Contact and semantic shift in extreme language endangerment

Ahtna riverine directionals in a cardinal world*

Andrea L. Berez-Kroeker
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

This paper examines the effects of contact with English on the directional system of Ahtna, an endangered Athabascan language of Alaska. The Ahtna directionals reference direction and location in the geographic landscape, but contact with the dominant English system is causing changes in lexicon and possibly the replacement of the entire semantic basis of directional reckoning in Ahtna. I present conversational evidence showing that the conflation of the Ahtna concept of upriver with the English concept of north is leading to the breakdown of the entire Ahtna cognitive directional basis. Although Ahtna is so endangered that we are not likely to witness the full replacement of its directional system, we can still see the processes of contact-induced change at work.
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1. Introduction

Contact between languages can lead not only to structural and lexical change, but can also cause change in speakers’ cognition of the surrounding world. The wholesale replacement of cognition – not just of lexicon or grammar – is especially likely in cases of extreme language endangerment, when speakers are more likely to replace the endangered cognitive system with that of the dominant language, rather than just map borrowed terms onto the native system.

In this paper I examine the effects of contact with English on the directional system of Ahtna, a highly endangered Athabascan language spoken by fewer than fifty

* I wish to thank Marianne Mithun, Sandra A. Thompson, Patricia Clancy, Jim Kari, Markle Pete, and two anonymous reviewers for their invaluable help with this paper; all errors are mine alone. An earlier version of the work here appeared in Berez 2011a.
elderly people in south central Alaska. The Ahtna directionals are a lexical class used
to describe and reference direction and location in the geographic landscape, but as we
shall see, contact with the dominant English directional system – that is, the cardinal
north-south-east-west system – is causing not only changes in lexicon, but also what
appears to be the replacement of the entire semantic basis for directional reckoning
in Ahtna. I present detailed conversational evidence from my fieldwork that shows
that the conflation of the Ahtna concept of upriver with the English concept of north
is leading to the breakdown of the entire Ahtna cognitive directional basis. Although
Ahtna is so endangered that we are not likely to witness the full replacement of the
directional system in that language, we can still see the processes of contact-induced
change at work.

In Section 2, I introduce the Ahtna directional system, including the morphol-
ogy of the lexical class, its riverine semantic basis, and some basic cognitive principles
of the system. Section 3 acquaints the reader with the geography of Ahtna territory,
which is crucial to understanding the signs of contact-based changes in the directional
system. These are presented in Section 4, along with a close, line-by-line discussion of
the conversational data. Section 5 contains concluding remarks.

2. The Ahtna directionals

2.1 Morphology of the directionals

Like other Athabaskan languages, Ahtna has a separate lexical class of directionals.
morphemic structure: a stem expressing orientation (a system that is largely, but not
completely, riverine), an optional prefix expressing relative distance or concepts like
’straight’, ‘adjacent to’, etc., and an optional suffix that expresses either a punctual vs.
areal distinction or an allative vs. ablative distinction (see Kari 1985, 1990, 2008, 2010;
Leer 1989; Moore & Tlen 2007). This structure is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affixed directionals</th>
<th>'utsene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'udaa'</td>
<td>dist.downriver.all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to distantly downriver'</td>
<td>to distantly downland'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nanii</td>
<td>nanaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med.upriver.punc</td>
<td>med.across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'intermediately upriver'</td>
<td>'intermediately across'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Tripartite morphemic structure of Ahtna directionals (from Kari 1990)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefixes</th>
<th>Stems</th>
<th>Suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>da- PROX</td>
<td>nae ‘upriver, behind’</td>
<td>-e ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na- MED</td>
<td>daa ‘downriver’</td>
<td>-dze ABL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’u- DIST</td>
<td>ngge ‘from water, upland’</td>
<td>-t PUNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts’i- ‘straight, directly’</td>
<td>tsen ‘toward water, lowland’</td>
<td>-xu AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka- ‘adjacent’</td>
<td>naan ‘across’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+gha- ‘from P’</td>
<td>tgge ‘up vertically’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n- ‘neutral’</td>
<td>igge ‘down vertically’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hw- AREA</td>
<td>‘an ‘away, off’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of the use of directionals in spontaneous narrative is shown in (2). Note that the speaker uses three variations built on the stem ngge‘‘upland’.

---

1. Because of the fusional nature of polysynthesis in Ahtna, I do not give morphemic parses for directionals throughout this paper. Instead, the reader may refer to the glosses to interpret the morphology of the directionals; glosses are consistently given for all morphemes present, even when it is not possible to indicate morpheme boundaries. Abbreviations used in this chapter are as follows: ABAN = abandoned word, ABL = ablative, ADJACENT = adjacent, ADVZ = adverbalizer, ALL = allative, AREA = area, CPT = compact, DEM = demonstrative, DIST = distal, EMPH = emphatic, FOC = focus, HES = hesitation word, INCEP = inceptive, INDEF = indefinite, IPFV = imperfective, ITER = iterative, MED = medial, NH = non-human, OBJ = object, PERAMB = perambulative, PFV = perfective, PL = plural, POSS = possessor, PROX = proximal, PUNC = punctual, REL = relativizer, SG = singular, SBJ = subject, SP/TMP = spatial and temporal, TERMIN = terminative.
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(2) Directionals in use²
01 KJ; Yihwtsën xona danggeh ta, dem.area.from then prox.upland.all among
cêna', stream
02 cêna', stream
03-04 ngge' ta kets'èdèl dze' yi ya upland among 1pl.sbj.go.ipfv.against.a.place thus there
xungge', kecdilaa de. adjacent.upland they.have.names sp/tmp.advz
‘From there in the uplands, as we go on upland, and there are names in the upland there.’

2.2 Semantics of the directional stems

The directional system is largely riverine; that is, the frame of reference of the system is based on the orientation of the flow of a river of some cultural and cognitive importance (see Kari 1985, 1990, 2008, 2010; Leer 1989). Kari (2010: 130) points out that the stems exist in orthogonally oppositional pairs (across::across (i.e., in both directions), upriver::downriver, upland::downland, up (vertically)::down (vertically); see also Leer 1989 for Na-Dene). The directionals can also be used to describe indoor locations and for some objects with intrinsic fronts and backs, like large game animals, rifles, etc.³

Figure 1 shows a schematic representation of the stems given in Table 1.

2.3 Absolute frame of reference and Major River Orientation

Levinson 2003, which is to date the most thorough typological treatment of the expression of spatial cognition in language, is useful here for sorting out notions of frames of reference, i.e., the reference points upon which linguistic coordinate systems are based. Levinson describes three types of frames of reference: intrinsic, relative, and absolute. Like the English cardinal system, the Ahtna directional system is an absolute system, meaning that orientation is determined by a feature of the larger environment, in this case, the direction of flow of the local river.

