Arapaho labeling questions, 6/28:

1. How do we handle determiners/nouns that appear to be “false starts”? Just label them INDP? See bolded example below:

*ANDY: Yes, INDP*

14a.015

\tx well... teecxo' **hu'un** nihii... nuhu'

\mb well teecxo' **hu'un** nihii nuhu'

\ge well long ago **that**(aforementioned) well... this

\ps ENGL part **det** part det.PP.ADJCT

\tx heeteihinoo, hinono'eiteen,

\mb heeteihi - noo hinono'eiteen

\ge where from - 1S Arapaho tribe

\ps vai.rel - infl ni

\tx nih'ee3neebixoo3eti3i', teecxo'.

\mb nih- 'ee3nee- bixoo3eti - 3i' teecxo'

\ge PAST- very- love e.o. - maybe long ago

\ps prefix- prefix- vai.recip - PART part

\ELANBegin 40.590

\ELANEnd 51.590

\ELANParticipant 53

\ft Well...long ago that well, the [tribe] that I'm from, the Arapaho

tribe, they really loved each other, long ago.

1. So far there’s been a lot of switching back and forth between English and Arapaho. When an Arapaho noun is used with an English verb, should I just label it INDP? For example:

*ANDY: I didn’t really think much about the code-switching issue. If English nouns are used with Arapaho verbs, they can actually be labeled just like Arapaho nouns. But in the opposite case of English verbs and Arapaho nouns, I guess we need yet another label (?!), because these aren’t really INDP cases. Rather, we’ll need to label them .VENG (Verb English). It would be nice to be able to find these.*

\ref 14b.001

\tx This is, that uh, the schools are teaching. You know that has to be

taught again.

\ELANBegin 0.910

\ELANEnd 6.210

\ELANParticipant 37

\ft This is, that uh, the schools are teaching. You know that has to be

taught again.

\ref 14b.002

\tx **heeteenebetiit**.

\mb **heeteenebetiit**

\ge **respect**

\ps **ni**

\ELANBegin 6.190

\ELANEnd 7.590

\ELANParticipant 62

\ft Respect.

1. Similarly, we never label nouns that are in English, even if they’re modified by Arapaho words, right? For example:

*ANDY: Actually you could label this, as DEF, and as INDP (since there’s tohuu- following, I consider the second clause to be separate from the first, so the noun is not SBJCT of the vii verb.*

14f.017

\tx **nuhu' owl dance**, tohuunee'eesiini.

\mb **nuhu' owl dance** tohuu- nee'eesiini

\ge **this owl dance** since.IMPERF- be thus

\ps det ENGL ENGL prefix- vii.backref

\ELANBegin 30.690

\ELANEnd 33.260

\ELANParticipant 53

\ft This owl dance, [it's named] because it's like that [owl].

1. Do we label personal names and place names? For example:

*ANDY: label these the same way as all the other nouns, with the labels after the ‘place name’ or ‘personal name’ marker that will already be there.*

\ref 14f.032

\tx Cee3koohut **Sandy**.

\mb cee3koohu - t **Sandy**

\ge IC.drive off - 3.S **Sandy**

\ps vai - infl **persname**

\ELANBegin 68.370

\ELANEnd 69.810

\ELANParticipant 53

\ft Sandy is leaving/driving off.

1. I want to make sure I’m understanding the presentational construction correctly. It shows up in a variety of forms and even though it’s a construction (grammar, p. 309), it can have free word order, right? For example, in the following text, the presentational form is used with the noun *sosoni’ii* , right, but in this case we don’t mark it PRED because we’re analyzing *sosoni’ii* in relationship to the following verb *tonoun*. Am I on the right track here?

*ANDY: Use PRED for this kind of case. Think of the English translation: ‘these Shoshones are the ones who…’ Nenee(ni)- is itself used as a copulative in Arapaho (‘John neneeni-t neyei3eihii = John is a student’). So any noun preceding nenee(ni)- is going to be a PRED.*

\ref 14f.022

\tx noh nuhu' **sosoni'ii**, nenee3i'

\mb noh nuhu' **sosoni'** - ii nenee- 3i'

\ge and this **Shoshone** - NA.PL IC.it is- 3PL

\ps part det **na**.DEFM.PP.AGENT - infl vai- infl

\tx niitonounoo3i' hi'in

\mb nii- tonoun - oo3i' hi'in

\ge IMPERF- use - 3PL/4 that(aforementioned)

\ps prefix- vta - infl det

\tx nihii biiino.

