東京外国語大学語学研究所『語学研究所論集』第 25 号 (2020), pp. 63–78.
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, *Journal of the Institute of Language Research* No. 25 (2020), pp. 63–78.

< Research note >

Current state of studies on pronoun substitutes and address terms : Thai, Burmese, Malay, Indonesian, Javanese and Korean

Hiroki Nomoto[1], Sunisa Wittayapanyanon (Saito)[2], Kenji Okano[1], Thuzar Hlaing[2], Yunjin Nam[1], Sri Budi Lestari[3]

[1]School of Language and Culture Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
[2]World Language and Society Education Center, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
[3]Center for Language Education, Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University

Abstract: Many languages in East and Southeast Asia exhibit an intensive use of pronoun substitutes, such as kinship terms, that refer to speakers and addressees in the way that personal pronouns do although they are not considered personal pronouns. The distribution of pronoun substitutes overlaps substantially with that of address terms. This study thus provides an overview of previous studies on pronoun substitutes and address terms in Thai, Burmese, Malay, Indonesian, Javanese and Korean and covers the following issues: whether the two phenomena are distinguished, the terminology used for them, their formal and semantic characteristics, their relation to personal pronouns and how pronoun substitutes differ from the so-called "imposters" (Collins & Postal 2012) in English.

Keywords: pronoun substitutes, address terms, personal pronouns, person terms, imposters

1. Introduction*

In most languages, there are specific words that exclusively refer to the speaker and the addressee. The Japanese words *watashi* 'I' and *anata* 'you', as well as the English words *I* and *you* are examples. Such words are referred to as personal pronouns in this paper for the sake of simplicity.[1] It is also possible to refer to the speaker or addressee without using personal pronouns. In accordance with Sneddon et al. (2010), expressions outside of personal pronouns that refer to the speaker and the addressee are called "pronoun substitutes." The most common pronoun substitutes are kinship terms. In (1), the words in gothic font are pronoun substitutes. The same words shown in **bold** are not examples of pronoun substitutes. They indicate neither the speaker nor the addressee but someone who has the property of being a mother or an older brother.

* This study received support from the JSPS grant aid JP20H01255. The following abbreviations used in this paper are not in the Leipzig Gloss Rules: HON: honorific; PART: particle.
This document is an English translation of the following article of ours: Nomoto, Hiroki, Sunisa Wittayapanyanon (Saito), Kenji Okano, Thuzar Hlaing, Yunjin Nam & Sri Budi Lestari. 2021. Daimeishidaiyoo, yobikake hyoogen kenkyuu no genjoo: Taigo, Birumago, Mareego, Indoneshiago, Jawago, Choosengo. *Gogaku Kenkyuujo Ronshuu* 25. 63–78. doi:10.15026/100158

[1] In the grammar of certain languages, there are separate issues surrounding whether to recognize the category of personal pronouns.

(1) a. [An older brother speaking to a younger sister] (“older brother” = speaker)
お兄ちゃんの言うこと聞かなかったら，**お母さん**に言いつけるよ．
oniichan no iu koto kika-nakat-tara, **okaasan** ni iitsukeru yo.
older.brother GEN say thing listen-NEG-COND mother to tell PART
‘If you don’t listen to me [= your older brother], I will tell mum.’

b. [A daughter speaking to her mother] (“mum” = addressee)
お母さんの**お兄ちゃん**の名前，何だっけ？
okaasan no **oniichan** no namae, nan dakke?
mother GEN older.brother GEN name what be
‘What is your [= mum’s] older brother’s name again?’

Elements employed as pronoun substitutes are often used to identify the speaker at the same time.[2] These types of expressions are referred to as address terms. For example, *okaasan* ‘mother’ can be added as an address term in (1b), and the expression can also be described as in (2).

(2) **お母さん**，お母さんのお兄ちゃんの名前，何だっけ？
okaasan, okaasan no oniichan no namae nan dakke?
mother mother GEN older.brother GEN name what be
‘Mum, what is mum’s older brother’s name again?’

As described above, there is some degree of overlap between pronoun substitutes and address terms. However, the distributions of the two do not completely overlap. For this reason, they must be treated separately. As shown in (3), *ten’in* ‘store clerk’ may be used as an address term, but it cannot be used as a pronoun substitute. To use it as a pronoun substitute, the honorific title *san* must be added, as in *ten’in-san*.

(3) おい，店員，｛お前／*店員｝の計算，違うじゃないか．
oi, ten’in, {omae / *ten’in} no keisan, chigau janai ka.
oi store.clerk you store.clerk GEN calculation wrong be.NEG Q
‘Oi, store clerk (%you), your calculations are wrong, right?’

It may be the case that phenomena such as pronoun substitutes exist in almost every language. However, in many languages, including English and the Chinese languages, pronoun substitutes are limited to baby talk (e.g., *mummy*) or a very small domain of use (e.g., the use of *the author* in the domain of academia). By contrast, there are also languages, such as Japanese, in which pronoun substitutes are

[2] When the intended addressee is not paying attention to a given dialogue, the act of identifying them has the effect of garnering their attention and engaging them in the dialogue. When an addressee has already been identified and is participating in the dialogue actively, reidentifying them will bring about interpersonal and social effects.

Table 1. Languages examined in this paper

Language	Primary areas of use	Family	Word order	Morphological typology
Thai	Thailand	Tai-Kadai	SVO	Isolating
Burmese	Myanmar	Sino-Tibetan	SOV	Agglutinative
Malay	Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei	Austronesian	SVO	Agglutinative
Indonesian	Indonesia	Austronesian	SVO	Agglutinative
Javanese	Indonesia	Austronesian	SVO	Agglutinative
Korean	South Korea, North Korea	Korean	SOV	Agglutinative

used more extensively. We began working on a cross-linguistic project to research pronoun substitutes and address terms in the latter group of languages.[3]

As a first step, this paper aims to organize the previous studies examining the pronoun substitutes and address terms in the languages in which we specialize (see Table 1). Moreover, the insights obtained through this process are also presented. First, section 2 summarizes the points we considered when conducting the investigation of the previous studies. Subsequently, sections 3–7 examine each of these points in detail. Finally, in section 8, we will explore prospects for future research based on this discussion. Regarding Thai, see Sunisa (2020), who discussed the topics addressed in this paper in greater detail.

2. The identification of issues

The common points on which we focused when examining the previous research concerning each language are as follows:

1. Are pronoun substitutes and address terms distinguished from one another?
2. What are the relevant expressions called?
3. The formal characteristics of pronoun substitutes and address terms
4. The semantic characteristics of pronoun substitutes and address terms
5. Relationship to personal pronouns
6. Other generalizations

Are pronouns substitutes and address terms distinguished from one another? As stated in section 1, the distribution of pronoun substitutes and address terms overlaps greatly. For this reason, it is possible that the two phenomena were not sufficiently distinguished in previous studies.

What are the relevant expressions called? In this paper, the terms pronoun substitutes and address terms are used, but these names are thought to have been used based on specific analyses. The use of

[3] Grant-In-Aid for Scientific Research (B). *Daimeishidaiyo, yobikake hyoogen no tsuugengogakuteki kenkyuu* (A cross-linguistic study of pronoun substitutes and address terms) (PI: Sunisa Wittayapanyanon)

the term pronoun substitute is premised on analyses showing that the relevant expressions are used in place of elements that would typically appear as personal pronouns. The use of address terms is based on analyses that view identifying the addressee as the act of calling. Not all previous research in the target languages of this study take these positions. In addition, in cases in which pronoun substitutes and address terms are differentiated, we also investigated what the superordinate concept that includes them is called. By grasping the terminology used, we will be able to not only understand the thought processes behind them but also build a foothold to discover other related studies.

Formal characteristics of pronoun substitutes and address terms Pronoun substitutes and address terms are not morphosyntactic classifications of linguistic forms; that is, they are not a part of speech or a syntactic category. Rather, they are a category of meaning that linguistic forms bear, that is, a usage or function. Just as the semantic function of modification exists in many syntactic categories such as noun phrases, adjectival phrases, verb phrases and prepositional phrases, pronoun substitutes and address terms can also be realized in various syntactic categories. For this reason, one of the main objectives of research on pronoun substitutes and address terms is to clarify the syntactic categories in which these semantic functions exist. Moreover, these pronoun substitutes and address terms are not limited to being just a single word but may be constructed from multiple words or morphemes (e.g, *ten'in-san* 'member of staff', *otonari no okyaku-sama* 'neighbouring customer'). This is a characteristic of morphosyntactic features.

The semantic characteristics of pronoun substitutes and address terms Elements that can become pronoun substitutes or address terms cannot be defined only through morphosyntactic features. While *okaasan* 'mother' and *oniichan* 'older brother' are common nouns, this does not mean that all common nouns can be considered pronoun substitutes or address terms. Semantic features such as "kinship terms" are also involved.

Relationships to personal pronouns A common point between personal pronouns and pronoun substitutes is that both designate speakers and addressees; however, only the former are exclusively used for that purpose. What are the other differences between the two? In modern Japanese, no closed class system of personal pronouns that share grammatical characteristics has been identified, as is the case for personal pronouns in English (Takubo 1997). However, whether or not this is directly related to the widespread use of pronoun substitutes cannot be understood by looking only at Japanese.

3. Difference between pronoun substitutes and address terms and how they are named

As there are common expressions that act as pronoun substitutes and address terms, and both are used to denote people, in languages other than Indonesian, the majority of the literature investigated did not properly distinguish between the two. For example, in a previous study examining Malay, Nor Hashimah et al. (2005) collected 71 pages of conversational data that include pronoun substitutes and address terms related to the family. However, in the accompanying discussion, both expressions are termed *kata panggilan* (addressing words) with no clear distinction between the two.

Table 2. Terms used in previous research

Language	Pronoun substitutes	Address terms	Previous studies
Thai	*kham-naam* (noun)	*kham-rîak* (address term)	Navavan (2016)
	–	*kham-rîak-khăan* (address term)	M. R. Kalaya & Amara (1986)
Burmese	*genkyuu* (reference), *daimeishiteki yoohoo* (pronominal use)	*yobikake* (address)	Yabu (1992)
Malay	pronoun substitute	–	Radiah (2007)
	–	*seruan vokatif* (vocative exclamation)	Asmah (2009)
	koshoo (appellation)	*yobikake* (address)	Onozawa (1996)
Indonesian	pronoun substitute	vocative	McGinn (1991); Sneddon et al. (2010)
	pengganti pronomina (pronoun substitute)	*sapaan (vokatif)* (address [vocative])	Alwi et al. (1998)
	imposter use	vocative use	Conners, Brugman & Adams (2016)
	referring	addressing, address term	Ewing & Djenar (2019)
Korean	pronominal substitute	–	Martin (1992)
	imposter	–	Kim (2015)
Japanese	*daimeishiteki yoohoo* (pronominal use)	*kokakuteki yoohoo* (vocative use)	Suzuki (1973)

Table 2 brings together the terminology specifically used to refer to pronoun substitutes and address terms. For reference, the terminology used in Suzuki's (1973) pioneering research on pronoun substitutes and address terms is included. Suzuki calls the superordinate category that brings together pronoun substitutes and address terms *ninshooshi* (personal terms). Conners, Brugman & Adams (2016) call the superordinate category that corresponds to Suzuki's *ninshooshi* people-referring expressions, while Ewing & Djenar (2019) call them "person terms." However, none of the other literature makes reference to the superordinate concept.

In a previous study on the Thai language, Navavan (2016) uses the term *kham-naam* (noun) in reference to pronoun substitutes as a sub-category of *kham-bɔ̀ɔk-bu-rùt* (personal expressions). The latter includes pronoun substitutes and personal pronouns. Similarly, Angkab (1972) posits pronouns proper and pronoun substitutes, including kinship terms, as a sub-category of pronouns. Navavan also uses the term *kham-bɔ̀ɔk-bu-rùt* in reference to personal pronouns. In other words, what is referred to by these expressions is ambiguous. To eliminate this ambiguity, Sunisa (2020) suggests the Thai expression *kham*

thɛɛn bu-rùt sàp-pha-naam in reference to pronoun substitutes.

In previous studies considering the Burmese language, Okell (1969: 99) called pronoun substitutes "personal referents." Okano (2019) translated this as *jinbutsu shijishi* 'terms referring to people'. Personal referents are a subclass of nouns and includes personal pronouns. As such, "personal referent" is not an expression specific to pronoun substitutes.

The term "pronoun substitute" used in this paper is taken from Sneddon et al.'s (2010) previous study on Indonesian and is premised on an analysis that relevant expressions arise in positions where personal pronouns would ordinarily be used. This view of the "substitution" aspect of these expressions is not limited only to studies on the Indonesian language. Table 2 shows terms that appear to be used as substitutions across languages. These are the uses of "pronoun/pronominal substitute" (Malay, Korean) and "pronominal use" (Burmese, Japanese). Prior research on Thai conducted by Angkab (1972) does not establish pronoun substitutes as a category but uses phrases such as "foreign loan words as pronouns" and "titles as pronouns" as sub-classifications of pronoun substitutes and address terms. The following are excerpts of a description that reflects the view of substitution (emphasis added by us).

> The original set of pronouns has been expanded in Burmese by a rather big, probably open, class of kinship, professional, and social terms that are *used in the place of pronouns*. (Burmese, Jenny & San San Hnin Tun 2016: 52)

> [...] the use of second-person pronoun is a complicated matter. Because of this, kinship terms, and titles are often *used as substitutes* (Malay, Liaw 1999: 40)

> Sebutan pangkat atau gelaran biasanya *berfungsi sebagai ganti nama*. (When you state ranks and titles, ordinarily these *function as pronouns*.) (Malay, Asmah 2009: 88)

> Certain sets of nouns are *pronominally used* to fill in the empty slots where "common" personal pronouns are found unsuitable to express various delicate differences of reverence in terms of age and social status. (Indonesian, Kaswanti Purwo 1984: 62)

There may be some criticism of the view of substitution, noting that it results from the influence of research on Western grammar (e.g., Alves (1997); Flannery (2009)). However, at least in the Proto-Tai and the Proto-Austronesian languages, the Western-style personal pronoun system was reconstructed and carried over to modern Thai, Malay, Indonesian and Javanese. Thus, personal pronouns are firmly present in the foundation of their grammars, and it is plausible that the numerous expressions that have arisen on top of this foundation may be considered substitutes of personal pronouns. This relationship to personal pronouns is explored further in section 6.

4. Formal characteristics

4.1 Syntactic categories

Forms that can become pronoun substitutes and address terms are often described in terms of semantic characteristics, with little reference to the syntactic category. It is obvious that kinship terms and proper

names are considered nouns. In addition to nouns, it has been noted that some of the other syntactic forms that can become pronoun substitutes include demonstrative pronouns (4) and locative pronouns (5) in Indonesian (Conners, Brugman & Adams 2016) and deictic demonstratives (6) in Korean (Park 2007).

(4) a. *Ini* udah mau bobo!
this already want sleep
'I want to go to bed!'

b. *Tuh* mau pergi kan?
that want go PART
'You want to go, right?' (Conners, Brugman & Adams 2016: 78)

(5) a. *Sini* dah kasi dech.
here already give PART
'I already gave it!'

b. *Sono* ikut ga?
there follow not
'Are you coming?' (Conners, Brugman & Adams 2016: 78)

(6) a. Referring to the speaker: *iccok* 'here'

b. Referring to the addressee: *kuccok* 'there', *kutay* 'over there'

We did not find any clear descriptions of the types of syntactic categories that can be address terms. This is likely because pronoun substitutes and their distributions overlap with one another. The syntactic categories that cannot be pronoun substitutes by definition but can function as address terms include second person personal pronouns (Navavan 2016).

4.2 Internal structure

Pronoun substitutes and address terms comprise many elements. It has been noted that forms in which a proper name is accompanied by an honorific title, professional title and/or kinship term can function as pronoun substitutes in Burmese (Okell 1969: 99–101) and Indonesian (Conners, Brugman & Adams 2016). The Burmese example in (7) consists of a professional title + an honorific title derived from a kinship term + a proper name.

(7) s^{h}ăyà ʔú ʔàuɴhlâ
teacher uncle (Mr.) Aung Hla

A similar description is found in Malay, though no distinction is made between pronoun substitutes and address terms (Asmah 2009: 50–51). Example (8) comprises a title conferred by the government + an academic title + a kinship term + a religious qualification + a proper name.

(8) Tan Sri Prof. Abang Haji Ali
Tan Sri Prof. brother haji Ali

Regarding address terms in Thai, M. R. Kalaya & Amara (1986) generalized that it is possible to include at least one from among pronouns/honorific titles, kinship terms, ranks, professional titles, names and terms of endearment, in that order, together with final particles such as *khá?* and *kháp*. Example (9) comprises an honorific title + a kinship term + a professional title.

(9) khun pâa ʔaa-caan
TITLE aunt teacher

Combinations such as that mentioned above are likely compounds. In syntactic phrases, there appears to be a difference between pronoun substitutes and address terms. The internal structure of address terms can be quite complex. The TUFS Asian Language Parallel Corpus (TALPCo; Nomoto et al. 2018) contains examples, such as the Indonesian example in (10). This corpus contains Japanese sentences translated into several other Asian languages.

(10) *Orang nomor satu sampai nomor sepuluh*, silakan masuk.
person number one till number ten please enter
'People with the numbers one to ten, please go inside.' (TALPCo #1647)

Complex noun phrases such as this are not recognized as pronoun substitutes.

(11) [To those people holding number tags from number 1 to number 10]
*Saya sudah panggil nama *orang nomor satu sampai nomor sepuluh* tadi.
1SG already call name person number one till number ten just.now
Intended: 'I already called the names of those who are 1 to 10 (= you).'

4.3 Behaviour of the short form

Regarding pronoun substitutes and address terms in Malay, Indonesian and Javanese, there are many that have full and short forms. Example (12) comes from Indonesian.

(12) *ibu – bu* 'mother', *bapak – pak* 'father', *adik – dik* 'little brother/sister',
kakak – kak 'older sister (, older brother)', *abang – bang* 'older brother',
profesor – Prof 'professor', *dokter – Dok* 'doctor'

Regarding Indonesian, Alwi et al. (1998: 259) and Sneddon et al. (2010: 167) state that the full form alone can become a pronoun substitute, but the short form cannot.[4, 5]

[4] However, in east Indonesia there are areas where the short form becomes a pronoun substitute (Alwi et al. 1998: 260).

[5] Conners, Brugman & Adams (2016) offer examples, such as the one below, in which the short forms are used as pronoun substitutes. However, the word *Pak* used in the example is highly likely to be an address term. As explained in section 4.4, the existence of particle such as *ya* is the key to distinguishing address terms from sentence-initial subjects.

(13) *Tadi pagi *Pak* pergi ke mana?
this morning father go to where
Intended: 'This morning, where did you go?'

Conversely, the short form can be used on its own if used as an address term (Alwi et al. 1998: 260; Sneddon et al. 2010: 167).

(14) Tadi pagi pergi ke mana, *Pak*?
this morning go to where father
'This morning, where did (you) go, father?'

Regarding Malay and Javanese, we did not find any descriptions of the differences in behaviour between full and short forms. This is one area that should be clarified by future research.

4.4 Zero pronouns/argument ellipsis

In relation to pronoun substitutes, descriptions are found in all languages regarding the frequent use of zero pronouns and argument ellipsis (Cooke 1968; Theeraporn & Uehara 2012; Okell & Allott 2001: xv; Mintz 2002: 92; Conners, Brugman & Adams 2016; Suh 1990). These phenomena have no direct relationship with pronoun substitutes. If the relevant phenomenon is the use of zero pronouns, this is a matter of the personal pronoun system, and if it is regarding argument ellipsis, then it is a matter of the syntactic phenomenon of ellipsis.

However, the key to understanding the differences between pronoun substitutes and address terms can be found in the regularity observed in zero pronouns and argument ellipsis. In a previous study on the Thai language, Cooke (1968: 16) proposed a generalization that noun phrases denoting the addressee are frequently omitted following address terms. In (15), the omitted noun phrase is represented by *pro*:

(15) khun bun-líaŋ khráp *pro* pay nǎy maa
TITLE Boonliang PART go where come
'Mr. Boonliang, where have (you) been?' (Cooke 1968: 16)

In this sentence, *pro* can be restored because of the presence of the particle *khráp*, which makes it clear that *khun bun-líaŋ* is not the subject at the beginning of the sentence but is, rather, an address term.[6] Conversely, it becomes unclear whether the element at the beginning is an address term or a pronoun substitute without the particle.

(i) *Pak* ya makan olahan sini mah ya?
father yes eat menu here PART yes
'*You* are eating (off) the menu here ya.' (Conners, Brugman & Adams 2016)

[6] See also the Indonesian example in footnote 5 .

5. Semantic characteristics

As stated in section 3, in almost all of the previous research, the difference between pronoun substitutes and address terms has not been clarified. For this reason, in this paper, unless reference is made to the distinction in previous research, these two are discussed together. It is important to note, however, that this does not mean that the examples offered here are applicable to both pronoun substitutes and address terms.

The semantic characteristics of pronoun substitutes and address terms noted in any language are kinship terms, proper names and the title names of professions such as 'teacher'. Kinship terms, in addition to usages referring to members of a family, also include fictional usages whereby they are expanded use for non-family members with whom similar relationships are maintained. In Japanese, an asymmetry can be seen in that while one can use *okaasan* 'mother' or *oniisan* 'older brother' as pronoun substitutes and address terms, one cannot similarly use *ko* 'child' and *otooto* 'younger brother'. However, no such asymmetry has been noted in any of the target languages.

Table 3 shows examples of pronoun substitutes and address terms other than kinship terms and proper names. In addition to the examples above, there are also titles such as *Dato/Datuk* (title) in Malay and terms of endearment such as *sayang* 'beloved person' in Indonesian (cf. English *honey*). The Malay word *encik*, which comes before a person's name similar to *Mr./Ms.*, can be used as a pronoun substitute and address term.[7] The Javanese examples were excerpted by us from textbooks used in Indonesian elementary, junior high and high schools.

6. Relationship to personal pronouns

When compared to Western languages, all the target languages in this paper have more personal pronouns. Table 4 reflects Yabu's (1992) summary of the Burmese personal pronoun system. Yabu and Okell (1969: 99–101) list a larger number of other personal pronouns that are not included in this table separately from pronoun substitutes. These are distinguished depending on the gender of the speaker and the degree of politeness. This type of personal pronoun system corresponds to the "open pronoun system" described by Thomason & Everett (2005). In this system, there are many different forms of first- and second-person pronouns, including those borrowed from other languages.

While there are many personal pronouns, Javanese has different characteristics when compared to Burmese. Table 5 shows the Javanese personal pronoun system. In Javanese, personal pronouns are limited to those in the table, the first person inclusive plural *awake dheweo* and *kita*, which is thought to have been borrowed from Indonesian. The reason for such a high number of personal pronouns is that novel forms have developed in accordance with the honorific system. While the Javanese personal pronouns can be classified as an instance of Thomason & Everett's (2005) "open pronoun system," the definition of which includes the fact that various forms of first- and second-person pronouns exist, it

[7] In Japanese, honorific titles cannot become pronoun substitutes (Nomoto 2019). However, an exception is that in the *otaku* 'geek' world, *shi* can be used as a second person pronoun (Shigehiro Kato, p.c.).

Table 3. Examples of pronoun substitutes and address terms other than kinship terms and proper names

Language	Example	Reference
Thai	PRONOUN SUBSTITUTES *khruu* 'teacher', *nák-rian* 'student', *naay* 'master', *bàaw* 'servant', *mɔ̌ɔ* 'doctor', *mêɛ-kháa* 'female salesperson'	Navavan (2016)
	ADDRESS TERMS *fɛɛn* 'lover', *khon-khàp-rót* 'driver'	Angkab (1972)
Burmese	*sʰǎyà* 'teacher', *sʰǎyàwùɴ* 'doctor', *kòdɔ̀* 'monk, royalty', *pʰóuɴdzí* 'monk', *wùɴdzí* 'minister', *hlésʰǎyà* 'carter'	Okell (1969)
Malay	*cikgu* 'teacher', *Dr.* 'doctor, Ph.D.', *Dato'/Datuk* (title), *Haji* 'Mecca pilgrim (male)', *Yang Arif* 'erudite person (used for judges)'	Nomoto (2020)
Indonesian	PRONOUN SUBSTITUTES *dokter* 'doctor', *profesor* 'professor', *lurah* 'village chief', *kapten* 'captain'	Alwi et al. (1998)
	ADDRESS TERMS *sayang* 'beloved person', *manis* 'sweet person', *Tuan Dokter* 'honourable doctor', *Pak Hakim* 'your honour', *Ketua* 'chief, leader'	
Javanese	*profesor* 'professor', *dokter* 'doctor', *suster* 'nurse', *prabu* 'king', *sultan* 'sultan', *kyai* 'Islamic elder', *raden* 'descendant of royalty and aristocrats'	
Korean	*sensayngnim* 'teacher', *ponkica* 'this reporter', *phansanim* 'judge'	Kim (2015)

Table 4. Burmese personal pronoun system (Yabu 1992)

Person		Singular	Plural
1	(used by men)	*tɕ̑ănɔ̀*	*tɕ̑ănɔ̀-dô*
	(used by women)	*tɕ̑ămâ*	*tɕ̑ămâ-dô*
2	(used by men)	*kʰìɴmyá*	*kʰìɴmyá-dô*
	(used by women)	*ɕ̑ìɴ*	*ɕ̑ìɴ-dô*
3		*t̪ù*	*t̪ù-dô*

Table 5. Javanese personal pronoun system (Sakiyama 1989; Lestari 2010)

Person	Direct form (*ngoko*)			Polite form	Respectful form	Humble form
	Free form	Prefix	Suffix	(*krama*)	(*krama inggil*)	(*krama andhap*)
1	*aku*	*tak-*, *dak-*	*-ku*	*kula*	*ingsun*	*dalem*, *kawula*
2	*kowe*	*ko(k)-*	*-mu*	*sampeyan*	*(pa)njenengan*	
3	*dhe(we)ke*	*di-*	*-(n)e*	*-pun*, *dipun-*, *piyambakipun*, *panjenenganipun*	*panjenengane*	

is unlikely that they constitute an open class. Moreover, given that the singular-plural distinction that existed in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian has largely disappeared, it seems as though a power is working to reduce the total number of personal pronouns.

Therefore, not having a personal pronoun system as a closed class is not a prerequisite for using pronoun substitutions. With both the Burmese and Javanese systems in mind, pronoun substitutes may be considered a direct extension of the expansion of the personal pronoun system.[8] The same was also stated by Jenny & San San Hnin Tun (2016) in the quote on page 68. As a result of this expansion, personal pronouns may be an open class, as in Burmese, or not, as in Javanese. In this view, the precondition for the general use of pronoun substitutes is not the absence of personal pronouns as a closed class but, conversely, that they exist synchronically or diachronically. Moreover, in contrast to Helmbrecht (2013), it is also not valid to consider the avoidance of personal pronouns for reasons relating to politeness as a functional background for the general use of pronoun substitutes. What is avoided is not personal pronouns in general but a form that does not describe the characteristics of the referent, which may be a personal pronoun or a pronoun substitute.

The fact that pronoun substitutes are an extension of the expansion of the personal pronoun system can also be seen via linguistic phenomena. In Burmese, if the personal pronouns for which the final syllable contains a low-level tone are followed by certain particles, the tone changes to a falling(creaky) tone (16a); however, this phenomenon is also observed in kinship terms (16b) and some proper nouns (Okano 2007: 39–40).

(16) a. *tɕănɔ̀* 'I (used by men)' → *tɕănɔ̂=gò* 'me'

b. *ʔămè* 'mother' → *ʔămê=gò* 'mother'

According to Sneddon et al. (2010: 257), in passive sentences of the type that use verb stems in Indonesian, the agent must be a personal pronoun (17a); however, a pronoun substitute may also be used in this position. The word *bapak* 'father' in (17b) may be used as a second-person pronoun substitute; however,

[8] In can be said that the zero pronouns examined in section 4.4 developed in the same way.

it cannot be used to refer to a non-speech-act participant who is a father.

(17) a. Surat ini harus *saya* tandatangani.
letter this must 1SG sign.on
'I must sign this letter.'

b. Surat ini harus *bapak* tandatangani.
letter this must father sign.on
'{You/*Father} must sign this letter.' (Sneddon et al. 2010: 259)

7. Imposters

Several previous studies on Indonesian and Korean discuss pronoun substitutes by assuming that they are "imposters," as described in Collins & Postal (2012). Imposters are defined as a phenomenon whereby the person lexically specified in the noun phrase does not match the person who is being referred to. For instance, *this reporter* in (18), as can be seen from the verbal agreement, is lexically third person. However, it refers to the speaker and writer and is used as first person.

(18) *This reporter* is/*am signing off from Madrid, Spain. (Collins & Postal 2012: 3)

A fascinating phenomenon surrounding imposters is that of binding. In English, there is an asymmetry between singular and plural forms. As can be seen from the contrast in (19), while the singular form can only bind the anaphor of the lexically specified person, the plural form can also bind the anaphor of the referent person.

(19) [A father (and mother) speaking to a child]

a. *Daddy* is enjoying himself/*myself.

b. *Daddy and Mommy* are enjoying themselves/ourselves on the beach.

(Collins & Postal 2012: 20)

Regarding this point, Kaufman (2014) stated that in Indonesian, the only elements associated with pronoun substitutes are the same pronoun substitutes (20a)–(20b) or a personal pronoun of the referent (20c). As in (20d), they cannot be associated with a third person personal pronoun.

(20) a. Hanya *bapak*$_i$ bisa mengerti bapak$_i$.
only father can understand father
'Only father (= you) can understand a father (= you).'

b. Hanya *bapak*$_i$ bisa mengerti diri bapak$_i$.
only father can understand self father
'Only father (= you) can understand father's self (= yourself).'

c. Hanya *bapak*$_i$ bisa mengerti diri anda$_i$.
only father can understand self 2
'Only father (= you) can understand yourself.'

d. *Hanya *bapak*$_i$ bisa mengerti diri-nya dia$_i$.
only father can understand self-POSS 3SG
Intended: 'Only father (= you) can understand himself (= yourself).'

(Kaufman 2014: 102)

According to Kim (2015), pronoun substitutes in Korean can only bind anaphors of the referent person.[9]

(21) a. (na) Kimmina-nun hangsang naycasin-ul/*kunyecasin-ul mit-ko iss-e.
I Kimmina-TOP always myself-ACC/herself-ACC trust-KO ISS-IND
'Kimmina (= I) always trusts myself/herself.'

b. (tangsin) emmeni-kkeyse-nun tangsincasin-ul/*kunyecasin-ul salangha-sip-ni-ka?
you mother-HON-TOP yourself-ACC/herself-ACC love-HON-NI-Q
'Does the mother (= you) love yourself/herself?'[10] (Kim 2015)

Another recent study on Korean and Indonesian languages related to imposters is that of Adams & Conners (2020), who discuss the topic in regard to person specification.

8. Future outlook

This study summarized the treatment of pronoun substitutes and address terms in previous studies on the target languages. This summary showed that, while the topic has been described and analyzed in depth in research of some languages, for other languages, it has been left entirely unexplored. For example, as seen in section 7, research on the Indonesian and Korean languages that deals with the imposter phenomenon has been progressing against the general linguistic background. However, in other languages, it can be said that there is almost no research that takes such a perspective into consideration.[11] Moreover, while some languages clearly distinguish between pronoun substitutes and address terms, others do not. Going forward, it is necessary to continue with cross-linguistic research on the target languages under common standards with reference to precedent examples on languages in which research has progressed.

For this purpose, in our project, we have begun creating a database of pronoun substitutes and address terms in the target languages of this study along with Vietnamese and Japanese. In this database, information about individual expressions will be recorded with regard to their formal and semantic characteristics and whether they are pronoun substitutes (first or second person), address terms or honorific titles (as well as examples when possible). We will also ensure that for each pronoun substitute and

[9] Zanuttini, Pak & Portner (2012) view Korean pronoun substitutes as a phenomenon unique to the subject of the jussive clause; however, Kim (2015) and Choi (2016) view them as imposters.

[10] In Japanese, one can say *watashi, Kim Mina* 'I, Kim Mina', but not **anata, Kim Mina* 'You, Kim Mina' or **watashi, sensei* 'I, the teacher'. Regarding such juxtapositions between personal pronouns and pronoun substitutes, further work is necessary to clarify such linguistic facts in the target languages of future research.

[11] One study into imposters in the Japanese language is Furuya (2016).

address term of a language, the option is available for one to search for corresponding expressions in another language.

The reason for collecting individual expressions is that even in the case of similar expressions, there may be differences as to whether they are used as pronoun substitutes or address terms. For example, the Burmese expressions *pʰèpʰè* 'father (polite)' and *mèmè* 'mother (polite)' can become pronoun substitutes, but *pʰâgìɴ* 'dad, daddy' and *mîgìɴ* 'mum, mummy' cannot. In Javanese, *professor* 'professor' can become a pronoun substitute, but *dosen* 'university lecturer' and *guru* 'teacher' cannot.

Honorific titles are investigated simultaneously for the following two reasons. First, the forms and distribution of terms that become pronoun substitutes and address terms overlap with those that become honorific titles, but they do not match exactly. For example, in Javanese, *kyai* 'Islamic elder' can become a pronoun substitute, but it cannot be used as an honorific title such as in **Kyai Mangun*. Moreover, as noted in the case of Indonesian (see section 4.3), in Javanese, honorific titles that have become so due to shortening cannot become pronoun substitutes. Second, there are forms that can function as pronoun substitutes only if accompanied by a title, not by themselves. Regarding Japanese, as argued in example (3) in section 1, we have already noted the differences between *ten'in* and *ten'in-san*. A similar phenomenon can be observed in Javanese. If the honorific titles *pak* 'Mr.' and *bu* 'Ms.' are added to the aforementioned *dosen* and *guru*, then they may be used as pronoun substitutes.

Moreover, regarding formal characteristics, this database also include anaphors and quantificational expressions, which are possible in Japanese although they were not discussed in previous studies on the target languages of this study. Burmese *kò* transformed from an anaphor to become a first-person pronoun substitute, as is the case for the Japanese *jibun* 'self'. In Javanese, as described in (22), a quantificational expression in the form of "noun + number" becomes a second-person pronoun substitute.

(22) *Wong loro* arep lunga ning ngendi?
person two FUT go to where
'Where are the two of you going?'

Through the creation of such a database, cross-linguistic comparisons could become possible, which is expected to contribute to the theoretical analysis and descriptions of pronoun substitutes and address terms. Moreover, we hope that our database will play the role of a questionnaire in research on other languages in which pronoun substitutes are generally used.[12]

References

Adams, Nikki & Thomas J. Conners. 2020. Imposter and their implication for third-person feature specification. *Linguistics* 58(2). 537–567. doi:10.1515/ling-2020-0047.

[12] Languages in which the common use of pronoun substitutes is observed are largely confined to the languages of Southeast Asia; however, according to Conners, Brugman & Adams (2016), this is also the case for the Dhivehi language of the Republic of the Maldives, which is a member of the Indo-European language family.

Alves, Mark J. 1997. Problems in the European linguistic analyses of Southeast Asian languages. *Explorations in Southeast Asian Studies: A Journal of the Southeast Asian Studies Students Association* 1(1). 1–10.

Alwi, Hasan, Soenjono Dardjowidjojo, Hans Lapoliwa & Anton M. Moeliono. 1998. *Tata bahasa baku bahasa Indonesia [A standard grammar of Indonesian]*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 3rd edn.

Angkab Palakornkul. 1972. *A socio-linguistic study of pronominal strategy in spoken Bangkok Thai*. University of Texas at Austin dissertation.

Asmah Haji Omar. 2009. *Nahu Melayu mutakhir* [Modern Malay Grammar]. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 5th edn.

Choi, Jaehoon. 2016. Jussive subjects as imposters. *Eoneohag* 74. 3–24.

Collins, Chris & Paul Postal. 2012. *Imposters: A study of pronominal agreement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Conners, Thomas J., Claudia M. Brugman & Nikki B. Adams. 2016. Reference tracking and non-canonical referring expressions in Indonesian. In Yanti & Timothy McKinnon (eds.), *Studies in language typology and change*, vol. 60 *NUSA*, 59–88. Jakarta and Tokyo: Universitas Atma Jaya and Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. doi:10.15026/87444.

Cooke, Joseph R. 1968. *Pronominal reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. `https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9hf0g4gn`.

Ewing, Michael C. & Dwi Noverini Djenar. 2019. Address, reference and sequentiality in Indonesian conversation. In Paul Bouissac (ed.), *The social dynamics of pronominal systems*, 253–287. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Flannery, Greg. 2009. Open and closed system of self-reference and addressee-reference in Indonesian and English: A broad typological distinction. In Yvonne Treis & Rik De Busser (eds.), *Selected papers from the 2009 conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, `http://www.als.asn.au/proceedings/als2009/flannery.pdf`.

Furuya, Kaori. 2016. PRO and (under)specification of person in imposter constructions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 6(9). 1723–1731. doi:10.17507/tpls.0609.01.

Helmbrecht, Johannes. 2013. Politeness distinctions in pronouns. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. `http://wals.info/chapter/45`.

Jenny, Mathias & San San Hnin Tun. 2016. *Burmese: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.

Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1984. The categorial system in contemporary Indonesian: Pronouns. In John W. M. Verhaar (ed.), *Towards a description of contemporary Indonesian: Preliminary studies*, vol. 2 *NUSA*, 55–74. Jakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya.

Kaufman, Daniel. 2014. The syntax of Indonesian imposters. In Chris Collins (ed.), *Cross-linguistic studies of imposters and pronominal agreement*, 89–120. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kim, Lan. 2015. A note on imposter expressions in Korean. *Eoneohag* 71. 139–160. doi:10.17290/jlsk.2015..71.139.

Lestari, Sri Budi. 2010. *Jawago no keigo nikansuru kijutsutekikenkyuu: Daisanshakeigo o chuushin ni [A descriptive study on the Javanese honorific system: Focusing on the third person's referent honorifics]*. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies dissertation.

Liaw, Yock Fang. 1999. *Malay grammar made easy: A comprehensive guide*. Singapore: Times Books International.

M. R. Kalaya Tingsabadh & Amara Prasithrathsint. 1986. *The use of address terms in Thai during the Ratanakosin period*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.

Martin, Samuel E. 1992. *A reference grammar of Korean: A complete guide to the grammar and history of the Korean language*. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle.

McGinn, Richard. 1991. Pronouns, politeness, and hierarchy in Malay. In Robert Blust (ed.), *Currents in pacific linguistics: Festschrift in honor of George W. Grace*, vol. C-177 Pacific Linguistics, 197–221. Canberra: Australian National University.

Mintz, Malcolm W. 2002. *An Indonesian & Malay grammar for students*. Perth: Indonesian/Malay Texts and Resource, 2nd edn.

Navavan Bandhumedha. 2016. *Way-yaa-kɔɔn thay [Thai Grammar]*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Printing House, 7th edn.

Nomoto, Hiroki. 2019. Daimeishidaiyoogo no imiron [The semantics of pronoun substitutes]. In *Dai 159 kai nihongengogakkai taikai yokooshuu [The proceedings of the 159th meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan]*, 486–492. https://www.ls-japan.org/modules/documents/LSJpapers/meeting/159/handouts/p/P-5_159.pdf.

Nomoto, Hiroki. 2020. *Mareego no kyookasho: Shookai bunpoo [Textbook of Malay: Comprehensive grammar]*. Tokyo: Next Publishing Authors Press.

Nomoto, Hiroki, Kenji Okano, David Moeljadi & Hideo Sawada. 2018. TUFS Asian Language Parallel Corpus (TALPCo). In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Association for Natural Language Processing*, 436–439. http://www.anlp.jp/proceedings/annual_meeting/2018/pdf_dir/C3-5.pdf.

Nor Hashimah Jalaluddin, Harishon Radzi, Maslida Yusof, Raja Masittah Raja Ariffin & Sa'adiah Ma'alip. 2005. *Sistem panggilan dalam keluarga Melayu: Satu dokumentasi [The addressing system in the Malay family: A documentation]*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Okano, Kenji. 2007. *Gendai Biruma (Myanmaa) go bunpoo [Modern Burmese (Myanmar) grammar]*. Tokyo: Kokusaigogakusha.

Okano, Kenji. 2019. Nihongo to birumago no soogohenkan niokeru mondaiten: Jinbutsu o shijisuru meishishuuhen no genshoo [Some problems on transforming between Japanese and Burmese: "Personal referents" and their relating phenomena]. *Tokyogaidai Toonanajiagaku* 24. 55–79. doi:10.15026/92935.

Okell, John. 1969. *A reference grammar of colloquial Burmese*. London: Oxford University Press.

Okell, John & Anna J. Allott. 2001. *Burmese/Myanmar dictionary of grammatical forms*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.

Onozawa, Jun. 1996. *Kiso Mareeeshiago [Basic Malaysian]*. Tokyo: Daigakushorin.

Park, Jin-Ho. 2007. Yuhyenglon-uy kwancem-eyse pon kwuke taymyengsa cheykyey-uy thukcing [Characteristics of the Korean pronoun system from the point of view of typology]. *Kwukehak* 50. 115–147.

Radiah Yusuf. 2007. Translating kinship terms to Malay. *Translation Journal* 11(3). https://translationjournal.net/journal/41malay.htm.

Sakiyama, Osamu. 1989. Jawago [Javanese] Takashi Kemei, Rokuro Kono & Ei'ichi Chino (eds.), *Gengogaku daijiten Dai 2 kan Sekaigengohen (chuu) [The Sanseido encyclopedia of linguistics Volume 2 World languages (2)]*, 209–212. Tokyo: Sanseido.

Suh, Cheongsoo. 1990. *Kwuke mwunpep [Korean grammar]*. Seoul: Deep-Rooted Tree Publishing House.

Sneddon, James Neil, Alexander K. Adelaar, Dwi N. Djenar & Michael Ewing. 2010. *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge, 2nd edn.

Sunisa Wittayapanyanon (Saito). 2020. Taigo deno daimeishidaiyoohyoogen, yobikakehyoogen nikansuru koosatu [A review of studies of pronoun substitute and address terms in the Thai language]. *Tokyogaidai Toonanajiagaku* 26. 1–23. doi:10.15026/95672.

Suzuki, Takao. 1973. *Kotoba to bunka [Language and culture]*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Takubo, Yukinori. 1997. Nihongo no ninshoo hyoogen [Personal expressions in Japanese]. In Yukinori Takubo (ed.) *Shiten to gengokoodoo [Perspective and linguistic behaviour]*, 13–41. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Theeraporn Ratitamkul & Satoshi Uehara. 2012. A contrastive case study of pronominal forms in English, Japanese and Thai: A parallel corpus approach. In Tadao Miyamoto, Naoyuki Ono, Kingkarn Thepkanjana & Satoshi Uehara (eds.), *Typological studies on languages in Thailand and Japan*, 137–158. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo Publishing.

Thomason, Sarah G. & Daniel L. Everett. 2005. Pronoun borrowing. In Charles Chang, Michael J. Houser, Yuni Kim, David Mortensen, Mischa Park-Doob & Maziar Toosarvandani (eds.), *Twenty-seventh meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, vol. 27, 301–315. Berkeley, CA: Department of Linguistics, University of California at Berkeley.

Yabu, Shiro. 1992. Birumago [Burmese]. Takashi Kemei, Rokuro Kono & Ei'ichi Chino (eds.), *Gengogaku daijiten Dai 3 kan Sekaigengohen (ge-1) [The Sanseido encyclopedia of linguistics Volume 3 World languages (3-1)]*, 567–610. Tokyo: Sanseido.

Zanuttini, Raffaella, Miok Pak & Paul Portner. 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30. 1231–1274. doi:10.1007/s11049-012-9176-2.

Author contact information: nomoto@tufs.ac.jp, sunisa@tufs.ac.jp, okanok@tufs.ac.jp,

thuzarhlaing@tufs.ac.jp, namyj@tufs.ac.jp, tari0828@apu.ac.jp

Received: 21 December 2020