Unlike the English cardinal directional system, however, the Ahtna riverine terms do not maintain a constant mapping to fixed bearings. Where the English system bases the main axis of the north-east-south-west on a single polar constant (‘north’) from

---

² See the Appendix for information about the discourse transcription system and conventions used in this paper.
³ See Berez (2011a, 2014) and Berez-Kroeker (to appear) for other uses of the directionals, including discourse uses.
which all other directional terms can be derived (i.e., by going clockwise from north to find east, south, and west; Levinson 2003:49), the Ahtna system orients its main upriver/downriver axis according to the flow of the major river in a given river drainage. All other directions in the drainage are calculated from that axis.

For ease of discussion here, I refer to this river-based axis orientation as Major River Orientation (MRO), which in fact subsumes two principles. The first of these is the fact of the orientation itself, which I am terming **Major River Orientation Principle 1** (MROP1), stated in (3):

(3) **Major River Orientation Principle 1** (MROP1): Ahtna speakers align the major upriver/downriver axis of the directional spatial grid with the major river in the particular drainage about which they are speaking.

The result of MROP1 is twofold. The first is that because all directions in a given drainage are calculated based on the upriver/downriver axis of the major river, directions on minor streams and tributaries are determined based on the major axis of the drainage,
and not on the direction of the flow of water in those streams and tributaries. This is stated in (4) as *Major River Orientation Principle 2* (MROP2):

(4) Major River Orientation Principle 2 (MROP2): Ahtna speakers ascribe to minor streams and tributaries the spatial grid of the major river in a given drainage.

The second result of MROP1 is that speakers will shift their mental coordinate system when crossing from one drainage to another, to match the flow of the major river in the new drainage (Leer 1989; Busch 2000; Levinson 2003; Kari 2010). This is illustrated in Figure 2, which shows a schematic representation of two adjacent river drainages separated by a mountain range. Thick lines indicate the major river, while thin lines represent tributaries flowing into the major river.

![Figure 2. Schematic representation of Major River Orientation Principles 1 and 2](image)

In Drainage 1, location A is considered to be *nae‘upriver‘ of location B, but location C, while indeed upriver of location D along the tributary, is in fact considered in Ahtna...
to be *ngge’*‘upland’ of location D. *Ngge’* refers to locations that are in a roughly perpendicular direction from the flow of the major river, which includes points along the tributaries. This illustrates MROP2, which requires Ahtna speakers to have an awareness of the local ecology so that they know which waterways are tributaries and which are major rivers. Note how MROP2 contrasts with English *upriver* and *downriver*; English speakers are likely to refer to location C as being upriver (or perhaps *upstream*) of location D, based on their placement along a waterway of any size.

Crossing from Drainage 1 into Drainage 2 brings a shift of the axis of the Ahtna absolute system to match the current of the major river in the new drainage. Consistent with the flow of the major river in Drainage 2, location A’ is considered to be *nae’*‘upriver’ of location B’, even though the relationship between these two locations is cardinally perpendicular to the relationship between A and B. Likewise, C’ is *ngge’* ‘upland’ of D’. This illustrates MROP1. Note how MROP1 contrasts with the English absolute frame of reference based on cardinal directions, in which the relationship between locations C and D would be described with the same term (e.g., *north* or *south*) as that used to describe the relationship between locations A’ and B’.

Kari (2008) gives a striking example of MRO in Ahtna discourse in a 49 minute recording by Chief Jim McKinley from 1981 about the geography of the Copper River region. In particular, Mr. McKinley discusses locations found on the Copper River and its tributary, the Klutina River, shown in Map 1.

![Map 1. The Copper River and its tributary, the Klutina River](image-url)
Two excerpts from the recording of Chief McKinley are given in (5) and (6). Note in (5) his use of forms of *nae‘* ‘upriver’ (as in *kanii* and *‘unni*) when referring to traveling upriver on the major Copper River, and in (6) his use of forms of *ngge‘* ‘upland’ when referring to traveling upstream on the Klutina River. *Tlaticae‘* ‘rear water mouth’ from IU 01 of (6) is the location of the village of Copper Center, which is shown on Map 1 at the junction of the two rivers.4

(5) Use of ‘upland’ for points along the Klutina River, which is a tributary of the Copper River

1-2 JM; Yet *kanii* ııdu yet

DEM ADJACENT.UPRIVER.PUNC FOC DEM

*kanii* yeldu,

ADJACENT.UPRIVER.PUNC then

03-04 Ggux, Hwts’ininyaaden see.

WORM 3SG.SBJ.GO.PFV.AREA.FROM.SP/TMP.ADVZ

‘From there the next place upstream is ‘where a monster emerged’.

[27 IUs about *Ggux Hwts’ininyaaden* omitted]

08-09 Yet *kanaa* ‘u-, ye *kanaa* ‘ud-,

DEM ADJACENT.ACROSS ABAN DEM ADJACENT.ACROSS ABAN

10 *kanaa* *‘unii* yak’a xona,

ADJACENT.ACROSS DIST.UPRIVER.PUNC still then

11 Tsedi Kulaen den copper 3SG.SBJ.EXIST.IPFW SP/TMP.ADVZ
da’e’ hwdi’aan see.

thus 3SG.HAS.NAME.IPFW.AREA

‘There on the other side and upstream is called ‘where copper exists’.

[17 IUs about *Tsedi Kulaen* omitted]

12-13 C’u *kanii* yak’a, T’aghes Ciit,

ADJACENT.UPRIVER.PUNC still cottonwood peninsula

14 T’aghes Ciit dae’ hwdi’aan.
cottonwood peninsula thus 3SG.HAS.NAME.IPFW.AREA

‘The very next place upstream there is named ‘cottonwood point’.


4. ‘IU’ stands for intonation unit; please see the Appendix for more information.
(6) Use of ‘upland’ for points along the Klutina River, which is a tributary of the Copper River

01 JM; Yiı ucaée yegha  
3SG.NH 3SG.POSS.river.mouth 3SG.OBJ.in.relation.to  
ts’inii’aayi gha  
3SG.SBJ.linear.extends.IPfv.straight.REL in.relation.to  
su Tl’aticaée,  
EMPH rear.water.mouth

02 dae’ konii de.  
thus 3PL.SBJ.say.IPfv SP/TMP.ADVZ  
‘There at the mouth the current flows by there, thus it is said ‘rear water mouth’ [Copper Center].’

03-04 Ye kanggat,  
dem ADJACENT.upland.PUNC then

05 Ts’ekul’uu’i Cae’e dae’ konii.  
one.that.washes.out INDEF.POSS.river.mouth thus 3PL.SBJ.say.IPfv  
‘The next place upland of there then is ‘one that washes out mouth’, thus it is said.’

