

Ahmed Ech-Charfi*

Mohammed V University in Rabat
Morocco

Khalid Elasri**

Mohammed V University in Rabat
Morocco

**EMOTION TERMS IN ARABIC:
A STUDY OF ARABIC-ENGLISH CONTACT¹**

Original scientific paper
UDC 811.411.21`02`373.45=111
811.411.21`02`367.6:159.942.3

This study investigates the change of emotion words in Classical Arabic as a result of contact with English. 213 English words were selected for this purpose the equivalents of which were checked up in two bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries from two different periods. As is the case in other domains of contact, the processes found to operate in the semantic change of emotions were calquing, loan translation, loan rendition and extension, in addition to what is termed here "descriptive translations". Descriptive translations are phrases intended to introduce the meaning of an item to users of bilingual dictionaries. What was noted is that some of these phrases ended up being lexicalizations of unfamiliar emotion categories. Loan words, however, were found to be very rare. It was argued that these kinds of change stand behind the development of Modern Standard Arabic.

Keywords: emotion, Classical Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic, English, language contact.

1. Introduction

Interest in the scientific study of emotions spans over a period of more than a century, the outcome of which is a large body of literature on the subject. This literature has been produced by researchers from different disciplines of enquiry but, unsurprisingly, most of these researchers were trained in psychology, and even those among them who had a different background were easily attracted by the psychologists' concerns. Emotions can sometimes be so intense that they completely go out of control and, consequently, appear external and "objective" not only to the

* Faculty of Education, Mohamed V University in Rabat, Boulevard Mohammed Ben Abdellah Regragui-Madinat Al Irfane-B.P. 6211 Rabat; a.echcharfi@um5r.ac.ma.

** Faculty of Education, Mohamed V University in Rabat, Boulevard Mohammed Ben Abdellah Regragui-Madinat Al Irfane-B.P. 6211 Rabat.

¹ We would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their comments on a previous version of the paper.

individual experiencing them, but also to the neutral observer. But on the other hand, their nebulosity does not help in the way of “carving their nature at its joints” without relying on the linguistic expressions provided by different languages to denote the various types of positive and negative emotions. In other words, the psychologist cannot address the nature of emotions directly without invoking the emotion terms made available by their language or some other language dominant in the field. The issue is that natural languages can sometimes diverge radically in the way they categorize emotions to the extent that it becomes unclear whether emotions are purely psychological phenomena or are mere artifacts of language and culture. Apparently, even linguists have found this problem so fascinating that they rarely discuss emotion terms from a purely linguistic perspective, that is, without getting involved in the controversy of whether emotions are universal or culture-specific (cf. Wierzbicka, 1999). As a consequence, not many studies can be found which deal with the semantics of emotion terms in diachrony or in contact situations; hence, the rationale for the present study on Modern Standard Arabic (MSA).

MSA is the name used by Western scholars to refer to the modern version of Classical Arabic (CA), a language that was standardized more than 14 centuries ago in response to the communicative and cultural needs of the Arab-Islamic Empire. Native speakers of Arabic do not usually distinguish between the classical and the modern versions and continue to believe that the two form one and the same language usually referred to as *al-fuṣḥā* (the purest variety). But irrespective of this dissonance, the differences between the classical and the modern usage, including vocabulary usage, cannot be denied, as will be shown in this study. As argued by many researchers, the major factor behind the development of MSA is contact with the major European languages such as English and French (cf. Holes, 2004).

In this paper, we will first compare a list of English emotion nouns with their MSA equivalents, as provided by two English-Arabic bilingual dictionaries, to see the extent to which these dictionaries converge or diverge on the proposed translations and, second, to check the original meaning of these translations in monolingual dictionaries of CA to see the extent to which emotion terms have changed meaning to parallel that of their English counterparts. A classification of the semantic changes will be suggested on the basis of the data investigated. The paper will be divided into four main sections, in addition to an introduction and a conclusion. Section 2 will provide an overview of the major issues and findings on emotions as an interdisciplinary field of research. Section 3 will present the methodology used to collect and analyze data. Section 4 will

present the results and, finally, Section 5 will discuss the findings through a diachronic semantic analysis of a set of words referring to "basic" emotions.

2. Overview of Emotion Research

According to Wierzbicka (1999: 32-33), three levels of emotional phenomena need to be distinguished. These are: "(1) the psychological phenomena themselves; (2) the conceptualization of these phenomena; (3) the words and expressions linked in a given language for the concepts in question". Although some studies are devoted to each of these levels separately, the general practice is to deal simultaneously with more than one level because emotions do not come in distinct categories independently from the linguistic expressions or the cultures in which they are categorized (for a general discussion of the major issues in the field, see the papers in Dalglish and Power, 1999; Barrett, Lewis and Haviland-Jones, 2016; Meiselman, 2016 and Russell, Fernández-Dols, Manstead and Wellenkap, 1995, among others).

One of the key challenges for psychologists is identifying accurately how emotions are experienced in real-life situations, rather than relying on conceptualizations shaped by different social groups. Because human beings experience emotions as strong internal reactions to external stimuli, common sense dictates that there should be no significant difference between the types of emotions recognized by the human race or the way they are experienced. As such, emotions fall squarely within the realm of psychology since they are mere reflections of biochemical reactions in the body at the level of consciousness. As Izard (1972: 51) asserts, "emotion is a complex process that has neurophysiological, motor-expressive, and phenomenological aspects". This understanding predicts that, although some differences might be recorded in the way languages and cultures categorize and label emotions, the emotions themselves are universal, that is, phylogenetic.

But when it comes to listing universal basic emotions, various proposals have been advanced, ranging between a set of four (e.g. James 1983) and nine (e.g. Tomkins, 1962; 1963), although the most popular theories today suggest only six (cf. Ekman, 1992) or seven (cf. Ekman and Cardo, 2011). This lack of consensus is due essentially to the nebulous nature of emotions: they tend to form a scale with varying degrees of intensity rather than discrete units, much like a color spectrum. Besides, the easiest way to identify emotion categories, viz. through linguistic labels, turns out to be the most problematic: emotion words do not have concrete meanings or at least meanings that can be abstracted from sense data; "rather, their meanings and

affective connotations are internalized, constructed, and negotiated in context” (Pavlenko 2008: 147). Besides, different languages provide different categories. As researchers on color perceptions were unable to assert with certainty that all human beings can see the same number of color shades because their linguistic differences indicated otherwise (cf. Berlin and Kay, 1969), so were researchers of emotion. In both cases, the linguistic facts simply do not support the commonsense idea that humans experience color and emotion phenomena in the same way, and this despite the fact that they have the same eye anatomy and exhibit similar physiological and behavioral reactions to various situations. That is why researchers turned to other methods believed to reflect better the human inner life. Nowadays, the use of facial expressions is one of the most common techniques of studying cross-cultural comparisons of human emotions.

To illustrate the notion of basic emotions, we will review briefly Ekman and Cardo’s (2011) paper. In this paper, the authors identify thirteen characteristics of basic emotions among which are distinctive universal signals, distinctive physiology, presence in other primates, etc. The first characteristic, for instance, refers to the fact that some emotions are always reflected in body changes that serve as signals for congeners of the state of mind of the observed individual. As Ekman (1999: 47) explains, “when we see a person with a disgust expression, we know that the person is responding to something offensive to taste or smell, literally or metaphorically, that the person is likely to make sounds such as “yuck” rather than “yum”, and is likely to turn away from the source of stimulation”. In this case, it matters little whether the person has a word for disgust in their language or not, just like any normal human being will be able to distinguish between blue and green colors even when their language has only one word for both. On the basis of the thirteen distinctive characteristics identified by Ekman and Cardo (2011), they conclude that there are seven discrete universal human emotions which are *anger*, *fear*, *surprise*, *sadness*, *disgust*, *contempt*, and *happiness*. The researchers, however, do not exclude the possibility that more basic emotions will be identified as more evidence for them is gathered. It should be pointed out that not all feelings are considered emotions within this line of research; according to Ekman and Cadora (2011: 365), “An emotion is either basic, or it is another affective phenomenon saturated with but different from emotions, such as mood, an emotional trait, an emotional disorder, etcetera”. This remains a topic of ongoing debate.

On their part, ethnologists and linguists are more interested in cultural and linguistic diversity than in physiological or behavioral homogeneity. Their writings abound with cases that would sometimes appear to the uninformed reader as mere curiosities. In his review of the ethnographic literature on the subject, Russell (1991) reports only cases for which there is enough evidence that the ethnographer was well acquainted with the culture and the language they were describing. Despite that, the list of the cases he reports can still seem strange for English speakers. For instance, while English boasts over 2,000 words for emotion categories, Lutz (1980) found only 58 in Ifalukian, a language spoken in the Caroline Islands in Micronesia, and Howell (1981) reports only 7 emotion words used by the Chewong of the Malaysian interior. As a result of this numerical incompatibility, one emotion category in one language could correspond to many in another. For example, the word *kunta* in Pintupi, an aboriginal language of Australia, covers *shame*, *embarrassment*, *shyness* and *respect*. Similarly, Samoans are reported to have one concept including *hate* and *disgust* and another including *love*, *sympathy*, *pity* and *liking*. In opposition, some languages appear to have categories corresponding to more than one in English. As a case in point, while the English concept of *disgust* refers to repudiation of decaying matter as well as for moral indignation, Ifalukian treats the two as separate categories and uses a distinct word for each. These examples and many others more indicate that comprehension and translation of emotion terms could be problematic for the non-native speaker, irrespective of whether the emotions have physiological or behavioral externalizations.

These facts have had deep implications not only for ethnology and linguistics, but also for psychology itself. One of the themes that bring together researchers from these different disciplines concerns the role of language in the development and shaping of emotions. As was explained earlier, one of the dominant assumptions in emotion research is the idea that emotions are "natural kinds", just like chemical or biological categories; they are out there independently of language or culture. But some psychologists working within the framework of Social Constructivism (for a review, see Linquist et. al, 2016) argue that language and culture do interfere in the categorization of emotions by drawing children's attention to particular emotion states and their function in society, i.e. as being either desirable or undesirable. Their position stands midway between universalism and relativism since they assert that variability is limited; the question, therefore, is how to account for it. In this respect, Wierzbicka's Natural Semantic Metalanguage (cf Wierzbicka, 1996; 1999; 2009) stands as a major

linguistic contribution to the study of emotions, besides others put forward by psychologists like Osgood, Fontaine and others (cf. Osgood 1975, Fontaine et. al 2007). But this controversy need not concern us here.

What is of more interest, however, is the more linguistically oriented research. More specifically, studies on the acquisition of emotion words by foreign language learners can directly be relevant to language contact (cf. Pavlenko, 2005; Pavlenko, 2006; Dewaele and Pavlenko, 2002; Marian and Kaushanskaya, 2008; Elasri, 2016). These studies indicate that emotion words and concepts, just like other linguistic items, can be subject to a number of processes as a result of bilingualism. Pavlenko (2008: 155) identifies seven processes displayed in the mental lexicon: "co-existence of L1 and L2 concepts, L1 conceptual transfer, internalization of new concepts, conceptual restructuring, conceptual convergence, conceptual shift, and conceptual attrition". Of these processes, conceptual restructuring, conceptual convergence, and conceptual attrition can have drastic effects on L1 emotion vocabulary. In particular, restructuring has been noted in cases where some L2 words do not have equivalents in L1 and, as a consequence, bilinguals tend to modify the use of an L1 near-equivalent without fully approximating it. In comparison, conceptual convergence pushes the modification to the limits until L1 and L2 concepts become identical. Apparently, conversion happens only in long and balanced states of bilingualism and biculturalism. As to attrition, it refers to situations where some L1 concepts and the words referring to them fall in disuse under the influence of L2.

This study will hopefully show that these processes are operating on the emotion vocabulary of MSA under the influence of English. It could be that this influence is not affecting only word meanings, but also the very nature of emotions experienced by users of MSA as opposed to those experienced by speakers of CA, but this issue is beyond the scope of this paper. Here, we limit ourselves to a semantic analysis of the MSA equivalents of English emotion words suggested by two bilingual dictionaries.

3. Method

MSA is a variety of Arabic that is used mainly for written and formal spoken purposes in Arab countries. It stands in a diglossic relationship with the colloquial in use in each of these countries. But while the colloquial varieties are acquired natively, MSA is learned only through formal education. Although it takes Arab children many years of schooling to achieve a reasonable proficiency in MSA, Arabs still hold to it

because it symbolizes their national identity and their connection with their heritage, especially their religious culture (cf. Suleiman, 2002).

MSA is the outcome of a long and laborious endeavor to modernize CA. The effort started in the second half of the 19th century by individual scholars, but soon a number of language academies were set up in different Arab countries, all with the objective of enabling the Arabic language to express modern scientific and technological knowledge without affecting substantially its grammar or vocabulary. The problem, however, is that decisions in these academies were too slow to satisfy the increasing needs of a globalized Arab World (cf. Hamzaoui, 1972). As a result, the burden of Arabicization of Western concepts shifted mostly to individuals with some knowledge of a foreign language and translating texts into Arabic. The translations are not always checked or approved by experts, but in the long run, they imposed themselves through usage. The story of the modern uses of Arabic emotion words, although not known in detail, probably began in this way.

In this study, the objective is to compare the meaning and use of emotion words in CA and MSA. Obviously, words change their meanings naturally as a result of use, but some of the changes documented below will be argued to be due to contact with English as the language of the former colonizer in many countries of the Middle East.

Several methods could be adopted in the study of semantic change. The traditional way is to compare dictionaries from different periods of time. With the advent of computer technology, this method is now supplemented with studies of digitized texts in search for differences of word use (cf. Blank and Koch, 1999; Allan and Robinson, 2012). These two methodologies are appropriate when no assumptions are made as to the causes of change, which could be mainly internal. In cases of external causes, however, as in situations of language contact, a direct comparison of word meanings in the languages in contact is probably the most straightforward method.

In order to trace semantic change in Arabic emotion words due to contact with English, we selected two English-Arabic bilingual dictionaries in an initial stage: Steingass (1882) and Baalabaki (1975). According to Steingass, his *English – Arabic Dictionary*, was “intended to be a companion to the Traveller who visits the East for pleasure or business purposes, and a help to the advanced Student who begins to translate from English into Arabic” (p. iii). The author adds further that “[i]n the interest of the Traveller, therefore, primary regard is paid to the modern idiom, as it is spoken at the present day, principally in Egypt - and Syria” (p. iv). In other words,

the compiler's objective was to provide for English words their equivalents in Arabic as they were used in the second half of the 19th century. In comparison, Baalabaki's *Al-Mawrid Al-Hadeeth* is intended as a modern bilingual reference for Arabic speakers learning English, emphasizing practical usage, contemporary meanings, and detailed definitions. In the preface to the 2008 edition, the compiler notes that *Al-Mawrid Al-hadeeth* "has become a constant companion to students, teachers, translators, researchers, scientists and (practically) every Arab intellectual" (p. 7), thus testifying to its wide use.

From a lexicographical perspective, the microstructure of these dictionaries appear to be similar. Both Steingass's and Baalabaki's dictionary are aligned with contemporary bilingual lexicography, offering definitions and usage examples relevant to modern Arabic speakers. As Zgusta (1971) notes, the structure of a dictionary directly influences the selection and presentation of lexical items, which is crucial in our study of semantic change. Understanding these typological differences helps contextualize how English influence may be reflected in Arabic emotion vocabulary over time.

The long period separating the publication of the two dictionaries will hopefully point to a change from instability and variation to standardization of the correspondence between English emotion words and their Arabic equivalents. As will be argued, the variation recorded in the two dictionaries points probably to a lack of equivalence between Arabic and English emotion words. On the other hand, the stability noted in the use of such terms in MSA, as reflected by the suggested translations in Baalabaki (1975), is probably the result of a long negotiation of correspondences between Arabic and English emotion terms conducted by members of the Arabic-English bilingual and bicultural elite.

In a second stage, the meaning and use of some of the Arabic words suggested to be equivalents of the English emotion terms were checked up in Ibn Mandhūr's dictionary of CA "*Lisān Al-ʿArab*". Although this dictionary was compiled in the 14th century, it was based essentially on a corpus of classical texts composed anterior to the 9th century, e.g. Quran, Hadith and pre-Islamic poetry. Other similar dictionaries were sometimes consulted for the sake of comparison. These Arabic monolingual dictionaries were consulted in electronic form only; searching for words in websites turned out to be much easier and faster than looking for a root first and, only after that, browsing for the appropriate meaning in the entry, as is usual with Arabic dictionaries. The following website was used for this purpose:

<http://www.baheth.info/>. The objective behind using a dictionary of CA is obviously to trace the possible changes in word meaning between the period before and after contact with English.

As to the list of English emotion terms, the one provided in Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson and O'Conner (1987) was used in this study. This list is constituted of 213 words. One reason why this list was favored over others was that it was constituted of nouns only while most of the other lists included verbs and adjectives as well. While Arabic has both nouns and verbs, it is questionable that it has adjectives (cf. Ech-Charfi, 2012). By limiting the search list to nouns, the problem of incongruence between English and Arabic in word category was avoided. Besides, Arabic has a rich morphology that makes possible the derivation of nouns from virtually all verbs. Another reason for favoring the list by the aforementioned authors (Shaver et al. 1987) was that the emotions it included were ranked according to their prototypicality following a study the researchers conducted on 200 native speakers of English. This ranking will allow us to limit the discussion only to the most prototypical cases and, thus, avoid at least partially the tricky issue of what constitutes an emotion term and what does not, an issue that studies on emotions cannot afford to disregard, as explained earlier.

The 213 emotion words were first entered in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and the corresponding translations in Steingass (1882) and Baalabaki (1975) provided for each of them. When more than one translation was proposed, each one was entered in a separate cell. In this way, we were able to identify duplicates both horizontally and vertically, using the find-and-highlight-duplicates tool in Excel. Horizontal duplicates point to agreement between the dictionaries; that is, both of them suggest the same Arabic equivalent for the English word, which may be interpreted as a sign of equivalence. In comparison, vertical duplicates indicate that an Arabic equivalent is proposed for more than one English emotion word. This kind of duplication is obviously an indication of lack of congruence between the two languages and alerts to possible meaning extension or change. This process resulted in a classification of the types of translations proposed, which will be subjected to further analysis in the light of the typology of semantic change proposed by Mott and Laso (2019) for contact situations. An initial description of these results is provided in the next section and a further discussion can be found in the following one.

4. Results

To trace the effect of English-Arabic contact on the meaning and use of emotion words in MSA, we will begin by a comparison of the two dictionaries sampled for this purpose. The comparison will be formulated first in the number of forms used as equivalents of English emotion words before moving to a discussion of the meaning of those equivalents.

The first remark to be made in this connection relates to the list of items for which no equivalent is provided. Since unrelated languages generally lack congruence in emotion terms, we would expect to find at least some of these terms in English to have no exact equivalent in Arabic and, therefore, it would not be surprising if such cases have no equivalents in bilingual dictionaries. What we notice, however, is that the two dictionaries show very few of such cases. Only around 20 items do not have Arabic equivalents in Steingass (1882) and only one in Baalabaki (1975). Here is the list of items not found in Steingass (1882):

Table 1: English emotion words not found in Steingass (1882)

carefreeness	enthrallment	homesickness	joviality	optimism
despondency	euphoria	hysteria	lividness	somberness
disgruntlement	grouchiness	isolation	nostalgia	titillation
edginess	grumpiness	jitteriness	obsession	vibrance

It is not clear why the author did not include these words but it is possible that he could not think of appropriate equivalents for them. Indeed, some of them such as "hysteria" and "nostalgia" have been borrowed into MSA while the others either have no equivalents or the equivalents suggested by bilingual dictionaries were rarely used. On his part, Baalabaki (1975) excludes only "practicality", which is not much of an emotion word after all.

