Nakoda "intensifier" -ȟ*

Vincent Collette

First Nations University of Canada

Abstract: The present article analyses the distribution and semantics of -ȟ in Nakoda (a Dakotan language of the Mississippi Valley Siouan branch). I show that -ȟ has distinct semantic and pragmatic meanings depending on the type of words it attaches to. More precisely, the suffix -ȟ can express intensification (with gradable expressions like adverbs and stative verbs), as well as focus (with non-gradable expressions like active verbs, pronouns and nouns), two notions that are often ill-defined in the literature on intensification. Moreover, -ȟ also encodes epistemic specificity (speaker's knowledge) with indefinite pronouns, a function also occurring in Lakota. Lastly, -ȟ also has a purely adverbializing function from which stems quantitative meanings (multiplication, pluralization).

Keywords: intensification, focus, epistemic specificity, Nakoda, Siouan languages

1. Introduction

Siouan languages have morphemes called "intensifiers" or "augmentatives" which have been reconstructed for Proto-Siouan (hereafter PS) as *-xti and *-xtE. Although the morphology of these elements poses no real problem, their semantics is blurred in many daughter languages that keep reflexes of both PS forms like Nakoda -ȟ and -ȟtįyą and Lakota -ȟča and -ȟčiŋ. A major issue is that the concepts of "intensification" and "augmentation" are complex notions that have not been properly studied and defined in Siouan linguistics, and, consequently, their usefulness as descriptive concepts does not fully reveal the complexity of their semantic and pragmatic meanings. The present article aims to bridge this gap by analyzing the distribution, semantics and pragmatics of -ȟ in Nakoda (a Dakotan dialect of the Mississippi Valley Siouan branch). In this article I show that -ȟ has distinct meanings depending on the type of words it attaches to. More precisely -ȟ and -ȟtįyą have complementary distribution, the latter occurring mostly on verbs and the former on all other word classes, but especially on NP and adverbs. Drawing on the work of Farkas (2009), Haspelmath (1997), and especially Guesquière (2017) and Athanasiadou (2007), I demonstrate that -ȟ can express intensification with gradable expressions (e.g. adverbs and stative verbs), as well as focus with non-gradable expressions (e.g. active verbs, pronouns and nouns), two notions that were often ill-defined in older literature on intensification. Moreover, -ȟ encodes epistemic specificity with indefinite pronouns, but has also a purely adverbializing function from which stems innovative quantitative meanings (multiplication, pluralization) peculiar to Nakoda.

The paper unfolds as follows: in section 2, I define the catch-all concepts of *intensification*, *emphasis* and *focus*. Section 3 deals with Siouan comparative data and the development of PS intensifiers *-xti and *-xtE in the Dakotan dialects: the aim is to illustrate the fact that Nakoda has innovated in distinctive ways not found in other Dakotan dialects. Section 4 provides a thorough description and analysis of the distribution and semantic and pragmatic functions of -ȟ̌.

2.   Intensification, emphasis and focus

Intensification is a well-known linguistic phenomenon that has been thoroughly studied by Bolinger (1972) for English, and more recently by Napoli & Ravetto (2017) for a selection of European and non-European languages. Although the term intensifier as been applied to various types of words in the linguistic literature (e.g. reflexive pronouns; see for example König & Siemund (2000), there is a need to clearly delineate between the related but distinct notions of intensification and focus. Bolinger (1972) defines intensification as any linguistic device that scales the quality of an entity upward, downward or somewhere between the two. Quirk et al. (1985), building on Bolinger's work, state that degree modifiers scale the degree of a gradable expression upward (i.e. amplifier) or downward (i.e. downtoner) from an assumed norm or standard. The traditional view of intensification (Quirk et al. 1985; Athanasiadou 2007) follows roughly the following distinctions (taken from Waksler 2012:28; see also Bolinger 1972:93) (Note the lack of isomorphy—one form for one meaning—with some of the so-called intensifiers):

AMPLIFIERS

- **boosters** increase the degree of target property on a scale (e.g., it is *very* hot; it is *so* cool; it is *very much* needed);
- **maximizers** increase the degree of target property up to the limit of the scale (e.g. it is *much* needed; it is *completely* covered in snow; it is *absolutely* awful);
- **emphasizers** reinforce the truth value of a proposition (e.g. I would *absolutely* not do that; You're *totally* getting hacked by someone; I am *so* getting my hair done by him).

DOWNTONERS

- **approximators** (e.g. it is *almost* dark);
- **compromisers** (e.g. he is *more or less* aware of this);
- **diminishers** (e.g. it was *partly* written);
- **minimizers** (e.g. I can *hardly* see it).

As seen in the preceding lists intensification is the process of modifying or scaling the degree of gradable properties expressed by adverbs, adjectives, and verbs (see Guesquière 2017:34), however, since adverbs belong to an eclectic word class, another important distinction is made between *degree modifiers* (i.e. intensifiers) and *focus modifiers* since these two types of modifiers are governed by different semantic and pragmatic parameters. While intensifiers enable the speaker to project a positive or negative scaling of the quality of a gradable expression (*very* big,

totally lost), this is not the case with focus modifiers (?*exactly* big, ?*only* lost, Bill *even* came). We follow here the definition given by Guesquière (2017:34) who states that "focus modifiers do not change the element or quality they scope over, but rather single it out in relation to alternative values, typically countering expectations and presuppositions in the discourse context." In sum focus markers have a clear discourse function, enabling the speaker to highlight some parts of the message and to guide the addressee/hearer in his/her understanding of the intended message. Researchers usually classify adverbs like *only*, *even* and *just* into distinct pragmatic types of focus. For instance, Nevelainen (1991) makes the following distinctions (see also Traugott 2009; Athanasiadou 2007 for an overview):

Focus markers

- **inclusives** single out a value but imply other alternatives (e.g. He *also* came along; I want some *too*; John *even* came!)
- **restrictives** split into:
    - **exclusives** evoke a value and exclude all other alternatives (e.g. It is *only* a matter of time; I *just* finished eating pizza);
    - **particularizers** demarcate the focus value more emphatically or precisely without evoking alternative values (e.g. I want the *exact* same one; He did *precisely/exactly* as he was told; Jill *just* stared at him; other particularizers include particularly, *particular*, *specific*, *specifically*).

