



<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/hrls19>

Published online: 21 May 2009.

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

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>

## S Q U I B S

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 (1a), the subject of "go" can be either "Bill" or "his wife".

In (1b), 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.

---

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

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.  
≠ 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