

lietuvių *irgi*, studentų paverstu *irgi*, čia lyg ir nereikėjo dar platinti. Tarmių *kėturpėsčia* studentų ir čia „panaujinta“ – *kėturpėsčia*.

Žodyno autoriai kai ką labai keičia, pavyzdžiui, visus vienskiemenius tvirtagalės priegaidės žodžius keičia tvirtapradžiais: *túos, šiúos, kuriúos, jīe, tīe* ir kt. visame tekste, bet iš kur yra *jiējie, jiējei, jiēje, juōsiuos* (bet ir *júosius*) (žr. p. 569).

Lyg ir labai apibendrintai teikiama vienoda žodžių sandūra. Buitiniame kalbėsenos stiliuje jos būna dažnai, balsiai, dvibalsiai – *ai* ir *a, e* balsiai, bet *-ai, -'ai* ir *-u, -o* nesusilieja: *atēiv'aei ó-k'ieč'ei Žvr, acārġ'ei užrġek* Bajoraičiai ir kt.

*Zanavykų šnektos žodynas* yra svarbus daugeliu požymių – apimtimi, gražiais šnekamosios kalbos sakiniais. Dirbo daug žmonių nuoširdžiai, atsidavę. Žodynininkų darbas yra sunkus, reikalauja didelio kruopštumo, akylumo, pastovumo. Nebuvo nuolatinio žodyno rengėjų kolektyvo, jis vis kito, mainėsi vadovai, todėl ir yra svyravimų. Dėl to ir nepasekta to klausimo literatūros, net Antano Tatarės hipernormalizmų su veiksmažodžių priesagomis *-yti* ir *-inti* atsiradimo (ištirta prof. Zigmo Zinkevičiaus<sup>5</sup>), o žodyno įvade iš esmės nepanagrinėta.

Vytautas Vitkauskas

Gauta 2004 04 21

Lietuvių kalbos institutas

P. Vileišio g., 10308 Vilnius, Lietuva

INETA SAVICKIENĖ

*THE ACQUISITION OF LITHUANIAN NOUN MORPHOLOGY*

Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003, 152 p.,

ISBN 3-7001-3138-0

(Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Linguistik und Kommunikationsforschung, 28)

The monograph under review<sup>6</sup> is the very first attempt at describing the emergence of nominal grammatical categories in the speech of a Lithuanian child. Therefore it deserves particular attention and a somewhat more extensive summary, as every further study on the acquisition of nouns will have to refer to the pioneer work of Ineta Savickienė of Kaunas VDU University.

The collecting and processing of data on the acquisition of Lithuanian was initiated by Prof. Magdalena Smoczyńska (Jagellonian University, Kraków) in 1992, and it took over ten years to obtain an exhaustive description of the acquisition of morphology by one Lithuanian child<sup>7</sup>. Another scholar whose efforts greatly contributed to this research was Prof. Wolfgang U.

<sup>5</sup> Zinkevičius, Z., *Lietuvių kalbos istorija IV*, Vilnius, 1990, 202–203 (apie matindamas 'matydamas', suvalginsiu ir kt.).

<sup>6</sup> The monograph is based on the doctoral dissertation: Ineta Savickienė, *Lietuvių vaiko daiktavardžio morfologija*, Kaunas, VDU, 1999.

<sup>7</sup> The acquisition of verbs was discussed on the basis of the same corpus of data by the author of this review (Paweł Wójcik, *The Acquisition of Lithuanian Verb Morphology: A Case Study*, Kraków: Universitas (Baltica Varsoviensia, 2).

Dressler, the initiator and *spiritus movens* of the international "Crosslinguistic Project on Pre- and Protomorphology in Language Acquisition". W.U. Dressler was also the editor of the reviewed monograph.

The study consists of seven chapters (11–124), preceded by W. U. Dressler's brief presentation of the project on pre- and protomorphology and of the monograph itself (7–8), and a preface (9–10). It is supplemented by a paper comparing the acquisition of noun morphology in Lithuanian and German (125–138).

The first, introductory chapter (11–15) presents the empirical data being the object of the investigation. In her longitudinal study Savickienė analysed transcripts of conversations with a Lithuanian girl named Rūta, recorded and put down in electronic format by the girl's mother. The material analysed covered the period from 1 year and 7 months (1;7) till two years and six months 2;6. Over this period, almost 35 hours of conversation were recorded. Rūta's and her parents' utterances were coded according to CHILDES, a program commonly used by psycholinguists.

After the presentation of the data, the author notes that the study was carried out within the framework of natural morphology and she gives brief descriptions of the first stages in the acquisition of morphology: premorphology, protomorphology and modularised morphology. She also points out that one of the goals of the study is to check whether the emergence of nominal categories in Rūta corresponds to the results of research into the acquisition of other languages, which shows that children first acquire diminutives, then number and, finally, case.

