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INTRODUCTION

Time goes by; English grows from the simple one as traditional grammar, turns into transformational grammar, and to be more complicated one as functional grammar. Each grammar has a strong relationship, because it is connected to each other. We will not hard to understand functional grammar if we have already mastered or understand transformational grammar, as well as when we master traditional grammar we will master the transformational easily.

Functional grammar is different from traditional and transformational grammar, in traditional and functional grammar the largest unit of grammatical organization is sentence and a sentence can be a simple sentence or complex sentence. But in functional grammar, Halliday (Martin, 1997: 165) argues that when clauses combine to form a clause complex, they do not thereby create a new grammatical unit of higher rank. In other word, clause is the higher rank of grammatical organization in functional grammar.

Each clause has relationship, whether it is an elaboration relationship, extension relationship, or enhancement. And each relationship could be parataxis and or hypotaxis clause complex. Elaboration parataxis occurs when one clause expands another by elaborating on it (or some position of it): restating in other words, specifying in greater detail, commenting or exemplifying. In other word, one clause elaborates on the meaning of another.
by further specifying or describing it. The secondary clause does not introduce a new element into the picture but rather provides a further characterization of one that is already there, restating it, clarifying it, refining it, or adding a descriptive attribute comment (Halliday, 1985: 196).

Based on the characteristics of the qualitative research by Bodgan and Biklen (1992), a researcher of qualitative research is the key instrument. It means that the researcher plays a dominant role in deciding which data to include and which one to exclude. First the writer finds the clause complexes that consist of conjunction or, then the writer analyzed whether it is an elaboration relationship, extension relationship, or enhancement relationship. After the writer classifies the clause, in this case, the elaboration relationship clause complex, the writer classifies the elaboration relationship clause complex according to the types of interdependency, whether it is parataxis or hypotaxis relation. After that the writer classify whether it is an inclusive or, or an exclusive or. And the last step is the writer classifies the clause complex whether the conjunction functions as warning, paraphrase, or self correction device.

**Functional Grammar**

As mentioned before, there are three kinds of grammar in English, and Functional grammar according to Gerot and Wignell (1994: 6) views language as a resource for making meanings. This grammar attempt to describe language in actual use and so focus on texts and their contexts. They do not only concern with the structure, but also with how those structures construct. Functional grammar start with the question “how are the meanings of this text realized”.

Functional grammar was introduced by Michael Halliday on 1985. For Halliday, language is ‘a system of meanings’. That is to say that, when people use language, their language acts the expression of meaning. From this point of View the grammar becomes a study of how meanings are built up through the use of words and other linguistic forms such as tone and emphasis (Bloor and Bloor, 1995: 1).

### Tabel 1.
The Main Differences in Perspective among Three Grammars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal + Traditional grammar</th>
<th>Functional Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Concern</td>
<td>How is (should) this sentence be structured?</td>
<td>How are the meanings of this text realized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Whole text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language level Of concern</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>= a set of rules for sentence construction</td>
<td>= a resource for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Semantics

As mentioned in table 1 functional grammar primary concerns in semantics. According to O’Grady, (1987: 268) semantics is the study of meaning in human language. Semantics refers to the systems of meaning in language, for example, how sentences relate to the real world of people, actions, places, and so on (Lock, 1996: 4). While Yule (1996:134) states that semantics is the study of how words literally connect to things, or more generally, the investigation of meaning as encode in language.

Lyons (1995:3) argues that semantics is traditionally defined as the study of meaning. The noun ‘meaning’ and the verb ‘mean’, from which it derives, are used, like many other English words, in a wide range of contexts and in several distinguishable senses. For example, to take the case of the verb: if one says

1. **Mary means well**

   One implies that Mary is well-intentioned, that she intends no harm. This implication of intention would normally be lacking, however, in an utterance such as

2. **That red flag means danger**

   In saying this, one would not normally be implying that the flag had plans to endanger anyone; one would be pointing out that it is being used (in accordance with previously established convention) to indicate that there is danger in the surrounding environment, such as a crevasse on a snowy hillside or the imminent use of explosives in a nearby quarry.

