THE HISTORICAL DETERMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, ETHNIC ROOTS AND ETHNOGENESIS OF THE OLD TURKIC ALPHABET IN THE STUDY OF THE OLD TURKIC LANGUAGE IN THE TURKOLOGICAL WORLD

A DETERMINAÇÃO HISTÓRICA DA ORIGEM, RAÍZES ÉTNICAS E ETNOGÊNESE DO ANTIGO ALFABETO TURCO NO ESTUDO DA ANTIGA LÍNGUA TURCO NO MUNDO DA TURCOLOGIA

LA DETERMINACIÓN HISTÓRICA DEL ORIGEN, LAS RAÍCES ÉTNICAS Y LA ETNOGÉNESIS DEL ALFABETO TURCO ANTIGUO EN EL ESTUDIO DE LA LENGUA TURCA ANTIGUA EN EL MUNDO TURCOLOGICO

Gizilgul ABDULLAYEVA[1]

ABSTRACT: Studying the Old Turkish language is very important in terms of investigating the ethnic roots of Turks, distinguishing the stages of development of Turkic languages, determining their place among world languages, revealing the nationality of the people and awakening their national consciousness. The realization of all this is related to the scientific research of the ancient Turkish language on the one hand, and its teaching on the other hand. Although it is said that it is mostly derived from the Aramaic-Pahlavi alphabet, there are sufficient facts that prove its connection with *tamgas*. The signs representing these words-*tamgas* were later included as graphemes in the Old Turkic alphabet. It is those graphemes that create both pictorial sign and speech sound harmony that make the Old Turkic alphabet come into being. All this directly confirms that the ethnic origin of the Old Turkic alphabet is based on *tamgas*.

KEYWORDS: Old Turkish language. Old Turkish alphabet. Aramaic-Pahlavi alphabet.

RESUMO: Estudar a língua turca antiga é muito importante para investigar as raízes étnicas dos turcos, distinguir os estágios de desenvolvimento das línguas turcas, determinar seu lugar entre as línguas mundiais, revelar a nacionalidade do povo e despertar sua consciência nacional. A realização de tudo isso está relacionada à pesquisa científica da antiga língua turca, por um lado, e seu ensino, por outro lado. Embora se diga que é derivado principalmente do alfabeto aramaico-pahlavi, existem fatos suficientes que provam sua conexão com tamgas. Os sinais que representam essas palavras-tamgas foram posteriormente incluídos como grafemas no alfabeto turco antigo. São esses grafemas que criam a harmonia dos sinais pictóricos e dos sons da fala que dão origem ao alfabeto turco antigo. Tudo isso confirma diretamente que a origem étnica do alfabeto turco antigo é baseada em tamgas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Língua turca antiga. Alfabeto turco antigo. Alfabeto aramaico-pahlavi.

[1] Baku State University (BSU), Baku – Azerbaijan. PhD of Philology, Associative Professor at the Department of Turkology. ORCİD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1194-0001. E-mail: gizilgulabdullayeva@gmail.com

RESUMEN: Estudiar el idioma turco antiguo es muy importante en términos de investigar las raíces étnicas de los turcos, distinguir las etapas de desarrollo de los idiomas turcos, determinar su lugar entre los idiomas del mundo, revelar la nacionalidad de las personas y despertar su conciencia nacional. La realización de todo esto está relacionada con la investigación científica de la lengua turca antigua, por un lado, y su enseñanza, por el otro. Aunque se dice que se deriva principalmente del alfabeto arameo-pahlavi, existen suficientes hechos que prueban su conexión con tamgas. Los signos que representan estas palabras-tamgas se incluyeron más tarde como grafemas en el alfabeto turco antiguo. Son esos grafemas que crean tanto el signo pictórico como la armonía del sonido del habla los que hacen que el antiguo alfabeto turco surja. Todo esto confirma directamente que el origen étnico del alfabeto turco antiguo se basa en tamgas.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Lengua turca antigua. Antiguo alfabeto turco. Alfabeto arameo-pahlavi.

