**Participants:**

Bettina Klimek (BK)

Christian Chiarcos (CC)

Max Ionov (MI)

Francesco Mambrini (FM)

Julia Bosque-Gil (JBG) (might need to leave the call earlier)

Fahad Khan (CNR)

Marco Passarotti (MP)

John McCrae (JMC)

Ana R. Luís (AL -- I have sent a request to join the group)

**Agenda**

1. **Follow-up of Marco’s presentation Latin word-formation extension**

* three main contributions
  + distinguish and link XYRule and XYRelation
  + moph:WordFormationRelation to generalize over ConversionRelation, DerivationRelation, possibly also CompositionRelation
  + CompositionRelation within morph
* Clear differentiation between relations and rules
  + and explicit link between them
* WordFormationRelation
  + proposal: create broader class moph:WordFormationRelation as generalization over morph:DerivationalRelation, ConversionRelation, possibly CompositionRelation
  + discussion whether to maintain morph:DerivationalRelation as subclass of this and further subclasses, e.g. neoclassical compounding, blending, clipping
  + Possible definition of moph:WordFormationRelation “A word formation relation is a relation that relates one or multiple source lexical entries with a target lexical entry.”
    - E.g. indicate that there are two vartrans:source elements and one vartrans:target
  + questions:
    - have only one class moph:WordFormationRelation (would include both derivational and compounding rules) or have also subclasses thereof, e.g. morph:DerivationalRelation, morph:Conversion, morph:CompoundingRelation
      * CC > these can be distinguished from the elements involved. the model would be much more compact, then
    - if and how to include compounding rules into this => Composition relation
* CompositionRelation
  + main problem for WFL is inadequacy of using decomp for generating compounds
    - ago + pes => agipes (thematic vowel)
    - sometimes, the form in the compound is not the canonical form, but an inflected form, e.g. fructis > frugo-
  + WFL model: one compound involves one composition rule (V+N => adj) but two composition relations (ago => agipes, pes => agipes)
    - CC > could also be modelled by having multiple sources in one composition relation [~ decomp]
    - Bettina > In favor of binary segmentation (pointer to MMOOn).
  + WFL needs reification of relation between the lexical entries involved in compounding processes. Problematic with decomp -> no way of stating that there are two word formation processes/relations involved, we can only indicate that something is composed of a set of items
    - CC > decomp has no direct links with morphological rules, this could be a motivation to introduce a morph:CompositionRelation
  + CC > We could also link directly from decomp to the rule
    - :Lungenentzündung a ontolex:LexicalEntry ;
    - decomp:subterm :Lunge\_lex;
    - decomp:subterm :Entzündung\_lex ;
    - wfl:hasMorphologicalRule [ … a morph:CompositionRule];
    - CC> understanding that the decomp:subterm object is kind of the source
  + CC+BK > previously discussed to permit morph:Morph as decomp subterm objects
  + MP > inelegant within WFL because similar things are treated differently, proposal to distinguish decomp and morph:Composition as lexeme-based vs. morpheme-based approaches to composition

> the module should be able to represent both kinds of resources

* + general consensus for handling composition within morph if redundancy with decomp is approved by ontolex chairs
  + **Then**: Clarify distinction between morph and decomp module needed!

Rules of thumb:

* if information about lexemes without order, use decomp module

JMC > probably if you are doing general-purpose lexicography, decomp would suffice

* if information about morphs together with order and/or details of morphophonology (thema vowel, interfixes), use morph module (requires the modelling of order) (or if you want to enrich your resource at a later stage)

CC > Risk of superseding decomp? (morph composition allows to express every piece of information from decomp, so, why keeping it?) We want to make something that is downward compatible

Fahad, CC > It might get confusing if we have different ways of modelling the same thing

Marco > But these two ways reflect two different theoretical approaches and types of resources. We are giving people the opportunity to treat their resources differently.

CC > We could (maybe) justify the presence of two different modelling choices, specially if we put a disclaimer

Bettina > We might need more examples

CC> We would need confirmation from OntoLex chairs that it’s OK to create a partially redundant model with the decomp module. TO-DO

**ToDos for next telco:**

Julia: Ask ontolex chairs: confirmation to create partially redundant model for decomp and morphology (if that is okay the WFL proposal is a starting point for testing data after adapting the morph module draft)

Look at <https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/universal-derivations> and consider it as test data resource to be included into OntoLex Morph Vocabulary Test Data Google folder.