

At and og in Danish spoken language – a description

Andrea Bruun

Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik 5: 1

2018

ISSN 2445-7256

Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik (SoS) er en serie arbejdspapirer om samtalegrammatik som udgives af forskergruppen DanTIN ("Danish talkin-interaction"). DanTIN består af studerende og forskere fra og omkring Lingvistik på Aarhus Universitet. DanTIN bestyrer hjemmesiden samtalegrammatik.dk. Udgivelserne i Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik er arbejdspapirer, studenteropgaver, rapporter, afhandlinger og andet som beskriver og analyserer samtalegrammatiske fænomener.

Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik er ikke fagfællebedømt, men en redaktionsgruppe under DanTIN har vurderet at udgivelserne i SoS fortjener at komme til offentlighedens kendskab. I nogle tilfælde er der tale om ældre eller nyere skrifter, som DanTIN har fået lov af forfatterne til at udgive. I andre tilfælde er skrifterne lavet til SoS. Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik kan frit deles med angivelse af forfatter, årstal samt tidsskriftets navn og nummer.

DanTIN udgiver også fagfællebedømte artikler. Du kan se mere om vores udgivelser, projekter og resultater på <u>samtalegrammatik.dk</u>, og her kan du også se hvordan du kommer i kontakt med os.

Billedet til forsiden (*Kyssepelikaner*) er taget af Eva Hellesøe Nielsen og redigeret af Sidsel Mosegaard Holm.

Redaktionsgruppen for dette nummer består af Ehm Hjorth Miltersen, Katrine Garly og Jakob Steensig.

Redaktionel kommentar

Da vi startede det samarbejde mellem studerende og forskere som senere skulle blive til DanTIN tilbage i 2009, var én af de første ting vi observerede, at skriftsprogets ord "og" og "at" havde en anden fordeling i samtalesproget end i skriftsproget. Dette var selvfølgelig ikke en original opdagelse. Selv *Den Danske Ordbog* (uden årstal) noterer at "infinitiv-partiklen "at" udtales [ʌ]". Men ingen har hidtil redegjort for den anderledes *grammatiske* systematik der findes i samtalesproget i forhold til skriftsproget når det gælder udtalen og brugen af infinitiv-partikler og forskellige typer konjunktioner.

Dette er præcis hvad Andrea Bruun gør i dette nummer af *Skrifter for Samtalegrammatik*. For at forklare problemstillingen tager Andrea Bruun udgangspunkt i skriftsproget, men i resten af skriftet tager hun udgangspunkt i de former ordene rent faktisk har i samtaledata. Derved får vi præcise formuleringer af hvordan det forholder sig med ordene a [a], at [ad], a [Λ] og og [Λ w], hvordan de fordeler sig på ordklasser og hvordan de bruges i dansk samtalesprog.

Editorial comment

There are two words in written Danish, "og" ('and') and "at" ('that' or 'to') which have totally different realizations, belong to different word classes and perform different functions in talk-in-interaction. Some of these differences have been noted in dictionaries and grammars before, but until now, no systematic investigation of the corresponding words in Danish talk-in-interaction has been carried out.

This is what Andrea Bruun does in this issue of *Skrifter i Samtalegrammatik*. She describes the systematic distribution and functions of the words a [a] and at [ad] ('that'), a [Λ] (infinitive particle and 'and') and og [Λw] ('and') based on data from Danish talk-in-interaction.

At and og in Danish spoken language – a description

by Andrea Bruun

1 Introduction

The idea behind the orthography of any given language is to depict the sounds of the spoken words of that language. That is why letters correspond to sounds in an approximation of phonemic transcription of the spoken language (Jervelund 2007). The spoken language is fluid and changes and develops all the time where the orthography is often more stationary due to orthographic rules. Over a period of time this can create a gap between the spoken language and the written language where the orthography is no longer representing the spoken language. This gap is one of the reasons why it is interesting to create a description of the spoken language.

This paper will describe the two words at and og as they are realized in Danish spoken language. This will be done by using their orthographic representations as the basis for the analysis and look in authentic conversations for possible variations of these words. The description will contain a brief overview of the words' distribution in the written language and then the distribution in the spoken language.

2 Method and data

The data used in this paper is different authentic Danish conversations from the corpus SamtaleBank (2018). When showing examples from this corpus, these will be glossed loosely after the Leipzig Glossing Rules (2015). The conversations in the SamtaleBank are already transcribed, but the extracts used in this paper are altered so that some features such as intonation markers are not present. This is done to ensure clarity of the examples, and because these did not seem relevant for this analysis. The corpus has been searched for instances of the two words at and og in order to describe their distribution in the Danish spoken language and in total there are over 300 occurrences.

