ONASSESSINGSUBJENCTIVEANDGERUNDCOMPLEMENTSIN PERSIANCONTROLCONSTRUCTION: THEPOSITIONOFGERUNDIN PERSIAN

Mahnaz Alikhouei[1], Bahram Modarresi[2]*,Mojtaba Monshizadeh[3]

[1]Ph.D student of general linguestics, faculty of foreign languages, Islamic Azad University, Science of Research Branch, Iran.
[2] Assistant professor of general linguestics department of general linguistics, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran.
[3] Associate Professor of general linguestics, department of general linguestics, faculty of foreign languages, Allame TabatabaeibUniversity,Tehran, Iran.

ABSTRACT

This study aims at assessing the gerund position in control constructions of Persian. When analyzing control constructions of Farsi, almost all linguists came to agreement that English gerund complement equals to Persian implicit complement. Upon the gerund position in grammar, some linguists believe that there is no verb gerund in today Persian. However, others completely disagree. The point which is worth noting is that, whether agreed with the existence of Persian gerund, there is an inevitable fact: the use of gerund is decreased in today Farsi. Therefore, this study attempts to answer this question that why implicit mode is used instead of gerund in Persian control constructions. To this end, firstly, two important attitudes on gerund position in Farsi will be explained. Then, two implicit and gerund modes will be compared in order to reach existent shared points. Finally, the researcher concludes that plenty of different structural similarities between these two modes in Farsi have resulted in replacing gerund mode with implicit one (at least in control constructions).

INTRODUCTION

Analyzing and assessing control construction and abstract pronoun refers to Chomsky (1981) generative grammar. In generativeliterature, control construction is the one in which the subject is essentially the same as the independent sentence subject and shares same references. There have been some researches about control constructions based on generative grammar limited mostly to the English language (despite the dominance claim and reference selection which has introduced its aim as generally describing language with no limit). In English control construction, the

complement part possesses gerund mode; however, linguists analyzing such construction in Persian believe that the English gerund complement is most of the time equal to complement clause in implicit mode. On the contrary, it is believed that in English gerund complement is non-finite; and in other words, it lacks person and number. This feature is the essential condition for English control constructions. However, in Farsi, implicit complement clause has person and number. In assessing Persian control construction, some linguists believe that the reason of using implicit mode instead of gerund mode in complement clause is lack of gerund verb mode in today Persian. Though others disagree with this, but the fact is that gerund mode is used today with a sharp decrease. In the present study, it is attempted to explain in what position gerundis basically placed. Therefore, in the following sections two important attitudes on Persian gerund syntactics will be discussed. Afterwards, in next part, the nature of Persian gerund and the definition introduced by Persian linguists of gerund will be represented. Also, the syntactic procedure of building gerund in Farsi will be expressed. Then the structural comparison between gerund mode and implicit mode in control construction will be assessed. At the end, the researcher's claim stating gerund mode being replaced by implicit mode will be proved based on the achieved shared features among these two modes.

GERUNDPOSITION IN FARSI

In Farsi, there is no point of agreement between linguists about gerund clause. In fact, there are two major attitudes towards that. Some believe that there is non-finite gerund clause (Bateni, 1969; Nematzadeh, 1994; Moinzadeh& Mosafa, 2009). The others believe that there is no gerund verb mode in Persian, and gerund is actually a noun (Karimi, 2005; Ghomeshi, 2001; Darzi, 2001). In the following these two attitudes will be taken into consideration.

Gerund as a non-finite verb clause

In Bateni's (1969) view, Persian gerunds could be placed in predicate position as a verb non-finite group. According to Moin and Mosafa (2009), this intrinsic attitude indicates two crucial points: first, the existence of gerund clause (non-finite clause) in Farsi; second, all Persian gerunds are verb. On defining gerund, Gharib et al. (1969) state that gerund is for expressing the act of verb attributed to the subject. Moeinzadeh and Mosafa (2009) indicated in their article that there exists gerund clause in Farsi and used syntactic criteria, word construction, and semantic features to prove their claim. Each criterion will be discussed shortly here.

Semantic feature

Moeinzadeh and Mosafa quoted Lines (1996) that a noun should always semantically have a reference in the outer world. They quoted from Mahutian (1997) that in Farsi a noun place can be filled in with noun. This noun could be accompanied with a descriptive construction such as adjective and/or companion clause (examples 1-3).

