CONSONANT SOUNDS OF MODERN TATAR COLLOQUIAL SPEECH: NORM AND VARIABILITY

^aGULSHAT R. GALIULLINA, ^bGULFIYA K. KHADIEVA, ^cENZE KH. KADIROVA, ^dAIGUL A. ABDRAKHMANOVA

Kazan Federal University, 18 Kremlyovskaya street, Kazan 420008, Russian Federation, Russia email: ^agul-khadieva@yandex.ru ^beditor@ores.su, ^cinfo@ores.su, ^dglobal@ores.su

Abstract: The article presents the results of consonant sound phonetic feature study in modern Tatar colloquial speech and their correlation with the literary norm. In particular, the normative variants of pronunciation were systematized and the most common deviations from the literary norm were indicated. In Tatar linguistics the normative aspect of linguistic units has been the object of research up to the present time. Various options, which are manifested in colloquial speech, were studied poorly. The article focuses on this problem for the first time. We have analyzed the original Tatar and consonant sounds borrowed from Russian language. Due to the fact that the influence of Russian language on spoken Tatar speech has increased now, the attention was focused on sound composition comparison between two languages. 96 phonograms of oral speech by Tatar language speakers from various age groups were involved for analysis. In the course of the study they found out that the revealed deviations from the norm in the field of consonant sounds are of a regular nature and can be considered the identification features of modern Tatar colloquial speech. The main reasons for the deviation from phonetic norms are an active penetration of dialectal features into modern Tatar speech and the phenomenon of interference that arose as the result of active bilingualism.

Key words: Tatar colloquial speech, language norm, variability, phonetics, consonant sounds.

1 Introduction

Spoken language plays a crucial role in human society. Its main function is to ensure everyday communication between people. In comparison to the codified literary language, the spoken language is considered primary in origin and application. Thus, every change and novelty that the language undergoes can first be seen in its spoken version. In time, if they stand the test of time, these new features make their way into the codified literary language (Galiullina, 2018).

Many changes occurring in the language arise under the influence of changes in spoken language. According to L.V. Scherba, "all changes in the language, which later appear in monologue speech, are forged and accumulated in the smithy of colloquial speech" (Shcherba, 1957; Nurhayati, 2018). Constantly observed language trends towards a more conservative and sustainable deserve a close attention of linguists. The sphere of oral conversation "free of conservatism" is the medium where the rethinking and the development of linguistic forms take place.

Each national language is one in all the diversity of its manifestations - dialects, jargons and literally processed forms.

The literary form, which has emerged from the national language in the process of its historical development, does not lose its connection with other forms of national language, namely with dialects, colloquial language, etc. The interaction of these subsystems at each stage of linguistic evolution reflects the social processes taking place in society through complex mediations. The regulator of literary language interaction with other subsystems is the norm, which is designed to filter the means coming into literary use from dialects, colloquial language and slang spheres. The norm itself is also subject to change; the social assessments of normative attitudes also vary depending on time, and on the nature of the processes taking place in society.

In the literary language, all aspects of the national language are processed and normalized - phonetics, vocabulary, grammar, word formation, stylistics. The term "language norm" means a set of rules for the choice and the use of language elements acting at different language levels (Kozhemyakina et al, 2006). In accordance with this they distinguish phonetic, lexical, grammatical and stylistic norms. Taking into account the fact that the Tatar conversational speech is spreading in various spheres of mass communication, the systematic and the complex research of Tatar colloquial speech has become necessary and urgent to reveal its specifics.

Until now the normative aspect of linguistic units has been the object of study in Tatar linguistics. The various variants manifested in colloquial speech remained hardly noticed. So, for example, this problem was raised in the works by I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay - the founder of the Kazan Linguistic School (Baudouin, 1963). Then this trend was developed by V.A. Bogoroditsky within the framework of this school. He reflected the specificity of the Tatar speech in his works (Bogoroditsky, 1953; Galiullina, 2014; Ismagilova et al, 2016; Ibrahimov & Saikhunov, 2008; Martyanov et al, 2018 Villalobos Antunez, 2016).

The purpose of this work is to analyze the phonetic characteristics of consonant sounds that are most characteristic for conversational speech and their correlation with the literary norm of the Tatar language. The objectives of the work: to determine the composition and their most common variants of consonant phonemes in Tatar colloquial speech; to reveal phonetic peculiarities in the field of consonantism, which are observed in the oral speech of Tatar native speakers.

The analysis was carried out on the basis of 96 phonograms of dialogical and monologic oral speech by the Tatar language speakers of different ages, the representatives of the middle and western (Mishar) dialects of the Tatar language (Sattarova et al, 2014).

