

As so explicitly manifested, the spoken thoughts verbalized ad lib go absolutely against a methodological analysis which regards no affiliation between the two integral elements of lexicon and syntax. The latter operates along the same lines as Travis's (1984) valid suggestion that the  $\theta$ -making parameter specifies the word order of arguments in relation to their predicates.

There were many instances, in the data, of the cases where within the sentences reconstructed by subjects were NPs void of the specific article acting as the specifier of an NP. This, it appears, had no effect on the subjects' conceiving of the meaning of the sentences. Let us flesh this out through the following sample:

*Sample 3 (article)*

A: The mayor of Oakland will soon be able to ...know...

B: Or...either

C: To know about all crime statistics...

A: Crime statistics is enough...ha?

C: Yes it makes sense.

One can so evidently observe, in this sample, that there is a mutual agreement between A and C in generating a phrase void of an article. The evidence as such bears the following interpretations: a) determiners including article carry little essential propositional meaning; b) meaning plays a crucial role in determining the phrase structure of the sentence; and c) the examples touch upon the X-bar theory claims that all types of phrase, including Noun phrase, share and require the two internal levels of structure, specifier and

B- No... the total of that....phrase 'political pressure created to lead to good results'.

It is so unequivocally stated that V requires and expresses the meaning relationships between some entities known as subject and object in the traditional sense. The object is decided to be the whole phrase 'political pressure created to lead to good results'. Though there are no further details stated, it could be argued that the Projection Principle entails sentence (1) cannot have the structure in (2).

(1) The mayor believes the political pressure created to lead to good results.

(2) The mayor believes [<sub>NP</sub> the political pressure created] [<sub>S</sub> lead to good results].

The NP is the subject of the embedded sentence at the level of D-structure, so it has to be analyzed as its subject at all syntactic levels of representation, even though it has objective case.

*Sample 2 (word order)*

A- Yes the former governor of California ...project...promote...crime statistics.

B- This project ...yes

C- The former governor of California...what?

B- You know...we can say the former governor of California promotes the project of crime statistics... I think...it makes sense because who promotes?...the governor...what?... the project

A- Yes... it has good sense...

<i>Grammatical Features</i>	<i>Grammar</i>	<i>Meaning</i>	<i>Intuition</i>	<i>Other</i>
001	7	3	0	2
002	5	2	0	0
003	5	0	0	0
004	1	7	2	-
005	0	7	4	0
006	0	3	0	0
007	0	0	0	0

### *Concurrent reports*

It turns out that the grammatical features codified as 007, 005, and 001 representing vocabulary, word order and verb tense respectively in table I, gave rise to further number of exchanges while articles, subject/ verb agreement, passives and pronouns (002, 003, 004 and 006 correspondingly) seemed to be taken less heed of:

The very delicate path the subjects took in reconstructing some sentences in groups reminds one of the ways Chomsky claims as to how the lexical entry projects the elements of the entry progressively onto a whole phrase.

### *Sample 1 (vocabulary)*

A- Now....we have...mayor believe political ....

B- Ok '*believe*' is the verb and mayor ...subject. X believes Y. X is 'the mayor' and Y is ...I think.....political pressure....will create....to create...no...

A- It is the 'political pressure created to lead to good results'

C- So you mean 'political pressure' is *object* of verb....

and whether these exchanges had been initiated concerned with a content-based or function-based grammatical feature. The purpose was to discover features of more importance to test takers, i.e., to find out whether the students were mostly grammar- or lexicon-oriented dealing, in particular, with tasks such as text reconstruction. Other descriptive reports involved information on the justifications and reasoning the students were to present as to the preference of a particular grammatical feature. A particular choice might call for syntactic, semantic (content-based), textual or other explanations and justifications as to its adoption. The data incorporated within the tables in the next page explicitly clarify the point under investigation:

*Table I: Descriptive statistics concerned with think- alouds*

<i>Grammatical Features of Concern</i>	<i>No. of exchanges generated in think-alouds</i>											
	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4		Group 5		Group 6	
	<i>C</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>H</i>
001	2	1	0	1	0	3	1	2	2	0	1	2
002	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	1
003	1	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	1	2	0	4
004	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
005	3	1	2	0	2	0	3	2	1	1	2	2
006	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0
007	5	1	0	2	0	4	3	1	4	1	2	2

*C=Chomskyan*

*H=Harrisian*

*Table II: Justification as to a particular preference in retrospections*

furthermore, did a sample sentence completion task on the board to give the subjects information as to how they were supposed to accomplish the test task by inserting appropriate function words, inflectional morphemes, etc.

The subjects then worked on the test task in groups of 3 members. Every member was required to think aloud his/her thoughts while working on the test task and provide his/her reasoning concerning a particular choice, or refutation of others' choices and ideas. Each group was supposed to work on the cloze test producing a syntactically accurate and semantically meaningful text. These completed versions of the original text were then discussed separately in groups in a subsequent testing session. Members were to retrospectively justify and explain their ideas including disagreements concerned with a particular choice. The task took about 20 minutes to complete.

### ***Data Collection and Data Analysis***

The process began with tape recording, containing essentially all the auditory events that occurred during the sessions. The collected data were then transcribed by the researchers and an EFL graduate student who possesses a noticeable fluency in the English language. At the next step, the processed segments were encoded into the terminology of the theoretical model. The researchers needed to compare the set of statements implied by a weaker hypothesis, here Harrisian structuralism, with the statements implied by the competing generativist processes. The data so analyzed provided detailed descriptive reports concerning think-alouds and retrospections in terms of the number of involvement of students in group discussions

can stand alone as a semantic unit. The cloze task contains only content words. These content words represent the underlying structure of sentences where no transformations have yet been applied (Keyser & Postal, 1976). Content words which "are mainly nouns, verbs, prepositions and, adjectives" (Cook & Newson, 1996, p.48) have lexical meaning.

Accordingly, the aim of using the cloze task as well as the protocol techniques was to detect which processes the test takers adopted in constructing a sentence while they verbalized their thoughts. In other words, if the subjects, according to the Projection Principle, projected the syntactic properties of the content words onto the surface structure of sentence by first adhering to the lexical meaning of content words and went through the same processes, as Chomsky asserts, in constructing a sentence (Cook & Newson, 1996) or stuck to the time-honored grammatical rules in their traditional sense?

### ***Procedures***

The subjects were given initial warm-up problems to get acquainted with the situation of the study and accustomed to the microphones and tape recorders. The individuals were briefed on what was required of them, and explained the procedures that were to be used: non-mediated concurrent and retrospective think-aloud. For this reason they were given some practice tasks to become familiarized with the techniques and follow the appropriate procedures.

The subjects were familiarized with the two types of words and morphemes, function and content words, by studying closely a brief list of the word types they were provided with. The researchers,

### *Methods*

Concurrent and retrospective thinking-aloud are two techniques adopted in this study whereby we probe the learner's internal states by verbal methods. The procedural variation adopted concerned with the concurrent think-aloud is of a non-mediated type in that the individual is prompted only when s/he pauses for a period of time. The prompts tend to be as non-intrusive as possible (e.g. keep talking).

### *Participants*

A total of 18 last-year students majoring in English language and literature, equally selected from both sexes, studying at the English Department of Foreign Languages and Literature in Shiraz University were chosen as subjects at the researchers' convenience. To ascertain the equivalence of the subjects as to their language proficiency, the researchers pretested them by applying the first sample of ARCO TOEFL test (Sullivan, P. N. & Grace- Yi- Qiu- Vhong, 1997). The rationale behind the choice of these subjects had to do with the researchers' supposition that they would be better capable of performing concurrent and retrospective thinking-aloud verbalizing their thought processes as they comprehended the passage. The subjects were all native speakers of Persian language coming from various provinces. Their ages ranged between 23 and 34.

### *Instruments*

The subjects were provided with a cloze task, derived from a just-assigned reading text, which is a short paragraph in length and

it bases syntax on categories that tie in with the *lexicon*"( Cook & Newson, 1996, p.135 ).

Binding theory, taken as an instance, as Cook and Newson (1996) state, is typical of the approach in several ways. First, it is an exemplification of the intimate relationship between lexicon and syntax seen in the Projection Principle; a full knowledge of Binding theory in the speaker's mind incorporates the interaction of syntactic and lexical knowledge. Syntax and vocabulary should be taken as not distinct but interwoven domains; abstract principles relate to actual lexical items. Second, it drives home that the theory is not about isolate rules but integrated principles. Binding theory is not just concerned with 'himself', or with reflexives; it applies to many areas such as pronominals, nouns, and so on. Third, "binding demonstrates the interconnectedness of the theory"(ibid, p.67). Structure-dependency comes into play, e.g. as the speaker is in need of relating structural constituents in the sentence.

