

“Story of Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl” was Written in Islamic Period in Chagatai Turkish with Uighur Script and Its Grammar Analysis

Hülya Uzuntaş*
(Istanbul)

Abstract: At number 598 of Huntington Collection in Bodleian Library which is located in Oxford, England, a Chagatai corpus which was rewritten with cursive Uighur alphabet is registered. That corpus was most probably written by Mansur Bahşı in Yazd in 1435 A.C. This corpus consists of 148 leaves and includes three prosaic stories. The first prosaic story (consisting of 67 leaves), Bahtiyâr-nâme, also known as “The Story of Ten Viziers,” is about a father and his son who fight against each other without knowing that they have father-son relationship. The second prosaic story (consisting of 47 leaves), Story of Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl, tells about a love story between Seyfe’l-Mülûk, the son of Egypt’s Sultan named Âsım ibn Safwan and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl, who is the daughter of the Garden of İrem’s sultan named Şâhbâl ibn Sârûh. Some pages from the beginning, some from the middle and some from the end of this second story are missing. The third story of the corpus, the Story of Rızvan şah and Ruh- afza, is a love story which has two characters. Available 34 leaves of this third story were studied by Prof. Dr. Ceval Kaya in 2008.

In this study, I will inform you about the second prosaic story of the corpus, Story of Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl and its grammar analysis.

Keywords: Uighur Script, Chagatai Turkish, Story of Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl

Özet: İngiltere’de Oxford’daki Bodleian Kütüphanesi, Huntington Collection, numara 598’de, miladî 1435’te muhtemelen Yazd şehrinde Mansur Bahşı tarafından kursiv Uygur harfleri ile istinsah edilen Çağatayca bir mecmua kayıtlıdır. 148 varaklık bu mecmua üç mensur eseri ihtiva etmektedir. Bu eserlerden ilki “On Vezir Hikâyesi” olarak da bilinen ve birbirlerini tanımadan

* Istanbul University, uzuntashulya@yahoo.com.

mücadele eden baba-oğul motifinin işlendiği 67 varaklık *Bahtiyâr-nâme*'dir. 47 varaklık ikinci hikâyeye ise, Mısır Padişahı Asım bin Safvan'ın oğlu Seyfe'l-Mülûk ile İrem Gülistânı'nın sultanı Şâhbâl-i bin Sârûh'un kızı Bedî'ü'l-Cemâl arasındaki aşkı anlatan baştan, aradan ve sondan eksik olan *Seyfe'l-Mülûk ve Bedî'ü'l-Cemâl Hikâyesidir*. Mevcut 34 varağı Prof. Dr. Ceval Kaya tarafından 2008 yılında hazırlanan, çift kahramanlı bir aşk hikâyesinin anlatıldığı *Rızvân Şâh ile Ruh-afzâ Hikâyesi* ise mecmuanın üçüncü hikâyesidir.

Bu çalışmada mecmuanın ikinci hikâyesi olan *Seyfe'l-Mülûk ve Bedî'ü'l-Cemâl Hikâyesi* ve gramer analizi hakkında bilgi vereceğim.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Uygur yazısı, Çağatay Türkçesi, Seyfe'l-Mülûk ve Bedî'ü'l-Cemâl Hikâyesi

Sogd origin Uygur alphabet system was used by Turks of Buddhist, Christian and Muslim faiths between the IXth and XVIIIth centuries. It is seen that the Uighur script was used by Muslim Turks in two manners. One of these shows that there exist copies written in Arabic. The script of the texts was originally written in Uygur while the other one indicates that there exist texts written in both alphabets as on the upper line appear Uighur script while on the lower line are seen Arabic script.

