

Electronic offprint from

# BALTIC LINGUISTICS

Vol. 3, 2012

ISSN 2081-7533

AURELIJA USONIENĖ, NICOLE NAU & INETA DABAŠINSKIENĖ, eds., *Multiple Perspectives in Linguistic Research on Baltic Languages*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012. viii + 287 pp. ISBN (10): 1-4438-3645-1, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3645-6

Reviewed by NATALIA PERKOVA, Stockholm

The volume *Multiple Perspectives in Linguistic Research on Baltic Languages* comprises ten articles, focused on a range of aspects of contemporary linguistics and united by a common subject: the Baltic languages. Various approaches and frameworks used by the authors overcome the hurdle between contemporary linguistic science and the sometimes too traditional and outdated views still dominant in Baltic linguistics. The articles in the volume are based on the papers presented at the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (Vilnius, 2010).

The book consists of three parts. The first part, “Corpus-based Contrastive Studies”, includes two studies—the research on epistemic necessity in Lithuanian and English (Audronė Šolienė) and the paper on case acquisition in Russian and Lithuanian (Maria Voeikova and Ineta Dabašinskienė). The second part, “Specialized and Professional Discourse in Lithuanian”, deals with sociolinguistic and discourse-based problems, such as prescriptivist language policy and its evaluation by the speakers of the language (Loreta Vaicekauskienė), multimodality in the discourse practices of bread promotion (Jūratė Ruzaitė) and the use of adverbial hedging devices in academic discourse of different genres (Jolanta Šinkūnienė). The final part of the volume, “New Perspectives on Grammatical Categories in the Baltic Languages”, is the biggest one and concentrates on various grammatical issues in modern Baltic languages. The issues covered in this part are as follows: the reportative nature of the Latvian ‘oblique mood’ and the continuum formed by its meanings (Joanna Chojnicka), the properties of specifying existential sentences (Violeta Kalėdaitė), the distribution of impersonal modal verbs (Erika Jasionytė), semantic networks of reflexive verbs (Andra Kalnača and Ilze Lokmane) and the status of numerals as a part of speech (Loïc Boizou).

In “Epistemic necessity in a parallel corpus: Lithuanian vs. English” (p. 10–42), Audronė Šolienė investigates the variety of modal expressions

in these languages. Using bidirectional parallel corpora of English and Lithuanian texts (which allows for comparability of statistical data), she aims to analyse the use of two basic strategies, namely modal verbs and modal adverbials (*auxiliary strategy* vs. *adverb strategy*, see van der Auwera *et al.* 2005), within the domain of necessity. In the paper it is argued that the verbal strategy is more common for the domain of necessity in both languages, though on the whole modal verbs of necessity are used in English about 2.24 times more frequently than in Lithuanian (the author rounds it up to 3). It should be mentioned that the log likelihood test calls the statistics concerning the use of modal adverbials into question (Table 5, p. 26).

Besides their prototypical modal meanings, modal verbs usually tend to receive epistemic readings, and a considerable part of the research focuses on this issue. The analysis shows that the epistemic use of modal verbs is quite uncommon for Lithuanian: only one verb, namely *turėti* ‘to have to’, is found in contexts of epistemic necessity. The epistemic readings of this verb make up only 24% of its overall use, while for the English verbs *must* and *would* it is 59% and 52%, respectively (Figure 1, p. 26). As necessity adverbs unambiguously refer to epistemic modality, it is no wonder that their normalised frequency is more than 4 times higher than that of epistemic *turėti*.

Finally, close scrutiny of translational equivalents in the parallel corpora gives additional evidence for the predominant use of adverbs of epistemic necessity in Lithuanian, as they occur about twice as often as the verb *turėti* in the contexts where English *must* is used in the source texts. The same is true for the reverse translational direction (that is, Lithuanian epistemic adverbs are more often translated with English *must* than different occurrences of *turėti* are). It is worth mentioning that Šolienė touches upon the problem of differentiation between epistemic nuances, which is quite unclear in most cases of the use of modal adverbials.

