

ДИНТАНУ

МРҲТИ 21.31.51

<https://doi.org/10.47526/3007-8598-2025.1-24>

D.O. RAKHIMDJANOV^{1*}  Zh.Y. NURMATOV² 

¹*International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor (Tashkent, Uzbekistan), e-mail: durbekr@umail.uz*

²*Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, PhD., Associate Professor (Kazakhstan, Turkestan), e-mail: zhakhangir.nurmatov@ayu.edu.kz*

ABU HAFS AL-NASAFI AND HIS WORK KITAB AL-KAND: CONTRIBUTION TO THE FORMATION OF HADITH STUDIES IN SAMARKAND

Abstract. The article examines the history of the manuscripts and research approaches to the unique work “Kitab al-Kand” by Abu Hafs Nasafi, which is one of the most important sources on the science of hadith in Transoxiana during the 8th–12th centuries. The study analyzes various manuscript versions, identifies major scholarly errors and recent discoveries related to the authorship, structure, and content of the treatise. Special attention is given to academic debates surrounding the manuscripts, comparisons between the Istanbul and Paris versions, and the issue of their critical edition. The author demonstrates the significance of this work for reconstructing the spiritual atmosphere of Samarkand and the broader region, as well as the role of “Kitab al-Kand” in shaping biographical tradition and the transmission of hadith. The article draws on a wide range of sources, including contemporary studies, and offers original conclusions regarding the optimal scholarly publication of the text. At the same time, the article emphasizes the need for further study of the little-known manuscript versions of Kitab al-Kand preserved in regional and international collections. The results obtained may contribute to a deeper understanding of the evolution of the hadith tradition in Transoxiana and its connections with the intellectual centers of the Islamic world. In conclusion, the importance of a comprehensive approach to studying the manuscript as a monument of Islamic culture and a source for the social, intellectual, and religious history of Central Asia is emphasized.

Keywords: Abu Hafs Nasafi, Kitab al-qand, science of hadith, jarkh and tadil, Samarkand, manuscript.

Д.О.Рахимжонов¹, Ж.Е.Нурматов²

¹*Ўзбекистан Халықаралық Ислам академиясы, тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент (Ташкент, Ўзбекистан), e-mail: durbekr@umail.uz*

²*Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, PhD., доцент (Қазақстан, Түркістан), e-mail: zhakhangir.nurmatov@ayu.edu.kz*

Әбу Хафс Насәфи және оның «Китаб әл-канд» еңбегі: Самарқандта хадис ілімінің қалыптасуына қосқан үлесі

**Бізге дұрыс сілтеме жасаңыз:*

D.O.Rakhimdjano, Zh.Y.Nurmatov. Abu Hafs Al-Nasafi and His Work Kitab Al-Kand: Contribution to the Formation of Hadith Studies in Samarkand // НИКМЕТ. – 2025. – №3 (5). – С. 21–30.
<https://doi.org/10.47526/3007-8598-2025.1-24>

**Cite us correctly:*

D.O.Rakhimdjano, Zh.Y.Nurmatov. Abu Hafs Al-Nasafi and His Work Kitab Al-Kand: Contribution to the Formation of Hadith Studies in Samarkand // НИКМЕТ. – 2025. – №3 (5). – С. 21–30.
<https://doi.org/10.47526/3007-8598-2025.1-24>

Мақаланың редакцияға түскен күні 24.06.2025 / қабылданған күні 25.09.2025.

Андатпа. Мақалада VIII–XII ғасырлардағы Мауераннахрдағы хадис ілімінің ең маңызды дереккөздерінің бірі болып саналатын Әбу Хафс Насафидің «Китаб әл-Канд» атты бірегей шығармасының қолжазба тарихы мен зерттеу тәсілдері қарастырылады. Зерттеуде әртүрлі қолжазба нұсқалары талданады, авторлық, құрылымдық және мазмұндық мәселелерге қатысты негізгі ғылыми қателіктер мен соңғы жаңалықтар анықталады. Ерекше назар стамбұлдық және париждік нұсқаларды салыстыру, ғылыми пікірталастар мен қолжазбалардың сыни басылымына қатысты мәселелерге аударылған. Автор бұл еңбектің Самарқанд және жалпы өңірдің рухани атмосферасын қайта қалпына келтірудегі, сондай-ақ биографиялық дәстүр мен хадистерді жеткізудегі рөліне тоқталады. Мақалада заманауи зерттеулерді қоса алғанда, кең ауқымды дереккөздерге сүйене отырып, мәтінді ғылыми жариялаудың оңтайлы жолдары жөнінде авторлық қорытындылар ұсынылған. Сонымен қатар мақалада аймақтық және шетелдік жинақтарда сақталған «Китаб әл-Канд» шығармасының аз зерттелген қолжазба нұсқаларын әрі қарай зерделеудің қажеттілігі атап өтіледі. Алынған нәтижелер Мауераннахрдағы хадис ілімінің дамуын және оның ислам әлемінің зияткерлік орталықтарымен байланысын тереңірек түсінуге ықпал етуі мүмкін. Қорытынды бөлімде қолжазбаны ислам мәдениетінің ескерткіші әрі Орталық Азияның әлеуметтік, зияткерлік және діни тарихының қайнар көзі ретінде кешенді зерттеудің маңыздылығы атап көрсетіледі.

