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ABSTRACT

The analysis of the dictionary published by P. S. Pallas makes it possible to clarify the chronology of changes in Kazakh dialects. The Kazakh dictionary of P. S. Pallas is important evidence that PTu *č* was still preserved in the 18th century in Kazakh, and the changes were PTu *j̣*, *f̣* not finished yet. The dictionary presents only those innovative changes of consonants that are common for all Kipchak languages. It was also interesting that in the Kazakh language spoken in the late 18th century, only 1 sound change from Proto Turkic; in the Tatar dictionary 2 sound changes; in the Nogai dictionary 1 sound change; in the Hill Mari language 2 sound changes; in the South Khanty 5 sound changes; in the North Khanty 3 sound changes, and in the East Khanty 1 sound change.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Currently, native speakers of the Kazakh language occupy a vast area of modern Kazakhstan. Some of them occupy Russia, Uzbekistan, China, Mongolia, Turkey, and other countries. There are more than 17 million native speakers of the Kazakh language, and they can understand each other perfectly across their entire distribution area due to minor phonological differences between dialects (cf. Dybo, 2010). The founders of Kazakh dialectology are Amanzholov, Dosqarayev, and Sauranbayev. Already in the 1960s, the first monographs describing specific dialects were published: a complex study of the eastern dialect by Bolatov (1970), Nurmagambetov (1974) worked on the Western dialect, Nakysbekov (1974) described the features of the southern dialect, and Omarbekov (1992) studied the phonetic differences in the consonant system of the Kazakh speech.

In his work, Amanzholov (1959) puts forward a hypothesis about the existence of three dialects of the Kazakh language, each associated with one of the three zhuzes. These are:

1) The southern dialect that covers Alma-Ata, Dzhambul, Shymkent, Taldy-Kurgan region, and some districts of the Kyzylorda region,
2) The western dialect that covers Aktobe, Guryev (now Atyrau region) and partly covers Kyzylorda and Kostanay regions,
3) The north-eastern dialect that includes the accents of Akmolinsk (now Nur-Sultan), Pavlodar, Semipalatinsk, Kokshetau, Qaraghandy, East Kazakhstan region, Northern Kazakhstan, and the Kostanay region.

On the other hand, Doskaraev (1954), based on his dialectological research, identifies two large groups. These are:

1) The south-eastern dialect that is common in Alma-Ata, Dzhambul, in the areas located to the south-west of Taldy-Kurgan and south-east of Kyzyl-Orda regions,
In this classification, the second group of dialects is divided into western and north-eastern subgroups (Dosqarayev, 1954, p. 87). Without delving into the detailed characteristics of dialect features specific to each area, we will only highlight the features that consistently correspond between Kazakh dialects, as described in the work of Dosqarayev (1954, p. 1). The first feature is the presence of the sound η in south-eastern regions and the corresponding ɵ in the north-western ones. The second is the presence of an affricative ðacb in south-eastern dialects when it corresponds to ꞏ in the north-western ones. The last one is the change γ > n was recorded in the south-eastern accents but not in the north-western ones.

Nurmagambetov (1974) also discusses an important morphonological feature of the eastern dialect (spoken in Ayagoz, Oskemen, Kosh-Agach, Bayan-Ölgii, and Xinjiang): the use of ə instead of ø in the plural endings of nouns.

However, these features are only present in the dialects of the 10th and 11th centuries. In the monograph of Normanskaya (2022), texts from different dialects of the 19th century were analyzed. The monograph focuses on the eastern, northern, and western dialects. It was observed that the main difference between the dialects lies in the rules of vowel harmony.

The Kazakh dictionary created by Pallas (1787–1789) was thoroughly analyzed by the Turkish scientist Ceritoglu, 2019. In his article, he provides all words from the dictionary that have parallels in the modern Kazakh language, along with an analysis of the possibilities of combining different vowels in the first and second syllables of the word. Additionally, special reflexes that differ from the modern Kazakh language were collected and compared with modern dialects (cf. Ceritoglu, 2019). However, we believe that, to understand the significance of P. S. Pallas’ dictionary, it is important to correlate its material not only with dialects but also with Proto-Turkic. This approach allows us to determine which reflexes are archaic and which are innovative, indicating the presence of Kazakh dialects in the 18th century.

