1. Introduction

- **Object**: semantic relations between verbs/VPs and their hyponyms/para-hyponyms.

Examples:

(1)  
    a. prendre : saisir  
    b. prendre : voler  
    c. prendre : dérober  
    d. donner : offrir  
    e. boire un café : savourer un café  
    f. nettoyer : balayer


X is a hyponym of Y iff F(X) entails, but is not entailed by F(Y) where F(-) is a sentential function satisfied by X and Y.

- Verbal hyponymy is much less investigated than nominal hyponymy:

  "hyponym-hyperonym pairs can be observed in all the major syntactic categories (...) but a short time with a dictionary will be sufficient to convince anyone that it is much easier to come up with nouns hyponyms than other types (...) the noun category is the natural home of hyponymy"

- **Hypothesis**: analysing the differences in rhetorical relations triggered at the lexical level by hyponym-hyperonym (henceforth h/H) verbal pairs is an efficient way to pin down the differences in the types of hyponymy relations verbs can instantiate.

Prima facie, the h-H verbal pairs given in (1) contribute to the same way to the interpretation of rhetorical relations between two sentences in asyndesis.

1. If the hyperonym is to the left (in A) and the hyponym to the right (in B), and if each element of B is either a hyponym, an anaphor or a repetition of the corresponding element in B, or has no corresponding element in A, we have what Danlos (2001) a case of Particularisation:

(2)  
   a. Fred a mangé son sandwich. Il l’a dévoré. 
   Fred ate his sandwich. He devoured it. (Particularization)
   b. Fred a mangé son sandwich. Il l’a savouré.
   c. Mon papa il a pris un poisson. Il l’a attrapé (ce matin)!
      My daddy he took a fish. He caught it!
   d. Fred m’a donné son ancien portable. Il me l’a offert.
      Fred gave me his old notebook. He offered it to me.

PS: another condition for Particularization to be triggered is that B does not include what Danlos (2001) calls a ‘marker of non-coreferentiality’ (an element impeding that A and B corefer, like next).

Particularisation takes place between two sentences A and B if the two sentences refer to the same event e and B conveys some new information about e.

2. If the hyperonym is to the right (in B) and the hyponym to the left (in A), and if each element of B is either a hyperonym, an anaphor or a repetition of the corresponding element in B, we have what Danlos (2001) calls a case of Generalization:

(3)  
   a. J’ai dévoré mon sandwich ce midi. Donc j’ai mangé. (Generalization)
   b. La tarte au pommes? Je l’ai dégustée ce matin. Je l’ai donc mangée.
   c. Mon papa il a attrapé un poisson. Donc il a pris quelque chose.
   d. Fred m’a offert son ancien portable. Il me l’a donné.

Since Particularization (a subcase of Elaboration, also possible with partial overlap) and Generalization (a subcase of Reformulation) are supposed to be incompatible with syntactic coordination (cf. Carston (2000), Txurruka (2003), Asher and Vieu (2005), Blakemore and Carston (2005), Zeevat and Jasinskaja (2007) like any other subordinating discourse relations, it is predicted that et should not be acceptable in such discourses.

This hypothesis rightly predicts the deviant character of the examples below:

(4)  
   a. # Fred a mangé son sandwich et l’a dévoré.
   b. # Mon papa il a pris un poisson et il l’a attrapé!
However, this generalization is falsified in at least three interesting ways.

1. With some h/H verbal pairs, the hyponym can be right-coordinated to its hyperonym

(6) a. Fred a mangé son sandwich et il l’a savouré.
   b. Il m’a donné son ancien portable et il me l’a offert.

Besides, with all h/H verbal pairs, sentences of the same type become much better once B contains an adjunct not present in A, when this adjunct appears post-verbally:

(7) a. Mon papa il a pris un poisson et il l’a attrapé ce matin.
   b. ?Mon papa il a pris un poisson et ce matin, il l’a attrapé.