Кілт сөздер: Абу Хафс Насафи, Китаб әл-Канд, хадис ілімі, жарх және тадил, Самарқанд, қолжазба.

Д.О.Рахимжонов^{1*}  Ж.Е.Нурматов² 

¹Международная Исламская академия Узбекистана, кандидат исторических наук, доцент (Ташкент, Узбекистан), *e-mail: durbekr@umail.uz

²Международный казахско-турецкий университет имени Ходжи Ахмета Ясави, PhD., доцент (Казахстан, Туркестан), e-mail: zhakhangir.nurmatov@ayu.edu.kz

Абу Хафс Насафи и его труд «Китаб ал-Канд»: вклад в формирование хадисоведения в Самарканде

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается история рукописей и исследовательских подходов к уникальному труду Абу Хафса Насафи «Китаб ал-Канд», который является одним из важнейших источников по науке хадиса в Мавераннахре VIII–XII веков. В работе анализируются различные версии рукописей, выявляются ключевые исследовательские ошибки и новейшие открытия, связанные с авторством, структурой и содержанием трактата. Особое внимание уделяется научной дискуссии вокруг рукописей, сравнению стамбульской и париждской версий, а также вопросу их критического издания. Автор показывает значимость труда для реконструкции духовной атмосферы Самарканда и всего региона, а также роль «Китаб ал-Канд» в формировании биографической традиции и передачи хадисов. Статья опирается на широкий круг источников, включая современные исследования, и предлагает собственные выводы по оптимальной научной публикации текста. Вместе с тем статья подчёркивает необходимость дальнейшего изучения малоизвестных рукописных вариантов «Китаб ал-Канд», сохранившихся в региональных и зарубежных собраниях. Полученные результаты могут способствовать более глубокому пониманию эволюции хадисоведческой традиции в Мавераннахре и её связей с интеллектуальными центрами исламского мира. В заключении подчёркивается важность комплексного подхода к изучению рукописи как памятника исламской культуры и источника по социальной, интеллектуальной и религиозной истории Средней Азии.

Ключевые слова: Абу Хафс Насафи, Китаб ал-канд, наука хадис, жарх и тадил, Самарқанд, рукопись.

D.O. Rakhimjanov¹, Zh.Y. Nurmatov²

¹*Uluslararası Özbekistan İslam Akademisi, Dr, Doç. (Taşkent, Özbekistan), e-posta: durbekr@umail.uz*

²*Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Uluslararası Kazak-Türk Üniversitesi, Dr, Doç. (Kazakistan, Türkistan), e-posta: zhakhangir.nurmatov@ayu.edu.kz*

Ebu Hafs Neseî ve Kitab al-Kand Adlı Eseri: Semerkand'da Hadis İlminin Oluşumuna Katkısı

Özet. Makale, VIII–XII. yüzyıllarda Maverâünnehir'de hadis ilminin en önemli kaynaklarından biri olan Ebû Hafs Neseî'nin “Kitâbu'l-Kand” adlı eşsiz eserinin yazma tarihi ve araştırma yaklaşımlarını incelemektedir. Çalışmada farklı yazma nüshaları analiz edilmekte, eserin müellifliği, yapısı ve içeriğiyle ilgili temel akademik hatalar ve en son keşifler ortaya konulmaktadır. Özellikle, yazmalar etrafındaki bilimsel tartışmalara, İstanbul ve Paris nüshalarının karşılaştırılmasına ve bunların tenkitli neşri meselesine dikkat çekilmektedir. Yazar, eserin Semerkand ve genel olarak bölgenin manevi atmosferinin yeniden inşasındaki, ayrıca biyografik geleneğin oluşumu ve hadislerin aktarılmasındaki rolünü göstermektedir. Makale, çağdaş araştırmalar da dahil olmak üzere geniş bir kaynak yelpazesine dayanmakta ve metnin bilimsel olarak en iyi şekilde yayımlanmasına yönelik özgün sonuçlar sunmaktadır. Aynı zamanda makale, bölgesel ve yurtdışındaki koleksiyonlarda korunan Kitab al-Kand'ın az bilinen yazma nüshalarının daha kapsamlı bir şekilde incelenmesi gereğini vurgulamaktadır. Elde edilen sonuçlar, Maverâünnehir'deki hadis geleneğinin evrimini ve onun İslam dünyasının entelektüel merkezleriyle olan ilişkilerini daha derinlemesine anlamaya katkı sağlayabilir. Sonuç bölümünde, el yazmasını İslam kültürünün bir anıtı ve Orta Asya'nın sosyal, entelektüel ve dini tarihi için bir kaynak olarak bütüncül şekilde incelemenin önemi vurgulanmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Ebû Hafs Neseî, Kitâbu'l-Kand, hadis ilmi, cerh ve ta'dîl, Semerkand, yazma eser.

