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# PROGRAM

## MONDAY, 24. APRIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15</td>
<td><strong>KEYNOTE TALK:</strong> Tom Güldemann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic macro-areas in Africa: when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boundaries are areas themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td><strong>INPUT TALK SESSION 1:</strong> Peter Auer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking and talking: how speakers jointly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maneuver in space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Paul Luff, Christian Heath, Menisha Patel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boundaries in interaction spaces: embodied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interaction within a large working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Martin de Heaver, Paul Luff, Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crossing Boundaries: interactions through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>locations within a moving environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Albert Acedo and Marco Painho:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You should participate” or “I want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to participate” — engaging spatial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Randi Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defining “community” through spatial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reference: Communities of practice in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isthmus of Tehuantepec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Sabine Lehner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representations of space and borders in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austrian public discourse on Asylum and in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>narratives of disPLACEd persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>Paul Longley, Jens Kandt, Tian Lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surname geographies, socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interaction and new functional regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td><strong>Dinner</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TUESDAY, 25. APRIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td><strong>KEYNOTE TALK:</strong> Setha Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language, Discourse and Space:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Conceptual Framework for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnography of Space and Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td><strong>INPUT TALK SESSION 2:</strong> Alfred Lameli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intangible Borders — Linguistic Areas and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-Cultural Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Stefanie Siebenhuetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual transfer of spatial reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>due to language contact? A semantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approach to cultural conceptualization in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the linguistic area Mainland Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Grossenbacher, Britain, Leemann, Kolly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blaxter, Wanitsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smartphone app methodologies for regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dialectology: the English North-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>divide in data from the English Dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>App</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Daan Hovens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the language of the euregio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rhine-meuse-north? Euroregional integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the future of languages near the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch-German border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Maja Miličević, Nikola Ljubešić, Tanja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samardžić</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing borders between states vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>languages: Twitter data to the rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Arjen Versloot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isolation and archaisms: a GIS-case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>study on Alemannic dialects of Wallis and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>northern Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>Balthasar Bickel, Curdin Derungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic areas bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td><strong>Dinner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:30</td>
<td><strong>PUBLIC EVENT:</strong> Ruth Wodak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The Language of Walls’ - Analyzing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rightwing Populist Discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WEDNESDAY, 26. APRIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>18  KEYNOTE TALK: Christian Berndt</td>
<td>Human geography's borders p. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>19 INPUT TALK SESSION 3: Barbara Tversky</td>
<td>Clarity and Ambiguity p. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>20 Ditte Boeg Thomsen, Marc D.S. Volhardt</td>
<td>Walking and wording the mountains in Yuhu p. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>21 Gaurav Sinha, David Mark</td>
<td>Exploring Landforms in Multiple Representational Spaces p. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>22 Jan Heegard Petersen</td>
<td>Boundaries in culture, physical landscape and language: The Kalasha (Northwest Pakistan) p. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>23 Ekaterina Egorova, Ross S. Purves</td>
<td>Investigating the Meaning of Landscape Terms through the Corpus-based Semantics Approach p. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>24 Elwys De Stefani</td>
<td>Talking about place names: Tourist guides' practices of self- and other-categorization p. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>25 Flurina Wartmann, Olga Chesnokova, Ross Purves</td>
<td>Mountains, moors, hills, lakes and rivers: Comparing folk language categorizations across formal landscape typologies p. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>POSTER SESSION* (see next page)</td>
<td>p. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>Conference Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THURSDAY, 27. APRIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>26 KEYNOTE TALK: Dan Montello</td>
<td>The Cognition of Boundaries and Regions in Geography and Geographic Information Science p. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>27 INPUT TALK SESSION 4: Frans Gregersen</td>
<td>Changing relationships between cities and their surroundings - with special reference to dialect levelling and language mixing p. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>28 Jürg Fleischer</td>
<td>Diffusion of (morpho)syntactic features in Continental West Germanic: do traditional dialect areas play a role? p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>29 Veton Matoshi</td>
<td>Variation of clitic doubling in Albanian dialects p. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>30 Li-Fang Lai, Shelome Gooden</td>
<td>Language ideologies and shifting boundaries: a case study of Yami diphthongs (ay) and (aw) p. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>31 Péter Jeszenszky, Philipp Stoeckle, Elvira Glaser, Robert Weibel</td>
<td>Analysing the Effects of Geographic Factors on Syntax Variation in Individual and Aggregate Phenomena of Swiss German p. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>32 Elwys De Stefani</td>
<td>Talking about place names: Tourist guides' practices of self- and other-categorization p. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>33 Flurina Wartmann, Olga Chesnokova, Ross Purves</td>
<td>Mountains, moors, hills, lakes and rivers: Comparing folk language categorizations across formal landscape typologies p. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>POSTER SESSION* (see next page)</td>
<td>p. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>Conference Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Posters**

- 34 Posters (see next page)
FRIDAY, 28. APRIL

8:00  Breakfast

9:00  WORKSHOPS

Inferring and Visualizing Boundaries from Empirical Data  p. 43

9:00  Hiking Aurigeno  p. 46

12:00  Lunch

WORKSHOPS

Inferring and Visualizing Boundaries from Empirical Data  p. 43

14:00  Leave take

* POSTER SESSION (BALINT ROOM)

A Mara Barbosa:
Reproducing and challenging language ideologies concerning Spanish in the U.S.: the case of Indiana  p. 27

B Christian Freksa and Ahmed Loai Ali:
Geographic objects, relations among them, and conceptual categories  p. 28

C David Mark and Gaurav Sinha:
Conceptualizations of The Horizon: A fundamental Experiential Boundary  p. 29

D Claudia Posch and Gerhard Rampl:
Mit ‹− ‹−′ geht’s abwärts.
The descent of a German Suffixoid  p. 30

E Dionysios Zoumpalidis and Julia Mazurova:
Crossing boundaries: the role of language and space in (re)shaping identity of ethnic Georgian teenagers in Moscow  p. 31

F Christina Brandenberger and Christoph Hottiger:
Defining the Boundaries of Exhibits in Science Centres - Between Architecture and Visitors’ Usage  p. 32

G Ekaterina Egorova:
Mountain Scenario in Alpine Route Directions  p. 32

H Karina Frick:
Public Valediction: Grief in Virtual Space  p. 32

I David Paul Gerards:
The so-called partitive article in Old Iberoromance  p. 32

J Heiko Hausendorf, Marcel Näf, Kyoko Sugisaki, Nicolas Wiedmer:
The Zurich Postcard Corpus (ZPC): 15,000 Ways to overcome Spatial Boundaries  p. 32

K Kenan Hochuli:
Interaction at markets  p. 32

L Johannes Kabatek:
Differential object marking in Spanish: Emergence and tendencies of the current system  p. 32

M Michele Loporcaro, Diego Pescarini, Tania Paciaroni, Alice Idone, Serena Romagnoli:
The Zurich database of agreement in Italo-Romance  p. 33

N Nathalie Meyer:
Massively Multimodal Communication and Space: A Case Study of Video Game Livestreaming  p. 33

O Peter Ranacher, Curtin Derungs, Balthasar Bickel, Robert Weibel:
Geographic isolation and morphological richness of languages in South-Eastern Asia  p. 33

P Hanna Ruch:
Assessing perceptual salience through a dialect recognition task  p. 33

Q Barbara Sonnenhauser and Martin Junge:
Description, usage and origin - The Supine in Slovene  p. 33

R Elisabeth Stark, Beat Siebenhaar, Simone Ueberwasser, Samuel Felder, Franziska Stuntebeck:
Individuals in WhatsApp Communication: Aspects of Accommodation – Variation in Time  p. 33

S Antonia Steger:
Lingering in Public. Interactive Practices of Spatial Production on Urban Squares in Zurich  p. 33

T Teodora Vukovic:
Determination, definite article use in Torlak dialects  p. 33
Welcome address by the Conference Organizers, Dr Chiara Cometta (Administrative Manager Congressi Stefano Francini SF), and Lorenzo Sonognini (Director of the Monte Verità Foundation).

Keynote Talk
Tom Güldemann (Humboldt University Berlin)

Linguistic macro-areas in Africa: when boundaries are areas themselves
Recent research on linguistic typology in Africa has identified a macro-areal linguistic profile of the continent comprising half a dozen large entities that are each geographically extensive and involve a great number of partly diverse languages. Their delimitation in space has to be addressed by means of a more abstract conceptualization, notably in terms of an internal areal structuring of cores vs. peripheries and a non-abrupt transition from one macro-area to another. Accordingly, the concept of areal “boundary” also assumes a more abstract meaning. In particular, boundaries are not clear-cut lines of demarcation but rather areas in their own right, namely “frontier zones” in between two macro-areas. The talk will discuss several such configurations and thereby elucidate the relationship between area and boundary in areal linguistics.
SESSION 1
This session will discuss the ways in which physical boundaries are treated in linguistics, conversation analysis, social geography and the social sciences. Physical boundaries are most prominent as natural boundaries (such as mountains or rivers) but also comprise built boundaries in terms of architecture (leading to entities such as cities, districts, buildings or rooms). Physical boundaries are known to have impacts on linguistic and social differences and are accordingly claimed to establish relevant linguistic and social areas ranging from face-to-face interactional spaces to regional communities. Nevertheless, their status as material given has long been challenged from different points of view. Take, for instance, the classical sociological argument that boundaries should not be taken as spatial facts with social impact but as social facts with spatial forms. The theoretical as well as methodological and empirical question then is to account for the social construction of boundaries without neglecting their physical and material manifestations. Talks related to this question may address the formation of physical boundaries within concrete settings of face-to-face interaction, within urban public spheres or larger regional areas.