Introduction

Language is the moral wealth of the people, the invincible foundation of the solidarity of every nation, and one of the main symbols of the state's independence. Language is the guarantor of the living, and development of national ideology, national consciousness, and national values throughout history. Language is the unchangeable address of living of the historical past, present and future of the nation. Of course, "the language is not an alphabet that we change every day, it is not a spelling rule that experts gather and propose a good or bad norm. A language is created when a nation is born, it develops and changes due to socio-political, economic and cultural conditions" (HAJIYEV, 2013, p. 6). The formation of the nation is based on the consolidation of the tribe. The history of consolidation of Turkic tribes dates back to the III-II millennium BC and ends at the end of the I millennium. It is probably an axiom that if a nation is formed, then the language used by this nation to communicate is also formed from this period of time. An English journalist's opinion about the Turkish language is very important:

> Turkic countries are about four times larger than France. But the Turkic language is not only within these countries, it is a language spread from the Danube River to the Nile and from Istanbul to the China-Machin border in different places, apart from being spoken in the palaces of the rulers in Iran and Egypt (HUSEYNZADE, 1905).

Historically, Turks have left a legacy of immeasurable value to the scientific environment and future generations in terms of studying the historical past of the Turk by using different alphabets and writing systems, in terms of getting to know the historical landscape of the Old Turkic language. These monuments, which include Turkic texts, are written in different

alphabets. We should not forget the old Azerbaijani-Arabic alphabet based on the Arabic script, the Turkic alphabet based on the Latin script, and finally the Turkish alphabet based on the Cyrillic script. One of them is the Old Turkic alphabet, known as Orkhon-Yenisei or "Rune" in the Turkological world.

Methodology

It is a known fact that our written monuments were mostly written in the old Turkish alphabet and the old Azerbaijani-Arabic alphabet. If the monuments written in the old Azerbaijani-Arabic alphabet belong directly to the Azerbaijanian Turks, the inscriptions written in the old Turkish alphabet show commonality because they belong to all the Turks in general. It is well known to the scientific community that these common monuments were written not with one alphabet, but with Orkhon-Yenisei, Sogdian, Manichean, Passe-pa, Chinese (hieroglyphs are meant), Tibetan, Syrian alphabets (KİPCHAK, 2011; 2016). Here, when we say the old Turkic alphabet, we will focus on the old Turkic alphabet in which the Orkhon-Yenisei monuments were written, and we will try to solve the main task based on this type of alphabet. The goal is to present our subjective opinion to the scientific community based on the phonetic and orthographic facts of the Old Turkic language. The origin of the Old Turkic alphabet, which is considered one of the oldest alphabets in the history of the writing culture of the Turkic peoples, is of particular interest. It is the result of this interest that, returning to the past, for the sake of the goal we set before ourselves, we once again proceed from the phonetic-orthographic principles reflected in the language materials of the Old Turkic written monuments, and then we proceed towards the researcher's ideas. As a result, the research determines that the approach and attitude towards the issue are not in the same direction. In other words, there is no unified opinion about the Old Turkic alphabet in the linguistics world. Because the opinions expressed are quite numerous and they separate because they have different directions. The world of science comes up with ideas about the origin of this alphabet that sometimes coincide with each other and sometimes reject each other. In our opinion, equivalence, or even a little familiarity with those ideas that are in conflict, can be considered sufficient to confirm our opinion. The main goal of our research is to convey our subjective ideas and thoughts about the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet to the scientific environment. It should also be noted that A. Rajabov, who is fundamentally and comprehensively engaged in the study of the Orkhon-Yenisei monuments, says that the research on the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet has gone through two historical stages. The stage before 1893 and the stage

after 1893, to be more specific, the stage after the reading of one of the monuments of Orkhon, "Kul tigin" by V. Thomsen. The author very correctly shows that the ideas about the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet at the first stage take a new direction after just this reading (RAJABLİ, 2004, p. 96). But whatever the historical stage, it doesn't matter, in the Turkological world conflicting opinions are put forward about the origin of this alphabet. Even in the opinions of the same researcher, there is a difference of opinion on this issue. Rommel notes that this alphabet is genetically related to the Greek-Gothic alphabet (SHUKURLU, 1993, p.17). N. Popov supports Rommel's ideas and concludes that the alphabet is of Gothic origin. And G. I. Spassky strongly opposes this thought and says the idea about its connection with the Slavs. The same opinion is defended by M.A. Kastren. But as a result of his research, he later put forward the idea that these monuments belong to the Siberian Tatars. The point is that G. I. Spassky later abandoned his earlier opinion and said that it was related to the *tamgas* reflecting the Tatars' kinship relations (RAJABLİ, 2004, p. 95). The Hungarian scientist G. Vambery also comes to the conclusion that it is similar to *tamgas*. There are also researchers who associate these scripts with Germanic runes. The Swedish officer Tabbert Stralenberg was the first to present to the world of science the connection of Old Turkic scripts with Germanic Runes. The term *Rune script* is also related to its name (SHUKURLU, 2015, p. 18). Which is still occasionally being used in the scientific world. The French scientist R. Gauthier connects the root of the Old Turkic alphabet with the Sogdian script, which was derived from the Aramaic alphabet. Being contrary to this opinion, A. Shukurlu's thoughts and opinions are also interesting for us. He writes: "... the Sogdian alphabet is originally written from top to bottom, and although the characters of that alphabet correspond in some cases to old Turkic characters, they are not in the form of geometric lines" (SHUKURLU, 2015, p. 20).

