

4. CASE

4.1. The Category of Case in Modern Lithuanian

4.1.1. Lithuanian, like the other conservative Indo-European languages, is a fusional inflecting language in which case marking can not be separated from number marking, and where gender correlates closely with declensional classes.

The category of case may be defined as ‘a distinctive, overtly marked form which can be assumed by a NP to indicate that the NP bears some identifiable grammatical or semantic relation to the rest of the sentence’ (Trask, 1995:35). Another possible definition from the verbo-centric position is given by Blake: ‘Case is a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear for their heads. Traditionally the term refers to inflectional marking, and, typically, case marks the relationship of a noun to a verb at the clause level or of a noun to a preposition, postposition or another noun at the phrase level’ (Blake, 1994:1). Thus, the term case traditionally refers to inflectional marking, but could be extended to cover prepositions.

Paulauskienė (1994: 98) gives the following definition of the category of case in Modern Lithuanian: ‘The category of case encompasses several levels of linguistic structure. It is therefore not possible to reveal all the features of the category considering only one level. Morphology, for example, gives a description of the case form system which, however, is not meaningless; paradigmatic relations are always based on the meaning of a certain case form in a syntagm’. The category of case is one of the basic categories of the noun signaling syntactic functions of the noun in a sentence. Consequently, a morphological description of case forms implies reference to syntax and semantics: these levels of linguistic analysis provide a necessary condition for disclosing the nature of the category.

4.1.2. If we assume that prepositional cases should be treated as one functional category, then within this category the syntactic functions of subject and object will be granted a central role. Next on the functional hierarchy come descriptive relations, within which the most peripheral member is the functional category of adverbial. Paulauskienė (1994) points out in this connection that due to the same syntactic content they convey,

prepositional constructions fall within the same general macroparadigm of cases and prepositions. These constructions act as functional equivalents of cases (i.e., they are equivalent in meaning) occupying the periphery of the category.

In a prepositional construction the noun case is linked to the verb via a preposition which governs a particular case; most frequent are the genitive, the accusative and the instrumental cases. In Lithuanian, the most common prepositions take the genitive (*ant* 'on', *be* 'without', *prie* 'to, at', *iš* 'from', *dėl* 'because of' and *iki* 'until'); the prepositions *į* 'to', *pas* 'at', *per* 'across', *pro* 'through', *prieš* 'in front of, before' and *apie* 'around, about' govern the accusative case, whereas the instrumental case combines with *su* 'with' and *po* 'under, after'. Prepositional constructions express a variety of relational meanings; spatial relations are the most prominent whereas other meanings are less frequent (cf. Ambrasas et al. 1997, Paulauskienė 1994, Valeckienė 1998, Šukys 1998).

4.1.3. Functions performed by cases are viewed as syntactic and semantic in nature. Verbs, the central element of a clause, govern nouns imposing on them a particular case. Some nouns are also governed by a nominal word class.

Valeckienė (1998: 251–252) maintains that it is the accusative and the nominative cases that are of utmost importance in clause formation in Lithuanian. The primary syntactic functions performed by the two cases depend on the transitivity of a verb. Nouns in the nominative case function as a grammatical subject, whereas nouns in the accusative perform the syntactic function of an object. The genitive case can enter into a close relationship with either the nominative or the accusative case depending on whether it is governed by a nominal word class or by a verb. Thus the adverbial (i.e., governed by a verb) genitive often appears after transitive verbs, in which case it performs the syntactic function of an object. The adnominal genitive (i.e., when governed by a noun) is often referred to as '*genitivus definitivus*'.

4.1.4. Case is a category of morphosyntactic properties which distinguish the various relations that a noun phrase may bear to a governing head. Some such relations are fundamentally syntactic in nature – for example, the subject, direct object, indirect object, and the genitive relations; cases used to encode relations of this sort (the so-called grammatical cases) include the nominative, the accusative, the genitive and the dative. Other cases – the concrete cases – encode relations which are instead fundamentally semantic; these include the instrumental case, and the locative (Kuryłowicz 1964, 1977, Stump 1998).

The most typical semantic and syntactic functions performed by different cases in Lithuanian are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: The most typical semantic and syntactic functions of Lithuanian case forms

Case	Semantic function	Syntactic function
Nominative	Agent	Subject
Genitive	Possessor	Possessive
Accusative	Patient	Direct object
Dative	Recipient, benefactive	Indirect object
Instrumental	Instrument/Comitative	Object
Locative	Location	Adverbial
Vocative	The case of address	

It has to be pointed out, however, that the Table 4.1 does not give a full list of functions performed by the cases in Lithuanian. Our research material corroborates the assertion that a number of other functions can be added to the list. For example, the adverbial genitive can function as an object, it can perform a partitive function, or denote indefinite quantity of an object. Moreover, the so-called genitive of negation rule operates in Lithuanian. Briefly put, the rule comes down to the following: in positive statements the direct object of transitive verbs is in the accusative case, whereas in the corresponding negated sentences the object noun is marked as genitive.

The genitive case plus a preposition can perform the function of an adverbial of place. The accusative, in addition to direct object, can function as an adverbial of place or time. A dative indirect object can perform different semantic functions, those of terminative, beneficiary, or percipient (the function of indirect object plays a smaller role than more concrete semantic meaning). The instrumental besides the object (semantic functions those of instrument and comitative), in addition can also function as adverbial of place and time. The locative case, a standard function of which is an adverbial of place, can denote time. It can be concluded then that cases in Lithuanian can be assigned basic and peripheral meanings.

4.2. *The Acquisition of the Category of Case: a Survey of Previous Research*

4.2.1. The category of case is considered to be one of the most complex grammatical categories. This is due to several reasons: first, the category of case is morphological in form and syntactic in content; second, it enters into multiple oppositions. It is generally accepted that with respect to child language, binary oppositions are acquired at an earlier phase than multiple ones. Therefore, in child language acquisition multiple categories often first emerge as members of a binary opposition. A case in point is the natural distinction between the opposition of direct and indirect cases. It is only at later phases that oblique cases are assigned their functional and semantic values and the distinction between such cases as accusative, genitive appears (Ceytlin 1988).

4.2.2. Data provided by research in other languages (cf. Slavic: Polish, Russian; Baltic: Latvian) demonstrate that children first grasp the existing contrast between the accusative and genitive singular case forms as opposed to the nominative case. Approximately at the same time children start using the vocative, the nominative plural, the locative singular, the dative and the instrumental cases (Smoczyńska 1985, Gvozdev 1949, Rūķe-Draviņa 1973). In addition, research into Slavic languages has shown that, as a rule, plural case forms in child language appear at the beginning of the third year.

4.2.2.1. With respect to Latvian, it is singular case forms that are acquired first. The first binary distinction which emerges in child language is the one between the nominative and the accusative singular forms (1;7-1;9), e.g., *bumba/bumbu* 'ball'. After a month, the third inflectional form, that of the locative (1;8-1;10), appeared. One month later, during the 1;11 period, the genitive case and the dative case forms appeared. Thus, at the end of the second year almost all inflectional cases of singular nouns emerged, with the exception of the vocative and the instrumental case endings. The nominative plural form appeared only at about 1;11. A brief comment is in order here. It has been maintained by a number of scholars that children acquire the category of number prior to that of case. However, this claim is not corroborated by Rūķe-Draviņa's research into child language acquisition in Latvian. According to her data, it is only at the end of the second year and during the first months of the third year that Latvian children acquire the plural case forms of the accusative, the dative, the locative, and, finally, the genitive case. Both singular and plural forms of the instrumental case emerged together

with the use of prepositions, and it is generally accepted that prepositions are acquired by children at a relatively late period. In Rūķe-Draviņa's data (1973, 1982) the first prepositions emerged at the age of 2;4.

4.2.2.2. The nominative singular case form (as the first one to be consistently used) emerges in other languages as well, not only in the ones mentioned above. This is a universal phenomenon related to the unmarked status of the category of number (i.e., singularity) and of the nominative case. The two categories are more natural than plurality or oblique cases (Dressler, Karpf 1995). Another feature which is manifested even in typologically distant languages is the fact that during the earliest phase of language acquisition nouns in the nominative case, even masculine nouns, are assigned the ending *-a*. Data from Slavic languages, such as Polish (Smoczyńska 1985) and Russian (Gvozdev 1949, Ceytlin 1988), Baltic languages (for Latvian see Rūķe-Draviņa 1973, 1982), Greek (Christofidou, Stephany 1997, Stephany 1997b) and German (Mills 1985) strongly testify to this tendency. Gósy (1989), who has analysed the acquisition of vowel harmony by Hungarian children, relates this tendency on the part of small children to assign the [a] sound the status of an allomorph, most probably because of the phonologically unmarked character of the sound. Soon after this period grammatical inflectional endings of the nominative singular emerge and enter into an opposition with the accusative case endings.

4.3. The Use of Cases in Rūta's and Mother's Speech

4.3.1. Our main focus in the analysis of case usage in Rūta's and Mother's speech is related to three topics: first, the relevant data of frequencies and the importance of the input, second, the analysis of the functions performed by the cases under discussion and the distribution of inflections and declension classes in their phonological/phonetic representation as a formal side of case marking. The starting point of our analysis is the classification of cases proposed by Kuryłowicz (1964, 1977). We will thus analyse grammatical cases from the point of view of their syntactic functions, whereas concrete cases (on this distinction see 4.1.4) will be discussed with respect to the semantic functions they are used to perform. Our hypothesis is that from a statistical point of view the frequency of occurrence of a certain case is inversely proportional to the degree of its functional markedness.

The frequency of occurrence (also in percentages) of all cases used in Rūta's and Mother's speech is presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: The frequency of occurrence of all cases in Mother's and Rūta's speech (1;7-2;5)

	Nom.	Acc.	Gen.	Dat.	Ins.	Loc.
Mother	5789 (48%)	2512 (21%)	2222 (19%)	565 (4,7%)	497 (4,1%)	379 (3,2%)
Rūta	5480 (58,6%)	1766 (18,8%)	1375 (14,6%)	375 (3,9%)	213 (2,3%)	170 (1,8%)

The above data clearly indicate that grammatical cases, i.e., the nominative, the accusative, the genitive, and the dative are much more frequent (except the dative) than the concrete ones, i.e., those of the instrumental, and the locative¹⁷. It can be concluded then that the sub-system of concrete cases, which is functionally marked, is characterised by a low frequency of occurrence. The frequency of grammatical cases differs greatly from that of concrete ones. For example, the frequency of the genitive case alone is higher than that of all concrete cases taken together. The most frequent case, then, is the unmarked nominative case, whereas the locative and the instrumental represent the cases with the lowest frequency of occurrence. Likewise, the locative case, due to its lowest frequency of occurrence, should be considered the most marked member in the case system.

The analysis of Rūta's and Mother's speech presented similar results, i.e., grammatical cases are the most favoured ones in the speech of both. Therefore, concrete cases can be claimed to remain on the periphery of the case system. On the other hand, the frequency of occurrence of individual cases in Rūta's and Mother's speech does show slight differences, especially in the use of the nominative case where Rūta's frequency exceeds that of Mother's by 10%. With respect to other cases, the frequency of occurrence is similar for both, Rūta and Mother.

Due to lack of data, not much can be said about the statistics concerning the use of cases in spoken Lithuanian. However, the tendencies in the use of cases in written Lithuanian are the same, that is, grammatical cases are more frequent than concrete ones (cf. Žilinskienė 1979: 78-88)¹⁸.

¹⁷ Kuryłowicz did not separate the vocative as a discrete case, therefore we do not include the vocative either.

¹⁸ With respect to spoken language, research into Slavic languages provides similar results. Thus in Russian the frequency of occurrence of cases is as follows: Nom. 32.6%, Acc. 25.3%, Gen. 22%, Dat. 4.1%, Loc. 10.1%, Ins. 5% (see Zemskaja 1979: 74). In Polish the respective numbers are: Nom. 34.2%, Acc. 29.8%, Gen. 19.2%, Dat. 4.8%, Ins. 4.4%, Loc. 7.6% (Laskowski 1989: 212).

The analysis of Mother's data allows us to make the assumption that spoken Lithuanian as used by adults could actually exhibit certain differences only in terms of statistics: it can be posited that the frequency of occurrence of the nominative case would be somewhat lower. This can be explained by the fact that child language, as well as child directed speech, is characterised by a frequent use of the nominative case. This is especially true of the early periods of language acquisition (cf. 6).

4.3.2. The frequency of occurrence of the different case forms of specific words reflects the nature of the category of case in Lithuanian, i.e., the degree of markedness of each case, on the other hand the semantics of a noun is a basic factor which influences the frequency of its case forms (cf. Laskowski 1989). Consider in this connection the animate/inanimate opposition of nouns presented in Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.3: The distribution of cases (%) in Mother's speech with respect to the feature of animacy

Mother's speech	Nom.	Acc.	Gen.	Dat.	Ins.	Loc.
Animate	55,2	8,9	11,1	8,5	2,5	0
Inanimate	35,2	29,6	23,1	0,4	5,1	5,7

Table 4.4: The distribution of cases (%) in Rūta's speech with respect to the feature of animacy

Rūta's speech	Nom.	Acc.	Gen.	Dat.	Ins.	Loc.
Animate	65,0	8,7	9,9	6,9	1,5	0
Inanimate	44,4	29,0	18,8	0,1	3,0	3,8

The results obtained from the analysis of the relevant data demonstrate that the same tendencies prevail in both Mother's and Rūta's speech. Therefore, our further discussion will be based on the general use of cases in Mother's and Rūta's speech. It has to be noted at this point that the statistical difference in the use of nouns denoting animate and inanimate nouns is significant. The most frequent case of animate nouns is the nominative case, the frequency of which is much higher than that of all other cases taken together. Inanimate nouns show also a preference for the accusative marking, with a frequency close to the nominative. On the other hand, the frequency of inanimate nouns marked nominative is 20% lower than of animates. The most marked case for inanimate nouns is the dative (0.4% in Mother's speech, 0.1% in Rūta's speech). This tendency is subordinated in Rūta's output to her greater initial preference

for the nominative case in general. In order to see that the distribution of the nominative in the output comes closer and closer to the frequency in the input see Tables 4.5 and 4.6.

