

## RELATIVIZATION IN SWEDISH Some contrastive aspects

1. Relativization is a widespread syntactic and pragmatic strategy, found in such diverse languages as Arabic and Korean, Nahuatl and German (The Chicago Which Which Hunt 1972). It is a process of modifier formation producing relative clauses (RC), which can serve several pragmatic functions, such as supplying new information, emphasis, cohesion etc. RCs have been much studied and they still offer interesting linguistic insights. Alongside the obviously common features many differences in detail can be observed even among closely related languages. The differences as well as the similarities can be of a syntactic or a stylistic nature. Out of the many interesting aspects of RC structure and usage a closer look will be taken only at the choice of the linking word and some rules governing its place and function.

The Swedish (S) RC will be taken as a starting point and contrasted with the equivalent structures in English (E), German (G) and Serbo-Croatian (SC). Since the content of an RC can be expressed in several ways, RCs are to be treated both as syntactic structures and as segments of discourse (e.g. van Dijk 1977: 114 ff).

2. Relative clauses are subordinate clauses derived from an independent clause which is linked to or "embedded" in another independent clause with a coreferent element (Maček 1975, 1985, 1986), as in the following example:

- 1) Lilla clownfestivalen är ett missvisande namn på ett stort evenemang. Det stora evenemanget utbryter i Stockholm på fredag. → RC Lilla clownfestivalen är ett missvisande namn på det stora evenemang som utbryter i Stockholm på fredag.

The RC functions as a modifier to the NP *ett stort evenemang*, syntactically speaking, and as a comment or new information, pragmatically speaking. Moreover, it joins the comment to the topic (*ett stort evenemang*) providing closer cohesion (in the sense of Halliday and Hasan 1976) than two independent sentences do. Cohesion is achieved by the introduction of the linking word (*som* in example 1/), and by some other syntactic means. The linking word performs several functions: it is a subordinator (introducing a subordinate clause), a relativizer (the subordinate clause is an RC), and an anaphoric element referring to an antecedent in the main clause. A further function of the linking word is its role as subject, direct or indirect object, and prepositional object in the RC itself.

The S linking word *som* has been variously classified as pronoun (Beckman 1959, Björkhagen 1962, Lindberg 1976, Nylund-Brodda & Holm 1975) and particle (Thorell 1977). A recent discussion on the E and SC uninflected relative linking words *that* and *što<sub>2</sub>* respectively (van der Auwera & Kučanda 1985) suggests that they are non-specific relative pronouns as well as non-specific relative conjunctions, which definition could be well applied to the S *som* as well. For the present purpose the discussion of the classification of the relative words will be left aside, and for the sake of simplicity, all linking words, regardless of their morphological and syntactic features, will be termed relativizers (R).

In the languages compared in the present paper there are three main types of relativizers with respect to their form (and etymology) as shown in the table below.

a) Conjunctive:	S <i>som</i>
b) Demonstrative:	G <i>der, die, das</i>
	E <i>that</i>
	S <i>där, dit</i>
c) Interrogative:	E <i>who, which</i>
	whose
	what
	where, when
	S <i>vilken, vilket</i>
	<i>vars</i>
	<i>vad</i>
	G <i>welcher, welche, welches</i>
	<i>wer, was</i>
	<i>wo, wann</i>
	SC <i>koi, koja, koje</i>
<i>čiji, čija, čije</i>	
<i>tko, što<sub>1</sub></i> (inflected for case)	
<i>što<sub>2</sub></i> (uninflected)	
<i>gdje, kada</i>	

a) S *som* is homophonous with the conjunction of comparison and unique in this respect among the languages here contrasted (leaving aside such non-standard or historical forms as E *as* and G *so*). This R is uninflected and unstressed. The last mentioned feature is a characteristic of all Rs.

b) A set of forms, in G *der, die, das*, fully inflected for gender, number and case, and E *that*, uninflected, are homophonous with the demonstrative pronouns. Apart from the lack of stress E *that* lacks the plural form *those* when it functions as an R. The S relative adverbs also belong here.

c) The third set of forms is homophonous with the interrogative pronouns. It is the set containing the largest number of forms in all the four languages, but they are

very unequally distributed in usage. It can be noted, for instance, that there are no other forms in SC, whereas the Germanic languages use forms from other sets as well.