V. Thomsen, who read the Old Turkic writings for the first time and revealed that they belong to the Turks, expressed the opinion that the origin of the alphabet is related to the Aramaic script. The views of V. Radlov partially coincide with the views of V. Thomsen. To be more specific, Radlov believes that the Huns created their own alphabet by combining old European Runes with Aramaic writing characters (SHUKURLU, 1993, p. 17).

T.D. Polivanov's thoughts and opinions (ROLIVANOV, 1929, p. 177-181) regarding the origin of the Old Turkish alphabet are also not overlooked. Thus, he notes that this alphabet was created among the Turkic tribes, that the alphabet was formed long before the time when these written monuments were created, that the Aramaic, Sogdian, and Pahlavi alphabets are at its root, and finally, some writing signs were derived from pictograms (SHUKURLU, 1993, p.

17). Turkish scientist A.J. Emre also thinks that pictograms have a special role in the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet (SHUKURLU, 1993, p. 17).

A.S. Amanjolov, who opined that the Goyturk alphabet was created no later than the first millennium BC, concludes that there are similarities between the Old Turkic alphabet and the Phoenician and Aramaic alphabets. V. Thomsen, who connects the root of this old alphabet with the Aramaic alphabet, does not hesitate to express the opinion that many writing signs are related to *tamgas*. The great Russian scientist N. Aristov notes that 17 out of 35 writing signs are formed from *tamgas* (ARISTOV, 1894, p. 28-34). P.M. Melioransky, who considers this alphabet as the most perfect and also the richest among the existing alphabets, doubts this opinion of N. Aristov (MELIORANSKY, 1899, p. 47). He claims that these signs have no any connection with the *tamga*. Thus, he opposes this idea (MELIORANSKY, 1899, p. 44). It should also be noted that in some sources, this idea, that is, the idea presented to the world of science that the Old Turkic alphabet is related to *tamgas*, was not written in the name of N. Aristov, but in the name of P. M. Melioransky (SHUKURLU, 2015, p. 20). But acquaintance with P.M. Melioransky's famous master's thesis entitled "Monument in honor of Kul tigin" written in 1899 overthrew this idea written in the name of P. M. Melioransky. It turned out that this idea, which we are talking about, belongs to N. Aristov, not P. M. Melioransky. P. M. Melioransky, on the contrary, is strictly against it (MELIORANSKY, 1899, p. 46-47). M. Novruzov, professor of the Turkology department, was of the opinion that the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet is based on the Aramaic alphabet, and it was derived from it. A. Rajabov, who presented quite a researcher's opinion on the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet, his own thoughts and opinions on the issue are also interesting. The author summarizes his opinion as follows:

> ... One important aspect is clear that the Gokturk alphabet appeared on the basis of the model of the Phoenician-Aramaic alphabet that existed before it. However, the creation of this alphabet is also influenced by ancient Greek writing. This is proven to some extent by the fact that in some texts written in the Gokturk alphabet, the line is sometimes written from right to left and from left to right (SHUKURLU, 2015, p. 21).

Regarding the diversity of this writing direction, we want to draw attention to one fact.

> According to one of the versions known to science, a writing method called "boustrophedon" was used at that time. Thus, writing is written from left to right, when it reaches the right edge of the writing material, it is moved to a new line, it is continued from right to left, when it reaches the left edge, it is written to the right again, falling to a new line, and so the writing was continued until the end. ... Later, the ancient Greeks took the first part of this type of writing and based it on the left-to-right principle, while the Arabs preferred writing in the right-to-left direction (HAJIYEVA, 1989, p. 3).