The question to be addressed now concerns the implications of this apparent isomorphism of English and Arabic emotions terms. Is it an indication that the two languages do not differ much as far as the emotions they describe, or is it simply the result of the dictionary compilers' insistence on providing translations in the target language despite differences in meaning and/or use between equivalents from the two languages? It seems that writers of bilingual dictionaries in general do feel the urge to provide corresponding forms in the target language probably because they believe that bilingual dictionaries are usually used by learners and, consequently, such dictionaries

must provide any kind of help possible. We will show throughout this section that this is indeed the case of many emotion words in the two English-Arabic dictionaries selected for this study.

The first piece of evidence comes from cases where equivalents are not single words, but whole phrases. In Steingass (1882), we counted 17 English items for which 19 different phrases were proposed as equivalents while the figure in Baalabaki (1975) rises to 65 English items for which 88 equivalent phrases were proposed. A classification of these phrases can be found in the following table:

Table 2: Types of Arabic phrases used to explain English emotion words

Noun + Adj	Noun + PP	Genitive P	Non-Nominal P	Explanation
abhorrence	determination	agony	inconsolableness	aggravation
agony	carefreeness	belligerence	displeasure	anguish
anxiety	discontentment	complacency	forlornness	apprehension
aversion	exultation	disappointment	insecurity	determination
craving	gratitude	distraction	startle	exuberance
delight	guilt	gratitude	uneasiness	interest
ecstasy	homesickness	impatience		melancholy
frenzy	nostalgia	self-control		mortification

Noun + Adj is found to be the most widely used type in Baalabaki (1975) while Steingass (1882) prefers genitive constructions. As to non-nominal phrases, they are the least frequent in both dictionaries. The reason why the number of such phrases is higher in Baalabaki (1975) than in Steingass (1882) is probably due to dissatisfaction with Steingass's translations. It should be pointed out that MSA during the 19th and the early 20th century was still in the making, and many words and expressions accepted as standard at that time were dismissed later as substandard (cf. Brustad, 2017 on the ideology behind this shift). Many such cases are found in Steingass' dictionary.

The use of phrases as translations for English emotion words is a clear indication that these words do not have single equivalents in Arabic. The use of an adjectival word in Arabic, for example, is one way of expressing a higher degree of an emotion which is denoted by a single word in English. As a case in point, while the English word "aversion" singles out a strong dislike as a distinct emotional category, Arabic apparently identifies only "dislike" as a category referred to as *budq*; that is why

“aversion” is translated simply as *buḡḡ šadīd* “strong dislike”. In comparison, the Noun + PP phrases are more of descriptions than equivalents. For instance, “determination” is translated as *ḥabāt ʿalā l-ʿazīmah*, meaning literally “holding to determination”. It seems that this translation was an improvisation because a simple query in arabiCorpus, an online corpus of MSA (<https://arabicorpus.byu.edu/>), returns no results for the expression. The same remark holds for the examples in the last column, although these were presumably intended as explanations for the dictionary users right from the beginning. For “obsession”, for example, Baalabaki proposes *ʾistiḥwāḏ*, but having perhaps realized that this equivalent was usually used for property rather than emotion, he decided to add a further explanation for what was meant by this Arabic word. The addition explains that the word denotes an abnormal control of an idea or emotion over a person causing him anxiety. This strategy, however, is rare in Baalabaki (1975) and is almost non-existent in Steingass (1882). In comparison, the use of genitive phrases is very frequent. For illustration, *rāḥat l-bāl* is given as equivalent to “complacency”, the expression meaning literally “comfort of mind”. But although this expression is common both in MSA and in the various colloquial varieties, not many similar expressions suggested for other emotion words are equally common. Besides, it is doubtful that *rāḥat l-bāl* means exactly the same as “complacency”. Regarding non-nominal expressions, they are recorded especially for English words with prefixes meaning contrast. “Insecurity”, for example, is translated as *ḡayr ʾāmin*, which corresponds more accurately to the adjective “insecure”. Besides, although *ḡayr* originally meant “other”, it has increasingly been used in MSA as some kind of prefix to express contrast, exactly like its corresponding English prefixes. But since this use is not limited to emotion words, a deeper analysis is left for future research.

Another indication of the incongruence between English and Arabic emotion words is provided by the number of Arabic equivalents suggested for English items. In general terms, Steingass uses a total of 320 words and expressions to translate around 193 English words while Baalabaki uses 412 equivalents for 212 English words. This imbalance between the list of English words and the suggested Arabic translations points clearly to mismatches between emotion categories in the two languages. Table 3 below gives more detail about word distribution in the two dictionaries:

Table 3: Number of Arabic equivalents for English emotion words

Steingass (1882)	English words	1	1	1	10	31	60	39	36
	Arabic equivalents	9	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Baalabaki (1976)	English words	2	3	7	4	29	65	72	26
	Arabic equivalents	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

As can be noticed, the number of Arabic equivalents ranges between 1 and 9, but most words have between 1 and 4 equivalents. The two dictionaries differ slightly in this regard. In particular, only three English words have between 6 and 9 Arabic equivalents in Steingass (1882) while 15 words in Baalabaki (1975) have between 5 and 8 equivalents. This is what we would expect when there is no one-to-one correspondence between emotion words in the two languages. On the other hand, 34 words in the first dictionary and 26 in the second have 1 equivalent each, thus indicating that the English words and their translations are assumed to be exact or near equivalents.

Let us consider some examples from the two groups. Steingass suggests 9 equivalents for "modesty", 7 for "mortification" and 6 for "power" whereas Baalabaki provides 8 equivalents for "sullenness" and "viciousness", 7 for "affection", "interest" and "passion", and 6 for "agony", "alienation", "caring", "distraction", "revulsion", "sheepishness" and "virtue". While some of these words like "modesty" and "virtue" can denote emotions or emotion-related behavior, the others denote only emotions. Therefore, while the relatively large number of equivalents suggested for the first group is somewhat expected, we would not expect the second group to have a similar number of equivalents if the emotion categories they refer to are similar in the two languages. It is true that some of these words are polysemous in English and, consequently, each sense could have a different equivalent in Arabic, but that by itself does not explain the multiple translations. As a case in point, of the 6 translations proposed by Baalabaki for "affection", at least 3 are intended to be exact equivalents; these are *ḥāṭifāh*, *šūḥūr* and *wiḏān*. But these are usually used to refer to emotion in general, although not all bilingual dictionaries list all of them as equivalents of the English term. As will be shown shortly, many Arabic words keep appearing as translations for different English emotion terms. All this indicates that the Arabic words are sometimes forced to correspond to English equivalents either by stretching or squeezing their meanings. It is very likely that bilingual language users in general do

the same, and this even for items that have single equivalents in bilingual dictionaries, as will be shown later.