Some additional remarks should be made. On page 24 Šolienė discusses the verb *turėti*, which is more frequently used in its primary sense ‘to have’. According to the author, one should distinguish between possessive and modal (necessitive) readings of this verb. However, the passage with statistics on its distribution is somewhat confusing: the author claims that “[t]he possessive *turėti* amounted to 394 occur-

rences” (ibid.) with the normalised frequency of 2.08, while the modal *turėti* has the normalised frequency of 1.33. Both the data in Table 3 and simple calculation show that in fact there are 394 occurrences of the modal *turėti*. In turn, the corresponding number of occurrences for possessive *turėti* should be 617, which indeed accounts for 61% of the overall use of this verb (1011 entries). Besides this factual inaccuracy, it’s a pity that no attention is paid to cases of co-occurrence of modal verbs and modal adverbs.

In “What can child language tell us about language development? A case for case study in Lithuanian and Russian” (p. 43–74), Maria Voeikova and Ineta Dabašinskienė approach the problem of language acquisition, focusing on the category of case. The authors investigate the degree of stability and basicness of this category in the systems of two genetically related languages. The research is conducted within the framework of Natural Morphology. Case grammemes are considered to take relatively long periods to acquire, which makes them a very interesting object of investigation. In addition, case systems are similar in the languages under discussion, but some differences are nevertheless attested, one of them being the more inflectional character of Lithuanian. In both languages core cases (nominative, genitive, and accusative) tend to be more frequent than peripheral, semantic cases. According to the authors, “[c]ase forms are systemically unequal and their prototypical functions influence their acquisition” (p. 59). Nominative forms of nouns describing animate entities tend to occur earlier in child speech. On the contrary, inanimate entities are often referred to in syntactic contexts where the corresponding NP is a direct object in the accusative.

Apparently, the frequency of particular case forms is reflected in the process of acquisition, as non-nominative forms tend to be acquired earlier than nominative ones in contexts which are pragmatically more typical for particular nouns, and therefore it seems reasonable to consider such cases as simple reproduction of forms. Sometimes the difference in the order of case acquisition is explained by the fact that in Russian some case forms are frequently used with prepositions to express locative meanings in the wider sense (e. g., *po nebu*<sub>DAT</sub> ‘across the sky’); Lithuanian often uses prepositionless instrumentals here. In addition, Lithuanian locatives do not require prepositions, whereas

Russian locatives do, cf. Russian *v nebe*<sub>LOC</sub> ‘in the sky’. Finally, the average time gap between the first appearance of different case forms is higher in the Russian data, which agrees with the assumption that “case distinctions in Lithuanian are more significant for the expression of syntactic relations and therefore must be acquired earlier than in Russian” (p. 69). To conclude, this pilot study is somewhat restricted in its data, but the methodology used can be tested in future research on the basis of a wider sample.

Loreta Vaicekauskienė’s article “‘Good language’ and insecure speakers: a study into metalinguistic awareness of tv and radio journalists in the context of language monitoring in Lithuania” (76–103) concentrates on the burning issue of inflexible prescriptivist language policy in Lithuania. Using a sample based on interviews with a group of Lithuanian journalists, the author examines how the evaluations which are made by official institutions responsible for language planning influence the judgement of language competence and linguistic self-confidence by the speakers themselves.

Current language planning in Lithuania took shape after the years of dominance of Russian, which had been stimulated by Soviet language policy. Due to this situation, Lithuanian, seen as one of the national symbols, was considered to be endangered, and many efforts were made to re-establish its privileges and to protect it from influence of other languages. Unfortunately, language policy in Lithuania in its aggressive character resembles the preceding policy of Russification, concentrating on the development and use of strict prescriptive norms. There are official institutions to define and approve norms and to monitor speakers, and the degree of monitoring goes as far as financial penalties, such as fines for repeated violation of language norms. The paradoxical nature of this situation is clear, given the wide linguistic variation within Lithuanian: there are considerable differences between dialects. For example, learning the orthoepic norm is often difficult, since patterns of accentuation depend on the dialect and even on the idiolect (see Kačiuškienė & Kruopienė 2010; Kavaliauskas & Melnikov 2011, among others).

