Complex Sentences in Flat Syntax: Annotation Guide

Part I: Theoretical Foundation

1.1 Complex Sentences Without Recursion

In flat syntax, **all clauses exist at the same syntactic level**. There is no recursive embedding where one clause is syntactically part of another. Instead:

• Clauses are separated by # boundaries

• Clauses are juxtaposed sequentially

• One clause may interrupt another (marked with { }), but this is a linear interruption, not hierarchical embedding

The representing asymmetry by recursion assumption (which flat syntax rejects): the traditional assumption that asymmetric relations between entities must be represented by part-whole embedding relations.

Flat syntax alternative: Asymmetric semantic or pragmatic relations between events can be represented by:

• Sequential juxtaposition of clauses

• Word order patterns

• Morphosyntactic marking (subordinators, deranked predicates)

• CE labels (Main, Adv, Comp, Rel)

1.2 The Four-Way Classification

Complex sentences involve clauses that are classified at the **Sentential CE level** using four primary labels:

CE Label	Description	Pragmatic/Semantic Characterization
Main	Main clause	Pragmatically **asserted** event
Adv	Adverbial clause	Non-asserted event; temporal/causal/conditional relation to main event
Comp	Complement clause	Action/proposition serving as argument of predicate
Rel	Relative clause	Action/state serving as modifier of referent

Critical insight from Croft: The morphosyntactic distinction between "main" and "subordinate" clauses is NOT a perfect indicator of syntactic embedding. It is better understood as indicating:

1. **Pragmatic distinction:** Asserted vs. non-asserted events

2. **Semantic relations:** Between events (temporal, causal, etc.) or between event and participant

3. **Morphosyntactic strategies:** Coordination markers, subordinators, deranked predicates

1.3 Deranked Predicates

Deranked verb forms are verb forms that overtly code their relation to the sentence. They include:

• **Converbs** (adverbial clause marking)

• **Participles** (relative clause marking)

• **Infinitives/Action nominals** (complement clause marking)

• **Gerunds** (various functions)

Key principle: Deranked predicates are **cues** to clause type, but not absolute determiners. The same form may appear in different clause types depending on context.

1.4 Why the Main/Subordinate Distinction is Fuzzy

Evidence that challenges traditional embedding:

1. **Coordinate deranking:** Some languages use subordinate morphology for coordinate meanings

2. **Insubordination:** Subordinate morphology used for main clause speech acts

3. **Speech act constructions:** Main clause patterns appearing in subordinate clauses

4. **Polyfunctionality:** Same subordinator for different clause types

Annotation principle: In flat syntax, we annotate based on **morphosyntactic form** and **pragmatic/semantic function**, not on assumed hierarchical structure.

Part II: Main Clauses

2.1 Characteristics

Main clauses are characterized by:

• **Pragmatically asserted** events

• Fully inflected predicates (not deranked)

• Can stand alone as independent utterances

• CE label: **Main**

2.2 Coordination of Main Clauses

Pattern: Multiple main clauses juxtaposed, often with conjunction

English examples:

```
I + ate # and + I + left
She + was + exhausted # and + she + went + to bed
John + had + no money # but + he + went + into this expensive restaurant
```

Annotation:

• Each clause marked with #

• Conjunction (and, but, or) belongs to the **second clause** as a **Conj** CE

• Both clauses labeled **Main** at sentential CE level

Semantic relations: The same semantic relations found in adverbial subordination (temporal, causal, conditional, adversative) can be expressed through coordination:

Semantic Relation	Subordinate Form	Coordinate Form
Temporal (anterior)	He washed the car # before + driving to the party	He washed the car # and + drove to the party
Causal	She went to bed # because + she + was + exhausted	She + was + exhausted # and + she + went + to bed
Means	He got into the army # by + lying about his age	He lied about his age # and + got into the army
Conditional	If + you + do + that # the terrorists + have + won	You + do + that # and + the terrorists + have + won
Adversative	Although + John + had + no money # he + went into this restaurant	John + had + no money # but + he + went into this restaurant

Key insight: Coordination vs. subordination is NOT determined by semantic relations between events, but by pragmatic assertion status and morphosyntactic form.

