

# Bilingualism and emotions<sup>1</sup>

ANETA PAVLENKO

## *Abstract*

*While several scholars have examined the influence of emotions on bilingual performance (Anooshian and Hertel 1994; Bond and Lai 1986; Javier and Marcos 1989) and second language learning and use (Arnold 1999; Schumann 1994, 1997, 1999), to date very little is known about ways in which bilinguals talk about emotions in their two languages. The present study investigates discursive construction of emotions in the two languages of Russian–English bilinguals. Previous studies (Pavlenko 2002; Wierzbicka 1992, 1998, 1999) have demonstrated that Russian and English differ in ways in which emotions are conceptualized and framed in discourse. The goal of the present study is to examine ways in which late Russian–English bilinguals, who learned their English post puberty, negotiate these differences in narratives elicited in both languages. It will be argued that in cases where the two speech communities differ in the conceptualization of emotions, the process of second language socialization may result in the conceptual restructuring of emotion categories of adult language learners, as evident in instances of second language influence on first language performance.*

## **Introduction**

In the past decade, the relationship between language, cognition, and emotions has come to the forefront in the study of cognitive linguistics, neurolinguistics, cognitive and cultural psychology, and linguistic anthropology (Bamberg 1997; Damasio 1999; Edwards 1997; Kitayama and Markus 1994; Kovecses 2000; Lutz 1988; Lutz and Abu-Lughod 1990; Markus and Kitayama 1991; Palmer and Occhi 1999; Wierzbicka 1999). Numerous studies demonstrated cross-linguistic and cross-cultural variability not only in emotion words and categories, but also in emotion scripts and ethnopsychological theories (Briggs 1970; Harré

1986; Heelas 1986; Levy 1973, 1984; Lutz 1988; Lutz and Abu-Lughod 1990; Palmer and Occhi 1999; Rosaldo 1980; Shweder and LeVine 1984; White 1990; Wierzbicka 1999).

Recently, the interest in emotions has spilled over to the fields of bilingualism and second language acquisition (SLA) where several authors have begun examining the role of affect in second language (L2) learning and use (Arnold 1999; Clachar 1999; Schumann 1994, 1997, 1999) and in bilingual performance and language choice (Anooshian and Hertel 1994; Javier and Marcos 1989; Schrauf 2000). Two approaches can be distinguished in the study of the relationship between L2 learning, bilingualism, and emotions. Scholars working within the separatist, often positivist, perspective view emotions as universal or at least independent from language. They examine links between emotions and attitudes toward various languages, suggesting that these links exert a significant influence over the processes of language learning and use (Anooshian and Hertel 1994; Arnold 1999; Bond and Lai 1986; Clachar 1999; Schumann 1994, 1998, 1999). While this research provides us with fascinating insights into the nature of language choice and use by multilingual individuals (see discussion below), it has a limited view of the relationship between language and emotions. Recently, scholars working within cognitivist and constructivist perspectives have argued for a more inclusive approach which views emotions as discursively constructed phenomena and, therefore, examines not only languages *and* emotions, but also languages *of* emotions (Bamberg 1997; Edwards 1997; Lutz 1988; Lutz and Abu-Lughod 1990; Wierzbicka 1994, 1999). This view raises interesting possibilities for explorations in the field of bilingualism: if – at least some – emotion categories and discourses differ between cultures and speech communities, how do bi- and multilingual individuals talk about emotions in their various languages? How do they perceive and categorize emotion states? What emotion scripts do they follow in their everyday lives? The aim of this paper is to explore perception, categorization, and narrative construction of emotions by one group of such individuals: late Russian–English bilinguals who learned their second language, English, as teenagers and adults. In what follows, I will first review existing studies on language and emotions in bilingualism and SLA and then proceed to discuss my own investigation, ending with some implications for future research on bilingualism and emotions.

## **1. The study of language and emotions in the fields of bilingualism and SLA**

It has recently been proposed that for some L2 learners secondary socialization turns into a process of discursive assimilation to a new speech community, or, more specifically, to new communities of practice (Pav-

lenko 1998; Pavlenko and Lantolf 2000). To date, however, very little is known about possible transformations that may occur in the conceptualization of emotions by late bilinguals, i. e., adult users of a second, or any additional, language. The goal of this section is to review existing studies which throw some light on the issue and to argue that the discursive perspective holds promise not only for examining first language socialization into the discourse of emotions (see, e. g., Bamberg 1997), but also for the study of secondary socialization in adulthood (on acquisition of emotions in adulthood in general, see Averill 1986).

### *1.1 Languages and emotions*

For many years, research on bilingualism and emotions was carried out in a separatist paradigm where languages and emotions were theorized as independent phenomena. As a result, researchers typically inquired as to whether the languages of bi- and multilingual individuals differed in their emotional impact (Anooshian and Hertel 1994; Javier and Marcos 1989). In the field of SLA, researchers examined the interaction between motivation and affect in L2 learning and use (Arnold 1999; Clachar 1999; Schumann 1994, 1997, 1999). These studies, combined with evidence that comes from case studies of bilinguals in therapy (Amati-Mehler, Argentieri, and Canestri 1993; Buxbaum 1949; Foster 1996; Greenson 1950; Krapf 1955) and from memoirs of bilingual writers (e. g., Hoffman 1989; Kaplan, 1993; Lerner 1997; Rodriguez 1982), point to interesting links between affect and L2 learning and use in bi- and multilingualism.

To begin with, both psycholinguistic explorations and psychoanalytic case studies suggest that when a second language is learned after puberty the two languages may differ in their emotional impact, with the first being the language of personal involvement and the second the language of distance and detachment, or at least the language of lesser emotional hold on the individual. The primeval emotionality of the first language has also been commented on by several bilingual writers who learned their second language in late childhood or adulthood:

... Chinese is the language with the deepest emotional resonance for me. It was the only language which mattered, and I think of it as the language of my heart. Perhaps that's why, even now, when I cry, I cry in Chinese. (Minfong Ho, in Novakovich and Shapard 2000: 161)

Spanish certainly was the language of storytelling, the language of the body and of the senses and of the emotional wiring of the child, so that still, when someone addresses me as 'Hoolia' (Spanish pronunciation of Julia), I feel my emotional self come to the fore. I answer Sí,

and lean forward to kiss a cheek rather than answer Yes, and extend my hand for a handshake. Some deeper or first Julia is being summoned. (Alvarez, in Novakovich and Shapard 2000: 218)

Indeed, it is this emotional distance between the first and second language that was posited as one of the key reasons to explain why some bilingual writers may prefer to write in a 'stepmother tongue', escaping the emotional overcharge and traumatizing powers of the 'mother tongue' (Kellman 2000). This view is also reflected in personal recollections of two Eastern Europeans who became American writers, Josip Novakovich and Jerzy Kosinski:

In my own case, English words didn't carry the political and emotional baggage of a repressive upbringing, so I could say whatever I wanted without provoking childhood demons, to which Croatian words were still chained, to tug at me and to make me cringe. (Josip Novakovich, in Novakovich and Shapard 2000: 16)

I think had I come to the United States at the age of nine I would have become affected by this traumatizing power of language. ... When I came to the United States I was twenty-four. Hence, I am not traumatized by my English – no part of my English affects me more or less than any other one. (Jerzy Kosinski, in Teicholz 1993: 46)

Explorations in the psycholinguistics of bilingualism clearly demonstrate that emotional distance between the first and the second language is experienced not only by highly reflective bilingual writers but also by other bilinguals. Bond and Lai (1986) show that code-switching and the use of the second language may act as a distancing function, permitting L2 users to express ideas in their second language that would be too disturbing in their first. Similarly, Javier and Marcos (1989) suggest that switching to the second language may represent an attempt to avoid anxiety-provoking materials. Other studies demonstrate that greater anxiety is produced by the presentation of emotional materials (e.g., taboo words) in the native/first learned language of bilingual speakers who learned their second language beyond early childhood (Gonzalez-Reigosa 1976; Javier 1989). Anooshian and Hertel (1994) show that Spanish–English and English–Spanish bilinguals who acquired their second language after the age of 8, recall emotional words (such as 'mother' or 'church') more frequently than neutral words ('table' or 'chair') following their presentation in the native language. Finally, interviews with late bilinguals (Grosjean 1982) and case studies of late bilinguals in therapy also suggest that, for many of them, personal in-

volvement is expressed in the native language and detachment in the second (Amati-Mehler, Argentieri, and Canestri 1993; Buxbaum 1949; Foster 1996; Greenson 1950; Krapf 1955; for an up-to-date review, see Schrauf 2000).

It would be, however, too simplistic to posit that late bilinguals have positive emotional attachments to their first language and no attachments to their second, or additional, language. Some bilinguals, in particular those who underwent negative experiences in the first language, may experience detachment from it which, in some cases, leads to language loss. Nowhere is this experience more visible than in the case of many World War II German expatriates who, like Gerda Lerner – a German refugee, soon to become an American scholar and writer – renounced their first language together with the ideologies it embodied for them:

The truth was, I no longer wanted to speak German; I was repelled by the sound of it; for me as for other Americans it had become the language of the enemy. ... I ceased speaking German altogether. (Lerner 1997: 40)

Other multilinguals acknowledge being emotionally attracted to their new languages which allow them to perform new and different emotional selves. ‘Learning French and learning to think, learning to desire, is all mixed up in my head, until I can’t tell the difference,’ admits Alice Kaplan (1993: 140), an American academic, in her memoir about learning French. At times, attraction to language may also lead to attraction to speakers of a particular language. “When I fall in love, I am seduced by language. When I get married, I am seduced by language,” writes a Polish–American writer Eva Hoffman (1989: 219) in her story about learning English. It is this affective aspect of the relationship between the second language and the learner that became the cornerstone of the study of L2 learning and emotions in SLA. Recent explorations show that L2 learners’ motivation, investment, and resistance are affected by the potential selves and means of self-expression afforded to them by the second language (McMahill 2001; Pavlenko 1998). Similar emotional investment in the second language has previously been shown in case studies of bilingual individuals undergoing psychotherapy (Amati-Mehler, Argentieri, and Canestri 1993).

