CHAPTER 10

Differing conceptualizations of the same landscape

The Athabaskan and Eskimo language boundary in Alaska

Gary Holton

This paper further explores the non-universality of landscape terms by focusing on one particular landscape, the Yukon Intermontane Plateau of western Alaska. This region serves as the boundary between two great language families of North America, Athabaskan and Eskimo, and thus offers a unique laboratory in which to examine the extent to which cultural factors in two genetically unrelated languages influence the categorization of a single, fixed landscape. Drawing on published lexical sources, unpublished place name documentation, and first-hand interviews with Native speakers, the results presented here demonstrate that, while Athabaskan and Eskimo speakers may occupy the same landscape, their respective languages conceptualize that landscape in different ways.

1. Landscape as a linguistic domain

Recent research into the ontology of places in human language suggests that cultural ideas and practices are the major force driving the categorization of landscape (cf. Levinson 2008). As noted by Mark et al. (2007), “different language groups/cultures have different ways of conceptualizing landscape, as evidenced by different terminology and ways of talking about and naming landscape features”. As is evidenced by the papers in this book, the cross-linguistic study of these different landscape terminologies reveals different ways of conceptualizing landscape in language. To a certain extent this result is not unexpected. Landscapes vary significantly across the earth, so human experiences of landscape must necessarily vary as well. Our experience of taiga woodlands at the Arctic Circle is necessarily different from our experience of coral reefs on a Pacific atoll. Indigenous and non-indigenous landscape terminologies may differ greatly. But what
happens when two different groups come to experience the same landscape? In this brief essay I explore that possibility by considering the conceptualization of landscape at the boundary of Athabaskan and Eskimo languages in Alaska.

Alaska is the meeting ground of two of the New World’s largest language families: Athabaskan-Eyak-Tlingit (hereafter Athabaskan) and Eskimo-Aleut (hereafter Eskimo). Alphabetical order of family names places Eskimo first. Athabaskan has the largest territory of any indigenous language family in North America, reaching from western Alaska east nearly to Hudson Bay and south to the California coast and the desert Southwest. Pairwise mutual intelligibility varies little throughout the entire complex of some forty or so languages. A relatively small population ranging over a huge territory over thousands of years has resulted in a rich array of linguistic tools for categorizing the landscape of that territory. Within Alaska the Athabaskan languages occupy one contiguous region of territory, stretching without interruption from the middle Kuskokwim River in the west to the Alaska-Yukon border and beyond in the east, and from Cook Inlet in the south all the way to the Brooks Range in the north. Throughout Alaska the Athabaskan region shares a border with just one other language family: Eskimo. Eskimo is a clearly defined language family consisting of some five languages, three of which border Athabaskan: Inupiaq (Inuit), Central Alaskan Yup’ik, and Sugpiaq (Alutiiq). But this border is extensive, stretching in an arc nearly 2000 km long from Cook Inlet in the Gulf of Alaska, paralleling the coast of Alaska all the way to the Alaska-Yukon border (see Figure 1).

In spite of the length of this border there is relatively little evidence of contact-induced influence on either of the two language families. Loanwords are relatively few (especially in the direction of Athabaskan from Eskimo), and there is little shared grammatical structure. In fact, it is difficult to imagine two more different language types. Eskimo is exclusively suffixing, while Athabaskan is almost exclusively prefixing. Eskimo morphology is agglutinative, while Athabaskan is the type example of synthetic, templatic morphology. Eskimo exhibits ergative case marking, while Athabaskan shows no traces of ergativity. The following examples from Tanacross Athabaskan and Central Yup’ik Eskimo demonstrate these differences.

1. Although the term ‘Eskimo’ is considered derogatory in some parts of the world, in Alaska it is the preferred cover term to refer to both the Inuit (including Alaskan Inupiaq) and Yupik (including Central Alaskan Yup’ik) branches of the family (Kaplan 1999).
The Tanacross example demonstrates a common property of Athabaskan verb stems, namely the phenomenon of distributed morphemes. The verb stem ‘see’ consists of two parts in the linear string: the rightmost form -’iił and a “prefix” n- occurring in a defined slot in the prefix string. The meaning ‘to see’ is distributed across both of these forms. In contrast, the Yup’ik morpheme ‘to see’ occurs on the left edge of the verb word. In Yup’ik the morphemes combine in an agglutinative manner with minimal phonetic accommodation. Tanacross exhibits a high degree of synthesis in the verb complex. For example, the prefix eg- in (1) results from a phonological merger of the first person singular subject prefix ih- and the “classifier” l-. Finally, note that in the Tanacross form the adverbial ‘again’ is incorporated as part of the verb complex, whereas in Yup’ik it occurs as a separate word.