1. NP[ماهی] را دوست دارم.
2. NP[ماهی گرانقیمت] را دوست دارم.
3. NP[ماهی گرانقیمتی را که دیروز دیدم] دوست دارم.

Then, they say the 4th example which includes angerund and state
that gerund does not point out anything in the outer world. They conclude
that gerund is different from common nouns put into noun place:

<div dir="rtl">

4. NP[دویدن] را دوست دارم.

</div>

Though in researcher's view, Moeinzadeh and Mosafa wrongly
interpreted noun as a notion which has essentially a reference in the outer
world or in the subjective world, according to Safavi (2004) the words'
reference is not fixed in the outer world and constantly ranges from the
most fixed to the most variable reference. For example, nouns such as love,
inspiration, and hatred have an outer (or subjective) reference just like
angerund like 'running'. Another semantic reasoning by Moeinzadeh and
Mosafa (2009) is about the difference between these two items in taking
noun complement. Both noun and gerund can take a noun as their
complement (examples 5-6). However, according to them, the semantic
relationship of this complementary structure is not the same in both
situations: if angerund is followed by a 'noun', this noun would be the
gerund's subject (example5). However, in example 6 the noun-complement
relationship is of possession type:

<div dir="rtl">

5. دویدن N[حسین] را دوست دارم.
6. کتاب N[حسن] را دوست دارم.

</div>

Syntactic criterion

Moeinzadeh and Mosafa's (2009) reasoning was of distributive kind
based on which when adding a propositional group (PP) the noun and
gerund will behave differently. Regarding gerund in examples 7-8 this
group can proceed or follow the gerund. According to them, based on
Persian linguistic structure, the language of this group is related to gerund
occupying only one syntactic position. Therefore, the two examples 7-8 can
be represented as examples 9-10:

<div dir="rtl">

7. دویدن PP[در مدرسه] را دوست دارم.
8. PP[در مدرسه] دویدن را دوست دارم.
9. NP[دویدن در مدرسه] را دوست دارم.
10. NP[در مدرسه دویدن] را دوست دارم.
11.

</div>

However, in words of Moeinzadeh and Mosafa, PP preceded by the
noun and adapted to the way Persian speakers talk, is a construction apart
from noun:

<div dir="rtl">

12. NP[کباب[PP[در رستوران] خوردن دارد.

</div>

In other words, PP cannot be placed in the previous position as a
noun phrase construction:

<div dir="rtl">

13. NP[.کتاب در مدرسه] را خواندم   ←*NP[در مدرسه کتاب] را خواندم.

</div>

Moeinzadeh and Mosafa represent more valid syntactic evidence to
prove their claim stating non-noun nature of gerund based on X-theory and

θ − $theory$. The quoted Radford (1988) that languages are either starting
head or ending head. Accordingly, optional constructions cannot be
preceded by the head in noun phrases of Persian:

14. .[NPکتاب در مدرسه] را خواندم   ←*[NPدر مدرسه کتاب] را خواندم.

But if the gerund is located at NP place, the optional construction
can then be either preceded by or follow the head (gerund):

15. [NPدویدن در مدرسه] را دوست دارم   ←[NPدر مدرسه دویدن] را دوست دارم.

Moeinzadeh and Mosafa then by means of θ theory attempt to
regard the gerund as a verb item:

16. حسن سینا را زد.
17. زدن سینا کار خوبی نبود.

They believe that the verb 'to hit' is 2-capacity holder and needs two
places: one is 'Hasan' at 'subject' place, the other is 'Sina' at 'direct object'
place. However, in example 16, the subjective role of 'Sina' is formed by
its meaning 'hitting'. On the other side, they hold that the example 16 is
vague; that is, it can be interpreted in two different ways. They quote
Radford (1988) that two sentences with two different meanings are
essentially derived from different deep structures. Hence, Moeinzadeh and
Mosafa state that example 16 could be derived from one of the following
deep structures:

18. [سینا مرتضی را زده است] کار خوبی نبود.
19. [مرتضی سینا را زده است] کار خوبی نبود.