[14 IUs about Ts’ekul’uu’i Cae’e omitted]

06 Ye kanggat ldu’,  
dem ADJACENT.upland.PUNC FOC

07 Ba’ane Ts’ilaggen Tak’adze’ dae’,  
outside someone.killed.him spring.POSS thus  
‘The next place upland is ‘spring of someone killed him outside’.

[33 IUs about Ba’ane Ts’ilaggen Tak’adze’ omitted]

08-10 Yet kangga,  
dem ADJACENT.upland

ya’a ldu’, Ta’k’ats’ Kaghi’aaden dae’.  
FOC spring linear.extends.IPfv.up.SP/TMP.ADVZ  
‘Next upland there is ‘spring water flows up’ thus.’


3. The Ahtna region

Before continuing on to the present study, some familiarity with the geography of the Ahtna region, including the location of towns, villages, highways, and major bodies of water, is required. The traditional Ahtna language area covers more than 35,000 square
miles of south central Alaska, consisting mostly of boreal forest and permafrost, and encompassing parts of three mountain ranges (the Alaska Range, the Chugach Mountains, and the Wrangell Mountains) and three major river drainages (the Copper, Matanuska, and Susitna Rivers) with countless tributaries, lakes, and glaciers. See Map 2.

Map 2. The Ahtna region
Most of the territory is unpopulated wilderness, with the majority of the region’s nearly 4000 residents centered in a few small towns and Native villages (Mentasta (Map 2, E7), Chistochina (F6), Gakona (F5), Gulkana (F5), Tazlina (G5), Copper Center (G5), Chitina (H6), and Cantwell (D2)) along several two-lane highways connecting to Anchorage to the southwest, Fairbanks to the northwest, and Valdez to the south. The region contains only a few other roads.

4. Riverine directionals in a cardinal world

4.1 The bilingual fieldwork conditions

The data presented in this paper come from my fieldwork with Mr. Markle Pete of Tazlina. Mr. Pete is an ideal consultant for studying Ahtna directional reference because of his knowledge of both the language and the geography of the region. He is a first-language speaker of Ahtna who is also fluent in English, and he has lived in the Copper River valley his entire life. In his youth he traveled on foot at least as far as Mentasta to the north (Map 2, E7), to the flatlands between the Copper River and the Wrangell Mountains to the east (Map 2, F-G6), and to Tazlina Lake and the Louise/Crosswind/Ewan Lakes region to the west (Map 2, F-G4). As an adult Mr. Pete worked in construction, building major sections of the Richardson, Tok, Glenn, and Edgerton Highways, as well parts of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. Even today he drives several times each month to Anchorage and occasionally to Fairbanks and Valdez. Mr. Pete is also currently employed as a teacher at the Ya Ne Dah Ah School (Map 2, G2), which is administered by the Chickaloon Village Traditional Council and is one of a handful of Alaska Native elementary schools. He is a respected tribal Elder and culture bearer for the Ahtna people, and is considered in his community to be an especially patient and engaging teacher of Ahtna language and tradition. He is also a modest teacher, one who will admit when he does not know the answer to a question.

My work with Mr. Pete on the topic of directional reference took place during four videotaped sessions over one week in early March 2010. The first three sessions involved the use of tabletop dioramas as stimuli, and the fourth used a printed

5. Mr. Pete and I spoke at length about publication and he has graciously granted me permission to print his words. In no case should Mr. Pete's expressions of uncertainty about the "correct" Ahtna words to use in these sessions be taken as an indication of Mr. Pete's inability to speak his Native language. Instead, it is merely a reflection of his status as a fluent speaker of two languages in contact, one of which is under the constant societal hegemony of the other.
Ahtna-language map of the region as a stimulus. The tabletop dioramas were made of colored fabric representing different landforms (e.g., snow-covered earth, grass-covered earth, bodies of water, highways) and figurines of people, cars, rifles, mountains, trees, and appropriate animals like moose, foxes, dogs, and tree squirrels. See Figure 3.

![Figure 3. Fieldwork on Ahtna directionals; Diorama of the Tazlina River. Pictured: the author (left) and Markle Pete (right)](image)

During the time in which this research took place, I had been conducting linguistic fieldwork in the Copper River valley for about seven months. Throughout that period Mr. Pete was my primary consultant, and the data that is presented here occurred after Mr. Pete and I had built a friendship and a trusting student-teacher relationship, which is reflected in the direct and sometimes joking tone of our interactions. It must also be noted that Mr. Pete is the only Ahtna consultant with whom I formed a close enough relationship to do the video-based research contained in this paper. It should not be forgotten that I was a guest in the Ahtna community, and many of the conversations presented here show Mr. Pete working hard to accommodate my lack of knowledge of the Ahtna language and the worldview presented in the directional system.

At the outset of the research program on the semantics of Ahtna directionals, my intention was to use the dioramas to create a fictional, anonymous landscape for the purpose of eliciting directionals. However, moments after I laid down white and blue cloths representing a snow-covered landscape and a river, Mr. Pete immediately assigned to the blue fabric the identity of the Tazlina River, which is the closest tributary of the Copper River to Mr. Pete’s home outside of the village of Tazlina. This exchange is shown in (7); note that elicitation sessions, like most of daily life for Mr. Pete, are bilingual.
(7) Assignment of Tazlina River to diorama

01 AB; Ga ldu’ na’ ((sic; intended: cêna’ ‘INDF.POSS.river’)),
DEM FOC river
cæk’ë.

river.mouth
‘This is a river; a river mouth.’

03-04 Alright? What did I?.

05 MP; Una’?, 3SG.POSS.river
‘A river?’

06 AB; Uh-huh?

07 MP; That’s r-,

08 a river,

09 AB; Una’, 3SG.POSS.river

10-11 yeah, uh-huh?.

12 Aen’,

13 una’, 3SG.POSS.river

14 Okay,

15 MP; Tazlina’,

Tazlina.River

‘The Tazlina River.’

16 AB; Okay. @@@@

((Markle Pete, oai:paradisec.org.au:ALB01-057, 00:01:31.130-00:01:44.560))

Mr. Pete’s rejection of an imaginary river and a fictional landscape leads me to assume such things are perhaps less important to him than thinking and talking about real locations. This was surprising, because the previous literature on the semantics of Athabascan directionals (e.g., Leer 1989; Kari 1989, 1996a, 1996b) presents the systems as abstractable and widely applicable to any landscape one may encounter. As we shall see, however, to Mr. Pete the system is far from abstract, and is instead grounded in the very physiography of the landscape and the communicative habits of the speech community.

As with any part of grammar, the usage of the Ahtna directional system by speakers on a daily basis influences the development of the semantics and structure of that system. With the Ahtna directional system, it is the landscape of Ahtna territory that
influences how Ahtna people use the system, and over time with repeated use across the speech community, the directional system has shifted from a proto-Athabascan system like that presented in Leer (1989) to one with region-specific semantics that are implicitly agreed upon by the speech community. Once the demography of the speech community changes, as it has been doing for the last century via intensive contact with English and a rapid decline in the number of Ahtna people who speak the language, the directional system (again, like any grammatical system) is susceptible to a new kind of contact-based semantic shift. Thus Mr. Pete’s refusal of a fictional landscape creates an opportunity to study the use of Ahtna directionals by a representative of the bilingual portion of the Ahtna community *in situ*, in reference to actual locations that are familiar to him.