2. Method

Currently, P. S. Pallas’ Kazakh dictionary is available online on LingvoDoc (http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/4295/1/perspective/4295/2/view). Turkic proto-forms have been added to it, and the dictionary was connected by etymological links with other Kipchak dictionaries by P. S. Pallas. Our preliminary analysis has revealed that during that period, many characteristic features of the Kazakh language began to form, which currently distinguishes it from other Kipchak languages (such as Tatar and Bashkir) and from the common Turkic ancestor language. Archaic Turkic reflexes were still preserved in some words. Then, we collected and analyzed all the forms in which there are different reflexes, such as in Proto-Turkic, Literary Kazakh, or Pallas’s Kazakh dictionary.

3. Results

In Table 1, let us consider all cases where the reflection in modern literary Kazakh or in the dictionary (Pallas, 1787–1789) differs from the reconstructed sound in the Proto-Turkic language. The information presented in the first two columns is quoted from the work of Tenishev and Dybo (2006, pp. 13–16, 156–157). The third column represents data acquired as a result of analyzing the Kazakh dictionary (Pallas, 1787–1789).

Next, we present illustrative material of these features with examples from the dictionary of the 18th century and discuss if there are the same reflexes in the eastern, southern, western, and northern dialects of the Kazakh language according to the audio dictionaries available on lingvodoc.ispras.ru.

A. Proto-Turkic "b-

lit. Kazakh əac, Kazakh бась, ‘head’ < Proto-Turkic *balć;

lit. Kazakh əap, Kazakh байырлып, ‘exists, sometimes’ < Proto-Turkic *bår;

lit. Kazakh ɥap, Kazakh бәйым, ‘ice’ < Proto-Turkic *bû(n)jir;

lit. Kazakh ɥuəiʃ, Kazakh мөөш ‘horn’ < Proto-Turkic *bux jużt (‘buxjût’);

lit. Kazakh ышкы, Kazakh мисаыр, ‘cat’ < Proto-Turkic *bûl(ik);


Even these examples show that the rules of transition "b- > m- are different in the literary Kazakh language and in the dictionary of the 18th century. This can be seen in the word lit. Kazakh ɥap, Kazakh əap, Kazakh бась ‘head’. We see the same reflexes in the dialect variants of this word, available on LingvoDoc and in the dictionary of the 18th century. In the dictionary of the Western dialect of the Kazakh language (Kostanay), the Dictionary of the Dzhambul dialect of the Kazakh language, the (https://lingvodoc:
The Number of Innovations in Kazakh Dictionaries of the Eighteenth Century

TABLE I: REFLEXES OF PROTO-TURKIC PRONOMES IN LIT. KAZAKH AND IN THE DICTIONARY OF THE 18TH CENTURY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-Turkic</th>
<th>Literary Kazakh</th>
<th>Kazakh Pallas 18th century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. *b</td>
<td>b-in</td>
<td>b-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. *b</td>
<td>b-w/j</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. *d-</td>
<td>t-(d-)</td>
<td>t-l-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. *d-</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *e</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *η</td>
<td>g/-j-in</td>
<td>g/b/do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *i</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *i</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *η</td>
<td>g/-j-in</td>
<td>g/b/do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. *i, *ř</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. *e, *e, *e, *e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. *u, *u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. *o, *o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. *o, *o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northern dialect of Pavlodar: muz ‘ice.’ Thus, it is clear that the modern literary reflex is an innovation.

B. Proto-Turkic *-b-
lit. Kazakh қанағат, Kazakh Қанағат ‘storm’ < Proto-Turkic *dabul;
lit. Kazakh ғың, Kazakh Ғың ‘water’ < Proto-Turkic *sib;
These examples show the distinction between the modern literary Kazakh language and the dictionary of the 18th century. In the Kazakh literary language *-b- is preserved in some form as a diphthong in the speech. However, in all available examples from the Pallas dictionary, it disappears.