As English emotion words have more than one equivalent in English-Arabic dictionaries, so are Arabic words found to correspond to more than one English word in these dictionaries. Table 4 below summarizes the frequency of such cases in Steingass (1882) and Baalabaki (1975):

Table 4: Arabic words used as equivalents for different English emotion words

Steingass (1882)	Arabic words	1	1	1	4	5	3	14	56
	English equivalents	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2
Baalabaki (1975)	Arabic words	2	1	1	1	1	14	18	63
	English equivalents	9	1	11	6	5	4	3	2

The table shows that some Arabic words can be suggested as equivalents for 5 to 11 English emotion terms. Baalabaki, for example, proposes *kaʔābah* as equivalent to "despondency", "depression", "sadness", "gloom", "unhappiness", "sullenness", "moroseness", "dolefulness", "glumness", "forlornness", and "somberness". Similarly, Steingass suggests *xawf* as corresponding to "fear", "panic", "insecurity", "dismay", "dread", "startle", "terror", "alarm" and "apprehension". Obviously, this is further evidence that the emotion categories in the two languages can sometimes be non-equivalent. But of more interest to us in this study is the indication that bilingual dictionary writers and, by implication, bilingual speakers do strive to find equivalents in the first language for words and expressions in the target language, despite lack of exact correspondence between them.

Even English emotion words which have a single equivalent should not be misinterpreted as straightforward cases. Firstly, these are very limited in number. As shown in Table 3 above, there are only 36 of them in Steingass (1882) and 26 in Baalabaki (1975), but the two lists converge on 6 items only. In other words, most of the words for which one of the dictionaries lists one equivalent have more than an equivalent in the other dictionary. In addition, even those 6 items do not all have the same equivalents. Therefore, the items with single equivalents are no less indicative of variation than the others.

This should not imply that the two dictionaries do not converge at all. In fact, there are cases in which they suggest similar translations for English emotions terms. More specifically, a total of 73 different English words are found to have at least one

similar equivalent; the total of exact equivalents itself amounts to 91 cases. Of course, 73 items form only around 17% of the list containing 213 words, which is rather a low overlap. Besides, this convergence does not exclude other divergent translations suggested for the same items. Some of the cases on which both dictionaries converge will be returned to later.

To conclude, we have shown in this section that there is a lot of variation between the two dictionaries regarding the Arabic translations they suggest for English emotion terms. This variation can be due to two main factors: 1- the lack of exact correspondence between the English emotion categories and their corresponding categories in Arabic, and 2- the redefining of Arabic words to parallel the meanings of English emotion words as a result of contact between the two languages and cultures. But so far, we have considered word forms only, with special focus on their frequency of occurrence in the two dictionaries. In order to argue for semantic change, we will have to compare the modern usage of these forms with classical usage. This will be carried out on a small set of words in the following section.

5. Discussion

Learners of a foreign language tend to transfer characteristics of their L1 to the target language, a phenomenon sometimes referred to as 'interference'. But at a certain point in the learning process, transfer may start to occur from the target language to L1; this usually happens when speakers develop a significant level of bilingualism. At the societal level, this kind of transfer is noted especially when the L1 community comes under the influence of a dominant culture and language. In such a situation, L1 speakers start to emulate the way ideas are usually expressed in the dominant language. Emotion terms in MSA provide good illustration of this fact, as the discussion in this section will show.

The most straightforward example to start with is perhaps the case of lexical loans. Generally, concepts for which no equivalent expression can be found in a language are often referred to by borrowed words when the borrowing community starts to feel the need to communicate those concepts. This concerns all types of concepts, including emotions. In the dictionaries examined in this study, however, very few of such loans are found. In particular, Steingass (1882) cites only "melancholy", and Baalabaki (1975) mentions "hysteria" and "nervousness" under Arabicized forms. Obviously, these lexical loans indicate that the emotions they refer to are not familiar to Arabic speakers, or at least not recognized to form separate categories. But the

limited number of emotion loans should not be interpreted as pointing to the scarcity of incongruent emotion categories in the two languages. Rather, their scarcity is due essentially to the dictionary writers' negative attitude toward lexical borrowing in general, an attitude that is prevalent among Arabic educated classes in general. In informal contexts where this attitude tends to be relaxed, however, the use of foreign words to express various emotions is rather usual.

A more acceptable way to render unfamiliar emotion concepts into MSA is loan translation or calquing. Calques are expressions modeled word-for-word on equivalents in the donor language, while using native vocabulary and grammar. MSA emotion calques often have complex structures, usually consisting of two words. Examples of such cases include *xaybat ḡamal* for "disappointment", *ḡadam riḡā* for "displeasure", and *ḡabṡ al-naḡs* or *tamāluk al-ḡāt* for "self-control". In these examples, the English words consist of a prefix and a base. Since the prefix "dis-" does not have an exact equivalent in Arabic, it is rendered as *ḡadam* meaning "lack", or *xaybat* meaning "disappointment". Similarly, "self-" is translated as *naḡs* or *ḡāt*, both with the same meaning as the English word, though not necessarily the same use. The two nouns in these calques stand in a relation of annexation. But although annexation is found in CA as well, the calques themselves are relatively recent. Steingass, for example, does not cite the examples just mentioned and, for "disappointment", he suggests only *xaybat*, which seems to be more accurate than *xaybat ḡamal*, which literally means "vain hope".

It should be pointed out that not all the calques suggested by the dictionaries are frequent in use. The two expressions suggested as equivalents of "self-control", for instance, are not used equally. A search in arabiCorpus yields 1,208 occurrences for *ḡabṡ al-naḡs* but 0 for *tamāluk al-ḡāt*, while *tamāluk al-naḡs* yields 2 occurrences, though not found in either dictionary. Similarly, while *xaybat ḡamal* occurs 1,320 times, *ḡadam riḡā* occurs only 58 times. But on the whole, calques are rare in the domain of emotions probably because Arabic lacks the resources to reflect exactly the structure of English emotion words, given that the two languages have different morphological structures.

Similar to loan translations are loan renditions. Loan renditions are less tied to target expressions and more imaginative (cf. Mott and Laso, 2019). Although examples of them are not numerous among MSA emotion expressions, examples can be found in the dictionaries sampled. "Homesickness", for instance, is usually rendered in Arabic as *ḡanīn li al-waṡan*, meaning literally "nostalgia for motherland". This expression

occurs 57 times in arabiCorpus, which is a relatively low level of frequency, but the expression is well-known in general usage, though. It is obvious that such expressions can easily escape the purists' censure, although they introduce a new category of emotion previously unlexicalized in the language.