Yet while there may not be much that is shared between the two language families in linguistic terms, there is no denying the great extent of shared landscape along their shared border. The western portion of this contact zone lies largely within the Yukon Intermontane Plateau, a physiographic region of taiga woodlands characterized by broad valleys and low rolling hills ranging in elevation from 100 m to 500 m. This region is bordered by the high peaks of the Alaska
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Range to the south and east, including the highest peaks in North America. To the west are found the lowland river basins and deltas of large rivers, including Alaska’s longest river, the Yukon. Vegetation is characterized by spruce, aspen, and birch forest at mid elevations; willow and alder thickets on floodplains; and open tundra at higher elevations. Soils are poorly drained and wetlands occupy more than half of the region; permafrost is widespread (McNab & Avers 1996). Especially in the north, riparian features prevail, with numerous oxbow, thaw, and morainal lakes. The climate is continental with an average annual temperature of just below freezing and typical extremes ranging from –45 to +30°C.

The landscape described in the preceding paragraph differs from the barren coastal plain and endless sea ice which are typically imagined to characterize the Eskimo region. This planar stereotype conceals the presence in Alaska of significant populations of Eskimo speakers in inland regions, in direct contact with Athabaskan speakers. The Yukon Intermontane Plateau has a long history as a zone of contact between Athabaskan and Eskimo peoples. Even today, after decades of indigenous language attrition under the influence of English, bilingual speakers of Eskimo and Athabaskan can still be found in border regions, including Stony River on the Kuskokwim River, Holy Cross on the Yukon River, and Alatna on the Koyukon River. Far from being seaward-looking coastal settlements, these villages are located well inland – hundreds of kilometers from the Bering Sea – in areas of taiga forest and topographic relief. Bilingualism between Koyukon Athabaskan and Inupiaq Eskimo facilitated a late-19th century cultural and linguistic shift in the Kobuk River valley, in which Athabaskan speakers adopted Inupiaq as their first language and eventually abandoned Koyukon (Burch et al. 1999). Similarly, bilingual Yup’ik Eskimo and Dena’ina Athabaskan place names attest to an area of overlapping Eskimo and Athabaskan territory on the middle Kuskokwim River. For example, Barometer Mountain (elevation 757 m) is known in Central Yup’ik Eskimo as Ekleyq ‘burned place’ and in Deg Hit’an Athabaskan as Digheq’un Deloy ‘burned mountain’ (Kari 1980). The two names share a specific meaning ‘burned’, but only the Athabaskan name contains the generic ‘mountain’.

In spite of this common landscape, preliminary investigation of landscape terminology in Athabaskan and Eskimo reveals some striking differences. Given the relative wealth of documentation for these two great language families as compared to other indigenous languages of North America, this is an area ripe for further research. In this brief essay I will focus on just two aspects of landscape categorization: elevations and streamscapes.
2. Elevation terms

Both Athabaskan and Eskimo have a well-defined category of mountain. In this sense Athabaskan and Eskimo are similar to each other (and to English) and different from languages such as Yéli Dnye, which Levinson (2008) has convincingly argued lacks such a category. However, Athabaskan and Eskimo each have different systems for categorizing elevations. In particular, Athabaskan has two distinct generic elevation terms for which scale is a crucial defining feature, while Eskimo languages only have one such term.

The Dena’ina Topical Dictionary (Kari 2007), the most complete source of Alaska Athabaskan landscape terminology, lists dozens of Dena’ina Athabaskan elevation terms but just three primary generic terms: dghili ‘mountain,’ tex ‘hill,’ and ses ‘ridge.’ These terms can be reconstructed for Proto-Athabaskan, and though there is quite a bit of variation as to their semantics in the individual languages, reflexes of each of these terms can be found in all of the Alaska Athabaskan languages. What is particularly interesting here is that Athabaskan languages distinguish two convex landform terms roughly equivalent to English ‘mountain’ and ‘hill.’ As in English, scale is a defining criterial feature distinguishing these terms. This distinction holds true across the Athabaskan languages. In Koyukon Athabaskan, spoken just to the north of Dena’ina, the term teyh refers to a ‘small hill, hillock’ and dieł to a ‘mountain, large hill, range of mountains or high hills.’ The latter term is “also said of hill, but generally restricted to larger ones” (Jones & Jetté 2000: 156).