Thus, making a generalization on the basis of what has been said, it is determined that there are two fronts based on the ideas formed in the Turkological world about the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet. That is, the leading ideas and opinions are accompanied by duality, so that on the one hand, it is said that the Aramaic - Pahlavi alphabet and on the other hand, the tamgas are the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet.

Of course, we do not deny that there are some correspondences between the Aramaic-Pahlavi alphabet and the Old Turkic alphabet, which the supporters of this idea exaggerate. We even consider it appropriate to highlight some of them:

1. The Old Turkic script is directed from right to left, as well as the Aramaic-Pahlavi script;

2. There is a similarity in the shape of the sign between the first letter of the Aramaic-Pahlavi alphabet *alif* and the grapheme (**❘**) of the ancient Old Turkic alphabet, which expresses the soft sound [s];

3. There is also a graphic similarity between the *nun* (ن) in the Aramaic-Pahlavi alphabet and **nt** (ひ) used in the Old Turkic alphabet;

4. The omission of vowels is found in the Old Turkic script, also in the Aramaic and Pahlavi script, etc.

We accept that there are some correspondences between the Aramaic-Pahlavi alphabet and the Old Turkic alphabet by some supporters, but we also want to point out that the lack of correspondence in the "*tamga* // speech sound" parallelism suggests that these similarities are unfounded. If we do not consider the right-to-left direction in the writing, we are of the opinion that the ideas about the equivalence of others, are absurd. Because the facts presented as equivalence related to graphic signs include most of them pictorial signs. That is, identity is based on external similarity. However, integrity should cover both their external and internal content. To put it more concretely, the graphic form compatibility as well as the speech sound compatibility expressed by those graphemes should be taken as a basis here. However, the landscape does not present this. If this alphabet was derived from the Aramaic alphabet, as almost many researchers have noted, then the single principle regarding whether vowels are written in Arabic script or not should have preserved its existence here as well. That is, short vowels had to be omitted in writing, and long vowels had to be reflected in the orthographic system. This is considered to be one of the leading orthographic laws to be observed in the writing of lexical language examples of Arabic and Persian origin. However, the ancient Turkish script is free from this. Some researchers, whether the vowel is written or not, still

associate to the long vowel. This is the opinion given with reference to what M. Novruzov said in live spoken language. First of all, there is no such thing as a long vowel in the vocal system of the Old Turkic language. Some inconsistency in Old Turkic writing on this issue refutes this idea. In other words, the legality in the writing of language units of Arabic and Persian origin does not appear in Old Turkish words. The fact that the words with the same phonetic structure and the same content are written in one way in the Orkhon monuments and in another way in the Yenisei monuments, the fact that it presents writing variety even within the same monument, supports our opinion. Relying on actual language samples clearly confirms this. Of course, if we follow the writing parallelism of the same lexical unit in the monuments, our idea becomes even clearer:

BODUN I spelling**: BOD**ᴜ* **N** →**BODN** − KₖC-7 (ABDULLAYEVA, 2007 p. 20))ЖⴕꝊ

BODUN II spelling**: BODUN** −KᵦŞq.− 14 (RAJABOV, 2009, p. 283))ⴕЖⴕꝊ

ÖTÜKEN I spelling**: ÖTÜK**ᴇ **N → ÖTÜKN** −KtC-8 (ABDULLAYEVA, 2007, p. 34) ꝊꝀⵤꞀꝀ

ÖTÜKEN II spelling**: ÖT**ü**K**ᴇ**N → ÖTKN** −KtC-8 (ABDULLAYEVA, 2007 p. 34) ꝊꞀꝀ

For a more accurate confirmation of the reality, it is clear from the examples that have been brought to attention that in the example of the ***bodun*** lexical language, which has the same phonological structure and contains the semantics of "people", sometimes the omission of the second vowel (**BOD**ᴜ**N** →**BODN)** is found, sometimes together with the existing phonoform of the lexical unit. i.e., the processing in the language of monuments with the full phonetic cover (**BODUN)** is noted. The same explanation applies to the lexeme ***Ötüken*** too, one of the onomastic units. Because in the orthographic system of the toponym of ***Ötüken***, which is a strategically strong place where the Gok Turks were located, we encounter a different spelling landscape when writing the word. So, in one variant of this lexical unit, we can clearly see that the third vowel (**ÖTÜK**ᴇ**N→ ÖTÜKN),** and in the other variant, the second and third vowels are omitted (**ÖT**ü**K**ᴇ**N → ÖTKN)**. Regarding this issue, the researcher Y. Aliyev writes that "in the absence of vowels in the graphics of the monuments, the unprincipledness is noticeable rather than the expectation of a single principle" (ALIYEV, 2019, p.75). According to us, this

