Grammar for adjusting assumptions: The Estonian enclitic *-gi/-ki* in interaction

Leelo Keevallik*

Department of Modern Languages, Uppsala University, Box 636, 751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

A B S T R A C T

The article shows how a bound morpheme, the enclitic *-gi/-ki* in Estonian, functions in the domain of interpersonal relations and mutual knowledge calibration in conversation. Speakers use the enclitic with verbs in order to adjust some assumption previously held by themselves or by their interlocutors. When formulating contributions in talk, participants always display assumptions about matters at hand as well as about what they believe other participants know. Furthermore, when accomplishing a first action in a sequence, they display an assumption that the next speaker will align in her action. All these assumptions are subject to adjustment by other participants who may present themselves as more knowledgeable on the subject matter or more entitled to provide opinions about it. The enclitic is used in reactive turns to indicate better epistemic access and higher authority in relation to a prior speaker, which may result in a disaligning action.

© 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

When participating in talk, speakers constantly display assumptions about matters that they talk about. These assumptions are not always correct and may be adjusted by other participants who present themselves as having more information or more authority on the matter. In interaction, different human experiences and perspectives are brought together, expressed in the temporally constrained turns within sequences of action. Implicit and explicit knowledge is displayed in speaker turns and it is also contested on the turn-by-turn basis. All of this is enabled by grammars that allow speakers to express various degrees of knowledge and may have developed special formats for carrying out different kinds of social action.

Many grammatical formats for expressing knowledge states and sources have already been thoroughly described in the literature on language. Evidential devices are used for showing the type of access the speaker has to the information, epistemic markers indicate the degree of speaker certainty. In addition, some grammatical devices are adapted to the task of conveying more subtle assumptions about the matter at hand. For example, a question in a specific form (positive/negative, with a tag or not) is heard as conducive of a certain kind of answer, thereby displaying speaker assumptions on what the answer will be (Sadock and Zwicky, 1985; König and Siemund, 2007). Thus, even though the authority to answer is rendered to the recipient of the question, the asker may indicate the degree of her own epistemic certainty. These assumptions and allusions need not be explicit but occasionally their existence can be proven by the subsequent behavior of other participants. Speakers can explicitly formulate an understanding of what the recipient of the allusive formulation conveyed

---

* Tel.: +46 18 471 13 15; fax: +46 18 471 13 23.
  E-mail address: Leelo.Keevallik@moderna.uu.se.

without saying (Schegloff, 1996:181), or articulate a 'missing' element of the addressee's preceding talk (Bolden, 2010), making public something that was only implicitly present in another participant's talk. Another example of a similar issue is that the first person to utter a statement on a subject in a conversation also makes an implicit claim that she has epistemic rights to the subject. Other participants may publicly confront this covert assumption (Heritage and Raymond, 2005). One strategy for doing that in English is to repeat the prior speaker's claim with a stress on the non-reduced copula (Stivers, 2005), another one in Finnish second assessments is to use the clitic *-kin*, which indicates independent access to the topic (Hakulinen et al., 2004:808). These are some examples of how linguistic structures can be employed to deal with matters that were only implicit in a prior turn.

The current study contributes to this line of research, looking at the grammatical enclitic *-gi/-ki* in Estonian, which is used for countering the assumptions expressed by a prior speaker or held previously by the speaker herself. It is a device for the speaker of a subsequent turn to make salient an epistemic gap between the current and a prior contribution and contest what was assumed there. Occasionally, this implies that the just-prior action is not responded to in the way the response was projected, resulting in a disaligning turn. Access to knowledge and authority to express the knowledge are closely intertwined with opportunities of alignment and affiliation in social interaction (as discussed across many contributions in the recent volume by Stivers et al. (2011a)). The current paper focuses on the Estonian enclitic in a specific sequential position: when it is used in turns that are reactive to something that has just happened, either in the conversation or in the context of talk. This position constitutes a subsection of the overall usage of the enclitic, supposedly representing its most dialogic facet.

A clitic is a grammatically independent and phonologically dependent morpheme. A proclitic attaches before the word and an enclitic after it. An enclitic can only appear with a host, which in the case of *gi/-ki* is basically any word, including nouns, verbs, adjectives and postpositions. *-gi/-ki* lacks prosodic independence, even though it may occasionally carry the main stress of the utterance. The enclitic is pronounced as a fortis (*k*) after voiceless sounds and as a lenis (*g*) after voiced ones, which shows its phonological dependence. Examples of its application are thus:

oleks 'would be' > *olekski*

oleme 'we are' > *olemegi*

The grammatical status of *-gi/-ki* is still being discussed. It has been characterized as an affixal particle (Tauli, 1972:93) but in the last comprehensive grammar it is interchangeably called an affix, a modal adverb, and a particle (Erelt et al., 1993:39, 1995:159,164). Its functions have been said to range from focusing to simple connecting, to marking of concessivity and surprise (Tauli, 1980:213–215; Erelt et al., 1995). In Finnish grammar, which is a close genealogical relative of Estonian, the corresponding item *-kin* (*-kaan/kään* in the negative) has been characterized as expressing speaker expectations, showing that her expectations were confirmed or contradicted (Hakulinen et al., 2004:807). It has also been suggested in the literature on Estonian that *-gi/-ki* has to do with expectations (Erelt et al., 1995:100; Metslang, 2002; Sang, 1983:44–45). In short, the semantics and pragmatics of the enclitic have seemed quite elusive. The *-gi/-ki* has also lexicalized with a number of adverbs, such as *ikkagi* 'still', *pealegi* 'in addition to', and *siiski* 'nevertheless', resulting in morphologically non-transparent words for present-day speakers.

Syntactically *-gi/-ki* is not applied according to the order of the words in the clause. Instead, the pragmatic effect it achieves depends on which type of word it is attached to (Metslang, 2002). Therefore, it is important to study its functions separately in different word classes, and the current paper only looks at verbs. At the same time, the scope of *-gi/-ki* has been claimed to be the whole sentence, not a single word or phrase (Tauli, 1980:212–215; Erelt et al., 1995:100). The present study shows that its area of operation is even wider than the sentence, namely, conversational sequence.

The theoretical aim of the paper is to demonstrate how a bound grammatical element functions across speakers and turns, dealing with the emergent status of knowledge and rights to knowledge. Pragmatic particles have been shown to function like that. For example, in Mandarin Chinese the final particles *ou* and *a* point out a gap between participants' knowledge and display expectations about the matter at hand (Wu, 2004). In order to explain the role of the enclitic *-gi/-ki*, it needs to be similarly scrutinized in relation to prior talk and, crucially, with regard to what the prior speaker has conveyed about his/her knowledge state and underlying assumptions. The present paper aims to show that in interactional data the contradicting or following of expectations can be empirically traced. One speaker says something that reveals her underlying assumptions, which are explicitly refuted by the next speaker with the help of the enclitic. The function of the enclitic can be elucidated by taking into account what has happened in the conversation so far and what the current speaker aims to do in relation to that. This is where the implicit "expectations" are at public display and may be explicitly oriented to by the next speaker. Thereby the expectations also become empirically available for the researcher and enable a functional analysis of the enclitic, grounded in participants' observable actions. The study thus illustrates how intuitive matters can be dealt with analytically.