Table 4.5: The distribution of nominative case in Rūta's speech with respect to the feature of animacy

Nominative	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5	Total
Animate	33	161	479	499	308	370	292	223	397	420	294	3476
	0,9%	4,6%	13,8%	14,4%	8,9%	10,6%	8,4%	6,4%	11,4%	12,1%	8,5%	100,0%
Inanimate	6	63	220	257	174	199	196	284	155	238	212	2004
	0,3%	3,1%	11,0%	12,8%	8,7%	9,9%	9,8%	14,2%	7,7%	11,9%	10,6%	100,0%

Table 4.6: The distribution of nominative case in Mother's speech with respect to the feature of animacy

Nominative	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5	Total
Animate	87	252	582	580	259	405	202	266	313	248	272	3466
	2,5%	7,3%	16,8%	16,7%	7,5%	11,7%	5,8%	7,7%	9,0%	7,2%	7,8%	100,0%
Inanimate	38	147	340	432	165	253	179	194	180	220	175	2323
	1,6%	6,3%	14,6%	18,6%	7,1%	10,9%	7,7%	8,4%	7,7%	9,5%	7,5%	100,0%

As can be noticed, the relation between animate and inanimate nominatives is at first very different in the input and the output, thus in 1;7 inanimate nominatives make up 18% in the output but 30% in the input, in 1;8 already 28% in the output but 37% in the input, later on the output percentages come closer and closer to those of the input

The instrumental and the locative are frequent enough (approximately 5% in Mother's and 3% in Rūta's speech) (see Tables 4.3 and 4.4). On the other hand, the dative of animate nouns shows a high frequency of occurrence in both Mother's (8.5%) and Rūta's (6.9%) speech. The locative case is not used at all. The results also show considerable differences in the use of animate and inanimate nouns marked for dative and locative. As far as the use of dative is concerned, the reason for this difference is the fact that the dative is the most likely candidate for the functions of the beneficiary, percipient, or experiencer (on semantic roles of cases see Jakaitienė 1988 and Valeckienė 1998). The dative performing these functions denotes an animate noun, i.e., a person or an animal. Thus the dative in Rūta's and Mother's speech belongs to the LSG 'Persons', 'Animals', and 'Toys'. The function of the experiencer is also assigned to a concrete inanimate noun (usually a part of a human body) which incorporates a certain physical or mental state perceived by a person. Examples of this kind are noted both in Mother's and

Rūta's speech, e.g., *kas kojytei atsitiko* 'what's the matter with the leg: DIM:DAT?'; *ar nosytei nešalta* 'isn't the nose: DIM:DAT cold?' (Mother); *pīteliams (piršteliams) gerai* 'the fingers: DIM:DAT are all right' 2;3 (Rūta). The dative of inanimate nouns belongs to the LSG 'Other things' and performs the function of the terminative which is related to the role of goal, e.g., *skalbiniams segti* 'to peg the laundry: DAT'; *šito negalima kaspinėlio balionams rišti* 'you mustn't use this ribbon to tie up the balloons: DAT'; *čia pieštukams drožti* 'this is to sharpen pencils: DAT with'; *čia žaisliukam sudėti* 'this is where you put your toys: DIM:DAT in'. Valeckienė (1998: 49) notes that the function of the terminative differs from those of the beneficiary, the percipient, and the experiencer in that the latter are attributed to a person, whereas the terminative is a characteristic role of a concrete inanimate noun.

The use of the locative resembles that of the dative. However, the former case is located in the periphery of the sub-system: the locative appears with animate nouns very rarely. This is due to the fact that the primary function of the locative case is to indicate place, which is a prerogative of inanimate nouns. It can be concluded then that the most marked member in the sub-system of animate nouns is the locative case.

The analysis of frequency distributions of cases yields the following results. The unmarked member in both sub-systems is the nominative case; the most marked member in the sub-system of animate nouns is the locative case, whereas the most marked member in the sub-system of inanimate nouns is the dative case. The frequency of occurrence of other cases exhibits considerable differences as well, and these depend to which of the two sub-systems – animate or inanimate – nouns belong. Our results corroborate the assumption that the meaning of the noun is influential on two parameters, first, the semantics of individual cases and, second, their potential of occurrence.

4.4. The Acquisition of Case in Rūta's Speech

4.4.1. A characteristic feature of Rūta's speech during the early phases of language acquisition (i.e., at 1;7-1;11) was the marking of masculine nouns by the premorpheme *-a* (see Table 4.7), e.g., *baka (bata)* 'shoe', *boka (bokštas)* 'tower', *obuoliuka (obuoliukas)* 'apple: DIM', *banana (bananas)* 'banana', *telelia (senelis)* 'granny', *pauka (paukštis)* 'bird', *piena (pienas)* 'milk', etc. At the same time appear the grammatically correct singular nominative forms with the inflectional endings

-as, -is. The first occurrences are direct imitations, and after a while these forms are already used spontaneously. Therefore Rūta's speech shows variation in inflectional endings: the nominative masculine singular case endings *-as* and *-is* appear side by side with the pre-morpheme *-a* (see Table 4.7), for example: *obuoliukas/obuoliuka* 'apple:DIM', *tenelis/tenelia* (*senelis*) 'granny', *bananas/banana* 'banana', *teniukas/teniuka* (*šuniukas*) 'dog:DIM', *smėlis/smėlia* 'sand', *Adis/Ade* (proper name), *Kastytis/Atyte* (proper name), *Tedis/Tedia* (proper name), etc. Feminine nouns ending in *-ė* in the nominative are also used with the pre-morpheme *-a*, as is exemplified by *palelia* (*piniginė*) 'purse', *bulia* (*bulvė*) 'potato', *apa* (*lapė*) 'fox'. However, such instances are extremely rare whereas masculine nouns with the pre-morpheme are much more common, especially at the early phase (i.e., until age of two, see Table 4.7). During the 1;9-1;10 period (protomorphology) Rūta is expanding her lexicon; simultaneously, the first morphologically correct markers and the pre-morpheme *-a* are used. This fact allows us to assume that the process of the formation of grammatical categories has begun.

Table 4.7: Frequency distribution per month of the pre-morpheme *-a*

Age	<i>-a</i> vs. <i>-as</i>		<i>-a</i> vs. <i>-is</i>		<i>-a</i> vs. <i>-ė</i>	
	1	2	-	-	-	-
1;7	1	2	-	-	-	-
1;8	5	7	-	-	-	-
1;9	26	149	8	51	4	222
1;10	4	280	6	78	4	214
1;11	3	148	-	-	-	-

4.4.2. In this section we will be concerned with the acquisition of individual cases; special attention will be paid to their morphological form. The tendencies of case usage characteristic of Rūta's speech will be compared with those of Mother's (for details see Tables 4.8 and 4.9).

The data presented in Tables 4.8 and 4.9 show that the use of the singular nominative is more frequent in Rūta's speech as compared to that of Mother's (the tendency is just the opposite with respect to other cases). On the average, in Rūta's speech, approximately 50% of noun tokens are used in singular nominative. In the early phase, i.e., at 1;7, this percentage was conspicuously bigger and reached 71%. After a month the situation changed: every month the frequency of noun tokens in singular nominative gradually dropped thus reaching 56% on the average until 2;1. Later the percentage of the frequency is even lower,

approximately 43%. The respective figures in Mother's speech are 42% and 34%. The apparent explanation for this high frequency of occurrence of the nominative case is the linguistic situation itself. Up to the period of 2;0 one-word utterances in Rūta's speech are answers to Mother's question 'What is this?'

Singular genitive and accusative occurs from 1;7 onwards. It is interesting to note that the frequency of the genitive up to 2;0 is relatively stable, 7.5% on the average, and it is only after the period of 2;0 that the percentage rises up to approximately 11%. The use of the genitive from 2;1 onwards remained stable (around 12%) in both Rūta's and Mother's speech.

The frequency of the genitive rises in Rūta's speech at 2;0 (see Table 4.8). This higher frequency is related to the acquisition of other meanings that the genitive case can express. The primary function that the genitive was used to express is possession. This function is primary in other languages as well, e.g., in Greek. In Russian, however, the object function is primary, whereas the meaning of possession is internalised only around the age of two. It is noteworthy that Rūta perceives the meaning of possession very early 1;7. She is able to answer the question *kieno?* 'whose?' correctly on her own, e.g., *kalelio (tėvelio)* 'father's:DIM', *Telės (Rūtelės)* 'Rūta's:DIM'.

Starting with 2;0, the use of the object genitive, especially the genitive of negation, becomes especially intensive. Up to the age of two, Rūta's speech patterns showed a frequent use of word combinations where the expected genitive case ending was substituted with the nominative case form, e.g., *mociutė nėra (močiutės nėra)* 'grandmother:NOM is not here', *nebėja anūnas (nebėra lėktuvo)* 'there is no plane:NOM here' 1;10, *nemoku sudėt kėdutė (nemoku sudėt kėdutės)* 'I cannot fold the chair:DIM:NOM', *nepagavau maza katytė (nepagavau mažos katytės)* 'I couldn't catch the cat:DIM:NOM' (1;11).

Accusative singular forms emerge in Rūta's speech at 1;8; the accusative is used to denote direct objects. During Rūta's period of one-word utterances, these should be treated as full sentences with a verb used elliptically, for instance, *mamytę, močiutę, lelią (myliu)* '(I love)¹⁹ Mother:DIM, grandmother, doll'; *pieną, bitę (duok)* '(give me) some milk, a bee'. Such utterances were common up to 1;10; later one-word utterances of the discussed type become two-word utterances, as in *dok*

¹⁹ Instead of an adult 3-word utterance Rūta produces 2-word utterances by omitting either the verb or case (dative or accusative).

Table 4.8: The distribution of cases in Rūta's speech (%) during the 1;7-2;5 period

Cases	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5	Total
Sg. Nom.	71,1	55,5	63,0	59,6	51,7	52,2	44,0	37,7	42,4	50,7	46,5	50,0
Sg. Acc.	5,8	13,9	15,0	14,7	16,2	12,4	19,7	18,2	17,3	13,1	13,4	15,5
Sg. Gen.	7,7	7,7	5,7	7,8	7,7	11,8	9,7	14,7	12,1	11,4	10,6	10,1
Sg. Dat.		0,6	0,8	2,0	6,1	2,8	5,2	5,2	4,7	4,1	3,0	3,6
Sg. Ins.		0,9	1,6	2,7	1,0	1,1	1,4	1,1	2,5	1,4	2,3	1,7
Sg. Loc.		2,4	1,1	1,5	1,4	2,8	0,8	0,4	1,7	1,2	1,8	1,4
Sg. Voc.	11,6	5,6	3,9	2,4	6,0	5,0	6,5	6,3	4,3	4,3	4,0	4,8
Sg.	96,2	86,6	91,1	90,7	90,1	88,1	87,3	83,6	85,0	86,2	81,6	87,1
Pl. Nom.	3,8	10,4	5,0	4,8	4,2	4,8	4,5	7,7	5,4	5,7	7,7	5,7
Pl. Acc.		0,3	0,8	1,2	1,7	2,4	4,3	5,1	2,9	1,1	3,5	2,5
Pl. Gen.		2,7	2,6	1,8	3,2	3,9	3,0	3,0	5,7	6,5	5,1	3,8
Pl. Dat.			0,1	0,1	0,1			0,1	0,6	0,2	0,2	0,2
Pl. Ins.			0,1	0,8		0,3	0,9	0,5	0,4	0,3	1,1	0,5
Pl. Loc.			0,3	0,6	0,7	0,5					0,8	0,3
Pl.	3,8	13,4	8,9	9,3	9,9	11,9	12,7	16,4	15,0	13,8	18,4	12,9
Sg. + Pl.	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Nouns (no.)	52	339	1028	1174	862	999	1010	1118	1159	1168	942	9851

bitę (duok bitę) 'give me the bee', *Pauliuka aboliuką (Pauliukui obuoliuką)* '{give} Paulius:DIM an apple:DIM', *teniuką tiupa (šuniuką supa)* 'the dog:DIM is being rocked', *atiuką akok (meškiuką užklok)* 'cover the teddy-bear:DIM'. Up to 2;1 the frequency of the accusative is about 14%, whereas later its occurrence reaches 18.5%. In the last two months of the observation period it decreases to 13% and remains on the same level of occurrence until the end. The frequency distributions of accusative singular in Rūta's and Mother's speech are actually very similar, i.e., 15% (see Tables 4.8 and 4.9).

