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1. Introduction

Documenting emotions in Australian languages is a complicated task, not only because of caveats inherent to the privacy of this domain, but also because of additional cultural obstacles specific to the Australian context. Indeed, among Aboriginal groups, emotions are often considered too mundane or sometimes too traumatic to be discussed with strangers (Ponsonnet 2014a). However, linguists who have successfully explored emotions in Australian languages have revealed a wealth of linguistic resources (Turpin 2002; Gaby 2008; Harkins 2001; Ponsonnet 2014b). Dalabon, for instance, a severely endangered Gunwinyguan language of south-western Arnhem Land, numbers more than 160 emotional lexemes, encapsulating fine emotional categories.

Interestingly, the Dalabon emotion lexicon contains mostly verbs and adjectives. Dalabon has only two emotion nouns proper: *yolh-no* ‘pep, feelings’, and *yirru* ‘conflict, anger’. This is a remarkably low figure if we compare, for instance, to French (≈315 emotion nouns and ≈350 emotion verbs according to Mathieu 2000), Tahitian (163 nouns among 444 emotion terms1), Japanese (≈520 emotion nouns and ≈400 emotion words of other classes2), or Ifaluk (42 emotion words, all but two glossed as nouns and two as adjectives3). Across semantic domains, Dalabon is not a particularly ‘verby’ language (Evans 2012; Polinsky 2012): nouns represent about 50% of entries in the Dalabon dictionary (Evans, Merlan & Tukumba 2004).

---

What are the causes and implications of this scarcity of emotion nouns in Dalabon? Is this an areal feature? Does it result from a structural property of the language? How does it relate to Dalabon speakers’ shared conceptual representations about emotions? Indeed, it seems that in Dalabon, the rarity of emotion nouns correlates with a limitation on the types of emotion metaphors available (Ponsonnet 2014b) – which relates to shared representations of emotions (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). But the question of the directionality remains open: does language reflect shared concepts and representations about emotions? Or does the rarity of nouns determine metaphors, which may in turn determine shared representations?

There is not enough space to answer or investigate all these questions in any detail in this paper, but I will present a preliminary assessment in order to identify directions for future research. To do so, I conducted a pilot survey of emotion nouns in a small sample of nine other Australian languages. The observations resulting from this survey are two-fold. Firstly, Australian languages, in general, seem to have few emotion nouns, although there may be nuances, possibly due to differences in typological profiles. Secondly, there is some semantic convergence among the nouns documented in the ten languages surveyed. Indeed, the semantic profiles of the two emotion nouns found in Dalabon are matched by nouns in most of the other languages in the sample.

In Section 2, I present the languages and the data considered in this study. Section 3 offers an overview of the distribution of emotion nouns across the languages of the sample. Section 4 discusses the semantics of the nouns and their convergence. I describe Dalabon full-fledged emotion nouns, yolh-no ‘pep, feelings’, and yirru ‘conflict, anger’. For each of these nouns, I discuss the distribution of comparable nouns across the sample. I also present a handful of noun-like derivations that are too rare or not independent enough to be considered full-fledged lexical nouns and noun-like forms. In Section 5, I consider in more detail the possible consequences of the scarcity of emotion nouns upon metaphorical representations of emotions.

2. Linguistic context and data

2.1 Dalabon

Dalabon is a non-Pama-Nyungan language of the Gunwinyguan family that used to be spoken by a few hundred people in Central Arnhem Land, in the Top End (Evans, Merlan & Tukumba 2004; Cutfield, this volume). Dalabon is now severely endangered, and known by probably less than a dozen speakers and semi-speakers in communities to the east of Katherine in the Northern Territory. It is being replaced by Barunga Kriol, an English-based creole. A number of Dalabon speakers are highly motivated to document their language and helped me carry out extensive documentation of the semantic domain of emotions. Emotions are defined here as internal (i.e. psychological) states that are cognitive (thus excluding sensations – pain, hunger) but not purely intellectual (thus excluding mental states such as
knowing or believing). Based on a large corpus combining narratives, stimuli-based elicitation and standard elicitation, I was able to compile a glossary of more than 160 emotion words or expressions, along with an analysis of emotional resources in general (Ponsonnet 2014b).

