Lao pronoun usage as reflected in post-1975 literature

Carol J. Compton
University of Wisconsin at Madison

0. Abstract.

Traditional Western analyses of the Lao pronominal system have tended to use Western categories of pronouns and Western definitions of what a pronoun is as the basis for decision-making about what constitutes a pronoun in Lao[1]. A preliminary analysis of written dialogues in Lao fiction (written by Lao for Lao) indicates that the most frequently used noun substitutes in dialogues are not such Western-determined "standard" pronouns, but rather pronominally used kinship terms which show not kinship (except in cases where actual familial relationships obtain), but rather aspects of the social relationships between the speakers.

1. Introduction.

This paper reflects the results of the initial phase of a developmental research project on Lao pronouns, kinship terms, and their use. This is the first of a series of papers which will be based on this data; here I have chosen to focus on the use of standard personal pronouns and the use of kin terms used pronominally in dialogues, quotations or direct speech found in a sample of the materials surveyed. As an initial limit for the data to be discussed in this paper, I have chosen to look at the use of **personal pronouns** in **written dialogue** as presented in **modern Lao fiction**. Thus the vocabulary items discussed in this paper were obtained by recording Lao personal pronouns and Lao kinship terms used pronominally found in **written** sources. However, the study will eventually incorporate **spoken** materials and other forms of written material as well.

Work on pronouns and their usage has been carried out by a number of well-known linguists who specialize in various languages of the Tai family. Recently Hartmann (1990) has investigated the use of pronominal strategies in Tai Dam

109

poetry. Studies of Thai (Siamese) pronouns have been done by Cooke (1968), Campbell (1969), and most recently Hoonchamlong (1991).

Jeremy Kemp (1984: 57) notes that the Thai vocabulary has a remarkable range of pronouns; then he raises the question "why do these [pronouns] apparently not provide an adequate range of substitutes?" Kemp then comments on Thai "kin categories and their use" as follows:

> The basic features of Thai kin and affine terminologies are well known and the minor variations noted between and within regions need not detain us. What is not well recorded are the ways in which people actually use their terminologies. Practice obviously varies according to personal, sometimes idiosyncratic, factors as well as with geographical and status differences. Social contexts are significant for their effect on the manner in which participants react to the structural properties of the terminologies themselves....

> Casson (1981: 230) notes,

> Critics have argued that, while practitioners of formal semantic analysis have been able to specify the genealogically-defined meaning of kinship terms, they have not been able to account for the social meaning communicated by the actual use of these terms in context.

As we look at the personal pronouns and kin terms found in the Lao data, we will explore the ways these words are used by the fictional speakers in the social contexts their authors have devised for them.

For participants in Lao society, social distance is something which one has to determine early on in a conversation in order to select the appropriate pronouns to use in the ensuing interaction. Many of the pronoun determining factors known to those who speak Thai are shared by those who speak Lao. For instance, Thai null pronominals are dealt with in Yuphaphann Hoonchamlong's 1991 dissertation; the behavior of this phenomena in Lao appears to be essentially the same and thus will not be discussed here. However, the

Lao pronoun system is not exactly parallel to the Thai system, but needs to be looked at in its own light.

Two obvious categories emerge when we look at the modern Lao pronoun system. They are the standard pronouns and the kinship system vocabulary used pronominally. Lao personal pronouns have been discussed by Hospitalier (1937), Nginn (1956), Gething (1976)[2] and Morev, et al. (1979). Lao kinship terms are discussed briefly in Barber (1979).

As a beginning of my study of the uses of standard pronouns and pronominally used kinship terms, I decided to begin with modern Lao literature as a way to learn how Lao writers portrayed the speech of Lao speaking to Lao.[3] By looking at what native speakers of the language viewed as "natural speech", I can begin to get some information about the use of Lao pronoun and kinship terminologies before I design my data collection procedures for the oral phase of the study.

For the standard first person singular pronouns (essentially equivalent to 'I' in English), Lao, like English and contrary to Thai, makes no distinction between male and female speakers (*khɔ̌y, khǎnɔ̌oy, khǎaphacâw*, etc. may be used either by men or women to refer to themselves). It is age, social status, degree of intimacy, and role in the speaking situation (among other things) which help determine the first person pronoun choice (and most personal pronoun choices) for Lao speakers.

2. Lao pronouns in written dialogues.

Volosinov (1986:117) says that "the basic tendency in reacting to reported speech may be to maintain its integrity and authenticity; a language may strive to forge hard and fast boundaries for reported speech." Traditionally, written Lao literature does not appear to have had clear, distinct visual conventions for marking off a passage as dialogue or reported speech. This is apparently beginning to change. A number of styles have been used to indicate direct speech, dialogues, or quotations in the modern Lao writings surveyed. In the post-1975 material, the most common forms found were: (1) to use a colon, drop down a line, and then begin the dialogue with a dash; or (2) to place the quoted or dialogue material in quotation marks (a typological device borrowed from Western print conventions). For an example of style (1), see *sɔ̌ɔŋ fâak faŋ* (1987:7), and for an example of style (2) see *dian khâaŋ thii sɛ́ɛlabǎm* (1982:49).

Another important point made by Volosinov (1986: 116) is that "the author's utterance, in incorporating the other utterance, brings into play syntactic, stylistic, and compositional norms for its [the reported speech's] partial assimilation...." In other words, the dialogues from which the personal pronouns we will discuss were obtained must be understood to be dialogues that were embedded in an authorial context. Since at this point in the study, we have little information about the authors other than their names, we cannot begin to consider the age, education, social status, etc. of the authors when we discuss this material.

Since 1975 there has been a great increase under the Lao Peoples Democratic Republic of publications in the Lao language; for instance, print runs of novels and short story collections may range from 5,000 to 10,000 now, while prior to 1975 the runs often ranged from as low as 200 to 2,000. The significance of this figure is two-fold: first of all, there are many more books available now for the general public to read and secondly, the writings of one author will be read by many more people than a pre-1975 author could possibly have hoped for.

Out of the wide variety of printed fiction available, sections from two of the more recently published novels were investigated; however, for this paper only examples from the 1987 novel have been chosen for discussion.[4]

The personal pronouns found in the 1987 data were:

Pronoun	Speaker	Frq	Pers	Comments
khɔ́y	Man	1	1Sg	('I', speaking about interaction with capitalists)
khành̀ɔy	Woman	1	1Sg	('I', in dialogue with older woman)
	Woman	2		('I', in a "letter" written to an older woman in the story)
khǎw	Man	1	3?	(the builder 'he') náay saaŋ khǎw
phûakkhǎw	Woman	1	3Pl	('they', referring to a couple)

Pronoun	Speaker	Frq	Pers	Comments
phən		16	3Sg/Pl	(usually singular; can be plural)
		(15)	Sg	
		(1)	Pl	(antecedent: farmers, citizens,etc.)
phûakphən		2	3Pl	('they')
háw	Narrator	2		
phûak háw	Narrator	1	1Pl	(of 'us', i.e. 'ours')
phǎy	Male	2	Interrog	('who')
	Female	1	Interrog	('who')

Note that the second person singular pronoun *câw* was **never used** at all.

The pronominally used kinship terms were:

Pronoun	Speaker	Frq	Pers	Comments
ʔâay	Male	37	1Sg	('I', when addressee is younger)
	Female	10	2Sg	('you', to somewhat older male)
as Noun	Irrel.	1	NA	(with actual meaning 'brother')
nɔ́ɔŋ	Female	13	1Sg	('I', when addressee is older)
	Male	12	2Sg	('you' to one somewhat younger)
as Title	Male	1	NA	('miss' or title + proper name)
phûaknɔ́ɔŋ	Female	1	1Pl	('we', when addressee is older)
as Noun	Male	1	NA	('younger siblings or subordinates')

It appears to me that we have here a **floating person**[5] attached to the kinship terms when they are use pronominally. In other words, whether one of these terms is first person or second person is determined by who is speaking to whom. The first person or second person part is determined primarily by the **real world relationship in age**[6] **of the two who are conversing** and is not a feature of the word being used pronominally itself. In addition, these words have **no kinship meaning**, unless they are used with

or about real kin of the speaker. They do, however, suggest a closer personal relationship between the speakers than the *khɔ̀y/câw* set ('I'/'you' set) would. Thus when I use *nɔ́ɔŋ* ('younger one') to another person, it socially declares that I am younger than the one I am speaking to (but usually not a great deal younger); I will choose a different kinship term to use pronominally (such as 'aunt' or 'uncle', 'mother' or 'father') depending primarily **on age distance from me as the speaker** and other factors about the dyad such as social distance and sex as well.[7]

Examples of other kinship terms found in use pronominally:

Pronoun	Speaker	Frq	Pers	Comments
ñáa phɔɔ	Female	5	2Sg	('respected male, quite a bit older')
ñáa mɛɛ	Female	2	2Sg	('respected female, quite a bit older')
ʔ̌ay	Female	2	2Sg	('you', to somewhat older female)
ʔǎa	Male	2	2Sg	('aunt, father's younger sister')

Examples of titles used as titles or pronominally:

Pronoun	Speaker	Frq	Pers	Comments
náaŋ	Male	7	--	('miss/woman, polite', + name)
	Male	1	2Sg	('you', to a woman only)
thâaw		3	--	('Mr.", used by narrator as a title + name in introductory material only)

Third person pronouns are found primarily in the framing and descriptive sections written by the narrator of the texts. Conversations between Lao who have close interpersonal relationships are marked by the dominant use of kin-type pronouns (rather than of the more "distant" or "neutral" pronouns) in a way not common in standard English. The bulk of the dialogues in these materials are between characters who have relationships of intimacy or familiarity.

Consequently, "kin-type pronouns" are primarily found in the actual dialogues analyzed from these texts. Only rarely in the conversations are the neutral *khɔy* or the inferior *khanɔɔy* found; occasionally a third person pronoun (neutral *láaw*, respect *phən*) or a respect title (*ñáa mɛɛ, ñáa phɔɔ, náaŋ* X or *tháaw* X or other) is used.

English or Western influences are used to view or analyze the subcategories of the category "pronoun". Those categories do not exist (in the same way) in Lao,—they are imposed on it from Western linguistics. Possession rests in the "of" or in the juxtaposition of the kin-type pronoun to a noun; the 'self' rests in the kin-type pronoun. The identity is in the human relationship: how do I view myself in relation to you.

Dialogues are used as teaching or speech opportunities in which the elder *ʔaay* teaches the younger *nɔɔŋ* something about life, society and world view. The percentage of "real" pronouns in the sentences just before (introductory) and just after (distancing, or returning to the narrator's point of view) a dialogue are much higher than within any dialogue, and such standard pronouns are used by the narrator or the story teller and are directed to the unknown reader. One has to take into consideration, of course, the fact that few conversations or dialogues between distant or non-intimate speakers occurred at all in these stories. Essays and newspapers may turn out to be the appropriate source for showing us the usage of the "standard" pronouns.

Texts teaching Lao usually don't teach kin-type pronoun usage, but only the neutral *khɔy/câw* set, thus leaving the new learner with only the distance options, not the intimacy-building options that the use of kin-type pronouns build (outsider vs. insider or intimate). In such an approach, the semantics of Lao pronoun usage is missed. This is also important in translation: how do the relationships appear vs. how they "feel" inside the language.

For instance, possession is part of the meaning of *khɔɔŋ*, not part of the meaning of *ʔaay* in the phrase *khɔɔŋ ʔaay* The human relationships are what is important in the kin-type pronoun; possession is left to the word *khɔɔŋ* or to simple juxtaposition after the thing possessed (modification position in which the kin-type pronoun is placed immediately after the thing/object/quality held by that person). For teaching purposes, use of kin-type pronouns is crucial to building appropriate human relationships. Just as Yuphaphann

Hoonchamlong indicates for Thai, a good deal of the time importance is put on establishing the pronoun to use before entering in to a conversation with another with whom has not previously had a conversation. Thus our current language teaching is inadequate if we do not give our students some guidance in the decision-making process that goes on for the selection of the appropriate kin-type pronoun to use with another. English essentially does not do this. Establishing the relationship and thus the degree of intimacy or distance is particularly significant in Lao society, because those kin-type pronouns carry with them a set of social relationships, expectations, and responsibilities to the other human one is addressing. One is thus accepting social and personal obligation and responsibilities that go with the kin-type pronoun choice (i.e. I can depend on your affection; there is concern there for the human aspect of the interaction, symbolized in the pro-form selected). What happens as one selects the appropriate pro-form is that one is determining the identity of self in relation to that other. It is a deeper level of the Lao language and is related to the acceptance of degree of intimacy which we generally do not show (linguistically overtly, at least) in English, through pronouns of the kin-type (except maybe in Black English and some other English dialects). The point is, then, that the Lao society expects one to act in relationship to that other person in particular ways, once the pronoun set has been determined between you. To change that pronoun usage later is to indicate a new phase or aspect of your relationship: returning to the more neutral khɔ́y/câw set can indicate anger or distancing; moving to a pronoun that has low status for a high status person can indicate anger or distance or termination of the relationship; moving from a neutral set to a more intimate set such as a kin-type pronoun set can indicate a greater closeness or intimacy in your relationship. There is a heavy social load for people, then, as they accept the use of the kin-type pronouns between them.

