

ARTYKUŁY ▶▶ KULTURA

LESKEN ALBATYR ▶

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University

Recognition and propaganda of Kazakh history in press

Abstract

The aim of the work is to investigate the cultural heritage of Turkic-speaking people. The key questions of the article: What are the history and theory of the Old Turkic script? What influence does the old ancient heritage provide on modern spiritual process?

K e y w o r d s : Turkic people, Orkhon inscription, Turkic language

Абстракт

Целью данной работы является исследовать культурное наследие тюркоязычных народов. Ключевыми вопросами статьи являются : История и теория древнетюркского письма? Какое воздействие окажет древнетюркское наследие на современный духовный процесс?

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а : Тюрки, Орхонские надписи, изучение тюркских языков

It is necessary that recognition and investigation of the same type of ancient Turkic people, their influence on modern spiritual process, the role and essence clearly represent the authority of our people in their world civilization. Today, more than a hundred years passed when the secrets, contents of our legacies named Orkhon written texts began to be discovered and the essence peculiar to the era of Turkic kaganad (Head of state) beca-

me clear to us. Up to now many studies were written about the marked history etched on the stone but there are many aspects of mentioned monuments which still have to be determined.

Orkhon Yenisei written texts etched on the stone play an important role in the history of the world civilization of VI–VIII centuries. They are an open witness for previous great culture, literature and art tradition before one and a half thousand years ago. In this case it is also impossible to implement the present treasure without studying and understanding the spiritual findings in its prosperous era. A. Khaddar said: “Searching, recognizing and treating the past should be respected. This was an internal prosperity and graduation of people, an equal joining to the advanced people of civilized society” (Kaidar, 2001).

The indicator of ancient Turkic civilization of the primary facts about Turkic written legacies of VII–IX centuries was recorded and became familiar to people but studying of the secrets of encrypted writings, findings of their heirs denoted to the fortune of XIX century. Three written texts were first published by P. G. Messerschmitt on the coast of Yenisei and 43 monuments were directly found by Radlov himself, and with a help of his pupils in the result of research works. In 1980 their number reached 135. According to the facts of prior to 2002 the number of ancient Turkic writings which were found in the south of Siberia were about three hundred (Kyzylasov, 2002).

Monuments defined prior to 2004 consist of about 500 big and small relics. In general, the number of ancient monuments found in the territory of Kazakhstan, about 30 (Amanzholov, 2003, p. 365). Findings from the coast of Orkhon – 75; Findings from the Yenisei – 158; Findings from Talas – 23; Registered in the region of Altai – 46; Registered in the region of Baikal – Saha – 17; Findings from the East Turkistan – 50; Findings from around Fergana – 17; Findings from the region Irtysh, Ili, Taraz – 12; Findings from around North Caucasus, the Volga–Don, the Danube – 100.

The ancient Turkic writings which attracted the world’s scientist’s attention have been examined in the euro-centralized direction from the last periods of XVII century and until the end of XX centuries. But the problem of profound investigation was dealt with by carrying out in the new direction and paid great attention to the comprehension of ancient writings in the sphere of “Turkic world” from the first years of XXI century.

The problem of investigating the written records which found on the cost of Orkhon, Yenisey, Talas was first arisen from these questions as: “Whose legacy is this?”, “What people are the owners of a great culture who created such system of complex writing?”, “What kind of ancient writings are they interconnected with?”, “What are their graphical hypothesis?”.

A lot of articles about the origin of secret writings of Orkhon, Yenisei, Talas and the heirs were published on the fact of the similarities and differences of optical features of signs, particularly hypotheses were also said about the origin of the Finns, the Goths, the Greeks, The opinions about foundations of the following researchers were formed and became the core of discussion between the end of XVIII century till the end of XIX century when the secrets of ancient writings were not discovered, for example: ancient Celtic (T. Bayer), Greek, Finn (Yu. Klaprot), Scythian or Greek-Gott (O.G. Tihkzen, N. Popov, G. Rommel), Slovenian, Kalmyk and Mongolian (G. Spassky), Slovenian (V. Florinsky), Usyn, Indokt, Scandinavian (A. Remyuza), Etrus, Malaysian (O. Donner), Tanba (A. Shiphner) and etc. (Sartkhozha, 2003, p. 392).

