SSM REPORT 5

Björn Hammarberg and Åke Viberg

REPORTED SPEECH IN SWEDISH AND TEN IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES

Rapportserien SSM Reports

SSM-rapporterna (serien *SSM Reports*) utgavs vid Institutionen för lingvistik, Stockholms universitet i anslutning till forskningsprojektet *Svenska som målspråk (SSM)* som understöddes av Skolöverstyrelsen 1973–1980. Redaktör för serien var Björn Hammarberg. Projektet var inriktat på studium av sådana företeelser i svenskans struktur och användning som utgör problem för vuxna inlärare av svenska som andraspråk med olika modersmål.

Förteckning över SSM-rapporterna

1. Hammarberg, Björn & Åke Viberg (1977), *Felanalys och språktypologi. Orientering om två delstudier i SSM-projektet.* 34 s.
   Även tryckt i *Nysvenska studier* 57 (1977) i form av två uppsatser, "Svenskan i ljuset av invandrares språkfel" av Björn Hammarberg (s. 60–73) och "Svenskan i typologiskt perspektiv" av Åke Viberg (s. 74–85).

2. Hammarberg, Björn & Åke Viberg (1979), *Platshållartvånget, ett syntaktiskt problem i svenskan för invandrare*. Andra, omarbetade upplagan. 67 s.
   En engelsk version är tryckt i *Studia linguistica* 31: 106–163 (1977) under titeln "The place-holder constraint, language typology and the teaching of Swedish to immigrants".

3. Hammarberg, Björn & Åke Viberg (1976), *Anaforiska processer i svenskan i invandrarperspektiv – några utgångspunkter*. 13 s.
   Även tryckt i *Nysvenska studier* 55–56: 213–226 (1976).

4. Åslund, Jan (1976), *Araber skriver svenska – arabisk syntax och arabers syntaxfel i svenskan*. 47 s.

5. Hammarberg, Björn & Åke Viberg (1976), *Reported Speech in Swedish and Ten Immigrant Languages*. 21 s.
   Även tryckt i *Papers from the Third Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, red. Fred Karlsson (1976). Turku: Academy of Finland, Text Linguistics Research Group. 131–148.

6. Strömqvist, Sven (1980), *En orientering om NP, kasus och prepositioner i ryska*. 21 s.

7. Viberg, Åke (1980), *Tre semantiska fält i svenskan och några andra språk: 1. Kognitiva predikat. 2. Perceptionsverbens semantik. 3. Emotiva predikat*. 103 s.
   En förkortad version av uppsats 1 är tryckt i *Svenskans beskrivning 12*, red. S. Fries & C.-C. Elert (1980). Umeå universitet. Uppsats 2 även i *Tvåspråkighet*, red. A. Stedje & P. af Trampe (1979). Stockholms universitet. Uppsats 3 även i *Kontrastiv lingvistik och sekundärspråksforskning*, red. B. Hammarberg (1979). Stockholms universitet, Institutionen för lingvistik.

8. Viberg, Åke (red.) (1983), *Studier i kontrastiv lexikologi: Perceptionsverb*. Andra, utökade upplagan. 133 s.

9. *Studium av ett invandrarsvenskt språkmaterial* (1983). 115 s.

10. Hammarberg, Björn & Åke Viberg (1984), *Forskning kring svenska som målspråk. Två forskningsöversikter: 1. Grammatik och ordförråd (Åke Viberg). 2. Fonologi (Björn Hammarberg)*. 64 s.
    Även i *Nordens språk som målspråk. Forskning och undervisning*, red. K. Hyltenstam & K. Maandi (1984). Stockholms universitet, Institutionen för lingvistik.

CONTENTS

Tables

REPORTED SPEECH IN SWEDISH AND TEN IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES[*]

One thing that we often have to do in human communication is to <u>report speech</u>, for example to tell or ask somebody what somebody else has said. From the point of view of immigrant instruction, it is interesting to find out if the means of expressing reported speech differ in various languages.

<u>Table 1</u> gives a simple illustration of the speech-reporting situation. Initially, we have the situation that is given in square brackets in section 0, the fact that Bo is watching TV. The first step is that some speaker S verbalizes this in an utterance to some listener(s) L. For our present purposes we may call this <u>non-reported speech</u>. <u>Reported speech</u> occurs when a speaker verbalizes the situation given in section 1 and renders it either in the form of <u>direct report</u> (section 2a) or in the form of <u>indirect report</u> (section 2b).[1]

0.	INITIAL SITUATION	
		[Bo is watching TV]
1.	NON-REPORTED SPEECH	
	[S utters to L]	Bo is watching TV
2a.	DIRECT REPORT	
[S utters to L]	Tom says	"Bo is watching TV"
2b.	INDIRECT REPORT	
[S utters to L]	Tom says	that Bo is watching TV

Table 1. A first illustration of speech reporting. Speech situations are indicated in square brackets. S = a speaker, L = a listener.

The little model in table 1 can be expanded and varied in several ways, of course. It may be applied recursively: <u>John says that Tom says that Bo is watching TV</u>, etc. Statement, question and command may be combined in various ways. So may the identity of the persons involved. Time and place relations may vary. Etc.

One example of a particular combination is given in <u>table 2</u>. What interests us here is the difference in form between direct and indirect report. We notice that the indirect form in this example brings about a change in word order, the insertion of a subordinating particle <u>if</u>, and the alteration of person, tense, and punctuation.

1.	NON-REPORTED SPEECH	
	[Tom utters to Fred] Was Bo watching TV?	

2a.	DIRECT REPORT	
[Sven utters to Bo]	Tom asked Fred	"Was Bo watching TV?"

2b.	INDIRECT REPORT	
[Sven utters to Bo]	Tom asked Fred	if you had been watching TV.