Some possible additional research topics that are suggested by the data considered in this paper include looking at both conscious and unconscious changes in the use of pronouns and pronominally used kinship terms. This would include stated changes in language policy involving pronoun usage, as well as understood, but unwritten changes in the usage of Lao pronouns. What were the meanings of various

kinship terms such as ʔâay and ʔ̃ay and what were the set of social obligations that went with their usage in the recent past? What are the current set of social expectations that go with the use of these kin-type pronouns? Or are there no actual or significant changes in the semantics and the usage of pronominally used kinship terms on the part of people in their everyday lives?

One might also explore some of the following questions: What are some of the vocabulary items, such as noun compounds, that make use of kin terms to describe social, political, bureaucratic or business relations? Which terms are new, which are of long standing, and which old terms have undergone significant changes in meaning? An example of one such change which was observed in rural Laos between the 1960s to the 1970s involves the components of the compound for 'relatives' or 'brothers and sisters.' The Lao for this term had traditionally been either ʔ̃aynɔ́ɔŋ or ʔâaynɔ́ɔŋ. The latter phrase began to be used in certain areas of Laos to refer to members of the Communist group; as this meaning began to dominate, people began to use the phrase ʔ̃aynɔ́ɔŋ to refer to 'relatives' or brothers and sisters,' and ʔâaynɔ́ɔŋ more and more frequently was used to indicate the political group. In fact, Kerr (1972:1174) includes in his definition of the phrase ʔâaynɔ́ɔŋ the definition "sibling, relatives, brethren, comrades." His definition for ʔ̃aynɔ́ɔŋ, however, contains only "siblings, brethren."

Other examples of uses of kin-terms in compounds are the following:

Compound	Components	Compound Meanings
lûuk-nɔ́ɔŋ	child + younger sib	subordinates
lûuk-lǎan	child + (grandson/granddaughter; nephew/niece)	subordinates
phɔɔ khaa	father + to sell	businessman
mɛɛ khaa	mother + to sell	businesswoman
phɔɔ náa	father + field	farmer

3. Findings

As Gedney (1989, 124) has noted, "Pronouns in Southeast Asian languages are especially susceptible to change and innovation." We have seen such changes within the Lao pronoun system over the last thirty years. One trend in pronoun usage that was noted in the dialogues was the

addition of a phrase clarifying or describing the person being referred to with the third person pronoun *phən*; that is, apparently to avoid an ambiguous reference, the pronoun would be followed immediately by a descriptive phrase. Examples are:

phən phùu lûuk sǎaw	her, the one who is the daughter
phən phùu câw hían	her/him, the one who is the head of the household/owner
phən phùu phǔa	him, the one who is the husband
phən phùu sǎay	him, the one who is the male

The addition of the word *phûak* 'group' will pluralize a singular pronoun or kin-type pronoun (for example, *phûak ʔâay*). However, if the kin-type pronoun does not suit all of those in the 'you' role, then it will be put together with a more general 'you' such as *câw* or *thaan*, giving *phûak câw* or *phûak thaan*.

One of the most important observations made in this study to date is that kin-type pronouns are in fact pronouns with a semantic field overlapping part of that of the kin terms to which they are related, but having definitions of their own. The noun substitute or pronoun in Lao is often or may be a term which denotes the general age distance between (and often the sex of) the speakers. Many of these forms are **floating pronouns** as far as person is concerned, for person is determined from real world factors of who is speaking to whom. The Lao pronoun system is a system based on interpersonal relations.

4. Conclusion

The use of kin terms pronominally has the effect of giving one the feeling of being a part of the Lao family, the local community and or of Lao society. These pronominal usages of kin terms build a sense of solidarity and also of general role or behavioral expectations from those who give and receive such terms. Not choosing kin-type pronominals, but functioning with only the now relatively neutral set (see Morev 1979) *khɔ̀y* and *câw* leaves a social distance between two speakers that leaves both with a cloudy view of how to relate to each other. A decision to use or accept kin terms marks a change in the quality of the relationship between the

speakers, and a movement into a more clearly socially-defined set of interpersonal behavioral patterns.

