

Перспективи подальших досліджень. Дослідження риторичних фігур у мовленні сучасних мас-медіа відкриває перспективи в поглибленні знань про тексти різного функційного призначення. З'ясування взаємодії прагматичних функцій інформаційного тексту важливе для розуміння особливостей його продукування та сприймання.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов / Ольга Сергеевна Ахманова. – [4-е изд., стереотип.] – М.: КомКнига, 2007. – 576 с.
2. Брандес М.П. Стилистика текста. Теоретический курс: [учебник] / Маргарита Петровна Брандес. – [3-е изд., перераб. и доп.] – М.: Прогресс-Традиция; ИНФРА-М, 2004. – 416 с.
3. Гальперин И.Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка / Илья Романович Гальперин. – М. : Изд-во лит. на иностр. языках, 1958. – 459 с. – (Библиотека филолога).
4. Ключев Е.В. Риторика (Инвенция. Диспозиция. Элокуция) : уч. пособие [для вузов] / Евгений Васильевич Ключев. – М. : ПРИОР, 2001. – 272 с.
5. Кузнец М.Д. Стилистика английского языка: пособие [для студентов педагог. ин-тов] / М.Д. Кузнец, Ю.М. Скребнев; под ред. Н.Н. Амосовой. – Ленинград: Госуд. учебно-педагог. из-во Мин-ва Просвещения РСФСР, Ленинградское отделение, 1960. – 175 с.
6. Мелкумова Т.В. Комунікативно-прагматичні функції виражальних засобів синтаксису (на матеріалі інформаційних та публіцистичних текстів): дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01 / Тетяна Володимирівна Мелкумова. – Запоріжжя, 2011. – 237 с.
7. Пономарів О.Д. Стилїстика сучасної української мови : підручник [для студентів гуманітарних спеціальностей вищих закладів освіти] / Олександр Данилович Пономарів. – [3-тє вид., перероб. і доповн.]. – Тернопіль: Навчальна книга – Богдан, 2000. – 248 с.
8. Тошович Б. Экспрессивный синтаксис глагола русского и сербского / хорватского языков / Бранко Тошович. – М.: Языки славянских культур, 2006. – 560 с.

УДК 373.2.016:81-053.4

LANGUAGE SEPARATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD: ONE SYSTEM OR TWO?

Natalia Ringblom
(*Stockholm, Sweden*)

В статті обговорюється проблема диференціації дитиною мовних систем у білінгвальному середовищі.

Ключові слова: мова, мовна система, диференціація, мовне оточення,

мотивація дитини, асоціативні слова, імітація, повторення, переклад.

В статье обсуждается вопрос дифференциации ребенком языковых систем в билингвальной среде.

Ключевые слова: *язык, языковая система, дифференциация, языковая среда, мотивация ребенка, ассоциативные слова, имитация, повторение, перевод.*

The article discusses the problem of differentiation by a child the two language systems in a bilingual environment.

Key words: *language, language system, differentiation, linguistic environment, child's motivation, associative words, imitation, repetition, translation, interpretation.*

Introduction. There are two points of disagreement about the way simultaneous bilingual children acquire their two languages: (a) whether they are able to separate them from the onset of acquisition or (b) whether a one-language phase precedes the acquisition of both languages as separate systems. Recently, however, the focus has shifted towards looking at the nature of interaction between the languages and the question whether the one/two-system discussion is a relevant issue at all has been asked (Genesee 2003). Following Deuchar & Quay (2000), I would suggest looking at the process of differentiation, which basically automatically discards the two-system theory.

This article discusses how and when it occurs in the child's language. It will be argued that a simple association (between a word and a person), imitation and autonomous speech work together in the child's development until the two language systems are differentiated. However, the child's understanding that there are two languages in his/her linguistic environment does not mean that the two languages developed totally independently of each other. To date, the process of differentiation has not been given enough attention in the literature, so it is hoped that my material can make a helpful contribution to the debate.

