Van Oirschot (1983) proposes a syntactic criterion to assess semantic relations holding between coordinated sentences. On the basis of this criterion he distinguishes four distinct types of coordination, which he calls (a) Identity Coordination, (b) Ordered Coordination, (c) Concurrent Coordination and (d) Concessive Coordination. This paper demonstrates that van Oirschot’s claim to the four types is unfounded and, hence, his theory is inadequate. Instead, it is argued that no syntactic criteria might at least in part explain whether coordinated sentences can be classified in order of decreased acceptability.

In the paper titled “Coordinated Sentences” van Oirschot proposes to examine semantic relations holding between coordinated sentences, syntactic relations. It is noted, will remain outside the scope of this analysis. However, he does not incorporate syntactic relations of coordinated sentences, as an examination of types of circumstances under which coordination is acceptable, as has often been the case, or as governed by acceptability judgments which rely largely on issues of common topicality extracted from coordination, because, as he rightly

---

notes in criticizing P. Liddell (1971), “a theory which endeavors to specify the circumstances under which sentences may correctly be coordinated, i.e., unambiguously the situations which may be reported on by means of a coordinated sentence is misguided” (1975).

In other words, van Oirschot does not want to rely on such criteria on the topicality of the coordinated sentences, he has recourse to the use of a syntactic device, the additive adjunct. That and as well as a means of extracting semantic characteristics. He claims that the presence of these additive adjuncts is coordinated sentences give rise to the generation of inferences which he classifies into two types: Incremental inferences, when the inferences are restricted to the sentence containing the additive adjunct, and Concessive, when the inferences extend beyond the bounds of the sentence at issue, relating it, or parts of it, to previous discourse.

These inferences affect in four ways or combination, which are: identity coordination, ordered coordination, concurrent coordination and Concessive coordination.

Identity coordination he calls coordinated sentences which always have either identical subjects or identical predicates. This type, therefore, can be specified by a particular formula:

\[
A \quad V \quad A
\]

To be denotes as a very good tennis-player, and Knoll is a very good tennis-player, too.

The second type of coordination he calls ordered coordination because “the order” in which the sentences occur is coordinate to the interpretation of the sentence (p. 142).

The third type of coordination he distinguishes in that concurrent coordination whereby sentences are “interrelating linked” by the presence of additive adjuncts.
The fourth and final type of coordination he terms **Conversational**, his characteristic being that, "neither instrumental nor existential interpretations seem to be available for this sort of coordination with an adverbial**.**" He adds that the conjunction is rendered incomprehensible with the addition of the adverb as well or too, the syntactic device he uses throughout his outline.

I propose to show three things: first, that, although von Ossows critiques, and quite rightly so, Richard Larson's (1971) theory of conjunction as misapplied, since it endeavors to specify the circumstances under which sentences may be coordinate**.** (p. 420), his account amounts to little else than what he criticizes. Second, in order to accept his four types of coordination, the criteria he proposes must stand on criticism. If there are counterexamples to his own, which however conform to the criteria he proposes then his theory collapses. Third, his four types of coordination are not genuine, distinct types, rather, unifying the same criteria, there can be proposed a method whereby we can classify coordinate sentences in order of decreased acceptability.

Indeed, identity Coordination means certain syntactic criteria and specific formulae can be set up, once a criterion for this type of coordination is that the two coordinated elements have certain identical subjects or identical predicates, as shown by the structures below. However, as far as the other three types of coordination are concerned, von Ossow does not give any syntactic criteria whereby the types can be identified.

Regarding the second type which he calls **Ordinary Coordination**, he refers to *identification of the entities involved* in the sentence. The adverbial is not present, the subject is not necessarily the same, but rather, the conjunction is used to indicate addition or opposition. However, he does not specify the nature of the relationship between the coordinated elements. Instead, he assumes that the conjunction is used to indicate addition or opposition, which is not always the case. For example, the conjunction *and* is used to indicate addition, while the conjunction *but* is used to indicate opposition.

Moreover, the presence of a conjunction does not necessarily indicate the presence of a coordinate sentence. For example, the sentence "I bought a new car and I sold my old car" does not contain a coordinate sentence. The conjunction *and* is used to indicate addition, not coordination.

However, this does not mean that the syntactic device for identifying coordinate sentences is not useful. In fact, it can be very useful in identifying the nature of the relationship between the coordinated elements. For example, if the conjunction *and* is used, it is likely that the sentence contains a coordinate sentence. However, if the conjunction *but* is used, it is likely that the sentence contains a contrastive sentence. Therefore, the presence of a conjunction does not necessarily indicate the presence of a coordinate sentence, but it can be useful in identifying the nature of the relationship between the coordinated elements.