The study reveals the importance of such properties of language, or rather discourse, as clarity, richness, naturalness, expressiveness and others (p. 89–90); these characteristics are viewed by the speakers as

crucial for competence in ‘good language’. In other words, the informants tend to evaluate highly the use of various rhetorical techniques. Interestingly, even such a feature of good language as correctness is viewed in terms of stylistic appropriateness rather than grammatical. What may be unexpected is that very correct language tends to be evaluated negatively, as lacking naturalness and liveliness. In fact, such observations fit the conclusion that “[c]ompetence in the sense of mastery of the grammar is only part of the linguistic competence of a person”, drawn in Lehmann (2007, 270).

The analysis of the interviews shows that in fact the constant monitoring of a target group by official institutions makes them feel insecure in their use of language (which is attested even for trained and experienced journalists), and such speakers tend to assess their competence quite negatively. The high degree of institutionalisation results in a familiarity with typical errors and what is expected to be correct, though these norms often contradict real, natural language usage. On the whole, the conclusions drawn in the study stress the failure of Lithuanian linguistic policy, as it makes speakers assess the knowledge of their mother tongue as insufficiently good, setting standards which are too abstract and artificial to be realised.

The paper “The discourse of food promotion: bread packages in Lithuania” (p. 104–136) by Jūratė Ruzaitė is devoted to the variety of strategies used in the discourse of bread promotion. The author addresses the problem from the perspective of multimodality, which is logically supported by the fact that texts are either oral or written and therefore are perceived via audio and visual channels. Thus, Ruzaitė analyses the semiotics of bread packages, and considers the design as a way of communicating with consumers.

The study shows that different modal components in package design support each other: for example, the use of traditional ornaments emphasises the connotations of cultural importance of such a product as bread. The structuring of textual information on the package is reflected in the use of more important, obligatory elements, such as the product name, the list of ingredients, contact information, and optional elements, among them the bread type, product description, etc. The product name reflects different strategies in choosing proper terms for bread promotion, such as specifying the type of bread (*Ruginė* / *Rugė* /

*Rugelis* for rye bread), reference to a particular region (*Kauno duona*), the use of words related to family or traditions (*Naminė* ‘home (bread)’, *Bočių duona* ‘ancestors’ bread’) and the evaluative characteristics of the product (*Gardžioji* ‘tasty’).

The crucial role of visual information lies in the uniqueness of logos of particular bread producers, as they need to be easily memorised and recognised. The language of logos is iconic, and the designers of bread packages tend to use elements related to such concepts as nature, family and traditions, the baker’s trade. In many cases the picture illustrates a certain component of the name of the bread and serves as an iconic sign. As for colours, those of the Lithuanian flag are used in design relatively often, emphasising the crucial role of bread as an integral part of Lithuanian culture. Finally, bread discourse is characterised by the use of terms specific for this industry, the most typical example being the importance of healthy nutrition. In other words, a wide range of components connected to the frame of bread can be incorporated into the practice of bread promotion.

Jolanta Šinkūnienė’s article “Adverbials as hedging devices in Lithuanian academic discourse: a cross-disciplinary study” (p. 137–167) is devoted to hedging as a mechanism of conveying the author’s stance. The corpus-based study concentrates on the use of epistemic-related adverbials (*gal* ‘perhaps’, *matyt* ‘evidently’, *turbūt* ‘probably’, etc.) as hedging markers. For Šinkūnienė, hedging is rather a pragmatic function, so in her opinion, elements with differing semantic values are used in this way. The occurrence of epistemic adverbials in academic discourse is delimited by the high degree of authors’ intentionality. The analysis of normalised frequencies of the units under discussion shows that they are more typical of fiction rather than of academic language. In addition, the distribution of epistemic adverbials varies in texts belonging to different scholarly areas: hedges occur more often in the texts belonging to the humanities. The analysis corroborates some cross-linguistically attested tendencies in the use of hedging devices in academic texts.

