Synopsis: This course offers an introduction into the semantic typology of spatial representations. Semantic typology is the crosslinguistic study of semantic categorization. Recent research has uncovered an astonishing amount of variation in how natural languages represent space. The domain of spatial representations in language encompasses a wide variety of properties and states of affairs, including spatial deixis, dimensionality and shape, disposition (including posture), orientation and directionality, topological and projective spatial relations, locative predication, and motion descriptions.

We will begin with a survey of the entire domain, briefly discussing landmark studies and noting open questions and unsolved problems. This will be followed by an in-depth look at recent advances in quantitatively modeling the interaction of language, culture, and the environment in shaping spatial reference in discourse and nonverbal cognition. A specific property of spatial representations - the use of reference frames in defining projective spatial relations - has been emerging as an unparalleled testing ground for studying the role of culture in cognition.

Goals:

- Participants will be provided with an overview of the field of semantic typology, with special emphasis on the typology of spatial semantics and on the most recent developments in this field.
- Successful completion of the course should enable students to design and carry out their own research projects in this field.

Time and place: Mo/Th 9-10:50am in JSB 203

Office hours: We 11-12:50 in the Starbucks lounge on the 1st floor of the William T. Young library. Participants are also encouraged to email the instructor with questions and comments (jb77@buffalo.edu)!

Outline and readings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Reading (listings b/w square brackets refer to optional advanced readings; “a/b” means read at least one of {a,b})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>Introduction: Spatial representations in language and cognition; semantic typology</td>
<td>Moore et al 2015; Bohnemeyer &amp; Wilkins ms. Ch8 pp1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>Deixis</td>
<td>Bohnemeyer 2015; Bohnemeyer 2012a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/20</td>
<td>Reference frames in language and cognition</td>
<td>Bohnemeyer &amp; O’Meara (2012)/Bohnemeyer (2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>The Levinson-Li debate</td>
<td>Bohnemeyer (ms.)/Bohnemeyer et al (under review); [Li et al 2002; Levinson et al 2002]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>Beyond Whorf: the “sociophonetics” of the mind</td>
<td>Bohnemeyer et al (2015); [Palmer 2015]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References:


**Course work:**

- A reading assignment package will be posted on Canvas ahead of each class. Every package will be accompanied by a few questions. Short written answers (of approximately half a page) will be collected in the beginning of the class for which the package is assigned. Answers can also be submitted through Canvas. **These answers count toward the student’s participation grade.**
- In-class participation. I grade participation as follows: Regular active participation – A; regular attendance and occasional active participation – B; regular attendance, no active participation – C; irregular attendance, no active
participation: D; poor attendance, no active participation: F. **Attendance will be taken at the beginning of every lecture.** Attendance counts as irregular if the student missed more than one lecture unexcused and as poor if more than three lectures were missed unexcused. **Active participation can be achieved both in-class and through answers to the reading questions.**

- For full credit, students complete a final project, on which the class works during the entire course. This project involves the collection and analysis of data from a speaker of a language other than the student’s first language. Students are welcome to design their own projects, but may also adopt one of a set of existing tools that will be made available to them. **A 5-to-10-page write up of the results is due on August 9.**

**Grading:** Students will be given a grade (A, B, C, D, F(ail)) or P/F at the end of the course for the work they have done, based upon their grading preference (determine this on the first day of class, or in a Canvas questionnaire). **The grade will reflect their participation (which can be boosted through submitting answers to questions on the reading assignments) and the final project at 50% each.** Per the organizers, students will NOT be able to receive a grade of Incomplete for Institute courses. Grades MUST be submitted by August 14, 2017, via Canvas (cf. https://lsa2017.uky.edu/guidelines-instructors).

**Auditing:** Auditors are permitted to attend class based on seating availability in the classroom (preference must of course be given to registered students). The role of an auditing student will be set to "Observer" in the People section of the Canvas shell.

**Appendix A: LSA Ethics Statement**

Sexual Harassment

The Linguistic Society of America is committed to providing its members with an environment that is free from sexual harassment in any form. To that end, it is the policy of the LSA that no LSA member, interviewer, publisher representative, or participant in any LSA-sponsored event, may engage in sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment consists of unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

- submission to such conduct is explicitly or implicitly made a term or condition of a person’s favorable interview report;
- submission to or rejection of such conduct by a person is used as the basis for making favorable or unfavorable decisions affecting the person; or
- such conduct has the purpose of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.
Sexual harassment can occur between individuals of the same or opposite sex. In addition to the behavior described above, sexual harassment may include, but is not limited to:

- lewd comments about an individual’s sex, sexuality, sexual characteristics, or sexual behavior;
- offensive sexually-oriented jokes or innuendos;
- sexually suggestive comments or obscene gestures;
- leering, pinching, or touching of a sexual nature.