2 Methodology

In the process of research, they used the set of methods and techniques that allowed to come to the main results. In order to collect and accumulate the actual speech material, they used the method of observation, language experiment and continuous sampling. Using the descriptive method, scientific-theoretical and practical material was studied, language and speech phenomena were described. The comparative method was used in order to compare intra- and interlanguage phenomena during the interpretation of obtained results, as well as to characterize the phonetic features of modern Tatar colloquial speech consonant sounds and their correlation with the literary norm.

3 Results and discussion

Language is realized only in speech, and the communicative function of language is determined by this fact precisely. The study of language and speech relationship in phonetic, lexical, morphological and syntactic terms promises many interesting things. Language can be considered as fully described and studied when these parts of the language are studied in paradigmatics and syntagmatics. Learning the language in all its richness implies the display of linguistic phenomenon implementation in speech (Shakirova, 2017).

The phonetic system of any language develops and constantly changes, like the language itself. In the process of historical development, the people, and consequently, the culture come into contact with other cultures, which primarily influence everyday life and language at all levels. It is rather difficult to say what the phonetic system of the Tatar language was a thousand years ago. First, there were no methods of recording the features of phonetics then. Secondly, the literary language was formed rather late, and there was a gap between written and oral colloquial language. One can assert with certainty that this process will last as long as the language develops and changes.

The existing set of rules for the pronunciation of phonemes and the patterns of their use in speech are accepted as the phonetic norms of the Tatar language, which are considered compulsory for all members of the language collective. When they study the modern oral form of the language, they found that modern spoken language undergoes changes and deviations from phonetic norms. The main reasons of this process are the active penetration of dialectal features into modern Tatar speech and the interference phenomenon that arose as the result of active bilingualism.

The system of Tatar literary language consonants includes 28 sounds: $[\Pi]$, [G], [T], $[\Pi]$, $[\Gamma]$, $[\kappa]$, $[\Phi]$, [c], [3], $[\Pi]$, $[\kappa]$, $[\mu]$, [M], [H], $[\Pi]$, [P], [X], $[\Psi]$ the articulation of which almost does not differ from Russian sounds, [B], $[\Pi]$, $[\Pi]$ are used in Russian borrowed words, and $[\kappa]$, [F], [h], [H], [W], $[\pi]$, $[\pi]$ are specific Tatar sounds.

In order to identify the conformity and the inconsistency of consonant sounds with the ortoepic norms of the Tatar language at the level of words and phrases, let us dwell on their linguistic features. The sign groups of consonant sounds correspond to their classification by development place and mode. Let us consider the cases that most often lead to the deviation from the norm in detail.

The pronunciation of consonants in Tatar speech is significantly influenced by vowels, for example: the labialization of consonants after labialized vowels туп [т^ууп] – тирән [тирән], котып [қ°ŏтоп] – кыргый [кы ргый]), the palatalization of consonants next to the vowels of the front row and the velarization with the rear-row vowels (кал-кил) correspond to the orthoepic norms of the Tatar language.

As for the labial consonant sounds [6], $[\pi]$, [M], [W], [B], $[\varphi]$ – the following positions are considered as normative pronunciation:

1) in the intervocal position both inside a word and at the junction of the words the explosive element of the sound [δ] weakens: ca δ a κ [ca $^{\circ}\delta$ a κ], κ apan ana [κ a $^{\circ}$ pa δ a $^{\circ}$ na];

2) the voiceless sound $[\pi]$ in the intervocal position, both within the same word, and at the junction of words, alternates with the voiced pair [б]: туп – тубы, салып ала [са^алыба^ала]. This sound is also voiced at the junction of the words in front of the voiced [б]: карап бирэ [қа^араббирэ];

3) The sound [w], transmitted at the beginning of the syllable with the letter B, and at the end of the syllable with the letters y, γ , is pronounced with the participation of elongated rounded lips that are not touching each other: BataH [wa^oTaH], $Ja\gamma$ [Jaw];

4) under the influence of the labial nasal sound [M], some sounds alternate with the nasal ones: κοM+лap [κοMHap];

5) the alternation of non-linear consonants next to the labial ones: унбиш [умбиш].

Deviations from the norm:

1) the pronounciation of labial-dental [B] instead of [w] is typical for the speech of Russian-speaking Tatars, who grew up in Russian-speaking environment: BataH [BataH], дәγ [дәв];

2) the absence of alternation when the affix of the plural is added under the influence of the nasal [м]: белем+ләр [бэлэмләр] instead of [бэлэмнәр];

3) the absence of non-labial alternation next with the labial ones: унбиш [унбиш];

 4) insufficiently soft labial consonants before the vowels of the front row: Мәрьям [мә^aрьйәм];

5) the absence of the vowel [a°] labialization after the labial consonants: δapa [δapa];

6) the pronounciation of voiceless pair [п] instead of [ф]: фиргавен [пиргәwэн]; 7) the pronounciation of the sound [w] instead of [б]: кабып [каwып], табып [таwып].

