Outline I

1. Dependency Grammars and Coordination: a short overview
   - Essential ideas of Dependency Grammars
   - Modelling Coordination in DG: two possible directions
     - 1. "Coordination structures do have heads"
     - 2. "Coordination structures are not usual dependency structures"

2. Bubble trees: a new syntactic representation
   - Preliminary definitions
   - Definition of bubble trees
   - Perspectives on dependency and constituency

Outline II

3. Handling coordination phenomena
   - Coordination bubbles
   - Shared coordination
   - Gapping and valency slot coordination
   - Agreement and coordination of unlikes
   - Constraints between coordination and extraction
     - Projectivity of a Bubble Tree
     - Handling Ross's Coordinate Structure Constraint

Outline III

4. Demo of a small hand-crafted XDG grammar featuring bubble trees
   - General Methodology
   - Extensible Dependency Grammar
   - Demo

5. Summary and Conclusion
“There’s only two things I want to say:
(a) Take things seriously, and
(b) let them talk to each other.”
[Blackburn 97]

- My main sources for this work:
  - Section 1 of this talk was partly inspired by an ESSLLI course on dependency grammar by Denys Duchier and Geert-Jan Kruifj [Duchier 02], and by various other works (see bibliography for details).
  - Section 2 & 3 are essentially a summary of [Kahane 97], with a few personal additions.
  - The demo relies on the XDG Development Kit developed by Ralph Debusmann [Debusmann 06].

- Dependency Grammar is essentially based on relationships between words (instead of groupings - or constituents - as in phrase-structure trees)

- The dependency relation, noted $A \rightarrow B$, is defined as an oriented relation between two words, where:
  - The “source” word $A$ is called the head or the governor ;
  - The “target” word $B$ is called the dependent or governee.

- Dependency in language can be of different types: morphological, syntactic, semantic. In this talk, we will focus only on syntactic dependency.

- The theoretical characterization of the notion of syntactic head is a difficult question. [Zwicky 85] argues for the use of eight different criteria, like subcategorization, morphosyntactic marking, concord, etc.

- Moreover, the dependency relation must also satisfy several formal properties: antisymmetry, antireflexivity, antitransitivity, labelling and uniqueness.
The syntactic structure of a sentence thus consists of a set of pairwise relations among words.

Depending on the chosen framework, this can lead either to a graph or a tree structure.

In the general case, dependency structures don’t directly provide a linear order (of the words in the sentence).

Dependency structure

- Linear order is taken into account by constraining the structure to satisfy some form of projectivity.
- Put simply, a dependency structure is said to be projective iff, ∀ words A and B where A → B, all the words situated between A and B in the sentence are subordinated to A.
- The projectivity constraint must sometimes be substantially “relaxed” in order to handle phenomena like extraction or languages with free word order.

Modern notion of DG is usually attributed to Lucien Tesnière [Tesnière 59].

DG comes nowadays in many different “flavors”:
- Functional Generative Description (“Prague School”, [Sgall 86])
- Hudson’s Word Grammar [Hudson 90]
- Meaning-Text Theory [Mel’čuk 88]

Coordination structures are usually hard to describe in terms of dependency.

Indeed, Coordination is often described as an orthogonal (ie. “horizontal”) relation...

... whereas dependency constructions are best at formalizing subordination (ie. “vertical” relations).
Let’s examine the two following examples:

Maria and Hans went camping. \(1\)

John stole and ate all the cookies. \(2\)

**Question:** Where is the head?

1. One of the coordinate elements? *No:* none has a higher priority than the other;
2. Both coordinate elements? *No:* this would lead John in (2) to have two heads, which violates one formal property (uniqueness) of the dependency relation;
3. The *and* connective? *No:* the connective in (1) cannot be the subject (e.g., it would never be inflected).