Scale is an important defining factor for both dghili and tex in Dena’ina. Not only is dghili generally larger than tex, but both are large as viewed by humans. The term dghili often refers to high, glaciated mountains which are relatively inaccessible to humans. For example, the Central Alaska Range is Dghili Teh ‘among the mountains,’ and Mt. McKinley (Denali) is Dghili Ka’a ‘big mountain.’ The term tex may refer to more accessible places – for example, hills which can be easily traversed on foot – but tex still refers to elevation features which are larger than humans. One cannot simply step over or jump off of tex. Scale is crucial to the meaning of Athabaskan elevation terms.

Eskimo languages also distinguish two primary elevation terms corresponding roughly to English ‘mountain’ and ‘hill’. The Yup’ik Eskimo Dictionary (Jacobson 1984) lists ingriq ‘mountain’ and penguq ‘hill’. The term ingriq refers to a prominent peak and is common in place names. These include both names of mountain peaks such as Ing’errlak ‘Roberts Mountain’ (lit. ‘major mountain’) on Nunivak Island and Ingr’urluq ‘Three Step Mountain’ (lit. ‘poor dear mountain’) near the Kwethluk River, as well as village names such as Ingricuar ‘Twin Hills village’ (lit. ‘little mountain’) or Ingrirrleq ‘Holy Cross Village’ (lit. ‘shabby
bit of mountain’). This root does not occur in words which do not refer to a mountain or place name. Scale is an important factor in the semantics of ingriq; this term refers only to large peaks.

In contrast, the Yup’ik term penguq is quite different in that it may refer to a range of scales. Jacobson (1984) lists nine terms derived from the root form peng-, namely pengurpaller ‘great big hill,’ pengurpak ‘big hill,’ penguq ‘hill,’ pengu‑gucuar ‘small hill,’ pengurraq ‘little hill,’ penuyaaq ‘tiny hill,’ pinguruq ‘imitation hill,’ penguguayaaq ‘baby hill,’ penguquineq ‘little bit of a hill.’ The crucial semantic feature of penguq is its convex shape. Other derivations of the root peng- include the terms pengunquaq ‘mound’ and pengulkuaq ‘tuuk,’ both of which may refer to rather small convex protrusions. In some dialects (e.g., Hooper Bay, Chevak, and Nunivak) the corresponding form pengu means not ‘hill’ but rather ‘(sand) dune’ of any size. The cognate Inupiaq Eskimo term pimuq means not only ‘individual round hill’ but also ‘swelling.’ The English geologic term ‘pingo’ is borrowed from Eskimo and denotes a mound formed by an expanding ice lens as the result of rapid draining of a thermokarst lake. While the most famous examples of pingos in the Mackenzie Delta of northwestern Canada may reach 50 m in height, pingos in western Alaska are typically much smaller, many no taller than a human. In English as in Eskimo, the defining feature of a pingo is its convex swollen shape, not its height. In fact, ‘pingo’ is probably a better translation of Inupiaq pimuq than is ‘hill,’ in the sense that the English technical term ‘pingo’ is scale-independent (though of course the Inupiaq term is not restricted to ice lens features). This is in sharp contrast to English ‘hill’ or Dena’ina tex, for which scale is a defining feature.

Further evidence for the primacy of shape rather than size in the meaning of penguq comes from the metaphorical use of the root in derived word forms. The verb pengiga’rte- ‘to break out in hives’ means literally ‘to suddenly be full of penguq,’ implying penguq as a kind of swelling. In the Yukon dialect the word pengulkuaq refers to a tussock of grass on the tundra, which could also be viewed as a kind of swelling. It is also interesting to note that, while all the other Yup’ik elevation terms occur frequently as roots in place names, the root penguq does not. The term penguq describes the shape of the landscape but fails to isolate a landform.

