<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Two 'yeah but' formats in Finnish. The prior action engaging nii mut and the disengaging joo mut utterances

Niemi, Jarkko

2014

Niemi , J 2014 , ' Two 'yeah but' formats in Finnish. The prior action engaging nii mut and the disengaging joo mut utterances ' , Journal of Pragmatics , vol. 2014 , no. 60 , pp. 54-74 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pra>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/154416>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.10.008>

---

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Two ‘yeah but’ formats in Finnish The prior action engaging *nii mut* and the disengaging *joo mut* utterances

Jarkko Niemi^{*}

PL 4 (Vuorikatu 3 A), FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

Received 11 February 2013; received in revised form 22 October 2013; accepted 28 October 2013

Abstract

Finnish differs from English and some other languages in that it has two ‘yeah but’ formats, *joo mut* (‘yeah but’) and *nii mut* (‘yeah but’). Drawing on audio and videotaped talk-in-interaction between friends and relatives, and on conversation analysis as a method, I examine the extent to which these two formats share functions and to which extent they are used differently. This study argues that the basic difference between the two ‘yeah but’ formats in Finnish is that one disengages from the line of action that was projected by the prior speaker and one engages in it. The disengaging *joo mut* utterance implies that the participants’ perspectives on the topic are divergent. The speaker of a *joo mut* utterance thus excludes at least some part of the opinion or the viewpoint of the prior speaker from the on-going discussion and, in addition, often suggests a closure of the sequence. By contrast, the engaging *nii mut* utterance is used when the speakers share some overall action line. Furthermore, the speaker of a *nii mut* utterance implies that the opinion or the prior speaker’s viewpoint is included in her/his own position and projects to expand the on-going sequence.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Responding; Yeah but format; Disalignment; Engagement; Finnish; Conversation analysis

1. Introduction

Early studies in Conversation Analysis have reported that when a speaker disagrees with an agreement-seeking action, such as an assessment, that disagreement is performed in turns that exhibit certain systematic features. For example, a disagreeing response to a question seeking a ‘yes’-type of response (such as *Y see what I’m talkin-*) might be initiated by an agreement token such as *yeah* followed by an expression of doubt (such as *Yeah, uh, I think I do, uh except...*, Sacks, 1987). Pomerantz (1984) discusses these features in more detail, showing the inclusion of delay devices, such as silences, hesitations, or prefaces to a disagreement with a weak agreement. As an example of a weak agreement, Pomerantz mentions the use of *yes* or *yeah* that occur before expressing disagreement with a *but*-initiated utterance in assessment sequences.

In this article, I will examine the disaligning ‘yeah but’ utterances in Finnish. By disaligning, I refer to performing an action such as disagreeing with an assessment, rejecting a suggestion, or opposing some project by the prior speaker (cf. the organization of preference/dispreference and + ‘plus’ and – ‘minus’ responses, Schegloff, 2007:58–61). Finnish differs from English and some other languages in that it has two ‘yeah but’ formats, *joo mut* (‘yeah but’) and *nii mut* (‘yeah but’). As a consequence, the speakers of Finnish can access a resource that is not available in some of the other languages. This study explores the extent to which these two ‘yeah but’ formats share functions and to which extent they are used differently.

^{*} Tel.: +358 405058325.

E-mail address: jarkko.j.niemi@helsinki.fi.

Studies on other languages have distinguished between integrated and non-integrated ‘yeah but’ utterances on the basis of the prosodic relationship between the parts of the ‘yeah but’ preface. In the integrated usage, the particle ‘yeah’ and the ‘but’-initiated utterance are pronounced within the same intonation phrase, whereas in the non-integrated usage, they form separate intonation phrases. Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (2000) state that when *yeah* and the *but*-utterance are produced as separate intonation phrases, the particle *yeah* can be regarded as an action of its own. On the other hand, when the particle *yeah* occurs in the same intonation phrase with the disagreeing utterance, its acknowledging force is weaker and it can merely signal reciprocity (see also Barth-Weingarten, 2003: 148, who uses the term *pre-disagreement marker* to refer to this type of *yeah*).

More recently, Steensig and Asmuß (2005) discussed the integrated and the non-integrated ‘yeah but’ utterances in Danish and German, using the terms *simple* (integrated) and *complex* (non-integrated) ‘yeah but’ utterances. The simple ‘yeah but’ format does not display the design features that are associated with dispreference. Instead, ‘yeah but’ follows the prior turn without a delay in a turn that is both fluent and unmitigated. In addition, the simple ‘yeah but’ utterances communicate rejection or disagreement, and that action is accomplished by pointing to the prior speaker’s lack of knowledge underlying their assertion or suggestion. The simple ‘yeah but’ utterance thus works to correct or update the prior speaker’s knowledge. On the contrary, the complex format of ‘yeah but’ has design features that are associated with dispreference. In this format, ‘yeah’ and ‘but’ are pronounced as separate intonation phrases, and the utterance is delayed and contains disfluencies. Furthermore, the complex ‘yeah but’ format opposes something in the prior speaker’s turn. In contrast to the simple format, the opposition created by the complex format is based on the personal view of the ‘yeah but’ speaker, and not on any lack of knowledge by the prior speaker that would need to be corrected or updated.

The previous studies have detected important differences in the usage of ‘yeah but’ utterances on the basis of their prosodic design. This study discusses two ‘yeah but’ formats that differ from each other in their lexical design in that they start with different particles (*joo* or *nii*). This article will analyze the functions of these lexically different formats and compare them to the prosodically integrated and disintegrated ‘yeah but’ formats in Danish and German to determine whether prosodic and lexical resources may be used for similar interactional purposes. The structure of this article is as follows: I will first outline the major aspects of the Finnish response particles *joo* and *nii*. Next, I will introduce the data used in this study, followed by two sections on analysis. In the first of these, I will analyze the use of *joo mut* utterances, and in second, the *nii mut* utterances. This article concludes by offering a comparison of the Finnish ‘yeah but’ utterances to the ‘yeah but’ utterances that occur in other languages.

2. *Joo* and *nii* as response particles

To date, no in-depth research has been conducted on the differences between the *joo mut* and the *nii mut* utterances in Finnish, but the particles *joo* and *nii* have been analyzed (for an overview of this research, see Sorjonen, 2001:9–12). The particle *joo* is originally a loan word from Swedish. The first mention of it in dictionaries usually states that it is an affirmative answer to a yes/no question or request for confirmation. The particle *nii*, on the other hand, is a Finno-Ugric word. Etymologically, *nii* is the instructive (instrumental) case form of the demonstrative pronoun *se*, ‘it; that; the’, in the plural with the meaning ‘thus; so; in that way’. However, it is currently understood to be an uninflected particle (Sorjonen, 2001:10).

According to Sorjonen (2001), there are several potential differences between the response particles *joo* and *nii*. Table 1 presents the implications of the particle *nii* on the left-hand side and those of *joo* on right-hand side.