2.2 Comparative sample

Ponsonnet (2014b) revealed that this language has a strikingly small number of emotion nouns, compared to the size of the emotion lexicon (Section 1). In order to put this observation into a cross-linguistic perspective, I carried out a pilot survey on a sample of Australian languages. I surveyed emotion nouns in nine languages selected among well-documented languages, so as to cover a combination of regions and genetic groups. The sample includes Pama-Nyungan and non-Pama-Nyungan languages, with some languages in the vicinity of Dalabon and some more distant languages in both categories. In this way, the respective roles of genetic grouping and regional patterns can be assessed. I investigated three languages belonging to different branches of the same family as Dalabon (the non-Pama-Nyungan Gunwinyguan family): Bininj Gun-wok, Jawoyn, and Rembarrnga; two languages adjacent to the Gunwinyguan region, one non-Pama-Nyungan (Mawng, Iwaidjan family), and one Pama-Nyungan (Yolngu Matha). I also examined three Pama-Nyungan languages spoken in more distant regions: Gurindji (Victoria River, Ngumpin subgroup), Kaytete (Central Australia, Arandic subgroup), and Kuuk Thaayorre (Cape York, Paman subgroup). Finally, I explored one non-Pama-Nyungan language not adjacent to Dalabon, namely Jaminjung (Victoria River, Jaminjungan family). This choice of languages was partly motivated by the quality of lexical documentation and/or publications on emotions (Turpin (2002) for Kaytete and Gaby (2008) for Kuuk Thaayorre). This pilot sample is obviously too small to be conclusive, and indeed the aim of the study was to identify questions for future research, rather than bring immediate answers. The data investigated for each language is listed in the Appendix.

---

4 I am extremely grateful to the Dalabon speakers and community for their support along the years, as well as to the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme for funding field work in Dalabon country (IGS0125). Many thanks also to Erika Charola, Murray Garde, Patrick McConvell, Felicity Meakins, Eva Schultze-Berndt and Ruth Singer for sharing precious unpublished lexical databases; and to David Wilkins for his extremely helpful comments on an earlier draft. Finally, I am thankful to the ASLAN project (ANR-10-LABX-0081) of Université de Lyon within the program Investissements d’Avenir (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) of the French government operated by the National Research Agency (ANR), for funding this research under a postdoctoral fellowship.

5 Although the level of lexical documentation across these languages differs, all have been extensively documented. A detailed dictionary (published or unpublished) is available for each. For Kuuk Thaayorre, I worked with a somewhat smaller lexicon, but this was complemented by Gaby (2008) on emotions in this language. Given the extent of the data available for each language, the number of attested nouns cannot reflect the quality or quantity of data. For instance, Turpin’s (2011) Kaytete dictionary contains more than 280 emotion-related entries (words and collocations) but only eight emotion-denoting nominals. The fact that in-depth dedicated exploration of Dalabon revealed only two emotion nouns demonstrates that the number of attested nouns does not reflect lack of documentation.
My definition of emotions as internal states (2.1) leaves out of the count some nouns that denote experiencers of emotions, such as the Jawoyn jotjonggali ‘jealous person’. In languages that have two distinct categories for nouns and adjectives, experiencer-denoting nouns are rare. In languages where there is only one class of nominals, lexemes that can denote the experiencer of an emotion are more numerous, because some of these nominals play a role comparable to adjectives in other languages. Focusing on nouns that denote emotions as internal states allowed me to identify comparable items throughout the sample.