Finally, it is clear that some bilinguals, in particular those who live and function in two or more linguistic and cultural environments, may have emotional links to and investments in all of their multiple languages and perceive all of them as vested with emotional power and significance. Thus, a Mexican–American writer, Richard Rodriguez (1982:

31–32), rejects the possibility that emotionality and intimacy could only be conveyed through his native language, Spanish:

Making more and more friends outside my house, I began to distinguish intimate voices speaking through *English*. ... After such moments of intimacy outside the house, I began to trust hearing intimacy conveyed through my family's English. ... there would also be times when I sensed the deepest truth about language and intimacy: *Intimacy is not created by a particular language; it is created by intimates.*

This possibility of internalization of new emotion categories, discourses, and scripts in adulthood – which, in turn, may lead to creation of new emotion links between the self and the second language – is the topic to which I will turn my attention next.

### *1.2 Languages of emotions*

In what follows I will argue that the social constructionist view of emotions as discursively constructed phenomena – which may differ cross-culturally – allows researchers in bilingualism and SLA to expand the scope of their work on bilingualism, emotions, and cognition, and to investigate emotion discourses of bilingual speakers. To date, however, very little research has been done in this area. Existing research suggests a possibility that cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences in emotion discourses may create instances of intercultural miscommunication and misunderstanding and may lead bicultural bilinguals to talk about emotions differently in their different languages.

To begin with, some studies indicate that bilingual individuals may perceive and discuss emotion states differently depending on the context of the event and the language in which it is recounted. Such differences were found in a series of studies by Ervin-Tripp (1954, 1964), who tested bilingual subjects twice on the same set of materials – Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) cards, semantic differentials, word associations, and sentence and story completion tasks – with the sessions in their two respective languages taking place six weeks apart. In her first study, Ervin-Tripp (1954) tested a single subject, a 27-year-old Japanese–American who was born in the United States but educated in Japan between the ages of eight and fourteen. The subject provided different and sometimes conflicting descriptions of the same TAT pictures depending on whether his answers were given in English or in Japanese. His responses in Japanese were more emotional, involving family issues, love, losses, and unfaithfulness. In English his descriptions were more formal, and people descriptions were defined by Ervin-Tripp as abstract and cold. For in-

stance, in his interpretation of a figure sitting on the floor, facing away, with the head resting on a couch, in Japanese he suggested that it was a woman weeping over her lost fiancé and considering suicide, while in English he said that the picture depicted a girl finishing a project for a sewing class. Next, Ervin-Tripp (1964) conducted the same type of experiment with sixty-four French–English late bilinguals who were raised in France and had lived in the US for more than four years. She found that these bilinguals also told different stories in each language when asked to relate what they saw on the TAT cards with an interval of six weeks between language sessions. For example, the picture, which in French elicited a variety of themes of aggression and striving for autonomy, in English led the same subject to talk about family support and striving for achievement.

While Ervin-Tripp's (1954, 1964) work focused broadly on verbal repertoires, Rintell (1984, 1990) examined perception and expression of emotion as an illocutionary act in the speech of second language learners and users. In the first study, 127 foreign students enrolled in the Intensive English Program at the University of Houston were asked to decide which emotion – *pleasure*, *anger*, *depression*, *anxiety*, *guilt*, or *disgust* – best characterized each of eleven tape-recorded conversations played to them. They were also asked to rate the intensity of each emotion on the Likert scale. Their responses were compared to those of 19 native English speakers, among whom existed a high level of agreement. The statistical analysis of the data demonstrated that while there were no effects for either age or gender, linguistic and cultural background and language proficiency played an important role in the students' performance. The strongest effect was that of language proficiency, whereby the scores of the beginner group (mean = 3.97) were significantly different from the scores of the intermediate (mean = 5.99) and advanced students (mean = 6.95). However, even the most advanced subjects in the sample did poorly on the task compared to native speakers, identifying the emotion conveyed in the conversations only about two thirds of the time. In addition, when learners of three major language groups were compared to each other, it was found that Chinese students had more difficulty with the task – their scores were consistently different from those of the Arabic- and Spanish-speaking students. Additional analysis of the data showed that for both native speakers and English as a Second Language (ESL) learners, it was easier to identify *disgust* and *pleasure* conveyed in conversation than *depression*, *anxiety*, *guilt*, and *anger*. This result indicates that emotions are not only linguistic and cultural but also local constructions, and that judgments about which emotions are conveyed by particular linguistic means differ not only cross-culturally but also across individuals, across contexts, and across emotion categories. In the

second study, Rintell (1990) collected personal experience narratives about emotional events from six native speakers of English and eight intermediate ESL students. Her analysis demonstrated that while both sets were similar structurally, L2 learners' stories were far less elaborate. The learners in the study employed direct, explicit statements of emotional response, and references to physical sensations, at the same time they did not use figurative language, reported speech, epithets, and de-personalization, all of which were features present in the native speakers' narratives.

What is particularly interesting in Rintell's (1984, 1990) work is the presence of systematic cultural differences in the categorization of emotion states. These differences suggest that comprehension of emotions conveyed in discourse is predicated not simply on language proficiency but also on cultural competence and familiarity with emotion scripts available in the target language speech community. Similar effects of familiarity with culture-specific scripts were demonstrated in my own work, which revealed that conceptual differences between Russian and American English led monolingual Russians and Americans to describe the same two films in very different terms, with Americans privileging the notions of 'privacy' and 'personal space', which are not part of Russian discourse (Pavlenko 1999). Interestingly, Russian-English bilinguals – but not Russian foreign language (FL) learners of English – also produced narrative accounts which discussed 'invasion of privacy' and 'violation of personal space', both in English and in Russian, thus suggesting that in the process of second language socialization conceptual restructuring took place in their mental lexicon.

Evidence of restructuring in the lexical organization of emotion domains comes from a word association study conducted by Grabois (1999). In this study, Grabois compared word associations with a number of concepts, including *love*, *fear*, and *happiness*, provided by monolingual speakers of Spanish, monolingual speakers of English, acculturated L2 users of Spanish who had lived in Spain for 3 or more years, L2 Spanish learners enrolled in a study abroad program, and FL Spanish learners enrolled in Spanish courses in an American university. Statistical analysis of the data demonstrated that associations supplied by the two groups of native speakers differed both in terms of the type of preferred associations (i. e., symbolic, metaphoric, related to sensory cues, etc.) and in terms of which specific words were elicited. For instance, in response to 'love', native speakers of English exhibited a greater preference for indirect – metaphoric and symbolic – associations, while native speakers of Spanish showed a preference for sensory and referential associations. Among the non-native speakers of Spanish, acculturated L2 users, or late bilinguals, consistently achieved higher

correlations with the associations provided by native speakers of Spanish than any other group.

Personal insights on transformation of emotional experiences, linked to second language socialization, come from a Polish–English bilingual, a well-known Australian linguist Anna Wierzbicka (1994). Wierzbicka, who moved to Australia from Poland as an adult, acknowledges that many of her daily emotions are perceived in terms of lexical categories provided by Polish, none of which have exact translation equivalents in English. Among such categories are *przykro mi* (literally: ‘to me it is unpleasant/hurtful’) or *jestem zła* (literally: ‘I am bad’, i.e., ‘I am displeased/angry/furious’). At the same time, within an English-speaking context, Wierzbicka sees herself talking, thinking, and responding in terms of English lexical categories such as *upset*, *frustrated*, *annoyed*, or *happy*, none of which have exact lexical equivalents in Polish. She points out that not only the lexicon but also the grammar colors her own and other Poles’ subjective experiences and interpretations of emotions. While in English emotions are conceptualized as states (‘to be happy, upset, or angry’), Polish allows for three different ways of viewing one’s emotions: active/volitional, passive/involuntary, and neutral. Thus, states Wierzbicka, ‘there is a difference, for me, between the experience of *gniewac się* (roughly, to manufacture anger within oneself; no equivalent in English) and that of *być zła* (roughly, to be angry)’ (1994: 136). The two categories are linked to distinct cultural scripts, one interpretable within the moral order of Polish culture, and one within the system of cultural values espoused by white middle-class Australians. Thus, it appears that in order to become a full-fledged member of a particular speech community and to be understood in terms of local discourses, some individuals may have to reroute ‘the trajectory of feeling,’ as did Wierzbicka and another Polish–English bilingual, an acclaimed Polish–American writer Eva Hoffman (1989). Hoffman recalls her own secondary socialization as a process that distanced her from her parents and their emotional world:

My mother says I’m becoming ‘English.’ This hurts me, because I know she means I’m becoming cold. I’m no colder than I’ve ever been, but I’m learning to be less demonstrative. (Hoffman 1989: 146)

Just like Alvarez (in Novakovich and Shapard 2000), cited earlier, Wierzbicka and Hoffman link their new emotional selves to new emotion speech acts, discourses, and scripts. Similarly, Cathy Davidson (1993), an American scholar who visited Japan several times and stayed there for extended periods, admits having internalized the Japanese cultural script for expressing embarrassment. While on a trip to France, she sud-

denly finds herself apologizing in Japanese, which comes as a shock not only to her husband and the customs officials but even to herself:

And in France, I realized that my language for cultural embarrassment, for not quite knowing just how I should act, is Japanese. If I were blindfolded and tossed into absolutely any foreign country – France, Hong Kong, Zaire – I'm positive that within two minutes I'd be bowing, apologizing, and exclaiming, '*Hazukashii!*' (Davidson 1993: 196)

Together, the studies and the personal narratives above suggest that adult socialization into a new language and culture may lead to changes in verbal repertoires, lexical-semantic networks, conceptual memory, and emotion scripts. Unfortunately, none of the studies constituted an investigation of emotion discourses of late bilinguals per se. While Ervin-Tripp's (1954, 1964) studies indicate that different bilinguals may indeed talk differently about the same stimuli in their two languages, she did not look specifically at the discourse of emotions and at the linguistic means employed by bilingual subjects. Grabois (1999) looked at lexical-semantic networks only but not at the actual discourse, and Rintell (1984, 1990), who did collect personal narratives, first of all, collected them from ESL learners with low degrees of cultural competence and, second, did not appeal to contrastive analysis to analyze L1 emotion discourses of her study participants. Thus, the present study constitutes the first controlled investigation of bilinguals' emotion talk known to the researcher.

## **2. Emotion discourses in Russian and English**

Russian and English were chosen for this investigation as the two languages, which in previous research were shown to construct emotions differently in discourse (Pavlenko 2002; Ries 1997; Wierzbicka 1992, 1998, 1999). To begin with, the two languages were shown to differ in the values attributed to emotionality in discourse and in the wealth of linguistic devices employed for this purpose. Wierzbicka (1992), in particular, argues that the defining characteristics of Russian are 'the tremendous stress on emotions and on their free expression, the high emotional temperature of Russian discourse, the wealth of linguistic devices for signalling emotions and shades of emotions' (p. 395). Her semantic explorations (Wierzbicka 1992, 1998, 1999) suggest that Russian possesses a much wider range of linguistic devices to express emotions which makes translation from Russian into English at times rather difficult. Ries's (1997) ethnographic study of post-Soviet Russian talk demon-

strates that contemporary Russian culture values suffering highly and, as a result, encourages ritualized litanies and laments as popular emotional genres in everyday talk. These litanies and laments could touch upon a variety of issues, from economics and politics to crime on the streets to the shortage of consumer goods. Empirical support for the claim that emotionality is more valued in Russian than in American English discourse comes from Pavlenko's (2002) study of emotion discourse of monolingual Russian and American English speakers. The analysis of a corpus of narratives elicited from 40 Russians and 40 Americans with the help of the same visual stimuli demonstrated that while both groups used approximately similar numbers of emotion word tokens (lexemes) (respectively 253 and 270), Russian narrators used 1.5 times as many different emotion words (lemmas) ( $n = 96$ ) as the American ones ( $n = 66$ ). Russian monolinguals also exhibited more lexical diversity in their choices of nouns (Russian  $n = 24$ , English  $n = 16$ ), verbs (Russian  $n = 34$ , English  $n = 14$ ), and adverbs (Russian  $n = 9$ , English  $n = 3$ ). In addition, Russian narrators privileged more emotionally charged words in their narratives, evoking *gore*'grief' where Americans talked about 'sadness', or *gnev*'wrath' where Americans talked about 'anger'.

The key difference between the two speech communities is in the predominant conceptualizations of emotions. According to Wierzbicka (1992), experiences comparable to 'joy', 'sadness,' or 'anger' are often conceptualized in Russian as inner activities in which one engages more or less voluntarily; as a result, they involve duration and are often designated by verbs, rather than adjectives (e. g., *radovat'sia*'to rejoice', 'to be actively happy, joyful'; *serdit'sia*'to be angry', 'to rage'; *stydit'sia*'to be ashamed', 'to be experiencing shame'). In contrast, in English emotions are conceptualized as passive states caused by external and/or past causes; as a result, they are more commonly expressed by means of adjectives and pseudo-participles, such as 'worried', 'sad', or 'disgusted'. Moreover, as Wierzbicka (1992: 401) points out, English has only a very limited number of intransitive verbs, such as 'to rejoice', 'to grieve', 'to worry,' or 'to pine' – and the whole category may be losing ground in modern English. An important difference between the verbal and the adjectival patterns is external manifestation of feeling: emotions designated by verbs – but not those designated by adjectives – tend to be expressed in action, often externally observable action (e. g., worrying may be expressed in pacing, sighing, or crying). Wierzbicka suggests that it is not accidental that emotion verbs are disappearing from modern English, as the Anglo culture encourages people 'to be glad' rather than 'to rejoice', or 'to be angry' rather than 'to fume' or 'to rage'. Russian, on the other hand, has a wide range of emotion verbs which share a number of characteristics emphasizing their active, processual, and

quasi-voluntary character, such as their frequent use in reported speech and co-occurrence with verbs of doing. Most of these verbs, such as *rasserdit'sial* 'to get angry', are reflexive, which strengthens the impression of emotions being self-induced, rather than due to external causes.

Pavlenko's (2002) study of emotion narratives of monolingual speakers of Russian and English also supports these claims: it was shown that American narrators favored adjectives (68 percent of all emotion word tokens in the corpus), while Russian narrators favored verbs (39 percent of all emotion word tokens in the corpus). The researcher noted that while conceptualization of emotions as states is also available to Russian speakers and is at times drawn upon, the emphasis in Russian discourse is on the active experiencing of emotions. As a result, not only Russian speakers used more verbs than adjectives in their narratives, they used imperfective and reflexive emotion verbs which stressed the processual aspect of the experience. These verbs were often used in conjunction with action verbs, which emphasized the links between the experiencing of 'feeling' and other observable actions (see examples in (1)). Of particular importance in the Russian corpus was the verb *perezhivat'* 'to suffer things through', which, together with the noun *perezhivaniia* 'feelings', 'emotions', accounted for 9 percent of all emotion word tokens in the Russian corpus. *Perezhivat'* has no translation equivalent in English: the meaning of the verb's perfective counterpart *perezhit'* is 'to live through' (e. g., difficult times), while the meaning of the imperfective lemma is more immediate and refers to the process of experiencing, processing, and dealing with particular emotions, literally indicating 'suffering through'. It is quite difficult to render the verb precisely in English as its closest counterparts 'experiencing' and 'processing' lack the emotional overtone of being nervous, anxious, 'suffering', and engaged in observable actions, crucial for understanding of *perezhivat'*, as seen in the examples below:

- (1) ... *ona sela v kreslo, ukhvatilas' za golovu, i perezhivala ochen' sil'no to, chto uznala iz pis'ma* ...  
 'she sat down in an armchair, clasped her head, and was suffering through (experiencing) very strongly what she found out from the letter'
- ... [*ona*] *vzdykhaet, perezhivaet chto-to, vspominaet, predstavliaet* ...  
 '[she] is sighing, suffering through (experiencing, processing) something, remembering, imagining'

... [ona] rezko vstaet, ubiraet pis'mo i, opiat'-taki perezhivaia, nervnichaia, idet kurit' ...

'[she] gets up abruptly, removes the letter, and, once again, suffering through (experiencing, processing) and being nervous, goes [outside] to smoke'

... one perezhivala svoi kakie-to emotsii, a vtoraiia devushka ei pomeshala ...

'she was suffering through (experiencing) her own emotions, and the other girl interrupted her (prevented her from doing so, bothered her)'

Ia dumaiu, potomu chto perezhivat' etu informatsiiu, kotoruiu ona poluchila iz etogo pis'ma, ei khotelos' odnoi, bez postoronnikh glaz ...

'I think that she wanted to suffer through (to process) the information she got from that letter alone, away from other people'

The connection between emotions, the body, and observable actions is particularly stressed in Wierzbicka's (1998, 1999) recent work where she argues that this connection is encoded and emphasized in Russian to a higher degree than it is in English. In a lexicographic analysis of *The Russian–English Collocational Dictionary of the Human Body* (Iordanskaja and Paperno 1995), she found that while some Russian expressions can be matched with English equivalents, the Russian expressions that link emotions and the body are both more numerous and more dramatic, and a wide variety of expressions involving all body parts, from eyes and eyebrows, to hands and legs, does not have lexical equivalents in English. In some cases, even when some translation equivalents are available, their range of use may be rather restricted. For instance, a comparison of the adjectives that can co-occur with the Russian phrase *vyrazhenie litsa* and with its English translation equivalent 'facial expression' suggests that Russian allows for a much wider range of possibilities, perhaps even encouraging greater facial expressiveness in the service of emotions (Wierzbicka 1999: 227). Pavlenko's (2002) study provides support to this argument as well – it was found that in the corpus of 40 narratives about emotions experienced by a woman in a film only one American participant remarked on her facial expression. In contrast, fifteen Russian narrators (38 percent) explicitly linked the woman's emotions, external appearances, and behavior, commenting on her facial expressions, gestures, and body language, and involving such diverse body parts as eyes, eyebrows, nose, head, hands, and shoulders.