It must be noted that von Ossow's theory of coordination is based on the idea that the conjunction is used to indicate addition or opposition. However, this idea is not always accurate. For example, the conjunction *and* is used to indicate addition, not opposition. Therefore, von Ossow's theory of coordination is not completely accurate.
They have four children, and they went to Spain last summer.

From being inconsequential, as predicted by van Oostendorp's theory, "as well" serves to mean (10) rather and. So one is inclined to classify (10) as a measure of Causal Coordination, or rather, an instance of coordination of decreased acceptability, despite the fact that it exhibits identity of subject terms. One is inclined to claim that not only the sharing of either subject or predicates in a necessary condition for the coordination type of increased acceptability, but also that the remaining terms which are not identical must be of a non-neutral form, i.e., of the same syntactic category, as in the case with van Oostendorp's example (17).

Envisaging a scale of acceptability, the next most acceptable type of coordination would be the coordination of non-clausal sentences or events which are in some temporal order, and, or exhibit a relation of cause and effect. However, since our knowledge of the world can afford us an explanation for the coordination of these two situations linguistically, any reference to the past of the presence or absence of the additive adjective in an explanation. Moreover, we would like to claim that the choice between the Incremental and Extensionsal coordination brought about by the additive adjective has a direct consequence of the degree of the relation that obtains between the two conjuncts.

Here specifically, the closer the relationship is between the two coordinated sentences the more likely we are to read as well as generating intra-sentential inferences, and the further the connection seems to be between them, the more likely we are to read as well as generating extratextual inferences. And this is as a result of our attempt to derive coherence in linguistic texts. We bring the knowledge of the world is used on what we read or hear. This is clearly shown in our previous analysis of the second type of coordination.

A schematic representation of this finding might be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Type</th>
<th>Degree of acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased acceptability</td>
<td>Decreased acceptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Aram's husband was never faithful to her and her best is 

(8) taking her to dinner tomorrow as well.

would again have to be an instance of Consecutive Coordination, since, as agree, there is no identity of any terms, the order does not seem to be relevant, and as well does not render it unacceptable.

The last type of coordination, Consecutive Coordination, seems to be, as has been already stated, the least acceptable. The syntactic test goes as follows: If you have as examples of coordination which becomes incomprehensible by the presence of the additive adjective, then there you find an instance of Consecutive Coordination. This example is the following.

(25) Alice is digging in the garden, and Peter is in the cell.

(26) Alice is digging in the garden, and Peter is in the cell as well.

(27) Peter is in the field, and Sue is ill.

With regard to these sentences, van Oostendorp argues that "they seem to say that they are doing something in common, merely making the sentence (27), i.e., the second sentence incomplete." The emphasis in the question, part 2, is to underline the function of the additive adjective, which is to bring about the common topic of the coordinated sentences. (Presumably, we can judge whether the coordination is acceptable, or not. Paying on the incremental criteria, van Oostendorp argues.

Having above, that there are counterexamples to his own, which, however, are not crucial, and because there are not four distinct types of coordination, we can wish to claim that the syntactic criteria of the presence of the additive adjective effects it a method whereby we can evaluate coordinated sentences in terms of a scale of increased acceptability.

Coordination of the first type is apparently the most acceptable one as the presence of the additive adjective does not bring about any difference in interpretation. However, although the syntactic formulae given for this type is supposed to secure some common topic of the two sentences, since either the subject or the predicate must be totally identical, it can be easily shown that this need not be the case.

Effect of presence of additive adjuct

A: Incorporated
B: Intratextual inferences
C: Extratextual inferences
D: Address

This scheme is more flexible and will therefore accommodate a much greater majority of coordinated sentences.

Thus coordinated sentences such as (27) or (28) will be accommodated within this scheme without worrying about the specific type in which they might belong since the four types of coordination proposed by van Oostendorp have been proved to be valid.

Now a final axiom both (25) and (26a) could be perfectly acceptable if uttered under certain circumstances. Suppose the conversation is about a party, and (24a) answers a question asking about Peter's and/or Sue's participation in it:

A: Do you know if Peter and Sue are coming tonight?

B: Peter is at another, and Sue is ill as well.

To conclude, it must be stressed that in this paper we have not addressed such questions as to which kinds of coordinated sentences seem to be more acceptable and more frequently used than others, or what to the significance of elliptical coordinated constructions as compared to their separated forms. Rather, we have concentrated on an account purporting to afford a method based on syntactic criteria whereby coordinated sentences can be classified into four distinct types. Having proved this theory unambiguously, we proposed instead that van Oostendorp's syntactic test can at best assign coordinated sentences along a continuum of decreased acceptability.

Notes

1. We's number is preserved throughout.

2. For a comprehensive critique of Robin Jackson (1970) see Kilts (1982).
Van Dreese (1980) defines identity as "nondestructive relative to a discourse."
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