

B. Khasenov^{1*}, Zh. Ibraimova²

¹*Bolashaq Academy, Karaganda, Kazakhstan;*

²*Karaganda Buketov National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
(e-mail: khasenov.bolat@bolashaq.edu.kz; zhenisgulibraimova@gmail.com)*

Evolution of Labial Consonants

This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the historical and phonological development of the labial consonants (p, b, m, u (w), v, f) in Turkic languages and their correlation with speech ontogenesis. The relevance of the study lies in the insufficient exploration of the phonological nature and archetypal basis of labial consonants within the Turkic consonant system. The main objective is to determine the stages of their historical evolution, describe phonetic correspondences and phonological interrelations, and reveal how these processes are reflected in the ontogenesis of child speech. The research employs comparative-historical, structural-phonological, and ontogenetic methods. The theoretical framework is based on N.A. Baskakov's historical-typological phonology and B. Sagyndykuly's "u-archetype" theory of phonogenesis. In addition, the experimental phonetic studies of A. Zhunisbek and Zh.A. Aralbaev on the Kazakh language substantiate the consonantal nature of the sound u. The material includes data from Old Turkic written monuments (the Orkhon and Yenisei inscriptions, Yusuf Balasaguni's Kutadgu Bilig, and Mahmud al-Kashgari's Divani Lughat al-Turk), as well as phonetic examples from modern Kazakh, Bashkir, Tatar, Khakas, Shor, Uyghur, and Turkish languages. Natural samples of child speech (papa, baba, mama, aua, etc.) were also examined and compared with historical phonological processes. The results confirm that labial consonants genetically derive from a single archetypal sound—p, which, over time, differentiated through its allophones (b, m, u, v) into independent phonemes. The consonantal status of u is consistently maintained in modern Kazakh phonology. Early acquisition of p, b, m and later emergence of v, f in child speech parallel the historical evolution at the ontogenetic level. Theoretically, the research contributes to clarifying the concept of phonological archetype and integrating comparative-historical and ontogenetic approaches. Practically, its findings can be applied in teaching historical phonetics, historical lexicology, comparative Turkology, experimental linguistics, and speech ontogenesis. The study also opens new perspectives for interdisciplinary research combining language history and speech development.

Keywords: archetype, sound, Kazakh language, vowel lips, language evolution.

Introduction

One of the distinctive typological features of the Turkic languages lies in the diachronic development of root meanings—from general and undifferentiated notions toward particular and concrete ones. Academician Ä. Qaidar clearly articulated this principle, noting that:

“The class of native Turkic, including specifically Kazakh, monosyllabic roots and bases is characterized by semantic filiation—that is, a sequential development of meaning from the general, undivided concept to a more particular and concrete one. The totality of meanings derived from a single root morpheme, while maintaining a genetic continuity with the original meaning, together constitutes a general notion that represents the initial stage of its semantic structure” [1].

Many Turkologists share this view, emphasizing that the meanings of primary roots initially reflected generalized conceptual fields, which gradually evolved—through prolonged stages of language development—into designations of specific objects and phenomena [2]. One of the crucial mechanisms contributing to this semantic differentiation is the system of sound correspondences within the Turkic languages. Nevertheless, as comparative linguistic evidence suggests, even when the external form or morphological composition of a word undergoes transformation and semantic shades are introduced, the originally generalized meaning can still be traced in the deeper layer of its etymological structure.

For instance, although the words *taqau* and *jaqyn* (“near”) exhibit distinct semantic nuances, they evidently derive from a common etymological base and share an identical archisememe. Their reconstructed roots—*taq* and *jaq*—can be identified in *The Structure of Monosyllabic Roots and Bases in the Kazakh Language* (hereafter OKO, pp. 191, 255). According to *The Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh Language* (hereafter QTTs), *taqau* means “to approach, to be close” (p. 775), whereas *jaqyn* means “not far,

* Corresponding author's e-mail: khasenov.bolat@bolashaq.edu.kz

near” (p. 253). The synonymous nature of these lexemes demonstrates the continuity of a shared semantic prototype. Within Turkological research, the question of which of the correlated forms should be regarded as the primary (archetypal) one remains a subject of long-standing scholarly debate [2–18].

The present article aims to trace the historical evolution of labial consonants in Turkic languages and to correlate these developments with certain phenomena observed in speech ontogenesis (child language acquisition). The primary objective is to identify the main historical stages of labial consonant formation and to compare their phonological development with ontogenetic patterns in speech.

