

instance, describes it in connection with al-Zubayr b. Bakkar's *Djamhara*, i, 105, 321, 379. Ibn Khaldūn, *op. cit.*, ii, 14, praises graphic representation in tree form (with its central 'amūd "column") as providing an immediate understanding of genealogical relationships; the Bülāk edition reproduces these trees in print.

The Muslim approach to the eternal debate about the greater worth, for society and individual, of either noble descent or personal qualities is succinctly expressed by *ḥasab wa-nasab* [q.v.]. The two words were originally allied, since noble descent and noble qualities were celebrated in Arabia as inseparable for true glory. In Islam, they tended to split into contrasting concepts, *nasab* being defined as nobility by parentage and *ḥasab* as nobility in character and deeds; the lexicographers' arbitrary re-interpretation of a verse by al-Mutallammi (ed. Vollers, no. I, v. 2) as embodying the contrast is typical for the process (al-Azhari, *Tahdhīb*, iv, 329a = LA). Islam distinctly preferred the egalitarian view (and the religious attitude later found firm support in philosophical ethics). In Qur'ān, XLIX, 13, the statement declaring the best person to be the one most pious followed upon a recommendation of "mutual acquaintance", something later understood as the core of *nasab* relationship; ignorance of *nasab* ultimately means exclusion from humanity (e.g. *ʿIqd*, iii, 312). The reputed radical proponents of equality, the *Shu'ūbiyya*/Ahl al-taswiya, supposedly argued that "human beings differ in worth not through ancestors and *aḥsāb* but through their deeds and character qualities, their personal nobility and highmindedness" (*ʿIqd*, iii, 410, cf. Mottahedeh, *loc. cit.*). The continuing debate on the topic is marked by speculations such as that of al-Kindī's pupil al-Sarakhsī who, as befits a courtier, favours the view that noble ancestry plus outstanding achievement constitutes double nobility, while lack of personal achievement vitiates ancestral distinction (al-Tawhīdī, *Baṣāʾir*, ed. Kāḍī, ix, 198 ff.), and it is, for instance, illustrated by al-Rāghib, *Muḥāḍarāt*, Bülāk 1286-7, i, 208 ff., where it is seen as a matter strictly concerning individuals and is no longer tribally oriented; noble descent has its advantages, but individual worth is decisive and may even compensate for ancestral misdeeds.

The importance of blood lines in animals such as horses and racing pigeons was well-known, and treatises were written on them [see *HAMAM* and *KHAYL*]. G. Levi Della Vida's standard edition of Ibn al-Kalbī's *Nasab al-khayl* (*Les "livres des chevaux"*, Leiden 1928) has been followed by more recent printings (Cairo 1948; Beirut 1407/1987); see also Sezgin, *GAS*, viii, 128, 272.

**Bibliography:** For the early *ansāb* literature, see *Fihrist*, 89-115; Marzubānī, *Nūr al-kabas*, Wiesbaden 1964, ed. R. Sellheim, 347 ff. For tribal lore and history, F. Wüstenfeld's *Genealogische Tabellen der arabischen Stämme und Familien*, Göttingen 1853-4, has been superseded by W. Caskel, *Ġamharat an-nasab. Das genealogische Werk des Hišām Ibn al-Kalbī*, Leiden 1966, the most complete treatment of tribal genealogy and, in its introduction, the best treatment so far of the problems of Arabic genealogical literature. By its very nature, the subject comes up constantly in studies of Arab history and literature, without having as yet found the exhaustive treatment it requires, but cf., for instance, Goldziher, *Muh. St.*, i, 177-207, Eng. tr. C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern, London 1967, i, 164-90; Bishr Farès, *L'honneur chez les Arabes*, Paris 1932, 81-8; S.D. Goitein's introd. to his edition of Balā-

*dhurī*, *Ansāb*, v, Jerusalem 1936; F. Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim historiography*<sup>2</sup>, Leiden 1968, 95-100; ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Dūrī, *Baḥṭh fī nashʾat ʿilm al-taʾrīkh ʿind al-ʿArab*, Beirut 1960, 39-43, Eng. tr. L.I. Conrad, Princeton 1983, 50-4; Sezgin, *GAS*, i, 244-8, 256 ff., ii, 36 ff. (F. ROSENTHAL)

**NASAF** [see *NAKHSAB*].

**AL-NASAFĪ**, the *nisba* of several religious figures and scholars from Nasaf or *Nakhsab* [q.v.] in the environs of Bukhārā (see al-Samʿānī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥaydarābād, xiii, 92-4).