4.2 Hints of contact-induced change

The first indication that Mr. Pete’s directional system may have come under the influence of the English cardinal system occurred midway through the first elicitation session. The stimulus at the time was the diorama as pictured in Figure 3. As we have just seen, the river in the diorama had been established as the Tazlina River, which flows in an easterly direction to its mouth at the Copper River (Map 2, 5F-G). In the diorama this is toward the bottom of Figure 3 (the Copper River is not represented). Thus, in terms of the cardinal directions represented in the diorama, Mr. Pete is sitting to the north of the Tazlina River, and I am sitting to the south.

It is also important to understand the actual cardinal directions of the room in which the sessions take place, because at times both Mr. Pete and I refer to these directions for clarification. In this and in all other examples from these four fieldwork sessions, the cardinal directions of the room, shown in Figure 4, are as follows: the video camera had been placed in the southern edge of the room and points north, thus east is to the reader’s right and west is to the reader’s left. In all examples in this paper, however, descriptions of gestures indicating direction refer to the directions understood by the discourse participants (Mr. Pete and myself) to be represented in the diorama unless otherwise specified. These were established as each diorama was being arranged on the table, and they reflected our shared knowledge of the regions depicted. The directions of the diorama are shown in Figures 3, 6, 7, and 8.

Approximately fifteen minutes into the session, Mr. Pete used the English words *north* and *south* for the first time, after having used exclusively Ahtna directional terms (I had not used those words that day either). At the time I was testing the integrity of MROP2. In (8), I had just placed the figurine of a hunter with a rifle to the south of and facing away from the river, with a toy moose in its line of sight. While this direction is upland of the Tazlina, if MROP2 is intact in Mr. Pete’s use of Ahtna directionals,
we would expect him to call this *daa’* ‘downriver’, in relation to the flow of the larger Copper River.  

(8) Use of English *north* and *south* in elicitation of Ahtna directionals; diorama: the Tazlina River

1-3 AB; Would you call this, um, ‘ungge? {{AB gestures upland/south}} ‘Would you call this ‘to distantly upland’?’

4-5 MP; ’Ungge ((sic)) yiel teldic’, ehn-heh. 

DIST.upland.ALL 3SG.with 3SG.SBJ.shoot.PFV

‘He shot it toward the distant upland, yes.’

6-8 AB; ’Ungge, Okay. Alright. 

DIST.upland.ALL

9-10 MP; It’s the south, ’uda’aa. {{MP points to south}}

DIST.downriver.ALL

‘To distantly downriver.’

11 AB; ’Uda’aa. 

DIST.downriver.ALL

‘To distantly downriver.’

12 MP; Ehn-heh.

13 AB; What if he’s like this. 

{{AB orients toy moose to downland/north of hunter}}

---

6. For this and all directions in this papers, the stem morpheme of the directional is the only morpheme that is relevant to the discussion. Readers may ignore affixes for now and rely on the English gloss to decode the stem that is present in each directional.
14 MP; North.
15 AB; Okay how do you say that.
16 MP; ‘Uné.
DIST.UPRIVER.ALL
‘To distantly upriver.’
17 AB; ‘Uné.
DIST.UPRIVER.ALL
‘To distantly upriver.’
18 MP; ‘Unuuxe cê-,
DIST.UPRIVER.AREA ABAN
19 Cena’ tsidi’aa de
INDEF.POSS.RIVER KEEP.LINEAR.OBJ.IN.POSITION SP/TEMP.ADVZ
xu su izelghaen le’.
AREA EMPH 3SG.SBJ.3SG.OBJ.KILL.PFV indeed
‘In an area distantly upriver, where the river extends out, he kills it (the moose) right there.’
20 AB; Uh-huh.
21-22 MP; Xu izelghaen means, they kill moose there.
AREA 3SG.SBJ.3SG.OBJ.KILL.PFV
23 AB; Xu izelghaen.
AREA 3SG.SBJ.3SG.OBJ.KILL.PFV
‘He kills it there.’
24 MP; Mm-hm.
25 AB; Okay.
26 AB; And did you just call this\(^7\) north? \{[AB gestures north across river]\}
27 MP; I would call north here,\(^8\)
28 AB; Mm-hm.
29 MP; that’s north, \{[MP gestures north on diorama, then north in room]\}
30 right here.\(^9\)
\((\text{Markle Pete, oai:paradisec.org.au:ALB01-057, 00:15:44.100-00:16:22.900})\)

In IU 01, I erroneously suggest the term ‘ungge ‘to distantly upland’ to indicate the direction away from the shore of the Tazlina River, which Mr. Pete at first accepts in IU 04. In IUs 07 and 08, I acknowledge that I understand and accept the referenced

7. The referent of this in IU 26 is the north direction in the diorama.
8. The referent of here in IU 27 is the north direction in the diorama.
9. The referent of here in IU 30 is north in the room.
direction as ‘ungge ‘to distantly upland’. However, Mr. Pete immediately recognizes our agreed-upon error in IUs 09 and 10, and corrects himself and me, saying that the direction is actually south, which he then translates as ‘udaa’a ‘to distantly downriver’. Referring to this direction as ‘udaa’a in Ahtna is to be expected in accordance with MROP2: the Tazlina River is a tributary of the Copper River, which is the major river in the watershed and flows, in this region at least, from north to south (Map 2, 5G-J). What is interesting, however, is that Mr. Pete uses this term as the translation of the cardinal English south (IU 09), rather than referring in any way to the flow of the nearby Copper River (i.e., he did not say in English downriver in IU 09).

In IU 13 I reverse the orientation of the figurines so that the moose is downland and to the north of the hunter. Mr. Pete immediately again uses an English cardinal term, north, to describe, and also translates this as ‘un’e ‘to distantly upriver’. Again, the use of ‘un’e ‘to distantly upriver’ is in accordance with MROP2, but the fact that Mr. Pete immediately provides a translation as English north is indicative of the bilingual teacher-student interaction as well as his own bilingualism. When I ask for clarification in IU 26 (did you just call this [i.e., north on the diorama] north?), Mr. Pete confirms that he indeed intended to say north by gesturing toward that direction both in the diorama and in the room. There is little doubt that Mr. Pete (i) is not confused by the directions in the diorama in relation to the actual directions in the room, and (ii) equates, at least to some degree, the notion of ‘north’ with nae ‘upriver’.

