## Clause complexity

- There are two systemic dimensions when interpretating clause complexity
- One is the system of interdependency, or 'tactic' system, parataxis and hypotaxis, which is general to all complexes - word, group, phrase and clause alike.
- The other is the logico-semantic system of expansion and projection, which is specific to clause combining.


## Interdependency

- A typical clause complex is a mixture of paratactic and hypotactic sequences.
- In parataxis, elements are of equal status. Each element could stand as a functioning whole. The relations can be logically (in general) symmetrical (salt and pepper, pepper and salt) or transitive (salt and pepper, pepper and mustard, salt and mustard).
- Hypotactic relationships are elements of unequal status. The dominant element (primary) is free, the dependent (secondary) of course is not. The relations are in general logically non-symmetrical (I breathe when I sleep $\neq$ I sleep when I breathe) or nontransitive (I fret when I have to drive slowly + I have to drive slowly when it's been raining $\neq \mathrm{I}$ fret when it's been raining)


## Logico-semantic relations

- Clause expansion is subdivided into elaboration, extension and enhancement
- Elaboration: one clause expands another by elaborating on it, restating it in other words, specifying it in greater detail, commenting or exemplifying it.
- Examples of clause connectors of elaborated, paratactic clauses: and, in other words, i.e., for example, e.g., to be precise, viz., or (rather), that is to say, for instance, in particular, in fact, actually, indeed, at least.
- Examples of clause connectors of elaborated, hypotactic clauses: which, when, where.


## Logico-semantic relations

- Extension: one clause expands another by extending beyond it, adding some new element, giving an exception to it, or offering an alternative.
- Examples of clause connectors of extended, paratactic clauses: (both....) and; not only ... but also, (neither...) nor, (and) yet; but, but not, not... but only, except, (either...) or (else)
- Examples of clause connectors of extended, hypotactic clauses: whereas, while, except that, as well as, without, instead of


## Logico-semantic relations

- Enhancement: one clause expands another by embellishing around it, qualifying it with some circumstantial feature of time, place, cause or condition.
- Examples of clause connectors of enhanced, paratactic clauses: then, so, for, but, yet, still, meanwhile, at that time, in that case / way, therefore, however, nevertheless
- Examples of clause connectors of enhanced, hypotactic clauses: because (of), as, in case, while, before, since, after, provided that


## Logico-semantic relations

- Projection is subdivided into locution and idea.
- Locution: one clause is projected through another, which presents it as a locution, a construction of wording.
- Example of clause relations of locution \&, parataxis: He said: "I don't like coke very much."
- Example of clause relations of locution \&, hypotaxis: He said that he doesn't like coke very much.


## Logico-semantic relations

- Projection is subdivided into locution and idea.
- Idea: one clause is projected through another, which presents it as an idea, a construction of meaning.
- Example of clause relations idea \& parataxis: He thinks: "I will never like coke"
- Example of clause relations idea \& hypotaxis: He decided that he will never be able to like coke.

|  | PARATACTIC |  | HYPOTACTIC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPANSION |  |  |  |  |
| elaboration | John didn't wait; he ran away. | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ =2 \end{array}$ | John ran away, which surprised everyo |  |
| extension | John ran away, and Fred stayed behind |  | John ran away, whereas Fred stayed |  |
| enhancement | John was scared, so he ran away. | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \times 2 \end{array}$ | John ran away, because he was scared | $\begin{array}{r} \alpha \\ \times \beta \end{array}$ |
| PROJECTION |  |  |  |  |
| locution | John said: <br> 'I'm running away' | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \text { "2 } \end{array}$ | John said he was running away. | $\begin{array}{r}\alpha \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| idea | John thought to himself: 'I'll run away' | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \text { '2 } \end{array}$ | John thought he would run away. |  |


| Although Alice has told the world | that her value for N is $175,828,273$, | she has not revealed her value for $p$ and $q$, |  | so only special | required to decrypt her own messages. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\alpha$ | $=\beta$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\alpha$ |  | $\alpha$ | $=\beta$ |
| $+\beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | x2 |  |
| Alice's choice of $N$ effectively becomes her public encryption key | and she could print it on her business card |  | post it on the internet |  | or publish it in a public-key directory along with everybody value of N |
| 1 | 1 |  |  | +2 | +3 |
|  | +2 |  |  |  |  |

(Analysis by Schneider \& Wirth, Above the clause. Clause complexity, term paper, department of linguistics and literary studies, TUD, SS 2005)

