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The particle *ne* occurs after various speech acts such as statements, questions, commands, suggestions, and so on. Also, the situations where *ne* occurs are varied. *Ne* occurs in situations 1) where the speaker believes that the information is shared between the speaker and the addressee, 2) where the speaker believes the addressee knows better than the speaker, 3) where the speaker believes the speaker knows better than the addressee, 4) where the speaker believes the addressee believes the opposite of what the speaker believes. The past analyses of *ne* fail to provide an account that is general enough to cover uses of *ne* after various speech acts in various situations. In addition, their claims are not precise enough to make predictions.

The goal of this paper is to present and test a governing principle for *ne* that is precise enough to be tested and general enough to cover uses of *ne* after various speech acts in various situations. I hypothesize that the use of the particle *ne* reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee is committed to the state of affairs denoted by the propositional content of the statement or directive preceding the particle. This paper argues that what is crucial in explaining the distribution and the interpretation of *ne* is the speaker's belief about the addressee's commitment, not the speaker's own commitment to the propositional content of the utterances.

1. Introduction

Japanese sentence-final particles (SFPs) convey the speaker's attitude toward what is being said. SFPs have no denotation and do not contribute to the truth-conditional meanings of utterances. In (1), examples of some SFPs are listed. As can be seen in (1), all the sentences have the same truth-conditional
meaning: they are true if Taroo has the property of singing well. However, SFPs in (1) are used to express different attitudes of the speaker. Since SFPs do not contribute to the truth-conditional meanings of utterances, SFPs cannot be treated in truth-conditional semantics. Since SFPs convey the speaker's attitude toward an utterance, and an utterance with an SFP is more appropriate in one context than another, pragmatic factors such as beliefs, intentions, and goals are essential for interpreting an utterance with SFPs.

(1) a. yo
   Taroo wa uta ga umai yo.
   TOP singing NOM be good at
   Taroo sings well, (I tell you).'

b. zo
   Taroo wa uta ga umai zo.
   'Taroo sings well, (damn it)!'

c. wa
   Taroo wa uta ga umai wa.
   'Oh, Taroo sings well.....'

d. sa
   Taroo wa uta ga umai sa.
   'Taroo sings well, (naturally).'

e. ne
   Taroo wa uta ga umai ne.
   'Taroo sings well, doesn't he?'

This paper focuses on the particle ne, and shows that the possible interpretations of ne follow as logical consequences of the ne-principle. Since the possible interpretations follow from the ne-principle and what the speaker and the addressee are considered to believe in a given situation, why a use of ne has a certain effect in a given context can be explained.

The particle ne can be used after statements, questions, commands, suggestions, and other kinds of speech acts, as shown in (2-6).

(2) Statement + ne
   Kyoo wa atsui ne.
   today TOP hot
   'It's hot today + ne'
(3) **Question + ne**

Doko e ikun da ne.
where DAT go COP
'Where are you going? + ne'

(4) **Command + ne**

Okinasai ne.
get up (command)
'Get up + ne'

(5) **Request + ne**

Namae o kaite kudasai ne.
name ACC write (give me a favor)
'Please write your name (for me) + ne'

(6) **Suggestion + ne**

Gohan tabeyoo ne.
meal eat(volitional)
'Let's have meal + ne.'

Past analyses tend to focus on the uses of *ne* after statements (e.g., Ohso: 1986, Cheng: 1987, Kamio: 1990 & 1994, Maynard: 1993), and do not provide a general account covering the uses of *ne* after other kinds of acts. Even though Masuoka (1991) attempted an unified analysis of the uses of *ne* after both statements and directives, his hypothesis is not precise enough to be tested. Masuoka claimed that "the underlying meaning of *ne* is the speaker's judgment that the speaker's knowledge and intention is not in conflict with what the speaker believes to be the addressee's knowledge and intention" [my translation]. It is not clear what knowledge and intention are being referred to. Thus, his claim cannot be tested.

Not only the speech acts that precede *ne*, but also the situations where *ne* occurs are varied. *Ne* occurs in situations 1) where the speaker believes that information is shared between the speaker and the addressee, 2) where the speaker believes the addressee knows better than the speaker, 3) where the speaker believes the speaker knows better than the addressee, 4) where the speaker believes the addressee believes the opposite of what the speaker believes.

Typically, *ne* has been described as being used when the speaker believes information is shared between the speaker and the addressee (e.g., Ohso:1986,
Cheng:1987, Masuoka:1991, Kamio:1979, 1989, 1990) or when the speaker believes the addressee has more information than the speaker (e.g., Cheng:1987). For example, the speaker may use ne when he makes a statement that expresses information that he believes to be shared between the speaker and the addressee, as in (7).

(7) Koko nisan nichi hontooni atsui ne.
    these 2, 3 days really hot
    'It's been really hot for a few days, hasn't it?'

The speaker may use ne to confirm whether what he believes is correct by depending on the addressee whom the speaker believes to know more about the information, as in (8).

(8) (Anata ga) tanaka-san desu ne.
    you NOM COP
    'You are Tanaka, right?'

As Cheng (1987) admits, contrary to his characterization of ne as the particle used when the speaker believes the addressee has better understanding of the information, ne can be used after a statement that expresses information that the speaker is considered to have better understanding than the addressee. When the speaker talks about his own perception or experience, as in (9), he is considered to have better understanding than the addressee.

(9) Boku wa mita koto nai ne.
    I TOP saw event not
    'I haven't seen (it) before.' (from Cheng:1987)

Also, ne can be used when the speaker tells the addressee something that the addressee does not want to hear (e.g., Cook: 1992). For example, the speaker may use ne after a statement that expresses a proposition that the speaker believes the addressee does not believe. For example, if a speaker wants to convince his addressee, who is satisfied with her presentation, that her presentation of a graph is bad, the speaker can use ne, as in (10).

(10) Kono zu no ichi wa guai warui ne.
    this graph GEN position TOP convenience bad
    'The position of this graph is not good, don't you think?'

As presented in (7-10), there are a variety of situations where ne occurs. However, past analyses fail to make claims general enough to account for all
uses of *ne* and still precise enough to predict the difference between *ne* and other sentence-final particles. For example, Cheng (1987)'s characterization (that *ne* is used when the speaker makes his understanding a better one by depending on the addressee, whom the speaker believes to have a better understanding than the speaker about the information) is not general enough, because *ne* can be used when the speaker has different beliefs and intentions, as seen in (7-10). As mentioned above, Masuoka (1991)'s claim (that the underlying meaning of *ne* is the speaker's judgment that the speaker's knowledge and intention is not in conflict with what the speaker believes to be the addressee's knowledge and intention) is not precise enough to be tested. Cook (1992) claims that *ne* indexes affective common ground between the speaker and the addressee. However, Cook claims elsewhere (1990) that another particle *no* indexes common ground between the speaker and the addressee, and does not characterize the difference between *ne* and *no*.

The goal of this paper is to present and test a governing principle for *ne* that is precise enough to be tested and general enough to cover uses of *ne* after various speech acts in various situations. The principle should be specific enough to predict the difference between other particles.

I hypothesize the general use condition of the particle *ne* as follows.

(11) Ne-principle

The use of the particle *ne* reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee is committed to the state of affairs denoted by the propositional content of the statement or directive preceding the particle.

This paper argues that what is crucial in explaining the distribution and the interpretation of *ne* is the speaker's belief about the addressee's commitment, not the speaker's own commitment to the propositional content of the utterances.

2. Explanation of the ne-principle

2.1. Definition of Commitment

The notion 'commitment' is defined following Lu (forthcoming). When one is committed to something, one is willing to be held responsible for it. When making a statement or directive, the speaker is committed to the speech act, and thus, willing to be held responsible for making the statement or directive.
Similarly, an addressee would be committed to, and thus, willing to be held responsible for
A. a state of affairs denoted by the propositional content of a statement if the addressee believes the proposition expressed by the statement to be true.
B. a state of affairs denoted by the propositional content of a directive if the addressee believes the addressee will perform the action expressed by the directive.