\mb nihii biii - no

\ge well... plume - OBV.PL

\ps part na - infl

\ELANBegin 38.480

\ELANEnd 42.220

\ELANParticipant 53

\ft And those Shoshones, they use those, well, [owl?] plumes.

1. If a noun plays two roles that overlap two clauses and/or sentences, do we mark it as .2V? For example, ‘plume’ in line 022 below is UNDER relative to the verb *tonoun*, but it also seems to be INADJ in relationship to the verb *nee'eesinouhu* in the following sentence. Do we mark it as .2V or do we only do that when one noun plays two roles within the same clause?

*ANDY: I think you’re overthinking this one. The noun occurs in one sentence. Then it’s dropped and replaced by a pronominal prefix (hi’-) in the second sentence. So no 2V, as it really doesn’t ‘appear’ in the two clauses.*

\ref 14f.022

\tx noh nuhu' sosoni'ii, nenee3i'

\mb noh nuhu' sosoni' - ii nenee- 3i'

\ge and this Shoshone - NA.PL IC.it is- 3PL

\ps part det na.DEFM.PP.AGENT - infl vai- infl

\tx niitonounoo3i' hi'in

\mb nii- tonoun - oo3i' hi'in

\ge IMPERF- use - 3PL/4 that(aforementioned)

\ps prefix- vta - infl det

\tx nihii **biiino**.

\mb nihii **biii** - no

\ge well... **plume** - OBV.PL

\ps part **na**.DEF.UNDER - infl

\ELANBegin 38.480

\ELANEnd 42.220

\ELANParticipant 53

\ft And those Shoshones, they use those, well, [owl?] plumes.

\ref 14f.023

\tx Noh neneenini',

\mb noh neneenini'

\ge and IC.it

\ps part vii

\tx hi'iinee'eesinouhuni3i nuhu'

\mb hi'- ii- nee'eesinouhu - ni3i nuhu'

\ge INSTR- IMPERF- that is how s.o. dresses - 4PL this

\ps prefix- prefix- vai.BACKREF - infl det

\tx sosoni'ii. Hiihoowtonouneeno'

\mb sosoni' - ii hiihoow- tonoun - eeno'

\ge Shoshone - NA.PL 3.IMPERF.NEG- use - 3PL/4

\ps na.DEF.SBJCT - infl infl+prefix- vta - infl

\tx nuhu' eagle.

\mb nuhu' eagle

\ge this eagle

\ps det ENGL

\ELANBegin 42.220

\ELANEnd 48.810

\ELANParticipant 53

\ft And [with] it, the Shoshones dress that way with them. They don't

use the eagle [plume]

1. I’ve run across instances like the following several times so thought I’d double-check how to handle it. Based on the prosody as represented by the comma and the free translation, it seems that *nehe’* would be labeled INDP. Apart from those two things, I’d want to label it SBJCT. Is there any way from the Arapaho alone here that we can tell the difference between whether an NP is INDP in this type of situation or not? (Because the pronominal affix will occur either way…)

*ANDY: This is not easy, huh? My judgment is that the proclitic ci’= used both times makes this two separate clauses, but you don’t have access to that subjective judgment, and the analysis is definitely subjective, plus I’d like to listen to the prosody myself as well. I’d’ say stick with INDP. We can always go back and check to see if INDP’s should be something else, but the general approach here is to use INDP (and/or ???) when in doubt, in order to make sure that analyses of other forms like SBJCT, ADJCT etc. will be very certain and not involve a lot of marginal elements.*

\ref 14h.009

\tx ci'nehe', ci'nih'iit.

\mb ci' - **nehe'** ci' - nih- 'ii - t

\ge too - **this** too - PAST- said - 3.S

\ps proclitic/part – **det** proclitic/part - prefix- vai - infl

\ELANBegin 17.260

\ELANEnd 18.560

\ELANParticipant D

\ft This one too, he said it too.