The Preposition Stranding in IRAQI Arabic Sluicing Conditions and Generalization

Assistant Lect. Weam L. Saleh
Email: weamalnaseri@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses and challenges the apparent violation of the Merchant Preposition Stranding Generalization (PSG) of 2001. As initiating with the description of the non-prepositive stranding language sluicing in Iraqi Arabic, optional tends to show in stranding and pied-piping a preposition. The study addresses an account arguing that Iraqi Arabic sluicing only derived from a cleft source under preposition stranded (p stranding). Therefore, pseudosluicing is an instance given its presence as sluicing.

The evident P-stranding violation is that the wh-pivots of clefts cannot be contributed significantly by a preposition in Iraqi Arabic. Therefore, in the face of initial appearances, the Iraqi Arabic is not a counter-example of the generalisation of the merchant. In addition, two separate sources in Iraqi Arabic of IP ellipse are proposed: sluicing and pseudosluicing, both of which generated by wh-movement plus IP deletion. On the basis of both these sluicing-related evidence, updated evidence for the study of Arabic Class II interrogatives as copular clauses are given.

Keywords: Preposition Stranding, IRAQI Arabic Sluicing.

1. Introduction

Prejudiciation against terminating a sentence by preposition was traditionally an issue for normative grammarists in search of frequency, enhancement and the appropriate use of the language (Takami, 1988). During the eighteenth siècle, sentences such as (1) were highly rejected as colloquial, inefficient or even rough and since then prepositions during grammar books and use guidelines have been criticized upon at the base of them (Alford, 1864).

(1a). who are you smiling to?

(1b). I was screaming at for being at danger.

The design seen in (1) above is commonly called preposition stranding. It described as a syntactic phenomenon by Denison (1998). It is in which the left a preposition deferred, i.e. stranded, at or near the termination of a clause with no directly accompanied object (Herslund, 1984). At this point, it must be noted that there is a special relationship between the

Phenomenon of stranding prepositions and informal discourse situations since style has been one of the principal reasons grammarists criticise the phenomenon (King & Roberge, 1990). Preposition stranding is more often used in the informal style and spoken langue; it is one of our language's outstanding characteristics. Many who are mindful of the norms and responsive to linguistic variations find stranded preposition to be bad grammar and may use alternatives, particularly in structured and written forms, carefully and actively (Kim,Sun-Woong, 2010). Examples can be contained in (2) and (3) below.

(2a) that the prison is the place, which the prisoner escaped from.

(2b) that the prison is the place from which the prisoner escaped.

(2c) that the prison is the place wherefrom the prisoner escaped.

(3a) my house was broken into last week.

(3b) somebody broke into my house last week.

(3c) last week somebody broke into my house

For other Arabic dialects, the Ostensible P-stranding Under Sluicing (OPUS) has already been noted by several articlas such as Jordan (Albukhari 2016), Libyan (Algryani 2012), Emirati (Leung, 2014). Such researches, based on theoretical solutions to sluicing, propose that sluicing in Arabic may be taken from two (approximately) synonyms of pre-Sluice: What mechanisms are similar in form with the precedent and which keys. As shown below, wh-cleft do not necessitate preposition piping (Phoocharoensil, 2017).

The writers use this interpretation to indicate that OPUS in Arabic would not contend against the presence of an ellipse site structure but rather against the notion that the ellipse site structure must be syntactically the same as the antecedent. While the details in the papers listed are consistent with a systemic approach to sluication, we can point out that this method is not imposed, as the papers do not show what happens when there is no well-founded pre-sluice.

 In addition, the authors consider wh-clefts only as an alternative pre-sluice, but in experiments 1 and 2 we will demonstrate the relevance of resumptive pronouns under structural analysis. In order to explain these critiques of existing Arabic literature and

of the following studies, it is important to recognise that Arabic, including Iraqi-Arabic, has three well-specified, specific techniques for shaping wh-questions: wh-movement (3a), wh-clefts (3b), and wh-resumption (3c) in the following example:

A wh-phrase fronting, the possible presence of a pronominal copula and the mandatory presence of the relative completentizer (aly) in most syntactic positions with the exception of local subjects distinguish the wh-clefting technique (Algryani, 2019). Ultimately, the reverberative approach is characterised by the omission of a quantitative complement, absence of a pronominal copula and the inclusion of a reverberating pronoun.

The interaction of P-stranding and sluicing in Iraqi Arabic is discussed from a PF-deletion perspective. Specifically, it aims to take account of the apparent infringements of the P-stranding generalisation and its consequences on the Iraqi Arab sluicing principle.

The article split into three parts and then the summary. The first part gives a description of the sluicing constructions and the hypotheses suggested to take into account the sluicing phenomena in Iraqi Arabic. The second part addresses the stranding of preposition from a crosslinguistic point of view. In the third part, the obvious breach of sluicing and its ramifications are addressed p-stranding generalisation.

2. Research Questions

The key purpose of this article is to clarify and examine the questions concerning preposition stranding in the Iraqi Arabic Language (IA) and to compare them with the theoretical English language. Two issues discussed in particular;

1. What is the syntax of Preposition Stranding constructions in Iraqi Arabic?
2. What is the syntax of Iraqi Arabic sluicing and generalisation?

3. Syntactic Of Sluicing

The word ' sluicing, 'initially developed by Ross (1969), applies to an elliptical form in which an individual wh-phrase operates as an embedded wh-question considering the fact that such a question is simplified phonologically to a wh-phrase, which usually has an obvious correlation in the antecedent clause. The form in (3) is an illustration of sluicing through Iraqi Arabic, which translated as a totally articulated wh-question

(4) Mustafa   ezem   wahed   lakin ma-aref   Mino
   Mustafa   invite.2ms   someone   but NEG-Known   who
 'Mustafa invited someone, but I don't know who'

There are two primary methods with regard to the syntactic form of sluicing. The first approach is the non-structural approach, which assumes no syntactic structure in the ellipsis site (Culicover and Jackendoff, 2006). The second is the theoretical perspective that claims in the elided content for a framework and is reflected by most analyses Chao (1987) and Merchant (2001).

Nevertheless, there is some dispute whether the unpronounced content includes lexically null components. Both dominant systemic methods are LF-copying and PF-

deletion. The previous implies a category of null filled by copying at LF the semantic element of the preceding clause (Chao 1987; Lobeck 1991). Abovementioned claims for a null-TP syntactic form which would be deleted after a whmovement process (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, Lasnik 2001).

The current article adopts PF-deletion as a potential explanation to discover to what limited extend it can be implemented to account for P-stranding in (Iraqi Arabic) IA. Considering the delete principle of positing a syntactic framework at the sluicing ellipsis level, the problem is how to decide the essence of this hidden framework. The sluiced clause, among others, has the syntactic structure of a wh-question, and is derived from wh-movement plus TP- deletion, according to Lasnik (2007) and Merchant (2008).

