An Analysis of Japanese Sentence-final Particle *Yone*: Compare *Yone* and *Ne* in Response

Jun Xu   JUN.XU@COLOSTATE.EDU
Colorado State University,
Fort Collins, USA

Abstract

Yone, a Japanese sentence-final particle (SFP), is frequently used in conversation, and some functions overlap with *ne*, another SFP. However, not much discussion has taken place about their differences. This study argues that the two Japanese sentence-final particles, *yone* and *ne*, express a distinction about the speaker's state of mind: *yone* indicates that an idea has been on the speaker's mind, while *ne* suggests a thought just emerged into the speaker's awareness. Naturally occurring conversation data provides evidence for this claim. The results show that the particles reflect the speaker's choice of presenting his/her state of awareness.

Keywords: Japanese, discourse, pragmatics, sentence-final particle, *yone*

1   Introduction

Ne and *yone* are two frequently used Japanese sentence-final particles in conversation (e.g., Asano-Cavanagh, 2011; Cook, 1990, 1992; Hasegawa, 2010; Hasunuma, 1992, 1995; Hayano, 2011, 2013; Izuhara, 1993, 1994, 2001, 2003, 2008; Kamio, 1994, 1995, 1997; Katagiri, 2007; Kato, 2001; Lee, 2007; Maynard, 1993; Miyazaki 2002; Morita, 2002; Saigo, 2011; Takubo & Kinsui, 1997; Tanaka, 2000; Xu, 2016; Zhang, 2009). While both *yone* and *ne* can be used as tag-like questions to seek confirmation, they can also show agreement or empathy (e.g., Hasunuma, 1992, 1995; Izuhara, 1993, 1994, 2001, 2003; Noda, 1993). Although *yone* and *ne* functions overlap, interchangeability has not been thoroughly studied (Asano-Cavanagh, 2011; Hayano, 2013; Noda, 1993; Xu, 2016). Also, as Hayano (2011) points out, research on Japanese sentence-final particles tends to consider that their use is rule-governed by the objectively discernible distribution of knowledge or information. However, such perspective overlooks the agency of the individual in presenting knowledge of information when using sentence-final particles through the dynamic courses of conversation (Hayano, 2011).

Using naturally occurring conversation data where *yone* and *ne* occur in a response environment, the present study attempts to show these differences between *yone* and *ne*：

    a. *Yone* is a marker of existing awareness that indicates an idea had already been on the speaker's mind.

    b. *Ne* is a marker of new awareness that shows a thought just emerged into the speaker's awareness.

    c. What *ne* presents is not necessarily something new, and it can be something the speaker had not thought of until the time of utterance.

    d. Speakers systematically select *yone* or *ne* to present their states of awareness.

It is necessary here to clarify three critical terms in this study: "response," "new awareness," and "existing awareness." First, according to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, a response is

something constituting a reply or a reaction.[1]   In other literature, a response can appear as the answer part in a summons-answer sequence (Schegloff, 2007), an initial assessment of something, or the second assessment in an assessment pair (Pomerantz, 1984). In this paper, the term "response" is used in a broad sense to examine four situations: (i) response to immediate conditions; (ii) response in recall; (iii) response to the answer to a question; and (iv) response to assessment.[2]

Second, throughout this paper, the term "new awareness" is used to describe what a speaker currently thinks, feels, or what the speaker has just noticed or recalled at the time of the utterance. Third, "existing awareness" refers to the speaker's knowledge or thoughts, such as information mentioned in previous discourse or knowledge already established before the moment of utterance.

Worth noting is that the present study does not intend to provide a general account for the distinction between *yone* and *ne*. Instead, this examination is limited to only four situations in response. However, they reveal how a speaker systematically displays one's state of awareness with *ne* and *yone*.

This article follows this organizational structure: The first section deals with the background of this study. The second part concerns the data and methodology of this study. Data analysis constitutes the third part, and the fourth part concludes this study.

2   Background

This section provides a brief review of the overlapped functions of *yone* and *ne*, the differences between them in response as showing agreement, and the relationship between information status and the choice of linguistic forms in Japanese.

2.1   The Differences Between *Yone* and *Ne* in Response

The literature has identified that *yone* has a few overlapped functions with *ne* (e.g., Asano-Cavanagh, 2011; Hasunuma, 1992, 1995; McGloin et al., 2013; Miyazaki, 2002; Noda, 1993; Zhang, 2009). This study focuses on *ne* and *yone* as response, which appears as agreement in Examples (1) and (2).[3] Here, responding to the assessment in line 1, speaker B can use either *ne* or *yone* in line 2 to show the agreement with speaker A's opinion, i.e., this restaurant's sushi is delicious.

(1)
```
 1   A:      kono mise       no sushi oishii    naa
             this restaurant LK sushi delicious FP
             'This restaurant's sushi is delicious.'
 2   B:   →  un  oishii     ne
             ITJ delicious FP
             'Yeah, delicious ne. (It is delicious, I agree with you.)'
```
(2)
```
 1   A:      kono mise       no sushi oishii    naa
             this restaurant LK sushi delicious FP
             'This restaurant's sushi is delicious.'
```

---

[1] Response [Def. 2]. (n.d.). In *Merriam Webster Online,* Retrieved April 18, 2021, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/response.

[2] Assessment is an action or an instant judgment about something. It is an interactive action commonly examined in Conversation Analysis (Pomerantz, 1984). She points out that "assessments are produced as products of participation; with an assessment, a speaker claims knowledge that which he or she is assessing" (Pomerantz, 1984:57). In the present study, *ne*-marked or *yone*-marked responses commonly appear as assessments. However, a response does not always appear as an assessment. Assessment is one category of response in this article.

[3] See Appendix for the list of abbreviations and transcription conventions.

```
2   B:    →   un  oishii    yone
              ITJ delicious FP
```
'Yeah, delicious *yone*. (It is delicious, I agree with you.)'

To date, the differences between using *yone* and *ne* in Examples (1) and (2) have received scant attention in the literature. Only Noda (1993) has discussed this issue by pointing out that *yone* and *ne* are not always interchangeable. She argues that in certain situations, one rather than the other is natural. For instance, *ne* is acceptable in Example (3) while *yone* cannot be used at the same turn in Example (4). Noda (1993:14) argues that *yone* cannot be used in greetings, so (4)B is incorrect.

