**Question**: I'm working on the chapter, and have a query regarding scripts. We have the Seri orthography and the phonetic to think about. The data I have sent you I presented in phonetic script, which to me, is the only way to present consistent onomatopoeic representations. I wonder how the other authors are doing this. Hence, should I be consistent and stick with the phonetic all the way through? and present it in phonetic brackets? Are other authors ignoring, or using, the local orthography? In my case, it is much easier and more consistent to use only the phonetic in the article.

**Answer**: I agree with you about the position of phonetic transcription in case of onomatopoeia – especially in languages where there is no 1:1 correspondence between letters and sounds. So far, I have received only one chapter and it ignored the phonetic transcription. When I think about works in which onomatopoeia (or other sound iconic phenomena) are described, it seems to me that it is always the author’s choice.

Generally, in typological works the Leipzig glossing rules are used. I have just checked them carefully – nothing about the phonetic is written there. My suggestion, for language with no 1:1 correspondence, is to use the phonetic transcription, too – if applicable, for example, **English *woof* should be given as follows: *woof* /wʊf/.**

……………………..

**Question**: My confusion lies with the idea of primary/secondary onomatopoeia. Upper Tanana is polysynthetic and verbs are very complex. Across the entire language family, stems do not have an inherent lexical category; so a particular stem may be used as a verb or a noun or something else. We get triples such as

*dlek dlek dlek* 'call of tree squirrel'

*deldlek* 'chattering noise of a tree squirrel' which is an inflected verb form with the stem dlek

*dlegn* is the noun 'tree squirrel', it contains a noun suffix

 If we say that dlek is primary onomatopoeia, we could imagine some kind of lexicalization path going like this:

*dlek* 'sound of tree squirrel' >

*dlegn* 'the thing that makes chattering sounds = tree squirrel'

*deldlek* 'to make noise of the tree squirrel'

... which would be good and well EXCEPT that this doesn't seem to be true! The noun stem is reconstructed as *də-ləʼgy-əy* where the stem (underlined) occurs in a bunch of words for other furry rodents and doesn't seem to be onomatopoeia at all. This would instead suggest a lexicalization path of

*dlegn* 'squirrel' >

*deldlek* 'make sound like a squirrel' >

*dlek* 'squirrel sound'

... in which case analyzing *dlek* as onomatopoeia would be somewhat odd, since it's not primary but a back-formation. I haven't looked at this carefully yet, but suspect that this situation is true of many onomatopoeias, and it strikes me as a chicken-and-egg problem. Do I simply go with speaker judgment here?

Another question I came up with has to do with pairs such as:

*t'an* 'sound of person hitting the water when falling in'

*tadet-t'an*

ta-det-t'an

into.water-3SG.S:QUAL:ø.IPFV:D-hit.water:IPFV

'there is the noise of splashing/paddling feet when swimming'

In these instances one could say that *t'an* is primary and the verb is secondary (although I think one can also make the opposite argument, see above), so I'd list *t'an* in the appendix/task 1 sheet. My question is though: do I discuss this kind of phenomenon in the chapter? There are (at least) two common & regular derivations for onomatopoeia verbs, which I find quite interesting and worthy of discussion.

**Answer**: I suggest the following: describe both possible analyses and if you have a chance, ask native speakers about their interpretation – especially whether *dlek* is a sound imitation or not.

The same applies to the second example: if it is a regular derivation, it definitely should be described in the chapter. These cases are intriguing and illustrate fuzzy boundaries between onomatopoeia and the major part of the lexicon. Therefore, they are highly valuable.