Now with regard to these conceptions, the study aims at collecting some empirical evidence to see whether these two aspects of language, namely lexicon and syntax, are distinct or integrated as the subjects are anticipated to follow either a pure rule-based structuralist or a GB meaning-based direction. More specifically, the study aims at providing an answer to the following question: is text-reconstruction (as a linguistic activity which resorts to the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary for accomplishment) lexicon-based or grammar-based?



child and/or second language learner acquires a massive set of vocabulary items, each with its own pronunciation, meaning, and syntactic restrictions. "So a large part of language acquisition is a matter of determining from the presented data the elements of the lexicon and their properties" (Chomsky, 1986, p.8). Also the Lexical Learning Hypothesis (Wexler & Manzini, 1987) claims that parameters, and not principles, belong to lexical entries. "It reduces all language acquisition to learning of lexical properties. Meanwhile, rules are considered as artifacts of interaction between the principles and the lexicon; rather than existing in their own right" (Cook & Newson, 1996, p. 120).

Within this system, proposed as a T-model by Chomsky and Lasnik in 1977 (a) the D-structure does not represent the semantic component of the grammar, (b) lexicon comes to take an upper position and (c) the theory of X-bar syntax replaces the phrase structure rules (Karimi, 1997). In this model, grammar is supposed to consist of several generative devices, each capable of characterizing a numerous number of structures and their associated terminal strings. Lexicon is part of the interface system functioning to tie the several independent components, here syntax and semantics, together. Lexical items typically (but not always) have a function in both the syntax and the semantics, and to be well-formed, the semantic value of each lexical item that figures in an expression must be discharged in the semantic component and its syntactic category discharged in the syntactic component (Sadock, 2003). "X-bar syntax replaces large numbers of idiosyncratic rewrite rules with general principles; it captures properties of *all* phrases, not just those of a certain type; and

previously thought (Willis, 1990). Chomsky asserts in what he calls the Projection Principle that the properties of lexical items project onto the syntax of the sentence meaning that speakers know what the words in their language mean, how they sound and how they may be used in sentences. The cruciality of this principle is that it emphasizes the lexical items of the mental lexicon, implying important notions including that lexical items are the representatives of syntactic rules or restrictions and that syntax observes subcategorization properties of each lexical item (Cook & Newson, 1996). Hereby, the Projection Principle is supposed to not only include subcategorization information, but, crucially argument structure and thematic information as well. Because the verb *bite* for example requires a two-place argument structure, the thematic roles written into the verb's thematic grid must be 'projected' to the syntax (ibid.).

The importance of lexical items is to the extent that they draw upon their syntactic and semantic properties to determine the 'word order' of a language as well (Shapiro, 1997).

Taking a look at the assumptions underlying the Universal Grammar theory associated with Noam Chomsky (1986), one is provided with a better way to the conception of the nature of lexicon as well as the fact that lexicon should be inseparably integrated with syntax. It is anticipated that Universal Grammar sees the knowledge of grammar in mind as having two components- principles that all languages have in common (Cook & Newson, 1996), and parameters on which they vary (Shapiro, 1997). These principles and parameters, that make the basis of all languages, constitute the core grammar. In addition to the core grammar, which is genetically pre-determined, the

grammarians see parts of speech as often identifiable through their position in sentences (Glauner, 2000).

The greatest so-called gift that structural grammarians have given to the world of English grammar is constituents. Constituents are the pieces and parts that fabricate sentences. Subject, predicate, and direct object would be a few of the basic constituents (Glauner, 2000). The constituents are merely another way for the structural grammarians to describe the forms that make-up sentence structure. Since the late 1950's, structural grammar has been challenged by transformational grammar (Liles, 1972). This new theory also consisted of very new ideas. The generative grammar was, in the first place, concerned with overcoming the inadequacies of certain theories of phrase structure modeled partly on procedures of constituent analysis in structural linguistics and partly on formal systems devised for the study of formal languages (Chomsky, 1980). The procedures and results of structural grammar have been absorbed into transformational grammar where they appear in base component (especially the branching rules) (Cattell, 1969). Many of the transformational grammarians believe that meaning is an integral part of linguistic description and that it is impossible to analyze a sentence apart from the underlying meaning associated with it (Liles, 1972). The structuralist assumptions about meaning persisted through the Chomskyan revolution and into the early 1970s. In fact, it persists even today in teaching methods and standardized instruments for assessing language skills of a wide variety of sorts.