(5a) Sara brought some thing, but I don't know [$_{CP}$ what [$_{TP}$ Sara bought]

Erteschik-Shir (1983), Pollman (1975), (Chung & McCloskey 1995), (Rodrigues & Vicente 2009), Nykiel 2013 and (Lugo-Candelas et al., 2016) have, however, claimed that the sluice clauses are simply extracted from a copular clause as given for in (5b):

(5b) Sara brought something, but I don't know what [it was]

Therefore, by deleting the subject it and copula, the sluice in (5b) believed to be extracted in a form of sluice clauses. Merchant (2001) states that Erteschik (1983) was especially worried with island development and island outcomes were negligible in deriving the sluice from such a copular system. The island is indifferent in somehow to sluicing; as defined in Merchant (2008), Ross (1969). In addition, such a system is a type of cleft structure or, more specifically, a type of reduced cleft structure system with a wh-phrase derived pivot. Merchant (2001) terms this form of ellipse 'pseudo sluicing,' and states that it is superficially distinct from real sluicing as seen by (6).

(6) Someone came today, guess who [it was that come] [sluicing]
                    Guess who [came]   Pseudo-sluicing

The two claims above are logical and pose a reasonable question; in what way the hidden structure of the sluiced clause is isomorphic or the structure of the corresponding clause identical. As a matter of fact, Merchant (2001) claims that sluicing stems from wh-questions rather cleft-like constructions , as claimed by Erteschik-Shir (1983) and Pollman (1975) . Therefore, with respect to the IA the issue is if, in the sense of P-stranding, sluicing may be derived from wh-questioning or from a copular source (i.e. cleft). Before addressing preposition in sluicing, IA sluicing and some of its characteristics are worth adding.

3.1 Sluicing in Arabic language -Iraqi dialect

In Iraqi dialect, sluicing looks like English sluicing throughout the context that it leaves a wh-remnant, although there are different aspects to the structure of the question in the two languages. In Iraqi dialect, there are many wh-phrases used to formulate questions and sluicing. This includes yaho/ mino 'who/whom,' shino 'what,' NP,' wein 'when,' and shlon 'how,' shkad 'how many' and leiš 'why. These all wh-phrases are system and interconnected clauses.

(7) A: Mustafa   SA'AD   Ahed .
　　　　Mustafa helped.3MS someone
　　　　'Mustafa helped someone '
　　B: yaho/ Mino
　　　Who?

(8)   wahed   kasser   Alshuback   lakin ma- aʕrəf   mino.
　Someone   broke. 3MS a window   but NEG-know.1S-NEG Who
　'Someone broke the window, but I don't know who'

(9) Mustafa   eshtara   laptop   lakin ma- ʕrəf   lemta.
　Mustafa   bought.3ms a laptop but NEG-remember.1S-NEG when
　'Mustafa bought a laptop, but I don't remember when'

(10) Mustafa   eshtraa   camera lakin ma-attheker ayya noah
　　Mustafa   bought.3MS a camera but NEG-remember.1s-NEG   which type

Iraqi Arabic sluicing can take place both in matrix and in embedded clauses. Incorporated clause sluices generated by verbs who choose CPs as supplement. Such collection of verbs will involve terms such as "'remember " forget" , "know" etc. The definition of a sluice, e.g. (7)-(10), is identical to a non-elliptical wh-question, although a sluice and a non-elliptical wh-question are distinguishable in phonology, which implies that sluices are elliptical wh-questions and the assumption proposed by the pf-deletion process.

3.1.1 Forms of sluicing constructions and term Typology

Sluicing Constructions   classified according to Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey (1995) in three different types that all the languages claim to exist. In the first form, the displaced wh-phrase is an appendix, which in the preceding paragraph does not correspond anything as in (11). Furthermore, the wh-phrase corresponds in the antecedent clause to an implicit reference, an extension or argument (12).

Finally, the wh-phrase of the third form is an implied argument allowed by a structure of argument (13). Ladusaw claims that any effective sluicing analysis must account for the three forms because sluicing is a unitary phenomenon, and one unified analysis must clarify it. Merchant (2001: 150) discusses a specific kind of sluicing known as contrast sluicing where 'information contents with sluice wh-phrase clash with their corresponding content' 14.

(11) A. Mustafa's drawing, but I can't think   why/where/whom   English
　　B. Mustafa   yarsim   walakin ma-a ʕrəf   leiš/ wein/ el-man   Iraqi Arabic

Mustafa   drawing.3ms   but   NEG-know.1S-NEG   why/where/whom

(12) A. Mustafa met someone, but I don't know who   English
     B. Mustafa qabel   wahed   lakin ma-qal   meno/yaho   IA
        Mustafa qabel.3ms someone   but NEG-said.3MS-NEG who
        'Mustafa met someone , but he didn't say who.'
(13) A. Mustafa is drawing. I can't imagine what   English
     B. Mustafa yersum   welakin ma- aʕrəf   šenu   Iraqi Arabic
        Mustafa yersum.3ms but NEG-know.1S-NEG   what
        'mustafa is drawing , but I don't know what'
(14) A. she has three phones, bu I don't know howmany headphones   English
     B. ʕendha thalath mobilat lakin ma- aʕrəf   kam samma'a   Iraqi Arabic
        'She has two phones, but I don't know how many headphones.'

3.1.2 Effects of form identity in Iraqi Arabic sluice
The cross-linguistic argument for the assertion that sluicing arises from wh-movement accompanied by the deletion of TP is that it has form-identity consequences such as morphologic case matching and precipitation stranding (toma, 2020). The case matching and the prepositional anomalies clearly defined from this form of study in sluicing. In addition to other language-specific sluicing details, this section looks into the effects of form-identity on IA sluicing systems to decide if they are proof of IA sluicing from standard wh-questionens.

3.2 Generalizing Form-Identity: Matching case
Form (1):
The sluiced wh-phrase only shows its equivalent in the preceding sentence in case-marking languages. Within the Typical Arabic wh-remnant in (15), for instance, ʔayy 'who' has Accusative Case and corresponds to the case of a car in the example below"sayratin" .The effect is an ungrammatical sluicing if the Wh-remnant carries a case other than that of the correlation. The case-marking influence should not however be seen as proof that Iraqi-Arabic sluicing derives from the Wh-questions. Contemporary Arabic dialects of IA are not case-marking languages. Whichever syntactic position it takes in the sentence, the sluiced wh-word takes the same structure. The wh-word sluice must bear the evidence of its correlation (Merchant 2001).
(15) eshtra ahmed-un sayarat-an lakin ma aʕrif ʔayy sayarat-in
   Bought.3ms Ahmed-Nom a car-ACC but   NEG know.1s which-NOM/which-ACC car -GEN
   'Ahmed bought a car but we don't know which car'.