3. Emotion nouns in Australian languages

The rich emotion lexicon of Dalabon (160+ words) comprises mostly verbs or adjectives used in predicative functions. There are remarkably few nouns: only two, yolh-no ‘pep, feelings’ and yirru ‘conflict, anger’. Emotion-noun inventories of the sample of Australian languages described in 2.2 suggest that the scarcity of nouns may (a) be an areal tendency of the Australian continent, and (b) depend on the typological profile of the language: in this sample, there are fewer emotion nouns in polysynthetic languages and in languages with coverbs. While the scope of this study does not allow further elaboration on this hypothesis, it is something that can be tested by extending the sample in future studies.6

The noun inventories are presented in Table 1. Like Dalabon, the other three Gunwinyguan languages of the sample have very few emotion nouns. There are three attested emotion nouns in Jawoyn and four in Rembarrnga and Bininj Gun-wok. Another non-Pama-Nyungan language of the same region, Mawng (Iwaidjan) has three nouns (against ≈45 emotional verbs and coverbs), but Yolngu Matha (geographically close to the Gunwinyguan family, but Pama-Nyungan) has ten (against more than 120 verbs and 50 adjectives, Ian Keen pers. com. July 2015). Among distant languages, some Pama-Nyungan languages have more emotion nouns: eight in Kuuk Thaayorre, and ten in Kaytetye, where nearly 180 emotion verbs are also reported. In the non-Pama-Nyungan Jaminjung, on the other hand, only one emotion noun is reported, along with at least 20 emotion coverbs. Gurindji, a Pama-Nyungan language of the same region as Jaminjung, has only three emotion nouns. In all these languages, nouns (or nominals) account for a significant proportion of the lexicon outside of the domain of emotions.

In this sample, non-Pama-Nyungan languages have two or three, and a maximum of four emotion nouns, while some Pama-Nyungan languages (including Yolngu Matha, spoken in the Top End, neighbouring non-Pama-Nyungan languages) have eight or ten emotion nouns. A hypothetical explanation to be explored in future research is the correlation with polysynthesis (for

---

6 See for instance Polinsky (2012) for comparable investigations of correlations between typological profiles and lexical distributions.
Table 1: Documented emotion nouns in a pilot sample of 10 Australian languages
The left column gives approximate labels rather than precise translations.
A blank cell means that the category is not lexicalized by a noun (it may be lexicalized by a word of another class).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pama-Nyungan</th>
<th>Non-Pama-Nyungan</th>
<th>TOTAL languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gur</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Kuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generic feelings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generic emotions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affection (compassion)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger (or conflict)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissatisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jealousy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joy, happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resentment (hatred)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorrow (grief)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
discussions on the definition and typological correlates of polysynthesis, see e.g. Fortescue 2007). Indeed, in Dalabon, it is the morphological process of noun incorporation (typical of some polysynthetic languages) that allows predicates to gain emotional senses (Ponsonnet 2014b). Another type with very few emotion nouns are languages that use coverbs. This is true of the non-Pama-Nyungan Mawng (three nouns) and Jaminjung (one noun) – the former is relatively close to Dalabon geographically, the latter more distant – as well as of the Pama-Nyungan Gurindji (three nouns). In Jaminjung and Gurindji, emotions appear to often be described by coverbs.

There is no clear general convergence as to which emotions are lexicalized by nouns across the ten languages surveyed. Several emotion categories are encoded by nouns in only one or two languages in the sample. Among the emotions that are more frequently lexicalized by a noun are desire, love and shame, with three languages each. However, two types of emotion nouns stand out as cross-linguistically common, and these correspond to the two nouns found in Dalabon. The most widespread is a generic term for feelings: yolh-no ‘pep, feelings’ in Dalabon, presented in 4.1. In addition, eight languages out of ten have words that denote conflict and also relate to anger, as does the Dalabon yirru ‘conflict, anger’, presented in 4.2.

4. Dalabon emotion nouns

4.1 Dalabon yolh-no ‘pep, feelings’

The Dalabon noun yolh-no denotes someone’s psychological and physical condition, energy, pep, and motivation. In (1) for instance, yolh-no refers to the speakers’ inclinations, and in (2) it refers to ‘the way one feels or thinks’.

