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Visualiser les émotions dans l’Égypte ancienne : images et textes
Goal of the talk

- To showcase (visual) methods
  - for identifying universal structures in emotion semantics
  - for unveiling language/culture specific patterns of expression

- To demonstrate that typological approaches may lead to new insights for Egyptian philology
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Languages and emotions – Linguistics

- Emotions
  - Important element of human existence
  - People feel emotions
  - People express emotions
  - People speak of emotions (Athanasiadou & Tabakowska 1998)

- Already in 1999:
  - “Feelings are now at the forefront of interdisciplinary investigations, spanning the humanities, social sciences, and biological sciences” (Wierzbicka 1999: 1)
Languages and emotions – Linguistics

Words and emotions

1. *Expressive vs. descriptive* emotion words
   - ‘wow’ vs. ‘joy’

2. Basic vs. non basic
   - ‘anger’ vs. ‘annoyance’

3. Words and expressions denote *various aspects of emotion concepts*, such as intensity, cause, control, etc.
   - They can be metaphorical and metonymical
     - *Boiling with anger* → ANGER IS HOT FLUID
     - *Have cold feet* → DROP IN BODY TEMPERATURE STANDS FOR FEAR
   - Metaphors and metonymies play a significant role in the way we conceive of the emotions (see Kövecses 1990, among many others)
In the Swadesh 200-word list, only one concept: FEAR (Swadesh 1952: 456-457)

- cf. Kövecses’ (1990) basic-level emotion concepts
  (see also Athanasiadou & Tabakowska 1998):
  - FEAR
  - ANGER
  - PRIDE
  - RESPECT

Wierzbicka (1999):
- FEAR-like
- ANGER-like
- SHAME-like

Ekman (1992; 1993) — *Psychology*
- FEAR, ANGER, SADNESS, DISGUST, SURPRISE, JOY
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- The issue of translatability
  - Some languages lack exact lexical equivalents for such emotions as JOY, DISGUST, FEAR, SURPRISE, SADNESS
    - Yankunytjatjara has no near-equivalent to DISGUST
    - Tahitian has no near equivalent to SADNESS (Goddard 2001)

- Some languages have more than one near-equivalent for an emotion
  - German ‘Angst’ and ‘Furcht’ for FEAR
  - Malay ‘terkejut’ and ‘terperanjat’ for SURPRISE (Goddard 2001)

- Untranslatability (culture-specific emotion words)
  - Russian ‘tosca’ [anxiety, sadness, boredom]
  - Japanese ‘amae’ [a pleasurable sense of dependence]
  - German ‘Schadenfreude’ [the feeling of rejoicing at somebody else’s misfortunes]

(for overviews, see Fontaine et al. 2013, Ogarkova 2013)
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**Note:** “what language X expresses simply is also expressible in language Y but at the price of some complexity”

(von Fintel & Matthewson 2008: 144)

*English*

‘anger’

*Russian*

‘serdit’sja’ [To be experiencing anger, to be actively cross, mad at someone]

‘zlit’sya’ [To be angry, mad, but not necessarily at a particular person]

(Pavlenko 2008)
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- Universal vs. culture specific

Conceptualizations based on real facts

vs.

Conceptualizations based on people’s ideas about the world

- Conceptualization of emotions “is governed by ecological, environmental, culture-specific and universal factors” (Athanasiadou & Tabakowska 1998)
Jackson et al. *to appear*. “Variation and Structure in Emotion Semantics Across a Global Sample of Languages”

- Emotion concepts vary in meaning across cultures, but not without limit

- Geographically closer languages co-express emotion concepts in more similar ways than geographically distant languages
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Das Herz in der ägyptischen Literatur des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.

Untersuchungen zu Idiomatik und Metaphorik von Ausdrücken mit ḫb und ḫḥḫ

Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrads an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

vorgelegt von

María Isabel Toro Rueda
aus Madrid (Spanien)
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- Onomasiological approaches to specific emotions
- Writing and emotions
- Cognitive linguistics and metaphor theory

Das Herz in der ägyptischen Literatur des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.

