An Anthropology of Emotion

Charles Lindholm

In the modern world where computers are capable of calculating faster and more accurately than any person, we like to believe our emotions, not our analytic abilities, make us human. In other words, instead of "thinking animals" we see ourselves as "feeling machines." Accordingly, we say that people who are cerebral and unemotional are "inhuman" and "heartless." We want our friends and lovers to be compassionate and ardent, not rational and calculating. For the same reason, our leaders never portray themselves as logically minded technocrats, but as empathetic individuals who "feel our pain." For entertainment, we appreciate the books and movies that stimulate us to experience the maximum amounts of fear, grief, indignation, or joy. In our personal lives, we make our choices on the basis of whether something "feels right." In light of our pervasive concern with feelings, the philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre has persuasively argued that the dominant modern creed ought to be called emotivism (MacIntyre 1981).

Anthropologists Avoided the Study of Emotion

Yet even though emotions take center stage in our daily lives, until quite recently anthropology has had very little to say about how emotions are interpreted, how they differ cross-culturally, or whether emotions have any universal character (for reviews of the literature, see Lutz and White 1986; Jenkins 1994; Rorty 1980). The disciplinary neglect of such a crucial aspect of the human condition is espe- cially remarkable since anthropologists have long relied on emotional relationships of rapport, empathy, and compassion to gain the trust of informants. Moreover, anthropologists often find the ties established during research to be among the most powerfully moving of their lives. The strong affective bonds with people that occur in anthropological fieldwork are not to be found in academic psychology, where emotional relationships with one's subjects (when they are humans instead of white rats) are discouraged; nor are they found in sociology, where impersonal surveys of large samples are the favored methodology. Only in psychoanalysis is the emotional relationship between therapist and patient (termed, in the depersonalizing jargon of the discipline, transference and counter-transference) made part of the intellectual equation, and even there the bond is formed only to be severed at the end of treatment – just as the academic psychologist must kill her rat after the experiment is concluded.

It is worth considering why anthropologists have been so unconcerned with the analysis of the meaning and context of emotion when their whole disciplinary practice is based on feelings of empathy. To a degree this disinterest has reflected a deep and recurrent anthropological anxiety about the validity of participant observation as a methodology. Hoping to be accepted as legitimate scientists, most anthropologists in the past have cautiously heeded Durkheim's warning that emotions cannot be properly studied because they are fluid, mixed, not easily defined, and consequently impossible to analyze (see Durkheim and Mauss 1963). From this point of view, emotions are too "soft" and too subjective to be appropriate topics for research by anthropologists seeking above all to be impressively "hard" and empirical.

However, although Durkheim admitted the difficulty of attaining an adequate analysis of emotion, he nonetheless made emotion – specifically the ecstasy of immersion in the collective and the sense of depression and alienation that occurs when excluded from the group or deprived of a sense of significance – the core of his social theory. This crucial aspect of his work has often been forgotten by sociologists and anthropologists more impressed with his empiricism and functionalism.

Yet Durkheim was certainly right to point out that emotion is a notoriously obscure concept, as is indicated in the ambiguity of the word itself: "emotion" has its etymological origins in the Latin word emovere – to move away – indicating both

elusiveness and agitation. Nor is the word emotion easily translatable cross-culturally (Wierzbicka 1993). The French, for example, unite feeling and emotion in one word: sentiment. And even in English the use of the word "emotion" is relatively recent, dating only from the eighteenth century. Formerly, English referred only to the passions – derived from the Latin passus – suffered, submitted – which suggests the overwhelming power of desire and the passivity of the individual, who is believed not to control feelings but to be enslaved by them.

This etymology suggests a further reason for the general exclusion of emotion from serious study by earlier anthropologists: the association of emotion with irrationality and sentimentality. In Western thought women have been regarded as the more emotional sex, making them best suited for homemaking and the helping professions, while men have been viewed as the reasonable ones, capable of success in the rational fields of business and science. For anthropologists seeking professional legitimacy in the sciences, a masculine meaning-centered and cerebral model of research naturally trumped any serious study of effeminate, irrational emotional states. (This point has been made most cogently by Lutz 1988.)

There is perhaps yet another disciplinary reason why emotion is not a traditional topic for anthropologists. Because emotion has been viewed in the West as a natural force that arises in the core of the individual, it falls within the disciplinary realm of psychology and physiology and not within the domain of anthropology, which has usually been concerned with the study of culture and symbolic relationships. As a result, when emotion has been the object of scientific scrutiny, it has been studied solely by psychologists and biologists who, naturally enough, measured, codified, and analyzed feelings within laboratory settings, leaving aside all cultural contexts.

The Philosophers of Emotion

In contrast to the remarkable lack of anthropological interest in the emotions, the nature of the passions and their relationship to the human condition has been very much a matter of fundamental concern in many non-Western societies, especially in religions devoted to achieving mystical communion. For example, in India the cultivation and intensification of prescribed passions (rasa) was thought to be a pathway to divine knowledge; as a result, specific emotional states were exhaustively described and invoked. Muslim Sufis, too, had a complex understanding of the vacillations of the heart that were said to occur upon the pathway to enlightenment. These indigenous theories of emotional capacities and transformation deserve much more attention from anthropologists than they have so far received.

Closer to home, throughout Western history many centrally important philosophers have occupied themselves with understanding emotion: Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Descartes, Hobbes, Kant, Hume, and Adam Smith are among those who developed partially overlapping and partially competing theories. (For a synopsis of some of these, see Gardiner et al. 1937.) All of them recognized at the outset that the passions, however conceptualized and categorized, were powerful and often dangerous motivators of human action. The question for these thinkers was not so much what the passions are (Aristotle argued for desire, fear, pleasure, and pain; Descartes proposed love, hate, desire, joy, astonishment, and grief), but how to control or channel them so they will not have destructive consequences.

