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Cotton in a Sogdian Document
in the Berlin Turfan Collection

Christiane RECK

Sogdian documents are rare in the Berlin Turfan collection. Werner Sundermann published one document nearly 20 years ago. Recently Dai Matsui and Yutaka Yoshida discovered and published two more documents in the Arat Estate in Istanbul, which are written in the same hands as the fragment published by Werner Sundermann. In preparation of the third volume of the catalogue of Middle Iranian texts in Sogdian script I came across another fragment of a document. It is not written in the same hand as the other documents. The ductus is similar to that part of preserved at ll. 21-25 of text A in DTS (Pelliot Chinois 3134). I publish it honouring Yutaka Yoshida, who accompanied my works with selfless help and manifold advice. I hope that he forgives me that I enter this difficult area of economic documents on this way.

The fragment Ch/So 19507 [Plate 1, recto: Fig. 1, verso: Fig. 2] is a piece of the bottom margin of a Chinese Buddhist scroll and measures 20,0 x 16,2 cm. On the Chinese side there are parts of three columns of Sogdian text preserved, orientated 90° to the Chinese columns and ignoring in this way the Chinese text. The Sogdian text is presumably a writing exercise containing a Manichaean

---

(1) Sundermann 1996, pp. 105-111.
(3) Documents turco-sogdien (DTS) by N. Sims-Williams & J. Hamilton, Text A, pp. 23-30, pl. 3.
(4) I thank all the colleagues who read the drafts of this article, discussed with me about it and gave me valuable advice. For all faults and errors I am responsible myself.
description of the Light Paradise.\(^6\) The text on the verso side which shall be edited here is written in a completely different, very cursive hand. The lines are directed slightly upward, seen in horizontal direction. There is no finding sigle given at the fragment. Because of the fact that it is a piece of a Chinese scroll reused with Sogdian text, one could assume that it was found in Toyoq. The ductus of the cursive script of the text on the verso side and some features of assimilation let assume that it was written in the 10\(^{th}\) or 11\(^{th}\) century AD. The listing of work on ll. /4/ and /5/ shows that presumably nearly the half of a line is missing. So the fragment seems to be broken approximately in the middle.

The character of this text on the verso side is not clear. The occurrence of verbal forms of the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) singular gives reason to interpret the text as a kind of an account of works done and possibly not satisfactorily paid. In this way it is possible again to compare it with text A of DTS as mentioned above. The names Zāk čōr and Māŋi čōr are not typical Sogdian names but Old Turkish or hybrid names. It is not clear, how the name in l. /4/ should be read, possibly ẓ-ỳ’n, as discussed below. The first part of the text reports presumably about works done in a house: ʾrk kōʾrm “I did a work.” Unfortunately no locative is marked neither by a preposition (ʾwy(h) or pr(w)) nor by the ending -yʾ. So the meaning is still doubtful. Afterwards reports follow about taking of amounts of raw cotton (kpʾs). It seems if it was the payment for the work in the house. Remarkable is that in addition to the measure ḏnk for tang another word is mentioned: βwζ-yn. It seems to be a measurement higher than tang, because it is located in front of it: l. /6/ ʾḏw βwζ-yn ʾḥry ḏnk kpʾ]s. Nevertheless it could be also a part of a combination of a thing (βwζ-yn) and an amount of raw cotton. Considering the context as an account of works one could also interpret this passage as that somebody has got such and such amount of raw cotton for such and such βwζ-yn. Then βwζ-yn could be a measurement of time? Anyway, in

\(^6\) RECK 2006, p. 218 # 295.
this case the word pr is missing. Other possibilities will be discussed in detail below. The result of the research and the discussion is that βwz-yn possibly could be related to the Khotanese būśinai “of byssus (?)” and so could be used in the same way like wšyny, Old Turkish bōz etc. The word wšyny for “cotton”, mentioned in other Sogdian documents, published by W. Sundermann, N. Sims-Williams & J. Hamilton and Y. Yoshida, does not appear in the preserved part of this document. Possibly one could reconstruct it in l. 1/2/ w[.