The presence of two different scale-dependent elevation terms in Athabaskan where Eskimo has just one reflects a greater emphasis on the scale and extent of elevations in Athabaskan. In contrast, Eskimo elevation terminology focuses more on the convex shape or quality of the landscape than on its vertical extent. Further

2. The only potential exception that I am aware of is Pengui, denoting an area of sand dunes on southwestern Nunivak Island.
evidence of the greater Athabaskan focus on topographic relief can be found by comparing the conceptualization of streamscapes in the two language families.

3. Streamscapes

Taken in their entirety, Athabaskan and Eskimo landscapes differ most in their relation to the ocean. The greater part of Eskimo territory lies along the coast, stretching inward along estuaries and river deltas; no Eskimo language community is without a saltwater coast. In contrast, Athabaskan territory lies for the most part inland, and only one Athabaskan language, Dena’ina, has an ocean coastline – and even then Dena’ina can be shown to have annexed coastal territory relatively recently (Kari 1996b). So it is not surprising that Eskimo marine and coastal terminology is much more elaborate and developed than it is in Athabaskan. Oozeva et al. (2004) document nearly one hundred terms relating to sea ice alone. See also Heyes, this volume. In contrast, in Athabaskan the ocean is simply yaatuuk chox ‘distant big water’ (Tanacross) or nuti ‘salt’ (Dena’ina). In fact, the Dena’ina Athabaskan place name for Cook Inlet, the major body of saltwater within Athabaskan territory, extending inland some 300 km from the Gulf of Alaska, draws an analogy with a river: Tikahntu ‘big water river’. But the zone of contact with which we are concerned here lies far from the ocean shore. Indeed, it is appropriate to focus here on the concept river, for the zone of contact between Eskimo and Athabaskan – the landscape with which this paper is concerned – lies not on the coast but inland among broad river valleys and rolling hills of the subarctic taiga.

While both Athabaskan and Eskimo languages have extensive inventories of river terminology, several differences can be discerned. First, while there is quite a bit of variation in the realization of stream terms among Athabaskan languages (Kari 1996a), all Alaska Athabaskan languages distinguish major and minor streams with distinct roots. Examples are Koyukon no’ ‘river, creek, stream, course of stream’ versus hen ‘large river’. In contrast, Yup’ik stream terms are either based on the root kuik ‘river’ or derived from noun or verb roots which themselves have more general meanings. There are no distinct Yup’ik roots distinguishing sizes of stream.

Associated riverine terminology is much more developed in Athabaskan than Eskimo. One place where this is apparent is in the concept of river mouth. The Dena’ina stem -kaq’ ‘river mouth’ occurs frequently in suites of place names sharing the same specific term (see below). It refers only to river mouths and is distinguished from roots such as -du ‘orifice’ and -zaq’ ‘human mouth’. In contrast, Yup’ik (Nunivak) and Inupiaq paa- refers more generally to ‘entry, door, opening
(river mouth)' (Amos & Amos 2003; Webster & Zibell 1970). In order to refer unambiguously to a river mouth, the term paa must occur in absolutive case as the possessed noun in a possessive construction: kuigem paanga 'river's mouth'. Other possessor nouns yield other types of openings, for example, qayam paanga 'kayak's hatch'. In contrast, Dena'ina -kaq' is unambiguously a river mouth. Only with additional derivation can its meaning be extended, as in h-da-kaq’ ‘doorway’ (area-opening-mouth).

Toponymy provides additional evidence of the relatively greater importance attached to the concept of river mouth in Athabaskan as compared with Eskimo. The root -kaq’ is a common component of Dena’ina Athabaskan place names, usually referring to villages located at the mouth of a river. Examples include Kqizaghetnu Hdaq’ ‘Stony River Village’, Hekålichen Hdaq’ ‘Lime Village’, and Tsayehtnu Hdaq’ ‘Pile Bay Village’. In contrast, there are few if any toponyms in Yup’ik based on the root paa-. A possible candidate would be Paamiut, literally ‘people of the river mouth’, referring to the people of the southeast coast of Nunivak Island – and by extension the site at which those people reside in this region. Another candidate is Paaluyar, referring to the site at the mouth of the Mekoryak River, though this word is perhaps better viewed as a general term for ‘river mouth’.