One of the most sophisticated and influential theories was put forward by David Hume, who made the radical argument that human beings are in truth motivated primarily by their fears, desires, and passions. As he wrote in 1737: "Reason alone can never be a motive to any action of the will . . . it can never oppose passion in the direction of the will . . . Reason is, and ought to be the slave of the passions, and can never pretend to any other office than to serve and obey them" (Hume 1978: 413, 415). Hume believed that primary passions, derived from sensation, give rise to secondary passions derived from reflection. He further distinguished direct emotions arising immediately from the experience of pleasure or pain (desire, aversion, joy,

hope, fear, despair, security) from indirect feelings that have the self as their object, and arise from various associations and impressions. Pride, humility, love, and hate are the primary indirect emotions; ambition, vanity, envy, pity, malice, and generosity are the secondary indirect emotions. There are as well other passions – revenge, sympathy, hunger, and lust – issuing from original instincts. Opposing emotions, Hume thought, could be aroused by proper stimuli and then marshaled against one another, leading to their mutual negation, and hence to peace. Many of his later writings consisted of meditations on how to achieve this beneficent goal.

Hume's theory was contested and complicated in 1759 by Adam Smith, who based his system on the human capacity for entering into sympathetic emotional communion with the feelings of others. For him, the tendency to sympathize depends on the type of passion felt, and Smith subdivides feelings into those derived directly from the body, such as pain, which excite little real sympathy, and those derived from the imagination, which arouse much more. As he says, "a disappointment in love, or ambition, will call forth more sympathy than the greatest bodily evil" (Smith 1982: 29). The passions of the imagination are subdivided into unsocial passions of resentment and hatred, which onlookers do not enter into easily, and the social passions of generosity, kindness, and compassion, which are particularly compelling. Between these extremes are the selfish passions of grief and joy. Smith's case histories, though certainly culturally bound, nonetheless give credit to the complex interaction of personality, context, and custom on human emotions, and raise the important question of the degree to which those emotions arouse a sympathetic response in others, and therefore are a source of social cohesion. His vision of the relation between emotion and community is one that anthropologists might well reconsider.

Capitalism and the Transformation of Feeling

With the brilliant exception of Smith, most later Utilitarian theorists greatly simplified Hume's system, though they too believed men and women were the slaves of passion, eternally seeking to avoid pain and attain pleasure. Like Hume, they also wanted to alleviate human violence, but instead of manipulating mutually negating desires, they argued that the "calm passion" of greed would make men and women single-minded, long-term calculators, impervious to the risky ambitions for glory that had caused so much havoc in the past. Avarice, a deadly sin for earlier moralists, became regarded by Utilitarian thinkers and their economist acolytes as both morally good and socially useful (Hirschman 1977). This is, in a nutshell, the argument made by Max Weber in The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (1930), where he discovered the roots of capitalism in the moral fervor and this-worldly asceticism of Calvinism.

The transformation of greed from sin to virtue illustrates the way that changes in the cultural climate can effect the experience and expression of emotions over time. Certainly, nascent capitalists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries struggled hard to subdue their more aggressive and expansive impulses in order to pursue profit with a new, single-minded devotion. But there was also a romantic backlash against the Utilitarian model of feeling, demonstrating that human passions cannot be so easily confined to such a narrow band. When Johann Wolfgang Goethe published The Sorrows of Werther in 1774 he tapped into this wellspring of repressed sentiment. His tale of the suicide of an idealistic young artist spurned in love inspired hundreds of poetic young men throughout Europe to commit suicide themselves as the ultimate expression of their sensitive hearts and total contempt for the predominant ethos of cool calculation and hard cash.

The combination of the emotional constraints demanded by capitalism and the romantic resistance to those limits serves to demonstrate how shifts in social organization, cultural context, and life style may have profound effects on the ways in which individuals experience emotion. A modern example of this correlation has been documented by the sociologist Arlie Hochschild, who shows how the increasing

importance of a service economy has led to increasing self-consciousness among Americans about the authenticity of their own feelings and the feelings of others.

This is because more people in the United States are presently working in positions that involve constant public interaction with customers and a high degree of emotional control. This pervasive "emotion work" can have pernicious effects.

For example, in her study of airline stewardesses, Hochschild found workers were required to smile and be friendly, regardless of their own moods, and were even expected to manipulate their inner feelings so they would correspond with the demanded outer expressivity. The obligatory professional maintenance of cheerfulness led many to experience deep feelings of self-estrangement and sometimes to a sense of emotional deadness. As Hochschild puts it:

> When the product – the thing to be engineered, mass produced, and subjected to speed-up and slow down – is a smile, a mood, a feeling, or a relationship, it comes to belong more to the organization and less to the self. And so in the country that most publicly celebrates the individual, more people privately wonder, without tracing the question to its deepest social root: What do I really feel? (Hochschild 1983: 198)

According to Hochschild, the value of "authentic" emotion, free of restraint or obligation, has risen greatly in the United States as a reaction against the pervasive management of feeling.

Scientific Theories of Emotion

The type of study undertaken by Hochschild of the complex interrelationship between social structure, political organization, historical change, cultural ideals, and emotional expressivity remains unusual, but it does offer a paradigm for the future. However, to be completely adequate, any such study must also be grounded in a theory of the fundamental nature of emotions themselves. Clearly, in order to act as primary motivating factors in an individual's social and personal life, emotions must be understood to have a degree of force and autonomy.

To develop such a theory requires turning to the physical sciences, where study of the physiology of the emotions has a very long history, beginning in the West with Aristotle's linkage of emotions with "pneuma" or vital spirits. Later medieval thought elaborated this doctrine, dividing people into four distinctive physical/emotional types: "choleric" (angry), "splenetic" (spiteful), "phlegmatic" (dull), "melancholiac" (depressed), each shaped by the relative predominance of the elemental fluids in the body (blood, yellow bile, phlegm, black bile). Remnants of this theoretical framework may be seen in Jung's concept of archetypical character types (which, incidentally, had great influence on Gregory Bateson and other Culture and Personality theorists).