The singular dative appears in Rūta's speech at 1;8-1;9; however, only a few examples were noted during this period. They are mainly one-word answers to the question 'Who to?', e.g., *Paliuka (Pauliukui)* 'to Paulius:DIM', *telelia (seneliui)* 'to grandfather', *mamai* 'to Mother', *sesei* 'to sister', *Ateliai (Rūtelei)* 'to Rūta:DIM'. Such examples demonstrate that Rūta perceives the meaning of the dative object correctly, but she is not able to put the dative object in the grammatically correct form (with exception of feminine nouns). From 1;10 and 1;11 onwards the dative gains more frequency. The increased occurrence of the dative may be attributed to Mother's influence; the dative in her speech makes up 3.8% against Rūta's 0.7%. In addition to the dative object which now

Table 4.9: The distribution of cases in Mother's speech (%) during the 1;7-2;5 period

Cases	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5	Total
Sg. Nom.	42,6	37,5	42,6	42,5	40,9	43,0	32,5	34,5	38,9	39,1	34,6	38,9
Sg. Acc.	7,0	13,4	14,0	16,0	16,2	13,2	17,2	16,9	17,4	15,8	14,9	15,3
Sg. Gen.	11,5	11,3	13,0	13,1	9,5	11,7	14,6	11,1	11,6	11,2	12,0	12,1
Sg. Dat.	2,0	4,1	3,3	3,8	5,8	4,3	4,0	5,3	4,5	3,4	2,5	4,0
Sg. Ins.	1,2	4,3	2,9	3,8	1,5	2,0	1,9	2,2	3,0	2,7	2,3	2,8
Sg. Loc.	1,6	2,3	2,5	2,6	4,4	4,0	2,1	1,5	3,0	2,0	2,5	2,7
Sg. Voc.	14,3	12	6,7	4,4	6,0	5,0	9,3	9,0	5,8	6,0	9,0	7,1
Sg.	80,3	84,9	85,0	86,3	84,3	83,3	81,5	80,6	79,2	80,3	78,7	82,8
Pl. Nom.	8,2	6,8	5,2	6,1	5,2	6,0	5,7	6,2	6,8	6,5	6,1	6,1
Pl. Acc.	3,7	4,0	4,2	2,7	3,5	2,7	5,3	6,0	5,5	4,1	6,0	4,2
Pl. Gen.	7,0	3,7	4,7	3,2	5,5	5,9	5,3	5,3	6,2	7,5	6,5	5,2
Pl. Dat.	0,4	0,2	0,2	0,5	0,3	0,1	0,5	0,2	1,0	0,7	0,5	0,4
Pl. Ins.	0,4	0,4	0,6	1,0	0,8	1,4	1,4	1,6	1,2	0,7	1,4	1,0
Pl. Loc.			0,1	0,2	0,4	0,6	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,7	0,2
Pl.	19,7	15,1	15,0	13,7	15,7	16,7	18,3	19,4	21,0	19,7	21,3	17,2
Sg. + Pl.	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Nouns (no.)	244	902	1924	2078	916	1345	998	1130	1214	1025	1091	12869

occurs in the two-word phrases, such as in *kiskis mamytei* (*kiškis mamytei*) ‘the rabbit to the Mother:DIM’ 1;10, *teniukui kybė* (*šuniukui skrybėlė*) ‘the hat to the dog:DIM’ 1;10, *paduot Pauliukai* (*paduot Pauliukai*) ‘to give it to Paulius:DIM’ 1;11, the dative is also assigned the meaning of logical subject. This use is exemplified by such instances as *mamytei nepakauda* (*mamytei nebeskauda*) ‘Mother:DIM does not feel the pain’, *Atytei nejeikia* (*Rūtytei nereikia*) ‘Rūta:DIM does not need it’. Thus, the singular form of the dative is used consistently from 1;10-1;11 up to the very end. On the average it reaches 4.5%; in Mother's speech it is about 4% throughout the same period. One exception is the period of 2;0 when the occurrence of the dative drops to 2.8%; this divergent pattern could be explained by the communicative situation which did not require the use of the dative at all.

A few examples of the instrumental singular were registered at 1;8; however, these instances are only a repetition of Mother's utterances. The frequency of instrumental rises to 1.6% during the period of 1;9 and to 2.7% during 1;10 (in protomorphology). Later its frequency of occurrence remains the same, 1.7% on the average. In Lithuanian, the instrumental case mainly denotes the instrument or conveys the comitative function. The relevant examples are *auka teliu* (*į lauką troleibusu*) ‘{we

are going} out by trolley-bus:INS' 1;9, *teliu (šaukšteliu)* '(with) a teaspoon:DIM:INS' 1;10, *patepė su stedula (piršteliu)* 'spread {something} with a finger:DIM:INS' 2;1, *su maišu ateis* 'is going to come with a sack:DIM' 2;3, *pažaisim su kamuoliuku* 'we are going to play with a ball:DIM:INS' 2;2. It should be pointed out that the instrumental case occurs twice as frequently in Mother's speech; up to the age of two its appearance was almost three times greater than in Rūta's data.

The locative, as well as the dative and the instrumental, singular case forms appear in Rūta's speech at 1;8, e.g., *Kur tėvelis? – gale (garaže)* 'Where is Daddy? – in the garage'. Its appearance is quite rare throughout the whole period of observation, i.e., it reaches only 1.4%. Examples include such cases as *auke (lauke)* 'outdoors', *kaimė* 'in the country', *tolete (tualete)* 'in the toilet', *kamė (kambaryje)* 'in the room', *alytėj (lovytėj)* 'in bed:DIM', *kibile (kibire)* 'in the bucket'. These examples demonstrate that the locative case in Rūta's speech is mainly used to signal the place. Mother uses the locative and the instrumental more than her daughter, i.e., 2.7%.

The vocative singular is conspicuously frequent in Mother's speech, especially during the first two months (about 14%). The actual instances mainly include different forms of the daughter's name: *Rūtyte, Rūtele, Rūtuže, Rūtute*. During the 1;7 period Rūta uses this case very often too; it makes up 11.6%. The vocative in Rūta's speech appears not only while addressing people (mostly her Mother), but also while addressing things, especially her toys. This is due to the fact that Rūta considers her toys as equal participants in the communicative act. Throughout the whole research period the vocative forms in Rūta's speech make about 5%, whereas the respective frequency for Mother is about 7%.

Plural forms of nouns appear at about the same time as singular forms. The nominative plural form was used spontaneously by Rūta at the age of 1;7. At this point the girl answers the question 'What is this?' using the nominative plural noun, e.g., *batai* 'shoes', *paukai (plaukai)* 'hair' (plural-dominant nouns); after a month the frequency of occurrence rises to 10.4%. From this time up to the end of the research period the frequency of occurrence remains stable, i.e., 5.7% on average. As far as Mother's speech is concerned, the frequency of the nominative plural is about 6% (1;7-2;5).

Another quantitative leap in the use of the nominative plural in Rūta's speech was noted in the period of 2;2. This period is marked by the emergence of a variety of nouns in the nominative plural (7.7%), and all of them are grammatically correct, e.g., *kamuoliukai* 'balls:DIM', *kas-*

tonai (kaštonai) ‘chestnuts’, *pasiukai (paršiukai)* ‘pigs:DIM’, *dijaciai (dviračiai)* ‘bicycles’, *dukės (dulkės)* ‘dust’, *mašinytės* ‘cars:DIM’, *lemputės* ‘lamps:DIM’, etc.

The genitive plural is more frequent than the accusative plural in both Rūta’s and Mother’s speech. The genitive appears in the period of 1;8; its frequency is nearly the same, i.e., about 3%, up to the period of 2;3 (in Mother’s speech it is about 5%), for instance: *bananų* ‘bananas’, *batų* ‘shoes’, *atytių (akyčių)* ‘eyes:DIM’, *teniukų (šuniukų)* ‘dogs:DIM’, *kasinių (kiaušinių)* ‘eggs’, *balų* ‘pools’. From 2;3 onwards the frequency of occurrence increases and reaches 6%. It should be noted that up to the age of two and also later the case forms of the genitive plural are grammatically correct. Such linguistic behaviour must have been influenced by the fact that all classes of the genitive plural are marked by the uniform inflectional ending *-(i)ų*.

The accusative plural is relatively rare up to 2;1. From this period onwards it becomes more frequent in both Rūta’s and Mother’s speech (respectively, 4.5% and 5.5% on the average). Examples of Rūta’s speech are *ežiukus (ežiukus)* ‘hedgehogs:DIM’ 2;1, *pasiukus (paukščiukus)* ‘birds:DIM’ 2;3, *popieriukus* ‘paper:DIM’ 2;3, *siūlus* ‘thread’ 2;3, *vaikus* ‘children’ 2;2, *niokatas (nuotraukas)* ‘photos’ 2;3, *akyles* ‘eyes:DIM’ 2;3, *ankytes (rankytes)* ‘hands:DIM’ 2;1, *papytes (kruopytes)* ‘grain:DIM’ 2;3.

Plural forms of the dative, instrumental and locative cases are very rare both in Rūta’s and Mother’s speech: they do not reach even one percent (see Tables 4.8 and 4.9).

The frequency of occurrence of Rūta’s singular and plural case forms is as follows: 1) nominative (55.7%), 2) accusative (18%), 3) genitive (13.9%), 4) vocative (4.8%), 5) dative (3.8%), 6) instrumental (2.2%), 7) locative (1.7%). The frequency ranking of case forms in Mother’s speech is the same: 1) nominative (45%), 2) accusative (19.5%), 3) genitive (17.3%), 4) vocative (7.1%), 5) dative (4.4%), 6) instrumental (3.8%), and 7) locative (2.9%). However, the frequency of oblique cases in Rūta’s speech is slightly lower than in Mother’s, because in Rūta’s speech the nominative is more frequent. It is also noteworthy that the genitive plural (5.2% in Mother’s speech and 3.8% in Rūta’s speech) is used more frequently than the accusative plural (4.2% and 2.5%, respectively). The accusative singular (15.3% in Mother’s speech and 15.5% in Rūta’s), on the other hand, is more frequent than the genitive singular forms (12.1% in Mother’s and 10.1% in Rūta’s speech).

4.5. Basic Functions of Cases and their Morphological Forms in Rūta's Speech

4.5.1. The nominative. The basic function of the nominative case in both Rūta's and Mother's speech was to mark the grammatical subject. Subject nouns mostly belong to the lexico-semantic groups: 'Persons', 'Animals', and 'Other things', i.e., nouns which underwent personification.

The nominative endings *-as*, *-is* (masculine gender), *-a*, *-ė* (feminine gender) appear together with inflectional endings of other cases, specifically, with those of the accusative and the genitive (we will take up the discussion of these cases as we go along). The singular nominative case inflection of masculine nouns *-as* is used correctly from the very beginning as a result of direct imitations; the premorpheme *-a* occurs from time to time up to the end of 1;10. There are some examples when Rūta pronounces the inflectional ending of the nominative *-is* without the final sound /s/, but these are mainly proper names. Most probably, such forms were used in the vocative, therefore, the girl could have memorised them as the principal forms, e.g., *Adi*, *Doli* (the names of the dogs; Nom. *Adis*, *Doris*), *tėleli*, *tėti* (Nom. *tėvelis*, *tėtis* 'daddy, dad'). Consider:

M: *Koks šuniuko vardas?* 'What is the doggie's name?'

R: *Adi.* 'Adi.'

M: *Ar tu jį taip šauki, kad jis ateitų?* 'Do you call him like this when you want him to come?' (1;8)

The nominative singular of feminine nouns was used with the proper case endings *-a*, *-ė*, and no significant deviations from the norm were noted. The only exception was a few cases when *-a* replaced the grammatically correct case endings (this usage coincided with the appearance of new nouns in Rūta's speech): *bulia* (*bulvė*) 'potato', *palelia* (*piniginė*) 'purse', *eika* (*sraigė*) 'snail', *netyta* (*nosinytė*) 'handkerchief: DIM'. Already at 1;7 Rūta used several feminine nouns ending in *-ė* and *-a* correctly, as in *bitė* 'bee', *Telė* (*Rūtelė*), *lialė* 'baby', *sesė* 'sister', *mama* 'Mother'. After a month singular noun forms become more frequent; moreover, the nominative plural case forms emerge as well: *ganenėlė* – *ganenėlės* (*grandinėlė* – *grandinėlės*), 'chain: DIM – chains: DIM', *kalelė* – *kalalėlės* (*kaladė* – *kaladėlės*), 'brick: DIM – bricks: DIM'.