(1) Yolh-ngan, nidjarra nga-h-ni.7
    feelings-1sg.POSS here 1sg-R-sit/be:PR

    Mak kinikah nga-bo-niyan.
    NEG there 1sg-go-FUT

    ‘As for me, my desire is to stay here. I won’t go anywhere else.’

(240909_81OK 704 (MT))

7 Abbreviations used in the glosses are: BEN = benefactive; COM = comitative; DEM = demonstrative; du = dual; DYAD = dyadic; FILL = morphological filler; FOC = focus; FUT = future tense; LOC = locative; NEG = negation; ONOMAT = onomatopoeia; PI = past imperfective; POSS = possessive; PP = past perfective; PR = present tense; PRIV = privative; R = realis mood; REDUP = reduplication; RR = reflexive/reciprocal; SEQ = sequential; sg = singular; SUB = subordinator.
Accordingly, the form yolh occurs in lexicalized compounds that relate to desire or boredom, for instance yolh-ni ‘pep, feelings’+‘sit/be’, ‘feel good, cheerful, be pleased, love, like’ and yolh-wudj(mu) ‘pep, feelings’+‘end, die’, ‘feel tired, lack energy, be sulky’. Yolh is more frequent in compounds than as an autonomous noun.

Speakers provided Kriol translations and metalinguistic comments of great consistency, highlighting the fact that someone’s yolh-no encapsulates their autonomy and individual particularities (Ponsonnet 2010).

This notion of individual inclinations and motivations can relate to someone’s physical state. Indeed, someone who has no energy can be tired, depressed, or even sick, hence the physical dimension of yolh-no. This also echoes compounds with yolh denoting boredom or depression (yolh-dukkarrun ‘pep, feelings’+‘tie+REFL’, ‘feel depressed’).

Yolh-no is not a body-part and is not assigned a clear and conventional location in the body, although there are indications that it could relate etymologically to an abdominal body-part (Ponsonnet 2014b:281). When asked to point to yolh-no on an X-ray-style drawing of a human body showing internal organs, some speakers located yolh-no in the head (the site of intellectual processes, Ponsonnet 2009), some in the abdomen, and one speaker stated that it was not on the drawing – plausibly because she construed yolh-no as immaterial.

Morphosyntactically speaking, yolh-no belongs to the nominal subclass of parts of animate wholes – along with other abstract attributes such as someone’s name, mind etc. As such, yolh-no is inalienable (Ponsonnet 2015). Therefore, it is always represented linguistically as possessed: a yolh-no has to be somebody’s yolh-no, as opposed to an abstract property detached from an experiencer. This implies that yolh-no cannot be used to refer to an abstract category of feelings as
in the English expression ‘the feeling of nostalgia’ for instance. That is, *yolh-no* is a generic concept in the sense that it refers to someone’s ‘bare emotional state’, but it is not a generic hypernym category for emotions, subsuming subtypes of emotions.

### 4.1.1 Related concepts in other languages

Generic concepts of ‘feelings’ are broadly attested across my Australian sample: a comparable noun is reported in eight languages out of ten. For some items, the definitions are too brief to tell whether the word is a generic category for emotions or a term for a generic feeling. However, in several cases it appears that the concepts resemble the one encapsulated by *yolh-no* in Dalabon, revolving around the notions of drive, life force or spiritual energy. In the vicinity of Dalabon, Jawoyn *ngan-yilk*8 is glossed as ‘spirit, gumption’. Further east within the Top End, Yolngu *maar* is described as one’s ‘feelings, moods and desires’ by Tamisari (2000:281). In Kuuk Thaayorre (Cape York), *ngeengk rithrr* is translated as ‘spirit’ or ‘soul’ (Gaby 2008:33) and *ngeengk* ‘belly’ is described as the seat of life force. In the Victoria River District, Gurindji *kawurrku* is reported to mean ‘lower chest’, ‘gut feelings’ and ‘life force’.