Introduction

The development of Islamic scholarship and the formation of hadith studies in Central Asia are inextricably linked to historical sources and manuscripts, whose significance cannot be overstated. Among these, Abu Hafs al-Nasafi's *Kitāb al-Kand* occupies a special place, serving as a crucial source for the history of religious and spiritual life, as well as the Islamic educational system in Transoxiana from the eighth to the twelfth centuries. This work extensively documents the biographies, scholarly activities, and hadith transmission traditions of renowned scholars and muhaddiths who lived in Samarqand and its surrounding regions.

The discovery of the manuscripts, their integration into academic study, and their examination from various scholarly perspectives have opened new avenues for researching Islamic culture and spiritual heritage. In recent decades, critical analysis of the *Kitāb al-Kand* versions preserved in the libraries of Istanbul and Paris, the identification of their textual features, and scholarly debates have further emphasized the significance of this monument.

This article systematically examines the history of the manuscript's introduction into scholarly circulation, the methods of its study, and its textual variations, while providing a comprehensive analysis of the place of *Kitāb al-Kand* in the history of Islamic scholarship and its contribution to the spiritual life of the region.

Results and discussion

In this article, the comparative-historical method, textual and philological analysis, as well as critical collation of various manuscript versions, are applied. The study compares the structural and content features of the work and identifies methodological errors in previous research. To

substantiate the conclusions, an interdisciplinary approach is employed, incorporating an analysis of the historical and cultural context based on a wide range of sources and recent scholarly studies.

Principles and Practices of Democratic Education

At the end of the nineteenth century, the Russian orientalist and academician V. V. Bartold highly appreciated the significance of this work—known from other sources—for the political history of Transoxiana. However, he expressed an incorrect opinion, stating: “...apparently, only the Persian translation of the anthology compiled by Abu Hafs’s student, Muhammad ibn Abd al-Jalil, has reached us” (Bartold, 1963: 59–61). This assumption, put forward by the scholar, misled many researchers for a long time. In other words, the independent Persian work entitled *Qandiya-yi Khurd* was regarded as a translation of the anthology *Muntakhab* by Abu al-Fadl Muhammad ibn Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi (Bartold, 1963: 59–61).

Subsequently, this hypothesis was further developed by other Russian-language scholars and gradually came to be accepted as an unquestioned axiom (Kandiya Malaya, 1906: 23). Scholars from Uzbekistan also expressed their views on the work *Kitab al-Kand*. They likewise emphasized that, until recently, the work had been known only in the form of an abridged Persian translation prepared by Abu Hafs al-Nasafi’s student, Muhammad ibn Abd al-Jalil, under the titles *Kand*, *Kandiya*, or *Qandiya-yi Khurd* (“Little Kandiya”) (Uvatov, 1994: 62–65).

The discovery of the work *Kitāb al-Kand* has a long history. Initially, scholars’ attention was drawn to the work of Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi entitled *Muntakhab Kitāb al-Kand*. In 1907, the National Library of France in Paris acquired a manuscript and catalogued it under the number “Arabe 6284.” In the library catalogue published in 1925 and prepared by E. Blochet, the manuscript is described as follows:

“An incomplete portion of a biographical dictionary of the muhaddiths of Transoxiana; the beginning and the end are missing. Nasaf, Samarqand, Bukhara, and Isfijab are frequently mentioned. The date 1127–28, indicated on folio 1a, testifies to the antiquity of the text. Script: naskh, fourteenth century; 75 folios; dimensions: 28.5 × 17 cm” (Blochet, 1925: 227).

In the 1950s, the scholars H. Ritter and A. Z. V. Togan examined this manuscript and expressed several opinions regarding it. According to H. Ritter, the manuscript represents a fragment of a history of the Hanafi scholars of Nasaf and Isfijab, written between 438 and 444 AH (1046–1053 CE) by ‘Abd al-Malik ibn al-Husayn ibn ‘Ali al-Nasafi (Ritter, 1950: 51). Professor Togan, on the other hand, considered the work to be a *zayl* (continuation) written by Abu al-Fadl Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi as a supplement to Abu Hafs al-Nasafi’s *Kitāb al-Kand fī Ta’rīkh Samarqand* (Togan, 1950: 207). The first opinion proved to be incorrect, whereas the second was considerably closer to the truth.