Tabel 2. Example based on table 1.

The reason for these changes is obvious: in the direct report, the lower clause still retains its deictic reference to the situation in which it was originally uttered, the situation in section 1 in the table. In the indirect report, the lower clause is governed deictically by the higher clause and is viewed in relation to the situation in which the higher clause is uttered (i.e. the situation in section 2b). Thus, Bo is third person in Tom's utterance to Fred, but second person when he is addressed by Sven. Tom's utterance is a direct question to the listener Fred, but not to the listener Bo.

The forming of indirect report thus involves a sentence subordination process and a number of other adjustments determined by the change in deictic reference. What we want to find out here is (a) to what extent various languages actually distinguish between a direct and an indirect form of report, and (b) what grammatical means they apply. We shall be concerned with Swedish in comparison with the ten immigrant languages that are involved as source languages in the SSM error investigation.[2]

Indirect report is a nice field to demonstrate the workings of subordination in languages, and it is also worthy of attention because it is an area of Swedish grammar where learners run into many problems. Report is, however, not a syntactic class but rather a functionally defined sentence-type. There is not a clear borderline between indirect report and other types of hypotactic sentences. Most typically, we have to do with a quotation clause that is governed by a verb of saying (say, tell, ask, report, write etc.). This is the type of sentences that we have investigated in our sample of immigrant languages. Further, the verb may be nominalized (the question whether...), or implied. We shall not deal here with cases where the quotation comprises longer stretches of sentences, nor with the additional markers of report that may occur, such as according to our spokesman and the like. But it is worthwhile to include examples of reported thought, i.e., quotations governed by a verb of thinking (think, believe, assume, know, remember etc.) since these sentences are constructed exactly like reported actual speech in Swedish and present the same learning problems. In languages like Swedish a criterion to show that a subordinate clause can be understood as indirect report is that it is possible (with reasonably acceptable result) to supply a "direct" counterpart. For example, one may try to judge in sentences like (1) and (2) if a verb

can be used as a verb of report.

(1) Lasse $\begin{cases} \text{sa} \\ \text{tänkte} \\ \text{?antog} \\ \text{?visste} \end{cases}$: "Peter är tokig".   Lasse said / thought / assumed / knew, "Peter is crazy".

(2) Lasse $\begin{cases} \text{frågade} \\ \text{undrade} \\ \text{?ifrågasatte} \\ \text{?visste inte} \end{cases}$: "Är Peter tokig?"   L asked / wondered / called in question / didn't know, "Is P cr?"

A group of sentences that are abundant in the error material consists of what we may label "pseudo-reports". These are sentences like I'll tell you what happened, He explained how the trap worked, I remembered what Ann had said. They look like indirect reports in that a clause with the form of an indirect wh-question is governed by a verb of saying or thinking. Yet the lower clause is not a quotation, and there is no "direct" counterpart. With an inquiring verb they could pass as indirect reports: I ask you what happened, He asked how the trap worked, I wondered what Ann had said. Pseudo-reports cause the same types of learning problems in Swedish as true indirect reports, judging from the error material, and they involve largely the same grammatical mechanisms. Hence, we shall give them some attention in the following.

If the direct and the indirect report form were always equally likely to occur, we would always have to rely on overt markers in order to tell them apart. But this is not actually the case. There are many contexts, styles, and types of text or discourse where the indirect form is clearly the dominant, or most expected one. This would apply, for instance, to most contexts in a reasoning text. Since we are primarily interested in the system of distinctive markers here, we shall mostly leave the bias of the context aside. But still, there are cases where the interpretation of direct or indirect has to be determined from the context in order, for instance, to identify a deictic referent, as in the Finnish sentence (3).

(3) /matti kysyy tuletko   sinä/   Matti asks,
     Matti asks come-QUESTION you   "Are you coming?"
                                 or
                                 ...if you are coming.

The person is adjusted in the indirect form in Finnish. Unless Matti and the reporting speaker address the same listener, /sinä/ 'you' will have different reference depending on whether the sentence is understood as direct or indirect report. The interpretation has to be derived from the context.

Now let us look at the various mechanisms that are used to form indirect report. Error data will be used to expose these mechanisms in Standard Written Swedish and to demonstrate that they constitute problems for foreign learners.

A.   Subordination mechanisms

Various means of subordination are used to form indirect report in the languages that we have looked at. Most of these grammatical means are employed in one way or another in Swedish,

so one way of putting together examples of them is to give a brief survey of direct and indirect quotation clause structure in Swedish. This is done in <u>table 3</u> and sentences (4) to (11).

	DIRECT		INDIRECT	
Statement	$\#$ X V	(4)	$\#$ <u>att</u> S V	(5)
Command	$\#$ V_{imp}		$\#$ <u>att</u> S V	
			<u>att</u> V_{inf}	
Yes-No Question	$\#$ V S	(6)	$\#$ <u>om</u> S V	(7)
Wh-Question				
Wh $\neq$ S	$\#$ Wh V	(8)	$\#$ Wh S V	(9)
Wh = S	$\#$ Wh V	(10)	$\#$ Wh <u>som</u> V	(11)

<u>Table 3</u>. Structure of direct and indirect quotation clauses in Swedish. Explanations:

$\#$ = clause boundary

X = an unspecified constituent

S = subject

V = finite verb

V_{imp} = verb in the imperative

V_{inf} = verb in the infinitive

Wh = interrogative word

() figures in parentheses refer to examples in the text

(4) "Rolf är hemma idag."   "Rolf is at home today."
     "Idag är Rolf hemma."

(5) Lisa säger, att Rolf är hemma Lisa says that...
     idag.

(6) "Är Rolf hemma idag?"   "Is Rolf at home today?"