This paper is a basic grammatical description with elements from Conversation Analysis (CA). This paper will not look at specific CA elements such as the conversational sequence where you look at the construction and organization of turns. Examples occur more or less free

of context but context is still considered to the extent that it is necessary in order to say something about the particular phenomenon.

3 at

3.1 Written language

In written Danish language *at* has two functions and only one form. The different functions will be described below.

3.1.1 Conjunction

<at> can function as a conjunction to a subordinate complement clause (Christensen and Christensen 2009:231-232) and corresponds to the English *that* (GRO 2018). The function of the clause is typically nominal and <at> is positioned first. Below are examples of <at> used as a conjunction (1, 2, 3)(Christensen and Christensen 2009:231-232):

- (1) Jeg mener **at** han havde sko på I mean-PRS that.CONhe had shoe.PL on I believe that he was wearing shoes
- (2) Damen sagde **at** jeg bare skulle tage en kage lady-DEF said that.CON I just should take-INF a cake *The lady said that I should just take a cookie*
- (3) **At** han har løjet er en kendsgerning that.CON he have lie-PERF be.PRS a fact *That he had lied is a fact*

3.1.2 Infinitive particle

- (5) Han begyndte **at** dans**e**he began to.INF dance-INF
 He started to dance
- (6) Vær klar til **at** hopp**e**! be ready to.PREP to.INF jump-INF *Be ready to jump*
- (7) Hun elsker **at** sy she love to.INFsew.INF *She loves to sew*

3.2 Spoken language

In Danish spoken language at shares some of the same functions with the orthographic <at> but it has different forms. From the instances of at that have been investigated, three different forms appear: [a], [ad] and [Λ] (the phonemic form is used due to orthographic limitations). Each form will be described below.

3.2.1 [a]

<at> is most often realized as [a], where it has the same function as the conjunction in the written language. It is positioned first in a subordinate complement clause as well. In the transcript a simple *a* will be used to represent this form. Example (8, 9, 10) shows this function:

SAMTALEBANK/SAM2/SAMFUNDSKRISE/L190

(8) AST: jamen det jo sådan **a** <u>a</u>lle

CON it PAR ADV that.CON everyone

betaler e∾næsten topskat...

pay almost top:tax

Yes but it (is) in that way that everyone pays top taxes...

SAMTALEBANK/SAM2/SAMFUNDSKRISE/L198

(9) AST: men så det så bare **a**but then it PAR just that.CON

lønningerne var st<u>e</u>:get salary-PL-DEF was risen But then it (is) just that the salaries had risen SAMTALEBANK/SAM2/PREBEN_OG_THOMAS/L1417-1418

(10) THO: det var så fordi jeg sku til Thailand it was PAR because I should to Thailand

a je:g holdt et års that.CON I held one year-GEN

pause break

It was (particle) because I was going to Thailand that I took a one-year break

In these examples it is clear when listening to the conversations that the <t> from the written language is not realized. However, some examples might be ambiguous about whether a /t/ sound is present or not due to the environment where they appear. An ambiguous environment is where [a] is followed by a [d] consonant (alveolar plosive). But these examples (11, 12) follow the same pattern as showed above: only the vowel, [a], is realized and the ambiguity is due to the following word starting with a [d] consonant.

SAMTALEBANK/SAM3/MADLAVNING/L191-192

(11) JOR: je:::g jeg tror ikk jeg har været ude

for **a** der var nogen der sagde PRÆPthat.CONthere was anyone there said

nej no

I, I do not think I have experienced that there was someone who said no

SAMTALEBANK/SAM4/MØDREGRUPPE1/L485-487

(12) DO: å- å vedkommende kørte and and person:concerned drove (0.6)

så langsomt **a** det begyndte å so slow that.CON it started to.INF

blive farligt become.INF dangerous

And- and that person was driving so slowly that it was starting to get dangerous

So on basis of these findings the claim is that in Danish spoken language the vowel [a] is the normal way to express the conjunction <at>from the written language which means that the <t> from the orthographic representation is not realized.