Session Input Talk
Peter Auer (University of Freiburg)

Walking and talking: how speakers jointly manoeuver in space
Walking together requires a high degree of interpersonal coordination, particularly in crowded spaces, when obstacles are in the way, or when one or more of the walkers do not know the way (exactly). The challenge even increases when the walkers are at the same time talkers. On the one hand, talk about non-related topics has to be abandoned and resumed when bodily coordination requires it; on the other hand, topical talk can be interrupted by situated talk linked to way-finding and manoeuvring in space, and hence become a resource for the latter. In my talk, I will present preliminary findings based on eye-tracking technology for investigating the relationship between talk and body movements while walking in a dyadic constellation. I will particularly focus on participants’ gaze, which is used by single walkers for orientation in space (intrapersonal coordination), but may at the same time be visible for co-walkers and then become an interactional resource for walking together. I will focus on a particularly challenging extract in which the two walkers-talkers have to cross a street.
Boundaries in interaction spaces: embodied interaction within a large working environment

In this paper we will consider how spaces within a large workplace configure and are shaped through the interactions between participants. Drawing on fieldwork and audio-visual recordings in a large multi-function, transport operations centre and previous studies of smaller operations centres we will reveal how a range of work and interactional practices are shaped by features of the everyday environment. These workplaces are ‘centres of coordination’ not just of the staff working there but for people and resources spread over a large physical area. To maintain awareness and distribute information to each other many of the practices that staff utilise are common to both large and small centres. For example, staff shout out loud brief summaries of critical summaries of events, transform texts on their screens into announcements and draw on subtle features of a colleague’s conduct, such as their being seem to type into a computer system to initiate collaboration on a common topic. These practices are ‘multi-modal’, drawing on an interweaving of talk, visual conduct and features in the material environment, both physical and electronic. They also rely on the visual and audio access participants have to each other. However, in the large multifunction control room there seems limits to the deployment of these practices. Although collocated within the same physical space staff seem to be sensitive to organizational boundaries within the workplace, deploying different forms of participation and engagement with members of other organisations who are located within the same space. In this paper we draw on field work undertaken in the site that includes extensive field observation, audio and visual recording of the activities of different teams within the centre, and interviews and conversations with staff. The analysis draws on ethnomethodology and conversation analysis and is primarily concerned with explicating the community of practice and procedure, the social organisation on which participants rely in the production and intelligibility of action and activity within the setting. The analysis raises issues concerning how we consider collocation and the ecology of social interaction. We will conclude by discussing the challenges of developing analyses of fine-grained details of social interaction that take account of material artefacts, features of the local environment and the organization of, and the boundaries between, spaces.
Martin de Heaver, Paul Luff and Christian Heath
(King’s College London)

Crossing Boundaries: interactions through locations within a moving environment
In this paper we draw on audio-visual recordings taking within cars to consider how participants orient to features of the environment both within the vehicle and in the outside world. In particular we will consider how drivers and passengers talk about features of the environment and boundaries, both visual and envisioned during their journeys. Drawing on interaction analysis we will consider how participants make sense of features of the environment and travelling through it with respect to their embodied conduct; their visual and bodily conduct. In this way we can develop analyses that tie participants conduct to the environment, particularly with regard to different locales and the boundaries between them.

In this paper we will also consider how participants draw on technologies within the car to consider the relationships between their location and the environment around them. We will present an analysis of how conduct of the drivers and passengers are shaped and by and mediated through the technologies. We consider how the participants make sense of the technology’s ‘contributions’, particularly when these contributions differ from their expressed experience and perceptions about routes, locations and places. For this analysis we will draw on fragments of conduct of the situated conduct of drivers and passengers and their moment-to-moment use and manipulation of the devices around them. In developing the analysis we draw on recordings using multiple cameras that capture simultaneously conduct within the car and also the environment through which they are moving. We will briefly consider the methodological challenges of collecting and analyzing such data, as well as the issues it present for developing ethnomethodological and interactional analyses of behaviour of people as they move through the world. We conclude by discussing some issues that arise in how we conceive of space, specific kinds of location and the physical and envisioned boundaries between them when we draw on such data.
Researchers observe that civic engagement is decreasing in developed nations. Low rates of participation are an evidence of the endemic problem about citizen engagement in a fast-paced society, where people face increasing demands on their time. Those responsible for implementing participatory processes do not know where the suitable places to successfully apply them are. We argue that there are other possible approaches to promote areas of collaboration, cooperation and participation apart from using administrative boundaries (neighborhoods, municipalities, regions, etc.) that might not cover the sense of pertinence and fruitful relationships of all citizens in a certain area. By spatializing and treating information based on citizens’ perceptions towards place (sense of place) and their social relationships (social capital) in the city level, we can create alternative local citizen-based clusters to administrative boundaries for civic engagement in local affairs. Sense of place and social capital play an important role in citizen participation and civic engagement. However, we know little about where these meaningful relationships and places are. At the city level, we are missing techniques to spatialize both in order to manage the dynamic information about citizens’ place perceptions and fruitful relationships. The main difficulty, from this perspective, is how to combine a particular personal perspective into a general objective view, providing shared or common meaningful places that can create commonalities and empowerment among citizens. This paper delineates shared citizen-based areas of civic engagement, from relating the individual sense of place and social capital spatial dimension, using spatial analysis techniques. It is assumed that for each citizen there exists at least one meaningful place with emotional connections and each citizen is intrinsically a social creature with associated social networks at the city level. This particular study compares the spatial dimensions of sense of place and social capital gathered through a Public Participation Geographic Information System (PPGIS) web-based tool. We use a large number of different qualitative and quantitative criteria for measuring sense of place and social capital from citizens, including map-based questionnaires and spatial tools. We also introduce a novel detailed discussion on the spatial relations between the three main concepts of the study: civic engagement, social capital and sense of place. This research bridges the general city administrative spatial boundaries perspective with a more citizen-centered collaborative approach through the creation of “engagement geographies”. Through these engagement geographies we obtain (1) the creation of a collective intelligence based on the mutual recognition and enrichment of individuals and (2) local environments for civic engagement and citizen participation both as a result of identifying common/shared citizen-based spatial boundaries by spatializing sense of place and social capital.
Defining “community” through spatial reference:
Communities of practice in the Isthmus of Tehuantepec

How are communities defined? How are communities of practice constructed and reinforced? Communities are often conceptualized as concrete geo-spatial objects, when in reality their boundaries are ill-defined and membership is ever-changing. Linguistic data from three communities of Isthmus Zapotec speakers show that identity as a community member predicts the use of certain types of spatial reference frames in small-scale space. An ongoing debate about the role of linguistic and non-linguistic factors in influencing spatial reference presents first and second language, education, literacy, topography, and population geography as potential factors (Levinson et al. 2002; Li & Gleitman 2002; Palmer 2015; inter alia). Large-scale crosslinguistic studies have yielded research showing that topography and population density influence frame use (Bohnemeyer et al. 2014, 2015, 2016); however, the three communities in the current study cannot be differentiated by broad-grained topographic classifications or population density.

Data for the present study were collected in the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, Oaxaca, Mexico in three locales: La Ventosa, Juchitán de Zaragoza, and Santa María Xadani, each located ten to sixteen km apart within a flat plain between the Sierra Sur mountains and the Laguna Superior on the Pacific coast. Daily travel between the towns is common for commerce, as are intermarriage and migration. Buses and collectivo taxis make travel between the towns easy and accessible.

In each of the three communities, forty pairs of speakers performed a referential communication task describing the location and orientation of configurations of toy animals so that a partner could construct a matching configuration. Descriptions were analyzed for use of spatial reference frames, strategies for locating and orienting an object with respect to the bodies of speakers, environmental objects, or the objects themselves. Speakers in La Ventosa show a strong preference for absolute frames, anchoring descriptions in cardinal directions, whereas speakers in Juchitán and Xadani made use of a more even distribution of strategies.

Each participant provided information on their level of education, and frequency of speaking Spanish as a second language, reading, and writing. These demographic data, along with the community in which the participant conducted the task, were used as predictor variables in a linear mixed-effects regression model. Only community membership was found to be a predictor of geocentric frame use, where speakers anchor their descriptions to an environmental feature (most commonly here, the prevailing North-South winds and the rising and setting sun).

This finding can be explained by observing that language use as a cultural practice is self-reinforcing within a community. Though community membership may be non-concretely defined and fluid, the linguistic practices of a community may be considered relatively stable due to the increased interaction of its members with one another vs. individuals outside the community. Community can then be defined by a culture of behavior, linguistic practices being one of those behaviors. Individuals can therefore move between communities, yet still engage in a specific community of practice for their present communicative context.
Sabine Lehner (University of Vienna)

Representations of space and borders in the Austrian public discourse on Asylum and in narratives of disPLACEd persons

Recent media reports on displaced persons (or refugees) in EU member states are dominated by key words evoking specific images of territory such as “(external) borders”, the construction of “fences” or “walls” and “transition zones”. The accommodation and housing of refugees are discussed in terms of “camps”, “tents”, “containers” etc. Specific places become symbols of the current debate, such as “Lampedusa”, “Lesbos” and “Calais”. In Austria, the recent implementation of so called “border management systems” and the annual limitation of accepted asylum applications show a discursive normalisation of (figurative/symbolic and concrete) borders. Different as they are, all examples link to concepts of space, borders and mobility. They structure the respective texts/discourse in spatial terms.

The proposed paper, which is part of an ongoing research project, will investigate the following questions: How are borders referred to in the Austrian public discourse? How can the relationship between different social actors, their actions and positioning in the discursively constructed spaces (borders) be described? How do refugees refer to and perceive borders/border crossings?

The data of the research project comprises various multimodal material: (1) media coverage on the arrival of refugees on Austrian borders and railway stations and the implementation of the so called “border management systems” at several Austrian borders, (2) ethnographic data collected in a housing for refugees and a learning centre in Vienna (Austria), and (3) participatory photo interviews and narrative biographical interviews with refugees. The proposed paper will explore the different concepts and qualities of space and borders from one or two data sets in more detail.

The study is based on a linguistically informed theory of space. Following Lefebvre’s triadic conception of space, I assume that space is socially produced, multiple, dynamic, relational, unfinished and contested (cf. Lefebvre 1991, Löw 2001, Massey 2006, Soja 2007). Similarly, I also conceptualize borders as social constructions (cf. Newman 2003) which have symbolic meanings and express power-relations. Borders also (re)establish or maintain differentiations based on practices of inclusion/exclusion (cf. Wodak 2015).

Analytically, the focus will be on the representation and ascribed qualities of borders as well as on border-related processes and practices. Given that space and borders are socially produced, further emphasis will be put on social actors, their practices and how they are discursively represented in relation to different spatial arrangements. Here, it will be of a specific interest to compare the data sets in order to gain insights into the “multiplicity” (Massey 2006) of spaces and borders, bringing together hegemonic and individual views on borders.
Surname geographies, socio-cultural interaction and new functional regions

This paper discusses the status, significance and practical utility of spatial boundaries arising from surname geographies in the United Kingdom. From the perspective of regional geography, surnames possess a number of properties that can turn them into informative markers of social processes. First, surnames are typically passed on from generation to generation according to lineage and, second, they developed according to geographically varying naming practices. Given low historic rates of inter-regional migration in the UK, we can observe relatively stable regional surname ‘pools’ that may identify granular geographies of socio-cultural interaction.

The first part of the paper will present a regionalisation of the United Kingdom based on recent surname geographies. At a highly aggregate level, six regions of different surname compositions emerge; they broadly reproduce the four UK countries (Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England) with England split into a northern, southern and urban English region. The results show that, while many of these regions are large and contiguous, they may also be dispersed across the country and cover, for example, multiple urban centres, reflecting wider and diverse networks of social interaction.

