



Projektet SVENSKA SOM MÅLSPRÅK (SSM)
The project SWEDISH AS A TARGET LANGUAGE

SSM REPORT 5

Björn Hammarberg and Åke Viberg

REPORTED SPEECH IN SWEDISH AND TEN IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES

Stockholms universitet
Institutionen för lingvistik
November 1976

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Reported Speech in Swedish and Ten Immigrant languages | 1 |
| Sammanfattning: Anföring i svenskan och tio invandrar- språk | 18 |
| Notes | 19 |
| References | 19 |

Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. A first illustration of speech reporting | 1 |
| 2. Example based on table 1 | 2 |
| 3. Structure of direct and indirect quotation clauses in Swedish | 4 |
| 4. Summary of mechanisms of forming indirect report | 17 |

REPORTED SPEECH IN SWEDISH AND TEN IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES*

One thing that we often have to do in human communication is to report speech, 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.

Table 1 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 non-reported speech. Reported speech occurs when a speaker verbalizes the situation given in section 1 and renders it either in the form of direct report (section 2a) or in the form of indirect report (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: John says that Tom says that Bo is watching TV, 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 table 2. 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 if, 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 $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{sa} \\ \text{tänkte} \\ \text{?antog} \\ \text{?visste} \end{array} \right\}$: "Peter är tokig". Lasse said / thought / assumed / knew, "Peter is crazy".

(2) Lasse $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{frågade} \\ \text{undrade} \\ \text{?ifrågasatte} \\ \text{?visste inte} \end{array} \right\}$: "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 table 3 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 ≠ S | # Wh V (8) | # Wh S V (9) |
| Wh = S | # Wh V (10) | # Wh <u>som</u> V (11) |

Table 3. 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." "Idag är Rolf hemma." | "Rolf is at home today." |
| (5) | Lisa säger, att Rolf är hemma idag. | Lisa says that... |
| (6) | "Är Rolf hemma idag?" | "Is Rolf at home today?" |
| (7) | Lisa frågar, om Rolf är hemma idag. | Lisa asks if... |
| (8) | "Varför är Rolf hemma?" "Vem är Rolf?" "Vad säger Rolf?" | "Why is Rolf at home?" "Who is Rolf?" "What does Rolf say?" |
| (9) | Lisa frågar, varför Rolf är hemma. vem Rolf är. vad Rolf säger. | ...who Rolf is. |
| (10) | "Vem är Rolf?" "Vad händer hemma?" | "Who is Rolf?" "What is happening at home?" |
| (11) | Lisa frågar, vem som är Rolf. vad som händer hemma. | ...which one is Rolf. |

A1. Word order

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 paralleled 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, a represents the learner's version and b 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 mår jag. [Finnish]

b. Jag har en granne som ringer varje morgon och
I have a neighbor who calls every morning and
frågar hur jag mår.
asks how I feel.

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

b. frågar de inte efter vad grannen heter.
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 uppvärms husen med varmt vatten.
[Greek]

b. Han förklarade hur husen uppvärms 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 "Rolf är inte hemma idag" versus att Rolf inte är hemma idag, "Är Rolf inte hemma idag?" ("Är inte Rolf hemma idag?") versus om Rolf inte är ... (om inte Rolf är ...), 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 att-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 Lisa säger, att Rolf är inte hemma 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 kan inte glömma det rummet. [Spanish]

b. Jag tror att jag inte kan 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: Jag tror inte (att) jag kan glömma det rummet '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 vet inte vad hon gör. [English]
b. Hon tror att jag inte vet vad hon gör.
She thinks that I not know what she is doing.

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

What is essential about att-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 att-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 att introduces quotations where the adjustment of person and tense has not taken place; as he remarks, att here functions like the colon in writing.

A2. Place holders

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 som that is inserted in cases where a wh-word (vem, vilken, vad) 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 som 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 som passar bra
We must think of what conditions are suitable
för dem.
for them.

A3. Subordinating particles

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

and the marks of question and exclamation are signals of direct report whereas the person adjustment, the small y of vad, 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 De står och tänker: "Vad ska vi göra för att öppna kassan!?"

B. Shift of mood

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 vara 'be' and strong verbs is still possible in officialese writing in contexts like Ordföranden menade att frågan vore tillräckligt utredd 'The chairman was of the opinion that the issue was sufficiently penetrated'. The use of the modal auxiliary skall, skulle occurs notably in reports without a governing verb, e.g., in a rendering of a witness report like Mannen skulle ha färdats i en skär Toyota 'The man was said to have travelled in a pink Toyota'.