Their other syntactic criterion is adding an adjunct to the items
'noun' and 'gerund'. If an adjunct is added to PP, this adjunct would be
verb-related not noun phrase-related (example 19). However, an adjunct
added to the gerund placed at noun position will be gerund-related (example
20):

20. کباب سرخ کرده[در کنار رودخانه] عالی است.
21. دیدن سینا [در مدرسه] عالی است.

Word-structure criterion
Moeinzadeh and Mosafa used word-structure evidences to prove
their claim about the verbal nature of gerund in Farsi. They quoted Spenser
(1997) that Persian gerund have syntactic features, rather than word-
structure. That is, it is possible to make gerund of all Persian verbs, and its
output is semantically predictable despite word-structure output which has
exclusive features. Another touchstone is the Persian gerunds' capabilities
for turning into passive form. Moeinzadeh and Mosafa hold that Persian
gerunds have object and are capable of becoming passive if derived from
transitive verb:

To martyr (to martyrize)   to break (to make broken)   to invite (to be invited)

On the other side, gerundstaken from intransitive verbs do not get passive form because they lack object:

playing (*to be played)   praying (*to be prayed)

They believe the limitation ruling on the above-mentioned word making is not justifiable if the Persian gerund is a product of word-structure procedure. This is due to this that limitation is related to time and resulted from the dominant semantics. They conclude that the item called gerund and put into noun place by traditional linguists is an item of verb kind which is a timeless clause in Farsi based on which their verbal nature would be interpreted regarding their semantic, syntactic and word-structure.

Second attitude: gerund as a noun

Linguists such as Karimi (2005), Ghomeshi (2001) and Darzi (2001) totally deny the existence of verbal gerund in Farsi. The French linguist, Lazar (2010), states in his Persian Grammar book that a full gerund in Persian holds only noun roles; and in fact, noun is angerund used for representing an act. Accordingly, the gerund complement in English and French is equal to complement in implicit mode in Farsi. To put simply, the following data are represented:

22.I want to do it. (English)
23.Je veux faire (French)

22. می خواهم این کار را بکنم(Farsi)

Darzi (2001) in an attempt to prove his claim stating that gerund clauses are not clauses in intrinsic role (rather nouns), represents below sentences in which the complement clause is non-finite:

23. الف- من قصد نامه نوشتن دارم.
24. ب- من قصد نوشتن نامه دارم.

In Darzi's words, in the example (24 A) the gerund 'to write' is placed after a complement. While in example (24 B) this gerund is accompanied by a morpheme 'ِ'[1] namely 'genitive' and is put before complement. Darzi quoted Nematzadeh(1994) that sentences like (example 24) have compulsory control construction. According to Nematzadeh, in such sentences the gerund complement clause specifier has an implicit pronoun (example 27). Also, in sentences of this kind, the internal chain is under control of main verb of an exceptional clause:

25. الف- من$_i$ قصد [IP]PROi نامه نوشتن] دارم.
26. ب- من$_i$ قصد [IP]PROi نوشتن نامه]دارم.

According to Nematzadeh (1994) quoted by Darzi, the sentence 24 is represented as sentence 25 where the verbal mode is declarative.

---

[1] . kasra

Following Chomsky (1981), Nematzadeh states that the implicit pronoun takes its genitive mode of the genitive kasra before it. This attitude is an instance of exceptional mode-giving for gerund clauses in Farsi. However, according to Darzi, Nematzadehinterpretation of mode-giving in Persian gerund clauses are problematic due to 3 reasons: first, the interpretation of implicit pronoun as an interpretation of exceptional clause makes the outer dominance of implicit pronoun possible despite its theoretical intrinsic role. Second, according to Chomsky (1986) the implicit pronoun owns intrinsic mode, rather than structural. Third, quoting Samiyan (1983), Darzi holds that Ezafe is not the preposition. Darzi (2001) represents syntactic reasoning in his article to prove this that Persian gerund clauses are noun constructions not clauses.

Superficial noun phrase

Darzi believes that in Nematzadeh's interpretation of example 25 noun phrase is expected to be placed at implicit pronoun's position and take the dominance and mode from the external ruler. However, example 26 which is in compliance with example 25, shows otherwise:

٢٧. الف- *من قصد [علی نامه نوشتن]دارم.
٢٨. ب- *من قصد [علی نوشتن نامه] دارم.