The second part will show how surname geographies can be combined with other geographic information in order to infer the spatial structure of social and built physical phenomena. Here, we will focus on road infrastructure and develop an approach that identifies new functional regions encompassing social interactions alongside their physical-material manifestations.

The third part discusses the uncertainty associated with the regionalisation, notably with respect to questions of temporal stability of the regions, spatial granularity, overlaps and transitions as well as the role of more complex, network forms of social interactions. We will also pay attention to appropriate geospatial and statistical methods to address these kinds of uncertainty and reflect on substantive limitations of surname geographies in depicting regions of socio-cultural interaction.

All in all, the paper gauges and develops possibilities of using surname geographies to identify new functional regions in socio-cultural and physical terms. In so doing, the paper contributes widely to debates in regional and social geography, notably issues of regional specificity, spatial heterogeneity, inference and generalisation of phenomena within increasingly mobile and diverse societies.
Language, Discourse and Space: A Conceptual Framework for the Ethnography of Space and Place

The paper examines the ways in which language and discourse shape space and place and locates spatial analysis more firmly in understanding patterns of social interaction, communication strategies and linguistic practices. The emphasis on language and discourse provides a methodologically explicit way to understand how spatial meaning is produced, manipulated and controlled through everyday communications. Language and discourse analyses draw upon many of the theories and methodologies including the social construction of space as well as embodied spatial practices and meaning-based frameworks. The unstable semiological relationship of language to ideas, thoughts and objects that underlies a social constructivist approach to spatial analysis informs this discussion. Further an in-depth consideration of the material effects of language, its performative and discursive aspects and its ability to mark identity also plays a significant role in producing space and making sense of people and place interactions.

This discussion covers the many ways language and discourse function in constructing, producing and transforming space through everyday communications and national and global media and information circuits. It reviews the specific relationships of place naming; words and space; discourse and space; and textual approaches to the built environment. It concludes with a comparative ethnographic example of how talk reframes the social and spatial context of living in co-operative housing in Washington, D.C. and New York City.
SESSION 2
This session is dedicated to boundaries of linguistic areas and socio-cultural interaction. It focuses on factors that play a role in shaping external and internal boundaries of linguistic areas. Determining the boundaries of linguistic areas is a notoriously difficult task. The main reason for this is that linguistic areas are complex multi-faceted constructs. For instance, areas with shared linguistic features are not necessarily congruent with climate zones or areas with shared socio-cultural values. At the level of interpersonal interaction, intergroup attitudes can override the general tendency of interlocutors to converge in conversation and therefore contribute to the maintenance of boundaries. We explicitly encourage a multi-disciplinary dialogue, in order to increase our understanding of the interaction between linguistic, socio-cultural, and ecological factors that may impede contact between speakers of different languages or language varieties and therefore contribute to shaping the boundaries of linguistic areas.

Session Input Talk
Alfred Lameli (University of Marburg)

Intangible Borders – Linguistic Areas and Socio-Cultural Practices
If a person moves from one town to another it is highly likely that he or she is pursuing a particular incentive. At first glance, one might assume that in 21st century Central Europe this incentive is economic in nature, such as job opportunities, lower rents etc. A closer look, however, reveals that many people, at least in Germany, are unwilling to move within a nation when the new location is distant culturally. It appears that there are intangible cultural borders within a nation that influence people’s behavior.

This is one result of a series of quantitative studies that we have performed in recent years. Most interestingly, from a linguistic point of view, there is a highly significant effect in both recent and historical dialects that is not captured by geographical distance, degrees of urbanity, political or religious borders and others. That is, a considerable amount of people avoids migration across the borders and transitions of linguistic areas.

In this paper I will demonstrate that this is rather typical behavior that can be replicated and substantiated with other non-linguistic phenomena. It will be argued that such behavior is due to long-standing routines and experiences that are tightened in social interaction.
Conceptual transfer of spatial reference due to language contact? A semantic approach to cultural conceptualization in the linguistic area Mainland Southeast Asia

The aim of this paper is a comparative description of the representation of static spatial notions in the Mainland Southeast Asian (MSEA) languages Lao, Thai, Khmer, and Vietnamese on a semantic level. Despite strong genetic diversity, the area is already assumed to be an excellent example of a classical Sprachbund. Accordingly, the area developed especially through language contact. The parallels within spatial language discovered on the conceptual level indicate that the languages of MSEA form a linguistic area on a conceptual level as well. In addition, the paper addresses the relation between linguistic and cognitive concepts.

Crosslinguistically, languages seem to differ to a considerable extent concerning the application of spatial reference such as frames of reference and may prefer one of the three different options. The research question concerns at which level one of the frames of reference (intrinsic, relative and absolute) is determined: perceptual, conceptual or linguistic. Assuming that perception is selective, choosing the encoding of spatial information may be culturally conditioned. A focus of the paper lies on the speakers socio-cultural background and its impact on the choice of spatial language encoding. It is further asked whether the spatial domain is a useful area when exploring the framework of conceptual differences.

The results are grounded in field-based data analysis of static spatial relations conducted with the Topological relations picture series (TRPS) and additional picture material, namely the Toy Series (TS) and focus on categories for evaluating spatial relationships. Since the MSEA languages show convergent behavior with regards to the choice of spatial reference alongside other linguistic expressions, these levels can act as further evidence defining the linguistic area MSEA from a socio-cultural and conceptual-semantic perspective. Using semantic maps the MSEA area can be confirmed at the level of spatial concepts that are based in part on conceptual borrowing.

As a result, the large consensus observed among the languages studied may unveil socio-cultural influences on the choice of linguistic representations. It is argued that a crosslinguistic approach determining the choice of spatial language may add to the question to what extent socio-cultural impact on the semantic-conceptual level can be seen as evidence for the existence of linguistic areas. Both the method and structure of argumentation can provide a model for similar questions addressing the existence of linguistic areas as well as to other cognitive dimensions within the Southeast Asian area under consideration. Additionally the investigation can serve as a complement to empirical assumptions of a conceptual transfer hypothesis and serve as starting point for further research on the existence of linguistic areas based on conceptual-semantic transfer.
Smartphone app methodologies for regional dialectology: the English North-South divide in data from the English Dialects App

English people often use linguistic criteria to determine where the South of England ends and the North of England begins. This “North-South divide” is not only linguistic, but also cultural and economic, and is often mentioned in the media and constructed in different ways by various agents such as politicians, journalists, comedians and laypeople in general (Dorling 2010, Wales 2006).

From a linguistic perspective, there are two major salient isoglosses that divide the North from the South of England, both based on innovations in the South. The first isogloss marks the presence or absence of FOOT-STRUT split: words like cup are pronounced [kʌp] south of this isogloss and [kʊp] to the north, so, in the North, FOOT and STRUT have the same vowel. The second isogloss marks the presence or absence of TRAP-BATH split. Speakers north of this line generally pronounce words belonging to the BATH lexical set with the same short open vowel as in TRAP words and hence laugh is pronounced [lɑːf], whereas in the South a distinction between the two lexical sets is drawn. Here, vowels in the BATH lexical set are lengthened and in some places backed, leading to laugh being pronounced as [lɑː:ʃ] or [lɑː:f] (Wells, 1982, p. 353).

Although these features are very salient and often used in linguistic stereotyping, little research (see Britain 2001, Ryfa 2008) has been carried out on the geographical location of these boundaries since the Survey of English Dialects (SED) from the mid-20th century. However, in January 2016, a smartphone application designed to crowdsource dialect data - the English Dialects App (EDA) (Leemann et al. 2016) - was launched with the aim of shedding new light on regional and national dialect distributions. The app consists of two parts: a quiz that collects users’ variant choices for 26 variables and a self-recording function. Since its launch, the EDA has been downloaded more than 70’000 times, and more than 40’000 people from nearly 5’000 locations around the UK have provided information on their own use of phonological, morphosyntactic and lexical variables, together with important social metadata. Here, using the more than 40,000 sets of quiz responses from the EDA, we shed light on the present-day location of the dialectological transition zone between the North and the South of England, as demonstrated by FOOT-STRUT and TRAP-BATH. Our data suggest that while the FOOT-STRUT split isogloss has moved northwards, that marking TRAP - BATH split remains relatively stable, possibly even showing signs of having moved southwards. Moreover, the fact that the app collected detailed user metadata allows us to examine how social factors such as age, education and mobility influence the location and the stability or shift of the two isoglosses. Our new app-based approach, we will demonstrate, is able to present a broad, nationwide, but also socially-sensitive picture of the linguistic North-South divide of England.
What is the language of the euregio rhine-meuse-north? Euroregional integration and the future of languages near the Dutch-German border

This research paper deals with the socio-cultural and linguistic integration of cross-border regions in Europe known as “Euroregions”. The focus is on the Dutch-German “euregio rhine-meuse-north”, where various language varieties are spoken. Apart from standard-Dutch and standard-German, these varieties include local dialects (Limburgish and Low German) and minority languages (e.g. Polish and Turkish).

By means of a survey, I have explored how well young people in this border area are prepared for living in an integrated Euroregion. More specifically, I have asked them about the languages that they are learning, their attitudes towards certain languages, their experience with and evaluation of cross-border interaction, their awareness of euroregional integration processes, and their attitudes towards living, working and studying at the other side of the border.

The survey included 60 pupils from a Dutch secondary school, and 60 pupils from a German secondary school. The distance between these two schools is merely six kilometres. All pupils in my survey are about 15-16 years old, and all pupils are in the final stage of their vocationally oriented secondary school education. This means that they have all decided already which language(s) they want to learn at school, and that they are all in the stage of making important decisions about their future study and/or career.

Some results of my survey research are rather alarming. Neither the Dutch nor the German pupils express particularly positive attitudes towards each other’s national language and the idea of learning it. Neither of the groups tends to answer that they can imagine themselves living, working or studying at the other side of the border. And neither of the groups seems to be aware about euroregional integration processes in their border area.

As English appears to be the only language that all pupils in my survey are learning, and the only language that most pupils think of in positive terms, English as a lingua franca might turn out to be the preferred mode of cross-border communication for this generation. However, my results indicate the possibility of certain alternative scenarios as well, including the use of the relatively unknown communication mode of receptive multilingualism (involving Dutch, German and local dialects).

Lastly, I discuss what my results tell about the meaning of the concepts “Europeanisation” and “European identity”, and how they relate to broader issues like the future of the European Union. Furthermore, I discuss which other domains of the euregio rhine-meuse-north should be explored to get a fuller understanding of Europeanisation processes. Within this context, I consider that intergroup contact and language contact may affect intergroup attitudes and communicative behaviour, for example when people like the ones from my survey end up on a mixed Dutch-German workplace. Theoretically, this means that euroregional integration processes may lead to the creation of new linguistic areas.
Establishing borders between states vs. languages: Twitter data to the rescue

In recent history, the languages of former Yugoslavia have undergone a complex interplay of unifying and diverging tendencies. After the disintegration of the country, its majority language, Serbo-Croatian, was split into four standard languages, Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian, corresponding to four newly formed states. Substantial effort has since been invested into identifying the differences and similarities between them; however, much of the discussion is based on scarce (if any) empirical data, and the actual present-day spread of many of the features considered typical of particular languages is still largely unknown.