Given that Mr. Pete is a first language speaker of Ahtna, a reasonable expectation – and the one I began my research with – would be that he keeps the riverine directional system of Ahtna separate from the cardinal system of English. However, the evidence presented in (8) leads me to suspect that for Mr. Pete the two systems are not completely distinct from one another, and that their contact with one another in my consultant’s daily experience, as well as his daily interaction with non-native speakers of Ahtna (not only myself, but most members of his community) is causing a change of meaning in the Ahtna system. In other words, a contact-based semantic change in the Ahtna directional system is occurring in some speakers. In bilingual settings at least, speakers conflate the directional systems of English and Ahtna in their speech to some degree.

4.3 Evidence of change: ‘Upriver’ becoming equated with ‘north’

While Mr. Pete’s translation of south as ‘udaa’a ‘to distantly downriver’ and north as ‘un’e ‘to distantly upriver’ allows us to suspect that some contact-base change is occurring in his use of the directional system, it is not sufficient to allow us to fully say so. This is because it does not tell us how Mr. Pete assigns directional terms across larger regions. In order to posit that the English directional system is influencing the Ahtna system, we need some evidence that MROP1 and MROP2, the two principles that
constitute the hallmark difference between the two systems, are not fully intact. In other words, we need evidence that Mr. Pete does not always shift the major axis of the spatial grid when transitioning from one drainage to another, and/or that he does not always assign to minor rivers the spatial grid of the major river.

I tested MROP1 in the second elicitation session by using two dioramas, one representing the Matanuska River drainage (Map 2, 2-3G), and another representing the adjacent Copper River Drainage (Map 2, between E5-7 and J5-7). These locations are ideal for testing MROP1 because the Matanuska River runs in a drainage located directly west of the Copper River drainage, and flows roughly perpendicular to the Copper. It begins at a glacier in the east and flows to the west and southwest into the salt water of the Knik Arm of Cook Inlet. The Glenn Highway, the only road connecting the Copper Valley to Anchorage, runs parallel to the Matanuska River along its north bank and is very heavily traveled by residents of the Copper River valley, including Mr. Pete.

If the Matanuska River drainage is perceived by speakers to be a separate drainage from that of the Copper River, we would expect that in accordance with MROP1, the main axis of the spatial grid would shift to match the flow of the Matanuska, with *naē* ‘upriver’ now corresponding to *east*. Indeed, the fact that the Matanuska drainage is considered to be a distinct drainage is supported by two observations. The first is a physical one: the change in terrain between the two drainages is obvious to anyone traveling along the Glenn Highway. Traveling westward toward Tahneta Pass, the elevation gain is gradual, but once one is over the pass, the terrain drops off dramatically and one finds oneself descending quickly though the deep river canyon. Figure 5 shows the elevation along the Glenn Highway; Tahneta Pass is at approximately mile 67.

![Figure 5. Elevation profile of the Glenn Highway](image)

The second reason for the clear distinction between the Copper and Matanuska drainages is based in Ahtna language and culture: the last point at the top of the pass from which the Copper River can be seen is named *Neketsílaexde* ‘where we turn around’. At this location, travelers would traditionally stop “to look back and say a prayer”
(Fred Ewan, p.c.; Map 2, G-4). The separation between the two drainages is part of shared Ahtna culture, and thus it is expected that MROP1 would cause a shift of the main axis of the spatial grid between the two regions.

The diorama representing the Matanuska River drainage is shown in Figure 6, along with the directions embodied in the diorama. The blue fabric represents the Matanuska River, and the black fabric represents the Glenn Highway.

![Figure 6. Diorama of the Matanuska River drainage](image)

The expectation of MROP1 is that Mr. Pete will refer to the upriver/east direction with some form of *nae*’*upriver*, because the Matanuska originates in the east and is a separate drainage from the Copper. Just prior to the excerpt in (9), Mr. Pete had instead referred to this direction with *ngge*’*upland*’ (which I discuss in Section 4.4); in IUs 01-04 I confirm that the east direction here is not a form of *nae*’*upriver*’.

(9) **Nae**’*upriver*’ only used for north-south rivers; diorama: the Matanuska River

1-2 AB; This isn’t, ’uniit?, {{AB indicates toy dog running upriver/east}}

3-4 or ’uné, ’unae?.

5-7 MP; ## Some-, except,

08-09 it’s e:hn, north they’d say ’uniit.

’[If] it’s (i.e., if the river were flowing from the)north, they’d say ’a point distantly upriver’.”
AB; Oh okay. Only if this is going north. \{[AB indicates flow of river]\}
MP; Yeah,
AB; Okay,
MP; that's\textsuperscript{10} going, west ((sic))
AB; we'll do that one in a minute,
MP; going so – east.
\(\text{(Markle Pete, oai:paradisec.org.au:ALB01-059, 00:10:11.340-00:10:29.090)}\)

Mr. Pete responds that ‘uniit ‘to distantly upriver’ would be an appropriate response only if the river were flowing from the north to the south (IUs 06-09). His first turn consists of the abandoned some- in IU 06 (which I interpret as being a truncation of sometimes), a hesitation in IU 08 while he makes a gesture indicating a north-south river that is perpendicular to the Matanuska, and the statement in IU 09 that if the river were coming from the north, one could say ‘uniit ‘to distantly upriver’ for the upriver direction. ‘Uniit is presumably not correct here for Mr. Pete because the Matanuska flows east to west (IUs 14-18). I confirm this in IU 11, in which I am gesturing to indicate a river flowing from north to south (which is the referent of this in IU 11). Mr. Pete’s gesture and statement that ‘uniit ‘to distantly upriver’ would be appropriate if the upriver direction were to the north shows that Mr. Pete is in fact aware of the connection between river direction and the Ahtna directional terms. However, for him ‘upriver’ can only be used when the river flows from north to south.

The reason for Mr. Pete’s association between nae’ ‘upriver’ and north is likely due to the prominence of the Copper River in Mr. Pete’s home region. For residents of the Central Ahtna dialect area, which includes the villages of Gakona, Gulkana, Tazlina, and Copper Center, the Copper River flows from north to south. Thus the opportunities to refer to the upriver direction as north (and vice versa) in English conversation are abundant, and in the next example Mr. Pete goes on to show that his association between the two terms, nae’ and north, is quite strong.

Example (10) is based on work with the diorama of the Copper River drainage. Notice that while the Copper River does flow southward for most of its 287 miles, at its headwaters it flows nearly due north out of the Copper Glacier before quickly turning counterclockwise around the base of Mount Sanford. The diorama shown in Figure 7 corresponds to the length of the entire Copper River (the blue fabric), the Richardson and Tok Highways (the black fabric), and the Wrangell Mountains (the green mountain figurine). Our shared knowledge is that the town of Tok (Map 2, D7), not depicted, would be off the top right corner of the table.

