

MAGDALENA SMOCZYŃSKA  
Jagiellonian University, Cracow

## THE CASE OF SŁAWUŚ: AN ATYPICAL DEVELOPMENT OF FIRST PERSON SELF-REFERENCE IN JAN BAUDOIN DE COUR- TENAY'S POLISH DIARY DATA<sup>1</sup>

In this paper an individual case of an unusual route of acquisition of self-reference and 1.sg. forms is presented, taken by a Polish boy who lived 100 years ago. The subject, Sławuś, born in 1888, was the son of the famous linguist Jan Baudouin de Courtenay who ran extensive diaries of the language development of his five children. In general, the boy's linguistic development was not delayed or abnormal in any sense. However, he used to refer to himself in the 3rd person, with the noun *panicz* 'young master' and 3.sg. verbs, and continued to do this consistently up to the age of 4;4, unlike most Polish children who typically stop using the 3rd person reference shortly after their second birthday. When he started using the standard self-reference forms, he committed all kinds of errors associated with the acquisition of Polish 1.sg. forms – the very same errors that usually appear in two- to three-year-olds. His particular case can serve as evidence that the cumulated input of a correct form a child had heard over more than two years may have no effect whatsoever on his language acquisition of that form. Sławuś's idiosyncratic developmental route will be presented and discussed against the background of typical ways of referring to self and of acquiring the appropriate person morphology by Polish children, as represented in the Szuman diary data.

Sławuś, who was born 112 years ago, was the son of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1848-1929), the prominent Polish and Russian linguist. The family in which Sławuś grew up was Polish<sup>2</sup>, and the basic language spoken at home was Polish, too. However, most of the time the family lived in a foreign and multilingual milieu. The linguist, who himself was born near Warsaw (in a district which belonged to the Russian-governed part of former Poland<sup>3</sup>), spent most of his life teaching at Russian universities, namely, in Kazan, Dorpat and St. Petersburg. During this time he went for seven years to teach in Cracow, which at that time formally belonged to the Austrian Empire, though, culturally, was definitely Polish. In 1918, when Poland has recovered her independence, the professor and his family left Russia and moved back to Warsaw.

---

<sup>1</sup> The research presented in this paper was financed by the Komitet Badań Naukowych (Committee of Scientific Research), grant no. 1 H01D 010 14. The paper was presented as a poster at the Child Language Seminar 98 in Sheffield, UK, in September 1998. A part of results of this investigation was also presented at the 27. Österreichische Linguistiktagung in Vienna in October 1999. E-mail address for correspondence: [ulsmoczy@vela.filg.uj.edu.pl](mailto:ulsmoczy@vela.filg.uj.edu.pl)

<sup>2</sup> Although the Baudouin de Courtenay family was of French descent, they considered themselves Poles, as they had lived in Poland for several generations.

<sup>3</sup> During most of Baudouin's life Poland did not exist as an independent state, as Polish territory was partitioned among Russia, Prussia and Austria at the end of the 18th century.

From 1885 to 1904 – which covers the Dorpat period, the Cracow period and a part of the St. Petersburg period – the linguist run detailed diaries of the language development of his five children. He undertook a systematic observation of his first daughter, Cezia, born in Dorpat in 1885, then continued to collect the data on three other children born during the family's stay in Dorpat, namely, Zosia (1887), Sławuś (1888) and Ewelina (1892). During the Baudouins' stay in Cracow (1893-1900) their youngest daughter, Mania, was born. Her diary was continued after the family had moved to St. Petersburg, that is, from 1900 to 1904.

The entire original set of manuscript data, which is kept at the Polish National Library in Warsaw, is enormous: it consists of ca. 12,000 pages. So far, only a small part of one child's diary has been published (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1974). The editor of the 1974 book, Maria Chmura-Klektowa, had selected about 10% of the data of the linguist's daughter Ewelina. Baudouin himself never analyzed his children's data<sup>4</sup>. Except for some minor projects, the only person who really explored them was Chmura-Klektowa, who used them in her studies on derivational neologisms (Chmura-Klektowa 1970, 1971, 1972; see also Clark, 1993, p. 166-168), but her untimely death in 1976 interrupted further work.

Several years ago I undertook a long-term project which involved transcribing most of the data<sup>5</sup> of all the five Baudouin children into computer format and making them available in the CHILDES system (MacWhinney & Snow, 1990; MacWhinney, 1995). A full description of Baudouin's data can be found in Chmura-Klektowa, 1966, 1974 and in Smoczyńska, in press.

## The subject and his linguistic environment



*Sławuś, aged 2;7.  
Dorpat, July 1891*

Sławuś (Świętosław) was born in Dorpat (now: Tartu in Estonia) on November 17, 1888 as the third child of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay and his wife, Romualda. At the time he was born, Jan (43) was professor of linguistics at Dorpat university and Romualda (28), one of the first women educated at the university in Russia<sup>6</sup>, was a freelance writer and journalist. Though living abroad, the family spoke Polish at home. Both parents used a standard version of Polish, typical of educated people living in central Poland. Jan, who was born in the vicinity of Warsaw, from the age of 14 lived in this city, where he also pursued his studies. Romualda grew up in a Polish environment in eastern Poland (Wołyń, now in Ukraine) where the southeastern dialect of Polish was spoken; then she moved to St. Petersburg and was educated there among Poles speaking a northeastern dialect, as well as among Russians. Her speech,

<sup>4</sup> It was mostly due to historical circumstances. After Baudouin left Russia in 1918, all his books and materials were kept by the Soviet authorities who refused to return them to the famous linguist until shortly before his death.

<sup>5</sup> The project involves the CHILDES transcription of all the data with the exclusion of the earliest period. Putting the earliest data into a computer-readable format would be extremely difficult technically, as Baudouin had devised an idiosyncratic system of phonetic transcription of the babbling sounds. On the other hand, these prelinguistic data seem to be of a relatively lesser value than later language data.

<sup>6</sup> She graduated from Bestuzhev's higher courses for women, where she had studied history.



*The nanny Józia Borowska  
with Sławuś, aged 2, Zosia, aged 3,  
and Cezia, aged 5. Dorpat, 1890*

however, had only few characteristics of eastern Polish dialects. When Sławuś was born, his older sisters, Cezia and Zosia, were 3;3 and 1;10, respectively.

However, the most important input for Sławuś' language development came from his nanny, a Polish woman Józia (Józefa) Borowska<sup>7</sup>. Józia came from the region of Sokółka (northeastern part of contemporary Poland) and spoke a north-eastern dialect of Polish. Sławuś and his sisters seem to have picked up some features of that dialect. Other servants in the Dorpat household were Estonian or German. These two languages were used by Sławuś's parents and Józia to communicate with them, but they also spoke (some) Polish themselves, and often addressed the children in Polish. Among friends visiting the family there were many foreigners: Germans, Russians, and other nationalities, and Sławuś used to play with a Russian boy who lived in the same house. Children thus often heard foreign languages spoken<sup>8</sup>, could understand quite a lot, and used some foreign language expressions<sup>9</sup>.