In this paper we aim to start overcoming this situation by looking at empirical data extracted from Twitter. We use the newly developed TweetGeo tool, which collects messages published in the geographical perimeter determined by the user. The tool allows filtering the obtained messages by additional criteria (e.g. the predominant language of an account, or the country of publishing). The user finally defines variables relevant for his/her study, which are then extracted from the tweet text or other metadata.

We focus on three variables commonly invoked as differentiating between Croatian and Serbian. Our first variable, phonetic in nature, concerns the reflexes of the Proto-Slavic vowel yat; we look at two values, e (as in mleko ‘milk’), and je (mlijeko), typical of Serbian and Croatian respectively. The second variable, štošta, is lexical, and it refers to the variants of the interrogative pronoun ‘what’, Croatian što and Serbian šta. The third variable, iraisaova, is morphological; the typical affix used for deriving verbs from (mostly) borrowed roots is -ira- in Croatian organizirati ‘organise’, generirati ‘generate’), whereas Serbian prefers -ova- and -isa- (organizovati; generisati), which we collapse together into the ova/isa variable level.

We apply a spatial trend detection analysis to the data, and we visualise the distributions of the different levels of our variables; see Table 1 and Figures 1-3. A particularly strong spatial trend (lower is stronger) is found for the iraisaova variable, i.e. its ira level; the e level of yat is also fairly concentrated, while the weakest spatial signal comes from štošta. The maps show that despite some discernible trends, linguistic areal patterns do not neatly correspond to the current state borders. While Croatian and Serbian do largely differ on the variables we look at in terms of dominance of variable levels, and Montenegrin patterns sometimes with one and sometimes with the other, the situation in Bosnian is far less clear-cut. Moreover, the point visualisations show some “mixed” areas for phonetics and lexis, with only morphology being spatially rather stable. Such results point to the current language borders being more administrative than linguistic; this claim should, however, be tested on a larger dataset, and on additional phenomena.

For the final paper we will extend the data sample, and add to the analysis a syntactic variable – the distribution of infinitives vs. da (‘that’) + present tense in complex predicates. In addition to the data, we will discuss the methodological approach behind the spatial analyses.
Arjen Versloot (University of Amsterdam)

Isolation and archaisms: a GIS-case study on Alemannic dialects of Wallis and northern Italy

This study offers a GIS-based analysis of the factors involved in the preservation of archaic morphological traits in the Alemannic dialects of Swiss Wallis and neighbouring regions. Any superficial overview will simply reveal the qualitative aspect of ‘isolation’ as an important factor. This study tries to objectivise that notion by fleshing out its components, such as: travel distance, elevation, population size and types of dialect contact.

Alongside the written High German standard, most German speaking Swiss speak Schwyzerdütsch, local or regional forms of the Alemannic German dialects. The dialects exhibit extensive geographical variation. The Wallisian dialects are known for their archaic character, such as the preservation of 5 different vowel qualities in unstressed syllables and several endings that resemble sometimes Old High German. Especially in northern Italy across the Swiss-Italian border near Zermatt, several Wallisian villages are found where archaic Wallisian dialects were or are still spoken.

Old High German had three different infinitive endings for verbs:
- an for strong verbs, e.g. helfan ‘to help’ and weak verbs class 1, e.g. setzan ‘to put’
- òn for weak verbs class 2, e.g. machchōn ‘to make’
- èn for weak verbs class 3, e.g. losēn ‘to loosen’

In most Swiss-German dialects, these three endings have been reduced to /ə/. In many Wallisian dialects, however, a distinction between several classes is maintained. The endings in Rima San Giuseppe (It.) (-a, -u, -e ) or in the Lötschtal (-n, -u, -ä, with limited n-apocope ) are closest to the Old High German position. In most dialects however, some form of simplification was applied, such as in Zermatt: -e, -u, -e.

The features of Elevation, Number of inhabitants, Town-village contrasts and Valley-slope contrasts and finally Spatial Neighbourhood Relations were evaluated, using a Geographical Information System. The most prominent condition for the archaisms in the infinitive endings in Swiss-German dialects turns out to be Isolation. Isolation has a double meaning here. In the first place: absolute isolation. Only villages with a high absolute isolation belong to the most archaic types. These villages have little contact to any other (Swiss German) villages. The second meaning of isolation is the isolation from other types. The most archaic morphological variants can apparently not survive in direct contact with the most reduced type in schwa. The model explains why no archaic infinitive endings are found in the Berner Oberland: the villages are not enough isolated in an absolute sense (they are all in contact with at least one other village) and are in direct contact with schwa-type dialects.
Linguistic areas bottom-up

The discovery of linguistic areas has traditionally been triggered by individual features: certain features — often only just a handful — are observed to have areally converging distributions (like bundles of isoglosses), and this is then taken as the key evidence for delineating linguistic areas. This approach is risky on two grounds: (i) because of unclear feature sampling, the approach lacks a straightforward way of telling true signals from chance; (ii) the approach requires crisp convergence even though linguistic boundaries are often expected to be fuzzy, as for instance reflected by the notion “linguistic continua” (e.g. Heeringa & Nerbonne 2001). An alternative framework that solves these problems is Predictive Areality Theory (Bickel & Nichols 2006). However, this approach is a means for hypothesis testing and model comparison and therefore lacks the flexibility of bottom-up, exploratory approaches.

Here we offer an alternative approach to exploratory area detection. The approach builds on the full range of known variation and iteratively learns spatial structure from data. We focus on two methods for this, one which is merely spatially informed and one which controls for genealogical relations between languages. As input data we use a database combining WALS (Dryer & Haspelmath 2013), PHOIBLE (Moran et al. 2014), WPD (Donohue et al. 2013) and AUTOTYP (Nichols et al. 2016+), resulting in rich global coverage of nearly 3000 languages. To the extent that results are consistent across methods, they suggest independence of genealogy.

The first method takes as input language coordinates and linguistic data. For each variable, clusters of spatially proximate languages with similar linguistic variable value are registered using the DBScan algorithm (Ester et al. 1996). After iterating all variables, aggregating spatio-linguistic clusters and levelling out the impact of the geographic distribution, linguistic areas are modelled as fuzzy regions consisting of groups of neighbouring languages of significant linguistic similarity.

The second method takes as input genealogical and linguistic data. Structural variation is first estimated at the level of language families. These estimates are then subject to a Principal Component Analysis and the resultant components are mapped onto the geographical distribution of families (in parallel to dialectometric approaches, Nerbonne et al. 1999).

Results across the two methods converge on a worldwide scale and detect several areas, partly confirming earlier claims in the literature, partly going beyond the state of the art.
Public Event
Ruth Wodak (Lancaster University)

‘The Language of Walls’ - Analyzing Rightwing Populist Discourse

Inclusion and exclusion of migrants and refugees are renegotiated in the European Union on almost a daily basis: ever new policies defining and restricting immigration are proposed by EU-member states. A re-nationalization can be observed, on many levels: traditions, rules, languages, visions, and imaginaries are affected. Walls have – again – become symbols of belonging inside – or of being excluded and having to stay outside? Should we thus agree with Robert Frost’s famous phrase “Good fences make good neighbors.”? (see R. Frost, „Mending Fences”).

In my lecture, I will analyze these recent developments in respect to immigration and asylum policies across Europe from a discourse-historical perspective, especially in respect to the rise of right-wing populist parties across Europe (Wodak 2015, The Politics of Fear, Sage): I focus on the discursive construction of national and transnational identities and related ‘border and body politics’: Who are the neighbors, who the strangers? Who proposes – and why – to ‘save’ our country from strangers? The data - analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively - consist of a range of genres, from the UK, Austria, Germany, France, etc (citizenship tests and language tests, party programs, TV documentaries, and election campaign materials).
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Keynote Talk
Christian Berndt (University of Zurich)

Human geography’s borders

After giving a selective, condensed overview of the way “border” and “boundary” have been employed as concepts in human geography, this talk engages with contemporary mobilizations of these concepts in the discipline. Special emphasis will be put on progressive conceptualizations of border and place at a time when methodological and political nationalism appear to be firmly back on the agenda. I illustrate my arguments with empirical material from my longstanding research on Ciudad Juárez, a troubled city at the Mexican-US-border.

SESSION 3

This session is concerned with the encoding of space in language describing geographic objects, such as mountains and valleys, and relationships between them. How are such places referred to in language? Is their linguistic categorization clear-cut or vague, on which factors does this depend and what implications does this have for communication? Talks in this session will address categorization of geographic objects from multiple perspectives including (cognitive) semantics, deixis and expression of spatial relations in language, linguistic diversity and onomastics, and work linking representations of geographic objects to language.
Session Input Talk

Barbara Tversky (Stanford University)

Clarity and Ambiguity

Clarity is often desired, indeed necessary, for quotidian affairs like train schedules, theater seats, and club membership and certainly for more serious affairs like citizenship, wedding dates, legal verdicts, and country boundaries. Yet determining boundaries is fraught with difficulties, and for many activities, like diplomacy and creativity, ambiguity can be productive. Results from experiments on creativity, design, categorization, and problem solving will illustrate both sides of the issues.

Talks Sessions 3

Ditte Boeg Thomsen (University of Copenhagen) and Marc D.S. Volhardt (IA Sprog)

Walking and wording the mountains in Yųhų

Through their vocabulary for geographic entities, speech communities share ways of carving up and categorizing the continuous areas of their physical surroundings. Crosslinguistic research has demonstrated that perceptual aspects of the environment, cultural practices and general features of the linguistic system all contribute to shaping the strategies a language employs to individuate and label environmental entities such as mountains, valleys and their different subparts (Burenhult & Levinson 2008). With its interest in communities’ collective delimitation of geographic objects, semantic typology thus shares a focus with the ethnography of place and territory, which asks which landscape entities communities single out for ritual attention as well as how social practices such as processions can impose and sustain territorial boundaries (Barabas 2004).

