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. Biẑæn 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 θ-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.

<div align="right">(Ghomeshi, 2001:20)</div>

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 bærænde 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.

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 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 bærænde mi-š-e].

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

? One must think that Sima will win.

b. *Bayæd tunest (ke) [bærænde 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$_i$ [VERB [PRO$_i$ [VERB$_{subjunctive}$]]]]

b. [SUBJECT [VERB [pro [VERB$_{subjunctive}$]]]]

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$_i$ mi-xa-d (ke) [un$_{*i/j}$ 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 sine Persian is a null subject language, and there exists a pro to occupy the subject position, then subjunctive clauses

Landau (2003, 2004) in order to see in which system Persian works better. Nevertheless, before beginning those tests, I would review the works of a few other researchers done on Persian control constructions.

A Short Review of Literature on Persian Control

Let's see how control discussions have altered during a period of ten years. Hashemipour (1989) discusses the binding effects of pronominals and controlled elements in Persian within GB framework, where she remarks the controlled element is controlled by an inherently referential antecedent. She further distinguishes between nonfinite and finite control structures regarding Case assignment. She comments since in Persian, VP is a head-final category, unlike the other categories (NP, PP, AP), θ-role assignment and subsequently Case assignment is from right to left. Therefore, in Persian, she asserts "The embedded [NP, IP] is assigned Case, instead of the operator." (Hashemipour, 1989:314)

Ghomeshi (2001) asserts that Persian is a null subject language; however, there is a subject agreement on the verb since the embedded verb is inflected for subject agreement. Therefore, she concludes, there seems to be no difference between these embedded clauses and any other clause with a null pronominal subject. Nevertheless, she argues that these clauses lack certain syntactic structures, mainly CPs and TPs, which lead to the lack of a Case position for their subjects. She states that in Persian, verb agreement is checked within vP assigning its external θ-role rather than Case assignment. Throughout her paper, Ghomeshi equates subjunctive clauses in Persian to infinitival clauses in English.

(20) a. Sima dust=dar-e [ketab be-xun-e].

(2000) matching, valuation, and deletion. Landau bases his argument, which is in favor of PRO's being Case-marked like any other DP, on the data from languages like Russian and Icelandic that show subject-oriented Case concord in control infinitives, as well as languages like Persian, Greek, Hebrew, and Romanian that exhibit control subjunctives.

Landau is also against Culicover and Jackendoff's (2001) Thematic Approach to control, suggesting that one should establish control syntactically by Agree/Move before resorting to pragmatics. Here he seems to see eye to eye with Hornstein in believing control to be syntactic. The only case where Landau prefers reductionist approach to control rather than PRO-based ones is in Backward Control, which is a pretty rare phenomenon, for instance in Tsez, only two verbs exhibit such a structure. In some languages, this number can be as great as five. Most backward control verbs are aspectuals (begin, continue, stop, etc.). According to reductionist approach to control, backward control is the covert movement of the controller to its matrix thematic position, which requires PRO to be licensed and interpreted in a position higher than that of the controller. Landau confesses that the evidence for backward control is a true challenge to standard theories of OC.

In the end, Landau admits two major problems of the Agree-based analysis of OC to be Split Control and Backward Control.

Having discussed the ideas held by the proponents of the Movement Theory of Control at one end of the control continuum and those held by the advocates of the Standard Theory of Control as the other end of the continuum, I am going to assess the Persian data in the tests of control put forth by Hornstein (1999, 2003, 2004) as well as those proposed by

B & H claim that in order to satisfy the minimalist approaches to grammar, one needs to achieve some reductions, which to them is the aim of the MTC.

They even assert Landau himself considers control to be an instance of Agree, and Agree in Minimalism has to do with movement; therefore, he is on their side in a way. B & H themselves seem to be moving a step backward after all the critiques to their theory, saying that control *approximates* raising rather than control *is* raising. They assert unlike raising, control makes the moving element appear in a θ-position before reaching [Spec, TP].