Form (2):
The P-stranded is accounted to ensure proof that sluicing is obtained by Wh-movement and TP- deletion from wh- questions. For eg, English permits P-stranding on wh-movement; therefore possible on sluicing (Joo, 2015). P stranding in   Iraqi-Arabic is not required in a normal wh-motion, (16) and thus generalisation

of P-stranding predicts that the P-stranding neither is allowed in sluice. This is not the highest guess, unexpectedly; P-stranding during sluicing is allowed by I A and is thus a counterexample to PSG (17).   That means this form-identity influence could not be taken strictly as evidence of the assumption that IA sluicing comes from usual wh-questions.

(16) mino etassal mustafa mʕa
   Who called.3ms Mustafa with?
   " who did Mustafa called with?'

(17) Mustafa hecha   mʕa wahed lakin ma-aʕrəf   mino
  Mustafa spoke .3ms   with   someone but NEG-know.1S-NEG who

Form (3)

A language (L) enables preposition under sluicing if (L) enables preposition stranding under regular wh-movement. Merchant (2001) has adapted the initial idea by Ross (1969), and he concluded that sluicing was a product of stranding into normal wh-movement, with consistency of (Ross 1969, McCloskey 1995) framework.

In sluicing-COMP generalisation, any phonologically implemented material such as complementariness, auxiliaries etc, which may appear in the COMP in sluicing, is subject to cross-language constraints. The COMP status has to be null in Iraqi Arabic sluicing as in the example (18).

In the COMP domain, no auxiliaries or complementizes exist. Merchant (2001) stated that No non-operator content can appear in COMP in sluicing, Operator here corresponds to the phonological constituent of the wh-phrase itself and "COMP" implies as normal all CP-dominated, but not TP-dominated, content (Slavkov, 2014). The generalisation in (18) rule out all sluicing components that do not form part of the wh-phrase itself: motions such as clitics, auxiliaries, etc., as well as base components such as completizers themselves.

In Iraqi Arabic, any phonologically realised material like complementary, auxiliaries, etc., which might appear in sluicing within the COMP domain, is restricted in cross-language. Sluicing, COMP must be null (18); COMP domain can not contain complementary or auxiliary components;

(18) Mustafa kan ysoogh fi sayara lakin ma-aʕrəf   ayya sayara (kan / ille)
  Mustafa was.3ms drive a car   but NEG-know.1S-NEG which car (was/that)
  Mustafa was driving a car, but I don't know which car (was/that)

Form (4)

Initially, despite the statement by Merchant, (2001) that the absence of sluicing-induced island effects cannot be treated as the homogeneous phenomenon (who differ in clausual islands from non-clausual islands and only late in them to give the hypothesis that the islands can be a PF-induced phenomenon) (Sungshim Hong, 2016).

The method developed here covers all legitimate sluicing violations. Where the island can be traced to a CED (or barrier) effect derived from the PIC. This can be the sentential subject constraint, the subject condition, the additional condition and complex noun sentence restriction (both with the relative provisions and the

complementary provisions Subsection clause) and the generalisation of freezing (Duguine & Irurtzun, 2014).(300 C19)

Although there is strong evidence that sluicing is the result of normal questions in the form of identity, sluicing is insensitive to the Islands form, as indicated by Merchant (2008), Lasnic (2007). Thus, if sluicing is derived by regular wh-movement, and is thus subject to its restrictions, what seems to be grammatical sluicing actually stems from grammatically incorrect island-violating structures (Antonelli, 2017). Sluicing is insensitive to Syntactic Iceland as in other languages in Iraqi Arabic.

In non-elliptical questions, the distribution of the front wh-questions is subject to island restrictions; nevertheless, it is not in sluicing. Displaced wh-phrases can have an explicit correlation within an island (20a), (21a); in non-elliptic wh questions this can not be allowed because of an island violation as in the two examples below:

(19) A. Mark and someone were walking together, but I don't know who.
      B. Mark and someone were walking together, but I don't know who$_i$ (mark and t$_i$ were walking together).
 (20) A. Mustafa wa wahed kan-o yamsho lakin ma-aʕrəf   mino
    Mustafa   and someone were. 3MP walking. 3MP but NEG-know.1S-NEG who
    'Mustafa and someone were walking, but I don't know who.'

  B. ….lakin   ma-aʕrəf   mino$_i$ Mustafa wa t$_i$ kan-o   yamsh-o
     But NEG-know.1S-NEG whoi mustafa and ti were. 3MP walking. 3MP
     But I don't know whoi mustafa and ti were walking'.
 (21)A. Muna taghdab   etha yeʕzem   wahed min jeran lakin ma-aʕrəf   mino
     Muna get angry .3SF when invite 3MS one of neighbour-his but NEG-know.1S-NEG who
     'Muna feel angry when he invites one of his neighbour, but I don't know who'
 B. ….Lakin ma-aʕrəf   minoi Muna taghdab etha yeʕzem   ti
     But NEG-know.1S-NEG whoi Muna be-angry 3SM when invites.3MS ti
     '……but I don't know who Muna feel angry wheni he invites ti'

The sluices under (A) above indicate that the wh-phrase is not limited by island restrictions as is the case with the non-elliptical wh-movement under (B). This is really a cross-linguistic fact concerning sluicing which appears to ameliorate the effects of the island sluicing techniques. According to PF deletion concept, the distinction between wh-movement in non-elliptical wh-questions and sluicing is that the island results in sluicing are phenomena of PF (Lasnik 2001, Merchant 2008). Consequently, even before the PF application, a deviance of the specification that includes the violation excluded (Lasnik 2007). Therefore, the pronunciation of the island in question is the source of the violation.

4. Stranding in the sluicing preposition
There has been much study to decide if pre-position sluicing may be allowed in a non-preposition language. Stjepanović conducted a research in 2008 on whether it is possible in Serbo-Croatian, a non-prepositive language. She reached the conclusion that there was insufficient evidence to contradict Ross' original claim (Chernova,

2017). She found however that in Croatian serbo-sluicing a preposition might be either lost or removed from a sentence. Further study will be carried out to validate the official explanation for this lack of preposition-loss (Yeun-Jin Jung, 2018).

In wh-movement, Merchant (2001) suggests that sluicing preposition stranding be permitted only in those languages that support normal p-stranding. While data from various languages enhanced by preposition stranding generalisation have been presented by Merchant (2001), recent research have revealed examples of languages which have no P-stranding, and which permit preposition under sluicing.

Iraqi Arabic is clearly another alternative exemplified in the paradigm (22) of p-stranding generalisation. It is a non-p-stranded language; because the p stranding is not permitted under normal wh-movement; however, sluicing is possible. Sluices, which violate the p-stranded generalisation, believed not to be the outcome of standard wh-questions, but of a copular source. Throughout this article I would claim that, considering its simplistic appearance like true sluicing, Iraqi sluicing in the form of p-stranding comes from elliptical wh-clefts and not standard wh-questions.