---

\textsuperscript{10}. The referent of that in IU 14 is the Matanuska river.
In (10), Mr. Pete and I are first discussing highway travel along the Richardson Highway, which runs parallel to the Copper River, in the area south of the junction of the Tok Highway. The directionals Mr. Pete uses here are to be expected: south, which is the downriver direction of the Copper, is 'uda'a 'to distantly downriver', and north, which is the upriver direction, is 'une' 'to distantly upriver'. In IU 12 I ask Mr. Pete what to call the direction one takes when one turns to the northeast on the Tok Highway. This is followed in IU 36 by a discussion of traveling all the way to Fairbanks, some 250 miles north of the Copper River area.

(10) Strength of association between nae’ ‘upriver’ and north on the Tok and Richardson Highways; diorama: the Copper River

1-3 AB; Okay, how about, the car,  

{{AB indicates toy car driving downriver/south on the Richardson Highway}}

04 driving on the Richards–

05 MP; 'Udaa’a.  

DIST.DOWNRIVER.ALL  

06 AB; on the Richardson,  

07 MP; 'Udaa’a.  

DIST.DOWNRIVER.ALL  

'To distantly downriver, to distantly downriver.'

08 AB; 'Udaa’a.  

DIST.DOWNRIVER.ALL  

'To distantly downriver.'

{{AB turns car around so that it is driving upriver/north toward Fairbanks}}

09 MP; 'Une'.  

DIST.UPRIVER.ALL  

'To distantly upriver.'
10 AB; 'Unë,
   dist.upriver.all
   'To distantly upriver.'
11 okay.
   {[AB indicates that the car is at the fork of the Richardson and
     Tok Highways, and heads upriver/northeast toward Tok]}
12 and then you get to here,
13-14 what's that direction. On Tok ((i.e., Tok Highway).
15-17 MP; Ehn, 'un- ehn,
   aban
18 Tok tsë' kughiaal.
   T. to 3sg.sbj.go.ipfv.area
   'Um, he is going to Tok.'
19 AB; Tok tsë'.
   T. to
   'To Tok.'
20 MP; Ehn-heh.
21 AB; And what direction is this.
   {[AB gestures upriver/northeast]}
22 MP; I don't know.
23-24 AB; Okay. Okay.
25 MP; I don't know.
26-27 AB; Okay, you just say Tok.
28 MP; ⟨SMILE⟩I can't know.
29-30 AB; Okay, that's alright.
31 MP; No I don't know.
32 AB; ⟨SMILE⟩Oh hush you⟨/SMILE⟩.
33 MP; @@@@@@@@⟨/SMILE⟩.
   {[AB moves car to Richardson Highway, then moves it
     upriver/north toward Fairbanks]}
34 AB; But this way is 'unë.
   dist.upriver.all
   'To distantly upriver.'
35-37 MP; That's uh, going to Fairbanks, 'unë
   dist.upriver.all
   'To distantly upriver.'
38-39 AB; Yeah, 'unë.
   dist.upriver.all
   'To distantly upriver.'
40 So this one’s not ‘un’e.
   {{AB moves car back to Tok Highway and indicates it moving upriver/northeast}}

   DIST.upriver.ALL
   ‘So this one’s not ‘to distantly upriver’?’

41 MP; I don’t know what they,

42 AB; Okay.

43-44 MP; what you call that #, you go west ((sic)).

45 AB; Okay.

46 MP; Eastwest ((sic)) I guess.

47-48 AB; Yeah north– northeast.

49 MP; Northeast.

50-51 AB; Northeast. Okay.

52-53 MP; Northeast, that’s right.

54 AB; Okay.

55 MP; That’s the name.

((Markle Pete, oai:paradisec.org.au:ALB01-059, 00:19:46.900-00:20:44.130))

On two fronts this rich example shows both the strength of the association between
nae ‘upriver’ with north, and the loss of integrity of MRO. First, consider Mr. Pete’s use
of upriver to refer to the route to Fairbanks (Map 2, A3; IUs 34-39). Fairbanks is quite
some distance from the Copper River, across a major mountain range and nowhere
near any southerly flowing river. That Mr. Pete agrees with my use of this term (i.e.,
my use of it in IU 34, which was a reiteration of what he had told me in IU 09) to refer
to Fairbanks is striking evidence for the erosion of MROP1 and MROP2, because the
association with north effectively extends beyond the Copper River region to refer to
locations hundreds of miles away and with no association with an upriver direction
(indeed, even the upriver direction of the Tanana River, in whose valley Fairbanks is
located, is to the east/southeast).\footnote{In Example (10) Mr. Pete agrees to my suggestion of ‘un’e as indicating the route to Fairbanks, but my suggestion in line 34 was based on previous conversations in which he used the term in this way. I am referencing information he already gave me but that is not shown here.} The English cardinal system allows for this kind of extension – north is north regardless of intervening physiographic features – but Ahtna has developed a lexicalized name for the Fairbanks region, Bāaaxe ‘a general area outside’. Mr. Pete does not use this term.

Second, and even more crucially, consider IUs 12-33, in which I ask Mr. Pete
about the direction to Tok. The Tok Highway follows the curve of the Copper River

\footnote{In Example (10) Mr. Pete agrees to my suggestion of ‘un’e as indicating the route to Fairbanks, but my suggestion in line 34 was based on previous conversations in which he used the term in this way. I am referencing information he already gave me but that is not shown here.}
around the north face of Mt. Sanford, and in this region the upriver direction is to the northeast. After some hesitation (and the abandonment of a directional in IU 16), Mr. Pete refers to this direction as Tok ts’è’ ‘to Tok’ (IU 18). His answer is significant, because it is the first time he needs to appeal to a grammatical system other than the directional system. He uses a postpositional phrase instead of a directional, and upon further inquiry (IUs 21-33 and 40-55) he comments that he simply does not know what to call it. This suggests that MROP2 is losing its centrality to the semantics of the Ahtna directional system: when the upriver direction on the Copper is no longer north, Mr. Pete hesitates about which directional term to select and instead opts for a different solution altogether (I return to his solution to the problem of directional reference near the headwaters of the Copper in Section 4.4).

4.4 The role of general topography

The evidence above supports the idea that there is some degree of contact-induced semantic shift occurring in Mr. Pete’s use of the Ahtna directional system, at least when interacting with a second language learner of Ahtna. The fact that Mr. Pete is unsure of what to say in cases in which upriver and north do not align suggests that this is the beginning of a shift, rather than a mature shift, when we would expect speakers to have fully integrated the new system into their grammar. While Ahtna is so endangered it is likely we will never witness a complete shift, it is still worth examining some of Mr. Pete’s strategies for dealing with directional reference in cases that are now problematic because of the gaps left in the shifting paradigm. Two of these are examined below.

