

# The Sogdian envoy Maniach and his namesakes in China<sup>1</sup>

WANG DING

Address: Shanghai International Studies University  
550 Dalian Road (W), Shanghai 200083  
email: w.wangding@foxmail.com

Received: July 20, 2019 • Accepted: November 10, 2019

© 2020 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest



## ABSTRACT

Chinese sources document foreign names with phonetic transcriptions and render them in Chinese characters with close, or at least approximate, sound value. Among the Sogdians who were active at the Chinese court of the 6<sup>th</sup> century there were two persons named He Zhuruo and An Weiruo respectively. The etymology of both names can now be tentatively identified with Maniach, the name which was recorded in a Byzantine source, being that of a Sogdian envoy to Constantinople. Hence the original written form of *Zhuruo* and *Weiruo* can be restored with the spelling *Moruo*. The reason for these misspellings goes back to the graphic similarity of the concerned characters. Some further emendations of similar kinds are also proposed.

## KEY WORDS

Maniach (*Μανιάχ*, var. Maniakh); *Manyaq/Mayaq čor*; He Zhuruo 何朱弱; An Weiruo 安未弱; Moruo 末弱; *Nebenüberlieferung* (secondary transmission) in onomastics; textual criticism

<sup>1</sup> This article is a part of the result of grant-in-aid project 18ZDA177 supported by the National Social Science Fund of China ('Edition and research on the ethnic inscriptions of the Northern Dynasty, the Sui and Tang times'). The contents of this paper were delivered at the Symposium of Sogdian–Turkic Relations in November 2014 at Istanbul, for the invitation and unforgettable days I owe sincere gratitude to Professor Mehmet Ölmez. I am indebted for advice on several points to Peter Zieme, Yoshida Yutaka, Pavel Lurje, Luo Xin, Jonathan Z. Liu and Gao Fengfeng, also to two anonymous reviewers of this Journal. I cordially thank Keith McMahon for having improved my English text.

Foreign concepts import new knowledge, but they are often not easy to be understood correctly. There are many reasons for this difficulty, among which the linguistic one stands at the beginning. The Turkish royal title *Tigin* (also spelt *Tegin*, ‘a prince; a son or grandson of a ruling *Qaghan*’) is a prime example in Chinese textual criticism. It had been for long time copied and printed in the sources as *tele* 特勒, until the Qing-era scholar Qian Daxin 錢大昕 (1728–1804) decisively pointed out this misspelling. He argued, on the ground of stone inscriptions, that Chinese readers often do not understand the meaning of a foreign word transcribed in Chinese characters, with the result that copyists sometimes make mistakes. But the form *teqin* 特勤 that appears in inscriptions, in particular those fashioned under an imperial decree, are trustworthy, because they are originals from the contemporary time.<sup>2</sup>

On the basis of materials that were not existent in Qian Daxin’s time, we can now add an earlier variant of the same title, 提勤 *tiqin*, which frequently appears in 6<sup>th</sup>–7<sup>th</sup> century Chinese documents from Turfan, for example, *Mo-fen-ti-qin* 摩奮提勤 ‘*Mo-fen Tigin*’ (TCW II/76, a document concerning military service from 637 AD), *Tiqin Si* 提勤寺 ‘the Tigin Temple (i.e. a Buddhist monastery donated by a certain Tigin)’ (TCW I/325). In contrast to this clear orthography, there were already miscopies even from the contemporary time, as in a tomb epitaph for the Turkish tribal leader Pugu Yitu (*Da Tang Jinwei dudu Pugu fujun muzhi* 大唐金微都督僕固府君墓誌), in which the tribal name *Tiele* 鐵勒 is miswritten as *Tieqin* 鐵勤. In this case, the graphically similar characters *qin* vs. *le* were confused in the same way as the correct form *Teqin* and the corrupted *Tele*. Since the misspelling *Tieqin* appears in a dated text from 678 AD, this case reveals that the confusion of both characters happened already in an early period, when the Chinese stood in close contact with the Turkish tribes and nonetheless were not always sure about language matters concerning their partners’ who’s who.<sup>3</sup> An official once in the Northern Wei administration is recorded by name in two different spellings Jin Qin 靳勤 vs. Jin Le 靳勒.<sup>4</sup> Here we can see how easily the confusion between the spellings *qin* and *le* can happen.

The emendation of *Tele* to *Teqin* has received full acceptance and confirmation.<sup>5</sup> The explanations touch a frequently occurring phenomenon in the Chinese literary tradition in the treatment of words of non-Chinese origin. Ignorant of the real etymon of an odd-looking foreign word, a copyist is often inclined to ‘correct’ it to a ‘normal’ one, a practice which we can call an ‘intentional emending-copying’, but in fact it can lead to a *disimproval* (cf. the German verb *verschlimmbessern*), a sort of act of ‘killing the patient with a cure’. In addition, there are also cases in which similar graphic forms of different characters cause a copyist’s unintentional errors.

<sup>2</sup> *Shijiazhai yangxin lu* 十駕齋養新錄, j. 6, fl. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Concerning a general overview and detailed discussion on Chinese transcriptions of Old Turkish words, Kasai 2014 is to be consulted especially for the advantage that the original forms are richly collected from the historic annals and the contemporary secular documents unearthed from the Silk Road regions as well.