In modern Kazakh, there are nineteen native consonant phonemes, traditionally classified according to the place of articulation as follows:

Labial consonants: p, b, m, u (w)

Apical (tongue-tip) consonants: t, d, n, š, ž, s, z, r, l

Mediolingual (tongue-middle) consonants: k, g

Dorsal (tongue-back) consonants: q, ğ, ŋ, j (y)

For analytical purposes, the consonant inventory was grouped based on their evolutionary tendencies, the period of phonemization (transition from allophones to independent phonemes), genetic relatedness, and regular sound correspondences—following the typological model proposed by N.A. Baskakov. In his classification, consonants are divided into front (labial), middle, and back groups [3]. For our purposes, front is interpreted as labial, middle as mediolingual (rather than “central”), and back as dorsal. Accordingly, in Kazakh, labial consonants include p, b, m, u (w); mediolingual consonants—y, t, d, n, š, ž, s, z, r, l; and dorsal consonants—q, ğ, k, g, ŋ.

Method and Materials

Research Material

The research material comprises phonetic data from both ancient and modern Turkic languages, including Kazakh. Comparative analysis was conducted on root forms containing the labial consonants p, b, m, u (w) in ancient Turkic written monuments such as the Orkhon Inscriptions, Kutadgu Bilig, and Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk, and their equivalents in modern Kazakh. In addition, data from Bashkir, Tatar, Shor, Khakas, Uyghur, Altai, Uzbek, and Turkish were incorporated. During the selection process, preference was given to roots exhibiting regular historical correspondences in labial consonants.

The analysis also drew upon phonological, comparative, and etymological materials from the works of N.A. Baskakov, B. Sagyndykuly, Ä. Zhūnisbek, Zh.A. Aralbaev, and E.N. Nadjip. Furthermore, natural samples of child speech (e.g., pəpə, bəbə, məmə, əwə, etc.) were included as auxiliary material. These data were used to explore parallels between the chronological stages of labial consonant development and the order of their emergence in speech ontogenesis.

Research Procedure

At the first stage, the occurrence and distribution of labial consonants in ancient and modern Turkic languages were identified, and their historical-comparative parallels were systematically organized. For this purpose, Baskakov’s model of consonant classification (front—labial, middle—mediolingual, back—dorsal) was adapted to the Kazakh phonological system.

At the second stage, the phonological evolution of p, b, m, u (w), f, and v was described. Based on Baskakov’s proposed allophonic chain [p (~ b ~ f/v ~ w ~ m)], the stages of transition from allophones to independent phonemes were reconstructed. Comparative analysis was also conducted in light of B. Sagyndykuly’s developmental sequence $u > p > b > v$, highlighting both the convergence and divergence between the two models.

At the third stage, data from speech ontogenesis were analyzed. Early babbling forms and phonetic substitutions in child speech (e.g., Bolat → Pouat, panda → badya, bouosy → volosy, bada → voda) were compared with historical phonological patterns. This procedure enabled the identification of a parallel between the sequence of emergence of p, b, m, u in child speech and their historical evolution in Turkic languages.

Data Analysis

The collected data were examined through comparative-historical and phonological methods. The primary objective was to determine the archetypal forms of labial consonants and to trace their historical and semantic evolution. The analysis revealed clear genetic relationships among labial consonants, reflected in

regular sound correspondences such as $p \sim b$, $b \sim m$, $p \sim u$, $b \sim v$, which are widely attested across the Turkic languages.

According to N.A. Baskakov, the earliest stage of development involved a single phoneme [p], while b, m, v, and u functioned as its allophones. Over time, these allophones differentiated into independent phonemes, marking distinct evolutionary phases:

Stage I (Proto-phase): [p ($\sim b \sim f/v \sim w \sim m$)] — undifferentiated allophonic system;

Stage II (Differentiation phase): [p, b, w, m] — phonemic stabilization;

Stage III (Later fricative phase): [f, v] — secondary fricativization.

In contrast, B. Sagyndykuly described this process in the reverse direction: u (a vocalic or semivocalic sonorant) $> p > b > v$, arguing that the evolution of labial consonants was initiated by the consonantalization of u. However, experimental research by Ä. Zhūnisbek provides evidence that in modern Kazakh, u functions exclusively as a consonant [w].

Phonological analysis thus confirmed that the Kazakh labial consonants p, b, m, u are historically related and derived from a single archetype. Furthermore, child-language data demonstrated that this developmental pattern is mirrored at the ontogenetic level: infants typically acquire p, b, and m between 8 and 9 months of age, while v and f appear later. This correlation supports the hypothesis that the historical evolution of labial consonants parallels their ontogenetic emergence, reflecting the inherent systematicity of language: the phonological laws that govern phylogenesis are reproduced in ontogenesis.