(3)
```
1   A:        ii   tenki   desu ne
              good weather COP  FP
```
'The weather is good, right?'
```
2   B:    →   soo  desu ne
              that COP  FP
```
'That is right *ne*.'

(4)
```
1   A:        ii   tenki   desu ne
              good weather COP  FP
```
'The weather is good, right?'
```
2   ?B:   →   soo  desu yone ⁴
              that COP  FP
```
'That is right *yone*.'

However, Noda's (1993) proposal fails to explain why *yone* and *ne* are not interchangeable in Example (5) even though they are in a non-greeting situation. In Example (5), the participants are talking about hourly pay at their part-time jobs. After finding out speaker B's hourly pay rate, speaker A comments that the pay rate is low (line 1). Speaker B shows his agreement with speaker A in line 2. In line 3, when speaker A further displays his response that the pay is low, only *yone* is possible. If *ne* is used in the same position (Example 5, line 3), the whole utterance becomes unnatural.

(5)
```
1   A:        yasukunai↑
              cheap-NEG
```
'Isn't it cheap?'
```
2   B:        Yasui
              Cheap
```
'(It is) cheap.'
```
3   A:    →   yasui yone
              cheap FP
```
'It is cheap *yone*.'

Surprisingly, no studies have discussed *yone* and *ne* as used in Example (5). Because Noda's (1993) proposal cannot successfully explain the use of *yone* in Example (5), this study attempts to show the difference between *yone* and *ne* through a new approach.

---

⁴ This sentence was judged as incorrect with a "*" mark by Noda (1993), but it is replaced with "?" in this study. Five Japanese native speakers were consulted about the naturalness of this example. One reported that the sentence 4(B) is unnatural. While the other four considered it acceptable, all agreed that the sentence 3(B) is more natural. What is important when changing the "*" mark to the "?" mark for 4(B), however, is that 3(B) is more appropriate than 4(B) in terms of naturalness even though native speakers might have different opinions about accepting sentence 4(B).

2.2 Information Status and the Choice of Linguistic Forms in Japanese

In many languages, speakers choose different linguistic features to present the various statuses of information (e.g., Akatsuka, 1985; Goldsmith & Woisetschlaeger, 1982; Gundel, 1985; Kamio, 1997; Kuno, 1972; Miyazaki 2002; Prince, 1992; Slobin & Aksu, 1982).

For instance, in Japanese, Kuno (1972) uses the notion of "old/new information" to explain the use of two particles, *wa* and *ga*. He proposes four different usages of *wa* and *ga*: thematic *wa*, contrastive *wa*, descriptive *ga*, and exhaustive-listing *ga*. He further points out that thematic *wa* presents old information while descriptive *ga* and exhaustive-listing *ga* convey new information.

Akatsuka (1985) illustrates the vital role a speaker's awareness plays in the choice of forms for conditionals. She argues that an understanding of what registers the speaker's awareness at the time of the utterance is pivotal in distinguishing the conditional S_1 *no nara* S_2 from other conditionals in Japanese. When S_1 *no nara* S_2 appears, S_1 always expresses new information that has just entered the speaker's awareness at the discourse site. She also notes that Japanese grammar is sensitive to the cognitive distinction between "newly-learned information" and the "state of knowledge."

Kamio (1997) distinguishes the Japanese sentence-final particles *yo* and *ne* using the theory of "territory of information," a theory based on the notion of psychological distance between a given piece of information and the speaker/hearer (see Kamio 1994, 1995, 1997 for details of the territory of information theory). He claims that the particle *ne* is a marker of shared information, which indicates a piece of information presumably within both the speaker's and addressee's territories. In contrast, the particle *yo* implies that the speaker and addressees do not share a piece of information. Such information exists in the speaker's territory but not within the addressee's territory.

Using the term "認識の現場性 *ninshiki no genbasei* (immediate awareness)," Miyazaki (2002) argues that *ne* as well as its corresponding particle in monologue, *na/naa*, present that a speaker's awareness is what he/she thinks, feels, and notices at the time of utterance. He used examples of *ne* and *na* from novels to argue this point (Miyazaki, 2002:11). For instance, *ne* and *naa* in Examples (6) and (7) are used to present the speaker's thoughts about what he/she has just seen.

(6)

[Shoya looked at Nobuko, who is in front of him.]
*odoroita **ne**!—marude betsujin da yo.*
'I am so surprised ***ne***. You look like someone else.'

(7)

"Nobuko san?"
to me o mihatta.
*"Odoroita **naa**!—marude betsujin da yo."*
"Nobuko?"
(He) opened his eyes widely.
"I am so surprised ***naa!*** You look like someone else."

All the studies reviewed here suggest it is possible to analyze the difference between *yone* and *ne* from a new perspective by focusing on how speakers use *yone* and *ne* to represent their states of awareness. The present study follows Miyazaki's (2002) framework of *ne*, which shows the importance of a speaker's awareness and analyzes the use of *yone* and *ne* in four responding situations. As described in the Introduction section, the present study argues that the differences between *yone* and *ne* are：

    a. *Yone* is a marker of existing awareness that indicates that an idea had already been on the speaker's mind.

    b. *Ne* is a marker of new awareness that shows a thought just emerged into the speaker's awareness.

c. What *ne* presents is not necessarily something novel, and it can be something the speaker had not thought of until the time of utterance.

d. Speakers systematically select *yone* or *ne* to present their states of awareness.

3   Data and Method

The present study examines the use of *yone* and *ne* in conversation using a cognitive-interactive framework. The reasons for this particular approach are twofold: First, this study's argument about the use of *yone* stems from Miyazaki's (2002) proposal about *ne,* which focuses on the speaker's awareness. Second, unlike the data used in Miyazaki (2002) and Noda (1993), which were constructed or taken from novels, this study examines how *yone* and *ne* are used in social interaction.

Methodologically, the present study proposes hypotheses about using *yone* and *ne* based on constructed, written, and conversation data. Naturally occurring conversation data provided the data for testing the hypotheses. To carefully examine the conversation data, conversation analysis (CA) with modification was partially adopted.