Finally, Wierzbicka (1992, 1999) suggests that the two discourses of emotions, Russian and Anglo, differ with regard to the predominant

ideologies of emotion encoded in them. In Russian, emotional activities are conceptualized as a key part of human inner life, or life of the soul, and the idea of emotionless composure is alien to mainstream Russian culture. This argument finds support in a number of Russian metaphorical expressions that present people as ‘giving in’ voluntarily to their feelings (*predavat'sia svoim chuvstvam*). In contrast, mainstream Anglo culture appears to value control and composure, which is reflected in such words and expressions as ‘upset’ or ‘to deal with one’s emotions’, which imply a temporary departure from a ‘normal’ state and a loss of control. The possibility that in some contexts Russians and Americans may draw on different emotion scripts was also borne out in Pavlenko’s (2002) study. It was found that in interpreting the behavior of the main protagonist in a film, many Americans drew on the uniquely Anglo notion of privacy (e. g., ‘she felt that her privacy was invaded’). In turn, the Russian participants drew on the cultural script which emphasizes the need to *perezhivat’* ‘to suffer through’ or ‘to give in’ to one’s emotions, with emotions clearly controlling individuals. The inference that the woman may want to be alone to give in to her feelings was not expressed by the American participants who suggested instead that she wanted to be alone ‘to deal’ with her feelings or even ‘to vent them’, presenting emotions as something that could and should be controlled – ‘dealt with’, ‘vented’ – by individuals.

Based on the discussion above, I would now like to ask the following: If ways of talking about emotions are indeed somewhat different in the two speech communities, what are some ways in which late Russian–English bilinguals perceive and discuss emotion states in their two languages?

## **Methodology**

*Objective.* The purpose of the present study was to investigate the discursive construction of emotions in narratives elicited from 31 late Russian–English bilingual participants, examining similarities and differences between descriptions of emotion states in each language.

*Subjects.* 31 late Russian–English bilinguals (13 males, 18 females), ages between 18 and 26, participated in the study. All were students at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. All the participants had learned their English upon arrival in the US, post puberty, between the ages of 13 and 19, through ESL classes, public or private school attendance, and naturalistic exposure. By the time of the study they had spent between 3 and 8 years in the US, interacting both in Russian and English on a daily basis. According to the background questionnaires, they continuously used

Russian with their families, relatives, and Russian-speaking friends, and English with English-speaking friends, as well as for educational and everyday interaction purposes. At the time of the experiment, all were fluent enough in English to be enrolled in regular undergraduate and graduate classes; none were enrolled in the Intensive English Language Program.

*Method.* Two 3-minute long films, with a sound track but no dialog, were used for narrative elicitation purposes. These films, *The Letter* and *Pis'mo* (The Letter), portrayed a roommate reading someone else's letter without their permission, as well as the reaction of the woman whose letter was being read. The first film in each pair was made in the US, and the second in Kiev, Ukraine, to control for context effects. Ukraine, rather than Russia, was chosen for production cost reasons. As expected, although the film was actually made in Kiev, the participants inferred that the action was taking place in Russia, or 'somewhere in the former Soviet Union'.

Each study participant was shown one film, then given a portable tape recorder and the following instructions, either in English or in Russian: 'Please, tell what you just saw in the film'/'*Pozhaluista, rasskazhite chto vy videli v fil'me*' (see Figure 1). All spoke directly into the taperecorder so that no social interaction with the interviewer would influence their recall. Ten participants (5 males, 5 females) performed the recall of *The Letter* in English, and ten (5 males, 5 females) in Russian. Due to elimination of subjects with inappropriate background, only 11 bilingual participants performed the recall of *Pis'mo*: 4 in English (1 male, 3 females) and 7 in Russian (3 males, 5 females). Assignments to language groups were randomized. In order to control for language mode, the participants assigned to the English group were greeted and interviewed in English prior to the elicitation procedure, and those assigned to the Russian group were greeted and interviewed in Russian. Nevertheless, all subjects were aware that the researcher was bilingual in Russian and English. If anything, this knowledge may have encouraged a more bilingual mode, and possibly, a more Russian perspective on emotions, which would not be necessarily adopted in interactions with monolingual English speakers.

Film	The Letter (American context)		<i>Pis'mo</i> (Russian context)	
Recall language	English	Russian	English	Russian
Subjects	10 subjects	10 subjects	4 subjects	7 subjects

Figure 1. Research design

Subsequent to the elicitation procedure, all narratives were transcribed and analyzed in the language in which they were told. All instances of emotion talk were identified and analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. In addition, all instances of language use that appeared to be errors – or deviations from the range of language variation exhibited by monolingual native speakers of the language in question – were compared to patterns of language use in the monolingual narratives elicited previously by the same films (Pavlenko 2002).

#### 4. Results and discussion

##### 4.1 The Letter and Pis'mo narratives

In what follows I will first provide examples of English and Russian narratives, based on *The Letter* and *Pis'mo*, and then discuss the results of the analysis of the corpus. An English narrative below is a recall of *The Letter* produced by an 18 year old male who arrived in the US at the age of 13.5 (all instances of emotion talk are underlined):

- (2) First, a student, possibly ... maybe a woman, walking into her apartment, into her house, we can see it's her house, by the way she checks her mail, and ... uhm ... she start checking her mail, the first letter she opens has a ... very bad news, as we see by her reactions, it could be death of a relative or a friend, uhm, we see that the woman has very strong character, she doesn't start cry, or have an emotional ... uhm ... emotional stress or anything, we see that it deeply upsets her, and, uhm, she takes it close to her heart, uhm, later on as the woman grieves about what happened, her roommate comes in and tries to find out what happened, takes a letter into her hands and starts reading, probably because the person that died or maybe has some kind of illness, is extremely close to this ... woman, and she doesn't wanna anybody to find out about it, she wants to, uhm, to think about him or her only by herself, and she, uhm, obviously gets angry at her roommate about not keeping her privacy, and trying to read the letter that brought her much pain.

A Russian narrative below is also based on *The Letter* and produced by an 18 year old male who arrived in the US at the age of 15 (all instances of emotion talk are underlined):

- (3) *V etom fil'me ia uvidel moloduiu zhenshchinu, idushchuiu po ... ulitse nebol'shogo gorodka, chto-to napodobie Itaki, vozmozhno ...*

*sel'skaia mestnost' ... ona zakhodit v dom, v kotorom, vidimo, razmeshchaetsia ee kvartira, po doroge zabiraet pochtu i otkryvaet pis'mo, kogda zakhodit v svoiu kvartiru ... chitaia eto pis'mo, ona nachinaet rasstraivat'sia i postepenno vpadaet v delv depressiiu, ona, vidimo ... a, chem-tologorchena chem-to, chem-to, chto napi-sano v etom pis'me i, vidimo, nachinaet ... plakat' ... ee sozhitel'nitsa, vidimo, zakhodit v eto vremia v kvartiru i predlali sprashivaet v chem delo, ona ... predlagaet prochitat' pis'mo, i, naverno, obsudit' eto pis'mo so ... so svoei podrugoi, predlagaet ei kakuiu-to emotsional'nuiu pomoshch, no ta otkazyvaetsia i ... ukhodit v sil'no podavlennom sostoianii ... ee podruga ... a ... kachaet golovo-i v nedoumenii i ... i saditsia na stul ... na etomlha etom fil'm zakanchivaetsia.*

'In this movie I saw a young woman, walking down ... the street of a small town, something like Ithaca, possibly ... countryside ... she enters a house, in which, it seems, is her apartment, on her way [up] she picks up [her] mail and opens a letter, when she enters her apartment ... while reading the letter, she starts getting upset and slowly sinks into de/into depression, she, it seems ... uhm, by something/is distressed by something, something written in this letter, and, it seems, starts ... crying... her roommate, it seems, enters the apartment at that point, and off/and asks what's the matter, she ... offers to read the letter, and, perhaps, to discuss it with ... with her friend, offers her some emotional help, but the other one refuses and ... leaves in a very depressed state ... her friend ... uhm ... shakes her head in puzzle-ment and ... sits down on a chair ... there/there the movie ends.'

An English narrative, elicited by *Pis'mo*, is told by an 18 year old female who came to the US at the age of 13 (all instances of emotion talk are underlined):

- (4) In the film a young lady walks into her house, it's night time, she checks her mail, and leaves some in the mailbox, she is pre-occupied with one letter that she received, which is not a business letter, it's a personal letter, and she walks up into her apartment, which looks rather run down ... she starts reading the letter, she turns on sad music, and she becomes very upset by it, she, uhm, thinks of writing back, and then she stares up in the distance for a while, she doesn't write back, she, her/somebody walks in, and it's probably somebody quite close to her, because they just walk into her apartment, and the ... person who walks in, she becomes very disturbed by the appearance

of the young lady, and asks her what's wrong, and I guess she tells her something is wrong, and she tries to console her, and she notices that the person who walked in is reading the letter over her shoulder, and she becomes upset and takes the letter away and goes outside to smoke.

