Gazdar (1981) has proposed an intriguing account of the COORDINATE STRUCTURE CONSTRAINT (CSC) and ACROSS-THE-BOARD EXCEPTION (ATBE) of Ross (1967). Central to this account is the coordination schema (1), which expands "any syntactic category" as a sequence of identical categories:

\[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \\
\beta
\end{array} \right]
\]

where \( \beta \in \{\text{and, or}\} \) and \( \alpha \) is any syntactic category.\(^1\)

The requirement of syntactic-category identity that (1) imposes on coordinate structures reflects a traditional, and presumably noncontroversial, view of coordination as involving elements 'of the same rank'. Less traditional and more controversial, however, is the way that Gazdar identifies syntactic categories — and it is on this mode of category identification that his CSC-ATBE results depend.

Consider in this connection examples (2a) and (2b), illustrating the CSC and the ATBE respectively:

\[
\begin{align*}
(2a) & \quad *\text{Mary, John likes Sally and Bill hates.} \\
(2b) & \quad \text{Mary, John likes and Bill hates.}
\end{align*}
\]

According to Gazdar, the conjuncts in (2a) are not expansions of the same syntactic category. While the first conjunct, \textit{John likes Sally}, is an expansion of the category S, the second, \textit{Bill hates}, is an expansion not of S but of a so-called "slash category", the category S/NP (a sentence with

\* My thanks to Elisabet Engdahl and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on an earlier version of this note.

\( ^1 \) An additional schema is required in order for the feature \( \beta \in \{\text{and, or}\} \) introduced in (1) to become realized as one of the lexical items and, or. (1) is, of course, specific to English, but it is an instantiation of a proposed universal set of coordination schemata — cf. Gazdar (1982), pp. 156–157. See also Gazdar, Klein, Pullum, and Sag (1982) for an updated version of (1). Since the problem to be discussed in this note is the same, mutatis mutandis, for the original and the updated versions of the coordination schema, and since the updated version presupposes a formal apparatus that it would take us too far afield to examine here, I shall continue, for practical reasons, to assume the version given in (1). But see note 10, below for some further information about the Gazdar-Klein-Pullum-Sag proposal.
a missing noun phrase). Since S and S/NP are distinct categories, the
ostensible coordinate structure *John likes Sally and Bill hates* cannot be
generated by the coordination schema (1) (or, in Gazdar’s grammar, in any
other way), and the ungrammaticality of (2a) is thus accounted for. In
(2b), on the other hand, both conjuncts, *John likes* and *Bill hates*, are
expansions of the same slash category, S/NP, and the coordinate structure
*John likes and Bill hates* is therefore generable.

While Gazdar does not propose a formal definition of SYNTACTIC
category in the cited paper, he obviously has in mind a definition in
which a slash category and its non-slash counterpart are identified as
categorially distinct; and a suitable definition can in fact be extrapolated
from a more recent paper, Gazdar and Pullman (1982) – hereafter, G and
P. Unfortunately, however, if this extrapolated definition of syntactic
category is adopted, and if at the same time one adopts G and P’s account
of reflexivization, then it seems that certain grammatical coordinate
structures involving reflexive pronouns cannot be generated by the
coordination schema (1). The problem has to do with examples like (3),
which, given the presumed definition of syntactic category, would have to
be analyzed as involving the coordination of distinct categories:

(3) John saw himself and Mary in the mirror.

Similar problems, moreover, arise under the presumed definition with
regard to certain grammatical coordinate structures involving reciprocal
pronouns.

In this note, I propose to describe this set of problems, and then very
briefly indicate their implications for G and P’s theory of Generalized
Phrase Structure Grammar (GPSG).

First, however, we need to consider the question of a definition of
syntactic category that is capable of achieving Gazdar’s CSC-ATBE
results. In GPSG, then, as in various other current theories, syntactic
categories are analyzed into complexes of syntactic features. In the
specific system of syntactic features proposed by G and P, several classes of
features that may be associated with a category are distinguished, among
them so-called ‘head features’ and ‘foot features’.2 HEAD FEATURES, as the

---

2 There are also features which are neither head features nor foot features, such as the
[BAR] features that are associated with the ‘level’ of the category in terms of X-bar theory.
In this connection, it is perhaps worth noting that the positing of a distinct set of [BAR]
features neatly solves what might have appeared to be a problem for Gazdar’s account of
coordination: the fact that phrases whose lexical heads are differently subcategorized are