2. Hyponyms can be left-coordinated with their hyperonym once donc is present in B, cf. also Winterstein (2010), Jayez and Winterstein (2011):

(8) a. J’ai dévoré mon sandwich ce midi et donc (oui) j’ai mangé.
   b. La tarte au pommes? Je l’ai dégustée ce matin et donc je l’ai mangée.

3. Researches in corpora show that lexical coordination (Abeillé (2006)) is sometimes acceptable between a hyponym and its hyperonym where sentential coordination is not:

(9) a. Tout au long d’un menu préparé par Martin Herrmann, vous dégustez-et-buvez les dix meilleurs vins Riesling de l’Ortenau. (Internet)
   b. # Tout au long d’un menu préparé par Martin Herrmann, vous dégustez les dix meilleurs vins Riesling de l’Ortenau et les buvez.

(10) a. Ma moutarde conserve-et-garde toute son onctuosité. (Internet)
   b. # Ma moutarde conserve toute son onctuosité et la garde.
   c. Son onctuosité, ma moutarde la-conserve-et-la-garde.

• Questions:

- Under which conditions is the sentential coordination acceptable between h/H verbal pairs? Why is donc sometimes obligatory? (section 2)

- Does the acceptability of the sentential coordination with h/H verbal pairs correlate with differences in the lexical semantics of each type of hyponyms, and if yes, how? what are the relevant classes of hyponyms? (section 3)

- Why is the lexical coordination easier to use between such verbal pairs than the sentential coordination? (section 4)
2. The condition of use of *A and B*

2.1. The question answer approach

2.1.1. Introduction

- Basic intuition: *et* is additive: for *A and B* to be appropriate, *B* must add something to what *A* provides.

- Theoretical translation in the Question Answer approach of Zeevat and Jasinskaja (2007): for *A et B* to be appropriate, *A* and *B* must provide disjoint answers to at least one common question.

(11) If *Q* is a question, *A* and *B* are disjoint answers to *Q* if there is no answer *C* so that both *A* and *B* entail *C*.

*Application 1. A et B* not appropriate with *Explanation*...

(12) a. Paul was blocked at the frontier by the police. He forgot his passport *(Explanation)*

  b. Paul was blocked at the frontier by the police and he forgot his passport (¬Explanation)

... because

i. either *B* explains *A*, but then *B* is an answer to the question *Q Why A?*, and *A* cannot answer *Why A?*

ii. or both *A* and *B* addresses the question *Q What happened?*, but *B* entails *A* (no disjoint answer — "the speaker is still trying to say *p* in giving *q* in support")

*Application 2. A et B* not appropriate with *Elaboration* or *Reformulation*, because since *A* and *B* are coreferential (they describe the same event in a different way), *A* and *B* will never be disjoint answers to the same question: one conjunct will always entails the other and itself.

2.1.2. Counter-examples

- *JZ* are aware of the fact that *and* is nevertheless sometimes acceptable with *Elaboration* or *Reformulation*

(13) a. The council built the bridge. John drew up the plans. *(Elaboration)*

  b. The council built the bridge and John drew up the plans.

(14) a. Alena broke her skis. She lost her only means of transport. *(Reformulation)*

  b. Alena broke her skis and thereby she lost her only means of transport.
• Their solution: for these counter-examples to work, we need a CG where the entailment between $A$ and $B$ is not acknowledged. For instance, we need for (14b) to work a CG which does not contain the information that the skis are Alena’s only means of transport (and thus does not contain the information that $A$ and $B$ describe the same event).

→ disjointness on a CG is weakened to possible disjointness (in these examples $A$ and $B$ are disjoint answers in this "ignorant" context).

• *thereby* is there to correct the CG on the point of disjointness.

2.1.3. Problems

• No clear explanation of why *et* is e.g. better with *prendre:voler* than with *prendre:attraper* (unless we are ready to assume that by default, the CG contains the information that $F(attraper)$ entails $F(prendre)$, but not the information that $F(voler)$ entails $F(prendre)$).

• *JZ* predict the unacceptability of sentences like (15), contrary to fact (note that *donc* is compulsory here):

(15) Alena n’avait que ses skis pour se déplacer dans la région. Hier elle les a cassés et a donc perdu son seul moyen de transport.