The front-line consonants: [T], [Д], [Ц], [Ц], [Ц], [С], [3], [Ш], [Ж], [Ж], [H], [Л], [р].

The basic normative principles of the front-language consonant pronounciation:

1) the feature of antero-consonant consonant pronounciation when they are formed, the front part of the tongue articulates towards the upper teeth or to the dental part of the hard palate, and, thus, they are pronounced somewhat softly;

2) under the influence of the front [ч], [ж] the back vowels [a], [y], [o], [ы] are pronounced somewhat softly;

3) [H] in front of labial [б], [M] loses the sign of frontology and passes into the sound [M]: унбер [умбэр];

 [н] before uvular [κ], [κ] [г], [F] passes into the uvular [н]: энкэй [эңкэй];

5) [ч], [ц], [щ] are pronounced only in the borrowings from Russian and European languages: чек, цирк, щетка, щи;

6) the sound [3] in front of a voiceless consonant of a monosyllabic word or an affix is somewhat unvoiced at the end of a word and between two words, where the second word begins with a voiceless consonant: TO3CbI3 [TO3^c CO3^c], $\breve{H}\Theta3$ KaT [$\breve{H}\Theta3^c$ Ka^oT];

7) the sound $[\pi]$ following the nasal consonants [H], [M], alternates with the nasal [H]: төнлә [төннә], аңламады [а^оңнамады]. Although such assimilation is not considered as the norm in the literary pronunciation, but it is common in colloquial speech.

8) The most common deviations in colloquial speech:

1) the substitution of slit sound [ч] with an affricate [ц] or [^тч] in the dialects and in the speech of Russian-speaking Tatars: чәчәк [цәцәк] / [^тчә^тчәк]; пычак [пы^тчақ] / [пыцақ];

2) the pronounciation of palatalized variants [T'] and $[\Lambda']$ instead of [T] and $[\Lambda]$, according to articulatory and acoustic signs similar to Russian sounds [T'] and $[\Lambda']$: ТИЕН [T'ИЭН]; ДИМЭК $[\Lambda'ИМЭК]$;

3) the use of the combination of sounds [дж] instead of the Tatar specific anterolanguage sound [ж]: жиләк [джиләк], елак [джылақ], жыр [джыр];

4) the replacement of affricate [ц] with the sounds [c] or [ч] is common in common speech: молодец [маладис], цирк [сирык], купец [купис], офицер [эфисэр], больница [бүльнис].

Back consonants [r], $[\kappa]$. During their articulation, the back of the tongue articulates towards the upper palate. The back consonants are characterized by the following pronounciation features, which are considered as the norm:

1) the alternation of the sound [κ] with the voiced pair [Γ] in the intervocal position and next to the sonorous [p] both within the same word and at the junction of the words:: түк – түгэ, бөк – бөгэ, ак – аграк, йөк алу [йө та^олу^w], биек рэшэткэ [бийэ трэшэткэ];

2) when the joint of words has uvular [κ], when the first word ends by the back [κ], it is likened to the last $\kappa\kappa \rightarrow \kappa\kappa$: бик куркак [биккуркак];

There are few typical deviations from the norm, associated with the back $[r], [\kappa]$.

Uvular consonants $[\kappa]$, [F], [x], [H]. When these sounds are articulated, the uvula descends toward the back of the tongue.

Among the uvular sounds, all three are considered as specific Tatar sounds except for [x].

The normative pronunciation:

2) if there are $[\kappa]$ with the voiced pair [F] or the front [m], then the voiceless sound $[\kappa]$ acquires the color of the consonant [x] at the junction of words: ak xanar $[a^{\alpha}\kappa^{x}anam]$.

Deviations from the norm:

1) the pronounciation of back [κ], [Γ] instead of uvular [κ] and [F]: *кар* instead of literary [$\kappa a^{\circ}p$] – [$\kappa a^{\circ}p$]; *асым* instead of literary [$a^{\circ}FыM$] – [a° ГыМ] / [аГыМ];

2) the replacement of the uvular [x] by posterior-lingual Russian [x];

3) the replacement of the uvular [H] with the front nasal [H]: coH [CyH];

4) the replacement of the uvular [н] with the combination of sounds [нғ]: миңа [минға];

5) the replacement of the uvular [κ] with the uvular [x]: Bakыт [wa^oxыт]; xaтын [κ a^oтын];

6) the replacement of the uvular [к] with the uvular [F]: вакыт [wa°eыm];

7) in common language and dialects (predominantly in the Mishar dialect), the uvular [F] falls out in Arab-Persian borrowings: гадэт [эдэт], гаеп [айып], гомер [умэр].