2. The data

The data include both telephone calls and face-to-face events. The telephone call corpus consists of 324 calls of two types: telemarketing calls from a daily newspaper and everyday calls between family members, relatives, friends, and colleagues. The corpus includes more than 10 hours of conversation and more than 100,000 words. This has been the primary database

of the study. Additionally, examples of face-to-face interaction have been used from a video recording of a preparation of a Christmas dinner (2 hours) and from the publicly available Tartu corpus of Spoken Estonian (http://www.cl.ut.ee/suuline/Korpus.php), which includes shorter excerpts of talk from a wide variety of situations. The corpus is constantly growing. The version used for this study included about 300,000 words and 30 hours of talk. About one-third of the data come from institutional settings but the enclitic does not seem to reflect specifically institutional practices, apart from the bias that it is often the representative of the institution who displays knowledge and authority on the subject.

In these two corpora 323 instances of *-gi/-ki* usage were registered (excluding the lexicalized items). The majority of these, 226, were attached to verbs, which are in focus here. The very frequent occurrence with verbs supports the choice of pattern for this study. At least in spoken usage, the enclitic usage with other word classes is much less frequent and functionally heterogeneous. For example, its use with nouns generally implies addition, 'too, also', a function that should be studied in its own right.

As the aim of this paper is to reveal the interactional and interpersonal facet of *-gi/-ki*, the core of the data is constituted by the dialogic instances where the turn involving a verb + *-gi/-ki* is an immediate reaction to some action by another participant or something that has just happened. The reason for this delimitation is that earlier work on more monologic data has resulted in the above broad accounts of "expectations", which are of course in some sense correct but have nevertheless relied entirely on researcher intuition and native competence. In contrast, a look at more dialogic cases reveals empirically how the expectations are publicly displayed, recalibrated and reacted to by participants using grammar in real time. For one thing, this approach reveals that even in cases that could superficially be interpreted as "following expectations" actually subtly contradict some aspect of the prior turn. The dialogic restriction leaves us with 111 cases.

Within this database, there appeared three general patterns, all of which have to do with knowledge or authority assumptions, either those previously held by the speaker herself or the ones made by another participant.[1] In the following, it will be shown how a piece of bound grammar can be used to mark subtle turn-by-turn shifts in relative knowledge status and oppose or adjust implicit assumptions in prior talk.

3. Invalidating own prior assumption

Knowing is not necessarily a stable pre-existing state, since access to knowledge may be granted in the course of an interactive event. Participants' state of knowledge may change from moment to moment when information is produced by other participants or discovered in the surround. The speakers may mark the change-of-knowledge-state with turn-initial particles in subsequent turns (Heritage, 1984) but they may also verbally expand on what exactly the changed state is about. One grammatical option for doing the expansion in Estonian is to use the verb + *-gi/-ki* pattern, as it underlines that something previously held valid by the speaker has turned out to be not so.

In example (1) Piia is marking a change in her understanding of Anu's knowledge state, and related to that, her prior assumption about Anu's knowledge. Before the excerpt Piia has been telling about her mother receiving a TV-set as a present. The story comes to the end in lines (1–4) where Piia summarizes that the TV-set was a surprise to the immediate family. This statement is followed by a generic repair-initiator from Anu, displaying problems with what Piia just said. Anu's 'what?' leads Piia to realize that this fact was news to Anu, as we can see in her subsequent turn that involves a verb + enclitic (line 6). All the names in the excerpts are pseudonyms.

The pragmatically adequate translation of *-gi/-ki* into English implies heavy stress on some element of the clause or some syntactic focusing pattern. Therefore, the enclitic is often untraceable in the idiomatic English line. Sometimes words such as *indeed* and *really* provide a match.

(1)
```
1      Piia:    et   see  oli s    ikkagi üllatus. sest    me ju
                that this was then  still  surprise because we JU
                'So this was still a surprise. because we'

2               teadsime      et   me ei  saa  seda.
                know:IMF:1PL  that me NEG get  it:PRT.
                'knew that we would not get it.'

3               (0.4)

4               telekat.
                TV-set:PRT
                'the TV-set.'
```

---

[1] Some formulaic turns, such as the pre-closing *ongi kõik* 'that's all' have not been included.

```
5      Anu:      misasja,
                 'What?'


6      Piia:  → aa, sa ei teagi   seda     vä.
                 oh  you NEG know:GI that:PRT QUES
                 'Oh, you didn't know that.'


7      Anu:      ei,
                 'No.'


8      Piia:     ei no vahepeal   oli       juba   siuke et:, ei-
                 no NO for.a.while be:IMF:3SG already such  that no
                 'Well, for a while it was like, no -'


9                nad leidsid      et   see on    ikka liiga
                 they think:IMF:3PL that it  be:3SG still too
                 'they thought that it was too'


10               kallis.    need sugulased  onju.
                 expensive these relative:PL ONJU
                 'expensive. y' know the relatives (did).'


11     Anu:      issand jumal.
                 'Oh my god!'
```

In the target line (6) Piia first uses the change-of-information-state token *aa* (Keevallik, 1999) showing that something in the prior turn was news to her. She then produces a continuation in which the problematic point is spread out in the form of a candidate understanding of the situation. In the explanatory expansion the verb + -*gi*/-*ki* pattern is used. The enclitic in particular marks that Piia previously held a different position on the matter, namely that she was not aware that the information in lines (1–2) was new to Anu. In fact, Piia has used the particle *ju* (line 1) which shows that the speaker assumes common epistemic ground among the participants (Erelt et al., 1993:100). Piia has thus explicitly expressed her assumption that Piia and Anu already share the information about the TV-set not being an option for the present. In line 8 Piia launches into an explanation: the relatives had at some point considered a TV-set too expensive (lines 8–10). She then retells the story in a different way, relying on a renewed set of knowledge assumptions.

The readjustment of Piia's knowledge state in line (6) also serves as an account for why the story was told in the way it was in the first place. In her turn, Piia thus takes care of the social issue of recipient design while explicitly marking her newly achieved access to a piece of knowledge. The turn-initial change-of-state token *aa* marks a generic realization, the following clause involving verb + enclitic makes explicit the mismatch between the speaker's prior assumption on Anu's knowledge state and her current adjusted state. Since the enclitic is embedded within a clause, it enables a more specific targeting of the adjustment than the generic change-of-state token does. In this particular excerpt, Piia even mentions knowledge in the clause, which does not have to be the case. At the same time, formatting the knowledge state adjustment as a question, as happens in the excerpt, is a recurrent pattern. The speaker expresses that she is reconsidering her prior assumptions in the light of what just happened and asks for confirmation of her new understanding. In the following example (2), the pattern is basically the same as in (1) but knowledge is not explicitly mentioned in the enclitic clause. A course-mate informs another one that she is not ready with her work. The recipient draws a conclusion based on that.

