Compounding in Divvun-tools
Compounding can be hard for writers

- because norm is not always clear
- because of other dialectal background than norm-based
- because of strong influence from majority language
- because of...?
Tools try to formalize those parts of morf grammar as far as possible consequently, the tools are hopefully helpful to such (and other) writers
Three issues relating to North Sámi compounds (two relevant to Julev Sámi)

1. Case in first part: loddemoahti vs. lottibeassi
2. Vowel reduction or not: lottečivga vs. lottibeassi (only North)
3. Shortened form acceptable or not: tjásjlådde vs. tjáhtjelådde
1. CASE

a. Mostly lexically specified by the first part:
   loddi ;  +SgNomCmp +SgGenCmp
   sátni ;  (default: +SgNomCmp )

loddemoahti
lottečivga
sátnevájas
*sánevájas

“Jodi lea buoret go oru”. 
drawbacks:

accepted as well:
lottemoahti
loddečivga

We can not for example mark čivga so it takes gen. on its left side because then we get:
*snuolggačivga and *baikkačivga and not snuolgačivga and baikačivga
b. Sometimes the second part can trigger a certain case on the first part:

\[
\text{uksa} \quad ; \quad (\text{default: } +\text{SgNomCmp}) \\
\text{geahči} \quad ; \quad +\text{SgNomLeft} +\text{SgGenLeft}
\]

\text{uksageahči vs. uvssageahči} \\
“end of a door vs. end where a door is”

described in Konrad Nielsen’s “Lappisk ordbok” on page 697.
another example:

- **sálbma**: (default: +SgNomCmp)
- **lávlun**: +SgNomLeft +SgGenLeft

sálbmalávlun AND sálmmalávlun

examples from Konrad Nielsen “Lærebok i lappisk” s. 290
2. Vowel reduction

Three classes:

a. obligatory reduction
b. no reduction
c. facultative reduction
a. Obligatory reduction

loddI AIGI ;

LEXICON AIGI: reduction in both nom. and gen.

loddemoahti
lottečivga
exceptions from the rule are hardcoded:

lottibeassi ;

drawbacks: we get lottebeassi as well
b. No reduction

reabbá ALBMILONG ;

LEXICON ALBMILONG : no reduction in nom. nor in gen.

reabbáealli
reappájuolgi
c. Facultative reduction

jorri ALBMILONGSHORT ;

LEXICON ALBMILONGSHORT : facultative reduction in nom.

jorribiegga AND jorrebiegga
jorridákti AND jorredákti
most words are GOAHTI-words:

báiski GOAHTI ;

LEXICON GOAHTI : obl. reduction in nom. facultative reduction in gen.

since norm for gen. is unknown

báiskeloddi
báiskkejuolgi AND báiskkijuolgi
3. Shortened forms

Only some words are normatively accepted, for example:

North:
beaivi > beai-
beallí > beal-
geahči > geaš-
mielde > miel-
vuolde > vuol-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julev:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tjáhtje &gt; tjásj-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giella &gt; giel-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giehta &gt; giet-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jahke &gt; jak-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bielle &gt; biel-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giehtje &gt; giesj-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuolle &gt; vuol-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jávrre &gt; jávr-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadde &gt; gátt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. Accepted as both first and middle part:

\text{tjáhtje+N+SgCmp:tjásj ;}

\text{tjásjlådde}
\text{várretjásjlådde}

\text{goahtesaje >>>}
b. Accepted only as middle part:

vuodnagiehtje+N+SgCmp:vuodnagiesj R ;

vuodnagiesjalmatja

*giesjalmatja
Big difference between oral language and written norm

Examples:
guoktenuppelohkái vs. *guoktenuplohkái
jávregáddesáttu vs. *jávregátsáttu
čielgamielkelákca vs. *čielgamiellákca
gusavuodjaláibi vs. *gusavuoiláibi etc etc.

This difference can create problems for writers. And it is not very easy to give good suggestions for these kind of “misspellings”.