We investigate the relationship between linguistic and ritual categorization of landscape entities and their boundaries in an endangered Otopamean language, Yųhų (Acazulco Otomi), spoken in Acazulco, a village situated at 2760 m.a.s.l. on an incline bordering a mountain range and a lacustrine plain in central Mexico. The immediate surroundings present elevation differences from 2500 to 4600 m.a.s.l., and the lacustrine plain is dotted with a variety of small hills and extinct volcanoes. Traditionally, people travelled to and from Acazulco on foot, but since the 1950s, the village has undergone industrialization, and for practical travelling purposes, people now depend on cars. Nevertheless, the inhabitants still engage in three types of ritual collective walking: 1) processions around and through the village, marking territorial boundaries, 2) processions up their “protector mountain”, making offerings to it, and 3) multi-day pilgrimages to the hot lowlands, following old ritual
and commercial routes. The geographical surroundings thus play a central role in this Otomí community, as also reflected and reinforced linguistically by the use of a geocentric Frame of Reference (ex. 1) and elaborate verb morphology for place and direction (ex. 2 and 3).

(1) ra="mbh pa xöntho na kho’í nuñ na za ra="mbh pa ’a mbotu’lí
IPFV=stand to mountain DET.SG person CONTR DET.SG tree IPFV=stand to at fir.place
‘The person stands to the mountain side (north), but the tree stands to the fir side (south).’

(2) gwa gín=nkö=ga=mbé
here 1.IRR=TRL.PFV=rest=1=PL.EXCL
‘Here we rest (going away from here).’

(3) o ra máx d=u=nkö gwa
now maybe 3.IRR=CSL.PFV=rest here
‘Now maybe they rest here (coming towards us).’

To zoom in on individuation and categorization of geographic objects, we elicit landscape terms and place names in Yūhū through photo categorization tasks, wordlists and narratives about pilgrimages and processions. Among our current findings are distinct linguistic treatment of Acazulco’s protector mountain, labelling of geographic objects depending on a combination of height, shape and vegetation, a lack of distinct terms for mountain and forest, with the boundary of ‘mountain’ (xöntho) following a line between wilderness and cultivated ground, and a tendency to label subparts of mountains based on human movement (mbo’tse ‘ascent’, ngö’i ‘descent’). We discuss our findings in light of the factors proposed by Turk et al. (2011) in their ethnophysiographic model for crosslinguistic comparison of landscape concepts.
Exploring Landforms in Multiple Representational Spaces

A landform is a 3-dimensional, part of or a deposit on the surface environment of earth (or another planet) recognized primarily due to its distinct form. A complete and formal understanding of landforms requires simultaneous exploration of multiple landform spaces and how people bridge them intuitively in daily life. In cognitive spaces, humans distinguish between various landform categories, which are used for classification and reasoning about landform instances that are observed in physical (geographic) space. There exists a rich and varied representation of categories and instances of landforms in our shared, communal linguistic and cultural spaces that vary from language to language and from culture to culture. Finally, we must also consider computational space, in which landforms are digitally encoded in varied ways for geoscientific analyses and general-purpose information dissemination.

Our long-term research agenda has been to explore these five interconnected landform spaces, the various ways people bridge these spaces, and how such knowledge can support intuitive (i.e., a combination of natural language, visual cognition, and sketch based) landform information processing in computational environments. In this presentation, we will report ongoing research on a reference ontology for the domain of landforms through studies of convex (e.g., topographic eminences) and concave (e.g., surface water features) landforms.

We have earlier recognized topographic eminences as convex landforms that protrude upwards toward the sky, rising above surrounding land in all directions (e.g., hill, mountain, mount, pillar, plateau etc.). An important corollary of this definition is that eminences do not include convex landforms that project sideward or are elevated lands that are not, however, completely surrounded by lower land. Eminences, defined thus, can still be of two kinds: eminences that are features of the land (i.e., attached to and materially and structurally dependent on the bedrock forming the earth’s surface), and eminences that are piled on and supported by the earth’s surface (e.g., mounds, dunes, drumlins, landslide talus, and cinder cones). However, what evidence exists to create such a broad eminence category? Should these be two separate sibling classes instead? We need more evidence from physical, cognitive, linguistic, and cultural spaces and also consider how eminences should be conceived and represented for computational spaces.

In contrast, all concave landforms are dependent features of the land, since they are “negative” areas of land that cannot exist independent of the host earth’s surface. In our ontology of surface water features, we recognize two fundamental types of concave landforms: longitudinal channels with potential to be containers for water to flow through, and depression landforms (basins) that have potential to contain and store water over longer periods of time. Such concave landforms must be spatially and conceptually delineated from their contained bodies of water, and the compound water features (e.g., river, stream, and lake) that spatially co-exist with, but are not semantically equivalent to concave landforms. As for eminences, we must explore the validity and modifications to this reference ontology with empirical evidence from exploration of the five related landform representation spaces.
Boundaries in culture, physical landscape and language: The Kalasha (Northwest Pakistan)

This paper explores to what extent characteristic features of the culture and language of the Kalasha, as well of the surrounding landscape, are reminiscent of “semplates”, an idea introduced by Levinson & Burenhult (2009) whereby an underlying perception of the world is reflected in the organization of different semantic fields or grammatical subsystems.

The Kalasha are a non-Muslim tribe of 3000 people who live in the Hindu Kush mountains in Northwest Pakistan, a region that is characterized by high mountains and a system of rivers crossing through its inhabited and cultivated areas. Kalasha villages are situated on steep mountain slopes, which are characterized by physical boundaries. Below the villages terraces of fields divide the flattening slopes. The houses are built on top of each other in successive rows. Between and above the villages irrigation channels cross-section the landscape and from the uppermost part of the villages the inhabited area meet stretches of oak trees and non-cultivated wasteland.

Underlying cultural and religious boundaries are the concepts onjēṣṭa ‘pure’ and pragata ‘impure’. These concepts, and the physical features of the landscape that can be said to manifest them, have an all-important impact on the daily lives of the Kalasha. Areas and landmarks above the villages such as irrigation channels, altars for worshipping, pastures and the wild forest are onjēṣṭa and forbidden area for women. Villages and fields constitute ‘mixed’ zones allowed for both sexes. The area around the menstruation and birth houses near the rivers are strictly forbidden areas for men. Graveyards, lying next to the rivers, are strictly pragata and forbidden for both sexes. If the sometimes invisible boundaries of these zones are not respected, sacrifices must be made in order to reestablish order in the micro-cosmos of the Kalasha.

The typical features of the landscape as well as the cultural boundaries are reflected in a variety of semantic layers expressed by morphology and lexicon: in sets of motion verbs with lexical specifications related to orientation and directionality (‘go upward’-‘go downward’-‘go across a mountain top’), in sets of ‘put’ and ‘removal’ verbs (‘take from location with no boundaries’ vs ‘take from location with boundaries’), in ‘carry’ verbs (‘carry across a boundary’ vs ‘carry not across a boundary’), in the geo-morphic adverbial system (‘uphill’-‘downhill’-‘across-hill’, ‘upstream’-‘downstream’-‘across-stream’), and in the deictic adverb system (‘there within a boundary’-‘there across a boundary’).

The paper will give examples of how the physical landscape and the cultural boundaries influence the Kalasha way of life. It will describe and give examples of the spatial coding within the semantic layers mentioned, and it will discuss to what extent we can speak of overarching semantic parameters, following Levinson & Burenhult (2009).
Investigating the Meaning of Landscape Terms through the Corpus-based Semantics Approach

Geographic information science has long acknowledged the importance of studying the way people abstract and conceptualize the complex spatial world around them [3]. The challenge of understanding this process is emphasized in the context of “natural” space, representing a (more or less) continuous land surface and thus characterized by fiat boundaries [6]. Apart from a scientific motivation (“how does human mind transform continuous surfaces into cognitive entities?” [5]), there is a practical need for the incorporation of such knowledge into GIS, where both the geometric abstraction and semantics can have important implications for a specific application at hand.

Our work addresses the meaning of landscape terms through the corpus-based semantics approach. The starting point is the idea that a word’s cognitive representation is an abstraction derived from the contexts in which it is encountered [4]; comparing linguistic contexts of particular words can thus suggest the degree of their semantic similarity. We demonstrate the potential of discovering landscape terms’ semantics in a corpus of mountaineering texts in English (6.3 million words) [2]. Although relatively small compared to the British National Corpus, which is often used in such studies, the corpus is landscape-focused and the texts describe experience in, or knowledge of, alpine spaces.

In the first case study, we examine linguistic contexts (defined as a 2 word window) of the most frequent landscape terms in our corpus (e.g. mountain, peak, face, summit, ridge, glacier, valley, wall, range). We group linguistic contexts into property types such as ENTITY BEHAVIOR, adopting an approach, which is based on the idea that “concepts and meanings are complex assemblies of properties”[1]. In addition, we adjust the property types scheme by adding new or specifying existing types to account for properties that are salient in the data (e.g. we add the property type SPATIAL EXTENSION for collocates such as stretch and rise, as in “valley stretches”, “mountain rises” ). Further, we report on the common types of properties as well as on those that are associated exclusively with certain landscape terms.

In the second case study, we focus more specifically on the fundamental concept of geometric abstraction of geographic objects by examining the use of spatial prepositions across and along, which “together form a two-member subset that schematizes most versions of a path extending over a bounded plane” [7]. The linguistic context here is defined as the first noun following the spatial preposition. We first report on landscape terms occurring exclusively with either of the two prepositions (e.g. glacier with across, ridge with along). Second, we analyze the wider context of nouns co-occurring with both prepositions, reporting on the way context dictates the type of geometric abstraction.

These two case studies demonstrate the potential of corpus-based semantics in moving beyond purely linguistic questions to those motivated by geographical research and show the potential of relatively small, but focused, corpora in exploring such questions.
Talking about place names: Tourist guides’ practices of self- and other-categorization

Discursive (Bertrand 2010) and anthropological (Senft 2008) scholars have mainly focused on the social relevance of place name usage, whereas pragmatic and interactional approaches to language have mostly studied the referential properties of place names in everyday interaction (Schegloff 1972, Werner 1995, inter alia). These studies have shown that speakers choose place names (or other place formulations) on the basis of a membership analysis (Schegloff 1972), which allows them to see their interlocutors as members of a specific social category (e.g. ‘neighbors’, ‘tourists’, ‘foreigners’, etc.) and to choose the appropriate place formulation with regard to that categorization. In this presentation, I further develop this line of thought by analyzing a setting of interaction in which place names are frequently mobilized, i.e. guided tours, which have also been approached by interactional researchers (e.g. De Stefani/Mondada 2014). In this setting, the following practices are recurrently observable:

- Multiple names for the same referent: Whereas in everyday interaction speakers use place names generally as a referential option, tourist guides mobilize place names as part of their general activity of providing information about a specific object of interest; frequently, tourist guides can be seen to use multiple place names (e.g. historical vs. current names) for the same spatial referent, thereby exhibiting their professional competence and identity;

- Applied etymology: A further way in which tourists guide exhibit their professional identity is by providing historical background on the origin and motivation of a place name; furthermore, such episodes of applied etymology are clearly recipient designed – in other words the same name is explained differently e.g. to adults or to schoolchildren.