2.3 Border Case: Coordinate Deranking

Problem: Some languages use deranked (subordinate-type) verb forms in coordinate constructions where both events are asserted.

Japanese example (English translation):

```
The old man worked at the mountain # and + the old woman tended the store
```

(In Japanese, first clause uses converb/-te form typical of subordination)

Annotation guidance:

• Annotate as **two Main clauses** if both events are pragmatically asserted

• The deranked form is a morphological strategy for coordination, not true subordination

• Mark both clauses with # and label both as **Main**

2.4 Border Case: Insubordination

Problem: Subordinate clause morphology used for main clause speech acts

Examples:

Spanish Subjunctive for imperatives:

```
Dígan-se-lo + Ustedes
tell:3SG.SUBJ-REFL-3SG.OBJ 2PL.FORMAL
"Tell them about it."
```

English Gerund for prohibitive:

```
No smoking
```

Russian Infinitive for prohibitive:

```
Ne + kurit'
NEG smoke-INF
"No smoking"
```

Annotation guidance:

• Annotate as **single Main clause** at sentential CE level

• The subordinate morphology is repurposed for speech act functions

• Do not create a phantom "matrix clause"

2.5 Border Case: Speech Act Constructions in Subordinate Clauses

Problem: Constructions typically restricted to main clauses appearing in syntactically subordinate clauses

Examples of main clause inversion constructions:

Acceptable in certain subordinate contexts:

```
I + knew # that + never before + have + prices + been + so high
I'm + leaving # because + here + comes + my bus
```

Not acceptable in other subordinate contexts:

```
*Nixon + regrets # that + never before + have + prices + been + so high
*I'm + leaving # if + here + comes + my bus
```

Annotation guidance:

• Annotate based on **morphosyntactic structure** (presence of subordinator)

• Label clause as **Adv** or **Comp** based on subordinator type

• The illocutionary force is pragmatic, not syntactic

Theoretical implication: Morphosyntactic "subordinate" structures are not absolute indicators of clause status, but rather strategies that typically (but not always) correlate with non-assertion.

Part III: Adverbial Clauses

3.1 Characteristics

Adverbial clauses are characterized by:

• **Non-asserted events**

• Express temporal, causal, conditional, or other circumstantial relations to main event

• Often marked by subordinating conjunctions (when, because, if, although)

• Or by deranked predicates (converbs)

• CE label: **Adv**

3.2 Adverbial Subordinators

English examples with subordinating conjunctions:

Temporal:

    after + I + ate # I + left

Causal:

    She + went + to bed # because + she + was + exhausted

Conditional:

    If + you + do + that # the terrorists + have + won

Adversative:

    Although + John + had + no money # he + went + into this expensive restaurant

Annotation:

• Adverbial clause marked with # boundary

• Subordinator (after, because, if, although) belongs to the adverbial clause as a clausal CE

• Main clause labeled **Main**, adverbial clause labeled **Adv**

• Order of clauses can vary (Adv # Main or Main # Adv)

3.3 Converbs (Deranked Adverbial Predicates)

Converbs are non-finite verb forms specialized for adverbial clause functions.

English examples:

Gerund converb:

```
He + got + into the army # by + lying + about his age
```

Participial converb:

```
after + I + ate # I + left
```

(Note: "after eating" would use gerund form)

Infinitive converb:

```
he + bought + a computer # to + work
```

Cross-linguistic note: Many languages have dedicated converb forms that mark:

• Temporal relations (simultaneous, sequential)

• Manner

• Cause

• Condition

Annotation guidance:

• Converb clause is still a full clause at sentential CE level

• Mark as **Adv**

• The converb form is the **Pred** CE at clausal level

• Morphological marking on the converb is glossed in the IMT line

3.4 Interruption Patterns

Adverbial clauses rarely interrupt their matrix clause. They typically occur:

• Sentence-initially: `# Adv # Main #`

• Sentence-finally: `# Main # Adv #`

Rare interrupting cases:

If interruption occurs, use `{  }` notation:

```
The man {when + he + arrived} immediately + left
```

But such patterns are extremely rare cross-linguistically and in actual discourse.