Since the *ne*-principle states that the speaker believes the addressee is committed, it follows that the use of *ne* reflects the speaker's belief that 1) the addressee believes the proposition expressed by the statement to be true, OR 2) the addressee is willing to perform the action expressed by the directive.

2.2. Directives

In this paper, directives are considered to be a speech act by which the speaker directs the addressee to do a certain action. Commands, requests, suggestions, and questions are considered to be subcases of directives. In making a command or request, the speaker orders or asks the addressee to do a certain action. Examples of commands are (12) and examples of requests are (13).

(12) a. Agare.
    enter (command plain)
    'Come on in.'

b. Agarinasai.
    enter (command polite)
    'Come on in.'

(13) a. Shio totte kure.
    salt fetch (give me the favor (plain))
    'Please pass me the salt.'

b. Shio totte kudasai.
    (give me the favor (polite))
    'Please pass me the salt.'

c. Shio totte.
    'Pass me the salt.'

Suggestions for joint action between the speaker and the addressee are also a subcase of directives in the sense that in making a suggestion, the speaker is directing the addressee to take the action with the speaker. Examples of
suggestions are in (14).

(14) a. Ikoo.
    go (volitional, plain)
    'Let's go.'

b. Ikimashoo.
    go (volitional, polite)
    'Let's go.'

Questions are a subcase of directives in the sense that by asking a question, the speaker directs the addressee to do a verbal action, which is to give the speaker an answer (providing the speaker with the information he wants in case of wh-questions). Examples of yes-no questions are in (15) and examples of wh-questions are in (16).

(15) a. Kyoo no kaji no koto kiita ka.
    today GEN fire GEN event hear(past, plain) Q
    'Did you hear about today's fire?'

b. Kyoo no kaji no koto kikimashita ka.
    hear(past, polite)
    'Did you hear about today's fire?'

(16) a. Doko e iku n da.
    where DAT go COP(non-past, plain)
    'Where are you going?'

b. Doko e iku n desu (ka).
    COP(non-past, polite)
    'Where are you going?'

2.3. Intonation on ne

As described in Jorden (1987), there are three kinds of ne: 1) ne with rising intonation, 2) ne with falling intonation, and 3) ne with falling intonation and long vowel (i.e., nee). This paper deals with only the first two types of ne (i.e., short ne with rising intonation and falling intonation). In this paper, ne with rising intonation will be written as ne? (with a question mark), while ne with falling intonation will be written as ne.

This paper assumes that rising intonation on ne indicates that the speaker suspects that the addressee is committed instead of believing that the addressee
is committed. That is, *ne*? reflects the speaker’s mental state that he thinks
but is not sure that the addressee is committed to the propositional content of
the speaker’s utterance.

This assumption is motivated by the fact that the speaker may be seeking
confirmation from the addressee when he uses *ne*? after a statement, as in (17).

(17) Kore wa toshokan desu *ne*?
    this TOP library COP
    'This is a library, right?'

If *ne* with rising intonation (*ne*?) reflects the speaker’s mental state that he
suspects that the addressee is committed to the propositional content of the
statement, the fact that the speaker may seek confirmation with *ne*? can be
explained: When the speaker thinks but is not sure that the addressee is
committed to the proposition, he may want confirmation from the addressee
that the addressee believes the proposition. Thus, by using *ne*, the speaker may
seek confirmation from the addressee.

There is another fact that motivates the assumption that rising intonation
on *ne* reflects the speaker’s mental state that he suspects that the addressee is
committed. It has to do with the difference in effects between the use of *ne*?
and *ne* after a directive. When the directed action is something that the
addressee believes to be beneficial only for the speaker, a directive with *ne* as in
(18a) sounds much more presumptuous than one with *ne*? as in (18b). With
(18a), the speaker sounds more like she is sure that her mother will buy her a
new skirt, while with (18b), the speaker sounds like she has to make sure of her
mother’s intention.

(18) a. Atarashii sukaato katte *ne*.
    new skirt buy
    'Please buy me a new skirt (I know you will).'

b. Atarashii sukaato katte *ne*?
    'Please buy me a new skirt, will you please?'

From the above motivations, this paper assumes that rising intonation on *ne*
reflects the speaker’s mental state that he suspects that the addressee is
committed to the propositional content of the speaker’s utterance.
3. Predictions

3.1. Importance of the addressee's belief

If the use of *ne* reflects the speaker's belief or suspicion that the addressee is committed to the proposition or the action, the addressee's belief or intention is crucial for the distribution of *ne*. This section shows that *ne* specifies the speaker's belief about the addressee's belief or intention, but it does not specify the speaker's own commitment to the proposition or the action expressed by the utterance.

3.1.1. No occurrence when the speaker believes the addressee had no chance to consider the proposition or the action

This section shows that *ne* specifies the speaker's belief about the addressee's commitment by showing that it is inappropriate to use *ne* in situations where the addressee's commitment is considered to be not present.

If the use of *ne* reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee is committed to the proposition, *ne* will not be used when the speaker believes the addressee has not had a chance to consider the proposition. If the speaker believes the addressee has had no chance to consider the proposition, the speaker believes the addressee cannot have a belief about the truth of the proposition. Thus, the speaker will not think the addressee believes the proposition to be true. For example, suppose a student, who does not usually say anything when he comes back home, says he saw something interesting to his sister, who has stayed in her room all day. In this situation, the speaker will not use *ne*, as in (19a), because he knows that his sister has no way of knowing what he saw that day, and thus cannot believe whether he saw something interesting is true or not.

(19) a. #Kyoo boku omoshiroi mono mita *ne*.
   today  I interesting thing saw
   'I saw something interesting today, right?'

b. Kyoo boku omoshiroi mono mita.
   'I saw something interesting today.'

If there is no *ne* as in (19b), the speaker does not sound like he thinks the addressee knows that he saw something interesting, and is simply stating he saw something interesting that day. Thus, (19b) is appropriate in this situation.

By using *ne* after a directive, the speaker makes it explicit that he believes
the addressee is willing to perform the action expressed by the directive. Thus, the ne-principle predicts that ne will not be used in a situation where the speaker believes the addressee has had no chance to consider the action. If the addressee has not considered the action, the speaker has no reason to believe that the addressee is willing to perform the action. For example, suppose there is a fire in the middle of the night. A mother, who never wakes up her little son in the middle of the night, wakes him up so that they can escape. In this situation, the mother will not use ne when she tells her son to wake up, as in (20a), because she believes her son had no chance to consider the action of waking up in the middle of the night.

(20) a. #Okinasai ne.
   wake up (command)
   'Don't you want to wake up?'

b. Okinasai.
   'Wake up.'

If the mother makes the command without ne as in (20b), she does not sound like she thinks her son has considered the action, and she is simply ordering him to wake up. Thus, in this situation, (20b) is appropriate.

3.1.2. The speaker may or may not be committed to the propositional content

The use of ne reflects the speaker's belief only about the addressee's belief and does not make any reference to whether the speaker is committed or not committed. In other words, when the speaker uses ne after a statement, he may or may not believe the proposition expressed by the statement to be true. When the speaker uses ne after a directive, he may or may not want the addressee to perform the action expressed by the directive.

Previous analyses (e.g., Ohso:1986, Cheng:1987, Masuoka:1991, Kamio:1991, Maynard:1993) do not make a distinction between whether the speaker has considered the proposition and whether the speaker believes the proposition to be true. The speaker must have considered the proposition in order for him to make an utterance that expresses the proposition, but he does not necessarily have to believe the proposition to be true. I argue that ne does not reflect whether the speaker himself believes the proposition to be true or wants the addressee to do the action expressed by the utterance preceding ne, but it does
reflect the speaker’s belief that the addressee believes the proposition or is willing to perform the action expressed by the speaker’s utterance.