However, eventually most scientific investigators set aside notions of innate emotional types and instead followed Darwin's claim that emotions are adaptive mechanisms humans share with their animal cousins: fear and anger prepare the body for flight or fight, and so on (Darwin 1965). In the United States, William James followed in Darwin's path, proposing that emotion is best seen as a byproduct of the bodily responses caused by the stimulation of the senses. The various emotions, from this perspective, are unconscious, innate, adaptive physiological reactions that impel humans (and animals) to action (Lange and James 1922). James's argument was later championed by a number of neurobiologists (for example, Funkenstein 1955), who claimed that different emotions are associated with different autonomic processes and chemicals.

Yet this perspective did not immediately carry the day. Opponents contended that physical changes do not necessarily arouse specific emotions; rather, the same stimulus could be interpreted completely differently, according to context (Cannon 1927).

The paradigmatic test of this theory was conducted by the psychologists Stanley Schachter and Jerome Singer. They injected their subjects with epinephrine, a drug that causes an accelerated heartbeat and a sense of excitement. Some were then put into situations where the stooges around them pretended to be irritated, while others were placed in situations where the stooges were euphoric. Not surprisingly, the experimental subjects surrounded by cranks felt cross themselves, while those surrounded by cheery people felt happy. Schachter and Singer concluded that appraisal "determines whether the state of physiological arousal will be labeled as 'anger,' 'joy,' 'fear,' or whatever" (1962: 380). For many researchers, Schachter and Singer's findings appeared to prove that emotions were best understood as a product of the evaluations of individuals – a conclusion that could easily be extended to favor a strongly cultural approach to the definition of emotion, since if the same sensation was interpreted differently by individuals according to context, then it followed that context made the emotion.

However, physiological explanations were soon resuscitated by sophisticated neurobiological research on the brain that showed that endorphins and other neurochemicals had significant and quite specific effects on mood. Schachter and Singer's experimental procedures were also brought into question (see Kemper 1987 for a review). Because of these problems, the purely cognitive-evaluative theory of emotions failed to convince many neurologists and psychologists who, like Hume, argued that "cognitions have largely evolved in the service of emotions" (Plutchik 1982: 544), or, somewhat less radically, that emotions exist in consciousness independent of cognition, aroused by unconscious drives or by other emotions (Izard 1971, 1972, 1977). For these researchers, choices we claim to have made for good logical reasons may well be generated by unconscious emotional preferences encoded at a visceral level (Zajonc 1980). This latter perspective obviously validates Freud's view of the importance of unconscious drives in human action, and it also tends to confirm Durkheim's picture of the manner in which emotional involvement in the collective propels human beings to act in ways that are against their own self-interest.

In an attempt to mediate between a cognitive-interpretive and an essentialist-biological argument, Silvan Tomkins asserts emotion might best be seen as a biological motivating system: "Without its amplification nothing else matters, and with its amplification anything else can matter" (Tomkins 1982: 356). Similarly, anthropologist David Parkin has written: "emotions are non-judgmental shapers of decisions. That is to say, emotions act autonomously, or at least appear to do so, in giving sense to an interpretation, not through comparison with other possible decisions, but by making that particular interpretation seem fitting" (Parkin 1985: 142). (For a recent neuroscientific linkage of emotion with cognition and perception, see Damasio 1999.) These authors have accepted the position (taken by Freudians as well) that emotion is the mechanism for directing the trajectory of unconscious drives. Some

aspects of these emotions hold across human beings everywhere: sudden intense input, for instance, causes a startle reaction; increased stimulus leads to distress; lowered stimulus is pleasurable; some emotional reactions, such as disgust, are innate.

Tomkins and others of his persuasion have also accepted the proposition that the vast majority of emotional responses are a result of a process of cultural learning; they can be blended, channeled, increased, reduced, and transformed almost infinitely. It follows that cultural differences in the revelation and experience of feelings may be a result of divergent attitudes toward those particular feelings, and not a consequence of differences in the innate character of the basic emotions (Izard 1980).

This leaves open the task of defining the emotions. As Durkheim warned, emotions do not form a natural class; they are perplexing even to describe, much less to categorize into any clear taxonomy or hierarchy such as that proposed by Hume. In consequence, despite considerable advances, the catalogue of emotions posited by psychologists remains confused. For example, Carol Izard (1980) has proposed nine primary emotions: interest, excitement, joy, surprise/startle, distress/anguish, disgust/contempt, anger/rage, shame/humiliation, fear/terror; Paul Ekman and his colleagues (1982a) claim to have discovered five essential emotional states: happiness, fear/surprise, sadness (or distress), anger, disgust; Theodore Kemper (1978) has restated Aristotle's case for the existence of only four primary emotions: fear, anger, depression, and satisfaction. These are only a few of the best known of the many categorizations of emotion suggested by modern science. Yet, despite disagreements among empirical researchers and commentators, it is clear that all the categorizations of primary emotions include at least the four posited by Kemper (and Aristotle). These appear among infants only 2 months old, who cry to elicit care, show fear when surprised, become angry when frustrated, and are happy when suckled (Trevarthen 1984: 152).

In this vein, psychological anthropologist Robert Levy has concluded "the central tendencies named by various emotional terms are probably universal but that the borders of the categories may differ" (1984: 229). He has been seconded by the experientialist linguist George Lakoff and his colleagues, who have argued that whenever emotions are described, the same set of metaphors is always utilized. For example, anger is invariably characterized in terms of an increase in body heat, internal pressure, and agitation that builds within the container of the body until there is an explosion. People are "red hot" and "ready to burst" when they are "inflamed" with rage. According to the experientialists, this linguistic prototype "corresponds remarkably well with the actual physiology" of anger; thus "the physiology corresponding to each emotion has a great deal to do with how the emotion is conceptualized" (Lakoff and Kovecses 1987: 221; see also Lakoff 1987; Ekman et al. 1983). Cognitive anthropologists have made similar assertions for the continuity of emotional experience. For example, there is a remarkable cross-cultural correlation in the colors people pick to represent various primary emotions, such as happiness, sadness, anger, and fear (D'Andrade and Egan 1974).