3.5 Multiple Adverbial Clauses

Question: When multiple adverbial clauses occur, are they recursively embedded?

Flat syntax answer: No. They are sequentially juxtaposed.

Example:

```
# After + I + woke up # when + the alarm + rang # I + made + coffee #
```

Annotation:

• Three separate clauses, all at sentential CE level

• First two labeled **Adv**

• Last labeled **Main**

• No hierarchical embedding of adverbial clauses

Morphosyntactic evidence: Languages do not distinguish between an adverbial clause subordinate to a main clause vs. an adverbial clause subordinate to another adverbial clause. The same converb or subordinator forms are used regardless of semantic scope.

Part IV: Complement Clauses

4.1 Characteristics

Complement clauses are characterized by:

• Serve as **argument** of a complement-taking predicate (CTP)

• Denote actions or propositions

• Often marked by complementizers (that, whether, if)

• Or by deranked predicates (infinitives, action nominals)

• CE label: **Comp**

4.2 Types of Complement-Taking Predicates (CTPs)

CTP Type	Examples	Typical Complement Form (English)
Utterance	say, tell, report	that-clause, direct quote
Propositional attitude	believe, think, know	that-clause
Perception	see, hear, feel	-ing clause, bare infinitive
Desiderative	want, wish, hope	to-infinitive

Manipulative	make, let, force, persuade	to-infinitive, bare infinitive
Modal	can, must, should	bare infinitive (grammaticalized)
Aspectual	begin, finish, continue	-ing clause, to-infinitive (grammaticalized)
Negative	not, never	(grammaticalized)

4.3 Finite Complement Clauses

Finite complements have fully inflected predicates and complementizers.

Examples:

Utterance CTP:

```
I + told + her # that + I + bought + a bicycle
```

Propositional attitude CTP:

```
That + he + resigned # isn't + surprising
```

(Subject complement)

Annotation:

• Complement clause marked with # boundary

• Complementizer (that, whether, if) belongs to complement clause as clausal CE

• Matrix clause labeled **Main**, complement clause labeled **Comp**

Alternative: Extraposition

```
It + isn't + surprising # that + he + resigned
```

(No interruption with extraposed complement)

4.4 Infinitives and Action Nominals (Deranked Complement Predicates)

Infinitives are non-finite verb forms specialized for complement clause functions.

English examples:

Desiderative CTP:

```
She + wanted # to + leave
```

Manipulative CTP:

```
I + persuaded + him # to + apply
```

Action nominals (gerunds in English) also function as complements:

```
I + enjoyed # reading + that book
```

Annotation guidance:

• Infinitive/gerund clause is still a clause at sentential CE level (if it has clause-like properties)

• Mark as **Comp**

• The infinitive/gerund is the **Pred** CE at clausal level

• Morphological marking is glossed in IMT line

4.5 Interruption Patterns

Complement clauses may interrupt matrix clauses depending on word order:

Matrix Order	Complement Position	Interruption?	Pattern
SVO	Subject complement	NO	`# Comp # V + Obj #`
SVO	Object complement	NO	`# Sbj + V # Comp #`
SOV	Subject complement	YES	`# Comp # Obj + V #` (rare)
SOV	Object complement	YES	`# Sbj {Comp} V #`

English examples:

No interruption (SVO object complement):

```
I + told + her # that + I + bought + a bicycle
```

Interruption (if English were SOV):

```
I {that + I + bicycle + bought} her + told
```

Mitigating factors:

• **Preferred Argument Structure:** Transitive subjects (A role) often unexpressed, reducing interruption

• **Extraposition:** Many languages allow complement postposing

• **Direct report strategy:** Utterance complements often pre- or postposed

4.6 Complement Clauses vs. Complex Predicates

Critical distinction: When does a CTP + complement form two clauses vs. one clause with a complex predicate?