In several languages across the continent, the generic term for feelings also relates to an abdominal body-part. In Jawoyn *ngan-yilk* (‘spirit, gumption’) also means ‘guts’. In Gurindji, life force is associated with the lower chest. The Kaytetye word for ‘belly’ or ‘liver’ also has generic emotional meanings (Turpin 2002, 2011: 69). As previously noted, the association of feelings with the belly occurs in Kuuk Thaayorre, where emotions can additionally be associated with the heart. In the two languages of the sample that lack a generic-feeling noun (Jaminjing and Mawng), the belly is also considered the seat of emotions.

While the Dalabon word *yolh-no* does not have an obvious simple translation in English (nor in French for instance), the family of concepts depicted above is not cross-linguistically exceptional. Comparable notions are reported on several continents. Lutz (1988:33) defines the Ifaluk (Micronesia) word *tip-* as ‘individual will or desire’. Maya Yucatec óol is translated by LeGuen (in press) as ‘will, desire, energy’ or ‘life energy’.

To summarize, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that the Dalabon concept of *yolh-no* is representative of a family of concepts for generic feelings as individual life force and energy found in a number of languages across Australia – as well as in some other languages across the world. While the Dalabon concept of *yolh-no* is not synchronically clearly associated with a body-part, comparable concepts are often associated with an abdominal body-part in other languages.

---

8 A possible cognate of Dalabon *yolh-no*. 
4.2 Yirru ‘conflict, anger’

In its most common sense, the noun *yirru* refers to fights, arguments and conflicts in general; these denotata relate to observable events, not to emotional (internal) events.

(4) *Biyi-ngong-no-kah, yirru-kah ka-h-kahka-ninj!*  
man-group-FILL-LOC conflict/anger-LOC 2sg>R-take:REDUP-PI  
‘And you brought me here to this mob of people, to this fight!’  
(Dalabon Dictionary)

*Yirru* is often ambiguous between conflict (external event) and anger (internal event): in (5), *yirru* could refer to either. When it heads a noun phrase, *yirru* is not clearly attested with a solely emotional sense. Some contexts (like (5)) seem to favor an emotional interpretation, but this is never absolutely compelling.

(5) *Mak munh yirru-kun kahnun ka-djare.*  
NEG DEM conflict/anger-GEN DEM 3sg-like/want  

[...] *Nga-h-dja-ni yirru-dih ka-h-yin.*  
1sg>R-FOC-sit/be:PR conflict/anger-PRIV 3sg>R-say/do:PR  
‘This one doesn’t want to fight. [...] I have no anger  
[I’m staying no conflict] he says.’ (20120706a_005_MT 049)

In addition, *yirru* can also be used as a predicate and denote an emotional behavior (‘angry behavior’ (6)) as well as aggressive potential (the word can then be glossed ‘dangerous’). In these cases, it denotes both the behavior and the accompanying emotion.

(6) *Nunda ngey nga-h-yirru ka-h-yin,*  
DEM 1sg 1sg-R-conflict/anger 3sg>R-say/do:PR  

rrrrr; *ka-h-yin.*  
ONOMAT 3sg>R-say/do:PR  
‘Now I’m angry he says, rrrrr, he goes.’ (20110613_002_LB 16)

In addition to the use of *yirru* as an autonomous word, there exists a relatively large set of compound verbs using *yirru* as their first component, describing the stages and aspects of anger as an emotional event: for instance *yirru-burlh(mu)* ‘conflict, anger’+‘appear’, ‘be(come) angry’, *yirru-ngalmu* ‘conflict, anger’+‘appear’, ‘be(come) angry’. Unlike the noun *yirru*, some of these compounds refer unambiguously to emotional states, as in (7), where the speaker explains that she was already angry in spite of not showing it (hence an emotion, not a behavior). In several of these *yirru* compounds (like the ones quoted above), *yirru* can be interpreted as meaning ‘anger’.