The Chinese equivalent is xi-xie 細緞. The measurement ʾyw lʾγsy kpʾs in l. 1/9/ “one laysi raw cotton” is translated as a network of strings used as a measure of capacity nowadays as discussed below. The term laysi seems to be borrowed from Chinese as discussed below as well.

Remarkable are the spellings of the terms, well known from Old Turkish documents: kāpāz as kpʾs, tang as ônk. The spelling of these terms sheds a new light on the development of these terms. In this way ônk represents a link between the Khotanese and Old Turkish term as already been proposed by Yutaka Yoshida in his review to Nicholas Sims-Williams’ edition of the Bactrian documents, where he refers to ônk in this document Ch/So 19507. On the other hand the tracing of kpʾs leads to assume two different ways of transformation.

In conclusion this text provides us with the following terms of the semantic field of cotton, except of the well-known wšyny:

---

(7) See the payment in Ancient Letters V: pr 4 styr 4 ʾδ(n)k ʾst(k)[.]m ʾβ(y)ʾrt, GRENET e.a. 1998 [2001], p. 97.


(9) Referring the relation between Sogdian wšyny and Old Turkish bōz, see RASCHMANN 1995, pp. 20-25.

(10) DTS, pp. 56-57.

(11) YOSHIDA 2000 [2003], p. 159.
kp’s kapās “raw cotton”
lʾγsy laysi “net”, measure for raw cotton
ōnk thang measure for raw cotton, currency?
βwz-yn βūzin possibly “cotton, cotton textile, cotton cloth”, currency?

Transliteration and translation of Ch/So 19507 verso:

/1/ zʾk cwr mʾ/n(·)(12)
/2/ sʾnkwn xʾny lʾ(γ)sy(13)
/3/ trxʾn xʾnyʾrk kōʾrmʾdr(w/p)[
/4/ ʾyw βwz-yn ʾ γ (xʾn)ʾy(14) (r)[k kōʾrm]
/5/ ʾrk kōʾrmʾyw βwz-ynʾdwʾdnk[15]
/6/ xʾnyʾdwβwz-ynʾdrγnkkpʾ(·)ʾ[16]
/7/ [4 ](·)mnky cwr t(w)msʾrʾywʾydrʾryʾ[17]
/8/ lʾγsy kpʾsʾʾγʾt XX XX Xʾdrγnktyʾw?[18]
/9/ zʾk cwrʾyw lʾγsy kpʾsʾʾγʾtʾzw[19]
/10/ [10 ]mʾydrʾryʾ ʾms[20]
/12/ [15 ](·)(16)ʾsʾʾyw wʾ(.)[22]

(12) The traces of letters are visible. They cannot be identified with certainty.
(13) Here two pieces of paper are glued together. It is remarkable that the last visible letter continues upon the lying up piece. But the stroke leading to the next letter terminates at the gluing line.
(14) The reading is uncertain. There are various possibilities and combinations as mentioned below.
(15) The stroke at the end of the word is misleading. There is a final r with diacritic stroke for l in l. /12/ misplaced because it is the Sogdian word sʾr as already written as well in l. /11/ correctly. This usage of misplaced strokes is also remarked in other Sogdian texts. It will be discussed in my contribution to the Papers of the International Symposium on Sogdian-Turkic relations, 21-23 Nov. 2014 in Istanbul.
(16) It could be possible to read some parts of letters. The last letter seems to be a w with the end of the underlinear stroke of k or p or an stroke like l as it is preserved in sʾr as well.
/1/ Zāk-čōr …[ {in}]  
/2/ Sangun’s house ne[t? {in}]  
/3/ Tarxan’s house I did the work. Two/three/part[ ]  
/4/ one būžin. Further {in} (ZYān)’s (?) (house) [I did] the wo[rk]  
/5/ I did the work one būžin two th[ang]  
/6/ the house two būžin three th[ang] cot[ton]  
/7/ [ ]Māŋi-čōr Tunsār-đāyu(?) you have/had taken. [ ]  
/8/ lāγsi raw cotton (he has/had brought/ Āγatōāt?) 50 th[ang] y[ou?]  
/9/ Zāk-čōr (he has/had brought / Āγatōāt?) one lāγsi raw cotton. [ ]  
/10/ [ ]… you had/have taken. Further [ ]  
/11/ [ ] to/from -Amγa you do [ ]  
/12/ [ ](to/from) … one …[ ]  