(22) A. Mustafa hicha   mʕa   wahed lakin ma-aʕrəf mʕa mino
        Mustafa called.3MS with someone but NEG-know.1S-NEG with who
        'Mustafa spoke with someone, but I don't know with whom'
    B. …lakin ma-aʕrəf   Mino.
         But   NEG-know.1S-NEG who
     '... But I don't know who'

4.1 P-stranding linguistic form of sluicing

The languages differ in relation to p-stranding licencing in normal, transparent travel. In certain languages, p -stranding is allowed, but not other languages (Kotek, 2013). Therefore, it appears that languages chose one of the two alternatives provided in support of whether or not an adposition permits a Wh-DP to be replaced in a language. Depending on the syntactical behaviour, the Merchant (2001) presents the cross-language generalisation in relation to sluicing that ' A language L will allow preposition stranding under sluicing if L allows preposition stranding under regular wh-movement ' (Merchant 2001: 92).

In favour of p-stranding generalisation, Merchant (2001) provides evidence from many p-stranding and non- p-stranding languages. English, Danish، French, Norwegian and Swedish, are among the languages studied by Merchant. Some examples from Merchant's languages (2001) are as follows:

(23) A. mark was speaking with someone, but I do not know (with) who   English
     B. who was speaking with?
(24) A. Mark har talat med någon; jag vet inte (med) vem.   Swedish
        Mark has talked with someone I know not with who
     B. Vem   har   Mark   talat   med?
        Who   has   Mark   talked with
 (25)A. Adrian har snakket med en eller anden, men jeg ved ikke(med) hvem. Danish
        Adrian has   talked with one or another but I know not with who

   B. Hvem har   Adrian   snakket   med?

     Whom   has   Adrian   talked   with

(26) A. Luna   hat   mei ien   sprutsen,   mar ik wyt net (mei) wa   French

    Luna has with someone spoked but I know not with who

   B. Wa hat Luna mei sprutsem?

    Who was Luna with speak

Such languages allow P stranding in standard wh-movement; hence, P-stranding permitted in sluicing. There are a groups of languages consists of those that in standard wh-movement do not allow p-stranding and anticipate that sluicing is not also allowed . Languages such as   German, Yiddish, Russian, Czech, Bulgarian, Polish and many other languages Including the French, Hebrew and Italian languages,. Merchant (2001: 94-9) provides the following illustrations;

(27)A. Anna hat mit jemandem gesprochen, aber ich weiB nicht, (mit) wem   German

   Anna has with someone spoken but I know not with who

 B. Wem hat sie mit gesprochen?

  Who has she with spoken?

(28) A. Anna rozmawiałaz kimś, ale nie wiem (z) kim   Polish

   Anna spoke with someone but not I.know with who

 B. Kim rozmawiałaAnna z?

   who spoke Anna with

(29) A. Pietro ha parlato con qualcuno, ma non so ?(con) chi   Italian

    Pietro has spoken with someone but not I.know with who

  B. Chi ha parlato Pietro con?

   Who has spoken Pietro con

(30) A. I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe ksero *(me) pjon   Greek

   The Anna spoke with someone but not I.know with who

 B.   Pjon   milise   me?

    Who   she .spoke with

(31) A. Ivan srechtna   [njakoi | njakogo]   Bulgarian

   John met.3rd. SG Someone   someone .Non-S

   John met someone

  B. Ivan tancuva [s   njakoi |s   njakogo]

   Ivan dance   with someone .G   with someone NON-S

   Ivan danced with someone.

  C. [Njakoi |Njakogo]   tancuva.

   someone.G   someone.non-S   danced.

   Someone danced.

The examples offer evidence for the generalisation of Merchant; nevertheless, data from other languages tend to disprove this generalisation on closer examination. Although the design of sluicing in certain non-p-stranding languages is in breach of the p-stranding generalisation, the ramifications of this infringement must be explored in order to deduce the fundamental structure of p-stranding sluicing.

4.2 The Violation of P-Stranding Under Sluicing

The Portuguese Brazilian sluices are a regular consequence of questions raised by Almeida and Yoshida (2006). We claim that the sluicing of BP is not an underlying copular cause, and thus offers more evidence for the theory of merchant by adding a variety of merchant (2001) sluicing diagnostics. Nonetheless, BP is an argument of the PSG. While BP is a language, that p stranding in sluicing permitted and is regarded by native speakers to be quite natural and appropriate (Almeida and Yoshida 2007: 352). Prepositioning and Pied-piping is essential in normal wh-questions (32a, b), but optional in the case of sluicing (33a, b) from (Yoshida and Almeida 2007: 350):

(32) A. Com   quemi   que a Francisca Ela caminha   ti ?
            With   whoi that the Francisca   walked   ti
            With whom did Francisca walked?'

      B. Quemi que a Francisca Ela caminha   com ti?
            Whoi   that the   Francisca   walked with ti
         'Who did Francisca walked with?'

(33) A. Francisca Ela caminha com alguém, mas eu não lembro com quemi a̶   F̶r̶a̶n̶c̶i̶s̶c̶a̶
         The Francisca walked with someone but I not remember with whoi t̶h̶e̶   F̶r̶a̶n̶c̶i̶s̶c̶a̶
w̶a̶l̶k̶e̶d̶ t̶i̶
                      w̶a̶l̶k̶e̶d̶ t̶i̶
        'Francisca walked with someone, but I don't remember with who.'

     B. A Francisca Ela caminha   com alguém, mas eu não lembro quemi   a̶ F̶r̶a̶n̶c̶i̶s̶c̶a̶ E̶l̶a̶
c̶a̶m̶i̶n̶h̶a̶   c̶o̶m̶ t̶i̶.
         The Francisca walked with someone but I not remember whoi t̶h̶e̶   F̶r̶a̶n̶c̶i̶s̶c̶a̶ w̶a̶l̶k̶e̶d̶
w̶i̶t̶h̶ t̶i̶
     'Francisca walked with someone, but I don't remember who.'

As a proof of their argument that sluicing in BP, the non-p stranding language, permits a   pied-piping   or stranding of   the   preposition   as   in (33)   , which is similar to   the counterproof of Merchant generalisation in Yoshida and Almeida (2007). Nevins (2009) argue, however, that BP is no counterexamples for p-stranding generation since that language has two sources of IP elliptical structure: sluicing   and   pseudosluicing.   Van   Craenenbroeck   (2007),   suggest   that the sluicing in p-stranding originating from a central copular root (cleft) rather than standard wh-questions (34) (P: 7).

(34)   A Francisca Ela caminha   com alguém, mas eu não sei
            The Francisca walked with someone but I not know
      A. quem q̶u̶e̶ a̶ F̶r̶a̶n̶c̶i̶s̶c̶a̶ w̶a̶l̶k̶e̶d̶ c̶o̶m̶.
            Who that the Francisca walked with
      B. quem é̶ (̶c̶o̶m̶)̶ q̶u̶e̶ a̶ F̶r̶a̶n̶c̶i̶s̶c̶a̶ E̶l̶a̶ c̶a̶m̶i̶n̶h̶a̶
            Who was with that the Francisca walked
            'Francisca walked with someone, but I don't know who.'