The subject of the study is the author's daughter Julia, who was born and raised in Stockholm, Sweden, to a Russian mother and a Swedish father and is the third child in the family. Since birth, she has been addressed in either Russian or Swedish. The parents tried to follow the one – person – one – language strategy (Ronjat 1913). However, after the child entered a Swedish day care at the age of 2 year 7 months, she gradually became Swedish dominant since the amount of Swedish input she received was much greater than Russian. The mother was the primary source of the Russian language; yet, the Russian grandmother came and visited the family every year and used to stay for several months. Julia was also exposed to Russian during one month long visits to the Crimea. The data (80 audio and video tapes both in Swedish and Russian contexts, 6 diaries) were collected between the ages of 1 year 4 months and 5 years in different socio-linguistic settings and transcribed at regular intervals.

Aim of the study. To analyze from a scientific point of view the problem of language separation and demonstrate on the example of the author's daughter Julia at what age do children distinguish between the two languages in a bilingual environment.

Materials and methods. According to Deuchar & Quay (2000), there is no reason to argue that there is any system at all before the bilingual child has acquired translation equivalents¹ and can respond differently to his/her interlocutors. Lexical differentiation is often believed to take place before pragmatic differentiation (that is, using the appropriate language according to the interlocutor; in our case, using more Russian with the mother and more Swedish with the father). However, researchers do not always use measures of pragmatic differentiation that are independent of translation equivalents (see discussion in Nicoladis 1998). Nicoladis' subject showed evidence of pragmatic differentiation before lexical differentiation took place, which suggests that the child's ability of pragmatic differentiation may lead to the beginning of the creation of two lexicons.

Arnberg (1992) doubted that language mixing on different levels (lexical and grammatical) has different reasons. She believes that two mechanisms are involved in the process of language separation: one includes what is called the elementary mental function (see Vygotsky 1978) and the other the higher mental function. If the mother speaks Russian and the father Swedish, the child will learn to associate these languages with these contexts. Arnberg described a situation where the child switched to English upon seeing his mother's car near the kindergarten. Similar findings were characteristic of Julia and her siblings when they spoke Swedish to each other. Often they would switch to Russian when their mother entered the room. When the higher mental function is involved, it is not the situation, but the child that controls the situation. The stimulation comes from the individual him/herself. Thus, the child is conscious of what is going on around him/her. When the elementary mental function is involved, the child receives stimulation from the environment.

Applying Vygotsky's higher and elementary mental functioning to the bilingual child, Arnberg (1992:479) argued that a child is also conscious of the language presentation and is able to reflect on the languages and even control his/her language production. Already at the age of 2;3–2;5, Julia was able to consciously correct herself when the "wrong" language had been used. However, the process itself started before that age, and Julia – to be understood properly – applied various strategies available to her, both linguistic and paralinguistic ones. Julia learned to separate the two languages gradually, in the process of communication, according to the patterns and feedback signals she found in the input.

However, the child is not just a passive receiver of information; she also plays an active role in the process of separation as well. She learns to distinguish between the linguistic varieties by associating words with different people and by repeating them after her caregivers, both occasionally and on purpose, just as she repeated everything else (like the actions of the parent: putting her diaper in the washing machine when she saw her mother putting clothes there (1;6) or collecting the food

¹ Words denoting the same meaning but in a different language.

left on plates when she saw her father doing it).

Two kinds of strategies will thus be looked at in order to determine how the child learns to understand that she is dealing with two different linguistic varieties:

those that focus on the active role of the child and
those that focus on the active role of the adult.

At what age do children distinguish between the two languages? Already at the age of two months, infants are able to discern syllable-like stimuli better than non-syllable-like stimuli (Bertoncini et al. 1981). Young children are also said to be able to distinguish between two languages from very early age in their development (Nicoladis 1998; Genesee et al. 1996). As early as ten to fourteen months old, bilingual babies have shown that they can babble in different patterns with their English-speaking mother and French-speaking father (Maneva & Genesee 2002). However, this may be due to children adapting to the language of their interlocutor from an early age, not necessarily because they have developed two completely separate linguistic systems, as has often been claimed.