The data consists of nine sets of face-to-face video-recorded multi-party conversations. The source of the data is the Sakura Corpus distributed by the TalkBank organization.[5] Conversation participants are native speakers of Japanese who are students at a Japanese university. In each video session, four students, who are classmates or close friends, talk about a given topic. Because the conversation participants were close, they used the non-polite conversation style (*da*-form). While the Sakura Corpus has 18 sets of conversation data, the data included in this study are female-male conversations and all-female conversations. Other data with fewer cases of *yone,* such as all-male conversations, were excluded. Although the data bias is toward female participants, gender is not a contributing factor to the general conclusion of the present study. Also, while two male participants' utterances were occasionally affected by dialect, the corresponding sentence-final particle *yone* in the dialect, *yona*, was not identified in the data. Thus, dialect does not influence the use of *yone* in this study's data.

There are 397 cases of *yone* in the final data examined for this study. Of those, 86 instances were speaker responses to various situations and, therefore, constitute this study's focus. Meanwhile, there are 1230 cases of *ne* in the same data sets since *ne* is the most frequently used sentence-final particle in Japanese conversation (Hasegawa, 2010).

The study first examined the 86 cases of *yone* for responses and identified four responding situations. Then, another 53 cases of *ne* in the same responding situations were compared with the cases of *yone* in response. This study did not identify and categorize all the instances of *ne* in response; this study's primary focus is *yone* while *ne* is used to compare with *yone*.

Data was transcribed using the revised Hepburn system of Romanization. Although transcription of utterances used standard Japanese pronunciations, paralinguistic features, such as pauses, sound stretches, and overlapping speech, were also noted in the transcription according to the transcription conventions developed by Jefferson (1984) with modifications. Also noted were non-vocal actions such as gestures, body alignment, and other contextual information. Roman letter codes masked individual speakers, providing anonymity.

---

[5] The data are from the database of TalkBank (https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/ca/Sakura). Most transcriptions of examples in this paper were updated to include details such as overlapped utterances, pauses, and gestures. Such non-verbal communication can provide critical supplemental cues when evaluating a speaker's intention and such inclusion adds to the argument of the present paper. In addition, five Japanese native speakers were consulted to ensure the accuracy of the final transcriptions used in the present paper.

4   Result and Discussion

In this section, *yone* and *ne* as used in four response situations will be carefully examined and discussed.

4.1   Response to Immediate Situations

In this study, "immediate situations" refers to situations in which the speaker has just received new information by seeing or hearing at the time of conversation. What the speaker has just seen or heard triggers a *ne*-marked utterance. In the present study data, *ne* is commonly used in such situations while *yone* is not.

Example (8) illustrates the use of *ne* based on what the speakers have just seen and heard. Four participants are talking about their ideal partners. Before the segment, speaker H says that he likes girls wearing framed glasses. Speakers L and K, two females, wonder what makes glasses appealing to speaker H.

(8)

```
1   L:        aa  kooiu    kanji↑ ((pretending to lift glasses with a finger of her
                          right hand))
                          ITJ this-kind feeling
                          'Oh, like this?'
2   H:    →   ii   ne
                          nice FP
                          '(That is) nice ne.'
3             (1.0)
4   L:        ii   no↑ eeee [igai
                          nice Q   ITJ   unexpected
                          'Nice?  That was unexpected.'
5   K:    →                  [eee igai       da  ne
                                  ITJ unexpected COP FP
                                  'That is unexpected.'
6   K:        sangurasu  no hoo  ga  ii   to omotteta
                          sunglasses LK side NOM nice QT thought
                          'I thought sunglasses were better.'
7   H:        Zenzen
                          Not-at-all
                          'Not at all.'
```

In line 1, speaker L uses gestures like touching the frame of a pair of glasses. Speaker H responds to the action with a *ne*-marked comment (line 2). His response "*ii ne* (that is nice)" is based on the immediate observation of speaker L's action. Thus, here speaker H uses *ne* to reflect what he has just observed. Another speaker, K, produced a *ne*-marked comment in line 5. Her immediate comment, "*igai da ne* (that is unexpected)," is based on what she has just heard from speaker H's response in line 2. Her thought that sunglasses were better was different from what she heard from speaker H's response. This difference indicates that newly-learned information triggered the use of *ne*.

Example (8) shows that *ne* is triggered by what the speaker has just seen or heard. This finding is consistent with Miyazaki's (2002) proposal. On the other hand, no *yone*-marked response exists in such situations in this study's data.

4.2   Response in Recall

In 4.1, we saw that only *ne* exists in response to what the speaker has just seen or heard. However, both *ne* and *yone* can be used in response where the speaker has just been reminded of already-known information. This section will illustrate how *ne* and *yone* are used to respond to the speaker's already-known information in recall. In this study, "recall" refers to situations in which old

information, such as information mentioned in previous discourse or knowledge already established before the moment of utterance, was brought into the speaker's mind.

4.2.1 *Ne* in Recall

Example (9) shows how *ne* relates to the speaker's own experience, which is already-known information to the speaker. Four participants talk about their ideal partners in this segment. Speakers H and G, two male participants, previously spoke about the same topic with others in a different session. Two female participants, L and K, ask them what they talked about in the previous session. After being reminded of some of their discussion topics, they are asked about another issue (line 1). Now speaker G has trouble recalling their conversation topics.

(9)
```
1   L:          ato   wa↑
                after TP
                'What else?'
2               (2.0)
3   G:          nani ga↑
                what NOM
                'What?'
4               (2.0)
5   H:          Fukusoo toka yuttotta jan =
                clothes like said      TAG
                'Didn't we also talk about something like clothes?'
6   G:    →     [=a:: yuttotta ne orera
                ITJ   said      FP we
                'Oh, we talked about that ne.'
7   K:          [=a:: iru  ne
                  ITJ need FP
                 'Oh,  it is necessary.'
8   G:          yuttotta yuttotta
                said      said
                'We did talk about it.'
```

Speaker H's utterance in line 5 triggers speaker G's *ne*-marked response in line 6. Although the information regarding what else they talked about as criteria for ideal partners in a different session is not new to speaker G, the information was not in his awareness until triggered by speaker H's comment that they also talked about clothes in line 5. Speaker G's *ne*-marked response produced in line 6 indicates that the information just entered speaker G's awareness. Furthermore, the *ne*-marked response associates with the change-of-state marker "*a:::*" (line 2) (Heritage, 1984). Thus, here *ne* can be considered as displaying new awareness.

4.2.2 *Yone* in Recall

Example (10) illustrates the use of *yone* where the speaker talks about information already-known to him/her.

(10)
```
1   I:          jikyuu     sen  en  tte ii   ne
                hourly-pay 1000 yen QT  good FP
                'It is good that your hourly pay is 1000 yen.'
2   E:          eq tabun    tabun   sonna    kanji   datta
                ITJ probably probably that-kind feeling COP-PST
                'Well, probably, it was something like that.'
3   L:          demo sempai sen  en  tte itteta [kara
                but  senior 1000 yen QT  said      because
                'But she (the person who is our alumnus) said it is 1000 yen.'
```

```
 4   E:      →                                        [itteta yone
                                                       said    FP
                                                      'She said it yone.'
 5   L:          Un
                 ITJ
                 'Yes.'
 6   E:          kenshuu  kikan   wa ne: yasui kamoshiren ne
                 training period TP FP  cheap possible    FP
                 'During the training period, the pay is probably less.'
 7   L:          Demo nai  n    janai [sonna      no]
                 but  no   NML TAG     that-kind NML
                 'But probably that kind of thing won't happen.'
 8   E:                          [hajime    wa] deeta nyuuryoku tte yutteta
                                  beginning TP  data  input      QT  said
 9               kensa    mo   nani mo   shizuni
                 check-up also what also do-NEG
                 'In the beginning, I will only input data into the computer and won't do check-ups or other
                 things.'
10   L:          ii   na::
                 good FP
                 'I am jealous.'
```

Before this segment, speaker E told others that she ran into an alumnus at a clinic where the alumnus works. Speaker E had an opportunity to work there, and the hourly pay was 1000 yen. Maybe because she has not started to work there yet, and her job will be only inputting data into a computer without doing anything such as checking patients (lines 8 and 9), she downgrades her stance (line 2). She does this by showing uncertainty with the adverb "*tabun* (probably)" when speaker I comments on how good the pay is (line 1). In line 3, speaker L mentions that the alumnus has said the pay is 1000 yen, and speaker E produces the *yone*-marked response in line 4. Indeed, she knows what the alumnus said about the hourly wage, and the information about hourly pay was already-known information to her. Her immediate *yone*-marked response shows that she knows the information clearly and has no problem in recall (line 4).

4.2.3   The Differences Between *Ne* and *Yone* in Recall

The environments are distinctly different when comparing the *yone*-marked response in Example (10) with the *ne*-marked responses in Example (9). *Ne*-marked responses tend to appear in situations where the speaker has trouble recalling his/her experience. *Ne* presents what has just entered the speaker's awareness. In this sense, it is the same as a *ne*-marked response to an immediate situation (see 4.1), which presents the speaker's new awareness. On the other hand, a *yone*-marked response does not associate with a speaker's recollection difficulties. In other words, the speaker does not use *yone* to present what has just entered the speaker's awareness; instead, *yone* displays one's existing awareness.

As Example (9) shows, *ne*-marked responses tend to occur with the change-of-state maker "*a::*" (Heritage, 1984). In the data for this study, 43 responses marked with *ne* or *yone* occur with "*a::*." Eighty-six percent (37 cases) occur with "*a::*" and *ne*, while only 14 percent (6 cases) are prefaced by "*a::*" and *yone*. This data indicates that the speaker tends to use *ne* to present information as something that has just entered one's awareness at the discourse site, even in a situation involving recalling the speaker's experience. Although the experience per se is certainly not new, a speaker can present it as a piece of new information by using *ne*. In contrast, "*a:: + yone*" is deployed where the speaker does not experience any recall issues. The speaker uses *yone* to indicate previous experience or knowledge, rather than some newly-learned information that has just entered the speaker's awareness.

Examples, such as Example (11), show how *yone* works with "*a::*." to indicate already-known information that just entered speaker E's awareness.

Speakers L and E are talking about people they met at a clinic where they worked as interns. S Sensei (Mr./Ms. S) is a person with whom both speakers L and E worked. When asked about his opinion of S Sensei by speaker L (line 1), speaker E comments that S Sensei is smart; *yone* and "*a::* " are attached.

(11)
```
 1   L:        S    sensei  wa↑
               name teacher TP
               'How about Mr./Ms. S?'
 2   E:    →   a:: ano  hito   atama ii   yone
               ITJ that person head  good FP
               'Oh, that person is smart yone.'
 3   L:        Tabun    osowaru   yo S    sensei ((talking to G))
               Probably be-taught FP name teacher
               'Probably Mr./Ms. S will teach you.'
```

In Example (11), "*a::"* still functions as a marker of change-of-state, and speaker L's question in line1triggers the use of *yone*. However, unlike Example (9), speaker E does not have difficulty in recall.

In sum, these examples demonstrate that the use of *yone* or *ne* can be decided by how the speaker wants to present his/her awareness rather than by the information per se.

4.3 Response to the Answer to a Question

In this section, we examine the use of *yone* and *ne* in question responses. The targeted *yone* and *ne* are in the line 3 position, as shown in Table 1.

	Response to the answer to a question
1	Question
2	Answer
3	→ Response + ***yone/ne***

Table 1. Response to the answer to a question

When used in response to a question's answer, the question, i.e., line 1, is designed differently, as shown in Table 2.

Ne-marked response		*Yone*-marked response	
1	WH question or Polar question	1	negative question/ WH question + candidate answer
2	Answer	2	Answer
3	*Ne*-marked response	3	*Yone*-marked response

Table 2. *Yone* and *ne* in response to the answer to a question

For *ne*-marked responses, the questions are WH questions or polar questions. However, for *yone*-marked responses, questions are primarily negative questions or in the form of "WH question + candidate answer." In this study's data, 14 *ne*- or *yone*-marked utterances appear as a response to the answer to a question. Table 3 shows the distribution.