In spite of the multilingual and multicultural environment in which the children grew up, the basic language heard and spoken there was definitely Polish. This was even more strengthened by the family moving to Cracow in southern Poland (then in Austria) which took place in July 1893, and where they subsequently spent seven years until June 1900. By this time Sławuś was 4;8 and the change of milieu had little impact on his basic language development.

Important information about the family milieu is contained in Baudouin's daughter Ewelina Małachowska's published recollections about her father and the family life (Małachowska, 1973a, b) as well as in the text of her unpublished book kept at the Archives of the Polish Academy of Science in Warsaw. Romualda's manuscript memoirs and diaries are also kept there. Very valuable information about the content of the diaries can be found in the Małachowska (1965) paper, as well as in her hand-written materials (person indexes, comments, clarification of family-specific terms, notions and items etc.). There are also hand-written recollections of childhood written by the eldest Baudouin daughter, Prof.

<sup>7</sup> Józia spent all her adult life with the Baudouin family. In their memoirs Baudouin's daughters consider her to have been almost a second mother figure for them.

<sup>8</sup> It is worth noting that Baudouin himself spoke about ten languages and used any opportunity to speak them.

<sup>9</sup> Within Polish spoken in the family a number of Russian and German words were used related to Dorpat's everyday life, such as names of professions, institutions etc., e.g. Russ. *morozhenshchik* 'ice-cream man', Russ. *izvoshchik* or Germ. *Kutscher* 'horse carriage driver', Germ. *Bettler* 'beggar', *Bahnhof* 'train station', etc. Relatively few Estonian terms were used, as Estonians belonged to the lower class.



*The Baudouin de Courtenay family before leaving Cracow, June 1900. Jan's sister Bronisława, Mania (3), Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Cezia (15), Jan's wife Romualda; standing behind them: Ewelina (8), Sławuś (11) and Zosia (13)*

Cezaria Jędrzejewiczowa<sup>10</sup>. Of course, a lot of information about input and multilingual influences can be found in the diaries themselves. However, no systematic study of the entire corpus has yet been possible, as the process of typing the manuscript into computer format and of editing it is still continuing and there remains a lot of checking to be done.

## The data

For each child two parallel diaries were run. One was entitled *Język* 'Language', the other *Rozwój ogólny* 'General development'. Records were made daily according to a detailed schema elaborated by Baudouin for his first daughter, and rigorously applied thereafter. In the 'Language' diary a double page was divided into several rubrics (columns), with all the circumstantial information on the left side and the child's speech entries on the right. The circumstances included detailed information about age, date,

---

<sup>10</sup> All photographs presented here come from Baudouin de Courtenay's family albums which were preserved and made available to me by Mrs. Marta Ehrenkreutz-Jasińska, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's great-granddaughter and grand-daughter of the eldest of his children, Prof. Cezaria Ehrenkreutz-Jędrzejewiczowa (Cezia). I am very grateful for help, support, information and materials received from Mrs. Jasińska, as well as from Prof. Andrzej Ehrenkreutz, the son of Cezaria.

exact place, the child's posture, description of the situation and of the activities of the participants plus some input language. The child's entries consisted of two rubrics, called *Fonacja* and *Cerebracja*. „Fonacja” was what the child said, transcribed in Baudouin's own phonetic notation. „Cerebracja” was what the child presumably meant. Sometimes additional comments were added concerning mode of articulation or possible other readings or providing a cross-reference to another place in the diary. Explicit general comments and remarks about the child's linguistic development do occur in the data, but they are very rare.

At this point the only data available in a more elaborated form are those of Sławuś. They cover daily records taken over nearly four years of Sławuś' life from the age of 1;4 to the age of 5;2<sup>11</sup>, most which was spent in Dorpat milieu. The boy's data that have been put into CHILDES format so far consist of 73 notebooks, ie. notebooks nos. 10-82, with 11 (double) manuscript pages in each, which amounts to ca. 800 double pages.

In Table 1 some rough quantitative data are presented as to Sławuś' data in the period studied. They are very preliminary, as the utterances are not yet morphologically coded and the checking for transcript accuracy is still being done.

Table 1. Quantitative characteristics of Sławuś' data

Age	No. of double pages	Child's tokens	Input tokens	Total tokens	% child speech	Errors (tokens)	% of errors
1;4-1;6	65	2666	1424	4090	65.2	27	1.0
1;6-2;0	134	7226	2783	10009	72.2	228	3.2
2;0-2;6	284	20301	7534	27835	72.9	944	4.7
2;6-3;0	114	9232	3035	12267	75.3	703	7.6
3;0-3;6	118	8996	2942	11938	75.4	824	9.2
3;6-4;0	43	3400	916	4316	78.8	660	19.4
4;0-4;6	73	6696	1579	8275	80.9	1506	22.5
4;6-5;0	33	2970	330	3300	90.0	871	29.3
5;0-5;2	8	543	124	667	81.4	131	24.1
TOTAL	872	62030	20667	82697	75.0	5894	9.5

These preliminary figures provide general characteristics of the data. First of all, they show that the total linguistic material collected over the 3-year period of Sławuś' life consist in ca. 60,000 child's word forms (tokens), whereas another ca. 20,000 tokens were uttered by his interlocutors (input language). This means that the boy's utterances form 75% of the corpus. This proportion shows an aspect of selection made by the linguist observer, cutting down the input speech data. In comparable parental Polish data collected by tape-recording the proportion is about 45% (Smoczyńska, 1998, p. 286). It is worth noting, however, that Baudouin's diary data, far from being a faithful record of the entire

<sup>11</sup> There is one important 4-month lacuna in the data, namely from 1;7.15 to 1;11.15, when the linguist went on a field trip to Northern Italy to study Slavic dialects spoken there. During this time Romualda was supposed to take notes (which she did, and the notes were preserved), but they are not included here, as their quality is much lower than that of Baudouin's records.

53. 27. 1893	10. 24 (1) 10 61 21	Podaj mi mały gwóźdź.	ciężki (A) prawie	Łaska panna (Larwi)	3907
28. 1890	25 10 18 70	Ukazywał u mnie, kołnierz i dżinsy. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	to ślad po a żem. ichi z żółtą jeż, jak jeż, jak jeż, jak	A. widać nie zacięto. widać nie mogę wcale powiedzieć. nie widać	
1894	26 (1) 11 18 11	Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie, jak mówić, jak mówić, jak mówić	Pr. obywateli na papierze, dróg (1890-1893) widać, że autonomicznie, jeż, jak, jeż, jak, jeż, jak jeż, jak, jeż, jak, jeż, jak jeż, jak, jeż, jak, jeż, jak	
1898	27 15 18 70	Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie (A)	opowiadanie.	
1898	28 15 18 70	Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie (A)	opowiadanie.	
		Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie (A)	opowiadanie.	
		Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie (A)	opowiadanie.	
		Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie (A)	opowiadanie.	
		Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie (A)	opowiadanie.	
		Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie (A)	opowiadanie.	
		Opowiedz mi o swoim dziele. Właśnie widać, że to jest nie to, jakiego potrzebuję. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka. To jest jakiegoś z wieszaka.	opowiadanie (A)	opowiadanie.	

Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Manuscript (kept in the National Library in Warsaw). Observations of children: Slawus. Language diary. Notebook no.76, p.907. Date of observations: March 25th-28th, 1893. Place: Dorpat. Age of Slawus: 4;4.8-4.4.11.

communicative exchange, **do contain** quite a lot of input language data, which is not often the case with classical diaries.

Another aspect worth investigating is density of data collection and selectivity of the data, which is reflected in the amount of data noted in subsequent periods. Several phases can be noted. The beginning phase consisting of four months (1;4-1;7) when about two thousand tokens per month were noted (it should be noted that the child's utterances were short: he was first at the one-word stage, and later at the two-word stage). After a four-month break in the data collection mentioned above, there was a four-month period (1;11-2;3) when the largest amount of data were recorded: three to five thousand tokens per month. Following this, another relatively rich period occurred which lasted for about one year (from 2;4 to 3;4) when one to two thousand word forms were noted every month (with a drop in the summer months, due to holiday absence of the observer or the observed). From 3;5 on the data became more selective: usually less than 1000 word forms were noted. This drop in the amount of data collected coincided with the raise in the percentage of „errors” recorded. This means that the data became less valuable in this period because of their selectivity. This high level (20 to even 37% of non-standard forms) is maintained to the end of the period under study. As far as the density of data collection is concerned, there is one irregular peak at 3;10 (1207) and another one at 4;4 – 4;6 where more data (ca. 1300 tokens at 4;4 and 4;6 and almost twice as many, 2487, at 4;5) were recorded. This period will be of special interest for us, because of the developments then taking place. Most probably, it is these very developments that made the linguist observe his son more closely.

This quantitative analysis shows a typical pattern followed by any parent who tries to run a diary of his/her child's linguistic development. The early period of emergence of lexicon, phonology and grammar is easy to observe. Everything seems new, everything seems to be an achievement, one can put down anything the child says, and still find it worth noting. This phase usually covers the period from the onset of speech to about 2;3. In the second period – from 2;3 to 3;4 in the case of Sławuś – the observer cannot help but become selective. One has the feeling that the child ‘can say practically anything’, so there is no reason to put down every simple utterance heard. However, there is still a lot going on in the child's language: complex sentences emerging in syntax, overgeneralizations and analogical formations blooming in morphology, frequent metalinguistic observations, and so on. On the contrary, the data collected in the last phase, from the age of 3;5 on, are so selective that they can be used and interpreted only in the light of earlier, less selective data. If we only looked at them, we would be convinced that the child makes an error every third or fourth word, which is completely wrong. In a study I made, based on non-selective Polish data of four children, known as the Szuman diary data (Smoczyńska, 1997), it was shown that at the age of 4 to 5 years erroneous forms constitute less than 2% of the child's total output.

Before we turn to the presentation of Sławuś' special case, let us consider the typical development of self-reference in Polish children, which will serve as background against which the unusual development observed in Sławuś can be compared.

### **Typical development of self-reference in Polish children**

There is a well-known phenomenon occurring in many languages, both in child speech and in child directed speech (CDS), which consists of 3rd person reference to speaker

and to addressee. Names are used instead of pronouns such as ‘I’ and ‘you’, and the 3rd person verb form is used, instead of 1.sg. and 2.sg. forms, respectively. In Polish this is a very typical pattern.

It should be said that pronouns as such – except for the demonstrative to ‘it, this’ – are a late acquisition for most Polish children. This is a broader phenomenon, typical of both CDS and child speech, namely, that all noun-like referents are initially referred to by nouns, and not by pronouns. In a comment noted in his diary Baudouin called it *bezzaimkowość* ‘pronounlessness’. This can be related with a parental strategy to attract the child’s attention to known lexemes. In the situation when not all words in an utterance are familiar it is a good idea to make overexplicit the part that can be recognized. On the other hand, the consistent nominal reference facilitates the acquisition of both syntax and case morphology<sup>12</sup>.

A typical Polish child thus will start with referring to him/herself with his/her name and 3rd person verb:

**3/1** *Jaś śpiewa* ‘Jaś sings’ instead of (*ja*) *śpiewam* ‘I sing’,

analogically, when addressing a parent:

**3/2** *mama śpiewa* ‘Mummy sings’ instead of (*ty*) *śpiewasz* ‘you sing’.

This strategy is probably modelled on parental speech, as adults often use the same technique:

**3/1** *mama śpiewa* ‘Mummy sings’ instead of (*ja*) *śpiewam* ‘I sing’,

and

**3/2** *Jaś śpiewa* ‘Jaś sings’ instead of (*ty*) *śpiewasz* ‘I sing’<sup>13</sup>.

In my paper on the acquisition of 1st and 2nd person reference, written in Polish (Smoczyńska, 1992), I analyzed the reference to speaker and addressee in the longitudinal data of five Polish children, as well as in the input they received. Table 2 shows the results concerning the shift from 3rd to 1st person reference in four children<sup>14</sup>.

If we take 90% as the criterion of the use of a form, three phases can be distinguished in the data of children studied:

1. A first phase where 3/1 forms dominate. It covers the period of several months following the onset of self-reference and is most clearly documented with Basia (1;7-1;11), Inka (1;7-1;10) and Kasia (1;6-1;10).

2. A transition phase where the two forms compete. With the three girls<sup>15</sup> it follows the first phase and lasts from about two months (Basia) to about half a year (Kasia). With Jaś, the competition phase starts from the onset of self-reference and covers almost the entire early data (1;9-2;2).

3. An eventual victory of 1st person reference which marks the beginning of acquisition of the standard way of referring to self. The mastery of 1st person reference takes place at

<sup>12</sup> Polish, like Latin, has seven cases in two numbers, and at least three gender-related paradigms.

<sup>13</sup> Note that the personal pronouns *ja*, *ty* are facultative, since the verb ending unambiguously marks the person.

<sup>14</sup> The data collection for the fifth child, Michał, started at 2;0 only and therefore the early stages of his speech development were not covered.

<sup>15</sup> With Inka, a preliminary phase can be found at 1;5-1;6 when both 1.sg. and 3.sg. forms are used in self-reference, but one should be aware of a very low number of occurrences at this early stage (12 at 1;5 and 9 at 1;6).



2;2 with Basia, at 2;3 with Jaś and Inka, and most probably at 2;4 with Kasia (unfortunately we lack the data for 2;4 and 2;5)<sup>16</sup>.

Table 2. Self-reference in four Polish children, verb (and subject) forms. The ratio of 3<sup>rd</sup> person reference to self (3/1) vs. 1<sup>st</sup> person reference (1/1). Based on Smoczyńska (1992), Table 1, p. 210.