I believe that the child may be able to distinguish between different varieties from very early on, but only when they are spoken with native-like or natural proficiency. Since the form of the word is arbitrary, it is almost impossible for the child to know what word belongs to which language when pronunciation is almost the same. Julia's data from this period (1;7–1;8) are also full of examples where she seemed to use the right language with the right person; a general examination of this evidence may be enough to prove that the child could distinguish between the spheres of use of the two languages:

GRANDMA: ты хочешь бутерброд?
'Do you want [a] sandwich?'

JUL: нет!
'No!' (1;7)

Many forms were learned in a context and were thus always used correctly from the very beginning: упаль! 'fell down'. Julia was used to saying the Russian words пить ('drink') and дай ('give') even to her father, and he seemed to understand her and never protested or forced her to say dricka ('drink' in Sw) or ge den ('give it' in Sw) to him. Thus, it was not easy for Julia to understand which language went with which person since everyone seemed to understand everything.

However, in that period Julia started to become increasingly aware that there were two different linguistic varieties, and at 1;9, Julia's preschool teachers noted that she had stopped using Russian words like на 'take', нельзя 'not allowed', никак 'doesn't work', не могу 'I can't', пить 'to drink' etc. in a Swedish context (which she occasionally did before). Thus, by the age of 1;9 Julia was capable of carrying a conversation at least with Swedish speakers without using any Russian elements. However, having separated the languages does not mean that a child has stopped mixing them. On the contrary, (conscious or) real mixing begins with language separation. At home Julia would still occasionally use Russian words with her monolingual father and with her sisters as well as many Swedish words with her mother and Russian-speaking relatives and friends when they came to visit.

Sometimes Julia used Swedish when she talked to her mother even after the age of 1;9, perhaps to achieve a special pragmatic effect (to emphasize her point) or

simply because she had a unified system of negation elements for both languages. However, in the example below, it appears that the child had to use Swedish to make her mother understand that she did not want to take off her pants simply because she did not want to pee. This was a common strategy for Julia: to use all possible means available to her in order to be understood.

The importance of the child's motivation. Successful bilingual development means that the child has to learn both languages and use them in interaction with different people. Bilingual children must somehow learn to interpret bilingual input and use the appropriate language in the right context. Still, children have to be motivated to separate the languages; in other words, they have to need it in their life. When the child has no need for one of the languages, he/she will probably not be motivated to do use it and will instead have a preference for one over the other. If the mother understands when the child speaks Swedish to her, it will take much longer for language separation to occur, and even then the chances are rather limited that the child will actually speak the other language. At home her “monolingual” father also reacted to her Russian speech and understood it to the extent that it was possible. At 1;10–1;11, Julia would often say пить ‘drink’ (Rus) and дай ‘give’ (Rus) even to her father, and he understood her and never protested or forced the child to say dricka ‘drink’ (Sw) or ge den/det ‘give it to me’ (Sw). The first “real” need for Julia to speak Swedish was perhaps in kindergarten, where no one understood Russian.

Associating words with different people. When a child acquires a language, he/she tries to combine the world of things around him/her with the world of words (Cejtlin 1997:23). I would add that the child tries to combine the world of people with the names they use for the things around them. Just as the child discovers that different words can be used for the same object (e.g. Limon (the name of Julia’s bird), птичка ‘little bird’ (Rus), fågel ‘bird’ (Sw), the child had to understand that some of these Russian words were only used by certain people, while others were not used (or understood) by them. Julia definitely associated different words with different people. The video camera was called mamma, and Hammarby (a Swedish football club) was called pappa. The violin that Julia’s older sister, Victoria, played was called “Victoria.” Julia also associated different objects with their function (the video camera was used to make recordings of her: as soon as the child saw the camera she said: Julia!).

