

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC PECULIARITIES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS CONTAINING THE SOMATIC COMPONENT “HAND”

The article deals with the substantivized, adverbial and verbal phraseological units of modern English with the somatic component “hand”. This study has demonstrated that the somatic component “hand” is characterized by high productivity, in the sense that it is the basis of generating a great number of substantivized and verbal phraseological units. With respect to adverbial PhUs, it has been shown that they are not numerous (about 30). The most common structural type of substantivized PhUs is the structure involving attributive word-combination, for adverbial PhUs – it is a combination of one structural and one notional word and a subordinate word combination that consists of two components; for verbal PhUs the structure of subordinate word combination is the most relevant. All the PhUs which were investigated fall into one of the following three varieties in terms of phraseological meaning: idiomaticisms, idiophraseomatisms, phraseomatisms. A great majority of PhUs are based on metaphor or metonymy. All of them are anthropocentric in their character. Some of them can form synonymic groups and antonymic pairs. The PhUs which were analysed can denote both people and inanimate things or both. Substantivized PhUs may express different degrees of favourability in terms of their evaluative nature: positive, negative or neutral.

Key words: phraseological units, somatic component, idiomaticism, idiophraseomatism, phraseomatism.

Formulation of the research problem and its significance. Recently, there has been an increase of interest in phraseological units with somatic components. The significance and relevance of these studies are connected with the fact that both domestic and foreign linguists are focusing their attention on somatic phraseological units as they represent such thematic fields as “human evaluation” and “human emotional states”, and are frequently used in speech and characterized by their contextual, expressive and stylistic flexibility.

Analysis of previous research dealing with this problem. Although a considerable amount of research has been devoted to somatic phraseological units in different languages (Ukrainian (I. Tymchenko [6]), Russian (D. Sknaryov [5]), and Bulgarian (S. Saidova [4]), little attempt has been made to investigate English somatic phraseological units from a structural or semantic point of view.

Almost 270 English substantivized, adverbial and verbal phraseological units with the somatic component *hand*, extracted exhaustively from the *English-Ukrainian Phraseological Dictionary* [7] and *Longman Idioms Dictionary* [8], have been subjected to in-depth analysis.

The goal and the specific tasks of the article. The objective of this article is to shed light on the structural, semantic and paradigmatic features of the phraseological units which have been investigated. To accomplish this purpose, a number of specific tasks need to be undertaken, among them:

- to analyze the structural types of phraseological units containing the somatic component *hand* and determine the most productive structural models according to which they are constructed;
- to identify the various types of phraseological meaning which they may have and the phrase-based semantic groups which they form;
- to demonstrate the paradigmatic relationships between phraseological units with the somatic component *hand*.

Presentation of the basic content of the research and an interpretation of the results which were obtained. Phraseology plays an important role in the psychological and cultural aspects of language processing and social cohesiveness. The normal use of phraseological expressions is sometimes self-conscious and creative, but at other times uncertain and can also be contentious. The diversity that exists in the definitions of phraseological units (PhUs) reflects the fact that there are certain differences between

the main criteria used by different authors. According to Aleksandr V. Kunin, phraseological units are stable word-groups whose meanings are partially or fully transferred [3]. R. S. Ginzburg defines them as customarily non-motivated word-groups that cannot be spontaneously formulated in speech but which are reproduced as ready-made units [2]. It is observed that free word-groups may undergo a process of grammaticalization or lexicalization.

The main aspects of phraseological investigation involve the stability, the systematicness and the semantic structure of phraseological units. Some researchers such as V. V. Vinogradov [1, c. 145–166], favour a classification based on the parts of speech to which the components of phraseological units belong. When this method of classification is employed, phraseological units are divided into groups in terms of their correlation to the parts of speech (the so-called sense classification). In conjunction with this, it is necessary to make a distinction between substantivized, adverbial, and verbal phraseological units. Substantivized phraseological units have a nuclear noun within their structure and perform the functions of that category of speech in the sentence.

Analysis of the grammatical structure of phraseological units containing the somatic component *hand* has shown that the majority of substantivized PhUs function within attributive structures. The prepositive attributes in these structures may be expressed by:

- an attribute: *an old hand, a free hand, clean hands*;
- an attribute in the comparative or superlative degrees: *younger (the youngest) hand, elder (the eldest) hand*;
- Participle I: *helping hand*;
- Participle II: *hidden hand*;
- a defining pronoun *all: all hands*;
- a noun: *nap hand*;
- a prepositional group with the preposition *of: a man of his hands, a shake of the hand*.