3.1.2.1. When the speaker is not committed to the propositional content of his utterance, but he believes the addressee is committed to it

If *ne* reflects the speaker’s belief that the addressee is committed to the propositional content but does not reflect the speaker’s commitment to the proposition, the speaker should be able to use *ne* when he himself does not believe the proposition to be true, but he believes that the addressee believes it to be true. Indeed, *ne* can be used when the speaker makes a statement that expresses a proposition that the speaker believes to be false, but believes the addressee believes to be true. One of the situations where the speaker makes such a statement is when the speaker is echoing what the addressee has said or what the addressee believes. For example, suppose a younger sister insisted that she can ride on a cloud. In response to her statement, her older brother echoes what she has said. In this case, the brother makes the statement "Mari can ride on a cloud" with *ne* to confirm whether his sister believes the proposition, as in (21). In example (21), after confirming his sister’s belief, the brother is showing the logical consequences of her belief, confirming whether she believes each proposition.

(21) Sis: Mari-chan kumo no ue ni noreru mon.
Mari (I) cloud GEN top LOC can ride SFP
'Mari can ride on a cloud.'
Bro: Mari-chan kumo no ue ni noreru *ne*?
Mari cloud GEN top LOC can ride
'Mari can ride on cloud, right?'
Soodattara kumo wa Mari-chan ga noreru kurai katai *ne*?
so COP if cloud TOP Mari NOM can ride as much solid
'If that is the case, the cloud must be solid enough for you to ride on it, right?'
Soshitara hikooki wa kumo ni butsukatteshimau *ne*?
then airplane TOP cloud bump
'Then, airplanes should bump against the cloud, right?'
If the use of *ne* specifies that the speaker is committed to the proposition, in the
given situation, the brother must sound like he also believes people can ride on clouds. But since he doesn’t sound like it, the use of *ne* does not specify that the speaker is committed to the proposition.

If *ne* following directive only specifies the speaker’s belief about the addressee’s willingness to perform the action and does not specify the speaker’s own intention, the speaker should be able to use *ne* in a situation where he believes the addressee is willing to perform the action but the speaker does not want the addressee to perform the action. One such situation is where the speaker echoes what the addressee has said he wants to do. The use of *ne* in this situation highlights the speaker’s belief that it is the addressee who is willing to perform the action. For instance, to a son, who is being difficult by saying he does not want to brush his teeth, the mother may say ‘Don’t brush your teeth. Get a cavity.’ with *ne*, as in (22).


        brushing do want not do want not no

       ‘I don’t want to brush my teeth. I don’t want to. I don’t.’

Mother: Ja, ha migaku no yamenasai *ne*.

then teeth brush NOMI stop(command)

‘Then, don’t brush your teeth, OK?’

If the speaker must be committed to the action expressed by the directive, the mother in (22) should sound like she really wants her son to stop brushing his teeth. But, since this is not the case, the use of *ne* does not specify that the speaker is committed to the action expressed by the directive.

3.1.2.2. The speaker may sound cold when he is expected to be committed

If the speaker can be either committed or not committed, as I claim he can, the speaker may sound detached or cold when the speaker is expected to be committed to the proposition. For example, when a husband, who has been diagnosed as having a tumor, comes back from the hospital saying that his tumor is not malignant, his wife may be interpreted as sounding cold if she says ‘that’s good’ with *ne* in an apathetic tone of voice.

(23) a. Yokatta *ne*.

           good

       ‘That’s good for you.’
b. Yokatta.

'That's good.'

Whether the speaker sounds cold or not depends on her tone of voice. In other words, the speaker may be interpreted as committed to the proposition 'the fact that the result of the test was good' was good', and does not sound cold with the utterance in (23a). However, since the speaker could be interpreted as sounding cold (i.e., the speaker is not committed to the proposition), the particle ne itself does not specify that the speaker is committed to the proposition. In otherwords, ne itself is neutral in terms of the speaker's commitment.

3.2. What the speaker intends to do by using ne differs depending on the speaker's commitment

The previous section (Section 3.1.) showed that it is the speaker's belief about the addressee's belief that ne specifies. The speaker may or may not be committed to the proposition or the action. When the speaker is committed, the speaker may believe he is more committed than the addressee, less committed than the addressee, or committed as much as the addressee. This section shows that while the use of ne does not specify the speaker's commitment, what the speaker intends to do by using ne differs depending on the speaker's commitment and what the speaker believes the addressee believes about the speaker's commitment.

This section shows that the ne-principle and the speaker's commitment constrains what the speaker is able to do by using ne. The speaker's commitment is classified into four categories: 1) when the speaker is NOT committed, 2) when the speaker is committed, and he believes he is less committed than the addressee, 3) when the speaker believes he is committed as much as the addressee, 4) when the speaker believes he is more committed than the addressee (includes the situation where the speaker believes the addressee is NOT committed).

The present approach, in which the function of ne is predicted to follow from the ne-principle and the degree of the speaker's commitment, is more comprehensive and more explanatory than an approach in which the possible functions of ne are listed (e.g., Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo (National Language Research Institute of Japan: 1951)). This approach is more comprehensive than
an approach in which one of the possible commitment of the speaker is considered as the core use of *ne*. Kamio (1990) seems to consider the third case (i.e., where the speaker believes he is committed as much as the addressee), and Cheng (1987) considers the second case (i.e., where the speaker believes he is less committed than the addressee), to be the core use of *ne*, overlooking the point that *ne* can be used when the speaker is not committed or when the speaker believes the addressee is not committed.

3.2.1. Statement + *ne*

The following four sections show that what the speaker may intend to do by using *ne* follows from the *ne*-principle and the extent to which the speaker himself is committed to the proposition.

In the following cases, what differs is only the speaker's commitment and what the speaker believes the addressee believes about the speaker's commitment. In all four cases, the speaker represents himself as believing that the addressee believes the proposition.

Case 1: The speaker does not believe the proposition to be true

The use of *ne* indicates that the speaker believes that the addressee believes the proposition. When the speaker himself does not believe the proposition to be true, and he believes the addressee also believes the speaker does not believe the proposition, the speaker may use *ne* to confirm whether the addressee believes what the speaker believes the addressee believes. As seen in (24), where an older brother confirms with his sister whether she believes people can ride on clouds, he may use *ne* to confirm she really believes this.

(24) Sis: Mari-chan kumo no ue ni noreru mon.
    Mari (1) cloud GEN top LOC can ride SFP
    'Mari can ride on a cloud.'
Bro: Mari-chan kumo no ue ni noreru *ne*?
    Mari cloud GEN top LOC can ride
    'Mari can ride on a cloud, right?'

If there is no *ne* in the brother's utterance in (24), he sounds like he is asserting that she can ride on a cloud, and does not sound like he is confirming whether she believes this.

Case 2: The speaker believes the proposition, but the speaker believes he believes
the proposition less strongly than the addressee

When the speaker himself believes the proposition, but he believes his commitment is weaker than that of the addressee's, the speaker may use *ne* to confirm whether the addressee believes the proposition in order to strengthen his own belief. For example, suppose X is supposed to pick up Tanaka, whom X has never met before, at an airport. Upon meeting a person who matches the description of Tanaka at the airport, X can confirm with the person whether he is Tanaka (i.e., whether his own belief is correct), as in (25a).

(25) a. X: Tanaka-san desu *ne?*

     COP

     '(You) are Tanaka, right?'

     b. X: Tanaka-san desu.

     '(You) are Tanaka.'

In (25a), X thinks the person is Tanaka. X believes the person who matches the description of Tanaka knows better than X whether he is Tanaka or not (since everybody is considered to know his own identity with certainty). Thus, X can use *ne* to confirm whether the person believes he is Tanaka in order to confirm X's own belief about the person. If *ne* is not used as in (25b), the speaker is asserting that the person is Tanaka and is not seeking confirmation.

This case (Case 2) is what Cheng (1987) considers to be the core use of *ne*. If Case 2 is the core use of *ne*, however, it is impossible to explain other cases, especially ones where the speaker does not believe the proposition (Case 1) or where the addressee does not believe the proposition (Case 4). Thus, Cheng's analysis is not comprehensive.