(2)
```
1    Mari:     ahah, (0.2) .h no ma ei lähe kuhugi. sest    ma %
                okay          NO I  NEG go  anywhere because I
                'Okay, (0.2) Well I won't go anywhere. because I'


2               ei jõua % seda  kooli     asja     ära teha
                NEG manage this:PRT school:GEN thing:PRT prepare:INF
                'will not manage to prepare the school thing'
```

```
3               ja  ära  viia.
                and away take:INF
                'and to take it there.'

4    Tiia:      ahhaa.
                'I see.'

5               (0.4)

6    →          sa  ei  käindki  koolis.
                you NEG go:KI    school:INS
                'You didn't go to school?'

7    Mari:      ei, ma ei jõudnud    sinna.
                no  I  NEG manage:PPT there:ILL
                'No, I didn't make it.'
```

Again, the turn-initial particle *ahhaa* (a variant of *aa*, Keevallik, 1999) in line (6) marks a change of information state and the expansion specifies in what respect the current speaker has to adjust her assumptions. The enclitic is used in a clause showing that Tiia previously believed that Mari had been to school. The turn-expansion constitutes a candidate understanding based on Mari's prior turn and Mari has to confirm it. The expansion of the turn thus elicits a confirmation of something indexed as news for Tiia. This very mechanism has also been described for the final particle *ou* in Mandarin Chinese (Wu, 2004:51–63), which illustrates the common social-epistemic underpinnings of divergent linguistic elements (enclitic, particle) in geographically and genetically disparate languages.

In contrast to the above examples, the change from a prior assumption to a new understanding need not be brought about by mere verbal information. Participants interact in a richly structured social environment where information does not have to be provided within talk and conversation. In example (3) the speaker notices a fact in her surround and marks her prior assumptions as changed after that. The example comes from a telemarketing call and in line (1) the client agrees to subscribe to a paper until the end of the year.

```
(3)
1    C:      seda    et aasta   lõpuni  tellime.
             this:PRT ET year:GEN end:TER subscribe:1PL
             'We'll subscribe (to it) till the end of the year.'

2    TM:     .h=

3    C: →    =aaah. siin polegi   midagid  enam. november -
             oh    here NEG:be:GI nothing  left  November
             'Oh, there is not much left. November -'

4    TM:     november-detsember.=
             'November and December.'

5    C:      =jah.
             'Yeah'
```

The client then discovers that there is not much time left till the end of the year. This change in her knowledge state is verbalized first in the change-of-state token *aaah* (a lengthened version of *aa*) and then explained in a verb + enclitic clause. The enclitic in particular marks the fact that the speaker previously held a different position on the time-span. Importantly, this is not a conclusion based on prior talk, there has to be another source of information. This shows that *-gi/-ki* is not restricted to the social action of formatting candidate understandings on the basis of talk, which could have been a hypothesis based on examples (1–2). The function of the enclitic may be found within the domain of epistemics regardless of the type of information source.

The following excerpt (4) comes from the beginning of a phone call between two sisters who live in different countries. From the fact that Elle answers the phone at home on her birthday, Kare draws the conclusion that she is not partying. This is another example of a conclusion is at least not entirely based on talk, as it takes into account the whole context: the exact

date, the time of the day, the location of the phone. The clause involving verb + enclitic expresses that partying was expected but that the speaker has just changed her prior assumptions. Again, the prior speaker has to confirm this interpretation of her preoccupations.

(4)

```
1    Kare:        no palju õnne, hh
                  NO much  luck: PRT
                  'Congratulations,'

2    Elle:        aitäh,
                  'Thanks,'

3    Kare: →      no mis teed  seal. sa  ei olegi
                  NO what do:3SG there you NEG be:GI
                  'What are you doing. you're not'

4                 kuskil   pidutsemas.=
                  somewhere partying
                  'partying somewhere.'

5    Elle:        =hh ei ole, (.) mul  on natuke õppida   ja nii.
                     NEG be      I:ADS is some  study:INF and so
                  'No, (.) I have to study a little.'
```

As it happens, all the examples so far have demonstrated cases with negative formulations, which is not surprising since one of the regular functions of the negative is to mark that an expectation is not fulfilled. The enclitic, however, can equally well appear in a positive clause, which shows that it marks a change in the speaker's state of knowledge independently of the polarity. In excerpt (5) from the beginning of a phone call a speaker draws a conclusion based on the circumstances, quite similarly to the prior excerpt. Esko answers his job phone and Kaire concludes that he is at work, which is apparently unexpected to the extent that it is mentioned. In line (4) Kaire marks that she has just changed her assumption that the contrary may have been the case. Indeed, she has called Esko's office and must have had some information as to his whereabouts. However, place of the call-taker is not regularly formulated in calls to land lines and if his presence at work was entirely commonplace, it would not have been worth mentioning at all. With the help of the enclitic Kaire shows that she now has epistemic access to the information that enables her to produce the statement. The conclusion is formulated in positive polarity.

(5)

```
1    Esko:        E:sko räägib.
                  NAME  speak:3SG
                  'Esko speaking.'

2    Kaire:       tere Esko, Kaire olen.
                  hi   NAME  NAME  be:1SG
                  'Hi Esko, this is Kaire.'

3    Esko:        tere tere.
                  'Hi.'

4    Kaire:→      sa oledki   tööl    täna.=
                  you be:2SG:KI work:ADS today
                  'You're indeed at work today.'

5    Esko:        =jah,
                  'Yeah,'

6                 (0.3)

7                 muidugi.
                  'Of course.'
```

Characteristically, the verb + enclitic pattern is also used in incredulity questions that ask for reconfirmation. The speaker marks that she has just heard something that made her seriously reconsider what she has held true so far. A formulaic way of doing that is displayed in (6). The phrase *ongi nii vä* 'is that so?' is regularly used in questions accomplishing incredulity.

(6)

```
1    Ene:        .hh e m tead     ma elistan, ja  ma ütlen    et, e mh
                        know:2SG I  call:1SG and I  say:1SG that
                        'You know I'm calling, to tell that,'

2                (0.3)

3                .h et   ma ei  saa tulla    laulma,
                   that I  NEG can come:INF sing:SUP
                 'that I  cannot come and sing,'

4    Rita:       o- ota m         kuna. mis:,
                   wait:IMP:2SG when  what
                 'Wait when. What,'

5    Ene:        e üldse. ennem jõule.
                   at.all before Christmas
                 'at all. before Christmas.'

6    Rita: →     ongi  nii vä.
                 be:GI so QUES
                 'Is that really so.'

7    Ene:        jah.
                 'Yeah.'

8    Rita:       oi sellest  on küll   kurb kuulda.
                 oh this:ELT is indeed sad  hear:INF
                 'Oh to hear this makes me sad indeed.'
```

The pattern described in examples (1–6) is most likely to have led to the characterization of *-gi/-ki* as a marker of surprise (e.g. Tauli, 1980:213–215). When a participant has just been provided access to new and unexpected information, surprise is easily implied. However, as will be shown with various related patterns below, the regularity of *-gi/-ki* usage is not to be found in the individual expression of emotions but in sequences of action. The enclitic is not in itself a marker of surprise. It expresses contrast with what the speaker or her interlocutor assumed earlier, which can be done with more or less affect.