A prepositional group may be placed in a postposition: *the hand of fellowship*.

We share the opinion expressed by Kunin which posits the existence of three types of phraseological meanings – idiomatic, idiophraseomatic and phraseomatic [3, c. 140].

PhUs with completely or partially transferred meaning have idiomatic meaning. For instance, *hand-me-downs* – well-worn clothes or footwear; *note of hand* – a signed document containing a written promise to pay a stated sum to a specified person or the bearer at a specified date or on demand.

PhUs with one of the meanings having a straightforward but complex meaning and others transferred ones have an idiophraseomatic meaning: *right-hand man* 1) the right hand; 2) (transferred) – an indispensable helper or chief assistant.

PhUs with a direct but complicated meaning have phraseomatic meaning: *helping hand* – assistance.

The semantic range of substantivized PhUs with the component *hand* is not broad. The following groups may be singled out: substantivized PhUs denoting a person: *numb hand* – a clumsy fellow; *a green hand* – a person without any experience; *a tight-fisted hand at the grindstone* – a very greedy person, and PhUs denoting:

- personal qualities: *iron hand* – tyranny; *clean hands* – honesty; *light hand* – delicacy, tact;
- objects: *hand-me-downs* – well-worn clothes or footwear; *four-in-hand* – a necktie tied in a loose knot with two hanging ends.

Most of the PhUs which were investigated have only one meaning.

However, there are certain ones amongst them which have two meanings: *a man of his hands* – 1) a brave person; 2) an experienced person; a person who undertakes many different kinds of work.

The PhU *dead hand* has three meanings: 1) a death grip; 2) a clever, quick-witted person; 3) the status of lands or tenements held inalienably by an ecclesiastical or other corporation.

Substantivized phraseological units with the somatic component *hand* may be used as terms; some instances are *dead hand* – (law) the status of lands or tenements held inalienably by an ecclesiastical or other corporation; *note of hand* – (finance) debt obligation.

Somatic phraseological units are mainly formed on the basis of metaphor (an imaginative way of describing something by referring to something else which is the same in a particular way) or metonymy (the substitution of a word referring to an attribute for the thing that is meant).

Substantivized PhUs with the somatic component **hand** are based on different types of similarity or contiguity. They may denote a person only, an inanimate thing or both. Most of them are of anthropocentric character, and imply an evaluation of a human being. The evaluation may be positive, negative or neutral.

Among substantivized PhUs we distinguish those denoting a person with:

1. *Positive assessment: a man of his hands* (a brave man); *a crack hand* (expert, master, dab).
2. *Negative assessment: numb hand* (clumsy fellow); *bad/poor hand* (an awkward inexperienced person).
3. *Zero assessment: workers by hand and brain* (workers of physical and mental work); *all hands* (a crew on a ship; all the participants); *elder/the eldest hand* (*in card games for two players, such as piquet*) the player who is the first to whom a complete hand is dealt.

PhUs denoting inanimate things with:

1. A positive assessment: *the hand of fellowship* (friendly support); *helping hand* (assistance).
2. A negative assessment: *iron hand* (tyranny); *hand-to-mouth existence* (a way of life in which you have hardly enough food or money to live on).
- 3) A zero assessment: *round hand* (a style of handwriting in which the letters have rounded shapes); *the last hand* (the last stroke/dash/touch).

Some substantivized PhUs may refer both to inanimate things and people, such as *a dead hand* – 1) a death grip; 2) a clever, quick-witted person.

Adverbial phraseological units have a nuclear noun in their structure. In the sentence, they perform the function of an adverb.

Adverbial phraseological units containing the somatic component **hand** are mainly represented by a combination of one structural lexeme with a notional one: *at hand; by hand; in hand*, or by a combination of two structural lexemes with one notional: *out of hand*.

In the sentence, these phraseological units perform the function of an adverbial modifier, characterizing the action of the verb or the conditions in which the action of the verb is performed. Structurally, they are monoliths; in the sentence, they perform the function of one member of the sentence; for instance: “*You are responsible enough to remain at hand when you are needed*” (J. Aldridge).

Adverbial phraseological units may have a subordinate structure, which according to the number of notional verbs may consist of:

- two components: *with a sparing hand; in bad hands; of all hands*;
- three components: *for one’s own hand, under one’s own hand*.