Results and Discussion

In modern Kazakh, the native labial consonants include p, b, m, and u (w) [4], while the fricatives v and f are considered borrowings. The genetic relationship among these sounds is revealed through sound alternations and historical correspondences, which are evidenced by data from Kazakh and other Turkic languages. For example, when the converb suffix -ıp is attached to the verb *şaп* (“to strike”), the root-final p changes to u (*şaıп*). Historically, labial consonants also display regular correspondences: $b \sim m$ (e.g., *buң* ~ *muң* “grief”); $p \sim b$ (*pus* ~ *bas* “to press”), etc.

According to S. Omarbekov and N. Zhūnisov, the alternation between p and b is a typical phenomenon in Kazakh dialects, and the change from b to p occurs quite frequently. In the literary language and dialects of Kazakh, the voiceless p rarely occurs in word-initial position and is mostly found in loanwords (e.g., *paluan* — *baluan*, *pal* — *bal*). The researchers note that the easy interchangeability of these two consonants (p, b) indicates their origin from a single phoneme [5].

Scholars also point out that one of the distinguishing features of Middle Turkic languages is the use of labial v and u in word-final position [2; 98, 6, 7]. For instance, the Old Turkic words *eb* (“house”) and *ab* (“to hunt”) were pronounced as *aw/av* in the Middle Turkic period. E.N. Nadjip writes: “Mahmud al-Kashgari states (vol. 1, pp. 31-32) that the Turkic u (bilabial) is pronounced as a labiodental sound by the Oghuz and related tribes; for example, instead of Turkic *äu* (“house”), the Oghuz say *av*; instead of *au* (“hunting”), they say *av*, etc.” [8].

Examples from medieval Turkic written monuments and comparative data from various Turkic languages show the genetic affinity of the consonants p, b, v, and u: *qypchaq* ~ *qyvchaq* ~ *qyuchaq*, *sub* ~ *suf* ~ *suv*, etc. [7; 64].

Through comprehensive comparison, Turkologists attempt to identify the archetypal consonant underlying these sound correspondences. For example, what was the original form of *biik* (“high”)? In some Turkic languages, this word begins with p (*pöyik*, *pözük*), while in others it starts with m (*mözük*). Scholars have proposed different hypotheses regarding which form represents the archetype.

Regarding labial consonant correspondences, N.A. Baskakov writes:

“In the earliest period, the labial consonants were represented by only one phoneme [p] with corresponding allophones in both the initial and final positions” [3; 100].

According to Baskakov, the allophonic composition of the voiceless p included [p ($\sim b \sim f/v \sim w \sim m$)]. In other words, only p functioned as an independent phoneme, while b, f/v, w, and m existed as its allophones. The differentiation of these allophones into distinct phonemes occurred gradually over several stages:

Stage I: p and its allophones (b, f/v, w, m) were present. In the early stages of consonant evolution in Turkic, only p had phonemic status, as shown by correspondences such as $p \sim b \sim m$ in initial position: – Uygh. *perek*, Khak. *pözük*, Shor dial. *pöyik* ~ Common Turkic *bük/biyik*, Old Turkic *bedük*, Tuvan *bedik*, Shor — meaning “high”;

– Khak. pū: r, pō: r, Alt. pörü, börü ~ Common Turkic börü, bürü, Kum. möre, Kara-Tat. mörü, mürö — meaning “wolf”.

Stage II: The sonorant allophones (m, w) differentiated and became independent phonemes

[p (~ b ~ f/v)];

[w];

[m].

Examples: may (“butter”)—bay (“rich”); tap (“to find”)—tau (“mountain”).

Stage III: Spirant consonants (v, f) emerged. Their phonemicization can be observed, for instance, in Kaz. ber — Oghuz (Tur., Az.) ver “to give”.

Stages IV–V: Voiceless and voiced allophones evolved into independent phonemes:

[p]; 2) [b]; 3) [f]; 4) [v]; 5) [w]; 6) [m].

B. Sagyndykuly also studied this issue extensively, offering an alternative reconstruction. He excluded the borrowed f and the nasal m from Baskakov’s model. According to Sagyndykuly, the archetype of labial consonants was the vowel u. He argued that u underwent two long evolutionary stages: the first being fortition (transition from vowel → sonorant → semiconsonant → voiceless stop), and the second being voicing (transition from voiceless to voiced):

u (vowel) > w (sonorant) > ... > up/uf > p > b > v [6; 33, 7; 68].

Sagyndykuly suggested that at least 3–5 millennia were required for the emergence of the p ~ b ~ v correspondences, whereas the transformation of the vowel u into the consonant p cannot even be chronologically estimated.