By the same principle, Julia associated two different linguistic varieties spoken around her with different people; still, understanding what it was all about was a gradual process. Some gestures were also associated with certain people. The child seemed to learn different words in a specific context. They were context bound, and she separated them by function, not linguistically; still, what exactly happened in her brain will remain a mystery. Since the words were context-bound, one could easily get the impression that the child was able to separate the languages:

JUL: Mamma, mas! (maslo)

‘Mom, butter’ (Rus)

COM: the child usually says this word pointing to the green package with margarine when she has breakfast with her mother. (1;8)

However, when the Russian word was unknown, the child would say the one

she knew, without reflecting much on adjusting the language to her interlocutor: As Julia started to spend more time in a Swedish-speaking environment she became even more dominant in Swedish. At 1;10, the mother made a note in the diary that Julia had a very intensive period of Swedish and used very few Russian words. In this period, it was crucial not to give up but to continue speaking Russian to the child. Perhaps, after having separated the languages, the child wanted to choose one of them. At the age of two, for instance, there was a period when it was basically impossible to find any Russian material in Julia's corpus. In all, there were no more than ten phrases in Russian; the rest were mixed or in Swedish.

In many situations, Julia saw that Swedish worked just fine. However, despite Julia's strong preference for Swedish, when she was alone with her mother, she would always switch to Russian (as much as possible, since Swedish dominance was so strong that most new words came entirely in Swedish). That was perhaps the only domain where she remained consistent. However, the time spent alone with her mother was not enough to sustain a good command of Russian. However, by the time Julia was 1;11 she was so good at associating different words with different people that she was also able to reflect on it:

Julia climbed into her parents' bed and said: Pappa sover 'Dad is sleeping' (Sw). Мама спит 'Mom is sleeping' (Rus). (1;11)

By around 2;1–2;2), Julia would simply pick the words from her lexicon that fit best in a given situation (a strategy that resembles code-switching). However, she still associated some phrases with certain situations.

Learning by imitation and repetition. Naturally, learning by imitation plays a substantial role in learning any language (see Cejtin 2000, Eliseeva 2008:49). Bandura (1977) argued that it is always important to take into consideration the child's ability and desire to imitate adults – as well as his/her desire to carefully observe what is going on. Still, language acquisition is more a matter of maturation than imitation.

However, imitation is a very important strategy in the language acquisition process, especially during the earliest stages; and even linguists who do not account for language acquisition in behavioristic terms must admit that a young child often wants to adjust to the language spoken by the interlocutor. Adults and siblings engage the child in different activities to develop his/her ability to imitate, which is also believed to be one of the main pre-conditions for developing speech (Cejtin 2000).

Julia loved to imitate both the words and actions of her caregivers. She started consciously repeating words after her caregivers from approximately 1;9–1;10:

COM: Julia and Victoria are sitting in the kitchen

VIC: Печенье!

'Cookie'

JUL: Сенье!

'Ookie'(1;9)

The child obviously showed a clear preference for shorter and simpler words with respect to phonotactics:

I tried to make Julia say яблоко ('apple') but she insists on saying äpple. Then

I gave up and asked her to say ябло. She repeated it (1;11).²

It is not a new idea that the level of pronunciation difficulty plays a role in the order of acquisition in children acquiring two languages simultaneously, and it has been supported by a number of researchers (Dieser 2007, 2009; Gagarina 2005 among others). Lisa Eliseeva, a monolingual Russian child, showed a similar tendency (see Eliseeva 2008). However, by the end of 1;11, Julia had learned to pronounce even difficult words in Russian,³ but she often made a recast of the syllables, as in: тависябра = ‘awathro = throw away’.⁴ She repeated all the words with great pleasure, both in Russian and Swedish, no matter how difficult they were (which is also consistent with previous research; at the time of his/her vocabulary spurt, the child stops paying attention to pronunciation difficulties).

Julia loved to repeat especially after her mother. By two years old, the child had also learned to closely imitate intonation (especially that of her mother and grandmother). She was taught not only to repeat different words, but also in what situations these words should be used (and by whom).

When the child understood that the two words meaning the same thing belonged to two different people, she used this newly acquired knowledge all the time (as she did with all her newly acquired knowledge; for instance when she learned to open a bottle, she started opening every bottle, or when she learned to close them, she closed them all). At the time Julia started repeating words and phrases after her caregivers, she also started to repeat everything else they were doing.

Tomasello (2003) also noted that for the child it is important to have someone she/he would like to imitate. Strong emotional bonds are necessary here. This desire to make her mother happy was very important to Julia, which was especially apparent in the child’s desire to repeat the correct form “for her.” These early repetitions also helped the child form her first syntax and morphology. In the majority of cases, the child also received feedback for having repeated the “correct” word, which illustrates the importance of caregivers in bilingual development.