8) The pharyngeal consonant [h] and the laryngal consonant gamza [ξ]. These consonants are used only in the words borrowed from Arabic and Persian languages. In colloquial speech, these sounds have a number of features that can be considered as deviations from the normative pronunciation. The deviations are related to the following fact: 1) these sounds are somewhat passive in colloquial speech; 2) their articulation causes difficulties in pronunciation for native Tatar language speakers.

Deviations from the norm:

1) in common language and in dialects (predominantly in the Mishar dialect), the pharyngeal [h] falls out: *hoeoc* [owoc], *hyuu* [ym];

2) in common speech and in the speech of Russian-speaking Tatars, the replacement of [h] with uvular [x] is quite common: шәһәр [шәхәр];

3) the pronounciation of the sound similar in articulation and acoustic characteristics to [й] sound instead of a laryngeal consonant [ɛ]: тээмин instead of [тэе мин] – [тэймин].

4 Conclusions

In oral conversational speech, the phonetic norms undergo the changes that are mainly conditioned by the influence of a place of residence or a place of a speaker's permanent long-term presence in a certain linguistic continuum, as well as by the phenomenon of interference.

The phonetic norms of the Tatar language are represented by the existing set of rules for the pronunciation of phonemes and the patterns of their use in speech, which are considered as compulsory for all members of the language collective. There is the opinion among the researchers that the phonetic system of the Tatar language is more stable and less subject to various kinds of influences. However, when they study the modern oral

form of the language, they found that modern spoken language undergoes changes, there are deviations from phonetic norms.

5 Summary

Thus, in Tatar colloquial speech the variability is manifested by $[\kappa]$, [F], which are replaced by the back $[\kappa]$, $[\Gamma]$. One should note the substitution of the slit, deep back [h] by Russian slit posterior [x]. In the Tatar language, the palatized variants $[\tau']$ and $[\pi']$ are varied rather actively, according to articulatory and acoustic signs similar to the Russian sounds $[\tau']$ and $[\pi']$. The main reasons for this are the interference that arose as a result of active bilingualism.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University. Monograph No. 17-14-16012 has been funded as an academic project by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research in the Republic of Tatarstan.

Literature:

1. Galiullina G.R. (2018). The phenomenon of lexical interference in the modern spoken Tatar language / TATARICA, 1(10), pp. 22-35.

2. Shcherba L.V. (1957). Selected works on the Russian language, p. 364.

3. Kozhemyakina V.A., Kolesnik N.G., Kryuchkov T.B and others. (2006). The dictionary of sociolinguistic terms. Institute of Linguistics RAS. Moscow, P.312.

4. Baudouin I.A. (1963). Selected works on general linguistics. Moscow The publishing house of the USSR Academy of Sciences, No.2, p.391.

5. Bogoroditsky V.A. (1953). Introduction to Tatar linguistics in connection with other Turkic languages. - Second edition, corrected and added. - Kazan: Tatgosizdat, p.220.

6. Galiullina G.R. (2014). On the issue of the terms "spoken language" and "literary language" restriction in modern Tatar linguistics. Philology and Culture, 4(38), pp. 57-60.

7. Ismagilova A. M., Galiullina G. R., Kuzmina Kh. (2016). Functional potential of mother tongue in conditions of bilingualism among youth of the Republic of Tatarstan. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 6(4), pp. 66-70.

8. Ibrahimov T.I, Saikhunov M.R. (2008). The issues of intonational synthesis of Tatar speech. Reconstruction of written text rhythm. Proceedings of the Kazan School of Computer and Cognitive Linguistics, pp.108-111.

9. Martyanov D., Kulsharipova R., Oglezneva N. (2018). Experimental Phonetics in Applied Linguistic Research. HELIX, 8(1), pp. 2946-2949.

10. Sattarova M.R., Zamaletdinov R.R., Nurmukhametova R.S. (2014). Variants of phoneme a in Tatar lingual areal. Life Science Journal, 1(10), pp. 657-660.

11. Shakirova G.R., Kharisova M., Kharisov F.F., Vinogradova N.F. (2017). Vowel system of Turkic languages: specification of teaching on condition of multicultural education. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. 7(9), pp.100-105.

12. Villalobos Antúnez J.V. (2016). Ciencia y Tecnología para la libertad, Opcion, 32(79), pp. 7-9.

13. Nurhayati M.H. (2018). Wisdom values in traditional phrases the Mamuju tribe in shaping this study entitled local the haracter of society: antrpolinguistics approach, Astra Salvensis, Supplement, No. 1, pp. 307-320.