Athanasiadou (2007:556) notes that some focus modifiers pragmatically evoke scalarity since they activate a scale of property when used with non-gradable expressions (I need *only* three; I need a *specific* pen to do that; John *even* came). In other words, while *three* and *pen* are not gradable but only imply a set of alternatives (i.e. three compared to two or four; a specific pen compared to any odd pen), *even* in John even came evokes a scale (the coming or not of John), and ranks its focus on a scale of evaluation — even ranks John coming's as actual albeit surprising. In sum focus modifier can (but do not have to) express the speaker's subjectivity as with *I just finished eating pizza*. Although I use English examples to delineate my working notions and assumptions, the lack of isomorphic relation between form and meaning (one form like *so* can have more than one meaning, depending on the context) seen with so-called "intensifiers" is also found in Washo (isolate; Beltrama & Bochnak 2015, and Bundeli (Indo-Aryan; Jaiswal 1962:166) and many others.

Unsurprisingly Nakoda intensifiers also show the same kind of semantic flexibility. In Nakoda, intensification can be expressed morphologically (with affixes and morphological processes) or with particles. First, the suffixes -ȟ and -ȟtįyą can be added on almost any parts of speech to express: a) amplification/boosters in (1a) and (1b), or emphasis (1c); or b) specification or focus in (2a) and (2b).

(1) a. *Owáštena-ȟ   ma-∅-ní.*
        carefully-**INT** DS-3s-walk
        'He is walking really carefully.'

     b. *Zitkána žé   nína ∅-júsina-ȟtįyą.*
        bird   DEM very 3s-small-**INT**
        'This bird is the smallest.'

      c. *O-wá-gihį̌-šį̌-**ħtįyą**!*
         DS-1A-able.to-NEG-**EMP**
         'I absolutely cannot do it!'

(2) a. *Dagú-**ħ**   yawá-bi ∅-wa-cįga.*
        something-**SPEC** read-SUB 3s-1s-want
        'I want to read something specific (about it).'

      b. *Duktédu-**ħtįyą**?*
         be.somewhere-**FOC**
         'Where did it happen exactly?'

        Downtoners scale negatively the property of gradable expressions. In Nakoda some of the downtoners are *ginįja* 'almost' (ADV) (approximator) and *štéħ* 'partly, -ish' (ENCL) (compromiser). Second, reduplication can also scale upward the quality degree of state verbs.

(3) a. *Šųktógeja nų́ba **tąk**tágabi*
        wolf   two   **REDUP**.be.big-3PL
        'The two wolves were very big.

      b. ***Wa**-má-wašte   cén,   wįyą óda wįcá-mn-uha.*
        REDUP-1s-be.nice because woman many 3PL.P-1A-have
        'Because I was good looking, I had many girlfriends.'

      c. *Wįcášta žé   hą́ska**ska**-bi.*
        men   those be.tall.**REDUP**-3PL
        'The men are very tall.'

        The particle *kó* is used to convey emphasis and more precisely the speaker's strong emotion, irony, surprise, joking, teasing which in many cases reinforces the truth value of a sentence ([Cumberland 2005](#):326).

(4) a. *Hįįį   a-∅-hámna   **kó**!*
        exclamation.FEMALE DS-3s-be.moldy **INT**
        'Oh! They are all moldy too!'

      b. ***Kó** he?*
        INT QST
        'What then?'

      c. *Žé'įš   **kó**!*
        DEM.too **INT**
        'That one too!'

        In the next section, I will cast the problem touch upon with examples (1) and (2) within historical and dialectal perspectives. More precisely, I claim that even though the notions of intensification and focus may seem similar at first site — as testified by the simple fact that Nakoda "intensifiers" *-ħ* and *-ħtįyą* can encode both notions—they are governed by different semantic and pragmatic parameters.

3.   Proto-Siouan *-xti and *-xtE

As a point of departure for my description and analysis of Nakoda -*ȟ* and -*ȟtįyą* (labelled "intensifiers" or "augmentatives" in the Siouan linguistic literature), let us examine Siouan comparative data. Two augmentatives *-xtE and *-xti have been reconstructed for PS (Rankin et al. 2015), although the semantics of these form is not straightforward. No meaning, except the label "augmentative", has been reconstructed for *-xtE: Crow -*šta* 'very' (Rankin et al. 2015); Mandan *xtéʔš* 'it's big'; in compounds *céxte* 'hurricane'; *cixtéc* 'it is very good' Rankin et al. (2015), and Lakota -*xčA* 'very, very much, really, particularly, in particular, especially, most; at all' (enclitic). On the other hand in PS *-xti yields a bewildering set of forms in daughter languages: Biloxi -*xti* 'augmentative, intensifier and superlative degree; real, true'; *pixtí* 'very good, best' (Kaufman 2011); Hoocąk -*xjį* 'verily, very, superlative'; *cooxjįną* 'it is very blue'; *céexjį* 'buffalo'; *Šųųkxete nįňąra ʾeewasaagre(xjį)?* 'Is your horse the fastest?' (Helmbrecht & Lehmann 2006); Kaw -*xci* 'real, very'; *hóxci* 'catfish'; *súsexci* 's/he/it is very fast' (Rankin & Cumberland 2007); Osage -*xci*∼-*xcį* 'real, really, exactly, very, full, indeed, precisely'; *Wažaže xci brįe.* 'I'm a real Osage'; *xúða-xci* 'real eagle' (Quintero 2009); Lakota -*ȟčiŋ* (suffix) 'very, very much, really, real, particularly, especially, most; at all'; *Osní ȟče* 'it is very/really cold'; *é ȟča* 'she/he/it is the real/very one'; *Iháŋkeya wašté ȟče kiŋ ičú* 'He took the very best one' (Ullrich 2011; Ullrich & Black Bear 2016); Nakoda -*ȟtįyą* 'very, exactly'; Hidatsa -*hdi* 'desiderative, urge'; *cagíhdi* 'be pretty, cute'; *eeríhdi* 'need to defecate' (Park 2012).

By examining the Dakotan comparative data it is evident that in Lakota and Dakota the reflexes of *-xtE (Lak. enclitic -*ȟča*∼-*ȟče* and Nak. suffix -*ȟ*) and *-xti (Lak. suffix -*ȟčiŋ* and Nak. suffix -*ȟtįyą*[1]) have a language-specific distribution. Lakota -*ȟča*∼-*ȟče* occur with main verbs (predicative use) while -*ȟčiŋ* occurs before verbs and attaches on adverbs (subordinate). In Nakoda, -*ȟtįyą* attaches mainly on verbs, while -*ȟ* occurs on all other parts of speech (nouns, pronouns, adverbs, some stative verbs). In both dialects the semantics of these elements is nearly identical since both can be translated by 'very, very much, really, real, particularly, especially, most; at all'. Let us examine some Lakota (from Ullrich 2011) and Nakoda examples.