Repair strategies and translation. I operate from the assumption that the main communicative intention of the child is to be understood (cf. Bloom & Tinker 2001). When the child wants something, she can express herself very clearly. If understood, she makes no attempt to change her linguistic behavior.⁵ If not, she applies all the strategies available to her (even para- or non-linguistic ones) to get satisfactory feedback from her caregivers.

When children use a language that their interlocutors obviously do not understand, they may respond in a variety of ways indicating that a repair or a reformulation of the utterance is needed (Genesee et. al. 1995:624). These ways may be either linguistic or non-linguistic (such as gestures, pointing or crying) and more or less successful. Most often Julia used a combination of strategies, for instance translating the word and pointing or repeating the word in the same language and

² It may be hypothesized that these early repetitions also help the child acquire her first syntax and morphology. Thus, the quality of input and parental strategies are crucial.

³ Usually, pronunciation difficulties no longer play a role after the vocabulary spurt (cf. also Eliseeva 2008:92).

⁴ The child starts to use various strategies to make pronunciation of the words easier: assimilation, elision of syllables, sound substitution, cluster reduction (Eliseeva 2008:48).

⁵ That is why many parents may feel they should pretend they do not understand when the child speaks the “wrong” language (cf. Döpke 1992).

pointing (which was more common). The child often tried out what might work in the situation:

COM: Julia is sitting at the table eating. Her father is sitting beside her. Julia's sock falls off her foot

JUL: пась!

'fell' (Rus; fell down 3p.sg.)

COM: Dad goes on reading his paper without paying attention to what the child said.

JUL: Упась!

'fell down' (Rus; fell down 3p.sg.)

COM: but Dad does not react anyway.

JUL: Упала!

'It fell down' (fem, Rus; fell down 3p.sg. FEM.)

COM: Dad just looks at her and does nothing. Julia starts to cry and uses the last alternative she can think of.

JUL: ramlä! (sc. ramlade)

'fell down' (Sw)

COM: Dad finally reacts and helps her. (1;9)

Communication was always purpose-oriented. Thus, Julia applied all the methods available to her in order to be understood. The strategy of "translation" (or rather speaking both languages simultaneously usually in order to emphasize or clarify something), was used by the entire family, and the child most likely simply picked it up from them.⁶ Translation was used both for emphasis and to ensure that the child would understand, sometimes for both purposes at the same time:

DAD: Vill du ha mjölk? (Sw)

'Do you want [some] milk?'

COM: no reaction

COM: Father asks the same question again.

COM: No reaction

DAD: хочет? (Rus 3p.sg.)

'She wants?' (wrong grammar but the meaning is clear; Dad has also learned this form)

COM: Julia reacts. She does want some milk. (1;6)

It is scarcely possible for the child to distinguish what is right and what is wrong in speaking since there is nothing right and nothing wrong for her when it comes to language choice, just the desire to make herself understood. At 2;1 the child had so much linguistic awareness that she was also able to translate from one language to another. One of the first examples of translation was noted at 2;1: Julia was going around singing *Blinka lilla stjärna där* 'Twinkle twinkle little star'. When her mother asked her: what are you singing? The child answered: *Blinka звездочка маленькая!* ('Twinkle (Sw.) little star (Rus).'⁷ This also shows that Julia was not only able to use the right language in the right circumstances but also understood that she was using two different linguistic varieties. After 2;0 such examples became very frequent in the data.

When not heard or understood, the child would easily switch between the two varieties. She would also translate easily when asked to. Repair strategies, like the child's ability to translate, were the main indicators of her awareness of the presence

⁶ These strategies will be discussed in more detail in chapter 10.

⁷ Julia had no way of knowing the word "twinkle" in Russian, but it is sufficient to note that she was trying to help her mother understand what she was singing in Swedish by translating it into Russian as well as she could.

of the two varieties in her environment. The strategy of translation may just as well have been borrowed from the input, but in order to use it, the child needs to have developed a great deal of language awareness and bilingual competence.