Untersuchungen zu Idiomatik und Metaphorik von Ausdrücken mit ja und hitj

Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrads an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen vorgelegt von

María Isabel Toro Rueda aus Madrid (Spanien)

M. Salah EL-KHOLI
2003

Das Herz in der Bedeutung „Verstand“ und „Gefühl“
Languages and emotions – Ancient Egyptian

„Du Pharao – ich Hulk“
Wahrnehmung und Versprachlichung von Wut
2012
Ines Köhler (FU Berlin)
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„Du Pharao – ich Hulk“
Wahrnehmung und Versprachlichung von Wut
2012
Ines Köhler (FU Berlin)

Cf. emotion vs. feeling (Scherer 2013)
Chapter 12. Affecting the Gods – Fear in Ancient Egyptian religious texts

Sven Eicke | University of Cologne

This chapter presents an analysis of the concept of fear and the usage of linguistic expressions referring to this emotion in selected Ancient Egyptian religious texts. By using approaches from Cognitive Linguistics and Psycholinguistics, a deeper insight into the ancient sources is gained. Furthermore, some considerations about the relationship between fear and public space, as well as about the meaning of individuality and identity, will be made within the selected corpora.

Anger and Agency

The role of the emotions in Demotic and earlier narratives

John Tait

2009
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„Du Pharao – ich Hulk“
Wahrnehmung und Versprachlichung von Wut
2012
Ines Köhler (FU Berlin)

Ende mit Schrecken oder Schrecken ohne Ende?
Zur Verwendung sprachlicher Ausdrücke für Furcht im Totenbuch
2015
Sven Eicke (Köln)

Chapter 12. Affecting the Gods – Fear in Ancient Egyptian religious texts
Sven Eicke | University of Cologne

This chapter presents an analysis of the concept of fear and the usage of linguistic expressions referring to this emotion in selected Ancient Egyptian religious texts. By using approaches from Cognitive Linguistics and Psycholinguistics, a deeper insight into the ancient sources is gained. Furthermore, some considerations about the relationship between fear and public space, as well as about the meaning of individuality and identity, will be made within the selected corpora.

Chapter published in:
Consensus and Dissent: Negotiating Emotion in the Public Space
Edited by Anne Storchi
(Culture and Language Use 19) 2017
p. 239–246

Anger and Agency
The role of the emotions in Demotic and earlier narratives

John Tait
2009

La joie pour identité
Les modalités d’emploi des termes liés à la joie dans l’anthroponymie égyptienne

2016
Cédric Gobeil"
Écriture des émotions en égyptien

Nathalie BEAUX
Collège de France et Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire (IFAO)
nathbeauxgrimal@aol.com

« L’étude du champ lexical et des écritures de quatre émotions, joie, tristesse, peur et colère, permettent d’affirmer que la culture égyptienne était fondée sur la joie, émotion dont le lexique est très largement supérieur à celui des autres émotions. »

Joy
Sadness
Fear
Anger
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Écriture des émotions en égyptien 2017

Nathalie BEAUX
Collège de France et Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire (IFAO)
nathbeauxgrimal@aol.com


Joy

Sadness

Fear

Anger
Languages and emotions – Ancient Egyptian

„Ich habe seinen Anblick geschmeckt …“
Verben der Wahrnehmung
und die semantischen Beziehungen zwischen Perzeption und Kognition
2015
Elisabeth Steinbach (HU Berlin)

TASTING IS FEELING EMOTIONS

You will not feel the fear of another (foreign) land’ (St. Louvre C26)

LingAeg 25 (2017), 373–390
Experiencing is Tasting
Perception Metaphors of Taste in Ancient Egyptian
Elisabeth Steinbach-Eicke

nn  dp-tn  snqt  n.t  ky  t2
NEG  taste:SBJV-2PL  fear-F  of  another  (foreign) land

‘You will not feel the fear of another (foreign) land’ (St. Louvre C26)
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The figurative network
Tracking the use of metaphorical language for “hot” and “cold” in Ramesside literary texts

- ANTAGONISM IS HEAT > EMOTION IS HEAT
- RESTRAINT IS COLD OR SILENCE

2018  By Camilla Di Biase-Dyson

‘The anger/agitation (lit. fire) rages in his belly’ (Amenemope, 13,7)
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Metaphors of sensory experience in Ancient Egyptian texts: Emotion, personality and social interaction.