The fact that the fictional characters in this data generally use the kin-type pronominals says something about the genre itself, about its intended audience and the way the authors of this kind of fiction wish the readers to view the interpersonal relationships between these fictional characters. As models of literature printed by the government for the public, it also indicates the stamp of approval (consciously or unconsciously) of the use of these terms as appropriate and desirable.

The changes which we can note are the apparently increased use of *phən* (he/she or they respect in the past) with a more neutral meaning (Morev 1979). What we continue to see is the continued dominance of the first and second person pronoun positions by kin-terms used pronominally[8] with the "standard" first and second person pronouns rarely appearing. In the third person, however, the "standard" pronouns are those most frequently chosen.

Further observations on Lao pronoun usage await the analysis of a much larger corpus of data, both written and spoken, before many additional comparisons and conclusions may be drawn.

Notes

[1] The Lao-Lao dictionary (1968) provides the following definition for *sapphanáam* :

ສັພນາມ ນ. ຄຳແທນຊື່,

ຄຳເວົ້າປະເພດນຶ່ງໃນໄວຍາກອນສຳລັບແທນຊື່.

[2] Not all of Gething's features agree with what I have found for Lao. For instance, Gething indicates that the third person singular form *mɔɔ* is used only to refer to males. However, my own observations and follow-up discussions on the usage of a female speaker from the Wapikhamthong area and another female speaker from Vientiane included uses of the form *mɔɔ* by a female to refer to a female (as well as to a male); it is important to note that such usage required that the person referred to be of approximately the same age as the speaker (e

in Gething's chart). In addition, the pronoun *phən* is listed by Gething as singular only; however, this pronoun can actually have either a singular or a plural antecedent. An example of a plural usage of *phən* is when it is used to refer to one's parents. Finally, the term *ñáa* is listed by Gething as referring only to males. In fact, this respect title can be used for both males and females (see the data in this paper: *ñáa mɛɛ*), but I do not believe that we find it standing alone (i.e. without another noun following it).

[3] In "Individual and Society in Modern Thai Literature," Mulder (1984, p. 71) suggests the importance of analyzing the "unsolicited documents that any literary society produces." Such documents are not there "because of the presence of a researcher, but have been produced by local people addressing other local people."

[4] They are *sɔ̌ɔŋ fàak faŋ* by *sɔ̌ɔ bupphǎanuwóŋ* (1987) and *dian khâaŋ thǔ sɛ́ɛlabǎm* by *phɔ̌ɔ phǔaŋsabǎa.* (1982).

[5] By this phrase I mean that Lao kinship terms used pronominally vary as to whether they are in the first, second or third person. If, in a conversation in Lao, I used the term *ʔ̌ay* to refer to myself, it is in the first person; if the younger person to whom I am speaking uses that same term, *ʔ̌ay*, to refer to me, that term is now second person. If, in a subsequent conversation with someone else, that younger person refers to me as *ʔ̌ay*, the term is now used in the third person. Thus, the "person" floats from first to second to third, depending upon who is speaking to whom about whom.

[6] It should be noted here that there are exceptions to real world age as the determining factor in which of the kinship terms will be used pronominally. One exception which I have observed is the use of the term *nɔ́ɔŋ* 'younger one' by a married woman to refer to herself (i.e. 'I'), when addressing her husband, even though she is actually quite a few years older than he. There are other situations in which a social or cultural factor such as role or rank may take precedence over age in decisions about pronoun choice. I thank Paul Benedict for raising this question in a discussion of this paper.

[7]Recently at a conference (April 1991), I met a young Lao woman who started a conversation with me in Lao. The second or third thing she said to me after the initial Lao greeting was *ʔɔ̀ən ʔ̃ay dâ[y] bɔ̃ɔ* or essentially 'May I call you older sister?'. This permission was important to her in order to learn from me whether or not I wanted to interact with that kin-type pronoun set (*ʔ̃ay/nɔ́ɔŋ*) or if I would choose the more distant set (*khɔ̀y/câ͞w*). Once the permission to use the more familiar set was given, the Lao conversational pronouns were established for us for that day and for any further amicable interactions.

[8]This dominance includes the usage of kin-type pronominals in the workplace to those who would formerly have been addressed by a title or a role or as *thaan,* a respect pronoun (personal observation in Vientiane, Laos, August 1989). Ai Nu notes a similar case in the use of kin terms in the work place in Burma.

