Some notes for assisting Afranaph consultants

The new software template will request more of our consultants than we have asked for up to now. There will be five lines to be filled out.

A) The example as given on the questionnaire, when there is a particular example from the AQ that is to be the model for translation into the response language. If there is more than one response language translation of a numbered example, e.g., (A11f), then each translation should receive a subnumeral (A11fi), (A11fii), (A11fiii), etc., and there should be a four line representation (B,C,D, and, if necessary, E) for each additional translation.

B) The roman-character based rendering of the sentence in its conventional written form for the response language, but only if there is a roman-character based form (enhanced by whatever additional unicode characters and diacritics that are necessary). Otherwise, the closest thing to a roman character based form (if either the characters are not roman-based or there is no standard orthography)

C) A morpheme breakdown. The morpheme breakdown should separate words by spaces and morphemes within words by dashes. Try to be as complete as possible, but if there are particular words used all the time that have a complex structure that does not vary, we may economize on those by adding a comment explaining the breakdown just once.

D) Gloss line. Try to left align each word with the word it corresponds to in the morpheme breakdown (C), but don’t worry too much about it, as our software will eventually straighten this out. Also, do not try to align the individual morphemes of line (B) with those of line (C), only the words have to be aligned.

   We have not yet fully standardized our gloss terms, but for Bantu languages, for example, SM and OM are subject marker and object marker when they are morphemes within a verb word (these are neutral terms so as to not prejudice the issue of whether these should be analyzed as clitics or affixes), and RFM and RCM are for reflexive marker and reciprocal marker, respectively, when these morphemes are embedded in verb words. Eventually we will standardize gloss terms so as to permit them to be searched efficiently.

E) The altered translation line. This line only needs to be filled out if the translated example is does not exactly correspond to (A). For example, if (A) contains a word that does not exist in the response language, it may be that the choice of verb is not crucial to what is being tested (which may be something to do with the distance between antecedents and anaphors). Consultants may alter the verb to one more convenient so that an appropriate example for this purpose can be formed. The exact translation may change. So if the (A) line contains the word scrutinize, for example, and there is no such word in the response language, the consultant may substitute something that means ‘examine’, and this difference would be recorded in line (E).

COMMENT line. If there are any notes the consultant wants to add, explaining why an example has been translated in one way or not another, what might be the right generalization about such cases, why certain special morphology has to be added or avoided for one example or another, or what might be the best gloss, or why one translation has a slightly different interpretation than
another or, in effect, any potentially relevant comment, this should appear after an example or after a section number (if the comment is more general).

For example (a slightly cooked version of Kinande)

A2ai) John washed himself
Yohani akánabâ
Yohani a-ka-nab-a
John SM-TM-wash-FV
John is washing
Comment: This means John is washing himself, even though the RFM is not possible here.

aii) Yohani akáyinabyâ
Yohani  a-ka-yi-nab-i-a
Yohani  SM-TM-RFM-wash-CAUS-FV
John washed himself
Comment: The RFM is possible here because the causative affix has made the verb transitive.

**There are some things that both consultants and caseworkers should keep in mind.**
- Consultants may need help deciding how to do glosses, not just in breaking down the word, but how to notate in the gloss line the parts that they break down.
- Consultants may need help deciding on fonts and phonetic representations in the morpheme breakdown and in the phonetic form.
- Consultants may need to be reminded that we need for them to provide sentences even when they are not acceptable, since that is useful data for us too.
- Consultants may need encouragement as to how to adjust the example they provide when our model example is not appropriate for their language for extraneous reasons, or at least how to recognize that something needs to be changed.
- We need to remind consultants to keep open minds about some of their conclusions, going back to adjust previous work as new understandings about glosses or translations come to light.
Consultants should understand that this is an important part of our process for getting the best possible result.
- Consultants need to understand that some of the duller parts of the work for their language are still of potential interest to us because distinctions that their language appears not to make may contrast in interesting ways with languages where many more distinctions are made.
- Consultants may need help teasing out their intuitions about sentences that have several meanings, and this is best achieved by providing some contexts where a given reading is favored or disfavored in favor of another. The section on proxy readings may especially require attention. Many consultants do not at first understand what we are after, or it may be that their language really doesn’t allow the distinction to be made in the relevant way, but some find that some consultants do have judgments about these cases after the reason for the different contexts is clarified.