Lakota

(5)   a.   *Wašté **ȟče**.*
              'It is really good (it is the best).'

       b.   *Hokšíla **ȟče**.*
              'He was really (just) a boy.'

(6)   a.   *Hé iyotáŋ **ȟčiŋ** waŋkátuya.*
              'This is the most important thing.'

       b.   *Líla **ȟčiŋ** owákaȟniǧe šni.*
              'I didn't understand it at all.'

---

[1]The final -*yą* of -*ȟtįyą* (with progressive nasalization) is an innovation of Nakoda. Since -*ȟtįyą* occurs mainly on verbs, the final -*yą* could well be the causative suffix which is often used to derive nouns into transitive verbs.

Nakoda

(7) a. *Owáštenaȟ maní.*
        'He is walking very carefully.

     b. *Dagúȟ opémijitų!*
        'Buy me something!'

(8) a. *Ǧíȟtįyą.*
        'it is deep yellow.'

     b. *Duktéduȟtįyą?*
        'Where did it happen exactly?'

These examples are crucial for a deeper understanding of the semantics of these cognates. Even though grammarians and lexicographers of the Dakotan dialects often give a single unifying meaning or translate both forms with a series of English adverbial equivalents, I claim that in Nakoda (but my analysis could apply to Lakota as well) *-ȟ* and *-ȟtįyą* have similar but distinct semantic and pragmatic functions in synchrony. Of course, on a very general level, the semantics of (7) and (8) may appear similar to the laymen, since, after all, they all invoke a departure or augmentation from a given norm (*a very cool guy*, *a real friend*), and are able to encode the speaker's subjectivity and perspective on the extra-linguistic reality. As can be seen with (7a) and (8a) above intensification is often translated with degree modifiers such as 'very, much, really (superlative adj.)' and both *-ȟ* and *-ȟtįyą* can act as positive scale boosters of the quality of gradable expressions like stative verbs and adverbs; this also applies to Lakota examples (5a) and (6a). Focus, on the other hand, singles out an entity or an event against a set of alternatives (5b), (6b), (7b), and (8b), but most importantly, when *-ȟ* and *-ȟtįyą* express focus they can only occur with non-gradable expressions like pronouns, nouns, and active verbs. The next section expands on these observations by providing a thorough description and analysis of these forms in Nakoda. Unfortunately due to space restrictions I concentrate only on *-ȟ*.

4.   Distribution and semantics of *-ȟ* and *-ȟtįyą*

In this section I document the distribution and semantics of -ȟ and -ȟtįyą. As noted in the previous section, while both -ȟ and -ȟtįyą can express intensity and focus, depending on the type of words they attach to,[2] they can also occur on the same stem as the following examples illustrate.

(9) a. *aháge* 'it is the last' (vs);
        ahágeȟ 'the last' (n); 'lastly, finally' (adv);
        ahágeȟtįyą 'it is the very last one' (vs); 'really last, very last one' (adv)

     b. Aháge-**ȟ**   ti-máni   wa-hí.
        finally-**adv** house-walk 1s-come.here
        'I finally came to visit.'

---

[2]A similar versatility is seen in Bundeli (Indo-Aryan) where one the emphatic suffix *-ai* can attach to different parts of speech and express: (i) restrictive/exclusivity on nouns (e.g., *mōṛā* 'boy' > *mōṛāi* 'only the boy'); and (ii) emphasis on verbs (e.g., *bō jaihai* 'he will go') (Jaiswal 1962:166 et seq.).

    c. Aháge-**ȟtįyą** nén wací.
       be.last-**INT** here dance
       'Here is the very last dance.'

(10) a. *omá* 'the other one' (PRO);
       omáȟ 'either one' (PRO);
       omáȟtįyą 'she/he/it is the very first' (vs)

    b. *Omá-**ȟ***   *ma-k'ú!*
       either.one-**spec** 1P-give.IMP
       'Give me either one!'

    c. *Omá-**ȟtįyą***   *žé*   *cįga-bi.*
       other.one-**SPEC** that want-3PL
       'They want the other one specifically.'

(11) a. *waktá* 'she/he is expectant, aware of something' (VI);
       waktáȟ 'expectantly, on guard' (ADV);
       waktáȟtįyą 'she/he is truly expectant, on his/her guard' (VI)

    b. *Waktá-**ȟ***   *m-ągá.*
       on.guard-ADV 1s-sit
       'I'm (sit) on my guard.'

    c. *Waktá-**ȟtįyą**!*
       be.on.guard-**int**.IMP
       'Be really on your guard!'

In terms of distribution and semantics we can make the following observations. First, the two elements are in a near complementary distribution: *-ȟtįyą* is attached mainly to verbs (and some pronouns), while *-ȟ* is found on other types of words (nouns, pronouns, adverbs, and demonstratives). Second, *-ȟ* can derive a verb into an adverb and loose its intensifying/focusing meanings; this is an innovation found in Nakoda that is not fully representative of its original semantics. Third, there is a semantic opposition between *-ȟ* and *-ȟtįyą* when they function as intensifiers, as with the stems *-saba-* 'to be black' (*sapsábaȟ* 'it is very black' vs *sabáȟtįyą* 'it is pitch black') and *-wįca-* (*wįcáȟca* 'old man, husband (for a female speaker)' vs *wįcáȟtįyąną* 'very old man' (with progressive nasal assimilation). However, this semantic opposition of degrees is found only with a handful of stems and textual examples are extremely rare. The distribution and functions of *-ȟ* and *-ȟtįyą* is captured in Table 1.

In the rest of this section I describe and analyze the semantics and pragmatics of *-ȟ*. The analysis highlights the fact that Nakoda has inherited the semantics of its forms from Proto-Siouan but innovated in ways not found in closely related dialects like Dakota and Lakota. The derivational suffix *-ȟ* is flexible semantically, since it has descriptive/quantitative properties (intensification, focusing, specification) as well as purely quantitative extensions (multiplication, pluralization). It can occur on almost all parts of speech, that is, on adverbs (time, space, and manner), interrogative and focus pronouns, ordinal numbers, demonstratives, nouns, and verbs. It also has an adverbializing function and is semantically bleached in that it does not express intensity or focusing as with *ahágeȟ* 'lastly, finally' (ADV) or *nųbáȟ* 'twice'.