Notes:  
/1/ Zāk-čōr: (z’k cw) Personal name (PN), cited in DTS, p. 75 (G20.1) as […] z’-k cw, because we do not know, whether the name is completely preserved, or there was still a part before, see also LURJE 2010, p. 469 #1550. Čōr is a very common, mostly final part of Old Turkish male names. The origin is not clear, see ZIEME 2006, pp. 115-117. It can be regarded as pre-Turkic, LURJE 2010, p. 167-168, ##391 and 392 (cw’kk).  
/2a/ Sangun: (s’nkwn) is a Turkish-Chinese title for “general”, see DTS, p. 85, written in another Sogdian document as sny’wn, s. Sundermann 1996, p. 109 (So 13881+So 13882/r/3/ transliterated there as s’γ’wn). See also ZIEME 2006, pp. 117-118.  
/3a/ Tarxan: (trx’n) is a Turkish honorific title, see DTS, p. 86 and pp. 53-54 (F3 and 21).  
/3b/ kō’rm: 1.Sg. Pret. of wn-/kt- “to do”. The combination of ’rk kt- is attested as well in the letters from Mt. Mugh (V 17, r/16-17/, Livšic 2008, p. 128 apud Bi & SIMS-WILLIAMS 2010, p. 506.
/3c/ ʾdr(w/p)]: mistake for ʾdr, or ʾdw or historical writing for ʾšpʾdy “part, portion?, bowl?” (Gharib #1767).

/4a/ βūžin: (βwž-yn) The reading is not completely certain. Instead of β also y could be read and vice versa. It is reasonable that the z with two dots below is to be read as ž. The only example for z is given in Zāk-čōr. There the z is not marked by a diacritic dot. The interpretation is not clear as well. The term βwž-yn should be a measure or something countable, because of ʾdw βwž-yn in l. /6/. Because of the problems mentioned above one should consider the possibility to interpret βwž-yn as a thing or object, which can be counted without a measure word.(17) This can be compared with the example given by Yoshida, quoted from a contract of debt (SI P 103.49). I cite a part of his English translation: “… one small cloth and six ch’engs of cotton, which are estimated to be equivalent to one picul and six pecks (of grain).”(18) The Chinese word for cloth in this case is 布 bu, Late Middle Chinese: pu.(19) Other sources use Chinese characters derived from forms of die 藍.(20)

After consultations with several colleagues I would propose to interpret βwž-yn as a loanword in Sogdian “made of cotton” related to the Khotanese būśinai “of byssus (?)”.(21) It can have been used in the same way like the Sogdian wšyn or the Old Turkish bōz.(22)

---

(17) I thank N. Sims-Williams for his advice.
(20) Referring the etymology of Old Turkish bōz, see Raschmann 1995, pp. 20-25.
(21) Bailey 1979, p. 300. I thank Ching Chao-jung, who encouraged me to follow this idea and N. Sims-Williams, who found at the end this Khotanese word, which does not exclude the relationship.
(22) Because of the reason, that we do not know whether it could be reconstructed really in l. 12 we cannot discuss about the fact that both terms could have been used in this document.
It should be mentioned for the sake of completeness that there is listed a NPers. √β būž “Weight, a raging fever” in the dictionary by STEINGASS.(23) Other dictionaries do not know such a word or such a meaning, Mo’īn’s dictionary brings up “swirl”, spelled baузh by STEINGASS.(24) Books of reference do not mention such a weight.(25) Document A in DTS mentions a presumably Chinese PN βwcyn.(26) A name very similar occurs in the bilingual text of the Arat collection published by Dai MATSUI and Yutaka YOSHIDA: butšīn.(27) Considering that the letter β in cursive script could also be read as γ the name Yočīn, mentioned in a document published by Dai MATSUI is also interesting.(28) In Old Turkish bužīn means a plant “hellebore”.(29) Possibly one could interpret βwž- as “tax”, see Chr. bwžbr “tax-gatherer, publican”, Sims-Williams 1985, 94R1, pp. 165 and 208, Gharib, p. 116 #2946. I. Gershevitch connects Chr. bwž- with S. β’zkrm, suggested by Frejman also as “tax-collector” (borsčik podatej/badša, A13,1).(30)