In the second chapter (16–36), the acquisition of diminutives is presented. Savickienė makes a few observations on the meaning of diminutives in general, discusses the emergence of diminutive forms in Rūta, their usage by the girl and her mother, the semantics of diminutive forms used by the participants of the conversation as well as the pragmatics of diminutives. The results of the calculations carried out by the author show that diminutives started being used by the girl very early (already at the age of 1;7) and their frequency was high when compared with the overall number of nominal forms (the most frequent were forms denoting animals, toys and body parts). Diminutives were acquired by Rūta earlier than inflectional endings, and on the whole their usage was determined by pragmatic factors (e.g., in order to show affection, to relieve an unpleasant situation etc.), whereas the meaning of smallness was expressed by means of the adjective *mažas* ('little', 'small').

The third chapter (37–48) is devoted to the category of number. First of all, the author explains how this category functions in contemporary Lithuanian and gives a survey of the results of research on the acquisition of number in other languages. Then a description of the emergence of the category in Rūta's speech is presented. Here Savickienė notes a very interesting fact: the girl perceived the difference between singular and plural very early (already at 1;7), but she continued to express the meaning of plurality by using interchangeably (often incorrectly) the numeral *du* 'two' and the adverb *daug* 'many'. The first plural forms emerged at 1;8, and at 1;9 a spurt of plural forms was recorded, and the first oppositions of singular and plural forms were observed.

In the most extensive chapter, which deals with the acquisition of the category of case (49–90), Savickienė analyses the emergence and distribution of particular cases in Rūta's speech, providing also comments about the semantic and syntactic functions of the constructions they are used in. The first opposition noted by the author at the age of 1;8 was accusative/genitive

singular vs. nominative singular. At the same time, nominative plural and vocative singular forms emerged. Singular forms predominated over the whole period studied, however, the number of plural forms increased conspicuously only after the age of two.

As far as the meaning of cases is concerned, the girl first acquired the basic meanings, and only later on the peripheral ones, as was to be expected. The most frequently used cases were: the nominative in the function of grammatical subject, the possessive genitive and the accusative used to encode the direct object. This order of acquisition of cases in Rūta corresponds to the findings in other languages.

In this chapter, Savickienė also discusses the mistakes made by the child when producing nouns. For example, during the first months of the period studied (1;7–1;11) Rūta tended to replace endings with the ‘premorpheme’ *-a* (e.g. *smėlia* instead of *smėlis* ‘sand:NOM’, *bulia* instead of *bulvė* ‘potatoe:NOM’, *obuoliuka* instead of *obuoliuko* ‘apple:DIM.GEN.SG’)<sup>8</sup>, and for a long time she used feminine dative endings for the nominative singular, e.g. *Pauliukai* instead of *Pauliukai* (proper name). The girl also made mistakes involving the use of cases, for example, up to the age of 2;3 several instances of lacking shift from accusative to genitive with negation (*ausytį nekauda* instead of *ausytės neskauda* ‘the ear:DIM.ACC does not hurt’) were recorded.

In the fifth chapter (91–104), the acquisition of declensional classes is presented. First of all, the author notes that there is no single, well-established classification of declensional classes in contemporary studies on Lithuanian grammar, and she proposes a new classification of nouns on the basis of the theory developed by Wolfgang Dressler. As a result, two macroclasses – masculine (I) and feminine (II) were distinguished, then seven microclasses were introduced within the first macroclass and four microclasses plus an isolated feminine paradigm (*sesuo* ‘sister’) within the second macroclass.

The author provides brief explanations of the notions of ‘microclass’ and ‘macroclass’, ‘inflectional productivity’, etc., but these descriptions could be more detailed. For example, what criteria were used in order to establish whether a microclass is productive or unproductive?

The productive classes are constituted by masculine nouns in *-as* (class I.1) and *-is, -ys* (I.3) as well as feminine nouns in *-a* (II.1) and *-ė* (II.3). The author observes that nouns belonging to these classes were the most numerous in the corpus studied, and their declension was acquired first.

The sixth chapter of the study (105–118) gives a brief overview of the acquisition of pronouns, with particular emphasis on the problem of self-reference and that of the ways of addressing the interlocutor. It was observed when studying different languages that during early conversations pronouns are infrequent both in child’s and parents’ speech. Instead, proper names or kinship terms are used. The same was observed in Rūta’s and her mother’s utterances.

<sup>8</sup> Similar phenomenon can be observed in verbs, where Rūta tended to use the neutral vowel *-a* or a reduplicated syllable instead of reflexive affixes or prefixes. However, I would rather use the term ‘filler’ for such substitutions, as it is difficult to judge unambiguously what the reasons underlying the use of such ‘empty’ syllables are. It well may be the child’s wish to preserve the prosodic shape of a word or phrase rather than to mark grammatical meaning.

In the conclusions (119–124) Savickienė notes that having analysed Rūta's data one can distinguish three stages of morphological development: premorphology (1;7), referring to the stage in which the girl made extensive use of onomatopoeia, interjections, and words which meaning or form could not be unambiguously identified; the stage of protomorphology (1;8-2;3), in which the first grammatical markers emerged, and the stage modularised morphology (2;4-2;5), in which the categories started to be used productively. After a brief summary of the results, the author notes that the process of acquisition of nouns by Rūta corresponds to the results of studies on the acquisition of other languages.