Table 1: Distribution and functions of *-ȟ* and *-ȟtįyą*

	intensification	focus	adverbializer
-ȟ	*adverbs (some stative verbs)	*pronouns (expresses epistemic specificity) *nouns *demonstratives	yes (derives verbs into adverbs)
-ȟtįyą	*stative verbs (superlative degree) *emphatic enclitic on stative verbs	*active verbs (some pronouns)	no

4.1.   *-ȟ* as an adverb, verb intensifier and pronoun emphasizer

The suffix *-ȟ* can function as an unbounded degree intensifier (INT) of gradable expressions and occurs on manner as in (12) and time adverbs[3] as in (13), but also on stative and auxiliary verbs like in (14). It expresses the speaker's subjectivity by increasing the degree of a target property on a scale.

(12) a. *Owáštena-**ȟ**   ma-∅-ní.*
          carefully-**INT** DS-3S-walk
          'He is walking very carefully.'

    b. *Ótąna-**ȟ**   má-∅-ni   wo!*
         straight.way-**INT** DS-3S-walk IMP.SG.MALE
         'Walk in a very straight way!' (i.e. be a good, respectable person)

    c. *Pté tą́ga   wa-páda   cén, dąyą́-**ȟ**   į-má-pį   no!*
         cow be.big 1A-butcher after really-**INT** DS-1S-be.full DECL.MALE
         'After I butchered a big cow, I'm really full!'

(13) *(...) waná éstena-**ȟ**   t'á-bi   jé.*
         then soon-**INT** die.3-PL always
       '(...) they always died very soon.'

(14) a. *(...) wé-ga   sapsábe-**ȟ**!*
               blood-gush be.black.REDUP-**INT**
          '(...) blood was gushing out' ([Parks & DeMallie 2012](#):100)

    b. *Ma-stústa áya-**ȟ**!*
         1S-tired   become-**INT**
         'I'm getting really tired!'

---

[3]It is worth noticing that *-ȟ* appears on some adverbs which do not have the simple counterpart without *-ȟ* making it difficult to decide if we are dealing with an intensifying suffix or not: *įdúȟ* 'unexpectedly, contrary to hope, really, certainly', *naháȟ* 'still, yet', *wanúȟ* 'maybe'. Other examples of intensified time, manner and space adverbs include: *hąyáke* 'morning' > *hąyą́kena* 'early in the morning' (with diminutive *-na*) > *hąyákenaȟ* 'very early in the morning'; *nągáhą∼nahą́* 'now' > *nągáhąȟ∼nągáȟ* 'right now, right away'; *įwáštena* 'slowly, carefully, gently' > *įwáštenaȟ* 'really slowly'; *wągą́duwa* 'up above, high up' > *wągą́duwaȟ* 'way up there, really high up'.

The suffix *-ȟ* occurs obligatory with the degree adverb *nína* 'very' in negative clauses, but adds no semantic content to the sentence.

(15)   a.   *Nína-**ȟ**   ∅-ktá-šį.*
            very-**INT** 3s-be.heavy-**NEG**
            'It's not very heavy.'

       b.   *Nína-**ȟ**   osní-šį.*
            very-**INT** be.cold-**NEG**
            'It is not very cold.'

       c.   *Nína-**ȟ**   koná-∅-wa-ye-šį*
            very-**INT** friend-3P-1A-DS-**NEG**
            'He is not my true friend.'

In Nakoda independent focus pronouns are formed on the stem *-iye-* and can function as the predicate of a clause *iyé* 'she/he is the one', *miyé* 'I am the one', *niyé* 'you are the one', and *ųgíye* 'we are the ones'. It can also occur in comparative constructions to indicate the MARK 'than X' (Cumberland 2005:130-131). When *-ȟ* is attached to an independent focus pronouns it emphasizes the identity of the person already coded by the independent pronoun and the person markers on the verb (namely *-wa-* and *-mn-* '1sg.').

(16)   *Tíbi   né   ∅-wa-gáǧa   m-iyé-**ȟ**.*
       house this 3P-1A-make 1-self-**EMP**
       'I'm building this house myself specifically.'

(17)   *Sąksája   né   wa'á-∅-mn-aza   m-iyé-**ȟ**.*
       silk.dress this DS-3P-1A-bead   1-self-**EMP**
       'I beaded this dress myself specifically.'

Cumberland (2005:131-132) analyses the occurrence of *-ȟ* on independent focus pronouns like *miyéȟ* 'my very self' as an instance of intensification. I object this analysis since the focus pronoun 'myself' is not gradable. In (16) and (17) *-ȟ* does not contribute to the identification of a referent by the speaker (focus marking), nor does it scale the degree of the quality of a gradable expression (intensification). I claim instead that *-ȟ* functions as an emphasizer only with this type of pronoun; it simply reinforces the truth value of the proposition by indicating that the speaker alone is responsible for building the house or beading the dress. Of course, the fact that speakers often translate *miyéȟ* as 'my very self' only proves the claim that so-called intensifiers can be used to express intensification and focus.

4.2.   *-ȟ* as a focus marker and epistemic specifier

Focus modification relates to the process of singling an entity against a set of alternatives. With noun phrases *-ȟ* contributes to the identification of a given entity (a particular road, thing or pail) against a set of alternatives (FOC).

Noun phrases

(18) a. *Ocą́gu-ȟ žé.*
          road-**FOC** that
          'That's [known to me] the road.'

      b. *Céǧa žé-ȟ   a-wá-hi.*
          POT that-**SPEC** INST-1S-came
          'I came with a pot [known to me].'

In the rest of this section, I show that when *-ȟ* functions as a focus marker it expresses epistemic specificity (i.e. sensitivity to the speaker's knowledge). This occurs specifically with indefinite pronouns and the indefinite article *wąží* 'one, a'. Table 2 contains some of the Nakoda pronouns and the nouns from which they are derived.