P- stranding appear to behave similarly in the Spanish sluices. (Šarić, 2015) further claim that the violation of sluicing p-stranding does not emerge from ordinary wh-questions, but from the underlying copular clauses as set out in (35).

(35) Francisca ha Ella anduvo   con una chica
     Francisca has walked with a girl

A. pero no sé cuál es la chica con la que ha Ella anduvo Francisca.
   But not known which is the girl with the that has walked with Francisca

B. pero no sé [CP cuál[IP es [DP la chica [RC con la que ha Ella anduvo Francisca]]]
   But not know which is the girl   with the that has walked with Francisca
   'Francisca walked with a girl, but I don't know which (girl it was with which she walked
with).'

This claim is a further reinforced by the assumption that blocking the copular source
will contribute to ungrammaticity because the copular clause is essentially the only
framework underlying the sluice as in (35). The checking of 'else modification' in
clefts and sluices that break p-stranding generalisation appears obvious in the example
(35).

In p-stranding circumstances, sluicing with else-modification is not allowed and the
cleft with other amendment is not grammatical as seen in (36a&b) below,
respectively. In standard wh-questions as in (37) below, else-modification is
justifiable; thus, grammatical is not p-stranding sluices. As the p-stranded sluices are
not allowed for any other else-modification it also considers that otherwise, which is
the right rule, the alteration should also not be included in stored clefts.

The following illustrations modified to endorse claim from Nevins et al. , 2009, P:
179- 184.

(36)A Francisca ha Ella anduvo 'con una chica rubia, pero no sé *(con) qué chica más'.
   Francisca has walked with a girl blonde but not know with what girl else.
   'Francisca walked with a blonde girl, but I don't know to what other girl.'

B. No sé qué chica más es la chica con la que ha Ella anduvo Francisca
   Not know what girl else is the girl with the that has walked Francisca
   'I don't know which girl it was with whom Francisca walked'

(37) ¿Con qué chica más ha Ella anduvo Francisca?
   With what girl else has walked Francisca
   'With which other girl did Francisca walked with?'

Besides that, it should be noted that despite the fact of English being a p-stranding
language, as many linguistics points out, it is not possible to a certain class of
prepositions with certain contexts.

(38) A. which hotel did you book a room in?
     B. whose wishes did Ahmed travelled against?

(39) A. In which hotel did he book a room?
     B. against whose wishes did he travelled?

English p-stranding violations are often the outcome of a cleft as in (40b) and (41b)
which are underlying, and not a wh-question, and is a trend for BP and Spanish. There

appears to be copular constructions in which an appropriate wh-question is not accessible (Vangsnes, 2017). In this term it worthy to know that the preposition and stranding was used long before any English speaker objected it (Antonelli, 2017).

In conventional English language, many sources find it reasonable. The major literature filled with the so-called final prepositions from Chaucer, Milton, Shakespeare, and King James interpretations of the Bible (Chernova, 2017).

Mignon Fogarty says that almost all grammarists confident that, at least in certain cases, it is fine to end a sentence with such as prepositions (Duguine & Irurtzun, 2014). The traditional english use by Fowler suggests among the most widespread myths regarding English prepositions is that they properly belong prior to their word or phrase (Joo, 2015).

Consequently, the clause or paragraph may not be inserted at the end. Probably the poet John Dryden created the first proscription in 1673 against the stranding in English (Kotek, 2013). When the phrase "the bodies that those souls have been frightened of' was objected to by Ben Jonson in 1611. Dryden did not clarify whether he felt that the expression would be restructured to include the preposition (SHIMADA, 2008).

Dryden also influenced his Latin work, which he thought was short, graceful and an expanded language to equate his writing with. Dryden may have adapted Latin grammar to English since the Latin doesn't really have sentences ending in prepositions and thus defines the law of non-phrase-end prepositions (Slavkov, 2014).

Other authors adopted it consequently. Many grammarists assisted analogy with Latin, such as Robert Lowth. In 1762, he wrote A Short Introduction to English Grammar, and he used construction. For informal than formal English, it was more appropriate (Sungshim Hong, 2016).

He also said ' This language is a language to which English is strongly inclined; it prevails in common dialogue'. He also suggested that It will fits well with the familiar writing style; but it is more graceful to place the preparation before the relative (toma, 2020). Furthermore, it will be clearer and much more in agreement with the Solemn and high Style. The proscription is still taught in schools in the early 21st century (Vangsnes, 2017). In the examples blow from van Craenenbroeck (2007) explain this issue more clearly (p: 9).

(40) Ahmed slept in a room in some hotel, but I do not know which hotel
A. ?? …but I don't know in which hotel.
B …but I don't know which hotel it was.
    C. ?? …but I don't know in which hotel it was

(41) Ahmed travelled against someone's wishes, but I do not know whose.
 A. ? …but I don't know against whose wishes.
 B ……..but I don't know whose it was.
    C. ? …but I don't know against whose wishes it was.

5. The violation of P-stranding in Iraqi-Arabic under sluicing

The Iraqi-Arabic appears to be a counterexample of the generalisation of the preposition stranding. The Iraqi-Arabic restricts standard wh-movement, of p-stranding characteristics, but still allows sluicing of p- beaches.

The prepositionless versions of the sluices are the same as and not less than the version of the piping in Iraqi-Arabic. Actually, the two variants are considered equal, justifiable and interchangeable on a consistent basis. This section examines the connections between sluicing and p-stranding in sluicing Iraqi-Arabic and tries to address for the apparent infringement of p-Stranding.

While p-stranding in Iraqi-Arabian as in (42) is not allowable, a preposition can be stranded in a wh-question if the subject is formulated with the complementiser ille.in the same way   a pronoun is resumed in relation to the preposition, which refers to the wh-remnant as in (43). The result is an ungrammatical structure when such a pronoun is not used.

(42) A. mʕa mino Mustafa masha?
    With whom Mustafa walked .3MS
    'With whom did Mustafa walked '

  B. Mino Mustafa masha mʕa?
    Who Mustafa walked .3MS with
    'Who did Mustafa walked with?'

Resumptive pronouns with in wh-questions and P-stranding
(43) Mino ille Mustafa masha mʕa-ah?
    Who that Mustafa walked .3MS with-him
    'Who did Mustafa walked with?'

P stranding under sluicing
(44)A. Mustafa masha mʕa wahed lakin ma-aʕrəf   mʕa mino
    Mustafa walked .3MS with someone   but NEG-know.1S-NEG with who
    'Mustafa walked with someone, but I don't know (with) who(m).'