The first section of the paper has argued that it is possible to mark a change in the speaker's state of knowledge by using verb + *-gi/-ki*. In particular, the verb + enclitic pattern indicates that her prior state of knowledge has merely amounted to an assumption, and the clause involving the enclitic *-gi/-ki* expresses a more solid fact-based understanding. This illustrates that participants' knowledge is not independent from the actual discourse or the evolving conversational events in real time. The speakers do not merely enter a social event with a set of knowings and expectations that they code in lexicon and grammar but the knowings and assumptions are continuously adjusted. It was shown above that the enclitic pattern can involve epistemic as well as other kinds of verbs, that the crucial new information may be obtained from verbal or non-verbal sources, and that the pattern occurs across both polarities, even though it is more common in negative clauses that already express that the matter is counter to expectations.

In contrast with a mere change-of-state token, the verb + *-gi/-ki* pattern spells out the nature of the change. The speaker's internal change-of-state from false assumptions to better knowledge is thereby made public. When it is the interlocutor who brings about the change-of-state, he has an obligation to confirm or disconfirm the formulation. By making her change-of-state public, the speaker can readjust the content of her narration (example 1), display appropriate affect in reaction to bad news (example 6), or show concern that the other is not having fun (example 4). To mark that I previously held assumptions that I just adjusted can thus be useful at several levels: to make sense for the interlocutor, to accomplish connectivity in real-time conversation, and to achieve social ends in relationships.

One obvious question arising from the above analysis is how much of the action import of the turns is due to the enclitic. Even though it occurs in the actions described, this could be a mere coincidence. However, it is impossible to just eliminate the enclitic from the turns above and retain the action profile of the turn. This is the paradox of the analysis and the reason why contrastive examples are hard to find. Formulations and conclusions without *-gi/-ki* such as *sa ei käinud koolis* 'you didn't go to school' and *sa oled täna tööl* 'you're at work today' do not explicitly mark the speaker's change-of-knowledge-state, nor

do they formally connect to prior discourse. The enclitic formalizes the link backward in time, its domain is the current turn plus the immediately prior discourse or context against which the change has taken place. The temporal dimension of the domain varies in regard to the specific actions. The affected action-span may be somewhat longer when it concerns an inappropriately recipient-designed story (example 1) and somewhat shorter when it is a result of a noticing in the physical surround (example 3). In any case, the domain of the enclitic is larger than a single clause, sentence or turn.

Based on occurrence regularities and the qualitative analysis, it can be claimed that verb + enclitic is a format used to express adjustments in the knowledge state in the form of a clause. As could be seen in examples (4–6), the turn-initial change-of-state token need not be used in the turns involving the verb + enclitic. The enclitic on its own can accomplish identical action from within the clause, i.e. later in the turn than the change-of-state token does. That in itself is an important interactional affordance, as it enables marking the news in a syntactically embedded way.

4. Invalidating interlocutor's assumption

In the above, it was shown that the enclitic -gi/-ki is regularly used in clauses that mark the just-accomplished change in the speaker's knowledge state, either as a result of an other participant's action or some contextual matter. In the current section the same mechanism is shown to function across speakers: one speaker conveys an implicit assumption and another one counters it, publicly marking the need to adjust the first speaker's state of knowledge or claimed social-informational status. This illustrates, among other things, how knowledge emerges in discourse across time and is negotiated among the participants. As a supplement to earlier studies on evidentiality that look at how speakers code their level of certainty of knowledge or its source (Chafe and Nichols, 1986; Fox, 2001; Kärkkäinen, 2003), the current section demonstrates how a grammatical device figures in interpersonal negotiations on access to knowledge and authority. Conversation analytic research in particular has been interested in how speakers manage presuppositions of epistemic access (Stivers et al., 2011b:10), epistemic stance (Kärkkäinen, 2003; Wu, 2004) and epistemic primacy. The latter is defined as "asymmetries in the depth, specificity or completeness" of participants' knowledge (Stivers et al., 2011b:13). Speakers may have differential access to a subject, and their access may be of varying depth and specificity, which implies that they also enjoy a different degree of authority in regard to the matter.

The section first shows how a participant may subtly challenge the assumptions displayed in a prior turn and display her superior epistemic access to the subject at hand. Second, a participant may address the prior speaker's epistemic rights and authority. The verb + -gi/-ki pattern is used for both of these tasks, as they are closely related: higher authority often comes with better access to the matter. The examples are arranged to show more of an emphasis on access first, and more emphasis on authority later. Finally, it will be argued that concerns of authority go beyond epistemic matters and that the enclitic may be used generally for establishing speaker rights to decide on interactional and interpersonal matters.

4.1. Targeting epistemic access

Example (7) shows a simple case of the practice of targeting a knowledge assumption conveyed in a prior turn by another speaker. It comes from a telemarketing call and in lines (1–4) the telemarketer offers to call back. By asking him to call in the afternoon the client conveys an implicit assumption that the call can also be made at other times during the day. In the following turn, the telemarketer refutes this assumption by using a clause with verb + enclitic.

```
(7)
1    TM:      ahhaa. (.) ah soo. .h a   kas: ee võibolla
              oh        right    but QUES   maybe
              'Oh. (.) right. maybe I could'

2             elistaksin    teile   omme    tagasi.
              call:COND:1SG you:ADS tomorrow back
              'call you back tomorrow.'

3             (0.2)

4             kas  sobib    see teile.
              QUES suit:3SG this you:ALL
              'Does that suit you.'

5    C:       jah, aga õhtupoole,=
              yeah but afternoon
              'Yeah, but in the afternoon,'
```

```
6     TM: →      =jaa  me  töötamegi    õhtupoole  alati. (.)
                  yeah we  work:1PL:GI  afternoon  always
                  'Yeah we always work in the afternoon. (.)'

7                [ iga päev.]
                  'every day.'

8     C:         [ mhmh,]
                  'Uhuh'
```

In terms of social action, the telemarketer aligns and complies in line (6), as he agrees to call in the evening. However, he also chooses to set the record right in terms of his work schedule. This clearly concerns the telemarketer's area of expertise and knowledge that he has access to. In the continuation after the complying *jaa* 'yeah' he expresses something that he has authority to know, in contrast to what the prior speaker merely assumed. In this way, the telemarketer's turn-expansion is an adjustment from an epistemically strong position. The verb + enclitic format allows the telemarketer to accomplish the compliance projected in the prior turn while adjusting the assumption displayed there and claiming first-hand knowledge on the issue. Part of the proof of his better epistemic access is the addition of time notions, 'always' and 'every day', which are used as evidence of his detailed knowledge of the work schedule.

Example (8) is a case where the caller to an office does not understand that the person who has answered the phone is the one she usually talks to. This is expressed in lines (2–4), where it becomes clear that the caller assumes she is not talking to Viiu Sisask. In her response, VS reverses the caller's assumption with a clause involving the enclitic. She obviously has access to her own identity and can thus make such a claim form an epistemically strong and authoritative position.