That is why the content of Orkhon written texts which became the world’s secret was being carried out and after being completely proved that it was the ancient Turkic’s legacy so Russian scientists as well as the foreign researchers tried to study the secrets of monuments on the cost of Yenisei, Talas and they also found new monuments.

In the second half of XX century the works of foreign scientists about the written tradition of ancient Turkic, the territory of foundation, findings, readings, the methods of reading, the periods of usage, the origin of clarification, the language of ancient Turkic writings, the philosophy of life were often published.

We want to note the articles of such researchers as A. Fon Gaben (1986) Dzh. Klosson and L. Bazen (1986), A. Temir (Tawzhanova, Nursapaeva, 1997, p. 48), A. Bombachy (1986), E. Tryarsky (1976) and other scientists for their valuable ideas, theoretical conclusions.

The translation development of ancient Turkic record readings of the texts, the transfer of refinement, the research results published an extensive monographic writings of Turkish scientists H. Orkhun (1987), T. Tekin’s (Shcherbak, 1973) findings were estimated as a significant contribution to the science of Turkic Studies.

Any non-cultural treasures and material commodities which are not natural came into the light due to the group of people or an individual. My speech would be proved with a great achievement of human civilization that the basis of written system was not only formed by the whole population but as well as by the individual personalities.

It is the real truth that the born treasure is constantly being developed, completed and updated from the representatives of people. All treasures will appear for the purpose of providing people or an individual (then it will become people's treasure) with the spiritual and financial needs. "At first the writing was the means of equipment that the property of church owners, chief and tsar in order to set up the aim for the people who served them honestly, but later on to leave the writing on the gravestone became as a tool of well-to-do actions and sayings of rulers of that time. The writing on the gravestone served to the rulers as the instrument of interrelationship to make contacts with people who lived a long way (in the provincials) and other countries in the last periods. The recommended factors of the ancient Turkic people's lifestyle by the scholar did not correspond the ancient Turkic philosophy of life, but his thoughts about the need for the formation of the ancient Turkic alphabet writing were very important. Then the writing was used for the purpose of trade", – said the British oriental researcher Dzh. Kloson who showed several primary conditions of the reason of the ancient Turkic writing system. The tradition of putting a mark on the private cattle of ancient Turkic people, the written records on different instruments and jeweler patterns, the rocks and balbal stones, the functional role of the rune small figures were known as the real value of our treasure.

The purpose of monuments which consisted of the wide texts of Kultegin, Bilgekhan, and Toykok is not only to praise an individual but to arouse people's consciousness through the actions of qualified kagans, to invite them to peace, to keep the national features with the help of territorial integrity, to reach the divine idea directed to the consciousness of future generation. Dzh. Kloson said confidently that ancient Turkic people took the sample of writing from other people's alphabet which were formed before and the reason of his conclusion was proved with the facts that Turkic people were not too religious and were not be able to be tradable, commercial, at the end of VI century they worked for the ruling-administrative and diplomatic purpose due to the order of Istemy kagan.

In conclusion, Dzh.Klосon pointed out that the discovery of written legacies which belonged to the sack epoch and foundation from different Eurasia territory inhabited by the ancient Turkic people, the formation of the ancient Turkic alphabet was not connected with the action of Istemy kagan.

The most of the letters of Orkhon-Yenisei alphabet in time of corresponding with the gender of signs of modern Turkic people from the side of form were the reason of flourishing of the theory which pulled out by A. Shiphner, N.A. Aristov, Dzh Emre, N. Malitsky, A. Sokolov, I.A. Baymanov (Baskakov, 1969, p. 384) and other investigators followed the direction that the ancient Turkic writing was Turkic people's own writing and the Turkic signs were possibly formed without influence of other writings. There are some points of view that the connection between the ancient Turkic writing and the Rune signs were causal accordance.