• As observed by Jayez and Winterstein (2011), no explanation of why *et* is *ceteris paribus* better when $B$ entails $A$ than when $A$ entails $B$, cf the contrast in (16) and their examples in (17)

(16) a. Il a pris un vélo et il l’a volé.
   b. ?Il a volé un vélo et il l’a pris.

(17) A. Est-ce que Paul va passer l’examen de statistiques?
   a. B. Il n’a pas beaucoup travaillé et donc je pense qu’il va abandonner.
   b. C. ?Je pense qu’il va abandonner et il n’a pas beaucoup travaillé.

2.2. The Winterstein/ Jayez approach

• Winterstein (2010) and Jayez and Winterstein (2011) recast *JZ* and others’ intuition that in $A et B$, $B$ should add something to $A$ in the DTS framework of Merin (1999)).

• Contrary to *JZ*, their analysis explicitly deals with the fact that in $A et B$, the CG is updated with $A$ before $B$ is processed.

• Basic intuitions: (i) $A$ and $B$ must provide arguments for the same conclusion $H$ (‘condition of co-argumentativity’), (ii) $A$ cannot settle the conclusion $H$ by itself (‘condition of additivity’) — once $A$ is updated, $B$ still has to change the probability of $H$.

• Proposal of JW:
• If $S$ is set of epistemic alternatives, they note
  - $S \vdash p$ the fact that for all $s$ in $S$ ($s \models p$)
  - $S \oplus p$ is the update of $S$ with $p$

• $A$ et $B$ is felicitous in an set of epistemic alternatives $S$ with respect to a conclusion $C$ iff $A, B, C$ respectively express the propositions $p, p', q$ such that
  - $p$ is conducive to $q$, that is $Pr_{S \oplus p}(q) > Pr_S(q)$
  - $p'$ is conducive to $q$, that is $Pr_{S \oplus p'}(q) > Pr_S(q)$
  - $p'$ is still conducive to $q$ once $p$ is updated in $S$, that is $Pr_{S \oplus p \oplus p'}(q) > Pr_{S \oplus p}(q)$

• **Application 1**: they can account for the differences in (16) and (17):
  - if $A$ entails $B$, $B$ cannot raise the probability of $C$ further: $et$ is not appropriate because $B$ cannot have any effect on $C$ once $A$ is updated.
  - if $B$ entails $A$, $B$ can still in principle raise the probability of $C$ once the context is updated with $A$

• **Application 2**: the compulsory character of donc with $et$ in the context of Generalisation

(18) a. Pierre a la grippe. Il est malade.
    b. # Pierre a la grippe et il est malade.
    c. Pierre a la grippe et donc il est malade.

W’s/JW’s account:

• **Condition of co-argumentativeness of $A$ et $B$:** $A$ and $B$ must point towards the same conclusion $H$
  - in the examples (18), $B$ is a consequence of $A$; therefore, $A$ is an argument for/points to $B$.
  - If $A$ and $B$ should point to the same conclusion, and if $A$ points to $B$, then $B$ should point to itself. This is not very plausible, hence the problem of (18b).
  - Adding donc makes this prima facie un plausible interpretation much easier. First reason why (18c) is better than (18b).

• **Condition of additivity of $A$ et $B$:** once $A$ is updated, $B$ must have a further effect on $H$
  - Prima facie, this requirement cannot be fulfilled in (18), since $A$ entails $B$
  - Assumption: to be appropriate, (18c) requires a context which does not take for granted that $A$ entails $B$: the speaker of (18b) seems to remind the hearer that $B$ is a consequence of $A$
• Problems

1. In *A et donc B*, do we have strong reasons to exclude that *A* and *B* point to a same conclusion $H \neq B$ even if *A* points to *B*?

(19) A. Est-ce que la candidate conviendrait pour le poste en langues romanes?  
    B. Son mari est brésilien et donc elle parle aussi portugais.

2. It is not clear that (18c) requires the weird CG assumed by Winterstein (same problem as for JZ).

(20) Comme nous le savons tous quand on a la grippe on est malade. Pierre a la grippe et donc il est malade.