Sorjonen argues that the first dimension that is related to affiliation is the most central one. By affiliation, Sorjonen refers to the capability of the particle *nii* to carry affective meaning by expressing, ‘I recognize the logic of what you are talking about; I know what you are talking about; I see your point’ (Sorjonen, 2001:132). Related to this dimension is an implication that the speaker has independent epistemic access to the state of affairs or to the type of state of affairs described, that he or she claims to ‘know what you are talking about’. And especially important for the present study is the observation that the particle *nii* is continuation-relevant, whereas *joo* is closure-relevant.

My hypothesis is that the afore-mentioned closure or continuation relevancy should be understood as the speaker of the disaligning *nii mut* or *joo mut* utterance implicating either an expansion of the sequence or a closure of it. I refer to this

Table 1

The main dimensions of the meaning that differentiate the particles *nii* and *joo* (from Sorjonen, 2001:280).

<i>nii</i>	versus	<i>joo</i>
affiliation		neutral registering, disaffiliation
shared information		new information
foregrounded information		backgrounded information
non-compliance		compliance
continuation relevant		closure relevant

Table 2

The disaligning *joo mut* and *nii mut* utterances.

	Integrated	Non-integrated	Total
<i>Joo mut</i>	21	6	27
<i>Nii mut</i>	33	19	52
Total	54/79 (68%)	25/79 (32%)	79

distinction by the terms *prior action engagement* and *disengagement*. A prior-action-engaging ‘yeah but’ (*nii mut*) utterance maintains the topic and expands the sequence. In contrast, a disengaging utterance (*joo mut*) resists a line of action that was projected by the prior speaker and often implies a closure of that sequence. That is, even though both of these formats disalign with the prior action, they are used differently with respect to whether or not they project an expansion of the sequence.

3. Data

The data for this study were gathered from naturally occurring audio and videotaped talk-in-interaction in Finnish between friends and relatives during telephone calls and face-to-face conversations. The data consist of a total running time of approximately 18 h.¹ For the present study, I have selected only those ‘yeah but’ utterances that are used to disalign with the prior speaker’s assertion or with the project initiated by that turn.

Table 2 shows that the *nii mut* utterances clearly outnumber the *joo mut* utterances in my data.² In an earlier study (Sorjonen, 1989), which was based on a different database, the *nii mut* utterances were also more frequent than the *joo mut* utterances, but that study made no attempt to differentiate between the functions of the formats.

When compared to the disaligning ‘yeah but’ utterances in Danish and German (Steensig and Asmuß, 2005:354), a difference emerges in the frequency of the integrated and the non-integrated ‘yeah but’ utterances. For example, in the Finnish data, the integrated ‘yeah but’ utterances are clearly more common (about two-thirds of all the cases, 68%), whereas in the Danish and German data, the non-integrated ‘yeah but’ utterances are predominant (62.5%). This raises the question of whether speakers of German and Danish utilize the possibility of producing the ‘yeah but’ format in the integrated or non-integrated form differently than speakers of Finnish. A further question is whether Finnish speakers make use of the lexical variation between the two ‘yeah but’ formats instead of distinguishing different actions on the basis of the integrated and the non-integrated form. These questions will be addressed in this study.

4. The disengaging *joo mut* format: corrective, challenging and concluding

The *joo mut* utterance is predominantly used in the integrated form, with *joo* and *mut* uttered in the same intonation phrase. These integrated utterances usually follow the prior turn either without a delay, or they are produced in a terminal overlap with it. I will argue that the unifying function of the *joo mut* format is that by using it, the speaker disengages from an action line that was projected by the prior speaker by implying that her/his perspective on the topic is at least partly divergent from the prior speaker’s perspective. As a consequence, a *joo mut* utterance often implies a closure of the sequence.

I will analyze three usages of the disaligning *joo mut* utterances, and in all of them, the utterance is used to disengage from the line of action that was projected by the prior speaker. I will demonstrate that with the *joo mut* utterance, (1) the speaker corrects or updates the prior speaker’s knowledge, (2) expresses a differing opinion about a state of affairs, or (3) offers a conclusion that differs slightly from what the prior speaker has stated.

4.1. The corrective *joo mut* utterances

A basic function of an integrated *joo mut* utterance is to claim that the other speaker has incorrect or insufficient knowledge about some state of affairs. With the *joo mut* utterance, the speaker works to correct or update the prior speaker’s knowledge by imparting new factual information (see Steensig and Asmuß, 2005:353). Furthermore, the *joo mut* utterance often implies that the prior speaker had initiated a line of action that had departed from some main line of action and consequently, it can be closed down.

¹ The data archive is located at the Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies at the University of Helsinki.

² One explanation for the difference in the frequencies is that the *joo mut* utterances are not used by speakers in disaligning (rejecting) responses to suggestions or proposals. In the current database, the speaker of the *joo mut* utterance accepts the suggestion or proposal but, for example, claims a need to do something else before undertaking the suggested action. These types of responses were omitted from the current study because they do not exhibit disalignment.

The corrective function of the *joo mut* utterances is illustrated by the following example. Two sisters, Tuula and Jaana, are discussing their skin problems that are stress-related. Jaana has just stated that she lost some of her hair due to her stressful life, and Tuula responds by sharing a stressful event in her own life.

1. Integrated *joo mut* utterance offering a correction. Sg 437. A face-to-face conversation.

- 1 Tuula: ja sitte ↑mulla se että .hhh et sillon ku tota
and then ↑I had the .hhh the time when um
2 .mt mä pyrin >sinne sihteeri<opistoon ja sit
.tch I applied >to the secretarial< college and then
3 mä pääsin sinne ja >mul oli< hirvee stressi siitä
I got in and >I was< very stressed
4 kun Jani ei hyväksynyt sitä? sehän, niinku, noteerasi,
because Jani didn't approve it? He, like, rated,
5 sen niinku ihan täysin pohjamutaan?
it among the worst options?
6 [.hhh ja että, ja]
[.hhh and so, and]
7 Jaana: [nii. vaik se] o-n arvoste-ttu [koulu. nii,]
PRT although it be-3SG value-PAS.PC school PRT
[yeah. although it] is a respected [school. yeah,]
8 → Tuula: [joo mut se] ei tien-ny
[PRT but it] NEG know-PPC
[joo but he] didn't know
9 → si-tä sit viel sillon.=nyt se tietä-ä? .hh
it-PAR then yet then now it know-3SG
it yet then.=now he knows? .hh
10 (0.5)
11 Tuula: nii ja, ja tota? mä pelkäsin että kuinka nyt
so and, and well? I was afraid of how
12 Jani tämän sulattaa,
Jani is going to take this now,

On lines 4–5, Tuula states that one source of stress was her husband, Jani, as he did not appreciate her choice of education. Her utterance (line 5) has a final rising pitch that implies that there is more talk to come and offers a place for the recipient to display understanding (Routarinne, 2003:165–170). In overlap with Tuula's continuation, Jaana responds with *nii* (line 7), which displays her knowledge of the event and claims affiliation with Tuula in the complaint. However, Jaana