The 29 signs of 38 from the Orkhon alphabet which showed by N.A. Aristov were similar to Turkic signs, but the correspondence of about the 20 of the Kazakh signs of gender is not a causal matter. The similarity of writing signs and tribe mark-signs from the side of representation does not completely prove that the ancient Turkic writing signs were not directly formed from the Turkic signs, and also do not meet the requirements of the rules of historical-grammatical theory. However, the ideological maintenance of common signs having been harmonious in the world graphical the system of symbols possibly connected with the interconnection between semasiography, ideography, and phonograph of grammatology development. A. Amanzholov said that the Turkic people's tribe signs had their own content in accordance with the external form. If there were a chance to define the ancient Turkic signs' primary content or meaning, we would have identified that the prediction of A Shiphner and N.A. Aristov were close to the reality (Amanzholov, 2001).

It is known that a famous poet, a figure of society O. Suleimenov is studying the problems of discovering ideological sides of the ancient writing signs, defining the content of primary writing signs, the etymology of modern separate words, so then comparing the content form of word with the primary graphical forms. The works of researcher are of great value in the wide range of language facts, new ideas and predictions.

The Rune researcher K. Sartkozhauly suggested the conception about the origin of the ancient Turkic writing corresponding the divine world

outlook of Turkic people connected with two fundamentals of knowledge. The scientist classified consonants which combined with the back vowels to the male group and other consonants which match the front vowels to the female group, consonants which go with the back and front vowels to the matching group and explains this process as two double bases in the cognition of ancient Turkic people. It's predictable that there were some peculiarities in the systems of State structure, chronologic periods, own features of the family-tribe languages in the part of the Turkic people settled in the boundless region. During the past years it was proved that the identification of alphabet system belonging to some separate monuments which found in the region of east Europe, middle Asia, Siberia of Eurasia territory recently.

One of the elements which take a special place in determining the heirs of monuments remained from the ancient Turkic tribal unions and sign of symbols – the genetic signs carried out the function of the coat of arms. The two signs which composed from the two graphic signs formed near the top edge of balbal stones found on the cost of Shu were precisely stored. A twin brother was one of the variants among the people of the marks of Kypshak, Kahly, Ysty tribes which consisted of vertical lines and marked differently as “poker sign”, “alphabet sign”, “stick sign”, “bullet sign”. The second component of the sign is the sign “kazan ear” similar to the signs of tribes as “karakesek” which belonged to middle zhuz and shomekey to small zhuz.

The tribal symbols widely stored in the tradition of the Kazakh population is a complex graphical system based on the historical and genealogical, social, geographical and territorial characteristics, illustrating the mythological and religious belief of people. Noise is found along the heritage character of the modern Kazakh characters are also consistent with the view of the monuments related to the ancestors of the Kazakhs who pointed that.

The correspondence of the signs stored in the written heritage which were found on the cost of Talas as the member of modern Kazakh people to the signs of a tribe suggested that the monuments in Talas and Chu related to the Kazakh ancestors.

Therefore, the language of the ancient writings found in the border region and in the land of Kazakhstan must be considered as the main sour-

ce for determining the path of historical development of the local people's language. The conservation of influence of the ancient Oguz, ancient Kyrgyz, ancient Uighur languages of the ancient monuments in the language of ancient Turkic written monuments were shown by N.A. Baskakov and he associated Orkhon-Yenisei records with the ancient Oguz and ancient Kyrgyz languages in other studies. V.G. Kondratiev considered that a common Turkic language was stored in the ancient inscriptions and monuments of the ancient Uighur and Oguz languages which were also used in Central Asia for hundreds of years. The scientist resembled the concept "common language" on a certain level of the conditional feature and explained that the features of the language were not only among the monuments of the ancient Uighur, ancient Oguz but they might be in a text monument (Kondratiev, 1981, p. 191).