(8)

```
1     VS:        jaa?   tere.=
                 'Yeah? hello.'

2     Eve:       =ma muidu   räägin   Viiu Sisaskiga,
                 I   usually talk:1SG NAME NAME:COM
                 'Usually I talk to Viiu Sisask'

3                aga nüüd mul  ükskõik   kellega. @
                 but now  I:ADS no.matter who:COM
                 'but now it doesn't matter.'

4                [ @]

5     VS: →      [ a:²] mina: mina olengi    Viiu  Sisask.
                 but    I     I    be:1SG:GI NAME  NAME
                 'But I am Viiu Sisask.'

6     Eve:       issand kui tore. @ .h aga äälest
                 Jesus  how nice      but voice:ELT
                 'Jesus that's nice. but (I)'

7                ei  tundnud ära.
                 NEG recognize:PPT
                 'didn't recognize (your) voice.'
```

In the turn where the enclitic is used the speaker aligns with the action trajectory projected by the prior speaker, such as agreeing to call in the evening (example 7) or to become a conversation partner "whoever" (example 8). However, the speaker simultaneously challenges an assumption conveyed by the prior speaker. The implication is that the prior speaker was mistaken, which can also be socially awkward, as in the above case when the answerer of the phone is not recognized. In both excerpts (7–8) the producer of the enclitic reacts to what the prior speaker has just said. The enclitic marks that the current utterance is reactively tied to the immediately prior talk, it functions as a formal connection between the current and the prior turn. Thus, the pattern of verb + enclitic among other things constitutes a part of the intersubjective reactive grammar of Estonian. It is used to formulate reactions to a prior action or event.

---

[2] *A* is a short of *aga* 'but'. It differs from the news receipt *aa* by being shorter and never carrying any stress or an independent intonation contour.

One type of prior events is questions. Even though a question officially treats the recipient as more knowledgeable, it may be designed in a way that already displays significant assumptions on the matter asked about. Thus, the answer may be formatted with the enclitic pattern. For example, in (9) the telemarketer asks whether the potential client's disinterest in the paper is due to the subscription of other newspapers. This question is not open to a variety of answers, as it seeks confirmation for a very specific hypothesis. A positive *jah* 'yeah'-final question is strongly conducive of a positive answer. The client, however, responds negatively and provides an account that includes the verb + enclitic format.

(9)

```
1    TM:     jah, (ja) on mõned    muud     lehed
             yeah and  is some:PL other:PL paper:PL
             'Yeah, and you have subscribed to'

2            tellitud           jah.
             subscribe:IPS:PPT QUES/yeah
             'some other newspapers right.'

3    C:      ei:, ma olen    üks@inda, m@a o@len   pensionär, ja
             no  I  be:1SG alone      I    be:1SG retired     and
             'No, I am alone, I'm retired, and'

4    →       ma olen   invaliid. ma lihtsalt ei  jõuagi
             I  be:1SG disabled  I  simply    NEG afford:GI
             'I'm disabled. I simply cannot afford'

5            neid       tellida  (X),
             these:PRT subscribe:INF
             'them (X),'
```

Syntactically, the clause in focus builds on the question by repeating the verb 'subscribe' (comp. lines 2 and 5) and is therefore hearable as a direct response to it.[3] The enclitic reinforces the crucial word 'afford' in the response turn, which also carries the main stress in the clause. This is the reason why *-gi/-ki* has been characterized as a marker of "communicative focus" (Erelt et al., 1993:100). It regularly reinforces the item that is prosodically and informationally in focus, as can be seen in examples (1–5, 7–9). However, the prosodic focus is pragmatically grounded in the interpersonal access to knowings and their adjustments. In the current example the verb + enclitic is used for refuting the assumption in the question that the client can afford newspapers, and the verb 'afford' is therefore focused. While refuting the assumption, the clause makes public what is tacitly implied in the question.

Another disaligning response to a question is shown in example (10). In line (1) a future newspaper subscriber asks how to mark the promised discount in the subscription form. The telemarketer discards the whole question by saying that there is nothing that has to be marked, as everything can be arranged on the phone (the continuation of TM's turn not shown). The question thus remains unanswered, TM's response is disaligning, prohibiting the sequence from proceeding the way it was projected by the client.

(10)

```
1    C:       ja kuidas ma selle  märgin?
              and how    I  it:GEN mark:1SG
              'And how should I mark that.'

2    TM: →    .hh e teil   ei olegi vaja      kuhugi
                    you:ADS NEG be:GI necessary nowhere
                    'You don't need to run anywhere'

3             joosta ega kuhugi   märkida.
              run:INF EGA nowhere mark:INF
              'or mark anything.'
```

---

[3] The clause also constitutes a summary of the three-part list: the client is alone, retired and disabled. The enclitic is regularly used in summarizing clauses of stories but these more monologic instances will have to wait for a separate analysis.

The telemarketer's turn includes the verb + enclitic pattern and reveals that the main presupposition of the question – that a form has to be filled out – does not hold. The telemarketer thereby demonstrates her better access to the information, which of course follows from her participant role in this interactional event. As a representative of the institution, she can claim the right and authority to adjust false assumptions by the client.

The epistemic assumption-orientation of the enclitic thus becomes clear across a variety of sequences, such as sequences initiated by directives, informings and questions. Next speakers may either align or disalign. In examples (7–8) the responses involving enclitics promote the course of action projected by the prior speaker. The verb + -*gi*/-*ki* pattern can thus be used in turns that comply with the action but nevertheless deal with the distribution of knowledge between the participants. It is a device of establishing the current speaker's access to and authority on the information previously assumed by the prior speaker. This may result in a quite innocent and reassuring action, as in the case of wrongly assumed work hours in example (7) but it may also constitute a socially problematic correction of facts, as in example (8). In disalignments (excerpts 9–10), the verb + -*gi*/-*ki* pattern similarly shows that the epistemic grounding of the prior turn was inadequate, and the inadequacy is formulated as the reason for not doing the projected action. The enclitic enhances the pragmatic focus of the clause while dealing with interpersonal matters across turns. The verb + enclitic pattern accomplishes a specific social task and the clauses are not replaceable by, for example, a clause without the enclitic. The latter would have a different pragmatic focus, which would not necessarily deal with the knowledge aspect.

4.2. Targeting authority

In some instances of -*gi*/-*ki* usage, matters of authority rather than access to knowledge seem to be the primary concern for the speaker. Interactants may have similar access but still be concerned with who possesses the rights and authority to the knowledge. A speaker may challenge the authority of the producer of a piece of information and establish her own rights to this particular information in the next turn (Stivers, 2005). As part of revising what the prior speaker said or implied the current speaker may display herself as more knowledgeable on the issue and with superior rights to the knowledge. This is illustrated in example (11) where the speakers are talking about Ene's sister who has recently moved to Holland.[4] Upon hearing about her move, Kaido speculates that the sister will get involved with a Dutch guy (line 2). This is formulated as a prediction, something that might happen in the future. The speaker also downgrades his epistemic certainty with the particle *ega* (Keevallik, 2009:150–155). Ene refutes his assumption that this is a mere hypothetical prediction by claiming that this is indeed what will happen.[5]

(11)

```
1    Kaido:    mts ega ta  sealt      tagasi ei  tule enam. (.)
                   EGA she there:ABL back   NEG come anymore
                 'I don't think she will come back.'

2              võtab     endale Ollandi   mehe    ja.
               take:3SG  self:ALL Dutch:GEN guy:GEN and
               'she'll marry a Dutch guy.'

3    Ene: →    võtabki.
               take:3SG:KI
               'That's what she'll do.'

4              (.)

5              päri[selt] ka.
               really    too
               'It's true.'

6    Kaido:        [võ-]

7    Kaido:    @@ võtab   ve. @
                  take:3SG QUES
                  'She will.'

8    Ene:      jaa.
               'Yeah.'
```

---

[4] This information is available within the call. The sister is referred to as 'sister' throughout the call and Ene has just presented the news of her moving to Holland.

