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Postal (1972) and Epée (1976) have argued against Chomsky's (1973) hypothesis concerning Wh Movement as a successive cyclic rule. Postal's first argument is based on the Preposition Dangle Argument. Epée offered a similar kind of argument, which might be called the Duala no-Dangle Argument.

Postal claimed that, if a wh-word is moved successively cyclically, it must be possible to strand a pied piped preposition in an intermediate cycle. However, a preposition can be stranded only in the lowest cycle, otherwise it must be pied piped into the maximal sentence-initial position.

Epée pointed out that the same argument against the successive cyclic nature of Wh Movement in Duala holds for the particle no. The particle no in Duala is obligatorily inserted after the first verbal element of the clause, if the questioned constituent originates to the right of the verb (Epée (1976, 194)). If Wh Movement is to be a successive cyclic transformation, it should be possible to strand the no-particle in any intermediate cycle. This, however, is not possible, and therefore Wh Movement must be regarded as a transformation that applies in a nonsuccessive fashion.

Contrary to these Dangle Arguments, a preposition in Afrikaans can be stranded either in its original position or in a position in an intermediate cycle. Furthermore, the Afrikaans wh-word + preposition can appear simultaneously in all the cycles of a well-formed sentence.

Before going any further into this matter, something has to be said about the pied piping of prepositions in Afrikaans.

*Wh* Fronting in Afrikaans is an obligatory rule. The following sentence is therefore ungrammatical.
(1) a. *julle dink wat?
you think what
b. wat dink julle?
what think you
‘What do you think?/What are you thinking?’

A wh-word can optionally pied pipe a preposition. One peculiar fact about such a pied piping is that a wh-word + pied piped preposition can (optionally) be replaced by a compound:

(2) a. vir wat werk ons nou eintlik?
for what work we now actually
‘For what do we actually work?’
b. waarvoor werk ons nou eintlik?
wherefore work we now actually
‘For what do we actually work?’

In (2a) the phonological form of both the wh-word (wat) and the preposition (vir) is altered as result of the substitution.

(3) vir + wat → waarvoor

A compounded preposition can be stranded, but only in the compounded form; the stranded preposition cannot remain in its original form:

(4) a. waar werk ons nou eintlik voor?

b. *waar werk ons nou eintlik vir?

The wh-word (waar) in (4a) can be either in the original form (wat) or in the compounded form waar if its preposition is stranded, although the form waar is preferred.

(4) c. wat werk ons nou eintlik voor?

But (4d) is certainly not permitted:

(4) d. *wat werk ons nou eintlik vir?

If the Afrikaans wh-word is moved across one cycle or more than one cycle, the preposition may be stranded in one of the intermediate cycles; or it may be pied piped into sentence-initial position, or it may be left in its original final position in the lowest cycle.

(5) a. [s NP V [sNP V Prep-Whs]s]
b. *julle dink ons werk vir wat
you think we work for what
c. vir wat dink julle werk ons ____?
for what think you work we
d. waarvoor dink julle werk ons?
wherefore think you work we
e. waar/wat dink julle werk ons voor?
where/what think you work we for
f. waar/wat dink julle voor werk ons?

In sentence (5f) the preposition (voor) is stranded sentence-
initially in the $S_1$ cycle in a structure of the following form:

\[ (6) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    S_0 \\
    \text{wh} \\
    \text{prep} \\
    S_1
\end{array} \]

$Wh$ Movement being an obligatory rule, the following sentence will be ungrammatical:

\[ (7) \quad \text{*dink julle ons werk waarvoor?} \]

Furthermore, the possibility exists in Afrikaans of having the $wh$-word + preposition appear in all the cycles of a sentence.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{(8) waarvoor dink julle waarvoor werk ons?} \\
    \text{wherefore think you wherefore work we} \\
    \text{‘What do you think we are working for?’}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{(9) waaroor dink julle waaroor stry ons die} \\
    \text{whereabout think you whereabout argue we the} \\
    \text{meeste?} \\
    \text{most} \\
    \text{‘What do you think we are arguing about the most?’}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{(10) waaroor dink jy waaroor dink die} \\
    \text{whereabout think you whereabout think the} \\
    \text{bure waaroor stry ons die meeste?} \\
    \text{neighbors whereabout argue we the most} \\
    \text{‘What do you think the neighbors think we are} \\
    \text{arguing about the most?’}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{(11) met wie het jy nou weer gesê met wie het} \\
    \text{with who did you now again said with who did} \\
    \text{Sarie gedog met wie gaan Jan trou?} \\
    \text{Sarie thought with who go Jan marry} \\
    \text{‘Whom did you say (again) did Sarie think Jan is} \\
    \text{going to marry?’}
\end{array} \]

The preposition can be stranded in the sentence-final position, while the $wh$-word can be fronted across an intermediate cycle:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{(12) wat/waar dink julle dink die bure stry} \\
    \text{what/where think you think the neighbors argue} \\
    \text{ons oor?} \\
    \text{we about}
\end{array} \]

The preposition can also be left dangling in the sentence-initial position of the lowest cycle:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{(13) wat/waar dink julle dink die bure oor stry ons?} \\
    \text{If the preposition is compounded in the lowest cycle, only the}
\end{array} \]
compounded form can appear in any higher cycle. Therefore, (14a) is a grammatical sentence, while (14b) is ungrammatical.

(14) a. waaroor dink jy waaroor stry ons die meeste?
   b. *wat dink jy oor waaroor stry ons die meeste?

If a preposition is stranded in the deepest embedded clause and only the wh-word is fronted in that clause, it does not imply that the same will happen in any of the higher sentences. In other words, preposition stranding in the lowest cycle does not necessarily imply preposition stranding in any of the higher cycles.

(15) waaroor dink jy waaroor dink die bure wat/haar stry ons die meeste oor?

In conclusion, we may therefore claim that the Afrikaans Wh Movement seems to be a bounded rule, the Afrikaans wh-word being moved successively from its original sentence-final position into the sentence-initial position of the next higher cycle. As we have seen, the main arguments in favor of such a claim are, first, the simultaneous appearance of a fronted wh-word in all the cycles of the same sentence and, second, the possibility of preposition dangling in an intermediate cycle in a well-formed Afrikaans sentence.
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Is make the claim a complex lexical item?

Alexander Grosu,
Tel Aviv University

Chomsky (1975, chapter 3, footnote 24) has suggested that make the claim is a complex lexical item derived by a (lexical) rule of Idiom Formation. This suggestion was motivated by the desire to provide a principled way of distinguishing between (1a) and (1b) within the framework of linguistic description proposed in Chomsky (1973; 1975).

(1) a. *this book(,) I never believed [sp the claim [sthat you would buy t]]
   b. this book(,) I never [v made the claim] [sthat you would buy t]

The distinction in (1) is predicted as follows: in the derivation