Table 2: Some Nakoda pronouns

ONTOLOGICAL CATEGORIES	NOUN	INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN	INDEFINITE PRONOUN	NEGATIVE PRONOUNS
THING	*dágu* 'thing, something'	*dágu* 'what'	*dáguȟ* 'something, anything' *dágu* 'something'	*dáguni* 'nothing'
PERSON	*duwé* 'person, someone'	*duwé* 'who'	*duwéȟ* 'someone, anyone' *duwé* 'someone'	*duwéni* 'nobody'
PLACE	—	*duktén* 'where (static)'	*duktéȟ* 'somewhere, anywhere'	*dukténi* 'nowhere'

Two important observations can be made here. First, since Siouan languages have a weak noun/verb distinction, one is not surprised to find that some of the generic nouns can also function as stative verbs (*duwé* 'she/he is someone' as in *Madúwe he?* 'Who am I?'), as interrogative pronouns (*duwé* 'who'), or even as indefinite pronouns (*duwé* 'someone') with no change in the surface form. Second, there are two sets of indefinite pronouns; one stemming from the conversion of bare generic nouns into indefinite pronouns, and another one where generic nouns are derived with *-ȟ*.

(19) a. *Dágu   síj-ec-∅-ų-'.*   (indefinite pronoun)
          something bad-do-3A-DS-DECL.F
          'She did something bad.'

      b. *Dágu opé-ya-tų-kta   žehą́?*   (interrogative pronoun)
          what buy-2A-DS-POT then
          'What did you buy then?'

(20) a. *Dagú-ȟ   yawá-bi ∅-wa-cį́ga.*   (indefinite pronoun)
          something-**SPEC** read-SUB 3s-1s-want.to
          'I want to read something specific (about it).'

b. *Dagú-**ȟ***   *wįcá-∅-k'u-kta*   *he*   *į-∅-m-úǧa.*   (indefinite pronoun)
anything-SPEC 3PL.P-3A-give-POT QST DS-3P-1A-ask
'I asked him if he will give people anything.'

Because of this fluidity in parts of speech membership -ȟ cannot be a marker of indefiniteness or intensification, and this is why I propose, following Haspelmath (1997:45-46), to analyze -ȟ as a marker of epistemic specificity.

The concept of specificity entered linguistics via philosophy of language, side-by-side with that of referentiality (see Farkas 2009; Enç 1991; Haspelmath 1997:22-23). While Payne (1997:264) thinks of specificity as essentially a matter of extra-linguistic referentiality when he states that "an entity is specific if the speaker assumes the existence of its referent in the extra-linguistic world", I believe this view cannot capture many of the phenomena described here. As proposed by Farkas (2009:909), the main function of specificity is to provide fine-grain distinctions within the semantics of NP, especially when formal devices such as indefinite/definite articles or pronouns are insufficient to capture the rich array of semantic, pragmatic phenomena that are associated with NP semantics. Although there are different types of specificity (see Farkas 2009), I will be concerned here solely with *epistemic specificity* since it is expressed with the suffix -ȟ in Nakoda. For Farkas (2009:910) epistemic specificity relates to the concept of intended referentiality or "whether the speaker has an intended referent in mind (specific) or not (non-specific)." For instance, the following avatar of a classical example which allows two readings illustrates the semantic specificity of NP:

(21)   a.   *Mary wants to marry **a Nakoda man**.*

      b.   SPECIFIC READING: "... but he does not want to."

      c.   NON-SPECIFIC READING: "... and I hope she'll find one."

If we take sentences (21b) and (21c) as possible continuation of (21a), then, we can say that (21b) forces a specific interpretation of the NP *a Nakoda man*, while (21c) is unable to do that. Thus, we will say that in (21a) and (21b) the referent of the specific NP *a Nakoda man* is constant across the speaker's and addressee's epistemic alternatives (Farkas 2009:911): for both of them the referent of the NP *a Nakoda man* is the same. Whether or not an NP receives a specific or unspecific epistemic reading in English is intimately related to the context of utterance since English does not have constant formal means to express this idea. However, as shown by Haspelmath (1997:38), some languages like Russian, Greek, and Lithuanian have two series of indefinite pronouns that are used whether the referent of an indefinite NP is specific or non-specific. The choice between these two series of indefinite pronouns is pragmatically governed by (i) the context of utterance (indefinites usually introduce new information in the discourse), and (ii) by the speaker's knowledge which relates to its ability to identify (or not), and to disclose (or not) the identity of a new referent to his/her addressee/hearer. In other words when the speaker does not have a referent in mind, then the non-specific indefinite pronouns are chosen. However, Nakoda displays a subtle distinction between known referents (indefinite pronouns with specifically known referents) and presupposed ones (indefinite pronouns with specific but presupposed referents). However, while Lakota expresses the distinction of epistemic knowledge morphologically—e.g. *takúȟčiŋ* 's/t hypothetical' vs. *tákuȟča* 's/t real' (taken from Ullrich 2011)—this distinction stems solely from the context of use in Nakoda.

In what follows I show that the speaker's knowledge (or epistemic knowledge) governs the selection of bare indefinite pronouns vs. derived indefinite pronouns in -*ȟ* in Nakoda. The derived pronouns can be +/− speaker's knowledge. The articulation between morphological specificity and speaker's epistemic knowledge for Nakoda indefinite pronouns is captured in Table 3.

Table 3: Specificity and speaker's knowledge with indefinite pronouns

INDEFINITE PRONOUNS		
non-specific *dágu*	**specific** *dagúȟ*	
referent is unknown to the speaker	referent is presupposed by the speaker	referent is known to the speaker only
***Dágu** síjecų'* 'She did s/t bad.'	***Dagúȟ** k'ú!* 'Give anything!'	***Dagúȟ** mnawá.* 'Give anything!'

(A) **+ Specific; speaker's knowledge only** (i.e. the speaker identifies the referent but does not disclose its identity to his/her addressee/hearer). In Nakoda the derived indefinite series in -*ȟ* is not restricted to certain types of constructions and occurs in declarative and imperative sentences as well as in irrealis contexts.