According to Levinson (1983:58) as in now common in logical semantics, we view a proposition as a function from possible worlds to truth values (i.e. as an abstract assignment of the value true to just those states of affairs which the proposition correctly describes). Then one way in which we can accommodate context is a function from possible worlds and that context to truth values.

Elaboration in Parataxis

An elaborating clause does not add any essentially new element to the message, but gives more information about what is already there. It may relate to the whole message or just to one part of the message; and it may restate it, or it may clarify or exemplify it; or it may add extra information about its attributes, including the speaker’s comment. As with all clause complexes, the paratactic-hypotactic distinction applies (Thompson, 1996: 201)

As mentioned before, elaboration occurs when one clause elaborates on the meaning of another by further specifying or describing it. The secondary clause does not introduce a new element into the picture but rather provides a further characterization of one that is already there, restating it, clarifying it, refining it, or adding descriptive attribute or comment. If the ‘elaborating’
relationship is encoded as a relationship between process, we get an appositive clause complex.

Many paratactic elaborating clauses are traditionally said to be in opposition to the preceding clause, especially when they restate the same message in different words, or make a nonspecific. For example:

1. I've had no nastiness, everyone's been fabulous
2. When you set out to fail, one thing is certain—you can't be disappointed

One clause expands another by elaborating on it (or some position of it): restating in other words, specifying in greater detail, commenting or exemplifying. In other word, one clause elaborates on the meaning of another by further specifying or describing it. The secondary clause does not introduce a new element into the picture but rather provides a further characterization of one that is already there, restating it, clarifying it, refining it, or adding a descriptive attribute comment (Halliday, 1985; 196).

Elaboration parataxis (notation 1 = 2). The combination of elaboration with parataxis yields three types, the first two of which could be regarded as apposition between clauses (Halliday, 1985; 203).

Generally, the relationship in paratactic elaboration can be paraphrased as 'in other words', 'to be precise' or 'for example' (Halliday, 1994:226). In spoken discourse, paratactic elaborating clauses are often difficult to distinguish from separate clause complexes since, as the examples show, there may be no explicit conjunctive signal of the relationship – the two clauses are simply juxtaposed. The main clue is in the intonation: if the speaker intends the clauses to be an elaborating complex, they will both have the same intonation pattern.

**Exposition**

Here the secondary clause restates the thesis of the primary clause in different words, to present it from another point of view, or perhaps just to reinforce the message; for example:

1. The clock doesn’t go; it’s not working
   1  =2
2. She wasn’t a show dog; I didn’t buy her as a show dog
   1  =2
3. Each argument was fatal to the other: both could not be true
   1  =2

The relationship may be made explicit by conjunctive expression such as or (rather), in other words or that is to say; or in writing, i.e.

**Conjunction Or**

Conjunction or coordination, is the process of combining two constituents of the same type to produce another, larger constituent of the same type. In traditional grammar, this has been called compounding; for example, two sentences that are combined by means of a comma plus a connecting word make a ‘compound sentence’, two subject NPs that are combined with the word and are called a compound subject (Murcia and Freeman, 1999:469).

In functional grammar, the semantic system whereby speakers relate clauses in terms of temporal sequence, consequence, comparison and addition. A further factor which is relevant to the types of conjunctive relation found in English is whether the conjunction is paratactic (coordinating) or hypotactic (Gerot and Wignell, 1994; 180).
A conjunction is a 'joining word'. Its main role is to link together two parts of a sentence. There are two types of conjunction: coordinating and subordinating conjunction. Coordinating conjunction, join equal parts of a sentence, e.g. two clauses which make up a sentence. While subordinating conjunction, join a subordinate clause to main clause (Leech et al, 2001; 98).