(7) Lisa frågar, om Rolf är hemma Lisa asks if...
     idag.

(8) "Varför är Rolf hemma?"   "Why is Rolf at home?"
     "Vem är Rolf?"   "Who is Rolf?"
     "Vad säger Rolf?"   "What does Rolf say?"

(9) Lisa frågar,
       varför Rolf är hemma.
       vem Rolf är.   ...who Rolf is.
       vad Rolf säger.

(10) "Vem är Rolf?"   "Who is Rolf?"
      "Vad händer hemma?"   "What is happening at home?"

(11) Lisa frågar,
       vem som är Rolf.   ...which one is Rolf.
       vad som händer hemma.

A1. <u>Word order</u>

The sentences in (8) and (9) illustrate the role of word order in forming such indirect wh-questions in which the wh-word is not the subject. They are parallelled in the error material by examples like (12) and (13) in which the learners have used the word order of the direct question. (Here and in the subsequent error examples, <u>a</u> represents the learner's version and <u>b</u> a Standard Swedish version with an English word-by-word translation. The native language of the learner is given in brackets. Underlinings are ours.)

(12) a. *Jag har en granne som ringer varje morron och frågar, hur <u>mår jag</u>. [Finnish]

  b. Jag har en granne som ringer varje morgon och
   I have a neighbor who calls every morning and

   frågar hur <u>jag mår</u>.
   asks how I feel.

(13) a. *frågar de inte efter vad <u>heter grannen</u>. [Japanese]

  b. frågar de inte efter vad <u>grannen</u> <u>heter</u>.
   they don't ask what the neighbor is called.

The same solution occurs in the case of pseudo-reports, as in (14).

(14) a. *Han förklarade hur <u>uppvärms husen</u> med varmt vatten. [Greek]

  b. Han förklarade hur <u>husen</u> <u>uppvärms</u> med varmt
   He explained how the houses are heated with hot

   vatten.
   water.

Another marker of subordination is the placement of sentence adverbials (including the negation) before the finite verb, as opposed to the placement after the finite verb in main clauses. If we negate the examples (4) - (11), we get <u>"Rolf är inte hemma idag"</u> versus <u>att Rolf inte är hemma idag</u>, <u>"Är Rolf inte hemma idag?"</u> (<u>"Är inte Rolf hemma idag?"</u>) versus <u>om Rolf inte är ...</u> (<u>om inte Rolf är ...</u>), and so on. The place of sentence adverbials is a clear criterion of subordination in the case of questions (examples (6) - (11)). For statements, the distinction between direct and indirect on this basis is less clear-cut since certain types of <u>att</u>-clauses may optionally (and do in fact frequently) occur with main clause word order especially in colloquial style (cf. Teleman 1967, Lindberg 1973, Andersson 1975). This gives us sentence variants such as <u>Lisa säger, att Rolf är inte hemma</u> as an alternative negative counterpart to sentence (5). Likewise, Swedes will hardly consider a sentence like (15a) as an error.

(15) a. Jag tror att jag <u>kan inte</u> glömma det rummet. [Spanish]

  b. Jag tror att jag <u>inte kan</u> glömma det rummet.
   I think that I not can forget that room.

In more formal writing, there is a stronger inclination to reject (15a) and require (15b). Another natural way of expressing this sentence is with negation raising: <u>Jag tror inte (att) jag kan glömma det rummet</u> 'I don't think (that) I can forget that room'.

It is also possible to find cases in the error material where the Verb-Negation order appears very awkward, as in example (16).

(16) a. *Hon tänker att jag <u>vet inte</u> vad hon gör. [English]

    b. Hon tror   att   jag <u>inte vet</u>   vad   hon gör.
       She thinks that I   not   know what she is doing.

The corresponding direct report would be <u>Hon tror: "Mamma vet inte vad jag gör"</u>. Notice that sentence (16) involves person adjustments characteristic of the indirect form, <u>Mamma</u> → <u>jag</u> and <u>jag</u> → <u>hon</u>. This may explain why (16a) is harder to accept than (15a).

What is essential about <u>att</u>-clauses for our present problem is that even if some of them allow main clause word order, the word order of (15b) is still available and natural, even in colloquial style, to help distinguish indirect report from direct. Yet, it is obvious that <u>att</u>-clauses form a point in the Swedish system where this distinction, so clear-cut elsewhere, tends to get neutralized. Teleman (1967,167) quotes sentences from his spoken corpus in which <u>att</u> introduces quotations where the adjustment of person and tense has not taken place; as he remarks, <u>att</u> here functions like the colon in writing.

A2. <u>Place holders</u>

In an earlier paper (Hammarberg & Viberg 1975) we have discussed the role of syntactic place holders in Swedish and related languages. One type of place holder that plays a part in connection with reported wh-questions in Swedish is the subject particle <u>som</u> that is inserted in cases where a wh-word (<u>vem</u>, <u>vilken</u>, <u>vad</u>) is the subject of a subordinate clause, i.e., precisely in those cases where the word order (Wh V) would otherwise signal a direct question (cf. Beckman 1922). Examples of this are (10), (11), (17) and (18).

(17) a. *och frågade vilken film var där [Spanish]

    b. och frågade vilken film <u>som</u> gick   där
       and asked   what   film   was on there

(18) a. *Vi måste tänka på vilka behållander passar bra för dem. [Japanese]

    b. Vi måste tänka på vilka förhållanden <u>som</u> passar bra
       We must   think of what   conditions   are suitable

       för dem.
       for them.

A3. <u>Subordinating particles</u>

A subordination marker that normally occurs in sentences like (5) and (7) is the subordinating conjunction, <u>att</u> 'that'

with statements and <u>om</u> 'if', 'whether' with questions. Consider examples (19) and (20) where <u>att</u> is missing in the learner's version.