One of the catalogues of the texts was written in Uighur script, during the Islamic period it was prepared by Osman Fikri Sertkaya and published in 1977 under the title of *A general outlook on the works of Islamic Period written in Uighur letters*.¹ In this catalogue the works were written during the Timürid period constitute a large group. One of these works will be focused in our paper which is a corpus written in Uighur script. It is a well-known manuscript and registered in the archive of Bodleian Library, Huntington Collection in Oxford, England under the number 598. There is no information about how many pages the original corpus consists which also includes *Bahtiyâr-nâme, the Story of Seyfe'l-Mülûk and Bedî'ü'l-Cemâl* and *the Story of Rızvan şah and Ruh-afza*, because some pages of the stories in the manuscript are missing. The explanation for that is the bad bindig technique. Moreover, some pages were intermingled in the binding. The available colophons point out that

¹ See. Osman Fikri Sertkaya, *A general outlook on the works of Islamic Period written in Uighur letters*, Bochum 1977.

the reproduction of the corpus was completed by a scribe named Mansûr Bahşı in the city of Yazd² in 1435. Each page at a size of 25x16.25 cm of this corpus whose 148 pages are remained is composed of 15 lines bounded by a frame.

Mansûr Bahşı³ about whom we do not have enough information also rewrote in 1432 another corpus written in Uighur letters in which *Sirâcü’l-kulûb*, the *Book of Mes’ele*, *Râhatü’l-kulûb*, *Muhabbet-nâme of Horezmî* and some poetical works are found. This corpus is kept in British Museum.

The corpus was examined by several investigators as P. Amédée Jaubert⁴ (1827), Arthur Lumley Davids⁵ (1832), Armin Vambery⁶ (1870),

² There is no information about the location of the copy in the work. But it is known that the scribal of this work, Mansur Bahşı, who is also the scribal of another corpus with Uighur letters in British Museum Or. 8193, copied that corpus in Yazd in C. E. 1432, so it is highly likely that this corpus was also copied in the same place

³ It is known that during Timur's son, Shahruh's period, even after the death of Shahruh, he is one of the notable Bahşis who lived under the auspices of the governor of Yazd, Emir Celaledin Çakmak, for many years. He is also the scribal of another corpus with Uyghur letters which is in British Museum, Orient 8193, copied in C. E. 1432. It is also known that he has a few copyrighted works. (Look for more information about Mansur Bahşı, Henry Franciscus Hofman, *Turkish Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*, Section III, Part I, Vol. 4: K-N, Utrecht 1969, pp. 118-121.). Beside these, it is known that in XIV. and XV. centuries the name “Bahşı” is given to clerks in the entourage of the Timurids and these Bahşis used the Uighur letters in their correspondence (See. Fuad Köprülü, *Literary Studies*, Ankara 1966, pp. 149-150.).

⁴ This corpus was first introduced by Paul Amédée Jaubert. In his article named, *Notice et extrait de la version turque du Bakhtiar-naméh*, Jaubert gives information about writing, and he translated the section titled “beşinçi kün-ni+óekAyat-i,” which he transcribed by the Arabic letters, to French “(See. P. A. Jaubert, “*Notice et extrait de la version turque du Bakhtiar-naméh*”, *Journal Asiatique*, X, 1827, pp. 146-167.).

⁵ See. Arthur Lumley Davids, *A Grammar of the Turkish Language*, Londra 1832, pp. 171-178; and French translation version of the same work “*Grammaire Turke*”, Londra 1836, pp. 177-184.

⁶ See. Armin Vambery, *Uigurische Sprachmonumente und das Kudatku Bilik*, Innsbruck 1870, pp. 174-177.

Wilhelm Radloff⁷ (1891), Mustafa Rahmi Balaban⁸ (1923), Reşid Rahmeti Arat⁹ (1930s), Mustafa Sinan Kaçalın¹⁰ (1980), Kamile Hicran Karakoç¹¹ (1980), Handan Yazanlar¹² (1980), Ceval Kaya¹³ (1980, 2008), Milan Adamoviç¹⁴ (2009) and various studies have been made on the text in the corpus.

