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This special issue includes a selection of papers that were presented at the panel “Bilingualism and emotions” during the Second University of Vigo International Symposium on Bilingualism in October 2002. The venue could not have been more appropriate for a meeting on this topic. The inhabitants of this wonderful Galician town are very often bilingual Galician-Spanish speakers, and the organizers of the conference, Fernando Ramallo, Xoán Paulo Rodríguez-Yáñez and Anxo M. Lorenzo Suárez, are staunch defenders of linguistic diversity and openness to new ideas. It was therefore the perfect location and the perfect context to bring researchers from different linguistic and theoretical backgrounds together around the theme of bilingualism and emotions.

There is a paradox in that the topic is very common to all bilinguals and yet it is under-researched. Every bi- and multilingual has strong opinions about the link between emotions and linguistic repertoires, and yet one of the flagship journals in psychology, Cognition and Emotion, has hardly ever touched upon the issue of emotions in a context where more than one language is spoken. The monolingual focus seems rather narrow considering that currently more than a half of the world’s population is bi- or multilingual (Romaine, 1995). Yet Western scholars in social sciences and humanities, and in particular in linguistics and psychology, have been
traditionally apprehensive about working with bi- and multilingual participants and informants, concerned that their perceptions, intuitions, and performances may exhibit ‘impure’ knowledge or ‘incomplete competence’ in the language in question, and convinced that languages are better studied in an ‘idealized’ case of monolingual competence. At times, they have also been guided by the assumption that whatever applies to monolinguals, should be applicable to speakers of more than one language. The third challenge to such research comes from the interdisciplinarity of the inquiry itself. Researchers in the different subfields of bilingualism, as well as those in the different disciplines that study emotions, use distinct methodologies that belong to specific paradigms and provide ‘evidence’ that might not be considered equally valid by other researchers. It takes courage to cross frontiers and boundaries. Yet topics such as bilingualism and emotions that are situated at the intersection of linguistics, cognitive, social, and cultural psychology, anthropology, and second language acquisition cannot be handled in any other way —they have to be studied by scholarly ‘border crossers’.

Examples of the way emotions affect the way multilinguals express themselves abound in the literature. One of the most amusing examples is provided by the famous 17th century diarist, Samuel Pepys, who, in discussing his love for a would-be lover Betty, appeals to intra-sentential trilingual code-switching, from English to French (in italics) to Spanish (in bold), e.g. “I *aime* her *de todo mi corazón*” [I love her with all my heart] (cited by Tomalin, 2002: 213). Consider the following episode from his diary. Samuel takes the heavily pregnant Betty to a shop, encourages her to touch his private parts in the coach on the way home, and then gets very concerned about being found out:

The mistress of the shop took us into the kitchen and there talked and used us very prettily; and took her [Betty] for my wife, which I owned and her big belly; and there very merry till my thing done, and then took coach and home, in the way *tomando su mano* [taking her hand] and putting it where I used to do; which *ella* [she] did suffer, but not *avec tant de* [with as much] freedom as heretofore, I perceiving plainly she had *algunos* [some] apprehensions *de me* [of me], but I did offer *natha* [nothing] more then what I had often done. But now comes our trouble; I did begin to fear that *su marido* [her husband] might go to my house to enquire *por ella* [about her], and there *trovando mi moher* [finding my wife] at home, would not only think himself, but give my *femme* [wife] occasion to think strange things. This did trouble me mightily; so though *ella* [she] would not seem to have me trouble myself about it, yet did agree to the stopping of the coach at the street’s end; and *yo allais con ella* [I went with her] home and there presently hear by him that he had newly sent *su* [his] maid to my house to see for his mistress. This doth much perplex me, and I did go presently home (Betty whispering me, behind the *tergo do* [back of] her *mari* [husband], that if I would say that we did come home by water, *elle* [she] could make up
la cosa [the thing] well satis [enough]). And there in a sweat did walk in the entry antes [in front of] my door, thinking what I should say to my femme [wife]; and as God would have it, while I was in this case (the worst in reference a [to] my femme [wife] that I ever was in my life), a little woman comes stumbling to the entry-steps in the dark; whom asking whom she was, she enquired for my house; so knowing her voice and telling her su dona [her mistress] is come home, she went away (...).

(Pepys, 11 Feb. 1667, cited by Tomalin, 2002: 212-213; translations in square brackets are by Tomalin and the editors)

It is possible that Samuel Pepys’ whimsical code-switching to French and Spanish may be linked to the high emotional content of the event he describes whereby “he moves from delight to eroticism to fear, sweaty panic and relief” (Tomalin, 2002: 212). The switches are not motivated by the desire to confuse a potential reader, as he wrote in shorthand and never showed his diary to anyone. He was not trying to hide it from his wife either, as she was a native speaker of French and probably knew some Spanish too. Rather, code-switching in his text may have served a distancing function, permitting Samuel Pepys to appeal to a second or third language to refer to people (su marido [her husband]) or events (trovando mi moher [finding my wife]) that may have been too troubling to refer to in his first language (cf. Bond & Lai, 1986; Javier & Marcos, 1989). Another possibility is that the words in French and Spanish were more exotic to Samuel and thus had a stronger emotional resonance than the equivalent words in the L1 (hence, references to ella [she]).