In 1953, R. Frye devoted a special article to this manuscript. One of his well-argued conclusions was that the text is not a purely historical work, but rather a copy of a biographical composition. On this basis, Frye categorically asserted that the manuscript was of no value for the study of the political history of Transoxiana. In his view, the Paris manuscript was merely a compilation, lacking clear organization and assembled from various now-lost urban chronicles (Frye, 1953: 166–168).

Frye’s article was sharply criticized by C. Cahen, who pointed out a number of erroneous judgments and emphasized the need for a more thorough examination of the text. He divided the manuscript into three parts. Regarding the first part, he supported the opinion of A. Z. V. Togan, confirming the authorship of Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi. As for the remaining two sections, he suggested that they likely belonged to other, unidentified authors. After this scholarly debate, the valuable manuscript largely disappeared from academic attention until the 1980s.

A unique manuscript of Abu Hafs al-Nasafi’s *Kitāb al-Kand* was discovered in 1967 in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul. Preserved under no. 70 in the “Turhan Valide” collection, it was initially identified by Fuat Sezgin as a copy of Abu Hafs al-Nasafi’s work entitled *al-Kand fī*

Ta'riḫ 'Ulamā' Samarqand (“The Sweetness [of the Account] Concerning the History of the Scholars of Samarqand”), composed as a *zayl* (continuation or supplement) to the biographical dictionary *Ta'riḫ Samarqand* by Abu al-'Abbas Ja'far ibn Muhammad al-Mustaghfiri (d. 1041) (Sezgin, 1967: 353).

Sezgin's first conclusion regarding the authorship proved to be correct. However, his second claim—that the work was a *zayl* (continuation) of Mustaghfiri's composition—was unfounded. This misunderstanding likely arose from the fact that in this version of *Kitāb al-Kand*, information derived from Mustaghfiri is cited in 169 instances. Rather than indicating that Abu Hafs al-Nasafi composed his work as a continuation of Mustaghfiri, this evidence demonstrates that he merely used Mustaghfiri's work as one of his sources.

The fate of these manuscripts changed dramatically after the publication of J. Weinberger's article in 1986. A staff member of the Department of Oriental Manuscripts at Princeton University Library, Weinberger compared the Paris and Istanbul versions and published a study entitled “*The Authorship of Two Biographical Dictionaries from Twelfth-Century Transoxiana.*”

After examining the Istanbul manuscript, he established that its author relied not only on the work of al-Mustaghfiri (cited 169 times), but also on Abu Sa'd al-Idrisi (421 times), as well as several other biographical compilations.

On this basis, Weinberger concluded that the manuscript is not a continuation of any earlier work, but rather an independent composition—an incomplete version of a biographical dictionary containing accounts of muḥaddiths who lived and worked in Samarqand, or who were otherwise connected with the city, from the early Islamic period up to the twelfth century. The work in question is Abu Hafs al-Nasafi's *Kitāb al-Kand fī Ma'rifat 'Ulamā' Samarqand*.

Since the only surviving manuscript of the work lacks six chapters at the beginning and six at the end, determining its original title has proven difficult. Various sources transmit the title of al-Nasafi's work differently:

1. *Kitāb al-Kand fī Ma'rifat 'Ulamā' Samarqand* (Abu Sa'd al-Sam'ani);
2. *Kitāb al-Kand min 'Ulamā' Samarqand* (Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani);
3. *Kitāb al-Kand fī Dhikr 'Ulamā' Samarqand* (al-Dhahabi);
4. *al-Kand fī Ta'riḫ Samarqand* (Katib Çelebi / Haji Khalifa);
5. *al-Kand fī Ta'riḫ 'Ulamā' Samarqand* (F. Sezgin).

Taking into account that Abu Sa'd al-Sam'ani was a contemporary of Abu Hafs al-Nasafi, J. Weinberger regarded his testimony as the most reliable and complete and concluded that the correct title of the work is *Kitāb al-Kand fī Ma'rifat 'Ulamā' Samarqand*.

By comparing the Istanbul and Paris manuscripts, Weinberger established that in the latter some biographies had been omitted; in certain cases only the name of the hadith scholar was preserved; some entries were abridged, while others were reproduced in full. Furthermore, relying on the report of Katib Çelebi in his *Kashf al-Zunūn* that al-Nasafi's student, Abu al-Faḍl al-Samarqandi, compiled a *Muntakhab* (“selection” or “anthology”) based on *Kitāb al-Kand*, Weinberger concluded that the Paris manuscript is in fact *Muntakhab Kitāb al-Kand fī Ma'rifat 'Ulamā' Samarqand* (“A Selection from the Book on the Knowledge of the Scholars of Samarqand”).

Weinberger further argued that for a long time it had been impossible to determine the authorship of the Istanbul and Paris manuscripts, partly because Katib Çelebi added the word *ta'riḫ* (“history”) to the title of the work.