G and SC have forms (often classed as relative adjectives) inflected for number, gender and case, and agreeing with the antecedent in number and gender, case depending on their function in the RC (G *welcher*, SC *koji*, *čiji*). It can be mentioned here that G has no uninflected Rs aside of the relative adverbs *wo* and *wann*.

The E *who* and *which*, and the S *vilken* and *vilket* are also "gender" inflections of a special kind, i.e. E personal vs. non-personal and S uter vs. neuter. Both E and S relativizers have genitive forms, i.e. E *whose* and S *vilkens* and *vilkets*. S has also a unique genitive form *vars* which is not unlike the E *whose* in that respect. Genitives are often used in the possessive function in which they can be compared to the special possessive R in SC, i.e. *čiji*, which however, has a full inflection for number, gender and case.

All the four languages have forms distinguishing personal and non-personal reference, but E and S are on one side with two forms for non-personal reference, i.e. E *which* and *what* and S *vilket* and *vad*, which are differently used than the G *wer*, *was* and the SC *što<sub>1</sub>*, *što<sub>2</sub>* on the other side.

S, E and SC have uninflected Rs that do not belong to the adverbials. Each language however, uses an uninflected form from a different set, as can be seen from the above table. The SC *što<sub>2</sub>*, moreover, is different from both the S *som* and the E *that*, because it is followed by a resumptive (personal) pronoun in oblique case.

E, G, and SC use adverbials from set c) as relativizers, S only uses for this purpose set b) words.

The applicability of the various forms in various syntactic constructions and at different stylistic levels differs in the four languages considerably. The general R, used in all styles, is *som* in S, *who*, *which*, *that* in E, *der* in G and *koji* in SC. In E *that* seems to be preferred in spoken style (Quirk 1968), whereas the S v- forms are restricted to formal usage only. G *welcher* is used as a variant of *der* in more careful style, though it is also found in some regional variants in more extensive usage. What is more colloquial, or more general in the Germanic languages (*som*, *der*, *that*) is more formal in SC (*što<sub>2</sub>*), and the other way round — the "interrogative" form is the most general (at least in standard SC usage).

In spite of the general applicability of S *som*, it is restricted in usage by some syntactic rules: i. it cannot occur in the genitive, ii. it cannot follow prepositions, iii. it cannot function as noun determiner, and iv. it cannot refer to other than substantival antecedents. These restrictions will be discussed, as well as the conditions under which they apply, and other strategies that can be used instead of *som* as R. Compa-

ri-son will be made with the other three languages, since differences of this kind are weak places in a foreign learner's usage and points of interference (see Hammarberg & Viberg 1977: 15 f).

2.1. If a genitive modifier is relativized *som* cannot be applied as an R since it does not inflect, so the following structures are used:

a) The R is the special genitive form *vars* which stands for the genitive singular or even plural in a not very careful style (Beckman, 1959, Nylund-Brodda & Holm 1977). In any case, the form is not common in spoken style, and the following example belongs to written varieties:

2) S Den man, *vars* hus nyligen brann.

b) The other inflected R which is applicable in the genitive, both singular and plural, is *vilkens/vilkets* — *vilkas*, but also only in written style:

3) S Den man, *vilkens* hus nyligen brann.

c) In spoken and everyday usage, the two v- Rs will be rejected for a construction with *som* e.g.

4) S Den man *som* huset brann *för*.

5) S Den man *som* ägde huset, *som* brann.

The two RCs introduced by *som* are acceptable in spoken usage.

On the ground of its lack of inflection the E *that* can be regarded as an equivalent of S *som*. The form *whose* is used for the genitive, and it is generally applicable for singular and plural, personal and non-personal, spoken and written usage.

6) E The man *whose* house was recently burnt down.

The two RCs in succession are also possible, but a distinction is made between personal (man) and non-personal (house) reference:

7) E The man *who* owned the house *which* was burnt down.