EMOTIONS AS CULTURAL CONSTRUCTIONS

With empirical scientists having established at least the rudiments of a basic set of emotions, a reasonable contribution for anthropologists would seem to be to study how these emotions can be blended, transformed, expanded, or contracted by culture. However, this is not the direction research has taken. Instead, when they have written about emotion at all, anthropologists have tended, mostly for reasons of disciplinary ideology, to argue against any universal emotions and in favor of the total authority of culture over feeling. This trend existed but was muted among earlier writers, such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, who conceded in an off-handed manner that there was probably some kind of natural "arc" of human emotional potential that was wider in range than any particular social configuration allowed – though it was never stated what the range actually was, or what the basic emotions might be.

However, during the 1960s a more radical cultural constructivist position of emotion was asserted. This position was correlated with the rise of interpretive anthropology and was spearheaded by Clifford Geertz, who argued quite seriously that the Balinese have no emotions at all, except for stagefright. According to Geertz, the Balinese lacked "individuality, spontaneity, perishability, emotionality, vulnerability" (1965: 399); they did not grieve at funerals, smiled regardless of stress,

and devoted their entire energies to a public aesthetic performance of rituals. They were, in effect, all surface. Somewhat less immoderately, in her widely cited ethnography of the Alaskan Inuit, Jean Briggs (1970) declared that anger did not exist among her informants, who, she said, were motivated solely by feelings of nurturance and rational judgment.

For some time, these strong claims for the authority of public culture over private feelings were allowed to stand without refutation, and their notoriety led other anthropologists to follow suit with their own demonstrations of the manner in which emotion is culturally constructed. But there was a break in the consensus when Briggs, in a reconsideration of her earlier findings, wrote that Inuit child-raising techniques relied heavily on frightening questions such as, "What a lovely new shirt. Why don't you die so I can have it?" (Briggs 1987: 12; see also Briggs 1978). According to Briggs, this type of frightening question, along with other socialization practices, served to make Inuit children hyperaware of their own antisocial tendencies and increased pressure on them to control their violent impulses, which were presumed to be very near the surface. Briggs concluded that Inuit anger did not vanish, as she had earlier claimed, but rather was a dangerous potential held in check only by strict training and constant control. Nonetheless, rage and cruelty did sometimes surface, particularly in the treatment of animals, which were sometimes nurtured, but also were often sadistically mutilated and killed. A parallel argument was made by Robert Paul (1978) in his analysis of outbursts of extreme aggression among the famously non-violent Semai.

Geertz's portrait of the Balinese as masks without content was challenged on similar grounds by the Norwegian anthropologist Unni Wikan. Undertaking fieldwork in Bali to reaffirm Geertz's research, she found something quite different lurking beneath the smooth surface of the ubiquitous Balinese smile. As she writes, for the Balinese:

> The heart, seen as a seething cauldron of passions, is a power to be reckoned with, though it works undercover and surreptitiously. Indeed, Balinese see the "acted" or "expressed" order in the form of predictable politeness and cheerfulness as necessitated by the tumults that would threaten were hearts allowed to reign. (Wikan 1990: 229)

In other words, the Balinese maintain their smiling composure not because they have no feelings, but precisely because their feelings are too strong and would expose them to danger if revealed. Nonetheless, those who are culturally knowledgeable can detect the quiver in the eyelid, the slight flush, that betray the carefully concealed passions trembling just beneath the relentlessly happy exterior.

Culture and Emotional Control

The sort of strict emotional control found in Bali is in fact quite common in face-to-face societies where people cannot escape the long-term consequences of yielding to their immediate impulses in public. Examples include the "face" demanded in China or the stiff upper lip of the English upper class. Sometimes in such cultures there is a class division of emotional labor; for example, among the Wolof speakers of Africa the inferior Griot are permitted and even required to enact the strong feelings which more respectable persons are forbidden to show (Irvine 1990). Even more commonly, emotion is divided by gender; stolidity is most often masculine, expressivity feminine. For instance, among the Swati Pukhtun khans whom I studied, men sat expressionless and silent at funerals while women wailed and keened hysterically in the background. These stereotypical public differences carried over into private life as well, as women were expected to be emotional and impulsive while men were phlegmatic and rational. However, the stoic male front hid considerable anxiety, which surfaced in pervasive (but hidden) fears of suffocating night demons (Lindholm 1980).

Of course, the control and manipulation of emotional expression is not only found in less complex societies, as we have seen in the example cited above of American airline stewardesses and other "emotion workers." Probably the most thorough account

of emotional control in a complex society was made by Norbert Elias, who showed how members of the Court society of France's Louis XIV had to be willing and able to enact emotional states that were pleasing to their superiors and to keep their own immediate reactions strictly in check in order to gain favor. Behind their well-controlled surface performance the courtier had feelings much like our own, though their attitudes toward their feelings differed: like the airline stewardesses obliged to smile continually and who suffer alienation as a result, we tend to believe that to maintain mental health and personal authenticity, our true feelings ought to be revealed; the courtiers, in contrast, believed that for safety and self-aggrandizement strong feelings had to be well disguised and false emotions displayed. Thus, the courtier, like the Pukhtun khan and the Balinese, hid his feelings because of a well-founded fear that revealing them would give his enemies an advantage. In none of these societies was there any of the modern Western notion that emotional suppression is alienating or inauthentic, though it could be very hard work indeed.

But there was also a fundamental difference in the concept of the nature of emotions in these societies. In Swat and France the public performance of emotion was always primarily for the other, not for the self. The Pukhtun wished simply to hide his feelings beneath a shell of invulnerability; the courtier had the more complex task of both hiding his real feelings and displaying false ones. However, neither had any desire to make the inner and the outer correspond; the courtiers and the khans certainly did not think that smiling would make them happy. Rather, for them, feelings were hidden or dissimulated for advantage, but the inner reality existed autonomously and was not easily obliterated or altered.