Camilla Di Biase-Dyson and Gaëlle Chantrain

- Sight: colours, shades and luminosity
- Sound: noise vs. silence
- Taste: sweet vs. bitter
- Touch: hot vs. cold, texture and surfaces
- Smell

- Seriousness is heaviness (dns)
- Leniency is softness (gnn)
- Etc.
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- Onomasiological approaches to specific emotions
- Writing and emotions
- Cognitive linguistics and metaphor theory

No attempt at studying the Ancient Egyptian’s expressions of emotion in a typological perspective
Semantic maps
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- ‘A semantic map is a geometrical representation of functions (...) that are linked by connecting lines and thus constitute a network’ (Haspelmath 2003)
- A semantic map is a method for visually representing cross-linguistic regularity in semantic structure based on patterns of co-expression (Georgakopoulos & Polis 2018)

**FIGURE 1.** A semantic map of typical dative functions / the boundaries of English *to* (based on Haspelmath 2003: 213)
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### Semantic maps – How are they build?

Based on empirical linguistic data (patterns of co-expression)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>SMELL (PERCEIVE)</th>
<th>HEAR</th>
<th>LISTEN</th>
<th>FEEL</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>TASTE (SOMETHING)</th>
<th>UNDERSTAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thin55</td>
<td>Changsha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ak</td>
<td>Gurdjar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentire</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clywed</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nenglengay</td>
<td>Sanapaná</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lingaiyi</td>
<td>Lengua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dai3n@n6</td>
<td>Nung-Ninbei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klevet</td>
<td>Breton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hnov</td>
<td>White Hmong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eta</td>
<td>Kal'na</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indr</td>
<td>Moresada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theng5</td>
<td>Mulam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka31ngiet33</td>
<td>Bulang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zu21</td>
<td>Tujia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>White Hmong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eta</td>
<td>Kali'na</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indr</td>
<td>Moresada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theng5</td>
<td>Mulam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka31ngiet33</td>
<td>Bulang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zu21</td>
<td>Tujia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semantic maps – How are they build?

Based on empirical linguistic data (patterns of co-expression)

More cross-linguistic data ⇒ more constraints
Semantic maps – How do we collect data?

Database of Cross-Linguistic Colexifications

CLICS³ is an online database of colexifications (polysemy or homophony) in currently 3156 language varieties of the world.

The original Database of Cross-Linguistic Colexifications (CLICS), has established a computer-assisted framework for the interactive representation of cross-linguistic colexification patterns. It has proven to be a useful tool for various kinds of investigation into cross-linguistic semantic associations, ranging from studies on semantic change, patterns of conceptualization, and linguistic paleontology. But CLICS has also been criticized for obvious shortcomings. Building on standardization efforts reflected in the CLDF initiative and novel approaches for fast, efficient, and reliable data aggregation, CLICS² expanded the original CLICS database. CLICS³ - the third installment of CLICS - exploits the framework pioneered in CLICS² to more than double the amount of data aggregated in the database.

2919 concepts
Semantic maps – How do we collect data?

Database of Cross-Linguistic Colexifications

CLICS³ is an online database of colexifications (polysemies or homophones) in currently 3156 language varieties of the world.

The original Database of Cross-Linguistic Colexifications (CLICS), has established a computer-assisted framework for the interactive representation of cross-linguistic colexification patterns. It has proven to be a useful tool for various kinds of investigation into cross-linguistic semantic associations, ranging from studies on semantic change, patterns of conceptualization, and linguistic paleontology. But CLICS has also been criticized for obvious shortcomings. Building on standardization efforts reflected in the CLDF initiative and novel approaches for fast, efficient, and reliable data aggregation, CLICS² expanded the original CLICS database. CLICS³ - the third installment of CLICS - exploits the framework pioneered in CLICS² to more than double the amount of data aggregated in the database.