(19) a. *tyvärr måste man säga det finns inget perfekta
jämlikhet [Japanese]

    b. tyvärr   måste man säga <u>att</u> det   finns ingen
       unfortunately must one say that there is   no

       perfekt jämlikhet
       perfect equality

       tyvärr måste man säga <u>att</u> det inte finns någon p. j.
                                     not   any

(20) a. *Jag hoppades, det här gången kunde jag läsa. [Japanese]

    b. Jag hoppades, <u>att</u> den här gången skulle jag kunna
       I   hoped   that this   time   would I   be able to

       läsa.
       read.

       Jag hoppades (<u>att</u>) jag skulle kunna läsa den här gången.

      Certainly <u>att</u> is not always obligatory, but can be left out in some types of sentences. We cannot digress into the problem of <u>att</u>-less clauses here, but some relevant discussion is found in Teleman (1967,169), Thorell (1967,236) and Andersson (1975,212ff. & 229).
      By contrast, the error material shows various ways of using <u>att</u> in the wrong context. There is a tendency towards overusing <u>att</u> as a marker of embedded quotations, and also to use it with pseudoreports.
      It is of course only with finite clauses that a distinction of direct/indirect can be expressed; but considering what was said above about <u>att</u> functioning like a colon, it is natural that we should find examples such as (21).

(21) a. *Hon prukar säga ofta <u>att</u> "jasså", men jag tror hon är
inte förstod prisis vad jag menar. [Finnish]

    b. Hon brukar ofta säga "jasså", men jag tror att hon
       She often says   "indeed!" but I   think that she

       inte har förstått   precis   vad jag menar.
       not has understood exactly what I   mean.

      <u>Att</u> used as a question embedder is shown with a yes-no question in (22) and with a wh-question in (23). The structure of the learners' sentences is <u>att</u> + Direct question.

(22) a. *En fråga till <u>att</u> bör äktenskapet avskaffas.
[Hungarian]

    b. En fråga till   är <u>om</u> äktenskapet bör   avskaffas.
       Another question is if marriage   should be abolished.

(23) a. *Vi kan inte säger att vad är skilnad melan Sverige
och Iran. [Persian]

    b. Vi kan inte säga vad   skillnaden   är mellan
We can not   tell what the difference is between

      Sverige och Iran.
      Sweden and Iran.

      Vi kan inte säga vad som är skillnaden ...

In (24) att is combined with a wh-question showing the
S V order of a subordinate clause.

(24) a. *Man vet inte att var gränsen står. [Turkish]

    b. Man vet   inte var   gränsen   går.
One knows not where the borderline goes.

(25) shows an alternative solution to (22): a yes-no
question is embedded without the om, but retains the V S order
of a direct question.

(25) a. *gå titta den nya våningen att jag vet passar mina
gamla gardiner dit. [Finnish]

    b. gå och titta på den nya våningen så att   jag vet
go and look at the new apartment so that I   know

      om mina gamla gardiner passar dit.
      if my   old   curtains fit in there.

A4. Nominalization

In some languages, indirect report is among those sub-
ordinations that are regularly done by means of nominalization.
The type of nominalization that we have in mind here results
in constructions like 'She told me his eating' for 'She told
me that he was eating', or 'Lisa said Rolf's having been at
home' for 'Lisa said that Rolf had been at home'. The verb of
the lower clause is turned into a participle with the subject
of the lower clause as a genitive modifier. In our language
sample, this applies in Turkish where it is the usual way of
subordinating sentences, and in Finnish where it occurs with
indirect statements as an alternative to a finite that-clause.
Nominalization is not a device for indirect report formation
in Swedish.
We have found no clear evidence that this kind of nomi-
nalization may influence learners of Swedish. The only possible
instance in our error material so far is the Turkish learner's
use of the genitive kungens in (26).

(26) a. *Du frågar om vad kungens hette. [Turkish]

    b. Du frågar   (om)   vad   kungen · hette.
You are asking (about) what the king was called.

A5. Intonation, punctuation etc.

Intonation in speech and punctuation, capitalization etc.
in writing serve as phonic and graphic markers of direct or
indirect report. In an error example like (27), the word order

and the marks of question and exclamation are signals of
direct report whereas the person adjustment, the small <u>v</u> of
<u>vad</u>, and the absence of a colon and quotation marks express
indirect report.

(27) a. *De står och tänker vad ska de göra att öppna kassan!?
    [Persian]

  b. De   står och tänker på   vad de   ska   göra
     They stand there thinking about what they shall do

     för att   öppna kassan.
     in order to open the cashier's office.

The corresponding direct report with the graphic markers
meticulously included, would run <u>De står och tänker: "Vad ska</u>
<u>vi göra för att öppna kassan!?"</u>

B.   <u>Shift of mood</u>

     The use of the subjunctive mood to express "indirectness"
has its well-known and interesting manifestations in German, in
cases where "indirect" implies "not necessarily factual from
the point of view of the present speaker". The use of mood to
express "indirectness" deserves to be noticed here as a
structural device available to languages. Its role in Swedish
is very limited, however. The subjunctive of <u>vara</u> 'be' and
strong verbs is still possible in officialese writing in con-
texts like <u>Ordföranden menade att frågan vore tillräckligt ut-</u>
<u>redd</u> 'The chairman was of the opinion that the issue was
sufficiently penetrated'. The use of the modal auxiliary <u>skall,</u>
<u>skulle</u> occurs notably in reports without a governing verb,
e.g., in a rendering of a witness report like <u>Mannen skulle ha</u>
<u>färdats i en skär Toyota</u> 'The man was said to have travelled
in a pink Toyota'.
     Another shift of mood is the elimination of the impera-
tive in embedded commands, as in <u>Jag sa åt honom att han skulle</u>
<u>vara försiktig</u> 'I told him that he should be careful' versus
<u>Jag sa åt honom: "Var försiktig!"</u>

C.   <u>Deictic adjustments</u>

     In a way, deictic adjustments such as shift of tense,
person, or place reference, are only secondary markers of
indirectness. As we tried to show with example (3), a basis
for the interpretation of the deictic reference has to be
given by the context and/or by the morpho-syntactic means that
we have discussed in sections A and B. But provided this, the
deictic markers strengthen the contrast between the direct and
the indirect form, and the extent to which a language uses
deictic adjustments tells us something about the importance of
the direct/indirect dichotomy in that language.