Criteria for TWO CLAUSES (Main + Comp):

• CTP denotes independent or partly independent event

• Separate or partly separate argument structures

• CTP has its own clausal CEs (arguments, other CPPs)

• Deranked but still clause-like complement

Criteria for ONE CLAUSE (CPP + Pred):

• CTP has grammaticalized to auxiliary or modal

• Fully shared argument structure

• CTP lacks other CEs

• Semantic contribution is modal, aspectual, or polarity

Grammaticalization cline:

```
Full CTP → Auxiliary/Modal → Affix
[Main # Comp] → [CPP + Pred] → [bound morpheme]
```

English examples:

Two clauses:

```
She + wanted # to + leave
I + told + her # that + I + bought + a bicycle
```

One clause (complex predicate):

```
She + might + lose
I + have + eaten
They + are + running
```

Annotation of complex predicates:

• Auxiliary/modal = **CPP** at clausal CE level

• Main verb = **Pred** at clausal CE level

• Both within single clause (no # boundary between them)

Examples in table format:

```
Analyzed Text: She + might + lose + the game
Clausal CEs:   Arg  CPP    Pred   Arg
Sentential CE: Main
```

```
Analyzed Text: She + wanted # to + leave
Clausal CEs:   Arg  Pred     Conj Pred
Sentential CE: Main    Comp
```

Border cases: The grammaticalization continuum means some CTPs are intermediate:

• **Perception verbs:** Often lose complement clause properties

• **Desideratives:** May grammaticalize to future/irrealis markers

• **Aspectual verbs:** Often grammaticalize to aspect auxiliaries

Annotation guidance: When in doubt, check for:

1. Independent argument structure → two clauses

2. Morphological reduction of CTP → complex predicate

3. Loss of other CEs around CTP → complex predicate

Part V: Relative Clauses

5.1 Characteristics

Relative clauses are characterized by:

• Serve as **modifier** of a referring phrase

• Denote actions, states, or properties

• Often marked by relativizers (that, which, who)

• Or by deranked predicates (participles)

• CE label: **Rel**

Functional role: Despite modifying a phrase, relative clauses are annotated as **clauses at the sentential CE level** in flat syntax, not as embedded within phrases.

5.2 Externally-Headed Relative Clauses

Most common cross-linguistically. The head noun is an overt argument of the matrix clause, and the relative clause modifies it.

English examples:

Non-interrupting (postposed):

```
Bilbo + found + the ring # that + Gollum + had + lost
```

Interrupting (subject relative):

```
The tree {that + fell + on {my} house} had + died + last winter
The man {who's + picking + pears} comes + down + from the tree
```

Annotation:

• Relative clause marked with # boundary (or { } if interrupting)

• Relativizer (that, which, who) belongs to relative clause as clausal CE

• Matrix clause labeled **Main**, relative clause labeled **Rel**

• External head is an argument of the matrix clause

5.3 Word Order and Interruption Patterns

Relative clause position relative to head noun:

Language Order	Relative Clause Order	Subject Relative	Object Relative
SVO	NRel (postposed)	**INTERRUPTS**	No interruption
SVO	RelN (preposed)	No interruption (rare)	**INTERRUPTS**
SOV	RelN (preposed)	No interruption	No interruption (if A unexpressed)
SOV	NRel (postposed)	**INTERRUPTS**	**INTERRUPTS**

English patterns (SVO + NRel):

Subject relative (interrupts):

    # The man {who + lives + next door} is + a teacher #

Object relative (no interruption):

    # I + met + the man # who + lives + next door #

Cross-linguistic note:

• **SVO languages:** Preposed relatives (RelN) extremely rare

• **SOV languages:** Both orders found; interruption varies

• **Preferred Argument Structure:** Reduces interruption when A argument unexpressed

5.4 Extraposition of Relative Clauses

English allows extraposition of relative clauses on subjects to avoid interruption:

Interrupting:

    The tree {that + fell + on {my} house} was + dead

Extraposed:

    The tree + was + dead # that + fell + on {my} house

Annotation of extraposition:

• Same as non-interrupting relative clause

• Relative clause follows matrix clause with # boundary

• Labeled **Rel** at sentential CE level

5.5 Participles (Deranked Relative Predicates)

Participles are non-finite verb forms specialized for relative clause functions.

English examples:

Present participle:

```
The man {picking + pears} came + down
```

Past participle:

```
The house {built + by my father} was + destroyed
```

Annotation guidance:

• Participial relative clause is still a clause at sentential CE level

• Mark as **Rel** (or {Rel} if interrupting)

• The participle is the **Pred** CE at clausal level

• Morphological marking on participle glossed in IMT line

Cross-linguistic variation:

• Many languages use participles as primary relative clause strategy

• Some languages have multiple participle forms for different tenses/aspects

• Participles may grammaticalize to adjectives (see §5.7)

5.6 Infinitive

```
The product {to + kill + ants}  is + on + the table
```

Characteristics:

• The infinitive modifies a noun (product)

• There is participant sharing: "product" is a participant in the killing event (as INSTRUMENT/MEANS)

• Can often be paraphrased with a full relative clause: "The product [that/which kills/is used to kill ants]"

5.7 Alternative Relative Clause Strategies

Several strategies minimize or eliminate interruption:

5.7.1 Internally-Headed Relative Clauses

The head noun is expressed inside the relative clause, not in the matrix clause.

Japanese-type example (English approximation):

```
# I + ate [WHAT: rice + that I + bought] #
```

Interruption patterns:

• **SVO, subject head:** No interruption

- **SVO, object head:** No interruption

- **SOV, subject head:** No interruption

- **SOV, object head:** No interruption (if A unexpressed)

Result: Internally-headed relatives minimize interruption, especially in SOV languages (where they are most common).

5.7.2 Correlative Relative Clauses

Relative clause and matrix clause juxtaposed, each with correlated demonstrative/pronoun.

Hindi-type example (English approximation):

```
# Which + man + came # that man + is + my friend #
```

Annotation:

- Two clauses juxtaposed with #

- First clause labeled **Rel**

- Second clause labeled **Main**

- No interruption

5.7.3 Adjoined Relative Clauses

Relative clause functions like an adverbial clause rather than embedded modifier.

Annotation:

- Similar to correlative

- Relative clause marked **Rel**

- Matrix clause marked **Main**

- No interruption

5.8 Property Concept "Relative Clauses"

Problem: In many languages, property concepts (adjectives) use relative clause morphology when modifying nouns.

Characteristics:

- Single word (possibly + relativizer/linker)

- Property concept predicate (tall, red, old)

- Relative clause verbal inflections

- No independent arguments (only the head referent role)

Example pattern (schematic):

```
tree [that-is-tall]
```

Annotation guidance:

If truly clause-like:

```
# tree {that + is + tall} #
Rel clause
```

If grammaticalized to lexical modifier:

```
tree + tall
Mod at phrasal CE level
```

Criteria for lexical modifier analysis:

• Single word or word + invariant relativizer

• No argument structure beyond head

• Grammaticalized relative marking

• Functions identically to underived adjectives

Theoretical note: Property concept words with relative clause morphology represent an intermediate stage in grammaticalization from clause to lexical modifier.

5.9 Prosody and Relative Clause Structure

English prosodic pattern: Relative clauses on subjects are consistently produced in the same intonation unit as their head, while relative clauses on objects are in separate intonation units.