3.2.2 [ad]

In some instances the <t> is realized through [d] giving the form [ad]. [ad] has the same function as [a] being a conjunction in subordinate complement clauses. The [ad] form is typically used in spoken language before hesitations in utterances. A typical hesitation marker in Danish is $\emptyset h$ (Samtalegrammatik 2014). Another hesitation marker is simply a pause causing silence in the utterance. So when [a] occurs before a hesitation marker as $\emptyset h$ or a pause it will be realized as [ad]. In the transcript at will be used to represent this form. This is shown in the examples below (13, 14, 15, 16):

```
SAMTALEBANK/SAM2/ANNE_OG_BEATE/L45-49
(13)
               det er fordi
       ANN:
                               at
                                          ø:::h
                    is because that.CONJ uh
               it
               (1.2)
               ham der min vejleder
                                          er med i ø:::h
                               counsellor is with in uh
               him there my
               (1.8)
                    national projekt→
               et
                               project
                     national
        It is because that guy, my counsellor, is in a national project
```

```
SAMTALEBANK/SAM2/ANNE_OG_BEATE/L66-67
```

```
(14) BE: men så:øh (0.5) reagerede han så å but then:uh react-PRT he ADV and sagde at øh de var ikke på said that.CON uh they were NEG on arbejde work
```

But then uh he reacted and said that uh they were not at work

SAMTALEBANK/SAM3/POLITIFORHØR/L76-78

(15)P2: så nytter det ikk noget du siger **at** then help it NEG anything you say that.CON (0.3)jam det der der har jeg alene været there there have I be-PERF but it alone It is no use (that) you say that "but that thing there I have been alone

SAMTALEBANK/SAM3/MADLAVNING/L373-374

(16) HAN: ø::h nu- (0.7) for eksempel har uh now for example have.PRS

jeg hørt **at** (0.4) I heard.PERF to.INF

hvis man går ind å arbejder me:dmed (.) if you walk in and work-PRS with with

foderudnyttelse fodder:utilisation

Uh now, for example I have heard that if you go in and work with with fodder utilisation

In these examples something equivalent to the <t> from the orthographic representation is present. The reason is probably that when hesitating you tend to stretch sounds, indicating some kind of trouble in an utterance (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018). The trouble in these examples would be a word search where the speaker is trying to find the right word(s) to use (Schegloff et al. 1977). So when a speaker needs to stretch a, [a], it becomes at, [ad]. The a form does not seem to appear in this position in the data.

Furthermore *at* can be used when a speaker wants to emphasize the complement clause. This is seen in the examples below (17, 18):

SAMTALEBANK/SAM3/GAMLEDAGE/L212

(17) LIS: nej men alene det **at** hun gjorde det no but alone it that.CONJ she did it No but only the fact that she did it

SAMTALEBANK/SAM3/POLITIFORHØR/L314

(18) P1: **at** gennemsnitlig så laver du that.CONJ average then make-PRS you

et indbrud (.) hver <u>a</u>nden °dag° a break-in every second day That in average you do a break-in every other day

3.2.3 [n]

The third form of <at> found in the data is the vowel [Λ]. This form functions as the infinitive particle within the infinitive phrase with nominal function. In the transcript \mathring{a} will be used to represent the [Λ] vowel as shown in the examples below (19, 20):

SAMTALEBANK/SAM2/PREBEN_OG_THOMAS/L1081

(19) THO: så ka han risikere å stå uden noget so can he risk-INF to.INF stand without anything Then he can risk ending up without anything

SAMTALEBANK/SAM2/ANNE_OG_BEATE/L89

(20) BE: jeg skal aflevere den

I must deliver it

°for å komme til eksamen°

for to.INF come to exam-DEF

I must hand it in to go to the exam

To briefly sum up this gives us three forms of the orthographic <at>: a, at and a. a is the standard way to express the conjunction and a is the normal way to express the infinitive particle. at is only used in special places such as before hesitation markers. An overview of the forms and functions is seen below. It can be seen as an alternative visualization of the rules of realization for at.

ORTOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION	FUNCTION	FORM	ENVIRONMENT
	conjunction	a [a]	in complement clauses
<at></at>		at [ad]	in emphasized comple- ment clauses before hesitation markers in complement clauses
	infinitive particle	å [ʌ]	before the infinitive verb

This means that the written <at> is realized through three forms (a, at and a) being in complementary distribution where at only occurs in the special environments listed above, a only before the infinitive verb and a elsewhere.

This corresponds to somehow to what you can find when looking at at in The Danish Dictionary (DDO) but is has not been investigated in the same way in a conversational corpus. Furthermore DDO claims that at is used as the infinitive particle when positioned first in the clause. It has not been possible to find such an example in the corpus. So in order to say something conclusive about this a greater corpus must be examined. Finally Christensen and Christensen (2009:155) claim that the conjunction at is often pronounced with audible final sound claiming that /t/ is often present in the spoken language. On the basis of the data examined in this paper, I claim the opposite.