(7) *Nunda ngey nga-h-yirru ka-h-yin,*  
DEM 1sg 1sg-R-conflict/anger 3sg>R-say/do:PR  

rrrrr; *ka-h-yin.*  
ONOMAT 3sg>R-say/do:PR  
‘Now I’m angry he says, rrrrr, he goes.’ (20110613_002_LB 16)
In summary, when used in isolation, the noun *yirru* primarily means ‘conflict’, which is not an emotion, but it often suggests emotional interpretations. When used predicatively, *yirru* means ‘angry’, and denotes both a behavior and the emotional state that triggers this behavior. Finally, *yirru* is used to form emotional compounds within which it can be interpreted as referring to ‘anger’, i.e. to the emotion proper.

### 4.2.1 Related concepts in other Australian languages

Eight languages out of ten resemble Dalabon in having either a noun glossed as ‘anger’, or a noun glossed with a word relating to ‘conflict’ (‘fight’, ‘argument’, often ‘trouble’) that is reported to denote angry behavior in some contexts. One language in the sample has a noun for anger that does not relate to conflict: Kuuk Thaayorre, where ‘anger’ is *ngeengk-kul*, literally ‘belly-lap’ (Gaby 2008:35). Nouns meaning ‘conflict’ and ‘anger’ proper are attested in Jawoyn and Kaytetye. Nouns meaning ‘conflict’ primarily, and ‘angry’ in some contexts (like Dalabon *yirru*) are also attested in several regions: in the Top End (Rembarrnga, Mawng and Yolngu Matha), and in the Victoria River District where Jaminjung *wirrij* is described as both a coverb and a noun, meaning ‘be aggressive, be angry, argue, fight’, and occurs in anger-related compounds. In the same area, Gurindji has a coverb with a comparable meaning. This coverb is not described as a noun in the latest description, but it was in an earlier version of the database I investigated. The other language where no noun is reported to relate to anger or angry behavior is Bininj Gun-wok (genetically very close to Dalabon), where the noun *kun-rid* (possibly cognate with Dalabon *yirru*) is only glossed as ‘trouble, argument’. However, *rid* occurs in conflict-related compounds that resemble Dalabon anger compounds with *yirru*. 
Altogether, anger is the specific emotion that is most frequently expressed with a noun in the sample (four languages, including Dalabon). When taking into account the languages where conflict-related nouns mean ‘angry’ (rather than ‘anger’), nouns associating ‘conflict’ and ‘anger’ are attested in eight languages, both Pama-Nyungan and non-Pama-Nyungan, in different regions. While some of these words are cognates, others certainly are not: Dalabon yirru is cognate with Rembarrnga jaeræ, but presumably not with Jawoyn bal, nor with Kaytetye ahe – among others. Therefore, the semantic resemblance is not inherited from a common etymon, but nested in different roots.

4.3 Noun-like forms in Dalabon

In addition to the two nouns yolh-no ‘pep, feelings’ and yirru ‘conflict, anger’, in Dalabon four other emotions can sometimes be expressed by a form that is interpretable as a noun or a nominalized form, namely fear, compassion, shame and resentment. Each is lexicalized by a noun in at least one other language in the sample, and most in more than one.

Fear is lexicalized by predicative compounds including the morpheme djong: djong-mun djong+INCHOATIVE, ‘be afraid’, djong-bruk djong+‘dry’, ‘brave’, djong-bon djong+‘go’, ‘leave in fear’, etc. Synchronically, djong is not a full-fledged Dalabon lexeme. Speakers seldom use it outside of predicative compounds, and tend to deny its existence when asked about it directly. However, there are a couple of occurrences of djong-no in isolation in my corpus, and some occurrences where it is treated as a noun (followed by a privative suffix that typically occurs on nouns: djong-dih-no djong+PRIV+3sg.POSS, ‘the one without fear’). Fear is lexicalized by nouns in two Pama-Nyungan languages of the sample, namely Yolngu-Matha, relatively close to Dalabon in the Top End, and Kuuk Thaayorre, in Cape York.