However, there is now a growing awareness that lexical knowledge is both more complex than it appears and more fundamental to learners' overall knowledge of a given language than

something different from *the carpet sat on the dog* as word order contributes to meaning and *carpet* and *dog* are not the same words within the system. In a system as such English word order has a particular structure: subject-verb-object; you might have heard of this funny sentence that *The adjectival noun verbed the direct object adverbially*.

The structural linguists of the Bloomfieldian era defined the meaning of a linguistic form as the situation in which the speaker utters it and the response it calls forth in the hearer (Bloomfield, 1933). So they obviously ignored "the association of meaning with linguistic utterances" (ibid, p. 153).

Though Bloomfield's limiting assumption was certainly not accepted by all linguists and was severely criticized, his way of thinking has had an unfortunate effect on language teaching for decades. The commitment to a meaning-less linguistic analysis was strengthened by Zellig Harris (1951) whose own thinking was apparently very influential in certain similar assumptions of Noam Chomsky, his student (Oller, 1979).

Structural grammarians are most famous for their descriptive approach to grammar. Descriptive tendencies in grammar can be recognized as a convention correlating some words in the language with types of situations (Olszewsky, 1969). A simple example of this is the knowledge of where specific words belong in a sentence, such as where the noun, verb, and adjective within a sentence belong. Using the descriptive tendencies it becomes a bit clear, and actually only takes the ability to talk to be able to figure it out. Structural

almost ignored or taken for granted whereas phonology and syntax have received most of the attention of theorists and language teachers alike" (Harley, 1995, p.17). This follows the fact that structural linguists initially contended that language was primarily syntax-based and that meaning could be dispensed with. This theoretical view asserted that language could break down into so many little pieces such as vocabulary and grammar. There was no question of whether language could be treated in this way without destroying its essence. Structuralists, including Harris, believed that the underlying structures which organize units and rules into meaningful systems are generated by the human mind itself, and not by sense perception. As such, the mind is itself a structuring mechanism which looks through units and files them according to rules. This is important because it means that for structuralists the order that we perceive the language is not inherent in the world but is a product of our minds (Tyson, 1999).

The idea of linearity is also of importance for structuralists because it shows that language operates as a linear sequence, and that all the elements of a particular sequence form a chain. The easiest example of this is a sentence, where the words come one at a time and in a line, one after the other, and because of that they are all connected to each other. Saussure according to Tyson (1999) remarks more about how he thinks the structure of language operates: he considers everything in the system as being based on the *relations* that hold between the units in the system. The most crucial kind of system, according to him, is a *syntagmatic* or what Saussure calls a linear relation. Since language is linear, it forms a chain by which one unit is linked to the next. A good example of this is the simple fact that in English word order governs meaning. *The dog sat on the carpet* means

adopted in this study. The findings take side with a lexicon-dominated integration-oriented approach to text-reconstruction

**Key words:** Lexicon, Syntax, Subcategorization, Projection Principle

## **Introduction**

"In the recent past, competing hypotheses about second language ability have been put forward based on differing assumptions as to the nature and structure of linguistic and communicative competence...backed up more or less by strong empirical evidence " (Vollmer, 1983, p.3). However, there seems to be no answer possible in the near future to the question: "what exactly is the structure of foreign language ability"(ibid., p. 3)?

Along the same lines, a long-lasting question in describing the nature of language which has still remained unresolved is whether it is possible, according to the old assumptions of structural linguistics, to isolate the knowledge of lexicon and grammar. This is while Bolinger (1975) claims: "There is a vast amount of grammatical detail still to be dug out of lexicon- so much that by the time we are through there may be little point in talking about grammar and lexicon as if they were two different things" (p. 299). Furthermore, the latest trends in linguistics as avowed most brilliantly in Chomskyan Universal Grammar (Cook & Newson, 1996), emphasize the importance of lexicon as the building blocks of any language, as well as the integration of vocabulary and grammar.