Case 3: The speaker believes he believes the proposition as strongly as the addressee

When the speaker believes he believes the proposition as strongly as the addressee, the speaker may use *ne* to acknowledge that the speaker and the addressee have shared beliefs. For example, suppose X and Y are walking on a very warm day. X feels it is hot and X also sees Y sweating. X states it is hot while displaying shared belief between X and Y by using *ne* as in X in (26a).

(26) a. X: Kyoo wa atsui desu *ne.*

     today TOP hot (polite)

     'It's a hot day, isn't it?'
b. X: #Kyoo wa atsui desu.

'It's a hot day.'

If *ne* is not used as in (26b), X sounds like he is simply describing the weather and does not sound like he is intending to implicate that there is a shared belief between X and Y. Thus, the utterance without *ne* is not appropriate in a small-talk situation, where the interlocutors are expected to display shared beliefs.

**Case 4: The speaker believes he believes the proposition more strongly than the addressee (and possibly that the addressee does not believe the proposition at all)**

The most extreme case, that is the case where the speaker believes the addressee has considered the proposition but does not believe it to be true, will be discussed here.

By using *ne*, the speaker represents himself as believing that the addressee believes the proposition to be true. Even if the speaker believes that the addressee does not believe the proposition, he may still use *ne* if he intends to make it appear to the addressee that he believes the addressee already believes the proposition. As discussed in Section 3.1., it is the addressee's belief that is focused by the use of *ne*. In other words, when the speaker uses *ne*, the speaker and the addressee both know that it is the addressee's belief that the speaker is referring to by using *ne*. If the speaker uses *ne* after a proposition that the speaker believes the addressee does not believe to be true, the speaker flouts the first part of maxim of Quality (i.e., the speaker says something he believes to be false). Assuming that the addressee believes the speaker is a rational being, the addressee infers that the speaker is saying something that he believes the addressee ought to believe, while making it appear to the addressee that the speaker believes the addressee also believes the proposition.

For example, when X tells his friend Y, who hates seeing a doctor, that Y should see a doctor regularly, X may use *ne* to tell Y he should go to see a doctor while making it look like Y also believes this, as in (27).

(27) Teekiteki ni isha ni mite moratta hoo ga ii ne.

regularly doctor by check receive NOM good

'It's better (for you) to be seen by a doctor regularly, don't you think?'

If *ne* is not used in (27), the speaker sounds like he is telling the addressee what is good for him without caring about how the addressee might take what the speaker is telling him.
3.2.2. Directive + *ne*

Case 1: The speaker does not want the addressee to do the action

The use of *ne* makes it explicit that the speaker believes the addressee is willing to perform the action. Since *ne* does not specify the speaker's commitment to the propositional content, as discussed in Section 3.1., the speaker may not want the addressee to do the action when he makes a directive. When the speaker does not want the addressee to do the action, the speaker can use *ne* to highlight that it is the addressee who wants to perform the action. One situation where the speaker makes a directive when he actually does not want the addressee to perform the action is when the speaker echoes what the addressee says he wants to do. As shown in (28), a mother whose son is being difficult by saying he does not want to brush his teeth may say 'Don't brush your teeth' with *ne* to the son to make it explicit that it is he who wants not brush his teeth. ((22) is repeated as (28) here)

   brushing do want not do want not no
   'I don't want to brush my teeth. I don't want to. I don't.'

Mother: Ja, ha migaku no yamenasai *ne*.
   then teeth brush NOMI stop(command)
   'Then, don't brush your teeth, OK?'

Even without *ne*, by echoing the son's intention, the mother can implicate that it is he who wants to do the action. But, the utterance with *ne* makes it more explicit that it is the son who wants to not brush his teeth.

Case 2: The speaker wants the addressee to do the action, but he does not believe he wants the addressee to do it as much as the addressee wants to do it

When the speaker wants the addressee to do the action, but he does not believe he wants the addressee to perform the action as much as the addressee wants to do it, the speaker can use *ne* to highlight the fact that the addressee wants to perform the action. One such situation is where the speaker is reluctantly suggesting that the addressee perform a joint action with the speaker. For example, a wife who really wants to go to St. Louis with her husband has been suggesting to her husband that they go to St. Louis together. The husband, who is not much interested in going to St. Louis, has not agreed to visit there with her. One day, they go to Carbondale together. When they are about to go
home, the wife suggests again that they go to St. Louis together. In this situation, the husband may use *ne* after the suggestion to let his wife know that he is suggesting that they go to St. Louis together not because he really wants to go, but because she has been persistent about it and he just wants her to shut up.

(29) Wife:

Sekkaku koko made kitanda kara saa, sentoruisu ni mo
this far here to came because SFP St. Louis DAT also
tsuideni ikoo yo. Nee ikoo yo.
go (volitional) SFP go (volitional) SFP

'Since we have come all the way (to Carbondale), let's go to St. Louis, too. Let's go!'

Husband:

a. Jyaa, ikoo *ne.*
then go (volitional)
'Then, let's go, OK?'

b. Jyaa, ikoo.
'Then, let's go.'

Even if there is no *ne* in the husband's utterance, as in (29b), the fact that the husband is making the suggestion implies that he decided to do what his wife has been suggesting they do together. But since the utterance with *ne* makes it explicit that he believes his wife wants to perform the action, the husband sounds like he has reluctantly decided to do what has been suggested (i.e., it is not that he wants do the action, but that she is so insistent that he has to agree with her).

**Case 3:** The speaker believes he wants the addressee to do the action as much as the addressee wants to do the action

By using *ne* after a directive, the speaker indicates that he believes the addressee is willing to perform the action expressed by the directive. Thus, when the speaker believes he wants the addressee to do the action as strongly as the addressee wants to do the action, the speaker can use *ne* to highlight the fact that the speaker knows what the addressee wants to do and what the addressee wants to do is exactly what the speaker wants the addressee to do. Therefore, by using *ne* in this case, the speaker can show that he and the addressee are
intimate enough for him to be able to order the addressee to do what the addressee wants to do, and the speaker can show solidarity between him and the addressee.

For example, suppose X knows that her best friend Y likes chocolate cake very much. X has invited Y to her place, and X puts some dessert on the table, including a chocolate cake. While Y is eating something else, X tells Y to eat the chocolate cake also, using *ne*, as in (30a).

(30) a. X: Kono keeki mo tabete *ne*.
   this cake also eat(request)
   'Please eat this cake, too, OK?'

b. X: Kono keeki mo tabete.
   'Please eat this cake, too.'

If there is no *ne*, as in (30b), X does not sound like she and her friend are as intimate as when *ne* is present.

Case 4: The speaker believes he wants the addressee to do the action more strongly than the addressee wants to do the action (and possibly that the speaker believes the addressee does not want to do the action at all)

The most extreme case, that is the case where the speaker believes the addressee does not want to do the action, will be discussed here.

Since the use of *ne* indicates that the speaker believes that the addressee is willing to perform the action, when the speaker uses *ne* after a directive that expresses an action that the speaker believes the addressee does not want to perform, the speaker flouts the first part of the maxim of Quality (i.e., the speaker says something he believes to be false). Assuming that he believes the speaker is a rational being, the addressee would infer that the speaker is saying something that he believes the addressee ought to do, while confirming that the addressee agrees with the idea of doing that action.

For example, suppose X, who is not rich, is presenting an expensive gift to Y, who has helped X with her work. Since Y knows that X is not very rich and should not spend a lot of money on a gift, Y says he cannot accept the gift. But, X, who really wants Y to take the gift, tells Y to take the gift with *ne*.

(31) a. Uketotte kudasai *ne*?
   receive (give me a favor)
   'Please take this, will you?'
b. Uketotte kudasai.

'Please take this.'

If there is no *ne* as in (31b), X sounds like she is telling Y what to do, without regard for what Y is thinking. By using *ne*, the speaker can implicate the following: 'Even though you don’t want to take this gift, I do want you to take this. Is that all right with you?', and is able to represent himself as caring about the addressee’s position.

This section (Section 3.2.) showed that while the use of *ne* does not specify the speaker’s commitment to the propositional content, what the speaker is able to do by using *ne* is restricted by the speaker’s commitment and what the speaker believes the addressee believes about the speaker’s commitment. Since what the speaker is able to do by using *ne* is constrained by how much the speaker is committed relative to the addressee’s commitment in a predictable fashion, it is not necessary to specify the speaker commitment in the *ne*-principle.