- 4   **melkee vaati-i   nii-tä, nii-tä,**
              almost demand-3SG those-PAR, those-PAR,
              almost demand those, those,
- 5   **kolme kasi kutos-i-a,**
              three eight six-PL-PAR
              three eight sixes, ((=a computer with a 32-bit microprocessor))
- 6   →   (0.4)
- 7   → Jouko: **j:↓oo mut ei yksityinen ihminen ei tarvi,**
              PRT   but NEG private   human   NEG need
              j:↓oo but a private person does not need,
- 8   Pekka: ei välttämättä. =[ei siis nopeus on niin, (.) ei se nii<]
              not necessarily. =[I mean the speed is so, (.) it is not so<]
- 9   Jouko: [(--)   (--)   (--)   että,]
                                                  [(--)   (--)   (--)   so-that,]
- 10   Pekka: [joo.
              [yeah.
- 11   Jouko: [nii,
              [yeah,
- 12   (.)
- 13   Pekka: riippuu mitä ohjelmii käyttää.
              it depends on what kind of programmes one uses.
- 14   Jouko: joo: no me: ollaan sitä sitte myyty neljään tonniin ni,
              yea: well we: have sold it for four thousand so,

On line 3, Pekka latches on to Jouko's yet incomplete telling a claim that clients (*ne*, 'they') would demand computers with a better microprocessor than those that Jouko is telling about.⁵ Jouko's *joo mut* initiated response to that (line 7) is delayed, and the response particle *j:↓oo* is modified by lengthening the consonant *j* and by lowering the pitch when pronouncing its vowels (indicated with ↓). Similar to example 1, the turn-initial particle *joo* can be interpreted as confirming the prior speaker's utterance at a general, factual level. In other words, there is a need for computers with a 386-processor. However, with the subsequent *mut* 'but' initiated talk, Jouko challenges Pekka with a counter-assertion that limits the

⁵ Jouko's turn on line 2 is neither syntactically nor pragmatically completed, as he has not mentioned the discount price of the computers. An anonymous reviewer pointed out that the pronoun *ne* 'they' in the expression 'nowadays they almost demand' could possibly refer to the computers. It is, however, evident in the reply on line 7 that the recipient treats it as referring to the clients.

- 19 Pertti: [Mite sitä] opetta-a jos ei?
How PRT teach-3SG if NEG
[How does one] teach if one can't?
- 20 (0.6)
- 21 Pertti: ↑mi-u miele-stä, hh. ite[°]k-käähh ossaa teh[-ä°.
I-GEN mind-ELA self-CLI know.how.to do-INF
in ↑my opinion, hh. can't °even do (('it')) onese[lf°.
- 22 → Sauli: [Joo
PRT
[joo
- 23 → mutta kun #on:: ee- eh-#, =
but when is
but when one #is/has:: ee- eh-#, =
- 24 Mauno: =Nii.
=Yea.
- 25 → Sauli: Kyl ↑neuvo-ma-a pysty-y, =Ei sitä ↑tarviik-kaa
PRT advice-INF-ILL be.able.to-3SG NEG PRT require-CLI
One can sure ↑advise, one does not ↑need to have
- 26 → kah#-ta: #ee# osa-t[a ja ↑neuvo-lo:.=
two-PAR know.how.to-INF and advise-INF
both skills #ee# to be able to do and to ↑advise.
- 27 Touko: [°(joo kyl)°]
[°(yeah sure°)]
- 28 Mauno: =Nii[:,
=Yeah[:
- 29 Pertti: [°Aha°.
[°I see°.
- 30 Sauli: Juu:.
Yea:.

- 31   Mauno: Joo,
              Yeah,
- 32   Pertti: <Selvä>.
              <okay>.

On lines 1–2 and 4–5, Sauli makes a positive evaluation of how Pertti's father acted. However, Pertti then expresses doubt over his father's ability to teach him how to manage the farm (lines 19 and 21). This assertion is made with an interrogative clause (rhetorical question) that establishes an argumentative context. More specifically, this assertion invites the others to join in the discussion and agree. The expression *miu mielestä*, 'in my opinion', on line 21, marks the interrogative as a second assessment that implies disagreement with the current topic (Rauniomaa, 2007:228–233).

Sauli's *joo mut* utterance (line 22) defends the position that he adopted earlier (lines 1–2 and 4–5) and the actions of Pertti's father, by making a distinction between advising and actually being able to do things. As a consequence, Sauli proposes to exclude the lack of skills as a basis for criticizing Pertti's father. Furthermore, the *joo mut* utterance is uttered in a terminal overlap with the prior turn and with the *joo* and *mut* pronounced in an integrated form. However, there is no sound lengthening in *joo*, nor is there any change in the pitch. There are, nonetheless, some disfluencies in the turn (hesitation *ee- eh-#*, line 23; a restart, line 25).

Argumentative contexts, such as those in examples 2 and 3, provide a different perspective on the disaligning *joo mut* utterances than example 1, where following the *joo mut* utterance, its speaker immediately resumed her main line of action. In examples 2 and 3 above, the sequence closing implication of the utterance is less clear due to the on-going argumentation.⁶ However, in example 3 above, Sauli's *joo mut* utterance (line 22), despite its lack of a clear sequence closing implication, does not engage in doubting or criticizing Pertti's father's action (i.e., it does not expand the criticizing). Rather, it implies a different perspective on the topic and disaffiliation with Pertti (see affiliation versus neutral registering, disaffiliation, Table 1). After Sauli's perspective is supported by some of the other men (lines 27 and 28), Pertti drops the topic without further argument (*aha*, 'I see', line 29; *selvä*, 'okay', line 32).

When compared to the results of Steensig and Asmuß (2005) in Danish and German, the challenging *joo mut* utterances are clearly different. They usually have the particle *joo* and the subsequent talk, which is initiated by *mut* 'but', produced in the integrated form (see Steensig and Asmuß, 2005:358–361). In other words, it seems that unlike the speakers of Danish or German, speakers of Finnish do not make use of the difference between the prosodically integrated and non-integrated forms of the 'yeah but' utterances to distinguish between the corrective use (section 4.1) and the challenging use (this section).

As mentioned previously, the speaker of the *joo mut* utterance often implies that the prior speaker had shifted the line of talk to a direction other than what he or she had originally intended. In example 1, Tuula's recounting of her experiences of her stress-related skin problems was cut short by Jaana's emphasized complaint about Jani. After this, Tuula returned to her topic shortly after the *joo mut* utterance. In example 2, the telling by Jouko was interrupted by Pekka's assessment, and after the *joo mut* utterance and a short negotiation, Jouko resumed his telling. Of course, the speaker of the *joo mut* utterance has not always initiated a project (Levinson, 2013:119–122) in her/his prior talk, but may be a recipient of another speaker's telling. When this is the situation, the function of the *joo mut* utterance can be something other than being corrective (example 1) or challenging (examples 2 and 3). Nonetheless, the sequence-closing implication of a *joo mut* utterance is often present in these types of contexts as well. Let us now review these contexts.

4.3. The concluding *joo mut* utterances

When responding to another speaker's telling, the speaker of a *joo mut* utterance often offers a conclusion that differs slightly from what the other speaker explicitly stated and by doing this, steers the conversation into another direction. I refer to this as the concluding use of the *joo mut* utterances.

