

Please cite as:

Bohnemeyer, Jürgen, Niclas Burenhult, Stephen C. Levinson & N.J. Enfield. 2003. Landscape terms and place names questionnaire. In N.J. Enfield (ed.), *Field Research Manual 2003*, part I: multimodal interaction, Space, event representation, 60-63. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. doi:10.17617/2.877604.

You can find this entry on:

<http://fieldmanuals.mpi.nl/volumes/2003-1/landscape-terms-and-place-names-questionnaire/>

REGULATIONS ON USE**Stephen C. Levinson and Asifa Majid**

This website and the materials herewith supplied have been developed by members of the Language and Cognition Department of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (formerly the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group). In a number of cases materials were designed in collaboration with staff from other MPI departments.

Proper attribution

Any use of the materials should be acknowledged in publications, presentations and other public materials. Entries have been developed by different individuals. Please cite authors as indicated on the webpage and front page of the pdf entry. Use of associated stimuli should also be cited by acknowledging the field manual entry. Intellectual property rights are hereby asserted.

No redistribution

We urge you not to redistribute these files yourself; instead point people to the appropriate page on the Field Manual archives site. This is important for the continuing presence of the website. We will be updating materials, correcting errors and adding information over time. The most recent versions of materials can always be found on our website.

Be in touch

The materials are being released in the spirit of intellectual co-operation. In some cases the authors of entries have not had the chance to publish results yet. It is expected that users will share results garnered from use of these materials in free intellectual exchange before publication. You are encouraged to get in touch with us if you are going to use these materials for collecting data. These manuals were originally intended as working documents for internal use only. They were supplemented by verbal instructions and additional guidelines in many cases.

The contents of manuals, entries therein and field-kit materials are modified from time to time, and this provides an additional motivation for keeping close contact with the Language and Cognition Department. We would welcome suggestions for changes and additions, and comments on the viability of different materials and techniques in various field situations.

Contact

Email us via <http://fieldmanuals.mpi.nl/contact/>

Language and Cognition Department

Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics

Postbox310, 6500AH, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Landscape terms and place names questionnaire

Jürgen Bohnemeyer, Niclas Burenhult, Stephen Levinson, Nick Enfield

(Note: this is a revised version of the ‘Toponyms’ questionnaire, MPI Field Manual 2001.)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Nature of the task: Checklist/elicitation guide. The idea is to make sure you have a comprehensive answer to each of the questions in the questionnaire. It is divided into two subsections, one dealing with landscape terms (2.0) and the other with place names (3.0). Although these pertain to two different kinds of phenomena, note that we are interested in the relationship between the two. The questionnaire does not detail a general methodology for obtaining answers.

The questions in the place names section (3.0) have been largely extracted from the *Toponym Questionnaire* of the 2001 field manual. We refer to that questionnaire for the full background, motivation and examples relating to these questions.

How to run: You are likely to have answers to several of the questions in your existing database. For further probing, classical elicitation/interviewing (*in situ* or from photos) is recommended (three consultants). Further suggestions as to elicitation techniques (e.g. director-matcher tasks) are given in the questionnaire. If you are unable to run the whole questionnaire, detailed information on any subset of questions would still be of great interest.

Coding & recording: The intended result that we are hoping to obtain from each researcher has the format of a concise descriptive report based on the points given in the questionnaire. Comprehensive lists of the landscape terms and place names that your analysis is based on should be included. If you elicit answers, you may directly transcribe the response, but recording of elicitation on video is preferable.

Conclusions: If you have run the questionnaire, please let us know. The output will be compared and discussed in the Space Project.

Citation: Publications should cite: “Landscape terms and place names questionnaire, designed by Bohnemeyer, Burenhult, Levinson, and Enfield, Field manual 2003, Language and Cognition Group, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics”. Please let us know of any research project undertaken using this questionnaire.