C. Proto-Turkic *-d-
lit. Kazakh қошқын, Kazakh Қошқын ‘knee’ < Proto-Turkic *dūr (< *dūr);
lit. Kazakh түркөм, Kazakh Түркөм ‘nails’ < Proto-Turkic *dirka-k;
lit. Kazakh трюм, Kazakh Трюм ‘four’ < Proto-Turkic *dört;
lit. Kazakh дөңүз, Kazakh Дөңүз ‘pig’ < Proto-Turkic *dąr;
lit. Kazakh қанағат, Kazakh Қанағат ‘storm’ < Proto-Turkic *dabul;
On the basis of these examples, it can be assumed that the lexemes in which the Proto-Turkic *d was preserved coincide at least partially in the literary language and in the Pallas dictionary. Unfortunately, there are no other examples in which the dictionary of the 18th century contains a word with ơ- and the original etymon in literary Kazakh could be found.

D. Proto-Turkic *-d-
lit. Kazakh қошқын, Kazakh Қошқын ‘high’ < Proto-Turkic *bEdi-k;
lit. Kazakh аяк, Kazakh Аяк ‘leg’ < Proto-Turkic *adak;
Reflexes in the dictionary of the 18th century and lit. Kazakh match. Unfortunately, there are few examples in the dictionary to say with confidence whether this innovation had been completed by the 19th century.

E. Proto-Turkic *č
lit. Kazakh чоң, Kazakh Чоң ‘a fly’ < Proto-Turkic *čepin;
lit. Kazakh жүм, Kazakh Жүм ‘to drink’ < Proto-Turkic *iç;
These examples show that in Kazakh in the 18th century. The Proto-Turkic consonant was still preserved. In Dosqarayev (1954), the presence of the sound v in the south-eastern regions is noted, with the corresponding ө in the literary language and the north-western dialects: чече—чәче (lit. Kazakh. чәчэ) ‘mother,’ чәл—шәл ‘old man.’ In the 19th century. In the north-western dialects, this transition was also present, cf. (https://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/775/5/perspective/775/6/view) northern dialect чөң ‘a fly’. Considering that in the 18th century, the Russian Empire included territories where speakers of North-western dialects currently live, it can be assumed that it was there that the transition of the Proto-Turkic *č > ơ took place in the 18th century. It was completed on part of the territories in the 19th century. In the south-east, the archaic reflex has not been preserved.

F. Proto-Turkic *j
lit. Kazakh жасыл, Kazakh Жасыл ‘star’ < Proto-Turkic *jul-ður (< *důr);
lit. Kazakh жүмүртка, Kazakh Жүмүртка ‘egg’ < Proto-Turkic *jamurtka;
lit. Kazakh жәңібер, Kazakh Жәңібер ‘rain’ < Proto-Turkic *jag-;
lit. Kazakh жәмән, Kazakh Жәмән ‘bad’ < Proto-Turkic *jAmаn;

ispras.ru/dictionary/775/5/perspective/775/6/view)
lit. Kazakh қаққы, Kazakh Ясельсере ‘green’, Дөжимил ‘grass’ < Proto-Turkic *jääl-i;
Kazakh Ясели ‘lightning’ < Proto-Turkic *jääl(-č)-;*

As mentioned above, two reflexes are represented in dialects: the south-eastern dialects with the
reflex дүйсө, and the north-western ones with жқ: жәзімет—жәзімет ‘well done’, жәққ—жәққ ‘no’, жер—
жер ‘soil.’ As far as we know, the reflex ʃ has not yet been noted in any papers regarding the Kazakh
language. Considering that the examples with Ж- are given not as doublets but as correspondences to
other translations, unlike Дже-, it can be assumed that in the 18th century, there was a transition of
Proto-Turkic ʃ > Kazakh жәс, which ended only in the 19th century.

G. Proto-Turkic ʃ
lit. Kazakh ай, Kazakh ʻай ‘moth’ < Proto-Turkic *aŋ
Unfortunately, there are few examples of the use of this consonant alone, not in combination in
the dictionary. However, this transition is characteristic of all Kipchak languages, and it is not surprising
that it occurred before the 18th century.

H. Proto-Turkic ʃ
lit. Kazakh кай, Kazakh Кай ‘goose’ < Proto-Turkic *käi,
lit. Kazakh ий, Kazakh Кый ‘woman’ < Proto-Turkic *кии,
lit. Kazakh Уйлұқыр ‘length’ < Proto-Turkic *иит-н.
This transition is also very ancient, and the dictionary by P. S. Pallas also demonstrates it.