In example 4, two friends, Vikke and Missu, are talking about the approaching university semester of their first school year. The day before, Vikke was helping one of their mutual friends to move her furniture and other belongings to another city, and Missu inquires about their friend's apartment (line 1). By doing this, Missu reveals her lack of knowledge as well as her assumption that Vikke possesses that knowledge.

⁶ In example 2, where an argumentative context prevails, the speaker of the *joo mut* utterances also resumes his telling, but this happens after some negotiation.

4. Concluding *joo mut* utterance. Sg 112a03. A telephone conversation.

- 1 Missu: .hh no hei kerro siitä kämpästä minkälaine se oli.
 .hh well hey tell me about the apartment what was it like.
- 2 Vikke: no s_o:n ↓to↑si: iha:na?,
 well it's ↓real↑ly lovely?,
- 3 (.)
- 4 Vikke: .hh niinku, mut ei siis, (.) °niinku°,
 .hh like, but I mean not, (.) °like°,
- 5 (1.5)
- 6 Vikke: .mt tiätenkää mikää si↑llai erikoine mutta siis
 .tch of course nothing ↑that special but
- 7 ↑on se tosi siisti.
 it sure ↑is really neat.
- 8 Missu: aijaa;
 Oh I see;
- 9 Vikke: ja, niinku aika siis, niinku, (0.2) no ei se nyt
 and, like quite, like, (0.2) well it was not
- 10 si↑llai ollu siisti ku me sinne tultiinki.
 neat in ↑that way when we got there.
- 11 Missu: ni[i,
 yeah,
- 12 Vikke: [ni, (.) tota, (0.5) nii tottakai siellä ol-i
 PRT PRT PRT of course there be-PST
 so, (.) umm, (0.5) so of course there was
- 13 vessa ihan hirvee ja >ikkuna-t ol-i kamala-t<
 toilet really dreadful and window-PL be-PST terrible-PL
 really dreadful toilet and >the windows were terrible<
- 14 ja uuni oli ihan kama:la ja, .hh
 and oven be-PST quite terrible and
 and the oven was just terrible and, .hh

- 15 → Missu: *joo mut te sa-i-tte ne sit siivo-t[tu-a.*
 PRT but 2PL get-PST-2PL them then clean-PC-PAR
joo but you (PL) got them cleaned up then.
- 16 Vikke: [nii, °nii.° sit
 yeah, yeah, when
- 17 ku siäl kuurattii ni .hh niinku, (.) semmonen
 we scrubbed there so .hh like, (.) kind of
- 18 aika, (.) (sanosko) uudenaikane tai semmone
 quite, (.) (should I say) modern or that kind of
- 19 niinku ↑näti:t sellaset valkoset kaapit ja,
 like ↑nice that kind of white cabinets and,

As a response to Missu's request for information, Vikke produces a highly positive assessment (line 2), which she then begins to downgrade. She provides another assessment that includes the adjective *siisti* which, like the English adjective *neat*, has two meanings: 'tidy' and 'cool'. She then explains, after Missu received the assessment with a newsmark *aijaa*, 'Oh I see', that she meant not 'tidy' but something resembling 'cool' (lines 9–10). Thereafter, Vikke elaborates on the untidiness of the apartment by providing details of its condition with a three-part list (lines 12–14). The verb tense in this elaboration, as well as the verb in the preceding negative assessment (lines 9–10), is in the past tense, expressing that Vikke is telling about the situation when she and her friend entered the apartment. This can be understood to imply that the situation had changed since then, and the general positive evaluations in the present tense are still valid (lines 2 and 7). Vikke finishes her turn with *ja* 'and', which expresses that the speaker could provide more examples (Koivisto, 2012:1256–1263). At this point, the recipient responds with a *joo mut* response (line 15).

The *joo mut* utterance displays Missu's understanding of Vikke's description of the apartment from the point of the end result, that being Vikke and her friend having cleaned the apartment. The turn-initial particle *joo* acknowledges Vikke's telling. In addition, the contrastive utterance initiated by *mut*, 'but', conveys a claim about both the co-participant and the mutual friend (statement of B-event, see Labov, 1972), and the utterance contains an inference marker, *sit*, 'then' (Hakulinen et al., 2004:794). In other words, Missu bases her assertion on Vikke's telling. Consequently, the *joo mut* utterance reflects the epistemic status⁷ of Missu as a relatively unknowing participant (see her request for information on line 1; the newsmark on line 8; and the continuer *nii* on line 11; Sorjonen, 2001:233–238).⁸

However, at the same time, with her *joo mut* utterance, Missu treats Vikke's remarks about the untidiness as a sidetrack and invites Vikke to return to the main line in describing their friend's apartment. Thus similar to the *joo mut* utterances in the previous examples (especially in 1 and 2), this *joo mut* utterance functions to close down a sequence. With her turn on lines 16–19, Vikke confirms Missu's understanding and returns to her positive evaluation of the apartment.

4.4. Summary of the *joo mut* utterances

In general, the speaker of the disaligning *joo mut* utterance disengages from an action line that the prior speaker projected. The corrective *joo mut* utterances (section 4.1) offer new factual information that explain why the prior speaker's assertion was not completely correct and that it therefore does not need to be taken into account in the on-going discussion. By contrast, the challenging use (section 4.2) of *joo mut* expresses disaffiliation or the separateness of the speakers' perspectives and it may involve closing the sequence and returning to the main line of action. The concluding

⁷ On epistemic stance and epistemic status, see Heritage (2012:4–7).

⁸ As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, at this point Missu is, of course, not completely unknowing. By her declarative utterance, she is asking for confirmation.

Fig. 1. The differing perspectives of Speakers A and B (A: ... B: *joo mut*...) implied by the *joo mut* speaker.

joo mut utterances (section 4.3), in turn, imply that the information that has been received is already sufficient so that the speaker does not need to continue. At the same time, they shift the direction of the conversation.

An important factor in the use of *joo mut* utterance is the speakers' differing perspectives. Speakers A (the prior speaker) and B (the *joo mut* speaker) can share some things in common (for example, the fact that there can be a need for computers with a 32-bit microprocessor in example 3), but in addition to this, there is something different (the claim that this does not affect the sale of computers to private customers). Fig. 1 represents the perspectives of Speakers A and B as being partly overlapping, but predominantly separate circles.

As Fig. 1 illustrates, some part of Speaker A's perspective is excluded from the on-going discussion by the *joo mut* speaker. This is a major difference from the *nii mut* utterances, which I will now turn to.

5. Engaging in the prior action with *Nii mut*

The disaligning *nii mut* utterances and the disaligning *joo mut* utterances are used in similar contexts. For example, both types of utterances can be used in an on-going argument sequence. However, the *nii mut* utterances are produced in the non-integrated form more often than the *joo mut* utterances (see Table 2). Furthermore, I will argue that these two utterance formats have different functions. For instance, the basic function of a *nii mut* utterance is to first claim recognition of the prior speaker's perspective and then to express that what that prior speaker has said does not completely cover the perspective of the *nii mut* speaker. As a consequence, and by contrast to *joo mut* utterances, the speaker of a *nii mut* utterance continues the overall action line that the prior speaker projected. This means that even though he or she first disaligned with the prior action, he or she engages in the prior speaker's line of action.