During the 1;7 period Rūta also uses the masculine nominative plural case ending *-ai* spontaneously, which is seen in *paukai* (*plaukai*) 'hair' and *batai* 'shoes'. However, the singular form of *batas* 'shoe' is *baka*. One month later Rūta used the nominative singular ending *-as* 12 times,

whereas the ending *-a* was used 5 times. Nearly all nominative plural forms (7 instances) have the ending *-a*: *leliuka (lēliukai)* ‘small children’, *gadelia (gaideliai)* ‘cocks:DIM’, *batuka (batukai)* ‘shoes:DIM’, *bata (batai)* ‘shoes’. The word *batai* is used correctly twice. During the 1;9 period only 25 forms with *-a* were noted; meanwhile, the correct case ending *-as* appears more than one hundred times. This is an important switch in transition from pre- to protomorphology. It deserves to be mentioned that the forms with *-a* are actually used interchangeably with *-as*: *pienas (1) – piena* ‘milk’ (1), *obuoliukas (8) – obuoliuka (24)* ‘apple: DIM’. The nominative plural occurs in its grammatically correct form in almost all contexts, e.g., *balionas – balionai* ‘balloon – balloons’, *bananas – bananai* ‘banana – bananas’ *obuoliukas – obuoliukai* ‘apple – apples:DIM’, *suniukas – teniukai (šuniukai)* ‘dog:DIM – dogs:DIM’. In fact, grammatically incorrect forms, such as *batukas – batiuka* ‘shoe: DIM – shoes:DIM’ or *suniukas – teniuka (šuniukas – šuniukai)* ‘dog:DIM – dogs:DIM’ appear very rarely. Based on this evidence it is possible to assume that the 1;10 period marks the final acquisition of the singular and plural nominative case forms in *-as/-ai*: only 15 tokens (out of 700) are marked by the premorpheme *-a*. The masculine nominative nouns with the inflection ending *-as* are consistently marked by the grammatically correct plural form *-ai*. On the other hand, the masculine nominative singular case ending *-is* is not that frequent; therefore, only a few masculine nominative plural forms are found in our data, as in *piteliai (piršteliai)* ‘fingers:DIM’, *teliai (puodeliai)* ‘cups:DIM’.

The feminine nominative plural forms ending in *-os* appear for the first time at 1;10 period; moreover, they appear in a correct form, i.e., *kotos (kortos)* ‘cards’, *palvos (spalvos)* ‘colours’, *natos* ‘musical notes’. The feminine nominative plural case form ending in *-ēs*, on the other hand, appears during the 1;8 period, for example, *ganenēlēs (grandinēlēs)* ‘chains:DIM’, *kaladēlēs (kaladēlēs)* ‘bricks:DIM’.

Masculine nouns ending in *-(i)us* are relatively rare in Mother’s speech; therefore, Rūta’s data show the same tendency. The set of relevant nouns consists of the proper nouns *Paulius* and *Dalius*; later, several other common nouns appeared up, e.g., *karalius* ‘king’, *televizorius* ‘TV set’, *traktorius* ‘tractor’, and *balius* ‘party’. The early acquisition of these endings was slightly complicated. Rūta quite often substituted the grammatically correct case ending *-(i)us* with the endings *-(i)as* or *-is*, as in *Polias, Pulis (Paulius), tezezizas (televizorius)* ‘TV set’. One explanation for this usage may be a more frequent appearance of the case endings *-(i)as* and *-is* in general. In Rūta’s speech the substitution of case

endings within this microclass continued up to the age of two. However, this usage was restricted to the name *Paulius*; moreover, the substitution occurred quite rarely. The girl used the diminutive form *Pauliukas* correctly: she must have heard the form more often. In our data plural forms of this microclass are not noted.

4.5.2. The accusative. It has already been mentioned (cf. 4.2.2) that the actual distinction between different case forms occurs together with the appearance of the nominative/accusative versus the genitive case opposition. The accusative occupies the second place among the most frequent cases in both Mother's and Rūta's speech (see Tables 4.8 and 4.9).

Basically, the accusative in Rūta's speech is used to mark the direct object; however, quite a few instances occur where the accusative denotes either location (rendered by a preposition + Acc) or time (see Tables 4.10 and 4.11).

Table 4.10: The frequency of the meanings expressed by the accusative singular in Mother's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Object	10	88	179	231	84	125	119	153	136	106	132
Place	4	23	83	95	53	43	46	33	61	43	20
Time	2	6	7	4	8	6	3	3	12	10	4

Table 4.11: The frequency of the meanings expressed by the accusative singular in Rūta's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Object	3	33	89	117	92	86	163	168	142	115	92
Place	-	14	67	55	45	25	27	32	48	28	17
Time	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	7	6	5

4.5.2.1. Rūta starts distinguishing the meaning of direct object rather early, at about 1;8; however, the formal expression of this function takes a grammatically incorrect form (the accusative case endings are substituted with the nominative case forms). Consider:

M: *Ką tu nori pamatyti?* 'What would you like to see?'

R: *Maliūnas (malūna)*. 'A mill:NOM'.

M: *Ką mudvi verdam?* 'What are we cooking?'

R: *Kamilas (kiaušini)*. 'An egg:NOM'.

M: *Ką myli?* 'Whom do you love?'

R: *Amūnas (Ramūna)*. 'proper name:NOM'. (1;9)

M: *Ką turi pintinėleje?* ‘What do you have here in the basket?’

R: *Teniukas (šuniuką).* ‘A dog:DIM:NOM’. (1;10)

R: *Dagolė pažįsti (Danguolę pažįstu).* ‘I know Danguolė:NOM’. (1;10)

R: *Alus gajė (alų gėrė).* ‘{They/he} drank beer:NOM’. (1;11)

R: *Kalatas ima, nesa, (chalatą ima, neša).* ‘{She} is taking carrying the bathrobe: NOM’. (2;0)

The above utterances contain nouns marked nominative; however, these nominatives function as direct objects. Despite such incorrect uses, Rūta assigns correct inflectional endings of the accusative to the majority of nouns. Thus masculine singular nouns end in *-ą, -į, -(i)ų*; feminine singular noun inflectional endings are *-ę, -ą*; masculine plural nouns end in *-(i)us*, whereas feminine plural nouns end in *-es, -as*: *bitę* ‘bee’, *aboliuką (obuoliuką)* ‘apple:DIM’, *teleiį (senelį)* ‘grandpa’ (1;8); *mamą mylia* ‘I love mummy’, *teniuką tiupa (šuniuką supa)* ‘(she) is rocking the dog:DIM:ACC’ (1;9); *bitę mylia* ‘I love the bee:ACC’; *bitę tuja (turi)* ‘(she) has a bee:ACC’; *patiuką apank (paukščiuką aprenk)* ‘get the bird:DIM:ACC dressed’, *statyk namą* ‘build a house:ACC’ (1;10); *kojytę koda (kojytę skauda)* ‘the leg:DIM:ACC hurts’ (1;11); *andenuką paleisk (vandenuką)* ‘turn on the water:DIM:ACC’; *batus padėsiu* ‘I shall put the shoes:ACC away’ (2;0); *mazai katytei kepuraitę uždėsiu (mažai katytei kepuraitę uždėsiu)* ‘I shall put the cap:DIM:ACC on the cat:DIM’ (2;2); *popiejukus keпам (popieriukus kerpam)* ‘we are cutting paper: DIM:ACC’; *prašom duoti natas* ‘will you please give me the music notes:ACC’ (2;3); *kakliuką jeikia mesiukui ajisti (kakliuką reikia meškiukui aprišti)* ‘it is necessary to tie the teddy-bear’s:DIM neck:ACC’ (2;5).

The above examples demonstrate that at first Rūta used one-word utterances marked accusative either while responding to questions asked by adults, or repeating Mother’s utterances. Somewhat later, from 1;10 onwards, Rūta uses two-word combinations (noun plus verb); the meaning of the verb in such cases is primarily related to transferring, handing over, or possession of certain items (this meaning is very easy for children to grasp): *duoti* ‘to give’, *nešti* ‘to carry’, *turėti* ‘to have’, *dėti* ‘to put’, etc. From the age of two, Rūta’s sentences become more varied and more complex syntactically. It is at this period that she starts using impersonal sentences; moreover, clauses are made up of three and more elements.

This period also shows some instances of the confusion between the objective genitive and the objective accusative. The accusative was the

first case acquired by Rūta for object marking; this is not surprising due to the fact that the basic and most common meaning of the genitive case in Lithuanian is to denote possession. Therefore, in some constructions which require the obligatory genitive case, the accusative is used. This is especially common with negative verbs (violation of the so-called genitive of negation rule) or in some combinations of nouns with the verbs *reikia* ‘need, must’ and *noriu* ‘want’, e.g., *petelį nekauda (pirštelį neskauda)* ‘the finger:DIM:ACC does not hurt’ (1;11); *katytei nosytę neskauda* ‘the cat’s:DIM nose:DIM:ACC does not hurt’ (2;0); *neatims ziedą Atytės* ‘nobody will take away Rūta’s:DIM ring:ACC’; *nekakyk (nelaikyk) lėlytę* ‘don’t hold the dolly:DIM:ACC’; *nesegausiu (nesugriausiu) gajazą* ‘I am not going to knock down the garage:ACC’ (2;1); *nemesk kamuoliuką* ‘don’t throw the ball:DIM:ACC’ (2;2); *uodegą nejeikia ciupti (nereikia čiulpti)* ‘you mustn’t suck the tail:ACC’; *magą neasiunk (neišjunk)* ‘don’t switch off the recorder:ACC’ (2;4); *negalima vezimą imti* ‘you mustn’t take the cart:ACC’ (2;5); *man liemenę eikia* ‘I need a waistcoat:ACC’; *man eikia aikastį (man reikia laikraštį)* ‘I need a newspaper:ACC’ (2;1); *mesiukai (meškiukui) reikia ziustą (žiurstą)* ‘the teddy-bear:DIM needs an apron:ACC’; *skajytę (skarytę) jam reikia* ‘he needs a headscarf:DIM:ACC’ (2;5); *noju balioną* ‘I want a balloon:ACC’; *noju kasetę* ‘I want the cassette:ACC’ (2;2).

The examples given above suggest that the use of the grammatically correct genitive of negation instead of the objective accusative causes considerable problems for Rūta (Smoczyńska 1985 notes the same problems in the acquisition of cases in Polish). Rūta starts using negative verbal clauses only at about 2;0; it takes about two months for the girl to master the correct usage. The above examples with *reikia* ‘must/need’ and *noriu* ‘want’ demonstrate that it is difficult for Rūta to perceive the syntactic potential of these verbs: problems arise in distinguishing between the classes of verbs which govern either the genitive or the accusative.

The accusative is the basic case used for marking direct object in Lithuanian. This marking does not depend on the semantic content of a noun; as such, the accusative case shows a distinctly transparent semantics (Paulauskienė 1994). It is due to this reason that the beginning of the acquisition of object meaning was very early; moreover, the process did not cause any major difficulties for Rūta.

4.5.2.2. The meanings of location and direction could be expressed by prepositional phrases. The very first prepositions that children start using denote location (cf. Johnston & Slobin 1979, Tomasello & Farrar

1984, Tomasello 1987, Bowerman 1994, 1996, Sinha et al. 1997). Prepositional phrases of direction containing the accusative appear somewhat later, at about 1;8-1;9 (Rūta starts to use prepositions of location correctly at 2;4; before that period she used the premorpheme *-a*). During the period of one-word utterances Rūta mainly repeats her mother's phrases, which, however, are reproduced without prepositions: *auką* (*į lauką*) 'outdoors', *dajelį* (*į darželį*) 'to the kindergarten' (1;8); *auką teliu* (*į lauką troleibusu*) 'outdoors:ACC by trolleybus'; *paduotuvę duonytės* (*į parduotuvę*) 'to the shop:ACC for bread:DIM' (1;9). The missing prepositions are replaced by the premorpheme *a*; at the beginning this was done not consistently, whereas later the element *a* always appears in the utterance. From approximately the period of 1;9 Rūta starts using the premorpheme *a* to denote a preposition: *a banioną* (*į balkoną*) 'into the balcony' (1;9); *a sodą* (*į sodą*) 'into the garden' (1;10); *a Liną* (*pas Liną*) 'at Lina's' (1;11), although instances of directional phrases without any prepositions still remain frequent.

Recall (cf. 4.5.2.1) that at the beginning of the observation period Rūta used to mark the object noun nominative instead of the grammatically correct accusative case. The same tendency is noticed in the acquisition of place marking. Up to 1;11 the nominative is used instead of the prepositional phrase with the accusative to denote the meaning of direction, e.g., *mamytė*, *sesė*, *Linas* instead of *pas mamytę* 'to mummy', *pas sesę* 'to sister', *pas Liną* 'to Linas' (1;9); *elytė* (*į lovytę*) 'to bed:DIM' (1;10). From the beginning of the 1;11 period this meaning is expressed by the premorpheme *a* and the accusative case marking on nouns, e.g., *geja sode a močiutė* (*gera sode pas močiutę*) 'it is pleasant at grandmother:ACC in the garden', *a miestą neseziavo* (*į miestą nevažiavo*) 'they/he didn't go downtown:ACC' (2;0). From 2;1 onwards another combination appears, namely, *pa Agytę* (*pas Agnytę*) 'to Agnė:DIM', *pa Atytę* (*pas Rūtytę*) 'to Rūta:DIM'. The month 2;4 marks the beginning of the correct pronunciation of the preposition *pas*, as in the following: *pas mamytę* 'to mummy', *pas maskiuką* (*pas meškiuką*) 'to the teddy-bear: DIM', *pas močiutę* 'to grandma'. All the way up to 2;6 Rūta uses the premorpheme *a* instead of the preposition *į* 'to', e.g., *a kapyklą* (*į kirpyklą*) 'to the hairdresser's', *a mokyklą* 'to school', *a dangų* 'towards the sky', *a darbą* 'to the work'; it has to be mentioned, however, that already at the end of 2;5 there appear several utterances with *į* 'to': *į sodą* 'to the garden'.

One more point has to be mentioned in this connection. The accusative form *lauką* (*į lauką*) 'outdoors' in the meaning of direction makes

up about half of the tokens used during the 1;9-1;10 period. This holds for both Rūta's and Mother's speech (see Table 4.12 below).

Table 4.12: The frequency of the prepositional construction 'į lauką' in Rūta's and Mother's speech

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Rūta	-	12	29	31	14	6	7	2	7	-	-
Mother	-	8	14	42	5	2	1	-	5	-	4

It seems possible to maintain that the girl had acquired the meaning of direction before she mastered the grammatical form itself. Most probably, there were no difficulties in this respect due to the relatively uncomplicated grammatical form of the construction. It consists of a prepositional phrase and a verb with a very clear meaning of direction: only a few verbs of motion, i.e., *eiti* 'to go on foot' or *važiuoti* 'to go by car/bus/train', etc. are found in the data.

Our data demonstrate that prepositions are acquired at a slower speed and later than case endings. The phenomenon we have discussed above (that is, the omission of a preposition in word combinations where its presence is obligatory) has been noted in a number of other languages as well. The first prepositions that appear in child language may be used not according to the grammatical norms observed by adults. A case in point is when the inherent meanings of a certain preposition are overgeneralised and used in the meaning of other prepositions. This is especially relevant with respect to prepositions denoting place (space). Such an assumption has been put forward by a number of scholars working with different languages, such as English (Johnston & Slobin 1979, Durkin 1981, Tomasello 1987); Hebrew (Dromi 1979); French (Clark 1985); Swedish (Rūķe-Draviņa 1980); Latvian (Rūķe-Draviņa 1980, 1982); Russian (Gvozdev 1949).

It is difficult to decide which meaning is acquired first: the meaning of place or the meaning of direction. Examples taken from Rūta's speech allow us to make a claim that these two meanings are confused (this is especially seen in examples where the noun *lauke* 'outdoors' is used). The frequency of the accusative prepositional phrases denoting direction in Rūta's speech is much higher than the occurrence of the locative case denoting place (cf. 4.5.6. on the locative case). Rūķe-Draviņa (1980), who compared prepositions of place in English, Swedish, Russian, Polish and Latvian, contends that prepositions of direction are acquired earlier than those denoting location inside a certain item. We cannot trace such

a pattern in Rūta's case due to the fact that both meanings appeared at about the same time, i.e., during the period of 1;8. What can be claimed, however, is that utterances expressing direction were more frequent than those with the meaning of place. The formal expression of location and direction was not always grammatically correct; this is especially noticeable up to the age of two. Therefore, our data corroborate Bowerman's (1996) claim to the effect that the process of the early acquisition of the category of spatial semantics is determined by language-specific features.

4.5.2.3. The meaning of *time* appears relatively late: the few examples noted at 1;11 and 2;0 are repetitions of Mother's utterances. From 2;3 onwards the frequency of the accusative case denoting time is very low (5 to 7 tokens per month); examples include *obuoliukai rudenį užaugs* 'apples:DIM will grow up in the autumn:ACC' 2;4; *pavasąjį dvijatį pirkšim* (*pavasarijį dviratį pirkšim*) 'we are going to buy a bike in the spring:ACC' 2;5; *kitą savaitę* (*kitą savaitę*) 'next week:ACC' 2;3, *dieną* 'during the day:ACC' 2;0, 2;3. From the very beginning of the observation period the accusative case in this meaning was used by the Mother, and in the period of 2;3-2;4 the frequency of this case use increased, reaching about 10 utterances per month. This may have had an impact on the emergence of the accusative denoting time in Rūta's speech as well. The frequency of occurrence of the accusative of time is rather low in both Mother's and Rūta's speech.

4.5.3. The genitive. The adverbial and adnominal genitive, as well as the prepositional genitive, perform a variety of functions in Lithuanian. In our material, the genitive was used to denote possession, place, time, manner, it was used in the function of object, etc. (see Tables 4.13 and 4.14 below).

Table 4.13: The frequency of the meanings denoted by the genitive singular in Mother's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Possessive	19	44	108	119	23	58	43	39	47	36	56
Object	7	33	94	84	32	58	63	38	62	46	43
Place	2	23	45	55	20	35	29	41	21	30	30
Time	-	2	1	4	2	-	5	-	2	-	1
Manner	-	-	-	10	9	4	6	7	9	2	1
Cause	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	-

Table 4.14: The frequency of the meanings denoted by the genitive singular in Rūta's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Possessive	4	18	15	43	30	60	31	71	76	45	36
Object	-	7	33	28	21	41	59	71	49	63	52
Place	-	1	11	18	6	15	10	20	3	17	9
Time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-
Manner	-	-	-	2	9	1	-	3	9	6	-
Cause	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

4.5.3.1. As we can see, the frequency of the genitive increased significantly in the beginning of protomorphology (1;9). The basic meaning of the genitive case in both Mother's and Rūta's speech is the meaning of *possession*. Already at 1;7 Rūta used the genitive of possession spontaneously in responding to the question 'Whose?' posed by adults. Based on the data from other languages, i.e., English, German, Russian, and Polish, scholars distinguish 4 phases in the acquisition of the meaning of possession: non-verbal, lexical, syntactic, and morphological phases. The non-verbal mode of expressing possessivity can be noticed at a very early age, for example when a child points to a thing using his/her eyes or fingers.

Materials collected in a number of languages demonstrate that the expression of the possessive meaning in the period of one-word clauses is lexical. This claim is substantiated by data from German (Mills 1985, Hasiba 1997); English (Bloom 1970, Brown 1973, Fletcher 1985), and Russian (Gvozdev 1949, Hasiba 1997, Ceytlin 1997b). A child often points at an object and utters the owner's name, e.g., *daddy* (the boy is pointing at the father's razor) (see Greenfield, Smith 1976: 149). Data from Russian suggest a very early perception and usage of the meaning of possession, as early as 1;6, when this meaning is expressed on a syntactic level (Hasiba 1997, Ceytlin 1997b). Quite soon the formal expression of possessivity makes use of the grammatically correct morphological markers, such as inflectional endings of the genitive case or prepositional phrases, e.g., *Varja butylka* (butylka Vari) 'Varia's bottle' (see Hasiba 1997: 42). Research in German and English revealed the fact that children start expressing the meaning of possession correctly not only by morphological but also by syntactic means much later, at about 2;5 (cf. Tracy 1986, Fletcher 1985).

Rūta expresses possessivity lexically by one-word utterances; however, such utterances are not always grammatically correct as is shown by the following example:

M: *Kieno vilkūtis?* ‘Whose is the whipping top?’

R: *Mama* ‘Mother:NOM:SG’ (1;8).

Even during the early period of case acquisition Rūta often uses morphological markers correctly (for example, microclass II.3), such as *Telēs (Rūtelēs)* ‘Rūta’s:DIM’ or *kalelio (tēvelio)* ‘daddy’s’. We have already discussed the first two basic means of expressing possessivity. The use of the possessive genitive by Rūta does not corroborate the assertion that syntax is acquired earlier than morphology. Even at the beginning of the two-word-phrase period, there are no grammatical errors in the formal rendering of the possessive construction; the same observation applies to the period of one-word utterances (except for a few ungrammatical forms *mama* ‘Mother:NOM:SG’ instead of *amos* ‘Mother:GEN:SG’). It follows that the meaning of possessivity is marked morphologically even during the period of one-word sentences and, therefore, it is safe to claim that Rūta acquired the linguistic expression of possessivity at a very early age. The morphological marker of the possessive genitive, i.e., the inflectional ending, was acquired very early and was used correctly.

Rūķe-Draviņa notes the morphologically correct marking of possessivity in Latvian child language for the first time only at 1;11. However, she has maintained on a number of occasions that children perceive meanings denoted by different cases much earlier, prior to the acquisition of formally correct expressions (see Rūķe-Draviņa 1973).

The most common senses of possession are related to ownership or belonging, as in *vaiko žaislas* ‘the child’s toy’, or referring to parts of the body *mergytēs rankytē* ‘girl’s:DIM hand:DIM’, and expressing kinship *mamytēs dukrytē* ‘mummy’s daughter:DIM’ (cf. Ceytlin 1988). All these possessive senses appear in Mother’s speech as well. Rūta has acquired the meaning of belonging/ownership first. This sense of possessivity was used in combination with personal names, mainly family members and friends. During the period of two-word utterances the genitive was used to refer to parts of the body, e.g., *šuniuko ausytē* ‘the dog’s:DIM ear:DIM; *Rūtytēs rankytē* ‘Rūta’s:DIM’ hand:DIM’, and for expressing the relations of kinship, as in *Rūtytēs mamytē* ‘Rūta’s:DIM mummy’; the latter sense, though, is rare in both Mother’s and Rūta’s speech.

The possessive genitive is very frequent in Mother’s speech up to 1;11. The period of 1;10 shows 119 tokens, but during the next month the genitive of possession occurred only 23 times. The average frequency of occurrence up to the end of observation period is 43 tokens. In Rūta’s speech, on the contrary, the possessive genitive appears more

frequent only from the age of two, occurring about 70 times per month. It can be concluded then that the girl used the possessive genitive spontaneously, not influenced by her Mother's usage.

4.5.3.2. The second most frequent meaning of the genitive case is that of object, and it is first noted in Rūta's speech at 1;8. However, in this meaning the genitive appears as the repetition of Mother's utterances. The frequency of occurrence of this particular meaning increases from 1;9 onwards in Mother's and, consequently, in Rūta's speech. The actual occurrences of the genitive are mainly spontaneous one-word answers to Mother's questions, e.g.,

M: *Ką pirksim?* 'What are we going to buy?'

R: *Duonytės.* 'Bread:DIM:GEN.'

M: *Ko nori?* 'What do you want?'

R: *Pieno.* 'Milk.:GEN'. (1;9)

M: *Ko pasiilgai?* 'Whom do you miss?'

R: *Lino pasiilgau.* 'I miss Linas:GEN'.

M: *Ko nori?* 'What do you want?'

R: *Gybo, duok gybą* (grybo, duok grybą) 'A mushroom:GEN, give a mushroom:ACC. (1;10)

Some examples of repetitions can be found as well, e.g., *atytės de (žuvytės dar)* 'more of the fish:DIM:GEN' (1;9); *noju miego* 'I want a sleep:GEN', *siusiuko* '(I want) a pee:GEN' (1;10). The protomorphological period (from 1;9) is another phase when the genitive of object becomes more frequent. Rūta starts using the verbs *noriu* 'I want' and *reikia* 'I need' which require the genitive case, e.g., *miego nori kikis* (*miego nori kiškis*) 'the rabbit wants sleep:GEN', *noju vėliavos* 'I want the flag:GEN', *noju buteliuko* 'I want the bottle:DIM:GEN', *noju lėlytės* 'I want the dolly:GEN', *noju sedainio* (*saldainio*) 'I want a candy:GEN', *noju siubytės* (*sriubytės*) 'I want the soup:DIM:GEN'; *eikia gatinės* (*reikia grietinės*) 'I need sour cream:GEN', *kepurytės eikia* (*kepurytės reikia*) 'I need the cap:DIM:GEN', *dijacio eikia* (*dvaračio reikia*) 'I need a bicycle:GEN', *kamuoliuko eik* 'I need a ball:DIM:GEN'. In addition to these two verbs, there are others, like *bijau kaimyno* 'I'm afraid of the neighbour:GEN', *paieskok Matyno* (*paieškok Martyno*) 'look for Martynas:GEN', *gejam alaus* (*geriam alaus*) 'let's drink beer:GEN', *bijau kiaulės* 'I'm afraid of the pig:GEN'.

The genitive of negated verbs, too, functions as direct object. The genitive of negation appears only during the period of two-word sentences because the genitive has to be combined with a verb. It deserves to be mentioned again that the use of the genitive of negation presents

certain difficulties for Rūta, i.e., particular problems of usage are caused by the complexity and diversity of the genitive of negation construction. The child has to understand that there are three different types of the genitive of negation constructions. The first type is represented by the verb ‘to be + Nominative’, e.g., *yra mama* ‘there is Mother’, *yra tėtė* ‘there is Daddy’, *yra kamuoliukas* ‘there is a ball:DIM’; however, when the verb *to be* is negated, the noun has to be marked as genitive, as in *nėra mamos* ‘Mother is not’, *nėra tėtės* ‘Daddy is not’, *nėra kamuoliuko* ‘there is no ball:DIM’. The second type takes the form of ‘verb + Accusative’, e.g., *pasiėkiu lempą* ‘I can reach the lamp’, *pažįstu kaimyną* ‘I know the neighbour’, *duok knygutę* ‘give the book:DIM’. The negative variant yields the obligatory elements ‘negative verb + Genitive’, e.g., *nepasiėkiu lempos* ‘I can’t reach the lamp’, *nepažįstu kaimyno* ‘I don’t know the neighbour’, *neduok knygutės* ‘don’t give the book:DIM’. The third type consists of ‘verb + Genitive’, for example, *noriu arbatytės* ‘I want some tea:DIM’, *reikia meškiuko* ‘I need a teddy-bear:DIM’. This type preserves the genitive with the negated verb, i.e., ‘ne-verb + Genitive’, e.g., *nenoriu arbatytės* ‘I don’t want any tea:DIM’, *nereikia meškiuko* ‘I don’t need a teddy bear:DIM’. The construction of the third type is, without doubt, easiest for a child to acquire because there is no need to change case marking. On the other hand, the first and the second types of the construction present problems due to the fact that Rūta has not yet acquired the syntactic rule to the effect that the negated verb always governs the genitive case. It is therefore because of this reason that Rūta, while using negated variants of verbs, retains the cases appearing in the positive constructions, namely, the nominative and the accusative.