Age	Basia			Jaś			Inka			Kasia		
	3/1 %	1/1 %	N	3/1 %	1/1 %	N	3/1 %	1/1 %	N	3/1 %	1/1 %	N
1;5							25,0	75,0	12			
1;6							44,4	55,6	9	95,2	4,8	42
1;7	100,0	0,0	3				82,9	17,1	35	89,4	10,6	113
1;8	65,0	35,0	20				93,3	6,7	75	93,7	6,3	191
1;9	88,2	11,8	34	47,7	52,3	44	97,4	2,6	117	90,2	9,8	306
1;10	92,5	7,5	67	72,2	27,8	79	82,6	17,4	121	79,1	20,9	273
1;11	84,7	15,3	59	40,3	59,7	72	72,9	27,1	129	60,1	39,9	168
2;0	69,1	30,9	68	40,7	59,3	135	74,2	25,8	62	46,8	53,2	111
2;1	46,2	53,8	39	29,8	70,2	124	53,1	46,9	81	36,7	63,3	128
2;2	4,8	95,2	63	18,8	81,2	138	26,1	73,9	115	13,3	86,7	105
2;3	2,6	97,4	39	4,5	95,5	111	1,7	98,3	174	12,9	87,1	93
2;4	1,0	99,0	97	5,3	94,7	132	4,1	95,9	146	no data available		
2;5	2,0	98,0	51	5,8	94,2	120	5,5	94,5	163	no data available		
2;6	0,0	100,0	64	0,7	99,3	143	1,1	98,9	179	2,0	98,0	149
2;7	2,0	98,0	51	0,5	99,5	207	0,0	100,0	148	2,1	97,9	142
2;8	5,3	94,7	57	3,3	96,7	215	1,5	98,5	68	0,0	100,0	215
2;9	2,8	97,2	36	1,7	98,3	233	0,7	99,3	153	10,2	89,8	442
2;10	0,0	100,0	47	2,4	97,6	245	0,0	100,0	58	7,1	92,9	266
2;11	0,0	100,0	55	0,0	100,0	127	3,1	96,9	161	9,4	90,6	286

In addition to the phenomena documented in Table 2, it should be noted that there is an accompanying process of referring to self by one's name in contexts other than that of subject. Thus the children used their name in a particular case form instead of a personal or possessive pronoun. For instance, accusative *Kasię* instead of *mnie* 'me.ACC', dative *Jasiowi* instead of *mi* 'me.DAT', genitive *Jasia* instead of *mnie* 'me.GEN', instrumental *Inką* instead of *mną* 'me.INS', locative *o Jasiu* instead of *o mnie* 'about me.LOC', and in possessive contexts genitive *Kasi* instead of possessive *mój – moja – moje* 'my'. With some children (Basia, Inka, Jaś) only 3/1 forms are used in the initial phase; with Kasia there is a competition of nominal and pronominal reference. In all the children the pronominal reference eventually wins, this event usually taking place one or two months after the victory of 1/1 subject-verb reference.

The development shown by the children studied illustrate the **typical route** Polish children take to master the person distinctions insofar as reference to the speaker is concerned. It does not mean, however, that there are no other possible routes. I have data on other, less typical, developments, such as:

<sup>16</sup> For Michał, the fifth child studied, the ratio of 1/1 form of self-reference was 78,3% at 2;0, 88,2% at 2;1, 93,9% at 2;2, and 99-100% thereafter. This means that he had mastered the 1st person self-reference at 2;2.

- using 1st person reference very early on,
- using the 1st person pronoun *ja* ‘I’ with third person verb forms,
- using the 2nd person pronoun *ty* ‘you’ with third person verb forms.

In these cases the personal pronouns function as equivalents of the child’s name<sup>17</sup>. In view of these less typical cases, I can only state that the 3/1 → 1/1 pattern of development is the **most typical** one among Polish children.

Another phenomenon worth reporting here was the tendency children showed to shorten their own name when used as subject in self-referring utterances. This is what Kasia did in her 3/1 phase. Since her name [kaśa] was too long to be used in a pronoun-like way, she shortened it to [kaa] (Smoczyńska, 1992, p. 211)<sup>18</sup>.

### Acquisition of 1st person verb forms

Once the child has started to use 1.sg forms, two problems can arise as far as the morphology of the 1.sg. forms is concerned. One of them has to do with nonpast (present and future) forms; the other with past forms (and those based on past forms). In order to discuss these problems it is necessary to present at least a sketchy description of Polish person-marking verb morphology.

Verbal morphology in Polish is rather difficult to learn, but this is not due to conjugation endings, but to complex rules of stem alternations that we will not discuss here. As far as sets of endings are concerned, three conjugations can be singled out<sup>19</sup>. The distinction is based on the stem vowel, which is also the final vowel (and quasi-ending) of the 3rd person non-past forms, thus:

CONJUGATION I <i>pisze</i> ‘(s/he) writes’	CONJUGATION II <i>lubi</i> ‘(s/he) likes’	CONJUGATION III <i>śpiewa</i> ‘(s/he) sings’
--	---	--

The sets of endings for particular person and number forms are usually the same across paradigms. This can be seen in the following tables presenting nonpast (i.e., present and perfective future) forms:

NONPAST TENSE FORMS			
SG.1	pisze-ę	lubi-ę	śpiewa-m
SG.2	pisze-sz	lubi-sz	śpiewa-sz
SG.3	pisze-∅	lubi-∅	śpiewa-∅
PL.1	pisze-my	lubi-my	śpiewa-my
PL.2	pisze-cie	lubi-cie	śpiewa-cie
PL.3	pisze-ą	lubi-ą	śpiewa-ją

<sup>17</sup> Recently, when conducting the research with the Polish version of the MacArthur CDI, I found a 2;6 year-old who according to her parents made the most classic pronoun reversal I have heard of among Polish children: consistent self-reference with *ty* + 2.sg. forms.

<sup>18</sup> Sławuś youngest sister, Mania, did the same thing. Her name *Mania* got shortened to *Man* or *Ma*.

<sup>19</sup> With a number of subclasses having to do with stem alternations, which we can ignore in the present context.

It can be seen that *-sz* [š] is strongly associated with 2.sg.,  $-\emptyset$  with 3.sg., *-my* with 1.pl., *-cie* with 2.pl., and *-ą* with 3.pl. As for the 1.sg., the situation is less clear: in the 3rd conjugation the ending is *-m*, whereas in the 1st and 2nd conjugation the ending is *-ę* [ɛ̃], cf. *pisz-ę* and *lubi-ę*<sup>20</sup>. If we look at the set of person endings of past tense forms (on p. 13, below) we see that *-m* is associated with 1.sg., *-ś* with 2.sg.,  $-\emptyset$  with 3.sg. and 3.pl., *-śmy* with 1.pl. and, *-ście* with 2.pl. It is thus obvious that there are systematic correspondences between person endings in non-past and past paradigms. In view of these correspondences, *-m* seems to be a more appropriate ending of non-past 1.sg. forms than *-ę* [ɛ̃]. In fact, the 1st and 2nd conjugation ending *-ę* [ɛ̃] seems to be an exception rather than the expected regular form.