---

* Indicates a graphic sign that is not reflected in the text.

is related to the instability of the orthographic norm. The visualization of the same lexical unit in the phonetic system of the Old Turkic written monuments with different orthographic appearance confirms that there is no question of the stability of the orthographic norm at the time when the monuments were written. However, in Aramaic and Pahlavi writing, it is a law that short vowels are not reflected in writing, and long vowels are included in spelling, and this is the fixed orthographic norm of the languages in question. Deviation from it means violation of the orthographic norm of these languages and conveying unscientific character.

Thus, in the comparison of integral and differential on two fronts, the second (i.e. attachment to the *tamga*) surpasses the first in such a way that the derivation of the Old Turkic alphabet from the Aramaic or Pahlavi alphabet is overshadowed and, as a result, has to be highlighted by its unscientific nature. All this reveals that the influence of *tamgas* is more clearly manifested in being etymological of graphic signs in the Old Turkic alphabet. Therefore, we consider it appropriate to base our opinion about the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet on the *tamgas*. In our opinion, these literal signs correspond to the name of the items in the everyday life of the ancient Turks, that is, to the name of the *tamgas*. We would like to draw special attention to the fact that pictograms are considered as the general name of these objects and subjects, and as written communication intensifies, the transition from pictographic writing to ideographic writing becomes even faster. Because these signs - *tamgas*, which were once the expressors of words with independent lexical meaning, later lost their function and task and accordingly became indicators of soft or hard consonant sounds in those lexical units. Since those indicators are accompanied by majority in terms of quantity, it indicates that the scientific reality is moving to this direction. Let's look at some of these signs to prove our point:

Table 1

№	Tamga	Orkhon-Yenisei alphabet
1.	− indicator of the word **eb** (house)	− expressor of the soft consonant [**b**]
2.	− indicator of the word **ok** (arrow)	− expressor of the hard consonant [**k′**]
3.	− indicator of the word y**ay** (bow)	− expressor of the hard consonant [**y**]
4.	− indicator of the word **er(ər)** (brave man)	− expressor of the soft consonant [**r**]
5.	− indicator of the of **the space between the two legs**	− expressor of the hard consonant [**ğ**]
6.	− indicator of the word **ant** (oath)	− expressor of the letter combination **nt**
7.	− indicator of the word **tağ** (mountain)	− one of the expressors of the hard consonant [**t**]

8.	– indicator of the word **en**(mək) (to descend)	– expressor of the soft consonant [**n**]
9.	– indicator of the word **at** (horse)	– one of the expressors of the hard consonant [**t**]
10.	– indicator of the word **as** (maq) (to hang)	– expressor of the hard consonant [**s**]
11.	– indicator of the word **süngü** (bayonet)	– expressor of the soft consonant [**s**]
12.	– indicator of the word **əl** (hand)	– expressor of the soft consonant [**l**]
13.	– indicator of the word **it** (dog)	– expressor of the soft consonant [**t**]

Source: Devised by the author

The compatibility of "*tamga*, graphic sign and speech sound" is obvious in all its nakedness. In fact, proof is not even needed. But still, we consider it appropriate to give brief information about some of them:

The first sign in the ***first*** example has gone down in history as a *tamga*, indicating the word *eb*, meaning *"house"*. The sign really looks like home. The word-*tamga* has a soft vowel, and that is why it joins the soft consonant required by the soft vowel of the Old Turkic language from a phonetic point of view. What is interesting is that the sign that comes out of the tamga was included in the Old Turkic alphabet as a graphic sign expressing not another speech sound, but the soft consonant sound [**b**] inside that word-*tamga*.

The sign in the ***second*** example as a word-*tamga* has gain a reality as an indicator of the word *ok*, i.e., "arrow". But after losing its *tamga* character, it settled in the Old Turkic alphabet as a grapheme expressing the sound hard [**k′**].