I. Proto-Turkic ḷ
lit. Kazakh жас, Kazakh Яс ‘young’ < Proto-Turkic *jääl;
lit. Kazakh кенк, Kazakh Кенк ‘hole’ < Proto-Turkic *көл;
lit. Kazakh кис, Kazakh Кис ‘human’ < Proto-Turkic *кил;
lit. Kazakh жәс, Kazakh Дөжимил ‘plants’, Ясельсере ‘green’ < Proto-Turkic *jääl-i;
lit. Kazakh кис, Kazakh Кис ‘human’ < Proto-Turkic *кил;

We see that Proto-Turkic ʃ has two possible variants in the Kazakh dictionary by P. S. Pallas s and ḷ.
Considering that these forms are not given as doublets to the same word, we can assume that these
are not dialectal variants but rather an incomplete change of ʃ, which is represented in most Kipchak
languages, to s, which is represented only in modern Kazakh and Nogai languages. The dictionary by
P. S. Pallas shows that this transition had not yet ended in the 18th century.

J. Proto-Turkic ṣ
lit. Kazakh дөңө, Kazakh Дөңөс ‘pig’ < Proto-Turkic *döñi;
lit. Kazakh Тындыс ‘depth’ < Proto-Turkic *teñi;
lit. Kazakh кенис, Kazах Кенис ‘width’ < Proto-Turkic *göñ;
lit. Kazakh сөй, Kazakh Сөй ‘sister’ < Proto-Turkic *simi;
lit. Kazakh сөйлөк, Kazakh Сөйлөк ‘bone’ < Proto-Turkic *siýök;

Unfortunately, there are few examples of ṣ in the inter-vocal or in the auslaut position in the
dictionary. Using these examples, we see that, in general, the reflex in literary Kazakh coincides with
the dictionary of the 18th century. The difference is that, in some cases, lit. Kazakh. It corresponds to
η in the dictionary of P. S. Pallas. As was mentioned above, in Dolsoyarov (1954), the transition η > ℓ
was present in the south-eastern dialects.

K. Proto-Turkic ᵁ, "n
lit. Kazakh ұй, Kazakh Ичерсе ‘drink’ < Proto-Turkic *iç;
lit. Kazakh ил, Kazakh Или ‘brother’ < Proto-Turkic *ini;
lit. Kazakh кис, Kazakh Кис ‘human’ < Proto-Turkic *ki sö;
lit. Kazakh кирпік, Kazakh Керекыми ‘eye lashes’ < Proto-Turkic *kîpik;

Analysis of examples with Proto-Turkic ᵁ, "n in the root of the word shows that in a very small
number of words, i is preserved. In most cases, it transforms into e. At the same time, when referring
to modern Kazakh dialects, we see in the eastern Semipalatinsk dialect, cf. http://lingvodoc.ispras.
Semipalatinsk, Taraz, Kostanay Kazakh. əʃ(ə) ‘drink’. It seems that this sound is the one that was
reflected as е in most words because of the lack of a special grapheme for writing it in the Russian
alphabet.

L. Proto-Turkic ʊ, "û, "ʊ, "ü
lit. Kazakh ек, Kazakh Ик ‘meat’ < Proto-Turkic *et;
lit. Kazakh жес, Kazakh Джеш ‘wind’ < Proto-Turkic *jel;
lit. Kazakh бет, Kazakh Бет ‘face’ < Proto-Turkic *bėt;
lit. Kazakh кей, Kazakh Кей ‘evening’ < Proto-Turkic *геч (-e);
Kazakh *текте* ‘ram’ < Proto-Turkic *teke*;  
lit. Kazakh *төрөк*, Kazakh *төрөк* ‘depth’ < Proto-Turkic *dergi*.

We see that in the part of words with Proto-Turkic *e* there is a “vowel breaking”: the transition of Proto-Turkic *e* > *i*, which is characteristic of the Tatar and Bashkir languages, and in other languages the *e* is preserved. The analysis of modern dialects audio dictionaries shows that in these words and in the eastern Semipalatinsk dialect, cf. http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/376/4/perspective/376/5/view, in the southern Taraz dialect, cf. http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/377/4/perspective/377/5/view the transition to *i* is also shown, cf. *it* ‘meat’.