A great number of adverbial phraseological units begin with the following prepositions: **of, in, with, by, under, off, at** etc.: *of all hands; in any hand; in bad hands; in safe hands, with both hands; with an easy hand; by hand, at one’s hands, at first hand, etc.*

The majority of phraseological units of this type have a prepositive attribute in their structure; but a preposition loses its grammatical function of performing a subordination with nouns, adjectives or numerals. The conjunctive function of the preposition is restored in the sentence in which the PhU is used and in which it is the first component; for instance: “*He carried the arrangement off with an easy hand when it came to the selection, looking around, criticizing, opening*” (T. Dreiser).

Some PhUs have a subordinate structure in which a preposition is in the middle position: *hand to fist; hand over head; hand over fist; ready at (to) hand; hand to hand*.

Adverbial PhUs with a coordinative structure corresponding to the number of notional words also consist of two components: *hand and foot* (with the verb **to bind**); *hand and glove*.

Some adverbial phraseological units are characterized by variations in terms of their components. The following components may vary:

- nouns: *hand over fist* or *hand over hand*;
- adjectives: *with a heavy* or *high hand*;
- adverbs: *close* or *near at hand*;

- defining pronouns: *on all hands* or *on every hand*;
- prepositions: *ready at* or *to hand*.

On the basis of their semantic features, adverbial PhUs are divided into two classes, qualitative and adverbial. Qualitative adverbial PhUs denote a process, characterizing it from the standpoint of quality. They are divided into the PhUs of manner and PhUs of measure and degree.

PhUs of manner may be used to characterize people's activities, such as *under hand* (dishonestly); *hand over head* (easily); *with a sparing hand* (frugally), or to express the intensity of the action, such as *with both hands* (at full strength).

Adverbial PhUs do not characterize an action qualitatively but denote the conditions under which the action is performed. We can distinguish the following types among them:

1. Adverbial modifiers of condition, indicating that under which the action is performed, such as *in any hand, of all hands* (in any case).

2. Adverbial modifiers of place, which denote spatial features: *on all hands* (everywhere), *on both hands* (each hand/either hand).

3. Adverbial modifiers of time, which denote the time duration necessary for performing a certain action: *near at hand* (close by), *hand in hand* (together; jointly).

4. Adverbial modifier of purpose: *for one's own hand* (in one's interests).

In certain cases PhUs may only have a single meaning: *in safe hands* (protected from harm or damage by someone trustworthy);

In other cases, the PhU may have two meanings: *hand over head* – (1) easily; (2) without attention to what one is really doing; *by hand* – 1) by manual rather than mechanical means; 2) by messenger, or else in person.

PhUs that are fully or partially redefined have an idiomatic meaning. They are represented by a combination of one structural lexeme with the notional one: *at hand; by hand; under hand; out of hand*; and those which consist of two notional components: – *hand in glove; hand over head*.

The following PhUs with more complicated meanings have idiophrasemic meaning: *hand and foot* 1) in all possible ways; 2) completely and persistently.

Phrasemic meaning is represented by the following PhUs: *in good hands* (in protective care), *in hand* (under one's control), *in safe hands* (protected by someone trustworthy from harm or damage), *from hand to hand* (from one person to another).

Verbal PhUs are characterized by generalized semantics of the procedural features, objectivized in the verbal grammatical categories of aspect, mood, person and time. In the sentence they (verbal PhUs) perform the function of predicate.

A great number of verbal PhUs begin with the following verbs:

- *to be: to be in one's hands, to be off one's hands, to be out of hand*;
- *to have: to have one's hands tied, to have a hand in something, to have a hand in the dish (pie)*;
- *to get: to get (one, something) in hand; to get (one, something) off one's hands; to get oneself in hand*.

Verbal PhUs which begin with the verbs *to be* and *to have* denote people being in a certain state, and verbal PhUs which begin with the verb *to get* denote the metamorphosis of a person from one state to another.

Verbal PhUs can form different phraseosemantic groups that are associated with

1. Marriage: *to bestow one's hand on someone /give one's hand to someone; to give one's hand and heart*.

2. Physical and mental abilities: *to turn one's hand to anything* (undertake an activity different from one's usual occupation); *to lay one's hand on the right spot*.

3. Traits of character both negative *to lay hands on the ark* (to disrespect); *to carry things with a high hand* (be haughty; be disdainful) and positive: *to have an open hand* (be generous); *to put one's hand in one's pocket* (to show one's generosity) – generosity.