Another way of borrowing English concepts into Arabic that could easily go unnoticed is what can be called "descriptive translations". These are phrases that translate the meaning of English emotion words, but since such words are usually simple, the translations are not the same as calques. Examples of descriptive translations from Steingass (1882) include *nizāf al-mawt* for "agony", *inkisār al-qalb* for "depression", *riqqat al-qalb* for "sentimentality", etc. and from Baalabaki (1975) *šurūd al-đihn* for "distraction", *ibtihāž bi al-našr* for "exultation", *ʔiqrār bi al-faḍl* for "gratitude", etc. Many of these translations, however, do not enjoy wide use. Some of these expressions do not occur at all in arabiCorpus, and only one of them occurs 60 times while the others occur only sporadically. This low frequency is most probably due to their relatively recent introduction into modern usage. But despite their low frequency, they indicate that the emotions they express are gradually recognized by modern Arabic speakers as separate categories. In fact, when these emotions are more central, word frequency could rise significantly. Such is the case of *šuḥūr bi al-đanb* suggested as equivalent to "guilt" by Baalabaki but not by Steingass. This expression occurs 250 times in arabiCorpus while dictionaries of CA do not mention it at all. In CA *đanb* is used to refer to a wrongdoing, not to the feeling associated with it. Therefore, *šuḥūr bi al-đanb* must have been calqued on the English "a feeling of guilt". All this suggests that new emotion categories can make their way to the thought of bilinguals through expressions coined by a minority of writers or dictionary compilers.

"Descriptive translations" have not been discussed much in the literature on semantic borrowing. Mott and Laso (2019) do not mention anything similar to them in their classification of semantic borrowing in situations of language contact. This lack of reference may be explained by a couple of factors. First, many studies cited on the topic concern related languages such as English, Spanish, French, etc. where many words are cognates. In such a situation, the languages in contact share more or less similar morphological resources and, thus, can use calquing as a strategy to borrow new concepts. Second, when non-related languages in contact are investigated, researchers often rely on dictionaries, but dictionaries generally do not always include phrases. Besides, it appears that contact between spoken languages may be slightly different from situations where the recipient language is basically written, as is the

case of CA. In this situation, borrowing must pass through an elite minority who, in the case of Arabic, generally hold a conservative ideology regarding the purity of their language³. Thus, “descriptive translations” are coined when no word-for-word translation is possible and these descriptive translations gain currency basically because the majority of monolinguals have no competence to create alternative equivalents.

In comparison with the types of borrowing discussed so far, semantic extension is noted to be far more prevalent in the domain of emotions, if not in MSA as a whole. Semantic extension can be defined as a type of “semantic change, referring to a widening of meaning in a LEXICAL item” (Crystal 2008: 181, *capitals in the original*). That is to say, the meaning of a word is extended to include parts of a semantic field that were originally outside its realm. In language contact, this happens when bilingual speakers realize that lexical equivalents in their two languages do not have exact senses and that one sense is wider than the other. Consequently, they start to extend the narrower sense to make it identical with the wider one. Alternatively, they shrink the wider sense to parallel the narrow one, a phenomenon called *narrowing*. Both meaning extension and narrowing could go unnoticed by the speech community, especially if they are gradual, and thus escape purists’ censure.

We will begin the discussion of meaning extension by the domain of emotion itself. Many ethnologists have noted that this domain can go unlabeled in some languages (cf. the review in Russell, 1991). This seems also to be the case in CA. Steingass (1882) gives three suggestions: *hayažān*, *ḥarakah* and *iḏṭirāb* while Baalabaki (1975) proposes three other equivalents: *ʔiḥsās*, *ʕāṭifah*, and *infiʕāl*. Obviously, the lack of agreement on a single equivalent is clear evidence that emotion had not been previously recognized as a separate concept. Today, of the six translations, only *ʔiḥsās* and *ʕāṭifah* have gained currency as widely recognized equivalents for the corresponding borrowed concept. Some writers use also *wiždān* or *šufūr* (pl. *mašāʕir*) for the same purpose.

What is the difference between the meaning of *ʔiḥsās* and *ʕāṭifah* in CA and MSA? The two are undoubtedly more frequent in modern than in classical usage. In arabiCorpus, for example, *ʔiḥsās* is attested 10,243 times in the singular form and 2,051 in the plural form. On its part, *ʕāṭifah* occurs 3,440 times and its plural form

³ Even non-literate societies may have recourse to such a strategy when they adopt purist language ideologies. An example that comes to mind is the expression corresponding to “iron-horse” used by some Amerindian tribes to refer to the train, as in Western movies.

4,161 times in the same corpus. In comparison, only three occurrences of *ʔihsās* are highlighted in the electronic version of the Lisān dictionary of CA under the entry "H.S.S". The dictionary explains that this is a verbal noun from *ʔahass*, meaning to sense and, by extension, to know since the senses are often the source of knowledge. The plural form of the word, however, cannot be found in Lisān or in any other dictionary of CA found in the website: <http://www.baheth.info>. In fact, Omar (2008) reports that this plural form is rejected by some purists on the ground that verbal nouns are never pluralized in CA, unlike the case of MSA. As to *ʔāʔifah*, the Lisān explains that it denotes kinship while the attribute *ʔaʔūf* describes someone who is generous with people and "protects losers". Dictionaries of MSA and bilingual dictionaries, however, tend to ignore some of these senses and focus instead on the sense of feeling or emotion. These remarks indicate clearly that these words shifted their meaning to become more similar to English words believed to be equivalent to them.

The same remark can be made in regard to *šufūr* (pl. *mašāʔir*) as well. This is also a very frequent word in MSA: the singular form occurs 20,242 times and the plural form 18,670 times in arabiCorpus and, at least in some of these occurrences, the word corresponds to emotion or feeling. But it is not clear why neither Steingass nor Baalabaki think that it can be equivalent to emotion. Baalabaki does, however, list it as equivalent to "feeling" and "affection". In CA, *šufūr* seems to be closely connected with the senses; in the case of the plural *mašāʔir*, lexicographers are very explicit that the word refers to the five senses. This meaning, however, is usually expressed by *hawāss*, the plural of *ḥāssah*. As in the case of *ʔahāsis*, Omar (2008) notes that *mašāʔir*, in the sense of emotions, is a neologism unknown in CA.