Let us now turn to the usages of the *nii mut* format. I will discuss three usages that all share an expression of disalignment that is based on the claim that the prior speaker's perspective does not entirely cover the perspective of the *nii mut* speaker, but leaves room for adjustment. In the first of the three usages, the speaker of *nii mut* utterance claims affiliation⁹ with the prior speaker's perspective; to differing extents, this can be seen as being present in all of the *nii mut* utterances. In the second section, I will discuss the *nii mut* utterances that are used to redo something that the speaker had done earlier. Finally, I will discuss the function of *nii mut* utterances that is not covered by the *joo mut* utterances in my data, which entails negotiating a line of future action after a suggestion by the prior speaker.

5.1. The affiliating *nii mut* utterances

The affective implication of the *nii mut* utterance – a claim of affiliation with the prior speaker's perspective – is most evident when the particle *nii* is pronounced as a separate intonation phrase with a falling pitch. Example 5 below represents this type of utterance. Before this segment, Missu has invited Liisa to join her and a mutual friend to begin the second part of the course that is required for taking the driving license test. Liisa has shifted back and forth in her response to that invitation. She finally expressed that she might join Missu and their friend (*kyl mäa voisin sille soittaa ku tekin ootte*, 'I guess I could phone him because you are going'). However, by this, Liisa neither clearly accepts the invitation, nor rejects it. Prior to the segment below, Missu stated that the second part of the course will begin next week.

⁹ "I feel the same way" (Jefferson, 2002); "I recognize the logic of what you are talking about" (Sorjonen, 2001:132); endorses the teller's perspective (Stivers, 2008); affective level of cooperation (Stivers et al., 2011); for an overview, see Lindström and Sorjonen (2013).

5. Non-integrated *nii mut* utterance. Sg 112b03. A telephone conversation.

- 1 Missu: .hh nii sit me ainaki nähtäs_ja.
.hh so at least then we would see each other and.
- 2 Liisa: <joo>. mää varmaa soi- @yyh mää inh:oo-n@.=
yeah I probably pho- oh I hate-1SG
<yeah>. I'll probably pho- @oh I hate ((it))@.
- 3 → Missu: =n:ii. mutta mää aattel-i että mitä pike:mmin se-m parempi?,
PRT but I think-PST PRT what soon-COM it-GEN better
=n:ii. but I thought the sooner the better?,
- 4 Liisa: ni[i on.]
that's [true].
- 5 Missu: [.hh ku] nyt kuitenkin jos muuttaa poiski ni mä en
[.hh because] anyway if one moves away now then I won't
- 6 a- mä en kyllä siis tuu ajamaan täv vuoden aikana
dr- I mean I for sure won't drive
- 7 paljon_ollenkaa.
almost at all this year.
- 8 Liisa: °.nii° (0.6) °joo°.
°.yeah° (0.6) °yeah°.

The particle *n:ii*, which is produced as a separate intonation phrase on line 3, offers an affiliative response to Liisa's expression of her feelings towards the driving school. Missu displays that she is able to recognize Liisa's feelings and to share them (see Sorjonen, 2001:140–142). The subsequent utterance that is initiated by *mutta*, 'but', continues the main line of action by inducing Liisa to join Missu and the mutual friend in taking the test. This utterance utilizes the formulaic expression *mitä pikemmin sen paremmin*, 'the sooner the better', which describes the situation on a general level. With her *nii mut* utterance, Missu thus displays affiliation with the feelings that Liisa described, but widens the perspective by also considering the matter as separate from the feelings it evokes. On line 4, Liisa acknowledges Missu's explanation as being valid. Overall, then, with her *nii mut* utterance, Missu encourages Liisa to sign up for the test despite her reluctant attitude towards it. The utterance is therefore used in the context of an on-going negotiation sequence where a response from the co-participant is still pending.

One central aspect that differentiates the *joo mut* and *nii mut* utterances is that the *nii mut* utterance can be used to claim affiliation with the prior speaker's perspective. This claim of affiliation is related to a more general difference between the *joo mut* and the *nii mut* utterances: unlike the *joo mut* utterances that propose to exclude something in the prior speaker's perspective (see examples 1, 2 and 3), the *nii mut* utterances do not propose exclusion. Instead, the *nii mut* utterances imply an inclusion of something in the *nii mut* speaker's perspective. As a consequence, the *nii mut* and *joo mut* utterances offer different types of disalignment. The *nii mut* utterances are seldom used to offer a direct rejection of a prior assertion, but serve to sustain the line of action that the prior speaker has projected.

As mentioned earlier, the claim of affiliation is most clear when the *nii mut* utterance is produced in the non-integrated form. When the *nii mut* utterance is used in an integrated form, other aspects of meaning are usually more relevant. Let us now turn to an analysis of the integrated *nii mut* utterances.

5.2. Nii mut doing a redoing

A central function of a *nii mut* utterance is to redo its speaker's own prior assertion in a sequential position that calls for an aligning response. When redoing an earlier assertion, the *nii mut* speaker usually claims that the other speaker has forgotten something or has not completely understood what the *nii mut* speaker has implied earlier. Simultaneously, the speaker conveys that he or she has independent epistemic access to the matter under discussion.

Similar to example 5 above, the *nii mut* utterance below is used in an on-going negotiating sequence. Alma and Ella, who is the wife of the town priest, are discussing a forthcoming congregation assembly in their hometown and the mass that is to be held in the local church on Sunday. At the beginning of the segment, Alma seeks Ella's acceptance by displaying a stance that the local people should not attend the mass, because their seats should be made available to outside visitors. However, Ella produces an assessment that implies her disagreement (line 11). In response, Alma uses a *nii mut* utterance to reformulate her prior point more explicitly. This *nii mut* utterance is integrated, fluent, and it is not delayed.

6. Redoing *nii mut* utterance. Sg 142b02. A telephone conversation.

- 1 Alma: =ku mä aattelin just tänään (.) ö (0.2) sanoinki
=as I thought just today (.) eh (0.2) and said ((it)) as
- 2 siitä tualla että, °.hh° et sunnuntaina ei
well there that, °.hh° that on Sunday #eh#
- 3 varmaan #ää# kannata (.) kovim paljo (0.3)
the locals better not (.) very numerously (0.3)
- 4 paikkakuntal#aiste#n tulla.
come ((to the church))
- 5 (0.3)
- 6 Ella: mnii<,
myea<,
- 7 Alma: kun on niim p#aljo#v °väkee°.
because there is so #many# °people°.
- 8 Ella: .hhh[h,]
- 9 Alma: [et] antaa paikkansa jollekkim (0.4) muille.
[so] ((one should)) give her seat (0.4) to others.
- 10 >muulle<.
>to another<.
- 11 Ella: **mutta on se hiano-o ku mei-tä paljon on sitte.**
but is it great-PAR when we-PAR lot is then
but it sure is great when there is a lot of us then.