In the above examples, superficial noun phrases and implicit pronoun accompany each other in complementary distribution. This, in Darzi's view, justifies that implicit pronoun cannot take constructional mode and, hence, interpreting exceptional mode-giving is not justifiable.

The intrinsic role of 'that'2

Darzi's second reasoning is in support of his claim emphasizing on the 'noun' intrinsic role of gerund clauses in Farsi which is optionally added to the complement clause. Hence, it cannot play in role of complement clause head:

٢٩. من قصد دارم (که) [PROi نامه بنویسم].
٣٠. *من که نامه می نویسم.
٣١. من قصد *(که) [نامه نوشتن] دارم.

Collocation limitation

Darzi's third reasoning is related to collocation based on which grammatically similar parts of speech can come with each other in Persian and, in his view, collocation of a noun phrases happens with an gerund clause (example 30), but collocation of a complementary clause does not behave so (example 31). This is another reason justifying the gerund clause to be a noun:

٣٢. من قصد [PROi خریدن خانه] و [IP فروش آن به او را] ندارم.
٣٣. *او [NP نشانی ما] و [CP علی در بانک کار می کند] را می داند.

Distributing the morpheme 'ezafe'

---

2 . که (Fa.)

Darzi quoted Samiyan (1983) that 'ezafe' comes within non-verbal head and some subsequent descriptors. In Samiyan's view, 'ezafe' cannot be placed between noun head and complement clause or relative clause. On this basis, Darzi concludes that since morpheme 'ezafe' must precede gerund (example 32) and we never put it before a complement clause (example 33), the gerund cannot be a clause:

34. من قصد *[نامه نوشتن] دارم.
35. من قصد *دارم[نامه بنویسم].

Specifier sign 'را'

Darzi believes that 'را' is the definite direct object's sign, and since it can be placed after the gerund in Persian, gerunds are noun in Persian:

36. من قصد [رفتن به آمریکا را] ندارم.

Gerund modes distribution

Darzi quoted from Karimi (2005) that if noun phrases lack any sign, direct object will precede main verb in Farsi while complement clauses must be preceded by the main verb. Otherwise, that sentence would be ungrammatical. Accordingly, since gerund modes must precede the main verb, they cannot be regarded as clause:

37. الف- من قصد [رفتن (PRO) به آمریکا را] ندارم.
38. ب- من قصد (PRO) ندارم [رفتن (PRO) به آمریکا را].

Word-structure witness

Darzi believes that gerunds behave like noun phrases in terms of word structure. For example, this part of speech (verb) takes plural suffix to form plural nouns (just like nouns). This plural suffix cannot be added to clauses:

39.I'm tired of his telling lie.

Additionally, in Darzi's view, gerund mode could be the complement of preposition 'از' which per se emphasizes on the nominal role of gerunds in Farsi [Darzi points out the case resistance principle introduced by Stole (1981) which limits clauses to the occasions lacking mode]. Accordingly, Darzi attempts to prove his claim (nominal role of gerunds) through representing the above-mentioned arguments.

IMPLICIT ANDGERUNDMODE IN FARSI
Introduction

As mentioned before, in control constructions, implicit mode of Persian complement clause replaces English gerund mode. The researcher believes that the reason of this replacement is the existent similarities between these two modes in Farsi. Hence, in this part, it is expected to analyze implicit and gerund modes in Farsi and determine the shared features of these two constructions.