	WH question	Polar question	Negative questions	WH question + candidate answer
Ne-marked response	4	6	0	0
Yone-marked response	0	1	2	1
Total	4	7	2	1

Table 3. The distribution of *yone* and *ne* in response to the answer to a question

To examine this point, observe the following examples:

(12)
```
1   A:    →    jikyuu        ikura↑
                hourly-payment how much
                'How much is your hourly payment?'
2   B:         jikyuu      wa sekkotsuin      ga  850 en  rashikku         ga
                hourly-payment TP bonesetter's-office NOM   yen restaurant's name NOM
3              950 en  kateikyooshi ga  1500 en
                   yen tutor        NOM     yen
                '850 yen per hour for a bonesetter's office, 950 yen per hour for Rashikku and 1500 yen for
                tutoring.'
4   A:    →    metcha ii  ne
                very   good FP
                'That's very good ne.'
5   B:         un  ichi jikan de
                yes one  hour  in
                'Yeah, per hour.'
```

In Example (12), four participants talk about their part-time jobs. First, speaker A asks about speaker B's hourly payment by using a WH question: "How much is your hourly payment?" (line 1). The question indicates that speaker A does not possess any knowledge about speaker B's salary. The information she receives from speaker B's answer in lines 2 and 3 thus forms her response. Example (12) illustrates that a *ne*-marked assessment reflects a speaker's awareness established when receiving information.

Negative questions, or WH questions followed by candidate answers, present a speaker's existing awareness, as illustrated by *yone*-marked responses in Examples (13) and (14). For instance, in Example (13), four participants talk about the hourly pay for their part-time jobs. Before this segment, speaker G says that even though he wants more money, he tolerates his low hourly pay rate because the part-time job is comfortable and close to his home.

(13)
```
1   I:         okane wa doodemo yokatta ↑
                money TP however good-PST
                'Money didn't matter?'
2   G:         soo hoshii kedo ne
                that want    but  FP
                'Didn't matter. I want money, though.'
3   E:    →    demo datte yasukunai↑
                but  but   cheap-NEG
                'But isn't it low?'
4   G:         Yasui
                Cheap
                'Low.'
5   E:    →    yasui yone sore
                cheap FP   that
                'That is low yone.'
```

In line 3, speaker E's question is negative, i.e., "*yasukunai* (isn't it cheap?)." Also, "*datte*" is used to strengthen the speaker's assertion and make others change their stance (Mori, 1994). The combination of "*datte*" and negative question shows speaker E already thinks that speaker G's pay rate is low. The question design indicates the question's purpose is to solicit an affirmative answer, not merely a responsive answer from speaker G. Upon receiving speaker G's expected affirmative answer (line 4), speaker E produces a *yone*-marked utterance (line 5).

In Example (14), *yone* appears in response to the answer to a question in the form of "WH question + candidate answer." Four participants are talking about their part-time jobs.

(14)

```
1   G:         demo dekireba shitakunai       naa:
               but  can-if   want-to-do-NEG   FP
               'But if it is possible, I don't want to do a part-time job.'
2   A:         majide↑
               Really
               'Really?'
3   B:         [honto
               Really
               'Really?'
4   G:         [e:::: baito          suki↑
               ITJ    part-time-job  like
               'What?  You like part-time jobs?'
5   A:         atashi wa meccha     suki da  mon
               I      TP extremely  like COP because
               'I like it very much.'
6   G:    →    e::::::: nande↑ hito   ga  ii   kara↑
               ITJ      why    people NOM good  because
               'Really?  Why?  Because (the co-workers) are nice?'
7   A:         hito   ga  ii   kara
               people NOM good  because
               'Because (the co-workers) are nice.'
8   G:    →    [a::: zettai     soo  da  yone.
                ITJ  definitely that COP FP
               'Oh,  definitely because of that yone.'
9   A:         [un
               Yes
               'Yes.'
```

Speaker G says that she does not want a part-time job (line 1), while speaker A says that she likes her part-time job very much (line 5). Surprised by speaker A's opposite opinion, speaker G first asks the reason using a WH question, i.e., "*nande* (why)." Then she produces a candidate answer: because speaker A's co-workers are nice (line 6). It is notable that the candidate answer, which is in the form of a polar question, does not stand alone; the formation of "WH question + candidate answer" shows that speaker G already has an opinion. Confirmed by speaker A (line 7), speaker G produces the *yone*-marked utterance in line 8. Here *yone* is chosen rather than *ne* because of speaker A's opinion that "*hito ga ii kara* (because they are nice)" was previously expressed in the specially designed question formation in line 6. She also upgrades her opinion with the adverb "*zattai* (definitely)" (line 8). This example clearly illustrates that *yone* presents the speaker's existing awareness.

Example (15) illustrates one case where *yone* can respond to the answer to a polar question. Four participants talk about another classmate who quit his part-time job. In line 1, speaker B asks whether the classmate is still coming to school. When speaker G tells her the classmate was not at school yesterday (line 4), speaker B produces in line 5 a response with *yone* and "*a::*."

(15)

```
1   B:    →    gakkoo kiteru↑ kare
               school coming  he
               'Is he still coming to school?'
2   C:         [shira-nai
                Know-NEG
               'I don't know.'
```

```
3   A:         [tte iu ka iru   no↑
              QT say Q  exist Q
            'Is he still here?'
4   G:         [kinoo     i-na-katta    yo↑
              Yesterday exist-NEG-PST FP
            'He was not here yesterday.'
5   B:   →   a:: i-na-katta    yone
            ITJ exist-NEG-PST FP
            'Oh, he was not here yone.'
```

In Example (12), as mentioned previously, speaker A produced the *ne*-marked response to the answer of a WH question because he has no access to speaker B's salary. In contrast, in Example (15), speaker B probably knows whether the classmate was at school yesterday, given that they are classmates and possibly take the same classes. Like Example (11), *yone* is also used as the maker of change-of-state "*a::.*" Here, *yone*, triggered by speaker G's answer in line 4, can also be considered already-known information that has just entered her awareness.

The preceding examples of *yone* and *ne* demonstrate the distinctions between *yone* and *ne* in response to a question's answer. Questions associated with a *ne*-marked response tend to be WH questions or polar questions, indicating the speaker seeks an answer because the speaker lacks knowledge or information. A *ne*-marked response also shows that the speaker's awareness manifests upon hearing an answer. In this sense, the response represents new awareness.