B & H do not agree with Landau, who believes θ-roles cannot license movement since they are not features. They believe θ-roles are required to be treated as features in order to license movement since movement is collapsed into two Merge operations, namely, Merge (internal) and Move (external). They argue if greed motivates internal Merge to check a feature, then external Merge is no exception since it is a similar operation. To them, a featural perspective of θ-role will reduce redundancy and ultimately meet the Economy Principle.

In the end, they claim since the MTC is a movement theory of Control rather than a Raising one, there might be some inconsistencies between Control and Raising.

Finally, Landau (2004) argues against the proposed solutions put forth by B & H (2004). He proposes an Agree-based Approach to OC. To Landau, an abstract Agree relation is what forms OC, whereas, to Hornstein, it is A-movement that is an instance of raising that forms OC. Landau admits that his Agree-based approach to control is adopted from Chomsky's

Landau (2003) criticizes Hornstein's reducing control to movement. He argues that Hornstein's data are not exhaustive enough to draw generalizations from. Landau resorts to the Standard view of control, which states there exists a PRO quite distinct from NP-trace since control involves two argument chains, whereas, raising involves only one. As a result, he proves the existence of the control module.

Landau makes a distinction between Partial Control and Exhaustive Control. He attributes Partial Control to desiderative, factive, propositional, and interrogative infinitives, whereas, Exhaustive Control is motivated by implicative, modal, and aspectual infinitives. Furthermore, Landau declares that Partial Control does exist, but Partial Raising does not.

(19)   a. We thought that the chair$_i$ preferred [PRO$_i$ to gather at 6].

b. *We thought that the chair appeared to be gathering once a week.

(Landau, 2003:493)

Therefore partial readings are not extracted from raising contexts. As a result, Hornstein's project of doing away with PRO and the control module is voided. Landau believes the Case properties of the Matrix verb assigns the raising/control distinction.

Boeckx and Hornstein (2004) argue against the weak points of their theory which are put forth by Landau (2003). They propose that the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) is superior to the Standard Theory of Control both conceptually and methodologically, and that the latter theory has no empirical advantage over the MTC.

<div align="right">(Culicover and Jackendoff, 2001:506)</div>

Therefore, the controller in (15) and (16) are identified thematically rather than syntactically. The only case where control appears to be syntactically based is adjunct structures, where in the absence of an overt subject, the controller is always the Matrix subject, no matter what its thematic role be. In such cases, neither a generic interpretation nor a split antecedent is ever possible.

(17) a. Helen examined Bernie in order/so as to vindicate herself / *himself / *oneself / *themselves.

b. Bernie was examined by Helen in order/so as to vindicate ?himself / *herself / *oneself / *themselves.

<div align="right">(Culicover and Jackendoff, 2001:503)</div>

Nevertheless, even in these cases, C & J believe that there is some sort of nonsyntactic influence to determine the controller.

Boeckx and Hornstein (2003) argue against C & J's arguments against their syntactic approach to control. They object to their treating adjuncts differently.

(18) John saw Mary [before leaving the party].

<div align="right">(Boeckx and Hornstein, 2003:270)</div>

They declare adjunct control constructions display all the properties of OC, that is, the need for a local antecedent that c-commands the controlled element. Just like OC constructions, control in adjuncts only yields a sloppy reading under ellipsis, yet it disallows split antecedents. Moreover, it merely allows de se interpretation. B & H argue that C & J's theory only accounts for the controller selection in nonfinite complements, mainly gerunds and infinitives.

nonfinite CP complements. Culicover and Jackendoff (2001) argue against Hornstein's (1999) Movement Theory of Control. They assert that the data Hornstein presents are not exhaustive to make generalizations from.

C & J base their arguments on some data that show semantic constraints are involved in determining the position of the controller. They believe Hornstein follows generative approaches such as Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG) and Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG), all of which believed in the unification of control and raising, while more recent approaches as Extended Standard Theory (EST), Government and Binding (GB) and Minimalist Program (MP) differentiate them.