Comparative evaluation of implicit and gerund modes of Farsi

Dependency on main verb in implicit and gerund modes

According to VahidianKamyar (1994) and Lazar (2010), there are two tenses for implicit mode in Farsi: past subjunctive and present subjunctive. There is no future subjunctive mood.According to Lazar (2010), past subjunctive is formedby the objective noun of the main verb in addition to the present tense of the verb 'to be' such as: خریدهباشم. And according to Darzi (2001), present subjunctive tense is formed by adding 'ب' to the present root of main verb (like 'بخرم'). In arguing about the use of subjunctive mood of the verb in a sentence, it seems that most Persian linguists came to agreement that subjunctive verb does not usually appear independently in a sentence; rather, it is often used in dependent clauses (NatelKhanlari, 1973; Shafayi, 1984;VahidianKamyar, 1994; Farshidvard, 2009; Lazar, 2010). Lazar (2010) believes that subjunctive mood never comes alone, rather, it always owns the value of possibility. Accordingly, this mood is almost rarely used in independent sentences. In terms of tense, it always functions dependent of the main verb. The tense determiner of the dependent clause is always the sentence meaning rather than adaptation principles. On the other hand, Farshidvard (2009) calls the gerund mode as subordinate because it is equal to subjunctive mode. For example, ' باید به خانه رفت' (gerund noun) equals to 'باید به خانه برود' (subjunctive mood).VahidianKamyar (1994) quoted Khanlari (1973) that a verb in subjunctive mood is always seeking another verb. Accordingly, Farshidvard (2009) considers gerund mode similar to subjunctive mood; that is, it follows the verb, sentence or any other element with the difference that subjunctive mood is possessor and gerund mood is non-possessor. In his view, the subjunctive mood and gerund mood could be named subordinate or dependent mood. Thus, for researcher, the first common feature among subjunctive and gerund mood is that despite this fact that declarative mood could function independently, subjunctive mood (like gerund one) functions often in dependent clauses and depends on the independent clause. Though it is claimed that subjunctive mood is inflectional, in contrary to declarative mood, this inflection is not a total one for all persons and tenses and, hence, is closer to the gerund mood in this regard.

Component arrangement and the elements sequence in subjunctive and gerund moods

As previously mentioned, in Persian controlconstructions the English gerund complement clause equals to Persian subjunctive mood of complement clause:

39. علی تصمیم گرفت متمم [به مهمانی برود].

Ali decided [to go to the party].

40.من سعی می کنم متمم [امتحان را بگذرانم].

I try [to pass the exam].

41. علی فراموش کرد متمم [به مادرش نامه بنویسد].

Ali forgot [to write a letter to his mother].

According to Karimi (2005) andGhomeshi (2001), Persian component arrangement in sentences is very simple (SOV). However, in sentences with complement clause, it is placed after the main verb (Matrix) in the base structure of this clause. In other words, the sentences' component arrangement is in form of SVO. Ghomeshi holds that though 'noun phrase and PP' constructions are placed before the main verb, in some specific and under functional conditions, the object can be preceded by the main verb (SVO). To put simply, there is a second state for the sentence component arrangement but there is no second one for the complement clause based on which it is capable of being preceded by the main verb. However, DabirMoghadam (2009) believes otherwise. DabirMoghadam, following SoheiliEsfahani (1976) explains that deep structure of noun complements in Farsi is obtained through the following construction rule:

NP → N(S)

SoheiliEsfahani is quoted by DabirMoghadam (2009) as saying in the second chapter of his handbook persuasive argumentations proving this construction rule the bases of which root from the emergence of superstructure pronoun 'این' (N in the above rule) at the left side of the complement clause or, in other words, at the center of complement clause. According to Soheili, though the complement clause could be placed after the main verb in the superstructure, the basic form of Persian sentences based on the major component arrangement (subject-object-verb) endorse that all noun complements in this language are placed before the main verb in the deep structure, and the performance of optional transformation in transferring complement sentence justifies the difference between deep construction and the corresponding superstructure. Accordingly, the above sentences 26-28 are formed from the below deep structures, respectively:

۴۲. علی این را که متمم [به مهمانی برود] تصمیم گرفت.
۴۳. من این را که متمم [امتحان را بگذرانم] سعی می کنم.
۴۴. علی این را که متمم [به مادرش نامه بنویسد] فراموش کرد.

Based on this, when a complement clause is placed before the main verb in deep structure, the presence of the pronoun 'این' is compulsory; otherwise, it leads to forming the below ungrammatical sentences:

۴۵. * علی Ø که متمم [به مهمانی برود] تصمیم گرفت.
۴۶. * من Ø که متمم [امتحان را بگذرانم] سعی کردم.
۴۷. *علی Ø که متمم [به مادرش نامه بنویسد] فراموش کرد.

In DabirMoghadam words, if the sentences containing noun complement is transferred by the 'complement sentence transfer'transformation, then the presence of the pronoun 'این' would be optional:

۴۸. علی (این را) تصمیم گرفت (که) متمم [به مهمانی برود].
۴۹. من (این را) سعی می کنم (که) متمم [امتحان را بگذرانم].
۵۰. علی (این را) فراموش کرد (که) متمم [به مادرش نامه بنویسد].