C1.   <u>Time</u>

     Swedish is among the languages in which the sequence of
tenses distinguishes indirect report from direct. Errors in
this respect are common with learners from several language
areas. Here are some examples.

(28) a. *Gubben fick veta att han är välkommen. [Polish]
                                    is

    b. Gubben   fick veta att han var välkommen.
       The old man was told that he was welcome.

(29) a. *I den har tid medelade "Nobelfredscomite" att de
        beslutade att ... [Arabic]
        decided

    b. Vid den här tiden meddelade Nobelpriskommittén
       By this   time announced the Nobel Prize Committee

       att den hade beslutat att ...
       that it had decided to

(30) a. *Han sa att de ska lyfta henne så att hon kan krypa
                will   can

     in i lockan. [Persian]

    b. Han sa att de   skulle lyfta henne så att hon kunde
       He said that they would lift her   so that she could

       krypa in genom   luckan.
       creep in through the hole.

(31) a. *Jag tänkte att, jag ska   gå till Kostgalleri. [Finnish]
                      will

    b. Jag tänkte, att jag skulle gå till Konstgalleriet.
       I   thought that I would go to   the Art Gallery.

    There are various misinterpretations that may arise in
Swedish from the failure to adjust tense, unless the context
secures the right interpretation. One effect may be the im-
pression that the reporting speaker explicitly acknowledges
the contents of the quotation as something 'factual' and
'still valid', as in Lisa told me that Rolf is spelled with a
capital R; cf. (28). Or the time sequence between the higher
and the lower predicate may be effected, cf. Lisa told me that
she loved Rold versus had loved Rolf; cf. also (29). Still
another effect is merely that the indication of direct/indirect
report is blurred.

(32) and (33) give examples of shift in time adverbials.

(32) Lisa berättade för mig: "Rolf är sjuk idag".
                         , att Rolf var sjuk den dagen.

    Lisa told me, "Rolf is sick today".
                   that Rolf was sick that day.

(33) SITUATION:
    [X tells Y on Wednesday [Lisa tells X on
    Tuesday. [Rolf will come on Wednesday]]]

    DIRECT:
    Lisa berättade för mig: "Rolf kommer i morgon".
                              tomorrow

    INDIRECT:
    Lisa berättade för mig att Rolf skulle komma (som) idag.
                                  today

Some Swedes use an optional <u>som</u> 'like' colloquially in expressions like <u>som idag</u>, <u>som på fredag</u> 'on Friday'. It is clear that the function of this <u>som</u> is to point out that the time expression has been deictically adjusted.

C2.   Place

Place reference may be shifted by means of place adverbials, as in (34).

(34)   Lisa sa i telefon
        "Vi har en fest och Rolf är också <u>här</u>".
        att de hade en fest och att Rolf också var <u>där</u>.

Lisa said on the phone
        "We are having a party and Rolf is <u>here</u> too".
        that they were ... and that R was <u>there</u> too.

Error examples are rare; here is one:

(35) a. *Men han glömde inte för vad då kom vi <u>hit</u>. [Polish]
                                                        here

   b. Men han glömde inte vad **vi** hade kommit <u>dit</u>   för.
      But he   forgot not what we had   got   there for.

C3.   Person

(36) and (37) are error examples where the adjustment of person is missing.

(36) a. *Hon frågar dem att vad ska <u>vi</u> göra. [Japanese]

   b. Hon frågar dem   vad <u>de</u>   ska   göra.
      She asks   them what they shall do.

(37) a. *En dag sa Ante till sin fru Sonja att <u>jag</u> inte
         trivdes bra här som i Läxenträsk. [Persian]

   b. En   dag sa   Ante till sin fru Sonja att <u>han</u> inte
      One day said Ante to   his wife Sonja that he   not

      trivdes   lika bra   här   som i Laxenträsk.
      liked it as   well here as   in Laxenträsk.

Cross-language discussion

After this look at the various markers of indirectness and the Swedish side of the problem, let us include the other languages and try to get a comparative view. The discussion will have to concentrate on a few selected points that will show alternative structural solutions in immigrant languages. Data from the languages will then be summed up in <u>table 4</u>.[3]

Word order

In Swedish word order plays a crucial role in signaling the distinction between main and subordinate clauses and thus between direct and indirect speech. This function of word order, together with its function to mark the difference between a direct statement and a direct yes-no-question, is found only in Swedish and a small group of related languages (the Germanic languages and to some extent French). We have

discussed this in Hammarberg and Viberg (1975). Indirect wh-questions were briefly discussed in that report. But word order in indirect wh-questions is a great problem to most immigrants learning Swedish, and the background of errors discussed in sections A1 and A3 above is rather different in different immigrant languages. Therefore we shall present a more detailed typology for word order in indirect wh-questions to complete the picture given in the earlier report. It is convenient to make the characterization in two steps:

(a) The extent to which the contrast between direct and indirect wh-questions is signaled by word order.