Richard et al. (1985; 58) states that conjunction is a word that joins words, phrases, or clause together, such as but, and. Units larger than single words which function as conjunctions are sometimes knows as conjunctive adverb, for example: however, and nevertheless. Furthermore Richard mention that conjunction is the process by which such joining takes place. There are two types of conjunction:

1. Coordination, through the use of coordinating conjunctions (also known as coordinations) such as and, or, but, these join linguistic units which are equivalent or of the same rank
2. Subordination, through the use of subordinating conjunctions, (also known as subordinators) such as because, when, unless, that. These join an independent clause and a dependent clause connecting words, including conjunctions and certain types of subordinators (despite this...; although they had left when he arrived...), are also important in expressing the logical connection between clauses in a discourse and thus also express textual meaning.

Both coordination and subordination involve the same rank; but in coordination the units are constituents at the same level of constituent structure, whereas in subordination they form a hierarchy, the subordinate unit being a constituent of the superordinate unit. The opposition between coordination, and that between parataxis and hypotaxis, are often treated as equivalent. But we may distinguish them as follows. Paratactic applies not only to coordinate constructions, but also to other cases where two units of equivalent status are juxtaposed (Quirk, 9185: 919).

Discussion
Kinds of Conjunction Or Inclusive Or

Data, conjunction or in elaboration paratactic relational in the English clause complex, which are taken from the resource books have various kinds and functions. One of the two kinds of conjunction or found in this research is inclusive or.

(1) *He wondered if he was awake or still sleeping* (LR: 1)

1. Conjunction or in he was awake or still sleeping indicate an inclusive or. It shows that or has the characteristics of showing alternative. The first alternative is true and the second alternatives are also true, in this case it is possible to having a condition between awake and still sleeping, it means that the statement is true.
2. One of the alternatives is true, in this case it is possible to having one of the conditions, whether awake or sleeping, it means that the statement is true.
3. If both alternatives is false, it means that the statement is false

According to Saeed there are two logical connectives which can correspond to English or. The first is called inclusive or and is symbolized as
thus giving logical forms like \( p \land q \). The truth table for this connective is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cc|c}
 p & q & p \land q \\
 T & T & T \\
 T & F & T \\
 F & T & F \\
 F & F & F \\
\end{array}
\]

The elaboration paratactic relational table for this clause complex is:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{He was awake or still sleeping} & \\
\hline
1 & ^\land q \\
P & ^\land q \\
\end{array}
\]

From the semantic point of view, \textit{he was awake or still sleeping}, means that the speaker wants to communicate that he wonders whether he is a sleep or has awake. On in other word, he is unconscious because he does not know whether he is a sleep or has awake.

(2) \textit{Yet the herdsman and the husbandmen that dwelt there were not many, and the most par of the people of Gondor lived in seven circle of the city, or in the high vales of the mountain borders.} (LR: 5)

1. Conjunction or in clause complex above shows that or has the characteristics of showing alternative. The first alternative is true and the second alternatives are also true, in this case it is possible whether the people of Gondor lived in seven circle of the city or lived in the high vales of the mountain borders, it means that the statement is true.

2. One of the alternatives is true, in this case it is possible the people of Gondor lived in seven circle of the city, or lived in the high vales of the mountain borders; this means that the statement is true.

3. If both alternatives is false, it means that the statement is false.

Because both alternative could be true, so the clause complex above is an inclusive or. And the elaboration paratactic relation table for this clause complex is:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{Yet the herdsman and the husbandmen that dwelt there were not many,} & \\
\text{and the most} & \\
\hline
1 & ^2 \\
P & ^3 \\
\end{array}
\]

\textit{Part of the people of Gondor lived in seven circle of the city, or in the high vales of the mountain borders.}

From the semantic point of view, \textit{the people of Gondor lived in seven circle of the city, or in the high vales of the mountain borders} means that the people of Gondor is lived in two different places, that is the seven circle of the city or in the high vales of the mountain.