In this case, if the syntactic process of 'gerund generation' is applied on the above sentences, it leads to turning the complement clause into gerund. In this case, DabirMoghadam (2009) states that since the gerund mood must be essentially placed before the main verb (SOV), this witnesses his claim stating that in deep structures of these sentences, the complement is put at a place before the main verb:

51.

52. علی مصدر [رفتن به مهمانی] را تصمیم گرفت.

53. من مصدر [گذراندن امتحان] را سعی می کنم.

54. علی مصدر [نوشتن نامه به مادرش] را فراموش کرد.

Therefore, in the researcher's sight, the second common point between subjunctive and gerund mood is that both include basic infrastructure with subject-object-verb component arrangement.

Superficial subject and the agreement in subjunctive and gerund moods

According to Ghomeshi (2001), in generative literature, the verbs taking gerund complements without subject are categorized under control verbs. To put simply, one of the features of control construction is that the subject of complement clause is removed in the main clause due to sharing same reference with a noun phrase (subject/object). In early 1980, the control theory, as one of the subcategories of dominance theory and reference choosing, introduced subjective pronoun as the subject of the complement clause. Subjective pronoun, in fact, has all the features of a personal pronoun. It only lacks superficial representation. Since this pronoun is not under dominance and, hence, is not either under the mode, therefore, it could be represented only as the subject of a timeless clause and nowhere else. According to Haegeman (1994) the subject of a timeless clause is subjective pronoun which lacks phonetic representation due to not receiving mode.

55.John wants [PRO to go].

In next analyses performed by the linguists, the presence of subjunctive pronoun as the subject of non-finite clauses (subjunctive complement) is proved in control constructions:

55. علی تصمیم گرفت (که) [PRO به مهمانی برود].

56. من سعی می کنم (که) [PRO امتحان را بگذرانم].

57. علی فراموش کرد (که) [PRO به مادرش نامه بنویسد].

According to Radford (2005), based on extended projection principle which is one of the dominance theory' and referencing choosing' principles, all clauses essentially have subject place; and meeting this principle is mandatory at all levels. However, based on this principle, it is not mandatory to fill the subject place essentially with a component; rather, it could be filled by a trace. Therefore, it could be concluded that if, according to DabirMoghadam (2009), the above-mentioned structures are under the syntactic process of 'gerund generation', then in the timeless clause of these gerund constructions there will be a subject place, too, which lacks phonetic representation. In other words, the place of timeless

clause means that 'gerund' takes subject place and this subject is the subjunctive pronoun:

٥٨. علی مصدر [PRO رفتن به مهمانی] را تصمیم گرفت.
٥٩. من مصدر [PRO گذراندن امتحان] را سعی می کنم.
٦٠. علی مصدر [PRO نوشتن نامه به مادرش] را فراموش کرد.

Therefore, it could be stated that, as the third shared point among subjunctive and gerund mood in Persian control constructions, the subject of the complement clause is the subjunctive pronoun in both moods.

Time issue in subjunctive and gerund mood

Piruz (2016) represents the contrast of time-having in two kinds of control constructions (controlling and gerund moods) through presenting data in his article. He claims that sentences such as (60) are finite constructions in which the complement clause of subjunctive mood has time head. In contrast, sentences such as (61) are non-finite constructions in which the complement clause of gerund mood lacks time head (the mentioned examples are represented here according to Piruz).

Finite construction: complement clause with time head

٦١. الف- علی گفت [CP (که) [pro TP به مهمانی برود]].
٦٢. ب- علی تصمیم گرفت [CP (که) [PRO TP به مهمانی برود]].

Non-finite construction: complement clause lacking time head

٦٣. علی [رفتن به مهمانی] را تصمیم گرفت.