  B. … lakin ma-aʕrəf mino[Mustafa masha   mʕa]
    But NEG-know.1S-NEG who [Mustafa walked.3MS with]
    '…but I don't know who [Mustafa walked with].'
  C. …lakin ma-aʕrəf mino [ille Mustafa masha mʕa-ah]
    but NEG-know.1S-NEG who[that Mustafa walked.3MS with-him]

Sluicing seems to be derived from a wh-question that does not have the structure of the preceding as in clause (44) with regard to p-stranding. Brazilian Portuguese sluicing under p stranding said to come from an underlying copular source in non-p-stranding languages, such as Spanish. While other languages tend to violate the PSG, they are a counterexample to the generalisation of Merchant.

Stjepanovic (2006) argued that p-stranding in Serbo-Croatian sluices in violation of the PSG do not require movements of the PP component. The problem at present is

whether Iraqi-Arabic patterns with these languages in that it is a common source, such as the cleft, that sluice in p-stranding constructions comes from.

I'll argue that non-regular wh-interrogative sluices that violates the PSG (the non-interrogative as wh-interrogative, which uses the complementary ille) are extracted by wh-movement and deletion by TP at the PF. Due to the fact that the only structure possible underlying a p-beach is ille-type wh-questions.

In order to explain the internal mechanism and formulation of sluicing under p-stranding it seems appropriate to explore an inner syntactical framework for that type of interrogative.

5.1 The syntax of ille-interrogatives

The interrogative form of Ille contains a wh-phrase in a clause first, preceded by the complementary ille, and the wh-word connected to a resumptive pronoun as in (45). The wh-phrase shows clause-initially in standard wh-interrogatives, and connected with a gab that labels the subject position connected by a wh-expression as in (46).

(45) Yaho ille Mustafa masha mʕa-ah?
     Who that Mustafa walked .3MS with-him
     'Who did Mustafa walk with?'
(46) mʕa minoi Mustafa masha ti ?
     With who Mustafa walked.3MS ti
     'With whom did Mustafa walk?'

The composition of unknown interrogators is defined by the usage of the ille particle. In Iraqi-Arabian or other contemporary spoken Arabic dialects, like Palestinians, the specific ille acts as a relativizer. The particle ille, interestingly, is not really a true relative pronoun as it shows complementary properties and features.

For eg, ille-interrogatives may not be used as a complementary prposition to the incorporated clauses. In this, unresolved questions are the same as in English. The complementary. Therefore, when a structure like the man I wrote to is English grammar, the man to whom I wrote a letter is not.

The same is true for Iraqi-Arabic, which shows that ille-interrogatives questions complement one another in relative measure. It appears that in (44) the underlying structure of p-stranding does not match the regular structure of wh-questioning, suggesting that the sluice does not derive from standard wh-questions.

The other solution is, therefore, to sluice from a copular (i.e., cleft) source in p stranding contexts, as in BP and Spanish. This statement can not be promising regardless of the fact that current copulas are covert in Iraqi-Arabic. It is possible to analyse ille-interrogatives as copular frameworks if some (pro) nominal components deemed optional.

(47) Mustafa, masha mʕa waħed
     Mustafa walked.3MS with someone
       A. lakin ma-ʕrafna mino (hu) ille Mustafa, masha mʕa-ah
     But NEG-knew.1P-NEG who PRON.he that Mustafa walked.3MS with-him

B. lakin ma-ʕrafna mino ~~(hu) (ir-rajel) ille Mustafa masha mʕa-ah~~

   but NEG-knew.1P-NEG who PRON.he the-man that Mustafa walked.3MS with-him

    'Mustafa walked with someone, but we didn't know who'

No copula or expletive 'it' as in (47a, b) suggests that these sluice-styles are cases of real sluice. Indeed, the copular structure "it was" in Iraqi-Arabic is not well formed. Nevertheless, an insightful examination of the data still seems possible to derive sluice from a copular source.

The idea that pronouns, acting as copulas, and a noun that occur in the positions between the wh phrase and the 'ille-clause' as shown in this hypothesis is empirically confirmed by (47a, b).

Copular verbs are typically used to connect the argument to the predicate. A pronominal copulas (PRON) in Iraqi-Arabic may perform this task in various ways, suggesting the inherent interaction of certain PRON with other copula-like properties.

(48) Al- alddabit (huwwa) Al-shareef

   The police officer PRON.he the- honest

   'The police officer is the honest person.'

(49) Mustafa mo-huwwa Al- alddabit

   Mustafa NEG-PRON.he-NEG the- police officer

   'Mustafa is not the police officer'

(50) Ahmed ma-kteb Al-wajib

   Ahmed NEG-wrote.3MS-NEG the-homework

   'Ahmed did not write the homework.'

In Iraqi-Arabic, PRON's syntactical behaviour suggests the combination of nominal and verbal features in that it's an influential verb. In fact, some scholars thought of PRON as an almost verb. PRON in (49) for instance is surrounded by negatively influenced verbs such as the past tens in (50).

The present type of 'be' that Semitic languets neglect can not be viewed as a copula, however. The implementation of the agreement features in I(nfl) is widely considered in PRON. PRON's obligatory condition in (48) shows I need to be planned.

During the past tense I overtly "be" hosts, however PRON is typically rendered to me in the present tense. The existence of PRON indicates that a predictive association is formed by PRON, without which no other correlation can be made. The statement that PRON in I or AGR under I is created appears to be supported by Fassi Fehri (1993).

It can be argued that sluicing is derived from a copular clause based on Doron 's analysis of PRON (1986). This appears to be valid if we take account of the fact that the only structure that can derive from a p-stranded sluice allows (pro) nominals to appear between the wh- phrase. In comparison, the relativiser ille and a clear or implied DP between the pronominal copula and ille clause contribute to the structure:

[wh-phrase + (PRON) + (DP) + ille clause]

5.2 **Ille-interrogatives as a role of   clefts**

A cleft is a pattern of English grammar in which some components of a sentence transferred from their usual location to a separate clause to give them further emphasis. A cleft sometimes called a splinter phrase, a splinter form and a splintering paragraph.

In (2009), Nevins et al. claimed that a hollow term is a word, which is separated (split) to emphasis on one part thereof. The primary term then replaced by a verb expression, which is normally the main verb. The centred part preceded, followed by a relative pronoun, relative determinant or relative adverb for the remainder of the paragraph.

For example   if we take the paragraph (mark felt a strong pain after breakfast), there are two possible cleft expressions can be formed are (was Mark who felt strong pain after breakfast), and (it was after breakfast that mark felt a strong pain).

Consider the basic declarative expression, for instance: "Steve went to the movie last week." In order to illustrate one item, the term could be interpreted in a variety of ways:

1. It was **Steve** who went to the movie last week.
2. It was to the **movie** that Steve went last week.
3. It was **last week** that Steve went to the movie.

The English language includes many variations of cleft structures, although the two primary forms are wh-clefts and it-clefts. Wh-clefts use "wh" words, which is generally "what" in construction. In addition, why, where, etc. are also can be applied. Copulas are covert in Arabic, present tense. Thus, a zero copula of cleft in the language is anticipated. The cleft in Iraqi-Arabic are composed of an optional pronominal copula (PRON) or (NP), and a Relative Clause. For eg, adverbial phrases can't be clefted, the elements that can be clefted are restricted.

