# 47a.

47a.008

\tx Uhh St. Stephens, Arapahoe. Language,

\mb uhh St. Stephens Arapahoe language

\ge uhh St. Stephens Arapahoe, WY language

\ps particle PART PART.#V.LOC #V.LOC.place name ENGL.INDP???

\tx uhh, he'iisih'iitoonoo3i.

\mb uhh he'- iisih'iit - oonoo3i

\ge uhh DUBIT- how call - 3PL.ITER (alt.)

\ps particle proclitic- vti - infl

\ELANBegin 43.620

\ELANEnd 51.760

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft uhh St. Stephens school, Arapahoe school. Language, uhh, I forget what

they used to call them.

I’m not sure here, because it probably should not be marked at all. Looks like “language” can be a noun modifier.

47a.013

\tx Noh hoowP

\mb noh hoow- P

\ge and 3.NEG- pause/break

\ps part infl+prefix- P

\tx hoowbeetnihi'neeniini nuhu'

\mb hoow- beet- nihi'neen- iini nuhu'

\ge 3.NEG- want to- INTENSE- DETACH this

\ps infl+prefix- prefix- prefix- deriv det

\tx hinono'eitiit, 'oh

\mb hinono'eitiit 'oh

\ge Arapaho language but/and

\ps ni.DEF.OBJCT??? part

\ELANBegin 81.190

\ELANEnd 85.270

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft And they don't want to [take] this Arapaho language seriously. And

“hoowbeetnihi'neeniini” is not analyzed as having a verb root at all, but it has all the verbal morphology (and there is no verb in the context that may go with this sentence). I marked it as DEF.OBJCT, but I wonder if I should have done #V.IMPOBJ.

47a.019

\tx Hi'in bei'ci3ei'i

\mb hi'in bei'ci3ei'i

\ge that(aforementioned) money

\ps det ni.pl.DEF.PP.IMPOBJ

\tx heetnosouniiitowoo3i' hi'in.

\mb heet- nosou- niiitowoo - 3i' hi'in

\ge FUT- still- ask for s.t. - 3PL that(aforementioned)

\ps prefix- prefix- vai.selfb - infl det.DEF.SBJCT???

\ELANBegin 124.450

\ELANEnd 127.330

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft They will be asking for more money.

The only reason for the question marks here is the use of the same demonstrative. I was not sure, if the speaker said it for the money, or for the General Council meeting in the previous sentence, but I marked for the latter one.

47a.024

\tx Nuh'uuno teecxo' nihcebkoohuutiit nuhu' ne'cih'eentou'u-' nehe' immersion, nii3o'ononi...

\mb nuh'uuno teecxo' nih- cebkoohuutiit nuhu' ne'- cih- 'entou'u - ' nehe' immersion

\ge this long ago PAST- thing run/managed this then- to here- be present - 0S this immersion

\ps det.EMPH part prefix- ni.DEPPART.DEF.PP.INDP det.ADJCT??? prefix- prefix- vii - infl det ENGL.DEF.SBJCT

\ELANBegin 141.280

\ELANEnd 150.050

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft The one who ran this Immersion School, as they call it, a long time ago

when it was first here... {Reference is to Dr. Steven Greymorning.}

\notes Niito' 'first' ???

“nihcebkoohuutiit” is analyzed as a noun, but it seems to have that “nuhu’” as an IMPOBJ. So I just marked it as ADJCT because it seems to be not licensed by the main verb in the clause.

# 47b.

\ref 47b.001

\tx that Bible,

\mb that bible

\ge that bible

\ps ENG ENGL.#V.DEF.INDP???

\tx neih'ii3ooninoo.

\mb neih- 'ii3oon - inoo

\ge 1S.PAST- thing called... - pers.PL

\ps infl+prefix- na.DEPPART + PLPOSS - infl.#V.INDP???

\ELANBegin 3.800

\ELANEnd 5.390

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft That Bible, as we call it.

You have said not to mark dependent participles, but I wasn’t sure whether you meant what’s marked as DEPPART or what precedes it. Anyways, there is no verb in this sentence, and no verb can be retrieved from the context for it. I marked it as INDP, just to avoid any other syntactic issues.

47b.016

\tx Yeah, nee'eeP nehe' nih'oo3oo,

\mb yeah nee'ee- P nehe' nih'oo3oo

\ge yeah that- pause/break this White person

\ps particle proclitic+prefix- P det na.#V.DEF.SBJCT???