The Dena’ina Athabaskan river mouth term -kaq’ differs from Yup’ik paa- in another important way. Rather than being an isolated term, the Athabaskan river mouth term is part of a larger structural system of riverine categories, reflecting Proto-Athabaskan *-kæq’e ‘stream mouth’, *-tł’at ‘stream headwaters’, *-wen ‘lake’; and *-na’ / *-nĩq’e ‘stream.’ These four landscape categories are the most frequent landscape terms in Athabaskan languages and occur repeatedly as generic terms in suites of toponyms sharing a common specific name (Kari 1996c). It is possible to identify semantically equivalent Eskimo terms for at least some of these categories, but they do not function in the same systematic way that the Athabaskan terms do. Yup’ik nanwar ‘lake’ and kuik ‘river’ have roughly the same semantic range as Dena’ina ven and kêtnu, respectively. But only in Dena’ina are these terms clearly connected via a term meaning ‘river mouth’. The Dena’ina root -kaq’ regularly denotes the mouth of a stream – and by metonymic extension any settlement or site located there. As discussed above the Yup’ik root paa- has similar semantics but does not occur regularly.

The fourth common Athabaskan riverine term, Dena’ina -tl’ugh, doesn’t seem to have any corresponding term in Eskimo. This reflects another fundamental difference in landscape categorization. In Dena’ina all streams have headwaters
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3. The distinction between PA *-na’ and *-nĩq’e and their role in distinguishing hydronymic districts are discussed in Kari (1996c).
which can be directly designated with the term *tl'ugh*. In Yup’ik the meaning ‘headwaters’ is a metaphorical extension of the term *kangiq*, whose basic sense is ‘meaning, principle, source’, as in the derived verb stem *kanginge*- ‘to discover’, literally ‘to acquire meaning.’ It is also possible to refer to upstream areas using directional terms or postural roots, though Yup’ik lacks the full inventory of directional terms available in Athabaskan. And postural roots have a much wider semantic range than Dena’ina *tl'ugh*. For example, the Yup’ik postural root *aci*- ‘area below, under’ can refer to the base of a mountain, the area under a table, or the area under a river bank.

While Athabaskan and Eskimo riverine terms may be used to refer to the same landscape, they delineate distinct prototype landscapes. The grid of Athabaskan terms denoting stream, mouth, and headwaters reflects a prototype streamscape consisting of a V- or U-shaped valley which rises significantly in elevation from mouth to head. The headwaters of these valleys may terminate in a headwall, steep pass, or even a glacier. There is no distinct term meaning ‘valley’; in a real sense the suite of stream terms is the valley. Jones and Jetté (2000) even list ‘valley’ as one of the meanings of the cognate Koyukon term -*tl'ot*. Kari (2007) lists a Dena’ina term *chahdaniltunt* ‘valley, gully, ravine’, but this term actually derives from the verb *h-d-l-tun* ‘ravine extends’, based on an abstract root *tun* referring to linear objects. So this Dena’ina term is really making reference to the linear feature of a valley rather than to the valley itself.

Even more striking evidence for the primacy of the valley in Athabaskan conceptualization of the landscape can be found from cases where valleys suddenly empty out onto large floodplains. In these regions the stream mouth term (reflecting PA *-*kæq’e) may be used to refer to the point of transition from steep valley to flat floodplain, even if there is no actual stream mouth. An example of such a situation occurs in Tanana Athabaskan territory.

Figure 2 shows an oblique view looking northeast up the valley of the Chatanika River. In the center of the image the river suddenly leaves the valley and emerges onto the Minto Flats, a region of interconnected lakes, streams, and marsh covering some 300,000 ha. The line marking the boundary between the base of the mountains and the start of the flats runs roughly from the upper left to the lower right corner of the figure. The English name Chatanika derives from the Tanana Athabaskan name *Dradlaya Nik’ a*, literally ‘whitefish (*Prosopium cylindraceum*) river’. The place where the river emerges from the valley is *Dradlaya Chaget*, literally ‘whitefish mouth’, following the standard Athabaskan generative naming pattern whereby a single specific term (in this case *dradlaya*) is combined with a generic geographic term (in this case *chaget*). Thus, we also find *Dradlaya Sedha* ‘whitefish hill’, etc. Viewed from the perspective of English physiography, it is possible to trace the course of the Chatanika River as it meanders across the
vast Minto Flats (referred to in Athabaskan as *Men Teh* ‘among the lakes’), nearly merging with Washington Creek, until it finally meets the Tolovana River, a more major stream which flows across the western side of the Minto Flats. Indeed, the official English name assigned to the river extends along this route.