4. Negative manifestation of people's behaviour: *to have (take) the law in one's own hands* (punish someone for an offense according to one's own ideas of justice, esp. in an illegal or violent way).

5. Activity characterized by its result. Positive assessment: *to go heart and hand into something; to try one's prentice hand at something*; negative assessment: *to work with the left hand; to sit on one's hands*;

6. Happiness/unhappiness, success/failure. We have singled out two subgroups opposed to each other. Verbal PhUs denoting positive effects connected with success and luck belong to the first subgroup, including examples such as *to have the game in one's hand, to have the staff in one's own hand*. The second group denotes negative effects – unhappiness or failure: *to chuck one's hand in; hold up one's hands; to throw in one's hand, to throw up one's hands*.

7. Interpersonal relationship: *to strengthen one's hands; to go hand in hand*.

8. Emotions: *to knead one's hands; to rub one's hands*.

The analysis of phrase-building models based on the number of their components has shown that most of them are built up according to a certain structural model and may consist of five components (37 %) (*be wax in one's hands; bring a baby up by hand*), four components (24 %) (*turn one's hand over; lay one's hand heavily*) and three components (21 %) (*hold one's hand*).

A smaller number of PhUs includes six components (13 %) (*wait on one hand and foot; go heart and hand upon something*).

The smallest group represent binary PhUs (3 %) (*deal a hand; change hands*),

PhUs that consist of seven (0,5 %) (*hold something in the hollow of one's hand*) and nine components (0,5 %) (*carry fire in one hand and water in the other*).

Idiomatic verbal PhUs are made up according to the following structural models:

V + N (*turn a hand*); V + Pron/N's + N (*stand one's hand*); V + Adj + N (*fight the lone hand*); V + Prep + Pron/N's + N (*throw in one's hand*); V + Prep + Prep + N (*be/get out of hand*); V + Pron/N + Prep + N (*play one's hand heavily*); V + N + Prep + N (*lay hands on the ark*); V + Pron/N's + N + Prep (*chuck one's hand in*), V + Pron/N's + N + Prep + N (*cross one's hands with silver*); V + Adj + N + Prep + Pron (*hold the whip hand of someone*); V + N + Prep + Pron/N's + N (*have the game in one's hands*); V + Pron/N's + N + Prep + Pron/N's + N (*put one's hand in a hornet's nest*).

The most productive are the following models: V + Pron/N's + N та V + Adj + N.

Idiophrasedomatic verbal PhUs are built up according to the following structural models:

V + N (*press hands*), V + Pron/N's + N (*read one's hand*); V + Adj + N (*have a heavy hand*); V + N + Prep (*lay hands on*); V + Pron/N + Prep + N (*take someone/something in hand*); V + N + Prep + N (*have/take a hand in something*); V + Pron/N's + N + Prep (*put one's hands on/upon*); V + Prep + Adj + N (*work with the left hand*); V + Pron + Prep + Pron/N's + N (*slip something into one's hand*); V + Pron/N's + N + Prep + Pron/N's + N (*bury one's hands in one's pockets*).

The most productive are: V + Pron/N's + N + Prep + N та V + Prep + Pron/N's + N.

Phraseomatic verbal PhUs are built up according to the following structural models:

V + Pron/N's + N (*tie one's hands*); V + Adj + N (*write a beautiful hand*); V + Prep + N (*send by hand*); V + Prep + Pron/N's + N (*hold up one's hands*), V + Pron/N + Prep + N (*get oneself in hand*); V + Pron/N's + N + V_{ed} (*have one's hands tied*), V + Pron/N's + N + Prep (*foul/soil one's hands with*); V + Pron/N's + N + Prep + N (*wash one's hands of something*); V + Pron/N's + N + Conj + N (*give one's hand and heart*); V + N + Prep + Pron + N (*grasp life with both hands*).

The following models are most productive: V + Pron/N's + N та V + Pron/N's + N + Prep + N.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. This study has demonstrated that the somatic component *hand* is characterized by high productivity, in the sense that it is the basis of

generating a great number of substantivized and verbal phraseological units. With respect to adverbial PhUs, it has been shown that they are not numerous (about 30).

The most common structural type of substantivized PhUs is the structure involving attributive word-combination, for adverbial PhUs – it is a combination of one structural and one notional word and a subordinate word combination that consists of two components; for verbal PhUs the structure of subordinate word combination is the most relevant.

