### **Free Translation**

A: "Your guard who was smitten with Kellehisesa, do you know where did he or Ekasa resided in 2421?"

A: "Do you know where the money was in the house?"

A: "Do you know when Ekasa was bribed for the bag with 1,446 dollars?"

A: (to self) "Kellehisesa sure fought to steal this bag Ekasa is supposed to secure."

# **Side-by-Side Translation from Gudi**

Note: Technically, the romanization of the Gudi script uses n with combining under comma

ubem jóvekitesilo lajik vannin lym datar kelexis- Thy protector gave their love to Kellahisesa, where esaka, šīke vez fy ekasa rusóxa vesumīkin ba will this person or Ekasa live in 2421? širin tó vek tó bir e?

šīke lajīk ódaminin vaz ačim belutīas aņvar?

Where was the money in the house?

rusóke buzil vannin ekasaka širin tó vek tó bir ge krun em dórim buzïlïm xotu?

When did they give to Ekasa 1,446 dollars to buy their bag?

jīk dosóņimīkanīkin ekasa.

kelexïsesa lajïk datarinin simenusin em xotu la- Kellehisesa loved to fight for the bag Ekasa was told to secure.

#### Gloss

- (1) *ube-m jóvekites-ilo lajïk vaṇ-nin ly-m datar kelexïsesa-ka*, 2-gen protect-ag.nmz pst give-3 3-gen love Kellehisesa-dat Thy protector gave their love to Kellehisesa,
- (2) š-ïke vez fy ekasa rusó-xa vesumï-kin ba širin tó vek tó bir LOC-Q person or Ekasa time-ADV live-3 two thousand four hundred two ten e?

Where [do this] person or Ekasa live in 2421 (lit. time-y live 2421)?

- (3) š-ike lajik ódami-nin vaz ači-m belut-ïas aṇvar? LOC-Q PST exist-3 at house-GEN hole-ADJ money Where was the money in the house's space?
- (4) rusó-ke buzïl vaṇ-nin ekasa-ka širin tó vek tó bir ge krun time-Q 3.pl give-3 Ekasa-dat thousand four hundred four ten six money\_unit em dór-im buzïl-ïm xotu?

  for buy-inf 3-gen bag

When did they give to Ekasa 1446¤ to buy their bag?

(5) kelexïsesa lajïk datari-nin simenus-in em xotu lajïk dosóṇ-im-ïkanïk-in Kellehisesa pst love-3 argue-inf for bag pst to\_be\_safe-inf-to\_force-3 ekasa. Ekasa

Kellehisesa loved to fight for the bag which Ekasa was forced to make safe.

## **Commentary**

### Vocabulary Choice

Gudi documentation did not come with very clear semantic indication as to what the labels in the grammar were supposed to mean and thus there were many cases where inferences were made. There is only one word which I wish to talk about in detail in this regard.

The word *rusóxa* is comprised of the lexeme whose meaning is "n. time" plus what is described as the "adverb suffix". While it is worth noting that the grammar provided does not specify that nouns can take this suffix, this suffix is the only time where the trigram 'xa#' appears in the grammar, and thus I have decided this is the most probable explanation. Since this clause opens with "where" and not "when" (a word provided and used later), I must assume that the time is not in question, with it being provided or presumed; the attached verb being "to live" and not "to exist" (also in the lexicon) makes me think that the aktionsart is not static and that there is a start and/or end to the action in question. In addition, the verb is not explicitly in the past tense (the Gudi past tense is only used as emphasis), so all of this makes me think that 2421 (a number with no other context) must be a year, meeting the time directive.

#### **Referent Resolution**

While Gudi is very clear that its verbs must be marked for person, it is less clear what the scoping of the independent pronouns are. The independent pronoun *buzïl* in (4) is marked for third person (distinct from a fourth person, which was provided in the grammar) and plural. It is unclear what exactly this fourth person is supposed to be (an obviative, generic, or some other classification), but as the fourth person does not distinguish number, it seems to me more likely that it is supposed to be a generic/indefinite person and thus by elimination, the third person would be specific and thus something already mentioned.

Since these actors are giving something to Ekasa, it makes sense that it is not Ekasa, but who else could it be? There is at least one other person in the passage so far, Kellehisesa, but one person a plural does not make; another person is needed. In (1) we have "thy protector", a distinct character from Kellehisesa by virtue of being different arguments to a verb like "give", but in (2) we have "person or Ekasa" as subject. Who is the person in (2)? Is it the same individual as this mysterious protector or perhaps is it Kellehisesa? If so, why was a pronoun not used instead?

To solve this quandary, I went under the assumption that a pronoun's antecedent is bound to the most recent eligible referent, which would mean that *vez* (person) was required to be used in (2) because it is referring to the protector and not the more-recently mentioned Kellehisesa. Similarly, this would mean that *buzïl* in (4) binds to the protector, Kellehisesa and Ekasa, but the last of which is discharged as it is mentioned separately later in the sentence.

#### **Question and Clause Syntax**

The Gudi grammar does not per se say how a question is formed, but does provide a section on question words, with the instruction that the question words appear either at the beginning and the end of the sentence. Given the punctuation in the text (and assuming that it is used in a manner similar to English), we know where the sentence start and end are, but this does not wholly solve the issue of questions in Gudi.

The issue stems from a lack of specificity in if there is gapping or movement involved when forming the questions. Since there is no indication what the arguments of the verbs are or even if they are required (the grammar does say that pronouns are seldom dropped even though they are marked on the verb because the verb-marked agreement does not specify number), and since noun subject-object-ness is based solely on word order, the fact that *ódamin* 'to exist' takes an object, 'money', is quite baffling as that is an intransitive verb in English (note: 'to exist' is the entirety of the lexeme's given definition), but if I interpret the verb "X *ódaminin* Y" as "Y exists in X", the syntax can be explained as having the subject of (3) be replaced with "where", which is subsequently fronted.

This also resolves (2): without a dative marking on the number, it would default to the object of the verb 'to live', which doesn't make sense unless it is an address. By interpreting the object of the verb 'to live' as the location, which is gapped and fronted with the question word where, one can more easily accept that the number is a year.

(2) however, has one more quandary, namely, (1). The 'where' word was not moved to the start of the sentence per se (by there being stuff ahead of it), but this might just be a demonstration of where the sentence actually starts and (1) is simply some pre-modifier. This is in line with the interpretation that 'person' in (2) is the protector as well, where the nominally complete sentence of (1) is simply some descriptor of 'person'. However, the need to highlight it separately is unusual, and I have chosen to interpret this as a sort of focus mechanism.

#### **Context Cues**

Although at time of writing it is not yet 2421 AD, I have decided to treat the year 2421 as in the past (perhaps in a different calendar) as it would make the narrative of the passage flow more smoothly. I imagine the speaker is questioning the listener about the misplacement of the bag; after all, Ekasa is forced to make it safe, and it appears that they had sold it. Thus, I am treating (5) as an explanation/resolution to the scene, and we just aren't hearing the responses. Thus, I have decided to format the free translation to reflect this.