In her paper “Reportive evidentiality and reported speech: is there a boundary? Evidence of the Latvian oblique” (p.170–192), Joanna Chojnicka concentrates on the notions of evidentiality and reportativity. The author summarises her detailed review of the literature on

the problem of boundaries between evidentiality and reported speech by claiming that “[i]t is not the marker that distinguishes reported speech from reportive evidentiality, but the function of the report in the discourse” (p. 175). Analysing examples from a corpus of Latvian parliamentary debates, she discusses the range of meanings expressed by oblique forms of verbs (traditionally treated as a special mood), among them reported speech, evidentiality and citation. The analysis reveals that the set of these meanings is better characterised as a continuum between reported speech proper and evidentiality proper. Interestingly, only in the ‘non-extreme’ contexts may one use the particle *it kā* ‘as if’ to emphasise different nuances of the oblique.

Even though the basic principles are well outlined, some statements are not very clear. For instance, the author distinguishes between reported speech and citation (the latter category comprises such fixed forms as proverbs, clichés, etc.), arguing that “[c]itation does not have an informative function, and speakers do not use it to share new knowledge with the audience (as is the case with reported speech and evidentiality)—its role is illustrative, and for achieving the abovementioned results (creating the atmosphere of familiarity, common ground, etc.) it would not make sense to cite something that is unknown or not obvious to the majority or all of the listeners” (p. 187). However, it seems that such use depends on the generic character of the information, and exactly its belonging to the common ground allows the speaker to omit reference to the source. The other problem lies in the overt use of the oblique: it is unlikely that the oblique is used in direct speech, so such examples as (10) on pages 186–187 are in fact indirect quotations, compared to (11) on page 188 where we have a direct quotation (that is, exact, literal reproduction of a certain formula). Thus, the oblique in any case refers to information received non-directly, and this information is based on the words (even in the examples analysed as evidential the existence of a verbalised opinion is presupposed).

It is an intriguing question whether the occurrence of particular grammatical forms of the oblique somehow correlates with its meaning, as it seems that verbal forms in the past tense somehow support the evidential semantics. One could suggest that the participial part of the complex verbal form (e. g., *esot mēģinājuši* ‘be.OBL try.PA.PST.M.PL’,



p. 186) somehow provokes such interpretation, as perfect/resultative grammemes are often used to express evidential-related meanings in the languages of the world, Latvian not being an exception. This problem could be investigated in further research on the subject.

Violeta Kalėdaitė's article "The Specifying existential sentence type in Lithuanian" (p. 193–205) is dedicated to the properties of Lithuanian existential sentences extended by relative clauses, that is, such structures as *Dar yra nemažai dėstytojų, kurie nepakenčia kritikos* 'There are still a few (sic!) university teachers who hate criticism' (p. 197). This type of existential sentences is characterised by verb-subject order and by a partitive genitive plural subject. The scope of the study is restricted to sentences with the verb *būti* 'to be'. For Kalėdaitė, the NP in the structure of an existential sentence is indefinite. She argues that the subject NP in existential sentences is to be further "expanded through descriptive identification" (p. 197). According to the author, there is a syntactic difference between the following sentences (i. e., one sentence is declarative and the other is interrogative):

- (1) *Yra naujovių, kurios tautai gali būti nepriimtinos.*  
 be.PRS.3 innovation.GEN.PL which.NOM.PL.F nation.DAT.SG  
 can.PRS.3 be.INF unacceptable.NOM.PL.F  
 'There are innovations / changes which might be unacceptable for the nation.' (see ex. (6), p.197)
- (2) *Gal tu tiki, jog iš tiesų yra vaiduoklių ar piktųjų dvasių?*  
 EMPH 2SG.NOM believe.PRS.2SG COMPL really be.PRS.3  
 ghost.GEN.PL and evil.DEF.GEN.PL spirit.GEN.PL  
 'Do you really believe that there are ghosts and evil spirits?'  
 (ex. (8), p.198)

However, it seems that the difference lies in the semantic nature of the verb *būti*, which has two independent meanings: first, it may be used in contexts with non-referential and indefinite NPs, and second, in contexts with referential and definite NPs (Padučeva 2004, 437–348). The intriguing nature of the latter meaning lies in such a crucial semantic component as the significance of opposition between two worlds—the world for which the existence of the entity (e. g., ghosts and spirits) is

seen as true and the real world. That is, in the structures like <LOC> *yra vaiduokliū* ‘Ghosts exist (in a certain world)’ the existence of ghosts in a concrete place is asserted. Logically, there is no semantic necessity for further description of referent / definite NPs. It also seems that the difference between so-called ontological existence (2) and existence in (1) is not crucial, as in both cases the existence of a certain entity is postulated, and the difference lies in the character of presupposition, that is, whether it is the real world which is meant or not.