All the PhUs which were investigated fall into one of the following three varieties in terms of phraseological meaning: idiomatisms, idiophraseomatisms, phraseomatisms. A great majority of PhUs are based on metaphor or metonymy. All of them are anthropocentric in their character. Some of them can form synonymic groups and antonymic pairs.

The PhUs which were analysed can denote both people and inanimate things or both. Substantivized PhUs may express different degrees of favourability in terms of their evaluative nature: positive, negative or neutral.

It is not yet possible to state unequivocally that all the problems associated with the PhUs have been solved. However, we feel that it is possible to affirm that these results which have been obtained, present promising prospects for further research in phraseological semantics.

References

1. Виноградов В. В. Лексикология и лексикография : избр. труды / В. В. Виноградов ; отв. ред. [и авт. предисл.] В. Г. Костомаров ; АН СССР, Отд-ние лит. и яз. – М. : Наука, 1977. – 318 с.
2. Гинзбург Р. З. Лексикология английского языка / Р. З. Гинзбург, С. С. Хидекель и др. – 2-е изд. испр. и доп. – М. : Высш. шк., 1979. – 269 с.
3. Кунин А. В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка : учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. / А. В. Кунин. – 2-е изд., перераб. – М. : Высш. шк. ; Дубна : Изд. центр “Феникс”, 1996. – 381 с.
4. Саидова С. Э. Соматические фразеологизмы в русском и болгарском языках : дис. ... канд. филол. наук / С. Э. Саидова. – Баку : [б. и.], 1992.
5. Скарёв Д. С. Фразеологизмы русского языка с компонентами-соматизмами: проблемы семантики и прагматики : дис. ... канд. филол. наук / Д. С. Скарёв. – Челябинск : [б. и.], 2006. – 240 с.
6. Тимченко І. В. Особливості синонімії і варіантності у фразеологічних одиницях з компонентом вуху в українській мові / І. В. Тимченко // Лінгвістичні дослідження ХДПУ. – Вип. 13. – Х. : [б. в.], 2004. – С. 64–68.
7. Баранцев К. Т. Англо-український фразеологічний словник / К. Т. Баранцев. – К. : Рад. шк., 1969. – 1051 с.
8. Longman Idioms Dictionary / Ed. by Stern Karen. – Longman, 1998. – 398 p.

Волошинович Наталія, Троцюк Аїда. Структурно-семантичні особливості фразеологічних одиниць із соматичним компонентом HAND. У статті досліджено субстантивні, адвербіальні й вербальні фразеологічні одиниці сучасної англійської мови із соматичним компонентом *hand*. Аналіз досліджуваних ФО дав підстави зробити такі висновки: для соматичного компонента *hand* характерна висока продуктивність, тобто здатність стати основою для формування великої кількості субстантивних і вербальних ФО. Щодо адвербіальних ФО, то вони нечисленні. Характерний структурний тип субстантивних ФО – атрибутивне словосполучення; для адвербіальних ФО – одновершинні ФО та двокомпонентні підрядні ФО; для дієслівних ФО структура підрядного словосполучення найбільш релевантна. Досліджувані ФО представлені трьома різновидами фразеологічного значення: ідіоматизми, ідіофразеоматизми, фразеоматизми. ФО здебільшого утворюються на основі метафоричного або метонімічного переосмислення. Усі вони характеризуються антропоцентричністю. Деякі з них можуть утворювати синонімічні групи й антонімічні пари. Крім особи, досліджувані ФО можуть позначати й неособу або і одних, і других. Субстантивні ФО характеризується позитивною, негативною або нульовою оцінкою.

Ключові слова: фразеологічні одиниці, соматичний компонент, ідіоматизм, ідіофразеоматизм, фразеоматизм.

Волошинович Наталия, Троцюк Аида. Структурно-семантические особенности фразеологических единиц с соматическим компонентом HAND. В статье рассматриваются субстантивные, адвербиальные и вербальные фразеологические единицы современного английского языка, в состав которых входит соматический компонент *“hand”*. Анализ ФО дал возможность сделать ряд выводов, а именно: для соматического компонента *“hand”* характерна высокая продуктивность, т. е. способность быть основой для формирования большого количества субстантивных и вербальных ФЕ. Что касается адвербиальных ФО, то они есть малочисленными. Характерным структурным типом субстантивных ФЕ есть атрибутивное словосочетание; для адвербиальных ФЕ – одновершинные ФЕ и двухкомпонентные ФЕ с подчинительной структурой; для глагольных ФЕ структура подчинительного словосочетания есть наиболее релевантной. Анализируемые ФЕ представлены тремя

разновидностями фразеологического значения: идиоматизмы, идиофразеоматизмы, фразеоматизмы. Большинство ФЕ образуется на основе метафорического или метонимического переосмысления. Большинство из них характеризуется антропоцентричностью. Некоторые из них могут образовывать синонимические группы и антонимические пары. Кроме лиц, анализируемые ФЕ могут означать и нелицо или и одних, и других. Субстантивные ФЕ характеризуются позитивной, негативной или нулевой оценкой.