<sup>4</sup> BS 1/21: (拓拔珪與姚興戰，) 獲前亡臣王次多、靳勒，並斬以徇；ws 2/40 has Jin Qin 靳勤.

<sup>5</sup> Schlegel 1896: 158 ff.; Marquart 1901: 212; Chavannes 1903: 132 n. 3 et passim.



## I. MANIACH AND HIS NAMESAKES

In this essay, I intend in a comparative way to show how a heretofore puzzling foreign name has two forms in Chinese historical sources, viz. *zhuruo* 朱弱 and *weiruo* 未弱. They are both corrupted from 末弱, both looking much alike and hence giving rise to their corrupted forms. By identifying the etymology hidden behind them, the graphic form *moruo* 末弱 can be re-constructed as referring to Maniach, the name of a Sogdian of the 6<sup>th</sup> century recorded by the Byzantine historian Menander Protector.

The first two above-mentioned names appear in the *History of the Northern Dynasties* (compiled during 643–659 AD), where a group of young foreigners at the court is the subject of narration. They are reported as being talented in song singing and music playing, hence they gained the grace of the contemporary emperor Gao Wei 高緯 (reg. 556–577 AD), a sovereign bearing the sobriquet ‘Heavenly Son without worries’ for his addiction to living in luxury and waste. They were given high-ranking posts. ‘During the reign years of Wuping (570–577 AD) there were so-called “barbarian minions”... Among them, He Zhuruo and Shi Chouduo as well as more than ten others were all versed in singing, dancing and playing instruments. They were even promoted to the post of Commander Unequaled in Honour.’<sup>6</sup>

The same story is narrated more briefly in the *Book of Northern Qi* (compiled in 636 AD), with the difference that only Shi Chouduo appears.<sup>7</sup> In contrast, the *Monograph of Music* to the *Book of Sui* (compiled during 621–636 AD) gives a detailed report of Gao Wei’s hopeless deterioration in the face of foreign entertainments and the fall of the Northern Qi empire.<sup>8</sup> In this context, An Weiruo 安未弱 is mentioned by name together with two other Sogdian entertainers, Cao Miaoda 曹妙達 and An Maju 安馬駒.<sup>9</sup> The *Comprehensive Statutes* (compiled in 801 AD) quotes the wording of the *Book of Sui* nearly verbatim, including the graphic form of An Weiruo.<sup>10</sup>

The names He Zhuruo 何朱弱 and An Weiruo 安未弱 are worth particular attention. In the second character of both, the similarity is remarkable: 朱 and 未 are of such a minimal graphic difference that a scribal error can be conjectured. In this case I think that both *zhu* and *wei* are scribal errors of *mo*: 末 > 朱; 末 > 未.

Thus a name \*Moruo 末弱 can be postulated. But what does it then stand for? Its Middle Chinese pronunciation<sup>11</sup> is \**muat ɽiak* (the second character belongs to 日母藥韻三等開口, *ńziak* in KARLGREN’s reconstruction). But bearing in mind that our protagonists lived in the mid-sixth

<sup>6</sup> BS 92/3055: 武平時有胡小兒……其何朱弱、史醜多之徒十數人，咸以能舞工歌及善音樂者，亦至儀同開府。

<sup>7</sup> BQS 50/694: 又有史醜多之徒胡小兒等數十，咸能舞工歌，亦至儀同開府、封王。

<sup>8</sup> SS 14/331: 後主唯賞胡戎樂，耽愛無已。於是繁手淫聲，爭新哀怨。故曹妙達、安未弱、安馬駒之徒，至有封王開府者，遂服簪纓而為伶人之事。後主亦自能度曲，親執樂器，悅玩無倦，倚絃而歌。別採新聲，為無愁曲，音韻窈窕，極於哀思，使胡兒闈官之輩，齊唱之和之，曲終樂闕，莫不殞涕。雖行幸道路，或時馬上奏之，樂往哀來，竟以亡國。

<sup>9</sup> Lurje 2010: no. 161, discusses a probable name form ‘*spz’k* ‘horsechild, foal’, which, I think, seems to fit to a Chinese translated name *Maju* 馬駒. Apart from An Maju 安馬駒, a Kang Maju 康馬駒 is encountered in a census register from Turfan of the seventh-eighth century (OtRy 1204). A vernacular form (Zhai) Ama (翟) 阿馬 ‘little horse’ seems to represent an alternative translation of ‘*spz’k*. For *Miaoda* 妙達 (\**miaw dat*), Pavel Lurje kindly pointed out to me that the name can be from Sogd. *mywδ’t* ‘given by tiger’. On the identification of semantically related (Shi) Miaozi 史妙尼 and its Sogd. form *mywn’yh* (fem.), see Yoshida 2016: 62.

<sup>10</sup> TD 142/3616.

<sup>11</sup> In this article, the Middle Chinese forms are cited from Pulleyblank 1991.



century, for the second word the early Middle Chinese form \**njak* or *njak* must apply. Hence the connection between \**muat njak* and Maniach seems transparent.

In Menander Protector's excerpts, Maniach (*Μανιάχ*, also transcribed with Maniakh) was a Sogdian, who was charged by the Western Türk Kaghan Dizaboulos (Ištāmi; in Chinese sources *Shidianmi* 室點密 or *Sedimi* 瑟帝米) first in 567 AD to open up the silk trade with the Sasanian Persia and again in the following year with the Byzantine Empire. He headed a delegation and carried with him 'credentials written in the Scythian script'.<sup>12</sup> In the eyes of the Eastern Romans, the Sogdians were descendants of the Scythians. It is well known that the Sogdian language was current in the vast area of Central and Inner Asia as a lingua franca. Its speakers, who were often known as polyglot, acted as messengers and negotiators for peace and war on behalf of various political powers. Maniach in Menander's account was a Sogdian diplomat in the service of the ascending Turkish Empire in the mid-sixth century.<sup>13</sup>

Nothing concrete is known about the person Maniach, nor about his homeland. Related name bearers are attested in Byzantine sources.<sup>14</sup> His namesakes in the cited Chinese texts, however, give clear indication of their origin based on the 'surnames' bestowed on them according to the Chinese custom that foreigners be given a surname by means of putting a signifying ethnic or country name in front of their real name. In the case of An Moruo, the whole name represents a person named 'Maniach from Bukhārā', while He Moruo refers to 'Maniach who hails from Kushaniya'.

Both Maniachs in the above cited Chinese sources were active as 'young barbarian entertainers' at the royal court in the time of Gao Wei's reign, i.e. around 570–575 AD, while the legate Maniach was reported to have been also active in nearly the same period. It is interesting to ponder whether it is only a pure homonymy, or whether there could have been some relation between the persons. With regard to the fact that the Sogdians were the best experts in multilateral diplomacy, Maniach & Co. could likely have undertaken tours in China, particularly for the Northern Qi which was notorious for its bias towards barbarian customs and goods. But the fact is that Menander told us in detail that Maniach was dead in 568 AD and that at his death he left his charge to his son. Hence Maniach must be older than his namesakes—these were known as 'barbarian young boys' at that time—in China. For this reason, they can scarcely be one and the same person.

Many efforts have been made in determining the etymology of the unusual name Maniach. A Syriac connection has been assumed on the basis of the ending part of the name, *ah*, which itself is a word with the meaning 'brother', and hence the whole name should refer to 'Mani brother'. According to this interpretation, this name would be religious and would indicate Maniach's affiliation to Manichaeism.<sup>15</sup> Another interpretation challenges the Manichaean assignment and

<sup>12</sup> *Menandri Protectoris Fragmenta*, ed. Müller 1851: 225–229, cf. Humboldt 1844: 466–467; Chavannes 1903: 234–235, 239; Yule 1915: 206–208; Blockley 1985: 110–115; Naitō 1988: 376–385; Wu 1998/2007: 48–50.

<sup>13</sup> For a recent survey of Maniach's diplomatic activities to Sasanian Persia and to Byzantium, see de la Vaissière 2005: 234–237.

<sup>14</sup> See Moravcsik 1958: 181, s.v. *Μανιάχ*.

<sup>15</sup> Schaefer 1948: 16; Pigulevskaya 1952: 202; eadem 1969: 164, 'Maniach (*Μανιάχ*), dieser Name ('Bruder des Mani') zeugt sowohl von Hochachtung vor dem Begründer des Manichäismus als auch davon, dass diese Lehre im Leben des Nahen Ostens wurzelte, wo man aramäische Dialekte sprach und wo auch der Name Maniach selbst herkommt. Zweifellos gehörte der Sogde Maniach selbst zu den Anhängern dieser Lehre.' See also Golden 1992: 128. Miyakawa & Kollautz (1984: 8) paraphrases Maniach's name directly as 'Manichäer'.



believes that Maniach could be a Buddhist name that contains ‘mani’, a ‘Buddhist Sanskrit term for the jewel.’<sup>16</sup> But how to understand the rest, that is, the *-ach*? No answer can yet be given.

Two personal names of probably Iranian origin might be drawn to attention in this connection: *Mavıayoc*, which is attested in Greek, has been explained as ‘Hausmann/house husband’.<sup>17</sup> It is also interesting to speculate whether the name *mnyk* on a Parthian ostrakon<sup>18</sup> can be related to Maniach.

The name *Manyaq/Mayaq čor* in the Uighur document P. 2988 from Dunhuang has been discussed in relation to Maniach in the Turco-Byzantine context. W. B. Henning, believing the reading *Manyaq* to be correct, proposed that its former part is identical with Maniach. ‘There is little doubt that it is the Sogdian name *Maniakh*, well-known from the Zemarkhos report’, he wrote to James R. Hamilton in a letter in 1959. For the same name, Hamilton suggested another reading *Mayaq čor*.<sup>19</sup> As we know, *čor* is a Turkic title and was often used as a name component. In the case of *Manyaq/Mayaq čor* it is not clear from the document whether he was a Turk or a Sogdian.<sup>20</sup>

## II. A TEXTUAL CRITICAL NOTE

Now let us turn to a note about Chinese textual criticism. The confusion of the similarly looking characters *mo* 末 and *wei* 未 is a typical example of erroneous transmission. For the same kind of confusion there are more examples. For the manuscripts we can mention the name Zhao Monu 趙末奴 in a Turfan document (Or.8212/542v, Ast.III.4.091), in which the second character is written erroneously with *wei* 未. Only with the etymological knowledge of *monu* can one be sure that this name is a hybrid formation of MCh \**mak* + translation of Sogd. *βntk*, going back to Sogd. *Mākhvandak* ‘servant of the Moon(-god)’<sup>21</sup>. The mistake can thus be determined and the real form restored. The example containing the same Sogdian name, An Monu 安末奴

<sup>16</sup> Lieu 1992: 226.