He provides several arguments for the phonetic affinity between the sonorant u and the voiceless p:

1. p easily alternates with u in final position (şap-ıp — şauıp);
2. In Old Turkic inscriptions, b/p within words corresponds to u in modern Kazakh (ab > au “hunt”);
3. Variants formed through p ~ b ~ u correspondences function stylistically and semantically in parallel within the literary language and dialects: qabak (“pumpkin”)—qauaq (“vessel made from pumpkin”); kebek (“cave”)—keueq (“burrow, den”), etc.;
4. These examples show that while p, b are now turning into u, historically the reverse process occurred — u > p.

In modern Kazakh, verbs such as baru (“to go”), kelu (“to come”), jüru (“to walk”), turu (“to stand”) denote action. The suffix -u functions as a verbal noun marker. Historically, its form was -uğ (-uq); during language evolution, the final ğ/q was lost, leaving u in word-final position. In Orkhon–Yenisey inscriptions, -u served the same function as the modern converb suffix -ıp/-ip:

añar körü biliñ türk amtı budun begler (“Look and know the beys of the present Turkic people”)—where körü corresponds to modern Kazakh körip.

In this example, -u follows a consonant and performs the function of a converb. When it follows a vowel, a prosthetic or epenthetic y is inserted before it, as in süleyü (“to wage war”), oplayu (“to depart”) [6; 34, 7; 70]. In our opinion, B. Sagyndykuly seems to have confused vowels with consonants. It appears that he relied on Zh.A. Aralbaev’s statement that the sound u can function both as a vowel and as a consonant. Aralbaev wrote:

“There is no purely pronounced u sound in Kazakh. After consonants, it is perceived as a diphthong, and after vowels as a sonorant u. The main component of the vowel u is ü or u, while its secondary, weakened component is the sonorant u (as in tau “mountain”), pronounced briefly and quickly” [9].

For example, B. Sagyndykuly, analyzing words such as suu, tuu, jauyn, egew, etc., identified three variants of the vowel u: pure u, diphthong uu/üu, and sonorant w.

The experimental phonetic research of Ä. Zhünisbek, however, provides a more precise view. He notes: “In school and university textbooks, the sounds represented by the letters i and u are incorrectly described as being “vowel after consonant, consonant after vowel”, while academic grammars correctly define them as letters denoting the combination of a vowel and a consonant”.

Zhünisbek concludes that in Kazakh, the sound u (w) is exclusively consonantal [4; 70]. Therefore, sequences such as üü and uu are not diphthongs but simply combinations like au, äu.

When examining the Old Turkic script, one finds no specific symbol for the consonantal u (w) sound [10]. Nevertheless, scholars, based on linguistic evidence, have suggested that the consonantal u did exist in ancient times. N.A. Baskakov argued: “In most cases, the initial consonants w, j, h in Turkic languages are historically ancient consonants (emphasis added — B.K.), originally present in the early stages of consonant and vowel system development. They later disappeared from most Turkic languages as the initial

consonantal element weakened, but traces of their disappearance remained—either as diphthongoid elements (e.g., in dialects of Karakalpak, Kazakh, Nogai, and others), or as the lengthening of the initial vowel (e.g., in Turkmen and others), or through secondary reappearance under the influence of neighboring languages” [3; 47].

He further demonstrated the correspondences between the initial consonants $v \sim w$ and diphthongoid elements $v \sim w \sim u \sim \ddot{u}$ across Turkic languages: Kaz. *ūr* — Tur./Azerb. *vur*, Kaz. *at* — Uzbek dial. *vata*, Karakalp. *uoq*, *uoy*, etc. Baskakov also cited experimental data showing that in Kazakh, the sounds *o*, *ö* are preceded by a consonantal *u* (*w*), meaning that Chuvash words like *von* (“ten”), *vot* (“fire”) would be pronounced as *won*, *wot* in Kazakh [4; 98]. From this, it follows that the Proto-Turkic language possessed a word-initial consonantal *u* (*w*).

We believe that in Proto-Turkic, *u* functioned solely as a consonant, and there is no reason to confuse it with a vowel. This is clearly supported by historical sound change evidence.

Generally, identifying which sound appeared first in word-initial position remains a complex issue. Most scholars consider *p* the archetypal labial consonant. According to their view, in the developmental stages of Proto-Turkic, the occurrence of *p* at the beginning of words was widespread, historically preceding *b*. In ancient and modern Turkic languages, words such as *baş*, *balıq*, *boş*, etc., were originally pronounced with initial *p* [18]. However, according to the Ramstedt–Pelliot law in Altaic studies, there is also a hypothesis suggesting that the voiced *b* was the original form in Proto-Turkic [19, 20].