C & J also comment on pro in English and pro in pro-drop languages, saying in English, pro can be licensed in subject position of untensed clauses; whereas, in pro-drop languages, pro can also be licensed in the subject position of tensed clauses. C & J propose a thematically based theory of control rather than a syntactic one.

> (15) A: John made Susan a promise.
>
> B: What was it?
>
> C: I think it was to take care of himself/*herself.
>
> > (Culicover and Jackendoff, 2001:506)

They believe if control were identified with the semantic role of Source, then the problem would be solved. In (15), the giver of the promise is the controller. However, it is possible for the recipient of the promise to be the controller too.

> (16) Susan was promised (by John) to be allowed to take care of herself/*himself.

(14) a. PRO Hearing the warning, John dodged the falling
brick.

b. *Him hearing the warning, John dodged the falling
brick.

(Kroeger, 2004:128)

Kroeger asserts there is something in the lexical entry of each and every
verb that determines both the existence and the nature of the control
relation and assigns the identity of the controller. Therefore, not only
syntax, but also semantics has a crucial role in determining the control
relation, the controller and the controllee.

Review of "Remarks and Replies" to "Movement and Control"

Hornstein's (1999) "Movement and Control" has motivated a good
number of "Remarks and Replies" by different scholars including
Culicover and Jackendoff (2001), Boeckx and Hornstein (2003), Landau
(2003), Boeckx and Hornstein (2004), and Landau (2004).

Hornstein (1999) proposes that OC (Obligatory Control) structures are the
residue of movement. Basing his classification of control on Williams
(1980), Hornstein presents a number of criteria as to distinguish
Obligatory Control structures from Non-Obligatory Control ones. He
asserts OC PRO can be replaced by reflexives; whereas, NOC PRO can
be replaced by pronouns. He assumes OC PRO and NP-trace to be similar
in that they both terminate in Case positions (Spec, IP) of the Matrix
clause. However, they are different in that, in control, a D/NP raises to a
θ-position, while in raising, a D/NP raises to a non-θ-position. As for
NOC, he calls it pro and believes it to be licensed at a cost in (Spec, IP) of

to study control in, instead, subjunctives seem to be acting in a similar manner. Consequently, for languages like Persian and Greek, nonfinites do not represent infinitives, but they imply subjunctives. That is why there is no one-to-one correspondence between English control verbs and those in Greek and Persian.

Janke (2003) eliminates Pro completely from the Theory of Control, introducing a new perspective to view control in which both lexical-semantic and lexical-syntactic properties of a predicate are involved in a control relation. Janke holds this proves the absence of controlled objects in control structures. To do so, he takes a binding approach to OC. However, Janke's approach has not been very popular since most other works on control do hold that there is a PRO, but the controversy is mostly on the distribution and interpretation of this structure.

Another issue at stake is whether PRO is anaphoric or pronominal or both. Different scholars have different viewpoints in this regard. Unlike Landau (2000) who treats PRO as anaphoric, Safir (2004) holds that "Logophorically sensitive pronouns are not typically anaphors." (Safir, 2004:271)

Furthermore, Kroeger (2004) distinguishes between anaphoric control (as in gerunds) that can be replaced by an overt pronoun and functional control (as in participles) that cannot be replaced by an overt pronoun.

(13) a. PRO Praising himself got John into trouble.

   b. His praising himself got John into trouble.

(Kroeger, 2004:128)

However, PRO cannot be replaced by an overt pronoun, as in ((14) b).

subject and object pro appear in finite clauses. The first type includes languages that allow not only subject pro but also object pro (like Thai and Korean). The second type encompasses languages that do not allow both subject and object pro to occur simultaneously (like English). The third type is attributed to languages like Spanish and Mandarin. These languages do allow subject pro; however, they disallow object pro.

Miller (2002) makes a wild generalization stating that subjunctives do not license PRO. However, in this paper, it will be shown that they do in Persian.

He asserts although the English subjunctive is [-Tense, -Agree], and as a result, it should license PRO, it does not. He calls subjunctive a separate mood.

