



Types of relationship between clauses

		TYPE OF INTERDEPENDENCY (TAXIS)		
		(i) paratactic	(ii) hypotactic	
LOGICO-SEMANTIC TYPE	(1) expansion	(a) elaboration	ca. 50%	ca. 50%
		1 <i>John didn't wait;</i> =2 <i>he ran away.</i>	α <i>John ran away,</i> = β <i>which surprised everyone.</i>	
			$\alpha...$ <i>John,</i> $\langle\langle=\beta\rangle\rangle$ <i>who was the leader,</i> ... α <i>ran away.</i>	
		“apposition”	“non-defining relative”	
		(b) extension	ca. 95%	ca. 5%
	1 <i>John ran away,</i> +2 <i>and Fred stayed behind.</i>	α <i>John ran away,</i> + β <i>whereas Fred stayed behind.</i>		
	“coordination”			
	(c) enhancement	ca. 30%	ca. 70%	
	1 <i>John was scared,</i> \times 2 <i>so he ran away.</i>			
	1 <i>John ran away,</i> \times 2 <i>for he was scared.</i>	α <i>John ran away,</i> \times β <i>because he was scared.</i>		
	“adverbial clause”			
(2) projection	(a) locution	ca. 50%	ca. 50%	
	1 <i>John said:</i> “2 <i>“I’m running away.”</i>	α <i>John said</i> “ β <i>he was running away.</i>		
	“direct speech”	“indirect speech”		
	(b) idea	ca. 5%	ca. 95%	
	1 <i>John thought to himself:</i> ‘2 <i>‘I’ll run away.’</i>	α <i>John thought</i> ‘ β <i>he would run away.</i>		
	“direct thought”	“indirect thought”		

Source: M. A. K. Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (compiled and slightly adapted from editions 1, 2, 3, 4).