If possible, we want to keep the default knowledge on h/H relations in the common ground.

3. *et donc* is acceptable even when *A=B*

(21) a. # L’argent a disparu et l’argent a disparu!  
    b. L’argent a disparu et donc l’argent a disparu!

3. **H/h verbal pairs in *A et B***

- I will adopt the two conditions of use of *et* of JW and propose an alternative proposal for *et donc* later.

- An advantage of JW on JZ is that they predict that (i) *et can* be appropriate between two sentences referring to the same event *e* (as soon as the second description of *e* has a further effect on *H*) (ii) *prima facie, A et B* is less problematic if *A* and *B* do not refer to the same event (the condition of additivity is easier to fulfill).

- However, the analysis has to be refined further to explain when *et* is possible with *Elaboration* or *Reformulation*.

3.1. **Hyponyms to the right**

- Q: how to account for the following contrasts?

(22) a. ?Pierre a mangé son sandwich et il l’a dévoré.  
    b. ?Le chat a bu son lait et il l’a lapé.  
    c. J’ai bu un café et je l’ai savouré.  
    d. ?Mon papa il a pris un poisson et il l’a attrapé.  
    e. Il a pris un vélo et il l’a volé.
3.1.1. Strong versus weak hyponyms

- **Proposal:**
  - Ducrot (1972)'s insight: "it is considered as normal to repeat a semantic element already present in previous discourse if it is repeated under the form of a presupposition".
  - if $A$ and $B$ refer to the same event, a further condition for $A$ et $B$ to be acceptable si that the description $p$ of $e$ provided by $A$ is presented as presupposed in the context $S_{\oplus p}$, that is $p$ must be presupposed by $B$ (= "the Ducrot's condition" on et)

- **Pairs like boire:savourer and boire:lapper differ on this respect:**

  (23) a. Je n’ai pas savouré mon café.
      $\rightarrow$ J’ai bu mon café.
  b. Le chat n’a pas lappé son lait.
      $\nrightarrow$ Le chat a bu son lait.

  • **savourer son café is a strong hyponym of boire son café:** savourer son café can presuppose the corresponding hyperonymic description boire son café

  • **lapper son lait is a weak hyponym of boire son lait:** without a specific context (e.g. focus), lapper y does not presuppose (but rather asserts) the corresponding hyperonymic description of $e$

- Given Ducrot’s condition on et, et should be ceteris paribus better with strong than weak hyponyms to the right conjunct $A$.

3.1.2. Other ways for $B$ to presuppose $A$

- 1. With a contrastive focus, a weak hyponym can be used as a strong one as soon as the alternatives are other hyponyms of the same hyperonym:

  (24) Le chat n’a pas LAPPÉ son lait.
      $\rightarrow$ Le chat a bu son lait.

  • But then, coordination is better, which confirms that it is the presupposition by $B$ of the hyperonymic description in $A$ which is at play:

  (25) Le chat a bu son lait, et il l’a LAPPÉ

  • 2. **et is better with the "analytic" version of weak hyponyms, e.g. prendre brusquement for saisir.** This is true with or without ellipsis of the hyperonym in $B$

    (26) a. ?Il a pris une pierre et il l’a saisie.
        b. Il a pris une pierre et il l’a prise brusquement.
        c. Il a pris une pierre, et brusquement.
        d. Il a pris une pierre et ce brusquement.
It is well known that when manner adverbials occur under focus, the sentence presupposes the corresponding affirmative sentence without the adverb (cf. e.g. Bellert (1977):19). In French, the modifier under focus is normally in post-verbal position ¹

- The following contrasts are of the same type:

(28)  
   a. Mon papa il a pris un poisson et il l’a attrapé ce matin.  
   b. ?Mon papa il a pris un poisson, et ce matin il l’a attrapé.  
   c. Mon papa a pris un poisson et c’est **CE MATIN** qu’il a attrapé.

(29)  
   a. Le chat a bu le lait et il l’a lappé ce matin.  
   b. ?Le chat a bu le lait et ce matin il l’a lappé.