But from the point of view of Tanana Athabaskan the Chatanika River ends at *Dradlaya Chaget*. Beyond that point the river is no longer identified as an individual stream course but rather by a variety of names referring to interconnected lakes and sloughs. When it finally does straighten out and begins to look like a river again, just prior to joining the Tolovana, it is called not *Dradlaya Nik’a* but *Nonilen No’,* literally ‘water flows creek’. It is not the same river but a different river. In contrast, the 100 km of river above *Dradlaya Chaget* are continuously referred to as *Dradlaya Nik’a*. The valley is the river.

Returning to Eskimo we find a variety of synonymous terms used to denote river valleys. In Yup’ik the most prominent of these is *naqa*, which Jacobson (1984) defines as ‘valley’, but which comparative evidence suggests might better be glossed as ‘pass,’ as in a passage between two mountains. The term does not occur in other Yupik languages or even in all dialects of Central Alaskan Yup’ik (Fortescue et al. 1994), and the corresponding Inupiaq term *aagiaq* is glossed ‘valley, pass’. More common are terms based on the root *kuik* ‘river’, as in Nunivak dialect *kuigyaner*, literally ‘thing that results from a river’. In the Yukon dialect we find the term *ilutak* ‘valley, dip, bay’, based on the root *ilu*- ‘interior’. These terms suggest a conceptualization of the valley as a depression such as those found on the lower courses of a river delta rather than a montane valley.
4. Conclusions

Due to the preliminary nature of this study, the above discussion has been limited to elevation and streamscape terminology. Yet even with this limitation we can make some clear generalizations about Athabaskan and Eskimo conceptualizations of their shared landscape. Most significantly, Athabaskan languages emphasize vertical features and mountain valleys, while Eskimo languages are less concerned with vertical scale and the notion of valley. (This generalization is further supported by comparison of toponymic structure and directional systems, though those issues must remain beyond the scope of this brief essay.) Ultimately, landscape categories tell us something about how humans relate to the landscape. “Landscape features are more likely to be driven by their ‘affordances’, by what they are good for in human activities and purposes” (Levinson 2008). In light of this statement we might surmise that Athabaskan and Eskimo speakers experience their shared landscape differently, perhaps because those conceptualizations are based on significantly different archetypal landscapes. While Athabaskan and Eskimo may share a long boundary region in Alaska, the archetypal Athabaskan landscape remains the rugged mountainous Alaskan interior region, while the archetypal Eskimo landscape lies along the relatively flat Bering Sea and Arctic Ocean coasts.

Of course, such speculation must of necessity be viewed with caution. The study of landscape categorization relies ultimately on a comprehensive documentation of the landscape lexicon, and while Alaskan languages are generally considered to be well-documented, the coverage of landscape vocabulary is rather uneven. For the Athabaskan languages, reasonably comprehensive lexical coverage is available for only two languages: Ahtna and Koyukon. In addition, comprehensive coverage of landscape vocabulary for Dena’ina can be found in Kari (2007). For the remaining languages the extent of coverage of landscape vocabulary must be inferred indirectly by seeking cognates from the better documented languages. For the Eskimo languages the situation is even more challenging. Technically comprehensive dictionaries exist for two Alaskan Eskimo languages: Central Alaskan Yup’ik (Jacobson 1984) and St. Lawrence Island Yupik (Jacobson 2009), but while these dictionaries provide meticulous coverage of morphological issues, their coverage of semantics is less detailed. For the study of landscape categories such cursory treatment limits our ability to understand fine distinctions between terms. We saw an example of this when we attempted to understand the distinction between Yup’ik naqa ‘valley’ and ilutak ‘valley, dip, bay’. We can infer something about the semantics of naqa by examining cognates in Eskimo languages outside the Yup’ik subfamily, but such methods are not wholly reliable for understanding synchronic meanings.
These difficulties point to the need for more first-hand field work with speakers of Athabaskan and Eskimo languages. Unfortunately, for this short paper I was able to do no more than make brief inquiries of speakers – sometimes relying on email and telephone. The tentative conclusions drawn here thus hide interesting variation across languages within each of the two families. Clearly, much more work needs to be done to understand the full extent of landscape categorization in Athabaskan and Eskimo languages.
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