[5] Note that there is no future tense marking in Estonian. Present tense stands for future as well.

```
9      Kaido:     @@@@ .hh no vaata,       mis  ma ütsin. /-/
                          NO see:IMP:2SG what I  say:IMF:1SG
                   'See, what did I say.'
```

Ene formulates her turn in line (3) as a statement that is not epistemically downgraded. On the one hand she aligns and confirms Kaido's prediction, but on the other she asserts her epistemic primacy regarding the knowledge domain, her sister's life. First of all, Ene reuses the verb from Kaido's turn to accomplish the confirmation, instead of simply using a confirmative particle. That already establishes the relative independence of the statement from the prior, as compared to a particle whose whole sense would have been essentially dependent on the prior turn. A verb repeat is generally an option of a response to yes/no questions and other first pair parts in Estonian (Keevallik, 2010) but in this context a verb repeat could not have been used on its own. The enclitic makes the response grammatical. It also functions as a reinforcement of the response, accomplishing an even more independent establishment of the facts and underlining speaker authority. Ene is indeed the only one in this conversation who is in the position to confirm her sister's dating status, as Kaido and Ene have not been in contact for several years and neither have Kaido and Ene's sister.[6] Ene has better epistemic access to her sister's life and can appeal to the socially grounded authority for her claim. The use of the grammatical pattern of verb + -*gi/-ki* is thus closely intertwined with social matters of who knows what with how much authority in comparison with another participant. What is a mere prediction for a participant with no access to, or authority on, the matter may be authoritatively established as a fact by an entitled participant.

Extract (12) presents a case where epistemic authority, and not access, is clearly the main issue. The topic of the talk is the preparation of a Christmas steak. In line (3) Hele expresses concern about the time the roasting is going to take. Confirming the roasting time in line (4), Kert simultaneously establishes his authority on the topic of steak preparation. He uses two verb + enclitic forms to reinforce his epistemic primacy, claiming deeper and more accurate knowledge as compared to the prior speaker. He is also the one physically handling the piece of meat during the excerpt, actually taking responsibility for its preparation.

(12)

```
1      Kert:      see  on vist  natuke liiga suur.
                  this is maybe little too   big
                  'This may be a little too big.'

2      Hele:      a    seda — äkki  peaks    pooleks lõikama,
                  but it:PRT maybe must:COND half:TRA cut:SUP
                  'But it — Maybe we should cut it into halves,'

3                 see võtab    mitu   tundi    aega     muidu.
                  it  take:3SG several hour:PRT time:PRT otherwise
                  'otherwise it'll take several hours.'

4      Kert: →    eino ta võtabki     mitu    tundi.
                  EINO it take:3SG:KI several hour:PRT
                  'Well it will take several hours.'

5                 peabki      võtma.   aga- aga ma vaatan.
                  must:3SG:KI take:SUP but  but I  see:1SG
                  'It has to. But let's see.'
```

The turn in lines (4–5) refutes the assumption displayed in the prior turn that a long preparation time should be avoided, even though Kert agrees on the factual matter that the steak in its current size will take time. The enclitic-enforced confirmation thus accomplishes the social aim of claiming expertise and establishing the current speaker as more of an authority than the producer of the initial statement. Kert's second clause 'it has to' further underlines his authoritative stance. Even this clause contains the verb + enclitic pattern. Cases such as this illustrate how the meaning of a grammatical pattern arises within the sequential contingencies of speaker turns, rather than being an expression of some pre-existing expectation on how things are. Kert here addresses an issue implied in Hele's turn and displays an independent and different stance to it, a task that is suitably carried out by the verb + enclitic pattern.

Relatedly, it has been argued that the Finnish corresponding enclitic -*kin(-kaan/kään)* in responsive position (in assessment sequences) displays that the speaker has independent access to the topic at hand, even though she agrees (Hakulinen et al., 2004:808). Verb + enclitic pattern is thus used in the two related languages, Estonian and Finnish, to claim

---

[6] Also this information come from the phone call itself: Ene has called Kaido on their mutual birthday, which comes as a big surprise to Kaido. They discuss that they have not met "since we were thirteen" and they are in their early twenties now.

authority of knowledge about a matter in the first hand expressed by another speaker. Along similar lines, Heritage and Raymond (2005) have argued that the linguistic formats of tag-questions and negative interrogatives in English, when used as second assessments, challenge the prior speaker's claim of epistemic primacy. Language structures arise from and are adapted to handling these kinds of interpersonal matters, including the establishment of epistemic ecologies among the participants. Participants obviously sometimes aim to set the records right when it comes to who is entitled to which piece of knowledge.

As a means of adjusting assumptions, the verb + enclitic pattern may be used for framing the prior turn as a misinterpretation of what the current speaker had said previously. Speaker A says something, B reacts, and A then adjusts the assumption displayed in the reaction. Typically, the verb 'think' + -gi/-ki is used for accomplishing this. The speakers in example (13) are discussing a common visit to the birthday party of a former class-mate. In line (1), Mari states that she will be looking for a present. Pire argues against this, suggesting that they make the present together. In the subsequent turn, Mari claims to have meant precisely this – that she will find a common present. She thus aligns with Pire on the matter of a common present but with the help of verb + enclitic she simultaneously refutes Mari's assumption that Pire did not mean that already in her first turn.

(13)

```
1    Mari:      /–/ kinki       ma vist  pidin         ise
                    present:PRT I   maybe must:IMF:1SG self
                  'I will probably have to look for'

2               vaatama.    sest .h –
                look.for:SUP because
                'the present myself. because –'

3    Pire:      ei me võime – s   kui  me lähme, s
                no we can:1PL then when we go:1PL then
                'No, we can – if we go'

4               me võime    küll kingi       koos     teha.=
                we can:1PL KÜLL present:GEN together make:INF
                'we can make the present together.'

5    Mari: →    =.h jaa. ma mõtlengi. (.)  et  ma võin
                    yeah I   think:1SG:GI that I   can:1SG
                'Yeah. that's what I thought. (.) that I can'

6               seda   ise: noh: nagu otsida, /–/
                it:PRT self NOH  like search.for:INF
                'look for it myself.'
```

In order to understand what Mari accomplishes here with the verb + -gi pattern, it is important to look closely at Pire's turn in (3–4). Pire initiates it with a negation word, expressing maybe not a blunt disagreement but definitely a turning point in the sequence. Her response does not align. The turn is furthermore initiated at a moment when Mari has already projected a continuation of hers, thus cutting into Mari's talk and not letting her finish. Pire then continues to make a proposal in the form of a full clause, as if accomplishing a first action in the sequence, which makes relevant a compliance as the next action. Mari indeed complies immediately, supporting the analysis. Crucially, Pire's turn does not show any understanding of the prior turn as having been an offer. She formats her turn as an alternative to what Mari said, as it is possible to hear Mari's turn in lines (1–2) as a statement about how she will go about her own present.