The R *that* is neutral and does not make the distinction, but the repetition of the same R may be less acceptable in careful style:

8) E The man that owned the house *that/which* was burnt down.

In G are all Rs inflected, as mentioned earlier, so there is no special form for the genitive:

9) G Der Mann *dessen* Haus brannte.

though in non-standard usage there may be other strategies applied (e. g. Der Mann *von welchem/von dem* das Haus gebrannt hat.)

In SC beside the inflected genitive of *koji* (kojega), or rather the possessive dative (kojemu/komu), the special possessive forms are more generally used, as in example 11) SC

10) SC Čovjek *kojemu* (? *kojega*) je kuća gorjela.

11) SC Čovjek *čija* je kuća gorjela.

But also the uninflected *što*<sub>2</sub> can be used, since it is followed by a resumptive pronoun in the possessive dative:

12) SC Čovjek *što mu* je kuća gorjela.

This strategy, however, belongs to a formal style.

Two RCs like in examples 5) S and 8) E are possible in both G and SC, but the structure has a somewhat looser cohesion than when expressed in one RC. Even looser cohesion is achieved when independent sentence structure is used (see also example 1/):

13) S Det är mannen. Hans hus brann.

14) E This is the man. His house was burnt down.

15) G Das ist der Mann. Sein Haus brannte.

16) SC To je taj čovjek. Njegova kuća je gorjela.

The cohesive link here is only pronominalized element introducing the second sentence and referring anaphorically to the antecedent in the first sentence.

2.2. Prepositional phrases as R cannot contain the uninflected forms. The equivalent structures are as follows:

a) In S *vilken/vilket* (or *vars* if the genitive is required) can be followed by a preposition:

17) S En verkstad, *till vilken* inga förkunskaper är nödvändiga, leds av Leif Peterson.

The same rule applies in E, where *who/which* are used.

18) E A workshop *for which* no previous knowledge is needed...

In G either *der* or *welcher* is used in the appropriate case form, and so is *koji* in SC. E.g.

19) G Eine Werkstatt *für die* (welche) kein Vorkenntnis notwendig ist...

20) SC Radionica *za koju* nije potrebno nikakvo predznanje...

b) In less formal styles S and E can “strand“ the preposition, while only S *som* and E *that* or *who/which* introduces the RC. A preposition is “stranded“ when it remains in the position it occupies in the source sentence:

21) S En verkstad... Inga förkunskaper är nödvändiga *till verkstaden*. ———  
*RC En verkstad som* inga förkunskaper är nödvändiga *till*...

22) E A workshop *which/that* no previous knowledge is needed *for*...

The difference between S and E is that E can strand the preposition both with the *wh-* R and with *that*, while in S stranding is restricted to *som*. There is one other difference between otherwise similar S and E strategies, i.e. the E *wh-* relativizers can be used in both non-restrictive (appositive) as well as in restrictive (obligatory) RCs, whereas *that* may be used only in the latter type. The S *som* is not restricted in that way.

23) E \*My uncle Sam, *that* lives in America.

means that there is only one person who is my uncle Sam, the RC only adds some information about him and does not restrict the reference among several persons as in the following example, where only one of my uncles is referred to

24) E My uncle *that* lives in America.

It is interesting that in G, where cases of preposition stranding are not unknown (e. g. in compounds: *Es ist vorgeschrieben* vs. *Er schreibt es vor*) there is no stranding in RC, just as in SC where no such strategy exists at all:

25) G \*Eine Werkstadt *die* keine Vorkenntniss ist notwendig *für*...  
In SC nevertheless, uninflected *što*<sub>2</sub> can be used with the preposition preceding the resumptive pronoun. There are two possible positions, i.e. before or after the verb, that the prepositional phrase can occupy:

26) SC Radionica *što* nikakvo predznanje *za nju* nije potrebno (*za nju*).  
This is a more formal structure than the prepositional phrase with *koji* in which SC differs from S and E, where the stranded structures are more colloquial.