1. **“coordination structures do have heads”**

**Some Evidence**

**First solution:** “coordination structures do have heads”, as argued in [Mel’čuk 88, Mel’čuk 98]:

1. In the general case, the coordination structure is not symmetrical:

   Hans slipped into his jacket and left. \(3\)
   \[\neq\] Hans left and slipped into his jacket. \(4\)

2. The right conjunct (connective included) is always omissible, while the left one is usually not:

   Hans, as well as Maria, came here \(\Rightarrow\) Hans came here. \(5\)
   \[\Rightarrow\] *As well as Maria came here. (6)

   For [Mel’čuk 88], the head of the coordination structure is always the **first conjoint**.

   This approach has one obvious advantage: it allows the coordinative construction to be analyzed in “pure” Dependency Grammar.

   But it also leads to various problems, notably for handling all types of “shared” constructions.
1. “coordination structures do have heads”
Mel’čuk’s approach - Illustrative Example

![Diagram](image1)

**Figure:** Analysis of sentence (3), in Mel’čuk’s approach

2. “Coordination structures are not usual dependency structures”
Tesnière’s and FGD’s Approaches

- **Second solution:** Many other researchers argue that “pure” DG is intrinsically *insufficient* to account for all coordination phenomena, and that a radically different approach must be sought:

  1. **[Tesnière 59, p.80-82]** already distinguished dependency and coordinative relations with his concept of “junction”;
  2. **Functional Generative Description** represents coordination by adding a new dimension to the tectogrammatical tree (by using special “bracketing”) [Žabokrtský 05]
2. “Coordination structures are not usual dependency structures”

Hudson's Approach

[Hudson 00] considers coordination as “a continuous string of words held together by principles other than dependency”.

The Dependency in coordination Principle states that

**Principle**

“The conjuncts of a coordination must share the same dependencies to words outside the coordination”

---

Preliminary definitions

Now that the general background of our talk is set, it's time to get to the heart of the subject!

We'll now examine in more detail a new syntactic representation, **bubble trees**, which also belongs to this class of “hybrid” dependency-constituency models, and which, in our view, is particularly appropriate for the treatment of coordination (among others).

Section 2 presents the mathematical structure and its formal properties, and Section 3 shows how it can be applied to the analysis of coordination phenomena.

---

Definition

A tree can be viewed as:

- An oriented graph;
- A binary relation \( \prec \), where \( x \prec y \) iff \((y, x)\) is a link in the corresponding graph, with \( x \) and \( y \) being 2 distinct nodes.

Definition

Each tree induces a dominance relation \( \preceq \) on node pairs, defined as follows: \( x \preceq y \) iff \( \exists x_1, x_2, ..., x_n \) such that \( x = x_1 \prec x_2 \prec ... \prec x_n = y \) \((n \geq 0)\).
### Preliminary definitions

#### What is a dependency tree?

- Let \( X \) be an arbitrary set of lexical units.

**Definition**

A **dependency tree** on \( X \) is simply a plain tree on \( X \), defined by the couple \((X, \prec)\).

- In the example on the right, the tree is defined by the couple \((X, \prec)\), where
  
  \[
  X = \{\text{Pierre, eats, noodles}\},
  \]
  
  \[
  \prec = \{(\text{eats, Pierre}, \text{subj}), (\text{eats, noodles}, \text{dobj})\}
  \]

(NB: we added labelling of grammatical functions to the tree relations)

#### What is a constituency tree? Illustrative example

*Don’t panic! Let’s clarify this with an example:*

- We specify our tree by the four-tuple \((X, \mathcal{B}, \phi, \prec)\), where:
  
  - \( X = \{\text{Pierre, eats, noodles}\} \)
  
  - \( \mathcal{B} = \{\text{S, VP, NP}_1, NP_2, V\} \)
  
  - \( \phi = \{(\text{S} \rightarrow \{\text{Pierre, eats, noodles}\}),
    (\text{NP}_1 \rightarrow \{\text{Pierre}\}),
    (\text{VP} \rightarrow \{\text{eats, noodles}\}),
    (\text{NP}_2 \rightarrow \{\text{noodles}\})\} \)
  
  - \( \prec = \{(\text{S, NP}_1), (\text{S, VP}), (\text{VP}, V), (\text{VP, NP}_2)\} \)

(Figure: One constituency tree)

### Definition of a bubble tree

#### Basic idea

- Intuitively, a **bubble tree** is a tree whose nodes are **bubbles**. Each bubble can
  - Contain other bubbles or a lexical element;
  - Form dependency relations with other bubbles.

