



Types of relationship between clauses

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

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