For three other emotions, there exist nominalized forms ending in -mi, which is an infrequent suffix in Dalabon, but a productive nominalizer in the neighbouring and genetically close Bininj Gun-wok dialects (Evans 2003:219). In Dalabon, -mi occurs on three very rare emotion-denoting verbal roots: wurdahmi, from the verbal root wurdah ‘suffer emotionally’, occurred only once, followed by the typically nominal comitative suffix -dorrung. Here wurdahmi means ‘compassion’, which is also expressed by a noun in Kaytetye (and see also nouns for sorrow or grief in Mawng and Yolngu).

(8)  Kardu da-h-marnu-kangu-ru-yan, maybe 2sg>3-R-BEN-belly-cry-FUT feel.sad
2sg>3-R-SEQ-give-FUT compassion-COM

‘Perhaps you’ll feel sad for him [a child crying for lollies], you’ll give [some] to him. Out of compassion.’ (20120714b_005_MT 015)
The other emotions that attract -mi forms are resentment and shame. Resentment is *njirrkmi*, from the verbal root *njirrk* ‘be upset, be resentful/be confused’ (Ponsonnet 2011). Shame is *yermi*, from the verbal root yer ‘avoid interactions for fear of others’. However, neither *yermi* nor *njirrkmi* were ever treated as nouns like *wurdahmi* above. Instead, the forms occur within verbal complexes, i.e. followed by verbal morphology (*njirrkmi-won* resentment+CAUSATIVISER, ‘dislike or hate someone’; *yermi-kan* shame+’take’, ‘cause to feel embarrassed’). Resentment is lexicalized by the cognate noun *kun-njirrke* in Bininj Gun-wok (Evans 2003:218). Shame is lexicalized in Bininj Gun-wok (cognate form *kun-yeme*), as well as in Rembarrnga, and in Mawng (adjacent to Bininj Gun-wok).

5. Dalabon nouns and emotion metaphors

In Dalabon, the scarcity of emotion nouns could correlate with some of the properties of emotion metaphors. Dalabon is rich in emotion metaphors (Ponsonnet 2014b) but some types are absent. Indeed, this language only represents emotions as states or parts of the person, never as entities independent of the person such as things, enemies, natural forces etc. In English for instance, one can ‘fight one’s fear’, where fear is represented as an enemy (Kövecses 2000:23). Comparable agentive metaphors occur in most Australian languages for which we have data on the matter, but they are conspicuously absent in Dalabon – and so are metaphors where emotions are treated as locations (e.g. French ‘*nager dans le bonheur*’, literally ‘to swim in happiness’).

The scarcity of emotion nouns may contribute to explaining the absence of such metaphors in Dalabon. Since emotions are depicted as predicates, it seems logical that they are metaphorically represented as states. Representing emotions as independent entities or locations would require that they stand as syntactic arguments or adjuncts, and these roles are more naturally expressed by nouns.

Furthermore, as explained in 4.1, one of the two Dalabon emotion nouns, *yolh-no* ‘pep, feelings’, is morphosyntactically inalienable. As such, *yolh-no* very rarely stands as an argument on its own. It is obligatorily possessed, and in most situations this possessor is raised to be treated as an argument, while *yolh-no* stands as a part of its possessor rather than a full argument (Ponsonnet 2015: 17-20). Therefore, emotion metaphors with *yolh-no* depict feelings as a part of the person rather than as an independent entity, hence the literal translation of (9) as ‘I’m entangled from the feelings’ rather than ‘my feelings are entangled’.

(9) *Yolh-ngan, wunga-yolh-dukka-rru-n.*

feelings-1sgross APPR:1sg-feelings-tie-RR-PR be.depressed

‘My spirits, I might get depressed.’
Lit. ‘I’m entangled in my feelings’, ‘I’m feeling-entangled.’
The only emotion that is metaphorically depicted as an entity independent of the person in Dalabon is anger. Indeed, the noun *yirru* ‘conflict, anger’ belongs to the nominal subclass of generic nouns and is therefore alienable (Ponsonnet 2015). It is not obligatorily possessed, does not usually raise its possessor, and can therefore stand as a full argument. This is the case in (10), where *yirru* is metaphorically depicted as an entity that is found when someone becomes angry. This metaphor of anger remains marginal, however, and with many other *yirru* compounds, anger is represented as a part of the experiencer of emotions (as with *yolh-no* above).