/4b/ Žyān: (z-γ’n) Possibly a PN. The reading is uncertain, alternative readings could be z-β’k (?), z-β’n, z-βn’ or z-γn’.

(23) STEINGASS, p. 206, see also VULLERS, p. 276: “gravitas, pondus; 2) febris”. It is also mentioned in Loghatniame, p. 6603. It is explained there as the weight, it means the level of heat or fever.
(24) Mo’īn, p. 602.
(26) DTS, text A, ll. 18, 23, p. 30 and Sims-Williams 2008, p. 44.
(27) Matsui 2012, p. 120. He explains this name as deriving from Skt. Buddhasena.
/6/  \textit{thang}: (\textit{t}nk) is well known as a unit of measurement of capacity (1), mostly attested for raw cotton in Old Turkish documents, s. YAMADA, pp. 496-498 and MORIYASU 2004, p. 102 #84. It is explained as a relatively big measure and the numbers are low. It is never mentioned together with another higher unit of measurements. MORIYASU quotes BAILEY, who recognized at first, that the equivalent for the Old Turkish \textit{tang} is Khotanese \textit{thamga}-.(31) YOSHIDA has already assumed, that “one may derive the Uighur form \textit{tay} from Sogdian \textit{t}nk, attested in the Ancient Letters V, 26 (cf. SIMS-WILLIAMS, \textit{BAI} 12 [1998b (2001)], p. 97). \textit{t}nk is also encountered in Ch/So 19507 (unpublished), where the word is used to indicate amount of \textit{kp’s} “cotton.”(32) BAILEY mentions the NPers. \textit{tang} \textit{šw} (derived from Turkish) as “half an ass’s load” (2) (according to VULLERS’ Persian Dictionary). (33)

In addition NPers. \textit{tang} is mentioned in the \textit{Codex Cumanicus} as “bale” (3), which means not a measurement of capacity and not a weight but a special measurement of textiles. (34) In the medical text P 19 a unit of weight is mentioned called \textit{drxmoŋ}, which includes the \textit{t}nk of our text. (35) HENNING offers a partly translation of P 19, connecting \textit{drxmoŋ} with NPers. \textit{diramsang}, (36)

---

(31) BAILEY 1961, p. 156 and BAILEY 1979, p. 148 \textit{thamga}- “a measure” of cotton, sugar or radish, “measure for cotton” SKJÆRVO & SIMS-WILLIAMS 2002, p. lxxvii. This measure is also used for hay, for example in Bactrian \textit{vaŋγo}, see SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007, p. 271.


(33) This Np. \textit{tang}

(34) NPers. \textit{tang} “balla” (Low Latin) is also mentioned in the \textit{Codex Cumanicus} (44b), see \textit{Codex Cumanicus}, ed. in facsimile by K. GRØNBECH, Kopenhagen 1936 (Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris; 1) and A. BODOGLIGETI: \textit{The Persian vocabulary of the Codex Cumanicus}, Budapest 1971, pp. 200-201.


Last but not least Hinz mentions ṭāṅk, with a long vowel ā as an Indian weight of 20,9628 gr. (the same as 1 dām) in the 16th century. It leads to a term tanga or tanka, which is known in Islamic coinage and connected by J. Allan with the Turkish tamgha. Here the circle is closed. In this way ṭāṅk could also be interpreted as a kind of coins? Could it be possible to use it for the interpretation of the passage in l. /8/ in connection with the number 50, which is relatively high for the common use of thang as a measurement of capacity for cotton? This high number could also be the result of an addition of some smaller amounts. Because of the fragmentary state of the text, one cannot decide it.