For Kalėdaitė, the so-called infinitival existential sentences (with the schematic structure *būti* + *k*-word + INF, e. g., *yra kam pasiskųsti* ‘there is someone to complain to’) may be characterised as a subtype of the specifying existential construction. This looks logical from a syntactic point of view, as relativisation may be postulated for both structures, however it seems reasonable to accent the additional modal semantic component in such infinitival sentences (the existence of some entities is needed).

Finally, the author emphasises the role of discourse factors for the use of specifying existential sentences. As the existence of the entity referred to by the subject NP is accented as a rhematic component, such structures are used in an introductory function. The modification of the NP, seen as restriction of a certain set of objects by naming their particular property, that is, the procedure of singling out a particular subset of objects, accents the importance of this property for the further discourse. All Kalėdaitė’s examples illustrate structures with finite relative clauses; it is not clear why she ignores other possible ways of modifying the NP in the existential sentences under discussion. Another potential domain for future research could be the presence or absence of an overt indication of location in specifying existential sentences and its correlations to other semantic and structural properties of such constructions.

The paper ‘Lithuanian impersonal modal verbs *reik(ė)ti* ‘need’ and *tekti* ‘be gotten’: a corpus-based study” (p. 206–228) by Erika Jasionytė presents a detailed data-driven analysis of two impersonal verbs undergoing gradual grammaticalisation into modal verbs. Both *reik(ė)ti* and *tekti* are widely used in sentences with non-nominative (dative) subjects and tend to express participant-external necessity. In addition to modal meanings, they preserve their original meanings

in certain contexts, cf. *Man teko sutikti prezidentq* ‘I chanced to meet the President’ vs. *Man teko paklusti* ‘I had to obey’ (p. 209). The data show that *reik(ė)ti* is used more frequently as a modal verb than *tekti*, if their overall use in the texts is taken into consideration.

The primary semantics of the verb *reik(ė)ti* is internal necessity, cf. English *need*. However, the analysis demonstrates that participant-internal readings are nevertheless not very typical for constructions with this verb. As for the syntax, the dative subject tends to be omitted in the majority of cases (81% of the examples with *reik(ė)ti* + INF), which may be explained by the highly generic nature of many such necessitive constructions.

Compared to *reik(ė)ti*, *tekti* is rarely used to express participant-internal necessity, which may be due to the happenstance nature of its primary meaning (‘x happens to get something by chance’). In contexts of participant-external modality the semantic component of happenstance seems to be preserved. The analysis shows that the semantics of the embedded verb correlates with the meaning of *tekti*: if used with stative verbs, *tekti* has a non-modal interpretation and refers to certain events which happened; on the contrary, in contexts with activity verbs *tekti* tends to denote participant-external necessity. Finally, this verb is marginally used in sentences of participant-external possibility. In fact, it seems that the connection with the original meaning of acquisition is crucial for the development of modal meanings, as the component ‘having/getting a certain state of affairs’, combined with a subjective evaluation of the situation, results in either necessity (for unfavourable situations) or possibility (for favourable situations), while the external nature of modality is related to the happenstance character of an event.

The corpus-based study reveals the close connection between modality and negation. Under negation more than half of the examples with *reik(ė)ti* in its present form (*nereikia*) have prohibitive semantics. By using such structures, the speaker implies that if there is no need to do something, then one should not do it. To sum up, the modal nuances are constructed due to the subjectivity manifested and reflect the speaker’s attitude towards the situation. The other verb, *tekti*, used in negative contexts, accents its happenstance meaning more often than as a modal. Moreover, the ratio of possibility readings is higher in negative contexts with *tekti*, compared to affirmative ones.

