two types of hypotheses whose concerns we hoped to be touched upon by the subjects involved with the question under scrutiny: the so-called valency-basd projectionist approach, according to which 'verbs' lexically specify the

A: Now I explain... The mayor of Oakland ...*of* is used here to show possession...that Oakland possesses this mayor...

In this example, the application of the preposition *of* is justified on the basis of the semantic explication.

One problem with the characterization of a category like 'preposition' is that, according to Abney (1987), they are to some extent anomalous; that they seem "to straddle the line between functional and thematic elements" (p.63). The only point to be discussed here is that the prepositions so unequivocally carry with them a lexical and not a grammatical meaning.

Sample 12 (word order)

A: 'Former governor of California' or 'California's former governor'?

B: Yeah, this governor belongs to California. So the two sentences are correct.

In this excerpt, A is unsure about the choice of the correct structure and expresses uncertainty. However, B shows his acceptance of both of the expressions justifying this preference on a semantic basis.

3- Intuition: statement which reflects sense of what sounds /seems right and what does not

Sample 13 (word order)

A: That the police report...report...has powerful information about crimes. Does it make sense?

B: Well I don't know the rule...I only know ...sounds...nothing is missing...yes the structure...the order is correct...

A: Yeah... 'will be able to' is in harmony with the verb 'can'...so we need future marker....will soon be able to know about all the crime statistics.

This exchange begins with A offering her version of the sentence. B continues by alluding to the rule that the present tense should not be used instead of a future tense. This exchange digresses to a discussion of comparison between verbs but resumes again to the need for the use of the future marker 'will'.

Sample 9 (subject/verb agreement)

A: Let me explain... 'police do identify the crimes'. We said *police* is plural so we use plural verb 'do'.

In this excerpt, A justifies the choice of a better alternative, namely, 'plural' verb alluding to the rule that a simple plural verb accompanies a plural noun.

Sample 10 (article)

A: We say 'all *the* crime statistics' because these crimes happen in this city so they are definite...we use 'definite article'...

What is so perplexing as to the accomplishment of a retrospective task is the conscious efforts made on the part of the subjects to justify the choices, attending more to the superficial aspects or better still the fundamental categories of the sentence.

2- Meaning: appealing to semantics or meanings of words in the text

Sample 11 (preposition)

Sample 6 (verb tense)

A: Can read…

B: Yes…can read…because something new is going to happen…they will soon be able to do…to read the internet…I mean statistics. So here we use can.

Sample 7 (subject/verb agreement)

A: Police *do* identify…*does*?

B: We use *do* to intensify.

A: No *do* but we can use…ok but not *does* because police is plural. So police do intensify the crimes.

Retrospective reports

The remainder of the data were later analyzed for the justifications and explanations, if any, that the subjects offered as to: first, the kind of grammatical features of the concern of the learners and second, the strategies and procedures taken by different groups to deal with and resolve such concerns. Based on the learner's overt statements or on the implications in such statements, a taxonomy of justifications was drawn up. The following examples from the transcripts illustrate these categories of justifications:

1. Grammar: justifications which refer to rules or categories

Sample 8 (verb tense)

A: The mayor of Oakland will soon be able to…we use the *future tense* to show that…

B: Well this is not happening just now

moves, one has to know its underlying structure captured by the propositional meaning.

Sample 5 (pronoun)

A- Ok, he is the former governor of California, yes? Can we say 'he was'?

B- Ok, he was the former

C- In the text...*the past sentence*...the mayor of Oakland talks about *he*...so this is the ...about the governor...also he is alive...so he is the former governor of California.

In this excerpt, the pronoun *he* is claimed by C to refer to the same entity articulated in close vicinity in the previous sentence, namely, *the mayor of Oakland*. This fact reminds one of the Chomskyan idea that pronominals such as *he* in what is expressed by C "do not have antecedents that are nouns within the same clause" (Cook & Newson, 1996, p.63); in other words, this pronominal is free within the local domain or the clause to which it belongs (ibid.). The mere discussion of pronouns dealt with within the principles and parameters theory, integrating the Binding principle with the lexical entry, is conspicuous evidence for the idea of lexicon-syntax interface.

Though there were presented no explicit allusions to the route through which the subjects came up with the two aspects of the inflectional phrase IP, namely subject/verb agreement and verb tense, the researcher came up with a great deal of helpful data where such concerns were dealt with lexically-dominated based on the content of the lexical entries carrying the concepts of tense and agreement; as one can note in the following samples:

complement, the former representing X" together with the head of the phrase and the latter formulating X' along with the head.

A merely list-based linear system of sentence construction can make no contribution to explicating such a process and falls evidently short of an adequate explication, though there were 10 cases where the subjects based their explanations on the traditional sense of the sentence construction. However, what kind of justification one could bring forth as to the lack of determiners as such?

Sample 4 (passive)

A- The project of ...

B- Crime statistics...no...putting the city crime statistics...

A- Yes...on the web...

B- Who put no promoted...the project...

C- Maybe governor of California

A- Ok. So make it passive... the ...a ...project was promoted to put...

C- Statistics...

A- Crimes statistics on the web.

The rule stating how to produce passives is not just a matter of counting words in a linear sequence in the traditional sense (i.e. that the object in the active sentence is to move to the beginning of the sentence to be the subject of the passive; that the active subject moves after the verb...and so on) . According to Cook and Newson (1996), any movement requires the movement of a right element in the right phrase, one introduced as the major aspect of the principle of structure-dependency. In order to know which element of the sentence