This is also how many Polish children feel about it. In my chapter on the acquisition of Polish (Smoczyńska, 1985, p. 631-632), I mentioned some children who correct this irregularity of the Polish conjugation system and overregularize the *-m* ending. They can do it in two ways: either they add the *-m* ending to the third person form [=stem], which results in:

SG.1 \**pisze-m* \**lubi-m* *śpiewa-m*

or they add *-m* to the correct 1.sg. form, which results in:

SG.1 \**pisz-e-m* \**lubi-e-m* *śpiewa-m*

The 1st conjugation form \**piszem* looks (and sounds) exactly the same in both cases, but if we examine the 2nd conjugation forms, we can discover what kind of rule the child has constructed. This can be seen more clearly, even within the 1st conjugation paradigm, in those cases that involve accompanying stem alternations in 1.sg. For instance, the standard forms of the verb *brać* ‘to take’ and *siedzieć* ‘to sit’ are:

	CONJUGATION I		CONJUGATION II	
SG.1	<i>bior-ę</i>	[b'ore]	<i>siedz-ę</i>	[šezɛ]
SG.2	<i>bierze-sz</i>	[b'ežeš]	<i>siedzi-sz</i>	[šeziš]
SG.3	<i>bierze-∅</i>	[b'eže]	<i>siedzi-∅</i>	[šezi]

If the child applies the revolutionary but in fact the most reasonable rule of adding *-m* to the stem, the resulting forms will be: *bierze-m* [b'ežem] and *siedzi-m* [šeziim]. However, if he or she chooses to make only a superficial, purely ‘cosmetic’ change of giving the form a ‘1.sg. look’ by adding [m], the resulting forms are *bior-e-m* [b'orem] and *siedz-e-m* [šezem], respectively, in which the e : o and r : ž, and z : ź stem alternations show that [m] was added to the 1.sg. form. Among the seven children studied, some – like Jaś – applied the deep, revolutionary revision of the paradigm<sup>21</sup>. Other children applied the cosmetic

<sup>20</sup> The final *-ę* [ɛ̃] is usually pronounced without nasality as [e], hence: [piše] and [lub'e], which results in neutralization of the distinction of 1st and 3rd person singular in 1st conjugation: *piszę* 1.sg. becomes identical to *pisze* 3.sg..

solution only. Still other children did not show any problems with acquisition of irregular 1.sg. forms. In those who did show problems, the regularized forms continued to occur for some time and eventually had to surrender to the pressure of standard language.

Let us turn now to the past tense paradigms. As we said, the endings are quite regular there: in fact, the set of endings is the same across all the conjugations. The complication consists in obligatory gender marking<sup>22</sup> and in a peculiar structure of the forms.

PAST TENSE FORMS: SG. FEMININE / PL. NONVIRILE

SG.1	<i>pisa-l-a-m</i>	<i>lubi-l-a-m</i>	<i>śpiewa-l-a-m</i>
SG.2	<i>pisa-l-a-ś</i>	<i>lubi-l-a-ś</i>	<i>śpiewa-l-a-ś</i>
SG.3	<i>pisa-l-a-Ø</i>	<i>lubi-l-a-Ø</i>	<i>śpiewa-l-a-Ø</i>
PL.1	<i>pisa-ly-śmy</i>	<i>lubi-ly-śmy</i>	<i>śpiewa-ly-śmy</i>
PL.2	<i>pisa-ly-ście</i>	<i>lubi-ly-ście</i>	<i>śpiewa-ly-ście</i>
PL.3	<i>pisa-ly-Ø</i>	<i>lubi-ly-Ø</i>	<i>śpiewa-ly-Ø</i>

PAST TENSE FORMS: SG. MASCULINE / PL. VIRILE

SG.1	<i>pisa-l-Ø-(e)m</i>	<i>lubi-l-Ø-(e)m</i>	<i>śpiewa-l-Ø-(e)m</i>
SG.2	<i>pisa-l-Ø-(e)ś</i>	<i>lubi-l-Ø-(e)ś</i>	<i>śpiewa-l-Ø-(e)ś</i>
SG.3	<i>pisa-l-Ø-Ø</i>	<i>lubi-l-Ø-Ø</i>	<i>śpiewa-l-Ø-Ø</i>
PL.1	<i>pisa-li-śmy</i>	<i>lubi-li-śmy</i>	<i>śpiewa-li-śmy</i>
PL.2	<i>pisa-li-ście</i>	<i>lubi-li-ście</i>	<i>śpiewa-li-ście</i>
PL.3	<i>pisa-li-Ø</i>	<i>lubi-li-Ø</i>	<i>śpiewa-li-Ø</i>

Jan Tokarski (1973) pointed to the agglutinative-like character of the rule forming the past-tense forms. The rule is pretty transparent, though quite complex. But its agglutinative-like character seems out of place in a fusional language like Polish. A form such as *śpiewa-l-a-m* '(I) sang f.' consists in four morphemes: the lexical stem *śpiewa-*, and three grammatical morphemes: the past tense marker *-l*, the feminine gender marker *-a* and the 1.sg. person marker *-m*. It is only the last one that conflates two markings, namely, that of person and number. All other distinctions get separate marking, exactly like in agglutinative languages<sup>23</sup>.

<sup>21</sup>This is, by the way, what has happened, historically, in some other Slavic languages. By the way, Baudouin de Courtenay qualified this change as a reasonable thing: in his words it was a 'sober' (trzeźwy) solution (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1922, reprinted in 1984, p. 126-129). He also noticed that children do a similar thing and said they are right to do so, when they remake other conjugations forms on the model of 3. conjugation: *śpiewa-m*, *śpiewa-sz*, *śpiewa-Ø* (*idem*, p. 136).

<sup>22</sup>For simplicity's sake, I did not include the neuter gender paradigm. However, due to pragmatic reasons, the neuter paradigm is in fact defective: only 3rd person forms are used, since neuter referents cannot function as speakers nor as addressees. 1st and 2nd person forms, *pisał-o-m*, *pisał-o-ś*, are only potential in Polish.

<sup>23</sup>This is due to the fact that past tense forms were formed by agglutination of a formerly analytical form, which consisted of past participle *pisał* m. / *pisał-a* f. and auxiliary *jeśm*. That these synthesis is not yet complete can be shown by the ability of personal endings (clitics) to move in the direction of the beginning of utterances, usually to be placed after the first word.