\tx no'ote'inowoo huut.

\mb no'ot- e'in - owoo huut

\ge a lot- know - 1S here

\ps prefix- vti - infl part

\ELANBegin 74.330

\ELANEnd 79.990

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft Yeah, this White guy, I(??) Know a lot here.

This one is really odd, because it is a TI verb that is inflected for 1S, but has an animate either subject or object (Undergoer). I am not sure whether the speaker made a mistake choosing an inflection, or had a wrong verb, or if it is an INDP altogether. In the following sentences it is though a subject.

47b.049

\tx “Niibeetniitonou'u nuhu'

\mb nii- beet- niiton - ou'u nuhu'

\ge IMPERF- want to- hear/understand - 1S/3PL this

\ps prefix- prefix- vta - infl det

\tx tei'yoonoh'o' heenetiit,” nih'iit.

\mb tei'yoonoh'o' heenetiit nih- 'ii - t

\ge children speaking PAST- said - 3.S

\ps na.pl.DEF.UNDER ni.???ADJCT prefix- vai - infl

\ELANBegin 282.431

\ELANEnd 285.681

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft “I want to hear these children talking,” [Greymorning(?) said].

\notes This use of the participle for 'speaking' appears to be an English interference. It is not grammatical in Arapaho, and not otherwise documented in this usage.

Since it is analyzed as ni I put a label on it, but I was not sure whether that should have been a UNDER label with “tei'yoonoh'o'” as a modifier, or even an INADJ, but there’s animacy issue in that case.

# 47c.

47c.008

\tx “heetneihoowP my work

\mb heetneihoow- P my work

\ge 2.FUT.NEG- pause/break my work

\ps infl+prefix+prefix- P ENGL ENGL.

\tx clothes,” nih'iit, “my clothes,”

\mb clothes nih- 'ii - t my clothes

\ge clothes PAST- said - 3.S my clothes

\ps ENGL#V.IMPOBJ??? prefix- vai - infl ENGL ENGL.#V.IMPOBJ.

\ELANBegin 34.840

\ELANEnd 39.320

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft “I will not [buy everyday clothes there], [just] my work clothes,” he

said, “my clothes,”

Again, there is no verb in the sentence, but all the verbal morphology is present. Here I just assumed that a vai verb is more likely to be present.

\ref 47c.014

\tx ci'nih'oo3ousei nihno'koohut,

\mb ci' - nih'oo3ousei nih- no'koohu - t

\ge too - white woman PAST- arrive by car - 3.S

\ps proclitic/part - na.PP.SBJCT. prefix- vai - infl

\tx from California, noonih'inoono'

\mb from California noonih'inoon - o'

\ge from California forget - 1S/3S

\ps ENGL LOC.placename vta - infl

\tx hiniisih'iit.

\mb hi- niisih'iit

\ge 3S- name

\ps infl- ni.SECOBJ.

\ELANBegin 63.330

\ELANEnd 68.140

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft there was that White lady too who came from California, I forget her

name.

\ref 47c.015

\tx That that name, hisei nihnoohowoot

\mb that that name hisei nih- noohow - oot

\ge that that name woman PAST- see - 3S/4

\ps ENG ENG ENGL.#V.DEF.SECOBJ??? na.PP.AGENT prefix- vta - infl

\tx nuhu' beh'eihoho.

\mb nuhu' beh'eihoho

\ge this old men

\ps det na.pl.obv.DEF.UNDER.

\ELANBegin 72.580

\ELANEnd 78.480

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft That, that name, [that] woman [went and] saw those old men

I figured that the questioned noun belongs to the previous clause, and I copied the label from it. I just wanted to make sure that it’s the correct choice over an INDP.

47c.078

\tx Noh notiitiinoo wo3onohoe.

\mb noh notiitiinoo wo3onohoe

\ge and thing searched for book

\ps part ni.DEPPART. ni.#V.INADJ???

\ELANBegin 327.470

\ELANEnd 330.750

\ELANParticipant 58

\ft And I looked them up in the book.

This is another issue with the clause that does not have a verb, but has a DEPPPART, I analyzed “book” as INADJ, but it really seems like it could also be a LOC or ADJCT.

\ref 47c.093

\tx Heetwonniiniitenowoo nuh'uuno.