**M. Proto-Turkic *ū, œ* — *ū, œ**

lit. Kazakh өйс, Kazakh Құс ‘bird’ < Proto-Turkic *Кул*;  
lit. Kazakh жұмыртқа, Kazakh Дұмұртқа ‘egg’ < Proto-Turkic *jumurtka*;  
lit. Kazakh ұйым ‘branch’, Kazakh Бұтқем ‘сук’ < Proto-Turkic *вұта*;  
lit. Kazakh құлақ, Kazakh Колак ‘ear’ < Proto-Turkic *Кал-как*;  
lit. Kazakh мөрү ‘stand’, Kazakh Тор ‘stand’ < Proto-Turkic *дүр*;  
lit. Kazakh құрсақ, Kazakh Корсақ ‘stomach’ < Proto-Turkic *Күрсак*.

In these examples, we also see in some words the Tatar-Bashkir “vowel breaking,” which is not characteristic of the literary Kazakh language. Judging by the materials of audio dictionaries available to us, this transition is characteristic of the Western Kostanay dialect, cf. data from the online dictionary http://lingvodoc.ispras.ru/dictionary/2479/1559/perspective/2479/1560/view: өсін — lit. Kazakh өсін ‘long’; өпі — lit. Kazakh өпі ‘sand’; өріп — lit. Kazakh өріп ‘seed’. Interestingly, similar reflexes can be found in the concordance of one of the first Cyrillic books, “Wisdom of the Son of Sirakhov,” published in the Kazakh language in 1891, cf. бөөж ‘branch’, for more information about these words, see the article by Gadzhieva (2022, p. 461) about the graphemic and phonetic features of this book.

**N. Proto-Turkic *ö, ę* — *ö, ę***

lit. Kazakh арман, Kazakh Урмань ‘forest’ < Proto-Turkic *орман*;  
lit. Kazakh қол, Kazakh Кұл ‘hand’ < Proto-Turkic *Кол*;  
lit. Kazakh арманар, Kazakh Ур ‘moat’ < Proto-Turkic *ор*;  
lit. Kazakh толкын, Kazakh Толкын ‘wave’ < Proto-Turkic *ди*;  
lit. Kazakh өйн, Kazakh Өйн ‘ten’ < Proto-Turkic *ён*;  
lit. Kazakh әуң, Kazakh Дөңүс ‘pig’ < Proto-Turkic *донү*.

As Gadzhieva (2022) notes, cf. the transition of Proto-Turkic *ö* > *u* is also present in some words in one of the first Cyrillic books created under the leadership of V. V. Katarinsky, the Primer for Kyrgyzstan, created in 1908 in the north of Kazakhstan.

**O. Proto-Turkic *ö, ę* — *ö, ę***

Kazakh Төөкем ‘pour’ < Proto-Turkic *döök*;  
lit. Kazakh мөрөтвөй, Kazakh Төөкөр ‘four’ < Proto-Turkic *дөр*;  
Kazakh Кун ‘skin’ < Proto-Turkic *гөн*;  
lit. Kazakh корү кәбіләтә, Kazakh Курмәс ‘sight’ < Proto-Turkic *гөр*;  
Kazakh Сөзү ‘light’ < Proto-Turkic *сөк*.

As shown in the article by Gadzhieva (2022, pp. 459–460), in most of the first books, there is a transition *ö* > *ü* in some words.

4. DISCUSSION

As a result of the consideration of the words with vowel breaking in the Kazakh dictionary by P. S. Pallas, created in the 18th century, we can note a tendency to a gradual decrease in words with a “vowel breaking.” If, in the 18th century, most vowels of the upper and middle rise have a variant with a “breaking,” and in some cases, it is the most frequent one, then in the 19th century, the change of most vowels was not recorded in all books, and in those where it occurs, it is a rarer reflex. In the dialect audio dictionaries recorded in the 21st century, the “breaking” is even rarer. This may be due to the fact that the Kazakh literary language is based on a dialect without “vowel breaking,” and under the influence of the literary language, this phenomenon began to disappear in modern dialects. At the same time, the analysis of the Kipchak dictionaries by P. S. Pallas shows that in the 18th century, the phenomenon of breaking was characteristic of the Kazakh language to the same extent as for Tatar and Bashkir, but the further language development went in two different directions.