Example:

Subject relative (single intonation unit):

```
7,78 [Meanwhile...] the man who's picking pears,
7,79 comes down from the tree.
```

Object relative (separate intonation units):

```
10,29 and put them in a couple of barrels,
10,30 that he's got down there.
```

Theoretical implication: The prosodic pattern for subject relatives suggests speakers may construe the external head + relative clause as a single unit, despite the morphosyntactic interruption pattern.

Annotation note: Flat syntax maintains morphosyntactic annotation regardless of prosodic grouping, but prosody may reflect alternative functional analysis.

Part VI: Diagnostic Decision Tree for Annotation

Step 1: How many clauses?

Ask: Is there more than one predicate element?

• **One predicate + auxiliaries/modals** → One clause (complex predicate: CPP + Pred)

• **Two+ independent predicates** → Multiple clauses → Proceed to Step 2

Complex predicate check:

• Shared argument structure?

• CTP grammaticalized to auxiliary?

• CTP lacks independent CEs?

→ If YES to all: One clause

Step 2: What is the pragmatic status?

Ask: Are the events asserted or non-asserted?

• **Both/all asserted** → Coordinate main clauses (all **Main**)

• **Mixed assertion status** → Main + subordinate → Proceed to Step 3

Assertion check:

• Can it stand alone as independent utterance?

• Would it be acceptable response to "What happened?"

• Lacks subordinate morphology?

→ If YES: Asserted (Main clause)

Step 3: What kind of subordinate clause?

Ask: What is the morphosyntactic marking and functional role?

Marking	Function	Label
Adverbial subordinator (when, because, if)	Circumstantial relation	**Adv**
Converb/gerund with circumstantial meaning	Circumstantial relation	**Adv**
Complementizer (that, whether, if)	Argument of CTP	**Comp**
Infinitive/action nominal	Argument of CTP	**Comp**
Relativizer (that, which, who)	Modifier of referent	**Rel**

Participle	Modifier of referent	**Rel**

Step 4: Does one clause interrupt another?

Ask: Does one clause's span interrupt the linear span of another clause?

• **No interruption** → Mark with # boundaries

• **Interruption** → Mark interrupting clause with { }

Common interruption patterns:

• Subject relative clauses (SVO languages): {Rel}

• Complement clauses on objects (SOV languages): {Comp}

• Genitive phrases within adpositional phrases: {Gen}

Step 5: Border case checks

Insubordination check:

• Subordinate morphology + speech act function + no matrix → **Main** clause

Coordinate deranking check:

• Converb/deranked form + both events asserted → Both **Main**

Property concept check:

• Single word + relative morphology + no arguments → Lexical **Mod**, not **Rel** clause

Complex predicate check:

• CTP + complement, but grammaticalized/shared arguments → **CPP + Pred** in one clause

Border Cases & Ambiguities with Infinitives

Case 1: Purpose vs. Relative - "Thing-for-purpose" Nouns

Some nouns inherently encode purpose (tool nouns, instrument nouns):

Ambiguous example:

• "He bought a knife to cut bread"

Two possible analyses:

Analysis A - Adverbial (purpose of buying):

• "He bought a knife [in order to cut bread with it]"

• Explains why he bought it

• The knife and cutting are separate considerations

Analysis B - Relative (type of knife):

• "He bought a knife [that is used to cut bread]" = bread knife

• Identifies what kind of knife

• The knife's purpose is part of its identity

How to decide?