As Weinberger convincingly demonstrated through specific examples, the title given by the Ottoman scholar misled Academician V. V. Bartold and V. L. Vyatkin, who had not seen the Arabic original of *Kitāb al-Kand*. In particular, Bartold put forward an erroneous view regarding the two titles of the work—*Kand* and *Kandiya*. The latter, however, is merely a relative adjective derived from the word “Samarqand” and has no direct connection with the work *Kitāb al-Kand* itself (a position also supported by Prof. Y. Paul).

Secondly, *Kitāb al-Kand* is not a *zayl* (continuation) of al-Idrisi's *Kitāb al-Kamāl*, as previously demonstrated. Thirdly, *Qandiya-yi Khurd* is not a Persian translation of *Muntakhab Kitāb al-Kand*, but rather one of numerous independent works devoted to the history of the city of Samarqand (Bartold, 1963: 89–93). Such works are closer in character to the genre of “popular books,” consisting of collections of narratives about saints, sacred places, and local legends.

On this basis, Weinberger concluded that the Istanbul manuscript represents the work of Abu Hafs 'Umar ibn Muhammad al-Nasafi, *Kitāb al-Kand fī Ma'rifat 'Ulamā' Samarqand*, while the Paris manuscript is an abridged version of the same composition, prepared by al-Nasafi's student Abu al-Faḍl Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi and known under the title *Muntakhab Kitāb al-Kand fī Ma'rifat 'Ulamā' Samarqand*.

J. Weinberger's article can hardly be described as a comprehensive and definitive study of the subject. For example, while criticizing H. Ritter, he states that the latest date found in the Paris manuscript is 1141–42, whereas the year 1142–43 also appears in the text. According to Weinberger, the Istanbul manuscript contains the biographies of 1,010 muhaddiths; however, our own calculations indicate that the total number is 1,027. Nevertheless, his scholarly conclusions remain highly significant for contemporary research. Until another complete version of the work is discovered, or the original title confirmed by al-Nasafi himself is identified, Weinberger's hypothesis remains the closest to the truth.

In 1991, the Tajik scholar Lola Dodkhudoeva, apparently unaware of Weinberger's article, published a new study. In her view, the Paris manuscript consists of several components:

1. A fragment from Idrisi's *Kitāb al-Kamāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl bi-Samarqand* (d. 1015);
2. A supplement by Abu Hafs al-Nasafi.

According to Dodkhudoeva, the manuscript combines these two works and was reworked in the twelfth century by Abu al-Faḍl Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi, who gave it the title *Qandiya*. In subsequent centuries, this abridged version—*Kichik Qandiya* (“Little Qandiya”)—was repeatedly revised by various authors, making it impossible to reconstruct the original Arabic text (Dodkhudoeva, 1991: 35).

The article also conflates the Persian work *Qandiya-yi Khurd* (“Little Qandiya”) with the Arabic composition *Muntakhab Kitāb al-Kand* (“A Selection from *Kitāb al-Kand*”), treating them as if they were the same text.

Professor Y. Paul, likewise unaware of J. Weinberger's study, independently compared the Paris and Turkish manuscripts and in 1993 published his article entitled “*Histories of Samarqand*.” In this study, he argued that the Istanbul manuscript represents part of the original work of Abu Hafs al-Nasafi, *Kitāb al-Kand*, while the Paris manuscript is an abridged—though in certain places even expanded—reworking by Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi.

With regard to the Persian work *Qandiya*, Paul offered several valuable observations. He suggested that, until the discovery of a complete version of *Kitāb al-Kand*, it may be assumed that its preface served as the basis for the Persian translation (in his article, for reasons unclear, this text is referred to as the “Arabic Qandiya”). In addition, Paul sought to develop methodological approaches for using *Kitāb al-Kand* as a source for the study of the political history of Central Asia, the processes of Islamization, the role of the ghazis, and the relationship between scholars and political authorities (Paul, 1993: 69–92).

After learning of the Istanbul manuscript, the publisher Nazar Muhammad al-Faryabi hastily issued an edition of it in 1991, without fully taking into account the existing scholarly research on the subject. As a result, a broader readership gained access to the work. However, the edition suffers from serious shortcomings. The most significant of these is that the Istanbul version was not collated at all with the Paris manuscript. Consequently, a number of unclear or incomplete words and phrases were printed incorrectly—errors that could have been corrected on the basis of the Paris copy. For example, instead of *wali* (“governor”), the text reads *wa ilo*; instead of *malik*, it reads *halik*; instead of *la-yahirranna*, it reads *la-yahizzanna*, and so forth.