A great number of theories have been proposed for Control, and subsequently a lot of constraints in different languages were discovered. Nevertheless, the two most influential ones have been that of Hornstein's and that of Landau's each of which has had its own proponents and opponents. Lightfoot (2002) has taken Brazilian Portuguese into these control theories and concluded that the data in this language yield themselves to Hornstein's Movement Theory of Control.

Panagiotidis (2002) draws a distinction between null subject languages and languages that do not allow null subjects (like English). He asserts English-like languages only demonstrate the strong null variety that attracts an XP from Spec vP.

Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002) observe control in different null subject languages including Greek. Like Persian, Greek lacks verbs that are [-Agree]. Therefore in Persian and Greek, there is no verbal infinitive

<div align="right">(Manzini, 2000, in Coopmans et al., 2000:261-2)</div>

Roeper (2000) views control from a pragmatic perspective suggesting that context might assign the controller of the controllee.

    (11) a. John lost the audience's interest. (The audience's interest is lost.)

          b. John lost interest. (John's interest is lost.)

          c. The audience was enthralled, but as John's voice turned to a monotone,

              John lost interest. (The audience's interest was lost.)

<div align="right">(Roeper, 2000, in Coopmans et al., 2000:312)</div>

Equally interestingly, he points out the influence of the lower nominal rather than the higher verbal properties on PRO.

    (12) a. John lost interest. $\Rightarrow$ agent

          b. John lost support. $\Rightarrow$ object

<div align="right">(Roeper, 2000, in Coopmans et.al., 2000:316-7)</div>

He calls this sort of control "Role Control" and believes it to be as important as Syntactic Control. (Roeper, 2000, in Coopmans et al., 2000:318)

Richards (2001) proposes a hypothesis regarding the properties of infinitival complements. He attributes overt raising of the ECM subjects into the matrix clause to "overcrowding" constraint, which does not allow the ECM subjects and the infinitival clause stay in situ. This contrast triggers raising even when the features motivating this raising are weak ones. (Richards, 2001:134)

Speas (2001) classifies all languages into three types regarding where the

(Manzini, 2000, in Coopmans et al., 2000:260)

Similarly, object control is felicitous in embedded infinitival structures; nevertheless, the subject of the subjunctive clause and the matrix subject cannot be coreferenced. However, the very subject of the subjunctive clause can be coreferenced with the matrix object.

(8) a. *Mi chiedono che vadano.

　　　　They ask me that they go:SUBJ.

　　b. Mi chiedono che io vada.

　　　　They ask me that I go:SUBJ.

　　c. Michiedono di andare.

　　　　They ask me to go.

(Manzini, 2000, in Coopmans et al., 2000:261)

Furthermore, the matrix subject and the subject of either the subjunctive clause or the gerund (long infinitival) structure can be coreferenced in adjuncts.

(9) a. Vado prima che mi arrabi.

　　　　I go before I get:SUBJ angry.

　　b. Vado prima di arrabbiarmi.

　　　　I go before getting angry.

(Manzini, 2000, in Coopmans et al., 2000:261)

However, this generalization does not hold for all adjuncts including rationale clauses.

(10) a. *Vengo perché ti aiuti.

　　　　I come in order that I help:SUBJ you.

　　b. Vengo per aiutarti.

　　　　I come to help you.

b) or in free participial and nominal adjuncts ((6) c).

(6) a. John$_i$ asked the policeman [$_{cp}$where [PRO$_i$ to go]].

b. I sold the book [to help the refugees].

c. Noticing that a crowd had gathered, Bill immediately called the fire department.

(Růžička, 1999:6-11)

Růžička draws a distinction between this last class of control constructions and the others. He emphasizes on the somewhat independence of the controlled participial clause upon the matrix clause. He further treats control with the PRO-theorem under the Minimalist Approach. As in the minimalist view, the issue at stake is checking of feature values, here, in control, too, the constraints for licensing the controller are to be present in the numeration for the arguments to reach the spell-out via merge.

