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Current state of the morphology module according to the goals:

The morphology module aims at fulfilling two modelling purposes:

**1.Stating elements that are involved in the decomposition of lexical entries and forms.**

1.1 Morphological decomposition on the lexical entry level.

scope: The kind of elements of which a lexical entry can consist should be as non-restrictive as possible. I.e. The decomposition of lexical entries encompass lexical entries, components, derivational affixes, inflectional affixes, stems, roots and zero morphs. However, a lexical entry can NEVER be composed of a form!

1.2 Morphological decomposition on the form level.

scope: Elements of which a form can consist include roots, stems, inflectional affixes and zero morphs. A form can NEVER be decomposed into lexical entries (including ontolex:Affix), components and forms.

→ apart from agreeing upon the exact wording of the definitions of classes and properties, these two purposes are basically finished. The results have been published in the following paper:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1c1uZilI2XRT1BFwE-CUUqKkfbVDG6xub>

**2. Enabling the representation of building patterns that are involved in the formation of lexical entries and forms.**

2.1 Representation of decompositional building patterns for lexical entries.

2.2 Representation of decompositional building patterns for forms.

→ a coherent proposal for modeling the automatic generation of forms (2.2) came from Max and Christian. It is still under discussion and needs refinement.

→ the model has to take the modeling of morph:InflectionalParadigm and morph:MorphologicalPattern into account

→ purpose 2.1 has been not addressed yet

Two issues to be discussed after the summer break:

1. Make clear what kind of instance data goes into the three classes :Paradigm, :InflectionType and :Rule. This is not so clear from looking at the URI design of the example code above, e.g.:

<#finnish\_noun\_type\_kala\_pl> a morph:Rule .

<#finnish\_noun\_type\_9> a morph:Paradigm .

<#finnish\_noun\_type\_kala\_case> a morph:InflectionType .

What is the difference between them? They look very similar to me here.

1. It would be great to either REUSE or CREATE morph:Morph instance data with this modelling. E.g.:

morph:replacement [morph:source "$", morph:target "ssa"]

The string “ssa” should be either the representation of an existing morph:SuffixMorph instance or it should be created as one together with the morph:SuffixMorph instance. Even better would be to also arrive at statements decomposing the created ontolex:Form instances again, e.g.

:kissasssa a ontolex:Form ;

morph:consistsOf :stem\_kissa , :suffix\_ssa .

Future procedure/tasks

* Bettina and John starting to write Specification
* Max and Christian working on automatic generation
  + State and describe different input methods
  + Create reference documentation taking morphology module input and generates all forms
  + Max makes diagrams with new proposed elements and maybe reference implementation