(Figure: A bubble tree)
Definition of a bubble tree

**Formal definition**

A **bubble tree** is a four-tuple $(X, \mathcal{B}, \phi, \triangleleft)$, where:

- $X$ is the set of lexical units;
- $\mathcal{B}$ is the set of bubbles;
- $\phi$ is a map from $\mathcal{B}$ to the non-empty subsets of $X$ (which describes the content of the bubbles);
- $\triangleleft$ is a relation on $\mathcal{B}$ satisfying $P_1, P_2$, and moreover:
  1. ($P_3$) If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\phi(\alpha) \cap \phi(\beta) = \emptyset$ or $\phi(\alpha) \subseteq \phi(\beta)$ or $\phi(\beta) \subseteq \phi(\alpha)$.
  2. ($P_4$) If $\phi(\alpha) \subseteq \phi(\beta)$, then $\alpha \triangleleft \beta$.
  3. If $\phi(\alpha) = \phi(\beta)$, then $\alpha \leq \beta$ or $\alpha \geq \beta$.

**Illustrative example**

The bubble tree is specified by the four-tuple $(X, \mathcal{B}, \phi, \triangleleft)$:

1. $X = \{\text{John}, \text{loves}, \text{Mary}, \text{hates}, \text{Ann}\}$
2. $\mathcal{B} = \{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5\}$
3. ...

![Figure: A bubble tree](image)

- The binary relation $\triangleleft$ is called the **dependency-embedding relation**, because it represents both the dependency relations between bubbles and the inclusion of bubbles in other bubbles (embedding).
- We can define two sub-relations of $\triangleleft$:
  1. The **dependency relation** $\triangleleft\triangleleft: \alpha \triangleleft\triangleleft \beta$ iff $\alpha \triangleleft \beta$ and $\phi(\alpha) \cap \phi(\beta) = \emptyset$.
  2. The **embedding relation** $\circlearrowleft\circlearrowleft: \alpha \circlearrowleft\circlearrowleft \beta$ iff $\alpha \triangleleft \beta$ and $\alpha \subseteq \beta$.
- If $\alpha \triangleleft \beta$, we will say that $\alpha$ **depends** on $\beta$, and represent it graphically by an oriented arrow linking the two bubbles.
- If $\alpha \circlearrowleft \beta$, we will say that $\alpha$ is **included** in $\beta$, and represent it graphically by inserting $\alpha$ inside $\beta$'s bubble.
It is a well known result that any dependency tree \((X, \prec_1)\) induces a constituency tree \((X, B, \phi, \prec_2)\) [Gaifman 65].

However, the reverse is not true in the general case. In order to “translate” a constituency tree into a dependency tree, we need to specify the head(s) of each constituent.

By doing so, we end up with what is called a co-headed constituency tree, which is a very common mathematical structure in computational linguistics (LFG, HPSG, GB are notably based on them).

A co-headed constituency tree induces a dependency tree, but the dependency relation is not explicit.

Interestingly, it can be shown that a co-headed constituency tree is also a particular case of a bubble tree, where every bubble contains a unique element (namely the head of the constituent).

Bubble trees are therefore a very valuable tool to compare different syntactic models.

**Moral of the story**: DG and PS models are much closer than they appear at first sight, and mathematical formalization can help create a common language between them, and foster “cross-fertilization” of ideas!

Put simply, coordination boils down to the fact that two or more elements together occupy one syntactic position. [Bloomfield 33]

We’ll group these elements in a bubble, called a coordination bubble, which occupies this position.