In contrast, a *yone*-marked response primarily occurs when answering negative questions or with "WH question + candidate answer" patterns. These question forms reveal that the speaker does not merely seek an answer but seeks an answer that confirms the awareness he/she has already established. Thus, using *yone* as a response to an answer presents the speaker's existing awareness.

4.4   Response to Assessments

In this section, using *yone* and *ne* in response to assessments is examined. The present study primarily focuses on *ne*- and *yone*-marked responses to assessments without *ne* or *yone*. The environment examined in the present study is shown in Table 4. *Ne* and *yone* in second assessment positions are considered.

Response to assessment		
1		Assessment
2	→	Assessment + *yone/ne*

Table 4. *Yone* and *ne* in response to assessments

First, *ne*-marked responses are examined. Four females talk about whether they prefer dogs or cats.

(16)
```
1   B:      kekka  inu ha    ga ookatta    tte yuu
            result dog group NOM many-past QT  say
          'The result was that more people prefer dogs.'
2   G:      inu ha     da  ne.
            dog group COP FP
          'More people prefer dogs.'
3   A:      un tooron    ni naranakatta    ne
            ITJ discussion to became-NEG-PST FP
          'well, it didn't become a discussion.'
4           atashi neko da  yo:: toka ni naranakata
            I      cat  COP FP   like to became-NEG
          'Nobody said I prefer cats.'
```

185

```
 5   C:   →    neko anma    inai      n janai no↑ iru   kana:
               cat not-much exist-NEG NML TAG  Q    exist FP
               'Not many people prefer cats, right?  I wonder if anyone prefers cats.'
 6   A:        iru   n   janai↑
               exist NML TAG
               'Aren't there people who prefer cats?'
 7   G:        e:::: neko namaiki       da  yo nanka
               ITJ   cat  self-conceit COP FP like
               'Really?  Somehow cats are self-conceited.'
 8   B:        e::: demo kawaii yone
               ITJ  but  cute   FP
               'Eh,  but they are cute.'
 9   G:        e:::: kawaii↑
               ITJ    cute
               'Really? (Cats are) cute?'
10   B:   →    koneko ga  kawaii demo
               kitten NOM cute    but
               'But, kittens are cute.'
11   G:   →    a::: koneko wa kawaii ne
               ITJ  kitten TP cute    FP
               'Oh, kittens are cute ne.'
```

They conclude they prefer dogs to cats in line 1. Speaker G is a dog person, and that might be why she is surprised in line 9 when speaker B mentions that cats are cute (line 8). Upon speaker G's reaction, speaker B modifies her statements by saying kittens are cute (line 10). In line 11, speaker G supports speaker B's view that kittens are cute by using *ne*. First, she contrasts kittens with adult cats by using the topic marker contrastive "*wa,*" showing her opinion that kittens are cute but not adult cats (line 11). This opinion corresponds to her utterance in line 7, in which she explains why she does not like cats, i.e., she thinks cats are conceited.

Speaker G's utterance in line 11 is prefaced with a prolonged interjection "*a::,*" which corresponds with "oh" in English and is a change-of-state marker (Heritage, 1984). Here, before speaker B's utterance in line 10 that kittens are cute, speaker G opines that cats are not cute. After hearing speaker B's statement in line 10, speaker G changes the referent of her assessment from "cats in general" to "kittens in particular." In this sense, *ne* presents speaker G's new awareness because she did not think that cats were cute until speaker B's line 10 assessment.

Example (17) demonstrates how a speaker can use *yone* to display one's existing awareness. Before this segment, four female participants talk about speaker A's part-time job. Speaker A works at a famous chocolate store.

(17)
```
 1   B:        e↑ choko      tabereru↑
               ITJ chocolate can-eat
               'Can you have chocolate there?'
 2   A:        choko      moraeta      yo↑
               chocolate  could-receive FP
               'I got some chocolate.'
 3   B:        [a: ii   na::
               ITJ good FP
               'I am jealous.'
 4   G:        [a: ii   na::
               ITJ good FP
               'I am jealous.'
 5   B:   →    zettai     oishii   yo
               definitely delicious FP
               '(The chocolate) must be very delicious.'
```

```
6   C:            Un
                  Yes
                  'Yes.'
7   A:    →       metcha oishikatta
                  very   delicious-PST
                  '(The chocolate) was very delicious.'
8   B:    →       da yone
                  COP FP
                  'It is yone.'
```

When speaker B finds out that speaker A receives some free chocolates, she immediately comments on the taste of the chocolates (line 5). In line 7, speaker A upgrades her comment on chocolate with the adverb "*metcha* (very)," saying it was very delicious. Speaker B's *yone*-marked response to speaker A's assessment (line 8) corresponds to her comment in line 5, i.e., "*zettai oishii yo* (definitely delicious)." Thus, Example (17) illustrates that *yone* displays a speaker's existing awareness.

4.5   Discussion

The data in this study shows that only *ne* is used to respond to immediate situations such as what a speaker has just seen, heard, or known. Prefacing *ne* with the change-of-state marker "*a::*" or "*ja*" indicates previous discourse leading to the speaker's new awareness (Hamada, 1991; Heritage, 1984). *Yone* is not found in such a situation.

 Ne can be used in recall. In the examples, although information is already known to the speaker, it is not in the speaker's awareness before the *ne*-marked utterance. Using *ne* indicates that information just entered the speaker's awareness. In this sense, the function of *ne* is consistent with the immediate situation; that is, the speaker uses *ne* to present already-known information as a new awareness. In contrast, because *yone* indicates a speaker's existing awareness, the change-of-state marker "*a::*" does not frequently preface *yone*-marked responses.

Different question designs result in different uses of *ne* and *yone* in response to a question's answer. In the *ne* examples, questions are WH questions or polar questions, indicating speakers seek specific information. Also, *ne*-marked responses, in this case, tend to occur with the change-of-state marker "*a::*." Thus, the use of *ne* reflects a speaker's new awareness. In the *yone* examples, the question design is different. Yes, speakers also seek the answer, but they already recognize possible answers when articulating the questions. One particular question design (negative question or question in the form of "WH question + candidate answer") solicits confirmation of the speaker's existing awareness rather than seeking new information. Thus, when an answer confirms knowledge, the speaker's response to it tends to be associated with the marker *yone*.