Appendix B: LSA ethics statement

Linguistic Society of America
Ethics Statement
May 2009

This document is intended to serve as a basic ethical framework for linguists of all subdisciplines. We hope that linguists will find it a useful resource for indicating to local review bodies, funding agencies, potential research consultants, and others that they are professionally committed to carrying out their work in an ethical manner. The document is intentionally written too be highly general; the point is not to provide the sole or final voice on what counts as ethical practice, but to provide linguists with some guidance for making ethical choices. Overlap between this document and other principles and regulations is therefore inevitable. Redundancy—and even conflict—with other principles is welcome to the extent that it serves the broader aims of encouraging linguists to actively engage with the ethical issues that arise in the course of their professional activities and of fostering increased discussion of ethics within the discipline.

Linguistic Society of America
Ethics Statement
May 2009

1. Introduction.
Linguists work in a variety of settings and approach the study of language from multiple disciplinary perspectives. Each setting presents its own set of potential ethical dilemmas. It is the responsibility of linguists individually and collectively to anticipate ethical dilemmas and to avoid bringing harm to those with whom they work.

Some kinds of linguistic research fall under the purview of formal human subjects regulations. This document is not meant to replace formal ethics oversight; nor is it
meant to provide an exhaustive code of conduct. Rather, it is meant to provide linguists working in all subdisciplines with a very general framework for making ethical choices.

2. Responsibility to individual research participants.
Research participants share their knowledge and often aspects of their lives with researchers. Even when a project focuses exclusively on the language and does not require institutional ethics review, linguists should recognize the collegial status of language consultants and respect their rights and wishes. Linguists should do everything in their power to ensure that their research poses no threat to the wellbeing of research participants.

- Research participants have the right to control whether their actions are recorded in such a way that they can be connected with their personal identity. They also have the right to control who will have access to the resulting data, with full knowledge of the potential consequences.

- Linguists are responsible for obtaining the informed consent of those who provide them with data (regardless of whether and how that consent is documented), for maintaining any expected confidentiality in storing data and reporting findings, and for ensuring that any individual’s participation in their research is completely voluntary at every stage. Anonymous observations of public behavior, which often cannot involve consent, should include no information that could inadvertently identify individuals or, where sensitive, the community.

- Linguists should carefully consider whether compensation of some kind is appropriate, be it remuneration for time and effort, or use of their knowledge and expertise to benefit participants or their communities.

- Where feasible, linguists should facilitate participants’ access to their research results.

3. Responsibility to communities.
While acknowledging that what constitutes the relevant community is a complex issue, we urge linguists to consider how their research affects not only individual research participants, but also the wider community. In general, linguists should strive to determine what will be constructive for all those involved in a research encounter, taking into account the community’s cultural norms and values.

Ideal frameworks for interaction with outside researchers vary depending on a community’s particular culture and history. In many communities, responsibility for linguistic and cultural knowledge is viewed as corporate, so that individual community members are not in a position to consent to share materials with outsiders, and linguists must try to determine whether there are individuals who can legitimately represent the community in working out the terms of research.
Some communities regard language, oral literature, and other forms of cultural knowledge as valuable intellectual property whose ownership should be respected by outsiders; in such cases linguists should comply with community wishes regarding access, archiving, and distribution of results. Other communities are eager to share their knowledge in the context of a long-term relationship of reciprocity and exchange. In all cases where the community has an investment in language research, the aims of an investigation should be clearly discussed with the community and community involvement sought from the earliest stages of project planning.

4. Responsibility to students and colleagues.
Linguists should model and promote ethical behavior in all their professional activities. They should strive to minimize harm to students, colleagues, and others over whom they hold power.

- Linguists should recognize and properly attribute the contributions of students and colleagues to their research. They should compensate students fairly for their assistance.

- Linguists should strive to evaluate student work in a fair and timely manner.

- Gender, marital status, race, ethnic background, social class, political beliefs, disability, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, age, and other such distinctions should not be used as a basis for discrimination.

- Intimate relations between instructors and students may lead to exploitation and conflicts of interest. Instructors and students should avoid such involvement when an instructor is in any way responsible for a student’s success.

- Linguists should ensure that their students receive instruction in the ethical practices appropriate for their field.

5. Responsibility to scholarship.
Linguists are collectively responsible for the reputation and progress of the discipline and should endeavor to maintain a high degree of professionalism in all aspects of their work.

- Linguists are subject to the standards of conduct found in other disciplines.

- They should practice honesty (e.g., by not plagiarizing or fabricating data) and carefully cite the original sources of ideas, descriptions, and data.

- Linguists conducting field research should do all they can to preserve opportunities for researchers who may follow them in the future.
• Linguists should make all reasonable efforts to preserve their original irreplaceable data and documentary materials.

• Linguists should strive to follow through on promises made in funded grant proposals and should acknowledge the support of sponsors.

6. Responsibility to the public.
Linguists have a responsibility to consider the social and political implications of their research.

• Linguists should make the results of their research available to the general public, and should endeavor to make the empirical bases and limitations of their research comprehensible to nonprofessionals.

• Linguists should give consideration to likely misinterpretations of their research findings, anticipate the damage they may cause, and make all reasonable effort to prevent this.
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