3.3. Obligatory vs. Optional

This section argues that it is not necessary to make a distinction between the uses of *ne* that are obligatory and the ones that are optional because whether the use of *ne* is obligatory or not in a given context follows from normal beliefs about the situations in which the speaker is expected to represent himself as believing that the addressee is committed to the propositional content of his utterance.

Kamio (1990) distinguishes between an 'obligatory *ne*' and an 'optional *ne*'. Kamio states that when the speaker assumes that the speaker and the addressee possess identical information as ALI (Already Learned Information), *ne* must accompany the speaker’s utterance (Obligatory *ne*) [Maynard’s translation]. In other words, Kamio claims that when the speaker believes that both the speaker and the addressee already believe the proposition expressed by the speaker’s utterance, the speaker must use *ne*. On the other hand, Kamio states that when the speaker especially wants to express a co-responding attitude by his own expression, the speaker’s utterance can be accompanied by *ne* (Optional *ne*) [Maynard’s translation]. In other words, Kamio claims that the use of *ne* is optional when the speaker does not think the addressee already believes the proposition expressed by his utterance, and the use of *ne* depends on whether the
speaker wants to seem to believe he and the addressee already believe the proposition in order to show solidarity with him. What distinguishes the obligatory *ne* and the optional *ne* is whether the speaker actually believes the addressee already believes the proposition expressed by his utterance.

In contrast to Kamio’s claim, the present approach claims that the use of *ne* is not determined by whether the speaker actually believes the addressee believes the proposition, but by whether the speaker intends to represent himself as believing that the addressee believes the proposition. When the speaker uses *ne*, he may or may not actually believe that the addressee believes the proposition. Since in the present approach the speaker’s actual belief about the addressee’s belief does not determine the use or non-use of *ne*, it is not necessary to make a distinction between obligatory *ne* and optional *ne* as Kamio does. In the present approach, all uses of *ne* (or other particles) are ‘optional’ in the sense that the speaker chooses them in order to achieve a certain effects that he wants.

If Kamio’s claim is correct, in a situation where the speaker is considered to believe that he and the addressee share a belief, *ne* must be used. For example, suppose that two people are walking outside on a hot day in summer and both of them can see the other one is also sweating. If one of them wants to say, ‘It is hot today’, Kamio’s claim predicts the speaker must use *ne*, because in this situation, he is considered to think that the other one also believes the proposition it is hot that day from the other person’s sweat. Thus, Kamio’s claim predicts that *ne* (32a) is acceptable, while (32b) is not acceptable in this situation.

(32) a. Kyoo wa atsui *ne*.
   today TOP hot
   'It’s hot today, isn’t it?'

b. Kyoo wa atsui.
   'It’s hot today.'

In contrast to Kamio’s claim, if the present claim is correct, *ne* does not have to be used in the same situation. It is what the speaker wants to achieve that determines the appropriateness of *ne*. Thus, both (32a) and (32b) are predicted to be acceptable in this situation, where the speaker sees the addressee’s sweat, and this is exactly the case. If the speaker’s goal is to display shared belief between the interlocutors, he chooses to use *ne*, as in (32a), but if he simply
wants to blurt out his own feeling about the weather without the intention of interacting with the addressee, he does not use *ne*, as in (32b). Since the prediction of the present claim is borne out, the present claim is supported.

The following section discusses how the present approach explains the fact that was explained by Kamio as 'obligatory *ne*'. There are some cases where *ne* must be used in order for an interaction to be natural. One such example is where two neighbors are making small-talk about the weather. The speakers in (33) both use *ne*. If *ne* is missing from either X or Y’s utterance in (33), the interaction does not function as small-talk.

(33) X:  Mainichi yoku furu  *ne*.
       everyday a lot fall
       'It rains a lot every day, doesn’t it?'

Y:  Soo da  *ne*.
     so  COP
     'It sure does.'

According to Kamio’s analysis, since X and Y are neighbors, X and Y both think that the proposition, it rains a lot everyday, is shared between the two. Because X and Y each thinks his addressee believes the same proposition as he does, they must use *ne*.

In contrast, the present approach, which claims that the use of *ne* is controlled by the speaker’s intention to represent himself as believing that the addressee believes the proposition, explains the fact that X and Y choose to use *ne* in the above situation as follows.

By using *ne*, X represents himself as believing that the addressee believes the proposition, and is able to acknowledge that the addressee believes the proposition. One situation where the speaker wants to acknowledge the addressee’s belief is where the speaker himself believes the proposition and he wants to make it explicit that he and the addressee have a shared belief. Making small talks is a case where the speaker wants to display a shared belief between him and the addressee. In small talk, what is important is not the content of what is said, but the fact that the interlocutors are interacting and displaying shared beliefs between them. Thus, upon meeting one’s neighbor, a person may use *ne* to tell his friend it rains a lot to display their shared belief, as in (34).

(34) X:  Mainichi yoku furu  *ne*.
everyday a lot fall
'It rains a lot every day, doesn't it?'

If X does not use *ne* in (34), he does not represent himself as believing that the addressee also believes the proposition. The fact that there is a particle like *ne* in Japanese, which reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee believes the proposition, forces speakers of Japanese to make a distinction between an utterance with *ne* and one without *ne*. Thus, if *ne* is not used in X's utterance, X sounds like he simply blurts out what he thinks at that time without acknowledging Y's belief, as in (35).

(35) X: Mainichi yoku furu.
      everyday a lot fall
      'It rains a lot every day'.

Since the goal of small talk is to interact with others and display shared beliefs, X's utterance without *ne* is not acceptable in the above small-talk-situation. Thus, *ne* in X's utterance is crucial in making the interaction smooth.

Next, we turn to the use of *ne* by Y. Assuming that the goal of small talk is to interact and display shared beliefs, Y responds to X by showing that he agrees with X (i.e., Y says 'that's right'). In showing agreement, if Y wants to make it explicit that he believes that X also believes that the proposition 'that's right' to be true, Y chooses to use *ne* as *Soo da ne* (that's right + *ne*). Since in small talk the interlocutors ought to display shared beliefs, Y chooses to use *ne*, which makes it explicit that he believes the addressee believes the proposition.

If there is no *ne* in Y's utterance, Y sounds as if he has the authority to tell X the correctness of X's previous statement. As mentioned above, the fact that there is a particle like *ne* in Japanese forces speakers of Japanese to make a distinction between an utterance with *ne* and one without *ne*. In other words, a simple statement without *ne* is not the same as in a language that does not have a particle like *ne*. In Japanese, the non-use of *ne* reflects the speaker's belief that he is the one who believes the proposition to be true, making himself look like he is the only one who believes the proposition. Thus, Y sounds as if he were the only one who believes X's statement is true, as in (36).

(36) X: Mainichi yoku furu *ne*.
      everyday a lot fall
'It rains a lot everyday, doesn’t it?’

Y: Soo da.
so COP

‘That’s right.’

Since in small talk, the interlocutors are expected to display shared beliefs, Y uses *ne* to acknowledge that he believes X also believes X’s statement is true, as in (33). Thus, the use of *ne* in Y’s utterance is crucial in a small-talk situation.

Thus, the uses of *ne* in the above example (33) are socially obligatory, not because the speaker is considered to actually believe that the addressee believes the proposition, but because the non-use of *ne* reflects the speaker’s belief that he is the one who believes the proposition and the fact that the speaker is expected to interact with the addressee and display shared beliefs with him in a given situation (i.e., small-talk situation).

3.4. Politeness Effect

When the speaker tells the addressee what he should believe, the use of *ne* has been described as reducing threat to the addressee’s face by implicating that the speaker and the addressee have shared beliefs or feelings (e.g., Cook:1992). There is some truth to this, but it is a one-sided account because it does not refer to the fact that the same utterance with *ne* may threaten the addressee’s face by implicating that the speaker is imposing his own belief on the addressee. This section shows that the *ne*-principle and what the addressee considers to be the speaker’s motivation for using *ne* predict whether an utterance with *ne* gives face-threat or reduces face-threat for the addressee.