- 12 → Alma: >nii mut< e[i me mahd]u-ta kirkko-o.=
 PRT but NEG we fit-INF church-ILL
 nii but the church does not have capacity for us.
- 13 Ella: [.hhhh,]
- 14 Ella: =>ei se sillä tavalla niin kovasti<, (0.2)
 =>it is not in that way so very<, (0.2)
- 15 #m# kovasti sanottu o että onko se niiv
 #m# very obvious whether it is so
- 16 valta- nelisen sataa sinne kirkkoom menee ni,
 enorm- the church has capacity for about four hundred people so,
- 17 (.) .mhhh [ni toiv]ottavasti omat ei iham pois=
 (.) .mhhh [so hope]fully the locals are not completely absent=

Sequentially, the position after the initial report by Alma (lines 1–4) would be the place for Ella to display her stance towards Alma's assertion. But, a short silence follows (line 5) that can foreshadow disagreement. In addition, the truncated response token *mnii*<, 'yea<', (line 6), which is uttered by Ella at an almost level pitch, treats Alma's prior turn as being incomplete (cf. [Sorjonen, 2001:255–261](#)). Because she refrains from expressing agreement, Ella may be understood to imply disagreement. For this reason, Alma proceeds to support her position, first with a *kun*, 'because' clause and then an *et*, 'so' clause (lines 7 and 9). These utterances provide an account of her prior assertion. However, Ella disaligns with Alma by assuming a contrastive perspective to the topic (line 11).

The particle *nii* at the beginning of Alma's *nii mut* utterance on line 12 can be interpreted as being a claim of affiliation with Ella's assessment. That particle expresses agreement, in principle, with the idea that everyone should attend the church. Furthermore, *nii* implies that the speaker has independent epistemic access to the object of discussion (see shared information versus new information in [Table 1](#)). In other words, the *nii mut* utterance claims that Ella's perspective is included in Alma's perspective. Yet the function of the *nii mut* utterance is to claim that the practice that is implied by Ella's assessment cannot be adopted due to the already implied claim that the church cannot accommodate everyone (lines 1–4, 7 and 9–10). This means that the *nii mut* utterance more explicitly states the speaker's prior position and seeks acceptance by the co-participant, implying that the other speaker does not see the whole picture of the situation under discussion. Ella's response on lines 14–17, however, indicates that the counter-assertion that Alma offered through her *nii mut* utterance is not an objective fact, but rather it is an evaluation that can be disputed.

The *nii mut* usages presented thus far have implied that its speaker has epistemic access to the object of discussion: recognition of the type of feelings that the prior speaker expressed (ex. 5) and shared knowledge and independent epistemic access (capacity of the church to have room for church goers, ex. 6). The current data suggest that the usages of the *nii mut* format may differ from some of the usages of the *joo mut* format with respect to epistemic access. Thus, the *joo mut* utterance in example 4 was used in a context where the speaker lacked independent epistemic access to the topic (not having seen the mutual friend's new apartment where the co-participant had helped her friend to move). The *joo mut* utterance was thus presented by a participant who had a non-primary epistemic status and, furthermore, the utterance was marked as an inference from the co-participant's prior talk (*sit*, 'then'), conceding her primary rights to information.

Another and more crucial difference between the *nii mut* and *joo mut* utterances, concerning the progression of the interaction, is that both the affiliative *nii mut* utterance (ex. 5) and the redoing *nii mut* utterance (ex. 6) are used in the middle of an on-going negotiation sequence. These utterances contribute to the progress of the negotiation. In contrast, the *joo mut* utterances (ex. 1 and 2) may be used in a context of an interrupted telling to claim that an action by the prior speaker was a departure from the main line of action. This sequential difference is one central aspect of use that differentiates the *nii mut* and *joo mut* utterances. This difference is also present in the last usage of the *nii mut* utterances that I will discuss. In that usage, the *nii mut* utterance is used to respond to a suggestion.

5.3. *Nii mut negotiating a possible course of future action*

The disaligning *nii mut* utterances are also used to respond to suggestions and proposals. In this sequential position, they are used to reject the suggestion or the proposal while they further the discussion on the course for future action. As a response to a suggestion or proposal, the *nii mut* utterance is therefore action engaging. By using it, the speaker claims to recognize the prior speaker's perspective and endorses that perspective by expanding the sequence. In many cases, the speaker of a *nii mut* utterance reformulates her/his own prior assertion.

Prior to example 7 below, Missu told Vikke how she had lost a hair clip that she had borrowed from a friend at a bar. By chance, a friend of Vikke's and an acquaintance of Missu is working in that bar, and Vikke suggests that Missu could ask her for the hair clip.

7. *Nii mut* utterance in negotiating suggestions. Sg 112b07. A telephone conversation.

- 1 Vikke: mutta soitas sille ja kysy että jos se kattoo et onks
but phone her and ask if she would take a look if
- 2 sielt löytyyny (°jo°).
it was found (°already°).
- 3 (1.0)
- 4 Missu: niij joo.h=
I see yeah.h=
- 5 Vikke: =(et jos se on siellä).
=(if it/she is there).
- 6 Missu: .hh jos Ø pyytä-is Mari-a puhelime-ej ja;
if Ø ask-CON.3SG 1NameF-PAR phone-ILL and;
.hh if ((one/I)) would ask Mari to phone and;
- 7 (0.2)
- 8 Missu: hhh .mt Beebaari-ssa?,
Name-of-bar-INE
hhh .tch at the B-bar
- 9 → Vikke: nii mut sää voi-si-t, =kannatta-a varmaa soitta-a
PRT but you be.able-CON-2SG be.worth-INF probably call-INF
nii but you could, =it is probably better to phone
- 10 sinne koti-in.
there home-ILL
(her)) at home.

- 11   (.)
- 12 → Missu: **niim mut mää aattel-i   et jos mää soitta-si-n sit**
               PRT but I think-PST.1SG that if I call-CON-1SG then
               nii but I thought that if I would phone then
- 13   **niinku sinne;**
               PRT there
               like there ((at the bar))
- 14   (0.2)
- 15   Vikke: [°dii:°]
               [°yep.°]
- 16   Missu: [hhh   ] no ihan sama se °on°.
               [hhh   ] well it's all the °same°.