This appears to clarify why ille-questioning is not easy to use for adverbial sentences. Since Iraqi-Arabic does not provide a specific 'it,' just the pseudo-cleft approach is used. However, what seems to be a clefted in Iraqi-Arabic is simply a pseudo-cleft.

(51) Mustafa (huwwa) ille akel petzza

    Mustafa ((PRON.he) that Ate .3MS pizza

    'It is Mustafa who ate pizza.'

(52) fel-madrassa (hiyya)   ille Mustafa sawaa haditha

     In the school (PRON. he) that Mustafa made.3MS an accident

    ' It is in the school that Mustafa had an accident .'

Pseudo clefts may be interpreted as identical copular clauses, since an equalisation with the subject NP can be accomplished with the free / headless relative clause (the predicate) (Declerck 1984). That is not astounding; the same trend is evident in languages like Malagasy, as stated by Malay in (Paul 2001) and Regular Arabic as sported by research of (Ouhalla 2004).

Although there are no head nouns in headless relative clauses, they may act as DP / NP as sported by (Harris and Campbell 1995). It is because unheaded relatives have somaticized a word in languages such as Iraqi-Arabic, Malagasy and Malays as explained in the example (52) which is also synonymous with (53).

(52) ille akel petzza (huwwa) mustafa.

    that ate.3MS petzza (PRON.he) Mustafa

  'The one who ate petzza is Mustafa.'

Such evidence indicate that a pseudo-cleft may be studied what seems to be a 'it-cleft' corresponding Iraqi-Arabian structure. This is why copular clauses composed of [NP PRON NP] considered as Arabic clefts. The wh-question in (54) may also therefore be claimed as a cleft wh-question that shows the form in (55):

(53) mino$_i$ t$_i$ (howwa) (il-walad) ille sawwa hadeth

    Who   t$_i$ (PRON.he) (the-boy) that made.3FS an accident

    lit. 'Who is the boy that had an accident?'

(54) '[CP WH-PHRASEi [TP ti (PRON) [(DP) [CP ille [TP]]]]]'

Because p-stranding sluicing is just focused on ille-type WH questioning, I recommend that an obvious violation of p-beach generalisation is not induced by sluicing. It comes from a copular source, a system whose TP is omitted in PF. Therefore, it recommended that Iraqi Arabic have two sources of TP-deletion: pseudo sluicing and sluicing. While pseudosluicing and sluicing may be extracted from wh-movement and TP- deletion, it only shows obvious that p-stranding effect results of pseudos-sluicing diplays   .

The assumption that wh- clefts cannot be driven by a preposition, as contrasted to standard wh-interrogatives, implies that no pied-piping or stranding of a preposition is necessary in ille interrogatives. Because there is no movement of the preposition in an ille-clause. The explanation appears to be in the complementary properties of ille in terms of its characteristics.

The reason could be that the complementiser ille has unexplainable characteristics that have to be tested, namely [uWH, uN, EPP]. [uN] is measured in conjunction with a nominal objective for the same feature; the characteristics [uWH, EPP] induce a wh-operator in some way to move with specCP (56). Therefore, C only attracts nominal constituents as an effective probe to move towards SpecCP; however, it accounts for incompatibility of non-nominal components with Ille.

The relative's head DP (which in itself may be a null pronoun) connect the nominal constructor. The pronominal clitic-ah-a'him as in (56) is a spelling out of the null wh-operator trace (or copy) that conducted by a pronominal clitic in the preposition.

(56) (ir-rajel) ille Mustafa masha mʕa-ah

    the-man that Mustafa walked.3MS with-him

    [DP (ir-rajel)[CP Opi. C ille[WH, EPP, N] [TP Mustafa masha mʕa Opi]]]

    the-man   that   Mustafa walked with

The concept in (56), therefore suggested to be derived of a cleft source, despite being simplified as sluicing, and thus a pseudo-sluicing illustration. Pseudo-sluicing generated from sluicing by wh-movement plus TP deletion at the structure of PF.

(57)   Mustafa   masha   mʕa waħed   lakin…
        Mustafa   walked.3MS with someone   but
    ma-aʕrəf [$_{CP}$ mani [$_{TP}$ ti (hu) [$_{DP}$ ille [$_{TP}$ Mustafa masha mʕa ah]]]].
    NEG-know.1S-NEG who (PRON.he) that Mustafa walked.3MS with-him
    'Mustafa walked with someone, but I don't know who'

Conclusions

Iraqi-Arabic is a non-p-stranding language which appears to be p-stranding under TP ellipses, while p-stranding under standard wh-movement is prohibited. The instance is prima facie proof against Merchant's (2001) p-stranding generalisation. In view of the characteristics and capabilities of pronominal copulas as well as the complementarity in ille-type wh-question, an illustration of pseudosluicing given its superficial sluicing appearance proposed that Iraqi-Arab Sluicing under p-stranding is a clogged source.

There are two consequences for the suggested account. Firstly, there are two examples of TP ellipsis in Iraqi-Arabic: pseudo -sluicing and sluicing. Sluicing is an elliptical wh-question example that corresponds to the generalisation of Merchant's p-stranding; while pseudo-sluicing is an elliptical clefting that occurs from the replacement of a clefted TP of a wh-phrase extracted pivot.

Furthermore, even pseudosluicing has apparent p-stranding consequences since wh-pivot of clefting cannot be driven by a pre-position. Such two forms of TP ellipse are basically generated from PF deletion of wh-movement and TP.

References
1. Alford, B. (1854). Notes And Queries. Geoffery Alford. s1-X(258), 289-289. doi: 10.1093/nq/s1-x.258.289d
2. Algryani, A. (2019). The Syntax of Sluicing in Omani Arabic. International Journal Of English Linguistics, 9(6), 337. doi: 10.5539/ijel.v9n6p337
3. Antonelli, A. (2017). WH-CLAUSES IN CLASSICAL PORTUGUESE: VERB MOVEMENT AND THE LEFT PERIPHERY | ORAÇÕES-WH NO PORTUGUÊS CLÁSSICO: MOVIMENTO DO VERBO E PERIFERIA ESQUERDA. Estudos Linguísticos E Literários, (58), 13. https://doi.org/10.9771/ell.v0i58.26803
4. Chao, W. (1987). On Ellipsis, unpublished Ph. D (Doctoral dissertation, dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst).
5. Chernova, E. (2017). On wh-movement in Spanish Echo Questions. Borealis – An International Journal Of Hispanic Linguistics, 6(2), 181-205. https://doi.org/10.7557/1.6.2.4146
6. Chomsky, N. & Lasnik, H. (1993). Principles and Parameters Theory. In Jacobs, J. von Stechow,A., Sternefield, W. & Vannemann, T. (eds.), Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research, 506-569. Berlin: de Gruyter.
7. Chomsky, N. (1972). Some empirical issues in the theory of transformational grammar. In Peters, S. (ed.), The goals of linguistic theory, 63-130. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs

8. Chung, S., Ladusaw, W. A. & McCloskey, J. (1995). Sluicing and Logical Form. Natural Language Semantics 3: 239–282.

9. Culicover, P., & Jackendoff, R. (2006). The simpler syntax hypothesis. Trends In Cognitive Sciences, 10(9), 413-418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.07.007

10.Declerck, R. (1984). The pragmatics of it-clefts and WH-clefts. Lingua, 64(4), 251-289. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(84)90065-2

11.Denison, C., & Kodadek, T. (1998). Small-molecule-based strategies for controlling gene expression. Chemistry & Biology, 5(6), R129-R145. doi: 10.1016/s1074-5521(98)90167-3

12.Duguine, M., & Irurtzun, A. (2014). From obligatory WH-movement to optional WH-in-situ in Labourdin Basque. Language, 90(1), e1-e30. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2014.0006

13. Erteschik-Shir, N., & Lappin, S. (1983). Under stress: A functional explanation of English sentence stress. Journal of linguistics, 19(2), 419-453.

14.Harris, A. C. & Campbell, L. (1995). Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

15.Herslund, M. (1984). Particles, Prefixes and Preposition Stranding. Nys, Nydanske Sprogstudier, 14(14), 34. doi: 10.7146/nys.v14i14.13331

16.Herslund, M. (1984). Particles, Prefixes and Preposition Stranding. Nys, Nydanske Sprogstudier, 14(14), 34. doi: 10.7146/nys.v14i14.13331

17.Joo, Y. (2015). Wh-Interrogative Acquisition and Wh-Movement in Child Language. Studies In Modern Grammar, 2015(83), 41-59. https://doi.org/10.14342/smog.2015.83.41

18.Kim,Sun-Woong. (2010). On the Reparability of Preposition Stranding. Linguistic Research, 27(1), 137-164. doi: 10.17250/khisli.27.1.201004.006

19.King, R., & Roberge, Y. (1990). Preposition Stranding In Prince Edward Island French. Probus, 2(3). doi: 10.1515/prbs.1990.2.3.351

20.Kotek, H. (2013). Intervention, covert movement, and focus computation in multiple wh-questions. LSA Annual Meeting Extended Abstracts, 4, 23. https://doi.org/10.3765/exabs.v0i0.797

21. Lasnik, H. (2001). When can you save a structure by destroying it? In Kim, M. & Strauss, U. (eds.), Proceedings of NELS 31, 301-320. Vol. 2. University of Massachusetts, Amherst: GLSA Publications.

22.Lasnik, H. (2007). On Ellipsis: The PF Approach to Missing Constituents. University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics 15, 143-153

23.Leung, M., Phan, V., & Leung, D. (2014). Endothelial function and left ventricular diastolic functional reserve in type 2 diabetes mellitus. Open Heart, 1(1), e000113. doi: 10.1136/openhrt-2014-000113.

24.Leung, T. (2014). The Preposition Stranding Generalization and Conditions on Sluicing: Evidence from Emirati Arabic. Linguistic Inquiry, 45(2), 332-340. doi: 10.1162/ling_a_00158

25.Lobeck, A. (1991). The phrase structure of ellipsis. In Rothstein, S. (ed.), Perspectives on Phrase Structure, 81-103. San Diego: Academic Press

26.Lugo-Candelas, C., Flegenheimer, C., McDermott, J., & Harvey, E. (2016). Emotional Understanding, Reactivity, and Regulation in Young Children with ADHD Symptoms. Journal Of Abnormal Child Psychology, 45(7), 1297-1310. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-016-0244-7

27.Merchant, J. (2001). The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis. Oxford University Press on Demand.

28. Nevins, A., Rodrigues C. & Vincente, L. (2009). Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and p-stranding. In Torck, D. & Wetzels W. L. (eds.), Romance Languages and

Linguistic Theory 2006: selected papers from 'Going Romance', Amsterdam, 7–9 December 2006. 175–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

29. Nevins, A., Rodrigues C. & Vincente, L. (2009). Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and p-stranding. In Torck, D. & Wetzels W. L. (eds.), Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2006: selected papers from 'Going Romance', Amsterdam, 7–9 December 2006.175–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

30. Ouhalla, J. (2004). Semitic Relatives. Linguistic Inquiry, 35(2), 288-300. https://doi.org/10.1162/002438904323019084

31. Paul, I. (2001). Concealed pseudo-clefts. Lingua, 111(10), 707-727. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0024-3841(00)00044-9

32. Phoocharoensil, S. (2017). Acquisition of English Preposition Pied-piping and Preposition Stranding. The International Journal Of Communication And Linguistic Studies, 15(2), 1-12. doi: 10.18848/2327-7882/cgp/v15i02/1-12

33. Pollman, T. (1975). Een regel die subject en copula deleert? Spektator 5, 282-292

34. Ross, J. R. (1969). Guess who? In Binnick, R., Davidson, A., Green, G. & Morgan, J. (eds.),Papers from the fifth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 252-286,Chicago Linguistic Society.

35. Slavkov, N. (2014). Long-distance wh-movement and long-distance wh-movement avoidance in L2 English: Evidence from French and Bulgarian speakers. Second Language Research, 31(2), 179-210. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658314554939

36. Sugisaki, K., & Snyder, W. (2002). The Acquisition Of Preposition Stranding And The Compounding Parameter. English Linguistics, 19(2), 291-307. doi: 10.9793/elsj1984.19.291.

37. Sungshim Hong. (2016). Even Wh-doublets Don't Move in a Language Without Wh-movement. Studies In Generative Grammar, 26(4), 427-451. https://doi.org/10.15860/sigg.26.4.201611.427

38. Takami, K. (1988). Preposition stranding. Lingua, 76(4), 299-335. doi: 10.1016/0024-3841(88)90022-8

39. toma, s. (2020). From Wh-Movement to Wh-In-Situ Acquisition of I-To-C Movement in English Interrogative Constructions by Kurdish Learners. Humanities Journal Of University Of Zakho, 8(1), 159-171. https://doi.org/10.26436/hjuoz.2020.8.1.585

40. Vangsnes, Ø. (2017). Wh-less degree questions. Nordic Atlas Of Language Structures Journal, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.5617/nals.5417

41. Yeun-Jin Jung. (2018). Coordinated Multiple Wh-questions in Wh-in-situ Languages: A Mono-Clausal Movement Analysis. Studies In Generative Grammar, 28(1), 91-125. https://doi.org/10.15860/sigg.28.1.201802.91

42. Young, L. (2008). Pied-piping and Preposition Stranding in Terms of Optimality Theory. Korean Journal Of English Language And Linguistics, 8(2), 251-264. doi: 10.15738/kjell.8.2.200806.251