<sup>17</sup> Weber 2003, esp. 444–445. On the Greek form, cf. Henning 1936: 6: ‘es sei hier beiläufig bemerkt, dass merkwürdigerweise Manis Name in seiner griechischen Namensform *Mavıayoc* in persischen und parthischen Hymnen aus Zentralasien vorkommt.’ On the referred MP form *m’ny’xyws*, the Parthian form *m’nxıws*, cf. Sundermann 2009.

<sup>18</sup> MacKenzie 1986: 111; cf. also Schmitt 1998: 190 no. 23; Schmitt 2016: 127 no. 273; Livšič 2010: 107 nos. 329, 330.

<sup>19</sup> Hamilton 1986: 86, 89. I owe the instruction of this name to Yutaka Yoshida and Peter Zieme.

<sup>20</sup> For the hybrid name formation comprising Turkic and Iranian elements, see Zieme 2006: esp. the section ‘Names ending in *čor*’, 115–116.

<sup>21</sup> For the attestations of the Sogdian name forms, see Lurje 2010: no. 232–233. It was W. B. Henning who for the first time pointed out that there was the practice of semantically translating an Iranian name into Chinese in the Tang times, with the example of (Shi) Sannu (石) 三奴, the name borne by the father of the wife of Kang Ayi Köl Tarqan (*Kang Ayi Qu Dagan* 康阿義屈達干, QTW 342/3476). He identified *Sannu* with Middle Persian *sēbuxt* and explained it being ‘the slave of the three (deities)’ (a known ‘trinity’ being referred to – i.e., if he was a Christian, the Christian trinity is implied). See Henning apud Pulleyblank 1952: 340 n. 2. Furthermore Henning has also discussed possible Iranian connections of the name borne by a Sogdian military from mid-seventh century, (Shi) Shennu 神奴 ‘god’s slave’, see *op. cit.* 337 n. 3. However, Sogd. *βγγ-βntk*, the real etymon of this name has been finally discovered by Yoshida 2006. On a general discussion on Sogdian names translated in Chinese, cf. Wang 2019b: 105–111. For translated Buddhist names in Old Turkic, it is worth noting Zieme 1978: 79–80, 83; Matsui 2010. – *Kang Ayi Qu Dagan* is except for *Ayi* generally sure regarding identification with the Turkic prototypes. *Ayi* 阿義 can be now reconstructed as *Ayi* on the basis of a Uyghur colophon, Hamilton 1986: 18, 11’. Furthermore cf. the name(s) *Ayi* (?) Alilan (?) Tegin Alp-Tarxan (Lurje 2010: no. 222).



(TCW II/306; OtRyu 3026), supports this emendation.<sup>22</sup> Mār Ammō, a disciple of Mani and the celebrated Manichaean church-leader in its eastwards missionary movement, is named in the Chinese Manichaean *Hymn-scroll* with the erroneously written form Wei-mao 未冒. But being a phonetic reproduction the name must be Mo-mao 末冒 (Mār Ammō).<sup>23</sup>

The character *mo* 末 was also easily misread as *zhu* 朱 and *mi* 米 owing to their similar graphic structure. A country called Zhulu guo 朱祿國 is recorded by Du Huan in his travelogue to the West.<sup>24</sup> A later source work has the name as Milu guo 米祿國.<sup>25</sup> This obscure name has turned out to be a misspelling of 末祿 to which the *New Book of Tang* has given a description: 'East (to Dashi) is Molu (Merw), a minor country, governing in townships. It has many people having the surname Mu.'<sup>26</sup> Molu is a correct writing, but the 'surname' Mu 木 must be again a corruption of Mo 末. The country was famous for producing the so-called *Molu die* 末祿氈, a kind of fabric.<sup>27</sup> The Buddhist lexicographer Huilin noted as follows, 'The (country) Bharuka (i.e. Aqsu in modern Xinjiang) yields fine white cotton fabrics and high-quality fine woolen rugs. They are liked by the neighbouring countries and China. The contemporaries call them *Molu die*. In fact they are woolen cloth (*maobu* 毛布). This is as said in the *Book of Geography (Kuodi zhi)*.'<sup>28</sup> Paul Pelliot has drawn much evidence to point out that the geonym *Molu* 末祿 has been copied and misspelled in various ways, such as Mulu 木鹿, Mucu 木麤, Mocu 末麤, Milu 米祿 and Zhulu 朱祿.<sup>29</sup>

Another example is the name of an envoy sent to the Tang from Maymurgh in Sogdiana during 730 AD, Moyemen 末野門<sup>30</sup>, which has turned out to be a miscopy of Weiyemen 未野門, \**mīwāi jīa muān* being a transcription of the well attested Sogdian PN 'βy' mn.<sup>31</sup>

It is rightly recognized also by Yoshida Yutaka that the same confusion appears in earlier sources, but in reverse. The king of Merv, who around 520 AD sent an emissary to the Liang, is in various historic works divergently recorded by name. One version has An Weishenpan 安未深盤<sup>32</sup>, while in a painting scroll from the Liang times he is called An Shi Mozipan 安石末絜盤<sup>33</sup>. The latter form is the right one, whose last three syllables, \**muat zi buan*, make good sense as a perfectly phonetic reproduction of the Middle Persian *marzbān* 'margrave'.<sup>34</sup>

In the year 926 AD, the Ugurs sent an envoy to the Later Tang court with a pair of white eagles as gifts. In the sources the name of the envoy has again the same alternative written forms *mo* vs. *wei*. The *Old History of the Five Dynasties* has Li Mo 李末, while the *New History* shows Li

<sup>22</sup> Wang 2011: 239.