As discussed in Section 3.2.1.(Case 4), when *ne* is used after a sentence whose proposition the speaker believes but believes that the addressee does not believe, the use of *ne* implicates that the speaker believes the addressee ought to believe the proposition, while making it seem to the addressee like the speaker believes the addressee already believes the proposition. By making it seem like the addressee also believes what the speaker believes, the speaker can reduce confrontation while telling the addressee what to believe. Thus, the use of *ne* has the effect of making the utterance less confrontational.

For example, when a mother tells her son, who hates seeing a doctor, that
he should see a doctor regularly, the use of *ne* makes the utterance less confrontational and less face-threatening, as in (37a). This is because the son trusts his mother and thinks that his mother would not impose her belief on him to manipulate him.

(37) a. Teekiteki ni isha ni mite moratta hoo ga **ii ne.**
    regularly doctor by check receive NOM good
    'It's better (for you) to be seen by a doctor regularly, don't you think?'

b. Teekiteki ni isha ni mite moratta hoo ga ii.
    'It's better (for you) to be seen by a doctor regularly.'

If there is no *ne*, as in (37b), the mother cannot represent that there is a shared belief between her and her son, and thus sounds like she is simply telling him what is good for him without caring about how he might take what she says.

On the other hand, the use of *ne* in (37a) has the potential to make the speaker sound manipulative by imposing her own belief on the addressee as if it were the addressee's belief in the first place, ignoring the addressee's autonomy. If the addressee thinks the speaker is imposing his belief on the addressee for the speaker's sake, the addressee feels like he is being manipulated by the speaker. For example, if the utterance in (37a) is made by a self-serving doctor who is only interested in making money, the addressee feels manipulated. This is because the patient (she) thinks that the doctor (he) is attributing his belief to her so that he can manipulate her (i.e., the doctor can make the patient come to see him regularly and he can make more money).

Thus, depending on how the addressee perceives the speaker's motivation for representing a shared belief between the speaker and the addressee, the use of *ne* can be a face-threat to the addressee, invading the addressee's autonomy.

3.5. Ironic Use

This section shows that *ne* can be used to make it explicit that the speaker is being ironic. This section first discusses what irony is, and then how *ne* can be used to indicate that the speaker is being ironic.

According to Sperber and Wilson (1986), an utterance is ironic when the speaker echoes a belief of someone other than the speaker and rejects or disapproves it. Kumon-Nakamura et. al. (1995), building on Sperber and Wilson's claim, describe that ironic utterances involve two major factors: 1) Ironic
utterances are intended to be allusive. They are intended to call the listener's attention to some expectation that has been violated in some way. 2) Ironically intended utterances involve pragmatic insincerity. They violate one or more of the felicity conditions for sincere speech acts.

Following the two major factors for ironic utterances proposed by Kumon-Nakamura et.al., the mother's utterance in (22) in Section 3.1.2.1. repeated here as (38) is ironic even without *ne*. In this situation, the son is being difficult by saying he does not want to brush his teeth. In response to him, the mother says, 'Then, don't brush your teeth.', as in (38).

   brushing do want not do want not no
   'I don't want to brush my teeth. I don't want to. I don't.'
Mother: Ja, ha migaku no yamenasai.
   then teeth brush NOMI stop(command)
   'Then, don't brush your teeth.'

The mother's utterance in (38) satisfies the two requirements for ironic utterances. 1) By echoing or repeating what the son wants to do (i.e., not brush his teeth), the mother can call attention to the fact that the son should be willing to brush his teeth, but he violated this expectation. 2) The mother is making a directive even though she does not want her son to perform the action expressed by her directive. Thus, a felicity condition for a directive (i.e., the speaker wants the addressee to perform the action) is violated.

As shown in Section 3.1., the use of *ne* specifies only the speaker's belief about the addressee's commitment. In other words, the speaker and the addressee both know that the speaker's use of *ne* refers to the addressee's commitment to the propositional content of the statement or directive. Thus, if the mother uses *ne* in her utterance in (38), she can make it explicit that she believes it is the son who wants the action, and thus, she is just echoing what the son wants. By making this explicit, the mother can strengthen the effects of the two requirements for ironic utterances. 1) By making it explicit that it is the son who wants to not brush his teeth, the mother can make it explicit that it is the son who is violating the expectation that he should be willing to brush his teeth. 2) By making it explicit that it is the son who wants to not brush his teeth, it becomes even more clear that the mother is making a directive even though she
does not want the addressee to not brush his teeth. Therefore, it becomes even clearer that the mother’s act of making the directive violates the felicity condition for a directive.

Thus, the ne-principle predicts that the use of ne should make it explicit that the speaker is being ironic in this situation. Therefore, it becomes clearer that the mother is being ironic with the directive with ne (39) than the one without ne (38), which is exactly the case.

      brushing do want not do want not no
      'I don’t want to brush my teeth. I don’t want to. I don’t.'
Mother: Ja, ha migaku no yamenasai ne.
      then teeth brush NOMI stop(command)
      'Then, don’t brush your teeth, OK?'
This section showed that the use of ne may make it explicit that the speaker is being ironic. This effect follows from the fact that the use of ne focuses on the speaker’s belief about the addressee’s commitment to the propositional content of the utterances, not the speaker’s commitment to the propositional content.

4. Ne vs. Yo

Ne and yo have similar properties. First, both ne and yo can occur after various kinds of speech acts, such as statements, questions, commands, suggestions, and so on. In addition, both of them refer to the speaker’s belief about the addressee’s belief. This section shows how the ne-principle and the yo-principle predict the difference between the two particles.

(40) Yo-principle
The use of the particle yo reflects the speaker’s belief that the addressee is NOT committed to the state of affairs denoted by the propositional content of the statement or directive preceding the particle.

(41) Ne-principle
The use of the particle ne reflects the speaker’s belief that the addressee is committed to the state of affairs denoted by the propositional content of the statement or directive preceding the particle.

According to the yo-principle, the use of yo reflects the speaker’s belief that the addressee is NOT committed to the proposition or the action. As discussed
in Kose (1997a), the claim that the addressee is not committed to the proposition or action refers to the following situations: 1) the addressee has not considered the proposition or the action (Case d in (42)), 2) the addressee has considered the proposition or the action but believes the proposition to be false or does not want to do the action (Case c), and 3) the addressee has considered the proposition or the action but has no opinion about them (Case b).

(42)

According to the *ne*-principle, the use of *ne* reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee IS committed to the proposition or the action. The situation where the addressee is committed to the proposition or the action is where the addressee believes the proposition to be true or is willing to perform the action (Case a in (42)).

The *yo*-principle and the *ne*-principle predict that *yo* and *ne* distribute complementarily in the sense that the two principles predict that *yo* can be used but *ne* cannot be used in a situation where the speaker believes the addressee has not considered the proposition or the action (i.e., 'out-of-the-blue situation', Cased in (42)), as confirmed in Kose (1997a) and Section 3.1.1. The two particles are complementary in the sense that the use conditions predict that *ne* can be used but *yo* will not be used in a situation where the speaker believes the addressee believes the proposition or is willing to perform the action (i.e., shared belief, Case a in (42)). Section 3.3. and Kose (1997a) confirm these points respectively.
4.1. The speaker wants to represent himself as believing that the addressee has contrary belief (Case c)

When the speaker believes that the addressee has considered the proposition but believes it to be false, the speaker may want to convince the addressee that the speaker is right and the addressee is wrong. When the goal of the speaker is to convince the addressee that the speaker is right and the addressee is wrong, yo and ne appear to have the following contrasting effects. With yo, the speaker appears to be stating strongly to the addressee that he should believe the proposition, while with ne, the speaker appears to be suggesting hesitantly to the addressee that he should believe the proposition as illustrated in (43).