In lines (5–6) Mari re-establishes her authority and authorship. She makes a point out of ensuring that this was indeed her idea too and that she is not just complying with Pire's proposal. Here the enclitic is again crucial, as it marks the explicit tie backwards to the earlier turn, achieving an adjustment of the assumption displayed there. Without the enclitic and the pragmatic focus on 'think' Mari's turn could sound like a simple offer to find the common present. With the current formatting, the turn also takes the authoritative stance that a joint present was Mari's idea from the start. The issue here is not primarily epistemics, who knows what, but more the ownership of the idea and the proposal. It is obviously important for speakers to claim primary authorship, even though they align and agree, as happens in this excerpt.

However, speakers may also challenge others' assumptions in a more confrontative way, for example, by refusing to do the next action and thereby undermining the local authority of the prior speaker. Excerpt (14) illustrates that. It starts when a topic of a prospective rental arrangement is coming to a close. In short, Pille has contacted a renter on behalf of Tiit, apparently because they believe that girls have a better chance. Tiit has now called to accuse Pille for messing things up with the contact person (referred to as 'aunty') to whom he has just talked to himself. Lines (20–24) can be heard as Pille's defensive account. After this rather troublesome sequence where Tiit ends up silent for a considerable time, Pille elicits a new

topic from Tiit in line (27). Tiit's answer to the question is disaligning, he refuses to take up any topic at all. He thereby refutes the assumption conveyed in Pille's question that they would continue to talk about other things.

(14)

```
1   Tiit:    noo täendab e mm (0.2) muud     nagu ei
             NOO mean:3SG          else:PRT like NEG
             'Well, I mean (0.2) there was nothing else'

2            ondki,    et   ma: lihsalt andsin      oma
             be:PPT:KI that I   simply  give:IMF:1SG own
             'I simply gave (her) my'

3            numbri     edasta[miseks]. sellele. .hh
             number:GEN forwarding:TRA   that:ALL
             'number to forward to him/her/that one.'

4   Pille:                  [a a,]
             okay

5   Tiit:    tädi  nagu ei osand   midagi suurt
             aunty like NEG can:PPT nothing much
             'The aunty could not tell (me)'

6            rääkida. ta ütles     et [oma] nik ise
             tell:INF she say:IMF:3SG that owner    self
             'much. she said that the owner'

7   Pille:                             [aa]
             okay

8   Tiit:    tuleb e j- (.) järgmine nädal kohale,
             come:3SG    next    week  place:ALL
             'would come (.) next week'

9            et   siis arutab. h
             that then discuss:3SG
             'and (we)'d discuss it then.'

10  Pille:   aa, jaajaja.
             okay yeah.yeah.yeah
             'Okay, yeah yeah yeah.'

11           (1.3)

12  Pille:   no üesõnaga jah, no mingi neljapäl    ta
             NO in.short yeah NO about Thursday:ADS he
             'Well, I mean yeah, apparently he'

13           pidi      tulema   nüüd. h mai tea
             must:IMF:3SG come:SUP now   I:NEG know
             'will come on Thursday, I dunno.'

14           (1.6)

15  Pille:   vot. h .h st    et   noh muidu
             VOT     because that NOH otherwise
             'Yeah. because otherwise'

16           oli nagu  see et   et  eeee-
             be:IMF:3SG like this that that
             'it was like –'
```

```
17                       (0.3)
18    Pille:      et   noh –
                  that NOH
                  'well'
19                       (0.8)
20    Pille:      nojah, üesõnaga oli         niuke värk onju.
                  NOJAH  in.short be:IMF:3SG such   thing ONJU
                  'Well, I mean that was the thing you know.'
21                       (0.7)
22    Pille:      .hhh et   ää ma  oin        nagu seal mingi
                       that    I   be:IMF:1SG like there like
                  'I was there like'
23                eesotsas eksju. ja  s    pärast seda
                  front:INS EKSJU  and then after  that:PRT
                  'in the front, y' know. and after that'
24                tulid        need ülejäänd tüübid. hh
                  come:IMF:3PL these other    dude:PL
                  'the other dudes showed up.'
25                .hh o:kei. mh
                      okay
                  'Okay.'
26                       (0.2)
27    Pille:      .hh aa mis  ise  räägid. h
                      but what self talk:2SG
                  'What will you talk about.'
28    Tiit: →     ee, muud    ma   ei  räägigi. hh
                      else:PRT I    NEG talk:GI
                  'I won' t talk about anything else.'
29                       (0.2)
30                muud    polegi    midagi      rääkida. hh
                  else:PRT NEG:be:GI nothing:PRT talk:INF
                  'There is nothing else to talk about.'
31    Pille:      aa.
                  'Oh.'
32                       (1.2)
33                ee (0.3) mmm  mm mis  tähendab.
                                   what mean:3SG
                  'What does that mean.'
```

   Syntactically, both clauses involving the verb + enclitic in lines (28) and (30) build explicitly on Pille's question by reusing the lexical item 'talk'. Reuse of the lexical items and -*gi*/-*ki* show that Tiit's present contribution is a reaction to the question. Indeed, several examples in the current section (9–12) show this repeating-reactive feature of the pattern. The repetition as well as the enclitic formally tie the current contribution to an earlier one, in order to undermine some more or less subtle aspect of it. The contrast with the prior is enhanced by the prosody as well as the enclitic. Example (14) is quite extreme as in lines (28–30) Tiit completely blocks the action sequence initiated by Pille. He thereby questions her authority to have asked the question in the first place and to have assumed that she would receive an aligning answer. Tiit's response leads Pille to ask for an account in line (33), which shows that she has interpreted it as severely disaligning and therefore accountable. The long pause in line (32)

further supports the analysis that Pille is waiting for Tiit to do something more, which he noticeably refrains from. 'There is nothing else to talk about' is a socially problematic way of discontinuing the conversation, particularly because these two participants usually chat for half an hour or so in the recordings. In short, Tiit uses the verb + enclitic pattern to accomplish a disaligning action that challenges Pille's authority to extract conversation topics from him in the ongoing call.

To summarize the current section, when a speaker declares another participant's assumptions invalid, she can deal with it in two ways: either by aligning in terms of action, or by disaligning with what the prior speaker projected. In extreme cases, the projected activity may be blocked altogether. The verb + enclitic pattern is one grammatical option for refuting assumptions while either aligning or disaligning in terms of action. The enclitic functions within the interpersonal sphere, marking that the current speaker is not going along with (all) the hearable assumptions in the prior turn. The enclitic deals with interpersonal relations, relative knowledge and relative authority of the participants. It is used in clauses that make explicit how the prior turn is considered inadequate and which of its assumptions are declared invalid. At a more general level, the enclitic is a cross-turn tying device, showing that the current turn is done in relation to a prior. In this way, the enclitic functions within the domain of the conversational sequence, where the speakers reveal their assumptions and "expectations" as the talk evolves. In the dialogic setting studied in this section, the "expectations" are assigned to the prior speaker, and concern access to knowledge and level of authority. The enclitic -*gi/-ki* is used to counter either an explicit or implicit assumption that has been evident in the prior speaker's talk and to mark the epistemic primacy and authority of the current speaker on the topic of that talk.