When *ne* is used in second assessments to respond to first assessments, the *ne*-marked second assessment tends to be different from the assessment on the same referent that the speaker made in previous discourse. When using *yone* in such a situation, the *yone*-marked second assessment remains consistent with prior assessments made or implied by the speaker. In this sense, *yone* presents a speaker's existing awareness.

Now let us examine the use of *yone* and *ne* in Example (18), four participants are talking about their ideal partners. Before this segment, they talked about what kind of things they do not like.

(18)
```
1   H:            kechi toka
                  stingy like
                  'Like being cheap?'
2   K:    →       a: kechi [iya    da ne
                  ITJ stingy  dislike COP FP
                  'Oh, I don't like being cheap ne.'
```

```
3   L:    →               [kechi  iya      da   yone
                           stingy dislike COP FP
                           'I don't like being cheap yone.'
4   H:          kechi  iya      da
                stingy dislike COP
                '(You) don't like being cheap.'
```

When speaker H brings up "being cheap," speakers K and L immediately respond to it with almost the same assessment. The difference is that speaker K's *ne*-marked response prefaces the change-of-state maker "*a::*" while speaker L's *yone*-marked response does not. Using only conversational data, it is indeed impossible to know a speaker's underlying intention. However, a reasonable interpretation exists to explain the differences between *yone* and *ne* in response: Speaker K uses *ne* to present her new awareness; that is, she thinks at the moment of utterance that being cheap is not good. Speaker L uses *yone* to indicate her existing awareness; that is, she presents her thought in this way because she believed for a long time that being cheap is not good.

Example (18) is different in a noteworthy way from the four types of responses examined in this study. Speaker K and Speaker L use *ne* and *yone* to respond to a new topic. The new topic is not newly-learned information, nor does the response occur in a similar turn with other cases included in the study. It appears that the proposed hypothesis in this study is also able to explain the use of *yone* and *ne* in different situations, which are unexamined closely in the present study. Future research should explore this point with examples of *yone* and *ne* in other responding contexts. [6]

5   Conclusion

This study examined the differences between *yone* and *ne* in the context of responses with naturally occurring conversation data. This study has found that generally, *ne* is used to present the speaker's new awareness while *yone* shows the speaker's existing awareness. Also, this study shows that using *yone* or *ne* can be decided by how the speaker presents his/her state of awareness, rather than by the information per se to which *yone* or *ne* is attached.

This study is limited in several ways. First, the differences between *yone* and *ne* demonstrated in the present study apply within the context of four types of response. While the proposed hypothesis appears to successfully explain the difference between *yone* and *ne* in Example (18), the present study could not further explore this point due to the limited data. Future research regarding whether this hypothesis works in other settings, such as seeking confirmation or providing new information, both contexts in which the use of *yone* and *ne* overlap, may further expand the understanding of *yone* and *ne*. Second, this study focuses on using *yone* and *ne* to consider speakers' states of awareness and does not analyze the pragmatic functions of *yone* and *ne* in response in detail. Further investigation into the difference of pragmatic functions of *yone* and *ne* in response and other situations is strongly recommended.

Despite its limitations, this study certainly adds to our understanding of complex Japanese sentence-final particles. It also extends our knowledge of Akatsuka's (1985) proposal that Japanese grammar is sensitive to the cognitive distinction between "newly-learned information" and the

---

[6] In addition, as one reviewer points out, the order of "*ne*" and "*yone*" in Example (18) cannot be reversed. That is, it is unnatural to say "*a kechi iya da yone*" followed by "*kechi iya da ne*" in a situation in which two speakers are almost simultaneously responding to a question. While this irreversibility seems to be naturally accounted for by this study about the use of "*yone*" and "*ne,*" this point cannot be elaborated due to limited data and should be subject to further exploration.

"state of knowledge." The methods used for this study may be applied to other research on final sentence particles. Considering the complexity and frequent use of *yone* and *ne* in conversation, the insights gained from this study may also be of assistance to the field of teaching Japanese as a foreign language.

Transcription Conventions

1. Transcript symbols
[the point where overlapping talk begins
]   the point where overlapping talk ends
(.)   micro-pause
(0.0)   length of silence
::   noticeably lengthened sound
=   latched utterance
↑   rising intonation
 (( ))   transcriber's descriptions
hh   laughter

2. Abbreviations
AUX   auxiliary
COP   copula
FP   final particle
ITJ   interjection
LK   nominal linking particle
NEG   negative morpheme
NML   nominalizer
NOM   subject marker
O   object marker
PST   past tense
Q   question marker
QT   quotative marker
TAG   tag-like expression
TP   topic marker

References

Noriko Akatsuka (1985). Conditionals and the epistemic scale. *Language* 61(3): 625-639.

Yuko Asano-Cavanagh (2011). An analysis of three Japanese tags: *Ne*, *yone*, and *daroo*. *Pragmatics & Cognition* 19 (3):448-475.

Haruko Minegishi Cook (1990). The sentence-final particle *Ne* as a tool for cooperation in Japanese conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*1: 29-44.

Haruko Minegishi Cook (1992). Meanings of non-referential indexes: A case study of the Japanese sentence-final particle *ne*. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 12(4): 507–540.

Haruko Minegishi Cook (2001). Particles. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *Key Terms in Language and Culture,*176-179. Malden, Blackwell Publishers.

John Goldsmith and Erich Woisetschlaeger (1982). The logic of the English progressive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(1): 79–89.

Jeanette K Gundel (1985). Shared knowledge' and topicality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9 (1): 83-107.

Mari Hamada (1991). *Dewa' no kinoo: suiron to seitsuzokugo* [The functions of '*dewa*': inference and connectives]. *Handai Nihongo Kenkyuu* 3: 25-44. (in Japanese)

Yoko Hasegawa (2010). The sentence-final particles *ne* and *yo* in soliloquial Japanese. *Pragmatics* 20 (1):71–89.