There is yet another strategy applying to the relativization of prepositional phrases. That is the application of relative adverbs instead of a prepositional phrase with other Rs. This strategy is available in all four languages. S shows a distinction from the other languages in using adverbs from a different (demonstrative) set, as already mentioned.

27) S Nästa "växthus" har i takfönstren bilder av den storm *där* (i vilken) de möttes.

28) E The next "glass house" in its roof window pictures of the storm *where* (in which) they met.

29) G Das nächste "Gewächshaus" hat in dem Dachfenster Bilder von dem Sturm *wo* (in dem) sie einander trafen.

30) SC Idući "staklenik" ima u prozoru na krovu slike oluje *gdje* (u kojoj) su se sreli.

c) In S and E the style shifts further in the direction of informality if the R is "deleted" leaving only the stranded preposition:

31) S En verkstad inga förkunskaper är nödvändiga *till*...

32) E A workshop no previous knowledge is needed *for*...

In both languages, however, this is possible only in restrictive RCs, when Rs can be left out even if no preposition occurs. In modern standard usage this strategy is not admitted if the R functions as the subject of the RC.

33) S Den boken du gav mig är på bordet.

34) E The book you gave me is on the table.

In G and SC such sentences are not possible at all. The only constructions without a link are two independent sentences:

35) G Das buch ist am Tisch. Du hast mir das Buch gegeben.

36) SC Knjiga je na stolu. Ti si mi dao tu knjigu.

2.3. A further restriction on the use of *som*, and also *that*, is when it serves as modifier to a noun. This noun refers to the antecedent in the main clause, and is often synonymous with it. It can be preceded by an R of the "interrogative" set. This structure occurs only in very formal styles, e. g.

37) S Sverige slöt sig 1855 till England och Frankrike *vilka stater* då voro Rysslands fiender.

38) E Sweden joined England and France in 1855, *which states* were at that time Russia's enemies.

39) G Schweden schloss sich in 1955 England und Frankreich an, *welche Staaten* damals Russlands Feinde waren.

- 40) SC Švedska se 1855 priključila Engleskoj i Francuskoj, *koje su države ta-  
da bile neprijatelji Rusije.*

2.4. With antecedents other than nominal, i.e. when the R refers to the entire main clause or to its predicate, there are particular constraints regarding the R. In the first place only the "interrogative" set is applicable, and in the second, only neuter, non-personal forms. In S and E they are *vilket* and *which* respectively, in G and SC the neuter and non-personal *was* and *što*, respectively. *It is important for a learner to note that the last two languages do not use the direct equivalents of the S and E R, i.e. welcher/der and koji, but direct equivalents of the S vad and E what. This fact is cause of one of the most frequent errors in some learners' usage, e.g.*

- 41) S Fläskfilet med en gräddig mild sås, sardellkryddad  
*vilket/vad gör den salt.*  
42) E Pork steak with a mild creamy sauce, topped with anchovies, *which/what*  
makes it salty...

The non-substantival antecedent is gender indefinite so a neuter/non personal form is in order, but equivalents may differ, so:

- 43) G Schweinsfilet mit einer rahmigen milden Sauce, bestreut mit Sardellen,  
*das/was sie salzig macht.*  
44) SC Svinjski odrezak s blagim umakom od vrhnja, posutim sardelicama,  
*koje/što ga čini slanim.*

2.5. Some types of antecedent require particular Rs. Pronominal antecedents (e. g. demonstratives and indefinites) as well as superlatives admit in S only *som* as an R.

- 45) S *Den som* inte hunnit stanna upp...  
46) S *Da måste någon som* var djärv smyga in...  
47) S *Jag köpte den bästa som* fanns.

In E restrictions are different with demonstrative and indefinite pronouns, and the distinction between personal and non-personal reference is important. Thus:

- 48) E *Those who/that* do not reach it stand up...  
49) E *That which/that* you did not understand was Chinese.  
50) E Then had *someone who* was bold to sneak in...  
51) E This is *something that* is called stranding...

As can be seen from the above examples demonstratives do not admit *that*, which is preferred with the indefinites, though *which* is possible:

- 52) E ?This is *something which* is called stranding.