Another shift of mood is the elimination of the imperative in embedded commands, as in Jag sa åt honom att han skulle vara försiktig 'I told him that he should be careful' versus Jag sa åt honom: "Var försiktig!"

C. Deictic adjustments

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. Time

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 här tid meddelade "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 impression 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

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 contrast 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 inversion 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 om 'if' in an indirect question is a clear mark of subordination, but a wh-word is not.

The second major type is represented by Japanese:

- (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 to may be used in all kinds of reported speech, both direct and indirect, questions as well as statements. 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 consistently marks subordination clause-finally. This is of course what is to be expected in an SOV-language.

The third major type is represented by Turkish. 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 indirect 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 invariable initial particle, ki.

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 possibilities, at least in some cases. But the language is consistent in allowing some kind of nominalization in all kinds of indirect speech. In our sample, Finnish is to a rather great extent a mixed type. In indirect statements two different constructions may be used. Either an initial subordinating particle että '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 accompanied 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 Persian informant. What is given in square brackets represents the intended speech situation that was first described verbally to the informant.

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.

| | 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

Anförelse 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 anförelse (avd 2a-b) och icke-rapporterat tal (icke-anförelse) (avd 1), samt mellan direkt och indirekt anförelse. Vad vi söker svar på är dels i vilken utsträckning språken gör en skillnad i uttrycksformen mellan direkt och indirekt anförelse, och dels vilka medel som då används.

Syntaktiskt är indirekt anförelse en del av det vidare problemet att underordna sats, och vi tar detta som ett tillfälle 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 tänkeverb (tänka, tro, anta, veta etc) styr en citatsats. Problemen att särskilja anförelser från andra hypotaktiska meningar berörs. Vi introducerar termen pseudo-anförelse för fall som Jag ska säga dig vad som hände. De liknar anförelser på så sätt att en sats med den indirekta frågeordsfrågas form styrs av ett säge- eller tänkeverb, men bisatsen är inte ett citat eller ens en sammanfattande parafra av ett citat. Kontextens roll för att identifiera direkt/indirekt anförelseform diskuteras.

Med exemplifiering ur svenskan och SSM:s felmaterial genomgås de olika grammatiska mekanismerna för att bilda indirekt anförelse: (A) satsunderordningsmekanismer som ordföljd, platshållare, underordningspartiklar, nominalisering, intonation 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 sats 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 likartade 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 underordningspartiklar och av nominalisering jämförs. Deiktiska justeringar exemplifieras genom en jämförelse med två språk som avviker starkt från svenskan genom att göra få sådana, nämligen persiska och japanska. Data för de elva språken sammanfattas i tabell 4.

NOTES

- * This report is an expanded version of a paper given at the Third Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics, Hana-saari, Finland, October 1-3, 1976. It also appears in the volume of Papers 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 non-reported speech as 'direct speech', but this term has traditionally been used for our concept direct report 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), Form and Function of Subordinate Clauses. University of Göteborg, Dept. of Linguistics. (Gothenburg Monographs in Linguistics I.)
- Beckman, Natanael (1922), En skolgrammatisk fråga i språkhistorisk belysning. Skrifter utgivna av Modersmålslära-
rens förening. Minnesskrift, 70-89.
- Greenberg, Joseph (1963), Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. In Greenberg, J. (ed.), Universals of Language. Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- Hammarberg, Björn (1975), Svenska som målspråk. Språkvård, Tid-
skrift utgiven av Svenska språknämnden 2/1975, 12-15.
- Hammarberg, Björn and Viberg, Åke (1975), Platshållartvånget,
ett syntaktiskt problem i svenskan för invandrare. SSM Report 2, University of Stockholm, Institute of Linguistics.
- Jespersen, Otto (1924), The Philosophy of Grammar. London.
- Kuno, Susumu (1974), The Position of Relative Clauses and Conjunctions. Linguistic Inquiry V, 117-136.
- Lambton, Ann K.S. (1974), Persian Grammar. Cambridge.
- Lindberg, Ebba (1973), Studentsvenska. Studier i stockholms-
abiturienters examensuppsatser 1864-1965. Stockholm.
- Teleman, Ulf (1967), Bisatser i talad svenska, in Holm, Gösta (ed.), Svenskt talspråk. Stockholm.
- Thorell, Olof (1973), Svensk grammatik. Stockholm.