Ccl.: **Elaboration** works fine with A et B as soon as B presupposes the event description given in A (and co-argumentativity/additivity are fulfilled).

3.2. **Hyponyms to the left**

- In general, coordinating a hyponym to the left and a hyperonym to the right gives worse results than with the reverse order:

(30)  
   a. J’ai vu ce film et je l’ai savouré.  
   b. ?J’ai savouré ce film et je l’ai vu.

- Cf. the condition of additivity.

- No "strong" hyperonyms — no hyperonym can presuppose its hyponym.

- However, even with hyperonyms to the right, B can still presuppose the event description already given in A: it is sufficient to background the hyperonym predication with additional material (the contrast below is due to the fact that *savourer un film* is a strong hyponym of *voir un film*).

(31)  
   b. Mon papa il a attrapé un poisson et il l’a pris ce matin.  
   c. (?) J’ai savouré ce film et je l’ai vu ce matin.

¹In French, the modifier has to be post-verbal in order to project, cf. (27), where the question makes sure that the occurrence of the event is taken for granted in the answer.

(27)  
   A. Comment est-ce qu’il l’a pris?  
   a. Il l’a pris **BRUSQUEMENT**.  
   b. # Il l’a **BRUSQUEMENT** pris.

That manner adverbs only project in postverbal position argues in favour of Beaver’s view that the projection of manner adverbials has to do with the sentential informational structure, and is not lexically triggered (cf. Beaver (2010), Beaver et al. (2011)).
• Two remaining questions:

1. It is sometimes possible to have the hyperonym to the left without back-grounding the hyperonymic description:

(32)   a. Fred m’a offert son ancien portable et ce matin, il me l’a donné.
       b. Il a balayé la cuisine et il l’a nettoyée.
       c. Le proviseur m’a confisqué mon Ipod et ce matin, il me l’a pris.

2. The problem of the hyperonym to the right often vanishes with et donc:

(33)   a. ?La tarte aux pommes, je l’ai dégustée ce matin et je l’ai mangée!
       b. La tarte aux pommes, je l’ai dégustée ce matin et je l’ai donc mangée!

Some natural occurrences of offrir et donner in Frantext:

(34)   a. Après le combat, il [est] humainement venu offrir et donner secours
       au blessé. (Rétif de la Bretonne)
       b. Le Prince mesme la leur doit offrir, et donner. (Antoine de
          Montchrestien)
       c. Il n’est point de secours qu’il n’ait offert et donné aux français qui en
          avaient beoin. (Gabriel Sémac de Meihlan)
       d. Je voudrais vous l’offrir et vous le donner. (Georges Sand)

3.2.1. Fake hyponyms

• The manner verb balayer is a troponym of nettoyer: sweeping is cleaning in a
  certain way.

• However, balayer is not a hyponym of nettoyer: it implies rather than entails
  there is no strict entailment between the two verbs, B can assert an event not
  asserted in A, and the condition of additivity can therefore be fullfilled.

3.2.2. Defeasible hyponyms

• Contrary to balayer, offrir on the other hand is probably bi-eventive (cf. Koenig
  and Davis (2001), Martin and Schaefer (t.a., 2012)).

• However, it entails caused possession with causers subjects, but not with agent

(35)   a. Le directeur des ressources humaines a offert une belle place à
       Marie, mais finalement, elle ne l’a pas prise
       b. Ces circonstances lui ont offert une belle place, # mais finalement,
          elle ne l’a pas prise
Donner, on the contrary, entails caused possession unrestrictively; this is why I will say that offrir is a defeasible hyponym of donner.

- With a defeasible hyponym to the left and its hyperonym to the right, et is unproblematic because it is always possible that B asserts the event component (the result) that B only implies.

3.2.3. The case of confisquer:prendre

- Confisquer seems to be a true (monotone) hyponym of prendre – no confiscation without a taking:

(36) ?La police lui a confisqué son sac, mais ne lui a jamais pris.

