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Non-projective sentence

Do Prahy měl přijet ráno.

*He was supposed to come to Prague in the morning.*
Non-projectivity is “non-standard” (1/2)

- a “violation” of one of the dominant rules of the DG

- a “dependent must appear in a sentence immediately adjacent to its head except that the two may be separated by dependent(s) of either words. This rule is applied recursively, so that if the inserted dependent has a dependent of its own, the latter may in turn be inserted between its own head and the head’s head” (A. Ninio, 2017, Projectivity is the mathematical code of syntax. Comment on “Dependency distance: A new perspective on syntactic patterns in natural languages” by Haitao Liu et al. Physics of Life Reviews, 21:215-217)
Non-projectivity is “non-standard” (2/2)

- cognitive requirements

  - language users prefer shorter dependency distances and thus avoid non-projective sentences – a result based cognitive requirements and the Zipfian least effort principle, i.e. without specific assumptions on grammar (e.g. R. Ferrer-i-Cancho, 2016, Non-crossing dependencies: Least effort, not grammar. In A. Mehler et al. (eds.), *Towards a Theoretical Framework for Analyzing Complex Linguistic Networks*, pp. 203-234, Springer, Berlin / Heidelberg)
Non-projectivity & sentence length (1/4)

Are non-projective sentences longer or shorter than projective ones?

Methodological aspects:
• sentence length measured in the number of words the sentence contains
• not the usual approach in the QL framework – length of a language unit is usually measured in the number of its “direct neighbours” in the hierarchy of units (e.g. words in morphemes or syllables, clauses in words, sentences in clauses, ...)
• our choice is motivated by technical reasons (much easier to get the number of words in a sentence than a number of clauses)
Are non-projective sentences longer or shorter than projective ones?

A speculative (i.e. non-empirical) considerations lead to two different answers.
Non-projectivity & sentence length (3/4)

• non-projective trees in **longer** sentences than projective trees  
  • more „space“ for the realization of non-projectivity  
  • random models

• non-projective trees in **shorter** sentences than projective trees  
  • cognitive processing difficulty (both an increasing sentence length and the appearance of non-projectivity make a sentence more difficult to process)  
  • theoretically, language users could “forbid” making long sentences (which are already difficult to process because of their length) even more complicated (by introducing non-projectivity)
Non-projectivity & sentence length (4/4)

Good news – the dilemma is solved!

• the chance that a sentence is non-projective increases with the increasing mean dependency distance (R. Ferrer-i-Cancho, C. Gómez-Rodríguez, 2016, Crossings as a side effect of dependency lengths. *Complexity*, 21(S2):320-328)

• the mean dependency length tends to increase with the increasing sentence length (J. Jiang, H. Liu, 2015, The effects of sentence length on dependency distance, dependency direction and the implications – based on a parallel English-Chinese treebank. *Language Sciences*, 50:93-104)

• it follows that the longer the sentence, the more likely it is non-projective (corroborated also empirically by R. Ferrer-i-Cancho et al., 2018, Are crossing dependencies really scarce? *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 493:311-329)
Frequency distribution of sentence lengths

• the same or different models?
• if the same model, the same or different parameters?
Language material and methodology

• Czech-PDT UD treebank (based on PDT 3.0)
• 35,213 sentences
• UD annotation scheme

• proportion of non-projective trees in the sample is 8.04%
  • Havelka (2007) detects 23.15% in the PDT

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>projective</th>
<th>non-projective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard deviation</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skewness</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative entropy</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Results


\[
P_x = \frac{(k+x-1-s)}{x-s} \cdot \frac{x-s}{m+x-1-s} \cdot q^{x-s} P_0
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>projective</th>
<th>non-projective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>32379</td>
<td>2831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions & perspectives

• non-projective sentences are longer than projective ones
• frequency distribution of sentence length
  • the same model (a special case of a very general frequency distribution basen on the Zipfian assumptions on the equilibrium between the “forces” of the speaker and the hearer)
  • different parameter values

• open questions
  • impact of the annotation scheme
  • impact of language, genre, author,...
  • relations to other properties
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