In all these examples, the Arabic words have extended their meaning. In the case of *ʔihsās* and *šufūr*, the extension is not too difficult to understand. Both words denote senses or feelings, that is, internal reactions to external stimuli. It is possible that both of them used to refer to bodily reactions such as the senses, but were later on extended to include internal feelings as well. Therefore, it is not surprising that a further extension happened later to cover cognitive aspects of feelings as well. Similarly, the extension of *ʔāʔifah* from kinship relations to the domain of emotion is also not completely unexpected. One's family and relatives usually evoke positive feelings and, as a result, the word for kin came to denote positive feelings as well. In a second stage, the meaning is broadened to include all sorts of feelings, positive and negative. But given that all these changes happened in the modern period only, they

must have been consciously monitored as a result of the influence of English and other major European languages. This is probably a specificity of semantic extension in diglossic standard languages like Arabic. In non-diglossic languages, a similar change is expected to be much slower.

Other Arabic emotion words have also been subject to semantic extension for probably the same reasons. Here, and because of space constraints, we will limit the discussion to words referring to what have been argued to be basic emotions. It should be recalled from Section 2 above that some researchers advance that basic emotions include *anger*, *fear*, *surprise*, *sadness*, *disgust*, *contempt*, and *happiness*. If these are indeed basic in the sense that they are universal, we would expect these English words to have exact equivalents in Arabic. We would also expect the two dictionaries used for this study to converge to a large degree on the equivalents suggested for them.

However, not all these predictions are born out. The two dictionaries do converge on equivalents of some of the basic emotions, but not on all of them. Both of them suggest *ḡaḡab* for "anger", *xawf*/*ḡaḡyah* for "fear", *mufaḡḡah* for "surprise", *ḡuzn* for "sadness", *qaraḡ* for "disgust", and *saḡāḡah* for "happiness". But they diverge completely in relation to "contempt"; while Steingass mentions *qaraḡ* and *ḡadāwah*, Baalabaki lists *xīzy* and *ḡār*. They also suggest other translations on which they diverge, and some of these translations are suggested for other English words as well. Note, for example, that *qaraḡ* is proposed as equivalent for both "contempt" and "disgust" by Steingass. Besides, while *qaraḡ* may be usual in some Middle Eastern countries, it is certainly not widely used in others, including North African countries, where *iḡmiḡzāz* is more usual. Judging from this dissonance, it appears that at least "contempt" and "disgust" may not have exact correspondents in CA. As to the others, they are very frequent probably among all Arabic speakers. In *arabiCorpus*, *xawf* occurs 29,005 times, *mufaḡḡah* 6,773 times, *ḡuzn* 12,170 times, and *saḡāḡah* 17,519 times.

But what does convergence on these equivalents indicate precisely? For *ḡaḡab*, *xawf* and *ḡuzn*, this convergence may be due to the meanings of these words in CA. It appears that they do not differ much from "anger", "fear" and "sadness", respectively, in English. This is good indication that these emotion categories are well established in the classical Arabic language and thought. For example, Al-Thaḡālibī (d. 1039 C.E) mentions in his classical book on CA lexicography a few categories of emotions among which are *ḡaḡab* and *ḡuzn*, each including words denoting various degrees. Although Al-Thaḡālibī does not mention *xawf*, there is no doubt that the category is well-

established, too. Even if these concepts are not universal, it seems that there is good chance that they are widely attested in natural languages. This is not necessarily the case with *saʕādah* "happiness" and *mufāẓaʕah* "surprise".

Although *saʕādah* is very frequent in MSA, as was pointed out earlier, and is usually assumed to be an equivalent of "happiness" in English, its use in CA cannot be linked to this meaning in a straightforward way. Al-Thaʕālibī (1938), for example, does not cite the word under the category *surūr*, which includes items referring to various degrees of happiness. Similarly, Lisān and other CA dictionaries mention *saʕādah* as antonymic to *šaqāʕ*, a word meaning misery and suffering. The related *saʕd* is usually opposed to *naḥs*, also meaning suffering and, by extension, bad omen as opposed to *saʕd* "good omen". All these facts indicate that *saʕādah* was not originally considered an emotion word, although it implied satisfaction associated with easy life. The word extended its core meaning to the connotations in a way that has been recorded very frequently. But the extension seems to have happened long before contact with English or any other modern European language; the word *saʕādah* had entered the Sufi jargon as a term meaning internal serenity achieved through prayers and meditation many centuries before that contact. It probably managed to surpass *surūr* in frequency with more or less the same meaning during that period and, consequently, became part of MSA usage.

By contrast, *mufāẓaʕah* does not seem to be an emotion term at all even after contact with English and other European languages. Like the English verb "to surprise", *fāẓaʕ* means basically to attack by surprise and, by extension, to do something unexpectedly. Thus, the noun *mufāẓaʕah* came to refer to any unexpected event. This is the only meaning to be found in dictionaries of CA, including bilingual ones like Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*, as well as in MSA dictionaries. But in MSA usage, a new verb form came into use that suggests that the root *f-ẓ-ʕ* can also refer to emotions caused by unexpected events. This form is *tafāẓaʕal*, which alters the verb diathesis by converting a transitive verb into an intransitive one, thus indicating that the initiator of the event is internal rather than external. Thus, *tafāẓaʕ* does not mean that a person surprised himself but rather that he experienced surprise as a result of some unexpected event. This verb occurs 1,346 in arabiCorpus but cannot be found in any dictionary of CA that we consulted, which implies that it is most probably a neologism. It developed perhaps as a translation of some of the uses of the passive form "to be surprised" in which no external cause of the surprise can be identified in the context of the utterance, as in "He was surprised by the sharp sensation he experienced". But

despite the development of such a verb form, the noun *mufāḥḥah* is still used to refer only to unexpected events.

What can be concluded from the discussion in this section is that most of the processes related to semantic borrowing can also be identified in Arabic-English contact in the domain of emotions. Among these processes are lexical borrowing, calques, loan renditions, and semantic extension. We have, however, identified a rather a less known process which we termed here "descriptive translation". "Descriptive translations" are phrases intended to render a concept in the recipient language. Although these descriptive translations are intended initially to help users of bilingual dictionaries, they have ended up to be treated as conventional expressions referring to single concepts, that is, lexicalized phrases. More research is needed to check whether this phenomenon is specific to semantic borrowing in standard languages only.

6. Conclusions

A general conclusion to be drawn from this study is that the domain of emotions, despite the difficulty it presents for commonsense as well as for scientific understanding, does not differ much from other domains as far as borrowing is concerned. The major processes recorded elsewhere are also found to operate in borrowing emotion words and categories. The effect on the cognition and communication of emotion categories, however, may be dramatic, but this issue remains to be explored. Another conclusion concerns the nature of MSA investigated here. Because this language is learned mainly through formal education, a minority of educated bilingual elites, among whom are dictionary writers, play a crucial role in introducing borrowed concepts into the language and shaping the expressions that refer to those concepts. Because these elites usually have negative attitudes toward lexical borrowing, they tend to prefer less overt ways such as calquing or semantic extension. The MSA emotion words and expressions have evolved essentially to conceal the effect of contact with English and other European languages. That is why the similarity with their CA equivalents is more in form than in meaning. In meaning and use, however, Arabic emotion words are becoming more similar to their English equivalents than their CA ones.

