

The ontology of inherent polysemy and dot objects  
Laure Vieu, IRIT-CNRS, Toulouse & LOA-ISTC-CNR, Trento.

Polysemy usually requires disambiguation procedures. Inherent polysemy, instead, is a type of systematic or regular polysemy (Apresjan 1974) which calls for simultaneous reference to entities of disjoint categories. "book", "lunch", "country" and "university" count among typical examples of inherent polysemy. Copredications such as "this thick book is incomprehensible" serve as evidence for the simultaneous reference to a physical object and an information object, and more precisely, for the reference to an instance of "dot object" of complex type Phys-dot-Info (Pustejovsky 1995, Asher 2011). In this talk I will first argue following (Arapinis 2013) that inherent polysemy does not appear in language by chance, but is grounded on specific ontological dependences in the world. In fact, it is high time that "complex categories" and "dot objects" be acknowledged in the computational ontologies used in knowledge representation, even where language is not directly involved (Arapinis & Vieu 2015). I will then discuss the representation of dot objects using formal ontology tools, namely mereology and two dependence relations, constitution and coincidence.

Jurij D. Apresjan. Regular polysemy. *Linguistics*, 12(142):5–32, 1974.

Alexandra Arapinis. Referring to institutional entities. *semantics and ontological perspectives. Applied Ontology*, 8:31–57, 2013.

Alexandra Arapinis and Laure Vieu. A plea for complex categories in ontologies. *Applied Ontology*, 10(3–4):285–296, 2015.

Nicholas Asher. *Lexical Meaning in Context: A web of words*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

James Pustejovsky. *The generative lexicon*. MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 1995.