A Russian narrative, elicited by *Pis'mo*, is told by a 19 year old female who arrived in the US at the age of 13 (all instances of emotion talk are underlined):

- (5) *Kino pro devushku, v amerikanskoj naverniaka obstanovke ... ona prishla domoi, proverila ... pochtu, m, poluchila kakoe-to pis'mo, i ... m ... pročitav ego, ochen' rasstroilas', m, pis'mo moglo byt', naverno, tam, ot ... (laughs) ia ne znaiu, mozhet byt', ee boy-friend'a, ili eshche chego-nibud' takogo tipa ... potom ona, a, i vključila eshche Pol Moria (laughs) ... val's, potom prishla ee ili sosedka, ili rodstvennitsa, i khotela, m, to est', ona sprosila naverniaka chto tam proislo/pochemu ona rasstroena, devushka nichego ei ne skazala, m, postaralas' ee uteshit' i pročitala pis'mo, i pochemu-to devushka ego zabrala i ushla, kurit' na lestnitsu ... mozhet byt', ne khotela prosto delitsia tem, chto bylo v pis'me napisano.*

'The movie is about a girl, most likely in American surroundings ... she came home, checked ... [her] mail, uhm, got some letter, and ... uhm ... having read it, got very upset, uhm, the letter could have been, probably, well, from ... (laughs) I don't know, maybe, her boyfriend (lexical borrowing in the original text), or something of the kind ... then she, uhm, turned on Paul Moria ... waltz, then came either her neighbor or a relative, and wanted, uhm, well, she definitely asked what is go/why she is upset, the girl didn't tell her anything, uhm, [she] tried to console her and read the letter, and somehow the girl took it away and left, to smoke on the stairs ... maybe, she just didn't want to share what was written in that letter.

#### 4.2 Data analysis

Instances of emotion talk in all of the narratives were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. In both analyses, a distinction was made between *lemmas* (units of meaning, or words) and *lexemes* (word tokens). The analysis focused on identifying similarities and differences between the narratives told in Russian and in English in the following areas: (1) identification of emotions experienced by the main protagonist

in each film (emotion lexicon); (2) framing of emotion states (emotion lexicon, collocations, and morphosyntactic constructions, word use patterns); (3) rationale provided for the behavior of the main protagonist (emotion scripts).

*4.2.1 Identification of emotion states.* The first stage of analysis focused on identifying the dominant and alternative interpretations of the main protagonist's emotional states. To provide a systematic description, I will first discuss narratives elicited by *The Letter* in English and Russian, and then narratives elicited by *Pis'mo* in the two languages.

The analysis of *The Letter* narratives in English showed that 9 out of 10 Russian–English bilinguals (90 percent) identified the girl primarily as 'upset' (17 tokens,  $M = 1.9$ ). The additional 17 lemmas in the English narratives included 'in anger' and 'angry' (4 participants), 'ashamed' (2 participants), 'to cry' (2 participants), 'frustration' and 'frustrated' (2 participants), 'puzzled' and 'puzzlement' (2 participants), 'desperation' (1 participant), 'disappointed' (1 participant), 'distressed' (1 participant), 'grieve' (1 participant), 'irritated' (1 participant), 'sadness' (1 participant), 'to sigh' (1 participant), 'sorrow' (1 participant), and 'worried' (1 participant). These words and expressions can be divided into six different emotion categories: *anger* (angry, in anger, irritated), *sadness* (desperation, distressed, frustrated, frustration, grieve, sadness, sorrow, upset, to cry, to sigh), *surprise* (puzzled, puzzlement), *disappointment* (disappointed), *shame* (ashamed), and *anxiety* (worried). Both the primary identification of the girl as 'upset' and alternative emotion categories pattern with the identification and categories deployed by American monolinguals in the previous study (Pavlenko 2002). In addition, the bilingual participants also evoked the category of anxiety.

The analysis of *The Letter* narratives in Russian demonstrated that 7 out of 10 bilingual participants (70 percent) identified the girl as *rasstroennaia*'upset'. The additional 14 lemmas in the Russian narratives included *plakat'*'to cry' (4 participants), *zla'*'angry' and *razozlit'sial'*'to get angry' (3 participants), *rasserdit'sial'*'to get angry, irritated' and *rasserzhenal'*'angry', 'irritated' (3 participants), *vozmushchenal'*'indignant' (2 participants), *zagrusti'*'to get sad', *grustnoel'*'sad', and *grustno'*'sadly' (2 participants), *vzdykhat'*'to sigh' (1 participant), *gorel'*'grief' (1 participant), *depressiial'*'depression' (1 participant), *ogorchenal'*'saddened' (1 participant), *podavlennoe [sostoianie]'*'depressed [state]' (1 participant). These lemmas can be divided into two emotion categories: *gnev'*'anger' (*vozmushchenal'*'indignant', *zla'*'angry', *razozlit'sial'*'to get angry', *rasserdit'sial'*'to get angry, irritated', *rasserzhenal'*'angry', 'irritated') and *grust'*'sadness' (*rasstroenal'*'upset', *rasstroit'sial'*'to get upset', *plakat'*'to cry', *zagrusti'*'to get sad', *grustnoel'*'sad', *grustno'*'sadly', *vzdykhat'*'to sigh',

*gorel'* 'grief', *depressiial'* 'depression', *ogorchenal'* 'saddened', *podavlennoe [sostoianie]'* 'depressed [state]'). The primary identification of the girl as being *rasstroennaial'* 'upset', as well as the alternative emotion categories, are the same as those deployed by Russian monolinguals in the previous study (Pavlenko 2002), except that in monolingual narratives the participants also evoked *udivlenie'* 'surprise' and *otvrashchenie'* 'disgust'.

As indicated earlier, only 11 Russian–English bilinguals watched *Pis'mo*: 4 recalled the film in English and 7 in Russian. In 3 out of 4 (75 percent) English narratives the girl was identified as 'upset'. Eight additional lemmas included 'disturbance' and 'disturbed' (3 participants), 'cry' (1 participant), 'nervous' (1 participant), 'preoccupied' (1 participant), 'sad' (1 participant), 'surprised' (1 participant), and 'unhappy' (1 participant). These lemmas can be divided into three emotion categories: *sadness* (cry, disturbance, disturbed, unhappy, upset), *surprise* (surprised), and *anxiety* (nervous, preoccupied). These categories overlap with the categories of sadness, anger, surprise, and disappointment identified by the American monolinguals (Pavlenko 2002), with the addition of the category of anxiety.

In the 7 Russian narratives, based on *Pis'mo*, 2 participants mentioned that the woman was *rasstroenal'* 'upset'. The additional emotion lemmas included *grustnaial'* 'sad' (2 participants), *plakat''* 'to cry' (2 participants), *ogorchenal'* 'saddened' (1 participant), *trevozhit'sial'* 'to be anxious' (1 participant), *melankholicheskoe [sostoianie]'* 'melancholic [state]', *slezyl'* 'tears' (1 participant). These lemmas can be divided into two emotion categories: *grust''* 'sadness' (*rasstroenal'* 'upset', *grustnaial'* 'sad', *plakat''* 'to cry', *ogorchenal'* 'saddened', *melankholicheskoe [sostoianie]'* 'melancholic [state]', *slezyl'* 'tears') and *trevogal'* 'anxiety' (*trevozhit'sial'* 'to be anxious'). Monolingual Russian narrators recalling *Pis'mo*, evoked only the category of *grust'* 'sadness', thus, we can see that the bilingual narrators added the categories of *gnevl'* 'anger' and *trevogal'* 'anxiety'.

In sum, the discussion above demonstrates that in their identification of emotion states of the main protagonist in the two films, Russian–English bilinguals patterned, in each of their languages, with the monolingual speakers of that language, using appropriate lexical resources in each case. While the bilinguals also consistently evoked the category of *trevoga* or 'anxiety', the importance of this finding is hard to judge; it is possible that this category would have also surfaced in monolinguals' narratives if larger numbers of participants had been interviewed.

**4.2.2 Framing of emotions.** In this section I will examine what linguistic means bilinguals use in their emotion talk. An analysis of the frequency of use of different word categories in the two languages of the bilingual

subjects suggests that, in the English corpus, adjectives, in particular adjectives derived from emotive verbs, such as ‘upset’, ‘distressed,’ or ‘disturbed’, are predominant (58 tokens, 59 percent). Thus, in their preference for adjectives in English, Russian–English bilinguals pattern with American monolinguals. Accordingly, in their English narratives, the bilinguals consistently frame emotions as states and not as activities, using perception copulas and change-of-state verbs. They also frame the young woman’s state as problematic through the use of collocations such as ‘something is wrong’:

- (6) ... she seems to be very distressed ...  
... she becomes upset ...  
... she reads the letter and she gets upset ...  
... she ... said hi, and noticed the state the young girl was in ...  
... [she] asks her what’s wrong ...

At the same time, not all instances of discursive construction of emotions are fully native-like in these narratives. A closer look at the vocabulary used by the bilingual participants (see Appendix 1) demonstrates that some retell the two films with high intensity, not witnessed in the monolingual American corpus (Pavlenko 2002):

- (7) ... she takes it close to her heart ...  
... the woman grieves about what happened ...

One Russian–English bilingual also produced the following instance of semantic transfer of a Russian metaphoric expression *byt’ v sebel’* ‘to be deep in thought’ (literally: inside oneself):

- (8) ... she is deep inside herself ...

The fact that not all Russian–English bilinguals have fully transformed their emotion discourse is particularly evident when it comes to the links made between emotions and the body. Eight out of fourteen participants (57 percent) made these links in their English narratives, paying significantly more attention to the body than American monolinguals did. Similar to the Russian monolinguals, they evoked body parts (head, face, hands) and behaviors (reactions, gestures):

- (9) ... her face first shows puzzlement ... which grows into anger, which then grows into sorrow or sadness ...  
... her face changes and, obviously, she doesn’t like what is written there ...