(b) How the contrast is made by word order.
In Swedish the basic mechanism for making the contrast involves two parts:
Wh-words are initial.
The position of the subject is strictly grammaticalized and differs in direct and indirect questions (VS/SV), a special case being when the subject is questioned.

It might be sensible to ask whether there is any other way of making the contrast than by inversion, and whether inversion always implies that there is a contrast.

Among the languages under discussion in this paper, only English belongs to the same type as Swedish:

(38) What is Peter doing?   Wh V S

(39) I wonder what Peter is doing.   Wh S V

The use of the so called operator <u>do</u> in direct questions is also important in marking the contrast between direct and indirect questions by word order:

(40) What did Peter buy?   Wh V S

(41) I wonder what Peter bought.   Wh S V

English is not as consistent as Swedish, though. There is no contrast in word order when the subject is questioned:

Swedish (cf. table 3)

(42) Who is coming?   Wh V   Wh V

(43) I wonder who is coming.   Wh V   Wh <u>som</u> V

Due to the place holder <u>som</u>, Swedish maintains the contrast even when the subject is questioned (see examples 10, 11 and 17, 18 above).

There is no contrast in word order between direct and indirect wh-questions in any of the other nine languages, at least not a consistent one. This is one possible reason why word order in indirect wh-questions is a problem to most learners. They are not used to making a contrast by word order in their own language. Viewed more in detail the background is rather different in different languages. In order to demonstrate this, the languages in our sample can be grouped into the following types:

I   Languages that do not obligatorily put wh-words in initial position (several subtypes).

      Japanese, Turkish, Persian, Hungarian

II   Languages that obligatorily put wh-words in initial
     position.

   This type may be subdivided as to whether there is or is
   not an inversion of subject and verb after an initial wh-
   word.

   a. Languages without an obligatory inversion.

      In this subtype the position of the subject is not
      grammaticalized. In the unmarked case the word order
      is SV but the subject may often occur somewhere after
      the verb, too. The choice of position seems to be
      governed mainly by textual factors. There is no con-
      trast in word order between direct and indirect wh-
      questions, at least not a consistent one.

      Polish, Finnish

   b. Languages that obligatorily put the subject after the
      verb in both direct and indirect questions.

      The position of the subject is not completely bound
      in this subtype, either. But it must not occur in
      front of the verb in a wh-question (provided it is
      not the subject that is questioned). Most often the
      subject occurs directly after the verb or verbs.

      Spanish, Greek

   c. Languages with an obligatory inversion in direct
      questions but without any inversion in indirect
      questions.

      Swedish, English

   The languages of type I are all SOV except Hungarian
which is today basically SVO with some reminiscent traits of
SOV. The languages of type II are all SVO. (Cf. Greenberg 1963,
Universals 11, 12.) Only type II c uses word order to make a
distinction between direct and indirect questions. In type II a
an inversion is not obligatory in either case and in II b in-
version is obligatory. This difference between I, II a and II b
is part of the background when it comes to explaining learners'
errors like (12), (13) and (14).

Particles and nominalization

   The subordinated status of a clause is often indicated
by morphological or lexical markers. In our sample of languages,
three different mechanisms may be distinguished: The use of
clause initial particles, the use of clause final particles,
and the use of nominalization.
   An important characteristic of a subordinate clause in a
language of the first type is that it is introduced by a
particle that belongs to a rather restricted set of grammatical
words. Swedish and most of the other languages in our sample
belong to this type. Many subtypes may be established that are
relevant to the discussion of the errors in section A3 above.
Persian, for instance, is characterized by using the same
initial particle ke 'that' to embed both statements and
questions. Compared to Persian, Swedish has a rather rich
system of different clause introducing particles. Another
relevant factor is whether a certain particle that introduces

a subordinate clause may introduce a main clause as well. If
the latter is the case, then the particle by itself is no
clear mark of subordination. In Swedish, e.g., the particle <u>om</u>
'if' in an indirect question is a clear mark of subordination,
but a wh-word is not.

The second major type is represented by <u>Japanese</u>:

(44) Jirō wa   Tarō ga   doa o   aketa to   iu
      Jiro THEME Taro SUBJ door OBJ opened QUOTE says

      Jiro says that Taro opened the door

The quotation particle <u>to</u> may be used in all kinds of reported
speech, both direct and indirect, questions as well as state-
ments. No clause introducers are found in Japanese. As Kuno
(1974) has noted, this is in accordance with the fact that
question words are not normally placed in initial position and
that relative pronouns are completely lacking. Japanese con-
sistently marks subordination clause-finally. This is of course
what is to be expected in an SOV-language.

The third major type is represented by <u>Turkish</u>. In this
language all types of indirect speech may be expressed by a
nominalized clause. The following examples give an idea of how
an indirect statement is formed:

(45) Ali   gel -di   Ali came
            come-PAST

(46) Ahmet Ali-nin geldiğini söyledi
            -GEN   'coming' said

      Ahmet said that Ali had come

The same kind of nominalization is used in both types of in-
direct questions. Indirect commands are nominalized, too, but
according to a somewhat different pattern and with another
suffix on the verb. In addition to this pattern, another pattern
exists in Turkish with an inveriable initial particle, <u>ki</u>.