Mother uses constructions with the genitive of negation quite often; they become even more frequent in the period of 2;1, when in her speech there appear negative commands, such as *nelipk* ‘don’t climb’, *neimk* ‘don’t take’, *nedaryk* ‘don’t do’, *negalima* ‘you must not’, etc.

The first constructions with the genitive of negation appear in Rūta’s speech at 1;10, even though they are very scarce. However, already after a month their number increases. At the beginning Rūta uses the Type 1 construction, i.e., ‘not to be + Genitive’; however, the genitive is substituted with the nominative case, e.g., *Amūnas nebėja* (*Ramūno nebėra*) ‘Ramūnas isn’t here’, *Pauliukas nėra* (*Pauliuko nėra*) ‘Paulius:DIM is not’, *mociutė nėra* (*močiutės nėra*) ‘granny is not’, *nėja dėžutė* (*nėra dėžutės*) ‘there is no box:DIM’ (1;11). After another month, during the period of 2;0-2;5, the number of the genitive of negation increases con-

siderably, especially the correct uses of the construction, for instance, *neliesk andenuko (vandenuko)* ‘don’t touch the water:DIM:GEN’, *mesiuo netuju (meškiuko neturiu)* ‘I haven’t got a teddy-bear:DIM:GEN’, *neduosiu kamuoliuko* ‘I am not going to give the ball:DIM:GEN’, *nematau ausytės* ‘I can’t see the ear:DIM:GEN’, *kojyčių neskauda* ‘the legs: DIM:PL:GEN don’t hurt’ (2;0); *peilių negalima akam (vaikam)* ‘children mustn’t take knives:PL:GEN’ (2;3); *neimsiu mašinos* ‘I shall not take the car:GEN’, *nebeliko vietos* ‘there is no room:GEN’, *nerandu kiaulės* ‘I can’t find the pig:GEN’ (2;4).

However, incorrect utterances appear as well, for example, *ausyte nekauoda (ausytės neskauda)* ‘the ear:DIM:ACC does not hurt’, *nepagavau maza katytė (nepagavau mažos katytės)* ‘I haven’t caught the cat: DIM:NOM’, *nemoku sudėt kėdutė (nemoku sudėt kėdutes)* ‘I can’t fold the chair:DIM:NOM’, *sunenioti suniuką nemoku (suvynioti šuniuko nemoku)* ‘I can’t wrap up the dog:DIM:ACC’, *nėja Ajatė (nėra Jūratės)* ‘Jūratė:NOM is not here’ (2;0); *Ūytei negalima sukos (Rūytei negalima šuku)* ‘Rūta:DIM mustn’t take the comb:NOM’ (2;1); *nejeikia kojine (nereikia kojinės)* ‘I don’t need the sock:ACC’, *netujim kamuoliuką (neturim kamuoliuko)* ‘we haven’t got a ball:DIM:ACC’ (2;2); *cia nėra tėlelis (čia nėra tėvelio)* ‘daddy:NOM is not here’ (2;3); *Legus nėra (Legaus nėra)* ‘there is no Lego:NOM’ (2;4). Type 3 utterances (with the genitive in both positive and negative variants) are quite numerous, e.g., *nejeikia suniuko (nereikia šuniuko)* ‘I don’t need the dog:DIM:GEN’, *neisim miegučio* ‘we aren’t going sleep:DIM:GEN’, *nebijau gyvatės* ‘I’m not afraid of the snake:GEN’, *nejeikia kojinės* ‘I don’t need the sock: GEN’. From 2;2 onwards the number of incorrect utterances decreases and till the end of the research period there happen to occur just one or two wrong structures. To sum up, the construction, which seemed difficult for Rūta at the beginning is acquired within the period of two or three months. Rūta mastered the rule of genitive case marking on nouns with negated verbs at about 2;3.

4.5.3.3. The meaning of place (direction) is most often conveyed by structures containing the prepositional genitive phrase and a verb of motion. The most common is the preposition *ant* ‘on’; some examples contain *iš* ‘from’ and *prie* ‘at/by’.

At 1;9 Rūta starts using the genitive to denote *direction*. As is the case with the prepositional accusative constructions used to denote direction, this structure often appears without prepositions or with the premorpheme *a*. The first utterances expressing location are mainly repetitions of Mother’s words, e.g.,

M: *Apyranke ant rankos reikia dėti?* ‘Shall I put the bracelet on the wrist:GEN?’

R: *Akos (rankos)*. ‘On the wrist:GEN’.

M: *Ant kėdės Rūta jau?* ‘Is Rūta on the chair:GEN already?’

R: *Kėdės*. ‘On the chair:GEN’.

M: *Kalėdų seneliui ant kelių*. ‘On Father Christmas’ lap:GEN’.

R: *Kenių*. ‘On the lap:GEN’. (1;9)

It has to be stressed, however, that already during this period Rūta is able to use the genitive of place spontaneously:

M: *Ant ko Rūta sėdi?* ‘What is Rūta sitting on?’

R: *A liopos (ant sofos)*. ‘On the sofa:GEN’. (1;10)

At the age of two Rūta starts using the prepositional genitive of place more frequently, only she replaces a preposition by the premorpheme *a*. This happens on the average 15 times per month, e.g., *an pūku (ant pūku)* ‘on the down’ (2;0); *as šokinėju a lovos (aš šokinėju ant lovos)* ‘I’m jumping on the bed’ (2;0); *a ankos (iš rankos)* ‘from the hand’ (2;2); *a arkliuko (ant arkliuko)* ‘on the horse:DIM’, *a lovos (ant lovos)* ‘on the bed’, *an zemės (ant žemės)* ‘on the ground’, *a pagalvės (ant pagalvės)* ‘on the pillow’; *pie kengajuko miega suniukas (prie kengūriuko miega šuniukas)* ‘the dog:DIM is sleeping by the kangaroo:DIM:GEN’ (2;4). However, the genitive does not always have the morphological marker, as can be seen from the following examples: *as sokinėju a sofa (aš šokinėju ant sofos)* ‘I am jumping on the sofa:GEN’ (2;0); *a sitie puodukai noju gerti (iš šitų puodukų noriu gerti)* ‘I want to drink from these cups:PL:GEN’ (2;2). It is easy to note that the genitive case endings are substituted with the nominative inflectional endings.

4.5.3.4. The genitive of *manner* is not very common in Rūta’s speech. All genitives denoting this meaning occur up to 2;3 as repetitions of Mother’s utterances, e.g., *vesti kulia (verstis kūlio)* ‘to do somersaults’, *a pijo (ant pilvo) gulėti* ‘to lie on the belly’. It is important to note at this point that from this particular period onwards the girl uses genitive prepositional phrases spontaneously when she wants to describe the manner of action. Such examples are *a jankenos (už rankenos) mane vesim (vešim)* ‘we are going to take me by the handle:GEN’; *mamyte, asigulk pa Ūtytę cia a nugajytės (atsigulk pas Rūtytę čia ant nugarytės)* ‘mummy, lie down here by Rūta:DIM on the back:DIM:GEN’; *supasi a kakuko (supasi ant arkliuko)* ‘he is rocking on the horse:DIM:GEN’; *gaziai a seniuko (gražiai ant šoniuko) miegok* ‘sleep nicely on your side:DIM:GEN’ (2;3); *maziukas noji a pilvo (mažiukas nori ant pilvo) miegoti* ‘the little one wants to sleep on the belly:GEN’; *nu statom as Lego (iš Lego) maliūną* ‘well, let’s build a mill from the Lego:GEN’ (2;4).

4.5.3.5. The genitive of *time* and *cause* appears several times in Mother's speech, as in *iš ryto* 'in the morning', *iki rytojaus* 'see you tomorrow', *iki vasaros* 'till summer', *už minutės* 'in a minute', *po mėnesio* 'in a month' (the latter has occurred in Rūta's speech as well); *iš džiaugsmo* 'with joy', *nuo vėjo* 'from the wind'. As has been pointed out before, the genitive of manner occurs very rarely, and the genitives of time and cause occur still less frequently. In communicating with a small child (up to three years of age), adults speak mainly about an action which is taking place *here* and *now* (cf. Bloom 1970, McNeil 1970, Berko Gleason 1993), and it only stands to reason that instead of nouns such adverbs as *now* or *soon* are used.

4.5.3.6. It was not difficult for Rūta to acquire the inflectional endings of the genitive case. During the 1;8-1;9 period (transition from pre- to protomorphology) just few forms with the premorpheme *-a* were used, e.g., *kaka* (*ant kaklo*) 'on the neck'; *mediuka*, *medutia* (*medučio*) 'honey: DIM'; *obuoliuka* (*obuoliuko*) 'an apple: DIM'; *kaninia* (*kiaušinio*) 'an egg'. At 1;7-1;8 the inflectional endings *-ės*, *-os* of feminine nouns emerged, and the masculine noun genitive ending *-(i)o* soon appeared. A bit later, at about 2;0, the genitive case ending *-(i)aus* emerged as well. The plural inflectional ending *-(i)ų* is the same for all classes; therefore, the acquisition of this case ending was not problematic at all, and already at 1;8 the following forms were used correctly, e.g., *obuoliukų* 'apples: GEN:PL', *tiulčių* (*sulčių*) 'juice: GEN:PL'. Illustrative examples of the accusative and the genitive cases appearing in prepositional phrases (denoting diverse adverbial meanings) demonstrated that frequently prepositions are omitted or the premorpheme *a* is used instead of them. The grammatical case in such constructions exhibits a correct morphological form (at least from the age of two onwards), but the form of prepositions is still not correct.

4.5.4. In Rūta's and Mother's speech the dative is used in the meanings of an indirect object and a logical subject. In all its uses the dative retains the general meaning of benefit/purpose.

Table 4.15: The frequency of meanings denoted by the dative singular in Mother's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Object	3	30	44	52	34	27	20	37	37	21	18
Subject	1	7	18	26	19	31	19	23	17	14	8

Table 4.16: The frequency of meanings denoted by the dative singular in Rūta's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Object	-	2	6	24	46	18	33	34	31	29	10
Subject	-	-	1	-	7	10	20	25	23	19	18

The dative in Rūta's speech appears later than the genitive or the accusative case. The range of meanings that the dative was used to express was not very varied. At the beginning a more frequent use was the dative of indirect object, and then from 1;11 onwards it was used to denote the logical subject (see Table 4.16). Already at 1;8 the girl repeats two utterances containing the dative object, which had been used by Mother, for example, *Pauliuka obuoliuką* (*Pauliukui obuoliuką*) 'an apple:DIM:ACC to Paulius:DIM:DAT'. At the age of 1;9, i.e., at the beginning of protomorphology, Rūta gives correct answers to the question 'To whom?' spontaneously. These facts allow us to suggest that the girl perceives the meaning of the dative correctly, e.g.,

M: *Kam sakai labas?* 'Who are you saying hello to?'

R: *Telelia (seneliui)*. 'To grandpa:DAT'.

M: *Kam duosi?* 'Who are you going to give it to?'

R: *Sesei, lialei, mamai*. 'To sister:DAT, to the small girl:DAT, to Mother:DAT'.

M: *Kam reikia šuku?* 'Who needs the comb?'

R: *Atelei (Rūtelei)*. 'Rūta:DIM:DAT'. (1;9)

At 1;10 the girl starts using spontaneously two-word noun phrases with the dative, e.g., *kiškis mamytei* 'the rabbit to mummy:DAT', *teniukui kybė (šuniukui skrybėlė)* 'the hat to the dog:DIM:DAT'. Table 4.16 demonstrates that from 1;11 onwards, in addition to a frequent occurrence of the dative object, there appears another meaning, that of *logical subject*, starts to be used consistently.

Mother used the dative with both meanings up to 1;11 quite frequently, which gave approximately 50 utterances per month. The frequent use of the dative by Mother influenced the corresponding frequency of the dative (from the period of 1;11 onwards) in Rūta's speech as well.

4.5.4.1. In Rūta's speech the dative is often used in the function of an indirect object, which is accompanied by a direct accusative object, e.g., *mamytei daviau buteliuką* 'I gave a bottle:DIM:ACC to mummy:DAT' (1;11), *Aytei skauda gerklytę* 'Rūta:DIM:DAT has got a sore throat:DIM:ACC' (2;1). There are very few examples where the dative performs the function of direct object. Only one verb *skambinti* (*telefonu*)

‘to phone’ was noted: *paskambink Ajatei* (*paskambink Jūratei*) ‘phone Jūratė:DAT’, *močiutei* ‘phone granny:DAT’ (2;2).