Similar conclusions were drawn on the basis of a comparison between the acquisition of nouns by Rūta and by an Austrian speaking boy called Jan, described in the paper supplementing the monograph (see footnote 3). Moreover, the data compared confirmed the thesis that children acquiring languages which are more complex with respect to their morphology detect and start using morphological distinctions earlier than children acquiring languages with a poorer morphology.

Not many critical remarks can be made on the interpretation of facts or forms by the author. We find a somewhat surprising segmentation on p. 24, where the form *trup-uč-iuk-q* 'a little' is given as an example of a diminutive with double suffixation. Synchronically, the simplex of *trupučiuką* is *truput-i* (even though formally and semantically it resembles a diminutive), thus *trupučiuką* cannot be presented as an example corresponding to *žmog-el-iuk-as* 'man:DIM'.

I also would not be willing to agree with the contention that the reason why at an early age (especially at 1;7) Rūta omitted the first syllable when uttering her name (saying *Tytė*, *Telė* instead of *Rūtytė*, *Rūtelė*) were difficulties with the pronunciation of the sound /r/ (p. 27). The fact that a difficult sound occurs in a form does not mean that the whole syllable must be omitted – 1;7 alongside *Tytė*, *Telė* one can find instances when the child used the form *Ūtytė*.

In section 2.2.4. (p.20), Savickienė claims that Ferguson's statement about baby talk being a simplified register does not hold for Lithuanian. As an argument she adduces the fact that in their conversations with children parents tend to use many diminutives, which are longer and more difficult to learn than simplicia. In my opinion, this conclusion is too strongly formulated. Frequent use of diminutives is just one of 'expressive processes' (discussed also by Ferguson). Examples of simplifying and clarifying processes, to use Ferguson's terminology, are extremely numerous in speech directed to Lithuanian children – the utterances are shorter, forms, phrases or sentences are often repeated, numerous baby-talk lexemes are used, etc.

As mentioned above, the interpretations of forms and facts, as well as the conclusions drawn by Ineta Savickienė are basically correct. A few comments should be made, however, with reference to the presentation of the empirical data used by the author, as well as of some calculations that were based on it.

When presenting the empirical data Savickienė notes that citations, onomatopoeia and baby-talk forms were excluded from the investigation (p.12). Such an approach is correct, since these forms do not prove that the child has mastered a grammatical category actively. However, the author does not exclude forms directly modelled on adult utterances. It seems to us that the reasons why these forms were included in the investigated corpus should have been explained. Imitations may have some impact on the results of calculation, and not exclud-

ing them may lead to certain misleading conclusions. It should be noted, however, that in the main part of the monograph the author does not forget this general rule and points out which nouns were not fully spontaneous.

In the introduction, Savickienė does not provide information about the total number of nouns recorded during the conversations and used in analysis. In the body of the book one finds divergences between the results of the calculations, and it is not quite clear how many forms were actually analysed. In the table presenting the distribution of cases, the overall number of tokens used by the child seems to be 9,851 and the mother seems to have used nouns 12,869 times (p. 60–61), whereas in the table presenting the distribution of nouns with respect to their declension the numbers are 9,677 and 12,812 respectively. It has to be emphasised that the discrepancy is insignificant and it does not have a negative impact upon the general results, as the author usually presents the data in form of percentages.

Finally, certain inconsistencies can be observed in the section discussing the use of cases by Rūta and her mother. In table 4.2 (p. 54) the vocative is properly excluded from analysis and its forms are not calculated. However, in tables 4.3 and 4.4, showing the distribution of cases with respect to the feature of animacy, vocative forms are not shown in the tables but they are calculated (the percentages for the six cases do not sum up to give 100). This mistake affects the results of calculation, as vocatives are very rarely used with inanimate nouns. Moreover, the relative frequency of inanimate nouns in the vocative differs in the girl's and the mother's utterances.

The above-mentioned remarks refer to minor mistakes, which do not diminish the value the exhaustive and carefully prepared monograph. The investigation has been carried out carefully, and the conclusions are formulated only after a detailed discussion of the results of studies into the acquisition of other, related as well as typologically different languages.

It should finally be mentioned that the book is carefully edited, and that the forms and fragments of conversations cited are provided with all the necessary grammatical information. The structure of the book is logical, major chapters are divided into smaller, numbered sections. This makes it easy for the reader to find his way in the text.

There can be no doubt that Ineta Savickienė's monograph will become a source of useful information not only for linguists or psycholinguists, but also for everybody interested in first and second language acquisition or developmental psychology.

Paweł Wójcik  
Uniwersytet Warszawski  
Katedra Językoznawstwa Ogólnego i Bałtystyki  
Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28  
PL-00-927 Warszawa

*Gauta 2004 06 08*