The first out of the three prosaic works found in the corpus is *Bahtiyâr-nâme*¹⁵ consisting of 67 levae which is also known as “*The Story of Ten Viziers*”. *Bahtiyâr-nâme* is a frame story composed of several intermingled stories. It talks about the encounter of the Sultan named Azadbaht who had to leave his newly born son during a war with his son Bahtiyâr whom he didn’t see for years and the consequence of this encounter.

The third story of this corpus composes several intermingled stories. The frame story is *the story of Rızvan şah and Ruh-afza* which is a love story with a happy ending. This story is also not complete because some pages related to the introduction and body paragraphs are missing. There

⁷ See. Wilhelm Radloff, *Das Kudatku Bilik des Jusuf Chass Hadschib aus Bâlasagun*, St. Petersburg 1891, pp. 247-249.

⁸ See. Mustafa Rahmi Balaban, *Bahtiyâr-nâme*, İstanbul 1923.

⁹ A transcription of the corpus, of which some parts are missing, made by Arat, is present as a transcription trial among Arat’s unpublished Works in Turkish Culture Research Institute.

¹⁰ See. Mustafa Sinan Kaçalın, *Bahtiyâr-nâme*. Index (A- H). İstanbul, 1980. (İstanbul University Institute of Turkic Studies Library, T. 2134).

¹¹ See. Kâmile Hicran Karakoç, *Bahtiyâr-nâme*. Index (I-K). İstanbul, 1980. (İstanbul University Institute of Turkic Studies Library, T. 2161).

¹² See. Handan Yazanlar, *Bahtiyâr-nâme*. Index (L-Ş). İstanbul, 1980. (İstanbul University Institute of Turkic Studies Library, T. 2135).

¹³ See. Ceval Kaya, *Bahtiyâr-nâme*. Index (T-Z). İstanbul, 1980. (İstanbul University Institute of Turkic Studies Library, T. 2136); *The Story of Rızvan şah and Ruh-afza in Uighur Letters*, 1st edition, Ankara, TDK Publications, 2008; 2nd edition, Ankara, TDK Publications, 2014.

¹⁴ Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aziz Merhan announced Milan Adamoviç’s study on the corpus with his paper titled “*About a Chagatai Tale Corpus with Uyghur Script*” at the 11th National Turcology Congress, which was organized by İstanbul University Institute of Turkish Studies between the dates 11 and 13 November 2014.

¹⁵ No independent study of the whole of *Bahtiyâr-nâme*, which is the first story of this corpus, has been published until today.

are only 34 leaves available which were published by Ceval Kaya. The work of Kaya consists of four sections. The first section gives explanation about the work, scribe, copy and performed studies. The second section comprises facsimile, transcription and translation, the third section includes notes and remarks about the text and the fourth section is the index (general index, index of grammatical inflections, index of foreign words). The work was published by Turkish Language Association in two editions in 2008 and 2014.

Actually, there is no study published on *the Story of Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl* which is the second story of the corpus. University of Istanbul Institute of Social Sciences has deemed the redaction of this story (consisting of 47 leaves) as the subject of my doctoral thesis upon the decision issued on 10 April 2014. Actually, I am carrying on my meticulous studies on its transcription into Latin letters, its translation into Turkish, linguistic characteristics and grammatical aspects of the story for which I prepared an index and explanatory notes. I prepared this paper with reference to my doctoral thesis.

The Story of Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl that also exists in *the story of Thousand and One Nights*, is the subject of my paper. This story tells of the love and bravery in an intermingled form. Story of *Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl* which is also present in oral tradition is a famous folk story told with variations in Arabic language, Old Anatolian Turkish, Ottoman Turkish, Azerbaijan Turkish, Turkmen Turkish, Chagatai Turkish, likewise in more than ten different geographic areas.

The story tells about love between *Seyfe’l-Mülûk* who is the son of the Egyptian Sultan named *Âsım ibn Safwan* and *Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl* who is the daughter of the Sultan of the Garden of Irem named *Şâhbâl ibn Sârûh*. The story gives information about a journey for which *Seyfe’l-Mülûk* sets off with the son of the vizier who is his earnest friend *Saïd* to find *Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl* with whom he felt in love after having seen her reflection on the dress sent by the prophet Solomon to his father.