In contrast, in some societies, such as Bali, appearance was meant not only to convince others but also to convince the self. The Balinese presumed that by changing the exterior expression of emotion one can, over time, change the internal feeling. As the Balinese say, "laughter makes happiness, it takes sadness out" and "if you only think good thoughts, it is impossible to feel sad" (Wikan 1990: 123, 152). Furthermore, Wikan claims the Balinese do not clearly distinguish thought and feeling – they think with their feelings and feel with their thoughts, which implies that feelings can be controlled just as thoughts can be controlled. There is also no unconscious in Balinese folk psychology: emotions are not internal, but are believed to be socially generated by specific situations and to be quite controllable and effortlessly changed and channeled.

As much as I admire her work, I must point out that Wikan's ethnographic material does not validate the Balinese ethnopsychology: instead, she provides accounts of how strong feelings of sadness and anger sometimes overwhelm the Balinese, despite their best efforts at control; nor do the Balinese have a lucid idea of why they have some feelings and not others, and they themselves often debate over whether feelings or thoughts have precedence in ordinary life.

Feeling as Embodied Thought

In stressing the unity of thought and feeling, conscious control over emotions, and the absence of an unconscious, Wikan has followed the lead of a number of recent researchers who have worked in the Pacific. Most notable among them is Catherine Lutz, who takes her examples from her research on the small, peaceful, non-competitive island of Ifaluk. The central "feeling-thought" there is fago, which translates as a combination of compassion-love-sadness. Fago is said to be an automatic consequence of relationships of mutual exchange. As one woman says, "I fago you because you give me things . . . If I take care of you, give you things, and talk to you, I'll know you fago me." Yet fago turns out not to be quite as nurturing as it seems on the surface, since Lutz explains it as a functional technique for "sanctioning the display of resources and abilities in the act of helping others" (1988: 139, 152; for a critique, see Russell 1991); in essence, beneath nurturance is a hidden agenda – a quest for power in a small-scale social universe where overt power-seeking is repudiated. Much like an archetypical Jewish mother, the Ifaluk can dominate one another by the purportedly selfless giving of succor.

A number of other ethnopsychological studies have followed Lutz's lead and have claimed that small-scale sociocentric cultures experience emotion not as private and inner motivation, but as a consequence of the enactment of specific public roles: a person will always feel x when another person does y. Contra Lakoff, emotions in these cultures are described not in terms of inner sensations as they are in the West ("He acted so coldly that I just boiled over with rage") but in terms of formal obligations and public relationships ("I fago you because you are my relative"). These authors also follow Lutz in focusing on the way in which emotion is correlated with power and social hierarchy (for some examples, see the essays in Lutz and Abu-Lughod 1990). From this perspective, the claim is made that emotion can best be understood as a form of cognitive assessment that arouses the body as well as the mind.

One of the most influential spokespersons for this position was Michelle Rosaldo, who worked among the Ilongot of the Philippines. As she wrote:

> What distinguishes thought and affect, differentiating a "cold" cognition from a "hot," is fundamentally a sense of the engagement of the actor's self. Emotions are thoughts somehow "felt" in flushes, pulses, "movements" of our livers, minds, hearts, stomachs, skin. They are embodied thoughts, thoughts steeped with the apprehension that "I am involved." (Rosaldo 1984: 143; for a fuller account, see Rosaldo 1980)

As in the model put forward by Schachter and Singer, emotions are here depicted as socially constituted and reflective of the mental constructs that are believed to make up culture; they are the "felt thoughts" in which the cultural habitus of power is embedded (or resisted) within the physical being of the relational self. In a real sense, this is a return to the position of the Greek Stoics who imagined the passions to be types of judgment, reliant on opinion. For them, as for the Balinese, the compulsions of desire could be eliminated by the exercise of proper logic.

There is much to be said for this point of view, which extended Geertzian interpretivism in a more complex manner and allowed anthropologists to analyze emotions as cultural artifacts for the first time. But a fundamental problem remained: viewed from an overwhelmingly cognitive position, emotions lose their autonomy and structure; there are no drives, no repression, no conflicts between internal desire and external constraint, no variations in emotional intensity and force. Feelings simply serve as the physical expression of authority (or protest against authority). And so, in principle, it would seem that anything can be felt, so long as it is expressed and defined in a discourse of power and opposition (for an example, see Kapferer 1995).

This constructivist and discourse oriented view flies in the face of a convincing array of physiological and evolutionary evidence already cited that indicates emotions are not infinitely malleable, nor totally cognitive, nor completely relational; nor is the quest for power the only motivation of human beings. Primary affects are more varied than this, and the drives that impel them do have some autonomy, force, and structure and do press toward expression no matter how thoroughly they are denied. To ignore this is to make analysis one-sided, without an oppositional dialectic.

A Dialectical View of Emotion and Culture

A different and more adequate understanding of emotion was achieved by Michelle Rosaldo's husband Renato in a well-known paper he wrote shortly after her tragic death in a fall while doing fieldwork. He reports that previous to her accident he did not believe the Ilongot when they told him a man killed an enemy to vent the rage caused by heart-rending grief over the death of a loved one. Headhunting, he thought, was a form of exchange, and death was an occasion for a ritual performance of reciprocity. But after the death of his wife he realized viscerally how overwhelming rage can indeed arise from profound grief. With his ordeal fresh in his mind, Rosaldo argued that compelling emotions can exist without ritual expression, while rituals can exist without emotional content, as mere platitudes. Ignoring the autonomous force and intensity of basic emotions such as anger, fear, and love, Rosaldo asserted,

is to dehumanize others, making it impossible to understand their deepest motivations (Rosaldo 1983; see also Chodorow 1999 on Rosaldo's later repudiation of this position).

The view of the emotions as active elements motivating an individual's relationship with culture makes better sense of ethnographic data than does the notion that emotions are really a form of cognition, wholly socially and linguistically constituted. For example, the anger that the Ilongot "throw away" when at home is expressed against others in headhunting, which not only relieves painful feelings of grief, but also displaces rage at their own neighbors and kin, which cannot be expressed without tearing apart the social fabric of their egalitarian communal society (Spiro 1984; for an example of the same phenomenon among the Mundurucu in South America, see Murphy 1960).