4 og

4.1 Written language

In written language <og> functions as a conjunction between coordinate clauses (Christensen and Christensen 2009:152) and translates into the English *and* (GRO 2018). The examples below show this function (21, 22, 23):

- (21) Hun elsker hunde **og** katte she love-PRS dog-PL and cat-PL She loves dogs and cats
- (22) Manden har hue **og** vanter på man-DEF has hat and glove-PL on *The man is wearing hat and gloves*
- (23) Der er ost **og** mælk i køleskabet there is cheese and milk in fridge-DEF There is cheese and milk in the fridge

4.2 Spoken language

$4.2.1[\Lambda]$

In spoken language og is realized as the vowel [Λ] and has the same function being a conjunction between coordinate clauses. In the transcription the vowel \mathring{a} will be used to show this. Its function is showed in the examples below (24, 25, 26):

SAMTALEBANK/TELEFON/BILEN/L140

(24) BO: så ringet jeg til lægen mandag **å** fik then called I to doctor-DEF Monday and got

penicillin penicillin

Then I called the doctor Monday and got penicillin

SAMTALEBANK/SAM3/POLITIFORHØR/L100

(25) P1: hvor du stjæler kaffe **å** kopper where you steal coffee and cup-PL Where you steal coffee and cups

SAMTALEBANK/SAM2/SAMFUNDSKRISE/535

(26) AST: det var kun når vi sku til fyn it was only when we should to Funen

å så noget and such something

It was only when we were going to Funen and stuff like that

$4.2.2 [\Lambda W]$

 \mathring{A} is the normal way to express the <og>conjunction but another form is also found in the corpus: [\land w]. It has the same function as \mathring{a} being a conjunction but it seems to occur under specific circumstances in conversation. This form will be transcribed as og in the following examples. The corpus does not have that many occurrences of the og form so the following will be preliminary observations that need to be investigated further.

Og seems to be used to emphasize the fact that there are two coordinated elements. This is seen in the example below (27). In this example the underlining from the transcription is included to show that the speaker is stressing this specific word.

SAMTALEBANK/SAM4/MØDREGRUPPE1/L336-337

(27) SUS: [menden-]den je:::g købte til dig det but it it I bought to you it

var chokolade <u>og</u> nødder was chocolate and nuts But the one, the one I bought for you that was chocolate and nuts

In this example the speaker Susanne (SUS) is emphasizing that the coffee she bought the recipient Dorte was not only with chocolate, but it was with chocolate and nuts. So as a tool for emphasis og can be used instead of \mathring{a} .

Og can also be used before hesitation markers such as $\emptyset h$ and pauses. This is seen in the examples below (28, 29):

SAMTALEBANK/SAM3/KARTOFLER_OG_BROCCOLI/L863-867

(28) TI: ja hvor hun skal ind på prøve yes where hun shall in on trial

> (0.4) TO: °o°kay⊅ okay

> > (.)

TI: **og** Ø[:h] and uh

Yes where she is going in on trial. Okay. And uh

SAMTALEBANK/SAM4/MØDREGRUPPE1/L878-879

(29) SUS: jamen der var to hundrede **og** (0.3) tre well there was two hundred and three

hundrede otteogtredive hundred thirty:eight

tilmeldt

registrer-PERF

Well there were two hundred and (pause) three hundred and thirty-eight registered

But \mathring{a} occurs in this position as well (30):

SAMTALEBANK/SAM3/MADLAVNING/53-54

(30) ANN: med ø:::h hverdagssituationer å::: with uh everyday:situations and

(0.9) with uh everyday-situations and

This means that both \mathring{a} and og can appear before hesitation markers. In order to say something conclusive this needs to be investigated further in a bigger corpus, but as a preliminary observation both forms can appear in this position.

Another possible hypothesis of usage of the og form is when reading aloud in conversation. In these cases the speaker will correct the normal spoken language \mathring{a} to og maybe in order to reflect the <g> in written language. This could be a possible explanation for example (31) below. In this example the speaker Sebastian (SE) is reading a list of rules aloud from his computer.

SAMTALEBANK/SAM4/STUDIEGRUPPE/L479-481

(31) SE: ellers skal der værero klokken toogtyve otherwise must there be quiet clock-DEF twenty:two

å der må ikk ryges eller drikkes **og** and there may NEG smoke-PAS or drink-PAS and

SE: medbragt ·hhh[hhh] hvorfor må man ikk det bring:along why may you NEG it

Otherwise there must be quiet at 22 o'clock and there must be no smoking or drinking and bring along.... Why can't you do that

Another possible hypothesis could also be that you sometimes put emphasis on the last conjunction when mentioning elements on a list. As mentioned before in this example the speaker is reading rules aloud and then the *og* could mark that the list is ending after the conjunction. Both of these hypotheses need to be investigated further.