2.0 LANDSCAPE TERMS

Landscape terms reflect the relationship between geographic reality and human cognition. Smith and Mark (2001, 2003) explore universals in the ontology underlying landscape terms. Are ‘mountains’, ‘rivers’, ‘lakes’ and the like universally recognized in languages as naturally salient objects to be named? Smith and Mark have conducted cross-linguistic elicitation in European languages which suggested strong universal conceptualizations of landscape features. However, recent work by Mark and Turk (ms) on landscape categorisation in Yindjibarndi (northwestern Australia) points to considerable cross-cultural variation. Other questions of interest to cognitive geographers are whether geographical entities have well-defined boundaries, and how entities are subcategorised. The following points are designed to help you elicit basic information about these issues in your research language. Elicitation can take the form of interviewing, preferably during ‘fieldwalking’. In order to spur spontaneous discourse about landscape categories in a controlled setting, you may also want to try a director-matcher game with photos of various features of local geography.

(a) Local geography:

- Try to get an idea of the features of the local geography of your fieldsite and consider suitable scientific terminology to describe them. A useful geographical dictionary is available online at The Geography Portal: <http://www.kesgrave.suffolk.sch.uk/Curric/geog/diction.html>

(b) Basic landscape categories:

- Which are the basic landscape terms in the language? You are likely to have documented much of this vocabulary already, but try to expand it and make it as exhaustive as possible.
- What do these landscape terms really denote? Try to define the meaning of terms in as much detail as possible. Can speakers elaborate on the extent/delimitation of entities denoted by landscape terms? Be careful to probe if size, shape, colour or any other characteristics of landscape entities are encoded in categories. Ask consultants to describe and delimit geographical features *in situ* and/or from photos. It may be a good idea to ask several consultants to define/delimit the same individual landscape feature (e.g. a particular mountain), and also to compare different individuals of a particular feature.
- Semantic specifications are often *anthropocentric*. Since linguistic meanings reflect people's ways of thinking and speaking, it is no surprise that meanings of landscape terms may refer not only to inherent physical features of referents, but also to distinctions in how people can and/or typically do interact with those referents. The physical characteristics of landscape features determine their *affordances* for humans, and these affordances are likely candidates for semantic encoding in expressions referring to these features. Consider types of water feature (*lake, pond, stream, creek*). Some may afford boating, swimming, particular methods of fishing, while others may not. Some types of sloped land may afford certain methods of agriculture and not other methods. Consider different forest types. Some may afford unhindered passage on foot, while others may not. Some may yield certain types of forest food (mushrooms, grubs, roots), while others afford different types. Some landscape features may be defined by their distance from a person when visible (e.g. a *mountain* can be seen from more than a day's walk away, while perhaps a *hill* cannot). When thinking about the semantics of landscape terms, try to think not just about the inherent properties of the landscape features, but also about what these features mean for the ways in which people interact with, talk about, and conceive of them.

(c) Subcategorisation:

- Do basic landscape categories display subcategorisation? Describe the referential details of any such subcategories. Is it possible to distinguish several levels of categorisation?
- What is the role of metaphor in subcategorisation? From which domains are metaphors drawn (human body, kinship etc)?

3.0 PLACE NAMES

Place names are at the intersection of spatial language, culture, and cognition. They provide a way to refer to space by naming the places referred to, rather than the objects or people that occur at the places. Presumably, places referred to by toponyms are places that play a marked role in the life of the language community. Thus the toponyms of a language community embody a knowledge structure that figures prominently in the spatial conceptualization of the community's environment. At the same time, the way reference to places is distinguished from reference to objects, animals, or people *at* places is an important piece in the puzzle of the 'natural language metaphysics' that underlies spatial reference and conceptualization in the language under study. There are three overarching questions: how to formally identify place names in the research language (i.e. according to structural criteria); what places place names are employed to refer to (e.g. human settlements, landscape sites), and how places are semantically construed for this purpose. The answers to the questionnaire should determine the basic formal and semantic properties of place names and thus lay the ground work for further research on discourse about places. Finally, the relation between place names and landscape terms needs to be investigated since this relation may not be simple. For example, there is evidence that in some languages the referents of place names are entirely different from those of landscape terms. (For more background, motivation and examples, see *Toponym Questionnaire* in the 2001 field manual.)

The task involves the compilation of an inventory of place names and a linguistic analysis of them according to the points set out in (a)-(c), below. Try to obtain information from several native speakers. Also, try to document the broader cultural significance of places denoted by place names by recording stories associated with them. Finally, if possible, document sites photographically.