Past tense forms (and forms based on them, such as the conditional and one version of the future imperfective), are the only finite forms that get gender marking. The distinctions are: masculine vs. feminine vs. neuter in singular and virile (+masculine, +human, ie. men) vs. non-virile (ie. anything **not being** men<sup>24</sup>) in plural. Also the gender marking is due to the non-finite, participial component of the past tense. The gender markers in singular are: -Ø for masculine, -a for feminine and -o for neuter, e.g. *pisal*, *pisala*, *pisalo*. As I said, first and second person forms have only masculine and feminine versions: *pisalem* m. vs *pisalam* f., *pisales* m. vs *pisalas* f. It should be noted that e, which appears in masculine forms is purely phonetic. The actual gender marker for masculine is -Ø, as can be seen in 3.sg. form (*pisal* = *pisal*-Ø and not *pisale* = *pisal*-e). In the above mentioned forms [e] gets inserted between *l* [w] and [m] or [ś] in order to facilitate pronunciation.

As it was shown, there are no irregularities in past tense forms, thus there are no real formal reasons to consider them difficult. Yet it has been found that boys sometimes start by using feminine 1.sg. past tense forms (Smoczyńska, 1985, p. 641-2)<sup>25</sup>. This is sometimes accompanied by the exclusive use of masculine second person forms, also when addressing female persons (cf. Rzętkowska, 1909; Brenstern-Pfanhauser, 1930).

Since the children make this error long after having acquired gender distinctions, both in noun (where the distinction is crucial for declensional pattern selection) and in verb agreement, it seems that the error has nothing to do with gender as such. It rather concerns pragmatic aspects of person switching in communication. In general, children – unless they are brought up by a (single?) father or have older male siblings – get much more input from women, which means that they hear 1.sg. feminine forms much more frequently than 1.sg. masculine forms. Whereas this works very well for girls who can just imitate the way their mother uses self-reference forms, boys do not get the appropriate model for their use of 1sg. forms. And the data show they initially do not make the necessary gender correction but directly imitate the form used by their female caretakers. Even the transparency of the past tense form structure is not sufficient to prevent male children from making this error.

Table 3 shows this phenomenon in two children studied: Michał and Jaś. The errors listed here and the obligatory context specified for them include not only past tense 1.sg forms, but also those of conditional mood (*pisalbym*) and of imperfective future tense form (*będę pisał*), which also require gender marking, as they are all based on the so-called ł-participle form.

Whereas with Jaś, the feminine self reference forms were marginal (the initial 100% error refers to the very first **four** occurrences of 1.sg. past forms only), Michał uses feminine forms in 60-78% of contexts from 2;0 to the end of 2;3. With Michał, the process went further. In a few cases he even ‘corrected’ the gender of adjectival predicates referring to himself, e.g. *Michał jest głodna* ‘M is hungry f.’ (instead of *głodny* ‘hungry m.’) or *Jestem głodna* ‘(I) am hungry f.’. These errors, enumerated under the heading ‘other fem. forms’, were restricted to self-reference. Michał **never** made gender agreement errors with other referents, and there is ample evidence that the problem was not related to grammatical gender as such.

<sup>24</sup> The virile/non-virile distinction seems to be a splendid candidate as prospective target for Polish feminists, once they decide to make Polish language less sexist.

<sup>25</sup> The same phenomenon was found by Gvozdev (1949) in his Russian-speaking son, Zhenya, until the age of 3.

Table 3. Feminine self-reference in 1.sg. past tense-based forms in Michał and Jaś' speech

Age	MICHAŁ				JAŚ		
	Fem.1.sg forms	1.sg contexts	Fem.1.sg %	Other fem. forms	Fem.1.sg forms	1.sg contexts	Fem.1.sg %
1;10		no data available			4	4	100.0
1;11		no data available			2	12	16.7
2;0	21	29	72.4	4	2	33	6.1
2;1	42	54	77.8	3	0	37	0.0
2;2	22	36	61.1	3	3	49	6.1
2;3	23	34	67.6	3	1	54	1.9
2;4	1	17	5.9	1	0	39	0.0
2;5	0	55	0.0	2	1	42	2.4
2;6	0	35	0.0	0	0	48	0.0

Of course, this kind of error gets easily (and eagerly) corrected by parents, as they are anxious to rectify what they consider to be a potentially wrong gender identification in their child. As can be seen, these problems, which in fact are definitely more linguistic than psychological, get settled typically at the same time when standard use of the first person form is acquired.

This is not necessarily the case with the *-m* marking overgeneralization in non-past forms, which can continue for quite a long time, cf. Table 4.

Table 4. Jaś's nonpast 1.sg *-m* overregularization in 1st and 2nd conjugation verbs (all kinds of *-m* forms together)

Age	1;7	1;8	1;9	1;10	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5	2;6	2;7	2;8	2;9	2;10	2;11	
overreg. -m	1				6	18	30	27	15	34	30	41	41	47	67	38	27	
contexts	3	2	13	4	11	26	37	43	38	46	41	66	73	71	91	71	59	
% overreg.	33.3				54.5	69.2	81.1	62.8	39.5	73.9	73.2	62.1	56.2	66.2	73.6	53.5	45.8	
Age	3;0	3;1	3;2	3;3	3;4	3;5	3;6	3;7	3;8	3;9	3;10	3;11	4;0	4;1	4;2	4;3	4;4	4;5
overreg. -m	21	23	40	43	65	63	34	17	23	6	3	3	2	4				1
contexts	46	46	74	84	111	102	107	63	103	53	46	52	59	42	49	16	29	32
% overreg.	45.7	50	54.1	51.2	58.6	61.8	31.8	27	22.3	11.3	6.5	5.8	3.4	9.5				3.4

Having presented the intricacies of the Polish person-marking system and having illustrated the typical development of Polish children with Szuman diary data, I can now turn to the description of the idiosyncratic development of self-reference forms in Jan Baudouin de Courtney's son.

### Self-reference forms in Sławuś' speech

The most striking fact about Sławuś' self-reference seems to be rather anecdotal in nature and has more to do with the historical and social conditions of life in a Polish family at the end of the 19th century than with important psycholinguistic issues. Sławuś used his name for self-reference yet this was not his first name (Sławuś) but the name of his

social role: the now obsolete word *panicz* which means ‘young master’. The word itself is derived from *pan* ‘master, mister’, with the suffix *-icz*, meaning ‘the son of’. The suffix can still be seen in many Polish family names, and the lexeme *pan* was (and still is) currently used to refer to men, both in address and as reference form. In present day Polish, when addressing a man or pointing at him, one would use the word *pan* ‘mister’ rather than *mężczyzna* ‘man (male)’ or *człowiek* ‘man (human being)’. Similarly, the word *pani* ‘Mrs., lady’ would be used instead of *kobieta* ‘woman’.

As Sławuś was the first (and only) boy in the family, his role of ‘young master’ (or master’s son) was unambiguous. The word *panicz* was sometimes, but by no means exclusively, used by his nanny Józia to talk **about** him, and less frequently (and only in the very earliest period) to talk **to** him. Most of the time Józia addressed him with 2.sg. forms and used his first name. Later on, as he kept talking about himself as *panicz* she (and some other family members) sometimes jokingly adopted this way of referring to him.