5. Conclusion

The article looked at the usage of the enclitic -*gi/-ki* in Estonian, the function of which has been difficult to formalize in grammatical descriptions. It demonstrated that a subset of usages limited to verb + enclitic pattern in conversational exchanges can be coherently described as invalidating a prior assumption. The enclitic is used in clauses that refute, correct, or adjust something that was implied earlier. The limiting of the dataset to the verb-based pattern in reactive turns enabled us to see a functional regularity that has so far been overshadowed by the general fuzzy picture of the occurrence of the enclitic in a variety of grammatical positions and, assumedly, functions. The verb + enclitic format ties the current turn to prior talk, either the speaker's own or somebody else's, (re-)establishing authority over the claim and the epistemic primacy of the current speaker on the matter. The enclitic -*gi/-ki* is therefore an item whose full description in grammar needs to incorporate social matters, such as distribution of knowledge among the participants, and their relative authority to make statements on the topic at hand.

The enclitic basically states "I know better than you/before and I am the one entitled to know". Thus, it deals with the issue of access and authority to knowledge (Stivers et al., 2011a), not simply epistemic certainty. The speaker is not in the first hand characterizing her own stance towards the piece of information being provided, but her supremacy in relation to the prior speaker or her own prior self. The enclitic marks that the speaker herself used to know/assume falsely or that the conversation partner knew/assumed falsely, occasionally by claiming knowledge that does not in the first hand belong to him. The enclitic enables accomplishment of a correction without explicitly telling the other person that he is wrong, thus being a more subtle social device. The adjustment is embedded within an explanatory clause. The grammatical device is used for dealing with social selves in relationship to each other: who knows better and who has more authority.

The proffered account of the meaning of -*gi/-ki* is more precise than the earlier ones that have generally claimed that the enclitic is a focusing device and deals with expectations. Expectations are hard to document empirically. The paper showed that speaker assumptions appear vividly in sequences of talk and action, as is witnessed by next speaker reactions to them. This is why the sequential method of conversation analysis is especially appropriate for studying patterns that deal with the 'unsaid', and the enclitic in particular. Grammatical matters, such as the polarity of the clause do not seem to be of much relevance when it comes to the functioning of the enclitic. Accordingly, the regularity of function does not occur within the morphological or syntactic structure of the language alone but can also be found in the interpersonal sphere. Furthermore, it is not justified to see the enclitic as only focusing the verb within the clause, as it deals with the relationship between the current and some previous turn. However, the fact that it appears on verbs in these patterns is relevant, as the same function is not achieved when the enclitic is used with items from other word classes. Future studies could analyze functions of -*gi/-ki* with nouns, adjectives, postpositions, etc. in dialogic or monologic settings. This paper showed that the functional domain of an enclitic can be a sequence of actions. A bound morpheme functions across speaker turns dealing with interpersonal matters of mutual knowledge and relative authority.

Transcription conventions

underlining	emphasis
-	truncation
[ ]	overlaps
=	latching of turns
(0.5)	pause length in tenths of a second
(.)	micropause

:	lengthening of a sound
@	a laughter syllable
.hh	breathing in,
hh	breathing out
((snort))	transcriber's comments
/−/	something has been left out from the same turn
boldface	the focused item in the excerpt
.	pitch fall at the end of an intonation unit
?	pitch rise at the end of an intonation unit
,	level pitch at the end of an intonation unit
-	unfinished intonation unit
/	alternative translations

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3	person
ABL	ablative
ADS	adessive
ALL	allative
COM	comitative
COND	conditional
ELT	elative
GEN	genitive
GI	clitic -*gi* (a phonological variant of the clitic -*ki*/-*gi*)
ILL	illative
IMF	imperfect
IMP	imperative
IPS	impersonal
INF	infinitive
INS	inessive
KI	clitic -*ki* (a phonological variant of the clitic -*ki*/-*gi*)
NAME	name
NEG	negation (particles *ei, ära*)
PL	plural
PPT	past participle
PRT	partitive
QUES	question particle
SG	singular
SUP	supinum
TRA	translative
Other capital letters	an untranslatable particle

References

Bolden, Galina, 2010. 'Articulating the unsaid' via *and*-prefaced formulations of others' talk. Discourse Studies 12 (1), 5–32.

Chafe, Wallace, Nichols, Johanna, 1986. Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology. Ablex, Norwood, NJ.

Erelt, Mati, Kasik, Reet, Metslang, Helle, Rajandi, Henno, Ross, Kristiina, Saari, Henn, Tael, Kaja, Vare, Silvi, 1993/1995. Eesti keele grammatika I–II [Estonian grammar I–II]. Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Eesti Keele Instituut, Tallinn.

Fox, Barbara A., 2001. Evidentiality: authority, responsibility and entitlement in English conversation. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 11 (2), 167–192.

Hakulinen, Auli, Vilkuna, Maria, Korhonen, Riitta, Koivisto, Vesa, Heinonen, Tarja Riitta, Alho, Irja, 2004. Iso suomen kielioppi. (The Comprehensive Grammar of Finnish).Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Heritage, John, 1984. A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In: Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, J.C. (Eds.), Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 299–345.

Heritage, John, Raymond, Geoffrey, 2005. The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences. Social Psychology Quarterly 68 (1), 15–38.

Keevallik, Leelo, 1999. Informatsioonikäsitluse partikkel *ahah* telefonivestlustes.(Information management particle ahah in phone conversations). Emakeele Seltsi Aastaraamat 43, 34–56.

Keevallik, Leelo, 2009. The grammar–interaction interface of negative questions in Estonian. SKY Journal of Linguistics 22, 139–173.

Keevallik, Leelo, 2010. Minimal answers to yes/no questions in the service of sequence organization. Discourse Studies 12 (3), 1–27.

Kärkkäinen, Elise, 2003. Epistemic Stance in English Conversation: A Description of its Interaction Functions, with a Focus on *I think*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

König, Ekkehard, Siemund, Peter, 2007. Speech act distinctions in grammar. In: Shopen, Timothy (Ed.), Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. 1. Clause Structure. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 276–324.

Metslang, Helle, 2002. In: Kasik, Reet (Ed.), *-ki/-gi* ka ja nende soome kaimud. (-ki/-gi, ka and their Finnish relatives). Lähivertailuja 12, 57–81.

Sadock, Jerrold M., Zwicky, Arnold M., 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. In: Shopen, Timothy (Ed.), Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. 1. Clause Structure, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 155–197.

Sang, Joel, 1983. Eitus eesti keeles [Negtion in Estonian]. Tallinn, ENSV TA Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1996. Confirming allusions: toward an empirical account of action. American Journal of Sociology 102 (1), 161–216.

Stivers, Tanya, 2005. Modified repeats: one method for asserting primary rights from second position. Research on Language and Social Interaction 38 (2), 131–158.

Stivers, Tanya, Mondada, Lorenza, Steensig, Jakob (Eds.), 2011a. The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stivers, Tanya, Mondada, Lorenza, Steensig, Jakob, 2011b. Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. In: Stivers, Tanya, Mondada, Lorenza, Steensig, Jakob (Eds.), The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 3–26.

Tauli, Valter, 1972/1980. Eesti grammatika I–II [Estonian grammar I–II]. Uppsala, Soome-ugri keelte Instituut.

Wu, Ruey-Jiuan Regina, 2004. Stance in Talk: A Conversation Analysis of Mandarin Final Particles. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.