(22) a. *Dagú-**ȟ**   opé-mi-ji-tų!*
          something-**SPEC** DS-1P-BENEF-buy
          'Buy me something [known to me]!'

      b. *Dagú-**ȟ**   kikmá opé-mi-ji-tų!*
          something-**SPEC** alike   buy-1P-BENEF-DS.IMP
          'Buy me something [known to me] like that!'

      c. *Dagú-**ȟ**   opé-ya-tų   céyaga.*
          something-**SPEC** buy-2A-DS should
          'You should buy something significant [know to me].'

      d. *Duká žé'įš   dagú-**ȟ**   awą́-∅-∅-yaga (...)*
          but   that.too something-**SPEC** DS-3O-3A-watch.over
          'But something [known to me] must have been watching over him (...)' (Parks & DeMallie 2012:120)

      e. *Dagú-**ȟ**   síja-bi-c   otí'įga.*
          something-**SPEC** be.bad-DECL I.think
          'I think it was a bad thing [known to me]!'

(B) **+ Specific; presupposed knowledge** (i.e. the speaker does not identify the referent but presupposes its existence). Speakers often translates this use of the derived indefinite pronouns with elective indefinites *anything, anywhere*[4] and *anybody* or other pronouns.

---

[4]Note that there is distinct set of indefinite elective pronouns which are build on the generic nouns: *duktégakošta* 'any which one' (PRO); *duwégakošta* 'anybody' (PRO).

(23) a. *(...) dágu ųspé-'ų-∅-kiya-bi   ená, dagú-ȟ   snok-∅-ų́-yą-bi.*
          thing teach-1PL.P-3A-DS-PL here something-**SPEC** learn-3P-1PL-DS-PL
          (...) we didn't learn any [specific but presupposed] of what they taught us.' [Parks & DeMallie 2012](:129; *dagúȟ* translated as 'nothing')

      b. *(...) dagú-ȟ   yuhá-bi   štén, én cądé e-gį́-knąge-šį!*
          something-**SPEC** have-3PL if   in heart DS-POS-carry-NEG.IMP
          '(...) whatever [specific but presupposed] they have, don't set your heart on it.' [Parks & DeMallie 2012](:139)

      c. *Dagú-ȟ   wįcá-∅-k'u-kta   he į-∅-m-úǧa.*
          something-**SPEC** 3O.PL-3S-give-POT QST DS-3P-1A-ask
          'I asked him if he will give people anything/something [specific but presupposed].'

Example ([23d]) illustrates well the pragmatics of -*ȟ*; here the speaker is talking about traditional laws and how Nakoda knowledge keepers are important in the dissemination of these tribal laws. Since these knowledgeable persons are few but well-known in their communities and beyond, the speaker presupposes such a person exists (*duwéȟ*), but does not disclose his/her identity to his/her addressee and indicates that the dissemination of these actual laws, whichever one (*dagúȟ*), is likely to occur in the future.

      d. *Žécen "duwé-ȟ,   dagú-ȟ   wó'ope, žé-∅-ca   o-nį́-∅-ji-yaga*
          then someone-**SPEC** something-**SPEC** law   be.that.kind-3S-DS DS-2P-3A-BENEF-tell
          štén, dąyą́ giksúya   wo!"
          if   well remember.IMP IMP.SG.MALE
          'Then [he said] "If someone [specific but presupposed] tells you about one of these laws [specific but presupposed], really remember it!"' [Parks & DeMallie 2012](:145)

(24) a. *Duwé-ȟ   nécen   į-má-∅-wųǧa các, e-p-cé-šį*
          anyone-**SPEC** be.this.way DS-1O-3A-ask such? DS-1S-think-NEG
          'I never thought anyone [specific but presupposed] would ask me (...)' [Parks & DeMallie 2012](:105)

      b. *(...) duwé-ȟ   dágu žé adų́we'-∅-i-kta.*
          someone-**SPEC** thing that scout-3S-go.there-POT
          '(...) someone [specific but presupposed] should go scout it out.' [Parks & DeMallie 2012](:74)

      c. *Duwé-ȟ   toką́   ∅-hí.*
          someone-**SPEC** different 3S-arrive.here
          'Somebody [specific but presupposed] different came.'

      d. *Duwé-ȟ   kišné-∅-ya-ya?*
          someone-**SPEC** love-3P-2A-DS
          'Do you love someone [specific but presupposed]?'

(25) a. *Dukté-ȟ   iyódąga.*
          somewhere-**SPEC** sit.IMP
          'Sit anywhere/somewhere [specific but presupposed]!'

b. *"Né tóga-bi   néca   dukté-ȟ,   aná-wįca-Ø-tą   (...)"*
   this enemy-PL be.this.kind somewhere-SPEC attack-3O.PL-3A-DS
   '"Some enemies attacked them somewhere [specific but presupposed] (...)"' (Parks & DeMallie 2012:14)

(C) – **Specific; – Speaker's knowledge** (i.e. the speaker does not identify the referent). I include here an example with *dóki* 'where to (dynamic)', altogether this last set of forms is harder to find in the literature.

(26) a. *Gá, né tokákihąbi,   **dágu**   wąyáka-bi, duká snokyá-bi-šį   cén.*
         then this those.in.the.lead **something.UNSPEC** see-3PL   but   know-3PL-NEG thus
         'Then those in the lead saw something [unspecific], but they didn't know what it was.'
         (Parks & DeMallie 2012:79)

      b. *Įknúhanaȟ, **dágu**   a-∅-pá-bi.*
         suddenly   **something.SPEC** DS-3P-hit-PASSIVE
         'Suddenly, something [unspecific] was hit.'

      c. ***Dágu**   ó-∅-mna.*
         something.SPEC DS-3A-smell
         'He smells something [unspecific].'

      d. ***Dóki**   ya'-í-šį   he?*
         somewhere.UNSPEC 2S-go-NEG QST
         'Didn't you go somewhere [unspecific]?'

The derived words *dáguni* 'nothing, none (inanimate referent)' and *duwéni* 'nobody, none (animate referent)' are formed from generic nouns by adding the negative suffix *-ni*. They function either as indefinite pronouns, and occur in positive or negative clauses or as negative partitives to indicate the absence of any representative of a given genre or set, and co-occur obligatorily with a negated verb (Cumberland 2005:360-362). The derivational suffix *-ȟ* also attaches to both negative pronouns and negative partitive to emphasize the negative scope of these function words. Note that *-ȟ* does not express epistemic specificity, focus, or intensification here since it has scope over the negative suffix only, hence its analysis as an emphatic element (EMP) which reinforces the truth value of the sentence.[5]

(27) a. *dágu-ni* 'nothing'
         thing-NEG

      b. *dágu-ni-**ȟ*** 'nothing at all'
         thing-NEG-**EMP**

(28) a. *duwé-ni* 'nobody'
         person-NEG

      b. *duwé-ni-**ȟ***
         person-NEG-**EMP**

---

[5]Examples (27b) and (28b) have also two near-synonymous stative verbs *dágunišį* 'there is nothing' and *duwénišį* 'there is nobody' that are built on the negative stems *daguni-* and *duweni-* on which is added the negative suffix *-šį*. This element has a predicative function which enables the concatenation of *-ȟtįyą* to derive the emphatic versions of these stative verbs: *dágunišįȟtįyą* 'there is nothing at all' and *duwénišįȟtįyą* 'there is nobody at all'.