\textit{Exclusive Or}
The second connective which can correspond to English or is called exclusive or, which can symbolize as \(^\lor\) (Saeed, 1997: 83). This connective has the truth table as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>p (^\lor) q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) *And ever as they talked Beregond was more amazed, and looked with greater wonder at the hobbit, swinging his short legs as he sat on the seat or standing tiptoe upon it to peer over the sill at the lands below* (LR: 20)

Conjunction or in clause complex above indicate an exclusive or. It shows that or has the characteristics of showing alternative. The elaboration paratactic relational table for this clause complex is:

\[\text{\smaller{\begin{align*}
\text{And ever as they talked Beregond was more amazed,} \\
\text{and looked with greater wonder} \\
\text{at the hobbit, swinging his short legs as he sat on the seat or standing tiptoe upon it} \\
\text{to peer over the sill at the lands below}
\end{align*}}\]

The explanation for this clause as follows:

1. One of the alternatives is true, in this case it is possible to having one of the conditions, sat on the seat or standing tiptoe, it means that the statement is true.
2. If both alternatives is true, it means that the statement is false
3. If both alternatives is false, it also means that the statement is false

Because both alternative could not be true, it means one of the statement should be false, so this clause complex is an exclusive or. From the semantic point of view, this clause complex means Beregond was amazed with the hobbit, who swinging his short legs as he sat on the seat or standing tiptoe upon it to peer over the sill at the lands below.

**Proposition of Conjunction Or**

**Or as Warning**

(6) *And now all realms shall be put to the test, to stand or fall-under the shadow* (LR: 24)

According to Murcia (1999), Or may have additional senses that go beyond the inclusive-exclusive distinction. One involves an imperative, or quasi-warning, clause complex followed by a statement of sequences. In case of conjunction or as warning, it can only be an exclusive or, because it would be unfair if we warn someone of something, but still he/she get the consequence.

1. One of the alternatives is true, in this case it is possible to having one of the conditions, whether stand or fall under the shadow
2. If both alternatives are true, it means that the statement is false
3. If both alternatives are false, it also means that the statement is false
   In such cases or may be paraphrased lexically as otherwise. This clause complex may also be naturally paraphrased syntactically with such conditional structures as:

   If all realms shall not be put to the test, (then) it would fall-under the shadow
   The elaboration paratactic relational table for this clause complex is:
   \[
   \begin{array}{c|c|c}
   \text{and now all realms shall be put to the test,} & \text{to stand or fall-under the shadow} & 1 \\
   \text{p} & \wedge q & 2
   \end{array}
   \]
   From semantic point of view, clause complex and now all realms shall be put to the test or fall under the shadow means that all sectors should be have a test, if it do not have a test, then all sectors will be fall under the shadow.

(7) The men in under your command or do you ask for my judgment on all your deed? (LR: 77)
1. One of the alternatives is true, in this case it is possible to having one of the conditions, whether the men is under his command or he ask for my judgment on all your deed
2. If both alternatives are true, it means that the statement is false
3. If both alternatives are false, it also means that the statement is false
   This clause complex may also be naturally paraphrased syntactically with such conditional structures as:

   If the men are not under your command, (then) I will judge on all your deed
   The elaboration paratactic relationship table for this clause complex is:
   \[
   \begin{array}{c|c|c}
   \text{the men in under your command} & \text{or do you ask for my judgment on all your deed?} & 1 \\
   \text{p} & \wedge 2 & \wedge q
   \end{array}
   \]
   From semantic point of view, clause complex ‘the men in under your command or do you ask for my judgment on all your deed?’ means that someone should admit that the men is under his command, if nobody admit it, then the one who is in the court will be judge for all what he did.
Or in paraphrases

(8) I counsel that we rest now, and set out hence by night, and so time our going that we come upon the fields when tomorrow is as light as it will be, or when our lord gives the signal (LR: 92)

1. Clause complex above shows that or has the characteristics of showing alternative. The first alternative is true and the second alternatives are also true, in this case it is possible to say that I counsel that we rest now, so time our going that we come upon the fields when tomorrow is as light as it will be or I counsel that we rest now, so time our going that we come upon the fields when our lord gives the signal.

2. One of the alternatives is true; in this case it is possible to say I counsel that we rest now, so time our going that we come upon the fields when tomorrow is as light as it will be or I counsel that we rest now, so time our going that we come upon the fields when our lord gives the signal.