References

- Al-Baṣṣalabaki, Mounir. 1975. *Al-Mawrid, a modern English-Arabic dictionary*. Beirut: Dār al-ʿilm Lil-Malāyīn.
- Allan, Kathryn . and Justyna A. Robinson 2012. Introduction: Exploring the “state of the art” in historical semantics. In Allan, K. and J. Robinson (Eds.), *Current Methods in Historical Semantics*, 1-15. Berlin/ Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Al-Thaḡālibī, Abū Mansūr. (1938). *Fiqh al-Lughā wa ʿasrār al-ʿarabiyya*. Ed. By Mustafa Al-Saqā, Ibrahim al-Abyārī and Abd al-Hafiz Shalabī. Cairo: Al-Halabi & Sons.
- Berlin, Brent and Paul Kay. 1969. *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blank, A. and P. Koch (Eds.), 1999. *Historical Semantics and Cognition*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brustad, Kristen. 2017. Diglossia as Ideology. In Jacob Høigilt and Gunvor Mejdell (Eds.), *The Politics of Written Language in the Arab World: Writing Change*, 41-67. Amsterdam: Brill. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w76vkk.7>
- Crystal, David. 2008. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, Sixth Edition. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dalgleish, Tim and Power, Mick. 1999. Cognition and emotion: Future directions. In Dalgleish, T. and Power, M. J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cognition and Emotion*, 799-805. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Dewaele, Jean-Marc and Pavlenko, Aneta. 2002. Emotion Vocabulary in Interlanguage. *Language Learning* 52/2. 263-322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00185>
- Ech-Charfi, Ahmed. 2012. Are there Adjectives or Adverbs in Arabic: A Defence of the Tradition. *Al-Lisān al-ʿarabī* 72: 3-48.
- Ekman, Paul and Dael Cordaro. (2011). What Is Meant by Calling Emotions Basic. *Emotion Review* 3: 2364-2370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073911410740>
- Ekman, Paul. 1992. An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion* 6: 169-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699939208411068>
- Ekman, Paul. 1999. Basic Emotions. In Dalgleish, T. and Power, M. J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cognition and Emotion*, 45-60. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Elasri, Khalid. 2018. Investigating the Effect of Lexical (non-) Equivalence on the Acquisition of L2 Emotion Terms. *International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature*. 6/7: 151-160.

- Evans, Rand B. "William James, 'The Principles of Psychology,' and Experimental Psychology." *The American Journal of Psychology* 103/ 4, 1990: 433-47, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1423317>
- Fontaine, Johnny & Scherer, Klaus and Roesch, Etienne & Ellsworth, Phoebe. 2008. The World of Emotions is not Two-Dimensional. *Psychological science* 18/12: 1050-7. <https://doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.02024.x>
- Hamzaoui, Rached. 1972. *L'Académie de langue arabe: œuvre et histoire*. Tunis : Publications de l'université de Tunis.
- Holes, Clive. 2004. *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Howell, Signe. 1981. Rules, not Words. In Paul Hellas & Andrew Lock (Eds.), *Indigenous Psychologies: The anthropology of the self*, 133-143. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Izard, Carroll. E. (1972). *Patterns of Emotions: A New Analysis of Anxiety and Depression*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- James, Wiliam. 1983. *The Principles of Psychology*. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press.
- Linguist, Kristen A., Maria Gnedron & Ajay P. Satpute. 2016. Language and Emotion: Putting Words into Feelings and Feelings into Words. In Lisa Feldman Barrett, Michael Lewis and Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones (eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (Fourth Edition), 579-594. New York/London: The Guilford Press.
- Lutz, Catherine. 1980. *Emotion words and emotional development on Ifaluk Atoll*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Marian, Viorica and Kaushanskaya, Margarita. 2008. Words, feelings, and bilingualism: Cross-linguistic differences in emotionality of autobiographical memories. *The mental lexicon*. 3/1: 72-91. 72-90. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.3.1.06mar>
- Meiselman, Herbet L. (ed.). 2016. *Emotion Measurement*. Amsterdam: Woodhead Publishing.
- Mott, B. and N. Laso. 2019. Semantic Borrowing in Language Contact. In A. Grant (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*, 155-172. New York: Oxford University Press
- <<http://www.baheth.info>> [Accessed 10-20 April 2022].
- Omar, Ahmed M. 2008. *Muṣṣam al-ṣawāb al-lughawī*. Cairo: ṣālam al-kutub
- Osgood, Charles E., Miron, Murray S. and May, William H. 1975. *Cross-cultural universals of affective meaning*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

- Pavlenko, A. 2006. 1. Bilingual Selves. In: Pavlenko, A. ed. *Bilingual Minds: Emotional Experience, Expression, and Representation*, 1-33. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598746-003>
- Pavlenko, Aneta. 2005. *Emotions and multilingualism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.,
- Pavlenko, Aneta. 2008. Structural and conceptual equivalence in the acquisition and use of emotion words in a second language. *The Mental Lexicon* 3: 91-120. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ml.3.1.07pav>
- Russell, James A. 1991. Culture and the Categorization of Emotions. *Psychological Bulletin* 110 (3): 426-450. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.110.3.426>
- Russell James A., José-Miguel Fernández-Dols, Antony S. R. Manstead and J. C. Wellenkamp. 1995. *Everyday Conceptions of Emotions: An Introduction to the Psychology, Anthropology, and Linguistics of Emotion*. Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media
- Shaver, Phillip, Judith Schwartz, Donald Kirson, and Cary O'Connor. 1987. "Emotion Knowledge: Further Exploration of a Prototype Approach." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52, (6): 1061-86. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.6.1061>.
- Steingass, Francis Joseph .1882. *English-Arabic dictionary: for the use of both travelers and students*. London : W.H. Allen
- Suleiman, Yaser. 2002. *The Arabic Language and National Identity: An Essay in Ideology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tomkins, Silvan S. 1963, *Affect Imagery Consciousness: Volume II, The Negative Affects*. London: Tavistock.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1996. *Semantics: primes and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1999. *Emotions across languages and cultures: diversity and universals*. Cambridge: University Press
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 2009. Language and Metalanguage: Key Issues in Emotion Research. *Emotion Review*, 1(1): 3-14. doi: [10.1177/1754073908097175](https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073908097175).
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1971. *Manual of lexicography*. Mouton: The Hague.