The coordination bubble contains two types of elements:
- The coordinated elements;
- The coordinating conjunctions (connectives).
Recursivity of coordination

- **Recursivity** of coordination: coordination bubbles can be themselves coordinated.

![Recursivity of coordination](image)

Shared coordination

**Example 1: lexical coordination**

- Several dependents can be shared, as detailed below.
- Note this particular case is called a lexical coordination, and must obey to special constraints [Abeillé 05]

![Bubble tree with two shared coordinations](image)

**Example 2: Right Node Raising**

- Our formalism can also easily account for Right Node Raising phenomena.

![Right Node Raising](image)
Note:

- “is thought to like” is called a **verbal nucleus**, i.e. a verb or a complex unit such as:
  - Auxiliary-participle (“have read”),
  - Verb-infinitive (“wants to read”),
  - Verb-conjunction-verb (“think that read”),
  - Verb-preposition (“look for”),
  - and all constructions built by transitivity from these.
- See [Gerdes 06] for details (in French).

**Shared coordination**

**Valency frame - formal definition**

- Formally (recursive definition):

  **Definition**

  Let $\alpha$ be a bubble part of the bubble tree $(X, \mathcal{B}, \phi, \triangleleft)$. We define the **valency** $v$ of $\alpha$ as the union of:
  - the set of bubbles that directly depends on $\alpha$;
  - the union of the valency of every bubble that includes $\alpha$.

  In other words:

  $$v(\alpha) = \{\beta \in \mathcal{B} : \beta \triangleleft \alpha\} \cup \bigcup_{\gamma : \alpha \circlearrowright \gamma} v(\gamma)$$

**Gapping and valency slot coordination**

- **Gapping**: If two clauses with the same main verb are coordinated, the second occurrence of the verb can be omitted (= ellipsis).

**Principle**

The valency of any coordinated element is the union of the valency of every coordination bubble containing it.
Gapping and valency slot coordination

Valency slot coordination (∼ Conjunction Reduction)

- We define a **valency slot bubble** as a *subset* of the valency of a governing element grouped in a bubble.
- Two valency slot bubbles can be coordinated if they are of the same kind.

![Valency slot coordination](image)

**Figure:** Valency slot coordination

---

Agreement and coordination of unlikes

How to handle (basic) agreement?

- As in most formalisms, a **feature structure** is associated to each element (bubble, word).
- In order to handle agreement, we have to constrain these feature structures. Let $\beta$ be a bubble containing two coordinated elements, $el_1$ and $el_2$. We would then have to enforce a set of constraints like:
  - $case(\alpha) = case(el_1) = case(el_2)$ \(^1\)
  - $number(\alpha) = number(el_1) + number(el_2)$ \(^2\)
  - $gender(\alpha) = \min(gender(el_1) + gender(el_2))$
  - ...

\(^1\) only for constituent coordination
\(^2\) for coordination with the “and” connective

---

Gapping and valency slot coordination

Similar or different phenomena?

- Do gapping and CR coordination refer to the same phenomenon?
  - **Pro:** They are formally very close (valency slot can be easily represented as gapping).
  - **Cons:** As [Crysmann 06] rightly points out, gapping is similar in many respects to true ellipsis (and hence to a semantic/pragmatic phenomenon), while CR essentially remains on syntactic grounds.
- Note that the constraint “of the same kind” in our definition of valency slot coordination is quite vague, and should be more clearly specified.

---

Agreement and coordination of unlikes

How to handle coordination of unlikes? (personal attempt)

- To handle coordination of unlikes, I propose to define a feature similar to the HEAD feature in HPSG, where the part-of-speech information would be encoded, and constrain its value for a given bubble to be the intersection of the values in the coordinated elements.
- Formally: $pos(\alpha) = pos(el_1) \cap pos(el_2)$
- We would then be able to analyze a sentence such as

  John is a republican and proud of it  \((7)\)

as long as the noun and the adjective share a positive value for the PRD feature, as required by the copula.
In order to explain how bubble trees handle the constraints between coordination and extraction, I'll first give some explanations about the **projectivity** of bubble trees.