In linguistics, there exists the view that phylogenesis is briefly recapitulated in ontogenesis [21, 22]. Based on this concept, the general development of human language is reflected in the development of a child’s speech—that is, the overall evolution of human speech is reproduced in miniature in child language.

In speech ontogenesis, labial consonants develop earlier than others [23]. Around the age of 8-9 months, infants begin to produce babbling sounds such as *pəpə*, *bəbə*, *məmə*, *əwə*, *əpə*, etc. According to A.N. Gvozdev’s observations, the first consonants acquired are the plosive labials (*p*, *b*, *m*), and substitutions between them are rare (our recordings include examples such as *Bolat* → *Pouat*, *panda* → *badya*). The fricatives (*f*, *v*) appear later. Since these sounds emerge relatively late in child speech, they are often replaced by *b* or *p*: *bouosy*, *bada* (“volosy, voda”, child *Asylai*); *bat’i* (“volosy”), *d’ip* (“zhiv”), according to Gvozdev’s diary [23; 98]. This phenomenon is directly related to the physiological development of the articulatory organs.

As for the consonant *u* (*w*), it also appears among the early-acquired sounds (found, for instance, in *əwə*, uttered around 7-8 months). It often substitutes *l*, *r*, and *v*: *dala* → *dawa* / *dava*, *jasył* → *dasyu*, *qyzyl* → *qyzyu*, *davaj* → *dawaj*, *belaya* → *beuaya*. In our practice, we have observed substitution of *ğ* by *u* (*w*): *toğız* → *touz*, *sağat* → *sauat* (Appendix A).

This phenomenon also exists in Turkic languages: for example, Old Turkic *yağ*, *tağ* correspond to modern Kazakh *jau*, *tau*. In child language, the consonant *u* (*w*) appears significantly earlier than *ğ*. While these data alone cannot serve as definitive proof, if we recall the hypothesis in Altaic studies (Starostin) that *u* (*w*) occurred in word-final position in Proto-Altaic, we may infer that languages preserving consonantal *u* (*w*) trace their origins to the deepest historical layers of the Turkic family.

Conclusion

The findings of the study demonstrate the complex yet systematic evolutionary nature of the historical-phonological development of the labial consonants (*p*, *b*, *m*, *u/w*, *v*, *f*) in the Turkic languages. The analysis confirms that all of these consonants originated from a single archetypal source, with *p* functioning as the initial phonemic unit. Over time, this sound differentiated through its allophonic variants, giving rise to new phonemes such as *b*, *m*, and *u* (*w*). Thus, the general direction of development for the labial consonants can be represented as:

[*p*] → [*b*] → [*v/w*] → [*m*].

The study further reveals that the differentiation of labial consonants was influenced not only by articulatory and acoustic factors but also by the intrinsic logic of linguistic evolution—the historical laws governing the phonological system itself. Although the theoretical frameworks of the Baskakov and Sagyndykuly schools differ, they share a common principle: the genetic unity and systemic evolution of labial consonants within the Turkic phonological continuum.

Data from speech ontogenesis partially confirm this theory. The fact that *p*, *b*, and *m* are the first labial consonants acquired in child speech, while fricatives and sonorants appear later, indicates that the historical-phonological development of these sounds is mirrored, in miniature, during individual speech formation.

This supports the principle of phylogenetic and ontogenetic parallelism: the overall evolution of language is briefly recapitulated in the process of speech development in the individual.

Consequently, the formation and development of labial consonants in the phonological system of the Turkic languages represent the outcome of a natural historical evolution. The recognition of p as the historical archetype, its extensive allophonic structure, and its correlation with speech ontogenesis together attest to the deep historical roots of the Kazakh phonetic system.