This presentation shows that, in tourist guides’ talk, place names are a major resource for self- and other-categorization, which participants make relevant in situ as the interaction unfolds. The analyses are based on a video recorded corpus of six guided tours that have been collected in Italy and in the Italian-speaking part of Switzerland. By using conversation analysis and interactional linguistics as methods of investigation and by focusing on place names, this contribution opens up the field of interactional onomastics as the study of (place) names in ordinary interaction.
Mountains, moors, hills, lakes and rivers: Comparing folk landscape categorizations across formal landscape typologies

Identifying geographic objects recognized across different cultural and linguistic backgrounds has been studied across a range of disciplines, including geography, linguistics, social anthropology, and emerging fields such as ethnophysiography and landscape ethnoecology (Johnson & Hunn, 2010; Mark, Turk, Burenhult, & Stea, 2011). However, little research has focused on comparing different landscapes based on culturally shared geographic categories. Here we investigate whether we can distinguish formally defined landscape types using folk landscape categories in an exploratory case study in Switzerland.

We selected five landscape types in the German-speaking part of Switzerland using a formal landscape typology of the Federal Office for Spatial Development (mountainous, moor, hill, lake, and river landscapes). For each type we selected two locations where we purposively recruited 30 participants in situ and conducted free listing, a method for category elicitation that has been successfully applied to many domains including geography (e.g. Mark, Smith, & Tversky, 1999; Williams, Kuhn, & Painho, 2012). To distinguish between highly salient and less salient geographic categories we calculated cognitive saliency values (Sutrop, 2001). Furthermore, we used measures of cosine similarity (Manning & Schütze, 1999) to quantitatively compare landscape descriptions between sites.

In total, we elicited 300 free lists from ten sites, and found between 153 and 214 distinct categories per site (arithmetic mean 179.5 ± 18.8). Cognitive saliency values showed a Zipf-distribution, with few highly salient categories and a large range of less salient categories. Pairs of locations belonging to the same landscape type consistently had the highest cosine-similarity values. Thus, for example, the descriptions of the two mountainous landscapes were most similar to each other when compared with all other locations.

Free listing proved to be a rich source of information on landscape categories. Cognitively highly salient categories appear to be relatively general categories, with less salient categories being often more specific to individual locations. Study sites within the same landscape type were consistently most similar in terms of cosine-similarity, indicating that free lists can be used to quantitatively compare descriptions across landscapes in a meaningful way.
Mara Barbosa  
(Texas A&M University Corpus Christi)

Reproducing and challenging language ideologies concerning Spanish in the U.S.: the case of Indiana

The present study investigated how Spanish-speaking immigrants see the major ideologies involving the role of the Spanish language and education in the U.S. Although Spanish is the most spoken minority language in the U.S., and about 17% of the population identifies as Hispanic, there are several monolingual and English-only ideologies reproduced daily in the country (Piller, 2001; Pavlenko, 2002). The present study analyzed sociolinguistic interviews with 17 Spanish-speaking immigrants living in three different cities in the state, using tools borrowed from Discourse Analysis (DA) (Martin, 2002; Gee, 2014) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Wodak & Meyers, 2002; Van Dijk, 1991, 2005). There are only few studies investigating major language ideologies in the discourse of Spanish-speaking immigrants in the U.S. (Achugar, 2008; Achugar & Oteiza, 2009; Achugar & Pessoa, 2009) and even fewer in the Midwest (Velazquez, 2008). We must investigate if the ideological discourse about Spanish in the U.S. is being adopted by the Spanish-speaking population or if they resist to these ideologies as such knowledge may help us making predictions about the future of the language in the U.S. (Luo & Wiseman, 2000; Rivera-Mills, 2000). Present in the participants’ discourse are several instances of reproduction and challenge of widespread ideologies concerning Spanish in the U.S. The major present ideologies in the data are: (1) Spanish as a language to be spoken only at home, (2) education in Spanish as not necessary in the U.S., (3) Spanish as not appropriate for public places, and (4) monolingualism as the norm, all of which have been identified among different population in the U.S. before (Pavlenko, 2002). Data also revealed that participants manipulated modality to express their very different attitudes towards Spanish and English in the U.S. Modality expresses the speaker or writer’s attitude towards what is being said or towards the interlocutor (Kitis & Milapides, 1997). While modal verbs expressing commitment and obligation are linked to English learning and use, for Spanish the modal verbs used express optionality and possibility, but never obligation. Modals like ‘must’ and ‘have’ are only linked to Spanish when it concerns the scope where Spanish can be present: it must be used only at home. These findings have direct implications in making predictions about the role of the language in the country since even if maintaining the language spoken at home is enough for its survival, what we see in the present study is a lack of commitment or obligation with the Spanish language in the U.S.
Geographic objects, relations among them, and conceptual categories

In my contribution I like to address (1) the categorization of geographic entities through instances; (2) through formal definitions; and (3) by means of cognitive concepts.

Individual geographic entities such as houses or nearby locations can be spatially categorized by location by forming neighborhoods that contain these entities as elements. This can be done either by explicitly relating the entities to one another or by defining territories that contain the entities and thus implicitly relating them.

Defining literally means: establishing boundaries, specifying what is inside (and implicitly: what is not inside). Forming categories by defining ‘territories’ works for well-structured physical domains such as geographic space, as we can arrange and describe locations in such a way that we can decide whether they are inside or outside a given territory. Similar considerations apply to non-spatial aspects of geographic objects.

This approach also works for abstract domains, if they form what in artificial intelligence (AI) is called closed worlds. Closed worlds are completely specified domains (e.g. in a data base), such that we can determine whether some entity belongs to a given category, or not.

The approach is less adequate for ill-structured open worlds, i.e. domains that may contain entities that cannot be easily classified as belonging to a certain category. A classical example from AI is the concept of a ‘chair’: it is impossible to define the concept of a ‘chair’ (i.e. to specify boundaries of spaces of physical features such as number of legs, shape, size, … that would constitute the concept of a chair). The same holds for many natural (e.g. geographic and biological) entities. However, in our digital world it becomes increasingly important that we are able to characterize hitherto uncategorized entities in terms of concepts we share.

In order to establish reliable communication and to apply mathematical approaches that are based on definitions of object features, we sometimes artificially force boundaries onto concepts. As a result we may get categories that are not very natural, as natural categories and cognitive concepts make heavy use of semantic and pragmatic context that is not captured in the definitions.

One way to include aspects of context is to move from definitions of physical features to definitions of relations between features in order to capture meaningful conceptual distinctions. For example, it would be arbitrary and unnatural to define absolute geographic boundaries between a valley and a mountain; but if we view ‘mountain’ as contrasting concept to ‘valley’, we may be willing to agree that a mountain starts wherever a valley ends. In other words, we may have clear-cut boundaries between geographic concepts even though we do not have clear-cut boundaries between the corresponding geographic objects.

I suggest that we should more clearly distinguish between the categorization of physical entities and the cognitive concepts we derive from relations between these entities, as we do much of our reasoning on a conceptual level rather than on the physical level.
Conceptualizations of The Horizon: A fundamental Experiential Boundary

“Spatial boundaries can be considered as real or imaginary lines separating two things.” The horizon is such a boundary, conceptualized in several different ways. One sense of the meaning of horizon is a boundary between sky and Earth. Another sense of meaning for horizon is the boundary between near and far, between here and not here. “The horizon” is a familiar component of the experience of landscape for many people. But is it a feature of landscape? What is the ontology of the horizon? Is it a universal concept? This paper explores conceptualizations of “the horizon” and describes a research plan for investigating the relative importance of the various conceptualizations in various contexts, including cross-cultural and cross-linguistic. In most conceptualizations, the horizon is a boundary.

The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) entry for horizon begins with two definitions: “The boundary-line of that part of the earth’s surface visible from a given point of view; the line at which the earth and sky appear to meet.” These are not presented by the OED as two different senses of meaning. However, we consider them to be ontologically distinct alternative senses. The first is a boundary on the surface of the Earth, essentially the boundary of a view shed from some viewing point. The second is a boundary in the visual image of the environment or landscape from a point, the boundary between sky and non-sky. A third definition of horizon, prevalent in art but also employed in environment psychology (cf. J. J. Gibson) ignores the curvature of the Earth and takes the horizon to be the theoretical line to which horizontal lines appear to converge in perspective. In a more abstract sense, the horizon also may be thought of as the outer limits of the landscape, beyond which things are inaccessible or non-existent. The horizon also serves as the location for some culturally important events, especially the rising and setting points of the Sun and other celestial bodies.

When viewing the horizon from the shore of a large body of water or from the edge a large featureless plane, all of these definitions converge. However, the various meanings diverge when there is irregular topography, trees, buildings, et cetera.

This project began when we noticed that several bilingual dictionaries for Australian Indigenous languages did not have a listing for the English word “horizon”. Did these people lack a term for the horizon? Did they not even have a concept for what English speakers refer to as the “horizon”? Or did the linguists documenting those languages simply not ask the questions that might have elicited such a term? This raised the question of what is the referent of “horizon” in English. This paper will discuss the conceptual, ontological, and computational aspects of this topic and maintain a cross-linguistic perspective.
Claudia Posch and Gerhard Rampl  
(Universität Innsbruck)

Mit ‘-wärts’ geht’s abwärts. The descent of a German Suffixoid

The Alps and their most outstanding “segment”, the mountain, are structuring the social lives of their inhabitants and the people who move within them. The landscapes in the mountains thus determine the seeing and thinking of people (Leitner 2014, 45). Landscapes may be viewed as “categories of the social” and are culturally coded, especially by the linguistic means used to refer to them. One particularly interesting element of the linguistic encoding of landscapes is the coding of movement within them, for example in the form of deictic expressions. The proposed paper will be mainly devoted to only one part of the extensive field of deictic expressions in German, namely one particular dimensional spatial deictic suffixoid: ‘-wärts’ (‘-wards’). ‘-wärts’ is used to form local deictic adverbs that indicate a certain direction more or less specifically. We will investigate the diverse uses and word formation patterns of this suffixoid by using the corpus linguistic tool Hyperbase Web Edition, which allows for a variety of statistical analyses of POS-tagged texts.