The sign in the ***third*** line was also used as a word-*tamga* and was recorded as a conveyor of the meaning of "yay" (bow) as one of the war weapons. Let's also say that as a pictorial sign it is similar to bow. After losing its *tamga* character, it entered the Old Turkic alphabet as an indicator of the hard [y] consonant, and it was fixed in this way.

The ***fourth*** sign was once the conveyor of the meaning of "brave, courageous, hero" related to human concept. Schematically, it looks like a human in appearance: Body, shoulders and arms. This sign is also associated with scarecrows, which are installed in gardens to create a disturbance due to the protection of ripening fruits and remind the concept of an imaginary person with a bell. Historically, it was called *oyuk*. As a carrier of the same meaning capacity to this lexical language example *oyuk* can be found in M. Kashgari's work "Diwan Lughat al-Turk":

<div dir="rtl">
بَردى ارَن قُنُق كُرُب قُتقا سَقار
قالدى يَقُرَ اُيُق كُرُب اَقنى
</div>

Bardı eren, koruk körüp kutka sakar,
Kaldı yawuz, *oyuk* körüp ewni yıkar... (KASHGARI, 2006, p. 150).

The ***fifth*** example is related to word-tamga ***ağ***. It was a word-*tamga* that expressed the "space between two legs". Indeed, there is a pictorial similarity. When writing this word in the old Turkic language, the vowel [a] does not enter the spelling. That is, as a *tamga*, the old Turkic spelling of this word is shown with this sign. Later, it was isolated from its *tamga* character and was included in the Old Turkic alphabet as an indicator of the hard [ğ] consonant. Most importantly, the "*tamga, grapheme and speech sound*" compatibility is still recorded. The existence of a word called ***ağ***, which conveys the semantic capacity of "the space between two legs", is also reflected in the M. Kashgari's "Dictionary". In reality, we feel the need of presentation of that lexical language example:

يُوز اَت مَنِک اَغِین کَجتی
Yüz at meninq *ağdın* keçti
(A hundred horsemen passed between my legs) (KASHGARI, 2006, p. 147).

In our opinion, not everything presented in the table needs this type of explanation. Because it is an axiom that the analysis of other examples brought to attention will lead to the same conclusion. It is also possible to increase the number of examples. In our opinion, the highlighted examples are satisfactory and are considered sufficient to support our opinion. This adaptation, i.e., the compatibility of the tamga and the graphic form compatible with these *tamgas*, as well as the parallelism of the speech sound expressed by these writing signs, leads to the conclusion that the fact that the tamgas stand at the root of the Old Turkic alphabet is based on a scientific basis and brings savings to reality that this basis rests on a very solid foundation. It is not necessary to forget to say that these words and *tamgas*, which used to be an expression of anything, present a similarity to those things as a pictorial sign. All these similarities and parallels, of course, make it possible to obtain a real scientific result.

Results and Discussion

Thus, historically realization as a *tamga*, but losing its characteristics of tamga in the later stages of the historical development of the language and becoming an indicator of the appropriate consonant sound in the Old Turkic alphabet, once again confirms that the root of these graphic signs is based on *tamgas*, originating from *tamgas*. This also brings clarity to the idea that the historical root of the alphabet is based on which period of time. To put it more concretely, it is absurd that the Aramaic and Pahlavi alphabets, whose historical roots go back

to AD history, stand at the root of these old writings that date back to the 5th-4th centuries BC (ASGAR, 2012, p. 231). In other words, the Aramaic and Pahlavi alphabets, which date back to AD, will never be able to reflect the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet, which is much earlier than AD. Of course, this is simply a blind view derived from the desire not to see 100% reality of the Turkish history, generally, state system, culture, customs and traditions... – as a whole, of course, born out of jealousy of its antiquity. Since there is no second sign that is as old as the *tamgas*, the Old Turkic alphabet, which has preserved its nationality, is considered one of the oldest alphabets. The finding of the "tomb of the prince in golden clothes" which contains several lines of writing with the Orkhon script and belongs to the 5th-4th centuries before the historical era also draws a thick line over the ideas that raise doubts about the antiquity of this alphabet. We want to point out the fact that sometimes it creates the idea that the Old Turkic alphabet is connected with the ancient Turkic period, which is one of the stages of the development of Turkic languages. This is a completely wrong idea. This period, which is surrounded by Tukyu, Uighur, Kyrgyz and Bulgar-Khazar stages, is characterized by the writing of old Turkic written monuments with different names. Oghuz monuments, Uighur monuments, Kyrgyz monuments, etc. is proof of that. Yes, these are the old written Turkic monuments that appeared in those historical stages. This historical fact remains in history. We confirm it. But we must not forget that the alphabet in which these monuments were written goes back to ancient times, as we mentioned, to *tamgas*. This alphabet is, undoubtedly, the Turkic alphabet, and the oldest alphabet in the Caucasus is precisely this alphabet. Because there is no second alphabet that goes back to ancient times as *tamgas*. It is the Old Turkic alphabet that conveys this reality in itself. Even though it is among the oldest alphabets, the Orkhon-Yenisei alphabet different from others due to its differential features and uniqueness. N. Khudiyev, who evaluates this very correctly, also writes about the fact:

> The Gokturk alphabet is also different from the ancient alphabets. The creators of this alphabet correctly determined the law of harmony, and the ways of usage vowels together with consonants. Therefore, the Gokturk alphabet was evaluated as the "best script" capable of reflecting the sound system of Turkic languages (KHUDIYEV, 2015, p. 44).

Conclusion

The article examines the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet. This research is based on the researcher's ideas to get deeper and detailed reality. Not only Turkish researchers, but also the opinions of foreign scientists are brought to the center of the research. It turns out that there are differences of opinion in the Turkological world about the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet. These represent two stages. The stage before the reading of the Old Turkic monuments, specifically the "Kul tigin" monument, and the stage after 1893. It is also stated that although the opinions are of different directions, two opinions are more leading about the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet are in the scientific community. One of them is the issue of the origin of the Old Turkic alphabet with the Aramaic-Pahlavi alphabet, and the other is the connection of this alphabet with *tamgas*. The article presents the author's personal conclusions about the research subject. As a result, it is suggested that the Old Turkic alphabet originated from tamgas. In the later stages of the development of the language, hard or soft consonant sounds inside the word-tamgas become a grapheme expresser and are included in the Old Turkic alphabet. Proofs and arguments are presented and confirmed based on examples recorded from old Turkic written monuments.

REFERENCES

ABDULLAYEVA, G. A. "**Kul Tigin" monument**. Baku: Azernashr, 2007, p. 214.

ALIYEV, Y. **Old language**. Baku: Science and Education, 2019, p. 147.

ARISTOV, N. A. Experience in clarifying the ethnic composition of the Kirghiz Cossacks of the Great Horde and the Karakirghiz. **Living antiquity**, n. 3-4, p. 28-34, 1894.

ASGAR, R. **Orkhon monuments**. Baku: Science and education, 2012.

HAJIYEV, T. **A unified communication language for Turks**. Baku: Education, 2013.

HAJIYEVA, Z. T. **Old alphabet**. Baku: Science, 1989.

HUSEYNZADE, A. **The benefits of learning Turkish**. "Hayat" newspaper, 1905.

KASHGARI, M. **Diwan Lughat al-Turk**. Translated and prepared for publication by Ramiz Asgar). Baku: Ozan, 2006. v. 1.

KHUDIYEV, N. **The language of Old Turkic written monuments**. Baku: Science and Education, 2015.

KIPCHAK, M. **History of Turkic script**. Baku: Laman Publishing House Polygraphy, 2017.

KIPCHAK, M. D. **Turkic alphabets** (Sogdian, Manichaean alphabet and passe-pa script). Baku: MBM publishing house, 2012.

MELIORANSKY, P. M. **Monument in honor of KulTegin**. St. Petersburg: Printing House of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1899.

RAJABLI, A. **Phonetics of the Gokturk language**. Baku: Nurlan, 2004.

RAJABOV, A. **Monuments of Old Turkic writing**. Baku: Nurlan, 2009. v. 1.

ROLIVANOV, E.D. Ideographic motif in the formation of the Orkhon alphabet. **Bulletin of the Central Asian University**, n. 9, p. 177-181, 1929.

SHUKURLU, A. **The language of Old Turkic written monuments**. Baku: Maarif, 1993.

SHUKURLU, A. **The language of Old Turkic written monuments**. Baku: Maarif, 2015.

How to reference this article

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.
Correction, formatting, normalization and translation.