I. ABU ʿL-HASAN MUḤAMMAD B. AḤMAD AL-BAZDAWĪ OR AL-BAZDAHĪ (i.e. from the village of Bazda near Nasaf), distinguished philosopher-theologian of the Ismāʿīlīs in Sāmānīd *Khurāsān* and Transoxania, who is generally credited with the introduction of Neo-Platonic philosophy into Ismāʿīlī circles. He succeeded Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-Marwazī in the headship of the *dāʿwa* [q.v.] of Nishāpūr. As a *dāʿī* he travelled to Transoxania and succeeded in converting the Sāmānīd ruler Naṣr b. Aḥmad and several dignitaries of the court to the Ismāʿīlī faith. This success, however, was short lived, and the fortunes of Ismāʿīlīs were reversed when the Turkish army revolted and effected a complete reversal of policy under Naṣr's successor Nūḥ. Al-Nasafī, along with a large number of Ismāʿīlīs and their sympathisers, was massacred in 332/943. For this reason Nāṣir-i *Khuraw* calls him *Khʾwādja-yi Shahīd* and *Shaykh-i Shahīd*.

The *K. al-Maḥṣūl* was the major work of al-Nasafī wherein Neoplatonism was adapted to Ismāʿīlī doctrines. This caused a sharp reaction within Ismāʿīlī circles and raised a bitter controversy. His contemporary Abū Ḥatīm al-Rāzī [q.v.], the chief *dāʿī* of Rayy, wrote his *K. al-Isḥāḥ* to rectify the errors in the *Maḥṣūl*. He criticises al-Nasafī with regard to some of his metaphysical conclusions, such as the precedence of *kaḍāʾ* over *qadar*, the imperfect nature of emanation of the Soul from the Intellect and the dissociation of *sharʿa* from the first *Nāṭiq*, i.e. Ādam. Soon afterwards, Abū Yaʿqūb al-Sijistānī [q.v.] wrote his *K. al-Nuṣra*, in which he criticised al-Rāzī but upheld the conclusions of al-Nasafī. This, in turn, led Ḥamīd al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Kirmānī [q.v.] to compile his *K. al-Riyāḍ fī ʿl-hukm bayn al-ṣādāyīn* (i.e. *al-Isḥāḥ* and *al-Nuṣra*). The *Maḥṣūl* has not survived, but some fragments and excerpts have been preserved in other works. An attempt to reconstruct the contents of the *Maḥṣūl* from those fragments is a desideratum. Two manuscripts, entitled *K. Kayfiyyat kaww al-ʿālam*, to be found in private Ismāʿīlī collections in India, are ascribed to al-Nasafī.

**Bibliography:** The main sources about al-Nasafī's activities are Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, ed. Riḍā Tadjaddud, Tehran 1971, 239-40; Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyyāsat-nāma*, ed. H. Darke, Tehran 1962, 267-75; These were studied by S.M. Stern, *The early Ismāʿīlī missionaries in North-West Persia and in Khurāsān and Transoxania*, in *BSOAS*, xxii (1960), 78-80. For a full description of his works and sources, see Ismail Poonawala, *Biobibliography of Ismāʿīlī literature*, Malibu, Calif. 1977, 40-43.

(I. POONAWALA)

II. ABU ʿL-MUʿĪN MAYMŪN B. MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD... B. MAḤMŪL... AL-HANAFĪ AL-MAḤMŪLĪ (d. 508/1114), one of the *mutakallimūn* [see *KALĀM*] whose scholastic position is representative of the early period as represented by ʿAbd al-Kāhīr al-Baghḍādī [q.v.], who is still endeavouring to find a convenient arrangement and an adequate formulation of the contents of *kalām*, and the younger *mutakallims* who have