Similarly, the Balinese ethnopsychology of emotions as easily regulated feeling-thoughts cannot explain the fear of sorcery that is so pervasive there. It is more reasonable to see this fear as the consequence of the severe repression demanded in ordinary interaction; witchcraft accusations and ecstatic possession trance are a response to this pervasive repression and serve, as Linda Connor writes, to "release violent pent-up emotions in uncontrolled behavior without having to take any direct personal responsibility" (1982: 225). In a like manner, among the Ifaluk the apparent surface harmony of society is also undermined by an overwhelming sense of fear; in this case fear of ghosts and an unrealistic anxiety about the sharing of food. Charles Nuckolls (1996) has argued that these frightening aspects of Ifaluk emotional life are transformations of the anger aroused by the severe suppression of childhood sibling competition over the affection of the mother. The strong cultural value placed on charity and empathy by the Ifaluk coincides with equally powerful, though repressed, feelings of anger, expressed in ubiquitous irrational fears.

Other recent ethnographies of the Pacific tell a similar story. Samoans, like the people of Ifaluk and Bali, do not speak of physical states when they talk of emotions but of stereotyped situations and appropriate responses – of "feeling-thoughts" in Wikan's phrase. Ethnopsychologists have sometimes taken this to indicate that their actual feelings are detached and relational. But when Samoans are engaged in an emotionally loaded situation it is easy to see the physiological signs of strong affect (flushing, tears, clenched teeth), despite the fact that these signs are unmentioned. Like the Ilongot and Ifaluk, Samoans also vehemently deny the existence of certain feelings, especially any resentment toward one's parents, since such animosity is considered to be absolutely immoral. But nonetheless Samoans sometimes do lose control of their pool of unexpressed anger, which floods into violence. This occurs especially during periodic drinking bouts, when drunken men rage against their peers, not against their elders; such violence is not "owned" by the perpetrator – he was "under the influence" of alcohol – and therefore his anger has no subversive meaning (alcohol has a similar function in the United States, allowing violent actions forbidden in daily life). By such unconscious balancing mechanisms, the equilibrium between social constraint and proscribed emotional impulse is maintained (Gerber 1985).

While the Ifaluk, Ilongot, and the Samoans deny anger, the Tahitians do the opposite; among them anger is "hypercognized"; that is, there is a large vocabulary available for discussing it. Sadness, in contrast, is minimally elaborated; it is "hypocognized." This means that in situations where we would talk about grief, the Tahitians talk about sensations of fatigue, aches and pains, and other forms of physical distress: "I have been feeling tired since my mother died." Sadness is "somatized" as an objective perception of a bodily state, but not felt to be subjectively involving. (Robert Levy calls the first state a feeling, the second an emotion. His useful distinction makes emotion an internalized and subjective subsystem of the larger objective physical category of feeling.) Yet the lack of a vocabulary to describe sadness does not mean that grief disappears. On the contrary, Levy (1984) asserts the emotions denied in discourse are manifested in powerful and uncanny ways; for example, as

"ego-alien" sensations of being overcome by malevolent spirits or illness. His model gives much-needed credit to the force and autonomy of primal emotional impulse and explores how they are dialectically involved in culture and experience.

Anger and sadness are not the only emotions repressed on the surface only to resurface in disguised forms. Among the rivalrous Pukhtun the advice of their national poet Khushal Khan Khattack made good sense: "The eye of the dove is lovely, my son, / but the sky is made for the hawk. / So cover your dovelike eyes / and grow claws" (quoted in Khan 1958: 12). Yet in this agonistic universe emotions of love, mutuality, and nurturance were indirectly revealed in performances of unstinting hospitality and idealized bonds of friendship. Deprived of attachment in reality, the Pukhtun sought it in symbols and fantasies. I should think the same would occur in any society where fundamental emotions are forbidden or denied (Lindholm 1980).

Culturally Specific Emotions

This is not to say that emotions are exactly the same everywhere, but it is to say that the psychological substrate out of which mixtures come is universal, though the specific colorations and intensities will differ across cultures and individuals. Each culture will produce its own blend of basic feeling states, since these states do not have hard and fast boundaries and can be mingled in specific ways. Fago (compassion, love, sadness) is one such culturally specific emotion; the Inuit have a parallel category of nallik, implying nurturance, love, pity, and the suppression of all anger. Ekman found in his survey of facial expressions that many preliterate societies merge fear and surprise. But even though some cultures may separate categories of emotion that others mix and elaborate experiences that other societies do not, this does not mean there is no commonality among them. We have already cited the consensus among neurobiologists and psychologists that such a substrate exists and must include at least the four basic emotions of fear, anger, sadness, and happiness and their permutations.

There also are culturally specific "emotions" that are barely emotions at all, since they do not move anyone; they are vague feeling states like "nostalgia for the lilies of the field"; narrowly defined, shallow, and culturally specific, with little if any motivating affect behind them. The Samoan concept of "respect" may be one such shallow feeling; while some Samoans say it is indeed a feeling inside, most say it is merely a form of ritual behavior. Nonetheless, such "affectless affects" probably are modeled after more highly charged feelings; in this case, a combination of love and fear (Gerber 1985: 130).

Alternatively, the unique emotional category may be a culturally specific transformation of a more fundamental impulse. One such is the Japanese emotion of amae, defined as an asymmetric adult bond of helpless dependency modeled after early infantile attachment. In showing amae, Japanese subordinates commonly act in a childlike and dependent way toward superiors, expecting to elicit nurturance in return. This highly valued emotion – often called "passive love" – favors "a considerable blurring of the distinction between subject and object" (Doi 1981: 8; see also Kumagai and Kumagai 1986.) Amae makes sense in the intensely group-oriented and hierarchical atmosphere of Japan, where it obliges a kindly superior to offer protection and provides a safe way for subordinates to act in a weak and needy manner. But it is an emotional constellation that is neither recognized nor valued in the United States, where personal independence is prized and where public expressions of helplessness and dependency among adults are strongly disapproved. Yet this does not mean that a need for nurturance and attachment is biologically unimportant for Westerners, only that we have ways of expressing it that are culturally specific, such as romantic love (Averill 1980, Lindholm 1999).