The specific corpus used for this investigation consists of articles on diverse mountain-related topics, often mountaineering reports, descriptions of mountains, expeditions, routes and tours. The temporal range of the corpus is from 1869 to 1998 and all together it consists of 18,6 Mio word forms. This corpus is particularly useful for our analysis as it mainly deals with descriptions of how a destination was reached. Our paper intends to show how formations with the suffixoid ‘-wärts’ have changed and its use decreased over the course of time as well as in which ways ‘-wärts’ is combined with other types of spatial references. The word formation patterns ‘-wärts’ allows for result, on the one hand, in more commonly known and used lexicalized adverbs such as ‘auswärts’, ‘einwärts’, ‘aufwärts’, ‘abwärts’, etc. One the other hand ‘-wärts’ also is used in more complex and exceptional combinations with different types of words and even names, such as in ‘ardenwärts’, ‘mekongaufwärts’, ‘höhlenauswärts’, ‘stradaufwärts’, etc. In our paper we will look at the word formation systematic behind these items as well as the spatial relations that can be described by using it. This is connected to questions such as: Are there specific environments in which this suffixoid is particularly likely to appear? Which forms or descriptions are used to replace the suffixoid, if it is less used today?
Dionysios Zoumpalidis (National Research University Higher School of Economics) and Julia Mazurova (Russian Academy of Sciences)

Crossing boundaries: the role of language and space in (re)shaping identity of ethnic Georgian teenagers in Moscow

Moscow, as a metropolis is undeniably one of the most culturally, ethnically and linguistically diverse cities in the world. As such, it has been an attractive milieu for migration flows predominantly from the former Soviet republics. Having settled in Moscow, some newcomers faced the problem of adaptation and access to good quality education. It was precisely the lack of equal opportunities in primary and secondary education that forced the Moscow authorities to establish schools with an ethno-cultural component for some ethnic minorities (Tatars, Georgians, Jews, Armenians, and Azerbaijanis among others) residing in Moscow on a long-term or permanent basis. In the context of urban linguistics, children of different ethnic backgrounds were provided with the opportunity to attend schools in Moscow where they could not only preserve their mother tongue but also participate in national celebrations, dances, songs and, in this way, preserve their ethno-linguistic and cultural heritage outside their homeland.

In this study, we are going to examine the role of language and space in (re)shaping identity of teenage students of ethnic Georgian background in the state Moscow school with a Georgian ethno-cultural component. More precisely, we are going to analyze how students (re)shape their identity in their attempt to cross linguistic, cultural and spatial boundaries in the context of institutional settings. While the language of instruction is Russian, the majority of school teachers are ethnic Georgians, which directly/indirectly influence the students’ ethnic self-perception and their language behavior. Likewise, classroom interactions are examined in light of the language ideologies (Bloomaert, 1999). In this respect, language ideologies allow us to examine the meta-level of socio-culturally motivated beliefs, ideas, political and cultural perceptions around language within a certain context and look at the social and political significance of linguistic practices (Woolard, 1998; Kroskrity, 2004).

In the present study, participant observation, quantitative (74 questionnaires filled out by students of 6th-11th grades) and qualitative (3 group interviews with students, 4 individual interviews with teachers, 2 with administrative staff, and 1 group interview with teachers) methods of data collection are used. We also attended the schools’ national and domestic celebrations observing the character of these events.

The preliminary results demonstrate that the vast majority of students of Georgian descent in the Moscow school with a Georgian ethno-cultural component are fluent in both Russian and Georgian languages. Students in Moscow express the idea that their peers in Georgia are different from them in many respects. In particular, it seems that the blurring of identity boundaries has an effect on the students’ language behavior at different levels (phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon).
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The Cognition of Boundaries and Regions in Geography and Geographic Information Science

Geographic boundaries divide the inside of a geographic region from its outside. They are conceptually one-dimensional but often so vague as to merit being recognized as geometrically two-dimensional. Geographic regions themselves are (approximately) two-dimensional pieces of Earth surface. No two places on the Earth’s surface are identical, but by generalizing over unique characteristics, we identify (mostly) contiguous sets of places that are similar to each other but dissimilar from places in other regions. Thus, regionalization is spatial categorization. Regions play an important role in the way geographers and other scholars organize their thinking and communication about the Earth, including its representation and manipulation in digital geographic information systems. They also play a central role in the way laypersons think and communicate, likely including people from all times and cultures. That is, regionalization—including circumscription by boundaries—is very likely to be universal, cognitively and culturally. In my talk, I discuss the fundamental concept of geographic regions and regionalization, including the nature of regional boundaries and their properties. I then focus specifically on cognitive regions—regions in the mind that reflect how individuals or cultures informally organize the Earth’s surface. I overview several empirical studies on the measurement and characterization of cognitive regions and boundaries, including studies on how they influence spatial and thematic judgments.
SESSION 4
This session concerns shifting boundaries in time and space, the diffusion and disappearance of linguistic features in dialect contact (with regard to: syntax, morphology, phonology, and the lexicon), but also the dissolution of boundaries as in virtual space or as a consequence of migration. As mobility and migration are at last blurring the boundaries between linguistic regions, how do people describe themselves and how does this conform to regions as they are conventionally thought of? In a wider perspective, research questions in this session also concern self assignment and identity construction: what labels do we assign ourselves in cultural, ethnic and linguistic terms? Topics of this session may also include: qualitative and quantitative methods in linguistic geography and variational linguistics, the description/determination of boundaries with regard to linguistic change.

Session Input Talk
Frans Gregersen (University of Copenhagen)

Changing relationships between cities and their surroundings - with special reference to dialect levelling and language mixing
It is well-known that there is a crucial difference between smaller cities which are dominated by their region and larger cities which dominate theirs. In my presentation I will

- discuss the concept of the city through history in order to shed light on their varying importance for language change
- and relate this discussion to the disciplines which have been studying the rural (dialectology) or the metropolis (sociolinguistics) speech communities
- exemplify throughout with primarily the development of Copenhagen, Denmark, and the changing relationships between Copenhagen lects and those of the surrounding countryside

A concluding section will argue that present day metropolises are not only diverse as to the local language varieties but also include minorities speaking a multitude of different languages. Theoretical debates on multilingualism and contact varieties will decide how we look upon the resulting speech communities.
Talks Session 4

Jürg Fleischer (Philipps-Universität Marburg)

Diffusion of (morpho-)syntactic features in Continental West Germanic: do traditional dialect areas play a role?

Although traditional dialect geography focused on phonetic and lexical features, syntax has caught up in the last years, with projects such as SAND (Syntactische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten) or SADS (Syntaktischer Atlas der deutschen Schweiz) documenting and describing patterns of areal syntactic variation for larger areas. However, for the time being there are not too many studies comparing the areal distribution of syntactic features with e.g. phonological ones, which, on their side, are mainly used in “traditional” dialect classifications (such as, e.g., the High German Sound Shift). For the time being, it seems that in some cases there is a fairly good correlation between traditional dialect areas and syntactic features, while in others syntax goes its own ways (see e.g. Glaser 2008: 101).

This paper addresses the question in a macro-perspective for the entire Continental West Germanic area, comparing phonological, (morpho-)syntactic and a few lexical phenomena. For the area of investigation, an exactly comparable data set is available in dialectal translations of the so-called “Wenker sentences”. These sentences were created and first used by Georg Wenker in the area of the German Empire between 1879 and 1888. Later, they were used in almost the entire Continental West Germanic area. So far, few analyses have taken advantage of this huge data base in its entirety, as the analyses are usually restricted to a part of the area (e.g., the German Empire, the Netherlands). Also, most existing analyses are concerned with phonetic phenomena.

Our analyses are based on a sample of more than 2,300 locations covering the entire space in a geographically defined grid (each quadrant covers 324 square kilometers). The Continental West Germanic languages are represented proportionally to the territory covered by them in pre-WWII Europe (2.128 German, 155 Dutch, 21 Frisian locations). The areal patterns of ca. 20 syntactic variables (among others: loss of the synthetic past tense; periphrastic progressive constructions; infinitival constructions; various uses of definite and indefinite articles; analytic comparative formation; negation structures; directional phrases) are compared with equally many phonetic variables, most of which are well-known and used for traditional dialect classifications (among others, various positions of the High German Consonant Shift: Wasser/Water ‘Water’, machen/maken ‘make’, Pfund/Fund/Fund ‘pound’; New High German Diphthongization: Eis/Is ‘ice’, Haus/Hus ‘house’; loss of nasal [+ compensatory lengthening]: Gänse/Geise etc. ‘geese’). Also, some vocabulary items that show differing areal patterns are taken into account to include the lexical domain.

Besides qualitative comparisons (based on impressionistic interpretation of maps), quantity-based similarity measurements such as Hamming distances (Nerbonne 2010) or NeighborNet will be used. It turns out that in many, though not all instances the areal patterns of syntactic features are relatively congruent with “traditional” dialect areas. As the syntactic and phonological features are of a demonstrably differing age in many instances, this suggests that “traditional” dialect areas are quite predictive and in that sense more “real” than usually thought.
Variation of clitic doubling in Albanian dialects

The main object of investigation in this paper will be clitic doubling of the direct object in the 3SG/PL (hereafter just clitic doubling) in Albanian. Clitic doubling in Albanian has been the object of many studies that were conducted on written or Standard Albanian (Buchholz 1977; Kalluli 2000; Kapia 2012 etc.) which is based predominantly on Tosk, the South Albanian dialect. So far, clitic doubling in Albanian is believed to correlate to focus marking since it is ruled out in combination with rhematized/focused objects. Moreover, and completely in line with this explanation, indefinite pronouns, such as çfarë ‘what’, kë ‘whom’, askënd ‘no one’, ndokënd ‘anyone’ are never clitic doubled since they are rhematized and thus focused (Kalluli 2000). Against this background, it is quite surprising that a cursory search in the Albanian National Corpus reveals many cases of doubled focused nominal objects and indefinite pronouns. A closer look at these sources reveals their origin from Albanian-language newspapers from Kosova and Macedonia, more precisely from those areas where Northeast Gheg is the or one of main spoken Albanian varieties. According to Përnaska (2012), clitic doubling in Albanian is in an ongoing process of generalization, a development which has achieved its highest level in Northeast Gheg, especially in Kosova. Self-conducted corpus analyses display a percentage of 90,16 % of doubled 3SG/PL direct objects in Northeast Gheg and only 31,16 % in South Albanian dialects; an intermediate position is occupied by Albanian dialects spoken in the modern Republic of Macedonia, where clitic doubling reaches a percentage of 69,48 %. The interim results of the corpus analysis further show that Albanian dialects within Macedonia disclose a strong correlation between clitic doubling and definiteness, the same pattern which is claimed for clitic doubling in West Macedonian (Tomić 2006: 252). As for South Albanian dialects, Kalluli (2000) can be cited, who states that Albanian and Modern Greek show the same correlation of clitic doubling and focus marking of the direct object. Only the preponderant occurrence of clitic doubling in Northeast Gheg, seems, thus far, to be an internal development, the functionality of which doesn’t have any equivalent in the vicinal (Slavic) language/vernaculars. The existence of functional variation of clitic doubling is a common phenomenon; its ubiquity is corroborated by findings on clitic doubling in other Balkan languages (Friedman 2006, 2008) and in Spanish dialects (Belloro 2007; Zdrojewski & Sanchez 2014); furthermore, it can be attributed to bilingualism (Ramirez-Trujillo 2006; Sanchez 2003).