The monographs of K. Sartkozha, G.G. Levin and V. U. Mahpirov were the bulky works written about the language of the ancient legacies for the past years. In the languages of Orkhon Turkic and Yakut people lexical and semantic parallels directed in the work G.G. Levin analyzed the types of structural and semantic models of homonyms in the language of monuments by V.U. Mahpirov who studied the ancient Turkic homonyms from the structural, semantic side and described the lexical correspondence of phono-semantic, semantic-thematic, quantitative and statistical features in the modern Yakut language and in the language of monuments. Having developed the translations of the written texts in the study of refinement of Orkhon legacies K. Sartkozhauly improved his new idea about the phonological structure of the ancient Turkic language, the form experience of the ancient Turkic alphabet (Sartkhozhauly, 2002, p. 218).

In conclusion, we may say that legacies which consisted with a word, word phrases and a sentence were still to be met in the part of Talas, Irtysh, Ile monuments. Such a small records were embossed for most products. They often become the subject of the discussion. There were still enough consistent legacies which readings and translations had not been fully recognized in Yenisei writings.

The heritage we still need to focus on is a deep research note that is in the data. Therefore, the above mentioned historical legacies are still needed to be deeply investigated and to be paid more attention from our side. The

new approaches and new points of view were arisen from the years of independence.

The important things according to above mentioned direction were put into the right way with the following actions: publishing of “the complete atlas of Orkhon written texts”, setting of “the copy of Kultegin monument” on the top of Astana, the systematic implementation of the special international conferences and conventions as the aim of Turkic studies, taking into account of the publication of rich folk legacies with the name “the word of the ancestors”, presentation of the twenty-volume edition of the ancient literary heritages to the audience and the scientific papers written from the new point of view of the history of Kazakh folklore prepared by the Institute of Literature and Art of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Academy of Sciences.

Literature

- Amanzholov, A. S. (2001). Genesis of Turkic runes. In: *Orkhonsky inscriptions* (p. 231–250). Semey: Epoch.
- Amanzholov, A. S. (2003). *History and theory of the ancient Turkic writings*. Almaty: Mektep.
- Baskakov, N. A. (1969). *Introduction to study of the Turkic languages*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Bazen, L. (1986). Concept of the age of the ancient Turkic peoples In: *Foreign Turkic studies* (p. 361–378). Moscow: Nauka.
- Bazylkhan, N. (2004). The theoretical problems of Turkish manuscript studies: historical and cultural aspects. In: *The study of ancient Turkic inscriptions: the present and the future* (p. 99–108). Astana: Atamura.
- Bombachy, A. (1986). Turkic literature. Introduction to the history and style. In: *Foreign Turkic studies* (p. 191–293). Moscow: Nauka.
- Gaben, A. (1986). Ancient Turkic literature. In: *Foreign Turkic studies* (p. 294–334). Moscow: Nauka.
- Kaidar, A. (2001). Whom do the ancient Turkic written monuments belong to? In: *Ancient Turkic civilization: written monuments. The materials of international scientific-theoretical conference* (p. 291–298). Almaty: Science 2001.
- Kondratiev, V. G. (1981). *Grammatical structure of the language of monuments of Ancient Turkic manuscripts VIII–XI centuries*. Leningrad: Pub. LSU.
- Kyzylasov, I. L. (2002). Results and prospects of Turkic Rune Studies. *Turkish Studies*, 2, 4–8.
- Kyzylasov, L. R. (1965). About dating of Yenisei literary texts. *Soviet archeology monuments*, 3, 32–37.

- Orkun, N. X. (1987). *Eski türk yazıtları*. Ankara.
- Sartkhodzha, (2003). *K. Orkhon heritage*. Astana: Kultegyn.
- Sartkhodzhauly, K. (2002). *United kaganat of Turkic people*. Astana: Foliant.
- Shcherbak, A. M. (1973). Melioransky and study of the monuments of Turkic literary texts. In: *Turkological collection. 1972* (p. 27–31). Moscow: Nauka.
- Tawzhanova, K. D., Nursapaeva, S. I. (1997). *Problems of Turkic linguistics in foreign publications*. Alma-Ata: Science.
- Triyarsky, E. (1976). Read more about the methods of Rube manuscripts. In: *Turkologiya* (p. 325–333). Leningrad: Nauka.