Most languages belonging to the first type seem to be
fairly consistent in having some initial particle in all types
of indirect speech. This seems to hold true at least for
Swedish, English, Spanish, Greek, Polish and Persian. Japanese
is very consistent, too, in always using clause final particles.
But of course there may be languages that are not consistent
and where the different types of indirect speech follow
different patterns. In Turkish there are two different possi-
bilities, at least in some cases. But the language is consistent
in allowing some kind of nominalization in all kinds of in-
direct speech. In our sample, <u>Finnish</u> is to a rather great ex-
tent a mixed type. In indirect statements two different con-
structions may be used. Either an initial subordinating par-
ticle <u>että</u> 'that' is used, or, as a second alternative, the
clause is nominalized:

(47) Olavi sanoo, että Pekka kuorsaa
            says   that   snores

      Olavi says that Pekka snores

(48) Olavi sanoo Pekan kuorsaavan
                   -GEN 'snoring'

      Olavi says that Pekka snores

But in indirect yes-no-questions nominalization is not used.
Usually such questions do not have an initial particle either,
but have the same form as a direct question:

(49) Kuorsaako Pekka?   Does Pekka snore?
      snores-Q

(50) Olavi kysyy, kuorsaako Pekka. (Q = QUESTION MARKER)
            asks   snores-Q

      Olavi is asking if Pekka snores.

In what is usually considered as substandard, yet very common
speech, indirect questions may be introduced by the particle
että 'that' in front of the verb with the question particle.
Another possibility is to use a conditional clause introduced
by jos 'if'. Then the indirect question is constructed exactly
as in Swedish. Actually, this last type is characterized by
Finns as a Swedish trait and was rather often totally rejected
by our informants.

Deictic adjustments

      In Swedish as in all the well known languages of Europe
such as English, German and French, indirect speech is accom-
panied by a series of deictic adjustment of time (adverbials,
tense), person and place (here/there). In many of the immigrant
languages some of these adjustments do not occur or at least do
not occur obligatorily. In order to illustrate the type of
languages that lack some of the deictic adjustments, we have
chosen to present data from the two languages in our sample
that are most dissimilar to Swedish in this respect. For ease
of reference the phenomena are discussed language by language.
At the end of this section there is a short summary mechanism
by mechanism that mirrors the presentation in the first part
of our paper (table 4).
      The following data were collected from a <u>Persian</u> infor-
mant. What is given in square brackets represents the intended
speech situation that was first described verbally to the in-
formant.

Non-reported speech

[Ali to Hassan:]

(51) (aja) (tu) khasteh hasti   Are you tired?
        Q   you tired   are [2 pers sing, present]

Direct report

[Hassan to Mohammed:]

(52) Ali sual   mikonad   (aja) (tu) khasteh hasti
          question is-making   Q   you tired   are

      Ali is asking, "Are you tired?"

Indirect report

(53) Ali sual   mikonad   ke   (man) khasteh hastam
          question is-making that   I   tired   am

      Ali is asking if I'm tired.

We also asked the informant what the indirect question would
be if reported at a later time than in a direct connection to
the original speech situation like:

(54) Ali sual   kard   ke   (man) khasteh hastam
          question made that I   tired   am

In all the different combinations of persons and tenses that
we tried on the informant the result was like this one. The
informant adjusted the person but preferred not to adjust the
tense. In all cases, however, he gave a form with adjusted
tense as a second alternative, or at least he recognized this
as a possible alternative when explicitly asked about that. As
a second alternative to (54) above he thus gave:

(55) Ali sual   kard ke   (man) khasteh bodam
          question made that   I   tired   was [1 pers sing,
                                                   past]

According to Lambton (1974, 155) even person may in some cases
be left unadjusted although we were not able to obtain such
forms from our informant:
'After verbs of saying, thinking, knowing, seeing, etc., the
tense of the verb is normally that of direct speech, but the
pronoun is not necessarily that of direct speech.'

     Japanese is another language that uses deictic adjust-
ments to a lesser degree than Swedish.

Non-report

(56) boku kao ga yogorete iru kai   Is my face dirty?
         I   face SUBJ dirty   is Q   [male speaker]

Direct report

(57) Taro wa   boku kao ga yogorete iru kai to   kiita
         Taro THEME I   face SUBJ dirty   is Q   QUOTE asked

      Taro asked, 'Is my face dirty?'

Indirect report

(58) Taro wa   jibun no kao ga yogorete iru ka (to) kiita
         Taro THEME self's face SUBJ dirty   is Q QUOTE asked

      Taro asked if his face was dirty

As can be seen from (58), tense is not adjusted in Japanese.
This holds true in general. But person is not always left un-
adjusted. In (58), reflexivization works as a kind of person
adjustment. The fact that personal pronouns often are left out
and that the verb is not inflected for person makes person
adjustment less prominent. The levels of politeness, a very
characteristic trait of Japanese, are neutralized in sub-
ordinate clauses. This might be of some importance for signal-
ing the distinction between direct and indirect report. But in
the main, adjustments are not as common in Japanese as in
Swedish and the distinction between direct and indirect report
is often not very sharp in Japanese.

	SWEDISH	ENGLISH	SPANISH	GREEK	POLISH	PERSIAN	ARABIC	FINNISH	HUNGARIAN	TURKISH	JAPANESE
A. Subordination mechanisms											
1. Word order	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−		−	−
2. Place holders											
a. subject pronouns	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
b. subject particle	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
3. Subordinating particles											
a. initial	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	−
b. final	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	(+)
4. Nominalization	−	▯						+		+	−
5. Phonic and graphic markers											
a. intonation											
b. punctuation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
B. Shift of mood:											
subjunctive of indirectness	−										
C. Deictic adjustments											
1. Time											
a. tense	+	+	(+)	−	−	−	+	+	−	+	−
b. adverbials	+	+									
2. Place	+	+		+	+	(+)		+	+		+
3. Person	+	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	+		(+)

Table 4. Summary of mechanisms of forming indirect report. The classification of categories (A1, A2 etc) refers to the sections in the text. A plus indicates that the language makes some regular use of the mechanism, a minus that this is not the case to a significant degree.

