

Glossing Dene Languages: Issues and Recommendations

Olga Lovick, Siri G. Tuttle, Sharon Hargus
Dene Languages Conference, Davis CA
July 6, 2019

Introduction

Inspired by LGR and Nau and Arkadiev (2015), who have proposed a general framework for the glossing of Baltic languages, we bring up some issues in glossing Dene languages, and provide a rationale for possible solutions.

In this presentation, we focus on issues in morpheme glossing in writing by linguists for linguists. While glossing in works for non-linguists will have different goals and solutions, the principles behind our choices may hold for those works as well.

Principles for glossing - 1

- **Independence:** Any example, along with its gloss, needs to be self-contained so that non-experts (e.g. typologists) can use it without introducing mistakes.
- **Consistency in representation** is a goal at all levels. Labeling and symbolic representation should be consistent within an analysis, and as much as possible, across the discipline.
- **Explicitness:** The analysis should be evident from the gloss.
- **Accessibility:** As our examples will show, maximal glossing is not always the best practice in presenting Dene material. Glossing at word level and at morpheme level may be appropriate in different contexts and to make particular points.

Principles for glossing - 2

- **Standardization:** Conventional description within the linguistics of a particular language family may use terms unfamiliar to general linguistics or to typological standard, and there may be good reasons for this. But the most general standard, external and internal to language family, allowing for correct interpretation should be adhered to. (LGR)
- **Practicality:** Fitting glosses onto pages and making things readable while taking up the least amount of space (including making abbreviations brief, but unambiguous)

Standardization: How do we do it?

(a) Koyukon, Axelrod (1993:74)

daadlekkut

de + le + le + kkuṭ

T + M + CL + cough + SML

‘s/he coughed once’

(b) Dëne Sųṭiné, Wilhelm (2007:37)

héssiṭ

z-é-∅-s-∅-ziṭ

ep-sem-CM-1s-cl-scream

‘I’m going to scream once’

(c) Slave (Rice 2000:266)

ya-h-í-tṭa

Preverb-epenthetic-semelfactive

situation aspect-stem

‘s/he jumped (once)’

(d) Navajo, Smith (1991:397)

shéch’id

‘I gave it a single scratch’

(Instantaneous) ^{Perf A: Sem}

Levels of detail

Depends on a number of factors:

- Audience (linguists or “community”)
- Item (text collection, teaching tool, example sentence...)
- Researcher focus (morphology, prosody, syntax...)
- ...

Thus the same sentence can be represented in many different ways. E.g. in Upper Tanana (taken from the story about the Tailed People):

*Hu'an hu'an k'idahtēeyh tl'aan
hekon'dahshyit.*

‘Put [the wood and grass] into their dens and set fire to it.’

Levels of detail (Upper Tanana)

Hu'an

their dens

hu'an

their dens

k'idahteeyh

you pl put pl things into hole and

tl'aan

hekon'dahshyit.

you pl hold a fire brand against it

'Put [the wood and grass] into their dens and set fire to it.'

Word glossing (non-technical)

Hu'an

3PL:dens

hu'an

3PL:dens

k'idahteeyh

2PL:put.PL.O.into.hole:IPV and

tl'aan

hekon'dahshyit.

2PL:hold.fire.against:IPV

'Put [the wood and grass] into their dens and set fire to it.'

Word glossing (technical)

Levels of detail (Upper Tanana)

Hu'an hu'an k'idahteyh tl'aan hekon'dahshyit.

hu-'an	hu-'an	k'i-d-ah-teeyh
3PL.PSR-den	3PL.PSR-den	hole-QUAL-∅.IPV:2PL.S:∅-handle.PL.O:IPV
their dens	their dens	you PL put [things] into holes

tl'aan he-kon'-d-ah-shyit.

and	against-fire-QUAL-∅.IPV:2PL.S:∅-push.LRO:IPV
and	you PL hold a firebrand against it

‘Put [the wood and grass] into their holes and set fire to it.’

Discussion

Each format has clear (dis)advantages.

Word gloss (non-technical): (+) conserves space and very easy to read, (-) lacks information (e.g. mode): suitable for text collections, learning materials

Word gloss (technical): (+) conserves space and can be adjusted to show information of interest, (-) lacks some information and is less easy to read: suitable for non-morphology linguistic papers

Morpheme gloss: (+) contains lots of information, (-) consumes lots of space and requires specialized knowledge to read: suitable for discussion of morphology

Morphological glossing

When it comes to full morpheme glosses, we discuss two separate issues:

- Glossing inflectional morphology
- Glossing derivational morphology

This presupposes a neat division between those -- we'll just pretend that this is possible in Dene languages.

Dealing with fusion

Dena'ina

shtutghiyut

shtu-t-gh-i-yuʔ

away-INC-CNJ-2SG.S:∅-SG.go:FUT

'You SG will go hunting'

Upper Tanana

statjhaat

sta-t-ʃj-haaʔ

away-INC-CNJ:2SG.S:∅-SG.go:FUT

'You SG will go hunting'

Dealing with fusion: Upper Tanana

		aa-pfv of ch'+l+dzüh/dzia' 'dance'	
1sg	ch'agndzia'	ch'-aa-ǰ-agn-dzia'	I danced
2sg	ch'ǰldzia'	ch'-aa-ǰ-ǰǰ-l-dzia'	you sg danced
3sg	ch'aldzia'	ch'-aa-ǰ-l-dzia'	s/he danced
1pl	nts'aldzia'	ch'-ts'-aa-ǰ-l-dzia'	we danced
2pl	ch'aldzia'	ch'-aa-ǰ-ah-l-dzia'	you pl danced
3pl	ch'ihaldzia'	ch'-h-aa-ǰ-l-dzia'	they danced