(29) *Mi-súga-bi   né   duwé-ni-**ȟ**   ∅-háske-šį.*
      1-y.brother-PL DEM someone-NEG-**EMP** 3S-tall-NEG
      'None of my younger brothers is tall.'

(30) *Wįcá-bi né   wąží-ni-**ȟ**   snok-∅-yá-bi-šį.*
      man-PL DEM one-NEG-**EMP** know.it-3-DS-PL-NEG
      'Neither of the men knew it.'

The numeral *wąží* 'one' functions as a numeral and an indefinite article which approximates the English a. The partitive *wąžíȟ* is formed by adding -*ȟ* on *wąži* and means either 'any' (elective existential) or 'a single one, a specific one' (specific with speaker's knowledge). Since wąží functioning as an indefinite article relates to the speaker's ability to identify (or not) the referent, and to disclose (or not) its identity to the addressee/hearer, we find the same pragmatic effects as with indefinite pronouns seen above.

(31) a. *Ą́ba waką́ **wąží** dágu ec-∅-úbi?*   (NUMERAL)
          [week] **one** what do-3S-DS-PL
          'What happened in one week?'

      b. *Iyécįgayena **wąží**   ų-cíga-bi.*   (INDEFINITE ARTICLE)
          car   **INDEF.ART** 1PL-want-PL
          'We want a car.'

SPECIFIC WITH SPEAKER'S KNOWLEDGE ONLY

(32) *Mína wąží-**ȟ**   ma-∅-k'ú-'.*
      knife one-**SPEC** 1O-3A-give.it-DECL.F
      'He gave me a specific knife.'

SPECIFIC BUT PRESUPPOSED

(33) a. *Įknúhąnaȟ wagágana wąží-**ȟ**   wócį   ∅-hí   štén (...)*
          suddenly   old.woman one-**SPEC** begging 3s-arrive.here if
          'If suddenly an old woman comes begging (...)' ([Parks & DeMallie 2012](#):135)

      b. *Žé n-įš žécen   wįcóȟ'ąge wąží-ȟ, én nį-∅-tį́-kta, snok-∅-yá-ya štén (...)*
          that 2-self there.is.that thing.habit one-**SPEC** to 2P-3A-kill-POT know-3P-2A   if
          'But if you know something specific will kill you (...)' ([Parks & DeMallie 2012](#):146)

      c. *Wąží-**ȟ**   n-iyé yužápa-m.*
          one-**SPEC** 2-self uncover.it-IMP.SG
          'One of you uncover it.' ([Parks & DeMallie 2012](#):12)

      d. *Ą́ba wąží-**ȟ**   én ∅-hí-kta.*
          day one-**SPEC** in 3s-arrive-POT
          'He will show up one day.'

      e. *Wįcášta ∅-háska wąží-**ȟ**   wą-wįca-n-aga   he?*
          man   3S-be.tall one-**SPEC** DS-3PL.O-2A-see.it QST
          'Did you see any tall men?' ([Cumberland 2005](#):363)

4.3.   *-ȟ* as an adverbializer

The derivational suffix *-ȟ* has also developed an adverbializing function as it derives manner adverbs from stative verbs, adverbs and numerals as in *ų́šiya* 'pitifully' > *ų́šiyaȟ* 'pitifully, in a pitiful manner'. Often times the underived stem does not exist in synchrony and the intensifying or focus meanings of *-ȟ* are bleached since it does not scale the degree of a gradable expression nor does it single out an entity against a set of alternatives as shown in (34) and (35).

(34)   a.   *wašté* 'it is good' (vs) >
          owášteȟ 'slowly, gently' (ADV) (*owášte)

   b.   *Owášteȟ ∅-máni.*
        gently   3s-walk
        'He walks gently.'

(35)   *Gá   wįcį́jana žé   ∅-giktá, hį́kna pamą́knena-ȟ,   dág-eye-šį-ȟ   ∅-yąká.*
       then girl   that 3s-get.up and   head.bowed-ADV thing-say.it-NEG-ADV 3s-sit
       'Then this girl got up and with her head bowed she sat silently.' (Parks & DeMallie 2012:52)

In some cases however the adverbializing function seems to express focus marking.

(36)   a.   *ecédu* 'it is as such' (vs) >
          ecéduȟ 'the same as another' (ADV)

   b.   *M-į́š   ecédu-ȟ   mi-jáǧa!*
        1-self the.same-ADV 1P-BENEF.make.it.IMP
        'Make me one exactly like this!'

The suffix *-ȟ* also derives manner adverbs of multiplication (e.g. I did it four times) from ordinal numbers: *nų́ba* > *nų́baȟ* 'two times'; *šákpe* (NUM) > *šákpeȟ* 'six times' (ADV). This way of forming multiplicatives is peculiar to Nakoda and does not occur in Dakota and Lakota which use the bare numerals: e.g. Lakota *Nų́pa-hí* 'He came twice'; *Tópa-ečúŋ* 'He did it four times' (Ullrich & Black Bear 2016:406). This type of adverb could be thought of as being akin to intensification since multiplication is an augmentation of an objective quantity while intensification is a boost of a subjective quality.

(37)   a.   *Yámni-ȟ   dágunišį aké   dóba.*
          three-ADV zero   again four
          'Three times zero and four (0004)' (last part of a telephone number)

   b.   *Nų́ba-ȟ   wa-básisa.*
        two-ADV 1s-sew
        'I'm double stitching.'

   c.   *Žéci nųbá-ȟ   wa'-í.*
        there two-ADV 1s-arrive.there
        'I went there twice.'

The adverbial *-ȟ* also has a predicative function in a verbless clauses expressing multiplication of two numerals.