This story whose first available page is 1 (107a) and last available page is 94 (84b) consists of 47 leaves. Some leaves of the text are missing

from the beginning, and from the mid and from the end of the text. As each page of the manuscript is composed of 15 lines, the total number of lines is 1410.

The colophon indicating the date found in the page 148a of the manuscript: *kutlug bolsun tîrîh sekiz yüz otuz sekizde tavuşkan yıl zül-hic[c]e ay-ning ev[v]elin-te mansûr bahşı bitidi*¹⁶. “May it be blessed, written by Mansûr Bahşı, at the first day of Dhu'l Hijjah of Rabbit year, year eight hundred thirty eight.”

The story begins with a sentence like: ... *tak-ı on ança mâl anga katıp köp pâdsâ-[h]-lar-ga lâyık tecem[m]ül-ler yasap kızını sâlih vezîr-ga tapşur-dı*. “And by adding countless goods and preparing presents fit for sultans, gave his daughter to vizier named Sâlih.” It is not usual to see such an introduction sentence for a story that gives impression of an unfinished narration; and is concluded with a sentence like *tak-ı köp imgek-ler tartıp ...* “and suffering very much...” which is grammatically inaccurate and has no semantic value. With regard to semantic and grammatical structures, it is evident that these two sentences cannot be either an introduction or a conclusion sentence of a story. So it shows that some pages from the beginning and from the end of *the Story of Seyfe'l-Mülûk and Bedî'ü'l-Cemâl* written in Uighur script in Chagatai Turkish are missing: For example, the missing elements at the last part of the text keep us from learning the sequel of heroes of the story. But when we examine the other versions of the story written in different dialects we see that the protagonists meet each other and live together for long years. So the story is concluded with a happy ending.

The title of the story is not available because the heading of the manuscript lacks some pages. But referring to the other versions of the story and following the tradition that the title of the story must bear the name of the protagonist when it comes to the story with two heroes, we can induce that this aforementioned story is entitled in the way in which the names of the protagonists are used.

When the available pages are examined, it is clear that some parts of the story are missing in the middle of the story as well:

¹⁶ Ceval Kaya, *ibid*, pp. 165.

There is an inconsistency in terms of meaning between the pages 22 and 23. At the page 22 it is told about *Seyfe’l-Mülûk* and his servants with whom he sets out for a journey to find *Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl* while the page 23 tells of the scene in which the prince and his servants are taken hostages by the black (cannibal) people: *tak-ı kem-e-lerin turguzup tengiz yakasında marguzâr iç<in>-de ...* “and they stopped their ships at the sea front on the grass... (22/14-15)”; “... *melikzâde-ni yârân-ları birl-e ol zengî-ler ol pâdş-â[h]-lar-ı katın-ga ilt-ti-ler... (23/1-2)*”.

There is no coherence between the pages 24 and 25, either. The page 24 tells about the sending of *Seyfe’l-Mülûk* and his five servants to the black (cannibal) sultan and to his daughter as foods, the girl’s falling in love with *Seyfe’l-Mülûk* and the physical features of this girl while the page 25 talks about the encounter of *Seyfe’l-Mülûk* with the monkeys: “...*boyı bir qar-a munâr-a teg baş-ı boyag-çı-lar-ning qazan-ı teg saç-lar-ı yapağı teg közleri ayak-lığ kan teg burnı bir mür-î teg ağız bir sandük ağız teg tiş-leri tonguz tiş-i teg... (24/12-15)*”; “...*yeyür irdi kim nâgâh bir tavuş işit-ti (25/1)*”.