(43) a. Kono zu no ichi wa guai warui yo.
   this graph GEN position TOP convenience bad
   'The position of this graph is not good, I tell you.'

b. Kono zu no ichi wa guai warui ne.
   'The position of this graph is not good, don't you think?'

This fact motivated scalar analyses like Yoshimoto (1992). Yoshimoto (1992) focuses on the difference between yo and ne and claims that yo strengthens the illocutionary meaning, while ne blurs the force of the utterance. As discussed in Kose (1997b), this kind of scalar approach is problematic because it stipulates a scalar ranking and thus cannot explain why yo seems to strengthen while ne seems to blur the illocutionary force, and it incorrectly assumes that SFPs show different degrees of strength of the same attitude.

The facts that motivated scalar analyses like Yoshimoto's follow from the yo-principle and the ne-principle. The use of yo reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee is not committed to the state of affairs denoted by the propositional content, while the use of ne reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee is committed to the state of affairs denoted by the propositional content. In other words, by using yo or ne, the speaker indicates different attitudes - by using yo, the speaker indicates that he believes the addressee is not committed, while by using ne, the speaker indicates that he believes the addressee is committed. From these principles the scalar relation follows that yo seems to strengthen and ne seems to blur the illocutionary force of stating or directing.

When the goal of the speaker is to convince the addressee who believes the
opposite of what the speaker believes that the speaker is right and the addressee is wrong, yo and ne have the following contrasting effects. By using yo after a statement, the speaker indicates that he believes the addressee does not believe the proposition. Thus, with yo, the speaker represents himself as someone who has not achieved his goal of making the addressee believe the proposition. This act makes the speaker appear more insistent in stating the proposition to the addressee. In contrast, using ne after the statement indicates that the speaker thinks the addressee already believes the proposition. Thus, with ne, the speaker represents himself as someone who already achieved his goal of making the addressee believe the proposition. Therefore, with ne, the speaker sounds less insistent.

For example, if a speaker wants to convince his addressee, who is satisfied with her presentation, that her presentation of a graph is bad, the speaker may use yo to state strongly to the addressee that her presentation is bad, as in (44).

(44) Kono zu no ichi wa guai warui yo.
this graph GEN position TOP convenience bad
'The position of this graph is not good, I tell you.'

On the other hand, if the speaker wants to avoid confrontation with the addressee when he makes her believe that what she believes is wrong, the speaker may use ne to state softly to the addressee as in (45).

(45) Kono zu no ichi wa guai warui ne.
'The position of this graph is not good, don’t you think?'

Since the present approach postulates independent principles for each SFP, it predicts that other SFPs do not necessarily differ in the same dimension. As argued in Kose (1997b), the difference among yo, zo, and wa is how directly the speaker can indicate that he believes the addressee should believe the proposition expressed by the utterance. The difference among yo, zo, and wa is not the same as the difference between yo and ne, which is whether the speaker represents himself as someone who has already achieved his goal or not. Thus, the present approach predicts that there will not necessarily be a single scale on which all SFPs can be placed, but there may be many separate scalar relations between particles.

4.2. A sincere answer to a sincere question

The yo-principle and the ne-principle predict that yo can be used but ne
cannot be used in answering a sincere wh-question in a sincere way. This section first discusses what the speaker is considered to believe when he gives a sincere answer to a sincere question. Then, it shows how the yo-principle and the ne-principle predict yo can be used but ne cannot be used in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question.

This section assumes that a wh-question expresses an open proposition, i.e. one that has unbound variable for at least one element. For example, the wh-question, 'What time is it?' is considered to express the open proposition, 'It is X o'clock', where X is a variable for what the questioner wants to know. A sincere answer to a sincere wh-question expresses a corresponding filled proposition.

(46) a. What time is it? \(\rightarrow\) 'It is X o'clock.' (open proposition)

b. It's nine o'clock. \(\rightarrow\) 'It is nine o'clock.' (filled proposition)

In answering a sincere wh-question like (46a), the answerer (the speaker) believes the questioner (the addressee) has considered the open proposition and expects a filled proposition, but does not know which of the possible filled propositions is true. Therefore, the answerer believes the questioner is not committed to the filled proposition. When the questioner (the addressee) is asking a question sincerely, he does not know which of the possible filled propositions is true and thus, does not believe the filled proposition to be true. If the addressee believed the filled proposition, he would not ask a question to the speaker.

Based on the above assumptions, the yo-principle predicts that yo can be used in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question: If the use of yo reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee does not believe the proposition to be true, yo can be used after a filled proposition constituting a sincere answer to a sincere question. This is because in answering a question, the answerer (the speaker) believes the questioner (the addressee) does not yet believe the filled proposition to be true. Thus, yo can be used to tell a questioner who has asked what time it is, as in (47).

(47) X: Ima nanji?

\[\text{now what o'clock}\]

'What time is it?'

Y: Kuji da yo.

\[\text{nine o'clock COP}\]

'IT's nine o'clock.'
In contrast, the *ne*-principle predicts that *ne* will not be used in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question. According to the *ne*-principle, by using *ne*, the speaker indicates that he thinks the addressee believes the proposition. Since the speaker indicates that he thinks the addressee already believes the proposition by using *ne*, *ne* will not be used in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question. This is because when the speaker gives a sincere answer to a sincere question, the speaker is considered to believe the addressee (the questioner) does not believe the filled proposition to be true. Thus, in the same situation as (47), where the speaker tells the questioner who asked what time it is, the speaker will not use *ne*, as predicted.

(48) X: Ima nanji?
     now what o’clock
   ‘What time is it?’
     Y: #Kuji da ne.
       nine o’clock COP
   ‘It’s nine o’clock, isn’t it?’

However, in some situation, *ne* can actually be used in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question, as pointed out by Hasunuma (1988) and Kinsui (1993). The next section presents in what situation *ne* can be used in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question and what effects the use of *ne* makes.

5. The use of *ne* in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question

Hasunuma (1988) and Kinsui (1993) point out that *ne* can actually be used even when the speaker is giving a sincere answer to a sincere question, if the question requires the speaker to think before he answers the question. For example in (49) Y may use *ne* when answering X’s question, which requires Y to calculate the number of years she has been working.

(49) X: Tsutomete nan nen me desu ka?
     work what year th COP Q
   ‘How long have you been working?’
     Y: Kotoshi de juukyuuunme desu ne.
      this year 19th year COP
   ‘(Let me see...) This is my 19th year.’

The fact that *ne* can be used even in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question
motivated Hasunuma and Kinsui to change the hypothesis that has the condition that the use of *ne* indicates the speaker’s belief that the addressee knows the proposition expressed by the speaker’s utterance. Since *ne* occurs in a situation where the hypothesis predicts it not to occur, Hasunuma and Kinsui conclude that the hypothesis that the speaker must believe that the addressee knows the proposition, must be changed.

Contrary to Hasunuma and Kinsui’s claims, the use of *ne* in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question can still be explained by the *ne*-principle, which has a condition that the speaker believes that the addressee believes the proposition expressed by the speaker’s utterance. The use of *ne* in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question can be explained by the *ne*-principle because the person whom the speaker is addressing to by using *ne* does not necessarily have to be the person other than the speaker. The speaker himself can be his own addressee. In other words, whom the speaker is addressing by using *ne* has to be inferred. Whom the speaker is looking at at the time of the utterance (i.e., whether the speaker is directly looking at the questioner’s eyes or not) helps to understand whether the use of *ne* is directed toward the questioner or the speaker himself. If the speaker’s use of *ne* is understood as directed toward the speaker himself, the speaker is considered to be interacting with himself while giving a sincere answer to the questioner.

If the speaker is understood as addressing himself when he gives a sincere answer to a sincere question, the speaker may use *ne* when he does not mind making it explicit that the speaker is interacting with himself when he answers to the questioner. Thus, the speaker will not use *ne* in answering a question that the speaker believes everyone believes he should be able to answer without conscious attention. For example, when the speaker is asked what his name is, as in (50), he is expected to be able to give an immediate answer.

(50) X: Anata no onamae wa?
    you GEN name TOP 'What is your name?'