(38) *Dóba-ȟ   nų́ba štén   šaknóǧą.*
      four-**ADV** two   then eight
      'Four times two equals eight.'

Some partially fluent speakers have extended the adverbial use of *-ȟ* with numerals to indicate plurality with animate reference. This use of *-ȟ* is not reported for the Lakota and Dakota cognates, and doesn't occur, to the best of my knowledge in the published Nakoda literature. This extended meaning is awkward since there is already an animate plural suffix *-bi* that occurs on nouns, verbs, and pronouns although demonstrative and nominal plural markers are often dropped in fast/informal speech: *Wįcá né nową́bi* 'the men are singing' (expected *wįcábi nená nową́bi*). Since the examples in (52) were produced by a partially fluent speaker in his early seventies, it might suggest that the pluralizing function of *-ȟ* is idiolectal. Since the marking of grammatical number is asymmetrically in Nakoda (*-bi* on verbs and animate nouns, and reduplication and demonstratives on inanimate nouns), this could be a form of regularization of plurality marking, one that conforms more closely to English, as indicated by the place name *Wazíȟeȟ* 'Cypress Hills' (from the traditional noun *Wazíȟe* 'Cypress Hills' (lit., pine mountain)). Note that the use of *-ȟ* on nouns to express plurality of animates were rejected by fluent speakers.

(39) a. *Ecá   cén   waną́gaš tatą́ga-ȟ   ∅-yúda-bi jé.*
         it.is.as.such because long.ago buffalo-**PL** 3s-eat.it-pl always
         'Because it was like that long ago, they always ate bisons.'

     b. *Jim ta-šų́ga-ȟ   táwa.*
         Jim 3-horse-**PL** 3s.owns.it
         'Jim's horses.'

5.   Conclusion

The present article analyses the distribution, semantics and pragmatic extensions of *-ȟ* in Nakoda (a Dakotan language of the Mississippi Valley Siouan branch). Like other means of intensification that are mentioned in cross-linguistic studies, Nakoda "intensifiers" have more than one function, depending on the type of words they attach to. The suffix *-ȟ* can express intensification (with gradable expressions like adverbs and stative verbs), as well as focus (with non-gradable expressions like active verbs, pronouns and nouns). One of the pragmatic extensions of *-ȟ* when occurring within noun phrases enables the speaker to expresses epistemic specificity or his/her ability to identify (or not), and to disclose (or not) the identity of a new referent to his/her addressee/hearer. In an example like *dagúȟ opéyatų céyaga* 'You should buy something significant' the very possibility of ordering one's addressee for something specific to be bought (without any further details) runs against the Gricean Maxim of Quantity (i.e. be as informative as possible) and shows that such assumptions are of doubtful utility for the description of lesser known languages. Lastly, *-ȟ* also has a purely adverbializing function from which stems quantitative meanings (multiplication, pluralization). This innovation is not found in other Dakotan languages.

References

Athanasiadou, Angeliki. 2007. On the subjectivity of intensifiers. *Language Science* 29(4). 554–565.

Beltrama, Andrea & M. Ryan Bochnak. 2015. Intensification without degrees cross-linguistically. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33(3). 843–879.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. *Degree words.* The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Cumberland, Linda A. 2005. *A grammar of Assiniboine: A Siouan language of the Northern Plains.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University dissertation.

Enç, Mürvet. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(1). 1–25.

Farkas, Donka. 2009. Specificity. In Kenneth Allan (ed.), *Concise encyclopedia of semantics*, 909–912. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.

Guesquière, Lobke. 2017. Intensification and focusing: The case of pure(ly) and mere(ly). In Maria Napoli & Miriam Ravetto (eds.), *Exploring intensification: Synchronic, diachronic and cross-linguistic perspectives*, 33–53. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Helmbrecht, Johannes & Christian Lehmann (eds.). 2006. *Hocąk-English/English-Hocąk: Learner's dictionary* Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt Nr. 21. Erfurt, Germany: University of Erfurt 2nd edn.

Jaiswal, Mahesh Prasad. 1962. *A linguistic study of Bundeli (a dialect of madhyadēśa).* Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.

Kaufman, David V. 2011. Biloxi-English dictionary with English-Biloxi index. Ms. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

König, Ekkehard & Peter Siemund. 2000. Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Traci Walker (eds.), *Reflexives: Forms and functions*, vol. 1, 41–74. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

Napoli, Maria & Miriam Ravetto (eds.). 2017. *Exploring intensification: Synchronic, diachronic and cross-linguistic perspectives.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.

Nevelainen, Terttu. 1991. But, only, just: Focusing adverbial change in Modern English 1500-1900. In *Mémoires de la société néophilologique de helsinki 51*, Helsinki, Finland: Société Philologique.

Park, Indrek. 2012. *A grammar of Hidatsa.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University dissertation.

Parks, Douglas R. & Raymond DeMallie (eds.). 2012. *Assiniboine narratives from Fort Belknap, Montana: Stories told by George Shields, Sr., Part 1. interlinear texts.* Bloomington, IN: American Indian Studies Research Institute.

Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Quintero, Carolyn. 2009. *Osage dictionary.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* New York, NY: Longman.

Rankin, Robert L., Richard T. Carter, A. Wesley Jones, John E. Koontz, David S. Rood & Iren Hartmann (eds.). 2015. *Comparative Siouan dictionary.* Leipzig, Germany: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at http://csd.clld.org/, Accessed on 2018-05-31.).

Rankin, Robert L. & Linda Cumberland. 2007. *English to Kansa dictionary.* Kaw City, OK: Kaw Nation.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2009. The semantic development of scalar focus modifiers. In Ans Kemenade & Bettelou Los (eds.), *The handbook of the history of English*, 335–359. West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Ullrich, Jan (ed.). 2011. *New Lakota dictionary: Lakȟótiyapi-English, English-Lakȟótiyapi & incorporating the Dakota dialects of Yankton-Yanktonai & Santee-Sisseton.* Bloomington, IN: Lakota Language Consortium 2nd edn.

Ullrich, Jan & Ben Black Bear, Jr. 2016. *Lakota grammar handbook.* Bloomington, IN: Lakota Language Consortium.

Waksler, Rachelle. 2012. Super, uber, so and totally: Over the top intensifications to mark subjectivity in colloquial discourse. In Nicole Baumgarten, Inke Du Bois & Juliane House (eds.), *Subjectivity in language and discourse*, 17–31. Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing Group Limited.