By 2;5 the child has become somewhat of a language purist who would not allow any “wrong” person to use the “wrong” language variety anymore. This was especially apparent with her Russian grandmother, who was trying to learn some Swedish and was looking for an opportunity to practice it:

Julia sees a little boat and says:

JUL: Liten båt!

‘Little boat’

GRANDMA: Liten båt!

COM: She hears how the child says it and repeats it after her

JUL: (very angry) Это не по-русски! По-русски «лодка»! (with emphasis)

‘This [is] not Russian! In Russian [it is] лодка!’ (2;6)

Autonomous speech. There is a special period in the child’s development called autonomous speech (see Vygotsky 2004:123). The notion of autonomous speech is closely connected with the notion of elementary and higher mental functions discussed above (cf. Arnberg 1992). Yet autonomous speech is almost forgotten by researchers nowadays and to my knowledge has never been discussed in relation to language separation. Thus, I find it important to explain the notion of autonomous speech here and describe it in more detail since it may be directly related to this issue by working together with simple association and repetition in development.

The period of autonomous speech characterizes the child’s development at the end of the first year and in the second year – the very period that is the focus of language separation studies. According to Vygotsky, autonomous speech (AS) is characteristic of all children at this age; it is a law rather than the exception and is a necessary period in every child’s linguistic development.

During the period of autonomous speech, it is the child who digests the information and actively produces his/her own speech. AS has its own rules and is thus called autonomous. Yet “the language of a child is always the result of cooperation with the people around him” (Vygotsky 2004:131). Many words of autonomous speech are understood only from the context since communication without a context is impossible with a child who is just 1;5 years old. Words in autonomous speech are different from words of “real” speech and at the same time have a lot in common with it. These words are even different in meaning (cf. under- and overextension also found in Julia’s data): коляска гуляет ‘The pram is walking’; Бабочка гуляет ‘The butterfly is walking’ (where ‘walking’ means на улице: ‘outside’; everything that was outside was ‘walking’).

During this period of development, the child simply cannot grasp the meanings of words and their meanings (ibid.). Vygotsky emphasized that communication in a certain period of development is only possible between the child and the people s/he knows very well since only these people can understand the child (Vygotsky 2004:125).

Autonomous speech is the speech constructed by the child him- of herself with the help of information received from input – in line with the child’s cognitive development at some particular point. The meanings of these words are also

constructed by the child. The child is even capable of creating phrases with the help of autonomous speech, but these sentences do not have any syntax; the words in these sentences just follow each other. The words are used only in order to express what the child feels (or sees) at that particular moment. One of the main peculiarities of autonomous speech is its agrammaticity, which means that the child does not combine the words with each other using syntax, but according to completely different laws. Often these are interjections that simply follow each other, exclamations that do not seem to have any sense to us. The parent hears the words that he/she wants to hear and attracts the child's attention to these very words, in this situation, and – which is relevant to us here – with this particular person.

Since the words in autonomous speech can only be used in a particular situation, the same word can mean different things, depending on the context. Nor are the meanings constant. In general, vocalizations with permanent meaning are very salient in the speech of young children. For instance, Julia used the word *akn* pointing at the balloon that she wanted her mother to buy on the way to the zoo. Whether the child meant the whole bundle of balloons (any of the balloons that were sold) or a specific one was not certain. Perhaps the word even meant the verb 'I want to have it.' However, in that particular situation *akn*+pointing meant that she wanted a balloon. *Akn*, to my knowledge, has no relation to any Russian word.

The main function of autonomous speech is to highlight some single fact in the situation, to point at something, which can be compared with a pointing gesture: *мама дѣт (идѣт)* 'mommy go (goes)'. During the period of autonomous speech, the child is not capable of noticing what different words have in common and cannot make generalizations about the difference between the mother's (Russian) and the father's (Swedish) speech. Perhaps at the very moment the child understands that a blouse, skirt and coat are clothes, she will also understand that *книга* 'book' is a Russian word and *bok* 'book' is a Swedish one, and both words refer to the same thing. Yet, at the time the period of autonomous speech is considered to have ended in monolingual children, Julia showed an awareness of the two languages that are present in her surroundings (viz. at 1;9). Perhaps this period is necessary for the child to develop cognitively and linguistically in order to understand what is going on around him/her – not only when it comes to understanding what linguistic variety should be used in what situation but also that the words might have a narrower (or broader) sense than the child assumed. The end of the second year is full of changes in the child's cognition and linguistic development. However, all of these changes are interrelated, and the child's awareness of there being two linguistic varieties present in his/her environment is just one part in this process.