3. If both alternatives is false, it means that the statement is false
Because both alternative could be true, so the clause complex above is an inclusive or. And the elaboration paratactic relation table for this clause complex is:

| I counsel that we rest now, and set out hence by night, and so time our going that | 1 | +2 | +3 |
| we come upon the fields when tomorrow is as light as it will be, or when our lord gives | p  |  |  |
| the signal |  |  | ^q |

Because both alternative could be true, so the clause complex above is an inclusive or. The clause complex is also a paraphrase since light is one of many kinds of signal. The speaker seems to be saying:

“We can refer to come upon the fields when tomorrow is a light as it will be, or when our lord gives the signal”

Since there is a possibility here of choosing the other option, or both, the logician’s definition still seems to hold true.

From semantic point of view, this clause complex means I suggest that we rest now, so time our going that we come upon the fields when tomorrow is as light as it will be or we can go when our lord gives the signal.

Or as Self Correction Device

(10) Messengers always ready to go at the urgent command of Denethor or his chief captains (LR: 19)

According to Murcia, at the causal level, this metalinguistic version of or shows up in what often appear as self corrections when a speaker has not expressed himself or herself satisfactorily.

1. Clause complex above shows that or has the characteristics of showing alternative. The first alternative is true and the second alternatives are
also true, in this case it is possible to say that Messengers always ready to go at the urgent command of Denethor or Messengers always ready to go at the urgent command of his chief captains.

2. One of the alternatives is true; in this case it is possible to say Messengers always ready to go at the urgent command of Denethor or Messengers always ready to go at the urgent command of his chief captains.

3. If both alternatives is false, it means that the statement is false

Because both alternatives could be true, so the clause complex has an inclusive or. Here, the or may be interpreted in reference to the prior statement itself in such a way as to suggest, “What I intended in the first clause complex was messengers always ready to get to the urgent command of his chief captains”

These uses of or do not necessarily match the full range of uses of any single word in other languages. The elaboration paratactic relational table for this clause complex is:

\[ \text{Messengers always ready to go at the urgent command of Denethor} \quad \text{or his chief captains} \]

From semantic point of view, this clause complex means that:

1. The messengers ready to go at the urgent command of Denethor anytime.
2. The messengers ready to go at the urgent command of his chief captains anytime.

Conclusions

Based on the main theories used to analyze all data from the resource book, it can be concluded that there are several findings concerning the conjunction in the elaboration paratactic relational. The findings are:

1. There are two kinds of Conjunction Or; Inclusive or and Exclusive or.

   Inclusive or occurs when the truth conditional way: any clause complex “X” or “Y” is true as long as one of its conjuncts is true. If both of the conjuncts are false, then the statement is false; if both are true, the statement is true.

   Exclusive or occurs when the conditional way: any clause complex “X” or “Y” is true as long as one of its conjunct is true. If both of the conjuncts are true or false, the statement is false.

2. The proposition that usually appears after conjunction or especially in elaboration paratactic mainly functions as:
   a. Warning

      Conjunction or can function as warning as in (Dt. LR: 103).

      This proposition can only an exclusive or. Because exclusive or seems to have an implicit qualification of ‘but not both’ thus it would be unfair if we warn some one of something, but still he/she get the consequence.
   b. Paraphrase

      Or is frequently used at the phrasal level in definitions of phrases. The speaker seems want to say: ‘You can refer to this as “...” or as “...” for
example “We can refer to say I seldom find myself thinking of Silas Marner without hearing a line of Browning with it has no definite relation or I seldom find myself thinking of Silas Marner without hearing a line of Browning with it has no obvious relation” (DT. 20)

Since there is a possibility here of choosing the other option, or both, the logician’s definition still seems to hold true. That is why, this proportion can only in inclusive or.

c. Self Correction Device

At the causal level, this metalinguistic version of or shows up in what often appear as self corrections when a speaker has not expressed himself or herself satisfactorily. Here, the or may be interpreted in reference to the prior statement itself in such a way as to suggest, “What I intended in the first clause complex was…”

These uses of or do not necessarily match the full range of uses of any single word in other languages. Thus, this proportion can be an inclusive or or an exclusive or.
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