The MIT Press

Double Indices
Author(s): John Grinder
Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Autumn, 1971), p. 572
Published by: The MIT Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177667
Accessed: 14/06/2014 03:30

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Linguistic Inquiry.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 62.122.73.17 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 03:30:20 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

possible, given such a notation, for SOV languages such as Japanese to have *-prefixed rules in their grammars. In fact, however, I know of no cases in any SOV language, or in any strict VSO language, for that matter, where Langacker's *-notation is called for. All "true" cases of bidirectionality seem to be limited to VSO languages like English and French, where late rules have moved their subjects to the left of the verb. But if my conjecture is correct, that all cases of the important mirror-image phenomenon noted by Langacker are best regarded as consequences of converting underlying VSO order to derived SVO order, then there are no true cases of bidirectionality in syntax.

References

Langacker, R. W. (1969) "Mirror Image Rules I: Syntax," *Language* 45, 575–598.

McCawley, J. D. (1970) "English as a VSO Language," *Language* 46, 286–299.

Ross, J. R. (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Double Indices

John Grinder,
University of California at San Diego

While there are serious unsolved difficulties with the analysis of pronominalization processes in natural language, it seems clear that any adequate statement of the phenomenon will make use of the notion of reference. Consider the strings of (1a, b):

(1) a. It is clear why people call *Acid Eddie that.*
b. *Acid Eddie* says that *he* is always tripping.

The italicized elements in each sequence are intended to specify antecedent-anaphor pairs. In the (a) sequence the anaphor *that* obviously refers to the *name* of the individual who is called Acid Eddie. In the (b) sequence, on the other hand, the anaphor *he* clearly refers to the *individual* who is called Acid Eddie. The anaphors are not mutually substitutable as (2) shows:

(2) a. *It is clear why people call *Acid Eddie him.*
b. **Acid Eddie* says that *that* is always tripping.

Presumably the referential indices (adopting Chomsky's convention) will be of use in separating the antecedent-anaphor possibilities. If so, there are cases in natural language where a single surface lexical item/node will bear more than one referential index, for example:

(3) Even *Acid Eddie*'s mother calls *him that.*

This content downloaded from 62.122.73.17 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 03:30:20 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions