

Social indexicality of the “zero” form of address terms in Japanese: The interpretation from the *Amae* concept on the basis of “inseparable self and the other”

Yoko FUJII

1. Introduction

Address terms have been widely studied since the study of pronouns of address in some European languages by Brown and Gilman (1960). Linguistic research on address terms in Japanese began because of the influence of sociolinguistics in the early '70s and has been pervasive since Suzuki (1973) presented the basic rules of address terms for the first and the second person. “Address terms” can be defined as the terms used to call the speaker and addressee in interaction. They include proper names, personal pronouns, kinship terms, titles, and suffixes such as the Japanese “-*san*,” “-*kun*,” and “-*chan*.” In many European languages, personal pronouns used as address terms differentiate social equality/inequality or solidarity/power (such as the T/V type of distinction) and are indexical: what Silverstein (1976) claims as “maximally creative or performative.” Address terms in Japanese are probably more creative and performative than those of European languages (Brown 1996 and many others) in that they index social relationship such as age, power, gender, solidarity, and, needless to say, kinship relations. Furthermore, the choice of address terms in Japanese are deeply dependent on all factors in the situation of interaction and changeable in ongoing communication and thus are indexical, letting people know not only the relationship between the participants but also what is going on among the participants in any given situation and how the interaction is expected to proceed. In other words, the address forms chosen by the participants are indexical in the sense that they are pointing on, presupposing, or bringing into the present context beliefs, feelings, identities, and events (Duranti 1997:37). In fact, how a Japanese speaker construes him- or herself and the other and chooses the most suitable address term out of all address terms in a given place of the interaction is very complex: formality, familiarity, *uchi* “ingroup”/*soto* “outgroup,” gender, seniority/juniority, respect/disrespect, arrogance/humility, and other factors can be the determinant for construing the self and the other.

The basic rules of address terms including kinship terms in Japanese (Suzuki 1973) illustrate social indexicality such as age, power, and social relationship. The real language practices, however, reveal some different usages from the presented rules. One rather unique way of addressing the hearer in Japanese is the “zero” form of address. This means that even though the Japanese language provides address terms for the speaker to use in addressing the other person, the speaker chooses to

use none of them. This study particularly focuses on the social indexicality of this rarely discussed, infrequently explored topic, the “zero” form of address by ethnographical approach. Focusing mainly on this form as used between husband and wife in Japanese, this study attempts to uncover the speaker’s motives for not addressing the hearer by referring to the Japanese cultural and psychological concepts of non-separation between self and the other and *amae* “dependence.”

2. Address terms between husband and wife in Japanese

Japanese is well known for having many kinds of address terms, which we can categorize into several sets of words: personal pronouns, kinship terms, titles, and names. If we try to pick only the first person pronouns of everyday use, we include *watashi*, *watakushi*, *jibun*, *boku*, *ore*, *uchi*, *atakushi*, and probably some more can be listed. Moreover, the case of the second-person pronouns is even more complicated: *Anata*, *anata-sama*, *anta*, *anta-san*, *kimi*, *omae*, *omae-san*, *otaku*, and others can be used in modern Japanese. If we think of the written language, we can add a few more: *onmi* (literally, “your body” in an honorific expression), *kiden* (“your palace”), and probably some others. Furthermore, when we look back to the history of the Japanese language, ten or more additional types of pronouns can be listed. In addition to these personal pronouns, the Japanese language provides the kinship terms to address the persons of kinship relations and even others. Among this variety of terms for the addressee, this study focuses on forms of address between husband and wife, particularly the language practice of a husband addressing his wife in Japanese society.

The age difference is considered important among kinship relations as well as other relationships in Japanese society. Thus, in the kinship relation, the speaker cannot use a personal pronoun or names for older persons of kinship relation, but instead uses kinship terms. For example, one does not call one’s mother *anata* “you” or by her name, but instead addresses her as “Mother.” On the other hand, the speaker does not use kinship terms in speaking to younger persons of kinship relation, but normally calls them by names and nicknames. For example, one does not call one’s younger brother *otouto-san* “younger brother” but one can call one’s elder brother *onii-san* “elder brother.”

The terms of address between husband and wife are varied. Yoneda (1990: 20) examines how a husband addresses his wife and compares his own survey with that of Watanabe (1963).

Table 1. The way of a husband addressing his wife (Yoneda 1990: 20)

Address forms	With other family members		Between husband and wife	
	Watanabe's survey ¹⁾ (1963)	Yoneda's survey (1986)	Watanabe's survey (1963)	Yoneda's survey (1986)
Names/Nicknames* ¹	17%	17%	25%	31%
Kinship Terms* ²	60%	53%	29%	25%
Personal Pronouns	8%	2%	35%	2%
Attention Getters ²⁾	8%	15%	13%	29%
Others	10%	13%	14%	13%

*¹ The proportion of names to nicknames is 2:1, and when a husband addresses his wife by name, he calls her by her name without *-san* or *-chan*.

*² Kinship terms here mean *okaa-san* “Mother,” *mama* “Mom,” and *obaa-chan* “Grandma.”

First of all, this table illustrates that how a husband addresses his wife depends on the situations in which they are involved. There are definite differences between the situations with and without the presence of family members other than the husband and wife. It is conspicuous that husbands tend to call their wives by name or nickname in their interactions in the absence of other family members (25% and 31%). However, with similar frequency, husbands call their wives by kinship terms even in interaction that do not include their children (29% and 25%). On the other hand, in an interaction including other family members, husbands tend to call their wives by kinship terms more frequently than when they are alone (60% and 53% vs. 29% and 25%). According to Yoneda (1990: 20), the actual usage of kinship terms shows that a husband tends to call his wife *mama* “Mom” in his 30s; *okaa-san* “Mother” from his 30s to his 50s; and *obaa-chan* “grandmother” when he is beyond his 70s. The transition of kinship terms depending on age reveals that those address terms index generation. In addition, the fact that a husband calls his wife by kinship terms such as *okaa-san* when alone with his wife illustrates the characteristics of the Japanese address term system in which the husband’s standpoint is from his children’s perspective. Japanese couples with children frequently call each other by the kinship terms from their children’s perspective, that is, *okaa-san* “Mother” or *otoo-san* “Father,” and even in interactions when their children are absent.

The point to be focused on in Table 1 is the “Attention Getters” and “Others.” “Attention Getters” include *oi* “hey,” *nee* (the phonological lengthening version of a sentence final particle “*ne*”), or *chotto* (literally, “a little”), all of which are functioning as attention getters. Table 1 shows that those markers are used more frequently in the interaction between only husband and wife. Comparing those markers with the use of the second-person pronouns such as *omae* or *kimi*³⁾ “you” in the interaction without other family members, we note that husbands used the second-person pronouns more often in the survey of 1963 (35%), but that the frequency of this usage declined to only 2% in the survey of 1986. Instead, the frequency of attention getters increases to 29% in the survey of 1986. In other words, the frequency of no address terms in 1986 is higher than that in 1963, which means husbands do not use any address terms for their wives more often in the 1980s⁴⁾. Furthermore, according to Yoneda, “Others” includes the case of “not to use any address terms to his wife” with rather high fre-

quency. In total, the ratio of husbands who do not use any address terms for their wives totals about 40% in the survey of 1986, which cannot be ignored among a variety of language practices of address terms from husband to wife. In fact, a small survey conducted for the students in my class (in 2012)⁵⁾ reveals 7 out of 20 students' fathers (about 35%) do not use any address terms to their wives at all, and 4 students' fathers hardly use address terms. In total, more than 50% of all of the students' fathers do not use or hardly use address terms for their wives⁶⁾.

From the relativistic point of view, language practices like address terms reveal social indexicality and a plurality of choices in address terms between husband and wife in Japanese compared to those of English and other Western languages. These terms index their relations as a couple, their psychological status, and their roles in the family. The choice of the address terms varies in each situation. It is relational in the sense that the speaker construes the self and the other in each situation, which is very different from English and Western languages where the speaker always refers to him- or herself as "I" and the addressee as "you." When a husband addresses his wife in the English culture, he addresses his wife by her first name or nickname, or by pet names such as "honey," "sweetheart," or "darling." In the broader culture, it hardly happens that the husband does not use any address terms for his wife, whereas it frequently happens in Japanese couples. In the following sections, the motives of the husband not using any address terms to his wife and the social indexicality of the "zero" form of address terms from husband to wife will be considered.

3. The cases of the "zero" address form

As Yoneda's survey shows, about 40% of the husbands he examined do not use any address terms from husband to wife, and my recent small survey of about 20 husbands reveals that this tendency is still observed in about 50% of the husbands in their 50s or older. Yoneda (1990: 21) confessed in his report that he himself had not used any address terms, personal pronouns, or attention getters for his wife for more than 14 years since his marriage and that when he had to talk to her directly, he had looked for the context in which he could avoid using the address terms.

Kurosaki (1994) investigates several cases of absence of address terms. The following case illustrates his parents' situation. His foster father does not have any reference forms of address terms for his foster mother.

- (1) 1 Father (calling his wife from the back door of the house): *oi*
attention getter
- 2 Kurosaki or his wife: *Hai. Dare-o yobu-noN?*
 "Yes. Who are you calling?"
- 3 Father: (silence)

In this case, the first call from Kurosaki's father is directly to his wife and uses an attention getter, "oi." However, the recipient of "oi" is not Kurosaki's mother but Kurosaki himself, or his wife. Then,

since his father does not have any reference forms for his wife, he just keeps silence. In this situation Kurosaki or his wife infer who his father wants to call. Since they know that his father does not have any reference forms for his wife, they know that the silence indexes his wife. Although the point of this case is the absence of reference forms (line 3), it can be observed that the husband avoids calling his wife in line 1 as well by using an attention getter: *oi*.

Kurosaki (1994) categorizes the reasons for absence of address terms into the following three groups: (1) the speaker cannot find the suitable address term according to his judgment; (2) although there are suitable address terms, the speaker missed the first chance to call the person by any address term and could not find another chance to start calling the person by using the term; and (3) the relationships and situations have changed since the person started calling the person by a certain address term and the speaker cannot shift to another term after the relationships and situations have changed, thus the speaker stopped using address terms altogether. The example shown in (1) may be categorized with the first reason or the second one.

An example of the cases explained by the second reason is illustrated in the following episode (Kurosaki 1994: 147). Kurosaki was adopted into his aunt's family when he was the first grade of senior high school. He started calling his foster father *otou-san* "father." However, he somehow missed the first chance to call his foster mother *okaa-san* "mother" and never found another chance to start calling her as *okaa-san* until he had his child, when he started to call his mother *obaa-chan* "grandmother" by taking his child's perspective. The following table is the system of his way of addressing his foster mother.

Table 2. The system of Kurosaki's address terms for his foster mother

(Kurosaki 1994: 146)

Vocative	Self reference	Second person reference	Reference form
Null	<i>boku</i> "I"	Null	Null

He had no address terms for vocative, second-person reference and reference forms for his foster mother, and he actually had difficulty in communicating with her in many situations. He just anticipated she would infer from the atmosphere that he had something to say to her, and then he approached her in a place in which he did not have to call her. The following interaction is the one in which he anticipates his mother's inference.

- (2)
- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 | Kurosaki: <i>denwa-yadee</i> | "telephone" |
| 2 | Mother: <i>dare-ni</i> | "To whom?" |
| 3 | Kurosaki: ... | (silence) |
| 4 | Mother: <i>watashi-ni?</i> | "to me?" |
| 5 | Kurosaki: <i>un sou</i> | "yes, right." |

He answered the phone for his mother and wanted to call her, but he did not have any address form for her. He then waited until his mother presumed that the telephone call was for her. This is the exact case in which although there are ordinarily suitable address terms—"Mother" in this case—the speaker missed the first chance to call his foster mother and could not find another chance to start calling her "Mother."

The third reason is illustrated by the following episode. A woman in her 50s had called her younger brother *boku* "you" (literally, "servant"⁷⁾) since she was little. However, after the younger brother got married, she started hesitating to address him as *boku*, since *boku* should be used as an address term for a little boy. She knew there were other ways of addressing him, such as his first name or a second-person pronoun, but she could never switch to other address forms than *boku* since any other address terms did not fit her feeling toward the brother. According to her, she now looks for the context in which she can avoid addressing him whenever she has to speak to him. This case is explicated by the reason that the relationships and situations have changed since the speaker started calling the person by a certain address term, and the speaker cannot shift it to another term after the situations have changed; thus, the speaker stopped calling the person by any address terms.

Considering the case in which the husband never directly addresses his wife in their face-to-face interactions, the reasons may not be as straightforward as those in other cases. As a tentative solution, the episode illustrated in (1) above was categorized by the first reason: that is, the speaker cannot find a suitable address term. However, according to the basic rules of address terms in Japanese, there are several ways for a husband to address his wife using the second-person reference like *kimi* or *omae*, kinship terms like *okaa-san* or *mama* "Mother," or her first name. Nevertheless, he never uses any of them. In other words, the determinant of choosing the "suitable" address term does not depend on relational or situational factors but deeply depends on the husband's psychological factors. That is, the husband probably never has an intention to address his wife by any address terms from the very beginning. Therefore, it can be assumed that the real motive of the husband's failure to use any address terms for his wife does not lie in the first reason presented above but must lie in a different, deeper psychological reason.

4. The *amae* concept

A leading Japanese concept, *amae* "dependence" presented by Japanese psychiatrist Takeo Doi (1971), can be proposed in this study as the psychological reason and motive of the husband's not using any address terms for his wife. *Amae* is a key concept for understanding not only the psychological and behavioral aspects of individual Japanese but also the structure of Japanese society as a whole (Doi 1973: 28). The concept of *amae* is rooted in the psychology of the infant in its relationship to its mother. According to Doi (1973: 74), "*amae* is used to indicate the seeking after the mother that comes when the infant's mind has developed to a certain degree and it has realized that its mother exists independently of itself." Thus, in principle, this *amae* phenomenon should be universally observable in all human babies in the East and the West. However, Doi (1973: 74) further claims that

this characteristic *amae* phenomenon can be particularly observable in the Japanese people and society, where the existence of the Japanese word *amae* in particular has helped in bringing this psychological principle into focus. The word *amae* has a long history in the Japanese language, which employs the verb form *amaeru* as well. Doi (1973: 67) further claims that this word "refers to the basic human relationships, and has, moreover, a rich associated vocabulary in Japanese that expresses all the many variations on the psychology summed up by *amae* and that clearly forms one broad pattern," which we cannot find in the languages of the West. He listed the words such as *suneru* "to be sulky," *higamu* "to be suspicious or jaundiced in one's attitude," *hinekureru* "to behave in a distorted, perverse way," *uramu* "to show resentment toward or hatred of," *tanomu* "to ask,"⁸⁾ *toriiru* "to curry favor with the other man as a means of achieving one's own ends; a method of permitting oneself to *amaeru* while appearing to allow it to the other man," *tereru* "to look embarrassed or awkward; in other words, the man who *tereru* creates difficulties in his inability to give his own desire for indulgence straightforward expression, but his trouble is not fear of rejection so much as shame at revealing his self-indulgence before others," all of which are closely connected with the psychology of *amae* (Doi 1973: 29-30).

Taking the Whorfian view of the relation between language and thought and comparing Japanese and the languages of the West, Doi (1973: 67) further claims, "one must conclude that there is an obvious difference between the Westerner and the Japanese in their view of the world and their apprehension of reality" through the existence of the word "*amae*." Furthermore, based on the existence of the vast variety of vocabulary of *amae* in Japanese, he suggests that the Japanese language has some reason to select the word *amae* from a variety of psychological phenomena by referring to arbitrariness of human selection of words (Doi 1973: 69):

Words, now, do not merely reflect unselectively every aspect of the situation during the early stages of psychological development. Selection invariably takes place; some things are dealt with in language, but other things, it would seem, cannot be, and are therefore banished from the consciousness. If language determines thought to a certain extent as Whorf says, then it is probably because of this fact.

Then, he further attempts to trace back the origin of the word *amae* in the Japanese language and proposes the speculation that the origin of the word *amae* and the myth of the sun goddess *Amaterasu oomikami* spring from the same roots. Thus, Japanese culture and society have been holding the concept of *amae*, rooted in the psychology of the inseparable mother-infant relationship, that is, "dependence," in its long history with the vast variety of vocabulary related to *amae*.

5. Inseparable self and the other

As could be understood from the above, the *amae* concept originally seeks the non-separation between mother and infant, and thus seeks to achieve identity with others. This concept agrees with

the Japanese ways of thinking that attempt to deny separation and generate identity with others and the surroundings. This way of thinking is further rooted in the Japanese way of Zen thought, which stresses an indivisibility of subject and object, non-separation of the self and others, and identity with all the surroundings, including nature. Japanese philosopher Kitaro Nishida's philosophy influenced by Zen also presents merging of subject and object.

This way of thinking of non-separation of self and others is found in Markus and Kitayama's study (1991) of cultural psychology, in which they presented the notion of the Japanese "interdependent self" compared to the American "independent self." Markus and Kitayama (1991: 227) explicate the interdependent self by a monistic philosophical tradition as follows.

The notion of an interdependent self is linked with a monistic philosophical tradition in which the person is thought to be of the same substance as the rest of nature. As a consequence, the relationship between the self and other, or between subject and object, is assumed to be much closer. Thus, many non-Western cultures insist on the inseparability of basic elements, including self and other, and person and situation. ... there is an emphasis on synthesizing the constituent parts of any problem or situation into an integrated or harmonious whole. Such a holistic view is in opposition to the Cartesian, dualistic tradition that characterizes Western thinking and in which the self is separated from the object and from the natural world.

The non-separation of self and others or indivisibility of subject and object can be seen in various aspects in our linguistic atmosphere, including the Japanese style of interaction (Fujii 2005, 2008, 2012; Katagiri 2007; Mizutani 1983 and others). Fujii (2012) presents culturally determined principles for interaction in which mutual consent is established in Japanese and American English, specifically focusing on the linguistic behavior of proposing ideas and co-constructing a story. Then, based on the results obtained, the study explicates that the differences between Japanese and American interactions originate in how self is situated in the place, or *ba*, of interaction. In the Japanese interaction, the participants' linguistic behavior shows "interdependent self" to each other in the sense that they reorient themselves at every moment of the interaction using the linguistic devices that seek the partner's response. While they are working together, they do not simply act as separated actors but rather resonate each other by entraining themselves in the given place or *ba*. Here, the boundary of self disappears and merges, as if self and other had one mind. Otsuka (2011: 5) explicates this Japanese characteristic of non-separation of self and other and merging self and others by introducing a frame of thinking of *ba* with reference to Buddhism. Otsuka (2011: 5) explains, "... in the East, subject and object are not considered separately, and self and other are not differentiated from one another. ... Buddhism significantly expresses this oriental philosophy. In Buddhism, all life is connected, and the subject and the object, self and other are not separated from one another. All are connected with each other by a causal relationship (Japanese *engi*; Sanskrit *pratiitya-samutpaada*: a causal relationship)." This notion of connectedness is further elaborated in the following way (Otsuka 2011: 5-6).

In Buddhism, ..., everything is connected in the chain of cause and effect and continues to change. Each is neither divided, nor remains the same. What I am is always changing and is never the same. Everything is changing in the chain of connectedness. Thus, I am just me at the same time I am you, and you are just you at the same time you are me. ... In addition, the concept of *ba* occurs as a word to represent a phenomenon that is not being divided. In other words, it does not mean that things are independently self-existent. Rather, it is the reality that things exist interacting and connected to each other. This is the basic idea of Buddhism.

Thus, it can be claimed that the Japanese leading concepts of *amae*, rooted in the notions of dependency of infant on mother and “interdependent self,” are deeply connected with the notion of non-separation of self and others, indivisibility of subject and object, and connectedness of all life, including nature, in Japanese Zen thought and Buddhism.

6. The ethnography of the “zero” form of address terms from husband to wife

Considering the “zero” form of address terms from husband to his wife, it can be speculated that this phenomenon is explicated by the *amae* concept and by the further connected notion of non-separable self and the other. First of all, various expressions for husband and wife illustrate indivisibility or the non-separable relation of husband and wife, such as *huuhu-wa kuuki-no-youna sonzai* “the husband and wife are like air,” *isshin dotai* literally “one mind, same body” in *huuhu-wa isshin dotai* “husband and wife have the mind of one person”, and *iwanaku-temo wakaru* “both understand each other without words.” This notion of non-separation of husband and wife, merging into one and resonating with each other, leads us to the *amae* concept in which husband and wife depend on each other and thus should understand each other and assume what the other is thinking without saying things explicitly. Here the concept of dependence between husband and wife is taken for granted, and each one is considered to be a part of the other— a second self—which is actually articulated in an expression *bunshin* (literally, “a divided body”).

In particular, the idea that husband and wife must understand each other without saying things explicitly is stronger for communication from husband to wife. A traditional Japanese expression, *husho huzui*, meaning “husband decides things and the wife follows him,” or “a way of life in which wife follows the lead set by her husband” illustrates the relation between husband and wife in the sense that the husband is the master of the family and the wife will follow her husband’s decision. Thus, it would be the case that the husband has a stronger idea that his wife must follow him, should understand him, and can assume what he is thinking even without his saying things explicitly. This unequal power relationship locating the husband at a higher position leads the husband to have the stronger *amae* notion in which his wife, he assumes, must understand him and know his desires or requests even without any explicit verbal behavior on his part. This claim is supported by

the fact that there are almost no cases reported in which the wife does not use any address terms; in other words, the “zero” form for her husband (as shown in footnote 6).

Second, in the basic rules of Japanese address terms, the speaker can use kinship terms or titles to address older persons or those at a higher position, such as *okaa-san* “Mother,” *onii-san* “elder brother,” *sensei* “teacher,” or *bucho* “director.” On the other hand, the speaker cannot use kinship terms or any titles to address younger persons or those at a lower position, such as *otouto-san* “younger brother” or *buka-san* “subordinate.” Instead, the speaker normally calls them by names or nicknames. Thus, a wife can call her husband by kinship terms like *danna*⁹⁾-*san* or *danna-sama* “master” but the husband does not address his wife as *oku-san*¹⁰⁾ “wife.” Therefore, the facts that the husband cannot use kinship terms for his wife and that there have been longstanding difficulties for the Japanese in using so-called second-person pronouns such as *anata*, *kimi*, and *omae*¹¹⁾ “you” make the list of address terms from the husband to his wife smaller than that from wife to husband. As a result, the “zero” form of address terms from the husband to his wife occurs frequently in the language practices of husbands and wives.

7. Conclusion

This study attempts to propose the social indexicality of the “zero” form of address term from husband to wife in the Japanese society by an ethnographical approach referring to the Japanese leading concepts of *amae* “dependency,” non-separation or indivisibility, and connectedness of self and the other. This study claims that on the basis of the rules of address terms in Japanese, the “zero” form of address terms from husband to wife index the power relationship between husband and wife, and thus references the notion of the husband holding stronger *amae* toward his wife, which is deeply connected with another Japanese leading concept of non-separation, indivisibility, or connectedness of self and the other.

Notes

- 1) Watanabe’s survey was conducted in 1963. The number of the participants was 105 and that of Yoneda’s survey in 1986 was 185.
- 2) Yoneda’s original term for this is *outou-shi* “response marker.” “Attention Getter” here is by the author.
- 3) Arai (1995) examined the transition of the use of the second-person pronoun *anata* “you.” *Anata* started to be used for the person in a higher position in terms of age and social hierarchy, then changed to be used

Table 1. The way of a wife addressing her husband (Yoneda 1990)

Address forms	Between husband and wife
Names/Nicknames	19%
Kinship Terms	41%
Personal Pronouns	16%
Attention Getters	22%
Others	2%

to the person in a lower position. At the same time, it could no longer be used to address the person in a higher position. Between husband and wife, *anata* is usually used from wife to husband, whereas the husband rather uses *kimi* to address his wife if they use the second-person pronouns.

- 4) According to Yoneda (1990), this tendency coincides with the results of Nippon Hoso Kyokai’s (the National Broadcasting Company) 1979 survey of 2,639 people.
- 5) The students observed their parents for a week, noting how their fathers addressed their mothers, and vice versa.
- 6) According to Yoneda’s survey in 1986 of how wives address their husbands, when wives call their husband by kinship terms, they use *otou-san* “Father.” When kinship terms are used, *otou-san* is more frequent than *papa* “Dad.” Wives use *otou-san* with other family members present more than they do when only husband and wife are present (77% vs. 41%). When husband and wife are alone, she uses “attention getter” (*nee* or *chotto*) about 22% of the time. When wives call their husbands by name, they use their first name + *-san*. The point to be emphasized here is the fact that it is never reported that wives never use any address terms for their husbands when they need to address them.
- 7) In the long history of the Japanese language, it has frequently occurred that the same personal reference has come to refer to both the first person and second person in interaction. *Boku* originally meant “your servant” to convey one’s inferiority to the addressee. At present, *boku* has become inappropriate when speaking to superiors or on formal occasions, and it can only be used to refer to oneself in an informal situation by male adult and boy speakers or to refer to a young boy addressee. Thus, it is rather unusual to continuously use *boku* as a habit of addressing one’s younger brother when he gets older.
- 8) Doi (1973: 30) introduces Dore’s analysis (1958) of the word *tanomu* in which Dore explicates that *tanomu* has “a sense roughly midway between the English ‘to ask’ and ‘to rely on,’ implying that one is entrusting some matter concerning oneself personally to another person in the expectation that he will handle it in a manner favorable to oneself.” Doi admits this explanation by adding, “*tanomu*, in other words, means nothing other than ‘I hope you will permit my self-indulgence.’”
- 9) *Danna* originally means “one who serves the temple” in Buddhism (Nihon Kokugo Daijiten 2006).
- 10) *Oku-san* originally means “the person who is at the back of the house.”
- 11) *Kimi* and *omae* can be used to the person at a lower position; thus, in case that husband uses the second-person pronoun to his wife, he usually chooses one of them.

References

- Arai, Chiaki. 1995. *Kosho no hensen*. (Transition of address terms). *Studies in Language and Culture* 4. Tokyo: Women’s University. 89–93.
- Brown, Roger. 1996. The language of social relationship. In Slobin, Dan I., Julie Gerhardt, Amy Kyratzis, and Jiansheng Guo (eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language: Essays in honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 39–51.
- Doi, Takeo. 1973. *The anatomy of dependence*. New York: Kodansha America.
- Dore, R. P. 1958. *City life in Japan*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fujii, Yoko. 2005. What do they verbalize and how? —The process of co-constructing a story by Japanese and American pairs—. A paper presented in the panel, ‘Exploring the relationship among culture, interaction and language: Cross-linguistic perspectives’ at the 9th International Pragmatics Conference. Riva del Garda: Italy.

- Fujii, Yoko, 2008. What causes differences in the process of mutual consent?: A comparison of story co-construction by Japanese and American pairs. A project report entitled 'A development of an empirical and emancipatory theory for culture, interaction, and language,' supported by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 2006-2007. 104-120.
- Fujii, Yoko. 2012. Differences of situating Self in the place/*ba* of interaction between the Japanese and American English speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44. 636-62.
- Katagiri, Yasuhiro, 2007. Content-relationship in consensus building dialogues—Toward a parameterization of interaction styles—. *Proceedings of the 135th Conference of Linguistic Society of Japan*. Linguistic Society of Japan, pp. 330-335.
- Markus, H. R., and Shinobu Kitayama. 1991. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*. Vol. 98, No. 2. 224-53.
- Mizutani, Nobuko. 1983. Aizuchi-to outou (Back-channels and responses). Mizutani, O. (Ed.), *Kooza Nihongo-no Hyougen (3) Hanashi Kotoba-no Hyougen (Japanese Expressions (3) Expressions of Spoken Language)*. Chikuma Shobo. Tokyo, 37-44.
- Nihon Kokugo Daijiten. 2006. Tokyo: Shogakukan.
- Otsuka, Masayoshi. 2011. On *ba* theory. A paper presented for the lecture on *ba* theory at the 2011 Tokyo Workshop on Emancipatory Pragmatics. ms.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural descriptions. In K. H. Basso and H. A. Selby (eds.), *Meaning in anthropology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 11-56.
- Suzuki, Takao. 1978. *Words in context: A Japanese perspective on language and culture*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Takahashi, Minako. 1982. Eigo ni miru huuhu no sougo kosho - Toku ni "mama" "papa" shiki ni yobiau jirei wo chushin to shite -. (Address terms of husband and wife in English - Focusing on the cases of calling each other *mama* and *papa*-). *Gengo Seikatsu*. Vol. 362. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo. 64-73.
- Yoneda, Masato. 1986. Huuhu no yobikata - Ankeito choosa no kekka kara -. (How to call each other between husband and wife - A report from the questionnaire -). *Gengo Seikatsu*. Vol. 416. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo. 18-21.
- Yoneda, Masato. 1990. Aru shakai soshiki no nakano kosho - Huuhu no yobikata to shokuba deno yobikake ni tsuite -. (Address terms in some social structure - The way to address between husband and wife and vocatives in work places -). *Nihongo-gaku*. Vol. 9. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin. 19-24.