He also predicts that based on where the Minimalist Program is heading to, not only the PRO-theorem, but also the null object and the PRO-drop parameter might be abandoned. (Růžička, 1999:186)

Manzini (2000) speaks of a peculiar type of control, which emerges in particular languages such as Italian. He asserts only in embedded infinitival structures can the subject of the subjunctive clause and the matrix subject of volition verbs be coreferenced; however, this is not the case in subjunctive complements.

(7) a. *Voglio che io vada.

I want that I go:SUBJ.

b. Voglio andare.

I want to go.

They, then, extend this categorization to adjectives and classify them as raising adjectives (such as "*likely*") and control adjectives (such as "*eager*").

(3) a. The doctor is likely to examine Pat.

　　b. Pat is likely to be examined by the doctor.

(4) a. The doctor is eager to examine Pat.

　　b. Pat is eager to be examined by the doctor.

(Sag and Wasow, 1999:285)

Similarly, Růžička (1999) categorizes different kinds of control based on the influence of the lexical classes and thematic specifications upon control conditions. Preliminary, he differentiates between the control verbs that require the control element (PRO) to be an argument (*promise, ask, persuade, endeavor, try, signal, teach, threaten, help, etc.*) and the control verbs that do not impose any restriction on the thematic properties of PRO (*hope, wish, expect, hate, like, choose, be afraid, want, etc.*), which can often be replaced by a gerund complement.

(5) a. He is afraid [PRO to kiss her].

　　b. She was afraid of [PRO asking for help].

(Růžička, 1999:6)

The first category is the so-called Obligatory Control class, and the second category is what has been called Non-obligatory Control (Williams, 1980, cited in Růžička, 1999:6).

Unlike Sag and Wasow, Růžička (1999) further discusses two other classes of control structures to be controlled complement clauses with filled C(P), which are found in indirect questions ((6) a) and controlled clauses as adjuncts, which can appear either in infinitival s-structures ((6)

A theory should fulfill both descriptive and explanatory adequacies; moreover, should it be applied to different languages, it can be narrowed down and thus approach Universality. Therefore, in this paper, there has been an attempt to observe Control Theory in Persian under these two Minimalist Approaches to Control Theory.

The first section reviews some recent works on Control Theory in general. The second section discusses a good number of "Remarks and Replies" to Hornstein's (1999) "Movement and Control". The third section is a short account on the literature on Persian control constructions. The fourth section investigates how Persian data yield themselves to the Movement Approach of Hornstein's and the Agree-based Approach of Landau's respectively. The fifth section concludes what was said throughout the paper.

Review of Literature

In this section, I would present some of the works done on Control on a chronological basis from 1999 to 2004.

Sag and Wasow (1999) differentiate raising verbs (like "*continue*") and control verbs (like "*try*") by setting two conditions. The former, unlike the latter, allow nonreferential subjects and preserve meaning when being passivized.

(1) a. The FBI tried to find Lee.

   b. Lee tried to be found by FBI.

(2) a. The FBI continues to visit Lee.

   b. Lee continues to be visited by FBI.

(Sag and Wasow, 1999:278-9)

Control in Persian

Pouneh Shabani Jadidi*

(Part 1)

Abstract

This paper investigates control constructions in Persian by running various tests of control offered by Hornstein (1999, 2003, 2004) in his Movement Theory of Control. And those proposed by Landau (2003, 2004) in his Agree-based Approach to OC under Standard Theory of Control.

The Persian data show consistency with Landau's tests of control, whereas, they prove to be inconsistent with those of Hornstein's. Therefore, Hornstein's theory that OC PRO is the residue of movement is refuted, while Landau's Agree-base Approach is supported by the data in this paper, including Persian showing case concord in its subjunctive control construction.

Key Words: control constructions – Agree-base Approach – Minimalist perspective – Movement Approach.

Introduction

This paper aims at shedding some light on the controversial issue of Control Theory viewed in the Minimalist perspective. Two of those most controversial theories are Hornstein's Movement Approach to OC and Landau's Agree-based Approach to OC.

---

* Ottawa University .