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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.
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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.
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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 recipiency (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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nii</th>
<th>versus</th>
<th>joo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>affiliation</td>
<td>neutral registering, disaffiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared information</td>
<td>new information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foregrounded information</td>
<td>backgrounded information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-compliance</td>
<td>compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuation relevant</td>
<td>closure relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
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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
then proceeds to a continuation, beginning with vaik, ‘even though; although’, that supports the complaint by offering an explanation as to why Jani’s conduct was unjustified.

Tuula responds with a joo mut utterance (line 8) at a point where the content of Jaana’s utterance is recognizable. With the turn-initial particle joo, Tuula confirms Jaana’s utterance on a general factual level (i.e., the secretarial college is respected). However in her subsequent talk that was initiated by mut ‘but’, Tuula corrects and updates Jaana’s knowledge: at the time when Jani expressed his dismissive stance, he did not know about the status of the school. As it becomes evident, this state of affairs has since been corrected (nyt se tietää, ‘now he knows’, line 9). Overall, then, Tuula’s joo mut utterance proposes to exclude the respected status of the institute as a basis for the complaint.3

Tuula’s turn is followed by a half a second of silence and during that time, Tuula looks away from Jaana but Jaana looks at Tuula. Then takes a turn and returns to her main line of action (note the particle nii (line 11) which can be translated here as ‘so’, as a sign of resuming the main line of action, Vilkuna, 1997; Sorjonen, 2001:270–273), which is the description of her stressful life situation and how it resulted in her developing psoriasis (data not shown). With her turns on lines 8–9 and 11–12, Tuula treats Jaana’s prior turn as a departure from the main line of action, that is, from Tuula’s description of her skin after her stressful situation. With her joo mut utterance, Tuula can be interpreted as having initiated a closure of a side sequence.4

This section has demonstrated that a joo mut utterance may be used to offer the prior speaker factual information about some state of affairs and, at the same time, to suggest a closure of the line of action that was projected by the prior speaker. When the speaker of the joo mut utterance provides either a correction or an update to the prior speaker’s knowledge, the disalignment expressed in the joo mut utterance is treated by its speaker as not being particularly problematic. This is evident from the absence of the clear signs of a dispreferred action in the joo mut utterance in example 1. Nevertheless, the joo mut utterance may also be used in more delicate situations. Let us now turn to examine these types of utterances.

4.2. The challenging joo mut utterances

The act of disaligning with a joo mut utterance may be socially more problematic when the speaker challenges the prior speaker with a counter-assertion that is based on a personal opinion or on a preference. Thus, instead of indicating that the prior speaker misunderstood some specific fact about the world, in these cases, the joo mut speaker displays that her/his opinion on the matter is different from the prior speaker’s opinion. I refer to this usage as the ‘challenging use’ of the joo mut utterances.

When a joo mut utterance is used to challenge the prior speaker, the utterance may be delayed and it may also contain disfluencies. These are common signs of dispreference (for example, see Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 2007:63–73; Tainio, 1998, on the preference organization in Finnish conversations). In example 2, the joo mut utterance is delayed and prosodically modified, but the particle joo and the contrastive conjunction mut are pronounced in the integrated form, as in example 1. This excerpt originates from a telephone conversation (in the 1990s), where Jouko is telling about a sale that his store has. Here he describes the computers that he has been selling at a discount.


1  Jouko: neljänkymmenen megatavan kovalevyllä nii
    with a hard drive of forty megabites so

2 .hh myytii sitä ulos nii,=
    .hh we sold it out so,=

3  Pekka: =on sii-n tila-a mut .hhh kyl ne nykyää
    is it-ESS space-PAR but .hhh PRT they nowadays
    =it sure has lots of memory but .hhh nowadays they ((the clients))

---

3 An anonymous reviewer suggested that Tuula could be proposing to exclude the unreasonableness of Jani’s behaviour rather than the status of the school as a basis for the complaint. But because Tuula states that Jani did not know about the status of the school, I interpret this as her excluding it as the basis for it.