- but prendre can nevertheless be coordinated with confisquer to the left:

(37) a. Le policier lui a confisqué son matériel et le lui a pris.
   b. Le proviseur m’a confisqué mon Ipod hier et cet après-midi, il me l’a pris.

- Two factors are at play here.

1. Although any confiscation ontologically presupposes a taking, the taking does not have to be denoted by confisquer:

(38) Le policier m’a pris mon permis et puis me l’a confisqué.

2. If A asserts the occurrence of a confiscation, it entails the occurrence of the taking. However, since the taking and the confiscation do not have to occur simultaneously, the occurrence of the taking can be asserted in B without generating redundancy. Indeed, although A entails the occurrence of e”, it does not fix yet its time of occurrence.

3.3. The compulsory donc

- Donc is not the single discourse marker which contributes to make et acceptable between two (partly/ totally) redundant discourse segments.

- On the model of Horn (1991)’s examples below...

(39) a. # I don’t know why I love you, and I do.
   b. I don’t know why I love you, but I do.

(40) a. # It’s odd that dogs eat cheese, and they do.
   b. It’s odd that dogs eat cheese, but they do.

... one can easily form the following contrasts:

(41) a. ?Je ne sais pas pourquoi je t’aime et je t’aime.
   b. Je ne sais pas pourquoi je t’aime et pourtant je t’aime.

With plus précisément (with h to the right):
With *même* ((with *h* to the right):

(43)  a. ?Pierre a mangé son sandwich, et il l’a dévoré.
    b. Pierre a mangé son sandwich, et il l’a même dévoré.

• Proposal:

  - In *et donc*/*et plus précisément*/*et même*, the DM is part of the sentence *B*:
    \[ [P]_A \text{ [et donc } Q]_B \]
  
  - As many others, these DMs are *presuppositional*: they refer to a sentence or
    proposition related to the proposition *Q* by the discourse relation conveyed
    and the examples below).
  
  - In the b-examples, the proposition presupposed by the DM is the proposi-
    tion *p* denoted by *A* and repeated in *B*
  
  - Therefore, thanks to the presence of the DM in *B*, this component *p*
    is presented as presupposed in *B*.
  
  - Ducrot’s condition is therefore fulfilled: *p* can be repeated without gener-
    ating a pragmatic oddity.

(44)  a. ?Peut-être que Marie l’a même dévorée. (Intended: no salient
      antecedent)
    b. ?Je l’aime quand même. (Intended: no salient antecedent)

(45)  ?Où est la tarte aux pommes? Peut-être que Marie l’a même dévorée.

• In this perspective, the ‘compulsoriness’ of the DM *donc*, *quand même* or *plus
  précisément* in these examples is in fact quite similar to the ‘compulsoriness’ of
  presupposition triggers studied by Amsili and Beyssade (2010) (e.g. *aussi* or
  *plus*):

    b. Jean est allé il y a deux ans au Canada. Il n’ira plus là-bas.

• But wait a minute... Ducrot’s claim is that it is considered as normal to repeat
  a semantic element already present in previous discourse if it is repeated under
  the form of a presupposition.

• In examples of the type (43b), it is plausible that *p*, although presupposed in
  *B*, does not re-appear under the form of an assertion in *B*.

• But *p* is clearly re-asserted in the following b-examples:
(47)  
  a. ?Il l’a volé et il l’a pris.  
   b. Il l’a volé et donc il l’a pris.  

(48)  
  a. ?Il l’a volé et il l’a volé.  
   b. Il l’a volé et donc il l’a volé.  

• Contrary to the a-examples which are pure repetitions, the b-examples are tautologies: they convey a reasoning from a proposition $p$ (presupposed by the DM) to the same proposition $p$.

• It is precisely because $p$ is not only the premisse but also the conclusion of this reasoning that it can be asserted a second time without generating a pragmatic oddity.


4. Lexical coordination

4.1. Introduction

• Abeillé (2006) discusses two possible analyses for (49), the first one as a coordination of lexical verbs (lexical coordination, 'L-coord.' for short), the second as a phrasal coordination ('P-coord.' for short) with ellipsis.