References

- 1 Кайдар А. Т. Структура односложных корней и основ в казахском языке / А. Т. Кайдар. — Алматы: Арыс, 2005. — 304 с.
- 2 Ескеева М. Тарихи дыбыс өзгерістері / М. Ескеева. — Астана: Еуразия ұлттық университеті, 2003. — 182 б.
- 3 Баскаков Н. А. Историко-типологическая фонология тюркских языков / Н. А. Баскаков. — М.: Наука, 1988. — 208 с.
- 4 Жүнісбек Ә. Қазақ фонетикасы / Ә. Жүнісбек. — Алматы: Арыс, 2009. — 312 б.
- 5 Омарбеков С. Ауызекі тіліміздің дыбыстық жүйесі / С. Омарбеков, Н. Жүнісов. — Алматы, 1985. — 208 б.
- 6 Сағындықов Б. Қазақ тілі лексикасының этимологиялық негіздері / Б. Сағындықов. — Алматы, 1996. — 168 б.
- 7 Сағындықұлы Б. Фонологические закономерности развития лексики тюркских языков / Б. Сағындықұлы. — Изд. 2-е — Алматы: Арыс, 2009. — 308 с.
- 8 Наджип Э. Н. Историко-сравнительный словарь тюркских языков XIV века / Э. Н. Наджип. — М., 1989. — 479 с.
- 9 Аралбаев Ж. А. Вокализм казахского языка: очерки экспериментальной фонетики и фонологии / Ж. А. Аралбаев. — Алма-Ата, 1970. — 188 с.
- 10 Сартқожаұлы Қ. Байырғы түрік жазуының генезисі / Қ. Сартқожаұлы. — Астана: Арыс, 2007. — 304 б.
- 11 Ramstedt G. J. Kalmückisches Wörterbuch. — Aufl. 2 / G. J. Ramstedt. — Helsinki, 1976. — 148 s.
- 12 Poppe N. Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen / N. Poppe. — Wiesbaden, 1960. — Т. 1. — 188 s.
- 13 Старостин С. А. Алтайская проблема и происхождение японского языка / С. А. Старостин. — М.: Наука, 1991. — 190 с.
- 14 Иллич-Свитыч В. М. Опыт сравнения ностратических языков / В. М. Иллич-Свитыч. — М.: Наука, 1971. — Т. 1. — 412 с.
- 15 Цинциус В. И. Сравнительная фонетика тунгусо-маньчжурских языков / В. И. Цинциус. — Л., 1949. — 400 с.
- 16 Малов С. Е. Древние и новые тюркские языки / С. Е. Малов // ОЛЖ. — 1952. — Т. 2. — № 2. — С. 135–143.
- 17 Щербак А. М. Сравнительная фонетика тюркских языков / А. М. Щербак. — Л., 1970. — 204 с.
- 18 Серебренников Б. А. Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков / Б. А. Серебренников, Н. З. Гаджиева. — М.: Наука, 1986. — 302 с.
- 19 Щербак А. М. Об алтайской гипотезе в языкознании / А. М. Щербак // Вопросы языкознания. — 1959. — № 6. — С. 51–63.
- 20 Мамедов А. Тюркские согласные: анлаут и комбинаторика / А. Мамедов. — Баку, 1985. — 479 с.
- 21 Якобсон Р. Звуковые законы детского языка и их место в общей фонологии / Р. Якобсон // В кн.: Избранные работы. — М.: 1985. — С. 105–115.
- 22 Pinker S. The language instinct: How the mind creates language / S. Pinker. — NY.: Penguin UK, 2003. — 403 p.
- 23 Гвоздев А. Н. Усвоение ребенком звуковой стороны русского языка / А. Н. Гвоздев // В кн.: Возрастная психология. — М.: Лабиринт, 2004. — С. 72–112.

Б. Хасенов, Ж. Ибраимова

Ерін дауыссыздарының эволюциясы

Мақалада түркі тілдеріндегі ерін дауыссыздарының (п, б, м, у (w), в, ф) тарихи-фонологиялық дамуы және олардың сөйлеу онтогенезімен байланысы жан-жақты қарастырылды. Такырыптың өзектілігі — түркі тілдерінің консонантизм жүйесінде ерін дауыссыздарының фонологиялық табиғаты мен архетиптік негізінің толық айқындалмауында. Осыған байланысты зерттеудің басты мақсаты — ерін дауыссыздарының тарихи дамуының кезеңдерін анықтау, олардың арасындағы дыбыс сәйкестіктері мен фонологиялық байланыстарды сипаттау, сондай-ақ бұл үдерістердің бала тіліндегі сөйлеу онтогенезінде қайталану сипатын айқындау. Зерттеу барысында салыстырмалы-тарихи, құрылымдық-фонологиялық және онтогенетикалық әдістер қолданылды. Теориялық негіз ретінде Н. А. Баскаковтың тарихи-типологиялық фонологиясы мен Б. Сағындықұлының у-архетипі фоногенез жөніндегі