On line 6, Missu formulates a preliminary plan on the basis of Vikke's suggestion (line 1). The turn contains what is referred to as the 'missing person' or 'zero person' construction, that is, the clause does not explicate who it is that will perform the action (the 'missing' subject is marked with a Ø-sign in the gloss; see [Laitinen, 2006](#)). However, when the utterance initial *jos*, 'if', combines with the conditional (subjunctive) form of the verb *pyytää* ('to ask'), the speaker of this utterance indicates that she would be the one asking ([Hakulinen et al., 2004:1285](#)). Even though both the agent and the beneficiary of this action is the speaker herself, this utterance can be interpreted as one that suggests a possible course for future action.¹⁰

After a short pause followed by an increment on line 8 that clarifies what Missu intends to do (phone the bar), Vikke responds with a *nii mut* utterance that develops the plan further. She recommends instead that Missu phones her friend at home (lines 9–10). She therefore suggests a revision of Missu's plan and redoes and specifies the suggestion that she offered previously on line 1. It is also important to note the self-repair on line 9 from *sää voisit*, 'you could', to the more persuasive *kannattaa varmaa*, 'it is probably better'. Then on line 12, Missu herself uses a *nii mut* utterance and provides a similar type of response to Vikke's suggestion. Missu redoes her own prior plan and revises the suggestion of her co-participant. However, this time, she makes it explicit that she herself will be making the call. Moreover, neither Vikke nor Missu explicates the reasons for selecting the option that they presented in the *nii mut* utterance. Nevertheless, both of them imply that when considering the bigger picture, it would be a wiser course of action. After the *nii mut* utterances, Vikke (on line 15) treats Missu's plan as being possible, but she does not endorse it with a slightly modified form of the particle *nii*, *dii*., 'yep' (see the dimension of compliance in [Table 1](#) and [Sorjonen, 2001:118–126](#)), and on line 16, Missu regards the two alternatives as being equal. In other words, the negotiation results in indecision.

One central aspect of the *nii mut* utterances occurs in example 7. This concerns its usability as a resource in an on-going negotiation to indicate how to proceed with some matter being discussed. For example, the *nii mut* utterances in example 7 clearly function differently than the sequence closing *joo mut* utterances in examples 1 and 2. In example 7, both speakers use a *nii mut* utterance to indicate that they share an overall action line – that of trying to find a solution to the problem of the lost hair clip – but at the same time, they negotiate some details concerning that problem.

Example 7 provides further support to the *nii mut* utterances functioning as a redoing (section 5.2). Both of the *nii mut* utterances in example 7 are involved in redoing. The reason for dedicating a separate section to the *nii mut* utterances that respond to suggestions or proposals is to underline a difference between the *nii mut* and the *joo mut* utterances. The *nii mut* utterance declines the suggestion on proposal. By contrast – despite the rarity of a *joo mut* utterance as a response to suggestions and proposals – the current data suggests that a *joo mut* utterance accepts the suggestion or the proposal but

¹⁰ This type of suggestion seems to be missing from the English directive-commissive action-types ([Couper-Kuhlen and Etelämäki, 2012](#)).

Fig. 2. The perspectives implied by the speaker of *nii mut* and *joo mut* utterances (Speaker B).

can express, for example, a need to do something else before it. As mentioned earlier, these cases have not been discussed in this article because they align with the action line of the prior turn.

5.4. Summary of the *nii mut* utterances

To summarize, the speaker of a disaligning *nii mut* utterance claims to recognize the prior speaker's perspective. At the same time, the speaker implies that this perspective does not entirely cover her/his own perspective. Thus the *nii mut* speaker suggests implicitly that the prior speaker's perspective is included in her/his own perspective. This is in contrast to the *joo mut* utterances. The *joo mut* speaker implies exclusion of something and, as a consequence, that the speakers' perspectives are at least partially different. Fig. 2 represents the perspectives that are implied by the *nii mut* and *joo mut* utterances.

In addition, the *nii mut* speaker engages in the action line that has been projected by the co-participant in the prior turn. The speaker achieves this by expanding the sequence in spite of the disagreeing or otherwise disaligning assertion that he or she first offered. The *nii mut* utterances are therefore often used as a part of an on-going negotiation sequence. In this way, their use differs from the use of *joo mut* utterances, as the latter often imply a closure of the sequence.

6. Conclusions and a cross-linguistic comparison

This article has analyzed the Finnish 'yeah but' utterances *joo mut* and *nii mut*. I have argued that the overall difference between the *joo mut* and *nii mut* utterances is that the former ones disengage from the line of action that was projected by the prior speaker and the latter ones engage in it. The prior-action-disengaging *joo mut* utterances imply that the participants' perspectives on the topic are divergent. The speaker of a *joo mut* utterance thus excludes at least some part of the opinion or the viewpoint of the prior speaker from the on-going discussion and consequently foregrounds her/his own opinion or viewpoint. A *joo mut* utterance also often implies that the action line that has been initiated by the prior speaker has formed some type of departure from a main line of action and, as such, it can be closed down. By contrast, the prior-action-engaging *nii mut* utterances are used when the speakers share some overall action line, such as negotiating a way to proceed with some problem. In addition, the speaker of the *nii mut* utterance implies that the opinion or the prior speaker's viewpoint is included in her/his own position. He or she also claims that the prior speaker's opinion or view point is not sufficient but in addition, something else needs to be taken into consideration.

I would like to suggest that it is possible that the anaphoric origin of the response particle *nii* (the meaning of 'thus', 'so') has influenced the use of the *nii mut* utterances. It might be possible that an anaphoric link – nowadays opaque to the language users – to a prior assertion and the subsequent further talk on the same topic induces the engagement with the line of action that was projected in the prior turn and differentiates the *nii mut* utterances from the *joo mut* utterances.

The prior action disengagement and engagement is reflected in the type of disalignment that is offered through the *joo mut* and *nii mut* utterances. The disengaging *joo mut* utterances usually resist the prior action in a rather direct way, such as through a straightforward rejection of the prior speaker's assertion or at least by refuting some aspect of it (example 2 *j: joo mut* a private person does not need). By contrast, the *nii mut* utterances usually present the disalignment in a more cautious way, for instance, by appealing to some (supposedly) common and shared experience (see example 5: *nii mut* I thought the sooner the better). This difference in the presented disalignment reflects the level of cooperation that is expressed in the *joo mut* and *nii mut* utterances. Thus the *joo mut* utterances resist some projected line of action and often suggest a closure of the sequence, whereas the *nii mut* utterances expand the sequence. I propose that this may account for the difference in the frequencies of the *joo mut* and *nii mut* utterances (Table 2). The *nii mut* utterances are more frequent because by using this utterance, the speaker engages in a prior action and

continues the discussion (this could be labelled as “the preference for continuity”, see the preferences for agreement and contiguity, Sacks, 1987).

When comparing the Finnish *joo mut* and *nii mut* utterance to the Danish and German ‘yeah but’ utterances, a major difference concerns the design of these turns. The majority of the disaligning ‘yeah but’ utterances in Danish and German have ‘yeah’ and ‘but’ uttered as separate prosodic units, which is the non-integrated form (Steensig and Asmuß, 2005). By contrast, the Finnish ‘yeah but’ utterances *joo mut* and *nii mut* are most often produced within the same prosodic unit, which is the integrated form (Table 2). Thus speakers of these languages (Danish and German vs. Finnish) seem to utilize different resources to implement actions such as disaligning with an action by another speaker but discussing it further. While Danish and German use the non-integrated form of the ‘yeah but’ utterances (Steensig and Asmuß, 2005:352), Finnish uses the integrated form of the *nii mut* utterances for that function. Secondly, for offering a matter-of-fact correction to the prior speaker’s knowledge, Danish and German use the integrated form of the ‘yeah but’ utterances (Steensig and Asmuß, 2005:351), whereas Finnish prefers the integrated form of the *joo mut* utterances. This means that Danish and German rely on prosody to make a distinction between these two actions (disaligning + correcting versus disaligning + discussing further), whereas Finnish makes use of the lexical variation between *joo* and *nii*.