These two possibilities illustrate some of the many ways in which emotions impact language choice and use in multilingual contexts. How do bi- and multilinguals express emotions in their respective languages? What are the links between their languages and emotions? The contributors to this special issue raise these and many other questions pertaining to the topic of bilingualism and emotions and offer intriguing answers, grounded both in theory and empirical evidence.

The discussion begins with a paper by Alexia Panayiotou, Bilingual Emotions: The Untranslatable Self. The author argues that certain Greek and English emotion terms, such as frustration and stenahoria, are language —and culture— specific despite the fact that they may appear to be translation equivalents. Based on her research with bicultural Greek-English bilinguals, she shows that connotations, cultural salience, and cultural scripts linked to these terms differ in the two speech communities, American English and Cypriot Greek, and consequently the terms are not used interchangeably by the speakers. Bringing bilingual and bicultural speakers into center of attention, Panayiotou offers a new approach to studies examining cross-linguistic similarities and differences (cf. Altarriba, 2003; Pavlenko, 2002; Wierzbicka, 1999).

The paper The ‘language’ and ‘feel’ of bilingual memory: Mnemonic traces by Robert W. Schrauf and David C. Rubin deals with the emotional intensity of
memories recalled in the first and second language. Contrary to the earlier claims about the strong emotionality of the first language (Anooshian & Hertel, 1994; Bond & Lai, 1986; Javier, 1989), these authors found that in a group of Spanish-English bilinguals, memories in Spanish, the first language (L1), were weaker than those recalled in English, the second language (L2). Challenging earlier results and offering new theoretical and methodological underpinnings for future inquiry, this study breaks new ground in research on language and emotionality in bilingual speakers.

Strong negative emotions associated with a language may have dramatic effects on the individual maintenance of that language. Monika S. Schmid, in her contribution *Identity and first language attrition: A historical approach*, considers L1 attrition of German in an anglophone context. Her analysis of a corpus of narrative autobiographical interviews with 35 German Jews who emigrated from Germany under the Nazi regime, shows that in explaining L1 attrition and language attitudes, experiences in the first language are more important than the length of exposure to the second. As one of the reviewers of this paper aptly remarked, this study offers a stark reminder of a little-recognized result of the horrors of domestic genocide: the rejection of one’s own mother tongue.

Larissa Aronin’s contribution, *Multilinguality and emotions: Emotional experiences and language attitudes of trilingual immigrant students in Israel* considers a more recent group of immigrants, namely young adult Russian Jews who immigrated to Israel where they learned Hebrew and English. Although the learning of two new languages led to a redistribution of language roles and functions and possibly a cultural and national identity renegotiation, the immigrants’ emotional attitudes towards all three languages turned out to be positive. These findings once again reinforce the importance of considering the context of language learning and use.

The last paper in the issue, Jean-Marc Dewaele’s *Blistering barnacles! What language do multilinguals swear in?!* takes us back to questions of language choice, this time for swearing and taboo words. Research suggests that the L1 is typically favored by bilingual speakers to express personal involvement, while the L2 allows them to signal distance and detachment (Amati-Mehler, Argentieri & Canestri, 1993; Anooshian & Hertel, 1994; Javier, 1989). Dewaele’s analysis of responses from more than 1,000 multilinguals to a web questionnaire (Dewaele & Pavlenko, 2001) suggests that it is the dominant language that is used most frequently, and that for 90% of the respondents the dominant language is the L1. Yet a sizeable proportion of the respondents indicated that they prefer their non-dominant language because the reduced emotional force of the swearwords and taboo words made their use more socially acceptable (at least in the speaker’s perception).

Several individuals have been instrumental in putting this special issue together. We are very grateful for the invitation that came from our gracious Spanish hosts
and journal editors, Fernando Ramallo, Xoán Paulo Rodríguez-Yáñez and Anxo M. Lorenzo Suárez — ¡muchísimas gracias! We are equally grateful to our colloquium participants and contributors to the special issue — without their commitment to the topic, there would be no conversation about bilingualism and emotions, so mille fois merci! And finally we are very thankful to people who typically remain invisible and yet are central in ensuring the validity of the scholarly enterprise, our reviewers: Jeanette Altarriba, Diana Ben Aaron, Kees de Bot, Catherine Harris, Bede McCormack, John Myhill, Monika Schmid, and Elena Schmitt. Ogromnoe spasibo! We hope that this special issue will serve to initiate a long-term conversation about ways in which emotions and feelings can impact language choice and use, as well as ways in which bi- and multilinguals encode and express emotions in their multiple languages.
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