Despite this, it can not be ignored that lexicon, though traditionally regarded as one of the three essential elements of language learning along with phonology and syntax, "has often been

# **Iranian EFL Learners' Approach to Text Reconstruction: Lexicon-based or Grammar-based?**

**F. Sadighi & Azam Karimi**

## **Abstract**

The plethora of the hypotheses put forth as to the nature and structure of second language ability, in particular concerning the lexicon-syntax interface, have one face with an apparently formidable problem still to be resolved. Various structuralist hypotheses put one on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, one could come up with such pure structuralist hypotheses as Harrisian which attach little or no significance to the very delicate role played by lexicon as an essential element of language learning, isolating the knowledge of the mental lexical items and syntax. On the other, a latest trend of linguistic assumptions as asserted so brilliantly by linguists of the caliber of Chomsky, not turning a blind eye to the magic of lexicon in bridging the gap between and associating the lexical items and syntax, emphasizes the integration of the two.

Accordingly, the present study aims at collecting some empirical evidence to see whether these two integral aspects of language, namely lexicon and syntax, are separate or integrated. More specifically, the study aims at providing an answer to the following question: is text-reconstruction (as a linguistic activity which resorts to the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary for accomplishment) lexicon-based or grammar-based? A total of 18 last-year students majoring in English language and literature took part in the study. Concurrent and retrospective thinking aloud were the two techniques

projection itself. Ghomeshi proposes that there are many functions (ke) can have, the complementizer function is only one of them. Nevertheless, as she, too, admits (ke) does head a CP; therefore, basing her theory on such a shaky reason does not seem quite reasonable.





- b. Bižæn diruz mi-dunest (ke) [færda mi-r-e].  
 Bijan yesterday DUR-know.PAST.3SG (COMP)  
 [tomorrow DUR-go.3SG].  
 Bijan knew yesterday he'd go tomorrow.  
 (Ghomeshi, 2001:26)

Ghomeshi agrees with Hornstein (1999) that PRO is a trace that can be assigned a  $\theta$ -role, but at the same time does not require a Case. She further proposes that the syntactic category of the embedded subjunctive clause in control constructions is vP. She draws the following tree for a given control construction:

(Ghomeshi, 2001:27)

She then makes a generalization about all Persian verbs stating that no matter if the external argument is pro, PRO, or trace, in [Spec, vP] position Persian verbs agree with them.

Ghomeshi admits to follow Hornstein's (1999) Movement Theory of Control in assuming PRO to be an NP-trace; however, she draws a quite distinct tree for raising constructions:

(Ghomeshi, 2001:34)

Further, she changes the syntactic category of (ke), which she herself has been replacing by (COMP), in order to prove her theory that control verbs select vP as their complements. In so doing, she calls (ke) a marker of subordination that can be cliticized onto any lexical item followed by a propositional constituent (vP, CP); however, it does not head a functional

Must be.able (COMP) [winner SBJ-become.3SG].  
 ? One must be able to win.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:20)

She attributes the ungrammaticality of ((26) b) to the fact that the null subject of the embedded subjunctive clause lacks an antecedent. Therefore, she states the reason why ((26) a) is acceptable, but ((26) b) is not has nothing to do with their semantic interpretation, but rather the difference lies in their syntactic well-formedness. However, I think both syntactic and semantic considerations are involved in grammaticality or ungrammaticality of control constructions since (27) is equal to ((26) b) except for the fact that it contains an antecedent for the null subject of the embedded subjunctive clause to refer to; still it is ungrammatical.

(27) \*Bayæd tunest (ke) [Sima bæænde be-š-e].

Must be.able (COMP) [Sima winner SBJ-  
become.3SG].

\*One must be able Sima to win.

Landau (1999, cited in Ghomeshi, 2001) uses temporal modifiers (*yesterday, tomorrow, etc.*) to test for the presence of distinct tense operators. Likewise, in Persian, control constructions that disallow conflicting temporal modifiers are said to be untensed (-Tense) as in ((28) a), whereas, noncontrol constructions do allow such structures; therefore, they are said to be (+Tense) as in ((28) b).

(28) a. \*Bižæn diruz mi-tunest (ke) [færda be-r-e].

Bijan yesterday DUR-be.able.PAST.3SG (COMP)  
[tomorrow SBJ-go.3SG].