As a result of these and other arguments, overbalanced anthropological claims for the power of culture over emotion have of late been very much muted. Richard Shweder, who has often been a major spokesman for a relativist, interpretive view of culture, now concedes "it is ludicrous to imagine that the emotional functioning

of people in different cultures is basically the same. It is just as ludicrous to imagine that each culture's emotional life is unique" (1991: 252).

The Future of the Anthropology of Emotion

We can determine then that an adequate psychological anthropology ought not to try to prove that every culture is emotionally unique (this is both obvious and fruitless), but that differences are culturally, structurally, and historically motivated variations resting upon a common psychic ground. The real task is the double one of seeking to discover what that ground may be and of finding what factors determine the alternative paths taken in the repression, expression, and interpretation of emotion.

In terms of comparative research agendas for the future, it might be worth considering whether some emotional blends (such as the love–sadness–pity constellation) are more common while others are rare or impossible. For example, can there be an emotional category which combines sadness and joy? Do certain combinations of emotion and types of emotional control correlate with certain types of social organization? Does Hume's categorization of emotions as primary and secondary, direct and indirect, have any validity cross-culturally? Or, to take a modern example, how applicable is Robert Plutchik's (1982) "emotion wheel," which distinguishes primary transient emotions of joy, acceptance, fear, surprise, sadness, disgust, anger, and satisfaction from secondary enduring ones of love, submission, awe, disappointment, remorse, contempt, aggression, and optimism? What sorts of cultures favor the Balinese notion that appropriate emotions can be manufactured through controlling one's behavior and thoughts, and what sort follow the Pukhtun/courtier belief that emotions exist autonomously, though they can and should be hidden or manipulated (Lindholm 1988, 1999)? What types of cultures display the modern American faith that spontaneous emotional expressivity equals authenticity?

We also ought to follow up the lead of ethnopsychology, but on a more sophisticated level, and spend time understanding and comparing the emotional theories put forward in various mystical traditions such as Sufism and Hinduism. This investigation should coincide with an in-depth study of the actual content and implications of the theories of emotion proposed by Western philosophers. In particular, Adam Smith's notion that mutual sympathy is at the core of civilization may be worth reevaluating.

Finally, it is worth stressing that the investigation of emotion is not simply an academic exercise. The infectious spread of terror and violence in today's world ought to lead us to think more about Hume's fundamental question: How can dangerous desires be re-channeled and toleration inculcated? To answer this inquiry, we first need to understand the passionate impulses that motivate popular uprisings, ethnic revivalism, and cultic zealotry; we need to think about what occurs when identity is challenged and about the kinds of emotional transformations that are aroused when individuals lose themselves in a mass movement. As I have argued elsewhere (Lindholm 1990), this requires thinking again about crowd psychology, a topic that was central to both Durkheim (1965) and Freud (1959) but one that has been forgotten by anthropologists, who have focused instead on "meaning-making" among free agents who appear to be suspiciously rationalistic and individualistic, regardless of their cultural heritage.

To restate: the evidence from many different fields strongly supports the existence of a constellation of fundamental emotional impulses within each individual; these impulses, which vary in strength and duration according to each person's psychic makeup, are expressed within and against the constraining and ordering framework of culture, history, and structure. This way of thinking about emotion does not undermine anthropological analysis. Instead, it provides a better foundation for comparative work and, perhaps more importantly, gives a basis for the humane claim that others are not so different from ourselves. They too are driven by contradictory desires for attachment and for autonomy; they too are overcome by rage and grief; they too are transported by love and joy. And all of us, however rational we are and whatever

our meaning systems, can sometimes be swept away by the passions of the collectives that surround us.

REFERENCES

Averill, James, 1980 Emotion and Anxiety: Sociocultural, Biological and Psychological Determinants. In Explaining Emotions. A. Rorty, ed. Pp. 37–72. Berkeley: University of California Press.

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

— 1978 The Origins of Nonviolence: Inuit Management of Aggression. In Learning Non- Aggression: The Experience of Non-Literate Societies. Ashley Montague, ed. Pp. 54–93. New York: Oxford University Press.

— 1987 In Search of Emotional Meaning. Ethos 15: 8–15.

Cannon, W., 1927 The James–Lange Theory of Emotion: A Critical Examination and an Alternative Theory. American Journal of Psychology 39: 106–124.

Chodorow, Nancy, 1999 The Power of Feelings: Personal Meaning in Psychoanalysis. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Connor, Linda, 1982 The Unbounded Self: Balinese Therapy in Theory and Practice. In Cultural Conceptions of Mental Health and Therapy. Anthony Marsella and Geoffrey White, eds. Pp. 251–267. Dordrecht: Reidel.

D'Andrade, Roy, and Michael Egan, 1974 The Colors of Emotion. American Ethnologist 1: 49–63.

Damasio, Antonio, 1999 The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Darwin, Charles, 1965 The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Doi, Takeo, 1981 The Anatomy of Dependence. Tokyo: Kodansha International. Durkheim,

Emile, 1965 The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. New York: Free Press. Durkheim,

Emile, and Marcel Mauss, 1963 Primitive Classification. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ekman, Paul, with Wallace Friesen, Phoebe Ellsworth, 1982a What Emotion Categories or Dimensions Can Observers Judge From Facial Behavior? In Emotion in the Human Face. Paul Ekman, ed. Pp. 39–55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 1982b What are the Similarities and Differences in Facial Behavior Across Cultures? In Emotion in the Human Face. Paul Ekman, ed. Pp. 128–143. Cambridge: Cambridge Uni- versity Press.

Ekman, Paul, with R. Levinson, Wallace Friesen, 1983 Autonomic Nervous System Activity Distinguishes between Emotions. Science 221: 1208–1210.