... [she] closes her face with her hands ... in/in desperation, or frustration ...  
 ... she sighs and puts her hand on her head ...  
 ... [she] sits, holding her head in a somewhat dramatic pose ...  
 ... very bad news, as we see by her reactions ...  
 ... she read the letter and was sitting there in a very upset manner ...  
 ... and the ... person who walks in she becomes very disturbed by the appearance of the young lady ...

The analysis of the word categories in the Russian part of the bilingual corpus (see Appendix 2) indicates that in Russian the bilinguals pattern with Russian monolinguals in their slight preference for verbs (39 tokens, 44 percent) over adjectives (35 tokens, 39 percent). They also use emotion lemmas of great intensity seen previously in the monolingual Russian corpus, such as *gorel* 'grief', *tragicheskaja* 'tragic,' or *burno* 'violently':

- (10) ... *[ona] vpadaet v shok* ...  
 literally: 'she falls into a shock'  
 ... *muzyka byla takaia tragicheskaja* ...  
 'the music was so tragic'  
 ... *ona nachinaet rasstraivat'sia i postepenno vpadaet v delv depressiiu* ...  
 'she starts getting upset and [is] gradually falling into de/into depression' (becoming depressed)

Similarly to Russian monolinguals, they also pay a lot of attention to external appearances and body language: 10 out of 17 bilinguals (59 percent) provided explicit links between emotions and the body in their narratives:

- (11) ... *ona stala kachat' golovoi i sdelala grustnoe litso* ...  
 'she started shaking her head and made a sad face'  
 ... *ee podruga ... a ... kachaet golovoi v nedoumenii* ...  
 'her friend ... uhm ... shakes her head in puzzlement'  
 ... *ee litso staetsia ... stanovitsia ochen' serieznoe* ...  
 'her face becomes [conjugation error] ... becomes very serious'  
 ... *ona ochen' perezhivaet ... m ... v odin moment ona prosto kinula pis'mo na stol, i zakryla litso rukoi, ona terebit volosy, ona vzdykhaet* ...

'she is suffering through strongly ... uhm ... at some point she simply threw the letter on the table, and covered her face with her hand, she is touching her hair, sighing'

However, once we take a closer look at the Russian narratives, we see that they are no longer fully native-like. While the participants continue discussing the woman as being or getting *rasstroennaia* 'upset', only one participant out of 17 mentioned that she was 'suffering things through' / *perezhivat*'. This emotion script appears to be disappearing, and, together with it, the view of emotions as an active process. While the bilinguals still favor verbs, in particular, *rasstroit'sia* 'to get upset' (semantically close to the English 'upset'), some also attempt to substitute verbs for adjectives, and some, as seen in example (12), shift between the two conceptualizations. As a result, the bilinguals' Russian narratives contain instances of semantic and morphosyntactic transfer in which narrators incorporate perception copulas and change-of-state verbs in their texts, thus exhibiting the influence of English on their Russian. Often, as seen in the examples below, they realize that they are not using the appropriate frames and start pausing, stumbling, stuttering, self-correcting, and running a meta-linguistic commentary. The first case exemplified below is the inappropriate use of the verb *stanovit'sia* 'to become' with emotion adjectives, in cases where monolingual participants use action verbs such as, for instance, *rasserdit'sia* 'to get angry' or *rasstroit'sia* 'to get upset'. This literal translation from English represents both semantic and morphosyntactic transfer as, in rare cases when this change-of-state verb is followed by adjectives, the adjectives are obligatorily in the instrumental case:

- (12) ... *ona stala eshche bolee rasstroennaia* ...  
 'she became even more upset'/NOM
- ... *ona byla, stala ... serdit'sia* ...  
 'she was, became (meaning: started) ... getting angry'
- ... *ee litso staetsia ... stanovitsia ochen' serieznoe* ...  
 'her face becomes [conjugation error] ... becomes very serious'/  
 NOM
- ... *ona stanovitsia ochen' kakaia-to takaia ... trudno, ia dazhe ne znaiu kak eto skazat' ... nu, kak-to melankholicheskoe u nee sos-toianie* ...  
 'she becomes so very ... it's hard, I don't even know how to say that ... well, she is in a melancholic state'

Another instance of L2 influence on L1 is the use of perception verb *vygliadet'* 'to look as if'. The uses of this verb exemplified below are inauthentic for a number of reasons. To begin with, the use of *vygliadet'* is a non-native like narrative strategy, not encountered in the narratives produced by monolingual Russians who favor either action verbs, such as *rasstroit'sial'* 'to get upset' or direct descriptions of states such as *ona rasstroenal'* 'she [is] upset'. In contrast, monolingual speakers of English in the previous study (Pavlenko 2002) preferred to phrase their opinions in a qualified way, stating that the woman 'seemed upset' or 'looked as if she was upset'. Secondly, the use of *vygliadet'* is also inappropriate in this context for pragmatic reasons, as in Russian it is used in a limited range of contexts to tell people that they either look well (*khorošo vygliadet'*) or do not (*plokho vygliadet'* 'to look badly', i. e., tired). Finally, the use of *vygliadet'* also creates morphosyntactic problems for the participants. To begin with, in Russian the verb is most frequently used with a limited range of adverbs, such as the ones above; in rare cases when it is used with adjectives, it subcategorizes for adjectives in the instrumental case. In contrast, in English the verb may subcategorize for an array of adjectives in the nominative case. Thus, the participants often pause, hesitate, and then resort to the construction *kak budto* 'as if', which allows them to avoid subcategorization errors (in particular, if they are no longer comfortable with case endings) and to produce a new clause:

- (13) ... *ona vygliadit kak, mozhet byt', ona budet plakat'*  
 'she looks as if, maybe, she will be crying' [here the subject missed an obligatory particle *budto* 'if' which should have followed *kak* 'as']
- ona vygliadela kak budto by ona byla zla na kogo-to ...*  
 'she looked as if she were angry at someone'
- ... *ona ne vygliadela kak budto by ona byla zla ... ona vygliadela kak budto by ei bylo ochen' ne grustno, no ne znlneponiatno, chto s nei bylo ...*  
 'she didn't look as if she were angry ... she looked as if she were not sad, but I don't kn/it's not clear what was going on with her'

Another case of L2 transfer is the use of the verb *chuvstvovat'* 'to feel'. Similar to *vygliadet'* 'to look as if', this verb is frequently used with a limited range of adverbs such as *khorošol'* 'well' (as in *chuvstvovat' sebja khorošol'* 'to feel well') or *plokhol'* 'badly' (*chuvstvovat' sebja plokhol'* 'to feel badly', i. e., to be ill); with adjectives the verb subcategorizes for the instrumental case. Moreover, in either case, it is obligatory to use the reflexive form of the verb which includes the particle *sebia* 'self' (e. g.,

*ona chuvstvovala sebja neschastnoil'* 'she felt [herself] unhappy'/INST). In the example below, the participant produced a literal translation from English which represents an instance of both semantic transfer (the inappropriate use of *chuvstvovat'* 'to feel' in combination with *grustnaial'* 'sad') and morphosyntactic/subcategorization transfer (the reflexive particle is missing and the adjective is in the nominative, instead of the instrumental case):

- (14) ... *ona chuvstvovala ... mm ... grustnaia*  
'she felt ... uhm ... sad'

In addition to the inappropriate uses of verbs, some participants exhibited L2-influenced semantic transfer in their use of emotion adjectives. To begin with, Russian has three translation equivalents of angry – *serdityil'* 'cross', 'angry at the moment', *zloi'* 'malicious', 'very angry', 'mean' (typically used as a personality characteristic), and *gnevnyil'* 'irate', 'in wrath' – each adjective more intense than the preceding one. Russian monolinguals favored the first term *serditaial'* 'cross' in their narratives. In contrast, as can be seen in example (13), some Russian–English bilinguals appear to have collapsed the distinctions and used the short adjective *zlal'* 'malicious', 'angry' in describing the main protagonist. Another case where the English concept appears to influence the use of a Russian word is the notion of *schast'iel'* 'happiness'. In Russian, the adjective *schastlivyi, -aial'* 'happy' is used to describe a lasting state of happiness, while the English 'happy' has a much wider range of usage and may be used to mean 'pleased' or 'satisfied' (for a discussion of the English 'happy' as being weaker than its Russian counterpart, see Wierzbicka 1999: 53). One Russian–English bilingual in the study has substituted the English concept for the Russian one, as seen in the example below, where *neschastlivaial'* 'unhappy' is used in the context where Russian monolinguals would use the adjective *nedovol'nal'* 'dissatisfied':

- (15) ... [*ona*] *vidit, chto ee doch' ne ochen' takaia ... schastlivaia ...*  
'[she] sees that her daughter is not that ... happy'

To sum up, the analysis of word frequencies in the corpus appears to suggest that the Russian–English bilinguals in the study are behaving appropriately in each language, constructing emotions in accordance with language-specific patterns, adjectival in English and verbal in Russian. A closer examination demonstrates, however, that their use of emotion discourses is not always language-appropriate. To begin with, we can see that the notion of *perezhivat'* 'suffer things through', dominant in the monolingual Russian narratives, does not appear in any but one

of the 17 narratives produced in Russian by the bilingual participants. We can also identify a number of instances of L2 influence on L1 in the Russian narratives where bilinguals attempt to frame emotions as states and in the process violate semantic and morphosyntactic constraints of Russian discourse. These findings suggest that at least some of the bilinguals in the study have transformed their emotion concepts and readjusted their verbal repertoires to fit better into their new speech community. At the same time, the use of emotionally charged vocabulary, links made between emotions and the body, and instances of L1 transfer, indicate that not all bilinguals have fully transformed their emotion discourse: some may still be in the process of doing so, and some may continue to adhere, at least to some extent, to Russian discourse patterns.