\mb heet- won- niin- iten - owoo nuh'uuno

\ge FUT- ALLAT- REDUP- get/take - 1S this

\ps prefix- prefix- prefix- vta - infl det.EMPH.UNDER

\ELANBegin 386.570

\ELANEnd 388.700

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft I [was supposed to] take some classes.

The verb is analyzed as TA, but it does not have an inflection for the obviative. So at first I labeled the determiner as OBJCT, but then I thought if the verb is TA it will be UNDER. I am not sure which is more appropriate here.

# 47d

In 47d there are lines 007-010 that just have single NPs for the whole clause. I marked them as INDPs, but I also thought they could be INADJ to “heetni'eenetiitoonin” in 006. My main question here is how many lines/clauses away from the verb is too many for the verb to license the NP.

\ref 47d.029

\tx nihco'oniini uhh, live, nih'iico'oniini you know trees alive all all year long.

\mb nih- co'on- iini uhh live nih'ii- co'on- iini you know trees alive all all year long

\ge PAST- always- DETACH uhh live PAST.IMPERF- always- DETACH you know trees alive all all year long

\ps prefix- prefix- deriv particle ENGL prefix- prefix- deriv ENG.VENG.SBJCT ENG ENGL.VENGL???SBJCT ENGL ENGL ENGL ENGL ENGL

\ELANBegin 159.670

\ELANEnd 168.270

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft they always uhh, live, it was always an evergreen tree.

Because of code-switching I can’t really tell which verb governs “trees”. I marked it as if it is an argument of “live” but really it is a part of an embedded clause, and then that clause is missing a main verb. So I almost want to mark it VENGL.SBJCT.2V.#V.SBJCT.

\ref 47d.041

\tx koobeexo'niihi' somebody,

\mb koo- beexo'- n - iihi' somebody

\ge INTERR- only- ? - ADV somebody

\ps proclitic- prefix- ? - deriv ENGL.#V???

\tx bells,

\mb bells

\ge bells

\ps ENGL#V.???

\ELANBegin 210.930

\ELANEnd 214.340

\ELANParticipant 58

\ft ??? somebody, bells,

Again here there is no analysis of the verb, and they are English nouns, so I am not sure what those arguments are.

\ref 47d.078

\tx Neinoo, nihbiinoot heinoo, noh

\mb neinoo nih- biin - oot he- inoo noh

\ge 1S.mother PAST- give - 3S/4 2S- mother and

\ps infl+oblposs.PP.AGENT prefix- vta - infl infl- na.oblposs.UNDER. part

\tx uhh Anita heinoo, teecxo'

\mb uhh anita he- inoo teecxo'

\ge uhh anita 2S- mother long ago

\ps particle ENGL.UNDER infl- na.oblposs.UNDER part

\tx hi'in can-cans wooce'.

\mb hi'in can-cans wooce'

\ge that(aforementioned) can-can dancer outfit you know that...

\ps det ENGL.DEF.SECOBJ part

\ELANBegin 366.840

\ELANEnd 375.900

\ELANParticipant 58

\ft My mother gave your mother, and uhh, Anita your mother, a long time

ago, those can-can skirts, you know.

\Notes {A kind of hoop to make skirts stick out}

…

\ref 47d.080

\tx Cologne, White O.

\ps ENGL.#V.SECOBJ ENGL.#V.SECOBJ???

I am not sure what “White O” is referring to here, I can’t tell whether it is the name of the cologne, or it’s somebody’s nickname.

\ref 47d.084

\tx Neisonoo nih'iit, heeyou

\mb ne- isonoo nih- 'ii - t heeyou

\ge 1S- father PAST- said - 3.S what (is it?)

\ps infl- na.obl.poss.SBJCT. prefix- vai - infl pseudovii.INTERR

\tx nih'iit, koolampshade

\mb nih- 'ii - t koo- lampshade

\ge PAST- said - 3.S INTERR- lampshade

\ps prefix- vai - infl proclitic- ENGL.PRED???

\tx nih'iit.

\mb nih- 'ii - t

\ge PAST- said - 3.S

\ps prefix- vai - infl

\ELANBegin 407.990

\ELANEnd 411.040

\ELANParticipant 38

\ft My father said, what is this, he said, is it a lampshade, he said.

I marked it PRED because I see it only as an argument of the “heeyou”, but I also wonder if it is functioning here as a verb, and if I don’t need to label it at all.

At last in 47e I skipped the lines that did not have any Arapaho in them, so I ended up labeling only 3 nouns.