    Y: #Nakamura Taroo desu *ne*.
        COP 'Nakamura Taroo, right?' (from Kinsui: 1993)

In answering questions like (50), it is predicted that the speaker will not use *ne*.
because the use of *ne* makes it sound like the speaker has to ask for confirmation from himself about his own name. Since the use of *ne* in giving a sincere answer makes the speaker sound like he is not sure about it and needs to think about it, the use of *ne* in giving a sincere answer is appropriate in a situation where the speaker has amnesia and is not sure about his own name.

If it is inferred that the speaker is addressing himself when giving a sincere answer to a sincere question, the use of *ne* indicates that the speaker believes that the addressee (which is himself) believes that the proposition expressed by an answer to the question is true. Since the speaker indicates that he is interacting with himself, the use of *ne* is appropriate when the speaker is answering a question that he believes everybody believes he may have to think about before answering. For example, for questions that the speaker believes everyone believes would require the answerer to calculate something, to search his memory, or to find appropriate words to express what he thinks, the speaker thinks everyone thinks it is natural for him to think about the answer. When giving an answer to this kind of question, the speaker may use *ne* in giving a sincere answer to let the questioner know that he has to think about the answer. For instance, when a worker who has been working for a while is asked how long he has been working, he may use *ne* to let the questioner know he has to calculate, as in (51).

(51) X: Tsutome te nan nen me desu ka?
   work what year th COP Q
   'How long have you been working?'

Y: Kotoshi de juukyuunenme desu ne.
   this year 19th year COP
   '(Let me see...) This is my 19th year.'

If *ne* is not used in Y's answer in (51), Y does not sound like he has to take time to calculate and sounds like he knows the answer off the top of his head.

If the use of *ne* in giving a sincere answer indicates that the speaker is addressing himself when answering a question, when the speaker uses *ne* in giving a sincere answer, the speaker exposes his mental activity of interacting with himself to the questioner. Thus, the speaker uses *ne* only when he does not mind exposing his mental activity to the questioner. Thus, the speaker is predicted not to use *ne* in a formal situation, where he is not expected to expose his private
mental life. For example, at a job interview, if an interviewee is asked for some information that he did not include in his resume (i.e., the interviewer is asking sincerely), he will not use *ne* in providing an answer to his interviewer even if it is a question of which he has to think about the answer, as in (52). If the interviewee uses *ne* he sounds like he believes he and the interviewer are close enough for him to expose his mental activity.

(52) X: Gakusei jidai ni zenbude ikutsu kurai no arubaito
college time at in total how many about GEN part-time job
o shimashita ka.
ACC did Q

'How many part-time job in total have you experienced while you were in college?'

Y: #Zenbude juuni desu *ne*.
in total twelve COP

'(Let me see,) it's twelve in total.'

An answerer may use *ne* in giving a sincere answer to the same question, as in (52), if the answerer and the questioner are close enough for him to expose his mental life. So, if X in (52) is Y's friend at a company whom Y met after finishing college, Y may use *ne* to let X know that Y has to think about it when he gives an answer.

If it is understood that the speaker's use of *ne* is directed toward the speaker himself, it is inferred that the speaker is addressing to his counterpart, which is independent from the speaker in his mind. This inference has the effect of making the speaker sound like he is observing himself (the addressee) as a third person. Thus, when the speaker is expected to give a subjective answer based on his senses or feelings, the speaker may sound detached if he uses *ne*. For example, suppose a patient is in a hospital because his hand hurts. When the patient is asked which hand hurts, he will not use *ne* in answering the question, because he thinks and he believes everybody believes he can answer the question immediately, he being the one who can feel the pain. If the patient uses *ne*, the use of *ne* makes him appear like he needs to think about which hand hurts and makes him sound like he is not talking about his own hand.

(53) X: Dotchi no te ga itai n desu ka.

which GEN hand NOM hurt COP Q
'Which hand hurts?'

Y: #Kotchi no te desu ne.
    this   GEN hand COP

'(I guess) it's this hand.'

If it is the patient's mother who is answering the question for her son, she may use *ne* in answering the question by a doctor, because she herself cannot feel the physical pain of her son and she may have to think about which hand of her son hurts.

This section showed that if *ne* is used in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question, it may be inferred that the use of *ne* is directed toward the speaker. The effects that are predicted if *ne* is directed toward the speaker himself are consistent with the actual effects of *ne*. Since the effects predicted from the *ne*-principle are consistent with the actual phenomenon, it is not necessary to change the *ne*-principle, which has the condition that the speaker believes that the addressee believes the proposition.

6. Summary and Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to introduce and test a governing principle of *ne* that is 1) precise enough to be tested, 2) general enough to cover the uses of *ne* after various speech acts in various situations, and 3) specific enough to be able to predict the difference with other SFPs.

Section 2 showed that the uses of *ne* after statements and directives can be unified by using the notion 'commitment' introduced in Lu (forthcoming). The use of *ne* reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee is committed to the state of affairs denoted by the propositional content of the statement or directive preceding *ne*. Section 3.1. showed that even though *ne* can be used in various situations, what is crucial about the use of *ne* is the speaker's belief about the addressee's commitment toward the propositional content of the speaker's utterance. The use of *ne* does not specify the speaker's own commitment toward the propositional content of his utterance. Thus, the speaker may be committed or not committed to the propositional content. Section 3.2. discussed that depending on the extent of the speaker's own commitment to the proposition, the speaker's intention may differ. Therefore, the uses of *ne* after various speech acts can be unified by the notion 'commitment' and the uses of *ne* in various
situations can be generalized by the specification that the speaker believes that the addressee is committed to the propositional content of the speaker's utterance.

Section 3.3. showed that a distinction between 'obligatory *ne*' and 'optional *ne*' is not motivated. The use of *ne* is not controlled by what the speaker actually believes the addressee believes, but by in what situation the speaker is expected to acknowledge the addressee's belief in Japanese society. Section 3.4. discussed the uses of *ne* when the speaker believes the addressee is not committed to the propositional content. Previous analyses have suggested that the use of *ne* in a situation where the speaker tells the addressee to believe what the addressee does not believe reduces confrontation with the addressee. This kind of description reflects reality, but is one sided because the speaker may sound like he is imposing on the addressee his own belief, depending on what the addressee perceives to be the speaker's motivation for using *ne*. Section 3.5. showed that since the use of *ne* makes it explicit that it is the addressee who is committed to the propositional content, the speaker may use *ne* to show that the speaker is being ironic.

Section 4 compared the *ne*-principle and the *yo*-principle to test whether the difference in the two principles can predict the difference between the two particles. Both *ne* and *yo* can be used when the speaker believes the addressee has a contrary belief and when the speaker gives a sincere answer to a sincere question, but with different effects. Section 4 showed that the different effects are consistent with the difference between the two principles. Section 5 showed that if *ne* is used in giving a sincere answer to a sincere question, it may be inferred that the use of *ne* is directed toward the speaker. The effects that are predicted if *ne* is directed toward the speaker himself are consistent with the actual effects of *ne*.

In further studies, the intonation and the vowel length of *ne*, which was briefly discussed in Section 2.3., can be analyzed to see whether an independent rule of intonation or vowel lengthening and the *ne*-principle can account for the possible interpretations of *ne* and *ne*?.

This paper focused on the sentence-final uses of *ne*, but *ne* also occurs in phrase-final positions (of non-sentence-final position) and even independently. Examples (54) and (55) illustrate the phrase-final use of *ne* and the independent
use of *ne*.

(54) Tanaka san ga *ne* kuru to *ne* urusaku naru to omou.

Tanaka Mr./Ms. NOM come if noisy become COMP think
'I think, you know, if Mr./Ms. Tanaka comes, you know, it becomes noisy.'

(55) (At the beginning of a conversation)

X: *ne*.

'You know what?'

Y: Nani?

'What?'

Even though the position of *ne* is different for non-sentence-final uses, the effects of such uses of *ne* seem to be similar to its sentence-final effects. Thus, it may be possible to formulate a use condition for *ne* that unifies sentence-final uses and non-sentence-final uses of *ne* in a precise way.
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