Discussion. When it comes to acquiring two mother tongues, the process of separation still seems to be intensely debated. The question itself may seem unnecessary if we assume that children do not even have such a process but develop two linguistic systems in parallel, independently of each other, which is known as the two-system model.

Arnberg (1981, 1987) had an interesting theory about the ways the child adjusts his/her speech to the surroundings. She argued that children separate the languages because they strictly associate each of them with a specific person, i.e. they

use elementary mental functioning. Thus, the strategy at home for raising bilingual children may increase their attention to dual language presentation in their environment. We know from the literature that children who appear to mix languages minimally or not at all have nearly always been raised based on a one-person-one language strategy. Arnberg considered language awareness to be the main factor in early language separation. There are also other factors as well that are important in the issue of language separation: imitation and observational learning (see Bandura 1977). De Houwer has emphasized that the Separate Development Hypothesis she proposed (De Houwer 1990) is only valid when children were brought up according to the one person-one language system, which brings us back to Arnberg's argument about elementary and higher mental functions. Still, the relevant question to ask is what happens when the parents mix their languages? Will this be fatal for De Houwer's theory? I believe this dilemma can only be avoided when the data rule the theory and not vice versa. Besides, how can we, as noted above, actually know that the child knows that Russian and Swedish are two different languages? How can Julia know then that Russian marks for case and Swedish does not? Why would she even be looking for a case in Russian then, especially after 1;10, when Swedish clearly becomes her dominant language?

Julia started to use the right language with the right interlocutor at 1;9 and give correct answers, at least in Swedish. Thus, it can be said that by 1;9 the child developed an ability to adapt her language to the situation and the interlocutor. Mixing still occurred in communication in the family and in situations where Julia had to communicate in Russian. Before 1;9 the "separation" was perhaps due to Julia acquiring different words in a specific context and associating them with a particular person. In her very first months, the child learned to associate Russian with Russian speakers and Swedish with Swedish ones. As noted, she also associated particular gestures with a particular speaker. Thus, it seems possible that a simple association between a word and a person, imitation and autonomous speech work together in development. Language differentiation is clearly more than a simple association; however, children may start with a simple association, then imitations, then autonomous speech until the "real" language systems have been differentiated as a result of exposure to two different varieties.

The child's motivation is another factor that has proved to be important in language separation. However, no matter how motivated the child is, it is still the parents' responsibility to provide equal development opportunities and more or less equal input in both languages before the critical period is over. The circumstances may change, and the child may later want to make more use of his/her weaker language in everyday communication, but the clear dominance of one language in his/her early childhood may have negative consequences for the development of the weaker language later on and require additional input and time to develop proficiency in that language. Parents should create meaningful situations so that the child wants to use both languages; it is important for them to create situations that will motivate the child to speak the language that does not develop according to age-relevant norms. The best motivation is a real need to talk, to express one's wishes and desires. Nonetheless, more case studies are needed that are focused on the process of

separation per se to understand this very intriguing issue.