Finally, in relation to the observations on English *yeah but* utterances and their different prosodic realizations (Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 2000:406, fn. 5; Barth-Weingarten, 2003:145–149), the Finnish *joo mut* and *nii mut* utterances in general confirm the idea that the particle ‘yeah’ in the integrated ‘yeah but’ utterances can be interpreted as resembling slightly a pre-disagreement marker that has a weak concessive force. The basic function of the integrated *joo mut* utterances, offering a matter-of-fact correction or an update to the knowledge of the prior speaker, is a case in point. The information offered in the *mut* ‘but’ utterance serves to replace or update the knowledge that is possessed by the other speaker, so that there is no possibility that both speakers could be right despite their having different opinions on the matter they are discussing. The integrated *nii mut* utterances, on the other hand, often redo a prior assertion by the same speaker and imply that this reformulated assertion explains why the other speaker’s opinion is not exactly accurate or observable.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Markku Haakana, Tiina Onikki-Rantajääskö, Marja-Leena Sorjonen, and the anonymous reviewers for their very useful and constructive comments on this paper. This study has been conducted in the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction, Academy of Finland and University of Helsinki, and I would like to thank the members of the CoE for their comments and discussions on different occasions.

Appendix A

Transcription symbols

. / ; / , / ? , / ?	falling/slightly falling/level/slightly rising/rising intonation
↑ / ↓	pitch upstep/downstep at the start of the following syllable
<u>en</u>	emphasis indicated by underlining
:	lengthening of a sound
[ ]	overlapping talk
(.)	micropause, less than 0.2 s
(0.5)	silences timed in tenths of a second
> <	talk inside is at a faster pace than the surrounding talk
< >	talk inside is at a slower pace than the surrounding talk
en<	glottal stop
a-	cut off
=	latching of turns
(joo)	uncertain hearing
@joo@	change in voice quality
#e#	creaky voice
°joo°	talk inside is more quiet than the surrounding talk
hh	audible exhalation; also used to indicate breathiness at end of an utterance
.hh	audible inhalation
---	unclear talk, not heard by transcriber

Glossing symbols

CLI	clitic particle
COM	comparative
CON	conditional
ELA	elative ('out of')
ESS	essive ('as')
GEN	genitive (possession)
ILL	illative ('into')
INE	inessive ('in')
INF	infinitive
NEG	negation
PAR	partitive (partitiveness)
PC	participle
PPC	past participle
PL	plural
PRT	particle
PST	past tense
SG	singular
Ø	zero person construction
1nameF	name, female

References

- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar, 2003. Concession in Spoken English. On the Realisation of a Discourse–Pragmatic Relation, From: http://aiemca.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Manuskript_Barth-Weingarten.pdf. Revised version of a doctoral dissertation (printed 08.06.11).
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, Etelämäki, Marja, 2012. Grammatical formats for directive actions in English and Finnish. In: Presentation at the kick-off seminar of the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Research on Intersubjectivity in Interaction, Helsinki, June 7–9. .
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, Thompson, Sandra A., 2000. Concessive patterns in conversation. In: Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Bernd Kortmann, (Eds.), *Cause–Condition–Concession–Contrast. Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Topics in English Linguistics 33, 381–410.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Viikuna, Maria, Korhonen, Riitta, Koivisto, Vesa, Heinonen, Tarja Riitta, Alho Irja, 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi (A Comprehensive Finnish Grammar)*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.
- Heritage, John, 2012. Epistemics in action: action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45 (1), 1–29.
- Jefferson, Gail, 2002. Is “no” an acknowledgement token? Comparing American and British uses of (+)/(-) tokens. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 1345–1383.
- Kangasharju, Helena, 2009. Preference for disagreement? A comparison of three disputes. In: Markku Haakana, Minna Laakso, Jan Lindström, (Eds.), *Talk in Interaction. Comparative Dimensions*. Studia Fennica Linguistica 14, 231–253.
- Koivisto, Aino, 2012. Discourse patterns for turn-final conjunctions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44, 1254–1272.
- Kotthoff, Helga, 1993. Disagreement and concession in disputes: on the context sensitivity of preference structures. *Language in Society* 22, 193–216.
- Labov, William, 1972. The study of language in its social context. In: Giglioli, P.P. (Ed.), *Language and Social Context*. Penguin, London, pp. 283–307.
- Laitinen, Lea, 2006. Zero person in Finnish. A grammatical resource for construing human evidence. In: Marja-Liisa Helasvuo, Lyle Campbell, (Eds.), *Grammar from the Human Perspective. Case, Space and Person in Finnish*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 209–232.
- Levinson, Stephen C., 2013. Action formation and ascription. In: Jack Sidnell, Tanya Stivers, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, pp. 103–130.
- Lindström, Anna, Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, 2013. Affiliation in conversation. In: Sidnell, Jack, Stivers, Tanya (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, pp. 350–369.
- Pomerantz, Anita, 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, John (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 57–101.
- Rauniomaa, Mirka, 2007. Stance markers in spoken Finnish. Minun mielestä and minusta in assessments. In: Englebretson, Robert (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 221–252.
- Routarinne, Sara, 2003. Tytöt äänessä. Parenteesit ja nouseva sävelkulku kertojan vuorovaikutuskeinoina (Girls talking. Parentheses and rising intonation as narrator's interactional devices). Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.
- Sacks, Harvey, 1987. On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences of conversation. In: Graham Button, John, R.E., Lee, (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organization. Multilingual Matters*, Cleveland, pp. 54–69.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer on Conversation Analysis*, vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, 1989. Vuoronalkuiset konnektorit: mutta (The turn-initial connectors: but). In: Hakulinen, Auli (Ed.), *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja I*. Kieli 4, 162–176, Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, 2001. Responding in Conversation, A Study of Response Particles in Finnish. *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series*, vol. 70. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

- Steensig, Jakob, Asmuß, Birte, 2005. Notes on disaligning 'yes but' initiated utterances in German and Danish conversations. Two construction types for dispreferred responses. In: Hakulinen, Auli, Selting, Margret (Eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation. Studies on the use on Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-interaction. Studies in Discourse and Grammar* 17, 349–373.
- Stivers, Tanya, 2008. Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (1), 31–57.
- Stivers, Tanya, Mondada, Lorenza, Steensig, Jakob, 2011. Knowledge morality and affiliation in social interaction. In: Stivers, Tanya, Mondada, Lorenza, Steensig, Jakob (Eds.), *The morality of Knowledge in Conversation. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics* 29, 3–24.
- Tainio, Liisa, 1998. *Preferenssijäsennys (The preference organization)*. In: Liisa Tainio (Eds.), *Keskustelunalyysin perusteet. Vastapaino, Tampere*, pp. 93–110.
- Vilkuna, Maria, 1997. Into and out of the standard language: the particle *ni* in Finnish. In: Cheshire, Jenny, Stein, Dieter (Eds.), *Taming the Vernacular. From Dialect to Written Standard Language*. Longman, London, pp. 51–67.