Freud, Sigmund, 1959 Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. New York: Norton.

Funkenstein, D., 1955 The Physiology of Fear and Anger. Scientific American 192: 74–80.

Gerber, Eleanor Ruth, 1985 Rage and Obligation: Samoan Emotion in Conflict. In Person, Self and Experience. G. White and J. Kirkpatrick, eds. Pp. 121–167. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gardiner, Howard M., with Ruth Metcalf and John Beebe-Center, 1937 Feeling and Emotion: A History of Theories. New York: American Book Company.

Geertz, Clifford, 1965 Person, Time and Conduct in Bali: An Essay in Cultural Analysis. Southeast Asia Studies. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hirschman, Albert O., 1977 The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before its Triumph. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell, 1983 The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hume, David, 1978 A Treatise of Human Nature. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Irvine, Judith, 1990 Registering Affect: Heteroglossia in the Linguistic Expression of Emotion. In Language and the Politics of Emotion. Catherine Lutz and Lila Abu-Lughod, eds. Cam- bridge: Cambridge University Press.

Izard, Carrol, 1971 The Face of Emotion. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

— 1972 Patterns of Emotions. New York: Academic Press.

— 1977 Human Emotions. New York: Plenum.

— 1980 Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Emotion and Emotion Communication. In Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology. H. Triandis, ed. Pp. 185–221. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
Jenkins, Janis, 1994 The Psychocultural Study of Emotion and Mental Disorder. In Psychological Anthropology. Philip Bock, ed. Pp. 97–120. Westport, CT: Praeger.
Kapferer, Bruce, 1995 From the Edge of Death: Sorcery and the Motion of Consciousness. In Questions of Consciousness. Anthony P. Cohen and Nigel Rapport, eds. London: Routledge.
Kemper, Theodore, 1978 A Social Interactional Theory of Emotion. New York: John Wiley.
— 1987 How Many Emotions Are There? Wedding the Social and the Autonomic Components. American Journal of Sociology 93: 263–289.
Khan, Ghani, 1958 The Pathans: A Sketch. Peshawar: University Books.
Kumagai, Hisa, and Arno Kumagai, 1986 The Hidden "I" in Amae: "Passive Love" and Japanese Social Perception. Ethos 14: 305–320.
Lakoff, George, 1987 Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lakoff, George, and Zoltan Kovecses, 1987 The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English. In Cultural Models in Language and Thought. Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, eds. Pp. 195–221. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lange, C. and William James, 1922 The Emotions. New York: Macmillan, Hafner Press.
Levy, Robert, 1984 Emotion, Knowing, and Culture. In Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion. Richard Shweder and Robert LeVine, eds. Pp. 214–237. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lindholm, Charles, 1980 Generosity and Jealousy: The Swat Pukhtun of Northern Pakistan. New York: Columbia University Press.
— 1988 The Social Structure of Emotional Constraint: The Court of Louis XIV and the Pukhtun of Northern Pakistan. Ethos 16: 227–246.
— 1990 Charisma. Oxford: Blackwell.
— 1999 Love and Structure. In Love and Eroticism. Michael Featherstone, ed. Pp. 243–263. London: Sage.
Lutz, Catherine, 1988 Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll and their Challenge to Western Theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lutz, Catherine, and Lila Abu-Lughod, eds., 1990 Language and the Politics of Emotion. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lutz, Catherine, and Geoffrey White, 1986 The Anthropology of Emotions. Annual Review of Anthropology 15: 405–436.
MacIntyre, Alasdair, 1981 After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory. London: Duckworth.
Murphy, Robert, 1960 Headhunter's Heritage. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Nuckolls, Charles, 1996 The Cultural Dialectics of Knowledge and Desire. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Parkin, David, 1985 Reason, Emotion and the Embodiment of Power. In Reason and Morality. Joanna Overing, ed. Pp. 135–151. London: Tavistock.
Paul, Robert, 1978 Instinctive Aggression in Man: The Semai Case. Journal of Psychological Anthropology 1: 65–79.
Plutchik, Robert, 1982 A Psychoevolutionary Theory of the Emotions. Social Science Informa- tion 21: 529–553.
Rorty, Amélie, 1980 Explaining Emotions. In Explaining Emotions. Amélie Rorty, ed. Pp. 1–8. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Rosaldo, Michelle, 1980 Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
— 1984 Toward an Anthropology of Self and Feeling. In Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion. Richard Shweder and Robert Levine, eds. Pp. 137–157. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rosaldo, Renato, 1983 Grief and a Headhunter's Rage: On the Cultural Force of Emotions. In Text, Play, and Story: The Construction and Reconstruction of Self and Society. Edward Bruner, ed. Pp. 178–195. Washington, DC: Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society.
Russell, James, 1991 Culture and the Categorization of Emotions. Psychological Bulletin 110: 426–450.
Schachter, Stanley, and Jerome Singer, 1962 Cognitive, Social and Psychological Determinants of Emotional States. Psychological Review 69: 379–399.
Shweder, Richard, 1991 Thinking Through Cultures: Expeditions in Cultural Psychology. Cam- bridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Smith, Adam, 1982 The Theory of Moral Sentiments. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Classics.

Spiro, Melford, 1984 Some Reflections on Cultural Determinism and Relativism with Special Reference to Emotion and Reason. In Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion. Richard Shweder and Robert Levine, eds. Pp. 323–346. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomkins, Silvan, 1982 Affect Theory. In Emotion in the Human Face. Paul Ekman, ed. Pp. 352–395. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trevarthen, Colwyn, 1984 Emotions in Infancy: Regulators of Contact and Relationships with Persons. In Approaches to Emotion. Klaus Scherer and Paul Ekman, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weber, Max, 1930 The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Scribner.

Wierzbicka, Anna, 1993 A Conceptual Basis for Cultural Psychology. Ethos 21: 205–231.

Wikan, Unni, 1990 Managing Turbulent Hearts: A Balinese Formula for Living. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zajonc, R., 1980 Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences. American Psychologist 35: 151–175.