According to Piruz, sentences like (60 الف) indicate a non-control construction where the complement clause has time and, hence, at their subject place, the syntactic subject mode, the removed subject pronoun (pro) is taken into consideration. Example 60ب is like 60الف with the difference that 60ب is a control construction and the subject of its complement clause is a subjunctive pronoun; and since the complement clause in example 60الف has time, hence, 60 ب has time, too. In contrast, in example 61, since we encounter a non-finite construction which is naturally timeless, and in which the item 'رفتن' has the nominal features (including receiving ezafekasra and being put at object place), therefore, time-having which is among the characteristics of a clause/sentence is not considerable in such constructions. According to Piruz and following Wermbrund (2007), gerund constructions in difference languages are typically the ones with no time projection. It is believed that in Persian, subjunctive clauses has time but Piruz (2016) argue that time in such clauses depends on the time features of the main clause. That is, the subjunctive mood in Farsi, in contrast to declarative mood, has a defective time head. The declarative mood, on the contrary, has the total time head which is due to this fact that when the time head is complete, based on the stages theory, all probe operations and objective are performed at the same stage. But if it is defective, this hinders the adapted operations. In this case, the operations experience a delay up to the next stage meaning the stage of main clause operations so that the adaptation is performed here. The result of this delay is adapting the time of complement clause to the independent clause. Piruz

(2016) believes that in terms of semantics, the subjunctive mood has dependent tense meaning that the time of complement clause is dependent on the time of independent clause. On the other hand, Matulian (2015) holds that in analyzing control construction, it is important to consider time issue existent in the inflection head (I). according to Matulian, and in terms of the time issue of subjunctive complement clause, there is no consensus in Persian control construction. Ghomeshi (2001) following Wermbrund (1999) assumes subjunctive complement clause smaller than TP and equal to VP; and selects the data from Farsi where control construction does not allow the independent sentences to have various time adverbs, and knows this constructions as a paradigm of head control construction (example 62):

64. * بیژون دیروز توانست که فردا بره.

Based on Darzi's (2001) and Karimi's (2005) interpretation, some control constructions are found in Farsi in which different time adverbs make no trouble in dependent and independent clauses:

65. الف- کیمیا دیروز پرویز را تشویق کرد که بره.
66. ب- کیمیا دیروز تصمیم گرفت که فردا بره.

Matulian (2015) divides Persian compulsory control construction into two groups in terms of symmetry and time agreement: a) complete control: where the dependent (complement)/independent clauses have the same time or agree upon time reference. In other words, the complement cannot timely behave differently from the independent sentence. In Persian, mood verbs (to be able to, to oblige, etc.) and phase verbs (to start, to finish, etc.) are among the verbs choosing reference time complement and form a complete control construction (example 64):

67. من امروز می توانم فردا بیایم.

b) incomplete control: where the time of complement clause is a level ahead of the main sentence time. That is, the time adverb of the main clause and complement clause are not apart from each other. Matulian believes that in Persian, tendency verbs (to decide, to attempt, etc.) and the verbs with compulsory nature (to promise, to guarantee, to pledge, to obey, etc.) are of this kind. But it is worth noting that there is an important point in comparing time in subjunctive and gerund moods: in Persian, the gerund complement clause could have reference time (example 65) and/or dependent time (example 66) just like the subjunctive complement clause:

68. * علی دیروز نوشتن نامه به مادرش در فردا را فراموش کرد.
69. علی امروز رفتن به مهمانی فردا را تصمیم گرفت.

On this basis, in terms of time reference issue in two main and complement clauses, subjunctive and gerund moods share points in Persian control constructions which is another common point among these two moods in control constructions.

As a conclusion it could be said that in this part analyzing subjunctive and gerund moods in Persian control constructions was taken into consideration. After reaching common points between these two, the

researcher's claim of gerund mood's being replaced by the subjunctive in Persian control constructions has been endorsed.

CONCLUSION

On assessing Persian control construction, following Piruz (2010), it could be mentioned that despite English language where complement clause of control construction has gerund mood, Persian complement clause could either have subjunctive mood (finite control) or gerund mood (non-finite control); though most linguists analyzing this construction in Farsi believe that in most cases the complement clause has a subjunctive mood. In terms of syntactic state of gerund, there is no consensus among Persian linguists. There are two major attitudes in this regard: firstly, it is believed that in today Persian, there exists the verb mode of gerund; secondly, it is believed that today Persian lacks any gerund verb mode, and gerund exclusively has nominal mode. It this article it was attempted to perform a comparison between subjunctive and gerund mood in Persian control constructions. It became clear that in terms of structure, there are some similarities between these two moods in Farsi including their dependence on the main sentence in terms of occurrence and their rare independent use. Also, in control constructions, the subject of complement clause in both moods is the implicit pronoun PRO. Basic component arrangement (deep structure) is subject-object-verb (SOV) in both situations. Finally, in terms of time, though subjunctive complement clause has a time head and the gerund complement clause lacks it, according to Piruz (2010) the time head in subjunctive mood is defective compared to declarative mood. Additionally, in terms of semantics, this clause has dependent time, meaning the time of complement clause depends on the time of independent clause. Further, according to Matulian (2015) time reference to both independent and complement clauses in both gerund and subjunctive clauses could be of time-reference or time-dependent type. Correspondingly, the researcher concludes that the reason of less using gerund mood in today Persian is that in spite of syntactic differences between these two, their previously-mentioned similarities justifies gerund mood's being replaced by the subjunctive.