Cite
Rzymski, Christoph and Tresoldi, Tiago et al. 2019. The Database of Cross-Linguistic Colexifications, reproducible analysis of cross-linguistic polysemy. DOI: 10.17613/Sawv-6w15

2919 concepts
Semantic maps – How do we collect data?
“ideally (...) it should be possible to generate semantic maps automatically on the basis of a given set of data”
(Narrog & Ito 2007: 280)
Regier, Khetarpal, and Majid showed that the semantic map inference problem is “formally identical to another problem that superficially appears unrelated: inferring a social network from outbreaks of disease in a population” (Regier et al. 2013: 91)
• What’s the idea?
  • Consider a group of social agents (represented by the nodes of a potential graph)
Inferring semantic maps

• What’s the idea?
  • If one observes the same disease for five of these agents (technically called a constraint on the nodes of the graph)
• What’s the idea?
  • One can postulate that all the agents met, so that all the nodes of the graph are connected (10 edges between the 5 nodes)
What’s the idea?
  
  This is neither a very likely, nor a very economic explanation
• What’s the idea?
  • But this is precisely what a colexification network does
Inferring semantic maps

• What’s the idea?
  • The goal would be to find a more economical solution and to have all the social agents connected with as few edges as possible, but still accounting for all the observations
What’s the idea?

- The goal would be to find a more economical solution and to have all the social agents connected with as few edges as possible, but still accounting for all the observations.
Inferring semantic maps

• How does it transfer to semantic maps?
Inferring semantic maps

• How does it transfer to semantic maps?
  • Nodes are meanings
Inferring semantic maps

• How does it transfer to semantic maps?
  • Nodes are meanings
  • Constraints are patterns of co-expression (connectivity hypothesis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item A</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inferring semantic maps

- How does it transfer to semantic maps?
  - Nodes are meanings
  - Constraints are patterns of co-expression (connectivity hypothesis)
  - One connects the nodes economically based on these constraints (economy principle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item C</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inferring semantic maps

• How does it transfer to semantic maps?
  • Nodes are meanings
  • Constraints are patterns of co-expression (connectivity hypothesis)
  • One connects the nodes economically based on these constraints, starting with the edge(s) that accounts for the most frequent constraint(s)
Inferring semantic maps

• How does it transfer to semantic maps?
  • Nodes are meanings
  • Constraints are patterns of co-expression (connectivity hypothesis)
  • One connects the nodes economically based on these constraints, starting with the edge(s) that accounts for the most frequent constraint(s), and then going down the scale
Inferring semantic maps

• How does it transfer to semantic maps?
  • Nodes are meanings
  • Constraints are patterns of co-expression (connectivity hypothesis)
  • One connects the nodes economically based on these constraints, starting with the edge(s) that accounts for the most frequent constraint(s), and then going down the scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polysemic item C</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inferring semantic maps

- How does it transfer to semantic maps?
  - Nodes are meanings
  - Constraints are patterns of co-expression (connectivity hypothesis)
  - One connects the nodes economically based on these constraints, starting with the edge(s) that accounts for the most frequent constraint(s), and then going down the scale
Inferring semantic maps

INPUT (lexical matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Specific Known</th>
<th>Specific Unknown</th>
<th>Irreals Non-specific</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Indirect Negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>&quot;etwas&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>&quot;irgend&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>&quot;je&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>&quot;jeder&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>&quot;n&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>&quot;dan ook&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>&quot;enig&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>&quot;iets&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>&quot;niets&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>&quot;any&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>&quot;ever&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>&quot;some&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALGORITHM (python script)

```
# MAIN LOOP
objfn = CG(T)
while (objfn < 0):
    print("objective fn is currently", objfn,)
    max_score = 0
    # choose next edge greedily: the one that increases objfn the most
    for e in PassE:
        # temporarily add e to graph G
        G.add_edge(*e)
        score = CG(T) - objfn
        G.remove_edge(*e)
        if (score > max_score):
            max_score = score
            max_edge = e
```

RESULT (semantic map)
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Welcome to the Concepticon

This resource presents an attempt to link the large amount of different concept lists which are used in the linguistic literature, ranging from Swadesh lists in historical linguistics to naming tests in clinical studies and psycholinguistics.