Dealing with fusion: Upper Tanana

(a) nts'aldzia'

n-ch'-ts'-aa-j-l-dzia'

DSTR-INDF-1PL.S-CNJ-PFV-VV-dance:PFV

'We danced PFV'

(b) nts'aldzia'

nts'al-dzia'

DSTR:INDF:1PL.S:aa.PFV:L-dance.PFV

'We danced'

(c) jok-'a'

ch'-d-u-ak-'a'

INDF-QUAL-OPT-1SG.S:H-sing.OPT

'I should sing'

(d) jok-'a'

jok-'a'

INDF:QUAL:OPT:1SG.S:H-sing.OPT

'I should sing'

Dealing with fusion

Again, we find that it depends on goals. Apart from explicit discussions of Upper Tanana morphophonemics, this “chunking” approach is less distracting to the reader and (slightly) more economical.

An added benefit is that it avoids the issue of unmarked or zero-marked categories.

This chunking approach is explicitly argued for (cf. McDonough 2000, Arppe et al. 2017 and Lovick et al. 2018; a similar approach is taken in Holden 2013).

Derivational glossing issues and recommendations

Degree of semantic transparency

Discontinuity

Positional glosses

Boundaries

Degree of semantic transparency

semantics	format		<i>Holden 2013</i>
completely predictable	normal	<p>yá-∅-l-gos</p> <p>up-3.IPFV-jump</p> <p>'he jumps up' (491)</p>	
	small caps	<p>ja na-na-s-dher ha</p> <p>here ITER-<u>one.stay</u>-1.IPFV-<u>one.stay</u> FUT</p> <p>'I will stay here again' (443)</p>	
	small caps	<p>ye-H-†·tsi</p> <p>3D-3.PFV-make₁</p> <p>'he made it' (467)</p>	

“Morphological idioms”

Tsek’ene

Ti-tsi#si-gh-n-ii-’q

in.water-head-1sO-qual-CNJ-PFV-handle.CO:PFV

‘s/he criticized me’ (lit. ‘he/she put my head in the water’)

Recommendation: show idiomaticity

Discontinuity

Witsuwit'en

A. repeat the lexical gloss

c'-o-n-i-yïn

UNSP.O-pick.while.stationary-round-IMPF-
pick.while.stationary

'he/she is picking [berries] while stationary'

Cf. [siyïn] 'he/she is standing'

B. "special label"

c'-o-n-i-yïn

UNSP.O-thm-round-IMPF-pick.while.stationary

'he/she is picking [berries] while stationary'

C. repeat abbreviated lexical gloss (Holden 2013)

c'-o-n-i-yïn

UNSP.O-p.w.s.-round-IMPF-pick.while.stationary

'he/she is picking [berries] while stationary'

Positional vs. semantic glosses

Witsuwit'en d- qualifier

a. Dincagh

d-in-cagh

wood-PF-be.big

'it (wood, rope) is big'

b. Tsë dincagh

tsë d-in-cagh

rock heavy-PF-be.big

'the heavy rock is big'

c. nec'idilhcot

ne#c'-d-i-lh-cot

ITER-UNSP.O-oral-2sS-V/V-take

'take the lead in singing'

d. s-k'ë-w-d-i-l-ts'it

1sgP-on-AR-qual-cnj-V/V-CO.goes

'I'm sleepy' (lit. '(sleep) fell on me')

Recommendation: content more
important than consistency

Boundaries

Special symbols for

Clf-root (·)

Disjunct-conjunct (#)

Pronominal-qualifier (%)

Witsuwit'en

s-k'ë#w%d-ï-l·ts'it

1sP-on-AR-QUAL-CNJ-CO.g-CO.goes

'I'm sleepy' (lit. '(sleep) fell on me')

-k'ë#w-d-l-ts'it 'be sleepy'

Tsek'ene

ti-tsì#O-gh-'ą 'criticize O'

Conclusion

Issue

Semantic transparency

Structural differences

Analytical differences

Terminological differences

Differences in abbreviation

Recommendation

Provide meaning when possible

Celebrate the differences

Continue discussion

Standardize

Standardize

Abbreviatory and terminological differences

Abbreviatory

E.g. imperfective: imp, impv, ipv, ipfv (LGR)

Terminological

Classifier vs. voice/valence

Terminological differences, cont.

Y-

3D (distal, Holden 2013)

4 (4th person, Rice 1989)

3 (3rd person object with 3rd person subject, Hargus 2007)

3>3 (third acting on third, Lovick forthc.)

C'/g/'-

Unspecified (Rice 1989)

Indefinite (Holden 2013, others)

We welcome your comments and questions

Comparison chart of glosses

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1n35OsHLINxsUdzVpL7c7hnN0slo4eXJMwN2Q_EH5U7k/edit?usp=sharing

Analytical differences

Zero morphemes

Dene Sų́líné.

yá-∅-l-gos

up-3.IPFV-jump

‘he jumps up’ (Holden 2013: 491)

Witsuwit’en

nəqɛdɛzət

nə-qɛ-d-ə-zət

cont-thm-thm-impf-travel

‘...he travels around’ (Hargus 2007:

812)

Analyzability

ja na-na-s-dher ha

here ITER-one.stay-1.IPFV-one.stay FUT

‘I will stay here again’ (443)