Moreover, the information contained on folios 70b and 71a of the manuscript—namely, the biographies of six scholars—was entirely omitted from the edition, although, for unknown reasons, these names are included in the book’s index (*al-Fihrist*). The omitted figures are:

1. ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Ali al-Jawbaki al-Nasafi;
2. ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Ali ibn ‘Isa al-Nasafi;
3. Abu’l-Qasim ‘Abd Allah ibn Muhammad al-Samarqandi al-Bakhtari;
4. Abu’l-Qasim ‘Abd Allah ibn Abi Salih al-Nishaburi;
5. Abu Muhammad ‘Abd Allah ibn Ahmad al-Samarqandi;
6. Abu Bakr ‘Abd Allah ibn Abi Nasr al-Tarazi.

As a result, beginning with biography no. 365, discrepancies arose between the numbers assigned to the biographies in the main text and the sequential numbers given in the index of the edition. Owing to the omission of pages, the text at the end of folio 70a was directly joined to the text at the beginning of folio 71b. Consequently, the isnād and biography of Abu Muhammad ‘Abd Allah ibn Abi Bakr al-Jawbaki al-Nasafi were mistakenly merged with the isnād and hadith transmitted by Abu Bakr ‘Abd Allah ibn Abi Nasr al-Tarazi. A similar error occurred in the case of Abu’l-Hasan ‘Ali ibn Hasan: his separate biography was omitted, and his isnād was incorrectly attached to the preceding biography of Abu’l-Hasan ‘Ali ibn Mittu.

In addition, al-Faryabi incorrectly vocalized (supplied diacritical marks to) a number of Central Asian technical terms, personal names, and toponyms, leading to erroneous readings. For example, instead of *dihqān* the text reads *dahuqān*; instead of *Khushnām*, *Khawashnām*; instead of *al-Marghinani*, *al-Marghaynani*, and so forth.

The serious shortcomings and omissions of this edition have underscored the necessity of preparing a fully scholarly critical edition of *Kitāb al-Kand* in the future. By comparing the biographies from the chapter “‘Ayn” preserved in the Paris manuscript, a number of errors in the Istanbul manuscript could be corrected and incorporated into a critical text. Indeed, the Turkish manuscript of *Kitāb al-Kand* contains numerous significant scribal mistakes introduced by the copyist (*nāsikh*).

In 1999, the Lebanese scholar Yusuf al-Hadi attempted to produce a critical edition of *Kitāb al-Kand*. In preparing this edition, he used both the Istanbul and Paris manuscripts. However, being unaware of the well-substantiated conclusions of J. Weinberger and Y. Paul—that the Paris manuscript is the sole copy of *Muntakhab Kitāb al-Kand* by Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi—he rejected these findings. The new edition included detailed indices (*fihrist*s) of personal names, geographical locations, historical events, and other data, which made the work more accessible and user-friendly. Nevertheless, this edition also suffers from substantial shortcomings.

Above all, it must be emphasized that in this so-called critical edition two independent works—*al-Kand* and *Muntakhab*—were combined and published under the single title *Kitāb al-Kand fī Dhikr ‘Ulamā’ Samarqand*, without due consideration of Western scholarship. In fact, these are two distinct and independent works: the Istanbul manuscript represents the original *Kitāb al-Kand*, whereas the Paris manuscript is the only known copy of *Muntakhab*.

In addition, several biographies preserved in the Paris manuscript were not included in the Tehran edition:

1. The complete biography of Abu Ahmad Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Nasafi (d. 1009) (Abu al-Faḍl Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Jalil al-Samarqandi: 73b–74a);
2. The complete biography of Abu Nasr Ahmad ibn ‘Ali ibn Muhammad al-Kufi al-Nasafi (d. 1013);
3. Part of the biography of Abu Nasr Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Bakar al-Rohibi al-Nasafi (d. 1035);
4. A missing portion of the biography of Abu Nasr Ahmad ibn ‘Ali ibn Tahir al-Jawbaki al-Nasafi (d. 951–52).

Yusuf al-Hadi maintains that folios 73b and 74a of the manuscript were lost. However, the loss of only the verso sides of these two folios is highly improbable. It is more likely that the editor worked not with the original manuscript itself, but with a copy in which certain folios were already missing.

Due to the incomplete collation of the two manuscripts, the section “‘Ayn” entirely omits two names added by Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Jalil that are absent from the Turkish manuscript:

1. Abu Ahmad ‘Abd al-Mu‘min ibn ‘Abd al-Karim al-Samarqandi al-Hakim;
2. Abu Ahmad ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Samarqandi al-Hakim.

Furthermore, the edition contains individual inaccuracies. For example, in the biography of al-Sayyid al-Imam Abu‘l-Muzaffar Qasim ibn Abi Shuja‘, the scholar’s name was published as al-Imam Muzaffar ibn Qasim, although the manuscript itself records it correctly (Abu Hafs ‘Umar ibn Muhammad al-Nasafi: 195b).