at hand the necessary formulas for ready use. At least five works by him are known, including: 1. *Tamhīd li-kawā'id al-tawhīd* (Cairo, ms. 2417, fols. 1-30; cf. *Fihris...* *Miṣr*, ii, 51), a treatise in which the contents of the creed are proved according to the scholastic method. The first chapter consists of an exposition of the doctrine of cognition, the last of the doctrine of the imāmate. The work closes with a *murshida* which contains the *doctrina de Deo* in an abridged form; 2. *Tabṣīrat al-adilla* (Cairo, mss. 2287, 6673; cf. *Fihris...* *Miṣr*, ii, 8), an elaborate work on dogmatics of nearly the same scheme as the *Tamhīd*; 3. *Baḥr al-kalām*, printed at Cairo 1329/1911 differs from the two foregoing works in so far as it deals with heresies and is polemical. It is identical with *Mubāḥaṭhat ahl al-sunna wa 'l-djama'a ma'a 'l-firaq al-dālla wa 'l-mubtadi'a* (Leiden, cod. or. 862) as well as with *ʿAkā'id* (Berlin, no. 1941; cf. Ahlwardt, *Verzeichnis*, ii, 400). The work is preserved in several libraries under one of these titles, and Brockelmann, I<sup>2</sup>, 547, SI, 757, lists two others.

**Bibliography:** Given in the article; cf. also Hādījī Khalifa, ed. Flügel, index, no. 6453.

III. ABŪ ḤAFṢ ʿUMAR NAḌJM AL-DĪN AL-MĀTURĪDĪ (d. 537/1142), jurist and theologian. Of his works the only one edited is the *ʿAkā'id*, which has the form of a catechism. It became popular and was much commented, probably because it was the first abridged form of the creed according to the scholastic method of the new orthodoxy. In Europe it became known as early as 1843 through the edition by Cureton (*The pillar of the creed*, no. 2). For editions of and commentaries on this work as well as for the other works of this scholar that have come down to us, cf. Brockelmann, I<sup>2</sup>, 548-50, SI, 758-62.

**Bibliography:** Given in the article.

(A. J. WENSINCK)

IV. HĀFIZ AL-DĪN ABU 'L-BARAKĀT ʿABD ALLĀH B. AḤMAD B. MAḤMŪD, an important Ḥanafī legist and theologian, born in Nasaf in Sogdiana, was a pupil of Shams al-A'imma al-Kardārī (d. 642/1244-5), Hamīd al-Dīn al-Ḍarīr (d. 666/1267-8) and Badr al-Dīn Kh̲āhrazāde (d. 651/1253). He taught in the Madrasa al-Kuṭbiyya al-Sulṭāniyya in Kirmān, came in 710 to Baghdād and died in Rabīʿ I 710/August 1310 (according to Kurashī and Ibn Taghribirdī: 701) apparently on his way back to Ḍihādī (in Khūzistān), where he was buried. His pupils were Muẓaffar al-Dīn Ibn al-Saʿāʾī, author of the *Madjmaʿ al-bahrayn* (d. 694/1294-5), and Ḥusām al-Dīn al-Sighnākī, a commentator on the *Hidāya* (d. 714/1314-15) [see AL-MARGHINĀNĪ].

The best of his works is thought to be the *Kitāb al-Manār fi uṣūl al-fikḥ*, a concise account of the foundations of law (Delhi 1870, Constantinople 1326 and often later); there are numerous later commentaries, but he himself wrote two, one of which is entitled *Kashf al-asrār* (2 vols., Būlāk 1316). Out of his original plan of writing a commentary on the *Hidāya* of al-Marghinānī [q.v.] there came the law book modelled on it *Kitāb al-Wāfi*, on which he composed in 684/1285 a special commentary, the *Kitāb al-Kāfi* (delivered in lectures in Kirmān in 689/1290). He had previously prepared a synopsis of the *Wāfi* entitled *Kanz al-dakāʾik* (Cairo 1311, Lucknow 1294, 1312, etc.) which Ibn al-Saʿāʾī in 683/1284 (this is no doubt the correct reading for 633 in Kaffawī) heard him deliver in Kirmān. This synopsis was used as late as the 19th century in Damascus and at the al-Azhar in Cairo (v. Kremer, *Mittel-Syrien u. Damaskus*, Vienna 1853, 136; idem, *Egypten*, Leipzig 1863, ii, 51). The best-known printed commentaries on the *Kanz* are: (a) *Tabyīn al-*