тұжырымдамасы алынды. Сонымен бірге Ә. Жүнісбек, Ж.А. Аралбаевтың қазақ тіліндегі эксперименталды фонетика бойынша еңбектері пайдаланылып, у дыбысының дауыссыздық табиғаты нақты дәлелмен негізделді. Материал ретінде көне түркі жазба ескерткіштерінің деректері (Орхон, Енисей жазба ескерткіштері, Жүсіп Баласағұндың «Құтты білік», Махмұд Қашқаридің «Дивани лұғат ат-түрк») атты еңбектері, сондай-ақ қазіргі қазақ, башқұрт, татар, хакас, шор, ұйғыр және түрік тілдерінің фонетикалық мысалдары алынды. Сонымен қатар бала тілінен алынған табиғи сөйлеу үлгілері (пәпә, бәбә, мәмә, әуә, т.б.) зерттеуге енгізіліп, тарихи фонологиялық процестермен салыстырылды. Нәтижесінде ерін дауыссыздарының генетикалық тұрғыдан бір архетиптік негізден, яғни п дыбысынан тарағаны дәлелденді. Уақыт өте келе бұл дыбыс өз аллофондары — б, м, у, в арқылы сараланып, жеке фонемаларға айналған. Сондай-ақ у дыбысының дауыссыздық қасиетке ие болуы қазақ тілінің қазіргі фонологиялық жүйесінде толық дәлелденді. Бала тіліндегі п, б, м дыбыстарының ерте, ал в, ф дыбыстарының кеш пайда болуы тарихи эволюцияның онтогенетикалық деңгейде қайталанатынын көрсетті. Зерттеу нәтижелері ерін дауыссыздарының тарихи даму заңдылықтарын айқындап қана қоймай, қазақ тілінің дыбыстық жүйесінің көне дәуірмен сабақтастығын да дәлелдейді. Мақала теориялық тұрғыда фонологиялық архетип ұғымын нақтылауда және тарихи-салыстырмалы әдісті онтогенездік деректермен ұштастыруда өте маңызды болады, ал практикалық маңызы — алынған тұжырымдарды қазақ тіл білімінің тарихи фонетикасы, тарихи лексикологиясы, салыстырмалы түркітану және эксперименталды лингвистика, сөйлеу онтогенезі курстарында, сондай-ақ фонетикалық талдау әдістемесінде қолдануға мүмкіндік береді. Бұл мақала болашақта тіл тарихы мен сөйлеу онтогенезін ұштастыра зерттейтін пәнаралық сипатындағы зерттеу жұмыстарының пайда болуына әсер ете алады.

Кілт сөздер: архетип, дыбыс, қазақ тілі, ерін дауыссыздары, тіл эволюциясы.

Б. Хасенов, Ж. Ибраимова

Эволюция губных согласных

В данной статье всесторонне рассматривается историко-фонологическое развитие губных согласных (п, б, м, у (w), в, ф) в тюркских языках и их связь с онтогенезом речи. Актуальность темы обусловлена тем, что в системе консонантизма тюркских языков фонологическая природа и архетипическая основа губных согласных до конца не изучены. Цель исследования — определить этапы исторического развития губных согласных, описать звуковые соответствия и фонологические связи между ними, а также выявить характер повторяемости этих процессов в онтогенезе детской речи. В работе использованы сравнительно-исторический, структурно-фонологический и онтогенетический методы. Теоретическую базу исследования составили историко-типологическая фонология Н. А. Баскакова и концепция Б. Сагындыкулы о фоногенезе с архетипом «у». Кроме того, были использованы труды А. Жүнісбека и Ж.А. Аралбаева в области экспериментальной фонетики казахского языка, которые позволили убедительно доказать согласную природу звука у. В качестве материала привлечены данные древнетюркских письменных памятников (орхонские и енисейские надписи, труды Ю. Баласагуни «Кутадғу билиг» и М. Кашғари «Дивани лугат ат-тюрк»), а также фонетические примеры из современных казахского, башкирского, татарского, хакаского, шорского, уйгурского и турецкого языков. Дополнительно использованы естественные образцы детской речи (пәпә, бәбә, мәмә, әуә и др.), сопоставленные с историко-фонологическими процессами. В результате установлено, что губные согласные генетически восходят к единому архетипу — звуку п, который со временем через свои аллофоны (б, м, у, в) дифференцировался и стал самостоятельными фонемами. Доказано, что согласный характер звука у устойчиво проявляется в современной фонологической системе казахского языка. Раннее усвоение звуков п, б, м и более позднее формирование в, ф в детской речи отражают историческую эволюцию на онтогенетическом уровне. Теоретическая значимость исследования заключается в уточнении понятия фонологического архетипа и интеграции сравнительно-исторического метода с онтогенетическими данными, а практическая ценность — в возможности использования полученных результатов в курсах по исторической фонетике, лексикологии, сравнительному тюркознанию и экспериментальной лингвистике. Исследование открывает перспективы для дальнейших междисциплинарных работ, объединяющих историю языка и онтогенез речи.

Ключевые слова: архетип, звук, казахский язык, губные согласные, эволюция языка.

Reference

- 1 Kaidar, A. T. (2005). *Struktura odnoslozhnykh kornei i osnov v kazakhskom yazyke* [Structure of monosyllabic roots and stems in the Kazakh language]. Almaty: Arys [in Russian].
- 2 Eskeeva, M. (2003). *Tarikhi dybys özgeristeri* [Historical sound changes]. Astana: Eurasia ulttyq universiteti [in Kazakh].