REFERENCES

1. Arnberg, L. (1987): Raising children bilingually: the pre-school years. Clevedon Avon: Multilingual Matters.
2. Arnberg L. (1981): Early childhood bilingualism in the mixed-lingual family. Linköping Studies in Education. Dissertations N 14, Linköping University, Dept. of Education.
3. Arnberg, L. & Arnberg, P. W. (1992): "Language awareness and language separation in the young bilingual child." In: R. J. Harris (ed.): Cognitive processes in bilinguals. Oxford etc.: Elsevier, 475-500.
4. Bandura, A. (1977): Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
5. Bertoncini J., Mehler, J. (1981): "Syllables as units in infant speech perception." In: Infant behavior and development 4, 247-260.
6. Bloom, L. & Tinker, E. (2001): The Intentionality Model and language acquisition. Monographs of the Society for research in child development. Serial No 267, Vol. 66, N. 4.
7. Сејтлин, С. (1997) - Цейтлин С.Н. Речевые ошибки и их предупреждение. Санкт Петербург.
8. Сејтлин (2000) Цейтлин С.Н. 2000. Язык и ребёнок. Лингвистика детской речи. Москва. Владос.
9. Deuchar, M. & Quay, S. (2000): Bilingual acquisition: theoretical implications of a case study. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. De Houwer, A. (1990): The acquisition of two languages: a case study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Dieser, E. (2007): "Early language separation. A longitudinal study of a Russian-German bilingual child." In: Featherston, S., Sternefeld, W. (eds.): Roots. Linguistics in search of its evidential base. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 133-160.
12. Dieser, E. (2009): Genuserwerb im Russischen und Deutschen. Korpusgestützte Studie zu ein- und zweisprachigen Kindern und Erwachsenen. München: Kubon & Sagner. Slavolinguistika.
13. Eliseeva (2008) - Елисеева, М.Б. (2008). Фонетическое и лексическое развитие ребёнка раннего возраста.
14. Gagarina (2005) - Гагарина, Н. В. (2005). Мяч или ball? Выбор первых слов русско-немецким билингвом. // Цейтлин, С. Н., Протасова, Е.Ю. (ред.). Детское двуязычие. Материалы международной научно-практической конференции. С.13 – 15. Санкт-Петербург.
15. Genesee, F. (2003): "Rethinking bilingual acquisition." In: J. M. deWaele (ed.): Bilingualism: challenges and directions for future research. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 158-182.
16. Genesee, F., Nicoladis, E., Paradis, M. (1995): "Language differentiation in early bilingual development." In: Journal of child language 22: 611-631.
17. Genesee, F., Boivin, I. & Nicoladis, E. (1996): "Bilingual children talking with monolingual adults: a study of bilingual communicative competence." In: Applied

- psycholinguistics 17: 427-442.
18. Döpke, S. (1992): One parent, one language. An interactional approach. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
 19. Maneva, B. & Genesee, F. (2002): "Bilingual babbling: Evidence for language differentiation in dual language acquisition." In: B. Skarbela et al. (eds.): Boston University Conference on Language Development 26, Proceedings. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 383-392.
 20. Ronjat, J. (1913): Le développement du langage observé chez un enfant bilingue. Paris: Champion.
 21. Nicoladis, E. & Genesee, F. (1998): "Parental discourse and code-mixing in bilingual children." In: International journal of bilingualism 2: 85-100.
 22. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978): Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 23. Tomasello, M. (2003): Constructing a language: a usage-based theory of language acquisition. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

УДК 81'42

КОГНІТИВНЕ ПІДГРУНТЯ МЕТАФОРИЧНОЇ НОМІНАЦІЇ

Олена Селіванова
(Черкаси, Україна)

У статті розглянуто когнітивне підґрунтя метафоричного перенесення у процесах номінації. Запропоновано нову типологію метафори залежно від когнітивних механізмів її творення. Виокремлено структурний, дифузний, геіштальний, сенсорний, архетипний і аксіологічний різновиди метафоризації.

Ключові слова: метафора, донорська зона, реципієнтна зона, геіштальт, синестезія, архетип, оцінка.

В статье рассматривается проблема когнитивной базы метафорических переносов. Предложена новая типология метафор в зависимости от когнитивных механизмов ее порождения. Выделены структурный, диффузный, геіштальтний, сенсорный, архетипный и аксиологический типы метафоризации.

Ключевые слова: метафора, донорская зона, реципиентная зона, геіштальт, синестезия, архетип, оценка.

The article focuses on a cognitive base of metaphorical transfers. New typology of metaphors depending on the cognitive mechanisms of its generation is offered. We selected structural, diffuse, gestalt, sensory, archetypical and estimate types of metaphors.

Key words: metaphor, donor domain, recipient domain, gestalt, synaesthesia, archetype, estimation.