REFERENCES

Bateni, M.R. (1969). Describing grammatical structure of Farsi.Tehran, Amir Kabir Publications.

Piruz, M.R. (2010). Revising interpretive elliptical characteristics.KhorasanLinguistics and Dialects magazine,Ferdowsi University, No. 3.

Piruz, M.R. (2016). Syntactic state ofelliptical pronoun.Al-Zahra University Quarterly, 8(18).

DabirMoghadam, M. (2009).Persian linguistic researches.Handbook, University Publication Center.

Shafahi, A. (1984). The basics of Persian grammar.

Safavi, K. (2004). On semantics.SurehMehr Publishing.

Farshidvard, K. (2009). Today complete grammar. Sokhan Publication.

Gharib, A., Bahar, M.T., Forouzanfar, B., Homayi, J., and Yasami, R.
(1969).Persian grammar (The Five Professors). Tehran,
JahanDanesh Publication.

Lazar, J. (2010). Contemporary Persian Grammar.Hermas Publishing.

Matulian, N.R. (2015). Distribution of elliptical pronoun in Persian
compulsory control construction.Lingual Indices Quarterly, 6(1).

Moeinzadeh, A., and Mosafa, J.A. (2009). PRO subjunctive pronoun in
Farsi: a possible construction. Professional Linguistics and
Khorasan Dialects Magazine, No.1.

NatelKhanlari, P. (1973). Persian Grammar. Tehran, BonyadFarhang Iran.

Nematzadeh, S. (1994).Research on cognition science and syntactic process
of Farsi.Ph.D. thesis, Tehran University.

VahidianKamyar, T. (1994). Subjunctive mood and verbs tenses.
Linguistics Magazine, 2.

Chomsky, N.(1981). Lectures on government and binding.studies in
generative grammar. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. (1986). Barries. Cambridge,MA:MIT.Press.

Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist Inquires:the framework In step by step
:Essays on Minimalist syntax in Honor of How ward Lasni, R.
Martin, D. Michaels and Uriagereka (eds) Cambridge M A: The
MIT Press.

Darzi, A. (2001). Non-finite control in Persian .studies in the linguistic
sciences volume 31, No.2 (full 2001)

Ghomeshi, J.(2001). Control and Thematic Agreement.Canadian Journal of
Linguistics.

Haegeman, L.(1994). Intoduction to government and binding theory.2nd
Edition.Oxford: Blackwell.

Karimi, S. (2005).A minimalist Approch to toScrambling.Berlin: Mouton
de Gruyter.

Lyons, J. (1996).LinguisticSemantics: Cambridge University Press.

Mahootian, Sh. (1997).persian: Routledge.

Noonan, M. (1985).complementation.in T. shopen(ed), Language Typology
and Syntactic Descrption.vol"II, Cambridge University Press,
PP.44-140.

Soheili-Esfahani,A. (1976). Noun pharase Complementation in
Persian.Unpublishedph.D.dissertation,University of Ilinois, urbana.

Spencer, A. (1997). Morphological theory, an Introduction to
word.Structure in generative grammar, Blackwell.

Stowell, T. (1981).Origions of phrase structure.ph. D. dissertation.
Massuchusetts institute of Technology.

Wermbrund, S.(1999). Modal verbs must be raising verbs. In Proceedings
of the 18th West Coast Confernce on Formal linguistics(Wccfl 18),
ed. Sonya Bird, Andrew Carnie, Jason D. Haugen ,and
PeterNorquest.Somervill, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Wermbrund, S.(2007).Gerunds areTenseless. University of
Pensylvaniawoking papers in linguistics.13(1).PP.407-420.