There is also an inconsistency in terms of meaning between the pages 26 and 27. While the page 26 gives information about the contact of *Seyfe’l-Mülûk* with monkeys, at the page 27 it is told the encounter of *Seyfe’l-Mülûk* with *Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl*’s foster sister named *Melîke Hatun*. “*tak-ı ol köşk-ning işikin-de köp biçin-ler çomak-lar yığaç-lar tutup kılıç-lar bağlanıp oturur... (26/13-15)*”; *bir kızını körd-i kim bir çadır-şab-nı yapınıp yatur ird-i (27/1-2)*”.

Orthographic and linguistic properties:

This story was written in Uighur cursive script to confer to the aesthetic style and illegibility of the text in a late period when there was a great probability to confuse the letters. Hereby, I want to explain you the general orthographic and linguistic properties of the story:

When we examine the linguistic properties of *the Story of Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî’ü’l-Cemâl* written in prose and in Chagatai Turkish, which is also the language of two other stories

found in the corpus, we see that the typical characteristics of the classic Chagatai Turkish have not become widespread yet.















1. There is no consistency in the text regarding the use of the auxiliary consonant /n/ which appear between case suffixes and on the third person possessive suffix: *sebebin-din* (3/8), *köksin-de* (7/8), *közin-din* (7/10), *tegresin-de* (7/11), *üstündin* (8/3), *için-de* (8/13), *ileyin-de* (13/1), *çerigin-din* (15/15), *bir birin-din* (22/4), *şerrin-din* (25/9), *korkunçın-dın* (26/5), *katında* (44/12), *könglin-de* (63/2) etc.; In addition, *oglı-ga* (3/2), *yaş-ı-ga* (3/6), *kazâ-sı-ga* (3/13), *köngli-de* (7/9), *boynu-ga* (9/12), *köngli-din* (15/8), *açıg-lan-ganı-dın* (39/2), *yanı-da* (48/7), *küni-ge* (69/12) etc.

2. At the first syllable there is a duality in the use of /e/ ~ /i/: *kış-e* (1/5), *keç-e* (59/14), *tip* (25/5), *tep* (17/4), *niç-e* (23/15), *neç-e* (19/7), *kitti* (80/13), *ketti-ler* (14/9), *kildi-ler* (88/10), *keldi* (5/12), *aytur irdi* (93/13), *bar erdi* (55/5), *almaz min* (12/7), *öltürür men* (78/13) etc. The dual use of the words which undergo changes generally depends on the vocal /i/ during the classical period of Chagatai Turkish and afterwards, supports the argument that the story was written before the classical period.

3. *The Story of Seyfe'l-Mülûk and Bedî'ü'l-Cemâl* is copied by using Uighur letters which have fewer signs in comparison to Arabic alphabet. The Uighur alphabet had the difficulty to meet the phonemes of Arabic and Persian words, so the scribe placed Arabic letters on the lower lines to show these consonants which do not exist in Turkish language in order to identify Arabic and Persian words written in Uighur letters. We cannot say that there is as many consistency in the text with regard to the orthographic feature as the scribe sometimes informs the reader about how to pronounce a word by putting Arabic letters below the word. But we also see that sometimes he writes the same word directly in Uighur letters without using Arabic letters. Ceval Kaya says that this orthographic form does not show the phonetic of the word but only its origin.¹⁷ Arabic letters

¹⁷ See. Ceval Kaya, "A new work commissioned by Uighur letters during Islamic Period: "The Story of Rızvan şah and Ruh-afza", Bir, Turkish World Studies Journal, 6, 1996, pp. 120.

which are used by the scribe as vowel points are the consonants like ح(h), خ(h), ع(‘), غ(g), ه(h).

 der-hâl (9/4)	 der-hâl (8/11)
 hâsıl (19/8)	 hâsıl (77/15)
 ‘işret (1/14)	 ‘işret (6/14)
 ta‘âl-â (3/13)	 ta‘âl-â (1/13)
 ‘an{m}ber (34/2)	 ‘anber (34/14)
 her (9/1)	 her (9/7)
 hîç (9/1)	 hîç (4/4)