4.2.3 *Emotion scripts.* The final step of the analysis compared the interpretations offered in the four sets of narratives for the first woman's departure from the room after the second woman started reading the letter. In *The Letter* narratives in English, six participants (60 percent) suggested that the woman left because she resented the invasion of her privacy (i. e., having her letter read) and didn't want to share the news with the other woman; three suggested that she was upset and wanted to be alone, and one stated that she left 'for the sake of dramatic gesture'. In the four *Pis'mo* narratives in English, two participants suggested that the woman resented the invasion of privacy, and two that she was upset and wanted to be alone. Both interpretations are similar to those provided by monolingual Americans (Pavlenko 2002), and the first one is expressed through culture- and language-specific Anglo concepts of 'privacy' and 'personal space'.

- (16) ... she, uhm, obviously gets angry at her roommate about not keeping her privacy, and trying to read the letter that brought her much pain ...  
 ... she felt she was intruded, her personal space was intruded, she just wanted to be alone by herself ...

In the Russian version of *The Letter* narratives, seven participants (70 percent) stated that the woman left because she 'didn't like'/*ne ponravitsia* the fact that the other woman read her letter, two suggested she left because she was *rasstroennaial'* 'upset', and one said that she needed *obdumat'* 'to think things through'. In the seven *Pis'mo* narratives, three participants inferred that the woman was *rasstroennaial'* 'upset' and wanted to be alone, two said that she wanted to smoke and maybe to change the scene, while two more said that she was displeased with her letter being read by the other woman. In sum, in the English version of

their narratives the bilinguals performed like American monolinguals, exhibiting sensitivity to the fact that the letter was read by the other woman and even evoking the concept of privacy. In the Russian narratives they opted for scripts that appear to be shared by the two cultures, such as the need to be alone when one is upset. Unlike Russian monolinguals, however, they did not invoke the salient Russian script of ‘giving in to one’s feelings’ and ‘suffering things through’, instead, one participant opted for the notion of *obdumat’* ‘to think things through’.

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, I argue that the data discussed above suggest that in the process of second language socialization some adults may transform their verbal repertoires and conceptualizations of emotions, or at least internalize new emotion concepts and scripts. The analysis of emotion vocabulary in the corpus suggests, at first sight, that the Russian–English bilinguals in the study use their lexical resources appropriately in each language, exhibiting an adjectival pattern in English and a verbal pattern in Russian. However, a closer look at the emotion scripts which they draw on suggests that, first of all, some of these bilinguals have internalized and actively deploy American concepts of privacy and personal space, and, second, that rather than adhering to emotion concepts and scripts salient in monolingual Russians’ narratives, they favor concepts and scripts shared by their two speech communities. As we can see, only one among 31 participants evoked the notion of *perezhivat’* and, with it, the salient Russian script of ‘giving in’ to one’s feelings and emotions. Moreover, the notion is evoked in passing and not deployed by that participant in the explanation of the woman’s departure. The possibility of internalization of new emotion concepts by Russian immigrants in America is also evoked by Andrews (1999: 100) whose subjects produced code-switches such as ‘*Oni budut ochen’ eksaited!*’ (‘They will be very excited!’). While in bilingual dictionaries ‘excited’ is usually glossed as *vzvolnovannyi*, the translation is only an approximate one, as the Russian word contains a negative element of worry or nervous agitation, absent from its English counterpart. Consequently, bilinguals who want to emphasize the positive aspect of being agitated, have to appeal to lexical borrowing and code-switching.

Most importantly, the participants in the present study also seem to be in the process of shifting their conceptualization of emotions from that of an active process to that of a state. The analysis of bilinguals’ narratives told in Russian demonstrates that some late Russian–English bilinguals attempt to frame emotions as states through uniquely English means, thus producing instances of L2-influenced semantic and morpho-

syntactic transfer. Thus, it is possible that in the process of second language socialization not only internalization of new concepts takes place, but also the process of attrition of concepts and scripts that would be marked and inappropriate in the new interpretive community. The results of the study also suggest that these individuals may be at different stages with regard to their discursive assimilation: some may have already approximated the emotion discourses of their new community, while others, as seen in the instances of L1 transfer, may either be in the process of doing so or may be adhering to Russian discourse patterns.

These results should not be surprising if we consider the fact that when changing speech communities, newcomers, often immigrants and refugees, also change interpretive communities or communities of meaning which share particular cultural scripts. As indicated previously with regard to personal recollections of bilingual writers, the process of learning a new language involves not only learning new vocabulary and the new rules of syntax and phonology, but, most importantly, learning to associate words and verbal patterns with particular scripts which are meaningful in the new community. What this means with regard to emotion vocabulary is best expressed by Lutz:

to understand the meaning of an emotion word is to be able to envisage (and perhaps to find oneself able to participate in) a complicated scene with actors, actions, interpersonal relationships in a particular state of repair, moral points of view, facial expressions, personal and social goals, and sequences of events. (Lutz 1988: 10)

It appears that the participants in the study are attempting to do just that, adjusting to their immediate semiotic environment and in the process transforming their emotion discourses. Thus, for them, just as it was for Davidson (1993), Hoffman (1989), or Wierzbicka (1994), secondary socialization may also involve internalization of new ideologies of emotion.

Clearly, the present investigation is limited in a number of ways. To begin with, the subjects in the study are late bilinguals, who learned their second language in adulthood, and made a transition as refugees and immigrants to a more powerful and prestigious linguistic and cultural community. Future investigations of bilinguals' emotion talk will need to expand the subject pool and investigate ways in which emotions are discussed by simultaneous bilinguals and multilinguals interacting with a number of linguistic and cultural communities. It would also be interesting to look at individuals making a transition to a second language not generally viewed as more powerful and prestigious than their first. Moreover, the present study constitutes a controlled experiment where

third person narratives about emotion states were elicited rather than spontaneously produced. While this research design allows for comparison between monolinguals' and bilinguals' narratives, it does not provide any insights with regard to ways in which bilinguals construct emotions in conversation and in first person or personal narratives. Thus, future research may need to combine a variety of methods which will include ethnographic investigations of bilinguals' emotion talk.

As a result of these limitations, it is possible that the present study raises more questions than it provides answers, and in the process opens new venues for the investigation of the relationship between bilingualism and emotions, in particular, emotion discourses. Is there a difference between emotion discourses of bilingual individuals in first and third person narratives? Is there a difference between verbal repertoires they deploy in narratives and conversations? How does second language socialization into emotion discourses take place? What happens in cases when individuals refuse to readjust their emotion repertoires and, as a result, sound too affectionate, emotional, or high-strung (or, in the reverse scenario, too cold and impassive) in their new speech community? What do verbal repertoires of other types of bilinguals look like, in particular, those of simultaneous bilinguals, who, unlike the participants in the present study, often belong to two different speech communities? I believe that answers to these and similar questions will significantly enrich our understanding of bilingualism and second language learning and provide us with new insights into the complex relationship between languages, emotions, and socially constituted selves in multilingual contexts.

*Temple University*

## **Note**

1. The transliteration of Russian Cyrillic used in this paper is based on the Library of Congress system.

## **Acknowledgments**

I am deeply grateful to Anna Wierzbicka and Robert Schrauf for continuous inspiration that comes from their interdisciplinary work on language, emotions, and cognition, to Jean-Marc Dewaele, Scott Jarvis, Slava Paperno, and Eun-hee Seo for their valuable help and support at various stages of this project, and to my two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Any remaining errors or inaccuracies are strictly my own.

### Appendix 1. Emotion words in L2 English produced by 14 Russian–English bilinguals

(51 words, 99 tokens)

Nouns (n = 16, 31 %; 17 tokens; 17%)	Adjectives (n = 22, 43 %; 58 tokens; 59%)	Verbs (n = 12, 24 %; 19 tokens; 19%)	Adverbs (n = 1, 2%; 5 tokens; 5%)
anger 2	afraid 1	bother 1	alone 5
death 1	angry 2	console 2	
desperation 1	annoying 1	cry 3	
disturbance 1	ashamed 2	die 1	
emotions 1	bad 2	feel 1	
frustration 1	disappointed 1	grieve 1	
heart 1	distressed 1	intrude 2	
illness 1	disturbed 3	like 1	
pain 1	dramatic 2	love 1	
privacy 1	emotional 3	share 4	
puzzlement 1	frustrated 2	sigh 1	
reactions 1	happy 1	upset 1	
sadness 1	irritated 1		
sorrow 1	nervous 1		
state 1	personal 4		
stress 1	preoccupied 1		
	puzzled 1		
	sad 2		
	surprised 1		
	unhappy 1		
	upset 24		
	worried 1		

Next to each word is the number of its tokens in the corpus.