(10)  
\[
\text{Kanh kirdikird-ko munguyh burra-yirru-ngalka.}
\]

\[
\text{DEM women-DYAD always 3du>3-conflict/anger-find:PR be(come).angry}
\]

‘These two women quarrel/get angry with each other [find anger] all the time.’ (20111207a_004_MT 21)

Dalabon metaphors for feelings (*yolh-no* ‘pep, feelings’) and anger (*yirru* ‘conflict, anger’) suggest that the absence of independent-entity emotion metaphors correlates with two linguistic parameters: (1) the scarcity of emotion nouns; (2) the morphosyntactic behaviour of emotion nouns. At this stage, the hypothesis is a simple correlation, i.e. a statement of co-occurrence. There is no firm ground to claim that emotion metaphors are constrained by linguistic features. Instead, metaphors may reflect speakers’ representations about emotions, and these may also influence the parts of speech used to talk about emotions in these languages. The hypothesis of the co-occurrence between the absence of independent-entity metaphors and the scarcity of emotion nouns can be improved and confirmed by comparing emotion metaphors across languages. Do Australian languages with as few emotion nouns as Dalabon present the same range of emotion metaphors? Do Australian languages with a larger number of emotion nouns (such as the Pama-Nyungan Kaytetye, Kuuk Thaayorre and Yolngu-Matha) depict emotions as entities independent of the person? These questions also require closer investigation of emotion metaphors in Australian languages, of the roles of emotion nouns in these metaphors, and of the syntax of nominals.

6. Conclusions

In spite of its large emotion lexicon, Dalabon has only two emotion nouns, against more than 160 verbs and adjectives. Such a low proportion of emotion nouns is cross-linguistically unusual. A pilot survey of nine other Australian languages showed that the scarcity of emotion nouns seems to be shared across Australian languages, at least in the north of the continent. However, in this small sample, the languages that are not polysynthetic and do not use coverbs tend to have a few more emotion nouns – up to ten.

The sample displays strong convergence with respect to the most frequent emotion nouns. Most languages in the sample have nouns with semantic profiles comparable to the two Dalabon nouns. One is a noun for generic feelings (*yolh-
no ‘pep, feelings’); the other is a noun for conflict, fights and arguments that extends to anger is some contexts (yirru ‘conflict, anger’). Dalabon also has marginal nominalized forms for fear, compassion, shame and resentment, and these emotions are also lexicalized by nouns in at least one (and often several) language(s) in the sample.

In Dalabon, the lack of emotion nouns, and the particular morphosyntactic behaviours of the only two emotion nouns, may be responsible for the absence of a certain type of metaphor where emotions are represented as entities independent of the person. This hypothetical correlation between metaphors and the proportion of emotion nouns can be tested in the future by studying emotion metaphors in other Australian languages, and comparing these metaphors with the emotion nouns available in each language.
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**Bininj Gun-wok, NPN, Gunwinyguan, Top End, Arnhem Land**
Evans, Nick. 2003. (See References.)

**Gurindji, PN, Ngumpin, Victoria River**

**Jaminjung, NPN, Jaminjungan, Victoria River**

**Jawoyn, NPN, Gunwinyguan, Top End, Arnhem Land**

**Kaytetye, PN, Arandic, Central Australia**
Turpin, Myfany. 2002 and 2011. (See References.)

**Kuuk Thaayorre, PN, Paman, Cape York**
Gaby, Alice. 2008. (See References.)

**Mawng, NPN, Iwaidjan, Top End, Arnhem Land**

**Rembarrnga, NPN, Gunwinyguan, Top End, Arnhem Land**

**Yolngu Matha, PN, Top End, Arnhem Land**