(a) The structural characteristics of place names:

- Phonological aspects: do place names behave like other classes with respect to phonological characteristics or are they aberrant in some way (possibly reflecting conservatism, substrate influence, borrowing, etc.)?
- Morphological aspects: do place names have morphological properties that allow them to be identified as a form class? And are there affixes or morphological processes that occur only in/with place names? Are place names simple terms or binomials or both?
- Syntactic aspects: What is the maximal projection of place names? Determiner phrases, noun phrases, or other? Does this differ across subclasses of place names? If so, what is the distribution? Do place names take attributes? Can they occur in the predication base or subject of non-locative predicates? Is there any difference in the range of topological or path relators (case markers, adpositions, relational nouns) that combine with place names as opposed to other nouns in the language?

(b) The semantics of place names:

- Lexical aspects: What kinds of entities have place names?
- Referential/denotational aspects: How is the place denoted by a place name defined in relation to the physical entity that occupies this place? Are they exactly coextensive? Do people have clear intuitions about this? Are boundaries between named places sharp or fuzzy? Are referents of place names entirely different from those of landscape terms? What is the density of place names?
- Is there any evidence of hierarchical organisation of place names (so that X is considered a subpart of Y, which in turn is seen as a subpart of Z)?

(c) Other issues:

- Etymology: What is the origin of place names? Do they show an internal structure that reveals a naming strategy? How transparent are they?
- Sociolinguistics: What is the distribution of indigenous and non-indigenous place names in sociolinguistic terms? How are recently founded settlements named? Do non-indigenous place names have the same formal and semantic properties as indigenous place names? Does it occur exceptionally/occasionally/frequently that the same place has different names in different languages? In case it does happen, do different place names referring to the same place have exactly the same reference? Are indigenous place names borrowed into contact languages? In case this does happen, do the borrowed place names always have exactly the same reference?

REFERENCES

- Basso, Keith H. 1984. 'Western Apache place name hierarchies'. In E. Tooker and H. Conklin (eds.) *Naming systems*. Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society 4: 78-94.
- Bohnemeyer, Jürgen. 2001. 'Toponym questionnaire'. In Nick Enfield and Stephen Levinson (eds.) *Manual for the field season 2001*, 55-61. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.
- Burenhult, Niclas. Ms. *Landscape terminology and toponyms in Jahai: a preliminary field report*.
- Descola, Philippe. 1994. *In the society of nature: a native ecology in Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hercus, Luise and Jane Simpson. 2002. 'Indigenous placenames: an introduction'. In Hercus, Luise, Flavia Hodges and Jane Simpson (eds.) *The land is a map: placenames of indigenous origin in Australia*, 1-23. Canberra: Pandanus Books.
- Hercus, Luise, Flavia Hodges and Jane Simpson (eds.). 2002. *The land is a map: placenames of indigenous origin in Australia*. Canberra: Pandanus Books.
- Hunn, Eugene. 1996. 'Columbia Plateau Indian place names: what can they teach us?'. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6(1):3-26.
- Kari, J. 1989. 'Some principles of Alaskan Athabaskan toponymic knowledge'. In M.R. Key and H. Hoenigswald (eds.) *General and Amerindian ethnolinguistics*, 129-50. Berlin: Mouton.
- Levinson, Stephen. 2002. 'Landscape terms and place names in Yéli Dnye, the language of Rossel island, PNG'. In Sotaro Kita (ed.) *2002 supplement (version 2) for the 'Manual' for the field season 2001*, 7-12. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.
- Mark, David M. and Andrew Turk. Ms. *Landscape categories in Yindjibarndi: ontology, environment, and language*.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1984. 'Principles of naming in Mohawk'. In E. Tooker and H. Conklin (eds.) *Naming systems*. Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society 4: 40-53.
- Smith, Barry and David M. Mark. 2001. 'Geographic categories: an ontological investigation'. *International Journal of Geographic Information Science* 15 (7): 591-612.
- Smith, Barry and David M. Mark. 2003 (in press). 'Do mountains exist? Towards an ontology of landforms'. *Environment & Planning B*.
- Wilkins, David P. 2002. 'The concept of place among the Arrernte'. In Hercus, Luise, Flavia Hodges and Jane Simpson (eds.) *The land is a map: placenames of indigenous origin in Australia*, 25-41. Canberra: Pandanus Books.