To briefly sum up this gives us two forms of the orthographic < og >: $\raise a$ and $\raise a$ being the standard way to express the orthographic conjunction and $\raise a$ being a less frequent form e.g. used to indicate emphasis. An overview of the forms and functions is seen below.

ORTOGRAPHIC REPRESENTA- TION	FUNCTION	FORM	ENVIRONMENT
	conjunction	å [∧]	between coordinates elements
<og></og>		og [ʌ w]	before an emphasized coordinated element before hesitation markers between coordinated elements to reflect orthography/to indicate last element of a list

This means that the written < og> is realized through two forms (\mathring{a} and og) being in complementary distribution where og only occurs in the special environments listed above and \mathring{a} elsewhere.

Further, DDO (2018) claims that the written language < og> is represented as a in the spoken language. They mention the spoken language og as a representation but do not explain where this form occurs. This paper has given some preliminary explanations on where og could occur.

5 [_{\lambda}]

The previous sections showed how <at> and <og> are represented in the spoken language. When comparing the forms from the written language with their forms in the spoken language, we saw that other forms were present. The results showed that in Danish spoken language there is no distinction between the infinitive particle \mathring{a} and the conjunction \mathring{a} . This means that in conversation the form [Λ] represents (at least) two functions. This has caused a tendency in the written language where language users are in doubt whether they should write at or og (Ordnet.dk 2011, Reichstein 2015). This causes alternative writings such as the example (32) below:

(32) Vi skal ud og spise weshall out and eat-INF We are going out to eat

Technically, this example is not grammatically wrong. It is possible to have og separating ud and spise and by that seeing them as two coordinate clauses. But in most cases this is not the intended meaning by the language users. The intended meaning is that the we in the example wants to go out in order to get something to eat. If this is the intended meaning then the language user should write at instead of og if following the standard grammatical rules. This is a claim that the spoken language has infiltrated the written language. Furthermore

this could be an argument for changing the written language so that it to a higher degree reflects the spoken language.

Finally, it should be pointed out that a and a have several other functions in the spoken language beside those mentioned in this paper. A can also represent <også> and a can furthermore represent the prepositions <ad> and <af> from the Danish written language. This means that there are even more forms to work with.

6 Conclusion

This paper has investigated how the two words <at> and <og> appear in Danish spoken language. <at> in the written language has only one form functioning as both a conjunction and the infinitive particle. In the spoken language at has three different forms: a, at and å. A and at function both as the conjunction from the written language with at only occurring before hesitations markers or to create emphasis. Å functions as the infinitive particle. <og> has one function in the written language. It functions as a conjunction between coordinated elements. In the spoken language two forms were found: å and og. Both forms function as conjunctions, but og seems to only appear under special circumstances. Such circumstances could be to emphasize that there is another clause, before hesitation markers or reflecting orthography or indicating the last element of a list. Å both represents the infinitive particle and the conjunction creating problems separating them in the written language.

References

- Christensen, Robert Z. & Lisa Christensen. 2009. *Dansk Grammatik* (2nd edn.). Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Margret Selting 2018. *Interactional Linguistics: Studying Language in Social Interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GRO Gyldendals Røde Ordbog. 2018. <u>https://ordbog.gyldendal.dk</u>. (accessed May 18th 2018).
- Jervelund, Anita Ågerup. 2007. *Sådan staver vi om ortografi og stavefejl*. København: Dansk Sprognævn og Dansklærerforeningens forlag.
- Leipzig Glossing Rules. 2015. https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resour-ces/glossing-rules.php. (accessed May 18th 2018).
- Ordnet.dk. 2011. https://ordnet.dk/sprogligt-1/at-eller-og. (accessed May 20th 2018).

Skrifter om Samtalegrammatik

- Reichstein, Tina. 2015. *At eller og?* https://syntaksis.dk/?s=at+eller+og. (accessed May 28th 2018).
- SamtaleBank. 2018. https://samtalebank.talkbank.org. (accessed May 14th 2018).
- Samtalegrammatik. 2014. Øh. http://samtalegrammatik.au.dk/opslagenkelt-visning/artikel/oehm/. (accessed May 17th 2018).
- Samtalegrammatik.dk. 2018. http://samtalegrammatik.au.dk. (accessed May 29th 2018).
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson & Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53(2). 361-382.