<sup>23</sup> Henning apud Tsui 1943: 216.

<sup>24</sup> TD j. 193.

<sup>25</sup> WXTK j. 339; cf. the critical apparatus in TD ed. 1988: 5296–5297.

<sup>26</sup> XTS 221B/6263: (大食) 東有末祿, 小國也。治城郭, 多木姓。 Cf. Kuwabara 1926/1968: 343–344.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Trombert 1996: 221.

<sup>28</sup> *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義, j. 82; T54.n2128p0837a19-20: 跋祿迦國。此國出細好白氈、上細毛罽, 為隣國、中華所重, 時人號為末祿氈。其實毛布也。見括地志說。

<sup>29</sup> For a detailed discussion, see Pelliot 1959: 493–495.

<sup>30</sup> XTS 212B/6247.

<sup>31</sup> Yoshida 1991: 239; apart from the names collected by Yoshida, a further variant in the Dunhuang document P. 3559 from 750 AD can be supplemented: (Xin) Yemen (辛) 也門 \**jīa muān*.

<sup>32</sup> LS 54/814; CFYG 968/3835.

<sup>33</sup> In the caption attached to the *Illustrated Description of Foreign Emissaries to Present Tribute to the Ling Dynasty (Liang Zhigong Tu 梁職貢圖)*, see Enoki 1984: 365 and the folded plate to the same article.

<sup>34</sup> Yoshida 2013: 62. n. 56.



Wei 李末.<sup>35</sup> At first sight the family name Li seems to be of Chinese provenance. But the historic situation of the family names is far more complex than it appears. In the Five Dynasties time, Li was officially the family name of the Later Tang royal house. But this explains that his Shatuo clan originally bore Zhuxie 朱邪 (var. Zhuye 朱耶) as its name. Li was bestowed onto them by the Tang emperor in reward for their extraordinary service to Tang. If we can put this Uigur envoy into the historic context and see him not necessarily as a Chinese person, instead, he could be a Uigur or Sogdian.<sup>36</sup> In this connection we can understand his given name more easily; I would like to suggest the form Mo (末 \*mak) as the genuine one, with a proposal that it might be a Sogdian name, viz. *Makh* ‘moon, Monday’.

A further non-Chinese name *mo-si* 末思 has several variants in the sources about the diplomatic intercourse between the Uigurs and the Later Tang. The first person is Zhai Mosi 翟末思 who was a representative of the Uigur Qaghan Renyu in 930 AD.<sup>37</sup> His given name is recorded as Mosi 末斯<sup>38</sup> as well as Weisi 未思<sup>39</sup>. While the latter variant *si* 斯 (\*siä) is a pure alternative form with almost the same sound value as *si* 思 (\*si), the former misspelling is already known in the above examples. Interestingly, the same name occurred in another mission likewise from the Uigurs in the next year, but for another person, An Mosi 安末思.<sup>40</sup> HAMILTON has discussed all these variants and taken the form *Mosi* 末思/末斯 as the correct one. Furthermore, he identified it (\*mbwâr-si) as a transcription of Turk. *Bars* ‘Tiger’.<sup>41</sup>

The next emendation begins with the same character *mo* 末. Among the four named members of the Uigur delegation sent to the Later Han in 948 ADE there is a certain Mo Xiangwen 末相溫.<sup>42</sup> The latter part of the name *xiangwen* 相溫 (\*siaŋ ʔwən) is a well-known transcriptional form of the Uigur title *sngwn* ‘general’. One wonders whether the surname *Mo* would have been a corruptel of *Mi* 米, again a transcribed Sogdian name referring to Maymurgh, one of the so-called Nine Surnames of Zhaowu. The reason for this mistake is that the characters *mo* 末 and *mi* 米 are graphically confusable.

<sup>35</sup> JWDS 138/1842: 後唐同光四年七月，回鶻復遣都督李末等三十人來朝，進白鶻一聯，明宗召對於廣壽殿，厚加錫資，仍命解放其鶻。XWDS 6/65: 後唐同光四年秋七月乙未，回鶻都督李末來，獻白鶻，命放之。CFYG 972/3859a proves also the spelling *mo* 末, but dating the event 7 years later: 後唐長興四年七月，迴鶻都督李末等三十一人進白鶻一聯。