Context + Intonation in Portuguese:

• "Ele comprou uma faca para cortar pão" (slight pause before "para") → PURPOSE (adverbial)

• "Ele comprou uma faca-para-cortar-pão" (no pause, compound-like) → RELATIVE

Semantic test:

• If you're identifying the TYPE of object → **relative**

• If you're explaining the REASON for the action → **adverbial**

Case 2: Portuguese "para + infinitive" Ambiguity

Portuguese "para + infinitive" is notoriously ambiguous:

Example: "Comprei um livro para ler"

Reading 1 - Adverbial (purpose):

• "I bought a book [in order to read (it/something)]"

• Reading activity is the purpose of buying

Reading 2 - Relative (reading material):

• "I bought a book [that is to-be-read / for reading]"

• Book = reading material (participant sharing)

Disambiguation cues:

Favors ADVERBIAL:

• Object specified: "Comprei um livro para ler *nas férias*" (temporal adjunct)

• Different patient: "Comprei um livro para ler *para as crianças*" (read to children)

Favors RELATIVE:

• Generic/type reference: "Comprei *um livro para ler*" (a reading-book, not a picture book)

• Contrastive: "Comprei um livro *para ler*, não *para colorir*"

Case 3: "Have/Ter + Object + Infinitive"

English: "I have work to do"

Portuguese: "Tenho trabalho a fazer" / "Tenho trabalho para fazer"

Analysis: **RELATIVE CLAUSE**

Evidence:

✓ "trabalho" is modified (what kind of work? work-to-be-done)

✓ Participant sharing: "trabalho" = PATIENT of "fazer"

✓ Can expand: "trabalho [que deve ser feito]"

✓ Cannot move: *"A fazer, tenho trabalho" ✗

Related constructions:

• "Não tenho nada **a dizer**" = nothing [to say/that should be said]

• "Há muito **a fazer**" = much [to do/that must be done]

• "É fácil **de entender**" = easy [to understand] (relative modifying property adjective)

Portuguese-Specific Patterns

1. "para" vs "a" vs "de" + infinitive

• "para + inf" (most ambiguous):

• Can be adverbial: "Vim para ajudar" (purpose)

• Can be relative: "livro para ler" (reading book)

• "a + inf" (more restricted):

• Usually relative: "trabalho a fazer", "nada a declarar"

• Especially after quantifiers: "muito a fazer", "pouco a dizer"

• "de + inf" (different pattern):

• After adjectives: "fácil de fazer", "difícil de entender"

• These are relative-like (modifying the adjective's property)

2. Position matters

- Post-nominal infinitives → more likely **relative**:

- "Tenho [um problema **a resolver**]" (noun + infinitive)

- Clause-final infinitives → more likely **adverbial**:

- "[Ele veio aqui] **para ajudar**" (action + purpose)

Final Diagnostic Flowchart

```
Is the infinitive adjacent to a noun?
    ↓ YES → Does the noun participate in the infinitive event?
            ↓ YES → RELATIVE CLAUSE
            ↓ NO → Check if it's actually modifying the main verb...
    ↓ NO → Does it express why/for what purpose/result?
            ↓ YES → ADVERBIAL CLAUSE
            ↓ NO → Is it an argument of the main predicate?
                    ↓ YES → COMPLEMENT CLAUSE
```

Part VII: Quick Reference Tables

Morphosyntactic Markers by Clause Type

Clause Type	Finite Marking	Deranked Marking	Conjunction/Relativizer
Main	Full inflection	(none)	Coordinating (and, but, or)
Adv	Subordinator	Converb	Adverbial subordinator (when, because, if, although)
Comp	Complementizer	Infinitive, action nominal	Complementizer (that, whether, if, for...to)
Rel	Relativizer	Participle	Relativizer (that, which, who, where, when)

Interruption Likelihood by Construction Type

Construction	Interruption Frequency	Most Common Pattern
Adverbial clause	Extremely rare	Peripheral (sentence-initial/final)
Complement clause	Moderate (depends on word order)	SOV object complement interrupts
Relative clause	High in SVO languages	Subject relatives interrupt in SVO+NRel
Genitive phrase	Varies by language	English Gen+N with prepositions

Two Clauses vs. Complex Predicate

Feature	Two Clauses (Main # Comp)	Complex Predicate (CPP + Pred)
Event independence	Separate or partly separate events	Single event with modal/aspectual/polarity modification
Argument structure	Separate or partly shared	Fully shared
CTP status	Lexical predicate	Grammaticalized auxiliary/modal
CTP has own CEs	Yes (may have own arguments)	No (only shared arguments)
Deranked form	Infinitive/that-clause	Bare infinitive/participial form
English examples	"want to leave", "said that..."	"might leave", "have eaten", "are running"