The earliest occurrence of self-reference with Sławuś was recorded at the age of 1;4. Utterances with *panicz* as subject became very frequent in the next month (136 instances). From the age of 1;11 Baudouin noted that the form *panicz* underwent abbreviation. Depending on the context (mostly the following word) it became reduced to one of the following forms:

- (1) *pańć, pańi,*
- (2) *pan, pań, pam, pa, pa, a, am, an, ań, a.*

It seems that this process eventually produced a shortened version of *panicz*, namely *pan*, identical with the base noun *pan* ‘man, Mister, master’. In fact the forms listed in (2) should rather be considered as phonetic realizations of the target form *pan* than of *panicz*. It is worth noting that the full range of these variants was recorded mainly from 1;11 to the end of 2;1. From 2;2 on Sławuś used either the long form *panicz* [paniɛ] or the short form *pan* [pan], with relatively little phonetic variation. It seems that these both lexemes became well established by then.

It should also be said that these two alternating forms, long and short, were found in subject position only. Whenever reference to self was made in another argument role, the oblique case forms of the full *panicz* were used: accusative *panicza* instead of *mnie* ‘me. ACC’, dative *paniczowi* instead of *mi* ‘me.DAT’, instrumental *paniczem* instead of *mną* ‘me.INS’, and genitive *panicza* instead of either genitive *mnie* or possessive *mój* ‘my’.

Since the word *pan* means ‘master, man’, the fact that the little boy used it to refer to himself was often commented upon, or laughed at, e.g. he would be asked *Pan? Jaki pan?* ‘Man? Which man?’ to which he would answer: *Panicz*. These interactions probably made Sławuś either use the full form *panicz* (as unequivocal and more appropriate than *pan*), or else avoid expressing the subject at all. At some periods Sławuś preferred to refer to himself with subjectless sentences including a third person verb.

The most striking thing, however, is that this way of referring to himself was used up to the end of 4;4. In this period the first person verb forms and the first person pronoun *ja* – as well as oblique forms *mnie, mi* or the possessive *mój* – did in fact marginally appear but their use was extremely rare and unsystematic. They appeared mostly as direct imitations or in rote learned nursery rhymes. In table 5 frequency data are given illustrating the distribution of person forms in subject position for self-reference in the period of 1;11 to 3;4, i.e. the period in which the data were collected in a relatively nonselective way (cf. Table 1, above).

Table 5. Sławuś' reference to self in subject position from 1;11 to 3;4

Age	1;11	2;0	2;1	2;2	2;3	2;4	2;5	2;6	2;7	2;8	2;9	2;10	2;11	3;0	3;1	3;2	3;3	3;4
panicz + 3.sg	73	80	77	49	36	24	29	37	22	17	7	24	14	7	33	31	33	45
pan + 3.sg	26	80	121	69	89	46	29	32	44	60	33	15	46	29	81	42	26	11
Ø + 3.sg	50	132	80	43	34	21	37	27	5	13	2			5	1	1		
1.sg	5	13	5	4	4		3	1						3	4	6	2	4
TOTAL	154	305	283	165	163	91	98	97	71	90	42	39	60	44	119	80	61	60
3/1 %	96.8	95.7	98.2	97.9	97.5	100	96.9	99	100	100	100	100	100	93.2	96.6	92.5	96.7	93.3

One can assume that Sławuś did not systematically use first person forms in self-reference until the age of 4;5. At 4;5 first person forms made a massive appearance, as can be seen in Table 6. Please bear in mind that the data were very selective at this time.

Table 6. Sławuś' reference to self subject position from 3;10 to 5;2

Age	3;10	3;11	4;0	4;1	4;2	4;3	4;4	4;5	4;6	4;7-5;2
panicz + 3.sg	4	2		4	12	6	18	5		
pan + 3.sg	12	5	15	26	15	21	15	9		
Ø + 3.sg	31	23	2	8	11	4	7	38		4
1.sg	3			2		1		143	156	78
TOTAL	50	30	17	40	38	32	40	195	156	82
3/1 %	94	100	100	95	100	96.9	100	26.7	0	4.9

This means that the boy mastered the first person reference more than two years later than the other Polish children studied. Two years is a tremendous span of time in language acquisition. Therefore one could expect him to have collected enough input information over these additional two years to acquire 1st person forms without problems.

Yet it appears that Sławuś started to make exactly the same errors at age 4;5-4;6 that other Polish children made (or started to make) about the age of 2. Most of his past tense forms were in fact feminine, as illustrated in Table 7. It took him 2 months to learn that he should refer to himself with masculine forms. (However, one should take into account a special circumstance that speaks in his favor. His job was not easy with the input he received, as his mother, his nanny, other female servants and his two older sisters all provided him with an inappropriate model of 1.sg. forms, the only right model being provided by his father).

Table 7. Sławuś' non-past first person forms from 4;5 to 5;2

PAST	Fem. 1.sg.	Masc. 1.sg.	Total contexts	Fem. 1.sg. %
4;5	87	10	97	89.7
4;6	67	42	109	61.5
4;7-5;2	8	35	43	18.6



Table 8. Sławuś' non-past person forms from 4;5 to 5;2

NONPAST	Overgener. <i>-m</i>	Correct <i>-ę</i>	Total contexts	Overgener. <i>-m</i> %
4;5	33	7	40	82.5
4;6	33	5	38	86.8
4;7 - 5;2	9	12	21	42.9

As for non-past tense forms, he seemed to have problems with acquiring the *-ę* ending of the 1st and 2nd conjugation verbs, which tended to be supplied with the additional, 'cosmetic' *m*.

Similarly, as in typical development, this problem is not easily solved by the child. The overgeneralized additional ending *-m* tends to be used in more than 80% of contexts at 4;5 and 4;6. Later, it does not seem to disappear totally, as the 9 instances noted represent ca. 43% of all contexts. However, the paucity of the data collected at that period, and an obvious tendency of the observer to an error-biased selectivity, make me reluctant to state anything definite as to how this curious story eventually ended up.

## Conclusion

It is often assumed that exposure to adequate input for a protracted period is beneficial for the acquisition of the underlying rules (Marcus et al., 1992). Indeed it is, **provided the subject pays attention to it**, in the sense of 'listening for grammatical cues' that Elisabeth Bates (Bates et al., 1997) has proposed, as different from 'listening for comprehension only'. The case of Sławuś shows that what we thought to be his **input** was not his **uptake**, and that in spite of the generally advanced level of his language development at the age of 4, he totally ignored the highly relevant linguistic input he needed so much. It is a puzzling result.

The other conclusion is that the data laboriously collected by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, day by day over 15 years, now a hundred years later have real face value. Their significance does not seem to be historical only, as many people had thought. On the contrary, these data, collected with admirable skill and accuracy, can contribute to current discussions on language acquisition. Especially valuable are the richest data of the periods when the observation was least selective. They will be available for computer-aided analyses, once the transcripts are edited and checked.