<sup>36</sup> In the time of the five dynasties the Uigurs sent frequently delegates. Not few emissaries bore a Sogdian surname, e.g. An Dianmin 安殿民 (SHY 7716a, 1011 AD), An Mi 安密 (ibid.), An Tieshan 安鐵山 (JWDS 138/1843, 948 AD), Shi Haijin 石海金 (JWDS 138/1843, XWDS 8/84, 940 AD; CFYG 972/11256), Shi Shouer 石壽兒 and Shi Lunsi 石論思 (JWDS 138/1842; CFYG 976/11299. 911 AD), Cao Wantong 曹萬通 (XTJCB 48/1057, 1001 AD; SHY 7720a) etc. There are also some envoys bearing the Chinese name Li: Li Wanjin 李萬金 (envoy to the Later Jin in 938 AD, JWDS 77/1023) and Li Wu 李屋 (JWDS 138/1843, CFYG 976/11302, 948 AD). Wu 屋 deserves a note. In the travelogue of the Song envoy to the Uigurs Wang Yande, a tribe Wudiyin 屋地因 is documented. Bai Yudong reconstructed it with Old Turkic *oq tegin* ‘Tribe of Tigin’, see Bai 2017: 64–65. Following this interpretation one can consider that Li Wu might be a Uigur bearing a Chinese surname and a Turkic given name *oq*, –Tribeman’. But cf. for the same person *Wudai huiyao* has a variant Li Wuzhu 李屋珠 (JWDS 138/1842).

<sup>37</sup> CFYG 972/3859: 迴鶻順化可汗仁裕遣使翟末思等三十人進馬八十疋、玉一團 (930 AD).

<sup>38</sup> XWDS 6/62: 十二月丁巳，回鶻順化可汗仁裕使翟末斯來 (930 AD).

<sup>39</sup> JWDS 138/1842, 回鶻遣使翟末思三十餘人，進馬八十四匹、玉一團 (930 AD).

<sup>40</sup> XWDS 6/63: 十二月己巳，回鶻使安求思來 (931 AD). CFYG 972/3859: 迴鶻使安末思來朝貢後 (931 AD).

<sup>41</sup> Hamilton 1955: 75, 148.

<sup>42</sup> JWDS 138/1843 (948 AD); CFYG 976/11302.



From the above discussion we can see that the characters 末, 未, 木, 朱, 求, 永, 米 are, owing to graphical similarity, prone to confusion and have repeatedly caused puzzling variants in textual transmission.

To sum up. Applying *Nebenüberlieferung* (secondary transmission) can solve some riddles in onomastic questions and lend a hand to textual criticism. The main issue of this essay—reconstructing the original Chinese form by means of settling its Sogdian original, i.e. Maniach—is a further case with the same method. For the Chinese textual tradition, on the other hand, the solution shows again that Chinese textual criticism concerning records containing foreign words can, with the help of the multilingual comparative philology, make a step forward not only in emendation but also in interpretation.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

- BAI Yudong 白玉冬 2017. *Jiuxing Dada youmu wangguo shi yanjiu* 九姓達韃遊牧王國史研究(8-11世紀) [Study on the history of the nomadic Kingdom of Nine Tatars from the eighth to the eleventh century A.D.]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.
- BLOCKLEY, Roger C. 1985. *The History of Menander the Guardsman: Introductory essay, text, translation and historiographical notes*. Liverpool: Francis Cairns.
- BQS: *Beiqi shu* 北齊書 [Book of Northern Qi]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1972.
- BS: *Beishi* 北史 [History of the Northern Dynasties]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.
- CFYG: (*Songben*) *Cefu Yuanguai* (宋本) 冊府元龜 [Prime Tortoise of the Imperial Library (Song edition)]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 1989.
- CHAVANNES, Édouard 1903. *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*. St. Pétersbourg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie impériale des sciences.
- DE LA VAISSIÈRE, Étienne 2005. *Sogdian Traders, a History*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- ENOKI, Kazuo 榎一雄 1984/1998. 'The *Liang chih-kung-t'u* 梁職貢圖: *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* XLII : 75–138 [Repr. in: *Studia Asiatica. The Collected Papers in Western Languages of the Late Dr. Kazuo ENOKI*. Tokyo: Kyūko-shoin, 1998, 318–383.
- FSC: *Fangshan shijing tiji huibian* 房山石經題記彙編 [Collected colophons of the Stone Sutras of Fangshan]. Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe, 1987.
- GOLDEN, Peter B. 1992. *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples: Ethnogenesis and state-formation in medieval and early modern Eurasia and the Middle East*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- HAMILTON, James R. 1955. *Les ouïghours à l'époque des cinq dynasties d'après les documents chinois*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- HAMILTON, James R. 1986. *Manuscripts ouïghours du IX<sup>e</sup>-X<sup>e</sup> siècle de Touen-Houang*. Paris: Peeters.
- HENNING, Walter B. 1936. 'Neue Materialien zur Geschichte des Manichäismus.' *ZDMG* 90: 1–18.
- HUMBOLDT, Alexander von 1844. *Central-Asien. Untersuchungen über die Gebirgsketten und die vergleichende Klimatologie. Erster Band*. Berlin: Carl J. Klemann.
- JTS: *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書 [Old Book of Tang]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.
- JWDS: *Jiu Wudai shi* 舊五代史 [Old History of the Five Dynasties]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976.
- KARLGRÉN, Bernhard 1957. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.





