

## Participants:

Bettina  
Julia  
Max  
Fahad  
James

N6:

Bettina: use ontolex:Form but add subproperty wordform

James: in dictionaries the term “word-form” is not used, “other form” is sufficient

Julia: canonical form includes a shorter stem but other form need a longer stem (Georgian)

Bettina: for lexicographers ontolex modelling should be sufficient

James: easy way to extract all wordforms of a lexical entry would be nice, at the moment one has to query all “otherForm” Forms plus the “canonicalForm” Form

Bettina: property ontolex:lexicalForm is mmoon:hasWordform

Fahad: just query by using superproperty ontolex:lexicalForm

Fahad: a lexical entry/lemma/headword is not always a member of the paradigm

Bettina: Result: 2c

Provide usage recommendation and how to represent all wordforms of a lexical entry, also if the lexical entry is not one member of the wordforms in the paradigm (Julia: put that statement somewhere in the lexicography module (e.g. label of lexicog:Entry), because it is not a part of the morphology domain)

Julia: refer to lexicography module here and combine it in the usage recommendation

Bettina: also add to usage recommendation whether to stick to this naming of Form instances:

```
:lex_child a ontolex:LexicalEntry ;  
  ontolex:lexicalForm :form_child_singular, :form_child_plural .
```

```
:form_child_singular a ontolex:Form ;  
  ontolex:writtenRep "child"@en .
```

```
:form_child_plural a ontolex:Form ;  
  ontolex:writtenRep "children"@en .
```

Or if they should better be written as they are: :form\_children instead of :form\_child\_plural because if a form entails multiple grammatical meanings they might get very long

N8 + N9:

Julia: has not found this data explicitly in lexicographic data

Bettina: maybe it is sufficient to just distinguish instances (via enumeration for example) and infer relations via same writtenRep or same meaning

Bettina: Decision: 1, lexicographers would probably also not use “allomorph” or “homonymous morph” but “don’t confuse with” or something more specific

James: is fine without the relations

General issue: model phonological processes explicitly?

James: prefers labeling the phonological process (Ablaut, inner modification ect.) instead of naming the particular phones involved; personal solution: collect all stems and interrelate them with the phonological process - would entail a list offering phonological processes

Bettina: generating wordforms goes beyond just describing existing morphological data within lexical datasets/traditional dictionaries (data enrichment, generating additional data)