4. We see that in the story past tense is used and appearing like *aydı, yid-i-ler, körd-i, olturd-ı, kıldı, köydi, boldı* ; future tense like *urgay, bolgay, ayıt-kay siz, kılğay men, bargay men, okugay*; present perfect tense of the verb “turmak” in the form of *kişi turur sen, kafir-ler turur, şehir-i turur, bar turur*; imperative like *keltür-gil, birgil, kelgil, oltur-gıl, kizeyin, kılayın, aytayın*; conditional past tense like *yit-ti irse, işit-ti irse, tidi irse, boldı irse, kördüm irse*; imperfect tense of the present perfect like *birür irdi-ler, kılur irdi-ler, koyar irdi-ler, okır irdi, yatur ird-i, yıgılar irdim*.

5. In the story written in Uighur cursive letters the consonant signs like D,S,T,Q and Z meet various phonemes in the following way: **D** = d and t; **S** = s, ş and z; **T** = t and d; **Q** = h(ح), h(خ), ‘(ع), g(غ), k(ق), h(ه); **Z** = z and s.

6. There are some missing vocals in some affixes and words. But there is no rules which could make any sense to solve the problem of missing vocals. This situation comes up in the orthography of the plural suffix *-lar* as inflection on word as well as in the orthography of the plural suffix *-lar* as inflection on third person and in the orthography of

the first syllable of the word *tak-ı*: *t(a)k-ı* (2/9), (3/9), (3/12), (5/7), (5/8), (6/5), (6/8), (8/3), (8/4), (11/7), (11/12), (14/5) etc.; *aydı-l(a)r* (3/5), *tidi-l(e)r* (3/11), *yitti-l(e)r* (3/15), *keltürdi-l(e)r* (5/14), *kıld-ı-l(a)r* (6/12), *boldı-l(a)r* (13/2), *koydı-l(a)r* (13/10), *tidi-l(e)r* (14/7), *ketti-l(e)r* (14/9) etc.; *dây-a-l(a)r* (3/14), *hat-l(a)r* (4/3), *toyl(a)r* (5/3), *nem-e-l(e)r-ni* (6/9), *üsdâd-l(a)r* (13/14), *perî-l(e)r-ning* (14/3), *kaygu-l(a)r* (14/10), *vezîr-l(e)r* (15/1), *sözl(e)rni* (15/10), *beg-l(e)r* (15/14) etc. In addition *tak-ı* (1/1), (2/14), (3/1), (3/8), (3/14), (5/2), (5/13), (6/1), (6/2), (6/4), (6/10), (7/9) etc.; *oglan-larım* (6/6), *nöker-leri* (7/1), *kızları-ning* (16/12), *hûr-larını* (18/8), *özleri* (21/15), *ihtiyâr-ları* (22/1), *kem-e-lerin* (22/14), *yârân-ları* (25/1), *singil-lerim* (29/11) etc.

7. Some inflections usually are written separately from words: *vezîr-ning* (2/13), *ton-ning* (7/7), *kızları-ning* (16/12), *vezîr-ga* (1/3), *katınga* (25/2), *iş-ke* (44/4), *kızı-nı* (1/3), *ün-ni* (8/12), *yarukın-da* (8/4), *katım-da* (13/10), *men-de* (39/13), *ton-dın* (14/9), *ay-dın* (16/10) etc.; But also there are inflections which are written adjacent to the word: *mening* (13/1), *munung* (15/8), *aning* (57/14), *dây-a-larg-a* (2/15), *katınga-a* (11/8), *ünin-i* (8/10), *haberin-i* (17/3), *iligin* (82/9), *ayakın* (82/9), *katında* (11/3), *munda* (44/4), *üstündin* (8/3), *mendin* (8/9), *mundın* (10/14) etc.

8. In the text there are complements written in Arabic and Persian language: *seyfe'l-mülük* (3/1), *bedi'ü'l-cemâl* (59/4), *tâce'l-mülk* (44/3) etc.; *gülistân-ı irem* (14/3), *namâz-ı şâm* (59/15), *şehristân-ı simîn-de* (75/3) etc.