4.4.1 Ngge’ ‘upland’ in the Matanuska River drainage

Let us return to the discussion of the axis of the directional grid in the Matanuska River drainage (Figure 6). Recall that this river flows from east to west, but that in (9), Mr. Pete rejected nae’ ‘upriver’ for east. Instead, as can be seen in (11), he uses ngge’ ‘upland’ to refer to the east.

(11) Use of ngge’ ‘upland’ for the upriver direction; diorama: The Matanuska River drainage

01 AB; What direction is this? { [AB moves toy car upriver/east] }
02 MP; ‘Ungge nac’e’aał.
   dist.upland.all 3s.sbj.indf.obj.handle.cpt.obj.iter.ipfv.peramb
   ‘S/he is driving back to distantly upland.’
03 AB; ‘Ungge.
   dist.upland.all
   ‘To distantly upland.’
Mr. Pete uses ‘ungge’ ‘to distantly upland’ to refer to a car driving in the upriver direction on the highway in IU 06, and ngge’ ‘upland’ to refer to a dog running upriver atop the frozen surface of the river in IUs 15 and 16. Before considering why Mr. Pete selected these terms, let us look at his other strategy for avoiding the now-inappropriate use of nae’ ‘upriver.’ 12

4.4.2 Tgge’ ‘up (vertically)’ along the Tazlina River to Tazlina Lake
The excerpt in (12) is based on a diorama of the trail system around Tazlina Lake (Map 2, G4), including the Glenn Highway and the Lake Louise region (Map 2, F4). This diorama, which Mr. Pete had in fact assembled from memory, is shown in Figure 8. The brown strip of fabric on the left represents an old trail that used to run parallel to the Tazlina River on its south bank up to Tazlina Lake; the blue fabric to the right represents the Tazlina River, which flows eastward from Tazlina Lake, also pictured. The black fabric represents the Glenn Highway. Again, the bottom of the figure represents east; Mr. Pete is sitting to the diorama’s north, and I am to the south.

---

12. Inappropriate now because nae’ is now reserved for north-south rivers.
In (12), we are discussing foot travel along the trail toward Tazlina Lake. Mr. Pete refers to this direction as ‘utgge’ ‘to distantly up (vertically)’. This is notable because the terrain in this area is not particularly vertical or steep.

(12) Tgge‘up (vertically)’ along Tazlina River; diorama: the trail to Tazlina Lake

01 AB; So if he's walking on the trail,

{{AB moves toy hunter upriver/west along a trail parallel to Tazlina River toward Tazlina Lake}}

02-03 how would you say, he's walking that way.

04 MP; Utgge natesdyaa.  

DIST.UP.ALL 3SG.SBJ.GO.IP.FV.ITER. INCEP  
‘S/he is starting to go back/again to distantly up (vertically).’

5-6 AB; Utgge, cause he's going up to the,  

DIST.UP.ALL  
‘To distantly up (vertically), cause he's going up to the’

07 MP; Yeah.

8-9 AB; lake? Okay,

10 MP; Going up to the lake.

11 AB; Okay.

12 MP; Utgge ts'ina'idyaa.  

DIST.UP.ALL 3SG.SBJ.GO.IP.FV.STRAIGHT. ITER  
‘S/he is going straight back to distantly up (vertically).’

13 AB; ts’ina’idyaa.  

3SG.SBJ.GO.IP.FV.STRAIGHT.ITER  
‘S/he is going straight back.’

14 MP; Mm-hm.  

((Markle Pete, oai.paradise.org.au:ALB01-060, 00:10:00.835-00:10:17.615))
Mr. Pete answers in IU 04 that the correct direction here is ‘utgge’ ‘to distantly up vertically’, which I echo in IU 05, and then ask for a reason in IUs 06 and 08. He confirms that the reason for ‘utgge’ ‘to distantly up (vertically)’ is that he’s going ‘up’ to the lake (i.e., the English polysemous up that includes nonvertical directions, see Section 5.3). A few seconds later, Mr. Pete confirms that this direction is ‘utgge’ ‘to distantly up (vertically)’; shown in (13), in response to my verification in IU 03 that ‘unë’ ‘to distantly upriver’ is not possible, even though this is the upriver direction on the Tazlina River.

(13) Confirming tge’ ‘up (vertically)’; diorama: the trail to Tazlina Lake
01 AB; Did you also say ‘unë’? {{AB points upriver/west along Tazlina River trail}}

DIST uprising all
‘Did you also say ‘to distantly upriver’?’

02 MP; Huh?
03 AB; Can this be ‘unë’? {{AB moves toy hunter in same direction}}

DIST uprising all
‘Can this be ‘to distantly upriver’?’

04 MP; Hehn-eh, ‘No.’
05 AB; No?,
06 MP; ‘utgge.

DIST up all
‘To distantly up (vertically).’
7-8 AB; ‘Utgge, okay.

DIST up all
‘To distantly up (vertically). Okay.’

((Markle Pete, oai.paradisec.org.au:ALB01-060, 00:10:30.783-00:10:38.223))

4.4.3 Why ngge’ and tge’?
Why does Mr. Pete select ngge’ ‘upland’ and tge’ ‘up (vertically)’ as alternate strategies to nae’ ‘upriver’ for referencing direction? First, let us consider the notion of a perpendicular spatial grid as part of a directional system. We might be tempted to force the Ahtna riverine directional system into a perpendicular grid like the English cardinal system: just as the north-south axis is 90 degrees to the east-west axis, it seems natural to conceive of the nae’ ‘upriver’-daa’ ‘downriver’ axis as being 90 degrees to the ngge’ ‘upland’-tsen’ ‘downland’ axis. A prototypical river flows through, and indeed, creates, a valley; a person walking perpendicularly away from such a river would of course be walking up a slope.

But there is no reason to think that such slopes only exist perpendicularly to a river, and experience with actual terrain tells us they usually do not. Furthermore, for semi-nomadic cultures, reference to elevation that needs to be surmounted (or
circumambulated) by foot or dogsled may be more important than strict adherence to a perpendicular grid, which is most useful for marine navigation. In this sense, the Ahtna directional system is more three-dimensional than the English system, including changes in elevation in the same paradigm as axial relations.

As for Mr. Pete’s selection of ngge’ ‘upland’ to refer to the east/upriver direction on the Matanuska, recall that this is an area of steep elevation change. The salience of the sloping topography makes ngge’ a reasonable choice when nae’ ‘upriver’ is not available, as it now is not available for the westerly flowing Matanuska because he now associates this term with north. While choosing ngge’ ‘upland’ to refer to an upwardly sloping direction is not necessarily innovative, reserving nae’ ‘upriver’ only for rivers that flow from north to south is innovative, and a sign of a semantic shift.