### Appendix 2. Emotion words in L1 Russian produced by 17 Russian–English bilinguals

(43 words, 89 tokens)

Nouns (n = 6, 14 %; 7 tokens, 8%)	Adjectives (n = 14, 32 %; 35 tokens, 39%)	Verbs (n = 17, 40 %; 39 tokens, 44%)	Adverbs (n = 6, 14%; 8 tokens, 9%)
<i>gore/grief, sorrow</i> 1	<i>vozmushchenal</i> indignant/FEM 2	<i>vzdykhat'/to sigh</i> 1	<i>burno/violently</i> 1
<i>depressiia/</i> depression 1	<i>grustnaia/sad/FEM</i> 6	<i>delit'sial/to share</i> 1	<i>grustno/sadly</i> 2
<i>slezy/tears</i> 1	<i>zla/angry/FEM</i> 2	<i>(za-)grustit'/</i> to get sad 2	<i>neterpelivol</i> impatiently 1
<i>sostoianie/state</i> 2	<i>melankholicheskoe/</i> melancholic/	<i>ne nraivit'sial/to</i> dislike, be disliked 4	<i>odna/alone</i> 2
<i>chuvstva/feelings</i> 1	NEUT 1		<i>plokho/badly</i> 1

Appendix 2 (continued)

Nouns (n = 6, 14%; 7 tokens, 8%)	Adjectives (n = 14, 32%; 35 tokens, 39%)	Verbs (n = 17, 40%; 39 tokens, 44%)	Adverbs (n = 6, 14%; 8 tokens, 9%)
<i>shok/shock</i> 1	<i>nekoroshie/bad/PL</i> 1 <i>ogorchenal</i> saddened/FEM 3 <i>plokhie/bad/PL</i> 1 <i>podavlenmoel</i> depressed/NEUT 1 <i>rasserzhenal/angry/</i> FEM 1 <i>rasstroennaial</i> upset/FEM 11 <i>serieznoel</i> serious/NEUT 3 <i>schastlivaial/happy/</i> FEM 1 <i>tragicheskaiial</i> tragic/FEM 1 <i>emotsional'naial</i> emotional/FEM 1	<i>obidet'/to offend</i> 1 <i>perezhivat'/to suffer</i> through 1 <i>plakat'/to cry</i> <i>pozhalet'/</i> to console 1 <i>proreagirovat'/</i> to react 2 <i>razozlit'sial/to get</i> angry 1 <i>rasserdit'sial/to get</i> angry 2 <i>rasstroit'sial/to get</i> upset 11 <i>trevozhit'sial/to</i> be anxious 1 <i>umeret'/to die</i> 1 <i>uspokoit'/to calm</i> someone down 2 <i>uteshit'/to console</i> 1 <i>chuvstvovat'/to feel</i> 1	<i>strashno/afraid</i> 1

\* Next to each word is the number of its tokens in the corpus.

References

Amati-Mehler, Jacqueline, Simona Argentieri, and Jorge Canestri (1993). *The Babel of the Unconscious: Mother Tongue and Foreign Languages in the Psychoanalytic Dimension*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

Andrews, David (1999). *Sociocultural Perspectives on Language Change in Diaspora: Soviet Immigrants in the United States*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Anooshian, Linda and Paula Hertel (1994). Emotionality in free recall: Language specificity in bilingual memory. *Cognition and Emotion* 8 (6), 503–514.

Arnold, Jane (ed.) (1999). *Affect in Language Learning*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Averill, James (1986). The acquisition of emotions during adulthood. In Harré, Rom (ed.), *The Social Construction of Emotions*. Oxford: Blackwell, 98–118.

Bamberg, Michael (1997). Language, concepts and emotions: The role of language in the construction of emotions. *Language Sciences* 19 (4), 309–340.

Bond, Michael and Tat-Ming Lai (1986). Embarrassment and code-switching into a second language. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 126 (2), 179–186.

Briggs, Jean (1970). *Never in Anger: Portrait of an Eskimo Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Buxbaum, Edith (1949). The role of a second language in the formation of ego and superego. *International Journal of Psychiatry* 18, 279–482.

Clachar, Arlene (1999). It's not just cognition: The effect of emotion on multiple-level discourse processing in second-language writing. *Language Sciences* 21, 31–60.

- Damasio, Antonio (1999). *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Davidson, Cathy (1993). *36 Views of Mount Fuji: On Finding Myself in Japan*. New York: Dutton.
- Edwards, Derek (1997). *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan (1954). Identification and bilingualism. Reprinted in Dil, Anwar (ed.), *Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1973, 1–14.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan (1964). Language and TAT content in bilinguals. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 68, 500–507.
- Foster, Rose-Marie (1996). The bilingual self: Duet in two voices. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 6 (1), 99–121.
- Gonzalez-Reigosa, F. (1976). The anxiety arousing effect of taboo words in bilinguals. In Spielberger, C. and R. Diaz-Guerrero (eds.), *Cross-cultural anxiety*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere, 89–105.
- Grabois, Howard (1999). The convergence of sociocultural theory and cognitive linguistics: Lexical semantics and the L2 acquisition of love, fear, and happiness. In Palmer, Gary and Debra Occhi (eds.), *Languages of Sentiment: Cultural Constructions of Emotional Substrates*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 201–233.
- Greenson, R. (1950). The mother tongue and the mother. *International Journal of Psychiatry* 31, 18–23.
- Grosjean, Francois (1982). *Life with Two Languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harré, Rom (ed.) (1986). *The Social Construction of Emotions*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heelas, Paul (1986). Emotion talk across cultures. In Harré, Rom (ed.), *The Social Construction of Emotions*. Oxford: Blackwell, 234–266.
- Hoffman, Eva (1989). *Lost in Translation. A Life in a New Language*. New York: Dutton.
- Javier, Rafael (1989). Linguistic considerations in the treatment of bilinguals. *Journal of Psychoanalytic Psychology* 6, 87–96.
- Javier, Rafael and Luis Marcos (1989). The role of stress on the language-independence and code-switching phenomena. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 18 (5), 449–472.
- Kaplan, Alice (1993). *French Lessons*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kellman, Steven (2000). *The Translingual Imagination*. Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kitayama, Shinobu and Hazel Rose Markus (eds.) (1994). *Emotion and Culture: Empirical Studies of Mutual Influence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kovecses, Zoltan (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krapf, E. (1955). The choice of language in polyglot psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 24, 343–357.
- Lerner, Gerda (1997). *Why History Matters: Life and Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levy, Robert (1973). *Tahitians: Mind and Experience in the Society Islands*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- (1984). Emotion, knowing, and culture. In Shweder, R. and R. LeVine (eds.), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 214–237.

- Lutz, Catherine (1988). *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll and Their Challenge to Western Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lutz, Catherine and Lila Abu-Lughod (eds.) (1990). *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Markus, Hazel Rose and Shinobu Kitayama (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, motivation, and emotion. *Psychological Review* 98, 224–253.
- McMahill, Cheiron (2001). Self-expression, gender, and community: A Japanese feminist English class. In Pavlenko, Aneta, Adrian Blackledge, Ingrid Piller, and Marya Teutsch-Dwyer (eds.), *Multilingualism, Second Language Learning, and Gender*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 307–344.
- Novakovich, Josip and Robert Shapard (eds.) (2000). *Stories in the Stepmother Tongue*. Buffalo, NY: White Pine Press.
- Palmer, Gary and Debra Occhi (eds.) (1999). *Languages of Sentiment: Cultural Constructions of Emotional Substrates*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pavlenko, Aneta (1998). Second language learning by adults: Testimonies of bilingual writers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 9 (1), 3–19.
- (1999). New approaches to concepts in bilingual memory. Keynote article. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 2 (3), 209–230.
- (2002). Emotions and the body in English and Russian. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 10 (1–2), 201–236.
- Pavlenko, Aneta and James Lantolf (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In Lantolf, James (ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. New York: Oxford University Press, 155–177.
- Ries, Nancy (1997). *Russian Talk: Culture and Conversation During Perestroika*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rintell, Ellen (1984). But how did you *feel* about that? The learner's perception of emotion in speech. *Applied Linguistics* 5 (3), 255–264.
- (1990). That's incredible: stories of emotion told by second language learners and native speakers. In Scarcella, Robin, Elaine Andersen, and Stephen Krashen (eds.), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, 75–94.
- Rodriguez, Richard (1982). *Hunger of Memory*. New York: Bantam.
- Rosaldo, Michelle (1980). *Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schrauf, Robert (2000). Bilingual autobiographical memory: Experimental studies and clinical cases. *Culture and Psychology* 6 (4), 387–417.
- Schumann, John (1994). Where is cognition? Emotion and cognition in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16, 231–242.
- (1997). *The Neurobiology of Affect in Language Learning*. Boston: Blackwell.
- (1999). A neurobiological perspective on affect and methodology in second language learning. In Arnold, Jane (ed.), *Affect in Language Learning*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 28–42.
- Shweder, Richard and Robert LeVine (eds.) (1984). *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Teicholz, Tom (1993). *Conversations with Jerzy Kosinski*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- White, Geoffrey (1990). Moral discourse and the rhetoric of emotions. In Lutz, Catherine and Lila Abu-Lughod (eds.), *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 46–68.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- (1994). Emotion, language, and cultural scripts. In Kitayama, Shinobu and Hazel Rose Markus (eds.), *Emotion and Culture: Empirical Studies of Mutual Influence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 133–196.
- (1998). Russian emotional expression. *Ethos* 26 (4), 456–483.
- (1999). *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