But we can also use these data **not in spite of the fact they are old, but precisely because they are old**, namely, to study the relationship between child language and language change. It is the problem that the great linguist foresaw himself. He expressed his views in the following way:

The most far reaching, most radical changes take place at any given time in the language of the children of a given tribe or nation. [...] It is not until later that the children gradually regress to the state of the language of adults, but a certain part of the changes effected in their language may still remain in it and, most importantly, the tendencies towards those changes, even though they usually

arise spontaneously with the following generation, pass into it through heredity as well. Accumulating and increasing in power in successive generations, the changes are finally strong enough to become ingrained in the language. (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1894b, reprinted in 1990, p. 264f. Citation translated by A. Adamska-Sałaciak, 1996, p. 106).

These views can now be tested against his own data. And for this kind of study, the value of the data will continue to grow, as centuries go by...

*Written in Cracow, at the very end of Second Millenium: December 2000*

## References

- Adamska-Sałaciak, A. (1996). *Language change in the works of Kruszewski, Baudouin de Courtenay and Rozwadowski*. Poznań: Motivex.
- Bates, E., Thal, D., Trauner, D., Fenson, J., Aram, D., Eisele, J., & Nass, R. (1997). From first words to grammar in children with focal brain injury. In D. Thal & J. Reilly (Eds.), *Special issue on origins of communication disorders. Developmental Neuropsychology*, 13, 3, 275-343.
- Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1894). Próba teorii alternacji fonetycznych [An attempt at a theory of phonetic alternations]. *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności, Wydział Filologiczny*, 2, 5, 219-364. Reprinted in: Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1990). *Dzieła wybrane* [Selected works]. Vol. 4 (pp. 140-278). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1922). *Zarys historii języka polskiego* [A sketch of history of Polish language]. Warszawa: Polska Składnica Pomocy Szkolnych. Reprinted in: Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1984). *O języku polskim. Wybór prac* [On Polish language. Selected works] (pp. 19-138), ed. by J. Basara, M. Szymczak. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1974). *Spostrzeżenia nad językiem dziecka* [Observations on child language]. Selected and edited by M. Chmura-Klekotowa. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Brenstern-Pfhanuser, S. (1930). Rozwój mowy dziecka [The development of child speech]. *Prace Filologiczne* (Warszawa), 15, 273-356.
- Chmura M. (1966). Badania J. Baudouina de Courtenay nad mową dzieci. [J. Baudouin de Courtenay's studies on children's speech]. *Prace Filologiczne* (Warszawa), 19, 23-28.
- Chmura-Klekotowa, M. (1970). Odbicie tendencji słowotwórczych języka polskiego w neologizmach dzieci [Reflection of derivational trends of the Polish language in children's neologisms]. *Prace Filologiczne* (Warszawa), 20, 153-159.
- Chmura-Klekotowa, M. (1971). Neologizmy słowotwórcze w mowie dzieci [Derivational neologisms in children's speech]. *Prace Filologiczne* (Warszawa), 21, 99-235.
- Chmura-Klekotowa, M. (1972). Slovoobrazovatel'nye neologismi v detskoj rechi na materialax polskogo i russkogo yazika [Derivational neologisms in children's speech from material in Polish and Russian]. In K. Ohnesorg (Ed.), *Colloquium paedolinguisticum* (pp. 83-110). The Hague: Mouton.
- Chmura-Klekotowa, M. (1974). Wstęp [Introduction]. In J. Baudouin de Courtenay (1974). *Spostrzeżenia nad językiem dziecka* [Observations on child language] (pp. 5-9). Wrocław: Ossolineum
- Clark, E.V. (1993). *The lexicon in acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gvozdev, A.N. (1949). *Formirovanie u rebenka grammaticheskogo stroja russkogo jazyka* [Formation of the grammatical system of Russian language in children]. Vol. 1-2. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Pedagogicheskich Nauk RSFSR.
- MacWhinney, B. (1995). *The CHILDES Project: Tools for analyzing talk*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- MacWhinney, B. i Snow, C.E. (1990). The Child Language Data Exchange system: An update. *Journal of Child Language*, 17, 457-472.
- Małachowska E. (1965). Profesor Jan Baudouin de Courtenay jako badacz rozwoju języka dziecka [Professor Jan Baudouin de Courtenay as a student of child language development]. *Prace Filologiczne* (Warszawa), 18, 371-376.
- Małachowska E. (1973a). Jan Baudouin de Courtenay w życiu prywatnym: wspomnienia o moim ojcu, I [Jan Baudouin de Courtenay in private. Recollections on my father. Part I]. *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, 3, 91-104.
- Małachowska E. (1973b). Jan Baudouin de Courtenay w życiu prywatnym, II [Jan Baudouin de Courtenay in private. Part II]. *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, 5, 119-131.
- Marcus, G.F., Pinker, S., Ullman, M., Hollander, M., Rosen, T.J. & Xu, F. (1992). Overregularization in language acquisition. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 57, 4, serial no. 228.
- Rzętkowska, J. (1909). *Przyczynek do badań nad rozwojem mowy dziecka, II* [Contribution to studies of the development of child speech. Part II]. Warszawa.
- Smoczyńska, M. (1985). The acquisition of Polish. In: D.I. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition. Vol. 1: The data* (pp. 595-686). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smoczyńska, M. (1992). Kategoria osoby w języku dziecka: Odniesienie do nadawcy i odbiorcy [The category of person in child language: Reference to self and to the addressee]. In B. Bokus & M. Haman (Eds.), *Z badań nad kompetencją komunikacyjną dzieci* (pp. 203-228). Warszawa: Energeia.
- Smoczyńska, M. (1997). Przyswajanie systemu gramatycznego języka przez dziecko [Acquisition of the grammatical system of language by children]. In: H. Mierzejewska & M. Przybysz-Piwkowska (Eds.), *Rozwój poznawczy i językowy dzieci z trudnościami w komunikacji werbalnej. Diagnozowanie i postępowanie usprawniające* (pp. 42-53). Warszawa: DiG.
- Smoczyńska, M. (1998). Krakowskie dane językowe dzieci w systemie CHILDES. In M. Smoczyńska (Ed.), *Studia z psychologii rozwojowej i psycholingwistyki. Tom poświęcony pamięci Marii Przetacznik-Gierowskiej* (pp. 283-296). Kraków: Universitas.
- Smoczyńska, M. (in press). Studying Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's Polish child language data 100 years later. In R.B. Finazzi & P. Tornaghi (Eds.), *Cinquant'anni di ricerche linguistiche: problemi, risultati e prospettive, per il terzo millennio. Atti del IX Convegno Internazionale di Linguisti, (Milano, 8-9-10 ottobre 1998)*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Tokarski, J. (1973). *Fleksja polska* [Polish flexion]. Warszawa: PWN.