This article was downloaded by: [Oregon State University]

On: 22 December 2014, At: 05:47

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH,

UK



Paper in Linguistics

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/hrls19

Deletion paths and the invasion of anaphoric Islands

Robert I. Binnick ^a, Georgia Green ^b & George Lakoff ^c

- ^a University of Kansas
- ^b University of Illinois
- ^c University of Michigan

Published online: 21 May 2009.

To cite this article: Robert I. Binnick, Georgia Green & George Lakoff (1971) Deletion paths and the invasion of anaphoric Islands, Paper in Linguistics, 4:1, 197-198, DOI: 10.1080/08351817109370253

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08351817109370253

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions

SQUIBS

Edited by Robert I. Binnick, University of Kansas and Georgia Green, University of Illinois

Deletion Paths and the Invasion of Anaphoric Islands*

George Lakoff University of Michigan

In his paper in CLS 6 called "Super EQUI-NP Deletion," John Grinder pointed out that examples like the following indicate the need for the concept of a "deletion path."

- (1) a. Bill said that going away would disturb his wife.
 - b. Bill said that it would disturb his wife to go away.
- In (la), the subject of "go" can be either "Bill" or "his wife".

In (lb), the subject of "go" can only be "his wife."

I would like to present some examples that work in the same way, but in a situation where there is no deletion as such involved, though there is incorporation of an anaphoric NP into an anaphoric island. Take the following examples:

- (2) a. Los Angeles claims that the fact that the local water tastes sour disturbs San Francisco.
 - b. Los Angeles claims that it disturbs San Francisco that the local water tastes sour.

The adjective "local" incorporates an anaphoric pronoun referring back to a city or district. (2a) is ambiguous, in that "local" may refer either to Los Angeles or San Francisco. In (2b), "local" can only refer to San Francisco. Similar examples can be given with "national".

- (3) a. Russia claims that the fact that national priorities are becoming less important upsets the U.S.
 - b. Russia claims that it upsets the U.S. that national priorities are becoming less important.

In (3a), "national" refers to either Russia or the U.S., while in (3b), "national refers only to the U.S. Such examples indicate that so-called deletion-path phenomena are more widespread than

is suggested by Grinder's paper.

On the Representation of Contain

Georgia M. Green University of Illinois

Expressions of the form x has y in it and x contains y seem to be synonymous in most of their uses:

- (1) a. This box has lentils in it.
 - b. This box contains lentils.
- (2) a. Organic cells contain DNA.
 - b. Organic cells have DNA in them.
- (3) a. This book has some good ideas in it.
 - b. This book contains some good ideas.

Although not in all:

- (4) a. His eye has a cinder in it.
 - ≠b. His eye contains a cinder.
 - c. This desk has 3 drawers in it.
 - \$\neq d\$. This desk contains 3 drawers.
- (5) a. Please have yourself in you.
 - b. Please contain yourself.

Under certain conditions, however, contain, even in the sense of (1), is not permitted while have . . . in is:

- (6) a. I emptied the box that had something in it, but I didn't see what.
 - *b. I emptied the box that contained something, but I didn't see what.
- (7) a. I emptied the box that had something in it, namely lentils.
 - *b. I emptied the box that contained something, namely lentils.

These conditions have to do both with the notion of emptying

^{*}This work was partially supported by grant GS-2939 from the NSF to the University of Michigan.