SAMMANFATTNING

Anföring i svenskan och tio invandrarspråk

    Att rapportera tal, t ex att återge vad någon sagt, är
en vanlig uppgift som vi alla ställs inför som språkbrukare.
Uppsatsen undersöker om uttrycksmedlen för detta varierar i
invandrarspråken. I tabell 1 och 2 visas skillnader mellan
rapporterat tal eller anföring (avd 2a-b) och icke-rapporterat
tal (icke-anföring) (avd 1), samt mellan direkt och indirekt
anföring. Vad vi söker svar på är dels i vilken utsträckning
språken gör en skillnad i uttrycksformen mellan direkt och in-
direkt anföring, och dels vilka medel som då används.
    Syntaktiskt är indirekt anföring en del av det vidare
problemet att underordna satser, och vi tar detta som ett till-
fälle att belysa bisatsbildning i svenskan och invandrarspråken.
    Vi ser i första hand på sådana fall där en rapporterad
sats styrs av ett sägeverb (säga, berätta, fråga, skriva etc),
men vi inkluderar även "rapporterad tanke", fall där ett tänke-
verb (tänka, tro, anta, veta etc) styr en citatsats. Problemen
att särskilja anföringar från andra hypotaktiska meningar be-
rörs. Vi introducerar termen pseudo-anföring för fall som Jag
ska säga dig vad som hände. De liknar anföringar på så sätt
att en sats med den indirekta frågeordsfrågans form styrs av
ett säge- eller tänkeverb, men bisatsen är inte ett citat eller
ens en sammanfattande parafras av ett citat. Kontextens roll
för att identifiera direkt/indirekt anföringsform diskuteras.
    Med exemplifiering ur svenskan och SSM:s felmaterial
genomgås de olika grammatiska mekanismerna för att bilda in-
direkt anföring: (A) satsunderordningsmekanismer som ordföljd,
platshållare, underordningspartiklar, nominalisering, intona-
tion och interpunktion, (B) modusväxling och (C) deiktiska
justeringar av tids-, plats- och personsyftning. I stort gäller
att svenskan är ett språk som använder extremt mycket av dessa
"indirekthetsmedel". Strukturen hos anförda satser i svenskan
sammanfattas i tabell 3 och exemplen (4)-(11).
    Därefter tas de olika invandrarspråken med i bilden för
att ge en komparativ översikt. En typologi ges för vilken roll
ordföljden (placeringen av frågeord, subjekt och verb) spelar
för att signalera skillnaden mellan direkt och indirekt fråga
i de elva språken. Detta kan belysa t ex hur sinsemellan lik-
artade språkfel hos invandrare från olika språkområden (jfr ex
12, 13, 14) kan ha varierande bakgrund i de olika språken.
Språkens användning av framför- och efterställda underordnings-
partiklar och av nominalisering jämförs. Deiktiska justeringar
exemplifieras genom en jämförelse med två språk som avviker
starkt från svenskan genom att göra få sådana, nämligen pers-
iska och japanska. Data för de elva språken sammanfattas i
tabell 4.

NOTES

*   This report is an expanded version of a paper given at the <u>Third Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics</u>, Hanasaari, Finland, October 1-3, 1976. It also appears in the volume of <u>Papers</u> from that conference, ed. by Fred Karlsson, published by The Text Linguistics Research Group, Academy of Finland, Turku 1976.

1   It would seem natural to refer to <u>non-reported speech</u> as 'direct speech', but this term has traditionally been used for our concept <u>direct report</u> in contexts where no explicit distinction was made between our case 1 and case 2a. See e.g. Jespersen 1924, 290.

2   Written errors by Arabic, English, Finnish, Greek, Hungarian, Japanese, Persian, Polish, Spanish, and Turkish learners of Swedish are taken into account in the error investigation which is a part of the SSM project. See Hammarberg (1975) for a general presentation. An extensive account for the error study is in preparation.

3   We base this section in part on work with native informants, in addition to standard grammars. And not least, we owe thanks to many colleagues around us whom we have approached now and then to get points in "their" languages clarified. Table 4 is not quite complete yet; we do not necessarily intend to leave it at that.

REFERENCES

Andersson, Lars-Gunnar (1975), <u>Form and Function of Subordinate Clauses</u>. University of Göteborg, Dept. of Linguistics. (Gothenburg Monographs in Linguistics I.)

Beckman, Natanael (1922), En skolgrammatisk fråga i språkhistorisk belysning. <u>Skrifter utgivna av Modersmålslärarnas förening. Minnesskrift</u>, 70-89.

Greenberg, Joseph (1963), Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. In Greenberg, J. (ed.), <u>Universals of Language</u>. Cambridge, Mass. and London.

Hammarberg, Björn (1975), Svenska som målspråk. <u>Språkvård, Tidskrift utgiven av Svenska språknämnden</u> 2/1975, 12-15.

Hammarberg, Björn and Viberg, Åke (1975), <u>Platshållartvånget, ett syntaktiskt problem i svenskan för invandrare</u>. SSM Report 2, University of Stockholm, Institute of Linguistics.

Jespersen, Otto (1924), <u>The Philosophy of Grammar</u>. London.

Kuno, Susumu (1974), The Position of Relative Clauses and Conjunctions. <u>Linguistic Inquiry</u> V, 117-136.

Lambton, Ann K.S. (1974), <u>Persian Grammar</u>. Cambridge.

Lindberg, Ebba (1973), <u>Studentsvenska. Studier i stockholmsabiturienters examensuppsatser 1864-1965</u>. Stockholm.

Teleman, Ulf (1967), Bisatser i talad svenska, in Holm, Gösta (ed.), <u>Svenskt talspråk</u>. Stockholm.

Thorell, Olof (1973), <u>Svensk grammatik</u>. Stockholm.