In the article “The semantics and distribution of Latvian reflexive verbs” (p. 229–256), Andra Kalnača and Ilze Lokmane classify reflexive verbs according to their semantic and morphosyntactic properties. The authors are guided by the principles suggested in (Geniušienė 1987), where a threefold model of analysis is proposed with emphasis on semantic, syntactic and formal levels of representation. They adhere to the derivational treatment of Latvian reflexive verbs and argue that these verbs form a separate set in the grammatical system of the language. However, the schematic labels used in the article reflect only the semantic and syntactic levels. In fact, the notion of a three-level diathesis, crucial for (Geniušienė 1987), is somewhat neglected: first, a referent level is not explicitly taken into account, and second, such labels as  $A=P$  are not informative, if used in isolation from the corresponding non-reflexive construction.

Reflexive verbs are divided into three groups on semantic and syntactic criteria: there are subject, object and impersonal reflexive verbs. The principles of this classification differ from those proposed by Geniušienė and are more vague, because the authors do not explicitly compare the diatheses of reflexive and corresponding non-reflexive constructions and simply define a certain class on the grounds of its own structure. For instance, subject reflexive verbs are those in which “an agent and patient are fully or partly coreferential. The agent is the syntactic subject of the sentence” (p. 236), cf. “Subjective *RVS* [*reflexive verbs*—N. P.] termed so because the surface subject of *RC* is identical with the subject of the corresponding *NC* [*non-reflexive construction*—N. P.]; changes in the *SynS* [*syntactic structure*—N. P.] of subjective *RVS* involve the direct object which may be either deleted or demoted” (Geniušienė 1987, 69). The use of semantic criteria in defining the subclasses of reflexive verbs results in an undesirable confusion of terms. For instance, Kalnača and Lokmane describe the syntactic properties of autocausative verbs as the simultaneous correspondence of the participant to both the agent and the patient, which seems at least perplexing, as semantic structures of non-reflexive and reflexive verbs are thus mixed up. In the sentence *Es ceļos no gultas* ‘I get up from the bed’ (p. 240) the verb *celties* ‘to get up’ doesn’t have two semantic roles; the explicit scheme of the diathesis change by Geniušienė (1987, 87) shows that “the change involves all the three diathesis levels”, and what is crucial is that the semantic role of the

subject referent changes to Actor. That is, the important difference in the semantic structure of the verbs is simply ignored by the authors.

It should also be mentioned that in the paper circumfixal reflexive verbs are analysed together with pure reflexive verbs (cf. *ibid.*, p. 152–155, where they are treated separately), which does not seem quite acceptable, as the semantics of prefixes is thus neglected, despite their important role in the resulting modal and aspectual meanings of verbs. Nevertheless, on the whole this preliminary classification of reflexive verbs is much more adequate than the traditional ones, though it would be advisable to elaborate it more carefully bringing in more data (e. g., denominal and deadjectival verbs).

In the final paper of this volume, “Do we need to count numerals as a part of speech in Lithuanian?”, Loïc Boizou concentrates on the problem of Lithuanian numerals and the procedure of part-of-speech tagging applied to this set of words. The author argues that numerals in Lithuanian manifest themselves either as nouns, e. g., *dešimt* ‘ten’, *šimtas* ‘hundred’, *dvejetas* ‘a group of two’, or adjectives, e. g., *du* ‘two’, *ketveri* ‘four (with *pluralia tantum*)’, *devintas* ‘ninth’, according to their morphosyntactic characteristics. In fact, the subdivision of numerals into more nominal ones and more adjectival ones is quite predictable and cross-linguistically valid, see (Corbett 1978), among others. According to Boizou, the semantic nature of the word class of numerals is not crucial for the needs of the syntactic parser. However, it seems that such a privileged character of syntactic criteria moves some important semantic properties of numerals (particularly, cardinals) to the background. Making an attempt to overcome the heterogeneity of this word class, Boizou underestimates the semantic nature of quantifiers (in fact, cardinal numerals are just a subset of quantifiers), though he does mention it (“semantic category of the quantifier”, “a nominal semantic feature”, p. 266). Nevertheless, he delimits the set of quantifiers on syntactic grounds, so that adjectival cardinals like *devyni* ‘nine’ are not included in this set. However, it seems difficult to find any difference but the morphosyntactic properties between such phrases as *devyni broliai* ‘nine brothers’ and *dešimt brolių* ‘ten brothers’. To sum up, it would be worthwhile for the author to elaborate his analysis relying on conclusions drawn in such works on the subject as Hurford (1987), von Mengden (2010) and others.