Possessive suffix used in Persian complements sometimes are written separately and sometimes adjacent to the previous word: *şehristân-ı simîn* (71/10), *gülistân-ı irem-ga* (79/5); *gülistânı irem* (7/13), *cezîreyi isfîd-pâş* (37/13) etc.

9. In addition to Arabic and Persian words there are also Mongolian words: *ögülge* (2/9), *nöker-i* (25/11), *igeçi* (29/7), *karanggu* (30/1), *agastı-ning* (43/15) etc.

a. In some borrowed words the original â phoneme is met by î: *îlim* (4/1), *îlîcin* (10/2), *îciz* (17/12), *kir-î-ge* (45/1), *îdil* (88/13) etc.

b. In some foreign words the original z (ذ and ض) phoneme is met with d: *ödürler* (39/5), *sergüdeşt* (64/6), *havud* (29/10).

c. There are also some copying mistakes done by the scribe as the missing or excessive letters, suffix and words: *ti[r]ler* (37/12), ‘*ûd u* ‘*an{m}ber* (34/2), *garıblık{-lık}-ning* (19/9), *irdiler{-ler}* (23/3-4) *yıgl-a-
{la}d-ı* (37/11), *düny-â-da{-dan}* (91/8), *kılgıl {kılgıl}* (25/5), *{tak-i}* (47/1) etc.

10. Scribal usually wrote the repeating letters in the words for once. Yet, there is not a rigid rule about this orthographic rule: *tecem[m]ül-ler* (1/2); *meş[ş]âta-lar* (1/10), *münec[c]im-ler-ga* (3/3), *tefer[r]üc* (4/13), *rak[k]âslar* (22/10), *ev[v]el-din* (32/10), *teg[g]inç-e* (32/10), *muras[s]a* (35/10), *tevek[k]el* (41/3), *müşer[r]ef* (90/14) etc. In addition, *moll-â-lar-ga* (4/1), ‘*izzet* (13/7), *ellig* (21/8), *şerrin-din* (25/9), *muhaddisler* (22/10), *mübeddel* (90/15) etc.

11. Some of the words and suffix which were not written by the scribe but added into the text because they comply with the parallelism found in the text are similar to: *kamış<-lar>* (40/14), *tengiz<-ler>de* (45/13), *biri<nçi>* (91/3), *<tip>* (3/2), *<serv> bânû* (77/12) etc.

12. Vav-ı atif used in the text are generally written adjacent to the previous word: *hüsnü cemâl* (2/6), *sabru ârâm* (7/10), *gencü mâl* (17/13), *rencü zahmet* (18/15), ‘*ayşu* ‘*işret* (20/11), ‘*ûdu* ‘*anber* (34/14), *gerdü gubâr* (40/9), *la’lu firûze* (41/1), *hamdu sen-â-lar* (80/9), *cânu cihân* (94/1) etc.; but there are also vav-ı atif which are written separately: *ir ü hatun* (10/15), ‘*ûd u* ‘*an{m}ber* (34/2).

13. Some hybrid words can be seen in the text: *karanggu-luk* (Mong. *karanggu* + Turk. *-luk*) (40/10); *yanglıg* (Chin. *yang* + Turk. *-lıg*) (9/5); *kökeldenş* (Mong. *kökel* + Turk. *-da* + *eş* > *-deş*) (51/12) etc.

14. The synonyms used in the text has enriched the vocabulary of the story: *dân-â biliglig* (21/10), *ton oprak* (53/10), *yat nâ-mahrem* (75/14) etc.

As conclusion, we can say that *the Story of Seyfe’l-Mülûk and Bedî-ü’l-Cemâl* written in Chagatai Turkish in Uighur script whose orthographic and linguistic properties we have discussed before can be considered as a reference that sheds light on the studies held on the Turkish language.