At the beginning the dative object was mainly used in combination with the verb *duoti* ‘to give’, e.g., *lėlytei daviau vieną* ‘I gave the dolly: DAT one:ACC’; *Egutei duodu* (*Eglutei duodu*) ‘I’m giving {it} to Eglė: DIM:DAT’; *neduosiu Pauliukui* ‘I won’t give {it} to Paulius:DIM:DAT’. Later there appear verbs of more varied semantics, e.g., *Etytei sekale lygina* (*Rūtytei suknelę lygina*) ‘she is ironing the dress for Rūta:DIM: DAT’, *pasakysiu tetei* ‘I will tell daddy:DAT’ (2;0); *nesiu pipinui* (*nešiu pingvinui*) ‘I will take {it} to the penguin:DAT’, *katytei padėdosiu* (*pamatuosiu*) ‘I am going to try {it} on the cat:DIM:DAT’, *mesk kamuoliuką Ūtytei* ‘throw the ball:DIM:ACC to Rūta:DIM:DAT’ (2;1); *mazai katytei kepuratę adėsiu* (*mažai katytei kepuraitę uždėsiu*) ‘I’m going to put the cap:DIM:ACC on the cat:DIM:DAT {head}’, *bezonei pagostyk ankytēm* (*beždžionei paglostyk rankytēm*) ‘stroke the monkey with the hands:DIM:DAT’ (2;2); *padėk Egutei tą seseniuką* (*padėk Eglutei tą seiliniuką*) ‘put that bib for Eglė:DIM:DAT’, *kandzio Ajatei uodas* (*įkando Jūratei uodas*) ‘a gnat has bitten Jūratė:DAT’, *Ūtytė geja, anes Ievutei sokoladą* (*Rūtytė gera, atneš Ievutei šokoladą*) ‘Rūta:DIM is good, she is going to give a chocolate to Ieva:DIM:DAT’ (2;3).

In some instances the dative and the direct object exhibit the relationship of belonging/possessivity. In terms of semantics, this aspect of the possessive meaning puts the dative closer to the genitive case. The only difference in meaning is the idea of *benefit* or *disadvantage* expressed by the dative, e.g., *gajazą masinai nesugausiu* (*garažą mašinai nesugriausiu* ≈ *mašinos garažo nesugriausiu*) ‘I will not knock down the garage:ACC of the car:DAT’ (2;1); *statom kalialiai jūmus* (*statom karaliui rūmus* ≈ *statom karaliaus rūmus*) ‘we are building the king’s:DAT palace:ACC’ (2;2); *balionai Pauliukui sepogo* (*susprogo*) ≈ *Pauliuko balionai susprogo* ‘Paulius:DIM:DAT balloons have burst’ (2;4).

4.5.4.2. One more important function of the dative has to be discussed. With certain verbs, the dative is used in *impersonal constructions*, i.e., constructions without a grammatical nominative subject. In such constructions the dative performs the role of a logical subject. In Rūta’s speech the dative in this latter meaning appeared later than the dative of object, at about 1;11-2;0 (one example at 1;9) (cf. 4.5.4.1). Despite its late appearance, the dative in the function of a logical subject became very frequent, especially with impersonal verbs, e.g., *lėlytei skauda* ‘the dolly:DAT aches’, *Atytei nejeikia* (*Rūtytei nereikia*) ‘Rūta:DIM:DAT does not need it’ (1;11); *mamytei atenka* (*užtenka*) ‘it is enough for

mummy:DAT' (2;0); *taip galima mamytei* 'mummy:DAT may do this' (2;1).

The dative as a logical subject is further used with many neuter adjectives, for instance, *nekieta gulèt Atytei* 'the bed is not hard for Rūta:DIM:DAT to lie' (2;0); *Ūtytei salta (Rūtytei šalta)* 'Rūta:DIM:DAT is cold' (2;1); *nesalta kengajukai (nešalta kengūriukai)* 'the kangaroo:DIM:DAT is not cold' (2;2); *tetei abai (labai) sunku* 'it is very hard for daddy:DAT' (2;3).

However, the data demonstrate that in Rūta's speech the dative as a logical subject is more frequent with impersonal verbs, especially with *reikia* 'have to/need' and *skauda* 'hurt/ache', whereas constructions with neuter adjectives are not so common.

4.5.4.3. Formal acquisition of the dative singular of masculine nouns turned out to be quite a complicated process. For a long time, up to the age of 2;6, i.e., in the protomorphological phase (with a few examples at the beginning of the modularised morphology), Rūta used to substitute the correct inflectional ending of masculine nouns with *-(i)ai*, i.e., the inflectional ending of feminine nouns, e.g., *Pauliukai (Pauliukai)* 'to Paulius:DIM', *Adomai (Adomui)* 'to Adomas', *mesiukai (meškiukai)* 'to the teddy-bear:DIM', *kengūriukai (kengūriukai)* 'to the kangaroo:DIM'. Only at the age of 2;6 Rūta used all the datives with the correct masculine ending *-ui*.

The situation was different while acquiring the dative of feminine nouns. The correct forms with *-ai* (e.g., *mamai* 'to Mother', *Ūtai* 'to Rūta', *mašinai* 'for the car') and *-ei* (for example, *Ūtytei* 'to Rūta:DIM', *sesei* 'to sister', *bitei* 'to the bee', *mamytei* 'to mummy') were used all the time (1;7-2;5).

Thus Rūta starts with the more transparent dative forms *-ai* (vs. Nom *-a*), *-ei* (vs. Nom *-ė*) and only later acquires the opaque dative form *-ui* (vs. Nom *-as, -is*).

Plural forms of the dative were rare in both Mother's and Rūta's speech. All instances of dative nouns (except for one, *nuotraukom* 'to the photos') are masculine, e.g., *piteliam (piršteliām)* 'to the fingers:DIM:DAT', *paukščiukam* 'to the birds:DIM:DAT', *vaikam* 'to children:DAT', *pieštukam* 'to pencils:DAT', *žaisliukam* 'to the toys:DIM:DAT'. There is a phonological omission of the final *-s* in the dative plural in Rūta's speech always. Mother uses plural datives without final *-s* also very often (12 tokens from 53).

4.5.5. The instrumental. The semantics of this case is quite complicated. It can be governed by nominals and verbs and used with or with-

out prepositions. The range of meanings characteristic of the instrumental is very wide: it can denote an *instrument*, a mutual action (a *comitative* function), *state*, *manner*, *time*, *place*, etc. We find the instrumental case in all these meanings in Mother's speech (some of them are used only once); Rūta, on the other hand, does not use the instrumental to denote state and time (see Tables 4.17 and 4.18).

Table 4.17: The frequency of meanings denoted by the instrumental singular in Mother's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Instrument	2	14	18	26	1	12	6	11	13	14	18
Comitative	1	19	23	40	13	10	10	9	14	10	14
Feature	-	3	2	8	-	1	-	5	2	3	3
Place	-	-	10	-	-	3	3	-	2	1	-
Object	-	-	2	5	-	1	-	-	4	-	1
State	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Time	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 4.18: The frequency of meanings denoted by the instrumental singular in Rūta's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Instrument	-	-	5	8	3	4	7	6	7	5	3
Comitative	-	2	9	17	5	7	4	5	17	7	7
Feature	-	1	1	4	1	-	-	-	4	3	12
Place	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	1	-	1	-
Object	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

The frequency of the instrumental case in Rūta's speech is even lower than that of the dative. The most frequent meanings are the instrument and the comitative. Mother's percentage of the use of the instrumental is higher, especially up to 1;11.

4.5.5.1. The most frequent function of the instrumental in Rūta's speech is the *comitative* role (with the omission of prepositions). This meaning refers to persons, and to a lesser degree, to things. At the beginning, such uses were one-word repetitions of Mother's utterances, e.g., *tete (su tete)* 'with daddy:INST', *Popo (su Popo)* 'with Popo:INST' (1;8). From the period of 1;9-1;10 onwards the frequency of spontaneous use of the instrumental rises, e.g.,

- R: *Kamuoliuku*. ‘{With} a ball’. (1;9.19)
 R: *A (su) mamyte*. ‘With Mother’. (1;9.27)
 M: *Su kuo šiandien buvai lauke?* ‘With whom were you outdoors today?’
 R: *Su Aste*. ‘With Asta:INST’. (1;10)
 R: *Su tete*. ‘With daddy:INST’. (1;11)

The above examples demonstrate that the girl understands the question of the instrumental *kuo/su kuo?* ‘who with?’ perfectly well. This period is also noted for the emergence of the preposition *su* ‘with’ or the premorpheme *a* in its stead. These items are often used interchangeably, e.g., *a sese/su sese* ‘with sister:INST’ (1;10); *a Pauliuku* ‘with Paulius: DIM:INST’; *su seliu (seneliu)* ‘with grandpa:INST’ (2;0). Also at 2;0 the instrumental prepositional phrase with a reciprocal predicate (comitative function) is already used with the correct preposition *su* ‘with’, e.g., *su močiute guli* ‘he is lying with granny:INST’ (2;0); *su seliu (seneliu) vėliavas žaidėm* ‘we played flags with grandpa:INST’, *su močiute buvau* ‘I stayed with granny:INST’ (2;1); *kamuoliukas guli su kegūriuku* ‘the ball:DIM is lying with the kangaroo:DIM:INST’ (2;2); *su Edita, su Ajate dajėm (su Jūrate darėm)* ‘we made {it} with Edita:INST, Jūrate:INST’, *noji su kepūjyte (kepūryte) gulėti* ‘he wants to lie with the cap:DIM:INST on’ (2;3); *kiskis miega su meskiuku* ‘the rabbit is sleeping with the teddy-bear:DIM:INST’, *namuose pabūti su kačiuku* ‘{I’d like} to stay at home with the cat:DIM:INST’ (2;5).

4.5.5.2. The instrumental in the function of an *instrument* appears in Rūta’s speech later by one month as compared to the appearance of the instrumental in the comitative function; moreover, the former use is represented by the repetitions of certain items which have been used by Mother. From the age of two onwards utterances with the meaning of an instrument become more spontaneous and more complex in terms of structure, e.g., *galvytę pausim tepūnu, adeniuku (galvytę plausim šampūnu, vandenuku)* ‘we are going to wash the head:DIM:ACC with the shampoo:INST, water:DIM:INST’ (2;0); *patepė Ūtytei su stedeliu (patepė Rūtytei su piršteliu)* ‘she anointed Rūta:DIM:DAT with the finger:DIM:INST’ (2;1); *su teliu prisuti aštytę aisto (su rakteliu prisukti vištytę vaikšto)* ‘she is walking around with the key:DIM:INST to wind up the hen:DIM:ACC’ (2;2); *atnes dovanų a maisu (atneš dovanų su maišu)* ‘he is going to bring presents:GEN in a sack:INST’, *su vezimu aziuosim (su vežimu važiuosim)* ‘we are going in a pram:INST’ (2;3); *vaziuosim su toleibusu* ‘we will be going by trolleybus:INST’ (2;4); *geriau su pistine (pirštine) valyti* ‘it is better to clean with a glove:INST’ (2;5).

4.5.5.3. The third most frequent meaning of the instrumental is that of denoting a certain feature, or its *descriptive* function; in this function the instrumental is governed by nouns. Up to 2;3 such constructions were not used spontaneously, and the four instances which appear during the period of 1;10 are only repetitions of the same example, i.e., *gazi su gėlyte (graži {maikutė} su gėlyte)* ‘{the undershirt} with the flower:DIM:INST is beautiful’. From 2;3 onwards Rūta already uses the descriptive instrumental spontaneously, e.g., *mergytė su kasyte* ‘a girl:DIM with a plait:DIM:INST’, *su sekale gazi su zeniukais (su suknele, graži su žirniukais)* ‘in a dress:INST, it is beautiful and spotted:INST’, *jeikia Ūtytei kanytes sitos su balionu (reikia Rūtytei kojinytės šitos su balionu)* ‘Rūta:DIM:DAT needs this:GEN sock:DIM:GEN with a balloon:INST on it’ (2;3); *su papūga va sitą (su papūga va šitą)* ‘I’d like this:ACC with a parrot:INST’ (2;4); *su papūga suknelė* ‘a dress with a parrot:INST’, *knygutė su meškiuku* ‘a book with a bear:DIM:INST’ (2;5).

4.5.5.4. The instrumental of *place* occurs just a few times, e.g., *steliu (po stalu)* ‘under the table:INST’, and it is the repetition of Mother’s utterance with the omitted preposition (1;9). On the other hand, *po langu* ‘under the window:INST’ is spontaneous utterance (2;2).

4.5.5.5. The instrumental of *state, time, and object* is not found in Rūta’s speech. There is just one instance of the instrumental object which occurs as the repetition of Mother’s words during the period of 1;10:

M: *Kuo vaišinsim, arbatyte, agurku, sriubyte?* ‘What are we going to treat with tea: DIM:INST, cucumber:DIM:INST, soup:DIM:INST?’

R: *Abatyte, agulku, siubyte.* ‘With tea:DIM:INST, cucumber:DIM:INST, soup: DIM:INST.’

4.5.5.6. The formal acquisition of instrumental inflectional endings (singular and plural) for Rūta was not complicated. From the very beginning masculine singular nouns were marked correctly by the case endings *-(i)u*. There are, however, few instances where the premorpheme *-a* was used instead of correct *-u*, e.g., *Lina (Linu)* ‘{with} Linas’ (1;9), *Pauliuka (Pauliuku)* ‘{with} Pauliukas’ (1;9), *su adonu (raudonu) palta (paltu)* ‘with the red coat’ (agreement error) (2;4), and the feminine ending *-a* was substituted with the masculine ending *-u*, e.g., *matiniu (mašina)* ‘{with}the car’ (1;11). Feminine nouns are marked by the case endings *-a* and *-e*. Masculine plural nouns are exemplified by nouns ending in *-(i)ais*, whereas feminine nouns most often have the case ending *-ėm*. The ending *-om* was noted just once (*kasom* ‘with plaits:INST’).