It seems a little bit unreasonable to label as nouns such units as *daug* ‘many, much’ and *kiek* ‘how much’: in spite of their distribution being very similar to that of nouns (e. g., *daug* and *kiek* govern genitive NPS), some of their properties are adverbial ones. For example, they are modified like adverbials, *daug* can be put in the comparative and superlative, etc. It is worth mentioning that cardinals differ from some other quantifiers with respect to their numerical nature: they denote the number of discrete objects and therefore are not compatible with uncountable nouns, while for such words as *litras* ‘litre’, *bokalas* ‘glass’, *daug* ‘many, much’, etc. compatibility with uncountable nouns is typical. It is also not clear why the author labels structures like *Jis buvo trečias / slipniausias savo komandoje* ‘he was the third / weakest in his team’ (p. 269) as attributive and not predicative. The label Q is first interpreted as *quantifier* (a footnote on p. 269), but then is given in the list of abbreviations as *quantification noun*.

On the whole, the articles presented in the volume give an overview of topical issues in modern Baltic linguistics. The authors draw attention to linguistic facts and try to use different frameworks and analyse the results against a wider background: one can find citations and criticisms of the existing literature on the corresponding topics. It is also noticeable that most of the authors use data taken from corpora which reflect not only the normalised language, but the real discourse of native speakers. Despite some negligence concerning consistency of glosses and misprints, the overall impression from this volume is highly positive, and almost all the papers outline further perspectives in research on the Baltic languages.

**Natalia Perkova**  
 Stockholm University  
 Department of Linguistics  
 SE-10691 Stockholm  
 Natalia@ling.su.se

## ABBREVIATIONS

COMPL — complementiser, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, EMPH — emphatic, F — feminine, GEN — genitive, INF — infinitive, LOC — locative, M — masculine, NOM — nominative, OBL — oblique,

PA — past active participle, PL — plural, PRS — present, PST — past, SG — singular

## REFERENCES

- CORBETT, GREVILLE G. 1978. Universals in the syntax of cardinal numerals. *Lingua* 46, 355–368.
- GENIUŠIENĖ, EMMA. 1987. *The Typology of Reflexives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HURFORD, JAMES R. 1987. *Language and Number: The Emergence of a Cognitive System*. Oxford & New York: Basil Blackwell.
- KAČIUSKIENĖ, GENOVAITĖ & IRENA KRUOPIENĖ. 2010. Taisyklingas viešosios kalbos kirčiavimas: siekiamybė ar būtinybė? *Žmogus ir žodis* 12.1, 80–87.
- KAVALIAUSKAS VIDAS & MAKSIM MELNIKOV. 2011. Dėl VLKK koreguotų priesaginių veiksmažodžių kirčiavimo normų. *Žmogus ir žodis* 13.1, 58–64.
- LEHMANN, CHRISTIAN. 2007. Linguistic competence: Theory and empiry. *Folia Linguistica* 41.3–4, 223–278.
- PADUČEVA, ELENA. 2004. *Dinamišeskie modeli v semantike leksiki*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- VAN DER AUWERA, JOHAN, EWA SCHALLEY & JAN NUYTS. 2005. Epistemic possibility in a Slavonic parallel corpus—a pilot study. In: Björn Hansen & Petr Karlík, eds., *Modality in Slavonic Languages. New Perspectives*. München: Sagner, 201–217.
- VON MENGDEN, FERDINAND. 2010. *Cardinal Numerals: Old English from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.