/7a/ Mājni-čōr: (mnky cwr) and Tu/onsār-ðāyu: (t(w)nsʾr ʾyw) seem to be two Personal Names. Mnk was mentioned as an unexplained part of a hybrid female PN, see Sundermann apud Zieme 2006, p. 122. References for māni “joy, felicity” as parts of male PN are given in documents from Dunhuang. The part Tu/on twn is explained by Lurje #1258 (p. 394) as “probably Turkic”. P. Zieme explains it as Old Turkish “first born”, Zieme 2006, p. 122, see also Clauson 1972, p. 513a (tu:n). Another possibility of interpretation could be “garment, clothing”, see Clauson 1972, p. 512b (to:n). It is part of the combination uzun tonlug “woman”, lit. “wearing long clothes”, see Clauson 1972, p. 520 (uzu:n tonlu:ğ). The sʾr could be the Sogdian postposition sʾr with kw or cnn “to, from” as well. Because of the difficulties to distinguish -r and -y, it could be also possible to read sʾy. The term ʾy(h) is known as a “female slave”. As such the ending -w cannot be explained. Besides these problems of interpretation could Tu/onsār-ðāyu be a female PN?

---

(37) Hinz 1970, pp. 11 and 34. Steingass, p. 277a: “a weight of about two ounces”.


(39) I thank S. Sims-Williams for his advice.


(41) I thank S.-Ch. Raschmann for her advice referring these names.

(42) Gharib # 3454, p. 136.
Christiane RECK

/7b/ ṭyṭ ry: 2.sg. tr.pret. or plupf. of ṭ`s- “to take” (GMS § 603). The past stem is ṭyt-. The -t is assimilated with ṭ to ṭ (GMS § 457), like in Christian sources.\(^{(43)}\)

/8a/ layṣi: (lʾγsy) appears once again on l. /9/. The completion of lʾ( to lʾγsy in l. /2/ is not without doubts because of the lack of a preceding numeral and the stretched form of the probably first part of the γ. But what could be an alternative word? The initial l shows that it is a loan word. Dai Matsui translated Old Turkish lagsı as “net”, originating from Chin. 絲子 (luo zi).\(^{(44)}\) The reconstructed early and late Middle Chinese forms for 絲 luo are lak.\(^{(45)}\) It is highly reasonable that the Sogdian layṣi has the same meaning and the same origin. The first idea to connect lʾγsy with rγsy mentioned in DTS, Text A, must have been rejected, because of the Old Turkish references of layṣi, as mentioned above. Its meaning “net” is much better fitting as rγsy, which has to be interpreted as “cloth or textile made from wool or fleece” corresponding to Old Turkish qars/qarz\(^{(46)}\), Chinese 褥子 (he zi), DTS, p. 85 with explanation on pp. 25-26. Sims-Williams & Hamilton connected it to Khotanese läysgûrya-, Bailey 1979, p. 371, apud DTS, p. 25.\(^{(47)}\)

/8b/ kapās: (kpʾs) “raw cotton” is related to Old Turkish kāpāz as mentioned in /6/ is attested completely once again in l. /9/ and to be reconstructed at the end of l. /6/. It could be traced to Pali kappāsa-,\(^{(48)}\) like Tokharian A, which preserves kappās.\(^{(49)}\) The Old Turkish kāpāz can be traced together with Khotanese kapāysa-,

\(^{(43)}\) Müller 1913, pp. 52, l. 10 (T II B 216, v/10/ now E5/72 = n 156/v/12/ (T II + T II B 16), Sims-Williams 2012, pp. 33-34), Gharib ## 2156, 2238, pp. 85 and 88, Müller 1913, p. 52.

\(^{(44)}\) Dai Matsui apud Raschmann 2007, p. 194, # 188 with n. 4. Published references for lagsı are Ch/U 6851/v/13/ and Ch/U 7012/v/2/ (uig.), Raschmann 1995, p. 139 # 58 (Ch/U 6851) and p. 142 # 62 (Ch/U 7012).