4 It should be noted that Jaana finishes her turn on line 7 with the particle nii that invites Tuula to return to the main line of activity. In other words, Jaana treats her utterance on line 7 as a departure from the main line of action (see Sorjonen, 2001:267–268).
melkee vaati-i nii-tä, nii-tä,
almost demand-3SG those-PAR, those-PAR,
among demand those, those,

kolme kasi kutos-i-a,
three eight six-PL-PAR
three eight sixes, (=a computer with a 32-bit microprocessor)

(0.4)

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,

Pekka: ei välttämättä. =ei siis nopeus on niin,(.) ei se nii<
not necessarily. =I mean the speed is so, (.) it is not so<

[ (--) (--) (--) että,]
[ (--) (--) (--) so-that,]

Pekka: [joo.
[yeah.

Jouko: [nii,
[yeah,

(.)

Pekka: riippuu mitä ohjelmii käyttää.
it depends on what kind of programmes one uses.

Jouko: joo: no me: ollaan sitä sitte myyty neljään tonniin ni,
yea: well we: have sold it for four thousand so,
group of clients who would want such a computer. This counter-assertion disputes the need for private persons to own that type of computer. By stating this, Jouko displays a difference in the perspectives that he and Pekka have on selling computers. He also implies that Pekka’s point can be excluded from the on-going discussion because it does not pertain to his (Jouko’s) own business, which is selling to private customers. Jouko’s joo mut utterance is formulated as a fact (for instance, no mitigations occur in it). However, the limitation that Jouko’s utterance expresses is not an objective fact, but rather, it is based on Jouko’s subjective evaluation. I claim that this is visible in the delay (line 6) that occurs before the joo mut utterance, as well as in the prosodic modification that Jouko makes when pronouncing the particle j:ioo.

After some further discussion on computers, Jouko (line 14) pursues the telling that was interrupted on line 3, and mentions the discount price of the computers. As in example 1, the joo mut utterance was thus produced here in the context of an interrupted telling by the joo mut speaker. However, this time, the joo mut utterance neither updated nor provided new factual information to the other speaker, but instead challenged him with a counter-assertion that was based on a personal evaluation. As noted, this affects the formulation of the joo mut utterance in that it is delayed and prosodically modified, but also affects the reception of it. As a consequence, in example 2, the recipient of the joo mut utterance does not accept the assertion in the joo mut utterance immediately as an objectively correct fact, but treats it as a matter of opinion that can be further discussed (ei välttämättä, ‘not necessarily’, line 8). On the other hand, in example 1, when the joo mut speaker offered an update to the other speaker’s knowledge and based that update on a real world fact, the other speaker offered no opposition after the joo mut utterance.

Thus, when a speaker uses the joo mut utterance to challenge the prior speaker by making a counter-assertion, the speaker’s utterance may be delayed and contain disfluencies. These are turn-features that are often linked to dispreferred actions. However, the data for this study, delays and the disfluencies do not occur frequently, and when the participants pronounce the particle joo, in most cases, there occurs neither change in the pitch level nor prosodic lengthening. We can therefore conclude that the challenging joo mut utterance is not necessarily formatted as a dispreferred action. This is related to their use in argumentative contexts, where the preference for agreement may not prevail (for example, see Kotthoff, 1993; Steensig and Asmuß, 2005; Kangasharju, 2009).

In example 3, the speaker of the joo mut utterance presents a counter-assertion and consequently challenges the prior speaker. The joo mut utterance is integrated and not delayed, but it contains a restart and is a part of an argument sequence. This example is from a coffee table conversation involving five men, all retired farmers in their sixties and seventies, who are reminiscing about old times. In the excerpt below, two of them, Sauli and Perti, end up arguing about the way Pertti’s father gave his farm to Pertti and his brothers (not present).


1 Sauli: .hh Ja isä ol sikäli vïksu et se ei ann“tant”
       .hh and father was wise in that way that he did not relinquish

2  #ta-?, †liia aika[see.
       ((the possession of the farm)) #ta-?, †too ear[ly

3 Mauno:                                 [Pojilee.
                                       [to his sons.

4 Sauli: Juu:: .hhhh et opetti opetti niiko joka #a- aa- a:#lan
               Yea:: .hhhh so that he taught every #l- li- line# of work

5 kunnolla.
     properly.

((13 lines omitted))
Pertti: [Mite sitä] opetta-a jos ei?
   How PRT teach-3SG if NEG
   [How does one] teach if one can’t?