Atsuko Hasunuma (1992). *Shuujoshi no fukugookei 'yone' no yoohoo to kinoo* [The use and functions of the compound sentence-final particle '*yone*']. *Taishoo Kenkyuu Dainigoo: Hatsuwa Maakaa Nitsuite*: 63-77. (in Japanese)

Atsuko Hasunuma (1995). *Taiwa niokeru kakunin kooi 'daroo' 'janaika' 'yone' no kakunin yoohoo* [Confirmation of action in dialogue: On the confirmation function of '*daroo*' '*janaika*' '*yone*']. In Niida Yoshio (ed.) *Fukubun no Kenkyuu* [Studies of Complex Sentences], 389–419. Tokyo, Kuroshio Shuppan. (in Japanese)

Kaoru Hayano (2011). Claiming epistemic primacy: *yo*-marked assessments in Japanese. In Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig (ed.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, 58–81. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kaoru Hayano (2013). *Territories of Knowledge in Japanese Conversation*. Utrecht, LOT.

John Heritage (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement." In John Heritage and J. Maxwell Atkinson (ed.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 299–345. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

John Heritage (2002). Oh-prefaced responses to assessments: a method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In C. Ford, B. Fox, and S. A. Thompson (ed.), *The language of turn and sequence*, 196-224. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

John Heritage and Geoffrey Raymond (2005). The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68 (1):15–38.

Eiko Izuhara (1993). *'Ne' to 'yo' saikoo – 'ne' to 'yo' no komyunikeeshon kinoo no koosatsu kara* [Revisit '*ne*' and '*yo*'- an analysis of the communicative functions of '*ne*' and '*yo*']. *Nihongo Kyooiku*:103-114. (in Japanese)

Eiko Izuhara (1994). *Kandooshi kantoojoshi shuujoshi 'ne/nee' no intoneeshonn – danwa shinkoo tono kakawari kara* [The intonation of interjection, interjectory particle, sentence-final particle '*ne/nee*'- the relation with conversation development]. *Nihongo kyooiku*: 96–107. (in Japanese)

Eiko Izuhara (2001). '*Ne' to 'yo' saisaikoo* [Re-revisit '*ne*' and '*yo*']. *Aichi Gakuin Daigaku Kyooyoobu Kiyoo* 49(1):35–49. (in Japanese)

Eiko Izuhara (2003). *Shuujoshi 'yo' 'yone' 'ne' saikoo* [Revisit sentence-final particle '*yo*' '*yone*' '*ne*']. *Aichi Gakuin Daigaku Kyooyoobu Kiyoo* 51(2): 1–15. (in Japanese)

Eiko Izuhara (2008). *Kantoojoshi shuujoshi no danwa kanri kinoo bunseki – 'ne' 'yone' 'yo' no baai* [A discourse management functional analysis of interjectory and sentence-final particle '*ne*' '*yone*' '*yo*']. *Aichi Gakuin Daigaku Kyooyoobu Kiyoo* 56(1): 67–82. (in Japanese)

Gail Jefferson (1984). Transcript notation." In J. Heritage and J. Maxwell Atkinson (ed.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis,* ix-xvi. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Akio Kamio (1994). The theory of territory of information: the case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21 (1): 67–100.

Akio Kamio (1995). Territory of information in English and Japanese and psychological utterances. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24 (3): 235–64.

Akio Kamio (1997). *Territory of Information*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing.

Yasuhiro Katagiri. (2007). Dialogue functions of Japanese sentence-final particles 'yo' and 'ne.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (7): 1313–23.

Shigehiro Kato (2001). *Bunmatsu joshi 'ne' 'yo' no danwa koosei kinoo* [The discourse constructive functions of the sentence-final particles 'ne' and 'yo']. *Toyama Daigaku Jinbun Gakubu Kiyoo* 35:31-48. (in Japanese)

Susumu Kuno (1972). Functional sentence perspective: A case study from Japanese and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3: 269-320.

DuckYoung Lee (2007). Involvement and the Japanese interactive particles *ne* and *yo*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (2):363–88.

Senko Maynard (1993). *Discourse Modality: Subjectivity, Emotion, and Voice in the Japanese Language*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing.

Naomi H McGloin, Mustuko Endo Hudson, Fumiko Nazikian, and Tomomi Kakegawa (2013). *Modern Japanese Grammar: A Practical Guide*. London, Routledge.

Kazuhito Miyazaki (2002). *Sheloshim 'ne' to 'na'* [The sentence-final particles 'ne' and 'na']. *Handai Nihongo Kenkyuu*14. 1-19. (in Japanese)

Junko Mori (1994). Functions of the connective *datte* in Japanese conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 4:147-163.

Emi Morita (2002). Stance marking in the collaborative completion of sentences: final particles as epistemic markers in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10: 220–233.

Keiko Noda (1993). *Shuujoshi 'ne' to 'yo' no kinou: 'yone' to kasanaru baai* [the functions of sentence-final particles 'ne' and 'yo': the cases of overlapping 'yone']. *Gengo Bunka to Nihongo Kyooiku* 6:10-21. (in Japanese)

Ellen F Prince (1992). The ZPG letter: subjects, definiteness, and information-status." In W. C. Mann and S. A. Thompson (ed.), *Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-raising Text*, 295-325., Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing.

Anita Pomerantz (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shaped." In J. Heritage and J. Maxwell Atkinson (ed.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 57-101. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hideki Saigo (2011). *The Japanese Sentence-final Particles in Talk-in-interaction.* Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing.

Emanuel A Schegloff (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis I*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Dan Slobin and Ayhan Aksu (1982). Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. In P. J. Hopper (ed.), *Tense-aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*: 185-200. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing.

Yukinori Takubo and Satoshi Kinsui (1997). Discourse management in terms of mental spaces. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28 (6): 741–58.

Hiroko Tanaka (2000). The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (8):1135–76.

Jun Xu (2016). *An Analysis of the Japanese Sentence-Final Particle Yone*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin Madison, Madison, Wisconsin.

Huifang Zhang (2009). *Shizen kaiwa niokeru 'yone' no imi ruikei to hyoogen kinoo* [The types of meaning and functions of 'yone' in natural conversation]. *Gengogaku Ronsoo Onrain Ban* 2: 17-32. (in Japanese)