In 2001, *Kitāb al-Kand* was translated into Uzbek in abridged form by Usmonkhan Temurkhon o‘g‘li and Bakhtiyor Nabikhon o‘g‘li and published in a popular format. As a result, a broad Uzbek-speaking readership gained at least partial access to the contents of this work. However, the translation was based on the Turkish edition prepared by Nazar Muhammad al-Faryabi, and thus the errors contained in that edition were reproduced in the Uzbek version as well.

Moreover, the translation omitted the isnāds of the hadiths, which are of crucial importance for scholarly research. Such abridgment significantly diminishes the academic value of the Uzbek publication. The edition also contains a number of specific inaccuracies. For example, the nisba of Ahmad ibn Nasr al-Ataki is rendered as “al-Atki.”

In the same passage, the phrase *rawā ‘anhu Aḥmad...*, meaning “Ahmad transmitted [a hadith] from Abu Mu‘adh Khalid ibn Sulayman al-Balkhi,” was incorrectly translated as “according to Ahmad regarding (Abu Mu‘adh)...,” which distorts the technical meaning of transmission terminology.

At the end of the introduction, the statement that “this manuscript dates to the eleventh century and consists of 98 folios” contains two major errors. First, Abu Hafs al-Nasafi lived primarily in the twelfth century, and most of the scholars mentioned in his work also belonged to that period; therefore, the manuscript cannot be dated to the eleventh century. Second, the Turkish version of the work consists not of 98, but of 198 folios (Abu Hafs ‘Umar ibn Muhammad al-Nasafi: 198b).

In summary, this translation should be regarded as a popular edition intended for general readers rather than as a work designed for academic purposes.

Based on the analysis of all manuscripts and editions of *Kitāb al-Kand*, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The manuscript held under number 70 in the *Turhan Valide* collection of the *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi* in Istanbul is an incomplete version of Abu Hafs al-Nasafi’s work *Kitāb al-Kand fī Ma‘rifat ‘Ulamā’ Samarqand*.
2. The manuscript held under number 6284 in the Arabic manuscript collection of the National Library of Paris (*Bibliothèque Nationale*) is the *Muntakhab* (“Selection”), compiled by Abu Hafs al-Nasafi’s student Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Jalil by abridging *Kitāb al-Kand*, occasionally adding new material, and rearranging the sequence of biographies.
3. The edition published in 1991 by Nazar Muhammad al-Faryabi, despite certain errors and shortcomings, can generally be considered reliable in its overall approach, as it issued one work separately without mixing it with others.
4. In the edition prepared by Yusuf al-Hadi, although some errors of the previous edition were corrected, two distinct works were combined under a single title, which constitutes a scholarly error.

Based on these conclusions, it is advisable to prepare separate critical editions of each of these two manuscripts. In the present study, taking the aforementioned shortcomings into account, both the Faryabi edition (Saudi Arabia) and the al-Hadi edition (Tehran) were used in some cases.

Where errors were detected in the printed editions, direct consultation of the manuscripts was necessary.

Abu Hafis al-Nasafi's works—*Kitāb al-Kand* and *Muntakhab*—contain biographies of 1,232 scholars from Transoxiana, active in various areas of religious and intellectual life between the eighth and twelfth centuries. The works primarily include the names of scholars who were connected in some way with the city of Samarqand—those born, living, working, or deceased there, or those who influenced the city's spiritual life. However, the works also provide biographies of scholars associated with other cities and villages, such as Dabusiyya, Kushaniya, Kish, and Nasaf. As noted, the author intended not only to compile a reference work on Samarqand but also a biographical dictionary of muhaddiths throughout the Sogd–Samarqand region.

More than 950 hadiths included in these works reflect various aspects of the spiritual life of Samarqand—its theology, morality, politics, legislation, and value systems. *Kitāb al-Kand* is therefore an important and valuable source for understanding the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere of Transoxiana, especially Samarqand, and the development of hadith scholarship from the eighth to the twelfth centuries.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Abu Hafis al-Nasafi's *Kitāb al-Kand* represents a unique biobibliographical dictionary, containing detailed biographies of scholars from Transoxiana who made significant contributions to the development of Islamic science, education, and spiritual life in the region. The hadiths included in this work are not merely a collection of sayings but constitute a valuable source for reconstructing the spiritual, cultural, and ethical framework of Muslim society in Central Asia between the eighth and twelfth centuries.

The comparative study of the manuscript versions, along with a critical analysis of scholarly approaches to their examination, highlights the importance of *Kitāb al-Kand* both for source studies and for understanding the intellectual and religious traditions of the region. Issues of textual analysis, the identification of authorial characteristics, and methods of knowledge transmission are particularly relevant in this context.

Thus, the work functions not only as a reference for individual scholars but also as a rich resource for a comprehensive study of the history of Islamic culture, social institutions, knowledge transmission, and the formation of the spiritual environment of Samarqand and Transoxiana as a whole. The study and future publication of *Kitāb al-Kand*, employing modern philological and historical-cultural approaches, will open new avenues for exploring the spiritual heritage of Central Asia and its contributions to the broader Muslim civilization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Jalīl al-Samarqandī. *Muntakhab Kitāb al-Qand*. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Arabic Manuscripts Collection, MS no. 6284, 75 fols.