Part VIII: Cross-Linguistic Notes

Languages with Extensive Converb Systems

• **Turkic, Mongolic, Caucasian languages:** Rich converb paradigms marking different temporal/causal relations

• **Annotation:** Each converb clause is **Adv** at sentential CE level

Languages with Obligatory Relative Clause Marking on Adjectives

• **Many African, Asian languages:** Property concepts take participial/relative morphology

• **Annotation decision:** If single-word + no arguments → Lexical **Mod**; otherwise **Rel** clause

SOV Languages with Non-Rigid Word Order

• **Many SOV languages:** Allow postposing of heavy constituents (including clauses)

• **Effect:** Reduces complement and relative clause interruption

• **Annotation:** Standard clause marking with #, no interruption { }

Languages with Correlative or Internally-Headed Relatives

• **Indo-Aryan, Tibeto-Burman, some Native American:** Non-interrupting relative clause strategies

• **Annotation:** Relative clause juxtaposed to main clause, labeled **Rel**

Part IX: Practical Annotation Examples

Example 1: Simple Coordination

```
Analyzed Text: I + ate # and + I + left .
Clausal CEs:   Arg Pred  Conj Arg Pred
Sentential CE: Main      Main
```

Example 2: Adverbial Subordination

```
Analyzed Text: after + I + ate # I + left .
Clausal CEs:   Conj  Arg Pred  Arg Pred
Sentential CE: Adv             Main
```

Example 3: Complement Clause (Finite)

```
Analyzed Text: I + told + her # that + I + bought + a bicycle .
Clausal CEs:   Arg Pred  Arg   Conj  Arg Pred     Arg
Sentential CE: Main            Comp
```

Example 4: Complement Clause (Infinitive)

```
Analyzed Text: She + wanted # to + leave .
Clausal CEs:   Arg  Pred      Conj Pred
Sentential CE: Main           Comp
```

Example 5: Complex Predicate (Not Two Clauses)

```
Analyzed Text: She + might + lose + the game .
Clausal CEs:   Arg  CPP     Pred   Arg
Sentential CE: Main
```

Example 6: Relative Clause (Non-Interrupting)

```
Analyzed Text: Bilbo + found + the ring # that + Gollum + had + lost .
Clausal CEs:   Arg     Pred    Arg        Conj  Arg      CPP   Pred
Sentential CE: Main                       Rel
```

Example 7: Relative Clause (Interrupting)

```
Analyzed Text: The tree {that + fell + on {my} house} had + died .
Phrasal CEs:   Mod Head  Head   Pred   Adp Head        CPP   Pred
Clausal CEs:   Arg        Conj  Pred   Arg       Gen   CPP   Pred
Sentential CE: Main       Rel
```

Example 8: Multiple Subordinate Clauses

```
Analyzed Text: When + I + woke up # after + the alarm + rang # I + made + coffee .
Clausal CEs:   Conj  Arg Pred      Conj   Arg         Pred   Arg Pred   Arg
Sentential CE: Adv                 Adv                       Main
```

Example 9: Extraposed Relative

```
Analyzed Text: The tree + was + dead # that + fell + on {my} house .
```

```
Phrasal CEs:    Mod Head  CPP   Head  Head  Pred  Adp Head
Clausal CEs:    Arg       CPP   Pred  Conj  Pred  Arg      Gen
Sentential CE: Main             Rel
```

Example 10: Insubordination (Subordinate Form, Main Function)

```
Analyzed Text: No smoking .
Phrasal CEs:   Mod Head
Clausal CEs:   (Pred)
Sentential CE: Main
```

(Gerund form typically subordinate, but functioning as prohibitive main clause)