(49) Le président apprécie et approuve votre proposition.

Abeillé’s claim: an elliptical analysis is possible for (49), with a marked prosody (prosodic boundary and rising contour before the conjunction), but a coordination of Vs is also available and in fact more natural.

• Argument 1: two verbs coordinated by L-coord. must be of the same aspectual type, which is not true of the elliptical P-coord., cf. (50).

(50)  
  a. ??Paul ressemble et téléphone à son père.  
   b. Paul ressemble beaucoup, et Marie téléphone souvent, à ce vieux professeur.  

• Argument 2: in P-coord., the two verbal or sentential conjuncts must constrain each other.

(51)  
  a. Le président aime, mais le vice-président n’aime pas, votre proposition.  
   b. ??Le président aime et il approuve, votre proposition.  

On the contrary, with L-coord., the two coordinated verbs must be understood as forming a natural class of process so that they denote one (possibly complex) event.

A specific case of L-coord. involves the same V. This construction is not possible with P-coord.
a. Les enfants sautaient et sautaient sur le gazon.

b. ??Les enfants sautaient sur le gazon et sautaient dessus.

- Argument 3. In French, VP complementizers as à and de cannot be shared by a coordinate phrase and must be repeated on each conjunct.

(53) *Il continuait à [lire attentivement le texte et ∅ relire sans cesse l’introduction].$\ _{VP}$

However, these markers can be shared in bare verbal L-coord.:

(54) Il continuait à le [lire et ∅ relire] sans cesse.

"If de and à are VP markers, the V coordination is 'hidden' inside the VP and they do not 'see' it":

(55) a. * à [VP et VP]
   b. à $\ _{VP}$[[ V et V] NP]

According to this test, (56) can be analysed as a case of lexical coordination.

(56) Je continue à boire et déguster mon Riesling.

4.2. Lexical coordination and h/H verbal pairs

- Fact to explain: with lexical coordination, it is possible to coordinate a hyperonym with a hyponym to the left, in absence of donc, even with 'real' (i.e. non defeasible/ non partial) hyponyms:

(9) a. Tout au long d’un menu préparé par Martin Herrmann, vous dégustez- et- buvez les dix meilleurs vins Riesling de l’Ortenau. (Internet)
   Throughout the menu prepared by Martin Herrman, you savour and drink the ten best Riesling wines from the Ortenau.
   b. # Tout au long d’un menu préparé par Martin Herrmann, vous dégustez les dix meilleurs vins Riesling de l’Ortenau et les buvez.

(10) a. Ma moutarde conserve- et- garde toute son onctuosité. (Internet)
   b. # Ma moutarde conserve toute son onctuosité et la garde.
   c. Son onctuosité, ma moutarde la- conserve- et- la- garde.

(57) a. Mais cependant que tout le monde savoure et mange de ces beaux fruits, eux ils n’ont pas le droit d’y toucher. (Internet)
   b. # Mais cependant que tout le monde savoure ces beaux fruits et les mange, eux ils n’ont pas le droit d’y toucher.

- Explanation:

  - With the sentential coordination, the two conjuncts $A$ and $B$ are successively updated in the context.
- Therefore, the assertion of the same propositional content in $A$ and $B$ generates a problem, unless *dons* presents it as presupposed in $B$ and enables its re-assertion *qua* conclusion of a tautological reasoning.

- With the lexical coordination, the two conjuncts $v_1$ and $v_2$ contribute to the same context update: one assertion only.

- Therefore, $v_2$ does not re-assert the event description provided in $v_1$: both $v_1$ and $v_2$ contribute to the same assertion.

- If no reassertion, no redundancy effect

- That the two conjuncts contribute to the same context update with lexical coordination explains why it is in general less constrained than sentential coordination between hyperonyms and hyponyms.

- Since the acceptability of sentences (a) suggests that lexical coordination is fully commutative and thus not dynamic, and since lexical coordination and sentential coordination are expressed by one and the same *et*, this speaks for a non dynamic analysis of the conjunction (cf. e.g. Geurts (1999)).
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