- KASAI, Yukiyo 2014. 'The Chinese phonetic transcriptions of Old Turkish words in the Chinese sources from 6<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> century, focused on the original word transcribed as *Tujue* 突厥.' *Nairiku ajia gengo no kenkyū* 内陸アジア言語の研究 / *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 29: 57–135.
- KUWABARA Jitsuzō 桑原隲藏 1926. 'Zui-Tō jidai ni Shina ni raijū shita Saikijin ni tsuite 隋唐時代に支那に來住した西域人に就いて [On the emigrants from Central Asia to China during the Sui and Tang times].' In: HANEDA Tōru 羽田亨 (ed.) *Naitō Hakushi kanreki shukuga shinagaku ronsō* 内藤博士還曆祝賀支那學論叢 [Sinological Festschrift for Dr. Naitō in honour of his 60th birthday]. Kyoto: Kōbundō, 565–660. [Repr. in: *Kuwabara Jitsuzō zenshū* 桑原隲藏全集 [Collected works of Kuwabara Jitsuzō], Vol. 2. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1968, 270–360.
- LS: *Liangshu* 梁書 [Book of Liang]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973.
- LIEU, Samuel N. C. 1992. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. [2nd ed.]
- LIVŠIČ, V. A. [Лившиц, В.А.] 2010. *Парфянская ономастика* [Parthian onomastics]. Санкт-Петербург: Петербургское лингвистическое общество.
- LUO Feng 羅丰 1996. *Guanyuan nanjiao Sui Tang mudi* 固原南郊隋唐墓地 [The Sui and Tang Graveyard in the South Suburb of Guyuan]. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe.
- LURJE, P. 2010. *Personal Names in Sogdian Texts*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- MACKENZIE, D. N. 1986. 'Some names from Nisa.' *Переднеазиатский сборник IV*: 105–115.
- MARQUART, Josef 1901. *Ērānsāhr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i. Mit historisch-kritischem Kommentar und historischen und topographischen Excursen*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- MATSUI, Dai 2010. 'Uighur manuscripts related to the monks Sivšidu and Yaqšidu at "Abita-Cave Temple" of Toyoq.' *Tulufanxue yanjiu – Disanjie Tulufanxue yanjiu ji Ou-Ya youmu minzu de qi yuan yu qianxi guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 吐魯番學研究——第三屆吐魯番學研究暨歐亞遊牧民族的起源與遷徙國際學術研討會論文集 [Turfan Studies. Papers of the Third International Symposium on Turfan Studies and Origins, Migrations of the Eurasian Nomads]. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 697–714.
- MİYAKAWA, H. & A. KOLLAUTZ 1984. 'Ein Dokument zum Fernhandel zwischen Byzanz und China zur Zeit Theophylakts.' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 77/1: 6–19.
- MORAVCSIK, Gyula 1958. *Byzantinoturcica II, Sprachreste der Türkvölker in den byzantinischen Quellen. 2., durchgearbeitete Aufl.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- MÜLLER, Karl (ed.) 1851. 'MENANDER PROTECTOR, *Fragmenta*.' In: *ibid. Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, IV. Paris: Ambroise Firmin-Didot, 200–269.
- NAITŌ Midori 内藤みどり 1988. *Nishi Tokketsu shi no kenkyū* 西突厥史の研究 [History of the Western Turks]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press.
- PELLIOT, Paul 1930. "'Tchin-mao" ou Tch'en Ngang?' *TP* (Second Series) 27/4-5: 424–426.
- PELLIOT, Paul 1959. *Notes on Marco Polo*, Vol. 1. Paris: Imprimerie nationale/Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve.
- PIGULEVSKAYA, Nina V. [Пигулевская, Н.В.] 1951. *Византия на путях в Индию. Из истории торговли Византии с Востоком. IV–VI вв.* Москва — Ленинград: Изд-во Акад. наук СССР. [German version: *Byzanz auf den Wegen nach Indien: Aus der Geschichte des byzantinischen Handels mit dem Orient vom 4. bis 6. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969.]
- PULLEYBLANK, Edwin G. 1952. 'A Sogdian colony in Inner Mongolia.' *TP* XLI: 317–356.
- PULLEYBLANK, Edwin G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- QIAN Daxin 錢大昕. *Shijiazhai yangxin lu* 十駕齋養新錄 [Gleanings from the Studio of an Old Hack's Progress]. Ed. Zhejiang shuju 浙江書局重刊本. Hangzhou, 1876.