Recall what we said in the first part of this lecture about the projectivity of a dependency tree:

**Principle**

“A dependency structure is said to be projective iff, ∀ words A and B where A → B, all the words situated between A and B in the sentence are subordinated to A.”

Ensuring the projectivity of bubble tree is not much more complicated!

**Or more formally (personal attempt):**

**Definition**

Suppose we have

1. A bubble tree \( (X, B, \phi, \lhd) \),
2. A linear order \(<\) on \( X \)
3. An (arbitrary) relation (either dependency or embedding) between two bubbles \( x \) and \( y \) (with \( x \) being the head), noted \( x \lhd y \).

**Definition (cont’d)**

1. We now define the **support** of \( x \lhd y \), noted \( Supp(x \lhd y) \) as the set of bubbles situated between the extremities of \( x \lhd y \). More precisely, we have \( Supp(x \lhd y) = \{ \beta \in B : x < \beta \leq y \} \).
2. We say that the relation \( x \lhd y \) is **projective** iff, for every bubble \( \beta \) in \( Supp(x \lhd y) \), we have \( \beta \leq x \).
3. Finally, we define a **projective tree** as a tree for which every relation is projective.
Recall [Ross 67]'s Coordinate Structure Constraint:

> In a coordinate structure:
> 1. no conjunct can be moved
> 2. nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of the conjunct"

The nice thing with bubble trees is that we don’t have to specify any special constraint to rule out these “movements”, they are blocked by simple and visual geometrical properties!

On the contrary, this example is perfectly grammatical\(^3\)

The structure is licenced because all the bubble relations are projective.

In order to show how our formalism could be practically used for parsing in NLP, I designed a small toy grammar featuring bubble trees.

I started from an existing grammar, written in the XDG\(^4\) formalism, and extended it so as to use bubble trees.

Work consisted of different steps:
- Specification of a new “dimension” in the grammar, representing the bubble relations ;
- Implementation of an additional constraint associated with our formalism, which prunes the search space ;
- Modification of various parts of the lexicon.

---

\(^3\)Even if the sentence sounds a bit weird!

\(^4\)Extensible Dependency Grammar
Extensible Dependency Grammar

- XDG is a new **grammatical formalism**, developed by Ralph Debusmann in his Ph.D thesis [Debusmann 06];
- Formally defined as a **multigraph description** language;
- Main features:
  1. Parallel architecture;
  2. Use of Dependency Grammar;
  3. Model-theoretic Syntax;
  4. Based on Constraint Programming.
- Comes with a (very good) development platform and constraint solver: **XDG Development Kit (XDK)**;

Summary

In this talk we discussed a new syntactic representation for the treatment of coordination, namely **bubble trees**.

1. We first analyzed how various Dependency Grammars frameworks handled coordination, and we pointed out that some researchers made a point of preserving the initial dependency model, while others emphasized its intrinsic insufficiency and proposed more expressive formalisms.

2. We then presented a new syntactic representation, the bubble tree, which integrates information from dependency and constituency in a single, coherent framework.

The next step was to examine in detail how the bubble trees were precisely handling various coordinations phenomena like shared coordination, gapping, agreement, and the constraints on extraction.

Finally, we showed how the formalism could be practically used for parsing in NLP by presenting a small demo of a hand-crafted XDG grammar featuring bubble trees.
Bubble trees seem to be a very promising mathematical framework for modelling difficult linguistic phenomena like coordination (as we have seen), but also extraction.

A lot of work remains to be done to characterize precisely how a “bubble grammar” would operate.

Moreover, there are a lot of interesting questions concerning the potential use of such formalisms in existing frameworks like TAG, LFG, HPSG, and CCG.

Thanks for your attention! Questions?

---
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