Personal reference is expressed by *who* only. Superlatives however, regardless of the kind of reference are relativized with *that*:

- 53) E I bought *the best that* was to be found.  
54) E He is *the best man that/\*who* I have met.

In G and SC the distinction between personal and non-personal reference is important too. Whereas in G the general *der* is used for personal reference with pronominal and superlative antecedents; *was* is used for non-personal reference. In SC the

Rs *tko* and *što*<sub>1</sub> refer to personal and non-personal antecedents respectively.

55) G Dann musste *jemand der* Mut hatte hineinschleichen.

56) G Es ist *etwas was* "stranding" heisst.

57) SC Onda se morao *netko tko* je hrabar ušuljati...

58) SC To je nešto što se zove "stranding".

Superlative antecedents in SC can also be relativized by *što*<sub>2</sub> with a resumptive pronoun, though this strategy does not apply to pronominal antecedents. E. g.

59) SC Kupio sam *najboljeg što* sam *ga* mogao naći.

(I bought the best<sub>masc</sub> that I could find him).

With demonstrative pronouns as antecedents in SC also the general R *koji* can be used. The distinction between *onaj tko* and *onaj koji* is between general and particular reference, i.e. *everyone who* (whoever) and *the one who* (he who).

2.6. The pronominal antecedent sometimes merges with the R, which is then used as a "free" or antecedentless R. There are similarities of structure in all the four languages examined. The Rs are the formal direct equivalents S *vad* E *what* G *was* and SC *što*<sub>1</sub>. E. g.

60) S Deras lekar strys av *det som* visas på TV.

→ Deras lekar strys av *vad (som)* visas på TV.

61) E Their games are influenced by *what* they see on TV

62) G Ihre Spiele sind beeinflusst von *was* sie im Fernsehen sehn.

63) SC Igre im se povode *za onim što* vide na TV.

Note that in SC the pronominal antecedent remains after a preposition. In a different structure it is elided:

64) SC Imitiraju *što* vide na TV.

(They immitate what they see on TV).

This kind of R is frequently found in proverbial texts, e.g.

65) S *Vad* du gör, gör snart.

66) E *What* you do, do quickly.

67) G *Was* du machst, mach schnell.

68) SC *Što* radiš, radi brzo.

These sentences are paraphrasable by sentences containing such pronominals as *det* or *allt*.

69) S *det som* du gör — *allt vad* du gör

70) E *that which* you do — *all that* you do

71) G *das was* du machst — *alles was* du machst

72) SC *ono što* radiš — *sve što* radiš

It is interesting to note here, that whereas G and SC use equivalent Rs with the demonstrative pronoun, S and E have different strategies. With the pronominal "all", only E differs from the other three languages. Errors in learner's usage that can (and do) occur is of the following type:

73) S \**det vilket/vad* du gör — \**allt som* du gör

74) E \**that that/what* you do — \**all what* you do

75) G \**das das* du machst — \**alles das* du machst

76) SC *\*ono koje radiš — \*sve koje radiš*

A unique case in the present considerations is the S optional double relativizer in example 60)S, i.e. *vad som*. It resembles Middle English relativizers of the type: *which that, whan that*. The function of the second R is to disambiguate the “interrogative” linking word and mark it as R.

3. A special function of the RC construction is emphasis. It is achieved by a strategy known as “clefting”, but also by RCs with demonstrative pronouns as antecedents, and by RCs with resumed antecedent as discussed in 2.3. The unemphatic statement:

77) S *Sven har gjort det.*

receives emphasis by “clefting”, i.e. a “dummy” pronominalization of the subject which becomes part of the nominal predicate of the main clause, the original predicate being expressed in the adjoined RC:

78) E *Det är Sven, som har gjort det.*

and also in the other languages:

79) Ā *It is Sven who did it.*

80) G *Es ist Sven der es getan hat.*

81) SC *?To je Sven koji je to učinio.*

The SC sentence can be heard in colloquial usage, probably under the influence of other languages. It is not quite natural though. The more natural emphatic structure would involve an RC with a pronominal antecedent, embedded in the main clause:

82) SC *Onaj koji je to učinio bio je Sven.*

83) G *Der(jenige) der es getan hat war Sven.*

84) E *The one who did it was Sven.*

85) S *Den som har gjort det är Sven.*

(Den är Sven — main clause

som har gjort det — embedded RC)

This structure is even more emphatic than the “cleft” sentence. The continuum of emphasis seems to run from sentences like the above examples, over “cleft” sentences, RCs with resumed antecedents, to RCs with Rs, and RCs with the elision of R, and further to various other structures (“contracted” RCs, e.g. *They left us something /which was/ good.*).

4. The very limited aim of the present study was to draw attention to the great structural similarities between various languages on the one hand and important differences on the other. It can be noticed that the greatest similarities can be found between the S and E RC formation strategies though there are not only stylistic but also structural differences that may cause interference in a learner’s usage. Likewise, though generally much more different than any of the Germanic languages, SC shows considerable agreement in RC formation, particularly with respect to choice of R, with G.

The S strategies may seem simplest, yet there are rules that do not exist in G and SC, and there are even rules in which E disagrees with S. Moreover rules from one

language tend to interfere in the usage of the other in a learner's performance, therefore both systems ought to be considered in language instruction.

Another aspect, which would be worth pursuing more extensively, is the difference in the pragmatic value of the various strategies in contrastive studies. Useful in language instruction would also be to compare various syntactic means of expressing the same message, and evaluating their contextual and situational appropriateness.

As a by-product it is interesting to observe the convergences and divergences among languages, due to contact or some universal trends in interaction with the particular language structures.

## REFERENCES

- Beckman, N. 1959. *Svensk språklära*. Stockholm.
- Björkhagen, O. 1962. *Modern Swedish Grammar*. Stockholm.
- Halliday, M. A. K., R. Hasan 1977. *Cohesion in English*. Longman: London.
- Helbig, G., J. Buscha 1977. *Deutsche Grammatik*. VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie: Leipzig.
- Katičić, R. 1986. *Sintaksa hrvatskog književnog jezika*. Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti: Zagreb.
- Lindberg, E. 1976. *Beskrivande svensk grammatik*. Lund.
- Maček, D. 1975. Relatives in English and Their in Serbo-Croatian. *Studies* 6, 26—62. The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian — English Contrastive Studies Project (YSCESCP): Zagreb.
- Maček, D. 1985. A Contrastive Outline of Relativization in English and Serbo-Croatian. In R. Filipović (ed.) *Chapters in Serbo-Croatian English Contrastive Grammar*, 423—452. YSCESCP: Zagreb.
- Maček, D. 1986. *Relativization in English and Serbo-Croatian*. YSCESCP New Studies 3.: Zagreb.
- Nylland-Brodde, E., B. Holm 1975. *Deskriptiv svensk grammatik*. Trelleborg.
- Peranteau, Levi, Phares (eds.) 1972. *The Chicago Which Hunt, Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*. The Chicago Linguistic Society: Chicago.
- Quirk, R. 1968. Relative Clauses in Educated Spoken English. *English Studies* 38 no. 3, 97—109. London.
- Thorell, O. 1977. *Svensk grammatik*. Stockholm.
- van der Auwera, J., D. Kučanda 1985. Pronoun or conjunction — the Serbo-Croatian invariant relativizer što. *Linguistics* 23, 917—962.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1977. *Text and Context*. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. Longman: London.
- Viberg, A., K. Ballardini, S. Stjärnlöf 1988. *Svensk grammatik*. Stockholm.

## Sažetak

### RELATIVIZACIJA U ŠVEDSKOM JEZIKU Neki kontrastivni aspekti

Relativizacija kao sintaktička i pragmatička strategija promatra se u švedskom, engleskom, njemačkom i hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku. Pažnja je usredotočena na vezivne riječi u funkciji relativizatora. Uspoređuje se njihova etimologija, pravila i ograničenja upotrebe, te čestota i stilistička vrijednost pojedinih relativizatora u gore navedenim jezicima.