- 3 Baskakov, N. A. (1988). *Istoriko-tipologicheskaya fonologiya tiurkskikh yazykov* [Historical-typological phonology of Turkic languages]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 4 Zhunisbek, A. (2009). *Qazaq fonetikasi* [Kazakh phonetics]. Almaty: Arys [in Kazakh].
- 5 Omarbekov, S., & Zhunisov, N. (1985). *Auyzeki tilimizdin dybystyq zhuiesi* [The phonetic system of spoken Kazakh]. Almaty [in Kazakh].
- 6 Sagyndykov, B. (1996). *Qazaq tili leksikasynyn etimologiyalyq negizderi* [Etymological foundations of the Kazakh language lexicon]. Almaty [in Kazakh].
- 7 Sagyndykuly, B. (2009). *Fonologicheskie zakonomernosti razvitiia leksiki tiurkskikh yazykov* [Phonological regularities in the development of the Turkic languages lexicon]. Almaty: Arys [in Russian].
- 8 Nadjip, E. N. (1989). *Istoriko-sravnitelnyi slovar tiurkskikh yazykov XIV veka* [Historical comparative dictionary of the Turkic languages of the 14th century]. Moscow [in Russian].
- 9 Aralbayev, Zh. A. (1970). *Vokalizm kazakhskogo yazyka: ocherki eksperimentalnoi fonetiki i fonologii* [Vowel system of the Kazakh language: Essays in experimental phonetics and phonology]. Alma-Ata: Nauka [in Russian].
- 10 Sartkozhauly, K. (2007). *Baiyrgy turik zhazyunyn genezisi* [The genesis of the Old Turkic script]. Astana: Arys [in Kazakh].
- 11 Ramstedt, G. J. (1976). *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch* [Kalmyk dictionary]. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- 12 Poppe, N. (1960). *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen* [Comparative grammar of Altaic languages] (Vol. 1). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- 13 Starostin, S. A. (1991). *Altaiskaya problema i proiskhozhdenie yaponskogo yazyka* [The Altaic problem and the origin of the Japanese language]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 14 Illich-Svitych, V. M. (1971). *Opyt sravneniia nostraticheskikh yazykov* [An attempt at comparison of the Nostratic languages]. (Vol. 1). Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 15 Tsintsius, V. I. (1949). *Sravnitel'naya fonetika tunguso-manchzhurskikh yazykov* [Comparative phonetics of Tungus-Manchu languages]. Leningrad [in Russian].
- 16 Malov, S. E. (1952). Drevnie i novye tiurkskie yazyki [Ancient and modern Turkic languages]. *OLiYa*, 2(2), 135–143 [in Russian].
- 17 Shcherbak, A. M. (1970). *Sravnitel'naya fonetika tiurkskikh yazykov* [Comparative phonetics of Turkic languages]. Leningrad: Nauka [in Russian].
- 18 Serebrennikov, B. A., & Gadzhieva, N. Z. (1986). *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskaya grammatika tiurkskikh yazykov* [Comparative historical grammar of the Turkic languages]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 19 Shcherbak, A. M. (1959). Ob altayskoi gipoteze v yazykoznanii [On the Altaic hypothesis in linguistics]. *Voprosy yazykoznaniia — Questions of linguistic*, 6, 51–63 [in Russian].
- 20 Mamedov, A. (1985). *Tiurkskie soglasnye: anlaut i kombinatorika* [Turkic consonants: anlaut and combinatorics]. Baku: Elm [in Russian].
- 21 Jakobson, R. (1985). Zvukovye zakony detskogo yazyka i ikh mesto v obshchey fonologii [Sound laws of child language and their place in general phonology]. *Izbrannye raboty — Selected works* (pp. 105–115). Moscow: Progress [in Russian].
- 22 Pinker, S. (2003). *The language instinct: How the mind creates language*. New York: Penguin UK.
- 23 Gvozdev, A. N. (2004). Usvoenie rebenkom zvukovoy storony russkogo yazyka [Acquisition of the sound system of Russian by the child]. *Vozrastnaya psikhologiya — Age psychology* (pp. 72–112). Moscow: Labirint [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Khassenov, Bolat Rashidovich (corresponding author) — PhD, Assistant, Professor, Karaganda Buketov National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan. E-mail: khassenov.bolat@bolashaq.edu.kz; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0092-7143>

Ibraimova, Zhenisgul Zhalgasbaevna — PhD in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Russian Language and Literature named after G.A. Meiramova, Karaganda Buketov University. E-mail: zhenisguliibraimova@gmail.com; ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5997-3198>