- QBQZ 全北齊北周文補遺 [Addendum to Complete Northern Qi and Zhou Prose], compiled by HAN Lizhou 韓理洲 et al., Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe 2008.
- QTW: *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 [Complete Tang Prose]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.
- QTWB: *Quan Tang wen buyi* 全唐文補遺 [Addendum to Complete Tang Prose]. Vol. 1–9, ed. by WU Gang 吳鋼 et al., Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 1994–2007.
- SCHAEDEER, Hans Heinrich 1948. 'Der Manichäismus und sein Weg nach Osten.' In: Heinrich RUNTE (ed.) *Glaube und Geschichte. Festschrift für Friedrich GOGARTEN*. Gießen: Wilhelm Schmitz, 1–19.
- SCHLEGEL, G. 1896. 'Tägin et Töre.' *TP VII*: 158–161.
- SCHMITT, R. 1998. 'Parthische Sprach- und Nebenüberlieferung aus arsakidischer Zeit.' In: J. WIESEHÖFER (ed.) *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse. The Arsacid Empire: Sources and Documentation. Beiträge des Internationalen Colloquiums, Eutin (27.-30. Juni 1996)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 165–204.
- SCHMITT, R. 2016. *Personennamen in parthischen epigraphischen Quellen*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- SHY: *Songhuiyao jigao* 宋會要輯稿 [Excerpts from Song Compendium]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1957.
- SS: *Suishu* 隋書 [Book of Sui]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973.
- SUNDERMANN, Werner 2009. 'Mani.' *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, 2009, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/mani-founder-manicheism> (accessed on 20 September 2019)
- TCW: *Tulufan chutu wenshu* 吐魯番出土文書 [The Unearthed Documents from Turfan], Vol. I–IV. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1992–1996.
- TD: *Tongdian* 通典 [Comprehensive Statutes], comp. DU You 杜佑, ed. by WANG Wenjin 王文錦, WANG Yongxing 王永興, LIU Junwen 劉俊文, XU Tingyun 徐庭雲 & XIE Fang 謝方. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988.
- TROMBERT, Éric 1996. 'Une trajectoire d'ouest en est sur la route de la soie. La diffusion du coton dans l'Asie centrale sinisée (6<sup>e</sup>-10<sup>e</sup> siècles).' In: *La Persia e l'Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X secolo*. Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 205–227.
- TSUI, Chi 1943. 'Mo ni chiao hsia pu tsan' "The Lower (Second?) section of the Manichaean hymns", with notes of W.B. HENNING. *BSOAS XI/1*: 174–219.
- WANG Ding 王丁 2011. 'Zhonggu beizhi xieben zhong de Han-Hu yuwen zhaji (I) 中古碑誌、寫本中的漢胡語文札記 (一) [Notes on Sino-Iranian words in medieval inscriptions and manuscripts, I]' In: LUO Feng 羅丰 (ed.) *Sichouzhilu shang de kaogu zongjiao yu lishi* 絲綢之路上的考古、宗教與歷史 [Archaeology, religions and history along the Silk Road]. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 235–243.
- WANG Ding 2019a. 'Huming Pan-tuo kao 胡名盤陀考 [On the βntk-names].' In: XIANG Qun 向羣 & WAN Yi 萬毅 (eds.) *Jiang Boqin jiaoshou bashi huadan qingshou lunwenji* 姜伯勤教授八十華誕慶壽論文集 [Festschrift in honour of Professor JIANG Boqin on the occasion of his 80<sup>th</sup> birthday]. Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, 179–206.
- WANG Ding 2019b. 'Huming shili 胡名釋例 [Sogdian names in Chinese sources: a typological study].' *Tonkō shahon kenkyū nenpō* 敦煌寫本研究年報 [Annual Journal of Dunhuang Manuscript Studies] 13 [Special issue as a *Festschrift* for Professor TOKIO TAKATA in honour of his seventieth birthday]: 99–134.
- WEBER, Dieter 2003. 'Maviayoc.' In: C. G. CERETI / M. MAGGI / E. PROVASI (eds.) *Religious themes and texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: Studies in honour of Professor Gherardo GNOLI on the occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> birthday on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2002*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 441–445.
- WS: *Weishu* 魏書 [Book of Wei]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.
- WU Yugui 吳玉貴 1998/2007. *Tujue Hanguo yu Sui-Tang guanxishi yanjiu* 突厥汗國與隋唐關係史研究 [History of the relationship between the Turkish Qanate and Sui-Tang]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.



- WXTK: *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考 [Comprehensive Examination of Literature]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986.
- XTS: *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書 [New Book of Tang]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.
- XWDS: *Xin Wudai shi* 新五代史 [New History of the Five Dynasties]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.
- XZ: *Xin Zhongguo chutu muzhi* 新中國出土墓誌, Shanxi juan 山西卷 Vol. 1/a. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 2000.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 1991. 'Sogdian miscellany III.' In: R. E. EMMERICK & D. WEBER (eds.) *Corolla Iranica. Papers in honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil MACKENZIE*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 237–244.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 2006. 'Personal names, Sogdian. i. in Chinese sources.' *Encyclopædia Iranica* (retrieved Nov. 8, 2017 from: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/personal-names-sogdian-1-in-chinese-sources>)
- YOSHIDA Yutaka 吉田豊 2013. 'Bakatoria-go bunsho kenkyū no kinkyō to kadai バクトリア語文書研究の近況と課題 [Recent developments and questions of the researches on Bactrian documents].' *Nairiku Ajia gengo no kenkyū* 内陸アジア言語の研究 [Studies on the Inner Asian languages] XXVIII: 39–65.
- YOSHIDA Yutaka 吉田豊 2016. 'Seian Shutsudo Hokushū Shi-kun boshi sogudo-go bubun yakuchū 西安出土北周史君墓誌ソグド語部分訳注 [The Northern Zhou Shi-jun epitaph discovered at Xi'an: Translation and commentary].' In: IWAMI Kiyohiro 石見清裕 (ed.) *Sogudo-jin boshi kenkyū* ソグド人墓誌研究 [Studies on epitaphs of Sogdians]. Tokyo: Kyūko shoin, 80–61.
- Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 [Glossary of All Sūtras], compiled by HUILIN 慧琳, Taishō 2128, Vol. 54.
- YULE, Henry 1915. *China and the way thither: being a collection of medieval notices of China*. Ed. by Henri CORDIER, Vol. I. London: The Hakluyt Society.
- ZIEME, Peter 1978. 'Materialien zum uigurischen Onomasticon. I.' *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten* 1977/78: 71–84.
- ZIEME, Peter 2006. 'Hybrid names as a special device of Central Asian naming.' In: Lars JOHANSON & Christiane BULUT (eds.) *Turkic-Iranian contact areas. Historical and linguistic aspects*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 114–127.