A Resource for the Linking of Concept Lists

This resource, our Concepticon, links concept labels from different conceptlists to concept sets. Each concept set is given a unique identifier, a unique label, and a human-readable definition. Concept sets are further structured by defining different relations between the concepts, as you can see in the graphic to the right, which displays the relations between concept sets linked to the concept set SIBLING. The resource can be used for various purposes. Serving as a rich reference for new and existing databases in diachronic and synchronic linguistics, it allows researchers a quick access to studies on semantic change, cross-linguistic polysemies, and semantic associations.

If you want to learn more about the ideas behind our Concepticon, have a look at our about page or read List et al. 2018, presented at LREC.
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Which concepts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Semantic field</th>
<th>Ontological category</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CONTEMPTIBLE</td>
<td>Deserving of contempt or scorn.</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BRAVE</td>
<td>Having or characterized by courage.</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>DECEIT</td>
<td>The act or practice of deceiving.</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Person/Thing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>UNPLEASANT</td>
<td>Not to one’s liking.</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>KEEN</td>
<td>Full of or characterized by enthusiasm.</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENVY</td>
<td>A feeling of discontent or covetousness with regard to another’s advantages, success, possessions, etc.</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Person/Thing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>EVIL</td>
<td>Intending to harm or being/acting ethically wrong.</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>BAD LUCK</td>
<td>An undesirable event such as an accident.</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Person/Thing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>ANGER</td>
<td>Belligerence aroused by a real or supposed wrong (personified as one of the deadly sins).</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Person/Thing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>INSOLENT</td>
<td>Unrestrained by convention or propriety.</td>
<td>Emotions and values</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Which concepts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Action/process</th>
<th>Entity/thing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMAZING</td>
<td>BE ANGRY</td>
<td>ANGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGRY</td>
<td>BECOME ANGRY</td>
<td>ANXIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHAMED</td>
<td>CARP</td>
<td>BAD LUCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTONISHED</td>
<td>CHOOSE</td>
<td>BLAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>CRY</td>
<td>COWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td>DARE</td>
<td>CUNNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORING</td>
<td>DELIGHT</td>
<td>CUNNING PERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAVE</td>
<td>DESIRE</td>
<td>ENVY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVER</td>
<td>EMBRACE</td>
<td>FAULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEMPTIBLE</td>
<td>FEAR (BE AFRAID)</td>
<td>FAULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECT (RIGHT)</td>
<td>FEAR OR FRIGHTEN</td>
<td>FEAR (FRIGHT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>FORGET</td>
<td>FEEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunning</td>
<td>GRIEVE</td>
<td>FORGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear</td>
<td>GROAN</td>
<td>FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>GRIEVE</td>
<td>FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreadful</td>
<td>HATE</td>
<td>FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evil</td>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>INCLINATION</td>
<td>FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td>ANGER</td>
<td>FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>ANXIETY</td>
<td>GOOD LUCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloomy</td>
<td>BAD LUCK</td>
<td>GOOD LUCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>BE ANGRY</td>
<td>GOOD LUCK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43  30  25
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Which concepts?

Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amazing</th>
<th>Greedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Insolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful</td>
<td>Keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Kind or polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brave</td>
<td>Lovely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clever</td>
<td>Merry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemptible</td>
<td>Passionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct (right)</td>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>Rude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunning</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear</td>
<td>Shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>Sorrowful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreadful</td>
<td>Surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evil</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>Ugly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>Vulgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloomy</td>
<td>Vulgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Angry    | True    |
| Ashamed  | Ugly    |
| Bad      | Wrong   |
| Beautiful |        |
| Brave    |        |
| Clever   |        |
| Correct (right) | |
| Cunning  |        |
| Dear     |        |
| Diligent |        |
| Evil     |        |
| Faithful |        |
| Gentle   |        |
| Good     |        |
| Greedy   |        |
| Happy    |        |
| Honest   |        |
| Merry    |        |
| Proud    |        |
| SAD      |        |
| Shy      |        |
| Surprised |       |

25 (attested)

Clics² (https://clics.clld.org)
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Which concepts?

Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMAZING</th>
<th>GREEDY</th>
<th>ANGRY</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANGRY</td>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>ASHAMED</td>
<td>UGLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHAMED</td>
<td>HONEST</td>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>WRONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTONISHED</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>INSOLENT</td>
<td>BRAVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td>KEEN</td>
<td>CLEVER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORING</td>
<td>KIND OR POLITE</td>
<td>CORRECT (RIGHT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAVE</td>
<td>LOVELY</td>
<td>CORRECT (RIGHT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVER</td>
<td>MERRY</td>
<td>CUNNING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEMPTIBLE</td>
<td>PASSIONATE</td>
<td>DEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECT (RIGHT)</td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>DILIGENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUEL</td>
<td>RUDE</td>
<td>EVIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNNING</td>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>FAITHFUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAR</td>
<td>SHY</td>
<td>GENTLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILIGENT</td>
<td>SORROWFUL</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREADFUL</td>
<td>SURPRISED</td>
<td>GREEDY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVIL</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXACT</td>
<td>UGLY</td>
<td>HONEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAITHFUL</td>
<td>UNPLEASANT</td>
<td>MERRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENTLE</td>
<td>VULGAR</td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOOMY</td>
<td>WRONG</td>
<td>SAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td>SHY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SORPRISED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43

25 (attested)
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20 (colexified)
Clics² (https://clics.clld.org)
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Emotions (properties) in CLICS\(^2\) (colexifications in 1220 languages)

- ANGRY
- BAD
- BEAUTIFUL
- BRAVE
- CLEVER
- CORRECT (RIGHT)
- DEAR
- DILIGENT
- EVIL
- FAITHFUL
- GENTLE
- GOOD
- HAPPY
- MERRY
- PROUD
- SAD
- SURPRISED
- TRUE
- UGLY
- WRONG

\(\text{8415, 96\%}\)

Lexifications vs. colexifications

20 (colexified)

Clics\(^2\) (https://clics.clld.org)
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Emotions (properties) in CLICS$^2$ (colexifications in 1220 languages)

20 meanings
366 constraints
31 edges

Verbs

Angry
Bad
Beautiful
Brave
Clever
Correct (Right)
Dear
Diligent
Evil
Faithful
Gentle
Good
Happy
Merry
Proud
Sad
Surprised
True
Ugly
Wrong

20 (colexified)
Clics$^2$ (https://clics.clld.org)
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Emotions (properties) in CLICS² (colexifications in 1220 languages)
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Emotions (properties) in CLICS\(^2\) (colexifications in 1220 languages)
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Emotions (properties) in CLICS² (colexifications in 1220 languages)

Carapana (Tucanoan; Amazonia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ro</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>ró</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ro</td>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>ro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Not an actual colexification
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Emotions (properties) in CLICS$^2$ (colexifications in 1220 languages)

Semantic map based on colexification patterns attested in more than 1 language variety
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Emotions (thing) in CLICS$^2$ (colexifications in 1220 languages)
Towards a semantic map of emotion concepts

Emotions in the world languages

(63 nodes/151 edges > more than 2 languages > 47 nodes/66 edges)
Looking inside the blackbox: Egyptian in typological perspective

Egyptians never smile and have no hope
Egyptian in typological perspective

A semantic map of emotional processes

17 concepts
23 links

5 concepts are never colexified with other processes in the data set:
• Be angry
• Become angry
• Dare
• Fear (be afraid)
• Forgive
Egyptian in typological perspective

A semantic map of emotional processes

17 concepts
23 links

204 colexification patterns
(195 = 2 meanings
9 = 3 meanings)