In addition, the Kazakh dictionary of P. S. Pallas is important evidence of the fact that Proto-Turkic *ē* was still preserved in the 18th century, and the change of Proto-Turkic *je*, *ı̄ (Common Turkic *s*) was not finished yet. The dictionary presents only those innovative changes in the Proto-Turkic consonants that are characteristic of all Kipchak languages, cf. (Tenishev & Dybo, 2006: 13–16). Thus, from the
point of view of graphemics and phonetics, the innovative changes that distinguish the modern Kazakh language from Tatar and Bashkir have just begun in the 18th century.

But one of the important indicators of the morphological proximity of the Kazakh language and the Eastern Bashkir dialects, as opposed to the southern Bashkir and Tatar, is the alternation of consonants in affixes, in particular in the plural suffix, cf. lit. Kazakh түрнәктәр, Kazakh Тырнаклыр ‘nails’ < Proto-Turkic *diriŋ-k; lit. Kazakh кирпиктер, Kazakh Керпеклярь ‘eyelashes’ < Proto-Turkic *kirpik.

From these examples it can be seen that in the plural suffix, as in the exponent of abstract nouns -Liš, (cf. lit. Kazakh үзүнөдөлө, Kazakh Усунур 'length' < Proto-Turkic *ūri-n; lit. Kazakh тереңдө, Kazakh Теренәк 'depth' < Proto-Turkic *deriŋ) there were no morphological alternations yet, which also displays the proximity of all Tatar, South Bashkir and Kazakh languages to each other.

So, summing up the results of this work, it can be noted that the Kazakh dictionary by P. S. Pallas is an important proof of the late division of the Kipchak languages. We have not identified a single phonetic transition that is completed, regularly represented in a significant number of examples, and would distinguish the Kazakh language from Tatar and Bashkir in the 18th century.

The material also shows that, in the Kazakh language spoken in the late 18th century, only one sound change was completed that distinguished it from the common Turkic proto-language according to the reconstruction (EDAL): *-b- > 0. For comparison:

- In the Bashkir language spoken in the late 18th century, 2 sound changes: Proto-Turkic *-b- > 0/σ > y;
- In the Tatar dictionary (Pallas, 1787–1789)—2 sound changes: Proto-Turkic *-b- > 0/v/σ > y;
- In the Nogai dictionary (Pallas, 1787–1789)—1 sound change: Proto-Turkic *-b- > y;
- In the Hill Mari language, cf. (Normanskaja, 2021, pp. 91–99)—2 sound changes: Proto-Mari *c > σ, *σ > y;
- In the South Khanty (Tobolsk) cf. (Normanskaja, 2022, pp. 84–93)—5 sound changes: Proto-Khanty. *a > a, *σ > u, *l > l/l, * č > l, *w > 0/λ; u;
- In the North Khanty (Berezovsky) cf. (Normanskaja, 2022, pp. 84–93)—3 sound changes: Proto-Khanty *k V > x, *č > ĺ, *č > ň;
- In the East Khanty (Vasyugan), see (Normanskaja, 2022, pp. 84–93)—1 sound change: Proto-Khanty *Α > 0/λ;
- In the Perm (Western) Mansi dictionary (Pallas, 1787–1789)—1 sound change: Proto-Mansi *y > 0;
- In the Northern Mansi, only one transition, according to the dictionary (Pallas, 1787–1789)—1 sound change: Proto-Mansi. *k V | V | V V V > x.

This comparison leads to a conclusion that from the point of view of sound changes in the 18th century, the Kipchak languages were so close to each other as Hill Mari, Meadow Mari, and other dialects of the Mansi language are to each other. At the same time, the Khanty dialects or languages, according to the European classification, differed more significantly from each other. Indeed, mutual understanding between native speakers of the Kipchak languages is preserved in the 11th century, but the native speakers of Western and Eastern Khanty do not understand each other.

5. Conclusion

The analysis of the dictionary published by P. S. Pallas shows that PTu *č was still preserved in the 18th century in Kazakh, and the changes were PTu *j, *l not finished yet. The dictionary presents only those innovative changes of consonants that are common for all Kipchak languages: PTu *-b- > 0. For comparison, in other languages, Tatar, Hill Mari, South Khanty, and North Khanty in the 18th century had more sound changes than in Kazakh.

List of Abbreviations

1. lit. Kazakh—literary Kazakh language
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