Mr. Pete’s use of tgge’ ‘up (vertically)’ in (12) and (13) to describe an area that is not particularly vertical is intriguing. Although tgge’ and its opposite igge’ ‘down (vertically)’ are morphologically members of the lexical class of directionals, they do not have an exclusively topographic semantic basis. These terms can refer to many kinds of steep verticals including ladders, cliffs, and trees. In (14) Mr. Pete uses tgge’ ‘up (vertically)’ to refer to the vertical cliff in Frog, Where Are You? (a picture book by Mercer Mayer), and in (14) he uses it to describe a squirrel’s perch at the top of a tree.

(14) Tgge’ ‘up (vertically)’ for true verticals
(a) MP; Utggahwnene u’el niyitats
   Dist.up.punc hill 3sg.obj.with 3sg.sbj.animal.rushes.pfv.termin
   lic’ae u’el dadits’et tuu
dog 3sg.obj.with 3sg.sbj.animate.moves.indep.down.pfv water
   yii taghiaqek.
in 3pl.sbj.pl.obj.water.move.indep.pfv
   ‘Up on a cliff it stops suddenly; he falls with the dog and they fall in the water.’
   ((Markle Pete, Naghaay Ndaane Zidaa ‘Frog Where Are You’,
   oai.paradisec.org.au:ALB01-042, pp. 21–22))

(b) MP; Dligi tgge’ dazdaa.
tree.squirrel up 3sg.sbj.sit/stay.up.ipfv
   ‘The tree squirrel is sitting high up (vertically) on something.’
   (((…)))

(‘Utggat adazdaa.
Dist.up.punc 3sg.sbj.sit/stay.up.ipfv
   ‘It is sitting at a point distantly high up (vertically) on something.’
   ((Markle Pete, oai:paradisec.org.au:ALB01-57, 00:12:17.225-00:12:20.610))
In both of these examples, Mr. Pete uses directionals based on the stem *tgge* ‘up (vertically)’. Using *tgge* to describe directions on the ground as well as vertical height can also be seen as an example of the Ahtna directional system incorporating the third dimension, but this time with perhaps some influence from English. English *up* encompasses a broad and very general semantic range, e.g., *upriver, uphill, uptown, up the road*, etc. Given that Mr. Pete is, like all other living speakers of Ahtna, bilingual in English, it is reasonable to suggest that perhaps *tgge* ‘up (vertically)’ is now being used to describe situations in which English *up* would be appropriate, rather than just to refer to things that are strictly vertical.\(^{13}\)

The semantic shift that is occurring in Mr. Pete’s use of the directionals is summarized in Figure 9.

\[\text{Figure 9. Diagram of semantic shift}\]

As *nae* ‘upriver’ becomes strongly associated with English *north* due to the prevalence of the north-south flowing Copper River, it is no longer available to Mr. Pete for ‘upriver’ in rivers that run in a different direction. This leaves a gap in the paradigm, which Mr. Pete fills with either *ngge* ‘upland’, possibly based on the slope of the land, or with *tgge* ‘up (vertically)’, possibly based on the semantic range of ‘up’ in English, a language in which Mr. Pete is bilingual.

---

\(^{13}\) Ahtna also has several far more grammaticalized – and hence semantically general – adverbal verb prefixes corresponding to English *up*, e.g., *a-* (*dazyaa ‘s/he went up’) and *ka-* (*kaghi’aa ‘linear object extends up’). *Tgge* is still phonologically independent and behaves as an affix-taking member of the directional lexical class, which further suggests that its semantic extension to describe landforms that are not particularly vertical is a new development.
5. Conclusion

Although Ahtna is Mr. Pete’s first language, a lifetime of full bilingualism with English is causing the erosion of Major River Orientation in his use of directionals. Evidence for this erosion can be found in his reluctance to use nae’ ‘upriver’ for rivers (or portions thereof) that do not flow north to south, and his extension of nae’ to refer to distant locations like Fairbanks.

Mr. Pete’s innovative use of Ahtna directionals indicates an ongoing shift of the semantic basis of the system. The first change in this shift is the strong association of nae’ ‘upriver’ to north. Although this step is not complete – we have seen that Mr. Pete is still aware of the connection between nae’ and river flow – it nonetheless leaves a semantic gap in the paradigm that other terms (ngge’, tgge’) must now be recruited to fill. It is likely that Ahtna will become extinct before the entire system shifts sufficiently that speakers no longer experience moments of hesitation about which terms to select, but this chain-shift pattern is a common indicator of contact-based language change (e.g., Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Heine & Kuteva 2005).

Important to this analysis is the understanding that during the fieldwork sessions described here, Mr. Pete was working to accommodate a learner of Ahtna whose first language is English. In fact this situation mirrors most of Mr. Pete’s opportunities to use Ahtna in his family and community. There are few fluent speakers of Ahtna today, and Mr. Pete spends most of his day communicating with learners or non-speakers of Ahtna. This daily contact with English influences the way Mr. Pete adapts his knowledge of the indigenous semantics of the Ahtna directional system to accommodate English speakers, who have a very different understanding of the semantics of direction. Mr. Pete’s shifting use of directionals does not reflect an ignorance of Ahtna language or the semantics of the directional system; rather, it reflects the fact that a very real contact-induced change is taking place in the language. In terms of Thomason and Kaufman’s model of the linguistic results of language contact (1988:50), Mr. Pete’s hesitation is typical of the early stages of intense contact leading to large-scale language shift, in which influence between the substratum and superstratum is moderate to heavy. The semantic change we observe in Mr. Pete’s use of the directionals is a natural result of intense language contact, even though the contact could arguably be viewed as unnaturally catalyzed by historical pro-English policies and economic pressure (a discussion that is beyond the scope of the present work). Regardless of the cause of the contact between the two languages, my interactions with Mr. Pete in this study are akin to those taking place within the changing demography of the Ahtna-speaking community. This of course has implications for language revitalization. Ahtna teachers and learners will need to decide if revitalization should include not just the re-integration of vocabulary for Ahtna directional terms, but also the entire semantic and cognitive system underlying the original terms.
Appendix: Transcription conventions

All transcriptions of spoken language are provided in the transcription system outlined in Du Bois (2006) and Du Bois et al. (1992). This system is based on the notion of the ‘intonation unit’, or IU, the holistic prosodic unit that forms the armature upon which speakers build discourse. Most text lines contain only one IU, the boundaries of which were determined by a series of acoustic and perceptual cues that are outlined in Berez (2011b). In some cases a line contains multiple IUs separated by a comma, a period, or a question mark, to save space.

The line breaks in the examples drawn from Kari (2010) do not match those found in the original publication. Kari’s line breaks correspond to normative sentences, but I have inserted line breaks at IU boundaries (with permission) for the purposes of this paper. Below are other symbols related to the transcription system that can be found in the examples of spoken language herein:

17 IU number
MP; Speaker identification label
, Continuing boundary tone
{]} Concurrent gesture
. Terminative boundary tone
? Appeal or rising boundary tone
@ Pulse of laughter
- Truncated word
_ Linked words
: Nonlexical segment lengthening
# Inaudible syllable
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