5 concepts are never colexified with other processes in the data set:
- Be angry
- Become angry
- Dare
- Fear (be afraid)
- Forgive
Egyptian in typological perspective

Formal Concept Lattices as Semantic Maps

2017
Daria Ryzhova and Sergei Obiedkov
National Research University Higher School of Economics,
Moscow, Russia
daria.ryzhova@mail.ru  sergei.obj@gmail.com
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Egyptian in typological perspective

‘All the ‘dentitions’ started to laugh/smile, every tooth is unveiled’ (Nile Hymnus, III, 7–8)

Cf. nṯḥḥ in PT
Egyptian in typological perspective

w.t ir.t rjm, k.t sbj
One eye cries, the other ‘laughs’
(pLondon/Leiden VIII,2)
Egyptian in typological perspective

The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play (1 Cor 10,7)

\[ \text{w.t ir.t rjm, k.t sbj} \]

One eye cries, the other ‘laughs’ (pLondon/Leiden VIII,2)

\[ \text{Έκαθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν, καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν.} \]

χειρισμός ηδιπλάσιος ευγωμ εκω αγω αντωγη εσωβε

The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play (1 Cor 10,7)
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The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play (1 Cor 10,7)

One eye cries, the other ‘laughs’
(pLondon/Leiden VIII,2)

The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play (1 Cor 10,7)
Egyptian in typological perspective
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On Forms and Functions, 201-231

The Verb *ib* and the Construction *ib=fr sdm*
On modal semantics, graphemic contrasts, and gradience in grammar

Stéphane Polis & Andréas Stauder
Liège (F.R.S.-FNRS, ULg) & Paris (EPHE)
Egyptian in typological perspective

The Verb \( ib \) and the Construction \( \textit{ib}=fr~sdm^* \)
On modal semantics, graphemic contrasts, and gradience in grammar

Stéphane Polis & Andréas Stauder
Liège (F.R.S.-FNRS, ULg) & Paris (EPHE)

Interaction entre modalité et subjectivité en néo-égyptien
Autour de la construction \( mrl + \text{w}véc.\ « \text{souhaiter que} \)∗

Stéphane Polis, Liège
Depuydt, Brief Communications (1993) JEA 79

For the sake of ḥwȝȝ, 'love': an exception to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule and its history

A historical explanation is offered for the exceptional behaviour of the Coptic verb ḥwȝȝ 'love, wish' in relation to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule. It is argued that, at the time when the Stern-Jernstedt Rule took effect, in early Demotic, there were two constructions subj + 'seek' and subj + 'wish' and that the verb subj in the latter meaning was barred from the indirect conjunction of the direct object because subj meant 'seek' in all its conjugations.
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προςδοκεῖ ‘to expect, hope’
σέλπιζε ‘to hope (that)’
I came here in the tomb hoping to see the work (…). (O. Senmut 78,1–2)
I was looking at the darkness, hoping for it to fall’ (Wenamun 1,42)
Egyptian in typological perspective
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Coptic Ṡⲟⲩⲧⲉ, lit. ‘eat’ (ⲟⲩⲧⲉ) ‘the heart, mind’ (ⲧⲗⲉ)
ⲣⲩⲧⲉ, lit. ‘do’ (ⲣ) ‘the heart, mind’ (ⲧⲗⲉ)
Egyptian in typological perspective

*in-n̄w rmṯ-swg jr ḫṯj=f, īw=f (r) ir rmṯ-rḥ*

‘If a stupid man regrets/repents/reflects, he will be a wise man’ (Anchsheshonki, XIX,8)
Egyptian in typological perspective

Before Demotic, no lexicalization, but
Before Demotic, no lexicalization, but

\[ \text{ḥ-twī ḫr \text{Km.t}} \]

‘If only I was in Egypt’ (Qadesh, §188)
Before Demotic, no lexicalization, but

\[ nn \, h\, l \, n=k \]

‘(may you be alive and healthy), without regrets’ (pAnastasi I, 2,7)
Conclusions
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