*ḥakāʾik* of al-Zaylaʿī (d. 743/1342-3) in 6 vols., Būlāk 1313-15; (b) *Ramz al-ḥakāʾik* of al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451) in 2 vols. Būlāk 1285 and 1299; (c) *Tabyīn al-ḥakāʾik* of Mollā Miskīn al-Harawī (written in 811/1408-9), Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312; (d) *Tawfiḥ al-Rahmān* of al-Ṭāʾī (d. 1192/1778), Cairo 1307 etc.; (e) the most important: *al-Baḥr al-rāʾik* of Ibn Nuḍjāy (970/1562-3) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g. two on the *Kitāb al-Nāfiʿ* of Nāsir al-Dīn al-Samarḳandī (d. 656/1258) entitled *al-Mustafā* and *al-Manāfiʿ*; on the *Manẓūma* of Naḍjm al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī (d. 537/1442-3) on the differences of opinion between Abū Ḥanīfa, his two pupils, and al-Shāfiʿī and Mālik entitled *al-Mustafā*, as well as a synopsis entitled *al-Muṣaffā* (finished on 20 Shaʿbān 670/22 March 1272); cf. Brockelmann, I<sup>2</sup>, 550, S I, 761; also on the *Muntakhab fi uṣūl al-dīn* of al-Akhsikātī (d. 644/1246-7; Ibn Taghribirdī, Hādījī Khalifa, no. 13095). On the other hand, he did not write a commentary on the *Hidāya*, as Ibn Kuṭlūbughā and Hādījī Khalifa, vi, 484, say (cf. the story of the origin of his *Wāfi* according to al-Itkānī (d. 758/1357) in Hādījī Khalifa, vi, 419). He also wrote a commentary on the *Kurʾān*, *Madārik al-tanzīl wa ḥakāʾik al-taʾwīl* (printed in 2 vols., Bombay 1279, Cairo 1306, 1326).

His confession of faith *al-ʿUmda fi uṣūl al-dīn* (apparently also called *al-Manār fi uṣūl al-dīn*: Kurashī, Ibn Dukmāk) became known quite early in Europe from Cureton's edition (*Pillar of the creed*, London 1843). In it he closely follows the *ʿAkāida* of Naḍjm al-Dīn al-Nasafī (see III. above) and also wrote a special commentary on it, *al-Iʿtimād fi 'l-iʿtikād*.

**Bibliography:** The following borrow from the same unknown source: Kurashī, *al-Djawāhir al-mudī'a*, Haydarābād 1332, i, 270; Ibn Dukmāk, *Naẓm al-djūmān fi tabakāt aṣḥāb al-nuʿmān*, ms. Berlin, Pet. ii, 24, fol. 147b; Ibn Kuṭlūbughā, *Tādj al-tarādjīm*, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1862, no. 86; Ibn Taghribirdī, *al-Manhal al-sāfi*, Ms. Paris, Bibl. Nat., Arabe 2071, fol. 16a. Also Kaffawī, *Iʿlām al-Akhyār*, ms. Berlin, Sprenger 301, fols. 282a-283b (extract: Laknawī, *al-Fawā'id al-bahiyya*, Cairo 1324, 101); Hādījī Khalifa, *Kashf al-zunūn*, ed. Flügel, index; Flügel, *Classen d. hanafit. Rechtsgelehrten*, Leipzig 1860, 276, 323, where the date of death is wrongly given; Brockelmann, II<sup>2</sup>, 250-3, S II, 263-8; Sarkis, *Dictionnaire de bibliogr. arabe*, col. 1852-3; N.P. Aghnides, *Mohammedan theories of finance*, New York 1916, 176, 181.

(W. HEFFENING)

AL-NASĀ'Ī, ABŪ ʿABD AL-RAḤMĀN AḤMAD B. ʿALĪ B. SHUʿAYB B. BAḤR B. SINĀN, author of one of the six canonical collections of traditions [see ḤADĪTH], b. 215/830, d. 303/915. Very little is known about him. He is said to have made extensive travels in order to hear traditions, to have settled in Egypt, afterwards in Damascus, and to have died in consequence of ill-treatment to which he was exposed at Damascus or, according to others, at Ramla, in consequence of his feelings in favour of ʿAlī and against the Umayyads. On account of this unnatural death he is called a martyr. His tomb is at Mecca. Al-Nasā'ī's collection of traditions is divided into 51 chapters, each of which is subdivided into *bābs*. As to the subjects, considerable space is given to traditions dealing with the ceremonial duties (*ʿibādāt*); the chapters *ihbās*, *nahl*, *rukba* and *ʿumra* (forms of bequest, donation etc.) do not occur in any of the other collections, although a part of the materials contained in them appears under different heads. On the other hand, chapters on eschatology (*fitan*, *kiyāma*, etc.), on the recounting of