

## Polysemous Qualities and Universal Networks

The topic of this talk is a reflection about the conceptual organization of qualities involved in polysemous associations and about their universal nature. This analysis follows on from a study carried out by a Franco-German working group on polysemous qualities as expressed in twenty-two African languages. In this frame, I proposed a model of the semantic networks built by the polysemous qualities following the method of semantic maps (Haspelmath, 2003).

The results showed that what is common between each particular network of a specific African language is not exactly the high number of recurring cross-linguistic polysemous associations but rather several semantic networks made up by qualities involved in recurring polysemous associations (see the annex). Such networks seem to be shared by each individual as an idealized cognitive model. That is why I called them “universal networks” - if we consider that the term “universal” does not refer to a systematic rule but a tendency (high or not).

The aim of this presentation so is to go deeper into the above-described results by the way of a confrontation with a sample of Indo-European languages in order to further justify the existence of these universal networks.

The study is based on a cognitive approach as developed by linguists and psycholinguists (Lakoff, 1987; Langacker, 1993; Lazard, 1992; Koch, 2004) as well as philosophers and psychologists (Proust, 1997; Searle, 1985). It will be shown how it is possible to observe cognitive correspondences between (a) the different universal networks, (b) some particular semantic domains - e.g. acrid taste, important dimension, small dimension, strong resistance, weak resistance... - which characterize these networks and (c) some linguistic and cognitive processes involved in the construction of meaning, i.e. inferential processes which are relative to symbolism, iconicity, pragmatism or conceptualization, on a larger cross-linguistic study.

**BLANK Andreas**, 2000. « Pour une approche cognitive du changement sémantique lexical : aspect sémasiologique », In *Mémoires de la société linguistique de Paris*, Tome IX, Peeters : Paris, p. 59-74

**FUCHS Catherine**, 1999. “Diversity in linguistic representations: a challenge for cognitive science”, in C. FUCHS & S. ROBERT (eds), *Language diversity and cognitive representations*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp. 3-19

**HASPELMATH Martin**, 2003. « The geometry of grammatical meaning : semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison”. In TOMASELLO Michael (ed.), *The new psychology of language*, vol. 2, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 211-242

**KOCH Peter**, 2000. « Pour une approche cognitive du changement sémantique lexical : Aspect onomasiologique ». In *Mémoires de la société linguistique de Paris*, Tome IX, Peeters : Paris.

**KOCH Peter**, 2004. “Diachronic onomasiology and semantic reconstruction”. In Wiltrud Mihatsch/Reinhild Steinberg (éds.), *Lexical Data and Universals of Semantic Change*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 79-106.

**LAKOFF George**, 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things*. The University of Chicago Press : Chicago.

**LANGACKER, Ronald W.**, 1990 *Concept, image and symbol : the cognitive basis of grammar*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

**LANGACKER Ronald W.**, 1993. « Reference-point constructions ». *Cognitive linguistics* 4-1, pp. 1-38.

**LAZARD Gilbert**, 1992. « Y a-t-il des catégories interlangagières ? », in S. Anschutz (ed), *Texte, Sätze, Wörter und Moneme*, Festschrift K. Heger, Heidelberg, Heidelberg Orientverlag : 427-434.

**PROUST Joëlle** (dir.), 1997. « Présentation ». In *Perception et intermodalité, approches actuelles de la question de Molyneux*, Paris, P.U.F., pp. 1-18

**SEARLE John**, 1985, *Du cerveau au savoir*. Conférences Reith 1984 de la BBC. Hermann, Paris