References

Barber, Martin John Philip. 1979. "Migrants and Modernization: A Study of Change in Lao Society." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Hull.

Bosch, Peter. 1983. *Agreement and Anaphora: A Study of the Role of Pronouns in Syntax and Discourse.* London: Academic Press.

Campbell, Russell N. 1969. *Noun Substitutes in Modern Thai: A Study in Pronominality.* Series Practica 65. The Hague: Mouton.

Casson, Ronald W. 1981. "The Semantics of Kin Term Usage: Transferred and Indirect Metaphorical Meanings." In *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Ronald W. Casson, pp. 230-244. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Cooke, Joseph R. 1968. *Pronominal Reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gedney, William J. 1989. "On the Thai Evidence for Austro-Thai." In *Selected Papers on Comparative Tai Studies*, edited by R. J. Bickner, J. Hartmann, T. J. Hudak, and Patcharin Peyasantiwong, pp. 117-163. Michigan Papers

on South and Southeast Asia No. 29. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan.

Gething, Thomas W. 1976. "Notes on Lao Personal Pronouns." In *Tai Linguistics in Honor of Fang-Kuei Li*, edited by Thomas W. Gething, Jimmy G. Harris, and Pranee Kullavanijaya, pp. 103-112. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.

Hartmann, John F. 1990. "Pronominal Strategies in Tai Dam Poetic Discourse," a paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, The University of Texas-Arlington, October 5-7, 1990.

Hospitalier, J. J. 1937. *Grammaire Laotienne*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Kemp, Jeremy H. 1984. "The Manipulation of Personal Relations: From Kinship to Patron-Clientage." In *Strategies and Structures in Thai Society*, edited by Hans ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp, pp. 55-69. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

kasúaŋsiksăathikăan. 2505. *wacanáanukŏmpháasăaláaw*.

Kerr, Allen D. 1972. *Lao-English Dictionary.*, Vols. I and II. Washington, D.C.: Consortium Press, The Catholic University of America Press.

Morev, L.N., A. A. Moskalev, and Y. Y. Plam. 1979. *The Lao Language*. Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences.

Mühlhäusler, Peter and Rom Harré. 1990. *Pronouns and People*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Mulder, Niels. 1984. "Individual and Society in Modern Thai Literature." In *Strategies and Structures in Thai Society*, edited by Hans ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp, pp. 71-84. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Nginn, P. S. 1965. *Elements de Grammaire Laotienne*, 2nd ed. Vientiane: Ministere de l'education nationale, Comité literaire lao.

phɔɔ phúaŋsabăa. 1982. *dĭan khâaŋ thii séɛlabăm*. Vientiane: *hóoŋ phím hɛɛŋ sâat.*

Phoumi Vongvichit. 1967. *wáyñaakɔɔnláaw síaŋ khŭaŋ : phanêɛksiksăasŭunkăaŋ.*

sɔɔ bupphăanuwóŋ . 1987. *sɔɔŋ fàak faŋ* . Vientiane: *hóoŋ phím hɛɛŋ sáat..*

Seree Weroha. 1991. "Semantic Considerations in Interpreting Inscriptions: Illustrations from Lue, Lao, and Kammuang." In *Papers on Tai Languages, Linguistics, and Literatures: In Honor of William J. Gedney on his 77h Birthday*, edited by Carol J. Compton and John F. Hartmann, pp. 187-193. Occasional Paper No. 16 DeKalb: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University.

Volosinov, V. N. 1986. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wilaiwan Khanittanan. 1973. "The Influence of Siamese on Five Lao Dialects." Ph.D. dissertation, Linguistics. The University of Michigan.

Yates, Warren G. and Souksomboun Sayasithsena. 1970. *Lao Basic Course*, Vol.1. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute, Department of State.

Yuphaphann Hoonchamlong. 1992. "Some Observations on *phǒm* and *dichǎn*: Male and Female First Person Pronouns in Thai." In *Papers on Tai Languages, Linguistics, and Literatures: In Honor of William J. Gedney on his 77h Birthday*, edited by Carol J. Compton and John F. Hartmann., pp. 195-213. Occasional Paper No. 16. DeKalb: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University.

Yuphaphann Hoonchamlong. 1991. "Some Issues of Thai Anaphora: A Government and Binding Approach." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.