\*Bijan could yesterday go tomorrow.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:17)

Moreover, since subjunctive verbs show agreement, they contradict with split antecedents or partial control. These issues will be discussed thoroughly in the following section of the paper.

As for Locality in control, Ghomeshi believes that control in Persian, like any other language, is local, except for the fact that it is restricted to certain predicates. That is why ((25) c) is unacceptable.

(25) a. Lazem-e (ke) [be-r-æm].

Necessary.3SG (COMP) [SBJ-go.1SG].

It is necessary that I go.

b. Mi=tun-æm (ke) [be-r-æm].

DUR-be.able.1SG (COMP) [SBJ-go.1SG].

I can go.

c. \*Mi=tun-æm (ke) [lazem baš-e (ke) [be-r-æm]].

DUR-be.able.1SG (COMP) [necessary SBJ-be.3SG  
(COMP)

[SBJ-go.1SG]].

\*I can be necessary to go.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:19)

Ghomeshi belongs to the group of scholars who believe in control being a syntactic phenomenon rather than a semantic one.

(26) a.? Bayæd fekr=kærd (ke) [Sima bæænde mi-š-e].

Must thought=do (COMP) [Sima winner DUR-become.3SG].

? One must think that Sima will win.

b. \*Bayæd tunest (ke) [bæænde be-š-e].

can have a *pro* in their subject position as well. If this prevails, then the agreement on the embedded verb can be different from the agreement on the matrix verb. This, Ghomeshi states, is true for non-control verbs; however, for control verbs, the result is mixed.

- (22) a. \*Mi-tun-æm (ke) [bi-ad].  
 DUR-be.able.1SG (COMP) [SBJ-come.3SG].  
 \*I can him come.
- b. Mi-xa-m (ke) [bi-ad].  
 DUR-want.1SG (COMP) [SBJ-come.3SG].  
 I want him to come.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:15-16)

Ghomeshi distinguishes between *pro* and *PRO*, considering *PRO* to fill a subject position that cannot be filled by an overt nominal and is controlled by an antecedent (controller), and *pro* to be a Case position which can be filled by an overt nominal and does not need to be coreferenced with the matrix subject.

- (23) a. [SUBJECT<sub>i</sub> [VERB [PRO<sub>i</sub> [VERB<sub>subjunctive</sub>]]]]  
 b. [SUBJECT [VERB [pro [VERB<sub>subjunctive</sub>]]]]

Interestingly, Ghomeshi asserts that subjunctives sometimes act differently from infinitivals in control constructions. The Obviation Effect in Persian, for instance, contradicts with *de re* versus *de se* readings proposed by Hornstein (1999). Obviation Effect is said to be the case when the pronoun and the matrix subject cannot have the same reference.

- (24) Žian<sub>i</sub> mi-xa-d (ke) [un<sub>\*i/j</sub> be-r-e].  
 Jian DUR-want.3SG (COMP) [he SBJ-go.3SG].  
 Jian wants him to go.

Sima friend=have-3SG [book SBJ-read-3SG]

Sima likes to read books.

b. Sima [ketab xundæn] –O dust=dar-e.

Sima [book reading] –OM friend=have-3SG.

Sima likes reading books.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:12)

Ghomeshi quotes from Kahnemuyipour (2001) that long infinitives in Persian (gerunds in English) can take the suffix –i, which is a suffix added to nouns to form adjectives; moreover, they can take the suffix –ha, which is a suffix added to nouns to pluralize them. Therefore, they are said to be nominal verbs. Ghomeshi declares that Persian lacks a true infinitive. She comments although subjunctives are almost always the counterparts to English infinitival complements, aspectual verbs (start, finish, begin) do not follow this generalization. Therefore Persian lacks backward control in its control structure as Landau (2004) asserts most common backward control verbs are aspectuals (begin, continue, stop, etc.).

Furthermore, Ghomeshi indicates that Persian lacks ECM constructions, that is, the embedded subject in Persian cannot get accusative Case from the matrix verb.

(21) Sima mi-xad (ke) azær (\*-O) be-mun-e.

Sima DUR-want.3SG (COMP) Azar (\*-OM) SBJ-stay.3SG. Sima wants Azar to stay.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:14)

Ghomeshi further points out since Persian is a null subject language, and there exists a pro to occupy the subject position, then subjunctive clauses