Ключевые слова: фразеологические единицы, соматический компонент, идиоматизм, идиофразеоматизм, фразеоматизм.

УДК 802.0:301.085-053.7

Олена Галапчук-Тарнавська

ВІКОВА ДИФЕРЕНЦІАЦІЯ СТРАТЕГІЙ І ТАКТИК СІМЕЙНОГО ДИСКУРСУ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ СУЧАСНОЇ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ)

Статтю присвячено вивченню мовленнєвої поведінки представників різних вікових груп й аналізу стратегій і тактик сімейного дискурсу, зумовлених віком комунікантів. Стратегії варіюють у діапазоні: жорсткі, м'які й гнучкі. Під час системного аналізу сімейного дискурсу виявлено універсально-вікові, преферентно-вікові та ексклюзивно-вікові мовленнєві тактики представників різних вікових груп. Виділено 14 найбільш частотних мовленнєвих ситуацій у межах сімейного дискурсу: незгода, звинувачення, переконання, погроза, попередження, прохання, докір, наказ, скарга, запрошення, поздоровлення, комплімент, знайомство та обговорення планів (ситуації розташовані в списку за ступенем частотності, від найбільш частотних до найменш частотних). Аналіз використання тактико-стратегічного арсеналу дорослими й дітьми дав підстави зробити висновок про те, що вибір стратегії і тактики залежить від типу мовленнєвої ситуації.

Ключові слова: вікова диференціація, сімейний дискурс, симетричні/асиметричні відносини, мовленнєві стратегії і тактики, мовленнєва ситуація.

Постановка наукової проблеми та її значення. Вік комунікантів – важливий фактор соціальної організації спілкування взагалі та мовленнєвої взаємодії зокрема. Він асоціюється з рольовою структурою в сім'ї і в певній соціальній групі, з вибором певної тональності та засобів комунікації. Вік розглядають як обмежений відносними хронологічними межами період у фізичному та психічному розвитку людини [3].

Дослідження вікових особливостей комунікантів становлять значний інтерес тому, що розширюють наші уявлення не лише про оволодіння мовою, але також про саму мову, про її функціонування в мовленнєвій діяльності; не лише про становлення пізнавальних та інших психологічних процесів, а й про їх побудову, розширюють наші знання про людину загалом.

Аналіз досліджень цієї проблеми. Сучасна, і вітчизняна, і зарубіжна, лінгвістика вікові особливості комунікантів розглядала переважно з позицій раннього онтогенезу дитячого мовлення (мовлення дітей від 1 до 6 років). Загалом можна виділити три напрями аналізу дитячого мовлення: психолінгвістичний, соціолінгвістичний, прагмалінгвістичний.

Психолінгвісти, ґрунтуючися на ідеях Л. С. Виготського і його школи, вивчають такі питання: генезис дитячого мовлення (Д. Б. Ельконін, О. М. Леонт'єв, В. В. Давидов, А. К. Маркова, І. М. Горелов, О. Р. Лурія, Т. Scovel) та закономірності формування і функціонування мовлення дітей (Д. Б. Ельконін, О. М. Гвоздев, С. Г. Тер-Мінасова, Л. С. Виготський, О. М. Леонт'єв, С. Л. Рубінштейн, О. І. Негневицька, О. М. Шахнарович, О. Д. Божович, О. О. Леонт'єв).

Соціолінгвісти у своїх дослідженнях, установлюючи кореляцію між суспільством і мовою в широкому сенсі, висвітлюють проблеми розвитку комунікативної компетенції дитини (W. Labov, A. Halliday, H. Grimm, B. Ackerman, M. Swain, M. Shatz, L. McCloskey, J. Astington); вікової градації та особливостей мовлення конкретної вікової групи (Ch. Hockett, H. Helfric, N. Coupland, J. Labov); вікових особливостей мовлення білінгвів (M. Clyne,