(0.6)

Pertti: ^mi-u miele-stä, hh. ite’k-kääh ossaa teh[-ää].
   I-GEN mind-ELA self-CLI know.how.to do-INF
   in my opinion, hh. can’t °even do ((‘it’)) oneself.

Sauli: [Joo
   PRT
   ]joo

mutta kun #on:: ee- eh-#,=
   but when is
   but when one #is/has:: ee- eh-#,=

Mauno: =Nii.
   =Yea.

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

kah#-ta: #ee# osa-t[a ja ↑neuvo-]o::=
   two-PAR know.how.to-INF and advise-INF
   both skills #ee# to be able to do and to ↑advise.

Touko: [ °(joo kyl)° ]
   [ °(yeah sure)° ]

Mauno: =Nii[;,
   =Yeah[

Pertti: [*Aha*.
   [*I see*.

Sauli: Juu:
   Yea:
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. 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 Peppa’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 kâmpästä minkälaine se oli. .hh well hey tell me about the apartment what was it like.

2 Vikke: no s_o:n↓to\(\uparrow\)si: iha:na?, well it’s ↓real\(\uparrow\)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\(\uparrow\)llai erikoine mutta siis .tch of course nothing ↑that special but

\(\uparrow\)on se tosi siisti.

it sure ↑is really neat.

7 Missu: ai\(\uparrow\)jaa;

Oh I see;

8 Vikke: ja, niinku aika siis, niinku, (0.2) no ei se nyt and, like quite, like, (0.2) well it was not

9 sil\(\uparrow\)lai ollu siisti ku me sinne tyttiinki.

neat in ↑that way when we got there.

10 Missu: ni\(\uparrow\)i, yeah,

11 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

12 vessa ihan hirvee ja >ikkuna-t ol-i kamala-t<

toilet really dreadful and window-PL be-PST terrible-PL

really dreadful t\(\uparrow\)oilet and >the windows were terrible<

13 ja uuni oli ihan kama:la ja, .hh

and oven be-PST quite terrible and

14 and the oven was just terrible and, .hh
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 status of Missu as a relatively unknowing participant (see her request for information on line 1; the newsmark on line 8; and the continuant *nii* on line 11; Sorjonen, 2001:233–238).

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.

The **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 affiliation 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 mää voisim 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 näätäs_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 aatteli 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 kuitenki jos muuttaa poiski ni mää en
    [.hh because] anyway if one moves away now then I won’t
    a- mää en kyllä siis tuu ajamaan tää vuoden aikana
    dr- I mean I for sure won’t drive
    paljo ollenkaa.
    almost at all this year.

6  Liability: °.nii° (0.6) "joo".
    °.yeah°(0.6) "yeah°.

The particle *nii*, 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 pikemmink 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 siiä 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 numerous

4 paikkakuntal#aiste#n tulla.
   come {{to the church}}

(0.3)

5 Ella: mnii<,
   myea<,

6 Alma: kun on niim p#aljo#v "väkee".
   because there is so #many# "people".

7 Ella: .hhh[h,]

8 Alma: [et] antaa paikkansa jollekkim (0.4) muille.
   [so] {{one should}} give her seat (0.4) to others.

9 >muulle<.
   >to another<.

10 Ela: 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.
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.

Ella: [.hhhh, ]

Ella: =>ei se sillä tavalla niin kovasti<, (0.2)
=>it is not in that way so very<, (0.2)

#m# kovasti sanottu o että onko se niiv
#m# very obvious whether it is so

valta- nelisten sataan sinne kirkkoon menee ni,
enorm- the church has capacity for about four hundred people so,

(,). 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 *nnii*, ‘yee=’, (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.


1  Vikke: mutta sikitas sille ja kysy että jos se kattoo et onks
      but phone her and ask if she would take a look if

2  sielt löytyny ("jo").
      it was found ("already").

3  (1.0)

4  Missu: nii 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-jo 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.
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, diii:, ‘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 ongoing 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).
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 viewpoint 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

![Fig. 2. The perspectives implied by the speaker of nii mut and joo mut utterances (Speaker B).](image-url)
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.
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Appendix A

Transcription symbols

: /; , ? , ? falling/slightly falling/level/slightly rising/rising intonation
↑ / ↓ pitch upstep/downstep at the start of the following syllable
en emphasis indicated by underlining
: overlapping talk
[ ] lengthening of a sound
( ) 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
\- 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
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