Abū Ḥafis ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad al-Nasafī. *al-Qand fī maʿrifat ʿulamāʾ Samarkand*. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, “Turhan Valide Sultan” Collection, MS no. 70, 198 fols.

Bloch, E. (1925). *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes des nouvelles acquisitions*. Paris. – P. 227.

Frye, R. N. (1953). City Chronicles of Central Asia and Khurasan: A History of Nasaf? *Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*, - Istanbul. – P. 166–168.

Paul, J. (1993). The Histories of Samarqand. *Studia Iranica*, 22. – P. 69–92.

Ritter, H. (1950). Arabische Handschriften in Anatolien und Istanbul. *Oriens*, 3, 51.

Sezgin, F. (1967). *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* (T. I). Leiden: Brill. – P. 935.

Toğan, A. Z. V. (1950). *Tarihde Usul*. İstanbul. – P. 207.

Бартольд, В. В. (1963). *Туркестан в эпоху монгольского нашествия*. В В. В. Бартольд, *Сочинения* (Т. I). Москва: Издательство восточной литературы. – С. 760.

Додхудоева, Л. (1991). Малоизвестная рукопись XIV в. по истории городов Мавераннахра. *Известия Академии наук Таджикской ССР. Серия: Востоковедение, история, филология*, № 3 (23), – С. 31–36.

Кандия Малая. (1906). Перевод краткой редакции на персидском языке арабского труда Абу Хафса Наджмеддина Умара б. Мухаммед ан-Насафи ас-Самарканди. Предисловие и примечания переводчика В. Л. Вяткина. *Справочная книжка Самаркандской области*, Вып. 8, - Самарканд. – С. 236–290.

Уватов, У. (1994). *Самарқанд уламолари. В Донолардан сабоқлар*. Ташкент: Абдулла Қодирий номидаги халқ мероси нашриёти. – Б. 62–65.

REFERENCES

Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Jalīl al-Samarqandī. *Muntakhab Kitāb al-Qand [The Selected Book of al-Qand]*. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Arabic Manuscripts Collection, MS no. 6284, 75 fols. (In Arabic).

Abū Ḥafs ‘Umar ibn Muḥammad al-Nasafī. *al-Qand fī ma‘rifat ‘ulamā’ Samarkand [The Book of al-Qand on the Knowledge of the Scholars of Samarkand]*. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, “Turhan Valide Sultan” Collection, MS no. 70, 198 fols. (In Arabic)

Barthold, V. V. (1963). *Turkestan v epohu mongolskogo nashestiya. [Turkestan in the Era of the Mongol Invasion]*. V.V. Barthold, *Sochineniya* (T. I). Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury. – S. 760. (In Russian).

Bloch, E. (1925). *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes des nouvelles acquisitions*. Paris. – P. 227. (In English).

Dodxudoyeva, L. (1991). *Maloizvestnaia rukopis' XIV v. po istorii gorodov Maverannakhra [A Little-Known 14th-Century Manuscript on the History of the Cities of Mawarannahr]*. *Izvestiia Akademii nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR. Seriya: Vostokovedenie, istoriia, filologiya*, № 3 (23), – С. 31–36. (In Russian).

Frye, R. N. (1953). *City Chronicles of Central Asia and Khurasan: A History of Nasaf? Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*, - Istanbul. – P. 166–168. (In English).

Kandiya Malaya. *[The Short Version of al-Qand]*. (1906). *Perevod kratkoi redaktsii na persidskom iazyke arabskogo truda Abu Khafsa Nadzhmeddina Umara b. Mukhammad an-Nasafi as-Samarkandi. Predislovie i primechaniia perevodchika V. L. Viatkina. Spravochnaia knizhka Samarkandskoi oblasti*, Vip. 8, - Samarkand. – S. 236–290. (In Russian).

Paul, J. (1993). *The Histories of Samarqand. Studia Iranica*, 22, – P. 69–92. (In English).

Ritter, H. (1950). *Arabische Handschriften in Anatolien und Istanbul. Oriens*, 3, 51. (In English).

Sezgin, F. (1967). *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums [History of Arabic Literature]*. (T. I). Leiden: Brill. – P. 935. (In German).

Toğan, A. Z. V. (1950). *Tarihde Usul. [Methodology in History]*. İstanbul. – P. 207. (In Turkish).

Uvatov, U. (1994). *Samarkand ulamolari [The Scholars of Samarkand] Donolardan saboqlar. Toshkent: Abdulla Qodiriy nomidagi xalq merosi nashriyoti*. – B. 62–65. (In Uzbek).