4.5.6. The locative. The meaning of the locative is not influenced by the meaning of the word it forms a phrase with. The most prominent

adverbial functions of the locative are those of *place* and, to a lesser degree, of *time*.

The meaning of *place* can be denoted by using grammatical cases or prepositional phrases. The basic meaning denoted by the locative is that of *place*, i.e., the state of being located inside the place denoted by the noun. A child is faced with two types of spatial relations: being located inside (expressed by the locative) and direction (expressed by prepositional phrases). The question arises whether prepositionless structures are easier to acquire, since prepositions are unstressed function words, usually acquired later by children.

As mentioned earlier, the locative in Lithuanian denotes place and time. The frequency of these meanings in Mother's and Rūta's speech are presented in Tables 4.19 and 4.20.

Table 4.19: The frequency of meanings denoted by the locative singular in Mother's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Place	4	20	44	51	40	51	21	16	34	19	27
Time	-	1	4	2	-	4	-	1	2	2	-

Table 4.20: The frequency of meanings denoted by the locative singular in Rūta's speech (1;7-2;5)

	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5
Place	-	8	11	17	12	28	9	4	18	11	17
Time	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	3	-

4.5.6.1. The locative of *place* was used spontaneously by Rūta only at 1;9, i.e., with the beginning of the protomorphological period. A month before this time Rūta was able only to reproduce her Mother's utterances, whereas at 1;9 she is able to answer the question 'Where?' spontaneously, e.g.,

M: *Ar žinai, kur močiutė?* 'Do you happen to know where granny is?'

R: *Kaime.* 'In the village:LOC.'

M: *Kur yra supynės?* 'Where is the swing?'

R: *Auką auke (lauke).* 'Outdoors:ACC, outdoors:LOC'.

M: *Kur tu buvai ką tik?* 'Where were you just a minute ago?'

R: *Auką (lauke).* 'Outdoors:ACC'.

In addition, Rūta used the locative spontaneously even when the question did not require this case in the answer:

M: *O Paulius turi arkliuką, kuris supa?* 'Has Paulius got a rocking horse?'

R: *Tupa dalely (supa daržely).* 'It rocks in the kindergarten:LOC'. (1;9)

From the emergence of the locative in Rūta's speech at 1;9 almost up to the age of two the girl tends to confuse the word *laukas* 'outdoors' with the two meanings it can possess, first, 'location of an action', and second, 'direction of an action', e.g., *lauke/i lauką* '{be} outdoors/{go} outdoors'. Rūta acquired the meaning of direction expressed by the accusative prepositional phrase *i lauką* 'to go out' first. Therefore, with the appearance of the locative form *lauke* '{be} outdoors', rules of the morphological case marking for assigning a particular meaning are confused. From 1;11 onwards Rūta has acquired the correct marking for denoting location and stops using the accusative prepositional phrase in the sense of 'being located inside'.

No idiosyncratic instances of the locative were noted in Rūta's speech, and from 1;9 onwards Rūta uses the correct form of a locative noun spontaneously, especially in one-word answers that she gives to the question 'Where?', as in: *darbe* (*darbe tėtis*) 'daddy is at work:LOC', *alytėj* (*lovytėj*) *meškiukas miega* 'the teddy-bear:DIM is sleeping in the bed:DIM:LOC', *kambajy* (*kambary jis yra*) 'he is in the room:LOC' (1;10). The above examples demonstrate that the first forms of the locative case used spontaneously are words denoting a concrete location. From 1;11 on Rūta starts using the locative in multi-word utterances, for instance, *čia kambajy miega* 'he is sleeping in the room:LOC here' (1;11); *čia kazkas yja nosytėj* (*čia kažkas yra nosytėj*) 'there is something in the nose:DIM:LOC', *maza katytė balkone yja* (*maža katytė balkone yra*) 'there is a small cat:DIM in the balcony:LOC', *kanda sisia* (*širšė*) *balkone* 'a wasp bites in the balcony:LOC' (2;1); *noju vezimuke miegoti* (*noriu vežimuke miegoti*) 'I'd like to sleep in the pram:DIM:LOC' (2;2); *ten baseine gejam* (*geriam*) *alaus* 'we drink beer in the swimming pool:LOC', *akal* (*vakar*) *buvo kavinėj* 'he was in the café:LOC yesterday' (2;4); *cia lauke megaitės būna kaitais* (*čia lauke mergaitės būna kartais*) 'you can see girls outdoors:LOC sometimes', *ne namuose, o sode* 'not at home:LOC but in the garden:LOC' (2;5).

Data from Latvian support this finding of an early and correct usage of the locative case when the noun denotes a concrete location (cf. Rūķe-Draviņa 1980). The locative case is noted as being one of the most common cases in Latvian child language. It is interesting to stress that Rūta's and Mother's data exhibit the reverse tendency. This might be caused by specific features of the respective languages, since the frequency of the locative in adult Latvian speech is much higher than in Lithuanian.

The earliest items used to denote the location of an action in child language are the adverbs *here* and *there* (cf. Bloom 1970, Antinucci &

Parisi 1975, Berko Gleason 1993). With the emergence of locative noun forms, these adverbs are still being used alongside with nouns for a certain period of time thus performing the role of an intensifier of location.

Rūta hardly ever uses the plural locative of nouns. The most frequent form is *namuose* ‘at home:LOC’ (starting from 1;10); the word *Lazdynuose* (2;0) (a residential area in the capital city of Vilnius) was used just once.

Mother uses the locative to denote place from the very beginning of the observation period. She is doing this quite often, which gives approximately 40 utterances per month (up to the period of 2;0). Later the numbers decrease and show about 20 utterances per month (for details see Table 4.19).

4.5.6.2. A few times Rūta used the locative in the meaning of *time*, e.g.,

M: *Rūtyte, kada eisi miegoti?* ‘Rūta:DIM, when are you going to bed?’

R: *Vakaje (vakare).* ‘In the evening:LOC’ (1;10)

R: *Ne, matai, kaip ryte atėjo Kalėdų senis.* ‘No, you see, Father Christmas came in the morning:LOC’ (2;4)

Also Mother uses the locative of time very rarely, two utterances per month on the average, e.g., *ryte* ‘in the morning’, *vakare* ‘in the evening’ (see Table 4.19). Also in Latvian child language the locative of time did not appear until 4;2 (see Rūķe-Draviņa 1980). All this put together can be taken as evidence that both in Latvian and Lithuanian the meaning of time for the locative case is peripheral.

4.5.6.3. The morphological form of the locative is quite simple: nouns of all declension classes take the inflectional ending *-e*, i.e., this is a superstable marker. Most frequent are locatives of masculine nouns (microclass I.1). The locative forms of noun belonging to other microclasses are usually used in a shortened form, e.g., *kambary* instead of *kambaryje* ‘in the room’, *lovytėj* instead of *lovytėje* ‘in the bed:DIM’, *vonioj* instead of *vonioje* ‘in the bathroom’. This tendency was adopted by Rūta following her mother’s speech pattern.

4.5.7. The vocative. The vocative is the case of address. It is therefore due to this reason that vocative nouns are very frequent in both Mother’s (especially during the first two months) and Rūta’s speech (see Tables 4.8 and 4.9). In frequency ranking, this case comes immediately after the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive cases. The meaning of the case is very transparent, consequently, its acquisition was not complicated. Rūta uses the vocative correctly from the very beginning of the observation period. The first words used in the vocative were *mama*

‘Mother’ or *mamyte* ‘mummy’, *teti* ‘father’; later there appeared the names of other family members, friends, or relatives. Moreover, Rūta also addresses her toys in the vocative thus treating them as equal members of the act of communication. This is exemplified by the following: *lėlyte* ‘doll:VOC’ (2;0), *akuti* (*vilkuti*) ‘wolf:DIM:VOC’(1;10), *bezione* (*beždžione*) ‘monkey:VOC’ (2;3), *mesiukai* (*meškiukai*) ‘teddy-bear: DIM:VOC’ (2;4).

It is important to note that Rūta formed these vocatives spontaneously (even from the age of 1;7); she had hardly ever heard them from her mother.

The morphological marking of the vocative case varies widely. For masculine nouns, the inflectional endings are *-ai* (*Linai*), $-\phi$ (*Poliuk* (*Pauliuk*), *-i* (*Adi*, *vilkuti*, *teti*), and $-(i)au$ (*Daliau*); the inflectional endings for feminine nouns are *-a* and *-e*, as in *mama*, *močiute*, *Ūyte*. The most frequent inflectional ending of the vocative case in Rūta’s speech were *-ai* for masculine nouns and *-e* for feminine nouns (due to diminutives). The vocative case of masculine nouns belonging to the microclass I.1 were marked in two ways, e.g., *kačiuk* ‘cat:DIM:VOC’ (2;5), *stirniuk* ‘deer:DIM:VOC’ (2;1), *mesiukai* (*meškiukai*) ‘teddy-bear:DIM:VOC’ (2;0) *kengūriuk* – *kengūriukai* ‘kangaroo:DIM:VOC’ (2;2). The appearance of these variants was determined by Mother’s speech and relevant examples include *vėžliuk* – *vėžliukai* ‘tortoise:DIM:VOC’ (2;2), *ežiukai* ‘hedgehog:DIM:VOC’ (2;2). The high frequency of feminine vocative nouns was caused by the constant use of the nouns *Rūta* and *mama*.

In addressing her daughter, Mother also resorted to the shortened version of the vocative, e.g., *Rūtyt* ‘Rūta:DIM:VOC’ (1;9, 1;10, 2;1, 2;3, 2;5), *dukryt* ‘daughter:DIM:VOC’ (1;9). The shortened forms of the vocative were also used while marking the name *Rūta* as a masculine noun, e.g., *Rūtuk* (1;10-2;5), *Rūčiuk* (1;10), *Rūtuliuk* (1;10). The change of gender in the name *Rūta* appears only in its diminutive form. This type of shift from one gender to another did not appear in Rūta’s speech. Thus Rūta appears to have avoided this rather opaque gender shift.

4.5.8. Having discussed the process of case acquisition in Rūta’s speech, we can draw the following conclusions:

1. The 1;8 may be considered to be the starting point of the morphological development of case forms in Rūta’s speech. It is at this period that the opposition accusative/genitive singular versus nominative singular first emerges. At the same time the vocative singular and the nominative plural appear, and they are soon followed by singular forms of the dative, the instrumental, and the locative. It has to be stressed that

all the above forms were recorded during the 1;8 period; however, not all of them occurred as spontaneous utterances. Quite often such forms represented repetitions of adult speech (cf. 4.4.1).

2. Different cases marked for number (i.e., singular and plural) appear at 1;8. This is the period when the process of the acquisition of case meanings and their morphological markers starts, and the acquisition of cases lasts till the age of two. The frequency of occurrence of singular case forms steadily increases during the period of 2;0-2;1; after a month the frequency of plural case forms rises too. Plural forms in Rūta's lexicon become increasingly numerous from the age of two. This tendency is exemplified by the relevant statistics: up to 2;0 there were hardly 8.4% of such forms (15.8% in Mother's speech), whereas later their frequency rises to 12.5% (19.4% in Mother's speech) (cf. 4.4).

3. Lithuanian is a highly inflected language; however, there were no serious difficulties in the acquisition of case forms. It is noteworthy that the easiest to acquire were declensional classes of feminine nouns. Problems were rather few in the acquisition of the case forms of masculine noun classes (cf. 4.5.1, 4.5.4).

4. Rūta acquired the meanings of cases gradually. First the basic meanings of particular cases were acquired and only later peripheral meanings were learnt. The most frequent case in Rūta's speech is the nominative in the function of grammatical subject (this function is extremely easy to master). The meaning ranked in second position was the possessive genitive followed by the accusative of direct object. It can be stated then that the first meanings to be acquired were the basic meanings of grammatical cases. Rūta started using concrete cases somewhat later, but even there the girl acquired basic meanings first, whereas acquisition of peripheral meanings was delayed till later (cf. 4.5).

5. The use of prepositional phrases shows the tendency for prepositions to be omitted up to the age of two. Another strategy on Rūta's part was to use the premorpheme *a* instead of a preposition. As mentioned above, the morphological case markers were acquired at an early age, i.e., up to the period of 2;0. In contrast, the grammatically correct forms of a number of prepositions did not appear until the end of the observation period. It can therefore be assumed that the category of case is acquired much earlier than prepositions (cf. 4.5.2, 4.5.3, 4.5.6).

The data obtained from Rūta's recordings corroborate certain universal tendencies of case acquisition, namely, that the subject nominative, the possessive genitive, and the accusative of direct object are acquired relatively early. Her data also confirms the assumption that the acquisition

of prepositions follows the acquisition of cases. Nevertheless, despite a number of similarities observed in the early acquisition across different languages, every language (and every child, for that matter) exhibits some idiosyncratic properties. It should be stressed in the first place that Rūta had acquired the inflectional endings of all the cases very early, that is, before the age of two. The early and uncomplicated acquisition of the case system shows that this particular category was not difficult for Rūta to master at all.

Some differences were noted even in the relevant data on the typologically related Latvian language. Latvian children acquire plural forms in a much later phase; in addition, the vocative and instrumental singular forms do not appear until the age of 2;0; moreover, even after the cases had been acquired their frequency of occurrence is very low. Another peculiarity is that the locative case is more common in both adult and child language of Latvians.