\(^{(45)}\) Pulleyblank 1991, p. 204.

\(^{(46)}\) References mentioned also in the glossary, Hamilton 1986, vol. II, p. 234.

\(^{(47)}\) This development was put in doubt by Martin Schwartz, 1974, pp. 401-402.


\(^{(49)}\) Pinault, G.-J.: Chrestomathie tokharienne: Textes et grammaire, Leuven / Paris 2008, p. 220. I thank Ching Chao-jung for her advice. According to her Kuchean fragments mention a unit
to another Middle Indian language or dialect where the intervocalic -s- changed into -z-.\(^{(50)}\) All forms go back to Sanskrit karpāsa.\(^{(51)}\) In NPers. karbās / kirbās كرباس means “linen, cotton, muslin”, preserving the -r- which is not written in the other references mentioned.\(^{(52)}\)

/8c/ ''γδʾt is difficult to explain. It seems to be 3.sg. tr.pret. or plupf. of ''βr- “to bring” (GMS § 603). But in this case the -r- is missing. Such a loss is to be noticed also in Christian late texts.\(^{(53)}\) The past stem is ''γt-. The -t is assimilated with δ of δʾrt- to δ (GMS § 457), like in Christian references.\(^{(54)}\) Another possibility would be to explain it as a PN ''γt-δʾt with the same assimilation, see LURJE 2010 ## 8, 9 and 19, pp. 67-68, ''γtprn, ''γtprtr and ''γtzʾt and many names with the second part δʾt, which usually means “given by …”. In this case it would be better to explain δʾt as a noun “law” and the whole name could be interpreted als Bahuvrīhi: “somebody to whom the law is come”.

/9/ **Amga**: (ʾʾmyʾ) is a Turkish-Chinese title, see DTS, p. 81, RÖHRBORN: *Uigurisches Wörterbuch*, Lf. 2, Wiesbaden 1979, p. 116.
Bibliography:


Loghatnāme, ed. by Mo‘īn, Mohammad & SHAHIDI, Ja‘afar, Tehran 1993-94.

LURJE, Pavel [2010]: *Personal names in Sogdian texts*, Wien 2010 (Iranisches Personennamenbuch, Bd. II: Mitteliranische Personennamen, Fasc. 8).
MATSUI, Dai [2004]: “Unification of Weights and Measures by the Mongol Empire as Seen in the Uigur and Mongol Documents”, in: Turfan Revisited: The First Century of Research into the Arts and Culture of the Silk Road, ed. by D. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST e.a., Berlin 2004, pp. 197-201.

MATSUI, Dai [2012]: “A Sogdian-Uigur Bilingual Fragment from the Arat Collection”, in: 语言背景的历史: 西域古典语言学高峰论坛论文集 (Yu yan bei hou de li shi : xi yu gu dian yu yan xue gao fang lun wen ji) = The history behind the languages: Essays of Turfan Forum on Old Languages of the Silk Road, ed. by 新疆吐鲁番学研究院 (Xinjiang tulufanxue Yanjiuyuan) Academica Turfanica, Shanghai 2012, pp. 115-127.


MORIYASU, Takao [2004]: Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße: Forschungen zu manichäischen Quellen und ihrem geschichtlichen Hintergrund, Wiesbaden 2004 (Studies in Oriental Religions; 50).


RECK, Christiane [2006]: Mitteliranische Handschriften, Teil 1: Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in sogdischer Schrift, Stuttgart 2006 (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland; 18,1)


Yoshida, Yutaka [2006]: *Kōtan shutsudo 8–9 seiki no Kōtango sezoku monjo ni kansuru oboezaki = Notes on the Khotanese Documents of 8th – 9th Centuries Unearthed from Khotan*, Kobe 2006 (Kōbeshi Gaikokugo Daigaku Gaikokugaku Kenkyūjo = Monograph Series in Foreign Studies; 38).