The major objective of this paper is to provide a solid overview of the ongoing changes of clitic doubling in Albanian dialects spoken in the periphery of the compact Albanian speaking territory, especially in Kosova and Macedonia. An analysis within the framework of Balkan linguistics shall tackle the complex question whether these variations can be attributed to the influence of other surrounding “dominant” languages (Macedonian, Modern Greek etc.) or if these variations are to be considered merely areal-bound developments.
Language ideologies and shifting boundaries: A case study of Yami diphthongs (ay) and (aw)

Phonological variations in dying languages/dialects raise important questions about boundary formation, language ideologies, identity representation, and language ecology and evolution. For instance, (ay) and (aw) raising in Martha’s Vineyard English (Labov 1972; Irvine & Gal 2000; Milroy 2003) developed from an ethnic marker separating Yankees from the Indian and Portuguese settlers in the 1930s, to one that signaled islanders-mainlanders opposition in the 1960s. Currently, the raised variants are largely supplanted by the unraised ones, and this change is clearly linked to the current ecological context of mainstream English-dialect contact accompanying growing reliance on tourism industry (Blake & Josey 2003). Conversely, in a stable context like Smith Island, where there is limited contact with the outside world, raised (ay) and (aw) are still preserved by the locals to articulate their island identity (Schilling-Estes & Wolfram 1997; Schilling-Estes 2002).

(ay) and (aw) raising in Yami, an endangered Austronesian language spoken on Orchid Island in Taiwan, presents similar issues. Raised (ay) and (aw) are innovative features (Rau & Chang 2006; Rau et al. 2009), by which Yami can be classified into south (S) and north (N) dialects. Specifically, S speakers prefer the older, unraised variants in words such as vahay [vaʁaɪ] ‘house’ and araw [aɻaʊ] ‘sun’, whereas N speakers favor the innovative, raised forms as in vahay [vaʁəɪ] ‘house’ and araw [aɻəʊ] ‘sun’ (Lai & Gooden 2016b). Other than phonological differences, the two dialects also differ in vitality, with the Northerners being reported to preserve Yami better (Li & Ho 1988; Rau 1995; Chen 1998; Lin 2007). Yet, the current socioeconomic transformation – the booming tourism industry – seems to have gradually reshaped the ethnic-linguistic boundaries of the island as the raised features have started diffusing to the non-raising area, making the S-N dichotomy become less rigid and even erased. Dialect contact and sociocultural conflicts provide important insights into the shifting boundaries.

With increasing reliance on tourism, young Yami people now do not see fishing or farming as a career option, but would travel across the island to engage in tourism-related services. The innovative, raised variants favored by younger speakers (Lai & Gooden 2016b) have accordingly also spread around the island and permeated through the non-raising area. However, the influx of the tourists has also provoked growing sociocultural conflicts between community members and outsiders. To express their resistance toward these “intruders”, the more vibrant, raised variants prevailing on the north coast may be adopted by the Yami speakers as a cultural resource to highlight their Yami identity in opposition to Others (Irvine & Gal 2000; Kroskrity 2000).

The diffusion of the raised variants involves complex ideological positioning and layered semiotic processes including inconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure (Irvine & Gal 2000). To illustrate, the raised/unraised distinction first creates a micro-levelled S-N split (iconization). Faced with increasing socio-ethnic conflicts, the local distinctiveness (raised variants) may then be promoted and evolve into a new communal system (erasure) to maintain the ethnic boundary between Yami and Others at a macro-social level (recursivity).

Key words: diphthong, nucleus raising, dialect contact, shifting boundaries, language ideologies, Yami
Analysing the Effects of Geographic Factors on Syntax Variation in Individual andAggregate Phenomena of Swiss German

We propose methods to quantitatively assess the potential impact of geographic factors on the variation of Swiss German dialects, focusing on morphosyntax. We use data from the “Syntactic Atlas of German-speaking Switzerland” (SADS). The SADS survey was conducted between 2000 and 2002 among over 3000 respondents answering 118 questions about (morpho)syntactic phenomena in one quarter of the German-speaking municipalities of Switzerland (Bucheli & Glaser, 2002). For each question, the survey recorded the answers of multiple respondents (3 to 26) per survey site.

In the first part of our study, two opposing conceptualizations of dialect boundaries were assessed. The isogloss model assumes the occurrence areas of different variants corresponding to a linguistic phenomenon to be separated by a crisp boundary. The conceptual model of the dialect continuum, on the other hand, assumes smooth transitions between the areas of prevalent dialect types as well as individual dialect phenomena. Methods have been developed to quantitatively model the relationship between variants of individual linguistic phenomena. With multiple answers per survey site, co-occurrence of different variants per site is present. About 40% of the SADS phenomena feature two main answer variants that are “competing” in the dialect landscape with a certain spatial autocorrelation, some of them gradually blending into each other, others exhibiting a rather steep gradient between their dominance areas. For an initial exploration of the transition patterns, we used various visualisations, including area-class maps using Voronoi polygons, as well as 3-D plots and cross-sections through the investigation area. We then calculated different characteristics of spatial patterns, based on which we were able to classify the different dialect phenomena regarding whether the transition can best be described by an isogloss or a dialect continuum model, respectively (Seiler, 2005). The latter model was tested by calculating residuals to benchmark trend surfaces, while isoglosses were tested using logistic regression due to the assumed binomial patterns. Moreover the transition patterns of the phenomena were quantitatively compared (Anon 20XX; Anon, 20XX). We thus were able to demonstrate that by dividing the study area into two dominance zones and a transition zone, we can best account for the nature of the transition, advocating an alternative conceptual model of spatial dialectal variation, positioned midway between the isogloss and the dialect continuum model.

Additionally, the effect of geographic distances was quantified. Euclidean distances and travel times were used to capture the possibility of language contact. Based on the SADS, a syntactic distance measure between survey sites was devised. It was shown that geographic distance is responsible for, and thus explains, the majority of the variance found in Swiss German syntax, as represented in the SADS data. Travel times (for the years 2000, 1950 and 1850) correlate with the syntactic spatial variation significantly better than Euclidean distance. Travel times of older years yield higher correlations than newer ones, but the difference is not significant. Correlation analysis of different (spatial) subsets of the study area was conducted to demonstrate the effect of different topographic constraints and contact possibilities on the linguistic variation (Anon 20XX; Anon, 20XX).
CSF AWARD CEREMONY

Established in 2009 in coincidence with the 20th anniversary of activity of the Congressi Stefano Franscini, the CSF award, corresponding to the sum of CHF 500, is assigned in each of the international CSF conferences for the best presentation given at the conference by a young scientist.
Hands-on workshop on Boundaries in Empirical (Linguistic) Data

The workshop consists of three individual sessions, conceived and hosted by the URPP members Curdin Derungs (University of Zurich), a GIScientist currently leading the GISLab, Wolfgang Kesselheim (University of Zurich), a conversation analyst and leader of the VideoLab, and Tanja Samardžić (University of Zurich), a computational linguist leading the CorpusLab. The general idea is to present case studies, including associated data, and to provide simple tools that allow hands-on discussions of boundaries in linguistics. Participants can register for one of the three case studies (appr. 15 participants per group):

Case study 1:
Boundaries in Interactional Space (VideoLab)

In the VideoLab’s part of our workshop, participants learn to analyse how people construct spatial units and their boundaries in interaction.

In a short input, participants will be introduced to relevant work from Sociology (Goffman), Psychology (Kendon’s Context analysis) and multimodal Conversation analysis (work on interactional space and interactional architecture). Working in small groups we will analyse video extracts from authentic interactions in an institutional context.

Our objective is to describe the dynamic ways how people make use of both embodied communicative resources (talk, gesture, body posture and movement, etc.) and of elements of the built environment in order to jointly construct spatial boundaries within the interaction situation, and to reflect on the dynamic nature of the boundaries which result from this interactive process.
Case study 2:  
Spatial Boundaries in Areal Linguistics (GISLab)

In the GISLab’s session we will discuss and apply different spatial statistical approaches for modelling linguistic boundaries and areas. Languages and dialects often show complex - and interesting - spatial variation. Linguistic boundaries and isoglosses are an intuitive way for conceptualizing continuous spatial variation as distinct entities. However, implementing algorithms for modelling linguistic boundaries is considerably complex and often no ground-truth information - other than linguistic intuition - is available. In this session we will tackle this challenge by discussing the particularity of different linguistic data sources - e.g. traditional dialectological data vs. more recent crowd sourced data - and a series of spatial statistical algorithms - such as clustering and interpolation. The discussion is followed by a hands-on exercise where different state of the art algorithms can be explored and tested for their applicability.
Case study 3: Spatial spread of linguistic features extracted from Twitter (CorpusLab)

The social network Twitter is potentially a rich source of linguistic data explicitly (GPS coordinates) or implicitly (place names) associated with spatial information. The network allows access to the content produced by their users through an API (application program interface), which made it an important source of data for studying various aspects of verbal interaction. In this workshop, the participants will be guided through the procedure of collecting and analysing Twitter data by means of a newly developed tool intended especially for linguistic research (GeoTweet). We will extract example features using pre-defined Python functions encoded in the tool and trace feature distribution in space by setting the parameters of the tool’s spatial analysis component implemented in R. We will look for plausible feature boundaries.

The three sessions share the same umbrella questions:

1. What information is used to create spatial entities?
2. What types of boundaries result from the analysis?

Findings from the three case study groups will be discussed in a common concluding session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Wolfgang Kesselheim</th>
<th>Curdin Derungs</th>
<th>Tanja Samardžić</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00–12:00</td>
<td>1: Boundaries in</td>
<td>2: Spatial</td>
<td>3: Spatial spread of linguistic features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactional Space</td>
<td>Boundaries in</td>
<td>extracted from Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Areal Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00–13:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00–14:00</td>
<td>Presentations (20 min per group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b Excursion: from Maggia to Aurigeno

A bus will pick us up at Hotel Monte Verità in the morning and take us to Maggia. The guided hike will start in Maggia, where we will have a look at the old village center and the beautiful Casa Martinelli. From there, we will cross a bridge above the Maggia river and continue our hike until we arrive in Moghegno. We will then walk to Aurigeno along stony trails to see the parish church with its impressive fresco cycle. In Aurigeno, we will have our packed lunch before we drive back to Ascona by bus.

The guided hike will take 2–3 hours, and it will comprise a short input talk on historical Dialectology.

Moghegno (photo: Adrian Michael, Wikimedia Commons)